

# Functional Semantic Features Of Interrogative Sentences And Their Significance In The Text

Abdullaeva Dilorom Akhmedovna

Candidate Of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department Of Uzbek Language And Literature, Russian And English Languages, Bukhara State Medical Institute, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 12 April 2025; **Accepted:** 08 May 2025; **Published:** 17 June 2025

**Abstract:** The article examines interrogative units and their functional-semantic aspects, the importance of interrogative units in the organization of the communicative field. The main function of interrogative units is to ask for content, which is revealed in examples. The article also scientifically analyzes the structure, semantics, and methodological use of interrogative sentences.

**Keywords:** Interrogative sentence, interrogative category, functional-semantic field of interrogativeness, core and periphery of the field, typology of interrogative sentences.

**Introduction:** The study of interrogative sentences has been a significant topic in linguistics since historical times. Interrogative sentences are characterized from the perspective of their structure, semantics, stylistic use, role in communicative action, etc. Such versatility indicates their capacity, complexity and ambiguity. However, interrogative constructions do not exist in language, primarily in speech, by themselves, but rather in a certain textual continuity, speech, and require understanding at a high categorical level. The first studies on the study of interrogative sentences in Russian linguistics were carried out in the scientific works of E.V. Gulyga and E.I. Shendels. [1, p. 97]. Linguist A.V. Bondarko states that "a set of interacting means constitutes a system - a grammatical-lexical field.

Interrogative sentences are multi functional and can be used for different purposes depending on the type of discourse they refer to. Functions of questions in discourse are still a relevant problem for such areas as theoretical linguistics in general and pragmatics in particular. They are studied in relation to intonation and lexical or syntactic marking although many aspects have not been researched yet especially those concerning categories of questions and speakers' intentions in the process of using interrogative sentences (Hautli-Janisz et al., 2021). When we speak

of the principle of the field, in the methods of analysis, in the approach to linguistic facts, we mean the important aspects of the field as a separate type of system, grouping and interaction of linguistic elements. Functional-semantic fields are language groups that have the following properties:

- 1) the presence of common invariant semantic functions in the linguistic means included in this group;
- 2) the mutual grammatical and lexical influence of not only homogeneous, but also heterogeneous elements;
- 3) a structure in which the following properties play a decisive role: a) the division "center (core) - periphery"; b) gradual transitions, partial intersections, "common segments" between the components of a given grouping and different groups. The functional-semantic field has a two-sided character and has a content plane and a plane of expression. The plane of expression is known It encompasses the formal-structural aspect of all the diverse linguistic means that are elements of a field.

A question is a statement intended to induce the listener to inform the speaker of something that requires clarification. Any question is based on some knowledge. By formulating a question, the questioner thereby wants to clarify this knowledge, to supplement and deepen it. A question is a form of thought that serves as a transitional link from incomplete

information (ignorance) to more complete information (new knowledge) based on the initial information (existing knowledge). The deep essence of the invariant of the interrogative category is that, with all the differences in speech situations where it is possible to use an interrogative construction or a construction corresponding in meaning to an interrogative one, the meaning of "request for information" remains unchanged. This invariant is seen both in rhetorical questions and in other types of transformed sentences.

The specific nature of the category of interrogativity and the field system of linguistic means and meanings that forms it is expressed in numerous interactions with other systemic integrations (motivation, expression of will, evaluation, emotiveness), which are included from a certain angle in the sphere of the question or reveal zones of partial overlap with it, and thus constitute the distant periphery of the functional-semantic field of interrogativeness [2, p. 205]. When determining the attribution of a particular interrogative sentence to the core or periphery, one can be guided by several components: the degree of expression of the categorical meaning, the form of its presentation, the pragmatic attitude of the speaker. The syntactic structure of the interrogative category, organized according to the field principle, is confirmed by the following fundamental features: it has its own syntactic unit – interrogative sentence – for expressing interrogative semantics; a clear opposition between the core and the periphery, based on the distinction between primary and secondary functions. The invariant meaning for all components of the core and the near periphery is the meaning of the query; interaction with other functional-semantic fields [3, p. 290].

Not only does the interrogative field as a whole have a complex structure, but also the microfields within the field are structurally subdivided into microfields of subsequent levels. Depending on the nature of the sentence containing the question, the number of its components changes. The semantic differences of the interrogative field consist in the number of components of each of the microfields [7, p. 74]. Thus, as this material shows, the opinions of researchers differ in their understanding of the functional-semantic field of interrogativeness.

In communicative linguistics of the text, continuing the tradition of functional analysis of language means in various spheres of social communication, the question is posed not only about how a particular text is organized in formal-structural and thematic-semantic respects, but also about why a given text form in the totality of its constituent structural elements is the most adequate in the embodiment of the author's

intent. The "why" question is addressed to the disclosure of motivations that lie outside the language, but dictate to the speaker / writer the choice of the corresponding linguistic materiality of the text. At the same time, the linguistic forms from which the text is created are chosen by the producer not arbitrarily, but in accordance with the extent to which their functional potential corresponds to the target settings implemented in a specific sphere of social and communicative practice. Correspondence/non-correspondence of linguistic means to the general goals of communication in a particular sphere can serve as the basis for their conditional division into two classes of unequal size: typical means, which have a high frequency and form in their totality the "generally accepted language of communication" in a given sphere, and atypical means, rarely used and even substantively dissonant with the communicative tasks of the corresponding sphere.

In the context of indirect communication, statements in the form of questions proper are used to pose a scientific problem that requires theoretical understanding from the author's point of view. This function of interrogative structures is most clearly manifested in the titles of scientific papers, as well as in the headings of their structural-compositional parts. Examples here include the titles of articles by Jürgen Schiewe ("Was ist Sprachkritik? Einige programmatische Überlegungen") (Schiewe, p. 19) and Heinz Kretzenbacher ("Wie durchsichtig ist die Sprache der Wissenschaften?") [5].

Observation of the textual material, moreover, shows that interrogative sentences with the function of formulating the problematic, which are not explicitly prepared by the pretext, are syntactically independent and tend to be used in the initial paragraphs of sections or at the boundaries of paragraphs of linguistic works. Their use, therefore, has a structural-compositional dimension; for example: (1) Der Ressourcencharakter der Sprache und das sprachliche Handeln Offensichtlich haben Sprachen, hat Sprache Struktur. Oder, anders gesagt, sie hat eine Menge von Strukturen. Was hat es damit auf sich? Hier kann es nützlich sein... (Ehlich II, S. 17); (2) Wissenschaftssprachliche Strukturen und der Rahmen der Fachsprachenanalyse Die in § 3 vorgestellten Daten sind leider keine Einzelfälle. Wie repräsentativ sie sind, ist auf der Grundlage umfangreicher Korpora weiter zu eruieren. Was aber kennzeichnet die Art von sprachlichen Strukturen, die den Kandidaten solche erhebliche Mühe gemacht haben? Immerhin haben... (Ehlich I, S. 336)

## REFERENCES

Гулыга, Е.В. Грамматико-лексические поля в

современном немецком языке / Е.В. Гулыга, Е.И. Шендельс. – М., 1969

Ахматова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М., 1996

Бондарко, А.В. Теория значения в системе функциональной грамматики на материале русского языка. – М., 2002.

Львова, О.В. Функционально-семантическое поле вопросительности в немецком языке. – М., 2012.\

Kretzenbacher, H. L. Wie durchsichtig ist die Sprache der Wissenschaften? / H. L. Kretzenbacher // Linguistik der Wissenschaftssprache / H. L. Kretzenbacher, H. Weinrich (Hrsg.). – Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1995. S. 15–35.

Ehlich K. Sprachliches Handeln – Interaktion und sprachliche Strukturen [Speech acts - interaction and linguistic structures]. Grammatik und Interaktion. Untersuchungen zum Zusammenhang von grammatischen Strukturen und Gesprächsprozessen [Grammar and interaction. Studies on the correlation of grammatical structures and discussion processes] / A. Deppermann, R. Fiehler, Th. Spranz-Fogasy (Hrsg.). Radolfzell, Verlag für Gesprächsforschung, 2006, S. 11-20