

ISSN: 1839-8308



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
LAW, LANGUAGE & DISCOURSE**

Volume 12, Number 1 (June, 2024)



**ACADEMICS EDUCATION
INTERNATIONAL JOURNALS**

OWNED AND OPERATED BY ACADEMIC JOURNAL EDITING ENTERPRISE INC.

The *International Journal of Law, Language & Discourse* (IJLLD) is an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural peer-reviewed scholarly journal, integrating academic areas of law, linguistics, discourse analysis, psychology and sociology, presenting articles related to legal issues, review of cases, comments and opinions on legal cases and serving as a practical resource for lawyers, judges, legislators, applied linguists, discourse analysts and those academics who teach the future legal generations.

For electronic submission

and to read more, please visit

<https://www.academics.education/ijlld/>

Academic Journal Editing Enterprises is the legal parent of Academics Education International Journals, our online division. The company is a legally incorporated entity with a Board of Directors and is registered under the Securities and Exchange Commission, Philippines. Academics Education is a division of SCOPE, the Scientific Community of Professional Educators. TESOL Academy is the teacher training arm of SCOPE.

© International Journal of Law, Language & Discourse (IJLLD) 2024.

This book is in copyright. Each scholar-author retains the right to be recognized as author of their individual contributions. You should also, under customary scholarship, cite the source (author, journal, year).



Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

ISSN 1839 8308



Index

ISSN 1839 8308



| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Foreword - Benefits and Drawbacks of Plain Legal English <i>Patrizia Giampieri e Vanessa Leonardi</i> | ... | 5 |
| Who's afraid of the passive? A corpus-study of passives in two legal genres and their simplified Plain English versions <i>Manon Bouyé</i> | ... | 11 |
| Approaching Plain Language In a Legal Translation Classroom <i>Ondřej Klábal</i> | ... | 41 |
| Moving from a rule-based approach to a functional understanding in Plain Legal Language <i>Hairenik Aramayo Eliazarian</i> | ... | 61 |
| On Critical Law Students' Attitudes Towards Plain Language <i>Aleksandra Łuczak</i> | ... | 83 |

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Patrizia Anesa
University of Bergamo, Italy

SHORT REPORTS, SUMMARIES, & FORUMS EDITOR

Maria Francisca Carneiro, PhD
Federal University of Paraná (retired), Brazil

REPRESENTATIVE EDITOR, AMERICAN TRANSLATORS ASSOCIATION

Paula Arturo
Universidad de Palermo, Universidad Austral, Argentina

SENIOR ADVISORS

Dr. John Adamson
University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan

Benedict Sheehy, PhD FAAL
Professor of Law, Canberra Law School
University of Canberra, ACT, Australia

Alan Runcieman, Adjunct Professor
(Department of Applied Linguistics,
Interpreting and Translation)
The University of Vic
The Central University of Catalonia
Vic, Catalonia, Spain

ADVISORY BOARD

Susan Berk-Seligson
Vanderbilt University, USA
Ruth Breeze
Universidad de Navarra, Spain
Craig Hoffman
Georgetown University, USA
Catherine Way
University of Granada, Spain
Zhen-hua Wang PhD
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

Jan Engberg
Aarhus University, Denmark
Kyo Kageura
The University of Tokyo, Japan
Girolamo Tessuto
University of Campania 'Luigi Vanvitelli' /
University of Naples 'Federico II', Italy
Robert Dickey
(Former Chief Editor, Retired)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Stanislaw Goźdź-Roszkowski
University of Lodz, Poland
Santri Emilin Pingsaboi Djahimo
Nusa Cendana University, Indonesia
Clara (Ho-yan) Chan, PhD, LLB
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen,
China
Patrizia Giampieri
University of Camerino & "Carlo Bo" Graduate
School for Interpreters and Translators, Italy
Hjalmar Punla Hernandez
University of the Philippines Los Baños, Philippines
Alex Kasonde
Africa University, Zimbabwe
Karen McAuliffe, PhD, LLB
University of Exeter, UK
Pietro Manzella
Association for International and Comparative
Studies in the field of Labour Law and Industrial
Relations (ADAPT), Italy
María José Marín
Universidad de Murcia, Spain

Katia Peruzzo
University of Trieste, Italy
Mary Phelan, PhD
Dublin City University, Ireland
Anna Franca Plastina
University of Calabria, Italy
Giuseppina Scotto di Carlo, PhD
Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale, Italy
Guang Shi, PhD
Nanjing Normal University, China
Guadalupe Soriano Barabino
University of Granada, Spain
Dedi Sanjaya
Manager, Research Management Centre, University
College of Yayasan Pahang, Malaysia
Prof. Peter Storey
Head of the Department of English Language &
Literature, Hong Kong Shue Yan University,
Hong Kong
Katharine Sherwood
Consultant, Proofreader & Reviewer, Italy
Antonio Tagliatela, MA, PhD
University of Tuscia, Italy

FOUNDER AND EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Dr. Paul Robertson



Foreword

Patrizia Giampieri

University of Camerino, Italy

Leonardi Vanessa

Sapienza - University of Rome, Italy

Benefits and Drawbacks of Plain Legal English

The *Plain Language Movement* acted as the catalyst for the *Plain Legal English Movement* aimed at questioning and challenging the clarity of legal language. Mellinkoff's *The Language of the Law* (1963) is one of the most influential publications to emphasise the defects of legal language. In the search for precision and caution, legal English tends to be verbose, archaic and redundant (Wydick 1978; Tiersma 1999; Williams 2004 and 2011). Tiersma (1999, p. 51) posits that “lawyers seem to have developed linguistic quirks that have little communicative function and serve mainly to mark them as members of the legal fraternity”. Legal writing, in fact, is claimed to be “the largest body of poorly written literature ever created” (Lindsey 1990, p. 2).

The literature has long addressed and discussed *legalese*, which is an intricate aspect of the language of the law. Its features are varied, such as nominalisation (Tiersma 1999, pp. 77-79; Williams 2004, p. 115; Coulthard and Johnson 2010, p. 10), the frequent use of passive forms (Williams 2004, p. 114), long sentences characterised by syntactic discontinuities and embeddings (Williams 2004, pp. 113-114; Williams and Milizia 2008, p. 2215; Coulthard and Johnson 2010, p. 22), lack of punctuation (Williams 2004, p. 113; Coulthard and Johnson 2007, p. 45) and deictic elements where pronouns, particles and adverbs refer back or forward to concepts, things or people mentioned in the text (Abate 1998, pp. 14-16; Bhatia 2010: 28). Furthermore, legal language is male-gendered and characterised by sexism as it still uses masculine generics (Griffith 1988: 135;

Leonardi 2021). Some scholars highlight the ambiguity in the use of modal verbs (for example, “shall” is used to express obligations or prohibitions instead of future actions or scenarios) (Tiersma 1999). There are also archaic expressions sourced from Latin and French, which may be incomprehensible to laypersons (Laster 2001: 246; Bhatia 2010, pp. 26-29).

Given the above, the Plain English Movement began in the 1970s with the aim of reducing the verbosity and intricacy of legal language (Wydick 1978; Williams 2004, 2008 and 2011). Some of the main features of plain legal English are aimed at: 1) eliminating archaic and Latin expressions and unnecessary words to reduce sentence length, 2) reducing nominalisation, 3) avoiding the passive voice and 4) using gender-neutral language. In practice, the general purpose of plain legal English is to draft legal texts that can be understood by the “average person” (Wydick 1978; Williams 2008; Tessuto 2008a, 2008b; Maci 2014; Gotti 2016). Since then, huge strides have been made and several institutions and legal drafters have embraced plain English principles (Williams 2008; Williams and Milizia 2008; Gardner 2016; Williams 2023).

Nonetheless, the use of plain legal language is currently controversial. Some scholars, for instance, inform about lawyers' fear of making mistakes when they use plain English (Adler 2012, p. 15), whereas others highlight the necessity of complexity in some legal expressions or phrases, as excessive simplification may be wrong or could give rise to inaccuracies (Solan 1993, pp. 129-138). Furthermore, some researchers suggest avoiding the indiscriminate use of plain language in legal translation by pointing out that legal translators should refrain from rendering an intricate legal text into plain target language, unless expressly requested by their clients or translation project managers (Giampieri and Harper 2023, p. 15). Others report that more than a matter of language and linguistics, it is the intrinsic character of the law and the growing importance of technical rules that make legal texts intricate (Zódi 2019). Hence, plain English would not necessarily make things easier and as acknowledged by Tessuto (2008a, p. 26) “how effective plain legislative language and discourse may be to make sense of the intricacy and complexity of law to the ordinary reader is open to question”.

In light of the above considerations, this special issue provides a discussion forum for investigating legal language from a plain English perspective. It also aims to create opportunities to integrate the work of linguists and legal scholars who focus on analyses of the processes related to the popularisation of the language of the law.

This special issue seeks to bring to the fore the advantages and disadvantages of plain legal English in modern society, in multi-cultural settings and multidisciplinary contexts. To what extent is plain English a resource or a challenge to institutions, legal drafters and people? How can it improve or affect our lives? It also provides an interdisciplinary platform for researchers, practitioners, and educators to present the most recent innovations, trends, concerns, and solutions already adopted in their professional areas. Their insights will converge in a truly multidisciplinary effort to devise and build advanced networks of knowledge to facilitate the interpretation of data in the field of legal linguistics, legal language, and legal translation with a specific focus on plain legal English vs. *legalese* in modern society.

In terms of contributions, Manon Bouyé conducts a comprehensive corpus-based analysis of passive forms within two distinct legal genres and their corresponding plain language versions. The primary objective of this analysis is to ascertain the extent to which passive constructs are deployed in legal mediation documents intended for the general public. To this end, two *legalese* corpora are scrutinised: one comprising legislative documents from the United Kingdom and New Zealand and the other encompassing judgments issued by the Supreme Court of Canada. These corpora are juxtaposed with two plain language corpora: one consisting of brochures with instructions on legal processes and another housing summaries of judgments by the Supreme Court of Canada. The empirical findings corroborate the prevalence of passive constructions within legal discourse. In particular, passive forms serve specific discourse functions in popularisation texts by re-orientating legal content.

Ondřej Klabal's work focuses on the challenges encountered by students in the field of Translation Studies when dealing with plain language. For example, they may have to decide whether to maintain a simplified style when translating into a language where plain language is not widely practised. When translating into English as a foreign language, however, students may be enticed to adopt plain language principles, or conversely, to draw inspiration from parallel documents drafted in *legalese*. In recognition of these translation challenges, the author provides a series of teaching activities designed to raise students' awareness of plain language principles while also bringing valuable language resources to the fore. Through these activities, students can acquire the necessary tools to make more suitable and informed choices in their translation tasks.

Hairenik Aramayo Eliazarian highlights how, in recent years, various Hispanic countries have witnessed a rise in Plain Language (Lenguaje Claro) initiatives by public institutions,

involving the creation of corresponding guides. These efforts aim to influence language use within communities through training, regulations, and teaching materials. The article analyses a corpus of plain legal language guides in Spanish, revealing their similarity in focusing on grammatical accuracy and stylistic correctness through abstract rules. However, the study argues that this form-oriented approach contradicts recent findings in writing pedagogy and faces resistance from professionals. Drawing on the theoretical framework for writing instruction developed by Myhill et al. (2020), the author suggests a paradigm shift, wherein plain language is conceptualised as a set of literacy skills rather than rigid rules. The aim is to offer more effective instruction tailored to the needs of legal practitioners.

Aleksandra Łuczak delineates the transformative impact of the emergence and evolution of plain language in Poland's legal context. This advent has unavoidably encountered resistance and bewilderment among numerous law students. Within this framework, the author examines Polish first-year law students' approach to plain English and their ability to understand *legalese* as opposed to plain English. This analysis also seeks to uncover the underlying reasons that prompt students to favour *legalese* over plain language. The author also provides several practical recommendations to foster the adoption of plain language principles among future legal practitioners.

References

- Abate, S. C. (1998). *Il documento legale anglosassone. [The Anglo-Saxon legal document]*. Hoepli.
- Adler M. (2012). The Plain Language Movement. In P. Tiersma and L. Solan (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law* (pp. 67-83). Oxford University Press.
- Bhatia, K. L. (2010). *Textbook on legal language and legal writing*. Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics – language in evidence*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Gardner, J. (2016). *Misused English words and expressions in EU publications*. European Court of Auditors.
- Giampieri, P., & Harper, M. (2023). *Legal Translation: from dictionary to corpus*. Le Penseur.
- Gotti, M. (2016). Linguistic Features of Legal Texts: Translation Issues. *Statute Law Review*, 37(2), 144-155.
- Griffith, M.E. (1988). Sexism, Language, and the Law. *West Virginia Law Review*, 91(1), 125-151.
- Laster, K. (2001). *Law as Culture*. The Federation Press.

- Leonardi, V. (2021). United in diversity and trapped in a paradox: (II)legal gender equality in the EU legal documents and their translations. In E. Federici & S. Maci (Eds.), *Gender Issues: Translating and Mediating Languages, Cultures and Societies* (pp. 243-266). Peter Lang.
- Lindsey, J. M. (1990). The Legal Writing Malady: Causes and Cures. *New York Law Journal*, 1.
- Maci, S. (2014). What Does He Think This Is? The Court of Human Rights or the United Nations?. (Plain) Language in the Written Memories of Arbitral Proceedings: A Cross-Cultural Case Study. *European Journal of Law Reform*, 16(3), 572-596.
- Mellinkoff, D. (1963). *The Language of the Law*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Solan, M. L. (1993). *The language of judges*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Tessuto, G. (2008a). Drafting Laws in UK Settings: Implementing Plain Language and Discourse? *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Il Drafting Internazionale, organizzato dal Dipartimento di Diritto Costituzionale Italiano e Comparato della Facoltà di Giurisprudenza dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II*.
- Tessuto, G. (2008b). Discourse System in English Arbitration Award. In V. K. Bhatia, C. Candlin & J. Engberg (Eds.), *Legal Discourse across Cultures and Systems* (pp. 181-197). Hong Kong University Press.
- Tiersma, P. (1999). *Legal language*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Wydick R. C. (1978). Plain English for Lawyers. *California Law Review*, 66(4), 727-765.
- Williams, C. (2004). Legal English and Plain Language: an introduction. *ESP Across Culture*, 1, 111-124.
- Williams, C. (2008). Legal English or legal Englishes? Differences in drafting techniques in the English-speaking world. Federalismi.it. *Rivista di Diritto Pubblico Italiano, Comunitario e Comparato*. 1, 1-13.
- Williams, C. (2011). Legal English and Plain language: an update. *ESP Across Cultures*, 8, 139-151.
- Williams, C. (2023). *The Impact of Plain Language on Legal English in the United Kingdom*. Routledge.
- Williams, C., & Milizia, D. (2008). How (un)readable is the European Constitution? A comparison of the English version and the Italian version. In A. Cannone (Ed.), *Studi in Onore del Prof. Vincenzo Starace* (pp. 2209-2227). Editoriale Scientifica.
- Zódi, Z. (2019). The limits of plain legal language: Understanding the comprehensible style in law. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 15(3), 246-262.

