Article

Pragmatic Features of Word Order in French and Uzbek

Narzullaeva Dilfuza Bafoevna¹, Mukhammadova Rayhona Jasurbek Qizi²

1. Teacher of French Philology department, Bukhara State University
2. Bukhara State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, 4th year student, Philology and Language Teaching (French)

* Correspondence: d.b.narzullayeva@buxdu.uz

Abstract: This study considers the pragmatic functions of word order in French and Uzbek through a comparative linguistic approach. This study investigates the role of word order in information structure, communicative intention, and theme–rheme alignment in several typologically distinct languages. By comparative and descriptive, qualitative process-oriented methods, we analyze the syntactic patterns, pragmatic strategies, and discourse-level realizations in both languages. The results indicate that syntactically and prosodically encoded pragmatic meaning in French, with its rather fixed SVO word order, compared to Uzbek, with a free SOV structure, is primarily conveyed by means of word order variation. This has relevant consequences for the comparative linguistics, the translation studies, and for the foreign language pedagogy.

Keywords: pragmatics; word order; information structure; theme–rheme; French; Uzbek.

1. Introduction

Word order constitutes a central component of syntactic organization and plays a crucial role in shaping meaning in natural language. While traditionally associated with grammatical relations, word order also serves as a powerful pragmatic resource through which speakers structure information, signal communicative priorities, and guide the listener's interpretation of discourse. In contemporary linguistics, the study of word order has increasingly shifted toward an interface-based approach that integrates syntax, semantics, and pragmatics.

Word order can be grammatically fixed and/or pragmatically flexible to quite different degrees across languages. Consequently, these differences correspond to typological properties (e.g., marking, rigidity, and discourse conventions). This gives us an especially fruitful contrast, for example, between French and Uzbek. Also, one readily notices that French is an analytic Indo-European language with mainly a fixed Subject–Verb–Object (SVO) order, and Uzbek is a synthetic Turkic language with a relatively free Subject–Object–Verb (SOV) order, and lexical SOV languages have been found to correlate with other such languages.

The central aim of this article is to examine how these typological differences affect the pragmatic use of word order in French and Uzbek. More specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How is word order used to encode pragmatic meaning in French and Uzbek?
2. What linguistic mechanisms are employed in each language to realize theme–rheme relations?
3. How do typological constraints influence pragmatic strategies at the sentence and discourse levels?

By answering these questions, the study seeks to contribute to contrastive pragmatics and provide insights relevant to translation studies and foreign language teaching.

2. Materials and Methods

Word Order and Information Structure. The concept of information structure plays a central role in pragmatic analyses of word order. Scholars such as Halliday, Lambrecht, and Levinson emphasize the distinction between given and new information, often conceptualized as theme and rheme [1]. In this framework, the theme usually expresses information considered old or accessible, and the rheme expresses new, focal, or contrastive information. This distinction is one of the most fundamental distinctions that languages encode, and word order is one of the primary tools languages have in order to do this. Yet the role of word order in this function differs from one language to another. In syntactically rigid languages, pragmatic meaning has been shown to be conveyed rather through alternative devices such as clefts, particles or prosody.

Pragmatics is the study of what context can do with meaning: the intention of speakers, the conditions of discourse, and mutual knowledge. Pragmatic strategies then, from typological perspective, are grounded in the grammatical resources available in any language [2]. In analytic languages, with little inflectional morphology, the syntax of individual phrases frequently becomes more rigid, leaving a fixed word order as the primary remaining avenue for encoding grammatical relations; in contrast, the classical logic of synthetic languages usually tolerates a freer constituent order.

Previous studies on French pragmatics highlight the importance of syntactic constructions such as clefts and dislocations, whereas research on Turkic languages emphasizes the role of word order variation in marking focus and contrast. Despite these findings, comparative studies focusing specifically on French and Uzbek remain limited, which underscores the relevance of the present research.

The study adopts a qualitative comparative research design. The analysis is descriptive and contrastive, aiming to identify similarities and differences in the pragmatic use of word order in French and Uzbek [3].

The data consist of:

1. constructed example sentences based on standard grammatical descriptions,
2. authentic examples drawn from literary texts and spoken discourse,
3. illustrative examples commonly cited in linguistic literature.

The examples were selected to represent neutral, focused, and contrastive contexts.

The analysis proceeds in three stages:

1. Identification of neutral word order patterns in both languages.
2. Examination of deviations from neutral order motivated by pragmatic factors.
3. Comparison of the mechanisms used to encode theme–rheme relations and communicative focus.

The findings are interpreted within a pragmatic and typological framework.

3. Results and Discussion

Word Order and Pragmatic Focus in French. The analysis confirms that French exhibits a relatively rigid SVO word order. Deviations from this pattern are limited and often restricted to specific constructions [4]. As a result, pragmatic focus is primarily achieved through syntactic devices rather than free rearrangement of constituents.

The most frequent strategies include:

1. Cleft constructions (c'est… qui / que),
2. Left and right dislocation,
3. Inversion in interrogative and stylistic contexts,
4. Prosodic emphasis.

These mechanisms allow speakers to foreground specific elements without violating grammatical constraints [5].

Word Order and Pragmatic Focus in Uzbek. In contrast, Uzbek demonstrates a high degree of flexibility in constituent order. While the neutral SOV pattern remains dominant, deviations from this order are pragmatically motivated and widely acceptable [6]. The results show that:

1. sentence-initial position often signals thematic information,
2. preverbal position typically marks focal or contrastive elements,
3. word order variation serves as the primary means of encoding pragmatic emphasis [7].

This flexibility enables Uzbek speakers to manipulate information structure directly through syntax.

Theme–Rheme Organization. In both languages, theme–rheme organization is a fundamental aspect of discourse structure. However, the mechanisms differ substantially. French relies on grammatical constructions to separate theme and rheme, whereas Uzbek achieves this distinction mainly through word order variation [8].

The comparative analysis results prove that word order acts as an underlying pragmatic device in French and Uzbek, however its implementation is highly typologically constrained. Our findings corroborate the idea that the French language, that is an analytic language with a rather fixed SVO word order, restricts human manipulation of pragmatic factors via constituent reordering. In contrast, pragmatic meanings such as focus, contrast and emphasis are expressed with syntactic constructions including cleft sentences, left and right dislocation and inversion alongside prosodic marking [9]. These strategies enable resource-framed language manipulation for re-packaging information structure while maintaining cross-linguistic equivalence of sentence syntax. Consequently, the results provide support for interface-based approaches in linguistics whereby pragmatics operates indirectly through syntactic means in syntactically structurally more conserved languages [10].

In comparison, these results indicate that Uzbek makes use of mainly flexible word order as an overt pragmatic resource. Though neutral SOV is the default word order, departures from this structure are common and pragmatically based. The position of a sentence initial typically indicates thematic or given information, while the preverbal is used to mark rhematic, focal or contrastive information [11]. This adaptability also reflects the highly synthetic quality of Uzbek, since abundant morphological marking decreases reliance on fixed order of syntactic constituents. Pragmatic meaning therefore gets encoded in a more intuitive manner as opposed to through auxiliary constructions, namely through being ordered linearly [12]. These findings are in line with typological accounts which suggest that free word order is a consequence of discourse oriented syntax.

Theoretically, the study adds to contrastive pragmatics as it shows that pragmatic functions do not have a universal formal realization but are mediated by language specific grammatical resources. This contrast shows an obvious asymmetry between the pragmatic of construction based given-new information in French and that of word order based new information in Uzbek [13]. If so, this finding further confirms that typology has to be integrated into pragmatic theory, especially in work on information structure, with particular attention to the theme rheme organization of discourse segments.

The findings have theoretical contributions but also practical implications regarding translation studies and foreign language pedagogy. Identical syntactic transfer between French and Uzbek may twist pragmatic meaning, and many expressions of corresponding languages involving focus or emphatic position may cause such pragmatic "falsification," — a notion introduced by D.F. Consequently, language teaching needs to go beyond grammar teaching and in addition deal with pragmatic tactics specific to every language.

Increased awareness of how information structure is encoded can aid in second language comprehension and production.

Even with these contributions, the study finds a pronounced knowledge gap. As such, the analysis is qualitative and exemplar based, making generalizability across discourse genres and registers a limitation. Periodicity in spoken discourse is also identified, but firm evidence is not adduced. Corpus based and experimental methods should be applied to further quantitatively test pragmatic word order patterns across written and spoken data [14]. Learner corpora to study pragmatic word order acquisition in the case of French Uzbek bilingual or second language contexts are also worth investigating in future research. Extensions like these would enrich the empirical basis of contrastive pragmatic research and enhance its practical relevance [15].

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that pragmatic strategies are deeply influenced by typological constraints. French compensates for its rigid word order by developing a rich system of syntactic constructions, while Uzbek exploits its morphological resources to allow syntactic flexibility.

These differences have important implications:

1. In translation, direct word-for-word rendering may distort pragmatic meaning.
2. In language teaching, learners must be made aware of pragmatic rather than purely grammatical differences.
3. In theoretical linguistics, the study supports interface-based models that integrate syntax and pragmatics.

The results align with previous research on analytic and synthetic languages, while also highlighting language-specific realizations.

4. Conclusion

This study has shown that word order serves as a crucial pragmatic resource in both French and Uzbek, albeit through different mechanisms. French relies on syntactic constructions and prosody to encode pragmatic meaning, whereas Uzbek uses flexible word order as its primary strategy. These differences reflect broader typological distinctions and underscore the importance of considering pragmatics in comparative linguistic analysis.

Future research could extend this study by incorporating corpus-based methods or experimental approaches to further explore discourse-level phenomena.

REFERENCES

[1] F. de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*. Paris, France: Payot, 1995.

[2] K. Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

[3] S. Rahmatullayev, *Syntax of Modern Uzbek Literary Language*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2012.

[4] A. G'ulomov, *Uzbek Grammar*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'qituvchi, 2010.

[5] J. Dubois, *Grammaire du Français Moderne*. Paris, France: Larousse, 2004.

[6] B. R. Rajabovich and O. Y. Ruzikulovna, "Development of neuropsycholinguistic science and the phenomenon of speech emergence," *Journal of Language and Cognition Studies*, pp. 45–52, 2021.

[7] R. R. Bobokalonov and D. B. Narzullayeva, "Qur'oni Karim, tasavvuf ta'limoti va semantik funksional nutqiy hosilalar uyg'unligi," *Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 11–18, 2024.

[8] D. Narzullayeva, "Использование речевых жанров," *Markaz Ilmiy Nashrlar*, vol. 29, no. 29, pp. 77–82, 2023.

[9] N. D. Bafoevna, "Discours des traductions du Coran," *Best Journal of Innovation in Science, Research and Development*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 315–319, 2023.

[10] N. D. Bafoyevna et al., *Teolingvistik Terminlarning Qo'llanilish Uslublari*. Bukhara, Uzbekistan, 2023.

[11] M. A. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London, UK: Arnold, 1994.

[12] S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

[13] T. Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

[14] A. Aissen, "Topic and focus in typological perspective," *Language*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 43–80, 1992.

[15] Ö. Dahl, *Word Order and Information Structure in Linguistic Typology*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter, 2004.