

SPEECH ACT VERBS

Ziyaeva Dilnoza Anvarovna

Bukhara State Medical Institute named after Abu Ali ibn Sina

+998994556999

Exploring Speech Verbs: A Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Languages

Speech verbs play a pivotal role in both English and Uzbek languages, serving as essential tools for communication and expression. They enable speakers to convey dialogue, thoughts, emotions, and actions effectively. In this article, we will delve into the functions, roles, and usage of speech verbs in both languages, exploring their nuances and significance in various contexts, including the speech of different characters.

Functions and Roles of Speech Verbs:

In both English and Uzbek, speech verbs serve several functions:

- Attribution of Speech:** Speech verbs attribute dialogue to specific characters, indicating who is speaking. For example, in English, verbs like "say," "speak," and "shout" perform this function. Similarly, in Uzbek, verbs such as "aytsin," "deysin," and "qarang" fulfill the same role.
- Expressing Manner of Speech:** Speech verbs convey the manner in which speech is delivered, whether it's whispered, shouted, or muttered. These verbs add depth and emotion to dialogue. For instance, in English, "whisper," "yell," and "mutter" fulfill this function, while in Uzbek, "hiss et," "yig'la," and "qizqizla" serve a similar purpose.
- Conveying Emotion and Tone:** Speech verbs contribute to the portrayal of emotions and tones in dialogue. They help in communicating whether speech is angry, joyful, sarcastic, or hesitant. English verbs such as "plead," "mock," and "stammer" carry emotional connotations, just like their Uzbek counterparts, including "yomonlash," "qizg'inchli," and "og'zidan chiqarmoq."
- Reporting Speech:** Speech verbs are crucial in reported speech, where characters recount or narrate what someone else said. English verbs like "report," "claim," and "state" serve this purpose, while Uzbek equivalents like "aytdi," "so'zlab," and "haqiqat" fulfill a similar role.

Usage in Different Characters' Speech:

The usage of speech verbs varies depending on the characteristics, personalities, and contexts of different characters. Let's explore how different types of characters might employ speech verbs:

1. **Protagonist:** Protagonists often use a diverse range of speech verbs to articulate their thoughts, feelings, and intentions. They may employ assertive verbs like "declare" or "assert" to convey confidence or uncertainty, depending on the situation.
2. **Antagonist:** Antagonists may utilize speech verbs with manipulative or aggressive undertones to intimidate or deceive others. Verbs like "threaten," "manipulate," or "sneer" might characterize their speech, reflecting their antagonistic nature.
3. **Supporting Characters:** Supporting characters may use speech verbs that align with their role in the narrative. For instance, a mentor figure might employ comforting verbs like "assure" or "encourage," while a comedic sidekick could use humorous verbs like "quip" or "joke."
4. **Background Characters:** Background characters often employ simpler speech verbs to convey basic communication without overshadowing the main dialogue. Verbs like "ask" "reply" or "respond" are common in their speech.

Comparative Analysis:

While both English and Uzbek languages share similarities in the functions and usage of speech verbs, there are also distinct differences influenced by linguistic and cultural factors. English tends to have a broader array of speech verbs, allowing for finer nuances in expression, while Uzbek may rely more on contextual cues and intonation to convey meaning.

In conclusion, speech verbs play a vital role in both English and Uzbek languages, facilitating effective communication and expression in various contexts. Their usage not only attributes dialogue but also adds depth, emotion, and tone to characters' speech, enriching the narrative and enhancing the reader's or listener's experience. Understanding the nuances of speech verbs in different languages enables writers and speakers to craft compelling dialogue that resonates with audiences across cultures.

Classes of Speech Act Verbs

Different types of speech act verbs are categorized based on special resource situation types. These types stem from the role of the utterance and the attitudes of the speaker, which are essential components of the overall resource situation type. Speaker attitudes encompass the speaker's stance towards the proposition, intention, and presuppositions. The propositional attitude of the speaker may involve belief, desire, or evaluation of the proposition. The role of the utterance is delineated by properties of the propositional content, including the type of event, agent, and temporal reference.

For instance, the verb "order" lexicalizes the specification of a future action by the addressee. Various combinations of speaker attitudes and properties of propositional content form distinct special resource situation types, associated with specific speech act verbs. Additionally, there exists a class of verbs known as "declarations," which are speech acts where the speaker, as a representative of an institution, brings about an institutional fact without necessarily expressing personal attitudes.

Declaratives differ from other speech act verbs in that they do not lexicalize speaker attitudes beyond the intention to establish a particular institutional fact. Examples of declaratives include verbs like "absolve," "baptize," and "nominate." Similar taxonomies of speech act verbs have been proposed by scholars such as Austin, Vendler, Bach, and Harnish. These classifications, though differing in details, generally encompass categories like statements, invitationals, authoritatives, and expressives, each comprising various types of speech acts based on the speaker's intentions and attitudes.

Speech acts are actions performed through speech, and the meanings of speech act verbs often align with properties of these actions. The components of speech acts and speech act verbs share significant similarities, as observed through their overlapping elements. These elements are crucial in determining the conditions under which a speech act is both successful and non-defective. However, not all speech act verbs can be fully described solely based on special resource situation types.

Verbs like "boast," "flatter," and "lie" pose challenges as their meanings encompass evaluations by both the speaker within the resource situation and the speaker describing the act performed by the resource situation speaker, termed the discourse situation. For example, "boast" not only reflects the speaker's positive evaluation of

their own actions but also indicates a negative evaluation by the discourse situation speaker of the resource situation speaker's exaggerated representation. Similarly, "flatter" and "lie" involve a combination of attitudes from both the resource and discourse situations.

This complexity highlights the limitations of a one-to-one correspondence between speech acts and speech act verbs. Despite Austin's assertion that speech act verbs provide a guide to speech acts, differences in their meanings do not always align with differences in illocutionary acts. The absence of a perfect correlation underscores the intricacies of linguistic expression and interpretation.

Performativity adds another layer to the study of speech act verbs, where certain verbs not only denote but also perform a particular speech act. Austin proposed a test to determine performativity by substituting the verb into the formula "I (hereby) x...". Verbs like "order," "promise," and "assert" fall into this category, often being part of institutionalized procedures for bringing about specific institutional facts. However, not all speech act verbs can be used performatively, as some actions require more than mere utterance to be performed effectively. For instance, while "promise" can be used performatively ("I promise to help you"), "convince" cannot be ("I convince you that..."), as it necessitates additional actions beyond speech alone.

Bibliography:

1. Andrew Lakoff, University of Southern California: Preparing for the Next Emergency. April 2007, *Public Culture* 19(2):247-271; DOI:10.1215/08992363-2006-035
2. Robin Tolmach Lakoff (2004). *Language and woman's place. Text and commentaries*. Edited by Mary Bucholtz. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. xiv + 309. ISBN 0-19-5167570.
3. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
4. Geckeler, H. (1984). Sobre la más moderna y reciente semántica: Análisis del contenido en rasgos distintivos. In H. Geckeler, *Semántica estructural y teoría del campo léxico* (pp. 246-281). Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
5. Pottier, B. (1963). *Recherches sur l'analyse sémantique en linguistique et en traduction mécanique*. Nancy: Université de Nancy.
6. Pottier, B. (1967). *Présentation de la linguistique: fondements d'une théorie..* Paris: Editions Klincksieck. 61

7. Saeed, J. (2009). Chapter 1: Semantics in linguistics. In *Semantics* (pp. 3-21). Oxford: Wiley & Blackwell
8. Saeed, J. (2009). Chapter 3: Word meaning. In *Semantics* (pp. 53-79). Oxford: Wiley & Blackwell.
9. Ziyoyeva, D. A. (2023). SEMANTICS OF THE SPEECH VERBS SPEAK, TALK IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. *Innovative Development in Educational Activities*, 2(6), 217-225.
10. Anvarovna, D. Z. (2023). PARADIGMATIC ANALYSIS OF SPEECH VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. *Journal of new century innovations*, 38(2), 49-52