ISSN-L: 2544-980X

## Method of Teaching Literary Translation Based on Cognitive Discourse Analysis

## Ziyadullayeva Mokhira <sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** Information regarding a research paper that demonstrates the accepted practices for defining discourse is provided in this page, the function of cognitive linguistics in working with literary texts on foreign languages and the translation lessons, the theoretical underpinnings of discourse analysis, and the examination of the text via a cognitive lens. The approach to teaching literary translation based on the text's cognitive discourse analysis is also discussed, along with its scientific basis and practical confirmation of efficacy through shown experimental and skillful work. Furthermore, the workouts and activities system focused on the development of the related competencies are discussed in our study report.

**Keywords:** discourse analysis, discourse semantics, literary text, lingvo-cognitive analysis, cognitive-discourse.

Communication and discourse competences are currently the focus of foreign language instruction. By developing these competencies, we can achieve our primary objective, which is to produce a secondary language personality that has the opportunity to communicate in it. Using literary texts in teaching future translators makes these competences particularly significant. "The translation and theory of translation" students must learn how to solve the tasks set for them according to their professional activities. Literary translation teaching problems, in general, and effective ways of teaching such texts, in particular, arose from the difficulty of training experts capable of interpreting literary texts. As a specialist, one must have both a thorough understanding of two languages - native and foreign - as well as the ability to translate literary texts, as well as have linguacultural abilities.

Researchers from both domestic and international fields are still interested in the literary text, including Yu.M. Lotman, I. Smirnov, G.A. Zolotova, R. Bart, and T. Kuhn. In the XIX century, when classical hermeneutics emerged, which considered text as a fact of culture, until the formation of structural studies of texts in the seventies of the XX century, literary prose research has not lost relevance. It is common knowledge that literary texts have educational potential. Modern methodological science provides a number of options for analyzing literary texts: Study of philology linguistic interpretation or analysis, according to B.G. Bobylyov [1] Gorelikov, M.I. and D.M. Magomedov [2,150], Novikov, L.A. [3,304]. Given that cognitive science studies the mental underpinnings of speech reproduction and understanding, in which language knowledge and information processing play a role, the findings of these studies can aid in a general understanding of an individual's thought processes. In order to demonstrate how the literary text functions as a system and how language comprehension mechanisms represent and transform it, our research paper. Kolshansky G.V. [4] (1990), speaking about the text, which is shown as a communication unit, specifies that literary text's delimitation and integrity are based not on the ordered logic of reasoning, but on the author's speaking and thinking activity. It is important to note that the author's work is reflected in a particular structure that, despite the semantic row, is justified by the individual's and psychological perception of the extralinguistic character or the provided plot. Zusman V.G. (2001) wrote that the literary concept is encoded in the author and recipient's consciousness as participants of a bilateral process by literary image, acting as a language form of existence esthetics and as a unit of teaching lingvo-cognitive analysis of literary discourse. It is therefore thought of as cognitive and interactive in the perception and interpretation of the semantic literary information contained within.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> a teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

It's crucial to note that the interpretation and perception of literary information mentioned in the text during foreign language instruction is regarded as a significant cognitive activity. The literary text, being a result of such text's set, and the literary activity forming a literary discourse are quite susceptible to description in the form of a certain structured space of literary images. These images form in the author and reader's consciousness as participants of literary communication, as peculiar language forms of existing esthetic-literary concepts. They can be characterized as a unit applied in teaching linguo-cognitive analysis of the offered literary discourse.

Different lingvo-cultural communities have distinct cognitive bases, which are characterized by differences in linguistic worldview and classification of surrounding reality, as confirmed repeatedly by studies conducted by I.V. Karasik, E.S. Kubryakova, E.S. Alexandrova, and A.A. Kibrik. It is impossible to implement effective cross-cultural communication or provide a sufficient translation without an understanding of the cognitive foundational elements of the foreign language linguistic worldview. To identify such units, a cognitive-discourse analysis of corresponding linguistic and fictional works is necessary. The cognitive foundation of the relevant lingvo-cultural community, whose language is acquired as a foreign language, could be revealed through this analysis. The cognitive-discourse analyses will assist methodologists in resolving challenges that arise when teaching literary translation in particular and translation as a whole. These challenges center on transferring the entirety of the original language's information and enhancing the dialogue between the author and the reader.

It is crucial to distinguish between the concepts of a discourse and the text when thinking about discourse analysis issues. The term "discourse," as has already been established numerous times, is similar to the concept of "text," but it emphasizes the dynamic and prolonged nature of language communication, whereas "text" is the product of language activity. Well, it is recognized that discourse analysis is the area of linguistics that studies a discourse. In his doctoral dissertation "The discourse analysis in cognitive prospect," Andrey Aleksandrovich Kibrik [5,90] identified the most widely used discourse analysis approaches currently in use. The method referred to as "the analysis of household dialogue" (Conversation analysis), in the words of A.A. Kibrik, is the first.

Guy Cook, a British scientist, presents an intriguing viewpoint in his book "Discourse" [6,122]. According to him, there are two types of language that could be studied: one is an abstraction designed for language and literacy instruction and research on how language rules function, and the other is a language that is used to transmit any kind of information and is thought to be coherent (it can match or fail to match the correct sentence or set of correct sentences). According to G. Cook, this final category of language includes discourse and search language. It is also the language that is used for communication. Discourse analysis is what provides coherence to a discourse. The author also points out that rather than focusing on the actual content of a given segment, the distinction between these two forms of language—artificially created and communicative—often has more to do with how we perceive or use them. Guy Cook thinks that anything can be considered discourse, from a cry or an exclamation during a conversation to notes made in the margins to major court cases or L.N. Tolstoy's novel "War and Peace" [7,45].

There are numerous linguists who hold this opinion, such as V.Z. Demyankova and N.D. Arutyunov. This is in line with the two definitions of discourse that are the most comprehensive that are currently available. Discourse, according to V.Z. Demyankov, is an arbitrary textual fragment made up of multiple sentences. The discourse is often, but not always, centered around a supporting idea; it establishes a broad context that describes characters, objects, circumstances, times, actions, etc.; this is the perspective of "ethnography of speech," which is defined less by the order of sentences and more by the number of topics that are universally understood to create the discourse and its interpreters. Discourse elements include the events that are presented, the people involved, performative information, and "non-events," or the following: a) background information explaining the events; b) evaluations of the participants in the events; and c) information connecting discourse with events.

The following is how N.D. Arutyunova defines discourse in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary: "Discourse is a coherent text combined with extralinguistic factors such as pragmatics, sociocultural



factors, psychological factors, and others; text taken in the event aspect; speech, considered as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in people's interaction and their consciousness mechanisms (cognitive processes)."[8,137]

Malcolm Coulthard, a fellow British scientist, highlights oral discourse and written text in his 1977 book "An Introduction to Discourse Analysis," noting that this is by no means a universally accepted division, as clear terms are always hard to come by. He then goes on to expand on his point of view, pointing out that German writers use the term "text" to refer to speech as well, whereas Howie and Widdowson use the term "discourse" to refer to written language. To further complicate matters, Coulthard interprets "pragmatics" as essentially intersecting discourse analysis and Leach and Levinson's definition of "pragmatics" [9,130-141].

The field of pragmalinguistic research, or situational interpretation of discourse, considers socially, psychologically, and culturally significant conditions and circumstances of communication. So, it makes sense that many scientists working on the theory of speech acts, logical pragmatics of communication, conversation analysis, dialogue analysis, linguistic text analysis, critical discourse analysis, sociolinguistic problems and ethnography of communication, cognitive linguistics, and psycholinguistics would naturally turn to discourse [10, 68-75].

To be conclude, the following competencies are disclosed as components of a translator's professional competence in the field of literary translation: communicative, linguistic, text-forming, technical, discursive, strategic, socio-cultural, sociolinguistic, explicit, and implicit; additionally, distinct skills and abilities of the translator that are crucial for the development and implementation of literary translations. It is offered the technique of teaching literary translation on the basis of text's cognitive discourse analysis; it is experimentally checked and its efficiency is proved. The technique of teaching literary translation is developed, with its cornerstone being the model relying on text's cognitive discourse analysis, which is carried out by means of the developed system of exercises and tasks.

## **References:**

- 1. BOBYLYOV, B.G., 1991. Theoretical bases of the philological analysis of the literary text in national teacher training University. The abstract of the doctoral dissertation. Moscow: Institute of the National-Russian bilingualism of NPA of the USSR. 2 items of l.
- 2. GORELIKOV, M.I. and MAGOMEDOV, D.M., 1989. Linguistical analysis of the literary text. 2nd prod. Fixed. And ed. Moscow: Russian language, 150 p.
- 3. NOVIKOV, L.A.2007. Literary text and its analysis. The 3rd, prod. Fixed. Moscow: URRS: LKI, 304 p.
- 4. Kolshansky, G. V. (1990). An objective picture of the world in knowledge and language. Moscow: Science
- 5. KIBRIK, A.A., 2003. The discourse analysis in cognitive prospect: dissertation in the form of science paper. Dr. philological sciences. Moscow. 90 p.
- 6. Cook G. Discourse. Oxford University Press. 1989
- 7. Cook G. Discourse. Oxford University Press. 1989.
- 8. VAN DIJK, T.A. and KINTSCH, W., 1983. Strategies of discourse comprehension. New York: Academic Press.
- 9. Mendzheritskaya E.O. The term "discourse" in modern foreign linguistics // Linguistic and cognitive problems of intercultural communication: Digest of articles. Ed. V.V.Krasnykh, A.I.Izotov. M.: "Philology", 1997. S. 130-133.
- 10. Makarov M.L. Fundamentals of Discourse Theory.— M.: ITDGK "Gnosis", 2003