

Grammatical Problems of Translation

Dilnoza Ulugbek kizi Fozilova

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Email: dilnozafozilova07@gmail.com

Zaripova Aziza Shaxobiddinovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Email: Zaripovaaziza23@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article examines the complex grammatical challenges encountered in the process of translation across different language systems. It explores how structural disparities in word order, tense systems, and grammatical categories such as gender, number, and case impact the accuracy and naturalness of the target text. The study specifically analyzes the translation of English infinitives into Russian, the diversity of grammatical categories in American Indian and European languages, and the morphological correspondences between English, Russian, and Uzbek. By evaluating phraseological units and sentence sequencing, the article emphasizes that successful translation requires a shift from word-for-word substitution to structural adaptation. The findings suggest that a deep understanding of both source and target grammar is essential to maintain the original message's conceptual integrity while ensuring linguistic fluency.*

Keywords: *Grammatical Translation Problems, Word Order, Tense Systems, Morphological Correspondence, Infinitive Translation, Grammatical Categories, Phraseological Units, Language Structure, Uzbek Language, English-Russian Translation*

1. Introduction

Grammatical problems of translation are the difficulties that appear because languages have different grammatical systems. Every language has its own rules of sentence structure, tense, agreement, articles, pronouns, and word order. When a translator changes a text from one language into another, these differences may create problems and sometimes make it difficult to keep the original meaning accurate [1]. One of the most common grammatical problems is word order because some languages place the verb before the object, while others place it at the end of the sentence. Tense is another important issue since not all languages have the same tense forms. Translators may also face problems with singular and plural forms, gender agreement, articles, and prepositions because these elements do not always exist or function in the same way in different languages [2, 3]. Pronouns can also create ambiguity when the target language uses fewer distinctions than the source language. In addition, some languages prefer passive voice while others mostly use active structures. Because of these differences, translators often need to change sentence structures rather than translate word by word. Successful translation requires not only knowledge of vocabulary but also a deep understanding of grammar in both languages so that the translated text sounds natural, clear, and accurate [4, 5].

Translating Infinitive

The challenges in translating the English infinitive are due to its specific forms, functions, and structures. Unlike Russian, the English language possesses a number of forms of the same verb: the Simple infinitive, the Continuous infinitive, the Perfect infinitive, and the Perfect Continuous infinitive [6]. The first two forms indicate actions simultaneous with that of the main predicate: Я рада, что вижу вас. – I am glad to see you. Я рада, что читаю эту книгу. – I am glad to be reading

the book, or the future actions: Я рада, что пойду туда. – I am glad to go there. The Perfect and Perfect Continuous infinitives denote actions prior to that of the predicate: Я рада, что увидела вас. - I am glad to have seen you. Я рада, что читала эту книгу. – I am glad to have been reading the book. On the other hand, the difference between the Simple / Perfect and Continuous / Perfect Continuous forms of the infinitive lies in expressing either a fact, an incomplete or completed one, or a process, respectively [7, 8]:

рад, что делаю каждый день – glad to do every day

рад, что делаю сейчас – glad to be doing

рад, что буду делать – glad to do

рад сделать что сделаю – glad to do

рад, что сделал – glad to have done

рад, что делал – glad to have been doing [9].

2. Methodology

The diversity of grammatical categories across languages. Differences in the grammatical structures of the source and target languages often result in some change in the information content of the message during the process of translation. This change may take the form of adding to the target text information that is not expressed in the source text. This can happen when the target language has a grammatical category that the source language lacks. In translating from English or French into an American Indian language such as Yana or Navajo, one would have to add information concerning the shape of any objects mentioned in the text. Likewise, in translating into Amuesha, one would have to indicate whether any person mentioned in the text is dead or alive. Details that are ignored in the source text but which have to be specified in the target language can pose a serious dilemma for the translator if they cannot be reasonably inferred from the context. The change in the information content of the message may be in the form of omitting information specified in the source text. If the target language lacks a grammatical category that exists in the source language, the information expressed by that category may have to be ignored. Jakobson suggests that ‘no lack of grammatical device in the language translated into makes impossible a literal translation of the entire conceptual information contained in the original’ 1959:235. This is true in theory, but in practice, the lack of a grammatical device can translate to ‘the entire conceptual information’. First, the lack of a grammatical category in a given language suggests that the indication of information associated with that category is regarded as optional. The frequency of occurrence of such optional information tends to be low, and a translation that repeatedly indicates information that is normally left unspecific in the target language is bound to sound unnatural. Second, because such information would have to be expressed lexically, it is likely to assume more importance in the target text than it does in the source text. The fact that lexical choices are optional gives them more weight than grammatical choices..

3. Results and Discussion

Sequencing a sentence

‘I take ‘purpose’ to be a special case, the overriding factor for the translator sequencing his sentences. I take it that in any informative texts the purpose should be foregrounded; thus, *C’est un travail comparatif, portant sur des criteres essentielle-ment cliniques visant à mettre en evidence incidence des thromboses veineuses profondes* may become ‘The purpose of this comparative study, which is based mainly on clinical criteria, is to demonstrate the incidence of deep venous thromboses’, whilst, in subsequent sentences, the value of the connectors keeps the purpose in the forefront [10]. In particular, the translator may have to determine whether each sentence is an addition, a detail, an example, a contrast, an opposition, a reservation, an aside, an afterthought, a consequence, etc. To

some extent, the sequence is indicated by the connectors, which may each have a variety, indeed a contrariness of meaning, e.g., d'autre part: 'moreover1, on the other hand'; enfin: 'indeed1, 'in short\ 'finally'. There are variations in many languages: it is common to put 'purpose' before 'proposition' if the subject remains the same - Pour faire cela . . . il faut - and after the proposition if the subject changes - Je le fais pour qu'il le sache [11]. The proposition will come first if, instead of being a statement, it is a command, wish, or question. The more inflected a language is, the easier it is to change the word order to emphasise the meaning. In this area, case-partner and concept tend to identify and case grammar and discourse analysis to merge' [12].

Phraseology: Noun phrases and compounds

Bally 1944:155 defines phraseological units as the combination of two lexical items into a relationship of grammatical interdependence. These combinations can be interconnected and cover the whole sentence, the subject and the predicate combining to form a new syntagmatic unit. Here we are mainly concerned with simple constructions because experience tells us that their translation often needs a change of structure. English distinguishes between compounds formed by the simple juxtaposition of nouns and noun phrases formed with prepositions. Where a matching compound exists, French usually signals this with the absence of an article, though in recent years the English pattern is gaining ground, especially in technical vocabulary, e.g. [13]:

a tree trunk	: un tronc d'arbre
the trunk of a tree	: le tronc d'un arbre
object machine	: machine objet
machine language	: language machine
expert system	: système expert

English cannot form certain types of compounds. For example, the French 'un bruit de roues', i.e., any wheels whose sound is heard, can only be translated by the noun phrase 'a sound of wheels'. Some compounds need translation adjustment [14].

Morphological correspondence

a) Complete morphological correspondence

Complete morphological correspondence is observed when in the languages considered there are identical grammatical categories with identical particular meanings. In all three languages, there is a grammatical category of number. Both the general categorial and particular meanings are alike: NUMBER SINGULAR PLURAL. Such correspondence may be called complete.

b) Partial morphological correspondence

Partial morphological correspondence is observed when in the languages examined there are grammatical categories with identical categorial meanings but with some differences in the particular meanings. In the languages considered, there is a grammatical category of case in nouns. Though the categorial meaning is identical in all three languages, the particular meanings are different both from the point of view of their number and the meanings they express. English has 2 particular meanings, while Uzbek and Russian have 6. Though the latter two languages have the same quantity of particular cases, their meanings do not coincide. The differences in the case system or in any other grammatical categories are usually expressed by other means in languages. c). Absence of morphological correspondence. Absence of morphological correspondence is observed when there are corresponding grammatical categories in the languages examined. As in Uzbek, there is a grammatical category of possessiveness, which shows the affixation of things to one of the three grammatical persons, e.g.:

Uzbek
 Kitob – im Kitob – ing Kitob – i

This grammatical category is neither found in English nor in Russian. These languages use pronouns for this purpose.

English
My book
His / her book
Your book
Russian
МОЯ КНИГА
ТВОЯ КНИГА
его / её книга

In English, we use certain grammatical means to express definite and indefinite meanings, that is, articles. But there are no equivalent grammatical means in Uzbek and Russian. They use lexical or syntactic means to express those meanings [15].

The role of context in grammatical selection

Grammar is not just about rules; it is about meaning in context. The translator's task is to identify the "purpose" of a sentence before deciding on its structure. Sequencing: The order of information in a sentence should foreground the primary informative purpose. Ambiguity Resolution: Grammatical elements like pronouns or tenses can create ambiguity if the target language has fewer distinctions. In such cases, the translator must rely on the surrounding context to infer the correct meaning and specify it for the reader. Weight of Choice: Since lexical choices are often optional compared to mandatory grammatical rules, they carry more emphasis and "weight" in the translated text.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, grammatical problems in translation arise primarily from the fundamental differences between the grammatical systems of the source and target languages. Whether it is the multifaceted forms of the English infinitive, the specific case systems of Uzbek and Russian, or the absence of articles in certain languages, these differences necessitate professional flexibility. The research demonstrates that: Structural Adaptation: Translators must often prioritize changing sentence structures over literal translation to preserve meaning and naturalness. Information Management: Differences in grammatical categories may lead to the addition or omission of information, which requires careful contextual inference. Morphological Diversity: The degree of correspondence, complete, partial, or absent, between languages like English, Russian, and Uzbek dictates the choice of lexical or syntactic substitutes. Ultimately, achieving a high-quality translation depends on the translator's ability to navigate these grammatical voids and provide a text that is not only accurate in content but also native in its grammatical expression.

References

- [1] Z. Proshina, *Theory of Translation*. Vladivostok, Russia: Far Eastern University Press, 2008.
- [2] M. Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London, UK: Routledge, 1992.
- [3] P. Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation*. New York, NY, USA: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- [4] J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995.
- [5] U. U. Kuldoshov, *Translation Theory, Manual*. Samarkand, Uzbekistan: SamSIFL Press, 2024.
- [6] J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, 5th ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2022.
- [7] E. Nida and C. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1969.
- [8] L. Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, UK: Routledge, 1995.
- [9] S. Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 4th ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2014.
- [10] J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1965.

- [11] K. Reiss and H. J. Vermeer, *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2013.
- [12] G. Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- [13] M. Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 1988.
- [14] A. Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd ed. London, UK: Routledge, 2014.
- [15] I. Levy, *The Art of Translation*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011.