

## THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LEXICAL ECONOMY AND ITS EXPRESSION THROUGH STYLISTIC DEVICES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

*Abdusamatova Durdonaxon Sodiqjon qizi*  
*Department of Linguistics*  
*Faculty of Psychology and Foreign Languages*  
*Bukhara International University*

**Annotation.** This article explores the theoretical foundations of lexical economy and its realization through stylistic devices in English and Uzbek. Lexical economy is understood as the ability of language to convey a maximum amount of information with a minimum number of linguistic units. The study investigates the role of ellipsis, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, phraseological units, abbreviations, and conversion as principal mechanisms of semantic compression. The research demonstrates that despite belonging to different typological groups, English and Uzbek share a common tendency toward concise and semantically dense expression. At the same time, the structural realization of lexical economy is determined by the specific grammatical organization of each language. English, as an analytic language, frequently relies on conversion, abbreviation, and syntactic reduction, whereas Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, achieves economy through productive affixation and contextual omission. The findings confirm that stylistic devices perform not only expressive but also cognitive and communicative functions by increasing semantic density and enhancing pragmatic impact.

**Keywords:** lexical economy, stylistic devices, semantic compression, English, Uzbek, comparative stylistics, language economy.

**Introduction.** One of the universal properties of human language is the tendency to communicate as effectively as possible while minimizing effort. This principle is reflected in the concept of lexical economy, which refers to the use of limited linguistic means to express a broad range of meanings. In linguistic communication, speakers constantly seek concise forms that preserve informational content and pragmatic effectiveness. The study of lexical economy occupies an important place in modern stylistics, functional linguistics, and comparative linguistics. Stylistic devices are particularly significant because they condense descriptive and conceptual content into compact and expressive linguistic forms. Thus, lexical economy is not merely a matter of brevity; it is a sophisticated mechanism of semantic compression. This article aims to examine the theoretical foundations of lexical economy and analyze how stylistic devices contribute to this phenomenon in English and Uzbek.

**Theoretical Background.** The concept of lexical economy is closely associated with the linguistic theories of George Kingsley Zipf, who formulated the Principle of Least Effort. According to Zipf, language users tend to choose forms requiring the smallest amount of physical and mental effort while maintaining communicative success. André Martinet further developed this idea by arguing that language evolves according to the need to achieve maximum communicative effect with minimal formal means. His functional approach explains why languages naturally favor concise and efficient structures. I. R. Galperin emphasized that stylistic devices enhance not only expressiveness but also economy by compressing broad semantic content into short forms. Similarly, I. V. Arnold introduced the notion of semantic density, demonstrating that a single lexical unit can simultaneously carry denotative, connotative, emotional, and stylistic meanings. Stylistic Devices as Means of Lexical Economy.

Ellipsis is the omission of structurally predictable elements. English: “Coming?” (= Are you coming?) Uzbek: “Borasan?” (= Sen borasanmi?) In both examples, omitted elements are easily recovered from context, which reduces formal redundancy. Metaphor compresses complex conceptual relations into a concise image. English: “Time is money.” Uzbek: “Vaqt — oltin.”

These expressions summarize the value of time through highly condensed imagery. Metonymy substitutes one concept with another closely associated with it. English: “The White House announced...” Uzbek: “Oq uy bayonot berdi.” A long phrase such as “the representatives of the U.S. administration” is replaced by a single expression. Synecdoche uses part-whole substitution. English: “All hands on deck.” Uzbek: “Barcha qo‘llar ishga.” The word “hands” stands for “people,” creating semantic compression.

Phraseological Units Idioms encode complex pragmatic meanings in fixed expressions. English: “Break the ice.” Uzbek: “Muzni eritmoq.” Abbreviations such as NATO, UNESCO, and BMT reduce formal length. Conversion in English allows words to change grammatical function without additional morphemes (e.g., to email, to text).

Typological Features and Lexical Economy. English is an analytic language where grammatical relations are often expressed through word order and function words. Therefore, lexical economy is frequently achieved through conversion, abbreviation, and syntactic reduction.

Uzbek is an agglutinative language. Numerous grammatical meanings can be encoded in a single lexical form. Example: “Kelmabsan-da.” This single word conveys person, tense, negation, and speaker attitude, illustrating a high degree of morphological economy.

**Discussion.** The comparative analysis reveals that lexical economy is universal in function but language-specific in form. Both English and Uzbek employ stylistic

devices to enhance communicative efficiency, yet each language relies on its own structural resources. In English, the most productive mechanisms include conversion and abbreviations. In Uzbek, agglutinative morphology and contextual implication play a more significant role. Nevertheless, metaphor, ellipsis, and phraseological units are highly productive in both languages.

**Conclusion.** Lexical economy represents one of the most important organizing principles of language. Through stylistic devices, languages are able to condense broad conceptual and emotional content into concise, expressive forms. The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek demonstrates that despite typological differences, both languages employ similar communicative strategies to achieve semantic density and pragmatic effectiveness.

### References

1. Arnold, I. V. (1986). *The English Word*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
2. Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
3. Galperin, I. R. (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House.
4. Hojiyev, A. (2002). *O'zbek tili stilistikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
5. Martinet, A. (1962). *A Functional View of Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
6. Zipf, G. K. (1949). *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.