What Plain Language Is Not

By Joseph Kimble

In my book Writing for Dollars, Writing to Please: The Case for Plain Language in Business, Government, and Law, I devote Part Three to ten false criticisms of plain language. The short excerpt below addresses the first of those ten. —JK

In the mind of anyone who cares to review the evidence and literature, the myths about plain language should have long since been obliterated. For at least 50 years, one expert after another has debunked them. But they are stubborn and pernicious. They keep spooking us, dissuading us, fooling us, and providing us with an excuse for clinging to legalese and officialese. So let’s try again to put them to rest. No need for stakes through the heart. These are mere apparitions, chimeras, hobgoblins. Know the truth, and fear not.

Plain language is not anti-literary, anti-intellectual, unsophisticated, drab, ugly, bland, babyish, or base.

This charge of debasing the language is loaded with irony. If anything is anti-literary, drab, and ugly, it’s traditional legal and official writing—those bastions of inflation and obscurity.

Take legal writing, which has been ridiculed and criticized for centuries. David Mellinkoff describes it as wordy, unclear, pompous, and dull. John Lindsey says that law books are “the largest body of poorly written literature ever created by the human race.” Bryan Garner agrees: “[W]e [lawyers] have a history of wretched writing, a history that reinforces itself every time we open the law books.”

The heritage of plain English is just the opposite. As Garner explains: “It is the language of the King James Version of the Bible, and it has a long literary tradition in the so-called Attic style of writing.” Plain English is the style of Abraham Lincoln, and Walt Whitman, and Mark Twain, and Justice Holmes, and George Orwell, and Winston Churchill, and E. B. White. Plain words are eternally fresh and fit. More than that, they are capable of great power and dignity: “And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good.” Or Shakespeare: “[A]nd, when he shall die/ Take him and cut him out in little stars/And he will make the face of heaven so fine/ And pay no worship to the garish sun.” Or Thoreau: “If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them.”

Why would we ever think that a profusion of fancy-sounding words in any way equates with wit, wisdom, depth, vitality, importance, usefulness, or reliability? How can we be so blind or indifferent to the manifold failings of legal and official style—in all their clotted, confounding verbosity?

It’s true that the term plain language is open to at least three misinterpretations. It may suggest something that’s colorless, that concentrates only on vocabulary, and that’s facile.

But it need not be colorless; it can be lively and expressive in the right context, such as a persuasive legal brief. And in every context, plain language can be elegant in its clarity and simplicity. After all, most legal and official documents are not read for pleasure: nobody expects rhetorical flourishes or stylistic flair in a contract; nobody curls up with a Medicare brochure. Readers just want to get the message, without travail.

As for achieving it, that’s never easy. Anyone can complicate matters; it’s much harder to simplify without oversimplifying, and only the best minds and best writers can hit that mark. In fact, writing simply and directly only looks easy. It takes skill and sweat and fair time to do the job. Or in Jacques Barzun’s memorable line: “Simple...
English is no one’s mother tongue. It has to be worked for.”

We are too far down the road to swap the term plain language for something else. A strong, extensive body of supporting literature has developed around it. More than any other term, such as clear communication, it signifies a new attitude and a fundamental change from past practices. It strikes a chord with the public. And once again, it can claim a glorious literary heritage.
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