

DISCURSIVE ONTOLOGY OF (LITERARY) TRANSLATION**Nargiza Savrievna Zokirova,***Assistant teacher at Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan*n.s.zokirova@buxdu.uz

Abstract. Researchers have identified the factors of means, communication, people, and gap as key determinants of translation in its discursive ontology and parameters of discourse analysis as a tool of the translator. In existing models, these factors, certainly, were considered earlier - separately and in different combinations. This article deals with the term “ontology” and discusses discursive ontology of translation.

Key words: ontology, discursive ontology, discourse, metaphysics, interpretation, translation, communication.

Ontology is a term that genetically ascends to philosophical discourse, in the semiotic space of which it is used to describe "the fundamental principles of being, the most general entities and categories of being" [New Philosophical Encyclopedia 2010, articles "Ontology" and "Metaphysics"]. This concept is close to the concept of metaphysics, however, since the time of I. Kant, ontology has been correlated with a new understanding of objectivity as a result of the design of sensory material by the categorical apparatus of the cognizing subject. Hence the impossibility of attributing the status of “real” to the sign structures of the language of description and recognizing their quasi-metaphysical status of “original principles and primary causes” within a certain system of interpretation. As emphasized by V.L. Vasyukov, “scientific theory [only] considers certain objects of its attention to exist; the universe of similar objects forms the ontology of this theory. Usually in this connection they speak of the ontological assumptions of the language of theory” [Vasyukov 2008]. Examples of such assumptions are the notion of linguistic consciousness and the notion of translation equivalence.

As studies in recent years have shown, the concept of discourse is a convenient tool for analyzing human language activity - a semiotic phenomenon of a cognitive (mental) and social (interactional) order [Langacker 2016; Geeraerts 2016], which should be considered as emerging and functioning at the intersection of cognitive, communicative and socio-cultural spheres of human activity. In translation studies, this circumstance led to a gradual shift in the research focus to the ontology of translation, which we designated as discursive [Leontieva 2012, 2013]. This ontology gradually absorbed the activity ontology, which at one time replaced the substitutive-transformational ontology [Galeeva 1999, 2011]. In discursive ontology, the object of modeling is the trinity of translation as a dynamic system that exists only in the activity and thanks to the activity of the translator [Yakovlev 2015], namely:

- translation-speech (cognitive processes in the mind of the translator);
- translation-communication (processes of interpersonal, social and cross-cultural interaction mediated by the work as a cognitive interaction of the consciousnesses of the author, translator, recipients and characters);
- translation-text (text as a product and instrument of both types of activity).

Analysis of this system object, according to A.A. Yakovlev, makes it possible to identify the relationship between the process, its product and “that mental and social “environment” in which both of them exist” [Yakovlev 2015].

Since the concept of A.A. Yakovlev is focused on translation in its activity interpretation, one might get the impression that, speaking of the discursive ontology of translation, we only multiply entities. This is not so, but in order to substantiate the critical differences between a discursive ontology and an activity ontology, we need a short historical digression. In addition, it is necessary to define the very epistemological model behind the term "ontology of translation" in general and "discursive ontology of translation" in particular, since the correctness of the formulation of the object of study and its description within the framework of any translation model and translation theory in general depends on this. Despite the

popularity of the term "ontology" in translation theory, neither the content of the concept behind it, nor its relationship with the concept of paradigm is clearly defined in any of the works known to us. The same applies to the content of the concept of "anthropocentrism" - the principle underlying this study and, from our point of view, fundamental for understanding the ontological nature of translation, regardless of the angle and methodology of a particular study.

The ontology of translation in this case can be defined as a system of assumptions shared by a certain group of people about the essential properties, principles and regularities of translation and the implementation of translation activity, "assumed" as objectively existing in the signs of the metalanguage of description from the standpoint of some scientific paradigm and scientific tradition and based on intersubjective experience of professional communications within specific scientific communities in a certain ethnosociocultural context. At the same time, ethnosociocultural contextualization of ontological assumptions explains the fact of striking differences between the models, principles and norms of translation proposed by scientists from different countries and in the space of different civilizations (for example, Russia, Europe, Asia, Africa, former colonial territories), from the perspective of different social, in including gender identities.

References:

1. Yakovlev A.A. Psycholinguistic aspects of translation. Krasnoyarsk: SFU, 2015. 160 p.
2. Vasyukov V.L. Formal ontology and cognitive research // Cognitive approach: philosophy, cognitive science, cognitive disciplines /ed. V.A. Lecturer. M.: Kanon+, 2008. S. 272–294.
3. Nargiza Savrievna Zokirova. (2022). THE FUNCTION OF COGNITIVE DOMINANTS IN THE TRANSLATOR'S DISCOURSE. *Conferencea*, 96–99. Retrieved from <https://conferencea.org/index.php/conferences/article/view/297>

4. 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
5. Zokirova Nargiza Savrievna. (2022). The Concept of Discourse as A Cognitive Phenomenon of Translation. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 7, 207–211. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1301>
6. Zokirova, N. (2021). Badiiy she'riy tarjimada g'ayrilisoniy jihatlarni saqlashda ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik tamoyillari: Tarjimada ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 6(6). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3496
7. Zokirova, N. (2022). ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ И КОГНИТИВНЫЕ СВОЙСТВА АДЕКВАТНОСТИ В ПЕРЕВОДСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 8(8). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/5751
8. Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi. (2022). INTERTEXTUALITY VS INTERDISCURSIVITY AS AN ESSENTIAL PHENOMENON OF MODERN DISCOURSE. *E Conference Zone*, 53–55. Retrieved from <https://econferencezone.org/index.php/ecz/article/view/422>
9. Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi. (2022). Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality: Relation of Concepts. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 7, 180–184. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1295>
10. Qosimova, N. (2022). ЗАМОНАВИЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКА НУҚТАИ НАЗАРИДАН ПАРАДИГМАЛАР МОЎЖИЯТИ ВА УЛАРНИНГ КЎЧИШ САБАБЛАРИ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ*

(*buxdu.Uz*), 8(8).

ИЗВЛЕЧЕНО

ОТ

http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/5808