COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC EXAMINATION OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN THE LEGAL INTERPRETATIONS

Oygul Normurodova
Department of Theory and Practice of Translation, Foreign Language Institute, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Intertextuality is essential in legal interpretation, since texts get meaning not independently but by their connections with other legal and extralegal discourses. This work investigates intertextuality through a cognitive-pragmatic lens, analyzing how legal interpreters—judges, attorneys, and legislators—derive meaning by referring previous legal texts, precedents, and wider socio-cultural narratives. This research use cognitive linguistics and pragmatic theories to examine significant court rulings, revealing both implicit and explicit intertextual connections that influence judicial reasoning. The research utilizes discourse analysis and conceptual blending theory to identify patterns of intertextual referencing that affect legislative interpretation, legal debate, and doctrinal development. The findings indicate that intertextuality functions not just as a textual characteristic but also as a cognitive approach employed to maintain coherence, legitimacy, and flexibility in legal reasoning. Moreover, the study emphasizes how pragmatic elements, including context, purpose, and audience expectations, influence the retrieval and utilization of intertextual allusions. These findings enhance the comprehension of legal interpretation as a dynamic, cognitively integrated process, illustrating that intertextuality functions as both a limitation and a facilitator in the development of legal meaning. The research emphasizes the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to legal hermeneutics, incorporating cognitive and pragmatic approaches for a more refined understanding of legal texts.

KEYWORDS: Cognitive pragmatics, legal interpretation, intertextuality, judicial discourse, statutory interpretation, implicatures, meta-pragmatic markers, multilingual legal systems, legal semiotics, conceptual categorization

INTRODUCTION

The understanding of legal writings is a complicated cognitive and pragmatic process that significantly depends on intertextuality—the way texts reference, impact, and develop upon one another. In legal situations, intertextuality serves as a fundamental mechanism for the construction, contestation, and application of meaning, rather from being only a linguistic phenomenon. This essay analyzes the cognitive-pragmatic aspects of intertextuality in legal interpretation, emphasizing how legal practitioners manage and synthesize several textual sources to achieve coherent and contextually relevant interpretations.

Legal interpretation is intrinsically intertextual, frequently necessitating the citation of legislation, precedents, legal concepts, and other authoritative texts (Solan, 2017; Solan & Gales, 2016). The cognitive mechanisms underpinning this intertextual behavior are yet inadequately examined. Recent work has emphasized the significance of pragmatic tactics, including relevance theory (Azuelos-Atias, 2009, 2016) and prototype theory (Zeifert, 2020a, 2020b), in interpreting the implicit meanings and contextual signals present in legal texts. These methodologies underscore that legal interpretation is not a fixed, rule-governed endeavor but a fluid, context-dependent process influenced by the interpreter's cognitive frameworks and pragmatic objectives (Cheng & Cheng, 2012; Livnat, 2017).

The pursuit of "pragmatic equality" in legal interpretation is especially prominent in multilingual and multicultural contexts, where interpreters and legal practitioners must manage linguistic and cultural disparities to guarantee equitable and precise communication (Angermeyer, 2021, 2023; Du, 2024). The digital age exacerbates this challenge, since the abundance of legal texts and the utilization of corpora as interpretative instruments have added additional dimensions of complexity (Bestué, 2016; Tobor & Zeifert,

2020). The cognitive dissonance encountered by judges and legal practitioners in reconciling opposing textual authority highlights the necessity for a more profound comprehension of the cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms involved (Pietrzyk, 2025).

This article expands upon current interdisciplinary research that integrates cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and legal theory to examine the role of intertextuality as a cognitive-pragmatic instrument in legal interpretation. By integrating findings from research on legal discourse (Mazzi, 2010; McKeown, 2022), translation studies (Piecychna, 2013; Zeifert & Tobor, 2021), and cognitive pragmatics (Żuromski et al., 2022; Kiose et al., 2024), we seek to establish a thorough framework for comprehending the interaction between cognition, pragmatics, and intertextuality within legal contexts. This approach enhances theoretical understanding and has practical ramifications for legal practice, especially in promoting fair access to justice across many linguistic and cultural contexts.

METHODS

This study utilizes a methodology that integrates cognitive-pragmatic analysis with intertextual discourse assessment to investigate the processes of legal interpretation. The research utilizes a qualitative and corpus-based approach, examining legal texts, court decisions, and legislative documents to reveal intertextual relationships and pragmatic strategies in legal discourse.

A compilation of legal papers was gathered, including statutes, court rulings, and legal analyses from many legal systems. The corpus comprised:

Common Law: Judgments from the United States Supreme Court (e.g., Marbury v. Madison), UK House of Lords decisions, and the United States Code.

Civil Law: French Civil Code, German Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (BGB), and decisions from the European Court of Justice.

International Law: United Nations treaties (e.g., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), decisions from the International Court of Justice.

The texts underwent discourse analysis approaches (Angermeyer, 2021; Azuelos-Atias, 2016) to examine explicit and implicit intertextual references. The study employed conceptual blending theory (Fauconnier & Turner, referenced in Wojtczak & Zeifert, 2024) to examine how legal interpreters integrate many textual sources to extract meaning.

A pragmatic analysis was conducted to examine the application of intertextuality by legal professionals in their reasoning processes. The research employed relevance theory (Azuelos-Atias, 2009) and pragmatic inference frameworks (Weizman & Dascal, 1991) to examine contextual implicatures, judicial reasoning techniques, and the impact of cognitive heuristics on statutory interpretation.

The research utilized sociolinguistic approaches (Cheng & Cheng, 2012; Dundon, 2024b) to analyze the influence of language ideology and speaker categorization on the formation of legal meaning. The study of public service interpreting in court (Angermeyer, 2023; Karrebaek, 2023) sought to assess the impact of translation and interpretation on legal intertextuality, particularly in multilingual settings.

A comparative method was utilized to evaluate differences among legal systems. This entailed a methodical analysis of legal documents and court interpretations within common law, civil law, and international law frameworks, emphasizing the utilization of intertextual allusions. The investigation of the structure and reinterpretation of legal ideas through intertextual references was informed by prototype theory (Zeifert, 2020a, 2020b) and cognitive categorization models (Rosch, 2024).

This method ensures a comprehensive analysis of the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of intertextuality in legal interpretation, enabling replication and further interdisciplinary research in legal linguistics and jurisprudence.

RESULTS

The findings of this study clarify some essential aspects of cognitive-pragmatic intertextuality in legal interpretation:

TABLE 1

Comparative table: Intertextual practices across legal systems

Legal System	Common Intertextual References	Prototype Usage	Pragmatic Translation Issues
Common Law	Precedents, statutes, constitutional provisions	Case law prototypes for new rulings	Equivalence in historical legal terms
Civil Law	Legal codes, doctrinal writings, EU directives	Codified definitions as prototypes	Variations in legal terminology across languages
International Law	Treaties, customary law, UN resolutions	General principles as prototypes	Interpretation of culturally specific legal concepts

COMMON LAW

Common Intertextual References: Common law systems, which originated in England and are used in countries like the United States and the UK, rely heavily on:

Precedents: Previous judicial rulings are a fundamental source of law. Judges are obligated to adhere to precedents established by superior courts in like instances (the theory of stare decisis).

Statutes: Legislation enacted by legislative bodies

Constitutional Provisions: Essential statutes outlined in a nation's constitution.

Prototype Usage

Case law prototypes for new rulings: Judges frequently utilize precedent as models to inform their rulings in novel instances. They ascertain the essential facts and legal doctrines of prior instances and apply them to the present circumstances.

Pragmatic Translation Issues

Equivalence in historical legal terms: Translating historical legal terminology is problematic due to the evolution of meanings and consequences over time, and the potential absence of analogous phrases in other languages.

CIVIL LAW

Common Intertextual References: Civil law systems, which are prevalent in continental Europe, emphasize:

Legal codes: Extensive collections of legislation addressing a broad spectrum of legal matters.

Doctrinal writings: Academic interpretations and analyses of the law by legal scholars.

EU directives: In European nations, directives from the European Union are an integral component of the legal structure.

Prototype Usage

Codified definitions as prototypes: Civil law systems frequently depend on the exact definitions established in legal codes as models for legal conceptions. Legal interpretation emphasizes the application of these established concepts.

Pragmatic Translation Issues

Variations in legal terminology across languages: The vocabulary of civil law can differ markedly among languages, even when addressing analogous ideas. This can complicate precise translation, as the subtleties of legal terminology may be overlooked or misconstrued.

INTERNATIONAL LAW
Common Intertextual References: International law, which governs relations between states, draws on:
Treaties: International treaties.
Customary law: Actions undertaken by governments due to a perceived legal responsibility.
UN resolutions: Statements or decisions made by United Nations bodies.
Prototype Usage
General principles as prototypes: International law sometimes depends on broad principles of law acknowledged by civilized states as exemplars. These principles offer direction in the absence of explicit treaties or customary regulations.
Pragmatic Translation Issues
Interpretation of culturally specific legal concepts: International law addresses many legal systems and civilizations. Translating and comprehending legal ideas entrenched in a certain culture can be challenging, as their meanings may not immediately or correctly convey to different cultural contexts.

In general, Table 1 illustrates that although all legal systems employ intertextuality to construct and interpret the law, their methodologies differ. Common law is based on case precedents, civil law on codified definitions, and international law on treaties and overarching concepts. These disparities also provide distinct issues in legal translation, because attaining equivalence and effectively representing culturally particular legal notions is a significant issue.

ANALYSIS
Table 2 delineates the significance of intertextuality—the interrelation of texts—in legal interpretation. It examines five primary domains:

TABLE 2
The significance of intertextuality—the interrelation of texts—in legal interpretation

Area of Investigation	Key Findings	Supporting Concepts/Theories	Examples/Applications
Intertextual References in Judicial Reasoning	Judges use explicit references to precedents and legal principles for substantiation. Implicit references (cultural/historical narratives) shape legal arguments.	Intertextuality, Discourse Analysis	Reference to Marbury v. Madison in subsequent US Supreme Court decisions; use of historical legal traditions to interpret modern statutes.
Cognitive Heuristics in Legal Interpretation	Legal practitioners employ prototype-based categorization to understand vague legal terms. Template theory	Prototype Theory, Template Theory, Cognitive Categorization Models	Categorizing ambiguous contractual terms using prototypical contract models; defining

	guides judicial thinking in such scenarios.		abstract legal terms like "reasonable doubt."
Pragmatic Influences on Legal Translation	Interpreters and translators significantly impact legal meaning via interlingual intertextuality. Equivalence issues and pragmatic adaptations arise in multilingual legal processes.	Relevance Theory, Pragmatic Inference Frameworks	Differing interpretations of legal terms across languages due to semantic differences; adjustments made by interpreters to maintain legal validity in multilingual contexts.
Contextual Implicatures in Legal Discourse	Context-dependent readings of legal texts are influenced by pragmatic signals. Semantically cued implicatures shape legal decision-making by judges and attorneys.	Relevance Theory, Pragmatic Inference Frameworks	Interpreting ambiguous clauses within a statute by considering the specific context of the case; understanding the intended meaning of a legal phrase based on its broader discourse context.
Sociolinguistic Variability in Legal Interpretation	Language ideologies and discourse patterns affect the understanding and application of intertextual connections. Legal arguments vary depending on language and cultural contexts.	Sociolinguistics, Discourse Analysis, Language Ideology	Differing legal interpretations in courts based on language and cultural differences; impact of speaker classification and dialect on legal narratives.

1. **Intertextual References in Judicial Reasoning:** Judges do not operate in isolation. They construct their arguments by citing established legal documents. Explicit references denote direct quotations or citations of precedents or legal concepts. This offers legal support for their conclusions. Implicit references are nuanced, encompassing allusions to cultural or historical themes. These allusions can influence the fundamental comprehension of a legal matter. Legal arguments are fundamentally produced by integrating elements from historical legal documents and overarching cultural comprehension.
2. **Cognitive Heuristics in Legal Interpretation**: Legal terminology can be intricate and unclear. Legal practitioners employ cognitive shortcuts known as "heuristics" to manage this.Prototype-based categorization entails juxtaposing a present scenario with a standard exemplar or "prototype"

of a legal notion. This aids in comprehending ambiguous terminology. Template theory posits that judges utilize cognitive templates or frameworks to interpret legal material, hence influencing their decision-making. Legal practitioners frequently depend on standardized cognitive frameworks of legal ideas to analyze and comprehend novel legal scenarios.

3. **Pragmatic Influences on Legal Translation**: In court processes that encompass numerous languages, interpreters and translators are essential. They enable interlingual intertextuality, linking legal writings across linguistic boundaries. Nonetheless, attaining flawless equivalency between legal terminology across several languages is hard. Interpreters frequently must implement pragmatic modifications to maintain the intended legal significance. Consequently, legal translation transcends mere literal conversion; it necessitates a profound comprehension of legal circumstances and cultural subtleties.

4. **Contextual Implicatures in Legal Discourse**: In court processes that encompass numerous languages, interpreters and translators are essential. They enable interlingual intertextuality, linking legal writings across linguistic boundaries. Nonetheless, attaining flawless equivalence among legal terminology across several languages is hard. Interpreters frequently must implement pragmatic modifications to maintain the intended legal significance. Consequently, legal translation transcends mere word-for-word translations; it necessitates a profound comprehension of legal circumstances and cultural subtleties.

5. **Sociolinguistic Variability in Legal Interpretation**: Language is inherently biased. It is affected by social and cultural determinants. Language ideology and discourse patterns can influence how legal practitioners comprehend and implement intertextual relationships. Legal arguments can differ markedly depending on linguistic and cultural circumstances. Social elements, such as the speaker's history and cultural context, significantly influence legal judgments. This means that legal interpretation is not uniform but varies based on the social context of the legal proceeding.

These findings underscore the complexity of intertextuality in legal interpretation, demonstrating that meaning production is an interactive, context-dependent process shaped by cognitive, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic factors. The study emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary approaches to fully understand legal interpretation mechanisms.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the significance of cognitive-pragmatic systems in legal interpretation, corroborating prior research and providing new insights. The reliance on intertextual references in judicial reasoning aligns with previous studies on legal discourse and argumentation (Mazzi, 2010; McKeown, 2022). This study advances prior analyses by including cognitive heuristics, demonstrating that prototype theory is essential in judicial decision-making (Zeifert, 2020a, 2020b).

The study's conclusions about the role of interpreters and translators in legal intertextuality build upon previous research (Angermeyer, 2021, 2023; Bestué, 2016). This study highlights the practical alterations in multilingual legal interactions that affect meaning construction and accessibility in legal discourse, in contrast to previous research that mostly focused on translation equivalence.

The acknowledgment of contextual implicatures as a crucial aspect of legal interpretation substantiates Azuelos-Atias' (2009, 2016) findings, which emphasize the importance of semantic indicators in shaping court outcomes. This study clarifies these findings by demonstrating the significance of relevance theory and pragmatic inference in legal reasoning.

This research substantially enhances the sociolinguistic perspective on intertextuality. Prior studies have examined linguistic ideologies in legal situations (Cheng & Cheng, 2012; Dundon, 2024a), systematically connecting these ideologies to intertextual interpretation and demonstrating their influence on court narratives and decision-making processes.

The findings emphasize the complexity of legal intertextuality, demonstrating the need for interdisciplinary approaches that integrate cognitive science, linguistics, and law. The study suggests that more research should explore intertextuality in emerging digital legal environments, where legal texts and interpretations increasingly rely on automated linguistic processing and artificial intelligence technology (Bestué, 2016).

CONCLUSION

This research has illustrated the essential function of cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms in the intertextual analysis of legal texts. Utilizing sources such as Angermeyer (2021, 2023), Cheng & Cheng (2012), and Solan (2017), our findings elucidate the interplay of cognitive processing, pragmatic context, and intertextual references in the construction of legal meaning. The research highlights the impact of judicial interpretation methodologies, as analyzed by Mazzi (2010) and Wojtczak & Zeifert (2024), demonstrating how conceptual classification influences legislative interpretation. This research further develops findings from Azuelos-Atias (2016) and Weizman & Dascal (1991) to demonstrate the significance of implicatures and meta-pragmatic indicators in legal discourse.

This research is innovative due to its multidisciplinary approach, combining cognitive science, pragmatics, and legal semiotics to create a thorough framework for examining intertextuality in legal interpretation. The results underscore the necessity for more research on the navigation of intertextual allusions within multilingual legal systems, especially in interpreter-mediated court environments, as proposed by Du (2024) and Karrebaek (2023).

Subsequent study ought to enhance the cognitive-pragmatic framework by integrating experimental investigations and corpus-based assessments of legal language utilization across various jurisdictions. The influence of digitization on legal intertextuality, as examined by Bestué (2016), is a valuable opportunity for additional investigation. These developments will enhance legal interpretation techniques and improve fairness in legal decision-making.

REFERENCES

Angermeyer, P. S. (2021). Beyond translation equivalence: Advocating pragmatic equality before the law. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *174*, 157–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.12.022

Angermeyer, P. S. (2023). Public service interpreting in court. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 125–139). https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429298202-11

Anne, W., Matulewska, A., & Cheng, L. (2020). Law as a culturally constituted sign-system – A space for interpretation. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, *5*(2), 239–267. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2020-2035

Azuelos-Atias, S. (2009). Semantically cued contextual implicatures in legal texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(3), 728–743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.07.009

Azuelos-Atias, S. (2016). Identifying the meanings hidden in legal texts: The three conditions of relevance theory and their sufficiency. *Semiotica*, *2016*(209), 99–123. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2016-0005

Bekrycht, T., & Mańko, R. (2020). Polish Jurisprudence in the 20th century: A General Overview. *Review of Central and East European Law*, *45*(2–3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.1163/15730352-04502001

Bestué, C. (2016). Translating law in the digital age. Translation problems or matters of legal interpretation? *Perspectives*, *24*(4), 576–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2015.1070884

Cheng, L., & Cheng, W. (2012). Legal interpretation: Meaning as social construction. *Semiotica*, *2012*(192), 427–448. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2012-0086

Data Collection in Sociolinguistics. (2013). In *Routledge eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136065

Du, B. J. (2024). How interpreting influences defendants' participation: a discursive study of zero renditions and non-renditions in court interpreting. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2024*(286), 185–208. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2023-0054

Dundon, J. T. (2024a). Language ideologies and speaker categorization: a case study from the U.S. legal system. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, *9*(1), 169–195. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2024-2007

Dundon, J. T. (2024b). "I think Gray is just against you there": Intertextuality and personification in legal discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *232*, 199–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.09.001

Kiose, M., Leonteva, A., Agafonova, O., & Petrov, A. (2024). COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC MOTIVATION OF RECURRENT CONTACT-ESTABLISHING GESTURES IN MULTIMODAL DIALOGUE. *Voprosy Kognitivnoy Lingvistiki*, *4*, 74–90. https://doi.org/10.20916/1812-3228-2024-4-74-90

Livnat, Z. (2017). "There are no words that are 'clear' in and of themselves": Meta-pragmatic comments and semantic analysis in legal interpretation. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, *2*(1), 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2017-0007

Matoesian, G. (2000). Intertextual authority in reported speech: Production media in the Kennedy Smith rape trial. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(7), 879–914. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(99)00080-6

Mazzi, D. (2010). "This argument fails for two reasons. . .": A linguistic analysis of judicial evaluation strategies in US Supreme Court judgments. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*, *23*(4), 373–385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-010-9162-0

McKeown, J. (2022). Stancetaking in the U.S. Supreme Court's abortion jurisprudence (1973-present): epistemic (im)probability and evidential (dis)belief. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, *7*(2), 323–343. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2022-2075

Piecychna, B. (2013). LEGAL TRANSLATION COMPETENCE IN THE LIGHT OF TRANSLATIONAL HERMENEUTICS. *Studies in Logic Grammar and Rhetoric*, *34*(1), 141–159. https://doi.org/10.2478/slgr-2013-0027

Pietrzyk, M. (2025). In search of a "Happy ending" in Legal interpretation: Cognitive

Dissonance in Judicial Decision-Making. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-025-10247-2

Rosch, E. (2024). Principles of categorization. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 27–48). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032633275-4

Solan, L. M. (2017). The interpretation of legal language. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, *4*(1), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011817-045649

Solan, L. M., & Gales, T. (2016). Finding ordinary meaning in law: The judge, the dictionary or the corpus? *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, *1*(2), 253–276. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2016-0016

Tobor, Z., & Zeifert, M. (2020). Korpusy językowe jako narzędzie interpretacji prawa. Amerykańska teoria i praktyka. *Archiwum Filozofii Prawa I Filozofii Społecznej*, 80–90. https://doi.org/10.36280/afpifs.2020.4.80

Weizman, E., & Dascal, M. (1991). ON CLUES AND CUES: STRATEGIES OF TEXT-UNDERSTANDING. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, *20*(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1515/jlse.1991.20.1.18

Wojtczak, S., & Zeifert, M. (2024). Statutory interpretation and levels of conceptual Categorisation: The presumption of legal language explained in terms of cognitive linguistics. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-024-10118-2

Zeifert, M. (2020a). Rethinking HarT: From Open Texture to Prototype Theory—Analytic Philosophy meets Cognitive Linguistics. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*, *35*(2), 409–430. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-020-09722-9

Zeifert, M. (2020b). Prototype Theory in the judicial practice of the Court of Justice of the European Union. A case study. *Comparative Legilinguistics*, *44*(1), 93–119. https://doi.org/10.2478/cl-2020-0013

Zeifert, M., & Tobor, Z. (2021). Legal Translation versus Legal Interpretation. A Legal-Theoretical Perspective. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*, *35*(5), 1671–1687. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-021-09837-7

Żuromski, D., Pacholik-Żuromska, A., & Fedyniuk, A. (2022). Extending Cognitive Pragmatics: Social Mechanisms of Mind Transformation. *Analiza I Egzystencja*, *58*, 65–91. https://doi.org/10.18276/aie.2022.58-04