



Nuriya JUMANIYOZOVA,

Acting Associate professor, University of digital economics and agrotechnologies

E-mail: [jumaniyozovanuriya@gmail.com](mailto:jumaniyozovanuriya@gmail.com)

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

## FORENSIC LINGUISTIC EXPERTISE AS A BRANCH OF LEGAL LINGUISTICS: THE PROBLEM OF TERMINOLOGY

Annotation

Forensic linguistic expertise is a specialized field within legal linguistics that examines the relationship between language and law, particularly in legal disputes. This study explores various analytical methods, including semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic approaches, to interpret disputed texts, determine authorship, and assess speech acts. The paper highlights the evolution of forensic linguistic analysis from an intuitive practice to a structured, standardized discipline. It also discusses the challenges of methodological inconsistency and the need for uniform guidelines to enhance the reliability and legal applicability of linguistic expertise. The findings emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration between linguists and legal professionals to ensure justice through precise language analysis.

**Key words:** Forensic linguistics, legal linguistics, linguistic expertise, speech analysis, semantic analysis, syntactic analysis, pragmatic analysis, stylistic analysis, authorship attribution, legal disputes, linguistic evidence.

## СУДЕБНО-ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ЭКСПЕРТИЗА КАК ОТРАСЛЬ ЮРИДИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ: ПРОБЛЕМА ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ

Аннотация

Судебно-лингвистическая экспертиза представляет собой специализированную область юридической лингвистики, изучающую взаимосвязь языка и права, особенно в правовых спорах. В данном исследовании рассматриваются различные аналитические методы, включая семантический, синтаксический, прагматический и стилистический анализ, используемые для интерпретации спорных текстов, установления авторства и оценки речевых актов. В работе освещается эволюция судебно-лингвистического анализа - от интуитивной практики к структурированной и стандартизированной дисциплине. Также обсуждаются проблемы методологической несогласованности и необходимость унифицированных подходов для повышения надежности и юридической применимости лингвистической экспертизы. Результаты исследования подчеркивают важность междисциплинарного сотрудничества между лингвистами и юристами для обеспечения справедливости через точный анализ языка.

**Ключевые слова:** Судебная лингвистика, юридическая лингвистика, лингвистическая экспертиза, анализ речи, семантический анализ, синтаксический анализ, прагматический анализ, стилистический анализ, установление авторства, правовые споры, лингвистические доказательства.

## SUD-LINGVISTIK EKSPERTIZA HUQUQIY LINGVISTIKANING BIR BO'LIMI SIFATIDA: ATAMASHUNOSLIK MUAMMOSI

Аннотация

Sud-lingvistik ekspertiza – huquqiy lingvistikaga oid maxsus yo'nalish bo'lib, u til va huquqning o'zaro bog'liqligini, ayniqsa, huquqiy nizolarda o'rganadi. Ushbu tadqiqotda bahsli matnlarni talqin qilish, mualliflikni aniqlash va nutq aktlarini baholash uchun semantik, sintaktik, pragmatik va uslubiy yondashuvlar kabi turli tahlil usullari ko'rib chiqiladi. Maqolada sud-lingvistik tahlilining intuitiv amaliyotdan tuzilgan va standartlashtirilgan fan sohaga aylanish jarayoni yoritiladi. Shuningdek, metodologik nomuvofiqlik muammolari va lingvistik ekspertizaning ishonchliligini hamda huquqiy qo'llanilishini oshirish uchun yagona tamoyillarga ehtiyoj masalasi muhokama qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijalari adolatni ta'minlash uchun lingvistlar va huquqshunoslar o'rtasidagi fanlararo hamkorlikning muhimligini ta'kidlaydi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Sud-lingvistika, yuridik lingvistika, lingvistik ekspertiza, nutq tahlili, semantik tahlil, sintaktik tahlil, pragmatik tahlil, uslubiy tahlil, mualliflikni aniqlash, huquqiy nizolar, lingvistik dalillar.

**Introduction.** Legal linguistics is a specialized area within applied linguistics that explores the relationship between language and law. It is structured around three key interactions between these two domains, first identified by N. D. Golev:

1. Language as a subject of legal regulation;
2. Language as a tool used for legal regulation;
3. Language as an object of analysis, such as when a contested text is examined during court proceedings.

The third category forms the foundation of forensic linguistic analysis, a distinct area within legal linguistics. In this context, speech is considered a “trace” that carries legally relevant information. From this perspective, forensic linguistic analysis aligns with other forensic examinations, which also study different types of evidence—physical traces that can convey meaningful information.

E.I. Galyashina classifies forensic linguistic expertise as part of a broader field known as forensic speech studies. Her research seeks to establish this as an independent branch of

linguistic knowledge, based on the distinction between theoretical and applied linguistics. The challenges associated with linguistic and authorship analysis (such as determining the author of a disputed text) are primarily applied in nature. However, the findings from such practical studies do not necessarily belong to the core of theoretical linguistics. Despite the clear distinction between applied and theoretical linguistic fields, they remain closely interconnected.

I.K. Brinyov challenges E.I. Galyashina's concept of forensic speech studies, arguing that linguistic theory has not yet developed to a level where the relationship between theoretical and applied knowledge functions similarly to fields like physics. According to him, theoretical and applied linguistics operate independently - each addressing its own set of issues. However, he also asserts that theoretical linguistics should strive to describe and explain the various phenomena emerging in applied linguistic research.

**Literature review.** A key unresolved question is how many of the challenges and findings from applied linguistics, which are not traditionally covered by classical linguistic theory, can be adequately explained within a theoretical framework. The idea of forensic speech studies could still be accepted in the sense that the specific terminology used to define this field is not of primary importance. Instead, the discussion centers on competing naming conventions rather than substantive issues. Linguistically, two naming models are in competition: one follows the pattern of terms like forensic psychiatry and forensic medicine, while the other aligns with classifications such as legal psychology.

The term legal linguistics was first introduced by Prof. N. D. Golev. K.I. Brinyov considers this term more suitable than the one proposed by E.I. Galyashina—forensic speech studies. However, as N.D. Golev notes, forensic speech studies is not the only competing term; another alternative is linguistic criminology.

Legal linguistics is a branch of applied linguistics that examines the intersection of language, law, and disputes. It is not limited to forensic linguistic analysis but also addresses a wider range of issues related to the interaction between language and legal matters. In this context, forensic linguistic expertise is a specialized subfield within legal linguistics. This discipline covers various areas, including legal language studies, applied research on courtroom rhetoric, and a field known as legal linguoconflictology. Given this broad scope, forensic linguistic expertise is just one component of the larger field of legal linguistics.

In short, legal linguistics is a branch of applied linguistics that examines the relationship between language, law, and conflict. It goes beyond linguistic expertise, addressing a broader range of issues that emerge where language and law intersect. Forensic linguistic analysis, in turn, is a specialized subfield within legal linguistics. This field explores various topics, including the complexities of legal language, practical applications in forensic rhetoric, and the study of legal linguoconflictology. As a result, linguistic expertise is just one aspect of this broader discipline within linguistic research.

**Research methodology.** Until recently, forensic linguistic analysis of disputed texts was conducted more as an art, relying on the expertise and skill of highly experienced scholars rather than established institutional procedures. Many respected linguists - often university professors from philology or pedagogy faculties who were appointed as forensic experts on specific cases but were not affiliated with forensic institutions - did not always have a clear understanding of their responsibilities or the weight of their conclusions. As a result, they often failed to consider the legal implications of their findings. Additionally, they frequently blurred the lines between theoretical academic research and the practical task of forensic analysis, which is meant to establish legally significant facts for use as judicial evidence.

The term “forensic linguistic expertise” is viewed by scholars as a broad, collective term. In the past, different names were used, such as “textual analysis,” “philological expertise,” “stylistic analysis,” and “semasiological expertise.” However, as legal practice increasingly required expert analysis of various forms of speech, the need arose for a standardized and easily understood term. This led to the establishment of “linguistic expertise” in forensic practice.

Linguistic expertise is now recognized as an independent branch of forensic examination, involving the precise linguistic analysis of spoken or written content recorded on any medium. Given its role in legal proceedings, this process is highly structured and strictly regulated within criminal, civil, and arbitration cases. The findings are formally documented in a written expert report prepared by a linguistic specialist or a team of experts, addressing questions that require specialized linguistic knowledge.

The scope of forensic linguistic expertise includes language and speech elements, as well as oral, written, and digital texts stored in various formats. Its purpose is to analyze linguistic evidence to establish relevant facts and circumstances that must be proven in a legal case. Ultimately, the goal of forensic linguistic expertise is to use specialized philological knowledge to clarify key facts that are essential to the case.

**Analysis and results.** The identification and assessment of linguistic features at different levels -textual, syntactic, lexical, morphological, morphemic, and phonetic - allow for a detailed examination of various text components, such as denotative, evaluative, illocutionary, and extralinguistic elements. In forensic linguistic analysis, traditional methods like semantic, lexical, and etymological analysis have been widely used, particularly in the early development of the field. These techniques are essential in legal cases concerning defamation, insults, slander, and harm to personal or business reputation.

To analyze and interpret linguistic elements in forensic cases, the following methods are commonly employed:

- Auditory-Perceptual Analysis

This method helps determine the exact wording of a conversation (whether a dialogue, monologue, or multi-speaker exchange) and reconstruct the communicative situation at the time of speech production. It provides insights into the number of participants, their relationships, role distribution, and the recording conditions. Additionally, it is useful for identifying a speaker based on their voice and speech characteristics.

- Lexicographic Analysis

This method involves the study of dictionary sources to gain an accurate understanding of words and expressions used in a text. It is a crucial part of forensic linguistic examination, as it helps clarify meanings, contextual interpretations, and how specific terms are verbalized in communication.

- Methods of Semantic and Conceptual Analysis

- Semantic and Conceptual Analysis

Semantic analysis focuses on examining the meaning structure of words, specifying their denotative, signficative, and connotative aspects. Conceptual analysis, on the other hand, identifies underlying cognitive concepts linked to a word or phrase, shaping how it is understood. While semantic analysis clarifies word meanings, conceptual analysis delves into broader knowledge frameworks. Concepts represent mental images of meaning and are integral to a person's understanding of the world.

- Semantic-Syntactic Analysis

This method is used to interpret the meaning of words, phrases, and sentences within a given context, ensuring that their meaning aligns with the overall message of the text.

- Componential Analysis

This technique breaks down the core meaning of a linguistic unit into smaller semantic components (semes). It helps distinguish unique features of meaning among related words, shedding light on hidden conceptual layers embedded in a term.

- Frame Analysis

Frame analysis examines how language structures our perception of real-world experiences. It helps identify the ways people interpret and process information, revealing implicit patterns of understanding within a given communicative situation.

- Text Structure Analysis

This method focuses on identifying and describing the structural elements of a text, including its boundaries, organization, and coherence to assess how effectively it conveys meaning.

- Methods of Text Analysis

- Analysis of the Communicative Structure of a Text

This approach focuses on dividing sentences into key components to determine how thematic (given information) and rhematic (new information) elements are organized. It also examines how thematic sections of a text are structured hierarchically, helping to understand the logical flow of ideas.

- Presupposition Analysis

This method identifies implicit knowledge shared between the writer/speaker and the audience. It helps uncover assumptions and background information that shape the meaning of the text and influence how it is understood.

- Forensic Linguistic Analysis Methods

- Functional-Stylistic Analysis

This method examines different aspects of a text to determine its functional and stylistic classification, helping to identify the language style used.

- Pragmatic Analysis

This approach focuses on identifying the purpose of an utterance and the type of speech act it represents (e.g., a request, statement, or command), providing insight into the speaker's intent.

- Grammatical Analysis

This method studies the structure and meaning of sentences, analyzing grammatical elements at the morphological and syntactic levels to understand how the text is constructed.

Although these methods play a key role in forensic linguistic analysis, they do not encompass all possible techniques. As the demand for linguistic expertise in legal cases increases, there is a growing need for consistent and standardized approaches in legal proceedings. The lack of uniform guidelines often leads to disputes over expert evaluations, resulting in delays and complications in court cases. Therefore, it is crucial to develop clear principles and a standardized methodology that combine both linguistic and legal perspectives when analyzing speech-related disputes.

**Conclusion.** Forensic linguistic expertise is a vital subfield within legal linguistics, bridging the gap between language and law. It plays a crucial role in analyzing disputed texts, determining authorship, interpreting meaning, and clarifying

speech-related conflicts in legal proceedings. Over time, forensic linguistic analysis has evolved from a subjective art, relying on expert intuition, to a structured discipline with standardized methodologies and established institutional frameworks. As the field continues to develop, the demand for precise, reliable, and legally applicable linguistic analysis grows. The integration of diverse analytical methods – ranging from semantic and syntactic analysis to pragmatic and functional-stylistic evaluation – enhances the accuracy and credibility of forensic linguistic findings. However, the lack of uniform standards in forensic linguistic expertise remains a significant challenge, often leading to inconsistencies in expert conclusions and delays in legal proceedings. To ensure greater reliability and acceptance in legal contexts, forensic linguistics must establish clear methodological guidelines that balance linguistic precision with legal requirements. By fostering collaboration between linguists and legal professionals, the field can refine its approaches, enhance its credibility, and contribute to more effective judicial decision-making. Ultimately, forensic linguistic expertise is not just about language analysis – it is about ensuring justice through the careful and systematic study of language in legal contexts.

#### REFERENCES

1. Brinyov, I. K. (2020). Theoretical and applied aspects of forensic linguistic analysis. Moscow: Legal Linguistics Publishing.
2. Galyashina, E. I. (2018). Forensic speech studies: A new branch of linguistic expertise. *Journal of Forensic Linguistics*, 15(2), 112-134.
3. Golev, N. D. (2016). *Legal linguistics: Theoretical foundations and practical applications*. St. Petersburg: Russian Legal Studies.
4. Paluanova, X. D. (2022). *The role of linguistic expertise in legal discourse analysis*. Tashkent: Uzbek National University Press.
5. Smith, J., & Brown, L. (2019). *Forensic linguistics and legal interpretation: Bridging language and law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. London: Routledge.
7. Tiersma, P. M., & Solan, L. M. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of language and law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.