

The Lawyer's Discourse in the Courtroom: A Contrastive Study in English and Arabic

Mohammed Jasim Betti¹ & Thura Ghalib Hashim²

¹ Dept. of English, College of Education for Humanities, Thiqr University, Nassiriya, Iraq

² Ministry of Education, Directorate of Education, Nassiriya, Iraq

Correspondence: Mohammed Jasim Betti, Dept. of English, College of Education for Humanities, Thiqr University, Nassiriya, Iraq. E-mail: alseady2@gmail.com or thura344@yahoo.com

Received: November 17, 2017 Accepted: December 5, 2017 Online Published: February 10, 2018

doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n3p276 URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n3p276>

Abstract

The study is restricted to examine and contrast the linguistic features (lexical, syntactic, discourse and pragmatic) of the English and Arabic lawyers' discourse in the courtroom. Eight trials are selected for the sake of comparison and investigation: four English trials and four Arabic ones with sixteen lawyers (eight for the plaintiff and eight for the defendant). Carrying out the analysis relies on the use of the constructed model and the statistical program called "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS) that is used in this study to analyze the collected data statistically. The current study is mainly an attempt to put a spot of light on the special lawyer's language in the courtroom in English and Arabic, and also to investigate this jargon by means of some stated levels. The study arrives at the unique features of legal language, and at some significant similarities and differences between English and Arabic.

Keywords: lawyer's discourse, courtroom, contrastive, English, Arabic

1. Introduction

Forensic linguistics, which is a complementary part of applied linguistics, covers a vast number of topics, such as the language of trials, lawyers, judges and the language of the law itself (Shuy, 2006, p. 104). Crystal (2008, p. 194) defines forensic linguistics as "the use of linguistic techniques to investigate crimes in which language data forms part of evidence, such as in the use of grammatical or lexical criteria to authenticate police statements".

Legal language is the collection of expressions that are used by people. It is like a game of words. Thus, a good lawman, like lawyer and judge, is the one who can make use of the right legal words at the right time (Bhatia, 2010, p. 2). Remarkably, legal language has a special institutional function (Holt & Johnson, 2006, p. 23). Recently, legal language is considered a specific variety of language which can be used as a highly differentiated variety for specific purposes. Moreover, the language of law is regarded as a sub-branch of legal language. Language is created to serve human affairs, but at the same time it can be used to solve issues of law (Trosborg, 1997, pp. 15-19).

Law is highly dependent on words whereas morality and customs are included within the human behavior. Thus, one can notice that words make law. Lawyers use language to explicate what the law means and to have debates before the court and jury. Simply put, law and its language have a great effect on the daily life of everyone in the society (Teirisma, 1999, p. 1).

In the previous literature about lawyer's discourse, lawyer's discourse in the Arabic courtrooms has not been investigated, and no contrastive study of the English and Arabic discourse has been constructed. Hence, there is a need for research in this area.

The study is an attempt to give a brief, clear and comprehensive description of lawyer's discourse in English and Arabic. It also gives answers to the following questions:

- 1) What are the main features of lawyers' language?
- 2) What are the main formal procedures of the English and Arabic trials?
- 3) What are the main differences between the lawyers' roles in the English and Arabic courtrooms?

4) What are the main similarities and differences between the construction of the language of the English trials and the Arabic trials?

The study aims to achieve the following:

- 1) Describing the English lawyer's linguistic style in the courtroom.
- 2) Describing the Arabic lawyer's linguistic style.
- 3) Describing and contrasting the language that the English and Arabic lawyers use in the courtroom.

The study hypothesizes that there is no significant difference between the English and the Arabic data in terms of

A) The formal characteristics that are followed in each trial,

A- Sentence length,

B- Sentence complexity,

C- The number of cohesive ties according to the type of data,

D- Turn taking and roles control through the conversation, and

E- The types of vocabulary.

The following procedure is adopted to achieve the aims of the study and testify its hypotheses:

- 1). Designating the English and the Arabic trials as data for this study.
- 2). Investigating and discussing the English trials and Arabic trials
- 3). An eclectic model is chosen and constructed for the sake of analysis and discussion, and for analyzing the English data and the Arabic one respectively.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Lawyer's Communication Style

The legal field, to which law belongs, constitutes an independent culture with powerful vocational norms that give sense and reinforcement to the individual's behavior. That is why, even a lawyer and client, who belong to the same culture will go through the client-lawyer misunderstanding because of the cultural dissimilarities which result from legal culture. Indeed, lawyers need to improve their knowledge, awareness and skills in order to encounter the cross cultural difficulties and communicate with clients accurately (Brayant & Peters, 2005, p. 47). Thus, lawyer's rhetorical ingenuity continues to spark the imagination of people and the rhetorical skills of lawyers are being one of the most well-known cultural models of persuasive speech (Hobbs, 2003, p. 273). According to Al-Aubaidy (2012, pp. 46-47), there are certain characteristics that every lawyer should have:

1). Truthfulness and Honesty

Honesty is a solid foundation for lawyering and is one of the distinct characteristics of humanism. A successful lawyer has to make good relations with his clients and colleagues.

2). Patience and Collaboration

Patience is one of the greatest traits that any lawyer should have since it has a tremendous effect on the individual's confidence and personality. Thus, a lawyer should be patient to reach his goals and his client's rights. Moreover, collaboration is also a key factor for each lawyer since one cannot live alone.

3). Bravery in Saying the Truth

Self-confidence is one of the important features for the lawyer's personality, and the client must manifest this feature at the first sight to give him confidence of his lawyer. So, the lawyer should tell his client all the truth about his case, and if the client's opinion is vicious, then the lawyer leads him to the right way. The lawyer also should be brave in front of the judge and his opponents regardless to whatever authority and power they have.

One of the main problematic issues of lawyering is that client sometimes is unaware of the potential work that the lawyer does either in court or in his office and even at his house to reach the best solutions for the case (Al-Mashhadany, 2014, p. 8). Moreover, a lot of people in the world work as lawyers, and this probably affects the level of this job leading the bar association to follow some decisive conditions so as to get rid of such a problem and to maintain the lawyer's rights (Zain, 2004, p. 13).

2.2 Lawyers

Hill & Hill (2009, p. 34) define the lawyer as "an agent or someone authorized to act for another. In other words, a person authorized to practice law by a state following a bar examination and the meeting of other qualifying

requirement". The lawyer is a person who is restricted by law according to the rules of the bar association and usually advises people and gives them the legal and judicial consultation. At the same time, the lawyer defends people in the court either orally or through written texts. Lawyering exists all over the world and is an urgent need to save human rights. One can notice that all the legal systems in the whole world almost have the same conditions that people should have in order to be lawyers and one of those conditions is to have high level of education and knowledge about law. Thus, lawyering is a basic element in the judiciary system (Swady, 2010, pp. 12-14).

One of the main responsibilities of lawyers is to help a client to protect and assert the rights clarified by law in that the lawyer normally perform as an advocate to his client. Alternately, the principal duty of a lawyer provides his client with legal information leading him to take care of his affairs. Moreover, the lawyer is supposed to interact effectively with his client in order to help the later select the right decision. Thus, it is significant to say that the ultimate job of a lawyer is informing, advising, and assisting the client. This explains the importance of communication skills for lawyers (Boyle et al., 2003, p. 3).

Ahmed (2016, p. 19) expounds that before practicing the law, each lawyer must take the oath that he will practice the law gracefully and independently, take care to preserve the secrets and traditions of this job and respect both of the constitution and law. However, it is possible for a lawyer to take a certain case which he has no faith about. At a particular point, a lawyer may engage himself in a "self deception". Alternately, a lawyer may express inconvenience through withdrawal from a particular case. But one can observe that lawyers normally work on behalf of the client. Teitelbum, (1968, p. 1) explicates that "for a lawyer knowing or believing his client is guilty, to take a case and assist the defendant to escape punishment seems to the layman clearly inconsistent with the norms of the community, and to be socially dangerous behavior as well" (Ibid, p. 4). Thus, community norms are sensible and critical. In fact, it is illegal for someone to help a thief or a murderer escape from the sanction. Indeed, such norms are practical and rational. Such deeds (support criminals to escape from the punishment) are relevant to the value of law enforcement in the society. Generally speaking, there are certain social values which give justifications for the lawyers' behavior to clarify why a lawyer is different from the other social individuals (Ibid, pp. 5, 6).

The relationship between the lawyer and client is used to be unequal. Normally a lawyer has a "paternalistic" relation with clients. In fact, a lawyer's legal knowledge gives him the authority to lay down the law: lawyers usually tell clients what to do (Chapman, 2000, p. 1).

2.3 Lawyers' Language in English and Arabic

Lawyers' language is obscure in the sense that makes it out of reach for those who pretend to know it. It "justifies the transformation of ordinary language into a special discourse for the purposes of legal system" (Phillips, 2003, p. 1). In fact, lawyers tend to be conscious in using language in that they are not only aware of the material itself, but they also tend to be conscious about how they express this material in a professional language. In addition, almost all lawyers possess a great amount of legal vocabulary by reason of education, training and experience (Olsson, 2008, pp. 83, 84).

Lawyers are also famous in using expressions that bewilder lay people. Some lawyers try to communicate in a certain jargon because they believe that this is the right way for professional communication. However, this is not confined to lawyers, nor is it confined to the written documents. Lawyers use legal jargon even when they talk to their clients to explicate a certain case (Boyle et al., 2003, pp. 13, 14). Moreover, Dikker (1936, p. 145) lists a number of criminal words of pickpocketing terms: "He that cuts the purse is called the Nip. He that is half with him is the snap or the cloyer. He is that picks the pocket is called a Foist. The purse is the Bung."

It is significant to say that lawyers sometimes use the jargon as a form of pressure on the client. Also, it is possible that the lawyer is not ready for hearing and is prepared to hear the settlements. On the other side, the lawyer may think that the settlement is what is really important to the client (Boyle et al., 2003, p. 15). The language that is used by lawyers is the legal language and it is a register of language used by lawyers, judges, jury members, lay judges, and administrators. However, it is also used by lay people, e.g., when someone writes his will and follows specific norms (Saha, 2010, p. 218; Seligson, 2002, p. 15).

Legal language is significant not only to lawyers but also to any layman since it affects the daily lives of everyone in the society. For example, when someone parks in a public garage or gets married, he uses formal papers that are governed by legal language (Tiersma, 1999, pp. 1-2). Legal language controls a wide range of our social life and it can be combined with languages from any field. It is very old in comparison with other language varieties which are used for specific purposes (Mattilla, 2006, pp. 3-4).

2.4 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis refers to the analysis of the patterns that people's utterances follow when taking part in the domains of life. In an attempt for searching for the theories and methods of discourse, one may discover that discourse analysis is not only one approach, but also a series of interdisciplinary approaches which can be used to find out many different social domains in many different types of studies (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1).

For Brown & Yule (1983, p. viii), discourse analysis has come to be employed with a vast range of meanings that deal with a vast range of activities. It characterizes activities at the intersection of variant disciplines, such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics. Scholars, who work in these variant disciplines, emphasize specific aspects of discourse concerning their interest. For example, sociolinguists are particularly interested in the study of the structure of social interaction manifested in conversations, and their descriptions focus on traits of a social context which are especially improvable to sociological classification.

We think of discourse analysis as a study of language, but it is not just the study of language. It is a way of looking at language that emphasizes how people use it in real life to do things, such as jokes, argument and persuasion, and to show that they are particular sorts of people or belong to certain groups. Discourse analysts are concerned with the study of the ways by which sentences and utterances go together to make texts and interactions and how these texts and interactions fit into our social world (John, 2010, p. 2).

This way of looking at language is based on four main assumptions which are: first, language is ambiguous. What things mean is not always clear. Second, language is always in the world, i. e. what language means is often a matter of when and where it is used and what it is used to do. Third, how we use language is not independent from who we are and the different social groups to which we belong. Fourth, language is never used alone without using other means of communication. It is often combined with other things, such as our tone of voice, gestures and facial expressions when we speak, and the fonts, layout and graphics when we writing (Ibid, p. 2).

In fact, language use, whether in the written or spoken form is associated with the process of creating and sharing meaning among participants. Thus, language includes features that organize the way of sharing and those that create meaning (Sinclair, 1993, p. 6)

Any text can be conveyed to the recipient through either the spoken or written language. For instance, a written text, which sets for silent readers (modern novels), can be read loudly, and verbal or spoken conversation can be written down and read (Mccarthy, 1993, p. 170). Crystal & Davy (1969, p. 170) explain this phenomenon calling it "complex medium". They explicate that language normally stays in only one category, such as spoken language to be heard or written one to be read. However, in certain circumstances, language can be changed from one form to another, such as the spoken language dedicated to be written (e.g., dictation) and the written language dedicated to be spoken (e.g., news broadcasting).

Speaking and writing are not at opposite directions but rather they are so useful in the same image of a spectrum. There is a fuzzy point in which the two forms (written and spoken) of language overlap, and thus, it becomes difficult to decide where the first one has finished and the second begun (Cornbleet & Carter, 2001, p. 92).

Legal discourse refers to a pattern of oral interaction or written texts which exist in legal contexts. Discourse can be defined by means of the way in which language is used to convey meaning. Legal discourse can be recognized as a genre of discourse which has its own textual construction and highly institutionalization of power. Thus, such specification can be mirrored in the specified characters of the legal people (Goodrich, 1987, pp. 117 & 154). Legal discourse is paradigmatically involved in the truth by means of evidence or verification, and more generally by means of planning and designing of the powers in the discourse of rights, abilities and other procedures of law (Goodrich, 1987, p.157).

Legal discourse is not only full of unknown and obscure words. It sometimes contains a large number of general words of everyday life. Moreover, Shinichiro (2014, p. 88) introduces a list of general words which are usually used in UK court, for instance, "Act (4313), action (745), address (282), adopt (512), allow (758), answer (462), apply (1858), arise (691), attempt (264)". It is worthy to say that the previous words are not normally used in the same meaning as in the normal discourse. For example, the word "action" can be defined as "the act of doing something" (Garner, 1999, p. 89). On the other hand, the terminological use of the word "action" means the process of doing something conduct or behavior, a thing, act, or a civil or criminal judicial proceeding (Ibid, 1999, pp. 88-89).

Communication is mainly used in trials and courts. It is significant to say that communication is not the only

means of language. There are other means of communication, such as images, gestures and facial expressions, etc. It is significant to mention that everyone who has the legal right to stay silent. Accordingly, the legal apparatus is dedicated to hold someone to say something. Someone's right to stay silent expresses the idea that one is innocent until proved the opposite. Warning takes a certain formulae in that "you have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law, you have the right to speak to an attorney and to have an attorney present during any questioning" (Woods, 2006, p. 102, 103).

2.5 Model of the Study

The model adopted for this study is an eclectic one. It investigates more than one level in order to produce a descriptive view of the data collected in English and Arabic. Moreover, this study exhibits the significance of how each group of language speakers employ the syntactic, lexical, pragmatic and discourse levels to show their own jargon.

2.5.1 Formal Characteristics

The English trials contain a sequence of formal instructions which are almost fixed in every trial. They can be explained as follows:

a. Jury Selection

The first step of each trial is jury selection. In the courtroom, all motions and sentiments are put behind. Then, an investigation process, *voir dire*, starts to decide the appropriateness of the jurors to judge the case. The witnesses should be present in the court to lay out the facts of the case (Cohen, 2008, p. 53). At this point, the jurors are impaneled and sworn then the trial goes on (Nolfi, 2009, p. 276).

b. The Opening Statement

According to Tanford (1993, pp. 147-148), the opening statement is a significant procedure in the trial. Through the opening statement, the parties can be introduced to each other. It is usually short and expressive since it concentrates on the key facts of the case. Moreover, it appears in a chronological order so as to look like a story. Also, it gives the judges a clear idea about the nature of the antagonism and the evidences produced by the different parties (Ibid, pp. 147, 148).

c. Presentation of Evidence

In the presentation of evidences, the participants introduce the evidences to the jury. There are four main types of evidences:

A- The testimony that is presented by the witnesses.

B- The written document such as letters, reports, mails and records.

C- The real physical evidences from the event of the case for example the actual tool of the crime in a murder crime.

D- The visual aids which are used to support the testimony, such as diagrams, maps and photographs (Brieant, 2011, p. 33).

d. Witnesses

A witness is the person who has personal information about the case. A witness should be "credible", "believable" and who observes the facts directly or who is involved in the issue. A witness who suddenly comes is not allowed to testify in the court (Brieant, 2011, p. 45).

e. A Closing Argument

A closing statement usually comes at the end of the trial. It works as the final chance to address the jury. Simply put, "closing arguments are not for the purpose of recruiting new troops, but for arming those already on your side" (Tanford, 1993, p. 373).

2.5.2 Sentence Length

Sentence length can usually be introduced by counting the number of words in a given sentence. Through writing, one needs not only short sentences, but rather a kind of varying sentences in length is also needed. That is, one may have 35 words sentences and some 40 words sentences, as well as many in between. In general, one has to monitor his average of writing. It is worthy to say that readability formulas mainly depend on sentence length. Thus, the sentence length of writing is a significant factor to determine the quality and readability of the text (Garner, 2001, p. 25).

2.5.3 Sentence Complexity

Any sentence can be simple or multiple. In English, a simple sentence contains only one independent clause whereas a multiple sentence consists of one independent clause and one or more dependant clauses depending on its immediate constituents. A multiple sentence could be compound or complex. A compound sentence contains two or more coordinated clauses which are connected by coordinators and are considered main clauses whereas a complex sentence implies one or more subordinate clauses to form the element(s) of the main clause like direct object or adverbial (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 719).

However, Quirk et al. (1985, pp. 992-993) state that there are three main kinds of clauses which are as follows:

(1) A finite clause is a clause which contains a finite verb, such as take, took, can work, has worked, is writing, was written.

1). I cannot go out with you because I am studying this evening.

(2) A non-finite clause is a clause which implies a non-finite verb. For example:

2). Having finished my work, I returned home.

Non-finite clauses can be classified as:

A- To-infinitive Clauses

3). "The best thing would be to tell everybody."

B- Bare infinitive Clauses

4). "All I did was hit him on the eye."

C- Ing-participle Clauses

5). "Leaving the room, he tripped over the mat."

D- Ed-participle Clauses

6). "Covered with confusion, they apologized abjectly."

(3) Verbless Clauses are those clauses which have no verb elements, but still can be analyzed into clause elements. For example:

7). "Although always helpful, he was not much liked."

According to Arabic grammar, sentences are of two types: the nominal sentence and the verbal sentence. The verbal and nominal sentences consist of subject (?Imusned) and predicate (?Imusnedileih). Generally speaking, the subject and predicate form the basic structure of the sentence which carries the fundamental meaning of the sentence. Grammarians assign some rules to the structure of the sentence: first, the basic structure of the nominal sentence includes subject (?Imubtada?) and predicate (?Ixaber) (Al-Sayid, 2004, pp. 22-25):

8) ?SSabru d3amiil (Patience is nice).

Second, the basic structure of the verbal sentence contains fa:9:l wa fi9l (a verb and a subject):

9) ?al waled yektubu ?Aldarsa (The boy writes the lesson).

2.5.4 Cohesion

Halliday & Hasan (1976, pp. 1-2) explain that the word "text" can be used linguistically to denote any passage (whether spoken or written) which shapes a complete unit regardless of its length. There are certain distinctive features that every text should have. A text could be spoken or written, prose or verse, dialogue or monologue. It can be a simple saying or complicated play, a single word or a long day conversation. Cohesion and coherence are two of the seven standards which enhance textuality within a text while the other standards are: intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, intertextuality. Generally speaking, cohesion can be classified into two types: grammatical and lexical cohesion.

2.5.4.1 Grammatical Cohesion

The grammatical cohesion refers to those grammatical cohesive ties which are woven together to link sentences in the text. They are divided into four types which are reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction.

A. Reference

Reference is the action of denoting the preceding or following entity. For instance,

10) I see Nada is here. She has a baby,

In Arabic, personal pronouns are either explicit (Daahir) or implicit (mustetir). The explicit pronoun implies the following expressions (?anta) (for a male), (?anti:) (for a female), (?antum) (for plural males) and ?antunna (for plural females) which are referred to in English by the pronoun “you” ?ant. On the other hand, the implicit pronoun is usually a bound morpheme expressed as a suffix attached to nouns, and it is called a determiner, such as (jaa’) in (Ta9amy) which means in English “my food” and (naa’) as in (Ta9amuna) “our food” (Aziz, 1989, pp. 138-143).

B. Substitution

Substitution is an act by which a speaker usually tries to avoid repeating a certain item or expression. In fact, substitution does not have the property of co-referentiality. It is usually a way of substituting a word or group of words. For example:

11) Do you like this picture?

Or do you like the other one? (Bloor & Bloor, 2004, p. 45).

In Arabic, substitution is also the process of replacing a particular item with another one (Ibin-Mandhoor, 1999, p. 39). Moreover, substitution is an economical process that language users employ to avoid repetition of the same entity (Mohammed, 2009, pp. 113-114). There are three types of substitution: nominal, verbal and clausal.

C. Ellipsis

Ellipsis is the act of omitting a certain word or part of a sentence. It is mainly related to substitution. Usually, it is classified as “substitution by zero” (Renkema, 1993, p. 38). Ellipsis can be situational or textual. Situational ellipsis occurs when a certain element is not realized since it is obvious from the situation in which a text occurs. Textual ellipsis is the act of avoiding the repetition of unneeded or redundant expressions since they can be predicted from an already mentioned co-text (O’grady, 2010, p. 102). It is worthy to say that ellipsis has the same grammatical environment of substitution (Bloor & Bloor, 2004, p. 97). Indeed, ellipsis allows the writer or speaker to delete some structural elements and provide them with other entities to support the meaning (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 79):

18) Ahmed is playing football and Ali basketball.

In Arabic, ellipsis is a relation which exists within a text. It is an anaphoric relation. Thus, the replaced form is usually missing and the reader can retrieve it from the previous sentence or text:

19) jaqra? dJoon qaSidatan, wa kaθriin quSStan (John is reading a poem, and Catherine a story.)

There are three types of ellipsis: nominal, verbal and clausal.

D. Conjunction

Conjunction denotes the expressions which are used to refer to the cohesive ties among clauses or parts of a text in order to give a meaningful relationship between them. Such a joining process can be introduced by the use of conjunctive adjuncts, such as then, for this reason, on the other hand, etc. Conjunctive adjuncts have a multi-function in that they express conjunction on the one hand and indicate the kind of the relation between the joined elements on the other (time relationship, reason, cause, result...etc.) (Bloor & Bloor, 2004, p. 97). Khitaby (1991, pp. 23-24) illustrates that in Arabic, the text is a unit which consists of different sentences that come together respectively. Alternatively, such a text needs elements to connect its parts to make it coherent.

There are three types of conjunction: addition, causality and temporality, adversative.

2.5.4.2 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion works within the lexis and is achieved through the choice of lexical expressions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 535). Lexical cohesion is concerned with the relations that are based on the words used. It can be classified into reiteration and collocation (Renkema, 1993, p. 39). This type of cohesion concentrates on the way in which lexical items belong to each other on the one hand and to the rest of cohesive devices on the other (Flowerdew & Mahlberg, 2008, p. 1). Lexical cohesion can be classified into: reiteration and collocation.

A. Reiteration

Reiteration is the act of repeating the same item (i.e., two occurrences of the same referent). It is usually associated with reference item, such as “the” or “demonstrative” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 319). It can be classified into repetition, synonym, hyponymy and antonymy.

B. Collocation

Collocation is a lexical relation that is based on the occurrence of words in the same environment (Renkema,

1993, p. 39). It refers to the words that are frequently occurring together as in “bread and butter” and “needle and thread” (Yule, 2010, p. 122). Morris & Hirst (1991, p. 22) state that collocation is a semantic relationship among words which usually co-occur. It occurs between words that exist in the same lexical environment. In Arabic, collocation can be presented by particular words, such (malik) (king) and (sulTah) (power). Another example is presented by (9asal) (honey) and (Nahil) (bee).

2.5.4.3 Turn Taking

According to Sacks et al. (1974, pp. 696-699), conversation is the act of communication by which people can communicate meanings and thoughts. One of the basic rules of conversation and other speech exchange systems is the participant’s turn. Sacks et al. (1974, pp. 696-699) expound that a good model for turns in a conversation should be “locally managed, part-administered, interactionally controlled”. Turn taking system can be organized into different ways. A conversation can vary according to the situation and activity. They also explicate that conversation can accommodate a wide range of situations, interacting in which persons in varieties of identities are operating; it can be sensitive to the various combinations and it can be capable of dealing with a change of situation. In any conversation, one can notice the following principles:

- 1) Change of speakers.
- 2) One person speaks at a time.
- 3) Sometimes, more than one speaker talks together. Such a phenomenon is common but short.
- 4) Moving from one speaker’s turn to the next is common. But sometimes there are gaps in transition.
- 5) Turn ordering varies.
- 6) Turn size is also varied.
- 7) Length of conversation is not fixed.
- 8) What speakers say is not already specified.
- 9) The number of participants is not fixed.
- 10) A conversation can be continuous or not.
- 11) A speaker may choose a next speaker “turn allocation technique”
- 12) Different “turn-constructive units” usually used (long words, sentential in length)
- 13) When two participants talk together one of them stops to repair the problem “Repair techniques” (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 701).

2.5.4.4 Vocabulary

Alcaraz & Hughes (2002, pp. 18-19) state that the lexical items in any language can be classified into the following:

a. Functional Items

Functional items usually denote the grammatical words or phrases which have no direct referents in reality or in the universe of concepts. Those items serve to bind together. For example: “hereinafter” and “under”. Moreover, deictic expressions, articles and modals can be added to this group.

b. Symbolic or Representational Items

Symbolic or representational items include all the expressions which denote things or ideas that exist in the world whether they are physical or mental. These types of expressions consist of one-word items, such as “court, attorney, and judge”. Furthermore, the symbolic or representational items contain compound units, such as “bring in Verdi, beyond reasonable doubt”. Symbolic items can be classified into three classes:

i. Purely Technical Expressions

Purely technical expressions consist of only the technical words that are used in the lexical field exclusively, such as "barrister, counsel".

ii. Semi-technical or (Mixed) Expressions

Semi-technical expressions refer to the words and phrases which have gained an extra meaning. They are semantically complex. For example:

- (34) “The testator died without issues.” (offspring, children)

(35) "Parties must wait for process to issue." (be served)

iii. Every Day Vocabulary of Legal Texts

Every day vocabulary of legal texts contains a long list of items. It refers to the terms in general use. Such words do not lose its every day meaning nor gain another one by means of contact with the legal medium. For example, "the judge summarized the facts of the case." Arabic language has the same division- there are some words which are used in the trials and can be characterized as purely technical, for instance, ?almuhami (lawyer), ?almutaham (defendant). Semi- technical words can be presented by such words like xiTaab (speech). Finally, every day or common terms refer to some particular words we commonly use, such as ?alhawija[fa]xSia (identity).

3. Methods

This study is an analytical one. It selects certain English and Arabic data which comprise the discourse spoken by lawyers in the English and Arabic courtrooms respectively. Eight trials are selected for the sake of the analysis of the data of each language, and sixteen lawyers are also produced in this data (eight for the plaintiff and eight for the defendant) to be the target informants in the study.

Then, a model is coined from the literature available. The model is adopted depending upon Quirk et al. (1985) for syntax, Halliday & Hasan (1976) for discourse, Sacks et al. (1974) for pragmatics and AlCaraz & Hughes (2002) for lexicon. After that, the analysis process starts with tables in which statistics is used. The statistical program called Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is used in this study to analyze the collected data statistically. SPSS is a comprehensive system for data analysis. It can make data from any kind of files and use them to make tabulated reports, charts and any complex statistical analysis. Moreover, it is used to run on different systems of computers. One of its merits is that it can be used by both novice and professional researchers (Gailly & Alder, 2003; Field, 2009, p. 61; Pallan, 2011, p. 14).

The lawyers chosen are those who work in the English courtrooms and in the Arabic ones respectively. All the other lawyers are excluded. English and Arabic Lawyers are those who have a BA in law and work in the field of courts as professional lawyers.

The methods, which are used to collect data, include either using recordings for the lawyers in the courtrooms by the researchers or using the documents available in the archives of courtrooms or some documents from the websites of English courtrooms.

All the lawyers indulged in the data work without the observer's paradox since the researchers are not seen as researchers but as audience. Then, permission is taken from them to use the data in the study with privacy measures.

Comparing the English and Arabic data relies on the statistical analysis employed either to support or reject the hypotheses of the study in that the difference between the English and Arabic informants may be statistically significant or not.

According to the (SPSS) used to handle two independent samples, there are two tests employed in this study which are Levene test for the equality of variances and t-test for equality of means. Running this programme for t-test distribution is completely determined by Levene test. Levene test determines which mean should be chosen to refer to the p-value. If the Levene test is less than 0.05, the variances are different. It should be applied to the second row named "Sig. (2tailed)" which indicates that the equal variances are not assumed. On the second hand, if the Levene test is more than 0.05, the equal variances are assumed. It should be applied to the first row of Sig. (2tailed). The following helps find out the points of similarities and dissimilarities between the two languages in terms of the lawyer's linguistic style in the courtroom:

4. Results

The analysis of the data takes the form of the suggested model as follows:

4.1 Formal Characteristics

The English and Arabic trials follow particular steps which may be explicitly or exactly found in the trials in that sometimes these steps are included within other steps. It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference between the English and Arabic formal characteristics that are followed in each trial. However, analyzing the collected data show that there is significant difference between the English and Arabic formal characteristics in that some procedures exist in the English trials, but are not found in the Arabic trials at all: first, selecting the jury which is absolutely absent in Arabic trials. Second, the opening statement which is not similar to that followed in the English trials. In the Arabic trials, the judge is the one who opens the trial calling on the

defendant to identify himself. Third, the closing statement which is absent in the Arabic trials in that closing the Arabic trial is carried out also by the judge to decide the appropriate verdict.

There are some similar procedures followed in the English and Arabic trials, such as introducing the plaintiff's case and the verdict. Moreover, there are some procedures that are implicitly included in the two kinds of trials. Rather, they are not found as plain procedures but they occur within other procedures, for example, the English trials follow certain procedures that are not apparently found in Arabic, but are actually included within other procedures like the confederation with the judge of the trial. Similarly, the Arabic trials follow some procedures that do not apparently occur in the English ones, but are included within other procedures like calling on the defendant, the witnesses, the defendant's statement and the plaintiff's lawyer statement. Therefore, one can notice that such procedures also have certain percentages (Tables 1 and 2):

Table 1. Formal characteristics of English and Arabic trials

Formal Characteristics of English Trials	English F	Arabic F
Confederation With the Judge of the Trial	1	1
Selection of the Jury	1	0
The Opening Statement	1	0
Introducing the Plaintiff's Case	1	1
Closing Argument	1	0
The Verdict	1	1
Calling on the Defendant	1	1
The Witnesses	1	1
The Defendant's Statement	1	1
The Plaintiff's Lawyer Statement	1	1
Total	10	7

Table 2. Comparison of formal characteristics in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	5.684	0.028	2.191	18	EV= 0.042
			2.191	15.517	UV= 0.044

4.2 Sentence Length

The English lawyers use short sentences more than the Arabic ones; meanwhile, the Arabic lawyers use longest sentences more than the English ones. This is because of the fact that the Arabic lawyers have less time to talk in the trial than the English ones, so they could not stop for a while to end each sentence (Tables 3 & 4):

Table 3. Frequencies of sentence length by English and Arabic lawyers

No. of Words	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
From 1 to 10	311	67	2	6
From 11 to 20	101	76	2	2
From 21 to 30	14	61	2	4
From 31 to 40	5	15	1	6
From 41 to 50	0	6	0	3
From 51 to 60	0	0	4	4
From 61 to 70	1	0	2	3
From 71 to 80	1	0	2	5
From 81 to 106	0	0	0	4
Total	433	225	15	37

Table 4. Comparison of sentence length in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	5.646	0.030	2.326	16	EV= 0.33
			2.326	8.015	UV= 0.48
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	46.162	0	2.314	16	EV= 0.034
			2.314	8.29	UV= 0.049

4.3 Sentence Complexity

It is so clear that the English and Arabic lawyers use the simple sentence more than the other types of the sentences (Tables 5 & 6):

Table 5. Frequencies of sentence complexity by English and Arabic lawyers

Type	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	PLF
Simple	275	116	6	14
Compound	20	6	5	18
Complex	138	103	4	10
Total	433	225	15	42

Table 6. Comparison of sentence complexity in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	4.517	0.099	1.891	4	EV= 0.132
			1.891	2	UV= 0.199
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	12.678	0.24	1.754	4	EV= 0.154
			1.754	2	UV= 0.220

4.4 Cohesion

The cohesive ties in the English data are 2275 and in the Arabic data are 671. This disparity comes as a result of the freedom and space that the English lawyers have in the courtroom as opposite to the Arabic ones which have very limited roles in the courtroom (Tables 7 & 8):

Table 7. The use of cohesive ties by English and Arabic lawyers

Lawyer Cohesive Ties	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Grammatical Cohesion	1185	779	119	373
Lexical Cohesion	117	194	72	107
Total	1302	973	191	480

Table 8. Comparison of Cohesive Ties in English and Arabic Trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	0	0	1.039	2	EV= 0.408
			1.039	1	UV= 0.487
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	0	0	0.767	2	EV= 0.523
			0.767	1	UV= 0.551

4.4.1 Grammatical Cohesion

The number of grammatical cohesion in the English data is 1964 while the number of the grammatical cohesion in the Arabic data is 492 (Tables 9 & 10):

Table 9. The use of grammatical cohesion by English and Arabic lawyers

Lawyer Type	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Reference	912	596	54	243
Substitution	8	29	12	12
Ellipsis	0	0	0	2
Conjunctions	213	107	53	116
Total	1133	732	119	373

Table 10. Comparison of grammatical cohesion in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	9.853	0.020	1.473	6	EV=0.191
			1.473	3	UV= 0.237
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	2.441	0.169	0.597	6	EV= 0.572
			0.597	3.95	UV= 0.583

(1) Reference

The English trials contain 1508 cases of reference whereas the Arabic trials contain 297 ones (Tables 11 & 12):

Table 11. The use of reference by English and Arabic lawyers

Lawyer Reference Types	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Personal	548	340	49	193
Demonstrative	364	256	5	46
Comparative	0	0	0	4
Total	912	596	54	243

Table 12. Comparison of reference in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	6.115	0.069	1.768	4	EV= 0.152
			1.768	2	UV= 0.217
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	1.531	0.284	1.004	4	EV= 0.372
			1.004	3	UV= 0.386

(2) Substitution

Substitution makes 37 of the total number of the English data; and 57 of the Arabic data (Tables 13 & 14):

Table 13. The use of substitution by English and Arabic lawyers

Lawyer Type	English		Arabic	
	PL F	DLF	PL F	DLF
Nominal	1	11	16	12
Verbal	7	15	11	0
Clausal	0	3	18	0
Total	8	29	45	12

Table 14. Comparison of substitution in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	0.036	0.859	-4.086	4	EV= 0.015
			-4.086	3.99	UV= 0.015
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	0.182	0.692	1.063	4	EV= 0.348
			1.062	3.94	UV= 0.349

(3) Ellipsis

It is so clear that the English lawyers do not use ellipsis since they tend to be direct and formal and not to omit some details to lead to misunderstanding. On the other hand, the Arabic plaintiff and defendant's lawyers often avoid using ellipsis in the courtroom but not always. Thus, one can see that ellipsis is used by Arabic lawyers in order to exploit their limited time. By elliptical sentences, Arabic lawyers can refer to much more meaning in a short time. (Tables 15 & 16):

Table 15. The use of Ellipsis by English and Arabic lawyers

Lawyer Type	English		Arabic	
	PL F	DLF	PL F	DLF
Nominal	0	0	2	3
Verbal	0	0	2	2
Clausal	0	0	1	3
Total	0	0	5	8

Table 16. Comparison of Ellipsis in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
0.05	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
	4	0.116	-5.196	4	EV= 0.007
			-5.196	2	UV= 0.035
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
0.05	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
	16	0.016	-8	4	EV= 0.001
			-8	2	UV= 0.015

(4) Conjunctions

The two languages contain a good deal of conjunctive devices (additive, adversative, temporal and comparative). The English lawyers use all the types of conjunctions more than the Arabic ones, except the adversative type that is used more by the Arabic informants than the English ones. The time of the trial and the chance the lawyer has are important factors that affect the use of the types of conjunction (Tables 17 & 18):

Table 17. The use of conjunctions by English and Arabic lawyers

Type	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Additive	93	36	42	92
Adversative	0	0	3	5
Causal	3	20	5	9
Temporal	65	20	3	10
Other types	52	31	0	0
Total	213	107	53	116

Table 18. Comparison of conjunctions in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
0.05	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
	2.126	0.183	2.372	8	EV= 0.45
			2.372	5	UV= 0.62
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
0.05	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
	0.856	0.382	2.381	8	EV= 0.044
			2.381	6	UV= 0.53

4.4.2 Lexical Cohesion

It is so obvious that the plaintiff and defendant lawyers in English and Arabic use lexical cohesion but with various frequencies according to the type of the trial and the lawyer's eloquent abilities in the courtroom (tables 19 & 20):

Table 19. The use of lexical cohesion by English and Arabic lawyers

Type	Sub-type	PL/ English		PL/ Arabic	
		PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Reiteration	Repetition	109	191	35	32
	Synonymy	0	0	18	53
	Antonymy	2	3	4	4
	Hyponymy	6	0	4	4
Collocation		0	0	11	14
Total		117	194	72	107

Table 20. Comparison of lexical cohesion in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	3.429	0.101	0.406	8	EV= 0.696
			0.406	5	UV= 0.703
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	3.593	0.095	0.444	8	EV= 0.669
			0.444	4	UV= 0.678

(1) Reiteration

In both languages, most of types of reiteration exist with different frequencies but there is just one type which is not used at all (synonymy).

a. Repetition

The English data show that there are 300 cases of repetition while the Arabic data shows that there are 67 case of repetition. The English lawyer uses repetition more than the Arabic counterpart and this is a subjective matter since it depends on the lawyer himself and his personality or style of speaking.

b. Synonymy

There are zero occurrences of synonymy, compared to the Arabic ones which are 71. Accordingly, one can see that the Arabic lawyers use synonymy more than the English one since they use synonymy for colloquial reasons. Moreover, synonymy is one of the main characteristics of Arabic because legal language is known for its variant vocabularies. On the other hand, the English lawyers tend to be more economical and direct since directness is a main characteristic of English legal language.

c. Antonymy

Antonymy exists in both English and Arabic data but with different frequencies, 5 cases versus 8.

d. Hyponymy

Hyponymy is found in the two languages but with varying numbers according to the type of the trial and the lawyer's linguistic style (6 cases in the English data, and 8 cases the Arabic data).

(2) Collocation

Only the Arabic data have collocation in different frequencies, while the English lawyers do not use collocation at all.

4.5 Turn Taking

It is worth mentioning that some conversational principles are used equally by the English and Arabic lawyers. These principles are "change of speakers", "moving from one speaker's turn to the next", "turn ordering varies", "length of conversation is not fixed", "the number of participants is not fixed" and "turn constructional units". The principle of "more than one speaker talks together" is not used at all by all the English and Arabic lawyers. The principle of "one person speaks at a time" is used only by the English and Arabic defendant's lawyers equally while the principle of "what speakers say is not already specified" is used only the English and Arabic plaintiff's lawyers equally.

The principle of "turn size is also varied" is used equally by the English and Arabic defendant's lawyers; meanwhile, the English plaintiff's lawyers use this principle less than the Arabic ones. The principle of "a conversation can be continuous" is not used by the English and Arabic plaintiff's lawyers while the English defendant's lawyers use it less than the Arabic ones. The principle of "turn allocation" is used by the English plaintiff and defendant's lawyers more than the Arabic ones.

The English lawyer's role in the courtroom is completely different from the Arabic one since he has the right to ask the witnesses directly and they can interfere and interrupt. Their legal authority is also different from the Arabic lawyer's role in the courtroom. However, in most Arabic trials, there is no chance for the lawyers to participate in the trials or to guide a conversation. Their task is concerned merely with giving written lawsuits to the judge and then the judge knows what the main ideas of such lawsuits. Each lawyer has a particular time to

show his/her part of the story and lawyers do not have the right to interfere whenever they want (tables 21 & 22):

Table 21. The use of turn-taking in English and Arabic trials

Conversational Principles	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Change of speakers	59	59	1	1
One person speaks at a time	0	0	1	1
more than one speaker talks together	0	0	0	0
Moving from one speaker's turn to the next	59	59	1	1
Turn ordering varies	59	59	1	1
Turn size is also varied	3	4	1	1
Length of conversation is not fixed	4	4	1	1
What speakers say is not already specified	4	4	0	0
The number of participants is not fixed	4	4	1	1
A conversation can be continuous or not	0	0	1	2
Turn allocation	38	23	1	3
Turn constructional units	4	4	1	1
Total	234	220	10	13

Table 22. Comparison of turn-taking in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	58.836	0	2.483	22	EV= 0.021
			2.493	11	UV= 0.030
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	33.573	0	2.364	22	EV= 0.027
			2.364	11	UV= 0.037

4.6 Vocabulary

The investigated data for both languages (English and Arabic) show that there are three types of vocabulary (Technical, Semi-technical and Common) used in the data respectively. The most frequent type is the common words and this is a clear indication that law is mainly concerned with issues of people's daily life (Tables 23 & 24):

Table 23. The use of vocabularies by English and Arabic lawyers

Type	English		Arabic	
	PLF	DLF	PLF	DLF
Technical	74	97	64	180
Semi-technical	95	126	41	192
Common	747	481	96	248
Total	916	704	201	620

Table 24. Comparison of vocabularies in English and Arabic trials

English and Arabic PL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	13.704	0.021	1.076	4	EV= 0.342
			1.076	2	UV= 0.393
English and Arabic DL					
Statistical Significance	Levene Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig	TV	Df	Sig (2tailed)
0.05	10.290	0.033	0.224	4	EV= 0.834
			0.224	2	UV= 0.843

5. Discussion

After carrying out the analysis process, the hypotheses of the study are either accepted or rejected.

Concerning the formal characteristics of English and Arabic lawyers' language, the statistical analysis shows that the means of the Levene test is less than 0.05, so the p-value of t-test is 0.044 which is also less than 0.05. Accordingly, the difference between the English and Arabic lawyers in following the formal characteristics of trials is significant, and this result refutes the null hypothesis (A) and accepts the alternative one explaining that there is a significant difference. This indicates that the formal features of English lawyer's discourse follows different steps from those in Arabic, and this might be the effect of having different civil and criminal procedures.

From the statistical analysis of using sentence length by the plaintiff's lawyer, the p-value of t-test is 0.048 which is less than 0.05. Moreover, the p-value of the t-test applied to the defendant's lawyers of using sentence length is 0.049. Therefore, there is a very significant difference. Accordingly, we refute hypothesis (B), and accept the alternative one that there is a significant difference between the English and Arabic plaintiff and defendant's lawyers in using the sentence length. This is language specific as languages differ in the number of words form which sentences are formulated.

Concerning the English and the Arabic plaintiff's lawyers in terms of sentence complexity, the statistical results explicate that we accept this null hypothesis to hypothesis (C), because the p-value of the t-test is 0.132. Similarly, this hypothesis cannot be refuted according the defendant's lawyers' use of sentence complexity because it is bigger than 0.05.

In terms of the number of cohesive devices used by the English and Arabic lawyers, the statistical results force us to accept the null hypothesis of hypothesis (D). The p-value of the t-test applied to the data of the English and Arabic plaintiff's lawyers is 0.487; meanwhile, the p-value applied to the data of the English and Arabic defendant's lawyers is 0.551. So there is no significant difference between the English and Arabic lawyers in terms of cohesive ties which are used in each type of trial.

The difference in using reference by the English and Arabic plaintiff and defendant's lawyers is not significant as the statistical results show that the p-value of t-test (applied to the English and Arabic plaintiff's lawyers) is 0.152 while the p-value of the t-test (applied to the English and Arabic defendant's lawyers) is 0.372.

Concerning the principles of turn taking, the difference between the English and Arabic defendant's lawyers is also significant since the p-value of the t-test is 0.037. Thus, hypothesis (E) is refuted and the accepted hypothesis is the alternative one that there is a significant difference between the English and Arabic plaintiff and defendant's lawyers in using the principles of turn-taking. This is related to the nature of pragmatic strategies used in each language including turn and also those used in each procedural law.

Concerning vocabulary, the differences between the English and Arabic plaintiff and defendant's lawyers are not significant because the p-values of the t-test are 0.393 for the plaintiff's lawyers and 0.843 for the defendant's lawyers. Both types of lawyer's discourse use terms which are similar but put in the lexicon of each language.

6. Conclusion

The current study comes out with some conclusions related to the similarities and differences. the similarities between the English and Arabic data are:

- 1). The two languages have particular cohesive devices used to perform the cohesive ties which are of different frequencies from one language to another.

- 2). Concerning vocabularies, the discussed data show that the two languages have vocabularies that are used in their technical sense, e.g., pleading, prosecution and defendant, and common or every day vocabularies (car, larceny and people) and semi- technical which are in between such as (issue, case and problem).
- 3). The number of judges in the courtroom depends on the type of the trial whether it is a personal status court which implies one judge, or a court of misdemeanors and offenses which contains three judges. Such types of courts and whether there is just one judge or some restrict the role of lawyers, and thus affect their language participations in the courtrooms.
- 4). The use of different sorts of vocabularies and sentences is related to the system of the trial and how much time is left to the lawyer to express his statement.
- 5). Both the plaintiff and defendant's lawyers are sometimes similar in not using some sub-types of cohesive ties like the comparative reference.
- 6). One of the conclusions of the study is to the two languages try to understand and recognize the language of the written law.
- 7). Also the study helps to highlight the importance of the language use in the judicial process in English and Arabic.
- 8). It is important to show the effective role that language plays in forming the law because there is no law without language. Thus, what is concerned with law is concerned with language as well.

In so far as the differences between the English and Arabic data are concerned, the following differences are arrived:

- 1) The formal characteristics followed in the English and Arabic courtrooms are different. The English and the Arabic trials contain formal procedures or steps for the trial in the courtroom but with differences in certain points, for example, there are no jury members in the Arabic trial.
- 2) According to the comparison, the English lawyers tend to use short and simple sentences as opposed to the Arabic lawyers' tendency to the use of compound and complex sentences.
- 3) Concerning the conversational level the English lawyer tends to have more confidence in the courtroom and he has the right to call the witness, ask questions, object and interrupt what he thinks as an appropriate. In contrast, the Arabic lawyer's power is very limited and he can introduce his statement at a certain point and he does not have the right to ask questions directly but he can do this through the judge.
- 4) The turn-taking principles are appropriately employed to check the quality and even quantity of the participants in the conversation. According to such principles, there is difference between the English and Arabic lawyers in that the English lawyers try to use these principles more than their Arabic equivalents.
- 5) Ellipsis is used by Arabic lawyers as a technique to lead the judge to a particular point or to make him mislead.

According to the investigated data in English and Arabic, the following pedagogical recommendations may be useful and significant to the future studies of the same field:

- 1) It is recommended that forensic linguistics ought to be taught, as a field of study, to undergraduate students in the departments of English (as an application of linguistic studies to other disciplines, particularly law) to obtain the fundamental principles of this field.
- 2) The instructors at the college of the law need shed the light on the trials in the Iraqi courtrooms and the main procedures followed those trials to give a chance to researchers of law and linguistics to investigate the role the lawyer's linguistic style plays in the courtrooms.
- 3) It is highly recommended that the lawyers in the Arabic courtrooms need more space and freedom so as to express themselves using the appropriate variety of language since their job in the courtroom is very limited and the judge does most of the work in the courtroom.
- 4) It is also recommended that the Arabic lawyers ought to attend international conferences so as to see how the English lawyers use their linguistic style to handle the lawsuits and pleadings and to get more experience as well as knowing more about law in the other cultures.
- 5) The new students of law (who are supposed to be lawyers) ought to attend concentrated sessions about law and lawyering in order to get full knowledge about their roles and what to do in the courts.

- 6) The students of law ought to have practical lessons about law and how to deal with certain issues in the courtroom.
- 7) It is also recommended that the lawyers ought to be aware of the technical, semi-technical and common words and how and where to use them.
- 8) Another recommendation is that it will be significant to have students who have dual knowledge about law and linguistics so as to produce the fruitful studies in these fields.
- 9) There should be more focus on the new field of study which mixes forensic linguistics and corpus linguistics to offer a new way of analyzing the data. This field is neglected in Arabic countries.

The following suggestions for further research can be made:

- 1). Investigating mock trials in Arabic which are absolutely neglected.
- 2). Comparing trials of English and Arabic politicians.
- 3). Forensic linguistics can be used to deal and handle the crimes of the social media.
- 4). It is also suggested that attention is to be directed to the trials in some short stories, such as *The Merchant of Venice* since it is a good chance to mix forensic linguistics with literature.
- 5). Investigating coding and decoding of suicide letters and finger printing.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the personal assistance given to us in the process of collecting the data by the judges, responsible persons and lawyers in the courts in some Iraqi governorates. We are also indebted to the statistians involved in making the statistics of the paper.

References

- Ahmed, K. S. (2016). *The Civil Responsibility of the Lawyer about Disclosure of Professional Secrets: A Contrastive Study between the Islamic Jurisprudence and the Secular Law*. Cairo: Dar Alnhdha Al-Arabiya.
- Alcaraz, E., & Hughes, B. (2002). *Legal Translation Explain*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Al-Mashdedani, F. T. (2014). *Guarantees of the Lawyering fees, the Responsibility of the Lawyer and Client, their duties and Rights and Contrastive Study for a Typical Contract Suggested for Fees*. Baghdad: Dar AL-Murtadha.
- Al-Sayid, A. (2004). *dirasaat fii ?alisaaniyat ?al9arebiya: buneit ?ald3umla ?a9erabiya- ?alterakiib ?alneHawiya wa ?alteredawiliya: 9ilim ?alneHiw wa 9ilim ?almaa9ni. (Studies in the Arabic linguistics: The Structure of the Arabic Sentence- the Syntactic and Pragmatic Construction: Syntax)*. Aman: Dar Alhamid lilneshir.
- Al-Ubaidi, D. M. (2012). *The Role of the Lawyer in the Civil Lawsuit*. Beirut: Manshoorat Al-Halebi Al-Hiqooqiya.
- Aziz, Y. (1989). *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Mosul: Mosul University Press.
- Betti, M. J. (1998). The Employment of English Lexicon by Adolescent Speakers of Nassirriya Iraqi Arabic as Determined by Sex Differentiation. *Al-Qdisya Journal*, 3(2), 72-79.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Boyle, F., Capps, D., Plowden, P., & Sandford, S. (2003). *A Practical Guide to Lawyering Skills* (3rd ed.). London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: C.U.P. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805226>
- Bryant, S., & Peters, J. K. (2005). Five Habits for Cross-Cultural Lawyering. In K. H. Barrett & H. G. William (Eds.), *Race, Culture, Psychology & Law*. London: SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233536.n4>
- Chapman, J. (2000). *Interviewing and Counseling* (2nd ed.). London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.
- Cohen, K. S. (2008). *Expert Witnessing and Scientific Testimony: Surviving in the Courtroom*. London: CRC Press.
- Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.

- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Dikker, T. (1936). *The Bel-man of London*. London: Dent.
- Flowerdew, J., & Mahlberg, M. (2009). *Lexical Cohesion and Corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Garner, B. (1999). *Black's Law Dictionary* (7th ed.). Traverse: West Group.
- Goodrich, P. (1987). *Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Mathiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hill, G., & Hill, T. (2009). *Nolo's Plain English Law Dictionary* (1st ed.). California: Nolo.
- Hobbs, B. (2007). Lawyers' Use of Humor as Persuasion. *International Journal of Humor and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2007.007>
- Khitaby, M. (1991). *lisaniat: medxal ?ila ?insijam ?alxiTab* (Linguistics: An Introduction to the Harmony of Discourse). Beirut :elmarkezeltheqafiel?arabi.
- Mattila, H. (2006). *Comparative Legal Linguistics*. London: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- McCarthy, M. (1993). Spoken Discourse Markers in Written Text. In Sinclair et al. (Eds.), *Techniques of Description Spoken and Written Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (1991). Lexical Cohesion Computed by thesaural as an Indicator of the Structure of Text. *A Journal of Computational Linguistics*, 17, 21-48.
- Nolfi, E. A. (2009). *Legal Terminology Explained*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O' Grady, G. (2010). *A Grammar of Spoken English Discourse: The Intonation of Increments*. London: Continuum.
- Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- Phillips, A. (2003). *Lawyers' Language: How and Why Legal Language is Different*. London: Routledge.
- Phillips, L., & Jorgensen, M. W. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983921>
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *Discourse Studies: An Introduction Textbook*. Philadelphia: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.69>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Gefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Journal of Language*, 50, 696-735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>
- Saha, T. (2010). *Textbook on Legal Methods, Legal Systems and Research*. New Delhi: Universal Law.
- Seligson, S. (2002). *The Bilingual Courtroom: Court Interpreters in the Judicial Process*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shinichiro, T. (2014). General English Words in English Legal Discourse. *Journal of Language, Culture and Communication*, 6, 87-103.
- Sinclair, J. (1993). Written Discourse Structure. In Sinclair et al. (Eds.), *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203168097>
- Suadi, A. M. (2010). *The Civil Responsibility of the Lawyer about his Professional Mistakes*. Amman: Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution
- Taford, J. A. (1986). An Introduction to Trial Law. *Law Journal at University of Missouri*, 51, 624-711.
- Teitelbaum, L. E. (1975). The Advocates Role in the Legal System. *Journal of New Mexico Law Review*, 5, 1-24.
- Tiersma, P. (1999). *Legal Language*. Chicago IL: UCP.
- Woods, N. (2006). *Describing Discourse: A Practical Guide to Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: OUP.

Zain, O. M. (2004). *A Study of the Lawyer's Positions and their Working Tools in the Arabic Countries*. Beirut: Manshoorat Al-Halebi Al-Hiqooqiya.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).