Analyzing Legal Metaphors: Implications for Justice

Asiimwe Kyomugisha T.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Metaphors play a central role in legal discourse, shaping not only how laws are understood but also how they are applied. This paper examines the pervasive use of metaphors in legal contexts, examining how they influence perceptions of justice, legal reasoning, and decision-making. Drawing on cognitive linguistics and critical discourse analysis, it highlights the dual nature of metaphors both as tools of clarity and as potential sources of bias. The analysis investigates traditional metaphors, such as architectural constructs of law, and their implications for social justice, power structures, and inclusivity. It also considers empirical research on judicial attitudes toward metaphors, uncovering how metaphorical language can sway public opinion and judicial outcomes. The paper concludes by advocating for the ethical and deliberate use of legal metaphors to promote transparency, accessibility, and fairness in the pursuit of justice.

Keywords: Legal metaphors, cognitive linguistics, justice, legal discourse, critical discourse analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Within legal discourse and even in ordinary conversation, metaphors abound. Their pervasiveness indicates something significant about the ways we understand law. How do the metaphors we use influence how we understand law? Are there any metaphors typically used in legal discourse, meanings that tell us something important about our understanding of justice? Can we develop a criterion for evaluating legal metaphors even before discussing what purposes such metaphors ought to serve? The primary thesis of this paper is that metaphors are pervasive in legal discourse, at times operating in such a manner that they depreciate the integrity of our legal system. Once metaphors are pointed out and their analysis is undertaken, they can often be seen to embody specific notions of law and justice. Not only do metaphors define relationships and structures, but their meanings suggest hidden assumptions, demands, and prejudices that the legal system would do well to examine [1, 2]. Our focus is to analyze a specific set of legal metaphors. We will also discuss how alternative metaphors might do a better job when correctly depicting the intention of the law. If given its proper functional weight, this kind of analysis and response can contribute to our understanding of the functions healthy discourse about law and justice should possess. We begin by examining some central metaphors and showing some of their meanings. In Part II, we discuss analyses of some significant meanings in 'Rape' and 'War and Rape' metaphors. The rote present in the vignette and the paper are, in some attitudes, triggered by the ways a legal examination is made when the person looks only at the superficial meaning and expression of a legal category such as rape, thus masking its altogether unnoticed direction. Even a simple category of rape has two major meanings [3, 4].

Understanding Metaphors in Law

Metaphors are one of the most pervasive ways of speaking, and a great deal of contemporary cognitive linguistic research addresses the question of what metaphors are and how they work. The ways that metaphors and metaphorical language operate in legal contexts are attracting more attention as well. Although several issues remain in the study of metaphors in legal communication, research interest has made great strides in this area. Historically, the prime metaphors associated with law are architectural. These arise from an image of law that perceives it as a place or structure built on a solid and secure foundation. Conceptual metaphors, like architectural metaphors, can structure ideas of events, actions, and other abstract processes [5, 6]. One can outline at least two types of metaphors in law. The first is

based on the presumption that law is a coherent system rationally derived. Conceptual metaphors are one variety of this first type of metaphor. The second type of metaphor distinguishes only the social actors in situ, so it does not provide a particular theory of law. In this view, no particular properties of law can be presumed: no law of logic, no sovereignty, no justice. A metaphor like "the law is an ass" represents this particular type. This metaphor can be identified as a linguistic metaphor. Linguistic metaphors cannot be "reduced in isolation to some other term" for clarity because "the context and technology usage of literary metaphor are mutually relevant, and it is reasonable to say that it is dependent upon interplay with other metaphors and other terms." Judicial decisions provide incredible evidence of the value of working with metaphors in the exploration of legal studies [7, 8].

Theoretical Frameworks for Analyzing Legal Metaphors

There are several theoretical frameworks for analyzing metaphors that can be employed to account for metaphors systematically from a linguistic and cognitive point of view. Cognitive linguistics, one of the main fields of metaphor research, delineates 'metaphor as a matter of thought, not just words.' Other relevant models that can be integrated into the cognitive linguistic approach are pragmatics and the role that context plays in metaphor. It has been shown that conversational and sociocultural contexts are also relevant in legal metaphors for shaping meaning, besides general cognitive processes. Critical discourse analysis provides a model that highlights the persuasive role of language and, in particular, the existing imbalance of power in linguistic interaction [9, 10]. Using the theoretical foundations of these models, several scholars have constructed a method to examine metaphors in judicial reasoning. Metaphor analysis does not only focus on the language use of the court, but on the broader implications of metaphor use. Meaning cannot be claimed to inhere in words because it is always contingent on culture, period, situation, etc. Since metaphors can describe and promote a social and political vision and behavior of power and authority, as well as the creation and maintenance of hierarchies, the study of metaphors can be linked with the study of societal structure and power distribution with a view ultimately to the attainment of justice. Metaphor analysis, for that reason, is inherently interdisciplinary [11, 12].

Empirical Studies on Legal Metaphors

This paper contrasts theoretical work about legal metaphors with empirical research into legal metaphors. It finds that, in general, the findings of empirical research into legal metaphors have empirical support from social science more generally. The paper encourages further research to find out what citizens of democratic societies seeking justice might want from the use of metaphor in law. The theory of metaphor is relevant to law because many theorists consider metaphor to be a basic cognitive operation involved in legal reasoning. However, legal writers experimenting with non-metaphorical legal communication have found that their judges sometimes do not understand or are not impressed when they do not see the usual metaphors. Empirical research is thus needed. This paper reviews empirical studies of metaphor in law, carrying out experiments, surveying what judges do in particular cases, asking many judges for their experiences, looking at what judges also talk about in more unguarded moments, usually in their training sessions, and looking at judgments over time. These studies find that although the number of metaphor cases is relatively few, they were once greater. Both judges and the public like to hear and use metaphors, even against official advice. Studies also find that changing the metaphors in use can change the courts' decisions. The sentiment is divided: public opinion is divided over, say, their judges' increasing reluctance to use metaphors, the differences in expression in two very similar cases, or indeed whether sentences in similar cases should be the same. The last substantive finding of much of this work is that good methodological practice in this field is very difficult to achieve: judges describe their methods and uses of language in ways that might be suspect; quantitative analyses are bedeviled by the inability of categories and other phenomena in law to be clear; and there are other anomalies in the work in this field. Law needs people who can sometimes speak both literally and metaphorically with conviction; interpretations and meanings aren't straightforward. There is a gap in the research literature on legal metaphors between, on one hand, cognitive accounts of metaphor, and, on the other, empirical accounts of how particular publics, or groups within the polity more generally, understand and interpret metaphor at work in law. This is at a time when polarization around, and critiques of, doctrinalist and particular interpretations of law are on the rise [13, 14].

Implications for Justice

One lesson we draw from the analysis of legal metaphors is that they can affect the development and application of law in ways that are both indirect and unaccountable. Because people are swayed by rhetorical appeal, the use of metaphors can shape how the law is understood and how people perceive the moral stakes. They serve to generate a subconscious or preconscious ethos that writers and speakers use rhetorically to enlist consensus concerning law and policy. They can thus affect judicial decision-making,

law-making, and lawyerly argumentation, including the advocacy of positions that might disadvantage or discriminate against female victims and other groups [15, 16]. Whether or not it is possible to alter the view about the importance of the legal system to one's life, the view of the injustice or justice of its outcomes can be altered. In this sense, overvaluation—the mythologizing of the subject matter of relevance—aims to predispose rational conclusions. Whether the description wholly mediates our avowed values or allows them to surface. In these respects, law and the language of the law, as mediating apparatuses for channeling moral judgment, are fair game for the rhetoric of justice. If such canons of interpretation are widely acknowledged, then the role and conduct of law practice would similarly be reformed. Lawyers, as the primary users in the mechanics of this application, have an ethical and educational interest in formulating law in language that is not only analytical and conceptually clear according to legal methodology but also makes the content more accessible to non-specialists [17, 18]. This consideration holds especially for what might be termed "institutional" law rhetoric, such as court decisions. The question for future discussion certainly one that is central to any legal philosophy that is concerned with questions of role and responsibility is the extent to which advocates of one position or another should be trained or inclined to use metaphor to obscure rather than illuminate. In the legal context, this proposes just the kind of ethical and pedagogical concern that would and should be at the very heart of any contested view of the language of law. The question is pitched in terms of plural concerns such as equality, fairness, and, more generally, questions of justice. The use of metaphor in legal discourse is, therefore, a contested label and a striking example of an oxymoronic argument [19, 20].

CONCLUSION

Metaphors in legal discourse are not merely linguistic embellishments but powerful tools that shape the contours of justice. Their ability to evoke subconscious frameworks for understanding law underscores their rhetorical and cognitive significance. However, this influence also brings ethical challenges, particularly in reinforcing biases or obscuring complexities. The deliberate and critical evaluation of legal metaphors can enhance the inclusivity, clarity, and fairness of the legal system. By encouraging a more conscious engagement with metaphorical language, legal professionals and scholars can better align the language of law with the ideals of justice, ensuring that metaphors illuminate rather than obscure the pathways to equitable outcomes. The ongoing exploration of metaphor in legal contexts promises to contribute meaningfully to the broader discourse on law, language, and societal values.

REFERENCES

1. Morelli A, Pollicino O. Metaphors, judicial frames, and fundamental rights in cyberspace. The American Journal of Comparative Law. 2020 Sep 1;68(3):616-46. ssrn.com
2. Osiejewicz J. Metaphor in Legal Communication. J. Int'l Legal Commc'n. 2021;2:97.
3. Bates BR. The (in) appropriateness of the WAR metaphor in response to SARS-CoV-2: A rapid analysis of Donald J. Trump's rhetoric. Frontiers in Communication. 2020 Jun 30;5:50.
4. Taylor C. Metaphors of migration over time. Discourse & Society. 2021 Jul;32(4):463-81.
5. Baldi B. Persuasion we live by. Symbols, metaphors and linguistic strategies. Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali. 2020:337-82.
6. Abdel-Raheem A. Where Covid metaphors come from: reconsidering context and modality in metaphor. Social Semiotics. 2023 Oct 20;33(5):971-1010.
7. Hong W, Rossi C. The cognitive turn in metaphor translation studies: A critical overview. Journal of Translation Studies. 2021;5(2):83-115.
8. Seering J, Kaufman G, Chancellor S. Metaphors in moderation. New Media & Society. 2022. steviechancellor.com Vol. 24, No. 3, 03.2022, p. 621-640
9. Yudistira R. CODE MIXING AS AN ANTI-POLITICAL INDISCRETION AMONG FARM LABORERS AT AJUNG, KALISAT, JEMBER. LiNGUA. 2023 Jun 1;18(1).
10. Meretoja H. A dialogics of counter-narratives. InRoutledge handbook of counter-narratives 2020 Oct 22 (pp. 30-42). Routledge.
11. Pamungkas A, Yuskar BO, Anwar M. The Use of Metaphors, Similes, and Personifications in the Truman Show Film. Bulletin of Science Education. 2024 Jan 8;4(1):1-5.
12. Li Y, Kenett YN, Hu W, Beaty RE. Flexible semantic network structure supports the production of creative metaphor. Creativity Research Journal. 2021 Jul 3;33(3):209-23.
13. Anleu SR, Mack K. Judging and emotion: a socio-legal analysis. Routledge; 2021 Feb 3.
14. Boginskaya O. The simplification of jury instructions: legal-lay interactions in jury trials. ESP Today. 2020;8(2):297-318.

15. Lu-Adler H. Kant's use of travel reports in theorizing about race—A case study of how testimony features in natural philosophy. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science. 2022 Feb 1;91:10-9.
16. Ricca M. Perpetually astride Eden's boundaries: the limits to the 'limits of law'and the semiotic inconsistency of 'legal enclosures'. International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue internationale de Sémiotique juridique. 2022 Feb;35(1):179-229. springer.com
17. Meyers G, Van Oirsouw CC, Keymolen EL, Goossens J. After the announcement: an interdisciplinary analysis of blockchain development in governments. Policy Design and Practice. 2023 Oct 2;6(4):505-19.
18. Ji P. Masking morality in the making: how China's anti-epidemic promotional videos present facemask as a techno-moral mediator. Social Semiotics. 2023 Jan 1;33(1):232-9.
19. Ricca M. Otherness, elsewhere, and the'Ecology'of law's implications: The semiotic oceans surrounding legal signification and its discriminatory exteriority/objectivity. International Journal of Legal Discourse. 2020 Nov 18;5(2):185-237.
20. Cowls J, Darius P, Santistevan D, Schramm M. Constitutional metaphors: Facebook's "supreme court" and the legitimation of platform governance. new media & society. 2024 May;26(5):2448-72. sagepub.com