

WHEN WORDS BECOME "MAGIC"

A Linguistic, Psychological, Historical & Biblical Analysis
of the Claim That Curse Words Are Literal Curses

HATE
BLASPHEMY
FILTH
ANGER
DECEPTION
CURSE

Anonymous 09/14/26(Tue)12:03:17 No:42978141

Cursewords are actual curses.
You should stop swearing because
every time you swear you utter a curse.
This is dark magic, no wonder it's
concealed so well.

Anonymous 09/14/26 No:42978327

>Great no cursing bibleet be like

Anonymous 09/14/26 No:42978897

A curse upon the christians.

>>42979383

If I insult someone,
what curse have I placed on him?

>>42979402

so what are blessing words?

>>42979455

Imao

CURSE
BIND
CONTROL
HARM
SUFFER

curse (n.)

1. a solemn imprecation
2. offensive language
3. a cause of harm
4. to invoke evil

swear (v.)

1. to use offensive language
2. to make an oath
3. to give a solemn promise

Etymology
Semantics
Meaning
Usage

Usage
Culture
Culture

LINGUISTICS

PSYCHOLOGY

HISTORY

THEOLOGY

BIBLICAL STUDIES

λόγος

logos
(word, speech)

דָּבָר

dābār
(word, matter)

Language
Emotion
Behavior
Neurobiology
Social Impact

Let no corrupt communication
proceed out of your mouth...
— Ephesians 4:29 (KJV)

Out of the same mouth
proceedeth blessing and cursing.
— James 3:10 (KJV)

Bless them which persecute you:
bless, and curse not.
— Romans 12:14 (KJV)

INTERNET
CULTURE

TRUTH?

PSYCHOLOGY

SCRIPTURE

HISTORY
OF MAGIC

LANGUAGE

CULTURE

HUMAN NATURE

HISTORICAL RECORD

BIBLICAL TRUTH

DISCERNMENT

WISDOM

TRUTH

CHARITY

A MORE EXCELLENT WAY

HOLY BIBLE

EXAMINE
ALL THINGS;
HOLD FAST
THAT WHICH
IS GOOD.

— 1 THESS. 5:21

SOLA SCRIPTURA
SOLA GRATIA
SOLA FIDE
SOLUS CHRISTUS
SOLI DEO GLORIA

4CHAN NARRATIVE BREAKDOWN BY VCG

SEPTEMBER 2026

When Words Become "Magic"

A Linguistic, Psychological, Historical & Biblical Analysis of the Claim That Curse Words Are Literal Curses

UPDATED BY VCG ON 9/19/2026 @ 00:00 EST - FULL PRINT EDITION

4Chan Narrative Breakdown by VCG - September 2026

SOURCE FIDELITY NOTE

This edition follows the complete linked Library of Rickandria paper: Abstract, Sections I-XXXIII, the five-lane methodology, speech-category table, strongest-case steelman, linguistic and etymological analysis, speech-act theory, psychology of swearing, pain and conditioning research, magical-thinking and thought-action-fusion sections, historical curse-tablet evidence, seven-question falsifiability test, the full biblical sequence from Matthew 5 through Numbers 22-24, Proverbs, Matthew 12, imprecatory Psalms, the online-environment section, the complete post-by-post forensic reading, Claim-Evidence Ledger, seven-kinds-of-power model, practical application, bibliography, and research note. The prose is re-typeset and closely paraphrased for print rather than copied as a raw webpage transcript.

ABSTRACT

Words Can Be Powerful Without Every Profanity Being a Spell

The September 18, 2026 /x/ thread argues that ordinary “curse words” are literally curses and that swearing therefore amounts to a concealed form of dark magic. The claim is rhetorically effective because it joins several truths: language affects people, taboo speech can produce unusual psychological and physiological responses, human societies have practiced ritual cursing, and Scripture treats speech as morally serious.

The evidentiary leap occurs when those facts are converted into an automatic occult mechanism. English words are polysemous; the history of swear and curse shows semantic development rather than a permanently fixed magical meaning. Experimental research documents real effects of swearing but investigates learned, contextual, emotional, and cognitive mechanisms rather than occult force. Archaeology documents deliberate ritual cursing but does not make every modern expletive the same action.

The biblical correction is equally important. Scripture distinguishes oaths, blasphemy, corrupt speech, imprecation, blessing, divination, enchantment, necromancy, and other categories rather than treating them as one phenomenon. Its warnings about speech are serious enough without adding a doctrine of unconscious verbal sorcery.

CENTRAL DISTINCTION

A word can be morally, socially, psychologically, legally, rhetorically, and religiously consequential without automatically functioning as an occult incantation.

CONTENTS

Complete Article Structure

1. I. The Thread and the Question We Are Actually Asking

2. II. Method: Five Questions, Five Kinds of Evidence

3. III. Before Debating the Claim: What Kind of Speech Are We Talking About?

4. IV. The Strongest Case for the Thread Before We Critique It

5. V. The Linguistic Problem: One Word, Several Meanings

6. VI. The Etymology Trap

7. VII. Words Really Do Things

8. VIII. The Psychology of Swearing: Why Taboo Words Feel Different

9. IX. Why 'Magic Words' Can Feel Like Magic

10. X. Magical Thinking, Thought-Action Fusion, and Symbolic Causation

11. XI. 'Hidden in Plain Sight' and the Self-Sealing Claim

12. XII. Historical Curses Were Real Practices - But Practice Is Not Proven Efficacy
13. XIII. Seven Questions the Literal-Curse Theory Must Answer

14. XIV. The Biblical Question Must Start With Biblical Categories

15. XV. 'Swear Not at All': Matthew 5 Is About Oaths

16. XVI. Scripture Has Direct Texts About Corrupt Speech

17. XVII. James 3: The Strong Biblical Doctrine of the Tongue

18. XVIII. What Does It Mean to Curse Someone?

19. XIX. Deuteronomy 18: What the Bible Actually Calls Occult Practice

20. XX. Balaam: The Most Important Biblical Case Study

21. XXI. 'Death and Life Are in the Power of the Tongue'

22. XXII. 'The Curse Causeless Shall Not Come'

23. XXIII. Matthew 12 and 'Every Idle Word'

24. XXIV. Biblical Blessing Is Not Merely 'White Magic'

25. XXV. Imprecatory Psalms: A Necessary Complication	30. XXX. A Better Model: Seven Kinds of Power in Words
26. XXVI. The Thread's Online Environment	31. XXXI. Why the Thread's Theory Feels Persuasive
27. XXVII. Line-by-Line Forensic Reading of the Thread	32. XXXII. Practical and Pastoral Application
28. XXVIII. Claim-Evidence Ledger	33. XXXIII. Final Finding
29. XXIX. What This Paper Is Not Saying	

RESEARCH SECTION

I. The Thread and the Question We Are Actually Asking

The September 18, 2026 /x/ thread begins with three linked propositions: because English speakers call certain profanities 'curse words,' those words are literal curses; saying them performs the curse; and the mechanism is hidden dark magic concealed by ordinary usage.

Several weaker propositions are easy to defend: words can hurt people, profanity can intensify emotion, ritual cursing is historically documented, and Scripture treats speech as morally serious. None is equivalent to the strong proposition that every utterance of a modern profanity automatically performs occult magic. That stronger proposition is the object of the investigation.

RESEARCH SECTION

II. Method: Five Questions, Five Kinds of Evidence

The source paper keeps linguistics, history, psychology, logic/methodology, and Scripture in separate evidentiary lanes. The distinction is not designed to isolate fields from one another; it prevents one kind of evidence from being made to prove a different kind of claim.

The thread itself is primary evidence only for what anonymous users posted. The larger the causal claim, the greater the evidence required to move from 'people believed this,' to 'people reported this,' to 'an effect occurred,' and finally to 'this supernatural mechanism caused it.'

Lane	Question	What It Can Establish	What It Cannot Establish by Itself
Linguistics	What do curse, curse word, and swear mean?	Usage, semantic distinctions, historical development	Whether supernatural forces exist or operate
History	How did historical people practice cursing or magic?	Beliefs, rituals, artifacts, social practices	Whether the rituals actually produced supernatural effects
Psychology	What effects can taboo language have?	Measurable cognitive, emotional, physiological, and social effects	A supernatural explanation merely because an effect exists
Logic / methodology	Does the conclusion follow from the evidence?	Validity, alternative explanations, falsifiability	Theological truth by itself
Scripture	What categories and claims does the biblical text actually make?	What the cited text says and how passages relate	Claims the text does not make merely because they sound compatible

RESEARCH SECTION

III. Before Debating the Claim: What Kind of Speech Are We Talking About?

Much of the confusion disappears once profanity, vulgarity, obscenity, insult, blasphemy, oath-taking, imprecation, blessing, incantation, and deliberate occult practice are no longer packed into one English word.

Oxford's Roman curse-tablet project is a useful historical control: the surviving objects were intentionally prepared, often named targets, appealed to gods or spirits, and were deposited in charged places. That is categorically different from blurting an expletive after hitting one's thumb.

Category	Working Description	Example	Same as Automatic Occult Magic?
Profanity	Taboo or irreverent language	Offensive exclamation	No evidence establishes automatic occult action
Vulgarity	Socially coarse language	Crude bodily expression	No
Obscenity	Grossly offensive speech	Explicit expression	No
Insult / reviling	Speech attacking a person	Degrading another person	No, though morally and socially consequential
Blasphemy	Irreverent or hostile speech concerning God or sacred things	Speaking against what is holy	Biblically serious, but not synonymous with every vulgar word
Oath / swearing	Solemnly invoking or pledging truth	'I swear...'	A distinct linguistic and biblical category
Imprecation / curse	Calling for evil, judgment, or harm to befall a target	'May judgment fall upon...'	Closer to the traditional meaning of curse
Blessing	Speaking or praying good concerning another	'God bless you'	Not simply a reverse magic spell
Incantation	Formulaic speech used within ritual practice	Ritual verbal formula	Can belong to magical practice
Enchantment / occult practice	Deliberate supernatural practice	Divination, charms, necromancy, etc.	Explicitly treated as occult in passages such as Deuteronomy 18

RESEARCH SECTION

IV. The Strongest Case for the Thread Before We Critique It

A fair rebuttal first states the strongest version of the intuition. Words are not neutral noise; taboo vocabulary can alter arousal, attention, emotion, pain response, and social relationships. Historical cultures used speech in curses, spells, oaths, blessings, and ritual actions. Scripture portrays the tongue as highly consequential.

That cumulative picture makes it reasonable to ask whether modern swearing participates in something older and more spiritually significant than many speakers realize. The question is serious. The evidentiary mistake occurs only when real psychological and historical effects are automatically renamed occult energy.

RESEARCH SECTION

V. The Linguistic Problem: One Word, Several Meanings

Modern dictionaries define 'curse word' as a rude or offensive word and recognize 'swear word' as a synonym. They also preserve different senses of curse: offensive speech on one hand, wishing evil on another on the other.

The crucial linguistic rule is simple: same word does not mean same activity. A person can run a race, run a business, run software, or have a run in a stocking. Polysemy is normal. Meaning is determined by use and context, not by choosing the most dramatic historical sense available.

RESEARCH SECTION

VI. The Etymology Trap

The history of swear and curse is genuinely intertwined with oaths, sacred invocation, imprecation, and profanity. The profanity senses developed through time rather than remaining frozen at one original meaning.

Using a word's origin to dictate every later use commits the etymological fallacy. Etymology answers where a word came from; usage answers what a speaker means now; metaphysics asks what causal power the utterance has. The first question cannot answer the third by itself.

RESEARCH SECTION

VII. Words Really Do Things

Speech-act theory supplies a middle position between 'words are magical' and 'words are only noises.' In the right conditions, speaking can constitute promising, commanding, warning, declaring, agreeing, apologizing, accusing, or vowing.

Institutional speech acts depend on authority and circumstance: saying 'I sentence you' does not create a legal sentence when spoken by a random passerby. Words can also produce real perlocutionary effects - fear, anger, persuasion, humiliation, reputation loss, mobilization, comfort - without requiring invisible occult energy.

RESEARCH SECTION

VIII. The Psychology of Swearing: Why Taboo Words Feel Different

The 2022 interdisciplinary review by Stapleton and colleagues summarizes distinctive emotional, physiological, cognitive, pain-related, interpersonal, and rhetorical effects of swearing. Learned taboo and aversive conditioning are among the mechanisms discussed.

A 2024 mini-review likewise finds repeated experimental hypoalgesic effects in acute pain tasks, especially cold-pressor paradigms, while emphasizing that the mechanism remains uncertain and that generalization to clinical pain is limited.

The valid experimental claim is that saying a taboo word can change measurable responses. The additional claim that the word contains supernatural force requires separate evidence.

RESEARCH SECTION

IX. Why 'Magic Words' Can Feel Like Magic

Children can learn early that particular words produce immediate and emotionally charged consequences: adults react, punishment follows, peers laugh, teachers intervene, and attention suddenly shifts. Over time the vocabulary becomes affectively marked.

An automatic bodily reaction to a forbidden word is therefore compatible with ordinary emotional learning. The experience can be genuine without the proposed occult explanation being correct. Experience and explanation must remain separate.

RESEARCH SECTION

X. Magical Thinking, Thought-Action Fusion, and Symbolic Causation

A 2026 systematic review describes magical thinking broadly as beliefs that thoughts or actions influence events in unrealistic ways and stresses that such tendencies exist in the general population as well as clinical contexts. It is therefore inappropriate to diagnose an anonymous poster from one thread.

The relevance is structural. The thread moves symbol -> represented thing -> causal identity: the phrase is called a curse word; therefore the word is a curse; therefore speaking it performs the supernatural effect associated with one meaning of curse.

Thought-action-fusion literature helps illustrate why thoughts, words, images, and represented events can feel causally or morally fused. Association and symbolism, however, are not sufficient evidence of supernatural causation.

RESEARCH SECTION

XI. 'Hidden in Plain Sight' and the Self-Sealing Claim

The concealment premise creates a falsifiability problem. Confirming evidence counts as proof, while contrary evidence can be redescribed as evidence that society forgot, experts are part of the concealment, or the mechanism is exceptionally well hidden.

A useful research question is therefore: what observation would cause us to conclude that the theory is mistaken? If the answer is 'nothing,' the proposition has been insulated from correction. That does not prove it false, but it does mean it is no longer functioning as an ordinary testable explanation.

RESEARCH SECTION

XII. Historical Curses Were Real Practices - But Practice Is Not Proven Efficacy

Ancient curse practices are well documented. Oxford describes lead tablets written to enlist gods or spirits to influence others, often through specialized wording, symbols, material objects, and deposition at temples, pools, graves, or other charged locations.

Greg Woolf describes curse tablets as a material technology used for varied goals over long periods, while Fritz Graf warns that modern umbrella terms can obscure distinctions among curses and binding spells.

History therefore establishes deliberate ritual practices involving intention, targets, appeals, objects, places, and formulas. It does not by itself establish that the invoked supernatural powers objectively produced the requested effects.

RESEARCH SECTION

XIII. Seven Questions the Literal-Curse Theory Must Answer

A theory becomes more useful when it makes its conditions and failure cases explicit. The source paper therefore asks seven questions before turning to Scripture.

Question	Why It Matters
Does intention matter?	If a person unknowingly says a taboo word, has magic occurred?
Must there be a target?	A traditional curse normally concerns someone or something. What is being cursed during an accidental expletive?
Must anyone understand the word?	If an English taboo word is spoken to people who know no English, does the alleged occult effect remain identical?
What happens in quotation?	Does a historian, actor, linguist, or Bible teacher activate the supposed effect by mentioning a taboo word?
Does translation preserve the power?	If cultures use different taboo vocabularies, where is the alleged magical property located?

What observable effect should occur?	A causal theory needs a specified consequence rather than an undefined 'dark energy.'
What evidence could disprove the theory?	If no result could count against it, the claim is self-sealing rather than testable.

RESEARCH SECTION

XIV. The Biblical Question Must Start With Biblical Categories

The KJV contains a richer taxonomy than the thread's single equation: oaths, blessings, curses, lies, false witness, blasphemy, corrupt communication, filthy communication, foolish talking, evil speaking, enchantment, divination, familiar spirits, witchcraft, wizardry, charms, and necromancy.

If Scripture itself distinguishes those categories, interpreters should hesitate before collapsing them back into one undifferentiated idea of 'magic words.'

RESEARCH SECTION

XV. 'Swear Not at All': Matthew 5 Is About Oaths

Matthew 5:33-37 begins from forswearing, performing oaths, and swearing by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, or one's head before concluding that communication should be 'Yea, yea; Nay, nay.' The subject is oath-taking and integrity.

James 5:12 makes the category explicit by saying 'swear not' and immediately naming heaven, earth, or any other oath. This does not approve vulgarity; it means vulgarity should be addressed from passages that actually concern corrupt or filthy speech.

RESEARCH SECTION

XVI. Scripture Has Direct Texts About Corrupt Speech

Ephesians 4:29 commands that no corrupt communication proceed from the mouth except what is useful for edifying. The context connects speech with truth, anger, bitterness, wrath, clamour, evil speaking, kindness, tenderness, and forgiveness.

Ephesians 5 adds filthiness, foolish talking, and inappropriate jesting; Colossians 3:8 commands believers to put away anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, and filthy communication. These are morally severe texts. Their mechanism is ethical and relational, not automatic verbal sorcery.

RESEARCH SECTION

XVII. James 3: The Strong Biblical Doctrine of the Tongue

James compares the tongue to a bit, a helm, and a small fire. It can boast, destroy, bless, curse, express hypocrisy, inflame strife, and reveal the difference between earthly and godly wisdom.

The decisive statement is that the same tongue blesses God and curses human beings made in God's likeness, and that blessing and cursing proceeding from the same mouth 'ought not so to be.' James's doctrine of speech is stronger than the thread's theory because it addresses actual moral destruction without inventing a lexicon of inherently magical syllables.

RESEARCH SECTION

XVIII. What Does It Mean to Curse Someone?

Romans 12:14 gives a clean contrast: 'Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not.' In context Paul forbids personal vengeance and directs believers toward good rather than retaliatory evil.

Here cursing is best understood as hostile speech or imprecation directed toward another person. That is morally different from an accidental vulgar interjection and also closer to the thread post that explicitly curses Christians. Linguistic classification as an imprecation still does not demonstrate supernatural efficacy.

RESEARCH SECTION

XIX. Deuteronomy 18: What the Bible Actually Calls Occult Practice

Deuteronomy 18 names divination, observing times, enchantment, witchcraft, charming, familiar spirits, wizardry, and necromancy. The list need not be exhaustive for its methodological value to be clear: Scripture possesses vocabulary for deliberate occult activity. The additional claim that ordinary profanity automatically belongs in the same category is supplied by the thread, not by the passage.

RESEARCH SECTION

XX. Balaam: The Most Important Biblical Case Study

Numbers 22-24 actually depicts someone being hired to curse a people. Balak summons Balaam with 'the rewards of divination' because he believes Balaam can bless and curse effectively.

The narrative repeatedly subordinates the desired curse to God's word. Balaam is told not to curse a blessed people, later says that God has blessed and he cannot reverse it, and confesses that he cannot go beyond the LORD's commandment to speak according to his own mind.

Whatever larger judgment one makes about Balaam, the narrative is poor support for autonomous verbal magic. Ritual effort and human intention do not override divine sovereignty.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXI. 'Death and Life Are in the Power of the Tongue'

Proverbs 18:21 is strong language and should neither be weakened nor inflated. Its chapter discusses fools whose mouths bring destruction, words that wound, contention, offended brothers, premature answers, and the fruit of one's mouth.

The natural contextual claim is that speech can have extraordinarily serious consequences: lies condemn, truthful counsel preserves, slander destroys relationships, commands can move people toward life or death, and teaching shapes generations. A universal metaphysical manifestation law is an additional interpretation rather than the proverb's explicit mechanism.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXII. 'The Curse Causeless Shall Not Come'

Proverbs 26:2 is proverbial literature rather than a laboratory protocol. Yet its image hardly supports terror that any hostile utterance mechanically lands on a target.

The verse instead depicts the causeless curse as not simply arriving, which sits uneasily with the thread's automatic model.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXIII. Matthew 12 and 'Every Idle Word'

Matthew 12:36 teaches that people will give account for every idle word. The context concerns blasphemy, false attribution of Jesus' works, good and corrupt trees, and the principle that the mouth speaks out of the abundance of the heart.

Speech is morally accountable and revelatory of character. The passage does not discuss sound frequencies, verbal manifestation, unconscious spellcraft, or occult energy.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXIV. Biblical Blessing Is Not Merely 'White Magic'

The thread's blessing-word challenge is useful. If curse words possessed fixed malevolent energy simply as a lexical class, one might expect a matching list of inherently benevolent words.

Biblical blessing is more complex: praise of God, prayer for another, covenantal pronouncement, ordinary words of good, and God's own blessing all appear. Speaker, recipient, intention, covenantal setting, divine will, and context matter. James 3 and Romans 12 do not present a secret positive-energy dictionary.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXV. Imprecatory Psalms: A Necessary Complication

Psalm 109 and other imprecatory passages contain severe appeals for judgment. A responsible analysis should acknowledge them rather than pretend the Bible contains no such language.

The form matters: the psalmist addresses God and asks God to judge. Judgment is not depicted as a self-operating force manufactured by syllables. Christians disagree about contemporary application, but an imprecatory prayer remains categorically different from an involuntary vulgar exclamation.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXVI. The Thread's Online Environment

4chan's anonymity and ephemerality complicate interpretation. Research on /b/, not /x/, found more than 90 percent fully anonymous posting and rapidly discarded identity signals. Those measurements should not be silently generalized to /x/, but the platform context remains relevant.

A sentence may be sincere, sarcastic, experimental, antagonistic, copied, role-played, memetic, humorous, or deliberately absurd. The responsible formulation is 'this post asserts X' and 'the reasoning resembles pattern Y,' not a diagnosis of the poster's personality or mental state.

The later ominous statement that the OP may not know whom he is speaking to is therefore evidence of ambiguity, not proof of supernatural self-identification.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXVII. Line-by-Line Forensic Reading of the Thread

The examined snapshot contains the original post and eleven replies. The table preserves the thread's movement without giving derailments or rhetorical aggression more evidentiary weight than they deserve.

Post	Role	Claim / Content	Forensic Assessment
42978141	Foundational claim	Because profanity is called 'curse words,' speaking it performs literal dark magic.	Equivocation among senses of curse; historical overlap does not establish automatic occult causation.
42978147	Profane insult	Directs profanity at the OP.	Illustrates emotional/rhetorical force, not supernatural mechanism.
42978327	Sarcastic Bible response	Mocks a simplistic 'Bible says no cursing' conclusion.	Accidentally highlights biblical taxonomy: oath, blasphemy, falsehood, filthy speech, imprecation, and occult practice differ.
42978333	'Infusing' words	Claims every act of cursing infuses speech with dark magic.	'Infuse' names a proposed mechanism without detecting or explaining it.
42978796	Tree-roots metaphor	Suggests original roots permanently determine a thing's nature.	Memorable metaphor, poor linguistics; semantic change is normal, and the botanical analogy is literally inaccurate.
42978810	Negative emotion	Suggests cursing may express anger and asks about better handling.	The thread's most empirically grounded move; connects naturally with Ephesians 4 on anger and speech.
42978897	Explicit imprecation	Directs a curse at Christians.	Linguistically closer to traditional cursing because there is a target and hostile wish; supernatural efficacy still unproved.
42979372	Implied menace	Suggests OP may not know whom he is addressing.	Too little evidence to distinguish joke, role-play, threat, bravado, or another intent.
42979383	Mechanism challenge	Asks what curse a profane insult actually placed on its target.	Strong methodological objection: specify outcome, target, conditions, and failure cases.
42979402	Blessing-word challenge	Asks for the matching positive class if negative words have fixed magical polarity.	Exposes weakness in the lexical-energy model; biblical blessing is contextual and relational.
42979455	Derail	Bathroom humor.	No substantive proposition; sometimes noise is simply noise.
42979706	Hardware tangent	Asks about the old computer in the OP image.	Unrelated to the supernatural thesis and insufficient to identify exact internal hardware.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXVIII. Claim-Evidence Ledger

The ledger below separates propositions that are well supported from the inferential bridges that are not.

Claim	Best Available Evidence	Finding
Modern curse words are called 'curse words'	Dictionary usage confirms the expression	Supported
Therefore each is literally a supernatural curse	The conclusion does not follow from the label	Unsupported
Swear can mean profanity	Modern dictionary usage	Supported
Swear can also mean oath-taking	Dictionaries, etymology, Matthew 5 and James 5 context	Supported

Swearing can affect emotion and physiology	Experimental and review literature	Supported
Swearing can affect acute pain tolerance	Repeated laboratory findings and 2024 review	Supported with limitations
These effects prove occult energy	No cited study identifies such a mechanism	Unsupported
Historical cultures practiced ritual cursing	Archaeological and textual evidence	Strongly supported
Historical practice proves supernatural efficacy	Practice/belief and efficacy are distinct questions	Not established by historical evidence
Ancient curse practices were identical to blurring profanity	Evidence shows more complex ritual and intentional practices	Unsupported
Scripture treats speech seriously	James 3, Matthew 12, Ephesians 4-5, Colossians 3, Proverbs	Strongly supported
Matthew 5's 'swear not' primarily concerns profanity	Context explicitly concerns oaths	Unsupported
Scripture forbids occult practices	Deuteronomy 18 and related texts	Supported
Scripture explicitly says every vulgar word is automatic witchcraft	No examined passage makes this identification	Unsupported
Humans can direct curses toward other humans	Biblically and historically documented	Supported
Such words autonomously override divine sovereignty	Balaam narrative points in the opposite theological direction	Not supported
'Death and life are in the power of the tongue' means words have serious consequences	Supported by Proverbs 18 context	Supported
Proverbs 18:21 teaches a universal verbal-manifestation mechanism	Not stated by the passage itself	Interpretive addition
'Hidden in plain sight' proves concealment	Can absorb both evidence and counterevidence	Methodologically weak

RESEARCH SECTION

XXIX. What This Paper Is Not Saying

Rejecting automatic dark-magic theory does not require approving profanity, denying speech acts called curses, denying historical occult practices, reducing biblical cursing to modern psychology, denying the biblical supernatural worldview, or pretending words cannot alter lives.

The conclusion is deliberately narrower: the proposition that ordinary modern curse words automatically become literal acts of dark magic whenever spoken has not been established by the evidence examined.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXX. A Better Model: Seven Kinds of Power in Words

A more precise model avoids the two bad extremes 'words are magic' and 'words are meaningless noise.' Human language has multiple kinds of real power that need not be collapsed into one invisible mechanism.

Kind of Power	What It Means
Semantic	Words communicate meaning.
Psychological	Words can trigger learned emotional, cognitive, physiological, and pain-related responses.
Social	Words can build trust, humiliate, create solidarity, provoke conflict, or damage relationships.
Performative	Under the right conditions, speaking can constitute promises, vows, declarations, commands, and other acts.
Legal / institutional	Testimony, contracts, verdicts, oaths, and official declarations can alter rights or obligations.
Moral	Speech can express truth, falsehood, love, hatred, blessing, cursing, edification, and accountability.
Religious	Scripture includes prayer, prophecy, blessing, cursing, vows, and explicit condemnations of occult practices.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXXI. Why the Thread's Theory Feels Persuasive

The argument becomes rhetorically powerful by placing true observations next to one another: words are powerful; some words feel unusually powerful; 'curse' has supernatural associations; historical curses existed; Scripture contains blessing and cursing; Scripture warns about the tongue; biblical texts condemn occult practice.

Once those facts are compressed, 'curse word = curse = magic' can feel almost self-evident. But the equality signs are the very propositions that require evidence. Linguistics separates senses, history separates casual profanity from ritual cursing, psychology supplies learned mechanisms for measurable effects, and Scripture distinguishes corrupt speech, oaths, cursing persons, and occult practice.

RESEARCH SECTION

XXXII. Practical and Pastoral Application

Removing an unsupported occult theory does not weaken biblical speech ethics. It can sharpen them. A person can avoid every conventional four-letter word while lying, slandering, humiliating, gossiping, flattering deceptively, raging at family members, bearing false witness, or speaking with cruelty.

James asks what kind of fountain the tongue reveals. Jesus relates speech to the abundance of the heart. Paul asks whether speech edifies and ministers grace. Colossians joins the rejection of malice, blasphemy, filthy communication, and lying with the call to speech 'always with grace.'

The practical questions are therefore deeper than whether a word appears on a taboo list: is the speech true, malicious, degrading, needlessly inflammatory, corrupting, edifying, false witness, glorification of wickedness, bitterness, or charity?

RESEARCH SECTION

XXXIII. Final Finding

The thread begins with a historical overlap of meanings and turns it into an ontology: because English speakers call profanity curse words, the OP concludes the words are literal curses; because they are literal curses, saying them performs magic; because most people do not recognize the magic, the mechanism must be successfully concealed. Each transition requires evidence that the thread does not supply.

Modern English distinguishes profanity, oath-taking, offensive language, and wishing evil upon someone. Experimental psychology shows that taboo language can produce real emotional, physiological, cognitive, social, and pain-related effects without identifying supernatural force as the cause. Archaeology shows deliberate curse practices without turning every expletive into the same ritual.

Scripture likewise provides a disciplined taxonomy. Matthew 5 and James 5 address oaths; James 3 and Romans 12 address blessing and cursing persons; Ephesians and Colossians address corrupt, filthy, malicious, and destructive speech; Deuteronomy 18 addresses explicit occult practices; Numbers 22-24 subordinates attempted cursing to divine sovereignty; Proverbs treats speech as profoundly consequential; and Matthew 12 makes words morally accountable.

The resulting conclusion is neither 'words do nothing' nor 'every forbidden word is dark magic.' Words matter profoundly because they communicate truth and falsehood, love and hatred, blessing and cursing, promises and lies, wisdom and folly. Scripture calls the tongue to moral accountability without requiring a theory of automatic occult vocabulary.

APPENDIX A

Scripture Index

Passage	What the Text Contributes	What It Does Not Establish by Itself
Numbers 22-24	Balak hires Balaam to curse Israel; the attempted curse cannot override God's determination.	Poor support for autonomous verbal magic; strong emphasis on divine sovereignty.
Deuteronomy 18:9-14	Names divination, enchantment, witchcraft, charming, familiar spirits, wizardry, and necromancy.	Shows Scripture has specific occult categories; does not identify all profanity as occult practice.
Proverbs 18:21	Speech can have consequences involving life and death.	Does not by itself teach a universal verbal-manifestation mechanism.
Proverbs 26:2	The causeless curse does not simply 'come.'	Undermines an indiscriminate automatic-curse model.
Matthew 5:33-37	'Swear not at all' appears in a discussion of oaths and truthfulness.	Should not be silently redefined as a direct text about modern profanity.
Matthew 12:33-37	Speech reveals the heart and is morally accountable.	Does not discuss occult energy or automatic spellcraft.
Romans 12:14	'Bless, and curse not' toward persecutors.	Addresses hostile cursing/imprecation and Christian response.
Ephesians 4:26-32	Anger, corrupt communication, bitterness, wrath, evil speaking, kindness, forgiveness.	Direct moral framework for speech without magical mechanism.
Ephesians 5:3-4	Filthiness, foolish talking, jesting contrasted with thanksgiving.	Directly relevant to Christian speech ethics.
Colossians 3:8; 4:6	Put away blasphemy and filthy communication; let speech be with grace.	Biblical ethics concerns character and relational use of speech.
James 3	The tongue can bless, curse, boast, destroy, and reveal divided moral character.	A powerful doctrine of speech, not a lexicon of magical syllables.
James 5:12	'Swear not' is explicitly tied to oaths by heaven, earth, or another oath.	Confirms the oath-taking category.

SELECTED SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Research Base and External Links

- [1] Library of Rickandria - original web edition
- [2] Primary 4chan /x/ thread No. 42978141
- [3] Stapleton et al. (2022) - The Power of Swearing: What We Know and What We Don't
- [4] Hay et al. (2024) - F@#\$ Pain! A Mini-Review of the Hypoalgesic Effects of Swearing
- [5] Eddy (2026) - The Many Manifestations of Magical Thinking: A Systematic Review
- [6] Berle & Starcevic (2005) - Thought-Action Fusion review
- [7] Woolf (2022) - Curse Tablets: The History of a Technology
- [8] Graf (2022) - Greek Cursing, and Ours
- [9] University of Oxford - Curse Tablets of Roman Britain
- [10] Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy - Pragmatics / Speech Acts
- [11] Cambridge Dictionary - curse word
- [12] Cambridge Dictionary - curse
- [13] Cambridge Dictionary - swear word
- [14] Online Etymology Dictionary - curse
- [15] Online Etymology Dictionary - swear
- [16] Kolb - Etymological Fallacy, in Bad Arguments
- [17] Bernstein et al. - 4chan and /b/: An Analysis of Anonymity and Ephemerality
- [18] Iowa State University Extension - Tree Anatomy 101

Primary biblical text: *The Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version, Pure Cambridge Edition*. Supplied project copy.

RESEARCH NOTE

This paper keeps four levels separate: text - what a cited source actually says; historical evidence - what can be established about human practices and beliefs; empirical evidence - what controlled observation or experiment has measured; interpretation - conclusions drawn by comparing those materials. Evidence that people believed in curses is not automatically evidence that curses worked. Evidence that words produce measurable effects is not automatically evidence that those effects are supernatural. And evidence that Scripture condemns one category of speech should not be transferred to another category without textual warrant.

CLOSING PRINCIPLE

The goal is neither reflexive skepticism nor reflexive credulity. It is to examine all things carefully enough that an attractive theory is not mistaken for a demonstrated one.

Original web edition: libraryofrickandria.com/cursing/

“Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.” - James 3:10

Soli Deo Gloria.