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ABSTRACT

Firthian prosodic analysis asserts the integration of both phonematic units and prosodies in the sense that both constitute one whole of integration between system and structure. That integration is not simply a string of segments into a linear order rather is seen as a part of a larger relation. The context in which the prosodic features occur is intensively called for and this creates a system that cannot be applied or imposed upon other systems. Courtroom discourse shows spoken interaction that exhibits interesting prosodic features. Some prosodic features are more prominent than others, depending on the role of the speaker, the part of discourse, and the context. Polysystemicity is intended to show that each system carries its own rules and features that needless to be generalized to other systems. The use of each prosodic feature by each participant carries an aim which is different from other participant’s aims. Therefore what is significant in courtroom discourse is the proper employment of the prosodic features to achieve purposes by each participant on argumentation part which is the selected part of each trial in the study.

1. Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Prosodic analysis is one of the most significant issues in phonology and linguistics. It is controversial at the same time. It entails many relations starting from grammatical aspects and reaching wider discourse. What is considered approval or interesting may be not so in other contexts. In the sense that any change in prosodic feature involves a change in meaning and the speaker or listener must shape his/her interaction in the light of that. Courtroom discourse is the context in which prosodic features are used to convey different meanings through the role of the participants engaged in the trials. Each participant carries an aim and tries to convince others with his/her opinion through argumentation. Firthian prosodic analysis is particularly used to uncover prosodic features in courtroom discourse which is spoken and interactive that all participants must engage in conversation according to each role specified in interaction whether asking, arguing, or answering. The use of different tones in different
parts of the utterance will result in a meaning different in use from one situation to another.

Integration between grammatical category and the employment of particular prosodic feature will lead to satisfaction, approval and so on. Since the ultimate aim in argumentation is to satisfy the listener, it is potentially necessary to focus on the proper use of prosodic features to achieve participant’s aim.

In this study, an attempt is made to show some of the merits of Firthian prosodic approach in accounting for courtroom spoken interaction. It is the first study which attempts at discovering the prosodic features utilized by participants in courtroom discourse. The data are taken from real courtroom situations, in particular the speech of the judge, lawyer, witness, etc. Courtroom discourse is characterized by the presence of prosodic features in particular ways. The enthusiastic spirit of the lawyer, for instance, is reflected clearly in his tone, stress, emphasis, etc., especially through his decisive part of the trial. Then the prosodies will be patterned according to their prominence. It is both qualitative and quantitative study.

1.2 Aims of the study
This study aims at:

1- Showing practically the main principles underlying the Firthian approach notably by its superiority to segmental approach in accounting for the interaction among participants in courtroom discourse.

2- Uncovering the prosodic features utilized in courtroom discourse among participants according to role classification and the extent to which Firthian prosodic analysis is adequate to reveal these features.

3- Highlighting prosodic features which are prominent in argumentation and which are essential to achieve intended meaning since each participant has a particular aim.

4- Individual variations on one role level are not significant to this study. Variations among roles are significant because the roles are not equally distributed.

1.3 Hypotheses : It is hypothesized that:

1- Courtroom discourse presents particular prosodic features which can be clearly and significantly reflected in the spoken form of each participant and this is accounted for through Firthian prosodic approach which emphasizes upon syntagmatic relations.

2- Argumentation in cross-legal examination is the part that reveals several interesting prosodies. These prosodies are
necessary for meaning to achieve particular purpose whether to persuade, confirm, or refuse, etc.

3- Not all prosodies appear in the same way through trials: some appear more prominent than others, and those will be emphasized.

4- Each role is considered as a representative one, in the sense that lawyer’s tone in the trial is taken into consideration to uncover the type of tone prominently used in argumentation by the lawyer’s role and its difference from other participants, the same is true about the judge and other roles.

1.4 Limits of the study

This study is limited to:

1- Only prosodic features in the light of Firthian approach are taken into account.
2- It is limited to stress, rhythm, tone and intonation which are analyzed in integration between system and structure.
3- Only the third part of the trial is taken into consideration which is cross-legal examination in which argumentation among participants takes place.
4- One trial is considered and the trial is taken from US Supreme Court. Participants are a judge, a lawyer, and a consultant.
5- Overlapped speech and interrupted sentences are excluded from this study because they cannot be measured reliably in praat, and they cannot present full meaning.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Firthian Prosodic Approach

Phonological theory is greatly supported by the work J. R. Firth (1890-1960); he is the first linguist who presents a proper sense of the term prosody and prosodic analysis. His 'Sounds and Prosodies' 1948 represents the first remarkable paper which documents exemplifications of the theory. Before that article, Firth presents some notions and remarks to prosodic analysis in his papers at 1934, 1935, 1936, and then Firth and Rogers 1937. According to Firth, several features of phonological theory were not explicitly dealt with in phonemic analysis. Many American authors like W. F. Twaddle in 'On defining the phoneme', C. F. Hockett in 'A system of descriptive phonology', and Z.S. Harris in 'Simultaneous Components in Phonology', tried to provide notions similar to Firth.¹ But they had worked within the limits of phonemics. Therefore Firth feels that the phoneme theory itself needs much verification and implementation (Palmer, 1970:ix-x).
Robins(1957:188) clarifies that Firth initiates the theory of prosodic analysis, which is later developed by his group working in London. Prosodic Analysis falls within the framework of phonology, and this occurs in the common area of descriptive linguistics. With the publication of the great Swiss scholar Ferdinand de Saussure's lectures in 1916 Cours de Linguistique generale, Paris,1949(4th edition), the modern era of descriptive linguistics has started. His lectures helped as an essential factor in transmitting the academic study of language from comparative and historical feature, to the principle of synchronic linguistics.

In a similar sense, Lyons (1962:191) denotes that the notion of phoneme is largely used particularly in America. Different phonemicists tend to use the same term. The main principles and concepts of phonemicists are similar which are in turn different from those of non-phonemicists. The term phoneme is used to refer to segmental phoneme as separate from suprasegmental phomemes. Then, there is an essentially different type of phonological analysis has been developed in London headed by J. R. Firth under the name “the prosodic approach." It is not supposed that either the first or the second will be considered adequate and can be used to account for the phonological structure in general, but one may be more appropriate than the other in the description of a particular language. Actually, any natural language cannot be primarily phonemic, or primarily prosodic (ibid:192).

### 2.2 Prosody and Prosodic analysis

The term prosody has been defined differently. It is important to mention that the origin of the word 'prosody' is taken from Greek which means "song sung to music" ,i.e, prosody includes words that are associated with music. In verse, it is used to handle versification rules which are basically patterns of rhythm. As regard linguistics, the situation is different; it is associated with features like intonation and stress. Although the boundaries and demarcation of prosody and its relation to other similar terms is hard to find, yet it is simply distinguished for being of extended nature (Fox,2000:1).

According to Trask (1996:292-293), the term prosodic can be defined in two ways: narrowly and broadly. In the narrow sense, it refers to variations, especially as recognized phonetically, in pitch and loudness, or phonologically to variations in tone, pitch, and stress. In the broad sense, it means any variable whether phonetic or phonological, that can be explained in relation to a domain larger than a single segment, and it means suprasegmental. While specifying the term prosodic analysis to the distinctive approach in phonology
founded by Firth and developed by his students in London school. It includes phonetic and phonological characteristics which are extracted from phonological representations and considered in two ways: prosodies or prosodic elements, and phonematic units (ibid).

Moreover, Crystal (2003:378) adds that the term prosody is used as a mass noun in suprasegmental phonetics and phonology, and also in the narrow sense. It is used and considered as a count noun in prosodic phonology by J. R. Firth. In addition to pitch, juncture, and stress, prosody is used to include other features of secondary articulation, such as nasalization, labialization, etc., which are essentially used for phonotactic limitations, or for specifying grammatical structure as for in instance in the phenomenon of vowel harmony.

Accordingly, Carr (2008:138) gives a definition of prosody that is related partly to suprasegmental features of speech, and partly to Firthian phonology. Besides, he also relates the term to the subsequent developments of Firthian phonology in the form of non-linear approaches, namely: autosegmental phonology.  

While Roach (2002:62) gives a very general definition by stating that prosody refers to features of speech which consist of sequences of more than one sound, and represented in the prosodic features like intonation, stress, rhythm, etc., Catford (1988:226) also presents a common notion of prosodic features as being phonetic ones, which describe relations that exist between two levels: segmental and stretches above the level of segments.

From a functional point of view, prosody is defined as being a feature which is abstracted above the segmental limits and is capable of characterizing, synthesizing language structure (Ball, Möller and Rutter, 2010:116). In addition, its function, in terms of Firthian prosody, is reflected in the horizontal phonological aspects and the function of its higher level is tone, for example, which is not specified to one place in a string, or it is one of many features like palatalization that can be specified to one word or syllable in the structure (ibid.).

One of the followers of FPA is Hill who gives a definition of prosodic analysis in the exact sense of the prosodic approach as" a system of analysis applicable to stretches of speech, theoretically of any length whatever the extreme case would be the whole corpus of a person's utterances in his lifetime." (1966:199).

2.3 The Structure of the Syllable

Syllable structure occupies a very significant position in FPA and it is considered as one of the main types of prosodies. Therefore, some information will be given in this section related to the nature,
construction, and constraints of syllable combinations. Nathan (2008:43-58) observes that there are many arguments concerning the production of speech sounds. Most of them agree that sounds are pronounced in groups and it is difficult to utter a single sound. So, it is possible to utter a consonant and a vowel especially concerning stops as for instance, [θa] or [kɑ], that is easier than pronouncing the above sounds alone as [θ] or [k]. Therefore, the term syllable is used to describe units above the single segment. Physically, syllable cannot be represented (it cannot be seen in spectrogram, nor shown in x-ray films of speakers) but it is possible to comprehend syllables in words. Some of syllable rules are orthographically, it is easy to know the number of syllable(s) in word(s), but it is harder to specify exactly the place of syllable divisions, as the word sitting [si t hɪn] or [sɪt tɪn]. Single segments are organized in syllables, and syllables constitute a hierarchical structure. Besides, onset and rhyme are the parts of the syllable, in which onset contains all segments except vowel, and rhyme includes nucleus and coda. Onsets and codas are optional parts, a syllable may or may not include onset or coda, but nucleus is obligatory one. Nucleus is the vowel of the syllable, and coda is the consonant (which may be more than one consonant), some rules exist concerning the restrictions of the occurrence of consonants whether in onset or in coda. Before showing these rules it is important to clarify that hierarchical structure is the feature of the main components of a syllable: word, foot: (onset) peak (coda). Hill (1966:209-212) shows that possible combinations of sounds (consonants and vowels) constitute a very large number. In monosyllabic words, for instance, C₁VC₂, it is observed that short vowels [ɪ], [ɛ], [a], [ɔ], [ʌ] with various consonants result in 225 possible combinations, in which only 15 or 6% are not permitted in CV combinations. Therefore, it is possible to get [pɪ], [prɪ], [plɪ], [pɛ], [prɛ], etc., like: pit, prince, plinth, peck, press, but *[skrɛ], and *[zʌ] are not permitted. The above proportion will be increased if VC₂ combination is investigated and so on (ibid).

2.3.1 Stress: Prominence and Levels

Stress occupies essential position in prosodic analysis that is reflected in its role and function in determining strong and weak syllables in relation to rhythm. It is the main factor in intonation to determine tonic syllables. Katamba (1989: 221) affirms that stress is greatly associated with the concept of prominence which is perceived as an auditory feature. A stressed syllable tends to be higher in pitch, loudness, and longer in duration than unstressed ones. However, pitch and length are more potential and significant scales than loudness.
While Abercrombie (1967:35), Gimson (1989:96), and Crystal (1998:363), assert that stress is basically related to the amount of force from the lungs in which harder pressure is imposed on the chest to produce stressed syllables. If the vibration is great it will results in louder and longer sound.

Interestingly, O’connor (1980:91) observes that all monosyllable words are stressed, while multisyllabic words include rules of different levels of prominence. The most prominent syllables receive primary stress, whereas less prominent are secondary stress, and weak syllables are those which essentially associated with schwa /ə/, the last two are unstressed but of unequal level.

Furthermore, Roach (2002:70) denotes that stress falls into two major classes. The first one is word stress, and the second is sentence stress. Basically word stress includes all lexical words, namely, nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Sentence stress is intended to validate the role of the word in establishing significant meaning to the sentence. In this study the tonic syllable (stressed and prominent) of the tone unit is the word that is significant to carry or add significant meaning.

Katamba (1989: 222), on the other hand, observes that in words of more than one syllable, the problem of stress assignment is raised more than in monosyllabic words. Since each lexical word (in isolation) is stressed it is potentially necessary to focus on words with complex structure in the sense complex words which include a suffix or more. The degree of prominence is also different in multisyllabic words; consider for instance, the word ‘mentality’ the anti-penult syllable is more prominent than the first and the final, as well as penult syllable.

2.3.2 Rhythm

Rhythm is largely connected with stress. It is simply the arrangement of stressed and unstressed syllables in a unit or in an utterance. English rhythm is stressed time but its occurrence is relatively regular, in the sense that it is not necessarily to have exact intervals from one syllable to another. A major unit in rhythm is foot. In which the duration from one stressed syllable to another is the same regardless of the number of syllables that exists in the foot unit. A foot may consist of a sequence of S (stressed, strong syllable) plus a W (weak, unstressed syllable) but if W occurs initially in an utterance it will be out of rhythmic structure because it is out of foot unit. So a foot must start with strong stressed syllable and followed or not by a weak syllable. See O’cconor (1998:97), Halliday(1967:12), and Christopherson (1970: 175), Pitt & Samuel(1990).
3. Methodology
3.1 Model of Analysis

Henderson's model (1949) is adopted in this study. It is basically synthetic approach (which means the integration of various aspects of prosodic structure at different structural units). Relying on Henderson's model, prosodic features are dominant whether shaping on the piece (word) or the sentence and will be revealed in particular units of the modern spoken courtroom discourse. Since Henderson relates prosody to style whether formal or informal and uses polysystemic principle in relation to speech situation, these will be taken into consideration in the analysis. Prosodic features are examined in syllables, words, and connected speech on the sentence level. The minimum unit is the syllable, and the maximum one is the sentence. However no prosodic feature can be observed above the sentence unit. Prosodic and phonematic elements are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The units</th>
<th>The prosodic features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence prosody</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence parts prosodies</td>
<td>Stress, length, tone relations among related syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable prosodies</td>
<td>Length, tone, stress, juncture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable parts prosodies</td>
<td>Aspiration, unexploded closure, clear and dark /L/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word prosodies</td>
<td>Velarization, labialization, stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonematic consonant and vowel units</td>
<td>Plosives, nasals, fricatives, glides, affricates; front, back, rounded, unrounded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth mentioning that phonematic units are not pronounceable, rather they are abstracted as C and V units.

3.2 Data Selection and Description

Legal text is written and spoken, and this provides a fertile field for study. Even written cases include spoken words that are transcribed in writing. The purpose of this study is to explore the prosodic features conducted by courtroom participants; therefore it is worth mentioning some points related to courtroom discourse.

3.2.1 Courtroom Discourse

Courtroom discourse is a kind of spoken interaction. It is a verbal behaviour integrated into the context of the courtroom. What is distinctive about interaction inside the courtroom is the employment of unique linguistic context as well as the restrictive role played by participants in trials. (Stenstrom, 1994:169) and (Bauman, 1977:5).
What concern this study is the prosodic aspects reflected through the speech of the judge, lawyer, defendant, etc. Other linguistic aspects related to syntax, semantics, pragmatics are disregarded. Showing the variation in the prosodic patterns will uncover the nature of interaction employed by the participants inside the courtroom and show the extent of the applicability of FPA, in particular, in revealing these variations.

Firthians insist on studying spoken discourse, much of their work being centred on phonology as the main concern in which meanings can be contrasted. However, Stenstrom(1994:169) argues that spoken interaction can be divided into three patterns:
1. Interviews
2. Discussions
3. Conversations

A legal cross-examination is considered one of the facets of interviews because it involves particular questions and courtroom examination and manifests a purpose which is only discovered later, after discussion with the person who is the subject of the cross-examination. Therefore the second party, or the interviewee, will be of special importance in giving answers. Particular prosodic features will be shown through pauses, intonation, stress, rhythm, etc, which are important throughout the trial, because each prosodic feature carries a function and has a particular effect.

3.2.2 Participant's Classification by Role

Courtroom discourse is based on the role played by each participant in the trial (cf Maley,1994), therefore the data will be divided on this basis:

- Judge
- Lawyer
- Consultant
- Attorney general
- Witness
- Jury

The role of the jury will be considered optional; the other five roles are obligatory. The nature of each role is an interactive one, but is not exchangeable (for further information, see Maley, 1994:135). It is possible to show participants' roles in the following table:

Table (3.5) Classification by Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant From</th>
<th>Participant to</th>
<th>Frequent sentence type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>Declarative/interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Data Analysis And Discussion**

This section deals with the analysis of the twenty selected utterances in an exchange between the judge(male), and the lawyer(female), on one hand, and the consultant(male) and the lawyer, on the other. The judge and the lawyer are the main participants. The procedure is to analyse each trial independently, then collectively, focusing upon its utterances in prosodic structure and grammatical realization by following these steps:

1. Since Praat creates a text grid for each sound file provided, it is considered economic to represent other three tiers, namely phonetic symbols and transcription, tone unit segmentation and structure, and rhythmic structure after showing the Praat picture.

2. After reading praat’s annotated sound file, each utterance will be divided up into its component parts: tone unit and rhythmic structure in tables. Other prosodic features will be shown in the synthesis of the utterance².

3. Some utterances are selected, which the researcher thought as carrying the most salient features, as representative examples to shade light upon the integration of prosodic-acoustic analysis, and how participants’ tones and sentence type are integrated. Frequency of occurrence of prominent tone types, tonic placement, and sentence type will be dealt with in the discussion.

The following is an overall framework of the trial:

1. Topic: Adoptive couple vs. Baby girl
2. Type: civil trial
3. Participants involved: Judge, Defense lawyer, consultant.
4. Trial summary: the Lawyer who is prosecuting on the behalf of the plaintiff is trying to convince the judge and the jury that the adoptive couple is right and the birth father is no more qualified, the central speakers are the lawyer and the judge.

The following table presents a detailed prosodic analysis (PA) of the selected utterances of the trial:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawyer</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Declarative/interrogative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Interrogative/declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Interrogative/declarative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.1) Prosodic Analysis of the First Trial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant involved</th>
<th>U. No</th>
<th>TS &amp; No.</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Tonic Placemnt</th>
<th>General Effects and Function</th>
<th>Frequent Sentence Type</th>
<th>Rhythmic Structure and Structure of Tone-unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Judge 1              | 1     | 1.A:Answer /əˈnsə/ | Tone1 | NT (Neutral Tonic) | To emphasize the last content word and to give the impression of power in formal context. | Interrogative (simple) | F1 /ˈplɪz/  
F2 /ˈkæd kæd ai /ˈha ˈhær əˈnsə  
PH /ˈkæd kæd ai ˈha ˈhær T  
T /əˈnsə plɪz/ |
| Lawyer 2             | 2     | 2.A. Answer /əˈnsə/  
2.B. Custody /ˈkæstədi/  
2.C. Protected /ˈprəˈtkt/ | 2.A:MT  
2.B: NT  
2.C: NT | 2. A: to highlight new information and give much focus to it.  
2. B: to make the last content word as stressed on (last weight principle)  
2. C: also to focus on the last content word as carrying the major focus in the utterance. | Complex Declarative | F1 /ˈjæs əˈnsə/əˈnsə iz  
F2 /ˈpɜːrənt wʊ ˈvɪzɪ ˈteʃn  
F3 /ˈrɑːts ˈhæz /ˈkæstədi əˈnsə  
F4 /ˈpɜːrənt wʊ ˈvɪzɪ ˈteʃn  
F5 /ˈrɑːts ˈhæz /ˈkæstədi əˈnsə iz  
PH TS T |
| Lawyer 3             | 3     | 3.A: needs /ˈniːdz/  
3.B: NT | 3. A: to make much affirmation on this element of the utterance that receives speaker attention.  
3.B: It occurs on the last content word since the speaker leaves it as new notion. | Complex Declarative | F1 /ˈsɔː jəl ˈbəʊ ˈdæd/  
F2  
F3 niːdz tə ˈdjuː tə ˈprəˌtek tɪmself iz tu ˈak  
F4  
F5 /wənˈliːglˈrɑːts/  
PH H |
| Lawyer 4             | 4     | 4.A: legal /ˈliːgl/  
4.B: child /ˈʃʃəld/  
4.B: NT  
4.C: NT | 4.A: it is used by the speaker for the sake of contrast.  
4.B: it is the focus of the speaker on the last parts of the utterance.  
4.C: it is stressed and prominent syllable. | Simple Declarative | F1 /ˈdə wæz /nauˈliːgl rəliː ʃəf  
F2  
F3 /tʃiːtwɪn ˈdəz /ˈʃʃəld and əˈ  
F4  
F5 /ˈfə ˈdær zəˈhæz ˈreliː ʃəf/  
PH H TS  
F6 /ˈdə wæz /nauˈliːgl rəliː ʃəf  
PH TS  
H /tʃiːtwɪn ˈdəz /ˈʃʃəld and əˈ  
H TS T  
H /ˈfə ˈdær zəˈhæz ˈreliː ʃəf/  
PH H |
| Judge 5              | 5     | 5.A: obligation /əˈliːʒən/  
5.B: father /ˈfaːðə/ | 5.A:MT  
5.B: NT | 5.A: it is used as a lexical contrast (he is obliged rather than being free).  
5.B: It is assigned as being ‘tonic-bearing’ syllable. | Simple Declarative | F1 /ˈwel ˈdə wæz əˈsa/ˈpəːt  
F2  
F3 /ˈliːʒən ənˈdæt ənwəd  
F4 /ˈfə ˈdær/  
H PH H  
F5 /ˈwel ˈdə wæz əˈsa/ˈpəːt  
PH TS T  
F6 /ˈliːʒən ənˈdæt ənwəd  
TS T  
H /ˈfə ˈdær/  
PH H |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant involved</th>
<th>U. No</th>
<th>TS &amp; No.</th>
<th>Tone Placemen nt</th>
<th>Tonic Placemen nt</th>
<th>General Effects and Function</th>
<th>Frequent Sentence Type</th>
<th>Rhythmic Structure and Structure of Tone-unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Parental /pə rentkl/</td>
<td>T4 (rise-fall) MT</td>
<td>It is emphatically used by the speaker to highlight its importance before any neutral meaning that it carries communicative important meaning.</td>
<td>Simple Interrogative</td>
<td>F1 F2 F3 //wɔi iznt ətæt ə ˈpə rentkl/ ræt/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H PH TS T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH H PH TS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H PH TS H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH H PH TS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H PH ˈwən fəm ˈhʌn F5 F6 F7 F8 /ˈmiːŋz tə ˈmiːnɪŋ ˈa/ ˈfæməl/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PH H H H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant involved</th>
<th>U. No</th>
<th>TS &amp; No.</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Tonic Placement</th>
<th>General Effects and Function</th>
<th>Frequent Sentence Type</th>
<th>Rhythmic Structure and Structure of Tone-unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11A:</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>11A: it is of special informative message, because the speaker makes the adjective of preceding the noun as the most prominent form and that is not the normal rule. It is the biological rather than the ‘adoptive’</td>
<td>Compound Declarative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11B:</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>11B: it is the usual way of specifying the focus of prominence rules ‘end weight principle’ it is the position of nucleus syllable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table (4.1) presents a number of prosodic features which operate in a structure of interrelated units. Sentence prosodies are expressed in the way in which words are combined together, and prosodies which have influence upon the sentence as a whole. Relations among words are stress and boundaries, and that is in relation to the number of syllables or word type whether lexical or grammatical as well as its internal structure. Sentence prosodies are tone and intonation, and among sentence pieces are rhythm and stress. But before illustrating further instances it is necessary to show how phonematic units are arranged and expressed within FPA:

Vowels and consonants are CV segmental relation. One is consonantal tier and the other is vowel tier. Both are abstracted not in terms of phonemes which are linearly contrasted. It is not significant to show how C and V are different rather it is the way in which both are composed to add meaning and be part of larger units.

The tone-unit is the major speaker’s focus. That many phonological units are held with it. In the judge’s U1, which consists of one tone unit, for instance, it is observed that the word ‘answer’ is the tonic syllable which is the core of meaning, it is falling tone, and it is neutral tonic, although the utterance starts with a rising pitch with ‘could’, see the following figure:
Figure (4.1) Praat analysis of Judge’s U1

Here the blue line is pitch pattern representing the F0 which is taken into consideration in this analysis in specifying stressed syllables and tonic syllable as well as tone type. Yellow line refers to intensity which is directly related to loudness, and it has shown variation bounded to the speed of the speech. Whenever the speaker talks quickly the intensity is lowered. So pitch variations are regarded as a scale for prominence to show the tone of the speaker and stressed syllables. The proof that ‘answer’ is the TS, the second utterance has emphasis up on it which is also TS but it is MT, see the following figure

Figure (4.2) Praat analysis of the lawyer’s U2
Here the word: answer /ɑːnsə/ is the TS of the first tone unit. The presence of the long pause between the second and third tonic syllable is a prosodic feature. That pause is to prepare the listener that what is coming is new information within the discourse function of intonation.

Boundaries among tone units are not stated by fixed rules, in figure (4.2) it is clear, but sometimes the speaker deliberately makes pauses in places that are not allowed grammatically, observe the following figure:

![Figure (4.3) Praat analysis of Lawyer’s U3](image)

Here it is supposed grammatically (the grammatical function of intonation) that the boundary is between ‘himself’ and ‘is’ but the speaker makes a pause in an unusual position.

Stress shift is also a significant prosodic marker that is capable of changing the meaning in the structure, but not the lexical meaning. Observe for instance:

U4L: There was no legal relationship between this child and the birth father or his relatives.

/legal/ was not stressed in this position because it is followed by a noun ‘relationship’, and priority of end weight principle is given to a noun not to an adjective. Here ‘legal’ is part of a larger combination of items in which it is stressed by the speaker for emphasis on the
‘subject matter’. While the same sequence occurs in the sentence, namely: ‘birth father’ stress is on the second element noun ‘father’, follows the normal rules of stress placement. These can well be observed in rhythmical structure as:

/ðeә wәz  nәu/ ˈli:gl rɪleɪʃnʃɪp бɪ/ˈtwiːn ɪdәnd әnd әә b3:θ /ˈfә:ðә sә: hɪz

/ˈrәәtɪvz/

5. Conclusions
The following conclusions have been arrived at:

1. Courtroom discourse shows a particular prosodic pattern. First tones are contrasted in the middle of the utterance towards the end. The most frequent tones are falling and rising falling tone, which confirms that what is presented in trial is necessarily new information. Pauses are not clearly stated before tone-units, but sometimes are stated in positions which intended to lead the listener to pay attention more to the next information.

2. If polysystemicity is to be understood within FPA as operating on different linguistic systems in which one cannot be imposed on another, so we get a narrow sense of polysystemicity. Within courtroom discourse polysystemicity operates with two senses: the first one is the way in which prosodic features are structured each in its own system, for instance falling tone is used to convey finality and confirmation, which cannot be imposed on other forms of intonation(each has its own system). The second one is the broader sense in which polysystimicity means the whole context in which speakers are engaged with. In this part (argumentation and examination) the context is rather formal (humour is rare at this part but may be evident in other parts of the trial). So it is not valid to impose that system on other parts of courtroom discourse. Each has its own system and that is essentially conveyed through prosody.

3. In any role involved it is observed that it is the purpose of the speaker which imposes rules upon his/her choice in manipulating prosodic features.

4. Not all interactions take place between two parts, in this sense it is closer to everyday discourse, but it is away from everyday discourse in the sense of formality and the right for interruption on the part of the judge. It is not preferred to be interrupted in everyday discourse, but in courtroom discourse interruption is used to clarify matters and uncover any ambiguity.

5. The use of falling tone and rise fall tone are the most salient forms of intonation. But in each interaction they are used to convey
different meaning relative to the participant role as well as subject matter of the trial.

6. Acoustic-prosodic analysis has resulted in integration between system and structure in the sense presented in FPA, phonetic exponents reveal features that can be used in phonological level. Pitch is an acoustic measurement used to convey important information on the phonological system through contrastive tones.
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الملخص

يؤكد مذبب فيرث العروضي على ضم الوحدات الصوتية والتنغيمات معاً لأنهما يمثلان
اندماج النظام مع التركيب. لا يشير هذا الاندماج إلى تنابع السواكن والحركات خطياً، بل
هو جزء من علاقة أكبر. وهنا تستدعي الحاجة إلى الاهتمام بالسياق الذي يعمل فيه
السمات العروضية لأنه سيخلق نظاماً غير مفروض على أنظمة أخرى أو يكون جزءاً منها.

يعكس خطاب المحاكمات تفاعلاً متنوعاً محملة بسمات عروضية، بعض منها أكثر تفرداً
وحضراً من غيرها شيئاً تبعاً لدور المتكلم وجزء الخطاب والسياق. ترى مقارنة (تعدد الأنظمة)
العروضية أن كل نظام يحمل معه أدواراً وسمات لا تحتاج إلى التعميم على أنظمة أخرى.
لذلك فهدف كل فرد في خطاب المحاكم يختلف عن الفرد الآخر والاستخدام البديل للصفات
العروضية هو ماسيوصلية إلى غايته في المناقشة وهو الجزء الذي تم اختياره في كل
محاكمه.