

**CROSS-LINGUISTIC VARIATIONS IN REDUNDANCY EXPRESSION: ENGLISH-
UZBEK FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES****Rasulov Zubaydullo Izomovich**

Doctor of Science, Professor. Bukhara state university.

Bukhara, Uzbekistan.

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0554-1319

email: z.i.rasulov@buxdu.uz**Oripova Sabrina Jalol qizi**

II year student of master degree

oripovas116@gmail.com<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17863807>

Annotation. This article explores redundancy in language as a functional and typologically conditioned phenomenon. By analyzing English examples and considering implications for morphologically rich languages such as Uzbek, the study highlights redundancy's roles in grammar, lexicon, and discourse. Redundancy is presented as a communicative strategy that enhances clarity, cognitive processing, and stylistic emphasis, rather than as mere repetition. The article integrates functional, typological, and cognitive perspectives, offering personal analytic reflections alongside evidence from established linguistic research.

Keywords: Redundancy, linguistic economy, grammatical concord, lexical pleonasm, morphological typology, functional linguistics, cognitive processing, stylistic expression.

Introduction. Language is an intricate system that balances efficiency with clarity. At first glance, certain constructions in English may appear redundant, with repeated markers, auxiliary verbs, and overlapping temporal or grammatical cues. However, a closer examination reveals that these repetitions serve critical functions: they reinforce meaning, prevent misinterpretation, and support cognitive processing.

In English, redundancy is observable in multiple forms, from subject-verb agreement to the presence of temporal adverbs alongside verb morphology. Reading such constructions, redundancy can not be viewed as a flaw, but as a deliberate communicative strategy, ensuring that meaning is transmitted clearly even in complex sentences or ambiguous contexts.

Languages with rich morphological systems, such as Uzbek, often encode grammatical information within single morphemes, reducing the need for overt repetition. Yet redundancy persists through stylistic devices, rhetorical repetition, and discourse strategies, indicating that it is a universal communicative tool that adapts to different structural constraints.

Redundancy in English is evident across grammatical, lexical, and stylistic levels. At the grammatical level, argument concord provides a clear example: in “*The student walks to the library every day*”, the suffix *-s* redundantly marks third-person singular, despite the singular subject *student*.

While seemingly repetitive, this redundancy enhances clarity, particularly in spoken language where context alone may not suffice for disambiguation.¹ Temporal redundancy also plays a similar role. For instance, in “*She had left yesterday*”, both the auxiliary *had* and the temporal adverb *yesterday* reinforce past time reference.

¹ Leufkens, S. C. (2020). A functionalist typology of redundancy. *Revista da ABRALIN*. – p.86

Reflecting on such structures, redundancy can be found to provide cognitive scaffolding, supporting comprehension under conditions of ambiguity or increased processing load.²

Lexical and stylistic redundancy further illustrates the functional nature of repetition.

Pleonastic expressions like *true fact* or *past history* emphasize meaning rather than merely repeating information.³

Stylistic redundancy in academic writing — such as repeated modifiers (*clearly evident*, *absolutely necessary*) — serves rhetorical and emphatic purposes, maintaining cohesion and highlighting salient points.⁴ So, we can find that these forms of redundancy guide the reader's attention, reinforce argumentation, and improve textual clarity.

The interplay of redundancy and morphological typology offers additional insight.

Languages with rich morphology, such as Uzbek, may encode information efficiently within single morphemes, reducing the need for overt grammatical redundancy.⁵ However, redundancy may persist through lexical repetition, discourse-level reiteration, or stylistic emphasis. Reflecting on these patterns, I hypothesize that while Uzbek may not require overt grammatical concord in the same way English does, functional redundancy still exists to ensure clarity, manage emphasis, and support comprehension. This perspective aligns with the dialectical view of redundancy and economy proposed by Isayeva, suggesting that what appears redundant in one context may be functionally necessary in another.⁶

Typological evidence supports this distinction so that languages with complex morphological systems tend to rely less on rigid word order, while analytic languages compensate for their lack of morphological marking with greater syntactic redundancy.

Reflecting on English and Uzbek, this suggests that redundancy adapts to structural resources: in English, multiple overt markers enhance robustness, whereas in Uzbek, redundancy may emerge more subtly, through optional markers, repetition for emphasis, or discourse strategies.⁷

From a cognitive viewpoint, redundancy plays an important role in making linguistic input easier to learn and mentally process. Research such as that by Mahowald et al. indicates that when multiple grammatical signals point to the same interpretation, listeners and readers understand sentences more efficiently. This effect is especially noticeable in structures that deviate from the most typical patterns of a language, where additional cues help guide interpretation, reduce ambiguity, and lighten the cognitive load. In this way, redundant features function as supportive scaffolding, reinforcing meaning and ensuring that even complex or unexpected constructions remain accessible to language users.⁸

Observing this leads to the fact that redundancy serves not only structural clarity but also cognitive efficiency, reducing the likelihood of misinterpretation.

² Mahowald, K., Diachek, E., Gibson, E., Fedorenko, E., & Futrell, R. (2022). Grammatical cues to subjecthood are redundant in a majority of simple clauses across languages. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12911> - p.4

³ Wit, E.-J. C., & Gillette, M. (1999). What is linguistic redundancy? Technical report. - p.12

⁴ Tikhonova, E., & Zavolskaya, O. (2025). Stylistic redundancy and wordiness in introductions of original empirical studies: rhetorical risks of academic writing. *Journal of Language and Education*. <https://jle.hse.ru/article/view/27389>

⁵ Karimov, A. (2008). *Morphological structure of Uzbek verbs*. Tashkent: Fan Publishing. - p.23–27

⁶ Isayeva, S. I. G. (2023). Redundancy and economy as a dialectical manifestation of language units. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 6(1), 531.

⁷ Filippova, O. (2023). Cluster implementation of functions of redundancy means in fiction text. *Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://www.scienceproblems.uz/index.php/journal/article/view/1304>

⁸ Mahowald, K., Diachek, E., Gibson, E., Fedorenko, E., & Futrell, R. (2022). Grammatical cues to subjecthood are redundant in a majority of simple clauses across languages – p.5

In practical terms, redundancy provides multiple channels through which meaning can be recovered, whether through morphology, syntax, or discourse.

Finally, redundancy functions rhetorically and stylistically. Lexical and discourse-level repetition in both English and Uzbek contributes to cohesion, emphasis, and persuasive force.

Academic writing often makes purposeful use of redundancy to strengthen the presentation of complex ideas and ensure that readers can follow the progression of arguments with clarity. Strategic repetition of key terms, concepts, or structural patterns helps maintain coherence across lengthy discussions and reduces the cognitive effort required to interpret dense information. In this sense, redundancy is not merely an excess of language, but a functional tool that supports comprehension, reinforces thematic continuity, and highlights the logical architecture of the text. Operating simultaneously at structural, cognitive, and rhetorical levels, redundancy contributes significantly to the effectiveness and intelligibility of scholarly discourse.

Conclusion. Redundancy is a functionally adaptive feature of language rather than mere repetition. In English, it manifests grammatically, lexically, and stylistically, supporting clarity, comprehension, and rhetorical effect. Typological theory and morphological considerations suggest that languages like Uzbek may exhibit less overt grammatical redundancy, but redundancy remains present in discourse and stylistic strategies. My reflections indicate that redundancy is both structurally and functionally motivated, facilitating communication across diverse contexts. Future corpus-based and experimental research, especially cross-linguistic studies involving Uzbek, would provide empirical evidence to substantiate these theoretical insights and further illuminate how redundancy adapts to different language structures.

References:

1. Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
2. Comrie, B. (1981). *The languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Filippova, O. (2023). Cluster implementation of functions of redundancy means in fiction text. *Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://www.scienceproblems.uz/index.php/journal/article/view/1304>
4. Isayeva, S. I. G. (2023). Redundancy and economy as a dialectical manifestation of language units. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 6(1).
5. Karimov, A. (2008). *Morphological structure of Uzbek verbs*. Tashkent: Fan Publishing.
6. Leufkens, S. C. (2020). A functionalist typology of redundancy. *Revista da ABRALIN*, 19 (3).
7. Mahowald, K., Diachek, E., Gibson, E., Fedorenko, E., & Futrell, R. (2022). Grammatical cues to subjecthood are redundant in a majority of simple clauses across languages. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.12911>
8. Tikhonova, E., & Zavolskaya, O. (2025). Stylistic redundancy and wordiness in introductions of original empirical studies: rhetorical risks of academic writing. *Journal of Language and Education*. <https://jle.hse.ru/article/view/27389>
9. Wit, E.-J. C., & Gillette, M. (1999). What is linguistic redundancy? Technical report. <https://www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf>
10. Wolf, L., Pimentel, T., Fedorenko, E., Cotterell, R., Warstadt, A., Wilcox, E., & Regev, T. (2023). Quantifying the redundancy between prosody and text. *arxiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17233>

11. Izomovich, R. Z. (2025, May). COGNITIVE ASPECTS OF SOCIAL STATUS IN LANGUAGE. In *CONFERENCE OF MODERN SCIENCE & PEDAGOGY* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 400-403).
12. Izomovich, R. Z. (2025). LINGUISTIC INFLUENCES ON NON-LINGUISTIC THOUGHT. *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING*, 3(8), 489-492.
13. Izomovich, R. Z., & Shavkatovich, S. Z. (2025). THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE ACQUISITION IN LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING. *INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENTS AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION*, 3(35), 345-350.
14. Izomovich, R. Z. (2022). On the Basis of Information-Discursive Analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies*, 18.
15. Izomovich, R. Z. (2024). PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF SOCIAL STATUS. *PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS*, 4(39), 53-56.
16. Sharipov, M. M. M., & Rasulov, Z. I. (2020). THE EFFECT OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL LEVEL OF ECONOMY ON LANGUAGE CHANGES. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (6), 127-130.
17. Yuldasheva, F. (2024). Gricean maxims of conversational cooperation. *Models and Methods in Modern Science*, 3(3), 57-61.
18. Erkinovna, Y. F. (2022). Politeness strategies. In *Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes* (pp. 80-82).
19. Yuldasheva, F. E., & Gulomov, S. (2022). POLITENESS LANGUAGE PATTERNS IN REQUEST. In *International journal of conference series on education and social sciences (Online)* (Vol. 2, No. 1).
20. Yuldasheva, F. (2021). The Expression of Politeness Category in The Uzbek And English Languages. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. Uz)*, 1(1).
21. Yuldasheva, F. (2025). POLITENESS RESEARCH IN PRAGMATICS. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(4), 822-826. Retrieved from <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/ijai/article/view/99048>
22. Erkinovna, Y. F. (2024). FACTORS FORMING THE DISCOURSE CONTENT OF THE MAXIM OF SYMPATHY. *Science and innovation*, 3(Special Issue 19), 425-427.