

Lingua-Cultural Analysis of Interrogative Sentences in English and Uzbek Languages

Turopova Charos Akhmatovna

*1st year Master's student of the Foreign languages and literature faculty, University of Economics and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan
charosturopova1998@gmail.com*

Kurbonov Parida Kurbonovich

PhD., associate professor of the University of Economics and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan

Abstract. *Interrogative sentences are an essential aspect of any language, reflecting both linguistic structures and cultural nuances. This study investigates the lingua-cultural features of interrogative sentences in English and Uzbek languages, emphasizing their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects. The research explores how cultural contexts influence the formulation and use of interrogative constructions. By comparing these two languages, the study highlights both universal and language-specific features of interrogatives. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic communication and cultural pragmatics, which is particularly relevant for language learners and translators.*

Key words: *interrogative sentences, lingua-cultural analysis, English, Uzbek, pragmatics, syntax, semantics.*

Introduction. Interrogative sentences serve as fundamental tools for information exchange across languages. They play a crucial role in human communication by allowing individuals to request information, clarify doubts, and engage in social interactions. The structure and usage of interrogatives vary significantly depending on linguistic and cultural contexts. While English and Uzbek belong to different language families—Indo-European and Turkic, respectively—their interrogative constructions reveal both universal and language-specific features.

This study aims to analyze the similarities and differences in the interrogative structures of English and Uzbek from a lingua-cultural perspective. By examining syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects, the research provides insights into how cultural norms shape the formulation and interpretation of questions in both languages. Understanding these differences is essential for effective cross-cultural communication and language learning.

Methodology. This study employs a comparative linguistic approach, analyzing data from English and Uzbek corpora, literary texts, and conversational discourse. The research follows a qualitative method, with a focus on syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic differences between interrogative structures in both languages.

Data Collection. The data used for analysis is sourced from: English and Uzbek corpora: The British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) are used for English, while Uzbek linguistic databases and online news articles are used for Uzbek.

Literary texts: Classic and contemporary literature, including works by William Shakespeare and Charles Dickens for English, and Abdulla Qodiriy and Chulpon for Uzbek.

Spoken discourse: Transcriptions of natural conversations from media interviews, daily conversations, and classroom settings.

Survey responses: Native speakers of both languages were surveyed to analyze real-world usage of interrogative structures in different contexts, including formal and informal settings.

Data Analysis. The collected data is analyzed using three primary approaches: Syntactic Analysis. The structure of interrogative sentences is examined, including word order, auxiliary usage, and question formation. For example: English: Did you see the movie? (Auxiliary + Subject + Verb + Object) Uzbek: Siz filmni ko'rdingizmi? (Subject + Object + Verb + Question Particle).

The difference in question formation, particularly the use of auxiliary verbs in English and the question particle *mi* in Uzbek, is analyzed to identify structural variations.

Semantic Analysis. The meanings and types of interrogative sentences are categorized, including yes/no questions, *wh*-questions, and rhetorical questions. Examples include:

Yes/No question:

English: Do you like coffee?

Uzbek: Siz qahva yoqtirasizmi?

Wh-question:

English: Where are you going?

Uzbek: Siz qayerga ketyapsiz?

Differences in how interrogative words like *who*, *what*, and *where* function in each language are analyzed.

Pragmatic Analysis. The study examines how cultural factors influence the choice and use of interrogative sentences. This includes: Politeness strategies: In English, indirect questions are often used for politeness (e.g., *Could you tell me where the station is?*), whereas in Uzbek, honorific forms are used (*Siz menga yordam bera olasizmi?*).

Formality levels: English often relies on intonation to convey formality, while Uzbek uses specific honorific markers to indicate respect.

Contextual use: Analysis of real-life conversations shows that Uzbek speakers tend to avoid direct questions in formal settings, preferring indirect questioning to maintain social harmony.

Comparative Framework. The findings are categorized based on linguistic and cultural distinctions, and a contrastive analysis is conducted to highlight the impact of language structure and cultural norms on question formation. Tables and charts are used to illustrate key differences.

Results. Syntactic Structures. English interrogatives typically follow the auxiliary-inversion rule. Examples include: *Do you like coffee?* *Where are you going?*

Uzbek, however, often relies on question particles such as *mi*. Examples include: *Siz qahva yoqtirasizmi?* (*Do you like coffee?*), *Siz qayerga ketyapsiz?* (*Where are you going?*). While English employs subject-auxiliary inversion (e.g., *Can you help me?*), Uzbek retains a fixed word order with the interrogative particle placed at the end. This fundamental syntactic difference illustrates the distinct structural frameworks of the two languages.

Semantic Features. Semantically, interrogative sentences in both languages serve to seek information, confirm assumptions, or clarify statements. However, the ways in which these meanings are realized differ:

English questions often rely on intonation and auxiliary verbs to convey subtle nuances. Uzbek questions use contextual cues and politeness markers to enhance clarity.

Pragmatic Features. Pragmatically, the formulation and interpretation of questions differ due to cultural factors. English speakers frequently use indirect questions for politeness: Could you tell me where the station is? Uzbek speakers, however, use honorifics and formal speech patterns to express politeness:

Kecha siz mehmonxonaga bordingizmi? (Did you go to the hotel yesterday?)

Discussion. Cultural Influence on Questioning Styles. Cultural norms significantly influence how questions are structured and received. In English-speaking cultures, direct questioning is common and often considered efficient. In contrast, Uzbek speakers may avoid direct questions in formal settings to maintain politeness.

Implications for Language Learning. Understanding these differences is essential for second-language learners. English learners of Uzbek must grasp the importance of honorifics and indirectness, while Uzbek learners of English need to be aware of the preference for directness and auxiliary inversion.

Conclusion. This study highlights the structural, semantic, and pragmatic distinctions in interrogative sentence formation between English and Uzbek. The findings reveal that English relies on auxiliary inversion and wh-words, whereas Uzbek depends on question particles and fixed word order. Additionally, cultural norms play a significant role in shaping how questions are phrased and perceived.

List of references:

1. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press
2. Jalolov, J. (2015). *Uzbek Language Structures*. Tashkent: National University Press.
3. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press.
5. Abduazizov, A. (2010). *Uzbek Syntax and Semantics*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
6. Mamadiytorova Mariyam Kosim kizi, & Bakhtiyorova Maftuna Bakhtiyorovna. (2025). PRAGMATIC AND STYLISTIC ASPECTS OF NEOLOGISMS IN CONTEMPORARY MEDIA AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCABULARY TEACHING. *Journal of Universal Science Research*, 3(1), 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14674390>
<https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/just/article/view/9454>
7. Mamadiytorova, M. ., & Bakhtiyorova, M. . (2025). PRAGMATIC AND STYLISTIC ASPECTS OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN ENGLISH (BASED ON MEDIA MATERIALS) AND THEIR ROLE IN TEACHING VOCABULARY. *Центральноазиатский журнал междисциплинарных исследований и исследований в области управления*, 2(1), 187–191. извлечено от <https://in-academy.uz/index.php/cajmrms/article/view/43009>
8. Mamadiytorova, M. ., & Bakhtiyorova, M. . (2025). PRAGMATIC AND STYLISTIC ASPECTS OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN ENGLISH (BASED ON MEDIA MATERIALS) AND THEIR ROLE IN TEACHING VOCABULARY. (2025). *Journal of Science-Innovative Research* in Uzbekistan, 3(1), 217-221. <https://universalpublishings.com/index.php/jsiru/article/view/9503>
9. Sadullaeva, N., & Bakhtiyorova, M. (2021). Reflection of Onomastic Principles in Naming. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 3001- 3007.
10. Бахтиёрова, М. (2024). Atoqli otlarning umumnazariy muammolari. *Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика*, 2(6), 40-45.
11. Ismoilov, A., & Bakhtiyorova, M. (2024). THE PROBLEM OF COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEANING IN PRESENT DAY LEXICOLOGY. *Current approaches and new research in modern sciences*, 3(7), 26-29.

12. Alisher o'g'li, I. A., & Bakhtiyorovna, B. M. (2024, May). THE PROBLEM OF COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS OF MEANING IN PRESENT DAY LEXICOLOGY. In Konferensiyalar| Conferences (Vol. 1, No. 10, pp. 748-752).
13. BAXTIYOROVA, M. (2024). ONOMASTIK KONSEPT TUSHUNCHASI. UzMU xabarlari, 1(1.4), 288-292. 14. Камолова, Р. Ш., & Бахтиярова, М. (2024). ЭМОЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ КОННОТАЦИИ ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ, ОПИСЫВАЮЩИХ ПОГОДУ. ТА'ЛИМ VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 4(1), 30-33.
14. Baxtiyoro va, M. (2023). ONOMASTIKONLARNING LINGVOMADANIY XUSUSIYATLARI. Namangan davlat universiteti Ilmiy axborotnomasi, (9), 464-469.
15. Baxtiyoro vna, B. M. (2023). INGLIZ VA O 'ZBEK BADIY ADABIYOTIDA ONOMASTIKONLARNING CHOG'ISHTIRMA SEMANTIK TAHLILI. " GERMANY" MODERN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: ACHIEVEMENTS, INNOVATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS, 9(1).
16. Baxtiyoro va, M. (2023). INGLIZ VA O 'ZBEK BADIY ADABIYOTIDA ASAR QAHRAMONLARI NOMLARINING MATN "JOURNAL OF SCIENCE-INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN UZBEKISTAN" JURNALI VOLUME 3, ISSUE 01, 2025. YANUARY ResearchBib Impact Factor: 9.654/2024 ISSN 2992-8869 221 YARATISHDAGI ISHTIROKI. Namangan davlat universiteti Ilmiy axborotnomasi, (10), 268-273.
17. Bakhtiyorovna, B. M. (2022). Discursive-pragmatic nature of anthroponyms. Asian Journal Of Multidimensional Research, 11(9), 110-114.
18. Bakhtiyarova, M. B. (2021). VERBALIZATION OF THE CONCEPT" ONIM" IN LINGUOCOGNITOLOGY. Ростовский научный вестник, (3), 11- 12.
19. Baxtiyoro va, M. B. (2020). ANTROPONIMLARNING SHAKLLANISHIDA MORFEMALARNING SEMANTIK VA USLUBIY XUSUSIYATLARI. Студенческий вестник, (36-3), 96-98.
20. Bakhtiyorova, M. (2019). THE EFFECT OF USING MNEMONICS. Студенческий вестник, (22-8), 63-65.
21. Pulatova, S., & Bakhtiyorova, M. (2019). THE STRUCTURALSEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS RELATED TO" SPORTS" IN PRESENT DAY ENGLISH. Студенческий вестник, (22-8), 69-71.
22. Bakhtiyorova, M., & Djumabayeva, J. (2017). WRITERS MAKE NATIONAL LITERATURE, WHILE TRANSLATORS MAKE UNIVERSAL LITERATURE. Студенческий вестник, (10), 55-56.
23. Bakhtiyorova, M., & Elmurodova, F. (2017). THE PRINCIPLES OF SEMANTICS. Студенческий вестник, (10), 52-54.
24. Bakhtiyorova, M., & Elmurodova, F. (2017). PAPERS IN ENGLISH. СТУДЕНЧЕСКИЙ ВЕСТНИК, 10, 52 Uzbek National Corpus (2024).