

# THE PHONO-SIGNOSEMANTIC ONTOLOGY OF MODERN ENGLISH

## “WILL” AND OTHER WORDS

By Dr. Mahmudjon Kuchkarov – Founder of the Odam Tili (Human Language) empirical theory;  
Odam Tili Academy, New York, USA

### 1. Introduction

Modern linguistics traditionally treats the link between word forms and meanings as arbitrary. In stark contrast, the emerging **Odam Tili** theory (from Uzbek “*Odam Tili*” meaning “*Human Language*”) proposes that language sounds and symbols are rooted in natural human experience [1][2]. Developed over two decades by **Dr. Mahmudjon Kuchkarov**, Odam Tili argues that phonemes and even letter shapes carry intrinsic meanings derived from our physical interactions with the world [3]. This paradigm-shifting framework reinterprets ancient narratives—most notably the biblical Eden story—not as mere myth but as linguistic allegory encoding the natural origins of human speech [1][4]. According to Kuchkarov, the Eden episode of Adam, Eve, the serpent, and the Tree of Knowledge symbolizes how fundamental shapes and sounds became the first language elements [4].

In this article, we delve into **phono-signosemantic ontology** – the notion that phonic (sound) and sign (symbolic shape) aspects of words are meaning-bearing [1]. We focus on the example of the English word “*will*” and related terms to illustrate how Odam Tili uncovers a surprisingly concrete logic behind their form and meaning. We also address the skepticism this theory has met in mainstream linguistics and AI circles, challenging claims that it is “*speculative*” by highlighting its empirical foundations [3].

---

### 2. Edenic Archetypes: “I”, “T”, and the Birth of Language

Odam Tili reframes the Garden of Eden scene as a linguistic birth moment, where key natural forms became prototypes for language [1][4]. In Kuchkarov’s retelling,

Adam (the first man) corresponds to the symbol “I”, and the Tree of Knowledge corresponds to “T”. This is not coincidence or mere visual pun – it is a reflection of real physical forms: a human standing upright resembles the shape of the letter “I”, and a tree with its horizontal branches atop a trunk mirrors the shape “T” [4].

Crucially, these shapes aren’t just visual symbols; they are linked to natural sounds produced by these entities [1]. For instance, when a person is suddenly jolted (as in a hiccup), a natural vocal sound “/i/” is often emitted – a sound Odam Tili associates with the human figure “I”. By contrast, when a wooden tree trunk snaps, it produces a sharp percussive crack – essentially a /t/ sound. According to Kuchkarov, early humans internalized such connections: the letter “T” became the **signosemantic mark** of the tree, anchored in the sound of a breaking tree limb [1][2].

Supporting this view, many words for tree across languages indeed feature a hard *T* sound – for example: *tree* in English, *tol* (willow) and *terak* (poplar) in Uzbek, *topol’* (poplar) in Russian, and *Tapuach* (apple) in Hebrew [2]. Odam Tili interprets this recurring *T* as no accident but a remnant of an ancient natural coding.

The symbol “I”, by contrast, represents the living, moving human. It stands upright, emphasizing human agency and consciousness [1]. When Adam is drawn as “I”, it underscores that in the beginning, the self-aware human form itself was a linguistic sign. Notably, Kuchkarov points out that humans differ from trees in one critical way: we can move from our spot, while a tree is rooted in place. This distinction is poetically encoded in myth: when Adam and Eve succumbed to mortality, they became still like trees. In Christian burial tradition, a wooden cross (☩ – essentially a “T”) is placed at gravesites – symbolizing that a once-mobile person has become motionless as a tree in death [4].

Indeed, in the Odam Tili analysis, a human only achieves the tree’s immobility in death – hence the cross mark “T” denotes a final rest [2]. The very word “*church*” is hypothesized in this framework to hark back to *cho ‘qqiga qo ‘yilgan cho ‘p* (Uzbek for “a stick set on a summit”) – possibly alluding to early funeral stakes on hilltops, though this etymology is speculative [3].

### 3. Natural Phonosemantic Patterns: Wind, Motion, and Reversal

Human language, in Kuchkarov's view, evolved by abstracting recurring natural experiences into sounds and symbols [1][2]. A vivid example is the **wind**. A gentle breeze causes tree branches to sway in a V-like arc; one can even hear a soft /v/ or /w/-sound in the rustling of leaves [4]. When the wind grows stronger, the oscillation doubles – tracing a “W” shape (two “V” s). Odam Tili suggests that the letter “W” (literally *double-V*) was chosen to represent a stronger, more forceful wind [1][2].

According to Odam Tili analysis, certain phonetic elements serve as “semantic inversers” – linguistic negations akin to multiplying by -1 in mathematics [3]. The phoneme /v/ is one such element. Kuchkarov posits that adding a /v/ sound to a root can flip its core meaning into an opposite. For example, in Russian *idti* (to go) versus *vernut'sya* (to return), the *ver-* prefix (with /v/) signals inversion [1][3]. These comparisons suggest that *V* often encodes a reversal or negation of an idea – functioning almost like a linguistic minus sign that inverts a word's sense [2][3].

### 4. The Serpent “S” and the Principle of Transformation

In Odam Tili theory, the serpent is foundational to human phonosemantics [1]. The snake's winding shape and hiss are visually and acoustically mirrored by the letter “S” [2]. The sound /s/ itself is the hiss of the snake – one of nature's primal danger signals. Kuchkarov's empirical research found that many languages use the sibilant /s/ or /sh/ in words related to smooth or snake-like qualities [2][3].

Examples include English *smooth* and Uzbek *silliq*, both meaning “sleek,” or *squeeze* and *siq* (to constrict) [3]. Even “sleep” (English), *spat'* (Russian), and *uyqu* (Uzbek) relate to serpent-like stillness. As one Odam Tili publication put it, “*the /s/ and /sh/ sounds originate from reactions to the hiss and rattle of snakes*” [2].

Beyond just S, the serpent contributed a deeper linguistic concept: **transformation**. The snake can coil into S, Z, or I shape and sheds its skin – symbolizing rebirth. Odam Tili interprets this as a metaphor for transformation within

stability [1][4]. Interestingly, the English *science* begins with *sci-* – seen as the serpent element combined with the human “I”. Kuchkarov argues that *science* at its root conveys the snake-like principle that nothing is created or destroyed, only transformed [1][4][5][6].

---

### 5. “Will”: A Case Study in Phono-Signosemantic Depth

The English word *will* exemplify Odam Tili’s analytic power [1][3]. “W” signifies directed, double-intensified motion, while “ill” depicts stillness or lifelessness. The combination yields *drive* + *destiny* — the human will to act despite mortality [3][4]. Odam Tili interprets this as an existential code embedded in the structure of the word itself.

In many Indo-European languages, the future tense derives from roots meaning *want* or *desire* (e.g., *je veux* → *I will*) [2]. The Odam Tili lens adds that the phonosemantic makeup of “will” — the dynamic *W* opposed to the static *LL* — made it naturally suited to express futurity and volition [1][3][4].

---

### 6. Challenges to the Theory and the AI Perspective

Kuchkarov’s claims challenge the linguistic orthodoxy of arbitrariness [1][3]. Critics label the interpretations as coincidental, but Odam Tili supporters argue the theory’s cross-linguistic consistency suggests a real natural code [3][4].

Even the AI community reflects this bias. Elon Musk’s AI *Grok* reportedly summarized Odam Tili as “*speculative*”, which Kuchkarov rebuts, emphasizing that the theory is grounded in empirical phonosemantic data across 50+ languages [3]. If correct, this would imply that AI models like GPT and BERT, which lack sensory grounding, fundamentally misunderstand the embodied nature of language [3][5].

Odam Tili proposes integrating **linguistic form with sensory reality** to make AI more human-like and context-aware [3][6].

---

### 7. Conclusion

The exploration of *will* and other words through phono-signosemantic ontology reveals the profound natural coding Odam Tili uncovers in human speech [1][4]. While extraordinary claims require rigorous testing, the framework encourages a reevaluation of linguistic dogma and a return to the embodied roots of meaning [1][3][5].

If even partially correct, it suggests language is not man-made abstraction but a natural mirror of reality — an insight with implications for linguistics, anthropology, psychology, and artificial intelligence alike [3][5][6].

---

### References

- [1] Kuchkarov, M. (2025). *Before OT and After OT: A Paradigm Shift in Human Sciences*. *Modern Education and Development*, 33(1), 69–71.
- [2] Kuchkarov, M. & Kuchkarov, M. (2025). *Human Language as Natural Coding: Insights from the Odam Tili Theory*. *World Scientific Research Journal*, 36(1), 143–145.
- [3] Kuchkarov, M. (2025). *Why “Odam Tili” is Not Speculative: A Call for a Linguistic Revolution*. *Journal of New Century Innovations*, 84(1), 32–34.
- [4] Kuchkarov, M. (2023). *The Odam Tili Theory: Language as Natural Coding*. OTA Press, NY.
- [5] Pulvermüller, F. (2005). Brain mechanisms linking language and action. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 6(7), 576–582.
- [6] Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. Basic Books.