

**SEMANTIC ANALYSIS AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SIMPLE SENTENCES  
IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK****Tursunova Shoxista**4<sup>th</sup> year student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages[tursunovashohista309@gmail.com](mailto:tursunovashohista309@gmail.com)**Norkulova Shoxsanam Gilmiddin qizi**4<sup>th</sup> year student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages[shoxsanam.12137@gmail.com](mailto:shoxsanam.12137@gmail.com)**Eshmuradova Hayotgul Daminovna**

hayotguleshmuradova@gmail.com

Senior teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

**Abstract.** This article examines the semantic features of simple sentences in English and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. It analyzes how meaning is constructed through syntactic structures in English and morphological markers in Uzbek. The study highlights both the differences and the shared semantic principles of the two languages, contributing to a better understanding of cross-linguistic sentence structure.

**Keywords:** simple sentence, semantic analysis, English, Uzbek, comparative

**INTRODUCTION**

In contemporary linguistics, the semantic analysis of sentence structures has become one of the central areas of research, particularly within the fields of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Simple sentences, as the most fundamental units of syntactic organization, play a crucial role in conveying meaning and structuring communication. Their study not only reveals the interaction between form and meaning but also provides insight into how different languages encode reality through grammatical and semantic means. The comparative investigation of simple sentences in English and Uzbek is especially significant due to the typological differences between these languages. English, as an analytic language, relies heavily on word order and function words to express grammatical relationships, whereas Uzbek, being an agglutinative language, utilizes affixation and morphological markers. These structural distinctions inevitably influence the semantic representation of sentence components such as subject, predicate, and complements, as well as the overall interpretation of meaning.

Furthermore, examining simple sentences from a semantic perspective allows for a deeper understanding of how meaning is constructed and interpreted across languages. It highlights issues such as predicate-argument structure, thematic roles, and the role of context in meaning formation. In intercultural and cross-linguistic communication, such differences may lead to misunderstandings if not properly understood, making this type of research particularly relevant for language teaching, translation studies, and applied linguistics.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The semantic analysis of sentence structure has long been a focal point in linguistic research, particularly within the frameworks of structural, generative, and functional linguistics. Early studies by Saussure emphasized the relationship between signifier and signified, laying the foundation for later semantic investigations<sup>1</sup>. Building on this, Chomsky's generative grammar introduced the distinction between deep and surface structures, which significantly influenced the semantic interpretation of sentences, including simple sentence constructions<sup>2</sup>. In the field of semantics, scholars such as Lyons have explored meaning as a systematic component of language, focusing on lexical and grammatical semantics<sup>3</sup>. His work highlights the importance of context and structural relations in meaning formation. Similarly, Katz and Fodor proposed a semantic theory based on componential analysis, arguing that sentence meaning can be derived from the semantic features of its constituents<sup>4</sup>. These approaches are particularly relevant for analyzing simple sentences, where meaning often depends on the interaction of basic syntactic elements.

From a functional perspective, Halliday's systemic functional linguistics provides a comprehensive model for understanding how language functions in context. Halliday emphasizes the role of the clause as a representation of experience, introducing concepts such as transitivity, which are crucial for semantic analysis of simple sentences<sup>5</sup>. This framework is especially useful in comparative studies, as it allows researchers to examine how different languages encode similar experiential meanings through distinct grammatical structures. In Uzbek linguistics, significant contributions have been made by scholars such as Sh. Rahmatullayev and A. Nurmonov, who have studied the structure and semantics of Uzbek sentences. Their research highlights the role of morphological markers and word order

<sup>1</sup> Saussure, F. de. (1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. Duckworth

<sup>2</sup> Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press

<sup>3</sup> Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics (Vols. 1 & 2)*. Cambridge University Press

<sup>4</sup> Katz, J. J., & Fodor, J. A. (1963). The structure of a semantic theory. *Language*, 39(2), 170-210

<sup>5</sup> Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd ed.)*. Edward Arnold

flexibility in expressing semantic relations within simple sentences<sup>6</sup>. Uzbek linguists also emphasize the importance of predicate-centered structures, where the verb carries essential semantic and grammatical information.

### METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative comparative approach to analyze simple sentences in English and Uzbek. Selected examples are examined through semantic and syntactic analysis, focusing on predicate structure and meaning. A contrastive method is applied to identify similarities and differences between the two languages.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The semantic structure of simple sentences represents a fundamental aspect of linguistic analysis, as it reveals how meaning is constructed through the interaction of syntactic elements. In both English and Uzbek, a simple sentence typically consists of a subject and a predicate; however, the ways in which these components contribute to meaning differ significantly due to typological distinctions between the two languages. English, as an analytic language, relies primarily on a fixed word order (Subject □ Verb □ Object) to express grammatical and semantic relationships, whereas Uzbek, an agglutinative language, uses affixation and flexible word order to encode meaning<sup>7</sup>. From a semantic perspective, the predicate plays a central role in both languages, as it determines the structure of the sentence and assigns thematic roles such as agent, patient, and experiencer. For example, in the English sentence "The student reads a book", the subject "the student" functions as the agent, while "a book" serves as the patient. In Uzbek, the equivalent sentence "Talaba kitob o'qiydi" conveys the same semantic roles; however, the relationships between components are reinforced by morphological markers rather than strict word order<sup>8</sup>. This demonstrates that while the underlying semantic roles are universal, their grammatical realization varies across languages.

Another important aspect of semantic analysis is the relationship between deep meaning and surface structure. According to generative grammar, sentences may have similar surface forms but differ in their underlying semantic representation<sup>9</sup>. For instance, passive constructions in English ("The book was read by the student") shift the focus of the sentence without altering the core meaning. In Uzbek, passive meaning is often expressed through verbal

<sup>6</sup> Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Universitet nashriyoti

<sup>7</sup> Saussure, F. de. (1983). Course in General Linguistics. Duckworth

<sup>8</sup> Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. MIT Press

<sup>9</sup> Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vols. 1 □ 2). Cambridge University Press

affixes, which again highlights the role of morphology in semantic encoding<sup>10</sup>. Furthermore, the concept of transitivity, as proposed in functional linguistics, provides valuable insight into how different types of processes (material, mental, relational) are expressed in simple sentences. English distinguishes these processes largely through verb selection and syntactic patterns, while Uzbek additionally utilizes verbal morphology to indicate nuances of meaning<sup>11</sup>. This difference affects how speakers of each language conceptualize and express actions, states, and relations.

Word order also plays a crucial role in determining the communicative focus and information structure of a sentence. In English, deviation from the standard word order is limited and often marked, whereas in Uzbek, word order is more flexible and can be adjusted to emphasize different elements of the sentence. Despite this flexibility, the semantic interpretation remains clear due to the presence of case markers and verb agreement<sup>12</sup>. This feature allows Uzbek speakers to manipulate sentence structure without losing meaning, which is less feasible in English. In addition, context significantly influences the semantic interpretation of simple sentences in both languages. Pragmatic factors such as speaker intention, cultural norms, and discourse context contribute to meaning beyond the literal level. For example, a simple declarative sentence may carry different implications depending on intonation or situational context, which is an important consideration in cross-linguistic analysis<sup>13</sup>.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the comparative semantic analysis of simple sentences in English and Uzbek demonstrates that, despite significant structural differences, both languages share common underlying semantic principles. English primarily relies on a fixed word order to express grammatical and semantic relationships, whereas Uzbek uses morphological markers and allows greater flexibility in sentence structure. These typological distinctions influence how meaning is encoded and interpreted in each language. The study also shows that the predicate plays a central role in organizing sentence meaning in both languages, assigning thematic roles and determining the overall semantic structure. At the same time, contextual and pragmatic factors contribute to meaning beyond the grammatical level, highlighting the importance of discourse in semantic interpretation.

<sup>10</sup> Katz, J. J., & Fodor, J. A. (1963). The structure of a semantic theory. *Language*, 39(2), 170-210

<sup>11</sup> Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold

<sup>12</sup> Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Universitet nashriyoti

<sup>13</sup> Nurmonov, A. (2012). *O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi*. Fan nashriyoti

## REFERENCES:

1. Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262530077/aspects-of-the-theory-of-syntax/>
2. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold. <https://archive.org/details/introductiontofu0000hall>
3. Katz, J. J., & Fodor, J. A. (1963). The structure of a semantic theory. *Language*, 39(2), 170–210. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/411200>
4. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620610>
5. Nurmonov, A. (2012). O‘zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Fan nashriyoti. <https://ziyouz.uz/ilmiy-ishlar/tilshunoslik/ozbek-tilining-nazariy-grammatikasi/>
6. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Universitet nashriyoti. <https://library.ziyonet.uz/uz/book/uzbek-tili>
7. Saussure, F. de. (1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. Duckworth. [https://monoskop.org/images/7/7b/Saussure\\_Ferdinand\\_de\\_Course\\_in\\_General\\_Linguistics.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/7/7b/Saussure_Ferdinand_de_Course_in_General_Linguistics.pdf)