LANGUAGE CRIMES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Muminov Dilshod Abdirashidovich
Toshkent kimyo-texnologiya instituti Shahrisabz filiali katta oʻqituvchisi
akademik88@gmail.com

Abstract
The article explores the semantic and structural characteristics of language crimes in English through the lens of structural linguistics methods. The analysis is based on the role these elements play within the linguistic system, with a focus on various linguistic relationships among the terms that represent language crimes.

Crimes committed through language are categorized into two main types based on their targets: those directed at individuals and those aimed at property. Components within this paradigm can belong to multiple fields simultaneously. The study highlights the contradictions within elements belonging to the same paradigm, examining both their general and specific characteristics.

Keywords: paradigm, constituents, language crimes, semantic field, microfield, microfield components, opposition, gradation, synonymy, dominant word, periphery, white-collar crimes, Internet-related crimes.

Introduction

In linguistics, the effectiveness of a theory is often measured by its applicability to language learners and its practical utility. Vocabulary organization, particularly through the content field method, represents a crucial aspect of linguistic analysis. This method systematically examines the lexical structure of a language, as the lexicon—whether native or borrowed—remains one of the most intricate and expansive areas of linguistics. Despite the advances in grammatical and syntactic development, which can be achieved relatively quickly due to their precise nature, vocabulary acquisition is more enduring and requires continuous learning throughout life. This distinction underscores the significance of vocabulary in language learning, echoing the famous observation by linguist David Wilkins: "Without grammar, very little can be conveyed; without vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed."

To address this challenge, a system-in-system approach can offer valuable insights. Creating a thematic index of language serves as a structured lexical repository not only for learners of different nationalities but also for native speakers. For example, the semantic field of "crime" encompasses various lexical units, reflecting the diversity of linguistic approaches in Western linguistics. Scholars such as Matthew, Lyons, and Kempson have used the term "word" to refer to basic lexical units, whereas Holliday, Sinclair, and Jones have preferred "lexeme." In Uzbek linguistics, distinctions between these terms are clarified, with a lexeme representing a name, expression, and functional meaning, while a word is identified by its grammatical significance. As R. Rasulov notes, a word is essentially an expression of a lexeme in specific contexts.

Materials and Methods:

The semantic field of "crime" is an established area within both Uzbek and English languages, encompassing several microfields. There is, however, no universally accepted classification for these microfields. Australian researcher I. Langford divides the field into three microfields: "crimes against the person," "crimes against property," and "crimes against society." In contrast, S. Sheludchenko and T. Kalinushko offer a broader classification, including categories such as "types of crime," "criminals," "crime objects," "law enforcement officers," "investigation processes," "types of punishment," "crime tools," and "consequences."[1]

In the Uzbek context, N. Jumaniyozova categorizes the legal discourse on crime into subframes like types of crimes and crime names. The subfield of "language crimes" represents a unique aspect of the broader crime semantic field, characterized by synonymous and hyper-hyponymous relationships.

Results and Discussions:

The subfield of "language crimes" involves crimes that inflict no physical harm but impact communication. For instance, fraud involves deception to gain trust and property, encompassing various schemes such as tax fraud, credit card fraud, and internet fraud. These lexical units often overlap with the microfield of "cybercrimes" due to their association with technology. Fraud-related terms illustrate how different forms of fraud can straddle multiple microfields, acting as interfield boundaries that facilitate the interaction of various semantic fields within the language system. Additionally, terms like fraudsters and swindlers denote individuals committing these crimes, with "fraud" itself evolving into a noun phrase through conversion. The term "threat" refers to the act of intending harm, legally defined as threatening to cause future harm. This can be done verbally or through non-verbal means such as gestures. In English, terms like extortion, coercion, duress, blackmail, and intimidation fall under the broader category of "threatening," each with specific connotations and applications.

Perjury, a critical aspect of language crimes, involves false testimony under oath, with the Federal Law of the USA defining violators as liars or perjurers. Defamation, a newer addition to language-based crimes, involves spreading false information to damage reputations, often seen on social media. It intersects with "Internet-related crimes" and "gender-based crimes" depending on the context.

Insulting, closely related to defamation, involves directly attacking personal feelings rather than reputations. Unlike defamation, which can involve written statements, insults are usually verbal. In English law, the severity of insult is typically considered less than that of defamation. Plagiarism, another form of intellectual crime, involves presenting someone else's work as one's own and has become increasingly relevant in the digital age. Terms like plagiarizer and plagiarist denote individuals who commit this crime.[2]

---

1 Leech G. N. Semantics: The study of meaning. (2nd editon). – Harmondsworth Penguin Education, 1981. – P. 205

2 Shuy. Language crimes: the use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom. – Cambridge, MA Blackwell, 1993. – P. 98.

Conclusion

Vocabulary is fundamental to language and underpins both speech and written text. Over time, the lexicons of English and Uzbek have evolved, enriched by both internal and external influences. Many terms have fallen out of use, highlighting the dynamic nature of language. Componential analysis, which breaks down semantic features into discrete units, is crucial for understanding vocabulary. This method offers a systematic approach to analyzing the lexicon, providing insights into the nuanced meanings of words and their interactions within the language system.

REFERENCES:

1. Iskandarova Sh., Qurbonova B. Theory of Linguistics. – Fergana, 2020.
2. Leech G. N. Semantics: The study of meaning. (2nd editon). – Harmondsworth Penguin Education,
3. Macmillan English Dictionary. – Macmillan Publishers, – 2007.
4. Shuy. Language crimes: the use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom. – Cambridge, MA Blackwell, 1993.
5. Rasulov R. General linguistics. – Tashkent, 2007.
6. Vilkins D.A. Linguistics in language teaching. – London: Edward Arnold, 1972.
7. Google.ru.
8. Ziyouz.net.