

MAIN STRATEGIES OF METAPHOR TRANSLATION IN TRANSLATOLOGY

Balayan Gayane Vladimirovna

Master of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: Metaphors are an inseparable part of every language, which are found in large numbers in most languages. Since the meaning metaphors cannot be understood from the surface meanings of the individual words that make up them, there are some problems in the processes of understanding and translation. This article is devoted to the study main strategies of metaphor translation discussed by popular scholars.

Key words: translation, analysis, linguistics, reproducing, translatability, translation techniques, types of metaphor.

In translatology, metaphor has gotten a great deal of attention, particularly in terms of its translatability and translation techniques. According to Bassnett, Lefevere and Snell-Hornby, there are three basic methods for translating metaphors in translatology.

- 1) a metaphor into the same metaphor, named direct translation;
- 2) a metaphor into a different metaphor—substitution of the image in metaphor with the same or a similar sense and the same or similar associations;
- 3) a metaphor into the sense—paraphrase, a shift to a nonfigurative equivalent.

In light of the fact that translation is now seen as one of many textual manipulation processes, where the concept of plurality replaces dogmas of faithfulness to a source text, and where the idea of the original is being challenged from a variety of perspectives, postmodern trends in translatology have been recognized by Bassnett, who perceived them as inaugurating a poststructuralist stage in the discipline.

As per Newmark, the translation techniques are tied to the various text kinds as well as the type of metaphor (standard, recent, dead, original, modified, cliché). According to Newmark's prescriptive model of metaphor translation from 1988, there are methods for communicating the right meaning of metaphors. While dead metaphors are not especially problematic, literal translation is often not possible. In vocative texts, cliché metaphors should be upheld in the TT [4]. In informative texts, they should be reduced to their sense or replaced with a more credible stock metaphor. For the translation of stock metaphors, the SL image should be legitimately reproduced in the TL, but the metonyms used may be transferred as long as the substitutes have the same connotations as the SL. However, the SL image is more commonly translated by images that are established to a similar degree. Stock metaphors may also be reduced

to their sense or literal language. Adapted metaphors should be translated using equivalent adapted metaphors or reduced to their sense. Recent metaphors should be translated using componential analysis. In vocative texts, original metaphors should be translated literally, as they “contain the core of an important writer’s message.” [1]

Moreover Newmark contributed to translatology with his seven strategies of metaphor translation that have almost always been taken up by the researchers and which are considered here. They are:

1. *Reproducing the same image* in the TL. The best technique to interpret common metaphors—most often, idioms—is in this way.

2. *Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image*. It is employed when there isn't an image that perfectly matches the one in the SL and doesn't conflict with TL culture.

3. *Translating metaphor by simile*. In situations where the context is not as emotive in nature as the SL, this tactic adapts an emotive metaphorical term to fit the TL.

4. *Translating metaphor by simile + sense*.

5. *Converting a metaphor to its sense*. This is a strategy where the image of the SL is reduced to its sense and rewritten to suit the TL.

6. *Deleting*. It is used when the metaphor is redundant.

7. *Combining the same metaphor with the sense*. These strategies are arranged according to preference, which means that Newmark [5] recommends that translators opt for the replacement strategy in the first instance and only if this is not possible, due to cultural clashes, to move down the list and opt for an alternative strategy.

Newmark [4, 48-49] argues that the most translatable metaphors are dead ones, whereas the translatability of stock and original ones is proportional to the proximity of the two systems involved. The problem of metaphor translation, from a semantic perspective, involves the concept of translational equivalence, which is connected to the nature and purpose of a trope in general as well as to its communication role and type. Regarding metaphor types, the Newmarkian time criterion—or, to put it another way, the freshness or originality of expressions—has frequently been employed. There are unlexicalized metaphors those are either completely or comparatively original and innovative, and there is a vast universe of lexicalized metaphors whose metaphorical essence is.

In translatology, metaphors were reflected on with respect to translatability or what was lost in translating them, their originality, cultural background or TL language richness. Metaphors are also culture-specific; they cannot be transferred intact from a source language (SL) to a target language (TL). There are several strategies of metaphor transfer from SL to TL. Newmark contributed to translatology with his seven strategies of metaphor translation that have often been taken up by other researchers.

Most of the work in translatology has commented on metaphors in a more traditional view, defining a metaphor as a linguistic expression which can describe the object more comprehensively, succinctly and forcefully than is possible in literal or physical language [4, 95]. By using Newmark's typology, it was possible to categorize different metaphors depending on type, such as dead, cliché, stock, recent or original metaphors. His extensive research on the strategies of metaphor translation proved immensely significant in the practical translational perspective. [1].

According to Toury, these target-oriented procedures should be considered along with other procedures that are similar to those proposed by Broeck and Newmark, which are as follows:

1. Metaphor into 'same' metaphor.
2. Metaphor into 'different' metaphor.
3. Metaphor into non-metaphor.
4. Metaphor into 0, complete omission in the target text.

One more scientist Deignan worked on ways of translation of metaphors and asked a group of Polish students to translate metaphorical expressions written in English into their language. Based on the students' translation, Deignan et al. identified the following translation patterns:

1. *Same conceptual metaphor and equivalent linguistic expressions.*
2. *Same conceptual metaphor but different linguistic expressions.*
3. *Different conceptual metaphors used.*
4. *Words and expressions with similar literal meanings, but different metaphorical meanings.*

Depending on the function of the text, the type of addressees, and the conceptual framework of the source and destination cultures, Schäffner offers metaphor translation possibilities. According to Schäffner's examination of several metaphors translated from German into English in a variety of political literature, there are five main patterns for translating metaphors.

1. A conceptual metaphor is identical in ST and TT at the macro-level without each individual manifestation having been accounted for at the micro-level.
2. Structural components Structural components of the base conceptual schema in the ST are replaced in the TT by expressions that make entailments explicit.
3. A metaphor is more elaborate in the TT.
4. ST and TT employ different metaphorical expressions which can be combined under a more abstract conceptual metaphor.
5. The expression in the TT reflects a different aspect of the conceptual metaphor.

REFERENCES:

1. Brankica B. Strategies of Metaphor Translation. Alpha University, Belgrade
2. Carbonell G. Metaphor: An Inescapable Phenomenon in Natural Language Comprehension. Pittsburgh. Carnegie-Mellon University
3. Carbonell, G. Metaphor - A Key to Extensible Semantic Analysis. Proceedings of the 18th Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. - 1980.
4. Newmark P .A book of translation. Hertfordshire Prentice Hall. New York-1988.
5. Newmark, P. Approaches to Translation, London, Prentice Hall International.-1981;1988
6. Ortony, A. Metaphor in Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension, R. Erlbaum, 1980.
7. Oliynyk T. Metaphor Translation Methods., Kyiv. Taras: Shevchenko National University (Ukraine)