

## PRAGMATICS OF INTERROGATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DETECTIVE TEXTS

Malikova Nodirakhon

**Oriental universiteti 2-bosqich magistranti**

**Ilmiy rahbar: dotsent v.b. Xodjalepesova Indira**

**<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17906333>**

**Abstract.** This article investigates the pragmatics of interrogation in English and Uzbek detective texts from a comparative linguistic perspective. The study focuses on speech acts, questioning strategies, politeness mechanisms, and pragmatic goals employed during interrogation scenes. The material is based on selected English and Uzbek detective narratives in which interrogation constitutes a core narrative episode. The analysis reveals that English detective discourse tends toward institutionally regulated, pragmatically restrained interrogation strategies, while Uzbek discourse is characterized by emotionally charged, morally oriented, and socially embedded interrogative practices. The findings contribute to pragmatics, discourse analysis, and comparative literary linguistics.

**Keywords:** interrogation discourse, pragmatics, speech acts, detective fiction, English–Uzbek comparison, discourse strategies

Interrogation is one of the central communicative events in detective fiction, where the investigation process is linguistically realized through structured interaction between interrogator and interrogated subject. From a pragmatic perspective, interrogation represents a complex form of institutional discourse in which speech acts are strategically employed to elicit information, control interaction, and establish truth. In literary detective texts, interrogation is not only a procedural narrative device but also a powerful pragmatic mechanism for constructing power relations, psychological pressure, and moral evaluation. A comparative analysis of English and Uzbek detective texts makes it possible to reveal how different cultural and communicative traditions shape the pragmatics of interrogation.

Modern pragmatic theory views interrogation as a type of goal-oriented institutional communication governed by asymmetrical power relations and strict role distribution. The interrogator occupies the dominant position and controls topic selection, turn-taking, and the illocutionary force of utterances, while the respondent is constrained by the obligation to provide information. In literary discourse, these institutional features are modified by narrative goals, character psychology, and ideological orientation. Thus, interrogation in detective fiction becomes a hybrid genre that combines legal-institutional pragmatics with artistic and psychological functions.

The relevance of the present study is обусловлена growing scholarly interest in institutional discourse, speech act theory, and pragmalinguistic analysis of literary texts. While the pragmatics of real-life police interrogation has been widely studied, its literary representation in a cross-cultural English–Uzbek framework remains insufficiently explored. This article aims to fill this gap by analyzing the pragmatic strategies of interrogation in English and Uzbek detective narratives and identifying their universal and culture-specific features.

The research material consists of selected interrogation scenes from English and Uzbek detective texts. The study employs comparative pragmalinguistic analysis, speech act analysis,

and discourse-functional interpretation. Each interrogation episode is examined in terms of illocutionary force, perlocutionary effect, politeness strategies, and communicative goals.

In English detective fiction, interrogation discourse is predominantly constructed as an institutionally regulated interaction characterized by pragmatic restraint and procedural logic. The interrogator's speech is marked by strategically deployed questioning techniques, including yes/no questions, alternative questions, and carefully structured wh-questions. These interrogative forms are often embedded within polite mitigation strategies and indirect speech acts. The frequent use of modal verbs and hedging expressions (*could you, would you mind, might you explain*) reflects the pragmatic orientation toward controlled pressure rather than open confrontation. Even in situations of strong suspicion, interrogators typically maintain formal politeness and discursive distance.

The illocutionary force of English interrogation questions is often softened through conventional politeness formulas, which serve to preserve the institutional legitimacy of the communicative act. However, behind this surface politeness lies a strategically calculated perlocutionary goal: to destabilize the interlocutor psychologically and provoke self-incriminating responses. Thus, English interrogation discourse demonstrates a high degree of pragmatic duality, where explicit politeness coexists with implicit coercion.

In Uzbek detective texts, interrogation discourse exhibits a markedly different pragmatic organization. Uzbek interrogations are often characterized by directness, emotional pressure, and moral evaluation. The interrogator's speech frequently includes imperative constructions, emotionally intensified questions, and evaluative remarks. Rather than relying primarily on mitigated indirectness, Uzbek interrogators often employ direct speech acts aimed at provoking emotional reaction, confession, or moral accountability. The pragmatic goal of information extraction is closely intertwined with ethical judgment and social condemnation.

The linguistic realization of interrogation in Uzbek discourse is also influenced by cultural norms of respect, hierarchy, and communal responsibility. Forms of address, honorifics, and culturally marked pragmatic particles play a significant role in structuring the interaction. Emotional escalation is not necessarily perceived as a violation of institutional norms but rather as a legitimate pragmatic tool for revealing moral truth. Consequently, Uzbek interrogation discourse is less procedurally neutral and more ethically charged than its English counterpart.

The contrast between English and Uzbek interrogation practices is clearly illustrated by the distribution of dominant pragmatic strategies, which is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Dominant Pragmatic Strategies of Interrogation in English and Uzbek Detective Texts**

<b><i>Pragmatic Parameter</i></b>	<b><i>English Detective Texts</i></b>	<b><i>Uzbek Detective Texts</i></b>
Type of Questioning	Indirect, mitigated	Direct, emotionally intensified
Politeness Strategy	Institutional politeness, mitigation	Hierarchical and moral politeness
Emotional Pressure	Implicit	Explicit
Use of Imperatives	Limited	Frequent
Evaluative Remarks	Minimal, implicit	Frequent, explicit
Communicative Tone	Procedural and restrained	Moralizing and confrontational

From a speech act perspective, interrogation in both literary traditions is structured around directive and commissive acts. However, their distribution and illocutionary realization differ significantly. In English detective discourse, questions often function as indirect directives that guide the respondent toward a preferred interpretation of events. In Uzbek discourse, interrogative utterances frequently combine the illocutionary force of questioning with that of accusation or moral reproach. This multifunctionality increases the pragmatic impact of the utterance and intensifies psychological pressure.

Power relations in interrogation discourse are linguistically encoded through turn-taking control, topic management, and speech act sequencing. In English texts, power is exercised through institutional authority and procedural competence. The interrogator maintains control by regulating the flow of information and strategically shifting between neutral inquiry and subtle confrontation. In Uzbek texts, power is more openly asserted through emotionally charged speech, authoritative imperatives, and overt moral positioning.

The relationship between interrogator and respondent is thus constructed differently in the two traditions. In English detective fiction, the respondent is treated primarily as a legal subject whose statements must be verified within a rational procedural framework. In Uzbek detective fiction, the respondent is often treated as a moral subject whose behavior is evaluated not only legally but also ethically and socially. This difference reflects broader cultural models of justice and responsibility.

The culturally conditioned ideological encoding of interrogation discourse is summarized in Table 2.

***Table 2. Ideological and Cultural Foundations of Interrogation Pragmatics***

<b><i>Cultural Dimension</i></b>	<b><i>English Model</i></b>	<b><i>Uzbek Model</i></b>
Concept of Justice	Legal-institutional	Moral-collective
Basis of Authority	Procedural law	Ethical and social hierarchy
Role of Emotion	Minimized	Central
Function of Interrogation	Information extraction	Moral exposure and confession
Position of the Interrogated	Legal subject	Moral and social subject

At the narrative level, interrogation scenes perform several important functions in both traditions. They serve as key points of plot development, zones of heightened psychological tension, and sites of character revelation. However, the pragmatic mechanisms through which these functions are realized differ. English narratives rely on gradual accumulation of evidence through controlled questioning, while Uzbek narratives often employ dramatic confrontation and emotional climax as pragmatic driving forces.

Despite these differences, universal pragmatic features can also be identified. In both English and Uzbek detective texts, interrogation discourse is structured around information asymmetry, strategic questioning, and progressive disclosure of truth. Both traditions exploit the pragmatic tension between what is said and what is implied, between cooperative and uncooperative responses, and between institutional authority and personal resistance. These universal features confirm the typological stability of interrogation as a core communicative genre within detective discourse.

The present comparative pragmalinguistic study demonstrates that interrogation in English and Uzbek detective texts is shaped by both universal institutional principles and culturally specific discourse strategies. English interrogation discourse is characterized by procedural rationality, pragmatic restraint, and indirect coercion, whereas Uzbek interrogation discourse foregrounds emotional pressure, moral evaluation, and socially embedded authority. These differences are linguistically encoded through distinct patterns of speech acts, politeness strategies, and emotional framing.

At the same time, both traditions share universal pragmatic foundations of interrogation, including strategic questioning, power asymmetry, and the communicative goal of truth extraction. The findings contribute to the development of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and comparative literary linguistics. The results may be applied in courses on institutional discourse, forensic linguistics, and intercultural communication, as well as in further interdisciplinary research on literary pragmatics.

### **Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:**

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Christie, A. (2001). *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd*. London: HarperCollins.
5. Conan Doyle, A. (2003). *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Uzbek Detective Prose Anthology. (2015). Tashkent.