

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ELLIPSIS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK ACROSS FUNCTIONAL STYLES

Annamuratova Maftuna Orifjon qizi

Master Student, UzSWLU, Tashkent

E-mail: abdumalikovamaftuna447@gmail.com

Islom Minniqulov

Scientific Advisor, PhD, UzSWLU

Annotation. The paper examines the structural and semantic features of ellipsis, the omission of linguistically recoverable items from context, in English and Uzbek. It discusses its realization in functional styles like journalism, science, and everyday communication, indicating convergences and divergences in ellipsis use. Text data are compared in the research to determine how functional style determines the use of ellipsis in the two languages, the synergy of syntax, pragmatics, and stylistic factors being disclosed.

Keywords: Ellipsis, Syntax, Pragmatics, Functional Styles, English, Uzbek, Comparative Linguistics, Omission, Context, Discourse Analysis

Ellipsis, the purposive omission of recoverable linguistic content, is a feature of efficient and contextually appropriate communication [2]. Although found everywhere in all languages, its specific realization is molded by a language's structural characteristics, pragmatic conventions, and functional pressures. This article is a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek ellipsis, juxtaposing how its realization varies in functional styles, illuminating the two languages. This assists in the easier comprehension of languages as well as reducing communication errors in both English and Uzbek languages.

English and Uzbek, as typologically disparate languages, both exhibit intense ellipsis. English, an SVO language, with gapping, stripping, and verb phrase ellipsis as customary means of elision [6]. Uzbek, which is predominantly SOV, illustrates subject and object ellipsis based on poor morphology. The present comparative analysis, based on data collected from journalistic texts, scientific papers, and samples of spontaneous speech in both languages, offers an insight into each style.

Ellipsis can be explained only from a multifaceted perspective. Deletion transformations from a generative perspective account for elliptical elements through the hypothesis that full structures are created before undergoing deletion [1]. Functional linguistics emphasizes ellipsis's communicative function and contextual appropriateness, the purpose of which is to bring about coherence and ease of fluency through the omission of redundant information [5]. Cognitive linguistics deals with how shared knowledge influences the hearer, presuming the ability of the audience to recall preceding references or ideas in discourse. This article will integrate all three perspectives.

Languages employ ellipsis differently. "Pro-drop" languages like Spanish more readily omit subject pronouns because verbal inflection by itself marks person and number. Topic-prominent languages, i.e., Japanese, can omit subjects according to topical information, relying on shared contextual information to infer who or what is being talked about. A cross-linguistic approach is thus helpful to understand ellipsis and prevents confusion during the translation of the texts from source to target languages [3].

English ellipsis includes:

- Gapping: "John likes tea, Mary coffee." (Instead of "John likes tea, and Mary likes coffee.")
- Stripping: "I like tea, and Mary too." (Instead of "I like tea, and Mary likes tea too.") This emphasizes similarity.
- Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE): "Will you drink it? Yes, I will." (Instead of "Yes, I will drink it.") This is a brief response.
- Nominal Ellipsis: "I'll take the red one, please." (omitting "car," but implicitly presupposing that the topic is cars)

Uzbek has subject, object, and copula ellipsis, frequently exploiting the richness of its morphology [4]. Note:

- Subject Ellipsis: "Kitobni o'qidim." ("Kitobni men o'qidim" is non-elliptical)
- Object Ellipsis: A: "Nima o'qiyapsiz?" B: "Kitob" (What are you reading? B: "A book"). The verb is omitted.
- Copula Ellipsis: "Men talaba" ("I [am] student"), omitting the verb "bo'lmoq" (to be), with the complete sentence being "Men talaba bo'lmoq"

Semantic recovery of the ellipses requires several things. There is mutual knowledge and understanding between the speaker and hearer from previous conversation. The antecedent must be available so the missing things are obvious. Context should reinforce the ellipses, not confuse the meaning.

Across the languages, different functional styles bring about different uses of ellipses. In ordinary conversation, economy and informality are favored. For example:

- English: "See you later!" (leaving out the subject and the verb "I will")
- Uzbek: "Xayr!" (leaving out "ko'rishguncha" – "until we see each other").

In scientific writing, clearness and precision are of more importance, minimizing the occurrence of ellipsis:

- English: Scientific articles typically avoid ellipsis to prevent ambiguity, and complete sentences are written to make meaning as clear as possible.
- Uzbek: The same, with the extra caution of using technical terms that have been previously defined in the document.

Even in legal texts, ellipsis may be used strategically for obfuscation or implicature: "So too," may mean "so too, I agree," or "so too, I'll join you in your conspiracy." Meaning may depend on who is speaking, but such implications may have legal explication,

Consider journalistic headlines:

- English: "President Visits Flood-Stricken Area." (omitting verbs to save space)
- Uzbek: "[Prezident] suv toshqini bo'lgan hududga tashrif buyurdi" (omitting 'The' or 'A', as relevant).

In summary, this comparative research enriches English and Uzbek linguistics with knowledge about their peculiar and shared characteristics in forming texts that are easily perceived by readers or listeners. Being common to the two languages and extending to many functional styles, it remains a topical problem in linguistics. Further research can explore these areas further, considering how computational linguistics can be utilized to process ellipses more effectively. Further research in cross-linguistic communication between English and Uzbek speakers can reduce errors in translation.

References

1. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.
2. Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
3. Huang, Y. (2000). *Anaphora: A cross-linguistic study*. Oxford University Press.
4. Karimov, G. (2000). *O'zbek tilining grammatikasi*. Toshkent: Sharq.
5. Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. Longman.
6. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.