WORLD SCIENCE PUBLISHING
LONDON LTD
LONDON
London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation

THE TRANSLATION OF METAPHOR AND IMAGERY IN UZBEK, ENGLISH, AND TURKISH LITERARY TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL ANALYSIS

Nurmuhammad Amonov

Abstract

Metaphor and imagery are fundamental elements of literary language through which writers communicate emotions, construct aesthetic experiences, and represent culturally shaped perceptions of reality. Their translation presents a significant challenge because figurative expressions convey not only propositional meaning but also stylistic, emotional, symbolic, and cultural associations. This article examines the translation of metaphor and imagery in Uzbek, English, and Turkish from a comparative linguistic and cultural perspective. Drawing on Conceptual Metaphor Theory, translation equivalence, and metaphor translation strategies, the study proposes an analytical framework for examining similarities and differences in figurative expression across the three languages. Particular attention is given to conceptual correspondence, cultural specificity, contextual interpretation, and the preservation of literary effect. Illustrative examples involving metaphors of the heart, light, the road, and flowers demonstrate how apparently similar images may produce different meanings across languages and how different linguistic forms may communicate comparable emotional experiences. The article argues that successful literary translation requires more than lexical substitution: it involves reconstructing the relationship between an image, its context, its cultural associations, and its function within the literary text. The proposed framework contributes to comparative translation studies by bringing together three languages with both historical-cultural affinities and significant linguistic differences.

Keywords: comparative translation studies, metaphor, imagery, Uzbek, English, Turkish, literary translation, cultural equivalence, conceptual metaphor, figurative language.

1. Introduction

Literary language differs from ordinary communicative language in its ability to transform everyday experiences into aesthetically meaningful expressions. Writers frequently employ metaphors, symbols, similes, and other forms of imagery to represent emotions, psychological states, social relationships, and abstract concepts. Through these devices, an ordinary object may acquire symbolic significance, a natural phenomenon may express an emotional condition, and a physical experience may become a means of understanding an abstract idea.

Metaphor is particularly important because it enables writers to communicate complex meanings through relationships between seemingly unrelated concepts. In a literary text, darkness may suggest despair, light may represent hope or knowledge, a journey may symbolize personal development, and a flower may evoke beauty, youth, love, or transience. However, these associations are not necessarily identical across languages and cultures.

The translation of metaphor therefore raises a fundamental question: how can a translator preserve not only what an expression means but also what it makes the reader imagine, feel, and associate with that meaning?

This question is particularly relevant to Uzbek, English, and Turkish. Uzbek and Turkish share important genealogical and structural characteristics as Turkic languages, as well as certain historical and

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

cultural connections. English, by contrast, belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family and has developed within different historical and literary traditions. Nevertheless, speakers of all three languages experience many common human emotions and physical experiences, which may provide a basis for comparable conceptual metaphors.

These similarities and differences make the three languages suitable for comparative investigation. A metaphor may be expressed through similar imagery in all three languages, may require a different linguistic construction in one language, or may depend on cultural associations that are not readily accessible to readers of another language.

Previous theoretical work has established that metaphor is not merely a decorative literary device. Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003) demonstrate its fundamental role in conceptualization, while Newmark (1985) examines the specific problems involved in transferring metaphorical meaning between languages. Monti (2009) further illustrates how the translation of conceptual metaphors involves intercultural negotiation even when the languages concerned share certain conceptual patterns.

Building on these approaches, the present article investigates metaphor and imagery through a three-language comparative framework.

The objectives are:

1. To examine the relationship between linguistic form, metaphorical meaning, and literary imagery in Uzbek, English, and Turkish.
2. To identify potential similarities and differences in the conceptual associations of selected images.
3. To discuss translation strategies for preserving the semantic, emotional, and aesthetic functions of figurative expressions.
4. To propose an analytical framework for future corpus-based research involving literary works in the three languages.

The article addresses three research questions:

- How are metaphor and imagery linguistically and conceptually realized in Uzbek, English, and Turkish literary texts?
- How do linguistic and cultural differences influence the translation of figurative expressions among these languages?
- Which translation strategies are most appropriate for preserving the literary function of metaphor and imagery?

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Metaphor as a linguistic and cognitive phenomenon

Traditionally, metaphor has often been understood as a figure of speech in which one object or concept is described in terms of another. Contemporary cognitive linguistics, however, recognizes metaphor as a mechanism through which people conceptualize abstract experiences by drawing on more concrete domains of experience.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003) explain that conceptual metaphors organize ordinary thought as well as literary expression. For example, the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY allows people to understand human existence through the experience of travelling. Expressions referring to paths, destinations, obstacles, and directions can consequently communicate ideas about decisions, personal development, and the passage of time.

The conceptual relationship may be shared across languages, but its linguistic realization can differ. English may describe someone as being “at a crossroads,” while Uzbek and Turkish may use different

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

constructions to communicate a comparable decision-making situation. A translator must therefore distinguish the conceptual structure from its particular verbal expression.

Three analytical levels are especially relevant:

First, the linguistic level concerns the actual words, grammatical constructions, and figurative expressions used in a text.

Second, the conceptual level concerns the relationship between the source domain and the target domain. For example, the physical experience of travelling may structure the abstract concept of life.

Third, the cultural level concerns the associations, values, traditions, and interpretative expectations that influence how a metaphor is understood.

These levels are interrelated, but they should not be treated as identical. Two languages may employ different words to express the same conceptual metaphor, while similar words or images may acquire different associations in different contexts.

2.2. Imagery and literary meaning

Imagery refers to language that evokes sensory perceptions, mental pictures, or emotionally meaningful representations. Visual imagery is especially prominent in literary texts, although figurative language may also appeal to hearing, touch, taste, and smell.

Metaphor and imagery overlap, but they are not interchangeable. A metaphor establishes a relationship between concepts, whereas imagery concerns the perceptual or imaginative experience evoked by language. A single metaphor can produce an image, and an image may acquire symbolic significance without functioning as a metaphor.

For instance, a description of a red flower may initially be literal. Within a poem about lost love, the same flower may represent beauty, memory, or emotional vulnerability. Its interpretation consequently depends on its position within the broader literary context.

When translating such passages, reproducing the dictionary meaning of individual words may be insufficient. The translator must also consider the image's role in the poem or narrative, its relationship to surrounding expressions, and its contribution to the author's stylistic choices.

This distinction is essential to comparative translation studies because an apparently successful lexical translation may fail to preserve the image's literary function.

2.3. Metaphor translation and equivalence

Translation equivalence does not necessarily require identical words or grammatical structures. Rather, it concerns the degree to which a target text reproduces relevant aspects of the source text's meaning and function.

Nida (1964) emphasizes the importance of the relationship between linguistic expression and the response of the target audience. Newmark (1988) provides a practical framework for translation methods and procedures, while his earlier discussion of metaphor addresses the specific challenges of transferring figurative language (Newmark, 1985).

For the present study, metaphorical equivalence is understood as a multidimensional relationship involving:

- Semantic equivalence: preservation of the intended meaning.
- Conceptual equivalence: preservation of the underlying relationship between concepts.
- Imagistic equivalence: preservation of the image or an appropriately corresponding image.
- Pragmatic equivalence: preservation of the communicative function in context.
- Stylistic equivalence: preservation of tone, register, emphasis, and literary effect.
- Cultural equivalence: preservation or effective reconstruction of relevant cultural associations.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

These dimensions may reinforce one another, but they may also conflict. A literal translation may preserve an image while making its intended meaning obscure. A culturally adapted translation may communicate the intended emotion effectively while replacing the original image.

The translator's task is therefore not always to preserve every dimension equally. It is to determine which features are essential to the literary passage and to make informed decisions when complete equivalence is unavailable.

3. Methodology

This article adopts a qualitative, contrastive approach to metaphor and imagery in Uzbek, English, and Turkish. It combines concepts from cognitive linguistics, literary stylistics, and translation studies to develop a framework for comparative analysis.

The current discussion is theoretical and illustrative rather than an empirical report based on a completed corpus. The examples are constructed or schematic representations of possible translation problems; they should not be interpreted as quotations from identifiable literary works or as evidence of actual language-wide frequency.

A subsequent empirical investigation could employ parallel literary texts, including original works and their published translations into the other two languages. Such a corpus would make it possible to compare the source expression with its actual translation and examine the decisions made by professional translators.

The proposed analytical procedure consists of four stages.

First, metaphorical and imagistic expressions are identified in the source texts. Each expression is examined in its immediate linguistic context and in the broader literary passage.

Second, the expressions are classified according to their conceptual domains, such as emotions, nature, light and darkness, movement, and human relationships.

Third, the corresponding expressions in the other languages are examined to establish whether the metaphorical image is retained, modified, replaced, explained, or omitted.

Finally, the translation choices are evaluated according to semantic accuracy, conceptual correspondence, cultural appropriateness, and stylistic function.

For a corpus-based version of the study, the analysis should record the source text, author, publication details, original expression, published translation, translator, context, and classification of the translation strategy. Where multiple translations exist, comparing them would provide additional evidence about the range of possible interpretative decisions.

4. Comparative Analysis of Metaphor and Imagery

4.1. Metaphors of the heart and emotional experience

The heart is a productive metaphorical domain in many literary traditions. As a physical organ associated with life, it can also represent love, courage, sincerity, suffering, and emotional experience.

English expressions such as "a broken heart" and "an open heart" demonstrate how physical states and actions can represent psychological experiences. Uzbek expressions involving yurak and Turkish expressions involving kalp or yürek may communicate related ideas, although their usage and stylistic associations must be established from contextual evidence.

Consider the following illustrative examples:

Language
Illustrative expression
Possible meaning
English

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

A broken heart
Emotional suffering caused by loss or disappointment
Uzbek
Yuragi ezildi
Deep emotional distress
Turkish
Kalbi kırıldı
Emotional hurt or disappointment

These expressions communicate related experiences, but they are not structurally identical. The English expression “a broken heart” presents emotional suffering through an image of physical damage. The Uzbek expression yuragi ezildi evokes the idea of being crushed or deeply distressed, while Turkish kalbi kırıldı uses the image of breaking.

The comparison illustrates a central problem in metaphor translation: expressions may belong to a similar conceptual domain without sharing precisely the same linguistic form or emotional intensity.

The translator should therefore evaluate the function of the expression in context. If the passage emphasizes the painful consequences of romantic rejection, a conventional target-language expression may preserve the intended effect more successfully than a word-for-word rendering. If, however, the writer deliberately develops an extended image of physical destruction, replacing the original metaphor with a conventional idiom may weaken the literary structure.

The distinction between conventional and creative metaphor is consequently important. Conventional metaphors often have established equivalents, whereas original literary metaphors may require more individualized translation decisions.

4.2. Light and darkness as images of knowledge, hope, and despair

Light and darkness constitute another productive domain for comparative analysis. In many literary contexts, light may be associated with knowledge, hope, clarity, or spiritual awareness, while darkness may evoke uncertainty, fear, concealment, or despair.

Illustrative conceptual correspondences include:

Conceptual image
English example
Possible Uzbek or Turkish rendering
Light as knowledge
The light of knowledge
Ilm nuri / bilginin ışığı
Darkness as uncertainty
A dark future
Qorong‘i kelajak / karanlık bir gelecek
Light as hope
A ray of hope
Umid nuri / umut ışığı

The expressions demonstrate that certain metaphorical associations can be linguistically accessible across the three languages. However, their apparent similarity should not be taken as proof that all associated meanings are universal.

For example, the image of light in a religious or mystical poem may carry spiritual significance beyond its general association with hope. In such a context, translating the expression as a simple

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

reference to optimism may preserve its broad emotional meaning while diminishing its theological or philosophical dimension.

Similarly, darkness may represent fear in one passage and privacy, protection, or contemplative silence in another. Its interpretation cannot be established solely from the word itself.

A translator should therefore examine the interaction between the metaphor and its literary context. This includes the surrounding images, the speaker's emotional position, the genre, and the symbolic system of the work.

The comparison also demonstrates why literal translation is not necessarily the opposite of creative translation. A literal rendering may be the best option when the image and its cultural associations are sufficiently compatible. Adaptation becomes necessary when the original wording fails to communicate the intended relationship or creates an unintended interpretation.

4.3. The journey as a metaphor for life and personal development

The conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY provides a useful framework for investigating the three languages. It represents abstract experiences through physical movement and spatial relationships.

Expressions involving paths, roads, destinations, and obstacles can communicate decisions, ambitions, difficulties, and personal development.

Consider the following schematic examples:

- English: "She is at a crossroads in her life."
- Uzbek: U hayotida muhim tanlov oldida turibdi.
- Turkish: Hayatında önemli bir yol ayrımında.

The Uzbek sentence means that the person faces an important choice in life. The Turkish sentence uses the image of a road junction, while the English expression uses a conventional metaphor involving a crossroads.

These sentences communicate a broadly comparable situation, but they differ in imagery. The Uzbek example makes the decision explicit without necessarily retaining the physical road image. The Turkish example retains a road-related metaphor, while the English expression employs an established figurative construction.

This difference illustrates a significant translation decision: whether to preserve the image or prioritize the communicative meaning.

If the source text contains an isolated metaphor whose main function is to express a difficult decision, a non-metaphorical equivalent may be appropriate. However, if the surrounding passage repeatedly develops the image of a journey, translating one expression literally and another descriptively could disrupt the coherence of the text.

In extended metaphors, consistency becomes especially important. A road may be introduced, followed by obstacles, detours, and a destination. Each subsequent image contributes to a larger conceptual structure. The translator must recognize this structure and reproduce it coherently in the target language whenever possible.

Comparative analysis should therefore examine not only individual metaphors but also the relationships among images across sentences and paragraphs.

4.4. Flowers, beauty, and the passage of time

Natural imagery occupies an important position in poetry and prose. Flowers, trees, seasons, rivers, and landscapes may evoke beauty, youth, love, renewal, death, or the passage of time.

The image of a flower is particularly suitable for comparative research because it can function simultaneously as a sensory description, a symbol, and a metaphorical representation.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Consider a hypothetical poetic expression:

"The flower of youth faded before its time."

The flower represents youth and beauty, while fading suggests decline or the premature loss of vitality. The sentence combines natural imagery with a metaphorical representation of human life.

A translator working into Uzbek or Turkish could preserve the flower image and the idea of fading, provided that the resulting expression sounds natural and retains the intended meaning. Alternatively, the translator might use an established expression referring to the passing of youth.

These alternatives are not necessarily equivalent in literary effect. Retaining the image preserves the source text's visual and symbolic qualities, whereas replacing it with a conventional expression may increase fluency but reduce the prominence of the original metaphor.

The image also demonstrates the importance of distinguishing shared human experiences from culturally specific interpretations. Flowers may be associated with beauty and transience in multiple literary traditions, but particular flowers can carry different historical, religious, national, or ceremonial associations.

Consequently, a translator should not assume that a flower possesses the same symbolic meaning in all three cultures. The relevant interpretation must be established through the source text, its literary tradition, and, where appropriate, historical or cultural evidence.

4.5. The role of contextual meaning

The preceding examples demonstrate that metaphor translation cannot be reduced to a list of equivalents. The same expression may function differently depending on the speaker, genre, historical setting, and surrounding imagery.

For instance, a road in a narrative may simply indicate physical movement. In a philosophical passage, it may symbolize personal development. In a poem, it may suggest separation, uncertainty, destiny, or the impossibility of returning to the past.

A translator who automatically assigns the same figurative meaning to every occurrence risks imposing an interpretation that the source text does not support.

Contextual analysis should therefore establish at least four aspects of a metaphor:

1. Its immediate meaning in the sentence.
2. Its relationship to the wider passage.
3. Its contribution to the author's imagery and style.
4. Its cultural and literary associations, where relevant.

This approach is consistent with the cognitive view that metaphor organizes thought and with translation theories that distinguish linguistic correspondence from communicative and stylistic equivalence.

5. Translation Strategies for Preserving Metaphor and Imagery

The comparative framework suggests several strategies that translators can use when transferring figurative language among Uzbek, English, and Turkish. The appropriate strategy depends on the nature of the metaphor, its context, and its function in the literary work.

5.1. Retaining the original image

The translator reproduces the metaphorical image using a natural expression in the target language.

This strategy is particularly suitable when the image is comprehensible to target readers and contributes significantly to the text's aesthetic or symbolic structure.

For example, an image of light representing knowledge may be retained in all three languages if the wording is idiomatic and the context supports the same interpretation.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

However, retaining the image should not be confused with mechanically reproducing the source-language grammar. The target expression may require changes in word order, morphology, or lexical choice.

5.2. Replacing the metaphor with a target-language equivalent

A translator may replace a source metaphor with a conventional metaphor or idiom that communicates a similar meaning in the target language.

This strategy is useful when the source image is unfamiliar or when a literal rendering would sound unnatural.

Its main advantage is communicative accessibility. Its principal risk is the loss of the source author's distinctive imagery.

The translator should therefore distinguish between an established idiom and a deliberately original metaphor. Replacing a conventional expression may be relatively straightforward, whereas replacing a creative metaphor may substantially alter the author's style.

5.3. Adapting the image culturally

Cultural adaptation involves replacing or modifying an image whose associations are difficult to reproduce in the target culture.

Such adaptation may be appropriate when the image depends on a specific cultural practice, historical reference, or symbolic convention that would otherwise remain inaccessible.

Nevertheless, adaptation should be justified by the text rather than by broad assumptions about national cultures. Uzbek, English, and Turkish literary traditions are internally diverse, and readers within the same culture may interpret an image differently.

Where cultural specificity is central to the work, preserving the original image and allowing readers to encounter its unfamiliarity may be preferable to replacing it.

5.4. Using an explanatory or non-metaphorical equivalent

Sometimes a metaphor cannot be transferred naturally without confusing the reader. In such cases, the translator may express its intended meaning directly.

For example, a metaphor that represents a person as being trapped in darkness might be translated descriptively as an expression of hopelessness if the image has no important function beyond communicating that emotion.

However, the decision becomes more complicated when darkness is part of a wider symbolic pattern. A descriptive rendering may preserve the immediate meaning but remove a link to other images in the work.

Explanatory translation should therefore be used selectively, particularly in poetry, where the image itself may be central to the artistic experience.

5.5. Compensating for lost imagery

Compensation involves preserving an important stylistic or emotional effect elsewhere in the target text when it cannot be reproduced in the same location.

This strategy may be relevant to poetry, where rhythm, rhyme, metaphor, and syntax interact. A translator may need to reorganize an expression to preserve the poem's overall aesthetic effect.

However, compensation should not become an excuse for arbitrary rewriting. The added or modified expression should remain consistent with the author's voice, the text's imagery, and its emotional development.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

5.6. Omitting a metaphor

Omission may occasionally be justified when a figurative expression is redundant, untranslatable without disproportionate distortion, or inconsistent with the target text's communicative requirements.

Nevertheless, omission is especially risky in literary translation because even a seemingly minor image may contribute to characterization, symbolism, atmosphere, or thematic unity.

It should therefore be considered a last resort when other strategies cannot preserve the relevant function adequately.

Table 1. Summary of metaphor translation strategies

Strategy
Main purpose
Principal risk
Image retention
Preserve the source image
Unnatural or unclear wording
Target-language substitution
Communicate the meaning idiomatically
Loss of original imagery
Cultural adaptation
Reconstruct cultural accessibility
Erasure of cultural specificity
Explanatory translation
Make the intended meaning explicit
Reduction of aesthetic effect
Compensation
Recover a lost stylistic effect
Unjustified additions or shifts
Omission
Avoid serious distortion
Loss of semantic or symbolic content

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. A translator may retain one image, adapt another, and compensate for a stylistic loss elsewhere. The central requirement is that each decision should be grounded in a careful interpretation of the source text.

6. Discussion: Toward a Three-Language Comparative Model

The analysis suggests that metaphor translation among Uzbek, English, and Turkish should be examined through a model that integrates linguistic, conceptual, cultural, and stylistic dimensions.

The first dimension concerns linguistic realization. Uzbek and Turkish share agglutinative morphology and a number of structural characteristics, but their lexical choices, idioms, and stylistic conventions cannot be assumed to correspond automatically. English may require different grammatical constructions to express a comparable metaphorical relationship.

The second dimension concerns conceptual correspondence. A metaphor may be based on a widely accessible physical experience, such as light, movement, or bodily emotion. This can facilitate translation, although the particular linguistic expressions may differ. Conversely, the same image may evoke distinct interpretations in different contexts.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

The third dimension concerns cultural interpretation. Metaphors often draw on historical narratives, religious traditions, social practices, and culturally established symbols. Such associations may influence the translator's choices even when the literal meaning is clear.

The fourth dimension concerns literary function. A metaphor may develop characterization, establish atmosphere, reinforce a theme, or connect several parts of a text through repeated imagery. Its significance cannot always be evaluated at the sentence level.

These dimensions lead to an important distinction between lexical similarity and functional equivalence. Two expressions may use comparable words but produce different effects. Conversely, expressions with different lexical structures may perform the same literary function.

The distinction also challenges the assumption that a translator must always choose between literal fidelity and free adaptation. A more useful approach is to identify which features of the source expression are essential and then select the translation strategy that preserves them most effectively.

For example, when a metaphor is central to an extended symbolic pattern, conceptual and imagistic continuity may be more important than immediate fluency. When the metaphor is conventional and its function is primarily communicative, an established target-language equivalent may be preferable.

The three-language perspective is particularly valuable because it allows researchers to investigate whether a translation choice reflects a genuine linguistic constraint, a cultural difference, a stylistic preference, or an individual translator's interpretation.

To establish such conclusions empirically, future research should compare published translations of the same literary work and document the relevant linguistic evidence. The analysis could include metaphor identification, classification of translation procedures, and independent assessment of semantic and stylistic equivalence.

A larger corpus could also reveal whether certain strategies occur more frequently in particular translation directions. Such claims should be based on systematic evidence rather than assumptions about the relative closeness of the languages.

7. Conclusion

The translation of metaphor and imagery in Uzbek, English, and Turkish literary texts presents a complex problem involving language, cognition, culture, and literary style. Figurative expressions communicate more than literal information: they organize abstract experiences, evoke sensory images, establish emotional relationships, and contribute to the aesthetic coherence of a work.

The comparative discussion demonstrates that apparently similar metaphors may differ in linguistic realization and contextual interpretation, while different expressions may communicate comparable conceptual meanings. Consequently, neither literal translation nor unrestricted adaptation can be considered universally appropriate.

The most effective translation strategy depends on the function of the metaphor within the text. Image retention may be preferable when the source image is meaningful and accessible. Idiomatic substitution may be suitable when the primary objective is to communicate a conventional meaning. Cultural adaptation, explanation, compensation, or omission may be necessary in more difficult cases, but each involves potential losses that should be carefully evaluated.

The article proposes a multidimensional framework based on semantic, conceptual, imagistic, pragmatic, stylistic, and cultural equivalence. This framework provides a foundation for more systematic comparative investigation of the three languages.

The principal contribution of the proposed approach lies in treating metaphor translation not simply as the replacement of figurative expressions but as the reconstruction of literary meaning across linguistic

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

and cultural boundaries. For Uzbek, English, and Turkish, this perspective offers opportunities to investigate both shared conceptual experiences and the distinctive ways in which individual languages and literary traditions represent them.

Further research should test the framework against a carefully selected multilingual corpus of original literary works and published translations. Such research would make it possible to identify recurring translation patterns, evaluate alternative strategies, and develop a more evidence-based account of how metaphor and imagery function across the three languages.

References

1. Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), On translation (pp. 232–239). Harvard University Press.
2. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). Metaphors we live by (With a new afterword). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1980).
3. Monti, E. (2009). Translating The Metaphors We Live By: Intercultural negotiations in conceptual metaphors. European Journal of English Studies, 13(2), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570902907243
4. Newmark, P. (1985). The translation of metaphor. In W. Paprotté & R. Dirven (Eds.), The ubiquity of metaphor: Metaphor in language and thought (pp. 295–326). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.29.14new
5. Newmark, P. (1988). A textbook of translation. Prentice Hall.
6. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating. E. J. Brill.
7. Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive translation studies and beyond. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
8. van den Broeck, R. (1981). The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. Poetics Today, 2(4), 73–87. https://doi.org/10.2307/1772487

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.