O‘ZBEKISTON MILLIY UNIVERSITETI XABARLARI, 2026, [15]
ISSN 2181-7324(Print)

FILOLOGIYA
http://journals.nuu.uz
Social sciences
ISSN 3093-8996(Onlayn)

UDK:81'33:34

Nuriya A.JUMANIYOZOVA,
PhD in Comparative Linguistics, Associate Professor, University of Digital Economics and Agrotechnologies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan,
E-mail: jumaniyozovanuriya@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6692-5552

Based on the review of Doctor of Philology, Professor X.D. Paluanova

FORENSIC LINGUISTICS AS A MODERN FIELD OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

Annotation

Forensic linguistics has become an increasingly significant area of interdisciplinary linguistic research, combining linguistic theory and methodology with legal and investigative practices. This study examines the development of forensic linguistics as a modern field of linguistic inquiry and explores its major areas of application, including authorship attribution, forensic phonetics, legal discourse, pragmatics, corpus linguistics, and digital communication. The study employs a qualitative analytical approach based on the examination of relevant scholarly literature and previous research in the field. The findings demonstrate that linguistic analysis can provide valuable evidence in various legal contexts, particularly in the examination of disputed texts, anonymous communications, speech recordings, courtroom interaction, and digital discourse. At the same time, the analysis emphasizes that forensic linguistic evidence should be interpreted cautiously, taking into account linguistic variation, contextual factors, data limitations, and methodological reliability. The study further highlights the growing role of corpus-based and computational methods in improving the efficiency and empirical foundation of forensic analysis. It is concluded that the continued development of digital communication and interdisciplinary research will further expand the scope and practical significance of forensic linguistics. The field therefore represents an important and rapidly developing area of contemporary linguistic research with both theoretical and practical implications.

Keywords: forensic linguistics, linguistic evidence, authorship attribution, forensic phonetics, legal discourse, corpus linguistics, digital communication.

СУДЕБНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА КАК СОВРЕМЕННОЕ НАПРАВЛЕНИЕ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

Аннотация

Судебная лингвистика в настоящее время представляет собой значимое междисциплинарное направление лингвистических исследований, объединяющее лингвистическую теорию и методологию с юридической и следственной практикой. В статье рассматривается развитие судебной лингвистики как современного направления лингвистической науки и анализируются основные области её применения, включая атрибуцию авторства, судебную фонетику, юридический дискурс, прагматику, корпусную лингвистику и цифровую коммуникацию. Исследование основано на качественном анализе научной литературы и существующих исследований в данной области. Результаты показывают, что лингвистический анализ может предоставлять ценную доказательную информацию в различных правовых контекстах, особенно при исследовании спорных текстов, анонимных сообщений, речевых записей, судебной коммуникации и цифрового дискурса. Вместе с тем подчёркивается необходимость осторожной интерпретации лингвистических доказательств с учётом языковой вариативности, контекстуальных факторов, ограниченности данных и методологических особенностей. Делается вывод о том, что развитие цифровой коммуникации и междисциплинарных подходов будет способствовать дальнейшему расширению сферы применения и практической значимости судебной лингвистики.

Ключевые слова: судебная лингвистика, лингвистические доказательства, атрибуция авторства, судебная фонетика, юридический дискурс, корпусная лингвистика, цифровая коммуникация.

SUD LINGVISTIKASI LINGVISTIK TADQIQOTNING ZAMONAVIY YO‘NALISHI SIFATIDA

Annotatsiya

Sud lingvistikasi bugungi kunda lingvistik nazariya va metodologiyani huquqiy hamda tergov amaliyoti bilan uyg‘unlashtiruvchi muhim fanlararo tadqiqot yo‘nalishiga aylandi. Mazkur maqolada sud lingvistikasining zamonaviy lingvistik tadqiqot yo‘nalishi sifatida shakllanishi va rivojlanishi hamda uning asosiy qo‘llanish sohalari, jumladan, mualliflikni aniqlash, sud fonetikasi, huquqiy diskurs, pragmatika, korpus lingvistikasi va raqamli kommunikatsiya masalalari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot ushbu sohadagi ilmiy adabiyotlar va mavjud tadqiqotlarning sifat jihatidan tahliliga asoslangan. Tadqiqot natijalari lingvistik tahlil bahsli matnlar, anonim xabarlar, nutq yozuvlari, sud jarayonidagi kommunikatsiya hamda raqamli diskursni o‘rganishda muhim daliliy ahamiyatga ega bo‘lishi mumkinligini ko‘rsatadi. Shu bilan birga, lingvistik dalillarni talqin qilishda til variativligi, kontekstual omillar, ma’lumotlarning cheklanganligi va metodologik yondashuvlarni hisobga olish zarurligi ta’kidlanadi. Xulosa qilib aytganda, raqamli kommunikatsiyaning jadal rivojlanishi va fanlararo yondashuvlarning kengayishi sud lingvistikasining qo‘llanish doirasi hamda amaliy ahamiyatini yanada oshirishga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: sud lingvistikasi, lingvistik dalillar, mualliflikni aniqlash, sud fonetikasi, huquqiy diskurs, korpus lingvistikasi, raqamli kommunikatsiya.

Introduction. In today’s globalized world, English has become the primary language of international communication in professional and academic contexts. Consequently, the demand for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has increased, as many learners need English tailored to their particular fields such as business, medicine, law,

engineering, or technology. Unlike General English, ESP focuses on specialized vocabulary, authentic tasks, and real-life communication relevant to learners' future careers. Effective ESP instruction therefore requires attention not only to language skills but also to professional contexts.

At the same time, rapid technological progress, especially in Artificial Intelligence (AI), is transforming educational practices. AI refers to computer systems capable of performing tasks that normally require human intelligence, including language processing, speech recognition, and adaptive learning. In language education, AI-powered tools such as intelligent tutoring systems, chatbots, speech recognition programs, and writing assistants provide personalized learning experiences, immediate feedback, and opportunities for interactive practice.

The integration of AI into ESP teaching is particularly beneficial because ESP learners often have specific goals and limited time. AI technologies can simulate professional situations, generate up-to-date materials, and adapt tasks to individual proficiency levels. This enables students to practice relevant communication skills and acquire field-specific terminology more efficiently. However, the use of AI also presents challenges, including overdependence on technology, concerns about accuracy, ethical issues, and unequal access to digital resources.

Despite these limitations, the teacher's role remains crucial. Educators guide students in the effective and responsible use of AI tools, evaluate learning outcomes, and ensure that technology supports meaningful language development. This paper explores how AI can enhance ESP instruction by improving specialized language skills while maintaining the essential role of the teacher in the learning process.

Literature review. Forensic linguistics has developed into an important interdisciplinary area of linguistic inquiry that brings together linguistics, law, and criminal justice. Although the systematic use of linguistic methods in legal settings is a relatively recent development, the significance of language in judicial and investigative processes has long been acknowledged. Linguistic evidence can be relevant to a wide range of legal activities, including criminal investigations, police questioning, courtroom interaction, legal writing, and the interpretation of legislative and judicial texts. As a result, contemporary forensic linguistics covers diverse forms of linguistic analysis conducted within legal and investigative environments.

An important early contribution to the establishment of forensic linguistics was Jan Svartvik's The Evans Statements: A Case for Forensic Linguistics (1968). In this study, Svartvik illustrated the potential of linguistic analysis in examining statements whose authorship or reliability was disputed in a criminal case. The significance of this work lies in its demonstration that systematic examination of linguistic patterns could generate evidence relevant to legal investigations. It consequently contributed to the recognition of linguistics as a potentially valuable source of forensic evidence.

The field subsequently broadened considerably, with researchers extending their attention beyond individual linguistic forms to the analysis of discourse in legal contexts. Coulthard (1994), in particular, highlighted the relevance of discourse analysis to such areas as police interviews, courtroom interaction, and contested texts. His work showed that forensic analysis requires attention not only to vocabulary and grammatical structures but also to wider communicative phenomena, including turn-taking, interactional organization, pragmatic interpretation, and the institutional nature of legal discourse. Thus, forensic linguistic research gradually shifted towards a context-sensitive understanding of how language functions within legal settings.

The analysis of legal discourse has likewise become a substantial area of scholarly investigation. From a sociolinguistic and discourse-analytic perspective, Gibbons (2003) explored the distinctive characteristics of communication in legal settings and drew attention to the unequal communicative relationships that may exist between legal professionals and other participants. Legal discourse frequently involves specialized terminology, institutional conventions, syntactic complexity, and established interactional practices. Accordingly, forensic linguists have investigated a range of issues, including the accessibility and comprehensibility of legal language, the interpretation of legal documents, courtroom communication, and the linguistic rights of individuals involved in legal proceedings.

Pragmatic analysis provides another important theoretical perspective within forensic linguistics. Meaning in legal communication cannot always be determined solely by examining the literal interpretation of an utterance. Factors such as implicature, presupposition, speech acts, deixis, ambiguity, and communicative context may substantially influence interpretation. Cotterill (2002), for example, demonstrated that courtroom interaction can be understood as a complex communicative process in which participants strategically employ language to construct accounts of events, establish credibility, question evidence, and shape interpretations. This perspective underlines the importance of integrating pragmatic and discourse-based approaches with more traditional linguistic analysis.

Research methodology. The emergence of corpus-based approaches has further contributed to the methodological development of forensic linguistics. Corpus linguistics allows researchers to examine authentic linguistic data in a systematic and, where appropriate, quantitative manner. Through comparisons between disputed materials and relevant reference corpora, researchers can identify recurrent linguistic tendencies that may remain difficult to observe through qualitative analysis alone. Corpus-based methods have been employed in a variety of forensic applications, including authorship analysis, plagiarism investigation, trademark disputes, legal language research, and the examination of anonymous or threatening messages. The increasing use of computational techniques has therefore strengthened the empirical basis and reproducibility of forensic linguistic investigations.

Nevertheless, the application of linguistic evidence in forensic contexts presents a number of methodological challenges. Coulthard, Johnson, and Wright (2017) emphasize that linguistic patterns need to be interpreted within their specific contexts because language is influenced by genre, communicative purpose, audience, situational factors, and individual characteristics. Consequently, the presence of a particular linguistic feature should not automatically be regarded as definitive evidence of authorship or speaker identity. Questions concerning the adequacy and representativeness of samples, linguistic variability, analytical reliability, statistical evaluation, and expert interpretation remain important considerations when assessing the evidential value of forensic linguistic analysis.

More recent developments have expanded the field into the domain of digital communication. The widespread use of social networking platforms, messaging applications, email, online discussion forums, and other digital environments has created new sources of linguistic evidence. Current forensic linguistic research increasingly addresses such issues as online authorship, cybercrime-related discourse, digital threats, online harassment, extremist communication, and the identification of anonymous users. Although digital communication provides researchers with substantial quantities of

potentially valuable linguistic data, it also introduces new analytical difficulties. These include pseudonymous identities, multimodal forms of communication, rapidly evolving online language practices, and questions concerning the authenticity and provenance of digital texts.

Analysis and results. The findings of the study indicate that forensic linguistics has evolved into a broad and interdisciplinary domain of linguistic inquiry rather than remaining limited to the examination of conventional legal language. The analysis of previous research demonstrates that linguistic methods can be applied at various stages of legal and investigative procedures. These applications include the examination of questioned statements, anonymous and disputed texts, speaker identification, courtroom interaction, and the interpretation of language used in digital environments.

A particularly prominent area identified in the literature is forensic authorship analysis. Researchers have demonstrated that a range of linguistic characteristics, including vocabulary selection, syntactic patterns, grammatical preferences, punctuation, and the distribution of function words, may contribute to the assessment of disputed authorship. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that individual linguistic characteristics rarely provide sufficient grounds for a definitive conclusion. More reliable results can be achieved by examining a combination of linguistic variables and comparing the questioned material with suitable reference texts or corpora.

The study also highlights the growing importance of forensic phonetics in the comparison and identification of speakers. Speech recordings can be examined through a variety of acoustic and phonetic parameters, including pronunciation, intonation, rhythm, and other measurable properties. Current research increasingly favors probabilistic models over absolute identification, as speakers naturally demonstrate variation across different communicative situations. Such an approach allows forensic experts to assess the strength of the evidence while taking account of both individual and contextual variation in speech.

Taken together, the findings suggest that contemporary forensic linguistics is becoming increasingly interdisciplinary, empirical, and technologically advanced. Modern research combines established linguistic approaches with corpus analysis, forensic phonetics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and computational techniques. The analysis further indicates that more dependable forensic conclusions can be reached when linguistic evidence is examined at several linguistic levels and interpreted in relation to the social, communicative, and legal context in which it occurs.

Therefore, the development of forensic linguistics demonstrates a broader transformation in linguistic research: language is increasingly treated not only as an object of theoretical study but also as a source of empirical evidence in real-world legal and investigative processes. The continued growth of digital communication, together with the increasing availability of computational tools, is likely to further expand both the methodological possibilities and the practical applications of forensic linguistic research.

Conclusion. The present study confirms that forensic linguistics has developed into a broad and interdisciplinary branch of linguistic scholarship with considerable relevance to legal and investigative practice. Over time, the scope of the discipline has extended beyond the analysis of legal terminology and disputed statements. It now incorporates diverse areas of inquiry, such as authorship identification, forensic speaker analysis, pragmatic and discourse studies, corpus-based investigation, and the examination of language used in digital settings.

The results indicate that linguistic analysis can make a meaningful contribution to criminal investigations and legal proceedings, particularly when linguistic evidence is evaluated systematically and in relation to the circumstances in which it was produced. The examination of vocabulary, grammar, syntax, phonetic characteristics, pragmatic meanings, and discourse structures may provide useful evidence in cases involving questioned speech or writing. However, such evidence should be treated with appropriate caution. No linguistic feature can generally be considered definitive on its own, since factors such as individual variation, the amount and quality of available data, contextual differences, and methodological constraints may influence the findings.

Technological progress has also become an important factor in the continued development of forensic linguistics. The application of computational techniques and corpus-based methodologies enables researchers to work with extensive collections of linguistic data and identify patterns with greater efficiency. At the same time, the rapid growth of digital communication has significantly broadened the range of materials available for forensic analysis. Social networking content, electronic messages, emails, and other forms of online interaction are increasingly being considered as potential sources of linguistic evidence.

Nevertheless, the field continues to face important theoretical and practical challenges. These include the need for greater methodological consistency, stronger statistical validation, effective approaches to multilingual evidence, and appropriate methods for analysing rapidly evolving forms of digital discourse. Addressing these challenges requires interdisciplinary collaboration involving linguists, legal practitioners, forensic experts, and specialists in computational analysis. Such cooperation can contribute to the development of more reliable and scientifically grounded approaches to the use of linguistic evidence in contemporary legal contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Baldwin, J. R., & French, P. (1990). Forensic phonetics. Pinter Publishers.
2. Cotterill, J. (Ed.). (2002). Language in the legal process. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230522770
3. Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (Eds.). (2010). The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855607
4. Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2017). An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence (2nd ed.). Routledge.
5. Coulthard, M., May, A., & Sousa-Silva, R. (Eds.). (2020). The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429030581
6. Gibbons, J. (2003). Forensic linguistics: An introduction to language in the justice system. Blackwell Publishing.
7. Gibbons, J., & Turell, M. T. (Eds.). (2008). Dimensions of forensic linguistics. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.5
8. McMenamin, G. R. (2002). Forensic linguistics: Advances in forensic stylistics. CRC Press.
9. Svartvik, J. (1968). The Evans statements: A case for forensic linguistics. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
10. Wright, D. (2025). Corpus approaches to discourse in forensic and legal contexts. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003017301