Comparative Legilinguistics
vol. 2025/63
DOI: https://doi.org/10.14746/cl.2025.63.2

The 'language of the law' and the 'sentiment of the language'. A cultural challenge to enrich global English for comparative legal studies with national identities

Giovanna TIEGHI*, **Research Professor of Comparative Public Law**
Department of Political Science, Law,
and International Studies (SPGI),
University of Padua, Italy
giovanna.tieghi@unipd.it

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5225-2870

Abstract*:* With the spread of the language and law theory in comparative constitutional law scholarship, the hegemony of the English language has often been overestimated, to the detriment of national cultural and linguistic identities. The worldwide ramifications of this reality, and in particular the related compelling role of the global dimension of the English language (*Global English*), have not entirely prevented the highly valuable process of adapting English to local needs. However, this aspect is still under-explored if we consider two related issues that are quite challenging: the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which emphasizes the relationship between language and power, and the open-ended meanings of the languages spoken within national jurisdictions that encompass a variety of domains, with their multiple versions, idioms, or '*Englishes*' of the Outer or Expanding

Circle. Trying to respond to the transitional challenge of the role of English language in the field of comparative law studies, this paper elaborates some practical methodological suggestions. They are meant to promote a more pluralistic, legal-linguistic understanding of comparative constitutional law to attain an updated legal literacy in teaching (*Content and Language Integrated Learning* – CLIL) and research (*Sentiment Legal Analysis* – SLA) in the era of new technologies. Outlining the framework for the rigorous practice of interdiscursivity, it thus pursues the following normative arguments: (i) Achieving a balance between a common global register and nuances of meaning related to local areas requires a methodological design that considers context, legal discourse, and an interdisciplinary approach; (ii) Using the expanded field of SLA in constitutional law contributes to an updated investigation on English as a Court language; (iii) Taking judicial language as a case study of English-language court discourse in continental systems encourages research into the subjectivity of idiomatic and cultural expressions relating to the national identity of judicial attitudes.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); Global English for Legal Studies (GELS); Englishes; Interdiscursivity; Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); Sentiment Legal Analysis (SLA).

*The shortened version of this paper is a chapter in E. Arban-JI. Yun, M. De Visser (eds.), *The Language of Comparative Constitutional Law. Questioning Hegemonies* (Hart, 2025).

1. Law And Language In The Global-Local Perspective: A Paradigm Shift For A Discursive Legal Education.

In the context of global and specific legal systems, the issue of legal language in legal communication requires problematization considering language and law theory in comparative constitutional law scholarship (Goodrich, 1984, p. 174), as well as the impact of new technologies and interdiscursivity.

Undoubtedly, the global dimension of the English language (*Global English*) plays a predominant role, thanks to the dissemination

of the theory above. However, to balance the overestimation of the hegemony of the English language and emphasize the crucial importance of national cultural and linguistic identities even in the field of constitutional law, the process of adapting the English language to meet local, domestic, human needs and cultures (Kachru & Smith, 2008) must be preserved as a highly valuable paradigm of constitutional value.

As demonstrated by the "fabric of social life",

> (…) in many parts of the world, as English is taken into the fabric of social life, it acquires a momentum and vitality of its own, developing in ways which reflect local culture and languages, while diverging increasingly from the kind of English spoken in Britain or North America (Graddol, 1997, p.2).

This empirical outcome has been debated in the linguistic literature since the 1990s. That decade has been considered "a revolutionary era, in that respect, with a proliferation of new linguistic varieties arising out of the worldwide implementation of the Internet, an emerging awareness of the crisis affecting the world's endangered languages, and an increasingly public recognition of the global position of English. In contrast", however, "the 1990s saw the emergence of a more comprehensive perspective in which spoken varieties became prominent" (Crystal, 2003, p. ix). That led to highlight "important theoretical issues" concerning the future of English (Graddol, 1997, p. 2) and also of the English *languages* (McArthur, 1998): issues which have an ever-increasing impact on how comparative constitutional scholars can profitably navigate linguistic provocations for an effective comprehension of the institutions of the new world era:

> According to many economists, cultural theorists and political scientists, the new 'world order' expected to appear in the 21st century will represent a significant discontinuity with previous centuries. (…) There are signs already" (it was in 1997) "of an associated shift of social values which may have a significant impact on the future decision-making of organizations, governments and consumers. (…) the future of English will be more complex, more demanding of understanding and more challenging for the position of native-

> speaking countries than has hitherto been supposed (Graddol, 1997, p. 3).

Notwithstanding the proliferation of literature relating to the connection between law and language as "both an obvious and a necessary project" (Goodrich, 1984, p. 174) and the ongoing debate on the role and the future of the English language, the centrality of capturing the global-local English dichotomy in the legal field is still under-explored (Smith, 2014). Specifically, the profile of different varieties of English (Smith, 2014) for effective communication (Smith, 2014) even in the comparative constitutional law field is not seriously considered as a tool for achieving an updated legal literacy in research and teaching and, above all, as a meaning-making process that can bring scholars together to share knowledge about the field itself (sec. 2).

Notably, we should grapple with two challenging related issues: the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which emphasizes the relationship between language and power (sec. 2.1), and the open-ended meanings of the languages spoken within national jurisdictions in the era of new technologies (sec. 2.2). The former, as an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social practice, focuses on investigating how societal power relations are established and reinforced through language use (Fairclough, 2013). The latter is devoted to an investigation of how the English language encompasses a variety of domains, with their multiple versions, idioms, or '*Englishes*' of the Outer or Expanding Circle (Crystal, 2003, p. 60; Kachru, 1989, pp. 85-93). It gives voice to experiential legal traditions that deserve to be analysed while balancing new global values with the constitutional realities of specific contemporary jurisdictions.

The aim, for the comparative constitutional law discourse, is to foster a new approach to theory-building and methodology taking judicial language – within the broader framework of judicial behavioural (Baum, 2009; Maveety, 2002) and sentiment (Ash et al., 2022) studies – as case study of the discursive way. How can global common values be harmonized with national constitutional systems

through the use of judicial language? The use of comparison (Ferrari, 2019) by justices of High Courts, which has been extensively studied in legal literature, remains under-researched at present when examined together with the related issue of English as a Court language in non-English speaking countries.

I argue that this kind of study requires the development of theories that exploit the linkages between those two dimensions in a manner that encompasses comparative research, also to face the challenges of comparative empirical work. Contemporary High Courts (Garoupa et al., 2021), more than other institutional actors, are indeed significantly contributing to making sense of discourses in the global context, extending to using them to understand reality and influence others: in other words, to move from the concept of 'discourse' to the notion of '*interdiscursivity*' (Tessuto, 2022, p. 21) (sec. 3). This starting point requires the outline of a detailed framework structured on the following basic assumptions: the inclusion, for teaching purposes, of an effective methodology fostered by the rigorous academic practice of *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)* (Pérez at al., 2018, pp. 177-184) (sec. 3.1); on the other hand, the usage, for research purposes, of the "expanding field of substantive interest for the theory of the law and the practice-of-law" known as *Sentiment Legal Analysis* (*SLA*) (Eliot, 2020) in the era of new technologies (sec. 3.2).

Ultimately, the challenge is now to study the contemporary value of comparative constitutionalism – beyond the traditional one – through the prism of the "Sentiment of the Language" as applied to "The Language of the Law" (Holmes, 1881). This paper explores an alternative, operational view of post-national constitutionalism dismissing the perspective limited to the constitutional positivistic design where the use of the language has remained largely an "invisible problem" (Navot, 2014, p. 301). It includes elements that extensive research has identified as critical factors in the legal and language debate: first and foremost, the critical importance of the intercultural, diversity-oriented use of English in contemporary democracies (Navot, 2014, p. 301). In particular, the process of the so-called openness of non-English speaking Courts (among which,

mainly, the Italian Constitutional Court – ICC) (Bergonzini at al., 2023) is presented as an example of discoursal practices in the discipline of law which are characterized "as defining different purposes within their discourse communities through variation in language features" (Tessuto, 2022, p. 121) (sec. 4).

2. The Global vs The Local Dimension: No Communication Without Representation.

Consequently, much beyond the unquestionable status of Global English as *lingua franca*, the challenge for comparative constitutional studies is to engage with language more systematically, regardless of the state of constitutional democracy. From this standpoint, to engage with language means to build a new understanding, and an empirical, methodological application, namely "to take two linguistic principles (multilingualism (Crystal, 2003, p. xiii) and a common language (Crystal, 2003, p. xiii)) on board" (Crystal, 2003, p. xiii-xiv). Both contributing in the name of an intercultural communication (Kurylo, 2013), the two linguistic principles result as "amazing world resources" for a substantially updated legal analysis and education (Goodrich, 1984, from p. 523). Precisely, they serve as tools to connect the global legal-linguistic content-register with the local: on the one hand, the principle of a common language "fosters cultural opportunity and promotes a climate of international intelligibility" (Crystal, 2003, p. xiv); on the other hand, the principle of multilingualism "fosters historical identity and promotes a climate of mutual respect" (Crystal, 2003, p. xiv).

"As the world is in transition, so the English language is itself taking new forms" (Graddol, 1997, p.2): legal inquiry and analysis require that scholars be trained to combine the global with the local, to develop a challenging *glocal* (Bauman, 2005; Bauman, 2013, pp.1-5; Tieghi, 2021, pp. 2963-64) empirical-discursive approach able to design a cooperative – and also intergenerational – dialogue on law and language. As a matter of fact, the intention of this paper is to be a

constructive resource in this regard, while taking a macro view of the various paradigms operating "under the umbrella of World Englishes" (Sadeghpour & Dangelo, 2022, pp. 9-10) for a scrutiny of comparative law itself:

> Developments in methodology and its plural use may lead to a reorientation of comparative law and consequently contribute to writing a manifesto of 'new' comparative law. Knowledge of the different methods and research of methodological pluralism could enable students to develop a greater sensitivity towards the complexity of legal problems through a perception that can progressively strengthen". It regards the proposal of "the study of methodological pluralism as an exciting challenge for comparative legal scholars (Scarciglia, 2023, p. xi and p. xiii).

2.1. The Challenge Of Defining An Updated Intercultural Linguistic Path In Comparative Constitutional Law Education: The Role Of Discourse Analysis Among Language, Law and Power.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), emphasizing the relationship between language and power (Fairclough, 2013, p.6), fosters the ability to analyse the dialectical relationships between discourse and power in relation to the specific topic and object of research. It thus assumes a crucial role as a driver in the challenge of defining an updated intercultural linguistic path in comparative constitutional law education and research. The specific feature not to be underestimated – or simply relegated to the sphere of linguistics – is the consideration of the language as a form of social practice. That is, related to the society and the actual use of language used in legal contexts (legal discourse) (Tessuto, 2022, p. 107). From this standpoint CDA entails a re-thinking of the comparative method itself.

The critical method of discourse analysis, indeed, seems to reinforce the comparative law methodology itself, being able to "provide a useful tool for understanding the socio-cultural contexts in which texts or genres are situated via language use alongside any

concrete social activity or practice by which questions of ideology, identity and interaction concern individuals, groups and institutions" (Tessuto, 2022, p. 121).

In this regard, focusing on some successive logical stages of the epistemology of some keywords can help to contextualize the methodology for the general purpose of a new understanding of the language of comparative constitutional law, with a view to better applying this theoretical framework to the specific case study of judicial language discussed below (at sec. 4):

a) the importance of the term '*discourse*' as the study of 'language in action' – in correlation with the 'law in action' paradigm – concerns looking at the text in relation to the social context in which it is used (Hyland & Patridge, *Introduction*, 2011, p. 1) and focusing on discourse as language in use, as language structure above the sentence level of the sentence and as "social practices and ideologies associated with language and/or communication" (B Gray and D Biber, 2011, p. 138). The ideological dimension of language, in particular, such as beliefs and feelings about it, has a significant influence on the integration of slang and colloquial expressions into standard language. It expresses representations about the nature, the structure, and use of linguistics forms in a social world (Rumsey, 1990, p. 346; Gal, 2023). Predominant cultural attitudes and institutional norms often dictate which linguistic forms are accepted. As a result, certain expressions may be embraced or marginalised;

b) the feature of the discourse '*analysis*' is related to "any instance of language-in-use, whether written, spoken, or visual, realized in different social and cultural contexts" (Tessuto, 2022, p. 106). This specific approach has a fundamental impact on legal studies – and mostly on comparative legal studies – because it discloses the common relationship between law and language as social and context-dependent phenomena;

c) the "critical" (Fairclough, 2013, p. 7) approach of the analysis as an interdisciplinary method to the study of the discourse: it brings with itself the institutionalism theory which "highlight(s) classifications which place value on sociological elements, such as the nature and makeup of the group itself, the position of its component

members or even existing forms of authority" (Ferrari, 2022, p. 2). By incorporating this perspective, the critical approach recovers the multifaceted nature of legal discourse and emphasises the idea of law as a mirror of society and, consequently, as "the fertile field for discourse analysts" (Shuy, 2005, p. 437).

Within this framework, the language of comparative constitutional law finds in the CDA "*not* analysis of discourse 'in itself' as one might take it to be, but", rather, "analysis of dialectical *relations between* discourse and other objects, elements or moments, as well as analysis of the 'internal relations' of discourse" (Fairclough, 2013, p. 4).

What seems to be of great importance for the purposes of this paper is, thus, the "networking characteristic" that defines CDA a potential driver for classifying the relationship between language and comparative constitutional law in a pluralistic, discourse-oriented way. In fact, as pointed out by Fairclough himself, "Since analysis of such relations cuts across conventional boundaries between disciplines (linguistics, politics, sociology and so forth), CDA is an interdisciplinary form of analysis, or as I shall prefer to call it a *transdisciplinary* form. What this term entails is" – and this is where the legal issues lie – "that the 'dialogues' between disciplines, theories and frameworks which take place in doing analysis and research are a source of theoretical and methodological developments within the particular disciplines, theories and frameworks in dialogue – including CDA itself" (Fairclough, 2013, p. 4).

To conclude, the relational dimension and the transdisciplinary nature of CDA provide an operational platform for the study of the use of the English language itself in a variety of contemporary legal traditions and in the era of global legal systems. Specifically, it allows us to arrive at an understanding of law as a social practice-oriented system that involves participants (legislators, judges, academics and also law students) who are conceived as members of the legal discourse community:

> When we approach law as a social practice, we are also concerned with what *social participants* are doing in legal institutions through their social activity and the way they are making interactive processes

> of meaning-making by using verbal or non-verbal language associated with a particular text or genre of legal discourse (Tessuto, 2022, p. 7).

2.2. Englishes In Action: Translation And Translatability In The Era Of New Technologies.

If languages are inseparable from their contexts of use by a community of participants, the open-ended meaning of the language spoken (i.e. in action) within national jurisdictions plays an important role not just in the understanding of the variety of domains the English language encompasses, but, also, in the identification and comprehension of the cultural values and institutional arrangements the different constitutional jurisdictions express (Bathia at al., 2008).

What marks the coherency with a law-linguistic investigation, hence, is the fact that languages "are not only congruent with, but also involved in the configuration of the worldviews and value systems manifested in cultures and embodied in texts". That means, from a specific constitutional standpoint, that "the spread of English worldwide foregrounds the issue of textual dynamics in intercultural settings" in such a way as to facilitate international contacts and exchanges that enrich the global dialogue on the articulation of common constitutional standards (i.e. democracy, the rule of law etc.) with local peculiarities. And these dynamics also favour the operational construction of up-to-date systems of knowledge, due to the unavoidable fact that the spread of the English language "also triggers hegemonic practices" (Cortese & Duszak, 2005, p. 11).

The struggle between language, law and power (Sacerdoti Mariani, 2004, pp. 17-34) involves a dynamic that has yet to be unravelled and expresses the transdisciplinary form of CDA, not only from a linguistic point of view. It is precisely within this dialectical framework that the study of "'languaging' strategies (verbal, visual, multimodal; English monolingual, bilingual, multilingual) through a range of methodological perspectives" can contribute to the recognition and appreciation of "respect for socio-cultural differences"

as a "constitutive value" (Cortese & Duszak, 2005, p. 25). Crystal has assumed the "expanded circle" of English that "better reflects the contemporary scene" of the multiple linguistic versions of English (Crystal, 2003, p. 60). He has also shown that technology has enabled and promoted the spread of English throughout the world (Crystal, 2001); as a result, it is now necessary to monitor the increasing potential of new technologies, particularly those that have an invasive effect on the process of shared communication between legal systems.

In particular, in a globalised world (Bolton, 2013), the urgency of balancing the global with the local involves civilisational considerations (Khanna, 2016) and rigorous methodologies. They both have to be consistent with the widespread use – and abuse – of new technologies increasingly devoted not to harmonise diversity but, rather, to eradicate it. Thus, generative AI can be considered a clear example of the so called "invasive species" (Pinchbeck, 2024) also in the specific field and process of discourse and legal translation (Yuan et al., 2021; Castillo et al., 218; Gulcehre et al., 2017). The comparison with an invasive species highlights several key points that are particularly relevant to the subject of this paper.

They can be summarised in their dangerously rapid spread with potentially disruptive consequences. Like invasive species in nature, AI-generated content is quickly populating many areas of digital platforms, and can disrupt natural habitats, altering the legal landscape through the digital one, potentially crowding out human-created content. Considering this scenario, the attempt to combine diverse research perspectives (legal register, discourse and genre, semiotics, forensic linguistics and also legal translation) with law-centric methodologies aiming to compare the legal languages of different countries (Tiersma, 1999, Trasborg, 1997; Tessuto, 2012; Goodrich, 1992) requires us to strongly improve the quality of the glocal approach from a cross-cultural perspective. To be effective, this process should follow two interrelated directions, i.e. by contributing to the identification of new paradigms of human-oriented global communication (Manaj, 2017; Sharifian, 2013; Smith, 1981) and, simultaneously, in terms of teaching and learning strategies (Kong,

2022; Galloway & Rose, 2021; Baratta, 2019; Kachru, 1985; Alptekin & Alptekin, 1984 – see sec. 3 of this paper).

The core challenge of reaching a glocal balance has for decades involved the critical attempt to invest in translation studies and strategies that need to be applied to different genres of legal texts in order to go beyond their native settings (Sarcevic, 2000). Now the aim is also to avoid invasive, technological attack (Mohamed et al., 2024). In an era of new technologies and the consolidation of the 'extended circle' of English, the issue is seriously underestimated, as evidenced by the fact that the relationship between the two different concepts of translation and translatability (which, instead, have consistent implications in the way the comparative legal perspective is approached) is only considered for linguistic purposes. The question is how to contribute to the shift from the traditional content of 'translation' to the growing interest in the communicative, pragmatic, cognitive and social aspects of legal 'translatability' (Biel & Engberg, 2013). The legal dimension needs to be prioritised, using a pragmatic approach to legal content, focusing on how jurisdictions use constitutional vocabulary in relation to the functioning of institutions. This is different from a 'simplistic' focus on linguistics alone.

If we consider the so-called 'process of recontextualization of legal discourse' (Andrus, 2011) – which, as in the case of written texts, is usually associated with translation from one legal language into another - and we contextualize it within the framework of the language of comparative law, some key points deserve structural consideration with regard to the inclusion of the diversity of *Englishes* in the desirable glocal process. First, for the crucial importance of the 'generic integrity' in the translation process (Bhatia, 2004); second, for the unavoidable ability to deal with the related concept of 'equivalence' of comparable concepts/terms which "depends upon the similarity or differences between two legal languages and systems compared" (Tessuto, 2022, pp. 124-125); third, for the interpersonal character of communication (Solan, 1993) which naturally defines the reciprocal learning process, where the transposition of different *Englishes* to the global register goes along with the transposition of one legal order to another.

In the light of the reconstruction mentioned, the preservation of the experiential characteristics of the law-linguistic traditions of various jurisdictions can lead, in a significant manner, to the preservation of the integrity of the legal-linguistic tool as a crucial paradigm that qualifies the nature of new knowledge in the improvement of the language of contemporary legal science. The challenge, as anticipated in the introduction to this paper, is the move from the concept of 'discourse' to that of 'interdiscursivity'.

3. Possible Methodological Solutions Of Legal-Linguistic Interdiscursivity And The Implications For Judicial Language.

Interdiscursivity, referring to "the mixing of diverse genres, discourses, or styles associated with institutional and social meanings in a single text" (Wu, 2012, p. 1312), plays a fundamental role in the process of the inevitable, institutional shift from abstract and fixed cultural categories to actual, situated activity (Griswold, 2004). It clearly approaches what, from a comparative law perspective, is called the process of 'hybridisation' (Gobbo, 2024, from p. 17), with its contemporary value-oriented features, primarily in the field of law and justice:

> The value system of a pluralistic and open society, although it varies in space and time, certainly does not depend, even to a small extent, on the judicial or legislative nature of the rules of the system, on the declarative or creative adaptation of the decisions of the ordinary judge, on the application of the Romano-Germanic version of the principle of legality or the British rule of law, or on the university or predominantly practical training of the legal class. The value system is mainly contained in the constitutional datum or is derived from jurisprudential or legislative principles, legal institutions and social data. In other words", the author pointed out, "the review of constitutionality is certainly a defining feature of legal systems, and the fundamental exception based on this perimeter is independent of the classic contrast between the Romanist family and the common law family, to which it is transversally opposed (Ferrari, 2014, p. 791).

The two concepts found their common ground in Bakhtin's dialogized "heteroglossia" studies: he charted the idea that "utterances in language are always dialogized and changing" which results in what he called 'hybridization' as "the mixture of different utterances within a single piece of language" (Bakhtin, 1981; Bakhtin, 1986). And what Bakhtin "holds in terms of the concept of dialogized heteroglossia brings us to the issue of interdiscursivity" namely, of the "linguistic phenomenon" which "permeates through language use, especially in contemporary institutional settings" (Wu, 2012, p. 1313). This is particularly crucial for the analysis proposed here in relation to comparative constitutional law: it paves the way for interdiscursivity to help not just linguists but also jurists, with the aim of contributing to the understanding of the 'language of comparative law' in order to promote, far beyond existing studies (namely, the CDA approach and stylistic one) (Wu, 2012, p. 1316), further methodological efforts (Scarciglia, 2024, p. 36) to strengthen the interdisciplinary nature of comparative law (Scarciglia, 2024, p. 37; Husa, 2022): in particular, the legal-linguistic component of this field of law, with its ontological characteristic of revitalising national legal-linguistic identities within the global institutional legal framework (Scollon, 2002).

This contribution is illustrated by considering the following specific findings: the first, coming from the origin of interdiscursivity in the academic debate, to better understand its contemporary manifestations in the legal systems; the second, explicitly providing its application within a glocal constitutional setting.

Starting with the former, the notion of interdiscursivity finds its precursors in what Fairclough coined as "the order of discourse" and in Pecheux's notion of "interdiscourse" (Helsloot & Hak, 2007): both have a significant impact on the so-called in-depth legal comparison (Scarciglia, 2024, pp. 40-41) as they "allow us to understand the textuality of hegemony, or in other words, the discursive processes by means of which subjects are produced and the common sense maintained" (Wu, 2012, p. 1313). These processes perfectly represent the efforts to be carried out in relation to non-native English-speaking countries (and their courts) to give strength, integrity, and intelligibility especially to the judicial voices expressed

in the texts of judicial judgments once transposed in the English language. But it also impacts on the way the academic discourse on judicial interpretation – and discussion during oral argument – following a court judgment is presented in the English language.

As regards the latter, within a contextualized (legal) environment, "interdiscursivity" is further increased on the basis of two complementary factors: on the one hand, "by the role of multimedia and web-mediated communication, because the *medium* involves a more dialogical manner of exchanging specialized information at the level of syntactic and rhetorical choices used to express meanings"; on the other hand, it is increased "by the interdisciplinary contexts of law" (Tessuto, 2022, p. 121). Constitutionally speaking, these two factors confirm, in this era of uncertainty, the new directions towards the so-called methodological pluralism and, primarily, towards the crucial role of differences in the global legal sphere:

> (…) a more recent neo-functionalist orientation aims to search for similarities and differences and, in a post-modern version, focuses instead on dissimilarities and divergences (Scarciglia, 2024, p. 39).

In fact, alongside a global linguistic register, which must be respected in terms of the common linguistic strands that must necessarily be compatible with the legal ones in order to ensure a correct understanding of what is written or said in the decision-making process, there can necessarily be a local register with all its specificities of identity: linguistic, institutional and cultural, as well as strictly legal (in terms of constitutional orientation).

At the very end of the path thus traced, the crucial challenge for comparative scholars seems to be monitoring "how the law positions itself to other discourse via a complex network of interdiscursivity and intertextuality, where language users create their own roles, identities, beliefs, and systems of knowledge" (Tessuto, 2022, p. 107). In this respect, the judicial discourse (Maley, 1985) – with its qualified language users, the judges – emerges as a special place of observation, due also to the growing number of experiments in non-English-speaking countries, such as Italy, to provide English

versions of official moments and texts of judicial decision-making processes.

Within the broader framework of judicial behaviour studies, the investigation into judicial language aims to provide a focus regarding the attempt to combine the linguistic with the legal in a way that allows comparative law scholars to experiment (through teaching and researching) (Ferrari, 2024, p. XX) the identitarian, effective, glocal law-linguistic dynamic in the field of constitutional law and justice. Everything seems to start from two basic steps, voluntarily expressed in an order (first teaching – sec. 3.1. – and then researching – sec. 3.2.) which presumes the adherence to the suggested methodological pluralism (Scarciglia, 2023; Midgley et al., 2017; Della Porta & Keating, 2008; Oderkerk, 2015) and the positive outcomes of experiential learning (ExL) (Golledge & Tieghi, 2024, from p. 307).

3.1. The Academic Practice Of CLIL Through Harmonization And Diversity.

Nowadays, teaching comparative law and the related subjects – and in particular, Global English for Legal Studies – offers a remarkable opportunity of experimenting with something extremely 'glocal': a challenging journey (Tieghi, 2024, pp. 1-14) between the necessity for a common legal-linguistic register and the need to avoid standardisation to the detriment of the legal-linguistic varieties of English.

International groups of students from different settings attending a law course; diverse national identities to include within a 'global' network of understanding (Wilson, 2017) and, first and foremost, the continuous confirmation, academic year after academic year, that "it is just as likely that the course of the English language is going to be influenced by those who speak it as a second or foreign language as by those who speak it as a mother-tongue" (Crystal, 2003, p. 172): all this has created the best conditions for asking how the content of comparative studies could be conveyed through a vehicular

language that would be an effective expression of glocal needs. In class, practices of dialogues among groups with students with different nationalities can promote the understanding of the common constitutional principles without eliminating, but rather by enhancing, the national legal peculiarities which, also through language, shape the characteristics of substantive constitutional law that qualify a given system.

As part of this inquiry, the practice of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) through English can act as a significant catalyst for future directions in the language of comparative law and for the compelling needs of intercultural comparative law (Diaz Perez et al., 2018, p. 178): fostering interdisciplinarity (law and language) in the teaching-learning process (Mewald, 2007), it promotes the implementation of the nuances of the language (Mehisto, 2012) of different legal systems through the understanding of the content related.

The goal of the integration of content and language learning is, indeed, to effectively learn contents through an additional language (foreign or second – primarily, English as a global language), and it is addressed by "discussing approaches to content-centred learning in a second language" (Thompson & McKinley, 2018). This "double-focused didactic approach" (Marsh et al., 2010; Marsh et al., 2015) finds its proper operational framework in a variety of subjects and issues to be analysed from a comparative law perspective (Tieghi, 2021, pp. 2963-2966).

To illustrate, one may observe the issues of judicial voicing disagreement (Lynch & Tieghi, 2025) and judicial objectivity (Breda, 2017) to investigate the Italian, the Australian and the UK legal systems from a comparative law outlook. Working at the intersection of both language class and law lecture, the aim is to use real legal questions to sharpen students' English and, simultaneously, explore how legal systems promote fairness through judicial behaviour using precise legal English. Not by chance, the two topics have been proposed as lectures within the Content and Language Integrated Learning 2024 and 2025 Cycle of seminars (scheduled within the

ELP-Global English for Legal Studies course), held at the University of Padua.

As for the judicial disagreement, some background information is necessary. I support the idea that one of the most enriching ways to gain an in-depth understanding of the inner workings of legal systems is to make comparisons between seemingly heterogeneous legal systems that are classified as uncommon both for the legal family to which it belongs and for the use of English, native/second language (Breda, 2025, p. 242). Furthermore, the challenge in terms of judicial disagreement is to acquire a register that complies with the judicial practices of the Australian legal tradition, which differ greatly from Italian customs and are unique among common law traditions. Australia is, in fact, known as a crossroads of common and civil law jurisdictions.

The current debate on the possibility of introducing dissenting opinions in the decision-making process of the Italian Constitutional Court and the modern impulse in Australia towards joint judgments focuses on the unexpected converse practices (Lynch & Tieghi, 2025, p. 226). The core legal-linguistic issue is the consent-dissent dichotomy. The linguistic tools applied, such as 'dissent', 'joint', 'consensus' and 'collegiality', are seemingly used to highlight the similarities and differences between the two judicial practices, but essentially to identify specific constitutional principles emphasized by the legal register of each system. From the Italian perspective, the concept of 'collegiality' risks coinciding with 'fixity and non-responsibility' (Bertolissi, 2023, p. 57 – translation by the author) but is valued in the local legal tradition of joint opinions as a distinctive feature of the legal system itself. This is a tradition in which, in order to be accepted within the constitutional dynamic, the various facets of the principle of pluralism must still be traced back to the principle of unity (Article 5 of the Italian Constitution). This tradition thus hardly assumes a core value in understanding the role of dissent as a constructive paradigm to enhance dialogue, and the linguistic tool itself is considered dangerous in the courts' consent-oriented approach to legitimacy. Nevertheless, the meaning of collegiality fosters discussion on the 'inherently constitutional nature of the tension

between freedom and division' (Lynch & Tieghi, 2025, p. 218), explaining how the Italian legal tradition conceives of the concept-term 'collegiality' and how it could be updated without abandoning local constitutional traditions.

As for the topic of judicial objectivity, indeed, by linking law, language and judicial communication, CLIL practices encourage – illustrating the judicial perspective – the systematic process of using the crucial tool of a wider "cultural diversity" (Marsh, 2009, pp. 4-16). As clearly affirmed,

> (…) a common concept such as objectivity in judicial discourse is constructed by national diverging clusters of significances. The cluster of textual qualifications made by the judicial system is culturally distinctive, rather like human DNA, and it has important pragmatic and theoretical implications (Breda, 2017, p. 12).

In order to investigate how courts decide when a judge should step aside, it is crucial to recognize and understand key legal terms such as 'recusal' and 'logical connection'. However, as the comparison between the UK and Australian systems demonstrates, achieving a comprehensive understanding of the concept of a "fair-minded observer" (Breda, 2025, p. 247) is key. This can be achieved by examining the actual words used by judges when explaining impartiality, as the UK's Porter v Magill rule and Australia's Ebner test are the only ways to understand this concept fully (Breda, 2025, pp. 249–250).

For every constitutional scholar in the world, knowing how to compare the legal tests and reasoning styles used in different judicial systems is crucial. This is also a concrete objective that should be adopted in comparative law courses. The promotion of 'encounters' with judges (i.e. meeting justices) in various forms (Tessuto, 2022, p. 118) has become essential for promoting interdiscursivity through comparative law 'in action' (Golledge & Tieghi, 2024, pp. 327–332; Klein, 2019, p. IV).

3.2. Sentiment Legal Analysis (SLA) As A Means To Understanding the Context and Tone of Diverse Judicial Voices.

The concrete means of communication used by contemporary justices as language users (i.e. written judgments, books, speeches, oral questions during oral arguments or oral interventions during meetings, interviews, podcasts, etc.) can be applied in their discourse practice (Solan, 1993) not only to deliver a formal judgment (Gageler, 2014, p. 195), but also to *inform* or rather to *persuade* public opinion and also to *educate* new generations (Keane, 2014, p. 19; Tieghi, 2020).

In this crucial cultural shift lies the great clue to a better understanding of judicial language in terms of interdiscursivity on the one hand, and in terms of national identity on the other. As we have seen, judicial language – in its daily practice – aims to shape the legal, local contexts and to give an account of the ongoing process of constitutional dialogue among the founding values (i.e. Court's collegiality) of a given community.

> Unity is certainly a value; but (…) not an absolute value; and one must question its limits, when it ends up taking on paternalistic and simplifying connotations that risk alienating almost anaesthetizing the citizenry (translation by the author): (Bergonzini & Tieghi, 2023, p. 186).

When we deal with English as a court language, the issue is indeed particularly challenging as it expresses the ideals and values of a judge or a single Court, rather than just the narrative of the proceeding. The focus, here, is on the former aspect. From a comparative law perspective, the role of judicial language must not be underestimated. Technology intercepts the problem. If we consider the dilemma of finding the balance between advances in artificial intelligence, particularly natural language processing (NLP) – the field concerned with making human communication, such as speech and text, comprehensible to computers (Eliot, 2020; Buchanan & Headrick, 1970) – as well as the human component of these language users, it is clear that caution is required in the methodology and

analysis of the research. However, it is evident that the judge/court assumes the role of highlighting the local and inherent components of the judicial voice:

> (The judge) is not a mechanism; he is not a calculating machine; he is a living man; and that function of particularizing and applying the law, which in vitro can be regarded as syllogism, is in reality an operation of syntheses, accomplished with fervor and mystery in the scaled crucible of the spirit when the interaction and welding of abstract law and concrete fact need for their completion and intuition and sentiment kindled in an unretiring conscience (Millar, 1955, p. 437).

Thus, if the judicial role, now more than ever (Barak, 2002), is to "bridge the gap between law and society and to protect the constitution and democracy" (Barak, 2006, p. 314) why not considering the ontological fact that "an important dimension of legal language is *sentiment* – that is, its positive or negative tone" (Ash et al., 2022, p. 362)?

For research purposes, Sentiment Legal Analysis (SLA), which involves detecting emotions, opinions and sentiment in natural language text (Liu, 2010), seems to be a valuable contribution to the field of constitutional law, providing an updated investigation into the individual – therefore domestic – use of English in courts. Considering the needs to understand the judicial voices in times of crisis, what thus appears to be taken into account is standard and non-standard dimensions in which sentiment can be expressed: the literature speaks about positive vs negative, but also neutral category or fine-grained (very positive, slightly positive etc.). The mentioned nuances reflect what SLA promotes: namely, a technological evaluation of individual thoughts, attitudes, and opinions toward a given object (Abimbola et al., 2024, p. 878). The aim is to shed light "upon the type of emotion that is expressed" (Wehnert et al., 2023, p. 79). Moreover, its aspect-based nature, whereby "the target of the sentiment is also identified" (Wehnert et al., 2023, p. 79), confirms its potential for approaching new legal-linguistic scenarios through human-centered artificial intelligence (HCAI).

Undoubtedly, many research opportunities have emerged in the field of SLA, opened up by recent interdisciplinary studies on case

law. For the purposes of this paper, it is crucial to note that these studies attempt to provide "a method for analysing the impact of judicial sentiments" (Ash et al., 2022, p. 373). Those impacts appear to be a significant enrichment for the study of the language of comparative law from a glocal perspective, albeit with due caution. That is due to the limitation, as a growing field at the intersection of linguistics and computer science (Toboada, 2016, p. 325), to only attempt to "automatically determine the sentiment contained in the text". For the purpose of constitutional studies, sentiment analysis research extracts information that goes far beyond single words. Rather, it considers the context of positive or negative words (Toboada, 2016, p. 325). This reveals the specific contribution that linguistic knowledge can make to determining the sentiment contained in a text without automation (Lee, 2013, p. 82).

When dealing with judicial language, it is important to consider the judicial method of balancing values, which involves processes of individual and collegial evaluation and comparison. This method is a key feature of the work of supreme courts at a national level. From this perspective, this kind of analysis proves its ability to incorporate the "descriptive analysis of legal language" (Ash & Chen, 2017) into the formal legal content of written or oral judicial communication in various ways: "embedding models to study the historical evolution of the culture understandings" (Kozlowski et al., 2019); "using supervised learning to extract measures of partisanship from text" (Gentzkow et al., 2019); using "supervised learning algorithms to extract measures of individual behaviours" and "attitudes" (Draca & Schwaez, 2019).

Given its features, the idea of applying SLA to analyze the judicial voices of different courts, as expressed through judicial language, is certainly challenging. Although the preliminary stage still needs to be implemented, recent studies acknowledge the relevance of this approach. As highlighted, it "has emerged as a powerful tool for understanding the underlying emotions and subjectivity in legal texts" (Wehnert et al., 2023, p. 77).

3.2.1. A Brief Overview: Case Studies in Judicial Sentiment Legal Analysis (SLA).

Recent case studies prove that it is a powerful tool that can be used for various purposes, such as quantifying judicial attitudes, predicting case outcomes and detecting bias. Of these, the aim of mapping the influence of language sentiment on legal development – once the tone (positive or negative) expressed in legal texts has been measured – seems to be the research path of most particular interest to this study. This line of research has yet to be implemented to date, but it has decisive potential in terms of strengthening national identity. Recent studies prove that the groundwork has already been laid.

A key example is the research on US Circuit Courts, in which scholars analyzed appellate court opinions in order to quantify judges' sentiments towards different social groups, and to examine how these sentiments influence legal outcomes (Ash & Chen, 2021). Using a method that embeds models to vectorize words and sentences to capture both sentiment and relevance to specific groups, the research showed that rulings with a more positive sentiment increase the chances of a case being reviewed or reversed by the Supreme Court, as well as leading to more citations. This influences legal development and persuasion among justices, considering judge demographics (i.e. age, race and political affiliation).

A second example is the application of SA to legal case prediction systems in Indian courts, where sentiment extracted from argument-based documents was used to predict judgements, particularly in areas such as domestic violence (Palitana et al., 2020). This helps legal professionals reduce the number of pending cases. Moreover, within the same legal system, this study is the first of its kind to use topic modelling and sentiment analysis on Indian legal documents, focusing on the Indian Supreme Court. It paves the way for a better understanding of legal documents (Gupta et al., 2023).

In the Swiss case law, SA has been used to identify subjective and social biases in the decisions of the Supreme Court. The study aimed to reveal the nuanced cultural and social attitudes encoded in

judicial language, thereby enhancing the understanding of the cultural characteristics of judicial decision-making (Wehnert, 2023).

Furthermore, recent efforts have been made to use deep learning to analyze maritime case law in Canada. The aim was to improve access to statutes and judicial opinions by analyzing judicial documents for sentiment. This facilitates better legal research and collaboration among court staff and has demonstrated the application of SA in different legal contexts and jurisdictions (Abimbola et al., 2024).

4. The Italian English Idiom And Sentiment And The Challenge Of Relationality: The Case Of The 'Openness' Of The Contemporary Italian Constitutional Court (ICC).

The increasing use of English in continental courts encourages research into the subjective nature of idiomatic and cultural expressions relating to national identity and domestic judicial attitudes. The process of the so-called "openness" characterised by the recent phenomenon of the Italian Constitutional Court's (ICC) introduction of specific third-party intervention measures[1] aimed to "open up to the voice of civil society" (Groppi, 2019, p. 468), has a profound impact on the issue under discussion. Indeed, the alternative perspective of openness as a "communicative experience" actually promotes a pragmatic path towards a civic constitutional culture (Tieghi, 2020) and reflects a significant attempt to address the

[1] To sum up, the above measures have, firstly, introduced the most significant innovation of amicus curiae briefs in Italian constitutional procedural law; secondly, they have extended the range of potential third-party interveners to other subjects; thirdly, they have introduced the possibility for the Court to call upon renowned experts when it deems it necessary to obtain information on specific fields of knowledge, thus framing the first step towards a more open and transparent constitutional justice system.

dialectical question between universalism and particularism in the legal-linguistic scenario:

> In every age, the mediation between universalism and particularism has produced happy syntheses, but also bitter conflicts and short-circuits (Ferrari, 2023, p. 45).

The result is a clear attempt to position the "Italian style" in the wider panorama of comparative constitutional law (Merryman, 1965; Merryman, 1966) and, in particular, in the field of constitutional justice: a field where the legal-linguistic perspective reveals new incentives to improve investigations into the Italian judicial language translations in English.

Recent trends towards an increased use of comparative law in the decision-making process (Groppi et al., 2025; Ferrari, 2019; Groppi & Ponthoreau, 2013) and the simultaneous ICC's effort to use the English legal language for official purposes point to an advanced path. Thanks also to the notable support of the 'Area di Diritto Comparato del Servizio Studi'[2] institutionalised within the Court's offices, remarkable attempts, albeit still in progress, are being made to expand "external interactions" as an internal component of the so-called relational approach (Barsotti et al., 2021, p.3). That seems to characterise the ICC's distinctive voice within the global network of Courts (Barsotti et al., 2021, p.3) while reporting on similar 'openness' trends in other courts around the world, without in any way compromising the relationship between non-English speakers and their own legal system (Dalal, 2023, from p. 255). The nuanced differences among the constructs of various legal linguistic paradigms are also beginning to be used to promote dialogue and dialogical legal reasoning (Tieghi, 2023i, p. 10), as well as transparency and interaction and comparison with other legal systems. They are actually

[2] For an overview of the activities and initiatives of the comparative law unit of the Court's research service and in particular the various research studies carried out since 2007 in support of the preparatory inquiry, please consult the section of the Court's website dedicated to comparative law studies at https://www.cortecostituzionale.it/actionDirittoComparato.do.

going to define, little by little, two specific trends. Firstly, judgment by judgment / speech by speech / report by report translated in English, a legal-linguistic identification of the Italian judicial style operates both under the mentions of the "world English umbrella" (Sadeghpour & Dangelo, 2022, p.1) and under the Italian constitutional law and values. They are both enriched by the new 'umbrella of openness' especially as regards the protection of fundamental rights. Secondly, the Court has increased its linguistic awareness in terms of interdiscursivity, legal translation and translatability (Tessuto, 2022, pp. 124 -125), as well as updated trends in comparative studies.

There are of course various possible degrees to which English could be admitted as a court language. In the last few years Europe has seen several initiatives, pilot projects and reforms by continental courts to "allow or seek to allow the use of other languages in courts proceedings that are non the official language in the respective state" (Kern, 2012, p. 188). "English", has been demonstrated, "figures most prominently among these languages" (Kern, 2012, p. 188). Within the European landscape the ICC is anyhow contributing, even if the English language is not part of official court proceedings, to enrich the debate on the importance of the so-called world Englishes. The trend serves the purpose of promoting each national court's own national law and identitarian constitutional values (Kern, 2012, p. 191). As for the ICC, however, the aim is rather to catch up with jurisdictions that have been involved in the global judicial dialogue for years (Barsotti et al., 2021, p. 2). This attitude, contextual with the increasing use of the legal English for academic purposes in the Italian comparative law field (Ferrari, 2024, p. XIX), is supported by the creation of an official English section on the Court's website (ICC website) and by the increased participation of Italian Justices in a variety of national and international conferences and meetings, where their official speeches are directly delivered in English (Tieghi, 2023).

This new communicative attitude has thus challenged the whole Court to practically give sense to the opening tool of 'relationality' (Barsotti, 2016) as the new identifying feature of the Italian constitutional justice system. If accurately transposed in the

daily work of the Court and, above all, implemented by the use of the English register aimed to promote Italian constitutional values and principles (such as, by way of example, dignity, perfect bicameralism, regional autonomy and asymmetry, loyal cooperation, incidenter or principaliter proceedings, manipulative judgments, principle of subsidiarity, principle of unity, generations of rights) it appears that the relational tool functions on a glocal basis. In other words, it reveals the potential to express the so called "Italian Style" (Barsotti et al., 2021, p.3) through its local, constitutional empowerment. Some perplexities and cautious acknowledgements (Groppi, 2019, p. 473) are thus positively contributing to encourage the Court itself to work towards an improvement of external relations with the task to effectively see legal-linguistic relationality in action, based on the promotional law approach (Groppi, 2023, from p. 73).

The journey is not yet over. But the study of the Court's crucial role in the process of incorporating the Italian sociolinguistic reality into the global discourse – which is the same effort that many courts are making with their non-English speaking judges to be part of the global judicial dialogue (Ferrari, 2019) – can continue to open up new, updated scenarios and analytical studies.

Certainly, the relational tool itself already seems to express the inner potentialities to become the legal-linguistic engine for the promotion of the Italian constitutional values, also through a specific English register that reflects the Italian cultural (Appadurai, 1996) and institutional heritage (Bassetti, 2015; Bassetti & D'Aquino, 2010). Based on the legal-linguistic premises discussed here, relationality clearly contributes to increasing internal and external transparency (Groppi & Lecis Cocco Ortu, 2021); to promoting the relational link between law and language as a "value synthesis of the State and society" (Ferrari, 2014, p. 791); to strengthening the legitimacy of the Court both nationally and internationally (Passaglia, 2018, p. 183); and to recalling the ideal of patriotism as a national, constitutional value in a globalised world (Barbisan, 2022). Last but not least, due to the common relational nature of both law and language, the tool also contributes to the definition of the language of comparative constitutional law to be used by contemporary scholars. From a

methodological view, in fact, the "'immersion' of a comparatist-at-law" – also through the different nuances of English – "in the everyday life and culture" of a specific country and system (Scarciglia, 2024, p. 21) favours, within the crucial setting of the constitutional justice, the re-consideration (and revitalisation) of differences in global discourse:

> From this point of view, the contribution of comparatists-at-law is undoubtedly crucial. They might also identify a dimension of differential constitutionalism in the contrastive form. Only incidentally can it be considered that, similarly to the *praesumptio similitudinis* in the comparative process, on the one hand, a presumption of similarity cannot be separated from the historical context in which the object or factor of comparison derives its origin; on the other hand, there would be a prevalence of differences, a *praesumptio dissimilitudinis* (Scarciglia, 2023, p. 164).

5. The "Language of the Law" Through The "Sentiment Of The Language": A New Methodology For The Intercultural, Interdisciplinary And Dialogical Language Of Comparative Constitutional Law?

It is essential to make conclusive remarks on the cultural challenge of enriching global English for comparative legal studies in relation to national identities, in order to identify the major trends on the issue outlined in the paper. The outcomes are challenging, yet promising.

First of all, the balancing of a common, unified global register with the nuances of meaning related to local areas through the "sentiment" (Cassese, 2015, p. 40) of the idiomatic expressions of each national community, clearly defines a new strength of contemporary constitutional law (Carducci, 2003, p. 115), which is too often unjustly underestimated from a comparative perspective. It is indeed comparison itself (Venter, 2022, p. 221) that can suggest the "keystone for overcoming the contradictions and vicious circle engendered by state constitutional systems without imposing uniform globalized visions". It effectively promotes, thus, the "interpretative

instrument that is consubstantial with the discursive method" and, not least, with the "dimension that reaches well beyond state borders and is capable of creating interrelations among different constitutional heritages" (Ferrari, 2014, p. 5).

Secondly, repositioning the local legal-linguistic constitutional heritage within the dichotomy of language and comparative constitutional method fosters the requalification of multiple legal 'Englishes' as proposed umbrella terms for the various paradigms of pluralistic democracies. That is highly valued for teaching, research and also experiential learning activities of comparative law. In fact, they represent the coexistence of different competing visions and tendencies that contribute to the definition of the so-called intercultural constitutionalism (IC), which implies the inevitable rethinking of the language of constitutional comparison (Venter, 2017). As IC is based on the "ethic of reciprocity" (Bonfiglio, 2020), it gives substance to the issue discussed here, namely the need for *glocal* communication in comparative law. In order to overcome the shortcomings of the marginalisation of certain regions in comparative research, local use of English must be revitalised reflecting the multidirectional tendencies to linguistic diversification and unification, by each and every state institution and also by academics. As the ICC's experience has shown, such use is intended to reflect legal English as a pragmatic, inclusive medium of global communication, as well as an authentic expression of the local cultural, institutional and social framework (De Visser, 2022). This is an example of constitutionalism based on the idea that "it is possible to formulate a constitutional idea of diversity that is properly intercultural" (Bonfiglio, 2020). A constitutionalism in action to be explored in its opening scenarios: for comparatist scholars, above all, dealing with a new complexity (Scarciglia, 2023, p. 124) and with comparative law beyond the state (Siems & Yap, 2024).

Third, the prism of constitutional justice offers a privileged point of observation and investigation: the relational approach and the "Italian style" of the ICC speak of a revitalised role of judicial language (Barbisan, 2024, from p. 103) and its "pioneering spirit" towards openness (Viganò, 2023, p. 40), which interacts with – and

intersects with – the language of constitutional comparison, necessarily aimed at promoting a rights-oriented platform of safeguards (Klinytskyi, 2022, p. 162). It is based on the premise that "maximum assistance to languages can be included as a part of the open" – and free (Ferrari, 2023, p. 47) – "society" (Klinytskyi, 2022, p. 162). For teaching purposes, the judicial language emerges as a preferred object of study through CLIL, primarily in light of its internal function of contributing to the glocal process of giving voice to domestic constitutional values and practices within global communities of judges. For research purposes, the identification of a sentimental dimension in judicial language helps to respond to the need of the comparative law methodology to improve the diagnosis of the influence of the judicial language – i.e. through a judge's decision, speech or questions (during oral argument) (Walker & Levi, 1990) – in terms of revitalization of domestic constitutional values (Barbera, 2024). "It could be that sentiment makes the ruling more expressive, increasing both negative and positive attention to it by other judges". Indeed, "These results add to the literature on judicial decision-making and judicial quality" (Ash et al., 2022, p. 374; Posner, 210; Ash et al., 2020; Ash & Macleod, 2021). Specifically, they add a local, identitarian, behavioural component to the contemporary, judicial role, too often relegated only to the global standard of the constitutional discourse (Barsotti et al., 2016) without considering Courts as "institutions of pluralism" (Sciarra, 2019, p. 7).

Finally, this updated, pluralistic framework (Michaels, 2009) requires a new awareness. The plural use of a legal-linguistic register can help to identify a specific place: "between cultures and peoples, between empires and the world of stateless villages, [...] where different peoples recompose their differences'" (White, 1991, p. X). From this perspective, the 'language of the law', through the 'sentiment of language', can thus contribute to a future understanding (Apurdai, 2013) of the contextual nature – and linguistic, legal and socio-political variability (Topchii & Chaiuk, 2021) – of constitutionalism around the globe. Indeed, the proposed approach, which aims to identify the intercultural, interdisciplinary and dialogical language of comparative constitutional law, reminds us to

think – and act – glocally: "Native speakers may feel the language 'belongs' to them, but it will be those who speak English as a second or foreign language who will determine its future" (Graddol, 1997, p. 10).

Conflict of Interest Statement

I, the author, declare that we have no conflicts of interest to disclose related to this manuscript. If any conflicts arise in the future, we will promptly inform the journal.

AI Use Statement

I confirm that artificial intelligence (AI) tools were not used in any aspects of my research.

References

Abimbola, B. (2024). Enhancing Legal Sentiment Analysis: A Convolutional Neural Network-Long Short-Term Memory Deciment-Level Model. *Mach. Learn. Knowl. Extr.*, no. 6.

Abimbola, B., Tan, Q. & De La Cal Marín (2024). E.A. Sentiment analysis of Canadian maritime case law: a sentiment case law and deep learning approach. *Int. j. inf. tecnol.* 16.

A Complete Guide to Natural learning processing. https://www.deeplearning.ai/resources/natural-language-processing/ .

Alptekin, C. & Alptekin, M. (1984). The question of culture: EFL teaching in non-English speaking countries. *ELT Journal*, *38*(1).

Andrus, J. (2011). Beyond texts in context: Recontextualization and the co-production of texts and contexts in the legal discourse, excited utterance exception to hearsay. *Discourse & Society*, *22*(2).

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, A. (2013). *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition.* Verso.

Ash, E. & Chen, D. L. (2017). Judge embeddings: toward vector representations of legal belief. *Technical Report*.

Ash, E. & Macleod, W. B. (2021). Reducing partisanship in judicial elections can improve judge quality: evidence from US state supreme courts. *Journal of Public Economics.*

Ash, E. et al. (2022). Measuring Judicial Sentiment: Methods and Application to US Circuit Court. *Economica.*

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays.* University of Texas Press.

Barak, A. (2002). *A Judge on Judging: The Role of a Supreme Court in A Democracy*. Harvard Law Review Association.

Barak, A. (2006). *The Judge in a Democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Baratta, A. (2019). *World Englishes in English language teaching.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Barbera, A. (2024). *La Costituzione come bene comune*, Inaugural Speech by the Chief Justice of the Constitutional Court Augusto Barbera, Rimini Meeting 2024 on "If we are not looking for the essential then what are we looking for?", August 23, 2024, at https://www.youtube.com/live/ow7BwqWxcuM?si=tFi_KMJROJHiyQ4S.

Barbisan, B. (2022). *Patriottismo costituzionale. Il caso italiano in prospettiva comparata.* Editoriale Scientifica.

Barbisan, B. Writing Styles, Voices for the Ear. Judges/Justices vs Law Professors in the U.S. Legal Tradition. In Tieghi, G. (ed.),

Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey. Jovene.

Barsotti, V. (2008). The Importance of Being Open: Lessons from Abroad for the Italian Constitutional Court. 8 *Italian J. Pub. L*. 28.

Barsotti, V. et al. (2016). *Italian Constitutional Justice in Global Context*. OUP USA.

Barsotti, V. et al. (2021). Introduction. Dialogue as a Method. In Barsotti, V. et al. (eds), *Dialogues on Constitutional Justice. Comparative Reflections on the Italian Style.* Routledge.

Bassetti, P. & D'Aquino, N. (2010). *Italic Lessons: An Ongoing dialogue.* Bordighera.

Bassetti, P. (2015). *Svegliamoci italici! Manifesto per un futuro glocal.* Marsilio. *E*n. tr. (2017). *Let's Wake Up, Italics! A Manifesto for a Glocal Future.* Calandra Institute.

Baum, L. (2009). *The Puzzle of Judicial Behavior.* University of Michigan Press.

Bauman, Z. (2005). *Globalizzazione e glocalizzazione.* Armando Ed.

Bauman, Z. (2013). Glocalization and Hybridity. *Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation*, V.1.

Bergonzini G., & Tieghi, G. (2023). Sull'autorevolezza del Giudice costituzionale. Riflessioni conclusive. In Bergonzini, G. et al. *Corte costituzionale in pubblico. L'autorevolezza del giudice.* Jovene.

Bergonzini, G. et al. (2023). *Corte costituzionale in pubblico. L'autorevolezza del giudice.* Jovene.

Bertolissi M. (2023). L'udienza pubblica dinanzi alla Corte costituzionale. In Bergonzini, G. et al. *Corte costituzionale in pubblico. L'autorevolezza del giudice.* Jovene.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse.* Continuum.

Bhatia, V. K. et al. (eds.). (2008). *Language, Culture and the Law. The formulation of legal concepts across languages and cultures.* Peter Lang.

Biel, L. & Engberg, J. (2013). Research Models and Methods in Legal Translations. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies.*

Bolton, K. (2013). World Englishes, globalisation, and language worlds. In Johannesson N.L. & Melchers, G. (eds.), *Of butterflies and birds, of dialects and genres: Essays in honour of Philip Shaw.* Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Centre for Global Englishes, Southampton University.

Bonfiglio, S. (2020). *Intercultural Constitutionalism. From Human Rights Colonialism to a New Constitutional Theory of Fundamental Rights.* Routledge.

Breda, V. (2025). Terra Australis Incognita: A Comparative Outlook. *DPCE Online*, no. 1/2025.

Breda,V. (2017). *The Objectivity of Judicial Decisions. A Comparative Analysis of Nine Jurisdictions.* Peter Lang Edition.

Buchanan, B. & Headrick, T. (1970). Some Speculations about Artificial Intelligence and Legal Reasoning. *Stanford Law Review*, vol. no. 23.

Carducci, M. (2003). *Tecniche costituzionali di Argomentazione Normazione Comparazione.* Pensa MultiMedia.

Cassese, S. (2015). *Dentro la Corte. Diario di un giudice costituzionale*. Il Mulino.

Castilho, S. et al. (2018). Approaches to human and machine translation quality assessment. In Moorkens, J. et al. (eds.), *Translation Quality Assessment: From Principles to Practice.* Springer.

Corte Costituzionale Italiana. Official website: *Introduction to the English Version.* https://www.cortecostituzionale.it/jsp/consulta/istituzioni/PresentazioneCorte_EN.do.

Cortese G. & Duszak, A. (eds.). (2005). *Identity, Community, Discourse: English in Intercultural Settings.* Peter Lang.

Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet.* Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge University Press.

Dalal, B. A. (2023). The Medium of Language is English in Indian Judiciary: Issues and Challenges. *Russian Law Journal*, Vol. XI, Issue 1.

De Visser, M. (2022). Towards a more Inclusive Constitutional Discourse: Overcoming Linguistic Barriers. '*Int'l J. Const. L. Blog.* http://www.iconnectblog.com/2022/05/towards-a-more-inclusive-constitutional-discourse-overcoming-linguistic-barriers/.

Della Porta, D. & Keating, M. (2008). *Approaches and Methodologies in Social Science: A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

Diaz Pérez, W. et al. (2018). Innovations and Challenges: Conceptualizing CLIL Practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 57(3).

Draca, M. & Schwaez, C. (2019). How Polarized are Citizens? Measuring Ideology from the Ground-up. Working Paper, University of Warwick.

E Ash, E. et al. (2020). Ideas have Consequences: the Impact of Law and Economics on American Justice. *Center for Law & Economics,* Working Paper no. 4.

Eliot, L. (2020). *AI and Legal Reasoning Essentials.* LBE Press Publishing.

Eliot, L. B. (2020). Legal Sentiment Analysis and Opinion Mining (LSAOM): Assimilating Advances in Autonomous AI Legal Reasoning. https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2010/2010.02726.pdf.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *The Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* Routledge.

Ferrari, G. F. (2014). "Civil law" e "common law": aspetti pubblicistici. In Carrozza, P. et al. (eds.), *Diritto costituzionale comparato,* Tomo II. Laterza.

Ferrari, G. F. (2019). (ed.). *Judicial Cosmopolitanism. The Use of Foreign Law in Contemporary Constitutional Systems.* Martinus Nijhoff.

Ferrari, G. F. (2019). Introduction: Judicial Constitutional Comparison and Its Varieties. In Ferrari, G. F. (ed.), *Judicial Cosmopolitanism. The Use of Foreign Law in Contemporary Constitutional Systems.* Martinus Nijhoff.

Ferrari, G. F. (2022). Characteristics of the State. In Ferrari, G. F.(ed.), *Introduction to Italian Public Law.* Giuffrè.

Ferrari, G. F. (2023). *I diritti nel costituzionalismo globale: luci e ombre*. Mucchi.

Ferrari, G. F. (2024). Preface. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey*. Jovene.

Gageler, S. (2014). Why Write Judgments ?. 36 *Sydney Law Review* 189.

Gal, S. (2023). Language Ideologies. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics.*

Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2021). The global spread of *English* and global Englishes language Teaching. In Selvi, A. F. & Yazan, B. (Eds.), *Language teacher education for global Englishes: A practical book.* Routledge.

Garoupa, N. et al. (eds.). (2021). *High Courts in Global Perspective. Evidence, Methodologies, and Findings*. University of Virginia Press.

Gentzkow, M. et al. (2019). Measuring group differences in high-dimensional choices: method and application to congressional speech. *Econometrica*, 87(4).

Gobbo, M. (2024). Searching for the Ancient Linguistics Roots of the Common Law: Some Very Personal Considerations on the Osmosis amongst Legal Cultures. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey*, Jovene.

Golledge, E. & Tieghi, G. (2024). Educating Young Generations on Law & Justice Experiential Learning: A Comparative Perspective 'in dialogue'. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey*. Jovene.

Goodrich, P. (1984) Law and Language: An Historical and Critical Introduction. *Journal of Law & Society*, vol. II, no. 2.

Goodrich, P. (1984). The Role of Linguistics in Legal Analysis. *Modern L.R.*, no. 47.

Goodrich, P. (1992). *Legal Discourse.* Macmillan.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The Future of English*. The British Council.

Gray, B. & Biber, D. (2011) *Corpus Approaches to the Study of Discourse.* In K Hyland K. & Patridge B. (eds.), *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Griswold, W. (2004). *Cultures and Societies in a Changing World*, II ed. Sage Publications.

Groppi, T., Ponthoreau, M.C. & Spigno, I. (2025). (eds.), *Judicial Bricolage. The Use of Foreign Precedents by Constitutional Judges in the 21st Century.* Hart Publishing.

Groppi, T. (2023). Giurisdizione costituzionale e opinione pubblica nella rivoluzione digitale. Dalla comunicazione delle decisioni alla promozione della cultura costituzionale. *Quaderni costituzionali*, 1.

Groppi, T. & Lecis Cocco Ortu, A. M. (2021). Openness and Transparency in the Constitutional Adjudication: Amici Curiae, Third-Parties Intervention and Facts-Finding Powers. In Barsotti, V. et al. (eds.). *Dialogues on Constitutional Justice. Comparative Reflections on the Italian Style.* Routledge.

Groppi, T. (2019). Towards Openness and Transparency: Recent Developments in the 'Italian-Style' Constitutional Justice. *Journal of Public Law*, vol. 11, no. 2.

Groppi, T. & Ponthoreau, M.C. (2013). (eds.), *The Use of Foreign Precedents by Constitutional Judges.* Hart Publishing.

Gulcehre, C. et al. (2017). On Integrating a Language Model into Neural Machine Translation. *Comput. Speech Lang.*, vol. 45.

Gupta, I., Chatterjee, I. & Gupta, N. (2023). A Two-staged NLP-based Framework for Assessing the Sentiments on Indian Supreme Court Judgments. *Int. j. inf. tecnol.* 15.

Helsloot, N. & Hak, T. (2007). Pêcheux's Contribution to Discourse Analysis'. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*.

Husa, J. (2022). *Interdisciplinary Comparative Law.* Edward Elgar.

Hyland, K. & Patridge, B. (2011). *Introduction.* In K Hyland K. & Patridge B. (eds.), *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Quirk, R. & Widdowson, H. (Eds.), (1985). *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures.* CUP Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1989). Teaching World Englishes. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 15 (1).

Kachru, Y. & Smith, L.E. (2008) *Cultures, Contexts and the World Englishes.* Routledge.

Keane, P. (2014). *The Idea of the Professional Judge: The Challenges of Communication* (Speech delivered at Judicial Conference of Australia Colloquium, Noosa, 11 October 2014).

Kern, C.A. (2012). English as a Court Language in Continental Courts. *Erasmus Law Review,* Vol. 5, Issue 3.

Khanna, P. (2016). *Connectography, Mapping the Future of Global Civilization.* Random House.

Klein, C.F. (2019). Preface. In Blengino, C. & Gascòncuenca, A. (eds.). *Epistemic Communities at the Boundaries of Law: Clinics as A Paradigm in the European Mediterranean Context.* Le Edizioni.

Klinytskyi, I. (2022). Language Rights and Official Languages in Constitutionalism. Do bilingual states give us more rights for our language?. *Scientific Journal of Bielsko-Biala School of Finance and Law,* vol. 26, no. 4.

Klinytskyi, I. (2022). Language Rights and Official Languages in Constitutionalism. Do bilingual states give us more rights for our language?. ASEJ.

Kong, L. (2022). Artificial intelligence-based translation technology in translation teaching. *Comput. Intell. Neurosci.*

Kozlowski, A. C. et al. (2019). The geometry of culture: analyzing the meanings of class through word embeddings. *American Sociological Review,* 84(5).

Kurylo, A. (2013). *Inter/cultural Communication: Representation and Construction of Culture.* SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lee, R. (2013). Sonia Sotomayor: Role Model of Empathy and Purposeful Ambition. Reviewing *My Beloved World* by Sonja Sotomayor (2013), *Minnesota Law Review Headnotes.*

Liu, B. (2010). Sentiment Analysis and Subjectivity. In Indurkhya, N. & Damerau, F. J. (eds.), *Handbook of Natural Language Processing*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Lynch, A. & Tieghi, G. (2025). Judicial Independence and Individuality: Liberty as a Paradigm Shift from 'Judicial to People' Voicing Disagreement. *DPCE Online*, no. 1/2025.

Maley, Y. (1985). *Judicial Discourse: The Case of the Legal Judgment.* (Festschrift in Honour of A. Delbridge, Beitrage zur Phonetik und Linguistik.

Manaj, L. S. (2017). Intercultural translation and communication. *Eur.J. Social Sci. Educ. Res.*, vol. 11, no. 1.

Marsh, D. (2009). Content and Language Integrated Learning: Leveraging Cultural Diversity. In Gimeno, M. & Carrio Pastor (eds.). *Content and language Integrated Learning: Cultural Diversity.* Linguistic Series, Studies in language and Communication, Vol. 92. Peter Lang.

Marsh, D. et al. (2015). *CLIL in Action: Voices from the Classroom.* Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Marsh, D. et al., (2010). *CLIL Practice: Perspectives from the Field.* England.

Maveety N.L. (ed.). (2002). *The Pioneers of Judicial Behavior*. University of Michigan Press.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English Languages.* Cambridge University Press.

Mehisto, P. (2012). *Excellence in Bilingual Education: A Guide for School Principals.* Cambridge University Press.

Merryman, J. H. (1965). The Italian Style: Doctrine. 18 *Stanford Law Review.*

Merryman, J. H. (1966). The Italian Style: Interpretation. 18 *Stanford Law Review*.

Merryman, J. H. (1966). The Italian Style: Law. 18 *Stanford Law Review.*

Mewald, C. (2007). A comparison of oral foreign language proficiency performance of learners in CLIL and mainstream classes at lower secondary level. In Dalton, C. at al. (eds.). *Empirical Perspectives on CLIL Classroom Discourse.* Peter Lang.

Michaels, R. (2009). Global Legal Pluralism. *Annual Review of Law & Social Science*, no.5.

Midgley, G. et al., (2017). Dealing with challenges to methodological pluralism: The paradigm problem, psychological resistance and cultural barriers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, no. 62.

Millar, R. (1955). *Book Review* to Calamandrei, P. Judicial Procedure and Democracy. *50 Northwestern Univ. Law, Review.*

Mohamed, Y. et al. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Language Translation: A *Review. IEEE Access*, Vol. 12.

Navot, S. (2014). The Invisible Problem of Language in Comparative Constitutional Law'. 25 *King's Law Journal.*

Oderkerk, M. (2015). The Need for a Methodological Framework for Comparative Legal Research: Sense and Nonsense of "Methodological Pluralism" in Comparative Law. *Rabels Zeitschrift für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht*.

Palitana, S. A., Sharma, K., Vakharia H., Dmonte, S. (2020). Predicting Decisions for Indian Court Cases Using Sentiment Analysis. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, Vol. 7, Issue 2.

Passaglia, P. (2018). La comunicazione istituzionale degli organi di giustizia costituzionale, tra ricerca di legittimazione e rivisitazione della tradizione. Appunti per una ricerca. In D' Alessandro, C. A. & Marchese, C. (eds.), *Ius Dicere in a Globalized World.* Roma.

Pinchbeck, D. *Generative AI and the Dark Forest, Daniel Pinchbeck's Newsletter*. https://danielpinchbeck.substack.com/p/generative-ai-and-the-dark-forest.

Posner, R. A., *How Judges Think*. Harvard University Press.

Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American anthropologist*, 92l.

Sacerdoti Mariani, G. (2024). A Path of Language and Life. The Power of Language and the Boundaries of Power. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey*, Jovene.

Sadeghpour, M. & Dangelo, J. (2022). World Englishes and 'Global Englishes': Competing or Complementary Paradigms? . *Asian Englishes*, 24.

Sarcevic, S. (2000). *New Approach to Legal Translation.* Kluwer Law International.

Scarciglia, R. (2023). *Methods and Legal Comparison. Challenges for Methodological Pluralism.* Edward Elgar Publishing.

Scarciglia, R. (2024). Methodological Pluralism as a Contemporary Challenge of Legal Comparison. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey.* Jovene.

Sciarra, S. (2019). *Rule of Law and Mutual Trust: A Short Note on Constitutional Courts as "Institutions of Pluralism".* www.cortecostituzionale.it.

Scollon, R. (2002). Interdiscursivity and identity. In Toolan, M. (ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics.* Routledge.

Sharifian, F. (2013). Globalization and developing metacultural competence in learning English as an international language. *Multilingual Education, 3*(7).

Shuy, R. W. (2005). Discourse Analysis in the Legal Context. In D Schiffrin, D. et al. (eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Siems, M. & Yap, P. J. (2024). (eds.). Comparative Law beyond the State. *The Cambridge Handbook of Comparative Law.* Cambridge University Press.

Smith, L. (1981). *English for cross-cultural communication.* St. Martin's Press.

Smith, L.E. (2014). World Englishes. *Key Concepts in Intercultural Dialogue*, No. 34.

Solan, L. (1993). *The Language of Judges.* University of Chicago Press.

Taboada, M. (2016). Sentiment Analysis: An Overview from Linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics.*

Tessuto, G. (2012). *Investigating English Legal Genres in Academic and Professional Context.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Tessuto, G. (2022). *English for Law. A Toolkit for Discourse and genre-based Approaches to ESP Language.* Giappichelli.

Thompson, G. & McKinley, J. (2018). Integration of Content and Language Learning. *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching.*

Tieghi, G. (2020). Diritto, esperienze comunicative, *Questioning*: nuovi itinerari di Giustizia costituzionale*?*. *Federalismi.it*, no.14.

Tieghi, G. (2020). Educare, non solo decidere. Nuovi scenari dalle recenti opere dei giudici costituzionali Grossi e Sotomayor. *Rivista AIC,* no.1.

Tieghi, G. (2021). Cities, Law and Language. Going beyond Through Educational Networks. *DPCE Online* no.3.

Tieghi, G. (2023i). Corte costituzionale e dovere di sperimentazione comunicativa in udienza. Riflessioni aggiornate sul dialogo con i Giudici. *Forum di Quaderni costituzionali,* no. 1.

Tieghi, G. (2023). Corte costituzionale italiana, vaccine mandate e comparazione: verso una "comparative mentality"?. *Corte Supreme e salute,* no. 3 (now also in Liberali B. & Padula, C. (2024). (eds.), *Gli obblighi di vaccinazione davanti alla Corte costituzionale*. Editoriale Scientifica).

Tieghi, G. (2024). "Looking Beyond our Borders". A challenging Legal Linguistic Journey Through the New Directions of Comparative Law. In Tieghi, G. (ed.), *Comparative Law and Global English for Legal Studies. A Law-Linguistic Journey.* Jovene.

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

Topchii, O. & Chaiuk, T. (2021). Sociolinguistic, Interpreting and Political Dimensions of English-Language Court Discourse of 21st Century. *Humanities Science,* vol.3.

Trosborg, A. (1997). *Rhetorical Strategies in Legal Language: Discourse Analysis of Statutes and Contracts.* Gunter Narr Verlag.

Venter, F. (2017). Rethinking the Language of Constitutional Comparison. *South African Journal on Human Rights.*

Venter, F. (2022). *The Language of Constitutional Comparison.* Edward Elgar.

Viganò, F. (2023). La Corte costituzionale e la sua comunicazione. *Quaderni costituzionali* no.1.

Walker, J. & Levi, A. (1990). (eds.), *Language in the Judicial Process.* Plenum.

Wehnert, S. et al., (2023). Mining Sentiment and Subjectivity in Swiss Case Law. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings,* Vol. 1-3594.

Wendel Holmes Jr., O. (1881). *The Common Law.* Little, Brown & Co.

White, R. (1991). *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires and Republics in the Great Lakes Region*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, R. J. (2017). *The Global Evolution of Clinical Legal Education: More than a Method.* Cambridge University Press.

Wu, J. G. (2012). Studies on Interdiscursivity. *Sino-US English Teaching,* vol. 9, No. 7.

Yuan, Z. et al. (2021). Research on language analysis of English translation system based on fuzzy algorithm. *J. Intell. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 40.