Syntactic and semantic usage of interrogative pronouns in English and Uzbek languages

D. T. Normamatova

Gulistan State University

E-mail: dilfuzalight@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

In this article it is expressed the semantic forms of interrogative pronoun and the use of interrogative questions as part of the design of a communication. It is also followed the interrogative pronouns' different activation and the accessing the connection of with other variants of syntaxes. It is clarified the functions of interrogatives which are "**Who, What, Which**" have variety of syntaxes denoting agentive, state, qualitative, relative and the function of object. Thereby, it is studied the positions and the scaling of agentive syntaxes in special and general questions. In the work it is enlightened that the most common prompt for creating questions in language is the interrogative pronoun, more commonly known in learning language system. In the article it is conveyed the differences and the categories of interrogatives and the using them in oral speech, their connections via prepositions, the studies of connotative connections by the examples. This article re-visits these pronouns drawing on a wide range of literatures to establish them into a coherent frame for designing and implementing large-scale in observing and working on pronouns.

Keywords: semantics, questionnaires, syntax, task, text, contextual, state, function, substitution, category, speech, object.

Developing the Republic in the world community and it's growing and international relations, commerce, tourism and cultural and economic relations between the countries strengthen future youth will be better able to speak English and freely discuss issues related to foreign languages; one of the most important tasks of today is to teach English for communicating in oral and written forms. [Таълим тараққиёти, 1999]

Also, because each language has its own lexical, grammatical, and stylistic features, it is impossible to translate the sentences without realizing their meaning into other languages. In this article, we will explore the syntactic-semantic meanings of the English interrogative pronouns and the extent to which their translation into Uzbek. Speaking in interviews, the speaker tries to get new information from the participants in the speech process to discover what is unknown to them.

Purpose of the research

To identify the expressive means of lexemes in English and Uzbek, to reveal their syntactic semantic functional meanings, to study the common and distinctive features of the spoken languages, and to characterize the specifics used in literary texts. At the same time, the study of the activation of syntactic semantics used in the interogative system in the systemic interconnection of the syntactic semantic meanings of both morphological, lexical and syntactic expressions in both languages. To explore the unique syntactic semantics and formal distributive features of words used in questions interrogative pronouns based on indicators such as syntactic linkage, linking with other syntax, syntactic positions (positions), lexical sources in the sentence. In addition, the results of this work can be widely used to improve translation theory, combining them with other

International Journal of Research
Available at
https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 07 Issue 03
March 2020

syntax, exploring lexical foundations, expressing lexemes, and explaining the peculiarities of verb lexemes and their use in compiling literary texts.

Object and the methods of the research

The subject of this article is the syntactic semantic meanings of the interrogative pronouns in each language, their expressive means, their syntactic semantic meanings, and their common and distinctive features in the English and Uzbek texts of various families. The functions and their peculiarities in the use of literary language in the world literature. The methods of comparative-typological system analysis, transformation and modeling are widely used in the article.

The results obtained and their analysis

Interrogative pronouns are: to the person (who?), to the subject (what?), to the mark (what? How?), to the amount (how many, how many), to the time (when?), to the purpose and reason (why, why?) and to the place (why?). where, where, where, where?) [Abdurakhmanov, 1973].

One of the grammatical character is that the interrogative pronouns which are expressed differently in syntactic semantics, its lexemes and characteristics within a group of pronouns. The interrogative pronouns have a very broad meaning: relativity, demonstrative, indefinite, negative, and cumulative meanings, and each of them requires certain lexemes to interact with other syntaxes.

Generally speaking, the use of all interrogative pronouns in sytactic semantics by their meanings and types, we call **interogatives** in international terminology. Intergative pronouns, such as **who**, **what**, **why**, **which**, **whose** pronouns differ from each other in syntactic semantics, are substitute or quasi-qualitative syntaxes, and may also have non-categorical characters on the other hand [Mukhin1973].

First, let's look at **who, what, which,** which are subgroups, and which are the following: *Who is speaking? Who of us can still remember his name? Who are ready to follow me? Whom did you see? Of whom are you speaking? Whom*

do you want? What are you talking about? What is it made of? What is his name? What is he? What do you take for me? Which will you take milk or ice-cream? Which of you did that? Which of the two is better? Which of the members were present? Which would you like best?

Examples are syntaxes that have the most variation among substitute interogative syntaxes, and have their own functions, such as expressing message, status, quality, equality or sentence completion. The interrogative agent syntax does not lose its meaning and position when it comes to other words. Only lexemes can change at this time.

Who is speaking?____Is John speaking?

Whom did you see? ___ Did you see my friend?

What are you talking about? ____ Are you talking about the event? Etc.

Formulas that have changed shape, that is, general interrogative (as opposed to special questions) do not simply represent the corresponding agent or complementary syntax, but also have the ability to link subcategory categories with other variables or elements. Through this transformative experiment, it becomes easier for the researcher to identify the characters present in the interogative syntax. There are also some limitations in the use of interogative syntax, as we can see in the following examples:

Who of us can still remember his name? Which of the two is better?

(қайси биримиз унинг исмини ҳали ҳам эслаймиз? Иккаласидан қайси бири яхшироқ?)

By restricting the preposition <u>of</u> this example in the sentence, we can distinguish the nouns syntax represented by nouns from interstitial interrogative syntax:

<u>*Who*</u> *can still remember his name? Ким ҳали ҳам унинг исмини эслай олади?*

Can John still remember his name? Жон ҳали ҳам унинг исмини эслай оладими? Which is better? Қайси яхшироқ? Is this book is better? Мана бу китоб яхшироқми?

In the substitutionary introgativity of the specified boundary transformation, syntaxes of additivity (similarity, conformity) can be formed, and this is the case with the load load.

Who else could be? Who else is coming?What else could I do but this?

This discrepancy shows that in a substitute interogotiv, the horse is directly linked to the horse. The prediction of Of and else is always involved in the interrogative discourse with the relative subclasses of who, who, what, which, that. There are different variants of each substitute interogotivity in the language, and they are interconnected with each other, so that syntaxes with interrogative object or medium can sometimes form prepositional:

Of whom __ Whom ... Of,

of whom are you speaking? ___ Whom are you speaking of?

About what ___ what .... about.

About what are you talking? ___ What are you talking about?

Of what ___ what .... Of.

For what do you take me? ___ What do you take me for. Ваҳ.к.

We have outlined above complementary and complementary substitution relative syntaxes. This is most commonly used in oral communication. In addition, verbal discourse sometimes includes a broader sense of prepositionalism, with the use of who is the substitute for the pronoun: *Who do you want? Who were you talking to?* When it comes to who or who, we can look directly at the conjunctive (s) variants of what or which ones can be changed meaningfully, and find out the differences in their relative meanings to the subject and by using examples of their qualitative category.

What papers do you read? What manner of man is he? What good is it?

International Journal of Research
Available at
https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 07 Issue 03
March 2020

Which book did you choose? Which boy won the prize? Which is the right road? I'm going with the girls___ which girls?

Another example is the verbal and written speech of what the pronoun has more quantitative than the quantitative unit. What time is it? So how much is the quantum syntax of what pronoun equals paradigmatic equivalence: How much time did it take you?

The foregoing data emphasize the detailed study of interogative and substitute syntaxes, and provide separate case studies (scientific) and broad reasoning with proper interpretation [Mukhin 1973].

Intergovernmental syntax plays an important role in exploring what and Which interconnects intersections in a broad and profound way.

In any language, interogative plays an important role in learning the main and secondary sentences in grammar. In science and practice, well-known grammar scholars have used interrogative to distinguish between main and secondary sentences. In particular, O. Jespersen makes the following requirement when examining a filler that is a secondary sentence: "When we use the pronouns *who* or *what* we use in the study of the owner, we can continue to use who and what in words and for verbs" [O. Jespersen, 1977]. In a word, the scientist refers to *how, why, when, where* to answer the question, which ones, and what to answer, as a complement. Comparison of Poutsma and condition (adverbial adjuncts by its term) is a compound word with the prefix*, to whom, to what, and when, where, why, in what way, for what purpose, how, how much* such as interogative. [Poutsma, 1996].

Interogative pronouns can be divided into interrogative and interrelated pronouns, both of which are relative pronouns. When interrogative are involved in the creation of interrogative, the link questioners are included in the accompanying sentences. The difference between the following phrases is that

International Journal of Research
Available at
https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 07 Issue 03
March 2020

they require the horse in some followings and sometimes the identifier in the following sentences.

Eg. Who put that light out? (B. Shaw) (interogative) Who goes light travels first. (tell) you hate people who have no character? (B. Shaw) (Relative). In the course of the speech, the Whom questionnaire is sometimes used instead of the Whom interogative form: "who are you calling a goat?" , "If You Come to Who, Who Are You Calling Sheep?" (R. Rosenblatt, 1984) "Do You Think They got orders?" asked Betty. "Yes, exactly who I know from you."

On the other hand, the form of the interogative receiver in which the revenue is exchanged can be applied to inanimate objects in the form of relative pronouns. Which pronoun applies only to inanimate objects: He made his way to the bench from which he had first departed. (R. Rosenblatt, 1984). She was surprised and amazed at almost the same way in which she put her aside (R. Rosenblatt, 1984).

Which also applies to inanimate objects, since there are no alternatives to the questioning. Eg. *she wore a bench of cyclamen procured by him from town __ a flower of whose scent she was very found*.It also allows you to choose a subject or person as opposed to which - who or what*"Am I to give the waiter anything: or will you do it yourself? "which waiter is it? The English one?" . But which is it to be? Fight or make friends?*(J. Waller, 1993).

Who _ is used only as a substantive pronoun. What (whatever) and which (whichever) are used in place of both substantive and subjective pronouns. *What makes you think that (E. Hemingway) What right have you to say that, sir. (J. Waller, 1993) which is better? Which book is better?*

Who interogative lexeme is usually expressed in conjunction with the verb section.Who knows it? If the phrase refers to more than one person, the verb is in the plural: Who are concerned with it? (J. Waller, 1993). What's next is always represented by the verb section.The analysis of each word is analyzed by a

International Journal of Research

Available at

https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/

e-ISSN: 2348-6848
p-ISSN: 2348-795X
Volume 07 Issue 03
March 2020

"question method", and the division of words into subnormal and quantitative syntax forms generic or non-node characters.The variation of lexemes in the form of interogative is defined by transmitted or non-categorical symbols to identify temporal, locative, and other syntactic phrases called displacement interrogative.The interconnectedness of syntax variants creates a paradigmatic equivalent, which is not a question for the researcher.To be more precise, interogative syntax transforms in a systematic way [A. Mukhin 1973].

As we talk about interogative pronouns, we will highlight some of them. In particular, *She saw John ___ Whom did he see?* In interogative we see not only complementary syntax, but also see lexemini, which means that the interogative transformation involves the presence of two interrogative syntaxes, namely substational and procedural syntax.

The process is expressed using an intergovernmental syntax doc lexekmi Do (P) ... Displays V1 in a general interogative: Did she see John transform into a general interogative? It is possible to generate a procedural interogative syntax.

Summary

As we examine the transformation of interogative pronouns, we learn not only the speech but also the language, its resources, which department is relevant, and their interrogative syntax are equivalent, and that interogative is of particular importance in the language.One of the semantic syntactic features of interogative is that it is used in two different ways for human names and others (animals, birds, and objects).Who basically comes with the function. *What_* the interogative pronoun can be both subject and object: what you have bought? (what did you buy?), what is your name? (What's your name?), A subjective allusion What questions were asked? (What kind of questions have you got?) (Adjective).Whose pronoun also comes with ownership.But here he was put in the form of Who's Own, because he is an interrogative (Possessive).

The pronoun_ *Whose* are mainly used as adjective pronouns, and in some cases, there may also be misspelled words identifying the interrogative pronoun *Whose*. It largely depends on the nature of the context.The effectiveness of using semantic features of interrogators in learning a foreign language is enhanced by enrichment and enrichment of speech, speech, systematic language learning, and the interrelationship between speech, and speech consistency.

References

1. Abdurakhmanov, G. A. . Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. Sh Khodzhiev. A. P Uzbek Grammar T - 1978

2. Storm, J. Storm. M. English Grammar T _1978, p -73-75

3. Buronov J, Comparative Grammar of English and Uzbek. T _1973. P- 96

4. Blokh M. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. M,, 1983.

5. Jespersen O. The Philosophy o f Grammar. Lnd., 1977.

6. 4. Mukhin. A. Syntaxemnical analysis of English language. M_ 1978 p-123 288

7. Poutsma H. A Grammar of the English Language. Groningen, 1996. P- 78

8. Bulletin of the Ministry of Public Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan № 5, 1999

9. Robert James Waller. "Slow walts in gend bend". New York_ 1993

10. Roger Rosenblatt. Children of War. New York, Anchor press_ 1984