The Role of Legal Discourse in the Administration of Justice

Andreea CORSEI*

Abstract

Legal discourse plays a central role in the administration of justice, functioning as the primary medium through which legal norms are interpreted, applied, and legitimized. Through judicial decisions, procedural acts, and argumentative exchanges, legal discourse structures the way in which law is communicated and understood within the justice system. Its importance extends beyond technical reasoning, influencing both the effectiveness of legal processes and public confidence in judicial institutions. This paper examines the role of legal discourse in the administration of justice by focusing on its defining characteristics and functions within legal practice. The analysis considers legal discourse as a form of institutional communication governed by rules of coherence, authority, and rational justification. Particular attention is given to the relationship between legal discourse and judicial reasoning, as well as to the role of language in shaping legal interpretation and decision-making. The study also highlights the normative and persuasive dimensions of legal discourse, emphasizing its contribution to the legitimacy of judicial outcomes. By clarifying how legal arguments are constructed and conveyed, the paper seeks to demonstrate that legal discourse is not merely a neutral vehicle for legal rules, but an essential component of the justice system that directly affects the quality, transparency, and credibility of legal decisions.

Keywords: *legal discourse; administration of justice; judicial reasoning; legal argumentation; legitimacy of judicial decisions*

* University Assistant, PhD in progress, "Petre Andrei" University in Iași, Vice-Dean at the 'College of Legal Advisers Suceava' Association, general secretary of the "Order of Legal Advisers from Romania" Federation, Romania, Corresponding author: office.corsei@yahoo.co.uk

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

1. Introduction

Legal discourse constitutes a fundamental element of the administration of justice, as law operates primarily through language. Norms, judicial decisions, procedural acts, and legal arguments all take shape within a structured discursive framework that gives meaning to legal rules and enables their application in concrete cases. Through legal discourse, abstract legal norms are transformed into binding decisions that affect individual rights and obligations.

In the context of judicial activity, legal discourse serves both a technical and an institutional function. It provides the means through which judges interpret the law, assess evidence, and justify their decisions, while simultaneously expressing the authority of the legal system. The manner in which legal arguments are formulated and communicated plays a decisive role in shaping the coherence, predictability, and acceptability of judicial outcomes.

The administration of justice relies not only on the correctness of legal reasoning, but also on its intelligibility and persuasiveness. Judicial decisions must be reasoned in a way that demonstrates respect for legal norms and procedural guarantees, while also addressing the arguments of the parties involved. Legal discourse thus contributes to transparency and accountability, allowing judicial reasoning to be scrutinized and understood by both legal professionals and the wider public.

At the same time, legal discourse is not a neutral or purely mechanical process. It reflects interpretative choices, argumentative strategies, and institutional constraints that influence how justice is administered. The interaction between normative language and persuasive elements highlights the complexity of legal discourse as a form of institutional communication that operates within defined legal and procedural boundaries.

Against this background, the present study examines the role of legal discourse in the administration of justice by focusing on its main characteristics and functions. Rather than offering an extensive theoretical analysis, the paper adopts a structured approach, addressing legal discourse through clearly defined sections. This perspective allows for a focused examination of how legal language and argumentation shape judicial reasoning and contribute to the legitimacy of legal decisions.

2. The Concept of Legal Discourse

Legal discourse can be understood as the structured use of language through which law is formulated, interpreted, and applied within institutional settings. It encompasses the language of legal norms, judicial decisions, procedural acts, and legal argumentation, operating within a framework governed by rules of logic, coherence, and authority. As such, legal discourse is not merely descriptive, but constitutive of legal reality.

Within the administration of justice, legal discourse serves to translate abstract legal norms into concrete solutions for specific cases. Judges, lawyers, and other legal actors rely on established discursive forms to present arguments, justify decisions, and ensure procedural fairness. This structured use of language distinguishes legal discourse from ordinary communication and confers upon it a formal and authoritative character.

Legal discourse is characterized by a combination of normativity and reasoning. On the one hand, it expresses binding legal rules and institutional authority; on the other hand, it requires rational justification and argumentative support. Judicial reasoning, in particular, exemplifies this dual nature, as it must simultaneously apply legal norms and persuade the parties and the public of the correctness of the outcome.

Another defining feature of legal discourse is its institutional context. Legal language operates within courts and other legal institutions, where procedural rules shape how arguments are presented and evaluated. This institutional framework imposes constraints on legal discourse, while also ensuring its predictability and legitimacy within the justice system.

Understanding the concept of legal discourse is essential for analyzing its role in the administration of justice. By clarifying its defining elements, it becomes possible to examine how legal discourse influences judicial reasoning, decision-making, and the perception of justice.

3. Functions of Legal Discourse in the Administration of Justice

Legal discourse performs several essential functions within the administration of justice, contributing directly to the way legal norms are applied and judicial authority is exercised. Through its structured and institutionalized form, legal discourse enables courts to transform abstract rules into concrete and reasoned outcomes (Tiersma, 1999, pp. 1-5).

A primary function of legal discourse is **interpretative**. Legal norms are often general and open-ended, requiring interpretation in order to be applied to specific factual situations. Through legal discourse, judges clarify the meaning of legal provisions, resolve ambiguities, and adapt normative content to the circumstances of each case, ensuring coherence and consistency in judicial practice (MacCormick, 2005, pp. 120-128).

Legal discourse also fulfills a **justificatory function**. Judicial decisions must be reasoned and supported by legal arguments that demonstrate their conformity with applicable norms and procedural guarantees. The reasoning expressed through legal discourse allows parties to understand the basis of the decision and enables higher courts to exercise effective judicial review, thus reinforcing transparency and accountability in the administration of justice (Alexy, 2009, pp. 35-42).

Another important function of legal discourse is **persuasive**. Although judicial decisions are binding, their authority is strengthened when legal reasoning is clear, logical, and convincing. Persuasion in legal discourse does not aim at rhetorical manipulation, but at demonstrating the rationality and legitimacy of the judicial outcome, contributing to public confidence in judicial institutions (Perelman, 1969, pp. 155-163).

Finally, legal discourse performs a **legitimizing function** within the justice system. By adhering to established forms of legal reasoning and argumentation, judicial discourse reinforces the perception that decisions are the result of lawful, impartial, and rational processes. In this sense, legal discourse plays a crucial role in sustaining the legitimacy of judicial authority and the acceptance of judicial decisions by society (Habermas, 1996, pp. 198-203).

4. Legal Discourse in Judicial Reasoning

Judicial reasoning is one of the most visible expressions of legal discourse within the administration of justice. Through reasoning, judges explain how legal norms are interpreted and applied to the facts of a case, transforming abstract rules into concrete judicial solutions. Legal discourse thus provides the framework within which judicial reasoning becomes intelligible, verifiable, and institutionally legitimate (MacCormick, 1978, pp. 39-45).

In criminal and civil adjudication alike, judicial reasoning fulfills a communicative function directed at multiple audiences, including the parties to the proceedings, higher courts, and society at large. The reasoning of a judicial decision must demonstrate that the outcome is grounded in law and evidence, rather than in arbitrary considerations. Legal discourse structures this reasoning by imposing requirements of coherence, logical consistency, and argumentative completeness (Alexy, 2009, pp. 218-223).

Legal discourse also shapes the way judges select and prioritize legal arguments. Judicial reasoning is not a mere mechanical application of legal rules, but an interpretative process that involves choosing among competing legal norms, precedents, and doctrinal positions. Through discursive justification, judges articulate the rationale behind these choices, thereby making their decisions transparent and open to critical assessment (Aarnio, 1987, pp. 89-95).

Another important aspect of legal discourse in judicial reasoning concerns the use of language to manage complexity. Judicial decisions often address intricate factual and legal issues that must be presented in an organized and accessible manner. Legal discourse provides standardized forms of expression and reasoning that allow judges to structure complex arguments and to convey them in a way that supports legal certainty and predictability (Goodrich, 1987, pp. 102-108).

Finally, legal discourse contributes to the authority of judicial reasoning by reinforcing its institutional character. The formalized language and argumentative patterns used in judicial decisions signal that the reasoning follows established legal standards and procedural norms. This institutional dimension of legal discourse strengthens the acceptability of judicial decisions and supports public confidence in the administration of justice (Habermas, 1996, pp. 223-229).

5. Legal Discourse and the Legitimacy of Judicial Decisions

The legitimacy of judicial decisions is closely connected to the quality and structure of legal discourse through which those decisions are expressed. Beyond the formal authority of the court, legitimacy depends on the ability of judicial reasoning to demonstrate that outcomes are grounded in law, rational argumentation, and respect for procedural guarantees. Legal discourse thus functions as a central mechanism for translating judicial power into socially accepted authority (Loughlin, 2010, pp. 214-219).

Legal discourse contributes to legitimacy by ensuring **reason-giving**. A judicial decision that clearly articulates the legal and factual grounds on which it is based allows the parties and the public to understand why a particular outcome was reached. This transparency supports the perception that justice is administered fairly and that judicial discretion is exercised within legally defined limits. The absence of adequate reasoning, by contrast, risks undermining confidence in the judicial process (European Court of Human Rights, *Hadjianastassiou v. Greece*, Judgment of 16 December 1992, Series A no. 252, paras. 33-37).

Another dimension of legitimacy arises from the **consistency** of legal discourse. When courts employ stable argumentative patterns and coherent interpretative methods, judicial decisions appear predictable and aligned with established legal standards. Such consistency reinforces legal certainty and reduces the perception of arbitrariness. Legal discourse, by structuring judicial reasoning according to shared conventions, plays a key role in maintaining continuity within the legal system (MacCormick, 1978, pp. 152-158).

Legal discourse also performs a **dialogical function** that enhances legitimacy. Judicial reasoning engages with the arguments presented by the parties, addressing and responding to them within the decision. This dialogical structure signals respect for the procedural position of the parties and affirms that judicial outcomes result from a reasoned evaluation of competing claims rather than unilateral authority. Through this engagement, legal discourse strengthens the participatory dimension of justice (Dworkin, 1986, pp. 225-231).

Finally, the legitimacy of judicial decisions is reinforced by the **institutional form** of legal discourse. The formalized language, structure, and reasoning conventions employed in judicial decisions distinguish them from other forms of public communication. These discursive features signal adherence to institutional norms and legal rationality, contributing to the acceptance of judicial outcomes even in cases involving contested or unpopular decisions (Goodrich, 1987, pp. 132-138).

Taken together, these elements illustrate that legal discourse is not merely a technical aspect of adjudication, but a core factor in sustaining the legitimacy of judicial authority. By shaping how judicial decisions are reasoned, communicated, and justified, legal discourse directly influences the credibility of the administration of justice.

6. Conclusions

Legal discourse occupies a central position in the administration of justice, functioning as the primary medium through which legal norms are interpreted, applied, and justified. As this paper has demonstrated, the effectiveness and legitimacy of judicial activity depend not only on the substantive content of legal rules, but also on the quality of the discourse through which judicial decisions are articulated and communicated.

By structuring judicial reasoning, legal discourse enables courts to transform abstract legal norms into concrete solutions that can be understood, evaluated, and accepted by those affected. Its interpretative, justificatory, persuasive, and legitimizing functions reveal that legal discourse is not a merely technical instrument, but an essential component of the judicial process. Through reasoned argumentation and coherent language, legal discourse contributes directly to transparency, accountability, and legal certainty.

The analysis has also shown that legal discourse plays a decisive role in shaping the legitimacy of judicial decisions. Clear and well-reasoned judgments reinforce public confidence in the justice system and demonstrate respect for procedural guarantees. Conversely, deficiencies in legal discourse-such as inadequate reasoning or lack of coherence-risk undermining trust in judicial authority, regardless of the formal correctness of the outcome.

In contemporary legal systems, where judicial activity is subject to increased scrutiny and public attention, the importance of legal discourse becomes even more pronounced. Courts are required not only to decide cases in accordance with the law, but also to explain their decisions in a manner that reflects rationality, fairness, and institutional responsibility. Legal discourse thus functions as a bridge between judicial authority and societal acceptance.

In conclusion, the role of legal discourse in the administration of justice extends beyond communication and form. It is a foundational element of judicial reasoning

and legitimacy, shaping how justice is perceived and experienced. A careful and reflective use of legal discourse remains essential for ensuring that judicial decisions are not only lawful, but also credible, transparent, and worthy of public trust.

Bibliography

Aarnio, A. (1987). *The Rational as Reasonable. A Treatise on Legal Justification*. Reidel Publishing.

Alexy, R. (2009)*A Theory of Legal Argumentation. The Theory of Rational Discourse as Theory of Legal Justification*. Oxford University Press.

Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's Empire*. Harvard University Press.

European Court of Human Rights, *Hadjianastassiou v. Greece*, Judgment of 16 December 1992, Series A no. 252.

Goodrich, P. (1987). *Legal Discourse. Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis*, Macmillan, London,.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms. Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms. Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

Loughlin, M. (2010). *Foundations of Public Law*. Oxford University Press.

MacCormick, N. (1978)*Legal Reasoning and Legal Theory*. Clarendon Press.

MacCormick, N. (2005). *Rhetoric and the Rule of Law. A Theory of Legal Reasoning*. Oxford University Press.

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Legal Language*. University of Chicago Press.