

Comparative Stylistic Analysis of the “Burnt Heart” as National Allegory in Niko Lortkipanidze’s Miniature “The Heart” and its English Translation

**„დამწვარი გულის“ როგორც ეროვნული და მორალური ალევგორიის
შედარებითი სტილისტური ანალიზი ნიკო ლორთქიფანიძის
მინიატურაში „გული“ და მის ინგლისურ თარგმანში**

ანნა ბარათელი

თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

Anna Barateli

Tbilisi State University

აბსტრაქტი

ნიკო ლორთქიფანიძის მინიატურა *გული* წარმოადგენს ღრმა ალევგორიულ ნაწარმოებს, რომელიც ასახავს 20-ე საუკუნის დასაწყისის საქართველოს ფსიქოლოგიურ, მორალურ და ეროვნულ საკითხებს. ტექსტის ცენტრში დგას „დამწვარი გული“ — მოტივი, რომელიც ერთდროულად წარმოადგენს ინდივიდუალურ და საყოველთაო მორალურ დეგრადაციას, რომელიც გამოწვეულია ავტორის თავისი სამშობლოსაგან სიშორით. ტექსტი, შექმნილი პოლიტიკური არასტაბილურობისა და ეროვნული იდენტობის კრიზისის ფონზე, მიჰყვება მარტივ ნარატიულ ხაზს, თუმცა ცხადყოფს უმნიშვნელოვანეს ეროვნულ ღირებულებებს.

კვლევა იყენებს აღწერით, ინტერპრეტაციულ და სტილისტურ მეთოდებს, რათა წარმართოს შედარებითი ანალიზი ორიგინალური ქართული ტექსტისა და ეთერ ჭურაძის ინგლისური თარგმანის შესახებ, აჩვენოს, როგორ უწყობს ხელს ლინგვისტური, სტილისტური და სტრუქტურული ხერხები ალევგორიული მნიშვნელობის შექმნას. განსაკუთრებული ყურადღება ექცევა გამეორებას, პარალელიზმს, მეტაფორას, ჰიპერბოლას, პერსონიფიკაციას, რიტორიკულ შეკითხვებს, ეპითეტებსა და სინტაქსურ კონსტრუქციებს. ეს ხერხები არა მხოლოდ აძლიერებს ნარატივის ემოციურ ზემოქმედებას, არამედ წარმოაჩენს ისტორიულ გულისტკივილს, მორალურ დაცემასა და იდეოლოგიური ბრძოლის პროცესს, ხოლო თარგმანის შედარება ორიგინალ ტექსტთან ნათლად აჩვენებს, როგორ

ინარჩუნებს, უსადაგებს ან მცირედ ცვლის თარგმანი ამ ელემენტებს, გავლენას ახდენს ტექსტის ტონზე, სიმბოლიკასა და მკითხველის აღქმაზე.

ანალიზი გვიჩვენებს, რომ ლორთქიფანიძის ერთი შეხედვით უბრალო მინიატურა მოიცავს ზოგადსაკაცობრიო გულისტკივილსა და ფასეულობებს, რაც ასახავს თუ როგორ არის გადატანილი სიმბოლური, მორალური და კულტურული მნიშვნელობები ენებს შორის.

Key words: *The Heart*, miniature, moral allegory, national allegory, literary symbolism.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: გული, მინიატურა, მორალური და ეროვნული ალევორია, ლიტერატურული სიმბოლიზმი

1. Introduction

Niko Lortkipanidze's miniature *The Heart* (1908) emerges as a profound symbolic narrative that reflects psychological, moral, and national issues of early twentieth-century Georgia through a depiction of a physical condition. Written during a period marked by political instability and identity crisis, the text transcends its literal storyline to construct a powerful allegorical framework centered on the motif of the "burnt heart." Through carefully selected linguistic strategies, Lortkipanidze reflects not only individual problems but also collective moral disintegration. Therefore, the heart does not function only as a simple narrative element, the text constructs it as a national and moral allegory, in which linguistic form mirrors historical trauma and ideological rupture. The symbolic loss reflects the broader crisis of Georgian identity.

The methodology of this study combines descriptive, interpretative, and comparative approaches within the framework of stylistic analysis. The research begins with the identification and examination of key linguistic features in the original Georgian text, including lexical choices, figures of speech, syntactic structures, and symbolic semantic fields. Each feature is analyzed in terms of its structural function, emotional resonance, and ideological significance. Next, the corresponding English translation by Eter Churadze (2022) is analyzed to determine how these features are preserved, adapted, or modified. This approach allows for a detailed understanding of how linguistic, stylistic, and cultural elements function in both texts. Thus, this article aims to:

1. Identify and analyze key stylistic devices in the original Georgian text that construct the motif of the "burnt heart";
2. Examine how these devices contribute to the formation of national and moral allegory;
3. Analyze the English translation to evaluate the preservation, adaptation, or loss of these stylistic and symbolic elements;
4. Compare the two versions to highlight shifts in meaning, tone, and emotional impact, assessing the effect of translation on readers' perception of the narrative's moral and national dimensions.

5. Examine the reasons behind stylistic and semantic shifts between the Georgian original and the English translation, identifying how linguistic and cultural differences influence the translator's choices.

The novelty of the present study lies in its combined stylistic and translational examination of *The Heart* as a national and moral allegory. While previous studies have primarily focused on the thematic and literary significance of Lortkipanidze's work, the current research demonstrates how specific linguistic and stylistic devices contribute to the construction of allegorical meaning and how these effects are preserved or modified in translation. By integrating stylistic analysis with descriptive translation studies, the article offers a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between language, symbolism, and cultural meaning in both the original text and its English translation.

2. Theoretical framework

This study is grounded in two interrelated theoretical domains: stylistics and allegory theory. Together, these frameworks provide the analytical tools necessary to examine how linguistic structures generate symbolic meaning and how literary form encodes ideological and cultural anxieties.

Stylistics, positioned at the intersection of linguistics and literary criticism, investigates the aesthetic, structural, and functional aspects of language in literary texts. It applies linguistic methods to analyze how lexical choice, syntactic patterns, and rhetorical devices contribute to meaning construction, emotional impact, and authorial intention (Fowler, 1986; Verdonk, 2002). Style can be understood as the author's linguistic fingerprint, reflecting both personal expression and deeper ideological positioning.

Allegory, as a literary and linguistic device, operates through a systematic correspondence between literal and figurative levels of meaning, where concrete elements consistently represent abstract concepts such as moral values, psychological states, and national identity. Unlike simple metaphor, allegory unfolds across the entire structure of a text, creating a coherent symbolic system that requires interpretative engagement from the reader. As Quilligan (1979) argues, allegory disrupts ordinary grammatical and referential stability, producing layered meanings that invite interpretation beyond the surface level.

The theoretical framework for analyzing the translation of *The Heart* draws on descriptive translation studies (DTS). According to Gideon Toury (1995), translation is a target-oriented activity, and attention must be paid to how cultural and linguistic shifts shape textual choices. DTS encourages a comparative examination of source and target texts to identify patterns and regularities in translation behavior, particularly regarding the treatment of stylistic devices. In the present study, analysis focuses on key features of the Georgian original that are central to its symbolic, moral, and emotional impact, such as metaphor, hyperbole, personification, rhetorical questions, epithets, and sentence structure. Special attention is given to how these devices are preserved, transformed, or omitted in the English translation by Eter Churadze, as such variations reveal interpretive strategies and highlight the challenges of conveying both linguistic and cultural subtleties across languages.

The present study also draws on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), which argues that metaphor is not merely a stylistic ornament but a fundamental mechanism of human thought. According to this approach, abstract concepts are frequently understood through more concrete domains. This perspective is particularly useful for examining how the motif of the heart functions as a conceptual representation of emotional, moral, and national values in Lortkipanidze's miniature.

By examining how linguistic tools and grammatical structures interact with symbolic meaning, this study shows that the text conveys historical and cultural concerns, transforming a seemingly simple narrative element into a potent allegorical tool that mirrors the moral and spiritual condition of Georgian society.

Overall, the combined use of repetition and parallelism in both the original and its translation intensifies the tragic atmosphere, effectively portraying human failure, emotional detachment, and existential emptiness in a deeply affecting manner.

3. Comparative Stylistic Analysis of *The Heart*

3.1 Metaphor and symbolism

A central stylistic feature of Niko Lortkipanidze's miniature *The Heart* is the extensive use of metaphor and symbolism to represent the profound moral and emotional emptiness resulting from separation from one's homeland. Throughout the text, physical and everyday elements are transformed into symbolic expressions of human integrity, emotional depth, and national belonging.

The most striking example appears in the description of the heart: „გულის მაგიერ ფერფლიღა დარჩენილიყო (para.10) (*Gulis magivrad perpligha darcheniliko* - literal translation: “instead of heart only ashes had remained”)”, translated as “There were only ashes in place of the heart” (para. 9). In both versions, the heart transcends its biological function and operates as the locus of emotional depth, moral virtue, and innate compassion, all of which have been eroded by distance from the homeland. This interpretation is supported by both literary tradition and the internal logic of the text. Across numerous cultural traditions, the heart conventionally symbolizes compassion, morality, emotional sensitivity, and humanity. In *The Heart*, these associations are reinforced by the narrative itself, as the absence of the heart is directly connected to the character's moral deterioration, emotional emptiness, and estrangement from his homeland. Therefore, the heart functions not simply as an anatomical organ but as a symbolic repository of ethical and emotional values. Its absence signifies not merely death, but a symbolic void created by exile and disconnection. However, a significant nuance emerges in the Georgian original. The suffix -ღა (-gha) in „ფერფლიღა დარჩენილიყო (para. 10) (*Perpligha darcheniliko* - literal translation: “instead of heart nothing but ashes had remained / only ashes were left”) (para. 9)” functions as an intensifying and limiting marker, emphasizing that nothing but ashes remained—the heart has been completely and exclusively consumed. This grammatical subtlety is not directly reproduced in the English translation. While the phrase “There were only ashes in place of the heart” preserves the visual metaphor, it does not fully capture the restrictive and absolute force

conveyed by -ღა (-gha - *literal translation: only/ nothing but*). Consequently, the translation slightly softens the intensity and finality of the original, illustrating the difficulty of transferring fine-grained grammatical and stylistic nuances from Georgian into English, even when the overall symbolic meaning remains intact.

The stylistic force of „ღა” extends beyond the meaning of the English adverb only. In Georgian, the suffix often carries emotional, restrictive, and emphatic functions simultaneously, conveying finality and inevitability. While “only” communicates restriction semantically, „ღა” additionally intensifies the speaker’s emotional stance, emphasizing that no possibility remains beyond what is stated. Consequently, the Georgian construction produces a stronger artistic and emotional effect than its English equivalent.

Metaphor is further developed through the depiction of physical illness: “*He was suffering from several diseases. No single treatment could cure him*” (para. 4). Although this statement refers to literal medical conditions, it simultaneously functions as a metaphor for deeper, incurable moral and emotional deficiencies resulting from separation from one’s native land. The character’s physical ailments mirror his internal emptiness, suggesting that his life has been shaped by political, social, and personal forces that have distanced him from Georgia. A closer comparison reveals a subtle shift in intensity: the Georgian phrase „ათასი სნეულებით იყო ავად, არავითარმა წამალმა არ იმოქმედა” (para. 4) (*atasi sneulebit iko avad, aravitarma tsamalma ar imokmeda* - *literal translation: “with a thousand illnesses he was ill, no medicine had any effect”*) (para. 4) conveys a sense of overwhelming, almost innumerable illness, whereas the English “*several diseases*” reduces this extremity to a more moderate degree of multiplicity. Despite this attenuation, the translation successfully preserves the metaphorical function of illness as an externalization of inner moral deterioration.

Beyond the heart itself, other objects acquire metaphorical significance. The map on the wall declares, “*I withered it*” (para. 11), and the picture on the table states, “*I burned it*” (para. 12), both symbolizing the severed connection to the homeland. These expressions also instantiate the conceptual metaphor HEART IS AN OBJECT, as the destruction of the heart is metaphorically enacted through the verbs “*wither*” and “*burn*.” Even the abandoned bedroom functions symbolically, reflecting the inner state of the deceased: its emptiness mirrors the absence of warmth, love, and moral substance in his life. In this respect, the English translation preserves the moral and emotional loss expressed in the Georgian original „მე დავაჭკნე!” (para. 14) (*me davachkne!* - *literal translation: “I withered it”*) (para. 14); „მე დავწვნი!” (para. 15) (*me davtsvi!* - *literal translation: “I burned it”*) (para. 15), maintaining the symbolic coherence of the text.

The metaphorical dimension is further intensified through the mother’s lament. In the Georgian original, „სადაა შენი კარგი გული, ამდენის ვაით და ვუთ რომ ჩავიდგი საგულებში?” (*sadaa sheni kargi guli, amdenis vaiit da vuit rom chagidgi saguleshi?*) (para. 11) - *literal translation: “where is your good heart that with so much ‘vai’ and ‘vui’ I put into your chest?”*) (para. 12), the interjections „ვაით” (para.11) (*vaiit*) and „ვეით” (para. 11) (*vuit*) function as purely exclamatory markers of distress, heightening the emotional force of the

utterance without contributing descriptive meaning. In contrast, the English translation—*“Where is your nice heart that I put in your chest with torture and torment at birth?”* (para. 10)—renders this emotional intensity through lexical means, replacing interjections with explicit expressions of suffering. While both versions preserve the semantic content and emotional weight of the lament, the Georgian original achieves a more immediate and affectively charged expression through its exclamatory forms. The translation, although faithful in meaning, only partially reproduces this immediacy, demonstrating once again the challenges of conveying stylistic and emotional nuances across languages.

At the same time, it is necessary to distinguish between metaphor and symbol in these examples. Expressions such as *“burned”* or *“withered”* function metaphorically because they transfer characteristics of physical destruction to abstract emotional and moral conditions. The heart itself, however, functions symbolically because it consistently represents broader concepts such as humanity, morality, national belonging, and spiritual integrity throughout the text. Thus, metaphor operates at the level of linguistic expression, whereas the heart develops into a central symbol that contributes to the text’s allegorical structure.

The interplay of metaphor and symbolism in both the original and its translation construct a powerful allegorical framework in which the *“burnt heart”* represents not only individual moral collapse but also a broader national and existential disconnection.

3.3 Hyperbole

Hyperbole serves as an important stylistic device in intensifying the emotional and moral weight of the narrative in Niko Lortkipanidze’s miniature *The Heart*. It amplifies both physical and psychological states, transforming them into expressions of deeper moral and emotional crisis.

A clear example of hyperbole first appears in the Georgian original: *„ათასი სნეულებით იყო ავად, არავითარმა წამალმა არ იმოქმედა”* (para. 4) (*atasi sneulebit iko avad, aravitarma tsamalma ar imokmeda* - literal translation: *“with a thousand illnesses he was ill, no medicine had any effect”*) (para. 4). This expression is clearly exaggerated because the character is not physically ill at all. The *“illness”* here refers to his spiritual, emotional, and moral condition rather than to an actual disease. His incurable sickness symbolizes his alienation from home, his distance from his roots, and his loss of genuine values. The phrase *„ათასი სნეულებით”* (para. 4) (*“a thousand illnesses”*) intensifies this idea through hyperbole, suggesting an immeasurable level of inner emptiness and moral corruption, while *“no medicine had any effect”* emphasizes that this condition cannot be healed by ordinary means, since its source is not physical but deeply psychological and existential.

The English translation renders this as: *“He was suffering from several diseases. No single treatment could cure him”* (para. 4). This formulation also exaggerates the character’s vulnerability, presenting his condition as overwhelming and incurable. Although it refers to physical illness on the surface, it functions hyperbolically to highlight the depth of his moral and emotional deficiencies. Compared to the Georgian original, however, the phrase *“several*

diseases” somewhat weakens the intensity of “*a thousand illnesses*,” reducing the sense of immeasurable suffering. At the same time, the addition of “*He was suffering*” introduces stronger emotional colouring, making the character’s state appear more affectively charged. This shift shows that the translation does more than reproduce literal meaning: it preserves the metaphor of illness while emphasizing psychological suffering and reinforcing the idea that the character’s true sickness is his spiritual estrangement rather than any physical condition.

3.4 Personification

Personification in *The Heart* intensifies the narrative by attributing human agency to inanimate objects, thereby transforming the surrounding environment into an active witness of moral and emotional decay.

The map and the picture, for instance, are presented as speaking entities: “*The map hanging on the wall answered, ‘I withered it’*” (para. 11) and “*I burned it, ‘the picture on the table said’*” (para. 12). In the Georgian original, „კედლიდან პატარა რუკამ გასცა პასუხი: მე დავაცხენე!” (*Kedlidan patara rukam gatsa pasukhi: me davachkne!*) (para. 14) - literal translation: “*from the wall the small map gave an answer: I withered it*”- (para. 14) and “*მე დავწვი!*” (*me davtsvi!* – I burned it) – „გახმაურდა სურათი მაგიდაზე” (*Gakhmaurda surati magidaze*- literal translation: “*the picture on the table made a sound*”) (para. 15), these objects similarly convey agency through completed actions, reinforcing their role as active participants in the narrative. The English translation preserves this personification effectively, maintaining both the grammatical structure and the symbolic function of the objects as animate voices within the text.

By claiming responsibility for the destruction of the heart, these objects come to symbolize external forces—such as society, distance, or memory—that have shaped the deceased’s character and contributed to his inner emptiness. In this way, personification elevates passive elements into active moral commentators, suggesting that the character’s losses and moral deficiencies are not only internal but also reflected in, and acknowledged by, the world around him. This attribution of agency to objects ultimately underscores the idea that forces beyond the individual’s control can leave enduring and irreversible marks on the human soul.

3.5 Rhetorical question

Rhetorical questions in Niko Lortkipanidze’s miniature *The Heart* function as powerful devices for expressing moral inquiry, emotional intensity, and existential disorientation. Rather than eliciting actual responses, these questions foreground absence, loss, and the collapse of expected human values.

The question “*Gentlemen, where has the heart gone?*” (para. 8)—rendered in Georgian as „ბატონებო, გული, გული, სადღაა?” (para. 9) (*batonebo, guli, guli, sadghaa?* – literal translation: *gentlemen, heart, heart, where is it?*) (para. 9)—conveys astonishment and moral concern rather than seeking a literal answer. Similarly, the mother’s anguished query, “*Where is your nice heart that I put in your chest with torture and torment at birth?*” (para. 10),

corresponding to the Georgian „სადაა შენი კარგი გული, ამდენის ვაით და ვუით რომ ჩავიდგი საგულებში?” (para.12) (*sadaa sheni kargi guli, amdenis vait da vuit rom chagidgi saguleshi?* – literal translation: “have you left me like this, miserable widow?”), dramatizes profound grief and a sense of betrayal. In both cases, the rhetorical questions highlight a stark contrast between expectation and reality: care, compassion, and moral integrity are anticipated, yet absence, neglect, and emotional emptiness prevail.

A particularly revealing shift occurs in the rendering of the Georgian line „ასე გამომიმეტე ქვრივი ოხერი?” (para.12) (*ase gamomimete kvrivi okheri?* – literal translation: “have you left me like this, miserable widow?”), which directly addresses the deceased in an accusatory rhetorical question. In the English translation, this is told from the 3rd person perspective: “She sobbed, ‘You had no pity on your widowed mother.’” (para. 10). This transformation from interrogative to declarative form retains the emotional content and accusatory meaning but diminishes the confrontational force of the original. The Georgian question implicates and directly challenges, engaging the reader in the immediacy of the mother’s moral and emotional appeal, whereas the English version presents the same sentiment within a more mediated narrative framework.

By leaving these questions unanswered, the narrative intensifies its tragic tone and underscores the futility of seeking understanding or consolation in a world marked by emotional detachment and moral failure. In this way, rhetorical questions draw the reader into the text’s moral and emotional tension, reinforcing its central themes of grief, loss, and the silent endurance of human suffering.

3.6 Epithet

Epithets in Niko Lortkipanidze’s miniature *The Heart* play a significant role in conveying character traits and emotional states, contributing to the overall expressive and affective depth of the narrative. Through carefully selected descriptive modifiers, both the Georgian original and its English translation construct nuanced portrayals of care, tenderness, and emotional suffering.

For example, the phrase “His sister’s tender hand” (para. 2) corresponds to the Georgian „დის ნაზ ხელს” (para. 12) (*dis naz khels* – literal translation: (to) sister’s tender hand), where the adjective *ნაზი* (*nazi*) emphasizes delicacy and care; this nuance is effectively preserved in the English rendering “tender.” Similarly, the expression “a calm and gentle person” (para. 2) reflects the Georgian „მშვიდ, წყნარ ადამიანისაგან” (para. 2) (*mshvid, tsknar adamianisagan* – from serene, gentle (calm) person), successfully maintaining both the sense of serenity (*მშვიდი*) and gentleness (*წყნარი*) present in the original. In the depiction of emotional expression, “bitter tears” (para. 2) translates „ცხარე ცრემლები” (*tskhare tsremlebi* – literal translation: “spicy tears”) (para. 2), preserving the intensity and painful quality associated with grief.

A more complex case appears in the Georgian phrase „თავზარდაცემული დედა” (*tavzardatsemuli deda* – literal translation: (“shock-struck mother”) (para. 11), which

encapsulates maternal shock and horror within a single lexical unit. The English translation—*“The mother, appalled at the tragic news”* (para. 10)—renders this meaning through an expanded descriptive structure rather than a single adjective. While this adaptation successfully conveys the emotional content and maintains the overall impact, it also illustrates a structural shift necessitated by the absence of a direct lexical equivalent in English. This example demonstrates how translation often requires syntactic expansion in order to preserve the semantic and emotional force of epithets across languages.

3.7. Syntactical constructions

The Georgian text of „გული” (*guli* – literal translation: *“heart”*) alternates between extremely short, stark sentences and long, cumulative structures, producing a rhythm that underscores isolation, emotional intensity, and moral desolation. For instance, the opening lines, *“მოკვდა.”* (*mokvda* – *died*) (para. 1) *„მოკვდა უცხოეთში.”* (para. 3) (*mokvda utskhoetsi* – literal translation: *“died abroad”*) (para. 3) are rendered in English as *“He died”* (para. 1) and *“He died in another country”* (para. 3). The translation preserves the brevity and finality of these sentences, effectively maintaining the sense of abruptness and the stark reality of death, though the English structure slightly smooths the abruptness inherent in the single-word Georgian sentences.

The long, cumulative sentence describing the chain of absences in the character’s life—*„ღის ნამ ხელს არ გაუსწორებია სასთუმალი; იდუმალის მწუხარებით არ შემოუხედავს ავადმყოფის ოთახში სატრფოს თვალებს; ნაცნობებს არ მოუკითხავთ; უკანასკნელ წამს შენდობა არ მიუღია იმ მშვიდ, წყნარ ადამიანისაგან, რომლის ძალა აღარ სწამდა, მაგრამ დამამშვიდებელი სიტყვების მისგან გავგონება მაინც უნდოდა; დედას არ დაუყრია ცხარე ცრემლები”* (para. 2) (*dis naz khels ar gaustsorebia sastumali; idumalis mtsukharebit ar shemouxedavs avadmkopis otaxshi da satrpos tvalebs; natsnobebs ar moukitxavt; ukanasknel wams shendoba ar miughia im mshvid, wynar, adamianisagan, romlis dzala aghar swamda, magram damamshvidebeli sityvebis misgan gagoneba maints undoda; dedas ar dauyria tskhare tsremlebi* – literal translation: *“His sister’s gentle hand had not smoothed the pillow; with hidden sorrow the beloved’s eyes had not looked into the sick man’s room; acquaintances had not come to inquire after him; at the last moment he had not received forgiveness from that calm, peaceful person in whose strength he no longer believed, but from whom he still wanted to hear comforting words; his mother had not shed bitter tears.”*) (para. 2) appears in English as *“His sister’s tender hand did not smooth the pillow on his bed; his sweetheart did not look into her lover’s room with mystic sorrow; his acquaintances did not inquire about his health; a calm and gentle person did not grant him forgiveness on his deathbed; his mother did not shed bitter tears”* (para. 2). The translation preserves the repeated pattern of negation and the sequence of emotional losses, but it adjusts the syntax for smoother English expression through semicolons and more balanced phrasing. In the Georgian original, the compressed structure and constant repetition of *“არ”* (para. 2) (*“not/did not”*) create a harsher and more overwhelming sense of abandonment, making each absence feel sharper and

more immediate. One reason for this stronger effect lies in the structural differences between Georgian and English. In Georgian, the negative particle „არ“ appears before each verb as a short, highly noticeable unit that creates a repetitive rhythmic pattern. Because of its brevity and frequency, the repeated negation produces a sharper sense of absence and rejection. In contrast, the English construction is grammatically heavier and syntactically more integrated into the sentence, resulting in a smoother flow that slightly reduces the abrupt emotional impact achieved in the Georgian original. In English, the sentence becomes more fluid and grammatically organized, which slightly reduces the intensity of this abrupt accumulation. However, the central effect remains unchanged: the character is presented as completely isolated, deprived of care, forgiveness, and emotional connection at the moment of death.

The alternation between short, stark sentences and long, cumulative structures give the text a deliberate rhythm, enhancing both the tragic tone and the thematic depth of the narrative.

4. Conclusion

Niko Lortkipanidze's *The Heart* exemplifies how a seemingly simple miniature can convey profound moral, emotional, and national concerns through allegorical narrative. The study demonstrates that the motif of the “burnt heart” functions not merely as a narrative element but as a complex symbol of individual and collective moral decline, historical grief, and the psychological consequences of separation from one's homeland. Through careful deployment of linguistic, stylistic, and structural devices—including repetition, parallelism, metaphor, hyperbole, personification, rhetorical questions, epithets, and syntactic constructions—the text creates layered meanings that resonate emotionally and morally with the reader. The absent heart operates simultaneously as a physical lack and a symbolic void, generating a double structure of meaning.

The comparative analysis of Eter Churadze's English translation reveals both the fidelity and subtle adaptation of these devices. While the translation preserves key symbolic and emotional features, slight lexical and syntactic adjustments reflect the translator's effort to render the text natural in English, occasionally softening or reshaping nuances of intensity present in the original Georgian. These variations illuminate the challenges inherent in transferring moral, cultural, and symbolic meaning across languages.

Ultimately, the interaction between the original text and its translation highlights the enduring universality of human grief, ethical reflection, and national identity, showing how literary and linguistic choices shape the transmission of meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Lortkipanidze's miniature demonstrates that even a brief narrative can serve as a powerful vehicle for allegory, reflecting historical, moral, and emotional realities in ways that transcend both time and language.

References:

1. Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic criticism*. Oxford University Press.
2. Lortkipanidze, N.. *The Heart* (1908) (E. Churadze, Trans.(2022)). *Caucasus Journal of Milton Studies*, 1(3), 16. <https://www.cjojms.com/index.php/research/article/view/37/34>

3. Rusieshvili, M., Dolidze, R., & Totibadze, S. (2022). *Stylistics: Seminar Reader*. Tbilisi State University Press.
4. Tambling, J. (2009). *Allegory*. Routledge.
5. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond*. John Benjamins.

ავტორის შესახებ:

ანა ბარათელი ფლობს ბაკალავრის ხარისხს ინგლისურ ფილოლოგიაში და ამჟამად სწავლობს ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის სამაგისტრო პროგრამაზე - ინგლისური ენის თეორია. ანა მუშაობს British Council Georgia-ში ინგლისური ენის მასწავლებლად. ფლობს CELTA-ისა და Cambridge C1 Advanced (CAE)-ის საერთაშორისო კვალიფიკაციებს. გამოქვეყნებული აქვს რამდენიმე სამეცნიერო სტატია და მონაწილეობა აქვს მიღებული სამეცნიერო კონფერენციებში. მისი კვლევითი ინტერესებია ლინგვისტიკა, ინგლისური ენის სწავლების მეთოდოლოგია და ენის ათვისების პროცესები.

About the author:

Anna Barateli holds a Bachelor's degree in English Philology and is currently pursuing a Master's degree in the Theory of Language. She works as an English teacher at British Council Georgia and holds both the CELTA and Cambridge C1 Advanced (CAE) qualifications. Anna has published several research articles and has presented her work at national and international academic conferences. Her interests include linguistics, English language teaching, and language acquisition.

E-mail: anna.barateli207@hum.tsu.edu.ge

სამადლობელი:

მადლობას ვუხდით ქ. მანანა რუსიშვილს ამ შემაძღვებლობისთვის. განსაკუთრებულ მადლობას ვუხდით ჩემს ხელმძღვანელს, ქალბატონ ნატო ფერაძეს, პროფესიული მხარდაჭერის, ფასდაუდებელი რჩევებისა და დაუღალავი შრომისთვის. გულითადად ვაფასებ შესაძლებლობას, მესწავლა და მემუშავა ისეთი მაღალი დონის პროფესიონალის ხელმძღვანელობით, როგორიც ქალბატონი ნატოა. მისი გამოცდილება, თავდადება და მუდმივი მხარდაჭერა ჩემთვის უდიდესი მოტივაციისა და პროფესიული განვითარების მნიშვნელოვანი საფუძველი გახდა.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Ms. Manana Ruseishvili for providing me with this valuable opportunity. I am especially grateful to my supervisor, Ms. Nato Peradze, for her professional guidance, invaluable advice, and unwavering support throughout this work. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to study and work under the mentorship of such an

outstanding professional. Her expertise, dedication, and continuous encouragement have been a great source of inspiration and have played a significant role in my academic and professional development.