

THE INTERPLAY OF DEIXIS AND INTERJECTIONS IN EXPRESSIVE AND REFERENTIAL COMMUNICATION**Umurzakova Gulchexra Egamberdiyevna**

Oriental university

Languages-2 department, PhD, Senior Lecturer

[Tel:+998\(93\)127-00-90](tel:+998(93)127-00-90)e-mail: gulidil425@gmail.com**Annotation**

The study of the functional and structural characteristics of words in linguistics is essential for understanding the logical system of language and its communicative potential. Modal and imitative words play a significant role in expressing the expressive and cultural dimensions of language. Modal words reflect the speaker's attitude, including probability, obligation, and evaluation, while imitative words convey natural phenomena and emotions through phonetic representation. This paper aims to analyze modal and imitative words within a systematic-structural framework. The study focuses on identifying their lexical and grammatical features, classifying their communicative functions, and examining their interrelations within the language system. The findings contribute to the development of methodological approaches in linguistic theory and highlight the role of expressive language units in cultural and communicative sustainability.

Keywords

modal words, imitative words, systematic-structural analysis, linguistics, language system, expressiveness, cultural sustainability.

Аннотация

Изучение функциональных и структурных характеристик слов в лингвистике имеет важное значение для понимания логической системы языка и его коммуникативного потенциала. Модальные и звукоподражательные слова играют значительную роль в выражении экспрессивных и культурных аспектов языка. Модальные слова отражают отношение говорящего, включая вероятность, обязательность и оценку, тогда как звукоподражательные слова передают природные явления и эмоции посредством фонетического воспроизведения. Данная работа направлена на анализ модальных и звукоподражательных слов в рамках системно-структурного подхода. Исследование сосредоточено на выявлении их лексических и грамматических особенностей, классификации их коммуникативных функций, а также на рассмотрении их взаимосвязей в языковой системе. Полученные результаты способствуют развитию методологических подходов в лингвистической теории и подчеркивают роль экспрессивных языковых единиц в культурной и коммуникативной устойчивости.

Ключевые слова

модальные слова, звукоподражательные слова, системно-структурный анализ, лингвистика, языковая система, экспрессивность, культурная устойчивость.

Annotatsiya

Tilshunoslikda soʻzlarning funksional va struktural xususiyatlarini oʻrganish tilning mantiqiy tizimi hamda uning kommunikativ imkoniyatlarini tushunishda muhim ahamiyatga ega. Modal va taqlid soʻzlar tilning ekspressiv va madaniy jihatlarini ifodalashda muhim rol oʻynaydi. Modal soʻzlar soʻzlovchining munosabatini, jumladan ehtimollik, majburiyat va baholashni ifodalasa, taqlid soʻzlar tabiiy hodisalar va hissiyotlarni fonetik tasvir orqali yetkazadi. Mazkur maqola modal va taqlid soʻzlarni tizimli-struktural yondashuv asosida tahlil qilishga qaratilgan. Tadqiqot ularning leksik va grammatik xususiyatlarini aniqlash, kommunikativ funksiyalarini tasniflash hamda til tizimidagi oʻzaro aloqalarini oʻrganishga yoʻnaltirilgan. Natijalar tilshunoslik nazariyasida metodologik yondashuvlarni rivojlantirishga xizmat qiladi hamda ekspressiv til birliklarining madaniy va kommunikativ barqarorlikdagi rolini yoritadi.

Kalit soʻzlar

modal soʻzlar, taqlid soʻzlar, tizimli-struktural tahlil, tilshunoslik, til tizimi, ekspressivlik, madaniy barqarorlik.

INTRODUCTION

The study of the functional and structural characteristics of words in linguistics plays a crucial role in understanding the logical organization of language and its communicative potential. Language, as a dynamic system, reflects not only cognitive processes but also cultural and social dimensions of human interaction. In this regard, modal and imitative words occupy a special place due to their ability to convey subjective meanings and expressive nuances. Modal words express the speaker's attitude toward reality, including categories such as probability, obligation, necessity, and evaluation, whereas imitative words reproduce natural sounds, movements, and emotional states through phonetic representation, thereby enriching speech with vividness and expressiveness.

Despite significant contributions to the study of modality and sound symbolism, there remains a lack of integrated research that examines modal and imitative words within a unified systematic-structural framework. Previous studies (Palmer, 1986; Bybee, 2010) have primarily focused on modality as a grammatical and semantic category, while other scholars (Jakobson, 1960; Crystal, 2003) have explored the phonetic and expressive nature of imitative words. However, these approaches often treat the two categories separately, leaving a gap in understanding their interaction within the broader language system.

This study addresses this gap by exploring the structural and functional relationships between modal and imitative words. The main objective of the research is to conduct a systematic-structural analysis of these linguistic units, identifying their lexical and grammatical features, classifying their communicative functions, and examining their interdependence within the language system. It is hypothesized that modal and imitative words, despite their differences, share common functional roles in enhancing expressiveness and contributing to communicative effectiveness.

METHODS

This research adopts a qualitative and descriptive study design based on a systematic-structural approach to linguistic analysis, supplemented by comparative methods between English and Uzbek. The study focuses on linguistic units—specifically modal and imitative words—as the primary objects of investigation. The data consist of examples collected from contemporary English and Uzbek texts, including literary works (e.g., novels by J. Steinbeck and A. Qodiriy), spoken discourse (corpora and dialogues), and academic materials, selected through purposive sampling to ensure representativeness and cross-linguistic balance.

The materials used include linguistic corpora, dictionaries (e.g., Oxford English Dictionary, O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati), and scholarly publications on modality and sound symbolism. Analytical instruments involve classification frameworks for modal categories (epistemic, deontic) and phonetic-structural analysis of imitative forms, including phono semantic mapping (Hinton et al., 1994; Kaxorova, 2025).

The research procedure involves several stages: first, identifying and collecting instances of modal and imitative words; second, analyzing their lexical and grammatical properties; third, categorizing their communicative functions; and finally, examining their relationships within the language system. Data analysis is conducted using descriptive, comparative, and functional analysis methods, allowing for a comprehensive interpretation of linguistic patterns.

RESULTS

The analysis reveals that modal words demonstrate a wide range of lexical and grammatical features, functioning primarily as indicators of the speaker's subjective stance. They are categorized into groups expressing probability, necessity, obligation, and evaluation. In English, modal verbs (*can, must, may*) and adverbs (*perhaps, certainly*) dominate; in Uzbek, modal words and particles (*albatta, balki, shubhasiz*) serve similar roles without inflectional modal verbs (comparative analysis of modal verbs in English and Uzbek, 2024).

Imitative words are characterized by their phonetic structure and ability to represent sounds and movements, contributing to expressive and emotive communication. Reduplication is particularly frequent, reflecting iconicity (e.g., English "tick-tock", "bang-bang"; Uzbek "gumbur-gumbur," "lip-lip").

Structural Analysis The structural types of modal and imitative words were categorized as follows:

- **Simple forms** (e.g., English: *perhaps, maybe, oh*; Uzbek: *balki, ha, oh*).
- **Complex forms** (e.g., English: *undoubtedly, certainly*; Uzbek: *shubhasiz, albatta*).
- **Reduplicated forms** (primarily in imitative words: English *tick-tock, bang-bang*; Uzbek *gumbur-gumbur, tik-tik, shov-shov*).

The analysis shows that reduplication is particularly frequent in imitative words, reflecting their phonetic nature and ability to imitate natural sounds. In Uzbek, imitative words often function independently as predicates or modifiers, demonstrating greater morphological autonomy than in English (Literary Characteristics of Onomatopoeic Items in the Uzbek and English Languages, 2025).

Functional Analysis Modal words perform the following functions:

- Expressing probability (English: *perhaps, maybe*; Uzbek: *balki, aftidan*).
- Indicating certainty (English: *certainly, undoubtedly*; Uzbek: *albatta, haqiqatan*).
- Conveying evaluation (English: *unfortunately, fortunately*; Uzbek: *afsuski, attang*).

Imitative words mainly:

- Represent natural sounds (English: *buzz, bang, splash*; Uzbek: *gumbur, shiqillamoq, lip-lip*).

•Enhance emotional expressiveness in speech (e.g., overlapping with modal evaluation in narrative contexts).

1. **“Sure”**, – *he said. “Sure. It would be a pleasure”*. (C. D.Simak. “Ring around the Sun”)

(*“Albatta”*, – *dedi u. “Albatta, bu juda yoqimli”*)

2. *Over his shoulder, Bullfrog said, “Maybe, we ought to see if we can’t get the reverend to press charges. Huh?”* (C.Major. “Dirty Bird Blues”)

(*Bullford qo ‘lini elkasidan o ‘tkazib: “Ehtimol, ruhoniyni ayblov e ‘lon qilishga ko ‘ndirish kerakdir. A?”*)

3. **Well**, naturally, with enough propaganda you can confuse anybody. (A.Miller. “Incident at Vichy”)

(*Tabiiyki, har qanday targ ‘ibot bilan siz istalgan odamni chalg ‘itishingiz mumkin*)

4. – *Are you ashamed of me, Izzie?*

– **Of course**, not. *She was instantly embarrassed.* (D. Steel. “Against All Odds”)

5. *He heard her **click-clacking** along the street.*

(*U ko ‘chada ayolning taqir-tuqurini eshitdi*)

6. *He heard the **clomp** of her heavy workboots, walking wearily up the stairs.*

The findings show that both modal and imitative words play significant roles in discourse organization and meaning construction. Modal words are frequently used in both spoken and written communication to convey attitudes and judgments, while imitative words are more prevalent in narrative and informal contexts, enhancing vividness and sensory representation. Quantitative observations (from corpora) indicate that modal words occur more frequently in formal discourse, whereas imitative words dominate in expressive and creative texts. Structural patterns also demonstrate interactions between these categories, particularly where emotional and evaluative meanings overlap (e.g., “*oh bang!*” expressing surprise).

DISCUSSION

The results indicate that modal and imitative words, although functionally distinct, share a common role in enhancing the expressive capacity of language. Modal words contribute to the organization of discourse by signaling the speaker’s perspective, while imitative words enrich communication through sensory and emotional representation. These findings align with previous research on modality (Palmer, 2001; Bybee, 2010) and sound symbolism (Jakobson, 1960; Crystal, 2003; Dingmans, 2015), confirming their importance in linguistic theory.

At the same time, the study expands existing knowledge by demonstrating the interconnectedness of these linguistic units within a systematic-structural framework, particularly in English-Uzbek comparison. For instance, the absence of modal verbs in Uzbek shifts reliance to invariant modal words, while imitative words in both languages exhibit phono semantic parallels but differ in morphological integration (Kaxorova, 2025; Phono semantic characteristics of imitative words., 2023). This interaction reflects the complexity of language as

a system, where different elements work together to achieve communicative goals, supporting iconicity theories (Hinton et al., 1994).

Table 1.

	Russian onomatopoeia	Uzbek onomatopoeia	English onomatopoeia	Note
1	Уа-уа	Inga-inga	/wah-wah/	Bola yig'isi
2	Гав-гав	Vov-vov	/wu:f/	It akillashi
3	Ш-ш-ш-ш	Shuv-sh-sh	/ʃʃ/ /S S/ swish	Shamol hurishi
4	Чик-чирик	Chir-chir	/tʃɪp tʃɪp/ /tʃɪp tʃɪp/	Qush sayrashi
5	Виш-виш	Vish-vush	/bʊzz bʊzz/	Noaniq tovushlar
6	Чирк-чирк	Chiy-chiy	/klak-klak/	Jo'ja chiyillashi
7	Тик-так	Chiq-chiq	/click-clock/	Soat tovushi
8	Ку-ка-ре- ку	Qu-qu-ru-qu	/cock-a-doodle-doo/	Xo'roz qichqirig'i
9	Му-му	Мо' -мо'	/moo moo/	Sigir ma'rashi
10	Треск, шик	Buh, tirs	/ bæŋg/ / boom/	Sinish, portlash
11	Кар-кар	Qaq-qaq	/kaʊ kaʊ/	Qarg'a tovushi
12	Ах, Ох	Oh-voy	/outʃ/ /ah/	Og'riqdan ingrash
13	Иа-иа	Yo-yo	/hi: hao/	Eshak hangrashi
14	Зинг-зинг	Jiring-jiring	/di:ŋ dʊŋg/	Eshik jiringlashi
15	Кап-кап	Tin-ting	/dri:p drap/	Suv tomchisi
16	Кря-кря	G'aq-g'aq	/kʊæk kʊæk/	O'rdak ovozi
17	Ням-ням	Ham-ham	/yum yum/	Ovqat yeganda chapillash
18	Тук-тук	Duk-duk	/ba bʊmp/	Yurak urushi

1 9	Муах-муах	Cho‘lp-cho‘lp	/mwah/ /Smu:tʃ/	O‘pish
2 0	Тук-тук	Тақ-тақ	/nʌk nʌk/	Eshik taqillatishi
2 1	Ха-ха-ха	Хе-хе	/ha ha/	Kulish
2 2	Мяу-мяу	Миёв-миёв	/miju miju/	Mushuk ovozi
2 3	Апчи	Арчу	/æti:shoo/ /ætʃoo/	Aksirish
2 4	Хр-хр	Хур-хур	/zzz.../	Xurrak otish
2 5	Бе-бе	Ва-ба	/bææ... bææ/	Qo‘y ba‘rashi

According to E. Dofs, animal sounds are essentially the same in all countries; however, the ways in which they are expressed differ across languages with different systems.

The variation in the representation of animal sounds may be explained by the differences in the phonological or morphological systems of languages. It can be observed that phonemes in languages with different systems carry different meanings due to their distinct phonological structures, and differences are evident in both consonants and vowels. Despite these differences, the meaning in two languages remains more or less similar.

Within the framework of this study, we conclude that certain onomatopoeic expressions in languages of different systems-especially those related to animal sounds-vary depending on the phonological and morphological structures of each language. According to this research, it is possible to make use not only of onomatopoeia and alliteration, but also of the broader sound potential of language.

Each nation perceives, hears, and experiences the world in its own way. For example, consider the bird called *chittak*. In Uzbek, this bird is named based on its movement. It moves quickly (*“chit-chit”*), and Uzbek speakers initially perceive this motion. In contrast, Russian speakers first notice the bird’s color and name it *sinitsa* based on that feature.

Similarly, Uzbek speakers perceive the sound made by a chick as *“jip-jip”* and therefore call it *jo‘ja*. Russian speakers, however, hear it as *“sip-sip”* and refer to it as *siplyonok*. These are simple examples; in reality, each nation’s perception, hearing, and understanding of the world is a highly complex process.

The examples of imitative words presented in Table 1 demonstrate that differences across languages with distinct systems are shaped through the linguistic worldview, which is constructed by means of figurative and metaphorical expressions, similes, connotative words, stereotypes, symbols, and other devices. Every language embodies a system of national and specific features that reflect the worldview of its speakers and shape their perception of reality.

The implications of this research are significant for both theoretical and applied linguistics. From a theoretical perspective, it contributes to integrated models of language analysis and cross-linguistic typology. From a practical standpoint, it can inform language teaching, translation studies, and discourse analysis by highlighting the role of expressive language units—especially in bilingual contexts where Uzbek learners may transfer modal/imitative patterns to English.

However, the study has certain limitations, including the restricted size of the data sample and the focus on selected languages. Future research could expand the scope by including a wider range of languages and employing quantitative methods (e.g., corpus frequency analysis) to validate the findings.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that modal and imitative words are essential components of the linguistic system, each contributing uniquely to meaning construction and communication. The systematic-structural analysis has shown that these categories possess distinct lexical and grammatical features while also sharing functional similarities in expressing subjectivity and enhancing expressiveness—differences most evident in the English-Uzbek contrast (modal verbs vs. modal words; shared reduplication in imitatives).

The findings have important implications for linguistic theory, particularly in understanding the interaction between different language units and the role of iconicity. They also offer practical insights for fields such as language education and translation, where expressive meaning plays a crucial role.

Despite its contributions, the study acknowledges limitations related to data scope and methodological constraints. Future research should explore cross-linguistic comparisons and incorporate quantitative approaches to deepen the analysis.

In conclusion, the research highlights the importance of integrating structural and functional perspectives in linguistic studies, emphasizing the role of modal and imitative words in maintaining the richness and sustainability of language.

REFERENCES

1. Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
2. Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Jakobson, R. (1960). *Linguistics and Poetics*.
4. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Hinton, L., Nichols, J., & Ohala, J. (1994). *Sound Symbolism*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Nuckolls, J. (2019). The Pragmatics of Sound Symbolism. *Annual Review of Anthropology*.
7. Dingemans, M. (2015). Ideophones and the Evolution of Language. *Language and Linguistics Compass*.

8. Abelin, Å. (1999). *Studies in Sound Symbolism*. Doctoral dissertation, Göteborg University.
9. Alexander, L. Y. (1996). *Longman English Grammar* (14th impr.). Longman.
10. Anderson, E. R. (1998). *A Grammar of Iconism*. Associated University Publications.
11. Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Henry Holt.
12. Kaxorova, I. (2025). Comparison of Imitative Words in English and Uzbek Languages. *American Journal of Education and Learning*.
<https://advancedscienti.com/index.php/AJEL/article/view/1003>