

PRINCIPLES OF LINGUISTIC ECONOMY (ECONOMY OF LANGUAGE) IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK OFFICIAL SPEECH

Kaypanova Raushan Joldasbay qızı

1st-year Master's student

in Linguistics (English Language)

at Tashkent University of Humanities

Abstract. The thesis investigates principles of linguistic economy in English and Uzbek official speech, focusing on how brevity is achieved without sacrificing legal precision and procedural transparency. The aim is to compare economy strategies across levels of language and across document genres. Methods combine contrastive linguistics, discourse analysis, and functional stylistics. The novelty consists in proposing criteria that separate acceptable economy (standardized compression) from risky economy (ambiguity-producing reduction).

Keywords. linguistic economy; official discourse; administrative genre; standardization; textual compression; legal clarity; pragmatic implicature

Linguistic economy is traditionally described as a tendency of language users to minimize effort while preserving communicative effect; however, within official speech this tendency cannot be reduced to mere brevity because institutional communication is constrained by legal enforceability, procedural accountability, and the need for uniform interpretation. Therefore, economy in administrative genres is best understood as regulated compression, where shortened forms are acceptable only insofar as they remain compatible with documentary standards, explicitness requirements, and stable reference. In both English and Uzbek, official speech develops conventional means of saving linguistic resources, but the permissible degree and the preferred devices differ due to typological properties, codification practices, and genre expectations. The present thesis treats economy as a functional principle operating at multiple levels of language, and it proposes a contrastive account of how economy is realized and normatively evaluated in

English and Uzbek official speech.

A theoretical clarification is necessary because the notion of economy has been used in two partially competing senses: economy as reduction of linguistic material, and economy as system-level optimization that enhances processing and predictability [1]. In official speech the second sense is crucial: repetitive formulae, fixed collocations, and standardized layout may appear redundant, yet they reduce interpretive variability and thus function as an institutional economy of risk. This allows a central distinction for analysis: compression economy, which shortens expressions through ellipsis, abbreviation, nominalization, and syntactic condensation; and standardization economy, which stabilizes expressions through templates, set phrases, and terminological consistency. In English administrative discourse, standardization economy is strongly linked to bureaucratic drafting traditions and the presence of institutional style guides; in Uzbek official discourse it is closely connected to normative regulation of document language and to the role of standardized requisites and fixed expressions in correspondence and acts [4]. The analytical task is to show how both economies interact and where they conflict with clarity.

At the lexical level, English official speech uses economy through specialized terms, compound nouns, and conventional collocations that compress complex relations into compact nominal groups, such as “compliance framework,” “risk assessment,” or “data retention period.” Such units are economical because they encode established institutional concepts and allow rapid reference across documents. Yet lexical economy becomes problematic when institutional jargon produces opacity for non-experts, turning economy of form into cost of comprehension. Uzbek official speech, by contrast, often balances terminological compression with explanatory expansions, especially where a term is relatively new or where clarity for broader audiences is required. A notable economy device in Uzbek is the productive derivational system that forms abstract nouns and action nouns; these may reduce the need for periphrastic constructions but can also increase nominal density. Since Uzbek is agglutinative, lexical and morphological economy

interact: a single derived form can carry a meaning that in English would require a multiword expression. However, because official Uzbek aims at unambiguous reference, lexical economy is frequently supported by terminological standardization and by the preference for stable equivalents in institutional texts [4]. In both languages, economy at the lexical level is thus not simply shorter wording, but selection of conventional units that minimize the need for contextual negotiation.

Abbreviation is a prominent economy mechanism, particularly in English official communication where acronyms and initialisms are pervasive. Abbreviations reduce repetition and facilitate document navigation, but they introduce a dependency on shared knowledge and on explicit definition practices. In English drafting norms, an acronym is typically expanded at first mention, after which the abbreviated form is used; this is a compromise between economy and accessibility. Uzbek official texts also employ abbreviations, especially for institutional names and legal acts, but the norm tends to be more cautious in high-stakes documents where misinterpretation could arise. The comparative implication is that economy is not universal in its acceptability: the same abbreviation strategy may be considered efficient in an English internal memo but stylistically or legally risky in a public Uzbek administrative act. This difference reflects a broader principle: official speech constrains economy by the anticipated readership and by the interpretive consequences of ambiguity, which aligns with pragmatic accounts emphasizing cooperation and inferential load [2].

At the morphological level, English exhibits economy through reduced inflection and through the multifunctionality of forms, for example, the use of bare infinitives in directives and the wide applicability of noun modifiers. Such morphology supports compact noun phrases and reduces explicit marking that would otherwise lengthen structures. Uzbek, conversely, can encode relations economically via case markers, possessive suffixes, and participial constructions; these enable dense packaging of dependencies within a single syntactic unit. Yet this density may increase processing load, especially when multiple suffixes stack and when long attributive chains precede a head noun. The economy principle here is

ambivalent: morphologically compact expressions are short in word count, but not necessarily economical in cognitive effort. Therefore, in official Uzbek, drafting practices often limit excessive suffix stacking by distributing information across clauses or by using more explicit analytic constructions when clarity requires it. This supports the broader view that economy in official speech must be evaluated by a dual metric: reduction of material and preservation of interpretability.

Syntactic economy is among the most visible contrasts between English and Uzbek official styles. English official documents frequently employ nominalization, passive voice, and prepositional phrases to condense actions into abstract entities, enabling compact referencing and a detached tone. For example, nominalizations allow the text to treat processes as objects that can be “subject to,” “in accordance with,” or “pursuant to” other provisions. This yields a high density of content words and a predictable syntactic patterning that supports scanning and cross-referencing. However, extensive nominalization can obscure agency and responsibility, which is a recognized risk in bureaucratic language, potentially undermining the transparency required in administrative communication [3]. Uzbek official discourse likewise uses nominal forms and participial clauses, but it often maintains clearer alignment between agent and action through explicit subject marking or conventional directive constructions. Because Uzbek allows subordinate relations to be expressed through participles and converbs, it can compress multiple propositions into a single sentence; yet excessively long sentences may conflict with contemporary recommendations for readability in official writing.

Ellipsis and omission represent a delicate economy strategy in official speech. In everyday conversation, ellipsis relies on shared situational context, but official documents cannot assume the same contextual availability; their meaning must remain stable across time, reproduction, and institutional transfer. Consequently, English official speech tends to use controlled ellipsis, primarily within fixed formulae, headings, and forms, where the layout supplies missing elements. Uzbek official texts similarly exploit form-based economy, especially in templates where requisites are predictable and the genre defines interpretive conventions. Here

economy is achieved not by linguistic deletion alone but by the interaction of language with document architecture: tables, fields, and standardized requisites carry information economically. This supports the claim that economy in official speech is partly multimodal and procedural, and that purely linguistic analysis must be complemented by genre and document studies.

Textual economy concerns how information is organized across the document. English official documents often prioritize modularity: sections, clauses, and enumerated items allow reuse and cross-reference, which reduces repetition. Although such structuring can increase length, it is economical in institutional processing because it supports citation, amendment, and selective reading. Uzbek official documents also employ modular organization, but the degree of internal cross-referencing may be shaped by local standards and the conventional structure of acts, orders, and letters. In both traditions, economy appears as a tension between the desire to avoid repetition and the need to restate key conditions to prevent misinterpretation. The functionalist perspective suggests that some repetition is not waste but a safeguard; thus, an adequate model of economy must treat redundancy as sometimes purposeful and institutionally rational [1]. This is especially relevant where documents must be interpreted by different offices, by courts, or by citizens without specialized training.

A contrastive synthesis can be formulated through criteria for acceptable economy in official speech. First, economy is acceptable when it is standardized, meaning that the shortened form has stable institutional recognition and a conventional interpretation. Second, economy is acceptable when it is recoverable, meaning that the document provides explicit definitions, references, or structural cues enabling the reader to reconstruct the intended meaning. Third, economy is acceptable when it is non-competitive, meaning that it does not introduce alternative plausible readings in the relevant legal or administrative context. Applying these criteria, English acronym-heavy drafting is acceptable in contexts with established definition conventions and specialized readership; it becomes problematic when acronyms are undefined or when multiple expansions exist. Uzbek morphological

compression is acceptable when suffix chains remain within familiar patterns and do not obscure role relations; it becomes risky when dense participial constructions create attachment ambiguities. These observations align with pragmatic and cognitive accounts: the cost saved in production may be shifted to interpretation unless conventions and structures compensate [2; 3].

Methodologically, the contrastive analysis of economy benefits from treating official speech as a system of genres rather than a single monolith. Orders, regulations, contracts, certificates, and official letters differ in how they balance brevity and explicitness. For instance, a certificate may maximize template-based economy, while a regulation may prioritize definitional clarity and controlled repetition. Therefore, economy is genre-relative: the same linguistic device may be economical in one genre and inappropriate in another. This genre sensitivity is particularly important for Uzbek official speech, where document requisites and formulaic openings and closings are strongly conventionalized and where deviations may be perceived as nonstandard. In English, genre conventions are also powerful, but institutional diversity produces a wider variation in drafting style between organizations. Hence, comparative conclusions must be framed as tendencies under genre constraints, not as absolute properties of the languages.

Conclusion. The analysis demonstrates that linguistic economy in English and Uzbek official speech is best conceptualized as regulated compression constrained by interpretive stability. English tends to realize economy through nominal group condensation, terminological compaction, and acronym-based reduction supported by definition conventions and modular document design. Uzbek tends to realize economy through derivational and agglutinative resources, template-based standardization, and genre-specific formulae that stabilize meaning across documents. In both languages, economy is acceptable when it is standardized, recoverable, and non-competitive, and it becomes risky when brevity increases ambiguity, obscures agency, or shifts interpretive burden onto the reader. The comparative model proposed in this thesis clarifies the boundary between efficient institutional brevity and clarity-threatening reduction, offering a functional basis for

improving drafting practices in both English and Uzbek official communication.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Qilichev E. Hujjatchilik va rasmiy nutq madaniyati. Toshkent, O'qituvchi, 2010. 176 b.
2. Mahmudov N. O'zbek tilining rasmiy-idoraviy uslubi. Toshkent, Fan, 2001. 192 b.
3. Martine A. Économie des changements phonétiques. Berne, A. Francke AG Verlag, 1955. 330 p.
4. Sapir E. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921. 258 p.
5. Grice H. P. Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1989. 406 p.
6. Galperin I. R. Stylistics. Moscow, Vysshaya shkola, 1981. 334 p.