

**DIFFERENCES IN THE REALIZATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
ECONOMY AND REDUNDANCY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK****Rasulov Zubaydullo Izomovich**

Doctor of Science, Professor

Bukhara state university, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0554-1319

email: [z.i.rasulov@buxdu.uz](mailto:z.i.rasulov@buxdu.uz)**Oripova Sabrina Jalol qizi,**

II year student of master degree

[oripovas116@gmail.com](mailto:oripovas116@gmail.com)**Annotation**

This article explores the interplay of economy and redundancy in English and Uzbek using a comparative-typological approach. Economy is realized through syntactic, lexical, phonetic, or morphological strategies, while redundancy ensures clarity, emphasizes meaning, and conveys social and emotional nuances. The study demonstrates that typological differences—analytic versus synthetic structures—affect how these principles are implemented, reflecting cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural aspects of communication.

**Key Words**

Economy, redundancy, English, Uzbek, analytic vs. synthetic; morphology, syntax, pragmatics, communication efficiency.

**Introduction.** Language relies on the balance between economy and redundancy to ensure effective communication. Economy allows speakers to convey meaning with minimal effort, while redundancy provides clarity, reinforces understanding, and reduces ambiguity. The comparative study of English and Uzbek illustrates how typological differences influence the realization of these principles. English, as an analytic language, achieves economy mainly through syntactic simplification, ellipsis, lexical abbreviations, and phonetic reductions. Uzbek, a synthetic agglutinative language, relies on morphological compactness, affixation, and word formation to express multiple grammatical and semantic features within single lexical units. Redundancy in English is often expressed through lexical and syntactic repetition, whereas in Uzbek it appears via morphological repetition and socially conventional forms. Examining these differences highlights how structural, cognitive, and socio-pragmatic factors shape language use.

The language system operates on a balance between two key principles: economy and redundancy. Though seemingly opposite, they work together to ensure effective and reliable communication. Economy aims to convey maximum meaning with minimal effort, while redundancy reinforces understanding by adding supplementary or repeated elements. Thus, language develops as a process that both reduces cognitive load and prevents loss of meaning.

A comparative-typological approach shows that English, as an analytic language, achieves economy mainly through lexical and syntactic strategies such as ellipsis, abbreviations, and compact constructions. Uzbek, a synthetic language, relies on morphological mechanisms like affixation and word formation. Redundancy appears differently in each: English uses lexical and syntactic repetition for emphasis, whereas Uzbek employs recurring morphological units and



socially conventional forms to stabilize meaning.

Studying these principles comparatively highlights not only structural differences but also cognitive, pragmatic, and social functions of language, with economy and redundancy jointly shaping communication.

In identifying the manifestations of economy in English and Uzbek, the comparative-typological method plays a crucial role, as it enables a systematic examination of differences related to the analytic and synthetic structures of these languages. Since English is an analytic language, the principle of economy is realized primarily at the syntactic and lexical levels. For instance, in the construction “*I saw him*,” meanings of person, tense, and action are expressed through separate linguistic units, while the verb form itself carries no excessive morphological load. This illustrates the tendency toward grammatical simplification characteristic of English.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, ellipsis functions as a key mechanism of syntactic economy in English. In sentences such as “*Want some?*” or “*Seen her today?*”, the omitted elements are easily recovered from the context, and communicative effectiveness remains intact. Analyzed from a functional-pragmatic perspective, this phenomenon highlights the role of ellipsis in increasing speech tempo and facilitating ease in dialogic interaction.<sup>2</sup>

At the lexical level, abbreviations—*exam* (examination), *ad* (advertisement), *fridge* (refrigerator), *lab* (laboratory), *math* (mathematics), *ASAP* (as soon as possible)—represent a clear expression of linguistic economy, as they reduce phonetic and semantic redundancy and reflect the dynamic nature of the language. This process is also significant within the socio-cultural context of English, where abbreviations frequently contribute to the speed and naturalness of spoken communication. Phonetic economy is likewise widespread in English, as seen in reductions such as *going to* → *gonna*, *want to* → *wanna*, and *got to* → *gotta*. These forms increase speech fluency and enhance convenience in dialogic communication.<sup>3</sup> In conversational discourse, shortened constructions are especially common, for example, “*Coming?*” instead of “*Are you coming?*” or “*Got it*” instead of “*I have got it.*” Such examples are regarded as manifestations of economy at the syntactic level.

Uzbek, by contrast, has an agglutinative—i.e., synthetic—structure; therefore, the principle of economy in this language is realized primarily at the morphological level. For example, in the verb form “*bordim*” (“*I went*”), the meanings of action, tense, and person are combined within a single word, which makes it morphologically more compact than the corresponding English construction “*I went.*” In this case, economy is achieved not by reducing the number of separate words, but by concentrating multiple grammatical meanings within one lexical unit.

In addition, word-formation processes in Uzbek also serve the principle of economy. In derived forms such as *o‘qituvchi* (*o‘qit- + -uvchi*), *yo‘zuvchi* (*yo‘z- + -uvchi*), and *o‘qilgan* (*o‘q- + -ilgan*), the meanings of action, agent, and result are expressed within a single lexical unit. This significantly reduces the need for more complex syntactic constructions and demonstrates the efficiency of morphological mechanisms in conveying grammatical and semantic information.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. – p.45, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>2</sup> Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman. – p.112.

<sup>3</sup> Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – p.46.

<sup>4</sup> Abdurahmonov, G. (1996). *O‘zbek tilining morfologiyasi*. Tashkent: Fan. – p.134.



In spoken Uzbek, shortened forms function as a socio-pragmatic realization of the principle of economy. Informal expressions such as *univer*, *prof*, and the use of *telefonga chiq* instead of *telefon qil* increase speech speed and ease interaction. Conversational economy is further achieved by omitting non-essential morphological markers, as in “*Borasan?*” for “*Borasanmi?*” or “*Qilding?*” for “*Qildingmi?*”. These reductions facilitate natural dialogue without causing ambiguity, since meaning is recoverable from context.

Comparative and functional analysis shows that although economy is a universal principle, its implementation depends on typological differences. In English, economy is mainly realized through syntactic simplification, ellipsis, phonetic reduction, and lexical abbreviation, whereas in Uzbek it operates primarily through morphological compactness, affixation, word formation, and shortened forms. In both languages, economy serves as a key factor in achieving communicative efficiency and reflects cognitive as well as social needs.

Redundancy, closely linked to economy, plays a complementary role by preventing semantic loss and stabilizing discourse. While language aims to minimize effort, it simultaneously employs additional elements to ensure clarity. In English, redundancy is typically expressed at the syntactic and lexical levels, as in emphatic constructions like “*I did see him.*” In contrast, Uzbek tends to realize redundancy morphologically through affixes and repetitive forms such as “*Men o‘zim bordim*” or “*shaxsan o‘zim aytdim,*” which reinforce meaning and reduce misinterpretation.

As noted above, redundancy represents a multidimensional phenomenon in linguistics, extending beyond mere grammatical excess to encompass semantic, stylistic, and communicative dimensions. Linguist Geoffrey Leech defines redundancy as a feature that facilitates successful communication by providing multiple cues that aid comprehension. This perspective highlights the crucial role of redundant elements in ensuring discourse stability and communicative clarity.<sup>5</sup> George Miller regards redundancy as a crucial mechanism in the human brain’s processes of information reception and processing. From his perspective, redundant elements enable listeners to experience a sense of semantic stability, while allowing speakers to convey their ideas with greater emphasis and clarity.<sup>6</sup> In this way, redundancy enriches speech by transforming it into a more nuanced and cognitively grounded human experience.

Redundancy is not merely a collection of superfluous words; rather, it serves as a means of conveying the complexity of human thought. Each redundant element reflects the speaker’s internal state, including their doubts, confidence, or emphasis. For example, the expression “*Men o‘zim shaxsan aytdim*” allows the speaker to communicate personal involvement, responsibility, and emotional stance. In such instances, language functions not simply as a vehicle for information but as a powerful mechanism for expressing individual perspective. For this reason, one of the founders of modern functional linguistics, M.A.K. Halliday, defines language as a system of meaning used in social contexts. This approach provides a theoretical foundation for interpreting redundancy as a tool that reinforces social and interpersonal meaning within communication.<sup>7</sup>

English, with its analytic structure, expresses redundancy mainly at the syntactic and lexical levels. Constructions like “*I did see him*” add emphasis and convey emotional intensity, enriching speech both intonationally and stylistically. Redundancy also aids comprehension,

<sup>5</sup> Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman. – p.60.

<sup>6</sup> Miller, G. A. (1951). *Language and communication*. New York: McGraw-Hill. – p.60.

<sup>7</sup> Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold. – p.2.



helping listeners process information more easily, particularly in spoken discourse. Phonological repetition, as in “*never ever*”, enhances rhythm, melody, and expressive effect. Additionally, redundant forms can signal the speaker’s attitude or emotional state, as in “*I really, really mean it*”, demonstrating that language serves not only as a medium of information but also as a vehicle for emotional expression.

Uzbek, as a synthetic language, expresses redundancy mainly through morphological means, such as affixes and repetitive elements. For example, in “*Men o‘zim bordim*”, the word “*o‘zim*” is redundant grammatically but emphasizes the speaker’s personal involvement, adding stylistic and emotional weight. Scholars like S. Sultonsaidova and O. Sharipova highlight redundancy as a stylistic device, analyzing expressions such as “*shaxsan o‘zim aytdim*” and “*o‘zim shaxsan ko‘rdim*” to show its pragmatic and expressive functions.<sup>8</sup> Redundancy in Uzbek is also often socially conditioned. Phrases like “*hurmatli janoblar va xonimlar*” may be grammatically excessive in formal contexts, yet they serve an important social function, conveying respect, attention, and adherence to cultural conventions.

So, economy and redundancy are universal principles, shaped by language typology. In English, economy is realized through syntactic simplification, ellipsis, phonetic reductions, and abbreviations, while redundancy appears in lexical and syntactic repetition. In Uzbek, economy relies on morphological compactness and word formation, with redundancy expressed through repeated morphological units and socially conventional forms. Together, these principles ensure clarity, efficiency, and expressive depth in communication, reflecting cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural aspects of language.

#### References:

1. Abdurahmonov, G. (1996). *O‘zbek tilining morfologiyasi*. Tashkent: Fan.
2. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
3. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
5. Miller, G. A. (1951). *Language and communication*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
6. Rasulov, Z. I. (2024). Linguistic economy and systematic construction of language. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 4(04), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue04-10>
7. Sultonsaidova, S., & Sharipova, O. (2009). *O‘zbek tili stilistikasi*. Toshkent: Yurist-Media Markazi.

<sup>8</sup> Sultonsaidova, S., & Sharipova, O. (2009). *O‘zbek tili stilistikasi*. Toshkent: Yurist-Media Markazi. – p.88.

