

BRITISH VIEW

MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL



GRAMMATICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

Saloydinova Nargiza Shukhratovna

Tashkent Institute of Architecture and Civil engineering

Abstract: English, Uzbek and Russian are typologically and genetically diverse languages. English and Russian belong to the Germanic and Slavic groups of the Indo-European language family. Uzbek belongs to the Turkic group of languages of the Altaic language family. Morphologically, English is analytical, Russian is synthetic, and Uzbek is agglutinative.

Keywords: comparative grammar, grammatical problems in translation, grammatical rod translation, grammatical conformity, rhyming translation, preposition translation problem, morphological conformity, syntactic conformity, grammatical transformation.

Introduction

Translation and interpretation is one of the oldest creative fields that has been formed in the history and culture of the peoples of the world for many centuries. The descendants of mankind, who have lived for thousands of years on different continents and regions of the world, have also expressed their creative passions, interests, opportunities and interests through translation. He turned it into a means of international communication, always using it effectively. [1]. Through translation and interpreters, the peoples of humanity became aware of each other and interacted with each other. However, trade, crafts. Over the centuries, the fields of agriculture, housing, road construction, agriculture, and armaments have been gradually developed and abandoned.

Materials and methods

Grammatical variations are the main tools used in Russian and Uzbek. The word order in English is strict. For example: Subject + predicate. Subject replace in the first place, predicate in the 2 place. If the verb is intransitive we may see the object in 3 place; Subject + Verb + Object. For example: **Engineer sent ten subcontractors**. Changing of any parts of speech can change the meaning of sentence. For instance: **Ten subcontractors sent Engineer**. But Uzbek and Russian parts of speech order in this case. We can change the parts of speech but the meaning is not changed in this case. For example: **Muhandis 10 ta ishchini yubordi. Инженер послал 10 рабочих. 10 ta ishchini muhandis yubordi. 10 рабочих послал инженер.** There are 3 types of grammatical correspondence: 1. complete; 2. partial; 3. incompatibility. We divide grammatical correspondence into two parts: morphological and syntactic. Full morphological correspondence is observed when the same grammatical categories exist: For example: tense category, number category etc.

Roofers-Том уорувчилар-Кровельщики

Partial morphological correspondence is observed when grammatical categories in languages do not correspond to each other. For example: There are 2

agreements in English and 6 in Uzbek. Differences in grammatical categories are usually expressed by other means in the language.[2].Morphological inconsistencies are observed in the case of inconsistency of grammatical categories in the language. For example, Uzbek has a grammatical category of possession. It is represented by affixes, however such grammatical categories do not exist in either English or Russian. They use rhymes in this. For example: Uzbek - English - Russian *loyiham-tu project- мой проект, loyihang -your project- твой проект, loyihasi his project- его проект.*

In English, accuracy and ambiguity are expressed by the articles "a / an", "the". But in Uzbek and Russian we use lexical and syntactic means to express clarity and ambiguity. For example: *Shartnomani bizga qandaydir ahamiyati bor deb o'ylaysizmi? Вы думаете, договор имеет какое-то значение для нас? Do you think contract may have a difference? Qandaydir ahamiyati bor deysizmi? Бунинг juda katta ahamiyati bor. Имеет какое-либо значение? Оно имеет большое значение. A difference? It will make the difference.* Complete syntactic consistency is the order of words in a sentence. For example: *adj. + noun = red pen - qizil ruchka - красная ручка. subject + noun = he laughed - u kuldi - он смеялся.*

Partial syntactic conformity is understood as the conformity of meaning, but different in structure. For example: *Glass + tube - N+N, shisha, naycha N+N, стеклянная труба -Adj+N.* In part syntactic coherence, we understand that in a sentence, the order of words, the omission of words, and the substitution of words for words are incompatible. *It is forbidden to smoke on site. Qurilish maydonida chekish man qilingan. Курить в стороуительной площадке запрещено. He pull out lever. U richagni tort. Он спустил рычаг.*

Lack of syntactic coherence refers to the lack of syntactic structure in a source language that is used for tajjima but is being translated. For example: *I heard the door open - Я слышал, как дверь открылась - Men eshikning ochilishini eshitdim. - To'ldiruvchi ergash gap.*

Used to replace, modify, drop, and add. Grammatical incompatibility means the absence of one or another grammatical form or construction in the target language, the incompatibility of the use of forms and constructions, differences in the combination of words, the absence of phrases with the same meaning.[3]. It is understood that For example: *She says he will go — U kelishini aytadi. Она говорит, что придет. She said he would go - U kelishini aytdi. Она сказал, что она придет.*

Prepositions and articles are used in English, but not in Uzbek. For example: There was a Miss Lich-Somehow there was a Miss Lich. Byla nekaya miss Lich. Transposition is the order of linguistic elements in the same language or to change. "At meeting"-so'z almashtirish (majlis vaqtida). Во время заседания.

Results

The grammatical structure of a language is a general feature of its system. Affixes, grammatical suffixes and word formation, syntactic models, word order, auxiliary words, etc. such as the grammatical structural elements of a language serve to convey a grammatical or formal meaning, a specific form of lexical meaning. It is important to express this meaning in the translation process, as grammatical forms of different languages are very rare corresponds to the meaning and function of the link. [5]. As a rule, there is only partial equivalence, which means that grammatical meanings are expressed through grammatical forms, yet the two languages seem to be similar to each other, only some parts of the link meanings are compatible, and similar meanings. mutually different. For example, the category of numbers in horses seems to be compatible in English, Russian, and Uzbek, but in fact they are incompatible with the use of many suffixes. However, there are many examples of other words without suffixes being expressed in English as plurals in Russian and Uzbek as plurals: Scissors - ножницы - qaychi

The first problem is that it is not possible to translate accurately. The meanings and grammatical structures of words in languages are usually not the same. We explain this by using the word "logos" as an example. No word in English can be the exact equivalent. It means words, opinions, discussions, content, and so on.

Conclusion

The interpreter should be able to choose the best equivalent in each situation. When we explain a grammatical problem, we can use tenses as an example. In modern English, which is one in most other languages, there are two in English: "I am going; I go / I am going is represented in both forms. Pronouns are also full of problems. In short, it is impossible to find a literal equivalent of one text to another. In most cases, the translator tries to understand the meaning of the original (the original of the translated work) as deeply as possible, and then to describe the understood meaning in the same language as the original.

References:

1. Haberland H. Linguistics and pragmatics // Journal of pragmatics/ - Amsterdam: John Benjamin's, 2001.
2. Hartman R. I. Contrastive textology and translation. London. 1981.
3. Hockett Ch. A Course in Modern Linguistics, N. Y., 1960
4. Hoof H. V. L'histoire de la traduction en Occident. Paris. 1991.
5. Hornby A. S. Oxford student's Dictionary of Current English. - Moscow, Oxford, 1984.
6. Kennedy A. G. Current English. - USA, 2001.
7. Mildred A Guide to Cross Language Equivalence, Z., 1984.
8. Muminov O. Guide to Simultaneous translation. T., 2005.
9. Muminov O., Sunnatov O. History of Translation. T. 2008.
10. Newmark P. A. Textbook of Translation. London. 2002.
11. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating, (theory and practice). London, New York. 2001.
12. Savory T. The art of Translation. London. 1957.