G.B. Mukaldyeva[1*] , A.K. Taussogarova[1] , S.B. Bektemirova[1] , A.E. Mukhamedina[2]

[1] Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty
[2] Atyrau University named after H. Dosmukhamedov, Kazakhstan, Atyrau
*e-mail: gulyiya@mail.ru

FORENSIC LINGUISTIC EXPERTISE AS AN EXPERT COMPARISON OF LINGUISTIC STRUCTURES IN LEGAL TEXTS OF DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS

The objective of this study is to examine the linguistic features of legal texts from various jurisdictions in order to identify similarities and differences in their linguistic structures. The primary focus is on the role of forensic linguistic expertise in the process of analysing and interpreting such texts.

The research methodology involves a comprehensive analysis of linguistic data from court documents from various countries, taking into account grammatical, syntactic and lexical features. The methods employed include a qualitative comparison of linguistic constructions, an analysis of the frequency of use of terms, and the identification of specific terminological turns.

The results of the study will facilitate a more profound comprehension of the impact of linguistic features on the interpretation of legal texts, as well as the identification of potential issues associated with the translation and interpretation of court documents across diverse cultural and legal contexts. The data obtained will be beneficial for the advancement of methodologies pertaining to forensic linguistic expertise and for enhancing international legal collaboration.

This study was conducted as part of the scientific project funded by ZhTN AP19677520, which focuses on the forensic-linguistic parameters of linguistic offences in conflictogenic texts in Kazakh-language mass media.

Key words: linguistic analysis, linguistic signs of crimes, expert opinion, linguistic research methods, analysis of legal terminology, principles of independence and objectivity of linguistic expertise.

Г.Б. Мукалдиева[1*], А.К. Таусоғарова[1], С.Б. Бектемирова[1], А.Е. Мухамедина[2]

[1]Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.
[2]Х. Досмұхамедов атындағы Атырау университеті, Қазақстан, Атырау қ.
*e-mail: gulyiya@mail.ru

Сот-лингвистикалық сараптама әртүрлі юрисдикциялардың құқықтық мәтіндеріндегі тілдік құрылымдарды сараптамалық салыстыру ретінде

Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – олардың лингвистикалық құрылымдарындағы ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды анықтау мақсатында әртүрлі юрисдикциялардағы құқықтық мәтіндердің лингвистикалық ерекшеліктерін зерттеу. Мұндай мәтіндерді талдау және түсіндіру процесінде Сот-лингвистикалық сараптаманың рөліне назар аударылады.

Зерттеу әдістемесі грамматикалық, синтаксистік және лексикалық ерекшеліктерді ескере отырып, әртүрлі елдердің сот құжаттарынан алынған лингвистикалық деректерді жан-жақты талдауды қамтиды. Қолданылатын әдістерге тілдік құрылымдарды сапалы салыстыру, терминдерді қолдану жиілігін талдау және нақты терминологиялық айналымдарды анықтау жатады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері лингвистикалық ерекшеліктердің құқықтық мәтіндерді түсіндіруге әсерін тереңірек түсінуге, сондай-ақ әртүрлі мәдени және құқықтық контексттерде сот құжаттарын жазбаша және ауызша аударумен байланысты ықтимал мәселелерді анықтауға ықпал етеді. Алынған деректер Сот-лингвистикалық сараптамаға қатысты әдіснамаларды жетілдіру және халықаралық құқықтық ынтымақтастықты кеңейту үшін пайдалы болады.

Бұл зерттеу ЖТН АР19677520 «Қазақтілді масс-медиадағы конфликтогенді мәтіндер: тілдік құқықбұзушылықтың сот-лингвистикалық параметрлері» атты ғылыми жоба негізінде жарияланды.

Түйін сөздер: лингвистикалық талдау, қылмыстардың лингвистикалық белгілері, сарапшының қорытындысы, зерттеудің лингвистикалық әдістері, құқықтық терминологияны талдау,

Г.Б. Мукалдиева[1*], А.К. Таусоғарова[1], С.Б. Бектемирова[1], А.Е. Мухамедина[2]

[1]Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы
[2]Атырауский университет имени Х. Досмухамедова, Казахстан, г. Атырау
*e-mail: gulyiya@mail.ru

Судебная лингвистическая экспертиза как экспертное сравнение языковых структур в правовых текстах разных юрисдикций

Целью данного исследования является изучение лингвистических особенностей юридических текстов из различных юрисдикций с целью выявления сходств и различий в их лингвистических структурах. Основное внимание уделяется роли судебной лингвистической экспертизы в процессе анализа и интерпретации таких текстов.

Методология исследования предполагает всесторонний анализ лингвистических данных из судебных документов разных стран с учетом грамматических, синтаксических и лексических особенностей. Используемые методы включают качественное сравнение языковых конструкций, анализ частотности употребления терминов и выявление специфических терминологических оборотов.

Результаты исследования будут способствовать более глубокому пониманию влияния лингвистических особенностей на интерпретацию юридических текстов, а также выявлению потенциальных проблем, связанных с письменным и устным переводом судебных документов в различных культурных и правовых контекстах. Полученные данные будут полезны для совершенствования методологий, относящихся к судебно-лингвистической экспертизе, и для расширения международного юридического сотрудничества.

Данное исследование подготовлено в рамках реализации научного проекта грантового финансирования ЖТН АР19677520 «Конфликтогенные тексты в казахскоязычных СМИ: судебно-лингвистические параметры языковых правонарушений».

Ключевые слова: лингвистический анализ, лингвистические признаки преступлений, заключение эксперта, лингвистические методы исследования, анализ юридической терминологии, принципы независимости и объективности лингвистической экспертизы.

Introduction

Forensic linguistics stands at the intersection of language, law, and justice, wielding a unique power to unravel complex legal puzzles. This review delves into the multifaceted realm of forensic linguistic expertise, exploring its methodologies, applications, and impact on legal proceedings.

The methodologies of forensic linguistics encompass diverse linguistic analyses, including authorship attribution, stylistic analysis, discourse analysis, and forensic phonetics. These techniques are applied to a wide array of forensic contexts such as criminal investigations, plagiarism detection, trademark disputes, and asylum cases, demonstrating the versatility and significance of linguistic expertise in legal settings.

The impact of forensic linguistic analysis extends beyond traditional legal domains, influencing societal perceptions and shaping public discourse. Through case studies and theoretical frameworks, this review elucidates the role of linguistic experts in uncovering deception, identifying linguistic markers of identity, and providing critical insights into language-based evidence.

Moreover, the review explores the challenges and ethical considerations inherent in forensic linguistic practice, emphasizing the need for rigorous standards, interdisciplinary collaboration, and continuous adaptation to evolving linguistic trends and technologies.

In conclusion, forensic linguistic expertise emerges as a potent tool for truth-seeking, justice, and linguistic empowerment, poised to navigate the complexities of language in the pursuit of legal and societal integrity.

Materials and methods

Stylistic analysis. This involves analyzing the style of language used in a text or speech to identify unique patterns that can be linked to an individual author. This includes examining sentence structure, vocabulary choices, use of punctuation, and overall writing or speaking style.

Authorship identification. Forensic linguists use statistical and computational methods to determine the likely author of a text by comparing it to known writing samples. This involves looking for similarities and differences in linguistic features

such as vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure.

Dialect analysis. Linguistic experts skilled in dialectology analyze spoken or written language to identify regional or social dialects. This information is useful in determining the origin of a text or speaker.

Discourse Analysis. This method involves analyzing the structure and content of communication in written or spoken texts. It can help identify patterns of deceit, manipulation, or coercion in language use.

Pragmatic Analysis. Linguistic analysts examine how language is used in specific contexts to understand speakers' intended meanings and effects on listeners or readers. This is important in legal cases where contract interpretation or witness testimony is involved.

Comparative Linguistic Analysis. Comparing different versions of texts or speeches can help detect changes, inconsistencies, or modifications. This can aid in identifying plagiarism, tampering, or forgeries.

Result and discussion

As you can see, linguistic expertise in criminology does not stand out as a special branch. One of the most common types of expertise is research related to the protection of honor and dignity and business reputation. The basic concepts associated with these categories are divided into three groups:

1. The object of influence is honor, dignity, prestige, reputation.

2. Characteristics of the process and means of influence – information, humiliation (of honor and dignity), slander, insult, indecent form, cynical form, obscene expressions.

3. The result of exposure is moral harm, moral suffering.

Honor is the ability of a person to evaluate his actions, to act in a moral life in accordance with accepted moral norms, rules and requirements in society. Discrediting a person in public opinion is a humiliation of honor (Churilina, 2008).

Dignity is a positive reflection of the social assessment of human qualities in one's own mind.

Business reputation is a public assessment of the business qualities of an individual or legal entity in the eyes of contractors, customers, consumers and others.

Defamatory information is information containing allegations of violation by a citizen or a legal entity of the current legislation, committing a dishonest act, improper, unethical behavior in

personal, public or political life, dishonesty in carrying out industrial, economic and entrepreneurial activities, violation of business ethics or business practices that detract from the honor and dignity of a citizen or business reputation of a citizen or a legal entity (Aubakirova, 2009:18-19).

Defamation is the dissemination of deliberately false information that discredits the honor and dignity of another person or undermines his reputation.

An insult is a humiliation of the honor and dignity of another person, expressed in an indecent form.

Negative information is information that contains a negative semantic component. It can be understood as information that has negative characteristics of a person, either legally or physically, from the point of view of common sense and morality, or from a legal perspective (to the extent that it can be understood by a capable citizen who does not have specialized knowledge in the field of law). If negative information does not correspond to reality, it can humiliate the honor, diminish the dignity, and discredit the business reputation of the individual to whom it applies.

The information in the text can be presented in the form of a statement, an opinion, an assessment, or an assumption.

A statement is an expression of a thought or position. It is a way of asserting something. An utterance is a linguistic expression that expresses a complete thought in the form of a sentence (Baranov, Grunchenko, Levontina 2008).

Our research, like any research on the problems of decoding speech, has faced the need to understand the concepts of «meaning» and «significance», which are so ambiguously defined in modern linguistics.

Some linguists consider this contrast to be simplistic, as meanings are also subject to a wide range of variation. They can be described along the lines of collective and individual, customary and occasional, normative and abnormal, linguistic and non-linguistic, and contextual and non-contextual (Nikitin, 1983:152).

The question of the differentiation between meaning and meaning has been a topic of concern for many linguists. In his remarkable monograph, «Sentence and Its Relation to Language and Speech», the classic of Russian linguistics, V.A. Zvegintsev, deeply and comprehensively reflected on many linguistic concepts, including the concept of «meaning», and he gave this definition: «The matching of the meaningful content of a sentence with the situational needs of a communication act forms the meaning» (Zvegintsev, 1976:193).

When we talk about a separate linguistic unit, we can use the concepts of meaning and meaning differentiation to differentiate between the invariant and the individual. With regard to the text as a complex whole, the concept of «meaning» seems to be generally inapplicable in this context, as it refers to a single linguistic unit and is characterized by one-sidedness and integrity, with all its possible components. In relation to the text, we can only speak about meaning, not about the personal meaning of Belyanin specifically, but about meaning as a significant essence derived from the interaction of various meanings among native speakers.

Forensic linguistic expertise is the study of a text – the analysis of its structure and content. Any text, due to its complexity, provides endless possibilities for analysis. No analysis can be completely complete, as there are many different angles to consider when analyzing a text. These angles depend on the goals of the analysis, and they can be used to uncover hidden information or to understand the author's intentions.

Thus, the traditional linguistic (philological) analysis of a literary text reveals the author's concept and the means of its representation. The subject of consideration in this analysis is everything that serves to achieve this goal, while the question of the author's biological field and its reflection in the linguistic structure may be completely irrelevant in most cases. Even if this aspect does come to the analyst's attention, the approach will be fundamentally different from that used in certain types of targeted identification expertise.

It is one thing to illustrate an already known fact; it is another to establish that fact. Determining the sex of the author of a text has nothing to do with the type of expertise being investigated, but this example seems to us to be extremely indicative of the position that any linguistic analysis, like other types of analysis (chemical or physical), has a logic and structure determined by its target orientation.

The purpose of linguistic research in protecting honor, dignity, and business reputation is determined by the analysis of normative documents. This type of research differs from other linguistic studies in its specific purpose and structure. It is an answer to the question of whether it is necessary to develop a special structure for linguistic analysis. The assertion of the uniqueness of this type of scientific research and the denial of the applicability of analysis schemes used in other situations are also important aspects.

The practical outcome of our research is to identify the parameters of the text that linguists must necessarily take into account in order to draw an objective conclusion that can serve the purpose of objectifying legal proceedings in cases similar to those under study. Currently, there is complete methodological arbitrariness in the field of linguistic analysis, which is evident in the diametrically opposed conclusions of experts on the same materials.

Evaluative statements should not be considered from the standpoint of their reliability or correspondence to reality, as they are expressions of personal opinions and views. These statements are only unacceptable if they contain abusive words, offensive figurative language, or emotional coloring. In dictionaries, such lexical units are usually marked with labels such as «rude» or «abusive».

The main thematic categories of swear words include animal names, sewage terms, appeals to evil spirits, accusations of illegitimacy, intimate relationship terms, and genital terms. The use of these words in an indecent context is considered an encroachment on someone's honor and dignity.

Thus, according to the authors, when considering cases by the court for protection of honor and dignity, only statements that meet certain linguistic criteria are subject to evaluation. These criteria include: the grammatical form of the statement being a narrative sentence with a predicative connection between its main members; whether it is a descriptive statement; and whether it contains swear words or expressions, verbal constructions with offensive figurative meanings, or offensive emotional coloring.

Let's take a closer look at the content of each question and the methodological approach behind it.

The first question is to determine the referential relationship between the disseminated information and the plaintiff. In some cases, further examination is not necessary, as the text does not contain any indication that negative information was attributed to the plaintiff's identity. Alternatively, linguistic analysis can break down the arguments of the defendant and prove the connection between negative information and the plaintiff's identity, which often requires a thorough review of all journalistic materials, considering verbal and nonverbal elements as well as intertextual relationships and presupposed information.

The second question aims to identify the essence of the information received by the recipients. To solve this problem, the linguist analyzes the entire conflict discourse and identifies the genre of the text as well as the presuppositions and implications. This analysis helps the linguist to understand the meaning of the information that has been widely shared.

What is right and what is wrong is a complex topic that requires a separate discussion. At this point, without clear criteria, it would be advisable to refer to universal human values and the features of national mentality. This issue is somewhat mitigated by the fact that it is less likely to be the subject of debate than other issues.

The third question aims to solve the fundamental problem of differentiating between information that is objectively verifiable and information that is subjectively unverifiable. This distinction can only be made from a linguistic perspective.

That is, not all negative information about a person can be considered defamation, which many experts tend to ignore, carefully proving what damage a piece of material causes to a plaintiff's reputation, while remaining silent about their demonstrative subjectivity.

Differentiating between two opposing groups of information requires a scientifically grounded methodology. It should be acknowledged that information components from both categories can be integrated into a single statement (Gubaeva, Muratov, Panteleev 2002:112-113).

The question of the importance of understanding the author's intent in linguistic analysis is a controversial one.

As a general humanitarian term, «intention» denotes the orientation of consciousness and thinking towards a specific object or goal (Gritsenko, 2005:70-71).

1. Protection of Honor, Dignity, and Business Reputation (Article 143 of the Civil Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan). The author's intention is not significant. Its definition is optional. The Civil Code focuses primarily on protecting citizens' rights and compensating for damages caused by one party to another. It regulates relations between parties and does not include punitive measures. The essence of the issue of protecting honor, dignity, and business reputation is not about clarifying the defendant's motives. It is important to determine whether moral harm has occurred. From this perspective, the author's motivation and goal-setting are of interest to the defendant and court only as additional information. A linguist's primary task in analyzing a text is to identify typical meanings (or variants of meanings) according to objective laws of decoding as perceived by the recipients (https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=1006061&doc_id2=1006061#pos=181;-101.19999694824219&pos2=1951;-100.19999694824219).

2. Insult (Article 130 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan). As with defamation, the most important result is the presence or absence of insult. However, because insulting is a criminal offense, the intent of the offender plays a significant role. Unlike in the Civil Code, which aims to compensate the victim, the Criminal Code seeks to punish the perpetrator, and the motives for their actions determine the severity of their guilt. Unfortunately, methods for determining intent in these cases are not perfect (examples of which are provided below). It is essential to distinguish between the perspectives of the plaintiff and defendant, as well as the addressee and recipient. The absence of intent does not mean the text is free from invective, as invectivity is determined by objective linguistic rules that govern stylistic norms and, more broadly, speech communication. Violation of these norms can cause moral harm, even if it is hypothetical (https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=31575252&doc_id2=31575252#activate_doc=2&pos=141;-102.19999694824219&pos2=2244;-79.19999694824219).

However, it is important not to confuse two fundamental questions: the essence of the information being disseminated and the author's intentions. It is unnecessary to mix these two interacting but still independent categories. Defamation implies the mandatory observance of two conditions: a defamatory meaning that does not correspond to reality and an intention to discredit, which involves the deliberate and knowingly false dissemination of information.

The logic of our argument leads us to the conclusion that the definition of invectivity in a text based on intention is an unfair shift of focus from the real, factual, explicit realm to the psychological, implicit one. Through an analysis of the methods for determining an author's intent, we have identified a specific typology that is based on differences in how communicators' intentions are decoded (Dahl, 1989).

In order to systematically realize our goal of describing the possibilities and limitations of using linguistic theories in the practice of a certain type of linguistic expertise, we note on the one hand the need to turn to the theory of implicitness, the theory of presuppositions. On the other hand, we consider concepts such as «ungrammatical», «neither false nor true», and «meaningless» inapplicable to the field of study (Ivanenko, 2005:339). Perhaps such characteristics, which are applicable in logic and computational linguistics, seem somewhat artificial in real speech practice.

The question of the defamatory nature of information is intrinsically linked to the issue of addressing and attributing information to a specific person. One of the most controversial aspects in the course of legal proceedings is the process of identifying the source of negative information that has been attributed to the plaintiff.

Negative information, non-literary vocabulary, and invective can only become the subject of consideration in cases of protecting honor and dignity or insulting if they relate to a specific person and are directed at that person. Unaddressed information is not the subject of these articles.

What means can be used to establish the reference of defamatory information to a specific individual or legal entity?

Based on the type of communication and information perception, these tools can be divided into two categories: verbal and non-verbal. Non-verbal communication, in turn, can be further divided into visual and audio means. Visual means are often used to create references, while audio means are rarely used for this purpose. Non-verbal references are used to avoid legal liability and achieve the goal of discrediting someone. Therefore, a linguist must analyze not only verbal text but also video and audio images, as well as the presuppositions associated with them, in order to accurately understand the conflict and provide a scientific analysis of the mass recipient's perception of the material (Kondrashova 2006: 275).

With regard to negative value judgments, there is a question about the validity of the author's opinion. Analysis of conflict texts in the modern press has shown that negative assessments are often used, not based on facts, within the framework of journalistic material. These assessments express a negative attitude towards a person or their activities, and are clearly aimed at shaping a certain public opinion, especially during election campaigns.

J. Himself, as a result of his attempts to find linguistic (grammatical and lexical) criteria for distinguishing between performative and constative utterances, Osin concluded that «it is probably impossible to create a list of all possible criteria. Furthermore, even if such a list were created, it would probably still not be possible to distinguish between performatives and constructives, since very often the same utterance can be used in both ways in different contexts» (Kotov 2004: 156).

Thus, truth and falsity as epistemological categories cannot be determined, qualified, or differentiated by linguistic methods. Instead, truth and falsity as linguistic categories only deal with ways of representing reality.

The search for an interdisciplinary approach to the categories of factuality and evaluativeness leads to an appeal to the theory of modality and its further development. This new angle of view is determined by the demand of society for a solution to a designated legal issue. An invariant part of the various definitions of modality is its definition as a category that relates a statement to reality through the perspective of a pragmatic individual.

In accordance with Article 129 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, insult is defined as a derogatory comment or behavior that damages a person's honor and dignity.

Let's take a look at the current ideas regarding the category of insults and their content.

From any perspective – psychological, pragmatic, legal or linguistic – we are dealing with situations that involve insults or non-insults in immeasurable amounts, which, of course, places a special responsibility on both the linguist expert and the judge, as it requires a deep understanding of the issue.

The psycholinguistic aspect of the insult. First of all, we will define the general group of phenomena that the insult belongs to, and we will include it in the system of established ones. Insult is one form of manifestation of a broader phenomenon – linguistic aggression. From a linguistic perspective, linguistic aggression, along with linguistic violence (and linguistic manipulation, demagogy, etc.), are considered forms of speech behavior that negatively impact people's communication, as they always aim to minimize or even destroy the addressee's linguistic identity, subjugate them, and manipulate them in favor of the speaker.

We agree with the statement of the problem. The issue is not so much about the term itself, but rather the difficulty in assigning a specific meaning to it. Categories of humanitarian knowledge, such as «insult» and «linguistic aggression», should be translated into legal language using not only general descriptions, but also specific categories that can be verified by equally specific methods.

In light of the issue of legalizing communicative and cultural concepts such as linguistic aggression and linguistic violence, it is important to consider the scope and limits of legal responsibility for expressions of linguistic non-neutrality or expressiveness. It is possible to exclude negative connotations from speech, just as it is possible to eliminate them from people's minds and communication practices.

Various legal categories, such as criticism, vilification, irony, insult, satire, and defamation, have been discussed in theoretical works by linguists. However, in a judicial context, these concepts can lead to ambiguous assessments, as evidenced by the diverse views of linguists on the topic. This ambiguity is further complicated by the fact that these concepts often overlap and can be difficult to distinguish. As a result, it is essential to carefully consider the implications of legalizing these concepts in order to ensure that they are used in a way that does not violate the rights of individuals.

As we are guided by the goal of providing the legal system with some linguistic guidance, we begin by examining the existing legal norms and concepts. However, we do not avoid the temptation to comment on the imperfections of the system and offer suggestions for improvement. Keeping this in mind, we will attempt to correlate the category of «insult» as an official and legally defined term with other related concepts and determine their areas of overlap.

Correlating related concepts, we must admit that the idea of linguistic aggression is more extensive than the idea of insult. Linguistic aggression can also take the form of a threat, which is an intentional psychological attack on a person that causes them to feel fear in order to achieve a specific goal.

When insulting, one person addresses another with negative words or actions aimed at destabilizing their psychological state. According to psychological research, insults can be seen as blows to the human psyche, causing emotional wounds and even potentially leading to murder.

The essence of this impact for the victim lies in two main aspects: firstly, the perception of a highly negative characteristic or attitude from the person doing the insulting; and secondly, the inability to continue communicating (to defend oneself, engage in debate) and resolve the conflict caused by the offender, beyond normal, acceptable forms and methods of expression.

For the insulted person, it is like being in front of an insulter with a peasant's pitchfork facing a warrior with a gun. In cases of public insults, there is also an additional factor of psychological discomfort – the awareness of public humiliation.

The legal aspect

Linguistic violence can be defined as a form of mental and emotional harm that is inflicted on an individual through verbal means. This type of violence can have a significant impact on a person's self-esteem and sense of worth. It can also lead to feelings of anxiety, depression, and even suicidal thoughts. In understanding insults as a form of verbal aggression, it is already possible to consider such phenomena from the perspective of legal linguistics. Because with such forms of speech and communication, the rights of the recipient's individuality are always violated and even usurped by the speaker. The legal significance is expressed by the concept of «violence», which in legal terms refers to the physical or psychological impact of one person on another.

By Article 129 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the legislator protects a person from linguistic aggression manifested through speech negativity that can cause harm to the recipient of aggression (mental suffering that may affect their health). In legal terms, the very act of speech aggression, as well as other intangible forms, is referred to as «moral harm», and the emotional discomfort experienced by the victim due to the insult is termed «moral damage». The legislature acknowledges that it is impossible to prove that there are only physical consequences, and that moral suffering itself is also possible. In some cases, the victim may document the occurrence or worsening of an illness as a result of the insult, but it is important to recognize the hypothetical possibility of causing harm to a person through these linguistic means.

The legal system needs to distinguish between different forms of verbal aggression, some of which are criminally punishable, and others that are simply conflicting. We believe that forms of linguistic aggression, such as answering a question with a question, labeling, and substitution of concepts, should be considered separately. However, can the very act of using these manipulative techniques, which are common in everyday speech and journalistic activities, be the basis for legal responsibility, and, in the case of insults, criminal liability?

At the beginning of the analysis, the author solves a crucial problem – determining the informational nature of the statement. Using different terminology, the researcher essentially follows the path we propose in our work for implementation.

Recognizing the lack of information in the text that could be considered relevant and could be verified, while also recognizing the inflammatory nature of the text, the linguist shifts the focus away from proving compliance with reality and into considering the stylistic form of the material, which in our opinion is entirely fair in this context. This stance reflects our declared position on the concept of «insult» as primarily a formal and stylistic phenomenon.

The concept of an «indecent» form of expression used in legal documents, which forms the basis for the concept of «insult», needs careful consideration and clarification from a linguistic perspective. What criteria should philologists use when determining whether a form of communication is decent or indecent?

The commentary to the Criminal Code of Kazakhstan explains that «indecent forms of discrediting a victim» means giving a negative assessment of their personality in a clearly cynical manner, which is in sharp contrast to the acceptable manner of communication between people in society. This includes using obscene language and making comparisons to odious historical or literary characters (Lebedeva, 2000).

«Cynicism» and «contrary to the accepted manner of communication in society» are not linguistic concepts and do not contribute to the implementation of classification. In this case, it would be unfair to attribute the lack of specificity in a legal norm solely to its imperfection or imperfect wording. We should not forget that we are dealing with high-level abstractions in these cases, and the need to define them in the legal context causes natural difficulties that cannot be solved by a simple, unambiguous directive.

Conclusion

In the realm of forensic linguistic expertise, the final part encapsulates the profound impact and ongoing evolution of this discipline. As technology advances and communication mediums diversify, linguistic experts are at the forefront of innovation, harnessing computational tools, artificial intelligence, and linguistic theory to augment their analytical capabilities.

The future of forensic linguistics promises interdisciplinary collaboration, bridging gaps between linguistics, law, psychology, and technology. This convergence enables a deeper understanding of linguistic behavior, cognitive processes, and socio-cultural influences, enhancing the accuracy and reliability of linguistic analyses in legal proceedings.

Furthermore, the ethical dimension of forensic linguistic expertise remains paramount, emphasizing the principles of impartiality, transparency, and ethical practice. As linguistic experts navigate the complexities of language variation, dialectal diversity, and sociolinguistic nuances, they uphold standards of integrity and fairness, ensuring that their contributions uphold justice and uphold the rights of all individuals involved.

In conclusion, forensic linguistic expertise continues to evolve as a dynamic and indispensable asset in the pursuit of truth, justice, and linguistic clarity. By embracing innovation, upholding ethical standards, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, linguistic experts pave the way for a future where language serves as a beacon of truth and understanding in the legal landscape.

References

Aktual'nye problemy sovremennoj lingvistiki: ucheb. posobie / sost. L.N. Churilina. M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2008.

Aubakirova A.A. O prirode dejatel'nostnyh jekspertnyh oshibok // Sudebnaja jekspertiza. 2009 № 1 (17). S. 18–21.

Baranov A.N., Grunchenko O.M., Levontina I.B. Lingvisticheskoe issledovanie tekstov dlja vyjavlenija v nih prizyvov k osushhestvleniju jekstremistskoj dejatel'nosti: metod. rekomendacii po interpretacii smysla prizyvov (tipovaja metodika) / pod red. prof. L.P. Krysina. M., 2008.

Nikitin M.V. Leksicheskoe znachenie slova (struktura i kombinatorika)./ M.V. Nikitin. – M.,1983. S. 152.

Zvegincev V.A. Predlozhenie i ego otnoshenie k jazyku i rechi. – M: Izd – vo Moskovskogo universiteta,1976. – 307s.

Gubaeva T. Jekspertiza po delam o zashhite chesti, dostoinstva i delovoj reputacii // T. Gubaeva, M.Muratov, B.Panteleev // Rossijskaja justicija. – 2002. – №4. C. 112-113.

Gricenko E.S. Gendernye aspekty pozicionirovanija chitatelja v predvybornom diskurse / E.S. Gricenko //Filologicheskie nauki. – 2005. – №4. – S.70 – 76.

The Civil Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (general part) (with amendments and additions as of 05.01.2024) was put into effect by Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated December 27, 1994 No. 269-XII

The Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (special part) (with amendments and additions as of 05.01.2024)

Dal' V.I. Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo jazyka: v 4 t./ V.I. Dal'. – M.: Russkij jazyk, 1989.

Ivanenko G.S. Cel' lingvisticheskoj jekspertizy v processah po zashhite chesti i

dostoinstva / G.S. Ivanenko // Problemy filologii v sinhronii i diahronii. Sb. statej k jubileju professora L.A. Glinkinoj/ Otv. red. S.G. Shulezhkova. – Cheljabinsk: Izd – vo OOO «Poligraf – Master», 2005. – S.338 – 346.

Kondrashova D.S. Teorija segmentnoj reprezentacii diskursa dlja reshenija zadach sudebnoj lingvisticheskoj jekspertizy pri izvlechenii iz teksta implicitnoj informacii / D.S. Kondrashova // Komp'juternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye tehnologii: Trudy