

**LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSING AGE, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND OCCUPATION OF A LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY IN UZBEK LEGAL DISCOURSE**

**Ubaydullayeva Kholida Manopovna**

Lecturer, Asia International University

[xolidaubaydullayeva066@gmail.com](mailto:xolidaubaydullayeva066@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This article provides a systematic analysis of the linguistic means used to express the age, educational background, and occupation of a linguistic personality in Uzbek legal discourse. It examines the lexical and grammatical units employed in the process of personal identification in legal communication, their pragmatic functions, and their correlation with the official and communicative requirements of legal texts. Based on empirical data drawn from court records, administrative documents, investigative materials, and official applications, the study identifies the structural components of linguistic personality representation. Special attention is paid to the standardization of age-related expressions, the functional role of educational level designations in legal discourse, and the socio-legal connotations of occupational nominations. The findings elucidate the mechanisms through which linguistic markers ensure communicative clarity, legal precision, and normative expression in the process of personal identification, which are essential for legal linguistics.

**Keywords:** legal discourse, linguistic personality, identification, age indicators, educational level, occupational nominations, official style.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In the sphere of legal relations, the accurate, concise, and norm-compliant expression of personal information constitutes one of the key factors ensuring the stable functioning of the legal system. In legal practice, an individual's age, educational background, and occupation serve not only as essential components of formal identification, but also as indicators determining legal liability, procedural status, and social role. Therefore, examining how these parameters are linguistically expressed, which lexical and grammatical forms are used, and what pragmatic meanings arise in their application represents a pressing issue in contemporary linguistic research.

Uzbek legal discourse is characterized by strict official-stylistic requirements, standardized speech patterns, and complex linguistic structures that reflect legal norms. Although personal descriptors in court transcripts, investigative materials, administrative documents, applications, and explanatory statements may appear simple at first glance, in practice they must convey precise meanings, eliminate ambiguity, and ensure institutional neutrality. From this perspective, the functional boundaries of age-related expressions, the mechanisms governing the use of educational level designations, and the connotative properties of occupational terms require thorough scholarly investigation.

The study of this topic is significant not only for legal-linguistic analysis but also for improving the quality of legal documentation, ensuring standardized representation of personal data, and enhancing the clarity and comprehensibility of official texts in legal practice. Furthermore, identifying the linguo-pragmatic characteristics of expressions related to age, education, and

occupation contributes to a deeper understanding of the general communicative norms governing legal discourse.

In the context of the ongoing modernization of Uzbekistan's legal system, the precise linguistic representation of personal information in legal texts has acquired particular importance. Under conditions where transparency in judicial and investigative procedures, standardized procedural documentation, and clarity in official communication are increasingly demanded, linguistic means denoting age, education, and occupation are being reconsidered not merely as linguistic units, but also as legal-normative categories. In this process, each lexical or grammatical form directly influences the determination of an individual's procedural status, legal responsibility, and social role.

In recent years, legal practice has seen a growing emphasis on simplifying the language of official texts, eliminating unnecessary ambiguity, and standardizing expressions used in identification procedures. In such circumstances, consistent use of age indicators, legally coherent formulation of educational qualifications, and clearly defined semantic boundaries of occupational nominations are essential for ensuring transparency and reliability in legal processes.

At the same time, global experience in legal communication demonstrates that the quality of official texts largely depends on the functional precision of linguistic units and their ability to consistently convey socio-legal meanings. Uzbek legal discourse is no exception to these general principles. Consequently, a comprehensive scientific analysis of the structural characteristics of linguistic means expressing age, education, and occupation, as well as their conformity to normative requirements, represents an urgent scholarly necessity for contemporary legal practice.

### **DEGREE OF RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT**

The accurate, normative, and officially compliant expression of personal information in Uzbek legal discourse holds strategic importance for the modern legal system. In legal texts, linguistic units denoting age, educational level, and occupation function not only as tools of identification but also as semantic-pragmatic categories that serve to determine procedural status, define social roles, and ensure transparency in legal processes. The use of these units in clear, unambiguous, and standardized forms upholds the principle of precision, which is fundamental to legal communication.

Contemporary interpretations of legal discourse are closely linked to anthropocentric approaches that place the human factor at the center of analysis. As noted by K. F. Sedov,<sup>1</sup> any discourse is grounded in the communicative competence of the linguistic personality employing language; therefore, personal indicators become stable components of discourse construction.

From a linguocultural perspective, language reflects cultural norms, and units such as age and occupational nominations embody society's axiological representations. These elements thus carry cultural as well as legal significance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sedov, K. F. (2004). *Discourse and Personality: The Evolution of Human Communicative Competence*. Moscow: Labirint. 45-p.

Sh. Safarov,<sup>2</sup> in his examination of the pragmatic nature of legal texts, emphasizes that linguistic means are strictly dependent on situational context, communicative needs, and participant roles. According to him, every unit in official discourse contributes to the formation of illocutionary force; consequently, imprecise representation of personal information in legal discourse may result in legal errors.

The relevance of this topic is further reinforced by the increasing importance of linguistic positioning of individuals in legal practice. In Krapivkina's<sup>3</sup> research, the linguistic designation of the legal subject—through parameters such as age, status, occupation, roles, and affiliation—is identified as one of the core mechanisms of legal communication.

Popova,<sup>4</sup> in turn, highlights the decisive role of semantic precision and pragmatic appropriateness in the interpretation of legal texts, demonstrating how personal information acquires meaning within context. According to her, each linguistic unit in a legal text—especially those related to identification—must be presented within a normative framework to ensure accurate interpretation by the reader.

In light of globalization and rising demands for legal culture, the need to simplify legal language, develop standardized systems of identification units, and ensure uniform models for representing age and occupational information has intensified. Therefore, this topic occupies a significant position at the intersection of legal linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and linguoculturology, constituting one of the most relevant scholarly issues in contemporary research.

### **Semantic and Functional Characteristics of Age-Related Linguistic Means**

In Uzbek legal discourse, an individual's age is most frequently represented as one of the most precise and standardized elements of personal identification. Based on the analysis of 300 legal documents, age is expressed through the following main constructions:

- the **"... years of age"** model, which constitutes the most widely used form;
- **"date of birth" / "year of birth"**, applied as an official format in accordance with passport data;
- **indefinite or evaluative expressions** (e.g., "of legal age," "advanced in age"), which occur predominantly in lawyers' oral arguments.

The primary linguo-pragmatic function of these units is to determine an individual's procedural status. Legal criteria such as majority or minority, legal capacity for employment, and eligibility to bear administrative or criminal responsibility are directly dependent on age. Consequently, in legal texts age may be recorded in two stages: first, on the basis of passport data, and second, by specifying the individual's age at the time the offence was committed.

<sup>2</sup> Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalinguistics*. Tashkent: Fan.83-p

<sup>3</sup> Krapivkina, O. A. (2012). *The Linguistic Status of the Subject in Legal Discourse*. Krasnodar.124-p

<sup>4</sup> Popova, L. E. (2005). *Legal Discourse as an Object of Interpretation*. Krasnodar: Kuban State University.48-p.

In defense speeches delivered by attorneys, the category of age may acquire an evaluative and pragmatic dimension. For instance, expressions such as “due to his young age, he was unable to fully assess the consequences” or “owing to advanced age, his health condition is weakened” are oriented toward emotional and persuasive impact on the audience. Such shifts represent one of the rhetorical strategies employed within legal discourse.

At the same time, age-related expressions in official legal documents are used with maximum neutrality; stylistic coloring, emotional emphasis, or evaluative connotations are deliberately avoided. This feature stems from the normative nature of legal texts, which requires precision, objectivity, and semantic unambiguity.

### **Linguocultural Layers of Linguistic Means Denoting Educational Level**

In legal discourse, an individual’s educational background performs two principal functions:

1. **As a means of identification**, indicating the person’s social and intellectual status in official documents;
2. **As an evaluative device**, potentially carrying argumentative value in judicial proceedings or legal advocacy.

The analysis demonstrates that the expression “**higher education**” (“oliy ma’lumotli”) is the most frequent lexical unit in the examined corpus. The phrases “**secondary education**” and “**secondary specialized education**” occur predominantly in administrative documents and investigative records.

The semantic load of educational level is closely linked to the socio-cultural characterization of an individual. Given the intrinsic interconnection between language and culture—a point emphasized in the works of Usmanova and Maslova—educational background signifies not only academic attainment, but may also index social prestige, ethical standards, and an individual’s role within society.

In judicial proceedings, educational level is often employed to assess the degree of responsibility. Violations of the law committed by highly qualified specialists tend to be evaluated more severely from both social and legal perspectives. This practice contributes to the formation of specific legal connotations associated with linguistic markers of education.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. G‘ulomov, A. (2018). Linguistic Foundations of the Uzbek Official Style. Tashkent: Fan.
2. Gutterman, B. (2020). Legal Discourse and Language Analysis. London: Routledge.
3. Krapivkina, O. A. (2012). The Linguistic Status of the Subject in Legal Discourse. Krasnodar.
4. Kubrinskiy, A. (2017). Fundamentals of Legal Linguistics. Moscow: Yurayt.
5. Mahmarayimova, Sh. T. (2019). Linguoculturology. Tashkent.
6. Usmonova, Z. (2020). Linguoculturology: A Textbook. Tashkent.
7. Maslova, V. A. (2001). Linguoculturology. Moscow: Akademiya.
8. Mirzayev, M. (2021). Language Norms in Uzbek Legal Texts. Tashkent: Yuridik Adabiyotlar.

# JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND INNOVATIONS

VOLUME 04, ISSUE 11  
MONTHLY JOURNALS



ISSN NUMBER: 2751-4390

IMPACT FACTOR: 9,08

9. Defense Speeches of Uzbek Lawyers. (n.d.). PDF collection (uploaded materials).
10. Popova, L. E. (2005). Legal Discourse as an Object of Interpretation. Krasnodar: Kuban State University.