DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO STUDYING LEGAL DISCOURSE

Raxmatova Bahora Ibodulla qizi
Teacher of Western languages Department at Oriental University
raxmatovabahorai@gmail.com +998900229660

Annotation. *The article discusses the problems and perspectives of studying legal discourse. A review of the literature on the study of legal discourse is given. Problems such as the lack of a clear unity in the definition of legal discourse, its various causes, typological and genre classification, and the used research methods are discussed. Various approaches to the study of legal discourse are emphasized, special attention is paid to the integral approach. The typology of legal speech and its genres are analyzed within the paradigm of communicative activity.*

Key words: *legal discourse, integral approach, typology, genre.*

The versatility of legal discourse is evidenced not only by its numerous features, but also by the variety of approaches to its study, each of which tries to reveal the essence of legal discourse from one or more aspects. In addition to the sociolinguistic approach, legal discourse is studied from the perspective of pragmalinguistics, cognitive science, linguocultural science, linguosemiotics, lexical semantics, psycholinguistics, functional linguistics, discourse analysis, legal linguistics, etc. moves.

Two or more approaches, the most studied of which are the sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic aspects of legal discourse.

Communicative and pragmatic aspects of legal discourse are also V.V. Zaitseva believes that interrogative speech is aimed at a comprehensive study of its cognitive, pragmalinguistic and linguistic aspects.

L. E. Popova examines legal discourse from the point of view of semantic, pragmatic, and interpretative approaches, and long pushes the integrity of such an approach to the diversity of the facts of legal discourse activity [22].

M.N. Fedulova also studies legal discourse from the point of view of criteria of pragmasemantic conditionality of linguistic tools [30]. The research is aimed at determining the discursive and metalinguistic functions of lexical units in the legal text in their interdependence. The diversity of approaches in the study of legal discourse inevitably leads to its different definitions.

According to this model, language and linguistic units, including text and speech, can be represented as entities or phenomena spread across four sectors.

Four aspects of language are distinguished: knowledge (thought - consciousness), language as a subject (system and linguistic material), culture and social space, which correspond to four sectors of language in an integrated scope: cognitive, linguistic, cultural and social. The units of these sectors are interconnected and interdependent and are activated in the process of communicative activity.

The integrated approach combines different points of view on the object of research for its integrated, multifaceted, voluminous presentation. The components of an integrated approach are a set of independent methods that combine in common. When describing the studied object, it has an idea that allows to determine their relationship and interdependence and, ultimately, to determine the integrity of the object. This approach corresponds to the modern multipolar paradigm of language learning and is considered acceptable for research.

According to L.A. Borisova, there is no single typology of legal discourse, and the identification of types of legal discourse depends on the criteria based on the classification and the scientific direction used by the researcher. As some researchers have pointed out [27], the basis for classifying speech as legal is non-linguistic reality in the form of the legal field of activity, which is divided into different legal fields. Law is defined as a set of standards of equality and justice, recognized in a certain society and provided with formal protection, regulating the struggle and coordination in the interaction of free will [19, p. 15]. Classification of legal fields is carried out on a number of bases, such as purpose (material and procedural branches), subject unit (primary, secondary, complex branches), regulation of relations (public law, private law) and others. Each of these large branches is divided into smaller branches, for example, public law as a subsystem of law that regulates relations that provide public (national) interests, constitutional (electoral), administrative, municipal, criminal, financial, arbitration, international, etc. includes. Private law includes sub-sectors such as civil, family, banking, labor, commercial and other types of law [37].

It can be seen that the verbalization of legal activity and legal relations takes place in the process of communication, that is, in the process of discursive activity. The most important thing is to know and understand the legal activities that are carried out with the help of this or that field of law and form the basis of communication. The typology based on legal fields seems very logical in terms of its substantive basis. As mentioned above, most researchers identify legislative and judicial types of legal discourse, which clearly correspond to its strategies. Identifying such types of oral and written legal discourse [4] is determined by the communication channel and, in our opinion, is related to the parameters of the

communication situation. Legal documents belong to genres rather than types such as speech, legal documents, legal advice [4, 20].

As mentioned above, a number of linguists agree with the general opinion that, from the point of view of sociolinguistics, legal discourse is a special type of institutional discourse that represents communication within a certain framework of status-role relations. However, V.I. Karasik, it is very difficult to completely abstract from the personal element in institutional discourse, because "the contrast between personal and institutional discourse is a research method. In fact, we rarely encounter completely impersonal communication" [9, p. 10]. A.V. Bogatyrev has the same point of view. According to Bogatyrev, this is due to the high level of saturation of the law.

An important feature of intertextual text elements, legal discourse is the coexistence of institutional and personal principles in it [3]. The same idea about the existence of institutional and personal principles in legal discourse was expressed by O.V. Kosonogov puts forward. Therefore, it is not strictly necessary to connect the legal discourse only to the relative-institutional speech, because some of its texts are not formed without expressing the personal beginning of the author, that is, without relying only on the communicative and moral laws of the jurisprudential institution. However, it is clear that leadership is an institutional feature in this dichotomy for legal discourse.

It is known that V.I. Karasik, within the framework of the aforementioned sociolinguistic approach to discourse analysis, proposes to distinguish institutional discourse on the basis of two features that constitute the system, such as goals and actors. To describe a specific type of institutional speech, V.I. Karasik suggests considering the following components: 1) participants; 2) chronotope; 3) goals; 4) values (including the basic concept); 5) strategies; 6) material (topic); 7) types and genres; 8) precedent (cultural) texts; 9) discursive formulas. L.A. In Borisova's case. examines these components in detail in relation to legal discourse [4]. The author emphasizes the following: 1) the form of common participants of the legal discourse is the state represented by its representatives and citizens; 2) chronotope of legal speech setting of legal speech: parliament, courtroom, legal advice, etc.; 3) the purpose of legal speech is to resolve legal relations. The functions of legal discourse are closely related to the goal, they are regulatory, executive and informative, interpretive, gathering presentation, code, instruction, argumentative, declarative [16, 20, 35]; 4) the values of legal speech are the basic concepts of "law" and "law" [12, 22]; 5) The strategies of the legal discourse are also determined by its purpose and consist of formation, application and formation, 6)

the topics of the legal discourse are diverse and determined by the areas of law in which legal relations are regulated; 7) genre differentiation of legal discourse differs from its classification into types and subtypes. The author explains this by the different content and criteria that researchers have included in the concept of "genre". 8) L.A. Borisova's legal texts include the texts of the country's Constitution, codes, international declarations and conventions, which are popular not only among experts, but also among ordinary people. 9) discursive formulas in legal speech are diverse, each genre of legal speech is characterized by a set of specific formulas [4].

K.A. Petruk, the features that make up the system of legal discourse are as follows: 1) time and place specific to legal dialogue;

2) purpose (regulating the activities of the social system, regulating social relations, ensuring certain freedoms and obligations, ensuring the compliance of the social system with the prevailing values and ideals);

3) values expressed in basic concepts (law, justice);

4) strategies (identification, regulation, regulation, control, organization) [21].

Conclusion. Defining and modeling legal discourse within an integrated approach are promising tasks for our further research. The study of legal discourse, as mentioned above, is carried out on the materials of legal texts. With an integrated approach, the legal text is considered in all its cognitive, linguistic, cultural, social and communicative aspects. Any legal text belongs to a certain genre of legal speech, so the issue of typology of this type of speech genres is very relevant.

REFERENCE

1.Balamakova A.V. Kommunikativno-pragmaticheskaja interpretacija intonacii voprositel'nogo vyskazyvanija v ustnom juridicheskom diskurse:avtoref. dis. … kand. filol. nauk [Communicative and Pragmatic Interpretation of Questions in Spoken Legal Discourse: abstract of cand. sci. diss.]. Ivanovo, 2010, 24 p.
2. Bahtin M.M. Sobranie sochinenij: v 7 t. Raboty 1940-h – nachala 1960-h godov [Collected]
Vol. 5. Works of the 1940s – early 1960s]. Moscow, Russkie Slovari Publ., 1997, pp. 159–160.
3. Bogatyrev A.V. Funkcionirovanie figur interteksta v sovremennom juridicheskom diskurse: avtoref. di kand. filol. nauk [Functioning of Intertext Figures in Modern Legal Discourse: abstract of cand. sci. diss.]. Volgograd, 2016, 26 p.

4. Borisova L.A. [Legal Discourse: Main Characteristics]. Jazyk, kommunikacija i social'naja sreda [Language, Communication, Social Environment]. Voronezh, 2016, pp. 133–151. (in Russ.)
5. Bujanova L.Ju. [Cognitive-Semantic and Social Potential of Lawmaking and Lawenforcement Language: Achievements, Problems and Perspectives]. Sb. nauchn. tr. [Collection of Scientific Papers]. Krasnodar, Izd-vo,KubGU, 2003, pp. 24–33 (32).
6. Golev N.D. [Legal Aspect of the Language from a Linguisitic Point of View]. Jurislingvistika-1. Problemy i perspektivy [Legal Linguistics-1. Problems and Perspectives]. Barnaul, 1999, pp. 11–58. (in Russ.)
7.Zajceva V.V. Kognitivnye, kommunikativno-pragmaticheskie i jazykovye osobennosti doprosa v juridicheskom diskurse: avtoref. dis. kand. filol. nauk[Cognitive, Communicative-Pragmatic and Linguistic Peculiaritiesof Interrogation in Legal Discourse: abstract of cand. sci. diss.]. Tambov, 2011