METHODS OF RENDERING LEXICAL–STYLISTIC EXPRESSIVENESS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

Bazarov Zokir Mexrikulovich

Uzbekistan state world languages university

Abstract: This article investigates the methods of rendering lexical–stylistic expressiveness in literary translation from a theoretical and translational perspective. Lexical–stylistic expressiveness is viewed as a crucial component of literary texts, reflecting the author's individual style, emotional depth, aesthetic intent, and cultural specificity. The study examines how expressive lexical units function within artistic discourse and analyzes the challenges translators face when transferring stylistically marked vocabulary between languages. Particular attention is paid to the asymmetry of expressive resources across languages and cultures, which often leads to partial loss or transformation of stylistic coloring in translation. The article outlines and systematizes key translation methods used to preserve expressive meaning, including functional substitution, stylistic compensation, semantic modulation, descriptive translation, and controlled stylistic neutralization. The role of the translator as an interpreter and creative mediator is emphasized, highlighting the balance between fidelity to the source text and adaptation to target-language norms. The findings suggest that successful literary translation relies on achieving functional and stylistic adequacy rather than formal equivalence, enabling the target text to recreate the aesthetic and emotional impact of the original.

Keywords: literary translation, lexical–stylistic expressiveness, stylistic coloring, translation strategies, functional equivalence, stylistic compensation, expressive vocabulary, translation studies

Literary translation occupies a central place in translation studies due to its complex nature and high artistic responsibility. Unlike technical or informational translation, literary translation aims not only to transfer semantic content but also to preserve the aesthetic, emotional, and stylistic qualities of the source text. One of the most challenging aspects in this process is the rendering of lexical–stylistic expressiveness, which constitutes the artistic and emotional coloring of a literary work. Lexical–stylistic expressiveness reflects the author's individual style, cultural background, ideological stance, and pragmatic intentions, making it a key element in the perception of literary texts.

In the context of artistic discourse, lexical units often carry additional connotations, emotional shades, evaluative meanings, and stylistic functions. These elements are deeply embedded in the linguistic and cultural system of the source language, which makes their reproduction in the target language particularly problematic. As a result, the translator is required to balance fidelity to the original with the norms and expressive resources of the target language. This article explores the main methods of rendering lexical–stylistic expressiveness in literary translation, focusing on theoretical perspectives and practical translation strategies.

Lexical–stylistic expressiveness refers to the ability of lexical units to convey emotional, evaluative, and aesthetic meanings beyond their denotative content. In literary texts, expressiveness is achieved through a wide range of linguistic means, including metaphor, metonymy, epithets, idioms, archaisms, colloquialisms, dialectisms, emotionally colored

vocabulary, and stylistically marked words. These elements contribute to the artistic imagery of the text and play a crucial role in shaping the reader's emotional response.

From a translation perspective, lexical–stylistic expressiveness represents a multidimensional phenomenon involving semantics, pragmatics, and stylistics. Scholars such as Nida, Newmark, and Vinay and Darbelnet emphasize that expressive meaning often cannot be translated directly due to differences in linguistic structure and cultural associations. Therefore, literary translation requires interpretative competence, allowing the translator to reconstruct not only meaning but also stylistic impact.

Furthermore, expressiveness is closely linked to cultural specificity. Many stylistically colored lexical units are culture-bound and evoke associations that may be unfamiliar to target-language readers. In such cases, literal translation may lead to stylistic loss or pragmatic failure. Consequently, translators must rely on functional and communicative equivalence rather than formal correspondence. One of the primary challenges in literary translation is the asymmetry between the expressive resources of the source and target languages. Languages differ in their lexical richness, stylistic norms, and cultural conventions. A stylistically marked word in one language may have no direct equivalent in another, or its equivalent may carry different connotations. This creates a risk of stylistic neutralization or overcompensation.

Another difficulty arises from the subjective nature of expressiveness. Emotional and stylistic effects are often implicit and context-dependent, making them difficult to identify and interpret. The translator must possess a deep understanding of the source text, the author's stylistic intentions, and the target audience's expectations. Failure to do so may result in distortion of the original tone, character portrayal, or narrative voice.

Additionally, the translator faces the challenge of maintaining stylistic consistency throughout the text. Literary works often employ a carefully constructed stylistic system, where lexical choices contribute to character speech, narrative perspective, and thematic development. Any inconsistency in rendering expressiveness may disrupt the coherence and artistic integrity of the translation.

To overcome these challenges, translators employ various methods to render lexical–stylistic expressiveness effectively. One of the most common approaches is functional substitution, which involves replacing a source-language expressive unit with a target-language unit that performs a similar stylistic and emotional function. This method prioritizes effect over form and is widely regarded as one of the most effective strategies in literary translation.

Another important method is stylistic compensation, used when expressive elements cannot be translated at the same textual location. In such cases, the translator introduces stylistic coloring elsewhere in the text to compensate for unavoidable losses. Compensation allows the translator to preserve the overall expressive balance of the literary work, even if individual elements are altered.

Semantic modulation is also frequently employed to adapt expressive meanings to the target language. This method involves changing the perspective or conceptualization of a lexical unit while retaining its emotional or stylistic impact. Modulation is particularly useful when direct equivalents exist but differ in usage or connotation.

In some cases, descriptive or explanatory translation is applied, especially for culture-specific or archaic lexical units. Although this method may reduce stylistic density, it ensures

semantic clarity and prevents misinterpretation. However, excessive use of descriptive translation may weaken the artistic quality of the text and should be applied cautiously.

Finally, stylistic neutralization may be used deliberately when preserving expressiveness is impossible or would violate target-language norms. While generally considered a loss, neutralization may be justified to maintain readability and communicative effectiveness.

The rendering of lexical–stylistic expressiveness highlights the creative role of the translator as a co-author of the literary text. Literary translation is not a mechanical process but an act of artistic interpretation. The translator must make informed choices based on linguistic competence, cultural awareness, and aesthetic sensitivity.

Modern translation theory increasingly recognizes the translator's subjectivity and interpretative freedom. Approaches such as Skopos theory and relevance theory emphasize the importance of communicative purpose and reader response. From this perspective, the successful rendering of expressiveness depends on the translator's ability to recreate the intended artistic effect rather than reproduce formal features.

At the same time, creative freedom must be balanced with respect for the original text. Excessive adaptation or stylistic embellishment may lead to misrepresentation of the author's voice. Therefore, the translator's task is to achieve an optimal balance between fidelity and creativity.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the rendering of lexical–stylistic expressiveness in literary translation is a complex and multifaceted process that requires both linguistic expertise and artistic sensitivity. Lexical–stylistic coloring plays a vital role in conveying the aesthetic and emotional dimensions of literary texts, making its preservation a key objective of literary translation. Due to linguistic and cultural differences, direct equivalence is often unattainable, necessitating the use of various translation methods such as functional substitution, stylistic compensation, modulation, and descriptive translation.The effectiveness of these methods depends largely on the translator's interpretative competence and awareness of stylistic norms in both the source and target languages. Ultimately, successful literary translation achieves not absolute equivalence but functional and stylistic adequacy, allowing the target text to evoke a response comparable to that of the original. Further research in this area may focus on comparative analyses of specific genres and languages to refine existing models of stylistic translation.

REFERENCES.

1. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall.
2. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: Brill.
3. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
4. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.
5. House, J. (2015). Translation Quality Assessment. London: Routledge.
6. Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Munday, J. (2016). Introducing Translation Studies. London: Routledge.
8. Venuti, L. (2012). The Translator's Invisibility. London: Routledge.
9. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). The Translator as Communicator. London: Routledge.
10. Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). Style in Fiction. London: Pearson.