



**ADABIY MATNLARNI MASHINA TARJIMASIDA USLUBIY
MUAMMOLAR**
**STYLISTIC CHALLENGES IN MACHINE TRANSLATION OF LITERARY
TEXTS**
**СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ МАШИННОГО ПЕРЕВОДА
ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫХ ТЕКСТОВ**

Usmonova Dona Satvoldiyevna-Fergana State University, Senior teacher, PhD
dona.s.usmanova@gmail.com +998906300018

ORCID ID 0000-0002-6806-8947

Rajabova Niginaxon Rahmatullayevna-Fergana State University, Bachelor's degree
student niginarajabova764@gmail.com +998904091175

ORCID ID 0009-0003-1410-7597

Annotatsiya

Sun'iy intellektning jadal rivojlanishi mashina tarjimasi sifatini sezilarli darajada yaxshiladi va uni kundalik hamda professional faoliyatda keng qo'llaniladigan vositaga aylantirdi. Biroq, badiiy matnlarni tarjima qilishda uning samaradorligi hali ham cheklangan. Ushbu maqolada mashina tarjimasining uslubiy muammolari, xususan, metafora, ohang, muallif uslubi va madaniy nozikliklarni saqlash masalalari tahlil qilinadi. Mashina va inson tomonidan bajarilgan tarjimalarning sifat jihatidan solishtirilishi shuni ko'rsatadiki, sun'iy intellekt asosiy ma'noni yetkaza olsa-da, chuqur uslubiy va emotsional qatlamlarni to'liq ifodalay olmaydi. Maqolada badiiy tarjima talqin qilish va ijodkorlikni talab qilishi, bu esa hozirgi sun'iy intellekt imkoniyatlaridan tashqarida ekanligi ta'kidlanadi.

Аннотация

Стремительное развитие искусственного интеллекта значительно повысило качество машинного перевода, сделав его широко используемым инструментом как в повседневной, так и в профессиональной сфере. Однако его эффективность при переводе художественных текстов остаётся ограниченной. В данной статье рассматриваются стилистические проблемы машинного перевода, с акцентом на сохранении метафоры, тона, авторского стиля и культурных нюансов. На основе качественного сравнения переводов, выполненных машиной и человеком,





показано, что, несмотря на способность ИИ передавать базовый смысл, он часто не способен воспроизвести более глубокие стилистические и эмоциональные слои. В работе утверждается, что художественный перевод требует интерпретативных и творческих способностей, которые остаются вне возможностей современных систем искусственного интеллекта.

Abstract

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has significantly improved the quality of machine translation, making it a widely used tool in both everyday and professional contexts. However, its effectiveness in translating literary texts remains limited. This article explores the stylistic challenges of machine translation, focusing on the preservation of metaphor, tone, authorial voice, and cultural nuance. Through qualitative comparison of machine-generated and human translations, the study demonstrates that while AI systems can reproduce basic meaning, they often fail to convey deeper stylistic and emotional layers. The paper argues that literary translation requires interpretative and creative abilities that remain beyond the current capabilities of artificial intelligence.

Kalit so‘zlar: mashina tarjimasi, sun’iy intellekt, badiiy tarjima, uslubiy tahlil, metafora, muallif uslubi, emotsional nozikliklar, madaniy kontekst, neyron tarmoqlar, tarjimashunoslik

Ключевые слова: машинный перевод, искусственный интеллект, художественный перевод, стилистический анализ, метафора, авторский стиль, эмоциональные нюансы, культурный контекст, нейронные сети, переводоведение

Key words: machine translation, artificial intelligence, literary translation, stylistic analysis, metaphor, authorial voice, emotional nuance, cultural context, neural networks, translation studies

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, machine translation has undergone a significant transformation due to advances in neural networks and artificial intelligence. Tools such as Google Translate and DeepL Translator are no longer limited to simple word-for-word translation; instead, they generate relatively fluent and grammatically correct texts.





As a result, machine translation has become an essential part of global communication [1].

However, despite these improvements, its application in literary translation raises important questions. Literary texts are fundamentally different from technical or informational texts. They are not only about conveying meaning but also about expressing emotions, constructing imagery, and reflecting the author's individual style. In this sense, translation becomes an interpretative act rather than a mechanical process [2].

This article examines the stylistic challenges that arise when machine translation is applied to literary texts. In particular, it focuses on how meaning is often preserved on the surface but weakened at a deeper stylistic level. It seeks to answer a central question: to what extent can artificial intelligence reproduce the expressive and aesthetic dimensions of language?

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative approach, focusing on the comparative analysis of translations. Several excerpts from English literary works were selected, particularly those rich in stylistic devices such as metaphor, symbolism, and emotionally charged language.

These excerpts were translated using neural machine translation systems, primarily Google Translate. The outputs were then compared with human translations, taking into account both published versions and independently produced translations.

The analysis was guided by the following criteria:

- preservation of figurative language
- accuracy of tone and emotional expression
- maintenance of narrative voice and stylistic identity
- cultural and contextual appropriateness

Rather than focusing on numerical evaluation, this study emphasizes qualitative differences that reveal how meaning is transformed or lost in the translation process.

RESULTS

The analysis revealed that machine translation often produces grammatically correct but stylistically weakened texts.





One of the most noticeable issues is the handling of metaphor. Figurative expressions are frequently translated literally, which leads to a loss of imagery and depth. For example, metaphorical phrases that evoke emotion or atmosphere in the original text often become neutral and descriptive in machine output. This shift significantly reduces the aesthetic impact of the text [3]. For instance, a phrase like “a broken heart” may be translated literally, but the emotional weight and implied meaning can be weakened or flattened.

Another major problem is the loss of authorial voice. Literary style is closely tied to individual expression, including rhythm, lexical choice, and sentence structure. Machine translation tends to standardize these features, producing texts that sound uniform and lack distinctiveness. As a result, different authors may appear stylistically similar after translation.

Emotional nuance is also difficult for AI systems to preserve. While the general meaning of a sentence is often retained, subtle tones such as irony, ambiguity, or tension are frequently misinterpreted or completely lost. This creates a gap between the original emotional effect and the translated version. This confirms that accuracy alone is not enough when dealing with literary texts.

Finally, cultural references present a serious challenge. Machine translation systems often fail to recognize context-dependent meanings or culturally specific elements, leading to oversimplification or misunderstanding. This is particularly problematic in literary texts, where cultural context plays a crucial role in shaping meaning.

DISCUSSION

The results highlight a fundamental limitation of machine translation: its inability to fully engage with language as a creative and interpretative system.

Artificial intelligence operates on patterns derived from large datasets, which allows it to predict probable word combinations. However, literary language often resists such predictability. In my view, this becomes especially noticeable when translating emotionally rich or metaphorical passages, where meaning depends not only on words but on interpretation. It relies on ambiguity, deviation from norms, and stylistic experimentation — elements that are difficult to model computationally [4].





Human translators, in contrast, actively interpret the text and make conscious decisions based on context and intention. They make conscious choices to preserve not only meaning but also tone, rhythm, and emotional resonance. In many cases, this requires creative transformation rather than direct equivalence. Translation becomes an act of rewriting, where the goal is to recreate the effect of the original text rather than its exact form.

At the same time, it would be inaccurate to dismiss machine translation entirely. Its speed and accessibility make it a valuable tool, especially at the initial stages of translation. In practice, it can serve as a draft generator, allowing human translators to focus on stylistic refinement.

Thus, the future of translation may lie in collaboration rather than replacement. Artificial intelligence can assist in processing large amounts of text, while human translators remain responsible for preserving the artistic and emotional integrity of literary works.

CONCLUSION

Machine translation has achieved remarkable progress and continues to evolve. However, its limitations become evident when applied to literary texts, where meaning is inseparable from style.

This study demonstrates that metaphor, emotional nuance, authorial voice, and cultural context are particularly vulnerable in machine-generated translations. While AI can reproduce surface-level meaning, it struggles to convey deeper layers of expression.

Therefore, literary translation remains a fundamentally human activity. Artificial intelligence can support the process, but it cannot replace the interpretative and creative role of the translator.

REFERENCES

1. Philipp Koehn. *Neural Machine Translation*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
2. Lawrence Venuti. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge, 2017.
3. Mona Baker. In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge, 2018.
4. Yves Scherrer. "Machine Translation and Literary Texts: Challenges and Perspectives." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 2021.

