



Received: July 12, 2022
Accepted: August 20, 2022
Available online: September 25, 2022

Dilfuza Normamatova

Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD)
Senior Teacher, Gulistan State University
Gulistan, Uzbekistan
E-mail: dilfuzalight@mail.ru

LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

ANNOTATION

In this article, the interrogative category, which is one of the specific categories of language aspects, is widely studied in linguistics at the lexical, morphological, semantic and functional level, as well as focusing on identifying their aspects related to the reflection of various situations and feelings in the language.

Relationships between people are activated as a result of the use of verbal and non-verbal means. The goals and conclusions of people and their mutual conclusions are connected to the language expression of the events happening around. During the exchange of ideas, a speaker expresses information in different forms based on the sign of reality, using different linguistic levels.

Studying the morphological and lexical features of the main means of speech expressing interrogativeness in English and Uzbek languages and the functional-semantic types of the speech act in the group sections and the cases of their mutual syncretization is a sophisticated way in learning languages. Furthermore, showing the principles of reflecting the unique features of the universal and differential aspects in fiction works according to the intellectual aesthetic nature of today's linguistic levels is one of the current problems of comparative linguistics.

The aim of the article is to enlighten comparatively the morphological, lexical, and pragmatic linguistic features of verbalizes representing the category of interrogative in the English and Uzbek languages.

The tasks of the research are to determine the specific aspects of the interrogative category at the pragmatic and functional semantic levels in the composition of interrogative sentences

Dilfuza Normamatova

Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)
Guliston davlat universiteti katta o'qituvchisi
Guliston, O'zbekiston

O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDAGI SO'ROQ GAPLARING LINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI

ANNOTATSIYA

Hozirgi kunda chet tili o'rganishda kommunikativ metod – barcha nutq va til aspektlarining birgalikda o'rganilishi muhim hisoblanadi. Ushbu maqolada til aspektlarining muayyan kategoriyalaridan biri bo'lgan interrogativlik kategoriyasi tilshunoslikda leksik, morfologik, semantik va funksional sathda keng o'rganilib kelinayotganligi bilan bir qatorda, ularning turli holatlar, his-kechinmalarni tilda aks ettirish bilan bog'liq jihatlari tillar kesimida aniqlashga zarurat bor. Kishilar o'rtasidagi munosabatlar verbal va noverbal aloqa vositalarining qo'llanilishi natijasida faollashadi. Atrof-muhitda sodir bo'layotgan voqealarning tildagi ifodasi kishilarning munosabatlari hamda ularning o'zaro xulosalari bilan chambarchas bog'liqligi tadqiqotchilar tomonidan isbotlangan. So'zlovchi turli lingvistik sathlar yordamida fikr almashinuvi jarayonida axborotni turli shakllarda aks etgan holda reallik belgisi asosida ifoda etadi. Axborotning xabar uzatish shakli savol-javob tarzida so'zlovchi va tinglovchining nutqiy vaziyatlarga ko'ra yondashuvi bilan bog'liq bo'ladi. Ba'zi ifodalar bayoni qisqa va sodda tarzda tuzilgani bois undagi axborot mazmunini tushunish oson kechadi. Boshqa bir ifodalar esa shakliy tuzilishiga ko'ra sodda bo'lsa-da, so'zlovchi nazarda tutgan maqsadni anglash uchun lissoniy kommunikativ vositalarni tushunishni talab qiladi.

O'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi interrogativlikni bildiruvchi nutqning asosiy vositalarining morfologik va leksik xususiyatlarini, nutq aktining guruhlar kesimida funksional-semantik turlari va ularning o'zaro sinkretlashuv holatlarini o'rganish, intellektual estetik tabiatiga ko'ra universal va differensial qirralarining o'ziga xos bo'lgan xususiyatlarini badiiy asarlarda aks ettirish ta-

in the English and Uzbek languages; to reveal the unifying and differentiating aspects of the linguistic features of interrogative means in an interrogative sentence device.

The form of information transmission depends on the target speech situations of a speaker and a listener in the form of a question/answer situation. The description of some expressions is made in a short and simple way, and it is easy to understand the content of the information in it. While other expressions are simple according to their formal structure, they require auditory communicative means (inference) to understand the purpose intended by a speaker.

Key words: interrogative, linguistics, morphology, lexical, pragmatic, speech act, language, verb, structure.

INTRODUCTION

As the population of the world is enormous, each nation creates its own communicative language system; thus, their language systems use existing words to define the linguistic cultural world of the peoples and to fully comprehend existence of their language nature. In the process of speech, each sound and word have a certain task, which ensures active participation in sending and receiving messages.

It is known that in many situations of people's lives, the process of exchanging ideas is carried out through questions and answers. In these exchanges, interrogative verbalizers are the main interrogative means of sentences forming questions.

A.M. Mukhin emphasizes that interrogative words are mainly composed of interrogative pronouns and calls them "interrogatives" in international terminology. That is, the category of interrogativeness is a philosophical, psychological, logical linguistic category, and it is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that organizes interrogative sentences and is implemented through interrogative verbalizers [Mukhin A.M., 1980; 222]. The unit of speech expressing interrogativeness is an objective reality in philosophy, an interdisciplinary category that provides continuity of speech in a language [Shchepkina I.G., 2001; 44].

In the process of speech communication, with the help of interrogative words, which are considered verbal means, not only the news about the events can be expressed, but also the individual's feelings and opinions can be expressed in relation to the addressee. From a pragmatic point of view, the participation of all word groups and sounds are verbal means in the specific formation of social situations and the development of meaningful information communication.

Thanks to this, by the end of the 20th century, the active study of pragmatic markers in the process of verbal communication by representatives of different cultures began to become widespread, and scholars have different concepts when defining them. In linguistics, the category of interrogativeness, like other grammatical

moyillarini lingvistik sathlarda ko'rsatish qiyosiy tilshunoslikning dolzarb muammolaridan biridir.

Maqolada o'zbek va ingliz tillarida interrogativlik kategoriyasini ifodalovchi verbalizatorlarning morfologik, leksik, pragmatik kabi lingvistik xususiyatlari chog'ishtirilgan. Shuningdek, o'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi so'roq gaplar tarkibida interrogativlik kategoriyasining pragmatik hamda funktsional semantik sathda o'ziga xos jihatlari aniqlash, so'roq gap qurilmasidagi interrogativ vositalarining lingvistik xususiyatlarini unifikatsion va differentsial jihatlari ochib berilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: interrogativ, lingvistika, morfologiya, leksika, pragmatik, nutq akti, til, fe'l, tizim.

categories distinguished by different signs, is one of the widely studied topics, and the study of verbal means that are active participants in the composition of an interrogative sentence is one of the most relevant topics up to now.

Whereas according to J.Searle – questions are a subclass of figurative sentences, because they are attempts by a speaker to get an answer, that is, to encourage a listener to perform a speech act [Searle J., 1986], A.Belknap and J.Steel have stated that a question is an abstract concept, and its formal analogue serves to organize interrogativeness [Belknap N., Steele T., 1981; 14].

The verbal means expressing the question (interrogativeness) marker first determines the tone, and the sentence with the meaning of interrogativeness has a separate tone, clearly different from the command sentence. In an interrogative sentence, a word with an interrogative meaning is characterized by a rising tone as a verbal means [Vinogradov V.V., 1960; 356].

Consequently, the category of interrogativeness determines the lexical and grammatical structures and features of many categories, such as time and space, quality and quantity categories, through question-answer content. Therefore, nowadays, the study of the category of interrogatives and the means of expression of the types of interrogative sentences is learned continuously in a wide way in linguistic systems such as grammatical, lexical and pragmatic.

METHODS

Linguistics is considered with the stem of a language and a communication. Language specialists explore how individuals learn information approximately by the language systems, how this information interatomic with other thought forms, how it changes between speakers and geographic districts, and how to demonstrate this information computationally. They ponder how to speak to the structure of different angles of a language (such as sounds or meaning), how to hypothetically clarify distinctive linguistic designs, and how diverse components of aspects connected with each other.

It applies both with the study of particular languages and the search for general or divers properties common to all languages or particularly compared languages.

Comparative study of two languages of different structures has both theoretical and practical significance, enables somebody to identify similar and distinctive features, find universals (general points) and unique (specific events), helps to penetrate deeper into the inner workings of each of the compared languages and understand their national identity [Zakiryanov K.Z., 2015; 224]. The theme of our comparative study are languages of different structures – the English and Uzbek languages – the first refers to a group of fusion languages, the second – to a group of agglutinative. Comparative research of languages of different structures can be carried out in three language layers: morphologic, lexical and pragmatic. While the comparative method involves classifying languages on the basis of linguistic and non-linguistic evidence, the typological method relies exclusively on linguistic information and uses this information to classify languages according to the linguistic characteristics that they

share or do not share [Meyer Ch.F., 2002; 34].

Although languages are classified typologically on the basis of syntactic characteristics that they share or do not share, much of the research in this area has been centered on morphology, lexical and pragmatic lines on contrastive analysis.

Contrastive analysis is not intended to offer a new method of teaching, but it is a form of language-description across two languages which are particularly applicable to curriculum development, the elaboration and evaluation of teaching materials, the diagnosis of learning problems and testing [Yahya Mohammed Ali Al-Marrani, 2009; 47].

Contrastive linguistics, on the contrary, captures the specific features of the compared languages on the basis of a certain set of general linguistic phenomena [Khamidova M.K., 2022; 375]. Therefore, when different language systems are compared in a contrastive way, it is useful to utilize different linguistic units [Buranov J., 1973; 70]. The contrastive analysis often helps to reveal ('discover') features in a compared languages that are not noticed when using the normal imaging. This gives an opportunity to study and understand the structure of languages more deeply [Usmanov S., 1972; 181], to study the comparison of interrogations based on linguistic characteristics as well as their structures in sentences. Furthermore, based on these issues, this study intends to reconsider the differences and similarities of English and Uzbek forms of interrogations by morphological, lexical, pragmatic units. Such information or input based on linguistic evidence could be useful for learners of English as a second/foreign language, who can have a chance to develop cultural awareness and communicative competence [Saleem A., Saleem T. & Aziz A., 2022; 17].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Morphological analysis.

Although the classification of sentences according to content and expression is the same in related and non-related languages, due to the fact that according to the languages belonging to different families their composition is also different in their morphological features. In Uzbek interrogative sentences, mainly grammatical verbalizations such as interrogative particles and interrogative pronouns serve as the main verbal means and have a different particular tone in the sentence [Normamatova D.T., 2020]. For example, in the Uzbek language, the role of the interrogative tone is greater in sentences that take the interrogative content with the help of interrogative endings such as **-a**, **-ya**, **-da**, **-ku**, **nahotki**. In the sentences of interrogative with **-mi**, **-chi** endings, the tone is not so strong. Interrogative sentences with these particles aim to find out whether a speaker will confirm or deny the opinion of a listener. Such interrogative sentences are often answered with the words **yes**, **no**, or the question word in the interrogative sentence itself [Sulaymanov A., Kholyorov H., 1979; 29].

– *Men bergan 5 dollarni tikdingizmi?*

– *Yo‘q, – deb javob berdi u.* [Shaw I., 2019; 46].

In the English and Uzbek languages, in some cases, that is, mainly in oral speech, the words **yes/no** are not included in the answer to a general interrogative sentence,

and in Uzbek, **yes/no** is a similar phenomenon.

- “**Are** you sure about the whistle and the sound of falling metal?” asked Holmes.
- “I think so,” answered Helen [Doyle A.C., 1989; 5].
- *Mendan keyin birov bu yerga kirgani yo ‘qmi?*
- *Zog ‘ham uchgani yo ‘q* [G‘ulom G‘., 1983; 221].

In English auxiliary and modal verbs such as **to be, to have, to do, can, may, must** are used to form this type of general questions. Although in Uzbek interrogative sentence with particles is similar in content to the general interrogative sentence type in English, the main difference is in their word order. For example:

1. – **Can** I buy a drink?
– No, I’ll drink some milk [Shaw I., 2019; 46].
2. – *Viski ichasizmi?*
– *Menga sutichish mumkin* [Shaw I., 2019; 46].
3. – **Are** you kidding me? The bookie said.
– No, honest [Shaw I., 2019; 27].
4. – *Kalaka qilyapsizmi meni? - to ‘ng ‘illadi u.*
– *Hech narsadn xabarim yo ‘q.* [Shaw I., 2019; 46].

In the given examples, the particle **-mi** in Uzbek interrogative sentences 2, 4 gives the interrogative meaning of the sentence. As can be seen from the examples, particle **-mi** can be added to the verb, at the end of the sentence, sometimes in the middle [Normamatova D.T., 2021; 162], whereas in English, in the word order of the general interrogative sentence **Can** and **Are** as the auxiliary verbal ways the first component at the beginning of the sentence. The stability of a word order is typical for the English language [Buranov J., Hoshimov U., Ismatullaev H., 1974; 93]. In the given examples, the auxiliary verbs *Can, Are*, which are lexically different in English, they are translated in Uzbek examples with the same particle **-mi**. General interrogative sentences are formed under the leadership of modal and auxiliary verbs and serve to raise the tone in the sentence [Kobrina N.A., Korneeva E.A., 1999; 235].

In Uzbek, one of the characteristics of the interrogative particles **-mi, -chi, -a, -ya** is that they express surprise, wonder and suspicion regardless of which part of the interrogative sentence is logically stressed [Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A., 1995; 29] and forms a pure interrogative sentence.

The fact that languages belong to different families, language groups cause grammatical problems in translation [Bakhtiyarov M., Yuldashev U., Khamzaev S., 2017; 257]. One of the examples is the difference in the translations of general and selective interrogative sentences in English and Uzbek. That is, since the expression of general interrogative sentences containing surprise, suspicion, doubt (**-mi, -chi, -ku, -a, -ya**) in Uzbek is not found in English, thoughts are expressed on the basis of different words:

1. “Suddenly he thought: **Supposing** she isn’t there – supposing she has gone” [Drieser T., 1958; 234].
– *Kerri uyda bo ‘lmasa-ya? U yerdan ketib qolganligi to ‘satdan ma ‘lum bo ‘lsa-ya* [Drayzer T., 1973; 218].

– *Nega bularni seyfga solib quliflamayapman-a? Gerstvud ichida o‘zidan so‘radi* [Drayzer T., 1973; 236].

2. “**Suppose** we didn’t have time to get married here?” [Drieser T., 1958; 155]

– *Bu yerda nikohdan o‘tishimizga mabodo vaqtimiz ziqlik qilsa-chi?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 138].

In Uzbek, in the interrogative sentences in examples 5 and 7, the interrogative sentence expressed with the particle **-ya -chi** means the tone of suspicion, and if the tone is raised at the end of the sentence, this tone of suspicion is expressed in the interrogative sentence in English with the supposing component, keeping the average tone. It is known that the word “**Suppose**” in English is translated into Uzbek as “taxmin qilmoq” in the meaning of “to assume, to intend”, but the classification groups of indirect speech acts and the linguistic forms representing them do not have the same appearance in different languages [Shamakhmudova A., 2019; 36].

The popular structure of the speech expression of surprise in English interrogative sentences is presented in the communication text “*Why don’t I shut the safe?*” expressed in the form, in which there would be a question related to the ability of the listener to act.

As can be seen from the examples, the grammatical and lexical expression of the same concept can be different in different languages. If a certain concept is expressed by one word in Uzbek, it can sometimes be expressed stylistically in English by a word, phrase, or even a completely different sentence. In our opinion, the meaning expressed by certain means in one language can be conveyed in a different way in another language. Interrogatives of this type are also used to express more rhetorical questions.

Due to the fact that, in linguistics, the morphemic set of words has variants with the help of affixes and perifixes, and the technique of modeling word forms is carried out by means of a paradigm (paradigm means a set of word forms, a system of morphemic variants) [Buranov J., 1973; 27]. The categories of case and possession of words in the English and Uzbek languages, are also different in interrogative sentences.

In Old English, syntactic relations were mainly expressed on the basis of case affixes. But later, as they were phonetically reduced and left the language, their functions are performed using prepositions or word order [Buranov J., Hoshimov U., Ismatullaev H., 1974; 25].

We can also find this idea in Otto Jespersen’s scientific work entitled “Philosophy of Grammar”: “in turn, the number of cases decreased with the appearance of prepositions expressing and differentiating other relationships in the structure of place - place and sentence” [Jespersen O., 1958; 172]. We examine the differences in the case system of interrogative pronouns in the English and Uzbek through examples.

– “**Who** did he come to see?” asked the drummer, incredulously [Drieser T., 1958; 197].

3. *U kimni oldiga kelardi? - Drue ishonqiramay so‘radi* [Drayzer T., 1973; 181].

4. “**What** are you looking **for**?” [Drieser T., 1958; 385].

– *Nimani izlayapsiz? deb goldi u* [Drayzer T., 1973; 373].

5. "Aren't you afraid?" She asked.
 – "What of" he answered [Drieser T., 1958; 385].
 – *Qo 'rqmaysamni ishqilib?*
 – *Nimaga qo 'rqaman? Javob qildi Gerstvud* [Drayzer T., 1973; 371].
6. Have this put in the evening papers.
 – "In which sir?" [Doyle A.C., 2000; 285].
 – *Shu satrlarni kechki gazetalarda e'lon qilishsin.*
 – *Qaysilarida, ser?* [Doyle A.C., 1989; 143].
7. "Where did you come from?" [Drieser T., 1958; 66].
 – *Siz qayoqdan kelib qoldingiz* [Drayzer T., 1973; 50].

The grammatical structure of the language shows the nature of word forms and the combination of words [Baskakov N.A., Abduazizov A.A., 1979; 73]. In Uzbek, interrogative pronouns are expressed by agreement suffixes of the case, while in English prepositions are used instead of such suffixes. In English prepositions can be used at the beginning, at the end of or together with interrogative elements in the interrogative sentences. The utilizations are diverse of the category of case in both languages According to their syntactic characteristics.

Lexical analysis.

According to Uzbek researcher, M.Irskulov "a lexical meaning is a single meaning related to an event or thing in the external world; it is associated with one word. Grammatical meaning does not reflect things and events in the world like alexical meaning and does not have a singular meaning. Grammatical meaning is also specific to one or more sets of words. Although the lexical and grammatical meanings differ from each other according to their nature, they are inextricably linked in speech. One does not exist without the other: a grammatical meaning appears in addition to a lexical meaning and expresses various grammatical relations: it shows the relation of one word to another word, the relation of a word to a person, number, time and tense" [Irskulov M., 1992; 53-54].

One of the lexical features of interrogatives in the Uzbek language is that the typical form of expressing a repeated question consists of a voice repeated alone with question intonation. The repeated sound **-a** is considered a question verbalizer, and as a full predicate in the sentence, it lexically expresses the feeling of surprise or suspicion. In such sentences, the semantic structure of the preceding sentence may be related to predicate or non-predicate elements. We observe the process of how to express this phenomenon in English and Uzbek languages by these examples.

1. "I came to tell you that-that I can't take the money".
 "Oh, that's it, is it?" [Drieser T., 1958; 81].
Men shuncha pulni ololmayman deb aytgani keldim.
 – *A?, hali shunday deng* [Drayzer T., 1973; 65].
2. "You weren't up at either Bigbitten or Grasslake by any chance?"
 "Why, no, sir, I wasn't [Drieser T., 1978; 142].
Katta mungir ko'lida yoki o'tloqzorda bo'lgan emasmingiz?
 – *A?, yo'q ser bo'lmaganman* [Drayzer T., 1976; 157].

3. “*And after all, you have been around hotels for quite a few years*”.

“*oh, one hotel. Isaid* [Shaw I., 2019; 146].

Har holda mehmonxonalarining hadisini olgansiz-da.

– *A?*, *shu paytgacha bittasida yashaganman* [Shaw I., 2019; 266].

The distinguishing feature between the interrogative paradigms – **a**, is that in sentences in Uzbek 1 and 2, the same component nucleus in the predicative position strongly expresses the meaning of affirmation in the interrogative form, while the interrogative paradigm – **a** in sentences 3 represents a negation verificative question that is semantically equivalent to **what** paradigm. That is, in the form of a question, a connotative meaning is added to the propositional meaning. On the contrary, there is no such questioning paradigm defined by one sound or one letter in English. In English, in the form of the interrogative paradigm given in example 1, **is it?**, a combination of two components expresses the content of an affirmative question, while in sentences 2 and 3, the components **why** and **oh** express a negative meaning and do not create the content of a question or re-interrogation.

One of the interrogative sentences is the question sentence that arises the need of extra information during the process of communication. One can call them clarifying questions, which are used to obtain additional information from the listener to the existing information. They are built on the improved of semantic structure of the previous sentence as well as the main reporting elements are focused. The form and content of this type of interrogations are similar in the English and Uzbek languages.

4. “*Why, Grass Lake. We went out for a row after we got there in the afternoon*”.

“*In the afternoon?*” [Drieser T., 1978; 288].

– *Biz kunduzi qayiqda sayr etmoqchi bo‘ldik.*

– *Kunduzi-ya? Birdan-a?* [Drayzer T., 1976; 327].

5. “*When you left Lycurgus to start on the trip, how much did you have?*”

“*About fifty dollars*”.

“*About fifty?*” [Drieser T., 1978; 315].

– *Likrugdan chiqib, shu sayoxatga jo‘naganlaringizda qancha pulingiz bor edi?*

– *Sal kam ellik.*

– *Sal kam ellik?* [Drayzer T., 1976; 360].

In both the English and Uzbek languages, in the sentence four verbal means appearing in the place of questions are related to modal and psychological predicates, while in sentence 5 they are used in relation to arguments. Asking as a question again can mean not only the syntactic-semantic structure of the sentence in relation to one element, but also the relation of the whole communicative sentence and its elements. So, the repeated type of an interrogative sentence can perform two different tasks: to ask or to explain a question to a listener. That is, a full question and a repeated re-question to the element involved in the semantic structure of the previous sentence. In the Uzbek language, the addition of the letters **-a**, **-ya** to words expresses both questioning and surprise content, while in English, this content is created by raising the tone in expressive sentences.

In the Uzbek and English languages, interrogative sentences that arise in

the process of exchange of ideas are similar in language expression of factual and verification, referential and anticipatory communicative forms according to a certain purpose. But interrogative expression that moves to the clarifying plan in the sentence, requiring repeated content through one letter or sound in place of the core component, is unique to the Uzbek language.

The different emotions in the sentences given above (sarcasm, stress, emphasis, protest, pity, rebuke, joy, cutting) are similar in content as interrogative sentences in both languages. However, in Uzbek, there are special types of interrogative sentences, sentences with the words "*bo'ladimi*" and "*aytmaysizmi*", so the structure of such sentences does not have an interrogative meaning in English.

1. "*I shall tell you*" – *he said. "I surprised the people at the office"* [Drieser T., 1958; 140].

– *Idoradagilarimizning hammasi yoqa ushlab qolsa bo'ladimi?* – *dedi u* [Drayzer T., 1973; 124].

2. "*It was cold outside, the night wind gusting*" [Shaw I., 2019; 45].

– *Ko'cha sovuq, shiddatli izg'irinni aytmayisizmi?* [Shaw I., 2019; 77].

This type of grammatical meaning is considered as the rhetoric question whereas in the English language is only expressed in direct. Thus, grammatical meaning often reflects existing relationships in different languages. If the lexical meaning means events about a certain thing in the environment, the grammatical meaning reflects, summarizes, groups and expresses the relations between these things/events with grammatical means.

In the Uzbek language, when the suffix **-lar** is added to the interrogative pronouns of the noun character, the plural form is formed, but in some cases, if it semantically expresses respect for a person in the singular, it lexically indicates a double word. Such pronouns can be paired to express the plural form [Sapaev Q., 2009; 140]. For example:

– *Majlisga kim-kim keldi?*

– *Majlisga kim-kimlar keldi?* – *yoshlar, qariyalar.*

In English, such repetition of interrogative pronouns in sentences like **who-who** is a lexical error in the sentence. In the first sentence given above, the speaker tries to clarify the identity of people unknown to him, in the second sentence to clarify the number or group of people who came to the meeting, and in the third sentence to express respect for the person.

Another differential feature of interrogative pronouns, which are the main means of the category of interrogativeness, in Uzbek and English is that almost all interrogative pronouns in Uzbek have alexical synonymic variation, while in English, interrogative pronouns express a homonymic form. As an example, we observe the lexical features of the interrogative pronoun determining the cause in both the Uzbek and English languages in the factual examples.

The **why** question component that determines the sentence is dialectical or journalistic. **Why?** is used as a synonym for a question in Uzbek, coming in the form of a word + adverb in the form of *nima* + *ga*, while in the English form the pronoun

why does not change, etc.

Table 1. Lexical expression of the pronoun "Why" in the Uzbek and English languages

Uzbek	English
Nima uchun, nega, nimaga, nechun, nima sababdan, ne sabab, namuncha	Why
<i>Nima uchun</i> o'shaning o'zinigina oldingiz?	" <i>Why</i> did you pick him up?"
<i>Nega</i> siz u yerdan ketib qoldingiz?	" <i>Why</i> did you leave there?"
<i>Nimaga</i> mendan stakan so'ray qolmadingiz?	" <i>Why</i> didn't you ask me for a glass?"
Salom, jonginam knyaz o'g'lon, <i>nechun</i> holing parishon?	"Greetings, my fair prince," she said. " <i>Why</i> are you so sad, tell me?"
<i>Nima sababdan</i> u biror ishning etagidan tutmayapti ekan-a?	" <i>Why</i> doesn't he get something to do?"
<i>Ne sabab</i> ko'ngling noxush? Savol so'radi oqqush?	" <i>Why</i> are you so dismal, gloomy, say?" –Swam, asked – "cloudy day".
<i>Namuncha</i> shoshasiz xo'jayin? – dedi u yonmayon qadam tashlarkan.	"Hey, boss," he said, walking along with me. " <i>Why</i> are you in a hurry?"

As it is seen from the examples, interrogative pronouns, which are one of the types of the pronoun word group in Uzbek, have a variety of lexical synonymous features according to their expression in the structure of the sentence, while in English they have acquired a homonymic or unique feature.

Pragmatic analysis.

Representatives of different cultures living in the world have different rules for information exchange and the use of pragmatic meanings. Sometimes they apply different means of questioning to get new information, or conversely, communication signs that are similar in form at the syntactic level but may have different pragmatic meanings.

Languages develop through humans' interactions or exchanges of ideas. During such speech acts, linguistic units may have the opportunity to express a number of content nuances such as command, request, surprise, surprise.

In our work, the pragmatic functions of interrogative sentences in two languages are analyzed using J.Searle's classification of speech acts (assertive, directives, commissive, declaratives and expressive) [John R.S., 1976], since on the basis of this classification being applied more systematically. Given the above, we will dwell a little on the function of the speech act in the pragmatic field.

Today, the theory of speech acts is one of the discussed, interesting and important topics in the field of pragmatics. The theory of the speech act was first introduced by English philosopher J.Austin; the author focused on the formation of the theory of the speech act, the analysis of the performative verbs that form the speech act, and the classification of the types of the speech act. The scholar's scientific views on this matter were reflected in the book "How to do things with words" [Austin J., 1986].

Based on J.Austin's concept of a speech act, J. Searle created and developed his new concept of speech acts. He pointed out the achievements and drawbacks of J. Austin's speech act. Later, this problem was also expressed in the linguistic views of M.Bakhtin, W.Humboldt, Sh.Bally, S.Kartsevsky, L.P. Yakubinsky, K.L. Buhler,

E. Benveniste, and others.

Issues of speech activity and speech acts were studied by Russian linguistics Yu. Gladkova, A. A. Leontev, I. V. Kodzukhova, A. V. Loginov et al., the existing views on this issue were summarized and supplemented. In Kodzukhova's interpretation, the speech act is the central concept and the purposeful implementation of the speech act using language tools in the speech process, the expression of the speech aimed at the speaker with a specific purpose [Kodzukhova I. V., 2019; 23].

As we know, an illocutionary speech act is an act of a person in the process of speaking and through speech, which covers different goals, and it depends on different relations of the communicative goal formed in the process of communication. According to J. Searle, the expressive factors of illocutionary speech acts are activities related to a speaker, listener, time and space, purpose and psychological characteristics [Searle J., Vanderveken D., 1986].

Sh. Safarov pays special attention to the speech acts in the book of "Pragmalinguistic". The scholar evaluates the place of the speech act theory in pragmalinguistic theory, gives detailed information about the locative, illocutionary and perlocutionary types of speech acts. According to Sh. Safarov, an illocutionary act is a direct participant in the structure of communication, a part of speech activity that ensures a purposeful and meaningful movement of communication [Safarov Sh., 2008; 83]. The illocutionary act is an expression of the interaction of the participants of the dialogue [Kuchibaev A., 2015; 22].

In the process of communication, the expression of speech structures is carried out in most cases through questioning structures. In these cases, the question shows the task of encouraging the listener to act, deviating from its original function, that is, the function of the need to obtain information. Because of this, speech acts have the nature of indirect and direct occurrence by people [Shomakhmudova A., 2019; 36; Borisevich K., 1996; 12].

According to views of linguists D. Vanderveken and J. Searle, directive speech act reveals the act of encourage to a listener to take an action on several purpose: please, question, urge, warn, demand, prohibit, allow, offer, advise, recommend, beg, plead, pray, guide and etc.

It was found out that interrogative constructions in the English and Uzbek languages perform the following directive speech acts in the language of certain situational and literary language: asking for guidance, demanding, advice, offering, requesting, insisting. For example:

Asking for guidance: *"How do people get on the stage, George?" – she finally asked, innocently* [Drayzer T., 1973; 330].

– *Odamlar qanday qilib ishga kirisharkan Jorj?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 336].

Demanding: *"Why don't you get out and look for work?"* [Drieser T., 1958; 345].

– *Undan ko'ra ish qidirib kelsang bo'lardi?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 330].

Advice: *"What would I do if they sent me away?"* [Hemingway E., 1971; 75].

– *Agar meni bu yerdan boshqa joyga o'tkazishsa nima qilaman?* [Hemingway E., 1973; 111].

Offering: *“What can I do for you, miss?” – He inquired, surveying her curiously* [Drieser T., 1958; 37].

– *Bizga qanday xizmatlar bor, mis? – So ‘radi, qiziqsinib tikilayotganini sira yashirmay* [Drayzer T., 1973; 21].

Requesting: *“Couldn’t you pay two dollars?”* [Drieser T., 1958; 70].

– *Ikki dollardan to ‘lab tura olmaysizmi? deb so ‘radi Minni* [Drayzer T., 1973; 53].

Insisting: *“What made you to deceive me so?” asked Carrie* [Drieser T., 1958; 270].

– *Nega meni aldadingiz? – so ‘radi Kerri* [Drayzer T., 1973; 254].

The form and manner of expression of the pragmatic content of the interrogative forms as a directive speech act (in particular, acts of asking for guidance, demanding, advice, offering, requesting, insisting) in the languages under comparison, their implicit expression as a syntactic unit was identified as a similar feature in Uzbek and in English.

According to the results of the analysis, it was found out that, unlike the English language, interrogative constructions in the Uzbek language, in addition to the above-mentioned speech acts, perform the following directive acts: questioning-investigating and advising.

In both languages, the form of interrogative as a verbal mean was defined as performative speech acts in the content of expressive speech acts such as dreaming, rebuke, getting angry, grieving, protesting in a certain communication environment. For example:

Dreaming: *If she could only get enough money to let her own easy?* [Drieser T., 1958; 79].

– *Bu og ‘ir ahvoldan qutulish uchun picha pul ishlab topsa, qani edi?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 63].

Rebuking: *“What did you do that for, Carrie?” – Minnie asked, when she saw it* [Drieser T., 1958; 68].

– *Nega bunday qilding? - dedi onasi uni zont olganidan kapalagi uchib* [Drayzer T., 1973; 52].

Getting angry: *“It’s a lie,” he said.*

“Lie, eh!” she said, fiercely, but with returning reserve [Drieser T., 1958; 214].

– *Bularning bari yolg ‘on.*

– *Yolg ‘onmi hali? Mis Gurstvud uning gapini baqirib takrorlasa ham o ‘zini darhol tutib oldi.* [Drayzer T., 1973; 197].

Grieving: *“What’s the use worrying?”* [Drieser T., 1958; 32].

– *Eh, nega muncha kuyib pishasan-a, axir hali yerparchin bo ‘lganimizcha yo ‘q-ku?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 305].

Protesting: *“What’s the use wearing good ones around here?” he asked* [Drieser T., 1958; 343].

– *Uyda yangi kiyimda yurishning nima hojati bor-a? Gerstvud savol berdi* [Drayzer T., 1973; 328].

One of the distinctive feature in the meaning of interrogations is that while it was found out reprimanding and regretting speech acts are as an expressive speech

acts only in the Uzbek language materials it was verified that there is the reference speech act functions expressive speech act in English language.

According to the style and form of expression, in the analyzed examples, it was studied as a similar feature that most expressive speech is explicitly expressed as a syntactic unit in the compared the English and Uzbek languages.

In the given examples, the expressive speech acts of protest and grief are explicitly similar in their expression, but in the Uzbek language, external means such as the addition of **-a**, **-ku** to words contribute to the stronger expression of illocutionary acts in these expressive speech acts. It was found out that interrogative means in the studied languages perform commissive speech acts such as agreement, threat, and promise in a certain communication environment and literary language. For example:

Agreement: *"Well, then, let's go, will you?"* [Drieser T., 1958; 202].

– *Unday bo'lsa ketaylik, ma'qulmi?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 18].

Threatening: *"Who were you with at the theatre last night?" The words were hot as they came* [Drieser T., 1958; 213].

– *Kechagi spektaklga kim bilan boruvding? Uning so'zlari bamisoli qaynoq lavaday Reining boshiga quyildi* [Drayzer T., 1973; 197].

Promising: *"Don't say anything, will you?" He asked, giving the girl's arm gentle squeeze* [Drieser T., 1958; 199].

– *Buni valdirab yurmaysiz! Xo'pmi? – U oqsoch qizdan do'stona so'radi* [Drayzer T., 1973; 182].

In the above examples, the speech act in the meaning of agreement and promise is explicitly expressed in the Uzbek language by the components such as **-ma'qulmi**, **-khopmi**, while the expressive speech act of agreement and promise is implicitly expressed using the syntactic unit **-will you**, which is characteristic of the English language. The fact that this context has the content of an assumed performative speech act, besides the protest speech act is typical for both languages.

Supposition: *"You are not familiar with this part at the country, are you?"* [Drieser T., 1958; 21].

– *Siz bu yerlar bilan tanish emassiz shekilli?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 5].

"Not alone, are you? Asked Hanson?" [Drieser T., 1958; 68].

– *Yolg'iz bo'lmassiz, albatta?* – *so'radi Timpson* [Drayzer T., 1973; 52].

"I suppose your people will be here to meet you?" He said [Drieser T., 1958; 27].

– *Hoynahoy sizni qarindoshlaringiz kutib olishsa kerak?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 11].

"He was no thief, many thoughts formulated themselves" [Drieser T., 1958; 276].

– *Nahotki u o'g'ri bo'lsa?* [Drayzer T., 1973; 260].

In the given examples, it seems that the sentence given by the Uzbek speaker is definitely expressing the prediction through the components of **shekilli**, **albatta**, **kerak**. The intention of the speaker is to encourage the listener to give the information about whether or not he has accurate information about the location of the listener in the first sentence, to know the information that someone will be next to the listener in the second sentence, and to tell the information about who will be greeted by the listener in the third sentence. In the first and second examples given in English, **are**

you. If the combination expresses confirmation, the speaker encourages the listener to confirm the given message; the third example has the characteristic of expressing an image.

As we can see, in the Uzbek language the interrogative sentences, like, **kerak**, **balki**, **ehtimol**, **nahotki** express the speech act of suspicion, guess, prediction, while in English, such interrogative sentences are often expressed in the content of the speech act of confirmation, indication (And in your case, the English language is the original and Uzbek is the translation, that's why first you should show the English version and then the Uzbek). Collected factual materials showed that in the Uzbek language, in the interrogative sentences, suspicion, guess, prediction are more common than in the English language. Unlike the Uzbek language, it was found out that interrogative sentences in English perform the function of a constative speech act in addition to the above-mentioned expressive speech acts, while it was found out that expressive acts such as excitement-interrogation consisting of one sound component were found only in the Uzbek language materials.

CONCLUSION

One of the specific categories of language aspects is the category of interrogativeness, which is widely studied in linguistics at the morphological, semantic and functional levels, and attention is paid to identifying the means of interrogatives related to various situations and the reflection of feelings in the language in a pragmatic direction.

Among the types of pronouns, interrogative pronouns are different according to their grammatical characteristics. One of the differences between the expression of interrogative pronouns in English and Uzbek is that in Uzbek interrogative pronouns are classified by category of case suffixes, while in English there is no such feature. Morphologically, in the English language prepositions are often used instead of suffixes added to interrogative pronouns in Uzbek.

Lexically, interrogative pronouns have a wide variety in the Uzbek language. For example, the interrogative pronoun denoting the reason has six variants in the Uzbek language: **nima uchun**, **nega**, **ne sababdan**, **nimaga**, **namuncha**, **nechuk**. In English, this interrogative pronoun is **why** is expressed through the component. In English, interrogative pronouns are unique words and do not acquire the feature of variation.

It is known from the research that the manner of expression of the interrogative verbal means that make up the interrogative is not the same for unrelated languages. So, morphologically, interrogative verbalizes in the English language differ from interrogative verbalizes in the Uzbek language due to the fact that they are expressed by category of possessives too.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmanova, O.S. (1966). *Dictionary of linguistic terms*. Soviet Encyclopedia Publishing House.
2. Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.
3. Austin, J. (1986). *Word as action in new foreign linguistics: Theory of speech acts*. Progress.
4. Baskakov, N.A., & Abduazizov, A.A. (1979). *General linguistics*. Teacher Publishers.
5. Belnap, N., & Stil, T. (1981). *The logic of questions and answers*. Progress.
6. Buronov, J. (1973). *Comparative grammar of English and Uzbek languages*. Teacher Publishers.
7. Buronov, J., Hoshimov, U., & Ismatullaev, H. (1974). *English grammar*. Teacher Publishers.
8. Gulomov, A.G. (1955). *Simple speech*. Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR.
9. Gulomov, A.G., & Asqarova, M.A. (1965). *Modern Uzbek literary language*. Teacher Publishers.
10. Hakimov, M. (2013). *Basics of Uzbek pragmalinguistics*. Academic Publication.
11. Irisqulov, M. (1992). *Introduction to linguistics*. Teacher Publishers.
12. Jespersen, O. (1958). *Philosophy of grammar*. Foreign Literature.
13. John, R.S. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
14. Khamidova, M.K., & Usanova, N.A. (2022). The contrastive method of research in modern linguistics. *Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(6), 374-376.
15. Kilichev, E. (1992). *Practical stylistics of the Uzbek language*. Teacher Publishers.
16. Kodzukhova, I.V. (2019). *Pragmatics of indirect interrogatives*. Chelyabinsk State University.
17. Kreidler, W. (2002). *Introducing English semantics*. Routledge.
18. Kuchiboev, A. (2015). *Text pragmatics*. Samarkand State University.
19. Maslihatul, U. (2015). A contrastive analysis of interrogative sentences in English and Indonesian. *Register Journal*, 8(2), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v8i2.151-162>.
20. Meyer, Ch.F. (2002). *Introducing linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Mukhin, A.M. (1980). *Syntax analysis and the language level problem*. Science.
22. Narziev, N. (2015). Semantics of interrogative sentences in English and Uzbek. International Conference on *Communicative aspects of modern linguistics and linguodidactics*. Samarkand.
23. Normamatova, D.T. (2021). Morphological study of the interrogative category in Uzbek and English languages. *Khorezm Mamun Academy*, (3), 161-165.
24. Saleem, A., Saleem, T., & Aziz, A. (2022). A pragmatic study of congratulation strategies of Pakistani ESL learners and British English speakers. *Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ.*, 7, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00134-9>.
25. Sapaev, K. (2009). *Modern Uzbek literary language*. Teacher Publishers.
26. Searl, J., & Vanderveken, D. (1986). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.
27. Shepkina, I.G. (2001). Category of interrogative in German and Russian languages. *DSc thes. in phil. scien.* Krasnodar.
28. Shomakhmudova, A. (2019). Classification of indirect speech structures represented by interrogative form in the Spanish communication text. *Foreign Philology*, (3), 36-44.
29. Todziev, Y. (1992). *Morphemics of the Uzbek language*. www.ziyo.uz.
30. Usmonov, S. (1972). *General linguistics*. Teacher Publishers.
31. Yahya Mohammed Ali Al-Marrani. (2009). A Comparative and Contrastive Study of Preposition in Arabic and English. *Language in India*, 9(7), 46-68.
32. Zakiryanov, K.Z. (2015). Comparative study of different structures with languages: linguo-methodological aspect. *Liberal Arts in Russia*, 4(3), 224-233. <https://doi.org/10.15643/libartrus-2015.3.6>.