The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

Legal Semantics and Statutory Interpretation in India: A Linguistic Analysis of Legislative Language and Judicial Reasoning

Dr. Ruchira Chaturvedi (ruchira@mpdnlu.ac.in),
Assistant Professor of Law, Dharmashastra National Law University, Jabalpur, India
Dr. Vimal Kumar Vishwakarma (vimal@mpdnlu.ac.in)
Assistant Professor of English, Dharmashastra National Law University, Jabalpur, India

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee **The RCSAS (ISSN: 2583-1380)**. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International License. (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). **Crossref/DOI:** https://doi.org/10.55454/rcsas.6.09.2026.002

Abstract: *Language is the primary tool employed to interpret and enforce the law. Every statute, constitutional provision, judicial decision, and legal concept largely depends on the definition of the words and phrases that compose it. India is a multilingual and multicultural society where language is of utmost importance in interpreting statutes. Semantic interpretation can resolve many issues such as ambiguity, vagueness, polysemy, hyponymy, and context. Hence, courts must evaluate the semantic principles and canons of construction to ascertain the meaning of statutory provisions. This paper discusses semantics and law in India, which covers the importance of lexical meaning, contextual meaning, denotation and connotation, ambiguity and vagueness, and practical meaning in ascertaining the meaning of statutes. The paper uses the qualitative doctrinal research methodology and examines the related provisions of the Constitution of India and Indian statutes. The text touches on the decisions of the Supreme Court of India as an example of how semantics can impact law. It argues that the field of semantics is not a subset of linguistics, but a vital tool for legal interpretation and adjudication. Thus, legal drafting must be semantically precise, while legal interpretation requires finding a balance between the literal meaning of the law and its legislative or constitutional purpose.*

Keywords: Indian Constitution, Indian Law, Legal Semantics, Linguistics, Pragmatics, Statutory Interpretation

Article History: **Received: 08 Sept- 2026;** **Accepted: 15 Sept- 2026;** **Published/Available Online: 30 Sept- 2026**

1. Introduction

There is hardly any disagreement that law is a system of linguistic expression. Every constitutional provision, statute, contract, judicial decision, and administrative regulation comes to have legal force through linguistic expression. Words create rights; words impose duties; and words are instruments of justice. Hence, the success of all legal systems depends upon the careful choice of words and the use of precise language.

Semantics is the branch of linguistics that studies the nature of meaning, including the relations between words, phrases and sentences, and how meaning is both inferred and distorted based on context. Legal language is a specialized use of language and employs terms found within legal statutes that diverge from their ordinary dictionary meanings. Illustrations include reasonable restriction, public order, good faith, knowledge, dishonestly, consent, and consumer and life.

The Indian legal system is not immune to semantic difficulties. Though India recognizes twenty-two scheduled languages, English is the language of law-making, the higher judiciary, and legal academia. In India, language, culture and law form a nexus that is constantly at play. Constitutional interpretation has broadened the semantic domain of some legal texts to take account of changing social norms and technology.

As modern courts take a contextual and purposive approach to the interpretation of statutes, it is increasingly clear that what might be treated as an academic exercise in semantics has a real effect on the reasoning of judges, and the resulting legal position. This paper positions the study of semantics in India in the cross-disciplinary context of statutory interpretation, and highlights it using a few key phrases in Indian statutes.

2. Semantics and Law

Semantics is the study of meaning. It focuses on how language is used to convey meaning and the different factors, such as context and culture, that can shape how meaning is interpreted. Semantics is especially important in legal contexts, where the application of legal consequences requires interpretation of linguistic phrases.

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

Legal writing, in contrast, is expected to be certain, precise and uniform, and definitions of terms are therefore often given. However, language is not static: in practice, many terms and phrases used by legislatures cannot be fully understood as mere definitions in the dictionary. They must also be interpreted in light of statutory purpose, constitutional norms, and legislative intent.

There are four major dimensions that can help understand the relationship between semantics and law.

2.1. *Lexical Semantics*

Lexical semantics involves the meaning of words. Many statutory terms are understood as having a special legal meaning. For instance, the constitutional term property under Article 300A has received a more extended legal meaning than its etymological meaning.

2.2. *Structural Semantics*

Syntax, punctuation and other aspects of sentence construction may affect the meaning of statutory text, and even small syntactic alterations may have legal effects.

2.3. *Contextual Semantics*

The meaning of words in statutes must be construed in the context of the statute, not in isolation or by reference to the dictionary. Courts will also have regard to the purpose and scheme of the statute in construing words.

2.4. *Pragmatics*

Legislative intent, constitutional structure, judicial precedent, and social context are always relevant, meaning that legal interpretation must sometimes go beyond literalism.

This shows the argument that legal interpretation is fundamentally an exercise in semantic analysis.

3. Statement of the Problem

Despite legislative regulation, statute law is characterized by a vagueness, ambiguity, polysemy and contextual relativity such that, couched as it is in somewhat ambiguous terms, every act contains words or paragraphs that mean different things. These terms are subject to statute, case law and the Constitution.

Despite a dearth of work in India on statutory language from the perspective of modern linguistic semantics, there is considerable scope for further work in this area, specifically on the impact of semantics on legal interpretation and judicial reasoning. This paper intends to address this gap by examining the semantic aspects of the selected statutory expressions.

4. Research Objectives

The study aims to:

1. examine the relationship between semantics and legal interpretation;
2. analyse the semantic principles applicable to Indian statutory interpretation;
3. investigate selected statutory expressions through linguistic analysis;
4. show the interpretation that courts give to the law.
5. highlight the importance of semantic precision in legislative drafting.

5. Research Questions

1. How does semantics influence statutory interpretation in India?
2. What semantic challenges arise in legal drafting?
3. How do Indian courts resolve lexical ambiguity?
4. How does contextual interpretation affect judicial reasoning?
5. What role does semantics play in promoting legal certainty?

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

6. Review of Literature

The relation of language and law has increasingly garnered the interest of scholars in the last half century. Though customary legal scholars have focused on statutory interpretation and jurisprudence, linguistic scholars have shown that legal reasoning is both conceptually and practically dependent on the interpretation of language. Semantics is the study of meaning, and is the theoretical basis for the interpretation of the contents of legal texts where rights, duties, prohibitions, and liabilities are expressed. In a multilingual country like India, semantics is even more important for legal interpretation.

One of the earliest thorough and systematic works on semantics is John Lyons' Semantics (1977). He defined semantics as the systematic study of linguistic meaning. He advocated the view that no word has a stable, intrinsic meaning; rather, it is the relation between the linguistic sign and the social and communicative context in which the sign appears that determines its meaning. This is particularly powerful in legal interpretation, because the literal meaning of legislative expression often hinges on the context of its enactment. The terms equality, liberty, and life in the Constitution were interpreted differently by judicial interpretation of the Constitution.

By contrast, Stephen Ullmann suggests in 1962 that meaning of words is fluid, and semantic change occurs through social developments, cultural changes, metaphorical extension and reinterpretation. This approach can explain, among other aspects, how a legal term comes to have a specialized meaning that diverges from the original over time. In Indian constitutional law, this semantic enlargement can be illustrated by the interpretation of Article 21, in which life has been interpreted to include dignity, privacy, livelihood, health, education and environment.

Based on Geoffrey Leech's (1981) work on semantic features of meaning, semantic meaning can be conceptual, connotative, social, affective, reflected, collocative and thematic. The multidimensional model of meaning also reflects how courts are generally required to look beyond conceptual meaning or definitions in the interpretation of statutes towards contextual and social meaning. The expression reasonable restriction, public order and good faith are only to be understood, not from conceptual semantics, but in relation to the legislative purpose and the constitutional policy in the light of the Constitution.

H. P. Grice (1975) extended the notion of the presumption of consistency to communication in natural language via his theory of conversational implicature. It's unsurprising that the assertion made by Grice that conversational speakers mean more than they say became the foundation for legal interpretation studies in the following decades. Courts will likewise look to statutory context, legislative history, and legislative purpose to determine legislative intent in a given statute: statutory interpretation is increasingly a matter of pragmatism rather than a matter of language.

The notion of the "open texture" of legal language was popularized by legal philosopher H. L. A. Hart (1961) who argued that legal rules cannot cater to all future possibilities and that judges should exercise interpretative discretion when statutory language was vague or ambiguous. This has been seen in Indian jurisprudence when constitutional courts interpret broad terminologies such as public interest, reasonable, justice, etc., in a fluid manner as per contemporary circumstances.

Aharon Barak (2005) has expanded on this concept of purposive interpretation, which embraces interpretation consistent with legislative intent and constitutional values, and the balancing of textual meaning and legislative purpose. This method of interpretation is similar to the Supreme Court of India methodology for constitutional interpretation, whereby literal interpretation of the text is frequently supplemented by purposive and contextual interpretation.

From a grammatical point of view, Peter M. Tiersma wrote in 1999 that legal language, with its technical vocabulary, specialized jargon, formal syntax, and institutional context, differs from ordinary usage. It can provide certainty, although absolute clarity is impossible because natural languages almost never offer unambiguous meaning or clear-cut categorization of things. His analysis is of great importance to the continuing work of statutory interpretation.

Lawrence M. Solan (2010) has analyzed legal reasoning (particularly judicial reasoning) linguistically, concluding that judges resolve legal disputes by relying more on semantics than on applying the law.

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

According to Solan, legal reasoning requires knowledge of semantics, pragmatics, syntax and discourse analysis. His work also stresses the interdisciplinary nature of linguistics and law.

Traditionally, the principles of statutory construction in India (including the literal rule, the golden rule, the mischief rule, and purposive interpretation) were only rules of language, as they only sought to ascertain the meaning of the language used in the statute. Interpretation of the Constitution, however, has shown that constitutional terms do not always have the same meaning as in a dictionary.

Article 21 has been interpreted widely in the regulation Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978), where the Supreme Court rejected the narrow interpretation of the word life as mere life, instead, the Supreme Court defined the wider definition to include dignity, fairness and procedural justice. The case is an example of how constitutional semantics develops through judicial practice.

Similarly, in E. P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu (1974), the Court's holding that equality is anti-arbitrariness transformed the formal understanding of equality as equal treatment into a substantive constitutional doctrine of equality. The Court was involved in semantic enrichment through constitutional jurisprudence.

In K. S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017) , the right to privacy was recognized as falling within the scope of the right to life and personal liberty, thereby further expanding the semantic scope of the right enumerated under Article 21 by taking into account the technological and informational challenges of the time.

For example, in Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015), the Supreme Court of India held that Section 66A of the IT Act was unconstitutional because the words such as grossly offensive and annoyance used in it were vague and violated speech freedoms. The judgment also shows that semantic ambiguity can render legislation unconstitutional.

Statutory interpretation and constitutional law have been one of the most widely researched subject in legal scholarship, but comparatively fewer Indian researchers have approached statutory interpretation, constitutional interpretation, and legal interpretation through the lens of linguistic semantics. Legal scholars tend to focus on jurisprudential approaches to court interpretations and linguistic scholars rarely focus on statutes. Consequently, there is an interdisciplinary gap between linguistics and law.

This study attempts to fill this gap by applying the theories of lexical semantics, contextual semantics and pragmatics to the interpretation of Indian statutes. Statutory expressions are analyzed from linguistic and legal perspectives with the aim of contributing to the emerging field of legal linguistics in the Indian context. Rather, it reflects that semantics is not only a sub-field or theory of linguistics but also an important analytic tool for legislative drafting, statutory interpretation, implementation, and social justice more generally.

7. Research Methodology

The research is doctrinal, qualitative. The Constitution of India, major Indian statutes, definition of terms in Indian statutes and Supreme Court of India decisions have been consulted. Secondary sources include written texts and monographs about the semantics of law, legal linguistics, statutory interpretation, and peer-reviewed academic literature.

The study employs the principles of description, analysis and interpretation. The study makes use of the semantic theories of John Lyons, Geoffrey Leech, Stephen Ullmann and H. P. Grice and the principles applied to statutory interpretation by the courts in India. A few statutory expressions served to illustrate the interplay between linguistic and legal reasoning.

8. Semantic Analysis of Selected Indian Statutes

Example 1: Constitution of India - Article 14

Expression: *Equality before Law*

Lexically, equality means sameness or equal treatment. But Article 14 does not imply equality in all respects. Indian constitutional jurisprudence has established that reasonable classification is not barred by the equality doctrine, if the classification is based on intelligible differentia and rational nexus to the legislative objective.

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

Thus, the semantic content of equality has shifted from strict sameness to a more complex constitutional principle of non-arbitrariness.

Example 2: Constitution of India - Article 19

Expression: *Reasonable Restrictions*

The adjective reasonable has no precise linguistic value, but instead, depends on proportionality, fairness, the public interest, and constitutional values.

Indian courts thus determine what constitutes reasonableness in constitutional terms not by reference to a dictionary definition, but in the context of the circumstances.

Example 3: The Constitution of India - Article 21

Expression: *Life*

The courts have also expanded Article 21 to include dignity, privacy, education, livelihood, legal aid, health, and a clean environment, though none of these are explicitly mentioned as rights.

It is one of the most meaningful cases illustrating semantic expansion in Indian constitutional law.

Example 4: Indian Contract Act, 1872: Section 13

Expression: *Consent*

In common language, consent means 'agreement', but in contract law, it must be free, voluntary, informed and must not be obtained through coercion, fraud, undue influence and mistake.

The legal meaning is therefore considerably narrower than the ordinary lexical meaning.

Example 5: Indian Contract Act, 1872 - Section 17.

Expression: *Fraud*

While everyday usage treats fraud as deception, it consists in the misrepresentation of material fact, active concealment, false promise, and the other deceits specified by statute.

It exhibits semantic broadening through legislative definition.

Example 6: Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

Expression: *Dishonestly*

Dishonesty is a term which is used in everyday language to refer to all forms of immoral conduct. However, in a criminal context the term has a more restricted meaning, involving conduct intended to cause wrongful gain to one person or wrongful loss to another.

This is an example of semantic narrowing: the statute's meaning is more precise than that of the term in common use.

Example 7: Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

Expression: *Knowledge*

Knowledge is usually awareness that the facts exist. The criminal law distinguishes knowledge from intention. Intention is having the desire to produce a consequence, and knowledge is believing a consequence will probably come about.

These subtle semantic distinctions may carry important implications for culpability.

Example 8: Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023

Expression: *Evidence*

Whereas evidence in other contexts can mean anything which proves or disproves a fact, in law evidence refers only to oral evidence, documentary evidence, and such other electronic evidence as is admissible by statute.

Accordingly, the legislature limits the semantic reach of the expression to ensure procedural certainty.

The Review of Contemporary Scientific and Academic Studies
An International Multidisciplinary Online Journal
www.thercsas.com
ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

Example 9: Right to Information Act, 2005

Expression: Information

In common parlance, information means facts and knowledge. However, the meaning of information in Section 2(f) is much wider than that. The definition includes recorded information in the form of documents, emails, reports, circulars, opinions, electronic records etc. held by public authorities.

Thus, the Act does not require (or imply) that authorities create new information or answer hypothetical questions, a semantic expansion and functional limitation.

Example 10: Consumer Protection Act, 2019

Expression: Consumer

In normal speech, a consumer is just a buyer. When defined in law, a consumer is defined as a person who buys goods or services, including online, for consideration, excluding certain business purchases.

In this way, the definition ensures these protections cover new modes of commerce, while restricting the misuse of consumer forums.

9. Preliminary Discussion

As noted above, the words used in statutes are not necessarily the same as everyday language. This semantic broadening is not used in criminal statutes, where semantic narrowing is used to provide legal certainty. Consumer law and information law are examples of legislation that adapts to changes in technology and society's needs.

The analysis also highlights the tendency of the Indian courts to look for elucidation of the term beyond its dictionary meaning, by reference to the intention of the legislature, the spirit and scope of the Constitution, and the purpose of the statute. Thus, semantics is vital in the judicial process.

10. Findings

The study finds that semantics plays an important role in statutory interpretation in the Indian legal system. Statutory language does not necessarily reflect the plain meaning of a word defined in the dictionary and always operates in a certain legal, constitutional and social context. Thus, through this analysis, it will be seen that the Indian courts adopt contextual, purposive and practical methods of interpretation of statutes to ascertain legislative intention.

In number of cases constitutionally defined terms and the terms used in statutory provisions are given a wider, narrower or modified connotation than the one they would ordinarily bear. Thus, expressions like life, equality, reasonable restrictions have been connoted more widely than is the normal case. By contrast, words such as dishonestly, knowledge, consent, and evidence, are often given more technical and restricted definitions by statute for reasons of legal certainty.

The analysis of court rulings also showed that ambiguity, vagueness, polysemy and variation in customary legal language are the inevitable results of using this type of language. These issues are often solved through judicial interpretation, which makes semantic analysis an indispensable component of judicial reasoning and decision-making.

The study identifies a gap between linguistics and law in contemporary Indian scholarship. Although jurisprudential theories of statutory interpretation have been the focus of study, comparatively little analysis has been done on the semantics of language in contemporary linguistics as a tool for statutory interpretation. The study finds semantics to be useful for rational analysis of judicial interpretation and drafting of legislation.

Finally, , the Court holds that semantic precision in drafting statutes affords greater legal certainty, lessens the prospects of interpretative conflict, and advances access to justice. Clear legislative language also assists courts in achieving consistency of decision-making whilst enabling them to remain responsive to the evolving principles of the constitution and the needs of society.

11. Conclusion

ISSN: 2583-1380 Vol. 6 | Issue No. 9 | September 2026 Impact Factor: 6.53

Semantics is not just another branch of linguistics but, as the study concludes, an essential dimension of the understanding and application of Indian law. From the text of a law through its formal notification in a gazette to its interpretation by the courts, the entire process hinges on linguistic meaning. As statutes are, by their nature, malleable and context dependent, courts generally interpret statutes according to the language used, legislative objectives, constitutional restraints, and current socio-legal conditions. A study of the Indian constitution and other statutes indicates that semantic change in the domain of purposive interpretation by courts coexists with semantic precision through statutory definition. The key terms relating to the rights to life, equality, reasonable restriction, consent, fraud, dishonestly and evidence are subject to purposive interpretation by the courts. The legislature seeks semantic precision for legal certainty. The relationship between language and the law defines legal reasoning more as a process of semantic interpretation than a mechanical application of legal codes and statutes.

The study shows the need for further interdisciplinary research between linguistic and legal scholars in India; the use of principles of lexical semantics, contextual semantics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis in law education, legislative drafting, and adjudication would increase the clarity, coherence, and accessibility of legal discourse in the country. Such an approach would lead to sounder legislation, greater consistency in judicial reasoning, greater consistency in the development of the law and more effective realization of the constitutional values of justice, equality and the rule of law.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, No. 45 of 2023.

Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, No. 47 of 2023.

Consumer Protection Act, No. 35 of 2019.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (1961). The concept of law. Oxford University Press.

Indian Contract Act, No. 9 of 1872.

Leech, G. (1981). Semantics: The study of meaning (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.

Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge University Press.

Right to Information Act, No. 22 of 2005.

Solan, L. M. (2010). The language of judges. University of Chicago Press.

Tiersma, P. M. (1999). Legal language. University of Chicago Press.

Ullmann, S. (1962). Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning. Basil Blackwell.

Selected Cases

E. P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1974) 4 SCC 3.

Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 SCC 225.

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare “No conflict of interest”.