



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Thesis for the Degree of Master of Arts

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF *WH*-
WORDS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**



Matluba Ortikova Nozimovna

Department of English Language and Literature

The Graduate School

Pukyong National University

February, 2022

영어와 우즈베크어의 wh-어휘 비교분석

Advisor: Soonhyuck Park

by

Matluba Ortikova



A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of English

in Department of English Language and Literature, The Graduate
School, Pukyong National University

February, 2022

A Comparative analysis of *Wh*-words in English and Uzbek

A dissertation

by

Matluba Ortikova

Approved by:

Jee-Won Hahn _____

(Chairman)

Soonhyuck Park _____

(Member)

Eunil Kim _____

(Member)

February 25th, 2022

LIST OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
I. Introduction	1
1.1 The purpose of the thesis.....	1
1.2 Organization	3
II. Theoretical Background	4
2.1 Types of <i>Wh</i> -questions.....	4
2.2 <i>Wh</i> -movement	7
2.2.1 <i>Wh</i> -in-situ	10
2.2.2 Medial <i>wh</i> -words	11
III. <i>Wh</i>-words in English and Uzbek	14
3.1 Grammatical features of <i>Wh</i> -words.....	14
3.2 Isomorphic and allomorphic features of <i>Wh</i> -words.....	25
3.3 Reduplication of <i>Wh</i> -words in Uzbek.....	34
IV. <i>Wh</i>-words as non-interrogative elements	37
4.1 <i>Wh</i> -words in exclamation usage	37
4.2 <i>Wh</i> -words Rhetorical question (interrogative).....	38
4.3 The <i>Ki</i> particle.....	40
V. Conclusion	42

References

A Comparative analysis of *Wh*-words in English and Uzbek

Matluba Ortikova

Department of English Language and Literature,
The Graduate School,
Pukyong National University

초록

본 논문은 영어와 우즈베크어, 두 다른 언어 속 wh- 단어들을 비교함으로써 보편성과 다양성의 개념을 논의하고자 한다. 필자는 의미론적 통사적 특징뿐만 아니라 형태학적 단위에도 따라 wh-단어에 많은 동일구조와 이형태(異形態)적 특징이 있다는 것을 발견하였다. 비록 언어들이 같은 어근의 단어, 일반적인 형태소, 또는 의문어를 가지지 않는 것과 같이 그 재료들이 다를 수 있지만, 그들의 구조(즉, 요소들과 그들의 기능 사이의 관계)는 유사할 수 있다. 영어는 게르만어족의 인도유럽어족에서 온 분석적인 언어인 반면, 우즈베크어는 위구르차가타이

남동부의 튀르크어족에서 온 언어이다. 그래서 이 논문에서 분석된 단어들의 개념에는 유사점과 차이점이 모두 있다.

두 언어의 wh- 단어들을 비교한 결과 우즈베크어는 영어에서 찾아볼 수 없는 특별한 특징들이 있음에도 불구하고 일부 언어의 공통점으로 영어의 틀도 설명할 수 있는 것으로 알 수 있었다. 본 논문은 영어와 우즈베크어로 된 질문적 해석을 위한 /무엇/어디/누가/왜/언제의 상태를 분석하며, 여기에는 구문적 표현과 실용적 관점의 특정 상호 작용에서 구성 질문을 도출하는 것이 포함된다. 영어와 우즈베크어의 예시는 모두 형태론적, 통사적, 의미론적 용법에서 의문대명사로 분류된다. 그럼에도 불구하고 두 언어를 분석하는 동안 소위 두 언어에서 의문 대명사의 형태학적 특성에 대한 많은 변형을 쉽게 인지할 수 있다.

본 논문에서는 wh- 단어가 의문 형태뿐만 아니라 감탄형, 서술형 조항의 구성 요소도 형성할 수 있다는 것도 분석하였다. 이를 바탕으로 감탄사와 미사여구는 대답을 요구하지 않는 누가/무엇/어디와 같은 wh-단어의 특성을 사용하였다.

Abstract

The current thesis discusses the concept of universality and diversity by comparing the *wh*-words in two different languages, English and Uzbek. I found that there are many isomorphic and allomorphic features in the *wh*-words according to not only the semantic-syntactic features but also the morphological unit. Although languages may differ in their materials like having no words of the same root, common morphemes, or question words, their structure (i.e. relations between the elements and their functions) may be similar. English is from Indo European Family in Germanic showing an analytical language, whereas Uzbek comes from Turkic family in Southeastern, Uighur-chagatay considering an agglutinative language. So, on the concept of *wh*-words they have both similarities and differences, which have been analyzed in this thesis.

Having compared two languages on the *wh*-words, it is known that in spite of the fact that Uzbek language has special unicals that cannot be found in English, it can also account for the frame of English language as it has some language universals. This thesis analyzes the status of *wh*-words *who/what/where/which/why/when* for the interrogative interpretations in English and Uzbek, including the derivation of constituent questions from a specific interplay of syntactic representations with pragmatic view. All given examples in English and Uzbek are classified in terms of the interrogative pronouns in morphological, syntactic, and semantic usage. Nevertheless, while analyzing both languages one can easily perceive many variations on the morphologic characteristics of interrogative pronouns in both so-called languages.

In the thesis it is also analyzed that *wh*-words can form a constitutive part not only of interrogative, but also of the clauses of exclamative and declarative. Based on this, in exclamation and rhetoric usages the characteristic of *wh*-words, *who/what/where* does not require an answer.

I. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of the thesis

Uzbek is an SXOV, *wh*-in situ language spoken preliminary in the Central Asian republic of Uzbekistan, formerly part of the Soviet Union. The language is understudied with the exception of descriptive grammars (Sjoberg 1963; Bodrogligeti 2003). So very little work on Uzbek exists in English and almost no research has taken place within the generative tradition including *wh*-questions and *wh*-words. Based on my field of work I decided to analyze and compare allomorphic and isomorphic features of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek.

It is clear for everyone that *wh*-questions are so important in order to build conversation skills, boost social skills, stimulate vocabulary, promote critical thinking skills, and demonstrate an understanding of something new due to the fact that as a human being there are always questions like *what*, *who*, *where*, *when* and *how* in our mind. In the period of being toddler we usually begin to ask and answer questions mainly including *wh*-words which are considered more complex rather than ‘yes’ and ‘no’ question types. Because of this, *wh*-words are such an exciting milestone for our young inquisitive minds. They are a vital part of our daily life and their significance goes far beyond our speech development. Learning to ask and answer *wh*-questions assists us in our whole life expectancy in followings:

To build conversation skills

To boost social skills

To stimulate vocabulary development

To demonstrate an understanding of something new

To promote reasoning, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills

To learn how to follow directions

To relay information to others

To build relationships

It can be seen that this list of benefits ranges from social skills to critical thinking. *Wh*-questions lay the groundwork for making new friends, preparing for preschool, middle school, colleges, universities, scientific researches, and of course, learning fun stuff.

Based on the above mentioned benefits, while learning foreign languages, it is important to analyze *wh*-questions and especially *wh*-words of those languages so as to understand the language and the conversation of native speakers. This research analyzes the similarities and differences of *wh*-words of *wh*-questions on the basis of morphological and semantic-syntactic levels of languages. This thesis reveals the interrogative aspect of question forms in English and Uzbek, including the characteristics of interrogative pronouns *kim(who)*, *nima(what)*, *qayer(where)*, *qachon(when)*, *nimaga(why)* in Uzbek and *who*, *what*, *where*, *when*, *why* in English. The *wh*-words indicate the meanings of ‘interrogation,’ and thus it is anticipated that the semantic characteristics of these forms will not differ significantly. While exploring the semantic-syntactic and morphological characteristics of these question words, it is analyzed that *wh*-words are listener-oriented interrogative sentences with strong communicative possessing the commonality in both so-called languages.

When it comes to the placing of *wh*-words in English, they are placed at the beginning of the sentence, whereas in Uzbek they usually stand before the predicate, which shows that Uzbek is a language type of *wh*-in situ.

(1) *What did you buy yesterday?*

(2) *Siz kecha nima sotib oldingiz?*

You yesterday what bought?

What did you buy yesterday?

Another difference between two languages is that the Uzbek pronoun *kim(who)* in contrast to the English pronoun *who* can be used to inquire about a person's profession like:

(3) *U kim (bo'lib ishlaydi)?*

He who? (What is his his profession?)

(4) *What is he (what does he do)?*

Such kind of differences may cause some errors as *Who is he?* (instead of *What is he?*) when Uzbek students speak English or vice versa.

Hence there are some clear isomorphic and allomorphic features of *wh* questions in English and Uzbek, and this thesis clearly explains them with sufficient examples in both languages.

1.2 Organization

The thesis includes five chapters. Chapter one explains the purpose of the thesis and organization. Chapter two analyzes the theoretical background by means of myriad examples in English and Uzbek together with Russian so as to be clear. Chapter three focuses on allomorphic, isomorphic features of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek together with the unicals in the language of Uzbek. In chapter four, the various usages of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek like rhetoric and exclamation are discussed. The fifth chapter will summarize and conclude the thesis on the theme of 'A Comparative Study of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek.'

II. Theoretical background

2.1 Types of *wh*-questions

A *wh*-question is a sentence which contains a *wh*-word somewhere in it. Nearly in all languages around the world, the words that are informally identifiable as *wh*-words are found. However, the semantics of these elements is a complex and controversial topic in linguistics. The term *wh*-phrase is generally used even when it discusses languages in which the relevant morpheme has an entirely different shape. Informally, when speakers ask a *wh*-question like

(5) *What did Ali write?*

It is usually presupposed that Ali wrote something, and a felicitous response to the question states the identity of the written thing. Here in this example the element whose identity the speaker trying to acquire is given by means of *wh*-word.

On the basics of *wh*-questions, there are three types of interrogative *wh*-movement. In the first type, there is a gap filled by a phrase which contains an interrogative *wh*-word. For instance,

(6) a. *What did Ann put ___ on the table?*

b. *Whose dinner did the monster devours ___ today?*

In the second type of *wh*-movement, the gap position can count for the rules of anaphora like the c-command condition on reflexives. For example:

(7) *How much criticism of herself can Ali tolerate ___?*

In the last type, the gap can be separated from its filler by multiple clauses and NP boundaries like:

(8) *Why did Mary say that Anna would believe that we had read a book by _?*

Usually, in main clauses of English, *wh*-movement regularly co-occurs with the movement of the highest auxiliary verb to C. The *wh*-phrase moves to a left peripheral position of C. Only one phrase can move in this manner, even when a question contains more than one *wh*-phrase. For instance:

(9) a. *What did Sheila put _ on which table? or*

b. *What which table did Sheila put _ on _?*

(9a), not (9b), is the only possible representation.

In English *wh*-words including *what*, *when*, *where*, *who*, *whom*, *which*, *whose*, *why* and *how* are usually main basics of *wh*-questions as they are used to ask about specific qualities, times, places, people and others. If we analyze them in detail, we can list them as following:

QUESTION WORDS	USAGES	EXAMPLES
What	Used to ask about things	- <i>What are you looking at?</i> - <i>What do you know about the exam</i>
When	to ask about time	- <i>When will the movie start?</i> - <i>When are you going to Korea?</i>
Where	Used to ask about places	- <i>Where is your new car?</i> - <i>Where does she study?</i>
Who	Used to ask about people	- <i>Who do you love the most in your class?</i> - <i>Who told you about it?</i>

Whom	Used to ask about people (object of verb)	- <i>Whom did you see in the morning? I saw Mr. Ahmad, my English teacher.</i> - <i>Whom was Janna talking to? She was talking to Jack, his new classmate.</i>
Which	Used to ask about choices	- <i>Which one do you choose? The left or right?</i> - <i>Of all the dishes in the menu, which one would you like?</i>
Whose	Used to ask about possession	- <i>Whose computer is this? Is it yours?</i> - <i>Whose pencils are these?</i>
Why	Used to ask about reasons/ causes	- <i>Why did it happen? I didn't understand.</i> - <i>Why is she crying?</i>
How	Used to ask about manner/ process	- <i>How can you solve this problem? Please tell us.</i> - <i>How can you explain it?</i>

As for the forming of *wh*-questions, there are two ways of forming, namely with and without an auxiliary.

1. With an auxiliary

Wh-word + auxiliary + subject + main verb ...? Auxiliary verbs are helping verbs (not main verbs). Common auxiliary verbs include *be, do, have*. Others are *will, shall, would, can, could, must, should, may, might* and others. For instance:

(10) a. *What do you do for a living?*

b. *Why should we read books?*

c. *When is she coming?*

2. Without any auxiliary (when WH-words replace subjects already) **Wh-word**
+ **main verb ...?** For example:

- (11) a. *What happened to Peter? A bad accident happened to him today.*
b. *Who won the game? Jane won the game.*
c. *Who gave you this present book? My cousin gave me this book.*

As we have observed, *wh*-words are the main basis for the exchange of interactive communication together with serving to engage greater learning and facilitate the exchange of information among communication partners.

From linguistics we know that the mechanisms of *wh*-question formation are diverse across languages. Although the main distinction is drawn between *wh*-movement and *wh*-in situ, there are some other interesting *wh*-properties that show differences in the languages of the world. Here we can observe some general facts about *wh*-questions cross-linguistically.

2.2 *Wh*-movement

The term *wh*-movement originated from early generative grammar of 1960s and 1970s. It was used as reference to the transformational analysis. The *wh*-expression appeared in its canonical position at deep structure. Then it moved leftward out of that position to land its derived position at the front of the sentence/surface structure. So *wh*-movement is considered one of the two basic strategies of *wh*-question formation. This is common in many languages of the world and is illustrated in English and Uzbek in this simple question; the *wh*-word raises from the site of its base-generation to a new clause-initial position.

- (12) a. *Who did John help?*
b. *John kimga yordam berdi?*

John whom helped?

In cases where more than one *wh*-phrases are involved, *wh*-movement languages fall into two distinct categories. On the one hand, languages like English front only one *wh*-word and the rest remain in their basic positions (i.e. *in situ*) as in the following example:

(13) *Who gave what to John?*

On the other hand, there are Slavic languages (Rudin 1988) which typically front all *wh*-words, as illustrated by Bulgarian like:

(14) *Koj kakvo dade na Ivan?*

who what gave to Ivan?

'Who gave what to John?'

Movement languages raise the *wh*-phrase from the site of its base-generation in the embedded clause to an initial position in the matrix clause (usually intermediate steps in movement are assumed) in complex questions like

(15) *Who do you think gave the book to John?*

The distinction between languages with and without multiple fronting applies in the same way as in simple questions, as shown in English and Bulgarian, respectively.

(16) a. *Who do you think gave what to John?*

b. *Koj kakvo misliš (če) dade na Ivan?*

Based on multiple *wh*-questions, three language types can be analyzed in linguistics. The first is a Chinese type having all *wh*-phrases *in situ*.

For ex: *Jinxian ni ruo le shenme?*

Today you did what?

What did you do today?

Whereas the second type in some languages like English, such that only one *wh*-constituent moves to the front position and the rest covertly. For example:

(17) *a. What are you doing here?*

b. In what situations do you prefer to do like this?

The last type is Russian that requires all *wh*-words to be placed in the front position. For instance:

(18) *Кто звонил тебе когда? Or Кто когда звонил?*

Who phoned you when? Or Who when phoned?

Who phoned you when?

It is clear that *wh*-words in some languages including Uzbek and Korean are polarity items that make empty any quantificational peculiarity of their own. This argument based on the fact that *wh*-words function not only as question words but also as universals and existential quantifiers. Here are some examples of *wh*-movement cases in languages.

English: *She should stop talking about syntax.*

What she should stop talking about?

He terminates his relationship with his girlfriend.

What does he terminate with his girlfriend?

Russian: *Он звонил Машу.*

He phoned Masha

Кому он звонил?

Who did he phone?

Я уважаю тебя

I respect you

Кому вы уважаете?

Who do you respect?

Uzbek: *Lola kitob sotib oldi .*

Lola a book bought.

Lola bought a book.

Lola kitobini qachon sotib oldi?

Lola the book when bought?

When did Lola buy her book?

Lola nimani sotib oldi?

Lola what bought?

What did Lola buy?

2.2.1 *Wh-in-situ*

Wh-in-situ is a type of *wh*-element which does not move overtly. In some languages like Japanese, all *wh*-elements are in situ, and in some other languages as in English, only one *wh*-word moves overtly while the other *wh*-words stay in situ. For example:

(19) *I wonder who has bought what?*

In this example of (19), the *wh*-word *what* cannot move as its landing site is already taken by *who*. For the interpretation of *wh*-elements in situ there is a debate on what mechanism is responsible for it. In the example, *what* is possibly fronted and adjoined to the embedded clause at LF. This operation is called *wh*-raising (in contradistinction to *wh*-movement, or QR (of non-*wh*

operators). Another approach is to interpret *wh*-in-situ without LF-movement, via choice functions. Cases of *wh*-in-situ are not to be confused with echo-questions like:

(20) *John bought WHAT?*

Here the landing site for *what* has not been taken by another *wh*-element. Despite the fact that English is already classified as a *wh*-movement language, it also has a *wh*-in situ option in the so-called echo-questions, as a following example:

(21) *John thinks he should buy what?*

Although such structures are more marked and uttered only under specific discourse cases, their availability is useful in demonstrating the base-generation sites of *wh*-words in *wh*-movement languages.

2.2.2 Medial *wh*-words

Medial *wh*-constructions are a typological alternative in complex *wh*-question formation in certain languages. Note that here the term medial *wh*-is used to refer to both the *wh*-copying and the *wh*-scope marking constructions. This reflects the basic insight that in both constructions, an extra *wh*-word appears in an intermediate position of a complex question (i.e. in the embedded clause), regardless of whether this extra *wh*-word is an exact copy of the one in the matrix clause or not. Whenever attested in a particular language, these constructions usually co-exist with one of the other two mechanisms for forming complex *wh*-questions described above (i.e. movement or in situ). Thus, it seems that medial *wh* can only be an additional mechanism of complex *wh*-question formation in a given language (i.e. it is a marked or a secondary

strategy within the movement or the in situ mechanism). This raises a number of issues with regards to the precise sociolinguistic and semantic status of medial *wh*-, but these remain beyond the scope of my thesis.

Typically, medial *wh*-structures are reported in languages that employ *wh*-movement in question formation (e.g. German and Afrikaans,); however, they have also been attested in in-situ languages such as Uzbek (*wh*-scope marking only). A further observation with regards to the distribution of the two constructions is that if a given language licenses *wh*-copying, *wh*-scope marking is likely to be available as well. On the other hand, the presence of *wh*-scope marking does not necessarily entail the presence of *wh*-copying. Examples of the two constructions from several different languages are given below. As Felser (2004) points out, *wh*-copying constructions are attested in the adult speech of a number of languages, including German, Frisian, Afrikaans, and Romani

German: *Wen glaubst Du, wen sie getroffen hat?*

who think you who she met has

Who do you think she has met?

However, when we compare to Uzbek language it is:

U kimni uchratdi deb o'ylaysiz?

She whom met do you think?

Who do you think she has met?

Usually goes to *Wh*-in situ.

English: *What do you think what we are looking for?'*

Uzbek: *Biz nimani qidiraymiz deb o'ylaysiz?*

We what looking for do you think?

What do you think what we are looking for?'

Or in colloquial speech:

Nimani qidiraymiz biz deb o'ylaysiz?

What looking for we do you think?

What do you think what we are looking for?

As these examples illustrate, both *wh*-arguments and adjuncts can participate in *wh*-copying. Although there are various accounts of these constructions in the literature, typically, they have been analyzed as an example of successive cyclicity, where the *wh*-phrase originates in a lower position of the embedded clause and raises through intermediate steps to the left periphery of the matrix clause. *Wh*-scope marking seems to be more productive cross-linguistically than *wh*-copying. It has been attested in a number of typologically distinct languages like German (Lutz, Müller & von Stechow 2000), Frisian (Hiemstra 1986; McDaniel 1989), Hungarian (Marác 1990, 2000; Mycock 2006), Russian and Polish (Stepanov 2000), Hindi (Dayal 1994, 1996, 2000), Kikuyu (Sabel 2000b), Malay (Cole and Hermon 2000; Mycock 2006), and Warlpiri (Legate 2002). In this construction, just as in *wh*-copying, a *wh*-word appears in an intermediate position of the complex question; this *wh*-word, however, is not necessarily an exact copy of the one appearing in the matrix. The *wh*-scope construction is illustrated in German in compared to Uzbek and English. Note that, similarly to *wh*-copying, *wh*-scope marking also has a counterpart with full long distance movement, as illustrated in

German: *Was glaubst du wen sie liebt?*

what think you who she loves

English: *Who do you think she loves?*

Uzbek: *U kimni sevadi deb o'ylaysiz?*

She whom loves do you think?

As we have analyzed, the Uzbek language usually prefers *wh*-in situ while, English and German go to both *wh*-medial and *wh*-movement.

III. Wh-words in English and Uzbek

3.1 Grammatical features of *wh*-words

According to common and different features of *wh*-words, it can be clearly noticed that they are distinguished from each other in both languages. Based on the morphological and syntactic-semantic aspects, it is vital to learn their differences for the learners of both languages so as to be aware of grammatical rules, learn the language, and to have correct communication in so-called languages. While learning languages, *wh*-words are fundamental as we all have so many questions in our mind like *why? how? what? where? when?* and if we just leave these words, remove these words, we cannot communicate and explain what we want to our peers in that language. Therefore, learners need all these questions to move ahead, they need certain words to create smooth communication in the learning languages. Based on their typological units, English and Uzbek have some allomorphic and isomorphic features that need to be considered.

Based on their typological classification, English is in the group of fusion while Uzbek is in agglutinative group. However, in spite of being in two different groups, they are considered analytic languages. One of the most noticeable characteristics of the *wh*-words in English, namely the so-called *wh*-movement, appears to go against the contention that they are indefinite. More specifically questions cover the sentences beginning with *wh*-words like *when, where, why, how many, how* which are also called content questions and require some substance or content in the response. From the morphological type, these words are called interrogative pronouns in both English and Uzbek languages. Interrogative pronouns exist in both languages. They are as follows:

Interrogative pronouns

English	Uzbek	Examples
Who?	Kim?(ni, ga, da, dan)	<i>Who is learning Korean?</i>
What?	Nima?(ni, ga, da, dan)	<i>What are you saying?</i>
Where?	Qayer?(ni, ga, da, dan)	<i>Where does he live?</i>
Which?	Qaysi?(ning, inga, indan, inda)	<i>Which page are you reading?</i>
Why?	Nimaga?(dan, sababdan)	<i>Why are you afraid of spiders?</i>
Whom?	Kimni?(dan, ga, da)	<i>Whom do you believe?</i>
How?	Qanday qilib?	<i>How did you come here?</i>

Interrogative pronouns are used in inquiry to form special questions. In English interrogative pronouns have two types of the category of case while in Uzbek has six categories of case.

Category of case in English

Nominative	Who/ what/which	<i>Who is your favorite actor?</i>
Genitive	Whose	<i>Whose place is this?</i>
Accusative	Whom	<i>Whom are you waiting for?</i>

Category of case in Uzbek

Nominative	Kim?(who)	<i>U kim?</i> <i>She who?</i> <i>Who is she?</i>
Genitive	Kimning?(whose)	<i>Kimning akasi angliyada oqiydi?</i> <i>Whose brother in England study?</i> <i>Whose brother studies in England?</i>
Accusative	Kimni?(whom)	

		<i>Sen kimni koryapsan?</i> <i>You whom see?</i> <i>Whom do you see?</i>
Dative	Kimga?(to whom)	<i>Buni kimga gapiryapsan?</i> <i>It to whom speaking(you)?</i> <i>Whom are you speaking to?</i>
Locative	Kimda? (who)	<i>Kimda samolyot bor?</i> <i>Who plane has got?</i> <i>Who has got an airplane?</i>
Ablative	Kimdan?(from whom)	<i>Sen buni kimdan eshitding?</i> <i>You it from whom heard?</i> <i>Whom did you hear it from?</i>

Other than wh-word kim(who)? nima?(what), qayer?(where), ?(which) also can be used with all six types of cases. For ex:

Qayerdan kelyapsan?
Where you coming?
Where are you coming?

Qaysini aytyapsan?
Which you speaking?
What you are speaking?

In Uzbek demonstrative pronouns like *Kim?*(who?) *Nima?*(what) *Qayer* (where) have the categories of number in plurality whereas it is not observed in English.

Different from English Wh-words Uzbek Wh-words can take plurality suffix “lar” and can be used in the singular and plural forms. Plural Wh-words

in those cases in which the wh-word is pluralized, it displays ambiguity. But in English no morphological difference between singular and plural wh-words.

Category of number in English

Singular	Plural	Example
Who?	-	<i>Who is coming?</i> <i>Who are your friends?</i>
What?	-	<i>What are you looking at?</i>
Where?	-	<i>Where is the book? Or where are the books?</i>
Whose?	-	<i>Whose is this book? Or whose are those book?</i>
Which	-	<i>Which book will you buy?</i>

Category of number in Uzbek

Singular	Plural	Example
Kim?(who)	Kimlar? (who-plr)	<i>Kimlar bu majlisda qatnashyapti?</i> <i>Who-plr this meeting attending?</i> <i>Who are attending this meeting?</i>
Nima?(what)	Nimalar? (what-plr)	<i>Kecha nimalar sotib olding?</i> <i>Yesterday what-plr bought?</i> <i>What did you buy yesterday?</i>
Qayer?(where)	Qayerlar? (where-plr)	<i>Qayerlar sening hududing?</i> <i>Where-plr your land?</i> <i>Where is your land?</i>
Kimning?(whose)	Kimlarning? (whose-plr)	<i>Kimlarning qarindoshlari shu yerda?</i> <i>Whose-plr relatives are here?</i> <i>Whose relatives are here?</i>
Qaysi?(which)	Qaysilar? (which-plr)	<i>Bu kitoblarning qaysilari senga tegishli?</i>

		<i>This books which-plr to you belong ?</i> <i>Which of these books belong to you?</i>
--	--	---

Category of possessiveness

In Uzbek different from English we can observe category of possessiveness of wh-words like the one of nouns, In this case the suffix expressing passivity is added to the end of the wh-words and express someone or something belong to the wh-word which it is joined.

1st person:	2 nd person	3rd person	Examples
Kimim? (who-my)	Kiming? (who-your)	Kimi? (who-his/her)	<i>Kiming yashaydi bu yerda?</i> <i>Who-your live here?</i> <i>Who lives here?</i>
Nimam? (what-my)	Nimang? (what-your)	Nimasi? (what-his/her)	<i>Bu do 'konni nimalari arzon?</i> <i>This shop what-plr-its cheap?</i> <i>What is cheap in this shop?</i>
Qayerim? (where-my)	Qayering? (where-your)	Qayeri? (where-his/her)	<i>Bu hududning qayerlari unumdor?</i> <i>This of land where-its harvestful?</i> <i>Which part is the most harvestful of this land?</i>
Qaysim (which-my)	Qaysing? (which-your)	Qaysisi? (which-his/her)	<i>Qaysing o'ziga hos rangda?</i> <i>Which-your has a special color?</i> <i>Which part has a special color?</i>

Usually in English, interrogative pronouns are placed at the beginning of the sentence. In Uzbek, they usually stand before the predicate. Here is the comparison of two languages:

English: *What did you buy yesterday?*

Uzbek: *Siz kecha nima sotib oldingiz?*

You yesterday what bought?

What did you buy yesterday?

As we have analyzed Uzbek language has more question words just for the *wh*-question *who* by adding different suffixes, whereas in English as a translation of these question words it is just used *who*, sometimes *whose*, *whom* or *to whom*. For instance:

(22) a. *Kimlarni ko'rdingiz?*

Who-plr you saw?

Who did you see?

b. *Kimlarda kitob bor?*

Who-plr have books?

Who has got books?

c. *Kimlardan so'radingiz?*

From whom asked?

Who did you ask from?

(23) *Qayerdan sotib olding bu kitobni?*

From where bought this book?

Where did you buy this book?

In Uzbek pronoun *kim/who* in contrast to the English pronoun *who* can be used to inquire about a person's profession:

(24) a. *U kim bo'lib ishlaydi?*

b. *What is he (what does he do)?*

In communication this differences may cause such errors as *who is he?* Instead of *What is he?* Hence, according to the morphological formation of

English and Uzbek interrogative pronouns do not correspond with one another. Due to their morphological characteristics interrogative pronouns in Uzbek are more different. This chapter discusses the grammatical and semantic peculiarities of the *wh*- words in English and Uzbek languages, which are most commonly used in speech. As we have learned above *Wh*-words are called interrogative pronouns, which have the broadest grammatical meanings. As a result of my observations on scholars' opinions, I can say that in all languages interrogative pronouns are divided into pronouns of nouns, pronouns of adjectives and pronouns of adverbs based on the functions that they perform in speech. In this chapter I will discuss *wh*-words in comparison with English and Uzbek languages.

Tursunov (1992) and Mukhtorov (1993) define the reference of interrogative pronouns to the subject, its sign and quantity, the place and time of the action, and other features. While utilizing the *wh*-questions, the speaker tries to identify information from the listener about something that is unfamiliar to him like the subject, the event and the action. Muhiddinova (2006) describes interrogative pronouns as interrogative pronouns used by the speaker to identify information about an object to an event, an event, and an action, that considered the function of the word group in the sentence in languages. According to Shvedova (1999) among *wh*-words the concept of pronoun *who* occupies the main place in the structure of pronominal outcomes. This is explained by the fact that it means not just one of the global concepts of being, but an animate being and, above all, a person who places himself in the center of everything around him, recognizes the world and the connections, relationships and dependencies established in it. While studying interrogative pronouns, we can also follow

Maitinskaya's opinion about the state of contradiction between the functions of *wh*- words from each other. For instance: "The interrogative pronoun *who* applies to both men and women, and it is opposed to *what* (like a

noun). It is usually applied to *where* so as to mean the place of something while *when* is used to refer the time or day of any event. For example:

(25) *Who is she/he standing by the window?*

(26) *What is the aim of this research? Or What is the name of this dog?*

(27) *Where do you live?*

(28) *When will she finish her research?*

As opposed to English, in Uzbek *where* can be used in various situations like *qayerda?* (*where at*), *qayerga?* (*where to*) by adding different suffixes like *-ga(to)*, *-da(at)* while in English it is used just *where* for both.

(30) *Qayerda o'qiysan?*

Where at study(you)?

Where are you studying?

Qayerga ketyapsan?

Where to going(you)

Where are you going?

But in English:

(31) a. *Where do you study?*

b. *Where are you going?*

Smirnitskiy (1959) said that the interrogative pronouns (*wh*-words) in English shows the evident definition to the target theme. For example, interrogative (and relative) pronouns like *who* and *what* which are refer to personal pronouns distinguished by their inherent characteristic difference, lies

mainly in terms of distinguishing between person (*who*) and nonperson (*what*), or more broadly, in terms of differentiation along the line of animate and inanimate. The pronoun *who* is used in relation to living things (and primarily to a person) while the pronoun *what* is used in relation to inanimate objects.

(32) *Who is that girl?*

Anavi qiz kim? (That girl is who)

(33) *What is the name of this book?*

Manabu kitobning nomi nima?

(This book name what).

As we have seen from the examples that mentioned above in Uzbek also *kim?* (*who*) and *nima?* (*what*) is used for persons and things or objects relatively like English.

So, above I consider Smirnitskiy, and Boronov (YEAR) has the similar ideas to about *wh*-question words, namely *who*, *what* and *kim*, *nima*. Thus, one of the syntactic-semantic features of interrogative pronouns with the addition of it is that they are used in two different ways for human names and other names like animal, object or bird. When we analyze the differences of *wh*-questions, especially, *who* and *what* according to Boronov (YEAR) *kim?* and *nima?* can be declined in six category of cases in Uzbek, whereas *who* can be declined only in three cases in English like illustrated below:

Common case _ *who*

Genitive case _ *whom*

Accusative case _ *whose*

Usually interrogative pronouns *what* and *who* substitute the part of speech in the sentences which they perform their syntactic functions. For instance:

(34) a. *What did you get from the market?*

Nima olding bozordan? (What bought from market)

b. *What should a person avoid?*

Odam nimadan qochishi kerak?

(A person from what should avoid)

In both of examples above, the interrogative pronoun *what* serves as a complement in English, while sometimes in Uzbek the first one can be the subject of the sentence. The interrogative pronoun for *what* is involved in the construction of a sentence which is given by the speaker to the listener to define the purpose and cause of the action, situation, event-the reality of the event, and serves as an adverb in the sentence in English. In Uzbek the interrogative pronoun *nega?* (why) is used as a synonym of *nimaga?* (why) in a dialectic or publicistic way while *wh*-question word *why* is used in English as the interrogative pronoun. In Uzbek, such constructions are formed in the form of suffixes while in English the word is changed.

(35) *Nimaga bunday ohangda so'zlayapsan?*

Why in such tone speaking?

Why are you speaking in a such tone?

(36) *Nega menga aytmading?*

Why me did not tell?

Why didn't you tell me?

When we classify the languages based on typology, Uzbek belongs to the agglutinative language, whereas English belongs to the fusion language. One similarity of both languages is their corresponding to the same group, namely, analytic. On the contrary to the above mentioned, Wiese argues that *wh*-pronouns are not interrogative rather, they are underspecified elements; due to

this under specification, *wh*-words can form a constitutive part not only of interrogative, but also of exclamative and declarative clauses. Based on the types of question:

Special questions: in grammar, such interrogative pronouns are called pure interrogative which requires answers

Rhetorical questions: means a rhetorical interrogative that has the character of an interrogator from the outside but does not ask a question.

Declarative sentences: in this sentence the message expressed by interrogation is understood as judgment.

Exclamative sentences: it is expressed by intonation, not according to grammatical means but the question component does not require an answer in the sentence. The feeling of excitement in this type of speech serves to organize the content of the speech.

So, it can be concluded from the discussions by linguists above mentioned, despite the fact that a lot of scientific work has been done on *wh*-question word forms, we still need some research on this theme the lack of comparative studies in English and Uzbek. Since Uzbek language is related to agglutinative, there are more words derived through the affixes. There is a similar kind of variation among languages regarding the number of rows that occur among the paradigms of preforms. It derives from the fact that different languages use different sets of categories (word classes) or general concepts (like person, thing, place, time, manner, amount, type, etc.) among their preforms.

As we have observed above, *wh*-words can possess six grammatical category of case endings in Uzbek to query in various aims so as to know about the object *nima* (*what*), to identify the transitivity *nima – ni* (*what*), to identify the owner of a thing *nima –ning* (*what*), to be concise about the reason of action *nima–ga* (*why*), *nima–da* (*what*), *nima–dan* (*what*), the time of an action-

qachon-ga (when), qachon-dan (when), qachon-gacha (until when) to clarify the place *qayer-ga (where), qayer-dan (where), qayer-gacha (till where)*, the cause of any event *nima-ga, nima sabab-dan, nima uchun (why)*. In comparison with Uzbek the pronoun *what* does not possess case endings in sentences and it is a word that cannot be in English.

3.2 Isomorphic and allomorphic features of *Wh*-words

As English and Uzbek vary according to morphological point of view, they are different in their category of case as well. There are six categories of cases in English compared to English having two categories. There are prepositions that can be used with *wh*-s which do not exist in Uzbek and postpositions are observed in Uzbek, whereas there are not these types in English. Both in English and Uzbek there are linking words that can be used with *wh*-s. As an illustration, some examples have been provided so as to be clear below.

(37) a. *What should I tell?*

Xo'p nimani aytishim kerak bo'lmasa?

What I should tell?

b. *What are you drinking so much milk for? Or Why are you drinking so much milk for?*

Why are you so much milk drinking?

Nimaga siz buncha kop sut tanovul qilayapsiz?

c. *What is it made of?*

U nimadan tayyorlanadi

It from what made?

d. *What are you looking at?*

Nimaga qarayapsiz?

What you looking at?

(38) a. Who did you ask about it from? Or Whom did you ask about it?

Bu haqida kimdan so'radigiz? It about from whom asked?

b. who did you help? Kimga yordam berdingiz?

To who you helped?

c. Who (whom) did you see?

Kimni ko'rdigiz? Who you saw?

(39) a. Where are you now?

Hozir qayerdasiz?

Now where(you)?

b. Where is he going to?

U qayerga ketyapti?

She where going?

c. Where did you begin to clean from?

Qayerdan boshlading tozalashni?

From where started (you) cleaning?

(40) Why are you learning Korean?

Nimaga (Nima uchun, nima sababdan) koreys tilini o'rganyapsan?

What for(what is the reason ,why)Korean learning

(41) When did you get to there? Or What time did you get to there?

Qachon (Qaysi payt) u yerga yetib bording?

As it is shown above the morphological characteristics of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek vary from each other. In English sometimes interrogative pronouns are applied by the linking words like *about* and the prepositions like *for, from, at*, while in Uzbek word type is being merged in inflectional suffixes *-ni, -ga, -dan* and linking words like *uchun, sababli* referred to as word-final suffixes.

One of the most common features of *wh*-words in English is that the question word is in front of the sentence, but it can be interpreted in the second position when there is a preposition or an adverb in the sentence. In this case it is important to take into consideration the organizations of interrogatives according to the syntactic role of the question expression: whether a subject, an object or an adjunct and others. Sometimes it is acceptable to put prepositions in front of the sentence such as:

- (42) a. *About what should I tell?*
 b. *For what are you eating so many apples?*
 c. *From whom did you ask for?*
 d. *At what time did you begin cleaning?*

Although there are resummptions syntactically in English the meaning of the sentences are kept in the sentences while it is not acceptable in Uzbek as suffixes cannot be separated from the question word.

Regardless the semantic features of *wh*-words, there are surely similar and different cognition in both English and Uzbek. For instance, *wh* words *who/kim*, and *what/nima* possess the substantial category in syntactic-semantics. According to the morpho-syntax, the interrogative pronoun *what* is unchangeable, whereas Uzbek interrogative pronoun *nima(what)* changes its word formation when it is translated into Uzbek like *nimaga(what to)*, *nima uchun(what for)*, *nima sababdan(what reason)*, *nima maqsadda(what aim)* and so on. In Uzbek the question word *kim(kim)?* can be changed into *kimga(who*

to), *kimdan*(*who from*), *kimda*(*who at*) and etc., whereas in English *who* is used for all with the alternative *whom*. Another *wh*-word *where* is unchangeable in English, whereas in Uzbek *qayer*(*where*) can be changed into *qayerga*(*where to*), *qayerda*(*where at*), *qayerdan*(*where from*), *qayerning*(*where of*) according to meaning. The difference to employ the *wh*-question words in English, it is expressed the question words by keeping it stable formation, while in Uzbek interrogative pronouns are given in different word formations. Thus, pronouns in Uzbek are well developed in their morphological unit. Here it is analyzed in both so-called languages with an example *Wh*-word *what*:

(43) *What can I do for you, ladies?*

Bizga qanday xizmatlar bor xonimlar?

Us how service there is ,ladies?

(44) *What is her address?*

U qayerda turadi?

She where at lives?

(45) *What sort of book do you want to read?*

Siz qanaqa kitob o'qishni xoxlaysiz?

You which book reading want?

According to examples the semantic features of interrogative pronouns' denotations are similar. In examples *what* and *qanday*(*which*) denote the qualitative utterance concerning to the words *do* and *xizmatlar*(*service*), locative utterance and *qanaqa*(*which*) possess the sign of qualitative utterance.

Comparing the similarities and differences of the pronoun *who/kim*, I will try to achieve the combination of phenomenon description explanation. In Uzbek linguistics *kim*(*who*) is defined to as an indefinite personal pronoun and the English *who* is in the same word category and has similar usages. In literary

examples, they share similar interrogative usages but they differ according to their syntactic restrictions as illustrated below

(46) a. *Who helped you in this work?*

Bu ishda sizga kim yordam berdi?

This work at you who helped?

b. *From whom did you take?*

Siz buni kimdan oldingiz?

You it who from took?

c. *To whom will you vote?*

Siz kimga ovoz berasiz?

You whom vote?

d. *Whom did you see?*

Kimni ko'rdingiz?

Whom saw?

The examples show that the interrogative pronoun *who/kim* can be both subject and object in the sentence. Since the category of case is well developed in the Uzbek language, they express the syntactic relation and defined affixes concerning grammatical means based on the characteristic components of the sentences.

As we have observed, interrogative pronouns like *kim(who)*, *nima(what)*, *qayer(where)*, *qaysi(which)* are variable according to its morphological mechanism in Uzbek meanwhile question words *who*, *what*, *where*, *which* are expressed in two forms in English, namely common and genitive cases. Studying *wh-* words and their morphological differences we found out that while the question word *who* changes its stem to *whom* when it functions as an

object in English, it accepts the case ending suffixes in Uzbek *kim(who)* – *ning(of)*, *- ni*, *- ga(to)*, *da(at)*, *- dan(from)*.

Comparing semantic features of the interrogative words *who/kim*, *what/nima*, *where/qayer*, the similar cognition in both two English and Uzbek languages can be assumed. Interrogations *who/kim*, *what/nima*, *where/qayer* possess the substantial category in syntactic semantics in both two languages.

Who?	Kim?
<i>Who shall translate this text?</i>	<i>Bu textni kim tarjima qiladi?</i> <i>This text who translate?</i>
<i>Whom did you give the book?</i>	<i>Kitobni kimga berdingiz?</i> <i>Book whom gave?</i>
<i>Whom did you ask about it?</i>	<i>Bu haqida kimdan so'radingiz?</i> <i>This about whom from asked?</i>
<i>For whom was this dedicated?</i>	<i>Bu kimga bag'ishlangan?</i> <i>This whom to dedicated?</i>
<i>Who has got a red pen?</i>	<i>Kimda qizil ruchka bor?</i> <i>Who red pen has?</i>

What?	Nima?
<i>What is it?</i>	<i>Bu nima?</i> <i>This what?</i>
<i>What did you see?</i>	<i>Nimani ko'radingiz?</i> <i>What saw?</i>
<i>What are you afraid of?</i>	<i>Nimadan qo'rqasiz?</i> <i>What from afraid of (you)?</i>
<i>What do you believe in?</i>	<i>Nimaga ishonasiz?</i> <i>What to believe (you)?</i>

<i>For what is this used?</i>	<i>Bu nimaga ishlatildi</i> <i>This what for used?</i>
-------------------------------	---

Where?	Qayer?
<i>Where is it?</i>	<i>Bu qayer?</i> <i>This where?</i>
<i>Where do you work?</i>	<i>Qayerda ishlaysiz?</i> <i>Where at work (you)?</i>
<i>Where are you coming?</i>	<i>Qayerdan kelyapsiz?</i> <i>Where from came (you)?</i>
<i>Where are you going?</i>	<i>Qayerga ketyapsiz?</i> <i>Where to going (you)?</i>
<i>Where do you see?</i>	<i>Qayerni ko'ryapsiz?</i> <i>Where saw (you)?</i>

As we compare *wh*-word question forms in English and Uzbek except mentioned above, the other interrogative pronouns like *which/qaysi*, is also changed in Uzbek in cases while they stay unchanged in English.

Which	Qaysi
<i>Which pen is yours?</i>	<i>Qaysi ruchka sizniki?</i> <i>Which pen yours?</i>
<i>Which (one) do you begin to write?</i>	<i>Qaysini (qaysi birini) yozishni boshlaysiz?</i> <i>Which one writing start (you)?</i>
<i>Which do you believe?</i>	<i>Qaysinga ishonasiz?</i> <i>Which believe (you)?</i>
<i>Which (color) do you buy?</i>	<i>Qaysindan(qaysi rangdan) sotib olasiz?</i>

	<i>Which from buy you?</i>
<i>In which shop did you see?</i>	<i>Qaysi do'konda ko'rdingiz?</i> <i>Which shop at saw (you)?</i>

The question word *why* is stayed unchanged in both English and Uzbek but with a little different versions like synonyms keeping the meaning of this question word in Uzbek.

Why	Nimaga
<i>Why are you being so happy?</i>	<i>Nimaga shunchalik hursandsiz?</i> <i>What for such happy (you)?</i>
<i>Why are you being so happy?</i>	<i>Nimadan shunchalik hursandsiz?</i> <i>What from such happy(you)?</i>
<i>Why are you being so happy?</i>	<i>Nima uchun shunchalik hursandsiz?</i> <i>What from such happy (you)?</i>
<i>Why are you being so happy?</i>	<i>Nima sababli shunchalik hursandsiz?</i> <i>What reason such happy (you)?</i>

As common and genitive cases exist in English and Uzbek, one of the Wh- words *whose/kimning* is usually stayed without changing in both so-called languages.

(49) a. *Whose book is this one?*

Bu kimning kitobi?

This whose book?

b. *Whose brother works in the USA?*

Kimning akasiAmerikada ishlaydi?

Whose brother in Amerika works?

c. Whose pupil is waiting there?

Kimning o'quvchisi anavi yerda kutyapti?

Whose student that place at waiting for?

Rasulov (2019) thinks the word semantic valence is that the main word requires components in sentences. Since the semantic structure of government (noun) it might be hidden agreement Nouns represent entities, verbs represent activities or states whereas adjectives represent qualities or characteristics. Based on some examples written above, the semantic features of interrogative pronouns' denotations are similar in some cases whereas in other *wh*-words may donate the condition of agency concerning to part of the speech positions. So as to understand this various conditions it is suggested to use transformation method by linguists. When the sentences are converted from interrogative sentences to declarative one, the agent of the sentence has been confirmed in translation method. For instance:

Who(m)	What	Where	Which
Kimni (whom)	Nimani (what)	Qayerni (where)	Qaysini (which)
Kimga (who to)	Nimaga (what to)	Qayerga (where to)	Qaysinga (which to)
Kimdan (who from)	Nimadan (what from)	Qayerda (where from)	Qaysindan (which from)

From the exemplified sentences it can be confirmed that they all have commonalty in demonstrating the questions including require the information from the listener that is unknown to the speaker in both languages English and Uzbek.

3.3 Reduplication of Wh-words in Uzbek

It can be observed special unicals in some languages which cannot be observed in any other language. Uzbek has also such kind of unicals which makes it different from others. One of them is a reduplication of Wh-words. Reduplicated Wh-words are interpreted as the non-interrogative elements. In this event question words like *who*, *what*, *where* are interpreted as the non-interrogative word by means of reduplication as illustrated below.

(50) a. *Kim-kim bordi bazmga?*

Who-who went to the party?

Who went to the party?

b. *Kim-kim biladi bu sirni?*

Who who knows about it?

Who knows this secret?

(51) a. *Nima-nima sotib olding?*

What-what did you buy?

What did you buy ?

b. *Nima-nima qilishimiz kerak?*

What-what do we have to?

What should we do?

(52) a. *Qayer-qayer seni hududing?*

Where-where is your place?

Wher is your land?

b. *Qayer-qayerda qor yog'di?*

Where-where did it snow?

Wher it snowed?

In these examples the pair form of those Wh-words can also donate the meaning of plurality. Nevertheless, in English morphology there is no such kind of repeated construction of above mentioned question words.

The plural from of the affix – **lar** (plr suffix” s”) can also be added to the certain *wh*-words which have noun characteristics so as to not only donate lexical meaning but also plurality, emphasis whereas in English *wh*-words do not accept plural suffix. So as to give such meaning verbs or auxiliary verbs are usually given in plural like in examples

(55) a. *Kimlar biladi bu sirni?*

Who-plr know this secret?

Who knows this secret?

b. *Kimlar bu fikrga qo'shiladi?*

Who-ple this idea agree with?

Who agrees with this idea?

c. *Kimlar ular?*

Who-plr they?

Who are they?

(56) a. *Nimalar bilasiz bu haqida?*

What-plr know this about?

What do you know about it?

b. *Nimalar bor do'koningizda?*

What-plr there are your shop in?

What are the in your shop?

c. Bu universitetning qayerlari remont qilindi?

This university of which-plr renovated?

Where are of this university renovated?

Besides the plural form of the affix- “*lar*” (*plr suffix “s”*) in Uzbek, the pair form of those *wh* words can also donate the meaning of plurality.



IV. Wh-words as non-interrogative elements

4.1 Wh-words in exclamation usage

What, as shown in (57a), accompanies the degree or frequency interrogatives and may demonstrate the speaker's exclamatory attitude by implying a high degree or frequency.

(57). a. *What a nice day! Qanday ajoyib kun!(what nice day)*

In (57a), the exclamative, the realization of the entity that is marked by the word *What/qanday* are above the norm for this context. So in (57a), the emphasis lies on the degree of a day at which is nice or lovely in both two languages. However, what is combined with the indefinite article in exclamative (57b), but not in interrogatives (57c) (Huddleston 1993):

b. *What a / what proposal he made!*

c. *What / what a proposal did he make?*

(58). a. *What's that? A note? Nima ekan? Xatmi? (What that is ? letter?)*

The exclamation usage of 'what' such as in (57b) not only shows the speaker's attitude to make a judgement regarding information on the proposed content, but is also derived from a speaker-oriented exclamative sentence that does not request information from the proposed content. As shown above, the question words *what* and *qanday(what)* employment in exclamation usage is similar in English and Uzbek. Sometimes it achieves the nuance of the exclamation based on its nature as an object-oriented – interrogative sentence. Nevertheless, *wh*-word in (58a) contrary to cannot be employed in exclamation usage, and thus, does not mark an object oriented interrogative sentence.

4.2 Wh-words in Rhetorical question (interrogative) usage

Rhetoric questions do not request the answer. This type of question usage possesses the style of confirmation in the embedded interrogative sentence. In rhetorical type of question, the strong emotional aim of the speaker

is expressed. Rhetorical questions are those that do not seek answers because the answers are already clear to both the asker and the answer. The purposes of such questions are mainly to emphasize the known answer, to stir some emotion.

(59) *Bolani kim sevmaydi?* (Children who does not love?)

Who does not love a child?

The embedded negative conception that is exists in the interrogative sentence is one of the peculiarity of a rhetoric question.

(60). a. *Bolani kim sevmaydi?* (Children who does not love?)

b. *Bolani hamma sevadi.* (Children all love)

Who does not love a child? Everyone loves a child.

Interrogative pronouns *who/what* are often used in dialogic rhetoric. In both English and Uzbek languages they use encouraging phrases that lead a listener to be brave and to be strong.

(61) *Who could object you? No one.*

Kim senga qarshi chiqa olardi? (Who you to object?)

Senga hech kim qarshi chiqa olmaydi. (You no one object)

(62) a. *Men senga nima berdim?* (I you to what gave ?)

What did I give you?

b. *Senga maktabga bor dedim.* (You to scholl to go I said)

I told you to go to school.

c. *Senga parkga borma dedim* (You to park to not go I said).

I told you not to go to the park.

(63) a. *Qarindoshlar nima deyishadi?* (Relatives what say?)

What will the relatives say?

(64) a. *Bog'ni obod qilgan kim?* (Garden grew who?)

Who is the person that grew the garden?

b. *Bog'ni obod qilgan men.* (Garden grew I)

I looked after the garden

c. *Bog'ni obod qilgan do'stim.* (Garden grew my friend)

My friend grew the garden.

In Uzbek *nima*(*what*) and English *what* can be employed in rhetorical questions, as shown in (62 a) and (60 3). However, there appears to be a slight nuance between them regarding the possibility of an opposing judgement on the proposed content. When rephrasing (62a)'s *nima*(*what*) rhetorical question into a declarative sentence that demonstrates an opposing judgement on the proposed content, both the verb *borma*(*do not go*) in (62c), which exhibits a possibility of order, and the verb *bor*(*go*) in (62b), which exhibits a strong possibility of order, are suitable when they rephrased.

In dialogic rhetoric the phrases like (64a) and (64b) are mainly expressed in the Uzbek language. As it is known the concept 'shame' is considered to be the most serious factor in Uzbek culture. In Uzbek language the following rhetorical phrases are very often used: *What will the neighbors say? What will the other people say? What a shame?* In the west people used to living on the basis of individualistic theory, meanwhile in the East a team, a group work is preferred. They used to take into the consideration people's ideas and point of views. These kinds of factors made an impact on the formation of the above mentioned linguistic phenomenon in dialogic rhetoric. In rhetoric questions *kim* (who) and *what* can be employed in ironic rhetorical questions in both two

languages, as shown in (65a, b, c). However, there appears to be a slight difference between them regarding the embedded concept ‘haughty’ on the proposed content. When rephrasing (64a)’s *kim (who)* rhetorical question into a declarative sentence that demonstrates an opposing judgment on the proposed content, the personal pronouns ‘men’(I) in (64b) and *do’stim (my friend)* in (64c) which exhibits similar concept of ‘haughty’, when they rephrase.

In other words, the rhetorical question with *kim (who)* and *nima (what)* could be interpreted as meaning that the possess possibility of similar conception, concerning the proposed content, or so it is understood as a rhetorical question. As stated above, the characteristics of the rhetorical questions of *kim (who)* and *nima (what)* in Uzbek, *who* and *what* in English seem to be similarity in rephrasing the interrogative sentences to declarative sentences. Meanwhile, the rhetoric is a social phenomenon it has it is significant peculiarities in different social groups and conditions in sociocultural point of view as lightly I have analyzed above.

4.3 The *Ki* particle

This section analyzes the Wh-words bound by the particle “*ki*”. The “*ki*” “particle appears usually at the end of the sentence structure and if there is “*ki*” particle in the sentence it makes the interrogative reading of the wh-word unavailable. For instance:

(65) a. *Sen nimani bilmaysanki..!*

You what do not know!

Sen nimani bilmaysan?

What do not you know?

Sen hamma narsani bilasan

You know everything.

b. *U qayerga borganki..!*

She where went ?!

U qayerga borgan? \

Where has she been?

U hechqayerga bormagan.

She has been nowhere.

c. *Siz kimga ishonasizki!*

You who to believe?!

Siz kimga ishonsiz?

Whom do you believe?

Siz hech kimga ishonmaysiz?

You believe no one.

In the above mentioned examples the Wh-words appear VP-internally. The structures in (65a-c) reveal that the Wh-word receives only the non-interrogative reading when the “*ki*” particle is in the domain. To be more precise, the interrogative reading is unacceptable when there is *ki* particle in the structure. It shows that the “*ki*” particle binds the wh-word yielding only the non-interrogative reading.

V. Conclusion

In the thesis I have conducted a comparative study of *wh*-words in English and Uzbek *kim(who)* / *nima(what)* / *qayer(where)* / *nimaga(why)* / *qaysi(which)* in Uzbek and *who/what/where/which/why* in English from the morphological and semantic usages in both languages. The results of analysis display followings:

1) As Uzbek language is related to agglutinative type of languages, there are more words that are derived through the affixes. Thus, the interrogative pronouns like *kim(who)/nima(what)/qayer(where)/qaysi(which)* can be declined in category of case by means of different inflectional suffixes such as: – *ni, ning, ga, da, dan*. In English the alternatives of these suffixes can be prepositions like *to, at, for, from*, but they are used separately from *wh*-question words where the suffixes are usually added to the question words in Uzbek. For instance:

(62) *What are you looking at? Nimaga qarayapsan?*

(63) *Where do you come from? Qayerdansen?*

(64) *Who are you laughing at? Kimga kulyapsan?*

2) In English the pronoun *what* does not manifest the characteristics of a case in grammatical category, but is generally regulated by the semantics and meaning.

3) There are six grammatical category of the case in Uzbek language which greatly influences the word defining while the English language has just two nominative and genitive cases. In English interrogative pronouns do not change

as generally happens in language and they remain unchanged, in both the number and gender whereas in Uzbek they are altered.

4) Since it is an analytical language, English does not mark interrogative words *who/what/where* the derived affixes it belongs to. For example, the word *what* possesses the category of sustentative when it denotes noun while when it is before the noun it denotes an adjective. For example:

(65) *What is on the table?*

(66) *What book will you buy?*

In conclusion it can be said that morphological, syntactic-semantic differences between the languages taken in consideration are significantly greater than the similarities. Although grammatical categories of Uzbek are very close to those of English *wh*-words, there are certain notable cases that we have learned in this thesis above. Within the linguistic representation, it is the elements in the end of the words – interrogative particles or that bear on the interrogative aspect. However, it is the element in the head of the sentences that constitutes the interrogative aspect in English. Both English and Uzbek *wh*-words can appear in interrogative, exclamative and declarative contexts as they are semantically underspecified lexical items that introduce a variable of a particular conceptual domain into the semantic representation.

Considering all the above findings, it can be understood that the comparative analysis plays an important role on language learning as different languages have their own unicals and universals like English and Uzbek.

References

- Akar, D. (1990) “*Wh-Questions in Turkish*” Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Bo_aziçi University.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. (1998) *Parameterizing AGR; word order, V-movement and EPP checking. (in) Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 491-539.
- Aoun, J & Y.A, Li. (1993a) *Wh-Elements In-Situ: Syntax or LF?*. *LI* 24-2, 199-238.
- Aoun, J & Y.A, Li. (1993b) *On Some Differences between Chinese and Japanese Wh-elements*. *LI* 24-3, 265-272.
- Bates, E. and B. MacWhinney (1989) “*Functionalism and the Competition Model.*” In E. Bates and B. MacWhinney (eds.), *The Crosslinguistic Study of Sentence Processing*, 3–73 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, S (1996) “*Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement.*” *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 1–56
- Belikova, A (2008) “*Reciprocal Verbs in the L2 French of Native Speakers of Russian.*” In Roumyana Slabakova et al. (eds.), “*Proceedings of the 9th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference*” (GASLA 2007) 1–14. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project
- Bhat (2007.) D.N “*Pronoun*” *Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory*. OUP , 9, 211

Buranov J (1973) “*Introduction to the comparative grammar of the English and Uzbek languages*”, 74, 111

Charles W. Kreidler (2002) “*Introducing English semantics*”, London and New York , 271

Dreiser T (2007) “*Bakhti qaro Kerri [Sister Carrie]*” T, Sharq Publ. 14-341. (In Uzb)

Dreiser T (2014) *An American Tragedy*, CUP. 2014, 7, 13

Gulomov. A , Asqarova M (1987) *Modern Uzbek Language. Lingua*. 91 (2-3), 175-84.

Han, Chung-Hye (2002) *Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions*. (in) *Lingua*, volume 1, 112, 201-229

Han, Chung-Hye & Laura Siegel (1997). *Syntactic and Semantic Conditions on NPI Licensing in Questions*. “*Proceedings of West Coast Conference in Formal Linguistics*”, volume 15, 177-191. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Khoshimov U (2016) “ *Dunyoning ishlari*”(The works of the world) volume 3:26, 29, 46,102.

Maytinskaya K. E (1969) “*Pronoun in different language system*”, volume 2, 215-220

Myers L. L (2007) “*WH-Interrogatives in Spoken French: a Corpus-Based Analysis of their Form and Function*”, volume 1, 110-164

Parmonov.A (2016) “*Structural-semantic types of interrogative pronouns in Modern English and Uzbek*” «Молодой учёный» . № 8 (112)

Rasulov R (2019) *The problems of Uzbek theoretical grammar, 13-25* TTT publication.

Sapaev. K (2008) *Modern Uzbek language, volume 2*, 140-167

Smirnitkiy I (1959) *Morphology of English language*, Volume 3 187-295.

Tursunov U, Mukhtorov A (1992) *Modern Uzbek language*, Volume 2 260-175.

Used websites

<https://www.proz.com/kudoz/english/linguistics/1091124functionsrhetericalquestions.html>

https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/114am_36.EPRA%20JOURNALS-4791.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/4047740>

<https://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/380553/tect1de1.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y>