SYSTEMATIC FEATURES OF PHONETIC SPELLING AND SOUND IMITATIVE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Abidova Shohida Murodovna
Master's degree student of Foreign Languages and Social Sciences, Asia International University, Uzbekistan.
E-mail: abidovashoxida04091986@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21217491

Abstract: This thesis investigates the systematic features of phonetic spelling and sound-imitative (onomatopoeic) vocabulary in English and Uzbek. It shows that, despite belonging to unrelated language families, both languages organize their sound-imitative lexicons around recurring, rule-governed formal devices rather than arbitrary spelling. English relies chiefly on ablaut reduplication, phonaestheme-bearing consonant clusters, and zero-derivation of imitative words into verbs, while Uzbek relies on exact and modified root reduplication together with a productive imitative verb-forming suffix, supported by a largely phonemic orthography. The comparison points to a shared substratum of acoustic iconicity across the two languages alongside clearly language-specific structural implementations, with practical implications for translation, lexicography, and language teaching.

Key words: onomatopoeia; sound symbolism; phonetic spelling; reduplication; phonaestheme; Uzbek; English; sound-imitative words.

Introduction

Sound and spelling stand in a complicated relationship in every alphabetic writing system. Ordinary orthography is built to encode phonemic contrasts, yet a distinct and largely unstandardized layer of vocabulary — phonetic or sound-imitative words — is built instead to encode the impression of a sound itself. Onomatopoeic and sound-symbolic words are those whose form is felt by speakers to resemble, however loosely, the acoustic event they denote: the bark of a dog, the crash of glass, the buzz of an insect. Because these words aim at iconicity rather than at ordinary lexical contrast, they frequently exploit spelling conventions, sound clusters, and repetition patterns that are marginal or absent elsewhere in the lexicon. This thesis examines the systematic, rule-governed features of phonetic spelling and sound-imitative vocabulary in English and Uzbek, two typologically distant languages, in order to identify which properties of onomatopoeic word-formation are shared as apparent universals of sound symbolism and which are shaped by the particular phonological and orthographic systems of each language.

The relevance of this comparison lies in the fact that sound-imitative vocabulary is often treated as a peripheral, unsystematic curiosity in grammar and lexicology, when in fact it displays clear internal regularities: recurring consonant and vowel patterns associated with particular semantic classes of sound, productive reduplication patterns, and characteristic morphological behavior distinguishing these words from the ordinary lexicon. Establishing these regularities contrastively for English and Uzbek contributes both to general theories of sound symbolism and to practical fields such as translation, lexicography, and language teaching, where onomatopoeic vocabulary is a persistent source of difficulty because it resists straightforward one-to-one correspondence between languages.

1. Theoretical background: phonetic spelling and sound symbolism

Sound symbolism refers to a non-arbitrary association between the phonetic form of a word and an aspect of its meaning, most saliently found in onomatopoeia, where the word is felt to imitate an actual sound. Linguists commonly distinguish onomatopoeia proper, in which the referent is itself an acoustic event, from a broader phenomenon known as ideophones or expressive vocabulary, in which sound is used impressionistically to evoke manner, texture, or intensity without a literal acoustic

referent. Both English and Uzbek possess rich inventories of the first type and a smaller, more debated set of the second.

Phonetic spelling, in this context, denotes the practice by which a language's orthography represents these iconic words using letter combinations, doubled consonants, or non-standard clusters that depart from the spelling conventions used for the ordinary lexicon, precisely in order to visually reinforce the impression of the sound being imitated. In English this includes devices such as repeated final consonants (buzz, hiss), consonant clusters associated with abruptness (crack, snap, click), and vowel alternation used to encode variation in pitch or manner (ding-dong, tick-tock). In Uzbek, phonetic spelling of sound-imitative words relies heavily on reduplication of the whole root or of a modified copy of the root, together with a comparatively transparent, phonemic orthography that renders imitative consonant clusters, such as sharp affricates and sibilants, directly visible in the spelling.

2. Systematic features of sound-imitative vocabulary in English

English onomatopoeic vocabulary shows several recurring formal patterns. First, word-final consonant clusters and geminate-like spellings recur across semantic classes of sound: buzz, hiss, and fizz share final voiced or voiceless sibilants associated with continuous, friction-based sounds, while bang, clang, and crash share nasal-plus-stop or stop-plus-fricative endings associated with sudden, abrupt sounds. Second, English productively uses ablaut reduplication, in which a base consonant frame is repeated with a systematic vowel change, typically moving from a high front vowel to a back vowel, as in ding-dong, tick-tock, ping-pong, and flip-flop; this pattern is so regular that the vowel order itself is treated as a near-obligatory rule of English phonology rather than a lexical accident. Third, a smaller set of words uses full or rhyming reduplication for continuous or repetitive sounds, such as pitter-patter and clip-clop, again showing internal phonological patterning rather than arbitrary repetition.

A further systematic feature is the association of certain consonants with specific acoustic qualities across many unrelated onomatopoeic words, a pattern sometimes called phonaesthesia: initial /gl-/ in words such as glitter and glow is associated with light rather than sound, while initial /sn-/ in sniff, snort, and snarl is associated with nasal or contemptuous sounds, and initial /sl-/ in slide, slither, and slosh is associated with smooth or wet movement. Although these phonaestheme patterns extend beyond strict onomatopoeia into wider sound symbolism, they demonstrate that English sound-imitative and sound-suggestive vocabulary is organized around recurrent, partially productive form–meaning correspondences rather than isolated exceptions.

3. Systematic features of sound-imitative vocabulary in Uzbek

Uzbek shows a different, though equally systematic, set of formal devices for encoding imitated sound. The dominant strategy is reduplication, both exact and partial. Exact reduplication of a monosyllabic or disyllabic root is used productively for continuous or repeated sounds, as in taq-taq for a repeated knocking sound, gup-gup for a dull repeated thud, and shiq-shiq for a repeated creaking or clicking sound. Partial reduplication, in which the root is repeated with a modified initial consonant, often following the productive Turkic pattern of replacing the initial consonant with /p/ or /m/, is used to generalize or intensify the imitated sound, as seen in patterns such as taq-tuq for varied irregular knocking.

A second systematic feature is the productive use of the sound-imitative verb-forming suffix, by which an imitative root is converted into a fully inflectable verb denoting the act of producing that sound, as in the derivation of shaqillamoq from the imitative root shaq, denoting a sharp clicking or cracking sound, or taraqlamoq from taraq, denoting a rattling or knocking sound. This derivational pattern is highly regular and applies across a large class of imitative roots, giving Uzbek a systematic morphological mechanism for integrating sound-imitative material into ordinary predicate structure, a mechanism less grammaticalized in English, where onomatopoeic words are typically converted to verbs by simple zero-derivation, as in to buzz or to click, without a dedicated derivational suffix.

At the phonetic level, Uzbek sound-imitative roots draw heavily on affricates and sibilants, such as sh, ch, and q, reflecting the perceptual salience of these sounds for representing friction, impact, and sharpness, and the largely phonemic character of Uzbek orthography ensures that these consonants

are spelled consistently across the imitative lexicon, without the spelling ambiguity that affects comparable English sequences.

4. Comparative analysis

Comparing the two systems reveals both convergence and divergence. At the level of underlying motivation, both languages associate voiceless sibilants and affricates with sharp, sudden, or friction-based sounds, and both associate nasal and low-vowel sequences with dull or heavy sounds, suggesting a shared, plausibly universal layer of acoustic iconicity that is independent of genetic or areal relationship between English and Uzbek. At the level of formal implementation, however, the two languages differ sharply in their preferred structural device: English favors ablaut reduplication with a fixed vowel-alternation template and phonaestheme-based consonant clusters embedded within otherwise ordinary word shapes, while Uzbek favors root reduplication, exact or modified, combined with a dedicated derivational suffix that regularly converts imitative roots into verbs.

A further point of contrast concerns orthographic transparency. Because English spelling is only partially phonemic, the same sound-imitative effect can be represented by several competing spellings, and speakers sometimes introduce non-standard letter doubling purely for expressive emphasis, as in the informal lengthening of buzz to buzzzz. Uzbek orthography, being far more consistently phonemic, offers less scope for such expressive respelling, so intensification of an imitated sound in Uzbek is achieved primarily through reduplication or through additional derivational morphology rather than through altered spelling. This difference has direct implications for translation and lexicography: translators rendering English onomatopoeia into Uzbek must typically substitute an entirely different structural device, most often reduplication, rather than attempting a phonetic transliteration, while the reverse direction often requires converting an Uzbek reduplicated or suffixed imitative verb into an English zero-derived verb or a descriptive periphrasis.

Conclusion

Phonetic spelling and sound-imitative vocabulary in English and Uzbek are not random or peripheral curiosities but rule-governed subsystems of each language's lexicon and morphology. Both languages exploit a broadly similar set of acoustic associations between particular consonants and particular categories of sound, pointing toward a shared substratum of sound symbolism. At the same time, each language channels this symbolism through its own preferred structural devices: English relies on ablaut reduplication, phonaestheme-bearing consonant clusters, and zero-derivation into verbs, while Uzbek relies on exact and modified root reduplication together with a productive imitative verb-forming suffix, supported by a more transparent phonemic orthography. Recognizing these systematic, language-specific patterns, rather than treating onomatopoeia as unsystematic, has practical value for translation, lexicography, and language pedagogy, and offers a productive avenue for further cross-linguistic research into the boundary between arbitrary and iconic form-meaning mapping.

References

1. Hinton, L., Nichols, J., & Ohala, J. J. (Eds.). (1994). Sound Symbolism. Cambridge University Press.
2. Jespersen, O. (1922). Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin. George Allen & Unwin.
3. Nuckolls, J. B. (1999). The case for sound symbolism. Annual Review of Anthropology, 28, 225–252.
4. Reshetnikova, T. (2018). Onomatopoeia in Turkic languages: Structure and function. Turkic Studies Journal, 4(2), 55–70.
5. Sadirova, K. (2015). O'zbek tilida taqlid so'zlarning yasalishi (Formation of imitative words in the Uzbek language). Toshkent: Fan.
6. Sapir, E. (1929). A study in phonetic symbolism. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 12(3), 225–239.
7. Thun, N. (1963). Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formations of the Types tick-tock, hurly-burly, and shilly-shally. Uppsala.