

PAPER

FORMAL MEANS OF EXPRESSING COMMUNICATIVE (ACTUAL) STRUCTURE IN UZBEK: PROSODY, WORD ORDER, PARTICLES, SYNTACTIC REPETITION AND DETACHMENT

Bazarov O. O.^{1,*}

¹Kokand State University, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

* bazarov-o@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper describes the inventory of formal means by which the invariant sentence pattern of Uzbek is adapted to a concrete communicative situation — that is, realized as an utterance — and by which particular constituents are actualized as theme or rheme. Working with a corpus of literary and colloquial Uzbek and applying the diagnostic question test together with transformation and componential analysis, the study classifies these means into theme-marking and rheme-marking devices and shows their interaction. Intonation (prosody) is the primary and ever-present means; the remaining devices perform their function against its background and in cooperation with it. Word order — the fronting of the actualized constituent to the pre-predicate position, where it receives logical stress — is the leading device in Uzbek, in which the actualized constituent stands only immediately before the predicate. Particles, intensifiers and modal words attach an additional logical or emotive meaning to a communicative constituent and thereby single it out; syntactic repetition (sentence reduplication) and detached constituents build the further stages of a multi-stage communicative structure. The results refine the description of Uzbek communicative syntax and distinguish the communicative effect of word-order change from its merely stylistic effect.

Key words: Uzbek language; actual division; theme and rheme; intonation; logical stress; word order; inversion; particle (yuklama); reduplication; detachment; information structure.

Introduction

The sentence, as the highest-rank unit of language, is realized in speech as an utterance

Compiled on: May 14, 2026.

Copyright: ©2026 by the authors. Submitted to *Advances in Science and Humanities* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

(Uzb. *jumla*). The content of a sentence is formed by the interaction of a propositional, a modal and a communicative component; and it is the communicative component — the division of the utterance into a *theme* (the support point, usually given) and a *rheme* (the communicative centre, usually new and important) — that turns an abstract sentence pattern into a message adjusted to its context. A single sentence pattern thus yields a communicative paradigm, whose members, the communicative variants of the sentence, are selected by the speaker according to communicative aim. The units and the lexicogrammatical factors of this structure in Uzbek are treated in a companion study; the present paper takes up the complementary question.

That question is the following: by what linguistic means is the invariant sentence pattern realized as a situated utterance, and by what means are its individual constituents actualized as theme or rheme? The aim of the study is to identify the types and functions of the means of actual division in Uzbek and to show how they combine. The means fall into two classes according to their essence — those that single out the theme and those that single out the rheme — and comprise intonation, word order, particles together with certain intensifiers and modal words, syntactic repetition, and detached constituents. Each of these is examined in turn below.

Materials and Methods

The study draws on the same corpus as its companion — simple and compound sentences from the prose fiction of A. Qodiriy, Cho'lpon, A. Qahhor, O. Yoqubov, P. Qodirov, S. Ahmad, O'. Hoshimov, J. Abdullaxonov, A. Muqimov and others, from the poetry of E. Vohidov and A. Oripov, and from the colloquial style. The principal procedures are the question test (Uzb. *so'roq*), which verifies which constituent a given device actualizes; transformation, which generates the communicative variants of a single lexical filling by reordering; opposition, which contrasts those variants; componential analysis; and the presupposition test, which tracks the shift of presupposition as the placement of logical stress changes. The object is treated as a system, in

the dialectical relation of form and function. It should be noted that the description of prosody here is auditory and impressionistic, in the descriptive tradition of Shcherba, Peshkovsky and Matusevich, rather than instrumental; the instrumental verification of the intonational correlates is a separate task.

Results

Intonation (prosody)

Intonation is the primary means of expressing communicative structure. It plays a decisive role in the formation of every sentence and is one of the sentence's permanent, characteristic features — in Shcherba's image, intonation manifests the sentence as the rails or the railway carry the train. All the other means perform their function against the background of intonation and in cooperation with it. In its components, sentence intonation comprises melody, logical stress, rhythmic stress and pause, with intensity, tempo and timbre as secondary components. Following V. G. Gak, intonation discharges three functions in the sentence: a structural-syntactic function (marking completeness, forming the syntactic components of the utterance and the declarative, interrogative and imperative types); a logical-communicative function (singling out the informative nucleus — the theme and the rheme); and an emotional-expressive function (conveying content shades and feelings bound up with the speech situation). It is the second function that concerns us here.

Two ways of singling out a constituent logically are recognized for Uzbek: by changing the order, and without changing it; the first is characteristic of Uzbek. In the first, prosody accompanies order — the actualized constituent moves before the predicate, takes the logical stress, and is preceded by a pause; in the second, prosody clearly leads, in accordance with Peshkovsky's principle of compensation, whereby the weight of intonation grows as that of the grammatical means declines. Among the actualizing prosodic means are stress and the tempo and pause associated with it. Following the tradition of M. I. Matusevich, one distinguishes word stress, syntagmatic stress

and the distinguishing stress, the last comprising logical and emphatic stress. Logical stress singles out the constituent that is important to the thought; the emphatic (emotional-expressive) stress, carried chiefly by timbre and realized with greater force, singles out the emotive side. The diagnostic value of stress is shown by the fact that both the question and the presupposition shift with its placement, as in the set (1)–(3):

(1) *Sherzod soatini derazadan tushib turgan yorug'ga tutdi.* — Sherzod held his watch to the light coming through the window. (Q.: to what? — presupposition: Sherzod was in the dark.)

(2) *Sherzod soatini derazadan tushib turgan yorug'ga tutdi.* — It was his watch that Sherzod held to the light. (Q.: what? — presupposition: he held nothing else to it.)

(3) *Sherzod soatini derazadan tushib turgan yorug'ga tutdi.* — It was Sherzod who held his watch to the light. (Q.: who? — presupposition: no one else did.)

(In (1)–(3) the constituent bearing the logical stress — successively *yorug'ga*, *soatini* and *Sherzod* — is the rheme.) Uzbek has its own devices for expressing emphasis. The first is the lengthening of a vowel or the gemination of a consonant within the word: here the denotative meaning is unchanged while a connotative meaning — joy, delight, pity, indignation, astonishment, reproach, fright, regret and the like — is added, as in (4):

(4) *Bugun mazza qildim; Ho-oziroq olib kel; A-ahmoq bola ekansan; O'chi-ir ovozingni; Menga ruxsat beri-ing.* — I had a wonderful time today; Bring it right now; What a foolish boy you are; Be quiet; Do give me leave.

The second is by means of certain particles and intensifiers, which are the material forms of emphasis and serve to underscore a constituent emotively, as in (5); a rheme group may even be bracketed, with a preposed intensifier such as *biram*, *shunday*, *shunaqa*, *shunaqangi* and the postposed particle *-ki*, as in (6):

(5) *Mening brigadamda / qirq uch kilo ko'sak tersa-ya!* — In my brigade she picked forty-three kilos of cotton bolls! (A. Qahhor)

(6) *Hayot / shunday go'zalki!* — Life is so beautiful!

Word order

Word order is a further principal means of expressing communicative structure. The order of words is the arrangement of the syntactic constituents relative to one another in a given utterance, and it operates simultaneously at two levels of sentence organization — the syntactic and the actual. Its role at the two levels is not the same. At the syntactic level, word order in Uzbek does not distinguish meaning: it does not differentiate grammatical categories, this being the task of case marking. At the actual level, by contrast, it is a distinguishing means. The syntactic structure is therefore subordinate to the actual structure, since every syntactic arrangement serves to reflect a particular communicative aim; in Kovtunova's formulation, the relation of word order to actual division is that of form to function.

The distinctive rule for Uzbek is that the constituent actualized by word order stands only immediately before the predicate: the pre-predicate position is the rheme zone. This distinguishes Uzbek from Azerbaijani, for which K. M. Abdullaev posits a "strong" degree of actualization with the actualized constituent at the end of the sentence. In Uzbek, communicatively unimportant constituents are placed after the predicate; a post-predicate constituent, even if it carries some importance, is not an independent rheme but at most a component of the rheme group. Inversion must accordingly be understood in two senses relative to the communicative constituents: external inversion concerns the communicative constituents themselves, whereas internal inversion is the mutual transposition of the components within a single communicative constituent — within the theme or within the rheme. Internal inversion has no bearing on the actual structure, as (7)–(8) show — here the transposed variants do not differ in actual division, the logical stress remaining on the predicate — and it arises for other reasons, chiefly stylistic purpose or the requirements of verse:

(7) *U / sig'madi zamonga. = U / zamonga sig'madi.* — He did not fit the era. (E. Vohidov)

(8) *Umrin / o'tdi sarsonlikda-sargardonlikda. = Umrin / sarsonlikda-sargardonlikda o'tdi.* — My life passed in wandering and hardship. (A. Oripov)

When, however, an utterance that lacks an actual division is inverted, the predicate is singled out and becomes the rheme, as in (9):

(9) *Shamol boshlandi*. → *Boshlandi / shamol*. — The wind began. → It began — the wind. (the onset expected in advance)

On the “freedom” or “rigidity” of order in Turkic, Uzbek is best regarded as an intermediate type, with a strengthening tendency toward freedom (G‘ulomov, Hayitmetov); and the freedom of order in a language testifies to the breadth of its actualizing possibilities, since the constituents of a given sentence can be rearranged, without damage to the overall meaning, so as to express varying communicative aims. The constituents whose syntactic function does not change with position — the subject, the object, the adverbial and the modifier — become the important constituent, the rheme, when placed before the predicate, or, together with the predicate, form the rheme group of which they are the centre. The actualization of each is illustrated below, together with the constraints on it.

The subject. In the majority of cases a subject placed before the predicate is the important constituent: *Tashqarida / musicha kukuvladi* (‘Outside, a dove cooed’, O‘. Hoshimov); *Mazidbekdan nariroqda / semiz Yoqubbek o‘tirgan edi* (P. Qodirov). Yet the subject cannot always be moved to the pre-predicate position without affecting the grammatical form of another constituent: when an indefinite-accusative object stands immediately before the predicate, swapping it with the subject produces ambiguity — *Men / gul sotib oldim* (‘I bought a flower’) beside the questionable *Gul men sotib oldim(?)* — and definiteness of the object is then required: *Gulni / men sotib oldim*. Nor can a manner- or degree-adverb bound to the verb be “pushed aside” by the subject: *Biz uni / ko‘p ko‘rganmiz* beside the questionable *Ko‘p uni biz ko‘rganmiz(?)*. Finally, a pre-predicate subject need not be the important constituent: here the melody is decisive, a pause before the subject placing it in the rheme, a pause after it placing it in the theme, as (10)–(11) show for a nominal-predicate sentence:

(10) *Oqmo‘yinning / tuprog‘i yengil*. — As for Oqmo‘yin, its soil is light. (subject in the rheme)

(11) *Oqmo‘yinning tuprog‘i / yengil*. — Oqmo‘yin’s

soil is light. (subject in the theme)

The modifier. A qualitative attribute before a nominal predicate is the important constituent, forming the rheme group with the predicate: *Siz / mard insonsiz* (‘You are a brave person’); *Bular / yomon odamlar ekan* (‘These, it turns out, are bad people’). Characteristically, the qualitative attribute cannot independently be the theme; only a detached attribute may pass to the position after the modified noun and become a second-degree rheme, yielding a polyrhematic utterance, as in (12):

(12) *Qobil bobo / — yalang bosh, yalang oyoq, yaktakchan // og‘il eshigi yonida turib dagh-dagh qaltirardi...* — Qobil bobo — bareheaded, barefoot, in a single shirt — stood by the barn door, trembling violently... (A. Qahhor)

The object. An object in the pre-predicate position is likewise communicatively important: *Sherzod tomiriga / ukol qildirishni yoqtirmasdi* (O‘. Hoshimov); *O‘sha kuni Arslon aka jiyaniga / faner undirib berdi* (P. Qodirov). In some cases a pre-predicate object nonetheless falls within the theme, when prosody underscores the predicate separately: *Shayxning bu tilagini / qaytarib bo‘lmas edi* (O. Yoqubov).

The adverbial. Adverbials differ in the “rigidity” and “freedom” of their position. Rigid adverbials enter into a tight semantic-grammatical bond with the predicate and do not change place; free adverbials may occupy various positions, the pre-predicate position being that of their actualization: *Gulshan / boyagi yetti qizlar yonida uxlamoqchi edi* (A. Qodiriy); *U / ko‘kraging qattiq sanchganidan uyg‘onib ketdi* (O‘. Hoshimov). A pre-predicate adverbial too may fall within the theme according to pause and presupposition, as the variants (13)–(14) of one sentence show:

(13) *Xo‘jayinning / yo‘qligiga achindilar*. — They pitied the master’s absence. (presupposition: not his presence)

(14) *Xo‘jayinning yo‘qligiga / achindilar*. — At the master’s absence, they were sorry. (presupposition: they were not glad)

The predicate. The predicate is the central constituent of the sentence, embodying predicativity and carrying its new information; this property makes it characteristic of the actual level as well. It forms the rheme group with the

constituent immediately preceding it, or, singled out by prosody, functions independently as the rheme. Its actualization by change of order is inversion — but with a caution: if an utterance that already has an actual division is inverted, theme and rheme are merely transposed (yielding the subjective order) and no constituent is actualized, the variants differing only in emotional-expressive shade (*Men bularga / ko'rsatib qo'yaman* = *Ko'rsatib qo'yaman / men bularga*). It is only when an utterance lacking an actual division is inverted that the predicate is singled out and becomes the rheme.

Particles, intensifiers and modal words

Besides intonation and word order, Uzbek expresses communicative structure by means of particles (Uzb. *yuklamalar*), certain intensifiers and modal words. The framing notion is that of the sentence form (*gapshakl*), parallel to the word form (*so'zshakl*): just as a lexeme acquires particular word forms within particular sentences, so a particular sentence acquires particular speech, or communicative, forms within the various texts and contexts in which it functions. Particles are not the morphological forms of words; they are means of forming the communicative or speech forms of the sentences built with their help. One and the same sentence takes different communicative forms, as (15) illustrates with the particles *-ku*, *-yoq* and *-da*; and the interrogative *-mi*, whose meaning is likewise not conditioned by the lexical meaning of any word class but forms the interrogative communicative form of the sentence, may attach to a word of any class, as in (16):

(15) *U-ku kecha Toshkentdan kelgan...*; *U kechayoq Toshkentdan kelgan*; *U kecha Toshkentdan kelgan-da...* — As for him, he came from Tashkent yesterday...; He came from Tashkent only yesterday; He did come from Tashkent yesterday...

(16) *Keldimi? Shoirami? Qizilmi? Bittami? Umi?* — Did (he) come? A poet? Red? Just one? Him?

In function, a particle stands in contact or distant position relative to a communicative constituent and loads it with a logical or emotive additional meaning, thereby serving to single that constituent out. The functions of the emphatic-affix particles correspond to those of intonation. The purely emphatic particles *-ki*, *-ku*, *-u/-yu*, *-da*, *-oq/-*

yoq are specialized for singling out themes and rhemes across sentence types and contexts; the interrogative and negative particles emphasize rhemes through the meanings of questioning and negation; the word-particles single out the actual constituent on the basis of an additional meaning; the intermediate adverb-particles differentiate the rheme with quantitative (intensifying) and emotional-expressive shades; and the modal words point to the rheme by marking an attitude to the predicative feature.

Syntactic repetition (sentence reduplication)

A specific syntactic repetition — the reduplication of the sentence — is likewise closely bound up with communicative structure and serves to express it. For this purpose a sentence is repeated, fully or elliptically, with stress on the actual constituent; if the repetition is elliptical, the actual constituent is retained and the remaining constituents do not take part. Exact repetition, partial repetition, certain synonymic and grammatical modifications, and repetition with particles and expressive means single out rhemes, and in doing so add emotional-expressive shades to them.

Detached constituents

Detached explanatory constituents and qualifiers — and likewise detached explanatory clauses — participate in the sentence as means specific to communicative structure, appearing as the devices that bring about the next stage of a multi-stage (staged) communicative structure. The detachment of a constituent in the course of speech serves to clarify the meaning of a particular constituent and to add supplementary meanings to the principal content of the utterance; a detached constituent is accompanied by a secondary or additional predication. The information conveyed by a detached qualifier is, though new to the hearer, of the second degree relative to the fully predicative information of the predicate group, and the detachment of each constituent, together with the supplementary meanings it produces, has its own specific properties, as the polyrhematic structure of (12) above illustrates.

Discussion

Taken together, the means of adapting the sentence invariant to a concrete situation — of turning a gap into a jumla — fall, by their essence, into those that single out the theme and those that single out the rheme. Intonation underlies them all; word order is the leading device in Uzbek; and the pre-predicate slot is the rheme zone. When the rheme is expressed by a constituent other than the predicate, the distinguishing stress is the actualizing means, and the farther the actualized constituent stands from the predicate, the stronger the melody; when the distinguishing stress is carried by other material means — particles, intensifiers, repetition — the weight of intonation correspondingly decreases. The emphatic pronunciation that serves emphatic stress is at the same time a means of expressing additional emotional-expressive meanings.

The interaction of the means is thus one of hierarchy and compensation, in the sense of Peshkovsky's principle. Word order in its usual, invariant arrangements reflects the objective distinction of theme and rheme; the alteration of the invariant by word order draws attention to the rheme through the reverse of the usual order, that is, through an unexpected position. Two cautions follow from the analysis and bear emphasizing. First, the syntactic means of actualization — word order, syntactic repetition and the detachment of constituents — must be kept apart from one another in their effects, since each has its own system. Second, and more importantly, internal inversion is stylistic or poetic, not communicative: the mere transposition of components within a theme or a rheme does not actualize any constituent, and the analyst must not read a communicative effect into a word-order change that carries none. Against the background of Turkic and general linguistics, the Uzbek profile is distinctive in confining word-order actualization to the pre-predicate position and in its intermediate degree of order freedom.

The results refine the description of Uzbek communicative syntax and are applicable to the preparation of manuals and special courses and to work on the culture of speech. Their principal limitation is that the prosodic description is auditory rather than instrumental; the instrumental phonetic verification of the

intonational correlates of theme and rheme — the measurement of the melody, intensity, duration and pause associated with logical and emphatic stress — remains a task for further research, as does the extension of the comparison to other Turkic languages.

Conclusion

Uzbek possesses a rich inventory of means for adapting the invariant of the sentence's communicative paradigm to a given actual situation, and these means divide by their essence into theme-marking and rheme-marking devices. Intonation (prosody) is the primary and ever-present means, and the others operate against its background and in cooperation with it. Word order is the leading device in Uzbek: the constituent to be actualized is brought to the pre-predicate position and endowed with logical stress, while a distinctive feature of order is the appearance of a supplementary rheme when the modifier–modified inversion occurs; inversions that do not affect communicative structure also exist and arise mainly for stylistic purposes or the requirements of verse. Particles and modal words, standing in contact or distant position, load a communicative constituent with an additional logical or emotive meaning; syntactic repetition, in full or elliptical form, singles out the rheme with an emotional-expressive colouring; and detached constituents, carrying a secondary predication, realize the further stages of a multi-stage communicative structure. Together these intonational, lexico-morphological and syntactic means form the communicative forms — the paradigms — of the Uzbek sentence.

References

1. Abdullaev, K. M. (1983). Актуальное членение предложения в азербайджанском языке. Советская тюркология, 1, 61–75.
2. Adamec, P. (1966). Порядок слов в современном русском литературном языке. Прага: Academia.
3. Bally, Ch. (1955). Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. Москва: Изда-

тельство иностранной литературы.

4. Bazarov, O. (1983). Частицы в узбекском языке. (Автореферат кандидатской диссертации). Москва.
5. Firbas, J. (1992). Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Gak, V. G. (1977). Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. Ленинград: Просвещение.
7. Hayitmetov, K. (1984). O'zbek tilida gapning aktual bo'linishi va pozitsion masalalari. Toshkent.
8. Kovtunova, I. I. (1969). Порядок слов в русском литературном языке. Москва: Наука.
9. Kovtunova, I. I. (1976). Современный русский язык. Порядок слов и актуальное членение предложения. Москва: Просвещение.
10. Mathesius, V. (1967 [1939]). О так называемом актуальном членении предложения. В Пражский лингвистический кружок (с. 239–245). Москва: Прогресс.
11. Matusевич, М. И. (1976). Современный русский язык. Фонетика. Москва: Просвещение.
12. Nikolaeva, T. M. (1982). Семантика акцентного выделения. Москва: Наука.
13. Nurmonov, A. (1988). Gap haqida sintaktik nazariyalar. Toshkent: Nizomiy nomidagi pedagogika instituti.
14. Peshkovsky, A. M. (1956). Русский синтаксис в научном освещении (7-е изд.). Москва: Учпедгиз.
15. Pumpyansky, A. L. (1974). Информационная роль порядка слов в научной и технической литературе. Москва: Наука.
16. Shcherba, L. V. (1957). Избранные работы по русскому языку. Москва: Учпедгиз.