In reference to the complexity and rigidity of the legal language, Mattila (2007:35-36) states that

> In legal language, it often occurs that communication fails because the message is hermetic, or closed. A legal message is sometimes formulated in such a complex way that a lay individual can hardly understand it. For example, this is often the case with laws and regulations, and with judicial decisions….. interpreting the legal text is a highly complex matter, notably because distilling meaning does not depend solely on linguistic arguments.

Observing the above-mentioned characteristics, one can anticipate the paramount importance of such theoretical data in devising machine systems specified for translating the legal language as well as improving current MT systems. Such theory should be indispensible to MT developers who aim at developing their outcomes.

3.3. Types of Legal Writing

It is worth noting here that such characteristics of legal English derive from the language use in legal corpus in which the level of formality can be characterized as frozen or formal. Such corpus comprises of legislative language, administrative and testament language, jury instructions, and documents such as endowment-assurance policies, hire-purchase agreements, and insurance policies. Hiltunen (1990) distinguishes three types of legal writing:

3.3.1. Academic texts which consist of academic research journals and legal textbooks

3.3.2. Juridical texts covering court judgments or law reports

3.3.3. Legislative or statutory writings consisting of Acts of Parliament, contracts, treaties, etc.