

# Be Clear! The Role of Clarity in Legal Communication

Karin Luttermann

*Catholic University of Eichstaett-Ingolstadt*

## Abstract

The rights of persons with disabilities have been strengthened in the past years. The impulse came from the passing of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its adoption in many parts of the world. In Germany, its ratification has led to numerous measures (laws, projects) for the creation of an inclusive society. Language is of special importance in this context. Easy Language is a form of barrier-free communication and is meant to make (specialist) information and (professional) communication accessible to certain target groups (among others, persons with mental disabilities, aphasia, German as a second language). It originated from practice-oriented work. Theoretically and empirically assessing its possibilities, potentials and limits urgently requires linguistic research, too. On a text linguistic basis, the contribution argues for the use of Clear Language and for a wider perspective on the concept of lay persons within expert-lay communication. The key question is how legal texts can be clearly formulated and conveyed to the addressees (including the average person)? – What is offered here is a sound solution: the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language (“Rechtslinguistisches Verständlichkeitsmodell”).

**Keywords:** Legal linguistics, Expert-lay communication, Clear Language

## 1. Introduction

Inclusion is a catchword in politics and society<sup>1</sup>. The German Behindertengleichstellungsgesetz (§ 11 BGG, Eng. Equal Rights Act for Persons with Disabilities) demands that state institutions provide information in Easy Language (“Leichte Sprache”<sup>2</sup>) to persons with special needs. The idea is that disabled persons should be able to participate in social life as independently as possible. Easy Language is defined by universal rules, which are characterized by a reductionist sentence structure, vocabulary and content and which are valid for any conceivable communicative contexts. It is regarded as a suitable means for making difficult texts easier and for breaking down communication barriers effectively. However, in Germany, theoretical and empirical research on Easy Language is still in their beginnings, especially concerning specialist texts<sup>3</sup>. What is required is an investigation into comprehensibility and comprehension of texts in Easy Language and, in particular, a reassessment of the term “Leichte Sprache” itself. This is where my contribution on Clear Language as a means of legal communication and knowledge transfer sets in. Using a text linguistic perspective (see paragraph 2), I will develop the concept of Clear Language (see paragraph 6) – which is part of the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language (“Rechtslinguistisches Verständlichkeitsmodell”, see paragraph 5) – and apply it to a legal text (see paragraph 7).

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the PLAIN 2019 Conference in Oslo. Essentials in Luttermann (2017).

<sup>2</sup> The term Germ. “Leichte Sprache” and the commonly used Eng. term “Plain Language” are not synonyms because they are not situated on the same conceptual level. In German, a distinction is made between “Leichte Sprache” and “Einfache Sprache” (Baumert, 2018; Bock, 2014; Maaß, 2020). For a brief overview of terminology in different languages see also paragraph 4.1.

<sup>3</sup> For an overview see, e.g., Bock/Fix/Lange (2017); Mälzer (2016); Maaß/Rink (2019).

## 2. Communication-oriented Text Linguistics

Communication-oriented text linguistics addresses questions of language use. It treats texts as utterances-in-function (Adamzik, 2016, 31). According to this view, sentences are subordinated to context and text function. The functions (information, appeal) denote the intention of the producer, i.e., the way the addressee is supposed to understand the text. The writer aims at influencing the reader in a certain way with the text. Concerning the interaction between experts and lay persons in the field of law, problems emerge if language for special purposes is used without taking lay comprehension into consideration. Law uses common language for regulating facts of life. However, the expressions are conceptually defined in a different way.

For legal experts, juridical concepts form the basis of their categorial perception. The transition from common meaning to legal meaning leads to a specification not necessarily recognized by lay people. For example, in German, in everyday language you may use the same verb “leihen” for “hiring” or “renting” a car from a dealer, “borrowing” eggs from the neighbor or a book from a colleague. In everyday language, “leihen” can thus be used for denoting several ways of use, even more so than English “borrow”. However, this is not so in the law (Luttermann, 2010a, 141).

For German legal experts, “Leihe” refers to using something free of charge and then returning it (§ 598 BGB (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, Eng. Civil Code)). This means that the verb “leihen” (Eng. “borrow”) can only be used for the book. In the case of eggs, we are legally dealing with a “Darlehen”, Eng. “loan” (§ 607 BGB), as the eggs cannot be returned after use in the same quality. Regarding the car, the legal term is “Mietwagen” (Eng. “rental car”). The customer pays for using the car (§ 535 BGB). This example may serve as an illustration for many more similar cases.

An important task for the further development of expert-lay communication is differentiating the lay continuum: from the average citizen to readers of Easy Language. Lay knowledge is gradual and fluid. At the same time, in order to achieve more societal participation, text linguists have to determine who communicates in what way with whom, when, where and to what end (Luttermann, 2017, 219 and Luttermann/Busch, forthcoming). For an adequate modification of language use in specialist texts they first need to know: Who are the intended addressees of Easy Language?

## 3. Addressees of Easy Language

### 3.1 Disability Law and Guidelines from Practice

Texts in Easy Language are predominantly addressed to persons with special needs. The German Behindertengleichstellungsgesetz (BGG, Eng. Equal Rights Act for Persons with Disabilities) for the first time determines that persons who have “long-term physical, psychological, mental or sense impairments” have the same right to lead an independent life as persons without special needs (§ 3 sentence 1 BGG). The explicit aim is to abolish

and prevent disadvantages for persons with a low level of literacy or with intellectual disabilities etc. as well as guaranteeing them equal participation in society and making it possible for them to lead an independent life (§ 1 section 1 sentence 1 BGG).

In contrast, guidelines from practice<sup>4</sup> (e.g. Network Easy-to-Read<sup>5</sup> or Inclusion Europe<sup>6</sup>) provide information in the narrow sense in Easy Language to people with cognitive and sensorial disabilities who have learning problems. The addressees also include persons with cerebral disorders or dementia as well as those with aphasia, autism and prelingual deafness. The largest target group are functionally illiterate people. In a broader sense, refugees and anyone learning German as a second or foreign language are also regarded as addressees. The message of the guidelines is that a very large circle of addressees is supposed to benefit from Easy Language. Any person who has problems with standard and specialist texts may use the ‘easier’ version in addition when they need it (Maaß, 2015, 15).

### 3.2 Heterogeneity

Seen from a linguistic angle, this heterogeneously broad circle of addressees is problematic. The main maxim of Easy Language is comprehensibility. However, text comprehensibility is not a characteristic in itself. It depends not only on linguistic features, but also on the reader himself, by making an active effort to comprehend what is being transmitted. That’s why extralinguistic factors such as interests, pre-knowledge or motivation of the recipients have to be taken into account, too.

In the Manual for Drafting Legislation by the German Federal Ministry of Justice, which guides the state ministries in language issues, there is a statement on the question of the addressees. What is interesting for us is that the Ministry of Justice has taken leave of the general requirement that regulations must be comprehensible for “everyone”. Instead, a distinction is made between an “unrestricted” and a “restricted” target group (BMJ, 2008, 33; Luttermann, 2010b, 148f.). Accordingly, there are laws only for specialists (wine law for wine growers) and laws for experts and lay persons. Criminal law, for instance, is directed to legal experts as well as to an “averagely reasoned person” (BMJ, 2008, 33). The lay person in this sense is the informed average citizen, i.e., a sensible and attentive person. The Manual defines the circle of addressees via the feature knowledge horizon.

In contrast, the target group of Easy Language seems arbitrary and incongruent. Whereas functionally illiterate people are hardly capable of capturing the meaning, many migrants are competent in reading in their first language (Luttermann, 2019, 7f.). The question of what is adequate for addressees requires deeper legal-linguistic academic research. In any case, heterogeneity should be avoided in making legal texts comprehensible.

---

<sup>4</sup> There is no uniform set of regulation.

<sup>5</sup> See <https://www.leichte-sprache.org/> (accessed 21 October 2020).

<sup>6</sup> See <https://www.inclusion-europe.eu/easy-to-read/> (accessed 21 October 2020). The rules are available in many languages.

## 4. Genesis of Easy Language

### 4.1 Background Information

Easy Language was developed mainly intuitively in practice. Its origins are in America, where movements to make language accessible for different target groups use the term Plain Language. For example, in the 1970s the group People First was founded by people with learning difficulties. This was followed by Inclusion Europe in 1988, a European association of persons with mental disabilities and their families. In Germany, Easy Language experienced a boost by the ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2009, which listed concrete aspects of communication:

For the purposes of the present Convention: “Communication” includes languages, display of text, Braille, tactile communication, large print, accessible multimedia as well as written, audio, plain-language, human-reader and augmentative and alternative modes, means and formats of communication, including accessible information and communication technology (art. 2 UN Convention).

What is striking is that the term “plain-language” is not translated in the same way in different languages. The German text of the UN Convention – laying the foundation for the development of Easy Language in German legislation itself – uses the equivalent “einfache Sprache”. Also attributes with meanings such as “easy access to information and communication technology” are used (“leicht zugänglich”)<sup>7</sup>. Similar wording also appears in the Italian version (“linguaggio semplice”) and the French one (“langue simplifiée“). In Germany, the term “Leichte Sprache”, which literally means “easy language”, is explicitly used for the first time in 2011 in the Barrierefreie-Informationstechnik-Verordnung (BITV, Eng. Barrier-free information technology regulation) for the transfer of administrative communication. The regulation specifies that Federal websites are to be offered in “German Sign Language and in Easy Language” (§ 3 section 2 sentence 1 BITV 2.0).

### 4.2 Target Group Test

The specifications of the regulation are insufficient from a linguistic point of view. Formulating the law comprehensively with everyday language is not always possible from a legislative perspective even for the average person, as shown with the example of “borrowing” vs. “loaning” vs. “renting” above (see paragraph 2). What is lacking are target group tests: The comprehensibility of easified specialist texts, especially legal texts, still awaits systematic empirical testing (Rink, 2019). There are hardly any target group tests with non-professional test persons for the comprehensible presentation of information in Easy Language. The trained test persons know the guidelines for forming short sentences or using personal pronouns and

---

<sup>7</sup> Im Sinne dieses Übereinkommens schließt "Kommunikation" Sprachen, Textdarstellung, Brailleschrift, taktile Kommunikation, Großdruck, *leicht zugängliches* Multimedia sowie schriftliche, auditive, in *einfache Sprache* übersetzte, durch Vorleser zugänglich gemachte sowie ergänzende und alternative Formen, Mittel und Formate der Kommunikation, einschließlich *leicht zugänglicher* Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologie, ein.

tenses (what is allowed/forbidden). However, such a test is necessary in order to find out what they actually know and understand and whether the law text is comprehensible or not. Instead, this is mainly determined through electronic tools working like readability formulas, in which certain parameters – e.g., number of syllables per word, paratactic sentence structure, no passive constructions<sup>8</sup> – have been implemented. Or correctors judge the texts according to Easy Language rule convergence (Bredel/Maaß, 2016, 136f.). This merely means checking whether the rules have been adhered to. This, however, says little about the recipients' abilities in comprehension.

This much is clear: Success in knowledge transfer can be tested through comprehensibility analyses with the intended circle of addressees. This is where the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language comes in, developed for the average person for the optimization of legal communication in Clear Language (see paragraph 5). What is to be sounded out is to what degree it works for persons with special needs (Easy Language addressees according to the BGG, see paragraph 3.1). For them, transfer accomplishment is even higher.

## 5. Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language

### 5.1 Aim and Method

The Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language is rooted in a pragmatic tradition, regarding the meaning of a word as the result of its use (Wittgenstein, 2006, § 43). The model aims at analyzing semantic interfaces and differences in lexemes occurring in both legal and everyday language (Luttermann, 2010b, 149f.). In addition, the model gives lay persons as text addressees more analytical power. The comprehensible presentation of specialist information requires not only expert knowledge but also taking into consideration the perspective of lay persons. Language use analysis shows what and how much lay persons can understand. In German criminal law (theft § 242 StGB (Strafgesetzbuch)), e.g., the word “Sache” causes problems of comprehension. For in contrast to lay persons, legal experts interpret animals as “Sache” (thing). The killing of a dog is treated as material damage (Luttermann, 2010a, 148f.).

The Comprehensibility Model outlines a precise order of four analytical steps, first determining expert knowledge (theory pattern) and lay knowledge (empirical/result pattern) through interviews and questionnaires. The empirical pattern uncovers what one lay person understands, the result pattern shows what many lay persons understand. Finally, the semantic interpretations of experts and lay persons are compared (comparative pattern)<sup>9</sup>. It is the only comprehensibility model so far that empirically determines lay knowledge and takes it into account in the process of analysis (Luttermann/Rawinsky, 2020, 148ff.). Both perspectives (expert and lay) are

---

<sup>8</sup> Lange (2019) found in an empirical study that the general prohibition of the genitive in texts written in Easy Language should be revised.

<sup>9</sup> The multi-perspectival approach is already being used for expert-lay communication in law in order to make legal communication clearer for the addressees. For details on this see, e.g., Luttermann (2015 and 2016); Luttermann/Engberg (2018); Leisser/Green, forthcoming.

of hermeneutic quality here. This multi-perspectivity weighs possibilities and limitations for optimizing legal texts (see paragraphs 6.4 and 7).

## 5.2 Maintaining Text Function

Through a comparison of perspectives, legal texts can be processed in a target group-oriented and legally secure way, differences being minimised or bridged. However, there is also the view that rephrased legal texts are excluded from any form of liability. The texts are thus neither legally valid nor litigable. However, this means that the claim of “keeping the text function stable” (Maaß, 2015, 141f.) becomes difficult to meet. Appellative texts are transformed into purely informational texts and lose their specifically appellative character. In law, texts do not primarily fulfil the function to inform. Beyond this, the aim is shifted. Instead of working on the comprehensibility of laws the aim of the modification is to create texts in Easy Language about laws, that is to inform about a legal subject. For this communicative task, a functional change of text type is adequate.

For the lay concept proposed here, however, text types are not negotiable (Luttermann, 2017, 221f.). For text types are conventionally valid patterns for complex linguistic actions, providing a guideline for both production and reception (Brinker, 2005, 144). Lay persons are trusted and expected to deal with the legal style. They are to be able to build up knowledge about text types. A text type provides information on the purpose of a text. I believe that denying linguistic experience or underestimating individual competences will not lead far.

## 6. The Concept of Clear Language

### 6.1 Maxims of Cooperation and Interaction

In linguistic pragmatics, understanding is not simply a technical process of transmission, rather, it is to be understood in terms of comprehensibility (producer) and comprehension (recipient) and can be constructed interactively (Shannon/Weaver, 1949). According to this, specialist texts are embedded in a situation, in which experts and lay persons with their social and cognitive competences are the most important factors. It is not the case that in knowledge transfer only the expert is active and the lay person passive. The lay person is also active by striving to understand the text. Expert-lay communication is based on cooperation. Experts and lay persons are expected to act in a cooperative way for understanding to be possible. According to the general principle of communication the producer expresses himself in the way demanded by the communicative purpose of the text. Four maxims of conversation serve implementation (Grice, 1979)<sup>10</sup>.

The maxim of quantity addresses the amount of information. Contributions are to be as informative as possible and no more informative than necessary. Quality refers to the validity of a statement, relation to its relevance regarding

---

<sup>10</sup> The maxims are no prescriptions, but rather general expectations speakers form about one another and on the basis of which they interpret utterances.

topic and situation. The maxim of modality regulates the way in which something is said. The imperative “Be clear” points in the direction of clear specialist texts. To put it in a nutshell: The concept of Clear Language focuses on the co-operation and interaction of experts and lay persons in legal communication.

## 6.2 Clarity

Clear Language aims at adequate comprehensible presentation and transfer of knowledge for lay persons and the extension of the lay concept in expert-lay communication. The concept refers to the average citizen and, additionally, to people above and below average, as well as people with disabilities. Clear Language is therefore the essential part of the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language, which combines text/expert perspective and user perspective (see paragraph 5). The word “clear” derives from Latin “clarus” (“bright”) and means “make clear, comprehensible”. Clarity is guided by the recipient horizon (see paragraphs 3.2 and 6.4). The issue is presenting legal texts to lay addressees in a comprehensible way, i.e., adequately with regard to content and addressee. Clarity aims at the demands of the content of a text, i.e., at the clarification of the subject of the text, for example by looking at coherence. It is necessary to test addressee groups in order to analyze to what extent they are capable of placing utterances in a thematically plausible context with the help of implication strategies. This can show what knowledge the text producer may presuppose and what knowledge needs to be built up within the text.

In addition, the content has to be presented at different levels. In contrast to Easy Language, differentiation is not to be guided by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which determines linguistic competence at six levels of difficulty (A1/A2/B1/B2/C1/C2) and has a different purpose (foreign language acquisition) (Heinemann et al., 2009, 27)<sup>11</sup>. What is decisive for scaling here is rather the background knowledge (world, situation, language) of the recipients themselves. They must be provided with possibilities of development, using gradually changing levels of complexity for communication to be successful and participation to become possible.

## 6.3 Arguments for using the term Clear Language

The term Clear Language is here considered preferable to Easy Language, because it encompasses adequacy regarding content and addressees (recipient horizon), which is crucial for optimizing legal texts (Luttermann, 2010b, 150). Adequacy regarding the content has the communicative function of keeping the facts stable. A new text can be developed in several steps taking into consideration what the test persons were able to understand, without the text type function being lost. In Easy Language, changes in the text focus one-dimensionally on the reduction of complexity of specialist knowledge

---

<sup>11</sup> This is what, e.g., Fröhlich (2017, 426-428) does. The LEA-model for writing acquisition of adults in German as a Second Language proceeds from six levels of acquisition (Alpha-Levels).

(reduction of language and content). In legal settings, this may be to the detriment of factual correctness (Luttermann, 2019 and 2020).

In addition, in German, the term Klare Sprache (“Clear Language”) has the advantage of not stigmatising (as opposed to Leichte Sprache, as “leicht” stands in antithesis to “schwer”, Eng. “difficult”) and therefore not being in danger of itself creating a linguistic barrier between those in need of using simplified paths of access to texts (i.e. needing “easy” texts) and those who do not (i.e. who can deal with “difficult” texts). Easy Language texts have the stigma of oversimplification. The readers are directed to a unique text universe, which may be seen as excluding (Bock, 2014, 34). In contrast, the concept of lay person within Clear Language does not contain any judgement. Rather, clarity means “non-judgmentally stating the existence of specific levels of knowledge without deducing any positive or negative judgements about persons” (Wichter, 1994, 55). As neither too little nor too much should be demanded of lay persons, pragmatic adequacy is of crucial importance in the macro- and micro-design of texts.

#### 6.4 Pragmatic Adequacy

Optimization of legal language needs pragmatic adequacy as a yardstick for whether an utterance is appropriate and suitable within a concrete context. Jurists and linguists search for solutions for an approximated level of communication between expert and lay knowledge. A specialist text is regarded as pragmatically adequate if the means of communication (verbal, nonverbal, paraverbal) are used in such a way that the text function respectively the intention of the producer is achieved. Adequate language use is based on the proportionality of the means in relation to the specific conditions of the whole communication process (topic and function of the text, cognitive factors).

The recipient horizon determines what is comprehensible for the addressees and what is legally possible. The latter is necessary for legal security. The Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language therefore offers a multi-perspectival methodology, with the help of which pragmatic adequacy may also be mapped in a suitable way. On this basis, legal texts can be written in Clear language. Pragmatic adequacy plays an important role for accessibility, participation and comprehensibility for everybody, including those with special needs. To achieve this goal, a large amount of legal-linguistic research with the respective target groups is still required. The research task is demonstrated with an example in the following.

### 7. Example

The legal language term “ordinary jurisdiction” is simplified in the following way (Maaß, 2015, 8; Luttermann, 2019, 16ff.)<sup>12</sup>:

#### **Ordinary jurisdiction**

2 persons have an argument.

**The persons go to a court.**

---

<sup>12</sup> In the source text the Ministry of Justice of Lower Saxony explains the technical term. See <https://www.mj.niedersachsen.de> (accessed 21 October 2020).

The persons go to an ordinary court.

Ordinary has **nothing** to do with clean here.

Ordinary courts are the contentious courts.

The word contentious comes from contention.

The ordinary courts settle contentions.

Ordinary courts include for example:

- District courts.
- And provincial courts.

The example is translated from German into English. In German, the term used for “ordinary” is “ordentlich”. In everyday language, this means “orderly, clean”. That’s not meant here. In English, the term “ordinary” is ambiguous, too. The general idea is “normal, usual, nothing special”. But not in this context. “Ordinary” is here linked to “contentious”. In everyday language the meaning of “contentious” is “controversial”. However, the passage does not mean that ordinary courts are controversial courts. The word “contentious” is here used in a technical-legal sense not accessible to intuitive comprehension. It is used in contradistinction to non-contentious (voluntary) administration of justice. Ordinary courts deal with civil and criminal law disputes.

In addition, the example shows further peculiarities with regard to the text structure which may be seen as excluding:

- The cardinal number “two” is given as a number and not a numeral word.
- The same lexemes (“persons, court”) occur several times. Recurrence is not stylistically elegant, but it does create clearness.
- No pro-forms are used. For example, the noun “persons” is not anaphorically substituted by the personal pronoun “they”.
- Furthermore, the sentence structure is redundant (“The persons go to a court. / The persons go to an ordinary court”) and every sentence has its own line.
- The sentences are short, with at most eight words. However, a simple sentence is not automatically a guarantee for comprehensibility in law (Luttermann, 2016; Brandt, 1991).
- In addition, the concept “ordinary jurisdiction” is explained through concrete examples. The selection of specific cases at the same time leads to a reduction of meaning. The legal-semantic expressions (“district court, provincial court”) depend on many presuppositions and therefore have to be explained.
- Finally, there are indents and bullet points for enumeration.

In my point of view, the sentences highlighted in green should be dropped for the sake of clarity. The eliminations and the additional elements marked in red lead to a text modified as follows:

Two persons have an argument. They go to an ordinary court. Its task is to settle contentions. A contention is an argument. Ordinary courts include for example: district courts and provincial courts.

To what degree these modifications lead to a better comprehension of the text, however, remains an open question and has to be tested on test persons. One thing, however, has become clear through this example: In the final instance, communication depends on the recipient horizon. Legal texts presuppose certain specialist knowledge, which lay persons do not necessarily have and are not familiar with. For this reason, such texts may form comprehensibility barriers for any person and not only for persons with disabilities. The specialist barrier may become greater, the less pre-knowledge lay person bring along or the more restricted their cognitive abilities are. This means that language use is particularly important. The transmission task – making legal texts accessible for lay persons – shall be fulfilled through Clear Language and methodologically with the help of the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language.

## 8. Outlook

This presentation aimed at providing a theoretical basis for the practice phenomenon Easy Language through text linguistics and legal linguistics. It does this by extending expert-lay communication to addressees hitherto not considered (Luttermann, forthcoming). This extension is linked to a new term: Clear Language. Clear Language is oriented towards the recipient horizon and does not contain any devaluation. The starting point of text optimization in Clear Language are not universal rules, but rather human beings for whom the texts are written. Those meant to read and understand the specialist texts should also have access to them.

To this end, the addressees have to be included in the hermeneutical process. A suitable approach is provided by the Comprehensibility Model of Legal Language, which searches for adequate language use as well as correct content and addressee-oriented knowledge transfer. The concept of Clear Language opens up a new field to applied linguistics: Everyone needs Clear Language for specialist communication!

## References

- Adamzik, K. (2016), *Textlinguistik. Grundlagen, Kontroversen, Perspektiven*, Berlin.
- Baumert, A. (2018), *Einfache Sprache. Verständliche Texte schreiben*, Münster.
- BMJ/Bundesministerium der Justiz (Ed.) (2008), *Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit. Empfehlungen zur Gestaltung von Gesetzen und Rechtsverordnungen*, Köln.
- Bock, B.M. (2014), “*Leichte Sprache*”. *Abgrenzung, Beschreibung und Problemstellungen aus Sicht der Linguistik*, in Jekat, S.J.; Jüngst, H.E.; Schubert, K. and Villiger, C. (Eds.): “*Sprache barrierefrei gestalten. Perspektiven aus der Angewandten Linguistik*“, Berlin, pp. 17-51.
- Bock, B.M.; Fix, U. and Lange, D. (Eds.) (2017), “*Leichte Sprache*” *im Spiegel theoretischer und angewandter Forschung*, Berlin.
- Brandt, W. (1991), *Müssen Gesetze schwer verständlich sein? Einwände eines Linguisten gegen Schutzbehauptungen der Juristen*, in Hattenhauer, C. and Eckert, J. (Eds.): “*Sprache – Recht – Geschichte*“, Heidelberg, pp. 339-361.
- Bredel, U. and Maaß, C. (2016), *Leichte Sprache. Theoretische Grundlagen. Orientierung für die Praxis*, Berlin.
- Brinker, K. (2005), *Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Methoden*, Berlin.
- Fröhlich, W. (2017), *Von der “Leichten Sprache” zur zielgruppengerechten Information. Leicht*

- Lesen in Österreich*, in Bock, B.M.; Fix, U. and Lange, D. (Eds.): “‘Leichte Sprache‘ im Spiegel theoretischer und angewandter Forschung“, Berlin, pp. 415-430.
- Grice, H. (1979), *Logik und Konversation*, in Meggle, G. (Ed.): “Handlung, Kommunikation, Bedeutung“, Frankfurt a.M., pp. 243-265.
- Heinemann, A.; Schepers, C. and Grotlüschen, A. (2009), *Schriftsprachkompetenzen erkennen und fördern – von Anfang an*, in “Alfa-Forum” 72, pp. 27-29.
- Lange, D. (2019), *Der Genitiv in der “Leichten Sprache“ – das Für und Wider aus theoretischer und empirischer Sicht*, in “Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik“ 70, pp. 37-72.
- Luttermann, K. (2010a), *Heutige Wechselwirkungen zwischen Allgemein- und Rechtssprache: Deutsch*, in Fischer, R. (Ed.): “Sprache und Recht in großen europäischen Sprachen. Juristische Begriffsbildung im Spannungsfeld zwischen Fachsprachlichkeit und allgemeiner Verständlichkeit“, Regensburg, pp. 139-154.
- Luttermann, K. (2010b), *Verständliche Semantik in schriftlichen Kommunikationsformen*, in “Fachsprache” 32 (3-4), pp. 145-162.
- Luttermann, K. (2015), *Linguistisch-pragmatische Zugänge zur Rechtssemantik: Was gesagt, was gemeint und was verstanden wird*, in Vogel, F. (Ed.): “Zugänge zur Rechtssemantik. Interdisziplinäre Ansätze im Zeitalter der Mediatisierung“, Berlin, pp. 275-292.
- Luttermann, K. (2016), *Indeterminismus und Performanz in der Sprache am Beispiel der Bedeutung von lebenslanger Freiheitsstrafe*, in Bülow, L.; Bung, J.; Harnisch, R. and Wernsmann, R. (Eds.): “Performativität in Sprache und Recht“, Berlin, pp. 163-188.
- Luttermann, K. (2017), *Klare Sprache als Mittel für Fachkommunikation und Wissenstransfer*, in “Information. Wissenschaft & Praxis” 68 (4), pp. 217-226.
- Luttermann, K. (2019), *Klare Sprache für Fachkommunikation und gesellschaftliche Teilhabe*, in “Zielsprache Deutsch” 46 (2), pp. 3-21.
- Luttermann, K. (2020), *Vertikaler Wissenstransfer zwischen Experten und Laien in Klarer Sprache. Grundlagen, Konzept und Beispiele*, in Ballod, M. (Ed.): “Transfer und Transformation von Wissen“, Berlin, pp. 147-171.
- Luttermann, K. (forthcoming), *Clear Language. Legal Linguistics as a Discipline for Comprehensible Communication in Law*, in Leisser D. and Green, L. (Eds.): “Contemporary Approaches to Legal Linguistics“, Wien.
- Luttermann, K. (forthcoming), *Recht konstituieren, vermitteln und verstehen*, in Luttermann, K. and Busch, A. (Eds.): “Sprache und Recht. Konstitutions- und Transferprozesse in nationaler und europäischer Dimension“, Münster.
- Luttermann, K. and Engberg, J. (2018), *Vermittlung rechtlichen Wissens an Kinder und Jugendliche im Internet und in Broschüren*, in Engberg, J.; Luttermann, K.; Cacchiani, S. and Preite, Ch. (Eds.): “Popularization and Knowledge Mediation in the Law / Popularisierung und Wissensvermittlung im Recht“, Wien, pp. 85-115.
- Luttermann, K. and Rawinsky, P. (2020), *Fachtexte verstehen in Klarer Sprache*, in Heidrich, F. and Schubert, K. (Eds.): “Fachkommunikation – gelenkt, geregelt, optimiert“, Hildesheim, pp. 145-170, available at: <https://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/1023> (accessed 12 September 2020).
- Maaß, C. (2015), *Leichte Sprache. Das Regelbuch*, Münster.
- Maaß, C. (2020), *Easy Language – Plain Language – Easy Language Plus. Balancing Comprehensibility and Acceptability*, Berlin.
- Maaß, C. and Rink, I. (Eds.) (2019), *Handbuch Barrierefreie Kommunikation*, Berlin.
- Mälzer, N. (Eds.) (2016), *Barrierefreie Kommunikation – Perspektiven aus Theorie und Praxis*, Berlin.
- Rink, I. (2019), *Rechtskommunikation und Barrierefreiheit. Zur Übersetzung juristischer Informations- und Interaktionstexte in Leichte Sprache*, Berlin.
- Shannon, C. and Weaver, W. (1949), *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*, Urbana.
- Wichter, S. (1994), *Experten- und Laienwortschätze. Umriß einer Lexikologie der Vertikalität*, Tübingen.
- Wittgenstein, L. (2006), *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, Frankfurt a.M.