The Linguistic Nuances of Legal Jargon

Kagaba Amina G.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Legal jargon, often perceived as complex and inaccessible, serves as a cornerstone of precision in legal communication. This paper examines the linguistic structures and nuances that define legal language, highlighting its role in ensuring clarity, uniformity, and precision within the legal system. It examines the advantages and challenges posed by legal jargon, particularly in fostering inclusion versus alienation of laypersons. A comparative analysis of legal terminology across common law, civil law, and religious law systems underscores the cultural and systemic influences shaping legal language. Finally, practical challenges in decoding legal jargon are discussed, emphasizing the need for a balance between professional specificity and public accessibility. The paper advocates for enhanced legal education and communication strategies to bridge the gap between legal professionals and the public, ensuring legal processes remain both precise and inclusive.

Keywords: Legal Jargon, Linguistic Nuances, Legal Language, Legal Systems, Common Law.

INTRODUCTION

Legal language can seem like an archaic dialect of a foreign language that holds special significance for those who use it. This unique form of human communication is characterized by its complexity, vocabulary, structure, and importance in the field of law. The terms used in legal language are often described as "damned words." Legal terminology, rules, and principles are based on English words but may have a different or more specific meaning than that used in everyday speech. The structures and phrases used in this language often follow a format that is considerably more formal than typical language. The degree of formality influences the function and emphasis of the language. This is partially the product of attempts to achieve a greater degree of precision, clarity, and uniformity. Since every word in a statute or rule is the product of a series of choices, each word can have rules of inclusion that provide some background, structuring, and constraint [1, 2]. Language in law operates within the law. Discourse in common law language can do so both implicitly and explicitly. It often reveals the functioning of law, the role played by legislation and judicial decisions, and the attitudes adopted towards social changes. A combination of lexical, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic nuances forms the legal language. The legal language is a means of professional communication, both oral and written. It may also strike a social chord as it communicates with laypersons. The language used in law is often viewed as complicated for those who have to interpret the law frequently. Many people have a fear of the law. The complicated language used in law often exacerbates that fear. However, realizing ways to use various legal terms, phrases, and codes can facilitate comprehension and, if necessary, interpretation of laws [3, 4].

The Role of Legal Jargon in the Legal System

Jargon is the language used by a specific professional group. It is generally necessary for communication among professionals. In law, jargon is used to enable legal professionals to be precise, to convey complex concepts in a few words, and to achieve uniformity in legal processes. Lawyers and judges need to communicate particular legal issues that cannot easily be expressed using ordinary language. Lawyers, for example, use Latin words to convey the concept of a thing speaking for itself. Without the use of legal jargon, abstract definitions would be necessary, making it difficult to be precise and compounding the

complexity of legal issues. Indeed, in drafting legal documents, legal jargon saves considerable space. In addition, the routine use of jargon in the courts aids precision in decision-making and minimizes misunderstandings. Legal jargon serves as a tool facilitating uniform interpretation of the law [5, 6]. Disadvantages arise when language or phrases only familiar to professionals are inserted into formal documents intended for the public. The use of jargon, translated or untranslated, unnecessarily serves to alienate the public from formal legal processes. Jargon should not be used for its own sake. It should be tempered with consideration for the audience and should be translated into documents intended for the public. Legal jargon has developed over time and has specific rules. Although legal jargon has its advantages, it does have subordinate disadvantages. In the effort to render a judgment, the courts are committed to rendering it in a language and style that meets the ordinary reader or person. This would necessarily entail the avoidance of excessive use of jargon, archaic expressions, and the use of outdated language [7, 8].

Key Features of Legal Jargon

Legal jargon, which can also be described as legalese or legal language, contains several key components that differentiate it from the English used in everyday conversation. Foremost is the lexicon, or vocabulary, which is characterized by the great variation in and formality of the terms used to express particular meanings. The vocabulary is highly technical and often carries connotations or conveys specific denotations that are not apparent to someone unfamiliar with the law. Confusion can arise in legal documents or arguments that involve laypersons or reference non-legal sources or meanings. Thus, a careful reading of how language is used and interpreted is the first step toward understanding specific texts and the broader field of linguistics [9, 10]. Legal language, for one, is packed with what are often identified as needlessly redundant abbreviations. In addition, legal writing is replete with forms, contracts, and phrases in Latin, a "dead language" once spoken in ancient Rome, that lawyers still apply as a matter of form. Like the use of acronyms, the use of Latin or a formal construct indicates a specialized or technical vocabulary. Moreover, legal language is filled with phrases and terms that use the formal historic structure of English. This includes directly addressing the court, using what is called "jargon," or highly specialized vocabulary distinct to baldness and spousal support when discussing grounds for divorce, "concubinage" and alimony. There is indeed a distinction. On the whole, the multifarious jargon of the law is used in context, and those with specialized tasks have many more words and phrases at their disposal. For a common reader or an average citizen, the distinctions are often of supreme irrelevance; thus, suggesting to a reader that a text is about "animal spouse rape" might overwhelm individual interest with more common terms like "bestiality" or "zoophilia." Therefore, in communicative contexts, professionals are intended to use the language and expressions that are usual to their audience [11].

Comparative Analysis of Legal Jargon in Different Legal Systems

Despite the globalized legal landscape of today's world, legal jargon in different areas and countries carries with it some very specific features linked to a country's cultural history and social orientation. It is therefore interesting to compare legal terms. What does the term 'justice' mean in societies based on Islamic law as opposed to societies based on Roman law? International law, whose practice has only the late 19th century as an authoritative source and comprises several regimes, with many principles, rules, institutions, interests, and values, does not differ. This is a world of tremendous diversity and complexity evolving, constantly shifting boundaries and rules. Thus, though comparable, the practices of key players in various regions or regimes are not uniform. Using common law, civil law, and religious law as a comparative tool, a somewhat predictable state with institutions, principles, and rules that endure within their territorial borders will be painted. In a few cases, international regulations related to the legal system were entered. The terms: 'judge', 'lawyer', 'court', 'property', 'contract', and 'justice' will be partially defined in these three legal systems. The need to have a minimum understanding of legal possibilities in several jurisdictions is a prerequisite for any legal practitioner evolving in the globalized world. When performing comparative law or studies, legal terminology needs to be recognized and taken into account. A word carries with it its meaning based on the context the expression is used. The terms and concepts here will be considered from different legal languages: English, French, and Arabic. Even if in one language the terms might resemble one another, varied legal societies will see to it that terms might differ while their meanings relate [12, 13, 14].

Practical Implications and Challenges of Understanding Legal Jargon

But there is much to say on this topic, and much research has been done on how jargon can fail to provide the kind of certainty its precision suggests, a failing that moves into ideas of exclusion built into language

more generally. In addition to this, there are practical implications: what do we do about jargon in law? How do we work to break it down into more easily communicable elements, and how much can be communicated in a way that is universally understandable without any specialized education? For non-lawyers, it is an enduring grievance that the language used in legal documents and proceedings bears no resemblance to ordinary speaking or writing. This jargon language is an exclusionary factor that seems to insulate the legal profession and legal concepts from society when in many ways this should be a porous border. Often, public misunderstandings of law and submission to illegal abuse can be traced back to misapprehensions around specific terminology or the origins of a legal principle. We need to understand the extent to which the law can produce concrete meaning to make concrete changes in this research project. Legal education is meant to give law students the tools to see through the jargon, to know exactly where the limits on the law's opacity are, and to make language and ideas legible to different audiences. The development of these skills often happens implicitly and incidentally in asking broad questions of law school students, touching on how law can be related to other people who do not have legal training. For future lawyers, translation is not the goal. We must train students to communicate this with a wide array of interested parties, some of whom may be professionally trained but not trained specifically in law. They must be comfortable responding to news coverage and know how a plaintiff might convey their story on social media. What emerges from these discussions, it seems, is the idea that the barriers to understanding the law (including its language) are very, very difficult to circumvent. Shifts in education and the profession will help, certainly. But the larger question is this: can you use plain language to describe legal concepts without losing their core meaning? In other words, how is interpretation seamlessly balanced with translation? Jargon serves a different purpose, no less profound (if potentially obfuscatory). Some language must be encoded to avoid dissipation. Some language must be legible to the public to ensure a genuine consensus. Ultimately, however, it seems that in law, as in many things, some things will remain relatively impenetrable [15, 16].

CONCLUSION

The linguistic complexities of legal jargon, while indispensable for precision and uniformity within the legal system, often create barriers for laypersons interacting with legal documents and processes. This paper highlights the dual role of legal language: as a tool for professional clarity and as a potential source of public alienation. Comparative insights across legal systems reveal the cultural and systemic underpinnings of legal terminology, illustrating the necessity for context-sensitive interpretation. Addressing these challenges requires targeted efforts in legal education and public communication to make legal concepts more accessible without compromising their technical integrity. Ultimately, the goal should be to create a legal language that respects its professional needs while fostering greater inclusivity and understanding in a diverse and globalized world.

REFERENCES

1. Brass PR. Elite groups, symbol manipulation and ethnic identity among the Muslims of South Asia. InPolitical Identity in South Asia 2024 Feb 29 (pp. 35-77). Routledge.
2. Sunstein CR. On the expressive function of law. University of Pennsylvania law review. 1996 May 1;144(5):2021-53.
3. Huisman R. Linguistic Perspectives on Legal" Construction": The Advantages of a Social Semiotic Approach. NALSAR Stud. L. Rev.. 2021;15:51.
4. Taiwo AJ, Alaba AJ, Adeoye JA. Context as a Pre-Condition for Meaning Fixation in Legal Texts: A Pragma-Contextual Analysis of Human Right Treaty-Based Legislative Text. LingLit Journal Scientific Journal for Linguistics and Literature. 2023 Sep 2;4(3):105-16. biarjournal.com
5. Flanagin A, Frey T, Christiansen SL, AMA Manual of Style Committee. Updated guidance on the reporting of race and ethnicity in medical and science journals. Jama. 2021 Aug 17;326(7):621-7. jamanetwork.com
6. Schalock RL, Luckasson R, Tassé MJ. An overview of intellectual disability: Definition, diagnosis, classification, and systems of supports. American journal on intellectual and developmental disabilities. 2021 Nov 1;126(6):439-42. researchgate.net
7. Choi JH, Hickman KE, Monahan AB, Schwarcz D. ChatGPT goes to law school. J. Legal Educ.. 2021;71:387.
8. Chalkidis I, Fergadiotis M, Malakasiotis P, Aletras N, Androutsopoulos I. LEGAL-BERT: The muppets straight out of law school. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02559. 2020 Oct 6.
9. Fulk RD. Cynewulf: Canon, dialect, and date. InCynewulf 2021 Oct 28 (pp. 3-21). Routledge.

10. Shahriar S, Hayawi K. Let's have a chat! A Conversation with ChatGPT: Technology, Applications, and Limitations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13817. 2023 Feb 27.
11. Guha N, Nyarko J, Ho D, Ré C, Chilton A, Chohlas-Wood A, Peters A, Waldon B, Rockmore D, Zambrano D, Talisman D. Legalbench: A collaboratively built benchmark for measuring legal reasoning in large language models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2024 Feb 13;36.
12. Lansford JE. Annual research review: Cross-cultural similarities and differences in parenting. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 2022 Apr;63(4):466-79.
13. Ergashev I, Farxodjonova N. Integration of national culture in the process of globalization. Journal of Critical Reviews. 2020;7(2):477.
14. Onishchuk I, Ikonnikova M, Antonenko T, Kharchenko I, Shestakova S, Kuzmenko N, Maksymchuk B. Characteristics of foreign language education in foreign countries and ways of applying foreign experience in pedagogical universities of Ukraine. Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala. 2020 Oct 5;12(3):44-65. lumenpublishing.com
15. Candeub A. Bargaining for Free Speech: Common Carriage, Network Neutrality, and Section 230. Yale JL & Tech.. 2020;22:391.
16. Gregorcic B, Pendrill AM. ChatGPT and the frustrated Socrates. Physics Education. 2023 Mar 22;58(3):035021.