

A. Abubakirova^{1*} , D. Dilbarkhanova² 

¹Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Kazakhstan, Almaty

²Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Kazakhstan, Turkestan

*e-mail: a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE ON POWER AND COORDINATION OF THE CONCEPTS RELIGION AND DISCOURSE

The article analyzes the critical discourse analysis as one of the paradigms in the discursive study of religion. Critical discourse analysis examines discursive and critical views on religion together, and is able to show the features and priorities of these areas, which are not among the main trends in modern science. The issue of discourse analysis is raised and discussed in the context of logic, semiotics, philosophy of language, analysis of relations, consensus, the legitimacy of ethical and moral values. The article represents and describes the importance of discourse in the understanding of religion as a concept and accepting the role of religion in everyday social relations through the critical discourse analysis and the discursive study of religion. It also provides guidelines for the analysis of discursive structures and analyzes the processes of revival and change in the field of religion. The concept of discourse is considered separately and its different meanings are shown. It analyzes how the process of critical analysis is carried out in the context of discursive research, and analyzes the main directions of practical critical discourse analysis. The problem of analysis of a discursive event arises in the context of non-linguistic conditions of occurrence of discourse (economic, political, etc.). It has been established that the meaning of discourse since the foundation of discursive analysis includes not only written or oral expression, but also non-linguistic semiotic processes. It has been shown that for each discursive sphere, epistemic beings differ both in terms of axiological value and in terms of subjective regulation.

Key words: religion, power, discourse analysis, coordination, religious discourse.

А. Әбубәкірова^{1*}, Д. Дильбарханова²

¹Нұр-Мұбарак Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

²Қожа Ахмет Яссауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.

*e-mail: a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Дін және дискурс концептілерінің билік пен бағдарлауға ықпалын сыни түрде талдау

Мақалада дінді дискурсивті тұрғыда зерттеудегі парадигмалардың бірі ретінде сыни дискурс талдауы сарапталады. Сыни дискурс талдауы дінге қатысты дискурсивті және сыни көзқарастарды бірлестікте талдай отырып, заманауи ғылымдағы негізгі тенденциялар қатарынан орын ала алмай келе жатқан бұл бағыттардың ерекшеліктері мен басым тұстарын көрсете алады. Дискурс талдамасы жайлы мәселе логика, семиотика, тіл философиясы, қарым-қатынас сараптамасы, келісімге келу, этикалық, моралдық құндылықтар легитимациясы аясында қозғалып, талқыланады. Мақалада сыни дискурс талдауы мен дінді дискурсивті тұрғыда зерттеу арқылы дискурстың дінді ұғым ретінде түсіне алудағы және күнделікті әлеуметтік қарым-қатынастағы діннің рөлін түсінудегі маңызы көрсетіліп, сипатталады. Сонымен қатар дискурсивті құрылымдарды талдауға арналған бағдарлар ұсынылып, дін саласындағы қайта жандану мен өзгеру үдерістері сараланады. Дискурс ұғымы жекелей қарастырылып, оның түрлі мағыналары көрсетіледі. Сыни тұрғыда талдау үдерісінің дискурсивті зерттеу мәнмәтінінде қалай жүзеге асатындығы сарапталып, тәжірибелік сыни дискурс талдауын жүзеге асырудың негізгі бағыттары талданады. Дискурстың пайда болуының тілдік емес жағдаяттары аясында (экономикалық, саяси, т.б.) дискурсивті оқиғаны талдау мәселесі бой көрсетеді. Дискурсивті талдама жасаудың іргетасы қаланған кезден бастап дискурстың мағынасы жазба не ауызекі пікір білдірумен ғана шектелмей, тілдік емес семиотикалық үдерістерді де қамтитыны анықталды. Әрбір дискурсивті сала үшін эпистемиялық болмыстар аксиологиялық құндылығы тұрғысынан да, субъективті реттелуі тұрғысынан да ерекшеленетіндігі көрсетілді.

Түйін сөздер: дін, билік, дискурс талдау, бағдарлау, діни дискурс.

А. Әбубәкірова^{1*}, Д. Дильбарханова²

¹Египетский университет исламской культуры Нур-Мубарак, Казахстан, г. Алматы

²Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави, Казахстан, г. Туркестан

*e-mail: a.abubakirova.work@gmail.com

Критический анализ влияния на власть и координацию концептов «религия» и «дискурс»

В статье анализируется критический дискурсивный анализ как одна из парадигм дискурсивного изучения религии. Критический дискурс-анализ рассматривает дискурсивные и критические взгляды на религию вместе и способен показать особенности и приоритеты этих сфер, которые не входят в число основных направлений современной науки. Ставится и обсуждается вопрос анализа дискурса в контексте логики, семиотики, философии языка, анализа отношений, консенсуса, легитимности этических и моральных ценностей. В статье представлена и описана важность дискурса в понимании религии как концепции и в признании роли религии в повседневных социальных отношениях посредством критического анализа дискурса и дискурсивного изучения религии. Также представляются принципы, которых нужно придерживаться для анализа дискурсивных структур, и анализируются процессы возрождения и изменения в области религии. Отдельно рассматривается понятие дискурса и показаны его различные значения. В статье анализируется, как осуществляется процесс критического анализа в контексте дискурсивного исследования, и рассмотрены основные направления практического критического анализа дискурса. Изучается проблема анализа дискурсивного события в контексте неязыковых условий возникновения дискурса (экономических, политических и т.п.). Установлено, что значение дискурса с момента основания дискурсивного анализа включает в себя не только письменное или устное выражение, но и неязыковые семиотические процессы. Показано, что для каждой дискурсивной сферы эпистемические существа различаются как по ценностному значению, так и по субъективной регуляции.

Ключевые слова: религия, власть, дискурс анализ, координация, религиозный дискурс.

Introduction

While considering the topic of the article, it is important to pay attention to the fact that the word "critical" is used in relation to religion and discourse, not in the sense of "aggressive", but to be able to consider the positive and negative aspects of religion as a concept on an equal level and in harmony. At the same time, we can critically consider the transformative power of religion and distinguish its influence on the formation of social equality and inequality. Criticism of religion in modern science formed within the framework of critical views formulated by K. Marx about 150 years ago. And he, in turn, turned the critical attitude towards religion into historical interest. The methodology and principles of the sociology of religion, despite the diversity of topical issues and topics of the present period, based on works of E. Durkheim, M. Weber. In writing this article, we aimed to present a critical discourse analysis that is relevant to today's reality. The main reasons for the success of this direction are to encourage scientists to understand the hegemonic role of religion in everyday life and to provide guidance for the analysis of the discursive structure, revival and change of inequality in the field of religion.

Justification of the choice of article's theme, goals, and objectives

The importance of discursive principles in the study of religion is reflected in the fact that the resurgence or rise of religion at the global level is directly connected with the widespread expansion of the capitalist market. Most of the studies, studying the consumer society, pay attention to the fact that instead of the traditional institution of religion, the set of religious beliefs and activities reflected in the name "spirituality" constitute the majority of public interest. But if we consider the situation in the context of the 21st century, other aspects will be revealed. Globalization and extreme freedom pose a great threat to the general tradition, and in particular to religion, which is an important part of that tradition. At the same time, the indescribable inequality in the world (in all spheres of life) is creating a new unregulated market for religions, creating an opportunity to offer the "promise of salvation" as their main product. The world community is still not able to get out of the discussions about the "death" or "resurrection" of religion, and does not pay attention to the ability of religion to create and change inequality in society. In writing this article, we have considered how critical discourse analysis can be useful in addressing this issue.

At the same time, another important issue for modern society is the mediation of the knowledge we receive every day, that is, the information we receive through media contains only one-sided information. However, we now live in a society where there are alternative proposals for this situation. Especially the last decade is characterized by the widespread spread of social networks and media that bring the peoples of the world closer together. Writing your thoughts, getting evaluation from someone you don't even know, even living in another corner of the world, getting answers, publishing events from your life, your lifestyle – everything is becoming a normal, unsurprising situation for us today. Although the level of access to the Internet is different in the world, even within the territory of one country, the number of people who are behind the global trends is limited. The reason is that nowadays the media itself publishes information and methods that are available to the public on social networks, and this process goes in the opposite direction too. The news that you could not read on the newspaper will appear in front of you as soon as your gadget is connected to the Internet. A citizen of the 21st century works in an environment saturated with media, text, and symbols. For the unemployed, the underemployed, and the employed, the majority of service or information-based work, consumption, and leisure organization depend on their ability to construct, monitor, and use texts and symbols (Luke, 1995: 5–6). Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that we live in the age of discourse.

Discourse research is not only a discussion of the meaning of the concepts underlying the topic for people, but also a consideration of what people do while talking about these concepts. And discursive research does not contrast speaking and doing, but considers both side by side. In other words, the discursive study of religion is to consider how concepts such as religion, spirituality, and faith are formed in discourse.

And the critical analysis that we are going to consider in the article is used to show the functions of religion in creating and maintaining inequalities. Although the system of social change proposed by K. Marx in the 19th century is not appropriate to be copied into the reality of the 21st century, his emphasis on economic power and inequality can provide a basis for a critical analysis of class discourse and the influence of class on discourse in capitalist society. The purpose of a critical analysis of religion is to analyze how the positions and demands of religion can shape and change inequality, consider-

ing its foundations. We can also analyze how the structures of secularism and post-secularism affect the social position of individuals, communities and religious traditions. However, this study only shows how critical discourse analysis can be used. First, we will analyze the concept of discourse, focus on its possible meanings and applications, and try to describe how to conduct critical analysis and conduct discursive research.

Scientific research methodology

The methodology used in this study was chosen according to the research directions and questions outlined in the introduction. The sources include the works of domestic and foreign scientists. The collected data were analyzed from a linguistic, philosophical and religious point of view, discursive research and distinctive features of the discourse were determined using the method of content analysis. The functions of the discourse as a paradigm were studied through analysis and synthesis, and the characteristics of the discourse were systematized.

Main part

The word discourse has many definitions and meanings. The historical version is to describe discourse as an act of conversation, linguistic communication. Recent versions explain discourse in terms of ontology. During the study of religion, in order to define the discourse, there is a tendency to highlight its differences and features within the framework of cultural studies and linguistic studies. For example, Engler, in his scheme, says that cultural studies focuses on how discourse forms and shapes things, and shows language as a tool used only by autonomous subjects (Engler, 2006: 517). Linguistic studies, in turn, focus on empirical studies of micro- and macro-level texts.

Discourse analysis is a universal topic addressed by various branches of modern humanities. Even each social institution has formed the form of its own special discourse. That is why discourse is now becoming one of the most relevant and popular research objects for several fields. Discourse can be considered as a means of regulating society and forming social principles. Today, the concept of discourse has the same role in social sciences as the role of the euro in the European economy (Makarov, 2003: 11). Moreover, the most widespread in scientific literature are linguistic and philosophical studies. Each of them has developed its own definition of

the concept of discourse and the analysis of discursive activity in accordance with its research object. Nevertheless, it is also worth noting that with this term, different fields of science define different concepts and show different meanings. For example, A. Usmanova, defining the concepts of discourse and discursive in a broad sense, says: "Discourse shows a complex interrelationship of linguistic experience and extralinguistic indicators (an important action manifested in a state convenient for sensory perception), which allow understanding the text, that is, forming an image of the participants of communication, their positions, provides information about goals, message creation and reception situations" (Usmanova, 2001: 240). The traditional meaning of the word discourse includes ordered written or spoken messages of an individual subject. However, in recent decades, many new concepts have been defined by this term, as a result of which it is widely used in humanities. In addition, considering the concepts of text and discourse as interchangeable concepts may be due to the absence of the term discourse in the languages of European civilization, where most of the sciences originated, and in the past only linguistic experience was included in the scope of this concept.

The concept of discourse, especially religious discourse, can be freely used in considering and solving religious problems. In modern philosophy, discourse is considered as a means of establishing social principles, regulating society, forming a democratic system, an open society, and a model of free communication, where communication participants are equal. In addition, hermeneutics, poststructuralism, postmodernism create their own special definitions of discourse and explain its essence in a special way. For example, within the framework of ideas of poststructuralism and postmodernism, discourse is a unique form of language manifestation that creates a social order, characteristic of a certain culture and society, that is, discourse can be realized through linguistic actions and can be a tool that can create social order in the society where it takes place.

Philosophical aspects of the discourse term based on the works of M. Foucault. According to his understanding, discourse is a complex set of linguistic actions, which are involved in forming an opinion about the object they see as possible. Discourse, being a means of knowledge, presents an expression of a unique, non-traditional way of analyzing culture. In his research, M. Foucault focuses not on the denotative meaning of discourse, but on the connotative meaning that is implied by

users, but not expressed openly (Foucault, 1996: 214). Although non-linguistic situations create an environment conducive to the emergence of discourse, they do not guarantee its establishment. The space of discursive activity is distinguished by the ability to combine different time situations that go beyond the definition of culture in language. M. Foucault observes that discourse has the power to say, to inform, through which we can clarify something. Speaking is an opportunity given only to those who are able to speak. In this state, discourse appears as a way of contesting power, like other categories in society. Thanks to the works of M. Foucault, the French school of discursive analysis is distinguished by its philosophical orientation, emphasis on ideological, historical, and psychoanalytic aspects of discourse.

Discourse is language embedded in social context. For this reason, we do not apply this concept to ancient texts. Discourse is not an isolated, limited textual or dialogical structure, because within it the paralinguistic applications of language are of great importance. Based on this, the discursive analysis of religious phenomena becomes relevant. Discourse is an important component of cultural and social communication. According to the point of view of modern sociolinguistics, every social institution has its own form of institutionalized discourse. For example, V. Karasik distinguishes types of institutionalized discourse as scientific, religious, business, political, mass media, legal, diplomatic, pedagogical, medical, military, advertising, sports, etc. (Karasik, 2000: 25-33).

Critical discourse analysis attempts to bridge these two positions. This is what we can see from the works of N. Fairclough. He, combining M. Foucault's ideas with a set of techniques known as functional linguistics, creates a tool that allows for in-depth analysis of texts. The theoretical aspects and methodological systems of critical discourse analysis are reflected in the framework of two major possibilities offered by discourse – structure and function. Discourse can be structuring because it not only presents and shows things abstractly, but creates and shapes them (Fairclough, 1992: 3). According to N. Fairclough, three things are formed in the course of discourse: social self-definition or subjective positions; social relations; knowledge and belief systems. These concepts may not be formed sequentially or alternately, but by distinguishing them in this way, we can make analytical analysis possible. As an example, it is possible to consider cultic contrasts in the study of religion. While for

one group particular religious beliefs and practices may be the way to salvation and happiness, for another group they may be the cause of deviation from the truth, transgression, and punishment. In order to answer the question of how this problem arises, we must consider two different discourses of the two groups mentioned above. Both sides are not lying, in their understanding, of course, only a third party who can conduct research from an objective point of view can determine which side is true. The formation of two different opinions on the same issue and concept is due to the use of two different discourses by its supporters. Neither of them are lying, but they may or may not be telling the whole and complete truth. A facet of reality can be reflected only according to the context in which the discourse takes place. Each conscious person decides for himself what to include and what not to include in his reality, and this choice may depend on many criteria. One of those conditions is to match their interest (Barker, 2011: 200).

Closely related to A. Barker's research on the self-interests of individuals in society, a second characteristic of discourse appears. In addition to being constructive, discourse can also be functional (Potter, 1987: 32-33). Discourse, as a form of social activity, affects both the reconstruction of society and social changes. In a work written in 1992, Edwards and Potter talk about the "action orientation" in discourse, and how things and actions are realized through discourse. Anti-cult research examines not only their structure, but also how to treat members, and the application of practical guidelines for preventing cult influence. Discourse on these cults can treat them as a social problem and suggest practical positions for its solution.

Although the structural and functional characteristics of the discourse and aspects related to them are common to many studies, the epistemological and ontological bases, methodological and interpretative positions vary depending on the scope of the study. The social context of the discourse is constantly, continuously being created, and therefore cannot be completely independent of the discourse. That is why small structural units (part of speech) are taken into account during the analysis. However, if the context of the discourse is independent, the stable forms of the discourse are reflected, the units of analysis are voluminous and are studied comparatively within broad social and cultural frameworks.

During the critical analysis we said that the works of M. Foucault and the rules of functional

linguistics are important. Critical discourse analysis makes concepts such as power, knowledge and ideology surrounding discursive processes the main object of study.

In colloquial circulation, ideology is used as a concept close to worldview, and in some historical periods, it was completely opposed to the concept of religion. The loss of influence of religion and magic created the basis for the emergence of secular belief systems or ideologies. Moreover, it, in turn, served to advance political activity independently of the values and creatures of the other world (Thompson, 1990: 77). Although this aspect of ideology is rooted in the history of concepts, critical discourse analysis uses it differently. It can be formulated as follows: "meaning in the service of power" (Thompson, 1990: 8). Ideologies are considered as structures of reality (physical world, social relations, social determination) according to different forms and values of discursive practices and can affect processes such as the emergence, processing, and re-formation of management relations (Fairclough, 1992: 87).

The modern discursive concept of ideology knows that retaining power is not achieved through oppression, but through persuasive language. If the correct ways of thinking and doing actions related to a problem are on one side and other actions are not taken into account, we can say that the discourse is working ideologically (Chouliaraki, 1999: 26). For example, if the actions and attitudes of a group of people are described as not far from their ethnic and religious foundations, the discourse destroys the differences in beliefs, practices and systems of thought within the group. Hegemony, being the pinnacle of an ideology, can also represent the point at which all other alternative structures are suppressed in favor of the dominant viewpoint.

There are two sides to the methodological foundations of a critical approach to ideology. First, it is considered how different aspects of language use contribute to the one-sidedness of the structure of things or how they serve the interests of certain social groups. Second, issues that are not mentioned, but which we take for granted, are considered. Universal concepts shape our perception of everyday life and contribute to the stability of hegemony. Critical discourse analysis aims to show the ways in which power inequalities are reinforced through discourse. In addition, it is realized by getting rid of "false consciousness" and paying attention to the pressure on alternative structures in the world (Fairclough, 1995: 17).

Results and discussions

Critical discourse analysis is a normative activity, and any critique by its definition provides an applied ethics (Van Dijk, 1993: 253). Nevertheless, it should be no more than creating resources for people to use in making their own decisions. Critical discourse analysis is not intended to provide a basis for revolution or other changes.

Although there are works that provide guidance and methodology for various ways of doing critical discourse analysis, there is no specific, established, conventionally agreed way of conducting this analysis. Researchers who are just entering this field and facing the challenges understand that analyzing a single sentence discourse is a very large-scale work and takes a lot of time. From this, we can conclude that each system of discourse analysis should be created separately. However, there are specific aspects to guide critical discourse analysis. Although each discourse analysis is unique, it is carried out within these aspects: text analysis, analysis of discursive practice, analysis of social practice. Now let's talk about each of these aspects.

The most important part of discourse analysis is text analysis. Any set of printed, written, transcribed sentences is considered as a text. In addition, there are many ways to analyze it. From linguistic analysis to text interpretation, everything helps to extract meaning from a text. Text analysis should begin with the analysis of words and proceed to a broader analysis that can analyze the meaning and significance of the entire text (Richardson, 2007: 46-47). Words give context to events and their participants. Describing a participant as a "thug, provocateur" or "freedom fighter, longing for freedom" in the context of a certain event ensures the formation of two different, completely opposed opinions about that person. In turn, the story also acquires a different meaning through words. Take the recent Syrian civil war as an example. Despite the fact that the main character of this war was "civil", external forces intervened and those forces used words like "neutralizer, compromiser, protector" to describe themselves, and used words like "destroy, break, kill" to describe the Islamic forces, thus the whole world knows well that the war had completely different character. By using such words with opposite meanings, "us" and "them", i.e. "right" and "wrong" parties are formed in the discourse. As a result, the "correct" party can justify any of its actions. Moreover, this formula in relation to religious trends is reflected in the declaration of competing religious

trends that live side by side with them as "misguided", "infidel", "satanic". Another example would be "naming". There are general names such as "Palenshe, Tugenshe" in Kazakh, and "Ivan Ivanov, Petr Petrovich" in Russian. It is known that we use such names to describe people of a certain age and social level. Let's look at one example: "If the secretary thinks so, why is it not a conspiracy if Muhammad al-Smith wants to do something, plans to do something, tells others about his evil deeds?" (Richardson, 2007: 50). From the point of view of critical discourse analysis, we should focus on the name "Muhammad al-Smith" in this sentence. Along with "Muhammad" the most popular and common name among Muslims, the most common surname in British society, "Smith" with the article "al", a feature of the Arabic language, indicates that the speaker believes that British Muslims are guilty and responsible for terrorist acts and attacks in Britain.

In order to understand the appearance and image of actions in discourse, we need to be able to analyze the interchange and transitivity between them. Hiding or completely ignoring the doer of the action by using a passive voice verb is of particular importance. Because it is through this linguistic structure (that is, through the use of a passive voice verb) that we can understand which aspect the discourse participants want to emphasize in a certain event or action. For example, in the sentence "Police officers managed to prevent terrorist attacks organized by Muslims", full information is given and the nature of the attackers and the competent authority to repel them are clearly indicated, but in the sentence "Terrorist attacks were prevented", we can only see the transaction between actions. Moreover, these two different discourses find their place depending on the purpose of the user, the creator. For example, if the first option is used in an environment where Islamophobic attitudes prevail, the second option is more flexible for an environment where the majority of the population is Muslim. At the same time, the use of discourses is influenced by many characteristics such as the medium of the discourse, the target audience, the intended purpose, and the date of its occurrence.

The next aspect that is worth paying attention to in the analysis of textual discourses is that the creator of the discourse conveys his subjective opinion and prediction through the discourse. This is done through additional verbs, adverbs, conjunctions. For example: "Isolations during the pandemic can cause losses to small business representatives", "Who can guarantee that the ongoing activities will not ag-

gravate the situation?", "According to forecasters, it will be cloudy and raining tomorrow". In all of these sentences, we understand that the speaker is speaking only hypothetically, and that the situations reported by him may not happen at all.

The text sometime contains messages that are conventionally accepted or self-explanatory. Possessive pronouns, interrogatives, and adjectives are often used in the construction of such sentences: "He is showing his image", "When will the exact answer be given?", "The children's hospital is being equipped with new equipment". From the first phrase, we can understand that the speaker had an opinion about the object or phenomenon in that context, and that the action that took place confirmed that opinion. If we notice from the next interrogative sentence that it has become difficult to get an answer to the common problem on the mind of the participants of the discourse and their demands regarding the answer (should be specific), from the last one we understand that the children's hospital used to have some tools, but new tools were brought in their place.

During the analysis of the text, the use of rhetorical tools should not be neglected. Linguistic and literary tools such as metaphor and metonymy are used to reveal the understanding-forming and persuasive aspects of the text (according to our research, discourse). As a clear example, we can recall the various metaphors related to war in S. Huntington's work on the conflict between Western and Muslim civilizations. At the same time, during the analysis of the discourse, it is necessary to pay attention to the plot-thematic connection. This is because it forms and establishes connections between objects and participants in time space (Jasinski, 2001: 390). But as a declarative text, although the sequence of events may be different, within discourse the same actions and events may be presented quite differently. The relationship between them allows us to evaluate how real opinions and thoughts are formed during the discourse.

As we mentioned above, discourse analysis is the analysis of the use of language in a certain social context. Therefore, we interpret the text in the context of a larger social experience. In his 1992 work, Fairclough identifies a third level between text and social context. This level is called "discursive practices" and involves the production and reception of texts. By studying discursive practices, we can understand how authors create texts using already existing discourses and genres, and how text receivers, in turn, use already existing discourses and genres in

receiving and interpreting texts (Phillips, 2002: 69). Discourse itself cannot exist alone, it cannot even be created. In the process of creating a discourse, it is possible to include certain parts of other discourses or texts, oppose it, criticize it, and give an explanation. The use of direct speech, indirect speech, and sentences is a practice that is widely used during discourse. Apart from the content, the discourse that is created takes even the sequence and correct usage from the existing discourses. For example, when working with students in the classroom, when talking to a doctor, when applying for a job, different discourse sequences and sentence sequences appropriate for this situation are used. In the same way, the genre is chosen depending on the discourse that is formed within the framework of some social activity: informal messages on social networks, a conversation while buying food from a store near the house, documentaries on television, poems, prose, methods of expressing thoughts in a scientific article. All these examples are distinguished by the fact that they use established, conditional discourses, and also contribute to the construction of discourses related to a particular situation. Self-definition, relationships, and beliefs in genre-based discourses can provide us with a lot of information about social interactions, predictions, and inferences. As for our research, we can also get information about the role of religious discourse within a certain social context.

Although discourse has the power to transform and reshape society, it would be naive to think that all discourse is equal. Although we all have our own opinions and thoughts, it is undeniable that the person who is higher in the structural hierarchy has priority in speaking and being heard in front of the public. For example, in the media discourse between representatives of the Islamic religion and representatives of local authorities in Western societies, the priority is given to the other side. The hegemonic discourse on Satanism in Finland was shaped by the expertise of evangelical Christian church experts on the subject. While we can base the analysis of the text above on certain rules and methods, the analysis of social practice does not easily succumb to the influence of certain aids. Locke describes the analysis of social practice as follows: "attending to the things that prompted its emergence, such as the immediate situation, and discursive situations and various socio-cultural practices at the institutional and social level that provide a broader contextual understanding" (Locke, 2004: 42). As an example of the analysis of social experience, we can take any social institutions that have contributed to the formation of

the assimilated, established, cultural heritage, social order in a certain society. In the case of our country, it can be seen from the recognition of the role of Hanafi Islam and Orthodox Christianity in the development of the people's culture and spiritual life, as stated in the preamble of the Law "On Religious Associations and Religious Activities". This means that for our country, Islam of the Hanafi direction prevails over any other Islamic directions and currents, conditionally and by tacit agreement, as a result of which it has priority in religious discourses. In the same description, we can talk about Orthodox Christianity.

Based on the above example, we can see that the text alone is not enough during the discourse analysis. Discourse becomes meaningful only in a wider social context. The social context is analyzed empirically. Attention is paid to participants, groups, intra-group and inter-group relations, their relations with society. And within the framework of critical discourse analysis, we analyze the context from a theoretical point of view and pay attention to the structure of power in the field of ideology and hegemony. The explanatory power of critical discourse analysis is reflected in its analysis of social practice. Attention to the social context can show us that the system of actions under discussion is a system selected from among the actions made possible by discursive practice, and can describe how this choice is made on the basis of social and cultural practices. However, other studies (surveys, ethnographic studies, interviews, etc.) should be conducted in order to obtain accurate information and complete conclusions. During the full analysis of critical discourse, the processes of production and consumption are also considered along with textual research. For example, in the study of the relationship between religion and the mass media, for a long time it was only within the framework of discourses related to religion in the mass media. But in the context of current conditions, it is important for us to analyze not only the explicit acceptance of religious discourse by the environment, but also how the external image of religious discourses is created by using non-religious media products.

In a generalized state, the analysis of religious language, narratives of individual religions, written traditions of confessions, genre and thematic structure of religious texts, will not be possible until the analysis concepts such as "religious discourse", "confessional type of discourse", "discursive environment of a certain religion" and changes experienced in various discursive spheres of basic

epistemic beings (knowledge, thought, faith, fact), of the system of actions, such as, verification, determination of authenticity, value assessment. This is because the importance, meaning and content of the main epistemic essences of each religion depend and are closely related to the discursive system in which they are reflected in context. Each confessional form of discourse is based on a hierarchical system of basic cognitions, and each of them has its own semantic value in the discursive activity of a certain confession. Religious discourse represents the discourse of faith, which transcends rational knowledge and acknowledges that divine knowledge is true.

In the context of religious experience, faith has a very high value as a universal worldview category. And within the framework of scientific discourse, belief is expressed only through its epistemological aspect and is considered as an incomplete, untested form of someone else's thought.

In the context of religious discourse, the requirements for verification are based not on truth's conformity to authenticity, but on its conformity to a higher, sacred truth provider. And if we take into account that the truth for religions is concentrated in their sacred texts, verification goes hand in hand with the process of interpretation. And in this field, the use of verification methods based on logic and rationalism is meaningless and ineffective. For example, within the scientific discourse, we cannot verify the statement "God created the world" as a fact, but within the religious discourse, on the contrary, this statement is recognized as a fact that corresponds to the content of sacred texts and successfully passes the verification process.

In the discursive field of religion, the analysis of the basic principles of verifying the authenticity of the text is also an important process. If evaluation in any discursive field is carried out on the basis of a category such as "right/wrong", within the framework of religious discourse, the honesty of the subject of the text being evaluated is taken into account, and deviation from the truth is considered as an action beyond the subject's control. During the verification of the authenticity of the religious text, information about the author's beliefs, knowledge, personal qualities, and teachers can be analyzed and taken as a basis. That is why it is of great importance to clearly define the limits of the discursive environment in which this activity takes place.

Religious discourse in its meaning as a religious text in a situation of real communication allows the use of various research methods. We can analyze

the religious discourse from the point of view of the completeness, correctness, and logical coherence of the text from the linguistic method, which studies the linguistic, lexical, and grammatical layers of the religious text. In this case, the researcher analyzes the possible situations of departure from it, based on the concept of "properly structured discourse".

From a sociological point of view, all types of religious discourse by participants can be broken down to rank-oriented discourse. In the first case, the participants of the communication try to reveal their inner world to the person to whom their speech is directed, and try to understand and accept the interlocutor as a religious person with all the consequences of his religious experience. And in the second case, the participants in the relationship show themselves as representatives of some faith and try to fulfill the role offered to them in accordance with the social and communicative situation. Person-centered discourse takes place in everyday and existential forms of communication, and everyday communication is the genetic origin of discourse. And the discussion of existence takes place as a theological dialogue. Rank-oriented religious discourse can be institutionalized or non-institutional, depending on which religious institutions function at a certain historical moment in the society in which it is being realized and formed. Within the framework of pragmatic concepts of discourse, the following types of communication are contrasted: ritual – non-ritual, informative – fascinative. Certain characteristics of the types of discourse expressed on a pragmatic and linguistic basis are interrelated. Non-ritual discourse can include such components as providing information and exchanging texts in a fascinative way. And the details of the ritual discourse are present in almost all discourses. However, it can be difficult to distinguish ritual texts within the context of existential discourse, to define the ritual aspects of a literary or philosophical text. And since the ritual level of religious discourse is very high, the analysis of ritual religious discourse is one of the most fruitful and effective directions in this research subject. It is true that the ritual is the language of religion for the nations with no written culture, for humanity in general (Gill, 1982: 76). Ritual is characteristic to different levels of different forms of discourse, which are distinguished on social and linguistic grounds. A ritual is a sign of one or a group of participants moving to a new state or level. And the ritual tone of mutual communication establishes the order and hierarchy in the team and is attached to the formed value system. Thus, religious discourse becomes a

relevant object of research of philosophy of religion, linguistic religious studies, cultural studies, etc. and in the framework of related fields of science. Analysis of religious texts from the point of view of modern theory of discourse allows studying them in a very broad social and cultural context, taking into account their specific place in religion.

We can see the first thoughts about the influence of religion and discourse on power and social orientation on the works of K. Marx. Describing religion as an opium, he not only compared it to a dangerous, harmful drug, Marx wanted to describe the legitimating power of religion in relation to social order (Hamilton, 2001: 93-94). P. Berger also gave this kind of explanation in his works: "Religion is the most widespread and the most effective tool of legitimation on the stage of history. All legitimation maintains a socially determined authenticity. The reason that the legitimization of religion is effective is that it connects the questionable reality structures of empirical societies with eternal reality. The weak realities of the social world are based on sacred realism, which, in turn, is by definition beyond the contingencies of human essences and human actions (Berger, 1973: 41). In his later works, Berger suggests that although legitimation is a matter of social harmony and coherence, from a critical point of view it can also be an attempt at hegemony. On this basis, he describes religion as an ideology and as an essence that serves power. Alternative constructions of authenticity come under pressure before the authority of an eternal, unquestionable origin (sanctity). Berger's conclusion is consistent with Marx's important social and economic theory of "alienation, separation". Critical discourse analysis can provide a methodological framework by distinguishing how these legitimations are discursively implemented and how religious differentiation is reflected within the discourse. Today, as everyone can see, despite the active implementation of the secularization process, any function of religion, especially its legitimizing power, is of great importance for modern society. The influence of religion is reflected in issues such as equality between races, reproduction, and the role of women in society. Examples include the situation of women in Afghanistan under the Taliban regime, the separation of men and women during worship in Orthodox Jewish communities, anti-abortion religious groups, the Catholic Church's opposition to contraception, related views on the dress code of Muslim women in many secular societies (hijab, niqab, burqa, etc.). Critical

discourse analysis aims to consider how these processes are formed and changed discursively.

K. Marx in his works, showed the influence of religion on the superiority of some class, but the reality of society explained that the influence of social characteristics such as race, nationality, gender, and age should not be ignored. And when the process of secularization gained massive support, the assumptions and studies that religion could create class or group differences were even left aside. But if we look at history, we can see that religion has been a divisive force in many situations. At the same time, the unifying power of religion is manifested in the current situations and problems. Although we cannot say that the process of secularization has stopped (most of the countries of the world recognize themselves as secular states), we cannot deny that religion plays an important role in people's spiritual and social life as a means of self-determination, as a basis.

The most common paradigm shift in modern science is to consider desecularization, or post-secularism, rather than secularization. A review of secularization based on critical discourse analysis defines desecularization as a dialectical and reflexive process, criticizing the characterization of post-secularism as a state of things or events. No one can question or change the special place of the concept of religion in public discourse. But through critical discourse analysis, we can see that this place of religion in public discourse and the quantitative (rather than qualitative) renaissance or renewal of religion cannot be grounds for rejecting secularization. Religious communities are entering the secular discourse, rethinking their social roles. Religious communities are forced to use secular principles

and demands in order to focus on themselves and make their opinions heard. This is because social structures have not yet been fully desecularized. Discursive conflicts can be reflected in the subjective application of secular customs. And critical discourse analysis can offer a methodological tool on how to discuss, describe and resolve the conflict. It can also consider why people may end up in conflict by choosing a certain direction. Critical discourse analysis can provide comprehensive demographic and quantitative analyzes of society, including text analysis, research on the production and reception of texts.

Conclusion

Discourse about religion has always been an integral part of public discourse. And individually, the concepts of religion and discourse actively influence social processes. Aspects such as the power of religion in the formation, change and reconstruction of social inequality and power, the legitimizing power of religion, dialectical processes in public discourse, and the structure of religion require special attention from the point of view of the field of religious studies, sociology, and linguistics in the context of modern social reality. The critical discourse analysis we considered, beginning with the works of K. Marx, has a great ability and opportunity to analyze, describe and explain the aspects of religion that we have mentioned above. Taking into account that the processes of legitimization, formation, reconstruction, and change related to religion are carried out within the discourse, the ability to critically analyze the discourse can help bring to light many unclear and hidden problems.

References

- Карасик В.И. (2000) Структура институционального дискурса. Проблемы речевой коммуникации / В.И. Карасик. – Саратов: Изд-во Саратов. ун-та. – 236 с.
 Макаров М.Л. (2003) Основы теории дискурса / М.Л. Макаров. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис». – 280 с.
 Усманова А.Р. (2001) Дискурсия, дискурс / А.Р. Усманова // Постмодернизм. Энциклопедия. – Минск: Интерпрессервис; Книжный Дом. – 240 с.
 Фуко М. (1996) Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности / М. Фуко. – М.: Касталь. – 448 с.

References

- Barker E. (2011) The cult as a social problem. In: Hjelm T. (ed.) Religion and Social Problems. – NY: Routledge. – pp. 198-212.
 Berger P.L. (1973) The Social Reality of Religion. – London: Penguin. – 231 p.
 Chouliaraki L. and Fairclough N. (1999) Discourse in Late Modernity. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. – p. 176.
 Engler S. (2006) Discourse. In: von Stuckrad K (ed.) The Brill Dictionary of Religion. – Leiden: Brill. – pp. 516-519.
 Fairclough N. (1992) Discourse and Social Change. – Cambridge: Polity Press. – 259 p.
 Fairclough N. (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis. – London: Longman. – 265 p.

- Foucault, M. (1996) *Volia k istine: po tu storonu znaniia, vlasti i seksualnosti* [The Will to Truth: Beyond Knowledge, Power and Sexuality]. – Moscow: Kastal. – 448 p. (in Russian)
- Gill S.D. (1982) *Beyond «the primitive»: The religions of nonliterate peoples* / S.D. Gill. Prentice-Hall, 156 p.
- Hamilton M. (2001) *The Sociology of Religion. Second Edition*. London: Routledge. – p. 320.
- Jasinski J. (2001) *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. – p. 675.
- Karasik, V.I. (2000) *Struktura institutsionalnogo diskursa. Problemy rechevoi kommunikatsii* [The structure of institutional discourse. Problems of speech communication]. Saratov: Izd-vo Saratov. un-ta. – 236 p. (in Russian)
- Locke T. (2004) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum. – 104 p.
- Luke A. (1995) *Text and discourse in education: an introduction to critical discourse analysis* // *Review of Research in Education*, №21, pp. 3-48.
- Makarov, M.L. (2003) *Osnovy teorii diskursa* [The basics of discourse theory]. M.: ITDGK «Gnozis». – 280. (in Russian)
- Phillips L. and Jørgensen M.W. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE. – 230 p.
- Potter J. and Wetherell M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: SAGE. – 216 p.
- Richardson J.E. (2007) *Analyzing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. – 287 p.
- Thompson J.B. (1990) *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. – 372 p.
- Usmanova, A.R. (2001). *Diskursiia, diskurs* [Discursive activity, discourse]. Minsk: Interpresservis; Knizhnyi Dom. – 240 p. (in Russian)
- Van Dijk T.A. (1993) *Principles of critical discourse analysis* // *Discourse and Society*. №4(2), pp. 249-283.