



INSULTING LEXEMES AND ANALYSIS OF THEIR LINGUISTIC-CRIMINOLOGICAL

Jumanazar Urozov Norqizilovich

Assistant professor

Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

urozovjumanazar@navoiy-uni.uz

Article history:	Abstract:
<p>Received: 11th March 2022</p> <p>Accepted: 11th April 2022</p> <p>Published: 23rd May 2022</p>	<p>This article analyses insulting lexemes and their lexical and legal classification, as well as linguistic-criminological analysis. In the recent past, there have been reports of invective lexemes being considered insulting, but not today, and moving towards neutral lexicons. In general, the concepts of insult and humiliation are explained. An analysis of the use of vulgar lexical items, vulgar words, rude and obscene words as insults.</p>

Keywords: Insults, obscene words, swearing, rude words, slander, verbal discrimination, general and legal concept of insult, obscene lexical units, vulgar words.

Many linguists today acknowledge the need to move beyond linguistics to social, national, spiritual, psychological, and cultural processes in order to properly understand language processes and clearly interpret linguistic facts. As a result, the deeper integration of linguistic knowledge with other scientific knowledge leads to the emergence and active development of interrelated scientific disciplines such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics. Linguistics, including linguistics, has a special place in these areas of linguistics. Although the term linguocriminalism has been actively used in world linguistics for the last 50-60 years, it is difficult to say that a system of principles has been developed. In the field of Uzbek linguistics, this area is not scientifically studied. Despite the fact that several studies on legal terminology have been conducted and PhD and doctoral dissertations have been defended in this field, it should be noted that the object and subject of this field in Uzbek linguistics has not yet been widely discussed. The role of linguocriminology should be significant in the current period of global changes in the reform of the judiciary and the judiciary in our country, and this will strengthen the position of linguistics as a direction that brings practical results was. In particular, the Arbitration Court and the Institute of Advisers, which have been introduced in our country in recent years, have shown that these areas pose a number of challenges to linguistics. The issue of linguistic support for the involvement of people without legal knowledge in legal proceedings is becoming increasingly important.

The number of lawsuits filed in connection with the lawsuit has risen sharply in recent years. The proliferation of lexical items that threaten human identity, dignity, and reputation has also raised the issue of differentiating levels of insult. So what language units are considered insulting? Linguist V.I. Jelvis: "In legal practice, it should be borne in mind that some insults may from time to time be used in the opposite sense, as an expression of admiration or friendship:" [1] In this regard, the lexeme of insult can be defined as follows: insult is defined in Article 140 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan as "inappropriately discriminating against the honor and dignity of another person".

In the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language, insults, contempt, humiliation; inferiority; comes in the form of insults. It is a word that is degrading, degrading, degrading. Insult words that belong to the vulgar category of non-literary lexical units are semantically graded. It is based on the positive or negative impact on the dignity, prestige, reputation of a person or legal entity. These processes provide linguistic clarification of problematic situations in the judicial system. Professor B. Urinbaev divides insulting words into 3 groups according to their meaning and scope:

a) vulgarisms that express the weakness of the character of the person and the client: such as *ezma, juvonboz, xumpar, buzuq, mug'ombir, latta*;

b) vulgarisms indicating the external shortcomings of a person: *mechkay, ko'ppak, maymoq, ilonbosh, simyog'och, qovoqbosh, ayronbosh, gumbaz, bordonday, qo'ng'iz, mo'ylov, kal, do'rdoq, qiyshiq, qo'tir*;

c) Vulgarisms that mean insult, mourning: *bachchag'ar, yaramas, ablah, xumpar, nomard, badbaxt, nonko'r, gumroh, qistaloq, ahmoq, sintaloq, xotin-taloq, galvars, kasofat, naxs, ko'ppak, og'moq (telbalanmoq), og'zi katta (kibr-havoli), nazarga ilmaydi (mensimaslik)*. [2]

Linguist TS Shakhmatova admits that words meaning insult (communicative disorder) in the modern sense imply the implementation of the following strategies of speech behavior:

1) Slander - the public dissemination of defamatory information;
 2) verbal discrimination - the expression of one's superiority in speech for racial, national, property or other reasons;

- 3) verbal discrediting - discrediting, degrading someone, undermining trust;
- 4) verbal insinuation - a negative perception of someone's social image. [3, 2017. 32.]

Insults are always directed at a specific person. Obscene words and actions that are not directed at a specific person can be considered harassment.

Insulting lexemes can be classified as follows:

T/r	Types of insults	Examples
1.	Cursing	<i>Iflos, qo'tir, ahmoq, bezbet</i>
2.	Socially stigmatized terms	<i>o'g'ri, fohisha, tovlamachi, firibgar, poraxo'r, kolxoz, haromi, lo'li</i>
3.	Terms with a negative history	<i>fashist, millatchi, qonxo'r</i>
4.	Calling another profession by the name of one profession	<i>shifokorni jallod, qassob deyish.</i>
5.	Zoosemantic metaphors	<i>mol, eshak, it, hayvon, cho'chqa</i>
6.	Negative verbs	<i>uxlatisht, kiydirish, yedirish</i>
7.	Terms that negatively assess human behavior	<i>ablah, yaramas, maraz, latta, lapashang, dovdird, itfe'l, jinni</i>

Deliberate use of abusive language is the use of words that are inappropriate for a person in the eyes of the public.

For example, if an employee is treated like, "Is it possible to be on time, you idiot?", You can be prosecuted administratively or criminally. To determine this, the expert is asked two questions:

- Are these words really rude, obscene, and insulting?
- Are these words ethically and aesthetically insulting?

The task of linguistic expertise is to provide a linguistic analysis of insulting words in texts that could damage a person's or an organization's dignity. [4, 2022. -B. 41]

N.D. Golev, who made a significant contribution to the development of jurisprudence in Russia, he argues: "The theoretical problem of the use of an inappropriate linguistic form of expression of opinion, which is so necessary in the linguistic examination of cases of insult or discrimination against human dignity, honor and business reputation, is always present. And this can often serve as a barrier. That fact must be taken into account." [5]

Linguists say that the deliberate use of insulting and rude expressions is an insult to a person and, of course, can be prosecuted criminally or administratively according to his semantic level. However, criminal proceedings will not be instituted for rude, insulting, shameless remarks made by an individual involuntarily, not for the purpose of insulting someone in public, but as a result of a conflict of interest. [6]

The most important aspects of a civil court's human rights record are:

- List and nature of insulting words;
- What lexemes they include;
- When they can be insulted and when they can't.

According to Sternin, "Concepts, obscene words, obscene expressions, vulgar words, and invective vocabulary are important in the use of these everyday words, as well as in linguistic and legal understanding. There is a normative, methodological and ethical classification of the use of the word." [7]

Linguistic analysis of insulting lexemes is not important for the trial process, but the conclusion of the analysis is considered important for the process. The following is a linguocriminalistic analysis of insult lexemes:

T/r	Insulting lexemes	Linguocriminalistic analysis
1.	Ahmoq(stupid)	1. <i>Stupid.</i> 2. <i>Insulting a person in public is used as an insult.</i>
2.	Lo'li	1. <i>A dancer who sings;</i> 2. <i>Used against women in a belligerent, quarrelsome, slapstick manner.</i>
3.	Haromi	1. <i>Intentional harassment of an unmarried person is considered an insult.</i> 2. <i>It is an insult if the word is used in public to deliberately discredit or discriminate.</i>

4.	Iflos(dirty)	1.Kirlangan, isqirt; 2. <i>Insulting a person in public is considered an insult when used inappropriately in a public speaking situation.</i>
5.	It (dog)	<i>It is considered insulting to compare a person to a dog and use it inappropriately in public.</i>
6.	Qo'tir	1. <i>It is an insult if it is applied to a person who has a skin blister and does not have a skin disease.</i> 2. <i>Linguistic-pragmatic analysis is used when the word is used in public for the purpose of deliberate discrediting.</i>

These principles of linguistic criminological analysis are important for the objective evaluation of the disputed text and should be applied to linguistic criminology as a whole. In the recent past, invective lexicons have been considered insulting, but today they are not considered to be such and are moving towards neutral lexicons. The task of linguistic expertise is to provide a linguistic analysis of insulting words in texts that could damage the reputation of a person or an organization. Linguist Sternin states that the process of conducting an expert should be based on the following principles in order to know whether the word insult is really used in the context of insult and whether it is purposeful:

1. The presence of negative expressions about the person in the text, ie expressions that negatively describe him;
2. These expressions are self-directed;
3. Negative expressions give a person a generalizing characteristic as a person;
4. Negative expressions insult the person from the content;
5. The expressions under analysis have an inappropriate language form;
6. Public insults (published in the press, recorded in television appearances, speeches at rallies, meetings, used in an official written statement or document addressed to an official organization, etc.).

Only when all six signs of insult are present can a linguistic conclusion be drawn about the presence of insult in the text. There are also the seventh and eighth signs of humiliation and insult, but they cannot be identified by a linguist:

7. The accuracy of the defamatory information;
8. The intention of the author of the statement to intentionally insult the person during the preparation and publication of the text. [5]

It is necessary to distinguish between the simple and the legal concept of impurity. The main difference between normative and insulting words is that they are allowed to be used in public: they are allowed to be used normally, non-normative - they cannot be accepted in public use. If an insulting phrase has a literary or colloquial form, it is not considered obscene. The use of vulgar (vernacular) words is also not regulated. If a word is a form of expression, the idea is expressed in a dictionary of words and phraseology.

Its use negatively characterizes the level of culture of the speaker, first of all, it indicates the low level of culture of the speaker, the primitiveness of the culture of speech. Linguistically, this use is obscene, but not insulting. The use of obscene language can lead to moral condemnation, but it cannot be regulated. Mass use of obscene words orally and in writing (for example, in the media, in fiction) should not be allowed, moral prohibition of the use of obscene words in public can be seen as a violation. In conversation (between friends) it can be used in certain situations. For example, how well this dog dances!

The use of obscene linguistic forms against a particular person is regulated by law. Such use would be derogatory in the legal sense of the word. For example, someone may use obscene language in a public place. If the insult is not said to a specific person, it can be considered petty harassment; the use of such words negatively describes the speaker and is not allowed to be used in public. There are still many problems with the use of obscene language. Gorbanevsky writes about the problem of their use in the media, and believes that the use of obscene words in newspapers, on the radio or on television should be considered petty hooliganism. [8].

In the case of public use of obscene language, the speaker may be fined for petty hooliganism (insulting public morals, insulting a specific person), but in many cases he is accused of insulting a particular interlocutor cannot. There are fines for obscene language in a public place, which violates public morality, but only for administrative offenses. Thus, if a phrase that slanders a person in terms of content has a normative-literary or verbal-expressive form, this form cannot be considered insulting because it remains in the normative category, although so ' their use in colloquial speech may seem stylistically inappropriate. There is no linguistic or legal basis for the insult in the text.

If the insulting expression in the content takes the form of a rude expression, it violates the moral prohibition of the public use of rude words, but it is also indecent and not regulated by law. It should be noted that for the everyday mind, both rude and obscene words and phrases are considered immoral.

In general, obscene words and phrases in a non-terminological sense are synonymous with native speakers. To the general public, all obscene, rude, and obscene words are considered equally obscene. In this regard, relying on his own linguistic consciousness, a speaker of any native language may consider those who use rude or obscene

words to be obscene, and as a result may resent the speaker for his obscene, rude words. The linguistic form of this statement is correct from the point of view of everyday consciousness, but not from the point of view of law.

From a legal point of view, only obscene words are an insulting linguistic form, but a number of conditions must be met in order to legally condemn or punish a person who uses obscene words and phrases.

Experts say that simply using obscene words and phrases is not a basis for legal intervention. This is possible and legal only in the following cases:

a) addressed directly to a specific person or group of persons;

(b) There is a direct intention to insult;

c) An invective (intended to offend) dictionary - describes a person as a person, not as individual actions or words. A generalized assessment of his personality is made.

d) When the phrase is used in public. [9]

It is important to distinguish between the general and legal concepts of insult. Since the truth is established in the trial, not justice, the offense cannot be the subject of discussion in the analysis of the disputed text. In addition, the plaintiff often confuses insult with criticism, that is, he sees criticism as insult. Some people may be offended by words that are completely offensive to them, while others may never be.

In general, the concepts of humiliation and insult are often indistinguishable. In fact, one can be upset about everything.

The difference between insult and humiliation can be seen in its individual, subjective, emotional and psychological nature, in the aspects of real discrimination. However, the everyday notion of insult is not legally insulting unless it negatively describes the person from a moral point of view and is expressed in an obscene manner. The final decision on the existence of the insult is made by the court in the event that the facts are true or inconsistent and that the plaintiff was intentionally insulted by the defendant.

To give a specific example, is it insulting for a judge to say that he is stupid when he leaves the courtroom?

Does this phrase insult the judge?

Let's take a look at the linguistic signs of the above-mentioned insults.

1. Are there negative statements about the person in the text?

A judge is stupid - a negative statement that gives negative information about a judge.

2. Are these statements made in the personal name of the judge?

No, it is not told to the judge in person, it is described indirectly, and will be announced in the courtroom as an assessment after the trial. This is because it is a rude expression used against the judge, not the judge.

3. Does negative speech describe a person as a whole, as a whole?

Yes, expression is a generalizing feature.

4. Is this negative statement insulting to the content judge?

Insult is discrimination in the form of obscene language.

The phrase being analyzed offends the judge, insults him, uses the word insult (invective) in public, and insults are morally condemned by the public consciousness; the rules of courtesy can be seen as a clear violation. Thus, in public, the defendant has degraded the public and professional status of the judge in a public place, which is discriminatory for the judge. Mass humiliation harms the judge. However, the analyzed statement does not insult the judge, because it does not contain information that discredits the judge, it is not a statement about the judge's moral shortcomings or his violation, but a subjective evaluative opinion. 5. Does the denial being analyzed have the form of obscene language?

The word idiot is a stylistic colloquial word that does not belong to obscene words and is not obscene, so it does not have the status of an insulting linguistic form in the legal sense of the word.

6. Will the insult be made public?

The term is used in a public place - in court, that is, in public places.

Thus, in a controversial statement, there are only three of the six characters that allow us to talk about insults, and it is precisely these basic characters that do not have all the necessary differential features of the insult in common.

From this point of view, from a legal point of view, saying "Judge is stupid" is not considered an insult to a judge. It should be noted that the intent to insult and to determine the veracity of the defamatory information. The court does not have the jurisdiction to insult the judge in this case.

An analysis of the semantics of the word fool allows us to identify two meanings of this word:

1. Stupidly ill (sick).

2. A very stupid person (in colloquial language).

In a controversial situation, the word idiot is used figuratively in colloquial language - a very stupid person, he is pronounced at home, not in a medical situation. An analysis of the situation at the trial, as well as the testimony of the plaintiff and witnesses, showed that the disputed statement was made by the defendant at the door as he was leaving the courtroom and was not made in person by the judge-judge. The defendant did not look at the judge; the judge was behind him, who said this as a subjective assessment of the judge's mental ability. It is an expression of his subjective assessment of the judge's conduct, uncultured but unspoken to the judge, and the judge cannot sue for insult. Given the communicative situation, the use of controversial words shows that there are no signs of insulting the judge - the phrase "judge is a fool" are not uttered to the judge in person, nor does he describe the judge as a

person who violates any rules. Ethics or laws are not subject to scrutiny. This violates the culture of speech, which indicates that the defendant has no culture, but is not regulated by law. So, in conclusion, in determining linguistic analysis of insulting lexemes, it is necessary to pay attention to the following: first, the analysis of the text is more effective in terms of the hierarchical nature of insulting lexemes. On this basis, the dictionary of insults is important for the expert.

Such a dictionary serves as a basis for clarifying the content of the disputed text, as well as for providing an inquiry; secondly, there are lexemes with an insulting content that are used as an insult lexeme in some areas and in a positive sense in others. If the two regions use the same type of words in the conversation, misunderstandings and inability to get to the heart of the matter can lead to a conflict between the two. In such cases, the linguistic examination of the insulting lexeme is important. But a linguist also needs vulgar, slang words, as well as an index of non-literal grammatical and phonetic units. Creating a national corpus of not only indices but also non-index units can serve great positive results. There is no source in Uzbek linguistics in this regard, and the judiciary needs such innovations; third, it is necessary to develop a clear list of lexemes that threaten a person's identity, dignity, or reputation, or invective lexicon in the recent past, which are considered insults but are not considered insults today and are part of a neutral lexicon.

REFERENCES:

1. Жельвис В.И. Слово и дело: юридический аспект сквернословия. Понятия чести, достоинства и деловой репутации: Спорные тексты СМИ и проблемы их анализа и оценки юристами и лингвистами. — Изд. 2-е, перераб. и доп. - Москва: Медея, 2004.
2. Sherboyeva G. Badiiy matnda sotsial chegaralangan so'zlar. - Andijon, 2017. - b. 32.
3. Шахматова Т.С. Оскорбление как инструмент языкового насилия в речевых ситуациях институционального общения // УЧЕНЫЕ ЗАПИСКИ КАЗАНСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА. - Казань, (йили). -Б. 2
4. To'rayeva D. O'zbek tilidagi shaxsiy yozishmalarda noadabiy unsurlarning hududiy xoslanishi: Fil. fan.fal.dok. (PhD) diss. – Qo'qon, 2022. -B. 41
5. Стернин И.А Оскорбление и неприличная языковая форма как предмет лингвистической экспертизы (бытовое и юридическое понимание) Опубликовано в: Антропотекст -1. Изд-во Томского университета, 2006.С.339-353
6. Ворошилова М.Б. Лингвистическая экспертиза [Текст]: задачник: Учеб. пособие. В 2 ч. Ч 1. Экспертиза конфликтного текста / М. Б. Ворошилова; ФГБОУ ВО «Урал. гос. пед. ун-т». — Екатеринбург, 2016. - 62 с.
7. Стернин И.А. О понятии «неприличная форма высказывания» и «неприличная лексика». Избранные статьи-2006-2012 (дата обращения: 17.10.2018).
8. Горбаневский М.В. Об ответственности за слово//Русская речь. -№1. 2007.
9. «Цена слова». Из практики лингвистических экспертиз текстов СМИ в судебных процессах по защите чести, достоинства и деловой репутации». / Под ред. проф.М.В.Горбаневского. Изд.3, испр. и доп. М.: «Галерея», 2002.
10. Quvonch Mamiraliyev. 2022. "Genre Modification in Uzbek Poetry of the Independence Period". European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements 3 (3):115-19. <https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejhea/article/view/1916>