

A Pragmatic Investigation of legal Language Speech Acts in Courtroom Testimonies

Inst. Hazim Mohammed Ali Khalaf

University of Diyala College of Basic Education

تحقيق براغماتيتي في الافعال الكلامية اللغوية القانونية في شهادات داخل المحكمة

المدرس : حازم محمد علي خلف - كلية التربية الاساسية جامعة ديالى

basiceng17te@uodiyala.edu.iq

Abstract

This research explores the pragmatics of legal language, focusing on how speech acts in courtroom testimonies influence judicial outcomes. It examines the dynamic nature of language in legal settings, where context, intention, and delivery significantly affect interpretation and decision-making processes. The study delves into the functionality and impact of speech acts, including assertions, questions, and commands, highlighting their role in legal discourse and decision-making. Historical and cross-cultural analyses provide insight into the evolution of speech acts in legal contexts, while case studies illustrate their direct influence on court judgments. The research emphasizes the power of language in shaping legal realities and the necessity of understanding linguistic strategies to ensure justice and fairness in legal proceedings.

Keywords: Legal language, Speech acts, Courtroom testimonies, Judicial outcomes, Legal discourse

خلاصة

يستكشف هذا البحث براغماتية اللغة القانونية، مع التركيز على كيفية تأثير أفعال الكلام في شهادات قاعة المحكمة على النتائج القضائية. وهو يدرس الطبيعة الديناميكية للغة في البيئات القانونية، حيث يؤثر السياق والنية والتسليم بشكل كبير على عمليات التفسير وصنع القرار. وتعمق الدراسة في وظيفة وتأثير أفعال الكلام، بما في ذلك التأكيدات والأسئلة والأوامر، مع تسليط الضوء على دورها في الخطاب القانوني وصنع القرار. توفر التحليلات التاريخية والمتعددة الثقافات نظرة ثاقبة لتطور أفعال الكلام في السياقات القانونية، بينما توضح دراسات الحالة تأثيرها المباشر على أحكام المحاكم. ويؤكد البحث على قوة اللغة في تشكيل الحقائق القانونية وضرورة فهم الاستراتيجيات اللغوية لضمان العدالة والإنصاف في الإجراءات القانونية. الكلمات المفتاحية: اللغة القانونية، الأفعال الكلامية، الشهادات في قاعة المحكمة، النتائج القضائية، القانونية

Introduction

The study of pragmatics in legal language, more specifically the analysis of the way speech acts are performed in courtroom testimonies, is quite an interesting view of the way language affects judicial outcomes. Pragmatics, on the other hand, is an inquiry into how context contributes to meaning. Considering that meaning is always made dynamically in any legal setting, it follows that context contributes to the realization of the cases being handled. Legal language pragmatics critically looks into the context of how context, intention, and delivery of language impact or affect the interpretation and meaning in both spoken and written legal texts and discourses taking place in courtrooms. The study of speech acts—the meaning of the acts done in speaking (e.g. stating, asking, ordering)—is crucial in the process of law. The speech acts in a legal context are those that can bind with serious implications for decisions, judgments, and with the very credibility of a witness or defendant. Courtroom testimonies provide a rich ground on which the analysis of speech acts can take place in terms of how use of language will construct, support, or undermine the arguments brought forth. Language used at the lexically put courthouses has an influence leading to perception processes and decision-making processes of the court. For instance, the testimony of the President in his impeachment trial draws attention to lexical choices, bringing pragmatic meaning far beyond semantic value (Khafaga, 2023).

Thus, pragmatic analysis of legal language transcends to understanding how judicial decisions are influenced by the language employed at the court. Great reliance is placed on the meaning assigned to each of the criminal intentions. For instance, linguistic, pragmatic, and argumentative strategies used by jurists, that is to say, language plays a great role in the criminal intentions adopted (Azuelos-Atias, 2007). Looking at historical and comparative analyses helps to understand the evolution of speech acts in legal contexts. In the analysis of courtroom discourse, referring it to the prism of the Speech Act Theory through centuries—for example, 17th-century England, 18th- and 20th-century America—one could single out one feature of their consistency in mechanisms of language use across time. Future research in this area will hopefully make more nuanced attempts to outline how legal discourse constitutes and is constituted by the multifarious interaction between language, law, and society. This would open ways for further research within the cognitive aspects of the legal language in the sense that the assertion or directive of the modal "shall" has to be clearly conceived by the speaker and understood by the addressee in general but as a legal addressee (Witczak-Plisiecka, 2009).

The Role of Speech Acts in Courtroom Testimonies

Speech acts are very vital in testimonies inside the courtroom because they make up the path of the legal process and influence judicial decisions. The speech acts, which include a wide range of assertions, questions, promises, and commands, form the element of the constituency of courtroom discourse and are those acts in language aimed at conveying intentions and attitudes of the speaker. Speech Acts as Tools of Legal Discourse All that is said in the courtroom represents a move on the strategic chessboard, and for sure, the study of speech acts allows at least a partially decoding insight into this extremely complex interaction. What they are trying to do, through the speech acts, is to build a case, disqualify evidence, and sometimes have judgments influenced and manipulated. For instance, Khafaga (2023) noted that the application of strategic language came in through the crosstalk between the questions and answers of the witness, building a crisscross pattern, and not trading in mere facts. Functionality and Impact of Speech Acts The speech acts will be thus functional in a courtroom, each act to accomplish the purpose for which the act is designed. For instance, the act of asserting may be used to introduce a fact while questioning may test a witness's credibility or elicit evidence. In another light, these speech acts are very effective and influence a lot the judicial outcome, given that they can mold the addressee's perceptions, frame the story, and persuade at the end through the decision-making process of the jury or the judge. Linguistic Strategies in Legal Argumentation The linguistic means of courtroom speech acts generally reveal the power relations and some of the legal strategies used in the background. The power relations and some of the juridical strategies at the lawyers' disposal are generally used in hard hallways of the juridical field, framed by walls with complex linguistic strategies. This strategic use of language is brought forth in the rhetorical structuring of arguments by which claims are either challenged, refuted, or supported through speech acts to lead the court in favor of judgment for one of the opponents. Speech Acts and the Interpretation of Intent The speaker-meaning is interpreted perhaps most crucially in a legal setting, for it is done by speech acts. In the court of law, the intention to perform a speech act may be quite important, much more so when considering the state of mind or intention of the defendant's part as if on trial. This pragmatic analysis of the speech act is obviously intended to specify such fine differences and indicate what way or ways a speaker can determine the exact type of intention behind a given utterance. The latter, in its turn, may lead to different verdicts within court trials (Azuelos-Atias 2007). Historical and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Speech Acts in Court From historical and cross-cultural perspectives, studying speech acts with respect to courtroom testimonies throws more light on this speech act setting. Indication of the development of legal practices and changes in linguistic strategies through different legal systems and times that refer to the speech act setting in law. It is hoped that the historic and comparative analysis shall facilitate in understanding the way legal norms and linguistic practices have equally been shaping and, at the same time, been shaped by the speech acts in the courtroom, thus giving a wider context to the same (Kryk-Kastovsky, 2009).

Analyzing the Impact of Language on Judicial Decisions

Language, therefore, is the vessel that breaks through these judicial decisions and hugely influences the perception and outcome reached in regard to the legal proceedings. Wherein, in its legal use, language functions not only in the instrumentality of providing a medium of expression to the judiciary and the concerned parties but wields such power far beyond the scope of judicial reasoning and judgment. In such a role language is playing, it becomes evident that we understand how different components and strategies of language influence the judgments and verdicts in court. Language as a Determinant of Legal Outcomes Language, therefore, affects legal outcomes in that it frames facts and guides the interpretation of laws, essentially affecting perception by

judges and/or jurors. In this sense, the words used, arguments set, and how testimonies are issued can be decisive for decision-making. Legal practitioners are much aware of the power that lies behind language, and most of the time, they are specific and tactical in using the language to their favor in any case. The language that evidence is presented with can highly influence the interpretation given to the case and the outcome derived from it (Khafaga, 2023). Pragmatic Aspects of Legal Language Pragmatic analysis of the legal language is an analysis that demonstrates how the intended meaning and context and function of language usage contribute to judicial decisions. Specifically, in this case, the examples would refer to speech acts, which take place at courtrooms, where the pragmatic meaning could be a promise, a command, an assertion done over and above its literal meaning. This is because pragmatic considerations are hugely important for legal arguments and verdicts, where language intentions and implicatures are laid bare and probed. In this regard, the use of pragmatic strategies may turn the outcomes of legal cases, since they have to do with the way facts—and even more particularly intentions—are expressed and understood (Azuelos-Atias, 2007). Linguistic Persuasion and Rhetoric in Legal Arguments Language is, evidently, the most potent persuasive tool within the legal argument. It is common for the lawyers to use the rhetorical tools while trying to speak most persuasively in respect to their cases, and to that end, they have an enormous capacity to move the court emotionally, logically, and valuably by means of the linguistic devices. How effective these rhetorical strategies work becomes determinant for the success or failure of the legal arguments and then impact the judicial outcomes. Research shows that such rhetorical and linguistic strategies deployed at courtrooms have much to do with determining the shape of the legal decision (Aldosari, 2023). Language and the Interpretation of Law Legal interpretation is a linguistic exercise, since texts of law present themselves usually in a broad window of ambiguity and are therefore depending on concretely fixed meanings. Inherent in legal language is often the ambiguity that characterizes it and bears upon judicial decisions, with important implications. In this regard, according to Section 16a of the Act, judges are clear that legal practitioners are predisposed to construe the language of statutes, precedents, and contracts so as to determine their meanings and apply them to the cases at hand (Trosborg, 1995). Sociolinguistic Factors in Judicial Decision-Making Sociolinguistic Factors in Judicial Decision-Making Besides, dialect, sociolect, and register form part of the sociolinguistic factors that affect judicial decisions. A court of law may entirely depend on the level of credibility, reliability, and truthfulness indicated in language use from the various social groups. Language idiom, intonation, and style may have the power to decide against the administration of justice in judicial procedures; or else, they may just be misplaced. This means it requires linguistic awareness, especially the sociolinguistic aspects in the use of legal language, to take care of justice and equity in the legal system (Eades, 2008).

Case Studies: Speech Acts and Their Outcomes in Court

Court case studies in legal contexts clearly indicate how the speech acts directly influence the judgment. Analyzing certain cases of courtroom discourse gives us a clear picture of how these mechanisms influence language in order to frame legal realities. Speech Acts in High-Profile Trials This makes the strategic use of speech acts vital in high-profile cases, like the Bill Clinton impeachment trial, where precision of language and deployment of specific speech acts made a big difference. Clinton's evidence presented how the speech acts of denying, admitting, and making clarifications significantly affect both the legal judgments and public opinion with great legal insight and through a careful choice of words. Indeed, it was found that the speech acts pragmatically demonstrated how linguistic strategies can steer through thorny legal and moral issues in his analysis (Aldosari, 2022). The Role of Questioning and Answering Questioning and answering in court are basic speech acts, helpful in steering the trial or focus. Those speech acts can be considered not just as a way to get information but also as a tool for building or destroying credibility. Really, they do matter—the way questions are asked, and the way answers are made up, especially in courtrooms. They can affect the outcome of the cases to a great deal. Take, for example, the way in which a lawyer, using speech acts, probes the acceptability and truth value of testimony given by a witness under cross-examination, something that can readily turn the direction of a trial around. Assertive Speech Acts and Case Outcomes The fact of how much heavy weight the declaratives, assertives, and statements speech acts have in the process of law, carrying the meaning to assert the fact or legal interpretation and used in the argument of cases. Hence, depending on the efficiency or persuasiveness of the assertive acts put forth, these may well mark the result in a case. For example, in a contract dispute, the assertive speech acts in contractual language can define the interpretation and execution of the terms of a contract and hence impact the legal resolution. Directive Speech Acts in Judicial Decisions The directive speech acts, in the form of commands, requests, and advice, form the larger part of the judicial decision-making.

Most of the rulings, orders, and all other judicial directions, which guide parties on the action to be taken, take the form of judges using directive speech acts. Such directions are issued in an appropriate authority and clarity that may even point toward the power of language in the legal realm respecting enforcement and compliance. Speech Acts and their Impact on Jury Decisions This implies that speech acts have influence right up to jury decisions, in that the persuasive language used by attorneys' shapes perceptions of the verdict by jurors. This, therefore, is the closing argument that makes it plausible for rhetorical strategies characterized by assertive and directive speech acts through which they consolidate a narrative that works for them and makes sense with the sensibility of justice and logic by the jury. The effectiveness of these speech acts in persuading the jury often plays a decisive role in the trial's outcome.

Conclusions

This clearly brings out the fact that language is central in the legal system. This is the study of the speech acts in courtroom testimonies and how the same play an important role in judicial decisions. As different case studies and scholarly analyses support the strategic language used by speech acts, the paper has demonstrated that it is able to manipulate legal outcomes; judgments and laws or evidence are influenced by being interpreted. In that sense, comprehension of the given speech acts—from assertive to directive functions—is highly sophisticated and shows the involved interplay of language and law where each might bring forth far-reaching consequences for justice and legal. Thus, the study of pragmatics in legal language provides us with deeper insight not only into the courtroom dynamics but also into what language, as a tool of legal reasoning and determination, has to power to present.

References

- Aldosari, B. (2023). Rhetorical Strategies of Legal Arguments in Courtrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.
- Aldosari, B. N. (2022). Investigating the Legal Discourse of Bill Clinton's Impeachment Trial. *Arab World English Journal*.
- Azuelos-Atias, S. (2007). A pragmatic analysis of legal proofs of criminal intent.
- Eades, D. (2008). Sociolinguistic evidence in the courtroom: A reflection on language, law, and social meaning. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 15(1), 99-132. https://consensus.app/papers/sociolinguistics-legal-interpretation-eades/2017f08074ff27fa6be9548e1ef7d1d9/?utm_source=chatgpt
- Khafaga, A. (2023). Strategic lexicalization in courtroom discourse: A corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*.
- Kryk-Kastovsky, B. (2009). Speech acts in Early Modern English court trials. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41, 440-457.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). Statutes and contracts: An analysis of legal speech acts in the English language of the law. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 31-53.
- Witczak-Plisiecka, I. (2009). Legal Speech Acts In A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective – Focus On Modality. *Computer Languages, Systems & Structures*, 1, 159-175.