

CLASSIFICATION OF INTERROGATIVES IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

Assistant professor,
Normamatova Dilfuza
 dilfuzanormamatova05gmail.com
 Uzbekistan,
 Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute.

In world linguistics, research on the theory of interrogatives within the framework of language levels is mainly based on the lexical features of interrogative pronouns. Although significant progress has been made in studying the role and significance of the lexical and semantic layer of language units, a comparative typological study of interrogative words as verbal means in Uzbek and English clarifies their semantic essence at the syntactic level. In traditional grammar, sentences formed with the participation of interrogative signs, linguistic interrogative units, or verbalizers are called interrogative sentences. There are several approaches of world linguists to the theory of research of interrogative sentences, which consider it partially important to observe the process of using interrogative verbalizers as verbal means in the essence of the interrogative sentence, in particular, in the process of expressing the purpose of the speaker to get some information from the listener.

The study of interrogative sentences by dividing them into types also acquires clarity and meaning in the study of their grammatical and lexical aspects. Because pure interrogative sentences and rhetorical interrogative sentences are completely different morphologically, lexically and especially phonetically, creating parameters of accuracy for the language learner, first of all, it requires a classification study of the category of interrogativity.

If we analyze the classification of interrogative sentences by linguists separately, almost every type of interrogative sentence is usually used to learn about something unknown to the speaker and to get information about it. Literally speaking, the classification of interrogatives at the linguistic level is mainly made up of interrogative pronouns, particles and intonation.

The division of interrogative sentences into such types is mainly determined by the structure and form of the sentences. Although interrogative sentences in English, like in Uzbek, are structured similarly to the form, they do not allow for a full formal description of the event during communication, and sometimes perform various functions to deviate from the content and accumulate additional meanings based on the context.

In Uzbek linguistics, interrogative sentences and the purposeful use of interrogative verbalizers in their expression have been widely studied by many linguists and researchers. R. Sayfullayeva, B. Mengliev, G. Bakiyeva in their scientific works entitled "Modern Uzbek Literary Language" like world linguists say that sentences are divided into declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences, emphasizing that sentences are a purely speech phenomenon, they do not limit the types of sentences. J. Buranov also said in this regard: "But it is impossible to draw a sharp line between these types of sentences. One species can replace another. Let's say, in form, the predicate sentence can express the content of the question, and the interrogative sentence can express the content of the predicate." For example:

1. Who does not love a mother? (question in form, message in content)
2. Do you look at the tablecloth? (question in form, proposal in content)

R. Sayfullayeva identified the types of interrogative sentences mixed with other meanings and defined them as follows:

1. **The question is the sentence itself: Did Salim come?**
2. **Question – surprise: Did Salim come?**
3. **Question - surprise: Does it rain like this in summer?**
4. **Question-satisfaction: Did Salim finish?**
5. **Question-doubt: Will he take it out?**

6. Question - guess: Aren't you a scientist?**7. Question – message: Did he finish? (See, in the sense of "finished.")**

If interrogative sentences are divided into types such as interrogative-command: "Won't we go faster?," A. G. Gulyamov calls such types of interrogative sentences mental manifestations of questions. A. G. Gulyamov mentally developed interrogative sentences: 1. A pure interrogative sentence. 2. Interrogative sentence. 3. Interrogative sentence. 4. Interrogative-command sentence. 5. Interrogative sentence. 6. Interrogative sentence. 7. Classifies on the basis of types such as interrogative sentences.

N. Mahmudov. A. Nurmonov, while thinking about the category of interrogativity, divides interrogative sentences formally into three parts in the scientific textbook "Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language":

1. Interrogative sentences formed based on interrogative particles (**-chi, -mi, -a, -ya**).

Would you recognize those people if you saw them now? (U. Hoshimov. Lives in a dream. – P.107).

2. Interrogative sentences formed using interrogative pronouns (who, what, when, where, etc.).

Wait, who's inside? (U. Khoshimov. Lifetimes in a dream. P. 108).

3. Interrogative sentences formed with the help of an interrogative tone.

The interrogative tone is a universal means of expressing a question. It is present in all types of interrogative sentences. However, when special formal means of expressing the question are not used, the tone is the main means of expressing the question.

For example: **Water came – Water came?**

A. Nurmonov divides the meaning of interrogative sentences into interrogative sentences representing different variants of semes:

1. Pure interrogative seme. 2. Semantics of surprise. 3. Semantics of doubt. 4. Semantics of command. 5. Semantics of the message. 6. Semantics of anxiety. 7. Semantics of anger. 8. Ironic semantics and others. The relationship of these semes within the interrogative archetype forms the semantic paradigmatic relationship of interrogative sentences. Within the semantic paradigm, the first seme is central to the interrogative sentence, while the remaining semes are considered border semes.

R. Sayfullayeva, B. Mengliev, G. Bakiyeva, agreeing with the scientific views of A. Nurmonov, in their textbook "Modern Uzbek Literary Language" call such sentences with semes mixed with other meanings interrogative sentences and according to the content of interrogative sentences, they are divided into two types of interrogative sentences:

1) a general question (in which the thing or event is fully defined: What is this? Is this a book? (in this case, the answer belongs to the predicate);

2) a private question (in which one side of the thing or event is determined: What kind of book is this? How much does the book cost? Where did you come from? (where the answer is any part except the predicate expressed by the interrogative pronoun).

If each of these two types forms an interrogative sentence model at the language level, their interrogative meanings are manifested through different semes:

1. Pure interrogative seme: What did you come with? (U. Hoshimov. – P. 50).

2. Semantics of surprise: Have you never been sick? (U. Hoshimov. Lives in a dream. – P. 67).

3. Semantics of doubt: Well done! Do you do sports? (U. Hoshimov. Lives in a dream. – P. 67).

4. Semantic imperative: Aren't you going to the wedding? Why are you crying? (U. Khoshimov. Lifetimes in a dream. – P. 62).

5. The semantic sign: should the working class rest, after all? (U. Hoshimov. Lives in a dream. – P. 35)

6. Semantic anxiety: Do you know that what you have done is a crime?

The relationship of these semes within the interrogative archetype forms the semantic paradigmatic relationship of interrogative sentences. Primarily, within the semantic paradigm of interrogative sentences, it expresses the interrogative seme and their connotative meanings through the relationship between form and content. According to the relationship between form and content, interrogative sentences are divided into two groups:

1) interrogative sentences that are proportional in form and content (pure interrogative sentences);

2) interrogative sentences that are disproportionate in form and content.

Interrogative sentences whose form and content are disproportionate include interrogative means and are considered interrogative sentences only in terms of form," but the speaker's intention is not to ask about an unknown event, but to provide information about a known event.

The classification of interrogative sentences is usually based on their form, content, or function. N. Mahmudov. In the scientific views of A. Nurmonov in this regard, there is almost no great difference in the formation of interrogative sentences according to the meaning of their mental or formal content. According to the authors, in traditional grammar, interrogative sentences are divided into general interrogative sentences and special interrogative sentences, and other interrogative sentences are studied in their composition. Interrogative sentences formed for communicative purposes are expressed through verbal means that are the basis of the predicative complex and their special linear arrangement. In the organization of interrogative sentences, intonation can serve as an additional tool. In most cases, the characteristics of the formal interrogative sentence representing interrogative sentences are determined by the following four features:

1. Word order.
2. Interrogative words.
3. Intonational form.
4. Question mark.

However, the combination of the aforementioned features in a sentence may not always represent an interrogative sentence. First of all, this is due to the fact that the content of the sentence is combined with formal signs. The conclusions of many scholars based on observations of interrogative sentences are that sentences in the form of interrogative sentences do not always have an interrogative character, but rather conjecture, surprise or doubt.

Another classification of the structure of the interrogative sentence was proposed by I. I. Pribitok, who classifies interrogative sentences as monopredicative structures and emphasizes that a certain criterion of the placement of predicative parts in interrogative sentences, that is, the placement of an auxiliary verb before the subject and an independent verb with a certain content after the subject in the sentence, is a stable state of interrogativity. At the same time, in his scientific work entitled "sentence representatives," the author also mentions some conclusions about the peculiarities of the omission of verbs with independent meaning after the subject in the structure of the interrogative sentence.

The expression of interrogative sentences in the classification adapted by David Crystal into three types, namely:

general interrogative sentences (Yes-No questions),

wh-questions,

alternative questions

in addition to the types of interrogative sentences, there are several other types of interrogative sentences:

exclamatory questions,

rhetorical questions,

affirmative interrogative sentences (Tag questions, Tags ,eh? (OK? Right? ay? eh?)

M. Ya. Bloch also proposes to classify interrogative sentences based on the answers and conclusions given to them, not on the basis of the communicative purpose. Interrogatives are

divided into three types according to the question-answer relationship, and they are divided into: 1) a type of relationship that always gives a verbal answer to a question; 2) a type of relationship that requires a regular response; 3) a type of question attitude that constantly attracts attention during speech and discussion. In this regard, interrogativity is first studied through the required answers, and at the same time, it is clarified whether the sentence has a question content or not. At the same time as the author, E. N. Lindstrom divides the categories of interrogativity into 9 types based on a pragmatic universal model:

- 1) real questions;
- 2) questions on the request;
- 3) exam questions;
- 4) didactic questions.
- 5) questions on the rules of etiquette;
- 6) preliminary questions;
- 7) questions and suggestions;
- 8) question-doubt;
- 9) game questions.

From the classification of interrogative sentences by a number of linguists, it can be seen that interrogativity is not considered a new or little-studied field in linguistics, this type of sentence (interrogative) has been studied from the point of view of structure, semantics, stylistic use, their role in communication.

The formation and development of any field of science begins with the emergence of interest in the object of this field. Questions arise through curiosity. It is understood that questions form the basis of the goal set for people in personal, professional, academic, scientific, and production development in existence and in any field.

The phenomenon indicating the marker of interrogativity is a question - a philosophical, psychological, logical linguistic category, a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that organizes interrogative sentences and is implemented through interrogative verbalizers. Also, the category of interrogativity is not a separate category, we study this category along with categories such as time and space, quality and quantity.

To analyze interrogative statements, it is necessary to clarify the structure and semantics of the word in which the question is expressed in the sentence and its function, which requires a comprehensive approach, in which the classification of interrogative sentences is based on their form, content or function. At the same time, their formal criteria are based on a pragmatic approach.

REFERENCES

1. David Crystal. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. – Cambridge: CUP, 1995.– 218p.
2. Normamatova D. T. Qualificative forms of interrogative means in english and uzbek languages. (2025). International conference on multidisciplinary studies and education, 2(4), 283-285. <https://eoconf.com/index.php/icmse/article/view/339>
3. Normamatova Dilfuza Turdikulovna (2018). Strategies of improving the language barrier. Научные исследования, (3 (22), 51-52.
4. Normamatova Dilfuza Turdikulovna Strategies of improving the language barrier // Научные исследования. 2018. №3 (22). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/strategies-of-improving-the-language-barrier> (дата обращения: 23.04.2026).
5. Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. – Cambridge: University Press, 2002. – P. 856- 866.

6. Turdikulovna, Normamatova D. "Verbal Means of Expressing the Category of Interrogativeness in Uzbek and English Languages." *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 05, 31 May. 2021, pp. 419-431.

7. Блох М. Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1983. – С. 253.

8. Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. – М.: Иностранная литература, 1958. – С.354.

9. Линдстрём Е. Н. Классификация русских вопросительных по форме высказываний на базепрагматически обоснованной универсальной модели. – Петрозаводск.: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук., 2003. – С. 189.

10. Маҳмудов Н., Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси. – Тошкент.: Ўқитувчи, 1995. – Б. 51-52 .

11. Сайфуллаева Р., Менглиев Б., Бокиева Г., Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент.: Ўқитувчи, 2006. – Б. 30.

12. Ҳожиев А. Тилшунослик терминларининг изоҳли луғати. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, [www. Ziyo.uz kutubxonasi](http://www.Ziyo.uz), – Б. 79.