

TRANSLATION ISSUES OF COMPLEX ANALYTICAL FORMS CARRYING GRAMMATICAL MEANING

M.Fazilat¹ 

1. Khudoyberdiyeva, Department of English Language and Literature, Gulistan State University 0009-0000-4055-7645

Mas'ul muallif: Fazilat Mansur qizi, Khudoyberdiyeva, Department of English Language and Literature, Gulistan State University 0009-0000-4055-7645.

e-mail:
xudoyberdiyevafazilat35@gmail.com

Received: 28 Sentabr 2026

Accepted: 03 Oktabr 2026

Published: 08 Oktabr 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author(s). Licensee Buxoro xalqaro universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi.

Iqtibos uchun: Fazilat, M. TRANSLATION ISSUES OF COMPLEX ANALYTICAL FORMS CARRYING GRAMMATICAL MEANING / M. Fazilat // Buxoro xalqaro universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi. — 2026. — T. 10, № 1. — B. 260–262.

Abstract. This article examines the challenges of translating complex analytical grammatical forms across languages, with a particular focus on English structures. Analytical forms, which consist of auxiliary verbs, particles, and syntactic constructions, encode grammatical meanings such as tense, aspect, mood, and voice. The study highlights that differences between source and target language systems often lead to grammatical mismatch, semantic loss, and pragmatic shifts. Drawing on contemporary translation theories and scholars such as Baker, House, Halliday, and Munday, the article analyzes how functional, semantic, and stylistic equivalence can be achieved in translation. It also discusses common translation strategies, including restructuring, simplification, omission, and compensation. The findings indicate that translators must balance form and meaning while considering contextual and discourse factors. The study concludes that functional equivalence and contextual adaptation are essential for accurately conveying the meaning of analytical constructions, especially in academic and technical texts.

Keywords: analytical forms, grammatical meaning, translation studies, functional equivalence, grammatical mismatch, semantic loss, aspect, modality, discourse, translation strategies.

ГРАММАТИК МА'НО IFODALOVCHI MURAKKAB ANALITIK SHAKLLARNI TARJIMA QILISH MUAMMOLARI

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola turli tillar o'rtasida murakkab analitik grammatik shakllarni tarjima qilish bilan bog'liq muammolarni tahlil qiladi. Analitik shakllar yordamchi fe'llar, partikllar va sintaktik tuzilmalar orqali zamon, aspekt, mayl va nisbat kabi grammatik ma'nolarni ifodalaydi. Tadqiqotda manba va tarjima tillari o'rtasidagi tizimlar farqi natijasida yuzaga keladigan grammatik nomuvofiqlik, semantik yo'qotish va pragmatik siljishlar ko'rib chiqiladi. Baker, House, Halliday va Munday kabi olimlarning nazariy qarashlariga tayangan holda, maqolada funksional va kommunikativ ekvivalentlik tamoyillari tahlil qilinadi. Shuningdek, tarjima jarayonida keng qo'llaniladigan qayta qurish, soddalashtirish, tushirib qoldirish va kompensatsiya strategiyalari yoritiladi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, tarjimonlar shakl va mazmun o'rtasida muvozanatni saqlashi va kontekst hamda diskurs xususiyatlarini hisobga olishi zarur.

Kalit so'zlar: analitik shakllar, grammatik ma'no, tarjimashunoslik, funksional ekvivalentlik, grammatik nomuvofiqlik, semantik yo'qotish, aspekt, mayl, diskurs, tarjima strategiyalari.

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПЕРЕВОДА СЛОЖНЫХ АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ФОРМ, НЕСУЩИХ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКОЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЕ

Аннотация. Данная статья посвящена анализу проблем перевода сложных аналитических грамматических форм между языками. Аналитические формы, включающие вспомогательные глаголы, частицы и синтаксические конструкции, выражают такие грамматические значения, как время, аспект, модальность и залог. В исследовании рассматриваются трудности, возникающие из-за различий в грамматических системах исходного и целевого языков, включая грамматические несоответствия, семантические потери и прагматические сдвиги. Опираясь на современные теории перевода и работы таких исследователей, как Baker, House, Halliday и Munday, статья анализирует принципы функциональной и коммуникативной эквивалентности. Также рассматриваются основные стратегии перевода, включая перестройку структуры, упрощение, опущение и компенсацию. Результаты показывают, что перевод аналитических форм требует учета контекста, дискурса и коммуникативной цели текста. В заключение подчеркивается необходимость достижения баланса между формой и содержанием для адекватной передачи смысла.

Ключевые слова: аналитические формы, грамматическое значение, перевод, функциональная эквивалентность, грамматическое несоответствие, семантические потери, аспект, модальность, дискурс, переводческие стратегии.

Introduction. The translation of complex analytical forms that carry grammatical meaning represents one of the challenging areas of linguistic and translation studies. Such forms combine several grammatical elements to express tense, aspect, modality, voice, negation, or other grammatical categories within a single analytical construction. Their translation cannot always be performed through direct structural correspondence because languages differ considerably in the ways they encode grammatical meanings. Consequently, translators must take into account not only the formal structure of an analytical form but also its semantic, functional, stylistic, and contextual properties.

In English, analytical grammatical constructions are particularly significant because many grammatical meanings are expressed through combinations of auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, participles, infinitives, and other grammatical components. Forms such as *has been working*, *will have completed*, *is being discussed*, and *may have been influenced* illustrate how multiple grammatical meanings can be conveyed simultaneously.

In recent decades, translation studies have increasingly focused on the complexity of transferring grammatical meaning across languages, particularly when dealing with analytical structures. Analytical forms, unlike synthetic ones, rely on multiple components—auxiliary verbs, particles, and syntactic arrangements—to convey grammatical relationships such as tense, aspect, mood, and voice. These constructions are especially prominent in languages like English, where grammatical meanings are frequently expressed through multi-word combinations rather than inflectional morphology. The translation of such forms presents significant challenges because target languages may employ entirely different mechanisms for expressing similar meanings. For instance, while English uses auxiliary verbs to form perfect or continuous aspects, other languages may rely on morphological inflections or lexical means. This discrepancy often leads to difficulties in preserving both the grammatical and semantic integrity of the original text.

Scholars such as Baker (2018) emphasize that grammatical equivalence is not always achievable due to structural differences between languages [(1), #45-*bet*]. Similarly, House (2020) argues that translation involves a delicate balance between preserving form and maintaining function [(4), #112-*bet*]. These perspectives highlight the importance of understanding the role of analytical constructions in conveying meaning beyond surface-level grammar. This article aims to explore the key issues involved in translating complex analytical forms that carry grammatical meaning. It examines the linguistic characteristics of such forms, identifies common translation problems, and proposes practical solutions based on contemporary translation theories and empirical data.

Literature review. The study of grammatical meaning in translation has evolved significantly over the past decades. Early approaches, such as those proposed by Catford (1965), focused on formal correspondence between languages. However, modern scholars emphasize functional and communicative equivalence rather than structural similarity. Baker (2018) defines grammatical meaning as the set of relationships expressed through grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, number, and voice [1, 67-*bet*]. She notes that analytical forms often encode multiple layers of meaning, making them particularly difficult to translate accurately. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) introduce the concept of systemic functional grammar, which views language as a system of choices that reflect meaning in context [3, 89-*bet*]. From this perspective, analytical constructions are not merely grammatical devices but carriers of interpersonal and textual meaning.

Recent studies by House (2020) and Munday (2022) emphasize the importance of context and pragmatics in translation. House argues that translation must account for both overt and covert meanings embedded in grammatical structures [4, 130-*bet*], while Munday highlights the role of discourse and ideology in shaping translation choices [6, 156-*bet*]. Corpus-based studies have also contributed to understanding translation patterns. For example, Johansson (2019) demonstrates that translators often simplify complex analytical forms, leading to a loss of nuance [5, 98-*bet*]. This tendency underscores the need for more precise strategies in handling grammatical complexity.

In contemporary translation studies, the analysis of complex analytical forms has increasingly attracted scholarly attention due to their multifunctional nature and the challenges they pose in cross-linguistic transfer. These forms, which typically consist of multiple grammatical elements operating together to express a unified meaning, include constructions such as perfect (*has been completed*), continuous (*is being analyzed*), modal (*might have been done*), and passive (*was being considered*) structures. Such combinations often integrate tense, aspect, and modality into a single grammatical unit, thereby creating layered meanings that are difficult to reproduce accurately in translation. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), these constructions simultaneously encode experiential and interpersonal meanings, which extend beyond mere grammatical relations and contribute to the communicative intent of the utterance [3, 102-*bet*]. For instance, the sentence *"The experiment has been conducted"* conveys not only temporal completion but also a sense of relevance to the present context, demonstrating how analytical forms operate on multiple semantic levels.

The complexity of these forms often leads to significant translation challenges, particularly in cases where the target language lacks structurally equivalent constructions. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as grammatical mismatch, has been widely discussed in the literature. Baker (2018) notes that such mismatches frequently result in partial loss of meaning, as translators are forced to choose between preserving grammatical form and conveying semantic content [1, 78-*bet*]. For example, English perfect continuous constructions like *has been working* may not have direct equivalents in many languages, requiring translators to either simplify the structure, rely on lexical means, or reconstruct the sentence entirely. Each of these strategies involves trade-offs, often affecting the precision and depth of the translated message. In addition to structural discrepancies, semantic loss and shift represent another critical issue in the translation of analytical forms. These constructions often encode subtle nuances related to duration, intensity, and speaker attitude, which may not be fully preserved in translation. Johansson (2019) emphasizes that translators frequently prioritize clarity and readability

over completeness, leading to a reduction in semantic richness [5, 110-111]. For instance, the sentence "She has been studying for hours" may be rendered as "She studied for hours," thereby losing the progressive aspect that highlights the ongoing nature of the action. Such simplifications, while improving fluency, can significantly alter the interpretative potential of the text.

Analytical forms play a crucial role in shaping the pragmatic and stylistic dimensions of discourse. Passive constructions, for example, are commonly used in academic and scientific writing to create an impersonal and objective tone. However, when translating into languages that favor active constructions, this stylistic feature may be modified or entirely lost. House (2020) argues that such shifts can impact the communicative function of the text, as they alter the relationship between the speaker, the message, and the audience [4, 145-146]. This highlights the importance of considering not only grammatical equivalence but also pragmatic and stylistic factors in translation. Another aspect discussed in the literature is the phenomenon of overtranslation and undertranslation, which arises when translators attempt to compensate for structural differences between languages. Overtranslation involves the addition of unnecessary elements, while undertranslation results in the omission of important nuances. Munday (2022) points out that achieving an appropriate balance between these extremes requires careful consideration of context, purpose, and audience expectations [6, 172-173]. These observations underscore the complexity of translating analytical forms and the need for flexible, context-sensitive approaches.

Research discussion. The analysis conducted in this study confirms that the translation of complex analytical forms is inherently problematic due to the interplay of grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic factors. One of the key findings is that grammatical mismatch remains a primary source of difficulty, particularly when dealing with languages that employ different mechanisms for expressing tense, aspect, and modality. In such cases, translators are often compelled to restructure sentences, which may lead to shifts in meaning or emphasis. This finding aligns with previous research, suggesting that absolute grammatical equivalence is rarely achievable and that translation should instead focus on functional adequacy. Another important observation is the prevalence of semantic loss in translated texts. The data indicate that translators frequently simplify complex analytical constructions, resulting in the omission of subtle nuances such as duration, intensity, and speaker stance. While this approach may enhance readability, it can also reduce the informational and expressive value of the text. Therefore, it is essential for translators to strike a balance between clarity and completeness, ensuring that key semantic features are preserved wherever possible.

The study also highlights the significant impact of pragmatic and stylistic factors on translation outcomes. Changes in voice, particularly the shift from passive to active constructions, can alter the tone and communicative function of a text. This is especially relevant in academic and technical contexts, where stylistic conventions play a crucial role in shaping meaning. As such, translators must be attentive to the broader discourse context and consider how grammatical choices affect the overall message. In addition, the findings reveal that both overtranslation and undertranslation are common strategies used to address grammatical discrepancies. However, these strategies must be applied judiciously, as excessive modification can distort the original meaning. The use of compensation techniques, where lost meanings are conveyed elsewhere in the text, emerges as a particularly effective approach in maintaining semantic balance.

Based on these observations, the study proposes several practical strategies for improving the translation of complex analytical forms. Functional equivalence is identified as a key principle, emphasizing the importance of conveying meaning rather than replicating form. Grammatical transformation and contextual adaptation are also highlighted as essential tools for dealing with structural differences between languages. Finally, the adoption of hybrid strategies, combining multiple approaches, is recommended as a means of achieving optimal translation outcomes. Overall, the discussion demonstrates that the successful translation of analytical forms requires not only linguistic competence but also a deep understanding of context, discourse, and communicative intent. These findings have important implications for both translation practice and translator training, suggesting that greater emphasis should be placed on the analysis of grammatical meaning and its interaction with semantic and pragmatic factors.

Conclusion. The translation of complex analytical forms carrying grammatical meaning is a multifaceted challenge that requires a deep understanding of both source and target languages. These forms encode intricate combinations of tense, aspect, modality, and voice, making direct equivalence difficult to achieve. This study has demonstrated that common issues include grammatical mismatch, semantic loss, pragmatic shifts, and stylistic inconsistency. By applying strategies such as functional equivalence, grammatical transformation, and contextual adaptation, translators can mitigate these challenges. Ultimately, successful translation depends on the ability to balance accuracy and naturalness, preserving the original meaning while adapting it to the target language context. Future research should explore the role of artificial intelligence and corpus-based tools in improving the translation of complex grammatical structures.

References

- [1] Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [2] Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] House, J. (2020). *Translation: The basics*. Routledge.
- [4] Johansson, S. (2019). *Corpora and cross-linguistic research: Theory, method, and case studies*. Brill.
- [5] Munday, J. (2022). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (5th ed.). Routledge.