



THE DOCTRINE OF THE COMMUNICATIVE (ACTUAL) STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE AND ITS RECEPTION IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT, CONCEPTUAL APPARATUS AND THE LANGUAGE-SPEECH DISTINCTION

O.O.Bazarov

Kokand State University, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22958528>

Abstract. This paper reconstructs the theoretical foundations of the doctrine of the communicative (actual) structure of the sentence and traces its reception in Uzbek linguistics. Distinguishing the sentence as a unit of language (*gap*) from the utterance as a unit of speech (*jumla*), it presents the communicative structure as the third constituent of sentence content, alongside the propositional and the modal constituents. It surveys the historical development of the doctrine — from antiquity and the Port-Royal grammarians through H. Weil (1844), the psychologicistic tradition (Gabelentz, Paul, Fortunatov, Peshkovsky) and V. Mathesius, who first established the phenomenon as a syntactic one, to its elaboration in the Prague and Russian schools — and documents its independent Central Asian antecedents (al-Zamakhshari's *mavzu* and *mahmul*; Fitrat) together with its modern Uzbek study. Drawing on a corpus of Uzbek utterances, it sets out the conceptual apparatus — theme and rheme, the communicative paradigm, and syntagmatically independent and dependent utterances — and analyses the terminological controversy surrounding both the phenomenon and its units. It argues that, possessing its own linguistic means and belonging to the content side of the text, the actual structure is a proper object of communicative and text linguistics.

Keywords: Uzbek language; functional sentence perspective; actual division; theme and rheme; sentence and utterance; language and speech; history of linguistics; Central Asian linguistic tradition; terminology.

1. Introduction

As the highest-rank unit of language, the sentence is an integrity formed by the organic connection of several aspects — intonational, semantic, modal, formal-grammatical and communicative. Traditional syntax, concerned mainly with the interior of the sentence, produced as its culminating result the theory of the sentence pattern; only comparatively recently, under the influence of the distinction between language and speech and of the systemic-structural approach to language, did the purpose and function of the sentence pattern — and with them the communicative aspect — become a subject of serious study. If word forms, sentence constituents and grammatical linkage arise within the sentence pattern, the essence of the pattern as an integrity is manifested only within the wholeness of the text. For this reason the actual structure of the sentence is a central problem both of the communicative syntax now taking shape and of text linguistics.

The present study rests on the distinction between the sentence as a unit of language — an abstract pattern (*gap*) — and the utterance as a unit of speech (*jumla*), the pattern as realized for a communicative purpose. The content side of the sentence is a system formed by the interaction of a propositional, a modal and a communicative constituent; and whereas the semantics of the sentence as a language unit contains only the proposition and objective

modality, the semantics of the utterance additionally involves the communicative structure and, at times, subjective modality [6]. It is the realization of the sentence pattern in speech that brings the communicative structure into being and determines its significance.

The aim of this paper is to lay out the theoretical foundations of the doctrine of communicative structure and to trace its reception in Uzbek linguistics. Its objectives are: to fix the place of the communicative structure among the structures of the sentence; to reconstruct the historical development of the doctrine; to document its Central Asian and modern Uzbek study; to present its conceptual apparatus as applied to Uzbek; and to analyse the controversy over terminology. The complementary questions of the lexico-grammatical factors of communicative structure and of the formal means that express it are treated in companion studies; the present paper is confined to foundations and historiography.

2. Materials and Methods

The material of the study is twofold. On the one hand, it comprises the body of scholarship on the actual division of the sentence — the European and Russian functional-sentence-perspective tradition and the Uzbek and Turkic syntactic literature — which is examined by the historical-comparative method and analysed as a developing system of ideas. On the other hand, it comprises a corpus of simple sentences drawn from Uzbek prose fiction (A. Qodiriy, O. Yoqubov, O'. Hoshimov and others) and from the colloquial style, which serves to illustrate the conceptual apparatus. The principal analytical procedure is the question test (Uzb. *so'roq*), by which the theme and the rheme of an utterance, and the distinction between syntagmatically independent and dependent utterances, are established; this is supplemented by transformation (the generation of communicative variants) and by componential analysis. The object is treated as a system, in the dialectical relation of the general and the particular and of language and speech.

3. Results

3.1. The place of communicative structure among the structures of the sentence

The propositional frame, which reflects a situation in the world, is the most basic constituent of sentence content, but it does not by itself make a syntactic construction a sentence, since a proposition may also be conveyed by units smaller than the sentence. For a real sentence two further frames must be added — the modal and the communicative. The communicative frame is thus the constituent that, on the realization of the pattern in speech, turns an abstract construction into a message adjusted to its context. The actual structure therefore stands in a definite relation to the syntactic and the semantic structures: the syntactic structure is formed on the basis of grammatical linkage within the sentence and serves as the material base for the actual structure, which is formed on the basis of communicative-value formation within the text [6]. Full or only partial correspondence between the units of these structures yields, respectively, concord or discord between them.

3.2. The historical development of the doctrine

The germs of the doctrine arose in remote antiquity: already in the Roman period Dionysius of Halicarnassus advanced views on word order closely bound up with it. After a long interruption, the question was taken up in the mid-seventeenth century by the Port-Royal grammarians — in the *Logic, or the Art of Thinking* (1662) of A. Arnauld and P. Nicole and in the *General and Rational Grammar* (1664) of A. Arnauld and C. Lancelot — and, in the following

century, by the French scholars Beauzée and Condillac and the German scholars Becker and Herling. The doctoral dissertation of the French scholar Henri Weil, *On the order of words in the ancient languages compared with the modern languages* (1844), brought the earlier views to maturity, and his ideas on the shaping of the sentence in connection with its communicative function became an important foundation for the later theory of the “actual division of the sentence” [8].

Before they were understood linguistically, Weil’s ideas were interpreted psychologically. His contemporary G. von der Gabelentz attended to the association of representations in the speaker’s consciousness, calling the first representation the “psychological subject” and the second the “psychological predicate”; G. Paul likewise used the terms “psychological subject” and “psychological predicate”, holding that the constituent under the logical stress is the psychological predicate, which conveys new information about something unknown [18]. The same current appears in the Russian tradition: F. Fortunatov distinguished the “psychological judgement” from the grammatical sentence, insisting that grammatical analysis differs sharply from psychological analysis; and A. M. Peshkovsky, who came close to the phenomenon of actual division, opposed the “intonational predicate” to the “grammatical predicate”, noting that the two coincide when the logical stress falls on the verb or the predicative word but otherwise diverge — though he left the phenomenon outside the bounds of grammatical doctrine and did not treat it specially [19]. It was the Czech scholar V. Mathesius who, criticizing these views, first proved that the phenomenon is linguistic — specifically syntactic — in nature; refining the distinction between the objective (direct) and the subjective (inverted) orders and describing several types of actually indivisible utterance, he gave the doctrine its decisive form [15, pp. 239–245]. His conclusions were developed by the Prague scholars (Daneš, Firbas) and taken up in Russian linguistics, where I. I. Kovtunova and K. G. Krushelnitskaya stressed the syntactic character of actual division and I. P. Raspopov treated it as an important factor of sentence structure and semantics [13; 14; 21].

3.3. The Central Asian and modern Uzbek reception

The phenomenon was not foreign to the philological tradition of Central Asia. According to A. Rustamov, it was known as early as al-Zamakhshari, and the parts of the actual division — theme and rheme — were rendered by the special terms *mavzu* and *mahmul*. In the twentieth century Fitrat, in his study of Uzbek syntax, discussed the relation between semantic and syntactic constituents and their mutual correspondence or non-correspondence, employing precisely these traditional terms. As A. Nurmonov emphasizes, this fact is of considerable importance for the history of linguistic thought, since Fitrat wrote before the theses of the Prague Circle had been published and before Mathesius’s ideas on actual division had been disseminated [7]. In modern Uzbek linguistics the topic re-emerged from the 1970s onward in the work of M. Turopova, K. Hayitmetov, M. To’xsanov, B. O’rinboev, A. Safaev and others; and in 1984 Karim Hayitmetov published the first Uzbek monograph on the subject, devoted to word order and positional matters — a work that, though it does not embrace every aspect of communicative structure, marks the first serious step in this direction [3]. The theme is further developed in the semantic-syntax studies of A. Nurmonov and his colleagues [6].

3.4. The conceptual apparatus

The utterance, or communicative variant of the sentence, consists of two parts differing in degree of communicative importance. The first is the support point of the utterance, usually

known to the hearer or recoverable from the situation, which serves as a “trampoline” for the important information; the second is the nucleus, which conveys the information that is new yet important and central. In V. A. Beloshapkova’s widely cited summary, the theme is the support point and point of departure of the message, communicatively less important than the rheme, and often the part recoverable from the preceding context, while the rheme conveys the message about the theme, is communicatively more important, embodies the principal content of the message, and usually coincides with the new information [10, p. 706]. A single sentence pattern is normally realized by several utterances; the appearance of more than one utterance, according as different communicative aims are pursued, yields the communicative paradigm of the sentence, whose members are its communicative variants, as in (1)–(3):

1.Xorijliklar bugun Buxoroga jo’nab ketishdi. — The foreigners left for Bukhara today. (Q.: where to?)

2.Xorijliklar Buxoroga bugun jo’nab ketishdi. — It was today that the foreigners left for Bukhara. (Q.: when?)

3.Buxoroga bugun xorijliklar jo’nab ketishdi. — It was the foreigners who left for Bukhara today. (Q.: who?)

The division of the utterance into theme and rheme is called the actual division precisely because it is the division that is actual — relevant — for the speaker in the given context. The utterances of a paradigm are, moreover, either syntagmatically independent — the invariant of the paradigm, whose actual division is context-free and coincides with the syntactic division (*Xurshida bonu / boshini ko’tarib qaradi*) — or syntagmatically dependent, arising when the canonical order is disturbed and the theme is recoverable from prior utterances (*Aksiga olib, darvozani / Ali Qushchi ochdi*). The question test serves equally to identify theme and rheme and to distinguish the two kinds of utterance.

3.5. The controversy over terminology

The literature exhibits marked terminological diversity, both for the phenomenon and for its units. The phenomenon itself is called the “actual division of the sentence” by Mathesius, the “functional sentence perspective” by his follower J. Firbas [1], the “semantic division” by K. G. Krushelnitskaya and L. A. Chernyakhovskaya, and the “logico-grammatical division” by A. L. Pumpyansky [20]; N. A. Slyusareva, mindful that meaning pervades all aspects of syntax, prefers not to use the term “semantic division”, while, as Hayitmetov observes, the very term “logico-grammatical division” makes grammatical categories appear to be interpreted from a logical standpoint [3, p. 25]. G. A. Veykhman, rightly criticizing the terms “actual division” and “semantic division”, proposes “predicative division”; but since theme and rheme do not always correspond to the logical subject and predicate, this term too has not gained wide currency, and G. A. Zolotova, though she does not consider “actual division” felicitous, acknowledges its prevalence [12]. In truth, no term captures the essence of the phenomenon in full — not even the most widely used, “actual division”.

The diversity extends to the units. They were first called the “psychological subject” and “psychological predicate” (Gabelentz, Paul); Mathesius, founding actual division as a distinct linguistic direction, replaced these psychologically coloured terms with “basis” and “nucleus”, and Raspopov used the similar “basis” and “predicated part”, while Krushelnitskaya preferred “given” and “new” [14]. Other scholars have proposed “lexical subject” and “lexical predicate” (A. I. Smirnitsky), “semantic subject” and “semantic predicate” (A. B. Ilyish), and “theme” and

“focus” or “topic” and “comment”. In present-day linguistics the terms “theme” and “rheme”, which go back to G. Ammann and were popularized by the German scholar K. Boost, are the most widely used. It should be added that, in Uzbek, replacing theme and rheme with *ma'lum* ('given') and *yangi* ('new') is not always felicitous, for the two pairs, though they sometimes coincide, rest on different criteria: the given–new distinction turns on what is known or unknown to the hearer, whereas the theme–rheme distinction turns, first of all, on the relative communicative importance of the parts.

4. Discussion

The persistent disagreement over terminology reflects the composite nature of the phenomenon, in which linguistic, logical and psychological facts are intertwined; this is why a single, fully adequate term has proved unattainable and why the history of the doctrine is in large part a history of successive reinterpretations — from the psychological to the properly syntactic and, latterly, to the textual. The distinction between language and speech, and between the sentence and the utterance, is what makes the doctrine coherent: it allows the communicative paradigm to be understood as the set of speech variants of a single language invariant, and it locates the communicative structure precisely at the point where the sentence pattern is realized as a message. Because the actual structure possesses its own specific linguistic means and is bound up with the content side of the text, it is properly an object of communicative and text linguistics, in which the syntagmatic and semantic linkage of sentences into a single whole is studied.

The Central Asian evidence carries a distinct historiographic weight. That the parts of the actual division were named in the tradition descending from al-Zamakhshari, and that Fitrat used the terms *mavzu* and *mahmul* before the Prague theses were published, shows that the essentials of the doctrine were grasped independently within the Uzbek philological tradition — a point that deserves a place in the history of general linguistics and not only in that of Uzbek studies. The results are directly applicable to the teaching of the theoretical grammar of Uzbek and of the history of linguistics, and they provide the conceptual groundwork for the description, undertaken in the companion studies, of the lexico-grammatical factors and the formal means of communicative structure. The principal limitation of the present paper is that its corpus is illustrative rather than exhaustive; a fuller treatment of the primary sources of the doctrine, and a systematic comparison of its Central Asian and European lines of development, remain tasks for further research.

5. Conclusion

The doctrine of the communicative (actual) structure of the sentence rests on the distinction between the sentence as a unit of language and the utterance as a unit of speech, and it treats the communicative structure as the third constituent of sentence content, built upon — but not reducible to — the syntactic structure. Its history runs from antiquity and Port-Royal through Weil and the psychologistic tradition to Mathesius, who established its syntactic nature, and thence to the Prague and Russian schools; and it has independent antecedents in the Central Asian tradition (al-Zamakhshari, Fitrat) and a modern Uzbek development beginning with Hayitmetov's 1984 monograph and continuing in the semantic-syntax studies of Nurmonov and his colleagues. Its conceptual apparatus — theme and rheme, the communicative paradigm, and syntagmatically independent and dependent utterances — applies to Uzbek as to other languages, while the abundance of names for both the phenomenon

and its units reflects its composite linguistic-logical-psychological nature. Possessing its own linguistic means and belonging to the content side of the text, the actual structure is a proper object of communicative and text linguistics.

References

1. Firbas J. Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
2. Fitrat A. O'zbek tili qoidalari to'g'risida bir tajriba. Nahv. – Toshkent, 1930.
3. Hayitmetov K. O'zbek tilida gapning aktual bo'linishi va pozitsion masalalari. – Toshkent, 1984.
4. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1995. – 232 b.
5. Nurmonov A. Gap haqida sintaktik nazariyalar. – Toshkent: Nizomiy nomidagi PI, 1988. – 100 b.
6. Nurmonov A. va boshqalar. O'zbek tilining mazmuniy sintaksisi. – Toshkent: Fan, 1992. – 294 b.
7. Nurmonov A., Mahmudov N. O'zbek tilshunosligi tarixi. I qism. – Toshkent, 2000. – 172 b.
8. Weil H. De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes. – Paris, 1844.
9. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М.: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1955.
10. Белошапкова В.А., Брызгунова Е.А., Земская Е.А. и др. Современный русский язык. – М.: Высшая школа, 1989. – 800 с.
11. Белошапкова В.А. Современный русский язык. Синтаксис. – М.: Высшая школа, 1977. – 248 с.
12. Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса. – М.: Наука, 1982. – 367 с.
13. Ковтунова И.И. Современный русский язык. Порядок слов и актуальное членение предложения. – М.: Просвещение, 1976. – 239 с.
14. Крушельницкая К.Г. К вопросу о смысловом членении предложения // Вопросы языкознания. – 1956. – № 5. – С. 55–67.
15. Матезиус В. О так называемом актуальном членении предложения // Пражский лингвистический кружок. – М.: Прогресс, 1967. – С. 239–245.
16. Николаева Т.М. Актуальное членение – категория грамматики текста // Вопросы языкознания. – 1972. – № 2. – С. 48–54.
17. Панфилов В.З. Взаимоотношение языка и мышления. – М.: Наука, 1971. – 232 с.
18. Пауль Г. Принципы истории языка. – М.: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1960.
19. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. – 7-е изд. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1956.
20. Пумпянский А.Л. Информационная роль порядка слов в научной и технической литературе. – М.: Наука, 1974. – 248 с.
21. Распопов И.П. Актуальное членение предложения. – Уфа: Изд-во Башк. гос. ун-та, 1961.