

STUDYING METAPHORS IN TRANSLATION THEORY

Abduraimova Gulzoda Sobirjon-kizi

Student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Bozorova Kamila Adhamovna

Student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ARTICLE INFO.

Keywords: metaphor, literary translation, translation transformations, translation, pragmatics, functional adequacy.

Annotation

The article deals with the problem of translating metaphorical means of expression in a literary text in the aspect of preserving their communicative and pragmatic functionality. The issue of metaphor as a universal cognitive mechanism for the nomination of the surrounding reality and the creation of artistic images is being resolved, while taking into account the national linguistic and cultural specificity of the communicant creating the metaphorical form. Linguistic analysis of the form and content of the translated text in comparison with the form and content of the original made it possible to identify cases of complete and partial translation of the metaphor and describe the accompanying lexical and grammatical interlingual transformations. The impossibility of a complete translation of the metaphor of the source text into the translated text is explained both by the peculiarities of the internal development of languages and by the nature of the linguistic thinking of the two peoples. The absence of translation in translation is considered to be a factor that reduces the functional equivalence of texts.

<http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/> © 2023 LWAB.

The connection of the conceptual system of a language with its lexico-semantic system is reflected in the search for correlations between the linguistic and conceptual pictures of the world, already traditional for modern linguistics. One of the processes of emergence and representation in the language of mental models is metaphorization. In the course of posing and solving the main problems of narrative psychology, the main attention is paid to metaphor, according to N.D. Arutyunov, moved to the field of practical speech research and to those areas that refer to thinking, cognition and consciousness, to conceptual systems [1, p. 8].

As the linguist V.G. So, a metaphor is the result of a relationship between two meanings of a word, a prime example of dynamics in the field of lexical semantics [1, p. 12]. Metaphor deepens the understanding of the world and creates new hypotheses. New metaphors are changing everyday language, transforming the ways of perceiving and comprehending the world.

According to E. McCormack, the metaphor arises in connection with the deep features of human thinking. It appears not because it is needed, not because it is impossible to do without it, but because it is inherent in human thinking and language. A person does not perceive phenomena in their pure form,

but endows them with their own properties [3, p. 385]. It is only then that the authors benefit from it for their work.

The narrator turns to metaphors to designate concepts that have not yet entered the dictionary and have not modeled the reaction of the entire public, that is, the motives for creating a metaphor can be not only an epistemological search, but also a desire to present in a new, original way, expressively designate certain concepts, as T. Yeshchenko notes [14, p. 276].

A new view of metaphor has been formed as a phenomenon that permeates everyday life and manifests itself not only in language, but also in thinking and actions, the usual conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. Metaphors as a linguistic expression become possible precisely because they exist in the human conceptual system [20, p. 387].

J. Lakoff and M. Johnson came to this conclusion thanks to linguistic data: based on linguistic facts, they gained access to metaphors that structure perception and thinking. This direction in the study of metaphor can be traced in the works of such linguists as N.D. Arutyunova, V.G. Gak, Yu.N. Karaulov, E. Cassirer, D.M. Kolesnik, E. McCormack, N.I. Sukalenko, V.N. Telia [3; eleven; 16; 17; 18; 23; 33; 35].

In the middle of the twentieth century. There were four areas of study of metaphor: nominal-objective; formal-logical; psychological; linguistic. Over time, the number of different approaches to the study of metaphor increases.

The linguistic interpretation of the metaphor is based on the selection (according to A.A. Taranenko) [35]:

- a) Semantic process. At the same time, the form of a language unit or the design of a language category is transferred from one designation object to another based on the similarity between these objects,
- b) The derived meaning of the language unit, which is formed on the basis of the named semantic process. The linguistic approach is applied to the general language, the so-called erased metaphors, which are clearly seen in the example of lexical nominations.

According to the epistemological approach (W. Quine, H. Ortega y Gasset, A. Baranov, Yu. Karaulov), the metaphor in scientific knowledge performs a constructive function, linking both different layers of the theory language and fragments of knowledge that are different in nature. M. Blair believes that metaphor, as an inevitable phenomenon of human thinking, conveys important information in the cognition and verbalization of the world. The analysis of the process of cognition presupposes the appearance of a metaphor, the main purpose of which is to define various works of human activity. Thus, personal information goes into the universal fund of knowledge, because the metaphorical property of the language opens access to this information for other people [4, p. 153].

Representatives of the logical direction, such as N. Arutyunova, N. Vezhbitskaya, believe that a metaphor is a logical operation of transferring a word-concept from one group to another (in this case, the language specificity is neutralized) [1, p. 6].

Metaphor in the linguoculturological aspect is a means of forming concepts that is consistent with the basic values of any culture, reflects and stores them (M. Johnson, J. Lakoff, E. McCormack).

The above approaches to the definition of metaphor converge on the fact that a metaphor is based on the ability of a word used in a figurative sense to characterize an object through its nomination by their similarity or similarity with another object. Researchers also include a sign of semantic two-dimensionality (J. Ortega y Gasset) to the generally recognized signs of metaphor [1, p. 69], semantic increment (V.K. Kharchenko) [3, p. 45].

There are many contradictions in the interpretation of metaphor. For example, according to the theory

of metaphor as a simplified comparison, a metaphor arises on the basis of figurative comparisons [4, p. 12]. The theory of metaphor as a substitution is based on the use of metaphor and metaphorical paraphrases instead of direct names of the corresponding objects. The theory of metaphor as the interaction of different semantics defines metaphor as the intersection of two conceptual systems for applying to the main subject of the metaphor of properties and associative implications associated with its auxiliary subject [1, p. 7].

A.A. Taranenko defines metaphor as a semantic process in which the form of a language unit or the design of a language category is transferred from one referent to another based on some similarity of the latter in the mind of the speaker [35, p. 108]. V.V. Dyatchuk and L.A. Pustovit believe that the metaphor, constituting the unity, continuity of the general and the specific in the lexical meaning of words covered by the process of transferring signs, is the result of a person's active cognitive activity. On the one hand, metaphor generalizes certain features that are transferred from one object to another, on the other hand, a metaphor is a hidden internal comparison that differs specifically in sensory content [3, p. 136].

G. Sklyarevskaya identifies such differential features of artistic and linguistic metaphors [1, p. 28]:

1. artistic metaphor is the object of study of poetics, and constitutes its main aesthetic category; linguistic metaphor is the object of linguistics research as a complex problem concerning various sections of linguistics and linguistic disciplines,
2. artistic metaphor performs an aesthetic function; linguistic - communicative,
3. artistic metaphor is unsystematic; the linguistic one has a systemic character, it is formed and functions according to the laws of the language system
4. the connotations of an artistic metaphor reproduce not a collective, but an individual (author's) vision of the world, it exists only within a specific context; in a linguistic metaphor, objective connotations that correspond to subject-matter connections, reproduce the linguistic experience of ethnic culture carriers and are fixed by usage behind the semantic potentialities of a certain word,
5. artistic metaphor is single and requires a certain author's explanation; language is commonly used and commonly understood;
6. artistic metaphor is irreproducible, unique; linguistic is characterized by a certain stability and reproducibility in speech,
7. artistic metaphor authorial, subjective; linguistic - "anonymous", objective,
8. Artistic metaphor is characterized by maximum syntagmatic conditionality; linguistic - minimal syntagmatic conditionality.

Therefore, both the consideration of the process of metaphorization and the definition of metaphor as a derived nominative meaning are associated with the word, which leads to the interpretation of metaphor as a lexical and grammatical group of words, while one of them is metaphorical, which, along with direct meaning, also has figurative meaning. The latter, as is known, is the result of metaphorization. With the help of the metaphorical meaning of words, the writer depicts the peculiarity, individuality of objects. With the help of metaphors, the author builds his own model of vision of the surrounding world. In the individual author's metaphor, there is an active interchange between the direct meaning of the word and its potential of associated meanings [1, p. 13].

In a work of art, the lexical meaning of a word is aesthetically updated, modified, i.e. reveals its idiofunctional character. The mechanism for updating the lexical semantics of a word can be traced in metaphorical structures. Metaphor, as a result of the relationship between two meanings of words, one of which is initial and the other is derivative, is a vivid example of dynamics in the field of lexical semantics. Metaphors, like other expressive means, are indicators of the writer's idiolect, reflect his

perception of the world and life credo, and therefore noticeably differ in individuality.

So, the definition given by A.A. Taranenko: metaphor is a semantic process in which the form or design of a language unit is transferred to another referent based on some similarity in the mind of the speaker. Studying the types of semantic transfers makes it possible to determine sets of actual semantic models individual for each language, to identify the specifics of national metaphorization. Metaphor as a means of forming and expanding the lexical meaning of words, as well as the main way of a person's cognitive and mental activity, has the ability to be a kind of model for representing human knowledge in the mind of an individual and at the same time provide them (knowledge) with a linguistic expression.

In the history of linguistics, there were several interpretations of the issue of classification of metaphors (in the works of D. Lakoff, V.P. Moskvina,

G.N. Sklyarevskaya). Various researchers singled out certain types of metaphors, developed various approaches and criteria according to which they distributed them into different classes.

As noted by V.P. Moskvina, so far there is no specific set of parameters by which metaphors can be classified. Therefore, the systematization, and in a large number of cases, the identification of such parameters, i.e. classification of metaphors from a linguistic point of view are really urgent tasks of the science of language [26, p. 46].

The researcher proposed, according to many scientists, the most complete classification of metaphors. It includes semantic, structural and functional classification of metaphors:

I. Semantic classification of metaphors. This classification is of the greatest interest, due to the large field for research activities. This classification is based on the features of the content of a metaphorical sign, which consist in their semantic duality (the main and auxiliary subject are indicated at the same time), i.e. the main subject is compared with an auxiliary subject, a term-comparison on a certain basis (aspect of comparison).

This classification delimits metaphors:

- on the main subjects of comparison;
- by auxiliary subjects of comparison (anthropocentric, animalistic, machine)
- according to the generality of the auxiliary and main subjects of comparison;
- According to the degree of integrity of the internal form of metaphors (figurative metaphors (general poetic and neological (individual-author's), erased metaphors and dead metaphors).

Based on the belonging of the sign-bearer of the image (auxiliary subject) to the system of terms of a particular industry, researchers traditionally distinguish the following groups of metaphors:

- medical (breathless with excitement [1, p. 34], she had been stricken as with a mortal sickness [1, p. 49])
- sports (it's a knockout [1, p. 55], took care to queer her pitch [1, p. 75])
- military (military carriage [1, p. 48], the only chink in his armor [1, p. 63])
- gambling (beauty was at present his chief asset, play my cards well [1, p. 21]),
- Zoological (coltish grace [1, p. 49], animal desire [1, p. 50], pig's eyes [1, p. 84]).

Classification by auxiliary subjects of comparison is interesting not only for philologists, but also for historians, culturologists, political scientists, and sociologists. The metaphor is social. Metaphors show how the picture of the world is reflected in the public mind. As G. Paul notes, from all the metaphors that have become commonplace in the language, one can see what interests prevailed among the people in a certain era, what ideals were laid down in the basis of culture at one stage or another of its

development.

According to A.P. Chudinov, each new stage of the country's social development is reflected in a metaphor, where, regardless of anyone's intentions, a true picture of public self-consciousness is recorded. The system of basic metaphors is the key to understanding the spirit of the times [1, p. 32]. Therefore, the relevance of their research is determined not only by purely linguistic needs, but also by interdisciplinary ones.

II. Structural classification of metaphors. The basis of this classification is the consideration of the external structure of the metaphor as a certain lexical and grammatical construction. External structure Metaphor is represented by a comparison, that is, a component of a phrase that is metaphorized, a word in a figurative sense, and a word-argument (a key word), that is, a component of a phrase that sets the theme of a figurative meaning.

With the presented classification, the features of the metaphor expression plan can be taken into account, in particular, the level affiliation of the unit that acts as the carrier of the metaphorical image. According to this parameter, there are two types of metaphors:

1. Verbal metaphors, which, according to their part of speech, are usually divided into:

- substantive (full of praise [1, p. 20]),
- adjective (went scarlet [1, p. 2], velvet look [1, p. 10]);
- verbal (blue eyes shone, He blushed [1, p. 8]);
- Adverbs (I'm absolutely stony [1, p. 26], divinely happy [1, p. 33]).

2. Phrasal metaphors.

According to the number of units-carriers of a metaphorical image, there are:

- a simple metaphor, where the plan of expression is represented by one word (It was heavenly [1, p. 34]);
- An extended metaphor (metaphorical chain), where the carrier of the metaphorical image is a group of thematically related units (he ... accepted compliments as he might have accepted a compliment on a fine old house that had been in his family for generations. It was a well-known fact that it was one of the best houses of its period, one was proud of it and took care of it, but it was just there, as natural to possess as the air one breathed [1, p. 21]).

There is also a classification according to the presence or absence of a key word:

- Metaphor-comparison (closed metaphor), in which there is a word-parameter and a reference word.
- a metaphor-mystery in which there is no reference word.

III. Functional classification of metaphors. Metaphors can be classified according to their functional characteristics. There are 4 types of them:

- A nominative metaphor used to refer to an object that has not yet received its own name. Such metaphors exist only at the moment of nomination, having performed the function of nomination, it loses its internal form.
- Decorative (artistic) metaphor. It is a means of decorating speech. Its main area of application is artistic speech.
- Evaluative metaphor. An expressive metaphor is intended, first of all, to create an emotional and evaluative effect. Metaphorical models of journalism are created mainly in order to transfer the evaluative attitude from the source concept to the metaphorical meaning.

➤ Explanatory (pedagogical, didactic) metaphor is characteristic of scientific speech.

Unlike the nominative metaphor, decorative, evaluative, explanatory metaphors retain imagery for a long time, since they, in fact, are created for the sake of an internal form, which in metaphors of this type has a certain functional load. The internal form of the nominative metaphor does not have such a load and therefore immediately fades into the background and is forgotten.

Thus, the parameters of the classification of metaphors are determined by the originality of the plans of content and expression, dependence on the context and functional specifics of the metaphorical sign. The analysis of metaphors can be carried out not only by any one, but also by various combinations of the parameters discussed above.

Literature

1. Vovk V.N. Yazykovaya metafora v khudozhestvennoy rechi. Priroda vtorichnoy nominatsii [Language Metaphor in Artistic Speech. Nature of the Secondary Nomination]. Kiev, Naukova Dumka, 1988. P. 127.
2. Gak V.G. Sochetayemost. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' [Co-occurrence Range. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia, 1990. P. 483.
3. Gal'perin I.R. Ocherki po stilistike angliyskogo yazyka [Essays on the Functional Styles of the English Language]. Moscow, Publishing house of literature in foreign languages, 1958. 123 p.
4. Komissarov V.N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskiye aspekty) [Theory of Translation (Linguistic Aspects)]. Moscow, Higher School. 1990. 253 p.
5. Korolova A.L. Semanticheskaya priroda obraznykh sredstv v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke [The Semantic Nature of Imaginative Means in Modern English]. Moscow, Publishing of the Moscow State Linguistic University, 1975. P. 19.
6. Sherzodovich, A. S., & Jamshedovich, B. F. THE MAIN FEATURES OF THE TRANSLATION OF LITERARY TEXT. *Sciencepublish.org*, 16.
7. Daminov Navruz, K. (2022). About Some Errors in the Process of Simultaneous Interpretation. <https://literature.academicjournal.io/index.php/literature/article/view/446>, 2(8), 1-7.
8. Daminov, N. K. (2022). Using Interpreting Strategies in Teaching Simultaneous Translation. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 12, 40-47.
9. Kudratovich, D. N. (2023). СИНХРОН ТАРЖИМА ҚИЛИШДА ҚЎЛЛАНИЛАДИГАН АЙРИМ УСУЛЛАР ТАСНИФИ. *IQRO JURNALI*, 1(2), 322-330.
10. Kuldoshev, U. U. (2022). MODERN TRANSLATION STUDIES: PROCEDURES, PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIES. *ВЕСТНИК МАГИСТРАТУРЫ*, 111.
11. Кулдошов, У. У. (2021). Таржимада Конверсивлик Ва Антонимлик Муносабатининг Берилиши. *Международный Журнал Искусство Слова*, 4(1-2).
12. Қўлдошов, Ў. Ў. (2022). БАДИИЙ ТАРЖИМАНИНГ ЛИНГВОМАДАНИЙ ЖИХАТЛАРИ ТАҲЛИЛИ. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 3(1), 670-678.
13. Daminova, N. K. (2022). YOSHLARDA INSONPARVARLIK FAZILATLARINI SHAKLLANTIRISH-DAVR TALABI. *Journal of Integrated Education and Research*, 1(7), 169-171.
14. Mukhtarovna, B. D., & Kudratovna, D. N. (2022). Professional socialization of youth in family education. *European Scholar Journal*, 3(3), 92-94.

15. KUDRATOVNA, D. N. (2022). Improving the pedagogical content of professional socialization of youth and students in the context of globalization. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*.
16. Nosirovna, K. A. (2022). NEWSPAPER STYLE. THE TRANSLATION ISSUES OF LEXICAL UNITS AND WORD COMBINATIONS IN NEWSPAPER TEXTS. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(2), 285-287.
17. Касимова, А. Н. (2022). TRANSLATION METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF PUBLICISTIC MATERIALS. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 5(3).
18. Эркинов, С. Э. (2011). Семантико-тематический принцип изучения профессионализмов в английском языке (по данным лексики и фразеологии военной сферы). *Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного гуманитарно-педагогического университета*, (5), 337-347.
19. Эркинов, С. Э. ОСОБЕННОСТИ КЛАССИФИКАЦИИ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫХ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ ПО СОДЕРЖАТЕЛЬНЫМ ПРИЗНАКАМ. *ББК 74.48 Р*, 76, 336.