ilmiy-amaliy jurnal · ISSN 3093-8694

UDK 81’367.3:811.111:811.512.133

Raimjonov Akbar Ikrom o‘g‘li,
English Language Teacher
School No. 6, Mirzaobod District, Syrdarya Region

Tuychiboyev Ikrom Bahodir o‘g‘li,
English Language Teacher
Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute, Gulistan

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF SENTENCE TYPES IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract. The article examines the pragmatic characteristics of the principal communicative sentence types in English and Uzbek, focusing on the relationship between grammatical form and speaker intention. Declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory sentences are treated not as purely formal syntactic patterns but as resources through which speakers perform speech acts, signal attitudes, negotiate social relations and influence their interlocutors. The analysis is comparative and contrastive: parallel sentence pairs are examined according to the grammatical marking of each type, its prototypical illocution, the non-prototypical functions it conventionally acquires, and the means by which politeness and social distance are encoded. The results show that the two languages converge almost completely at the level of communicative function, while the mechanisms of realisation diverge substantially. English relies on word order, subject–auxiliary inversion, modal verbs and prosody; Uzbek employs agglutinative morphology, interrogative and emphatic particles, flexible constituent placement and the grammaticalised opposition between sen and siz, which encodes respect in the verb form itself. An adequate pragmatic description must therefore combine grammatical structure, literal semantic content, communicative situation and inferred speaker intention.

Keywords: *pragmatics; sentence types; English language; Uzbek language; speech act; illocutionary force; declarative sentence; interrogative sentence; imperative mood; indirect speech act; politeness strategies; contrastive analysis.*

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA GAP TURLARINING PRAGMATIK JIHATLARI

Annotatsiya. Maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi asosiy kommunikativ gap turlarining pragmatik xususiyatlari, xususan grammatik shakl bilan so‘zlovchining niyati o‘rtasidagi munosabat tahlil qilingan. Darak, so‘roq, buyruq va undov gaplar sof sintaktik qoliplar sifatida emas, balki so‘zlovchi nutqiy aktlarni amalga oshiradigan, munosabatini bildiradigan, ijtimoiy aloqalarni tartibga soladigan va suhbatdoshiga ta’sir ko‘rsatadigan til vositalari sifatida qaralgan. Tahlil qiyosiy-tipologik va kontrastiv yo‘nalishda olib borilgan: parallel gap juftliklari har bir turning grammatik ko‘rsatkichi, prototipik illokutiv kuchi, an’anaga ko‘ra orttiradigan noprototipik vazifalari hamda xushmuomalalik va ijtimoiy masofani ifodalash usullari bo‘yicha o‘rganilgan. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatdi: ikki til kommunikativ vazifa darajasida deyarli to‘liq mos keladi, biroq bu vazifalarni ifodalash mexanizmlari sezilarli farq qiladi. Ingliz tili so‘z tartibi, ega bi-

lan yordamchi fe’l inversiyasi, modal fe’llar va intonatsiyaga tayanadi; o‘zbek tilida esa agglutinativ morfologiya, so‘roq va kuchaytiruvchi yuklamalar, gap bo‘laklarining erkin joylashuvi hamda fe’l shaklida hurmatni ifodalovchi sen – siz zidlanishi asosiy vosita bo‘lib xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: *pragmatika; gap turlari; ingliz tili; o‘zbek tili; nutqiy akt; illokutiv kuch; darak gap; so‘roq gap; buyruq mayli; vositali nutqiy akt; xushmuomalalik strategiyalari; kontrastiv tahlil.*

ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ТИПОВ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЙ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация. В статье анализируются прагматические характеристики основных коммуникативных типов предложений в английском и узбекском языках, прежде всего соотношение между грамматической формой и коммуникативным намерением говорящего. Повествовательные, вопросительные, побудительные и восклицательные предложения рассматриваются не как чисто формальные синтаксические схемы, а как языковые ресурсы, посредством которых говорящий совершает речевые акты, выражает отношение, регулирует социальные связи и воздействует на собеседника. Анализ проведён в сопоставительно-типологическом и контрастивном ключе: параллельные пары предложений изучались по грамматическому маркеру каждого типа, его прототипической иллокутивной силе, конвенционально приобретаемым непрототипическим функциям и способам выражения вежливости и социальной дистанции. Результаты показали, что на уровне коммуникативной функции два языка совпадают почти полностью, тогда как механизмы реализации существенно расходятся. Английский язык опирается на порядок слов, инверсию подлежащего и вспомогательного глагола, модальные глаголы и интонацию; узбекский — на агглютинативную морфологию, вопросительные и усилительные частицы, свободное расположение членов предложения и грамматикализованное противопоставление sen – siz, выражающее уважение в самой форме глагола.

Ключевые слова: *прагматика; типы предложений; английский язык; узбекский язык; речевой акт; иллокутивная сила; повествовательное предложение; вопросительное предложение; повелительное наклонение; косвенный речевой акт; стратегии вежливости; контрастивный анализ.*

INTRODUCTION

A sentence can be described exhaustively in grammatical terms, yet communication cannot be explained by grammar alone. Speakers frequently say one thing formally while performing a different communicative action. A question may be used not to obtain information but to request an action; a statement may convey criticism indirectly; a command-like construction may function as an invitation. This interplay of form, intention, context and interpretation makes sentence types an important object of pragmatic investigation.

Modern pragmatics treats meaning as something that emerges from the encounter between linguistic expression and communicative context. Degen notes that contemporary research increasingly models interpretation as inferential: hear-

ers evaluate not only the literal content of an utterance but also why the speaker chose that particular expression [6]. The sentence "It is cold in here" is formally declarative, yet in an appropriate setting it means "Please close the window". The interpretation comes not from grammatical form alone but from shared knowledge and reasoning about intentions.

For Uzbek teachers and learners of English the issue is practical as well as theoretical. A learner may master the formal paradigms of English sentence types and still produce utterances that are grammatically faultless and pragmatically inappropriate, because the directness conventions and address forms of the first language travel with the syntax. Translators meet the mirror image: a formally equivalent rendering can turn an invitation into an order. The article therefore compares the pragmatic realisation of the principal communicative sentence types in the two languages. It establishes which functions each grammatical type performs, which formal means realise them, and where the systems converge and diverge.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Two strands of research inform the analysis. The first is general pragmatic theory. Degen's review of inferential approaches describes interpretation as probabilistic reasoning about a speaker's choice among available alternatives, which explains how a hearer recovers a request from a declarative utterance [6]. House and Kádár argue that speech acts should be studied within interaction rather than as isolated linguistic products [7]. An utterance acquires its pragmatic value through its place in a conversation, the relationship between participants and the response it elicits. The principle matters in contrastive work: formally parallel sentences may carry different degrees of directness in two cultures.

The second strand consists of comparative studies of English and Uzbek. Bereketova and Bafoyeva describe the structural types of sentences in the two languages and identify constituent order as the clearest typological difference between them [3]. Zikirova examines the actual division of the sentence and shows how topic and focus are distributed differently [2]. Normamatova demonstrates that interrogativity is marked by distinct morphological and syntactic devices, while both languages exploit questions for a wide range of purposes [1]. Gadoyeva and Ibragimova trace the contextual use of the imperative mood and note that English combines imperative meaning with modal softening whereas Uzbek relies on morphological markers of hierarchy and respect [5]. Farkhodova stresses that politeness strategies are shaped by cultural as well as linguistic norms [4]. These works describe either the formal inventory or the pragmatics of a single type. A unified account covering all the principal types along one set of parameters is largely absent, and the present article addresses that gap.

METHODOLOGY

The study is theoretical and analytical. No experiment, questionnaire or informant survey was conducted. The material consists of the comparative and pragmatic studies listed in the references and of parallel sentence pairs constructed by the authors as minimal translation equivalents. Such pairs are standard in contrastive description: they isolate a single variable — order, form or morphological marking — while propositional content is held constant.

Three methods were combined. The comparative-typological method established how each sentence type is formally marked. Contrastive pragmatic analysis compared the illocutionary force each form conventionally carries. Content analysis of the cited literature systematised existing observations and positioned the authors' interpretation in relation to them.

Each type was described along four parameters: the grammatical markers that identify it; its prototypical illocution; the non-prototypical illocutions it conventionally acquires; and the devices expressing politeness and social distance. Sentences in both languages are traditionally classified by communicative purpose as declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory. That classification is useful, but no grammatical type corresponds to a single function, and the four parameters are designed to capture this flexibility.

RESULTS

The primary grammatical function of a declarative sentence is to present information. English commonly employs SVO order, as in "The student completed the task", while Uzbek uses SOV: "Talaba vazifani bajardi".

Declaratives nevertheless perform far more than assertion: promises, warnings, accusations, indirect requests, advice, agreement or evaluation. "I will help you tomorrow" and "Men sizga ertaga yordam beraman" are declarative in both languages, yet in context each is a promise rather than a description of a future event. A statement may also influence indirectly. "The window is still open" may merely describe a situation, but in certain circumstances it means "Close the window"; Uzbek permits the same use in "Deraza ochiq qolibdi". The hearer recovers more than the literal proposition because contextual knowledge supplies an additional layer.

Information structure matters particularly in Uzbek, where constituent order may be adjusted for emphasis, topic and focus [2]. In English a change of informational focus usually requires stress or a marked construction; Uzbek can combine placement with particles and morphology to foreground an element. In "Ali kitobni oldi" ("Ali took the book") attention may fall on the agent, the object or the action, depending on context and prosody. Declaratives also reveal social relations: "You need to submit this today" is an instruction from a superior but advice between colleagues, and in Uzbek the distinction between sen and siz adds respect, distance or familiarity to the propositional content.

Interrogative sentences illustrate the gap between form and purpose especially clearly. Their prototypical function is to request information, yet questions also express requests, suggestions, criticism, surprise or disagreement. English yes/no questions generally involve subject–auxiliary inversion: "Are you ready?" or "Did he arrive?" Uzbek preserves its basic order and adds the particle -mi: "Siz tayyormisiz?", "U keldimi?" Normamatova shows that interrogativity is realised through different morphological and syntactic devices, while both languages employ questions for a wide range of pragmatic purposes [1].

Wh-interrogatives display the same contrast. English normally places the interrogative element near the beginning of the clause, as in "Where are you going?", whereas Uzbek retains it in the position associated with its grammatical function: "Siz qayerga ketyapsiz?" English thus shows more visible syntactic rearrangement; Uzbek relies on interrogative words and morphology without comparable inversion.

Pragmatically, questions are more versatile than either pattern suggests. "Can you open the door?" is grammatically a question about ability but functions in conversation as a request; a literal "Yes, I can" without opening the door fails to respond to the intention. Uzbek has the parallel form "Eshikni ochib bera olasizmi?". The degree of directness may nevertheless differ across cultures, since politeness strategies follow cultural as well as linguistic norms [4]. Questions may also criticise: "Why are you always late?" can request an explanation but usually communicates dissatisfaction, as does "Nega doim kech qolasiz?". Rhetorical questions move further still. "Who does not want to be happy?" expects no list of people; it strengthens the proposition that everyone wants happiness. Uzbek "Kim baxtli bo‘lishni istamaydi?" works identically: the form remains interrogative, while the expected response is acceptance of an implied assertion.

Imperative sentences are conventionally associated with commands, but their actual range covers requests, invitations, advice, instructions, warnings, permission and prohibitions. English imperatives employ the base form with the subject unexpressed: "Come in", "Sit down", "Be careful". Uzbek possesses a richer morphological system: kel addresses a familiar singular interlocutor, keling several people or one addressee respectfully. Such morphology conveys social information that the English verb form does not encode. Gadoyeva and Ibragimova show that imperative constructions differ significantly in contextual realisation, English combining imperative meaning with modal softening while Uzbek draws on morphological markers of hierarchy and respect [5].

The same form may acquire different values in context. "Have some tea" is formally imperative but functions as an offer, and "Choydan oling" is a conventional invitation rather than an exercise of authority. "Take an umbrella" is advice, "Be careful!" a warning, "Come and see us sometime" an invitation. Imperative mood should not be equated automatically with coercive force.

Social status is particularly visible in Uzbek. The forms o‘tir and o‘tiring both concern sitting but differ in interpersonal marking, the second indicating respect, politeness, plurality or distance; English relies more on lexis, modals, tone and surrounding discourse. Negative imperatives show the same pattern: English uses don't, as in "Don't touch it", while Uzbek employs the marker -ma in "Unga tegma" or the respectful "Unga tegmang".

Exclamatory constructions are the type most closely tied to the expressive function: they convey the speaker's emotional or evaluative stance rather than transmit information or elicit action. English marks them lexically and syntactically through what and how in a non-interrogative pattern — "What a wonderful book!", "How quickly the time passes!" Uzbek uses intensifying words such as qanday and naqadar, as in "Qanday ajoyib kitob!", and may also mark exclamation prosodically on a declarative frame. In both languages one construction may carry praise, surprise, indignation or irony, so evaluative polarity is determined by context and intonation rather than by form.

DISCUSSION

The results indicate that the two languages converge in communicative function and diverge in formal realisation. Speakers of both use declaratives for assertions and indirect requests, interrogatives for information seeking and indirect speech acts, imperatives for commands as well as invitations, and exclamatory constructions for evaluative expression. The inventory of functions is largely shared, which supports the view that the form–function relationship is governed by general pragmatic inference rather than by language-specific rules [6].

The mechanisms, however, are distributed differently across the two systems. English, with its relatively fixed word order, grammaticalises sentence type mainly in syntax — inversion, interrogative-element position, the absent imperative subject — and delegates social meaning to modal verbs, lexical hedges and prosody. Uzbek, an agglutinative language, encodes much of the same information morphologically: -mi marks interrogativity without disturbing constituent order, -ng marks respect inside the imperative, -ma marks prohibition. This agrees with earlier contrastive work on structural types [3], interrogativity [1] and the imperative mood [5]. It adds the observation that the languages differ not in what they can mean, but in where in the system that meaning is located.

A separate observation concerns social deixis. In Uzbek the sen – siz opposition is obligatory: a speaker cannot formulate an imperative or a second-person declarative without simultaneously taking a position on the relationship with the addressee. English has no comparable obligatory choice and signals deference by optional means that may be omitted without ungrammaticality. The asymmetry accounts for a recurring source of pragmatic failure in both directions of translation and for part of the difference in how politeness is realised in the two cultures [4]. It also supports the argument that speech acts are best analysed in interaction, where

the relationship between participants belongs to the data rather than to the background [7].

A complete pragmatic analysis of an English or Uzbek sentence must therefore combine four interconnected components: grammatical structure, literal semantic content, communicative situation and inferred speaker intention, since social relationship and cultural convention shape the interpretation of each. The limitations of the study follow from its design. The analysis rests on constructed sentence pairs and published descriptions rather than on a corpus of natural interaction, so the relative frequency of the functions described cannot be estimated. Intonation, repeatedly invoked above, was not measured instrumentally, and regional and register variation within Uzbek was left aside. Corpus-based and experimental verification would be a natural continuation.

CONCLUSION

The pragmatic study of sentence types in English and Uzbek demonstrates that sentence meaning cannot be reduced to grammatical classification. Declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory structures provide conventional frameworks, but their actual functions are determined through the interaction of form, context, speaker intention and social relations.

The comparison shows extensive functional similarity alongside a systematic difference in the means of realisation: English concentrates the marking of sentence type in syntax, while Uzbek encodes it, together with respect and social distance, in an obligatory morphological apparatus.

For language teaching and translation the implication is that formal equivalence between an English and an Uzbek sentence does not guarantee pragmatic equivalence. Instruction that presents sentence types only as grammatical paradigms leaves learners unable to judge whether a form suits a situation. Describing each type together with its conventional non-prototypical functions and its politeness value offers a firmer basis for communicative competence in both languages.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar:

1. Normamatova D. T. Linguistic Features of Interrogative Sentences in the English and Uzbek Languages // Philology Matters. – 2022. – Vol. 42, No. 3. – P. 73–87.

2. Zikirova R. Comparative Analysis of Actual Division of the Sentence in English and Uzbek // Central Asian Journal of Education and Innovation. – 2023. – Vol. 2, No. 5, Part 2. – P. 214–217. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7964662.

3. Bereketova N. N., Bafoyeva N. S. Structural Types of Sentences in English and Uzbek Languages // PEDAGOGS. – 2024. – Vol. 58, No. 4. – P. 125–127.

4. Farkhodova Sh. The Principle of Politeness in English and Uzbek Speech Adaptation // Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics. – 2024. – Special Issue 1. – P. 390–395. DOI: 10.47689/2181-3701-vol2-iss1/S-pp390-395.

5. Gadoyeva M. I., Ibragimova M. Contextual Use of the Imperative Mood in English and Uzbek Languages // TLEP – International Journal of Multidiscipline. – 2025. – Vol. 2, No. 7. – P. 154–157.

6. Degen J. The Rational Speech Act Framework // Annual Review of Linguistics. – 2023. – Vol. 9. – P. 519–540. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031220-010811.

7. House J., Kádár D. Z. Speech Acts and Interaction in Second Language Pragmatics: A Position Paper // Language Teaching. – 2025. – Vol. 58, No. 3. – P. 396–407. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444822000477.