

CATEGORIAL FEATURES OF POLITICAL VS. RELIGIOUS DISCOURSES: LINGUO-SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS

Natalia A. Bozhenkova¹

Pavel A. Katyshev²

Darya V. Atanova³

Raisa K. Bozhenkova⁴

Abstract: The article offers a comparative description of iconic constituents of religious and political discourses as the most complex and symbolically saturated types of institutional interaction. The research is based on a systemic multi-level analysis of the component structure of discourse in order to identify and characterize linguistic and sociocultural constants and markers of semasiologically holistic polycode practices combined by certain axiological attitudes. The methodological concept aimed at modeling institutional interactions made it possible to characterize the methods and mechanisms of explication and transformation of the iconic elements of

political/religious communication, which determine algorithms of verbal-discursive behavior. The combination of methods of discourse analysis, linguistic-cognitive projection and functional-pragmatic consideration of textual units of the mentioned spheres of communication made it possible to qualify and taxonomize the linguosemiotic components of discourse data, which, while receiving a specific refraction in a socio-communicative reality, clearly demonstrate the typological signs of a linguocultural universe. The results of the study indicate that, despite the conceptual contrast between politics and religion, these types of discursive practices have

¹ Federal State Budget Educational Institution of Higher Education - "Pushkin State Russian Language Institute"

² Federal State Budget Educational Institution of Higher Education - "Pushkin State Russian Language Institute"

³ Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education «Southwest State University»

⁴ Federal State Budgetary Institution Of Higher Professional Education - "Pushkin State Russian Language Institute"

many correlating features, which are based on a comparable similarity of content, mechanisms and methods of generating discursive constructs, correlated principles of representation of mental categories and a definite analogy of symbolic-symbolic design of a communication process.

Keywords: political discourse, religious discourse, socio-and linguocultural constants, linguocultural signs.

Scientific value

In the scientific paradigm of contemporary linguistics, where the object of research is speech communication in the context of socio-cultural structures, systematization of the conceptual foundations of various approaches of humanitarian knowledge to the analysis of the discursive practices of the new information society is the methodological key to solving many research problems. The combination of methods of discourse analysis, linguistic cognitive projection, modeling of institutional interactions and functional-pragmatic consideration of textual units of political and religious spheres of communication made it possible to qualify and taxonomy the semi-

457

sociological components of discourse data, which receives a specific refraction in the socio-communicative reality. The methodology of a comparative-typological study of verbal/non-verbal signs representing the corpus of religious and political communication can be extrapolated to other institutional interactions (both in synchronic and diachronic aspects) and become the basis for creating a model of linguosemiotic space of various mental communities.

Topicality

In the context of a modern integrated communicative reality, the problem of explication of typological mechanisms for organizing interactions, the determinants of which are the mental universals of individual/collective consciousness, occupies a special place. In this regard, the most complex and symbolically saturated types of institutional discourse are political and religious, having (with the ideological polarity of politics and religion) quite a few correlating signs of considerable interest. Comparative characterization of iconic constituents of religious and political discursive practices based on a systematic multi-level analysis of the component structure of discourse clearly

demonstrates the processes of diffusion and re-contextualization of language and speech influence techniques, which in turn makes it possible to identify new linguocultural resources of institutional communication practices and identify markers for their implementation.

Novelty

A comparative study of linguosemiotic markers of the two most important spheres of human existence, i.e. politics and religion, made it possible to substantiate the principles of modeling modern society space, identify synergistically organized mechanisms for building institutional interactions; construct algorithms for the use of verbal and non-verbal sign systems in religious and political discourses; describe axiological, semasiological and pragmatic identifiers of political and religious discursive interaction. A significant result of the work is the verification of the methodological concept of the study, the most important components of which are the multi-level ways of representing and interpreting discursive constructs (from the functional and stylistic analysis of the corpuses of political/religious texts that characterize their genre specificity, prior

458
to critical discourse analysis, the communicative tools used, social asymmetry indices, fixed by ideologically marked discursive practices in order to identify areas of possible risk communication).

Introduction

The modern era, which involves multiple non-screen forms and methods of information broadcast, determines the daily inclusion of subjects in the social interactive space, which leads to the formation of certain communication relationships and the roles of participants of one or another type of verbal interaction. As a result, the issues of the functioning of the socio-communicative system, its structural and semiotic organization, the mechanisms of education and existence of the most important social realities are of particular importance. In this regard, the decisive link in building a model of social being and the image of the world as a whole is discourse (in a broad sense, emotive-informational interaction, reflecting the connection between language and reality), since images and concepts are produced and become real only within the framework of discourses, and social interactions cannot be understood

without reference to discursive practices in which their semantic field is formed [15].

As you know, discourse is a multi-valued term for a number of disciplines exploring language, language behavior, language functioning in culture, etc. The interpretation potential of this definition is extremely wide: the concept is being developed not only in linguistics, but also in other sciences such as sociology, philosophy, political science, logic, and in different paradigms of knowledge, it is used in various meanings. In this connection, the taxonomy of the term discourse proposed by E.A. Kozhemyakin is shown below:

- formal interpretation: discourse appears as a category of natural oral or written language - a relatively complete in terms of meaning and structure, a speech work whose length varies from a syntagmatic chain of two or more statements to a meaningful piece of work (story, conversation, descriptions, instructions, lectures); this interpretation is characteristic mainly of linguistic theories proper;

- pragmatic interpretation: here the emphasis is placed on the pragmatics of the implementation of statements and

their dependence on cultural, social and psychological factors; This definition is characteristic of pragmatic theories in both linguistic and semiological, sociological and psychological research;

- critical interpretation: discourse is considered as a corpus of prescriptions, rules, requirements and their practical expression in order to rationalize, evaluate and confer a certain meaning to social facts (as a rule, a specific historical period, social community or an entire culture);

- functional interpretation: discourse refers to any way the language functions in a social context; This approach has taken a firm position in Europe and Russia in recent decades [10: 11].

In modern human science, “discourse” is a stable, socially and culturally defined tradition of human communication, in which the linguistic factor that determines the development of communicative behavior, norms of reproduction and interpretation of language constructs in social reality [15: 1], and a similar presentation of the phenomenon of discourse reflected in the work of a number of scientists. Thus, N. Fairklo considers discourse as “a language used in the process of

representing social practice that is different from a particular point of view” [16: 4]. L. J. Phillips and M. V. Jørgensen, in turn, believe that “discourse is a form of social behavior that serves to represent the social world (including knowledge, people and social relations)” [17:17]. R. Barth calls discourse “synthetic and integrating transtextual education” and highlights its properties such as functionality, processuality, relevance [1: 39]. M. Foucault believes that discourse is “a socially conditioned organization of the system of speech and action” [18: 27]. T. A. Van Dijk, analyzing models of situations as behavioral models, by discourse means “the functional part of communicative and more general social and cultural goals of social groups or individuals” [6: 21]. According to van Dijk, discourse involves the interaction between language and reality, which provides a world view and existence. S. Saranji and M. Beinham understand discourse as a way in which the language is formed and at the same time forms a sociopolitical reality [16: 5]. V.I. Karasik asserts that “discourse is a speech practice, i.e. interactive activities of the participants of communication, establishing and maintaining contact,

emotional and informational exchange, exerting influence on each other, interweaving instantly changing communicative strategies and their verbal and non-verbal incarnations in the practice of communication” [7: 18].]. O. F. Rusakova characterizes the discourse as “a complexly structured communicative-sign system with six main plans: intentional (power intentions, strategies, designs), relevant (the embodiment of power intentions in real activity, having a sign-symbolic character), virtual (recognition and understanding of meanings, values, identities), contextual (expansion of the semantic field based on sociocultural, historical and other contexts), psychological (emotional, energetic charge, content in discourse and gives it a suggestive force) and “sedimentary” (the imprint of all the plans listed above in the public consciousness and experience, in that the constructed and materialized society environment, which shapes are a reflection of the culture) [16: 5]. K.F. Sedov, abstracting from the terms conveying linguistic and textual communication, nominates discourse as “an objectively existing verbal-sign construction that accompanies the process of socially significant interaction

of people” [14: 8]. M. Chimombo and R. L. Roseberry define discourse as “an extremely complex process consisting of numerous interdependent components. It arises from mental processes intersecting, for example, with psychological, social, cultural and other aspects of life” [16: 4]⁵.

Summing up various research interpretations, we propose the following interpretation of this phenomenon: discourse is a certain dimension of the communicative space, designed as a chain/complex of statements (i.e., as a process and result of a speech act), which latently contains a multi-level system of formal elements connected by syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations, and explicates the pragmatic-ideological attitudes of the subject of the utterance, limiting the potential inexhaustibility of text values as the product of social and communicative activity. At the same time, the most important factor organizing the discursive practice is the wide societal context, which determines both the “rules of the game” (for a particular type/type of discourse) and the mechanisms for the actualization of

461

socially (and personally) significant meanings.

1. Materials and methods

The methodological concept of the research is aimed at a multidimensional study of the social issues of discursive practices and includes linguocognitive and linguoculturological vectors describing discourse, dependent on a multidimensional set of components of the sociocommunicative context. This methodology was based on both humanitarian and heuristic methods (registration, instrumental methods, modeling method; taxonomic, dynamic and explanatory description), and linguistic methods - the method of formalizing linguistic descriptions, component, contextual and categorical synchronous analysis, the method of segmentation of specific verbal phenomena (facts), followed by their generalization, abstraction and characterization of the underlying ethnomental entities, etc.

The material for the study of political discursive practices was the

⁵ Of course, this is far from an exhaustive list of interpretations of the phenomenon of *discourse*.

scripts of public speeches of representatives of the world political elite (Russia, the USA, France, Germany). The choice of subjects of political communication is due to two factors: on the one hand, the state foreign policy, taking into account the current geopolitical situation, is of increasing interest to researchers, including linguists; on the other hand, the speeches of the first persons and official representatives of the foreign affairs agencies of various countries largely shape the global political discourse, therefore, the analysis of speech products (speeches) allows building a completely objective picture of the unification and specificity of the use of communicative strategies in linguocultural universes. The second material selection criterion was the genre and thematic community of speeches, and therefore special attention was given to press releases published in official sources, briefing texts, comments and interviews that explicate the essential unity (with ambiguity of ideological positions) of the linguo-semiotic constituents of the political space (more than 500 units). As a research field of religious discourse, texts of Russian and English-speaking (Orthodox and Protestant) sermons were

chosen that have a single biblical basis, meaningfully close religious articles, prayers, theological commentaries (more than 500 units).

The integrity of the proposed model for the study of communicative interaction, focused not only on national values of society, but also on tense points of institutional communication regarding which public consciousness is manipulated, and the correlation of the volume of research material provides, according to the authors, the accuracy of the conclusions of the comparative typological analysis.

2. Results

The problem of explicating typological mechanisms for organizing communicative practice in the context of modern integrated reality, where the object of research is speech communication in the context of socio-cultural structures that determine the mental universals of individual/collective consciousness and determine the linguistic and cultural experience of the nation, occupies a special place in the scientific paradigm of modern linguistics. Multiple discursive practices as separate space-time formations are in a state of

continuous development, involving mutual influence and interdependence, interpenetration and complementarity of different discursive types and genres, each of which is determined by the thinking, behavioral, ethnocultural components of social relations in the context of world economic and political processes.

In this regard, a comparative description of linguosemiotic markers of the two most important spheres of human existence, i.e. politics and religion, made it possible to systematize the conceptual foundations of different approaches of humanitarian knowledge to the analysis of the discursive practices of modern society and thus allowed:

- substantiate the principles of modeling modern social space;
- identify synergistically organized mechanisms for building institutional interactions;
- qualify and taxonomize the identifiers of political and religious discursive interaction, to compare their semantic, syntactic and pragmatic characteristics;
- construct algorithms for the use of verbal and non-verbal sign systems in religious and political discourses;

- study the processes of diffusion and re-contextualization of the language and methods of speech influence;

- identify new linguocultural resources of institutional communication practices and identify markers of their implementation.

A significant result of the work is the verification of the methodological concept of the research, the most important components of which are the multi-level methods of representing and interpreting discursive constructs:

- a macro approach involving an integrated analysis of various discursive components and properties within the framework of the constituent fundamental structures of society discourses (from identifying constitutive features and characterological dominants of discourses to defining the discursive means of expressing them in a wider institutional space);
- critical discourse analysis used to identify social asymmetry indicators recorded by ideologically marked discourse practices;
- method of discursive psychology, which allows to consider the participants of discursive interaction,

their mental states, to characterize the totality of their cognitive models, etc. ;

- method of linguistic and cultural interpretations, giving a holistic view of the semasiological nature of the sign units used in political and religious discursive practices;

- functional and stylistic analysis of the corpuses of political/religious texts, characterizing the features of their genre specificity;

- pragmatic analysis of speech acts, the use of which allowed to identify certain communicative tools (strategies/tactics /speech steps) and identify areas of possible communication risks.

The methodology of the comparative-typological study of verbal/non-verbal signs that manifest the corpus of religious and political communication can be extrapolated to other institutional interactions (both in synchronic and diachronic aspects) and become the basis for creating a model of linguosemiotic space of various mental communities.

⁶ While other methodologies “work” on interpreting the universe as a given construct, the critical discourse analysis is aimed at in-depth study of the techniques of its production and description of the mechanisms for its designation [25: 17]. In other words, in a critical discourse analysis,

Discussion

Global and local informational and communicative spaces are characterized by an ever increasing complexity of social relations, an extension of the semasiological sphere, an increase in connotative elements in it, which, on the one hand, necessitates a timely assessment and interpretation, on the other hand, it directs the research idea to the methodological framework of critical discourse -analysis, the most important feature of which should be considered to be the setting for the study of mechanisms for creating socially determined ideas and objects that make up our universe, and ways to objectify them in the time aspect⁶.

Being a multidimensional sociocultural phenomenon and semantic multimodal unity, including various aspects of communication (establishing and maintaining contact, emotional and informational exchange, influencing each other) and representing a certain area of functioning of the language involved in the field of assessments,

it is customary to regard discourse as a constitutive of the social world, formed by different-level and diverse categories, and proceed from the fact that the world cannot be known independently of the knowledge of discourse.

cognitive attitudes and mythologies of various social groups [6: 4], discourse not only objectifies the "interpenetration" of various semiotic systems, but also simultaneously generates complex implementations of verbal and non-verbal components. Multiple discursive practices such as separate spatial-temporal formations are in a state of continuous development, implying interdependence, mutual influence and complementarity of different discursive types and genres, each of which is an intellectual-behavioral projection of social relations [5]. It is no coincidence that the modern paradigm of discursive practices⁷, implemented in the societal space is expanding more and more, covering new speech-behavioral phenomena, and today fall into the field of scientific description:

- personal discourse (existential and everyday);
- institutional discourses (pedagogical, scientific, administrative, military,

sports, medical, political, mass media, religious, family, etc.);

- discourses of identity (national, supranational, regional, religious, etc.);
- ideological discourses (discourses of democracy, citizenship, parliamentarism, authoritarianism, populism, racism, fascism, etc.);
- discourses of illegitimate practices (extremist, terrorist, radical discourses, etc.);
- business discourses (discourses of business communication, marketing, corporate culture, etc.);
- art discourses (discourses of theater, cinema, literature, visual arts, architecture, fashion, etc.);
- discourses of subcultures (different youth cultures, criminal discourse, discourse of substance abuse, play and other addiction, etc.);
- habitat discourses (discourse at home, interior, city, landscape, etc.);
- body discourse (body discourse, bodybuilding discourse, sexual discourse, etc.);

⁷ According to A.A. Kibrik, to understand the diversity of discourse, it is important to take into account at least four parameters: the most important are the differences in mode (oral/written), genre, functional style, formality. Accordingly, all taxonomization principles proposed today are independent of

each other and constitute a complex combinatorics of various possibilities [9: 19]. It is with a detailed study of the combinatorial types of discourse that the further progress of discourse analysis as a scientific discipline is connected.

- dream discourse and the others⁸.

In the context of world geo-economic processes, institutional discourses are of particular interest, embodying typical models of social interaction, developed in the process of cultural, historical and ethnopolitical development of a nation, which, in turn, led to the formation and functioning of typological mechanisms for organizing communicative practice for a certain linguistic culture. The key realities of the institutional type of communication are various researchers include the concepts of *social institution*, *social status*, *social role*, where a social institution is an authority that ensures the organizational and disciplinary interaction of subjects based on generally accepted standards and ways of hierarchical subordination; social status - a characteristic of a subject occupying a particular position in the social hierarchy of an institution in accordance with certain criteria (educational/professional level, prestige of the profession and occupation, official position, amount of power, etc.); social role is a way of objectifying status, corresponding to the regulatory regimes

466

of social institutions in which people carry out their professional and powerful activities, and is demonstrated in certain patterns of behavior. At the same time, it is important to note the ambivalence of the correlation of the above categories: on the one hand, social institutions “produce” and broadcast discourses (in the form of ideas, concepts, constituents, principles, images and other symbolic figures), which define the framework, focus centers (so-called “glasses”) Of our vision and understanding of reality, on the other hand, institutional discourse produces and explicates norms and standards of status-role behavior, reinforces binary relations norm / abnormal, positive / negative, admissible / unacceptable, good / evil, canonical / heretical, etc., expressed in moral imperatives, traditions, rituals, codes of conduct, legal acts, etc. [13: 194].

All components that make up the communicative relationship are interpreted in the framework of the relevant social institution, and the institutional communication developing in it is characterized by specific linguistic and speech means: the

⁸ The above list is certainly far from finished; It can be supplemented with new forms of institutional communication.

meanings of signs in the form of a code are fixed in the linguocultural consciousness⁹ of the native speaker (and the ethnic group as a whole) and accumulate in a complex way / are generated in the discursive act [22]. It is in institutional discourse that the personal and socially important values are actualized, i.e. the representatives of the ethnomental sphere, which, according to semasiological ideas, are very diverse and include both verbal and non-verbal code: the language manifests itself in a graphic image and in a “verbal” text, and in bodily gestures, and in other semiotic forms.

From these positions, the most “stable” and symbolically saturated types of institutional discourse – political and religious – whose linguosemiotic constituents receive a specific refraction and frame in a socially communicative reality – are significant [3]. Despite the conceptual antithesis of politics and religion, these types of discourse have many points of contact, which are based on a certain unity of the “production” of knowledge, and the similarity of principles and mechanisms for generating discursive constructs, and the relative analogy of the symbolic design of the communication process¹⁰.

⁹ R.K. Bozhenkova defines linguocultural consciousness as a special level of conscious experience that builds on its linguistic levels, and acts as a system of linguocultural norms developed in the process of communication, organized in the form of codes [22].

¹⁰ This statement is a summation of a multilevel analysis of the discourse component structure, including a detailed description of the following, according to V.I. Karasik [8], categorical signs of social interaction: 1) participants who are usually classified into agents and clients: the first are those who play active role in institutional communication, to the second - those who turn to agents and act as representatives of society as a whole in relation to representatives of the institute; 2) chronotop, which implies a description of the place and time of the conventionally fixed discursive interaction; 3) goals; 4) values (within the stated genres of religious and political discourse - the goals of institutional communication are fundamentally different, which is due to the fundamental difference

in the presentation of the key cultural concept and the values it defines); 5) strategies that meet the goals of this type of communication and are reduced to the main intention of communication; 6) material; 7) types and genres (the principles of distinguishing genres in religious and political discourse are also reduced to the intentional content of these types of communication, respectively, do not reveal any significant similarities); 8) precedent (cultural) texts (in the content-semantic field of both religious and political discourse, the category of precedence plays a crucial role, since the recipient identifies and reproduces key axiological signs only if they are in the presupposition - as a result of reading / listening to similar texts); 9) linguistic and speech features reflected in characteristic discursive formulas, which are a peculiar model of not only the cognitive processes of communication participants, but also the mechanisms for organizing the linguocultural universe as a whole [4: 318].

Undoubtedly, the oldest and most important type of institutional communication that formed the basis for the development of all other forms of social communication can be called the practice of religious departures: religion and the church (as its main institution) arose earlier than all existing institutions — the institute of politics, schools, the army, etc. ; all the institutions functioning in modern society derive their sources from religious interaction. Religion is a worldview and attitude that determines human behavior, and cult actions based on faith¹¹ in the divine, in the existence of a higher power, in their all-encompassing power [2: 6]. At the same time, political discourse is also an ancient form of knowledge and social interaction that emerged with the emergence of the concept of “power”: politics is a semantic and sense-reproducing activity regulated by certain historical and ethno-cultural codes (traditions) aimed at forming, maintaining and развития. changing relations of dominance and subordination in society. Accordingly, in the political discourse all the constituents

of the social field are objectified since they either constitute the actual subject of communication, realizing the deictic function, or act as elements of a wide axiological-pragmatic context. It can be said that the functioning of both types of discourse is represented in two aspects: on the one hand, they are focused on achieving, “semiotic consolidation” and translation of value-pragmatic experience, on the other hand, on the preservation and reproduction of a social institution (religion or politics). The basic component of the social institution of politics, as well as the social institution of religion, determines the sustainability of their existence and at the same time the possibility of transformation, often necessary for further development.

In this regard, it should be noted that political and religious communication (despite the rigid opposition of institutional discourse to personal on the basis of personal or representative orientation of the subjects of communication) can rarely be characterized as “absolutely status communication”: the institutional nature

¹¹ “Faith” as a concept turns out to be an operating object in the logical pair “truth is a lie” and is reflected in human

communicative actions (verbal and non-verbal) in different directions, depending on the degree of acceptance of this concept.

of these forms is always gradual¹². Thus, the status-role characteristics of subjects of a religious field, as well as subjects of a political field, defined by genre specifics, themes and tonality of discursive practice, affect the lexical-grammatical, stylistic and other semasiological characteristics of social interaction, often expressing a personality-oriented orientation of communication. This allows them to be defined as mixed types of social communicative practice¹³, in which signs of not only institutionalization are found, but also personalities: the normative determination of social relations/communication and social coercion (the institutional component) determine the disciplinary functions of organizing these relations and manifest themselves in religious practice in the form of control over their observance, meeting ritualistic prescriptions, in political practice - in the form of a system of laws, decrees, Lament etc .; as for social coercion, in two cases it is leveled to the level of “voluntary personal choice”, i.e. In a certain way it borders on signs of personal discourse.

At the same time, the significance of the personal characteristics of the agent of discursive practice (personal component) in religious and political communication can be of decisive importance. Of course, the gradual character of institutional interaction correlates with the kind of communicative event that determines the different degrees of strict adherence to pattern. An example of a “tough” variety in religious discourse is a church service with a clear differentiation of typed stages, participants, texts, and other elements of worship; The genres of confession and spiritual conversation with a priest, the structure of which with the immutability of the defining components is very variable, can be attributed to samples of the “soft” variety. In the political discourse, the illustrations of the first option can be provided by briefings of representatives of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of any state, the second option - political interviews, political commenting and even pre-election debates.

The intersection of political and religious discourses is marked by diverse

personalization has always had a special meaning.

¹² In contrast, for example, from scientific, medical, military discourses.

¹³ This probably includes the pedagogical and sports types of discourses, where

symbolic means. First of all, in the political and religious discourse there is a mythologization of human consciousness¹⁴, a trustworthy attitude to the word and (to a certain extent) belief in the “higher” purpose of the leader¹⁵ [21: 57]. These types of communication a priori imply the ability and ability to “impose” (even inspire) others with their ideas. In the political discourse, ideologies are included in purposeful propaganda and agitation - forms that are present in a modified form in religious discourse (for example, in the text of a church sermon). Political discourse unites people with a higher political idea, just as in religion people are united by one religion. At the same time, the basic organizing principle of the communicative space of both types of discourse is the basic functional-semiotic triad *integration – orientation – agonality*, which is projected onto the dichotomy of “one's own – others”. Orientation includes the formulation and explanation of one's own (political/religious) position, the

rationale for the importance of compliance with the designated targets and values; integration includes the search, involvement and solidarity of like-minded people; agony implies a kind of aggression, the struggle against opponents who may in one way or another prevent the embodiment (verbal or non-verbal) of axiological postulates of the relevant discourse. Going beyond a certain community that adheres to certain views (ideological or religious) inevitably leads to the ousting of a given political or religious group - to the transition from the category of “own” to the category of “alien”.

In this regard, the language of politics and religion, on the one hand, turns out to be the “language for initiates,” on the other, it should be accessible to the broad masses (“alien”), which, if certain ideas are adopted, can be transferred to the class of “their own”¹⁶. It should be noted that, in most cases, people do not directly come into contact with the world politics and the religious sphere, and their knowledge in this area

¹⁴ The mythologization of human consciousness is certainly supported by appropriate attributes: the icon, Holy banner, censer - in religion; portraits of leaders, sculptural works, ideological symbols - in politics.

¹⁵ Which, of course, is not related to a specific personality.

¹⁶ It is no coincidence that today the language of politics, as well as the language of religion, is incorporated into the personal discourse itself — everyday and everyday communication.

is not based on their own experience of political participation/religious service, but mainly on the basis of the “verbal images” offered to them various forms (from dogmatic postulates, descriptions, opinions to comparisons and conclusions) and can be implemented in a wide variety of speech actions corresponding to a given discursive genre. However, all such messages, in addition to explicit, lexically expressed information, necessarily include the implicit-connotative layer - first of all, emotively colored keywords representing basic orientations, values, symbols, etc. Implicit information can also be obtained by summarizing, “reading between lines”: the characteristics of the chronotope of a verbal act, its connection with historical, cultural, axiological and other factors, semantic uncertainty and a given ritual are significant linguistic components, etc. This gives grounds to evaluate the constitution of both political and religious types of discourse as a kind of synergetic unity: social interaction unfolds in two planes - in the plane of “first order signs” (natural human language) and in the plane of “second

order signs” - a special metalanguage created for decoding and interpreting “first order marks”.

The language of religious discourse is formally conservative, which is caused by the need to preserve the dogmatic value potential of this type of communication. The political language, being in some way between two poles - a functionally determined special language and a socio-co-ordinate of a certain group with an ideology peculiar to it - also tries to preserve the stencil forms and communication formulas for the sustainable functioning of the community. In a broad context, the language of religion, as well as the language of politics, is designed for a specific group, which must be (at least elementary) prepared for the perception of the message. At the same time, the language of religion is a semiotic system of a group, which, unlike the participants in a political discourse, is limited and united not by the unity of political views and ideology, but by a stronger entity — faith. The language of politics, as well as the language of religion, is inherent in euphemism and even esotericism¹⁷. “Politicians, like no other, know how to

¹⁷ Of course, esotericism in religion and politics has a different tonality, but by their

nature, both religious and political discourse are theatrical and suggestive.

evade a direct answer to a question, know how to say a lot and say nothing” [17: 58], however, the esotericity of political discourse is pragmatic, while esotericism in religious discourse is based on the inner mysticism of linguistic signs which, due to their unusualness and vagueness, create the effect of the unreal, divine, which one would like to believe: the “magic” of the influence of religion is largely contained in the word.

In addition, both the language of politics and the language of religion performs a kind of “advertising” function: relying on sign constants and linguocultural realities, the recipients must consciously / unconsciously change their attitude to certain facts / phenomena of reality. It is no coincidence that political leaders' speeches are usually full of promises, and the texts of campaign speeches are usually based on the following (admitting some variations) pattern: “If you follow us / share our views, you will / will get.... you are guaranteed, If not expects you ... , etc. Provided distraction from the real lexical content of any of the ideologically marked texts, it can be summarized as a

kind of semantic constant: “If you stay with us, you will have a bright future and a happy life, if you share the views of others (opponents, our ideological opponents, enemies), do not expect anything good in the future”. The same is observed in religious discourse, but when stating such formulas, the cleric is more appealing to the emotional sphere of the believer, which is why ideas of sin, punishment, hellish torment, retribution in the next world become an absolute. All this allows us to state that both types of discourse are characterized by impressiveness, obvious irreality and significant manipulative potential.

The most important is the fact of orientation of political/religious discursive practices towards the mass recipient and, as a result, the vector orientation of the basic constituents of religious and political communication (primarily linguistic communication) into other diverse spheres of social reality. With the help and due to the universality/integration of the key concepts of “faith” and “power”, religion and politics (respectively) permeate “interrelated conflicting discourses within the framework of a given setting (setting)” [26: 12], creating intertextual

connections with other types of communication in synchronic and diachronic sections. For example, recently, the inclusion of religious-discursive techniques in the media universe has been actively practiced [20]: due to the growing interest in various faiths and beliefs, the emergence of various religious trends and teachings, modern media are taking on the mission of spreading religious ideas and beliefs among population. Political communication is not only mediated by the media: media resources are the main medium of its existence. Moreover, new means and technologies give rise to new forms and methods of information transmission, which in turn leads to the emergence of new mono- and polysemiotic communication systems, the content of which is politics and religion, and the form of existence is a display text with special differential features: nonlinearity (branching, no beginning and end), multi-coding (multimedia), interactivity (direct connection with the reader, the reader's influence on the structure of the text), which directly affects both political/religious discourse and its sign (in the broad sense) components. As a result, today the language of politics and

the language of religion are extrapolated to the existential and everyday communication of the widest civilian masses; we already see signs of political and religious convergence in the so-called “culture of everyday life” (in both ordinary verbal behavior and folk anecdote genre, in the author's song, and in theatrical production with acute socio-political overtones): such an intense practice has a significant impact on the communicative-psychological organization of a particular person and the target audience as a whole.

Thus, both political discourse and religious discourse as a type of institutional-personal communication not only fully manifest the culture of an individual society with its ideological attitudes, mental symbols, and other axiological components, but are also characterized by the same (with different verbal design) sociocultural markers – metaphorical, euphemistic, polemical, ideological (with a clear demonstration of the dichotomy of “bad-good”, “friend-foe”), a certain emotional slogan peculiarity, the assertion of “absolute truth”, and – the dominant part – irrationality, which is based on rituals, symbols and “pulsating” uncertainty denotations.

However, with a pronounced correlation of discursive categories, the formation and functioning of religious and political discursive practices (as, indeed, any other discursive form of communication) is determined to a greater degree by collective and idio-ethnic factors, which are represented in the features of linguocultural codes that “frame” this communicative act and embodies the various principles of the conceptualization of mental categories. Being social and national in nature, a language cannot fail to bear the imprint of the characteristics of worldview, ethical and moral values, as well as the norms of speech behavior characteristic of this universe. In other words, the norms and strategies of behavior are determined by the laws and values of this socio-communicative system, which, in turn, has been shaped by cultural and historical factors.

3. Conclusion

Discursive means, embodying the general characteristics of the communicative behavior of various social groups (from a small community to a whole ethnic group), do not simply characterize society — they themselves are part of it, its purpose and means, and

474

imply the modification of the “self” of an individual / society in such a way that the vision of the world turns out to be limited to language frames. Accordingly, identifying the dominant characteristics of political and religious practices as the two most important components of human existence through the prism of linguistic and cultural aspects of the formation of discourse allows not only to describe ethno-lingvo-semiotic space, to compare its semantic-syntactic and pragmatic characteristics, to study the processes of language diffusion and interpenetration of language methods of influence, but also to typify identifiers of the most complex social phenomenon of human communication.

Further study of the mechanisms for organizing interpersonal/intergroup political and (or) religious interaction, thereby identifying the key markers of communicative interaction, analyzing the ways of manifestation of ethno-culturally determined constituents of communication, which help build patterns of discursive behavior and national-linguistic picture of the world as a whole, comparative consideration of their refractions in different linguocultural universes will provide an opportunity to achieve a new, higher and

harmonious level of reality acceptance, its competent operating structures that will promote the development of productive social relations and overcome potentially conflict situations in the conditions of modern globalization processes.

References

- Bart R. Selected Works: Semiotics: Poetics: Translated from French / G.K. Kosikova. M.: Progress, 1989. 616 p.
- Bobyreva E.V. Religious discourse: values, genres, strategies (based on the material of Orthodox dogma): Author's abstract, Volgograd, 2007. 43 p.
- Bozhenkova N.A., Atanova D.V. Verbal ways to reflect the linguocultural traditions of society (on the material of the Russian, English and German languages) // SWSU. Part 2. 2012. № 5 (44). Pp. 269-274.
- Bozhenkova R.K., Atanova D.V. Constitutive signs of religious discourse (on the material of Orthodox dogma) // SWSU. No. 2 (47). Kursk: SWSU, 2013. Pp. 205-212.
- Bozhenkova R.K., Bozhenkova N.A. Some Thoughts on the Nature of the Linguistic and Cultural Consciousness of a Language Personality // Current Issues in the Study and Teaching of Russian Language and Culture: International Forum on Research, Theories, and Best Practices. USA, Washington, D.S. 2007. Pp. 43-48.
- Dijk, T.A., Discourse and power: representation of dominance in language and communication. Translated from English. M.: Librokomb, 2013. 344 p.
- Karasik V.I. On the types of discourse // Language personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of research papers. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000. Pp. 5-20.
- Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse: monograph. Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. 477 p.
- Kibrik A.A. Modus, genre and other parameters of the classification of discourses // Linguistics studies. № 2. Pp. 3-21.
- Kozhemyakin E.A. Discourse analysis as an interdisciplinary methodology: a historical aspect // Scientific bulletin of Belgorod State University. 2008. № 15 (55). Pp.5-12.
- Maroshi V.V. What is discourse? [Electronic resource] Access mode: http://old.nsu.ru/education/virtual/discourse2_27.htm (date of access 08/15/2018).

- Ricoeur P. Conflict of interpretations. Essays on hermeneutics. M.: Kanon-Press-c, 2002. 629 p.
- Rusakova O.F., Rusakov V.M. PR Discourse: Theoretical and Methodological Analysis. Ekaterinburg: Institute of Philosophy and Law, Institute of International Relations, 2008. 282 p.
- Sedov K.F. Discourse and personality: the evolution of communicative competence. M.: Labyrinth, 2004. 320 p.
- Silantsev I.V. Newspaper and novel: discourse rhetoric blend. [Electronic resource] Access mode: http://www.plam.ru/literat/gazeta_i_roman_ritorika_diskursnyh_smeshenii/index.php (date of access: 08/15/2018).
- Modern Discourse Theories: Multidisciplinary Analysis ("Discourse studies" series). Issue 1. Ekaterinburg, 2006. 177 p.
- Филлипс Л.Дж., Йоргенсен М.В. Дискурс-анализ. Теория и метод / Пер. с англ. 2-е изд., испр. Харьков: Изд-во «Гуманитарный центр», 2008. 352 с. Phillips L.J., Jorgensen M.V. Discourse analysis. Theory and method / Translated from English, 2nd ed., Kharkov: "Humanitarian Center" publishing house, 2008. 352 p.
- Foucault M. Archeology of knowledge: Translated from French / Edited by Br. Levchenko. Kiev: Nika-Center, 1996. 208 p.
- Chudinov A.P. Political linguistics: Textbook, 2nd ed., M., 2007.
- Chumakova K. Religious discourse in mass media [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <http://discourseanalysis.org/ada6/st47.shtml> (date of access: 08/15/2018).
- Sheigal E.I. Semiotics of political discourse. Volgograd, 2000. 326 p.
- Bozhenkova R.K. Comprehension of text in the aspect of linguistics and culturology / R.K. Bozhenkova. Raleigh, North Carolina, USA: Lulu Press, 2015. 153 p.
- Östman J., Virtanen T. Discourse Analysis. Handbook of Pragmatics, Manual. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam & Philadelphia. 1995. Pp. 239-253.
- Thompson J. Studies in the Theory of Ideology. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1984. 356 p.
- Winch P. The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy. Second Edition/ London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1990. 160p.
- Wodak R. Disorders in Discourse. London: Longman, 1996