

SYNONYMIC RELATIONS AMONG ONOMATOPOEIC WORDS

Ziyaev Avaz Ikhtiyorovich,

*Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Department of English Language and Literature,
Kokand State University*

Mokhidil Sharipova,

*Doctoral Student,
Kokand State University*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18001645>

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi onomatopoeik so'zlar orasidagi sinonimik munosabatlarning qiyosiy lingvistik tahlilini taqdim etadi. Unda tovushni taqlid qiluvchi leksik birliklar tovush intensivligi, rezonans, semantik maydon, hissiy ohang va stilistik funksiyaga asoslangan holda sinonimik klasterlarni qanday hosil qilishi o'rganiladi. Ingliz onomatopoeik sinonimlari, asosan, stilistik va pragmatik nuanslar bilan ajralib tursa-da, ularning o'zbekcha hamkasblari fonetik gradatsiya, yorqin tasvirlar va morfologik o'zgaruvchanlikka ko'proq tayanadi. Topilmalar onomatopoeik so'zlar orasidagi bu sinonimik munosabatlar mutlaq ekvivalentlik emas, balki semantik davomiylik ekanligini ta'kidlaydi va ikkala tilning fonosemantik, kognitiv va ekspressiv xususiyatlariga oid muhim tushunchalarni ochib beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: Onomatopoeia; sinonimiya; tovush simvolizmi; fonosemantika; Ingliz; O'zbek; qiyosiy tilshunoslik; hissiy ifoda; ideofonlar; semantik gradatsiya.

Annotation: This article presents a comparative linguistic analysis of the synonymic relations among onomatopoeic words in English and Uzbek. It explores how sound-imitating lexical units form synonymic clusters based on sound intensity, resonance, semantic field, emotional tone, and stylistic function. While English onomatopoeic synonyms are largely distinguished by stylistic and pragmatic nuances, their Uzbek counterparts rely more heavily on phonetic gradation, vivid imagery, and morphological variation. The findings highlight those synonymic relations among onomatopoeic words are not absolute equivalences but semantic continuums, revealing important insights into phonosemantic, cognitive, and expressive properties of both languages.

Keywords: Onomatopoeia; synonymy; sound symbolism; phonosemantics; English; Uzbek; comparative linguistics; emotional expression; ideophones; semantic gradation.

Аннотация: В данной статье представлен сравнительный лингвистический анализ синонимических отношений между звукоподражательными словами в английском и узбекском языках. Исследуется, как лексические единицы, имитирующие звуки, формируют синонимические кластеры на основе интенсивности звука, резонанса, семантического поля, эмоционального тона и стилистической функции. В то время как английские звукоподражательные синонимы в основном различаются стилистическими и прагматическими нюансами, их узбекские аналоги в большей степени опираются на фонетическую градацию, яркие образы и морфологические вариации. Результаты показывают, что синонимические отношения между звукоподражательными словами не являются абсолютными эквивалентами, а представляют собой семантические континуумы, раскрывая важные сведения о фоносемантических, когнитивных и экспрессивных свойствах обоих языков.

Ключевые слова: Звукоподражание; синонимия; звуковой символизм; фоносемантика; английский; узбекский; сравнительная лингвистика; эмоциональное выражение; идеофоны; семантическая градация.

Introduction. One of the defining factors of a language's semantic richness is its system of synonymic relations. Synonyms ensure clarity, imagery, and stylistic diversity in speech. Among these, onomatopoeic words — which imitate natural sounds through phonetic imitation — represent one of the oldest and most expressive layers of vocabulary. In both English and Uzbek, such words unite into synonymic clusters differentiated by sound intensity, resonance, source of movement, and emotional tone. For example, in English, *bang*, *boom*, *crash* all describe loud, impactful sounds, while in Uzbek, *shart*, *sharaq*, *gurs* express similar meanings through the language's own phonosemantic style. Studying onomatopoeic synonymy thus provides valuable material for linguistic typology, phonosemantics, and cognitive semantics.

Methods. The article employs linguistic methods such as descriptive analysis, comparative analysis, and componential analysis. Identifying the lexical, phonetic, and stylistic characteristics of onomatopoeic units and determining the common and distinct features of synonymic clusters in English and Uzbek allows the article to be more comparative based and precise.

Results. The study demonstrates that onomatopoeic synonymy in English and Uzbek operates through systematic phonosemantic variation. These synonymic relationships emerge from subtle differences in sound intensity, resonance, source of sound, and emotional expressiveness, which together form semantic continua rather than discrete categories. Each group of synonymous onomatopoeic words reflects degrees of sound strength, duration, and affective tone, enabling speakers to express finely nuanced perceptions of auditory reality.

1. Synonymic clusters based on sound intensity and duration. In both English and Uzbek, sound-imitative words describing impacts, collisions, and explosions reveal clear hierarchical gradations of meaning. In English, words such as *bang*, *boom*, *crash*, and *slam* share the core sense of a sudden, forceful sound but differ according to the intensity, resonance, and duration of the acoustic event: *Bang* represents a short, sharp sound caused by a sudden impact — “*The door banged shut in the wind.*” The brief, high-pitched quality of *bang* evokes an immediate but momentary disturbance. *Boom* refers to a deeper, longer, and more resonant explosion — “*The cannons boomed across the valley.*” Its rounded vowel and voiced bilabial onset mirror the spreading vibration of an echoing sound. *Crash* denotes a loud, chaotic noise associated with breaking or collapsing — “*The vase crashed to the floor.*” The affricate onset /kr/ reinforces the perception of fragmentation and disruption. *Slam* occupies a narrower stylistic space, describing an abrupt, forceful closure, as in “*She slammed the book on the table.*” It conveys a sense of anger or finality.

In Uzbek, the corresponding cluster — *shart*, *sharaq*, *gurs*, *gumbur* — displays a similar gradational relationship but emphasizes phonetic imitation and cultural imagery: *shart* conveys a brief, sharp strike — “*Eshik shart yopildi*” (“The door closed with a sudden thud”). The sibilant onset and voiceless consonant express precision and speed. *Sharaq*

implies a more resonant sound involving metallic or hard surfaces — “*Temir sharaq etib tushdi*” (“The metal fell with a ringing clatter”). *Gurs* indicates a heavier, duller sound — “*Gurs etib yerga yiqildi*” (“It fell to the ground with a thump”). *Gumbur* suggests a deep, echoing boom that reverberates — “*Uzoqdan gumbur ovoz eshitildi*” (“A distant booming sound was heard”). The Uzbek sequence thus forms a phonosemantic gradient from short and sharp (*shart*) to long and resonant (*gumbur*). Vowel openness, consonant voicing, and syllabic weight cooperate to encode perceived loudness and depth. This gradation pattern shows that synonymy among onomatopoeic words is systematically motivated: small changes in sound structure lead to predictable semantic and perceptual shifts.

2. Synonymy among speech-related onomatopoeia. A second synonymic domain involves words that represent low, indistinct, or secretive speech sounds. These words share a general auditory field but differ by clarity, pitch, and emotional intention. In English, the set *whisper – murmur – mutter* reflects a continuum of decreasing clarity and increasing emotional load:

- *Whisper* signifies quiet, deliberate speech, often associated with secrecy or intimacy — “*They whispered softly in the dark.*”
- *Murmur* denotes a continuous, low-pitched sound, expressing gentleness or dissatisfaction — “*The audience murmured in agreement.*”
- *Mutter* indicates a low, often irritated tone — “*He muttered something under his breath.*”

These distinctions rely on stylistic and pragmatic differences, rather than purely phonetic ones. Each term’s consonantal pattern and vowel length suggest subtle shifts in emotional color. In Uzbek, the equivalents *pichirlamoq – g’o’ldiramoq – ming’illamoq* show a similar pattern but are based on stronger phonetic mimicry:

- *Pichirlamoq* refers to soft, secret speech — “*U pichir-pichir gaplashdi*” (“They spoke in whispers”).
- *G’o’ldiramoq* represents a deeper, rolling tone that is barely intelligible — “*U g’o’ldirab nimanidir aytdi*” (“He mumbled something indistinctly”).
- *Ming’illamoq* expresses nervous or complaining muttering — “*U ming’illab gapirdi*” (“He spoke in a whining tone”).

These Uzbek synonyms form a gradient of articulation and emotion, ranging from softness and secrecy to restlessness and complaint. Unlike English, where synonymy arises from contextual nuance, Uzbek exhibits explicit sound gradation as the basis for synonymic contrast.

3. Synonymy in laughter onomatopoeia. A third area of synonymic relationship appears in expressive and emotional sounds, particularly those of laughter. Onomatopoeic verbs for laughter in both languages reflect emotional tone, intensity, and social intent. In English: *Giggle* suggests light, playful laughter, often restrained or nervous — “*She giggled*

shyly.” *Chuckle* denotes quiet, internal laughter expressing amusement — “*He chuckled at the memory.*” *Snicker* implies a suppressed, mocking laugh — “*They snickered behind his back.*” These words form a stylistic point of view, distinguished by emotional subtext rather than pure acoustic features. In Uzbek, the equivalents *piq etib kulmoq* – *hiqillab kulmoq* – *qiqirib kulmoq* reveal greater phonetic intensity: *piq etib kulmoq* expresses a short, soft laugh — “*U piq etib kuldi*” (“She let out a brief laugh”). *Hiqillab kulmoq* indicates laughter mixed with gasping or emotional strain — “*U hiqillab kuldi*” (“He laughed uncontrollably”). *Qiqirib kulmoq* represents loud, uninhibited laughter — “*U qiqirib kuldi*” (“She laughed loudly and freely”). The Uzbek system, with its rich phonetic texture and rhythmic syllables, portrays a vivid scale of emotional states. Thus, synonymic differentiation is achieved through phonosemantic gradation, where sound form corresponds directly to expressive force.

Across all three domains — impact sounds, speech sounds, and emotional expressions — synonymy among onomatopoeic words is organized as a semantic continuum grounded in phonetic variation. In English, the distinctions tend to be stylistic and pragmatic, serving the needs of tone and context. In Uzbek, they are phonetic and imagistic, driven by the intensity, duration, and emotional resonance of sound imitation. These findings confirm that synonymic relations in onomatopoeic systems are not arbitrary: they arise from systematic correspondences between phonetic form and perceived meaning, revealing how each language encodes sensory experience into lexical structure.

Discussion. The comparative analysis demonstrates that the principles of synonymic differentiation among onomatopoeic words vary typologically between English and Uzbek:

Feature	English	Uzbek
Basis of differentiation	Stylistic nuance and pragmatic use	Phonetic imitation and intensity gradation
Morphological flexibility	Fixed lexical forms	Reduplication and derivation common
Semantic range	Narrow (focused contrast)	Broad, covers emotional and acoustic intensity
Example	<i>bang – boom – crash</i>	<i>shart – sharaq – gurs – gumbur</i>

According to Ohala (1997) and Hinton et al. (1994), such synonymic distinctions arise from sound symbolism — the way phonetic variation maps to perceived meaning. In Uzbek, voiced consonants like /g/, /b/, /r/ increase perceived heaviness, while fricatives like /sh/, /s/ create lighter, sharper sounds. English shows a similar but less systematic mapping.

Conclusion. The study shows that onomatopoeic synonymy in English and Uzbek forms a structured system of meaning differentiation based on variations in sound form, intensity, and emotional tone. These relationships are not arbitrary but reveal a continuous spectrum of meaning, where each word conveys subtle distinctions in auditory and expressive nuance. In English, synonymy tends to depend on **stylistic and contextual factors**: words like *bang*, *boom*, and *crash* share a central sense of impact but differ in

emotional coloring and usage. Uzbek, however, develops **broader and more phonetic synonymic chains**, such as *shart*, *sharaq*, *gurs*, and *gumbur*, which reflect progressive changes in sound intensity and resonance. The Uzbek system also gains expressive richness through morphological devices like reduplication and affixation.

Overall, both languages demonstrate that onomatopoeic synonymy constitutes a **semantic continuum** rather than a set of fixed equivalents. By encoding perception and emotion through sound variation, these synonymic patterns enhance linguistic imagery and reveal deep connections between **sound, meaning, and human cognition**.

References:

1. Arnold, I. V. (1986). *The English word*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
2. Hinton, L., Nichols, J., & Ohala, J. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Sound symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Jakobson, R. (1965). Quest for the essence of language. *Diogenes*, 13(51), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/039219216501305102>
4. Marchand, H. (1969). *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
5. Ohala, J. J. (1997). Sound symbolism. In *Proceedings of the Seoul International Conference on Linguistics* (pp. 98–107). Seoul: Seoul National University.
6. Dingemans, M. (2018). Redrawing the margins of language: Onomatopoeia, ideophones, and sound symbolism. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 12(4), e12270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12270>
7. Johansson, N., & Zlatev, J. (2013). Motivations for sound symbolism in language evolution. *Interaction Studies*, 14(2), 173–196. <https://doi.org/10.1075/is.14.2.02joh>
8. Yusupov, O. (2009). *O'zbek tilida taqlidiy so'zlarning semantik xususiyatlari*. Tashkent: Fan.
9. Sharipova M. Phonosemantic analysis of onomatopoeic word in English Language. *FarDU. Ilmiy xabarlar*. 2024(6), 334-336. DOI: 10.56292/SJFSU/vol30_iss6/a69