



Research Article

SOCIAL FACTORS SPECIFYING THE SPEECH OF COURT SESSION PARTICIPANTS

Submission Date: Sep 14, 2024, **Accepted Date:** Sep 19, 2024,

Published Date: Sep 24, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-05-09-04>

Journal Website:
<https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjps>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

Khurmatillo Ismoilov

Doctorate (DSc) of Andijan State University, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The expression of language units in a court session serves as a prime example of the manifestation of social standing and its corresponding speech patterns. Unlike any other speech situation, the court's reliance on its just principles, strict rules and regulations in conducting discussions, and its commitment to fair justice based on citizens' equality before the law and the court, underscore its official status as an arm of state power. The article will highlight the social factors that influence the speech of the main participants in a court session: the presiding judge, the state prosecutor and the defense attorney. It will analyze how these factors contribute to the unique language they use in their speeches.

KEYWORDS

Speech impediment, social factors, court session, presiding's (judge) speech, public prosecutor's (prosecutor) speech, defense attorney's speech.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the meaning of language units fully requires studying them in relation to context and speech situations. The social stratification of a society speaking a particular language is diverse. Accordingly, each group has its own unique linguistic characteristics. For example, regional differentiation, professional differentiation, and others. The

differentiation of each social group based on its own linguistic markers makes studying its social causes particularly significant [7]. As Abduhamid Nurmonov pointed out, "professional differentiation" leads to each group having its own unique linguistic markers, which we can assess as factors contributing to the social characterization of speech within an individual's



social status. Particularly, the expression of language units in a court session serves as a prime example of the manifestation of social standing and its corresponding speech patterns. Unlike any other speech situation, the court’s reliance on its just principles, strict rules and regulations in conducting discussions, and its commitment to fair justice based on citizens’ equality before the law and the court, underscore its official status as an arm of state power. It is well-known that oral speech is distinctive in its constant exposure to a range of factors in various conditions and situations. A court session is a process that unfolds as a live (oral) interaction, involving face-to-face communication among specific participants, with a defined time and composition. When describing the sociolinguistic aspects of speech, the physical proximity of the communicants, or their face-to-face interaction, is considered crucial. “When

communication is established face-to-face, interlocutors express their thoughts and intentions clearly and easily. This is because they are aided by certain paralinguistic means such as facial expressions and gestures, and the imperative, influencing function of speech is also perceived” [1]. It’s true that sociolinguistic investigation of speech is increasingly intertwined with pragmatic approaches, which focus on the use of language units in actual speech events [10]. From members of each social group, certain aspects of language proficiency are expected within a specific range of word choice and characteristic speech patterns. We can observe similar speech patterns among participants in a court session. For instance, the choice of specific language units in the speech of the presiding judge, the state prosecutor, and the defense attorney during a trial is influenced by several factors, including:

Table 1

Forms of speech expression specific to social class	
specified / unspecified	Presiding Judge’s speech
specified	use of strict adherence to literary language norms, formal style of speech, strength of the commanding act, firm tone, speech aimed at promoting the law and raising legal awareness, logically reasoned arguments, expression of the content of laws, observance of all legal language rules.
unspecified	use of emotional-expressive elements of language, exclamatory words; periphrases, phraseological units, proverbs and sayings, argot and jargon, occasionalism, archaisms and historicisms, interjections and onomatopoeia, barbarisms and vulgarisms.
	State Prosecutor’s speech



specified	use of strict adherence to literary language norms, formal style of speech, observance of all legal language rules, speech devoid of passion, clear, accurate, fluent, and impactful structure of speech, firm tone, speech based on facts and current legal norms, demonstrating a high level of legal culture [4] .
unspecified	use of speech with a mixture of legal terms, exclamatory words [6]; periphrases, phraseological units, proverbs and sayings, argot and jargon, occasionalism, archaisms and historicisms, interjections and onomatopoeia, barbarisms and vulgarisms.
Defense Attorney’s speech	
specified	strict adherence to literary language norms; speech within formal style; full compliance of speech with humanitarian principles; acting as a defender of the defendant's rights and legal interests; speech in harmony with the psychological portrait of the defendant; defense art, speech competence; appearing as a person providing legal assistance to individuals and legal entities; a speech aimed at expressing the interests and protecting the rights of the defendants
unspecified	use of argot and jargon, occasionalism, archaisms and historicisms, interjections and onomatopoeia, barbarisms and vulgarisms.

The table shows that the social groups involved in the court session, while conforming to the requirements of social status-specific (speech) appearances and abandoning those that are not, engage in communication that reveals their social standing and contributes to the social characterization of their speech. The words, phrases, and sentences expressed within this context represent socially-conditioned

speech. It’s noteworthy that this type of speech necessitates a response from the addressee to the speaker, which involves choosing linguistic units that align with the speaker’s speech style and employing specific linguistic and extralinguistic methods of communication.

In sociolinguistic research, the speaker’s identity and the unique characteristics of their speech are so



significant that they allow us to recognize, based on a given sentence or context, the specific boundaries and social characteristics of the language units used, thus revealing the social group to which this speech style belongs. These factors manifest in distinctive ways during the court process, leaving their mark on the court session minutes and the text of the judgment. Particularly: "The application of preventive measure in the form of imprisonment against Komilov Komil Komilovichgaovich should be rejected." "Komilov Komil Komilovich should be sentenced to 3 (three) years of imprisonment in accordance with Article 241, Part 1, Article 276, Part 1 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan". The use of phrases like "let it come into legal force," "let it be executed immediately," "let the precautionary measure be rejected," and "let the penalty of deprivation of liberty be imposed" in the excerpts from court rulings is characteristic of the speech of the presiding judge, and through this aspect, his social status is understood. Moreover, the inclusion of such expressions in his speech is linked to the status of the society within the community [8]. The characteristic features of a legal speech are that it expresses the content of laws, logically justifies arguments, expresses opinions in a firm tone, and adheres to all the rules of legal language within the framework of a formal style.

"I request that when determining the punishment for K. Komilov, you take into account his personality, family circumstances, as well as his full confession of guilt, the full compensation of the damage inflicted on the victim K. Komilova, and the absence of any claim from him. ... "I request that the esteemed jury reconsider the previous court decision."

The phrase "respected jury" and the expressions "I request you to impose a sentence" and "I request a change" in this passage indicate that the speech belongs to the state prosecutor.

This attribution is due to the fact that the speech focuses on the analysis of a criminal incident. The prosecutor, by virtue of his role, is responsible for assessing the committed crime or offense based on existing law, acting as the defender of state and legal interests.

Moreover, the prosecutor, who is the representative of the law and the state, is characterized by the fact that their speech focuses on proving the guilt of the defendant with the available material evidence. This distinguishes it by its content, choice of linguistic units, seriousness, formality, and lack of emotion. "Because the prosecutor, from the perspective of their duty, assesses the committed crime or violation based on current law" [5]. The prosecutor should be a highly cultured individual, demonstrated by their accurate pronunciation, expressive and impactful speech [6].

"Your Honor and members of the jury! ... I ask for K. Komilov to be acquitted and released from the courtroom". "I request that you issue a verdict of acquittal for K. Komilov, my client, under Article 277, part 3 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan". This passage demonstrates that the phrases "Your Honor and members of the jury!" and "I ask for K. Komilov to be acquitted and released from the courtroom," "I request that you issue a verdict of acquittal..." are characteristic of a lawyer's speech, due to the addressing of the court and the request for an acquittal.

According to lawyers, one of the most crucial speeches in a trial is the defense attorney's closing argument. This argument represents the pinnacle of the attorney's work on the criminal case. It's a moment where the attorney defends the individual on trial, regardless of the crime they are accused of or the law they may have broken, appealing to humanitarian principles and striving to ensure a fair outcome [3]. This is a lawyer, authorized to defend the rights and legal interests of suspects, defendants, and convicts in



accordance with the procedures established by law, and to provide them with the necessary legal assistance. Lawyers may act as defenders in the case [2].

In the exercise of their professional activities, lawyers are obligated to adhere to the requirements of current legislation, the rules of legal ethics, the attorney-client privilege, and the lawyer's oath. They must utilize the means and methods provided by law to protect the rights and legal interests of individuals and legal entities who seek their legal assistance [11]. A lawyer's language (speech) is characterized by a strong emotional impact and vividness, often employing a variety of literary devices, such as metaphors, similes, examples, and more [9]. The content and skill of the lawyer's speech during the trial, including their masterful use of language and their profound understanding of the defendant's psychological profile, are of paramount importance. The defense attorney's closing arguments for K.Komilov are as follows: "Respected jury! When we look at these defendants before us, sincerely remorseful and deeply troubled, we have faith in their youth and their future commitment to serving their families, our people, and our homeland" (From the court transcript).

As the analysis above suggests, there is a need to study the sociolinguistic characteristics of the speeches of the presiding judge, the state prosecutor, the defense attorney, and other participants in the courtroom from the perspective of the "speaker-speech" intersection which requires extensive research. The speech of these social roles will be the object of our future investigation, while their socio-

psychological linguistic features will be the subject of our research.

REFERENCES

1. Iskandarova Sh. Forms of communication of the Uzbek speech habit: Filol.fan.nomz. ... diss. Samarkand: 1993.
2. Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Article 49.2 Toshkent: Adolat, 1993. – 261 p.
3. Karimov S., Mamatov Kh., Buriev I. The Language Culture of a Lawyer. - Tashkent: Zarkalam, 2004. - P. 146.
4. Mirhamidov M., Hasanov S. The Language culture of a Lawyer. - Tashkent: Science and Technology, 2005. - 314 p
5. Moydinov Q. The Lexical System of Legal Speech in the Uzbek Language: Philol. Sci. Ph.D. ... Diss. - T., 2019. - P. 43.
6. Mirhamidov M., Norpolatov N., Hasanov S. Legal Language and the Speech of a Lawyer. - Tashkent: University, 2004. - P. 122.
7. Nurmonov A. The Relationship of Linguistics with Sociology // Selected Works. Vol. 1. - Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012. - P. 136.
8. Nurmonov A. Selected Works. Three Volumes. Vol. 1. - Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012. - P. 21.
9. Saidov A., Sarkisyants G. Legal Language and the Speech of a Lawyer. - Tashkent: Adolat, 1994. - P. 5.
10. Yuldasheva X. Sociolinguistic study of Uzbek historical novels. Filol.fan.b.falsafa doc. ... (PhD) diss. – Tashkent: 2017. – B. 5.
11. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Advocacy" (No. 349-I, December 27, 1996), Article 7. <http://www.lexuz.uz>