

## Communicative-Semantic Types of Interrogative Sentences

***Kholmatova Vazira Narzullaevna***

*Karshi state Institute of Engineering and Economics, Associate Professor of the Department's  
"Foreign Languages", Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology*

**Abstract.** *In the process of communication, the speaker is not limited to conveying simple information about the events in reality, but also expresses his attitude towards this event and tries to influence the mind and emotions of the listener. Interrogative sentences are the linguistic manifestation of a speech act with the purpose of asking a question. In other words, a question sentence is a syntactic device that corresponds to a certain type of speech act. Therefore, while describing the question sentence as a surface structure with certain syntactic features, it should also be noted that it has semantic properties.*

**Key words:** *Speech structure, interrogative sentences, semantics, pragmalinguistics, speech acts, intention, connotative meaning, root meaning.*

Query structures can be classified in different ways according to their functional performance. The most important of these indicators is the functional-semantic feature of asking a question, this feature is manifested directly in the process of analysis of the communication situation and determines the structural structure of the structure. Based on this criterion, Professor L.P. Chakhoyan distinguishes seven functional-semantic groups of question structures: verification (verification, confirmation) question, appellative (appeal) question, re-questioning question, determination question, information question, identification question and conflict question ( Chakhoyan 1979: 79-85).

When this classification is analyzed from the point of view of the theory of speech acts, it becomes possible to make certain clarifications. In particular, the first or the second of the proposed groups have a primary character, they arise spontaneously, naturally during direct speech communication. Those in the third and fourth groups have a secondary character and appear as a response to the interlocutor's words. For example, compare :

- 1<sup>a</sup>) Where did you learn to speak like that (Harold Pinter);
- 1<sup>b</sup>) My father saw the traces of coal in the snow, and asked my mother in the evening : " Who did we give coal to ?" ( O'. Hoshimov).
- 2<sup>a</sup>) Do you like my dress, Mr. Goldberg? (Harold Printer);
- 2<sup>b</sup>) "I came with a good job," said my mother in a calm tone. "Do you know Adilkhoja ?" (Otkir Hashimov).
- 3<sup>a</sup>) M. Your, you spend too much time in bed.  
L. What do you mean? (Harold Pinter);
- 3<sup>b</sup>) A.-Don't you know Basharatkhan ? said my mother hastily.  
B. - What was it? - said the woman interrupting my mother (O'tkir Hashimov).
- 4<sup>a</sup>) P. Well, I'll have to be off.

G. Off ? (Harold Pinter);

4<sup>b</sup>) A.—If he is older than you, he will be smarter than you .

B. - What about yourself? —My mother caught my father's eye (O'tkir Hashimov).

When comparing the structure of question structures belonging to the primary and secondary groups, it is known that the elements referring to the content of the question in the primary group are somewhat more clearly expressed than those in the secondary group. Already, in structures of the secondary type, the speaker relies on the previous syntactically expressed linguistic situation when forming the question, and therefore does not repeat the elements present in the previous replica. These elements are easily replayed in the listener's mind. Importantly, any type of expansion in the secondary question structure causes connotative meaning to arise. For example :

Q. Where is my tea?

M. I took away. You didn't want it.

S. What do you mean, you took away? (Harold Pinter).

- Tagin will put himself in the goal! Dadavoy spat between his teeth. "Do you have permission ?" - he said, his voice sounded like iron.

- Why? "What do I need permission for, Comrade Toship?"

The appearance of the second clarifying question in these dialogue fragments is due to the fact that the speech act of the question indicates the active beginning of the communication process. Having such a characteristic of the question is determined, first of all, by the realization of the communicative-pragmatic goal. This goal is manifested in the performance of a certain communicative task of the sentence. (Ivanova and dr. 1981:268). This feature of the question is seen, secondly, in its conditioning by the communication environment, because the element of the semantic structure to which the question is directed is important for the formation of the speech structure.

Interrogative sentences have the appearance of real (when the question is about things and events in reality), appellative (when the question is directed to the interlocutor's mind, mental state), directive (when the question is directed to an instruction, recommendation) in relation to the expressed intention, communicative. In appellative and directive interrogative constructions, the subjective modality dye constructions are usually activated. (Zolotova 1982: 239).

According to the types of logical operations, which are the basis of the formation of corog structures, they are divided into two types. The first of them has the character of clarification and is formed when the speaker feels the desire to clarify and compare the known knowledge, and the second has the character of searching for information and occurs when the speaker is looking for missing information.

Communicative-semantic types of interrogative sentences are distinguished on the basis of the interrelation of the request intention and logical actions.

In particular, question structures for the purpose of objective-determinism constitute types of determination in relation to the execution of logical operations, if they are factual in relation to the intention of communication. These question structures appear in different ways depending on how the question is directed. For example :

1) Did you sleep, Edward? (Harold Pinter);

2) Is that you, Petty? (Harold Pinter);

3) You got a flat of your own (Harold Pinter);

4) Did you sleep well? (Harold Pinter).

The first of these structures is a question of fundamental determination, while the second has the character of referential determination. In the third structure, the goal of question identification is intended, and in the fourth, subjective modality occurs.

A speech structure can take the form of an evaluation when a question is asked about an event that has not yet happened. A question with the purpose of determining in such a possibility has the nature of obtaining information, but since the question is directed to an event that has not been observed in reality, it receives the content of evaluation. For example :

- 1) What are you going to do? (Harold Pinter);
- 2) What would my father say , if he knew? And what would Eddie say? (Harold Pinter);
- 3) What do you want to claim now ? (Abdullah Qahhar) ;
- 4) Well, shall we teach Muhayo again that " this is not that, this is this " ? With which face do we want to teach intelligence? (Abdullah Qahhar).

Directive interrogative structures are formed when the speaker needs instructions for future action in the context of communication. Accordingly, this type of speech activity is connected with other extralinguistic activities. Two types of directive questions are distinguished based on the difference in the logical operations to be performed. In the first of these, express the purpose of accepting or denying the instruction given by the interrogative sentence:

Shall I tell you who they're looking for? (Harold Pinter).

But directive-information-seeking query structures are often directed at obtaining a specific directive:

V. What shall I do with it?

M. Well, I don't... (Harold Pinter).

Thus, it is necessary to distinguish between primary and secondary interrogative structures relative to the occurrence of the interrogative situation. The first of them occurs in order to determine uncertainty in a given situation, while the second aims to obtain information about certain aspects of the situation.

At this point, we would like to remind you that there is another type of interrogative structures with a mixed communicative purpose in the English and Uzbek language systems. These types of constructions are sentences that have both interrogative and negative forms at the same time. Sentences of this type are often characterized in two ways, that is, some classify them as interrogatives, while others classify them as negatives (Wunderlich 1981; Hudson 1995).

L.K. Chistogonova and I.V. Andreeva, studying such structures from the point of view of describing the asymmetry of levels, distinguishes the following contrast:

- 1) Question structure-message statement;
- 2) Formed negative structure - a sentence with an affirmative meaning (Chistogonova 1984; Andreeva 1985).

It is well known that a typical interrogative sentence expresses the main question schema and shows the symmetry of both levels. In fact, it has the form of a question at the syntactic level and expresses the intention of asking a question at the communicative level. The question-negation structure that we are analyzing now differs from the usual question sentence in that it has a formal indicator of negation. In this view, structures show that the speaker does not always intend to get information, and the meaning of the structure is not related to the grammatical meaning.

Under the influence of the context, on the one hand, the contradiction between the functional types of the sentence disappears and the meaning of the message appears in the composition of the sentences in the question-negation structure, on the other hand, the meaning of the affirmation is activated as a result of the neutralization of the negation/affirmation contrast. Such an interpretation, of course, gives rise to an idea about the specific structural features of question structures of this type. But this approach is not able to describe the structural and communicative features of these structures and to describe the reasons for the semantic shifts in the content.

In the linguistics literature, it is often noted that the sentence is a multifaceted and multidimensional phenomenon (Mahmudov, Nurmonov 1995; Safarov 1983), the authors list several aspects of the sentence. In particular, V.G. Admoni distinguished the content and structure aspects of the sentence and proposed to distinguish seven types in terms of content (Admoni 1975). Content aspects V.G. It is interpreted by Admoni as a feature objectively inherent in the formal indicators of the sentence. E.V. Gulyga notes four main aspects of the sentence phenomenon: 1) formal-syntactic; 2) semantic-syntactic; 3) communicative; 4) nominative (Gulyga 1975).

English linguist R. Huddleston believes that the consideration of the semantic-syntactic role encourages recognition of the traditionally distinguished types of declarative, question, and exclamatory sentences as the main categories (Huddleston 1995: 365). is not limited to, but also covers intermediate structures with mixed communicative target characteristics. Speech structures in the question-negation structure are just such.

Preliminary observations on sentences in the interrogative-negation structure confirm that they are formed within the framework of existing models in the language and that they include features of both types. For example, Why haven't you told me? is an example of the symmetry of the constructive and communicative levels, that is, the sentence is a question and a negation both in terms of form and meaning.

So, changes in the content structure of interrogative speech structures are one of the unique features of the communication system, and the fate of this problem makes it possible to determine the factors that ensure the realization of the communicative-expressive function of the language.

## REFERENCES

1. Chakhoyan L.P. Syntax dialogichesk ee rechi angliyskogo zyzyka. - M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1979.
2. Harold Pinter. Plays: one. -London, 1987.
3. Otkir Hashimov. The affairs of the world. (stories). - T.: "Ilm-ziyo-zakovat", 2019.
4. Ivanova I.P., Burlakova V.V., Pocheptsov G.G. Theoretical grammar of the modern English language. -M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1981.- 268st .
5. Zolotova G.A. Communicative aspects of Russian syntax. - M.: Nauka, 1982.-368 p.
6. Abdullah Qahhor. Love.-T.: New age generation, 248 p.
7. Wunderlich D. Questions about questions// Crossing the boundaries in linguistics. -Dordrecht: Reidel, 1981.- p.131-158 .
8. Hudson RA The meaning of questions// Language, 1995. Vol.51 .- p.1 -31.
9. Chistogonova L.K. Sintakshicheskie phraseologizmy so znacheniem otritsaniya v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke. Autoref. diss ... cand. Philol. science - L., 1984.-24 p.
10. Andreeva I.V. Grammaticheskaya category of Austrian and contemporary English language. Autoref. diss ... cand. Philol. science - M., 1985.-23 p.
11. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. - T.: Teacher, 1995. - 232 p.
12. Safarov Sh. Principle of system-semantic analysis of syntax. -S amarkand : SamGU, 1983.-97p.
13. Admoni V.G. Soderzhateln ee i komposisionnye aspekti predlozheniya// Teoreticheskie problemy syntaxisa indoevropskikh yazykov. L.: Nauka, 1975.
14. Guly E.V. O semantic predlozheniya // Teoreticheskie problemy syntaxis indoevropskikh yazykov. L.: Nauka, 1975.
15. Huddleston R. Introduction to the Grammar of English. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. - 483 p.

16. Kholmatova V.N. Connotative, nominative and predicative aspects of speech structure semantics // Journal of foreign philology: language, literature, education. - Samarkand : SamDCHTI, No. 4 (89), 2023, pp. 50-53.
17. Kholmatova VN Speaking structures of semantics connotative sections // UZBEKISTAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY NEWS , - T.: 20 23, [1/12/1], ISSN 2181-7324.