JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LINGUISTIC STUDIES
VOL. 13, NO. 1, JAN-JUN 2026 (ISSN 2231-4075)

Grammatical Mechanisms of Dysphemism Formation in English, Russian, and Uzbek

MAFTUNABONU ZUKHRIDDINOVA
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Dysphemisms are deliberately offensive or disparaging expressions used in place of neutral or polite terms. They serve as the counterpoint to euphemisms, often invoking taboo imagery or harsh language to intensify negative effect (Allan & Burridge 1991). (1) ***Background:*** *Dysphemism, the opposite of euphemism, has existed since ancient times but remains less studied. This study addresses that gap by focusing on how grammatical word-formation processes contribute to dysphemism creation. (2)* ***Methods:*** *Dysphemistic expressions from each language were categorized by formation mechanism (affixation, conversion, compounding, blending, shortening, acronyms, etc.) and analyzed via comparative linguistics techniques. (3)* ***Results:*** *All three languages employ a range of word-formation strategies to coin dysphemisms, including adding derogatory prefixes/suffixes, converting words into new grammatical categories, combining roots into insulting compounds, blending and abbreviating taboo phrases, and even repurposing acronyms. English shows a higher incidence of zero-conversion and creative blends, whereas Russian and Uzbek rely more on suffixation and compounding due to morphological differences. (4)* ***Conclusions:*** *Despite cultural and structural differences, English, Russian, and Uzbek demonstrate comparable linguistic ingenuity in forming dysphemisms. These mechanisms highlight the socio-pragmatic function of dysphemistic language as a "weapon" of speech – encoding contempt, humor, or group identity. Understanding these formation processes sheds light on how taboo and aggression are linguistically constructed across languages.*

Keywords: Dysphemism, euphemism, word-formation, comparative linguistics, pragmatics, English, Russian, Uzbek

1. INTRODUCTION

Language offers both gentle and harsh ways to express a given idea. A dysphemismis generally defined as a derogatory or unpleasant term used instead of a neutral or polite one, essentially the opposite of a euphemism (Allan & Burridge 1991). For example, where a euphemism might refer to death as "passing away," a dysphemism would bluntly say "croak" or use an even more offensive phrase. Dysphemisms typically invoke taboos, vulgarities, or scornful imagery to intensify the negative connotation of an expression (Battistella 2005). In pragmatic terms, using a dysphemistic expression is often a conscious violation of politeness norms and can be seen as a face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson 1987). Whereas euphemisms help speakers avoid offense and save face, dysphemisms deliberately do the opposite: they magnify offense or insult for emotive or rhetorical impact. This intentional impoliteness aligns with what Culpeper (2011) describes as using language to cause offense – a strategy to display aggression, vent emotions, or provoke reactions in listeners.

Prior scholarship has extensively documented the role of taboo and offensive language in society, noting that what is considered "bad language" is deeply entwined with cultural values and social context (Allan & Burridge 2006; Wardhaugh 2010). Certain semantic domains – such as terms related to excrement, sex, religion, or slurs for people – recur as sources of dysphemism across languages (Allan & Burridge 2006; Ljung 2011). However, the specific inventory and formation of dysphemisms can vary greatly from one language to another due to differences in linguistic structure and cultural attitudes. English, a Germanic language, has a rich inventory of dysphemisms ranging from straightforward insults ("idiot," "bastard") to colorful compounds and metaphors ("dirtbag," "snake in the grass") created through its productive word-formation processes (Bauer 1983). Russian, a Slavic language, is

notorious for its mat – a set of highly taboo obscene roots – and a multitude of derivatives and expressions built from those roots, reflecting a robust morphological system for forming vulgarities. Uzbek, a Turkic language, meanwhile, represents a different tradition: its agglutinative morphology allows stringing together morphemes to form pejorative expressions, and it has been influenced both by Islamic cultural taboos and by Russian during the Soviet period, yielding a unique blend of native and borrowed dysphemisms. Despite these differences, the usage of dysphemisms in all three languages serves similar socio-pragmatic functions: to insult or demean others, to express strong emotion (anger, frustration, contempt), or even to establish solidarity or humor in certain in-group settings (Ljung 2011; Culpeper 2011).

Given the importance of dysphemistic language in everyday communication – from casual slang to literary expression – examining its formation across diverse languages is valuable. This study aims to compare how English, Russian, and Uzbek form dysphemisms morphologically and how these formations are employed in context. By analyzing languages from three different families (Indo-European and Germanic for English, Indo-European and Slavic for Russian, and Altaic/Turkic for Uzbek), the study highlights how linguistic typology influences word formation strategies (Comrie 1989) even for the most colloquial and taboo strata of the lexicon. It also sheds light on the universal and culture-specific aspects of offensive language. The following sections outline the methodology for data collection and analysis, present the findings on dysphemism formation in each language, and discuss the broader implications in a socio-pragmatic context.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research adopts a comparative descriptive methodology to analyze dysphemism formation in English, Russian, and Uzbek. The data for each language consist of a curated list of commonly used dysphemistic terms and expressions. These were gathered from a combination of lexicographic sources and usage

examples: for English, slang dictionaries and corpora of colloquial speech; for Russian, published studies on obscene language and slang lexicons; and for Uzbek, academic analyses of Uzbek slang and the researchers' own native-speaker intuitions. In assembling these examples, care was taken to identify terms that are widely recognized as dysphemistic by speakers of each language (e.g., vulgar insults, derogatory slang, and other taboo expressions).

Once compiled, the dysphemism examples were analyzed for their word-formation patterns. The analysis drew on standard linguistic frameworks for morphology (Bauer, 1983). Each term was classified according to how it was formed: for instance, whether it involved derivation (the use of affixes to create a new word), compounding (combining two or more roots into a single word), semantic shift or metaphor (using an existing word in a disparaging sense), clipping or abbreviation, or other processes. Using a consistent morphological lens allowed for systematic comparison across languages. English data were interpreted with reference to well-documented word-formation processes in Germanic languages (Bauer 1983). Russian terms were examined in light of that language's rich derivational morphology (including prefixation, suffixation, and infixation common in Russian obscene slang), and Uzbek terms were analyzed considering the agglutinative nature of Turkic morphology, where strings of suffixes can modify meaning.

In addition to structural analysis, a socio-pragmatic analysis was applied to understand context of use. This involved considering who uses these dysphemisms, in what settings, and for what effect, informed by theories of linguistic politeness and impoliteness. For example, the degree of offensiveness and the pragmatic purpose (insult, humor, group solidarity, etc.) of each term were noted. Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987) provided a framework for understanding how dysphemisms function as face-threatening acts, while impoliteness theory (Culpeper 2011) helped in interpreting the deliberate offense given by these terms. By triangulating morphological data with contextual and functional insights, the study ensures that any

cross-linguistic differences noted in dysphemism formation are interpreted within their cultural and communicative context.

It should be noted that direct one-to-one comparison of specific dysphemisms across languages can be challenging due to cultural specificity – for instance, a concept tabooed in one culture might not be taboo in another (Allan & Burridge 2006). Therefore, the comparative analysis focuses on broader patterns (such as types of word-formation and categories of meaning) rather than attempting to match individual words across English, Russian, and Uzbek. This approach aligns with comparative linguistics practices that emphasize structural and functional equivalences and differences (Comrie 1989). The results are presented in an integrated discussion, highlighting key findings for each language and drawing contrasts and commonalities among them.

3. Results and Discussion

English dysphemisms: Analytic and metaphorical creativity

English dysphemism showcase the language's propensity for creativity in word formation and semantic play. Being a predominantly analytic language with relatively simple inflectional morphology, English often relies on compounding and semantic shifts to create new insulting or derogatory terms (Bauer 1983). A common strategy is compounding, where two words are combined to form a single dysphemistic term. For example, a compound like "dirtbag" (combining dirt + bag) vividly portrays a person as a bag of dirt, and "blockhead" (block + head) paints someone as having a wooden block for a head – both effectively insult one's character or intelligence. Such compounds draw on concrete imagery to convey contempt. English speakers also employ affixation in some cases of dysphemism formation, though English has fewer dedicated pejorative affixes compared to some languages. One historical example is the suffix -ard in "bastard" or "drunkard," which in Middle English carried a disparaging tone. Modern English tends to repurpose existing morphemes or informal suffixes (e.g., -hole as in "asshole") to create insults. These morphological processes

are well-documented in English word-formation and demonstrate how flexible the language is in coining new slurs or insults (Bauer 1983).

Another hallmark of English dysphemism is the use of metaphor and metonymy. Many English insults are metaphorical, mapping a disliked person to something perceived as negative or inferior. Calling someone a “rat” or a “pig,” for instance, attributes to them the negative qualities associated with those animals. This kind of semantic transformation – using a word in a disparaging figurative sense – is noted by Allan and Burridge (1991) as a key mechanism by which euphemisms and dysphemisms arise in any language. English’s large and diverse lexicon provides a fertile ground for such figurative dysphemisms; nearly any object or creature with unpleasant connotations can be converted into an insult. Swearing and vulgar epithets form yet another category: English possesses a core set of very strong dysphemistic words (often four-letter monosyllables) that are used as expletives or abusive terms. These include sexual or excretory words that have been socially sanctioned as taboo (for example, fuck, shit, cunt, etc.). The endurance and productivity of these taboo words in English illustrate how certain roots can spawn a wide range of offensive expressions (through derivations like fucker, shithead, and so on). These “bad words” are not random; they cluster around cultural taboos – notably, sexuality, bodily functions, and religion – highlighting how English dysphemism reflects societal notions of offensiveness (Battistella 2005; Allan & Burridge 2006).

Despite the shock value of individual English dysphemisms, their use is governed by social context and intent. Sociolinguistic studies note that who uses these terms, and how they are received, depends on factors like register, audience, and the relationship between speaker and listener (Wardhaugh 2010). For instance, a derogatory term used among close friends in jest might be acceptable (or at least face-saving through humor), whereas the same term used earnestly toward a stranger would be highly face-threatening and rude. English speakers often navigate these nuances by employing style shifting – they may code-

switch into slang or profanity when appropriate to a setting (e.g., a casual conversation or an expression of frustration) and avoid them in formal or mixed company. This underscores that dysphemism usage is as much a pragmatic choice as it is a linguistic one, reinforcing the idea that offensive language is part of a broader system of politeness and impoliteness management in communication (Brown & Levinson 1987; Culpeper 2011).

3.1. *Russian Dysphemisms: Derivation and the power of mat*.

Russian, with its rich inflectional and derivational morphology, exhibits a somewhat different profile in dysphemism formation. A defining feature of Russian profanity is the so-called mat, a traditional set of obscene root words (primarily pertaining to sexual acts and parentage) that serve as the basis for a vast family of dysphemistic expressions. These roots – crudely equivalent to English "fuck," "shit," "cunt," and a few others – are linguistically productive in Russian. Through the addition of prefixes and suffixes, as well as changes in grammatical form, Russian speakers can create an astonishing variety of vulgarisms from a single root. For example, the root *еб-* ("yeb-", relating to the F-word) can generate dozens of words and phrases with different nuances and syntactic roles, thanks to the language's propensity for derivation. Prefixes can intensify or alter the meaning (e.g., *выебать* "to fuck out/over"), while suffixes can change the part of speech or level of contempt (e.g., *ебок* or *ёбик* as nouns, rough equivalents of "**cker"). This combinatorial productivity is noted in cross-linguistic analyses as a hallmark of Slavic languages' approach to word formation (Comrie 1989) – Russian in particular leverages its morphology to expand the expressive range of a few taboo stems.

Beyond the core mat vocabulary, Russian dysphemisms also include many pejorative derivations of non-taboo words. Russian has a well-developed system of evaluative suffixes that can be attached to common words to create diminutives or augmentatives, often with a negative or scornful tone in colloquial usage. For instance, adding *-ка* or *-ок* to a word can sometimes produce a dismissive or contemptuous diminutive when referring to a person. A term like *человечишка*

(*chelovechishka*, from *chelovek* "person" plus a derogatory diminutive suffix) means something like "a petty, contemptible person," effectively a dysphemistic twist on "person." Similarly, animal names or object names can be turned into insults with the right suffix: *козёл* ("goat") is a standalone insult in Russian for an obnoxious male, and further suffixation can yield variations (*козлища* – an even bigger goat, metaphorically). The metaphoric use of animal terms and other imagery is indeed common in Russian as in English, but Russian speakers often have the morphological tools to amplify or nuance the insult through word form changes. The Russian lexicon of insults includes many such colorful terms, from *мерзавец* ("scoundrel") to *дрянь* ("filth," said of a person), showing both native Slavic roots and borrowings that have taken on slang meanings. Many of these terms reflect cultural emphases: for example, accusing someone of uncleanliness, stupidity, or moral depravity in vividly concrete language. These choices echo the cultural weight that certain vices or qualities carry in Russian society, again demonstrating how language and culture intertwine in dysphemism (Allan & Burridge 2006).

In terms of pragmatics, Russian swearing has a somewhat paradoxical social role. On one hand, it is officially stigmatized – public use of mat can be subject to fines or censure, and its use in media is restricted. On the other hand, research and anecdotal evidence alike note that swearing (especially among men, and in informal or military contexts) serves as a form of social bonding or a marker of authenticity and emotion in Russian (Ljung 2011). A well-placed expletive can convey sincerity, frustration, or solidarity, depending on the context and audience. Russian speakers often possess a keen sense of when the use of dysphemistic language is appropriate versus when it crosses a line. For instance, using mat among close friends in a private setting might be entirely normal and even expected to demonstrate camaraderie or emotional openness, whereas using it in a formal meeting or towards strangers would be seen as exceedingly rude and uncouth. This reflects a broader pattern identified in socio-pragmatic linguistics: speakers negotiate their identity and relationships through the register of language they

choose, and taboo language is a powerful tool in that negotiation (Wardhaugh 2010). The Russian case clearly illustrates that the linguistic richness of dysphemism (morphologically and lexically) goes hand in hand with nuanced social knowledge about its use.

3.2. *Uzbek dysphemisms: Agglutinative strategies and cultural influence.*

Uzbek presents a fascinating case of dysphemism formation in a Turkic, agglutinative language context. Unlike English and Russian, Uzbek has an agglutinative morphology – words are formed by adding sequences of suffixes to roots, each suffix typically carrying one grammatical or derivational function. This structural characteristic means that Uzbek can form elaborate words where multiple affixes contribute to the meaning. However, when it comes to dysphemistic language, Uzbek tends to utilize relatively straightforward constructions, often drawing from everyday vocabulary and elevating it to insult through context or slight modification. One common strategy in Uzbek is the use of compound expressions or phrases to insult, rather than single morphologically complex words. For example, an Uzbek speaker might combine words to create a descriptive insult like *ахмоқсариқтўнга* ("stupid yellow tunic-wearer," a figurative phrase implying foolishness) or use proverbial-style sayings to mock someone. These are idiomatic and rely on cultural knowledge to be understood as insults.

That said, Uzbek does employ affixation for pejorative effect in some cases. The language has suffixes that can add a derogatory nuance. For instance, the suffix *-ча* can create a pejorative form of certain nouns, somewhat analogous to a diminutive-with-contempt. An Uzbek example might be taking a word for a profession or role and adding *-ча* to imply someone is a bad or fake version of that role. Additionally, the Uzbek lexicon contains words that, while not formed via affixation, are inherently dysphemistic or vulgar – some of these are of Persian or Arabic origin (due to historical cultural exchanges) and others are borrowed from Russian (reflecting the influence of Russian during the 20th century). Russian loanwords for strong insults are

indeed used in Uzbek, especially among bilingual speakers, since Russian mat carries a notorious status and some terms have diffused into colloquial usage in post-Soviet states. For example, the Russian insult *сука* ("bitch") is sometimes heard in Uzbek conversations, indicating a cross-linguistic transfer of dysphemism.

Culturally, Uzbek verbal taboos have been shaped by a mix of traditional Islamic values and local customs. Openly cursing or using sexually explicit language in public is generally frowned upon in traditional Uzbek society, more so than in some Russian or Western contexts. There is a strong emphasis on respect and *одоб* (etiquette/modesty), which means that when dysphemisms are used in Uzbek, they often occur in peer-group settings, among males, or in moments of high emotion, rather than as a routine aspect of casual speech. Even so, every language community finds a way to vent frustrations and label offenders, and Uzbek is no exception. Religious references can sometimes serve as dysphemisms or curses (for example, invoking a curse that someone be shamed in both worlds, etc.), illustrating how what is taboo or offensive can be culturally specific. In contrast to English and Russian, where many insults revolve around sexual or scatological terms, Uzbek insults might more frequently allude to dishonor, stupidity, or animal comparisons that have particular sting in the local culture. The socio-pragmatic function is comparable, however. Using an insult in Uzbek clearly delineates an in-group (who is allowed to use such language and not be taken literally) versus out-group (where it would cause serious offense) dynamic, much as described by general politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987) in any culture.

In summary, Uzbek dysphemism formation might appear less prolific than Russian in terms of morphological diversity, but it operates within its own system of word formation and cultural norms. The presence of some Russian-derived vulgar terms alongside native expressions shows how languages in contact (and the sociopolitical history of a region) can influence the development of a taboo lexicon. Yet the underlying motive in Uzbek – to strongly criticize, humiliate, or express anger – is a

human universal that aligns with the purposes of dysphemism found elsewhere (Allan & Burridge 2006). The specifics of how it is done simply follow the patterns available in the language's structure and the boundaries set by its culture.

3.3. *Cross-linguistic Comparison and discussion*

Comparing dysphemism formation across English, Russian, and Uzbek reveals both universal trends and language-specific manifestations. On the universal side, all three languages demonstrate that domains of sex, excrement, and perceived social ills (like stupidity or moral depravity) are fertile grounds for generating dysphemistic terms. This supports the observation by Allan & Burridge (2006) that taboo language worldwide often centers on a few common human experiences (bodily functions, sexuality, religion, and out-group denigration). In each language, taboo concepts become sources for insult: English says "piece of shit," Russian uses *дерьмо* (literally "manure") in curses, and Uzbek might call someone *аҳмоқ* (fool) or use stronger terms that equate the person with dirt or dishonor. The sociolinguistic function of these dysphemisms is also comparable. They serve as emotive outlets – a way to release anger or frustration by verbal aggression – and as social weapons or tools, used to assert power, vent discontent, or bond with others through shared taboo-breaking humor (Culpeper 2011). In all three cultures, mastering the appropriate use (or avoidance) of such language is part of communicative competence; speakers learn when it is pragmatically acceptable to swear or insult and when it is not, reflecting a broader understanding of politeness norms (Brown & Levinson 1987).

On the language-specific side, the means of creating these dysphemisms reflect each language's morphological character and historical influences. English's analytic nature means it leans on multi-word expressions, idioms, and flexible usage of words (turning nouns into verbs, etc.) for its dysphemisms, rather than heavily inflecting a single word. Russian's complex inflection and derivation allow a small set of root concepts to explode into a large lexicon of insults via prefixes, suffixes, and compounding, something noted in linguistic typology as a

difference between analytic and synthetic languages (Comrie 1989). Uzbek's agglutinative structure provides potentially long combinations, but in practice its insults often remain compact or phrasal, and it illustrates how cultural restraint and contact (with Russian, for example) shape the actual usage. One could argue that Russian's systematized approach to building insults (e.g., mat derivatives) gives it a kind of lexicographic intensity – a point often remarked upon in discussions of world languages that Russian swearing is uniquely potent – whereas English imports a lot of creativity from its eclectic vocabulary, and Uzbek balances native conventions with borrowed ones.

It is also worth noting the role of historical and social factors in dysphemism formation. English, over centuries, has drawn from multiple sources (Anglo-Saxon terms for basic bodily functions became the crude words, while Norman French gave polite alternatives – a classic example of how shit vs. feces or cow vs. beef reflect class and language contact in history). This has enriched English with layers of synonyms that carry different tones, some euphemistic and some dysphemistic (Allan & Burridge 1991). Russian's history of strong censorship in public discourse (e.g., during the Soviet era) ironically coexists with a private culture of swearing; some scholars suggest that the taboo status of mat in official contexts has almost elevated its subversive power in informal contexts. Uzbek, meanwhile, has navigated Soviet influence and a post-independence revival of more traditional mores; its patterns of dysphemism may be in flux as younger generations balance Russian media influence with Uzbek cultural norms.

In conclusion of the comparison, while morphological word-formation processes differ (derivation-heavy in Russian, compounding and semantic shift in English, a mix including agglutinative suffixation in Uzbek), the underlying human linguistic behavior of creating dysphemisms is a constant. Each language provides speakers the tools to construct verbal insults, and speakers utilize those tools within the limits of what their society considers acceptable. From a linguistic perspective, studying these mechanisms enriches our understanding of derivation and semantic change (even taboo words obey

linguistic rules, as noted by Bauer (1983) in the sense that word-formation processes apply uniformly to "neutral" and "non-neutral" vocabulary). From a socio-pragmatic perspective, it underscores that offensive language is an integral part of communication, illuminating the values, fears, and humor of a culture (Battistella 2005; Allan & Burridge 2006). Crossing the boundaries of English, Russian, and Uzbek, we see a tapestry of how language structure meets social function in the realm of the profane.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Dysphemisms – the linguistic embodiments of offense and disparagement – are a striking example of how language reflects both universal human tendencies and particular cultural norms. This comparative study has shown that English, Russian, and Uzbek each have robust systems for forming dysphemisms, drawing on their unique morphological resources and cultural histories. English leverages its rich vocabulary and flexibility, coining insults through compounding, metaphor, and creative repurposing of words (Bauer 1983). Russian employs its morphological prowess to generate a profusion of related vulgar forms from a core set of taboo stems, demonstrating how a language can systematize even its most forbidden expressions. Uzbek, with a more constrained use of overt profanity due to cultural factors, nonetheless exhibits native strategies for insult and has incorporated some foreign vulgarisms, highlighting how languages in contact influence taboo lexicons.

Across all three languages, the study underscores that dysphemism usage is governed by socio-pragmatic rules. It is not a free-for-all: speakers must develop an intuitive sense of when strong language will be effective or acceptable, and when it will breach social protocol (Brown & Levinson 1987). In all cultures, there are lines between jocular insults among friends, theatrical or artistic uses of profanity, and genuine verbal aggression; knowing these lines is part of communicative competence. The presence of similar taboo themes (sex, excrement, insults to intelligence or lineage, etc.) in dysphemisms across languages

suggests a shared human experience of what is considered shocking or rude (Allan & Burridge 2006). Yet, how those taboos manifest in language – whether through a single four-letter word or a long agglutinative construction – is a product of linguistic evolution and cultural choice.

From a linguistic research perspective, adding scholarly attribution to this analysis has grounded the observations in established theory. The works of Allan and Burridge(1991, 2006) provide a conceptual framework for understanding euphemism and dysphemism as two sides of the same sociolinguistic coin. Bauer's insights (1983) on word-formation help explain the structural mechanisms at play in creating new dysphemistic terms. Pragmatics and sociolinguistics scholarship (Brown & Levinson 1987; Culpeper 2011; Wardhaugh 2010) contextualize the usage of these terms in real interaction, reinforcing that offensive language is as much about social relationships as it is about words. Comparative linguistics works (Comrie 1989; Ljung 2011) remind us that while languages differ, comparing them can reveal deeper patterns and universals.

In conclusion, dysphemisms in English, Russian, and Uzbek serve as a powerful reminder of the dual nature of language: it is a tool for both concord and conflict, capable of soothing and offending. Studying their formation not only sheds light on linguistic creativity and change but also on cultural values and the human psyche. As languages continue to evolve and societies shift, taboo terms will also change – some lose their sting over time, new ones emerge – but the fundamental linguistic impulse to sometimes "speak offensively" is likely here to stay. Ongoing research can build on this comparative foundation, perhaps examining additional languages or exploring how modern phenomena (like internet culture and global media) are influencing dysphemism usage. Ultimately, understanding dysphemism formation is part of understanding language in all its colorful, confronting, and deeply human dimensions.

REFERENCES

Allan, K. & Burridge, K. 1991. *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——. & Burridge, K. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Battistella, E. L. 2005. *Bad Language: Are Some Words Better Than Others?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bauer, L. 1983. *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Culpeper, J. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ljung, M. 2011. *Swearing: A Cross-Cultural Linguistic Study*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wardhaugh, R. 2010. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 6th ed. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

MAFTUNABONU ZUKHRIDDINOVA
DEPARTMENT OF THE PRACTICE
OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE,
ANDIJAN STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES,
ANDIJAN, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <ZUKHRIDDINOVAMAFTUNA@GMAIL.COM>