

**THE COMMON SYSTEM OF SPEECH ACTIVITY VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES AND THE PRINCIPLES OF THEIR CLASSIFICATION****Ibodova Khurshida Nasimovna**

Teacher of the department of philology, university of information technologies and management

**Abstract**

Speech activity verbs (*nutqiy faoliyat fe'llari*) form a core semantic and pragmatic class in both English and Uzbek, serving as lexical markers of human communicative acts. This article provides a detailed comparative analysis of the common system and classification principles of speech activity verbs in English and Uzbek. It examines semantic, pragmatic, and functional criteria used in each language's linguistic tradition. The study reveals both universal patterns (e.g., encoding speaker intentions and illocutionary force) and language-specific features (e.g., Uzbek's activity-based semantic grouping versus English's illocutionary-force taxonomy). Within the anthropocentric paradigm, these verbs highlight language as a reflection of human social interaction, cognition, and cultural values. The findings contribute to contrastive linguistics, lexicography, language teaching, and the broader understanding of how languages categorize human speech behavior.

**Keywords:** speech activity verbs, speech act verbs, classification principles, contrastive linguistics, English, Uzbek, pragmatics, semantics, anthropocentric paradigm, illocutionary force.

**Introduction.** Language serves as the primary medium of human interaction, and verbs that denote speech activity occupy a central position in this system. These verbs do not merely describe physical actions; they encode intentions, social relations, mental states, and the performative power of utterances. In Uzbek linguistics, they are traditionally grouped under the semantic category *nutqiy faoliyat fe'llari* (speech activity verbs), alongside other activity-based classes such as mental or physical activity verbs. In English and Western linguistics, the equivalent domain is studied primarily through the lens of speech act theory and lexical pragmatics, where verbs are classified according to illocutionary force.

A comparative study of these verbs in English and Uzbek reveals both shared human communicative universals and language-specific organizational principles. Such analysis is particularly valuable within the anthropocentric paradigm, which views language as a human-centered phenomenon shaped by and shaping cognition, society, and culture.

This article aims to:

1. Define and describe the common system of speech activity verbs in both languages.
2. Analyze and compare the principles of classification used in Uzbek and English linguistic traditions.
3. Provide a broad theoretical discussion of their place in semantics, pragmatics, and contrastive linguistics.

**Methods.** The study employs a contrastive, descriptive-analytical, and typological methodology. Data were drawn from major grammatical and lexicological works in Uzbek linguistics (semantic verb classification traditions) and Western pragmatics and lexical semantics (Austin, Searle, Verschueren, Ballmer & Brennenstuhl). Examples were collected from dictionaries, corpora, and scholarly literature in both languages. Classification principles were compared along semantic, pragmatic, syntactic, and functional dimensions. The analysis integrates insights from the anthropocentric paradigm to interpret how these verbs reflect human communicative needs and cultural worldviews.

**Results.** Both English and Uzbek possess a rich inventory of verbs that denote acts of speaking, informing, directing, committing, and expressing attitudes. These verbs form a coherent subsystem within the verbal lexicon.

In Uzbek, speech activity verbs are part of a broader semantic classification of verbs according to the type of human activity they represent:

- Speech activity verbs: *gapirmoq, so‘zlamoq, demoq, aytmog, bayon qilmoq, va‘da bermoq, buyruq bermoq, so‘rashmoq, tanqid qilmoq, etc.*
- These verbs often combine with various syntactic constructions to express different communicative intentions.

In English, the equivalent class includes verbs such as *say, tell, speak, utter, assert, claim, promise, order, request, apologize, thank, declare, etc.* Many of these can function performatively (“I promise...”) or descriptively (“She promised...”).

Classification is primarily semantic and activity-based. Verbs are grouped according to the nature of the human activity they lexicalize:

Speech activity (*nutqiy faoliyat*)

Mental activity (*aqliy faoliyat*)

Physical activity (*jismoniy faoliyat*)

State verbs, etc.

Within speech activity verbs, further subdivision may occur based on manner (*ming‘irlamoq* – to mumble), intensity, or social function. This approach emphasizes the human agent and the type of action performed.

Classification is predominantly pragmatic and illocutionary-force-based, following the speech act theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975):

Assertives/Representatives: *state, claim, assert, observe* (commit the speaker to the truth of the proposition).

Directives: *order, request, command, ask* (attempt to get the hearer to do something).

Commissives: *promise, vow, guarantee* (commit the speaker to a future action).

Expressives: *thank, apologize, congratulate* (express a psychological state).

Declaratives: *declare, resign, appoint* (bring about a change in institutional reality).

Additional lexical-semantic classifications exist (e.g., Ballmer & Brennenstuhl, 1981), which organize English speech activity verbs into detailed semantic fields based on features such as speaker attitudes, direction of fit, and situational roles.

Comparative Analysis of Classification Principles

<i>Aspect</i>	<b>Uzbek Tradition</b>	<b>English/Western Tradition</b>	<b>Common Features</b>
<i>Primary Basis</i>	Semantic (type of human activity)	Pragmatic (illocutionary force)	Both center on human communicative intent
<i>Main Categories</i>	Nutqiy, aqliy, jismoniy faoliyat	Assertives, Directives, Commissives, etc.	Focus on speaker-hearer interaction
<i>Performative Use</i>	Present but less emphasized	Central (Austin’s performative hypothesis)	Both recognize performative potential
<i>Cultural Encoding</i>	Strong social hierarchy and respect markers	More neutral; context-dependent	Reflect cultural communicative norms
<i>Syntactic Behavior</i>	Rich case and agreement systems	Complex complementation patterns	Govern specific syntactic structures

**Discussion.** The comparison reveals that while both languages possess a dedicated class of speech activity verbs, the organizing principles differ significantly. Uzbek classification is more holistic and activity-oriented, reflecting a broader anthropological view of human action. English classification is more fine-grained and force-oriented, arising from the philosophical-pragmatic tradition that prioritizes what speakers *do* with words.

These differences have important implications within the anthropocentric paradigm. In Uzbek, the grouping of verbs by activity type underscores the human agent as the central figure in communication. In English, the focus on illocutionary force highlights language as purposeful social action. Both approaches ultimately affirm that speech activity verbs are not neutral descriptors but active participants in constructing social reality.

Universal features include the encoding of speaker intention, direction of fit between words and world, and the distinction between performative and descriptive uses. Language-specific features appear in the degree of lexicalization of social hierarchy (stronger in Uzbek) and the explicit performative potential (more systematically theorized in English).

From a contrastive and applied perspective, these differences pose challenges and opportunities for translation, language teaching, and natural language processing. Misalignment in classification principles can lead to pragmatic failures in cross-cultural communication. At the same time, the shared human foundation of these verbs offers a basis for developing universal models of communicative competence.

In the broader context of linguistic research, speech activity verbs serve as a bridge between semantics and pragmatics, between lexicon and discourse, and between individual cognition and social interaction. Their study continues to evolve with new methodologies in corpus linguistics, cognitive science, and digital communication analysis.

**Conclusion.** Speech activity verbs constitute a vital subsystem in both English and Uzbek, reflecting fundamental aspects of human communication. While Uzbek linguistics organizes them primarily through semantic activity-based classification, English linguistics emphasizes pragmatic illocutionary-force taxonomies. These differing principles reveal complementary perspectives on the same human phenomenon.

A deeper understanding of their common system and classification criteria enhances contrastive linguistics, supports more accurate translation and language teaching, and contributes to the anthropocentric view of language as a dynamic expression of human social and cognitive life. Future research should combine corpus-based methods with cognitive and intercultural approaches to further illuminate both universal patterns and language-specific realizations of speech activity verbs.

#### References:

1. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Ballmer, T.T. & Brennenstuhl, W. (1981). *Speech Act Classification*. Springer.
3. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Traugott, E.C. and other historical pragmatics studies on speech act verbs.
5. Verschueren, J. (1980). *On Speech Act Verbs*. John Benjamins.