

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PHONEMES AND MEANING: AN IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS

Yuldasheva Dilorom Aliyevna,
Senior-teacher of the Department of Foreign Languages
Kokand State University
dilyahanumdilya@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18001708>

Annotation. This article offers a comprehensive synthesis of theoretical, experimental, typological, developmental, and neurocognitive evidence on the complex relationship between phonemes and meaning, arguing that the traditional Saussurean notion of pure arbitrariness must be tempered by systematic tendencies that shape lexical structure and lexical access. The first section revisits foundational theory Saussure's model of the linguistic sign and Jakobson's work on phonological function while tracing historical observations of phonesthemes and phonosemantic clusters that suggest sub-lexical patterns can bias semantic interpretation. By integrating classical linguistics with contemporary corpus-driven and experimental approaches, the article frames the debate as one between combinatorial convention and perceptually grounded iconicity rather than as an either/or dichotomy.

Keywords: phoneme, phonology, sound symbolism, phonestheme, arbitrariness, phonosemantic mapping, bouba/kiki effect, lexical access, cross-linguistic patterns, neurocognition.

Аннотация. В данной статье предлагается комплексный синтез теоретических, экспериментальных, типологических, развивающих и нейрокогнитивных данных о сложной взаимосвязи между фонемами и значением, утверждая, что традиционное социуренское представление о чистой arbitrariness должно быть смягчено систематическими тенденциями, формирующими лексическую структуру и доступ к лексике. В первой части статьи пересматривается основополагающая теория модель языкового знака Сауссура и работа Яковсона по фонологической функции при обосновании исторических наблюдений фонем и фоносемантических кластеров, которые подразумевают, что сублексические паттерны могут влиять на семантическую интерпретацию. Интегрируя классическую лингвистику с современными корпусными и экспериментальными подходами, статья формулирует дебаты как противостояние комбинирующей конвенции и перцептивно обоснованной иконичности, а не как дихотомию.

Ключевые слова: фонема, фонология, звуковой символизм, фонема, произвольность, фоносемантическое отображение, эффект буба/кики, лексический доступ, межъязыковые модели, нейрокогниция.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola fonemalar va ma'no o'rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlar haqida nazariy, eksperimental, tipologik, rivojlanish va neyrokognitiv dalillarning keng qamrovli sintezini taklif etadi, ya'ni an'anaviy Saussur konsepsiyasining to'liq ixtiyoriylik g'oyasi sistematik tendensiyalar bilan yumshatilishi kerakligini ta'kidlaydi, bu tendensiyalar leksik tuzilma va leksikaga kirishni shakllantiradi. Birinchi bo'limda asosiy nazariyaga qaytib, Saussur til belgisining modeli va Jakobsonning fonologik funksiyasi ustida ishlari ko'rib chiqiladi, shuningdek, fonestemlar va fonosemantik klasterlar bo'yicha tarixiy kuzatishlar aytiladi. Klassik lingvistika zamonaviy korpusga asoslangan va eksperimental yondashuvlar bilan birlashtirilgan holda, maqola bahsni kombinatsiyali konvensiya va sezilarli asoslangan ikoniklik orasidagi kuch bilan ifodalaydi. ya'ni bu dixonatiya emas.

Kalit so'zlar: fonema, fonologiya, tovush simbolizmi, fonema mavzusi, o'zboshimchalik, fonosemantik xaritalash, bouba/kiki effekti, leksik kirish, tillararo naqshlar, neyrokognitsiya.

Introduction. Language science has long confronted a paradox: on one hand, phonemes—the smallest contrastive sound units in a language—are treated as arbitrary

building blocks; on the other hand, many empirical findings reveal systematic links between sound and sense. This article synthesizes classical theory and contemporary empirical trends to offer a comprehensive, scientifically grounded account of how phonemes relate to meaning. Drawing on foundational work (Saussure), experimental classics (Köhler's bouba/kiki), large-scale typological analyses (Blasi et al., 2016), and neurocognitive frameworks (Hickok & Poeppel; Pulvermüller), I present a coherent narrative that integrates phonological structure, sound symbolism, developmental trajectories, neural correlates, and computational approaches. This is written with the precision and SEO-aware density necessary to position this piece above competing web content while remaining scientifically rigorous and accessible.

Literature Review. The relationship between phonemes and meaning has been a central topic in linguistic theory, oscillating between the principle of arbitrariness and evidence for systematic sound–meaning correspondences. Saussure's foundational claim that the linguistic sign is arbitrary established phonemes as contrastive units devoid of inherent semantic content. This position laid the groundwork for structural phonology and remains influential in explaining why phonemic differences primarily function to distinguish lexical items rather than encode meaning directly.

However, subsequent linguistic research has demonstrated that arbitrariness does not fully account for observable regularities in sound–meaning mappings. Jakobson's work on phonological universals and markedness suggested that phonological features interact with cognition and perception. The notion of **phonesthemes**, later explored in English and other languages, further challenged strict arbitrariness by revealing statistically significant associations between sub-lexical sound clusters and semantic fields.

Experimental evidence strengthened this perspective through studies of **sound symbolism**. Köhler's bouba/kiki experiment and its replications (Maurer et al., 2006) showed robust cross-modal correspondences between phonetic properties and visual shapes across age groups and languages. These findings indicate that certain phonetic features are perceptually grounded and can systematically bias meaning interpretation.

Large-scale typological research has provided decisive empirical support for these tendencies. Blasi et al. (2016), using data from thousands of languages, demonstrated recurring sound–meaning association biases that exceed chance levels. Their findings suggest that while lexical systems are largely conventional, they are shaped by universal perceptual and cognitive constraints.

Neurocognitive studies further contribute to this discussion by demonstrating early and distributed interactions between phonological and semantic processing. The dual-stream model proposed by Hickok and Poeppel (2007) explains how phonemic input is rapidly integrated with lexical-semantic representations. Pulvermüller's work (1999, 2005) provides

evidence for embodied semantics, showing that phonological forms associated with action-related meanings activate corresponding sensorimotor brain regions.

Recent reviews (Sidhu & Pexman, 2018) synthesize these findings into mechanistic accounts of sound symbolism, highlighting how articulatory, acoustic, and affective dimensions of phonemes map onto conceptual structures. Together, the literature converges on a hybrid model in which phonemes are primarily combinatorial units, yet exhibit probabilistic and perceptually motivated associations with meaning across languages.

Methodology. This study employs a qualitative theoretical approach based on systematic literature review. Classical linguistic theories, experimental studies on sound symbolism, typological analyses, and neurocognitive research were analyzed and synthesized to examine phoneme–meaning relationships. The methodology focuses on comparative analysis and conceptual integration without collecting original empirical data.

Historical foundations and the paradox of arbitrariness

Ferdinand de Saussure’s early twentieth-century formulation of the linguistic sign emphasized the arbitrariness of the link between signifier and signified: the sound pattern of a word and its meaning are not motivated by an intrinsic connection. This theoretical cornerstone explains why phonemes serve primarily as contrastive units: changes in voicing, place, or manner of articulation (the features that define phonemes) can produce minimal pairs such as English “pat” versus “bat,” where a single phonemic difference reshapes lexical identity. The Saussurean view remains vital because it captures the combinatorial and conventional nature of lexical systems—phonemes alone seldom serve as deterministic carriers of semantic content across the lexicon.

Yet the arbitrary model proved incomplete as researchers documented patterned exceptions. Roman Jakobson and contemporaries highlighted recurrent phoneme distributions linked to morphological and pragmatic categories. Subsequent work on phonestemes—phoneme clusters like English *gl-* in *gloss*, *glitter*, *glow* that appear to cluster around semantic fields—suggested that sub-lexical sound patterns can be statistically associated with meaning. Thus, the classical dichotomy is replaced by a nuanced view: while most lexical signs are conventional, systematic tendencies and partial iconicity coexist with arbitrariness and meaningfully shape the lexicon and lexical access.

Phonemes in phonology and psycholinguistics: structure, processing, and meaning contribution

Phonemes exist as abstract entities characterized by distinctive features—voicing, place, and manner—that define a language’s phonological contrasts. These features govern permissible combinations (phonotactics) and influence morphological alternations and allophonic variation. From a psycholinguistic perspective, phonemes support fast and robust word recognition: acoustic input activates a cascade of sublexical to lexical representations, where phoneme-level patterns constrain candidate words in the mental lexicon. Crucially,

meaning emerges not from isolated phonemes but from structured sequences that map onto morphemes and established lexical items; nevertheless, phonemic composition affects lexical access speed, ambiguity resolution, and the statistical distribution of meanings across the lexicon.

Experimental studies of word recognition and language acquisition show that infants rapidly learn to segment and use phonemic contrasts to distinguish lexical items, and adults exploit phonotactic and phonemic regularities to infer word boundaries and probable meanings. In morphological systems, phonemes can signal grammatical contrasts (e.g., voicing alternations that mark tense or case), and in certain languages, phonological alternations are directly tied to meaning distinctions. The outcome is a model in which phonemes function both as combinatorial primitives and as probabilistic cues that bias meaning assignment during processing.

Sound symbolism, phonesthemes, and cross-linguistic regularities

The most compelling evidence against absolute arbitrariness comes from research on sound symbolism and large-scale typological patterns. Wolfgang Köhler's 1929 demonstration (the bouba/kiki effect) revealed that speakers reliably match rounded shapes with soft-sounding labels (e.g., "bouba") and jagged shapes with sharp-sounding labels (e.g., "kiki"), a finding replicated across languages and ages, including in infants (Maurer, Pathman & Mondloch, 2006). Modern reviews (Sidhu & Pexman, 2018) document a resurgence of experimental work showing that certain phonetic qualities—vowel height, consonant voicing, and spectral properties—correlate with sensory and affective meanings.

Large-scale computational and typological analyses have further substantiated these tendencies. Blasi et al. (2016) analyzed thousands of languages and reported sound–meaning association biases that recur cross-linguistically, indicating that linguistic communities converge on similar phonosemantic mappings more often than chance would predict. These results do not overturn Saussure's insight but refine it: across diverse lexicons, phonemes and feature combinations systematically bias the meanings of newly coined or ideophonic words, particularly in semantic domains tied to sensory experience, intensity, and shape.

Concrete examples in English illustrate this micro-patterning. The cluster gl- often collocates with light-related meanings (glow, glimmer, glitter), while sn- frequently appears in words tied to the nose and mouth (sneeze, sniff, snout). These patterns, labeled phonesthemes, are not morphemes in the strict sense but function as statistical affordances that speakers exploit in coinage and poetic language, and that listeners use as heuristics in interpretation.

Neurocognitive and developmental perspectives: mapping sound onto meaning

Neuroimaging and electrophysiological research provide converging evidence that phonological and semantic processing interact early and in distributed cortical networks. The dual-stream model of speech processing (Hickok & Poeppel, 2007) delineates dorsal and

ventral pathways for sensorimotor and comprehension-related processing, respectively, and offers a scaffolding to understand how phoneme-level input is rapidly integrated with lexical-semantic representations. Work by Pulvermüller and others has shown semantic somatotopy, whereby action-related words preferentially activate motor regions associated with the relevant effector, demonstrating that word meaning can be instantiated in modality-specific brain systems.

Developmental evidence amplifies these conclusions: infants and toddlers demonstrate consistent cross-modal correspondences between sound and shape or size, suggesting that mappings between phonetic properties and sensory-conceptual features are accessible early in life and likely scaffold word learning. These findings imply that the brain exploits both learned conventions and perceptually grounded associations when mapping sound to meaning, with neural circuits tuned to exploit phonological regularities for efficient lexical access.

Computational modeling, NLP implications, and future directions

Contemporary computational linguistics has started to quantify phoneme–meaning correspondences using distributional models and machine learning. Researchers are embedding phonetic sequences into vector spaces and correlating these with semantic embeddings derived from large corpora; results indicate modest but reliable associations that improve tasks like brand name generation, onomastics, and low-resource lexicon augmentation. The trend points toward integrative models that combine phonology, distributional semantics, and typological priors to predict likely meanings for novel forms, shedding light on language evolution and lexical innovation.

Future research will benefit from richer multimodal corpora, cross-linguistic databases of ideophones and phono-expressive vocabulary, and neurocomputational models that simulate how perceptual constraints and social conventions jointly shape sound–meaning mappings. The practical implications extend to lexicography, second-language pedagogy, branding, and human–computer interaction: understanding phoneme–meaning tendencies can guide the creation of memorable product names and more natural-sounding synthetic speech.

Conclusion. The relationship between phonemes and meaning is neither wholly arbitrary nor strictly motivated; instead, it is a layered system in which phonemes serve as combinatorial primitives, while statistical and perceptual forces generate recurrent, cross-linguistic tendencies. Historical linguistics and psycholinguistics show how conventions solidify into lexicons, while experimental and neurocognitive work demonstrates early-emerging, modality-driven associations. Large-scale typological studies corroborate that sound–meaning biases are a real and pervasive force shaping human languages. This synthesis reconciles Saussurean insights with contemporary empirical discoveries, offering a robust framework for understanding how the smallest units of sound contribute to the scaffolding of meaning.

References:

1. Maurer, D., Pathman, T., & Mondloch, C. J. (2006). The shape of boubas: Sound–shape correspondences in toddlers and adults. *Developmental Science*, 9(3), 316–322. This empirical study documents the presence of sound–shape mappings in early development, supporting perceptual bases for sound symbolism.
2. Blasi, D. E., Wichmann, S., Hammarström, H., Stadler, P. F., & Christiansen, M. H. (2016). Sound–meaning association biases reflected in the lexicon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(25), 6837–6842. A large-scale typological analysis showing systematic sound–meaning biases across diverse languages and semantic domains.
3. Sidhu, D. M., & Pexman, P. M. (2018). Five mechanisms of sound symbolism. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(6), 1619–1643. A contemporary review synthesizing experimental findings and proposing mechanistic pathways by which phonetic features map onto conceptual dimensions.
4. Aliyevna, Y. D. (2023). Study Of Concepts Expressing The Relationship Between New And Old Information (Theme And Rheme) Expressed In A Sentence. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 7(2).
5. Hickok, G., & Poeppel, D. (2007). The cortical organization of speech processing. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 8(5), 393–402. This influential review presents the dual-stream model of speech processing, offering a neurobiological scaffold for understanding phonological–semantic integration.
6. Pulvermüller, F. (1999). Words in the brain’s language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(2), 253–336. Pulvermüller argues for distributed, modality-specific representations of word meaning, providing neurophysiological evidence that semantics and sensorimotor systems are tightly coupled.
7. Yuldasheva, D. (2024). THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE SEMANTICS. *Академические исследования в современной науке*, 3(26), 193-196.
8. Pulvermüller, F. (2005). Brain mechanisms linking language and action. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 6(7), 576–582. This review synthesizes neuroimaging and electrophysiological data showing how action-related words recruit motor circuits, underscoring embodied aspects of meaning.

