

**TERRITORIAL AFFILIATION OF THE SUBJECT IN LEGAL DISCOURSE AND ITS
PRAGMATIC-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS (A Comparative Study Based on Age-Related
Oral Discourses)**

Kholida Ubaydullayeva Manopovna

Lecturer, Asia International University

xolidaubaydullayeva066@gmail.com

Annotation. This article examines the territorial affiliation of the subject in legal discourse from a pragmalinguistic perspective. The study aims to identify the role of territorial parameters in shaping the subject and ensuring the normative force of legal statements. Legal discourse is analyzed in comparison with spontaneous oral discourse, which makes it possible to trace the formation of the concepts of subject and territory at different age stages. The results demonstrate that territorial affiliation is a key pragmatic factor that defines the scope of the subject's authority and reinforces the binding nature of legal norms. The findings contribute to theoretical and applied research in the fields of legal linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and discourse analysis.

Keywords: legal discourse, subject, territorial affiliation, pragmalinguistics, discourse analysis, institutional subject, chronotope, spontaneous oral speech, age-related discourse, legal language

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research directions in linguistics focusing on discourse studies have expanded significantly. There has emerged a need to investigate language units not only within the framework of grammatical and semantic systems but also from the perspective of their functioning in real communicative situations. In particular, legal discourse—being a primary speech mechanism that ensures legal order in society—holds special significance for pragmatic-linguistic analysis. This is because speech in legal texts not only conveys information but also performs a socially and legally binding function.

As linguist Z. Pardayev notes: “Modern linguistic research recognizes that the central focus of observation is always the human being—the linguistic personality—and language constitutes one of its essential characteristics. Language, in turn, is closely connected with the notion of activity, and they cannot be separated from one another. In this sense, language is regarded as an activity underlying pragmalinguistics, one of the modern directions of linguistics.”

Within legal discourse, one of the central categories is that of the subject. The subject determines who performs the speech act, where it is performed, and on the basis of which authority. In particular, the territorial affiliation of the subject in legal texts constitutes an important pragmatic indicator that determines the scope of application of norms, the boundaries of authority, and the mechanism of responsibility.

This article provides an in-depth pragmatic-linguistic analysis of the territorial affiliation of the subject in legal discourse and compares the mechanisms of its formation with the development

of spontaneous oral discourses across different age stages. Such an approach allows for identifying the relationship between the concept of the subject and cognitive, social, and legal factors.

RESULTS AND METHODS

1. Pragmalinguistics and Discourse Theory

Pragmalinguistics studies language in its actual use, that is, within the framework of speech acts. In this direction, the intentions of speech participants, their social status, their interpersonal relations, as well as the expected effect of speech become the main objects of analysis. Unlike text, discourse represents the manifestation of language units in close connection with extralinguistic factors.

Considering discourse theory, linguist L. Raupova's following observation helps clarify the essence of the issue: "Discourse is the process of exchanging ideas between a speaker and a listener, responding appropriately to questions. Discourse, that is, the process of speech communication, is connected with dozens of ethnic (national), ethnographic, social, historical, ethical-aesthetic, philosophical-cultural, and purely linguistic factors. The communicative nature of language and its social character gain their full meaning precisely through discourse."

From a pragmatic-linguistic perspective, legal discourse is:

- highly normative,
- characterized by strictly defined roles,
- an institutional type of discourse that allows almost no interpretative ambiguity.

Therefore, in legal discourse, the clarity of the subject—especially its territorial affiliation—is an important condition for pragmatic success. As K. Sedov notes, "The linguistic personality, that is, the human being as an entity capable of producing and understanding speech, is becoming an integrative object of study in new and rapidly developing fields of linguistics (psycho-, socio-, cognitive-, pragma-, ethno-, ontolinguistics, and others)."

2. The Concept of the Subject in Legal Discourse

In legal discourse, the subject is a person or institutional structure that performs a legal action, evaluates it, or bears responsibility for it. The subject may appear in the following forms:

- individual subject (citizen, official);
- institutional subject (court, prosecutor's office, law enforcement bodies);
- abstract subject (state, law, authorized body).

All these subjects in legal discourse are expressed together with a territorial parameter. Territory restricts or expands the authority of the subject and determines the binding force of speech.

3. The Role of Territorial Affiliation in Legal Discourse

Territorial affiliation is a pragmatic marker indicating the subject's connection with a specific spatial unit (state, region, district, neighborhood). In legal discourse, territory performs the following functions:

1. Determining authority
2. For example, a “district court” and a “regional court” do not have identical functions.
3. Defining the scope of application of norms The phrase “within the territory of the Republic of Uzbekistan” indicates the national scope of the norm.
4. Determining the limits of responsibility Responsibility is defined within the territory where the subject's action took place.

From a pragmatic-linguistic perspective, territorial affiliation strengthens in the addressee's consciousness the strictness and binding nature of the norm.

4. Formation of the Concepts of Subject and Territory in Oral Discourses

To understand territorial precision in legal discourse, it is important to examine the cognitive development of the concept of the subject. This process is clearly manifested in spontaneous oral discourse across different age stages.

4.1. Ages 6–7: Situational Subject and Indeterminate Territory

At this stage, children's speech does not clearly distinguish between subject and territory.

Example:

“There was a person there. Then he left. Then we all ran.”

Here, “there” is a deictic unit that does not define territory in legal or social terms. The subject exists only within the situation.

This differs fundamentally from legal discourse.

4.2. Ages 10–11: Partial Differentiation of Territory

At this stage, the concept of territory appears but is not yet normative.

Example:

“This incident happened at school. A boy broke the rule. Then the teacher came.”

The unit “at school” indicates territory but is not linked to legal authority.

4.3. Ages 15–16: Institutional and Territorial Subject

At this age, speech approaches legal discourse.

Example:

“This incident occurred within the neighborhood territory. Later it was reviewed by the district internal affairs department.” Here, the subject (internal affairs department) and territory (neighborhood, district) are clearly defined and normative.

5. Chronotope and Pragmatic Precision in Legal Discourse

In legal discourse, the spatiotemporal framework (chronotope) is strictly defined. Unlike oral speech:

- time is expressed through exact dates;
- place through precise territorial units;
- subject through a clearly defined scope of authority.

Example:

“On March 15, 2024, within the territory of a certain district...”

Such constructions minimize interpretative possibilities from a pragmatic-linguistic perspective.

CONCLUSION

The conducted research shows that the territorial affiliation of the subject is a central pragmatic-linguistic category in legal discourse. It determines the legal status of the subject, defines the scope of application of norms, and forms a sense of obligation in the addressee’s consciousness.

A comparative analysis with oral discourses demonstrates that the concept of territorial affiliation develops gradually in the process of cognitive development. Only during adolescence does this concept reach the normative level characteristic of legal discourse.

These conclusions serve as a solid theoretical foundation for further research in legal linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and discourse analysis.

References.

1. Ковалева, Л. М. (2008). *Английская грамматика: предложение и слово*. Иркутск.
2. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025, March 15). *Modern digital technologies in education: Problems and prospects*. International Online Conference: Subject in Legal Discourse (pp. 6–9).
3. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025). *Linguistic means reflecting the subject in legal discourse*. International Journal of Academic Innovation, 535–540.
4. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025). *Factors of subject representation in the legal discourse of the Uzbek language*. Global Conferences, 128–131.
5. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025). *Legal discourse as a type of specialized discourse: Scientific and practical research of Uzbek scholars*. Scientific-Theoretical and Methodological Journal, 6(18), 103–108.

6. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025). *Legal discourse — A type of specialized discourse* (pp. 532–537).
7. Ubaydullayeva, K. M. (2025, June). *The study of legal discourse: International and Uzbek linguistic experience*. *Bulletin of Science*, 6.
8. Пардаев, З. (2013). *Прагматик лингвистика: Ўқув-услубий қўлланма*. Самарканд.
9. Раупова, Л. (2011). *Диалогик нутқнинг дискурсив талқини*. Тошкент: Ўзбекистон фанлар академияси «Fan».
10. Седов, К. Ф. (2004). *Дискурс и личность: эволюция коммуникативной компетенции*. Москва: Лабиринт.