

PAPER

## TYPES OF FORENSIC TEXTS CONTAINING “DEFAMATION” CONTENT

Najmiddinova Nilufar Yuldoshovna<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior expert of the Republican Forensic Expertise Center named after H. Sulaimanova.

\* najmiddinova@gmail.com

### Abstract

This article explores the linguistic analysis of forensic texts involving defamation of individuals. Particular attention is paid to categorizing evaluative, ironic, insulting, and dishonoring expressions from the perspective of forensic linguistics. The texts are studied from semantic and pragmatic perspectives, with various expression forms and their interpretation in expert analysis illustrated through real examples. The article also investigates the accuracy, contextual relevance, and socio-political dependence of forensic texts.

**Key words:** forensic linguistics, defamation, evaluative expressions, linguistic expertise, personal insult, irony, semantics.

### Introduction

Forensic examination represents a specialized procedural activity that applies scientific and technological advancements within criminal, civil, economic, and administrative proceedings. Its primary function is to clarify case-relevant facts crucial for delivering a fair and lawful resolution. On the basis of a request from an investigator, inquirer, or the court, a specialist with relevant expertise (i.e., a forensic expert) analyzes material evidence and circumstances pertinent to the case.

The findings of this examination are formally presented in the form of an expert opinion. This document outlines the grounds for initiating the examination, the conditions under which it was conducted, the objects of analysis, the specific questions addressed, and the expert's conclusions. This opinion serves as a legitimate source of evidence; the established facts contained within may be admitted as probative in court proceedings.

The scope of forensic examination includes a broad array of evidentiary objects, such as physical evidence and samples obtained for testing, human remains, body parts, the living human body, crime scene reconstructions, and documentation of various types.

Based on the nature of the issue, the object of analysis, and methodological criteria, forensic examination is typically classified into several domains: criminalistics, transport engineering, medical and psychiatric, agricultural, ecological, biological, economic, and technical-engineering expertise, among others. Each of these types follows its own distinct

methodology tailored to the discipline involved.

Forensic examinations are also categorized according to several procedural and structural factors:

- by the number of experts involved: single-expert or panel (commission-based) examinations;
- by the extent of investigation: primary or supplementary (additional) examinations;
- by sequence: initial and repeated examinations;
- by disciplinary scope: single-subject or interdisciplinary (complex) examinations;
- by the number of objects under review: limited-object or multiple-object examinations.

The appointment, implementation, and legal evaluation of forensic examinations are regulated under specific procedural laws relevant to the jurisdiction and type of case.

In Uzbekistan, forensic examinations are primarily conducted by state-run institutions designated for this purpose. These include the Republican Center for Forensic Expertise named after K. Suleymanova and its regional departments, as well as the Central Bureau of Forensic Medical Examination under the Ministry of Health and its subdivisions. Additional forensic services are also provided within specialized units of various other ministries and agencies, such as the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Defense.

The quality and reliability of forensic conclusions are ensured through the use of modern specialized equipment, the employment of highly qualified personnel, and the application

of standardized expert methodologies. These factors collectively contribute to the scientific rigor and evidential credibility of forensic examinations conducted within the country.

## Materials and Methods

Forensic linguistics has become an increasingly important field that analyzes language usage in legal contexts. In particular, linguistic expertise concerning texts that attack an individual's dignity, reputation, and professional credibility has become a pressing issue. Defamatory content often appears in mass media, social networks, and other forms of communicative activity. Accurately identifying, analyzing, and interpreting such texts requires a deep understanding of both linguistic and legal criteria.

The following methods were employed in the study:

descriptive linguistic analysis – to classify expressive elements within texts;

pragmatic analysis – to determine the social-contextual impact of the message;

discourse-based approach – to analyze the degrees of irony, insult, directness, and evaluation in expression;

comparative method – to compare various types of defamatory texts.

## Research and Discussion

In the Uzbek language, defamatory expressions appear in many forms and are often carefully disguised within evaluative grammatical structures. This places significant demands on the linguistic expert's understanding of not only vocabulary but also pragmatics.

In most cases, the actual meaning of irony or metaphor emerges only within the context, making it essential to analyze the text not just at the word level but at the discourse level.

Key elements in forensic analysis of such texts include:

- The speaker's intent;
- The listener's or reader's perception;
- The explicit and connotative meanings within the text.

In the domain of forensic linguistics and legal discourse analysis, defamatory statements can be categorized into several distinct types based on their linguistic explicitness, pragmatic intent, and contextual dependence. One salient category comprises explicitly defamatory statements, which are characterized by overtly accusatory or derogatory language aimed directly at damaging a person's reputation. These utterances typically contain pejorative adjectives and nouns such as "fraud," "liar," or "criminal," and are structured as assertive declarations that leave minimal room for alternative interpretations. Their directness often makes them the easiest form to identify and classify as defamatory, although the broader communicative context, such as humor or satire, may influence their interpretation and legal significance.

A more nuanced category includes implicit or ironic statements, which communicate defamatory content through sarcasm, irony, or innuendo. These utterances are pragmatically encoded, requiring the hearer to infer the derogatory intent based on shared knowledge, tone, or contextual clues. Such statements frequently employ ironic phrasing, quotation marks to signal disbelief or mockery, or double meanings that obscure their literal interpretation. Their indirectness presents a challenge for forensic experts, who must often conduct detailed discourse analysis to uncover the intended meaning, particularly when intonational or prosodic cues are unavailable in written texts.

Another significant type involves evaluative and disparaging remarks, which may appear to be expressions of personal opinion but function in practice to undermine the target's

social credibility, intellectual competence, or professional integrity. These statements rely on evaluative adjectives such as "incompetent" or "worthless" and often utilize rhetorical strategies that elevate the speaker's credibility while implicitly casting doubt on the target. Though formally presented as opinion, these utterances may be interpreted as asserting hidden factual claims, raising complex questions about the boundary between protected speech and defamation in judicial review.

A further category, known as contextual defamation, encompasses statements that are seemingly neutral when considered in isolation but acquire defamatory implications through narrative framing, temporal sequencing, or intertextual reference. For instance, a statement such as "We all know how he handled the company finances last year" may appear innocuous but conveys a strong defamatory implication when linked to prior discourse suggesting misconduct. The interpretation of such utterances often depends on the reconstruction of broader discursive or multimedia contexts, which may involve tracking the evolution of reputational framing across multiple texts or platforms.

Finally, there exist fact-like but unverified claims, which present speculative or false information in the linguistic form of factual assertions. These utterances may relate to allegations of moral or legal transgressions and are distinguished by the absence of hedging language or evidentiary attribution. Although not supported by verifiable data, their assertive syntactic structure and lack of disclaimers can mislead the audience into perceiving them as truth. The expert's task in such cases involves evaluating the epistemic modality of the statement—whether it is likely to be interpreted by the average reader or listener as a factual claim rather than rumor or opinion.

Together, these categories highlight the complexity of identifying and classifying defamatory content, particularly when intention, context, and interpretation diverge. Expert linguistic analysis plays a critical role in unpacking these nuances, informing both legal deliberations and broader discussions about language, harm, and responsibility in public discourse.

## Conclusion

Defamatory texts are often characterized by their implicit nature, making use of evaluative language, ironic undertones, and meanings that are shaped through contextual interpretation. Such texts may not always contain overtly offensive or accusatory terms; rather, they frequently rely on connotative expressions, intertextual references, or rhetorical devices that subtly undermine the reputation or dignity of an individual. Therefore, forensic linguistic analysis must extend beyond surface-level lexical evaluation and incorporate pragmatic methodologies that account for discourse-level implications, speaker intent, and situational context.

Given the increasing complexity and diversity of modern communication—particularly across digital platforms—linguistic experts are expected to possess a nuanced understanding of how meaning is constructed within texts, not only through words themselves but through their interaction with broader sociocultural frameworks. Accordingly, expert assessments should prioritize contextual reconstruction, irony detection, and the pragmatic functions of language in order to determine whether a given utterance constitutes defamation.

Looking forward, the development of automated systems for detecting defamatory language represents a critical area of innovation in forensic linguistics. Integrating artificial intelligence and natural language processing technologies could enhance the speed, objectivity, and scalability of textual analysis, particularly in environments where manual review is impractical. However, such systems must be designed to interpret not only

linguistic forms but also the subtle pragmatic cues embedded within discourse—a task that remains a major interdisciplinary challenge.

## References

1. Komissarov, V. N. (2000). *Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Moscow: ETS.
2. Solganik, G. Y. (2002). *Stylistics of the Modern Russian Language*. Moscow: Akademiya.
3. Shiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
4. Tursunov, S. (2021). "Analysis of Defamatory Expressions in Forensic Linguistics," *Uzbek Linguistics*, 3(2), 43–56.
5. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.
6. Rajapova, M. (2023). BADIY USLUB VA ALLEGORIYANING O'ZIGA HOS XUSUSIYATLARI TADQIQI. Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования, 2(9), 121–124.
7. Sotvoldiyev, I., & Rajapova, M. (2023). Easy methods of reading and reading strategies. In *International Conference On Higher Education Teaching* (Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 133–139).
8. Rajapova, M., & Mamadaliyeva, M. (2023). INTERPRETATION OF ALLEGORICAL MEANS IN DISCOURSE. In *International Conference On Higher Education Teaching* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 15–19).
9. Rajapova, M. (2021). Principles of cognitive metaphor and allegory in discourse. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.
10. Rajapova, M. (2020). BADIY MATNDA QO'LLANILUVCHI ALLEGORIK VOSITALARNING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Scienceweb academic papers collection*.