

PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATING VERBS
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПЕРЕВОДА ГЛАГОЛОВ
FE’LLARNI TARJIMA QILISH MUAMMOLARI
Kholikova Dilfuza Abdumukhtarovna, ESL teacher of FerSU

dilfuzaxoliqova81@gmail.com

Supervisor: Ganiyeva Dildora Azizovna, Ds of FerSU.

Annotation: In this article it is discussed the theory of translation and the principles of translating different types of verbs. The author presented different examples for adequate translation.

Key words: translation, theory, transfer, poor and rich languages, lexical meaning, contextual, grammatical meaning, target language.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada tarjima nazariyasi va har xil turdagi fe'llarni tarjima qilish tamoyillari muhokama qilinadi. Muallif adekvat tarjima uchun turli misollar keltirdi.

Kalit so'zlar: tarjima, nazariya, transfer, kambag'al va boy tillar, leksik ma'no, kontekstual, grammatik ma'no, maqsadli til.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматривается теория перевода и принципы перевода разных типов глаголов. Автор привел разные примеры для адекватного перевода.

Ключевые слова: перевод, теория, перевод, бедные и богатые языки, лексическое значение, контекстуальное, грамматическое значение, целевой язык.

It is considered on the matter of Translation all scientists are divided into two groups on the question translatability. First group think that it is impossible to accomplish the translation. Because the spirit of the nation is reflected in the language, to transfer this spirit into another language is impossible. Humboldt and his followers George Munen and Spanish Hose Ortega approve this idea. The first group scientists lean on the ideology that developed and not developed, poor and rich languages exist in the world. In contrast with them, Barkhudarov , Schwester,

Catford, Federov, Fiterman think it possible to translate from one language into another one.¹

We have to take into consideration the contextual, grammatical, lexical meaning of a verb while translating. Adequacy of our translation, first of all, depends on the translation of the verb. We can not translate a verb separately from the context. By this way we may spoil of the beauty of translation. Besides lexical meaning verbs have grammar meaning. And at the same time a few categories are shown in a verb as a part of it. These are: tense, aspect, mood, voice, person and number.² In a sentence a verb can be a predicate or a part of it. “³

For instance, in the sentence “ One young man, waiting on the walk outside for the appearance of another grinned at her as she passed. “The underlined verb as a predicate according to the structure of a word. However the word itself can be called verb in morphology without any alteration in form or meaning, it just comes with another name. When it is translated into uzbek we have to change structure and word order of the sentence as following: ”U o’tib ketayotganda tashqaridagi yo’lkada kutayotgan bir yosh yigit unga iljayib qo’ydi.” If we take out the main verb “grinned “ of the sentence it loses nearly the whole essence in it. Thus, we can not miss the main verb in both English and uzbek languages. But in case we miss one of the words as “young”, ”one “, “outside” , appearance it does not reflect so much basic meaning of the sentence. While investigating thoroughly the sentence we may notice that if we take the following verb forms “passed”, ”waiting “ out of the sentence it also can not reflect negatively to understand meaning. Because according to the structure of the sentence they are in the second position. But by missing the main verb, at the same time predicate “grinned” we may lose the essence of the sentence. Together with having lexical meaning “smile “, this word has grammatical meaning as a verb. It includes the category of tense with the help of ending “ed”, feature of voice as well as being predicate. As a predicate “grinned” is not complex. Because it has only one

¹ “ A linguistic theory of translation”. J. C . Catford . London.. 1965

² “The theory of English Grammar” I. G. Koshevaya .

³ “The structure of English” CH .CH Fries.

part. Thus this verb can be translated from its source language into target one easily like any other independent words.

There are such type of verbs in almost every typical languages which have two parts, and one of them can't be transferred into target language. It means one of them has no independent meaning but can help to express tendency sometimes, person, and category of number. These verbs perform their own position basically in grammar, (not lexicology), joining to the meaning of the main verb. Really they can cause some troubles in translation of original texts. According to their features we can divide them into following groups:

1) Verbs which are auxiliary but are not conjugated in the infinitive mood. For instance, can /could, may /might, shall/should, must, ought to, will/would and so on.
2) Verbs which are auxiliary and also they can be used as an infinitive.

While investigating “defective verbs” it is tried to justify following peculiarities which belong to the verbs in the first group by means of some sentences: Firstly, they load further meaning to the verbs which they go together like it is observed in sentences on lower lines: “A gas –filled tube can carry a larger current than a high vacuum tube.” In this sentence “can“ indicates its own meaning as capability or the chance to do that action when it goes with “carry”, and it is translated into uzbek as “tashiy olmoq”. The basic meaning was expressed in the word “ tashiy olmoq “. But the modal verb can give extra information about how the action is carried out as well as the ability to finish that action. According to grammatic rules “Can”, like all modal verbs, can not be used in an infinitive or continuous form. We use “be able to” in situations where we need these forms as it is shown in the example: ”I’d like to be able to swim.”⁴ There such kind of verbs in modern English which were not defective (in other words “preterite present verbs”) in the history of English language. According to their original they have not defect for this reason they can be conjugated combining with special endings. On this matter, it is very interesting that the verb “ ought to” which considered as defective in current grammar of English, is

⁴ English Grammar and Vocabulary. Michael Vince with Paul Emmerson. Macmillan. 2003.

in fact, the past tense form of “owe” which means 1. “possess” 2. “borrow” 3. to be thankful of someone. And now we use ordinary “owed” instead of historical “ought”. Linguists and native speakers contributed to change forming its past in morphological way as a result of development of the language and by is not so big alteration. At present “owe” was converted into regular verb from the list of irregular verbs (because “ought” was formed by changing in stem.) Now they are considered two separate verbs as if they were never depended on one another. “ought” is a modal verb which can go and indicate meaning with this change they quitted some confusions on word formation even it a main verb at the same time it has category of tense , number. It indicates modality with the particle “to” like inseparable parts of in a verb phrase when they are used as a predicate.

According to modern grammar of English language the combination “ought to” means one’s duty or something which should be done, as

well as we can use this defective verb in the past form as “ought to have done” and we can translate it “qilish kerak edi” . As it is known from the combination “ought to have done “, perfect tense was used but the meaning is in the past simple.

In conclusion, “We can not know the peculiarity of a certain language not until we do not get to the point that we can not translate something from that language into another one.”⁵ this meaningful idea referred to the theory of the translation by Florin even in contemporary linguistics have the same importance.

References

1. “A linguistic theory of translation”. J. C . Catford . London.. 1965
2. English Grammar and Vocabulary. Michael Vince with Paul Emmerson. Macmillan. 2003. P.89
3. “Neperevodimoe v perevode”. S. Vlaxov, S. Florin. Moscow. 1980.P 121
4. “The theory of English Grammar” I. G. Koshevaya . new edition.2000.P.76
5. “The structure of English” CH .CH Fries.1993. P.84

⁵ “Neperevodimoe v perevode”. S. Vlaxov, S. Florin. Moscow. 1980