

The Role of Bilingual Translation Discourse in Teaching Foreign Languages

Sobir Amirovich Khamzaev,
Associate professor of the department
“Theoretical aspects of the English language №1”,
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages,
Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD).
sobir.khamzaev@yahoo.com

Eldar Zamirovich Gilyazetdinov,
Senior teacher of the department
“Teaching English Language Methodology №2”
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.
eldar_85g@mail.ru

Feruza Lutpullayevna Ashurova,
Senior teacher of the department
“Teaching English Language Methodology №2”
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.
Feruzaashurova.75@mail.ru

Zarifa Nabiyeвна Ibragimova
Teacher of the department
“Teaching English Language Methodology №2”
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.
Zarifanabiyeвна1963@mail.ru

Khulkar Normuminova Abduvasiyevna
Teacher of the department
“Teaching English Language Methodology №2”
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.
hulkarnormuminova@gmail.com

Abstract: The article analyzes the use of discourse analysis in the translation process. A critical analysis of linguistic research on this topic is proposed, the advantages and disadvantages of the approaches developed by the authors to the method of using discourse analysis by a translator to optimize the process of understanding the source text are highlighted. The sequence of cognitive actions of the translator at the stage of perception and understanding the discourse in the original language and the generation of the discourse in the target language is revealed. The necessity to investigate the discourse as a unique set of meanings using tools in the form of discourse categories is substantiated. It is discussed in the article, that the use of discourse analysis in the translation process will be more effective if the cognitive organization of discourse is taken into account. The translator's cognitive actions are regarded as one of the main factors in the process of translation.

Keywords: *discourse analysis, translation process, discourse categories, translator's cognitive actions, cognitive organization of discourse, utterance.*

Chet tillarni o'qitishda bilingval tarjima diskursining o'rni

Sobir Amirovich Xamzaev,
“Ingliz tilining nazariy jihatlarini №1”
kafedrasi dotsenti
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti,
Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha

falsafa doktori (PhD).
sobir.khamzaev@yahoo.com

Eldar Zamirovich Gilyazetdinov,

“Ingliz tilini o‘qitish metodikasi №2”
kafedrası katta o‘qituvchisi
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.
eldar_85g@mail.ru

Feruza Lutpullayevna Ashurova,

“Ingliz tilini o‘qitish metodikasi №2”
kafedrası katta o‘qituvchisi
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.
Feruzaashurova.75@mail.ru

Zarifa Nabiyevna Ibragimova
“Ingliz tilini o‘qitish metodikasi №2”
kafedrası o‘qituvchisi
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.
Zarifanabiyevna1963@mail.ru

Xulkar Normo`minova Abduvasiyevna,

“Ingliz tilini o‘qitish metodikasi №2”
kafedrası o‘qituvchisi
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.
hulkarnormuminova@gmail.com

Annotatsiya: Maqolada tarjima jarayonida diskurs tahlilidan foydalanish tadqiq etiladi. Ushbu mavzu bo'yicha lingvistik tadqiqotlarning tanqidiy tahlili taklif etiladi, asliyat matni tushunish jarayonini optimallashtirish uchun tarjimon tomonidan diskurs tahlilidan foydalanish usuliga mualliflar tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan yondashuvlarning afzalliklari va kamchiliklari yoritiladi. Tarjimonning asliyat tilidagi nutqni idrok etish va anglash bosqichidagi kognitiv harakatlarining ketma-ketligi va nutqning tarjima tilida hosil bo'lishi ochib beriladi. Diskursni nutq kategoriyalari shaklidagi vositalar yordamida o'ziga xos ma'nolar majmuasi sifatida tadqiq qilish zarurati asoslanadi. Maqolada diskursning kognitiv tashkil etilishi hisobga olinsa, tarjima jarayonida diskurs tahlilidan foydalanish samaraliroq bo'lishi haqida so'z yuritiladi. Tarjimonning kognitiv harakatlari tarjima jarayonining asosiy omillaridan biri sifatida qaraladi.

Kalit so'zlar: diskurs tahlili, tarjima jarayoni, nutq kategoriyalari, tarjimonning kognitiv harakatlari, diskursning kognitiv tashkil etilishi, jumla.

Роль билингвального переводческого дискурса в преподавании иностранных языков

Хамзаев Собир Амирович,

Доцент кафедры
«Теоретические аспекты английского языка №1»,
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков,
Доктор философии по филологическим наукам (PhD).
sobir.khamzaev@yahoo.com

Эльдар Замирович Гилязетдинов,

Старший преподаватель кафедры
«Методика преподавания английского языка №2»
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков.
eldar_85g@mail.ru

Феруза Лутпуллаевна Ашурова,

Старший преподаватель кафедры

*«Методика преподавания английского языка №2»
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков.
Feruzashurova.75@mail.ru*

Зарифа Набиевна Ибрагимова,
*Преподаватель кафедры
«Методика преподавания английского языка №2»
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков.
Zarifanabiyevna1963@mail.ru*

Хулкар Нормуминова Абдувасиевна,
*Преподаватель кафедры
«Методика преподавания английского языка №2»
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков.
hulkarnormuminova@gmail.com*

Аннотация: В статье анализируется использование дискурсивного анализа в процессе перевода. Предлагается критический анализ лингвистических исследований по данной теме, выделяются преимущества и недостатки разработанных авторами подходов к методу использования дискурсивного анализа переводчиком для оптимизации процесса понимания исходного текста. Выявлена последовательность когнитивных действий переводчика на этапе восприятия и понимания дискурса на языке оригинала и порождения дискурса на целевом языке. Обоснована необходимость исследования дискурса как уникальной совокупности смыслов с использованием инструментов в виде категорий дискурса. В статье также обсуждается, что использование дискурсивного анализа в процессе перевода будет более эффективным, если учитывать когнитивную организацию дискурса. Познавательные действия переводчика рассматриваются как один из основных факторов процесса перевода.

Ключевые слова: *дискурс-анализ, переводческий процесс, категории дискурса, когнитивные действия переводчика, когнитивная организация дискурса, высказывание.*

INTRODUCTION

Currently, the requirements for university graduates engaged in the study of various types of translation activities have undergone major changes. In connection with the new understanding of the place and role of both language and educational policy of the Republic of Uzbekistan, scientists are more often emphasizing the need to have knowledge of communication theory, a sufficient thesaurus to establish and maintain contacts in various spheres of communication and interaction situations, as well as formed communication skills, which is the basis of communicative and speech competence.

Thus, if there is a social order presented in the state educational standard, contradictions arise in the theoretical and practical aspects of the investigated problem, as well as in the need to teach students foreign languages, focusing on existing requirements, i.e. when teaching students of the translation faculty to consecutive interpretation, it is important to take into account the essential role of discourse analysis. In this regard, a number of contradictions have emerged in the methodology of teaching consecutive

interpretation to students studying in the field of theory and practice of translation studies:

- between the justified need of graduates of higher educational institutions to possess the skills of consecutive interpretation (based on English) at a high level and the lack of development in the methodology of teaching foreign languages of effective ways of teaching consecutive interpretation (based on English, Uzbek and Russian) to students of the translation faculty using discourse analysis;

- between the urgent need to intensify the teaching of consecutive interpretation to students of the translation faculty on the material of English, Uzbek and Russian languages in the system of higher linguistic education for intercultural communication in today's constantly changing world and the lack of an appropriate scientifically based and experimentally tested methodology.

These contradictions determined the purpose of this study, namely, the ways of teaching consecutive interpretation to students of the Faculty of Translation using discourse analysis, as well as the need to develop a training consisting of a system of exercises and tasks that can form

competencies that are part of the professional competence of a translator.

According to Minyar-Beloruchev R.K. (Min'yar-Beloruchev R.K., 1980), unlike one act of speech, the components of one act of communication with translation are doubled: two speech situations, two sources of the message, two recipients are obtained, while the translator plays both the role of the addressee or recipient of the original message, and the role of the source of the new text, the text of the translation that is, the appearance of translation creates a new type of communication – communication with doubled components, the purpose of which (like another type of communication) is to transmit a message (invariant in translation). The code and various types of information (background information, information about the structure, semantic and situational information) serve in any communication as a kind of converters, the purposeful use of which leads to the production of communication units: meaning, additional aesthetic effect. However, this is characteristic of only one act of communication with translation. In the process of translation, there is a constant redistribution of roles between communication participants. Therefore, when studying the discourse in translation (the translator's bilingual discourse), it is necessary to consider not only the text of the source language and the text of the target language, the speech situation, but also take into account all the components of the act of communication with the translation process.

Thus, for the most complete and correct understanding of the translator's bilingual discourse, it is necessary to turn to discourse analysis (more precisely, to the analysis of the translator's bilingual discourse).

METHOD

The concept of discourse in the phrase "discourse analysis" in the scientific theory of linguistics was firstly introduced in 1952 by Harris Z. (Harris Z., 1952). His article "Discourse analysis" considered the method of distribution in relation to super-phrasal units. It was he, who began to emphasize the dynamic, changing nature of discourse over time, in contrast to the text, which was considered static and remained unchanged in any communicative environment and situations of interaction. However, the scientific direction of discourse analysis has been formed only in recent decades and has become one of the central sections of linguistics. Currently, discourse

analysis is presented to us "as an integral sphere of the study of linguistic communication in terms of its form, function and situational, socio-cultural context" (Makarov M.L., 2003). So, the analysis of the translator's bilingual discourse studies intercultural communicative communication taking into account linguistic, communicative, and cognitive components.

In connection with the development of cognitive linguistics, as well as the cognitive model of translation, where an attempt is made to consider all the studied phenomena, processes, units and categories according to their connection with other cognitive processes (memory, perception, imagination, emotions) the development of a discourse analysis model is receiving a new direction. The concept of discourse is included in the cognitive-discourse paradigm of linguistic knowledge (Kubryakova Ye.S., 2000), which allows for more effective analysis of discourse practice and production processes, as well as text perception, and according to the term "discourse" suggested by Kubryakov E.S. is understood precisely as "a cognitive process associated with real speech production, the creation of a speech acts, while the text is the final result of the process of speech activity, resulting in a certain finished (and fixed) form" (Kubryakova Ye.S., 1997).

The same opinion is expressed in the works of Slyshkin G.G., a representative of the cognitive school, who says that discourse is an object of cultural research: "Like any cultural artifact, any unit of language or speech can serve as the main one for the formation of a linguocultural concept in the collective consciousness. This also applies to discourse... The discourse is an object, and the concept is an analysis tool" (Slivshkin G.G., 2000). Thus, when analyzing a translator's bilingual discourse, it is necessary to study not only its structure (components of this discourse), but also its cognitive component, as well as extra-linguistic factors.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Considering the translator's bilingual discourse as one of the varieties of discourse presented in modern linguistic science, following Gural S.K. (Gural' S.K., 2012), it can be assumed that it has the following basic categories: proposition, reference, explicature, implicature, inference, presupposition, and mental lexicon. However, bilingual discourse has a number of features peculiar only to it.

The proposition is when translator must be able to isolate the “key” of the sentence to reveal the communicative component of the utterance, supplementing and restoring the proposed form of the utterance to the level of a complete proposition and its further correct translation for the final addressee. Initially, the proposition denotes the source of the message (text in the source language). The translator’s proposition, in turn, includes the source’s proposition (how s/he understood it), as well as the goals and objectives of the translation process itself (how the result of this action is seen by the translator).

Reference is the relationship between words used and objects. The translator, performing the role of both the addressee and the source, must have a certain information reserve. The total amount of information that can be extracted from the speech acts is a variable quantity and depends on each individual. It is assumed that the translator must have an information reserve of the third degree out of five (that is, the most significant signs of the denotation are clearly recognized by the communicant, and s/he is able to distinguish it from a group of similar subjects) for correct interpretation and further transmission of information (Min’yar-Beloruchev R.K., 1980). However, with an introductory reference, the translator, acting as the source of the message, needs to resort to linguistic redundancy, explaining certain concepts.

Explicature – in this case, the differences are indicated between what is specifically said (explicature) and what the source of the message implies (implicature). Implicature is what is implied; subtext; meaning, i.e. the term “discourse” is considered as a category of language communication. Consequently, the difference between discourse and other units of language is that it contains a lot of implicit information that can be considered only through the analysis of the subtext, and its content also says that at the discourse level, known information is the main topic in the text, and unknown information is service (auxiliary). The main task of discourse analysis is to find contacts and connections between two topics not only in the text, but also in the language situation associated with it.

Inference is the operation of extracting meaning or information from a text or discourse that is not directly represented. In real working conditions, the translators has at their disposal only a speech work, which s/he will have to transform by means of another language, preserving the

necessary information that can cause the final addressee to have the necessary communicative effect according to the given purpose of translation (Min’yar-Beloruchev R.K., 1980). Therefore, the translator has to make an appropriate conclusion based on the logic of the message content and its cognitive operations, taking into account the role behavior of the communicants, as well as their social status.

Presupposition is a semantic component of an utterance characterized by semantic correctness and contextual relevance, which cognitively precedes the utterance. The mental lexicon is a complex system that includes a large number of words in a person’s vocabulary that are in a certain degree of order, and a high speed of operating with them. In the works of Gural’ S.K., the mental lexicon is compared with a dictionary, where, firstly, the words are in alphabetical order, and, secondly, its content is fixed and becomes constant (Gural’ S.K., 2012). In the translator’s bilingual discourse, these are words of both target and source languages, which are also closely interrelated in the mental lexicon, allowing the translator to freely operate with them in the translation process, taking into account the content of a particular word, which may change over time.

The translator’s oral bilingual discourse has all of the above basic cognitive categories inherent directly in the discourse itself, highlighting its own characteristics in each of them. However, its formation is impossible without the formed components of the professional competence of a translator, which gives a synergistically new meaning to the translation process.

All-in-all, we can denote the fact that there is a complex system in the translator’s bilingual discourse, which includes: structural components (components of communication with translation) and cognitive processes, which, developing according to their own rules, evolving, represent a complex self-organizing system.

One of the modern scientific trends in translation studies is the use of discourse analysis in order to optimize the translation process. According to Ukhvanova-Shmygova I.F., discourse analysis is “a comprehensive analysis of all kinds of content and reconstruction of all kinds of contexts embedded in it” (Uxvanova-Shmigova I.F. et al., 2002: 10). During its implementation, the translator identifies the key characteristics of communicants, determines the communicative strategies they use, explores national-cultural, historical, social, situational and others aspects of

the discourse content, establishes the purpose of the translated discourse, which creates the basis for a deep understanding of its meaning. Gavrilenko N.N. argues that “analysis of the text in the specialty from a discourse position will be one of the important stages in the translator’s activity, determining the adequacy of understanding and translation of the text, and therefore, this analysis should be taught to future translators” (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010: 30).

Despite the fact that many authors are convinced of the validity of the introduction of the terms “discourse” and “discourse analysis” into the theory and practice of translation (Uxvanova-Shmigova I.F. et. al., 2002; Gavrilenko N.N., 2010; Volkova T.A., 2007), there are different points of view about the ways of implementing discourse analysis in the framework of the translation process. For example, Volkova T.A. believes that discourse is one of three figures of communication, while the other two are figures of text and reality (Volkova T.A., 2007).

In accordance with this statement, at different stages of the translation process, the author suggests a consistent analysis of the features of communication (functions, typical properties and communicative strategies), features of discourse (nodal points, goals, values, chronotope, form, subject matter, participants and interdiscursivity), as well as linguistic features of the text. In addition, Volkova T.A. considers it necessary to investigate the various characteristics of the text, which include authorship, targeting and narrative, interpreted as “a complex of texts related to a specific situation” (Volkova T.A., 2007: 99).

An in-depth study of the features of communication, discourse and text considered within the framework of the translation process seems to us somewhat redundant for a number of reasons. Firstly, as practice shows, a translator often has to work under tight deadlines, therefore, translation analysis should, in our opinion, be carried out with the help of tools that make it possible to identify supports for understanding the meaning of the translated discourse as effectively as possible. With this there is no need to analyze in the process of translation all possible functions, typical properties and strategies of the type of communication under consideration, since only those that correspond to its goals will be reflected in the discourse. In addition, we consider to some extent artificial, the separate consideration in the process of translation analysis of the features of

communication, discourse and text, taking into account their logical interdependence.

In particular, the translator should record in the process of discourse analysis the arsenal of linguistic means that the author used to implement a particular communicative strategy. In addition, Volkova T.A. declares the need to carry out a translation analysis of the features of communication, discourse and text, but there is no explanation of how the translator should take into account the material figure of reality in the process of working on the text. Meanwhile, the author of the concept of the three-part structure of communication Prokhorov Yu.Ye., whose positions are developed by Volkova T.A. in her research, describes the figure of reality, resorting to the concepts of “landscape of reality” and “paralinguistic models” (Prokhorov Yu.Ye., 2006). By this issue, Prokhorov Yu.E. understands “the totality of the material conditions of communication”, emphasizing that “the reality in which the act of communication takes place is always peculiar; it binds both text and discourse with its bond – the landscape of reality” (Prokhorov Yu.Ye., 2006: 175).

Paralinguistic models, according to Prokhorov Yu.Ye., include various types of non-verbal means: phonation (intonation, tonal voice level, tempo, pause placeholders, etc.), kinetic (gestures, poses, facial expressions, etc.) and graphic (font, font selection, text architectonics) (Prokhorov Yu.Ye., 2006: 175). In our opinion, the answer to the question of how to take into account paralinguistic models in the translation process is contained in the work of Kreidlin G.E., who notes that “the semantic language used should be universal for verbal and nonverbal units, since only on a general and solid the semantic foundation can achieve the internal integrity of nonverbal semiotics” (Kreydlin G.Ye., 2002: 12-13). Thus, information of an emotional, logical and other nature, transmitted by means of paralinguistic means, should find reinforcement in translation at the semantic level.

Within the framework of the description of translation proposed by Volkova T.A., it remains unclear why the author considers the analysis of discourse and the selection of discourse characteristics of the text as separate stages (Volkova T.A., 2007:94) (it is logical to assume that the text has textual characteristics, and the discourse has discursive characteristics). The statement of Volkova T.A. that authorship is a discursive characteristic of the

text seems to us quite controversial. In our opinion, the author mixes such concepts as the collection of external data about the text, linguistic analysis of the text and discourse analysis. Alekseeva I.S. understands information about the authorship of the text under external data, the time of its creation and publication, belonging to the global text, as well as the customer's wishes related to the associated text processing (for example, selective translation, change of style register, adaptation, etc.) (Alekseeva I.S., 2011:334).

In other words, these are the data that have an external, i.e. obvious character. The next step is to establish the true source and recipient of the text, which is, according to Alekseeva I.S., the most important and non-obvious point. For example, a business letter has a specific author, by whom it was compiled, but nevertheless written in the interests of the company and on its behalf, which means that the real source in this case will be the company (Alekseeva I.S., 2011:334). Thus, the author of the text and the addressee in terms of communication may not coincide. Despite the shortcomings we have highlighted, the study conducted by Volkova T.A. convincingly proves that the use of discourse analysis allows for higher quality translation and has a number of pragmatic advantages over traditional translation analysis.

The scientific idea of the didactic advantages of using discourse analysis in the framework of teaching translation of special texts is developed by Gavrilenko N.N. (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010). As the researcher notes, "... the analysis of the text from discourse events, familiarity with the genres of special discourse that are often found in the translator's activities, allow students to teach a professional understanding of the text for the purpose of its subsequent translation into their native language" (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010:175). According to Gavrilenko N.N., the inclusion of teaching discourse analysis in the process of professional training of future translators causes great interest of students and increases the motivation of learning (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010:175). The author suggests to carry out the translation analysis of a special discourse according to the following scheme: 1) the topic and subtopics of the utterance; 2) the conditions and circumstances of the creation of the utterance; 3) the communicative functions and goals of the special discourse; 4) the communication channel; 5) the genre of the special discourse; 6) interdiscursivity; 7) the characteristics of the communicants – the sender and recipient of the

special discourse; 8) the logical and semantic structure of the special discourse; 9) the main and secondary information of the utterance; 10) socio-cultural, sociolinguistic, background and linguistic features of the special discourse (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010:157).

Having analyzed this scheme, it can be concluded that Gavrilenko N.N. uses the concepts of "discourse" and "utterance" as synonymous, which, in our opinion, is incorrect within the framework of the translation process. Becoming the object of translation, discourse is interpreted as an ordered and limited set of statements. The translator performs both the analysis of the discourse as a whole and the analysis of individual statements as its constituent parts. It should also be noted that N.N. Gavrilenko suggests exploring the communicative aspects of discourse, its linguistic and extra-linguistic features, without indicating, however, how the cognitive organization of discourse is taken into account in the translation process. Thus, the purpose of this article is to describe the methodology for implementing discourse analysis within the framework of the translation process, taking into account the cognitive organization of discourse.

The research of Mikhaleva O.L. is devoted to the problem of cognitive organization of discourse (Mikhaleva O.L., 2009). The author defines discourse as "the verbalization of a certain mentality, or such a way of interpreting the surrounding reality, as a result of which not only the surrounding world is reflected in a specific way, but also a special reality is constructed, its own (inherent in a certain society) is created a way of seeing the world, a way of ordering reality, implemented in a wide variety of practices" (Mikhaleva O.L., 2009:22-23). Exploring the cognitive organization of discourse, the author arranges its components in a hierarchical sequence. Mentality (mental space discourse) is a set of concepts structured through frames. The way concepts are structured is controlled by the work of the cognitive scenario. The cognitive scenario, according to the author, is "an ordered sequence of actions that controls both the choice of a specific set of slots from a frame structuring a certain concept, and the sequence of their activation" (Mikhaleva O.L., 2009:23). Vatolina T.G. emphasizes the general recognition of the scientific fact that discourse is organized around one or more several reference concepts (Vatolina T.G., 2011:37). According to the author, the central concept is always set in the written discourse in the

title, and in the oral one – in the main topic of conversation. The conceptual sphere of discourse is “a set of concepts actualized in discourse and interconnected with each other” (Vatolina T.G., 2011:38).

Based on these theoretical provisions, we can conclude that the sequence of actions of the translator at the stage of perception and understanding of the discourse in the original language will be as follows:

- 1) analysis of the perceived discourse in order to identify discourse categories relevant to its understanding;

- 2) formation of basic concepts of discourse on the basis of the selected discourse categories;

- 3) analysis of individual statements as constituents of discourse based on the coherence mechanism;

- 4) formation of concepts of individual statements and their inclusion in the conceptual sphere of discourse;

- 5) the formation of a central concept as a carrier of the global meaning of discourse.

We propose to analyze the perceived discourse in order to identify discourse categories relevant to its understanding in accordance with the classification proposed by Ukhvanova-Shmygova I.F. (Uxvanova-Shmigova I.F., et. al., 2002). The author distinguishes the addressee-identifying, tuple-identifying and code-identifying discourse categories (Uxvanova-Shmigova I.F., et. al., 2002:16). To addressee – identifying categories, significant for the translation process, we refer to self-identification (reflection in the discourse of the addressee’s social status); chronotope of discourse (time and space); mission (goals and objectives of discourse); attribution (a set of real and attributed qualities of the addressee); activity (indication of the characteristics of the addressee’s activity); role (demonstration by the addressee of certain role characteristics). As the addressee – identifying categories of discourse relevant to the translation process, we will single out the target audience and the communication strategy. Tuple-identifying categories of discourse are categories of intertextuality, inter-subjectivity and inter-objectivity, demonstrating the possibilities of expanding the content potential of discourse by means of references to other texts, events and subjects.

The most relevant code-identifying categories of discourse in the framework of the translation process are the stylistic range that defines lexico-semantic, syntactic

and grammatical features of the source text, as well as the genre canon. Analysis and consideration of discourse categories in the process of translation determines the depth of understanding of foreign language discourse, contributes to the formation of concepts and contributes to the achievement of the goal of translation (i.e., the fullest possible identification of the meaning of the discourse in the original language and its transmission using the means of the translation language).

The next step is to analyze individual statements as constituents of discourse. A coherent chain as a binding mechanism of discourse statements ensures the movement of meaning within the semantic field of discourse. Theme-rhematic structures can be chain, fan-shaped or generalized (minimally tied to context by juxtaposition) (Babenko L.G., 2000:269). The expression found in the utterance in the position of the rhema serves as the basis for recognizing the concept and, consequently, for understanding the meaning of the utterance. Alimuradov O.A. includes the following elements in the meaning of the utterance: presupposition (information obtained from the context); propositional component (semantic core of the utterance); inferential components (inference knowledge); angle of view, under which the addressee represents the situation considered in the statement; semantic multilayering (a deeper semantic layer plus surface layers, as well as relationships, installed between them) (Alimuradov O.A., 2004:202). The information obtained as a result of the cognitive analysis of an individual utterance, together with the information extracted as a result of the analysis of discourse as an integral education, is compared with the mental structures of knowledge, and concepts (lexical, grammatical or syntactic) are formed. The process of perception and understanding discourse in the original language ends with the formation of the conceptual sphere of discourse and the identification of a central concept reflecting the global meaning of discourse.

The next stage of the translation process is the generation of discourse in the target language. Following Gavrilenko N.N., we consider translation as “the generation of a speech act, in the process of which the intentional meaning is not transferred from the source text to the translation text, but is created by the translator as a new unity of form and content, in new communicative, cultural and linguistic conditions” (Gavrilenko N.N., 2010:7). Thus, at this stage of the translation

process it is not a sequential series of inter-language transformations that is carried out, but the reconstruction of meaning in the target language by verbalizing the conceptual sphere of discourse. The order of the translator's actions at the stage of generating a discourse in the target language will be as follows: 1) objectification of the basic concepts of discourse by recreating discourse categories with using the means of the translation language; 2) objectification of lexical, grammatical and syntactic concepts of individual statements using the means of the translation language; 3) construction of a coherent chain of statements that ensures the logical and semantic unity of the generated in the language of the discourse translation.

CONCLUSION

Objectification of concepts in the process of generating discourse can occur in various ways. The concept is objectified in language:

1) ready-made lexemes and phrases from the lexical and phraseological system of the language, having suitable sememes or separate semes of different ranks; 2) free phrases; 3) structural and positional schemes of sentences bearing typical propositions (syntactic concepts); 4) texts and sets of texts (if necessary, explication or discussion of the content of complex, abstract or individually authored concepts) (Rudakova A.V., 2004:48).

Based on the theoretical propositions discussed above, we can conclude that for maximum penetration into the meaning of the translated discourse, it is advisable to carry out translation analysis in two directions: firstly, to study discourse as an integral education tools in the form of discourse categories; secondly, to analyze individual statements as constituents of discourse. This method of implementing discourse analysis allows the translator to create a conceptual sphere of discourse and highlight its central concept, which in our understanding correlates with the global meaning of discourse. When generating a discourse based on the concepts formed in the translator's mind there can used lexical, syntactic and grammatical means of the target language. The translator harmonizes the referential, actualization, modus and deictic plans of utterances, and there takes place the construction of utterances into a single coherent chain.

In conclusion, we can note that the discourse analysis finds effective application both at the stage of perception and understanding

discourse in the original language by the translator, and at the stage of generating the discourse in the target language.

REFERENCES

1. Aitchison J. (2005) Words in the mind. An introduction to the mental lexicon / J. Aitchison. – Maldon a. o.: Blackwell Publishing.
2. Alekseeva I.S. (2011) Vvedenie v perevodovedenie: ucheb. posobie. 5-e izd. SPb.: Filologicheskiy fakul'tet SPbGU.
3. Alimuradov O.A. (2004) Znachenie, smisl, konsept i intensional'nost': sistema korrelyatsiy: dis. ... d-ra. filol. nauk. Stavropol'.
4. Amirovich, K.S., Zamirivich, G.E., Abduganiyevna, S.N., & Bakhtiyarovna, S.S. (2020). The problems of developing an ESP course and the importance of ESP teacher training on the example of Uzbekistan. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 2020, 7(7), pp. 1080–1085
5. Babenko L.G. (2000) Lingvisticheskiy analiz xudojestvennogo teksta. Yekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural. un-ta.
6. Gavrilenko N.N. (2010) Ponyat', chtobi perevesti: perevod v sfere professional'noy kommunikatsii. Kn. 2. M.: Nauchno-texnicheskoe obshchestvo imeni akademika S.I. Vavilova.
7. Gural' S.K. (2012) Diskurs-analiz v svete sinergeticheskogo videniya: [ucheb. posobie] / S.K. Gural'. Tomsk: Izd-vo Tom. un-ta.
8. Harris Z. (1952) Discourse analysis // *Language*. Vol. 28. № 1. pp. 1–30.
9. Kreydlin G.Ye. (2002) Neverbal'naya semiotika: yazyk tela i yestestvenniy yazyk. M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
10. Kubryakova Ye.S. (1997) Vidi prostranstv teksta i diskursa / Ye.S. Kubryakova, O.V. Aleksandrova // *Kategorizatsiya mira: vremya i prostranstvo: materialy nauch. konf. Moscow, str. 15-25.*
11. Kubryakova Ye.S. (2000) O ponyatiyax diskursa i diskursivnogo analiza v sovremennoy lingvistike: obzor // *Diskurs, rech', rechevaya deyatel'nost': funktsional'nie i strukturnie aspekty. Moscow, str. 5-13.*
12. Makarov M.L. (2003) Osnovi teorii diskursa / M.L. Makarov. Moscow: Gnozis.
13. Makhmudovuch, K.A., Khamzaev, S.A, Begov, F.R, Khudayberganov, G.R, Khudayberganova, M.A. (2019) Aspects of research the connotation in compounds with color component (On the example of Uzbek place

names). *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 2019, 9(1), pp. 4619–4624.

14. Min'yar-Beloruchev R.K. (1980) *Obshaya teoriya perevoda i ustniy perevod* / R.K. Min'yar-Beloruchev. Moscow: Voenizdat.

15. Min'yar-Beloruchev R.K. (1980) *Obshaya teoriya perevoda i ustniy perevod* / R.K. Min'yar-Beloruchev. Moscow: Voenizdat.

16. Mixaleva O.L. (2009) *Politicheskii diskurs*. Moscow: URSS: Librokom.

17. Proxorov Yu.Ye. (2006) *Deystvitel'nost'. Tekst. Diskurs: ucheb. posobie*. 2-e izd. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka.

18. Rudakova A.V. (2004) *Kognitologiya i kognitivnaya lingvistika*. 2-e izd. Voronej: Istoki.

19. Slishkin G.G. (2000) *Ot teksta k simvolu: lingvokul'turnie konsepty presedentnix tekstov v soznanii i diskurse* / G.G. Slishkin. Moscow: Academia.

20. Uxvanova-Shmigova I.F. (2002) *Metodologiya issledovaniy politicheskogo diskursa: aktual'nie problemy soderzhatel'nogo analiza obshestvenno-politicheskix tekstov: sb. nauch. st./ pod obsh. red. I.F. Uxvanovoy-Shmigovoy*. 3-y vip. Minsk: Texnoprint, 2002.

21. Vatolina T.G. (2011) *Kognitivnaya model' detektivnogo diskursa (na materiale angloyazichnix detektivnix proizvedeniy XIX–XX vv.): dis. ... kand. filol. nauk*. Irkutsk.

22. Volkova T.A. (2007) *Diplomaticeskii diskurs v aspekte strategichnosti perevoda i kommunikatsii: na materiale angliyskogo i russkogo yazikov: dis. ...kand. filol. nauk*. Chelyabinsk.