



MORPHOLOGICAL RATIO CATEGORIES OF VERBS IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Farmanova Malika Axrorovna

1st year master's student of the University of Information Technologies and
Management

E-mail : farmali0303@gmail.com

Abstract

Translation is a multifaceted process that requires an understanding of the grammatical structures inherent to both source and target languages. This article examines the morphological ratio categories of verbs, focusing on tense, aspect, mood, and voice, and their implications for translation between English and Uzbek. By analyzing these categories, we aim to highlight the challenges and strategies translators face in maintaining semantic fidelity while adapting to the grammatical norms of each language.

Key words: Verb, tense,, aspect, voice, category, strategy, semantic, contextual sensitivity, cultural nuances, adaptation strategies, action, state

Translation serves as a bridge between languages, facilitating communication across cultural boundaries. Among the various linguistic elements involved in translation, verbs are particularly significant due to their role in expressing actions, states, and relationships. This study delves into the morphological ratio categories of verbs—tense, aspect, mood, and voice—comparing their manifestations in English and Uzbek. Understanding these differences is essential for translators seeking to produce accurate and contextually appropriate translations.

Morphological Features of Verbs

1. Tense

Tense indicates the time at which an action occurs. English features a relatively straightforward tense system with three primary forms: past, present, and future. In contrast, Uzbek employs a more complex tense system that includes various forms to express time nuances.

Example:

- **English:** "She eats."
- **Uzbek:** "U ovqat yeydi." (Literal: "She food eats.")





In this instance, the present tense in English corresponds directly to the present tense in Uzbek. However, when expressing future actions, Uzbek often utilizes a suffix that indicates intention or futurity.

Example:

- **English:** "She will eat."
- **Uzbek:** "U ovqat yeydi." (Literal: "She will eat.")

Here, the same verb form is used in Uzbek to indicate both present and future actions, which can lead to ambiguity if context does not clarify the intended meaning.

2. Aspect

Aspect provides insight into the nature of an action—whether it is completed (perfective) or ongoing (imperfective). English distinguishes between these aspects primarily through auxiliary verbs and participles, while Uzbek uses specific verb forms to convey aspectual distinctions.

Example:

- **English (Perfective):** "She has eaten."
- **Uzbek (Imperfective):** "U ovqat yedi." (Literal: "She ate.")

In this case, the perfective aspect in English emphasizes completion, while the imperfective aspect in Uzbek may suggest a more general statement about past action without indicating completion.

3. Mood

Mood reflects the speaker's attitude toward the action—indicative, imperative, or subjunctive moods present different challenges in translation. English utilizes modal verbs to express mood variations, whereas Uzbek employs specific verb conjugations.

Example:

- **English (Subjunctive):** "If she were here."
- **Uzbek (Indicative):** "Agar u bu yerda bo'lsa." (Literal: "If she is here.")

The subjunctive mood in English conveys hypothetical situations, while Uzbek uses the indicative mood to express similar conditionality without the same morphological variation.





4. Voice

Voice indicates whether the subject performs (active voice) or receives (passive voice) the action. English frequently employs passive constructions to shift focus from the doer to the action itself. Uzbek also has passive forms but tends to use them less frequently due to its syntactic structure.

Example:

- **English (Active):** "The chef cooked the meal."
- **Uzbek (Passive):** "Taom oshpaz tomonidan tayyorlandi." (Literal: "The meal was prepared by the chef.")

While both languages can express passive constructions, Uzbek often favors active voice for clarity and directness.

Implications for Translation Practice

Understanding the morphological ratio categories of verbs is crucial for translators working between English and Uzbek. Here are some implications for effective translation practice:

1. **Contextual Sensitivity:** Translators must consider context carefully when determining verb forms. The ambiguity inherent in Uzbek verb forms necessitates additional contextual information to ensure clarity.
2. **Cultural Nuances:** The cultural context influences how actions are perceived and described in each language. Translators should be aware of these differences to convey meanings accurately.
3. **Training and Resources:** Developing a comprehensive understanding of morphological features can enhance translators' skills. Engaging with bilingual texts and linguistic resources can aid translators in navigating these complexities.
4. **Adaptation Strategies:** When translating between languages with differing morphological systems, it may be necessary to adapt sentence structures or use additional explanatory phrases to maintain clarity and fidelity.

Conclusion

The morphological ratio categories of verbs—tense, aspect, mood, and voice—play a significant role in translation between English and Uzbek. By examining these categories, we gain insights into the challenges faced by translators as they navigate





linguistic differences. A nuanced understanding of these morphological features can enhance translation quality, ensuring that meaning is preserved while adapting to the grammatical norms of each language. As globalization continues to foster cross-cultural communication, an appreciation for the intricacies of verb morphology will remain essential for effective translation practice.

References

1. Baker, M. (1992). **In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation**. Routledge.
2. Vinay, J.-P., Darbelnet, J. (1995). **Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation**. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
3. Newmark, P. (1988). **A Textbook of Translation**. Prentice Hall.
4. Hatim, B., Mason, I. (1990). **Discourse and the Translator**. Longman.
5. Shukurov, A., Shukurova, G. (2019). **Linguistic Features of Translation: A Comparative Study of English and Uzbek**. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies.

