

UDC 81'42, 81'44

Федуленкова Татьяна Николаевна
Владимирский государственный университет
г. Владимир, Российская Федерация
fedulenkova@list.ru

**REVIEW OF THE MONOGRAPH OF L. A. NEFEDOVA,
E. SH. NIKIFOROVA, N. S. OLIZ'KO «COURTROOM DISCOURSE
COGNITIVE TYPE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY»**

Abstract

The book reviewed presents the results of comparative linguistic study of Russian, Kazakh and American cognitive models of courtroom discourse. The discourse common relevant features are institutionality, conventionality and theatricism. During the analysis of courtroom session transcripts, the unity of locution, illocution and perlocution was found to characterize the discourse type independent of the language. The first one is meant to inform about the defendant, the second one is performed by a courtroom subject (prosecutor, lawyer, defendant, witness) with a certain intention and results in the third one. Also, intertextuality was observed to be expressed in various inner-text and inter-text relations. Speech behavior of the subjects was found to follow common strategies depending on the roles performed. It was shown that accusation strategy is characterized by a number of tactics that include creating the negative image of the defendant, giving facts that prove the defendant's guilt, discrediting the evidence in favor of the defendant, defendant's words and the lawyer's reasons, demonstrating the most shocking details of the crime, providing abundant quotations. Symmetrical speech behavior of the defense strategy used a number of opposite tactics to confront the prosecutor's position. Besides, in all the three languages, emotional appeal was found and interpreted as a separate strategy. Language-specific differences were observed in terms of tactics manifestation. American participants tactics were mostly geared toward direct confrontation, more factual presentation with bigger detail and demonstration the evidence. Russian participants tactics combined confrontation with compromise, was less detailed and more generalizing, rarely demonstrative and mostly descriptive. Kazakh participants tended to be most compromising. These are obviously the results of differences among the three nations following their social-cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

Keywords: courtroom language strategies and tactics, common relative features, language-dependent differences, more or less detailed linguistic presentation of facts, language means of confrontation and compromise, social-cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

doi: 10.22250/2410 7190_2019_5_2_197_205