



Research Output Journal of Education 5(2):6-11, 2025

ROJE Publications

PRINT ISSN: 1115-6139

<https://rojournals.org/roj-education/>

ONLINE ISSN: 1115-9324

<https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJE/2025/52611>

Page | 6

The Power of Persuasive Language in Judicial Opinions

Kakungulu Samuel J.

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Judicial opinions wield immense power, not only in shaping the outcomes of legal disputes but also in molding societal norms and public perceptions of justice. This paper examines the persuasive tools embedded in judicial language, exploring its symbolic enactment of authority, its rhetorical techniques, and its impact on legal interpretation. By dissecting the use of analogies, metaphors, emotive language, repetition, and parallelism, the analysis illuminates how judges craft their reasoning to establish authority, persuade audiences, and legitimize decisions. Moreover, it underscores the ethical considerations and responsibilities accompanying such linguistic choices. As a communicative enterprise, the law depends on its language for both clarity and persuasion, making rhetorical skills a cornerstone of judicial practice. The study concludes by emphasizing the importance of rhetorical training for judges and advocates, suggesting that further research into the evolution of judicial communication can enhance understanding of its role in shaping law and society.

Keywords: Judicial opinions, persuasive language, legal rhetoric, analogies, metaphors.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, the language of judges has held the power to liberate or condemn, to free people from bondage, to alter the course of politics, to uphold civil rights, to determine the fate of wars, to make redress for past wrongs, and has had the potency to resonate in the public sphere and effect legislative and social change. Public faith in the judiciary is integrally tied to the belief that laws are just and fairly interpreted by common sense and reason. Fairness is at least to be perceived. Regardless of the body of precedent, legal skill, and erudition a judge possesses, justice is not served unless it can be communicated and accepted as such. This creates a difficult task as the members of a society have different backgrounds, opinions, perspectives, commitments, biases, and values. Yet, how the perception of justice is articulated and communicated is no small consideration. People feel vindicated and represented by decisions rendered by the morally authoritative cast of judges, both at the common level and the court of appeal legal systems. Consequently, throughout history, eloquence and secretly persuasive language have undergirded legal conclusions and rhetorical moves. In the courts of today, the judicial pronouncements undergo a gulf between those who control truth and those who are subordinated and subjugated by it. To combat this, linguistic strategies are engaged to lend legal authority to the law and create an impression of fairness. This paper addresses the nexus between linguistics, persuasion, and the oppression and power-play language can involve in the judicial process [1, 2]. Judicial language tells the everyday goings-on of the court what is true and what is false; it gives justification for the distribution of coercion and what claims are and is not compensable. This analysis is the first of three dominant themes that afford linguistic texts the authority to legally persuade. The theme is the symbolic enactment of authority by positionality and one where drawings from various scholars serve as inspiration. This topic determines that the courtroom should and does follow the constitutional hierarchy of authority with the judge at the head of the dominative pyramid. In the process, because of the ordainment by the written code of the judiciary

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

cadres, litigants submit to their proffered constitutions and are perceived to be more obliging. This encourages a perceived fairness that is legitimate as such [3, 4].

The Role of Language in Judicial Opinions

Language is at the center of a judicial opinion. Judges use the written word to frame disputes, describe facts, and offer legal arguments. Their language is often a tool used to establish their power and authority. The wording of an opinion can emphasize aspects judges find important: arguments made or conceded, facts that judges find particularly influential, and moral or legal reasoning. The use of language and the way it frames an argument has a reciprocal effect. This means not only calling up certain thoughts but making some thoughts possible or likely in a way those thoughts would not occur if different languages were used. Language can raise the possibility, or initiate thoughts, that have practical import. In the law, this means that the application of language to ethical concerns, or the refusal to do so, can change outcomes [5, 6]. In the legal world, it is well known that the way a document is drafted or the way a person tells his (or her) story can change outcomes. To be a successful advocate, a letter writer or a witness can shape the facts presented as well as the logic or appeal of the matter at issue, depending on linguistic choices. Language can win cases, prove a point, or attain legal correction. Additionally, a fact in the trial might exemplify (or fall short of) crucial criteria. A judge in a trial might be challenged to be more alert to this subtle aspect of the language-based description. In a trial, a court may, for better or worse, approach their task with this language as dialogue as a similar part of their sensibility, and they may not even be able to say why in a principled way. The use of "values" is visible in the texture and tone of language which is focused on the very facts of a ruling that is combined with written opinion. Ethical language indicates a missing link. It also provides a simultaneous integration or jointure. In the law, some facts are not assumed. They are deduced, reasoned, argued, and vouched for. Some facts and legal aspects can even hinge on certain linguistic cues. The nuances of linguistic description require attention in the courtroom [7, 8].

Rhetorical Devices and Techniques in Judicial Opinions

The only weapon courts and appellate judges have in writing opinions is the power of their words. They are not legislators; they cannot coerce. The reader might be forgiven for a wry grin at the humble claims made at the outset of judicial opinions. Legal reasoning, of course, owes much more than its power just to the words of the opinion. Lawyers and judges typically cite factual and evidentiary support, doctrinal and precedential authorities, constitutional sources, and broader purposes of the law in support of the ultimate holding. But there is little doubt that the power of judicial opinions depends significantly on the persuasiveness of the words and stylistic features judges use. Evidence from experimental studies supports this conclusion. Empirical work shows that opinions with poor reasoning but highly readable prose are associated with more favorable assessments by subjects than are pieces with strong reasoning but poor writing. Technique in judicial opinions, of course, has multiple aims: clarity, poetic beauty, energy, narrative appeal, and other standards commend themselves.

Analogies: Analogies that illustrate, elucidate, persuade, and clarify are a staple of judicial opinions. **Metaphor:** A metaphor is a figure of speech that explains an object, thing, or concept by placing it in terms of some other dissimilar or distinct object. Several styles can be employed by writers, with spatial or geographical metaphors often particularly effective in rhetorical contexts.

Emotive Language: Emotive language consists of words and phrases that are deliberately felt to produce an emotional response in the reader or the audience. It is the language that the writer purposefully chooses that can be considered or described as persuasive. Judges might be thought of as engaging in a bit of framing when they deploy emotive language.

Repetition: Repetition, the use of the same word more than once, can be a powerful way of making a point or altering the reader's perceptions. Repetition can take various forms, including anadiplosis and epizeuxis.

Parallelism: Parallelism refers to a form of persuasive language that encourages an individual to think along particular lines of reasoning. Addressing such rhetoric is frequently challenging because it prolongs the amount of time in which the issue is addressed and forces the person scrutinizing it to spend additional time attempting to uncover parallels [9, 10].

Analogies and Metaphors

Analogies and metaphors are used by judges and advocates as powerful persuasive tools in judicial writing. Analogies serve to reveal some meaningful parallel or relationship between a known concept and a complex or contested legal concept. This construction process can make an abstract or complex point more easily understood and offer a reason why one way of reasoning from a settled principle is superior to

another. The more unusual, the better in many instances. The stronger the parallel, the more strongly the audience is impressed with the point [11, 12]. Consider a judicial opinion expounding a legal doctrine. In contemporary legal writing, most textualist and originalist judicial opinions work to avoid anything abstract, to avoid analogies, and often the use of metaphor is discouraged for fear of activating the reader's emotions. Using metaphors can be completely rational and in style where they enhance the legal complexity. The cognitive effect of using an analogy is to bridge the gap in reasoning left by the major premise and the conclusion from that major premise. Metaphors generally work by showing congruent effects to an audience. Cognitive research shows that metaphors are more than illustrative devices; analogical reasoning has informally been used, and the study of cognitive science has shown how metaphor is involved in all forms of reasoning, and its use is neither lazy nor fuzzy-headed. The function of these figures of speech is literally to assist the reason in its integration of data by showing how ideas in two disparate categories share common features. Metaphor involves a transfer of structural features of one category to another category. These must be inventive enough to overcome ordinary mappings and necessary connections in the audience's brain that can otherwise resist "imaginative comparison." Impact in a legal context has been enhanced when a vivid metaphor has a close connection or effect with reasoning. However, the strong induction at this point suggests that the metaphor works through logic enlivened with its distinctive emotional overtones as much as through an emotional, non-rational appeal. An argument that "Courts handle issues piecemeal" crafted a beautiful analogy about pie and the human palate. With federal rules as comparative hyperbole, and coupled with an intricate prescription analysis for an injunction medical analogy, racism as poison doctrine theory worked far more forcefully. The use of metaphor made arguments more understandable and poignant. In addition, there was a master of rhetorical context, perfectly suited to articulate language to the court and the adversary. Configuration is critical [13, 14].

Emotive Language

Emotive language plays an important role in shaping judicial opinions. It actively influences the connotation of issues and thereby affects public perception. Because of the connotation certain emotive words possess, judges can express emotionally charged verbal messages and indicate their personal opinions. The emotional resonance of the chosen expressions can contribute to combining facts with additional content in a persuasive way and also embodies forces that judges employ in a complete persuasive task. Engagement of the audience in the issues is at the heart of emotive language. The authors of the written opinion have, admittedly, a captive audience. Nevertheless, the choice of "emotional" words and the play of various linguistic strategies to stress assertions and justify conclusions can make the reader understand and accept what the author is proposing. Several cases are ripe for such an analysis [15, 16]. Ethical considerations underline the arguments deliberated until now. Indeed, the risk exists that those who are subjected to the emotive language of judges are, at least to a certain extent, influenced and even swept along by these terms. A balance exists in judicial activity between "emotional" and "objective" discourse. Precisely because of this, those with "function" tend to identify those "pathos" that legitimize the conclusions confided in a discourse guided ultimately by a rational principle. Excessive reliance on emotional appeals is inconsistent with the idea of a written opinion, inspired by the intent of communicative efficacy and even more so with the neutrality that judges must show. Furthermore, persuasive "emotional" writing may be interpreted as a meager means to fill juridical holes, leave the court psychologically spent to be forgotten in the fractured legal setting or create some instant sense of urgency to attend to a fast-closing window of judicial or legislative opportunity. The dog who dominates at the center stage of a legal comedy may suggest that emotive principles may also give rise to negative readings which may subsequently polarize judgments [17, 18].

Repetition and Parallelism

Repetition While repetition might at first blush seem to indicate a lack of diction, its potential persuasive force simply cannot be discounted. Repeated phrases are remembered: they appear as headings in the mind's index. In the realm of rhetorical argument, repetition aids us in retention by facilitating rhythm, balance, and comprehension. Repeating words creates a rhythm, a kind of pacing associated with ritualistic chants. Repeated structure reminds us of parallelism – one of the most powerful rhetorical tools. Except for being memorable, a term repeated might be pushed in the direction of assuming the character of a 'dominant premise,' as it becomes counted as a datum to be construed in favor of its proponent. Suspicion of mere usage could very well be missing interesting psychological effects of the repeated phrase. If what is familiar to us is trusted, preferring the repeated phrase could be associated with a heightened perceived credibility and authority. A phrase repeats an idea articulating a position, but

by occurring repeatedly through an opinion, the judgment is linguistically marked as a product of judicial authority. Further, metaphorically, repetition can be seen as reinforcing a theme, presupposing that the first slogan contained a message that should be heard, forcing the listener to construct what now comes to him as an idea that, by definition, is about to be repeated and meant to gather his interpretative attention, this time connoting authority, having been inaugurated [19, 20]. Parallelism It is important to note that when discussing parallelism, we must weigh notions of meaning, as even the terms used in repetition must resonate without contradiction. Parallelism connects points, arguments, reasons, facts, benefits, and/or authorities. It draws necessary or compelling comparisons between different legal principles, historical facts, linguistic predicates, or, perhaps, values. It can also connect different analogous cases and distinguish legal precedents. For judicial drafting, these analogies are not fuzzy and illogical but are a form of argument that involves a comparison between two things that have relevant similarities. Thus, when I write about issues that are similarly parallel structurally. Notably, some scholars have suggested artificial methods for indicating the culmination of an argument in brief or gavel opinions. The effect of signposting efficient judicial writing through the use of blank space presents a considerable appeal for a busy judge in communicating to harried readers. The wry humor of this is evident to all. Finally, a parallel time-series narrative can be seen as organizing the dispute in a manner that the judge might most fully understand, thus understanding the maker, to the judge, which is some form of parallelism of logic that follows once in a case [21, 22].

Impact of Persuasive Language on Legal Interpretation

Language matters. The way judges craft their opinions — their language, their stories, their silences — has enormous implications not just for how cases currently before the courts are decided, but also for the laws and legal rules that appellate courts make, and the way those legal rules are interpreted by administrative agencies, attorneys, and judges in the future. The law, and the application of that law, is an inherently social, or communicative, enterprise — and as our discussion highlighted, it is founded on storytelling. The tools of legal interpretation — text, legislative history, purpose, policy, precedent, and common law — necessarily involve the persuasive manipulation of language. And when a decision-maker is stuck, these same tools form the materials with which the new law is made. How an opinion justifies or minimizes the reach of these tools — and the rhetorical choices that go along with these justifications — affects how the law is made and applied [23, 24]. Judges have discretionary and interpretive authority to decide what pieces of information are relevant and to manipulate the persuasive value of that information through the rhythm of their stories and the meted diction of their opinions. This week's course reading — Parts I, II, and most of III — unpacks the notion of interpretive authority. Judges create and harbor the “shadow of pre-disclosure” over the receptor of the decision by adopting a decisional stance in their opinions meant to obscure or disclose the normative propriety of their decisions. The articulation of a decisional stance — and the attendant revelation that the law is a choice — is a serious matter because the way a judge articulates a decision inevitably carries implications for the future, both for the case at hand and for the precedential appeal of the opinion. Will future decision-makers see themselves or “us” in the story? Language is a rhetorical tool used to shape social conventions, articulate and enforce social norms, and tell stories about the emotionally freighted consequences of people's behaviors. With great authority comes great responsibility: judges must speak the law in a way that obligates, rather than manipulates, the public and other governmental actors [25, 26].

Future Directions

Language cannot definitively determine meaning, but it undeniably shapes how case law is retrieved and interpreted. Language can be a tool for judgment, persuasion, and shaping public perception. For these reasons, the language used in judicial opinions should be carefully crafted and critiqued. Judicial opinions clarify and explain the law, but in doing so they simultaneously represent and interpret the law. As a result, the rhetorical dimensions of legal discourse act to influence both the law's construction and our understanding. Each linguistic decision made within an opinion has rhetorical implications, and these implications shape not only the particular legal dispute at issue but also the broader legal landscape. Legal doctrines are crafted, tested, and contested through the rhetorical means of language. In courtrooms across the country, legal practitioners must consistently persuade judges, opponents, and juries through oral and written advocacy [27, 28]. Recent studies have found that the more judges use legalistic language that conveys certainty, the more the U.S. Circuit Courts elicit deference from the Supreme Court. Thus, an increase in legal language may suggest an increase in the third-person observers' perception of authority. In conclusion, training judges in the art of persuasively discussing law in judicial opinions will further develop their ability to persuade naysayers, induce confidence, and ultimately

achieve legitimacy for the judiciary as experts in the law. Finally, alternative accounts of the law are desirable as they raise awareness concerning how the law interacts with public/community values. Legal language and rhetoric are power-laden tools used by advocates, judges, and other legal practitioners arguing cases in a court of law. Further study into how these communities communicate with one another and how their communications change as these communities evolve is a worthwhile endeavor [29, 30].

CONCLUSION

Judicial language is more than a tool for resolving disputes; it is a dynamic force that shapes legal interpretation and societal norms. The rhetorical strategies employed by judges—whether through analogies, emotive language, or repetition—play a vital role in legitimizing judicial authority and influencing public trust in the legal system. These linguistic choices carry significant ethical implications, balancing the need for clarity and persuasion with the obligation to remain impartial and fair. As the judiciary continues to navigate complex legal and social landscapes, fostering rhetorical expertise among judges is crucial for enhancing their ability to communicate effectively and uphold the legitimacy of the judiciary. Further exploration into the evolving nature of judicial language promises to deepen our understanding of its transformative potential in law and society.

REFERENCES

1. Carter T, López R, Songster K. Redeeming justice. *Nw. UL Rev.*. 2021;116:315.
2. Martin JW, Heiphetz L. “Internally wicked”: Investigating how and why essentialism influences punitiveness and moral condemnation. *Cognitive Science*. 2021 Jun;45(6):e12991.
3. Matanzima J. “Disempowered by the transition”: Manipulated and coerced agency in displacements induced by accelerated extraction of energy transition minerals in Zimbabwe. *Energy Research & Social Science*. 2024 Nov 1;117:103727.
4. Carey B. The language of public reason. *Journal of Social Philosophy*. 2022 Mar;53(1):93-112.
5. Denison A, Wedeking J, Zilis MA. Negative media coverage of the supreme court: The interactive role of opinion language, coalition size, and ideological signals. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2020 Jan;101(1):121-43.
6. Lu N, Yuan C. Legal reasoning: A textual perspective on common law judicial opinions and Chinese judgments. *Text & Talk*. 2021 Jan 27;41(1):71-93.
7. Greenstein S. Preserving the rule of law in the era of artificial intelligence (AI). *Artificial Intelligence and Law*. 2022 Sep;30(3):291-323.
8. Callister PD. Law, artificial intelligence, and natural language processing: a funny thing happened on the way to my search results. *Law Libr. J.*. 2020;112:161.
9. Huang H, Liu SQ, Lu Z. When and why language assertiveness affects online review persuasion. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. 2023 Aug;47(6):988-1016. [\[HTML\]](#)
10. Ostinelli M, Luna D. Syntax and the illusion of fit: How grammatical subject influences persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 2022 Feb 1;48(5):885-903.
11. Al-Dala'ien OA, Al-Daher Z, Al-Rousan M, Al-Shboul Y, Zabadi MI. Morphology of COVID-19 neologisms in modern standard arabic. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 2022 Feb 28;8(1):111-32.
12. Mulcahy S. Dances with laws: from metaphor to methodology. *Law and Humanities*. 2021 Jan 2;15(1):106-33.
13. Giang DN. Vietnamese concepts of love through idioms: A conceptual metaphor approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2023 Apr 1;13(4):855-66.
14. Murashova EP. The role of the cognitive metaphor in the hybridisation of marketing and political discourses: An analysis of Englishlanguage political advertising. *TLC Journal*. 2021 Apr 1;5(2).
15. Webster SW, Albertson B. Emotion and politics: Noncognitive psychological biases in public opinion. *Annual review of political science*. 2022 May 12;25(1):401-18.
16. Khrais LT. Role of artificial intelligence in shaping consumer demand in E-commerce. *Future Internet*. 2020 Dec 8;12(12):226.
17. O'Sullivan K, Hunter J, Kemp RI, Vines P. Judicial work and traumatic stress: Vilification, threats, and secondary trauma on the bench. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*. 2022 Nov;28(4):532.
18. Ponsonnet M. 49 Emotional linguistic relativity and cross-cultural research. *Language and Emotion*. Volume 2. 2022 Nov 7:1033.

19. Roy FG. Harnessing Rhythmic Movement Intervention for Body Awareness and Social Interaction in Children With Special Needs. In *Integrating the Biopsychosocial Model in Education 2025* (pp. 105-128). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
20. Putra DA, Wicaksono A, Suhartono S. Teaching Vocabulary Using Song in The Second Grade Students of Miftahul Huda Islamic Elementary School. *ELTT*. 2023 Oct 9;9(1):64-8.
21. Thomsen S, Sandbæk A, Agergaard S. Doing physical activity or not: an ethnographic study of the reasoning of healthcare workers and people with type 2 diabetes. *Social Theory & Health*. 2024 Jul 24;1-8.
22. Rickabaugh J. Regional public sector organizations: A broader taxonomic classification to cross-pollinate empirical research. *Public Administration*. 2023 Mar;101(1):271-83.
23. Ienca M. On artificial intelligence and manipulation. *Topoi*. 2023 Jul;42(3):833-42.
24. Macagno F. Argumentation profiles and the manipulation of common ground. The arguments of populist leaders on Twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2022 Apr 1;191:67-82.
25. Hudson DZ. A Case for Varying Interpretive Deference at the State Level. *Yale LJ*. 2009;119:373.
26. Wurman I. Importance and Interpretive Questions. *Va. L. Rev.*. 2024;110:909.
27. Gray CM, Santos C, Bielova N, Toth M, Clifford D. Dark patterns and the legal requirements of consent banners: An interaction criticism perspective. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems 2021 May 6* (pp. 1-18). [acm.org](https://www.acm.org)
28. Ahmad K, Maabreh M, Ghaly M, Khan K, Qadir J, Al-Fuqaha A. Developing future human-centered smart cities: Critical analysis of smart city security, Data management, and Ethical challenges. *Computer Science Review*. 2022 Feb 1;43:100452. [[HTML](#)]
29. Schmidt TP. Judicial minimalism in the lower courts. *Virginia Law Review*. 2022 Jun 1;108(4):829-913.
30. Demin AV. Certainty and Uncertainty in Tax Law: Do Opposites Attract?. *Laws*. 2020 Dec 4;9(4):30.

CITE AS: Kakungulu Samuel J. (2025). The Power of Persuasive Language in Judicial Opinions. Research Output Journal of Education 5(2):6-11. <https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJE/2025/52611>