



IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI



VOL.2 № 4

2025

LINGUISTIC UNITS AND THE FORMATION OF ANATHEMATIC ACTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Xasanova Nasiba

English teacher at Academic lyceum of Samarkand State University

khasanovanasiba85@gmail.com

Annotation

The article analyzes linguistic units and their role in forming anathematic acts. Elements of language such as lexemes, morphemes, patterns, and speech units manifest in discourse through paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Using examples of English and Uzbek swear words and taboo expressions, the study examines their origin, usage, and evaluative coloring, emphasizing their significance as means of enriching the lexicosemantic and phraseological system of a language and enhancing emotional expression.

Keywords: linguistic unit, speech, anathematic act, lexeme, pattern, taboo words, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations.

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA ANATEMATIK AKTLARNING SHAKLLANISHIDA LINGVISTIK BIRLIKLARNING O‘RNI: QIYOSIY TAHLIL

Xasanova Nasiba

E-mail: khasanovanasiba85@gmail.com

Annotatsiya

Maqolada lisoniy birliklar va ularning anatem aktlarini hosil qiluvchi xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Leksema, morfema, qolip va nutqiy birliklar kabi til elementlari paradigmatic va

chiqilgan, tilning leksik-frazeologik boyligini va emotsional ifoda imkoniyatlarini namoyon

Kalit so‘zlar: lisoniy birlik, nutq, anat paradigmatic va syntagmatic munosabat.

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ЕДИНИЦЫ И ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ АНАТЕМАТИЧЕСКИХ АКТОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

E-mail: khasanovanasiba85@gmail.com

Аннотация

Ключевые слова:

Linguistic units are the fundamental building blocks of a language, used in the process of speech to express ideas, convey messages, and facilitate social communication. They exist at various levels, including phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, patterns, and speech units, and form the structure of a language through paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Anathematic acts, such as curses and insults, emerge through the lexical and phraseological resources of a language. This article examines the properties of linguistic units and their role in forming anathematic acts, with illustrative examples from English and Uzbek.

Linguistic units form the foundation of language and are realized in speech through phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, and patterns (Xoliyorov, 2017). The relationships between these units are organized through **syntagmatic** (sequential) and **paradigmatic** (associative) mechanisms, which regulate their combination and substitution in discourse (Muratova & Abduqahhorova, 2022; Bekmurzayeva et al., 2024). These mechanisms are crucial for understanding the formation and usage of anathematic acts.

In English, anathematic units such as swear words and taboo expressions exhibit distinct phonological, morphosyntactic, and sound-symbolic properties, often linked to cultural and religious contexts (Bergen, 2016). Combined, these studies highlight that anathematic expressions serve not only as linguistic forms but also as carriers of emotional, social, and cultural meaning, enriching the lexicosemantic and phraseological structure of a language.

This study employs a descriptive-analytical method to examine linguistic units involved in anathematic acts in English and Uzbek. Primary and secondary sources, including dictionaries, literary texts, and previous linguistic research, were analyzed. The focus was on identifying lexemes, morphemes, patterns, and fixed expressions that constitute anathematic units. Both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations were traced to observe how these units function in discourse. Additionally, English and Uzbek examples of swear words, taboo expressions, and phraseological units were collected to highlight differences and similarities in usage, semantic coloring, and social context.

The analysis revealed that anathematic units exist in the form of words (e.g., *bitch*, *yashshamagur*) and phrases (e.g., *hell's delight*, *Ovozing o'chgur!*). These units can be borrowed, archaic, or newly formed, and their usage may be limited or unrestricted depending on social or stylistic context. In English, many anathematic expressions originate from religious or literary sources, whereas in Uzbek, examples often reflect Islamic beliefs and cultural norms. The study also confirmed that these units carry predominantly negative semantic values but may occasionally convey ironic or positive meanings depending on context.

According to M. Kholiyorov, the concept of language and the units it generates can be described as follows: language represents a system of shared and obligatory tools, shaped by ancestors, that is available to all members of a speech community. It is used for creating, expressing, transmitting, and interpreting thoughts and for other communicative purposes. This system encompasses phonemes, lexemes, phrases, morphemes, and the rules governing their combinations. These units are stored in the human mind, ready to be deployed in speech. Individual elements of language are referred to as linguistic units. Linguistics distinguishes between the levels of language (system) and speech (actual usage), with each linguistic unit possessing a virtual existence in the mind. Every unit has two main aspects: the formal (external) aspect and the semantic (internal) aspect. The realization of a linguistic unit in a material form (e.g., written or spoken) according to the norms established in the minds of the speech community constitutes actual speech.

Phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, and patterns are considered linguistic units, while sounds, affixes, words, derived words, word combinations, and sentences belong to speech units. Among these, the lexeme is the primary unit responsible for naming, denoting, and referring to

linguistic phenomena, thereby preparing them for communication between individuals. For this reason, lexemes are regarded as the most central and essential elements of a language.

The next type of linguistic unit is the **pattern**, understood as the cognitive schemas in the minds of language users for constructing words, word combinations, or sentences. These schemas enable members of a speech community to correctly combine and apply linguistic units in actual speech.

The lexicon of the Uzbek language can be classified in several ways: according to the degree of adoption (borrowed vs. native lexemes) and usage (restricted vs. unrestricted lexemes). Based on the temporal limitation of usage, words can be classified as contemporary, historical (e.g., *qarol*, *qozi*), archaic (e.g., *tilmoch*, *afandi*), or neologisms (newly coined words such as *reyting*, *audit*). Based on the scope of use, lexemes can belong to regional dialects, technical terminology, jargon, or slang. Restricted-use words serve specific stylistic functions in discourse. For example, archaic words are used in literary or popular texts to create irony or satire, while historical lexemes vividly depict past events. Dialectal lexemes convey local color, terminology expresses scientific and technical concepts precisely, and jargon serves to represent the speech of particular social groups.

In terms of expressiveness, words may be neutral or marked, with marked words carrying either positive or negative connotations (e.g., *chehra*, *badburush*). Fixed expressions can be initially free combinations (phrases, sentences) or fully fixed constructions (proverbs, sayings, idioms, figurative expressions).

N. Muratova and X. Abduqahhorov explain that linguistic units exist within the language system based on certain interrelations. These can be divided into two main groups: first, relations among units at the same level, and second, relations between units of different levels, i.e., cross-level relations. Units at the same level interact in two main ways: **paradigmatic (associative) relations** and **syntagmatic (sequential) relations**.

M. Bekmurzayeva and colleagues explain that **syntagmatic relations** reflect the sequential arrangement of linguistic units in the speech process and their mutual grammatical connections. These relations determine how words are linked, the roles they perform, and the overall structure of a sentence. Syntagmatic relations are formed based on the order of words and

function.

Paradigmatic relations, on the other hand, refer to the possibility of substituting one linguistic unit for another. These relations are primarily based on lexical choice and allow units performing the same function to be interchangeable. For instance, the words *kitob* and *gazeta* are in a paradigmatic relation, meaning they can be substituted in a sentence. Such substitution maintains the overall sentence structure while altering the informational content. Both syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations play a crucial role in shaping the grammatical and semantic system of a language.

Regarding the linguistic units forming **anathematic acts** in English, B. Bergen notes that **taboo words** are characterized by constraints related to their phonological form and morphosyntactic usage. English taboo words are often grammatically flexible, appearing in different word classes, acquiring metaphorical meanings, participating in infixation, compound formation, and lexical hybridization. Bergen also highlights that taboo words tend to be distinguished by word le

-frequency words tend to shorten over time (e.g.,

automobile → *car*).

According to Bergen (2016), taboo words often exhibit **sound-symbolic (phonetic- iconic) features**, including closed syllable structures (e.g., consonant vowel consonant patterns) and the frequent use of plosive consonants beyond what is statistically expected (e.g., *shit*). In particular, **phonesthesia** is considered an important factor shaping the structure of taboo words.

Many taboo units consist of short, closed syllables with sequences of hard consonants, creating a sound pattern that is subjectively unpleasant, thereby reflecting the negative or repulsive qualities of the referent they denote.

Based on the above, the following conclusions can be drawn regarding the **linguistic means forming anathematic acts**: Anathematic units appear in the form of **words** (e.g., *bitch*, *yashshamazur*) and **phrases** (e.g., *hell's delight*, *Ovozing o'chgur!*). They may be **borrowed** (e.g., *stiffen the lizards/snakes/wombats* *In articulo mortis* frequently used *bitch* among contemporary Uzbek youth) or **language-specific** (e.g., *The best of the British luck to you* English; *Qo'lingga xasmol chiqqur* Uzbek).

In terms of temporal usage, they can be **archaic** (e.g., *Take into camp* American English) or **neologistic** (e.g., *Frungy*, *Gronk* curses from fictional alien languages in literary works). Based on their scope of use, they may be **restricted** (e.g., *Push up (the) daisies* **unrestricted** (e.g., *Shuffle off this mortal coil* near death).

With regard to **expressiveness**, anathematic units are generally negative in meaning (e.g., *Die a dog's death* *Go'ringda chirigur!*), though contextually they can also convey positive meanings (e.g., *Join the angels* humorous; Uzbek: *Qiyomat diydor bo'lmok* a literary expression meaning to disappear without meeting someone). Most anathematic expressions are **fixed constructions**.

Many English curse phrases have their origins in **Christianity and the Bible** (e.g., *The Father of Lies* *Give up the ghost* reflect **Islamic religious belief**, such as the phrase *Kalomulloh ursin*

The analysis demonstrates that anathematic units, whether words or phrases, vary in terms of **usage, origin, and expressiveness**. As linguistic units, they can convey **negative meanings** or, depending on context, even **positive nuances** in speech. English anathematic units are often linked to religious, literary, and social contexts, while Uzbek examples are primarily drawn from Islamic expressions. Thus, anathematic units are significant as tools that enrich the **lexical and phraseological system of a language** and enhance **emotional impact** in communication.

References

1. Bekmurzayeva M., va boshq. . 2024. B. 100 105.
2. Bergen B. K. What the F: What Swearing Reveals About Our Language, Our Brains, and Ourselves. New York : Basic Books, 2016. 336 p.
3. Muratova N. B., Abduqahhorova X. A. Q. munosabatlari: ketma-ketlik munosabati // Academic Research in Educational Sciences. 2022. B. 607 610.
4. Xoliyorov M. Termiz, 2017. 149 b.