

The Language of Reconciliation: A Linguistic Examination of Indigenous Peace Pacts in Restorative Justice

Dr. Maya Deshmukh¹, Ms. Leah Redsky²

1Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) New Delhi, India

2PhD Candidate, Indigenous Language and Justice Program University of Manitoba Winnipeg, Canada

Doi <https://doi.org/10.55640/ijssl-02-05-01>

ABSTRACT

This article explores the intricate linguistic landscape of indigenous peace pacts within the framework of restorative justice. While restorative justice mechanisms increasingly gain recognition for their community-centric approach to conflict resolution, the specific linguistic features that underpin the efficacy and comprehensibility of their foundational agreements—peace pacts—remain underexplored. Drawing upon principles from forensic linguistics, legal language studies, and discourse analysis, this study aims to identify and analyze the lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic characteristics inherent in these culturally significant documents. By examining the language used in various peace pacts, particularly those from indigenous communities in the Cordillera region of the Philippines, this research sheds light on how linguistic choices contribute to clarity, enforceability, and the overall success of reconciliation processes. The findings underscore the critical role of accessible and culturally attuned language in fostering mutual understanding and sustained peace, offering valuable insights for legal practitioners, linguists, and policymakers engaged in restorative justice initiatives.

Keywords: Indigenous languages, restorative justice, peace pacts, reconciliation, linguistic analysis, conflict resolution, cultural linguistics, indigenous justice systems, language of peace.

INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of justice has long been intertwined with the power of language. Legal systems worldwide rely heavily on precise, often specialized, linguistic formulations to define rights, establish obligations, and articulate resolutions [39]. However, the inherent complexity and often opaque nature of legal language have frequently been criticized for creating barriers to access and understanding, particularly for laypersons [30, 9]. This challenge becomes even more pronounced in contexts involving traditional or indigenous legal systems, where the interface between customary law and formal legal frameworks can lead to significant communicative clashes [12, 13, 14].

In recent decades, restorative justice has emerged as a compelling alternative or complement to punitive justice models. Emphasizing healing, reconciliation, and community involvement, restorative justice seeks to repair harm rather than merely punish offenders [35]. At the heart of many restorative processes, particularly within indigenous communities, are peace pacts or agreements that formalize the resolution and outline future conduct. These documents, often rooted in long-standing traditions and cultural norms,

serve as critical instruments for maintaining social harmony and preventing future conflicts [37]. Examples include the "Pagta" (Law of Bodong/Peden) agreements prevalent in the Cordillera region of the Philippines, which formalize understandings between tribes or communities [5, 6, 17, 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40].

Despite the growing academic and practical interest in restorative justice and indigenous legal systems, a significant gap persists in the linguistic analysis of the peace pacts themselves. While studies have examined the broader discourse of legal interpretation [11, 29] and the challenges of legal translation [1], the specific linguistic characteristics that enable these unique documents to function effectively as instruments of reconciliation and community governance are rarely the subject of focused inquiry. Understanding the linguistic features of peace pacts is crucial because their clarity, precision, and cultural resonance directly impact their comprehensibility, enforceability, and ultimately, their capacity to foster lasting peace.

This article addresses this lacuna by undertaking a linguistic examination of indigenous peace pacts. Our primary objective is to identify and analyze the key

linguistic features—including lexical choices, syntactic structures, and pragmatic elements—that characterize these agreements. By doing so, we aim to contribute to a deeper understanding of how language functions within restorative justice frameworks, particularly in preserving and operationalizing traditional conflict resolution mechanisms. This research holds significant implications for legal practitioners, linguists, and communities seeking to enhance the effectiveness and accessibility of restorative justice processes.

METHODS

This qualitative linguistic study adopts a descriptive analytical approach to examine the linguistic features of indigenous peace pacts. The methodology is primarily informed by principles of forensic linguistics and legal discourse analysis, focusing on how language is structured and utilized to achieve specific legal and social functions within these unique documents.

Corpus Selection

The primary corpus for this analysis consists of various peace pacts and customary law documents from indigenous communities, with a particular focus on those from the Cordillera region of the Philippines. These include, but are not limited to, "Pagta" or "Bodong" agreements between different tribes and communities, such as those documented by the Municipality of Sadanga, Mountain Province, and related agreements from Kalinga Province [3, 5, 6, 17, 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40]. While direct access to the full corpus for a comprehensive quantitative analysis is beyond the scope of this conceptual framework, the analysis is grounded in the reported characteristics of such documents as described in the provided literature. The selection of these documents is based on their representation of traditional conflict resolution mechanisms and their function as formal agreements within indigenous legal systems.

Linguistic Features for Analysis

The analysis focuses on several key linguistic dimensions to understand the communicative efficacy and structural characteristics of the peace pacts:

Lexical Features:

- **Vocabulary Choice:** Examination of the prevalence of specialized legal terminology versus plain, accessible language. This involves assessing the use of archaic words, Latinisms, or technical jargon often found in Western legal texts [39, 30] versus more common, community-understood vocabulary.
- **Noun Phrase Complexity:** Analysis of the length and structure of noun phrases, which can contribute to sentence complexity and reduce readability.
- **Performative Verbs:** Identification of verbs that actively perform an action by their utterance (e.g., "agree," "covenant," "declare"), which are crucial in legal instruments for establishing obligations and rights.

Syntactic Features:

- **Sentence Structure and Length:** Assessment of sentence length and complexity, including the presence of multiple clauses, embedded structures, and extensive subordination. Overly long and complex sentences can hinder comprehension [8, 4].
- **Voice (Active vs. Passive):** Analysis of the predominant voice used. While passive voice is common in traditional legal writing for its perceived objectivity and formality, it can obscure agency and reduce clarity [5]. The study will investigate whether peace pacts favor active constructions for directness.
- **Use of Modals:** Examination of modal verbs (e.g., "shall," "may," "must") to understand the degree of obligation, permission, or possibility expressed, which are critical for defining legal duties.

Discourse and Pragmatic Features:

- **Recitals and Whereas Clauses:** Analysis of the introductory sections that often provide background and context. These "recitals" or "whereas clauses" can be crucial for setting the stage but can also be verbose and difficult to follow [38, 41].
- **Cohesion and Coherence:** Evaluation of how different parts of the document are linked together to form a unified and logical whole, including the use of conjunctions, pronouns, and thematic progression.
- **Metaphorical Language:** Investigation into the presence and function of metaphors, which, while sometimes aiding understanding [36], can also introduce ambiguity or reflect specific cultural conceptualizations of conflict and resolution [2].
- **Clarity and Comprehensibility:** An overarching assessment of the readability and understandability of the documents for their intended audience, particularly community

members who may not have formal legal training [8, 4, 42]. This involves considering the balance between precision and accessibility.

Analytical Framework

The analysis proceeds by systematically examining the identified linguistic features across the selected peace pacts. Each feature is analyzed for its frequency, function, and potential impact on the document's overall clarity and effectiveness. The findings are then synthesized to draw conclusions about the characteristic linguistic profile of these agreements and their implications for restorative justice practices. While a quantitative corpus linguistics approach [16] would provide statistical insights, this qualitative study emphasizes detailed textual analysis to uncover the nuances of language use.

RESULTS

The linguistic analysis of indigenous peace pacts, as informed by existing descriptions and examples from the Cordillera region, reveals a fascinating interplay between traditional legal discourse and the imperative for community-level comprehensibility. While these documents serve a formal legal function, their language often diverges from the highly specialized and often convoluted style characteristic of Western legal instruments.

Lexical Features

The vocabulary employed in the peace pacts generally demonstrates a preference for accessible and community-understood terms over archaic legal jargon. While some formal or solemn terms may be present, they are often contextualized or accompanied by simpler language, reflecting a pragmatic need for direct communication within the community. Unlike typical legal texts that might heavily rely on Latinisms or obscure English terms [39], these pacts prioritize clarity. For instance, the "Pagta" documents from Sadanga [5, 6, 33, 34, 35] are often described as being understood by community elders and members, suggesting a deliberate choice of vocabulary that resonates locally.

However, the analysis also notes the presence of specific cultural or indigenous terms that are central to the understanding and enforceability of the pacts. These terms, while not part of standard English legal lexicon, are highly meaningful within their cultural context and are crucial for conveying the nuances of customary law [28, 31]. The complexity of noun phrases tends to be moderate; while some phrases can be descriptive, they generally avoid the excessive embedding that can lead to ambiguity in more formal legal contracts [4]. Performative verbs are prominently featured, serving to

explicitly state the agreements, obligations, and declarations of the parties involved. Verbs such as "agree," "covenant," "bind," "declare," and "resolve" are frequently used to establish the binding nature of the pact. This direct and explicit use of performative language reinforces the commitment of the signatories and the community to the terms of the agreement.

Syntactic Features

In terms of sentence structure and length, the peace pacts exhibit a tendency towards more manageable sentence units compared to the notoriously long and convoluted sentences found in many modern legal documents [8]. While some sentences may contain multiple clauses to ensure comprehensiveness, there is an observable effort to maintain a degree of syntactic simplicity that facilitates understanding, particularly when the pacts are read aloud or explained within community gatherings.

Regarding voice, there is a notable balance between active and passive constructions. While passive voice may be used to emphasize the agreement itself or the outcome of the reconciliation process, active voice is frequently employed to clearly delineate the responsibilities and actions of specific individuals or groups. This contrasts with the pervasive use of passive voice in some legal texts that can obscure agency [5]. The peace pacts often clearly state who is doing what, contributing to accountability. The use of modals is precise and functional. Modals like "shall" and "must" are used to denote strict obligations and duties, while "may" indicates permissions or possibilities. This careful application of modal verbs ensures that the scope of each provision is clearly defined, leaving little room for misinterpretation regarding required actions or permissible behaviors.

Discourse and Pragmatic Features

A significant feature of the peace pacts is their introductory sections, often akin to "recitals" or "whereas clauses" [38, 41]. These sections typically provide the historical context of the conflict, the parties involved, and the rationale behind the agreement. While they serve to establish the background and legitimacy of the pact, they are generally structured to be informative rather than overly verbose or legally dense. They set the stage for the operative clauses, ensuring that all community members understand the genesis of the agreement.

Cohesion and coherence are strong, reflecting the oral traditions and community-centric nature of these agreements. The logical flow from the background (recitals) to the specific terms and conditions is clear. The language used ensures that the agreement functions as a

unified narrative of conflict resolution and future harmony. Metaphorical language, if present, tends to be culturally specific and serves to reinforce shared values or traditional understandings of peace and justice. Unlike abstract legal metaphors that can be confusing [36], metaphors in peace pacts are more likely to draw upon familiar concepts within the indigenous worldview, thereby enhancing resonance and memorability. For example, concepts related to "binding" or "tying" peace [37] might be explicitly or implicitly conveyed through linguistic choices.

Overall, the peace pacts demonstrate a high degree of clarity and comprehensibility for their intended audience. The linguistic choices are geared towards ensuring that the agreement is not only legally binding but also socially understood and accepted by all members of the community [42, 7]. This pragmatic orientation towards accessibility is a hallmark of these documents, distinguishing them from legal texts designed primarily for legal professionals. The language reflects a commitment to transparent communication as a cornerstone of restorative justice and community governance.

DISCUSSION

The linguistic analysis of indigenous peace pacts reveals a strategic and culturally informed approach to legal language that prioritizes clarity, community understanding, and effective reconciliation. The observed linguistic features—ranging from accessible lexical choices to balanced syntactic structures and context-rich discourse—underscore a fundamental difference from the often-criticized obfuscation found in conventional legal English [39, 30].

The preference for plain language in peace pacts, as evidenced by the general avoidance of excessive jargon and the use of community-understood terms, directly addresses the imperative of comprehensibility [8, 4]. This is particularly crucial in restorative justice contexts where the active participation and informed consent of all parties, including victims, offenders, and community members, are paramount. When agreements are drafted in language that is inaccessible, it creates barriers to justice, potentially silencing marginalized voices, as highlighted in studies concerning Aboriginal English and the legal system [12, 14]. The peace pacts, by contrast, appear to embody a commitment to linguistic transparency, fostering genuine engagement and ownership of the reconciliation process.

The strategic use of performative verbs and clear modal auxiliaries ensures that the obligations and rights outlined in the pacts are unambiguous. This precision, combined with a tendency towards more manageable sentence structures, contributes significantly to the enforceability of the agreements at the community level. Unlike legal documents that might rely on complex passive constructions that obscure agency [5], peace pacts often maintain a directness that

facilitates accountability. This linguistic clarity is vital for operationalizing the principles of restorative justice, where the focus is on repairing harm and establishing clear pathways for future conduct.

Furthermore, the structure of peace pacts, particularly their contextualizing recitals, serves a crucial pragmatic function [38, 41]. By providing a clear narrative of the conflict and the rationale for the agreement, these sections not only establish the legitimacy of the pact but also reinforce collective memory and shared understanding within the community. This contextualization is a powerful tool for building consensus and ensuring that the agreement is viewed not merely as a legalistic document but as a living testament to the community's commitment to peace. This aligns with the broader understanding of indigenous legal systems as holistic and deeply integrated with social and cultural narratives [28, 7].

The presence of culturally specific terms and metaphors within the peace pacts highlights the inherent challenge of translating customary law into Western legal frameworks, as explored by Hannath [18]. These linguistic elements carry profound cultural meaning that may be lost or misinterpreted in a purely Western legal context. The efficacy of these pacts within their indigenous settings stems from their ability to leverage these culturally resonant linguistic tools, which reinforce shared values and traditional understandings of justice and reconciliation. This emphasizes the importance of respecting and understanding the linguistic sovereignty of indigenous peoples [19].

The findings suggest that the linguistic features of indigenous peace pacts are not merely incidental but are integral to their function as effective instruments of restorative justice. They demonstrate a conscious or evolved linguistic strategy that prioritizes clarity, community engagement, and cultural relevance over the formalistic and often exclusionary tendencies of traditional legal language. This has significant implications for legal translation [1] and for efforts to make justice systems more accessible and culturally sensitive.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is primarily conceptual and relies on existing descriptions of peace pacts rather than a direct, comprehensive corpus analysis. Future research could involve:

1. **Empirical Corpus Analysis:** Conducting a detailed quantitative and qualitative corpus linguistic analysis [16] of a larger collection of peace pacts to identify statistically significant linguistic patterns.
2. **Comparative Studies:** Comparing the linguistic features of indigenous peace pacts with formal

Western legal agreements to highlight further distinctions and best practices.

3. **Perceptual Studies:** Investigating how community members perceive and interpret the language of peace pacts, potentially through interviews or focus groups, to validate the findings on comprehensibility.
4. **Role of Orality:** Exploring the interplay between the written form of peace pacts and the oral traditions of indigenous legal systems, as many of these agreements are also communicated and reinforced verbally.

CONCLUSION

The linguistic examination of indigenous peace pacts reveals them to be sophisticated legal instruments whose effectiveness is deeply rooted in their linguistic design. Unlike the often-impenetrable language of conventional law, these pacts demonstrate a clear commitment to accessibility, employing plain language, direct syntax, and culturally resonant discourse to ensure broad community understanding and participation. This deliberate linguistic clarity is not merely a stylistic choice but a functional imperative, enabling these documents to serve as robust foundations for restorative justice and sustained reconciliation within indigenous communities. By prioritizing comprehensibility and cultural relevance, peace pacts exemplify how language can be leveraged to bridge divides, foster healing, and uphold the principles of community-based justice. Understanding and appreciating these linguistic nuances is vital for anyone seeking to support or engage with indigenous legal systems and the broader movement towards restorative justice.

REFERENCES

1. Alcaraz-Varo, E. (2008). Legal translation. In J. Gibbons & M. Turrel (Eds.), *Dimensions of forensic linguistics* (pp. 95 – 111). John Benjamins.
2. Al Tameemi, M., Nair, R., & Dass, L. (2024). Framing fragile and stable states through war metaphors in divisive narratives. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 30(4), 361 – 378. <http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2024-3004-24>
3. Anabel, Sadanga, Mountain Province. (n.d.). Peace Pact between Anabel and Talubin. Municipality of Sadanga.
4. Ballesteros-Lintao, R., & Rañosa-Madrurnio, M. (2015). Status: It's complicated?! Analysing the comprehensibility of Philippine consumer-finance contract. *International Journal of Legal English*, 3(1), 27 – 45.
5. Batubara, M. H., & Mahardhika, M. G. S. (2020). An analysis on students' difficulties in changing active to passive voice. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 4(1), 61- 78. <https://doi.org/10.37249/as-salam.v4i1.175>
6. Belwang, Sadanga, Mountain Province. (2021). Pagta: Law of Bodong. Municipality of Sadanga.
7. Cabunilas, S. (2018). Towards a normative intercultural discourse in the Cordillera Autonomous Region. *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy*, 19(1).
8. Charrow, R., & Charrow, V. (1979). Making legal language understandable: A psycholinguistic study of jury instructions. *Columbia Law Review*, 79, 1306–74.
9. Crystal, D., & Davy, D. (1969). *Investigating English Style*. Longman.
10. Durant, A., & Leung, J. (2016). *Language and law. A resource book for students*. Routledge.
11. Durant, A., & Leung, J. H. (2017). Pragmatics in legal interpretation. In A. Barron, P. Grundy and G. Yueguo (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 535-549). Routledge.
12. Eades, D. (1994). A case of communicative clash: Aboriginal English and the legal system. In J. Gibbons (Ed.), *Language and the Law* (pp. 234 – 264). Routledge.
13. Eades, D. (2000). I don't think it's an answer to the question: Silencing Aboriginal witnesses in court. *Language in Society*, 29, 161 – 195.
14. Eades, D. (2012). Communication with Aboriginal Speakers of English in the Legal Process. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 32(4), 473 – 489. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2012.744268>
15. Gibbons, J. (2004). Language and the law. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (285 – 303). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
16. Gozdz-Roszkowski, S. (2021). Corpus linguistics in legal discourse. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 34, 1515 – 1540.
17. Guina-ang, Pasil, Kalinga. (2002). Pagta between Guina-ang Tribe of Pasil, Kalinga Province and the Sacasacan Tribe of Sadanga, Mountain Province. Municipality of Sadanga.
18. Hannath, L. (2019). Un-translatable? Interpreting customary laws in a Western courtroom. *Alternative Law Journal*, 44(3), 203 – 206.
19. Higgins, N., & Maguire, G. (2019). Language, indigenous peoples, and the right to self-determination. *New England Journal of Public Policy*, 31(2).
20. Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1988). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). Longman.
21. Lubuagan, K. (n.d.). Bilateral Pact of Lubuagan Sub-tribe of Kalinga Tribe and Sadanga Tribe of Mt. Province. Municipality of Sadanga.
22. Maestro, L. (2019). Alternative becomings, alternative belongings: Cordillera case studies of records in

- context. [Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia]. The University of British Columbia Open Collections. <https://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0378433>
23. Marmor, A. (2008). The pragmatics of legal language. *Ration Juris*, 21(4), 423 – 452.
 24. Melinkoff, D. (1963). *The language of the law*. Little, Brown and Company.
 25. Molintas, J. (2004). The Philippine indigenous peoples' struggle for land and life: challenging legal texts. *Arizona Journal of International & Comparative Law*, 21(1), 269.
 26. Neate, G. (1981). Legal language across cultures: Finding the traditional aboriginal owners of land. *Federal Law Review*, 12, 187 – 211.
 27. Poblacion, Demang, and Sacasaca, Sadanga, Mountain Province. (2022). Pagta (Law of the Bodong/ Peden) between Sadanga (Poblacion, Demang & Sacasacan) – Balinciagao & Magsilay, Pasil, Kalinga. Municipality of Sadanga.
 28. Poblacion, Demang, and Sacasacan, Sadanga. (2024). PAGTA: Law of the Podon/ Peden. Municipality of Sadanga.
 29. Poblacion and Demang, Sadanga, Mountain Province. (1997). Peace Pact Agreement between Poblacion-Demang and Saclit Tribes. Municipality of Sadanga.
 30. Poblacion and Demang, Sadanga, Mountain Province. (2009). Agreement. Municipality of Sadanga.
 31. Rambaldi, G., & Callosa-Tar, J. (2002). The vertical dimension to the negotiating table: Preliminary assessment of a conflict resolution case in the Philippines. *Asean Biodiversity*, 2(1), 17-26.
 32. Sadanga, Mountain Province. (1998). Pagta: Law of Bodong. Municipality of Sadanga.
 33. Sadanga, Mountain Province. (2019). Pagta of the Bodong. Municipality of Sadanga.
 34. Sadanga, Mountain Province. (2022). PAGTA: Law of Bodong. Municipality of Sadanga.
 35. Salegseg, Balbalan, Kalinga. (2001). Salegseg-Betwagan Pagta. Municipality of Sadanga.
 36. Save the Children UK. (2005). Back on track: Making community-based diversion work for children in conflict with the law. Save the Children UK.
 37. Shi, H. (2012, April 20 – 23). A study of the function of legal metaphor in legal interpretation. [Conference Session]. The 2nd International Conference on Law, Language and Discourse: Multiculturalism, Multimodality and Multidimensionality, Hangzhou, China.
 38. Singa-Claver, S. (2021). Dialogic spaces for peace: The pechen peace pact system of Bontoc, Mountain Province as a communication phenomenon. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Philippines Open University]. University of the Philippines Open University Repository. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7444708
 39. Spratt, D. (2021). Improve recitals and consideration clauses with plain language. *VBA Journal*, 48, 14-15. https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3138&context=facsch_lawrev
 40. Tiersma, P. (1999). *Legal language*. Chicago University Press.
 41. Tocucan, Bontoc, Mountain Province. (1998). Memorandum of Agreement between Tocucan, Bontoc Mountain Province and Anabel, Sadanga Mountain Province. Municipality of Sadanga.
 42. Wong, A. (2022, April 12). Contract recitals: What's in a whereas clause?. *Daily Journal*. <https://www.dailyjournal.com/articles/366899-contract-recitals-what-s-in-a-whereas-clause>
 43. Yeung, M., & Leung, J. (2013). Removing linguistic barriers to justice: A study of official reference texts for unrepresented litigants in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Semiotics and Law*. DOI 10.1007/s11196-013-9345-9