INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON HUMAN COMPUTING STUDIES

https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJHCS e-ISSN: 2615-8159 | p-ISSN: 2615-1898

Volume: 7 Issue: 2 | August 2025

Metaphor As A Stylistic Device In Text Linguistics

Xolbayev Farrux Uskanovich

Mahmudova Komila Sobirjanovna

Teachers of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

----------***----------

Abstract: the research aims to identify the conceptual metaphor underlying metaphorical linguistic expressions in key texts by five of the greatest English language stylists. It then compares these expressions to their Bulgarian translations to see if the metaphor is lost or changed in any way. Conclusions about translated literature are drawn, outlining instances when the kind and quantity of metaphors are similar to those in original material.

Key words: metaphor, text linguistics, literature, translation, cognitive theory, stylistic device.

INTRODUCTION

For many centuries, the phenomena of metaphor has baffled linguists, philosophers, and psychologists alike. Many significant hypotheses that attempt to explain its complexities have been put out recently. By utilizing Aristotle's definition of the term and adopting Richards' theories of metaphoric structure [10. 28p], contemporary researchers have proposed theories such as replacement, comparison, interaction, and so on in an attempt to explain metaphor. The conventional viewpoint, on the one hand, holds that metaphors are limited to the level of language. The second perspective, which was first put out almost thirty years ago by Lakoff and Johnson [6. 43p], maintains that metaphor is a conceptual tool that relates to cognition and has a complex interaction with language. This shift in viewpoint has implications for several branches of science that study language, culture, translation, and literature. Metaphor studies have grown to be a significant field of study. From a cognitive perspective, it led to interdisciplinary research on discourse analysis (Musolff 2004; Charteris-Black, 2004), education (Cameron 2003), translation studies (van den Broeck 1981, Dagut 1987, Mandelblit 1995, Schäffner 2004, Dickins 2005), and more recently, cognitive poetics (Tsur, 1992; Stockwell 2002).

METHODS

Both structurally and etymologically, translation and metaphor happen to be very close: translation comes from Latin “transferre”, trans – ‘across’, ferre – ‘carry’. Metaphor, similarly, derives from the Greek “meta” – ‘change’ and “pherein” – ‘carry’ (etymonline.com). The metalanguage of both contains the concepts of source and target domains, languages, cultures. The Bulgarian word *превод* contains the same connotations. Tymoczko concludes that in most Indo-European languages the words *translation*, *metaphor*, and *transfer* are conceptually related.

Copyright (c) 2025 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON HUMAN COMPUTING STUDIES

https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJHCS e-ISSN: 2615-8159 | p-ISSN: 2615-1898

Volume: 7 Issue: 2 | August 2025

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

While selecting a translation strategy for a text is the main challenge in translation, translating metaphors is a crucial specific issue [8.65p]. Translation of metaphors is difficult, to put it mildly, because of their intricate nature. Kloepfer [5.78p] was the first to bring this up, and a lot of attention has been focused on it since then. In an effort to bridge the two fields of study, several attempts have been undertaken to investigate different facets of metaphor in translation. Fernandez provides a thorough summary of the various methods according to textual, cultural, and cognitive traits. Within the linguistically oriented approaches, there are four different perspectives on the translatability of metaphors, based on her categorization. Assuming that metaphors are inherently unpredictable, they pose a particularly challenging test of a translator's skill because they entail cultural experiences and semantic associations. This perspective has been supported by scholars like Vinay and Darbelnet, Nida, and Dagut. Mason adopts a more moderate approach, asserting that metaphors can be translated with a degree of non-equivalence and that the degree to which they can be translated into the target language relies on the cultural and semantic associations they make in the source language. We can only prove a degree of translatability because a precise depiction is impossible given the improbable completeness of the overlap. A different perspective maintains that metaphors are completely translateable and don't provide any unique issues; this viewpoint is mostly backed by Kloepfer and Reiss.

Theories of metaphor translation in cognitive science

The Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and other more discursive and culturally oriented translation theories that have been proposed over the last thirty years have markedly altered not only the understanding of metaphor but also its influence on translation practice and research. These developments represent a radical departure from the linguistically limited understanding of metaphor. The Cognitive Translation Hypothesis is introduced by Mandelblit [7. 483-495p], who also examines two metaphor translation schemes:

- Similar mapping conditions: if there is no conceptual change between the two languages' metaphors, SMC will result.
- Differing mapping circumstances (a conceptual shift results in DMC).

According to Schäffner, conceptual metaphors can have the same macro-level meaning in both the source text (ST) and the target text (TT). Entailments are explicitly made by structural elements. While ST and TT use distinct metaphorical phrases that can be united under a more abstract conceptual metaphor, the TT uses a more sophisticated metaphor. One feature of the conceptual metaphor is reflected differently in the TT manifestation [11. 1253-1269p].

Notable is Müller's method, which takes a strong stance on cognition. Her reasoning disproves the idea that "dead" and "live" metaphors are mutually incompatible. She contends that metaphors function at the level of language usage rather than the level of the language system. In light of this, metaphoricity is a dynamic aspect of a person's cognitive activation process at any given time. Empirical research on multimodal metaphors—which combine words, gestures, visuals, etc.—supports her views.

Copyright (c) 2025 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJHCS e-ISSN: 2615-8159 | p-ISSN: 2615-1898
Volume: 7 Issue: 2 | August 2025

Translation and literary use of metaphor

Literary translations between languages and cultures of the highest form of the language of literature that is taught and studied in academic institutions are the most significant manifestation of both culture and language that Cultural Linguistics cannot ignore. In literature classes, cognitive linguistics can be a very useful tool because it clarifies literary analysis by using our conceptual understanding of conventional metaphor as a foundation for understanding the work's hidden meaning that is hidden behind lexicalized, sleeping, conventional, or novel linguistic metaphorical expressions. Additionally, cognitive grammar can shed light on how well or poorly a metaphor is translated, which can enhance or detract from a piece of art's artistic effect.

Metaphor in Literary Discourse

In addition to forcing us to reconsider the function of metaphor in ordinary language, conceptual metaphor theory also offered a fresh perspective on metaphor in literature. In literary discourse, metaphor is approached from two different angles. Because of the way metaphors in literary discourse interact with one another and with other elements of the texts they appear in, some scholars believe it to be no different from metaphor in other types of discourse, while others see no similarities because they believe it to be far superior to metaphor in other types of discourse. As a result, their comparison is impossible. Metaphor in literary speech is preferable than metaphor in other genres of conversation, according to Semino and Steen.

According to Lakoff & Turner in More than Cool Reason, poetic metaphor is a fresh rephrasing of conceptual metaphors that we employ on a regular basis. Poets artistically reinterpret and question common metaphors. Stated differently, the majority of poetic language, according to cognitive linguists, is derived from common, everyday mental analogies. Original and creative metaphors are only imaginative formulations of traditional intellectual metaphors.

CONCLUSION

Based on the available facts, we can confidently declare that our first hypothesis was refuted. Both the response to the first claim—that there would be numerous instances of explanation, paraphrasing, and loss of metaphor—and the second—that the TT will be longer than the ST and have a higher type/token ratio—are unquestionably negative. Another negative assertion that has been proved to be true is that inventive metaphors will be more common.

REFERENCES:

1. Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*. London. New York: Continuum.
2. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Palgrave, Macmillan.
3. Dagut, M. (1976). Can "metaphor be translated? *Babel* 22 (1): 21-33.
4. Fernadez, E. S. et al., (2005). Translations we live by: the impact of metaphor translations in target systems. *Servicio de Publicaciones e Intercambio Editorial de la UVA*, edited by Fuertes Olivera, Cood,.61-81. Available from Pedro A. Fuertes-Olivera, Aug 17, 2017.
5. Kloepfer, R. (1967). *Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. Romanisch-deutscher Sprachbereich*, Munich, W. Fink (Freiburger Schriften zur Romanischen Philologie 12).
6. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Copyright (c) 2025 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJHCS e-ISSN: 2615-8159 | p-ISSN: 2615-1898
Volume: 7 Issue: 2 | August 2025

7. Mandelblit, N. (1995). The cognitive view of metaphor and its implications for translation theory. *In Translation and Meaning*, Part 3, 483 − 495.
8. Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford, Pergamon.
9. Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism, the potentials and limitations: categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes, Manchester, U.K, St. Jerome Pub.
10. Richards, Iv. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford University Press.
11. Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach. In *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1253-1269.
12. Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics. An Introduction.* London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
13. Abdurasulovna, E. Z. (2023). REMARKS ON CAUSAL COMPLEX PREPOSITIONS. *SCIENCE AND INNOVATION IDEAS IN MODERN EDUCATION*, *1*(6).
14. Ziyoda, E. (2023). PREDLOGLARNING O‘ZGARISHI VA DERIVATSIYASI XUSUSIDA. *International Journal of Contemporary Scientific and Technical Research*, 455-457.
15. Nasrullaeva, N. (2016). THE CONCEPTS “MAN” AND “WOMAN” IN THE ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGY. *Scientific enquiry in the contemporary world: theoretical basics and innovative approach*, *74*.

Copyright (c) 2025 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/