



THE CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF STYLISTIC DEVICES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK JURIDICAL RHETORIC

Khujaniyazova Hilola Turaevna

Senior Teacher, Researcher,

Uzbekistan State University of World Languages,

hilola.x.t@gmail.com

Abstract

Juridical rhetoric reflects not only juridical principles but also the cultural norms and communicative traditions of a society. This article explores how stylistic devices function within English and Uzbek juridical rhetorics, concentrating on their cultural embeddedness. It examines how metaphor, euphemism, rhetorical questions, and other linguistic tools are culturally conditioned and differently perceived in courtroom rhetoric. Introduction Juridical rhetoric is not merely about conveying facts; it is a cultural performance shaped by historical traditions, values, and communicative expectations. In both English and Uzbek juridical rhetoric, lawyers use stylistic devices to persuade, appeal to values, and build credibility.

Keywords: Juridical rhetoric, stylistic devices, juridical discourse, courtroom language, cultural dimensions;

Introduction

Judicial rhetoric is adversarial in English-speaking juridical systems, particularly common law traditions. Lawyers use the courtroom as a platform to make persuasive and emotive arguments. To dramatise the case and evoke strong feelings in the jury, stylistic methods such as metaphor, antithesis, and hyperbole are frequently employed (Tiersma, 1999; Leech & Short, 2007). On the other hand, collectivist principles and a predilection for formality, modesty, and social harmony influence Uzbek juridical rhetoric. The courtroom serves as a forum for



ethical discussion and reconciliation rather than as a battleground. Here, social cohesion is maintained by the use of stylistic techniques like proverbs, indirect metaphors, and polite euphemisms (Crystal & Davy, 1969).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphors work as a cognitive link between the audience's comprehension and abstract juridical notions. Metaphors like "the long arm of the law" and "justice is blind" are used in English juridical rhetoric to emphasise the authority and fairness of judicial systems. Both institutional and individualistic principles are reflected in these analogies. Uzbek rhetoric emphasises moral obligation and the welfare of the community by using analogies from rural or family life, such as "sud adolat urug'ini sochadi" (the court sows the seeds of justice). This is indicative of a culture in which ethics, law, and group identity are intertwined. In English juridical language, euphemisms frequently seek to soften unpleasant realities; for example, using "correctional facility" rather than "prison" softens the tone (Charrow et al., 2001). These euphemisms serve to maintain professionalism and avoid emotional escalation in adversarial settings.

In Uzbek courts, euphemisms are not just professional; they are cultural imperatives. For example, "yomon yo'lga kirgan" (someone who has gone down a wrong path) may replace the direct term jinoyatchi (criminal), signaling an opportunity for moral redemption rather than strict condemnation.

Rhetorical questions are a tactic used in English juridical language to engage juries and challenge the opposition. Enquiries such as "Is this the justice we stand for?" are meant to elicit scepticism and bring the audience into line with the speaker's position (Haigh, 2018). It's possible that Uzbek attorneys employ rhetorical enquiries more tactfully, like "Sudimiz adolatga qarshi chiqadimi?" (Will justice ever be upheld by our court?). Rather than dividing the audience, this serves to uphold common moral principles. Instead of provoking conflict, the rhetorical inquiry becomes an invitation to unification. The usage of maqollar (proverbs), which convey cultural validity and ancestors' wisdom, is one of the distinctive characteristics of Uzbek juridical rhetoric. For example, "Adolat bor joyda baraka bor" (Where there is justice, there is blessing) gives arguments moral weight by securing the argument in the collective memory and national identity.



On the other hand, because English rhetoric places more weight on judicial precedent than on folk sayings, proverbs are rarely used in courtrooms. Phrases like “Let justice be done though the heavens fall” are employed as strong emotive phrases, though.

Cultural norms influence different politeness techniques. Juridical decorum governs the professional etiquette that English lawyers uphold: “Your Honour” “May it please the court”. These forms support hierarchy and foster ethos. Politeness is more complex and intricately ritualised in Uzbek speech. Using honorifics, lawyers frequently refer to the judge as *hurmatli sud*, demonstrating their respect for both the role and the elder person it represents in culture. This increases the speaker's credibility by reinforcing a feeling of moral obligation and communal respect. Controlled emotional appeals can be used in English juridical rhetoric, especially when speaking to a jury. Hyperboles or emotionally charged phrases like “a heinous and barbaric act” are accepted as legitimate persuasion (Tiersma, 1999).

In Uzbek courts, however, overt emotionalism is culturally discouraged. Lawyers must demonstrate self-control, and emotional appeal is often conveyed through tone, metaphor, or references to family and community rather than exaggeration. In judicial rhetoric, stylistic techniques are socially and culturally created and do not operate in a vacuum. Uzbek juridical language supports indirectness, collectivism, and ethical deliberation, whereas English juridical rhetoric favours directness, confrontation, and dramatic appeal. Though in culturally different ways that are consistent with larger ideals and communication traditions, both systems make use of stylistic tropes including metaphor, euphemism, and rhetorical questions. In cross-cultural juridical circumstances, where misreading rhetorical cues can result in misunderstanding or even injustice, it is crucial to comprehend these distinctions.

In conclusion, without acquiring the ability to speak effectively, it is difficult to achieve success in any sphere — be it military, diplomatic, or commercial. Rhetoric is primarily the science concerned with various forms of language that influence an audience and with the methods of persuasion. The function of rhetoric, both in antiquity and today, is to educate, to delight, and to inspire. Persuasion can take both oral and written forms, and it requires evidence and



arguments aimed at transforming or shaping underlying moral and cognitive frameworks. As noted by philosophers of the ancient world, the art of oratory is a method of comprehending and interpreting complex phenomena; it is meant to disseminate enlightenment among people. It engages with facts, events, and figures, organizing them into a coherent system. Rhetoric draws upon the discoveries and advancements of numerous disciplines. It is grounded in psychology, philosophy, logic, ethics, aesthetics, and other fields. Rhetoric is a discipline that fosters reasoning, logical thinking, and the ability to draw general conclusions. Many orators were also prominent scholars and political figures of their time. The types of oratory constitute a distinct field, characterized by the presence of a specific linguistic object and a unique set of methods for analysis and evaluation.

References

1. Cardozo, B. N. (1921). *The Nature of the Judicial Process*. Yale University Press.
2. Charrow, V. R., Crandall, J. A., & Charrow, R. P. (2001). *Clear and Effective Juridical Writing* (3rd ed.). Aspen Publishers.
3. Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). *Investigating English Style*. Longman.
4. Gibbons, J. (2003). *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Blackwell Publishing.
5. Haigh, R. (2018). *Juridical English* (5th ed.). Routledge.
6. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
7. Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.
8. Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Juridical Language*. University of Chicago Press.
9. Wales, K. (2014). *A Dictionary of Stylistics* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
10. Dalieva M. Methods, Challenges, and Ethical Considerations in Data Collection of Corpus Compilation //Innovative Technologica: Methodical Research Journal. – 2024. – T. 3. – №. 3.



11. Dalieva M. DIACHRONIC CORPORA AND LANGUAGE EVOLUTION OVER TIME //Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 10. – C. 58-60.
12. DALIEVA M. Types of cognitive models of polysemy of linguistic terms //cognition. – 2024. – T. 2181. – C. 3663.
13. Dalieva M. K. et al. Communicative approach in teaching speaking //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 43-44.
14. DALIEVA M. LISONIY TERMINLARNING SHAKLLANISHIDA KOGNITIV JARAYONLARNING AHAMIYATI //News of the NUUZ. – 2024. – T. 1. – №. 1.4. – C. 309-312.
15. Dalieva M. K. et al. The function of english songs to improve listening skill //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 30-32.
16. Dalieva M. INTEROPERATION OF LANGUAGE, SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY, AND INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION //Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 1. – C. 1-4.
17. Dalieva M. K. et al. The theories of teaching vocabulary in context //NovaInfo. Ru. – 2021. – №. 124. – C. 45-46.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.