

and unclear. On the other hand, legal language should avoid over-abstraction, in that way enabling decoding with minimum effort.

3.2.3. Universality and Aloofness

3.2.3.1. Abstraction and Hypothetical Character: Modern law has an abstract character as it regulates entities that are mere mental creations: rights and duties. Law is based on experience drawn from the real world. However, it regulates hypothetical future cases which entails the use of conditionals and the word *if* is highly frequent, while the present tense dominates.

3.2.3.2. Impersonality and Objectivity: The use of the passive is a feature of legal language for the purpose of bringing the object of the action into the foreground while giving the actor a secondary role. Objectivisation is also apparent in drafting laws and particularly in the language of advocates. An advocate may write: “It appears that Article 27 of the law ... should be interpreted....” Instead of saying “it seems to me that Article 27” (ibid:77)

3.2.3.3. Neutrality: The style of the legal language should be as neutral as possible due to the fact that the principal intention is to have an effect on the understanding rather than the feeling of the reader or listener.

3.2.3.4. Metaphors: In modern legal language, metaphors are rare; nevertheless, there are some exceptions to this fact. Their existence is attributed to the fact that some legal terms originate from metaphors. An example of metaphor in the legal language is “burden of proof, lion’s share, etc.)

3.2.4. Systemic Character: This entails that each element of the order forms part of a greater whole. An article forms part of a law, and a law forms part of legislation. The systemic character of the legal order appears clearly when