

TIL BILIMI HÁM ÁDEBIYATTANÍW

Til bilimi

GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS AND WORD FORMATION OF ONOMATOPOEIC WORDS
IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK

Bayimbetova Mekhriban Berdibaevna – Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences

bayimbetovam@mail.ru

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Ajiniyaz

INGLIZ VA QORAQALPOQ TILLARIDA TAQLID SO‘ZLARINING
GRAMMATIK VAZIFALARI VA SO‘Z YASALISHI

Bayimbetova Mexriban Berdibaevna – filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori

Ajiniyoz nomidagi Nukus davlat pedagogika instituti

ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ ФУНКЦИИ И СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЕ
ПОДРАЖАТЕЛЬНЫХ СЛОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И КАРАКАЛПАКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Байымбетова Мехрибан Бердибаевна – доктор философии по филологическим наукам

Нукусский государственный педагогический институт имени Ажинияза

Tayanch so‘zlar: taqlidiy so‘zlar, taqlidiy so‘zlar, tovush simbolikasi, so‘z yasalishi, so‘z turkumlari, ingliz tili, qoraqalpoq tili.

Rezume. Maqolada ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillaridagi taqlidiy so‘zlarning grammatik vazifasi va so‘z yasalishi ko‘rib chiqiladi. Tahlillar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, har ikki tilda ham taqlid so‘zlar turli so‘z turkumlari sifatida qo‘llanadi. Ingliz tilida ko‘proq konversiya va sintaktik moslashuvchanlik namoyon bo‘lsa, qoraqalpoq tilida grammatik funksiyalarni rivojlantirishda morfologik derivatsiya va reduplikatsiya aniqroq qo‘llaniladi.

Ключевые слова: подражательные слова, онomatopeя, звуковая символика, словообразование, части речи, английский, каракалпакский.

Резюме. В статье рассматривается грамматическое функционирование и словообразование подражательных слов в английском и каракалпакском языках. Анализ показывает, что в обоих языках подражательные слова используются как разные части речи. Английский язык в основном демонстрирует конверсию и синтаксическую гибкость, в то время как каракалпакский язык более отчетливо использует морфологическую деривацию и редупликацию в развитии грамматических функций.

Key words: imitative words, onomatopoeia, sound symbolism, word formation, parts of speech, English, Karakalpak.

Summary. The article examines the grammatical functioning and word formation of imitative words in English and Karakalpak. The analysis shows that both languages use imitative words as different parts of speech. English predominantly demonstrates conversion and syntactic flexibility, whereas Karakalpak more clearly employs morphological derivation and reduplication in developing grammatical functions.

Introduction. Imitative words occupy a distinctive position in the lexical systems of languages because their form is motivated, to varying degrees, by sounds, movements, or other perceptual phenomena. Previous scholars have examined imitative vocabulary from phonosemantic, iconic, historical, and functional perspectives. Anderson [1:246] considers the relationship between linguistic form and meaning within the broader framework of iconicity. Flaksman [2:1067] further examines the nature and historical development of imitative vocabulary in English. Thus, forms such as screech, chirp, and boom can be viewed as linguistically motivated by their association with environmental sounds.

The imitative origin of such words distinguishes them from ordinary lexical items; however, their iconic motivation does not prevent them from functioning as conventional grammatical units. Sugahara [5:17,51] examines onomatopoeia in spoken and written English from a corpus- and usage-based perspective, demonstrating the importance of contextual functioning. Stump [4:2] discusses the linguistic characteristics and status of onomatopoeia in Modern English, while Siddiq [3:106] specifically considers its relationship to word-class categories. These studies suggest that imitative words should be analyzed not only according to their phonetic and semantic motivation but also according to their grammatical categorization and functional behavior.

English terminology includes several designations for this type of vocabulary, such as onomatopoeic, imitative, and echoic. Although these terms may overlap in their application, the differences in their usage highlight the need for a systematic examination of imitative vocabulary from both formal and grammatical perspectives. Therefore, the present study focuses on the grammatical functioning and word-formation patterns of imitative words in English and Karakalpak, with particular attention to the ways in which their iconic motivation interacts with grammatical categorization and morphological development.

The grammatical flexibility of imitative words is particularly significant. According to Sugahara [5:14,51], English onomatopoeia can function as nouns, verbs, interjections, adjectives, and adverbs. For example, *clatter* can function as a verb, *chug* as a noun, and *bump* as an adverb.

Karakalpak imitative vocabulary demonstrates a related but structurally different pattern. The collected material indicates that imitative forms can function as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbial expressions. In addition to syntactic context, morphological derivation and reduplication contribute to the development and grammatical functioning of these forms. Consequently, Karakalpak provides useful evidence for examining the relationship between imitation, morphology, and syntax.

Although imitative vocabulary has received considerable attention in linguistic research, a comparative examination of the grammatical functioning and word-formation of imitative words in English and Karakalpak remains relevant. Comparing the two languages makes it possible to identify a common tendency toward grammatical integration, as well as language-specific mechanisms through which imitative forms acquire different grammatical functions. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the grammatical functioning and word formation of onomatopoeic words in English and Karakalpak, and to identify the similarities and differences in the mechanisms through which these forms integrate into the grammatical systems of the two languages.

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What grammatical functions can imitative words perform in English and Karakalpak?
2. What word-formation mechanisms contribute to the grammatical development of onomatopoeic words in two languages?
3. What similarities and differences can be identified between English and Karakalpak in the grammatical functioning and word formation of imitative words?

Materials and methods. The study employs a comparative linguistic approach to study the grammatical functioning and word-formation patterns of onomatopoeic words in English and Karakalpak. The analysis is based on collected linguistic and literary examples illustrating the use of imitative forms in various grammatical contexts.

The material was analyzed according to three main criteria: grammatical function, morphological structure, and word formation mechanism. First, imitative forms were classified according to the grammatical functions they perform in context. Particular attention was paid to noun, verb, adjective, adverbial, and interjectional functions. Secondly, morphologically related forms were examined to determine whether grammatical differences were associated with morphological modification. Thirdly, the formal mechanisms involved in the development of imitative forms were compared across the two languages.

For English, the analysis primarily focuses on the multifunctionality of imitative forms. Particular attention is paid to cases where the same or closely related form performs different grammatical functions depending on its syntactic position and contextual usage. Such cases are interpreted in relation to conversion and syntactic flexibility.

For Karakalpak, the analysis focuses on the relationship between imitative bases, morphological derivation, reduplication, and grammatical function. Examples containing related nominal and verbal forms are compared to identify morphological development. Reduplicated forms are analyzed according to their grammatical function within the sentence.

The comparative interpretation draws on previous descriptions of imitative vocabulary and word formation in English and Karakalpak, including the observations of Baskakov [6:239-244] and Embergenov [7:17-21], as well as relevant studies of English onomatopoeia and sound symbolism.

Results. *Grammatical functioning of imitative words in English.* Analysis of English material demonstrates that onomatopoeic words can perform several grammatical functions, particularly verbal, nominal, adjective, adverbial, and interjectional. Their grammatical interpretation is

largely determined by their syntactic position and contextual usage.

The verbal function is illustrated by the following examples:

1. The cannons *boomed* incessantly. (*Pushkiler toqtawsız pañqıldap atıldı*)

2. His heavy boots *clatter* upon the round pebbles. (*Onıñ awır etikleri taslardıñ üstinde toqıldap ketti*)

In both examples, the imitative forms “boomed” and “clatter” function as verbs and denote the production of sounds. The examples demonstrate that an imitative form can be incorporated directly into the verbal system and can receive grammatical marking, as in the past-tense form “boomed”.

The nominal function is demonstrated by:

1. The cannons’ *booms* startled them. (*Pushkiden atılğan oqlardıñ dañğurlısı olardı shorshutıp jiberdi*).

2. The *chug* of the engine still filled our ears. (*Matordıñ warıldısı ele qulağıımızdan ketpey tur*).

Here, booms and chug function as nouns. The first example contains the plural form “booms”, while “chug” appears in the noun phrase “the chug of the engine”. These examples demonstrate that imitative forms can become nominal lexical units referring to the sounds themselves.

Imitative forms can also occur in adjectival or attributive positions. For example:

The cannons let out a **booming** sound incessantly. (*Toplardan gúmbirlegen ses tınımsız kelip tur*)

In this construction, booming modifies the noun sound and therefore performs an adjectival or attributive function. The example demonstrates that an imitative base can participate in a derived form that functions within an adjective construction.

An adverbial function is illustrated by:

The cannon went **boom**.

The carriage went **bump, bump, bump** over the sleepers. (*Vagon uyıqlap atırğanlardıñ üstinen bampıldap (signal berip) óte berdi*)

In these examples, boom and bump, bump, bump occur after the verb went and represent the sound associated with the action. The repeated form bump, bump, bump additionally conveys the repeated character of the sound. Rather than treating these forms as prototypical adverbs, they can be more accurately described as performing an adverbial function in a sentence.

Interjectional usage can be illustrated by expressive forms like **Oho!** and **Hmph!**, which occur independently of the syntactic structure of the surrounding sentence and express an immediate reaction or sound-like response.

The examples demonstrate that English imitative vocabulary possesses considerable grammatical flexibility. In particular, forms such as ‘boom’ can occur in different grammatical environments: “boomed” functions as a verb, ‘booms’ as a noun, while “boom” in “The cannon went boom” functions as an independent sound expression associated with the action. This flexibility indicates that syntactic context and morphological marking contribute substantially to the grammatical integration of imitative forms.

The English data therefore provide evidence that imitative words can move beyond their original sound-representational function and participate in several grammatical constructions. Conversion is particularly relevant where the same lexical base occurs in different grammatical categories, while derivational morphology can

further modify an imitative base, as illustrated by 'boom' → 'booming'.

Grammatical functioning of imitative words in Karakalpak.

The analysis of Karakalpak linguistic material demonstrates that imitative words can also perform the functions of several parts of speech. The collected examples show their use as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. However, unlike the English examples, the Karakalpak material particularly demonstrates the importance of morphological derivation and reduplication in the development of grammatical functions.

The following examples illustrate this multifunctionality:

a) *Ġawırlı kem-kem kúsheydi* (Noun).

b) *Balalar qonıraw shalıńıwdan birden ġawırlastı* (Verb).

In the first example, *ġawırlı* functions as a noun, whereas in the second example, the related form *ġawırlastı* functions as a verb. This demonstrates that an imitative base can participate in the formation of different grammatical categories.

A similar pattern can be observed in the following examples:

a) *Alıslardan ġazlardıń ġańqıldısı* esitildi (Noun).

b) *Ele nesin kóripseń, qıl taqqan soń ġańqıldaydı* (Verb).

Here, *ġańqıldısı* functions as a noun denoting the sound, while *ġańqıldaydı* functions as a verb describing the production of that sound.

Imitative words can also function as adjectives and adverbs:

a) *Júyrikten júyrik shıqsa, ayaqları tıpr-tıpr* (Adjective).

b) *Balalar ġarrını kóriwden tıprlap qashtı* (Adverb).

These examples demonstrate that the grammatical function of an imitative expression depends on its syntactic relationship with other elements of the sentence. The form *tıpr-tıpr*, for example, characterizes the state or appearance of the legs in (a), while *tıprlap* describes the manner of the children's movement in (b).

Further evidence can be found in Karakalpak literary texts, where imitative words are frequently used in various grammatical functions. For example:

1. *Amanlıqtıń jıǵırdanı qaynap dir-dir etti* (T.Qayıpbergenov). (Verb). 2. *Asıǵıs kiyiniw, patı-sattını jıynaw baslandı* (T.Qayıpbergenov). (Noun). 3. *Olar jóninde el ishi duw-duw ǵáp* (T.Qayıpbergenov). (Adjective). 4. *Xan selk-selk kúldi: – Sen Maydabıykesen...* (T.Qayıpbergenov). (Adverb).

The literary examples provide further evidence that imitative words have a broad grammatical distribution in Karakalpak. They occur not only as independent sound

expressions but also as elements integrated into nominal, verbal, adjectival, and adverbial constructions.

The English and Karakalpak examples demonstrate a common tendency: imitative words can move beyond their original sound-imitative function and participate in the grammatical system of the language.

Discussion. The contrast between the two languages can therefore be interpreted typologically. English examples in the present material demonstrate a relatively high degree of functional flexibility of unchanged imitative forms, whereas Karakalpak demonstrates extensive morphological and syntactic derivation. This difference is consistent with the broader structural characteristics of the two languages and illustrates how similar lexical-semantic material may be grammaticalized through different mechanisms.

At the same time, the languages share an important characteristic: imitative words are not peripheral lexical items restricted to reproducing sounds. In both languages, they can develop grammatical functions and become part of ordinary vocabulary. Consequently, the study of imitative words should consider not only their phonetic motivation but also their morphological productivity and syntactic behavior.

The findings also support the view that the distinction between imitative words and ordinary lexical items is not absolute at the grammatical level. Once an imitative form enters a syntactic construction or undergoes derivation, it can perform the same grammatical functions as other lexical items. This is particularly evident in the examples where imitative roots develop into nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

Conclusion. This study examined the grammatical functioning and word-formation patterns of imitative words in English and Karakalpak. The analysis demonstrates that imitative words constitute a productive lexical-grammatical category in both languages.

The principal comparative finding is therefore that both English and Karakalpak allow imitative words to move beyond their primary sound-imitative function and become integrated into different grammatical categories, but the mechanisms of this integration differ. English demonstrates considerable functional flexibility of imitative forms in syntactic contexts, whereas Karakalpak demonstrates extensive derivational productivity through affixation, reduplication, and auxiliary constructions.

The study contributes to the comparative investigation of imitative vocabulary by demonstrating that its linguistic significance extends beyond phonetic imitation to include morphological productivity and syntactic functioning. Further research could expand the corpus of English and Karakalpak imitative words and investigate their semantic, cognitive, phonological, and conceptual properties in greater detail.

References

1. Anderson E. A Grammar of Iconism. London: Associated University Press. 1998.
2. Flaksman, M. From IE *u e- TO English window: on the age and number of imitative words in English. St. Petersburg State Electrotechnical University Press. 2019. – P.1067.
3. Siddiq M.B. Onomatopoeia and word class categories analysis in Hulk digital comics. Annual International Conference (AIC), 2019. – P. 106.
4. Stump G. Onomatopoeias in Modern English. Emeritus, University of Kentucky. 2020, – P.2.
5. Sugahara T. Onomatopoeia in Spoken and Written English: Corpus- and Usage-based Analysis. – Hokkaido: Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers. Dissertation paper. 2010. – P. 17, 51.
6. Баскаков Н.А. Каракалпакский язык. Фонетика и морфология. Часть I. – Москва: «Академии наук СССР». 1952.
7. Ембергенов У. Хэзирги каракалпак тилиндеги еликлеуиш сөзлер. – Нөкис. «Қарақалпақстан». 1990.