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Generally accepted definition of discourse - (Fr. —discours, Eng. —Discourse, from Lat. —discursus - movement, circulation, conversation) as a notion covering all the aspects of its use did not exist and it is possible that this contributed to the widespread popularity acquired by this term during the last decades: linked to various non-trivial understanding of different concepts successfully satisfy the requirements by modifying by the more traditional notions of speech, text, dialogue, style and even language. conversation speech, the process of linguistic activity, a way of speaking.

The term discourse was widely used in the early 1970's and originally the meaning was close in Russian linguistics as the term - "functional style" (speech or language).

N.D. Arutyunova considers discourse as "a coherent text together with the extralinguistic - pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological and other factors, the text in the event-aspect, we consider it as purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and their mechanisms of consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse – it is —a speech immersed in life". Discourse involves paralinguistic support speech (facial expressions, gestures), the following main functions dictated by the structure of discourse: the rhythmic, referential linking words with the subject field of application of language (deictic gestures), semantic, the function of the impact on the interlocutor" [1].

According to B.Z. Demyankov: "Discourse – it is an arbitrary piece of text consisting of more than one sentences or independent part of the proposal. Often, but not always, centered around a certain reference concept, creates a shared context, describing the actors, objects, events, times, actions, etc., to determine not so much a sequence of proposals as those for creating a common discourse and his interpreter's world who "built" during the deployment of the discourse. The initial structure of discourse is a sequence of elementary propositions, linked together by logical relations of conjunction, disjunction, etc. Elements of discourse: set out the events, participants, performance information and the "non-event":

a) the circumstances surrounding the event;
b) the background, explaining the events; c) assessment of participants in the events;
d) information that relates to the events of discourse" [2].

Linguistic understanding of discourse in international studies is ambiguous. A French linguist who has devoted a series of papers on the analysis of discourse, P. Serio leads is certainly not an exhaustive list of eight different understandings, and it is only in the French tradition.

- the equivalent of "speech" or any particular utterance;
- the unit size exceeding the sentence;
- the impact statement on its recipient, taking into account the situation of enunciation (in pragmatics);
- the conversation as the main type of expression;
- the use units of language, their verbal update;
- socially or ideologically limited type of expression, for example, feminist discourse, the administrative discourse;
- the theoretical construction, intended to study the conditions of production of the text [6].
Sheygal E.I considers discourse as a complete speech act with semiological positions, thereby performed a systematic description of language functioning or language in action. She concludes that the sender uses a combination of elementary speech domination as a part of a generalized communicative power of discourse. At the same time, interpreting linguistic signs at the communicative level of the text (predicative unit offers a sequence of sentences, etc.) as units of speech (speech acts, verbal measures, speech passages, etc.), the author argues that it is necessary to consider their functional properties as aspects of the data in the traditional sense: the semantic, syntagmatical, syntactic (lexical and syntactic) and pragmatic ones. After Sheygal E.I, discourse is characterized by the communicative-functional parameters, such as:

1) the limit, while the lack of stringent structural constraints. Discourse can include any number of units of speech and a list of activities: from a sequence of two or more speech acts to a set of speech events;
2) the system, is in compliance with the laws of any production of discourse and its elements are regular ways of speech activity (syntagmatical, semantic, pragmatic, syntactic); 3) functional completeness and certainty of a particular communicative discourse, this option actually activity- (functional), and serves, as the communicative-functional approach to the study, a distinctive core of real communication and excretion in research practice, the criterion of the transition units of speech activity in a particular discourse linguistic identity [6].

The authors of the French language dictionary gives the following definition of discourse: "In modern linguistics the term discourse means any sentence that exceeds the volume of words, considered from the perspective of the binding sequence of phrases with each other. In contrast to the approach that the sentence is a terminal unit of language, discourse analysis opens new perspectives for linguistic research‖ [5].

If the type of discourse is understood as a class text, traditionally used to achieve certain communicative goals in the standard terms of communication, characterized by a specific composite structure, the genre we consider the class of texts that are traditionally used to achieve certain communicative goals in a particular communication. Thus, the type of discourse is invariant with respect to specific forms of its existence, by genre. Genre, in turn, supports an invariant of texts, with particular communicative purpose and used in the specific context of communication "[7]. Genre of discourse is a specification of the type of discourse and in real communication it is the combination of genres and their creation of intermediate forms. The emergence of mixed genres is due to the multidimensionality of the object of investigation. For this reason it is impossible to construct a complete and comprehensive classification of types of discourse that takes into account absolutely all its properties.

Speaking of genre affiliation discourse, V.I. Karassik believes that "the genre and stylistic categories of discourse allow the recipient assign a text to a specific area of communication on the basis of the prevailing views about the norms and rules of communication, the conditions of relevance, the types of communicative behavior". These categories characterize texts in terms of their compliance with the functional varieties of speech (stylistic affiliation, genre canon klishirovannost, variability, the degree of compression). In the process of establishing the text the author, depending on the communicative situation, defines a particular stereotype, the canon, from which he carries out his plan. It comes to choosing a style in which speech product "cast" in a particular genre. Intra-genre variation is the text of the possibility of further development within the chosen direction [3].

Like the functional style, every type of discourse has its own set of genres that characterize the person's speech in typical situations of communication. Based on the fact that the term "discourse" is multi valued, and there is no single correct definition of it, it should be noted that the categories of discourse as ambiguous. So that, G.G. Proskuryakov classifies discourse in terms of: characteristics of speech in the context of the discourse features of the sign reflecting the real situation, this discourse and the characteristics of the communicative situation. Scientist highlights the television and radio discourse, newspapers, theatrical, cinema discourse, literary, discourse in the field of "public relations, advertising, political, totalitarian, non-religious, untruthful, ritual,
etiquette, folklore, mythology, holiday, nonverbal, intercultural, visual, hierarchical, ironic [4]. However, G.M. Yavorskaya types the discourses on the basis of: scope of operation (scientific discourse, political discourse), the situation of communication (telephone calls, examination dialogue), the principles of the structure of communication (narrative discourse), pragmatic purposes (for instructions, laws, didactic discourse), etc. [7]. In our research we follow the classification of V.I. Karassik who distinguishes two main types of discourse: the personal (individual-oriented), and institutional [3]. In the first case, the speaker serves as a personality in all the richness of his inner world, in the second case - as a representative of a particular social institution. Thus according to above-mentioned classification the political discourse that is in the focus of our research is institutional type of discourse. As the main function of political discourse is its use as an instrument of political power (the power struggle, the mastery of power, its storage, implementation, stabilization and redistribution). On the base of this fact the functions of language policy should be considered manifestations of aspects of its instrumental function.

One of the most significant studies of political discourse in recent years is the work of E.I. Sheygal "Semiotics of political discourse, from the perspective of a political discourse, as well as other kinds of discourse, has two dimensions: the real and virtual. By actual measurement the researcher understands the current speech activity in a particular social space, as well as the final product of the speech activity (text), taken in conjunction the linguistic, paralinguistic and extra linguistic factors. Virtual dimension of discourse, according to E.I. Sheygal - a semiotic space, including verbal and nonverbal signs, the cumulative denotation which is the world of politics, thesaurus utterances, a set of models of speech acts and genres that are specific to communication in this area [6].

The process of political communication is expressing not only through agitation programs, speech of politicians and interviews in newspapers, but also includes specialized characters as both verbal (political terms, anthroponomy, etc.) and nonverbal (political symbols, etc.) and non-special-centered characters, originally nominative for not focused in this sphere of communication, however, due to stable operation in it, acquires its specific content (this applies in particular to the personal pronouns). The whole body values constituting semiotic space of political discourse, and there is what is commonly referred to as the language of politics.

Mobilization for action is the most significant manifestation of the instrumental functions of political discourse, which should encourage taking the action. Stimulation can be in the form of direct reference - in genres slogans, appeals and proclamations, as well as in legislation. Other way for incentive to action is to create a corresponding emotional mood (hope, fear, pride of the country, confidence, sense of unity, cynicism, hostility). And, finally, speech acts can stimulate responses, which are substituent of action – for example - a threat. An important incentive for political actions are such speech acts as an expression of support and confidence.

Feature of the political language as a special sublanguage is its accessibility for understanding virtually by all members of the community as a consequence despecialization of political terms. Scale despecialization in political communication stems from the fact that the policy - the only professional sphere, in which the communication oriented to the mass recipient. Political communication is not just caused by media, but the media are actually the main medium of its existence, so that language policy is deprived of property corporatism inherent in any special language. [3,2]
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