The Concept of Discourse as A Cognitive Phenomenon of Translation

| Zokirova Nargiza Savrievna, | Assistant teacher of Bukhara State university, Uzbekistan n.s.zokirova@buxdu.uz Contact number: +998914102002 |

ABSTRACT	Growing integration of the world's economies, cultures, and politics generates increasing global communication and with that, unprecedented volumes of materials for translation, in all languages, in all directions. This poses a seemingly impossible challenge, as human translation of such a vast body of texts requires an infinitely large number of skilled translators, and as the number of texts is multiplying by the second, it becomes virtually an unfeasible task to translate all of them. This article deals with the term of cognitive phenomenon in translation and the concept of discourse. The author discusses the cognitive model of translation and also analyzes properties of discursive activity.
Keywords:	translation, cognitive phenomenon, discourse, anthropocentric setting of translation, aspect of discourse, cognitive model of translation

I. Introduction

The concept of discourse - "a special term in the sciences of human spirituality" - appeared in linguistics to designate not so much a new object as a new procedural and activity perspective for describing a language - in its correlation with speech, the consciousness of a language user and the communicative reality in which this consciousness is formed, functions and exists. The focus of such a description is an active subject, since no factors "can affect the discourse except through the cognitive system of the speaker", and therefore the cognitive approach to the study of discourse is focused on comprehending the features of the discursive representation of the subject.

II. Literature review

From this point of view, the concept of discourse optimally corresponds to the anthropocentric setting of translation studies.

At the same time, the category of discourse, in the ontology of which consciousness-image, consciousness-activity, language, text, cognitive, communicative (intersubjective), social, ethnic, cultural and semiotic dimensions of reality and the current and historical modes of "speech being" are joined into a systemic whole (V. I. Tyupa) of a person in the world, when modeling translation, it allows to take into account the principle of continual unity of consciousness and being, consciousness and life, consciousness and the world, consciousness and activity, on which the actual 4E-interpretation of cognition is based. For the semiotics of translation, this has important methodological implications. Discourse analysis involves an interdisciplinary approach that requires the development of a qualitatively new methodological apparatus, since each time the researcher actually creates a new object, which cannot be adequately described in the case of unreflective borrowing of terms,

without embedding them into a consistent system of coordinates of a particular study. Such non-reflective borrowing characterizes many studies in the field of translation studies, where, when declaring a discursive approach, discourse analysis is either replaced by "cognitive" analysis of the text, or limited to several of the above dimensions and/or modes of the ontology of discourse. This circumstance not only deprives the discursive approach of the pathos of integrativity. How the historically continuous practice of signifying discourse constructs reality (cognitive function) and forms personalities and identities (communicative function), and in the textual function (from Latin textus - fabric, connection, connection; not in the sense of "text ≈ discourse") becomes a sign mediator, connecting people in time and space, with each other and reality. Thanks to these functions, in discourse as a substance of a cognitive-semiotic order distributed in time and space, all modes and dimensions of a person's speech existence in the world are combined into a single whole, forcing any of which leads to the destruction of the empirical systemic nature of the discourse, replacing it with another, reduced object of study. For this reason, without a clear understanding of what is discourse as a functional system and discourse analysis as a method of studying it, it is hardly possible to identify new patterns (mechanisms) of translation, and outside this goal, translation modeling is actually meaningless. According to G.N. Manaenko, it is customary to define discourse based on one aspect of the systemic phenomenon of speech - text (productive aspect; discourse = speech-text + context) or speech activity (dynamic aspect; speech = discourse-communication + text). In the first case, the discourse is interpreted as a text in a certain mode of its existence, "a text and something else" (the institutional and socio-historical framework of its production, extra linguistic factors that determine its structure and functioning in the process of communication). At the same time, the person who creates / perceives the text in the process of activity disappears from the definitions, dissolving in the discursive formation. The activity interpretation of discourse is anthropocentric, but basically limits the discourse to a single speech event.

As a result, another significant aspect of discourse disappears - "ideology as a social reality of a certain society in a certain historical period", and with it an equally significant aspect - "the power of discourse", "discursive order", which sets the limiting scenarios of feelings, actions and assessments, which how and what to do, want and say. Meanwhile, as S.N. Plotnikov, "since text and speech cannot function otherwise than in context and being appropriated by someone", "speech appropriated by the speaker remains speech, and text in context remains text", and such definitions do not say anything about discourse. As an independent phenomenon, discourse is defined as "an intermediate link between text and context, which allows making one text the context of another, involving the context in the text, introducing text elements into non-linguistic contexts, giving meaning to the text and the surrounding world", which implies "migration and exchange of content between syntax , semantics and pragmatics, text, context and meaning" and ultimately between people, social groups and entire cultures in their historical dynamics. It is noteworthy that in psychology, speech, through which discourse is traditionally defined, is interpreted simultaneously as: a language that functions in the context of individual consciousness; an act of activity of an individual, expressing his personal attitude, i.e. knowledge and experience "in their inseparable unity and interpenetration in which they are given in consciousness"; "a form of existence of consciousness (thoughts, feelings, experiences) for the Other, serving as a means of communication with him"; directly the very form (process) of this communication; the fundamental mechanism of mental activity, the form of existence of thinking-for-itself [Big psychological dictionary 2008]. Let's compare the interpretation of discourse as "a verbally articulated form of objectification of the content of consciousness".

III. Analysis

The "form of objectification" is understood procedurally, which is consistent with the idea that "by formulating a thought in speech, we often form it", that the thought is not expressed, but is performed in the word, that this dynamic process is mediated by the meaning of the word (comprehension of the meanings ↔ signification of meanings), acting simultaneously as an object of consciousness and a method, and a mechanism of awareness, a system of tools and a system of actions leading to the formation of meaning. This is the basis for the idea of the dual ontology of the word as an inter-subjective, inter-psychic phenomenon, both cognitive and communicative. It is curious that long before the term "discourse" appeared, the essence of this phenomenon was summed up by M.M. Bakhtin: "The real reality of language-speech is not an abstract system of linguistic forms, not an isolated monologue statement and not a psychophysiological act of its implementation, but a social event of speech interaction carried out by the statement." The arrangement of accents by M.M. Bakhtin seems to be more accurate: in discourse, subjects interact (communicate) through speech (language, text) ("meeting of consciousnesses"), and not systems of society and culture per se, which allowed M.M. Bakhtin to consider the speech activity of the subject, including auto-communication, as a phenomenon by definition inter-subjective, inter-psychic, i.e. dialogic. According to M.M. Bakhtin, the word as a two-way act "expresses 'one' in relation to 'the other'" and "is equally determined by both those whose it is and those for whom it is" [Bakhtin 2000]. At the same time, verbal communication involves "not adding up, imposing one on top of the other symmetrical activities", but the interaction of subjects as partners, maintaining natural polyphony and relativism as a stimulus for dialogue. Since "verbal communication is always accompanied by social acts of a non-verbal nature, <...> being often only their addition," the text as a means and product of communication is "a powerful capacitor of unspoken social assessments" that organizes its form.

IV. Discussion

From this point of view, speech activity per se does not exist: there is a system of speech actions that mediates non-speech activity, addressed to the internal, objective and socio-cultural world. Accordingly, the discourse reflects fragments of the subject's sociocultural knowledge, which, as meta-schemes, organize the subject's activities and become markers of social, gender, and other identities that are significant for him.

In general, discursive activity is a phenomenon at the same time:

1) cognitive, because it involves the interpretation by each subject of values, meanings, knowledge (including fragments of ideological and axiological paradigms, individual and cultural-historical experience) that are (re)produced in the discourse, in connection with which any discursive action reflects the structure of the image of the world (consciousness -image) of the subject, primarily cognitive dominants in its basis; - mediated by the hypertext of ethno-socio-culturally modulated and affectively marked (connotated) "living" knowledge, which acts as a constructive element of the subject's consciousness;

2) social, involving interaction with other subjects as carriers of synharmonic systems of social cognition to varying degrees21;

3) semiotic, since it is carried out through the text, in the structure of which various schemes and models of the interpretation of the world and evaluative codes of sociocultural deixis are "embedded"; the text provides (through linguistic and other markers of perspective) the very possibility of a "meeting" (M. Bakhtin) of the consciousnesses of subjects, their cognitive interaction as interpretation in interaction and interaction through interpretation, i.e. the possibility of their communication.

From what has been said, three properties of discursive activity can be deduced:

1) interactionality - the orientation of the consciousness of the subject outside, to the external context of ethnosociocultural reality and to the consciousness of the Other, including in subjective interpretive acts of introspection and reflection, social categorization and meta-representation (theory of mind);

2) interpretive nature - functional mediation by the internal (cognitive) context of the semiotic structures of consciousness of each subject of discourse and cognitive procedures of "natural semiosis";

3) the leading role of the cognitive mechanism of perspectives (from)ation, which provides the very possibility of a "meeting" of the consciousnesses of discourse subjects interpreting each other and the world through text and language.

V. Conclusion

In the cognitive model of translation, it is necessary to take into account each of these properties, which form a synergistic trinity, linking various discourse ontologies into a single whole. Within the framework of a comparative analysis of textual material (parallel texts of originals and translations), this trinity can be taken into account through the use of discourse analysis techniques.

Used literature:
1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. Issues of general and private theory of translation. M.: LKI, 2009.
2. Big psychological dictionary. 4th ed., supplement. and correct. / Ed. B.G. Meshcheryakova, V.P. Zinchenko. M.: AST; St. Petersburg: Prime-Eurosign, 2008.
3. Galeeva N.L. Translation in the linguoculturological research paradigm. Tver: TVGU, 2011.
4. Bart R. Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics. Moscow: Progress, 1994.
5. Bakhtin M.M. Freudianism. Formal method in literary criticism. Marxism and the philosophy of language. M.: Labyrinth, 2000.
6. Plotnikova S.N. Speaking / writing as a linguistic, communicative and discursive personality // Bulletin of the Nizhnevartovsk State University for the Humanities. 2008. No. 4.
7. Zokirova Nargiza Savriyevna. (2021). Interpretation of Concepts of Human Dignity by Heroes in Utkir Khoshimov's Works. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 11. https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.11.468
8. Zokirova N S. (2020). TRANSLATOLOGY AND THE ANALYSIS OF ITS LINGUISTIC MECHANISM. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, *1*(4), 8-10. Retrieved from https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejhea/article/view/80.
9. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna (2021).The category of politeness in different linguocultural traditions. ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL 11 (2), 1667-1675
10. Anvarovna, F. A. (2021, December). ON PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES OF TRANSLATION. In Archive of Conferences (pp. 97-99).
11. Nafisa, K. . (2021). Semantics and Pragmatics of a Literary Text. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 374-378. https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/567
12. Khaydarova L., Joanna I. Dark Tourism: Understanding the concept and the demand of new experiences //ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 7.603. – 2022. – T. 11. – №. 01. – C. 59-63.
13. G'ayratovna, R. . M. . (2021). Semantics of euphemistic and dysphemic units. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 243-246.

14. Irgasheva Feruza Bakhtiyorovna. (2021). INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE INTO THE TRANSLATION PROCESS . CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE, 2(1), 32-34.

15. Kasimova, N. F. (2017). Communicative functions of the interrogative sentences in English. InПриоритетные направления развития науки(pp. 59-62). www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29929516

16. Ramazonovna T. S. On binary structured speech products in french //Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. – 2021. – Т. 10. – №. 10. – С. 381-386.

17. Zokirova, N. (2022). ТЕОРИЯ ТРАНСЛАТОЛОГИИ: ОТ ПЕРЕВОДЧЕСКОЙ ТРАДИЦИИ К ТРАНСЛАТОЛОГИИ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, *6*(2). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/4814

18. Zokirova, N. (2021). Badiiy she'riy tarjimada g'ayrilisoniy jihatlarni saqlashda ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik tamoyillari: Tarjimada eqvivalentlik va adekvatlik. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, *6*(6). http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3496