BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 Isdoi:omiddinova Imrona
BG PULSE JOURNAL

LEXICAL EQUIVALENCE AND SUBJECTIVITY IN WORD CHOICE IN TRANSLATING DIALOGUE AND INTERIOR MONOLOGUE

Moxigul Altundag'
Lecturer at the Higher School of Turkish Studies,
Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines lexical equivalence and subjectivity in word choice in Turkish translations of dialogue and interior monologue in Said Ahmad's short stories. A comparative analysis of the Uzbek originals and their Turkish translations focuses on colloquial vocabulary, forms of address, phraseological units, and emotionally charged words. In dialogue, the analysis considers how lexical choices convey relationships between characters, the tone of their exchanges, and their distinctive speech patterns. In interior monologue, it explores how word choice shapes the portrayal of characters' emotions and trains of thought. The translator's individual interpretation is examined in passages where several Turkish renderings are possible. The selected renderings are evaluated according to how closely they preserve contextual meaning, stylistic nuances, and the distinctive features of each character's voice.

Keywords: Said Ahmad, literary translation, Turkish, dialogue, interior monologue, lexical equivalence, word choice, translator interpretation.

Introduction: Word choice in literary translation influences how readers understand a character's voice, emotions, and relationships. In dialogue, a form of address or a colloquial expression can signal intimacy, deference, or tension between speakers. In interior monologue, lexical repetition, hesitation, and emotionally charged vocabulary can reveal a character's uncertainty or trace a shift in feeling. A translation may convey the basic meaning of an expression while altering its tone or the impression it creates of the character. Evaluating lexical equivalence therefore requires attention to what an expression does in the passage as well as what it means.

The Turkish translations of Said Ahmad's short stories provide a basis for examining these issues in Uzbek–Turkish literary translation. The linguistic affinity between Uzbek and Turkish can make a formally similar word seem like an obvious choice. Its register, connotations, or typical contexts of use, however, may differ across the two languages. A Turkish equivalent that works in a conversation between characters may sound too formal in a passage that represents a character's private thoughts. Conversely, a colloquial rendering may read naturally in Turkish while making an exchange sound more familiar or more confrontational than it does in the Uzbek original.

This study treats subjectivity in word choice as the translator's interpretive judgment when several Turkish renderings are plausible. For instance, a translator may retain a culturally marked form of address, choose an idiomatic Turkish equivalent, or use a more neutral expression. Each choice can foreground a different aspect of the original, such as social distance, emotional tone, or cultural specificity. The analysis examines the wording of the translations and the effects of those choices in context.

The article aims to determine how lexical choices in Turkish translations of Said Ahmad's short stories convey the distinct functions of dialogue and interior monologue. Selected passages from the Uzbek originals and their Turkish translations are compared with particular attention to colloquial vocabulary, forms of address, phraseological units, and emotionally marked words. The analysis considers contextual meaning, register, and character voice. It asks how Turkish

renderings convey interpersonal relationships in dialogue, how they represent emotion and the movement of thought in interior monologue, and what is gained or lost when a translator selects one plausible lexical equivalent over another.

Materials and Methods: The study employs a qualitative, source–target comparative design. The corpus comprises selected Uzbek short stories by Said Ahmad and their corresponding published Turkish translations. Passages are selected purposively according to two criteria. First, the Uzbek passage contains either dialogue, understood as an exchange between characters, or interior monologue, understood as the textual representation of a character's unspoken thoughts. Second, it contains at least one lexical item whose interpretation depends on the narrative context, the relationship between speakers, or the character's emotional state. The Uzbek text serves as the sampling frame so that expressions omitted or substantially reformulated in Turkish remain eligible for analysis.

The unit of analysis is a contextualized lexical item, which may consist of a single word or a multiword expression. The analysis focuses on colloquial vocabulary, forms of address, idiomatic expressions, and emotionally marked lexis. Each item is examined within the surrounding passage to establish who speaks or thinks, whom the utterance addresses where applicable, and what the expression contributes to the scene.

The Uzbek passages are aligned with the corresponding segments of the Turkish translations and classified according to discourse type in the source text. The source expression and its Turkish rendering are then compared across four dimensions: contextual meaning, register, evaluative or emotional connotation, and discourse function. In dialogue, discourse function is assessed in relation to interpersonal cues such as familiarity, deference, or conflict. In interior monologue, it is assessed in relation to the expression of emotion, self-evaluation, or hesitation. Each dimension is coded separately to distinguish preservation, attenuation, intensification, or a qualitative shift. This allows a rendering to be described, for example, as preserving contextual meaning while reducing the emotional intensity of the source expression.

The analysis distinguishes the translation procedure from its effect in context. A published rendering may involve an idiomatic substitution, a shift towards a more general or specific term, a change in register, or an omission. The effect of that procedure is evaluated against the function of the Uzbek expression in the passage. Each case is documented with the story title, page references for both editions, the paired excerpts, and a brief rationale for the classification.

Subjectivity is operationalized as the interpretive latitude observable when two or more grammatically and pragmatically viable Turkish renderings give different weight to features of the same Uzbek expression. In such cases, the published rendering is compared with clearly identified analytical alternatives. These alternatives are assessed against the same criteria as the published translation to determine which features each option preserves or shifts. The interpretation is confined to effects observable in the paired texts and the proposed alternatives. Because the sample is purposive, the findings characterize the selected passages and support qualitative comparison between dialogue and interior monologue.

Results and Discussion: Lexical equivalence in the selected passages is assessed across four dimensions: contextual meaning, register, emotional or evaluative connotation, and discourse function. These dimensions are treated separately because a single Turkish rendering may preserve one feature of an Uzbek expression while shifting another. A form of address, for example, may identify the intended addressee accurately while changing the degree of familiarity between the speakers. Similarly, an emotionally marked word in interior monologue may retain its basic

meaning while conveying a weaker or stronger reaction. The analysis therefore considers how each lexical choice contributes to the interpretation of the passage as a whole.

The organization of the results follows the discourse types identified in the source text. In dialogue, the analysis examines how lexical choices position speakers in relation to each other and convey their attitudes during an exchange. In interior monologue, it examines how those choices represent a character's perception of events, emotional response, and movement from one thought to another. The distinction provides a basis for comparing the effects of similar translation procedures across different narrative contexts.

In the analysis of Said Ahmad's short stories and their Turkish translations, lexical equivalence is treated as a relationship between an Uzbek expression and its Turkish rendering across four dimensions: contextual meaning, register, emotional or evaluative connotation, and discourse function. Contextual meaning concerns the sense an expression acquires in a particular passage. Register concerns the level of formality and the social or stylistic associations of the wording. Connotation concerns the evaluative stance or emotional intensity attached to the expression. Discourse function concerns the role the expression plays in the exchange between characters or in the representation of a character's thoughts.

These dimensions provide a basis for describing lexical correspondence with greater precision. Semantic preservation can coexist with a change in register or a reduction in emotional intensity. A shift in register can also affect discourse function by changing how the reader interprets a character's attitude. The significance of such shifts depends on the role of the source expression in the passage. Accordingly, the assessment considers both the lexical item and the surrounding text, where other linguistic cues may sustain a feature that is less explicit in the corresponding Turkish expression.

The analysis of dialogue centers on the relationship between lexical choice and interpersonal meaning. Forms of address, colloquial vocabulary, and idiomatic expressions contribute to the representation of familiarity, respect, social distance, and conflict. Their function depends on the relationship between the speakers, the position of the utterance in the exchange, and the interlocutor's response. Register and connotation therefore contribute directly to how the reader understands the interaction.

In assessing Turkish renderings, contextual meaning and interpersonal function are evaluated separately. A rendering may preserve the content of an utterance while modifying the degree of deference, familiarity, or tension it conveys. A shift toward a more neutral register can reduce the salience of these cues, whereas a more strongly marked choice can increase their prominence. The effect is assessed at the level of the exchange, since the surrounding dialogue may reinforce, modify, or compensate for a shift in an individual lexical item. This distinction helps determine whether a lexical change affects the portrayal of the speaker's attitude or the relationship between the characters.

In interior monologue, lexical choice shapes the representation of a character's perspective, emotional state, and evaluation of events. Emotionally marked and evaluative expressions contribute to the reader's understanding of how a character interprets an experience and how that interpretation develops. Their function is best assessed in relation to the sequence of thoughts, particularly where the passage marks hesitation, self-correction, or a change in emotional intensity.

Lexical repetition also contributes to the organization of interior monologue. The recurrence of an expression can link successive thoughts or indicate that a character repeatedly returns to the same concern. Where the Turkish text uses lexical variation, the assessment considers how that variation affects continuity within the passage. Emotional connotation and discourse function are

therefore evaluated alongside contextual meaning. A rendering can retain the subject of a character's reflection while changing the force of their self-evaluation or the way the reader follows the development of their thoughts.

Subjectivity is examined as the scope for interpretive judgment when several Turkish renderings are contextually plausible. Each choice can give different weight to semantic precision, idiomatic usage, emotional force, or the preservation of character voice. The relative importance of these features depends on the function of the expression in the source passage. The evaluation of a lexical decision consequently requires a consistent set of criteria applied to the published rendering and to any proposed analytical alternatives.

The distinction between translation procedure and textual effect is central to this comparison. Generalization, specification, idiomatic substitution, and register adjustment describe how an expression is rendered. Preservation, attenuation, intensification, and qualitative shift describe the effects that can be identified in context. A procedure can have different effects across passages because its consequences depend on the surrounding discourse. This approach grounds the discussion of subjectivity in observable textual differences and keeps claims about the translator's choices within the scope of the evidence.

Dialogue and interior monologue differ in the kinds of interpretive cues most directly affected by lexical choice. In dialogue, shifts in register and connotation can affect how readers infer the relationship between speakers and interpret their attitudes toward one another. In interior monologue, comparable shifts can affect how readers perceive emotional intensity, evaluative stance, and continuity of thought. The same translation procedure can therefore have different consequences depending on whether the lexical item functions within an interpersonal exchange or within the representation of private thought.

The comparison establishes a common basis for evaluating lexical equivalence while accounting for the distinct functions of the two discourse types. It also clarifies the scope of judgments about character voice. In dialogue, character voice is assessed through the ways speakers position themselves in relation to others. In interior monologue, it is assessed through the language a character uses to interpret experience and evaluate their own responses. Claims about recurring translation patterns depend on the distribution of these effects across the passages examined in the selected editions.

Conclusion: This study approaches lexical equivalence in Turkish translations of Said Ahmad's short stories through four dimensions: contextual meaning, register, emotional or evaluative connotation, and discourse function. Assessing these dimensions separately makes it possible to explain how a Turkish rendering can preserve the meaning of an Uzbek expression while changing its tone or its contribution to character portrayal. The surrounding passage is essential to this assessment because the function of a lexical item depends on the narrative situation in which it occurs.

Dialogue and interior monologue call for different criteria when assessing discourse function. In dialogue, forms of address, colloquial vocabulary, and idiomatic expressions help readers infer familiarity, deference, or tension between speakers. In interior monologue, emotionally marked words, evaluative expressions, and lexical repetition help readers follow how a character interprets an event and how that interpretation develops. A shift toward more neutral wording can therefore affect the perceived social distance between speakers in dialogue or alter the force of a character's self-evaluation in interior monologue.

Subjectivity in word choice can be examined by comparing a published rendering with plausible Turkish alternatives in the same narrative context. One option may convey a culturally

specific form of address more closely, while another may reproduce the conversational register more naturally. The relevance of each difference depends on the role of the original expression in the passage. Comparing the options on the same criteria grounds the assessment in observable effects on meaning, register, connotation, and character voice.

The framework thus provides a basis for explaining how individual lexical decisions shape two aspects of character portrayal in Uzbek–Turkish literary translation: relationships expressed through dialogue and the representation of private thought through interior monologue. Any conclusions about recurring translation patterns remain specific to the stories, passages, and editions included in the corpus.

References

1. Hamidov, X., and M. Abdullayeva. "Alternative Versions and Functional Characteristics of Phraseologists in Uzbek. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION, 4 (3), 51–54." 2024,
2. Khamidov, X. K., Bultakov, I. Y., Raxmanberdiyeva, K. S., Kasimova, S. S., & Sodiqova, S. B. (2024). Linguistic Expertise of Educational Literature: Analysis and Results. Journal Power System Technology, 48(4), 4017-4027.
3. Abdullayeva M. FORMATION OF ALTERNATIVE VARIANTS IN THE PROCESS OF ARTISTIC TRANSLATION (ON THE EXAMPLE OF A WORK OF “SUCH IS LIFE”) //International Journal of Artificial Intelligence. – 2025. – T. 1. – №. 3. – C. 1287-1291.
4. Kasımova S. S. Transformación de frases y sus destrucciones //Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología-Serie de Conferencias. – 2024. – T. 3. – C. 740.
5. Hamidov H. Türkçede insan ilişkileriyle ilgili deyimler //Türk Dili Dergisi. – 2002. – T. 610. – C. 58-60.
6. Khamidov X. K. WORD CHOICE AND THE PROBLEM OF “FALSE EQUIVALENCE” IN THE UZBEK TRANSLATION OF GÜNTEKIN’S “ÇALIKUŞU” //Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. – 2026. – T. 13. – №. 5. – C. 712-717.
7. Hamidov K. K. Regarding the transference of metaphors in uzbek novels in Turkish translations //AJMR: Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research. – 2021.
8. Hamidov X. TURKCHA MAROSIM NOMLARI VA ULARNING TARJIMASIGA DOIR //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2022. – T. 2. – №. Special Issue 28. – C. 230-237.
9. Mukhiddinova D. Z. Trends in the development of the Jordanian short story of the twentieth century //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – T. 11. – №. 3. – C. 1695-1704.