

1 **Clarity and precision in legal language: Linguistic-discursive analysis of Organic Law**
2 **3/2021 on the regulation of euthanasia in Spain.**

3
4 Hernando-Garreta, A.^a, Centeno, C.^b, Olza, I.^c

5
6 ^a ATLANTES Global Observatory of Palliative Care
7 Institute for Culture and Society (ICS) of the University of Navarra
8 Pamplona, Navarra (Spain)
9 ORCID: 0000-0001-8181-6957

10
11 ^b Clínica Universidad de Navarra (CUN)
12 ATLANTES Global Observatory of Palliative Care
13 Institute for Culture and Society (ICS) of the University of Navarra
14 Pamplona, Navarra (Spain)
15 ORCID: 0000-0003-3395-7039

16
17 ^c Bonds, Creativity and Culture
18 Institute for Culture and Society (ICS) of the University of Navarra.
19 Pamplona, Navarra (Spain)
20 ORCID: 0000-0002-0708-4417

21
22 **Corresponding author:**
23 Alicia Hernando-Garreta: ahernandoga@unav.es (Telephone number: +34 679 244 476)

24
25 These authors contributed equally to this work

26 **Abstract**

27

28 Spain has recently regulated the practice of euthanasia through the Organic Law 3/2021. The
29 social relevance of this law clear, as it directly affects fundamental rights enshrined in the
30 Spanish Constitution. The aim of this article is to examine the clarity and precision of the
31 discourse with which the legislator refers to the context of end-of-life care. A linguistic-
32 discursive analysis of the Organic Law 3/2021 is carried out using a mixed methodological
33 approach. The data are categorized and quantified in order to detect potential designative and
34 interpretative problems. We find argumentative inconsistencies in the preamble (n=2) and
35 abundant problematic lexical-semantic choices (n=151) such as vagueness, ambiguity,
36 euphemisms, improper epistemic expressions, evaluative adjectives, verbs of appreciation.
37 Although a legal text must be sufficiently abstract given its generalizable nature, the euthanasia
38 law presents a series of phenomena that affect its interpretation and are potentially negative for
39 its procedural concreteness and effective execution.

40

41

42 **Keywords:** discourse analysis, legal language, euthanasia, ambiguity, vagueness.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 **1. Introduction: Organic Law 3/2021 in Spain**

50

51 In 1994, the practice of euthanasia¹ began to be debated in the Spanish Congress and, since then,
52 almost twenty legislative initiatives have emerged over the years. This process recently
53 culminated in the approval of Organic Law 3/2021 (on March 24, 2021) regarding the regulation
54 of euthanasia; it entered into force in June 2021. The context in which this law was drafted and
55 executed is noteworthy in several ways.

56

57 (a) On the one hand, the final phase in the process of approving this law coincided with the
58 outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced a wide-scale halt of activities and directly
59 impacted the performance of professionals in all areas. It brought about singular –and obvious–
60 complications for workers in the healthcare sector. High rates of death comingled with a feeling
61 of exhaustion on the part of healthcare personnel generated mixed reactions in society and
62 among healthcare professionals themselves when faced with the approval of a euthanasia law
63 that entails specific training for workers in said field (Altisent et al., 2021; Bertolín-Guillén,
64 2021).

65

66 (b) On the other hand, not only was the external context relevant for the drafting and execution
67 of the law, in addition, the period of time after which the regulation itself came into force (three
68 months) was extraordinary since an organic law² of this nature usually takes longer. The *vacatio*
69 *legis* was scarce in comparison with the training that professionals involved in this matter need,
70 which the law itself proposes (Arruego, 2021). Especially of note, it granted a reduced space of

71 time for the formation of related commissions and the elaboration of the best practices manual
72 that the legislative text proposes.³

73
74 The elaboration of the law, its implementation and especially its entry into force have generated
75 a complex debate in Spain on a variety of ethical, social and, of course, legal issues. Regular
76 criticism of basic aspects related to the law in terms of its linguistic formulation stands out. Said
77 criticism is found in texts that generally defend the need for the law and its suitability on other
78 levels (Bertolín-Guillén, 2021); it has mostly come from legal specialists generically pointing to
79 the use of euphemisms or ambiguous terms, stressing, above all, the problems that these
80 linguistic phenomena may occasion when applying the law (Martínez López-Muñiz, 2021).

81

82

83 **2. Objective and structure**

84

85 Within the framework described, this study aims to present a linguistic-discursive analysis of the
86 text of the law to shed light on its expository clarity and argumentative foundation. This analysis
87 is part of a broader project (author, in progress) to study current public discourse (political,
88 media and institutional) on palliative care (PC) in Spain. It began with analysis of Organic Law
89 3/2021 since references to PC there strongly impact how the discipline is represented in the
90 public sphere. In a first careful reading of the text, we notice, in line with criticism from jurists
91 mentioned in § 1, what we define *a priori* as inconsistencies and ambiguities in the effective
92 formulation of the law. The present study aims to systematically develop an analysis in this
93 direction, offering structured linguistic-discursive evidence on the expository and argumentative

94 clarity of the law, pointing, above all, to possible interpretive problems that may derive, on the
95 one hand, from the lexical choices of the text and, on the other, from the law's own
96 argumentative progression. For this, we rely on the premise that all interpretation and application
97 of the law directly depends on its linguistic formulation, as proposed in Article 3 of the Civil
98 Code:

99
100 1. Regulations will be interpreted *according to the plain meaning contained in their words*, in relation with
101 the context, historical and legislative background, and social reality of the time in which they are to be
102 applied, fundamentally attending to their spirit and purpose" (emphasis added).⁴

103
104 Likewise, we start from the hypothesis that, as often happens with legislative texts (Sainz
105 Moreno & Silva Ochoa, 1989), it is possible that Organic Law 3/2021 contains problematic
106 linguistic-discursive choices based on a lack of clarity and precision in the designation of
107 referents, and on deficiencies and weaknesses in its argumentative framework.

108 After presenting the methodology (§ 3), analysis herein is structured in two large blocks. First,
109 we briefly approach the argumentative body of the preamble (§ 4.1). In what follows, we develop
110 a qualitative critical analysis of passages in the text whose interpretation is subject to ambiguity
111 and vagueness based on certain lexical choices, and to a variable degree of subjectivity,
112 designative non-specificity and/or opacity (§ 4.2). As a result of this study, a series of
113 conclusions are obtained showing that the application of the law may be compromised by
114 deficiencies in its linguistic formulation (§ 5).

115
116

117 **3. Methodology: Critical discourse analysis and qualitative approaches**

118

119 This study will be carried out with the hermeneutical approach found in critical discourse
120 analysis (CDA) (Meyer, Wodak, et al., 2003; Pardo Abril, 2013) in order to determine the quality
121 of the text and the possible difficulties social agents may have when interpreting the law
122 regulating euthanasia. It is therefore based on a critical perspective of discourse analysis, which,
123 with sufficient epistemological distance, is capable of understanding and categorizing the text
124 and its interpretation, as well as of detecting possible problematic aspects in its structure and
125 configuration (Gómez García, 2017: 188).

126

127 In the framework of the CDA, we will use, fundamentally, qualitative analysis tools, divided into
128 two main facets.

129 (1) On the one hand, analysis of the argumentative structure will be limited to the preamble,
130 which positions the law socially and legally and establishes the conceptual premises that support
131 the subsequent articles where specific regulatory protocols related to the practice of euthanasia
132 are discussed. This analysis of the preamble of the law is based on the argumentation model
133 defined in van Dijk (1993).

134 (2) On the other hand, an exhaustive qualitative analysis of the preamble itself and of the rest of
135 the text of the law (articles 1 to 19) will be carried out in order to detect lexical-discursive
136 choices whose interpretation is not unequivocal, or univocal enough. Later, these formulations
137 will be ordered, categorized and quantified in a mixed approach (quantitative-qualitative) that
138 will help identify the passages of the legislative text that give rise to interpretive problems.

139

140

141 **4. Analysis and results**

142

143 4.1. The argumentation found in the preamble

144

145 The preamble to a law is neither mandatory nor regulatory; it therefore allows legislators to
146 flexibly explain the reasons or arguments that found the law and its contents. Despite
147 controversy related to its normative validity, it is traditionally understood as a fundamental
148 source for interpretation of the law. This is so because, as pointed out, the Civil Code establishes
149 that every law must be understood not only in terms of its plain language, but also in the context
150 in which it was issued, and it is precisely in the preamble where legislators present the
151 motivation behind the normative text, as well as its meaning and purpose.

152 Here, we briefly analyze the argumentative structure of the preamble to the Spanish law
153 regulating euthanasia. Broadly speaking, we find that the preamble follows the structure of legal
154 argumentation formulated in van Dijk (1993), which is presented below and then applied to the
155 arguments contained in the preamble.

156
157 Figure 1. Argumentative structure of the preamble to the law

158

159 This argumentative model allows us not only to situate the conditions under which the text was
160 written (argumentation, justification, framework, circumstances, starting point, facts, legitimacy,
161 reinforcement and conclusion), but also to balance the weight of the arguments and the space
162 dedicated to each of them. The main argumentative problems worth highlighting associated with
163 this preamble are as follows.

164

165 (a) The authoritative argument that it cites corresponds to jurisprudence from the European Court
166 of Human Rights, which occupies a greater space than one might, *a priori*, expect since it is used
167 fundamentally to legitimize it even though it lacks a direct thematic relationship with the law
168 (legitimation argument).

169
170 (b) The first reason (initial argumentative germ) for which the regulation arises (*responds to*
171 *demand*) is uncritically assumed and lacks justification since no empirical data is presented that
172 truly demonstrates the need for the norm.

173
174 (c) Along these same lines, the fundamental reasons for regulating euthanasia are presented as a
175 series of circumstances that each individual perceives (they are, therefore, not objective: e.g.,
176 *enduring unbearable suffering*). Analogous examples from other neighboring countries are also
177 used, yet their similarity to the Spanish case is insufficiently illustrated.

178
179 In short, the argumentation on which the is preamble to the law is based is inconsistent in several
180 places, especially considering the absence of objective evidence to justify the so-called
181 "sustained demand in today's society" on which it is based. This is also clear given the
182 insufficiency of the arguments based on external analogy (e.g., Court of Human Rights, other
183 countries in the European setting) that seek to legitimize it.

184

185 4.2. Problematic lexical-discursive choices

186

187 4.2.1. The quality of legal language

188

189 Legal language, and the legal lexicon in particular, have been the object of linguistic study on
190 numerous occasions and the topic of extensive debate. We must first ask for whom laws are
191 written—for the society that must understand their content and abide by them, or for jurists who
192 must interpret them in the first and last instance? If the answer is society, the related texts must
193 be clear and simple such that they are accessible to whomever may receive them; however, if
194 they are addressed to specialists on the matter in order for them to optimally perform their work,
195 inevitably, the language must be specific and technicalities will abound.

196

197 Actually, being at the same time addressed to specialists and citizens, legal language should keep
198 a complex balance between clarity and specificity, what allows for an effective and non-
199 problematic application of regulations. Therefore, this language not only has a specific style, but
200 also must adhere to basic stylistic principles such as brevity, simplicity and precision. To the
201 extent that it meets these characteristics, we can assess the quality of the law. However,
202 examples abound of laws that directly contravene these three assumptions. In terms of brevity,
203 we usually find complex syntax that makes reading the law difficult and takes away from
204 simplicity. Regarding precision, ambiguities or vagaries frequently appear that obscure the text
205 and distance it from precision.⁵ In light of these problems, several measures under the scope of
206 Plain Language Movements have been taken to help correct certain linguistic flaws so that
207 citizens can understand what laws say. For instance, Duarte & Martínez (1995) present a small
208 compendium of all the literature or regulations related to drafting laws for their correct
209 elaboration and consequent application, as well as proposals to follow in each one of them. This
210 division was carried by country. Examples of publications regarding legislative drafting include

211 the Austrian guidelines, *Legistische Richtlinien*, which stand out for being very thorough, and the
212 German ones, *Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit*, considered the most emblematic. In the Spanish
213 case, perhaps the best known one is the *Acuerdo del Consejo de Ministros* from October 18,
214 1991, in which guidelines regarding the form and structure of bills were approved.⁶

215
216 Despite the fact that, as noted, there has been much effort to improve the quality of drafting laws,
217 the presence of certain linguistic-discursive aspects that make textual interpretation problematic
218 seems inevitable (Marchese, 2012; Rodríguez-Toubes Muñoz, 2017). This is also the case for the
219 Spanish organic law 3/2021, where these problems seem to be more intense at the lexical level,
220 with relevant interpretative and discursive effects that affect clarity in the law.

221
222 In what follows, we present a taxonomy of the most common lexical-discursive problems found
223 in the qualitative analysis of the law. Each section (4.2.2-4.2.6) will define, exemplify and
224 critically comment relevant instances of the categories identified, which are not exclusive –i.e.
225 several problems may apply to the same passages and linguistic expressions. In section 4.2.7, a
226 summary of results is offered.

227

228 4.2.2. Ambiguity

229

230 Ambiguity is opposed to the maxims of precision and clarity and, together with vagueness,
231 constitutes one of the two fundamental problems of legal language, since both contribute to the
232 non-specificity of language. There are three types of ambiguity: semantic, syntactic and
233 pragmatic. Here we are not as interested in deepening the typology of ambiguity as in the

234 specific examples thereof found in the law regulating euthanasia. However, fundamentally, we
235 identify issues of semantic ambiguity, which is, in general, the most productive and least
236 avoidable of the three. By definition, we speak of ambiguity when different –and often
237 contradictory– interpretations of the same word or group of words can be admitted, thus
238 generating confusion and lack of univocal readings.

239

240 Let us analyze some examples (emphasis added in all excerpts):

241

242 The legalization and regulation of euthanasia *are based on the compatibility* of certain essential principles
243 that are the foundation of individual rights, and that are thus included in the Spanish Constitution. They are,
244 on the one hand, the fundamental rights to life and physical and moral integrity, and, on the other,
245 constitutionally protected goods like dignity, freedom or autonomy of will.

246 Making these rights and constitutional principles *compatible is necessary and possible*, for which
247 legislation respectful of all of them is required. (Preamble, page 1)

248

249 First, it is stated that the legalization and regulation of euthanasia are based on the compatibility
250 of principles that are the basis of rights and goods and that it is necessary and possible to make
251 those principles and rights compatible. If these principles are the basis of rights, there would be
252 no need to make them compatible, and thus the legislation as proposed would not be necessary.
253 In addition, it seems contradictory to say that it would be necessary and possible to reconcile
254 them if legalization and regulation of the law are based on compatibility. This interpretation
255 abandons the protected goods of dignity, freedom and autonomy of freedom, which, however,
256 later take precedence over the right to life. This is not a legal problem, but rather a problem in
257 how it was drafted, and can cause confusion.

258

259 On the other hand, the following statement also seems ambiguous:

260

261 To that end, this law regulates and decriminalizes euthanasia *in certain clearly defined cases* that are
262 subject to sufficient guarantees that safeguard absolute freedom of decision, ruling out external pressure of
263 any kind. (Preamble, page 2)

264

265 It is ambiguous to speak of certain cases if the law contemplates legality only in the case of
266 serious, chronic and disabling disease or serious and incurable illness as defined in Article 3. The
267 phrase *certain cases* implies a broader and more difficult to interpret series of possibilities given
268 the lack of specificity. This question could have been easily solved by referring to the
269 fundamental requirement of serious, chronic and disabling disease or serious and incurable
270 illness and then expanding the conditions to which they are subject. Increasing the casuistry in
271 which euthanasia is acceptable seems intentional; this also fits in with the guaranteeing nature of
272 the law, which safeguards the different particularities in society.

273

274 On the other hand, at the end of the preamble, recapitulating the need to regulate the practice of
275 euthanasia and all that it implies, we find two other ambiguities that generate gaps and may
276 incite certain debate, namely *mitigated by other means* and *a fully capable and free person*.

277

278 It is understood as an action that directly and intentionally causes the death of a person through a single and
279 immediate cause-effect relationship, at the informed, express and repeated request of said person; it is
280 carried out in a context of suffering due to an incurable illness or disease that the person experiences as
281 intolerable and that could not be *mitigated by other means*. (Preamble, page 3)

282

283 What other means are referred to here? If strictly applied, this seems to imply that a patient with
284 an incurable illness or disease will not be able, for example, to request euthanasia if they have
285 not previously received palliative care and have not yet exhausted all possibilities of relief.
286 However, we know that this is not the case because, Article 5, in *Requirements for the provision*
287 *of assistance in dying* states that *the patient must have all available information in writing*
288 *regarding their medical process, the different alternatives and possibilities of action, including*
289 *access to comprehensive palliative care...* However, having said information in no way obliges
290 them to receive these services. Data collected by research in palliative medicine reveals reduced
291 access to this type of care for a variety of reasons.⁷

292
293 On the other hand, and further on, after considering constitutional rights and goods in the context
294 of euthanasia, the patient is required to be a *fully capable and free person* in order to precedence
295 over the right to life:

296
297 When a *fully capable and free person* faces a vital situation that, in his opinion, violates his dignity,
298 intimacy and integrity, as defined by the context of euthanasia described above, the good of life can wane
299 in favor of other goods and rights with which it must be weighed, since there is no constitutional duty to
300 impose or protect life at all costs and against the will of the bearer of the right to life. (Preamble, page 3)

301
302 Based on the context, this statement seems to exclude all people who have some sort of
303 intellectual disability or a disease that directly affects said abilities. However, Article 6, referring
304 to the *Requirements for requesting the provision of assistance in dying*, contemplates different
305 solutions so that they can access it in case of incapacity. Another problem that stems from this
306 ambiguity is the use of the adjective *free*. It seems evident that, when a person is ill and

307 experiences intolerable suffering, (s)he cannot be free since (s)he is under the pressure of pain
308 and (s)he may be surround by other circumstances that do not allow him/her to freely decide.
309 This would be the case of those who feel they are a burden to their family, do not have financial
310 resources to pay treatment, or are in an anxious-depressive state, etc.

311

312 Another case of ambiguity is found in the definition of *Informed Consent*:

313

314 Informed consent: the patient's free, voluntary and conscious agreement, expressed in full use of their
315 faculties after receiving the *appropriate information*, so that, at their request, one of the actions described in
316 letter g) takes place. (Article 3, a), page 4)

317

318 On what basis is this information adequate? Clearly this includes reference to the information
319 that their doctor should provide about prognosis, treatments, etc., but what may be adequate for
320 the doctor could be insufficient for the family, for example. Specifying this in more detail may
321 help serve as a guide for the medical community and thus help avoid possible communication
322 problems or those related to the doctor-patient relationship.

323

324 Another definition that could generate controversy is that of *Situation of de facto incapacity*,
325 Article 3, h), precisely because, as in the previous example, the lack of specification can generate
326 ambiguity:

327

328 "Situation of de facto incapacity:" a situation in which the patient lacks sufficient understanding and will to
329 autonomously, fully and effectively govern his or herself, regardless of whether *support measures* are or
330 have been adopted for the exercise of their juridical capacity. (Article 3, h), page 5)

331
332 What type of support is necessary in this case? From the context, this likely refers to legal
333 measures, however, some might think it refers to psychological support measures for the patient
334 prior to their incapacitation. A person outside the world of law would not necessarily know
335 which documents or actions this statement refers to. The syntactic use of the passive voice
336 (measures have been adopted) is also complex, although common in the drafting of laws. Who is
337 directly responsible for this issue? The text also fails to provide clues regarding the citizen who
338 must interpret the law, which generates certain confusion or difficulty when applying the law.

339
340 Regarding the wording of Article 4 on the *Right to request the provision of assistance in dying*,
341 we repeatedly find another series of ambiguities that generate gaps or, rather, favor non-
342 specificity towards increasing the euthanasia context and guarantee greater access. These
343 expressions or phrases include: *means of support and resources will be guaranteed; accessibility*
344 *measures; reasonable modifications; pertinent measures to provide access*. The nouns *means*,
345 *resources*, *measures* and *modifications* are all polysemic and open up a wide field of
346 possibilities. In addition, in the last two examples, the adjectives that specify them, *reasonable*
347 *and pertinent*, imply subjectivity due to their evaluative nature so they do not help to clarify the
348 terms.

349
350 Articles 5 and 6, which are dedicated to the requirements for receiving the provision and making
351 the request respectively, contain other examples of ambiguity and both specifically refer to
352 *means*.

353

354 Having voluntarily made two requests in writing, *or by other means* that leave a record, and that are not the
355 result of any external pressure, with at least fifteen calendar days between each request. (Article 5, c), page
356 5)

357
358 The only alternative to a request in writing would be an oral one, which we understand as a
359 request in the form of a voice recording, video or similar. However, it could also just be a simple
360 conversation. Only requiring that it *leaves a record* means anyone could prepare a written text
361 that would substantiate a conversation about the person's will and thus provide the required
362 evidence, but they could have changed the information based on specific interests at play. The
363 same can be found in Article 6:

364
365 In the event that it is impossible for you to date and sign the document due to your personal situation or
366 health condition, you may use *other means* to record it, or *another person* of legal age and fully capable
367 may date and sign it in your presence. (Article 6, 1), page 6)⁸

368
369 There is a clear lack of specificity about *the means for leaving proof* because using another
370 means, as expressed, might give proof of a request, but it would not necessarily include a
371 signature. The same would happen with *another person*. The use of indefinite determiners like
372 *another* generates precisely what its name indicates, indefiniteness. Since this is a law that seeks
373 to guarantee and establish a new right, it is reasonable to think that its use of words is deliberate
374 and contemplates all possible particularities. However, using this resource is sometimes a
375 double-edged sword for jurists, who, due to their lack of specification, may face interpretive
376 problems.

377

378 4.2.3. Vagueness

379

380 Vagueness supposes, along with ambiguity, one of the biggest problems when interpreting the
381 law, as mentioned in the previous section. A term is vague when it does not have a specific
382 determination, but rather is broad or general and is also free in its choice or application. The
383 imprecision or indeterminacy that characterize vagueness generates an unspecific context of
384 interpretation that is sometimes conflictive.

385

386 When talking about vagueness, in general, a distinction is made between two types, namely
387 intensional vagueness and extensional vagueness. For the former, indeterminacy does not allow
388 the question to be known exactly. An example of this is the world *relevant*. For extensional
389 vagueness, however, there is some gradation. An example in this sense can be found in Article
390 11, 1), referring to the *fulfilment of the provision of assistance in dying*.

391

392 Once positive resolution has been reached, healthcare professionals must fulfil the provision of assistance
393 in dying with the utmost care and professionalism, applying the corresponding protocols, which will also
394 contain *criteria regarding how and when to carry out the request*. (Article 11, 1), page 8)⁹

395

396 The expression of containing *criteria regarding and when* is vague because it does not specify if
397 certain and orderly guidelines must be followed, nor in relation to time are periods, hours or
398 minutes spoken of. Here interpretation and calibration of the margins in this regard are up to
399 those responsible for execution of the protocols.

400

401 When dealing with the phenomenon of vagueness, it is also common to differentiate between
402 gradual and combinatorial vagueness when carried out from the point of view of legal
403 interpretation. Another possible classification of vagueness refers to the dimensions of the term
404 as part of analysis from the philosophy of language (Ferrari (2020) and Keefe (2000)
405 respectively).

406
407 From the philological point of view, the vagueness in the *Euthanasia Regulation Law* is closely
408 linked to the subjectivity that underlies the terms and that is so recurrent in the text.

409
410 4.2.4. Subjectivity

411
412 Legal-administrative texts are mainly characterized by objectivity since clarity and precision are
413 sought, and, for this, a denotative lexicon must be used, that is, an objective one. However, in the
414 law that concerns us, the presence of subjectivity is striking, especially that which is manifested
415 through evaluative adjectives –whose interpretation relies on each subject’s perspective– and the
416 verbal semantics. This subjectivity also results in certain fundamental terms being vague. Thus,
417 we find, for example, *unbearable suffering* a fundamental requirement for the practice of
418 euthanasia to take place. This *suffering* is subject to diverse perspectives depending on the case.
419 What is unbearable for one patient will not be the same or in the same quantity for another,
420 although the context may be the same or similar. That one of the fundamental requirements is
421 problematic reveals a deliberate use of language and discloses the quality of the law.

422

423 The examples listed in the table below help illustrate the subjectivity in the text. Nominal
424 syntagma (NS) are collected in the left-hand column and verbal syntagma (VS) in the right-hand
425 column. Isolated words organized by grammatical categories are not presented because, in this
426 way, it is easier to contextualize the terms and analyze their subjectivity load, as well as their
427 positive or negative connotations.

428

429

Adjectives (NS)	Verbs (VS)
<i>Unbearable suffering</i>	<i>It is necessary and possible</i>
<i>Unfavorable environment</i>	<i>Considered acceptable</i>
<i>Hasty decisions</i>	<i>Considered unacceptable</i>
<i>Appreciable improvement</i>	<i>Considered incompatible</i>
<i>Constant and intolerable suffering</i>	<i>Experienced as unacceptable</i>
	<i>There is a high probability</i>
	<i>The doctor believes that</i>
	<i>Considered intolerable</i>
	<i>It is incompatible</i>
	<i>Considered appropriate</i>
	<i>Considered without prospects</i>

430

431 Table 1. Adjectives and verbs based on subjective interpretations

432

433 Taking into account NS, it first seems evident that a negative connotation prevails. However,
434 there are more nouns with a neutral or positive connotation, like *environment*, *decisions*,
435 *improvement*, when faced with repeated suffering. This is because the adjectives that specify
436 them, except for appreciable, are all negative. Thus, the reader's interpretation constitutes a
437 problem that should be resolved regardless of whether it is a subjective question or not. An

438 apparent exception to these examples is found in the NS phrase *appreciable improvement*, but if
439 we contextualize it, we find that it speaks of the non-existence of appreciable improvement, so
440 semantically it also refers to an outwardly negative context.

441
442 The term *unfavorable environment* is also a vague and subjective concept. One's environment
443 may be determined by very different circumstances and are not specified. Thus, for example, a
444 patient's family context, economic situation, personal baggage and current situation, etc. all come
445 to mind. The key, however, lies in what it means to be unfavorable. We understand unfavorable
446 for situations that present an adverse and detrimental scenario in all cases where there are
447 objective signs of said adversity. However, in the context of illness, what might seem irrelevant *a*
448 *priori*, could be an unbearable burden for the patient. Measuring or contemplating these cases is
449 a problem for the legislator given the impossibility of collecting the entire range of possibilities.
450 Therefore, given the nature of the subject, these vague terms are intentionally used without
451 specification and indirectly favor the expansion of the euthanasia context.

452
453 Verbal syntagma, for its part, contains degrees of subjectivity that are complemented, for the
454 most part, with an evaluative adjective implying an attributive or predicative function.

455
456
457 Figure 2. Subjective load and evaluative valency of verbs and adjectives

458
459
460 The inverted pyramid represents the subjective load that verbs themselves contain. With *to*
461 *consider* and *to experience*, the individual develops the action, making it more subjective; on the
462 other hand, with *to emerge*, *to be* and *to exist*, the individual is not an agent, but rather simply
463 expresses an attitude towards it and there is less subjectivity in the syntagma. If we look at the

464 examples presented, we see that the verb *to consider*, the most subjective of all, is by far the
465 most productive. The adjectives with which the verbal nuclei are combined are ordered from
466 negative to positive valencies.¹¹ Undoubtedly, all of them are evaluative and that they all involve
467 some subjectivity. For this reason, establishing clear and objective delimitations in the
468 requirements for applying for euthanasia is a complex task. The arguments in the preamble entail
469 less objectivity when evaluative language is present.

470

471 4.2.5. Euphemisms

472

473 Sometimes, the difficulty to interpret legislative language is based on the presence of
474 euphemisms, which contribute to an overall strategy of mitigation of negative effects in
475 communication. Replacing negative and taboo terms with counterparts that have a positive
476 connotation attenuates the impact of a possibly threatening message.

477

478 In the law analyzed here, there are a series of euphemisms to replace the expression *deliberate*
479 *act to end life*, which necessarily appears in the text in order to define euthanasia. The
480 euphemistic terms used are varied and include *assistance*, *act of medical aid*, *provision*, or
481 *healthcare action*, which have a rather positive connotation. We briefly collect the results
482 obtained when analyzing euphemisms in the law.

483

EUPHEMISMS OR EUPHEMISTIC EXPRESSIONS		NON-EUPHEMISTIC EXPRESSIONS	
<i>Assistance in death</i>	1	<i>Deliberate act to end life</i>	1
<i>Assistance necessary to die</i>	2	<i>Deliberate end to a patient's life</i>	1
<i>Assistance in dying</i>	7	<i>To end life</i>	1

484	<i>Provision of assistance in dying</i>	58	<i>Action that causes a person's death</i>	1
485	<i>Provide assistance in dying</i>	1		
486	<i>Assistance</i>	2		
487	<i>Provision</i>	8		
488	<i>Act of medical aid</i>	1		
489	<i>Healthcare action</i>	1		
490	<i>Euthanasia-related conduct</i>	5		
491	<i>Euthanasia-related act</i>	1		
492	<i>Euthanasia</i>	21		
493				
494				
495				
496				
497				
498				
499				
500				
501				
502				
503				
504				
505				

Table 2. Euphemisms and non-euphemistic expressions

509 The left-hand column presents the euphemisms or euphemistic expressions used and their raw
510 frequency. The right-hand column presents the use of non-euphemistic terms or direct references
511 to death. The overall numerical difference is very high. We found 108 euphemistic phrases
512 compared to 4 direct references to death, revealing a clear intention to get rid of *death* as a term,
513 considering it taboo. The two most frequent substitutions are *euthanasia* (21) and *provision of*
514 *assistance in dying* (58); the rest of the expression directly related to one of the two. There are
515 two constructions with reference to euthanasia (*euthanasia-related conduct* and *euthanasia-*
516 *related act*), while the rest are a simplification or version of *provision of assistance in dying*.
517 Perhaps more surprising is the fact that the law was not named the *Regulation of the provision of*
518 *assistance in dying* instead of the *Regulation of euthanasia*. Perhaps this decision was carried out
519 following the example of other countries that previously decriminalized the practice.

520

521 In any case, it seems that these uses are linked to a consistent will to evade in order to hide an
522 unpleasant idea, namely death. In this sense, some authors believe that, when employing
523 euphemisms, it is not so much a question of attenuating the message, but of expressing what is
524 considered politically correct. On the other hand, euphemisms are sometimes resorted to as a
525 manipulation mechanism through linguistic obscurity with ambiguous or vague words or
526 constructions. As we have shown, this also occurred in the drafting of this law, where, on
527 occasions, delimiting certain issues becomes particularly complex or gives rise to a variety of
528 interpretations. This communicative strategy contravenes the maxims of clarity, accuracy and
529 conciseness, but it is diluted by other bureaucratic transfers and, for many, goes unnoticed
530 (Sánchez García: 2018, 31-89).

531
532 Finally, let us examine one last complex example. In the preamble, euthanasia is defined as a
533 *deliberate act of ending a person's life*, but later it is said to be an act of medical aid. This is not
534 possible since a doctor seeks to eliminate suffering rather than the person, which is what has
535 generated controversy. A euphemism is acceptable as long as it does not contravene the case. In
536 other examples, however, we can clearly see how a new reality is constituted through
537 euphemistic language, such as the fact that deliberate death is not only not intended, but is now a
538 provision, an aid and, ultimately, a right.

539
540 4.2.6. False synonymy

541
542 Finally, another linguistic issue that often generates confusion when interpreting the law refers to
543 proposed synonymies between terms that are not, in fact, synonymous. In the case of LO 3/2021,

544 it becomes especially problematic given that it occurs in the definition of terms that are a *sine*
545 *qua non* condition for accessing euthanasia. They include *grave, chronic and disabling illness*
546 and *grave and incurable disease*. Both *illness* and *disease* are partial synonyms that give rise to
547 confusion between the two and, therefore, a broad definition of each is offered. However, the
548 problem persists.

549
550 Regarding definitions, there are a series of basic rules and guidelines to follow when drafting
551 legislation that in the text under discussion have not been complied with and may cause
552 confusion.¹² According to Salvador Coderch (1989: 166-167), it is advisable to "*define only if*
553 *necessary*. A legislator's definitions tend to specify cases of vagueness, settle doubts in cases of
554 ambiguity, restrict or expand usual meanings, particularize the reference to a certain set of
555 things, etc.". We start from the fact that the law that concerns us here surely intended to avoid
556 vagueness, ambiguity and to specify, however, vague or ambiguous terms were used in the
557 definition that do not resolve the issue. For example, a *grave, chronic and disabling illness* is
558 defined as a *situation that refers to limitations...* In order to clarify them and resolve the
559 situation, adjectives are used, but as advanced in the subjectivity section, far from specifying, it
560 broadens the question to the perspective of the person who experiences and assesses it. The
561 definition thus fails to meet the aim and becomes invalid.¹³

562
563 Another basic guideline to follow includes not defining the same expression differently when
564 using it several times (Salvador Coderch, 1989: 169-170). In the development of this specific
565 guideline, it is necessary to use different terms to designate different concepts. This is clearly
566 neglected since *serious illness* and *serious disease* are defined. It would have been more

567 appropriate to use different adjectives to help the reader more clearly differentiate since the terms
568 are non-specific and synonymous.

569
570 To these two problematic examples we can add other drafting issues. The two concepts in
571 question sometimes appear in one order (Preamble, Article 3 and First Final Provision) and
572 sometimes in another (Articles 5 and 12). In addition, there is sometimes mention of *physical or*
573 *mental suffering* (for example: *with the consequent physical or mental suffering* in Preamble I)
574 and *physical and psychological suffering* at other times (for example: *causing physical or*
575 *psychological suffering* in Preamble II). In context, we clearly understand that this is about the
576 same thing, but the synonymy between mental and psychological was unnecessary and only
577 contributes to the problem. Let us recall that these are the fundamental prerequisite for
578 requesting euthanasia, which is why the drafters should have taken special care when using them
579 and should have attempted to avoid causing confusion.

580
581 4.2.7. Summary of results

582
583 Below we include a synoptic table of the mixed analysis carried out in this study. The main
584 lexical-discursive problems detected through qualitative methods are summarized and then
585 broadly quantified. The main argumentative inconsistencies analyzed in section 4.1 are also
586 included in the table. The full analysis of the law is provided as supplementary material in:
587 <https://bit.ly/euthanasiaSpain>.

Phenomenon	(#)	Category	Linguistic effect	Example
Mitigation	108	Euphemisms	Opacity and imprecision	<i>Act of medical assistance, healthcare action, aid in dying, aid for dying, aid for death, service, aid, euthanasia-related conduct, euthanasia-related action, euthanasia</i>
Non-specificity	(>40)	Vagueness	Imprecision	<i>Incurable disease or illness that a person experiences as unacceptable and that has not been alleviated by other means.</i>
		Ambiguity	Imprecision	<i>The legalization and regulation of euthanasia are based on the compatibility of certain essential principles... including, on the one hand, the fundamental rights to life and to physical and moral integrity, and on the other, constitutionally protected goods such as dignity, freedom and autonomy of will. It is necessary and possible to make these constitutional rights and principles compatible, and it requires legislation that respects all of them.</i>
		Subjectivity	Imprecision	Evaluative adjectives: <i>unbearable, unfavourable, hasty, appreciable, constant, intolerable</i>
			Imprecision	Verbs of appreciation: <i>to consider, to experience, to emerge, to be (+adj) and to exist (+adj)</i> .
			Imprecision	Epistemic expressions: <i>in their view</i>
Argumentative inconsistency	4/6	Absent or unspecific argumentative evidence	Argumentative weakness	<i>And it is precisely the legislator's obligation to respond to society's demands and values, preserving and respecting rights and adapting the rules that order and organize our coexistence.</i>
		Questionable wording	Argumentative weakness	<i>The European Court of Human Rights' ruling from May 4, 2013 (<i>Gross v. Switzerland</i>) is relevant in that it considers it unacceptable that a country that has decriminalized euthanasia-related conduct does not develop and enact a specific legal regime, specifying the modes of practice of said euthanasia-related conduct.</i>

588
589
590 Table 3. Summary of results.

591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613

5. Discussion

The linguistic difficulties that can arise in drafting a given law are evident and, despite the efforts of professionals to avoid them, adapting as much as possible to the regulations governing legislative language, a variety of problems arise that make it difficult to interpret the text. As seen in this linguistic-discursive analysis, *Organic Law 3/2021 (March 24) on the regulation of euthanasia* presents problematic issues related to linguistic drafting and, therefore, interpretation.

Firstly, the present study has confirmed that the preamble to the law conforms to the pattern of legal argumentation found in van Dijk, but it has also revealed certain elements that leave room for debate. The arguments are not always backed by evidence and the text does not meet standards of clarity and precision.

Secondly, the law as a whole presents more than forty examples of linguistic issues that lead to non-specificity and, therefore, give rise to interpretative issues. Its ambiguity, vagueness and subjectivity very often leave gaps that, together with euphemisms and false synonyms, obscure the message and raise the possibility that the law intends to broaden the euthanasia context. On the other hand, given the nature of the subject matter, which incites diverse reactions, a deliberate use of language to mitigate is evident. All of these linguistic issues denote a hasty drafting of the law and generate interpretive problems that directly affect the correct application of the law.

614 We can conclude, therefore, that this legislative text presents a series of discourse-related
615 inconsistencies that are possibly the result of both the rapid context in which the law was
616 elaborated, and the typical nature of legal language. To regulate the practice of euthanasia,
617 surrounding countries have faced a similar problem due the use of non-specific language. For
618 instance, in the recent case of Portugal (2021), the law was only approved after having to
619 reformulate the text.¹⁴ This fact once more highlights the need for linguistic-discursive analysis
620 of legislative texts for their corresponding approval, interpretation and application.

621
622
623
624 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,
625 or not-for-profit sectors.

626 **Notes:**

- 627 1. The mixed parliamentary group that year, with deputy Pilar Rahola as spokesperson,
628 promoted a non-legal proposal for the creation of a parliamentary paper with the aim of
629 studying "legal recourse for the social demand that has emerged around euthanasia."
- 630 2. Note here the third final provision of the law, where the ordinary nature of certain articles
631 and provisions is specified: "This law has the character of an organic law with the exception
632 of articles 12, 16.1, 17 and 18, of the first additional provisions, second, third, fourth, fifth,
633 sixth and seventh, and the sole transitory provision, which have the character of ordinary
634 law".
- 635 3. For this reason, it was, in fact, necessary that Article 17, referring to the Guarantee and
636 Evaluation Commissions, enter into force –exceptionally– the day after the publication of
637 the law in the BOE. It would be impossible to practice euthanasia without these
638 commissions and without a best practices manual to ensure compliance.
- 639 4. Original Spanish text: "Las normas se interpretarán según el sentido propio de sus palabras,
640 en relación con el contexto, los antecedentes históricos y legislativos, y la realidad social del
641 tiempo en que han de ser aplicadas, atendiendo fundamentalmente al espíritu y finalidad de
642 aquellas".
- 643 5. Other typical characteristics are, for example, a technical lexicon, a tendency to
644 nominalization, overuse of passive constructions or the use of identifying determiners.
- 645 6. This example is repealed by a subsequent Agreement: BOE 180/2005, of July 29, 2005, with
646 reference BOE-A-05-13020. Also of note, the Report of the Commission for the
647 modernization of juridical language presented in 2011 to the Council of Ministers and
648 accessible at the General Access Point of the Administration of Justice.

- 649 7. See official data for Spain in the European Atlas of Palliative Care. Spain has 0.6 specialized
650 services per 100,000 inhabitants, while the European average is 0.8. The optimal ratio,
651 according to the standards of the European Association for Palliative Care, is 2. (Arias-
652 Casais et al., 2019. *EAPC Atlas of Palliative Care in Europe 2019*).
- 653 8. Original Spanish text: En el caso de que por su situación personal o condición de salud no le
654 fuera posible fechar y firmar el documento, podrá hacer uso de *otros medios* que le permitan
655 dejar constancia, o bien *otra persona* mayor de edad y plenamente capaz podrá fecharlo y
656 firmarlo en su presencia.
- 657 9. Original Spanish text: Una vez recibida la resolución positiva, la realización de la prestación
658 de ayuda para morir debe hacerse con el máximo cuidado y profesionalidad por parte de los
659 profesionales sanitarios, con aplicación de los protocolos correspondientes, que contendrán,
660 además, criterios en cuanto a la forma y tiempo de realización de la prestación.
- 661 10. There is no parallel equivalence between the verbal actions and the adjectives presented in
662 the table.
- 663 11. Salvador Coderch (1989) defines a set of norms and guidelines to follow for elaborating
664 definitions in legislation. We will exclusively focus on the two guidelines that are most
665 relevant here.
- 666 12. It seems widely accepted that, when drafting a law, some intentionally leave it as such,
667 postponing the matter until a judge rules, if the need to specify arises.
- 668 13. See, for example: “*Portugal's top court rejects bill to legalise euthanasia*. [...] The decision
669 came after the country’s recently re-elected President Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa, a
670 conservative, asked the court to evaluate the legislation on the grounds that *it appeared to*

671 *contain “excessively undefined concepts”*. Article published in *Reuters* (March 15, 2021),
672 <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-portugal-rights-euthanasia-idUSKBN2B72JP>.
673

674 **References**

675

676 *Studies*

677

678 Altisent, R., Nabal, M., Muñoz, P., Ferrer, S., Delgado-Marroquín, M. T. & Alonso A.

679 Eutanasia: ¿es esta la ley que necesitamos? *Atención Primaria*; 2021. 53, 102057.

680 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aprim.2021.102057>

681

682 Arias-Casais, N., Garralda, E., Rhee, J. Y. et al. *EAPC atlas of palliative care in*

683 *Europe*. Romania; 2019. 122, 0-6. <https://dadun.unav.edu/handle/10171/56787>

684

685 Arruego, G. Las coordenadas de la Ley Orgánica de regulación de la eutanasia. *Revista Española*

686 *de Derecho Constitucional*; 2021.122, 85-118. <https://doi.org/10.18042/cepc/redc.122.03>

687

688 Author (in progress).

689

690 Bertolín-Guillén, J. M. Eutanasia, suicidio asistido y psiquiatría. *Revista de la Asociación*

691 *Española de Neuropsiquiatría*; 2021. 41(140), 51-67. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4321/s0211->

692 [57352021000200003](https://dx.doi.org/10.4321/s0211-57352021000200003).

693

694 Duarte, C., & Martínez, A. *El lenguaje jurídico*. Buenos Aires: A-Z; 1995.

695

696 Dijk, T. A. van. Principles of critical discourse analysis, *Discourse and Society*; 1993. 4(2), 249-

697 283.

698

699 Ferrari Yaunner, M. El lenguaje del Derecho, retos y posibilidades para la interpretación jurídica.
700 *Revista Derechos En Acción*; 2020. 17(17). <https://doi.org/10.24215/25251678e476>
701
702 Gómez García, J. A. *La argumentación jurídica: teoría y práctica*. Madrid: Dykinson; 2017.
703
704 Keefe, R. *Theories of vagueness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2000.
705
706 Marchese, M. C. El discurso legal-normativo como praxis social. Análisis crítico de las leyes
707 sobre vivienda para habitantes de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires en situación de pobreza. *Revista de*
708 *Llengua i Dret. Journal of Language and Law*; 2012. 57, 43-70.
709
710 Martínez López-Muñiz, J. L. El deber de proteger la vida, y especialmente de los más
711 debilitados, frente a un inexistente derecho a quitarse la vida por sí o por otros. *Revista Española*
712 *de Derecho Constitucional*; 2021. 122, 47-83. <https://doi.org/10.18042/cepc/redc.122.02>
713
714 Meyer, M., Wodak, R., Eguibar, B. & Fernández Aúz, T. *Métodos de análisis crítico del*
715 *discurso*. Barcelona: Gedisa; 2003.
716
717 Pardo Abril, N. *Cómo hacer análisis crítico del discurso. Una perspectiva latinoamericana*. 2a.
718 edición. Universidad Nacional de Colombia: Instituto de Estudios en Comunicación y Cultura
719 (IECO); 2013.
720

721 Rodríguez-Toubes Muñoz, J. La imprecisión del lenguaje legislativo, expuesta en el artículo 18
722 LRJSP. *Cuadernos Electrónicos de Filosofía Del Derecho*; 2017. 36, 11.
723 <https://doi.org/10.7203/CEFD.36.10447>

724
725 Sainz Moreno, F., & Silva Ochoa, J. C. da. *La calidad de las leyes*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Parlamento
726 Vasco; 1989.

727
728 Salvador Coderch, P. Definiciones y remisiones. In Sainz Moreno, F., & Silva Ochoa, J. C. da.
729 (1989): *La calidad de las leyes*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Parlamento Vasco; 1989. 157-182.

730
731 Sánchez García, F. J. *Eufemismos del discurso político: las claves lingüísticas del arte del*
732 *disimulo*. Madrid: Visor Libros; 2018.

733
734
735 ***Legislative and Institutional texts***

736
737 Código Civil español. Real Decreto de 24 de julio de 1889 por el que se publica el Código Civil.
738 Gaceta de Madrid. Núm. 206, de 25 de julio de 1889.
739 [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/rd/1889/07/24/\(1\)/con](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/rd/1889/07/24/(1)/con)

740
741 Ley Orgánica 3/2021, de 24 de marzo, de regulación de la eutanasia. Boletín Oficial del Estado,
742 núm. 72, de 25 de marzo de 2021. https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2021-4628

743

744 Proposición no de Ley sobre la creación de una ponencia que estudie dar curso legal a la
745 demanda social generada en torno a la eutanasia (núm. exp. 162/000093). Pleno del Congreso de
746 los Diputados (24 abril 1994).
747 https://app.congreso.es/AudiovisualCongreso/escucharAudio?legislatura=Legislatura_V&carpeta
748 [=Iniciativas&nombreFich=05_000400_19940426_01_162000093.mp3&tipo=S](https://app.congreso.es/AudiovisualCongreso/escucharAudio?legislatura=Legislatura_V&carpeta)
749
750 Resolución de 28 de julio de 2005, de la Subsecretaría, por la que se da publicidad al Acuerdo
751 del Consejo de Ministros, de 22 de julio de 2005, por el que se aprueban las Directrices de
752 técnica normativa. Boletín Oficial del Estado, núm. 180 de 29 de julio de 2005.
753 [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/res/2005/07/28/\(1\)/con](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/res/2005/07/28/(1)/con)
754

Figure 1. Argumentative structure of the preamble to the law




Table 1. Adjectives and verbs based on subjective interpretations

Figure 2. Subjective load and evaluative valency of verbs and adjectives




Table 2. Euphemisms and non-euphemistic expressions

Table 3. Summary of results