HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

"COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES OF ONOMATOPOEIC UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DIALOGIC SPEECH"

Kayumova Ozoda Baxrom qizi
O'ZDJTU, Mustaqil izlanuvchi
bakhramovnaozoda@gmail.com
Orcid number: 0009-0008-2955-2817
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23384248

Abstract: This article examines the communicative and pragmatic functions of onomatopoeic units in English and Uzbek dialogic speech. The study focuses on the ways in which sound-imitative expressions contribute to the organization of interaction, the transmission of emotions, the expression of attitudes, the management of conversational turns, and the achievement of communicative intentions. Particular attention is paid to the relationship between the phonetic form of onomatopoeic units and their contextual pragmatic meanings. The research adopts a comparative descriptive approach, combining contextual, functional-semantic, and pragmatic analysis. Illustrative examples from English and Uzbek are used to identify similarities and differences in the use of sound-imitative expressions in dialogue. The analysis suggests that onomatopoeic units can perform several communicative functions simultaneously, including sound representation, emotional intensification, evaluative expression, attention management, and the dramatization of conversational events. Their pragmatic interpretation depends not only on their lexical meaning but also on intonation, repetition, conversational position, and the relationship between interlocutors. The study highlights the importance of distinguishing cross-linguistic functional similarities from language-specific forms and cultural conventions.

Keywords: onomatopoeia, dialogic speech, pragmatics, communicative strategies, English, Uzbek, sound symbolism, expressivity, speech acts, intercultural communication.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek dialogik nutqida onomatopoetik birliklarning kommunikativ va pragmatik funksiyalari tadqiq etiladi. Tadqiqot tovushga taqlid qiluvchi ifodalarning nutqiy o'zaro ta'sirni tashkil etish, hissiyotlarni yetkazish, munosabatlarni ifodalash, suhbat navbatlarini boshqarish va kommunikativ maqsadlarga erishishdagi o'rniga qaratilgan. Onomatopoetik birliklarning fonetik shakli bilan ularning kontekstual-pragmatik ma'nolari o'rtasidagi munosabatga alohida e'tibor beriladi. Tadqiqotda kontekstual, funksional-semantik va pragmatik tahlilni birlashtirgan qiyosiy-tavsifiy yondashuv qo'llaniladi. Dialogda tovushga taqlid qiluvchi ifodalarning qo'llanishidagi o'xshashlik va farqlarni aniqlash uchun ingliz va o'zbek tillaridan namunaviy misollar keltiriladi. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, onomatopik birliklar tovushni ifodalash, hissiy ta'sirni kuchaytirish, baholash munosabatini bildirish, diqqatni boshqarish va suhbat jarayonidagi voqealarni dramatik tarzda tasvirlash kabi bir nechta kommunikativ funksiyalarni bir vaqtning o'zida bajarishi mumkin. Ularning pragmatik talqini nafaqat lug'aviy ma'noga, balki intonatsiya, takrorlanish, suhbatdagi o'rin va suhbatdoshlar o'rtasidagi munosabatlarga ham bog'liq. Tadqiqot tillararo funksional o'xshashliklarni muayyan tilga xos shakllar va madaniy me'yorlardan farqlash muhimligini ta'kidlaydi.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Kalit so‘zlar: onomatopeya, dialogik nutq, pragmatika, kommunikativ strategiyalar, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, tovush ramziyligi, ekspressivlik, nutqiy aktlar, madaniyatlararo muloqot.

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются коммуникативные и прагматические функции ономатопоэтических единиц в английской и узбекской диалогической речи. Исследование посвящено тому, каким образом звукоподражательные выражения способствуют организации речевого взаимодействия, передаче эмоций, выражению отношения говорящего, управлению очередностью реплик и достижению коммуникативных намерений. Особое внимание уделяется взаимосвязи фонетической формы ономатопоэтических единиц и их контекстуально-прагматических значений. В исследовании применяется сравнительно-описательный подход, объединяющий контекстуальный, функционально-семантический и прагматический анализ. На основе иллюстративных примеров из английского и узбекского языков выявляются сходства и различия в употреблении звукоподражательных выражений в диалоге. Анализ показывает, что ономатопоэтические единицы могут одновременно выполнять несколько коммуникативных функций, включая звуковое изображение, усиление эмоциональной выразительности, выражение оценки, управление вниманием и драматизацию событий диалогического взаимодействия. Их прагматическая интерпретация зависит не только от лексического значения, но и от интонации, повторения, позиции в разговоре и характера взаимоотношений собеседников. В исследовании подчёркивается важность разграничения межъязыкового функционального сходства, специфических языковых форм и культурных норм.

Ключевые слова: ономатопея, диалогическая речь, прагматика, коммуникативные стратегии, английский язык, узбекский язык, звуковой символизм, экспрессивность, речевые акты, межкультурная коммуникация.

INTRODUCTION

Language serves not only as a means of conveying factual information but also as a resource for expressing emotions, establishing interpersonal relationships, and regulating communicative interaction. In dialogic speech, speakers frequently employ expressive linguistic units that enable them to reproduce sounds, communicate psychological states, and make their utterances more vivid and contextually meaningful. Onomatopoeic units constitute an important part of this expressive repertoire.

Onomatopoeia refers to the linguistic representation of sounds through forms that imitate or evoke auditory experiences. In English, examples include buzz, bang, click, splash, and meow. In Uzbek, corresponding or functionally comparable forms include g‘uv-g‘uv, qars, taq, shalop, and miyov. These examples illustrate sound imitation; however, their meanings and pragmatic functions cannot always be equated directly across the two languages.

In actual communication, onomatopoeic expressions may represent environmental sounds, reproduce the actions of people or animals, reinforce emotional reactions, and create a vivid conversational atmosphere. Their significance becomes particularly evident in dialogic speech, where meaning emerges through interaction between speakers rather than through isolated lexical items.

The pragmatic interpretation of an onomatopoeic unit depends on several factors, including the communicative situation, intonation, repetition, the speaker’s intention, and the listener’s expectations. For example, the English expression Bang! may represent an explosion, imitate a sudden impact, or function as an expressive element in a dramatic narrative. Similarly, the Uzbek expression Qars! may

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

reproduce a sharp sound or emphasize the suddenness of an action. The precise interpretation in each case depends on the surrounding discourse.

Although onomatopoeia has been examined from phonetic, lexical, semantic, and comparative perspectives, its role as a resource for achieving communicative and pragmatic goals in English and Uzbek dialogue deserves further systematic analysis. Previous studies of onomatopoeic and imitative words in Uzbek and English have addressed their structural, semantic, and linguopragmatic properties, providing a basis for a more interaction-oriented comparison.

The purpose of this article is to identify, analyze, and compare the principal communicative and pragmatic strategies associated with onomatopoeic units in English and Uzbek dialogic speech. The study aims to investigate how sound-imitative expressions function within conversational interaction and how their phonetic, semantic, and pragmatic properties contribute to the realization of speakers' communicative intentions. Particular attention is devoted to the role of onomatopoeic units in expressing emotions, conveying evaluative attitudes, emphasizing significant events, attracting the interlocutor's attention, and creating expressive and contextually meaningful dialogue. Furthermore, the research seeks to establish the extent to which these units perform similar communicative functions in English and Uzbek, while accounting for language-specific linguistic structures, conventional patterns of sound imitation, and sociocultural factors that may influence their interpretation.

The objectives of the research are as follows:

To clarify the linguistic nature and functional characteristics of onomatopoeic units by examining their phonetic structure, semantic properties, expressive potential, and relationship with other sound-imitative and interjectional forms in English and Uzbek. This objective also involves distinguishing the direct representation of sounds from the additional meanings that such expressions may acquire in particular communicative contexts.

To identify and classify the principal communicative functions of onomatopoeic units in dialogic interaction, including sound representation, event identification, emotional intensification, evaluative expression, attention management, and narrative dramatization.

To examine the pragmatic roles of onomatopoeic units in expressing emotions, attitudes, and communicative intentions.

To compare the use of onomatopoeic units in English and Uzbek dialogic speech by analyzing illustrative examples from both languages and identifying similarities and differences in their formal structures, semantic associations, and communicative functions.

The research is guided by the following central question: How do onomatopoeic units contribute to the achievement of communicative intentions in English and Uzbek dialogic speech, and which aspects of their pragmatic use are shared across the two languages or determined by language-specific and sociocultural conventions? To address this question, the study also considers several subsidiary research questions: What communicative functions are most relevant to the interpretation of onomatopoeic units in dialogue? How do contextual and prosodic features influence their pragmatic meanings? To what extent can English and Uzbek sound-imitative expressions be considered functionally equivalent? What strategies can be employed to preserve their communicative and expressive effects in translation? By addressing these objectives and research questions, the article seeks to provide a comprehensive comparative account of onomatopoeic units as multifunctional linguistic resources in English and Uzbek dialogic speech. The proposed analysis is expected to clarify

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

the relationship between sound imitation and pragmatic meaning and to establish a theoretical basis for further empirical investigations using authentic conversational data from both languages

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

Onomatopoeia refers to the imitation of sounds from nature, animals, human activities, and mechanical processes. However, languages represent sounds differently according to their phonological systems and linguistic conventions. For example, a dog's sound is expressed as woof in English and vov-vov in Uzbek. Although these units may represent similar sounds, they can differ in frequency, stylistic associations, and pragmatic functions. Onomatopoeia may also overlap with interjections: Ouch! expresses pain, while Bang! imitates a sound, though both can convey emotion depending on context. In Uzbek, taqlid so‘zlar include forms imitating sounds, movements, and states. This study focuses primarily on sound-imitative units and examines related expressive forms when relevant to the pragmatic interpretation of dialogue.

Pragmatics investigates how utterances acquire meaning in specific communicative contexts. Austin and Searle demonstrated that utterances can perform actions rather than merely describe states of affairs. Grice, in turn, emphasized the role of conversational cooperation and inference in interpreting speakers' intentions. These theoretical perspectives are relevant to the study of onomatopoeic units because their communicative force frequently exceeds their literal sound-representational meaning. Consider the following illustrative dialogue:

A: What happened in the kitchen?

B: Crash! The plates fell off the table.

The word Crash! represents a sudden, loud impact. At the same time, it immediately foregrounds the event and conveys its unexpected character. It functions as a compact narrative device, allowing the speaker to communicate an event before providing a fuller explanation.

A comparable Uzbek example is:

A: Oshxonada nima bo‘ldi?

B: Qars! Likopchalar stol ustidan tushib ketdi.

Here, Qars! reproduces a sharp impact and establishes the event as the central focus of the response.

Research on English and Uzbek imitative vocabulary has considered the structural, phonetic, semantic, and functional properties of such units. For instance, Mamatmo‘minov and Mengboyev discuss the study of imitative words in Uzbek linguistics, while recent comparative research has addressed the linguopragmatic properties of onomatopoeic units in English and Uzbek. Nosirova's comparative study, Linguopragmatic Characteristics of Onomatopoeic Units in English and Uzbek Languages, explicitly considers the phonetic, morphological, semantic, and sociocultural aspects of these expressions. Such work provides a relevant starting point for examining the relationship between linguistic form and communicative function. However, claims about the relative frequency of particular forms, their distribution across speech genres, or their dominance in either language require systematic empirical verification.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employs a comparative descriptive methodology designed to examine onomatopoeic units as components of dialogic interaction. The following methods are proposed: Comparative analysis. This method identifies functional similarities and differences between English and Uzbek

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

sound-imitative expressions. Contextual analysis. Each unit is interpreted in relation to the surrounding utterances and the communicative situation. Functional-semantic analysis. This method examines the relationship between the sound represented by a unit and its broader expressive or discourse-related meaning. Pragmatic analysis. The analysis considers the speaker's communicative intention, the listener's potential interpretation, and the interpersonal effect of the expression. Discourse analysis. This method investigates how onomatopoeic units contribute to turn organization, narrative progression, emphasis, and the management of conversational interaction. For the purposes of the article, the analysis distinguishes five functional categories: Sound representation and event identification. Emotional expression and intensification. Evaluation and interpersonal positioning. Attention management and conversational turn organization. Dramatization and narrative structuring.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The most direct function of onomatopoeic units is the representation of acoustic events. They enable speakers to convey information about sounds without relying exclusively on descriptive phrases. Consider the following English dialogue:

A: Did you hear something outside?

B: Yes, bang! It sounded like the door slamming.

The expression bang reproduces the perceived sound and makes the event immediately accessible to the listener. Its short form and initial position give it considerable expressive prominence.

A functionally comparable Uzbek dialogue is:

A: Tashqaridan ovoz eshitdingmi?

B: Ha, taq! Eshik qattiq yopilganga o‘xshaydi.

The unit taq represents a short, sharp sound. Depending on the situation, other Uzbek forms may be more appropriate for a heavier impact or a different acoustic event. The comparison demonstrates that onomatopoeic units can serve as economical means of event identification in both languages. Nevertheless, their exact phonetic forms are conventionalized and should not be regarded as universally interchangeable. From a pragmatic perspective, sound representation may also help establish a shared focus of attention. The speaker directs the listener toward a salient event, after which the dialogue may develop through clarification, explanation, or evaluation.

Onomatopoeic units may communicate emotional involvement by reproducing sounds associated with fear, surprise, pain, excitement, or other reactions. In such cases, the expression does not simply identify an acoustic event; it also contributes to the speaker's emotional presentation of that event. Consider the following English example:

A: What happened when the lights went out?

B: Boom! Everyone started shouting.

The expression Boom! dramatizes the suddenness of the event. It may also indicate that the speaker is presenting the incident as surprising or intense. A comparable Uzbek example is:

A: Chiroqlar o‘chganda nima bo‘ldi?

B: Gurs etdi! Hamma baqira boshladi.

In this constructed example, gurs represents a heavy, sudden impact or rumbling sound. Its suitability depends on the intended acoustic scene; it should not be treated as a fixed translation of boom in every context. Repetition can further increase expressive force. For example:

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

A: What could you hear in the distance?
B: Bang, bang, bang! Then everything went quiet.
A possible Uzbek rendering is:
A: Uzoqdan nima eshitildi?
B: Qars-qars-qars! Keyin hamma yoq jimib qoldi.

The repeated units evoke a sequence of sounds and contribute to the temporal organization of the narrated event. However, repetition does not automatically indicate stronger emotion. It may instead represent duration, frequency, rhythm, or the recurrence of an acoustic event. The intended interpretation must therefore be established through context.

Onomatopoeic expressions can also contribute to the speaker's evaluation of an event. Their expressive force may convey disapproval, amusement, admiration, disbelief, or criticism, particularly when combined with prosody and evaluative language. Consider this English dialogue:

A: Did you see how he dropped the box?
B: Crash! Everything fell apart.

The initial expression foregrounds the accident and may contribute to a humorous or dramatic interpretation of the event. The precise interpersonal effect depends on the participants' relationship and the tone of the exchange.

A comparable Uzbek dialogue is:
A: Qutini qanday tushirib yuborganini ko'rdingmi?
B: Gurs etdi! Hammasi sochilib ketdi.

Here, gurs emphasizes the impact of the falling object. Depending on intonation and context, the response may communicate surprise, concern, or amusement. It is important to distinguish the semantic contribution of the onomatopoeic unit from the evaluation generated by the whole utterance. The expression may primarily reproduce a sound, while the speaker's attitude emerges through the accompanying words, intonation, facial expression, and shared background knowledge. Consequently, pragmatic analysis should not assign a fixed emotional value to a particular sound-imitative form without contextual evidence.

Dialogic communication involves the coordination of speaking turns and the management of shared attention. Onomatopoeic units may help speakers introduce a new event, interrupt an ongoing description, imitate a sound for the listener, or invite a response. Consider the following constructed English dialogue:

A: I was walking home when suddenly
B: What?
A: Splash! I stepped straight into a puddle.

The expression Splash! provides an expressive transition from the unfinished narrative to the central event. It also makes the account more vivid and encourages the listener to imagine the scene.

A comparable Uzbek example is:
A: Uyga qaytayotganimda birdan
B: Nima bo'ldi?
A: Shalop etib to'g'ri ko'lmakka qadam bosibman.

The unit shalop evokes a splashing sound and functions as a compact narrative signal. In these examples, the onomatopoeic unit does not independently manage the entire conversational turn. Rather, it contributes to turn construction by foregrounding the event and creating a recognizable point

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

of transition. This distinction is important because conversational organization depends on several interacting features, including syntax, pauses, intonation, sequential context, and the interlocutors' expectations. Onomatopoeia is one possible resource within this broader system.

Onomatopoeic units are especially effective when speakers reconstruct events for listeners. Their sound-imitative character enables speakers to present an experience as if it were unfolding in the immediate communicative situation. For example:

A: How did the machine stop?

B: It went click, click, click, and then stopped completely.

In this English example, repetition represents a sequence of mechanical sounds and helps establish the progression of the event.

A functionally comparable Uzbek example is:

A: Qurilma qanday to‘xtadi?

B: Taq-taq-taq qildi-da, keyin butunlay to‘xtadi.

The repeated unit taq-taq-taq provides an auditory representation of the event. The verb qildi integrates the sound-imitative expression into a larger syntactic structure. The comparison illustrates a possible structural difference in how the expressions are incorporated into the utterance. English can use onomatopoeic forms directly as sound representations or combine them with verbs, while Uzbek may employ repeated imitative forms in constructions with verbs such as qilmoq or etmoq. The precise grammatical patterns vary according to the unit and context. Such examples also demonstrate that the communicative effect of onomatopoeia is not limited to sound imitation. It can help speakers organize information temporally, maintain listener interest, and reconstruct the sequence of an event.

RESULTS

The examples discussed above suggest several dimensions along which English and Uzbek onomatopoeic units can be compared. First, both languages use sound-imitative expressions to represent salient acoustic events. Second, these expressions may contribute to emotional and evaluative meaning. Third, repetition can reproduce recurring sounds or establish rhythm. Fourth, their pragmatic force depends on their position within the dialogue and their relationship to surrounding linguistic and contextual information. At the same time, equivalent communicative functions do not necessarily require identical lexical forms. English bang, for example, may correspond to Uzbek qars, gurs, or another expression depending on the type of sound and the communicative situation. Similarly, English splash and Uzbek shalop may be functionally comparable in a particular context, but their distribution and collocational behavior should be examined rather than assumed to be identical. The comparative approach must therefore distinguish three levels of equivalence: Acoustic equivalence: the expressions represent similar sounds, Semantic equivalence: the expressions convey comparable event-related meanings, Pragmatic equivalence: the expressions perform comparable functions in the particular interaction. These levels may overlap, but they are not identical. Two expressions can be acoustically and semantically comparable while differing in emotional associations or conversational appropriateness. A detailed empirical study should examine these differences through authentic examples rather than relying exclusively on isolated lexical pairs.

The pragmatic properties of onomatopoeic units create particular challenges for translation. A literal translation may preserve the general meaning of a sound while failing to reproduce its stylistic or interactional effect. For example, the English dialogue:

A: What was that noise?

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

B: Crash! The shelf collapsed.
could be rendered into Uzbek as:
A: Bu qanday ovoz edi?

B: Gurs etib shkaf qulab tushdi.

Depending on the intended scene, a translator might choose another Uzbek expression or replace the isolated sound imitation with a descriptive phrase. The appropriate choice depends on the acoustic event, the target-language conventions, and the desired effect on the reader or listener. Three translation strategies are particularly relevant. Direct functional substitution. An English sound-imitative form is replaced with a conventional Uzbek expression that represents a comparable event and performs a similar pragmatic function. Contextual adaptation. The translator selects a different form because the target language conventionally represents the sound differently or because the original expression would sound unnatural in the translated dialogue. Descriptive compensation. The translator uses a descriptive phrase or an expressive verb to preserve the relevant event, emotion, or narrative effect when a direct onomatopoeic equivalent is unsuitable. The selection of a strategy should be guided by the communicative function of the original expression rather than by phonetic similarity alone. In intercultural communication, awareness of these differences can help language learners and translators avoid the assumption that sound imitation is universal in its linguistic realization. Although the acoustic experience may be shared, its conventional representation and discourse use are shaped by the individual language.

DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis supports several preliminary observations. First, onomatopoeic units perform communicative functions beyond the direct imitation of sounds. In dialogic contexts, they may foreground events, intensify emotional expression, support evaluation, and contribute to narrative organization. Second, their pragmatic meanings are context-dependent. The same unit may represent an acoustic event in one dialogue and function primarily as a dramatic or expressive device in another. Third, repetition is an important resource for representing recurring sounds and establishing rhythm. Its interpretation depends on whether the speaker intends to convey frequency, duration, intensity, or another contextual meaning. Fourth, English and Uzbek may employ different conventional forms to express comparable acoustic events. As a result, pragmatic equivalence is often more important than formal or phonetic similarity in comparative analysis and translation. Fifth, onomatopoeic expressions interact with other communicative resources, including intonation, lexical choice, syntax, conversational sequencing, and shared contextual knowledge.

CONCLUSION

Onomatopoeic units constitute an expressive resource in English and Uzbek dialogic speech. Their role extends beyond the imitation of natural and human-produced sounds: they can contribute to emotional expression, event identification, evaluation, attention management, and the dramatization of conversational narratives. The comparison indicates that both languages can employ sound-imitative expressions to make dialogue more vivid and to facilitate the representation of salient events. However, the forms used to represent comparable sounds do not necessarily correspond directly in phonetic structure, semantic range, or pragmatic function. The interpretation of an onomatopoeic unit depends on the communicative situation, the speaker's intention, the listener's expectations, intonation,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

repetition, and the surrounding discourse. Accordingly, these expressions should be examined as context-sensitive components of interaction rather than as isolated lexical items.

The study also demonstrates the relevance of pragmatic equivalence to English–Uzbek translation. Translators should consider not only the sound represented by an expression but also its expressive, interpersonal, and narrative functions in the original dialogue. The principal limitation of the present draft is the absence of a systematically compiled and verified corpus of authentic dialogue.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
4. Mamatmo‘minov, T., & Mengboyev, S. (2022). O‘zbek tilshunosligida taqlid so‘zlarning o‘rganilishi [The study of imitative words in Uzbek linguistics]. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 2(5), 254–256.
5. Nosirova, N. A. (n.d.). Linguopragmatic characteristics of onomatopoeic units in English and Uzbek languages. Tadqiqotlar. Bibliographic details should be verified against the journal's official record before submission.
6. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Dingemanse, M. (2012). Advances in the cross-linguistic study of ideophones. Language and Linguistics Compass, 6(10), 654–672. https://doi.org/10.1002/lnc3.361