



## THE CREATION AND MEANING OF HUMOUR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

**Azimova Marjona Salim qizi**

*Senior teacher of SamSIFL*

**Yulchiyeva Sabrina**

*Student of SamSIFL*

**Annotation:** *The concept of political discourse is very capacious and ambiguous. Political discourse is a complex multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon that lies at the intersection of various disciplines, and has a number of functions and characteristics aimed at acquisition of authority, its maintenance and redistribution of power, acting as an instrument of influence. The question of its genre classification is of great interest for modern linguistics, which remains open for now. Currently allocated and describes many genres of modern political discourse, in particular, political debates, political interviews, press conferences, international negotiations and political advertising, reportage. Recently, this type of speech behavior of a politician when he deliberately amuses the audience using at the same time various jokes and witticisms.*

**Key words:** *humor, politics, politicians, genre.*

Modern political discourse is complex and diverse, subject to constant change. On the one hand, it affects consciousness and mood of society, imposes certain points of view and forms a picture of the world. On the other hand, the increasing spread there is a tendency for politicians to “flirt” with the audience, their language when this becomes unnecessarily reduced.

As we noted earlier, many political speeches and debates are increasingly losing formality and taking on the appearance of a show, which are often full of jokes. Many politicians deliberately “amuse” and shock the audience. Even K. Hudson emphasized that the peculiarity of the language of politics is not so much in what is said, but how it is said [3, p. 133].

In connection with this, we believe that although the concepts of the comic and political seem, at first glance, to be of different orders, the comic plays an important role in political discourse. Due to the porous boundaries of political discourse, it is often genre interpenetration occurs between types of discourse.

Features of the comic in the political discourse of the late 20th century is that it is implemented largely indirectly in mass media discourse. This, in particular, applies to such prototype genres of political discourse such as political speech, parliamentary debate, political interview.



Of particular interest for our research will be humor with point of view of political emphasis as a component of political discourse. Political humor is a means of communication both within the government itself, so the authorities with the people, as well as within the people regarding the authorities [2, p. 147].

The presence of discursive humorous practices in political speech much deeper and more significant than it might seem, and they are based on a wide range of rational and irrational factors. Humor in politics exists in two settings, on behalf of the politician and on behalf of the people about power. Political humor that comes from people involved in the struggle for power, is meaningful and can be used for improving communication links with partners, opponents and people.

In another case it becomes a spontaneous, unconscious phenomenon. This phenomenon can be observed if the politician has an unconscious desire to circumvent the current problem, in the absence of mutual understanding, change of connotations, etc. [5]

A deliberate joke or humorous statement can act as a means of overcoming communication difficulties, occupy neutral position, smooth out contradictions [4, p. 24].

Humor in a political situation can arise from the following needs - as we noted earlier, a way out of a conflict situation, but also in cases where it is necessary to demonstrate a tough, principled position in defending interests.

Conscious humor plays an important role in political discourse when creating the image of a politician. It is clear to everyone that a cheerful, smiling, a politician is a charming and likable person who able to create a mood of openness and willingness to compromise. As an example, it is enough to recall the US President, Barack Obama.

However, in such a matter it is very important to observe moderation, because people do not want to see a frivolous, frivolous person in power. Humor as a means of influencing the ratings of political figures can also be conscious and unconscious. To create humor in political discourse there may be such linguistic means of expressing humor as – linguistic game or pun, zeugma, irony, chiasmus and occasionalisms, etc. The most characteristic types of humor in politics are anecdote, sarcasm and irony, jokes, and speech errors that create comic relief effect.

So, humor is an integral part of the political process and social life of society, a modern and unique manifestation of democratization. Despite the frequency of the use of humor in political communications, the topic of humor seems to be insufficiently studied. At present, no methodology has been developed for using humor, which would allow for a predictable impact on



public consciousness. However, the influence of humor on behavior cannot be denied public.

Nowadays, humor is an integral part of political life society, a unique manifestation of democratization. Under humor refers to the use of various linguistic means aimed at creating a humorous, comic effect.

### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Azimova M.S. Techniques for creating comic and humor effects in political speech// The journal of integrated education and research. -issn 2181-3558, 2023-yil. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo/6675409> sjif (2023): 5.903
2. Chudinov A.P. Political linguistics: textbook. allowance / A.P. Chudinov. – M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2006. – 254 p.
3. Hudson K. The language of modern politics / K. Hudson – L.: Macmillan, 1987. – P. 165
4. Lyubimova, T. D. Comic, its types and knowledge / T. D. Lyubimova. – M.: Nauka, 1990. – 32 p.
5. Siegmann J.V. The structure of modern political discourse: speech genres and speech strategies / Zh. V. Siegmann. – M.: 2003. – 239 p.