Scientific article
IRSTI 21.31.35

The analysis of the linguistic and philosophical paradigms based on the concept of discourse in the academic study of religion

Arailym Abubakirovaᵃ✉**, Meirambek Shimtemira**ᵃ**, Albina Duissenbayeva**ᵃ

ᵃEgyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

✉ *a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com*

Abstract. The article provides an overview of existing definitions, research and achievements in the field of linguistics and philosophy concerning the concept of discourse. Additionally, it offers a new analysis of discourse as a philosophical-linguistic phenomenon and paradigm. A review of studies on the concept and term "discourse" is provided, and the history of the formation of the concept of discourse analysis as a separate direction is analyzed. The directions of application of discourse as a term and concept in the context of modern science are shown. It also defines the philosophical aspect on the basis of the works of M. Foucault. In this regard, Foucault's theories also examine discourse as a coercive principle that causes people to feel fear and apprehension, as a great force that regulates inconsistencies, and as a tool for creating restrictive, and regulating processes. The rules on which discursive laws are based are considered, and their role in the formation of communicative competence is analyzed. The influence of extralinguistic features of discourse has been studied. The differences and connections between the macro and micro levels of the structure of the discourse are shown. An explanation and classification of discursive modes are given, their features are described. Schools conducting discursive research are shown and an overview of their methods is given. Attention is drawn to the importance and characteristics of oral discourse. The role of discourse in the establishment of linguistic communication is considered and conclusions are drawn.
Key words: discourse; linguistics; semiotics; M. Foucault; discursive practices; discourse analysis; discursive laws; register, modus.

Introduction

If we look at the history of linguistics, we see that until the middle of the twentieth century, the main trend was to consider language as a structure based on certain forms, which does not go beyond those forms. However, the shortcomings of this approach and the low level of adaptation have laid the foundation for a new functional-communicative paradigm, which shows that we should take into account that no linguistic phenomenon can be correctly interpreted and analyzed outside the context and the area of its application. As a result, the study of language began to be based not only on linguistic fields that study the basic level of linguistic units, but also on such large-scale structural elements as "text", "discourse", which became the object of study of philosophers. While scientists in the early twentieth century sought answers to questions about how language is formed and how its units are arranged, researchers in the second half of the twentieth century tried to understand and explain how language works. As it was not possible to find answers to these questions using only the methods of linguistics, a wide range of interdisciplinary connections began to emerge. The most important and most effective in the study of discourse is the connection with philosophy. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the importance of human influence and subjectivity in language came to the fore, emphasizing that language allows human beings to achieve their own goals by performing certain communicative functions. Individual analysis of discourse allows to clearly identify the correspondences between structure and function, showing that the scope and context of language directly affect its structure and forms. By combining the achievements of the two main research paradigms in linguistics, we can summarize the ways of describing concepts that include the content of the concept of discourse, which is described as a special phenomenon: in formal interpretation, the strict hierarchy of discourse elements is established, interaction between them and rules for governing these actions are discussed; in functional interpretation discourse is explained as using a language and explaining the activities of language; discourse is interpreted not as a simple selection of individual units of the language system, but as a set of organized, contextual language use units. The study and comparison of discursive practices shows that the socio-cultural environment in which each discourse is formed and takes place, the philosophical preconditions that affect it are not homogeneous, each discourse has its own peculiarities. Because people communicate with each other not through simple elements of language, sounds, syllables, or words, but through discourse.

Identification of the research problem

Today, scholars often dismiss the vast majority of definitions of religion that have been used in recent decades and argue that a new definition of religion is needed, which will properly describe the authority and functions of it in the contemporary society. There is a lack of understanding and satisfaction not only in the definition of religion, but also in other aspects and theories of Religious Studies. Because Religious Studies scholars have a big, important problem in their research. Although Religious Studies seeks to establish itself as a secular science and to make its research and terminology as scientific as possible, religion, which is its main object

326 **№4(149)/ 2024** *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

of study, is not a phenomenon that fits into the realm of science. That is why some scientists accept the methods of the social sciences, while others prefer the methods of the humanities. The analysis of discourse will help us to determine the solution to this problem and possible directions of development of it. The purpose of this research is to analyze the linguistic and philosophical paradigms based on the concept of discourse in the academic study of religion and to demonstrate their effectiveness and usefulness.

Relevance of the study

The relevance of discourse analysis and discursive research has become especially important in the last decade. At the beginning of the XXI century, scientists were engaged only in the study of past works in the field of Religious Studies. By the end of the first decade, they realize that there are many biological, linguistic, and neurological paradigms in their fields, that the paradigm of Religious Studies has not been developed, and that there is no concept to describe modern situations. The methods and paradigms still used in the field of Religious Studies are based on the text and historical events of the early twentieth century, and intertwines with the principles which make universal, generalized conclusions. And this system is not at all flexible in describing the modern religious situation. Hence the need for a new model and paradigm for the study of religion appears. Methods and forms of discourse analysis can be an alternative to the methodology used in the last century. And since the relationship between religion and man in the modern era can be recognized as a discursive activity, the need for paradigms that help to analyze discourse during the study is clearly shown.

Research methodology

The methodology used in this study was selected in accordance with the research areas and questions outlined in the introduction. The sources include the works of both domestic and foreign scholars. The collected data were analyzed linguistically, philosophically and religiously, and the features of the discourse analysis and discourse itself were identified by the method of content analysis. The functions of discourse as a paradigm were studied by analysis and synthesis, and the characteristics of the discourse were systematized.

Review of definitions of the concept of discourse

The French word "discours" comes from the Latin word discursus, which means to think, to argue. Discourse is a unique concept in modern philosophy and linguistics that is very popular but very difficult to define. In languages belonging to the Romance-Germanic language group, the word discourse is common and is used in such senses as speech, expression, thought, and utterance. And in the Kazakh language there is no translation that is a direct equivalent of this word, so the word discourse is added to the language as it is read. The meaning usually refers to the text, a language element larger than a sentence, reflection, expression of opinion. In the general scientific community, it has not been long since the focus on discourse as a subject

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ. **№4(149)/ 2024** **327**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

of scientific research began. In showing the difference between text and discourse, scientists emphasize the variable, dynamic nature of discourse, and the stable, static state of the text. The linguistic units of the discourse are closely related to each other and allow us to perceive them as a homogeneous system. Any discourse can be text, but any text cannot be discourse (Borbotko, 1981: 8-9).

According to the classical philosophical views, the concept of discourse includes the gradual development of an idea, the acceleration of that idea through concepts and notions. From the point of view of modern French philosophy, the discourse reflects the mentality and ideology reflected in the text. They are interconnected and integrated into everyday life, that is, the discourse is considered in the context of cultural, social, and psychological basis. The definition of the concept of discourse in the philosophy of the twentieth century is not homogeneous, so it is possible to analyze several versions. First, under the concept of discourse, we understand the language structure that develops in the form of a monologue, recognizing it as speech or text. Second, discourse is also analyzed as a sequence of communicative actions performed through language. It is known that this system of communication consists of such processes as conversation, dialogue, exchange of information. Discourse is associated with an activity that has a certain area of language and a certain vocabulary. Discourse development is carried out according to certain rules. In this process, from language rules to social, cultural and political rules are taken into account. Thus, the discourse is formed in a certain semantic environment and is aimed at conveying certain meanings. Therefore, the term discourse itself requires additional definition. When it comes to discourse, it should be noted that it is related to scientific, political, philosophical, cultural, literary or other areas. Based on this concept, we can describe the discourse as a "language within a language."

The founder of modern linguistics F. de Saussure seldom used the term discourse and recognized language as the only object of study in linguistics. He explained that speech is a reflection of language in life. But E. Benvenist uses the term discourse instead of speech; E. Brussians adds the third element – discourse to the language and speech community. By studying these works and principles, we can explain each of these concepts as follows: language is a system of symbols, discourse includes certain combinations that allow the speaker to use language, and speech is the name of the process of linguistic action (Philosophical Encyclopedia: http://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/enc_philosophy).

Discourse as a term became very popular in the second half of the twentieth century. And to the scientific theory of text linguistics was introduced in 1952 within the phrase "discourse analysis" by Z. Harris. Explaining the concept of word as a simple expression of thought, Z. Harris interprets discourse as a complex expression of thought by several words. Thus, by the end of the twentieth century, the concept of discourse taken from structural linguistics gained a broad scientific meaning, including various meanings as a term, and contributed to the formation of a new field of discursive analysis in semiotics and linguistics (Philosophical Encyclopedia: http://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/enc_philosophy). Representatives of the field of semiotics G. Graymas and J. Courtes tried to show the similarities and differences between discourse, language and speech. Discourse is connected with speech by the fact that both are processes and actions. But in discourse there is a system, which is unique, its internal

328   №4(149)/ 2024   *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

structure and appearance are established, and characteristics such as type, style, and genre are defined. Although being systematic brings discourse closer to language, if language is a universal, small system, then discourse has a specific system which is considered as speech and socio-cultural nature. Discourse is usually integrated into the cultural and social context. For example, E. Benvenist defines discourse as speech that is directed at the speaker opposed to the message that takes place without the explicit intervention of the subject of expression (Benvenist, 1974: 129).

The formation of the above-mentioned concept of discursive analysis as a separate direction in linguistics took place in the second half of the twentieth century. During this period, the important works of representatives of the European school of text linguistics (T. van Dijk, W. Dressler, J. Petofi) and fundamental works of American linguists (W. Labov, J. Grimes, R. Longhecker, T. Givon, W. Chaif) which intertwined the discursive studies with traditional linguistic themes are appeared. In 1980-1990 general theories, reference books and textbooks on the theory of discourse were published. Among them is "Discursive Analysis", published in 1983 by J. Brown and J. Yul, "The structure of social action: a study based on the analysis of everyday dialogue" published in 1984 by J. Atkinson and J. Heritage, van Dijk's four-volume "Handbook of Discursive Analysis" in 1985, "Description of Discourse" published in 1992 ed. Thompson, U. Mann, the authors, led by J. Dubois, wrote in 1993 "Transcription of Discourse", "Discursive Studies" published by Ya. Renkema in 1993, D. Schiffrin's "Discourse Orientation" in 1994, ed. "Discourse, Consciousness and Time" published by W. Chafe in 1994, van Dijk's two-volume "Discursive Research: An Interdisciplinary Introduction" in 1997.

One of the most interesting definitions of the concept of discourse is occurs in the work of P. Serio. He defines discourse as a socially or ideologically limited form of expression (Serio, 1993: 92). Based on this definition, we can use the term discourse to denote a system of restrictions on the unlimited number of opinions based on a particular social or ideological position. Yu.S. Stepanov agreeing with this view offers the following definition: discourse is a special form of language usage to express a mentality, in this case it also applies to ideology, and special use is the basis for the formation and definition of some special aspects and special rules of language. As a result, a special "mental world" emerges (Stepanov, 1995: 38).

P. Serio distinguishes eight different meanings of the term "discourse": 1) the equivalent of the concept of "speech", i.e. any specific expression; 2) a larger unit than the word; 3) the impact of the opinion on the recipient, based on the situation; 4) conversation as the main form of expression; 5) the text spoken by the speaker, the speaker is not taken into account in the message; 6) use of language units, their language activation; 7) a socially or ideologically limited form of expression specific to a particular segment of society; 8) theoretical structure for the study of text production (Serio, 1999: 26-27).

Discourse in the works of Russian schools

In European and Russian schools of linguistics, the understanding of discourse is based on the categories of "natural, living language" and "communication with the speaker." For example, T.A. van Dijk interprets discourse as an expression the content and image of which define

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ. **№4(149)/ 2024** **329**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

cognitive principles or boundaries (Dijk, 1989: 70-98). From a structural point of view, van Dijk interprets discourse as a communicative event that takes place between the speaker and the listener or observer in the course of communicative action in a certain time and space context. This communicative activity can take place through speech, writing, and may include verbal or non-verbal components.

Now let us talk about the work of Russian schools on discourse and their classification. Moscow direction of the Russian school is described by works of V.I. Tjupa and his colleagues by the journal "Discourse". They use the paradigm of van Dijk to define discourse. The discourse, according to the Moscow school, is a "communicative event" with three main aspects: creative (subject of communicative origin - the author), referent (subject-semantic aspect of expression), receptive (addressee) (Tjupa, 2001: 24). By highlighting these aspects, the representatives of the Moscow school emphasize that in the implementation of the discourse we should pay attention not only to the author's directions, but also to the methods and strategies of the reader. To understand discourse, we must understand its interactive nature. The study reveals the meaning and individuality of speech, the problems of the ideal, implicit reader, which presupposes discourse.

The next Russian school is the Volgograd school. It is based on the definition of discourse proposed by N.D. Arutjunova. Discourse is a text with an internal connection, including extra linguistic, i.e. pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological factors; text considered in the context of the situation; speech, which is considered as a targeted social activity; a component that is reflected in the interaction of people, in their space of consciousness (cognitive processes) as a participant. Discourse is a "immersed in life" speech (Arutjunova, 1990: 136-137). Scholars of this school describe the sociolinguistic principles of discourse analysis in combination with textual linguistics. As for the typology of discourse, they are based on the criteria of imparting knowledge and knowledge related to a particular field (religious, pedagogical, business, etc.). The discursive study of the Volgograd school is carried out as a linguistic-social study (Sheigal, 2000: 9). The phrase "immersed in life" used to define the concept of discourse does not apply to ancient texts in which it is impossible to determine the connection with living society.

In structural research, the discourse and the text are contrasted in several aspects. For example, if the discourse is functional, the text has a structure, if we consider the discourse as a process, we consider the text as a product, if the discourse is dynamic, the text is static, if the discourse is relevant at the moment, the text has a virtual meaning. From this we can distinguish text as a structural product (Brown, 1983: 24) and discourse as a functional process (Hess-Lüttich, 1979: 25).

N.D. Arutjunova's definition identifies two main aspects of discourse analysis: communicative (extra linguistic features are important because we consider discourse as a social action) and cognitive (discourse as a mechanism of cognition). Based on this concept, discursive analysis can be a study of the mental spaces of people who play different roles in the implementation of different forms of discursive action and use special tools to harmonize this action (Savelyeva, 2002: 16). In analyzing discourse along with linguistic social aspect, we can also highlight the linguistic-cognitive aspect.

Considering the various directions, schools, works related to the study of discourse, we see that the definitions of this term are not contradictory, but complementary. There are three main directions of using this term.

330 **№4(149)/ 2024** *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

1) Linguistic use of the term discourse. It is important to note that even in this use, the semantic scope of the term is very wide, but underlying all this is an attempt to identify, clarify and develop concepts such as speech, text, dialogue.

2) This application is more popular in journalism, not in the field of science comes from French structuralists and poststructuralists, especially from the works of M. Foucault. Underlying this application is an attempt to clarify the traditional forms of the concept of style. Discourse in this sense describes the method of appearance of the text and has a definition of what or whose discourse.

3) This application is associated with the works of J. Habermas. Discourse is a unique, perfect form of communication, carried out as far as possible from factors such as social reality, traditions, prestige, communicative consistency, with the aim of critically discussing the views and actions of participants in communication.

We consider the second direction of these basic uses, to be exact Foucault's views. M. Foucault concludes: "Discourse is a delicate connecting space that brings language and reality closer together". In the course of research on the concept of discourse, it is impossible not to dwell on M Foucault's concept. In the second half of the twentieth century M. Foucault based on the ideas of E. Benvenist presents his views and theories on discursive analysis. At the same time, the works of representatives of the French school of discourse-analysis close to linguistics began to be published. They understood discourse as a concrete expression of spoken or written language, a complex but orderly process, or the result of speech specific to a particular socio-political group or epoch (Parret, 1987: 205). Foucault's discourse is defined as a set of opinions inherent in certain structural systems. For this reason, we can talk about climate discourse, economic discourse, historical discourse, psychiatric discourse (Foucault, 1996a: 108). M. Foucault offers an original version of the use of tools in the formation of the sequence of discourse, analyzing the discourse formed in accordance with traditional notions. According to him, the main goal should be to determine the position of the speaker, but it should not be related to the opinion being expressed, but to the interchangeable subjects of opinion and the ideologies expressed through it. About this M. Foucault writes: "In my view, discourse in any society is controlled, selected, systematized and dismantled by some processes, and the function of these processes is to neutralize its power and the threats associated with it, to control unpredictable aspects of its situations, to help to escape from its dominant, dangerous material side (Foucault: 1996b: 51). The main idea of M. Foucault's theory is that the main mean of knowing, mastering, accepting the environment, the reality of the environment is speech. Through communication, people not only learn about the world, but also establish the laws and rules of that conversation and accordingly specific structures of thinking are formed. Thus, M. Foucault bases the general activity of people on speech or discursive practices. Defining the concept of discursive practices, he concludes: "This concept should not be confused with the expressive operations that result in the formation of ideas, images, preferences, with rational actions that can take place in the system of concepts, and with the competence of the speaker in creating grammatical phrases. It is a set of anonymous historical rules, which are always defined in time and space, and they create the conditions for the implementation of the activity of expression in this era, for this social, economic, geographical, linguistic space" (Foucault:

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.   **№4(149)/ 2024**   **331**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

1996a: 118). According to Foucault's concept, discourse is defined and expressed by expression. "Instead of narrowing down the already vague meaning of the concept of discourse, I expanded its meaning: an established practice that takes into account the common part of all opinions or individual groups of opinions or some amount of opinion" (Foucault: 1996a: 81-82). Thus, in M. Foucault's view, language practice itself is discourse, which includes a set of many opinions inherent in a particular structure. It is important to keep in mind that expression is not just a verbal expression of opinion, but any form of human knowledge. The interest and purpose of discursive analysis is reflected in determining the historical place of each discursive event, showing and refining the "historical unconscious" of different epochs, from the Renaissance to the twentieth century. Each field of science has its own discourse and takes different forms; extra linguistic factors take precedence over linguistic factors and play a determining role.

Foucault interprets discourse as a complex and differentiated experience, arguing that it is subject to rules and transformations that can be analyzed. The use of discourse as a concept in historical analysis helps to write history from a new perspective, which he calls the "archaeological" method. He defines as his method analyzing systems of describing and dismantling discourse as a material practice, creating analyze of eras and different spheres of society and life on the basis of power of particular discourses. Foucault explains discourse as a coercive position that arouses feelings of fear and apprehension in people, equating it with a great force that regulates instability, and as a creator of limiting, regulatory processes.

In his article "Sequence of Discourse" M. Foucault hypothesizes that the creation of discourse in society is simultaneously controlled and selective, organized and disseminated through certain processes. In short, he argues that there are some regulatory principles. These principles can be divided into several groups:

1. External processes. They seek to control and limit the powerful forces of discourse. The simplest example is a ban. It is known that it is impossible to talk on any topic, with any person, anywhere, so we can identify three types of prohibitions: banning the object; procedure of circumstances; exclusive or priority rights of the speaker. These prohibitions can interact and create a web around topics that cannot be moved or freely discussed. According to M. Foucault, this network is very thick around politics and sexuality. The next external process is separation and exclusion. Underlying this process is the contrast between consciousness and insanity. From the very beginning of human society, a person whose discourse does not correspond to the discourse of others is described as an insane person. The situation has not changed much today. The words of those accused of insanity are either completely ignored or cause great public controversy and debate. It all depends on the context in which the situation is discussed and the context of the discourse. The contrast between truth and falsehood is seen as a manifestation of the pursuit of truth. According to M. Foucault, each epoch has its own way of striving for reality, and it gives some direction to the actions of those who lived in that epoch. Recall the period of positivism in sociology, when all the requirements for how research should be conducted were given in a ready state and all were obliged to follow it.

2. Internal processes. They involve the control of discourse through discourses and serve as processes of grouping, regulation, distribution. They try to prevent the discourse from happening by chance. There are primary and secondary discourses; the second is the analysis of

332 №4(149)/ 2024 *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

the remarks made to the first. And the author is considered as a central force uniting discourses. Discipline plays an important role in the implementation of these processes. Because the expression of opinion must be focused on the form of any object, must use certain conceptual and technical means, must correspond to a specific image of the theoretical basis.

3. The third group of processes includes the implementation of the first two groups. A person who does not meet or cannot meet the requirements can never join the discourse. Being the most visible, superficial form of these limiting systems, the procedure or ritual defines the competence required for the speaker, as well as clarifies the various actions, situations, signs in addition to the discourse. The ritual determines the effect of the words and their effect on the person being spoken. A discursive community ensures that discourses are stored and implemented in a closed community. Although a doctrine or knowledge may seem to want to include many individuals and followers, it also has a limiting function. Depending on the subject's opinion, it is either questioned or prohibited from commenting on other matters. All of these principles are closely interrelated and serve such functions as the division of subjects into discourses and the determination of the relevance of discourses to subjects.

In his work M. Foucault argues that the regulatory processes we have discussed above can be reflected in two "ensembles". The first is the "critical ensemble", which deals with constraints, discusses how discourses are subdued, abbreviated, and arranged; the second is the "genealogical ensemble", which shows how discourse systems have been formed and developed on the basis of or against these principles of restraint and rape. All of these processes are designed to regulate and limit discourse that is initially uncontrollable and subject only to its own rules.

M. Foucault is considered by both contemporaries and later researchers to be a structuralist. This conclusion is based on the analysis of his works. For example, in the "History of the Clinic" he uses the concept of "structure" in its entirety, replacing it with the concept of "discourse". In his works, discourse is reflected as the founder of society, managing the actions of its participants, the creator of objective conditions. Considering the analysis of the concept of discourse in the works of Foucault, the following intermediate conclusions can be made: the discourse is ordered; the role of regulatory principles is not homogeneous; discourse regulation is artificial; discourse and social reality define each other. M. Foucault's works are valuable for their history and application in theoretical research.

Discursive laws

Before dwelling on the laws within the discourse, it should be borne in mind that the formation of the discourse is influenced by the extra linguistic principles of the implementation of relations. Some scholars call this the principle of communication, while others interpret it as discursive laws. The general meaning of these laws is a set of rules that speakers must follow from the beginning of a relationship. These include:

– Striving for partnership: each interlocutor is interested in the effectiveness of their relationship at the end, so they pay attention to each other's rights and responsibilities;

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ. **№4(149)/ 2024** **333**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

– Appropriateness of opinion: the opinion should be as relevant as possible to the context of the communicative environment and be of interest to the participants;

– Authenticity: the information conveyed must correspond to the authenticity of the communicative environment;

– Informative: it is impossible to speak only to say something, the discourse must contain new information;

– Quality: the delivery of information should be as accurate and economical as possible.

Based on these laws, we can define the characteristics of discourse as follows:

– Uniqueness (structure and individuality);

– Completion;

– Formalization;

– Belonging to a certain genre and register;

– Extra linguistic aspects i.e. focus on the implementation of a specific communicative goal, to be in accordance with the context of the participants and the communicative environment.

Although most of the above characteristics apply to ordinary texts, extra linguistic features are unique to discourse. According to this feature, there is an opportunity to form opinions and actions with a cultural, social, professional orientation. In this regard, it is worth mentioning the registers of discourse. V.I. Karasik considers discourse as a refinement of speech in various spheres of human life, distinguishing between business or institutional and game discourse registers (Karasik, 2004: 277). The purpose of the first type is to adapt people to the realities of the environment, while the purpose of the second is to free people from the stereotypes of perception of the environment and social behavior, freeing them from the determinism of nature and other people. Simply put, game discourse is seen as a platform for creativity and the perception of those creative results. M.J. Oleshkov describes the characteristics of institutional discourse as follows: participants with a degree, local chronotope, systematized goal within this social institution, ritually established values, deliberately established strategies (sequence of language actions in typical situations), limited nomenclature of genres, strictly established precedent phenomena system (names, comments, texts, situations) (Oleshkov, 2006: 123). According to this description, we see that this institutional discourse is used in the formation and dissemination of information that should be directed to the target audience, the environment. According to researchers, institutional discourse has a wide range of opportunities to systematize communication services. From this discourse, social institutions are considered as culture, and their manifestation is established as organizational symbolism (legends, parables, rituals, symbols, etc.), which in turn establishes the relationship of authority (teacher's authority over the student, the clergy's authority over believers, etc.). When comparing person-oriented relationships and degree-oriented relationships, we find that in the second type of relationship, participants can only express themselves in limited role systems, as they interact on behalf of a specific group of people. According to R. Wodak, institutional discourse is not focused on a single type of discourse, but reflects a complex system of interconnected or conflicting discourses within a given situation (Wodak, 1996: 12), which reflects the reality of the communication environment or "social experience".

334   **№4(149)/ 2024**   *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

Discourse structure

There are two types of discourse structure: global or macrostructure (includes large parts of the discourse, for example, when talking about a newspaper article, the macrostructure corresponds to a paragraph) and local or microstructure (consisting of minimal units). These structures are not strictly separated from each other. On the contrary, they are expressed as two levels of hierarchical structure of discourse. While the global connection of the discourse is ensured by the uniqueness of the theme of that discourse, the local connection is reflected in the connection between the smallest discursive units and their parts. American linguist T. Givon represents four types of local communication: referential (unit of participants), spatial, periodic, and situational. The smallest parts of the discourse are the expression or phrase (oral modus of discourse) and the formation above the phrase (written mode of discourse). The word modus is used here as a term that is close to the meaning of types of discourse, defining the channels of information transmission and giving a clear definition of that concept. The following modes of discourse can be specified: oral (form of information delivery - acoustic); written (form of information delivery - visual); mentally (there are no traces of human linguistic activity, because the originator and receiver are the same person); gesture (based on visual communication between speaker and receiver) (Kibrik, 2009: 4); electronic submode (modern technical means and social networks are considered as channels of information transmission) (Kibrik, 2009: 4).

Results and discussions

For modern science, the full use of the essence and possibilities of discourse, discursive analysis, and discursive research is a very young, unstable, inhomogeneous direction. However, the provided researches can be organized in several directions. Researchers have found that the study of dialogue in everyday life is one of the most fruitful areas of discourse research. We can single out a number of schools that formed the basis for this discursive research: the school on which the study of discourse was based (the research of J. Grimes and J. Hinds); school where methods of research of information flow are developed and substantiated (works of W. Chaife); a school where experiments in the study of discourse were done (research by R. Tomlin); school where "discourse grammar" was created (R. Longhecker); a school in which strategies for understanding discourse have been studied (T.A. van Dijk, W. Kinch); school where a general model of discourse structure was made (L. Polanya); school where socio-linguistic methodology in the study of discourse was created (U. Labov, J. Gampers).

The methods used by the abovementioned schools in their research are also diverse. Transcription of oral discourse poses a very large set of methodological issues. This is because a scientist who wants to transcribe any oral discourse faces many interpretive and technical problems. When studying oral discourse, experts emphasize that not only the words spoken by the speaker, but also his pauses, laughter, incomplete sentences, facial expressions, gestures - all this is very important. Without taking into account these features, it is impossible to fully study the oral discourse. Oral discourse is of interest to researchers because of its freedom,

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.   **№4(149)/ 2024**   **335**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

undertaking, and ability to provide important information and to directly influence participants at the same time. And turning it into a written form and making it an object of study requires taking into account many of the aforementioned features and aspects.

Conclusion

In order to understand and study discourse both as a concept and as a phenomenon, we need to take into account its register, mode, and, if necessary, even its characteristics, such as genre, service style, formality. Although these properties are independent of each other, together they can form a general characteristic of discourse. For discursive analysis to develop as a separate branch of science, we need to fully study the types of discourse. And this study can cover the following three aspects.

First, it is necessary to study and classify discursive diversity. This is because the unsystematic amount of information is the basis for the study to become chaotic.

Second, we can interpret and clarify the image of lexical and grammatical choices made by the speaker or writer only through the classification features that indicate the types of discourse.

Third, the problem of creating a general theory of discourse is related to the classification of discourses.

All topical issues of discursive analysis are addressed differently for each type of discourse. A.A. Kibrik says that to date no universal theory of discourse has been developed, and discursive analysis or research is a mosaic field. And this problem, as mentioned above, can be solved only by forming a classification of types of discourse. Today, existing methods in linguistics and philosophy are used in the study of discourse as a phenomenon. However, the fact that discourse is only now gaining attention and revealing its significance and importance shows that we need not only to study discourse, but also to consider it as an "applied discourse." This concept is reinforced by the importance of discourse as a discursive competence in the process of language learning, forming a wide choice of opportunities with its laws, characteristics, and structures in the establishment of interdisciplinary, intercultural relations. Another example of the importance of the applied aspect of discourse is the fact that the discursive laws, the characteristics of discourse, its structure and pragmatism can be of importance while establishing interpersonal, intercultural, interdisciplinary relations during the process of learning a new language, if used properly. Thus, discursive competence plays a particularly important role not only in the process of acquiring new knowledge, but also in the formation of a person's worldview. Focusing on discourse analysis in language learning D.A. Demo suggests that it can show how a new language can be used and how a learner can solve a communicative problem (Demo, 2001: www.cal.org/ericcll).

When communicating, it is not so much a matter of what we say as it is a matter of how we say it or how we express it. Human history is full of examples of how views and attitudes toward cultural, universal values and principles have changed as a result of ideological discourse directed to the right place, time, and audience.

336 **№4(149)/ 2024** *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

CONTRIBUTION OF THE AUTHORS

Abubakirova Arailym Yessimkhanqyzy – systematization of the content of the article, the main idea, development of research conclusions and thesis; determination of the general directions of the research work and drawing conclusions, as well as formulation of the research results.

Shimtemir Meirambek Sayranuly – identification, compilation and analysis of the database of article sources; collection of data necessary for the study and implementation of their scientific analysis.

Duisenbayeva Albina Kurakhbayevna – scientific editing of the article, preparation for publication, as well as control over the academic integrity of the study; verification of scientific content and implementation of editorial work on the article.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors of this work declare that there is no conflict of interests.

References

Арутюнова Н.Д. Дискурс. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990. 688 с.

Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. М.: Прогресс, 1974. 448 с.

Борботько В.Г. Элементы теории дискурса: Учебное пособие. – Грозный: Чечено-Ингушский государственный университет им. Л.Н. Толстого, 1981. 113 с.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. Discourse analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1983. 304 p.

Demo, Douglas A. Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Center for Applied Linguistics. 2001. URL: www.cal.org/ericcll.

Дейк Т.А., Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. М.: Прогресс, 1989. 307 с.

Философская энциклопедия. URL: http://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/enc_philosophy.

Фуко М. Археология знания. Киев: «Ника-Центр», 1996а. 208 с.

Фуко М. Порядок дискурса. Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет. М.: Касталь, 1996б. 448 с.

Hess-Lüttich E. W. B. Texttheorie und Soziolinguistik - eine pragmatische Synthese. Entwürfe zur Anwendung linguistischer Literaturanalyse. Inaug. Diss. Bonn, 1979. 320 p.

Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2004. 390 с.

Кибрик А.А. Модус, жанры и другие параметры классификации дискурсов. Вопросы языкознания, № 2. 2009. 3-21 сс.

Олешков М.Ю. Основы функциональной лингвистики: дискурсивный аспект: учеб. пособие для студентов фак. рус. яз. и лит. – Нижнетагильская государственная социально-педагогическая академия. Нижний Тагил, 2006. 146 с.

Parret H. Prolégomènes à la théorie de l'énonciation: De Husserl à la pragmatique. Berne, Francfort/M., New York, Paris, 1987. 418 p.

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ. **№4(149)/ 2024** **337**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

Савельева В.В. Художественный текст и художественный мир: соотнесенность и организация: автореф. дис... докт. филол. наук. Алматы, 2002. 48 с.

Серио П. О языке власти: критический анализ. В кн: Философия языка: в границах и вне границ: Междунар. сер. моногр. Т 1. Харьков: Око, 1993. 83-100 сс.

Серио П. Как читают тексты во Франции // Квадратура смысла. Французская школа анализа дискурса / Пер. с франц. и португ. М.: Прогресс, 1999. – 14-53 сс.

Степанов Ю.С. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип. Причинности // Язык и наука конца ХХ века. Сб. статей. М.: РГГУ, 1995. – 35-73 сс.

Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического р. дискурса. Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. 368 с.

Тюпа В.И. Аналитика художественного. Введение в литературоведческий анализ. М.: Лабиринт; РГГУ, 2001. 192 с.

Wodak R. Disorders of Discourse. London: Longman, 1996. 200

Әбубәкірова Арайлыма[a], Шимтемир Мейрамбека[a], Дүйсенбаева Альбина[a]
[a]Нұр-Мүбарак Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Дінді академиялық зерттеуде дискурс концепциясы негізіндегі лингвистикалық және философиялық парадигмаларды талдау

Аннотация. Мақалада тіл білімі мен философия саласында дискурс ұғымына қатысты анықтамалар, зерттеулер мен жетістіктерге шолу жасалып, философиялық және лингвистикалық феномен әрі парадигма ретіндегі дискурстың жаңа талдамасы қарастырылады. Дискурс ұғымына, терминіне қатысты жүргізілген зерттеулерге шолу жасалып, дискурсивті талдау ұғымының жеке бағыт ретінде қалыптасу тарихы талданады. Заманауи ғылым аясында дискурстың термин және ұғым ретінде қолданылу бағыттары көрсетіліп, М. Фуко еңбектері негізінде философиялық қыры айқындалады. Осы орайда М. Фуко теорияларында дискурстың адамдарға қауіптену мен қорқыныш сезімдерін ұялататын мәжбүрлеуші ұстаным, жүйесіздікті реттеуші үлкен күш ретінде қарастырылып, шектеуші, реттеуші үдерістерді жасақтаушы құрал болып түсіндірілетіні де сарапталады. Дискурсивті заңдар негізделетін ережелер қарастырылып, олардың коммуникативті құзіреттілікті қалыптастырудағы рөлі талданады. Дискурсқа тән экстралингвистикалық сипаттардың ықпалы зерделенеді. Дискурс құрылымының макро және микро деңгейлері арасындағы айырмашылық пен байланыс көрсетіледі. Дискурс модустарының түсіндірмесі, жіктемесі беріліп, олардың ерекшеліктері сипатталады. Дискурсивті зерттеулер жүргізіп жүрген мектептер көрсетіліп, олардың әдіснамасына шолу жасалады. Ауызекі дискурстың маңыздылығы мен ерекшеліктеріне назар аударылады. Тілдік қарым-қатынас орнатудағы дискурстың рөлі қарастырылып, тұжырым жасалады.

Түйін сөздер: дискурс; лингвистика; семиотика; М. Фуко; дискурсивті тәжірибелер; дискурсивті талдаулар; дискурсивті заңдар; регистр; модус.

338 **№4(149)/ 2024** *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

Абубакирова Арайлыма[a], Шимтемир Мейрамбека[a], Дуйсенбаева Альбина[a]

[a]Египетский университет исламской культуры Нур-Мубарак, Алматы, Казахстан

Анализ лингвистических и философских парадигм на основе концепции дискурса в академическом изучении религии

Аннотация. В статье представлен обзор существующих определений, исследований и достижений в области лингвистики и философии, касающихся концепта дискурса, а также новый анализ дискурса как философско-лингвистического феномена и парадигмы. Приводится обзор исследований по понятию и термину «дискурс», анализируется история становления концепции дискурсивного анализа как отдельного направления. Показаны направления применения дискурса как термина и концепта в контексте современной науки и определяется философский аспект на основе произведений М. Фуко. В связи с этим также анализируется тот факт, что в теориях М. Фуко дискурс рассматривается как принуждающий принцип, который вызывает у людей чувство страха и опасения, как великая сила, регулирующая несоответствия, и как инструмент для создания ограничительных, регулирующих процессов. Рассмотрены правила, на которых основаны дискурсивные законы, и проанализирована их роль в формировании коммуникативной компетенции. Изучено влияние экстралингвистических особенностей дискурса. Показаны различия и связи между макро- и микроуровнями структуры дискурса. Даны объяснение и классификация дискурсивных модусов, описаны их особенности. Показаны школы, проводящие дискурсивные исследования, и дан обзор их методик. Обращается внимание на важность и особенности устного дискурса. Рассмотрена роль дискурса в установлении языковой коммуникации и сделаны выводы.

Ключевые слова: дискурс; лингвистика; семиотика; М. Фуко; дискурсивные практики; дискурсивный анализ; дискурсивные законы; регистр; модус.

References

Arutjunova N.D. Diskurs // Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar' [Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary]. (Moscow, 1990, 688 p.) [in Russian].

Benvenist Je. Obshhaja lingvistika [General linguistics]. (Moscow,1974, 448 p.) [in Russian]

Borbot'ko V.G. Jelementy teorii diskursa: Uchebnoe posobie. [The elements of the theory of discourse. Didactic material]. (Groznyj, 1981, 113 p.) [in Russian]

Brown, G., & Yule, G. Discourse analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1983. – 304 p.

Demo, Douglas A. Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Center for Applied Linguistics. 2001. URL: www.cal.org/ericcll.

Dejk T.A., van. Jazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikacija [Language. Cognition. Communication]. (Moscow, 1989, 307 p.) [in Russian]

Filosofskaja jenciklopedija [Philosophic encyclopedia] http://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/enc_philosophy [in Russian]

Fuko M. Arheologija znanija [The archaeology of the knowledge]. (Kiev, 1996a, 208 p.) [in Russian]

Fuko M. Porjadok diskursa // Volja k istine: po tu storonu znanija, vlasti i seksual'nosti. Raboty raznyh let [The order of the discourse]. (Moscow, 1996b, 448 p.) [in Russian]

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

№4(149)/ 2024   **339**

Hess-Lüttich E. W. B. Texttheorie und Soziolinguistik - eine pragmatische Synthese. Entwürfe zur Anwendung linguistischer Literaturanalyse / Inaug. Diss. – Bonn, 1979. – 320 p.

Karasik V.I. Jazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs [The language circle: individual, concepts, discourse]. (Volgograd, 2004, 390 p.) [in Russian]

Kibrik A.A. Modus, zhanry i drugie parametry klassifikacii diskursov. Voprosy jazykoznanija, № 2. – 2009. [Modes, genres and other parameters of the classification of discourse. The problems of linguistics, № 2. – 2009] – 3-21 ss. [n Russian]

Oleshkov M.Ju. Osnovy funkcional'noj lingvistiki: diskursivnyj aspekt: ucheb. posobie dlja studentov fak. rus. jaz. i lit. [The basics of functional linguistics: discursive aspect]. (Nizhnij Tagil, 2006, 146 p) [in Russian]

Parret H. Prolégomènes à la théorie de l'énonciation: De Nusserl à la pragmatique. – Berne, Francfort/M., New York, Paris, 1987. – 418 p.

Savel'eva V.V. Hudozhestvennyj tekst i hudozhestvennyj mir: sootnesennost' i organizacija: avtoref. dis…dokt. filol. Nauk [Literary Text and the Artistic World: Relevance and Organization]. (Almaty, 2002, 48 p.) [in Russian]

Serio P. O jazyke vlasti: kriticheskij analiz. v kn: Filosofija jazyka: v granicah i vne granic: Mezhdunar. ser. monogr. T 1. [About the language of the power: critical analysis]. Harkov, 1993, 83-100 pp.) [in Russian]

Serio P. Kak chitajut teksty vo Francii // Kvadratura smysla. Francuzskaja shkola analiza diskursa / Per. s franc. i portug. [How do they read texts in France]. (Moscow, 1999, 14-53 pp.) [in Russian]

Stepanov Ju.S. Al'ternativnyj mir, Diskurs, Fakt i princip. Prichinnosti // Jazyk i nauka konca XX veka. Sb. Statej [Alternative world. Discourse. Fact and principle]. (Moscow, 1995, 35-73 pp.) [in Russian]

Shejgal E.I. Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa [The semiotics of the political discourse]. (Volgograd, 2000, 368 s.) [in Russian]

Tjupa V.I. Analitika hudozhestvennogo. Vvedenie v literaturovedcheskij analiz [The analytics of the artistic. Introduction to the literary analysis]. (Moscow, 2001, 192 p.) [in Russian]

Wodak R. Disorders of Discourse. – London: Longman, 1996. – 200 p.

Information about authors

Abubakirova Arailym Yessimkhanklyzy – PhD student, senior lecturer, Nur-Mubarak University, al-Farabi ave.73, 050600, Almaty, Kazakhstan. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4975-8931, a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Shimtemir Meirambek Sairanuly – PhD student, senior specialist on Educating and Social Development Department, at Nur-Mubarak University, al-Farabi ave.73, 050600, Almaty, Kazakhstan. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8942-5803, a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Duissenbayeva Albina Kurakhbayevna – PhD., acting associate professor, Nur-Mubarak University, al-Farabi ave.73, 050600, Almaty, Kazakhstan. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4556-3152, duissenbaevadka@gmail.com

340   **№4(149)/ 2024**   *Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.*
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489

Авторлар туралы мәлімет

Әбубәкірова Арайлым Есімханқызы **–** PhD докторант, Нұр-Мүбарак университетінде аға оқытушы, Алматы, Қазақстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4975-8931, a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Шимтемир Мейрамбек Сайранулы **–** PhD докторант, Тәрбие істері және әлеуметтік даму департаментінде бас маман, ЕУИК Нур-Мубарак, пр.аль-Фараби73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8942-5803, shin-miko@mail.ru

Дүйсенбаева Альбина Құрақбайқызы **–** PhD, қауымд.профессор м.а., Нұр-Мүбарак ЕИМУ, әл-Фараби даңғылы 73, 050060., Алматы, Қазақстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4556-3152, duissenbaevadka@gmail.com

Сведения об авторах

Абубакирова Арайлым Есимханкызы **–** PhD докторант, старший преподаватель, ЕУИК Нур-Мубарак, пр. Аль-Фараби, 73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4975-8931, a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Шимтемир Мейрамбек Сайранулы **–** PhD докторант, главный специалист, Департамент воспитания и социального развития, ЕУИК Нур-Мубарак, пр. Аль-Фараби, 73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8942-5803, shin-miko@mail.ru

Дуйсенбаева Альбина Курахбаевна **–** PhD, и.о. асс. профессора, ЕУИК Нур-Мубарак, пр. Аль-Фараби, 73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4556-3152, duissenbaevadka@gmail.com

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ. **№4(149)/ 2024** **341**
Тарихи ғылымдар. Философия. Дінтану сериясы
ISSN: 2616-7255. eISSN: 2663-2489