

LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN LAWYERS' SPEECH: CONTEXTUAL AND PRAGMATIC APPROACHES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK JURIDICAL RHETORIC

Khujaniyazova Hilola Turaevna,
Senior Teacher, Researcher,
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages,
hilola.x.t@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes the relationship between language and culture in lawyers' speeches within English and Uzbek juridical rhetoric, as well as the significance of contextual and pragmatic approaches. The article examines the distinctive features of juridical discourse in both cultures, methods of influencing the audience, and cultural factors that enhance the effectiveness of speech. Examples from English and Uzbek lawyers' speeches are provided to illustrate their adaptation to language and culture.

Keywords: Juridical rhetoric, lawyers' speech, language and culture, contextual approach, pragmatic approach, juridical communication, discourse analysis.

Introduction

Juridical rhetoric is an essential part of juridical communication, where effective speech is created based on the complex relationship between language and culture (Coulthard, 2014). Particularly, lawyers' speech forms a reliable and persuasive expression in court proceedings when contextual and pragmatic factors are taken into account. This article analyzes the role of language and culture in lawyers' speeches within English and Uzbek juridical rhetoric, as well as the distinct characteristics and differences of contextual and pragmatic approaches. The effectiveness of juridical speech often depends on its contextual and pragmatic features. The contextual approach studies the content of the speech and its adaptation to the audience and situation, while the pragmatic approach

investigates the ways to achieve the intended purpose through speech. A lawyer's speech must be constructed according to the context and employ various rhetorical tools to persuade the audience. American scholar Jean Goodwin expresses the following view about advocacy in her article: "Advocacy involves advancing the most convincingly reasoned suggestions for change, informed by defensible, rigorous evidence. Scientists thus perceive the speech activity advocating as providing an overall framework within which they offer arguments in policy controversies". (J. Goodwin, 2009)

In English juridical rhetoric, the logical construction of speech and clear presentation of evidence hold a primary position. At the same time, it is also considered important to emotionally influence the audience. For example, if we analyze the speech from a contextual and rhetorical perspective: "A house divided against itself cannot stand" (Goodwin, 2005). Through this phrase, author highlights the division within society in a historical and social context, calling the audience to unite. This unique metaphor affected the emotions of the audience. In Clarence Darrow's speech during the "Scopes Monkey Trial," a pragmatic approach is evident: "We are not here to destroy faith, but to protect the right of every man to think and to believe as his conscience directs" (Darrow, 1925). Here, Darrow appeals to the audience to consider their personal rights, strengthening his juridical position. The arguments presented in the speech correspond both to the audience's consciousness and their social values.

In Uzbek juridical speech, culture and traditions play a very significant role. For a lawyer's speech to be effective, the cultural background, social respect, and customs of the audience must be taken into account. In speech samples taken from the practice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the formality of the language and its basis in respect are clearly evident: "Hurmatli sud, mening mijozim qonun oldida teng huquqlidir. Biz barcha dalillarni aniqlik bilan taqdim etishga tayyormiz va adolatning yuzaga chiqishini talab qilamiz" (Honorable court, my client is equal before the law. We are ready to present all evidence clearly and demand the realization of justice).

Here is the English translation of your explanation: In the given speech, the phrase "**Hurmatli sud**" (**Honorable court**) — expresses respect and formality towards the court. It indicates the official nature of the judicial process and shows that the speaker respects the court. The statement "**Mening mijozim qonun oldida teng huquqlidir**" (**My client is equal before the law**) — emphasizes that

the lawyer insists on the juridical rights of their client not being violated, grounding the argument on the principle of equality. This sentence signifies that the lawyer demands the protection of their client by the court. The phrase “**Biz barcha dalillarni aniqlik bilan taqdim etishga tayyormiz**” (We are ready to present all evidence clearly) — conveys transparency and openness. The lawyer indicates their readiness to provide all necessary facts and evidence, meaning they are prepared to use every possible means to ensure the court process is fair. Finally, “**Adolatning yuzaga chiqishini talab qilamiz**” (We demand the realization of justice) — shows that the speaker is requesting the court to issue a fair and just decision. The main purpose and intention of this speech is clear. From a pragmatic perspective, these statements demonstrate the lawyer’s formal and respectful attitude towards the court, as well as their determination to protect the client’s rights. The speech is intended to influence the listener — the judge — and to urge them to make a fair decision in favor of the client’s interests.

Context includes where, among whom, and in what situation the speech is delivered. This phrase is spoken during a court session, either in a claim or defense process. Therefore, the speech must be formal and based on juridical norms. The client’s equality before the law is emphasized. In this context, there is a potential risk that the client’s rights might be violated or that they might face unequal treatment. The lawyer defends their client’s juridical interests and demands a just decision from the court.

Moreover, the lawyer declares readiness to present all evidence clearly and comprehensively, which aims to ensure the transparency and fairness of the judicial process. The primary listener here is the judge; however, other parties involved in the trial, witnesses, and observers are also present. The speech must be formal and juridically appropriate because the court process is governed by strict rules. From a pragmatic viewpoint, this speech exemplifies the lawyer’s respect for the court, determination to protect the client’s juridical rights, and trust in justice. From a contextual perspective, it is uttered in the formal and juridical environment of the court process with the purpose of defending the client’s interests. The speech embodies essential elements such as respect for the court, openness with evidence, and a demand for justice.

In such speeches, culturally, showing respect and maintaining a formal style are of great importance. As Uzbek scholar S.Usmonov stated, “*Advokatning vazifasi jinoyatni emas, shu jinoyatni ma’lum shart-sharoitlar ta’sirida sodir etgan*

shaxsni himoya qilishdan iborat. Advokat faoliyatining eng muhim qoidasi quyidagi tezisdagi bayon qilingan: gumonlanayotgan shaxs hali aybdor degani emas. Ushbu prinsipga ko'ra, sud o'z hukmini e'lon qilmagunga qadar ayblanuvchi aybsiz hisoblanib, himoyachining faoliyati esa jamiyat tomonidan insoniy, adolatli deb baholanadi". (The lawyer's duty is not to defend the crime itself but to defend the person who committed the crime under certain conditions. The most important rule of the lawyer's activity is expressed in the following thesis: a person under suspicion is not yet considered guilty. According to this principle, until the court issues its verdict, the accused is regarded as innocent, and the activity of the defender is considered humane and just by society). (S. Usmonov, 2007)

A contextual approach to defense speeches by lawyers focuses on taking into account cultural and social factors within the speech to better understand and persuade the audience. English lawyers tend to emphasize the juridical and evidential context more, whereas Uzbek lawyers place greater importance on cultural customs and social respect. This difference stems from the distinct histories and social structures of their respective juridical cultures. The pragmatic approach highlights the practical purpose of the speech. English lawyers attempt to persuade the audience by combining logical and emotional elements, while Uzbek lawyers' pragmatic approach places more emphasis on the audience's cultural codes, including respect and ethics.

Language is the primary means of expressing culture and, in juridical speech, its features are closely linked to the cultural background of the audience. English juridical discourse emphasizes individual rights and a formal logical structure, while in Uzbek juridical speech, social relations, respect, and cultural context are highlighted more. Therefore, a deep understanding of cultural differences is necessary to effectively convey juridical speech.

Although the contextual and pragmatic aspects of English and Uzbek juridical speech differ, in both cultures, language and culture play a crucial role in ensuring the effectiveness of juridical communication. Considering cultural and linguistic context in lawyers' speech is an important tool for ensuring justice and fairness in court proceedings.

References:

1. Coulthard, M. (2014). An Introduction to Juridical Discourse Analysis. Routledge.
2. Goodwin, D. K., Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln. Simon & Schuster. 2005.
3. Darrow, C., The Scopes Monkey Trial transcripts. USA., 1925.
4. Sapir, E., Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. Harcourt, Brace. 2009.
5. Salomov B. S., "O'zbekiston advokatlarining himoya nutqlari", Toshkent., 2006.
6. Xolmuminov, S., O'zbek yuridik nutqining madaniy aspektlari. Toshkent: Huquq. 2018.
7. Usmonov S., Yuristning nutq madaniyati. Toshkent, 2007.
8. Dalieva M. Methods, Challenges, and Ethical Considerations in Data Collection of Corpus Compilation //Innovative Technologica: Methodical Research Journal. – 2024. – T. 3. – №. 3.
9. Dalieva M. DIACHRONIC CORPORA AND LANGUAGE EVOLUTION OVER TIME //Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 10. – C. 58-60.
10. DALIEVA M. Types of cognitive models of polysemy of linguistic terms //cognition. – 2024. – T. 2181. – C. 3663.
11. Dalieva M. K. et al. Communicative approach in teaching speaking //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 43-44.
12. DALIEVA M. LISONIY TERMINLARNING SHAKLLANISHIDA KOGNITIV JARAYONLARNING AHAMIYATI //News of the NUUZ. – 2024. – T. 1. – №. 1.4. – C. 309-312.
13. Dalieva M. K. et al. The function of english songs to improve listening skill //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 30-32.
14. Dalieva M. INTEROPERATION OF LANGUAGE, SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY, AND INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION //Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 1. – C. 1-4.
15. Dalieva M. K. et al. The theories of teaching vocabulary in context //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 45-46.

16. Dalieva M. ANALYZING CULTURAL DISCOURSE IN JADID WRITINGS THROUGH CORPUS METHODS //EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements. – 2025. – T. 1. – №. 4. – C. 28-34.
17. Khabibullaevna D. M. et al. The Role Of Polysemy In The Conceptual Integration Of Phraseological Units: A CrossLinguistic Approach //Czech Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovations. – 2025. – T. 40. – C. 4-9.
18. Khabibullaevna D. M. et al. A Corpus-Based Study of Jadid Reforms and Media Transformation in Central Asia //Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity. – 2025. – T. 41. – C. 118-121.
19. Khabibullaevna D. M., Kamilovich S. E. DIGITAL TEXT ANALYSIS OF JADID PUBLICATIONS //Web of Humanities: Journal of Social Science and Humanitarian Research. – 2025. – T. 3. – №. 4. – C. 15-19.