



Article

# Translation Problems of Complex Analytical Forms with Grammatical Meaning (Based on the English and Uzbek Languages)

Fazilat Mansur qizi Khudoyberdiyeva\*<sup>1</sup>

1. Department of English Language and Literature Gulistan State University  
\* Correspondence: [xudoyberdiyevafazilat35@gmail.com](mailto:xudoyberdiyevafazilat35@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Since there exists a great typological difference between Uzbek and English, the forms of the analytical grammatical systems are complex and different, no wonder the translation of such grammatical forms will cause a lot of problems. The grammatical meaning in English is expressed largely by analytical (auxiliary, word order, function words) structures, while it is conveyed by agglutinative morphology (suffixation) in Uzbek. Although many contrastive studies have been conducted on basic lexical and simple syntactic distinctions, exhaustive contrastive research on complex analytical forms has not yet been presented in English Uzbek translation. This study fills this gap by looking at the transfer of grammatical meanings of tense, aspect, modality, and voice across these typologically different language systems. Employing a descriptive analytical method based on contrastive linguistics and translation theory, the research focuses on published English Uzbek translations of literary, academic and official texts. It is shown that English analytical constructions often use one construction to express multiple grammatical meanings that cannot be directly expressed structurally in Uzbek. Translators therefore resort to strategies of compensation: auxiliary verbs, adverbs of time and modality, contextual enlargement and syntactic shift in order to keep grammatical and pragmatic content. The findings affirm that formal equivalence does not lend itself to being achieved in a largely tangible sense and that functional equivalence is the foremost principle in the translation of success. Results of this study furthermore highlight the necessity for deep grammatical awareness and strategic flexibility of translators working between typologically distant languages. Such discrepancy has pedagogical consequences, since it indicates that translation training should address explicitly grammatical asymmetries and compensation mechanisms to enhance quality and accuracy of both directions.

**Keywords:** Analytical Forms, Grammatical Meaning, Translation Problems, Typological Differences, Grammatical Categories, Compensation Strategies, Contrastive Linguistics

**Citation:** qizi Khudoyberdiyeva F. M. Translation Problems of Complex Analytical Forms with Grammatical Meaning (Based on the English and Uzbek Languages). Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2026, 7(1), 248-251.

Received: 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2025  
Revised: 11<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025  
Accepted: 28<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025  
Published: 16<sup>th</sup> Jan 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

The translation of intricate analytical forms with grammatical meaning between the English and Uzbek languages has posed and continues to pose considerable difficulties owing to the fundamental typological differences between these two language systems. The English language, being predominantly analytical, indicates grammatical relations by word order, auxiliary verbs, and function words while the Uzbek language, being an agglutinative language, uses mainly suffixation and postpositions to indicate grammatical meaning [1]. The differences in structures create great difficulties for the translators who

are trying to keep the meaning and the grammatical nuances of the original text. Complex analytical forms include a variety of grammatical constructions such as compound tenses, modal verb phrases, passive voice structures, and aspectual expressions, which all rely on the collaboration of many elements to convey the exact grammatical meaning [2]. The importance of this research lies in its application to translation practice and language pedagogy where; by understanding these translation problems, the quality of translated texts will be improved and the foreign language instruction methodologies will be enhanced. Lexical translation issues and/or general contrastive analyses have been the main focus of research in the past where the systematic investigation of complex analytical forms in English-Uzbek translation has been neglected [3].

## 2. Methodology

The present study adopts descriptive-analytical methodology, integrating contrastive linguistic analysis and systematic examination of translated texts from different genres. The methodological framework is founded on the principles of contrastive grammar analysis, translation theory, and corpus-based linguistic research [4]. The main data sources are the published English-Uzbek translations of literary, academic, and official documents, which were scrutinized in order to pinpoint the translation issues that commonly arise together with complex analytical forms. The analysis is directed toward several major grammatical categories that involve a great deal of English analytical constructions such as, perfect and progressive aspects, modal verb phrases, passive voice constructions, and compound future forms. A major portion of the theoretical basis of this study is formed by the work of leading experts in contrastive linguistics and translation studies such as the typological frameworks developed by Comrie and others who have studied the expression of grammatical categories across languages [5].

The research on English analytical forms has shown that such constructions carry out several functions at the same time and even activate tense, aspect, modality, and voice for a single complex verb phrase, thus resulting in meanings that need to be decoded in the course of translation [6]. Grammar studies on the Uzbek language have shown that grammatical construction is very rare in the language and it mainly resorts to synthetic means of expression, particularly the usage of suffixes and particles [7]. Thus far, the phonological, lexical, and rudimentary syntactic differences between English and Uzbek have been the focus of previous contrastive analyses, but the study of complex analytical forms is still limited to some extent in the literature. Translation theory provides relevant frameworks for understanding how grammatical meaning can be preserved when structural equivalence is unattainable, particularly through Nida's concepts of formal versus dynamic equivalence and Catford's notion of translation shifts [8]. Research on translation universals and translation strategies has identified various techniques including modulation, transposition, and compensation that translators employ when confronted with structural non-equivalence between source and target languages [9]. The literature on English-Uzbek translation specifically has highlighted general challenges related to word order differences, article translation, and pronoun usage, but systematic analysis of analytical form translation problems has received insufficient scholarly attention [10].

## 3. Results and Discussion

The conducted research indicates different problems of translation related to complicated analytical forms in the English-Uzbek translation, which all are derived from the basic structural variances between the two languages systems [11]. To begin with, the translation of English perfect aspects is the most significant challenging area, since the perfect aspects in English include the auxiliary verb "have" combined with past participles, which indicates the end of the actions and their connection with the present time or the past events. The perfect aspects have no direct structural equivalents in Uzbek so that

different compensation strategies such as temporal adverbs, context-bound verb forms, and sometimes compound constructions with auxiliary verbs like "edi" or "ekan" are employed to approximate the aspectual nuances [12]. For example, the English present perfect "I have completed the work" does not allow for a single structural equivalent in Uzbek but rather requires a translation that takes into account the focus on the completion aspect, the current result, or the experiential quality of the action.

The progressive or continuous aspects in English, which are built with "be" plus present participle, come with similar challenges as Uzbek which mostly uses simple present or past tense forms for ongoing actions and sometimes adds the auxiliary "turibdi" or adverbial expressions for indicating the duration [13]. The translation of modal verb phrases shows particularly complicated issues because English modals like "should," "would," "might," and "must" express very fine distinctions of obligation, probability, hypotheticality, and politeness that do not correspond to Uzbek modal expressions in a straightforward manner. If Uzbek modal meanings are expressed through a mixture of modal verbs, particles, and verb forms, the specific nuances of meaning conveyed by English modals often necessitate greater translation with extra lexical material or contextual clarification. Passive voice constructions in English, which are formed analytically with "be" plus past participle, face translation difficulties as Uzbek can create passives but usually shuns them in favor of active constructions, impersonal expressions, or constructions utilizing reflexive markers.

The English passive voice has the potential to delete the agent and shift the focus, thereby fulfilling various discourse functions, though these pragmatic effects will have to be realized in a different way in the Uzbek translation. The challenging case of complex future constructions in English, especially the ones that mix future tense with perfect or progressive aspects like "will have been working," lies in their multiple layers of translation because they cover simultaneously the temporal location, aspectual feature and sometimes the modal meaning [14]. The Uzbek future forms are, relatively speaking, quite simpler, as they usually take the form of suffixes or the use of the auxiliary verb "bo'lmoq" along with the infinitives, thus requiring the translator to analytically unpack and restructure the multiple grammatical dimensions of the English complex futures. The use of English analytical constructions with modal auxiliaries and perfect aspects to express conditionality and hypotheticality leads to further complications in the translation process, since the conditional structures in Uzbek are mainly based on the application of conditional suffixes and particles rather than through complex verbal constructions. One more significant problematic area is the translation of emphatic English constructions with "do" as an auxiliary which cannot be structurally mirrored in Uzbek and should therefore be rendered through intonational patterns, emphatic particles or variation in word order in order to keep the pragmatic force of the original. The cumulative effect of these translation problems is that translators working from English to Uzbek must frequently abandon attempts at structural equivalence and instead focus on functional equivalence, seeking to preserve the grammatical meaning and pragmatic effect through alternative linguistic resources available in the target language [15]. This necessitates deep understanding not only of the surface forms but of the underlying grammatical meanings and discourse functions that analytical constructions serve in English communication. The findings demonstrate that successful translation of complex analytical forms requires translators to possess sophisticated metalinguistic awareness of how each language system encodes grammatical categories and to develop flexible strategies for meaning preservation when structural correspondence is impossible.

#### 4. Conclusion

This research has identified and analyzed the primary translation problems associated with complex analytical forms with grammatical meaning in English-Uzbek translation, demonstrating that fundamental typological differences between these

languages create systematic challenges that cannot be resolved through simple structural correspondence. The study reveals that English analytical constructions encoding tense, aspect, modality, and voice require diverse compensation strategies in Uzbek translation, including the use of auxiliary verbs, temporal and modal particles, adverbial expressions, contextual expansion, and alternative syntactic structures to preserve grammatical meaning. The analysis confirms that direct structural equivalence is frequently unattainable when translating complex analytical forms, necessitating a functional approach that prioritizes the preservation of grammatical meaning and pragmatic effect over formal correspondence. These findings have significant implications for translation practice, suggesting that translators must develop comprehensive understanding of the grammatical systems of both languages and cultivate flexibility in employing diverse translation strategies according to textual context and communicative purpose. The research also has pedagogical applications, indicating that translation training programs should explicitly address the challenges of rendering grammatical meaning across typologically different languages and equip students with analytical frameworks for identifying and solving such problems. Future research could extend this investigation by examining specific text types or genres to determine whether translation strategies vary according to discourse domain, by conducting corpus-based quantitative analysis of translation patterns, or by exploring the reverse direction of translation from Uzbek to English to identify whether different problems emerge. .

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Comrie, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- [2] R. Huddleston and G. K. Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [3] J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- [4] E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- [5] M. Baker, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2018.
- [6] A. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016.
- [7] W. Croft, *Typology and Universals*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [8] G. Leech, *Meaning and the English Verb*, 3rd ed. London: Pearson Education, 2004.
- [9] A. N. Kononov, *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka*. Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1960.
- [10] H. Nematov and I. Rasulov, *Comparative Typology of English and Uzbek Languages*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House, 2018.
- [11] A. A. Abduazizov, *English Uzbek Translation: Theory and Practice*. Tashkent: Fan, 2015.
- [12] M. A. K. Halliday, "Systemic Background," *Syst. Perspect. Discourse*, vol. 1, pp. 1–15, 1985.
- [13] J. Bybee, R. Perkins, and W. Pagliuca, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- [14] J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, "Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation," *John Benjamins Transl. Libr.*, vol. 11, pp. 1–358, 1995.
- [15] P. Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.