

Semantic and Grammatical Features of Official Style in English And Uzbek Languages

Khayrullayeva Yulduz Jura kizi

Information Technologies and Management University, Assistant teacher, department of Filology, Uzbekistan

Received: 14 March 2026; **Accepted:** 02 April 2026; **Published:** 28 April 2026

Abstract: Official style has a significant function in administrative, legal, diplomatic, and institutional communication. This research explores the semantic, grammatical, and functional aspects of official style in English and Uzbek languages. Through comparative linguistic analysis, the study determines both similarities and differences in structural organization, lexical choice, and pragmatic features. The results reveal that both languages demonstrate common characteristics such as formality, accuracy, and standardization, while variations are observed in syntactic patterns, terminology, and cultural norms. This research enhances the understanding of official discourse from a cross-linguistic perspective.

Keywords: Official style, formal discourse, comparative linguistics, administrative language, formality, accuracy.

Introduction: Language serves as the main tool of communication in various spheres of social life. One of the most important functional styles of language is official style, which is widely used in administrative, legal, diplomatic, and institutional communication. Official style plays a crucial role in maintaining formal relations between institutions, organizations, and governments. In modern globalization processes, international cooperation and communication have expanded significantly. As a result, official documents, agreements, legal acts, and administrative texts are increasingly used in multilingual environments.

Therefore, studying official style features in different languages becomes essential for effective communication and translation. Official style is characterized by precision, clarity, objectivity, and neutrality. Unlike other functional styles, official language avoids emotional expressions, figurative language, and subjective opinions. Instead, it relies on standardized expressions, formal vocabulary, and structured organization. Many linguists have studied functional styles and official discourse. According to Galperin, official style represents one of the major functional styles characterized by standardization and formal vocabulary. Similarly, Vinogradov emphasized that official style performs administrative and legal

communication functions. In Uzbek linguistics, scholars such as Sh. Rahmatullayev and A. Nurmonov also examined official style features and administrative terminology. Their research highlights the importance of clarity and precision in official communication.

METHODOLOGY

This research applies qualitative comparative linguistic analysis. The study examines official texts in English and Uzbek languages to identify linguistic patterns and structural features. The following methods were used. Comparative method – comparing linguistic features of two languages, descriptive method – describing grammatical and semantic structures, discourse analysis – analyzing official communication patterns, functional analysis – identifying communicative purposes.

The research materials include:

- Government documents
- Official letters
- Legal texts
- Administrative announcements
- Institutional regulations

RESULTS

The analysis revealed several significant linguistic

features that characterize official style in both English and Uzbek languages. These features primarily relate to lexical choice, grammatical structure, and functional usage, all of which contribute to the overall formality, precision, and clarity of official discourse. One of the most distinctive characteristics of official style is the use of formal vocabulary and standardized expressions. In English official documents, a range of conventional lexical units is widely employed, including *hereby*, *pursuant to*, *in accordance with*, *aforementioned*, and *hereby declare*. These expressions function as legal and administrative markers that signal formality and institutional authority. They are often used in normative texts, contracts, and legal statements to ensure accuracy and eliminate ambiguity. Such lexical items are not only stylistically marked but also carry specific pragmatic functions. For instance, the use of *hereby* explicitly indicates the performative nature of a statement, while *pursuant to* and *in accordance with* establish a clear reference to legal or regulatory frameworks. As a result, these expressions enhance both the precision and the binding force of the text. Similarly, Uzbek official discourse relies on a set of standardized lexical units that perform equivalent functions. Commonly used expressions include *mazkur*, *ushbu*, *muvofig*, *belgilangan tartibda*, and *qaror qilinadi*. These lexical elements contribute to the formal tone of the text and ensure consistency across administrative and legal documents. For example, the use of *mazkur* and *ushbu* serves to specify referents clearly, while *muvofig* establishes logical and legal relationships between statements. Another important feature of official style in both languages is the avoidance of informal vocabulary, contractions, and emotionally colored expressions. Official discourse prioritizes neutrality and objectivity; therefore, expressive or subjective language is systematically excluded. Instead, preference is given to neutral, precise, and unambiguous lexical units that facilitate clear interpretation.

From a grammatical perspective, English official style is characterized by the frequent use of passive voice constructions. Sentences such as “The application shall be reviewed” and “The agreement was signed” illustrate the tendency to foreground the action rather than the agent. This grammatical strategy contributes to impersonality and objectivity, which are essential features of official discourse. By omitting or backgrounding the subject, passive constructions reduce subjectivity and emphasize procedural or institutional processes.

In contrast, Uzbek official texts predominantly employ impersonal constructions rather than passive forms in the strict grammatical sense. Examples such as “Ariza

ko‘rib chiqiladi” and “Qaror tasdiqlandi” demonstrate the use of generalized or agentless structures. These constructions serve a similar function to the English passive voice, namely, to eliminate explicit reference to the subject and to focus on the action itself. This reflects the typological characteristics of the Uzbek language, which favors predicate-centered sentence structures. In addition to voice and sentence structure, modality plays a crucial role in official discourse. English official texts frequently utilize modal verbs such as *shall*, *must*, and *may* to express obligation, necessity, and permission. These modal verbs are essential in legal and administrative contexts, as they define rights, duties, and procedural requirements. For example, *shall* is often used to indicate mandatory actions, while *may* expresses permission or possibility. Uzbek official style employs equivalent modal expressions, including *kerak*, *lozim*, and *mumkin*. These forms perform similar communicative functions by indicating obligation, necessity, or permissibility. Despite structural differences between the languages, the functional role of modality remains consistent, highlighting the universal importance of regulating actions and responsibilities in official communication.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study confirm that official style in both English and Uzbek languages demonstrates a set of universal linguistic characteristics that are typical of institutional and administrative communication. These include a high degree of standardization, lexical precision, grammatical regularity, and pragmatic neutrality. Such features ensure clarity, consistency, and legal validity of official texts, which are essential in formal communicative contexts. At the same time, the comparative analysis reveals a number of significant differences that reflect typological, structural, and cultural distinctions between the two languages. One of the most prominent differences lies in syntactic organization. English official discourse tends to rely heavily on passive voice constructions, which allow the speaker or writer to avoid explicit reference to the agent and emphasize the action itself. This feature is closely related to the tradition of impersonal and objective representation in English administrative and legal writing. In contrast, Uzbek official style predominantly employs impersonal and generalized verb forms rather than passive constructions in the strict grammatical sense. This reflects the agglutinative nature of the Uzbek language and its preference for predicate-centered sentence structures. As a result, while both languages aim to achieve objectivity and neutrality, they employ different grammatical mechanisms to do so. Another important distinction

concerns lexical composition and terminology. English official style is strongly influenced by Latin and French lexical borrowings, which historically entered the language through legal and administrative domains. Terms such as *pursuant*, *hereby*, and *aforementioned* exemplify this tendency and contribute to the formal and authoritative tone of the discourse. On the other hand, Uzbek official language relies more extensively on native lexical resources and standardized administrative expressions.

Although modern Uzbek also incorporates international terminology, especially in legal and economic contexts, there is a noticeable tendency to maintain linguistic authenticity and transparency through the use of indigenous lexical units. Pragmatic differences are also evident in the degree of explicitness and directness. English official texts tend to be relatively concise and direct, often prioritizing efficiency and brevity. Uzbek official discourse, by contrast, may include more elaborated expressions and formulaic constructions that reflect cultural norms of politeness, respect, and formality.

Furthermore, the study highlights the role of cultural and institutional factors in shaping official style. Language is not only a system of grammatical and lexical rules but also a reflection of social practices and communicative traditions. Therefore, differences in official discourse can be interpreted as manifestations of broader cultural and administrative conventions. From a theoretical perspective, the results of this study support the assumptions of functional stylistics and discourse analysis, which emphasize the relationship between language form and communicative function. Official style, as demonstrated in this research, is a highly regulated and purpose-oriented variety of language, where linguistic choices are determined by the need for clarity, precision, and institutional authority. The findings also have practical implications. A deeper understanding of official style features can significantly improve translation quality, especially in legal and administrative contexts. Translators must be aware not only of lexical equivalents but also of structural and pragmatic differences between languages. Failure to account for these factors may lead to misinterpretation or loss of meaning. In addition, the results are relevant for language teaching, particularly in the context of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and professional communication training. Learners need to develop not only general language competence but also the ability to use language appropriately in formal and institutional settings.

CONCLUSION

The present study has examined the semantic,

grammatical, and pragmatic features of official style in English and Uzbek languages from a comparative perspective. The analysis has demonstrated that, despite belonging to different language families and typological systems, both languages share a number of fundamental characteristics that define official discourse as a functional style. These shared features include a strong emphasis on precision, clarity, objectivity, and standardization. In both languages, official style is designed to ensure effective communication in administrative, legal, and institutional contexts, where accuracy and unambiguity are of paramount importance. At the same time, the study has identified several important differences. These differences are primarily observed in syntactic structures, lexical composition, and pragmatic conventions. English official style is characterized by extensive use of passive constructions and borrowed terminology, while Uzbek official discourse relies more on impersonal constructions and native lexical resources.

These findings highlight the importance of considering both universal and language-specific features in the study of official discourse. They also demonstrate that linguistic differences are closely connected to cultural, historical, and institutional factors. The research contributes to the fields of comparative linguistics, functional stylistics, and discourse analysis by providing a systematic and detailed examination of official style in two distinct languages. It also offers practical insights for translation studies, language teaching, and professional communication. However, the study has certain limitations. The analysis is based on a limited corpus of official texts, and further research could expand the dataset to include a wider range of genres and contexts. Additionally, future studies may explore cognitive, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic aspects of official discourse in greater depth.

REFERENCES

1. R. Galperin (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House.
2. Viktor Vinogradov (1955). *The Theory of Functional Styles*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. David Crystal (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Norman Fairclough (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
5. Geoffrey Leech (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
6. M. A. K. Halliday (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.