

## SPEECH ETIQUETTE AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS IN JURIDICAL RHETORIC

**Beyliyeva Alfiya Bakhodir kizi**

Master's student, Uzbekistan state world languages university

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7833550>

**Abstract:** In this article, speech etiquette and its some characteristics are studied and analyzed according to scientific research. As it is known rhetoric has been the central sphere for human beings from history till now. The role of speech etiquette is important in juridical rhetoric because there discussed and carried out the struggle of the person. Such kinds of peculiarities are looked through in this work.

**Keywords:** rhetoric, speech, etiquette, jurisprudence;

## РЕЧЕВОЙ ЭТИКЕТ И ЕГО ОСОБЕННОСТИ В ЮРИДИЧЕСКОЙ РИТОРИКЕ

**Аннотация:** В данной статье речевой этикет и его характеристики изучены и проанализированы по данным научных исследований. Как известно, риторика была центральной сферой для человека от истории до наших дней. Роль речевого этикета важна в юридической риторике, поскольку там обсуждается и осуществляется борьба личности. Такого рода особенности просматриваются в данной работе.

**Ключевые слова:** риторика, речь, этикет, юриспруденция;

## INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric, it is still argued, is only effective when used to deceive an audience and mask one's true intentions. This is because direct communication of the truth does not require the use of rhetorical devices. This, however, is not Aristotle's perspective: When speaking to a public audience, even those who are only attempting to demonstrate what is reasonable and true require rhetorical support. Even if the speaker possessed the greatest in-depth understanding of the subject, Aristotle claims that it would be impossible to teach such an audience. Evidently, he believes that the average listeners of public speeches are unable to follow an accurate justification based on the fundamentals in science. In addition, a group like this is susceptible to distractions from other issues and might occasionally be swayed by flattery or attempts to further one's own interests. And if a nation has poor rhetorical practices, laws, and a constitution, the issue just becomes worse. The majority of subjects that are often covered in public speeches do not allow for precise information but rather leave space for ambiguity; it is crucial in these situations that the speaker comes across as a credible individual and that the listener is in a sympathetic frame of mind. Due to all of these factors, persuasion rather than information is required to influence juries and assemblies.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

While it's true that some individuals are persuasive by accident or habit, rhetoric provides us a way to identify every tactic of persuasion on every subject. Communication experts use persuasion "as a symbolic process in which they attempt to persuade others to alter their attitudes or actions with relation to an issue by communicating a message in a setting of free choice." According to him, the essential components of this notion of persuasion are: Words, pictures, sounds, and other symbolic elements are used in persuasion. It entails a conscious effort to sway people. Self-persuasion is seen as another essential component. People are not compelled when being persuaded; instead, they have a choice.

Although though the art and science of persuasion have been studied since the time of the Ancient Greeks, there are substantial modern variations between the two. Perloff [4] identifies five key differences between traditional and contemporary persuasion:

1. Convincing communication spreads far more quickly. Internet, radio, and television all hasten the dissemination of persuading ideas.

2. Influence is a lucrative industry. Several additional businesses rely on persuasion to sell goods and services, in addition to those that exist only to use persuasion (such as advertising agency, marketing companies, and public relations organizations).

3. Modern persuasive techniques are significantly more sophisticated. Several advertisements in the article utilize overtly persuasive techniques, while many other messages are far more subtly worded. For instance, companies may occasionally meticulously create a very particular picture intended to persuade viewers to purchase goods or services in order to achieve the projected lifestyle.

4. Influence is more complicated. Marketers must be more astute when choosing their persuasive medium and message since consumers are increasingly diversified and have more options. Efforts to Persuade There are three ways to influence someone. According to Aristotle, a speaker's success in persuading an audience rests on his capacity to establish a personal connection with them. To appeal to the audience, he needs to proceed methodically. The speaker should remember these three crucial points when they talk. The tripartite division - known by subsequent rhetoricians as the Rhetorical Triangle[3] - consists of logos, ethos, and pathos. Logos mostly uses the wording of the argument or appeals to reason.

It deals extensively with the writer's style and the method he presents his point of view, in addition to the argument's linguistic components and content. Thesis should be explicit and unambiguous, and it should be backed up by compelling arguments and reliable data [2]. A further attractiveness of Logos is the order's well-thought-out and logical organization. Another topic that appeals to the writer's personality is ethos[5]. It may be viewed as the part the author plays in formulating and constructing an argument. Using various strategies, such as voice fusion and dynamic spectacles, the speaker must highlight his virtues in order to appear believable.

In addition to ideas and ideals, pathos appeals to the emotions and the sympathetic imagination. The role of the audience in the argument is another way to conceptualize pathos. The audience should be emotionally invested in what they are hearing from the speaker[6]. The persuasive speaker must use a variety of strategies and visuals to engage the audience's emotions and imagination. The audience will likely be captivated by the speech if the speaker offers the immediate answer to the issues that the majority of the audience are seeking. It is the writer's responsibility to appeal to the listeners' ideals and beliefs.

## RESULTS

The three types of public discourse are divided into three categories in the second section[5]. The deliberative species is described as the speech that occurs in the assembly. In this type of rhetoric, the speaker either urges the listener to do a certain action or issues a warning against taking a certain action. Hence, the audience must assess future occurrences and determine whether they will benefit or hurt the polis, and whether they are good or bad for the polis. The judicial species is described as speech delivered in front of a court. The speaker either blames someone or stands up for herself or another person. This type of discourse naturally discusses historical events.

It is up to the audience - or jury - decide if a former occurrence was fair or unfair, that is, whether it was legal or not. The third species of speech[3], called epideictic speech, praises or criticizes someone, trying to characterize their actions as either honorable or dishonorable. Unlike the deliberative and judicial species, which have their context in a contentious situation in which the listener must decide in favor of one of two opposing parties, the epideictic speech does not aim at such a decision. The three species are covered in the first book of Rhetoric, and each chapter is seen as adding to the argumentative method of persuasion or, more accurately, to the element of argumentative persuasion that is distinctive[4].

The chapters cover the second stage of argumentative persuasion, which is present in all three types of rhetorical speaking. The second method of persuasion, which appeals to the audience's emotions, is outlined. The speaker's personality will determine the third method of persuasion. Although if dialectic lacks a clear subject, it is nonetheless clear that it relies on a methodology since it must understand why some arguments hold up while others do not. If rhetoric is just the public speaking equivalent of dialectic, then it must be based on an examination of what is convincing and what is not, which in turn makes rhetoric an art.

Also, dealing with arguments based on presumptions that are widely accepted is crucial to both professions. So, the majority of the dialectical tools may be adapted by a rhetorician who seeks to convince through arguments or (rhetorical) evidence. Yet, convincing someone in front of a large group of people involves more than just arguments and evidence; it also involves credibility and attitudes. Because of this, the two fields also exhibit notable distinctions.

### DISCUSSION

The term "technical" suggests the following two qualities[6]:

1. Technological persuasion must be based on a technique, which means we need to understand why certain things are persuasive and others are not. Also, a thorough examination of what it means to be persuasive must underpin systematic persuasion.

2. Preexisting facts, such as oaths, witnesses, testimonies, etc., are non-technical as they cannot be supplied by the speaker, whereas technical means of persuasion must be given by the speaker himself. Three elements make up a speech: the speaker, the topic being discussed, and the audience to whom the speech is directed.

This would explain why there are only three technical methods of persuasion: Technological means of persuasion can be found in the speaker's persona, the listener's emotional state, or the argument itself. When a speech is delivered in a way that makes the speaker credible, persuasion is effected through character[4]. If the speaker comes off as credible, the audience will make the second-order determination that the speaker's claims are correct or defensible. This is particularly crucial when there is a lack of precise knowledge but allow for uncertainty. As a result, the speaker must evoke emotions because they have the power to alter The judgments. For example, to a judge who is in a good mood, the subject of his judgment appears to be doing nothing wrong or wronging only slightly; however, to a judge who is angry, the subject of his judgment appears to be doing the exact opposite.

How is it possible for the orator to bring the audience to a certain emotion? Aristotle's technique essentially rests on the knowledge of the definition of every significant emotion. Let, for example, anger be defined as “desire, accompanied with pain, for conspicuous revenge for a conspicuous slight that was directed against oneself or those near to one, when such a slight is undeserved.” According to such a definition, someone who believes that he has suffered a slight from a person who is not entitled to do. There are two types of arguments according to Aristotle[5]:

inductions and deductions. The definition of induction is the process of moving from specifics to a universal. A deduction is an argument in which, after making certain assumptions, something other than the suppositions follows logically from them or as a result of their veracity. The inductive argument used in rhetoric is an example; unlike other inductive arguments, it proceeds from one particular to another comparable particular if they belong to the same genus rather than from numerous particular examples to one universal case.

In a democracy, it is essential to present multiple points of contention to the populace in a persuasive manner. One must be proficient in the effective use of words for this. The Greeks of antiquity were masters at it. Eloquence was highly regarded in ancient India as well. Similar to how the leaders of men defended their positions in the majority of Greek epics with all the eloquence they possessed[4]. These debates were conducted with a great lot of skill and strength. For the lawmaker, factual knowledge and competence are unquestionably essential. Yet they alone won't go him very far if he lacks eloquence. In the end, the goal of arguments is to persuade and convince. Nobody who struggles to articulate themselves effectively, stumbles over their words, or stammers when engaging in conversation can expect to be paid attention to. Yet, a guy who has an ample supply of words, understands how to use them, and is consistently prepared to make himself understood commands respect. He can captivate his listeners with his eloquence. If one is committed to succeeding, they may learn how to be eloquent. The Greeks were aware of it and supported it as a component of education[3].

Their words take on a flamboyant quality as a result of their intense emotion. Nonetheless, there are several aspects of elocution that must be learned. One is logic, which is the skill of organizing data and formulating inferences. The speaker needs to be able to discern between valid arguments and sophistry that makes the weaker argument appear to be the stronger. As a result, the fundamental subject for elocution students is reasoning. The speaker in rhetoric must be able to modify his craft to the demands of the circumstance, the audience, and its mood. For serious moments, brevity may sometimes become the spirit of wit.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

To others, the orator or persuasive speaker must enlarge and dilate. Before, speakers used a complex diction. They now like to be succinct, truthful, and direct. Nonetheless, the speaker has to have flair, voice, and manner regardless of how long they talk. The goal is the same: to act with conviction. Nowadays, India is a republic. Her councils are democratic. The representatives of the people discuss and debate state policy there. There should now be consistent content on rhetoric for both law students and readers of general publications.

### **THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:**

1. Kuypers, Jim A. ed. Purpose, Practice, and Pedagogy in Rhetorical Criticism (Lanham, MD: Lexington Press, 2014).
2. Kuypers, Jim A. and Andrew King. Twentieth-Century Roots of Rhetorical Studies (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001).
3. MacDonald, Michael, ed. The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies. Oxford Handbooks. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2017.
4. Rainolde (or Rainholde), Richard. A booke called the Foundation of Rhetorike at Project Gutenberg.

5. Rorty, Amélie Oksenberg (ed.). *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press, 1996.
6. Sloane, Thomas O. *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001.
7. Steel, Catherine. *Roman Oratory. Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics 36*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006. 20. Vickers, Brian. *In Defence of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.