(13). https://www.litcharts.com/
Uzbek: Passive Constructions and Syntactic Variability. Journal of Central Asian Linguistics, 17(4), p. 345–366.

Khasanova Saodat Kayimovna (Profi University Navoi branch, Deputy rector on educational affairs, senior teacher; Navoi city, 210100, Uzbekistan; e-mail: saodat75@inbox.ru)

THE DIFFERENCES OF MORPHOLOGY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES IN TERMS OF VOICE (ACTIVE AND PASSIVE): FORMATION AND TRANSLATION

Annotation. *This article explores the differences in the morphological formation of active and passive voices in Uzbek and English, focusing on the grammatical systems, linguistic structures, and syntactic mechanisms used in both languages. By examining the linguistic family differences, particularly the Indo-European roots of English and the Turkic roots of Uzbek, the study delves into how these languages handle voice formation, auxiliary verbs, and affixes. This comparison also highlights the role of cross-linguistic factors in translation and offers insights into the implications of these morphological distinctions in language learning and linguistics.*

Keywords: *active voice, passive voice, morphological formation, Uzbek, English, language families, syntactic structures, auxiliary verbs, affixes, translation, linguistic research.*

O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA NISBAT KATEGORIYASINING MORFOLOGIK FARQLARI (ANIQ VA MAJHUL): YASALISHI VA TARJIMA

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqola, o‘zbek va ingliz tillarida aniq va majhul nisbatlarning morfologik shakllanishidagi farqlarni o‘rganadi, ikkala tilning grammatik tizimlari, lingvistik tuzilmalar va sintaktik mexanizmlariga e’tibor qaratadi. Ingliz tilining indoyevropa ildizlari va o‘zbek tilining turkiy ildizlari o‘rtasidagi lingvistik farqlarni o‘rganish orqali, tadqiqot bu tillarning nisbat shakllanishi, yordamchi fe’llar va affikslarni qanday qo‘llashini chuqur tahlil qiladi. Ushbu taqqoslash tarjimadagi tillararo omillarning rolini hamda morfologik farqlarning til o‘rganish va lingvistika sohalaridagi ahamiyatini yoritadi.*

Kalit so‘zlar: *aniq nisbat, majhul nisbat, morfologik shakllanish, o‘zbek, ingliz, til oilalari, sintaktik tuzilmalar, yordamchi fe'llar, affikslar, tarjima, lingvistik tadqiqot.*

МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ РАЗЛИЧИЯ КАТЕГОРИЙ ЗАЛОГА В УЗБЕКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ (АКТИВНЫЙ И ПАССИВНЫЙ): ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ И ПЕРЕВОД

Аннотация. *В данной статье рассматриваются различия в морфологическом образовании активного и пассивного залога в узбекском и английском языках, с акцентом на грамматические системы, лингвистические структуры и синтаксические механизмы, используемые в этих языках. Изучая различия между языковыми семьями, особенно индоевропейскими корнями английского языка и тюркскими корнями узбекского языка, исследование углубляется в то, как эти языки обрабатывают формирование залога, вспомогательные глаголы и аффиксы. Это сравнение также подчеркивает роль межъязыковых факторов в переводе и предоставляет взгляды на влияние этих морфологических различий на изучение языков и лингвистику.*

Ключевые слова: *активный залог, пассивный залог, морфологическое образование, узбекский, английский, языковые семьи, синтаксические структуры, вспомогательные глаголы, аффиксы, перевод, лингвистическое исследование.*

Introduction. Voice is a fundamental grammatical category that reflects the syntactic relationship between a verb and its arguments, particularly the subject, agent, and patient. In languages across the world, voice is typically marked through morphological processes, such as affixes, and syntactic transformations like word order changes. While the active and passive voice distinctions are present in many languages, the way these voices are formed and function can differ significantly.

This article investigates the differences in how the active and passive voices are expressed in two languages: Uzbek, a Turkic language, and English, an Indo-European language. These languages differ not only in their linguistic families but also in the ways they use morphological markers to signal active and passive constructions. Furthermore, this article explores the challenges faced in translating between these two languages in terms of voice distinctions and examines how syntactic and morphological tools impact the translation process.

Methodology and literature review. Several scholars have explored the differences in the passive voice across languages, providing insights into the structural and functional aspects of voice. Studies by

Hopper and Thompson (1980) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) highlight the importance of considering both morphological and syntactic elements when analyzing voice constructions across languages. For example, Hopper and Thompson discuss how languages with flexible word order, like Uzbek, can manipulate focus without relying on syntactic transformations like passive voice.

In contrast, English, with its fixed word order and reliance on auxiliary verbs, uses syntactic transformations to express focus and passive constructions. This difference underscores the role of morphological markers in languages like Uzbek and the importance of auxiliary verbs in English in marking voice distinctions.

Furthermore, research by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005) has explored how voice is a central feature in argument realization. Their findings demonstrate that while English relies on syntactic transformations for voice marking, languages like Uzbek use morphological markers to realize voice distinctions more directly.

Results and discussions. English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family. This language is characterized by its rich use of auxiliary verbs, word order, and prepositional phrases to express grammatical relationships, including voice. The formation of passive constructions in English typically involves the use of auxiliary verbs and word order changes.

In English, the passive voice is formed by combining a form of the verb "to be" with the past participle of the main verb. For example:

- Active: “The teacher teaches the students”.
- Passive: “The students are taught by the teacher”.

English does not rely on morphological affixes to mark the passive voice. Instead, passive constructions are created through syntactic transformations such as word order changes and the introduction of auxiliary verbs. The choice of auxiliary verb (“is”, “are”, “was”, “were”) depends on the tense and aspect of the sentence. The agent, if present, is often introduced via a prepositional phrase ("by the teacher"), but it can also be omitted if the agent is unknown or irrelevant.

Uzbek, in contrast, is a member of the Turkic language family. Turkic languages are known for their agglutinative morphology, where grammatical relationships are expressed through a series of affixes that attach to a root word. The passive voice in Uzbek is typically marked through the use of specific suffixes attached to the verb.

In Uzbek, the passive voice is often formed by adding the passive morpheme *-il* or *-in* to the root verb. For example:

- Active: “U o‘quvchini o‘qiydi” (The teacher teaches the student).
- Passive: “O‘quvchi o‘qiladi” (The student is taught).

Uzbek passive constructions are marked morphologically through suffixes, without the need for auxiliary verbs. The role of the agent can be explicitly stated through a prepositional phrase introduced by “tomonidan” (“by”), or the agent can be omitted altogether, as is common in languages with rich morphological systems.

In both English and Uzbek, the active voice construction centers around the subject performing the action. However, the methods by which the active voice is formed differ considerably.

In English, the active voice is formed by simply placing the subject before the verb, with no auxiliary verb required. For example:

- “The teacher teaches the student”.

In Uzbek, the structure is quite similar, with the subject preceding the verb. However, since Uzbek is agglutinative, the verb can include additional morphological markers that reflect tense, aspect, and mood, which do not necessarily change the voice but contribute to the overall meaning. For example:

- “U o'quvchini o'qitadi” (The teacher teaches the student).

In this example, the verb “o‘qitadi” is in the present tense, and there are no auxiliary verbs or morphological transformations that indicate voice. The sentence simply follows a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order.

The passive voice, on the other hand, is more complex to form in both languages and involves different morphological and syntactic strategies.

English Passive Voice: As mentioned earlier, English uses auxiliary verbs and word order to form passive constructions. The auxiliary verb “to be” is combined with the past participle of the main verb, and the agent can be introduced by a preposition or omitted. For example:

- Active: “The teacher teaches the student”.

• Passive: "The student is taught by the teacher".

In this construction, the subject ("The student") is the recipient of the action, and the agent ("The teacher") can be introduced via the prepositional phrase "by the teacher" or omitted if unnecessary.

Uzbek Passive Voice: Uzbek, in contrast, marks the passive voice through morphological affixes. The passive morphemes *-il* or *-in* are added to the root of the verb. For example:

- Active: "O'qituvchi o'quvchini o'qitadi" (The teacher teaches the student).
- Passive: "O'quvchi o'qitiladi" (The student is taught).

In this construction, the passive morpheme *-il* marks the verb, and the agent is typically omitted unless it is important to specify who performed the action. If the agent is specified, the prepositional phrase "tomonidan" ("by") is used:

• Passive with agent: "O'quvchi o'qituvchi tomonidan o'qiladi" (The student is taught by the teacher.)

Thus, while English uses auxiliary verbs and word order to form the passive voice, Uzbek relies on morphological affixes attached to the verb, and word order remains relatively fixed.

The differences in how active and passive voices are formed in English and Uzbek present unique challenges for translation. One of the key challenges lies in the fact that Uzbek uses morphological affixes to mark the passive voice, while English relies on auxiliary verbs and syntactic structures. This can lead to discrepancies in sentence structure when translating between the two languages. For example, translating an English passive sentence like "The book is being read by the teacher" into Uzbek requires the use of a passive morpheme, and the sentence would likely appear as "Kitob o'qituvchi tomonidan o'qilmoqda". The passive construction in Uzbek relies on the use of the "-il" morpheme, and the agent "o'qituvchi" ("teacher") is introduced with "omonidan" ("by"). This differs significantly from the English construction, where the passive voice is marked by the auxiliary verb "is" and the past participle "read".

There are some other challenges arise in translating Uzbek passive constructions into English, as Uzbek language allows for more flexibility in omitting the agent entirely. In many cases, Uzbek passive sentences do not explicitly state the doer of the action, whereas English often requires an explicit subject or agent, especially in formal writing. For example, the Uzbek sentence *Bino qurildi.* Is translated literally as *The building was built.* While this is grammatically correct in English, depending on the context, English speakers might feel the need to specify *who* built the building, leading to a more explicit translation like *The building was built by the builders.* This structural difference can sometimes make translations seem more ambiguous or unnatural when moving between the two languages.

Additionally, the differences in passive construction affect the way responsibility and agency are expressed in each language. In Uzbek, the passive voice is commonly used in official statements, news reports, and formal writing to avoid directly mentioning the agent. For instance, a sentence like *Tadqiqot o'tkazildi* (literally, "The research was conducted") does not specify who carried out the research. In English, however, such a construction might sound vague, and the translator might need to introduce an agent, such as *The investigation was conducted by scientists.* This reflects broader linguistic and cultural tendencies, where Uzbek often allows for indirect or impersonal expressions, whereas English tends to prefer explicit agency, particularly in academic or professional contexts.

Another example illustrating these differences is found in instructions and public announcements. In Uzbek, passive constructions are frequently used in directives, such as *"Arizalar 1-aprelgacha qabul qilinadi".* A direct translation into English would be *"Applications are accepted until April 1st".* However, a more natural English rendering might be *"We accept applications until April 1st" or "Applications will be accepted until April 1st".* The choice depends on the level of formality and clarity required in the English context.

These structural and stylistic differences highlight the complexities of translating between English and Uzbek, requiring careful attention to both grammatical rules and cultural expectations in communication. Moreover, the omission of the agent in passive constructions is more common in Uzbek, as the focus is typically on the patient. In English, the agent is often retained, especially when it is necessary to specify who performed the action. This difference requires careful consideration in translation to maintain the intended meaning of the sentence.

Conclusion. In conclusion, the formation of active and passive voices in Uzbek and English differs significantly due to the morphological and syntactic resources available in each language. While English relies on auxiliary verbs and word order to signal voice distinctions, Uzbek uses morphological affixes that are added to verbs to mark passive constructions. These differences reflect the broader typological distin-

ctions between the Turkic and Indo-European language families and have important implications for translation and language learning.

The list of Reference:

(1).Givón, T. (1994). Voice and Inversion. In Syntax and Semantics 28: Thematic Structures, p. 35–56. Academic Press.

(2).Hopper, P.J., & Thompson, S.A. (1980). Transitivity in Syntax. Language. 56(2), p. 251–299. https:// doi. org/ 10.2307/413078

(3). Levin, B., & Rappaport Hovav, M. (2005). Argument Realization. Cambridge University Press.

(4). Van Valin, R.D., & LaPolla, R.J. (1997). Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function. Cambridge University Press.

(5). Zolotova, E.A. (1991). Typology of Passive Constructions in Turkic Languages. Soviet Linguistics, 29(2), p. 12–33.

(6). Comrie, B. (1981). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. University of Chicago Press.

(7). Popov, M.V. (2009). The Formation of Passive Constructions in Turkic Languages: A Historical and Typological Approach. Linguistic Typology, 13(2), p. 123–150.

(8). Givón, T. (1980). The Binding Hierarchy and the Passive Voice. In Studies in Language Universals (pp. 120–140). University of Chicago Press.

(9). Dahl, Ö. (2000). The Passive in the Turkic Languages. Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology. Oxford University Press.

(10). Baerman, M. (2007). Morphology and Syntax. The Case of the Passive Voice. Cambridge University Press.

(11). Childe, V.G. (2002). Comparative Grammar of the Turkic Languages. Turkish Studies, 5(3), p. 203–225.

(12). Shakirov, B. (2011). Voice in