ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS

Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

Grammatical And Stylistic Factors Of Word Order Change In Translation (English–Uzbek)

Yulduzxon Okhunjonova Avazjon qizi
Tashkent State Transport University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: yulduzmakhmudjonova@icloud.com

Abstract

English is a verb-medial language that allows modifiers after the noun, whereas Uzbek is verb-final and places every modifier before its head. Translation from English into Uzbek therefore involves constant reordering, yet it is not clear which reorderings the target grammar imposes and which depend on the translator. This article examines English constructions whose word order conflicts with Uzbek and compares their possible Uzbek renderings in terms of grammaticality, naturalness and information structure. The reorderings are classified as obligatory, preferential or optional following Klaudy's model of translation transformations. Reordering inside the noun phrase proved obligatory. Relative clauses, participial phrases and prepositional modifiers move before the head and often require an added participle such as *kelgan* or an existential *bor*. Conditional and temporal clauses and the time–place order of adverbials showed preferential reordering. Causal and concessive clauses and sentence-final adjuncts allow both orders, and the choice affects emphasis. Constructions that mark information structure depend on the Uzbek preverbal focus position. English clefts and passives with a given subject keep their focus only when the focused element is placed before the verb or the object is moved to the front. The translator's freedom thus increases from the phrase to the clause and to the level of focus.

Keywords: word order; permutation; information structure; English–Uzbek translation; obligatory and optional transformations; focus

1. Introduction

Languages with the same basic word order allow a translator to follow the source sentence and adjust only details. English and Uzbek do not share it. English is subject–verb–object and places relative clauses, participial phrases and prepositional phrases after the noun. Uzbek is subject–object–verb, ends the clause with the finite verb and admits no modifier after its head in the written standard (Bodrogligeti, 2003; Johanson & Csató, 1998). The two languages represent the two most frequent word order types (Dryer, 2013) and follow Greenberg's (1963) correlations closely. Uzbek participles occupy the place of English relative clauses, and Uzbek converbs that of adverbial clauses, both before the word they depend on. An English sentence rendered in Uzbek is often reversed from end to beginning even when its content is kept intact.

Word order also organises information. The Prague School described the sentence as moving from given information to new information (Mathesius, 1975; Firbas, 1992), and English controls this movement with marked themes, the passive and cleft sentences (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Lambrecht, 1994). English places unmarked focus at the end of the clause. Turkic languages place it immediately before the verb and reserve the initial position for the topic (Erguvanlı, 1984; İşsever, 2003). A clause-final English element translated into Uzbek may therefore land in the middle of the clause, where it loses its prominence unless it occupies the preverbal slot.

Barkhudarov (1975) listed permutation among the four elementary translation transformations. Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) treated related changes as transposition and Catford (1965) as structure shifts. Retsker (1974) and Komissarov (1990) held that the communicative structure of a sentence should survive changes in its grammatical structure. Studies of related languages show that translators adapt information structure to the target language even when grammar would allow a literal version. Doherty (2006) demonstrated this for English and German, Hasselgård (2004) for English and Norwegian, and Baker (2018) discusses it as a general translation problem. Klaudy (2003) separates obligatory transformations, without which the target text would be ungrammatical, from optional ones

ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS
Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

based on norms and choice, with preferential transformations between them. Shifts also vary with language pair and direction (Klaudy & Károly, 2005).

Word order change in English–Uzbek translation has been mentioned in general descriptions of grammatical transformations but has not been analysed construction by construction. The present study addresses three questions. RQ1 asks which English constructions require reordering in Uzbek. RQ2 asks which of these reorderings are obligatory, preferential or optional. RQ3 asks how reordering affects the information structure of the sentence.

2. Materials and methods

The study compares English constructions with their Uzbek translation equivalents. Six groups were selected because their order conflicts with the Uzbek verb-final, left-branching pattern: postposed noun modifiers, adverbials of time and place, adverbial clauses, existential sentences, constructions marking information structure, and sentence-final free adjuncts. For each group the author, a native speaker of Uzbek, constructed English sentences that isolate one word order problem and set out their possible Uzbek translations. The examples illustrate grammatical possibilities and do not represent frequencies. The Uzbek variants were checked against reference grammars (Bodrogligeti, 2003; Johanson & Csató, 1998) and judged for grammaticality, naturalness in written Uzbek and preservation of the source information structure. An asterisk (*) marks ungrammatical variants and a question mark (?) marks variants that are grammatical but marked or unnatural in written prose. Examples are numbered, with the English sentence followed by its Uzbek versions.

Each reordering was classified according to Klaudy (2003). A reordering was considered **obligatory** if the English order produces an ungrammatical Uzbek sentence, **preferential** if the English order is grammatical but marked in written prose, and **optional** if both orders are natural and differ only in emphasis or style.

3. Analysis

3.1 Obligatory reordering

Reordering is unavoidable whenever an English modifier follows its head. Relative clauses and participial phrases move in front of the noun, and the finite verb of a relative clause becomes a participle:

1) The woman who taught me English now works in Bukhara.
Menga ingliz tilini o'rgatgan ayol hozir Buxoroda ishlaydi.

2) a house built by my grandfather
bobom qurgan uy

A clause introduced by *kim* after the noun (**Ayol, kim menga ingliz tilini o'rgatgan, …*) does not occur in modern written Uzbek, so there is no grammatical alternative. Prepositional modifiers move as well, and here the reordering often forces an addition. In 3) the ablative *akamdan* cannot attach to *xat* on its own and needs the participle *kelgan* 'that came'. In 4) the prepositional phrase becomes a possessive construction, literally 'a girl whose hair is long'.

3) I have read the letter from my brother.
Akamdan kelgan xatni o'qib chiqdim.

4) a girl with long hair
sochi uzun qiz

Barkhudarov (1975) treated such combinations of permutation and addition as complex transformations. The added word is a consequence of the move, not an independent decision. Indirect questions and object clauses belong to the same group. They are nominalised and placed before the verb, and their subject takes the genitive:

5) I don't know why she left.
Uning nega ketganini bilmayman.

3.2 Preferential reordering

In a second group the English order is grammatical in Uzbek but sounds marked in writing. Adverbials of time and place are a simple case. English names the place first, Uzbek the time:

ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS
Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

6) We met in Samarkand last summer.
O'tgan yozda Samarqandda uchrashdik.
?Samarqandda o'tgan yozda uchrashdik.

The second version moves *o'tgan yozda* into the slot before the verb and suggests that the time is the point of the sentence. Conditional and temporal clauses are another case. Written Uzbek puts them first, as in 7) and 8). A conditional added at the end with *agar* is common in speech but reads as a trace of the source in a written text, and *qachonki* 'when' sounds bookish today.

7) Call me if you need anything.
Biror narsa kerak bo'lsa, menga qo'ng'iroq qiling.

8) I'll tell him when he comes back.
Qaytib kelganida unga aytaman.

Existential sentences also belong here, with one complication. Uzbek normally puts the place first and ends with *bor*, as in 9). When the subject is already known, as in 10), it comes first. The order therefore carries some of the meaning of the English article, and reversing it changes what is presented as new.

9) There is a pharmacy round the corner.
Burilishda dorixona bor.

10) The pharmacy is round the corner.
Dorixona burilishda.

3.3 Optional reordering

The third group allows both orders, and the choice affects emphasis rather than grammaticality. Causal clauses are the clearest example:

11) She didn't come to the lesson because her son was ill.
O'g'li kasal bo'lgani uchun u darsga kelmadi.
U darsga kelmadi, chunki o'g'li kasal edi.

The first version ends on the main event and sounds neutral. The second leaves the reason for last, which suits a context where someone has just asked why she was absent. Concessive clauses behave in the same way, except that the postposed version with *garchi* in 12) has a literary, slightly old-fashioned ring.

12) He went to work although he had a fever.
Isitmasi bo'lsa ham, ishga bordi.
Ishga bordi, garchi isitmasi bor edi.

Sentence-final free adjuncts also leave the translator two routes. In 13) the detail can become a converb at the start of the sentence, where it turns into background, or a sentence of its own, which keeps the small pause that English places before it.

13) He walked out, his hands in his pockets.
Qo'llarini cho'ntagiga solib, u chiqib ketdi.
U chiqib ketdi. Qo'llari cho'ntagida edi.

The most consequential choices concern focus. An English cleft singles out one element, and Uzbek can express the same emphasis only by placing that element directly before the verb, sometimes with *aynan* 'precisely'. In 14) the object is moved forward so that *onam* stands next to the verb. The neutral order, given second, is correct but merely reports what the mother did. In 15) *aynan* keeps the university in focus, while the second version turns it into a background setting.

14) It was my mother who chose this name.
Bu ismni onam tanlagan.
Onam bu ismni tanlagan.

15) It was at university that they met.
Ular aynan universitetda tanishgan.
Universitetda ular tanishgan.

ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS
Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

Passive sentences raise the same issue. In 16) the bridge is already known and the designer is the new information. Of the three Uzbek versions, only the first keeps this distribution. It uses the active voice with the object in first position, and the accusative ending keeps *ko'prikni* recognisable as the object. The passive with *tomonidan* sounds like an official report, and the neutral subject-first order moves the focus back to the bridge.

16) The bridge was designed by a young engineer from Fergana.
Ko'prikni farg'onalik yosh muhandis loyihalagan.
Ko'prik farg'onalik yosh muhandis tomonidan loyihalangan.
Farg'onalik yosh muhandis ko'prikni loyihalagan.

4. Results

The constructions examined fall into three groups according to the freedom left to the translator. Reordering is obligatory whenever an English modifier follows its head, because Uzbek has no grammatical position for a modifier after the noun. Relative clauses, participial phrases, prepositional modifiers and object clauses therefore move in front of their heads, often together with an added participle or possessive construction. Reordering is preferential with conditional and temporal clauses, the time–place order of adverbials and existential sentences, where the English order is possible but sounds marked in written Uzbek. In existential sentences the order of place and subject also signals whether the subject is new or known. Reordering is optional with causal and concessive clauses, sentence-final adjuncts and constructions that mark focus. Both orders are grammatical in these cases but distribute emphasis differently, and English clefts and passives keep their focus only when the focused element is placed directly before the Uzbek verb.

5. Discussion

Reordering in English–Uzbek translation operates on three levels with different degrees of freedom. Inside the noun phrase the translator has no choice. Uzbek offers no position for a modifier after its head, so relative clauses, participial phrases and prepositional modifiers move and often bring an added participle or existential with them. These are obligatory transformations in Klaudy's (2003) sense and follow directly from the correlations described by Greenberg (1963). At clause level the status depends on the clause type. Conditional, temporal and object clauses are fronted almost always, whereas causal and concessive clauses and free adjuncts allow both orders. At the level of information structure a neutral order is always available, but it often expresses a different focus from the English sentence, as the cleft and passive examples show. A single count of permutations would mix forced and chosen changes. It would overstate the translator's freedom in the noun phrase and hide it between clauses and at the level of focus, where the real decisions are made.

The main difficulty lies in the opposite placement of unmarked focus. English stresses the end of the clause, and Uzbek stresses the position before the verb. A translation that keeps the English sequence of constituents as far as Uzbek grammar allows moves the focal element into the middle of the clause. Preserving the communicative structure, as Retsker (1974) and Komissarov (1990) required, means identifying the focus of the English sentence and building the Uzbek sentence around the preverbal slot. Uzbek provides the necessary means. Case marking allows object fronting without ambiguity, *aynan* strengthens contrastive focus, and the order of locative and subject in existential sentences separates new from known referents. Doherty (2006) and Hasselgård (2004) described such adjustments for German and Norwegian as a matter of preference. For English and Uzbek they are a condition for keeping the focus of the source.

Reordering also affects rhythm and tone. Fronted subordinate clauses create long, left-branching sentences that end with the main event. This pattern is typical of literary Uzbek but slows down narration that is brisk in English. Keeping the English order with *chunki*, *lekin* or a new sentence preserves the pace, although accumulated connectives or a cause marked twice (*chunki ... bo'lgani uchun*) make the text sound translated. The translator's attention is therefore best spent where choice exists. The order inside the noun phrase is fixed by grammar, while the order of clauses and the position of focus require a decision based on what the English sentence emphasises.

ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS
Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

6. Conclusion

English constructions whose order conflicts with Uzbek fall into three groups. Noun modifiers, object clauses and indirect questions are moved before their heads or predicates, often with an added participle or existential, and these changes are obligatory. Conditional and temporal clauses, time–place order and existential sentences are reordered preferentially. Causal and concessive clauses and free adjuncts allow both orders. In constructions that mark information structure, only the use of the preverbal position and object fronting preserves the focus of English clefts and passives with a given subject.

The analysis relies on constructed examples and the author's native-speaker judgments. It therefore describes possibilities and tendencies but does not measure frequencies. A corpus study of published English–Uzbek translations would show how often translators choose each option, and the acceptability judgments for marked variants should be tested with a larger group of speakers.

References

1. Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
2. Barkhudarov, L. S. (1975). *Yazyk i perevod: Voprosy obshchei i chastnoi teorii perevoda* [Language and translation: Issues of general and specific translation theory]. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
3. Bodrogligeti, A. J. E. (2003). *An academic reference grammar of modern literary Uzbek* (Vols. 1–2). Lincom Europa.
4. Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
5. Doherty, M. (2006). *Structural propensities: Translating nominal word groups from English into German*. John Benjamins.
6. Dryer, M. S. (2013). Order of subject, object and verb. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. https://wals.info/chapter/81
7. Erguvanlı, E. E. (1984). *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. University of California Press.
8. Firbas, J. (1992). *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Greenberg, J. H. (1963). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of language* (pp. 73–113). MIT Press.
10. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
11. Hasselgård, H. (2004). Thematic choice in English and Norwegian. *Functions of Language*, 11(2), 187–212. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.11.2.03has
12. İşsever, S. (2003). Information structure in Turkish: The word order–prosody interface. *Lingua*, 113(11), 1025–1053.
13. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. Á. (Eds.). (1998). *The Turkic languages*. Routledge.
14. Klaudy, K. (2003). *Languages in translation: Lectures on the theory, teaching and practice of translation*. Scholastica.
15. Klaudy, K., & Károly, K. (2005). Implicitation in translation: Empirical evidence for operational asymmetry in translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(1), 13–28. https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.6.2005.1.2

ACADEMIA ONE
PEER REVIEWED JOURNALS
Open Herald: Periodical of Methodical Research
Volume 4, Issue 11, November, 2026
ISSN (E): 2810-6385
Website: https://academiaone.org/index.php/6

16. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty)* [Translation theory: Linguistic aspects]. Vysshaya shkola.
17. Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Mathesius, V. (1975). *A functional analysis of present day English on a general linguistic basis* (J. Vachek, Ed.; L. Dušková, Trans.). Mouton.
19. Retsker, Ya. I. (1974). *Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika* [Translation theory and translation practice]. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
20. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans. & Eds.). John Benjamins.