POLITICAL DISCOURSE'S CHARACTERISTICS AND ELEMENTS

Lobar Zokirova

JSPU

lobarzokirova@mail.ru

Abstract: *This article is dedicated to the that political discourse in a limited sense implies an institutional approach. Political discourse is implemented using linguistic tools, but it also involves extra linguistic elements that shape the axiological structure of communication and cognitive structures that shape the circumstances under which the discourse can even exist. The definition of political discourse can be broken down into two main categories: narrow and broad. In our opinion, because of the discourse's nature, these traits are particularly relevant to the discourse under consideration.*

Keywords: *Political, discourse, linguistic, element, structure, comic, function.*

Because it is a complex unity of linguistic form, knowledge, and action, political discourse, which is an essential component of social relations, both forms and is formed by them. Political discourse is implemented using linguistic tools, but it also involves extra linguistic elements that shape the axiological structure of communication and cognitive structures that shape the circumstances under which the discourse can even exist. According to L. N. Sinelnikova, political discourse is agonizing in nature and entails a struggle for power is a place where people constantly compete for resources, including natural, human, financial, and image-related ones. People who were considered "alien" had to be made "ours" or, if necessary, relocated into that category, and any such movement had to be ideologically justified. One of the first areas to emphasize was the function of communication (text and speech) in the exercise and legitimization of power in society. R. Wodak expands on this notion by arguing that language only has power because of people. B. V. Markov, on the other hand, holds that control of human behavior through the use of language is the foundation of power. According to E. I. Sheigal power can be manifested and used through language, "Each aspect of discursive power has its own ways and means of implementation: these can be specific linguistic units, stylistic means, speech acts, or communicative moves." The definition of political discourse can be broken down into two main categories: narrow and broad.

Political discourse in a limited sense implies an institutional approach (i.e., the presence of strong ties with the institutions of political life), whereas political discourse in a broad sense is implemented in non-institutional discourse is one of the most prominent foreign linguists who follow a strict methodology in defining the limits of political discourse. Political discourse, according to A. T. Van Dayk, is "the discourse of politicians, implemented in the form of government documents, parliamentary debates, party programs, and speeches by politicians". A broad approach, known as "field," considers all texts on political topics in general as well as the speech production of politicians. While genres of reaction, which incorporate elements of political and mass media discourses, are on the periphery of the discourse, genres of the exclusively political sphere are at its core.

Researcher E. I. Sheigal points that, "political discourse" refers to any speech formations where the subject or addressee's content has anything to do with politics in his book "Semiotics of Political Discourse." According to the scientist, the struggle for power is the primary theme and driving motivation of communication in the political sphere. The degree of manipulation in this type of communication should be noted; language in political discourse is primarily used as a tool of influence (management and control). Political discourse, in E. I. Sheigal's opinion, "displays the primacy of values over facts, the predominance of influence and evaluation over informing, and the predominance of emotional over rational". Political discourse is defined by Zheltukhina as "socially-oriented communication that has the character of persuasive communication". Zheltukhina studies the specifics of speech impact and the suggestiveness of mass media discourse. Political text authors' ideologies should be taken into account, Political discourse is a particular variety of ideological discourse, according to Yu. A. Sorokin, who views it as having a unique existence and functioning. The researcher sees a difference between them in the way the pragmatic task is expressed because, in his opinion, pragmatic meanings are expressed explicitly in political discourse while they are concealed and take on an implicit nature in ideological discourse. The author classifies political discourse as a sub discourse and ideological discourse as a meta discourse in light of this opposition. When it comes to the state ideology that aims to justify the current order, such a discourse interpretation is particularly pertinent. The following antinomies of political discourse are identified by A. P. Chudinov in his book "Political Linguistics": rituality and informative; institutional and personal character; esoteric and public; reductionism and multidimensionality of information in a political text; authorship and anonymity of the political text; inter textual and autonomy of the political text; aggressiveness and tolerance.

By discussing the properties of political discourse in contemporary humanities, we can generalize the fundamental discourse-forming characteristics of that discourse. According to the literature on political discourse and the definitions above, political discourse is characterized by communicativeness, evaluative, and aggressiveness, as well as thematic certainty (important socio-political topics). The ideological component that underpins the conflicting confrontation of the parties comes to the forefront in contemporary political discourse. E. A. Linnas considered the political discourse. In his analysis of the discourse under consideration, identifies the following crucial socio-cognitive traits: institutional, ideology (the core beliefs of a social group and its members), mythology as an expression of language's magical function, and conventionality, which is understood as a stereotype of behavior socially significant for achieving goals. In our opinion, because of the discourse's nature, these traits are particularly relevant to the discourse under consideration. The operation of political discourse, which is especially relevant to mass communication, will be covered in the section after this.

REFERENCES:

1. Wodak R. What CDA is About: A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments // Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis / R. Wodak, M. Meyer (eds). – London : Sage, 2001. – P. 1–14

2. Шейгал, Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса : моногр. / Е.И. Шейгал ; Волгоградск. гос. пед. ун-т. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. – с 368

3. Чудинов, А.П. Политическая лингвистика : учеб. пособие / А.П. Чудинов. – 2-е изд., испр. – М. : Флинта : Наука, 2007. – 252 с.

4. Плотникова, С.Н. Политик как конструктор дискурса реагирования / С.Н. Плотникова // Политический дискурс в России – 8. Святые без житий. – М. : МАКС Пресс, 2005. – Вып. 8. – С. 22–26

5. Желтухина, М.Р. Специфика речевого воздействия тропов в языке СМИ : дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.19 / Желтухина Марина Ростиславовна. – М., 2004. – с 35

6. Сорокин, Ю.А. Политический дискурс: попытка истолкования понятия / Ю.А. Сорокин // Политический дискурс в России. – М., 1997