COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS 'WHAT' AND 'WHO' IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Normamatova Dilfuza Turdikulovna

Gulistan State University Gulistan, Uzbekistan
e-mail: dilfuzalight@mail.ru

Abstract
This article reveals the interrogative aspect of question forms in English and Uzbek, including the characteristics of interrogative pronouns 'Kim'/'Nima' in Uzbek and 'Who'/'What' in English. 'What'/'Who' and 'Kim'/'Nima' in two English and Uzbek languages by definition indicate meanings of both "interrogation", and thus it is anticipated that the semantic characteristics of these forms will not differ significantly. When studying the semantic characteristics of both 'who/kim' and 'what/nima' are listener-oriented interrogative sentences with strong communicativity possess the commonality in English and Uzbek.

It is analyzed, the status of interrogative words "Who' and 'What' (WH-words) for interrogative interpretations in English and Uzbek, including the derivation of constituent questions evolves from a specific interplay of syntactic representations with pragmatics. The given examples in English and Uzbek to compare the interrogative pronouns in morphological usage verify the evident distinctions. However, one perceives many differences when examining the morphologic characteristics of interrogative pronouns 'Who' and "What' in both English and Uzbek languages. In a cross-linguistic overview, we discuss the characteristic elements contributing to the derivation of interrogatives in Uzbek. It also replies in the article that WH-words can form a constitutive part not only of interrogative, but also of exclamative and declarative clauses. Based on this, characteristic of interrogatives in exclamation and rhetoric usage the question usage does not solicit an answer.
Key words: Interrogative, morphology, semantics, pronoun, language, English, Uzbek, who, what, kim, nima.

Introduction

Applying the comparative characteristic of interrogative pronouns in English and Uzbek is problematic in several ways. First of all, it is not generally made clear what commonality and different features of interrogative pronouns *what* and *who* in English and in Uzbek. Defining and delimiting interrogatives what and who in different language families are rather problematic. And why they should be applicable to learn. To differentiate interrogative pronouns in two languages according to their morphology and syntactic semantics involves the opportunity in language acquisition for English learners in Uzbekistan. It is true that, interrogative pronouns are fundamental to be acquired in language learning.

English and Uzbek are the languages that have many differences and some similarities in their typological units. According to their typological classification English is in the group of fusion and Uzbek is in agglutinative group. However, there is a typological connection due to fact that both of them are analytic languages.[2] One of the most prominent characteristics of the interrogative pronouns of English, namely the so-called 'wh-movement', appears to go against

the contention that they are indefinite.[1] These questions cover the questions beginning with wh-words like when, where, why, how many, how much they are also called content questions and require some substance or content in the reply. In morphology these words are called interrogative pronouns in both English and Uzbek languages.

Interrogative pronoun what is expressed to ask about indefinite object meanwhile the pronoun who is expressed to identify the person. Question words what and who exhibit the meaning of query, thus the semantic characteristics of these pronouns are expected similar significantly.

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.

The studies have produced some regarding analysis of this issue. Accordingly, the present work examines the interrogative pronouns of morphological formations in two languages. To study the comparison of interrogations based on grammatical characteristics and syntactic relations in sentences. Furthermore, based on these results, this study intends to reconsider the differences and similarities of question forms in English and Uzbek from the grammatical means.

Objectives of the study

The objective of the work is to study syntactic and semantic peculiarities of interrogative pronouns 'Kim'/'Nima' in Uzbek and 'Who'/'What' in English.

To investigate the similarities and differences of 'who' and 'what' in Uzbek and English languages.

To investigate the morphological differences of interrogative question words 'who' and 'what' in interrogative sentence.

To study principles and functions of interrogative pronouns' 'who' and 'what' in English and Uzbek languages. To analyze using the interrogative words 'who' and 'what' in speech acts.

In order to achieve the objectives which are mentioned above we will carry out the study conducting comparative and contrastive methods of linguistics.

Method

In world linguistics, interrogative pronouns has been studied so far in the monographs of major linguists, in scientific articles and pamphlets on language learning. Below we discuss the grammatic and semantic peculiarities of the pronouns 'who' and 'what' in language, which are most commonly used in speech.

Among the groups of pronouns, the interrogative pronouns have the broadest grammatical meanings which are studied in the scientific works of many linguists, such as D. N. S. Bhat, O. Jesperson, M. Changhak, H. Wiesi, M. Baltin, N. Y. Shvedova, A. M. Mukhin, A. I. Smirnitsky, V. N. Jigadlo, J. Buranov, G. Abdurakhmonov, A. Nurmonov, U. Tursunov, H. Mukhiddinova, A. A. Parmanov.

As a result of our observations of the opinions of scholars', we can say that in all languages interrogative pronouns are divided into pronouns of nouns, pronouns of adjectives and pronouns of adverbs according to the functions they perform in speech.

Although there are several types of interrogative pronouns, in this article we will talk more about the grammatical functions and semantic features of interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what' comparative studying in English and Uzbek languages.

According to U. Tursunov and A. Mukhtorov, interrogative pronouns refer to the subject, its sign and quantity, the place and time of the action, and other features. Using the interrogative pronouns, the speaker tries to identify information from the listener about something that is unfamiliar to him - the subject, the event - the event and the action [10]. Agreeing to this conception H. Muhiddinova describes interrogative pronouns as interrogative pronouns used by

the speaker to identify information about an object - an event, an event, and an action, which means that it is the function of the word group in the sentence [19].

Studying the Wh-pronouns N. Y. Shvedova explains the conception "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, cognizes the world and the connections, relationships and dependencies established in it"[8].

In the process of studying pronouns 'who' and 'what', we can also follow Maitinskaya's opinion about the state of contradiction between the functions of who and what interrogative pronouns. "The interrogative pronoun 'Who' applies to both men and women, and it is opposed to what (like a noun)'What' Thus, in English, the questioning and personal pronouns in their relation to indication on humans or non-humans do not match"[20].

The opinion given by Smirnitskiy about the interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what' in English shows the evident definition to the target theme. "Interrogative (and relative) pronouns '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 non-person (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), and the pronoun 'what' is used in relation to inanimate objects"[13].

In view of the above, we consider Smirnitskiy and J. Boronov has the similar conception to about the pronouns 'who' 'what and 'kim' 'nima'. Thus, one of the syntactic-semantic features of interrogative pronouns with the addition of is that they are used in two different ways for human names and other names (animal, object, bird).

As to A. Parmanov In Uzbek, 'kim' is defined as an indefinite personal interrogative pronoun, and the English 'who' is in the same word category and has similar usages. Therefore, from the perspective of contrastive linguistics, 'who' and 'kim' satisfy the essential basis of comparison[9]. We argue that although the interrogative pronouns 'kim' in Uzbek and 'who' in English are in the same word category and has similar usages there is a big difference in their word formation or morphology that we discuss in next sections.

 Studying the typological study of interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what', 'kim' and 'nima' in English and Uzbek, J. Boronov, verifies that 'kim' and 'nima' in Uzbek can be declined in six category of cases, meanwhile 'who' and 'what' are used with the prepositions and auxiliary words in English[2]. We conduct the analyzes based on the scientific views of J. Buronov and D. N. S. Bhat in comparative study of interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what' in English and Uzbek.

As we stated above that 'kim' and 'nima' can be declined in six category of cases in Uzbek, however 'who' can be declined only in three cases in English.

Common case _ who

Genitive case _ whom

Accusative case _ Whose

When interrogative pronouns 'what' and 'who' are substitute the part of speech in the sentences they perform their syntactic functions replaced:

What did you get from the market?

What should a person avoid?

in both of examples above, the interrogative pronoun 'what' serves as a complement.

The interrogative pronoun for 'what' is involved in the construction of a sentence is given by the speaker to the listener to determine the purpose and cause of the action, situation, event - the reality of the event, and serves as an adverb in the sentence.

The interrogative pronoun 'nega' is used as a synonym 'nima ga' in a dialectic or publisistic way as the interrogative pronoun. In Uzbek, such constructions are formed in the form

of morph + suffix 'nima + ga', whereas, in English we can observe the case of the substitution of the pronoun for 'what' with the pronoun 'why'.

Нима+**га** менга жуда тикилиб қолдинг?

Stand up, **why** don`t you?

Не+**га** ўрнингиздан турмаяпсиз?

According to the classification of typology of the languages Uzbek belongs to the agglutinative language whereas English belongs to the fusion language. One of the commonality of English and Uzbek languages is their corresponding to the analytic group.

Observing interrogative pronouns peculiarities H. 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.

Special questions: in grammar, such interrogative pronouns are called pure interrogative pronouns and of course require an answer to the question.

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

In declarative sentences: the message expressed through interrogation is understood as judgment.

In exclamative sentences: it is expressed through intonation, not expressed by grammatical means, and the question component does not require an answer in the sentence. The excitement felt in the speech serves to organize the content of the speech.

Based on the above information, it can be said that in spite of much scientific work on the study of interrogative pronouns 'who' and 'what', the lack of comparative studies in English and Uzbek.

Results and discussion
This study carries out the work on morphological characteristics of interrogative pronouns what and who, thus to examine the derivations and use them in English and Uzbek languages. As mentioned above, the interrogative pronouns who and what possesses commonality in semantic due to the existence of formation there some differences. As 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 proforms. 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 proforms[1]. For example, the interrogations what/nima and who/kim can possess six grammatical category of case endings in Uzbek to query in different purposes: to know about the object - *nima,* to identify the transitivity *nima – ni,* to identify the owner of a thing *nima – ning,* to be concise about the reason of action *nima – ga, nima – da, nima – dan.* Meanwhile, the pronoun *what* does not possess case endings in sentences and is not changeable word in English. Due to English and Uzbek are in different language systems in morphological point of view, they are varied in their category of case[2]. 6 categories of cases are compared with common case and possessive case in English. To say that, prepositions, postpositions and linking words are the signal structures applied to denote the case endings in the sentences displayed below.

    1. a.   **What** should I think about? (E.H.F.A)

           b.   Xo'p **nimani** o'ylayin bo'lmasa? (E.H.A.Q)

2. a.   **What** are you eating meat for? (E.H.F.A)

    b**.**   **Nimaga** siz go'sht tanovul qilayapsiz? (E.H.A.Q)

This study verifies the morphological characteristics of interrogative pronoun – *what* in English and Uzbek. As shown above, in 1 (a) and 2 (a) in English the interrogation *what* is employed through the linking word *about* and the preposition *for* while in Uzbek 1 (b) and 2(b) word type is being merged in inflectional suffixes – **ni** and – **ga** referred to as word -final suffixes in Uzbek linguistics. One of the most features of interrogation *what* 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. One accepted system organizes interrogatives according to the syntactic role of the question expression: whether a subject, an object or an adjunct [7]. Many linguistic descriptions of question words characterize in the interrogative sentences types by changing them in word order corresponding components. For example, in above sentences 1 (a) and 2 (a) the question word *what* is in front of the sentence. It is acceptable when preposition or an adverb are in the beginning point of the sentence in English.

3. a. **About what** should I think?

    b. **For what** are you eating meat?

Based on 3 (a, b) although there is resumptions syntactically the meaning of the sentences are kept in the sentences. Conversely, it is not acceptable in Uzbek linguistics.

Comparing the semantic features of the interrogative words *who/kim* and *what/nima* are mean the similar cognition in both two English and Uzbek languages and interrogations *who/kim* and *what/nima* possess the substantial category in syntactic semantics. Although, interrogative pronouns what/nima can stand for adjectives, adverbs, or even verbs each language family, each language has its individual grammatical mechanism [9]. As we mentioned above, according to the morpho – syntax the interrogative pronoun *what* is unchangeable whereas Uzbek interrogative pronoun *nima* changes its word formation when it is translated into Uzbek. As shown below, the difference is that to employ the interrogation in English interrogative sentences it is expressed the word *what* by keeping it stabile formation. Conversely, the interrogation *nima* in Uzbek is given in different word formation. Thus, pronouns in Uzbek are well developed in their morphological unit.

4. a.   **What** can I do for you, miss?

    b.   Bizga **qanday** xizmatlar bor miss?

    c.   **What** is your address?

    d.   **Qayerda** turasiz?

    e**.**   **What** sort of work do you want to do?

    f.   Siz **qanaqa** ish qidiryapsiz?

Based on 4 (a – f) the semantic features of interrogative pronouns' denotations are similar. In 4 (a, b) *what* and *qanday* denote the qualitative utterance concerning to the words *do* and *xizmatlar*. In 4 (c, d) the interrogative pronouns *what* and *qayerda* possess the locative utterance and in 4 (e, f) *what* and *qanaqa* possess the sign of qualitative utterance.

Comparing the similarities and differences of the pronoun *who/kim*, the article tries to achieve the combination of phenomenon description explanation. In Uzbek linguistics *kim* is defined to as an indefinite personal pronoun and the English *who* is in the same word category

and has similar usages [9]. Working on literary examples, they share similar interrogative usages but they differ according to their syntactic restrictions.

5.   a. **Who** won the fighting this summer? (EHFA)

b. Yozgi urushda **kim** yutdi? (EHAQ)

6.   a. But **whom** could he ask? (ShHCS)

b. Siz bu ishni **kimdan** ko'rasiz?

The study shows that the interrogative pronoun *who/kim* is the subject in 5 (a, b) when the answer of the verb. In 6 (a, b) it is merged *whom/kimdan* when the answer is object. As the category of case is well developed in Uzbek they express the syntactic relation and defined affixes concerning grammatical means according to the character of the components in sentences [10]. As English and Uzbek languages are in different language systems the category of case varies naturally by using them in the sentences. Common case and possessive case are contrasted with six cases in Uzbek: in common case *kim*, possessive *kim - ning*, genitive case dative *kim - ni*, vocative case *kim - da*, *ga*, ablative case *kim - dan*. Thus, interrogative pronoun *kim* is variable due to its morphological mechanism in Uzbek meanwhile question word *who* is expressed in two forms in English. Studying question words *who/kim* and their morphological differences we found out that while the question word *who* alters its stem to *whom* when it is an object in English it accepts the case ending suffixes in Uzbek *kim - ning, - ni, - ga, da, - dan*.

Comparing semantic features of the interrogative words *who/kim* we assumed similar cognition in both two English and Uzbek languages. Interrogations *who/kim* possess the substantial category in syntactic semantics in both two languages.

7.   a. **Who** shall translate for us?

b. **Kim** bizga tarjima qiladi?

8.   a. **Whom** did he come to see?

b. U **kimni** ko'rishga keldi?

9.   a**. Whom** did you know this?

b. Buni **kimdan** bildingiz?

10.   a. For **whom** this was written?

b.   Bu xat **kimga** yozilgan?

Based on studying semantic structures of question words *who/kim* in English and Uzbek can be compared we tried to enlighten their characteristics.

According to R. Rasulov the word semantic valence is that the main word requires corresponding components in sentences. Because of in the semantic structure of government (noun) it might be hidden agreement [11]. Nouns represent entities, verbs represent activities or states, and adjectives represent qualities or characteristics [3].

Based on 7-10 the semantic features of interrogative pronouns' denotations are similar. In 7 (a, b) *who* and *kim* denote condition of agency concerning to the verb positions *translate* and *tarjima qiladi* the agent of the sentence are *who/kim*. In order to clarify this situation we can use transformation method.

11. a. **Who** shall translate for us? – **Bob** will translate for us.

b. **Kim** bizga tarjima qiladi? – Bizga **Bob** tarjima qiladi.

While the sentences converted from interrogative sentences to declarative one the agent of the sentence has been confirmed in translation method. In 8 – 9 -10 the interrogative pronouns *whom* and *kimni, kimga, kimdan* possess the objective conditions. In 9 -10 (a, b) *whom* and *kimga* and *kimda* possess the adressive utterance.

As shown above these sentences confirm that they all have commonalty in demonstrating the questions and thus, in fact they request the information from the listener that is unknown to the speaker in both English and Uzbek languages.

In Uzbek linguistics, the affix – **lar** can be added the interrogative pronouns who/kim and what/nima which they have noun characteristics. Thus, in a form of pair form kim – kim and nima – nima denotes the means of plurality [11]. Eg.

12. a. Kim – kim keldi?
Translation: Who – who came?

b. Nima – nima olding?
Translation: What – what you bought?

c. Kim – kimlar keldi?
Translation: Who – whos came?

d. Nima – nimalar olding?
Translation: What – whats you bought?

We can meet the repeated form of words kim/nima which possess the affix – **lar** to the of stem words, more often they do not denote only the lexical means but also, they mean plurality, emphasis and repetition.

Contrastingly, there is no the repeated construction of interrogative words who and what in English morphology. To realize the plurality form of what and who in grammar is expressed by the auxiliary verb are after the words what and who.

Who are they?

What are you speaking about?

Contexts for interrogative words 'Who' and 'What'

The speech act of asking is then carried out via specific intonational signs, embedding the sentence as a question. In this section we will develop the point in declarative, interrogative, exclamative and in rhetoric usage.

The study examines the morphological characteristics of declarative forms in Uzbek and English. As mentioned below, -nima/kim - in Uzbek and who/what in English possess a commonality in that they form a type of semantic paradigm comprising a similarity declarative meaning due to the existence of these forms. However, while English –who/what- demonstrate only meaning of declarative in declarative sentences, Uzbek kim/nima, in addition to signifying speculation, also exhibits the meanings of declarative sentence and plain style. That is to say, who/what in English is a form in which different modality, sentence type, and speech style are being merged. In Uzbek, sentence type and speech style are being merged in inflectional

suffixes (referred to as sentence-final suffixes in linguistics kim - dir and nima - dir). Interrogative sentences in speculation form in Uzbek are typically made by adding the sentence-final indefinite particle - **dir**.

As to Bhat, there are several other distinctions that are associated with indefinite pronouns, occurring in different languages. All these involve the derivation of marked indefinite pronouns from unmarked indefinite pronouns through their association with some specific notion. For example, according to Uzbek grammar a distinction among its indefinite pronouns concerning the knowledge of the speaker. It has a- **dir** series of indefinites derived stem word *kim/nima* (*kim+dir* 'someone', *nima+dir* 'something', etc.) that can be used only if the speaker cannot identify the referent.

Uzbek

13.   a. Duyoga kelib **nima** karomat ko'rsatdik. Question word in directive]

   b. Har **kimga** xiyonat qilishi mumkin [Question word in directive]

   c. **Kimdir** k'otarmoqchi bo'lgan edi Shayx siltab yubordi. [Question word in speculative]

   d. U **nimanidir**, juda muhum narsani aytishga ikkilanar edi [14]. [Question word in speculative]

English

14.   a. **What** one thing to take up and master [interrogation of directive]
    b. As he knew **who** would speak for him[15]. [Interrogation of directive]

Based on (13 a. b) and (14 a. b), the subject of analysis in this study— declarative forms in Uzbek and English — organized based on a similar sentence style. In 13 (c. d) in Uzbek the interrogative words kimdir/nimadir possess the means of speculation. Here, interrogative words kimdir and nimadir denote unknown person and unknown thing meanwhile, in English it is used the indefinite pronouns someone and something in that situational style.

Exclamation usage

What, as shown in (15b a), accompanies degree or frequency interrogatives and may demonstrate the speaker's exclamatory attitude by implying a high degree or frequency.

15. a. What a nice day!

    Qanday ajoyib kun!

In 15 (a) the exclamative, the realization of the entity that is marked by the word What/qanday are above the norm for this context. So in 15 (a), the emphasis lies on the degree of a day at which in nice or lovely in both two languages. However, what is combined with the indefinite article in exclamative 15 (b), but not in interrogatives 15 (c) (cf. Huddleston, 1993):

   b. What a / what proposal he made!

   c. What / what a proposal did he make?

16. a. What's that? A note? [15]

    Nima ekan? Xatmi? [16]

The exclamation usage of 'what' such as in 15 (b) not only demonstrates 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' employment in exclamation usage is similar in English and Uzbek. Sometimes it achieves the nuance of the exclamation based on its nature as a object – oriented – interrogative sentence. However, -keyss-nya in 16 (a) contrary to cannot be employed in "exclamation" usage, and thus, does not mark a object-oriented interrogative sentence.

Rhetorical question (interrogative) usage

Rhetoric questions do not request the answer. In this type of question usage possesses the style of confirmation in embedded interrogative sentence. In rhetorical type of questions it is expressed the strong emotional aim of the speaker [5]. 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 [21].

> Bolani kim sevmaydi?
>
> Who does not love a child?

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

> 17. a. Bolani kim sevmaydi?
>
> Bolani hamma sevadi.
>
> Who does not love a child?
>
> Everyone loves a child.

Rhetoric is a social phenomena it has it is significant peculiarities in different social groups and conditions [22].

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. (Who could object you? Kim senga qarshi chiqa olardi? Senga hech kim qarshi chiqa olmaydi).

> 18. a. Men senga **nima** dedim?
>   **What** did I tell you?
>
> b. Senga **majlis**ga bor dedim.
>   I told you to go to **meeting**.
>
> c. Senga **majlisga borma** dedim.
>   I told you **not to go to meeting**.
>
> 19. a. Qo'shnilar **nima** deyishadi?

What will the neighbors say?

b. **What** a shame?
   Qanday uyat?

20.   a. Bog'ni obod qilgan **kim**?
      Who is the person that grew the garden?

b. Bog'ni obod qilgan **men**.
   I looked after the garden

c. Bog'ni obod qilgan **do'stim**.
   My friend grew the garden.

In Uzbek 'nima' and English 'what' can be employed in rhetorical questions, as shown in (18 a) and (19 a). However, there appears to be a slight nuance between them regarding the possibility of an opposing judgement on the proposed content. When rephrasing (18a)'s 'nima' rhetorical question into a declarative sentence that demonstrates an opposing judgement on the proposed content, both the verb 'borma' in (18 c), which exhibits a possibility of order, and the verb 'bor' in (18 b), which exhibits a strong possibility of order, are suitable when they rephrased.

In dialogic rhetoric the phrases like (19 a) and (19 b) 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' and 'what' can be employed in ironic rhetorical questions in both two languages, as shown in (20.a, b, c). However, there appears to be a slight difference between them regarding the embedded concept 'haughty' on the proposed content. When rephrasing (20.a)'s - 'kim' rhetorical question into a declarative sentence that demonstrates an opposing judgment on the proposed content, the personal pronouns 'men' in (20.b) and 'do'stim' in (20.c) which exhibits similar concept of 'haughty', when they rephrase.
In other words, the rhetorical question with 'kim' and 'nima' 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 and 'nima' 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 phenomena it has it is significant peculiarities in different social groups and conditions in sociocultural point of view as lightly analyzed above.

Conclusion
The present article has analyzed the comparative study of interrogative pronouns 'kim'/'nima' and 'Who'/'What' in morphological and semantic usages in English and Uzbek languages. Results of the analysis are as follows.

As Uzbek language is related to agglutinative there are more words are derived through the affixes. Thus, The interrogative pronouns 'kim' and 'nima can be declined in category of case via the different inflectional suffix – ni, ning, ga, da, dan. 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.

There are six grammatical category of case in Uzbek language which are greatly influence the word defining. English interrogative pronouns do not change as generally happens in language and they remain unchanged, in both the number and gender.

Being an analytical language English does not mark interrogative words 'who' and 'what' as the derived affixes it belong to. For example, the word what possesses the category of substantative when it denotes noun while when it is before the noun it denotes an adjectives. For example,

'What is on the table?'

'What book did you read?

In conclusion we can say that morphological 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 interrogatives 'kim' and 'nima' in Uzbek show notable case.

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 elements in the head of the sentences that constitute interrogative aspect in English. WH-words, can appear in interrogative, exclamative and declarative contexts alike in English and Uzbek; they are semantically underspecified lexical items that introduce a variable of a particular conceptual domain into the semantic representation.

Considering all the above findings, we can say that in the field of language learning based on morphological comparative analysis plays an important role.

REFERENCES
1.   D. N. S. Bhat. Pronouns. Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. OUP _ 2007. 9, 211
2.   J.,Buranov. Introduction to the camparative grammar of the English and Uzbek languages. T_1973, 74, 111
3.   Charles W.Kreidler. introducing English semantics. London and New York – 2002, 271
4.   Jesperson O. A modern English Grammar on historical principles. London, Dryton house Publ _ 1928. 28
5.   A. Gulomov. M. Asqarova. Modern Uzbek Language. Tashkent _1987, 58
6.   Huddleston, Rodney. 'Remarks on the Construction You Won't Believe Who Ed Has Married.' Lingua. 1993. 91 (2-3), 175-84.
7.   L. L. Myers. WH-Interrogatives in Spoken French: a Corpus-Based Analysis of their Form and Function. Dissertation. Texas – 2007, 164
8.   Н. Ю. Шведова. Местоимения и смысл. Москва – 1998,- 58-59.
9.   A. Parmonov. Structural-semantic types of interrogative pronouns in Modern English and Uzbek. «Молодой учёный» . № 8 (112) . Апрель, 2016, 1154
10.   U. Tursunov, A. Mukhtorov. Modern Uzbek language. Tashkent _1992, 260
11.   R. Rasulov. The problems of Uzbek theoretical grammar. Tashkent – 2019, 13
12.   K. Sapaev. Modern Uzbek language. Tashkent – 2008.140
13.   I. Smirnitskiy. Morphology of English language. Moscow 1959, 187
14.   U. Khoshimov. Dunyoning ishlari. Tashkent_ 2016, 26, 29, 46,102.
15.   T. Dreiser. An American Tragedy. CUP. 2014, 7, 13
16.   T. Dreiser. Bakhtiqaro Kerri [Sister Carrie] T, Sharq Publ_ 2007. 14-341. (In Uzb)
17.   E. Hemingway. Alvido qurol [Farewell to Arms] T, O'qituvchi_1973. 14-277. (In Uzb)
18.   E. Hemingway. Farewell to Arms. Leningrad, Prosveshaniye_1971. 123-190. (In Eng)
19.   H. Mukhiddinova. Modern Uzbek Language. Tashkent_2006, 98
20.   K. E. Maytinskaya. Pronoun in different language system. Moscow_ 1969, 220.

21.   https://www.proz.com/kudoz/english/linguistics/1091124-functions-of-rhetorical-questions.html
22.   https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/114am_36.EPRA%20JOURNALS-4791.pdf