

e-ISSN 3060-5059

DOI: 10.67227



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in
Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 9

2026



Founded in 2024



publishscience.uz



publish_science_journal@mail.ru



PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA NUTQIY FAOLIYAT FE'LLARINING DERIVATSION VA SEMANTIK XUSUSIYATLARI: QIYOSIY TAHLIL

Iskandarova Shaxodat Ravshanbekovna

Al-Xorazmiy universiteti, ma'ruzachi.

e-mail: ishahodat5@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3700-017X>

Annotatsiya.

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi nutq fe'llarining derivatsion va semantik xususiyatlari qiyosiy-tipologik nuqtayi nazardan tadqiq etiladi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi asosiy derivatsion modellarni aniqlash hamda so'z yasash jarayonlarining nutq fe'llari semantik tuzilishi va ma'no ko'lamiga ta'sirini yoritishdan iborat. Tahlilda tavsifiy, qiyosiy-tipologik, komponent tahlil va leksik-semantik maydon metodlaridan foydalaniladi. Agentivlik, kauzativlik, o'zaro harakat, intensivlik, harakat usuli va kommunikativ maqsad kabi semantik xususiyatlarga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Natijalar derivatsiya har ikki tilda nutq fe'llari paradigmasining differentsiatsiyasi va kengayishiga xizmat qilishini, biroq derivatsion va semantik modifikatsiya vositalari tillarning strukturaviy xususiyatlariga ko'ra farqlanishini ko'rsatadi. O'zbek tilida derivatsiya asosan agglutinatив xususiyatga ega bo'lsa, ingliz tilida affiksatsiya, konversiya va boshqa so'z yasash usullari faol qo'llanadi. Tadqiqot derivatsiyani nafaqat so'z yasashning formal mexanizmi, balki nutq faoliyati leksik-semantik maydonidagi semantik munosabatlarni tashkil etuvchi muhim omil sifatida ham yoritadi.

Kalit so'zlar: nutq fe'llari, derivatsiya, derivatsion semantika, leksik-semantik maydon, nutq faoliyati, nutq paradigmasi, so'z yasalishi, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili.

СЛОВООБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ И СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ГЛАГОЛОВ РЕЧЕВОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

Искандарова Шаходат Равшанбековна

Университет Аль-Хорезми, лектор.

Аннотация.

В статье исследуются деривационные и семантические особенности глаголов речи в английском и узбекском языках с сопоставительно-типологической точки зрения. Цель исследования заключается в выявлении основных деривационных моделей и определении влияния словообразовательных процессов на семантическую структуру и объём значений глаголов речи. В анализе применяются описательный, сопоставительно-типологический, компонентный методы, а также метод лексико-семантического поля. Особое внимание уделяется таким семантическим признакам, как агентивность, каузативность, взаимность, интенсивность, способ действия и коммуникативная цель. Результаты показывают, что деривация способствует дифференциации и расширению парадигмы глаголов речи в обоих языках, однако средства деривационной и семантической модификации различаются в зависимости от их структурных особенностей. В узбекском языке деривация преимущественно характеризуется агглютинативной моделью, тогда как в английском языке активно используются аффиксация, конверсия и другие способы словообразования. Исследование рассматривает деривацию не только как формальный механизм словообразования, но и как важный фактор организации семантических отношений в лексико-семантическом поле речевой деятельности.

Ключевые слова: глаголы речи, деривация, деривационная семантика, лексико-семантическое поле, речевая деятельность, речевая парадигма, словообразование, сопоставительное языкознание, английский язык, узбекский язык.

DERIVATIONAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF SPEECH ACT VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Iskandarova Shaxodat Ravshanbekovna

Al-Khwarizmi University, Lecturer.

Abstract.

This article examines the derivational and semantic features of speech verbs in

English and Uzbek from a comparative-typological perspective. The study aims to identify the major derivational patterns and explain how word-formation processes influence the semantic structure and scope of speech verbs. The analysis employs descriptive, comparative-typological, componential, and lexical-semantic field approaches. Particular attention is paid to semantic features such as agentivity, causativity, reciprocity, intensity, manner, and communicative purpose. The findings demonstrate that derivation contributes to the differentiation and expansion of the speech-verb paradigm in both languages, although the means of derivational and semantic modification differ according to their structural characteristics. Uzbek predominantly exhibits an agglutinative pattern of derivation, whereas English relies on affixation, conversion, and other word-formation processes. The study highlights derivation not only as a formal mechanism of word formation but also as an important factor in organizing semantic relations within the lexical-semantic field of speech activity.

Keywords: speech verbs, derivation, derivational semantics, lexical-semantic field, speech activity, speech paradigm, word formation, comparative linguistics, English, Uzbek.

Introduction. Language represents human experience through a complex system of lexical, grammatical, and semantic relationships. Among the various areas of vocabulary, the lexical-semantic field of speech activity occupies a particularly important position because speech is one of the principal means through which people communicate information, express intentions, convey emotions, influence others, and establish social relationships. Speech verbs therefore constitute a significant lexical group that reflects different aspects of communicative activity. Verbs such as *speak, talk, say, tell, ask, answer, explain, announce*, and *whisper* in English and *gapirmoq, so'zlamoq, aytmoq, demoq, so'ramoq, javob bermoq, tushuntirmoq, xabar bermoq*, and *pichirlamoq* in Uzbek do not simply denote the general act of speaking; they represent different participants, purposes, manners, directions, and communicative effects of speech.

The study of such lexical units requires consideration of both their semantic content and their relationships within the language system. From the perspective of structural linguistics, the meaning of a lexical unit cannot always be understood independently of its relations with other units. The distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations introduced within structural approaches provides an important theoretical basis for examining lexical organization. In this respect, speech verbs can be regarded as members of an interconnected lexical-semantic system in which individual verbs acquire and specify their meanings through their relationships with other units of the same semantic field. The concept of the lexical-semantic field, particularly associated with the work of Jost Trier, further emphasizes that lexical units are organized into interconnected semantic structures rather than existing as isolated elements.

An equally important aspect of the organization of speech verbs is their derivational potential. Derivation is traditionally understood as one of the principal mechanisms of word formation, but its role is not limited to the formal creation of new lexical units. As Bauer points out, derivational morphology involves both formal and semantic aspects of word formation, while productivity is also an important characteristic of derivational processes. Consequently, a derivational operation may introduce a new semantic component into a lexical unit, modify an existing component, or establish a new relationship between a derived form and other members of a lexical-semantic field.

English demonstrates its own range of derivational mechanisms. Research in English morphology identifies affixation, conversion, back-formation, and other processes as important mechanisms of verb formation, with derived verbs displaying different semantic relationships to their bases. Therefore, a comparison of English and Uzbek is particularly productive because the two languages employ different morphological resources and structural patterns in expressing related semantic distinctions. Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, frequently expresses grammatical and derivational meanings through sequences of clearly identifiable affixes, whereas English makes use of a combination of affixation, conversion, lexical formation, and syntactic strategies.

The comparative study of speech verbs also requires attention to the distinction between derivational and grammatical processes. Derivation generally contributes to the formation of new lexical units and may alter their lexical meaning or word-class characteristics, whereas inflection primarily expresses grammatical information. At the same time, the boundary between derivation and inflection is not always entirely straightforward, particularly in English morphology. Contemporary morphological research therefore treats the relationship between the two as an important theoretical issue rather than as an absolutely rigid distinction. For the present study, this distinction is important because the semantic scope of speech verbs may be influenced by both lexical derivation and grammatical modification.

In Uzbek linguistics, questions of lexical meaning, word formation, derivational morphology, and the systemic organization of vocabulary have been investigated within the broader development of Uzbek lexicology and morphology. The works of Uzbek linguists such as Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. Hojiyev, E. Begmatov, R. Sayfullayeva, A. Nurmonov, and other scholars provide important theoretical foundations for examining the lexical and grammatical structure of Uzbek. Their approaches make it possible to consider derivation not simply as a formal operation but as a process closely connected with lexical meaning, grammatical organization, and the functioning of language units within the system.

Despite the considerable body of research devoted to English word formation, Uzbek derivational morphology, lexical-semantic fields, and speech-related vocabulary, the comparative relationship between derivational processes and the semantic organization of speech verbs in English and Uzbek remains a relevant area for further investigation.

The study employs comparative-typological, descriptive, componential, semantic-field, and contextual methods.

The comparative-typological method is used to identify similarities and differences between the two languages, while componential analysis makes it possible to identify specific semantic features associated with derived speech verbs. The semantic-field approach is applied to determine the position of individual lexical units within the broader system of speech-related vocabulary.

The results of the study may contribute to a broader comparative understanding of the lexical-semantic field of speech activity in English and Uzbek and provide a theoretical basis for further investigation of speech verbs within comparative and contrastive linguistics.

Literature review

The relationship between word formation, lexical meaning, and semantic organization has been investigated from different theoretical perspectives in both general and comparative linguistics. For the purposes of the present study, three interconnected areas of previous research are particularly important: theories of lexical-semantic fields and paradigmatic relations, approaches to derivational morphology and derivational semantics, and studies of speech verbs as a distinct semantic and communicative group.

One of the theoretical foundations for examining lexical units as elements of a structured system can be found in the structuralist tradition. Ferdinand de Saussure's conception of language as a system of interrelated signs established the principle that linguistic units should be studied not only individually but also through their relations with other units within the system. This principle subsequently influenced the development of paradigmatic approaches to lexical analysis.

The theory of lexical-semantic fields developed this systemic perspective further. Jost Trier's field theory proposed that vocabulary can be organized into interconnected semantic fields in which the meaning of an individual lexical unit is partly determined by its position in relation to neighboring units. Later approaches to lexical semantics expanded this idea by emphasizing hierarchical, paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and associative relationships within lexical structures. From this perspective, speech verbs can be understood not as an arbitrary collection of verbs referring to speaking, but as a structured group whose members occupy different semantic positions depending on the type, manner, purpose, participants, and communicative effect of the speech activity they denote.

The semantic analysis of lexical units was further developed through componential approaches. Eugene A. Nida's work on componential analysis demonstrated the importance of identifying smaller semantic components that distinguish related lexical items. This approach is particularly useful for speech verbs because semantically related verbs often share a general component such as communication or speech while differing according to additional components. For example, verbs corresponding to *speak*, *ask*, *answer*, *whisper*, and *shout* may belong to the broader domain of speech activity but differ with respect to manner, communicative direction, interaction, intensity, or pragmatic purpose.

Another important direction of research concerns the relationship between morphology and lexical semantics. Laurie Bauer emphasizes that derivational morphology has both formal and semantic dimensions and should be examined as part of the broader system of word formation. He also draws attention to productivity as an important characteristic of derivational processes. This perspective is particularly relevant to the present study because a derived lexical unit is not simply a formally expanded version of its base; the derivational relationship may also involve a predictable or partially predictable modification of meaning.

Rochelle Lieber's research provides an important theoretical basis for investigating the semantics of derivation. Her work on morphology and lexical semantics focuses specifically on the relationship between morphological structure and meaning and examines how word-formation processes contribute to semantic interpretation. In her analysis of verb formation, Lieber demonstrates that derivational processes may involve systematic semantic relationships between a base and a derived verb. This approach is particularly relevant to speech verbs because derivation may introduce such semantic dimensions as causation, participation, agency, or changes in the type of event expressed by the verb.

The study of speech verbs from a semantic-field perspective is especially relevant to the present research. Within the broader lexical-semantic field of speech activity, verbs may be grouped according to different semantic components. One group may denote general speech activity (*speak*, *talk*, *gapirmoq*, *so'zlamoq*), another may express information transfer (*tell*, *inform*, *aytmoq*, *xabar bermoq*), while others represent questioning, answering, ordering, requesting, persuading, whispering, shouting, and other communicative behaviors. Such classification demonstrates that the semantic field is internally structured and that individual verbs occupy different positions within the broader speech paradigm.

Uzbek linguistics has developed substantial theoretical foundations for the study of word formation, lexical semantics, morphology, and lexical structure. The works of Azim Hojiyev are particularly important for the analysis of Uzbek derivation. Hojiyev's research includes major studies devoted to Uzbek word formation, morphology, lexicology, and grammatical structure, including *O'zbek tilida so'z yasalishi* and works on the formation of grammatical forms. His approach provides an important basis for distinguishing word-forming processes from grammatical form formation and for examining the semantic contribution of derivational elements.

The lexical and semantic research of Sh. Rahmatullayev is also important for understanding the systemic organization of Uzbek vocabulary. His work contributed substantially to the development of Uzbek lexicology, lexicography, and the study of lexical relations. In addition, the research tradition represented by scholars such as A. Nurmonov, E. Begmatov, R. Sayfullayeva, A. G'ulomov, and other Uzbek linguists has contributed to the description of Uzbek lexical, morphological, and grammatical structures.

A particularly relevant direction in Uzbek linguistic research is the study of derivational processes through lexical-semantic analysis. Existing research demonstrates that derivation in Uzbek can be examined not only at the formal level but also in relation to changes in lexical meaning. Such approaches support the present study's assumption that derivation can contribute to the expansion and internal differentiation of a lexical-semantic field.

Despite these theoretical and descriptive achievements, a number of issues remain insufficiently explored from a comparative-typological perspective. Previous studies have often concentrated either on the formal mechanisms of derivation, the semantic classification of speech verbs, or the general characteristics of English and Uzbek morphology. Less attention has been devoted to the interaction of these dimensions: namely, how derivational processes modify the semantic structure of speech verbs and how such modifications influence their position within the lexical-semantic field of speech activity in two structurally different languages.

The present study builds on these previous approaches but shifts the focus toward the derivational-semantic organization of speech verbs. Derivation is viewed here as a mechanism that can expand the lexical-semantic field, introduce additional semantic components, and establish new paradigmatic relations between speech-related lexical units. In this sense, the speech paradigm is understood as a dynamic system in which basic speech verbs and their derivatives are related through semantic, morphological, and functional relationships.

Theoretical foundations of derivational-semantic analysis of speech verbs

The analysis of speech verbs requires an approach that brings together morphology, semantics, and paradigmatic relations. Speech verbs are not isolated lexical units; they form a structured semantic system in which individual members are connected through common and contrasting semantic features. At the same time, derivational processes may change the semantic configuration of a lexical unit and consequently influence its position within this system.

The semantic consequences of derivation can be particularly clearly observed in verbs denoting human actions. A basic verb may express a relatively general action, while a derived form can specify the participant structure, direction, manner, intensity, or communicative character of that action. This principle is especially significant for speech verbs because speech itself is a complex communicative event involving at least a speaker, an addressee, a message, and a communicative intention.

For this reason, the semantic structure of a speech verb can be represented through a number of potential components. These may include:

- **Speech** — involvement in verbal communication;
- **Agent** — the participant who performs the speech action;
- **Addressee** — the participant toward whom the speech is directed;
- **Interaction** — reciprocal or dialogic communication;
- **Causation** — causing another participant to perform a speech action;
- **Intensity** — the degree or force of speech;
- **Manner** — the manner in which speech is produced;
- **Information** — transmission of information;
- **Purpose** — communicative intention or function.

Not every speech verb contains all these components. Rather, different lexical units are distinguished by the presence, absence, or prominence of particular semantic features. Thus, *speak* and *whisper*, for example, share the general component (SPEECH) but differ in the manner and intensity of the speech event. Similarly, *ask* and *answer* are connected through the broader communicative field but represent different directions of interaction.

This componential perspective can be combined with the theory of lexical-semantic fields. A lexical-semantic field can be understood as a group of lexical units united by a common semantic domain and differentiated by more specific semantic features. Within the field of speech activity, therefore, derivation can serve as one of the mechanisms through which the field becomes more internally differentiated.

The concept of the speech paradigm is particularly useful in this context. In the present study, the speech paradigm refers to the interconnected set of lexical units representing different forms, participants, purposes, manners, and communicative relations associated with speech activity. The paradigm is not understood merely as a morphological paradigm. It is a broader lexical-semantic structure in which speech verbs and related derived units occupy different positions according to their semantic characteristics.

For example, the Uzbek sequence *gapirmoq* – *gaplashmoq* – *gapirtirmoq* demonstrates three different configurations of the speech event. The base verb *gapirmoq* expresses the general act of speaking. *Gaplashmoq* introduces an interactional or reciprocal dimension, while *gapirtirmoq* introduces causativity. Consequently, derivation contributes to the semantic differentiation of the speech paradigm.

A similar principle can be observed in English, although the morphological realization may be different. English uses suffixation, conversion, and other word-formation processes to create or extend lexical categories. Forms such as *speak* – *speaker* demonstrate the relationship between a speech action and its agent, while conversion is particularly relevant in speech-related vocabulary, as illustrated by pairs such as *answer* – *to answer*, *question* – *to question*, and *debate* – *to debate*. These relationships demonstrate that the semantic organization of speech vocabulary cannot be explained exclusively through overt affixation.

The distinction between derivation and inflection is also important for the present analysis. Inflection changes the grammatical form of a lexical unit without normally creating a new lexical item, whereas derivation may result in a new lexical unit with a modified lexical meaning. In the case of speech verbs, grammatical categories such as tense,

aspect, person, number, mood, and voice may further modify the interpretation of the speech event, but these grammatical modifications should be distinguished from derivational semantic changes.

Accordingly, the present study adopts a three-level analytical model:

morphological form → semantic modification → paradigmatic function.

At the first level, the formal structure of the lexical unit and its derivational mechanism are identified. At the second level, the semantic changes associated with the derivational process are determined. At the third level, the newly formed or modified unit is examined in relation to other members of the speech paradigm.

This model makes it possible to move from a purely formal description of word formation toward an integrated analysis of derivation and lexical semantics. It also provides a basis for comparing English and Uzbek, since the two languages may employ different formal mechanisms while expressing comparable semantic relations.

Derivational-semantic features of speech verbs in Uzbek

Uzbek derivation provides a clear basis for examining the relationship between morphological structure and lexical meaning. As an agglutinative language, Uzbek commonly uses affixation to express additional semantic components such as interaction, causation, agency, and manner. A. Hojiyev's work on Uzbek word formation is particularly relevant because it explains derivation as a systematic process connecting a derivational base, word-forming elements, and the meaning of the resulting lexical unit.

The verb *gapirmoq* represents the general concept of speaking. Derivational modification can add specific semantic components:

Base / Derived form	Main meaning	Added semantic component
<i>gapirmoq</i>	speaking	[+Speech]
<i>gaplashmoq</i>	speaking with others	[+Interaction]
<i>gapirtirmoq</i>	causing someone to speak	[+Causation]
<i>so'zlovchi</i>	person who speaks	[+Agent]

Thus, *gapirmoq* → *gaplashmoq* adds the component of reciprocal interaction, while *gapirmoq* → *gapirtirmoq* introduces causation and an additional participant. Derivation therefore changes not only the form of a word but also the semantic structure of the speech event.

However, not every semantic difference between Uzbek speech verbs is produced through derivation. For example, *pichirlamoq*, *baqirmoq*, and *qichqirmoq* express manner or intensity but function as independent lexical members of the same semantic field. Therefore, the analysis should distinguish between derivational modification and lexical-semantic differentiation.

The Uzbek speech paradigm can consequently be viewed as a multidimensional system in which morphological and lexical mechanisms express different aspects of speech activity.

Derivational-semantic features of speech verbs in English

English differs from Uzbek in the ways semantic relations are expressed. In addition to affixation, English uses conversion, lexicalization, and analytical constructions. The works of L. Bauer, R. Lieber, and I. Plag are relevant to this pattern because they emphasize the relationship between word formation and lexical meaning.

Conversion is especially important:

Form	Process	Semantic result
question (N) → question (V)	conversion	communicative action
answer (N) → answer (V)	conversion	action of responding
debate (N) → debate (V)	conversion	action of discussing

Unlike Uzbek, English can create a new lexical category without an overt affix. Affixation is also productive, as in *speak* → *speaker*, where -er adds the semantic component [+Agent].

English speech verbs are further differentiated lexically:

Semantic dimension	Examples
General speech	<i>speak, talk</i>
Information	<i>tell, inform, announce</i>
Inquiry	<i>ask, question</i>
Response	<i>answer, reply</i>
Interaction	<i>discuss, debate, argue</i>
Influence	<i>persuade, convince</i>
Manner	<i>whisper, murmur</i>
Intensity	<i>shout, yell</i>
Agency	<i>speaker</i>

These examples show that the English speech paradigm cannot be explained through affixation alone. Semantic differentiation is distributed across derivation, conversion, independent lexical units, and analytical constructions.

Comparative analysis of speech verbs in English and Uzbek

The two languages express broadly similar semantic dimensions of speech activity, but they use different linguistic mechanisms.

Semantic dimension	English	Uzbek	Main contrast
Basic speech	speak, talk	gapirmoq, so'zlamog	Mainly lexical in both
Interaction	talk, converse	gplashmoq	Lexical vs. derivational
Causation	make someone speak	gapirtirmoq	Analytical vs. morphological
Agency	speaker	so'zlovchi	Derivational in both
Manner	whisper, murmur	pichirlamoq	Mainly lexical
Intensity	shout, yell	baqirmoq, qichqirmoq	Mainly lexical

The clearest difference concerns morphological transparency. Uzbek often expresses semantic relations such as reciprocity and causation through morphological modification, whereas English frequently uses separate lexical verbs or analytical constructions.

For example:

Uzbek: *gapirmoq* → *gplashmoq*

English: *speak* → *talk / converse*

and:

Uzbek: *gapirmoq* → *gapirtirmoq*

English: *speak* → *make someone speak*

Therefore, formal non-equivalence does not necessarily indicate semantic non-equivalence. Both languages distinguish speech, interaction, causation, agency, manner, and intensity, but distribute these meanings differently across morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.

Discussion

The comparison shows three main findings. First, derivation contributes to semantic differentiation in both languages. In Uzbek, this relationship is particularly transparent because affixes can explicitly introduce components such as interaction and causation. In English, similar semantic relations may be expressed through derivation, conversion, or analytical constructions.

Second, the speech paradigm is not limited to derived verbs. Independent lexical units such as *whisper*, *shout*, *argue*, and *persuade* also occupy distinct positions within the speech-activity field. Consequently, derivational and lexical-semantic relations should be analyzed together rather than treated as identical phenomena.

Third, the comparison demonstrates that similar semantic concepts may have different formal realizations:

Base speech concept → *morphological, lexical, or syntactic modification* → *additional semantic component* → *new position in the speech paradigm*.

This approach makes it possible to study the speech-activity field as a system of interconnected semantic units rather than as a simple list of related verbs.

The comparison shows that Uzbek and English employ different linguistic resources to organize the semantic field of speech activity. As an agglutinative language, Uzbek relies more extensively on affixation to express additional semantic components. English, by contrast, uses a combination of affixation, conversion, lexical differentiation, and syntactic constructions. This difference is particularly visible in the expression of causation and interaction.

In Uzbek, meanings such as causation and reciprocity can be expressed directly through morphological derivation. For example, *gapirtirmoq* contains a causative meaning, while *gplashmoq* expresses interaction. In English, similar meanings are more often expressed through independent lexical units or analytical constructions, such as *talk/converse* and *make someone speak*. However, both languages use derivation to form agentive nouns, as in *speaker* and *so'zlovchi*.

Manner and intensity are mainly expressed through independent lexical verbs in both languages. Forms such as *whisper*, *murmur*, and *shout* in English and *pichirlamoq*, *baqirmoq*, and *qichqirmoq* in Uzbek demonstrate that semantic differentiation is not limited to derivational morphology. Therefore, the speech paradigm in both languages is formed through the interaction of morphological and lexical-semantic relations.

These findings support an integrated approach that combines derivational morphology, lexical semantics, semantic-field theory, and comparative typology. The comparison should therefore focus not only on formal correspondence between English and Uzbek lexical units but also on their functional-semantic equivalence. This makes

it possible to identify how similar semantic components of speech activity are expressed through different linguistic structures.

Conclusion

The comparison of English and Uzbek speech verbs shows that both languages represent similar semantic dimensions of speech activity, including speech, interaction, causation, agency, manner, and intensity. Their main difference lies in the linguistic means used to express these meanings.

Uzbek more frequently makes certain semantic relations morphologically explicit, as in *gapirmoq* → *gaplashmoq* → *gapirtirmoq*. English relies on a broader combination of affixation, conversion, lexical differentiation, and analytical constructions. Thus, the same semantic distinction may be expressed by a derived form in Uzbek but by a lexical or syntactic construction in English.

Overall, derivation should be treated not simply as a word-formation mechanism but as one factor in the semantic organization of the speech paradigm. The combination of morphological, lexical-semantic, and comparative analysis provides a clearer basis for identifying the typological features of the speech-activity lexical-semantic field in English and Uzbek.

REFERENCES

1. Bauer L. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. – 2nd ed. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003. – 384 p. – ISBN 978-0-7486-1705-0. – URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrdv8>
2. Bauer L., Lieber R., Plag I. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – DOI: 10.1093/acprof/9780198747062.001.0001. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198747062.001.0001>
3. Hojiyev A. *O'zbek tili so'z yasalihi tizimi*. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2007. – 168 b. – URL: <https://www.scribd.com/document/1053272316/Azim-Hojiyev-O-Zbek-Tili-So-z-Yasalishi-Tizimi>
4. Hojiyev A. *O'zbek tili morfologiyasi, morfemikasi va so'z yasalihi nazarid masalalari*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2010. – 256 b. – URL: <https://arm.turonuniversity.uz/oz/site/view?id=2455>
5. Lieber R. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511486296. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486296>
6. Lyons J. *Semantics*. – Vols. 1–2. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=jQA6wVLCINUC>
7. Nida E. A. *Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures*. – The Hague: Mouton, 1975. – 272 p. – ISBN 978-90-279-3137-5. – URL: <https://search.worldcat.org/title/1717878>
8. Nurmonov A., Iskandarova Sh. *Tilshunoslik nazariyasi*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008. – 176 b. – URL: <https://tiu-edu.uz/media/books/2025/01/11/Tilshunoslik-nazariyasi-Nosirjon-Uluqov.pdf>
9. Plag I. *Word-Formation in English*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511841323. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841323>
10. Rahmatullayev Sh. *Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili*. – Toshkent: Universitet, 2006. – 476 b. – URL: <https://cspu.uz/hozirgi-adabiy-ozbek-tili>
11. Saussure F. de. *Cours de linguistique générale*. – Paris: Payot, 1916. – URL: https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Cours_de_linguistique_g%C3%A9n%C3%A9rale
12. Sayfullayeva R. R., Mengliyev B. R., Boqiyeva G. H., Qurbonova M. M., Yunusova Z. K., Abuzalova M. K. *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. – Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2009. – 416 b. – ISBN 978-9943-10-208-8. – URL: <https://akbt.urdu.uz/uz/books/431>
13. Trier J. *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes. Bd. 1: Von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts*. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1931. – 347 S. – URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=G8EqAAAAAAAJ>