

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE OFFICIAL STYLE IN THE GERMAN AND  
UZBEK LANGUAGES**

**Isaeva Gulora Faxriddinovna**

Teacher of UzSWLU

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20008434>

**Abstract:** This article is dedicated to a comparative analysis of the functional-stylistic features of the official style in the German and Uzbek languages. The study comprehensively examines the role of the official style in state administration, legal, and diplomatic spheres, as well as its genre diversity and the linguistic norms characteristic of this style (impersonality, conciseness, logicality, and terminological standardization). The research classifies the individual and institutional forms of the official style and analyzes the syntactic and lexical structure of various document types. Furthermore, the scientific perspectives of Uzbek linguists (N. Mahmudov, E. Begmatov) and Russian scholars (E.P. Rashevskaya, G.P. Nesgovorova) are compared within the scope of the topic. The results of the research indicate that the official style is an essential tool for regulating socio-political and legal relations in society, distinguished by strict literary norms, logical consistency, and a high degree of formalization.

**Keywords:** official style, functional style, diplomatic correspondence, legal documents, linguistic norms, impersonality, terminological standardization, comparative linguistics.

Style is the differentiation of language based on the functions it performs in relation to specific spheres of human activity. In the process of communication across all spheres of life, individuals differ to some extent in their selection and application of lexical, phraseological, grammatical, and phonetic language tools. This selective utilization of language resources within the framework of a national language leads to the emergence of diverse forms of speech.

The style of speech is directly linked to the function of the language; for this reason, they are referred to as 'functional styles. A functional style is understood as an auxiliary system within a specific literary language, characterized by distinct features and scopes of usage that differentiate it from others. These are, in turn, categorized based on the primary functions of speech - namely, serving as a means for communication, information, and persuasion - into the following types: colloquial, official, scientific, publicistic, and artistic styles.

Official style is the manifestation of the modern Uzbek language within state-administrative and legal institutions, as well as in official diplomatic relations. Legislative texts, decrees, ordinances, orders-in short, all official documentation-are formulated in this style. This style possesses both oral and written forms; consequently, each of these forms adheres to its own specific norms.

The aforementioned norms are also characteristic of German official texts. In turn, the official style in the German language is defined by specific features such as impersonality, objectivity, conciseness, brevity, strict literary form, and clarity. According to E. Zakharova, the following forms of official style are distinguished in the German language:

- Written-monologic (in documents, administrative materials, protocols, etc.);

- Oral-monologic (in the speeches of officials);
- Oral-dialogic (in official communication).

The aforementioned forms of the official style constitute the norms characteristic of the German official style, in which the use of vocabulary typical of the colloquial style is inappropriate. Within the official style, a specific functional lexicon is observed depending on the document type: some components are purely German words, others are terms borrowed from foreign languages, and some are non-terminological clichés. For example, in the field of jurisprudence: *Strafverfahren* (criminal proceedings), *Urteil fallen* (to pass judgment), *Zeuge* (witness), *das Wort entziehen* (to withdraw the floor), *der Gerichtshof* (court of justice).

Thus, at the beginning of every official letter, message, or application, a brief description of the document's content is provided. For example: *Betreff: Urlaubsgesuch wegen dringender Familienangelegenheiten* (Leave application due to urgent family matters).

The final section of a document often lists the number of attached documents or enumerates them specifically, for example: *Geburtszeugnis* (birth certificate), *Leumundszeugnis* (certificate of good conduct/character reference), and *Reifezeugnis* (school leaving certificate/diploma).

Every protocol, based on a specific template, must utilize a distinct vocabulary. For instance, nouns such as *Protokoll über* (minutes of...), *anwesend* (present), *Teilnehmer* (participants), *Leitung* (chair/leadership), *Tagesordnung* (agenda), *Beginn* (start), *Verhandlungsablauf* (proceedings), *Beschluss* (resolution), and *Unterschrift des Protokollanten (Schriftführers)* (signature of the minute-taker/secretary). Furthermore, pronominal adverbs such as *hiermit* (hereby), *hiervon* (hereof/of this), and *hierfür* (for this) are characteristic of the official style:

- *Hiervon werden Sie rechtzeitig in Kenntnis gesetzt.* (You will be informed of this in due time.)
- *Hiermit bitten wir Sie ...* (We hereby request you to...)

The official style distinguishes itself within the system of functional styles through its specific communicative purpose. Its primary objective is to facilitate official oral and written communication between state agencies, administrative bodies, and public organizations at various levels, as well as between these entities and the general public. Similar to the Uzbek language, this style is manifested in legal documents, laws, decrees, statutes, diplomatic correspondence, judicial and commercial records, official statements, and other formal speech genres.

A number of linguists emphasize that the core stylistic features characteristic of the German official style include impersonality, thematic objectivity, conciseness, adherence to strict literary norms, and clarity.

Furthermore, one of the characteristic features of German official texts is the high frequency of nominalized compounds, extended attributive groups, and *um...zu* + infinitive constructions. Passive constructions serve to maintain the impersonality of the official text—meaning the active subject is not expressed in the sentence—which enhances objectivity.

In addition, abstract nouns formed with the suffixes *-ung*, *-heit*, *-keit* (e.g., *Entscheidung*, *Möglichkeit*, *Zuständigkeit*), verb-noun collocations that enhance semantic subtlety and formality (such as *zur Sprache bringen*, *Verwendung finden*, *Bericht erstatten*), and adverbs/prepositions like *vermittels*, *betreffs*, *gemäß*, *hiermit*, *hiervon* serve to increase formality, while sequentially enumerated units lend systemic organization and precision to the official text.

In Uzbek linguistics, it is observed that a nearly identical definition of the official style is provided. In particular, in the textbook *State Language Administration (Davlat tilida ish yuritish)* authored by N. Mahmudov, A. Rafiyev, and I. Yoldoshev, the official style is defined as follows:

“The official-administrative speech style is the style serving social and legal relations in society, as well as formal political-economic and cultural ties between states and within the state.” Indeed, the official-administrative style plays a crucial role in the activities of state, organizational, and public institutions. Consequently, this style is used to create legally binding documents, regulate communication, and facilitate systematic interaction between the state and its citizens.

It is also observed that in the book *Essays on Uzbek Speech Culture (O‘zbek nutqi madaniyati ocherklari)*, compiled by a team of authors led by E. Begmatov, it is noted that the official style serves social and legal relations in society, as well as specific official, political-economic, and formal socio-cultural relations between states.

This approach complements the aforementioned point and emphasizes that the official style encompasses not only legal documents but also documents in cultural and organizational spheres, while also highlighting that the scope of the official style is expanding and necessitates its application across various contexts.

A similar definition is provided in the study guide “*Types of Diplomatic Correspondence in the Official Style*” by M. Muhitdinova and N. Abdullayeva: “The official style is a speech style serving social and legal relations in society and mutual official interactions; it is distinguished from other styles by its documentary character”. This definition emphasizes the specific characteristic of documentation, which was not explicitly mentioned in the previous points. Indeed, the official style stands out from other styles precisely because it is formalized in the form of documents, based on normativity, and possesses legal force.

The definitions and characterizations provided for the official style clearly define the unique place of this functional style within the speech system. This style serves as a linguistic tool for formal interactions, regardless of the field of activity, social status, or professional affiliation of society members. Compared to other functional styles, the official style is distinguished by its significantly broader scope of application. Specifically, in the process of scientific activity - such as thesis defenses, scientific symposiums, conferences, and congresses - elements of official communication act as an important communicative component. This further demonstrates the multi-functionality and importance of the official style in social communication.

Another important aspect of the official style is its functioning in both individual and institutional (collective) forms. From this perspective, the official style is divided into two types:

1. Individual: Formal speech types generated by individuals (e.g., applications, receipts, wills, and formal statements).

2. Institutional: Speech units formalized on behalf of a team or institution (e.g., diplomatic correspondence, international treaties, decrees, declarations, etc.).

Both of the aforementioned forms are widely used, and this situation clarifies the socially coordinating function of the official style.

The official style manifests in two directions regarding its speech formation: oral and written. Nevertheless, this style is generally expressed through written documents, protocols, orders, and other genres of official documentation. This indicates the high significance of official correspondence and the document management system in societal life.

Furthermore, the official style is highly differentiated in terms of genre, encompassing various types of texts—normative-legal documents, official announcements, applications, diplomatic protocols, international agreements, decrees, and resolutions. The standardization of these genres based on stylistic criteria enables their effective use in official communication.

Another characteristic feature of the official style is its genre diversity. Within the system of functional styles of language, the official style is uniquely distinguished by the variety of its genre characteristics. It covers administrative business, diplomatic relations, and official

documents related to legislation. For this reason, various terms are used in sources to refer to this style, such as: official business style, official-administrative speech style, office work style, official document style, paperwork style, epistolary style, laws style. D. Babaxanova, reflecting on the usage of these various names, considers the designation “official-business style” (*rasmiy-ish uslubi*), utilized by the Russian scholar M.N. Kozhina, to be scientifically correct from both linguistic and linguopsychological perspectives.

Indeed, the genre diversity of the official style and the consequent formation of various types of texts within it, the use of specific lexical and grammatical units in each text, the high degree of syntactic standardization, and the simultaneous strict adherence to all norms of the literary language—all these factors indicate the considerable complexity of this style. Reflecting on this matter, Russian scholar G.P. Nesgovorova links the complexity of the official-business style to the diversity of its texts.

In her view, this diversity is multi-layered, involving the number of sub-styles and the difficulty in determining their boundaries or establishing conditional demarcations. The scholar observes that despite the complexity of the official-business style, a paradox is present: while the high level of formalization of materials, the distinct stratification of sub-styles, and the specificity of its composition are evident, these factors do not yield satisfactory outcomes. Consequently, she asserts that it is quite difficult to arrive at a precise and definitive characterization of the official-business style.

The functional capabilities of the official style are also extensive. The official style serves not only to record official communication between people but also to fulfill the task of conveying information regarding these interactions. This objective lies at the foundation of all official documents. For example, meeting minutes provide information about the issues set on the agenda, their discussion, and the decisions adopted. Even in an employment application, information regarding the applicant's intent is conveyed. Similarly, a text announcing the time of a conference provides information about that event.

In linguistics, the official style is studied by dividing it into internal sub-types based on its scope of application. In this regard, two primary types of the official style are distinguished:

- a) The style of legislative documents and documents related to diplomatic relations;
- b) The style of administrative (office) documents.

Reflecting on the linguistic features of official-administrative texts, the linguist N. Mahmudov noted objectivity as one of the most critical requirements for such documents. Furthermore, he emphasizes that administrative documents must meet the requirements of precision, conciseness, brevity, and semantic completeness.

Russian scholar E.P. Rashevskaya identified the following linguistic features of the official-business document style:

1. Formality, authenticity, and reserve;
2. Completeness of information in a clear and concise presentation;
3. Lack of emotionality, an official tone, and incompatibility with personal feelings or subjectivity;
4. Stereotypical nature of documents, implying that the official context requires the standardization and limitation of speech tools.

Another Russian scholar, G.P. Nesgovorova, highlighted the following aspects characteristic of business documents:

- Reliability and authenticity of content;
- Completeness of information;
- Brevity of expression without compromising content;
- Neutrality of tone in presentation;

- Logical assessment of facts and results;
- Absence of ambiguous expressions (avoidance of homonymy at all levels);
- Uniformity of speech tools and standardization of terminology.

Based on these views, it can be stated that in the approaches of both scholars, features such as formality, precision, and neutrality occupy a central place. However, while E.P. Rashevskaya places more emphasis on the stylistic and functional characteristics of the official style, G.P. Nesgovorova pays special attention to linguistic-syntactic and semantic precision, such as logical coherence, accuracy, the prevention of language errors, and the avoidance of homonymy.

### REFERENCES

1. Рашевская Е.П. Деловой русский язык. Учебное пособие. – Кострома, 2012. – С.8.
2. Ильмухаметов А.Г. Формирование и развитие официально-делового стиля башкирского литературного языка. Автореферат. – Уфа, 2005. – С.18.
3. Несговорова Г.П. Пособие по написанию разного рода деловых текстов [https://www.iis.nsk.su/files/item/sbor\\_kas\\_16\\_nesgovorova.pdf](https://www.iis.nsk.su/files/item/sbor_kas_16_nesgovorova.pdf).
4. Aminov M., Madvaliyev A., Mahkamov I., Mahmudov N. Ish yuritish. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2003. – B.15
5. Бабаханова Д.А. Официально-деловой стиль современного узбекского литературного языка: Автореф. канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1987. – С. 5.
6. Muhitdinova M., Abdullayeva N. Rasmiy uslubning diplomatik yozishmalar turi. – Toshkent, 1997. – B.56.
7. Lutfullayeva D.E. Mustaqillik davri rasmiy-idoraviy ish uslubi taraqqiyoti. Monografiya, – Toshkent, 2020. – B.6.
8. Учурова С.А., Луговых Е.В., Ильнер А.О. Grundlagen der deutschen Sprachtheorie: Lexikologie, Phonetik, Grammatik und Stilistik. Учебное пособие. – Екатеринбург, Издательство Уральского универ., 2018. – 244 с.
9. Захарова Е.А. Стилистика немецкого языка, 2013. – Бузулук. – С. 14-15.