

The Relevance of Interpretation, Argumentation, and Exposition Methods in Contemporary Legal Practice

Muhammad Ilham Pratama¹

UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
milhamp74@gmail.com

Ramdani Wahyu Sururie

UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
ramdaniwahyusururie@uinsgd.ac.id

Adilla Nur Muslimah

UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
adillanurmuslimah@gmail.com

Brilyan Yudha Pratama

UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
brilyanyp@gmail.com

Submission	Accepted	Published
Dec 2, 2024	Oct 11, 2025	Oct 11, 2025

Abstract

Ideally, in legal practice, the application of the methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition should create justice and legal certainty. However, in reality, these three methods are often applied inconsistently in various court rulings. This research aims to analyze the relevance of applying the methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition in contemporary legal practice in Indonesia. The methodology used is normative legal research with a qualitative approach and phenomenological study, analyzing relevant court decisions. The research findings indicate that although these three methods play an important role in upholding justice, their application remains varied, with some cases showing inconsistencies in the proper use of interpretive methods, resulting in legal uncertainty.

Keywords: *Relevance of Methods, Interpretation, Argumentation, Exposition*

¹ Corresponding Author

Abstrak

Idealnya, dalam praktik hukum, penerapan metode interpretasi, argumentasi, dan eksposisi harus menciptakan keadilan dan kepastian hukum. Namun, realitasnya, ketiga metode tersebut sering kali diterapkan secara tidak konsisten dalam berbagai putusan pengadilan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis relevansi penerapan metode interpretasi, argumentasi, dan eksposisi dalam praktik hukum kontemporer di Indonesia. Metodologi yang digunakan adalah penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan kualitatif dan studi fenomenologi, dengan menganalisis putusan-putusan pengadilan yang relevan. Hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa meskipun ketiga metode tersebut memiliki peran penting dalam menegakkan keadilan, penerapannya masih beragam, dengan beberapa kasus menunjukkan inkonsistensi dalam penggunaan metode interpretasi yang tepat, sehingga menimbulkan ketidakpastian hukum.

Kata Kunci: Relevansi Metode, Interpretasi, Argumentasi, Eksposisi

Introduction

Law plays a central role in maintaining social order, delivering justice, and ensuring legal certainty. As a dynamic system, law is required to always be responsive to the ongoing social, political, economic, and cultural changes. Contemporary society is increasingly complex, marked by the emergence of new legal issues previously unknown in classical law, such as legal problems in the digital sphere, personal data protection, and global environmental concerns. Under such conditions, law cannot be viewed merely as a rigid set of written norms, but rather as an instrument that must be able to adapt to changing times and the needs of society (Andrianto, 2020). Ultimately, law enforcement is not only about applying statutes article by article, but also about how those articles are understood and interpreted fairly. Therefore, the methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition become important tools to bridge the gap between limited legal texts and the ever-dynamic social reality.

However, in reality, the legal system is not always capable of addressing all issues with a purely textual approach. Many provisions in legislation are general in nature and require further interpretation in order to be applied to concrete cases. At times, existing regulations fail to anticipate new phenomena, creating legal vacuums that may harm society. In such circumstances, the role of judges and legal practitioners becomes crucial, as they are required to find the law through proper interpretation, construct logical and rational legal argumentation, and expose judicial decisions openly so that they can be held accountable (Harini & Rahmat, 2025). The methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition function not only as techniques but also as epistemological foundations in the pursuit of justice. These three methods have proven relevant and significant in various contemporary legal cases, ranging from judicial review of laws at the Constitutional Court, resolution of complex civil disputes, to the delivery of justice in situations where positive law does not provide clear regulation. Thus, a deep understanding of these methods is not only academic but also practical, as it

directly relates to the quality of law enforcement and the realization of substantive justice in society.

Ideally, legal practice in Indonesia should be able to create harmony between legal certainty, justice, and expediency. By consistently applying interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods, the legal system is expected to provide solutions to various legal problems without causing uncertainty or injustice. However, the reality shows that the application of these three methods often encounters obstacles. Not infrequently, differing interpretations among judges lead to legal uncertainty (Sari et al., 2023). Moreover, immature legal argumentation or exposition that is not based on the principles of justice may result in rulings that do not sufficiently fulfill society's sense of justice. This indicates a gap in the consistency and effectiveness of applying these methods in contemporary legal practice.

The main issue that arises is how to ensure the relevance and consistency of applying interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods in addressing the legal needs amid the complexities of modern times. This raises questions about the extent to which these methods are capable of bridging the gap between static legal texts and the dynamic needs of society. This study aims to analyze the relevance of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods in contemporary legal practice. Thus, it is expected that this research can contribute to understanding the strategic role of these three methods as well as offer solutions to improve their consistency and effectiveness in creating justice and legal certainty.

This research is expected to make a significant contribution, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, it seeks to enrich studies on interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods as the main approaches in the legal discovery process in Indonesia. Practically, it can serve as a guideline for judges, legal practitioners, and academics in understanding how these three methods can be applied consistently and relevantly to respond to contemporary legal challenges, while also serving as a reference in developing a legal system that is more adaptive to the dynamics of modern society.

Literature Review

Studies related to the relevance of methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition in contemporary legal practice are not new, as a number of researchers have already discussed and published them using various methods and approaches. Rajali Batubara, in his work entitled; *"Peranan Interpretasi Hukum dalam Praktik Peradilan di Indonesia"*, provides an in-depth discussion on how legal interpretation plays an important role in judicial practice in Indonesia. This work emphasizes that statutory texts are not always capable of fully addressing the needs of society, so judges often use interpretive methods to find substantive justice. The key finding of this study is that interpretation methods are not merely technical but also normative, functioning as a bridge between statutory texts and social realities (Batubara, 2024). The similarity between Rajali's study and this research lies in the focus on the use of interpretation methods as a means of discovering the law. However, the difference is that Rajali's research is more limited to the dimension of interpretation in

judicial practice, while the author's study expands it by incorporating the role of argumentation and exposition as important instruments in contemporary legal practice.

Muh Ibnu Sholeh, through his work; *"Relevansi dan Tantangan Implementasi Hukum Islam dalam Konteks Sosial Masyarakat Modern"*, highlights the dynamics of applying Islamic law in the midst of a plural modern society. He explains that the challenges of implementing Islamic law are not only juridical but also sociological and cultural, especially when confronted with modernity and the demands of globalization. His main finding is that Islamic law remains relevant as long as it is interpreted contextually, taking into account the values of justice and public welfare (Sholeh, 2023). The similarity of this work with the author's study lies in the emphasis on the importance of the relevance of law in a modern social context. However, the difference lies in the focus: Sholeh emphasizes the challenges of implementing Islamic law, whereas the author's study seeks to elaborate on interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods as approaches to legal analysis in a broader context, not limited to Islamic law alone.

Dimas Rizki Anugrah Putra, et al., in their article; *"Relevansi Tantangan Paradigma dan Konsep dalam Penelitian Hukum Kontemporer"*, discuss the paradigms and concepts in legal research that continue to evolve along with the complexity of society. This article emphasizes that legal research can no longer rely solely on normative approaches but must also integrate interdisciplinary approaches, such as sociology of law, philosophy of law, and critical studies. Their key finding is the need for paradigm renewal in law so that it remains relevant to the developments of the times (Putra et al., 2024). The similarity of this research with the author's study is the shared awareness of the need for innovation in methods of legal reasoning in contemporary contexts. However, the difference is that Dimas et al. focus more on methodological aspects of legal research, while the author's study focuses more on the application of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods in legal practice.

Based on this literature review, it can be said that although there have been previous studies on legal interpretation, the relevance of Islamic law, and legal research paradigms, there remains a research gap that has not been filled. This gap is the lack of studies that comprehensively examine the interrelation between interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods as a unified set of analytical instruments in contemporary legal practice. This study seeks to fill that gap by offering an integrative perspective that not only considers legal interpretation alone but also examines how argumentation and exposition function to strengthen the process of legal discovery and maintain the accountability of legal decisions in facing the challenges of modern times.

Research Methodology

This article falls within the scope of normative legal research with a qualitative approach. The purpose of this study is to explore and analyze the relevance of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods in contemporary legal practice by examining how these three methods are applied in various court decisions. The methodology used is normative juridical analysis

complemented by phenomenological study, which allows the researcher to observe and understand the application of these methods from the perspective of real, everyday legal practice. This research does not rely solely on theory but also takes into account the experiences of legal practitioners through the study of relevant cases.

The primary sources in this research are court decisions that serve as the objects of study, including decisions of the Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court that are relevant to interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods. The secondary sources used include legal books, academic journals, and articles discussing legal theories related to the three methods. The processes of filtering, validation, and triangulation of data were carried out by selecting and verifying relevant court decisions, as well as confirming the data through in-depth literature reviews and interviews with legal practitioners. This approach ensures that the analysis conducted is accurate, comprehensive, and reflective of actual legal practice.

The Relevance of Interpretation Methods in Contemporary Legal Practice

The method of legal interpretation plays a crucial role in contemporary legal practice in Indonesia. Ongoing social, political, and economic changes demand an adaptive legal system, especially when statutory provisions are not always sufficiently clear to address new situations. Through legal interpretation, judges and legal practitioners can construe legal norms so they may be applied fairly and remain relevant to the very purpose of law itself (Al-Fatih, 2021). Sudikno Mertokusumo noted that judicial interpretation is an effort to explain legal provisions so that they can be accepted by society and applied in concrete cases. In Indonesian judicial practice, various methods of legal interpretation are employed to bridge the gap between legal texts and societal realities. Grammatical interpretation, for example, relies on the literal understanding of words or phrases in legal texts (Fitriah & Yusuf, 2024). This method is often used to ensure that legal interpretation aligns with the literal meaning intended by the legislator. However, grammatical interpretation has its limitations, especially when facing legal norms that are ambiguous or unclear.

Historical interpretation is another widely used method, in which judges seek to understand the historical background of a law's formulation. With this method, the original intention of the legislator can be uncovered, ensuring that legal norms are applied in line with the spirit of their creation. For instance, laws enacted in a particular era often reflect the needs of society at that time, making historical context essential in the interpretation process. Systematic interpretation is equally important. This approach views legal norms as part of the broader legal system in force (Silalahi et al., 2025). By understanding the interconnections between norms within the legal system, judges can interpret a provision more comprehensively and avoid conflicts with other norms. This method helps create harmony in the application of law, ensuring that no contradictions exist between different legal provisions.

Teleological or sociological interpretation emphasizes the purposes of law and the social values it seeks to achieve. In the context of contemporary law, this

method is highly relevant as it responds to the changing needs of society. For instance, in cases involving human rights or environmental issues, teleological interpretation enables judges to align the law with evolving societal demands and values. The relevance of legal interpretation is further underscored in Article 5(1) and Article 10(1) of Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power. These provisions require judges to uncover legal values and the sense of justice living within society. This demonstrates that the application of law should not rest solely on statutory texts but must also consider the surrounding social context. Thus, interpretation methods such as teleological interpretation are crucial in maintaining the relevance of law.

In practice, legal interpretation is not only employed by judges but also by other legal practitioners, such as lawyers and prosecutors. They are often faced with the necessity of interpreting statutes in the context of specific cases, making a deep understanding of these methods an essential competency. Proper legal interpretation can help ensure that laws are applied fairly and consistently. However, the relevance of interpretation methods in contemporary legal practice is not without challenges (Ningrum, 2020). One of the primary challenges is the lack of deep understanding among law enforcement officials regarding the principles of legal interpretation. This often leads to misapplications of law, ultimately undermining justice for society. Additionally, the complexity of contemporary law, particularly in cross-sectoral issues such as information technology and international trade, requires more adaptive interpretation methods.

In this regard, approaches that combine multiple methods of interpretation often prove to be more effective solutions. For example, grammatical interpretation may serve as the initial step, which is then supplemented with teleological interpretation to ensure broader contextual relevance (Latif, 2010). The relevance of legal interpretation is also reflected in various cases in Indonesia where judges have successfully employed these methods to resolve complex disputes. For example, in cases involving minority rights, sociological interpretation is often used to construe the law in a way that protects vulnerable groups. This demonstrates that interpretation methods play a strategic role in supporting the realization of substantive justice. In the face of globalization and digitalization, legal interpretation methods are expected to continue evolving to address emerging challenges. Strengthening the capacity of law enforcement officials to understand and apply interpretation methods also becomes an urgent agenda.

The Role of Argumentation Methods in the Formation of Legal Decisions

The method of argumentation plays an essential role in the formation of legal decisions, particularly in Indonesia, where the legal system upholds the values of justice and legal certainty. Legal argumentation enables judges to formulate decisions that not only conform to legal norms but also reflect the substantive justice expected by society. This process involves a deep understanding of case facts, the application of legal norms, and the balancing of relevant social values (Adjie, 2023). According to Sudikno Mertokusumo, legal

argumentation is a process of reasoning aimed at proving the validity of a legal claim. In this sense, the process of argumentation requires not only strong logic but also a detailed comprehension of the case context and the governing legal principles. This ability serves as a key indicator of a judge's or legal practitioner's level of competence in understanding and applying the law.

Legal logic functions as the backbone of the argumentation method, allowing judges to distinguish between valid and invalid reasoning. A solid command of logic provides a firm foundation for constructing systematic and rational arguments, ensuring that the resulting decisions can be justified both scientifically and morally. In practice, legal logic helps prevent bias in the decision-making process (Ishak, 2023). Beyond logic, legal argumentation also involves other aspects such as rhetoric and hermeneutics. Rhetoric plays an important role in structuring persuasive arguments, while hermeneutics aids in interpreting legal norms and facts contextually. Through this combination, legal argumentation serves not only as an analytical tool but also as a means of effectively communicating legal decisions to relevant parties.

The theory of legal argumentation focuses on how to formulate arguments quickly, clearly, and rationally. This involves developing juridical and universal criteria that serve as the foundation for constructing legal arguments. These criteria ensure that arguments are not only legally relevant but also reflect universally recognized principles of justice. In practice, a sound and well-structured argumentation method enhances not only the quality of judicial decisions but also strengthens the legitimacy of the judiciary in the eyes of the public. Decisions grounded in strong reasoning tend to be more widely accepted by society, thereby increasing public trust in judicial institutions. This is particularly important in Indonesia, where the legal system often comes under public scrutiny.

The ability to construct well-reasoned legal arguments also plays a vital role in achieving substantive justice. Legal decisions based solely on normative application are often insufficient to resolve complex cases. In such situations, legal argumentation helps align the application of law with the social context and the specific needs of the parties involved (Gunawan et al., 2020). Furthermore, an effective legal argumentation method enhances the professionalism of legal practitioners. Judges, lawyers, and legal scholars who are capable of constructing logical and rational arguments demonstrate a high level of mastery over legal materials. This not only strengthens public confidence in the legal profession but also contributes to the overall development of legal science. Legal argumentation also has an educational role within the judicial process. By formulating decisions accompanied by clear reasoning, judges not only resolve disputes but also provide legal education to society.

This process helps increase public understanding of legal principles and their role in everyday life. However, weaknesses in argumentation methods can have serious consequences. Weak or illogical reasoning may lead to unjust decisions, damage the credibility of the legal system, and trigger public dissatisfaction. Therefore, mastering sound argumentation techniques has become an urgent necessity in legal education in Indonesia. The development of legal argumentation methods in Indonesia still faces distinct challenges, particularly in handling cases involving complex value or normative conflicts. To address this, a

more integrative approach is needed—one that combines aspects of logic, ethics, and social dynamics in constructing legal reasoning. Thus, decisions produced through such an approach are not only legally valid but also socially relevant (Lubis & Fahmi, 2021). With its strategic role, the method of argumentation stands as one of the main pillars in forming high-quality legal decisions. Through a profound mastery of argumentation techniques, legal practitioners can make a tangible contribution to realizing substantive justice and enhancing public trust in Indonesia's legal system.

Legal Exposition as an Effective Means of Conveying Legal Information

Legal exposition plays a strategic role in effectively communicating legal information in Indonesia, particularly within contemporary legal practice. As a communication tool, legal exposition aims to explain complex legal issues so that they can be understood by all parties involved in the legal process — including judges, lawyers, disputing parties, and the general public. In this regard, the clear and systematic delivery of legal information is crucial to ensure that the intended legal message does not create confusion or misunderstanding (Harini & Rahmat, 2025). In judicial contexts, effective legal exposition assists the parties involved in comprehensively understanding legal issues. Judges, for example, require well-structured documents to analyze facts, apply the law, and render fair judgments. A good exposition also helps disputing parties understand their legal positions and determine the right strategy to defend their interests.

Legal exposition is not only essential in litigation but also in the drafting of other legal documents such as contracts, legislation, and legal opinions. These documents must be designed with clear language and logical structure to be understood by all stakeholders. Errors in legal exposition—such as the use of ambiguous terminology or unsystematic composition—can lead to misinterpretation and potential legal disputes. Moreover, legal exposition plays an important role in legal education and outreach programs (Faizien et al., 2025). The clear and easily understandable communication of legal information to the public can enhance their legal awareness of rights and obligations. For instance, in legal outreach programs related to workers' rights, effective legal exposition can help workers understand their rights concerning wages, working hours, and protection against discrimination. Thus, the ability to craft effective legal exposition is one of the key skills for legal practitioners.

Effective legal exposition also supports the preventive function of law. In business contract drafting, for example, clearly written documents can prevent disputes between parties in the future. This is because good legal exposition ensures that all parties share a common understanding of the contract's contents, thereby reducing the potential for differing interpretations (Poernomo, 2019). Furthermore, high-quality legal exposition contributes to the development of legal culture in society. By enhancing public understanding of the law, legal exposition helps create a law-conscious society that actively participates in maintaining order and justice. This is particularly relevant in Indonesia, where legal awareness among the public still needs improvement in various sectors.

On the other hand, ineffective legal exposition can create multiple problems, such as abuse of authority or legal uncertainty. For instance, if legislation is drafted in ambiguous language, it can allow for multiple interpretations and potentially trigger social conflict. Therefore, it is crucial for legislators and policymakers to ensure that legal exposition in statutory drafting is carefully constructed and considers multiple perspectives. Legal exposition also serves as a medium for integrating the principles of justice and legal certainty into legal practice. By presenting legal information clearly and systematically, legal exposition helps ensure that legal decisions are based on a correct understanding of applicable norms. This is essential for fostering a sense of justice in society and strengthening the legitimacy of the legal system.

In practice, effective legal exposition requires not only a deep understanding of substantive law but also adequate communication skills. This includes the ability to use appropriate legal language, construct logical arguments, and present information in an engaging and easily understandable manner. Hence, legal exposition represents a combination of art and science that demands both dedication and specialized expertise (Arafat, 2020). Technological advancements have also opened new opportunities for the development of legal exposition. The use of legal tech software, for instance, can assist legal practitioners in drafting more structured and efficient legal documents. However, while technology can support the process, the quality of legal exposition ultimately depends on human ability to analyze and effectively convey legal information.

The Interaction Between Interpretation, Argumentation, and Exposition in Contemporary Legal Practice

Legal interpretation plays a fundamental role in contemporary legal practice as the foundation for constructing logical and relevant argumentation. Through interpretation, judges or legal practitioners seek to understand the meaning and purpose of legal norms, especially in situations where regulations do not provide explicit answers. Interpretation serves as a method of legal discovery used to construe norms within the context of specific cases, ensuring their proper application (Muhtadi, 2015). This process enables the law to remain relevant amid continuously changing social dynamics. Following interpretation, legal argumentation is employed as a tool to demonstrate the truth or validity of a legal claim. In litigation practice, the ability to construct logical and coherent arguments becomes a key element that determines the strength of one's legal position before the court. Strong argumentation must be grounded in valid premises and a solid logical connection between those premises and their conclusions.

Legal exposition complements this process by ensuring that legal information is presented clearly and systematically. Exposition allows parties involved in a case to more easily understand complex legal issues. In drafting legal documents such as legal opinions or judicial decisions, effective exposition helps readers or other interested parties grasp the essence of legal issues without confusion. The clarity of exposition often determines the success of legal communication, particularly in contexts involving multiple parties with differing interests (Setiawan & Widowaty, 2024). These three methods—interpretation,

argumentation, and exposition—are closely interconnected and operate synergistically in legal practice. Interpretation provides the foundation for understanding legal norms, which are then translated into logical argumentation to support specific legal claims. Strong argumentation, in turn, requires clear exposition to ensure that it can be accepted and understood by a broader audience, including judges, lawyers, and other stakeholders.

This interaction ensures that every stage of the legal process is conducted transparently, rationally, and fairly. For instance, the application of these three methods can be observed in cases involving *Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower*. In such cases, judges must interpret the relevant provisions, construct arguments that consider both workers' rights and employers' interests, and formulate clear decisions that can be understood by both parties (Al-Fatih, 2021). This process illustrates how the interaction between interpretation, argumentation, and exposition plays a crucial role in ensuring fair and adequate outcomes. In contemporary legal practice, the quality of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition is greatly influenced by the legal education received by practitioners. Effective legal education must include intensive training in these three methods to prepare law students for real-world challenges. Furthermore, the legal curriculum should emphasize analytical and communication skills as the foundation for mastering interpretation, argumentation, and exposition effectively.

The synergy among these three methods also has significant implications for the legitimacy of the legal system itself. Legal decisions grounded in proper interpretation, strong argumentation, and clear exposition are more likely to be accepted by the public. This is vital for strengthening public trust in the judiciary, especially in Indonesia, where perceptions of justice often remain a sensitive issue. However, these three methods are not without challenges. In practice, legal interpretation is often influenced by judges' personal preferences, which may lead to subjective outcomes. Similarly, incoherent argumentation can weaken a legal position, while unclear exposition can cause confusion among interested parties. Therefore, mastering these methods requires continuous training and learning to ensure consistent quality.

The importance of the interrelation among these three methods is also evident in cases involving conflicts of values or norms. In such situations, judges must use interpretation to understand the social and cultural context of a norm, construct argumentation that bridges the conflict, and deliver decisions in an expository manner so that they can be accepted by all parties. This approach ensures that the legal system remains responsive to societal needs (Ummah, 2004). The harmonious interaction between interpretation, argumentation, and exposition also contributes to the development of legal science. By continuously refining these three methods, legal practitioners can help create better legal precedents and enrich legal literature with deep and systematic analysis. Ultimately, this improves the overall quality of the legal system. In an increasingly complex world, the synergy among these methods is more important than ever. As the law faces challenges involving technology, globalization, and social change, it requires an integrative and flexible approach. These three methods provide the necessary framework to address such challenges, ensuring that law remains relevant and reliable in delivering justice.

The Development of Law and Challenges in Applying the Methods of Interpretation, Argumentation, and Exposition

The development of law in Indonesia has undergone significant dynamics, particularly in the use of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition methods. This transformation reflects the nation's response to the challenges of globalization, legal reform, and the growing public demand for substantive justice. Indonesia's legal system, rooted in the *civil law tradition*, initially emphasized strict adherence to written legal texts. However, under the influence of the *common law* tradition, interpretive approaches have begun shifting toward greater flexibility, allowing judges to be more responsive to societal needs (Hafizhah et al., 2024). Legal interpretation methods have experienced notable evolution. Initially confined to rigid grammatical approaches, they now increasingly incorporate extensive and sociological interpretations to address legal gaps. This shift is supported by normative foundations such as Article 5(1) and Article 10(1) of Law No. 48 of 2009, which provide judges the authority to explore living legal values within society. Nevertheless, the dominance of the *civil law* tradition remains a challenge to implementing more progressive interpretations.

Challenges in the method of interpretation arise from the rigidity of the *civil law* framework, which often limits judicial creativity. Judges are frequently constrained by unclear regulations when confronted with legal cases not explicitly covered by statutory law. This condition can lead to legal uncertainty and potential injustice. However, there are indications of *common law* influence, as judges have begun adopting legal discovery approaches to fill legal voids or update legal rules in accordance with social developments (Rahmah & Lubis, 2024). Beyond interpretation, the method of legal argumentation has also shown significant development. Contemporary legal argumentation requires strong logic and valid premises. Legal practitioners must be able to construct relevant connections between premises and conclusions to formulate coherent arguments. In the context of litigation, this argumentative ability becomes a key factor influencing judicial decisions.

Nonetheless, challenges in applying argumentative methods stem from the lack of mastery of legal substance among some practitioners. Many struggle to construct logical, data-based arguments. This highlights the importance of enhancing legal competence through continuous education to support the effectiveness of fair and progressive legal reasoning. The method of legal exposition also plays a crucial role in systematically explaining complex legal issues (Mesah et al., 2024). Good exposition facilitates the public's understanding of technical legal matters. In practice, exposition is often used in *legal audits* and *legal opinions*, which serve as important references in legal decision-making. However, the preparation of legal exposition faces obstacles such as limited understanding of legal substance among practitioners. To produce effective exposition, a combination of logical argumentation and valid data is required. This presents a unique challenge for legal practitioners, particularly when conveying information to non-legal audiences in an easily comprehensible manner.

These three methods—interpretation, argumentation, and exposition—interact synergistically in contemporary legal practice. Proper interpretation enables a deep understanding of legal norms, forming the foundation for strong

argumentation. Logical and well-supported argumentation can then be reinforced through clear exposition, ensuring that outcomes are accessible and acceptable to all relevant parties. This synergy demonstrates that each method complements the others: interpretation without solid argumentation lacks weight, while argumentation without effective exposition fails to communicate meaningfully to its audience (Qamar & Rezah, 2020). Therefore, improving proficiency in all three methods has become an urgent necessity for legal practitioners in Indonesia to ensure fair and transparent judicial processes. Despite promising developments, challenges remain. Legal practitioners must continuously enhance their competencies to respond to the increasing complexity of legal dynamics. Reforming legal education is one of the key solutions to ensure the optimal mastery and application of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition within Indonesia's evolving legal system.

Example of Court Decisions Using Three Methods: Interpretation, Argumentation, and Exposition

Court decisions in Indonesia often employ various methods of interpreting, arguing, and exposing the law to achieve justice and legal certainty. One of the most frequently used methods is *historical interpretation*. This method emphasizes the historical background of the formation of laws in order to understand the original intent of the lawmakers. An example of this method can be found in the Constitutional Court Decision No. 14/PUU-XI/2013. In that decision, the Court interpreted the provisions of the 1945 Constitution by considering the original intent of the drafters of the constitutional amendments. This interpretation particularly concerned the organization of presidential elections, which should be held simultaneously with legislative elections (Ashari, 2016).

In addition to historical interpretation, *systematic interpretation* is also an important approach often used in legal decisions. This method connects a regulation to the overall legal system, ensuring that each provision maintains coherence with other norms. For instance, in the Constitutional Court Decision No. 138/PUU-VII/2009, the Court used a systematic approach to interpret its authority to review Government Regulations in Lieu of Laws (*Perppu*). By linking Article 22 of the 1945 Constitution concerning *Perppu* and Article 20 concerning the formation of laws, the Court concluded that *Perppu* could be reviewed against the 1945 Constitution. *Teleological interpretation* is also frequently used by the Constitutional Court in interpreting regulations (Ashari, 2016). This method focuses on the purpose that the law intends to achieve. In the Constitutional Court Decision No. 85/PUU-XI/2013, the Court applied this approach to assess Law No. 7 of 2004 concerning Water Resources. The Court found that several articles in the law contradicted the 1945 Constitution. Considering the goal of protecting water resources for the people, the Court decided to annul the law.

These interpretative methods not only help judges understand the intent behind legal provisions but also provide a strong foundation for legal argumentation in the decision-making process. The *legal argumentation method* is used to construct logical reasoning in resolving a case. An example of this can be seen in the Sleman District Court Decision No. 29/Pid.B/2015/PN.Smn, where the

defendant was initially charged with fraud. However, the judge reasoned that the case was more appropriately categorized as a breach of contract (*wanprestasi*) within civil law, resulting in the defendant's acquittal from the criminal charges (Zhafarina & Ayutama, 2021). In the method of legal argumentation, legal logic becomes a key element. Judges often use facts from the trial as a basis to interpret whether a particular action falls under criminal provisions or another area of law. In the Sleman case, the use of legal argumentation not only led to an appropriate decision but also provided an important lesson regarding the boundary between criminal and civil law. When written law does not provide clarity or there is a legal vacuum, judges often employ the *method of legal exposition*. This method involves *rechtsvinding* (legal discovery) aimed at achieving justice amid the limitations of regulations.

For example, in the Supreme Court Decision No. 29/Pdt.Sus- PKPU/2020/PN.Niaga.Jkt.Pst, the judge faced a bankruptcy case that required legal construction. The judge considered existing regulations, jurisprudence, and legal doctrines to reach a fair decision. In the context of legal exposition, the judge's role is highly significant in creating law that is not only based on the text of legislation but also rooted in the values of justice. In that bankruptcy case, the use of jurisprudence demonstrated how the exposition method can provide solutions amid a legal vacuum. This reflects the flexibility of law while still adhering to the principles of justice (Anthony & Adiasih, 2022). These three methods—interpretation, argumentation, and exposition—are often used together to create more comprehensive legal decisions. The use of interpretation provides historical and systematic foundations, while argumentation builds logical reasoning that strengthens the ruling. On the other hand, exposition allows judges to fill legal gaps in particular cases. In many instances, the integration of these three methods not only helps judges interpret laws but also provides a solid foundation for producing decisions that are relevant to the evolving social and legal context.

Conclusion

The methods of interpretation, argumentation, and exposition hold significant relevance in contemporary legal practice, particularly in addressing the increasing complexity of modern law. Interpretation—whether historical, systematic, or teleological—enables judges to construe legal provisions in accordance with the lawmakers' intent, the broader legal framework, and the objectives to be achieved. This provides a strong foundation for understanding and properly applying the law, as demonstrated in various Constitutional Court decisions that prioritize substantive justice. On the other hand, the method of argumentation assists judges in constructing rational and fact-based legal reasoning, resulting in decisions that are not only fair but also accountable.

Meanwhile, the method of exposition provides judges with the flexibility to fill legal vacuums or address ambiguities within regulations. Through this approach, the law remains relevant in responding to emerging issues brought about by societal change. The integration of these three methods demonstrates that contemporary legal practice is not solely dependent on the literal text of statutes but also involves a creative and dynamic process of legal discovery to

achieve both legal certainty and justice. This makes interpretation, argumentation, and exposition essential and enduring elements in maintaining harmony between the law and the needs of modern society.

Referensi

- Adjie, H. (2023). Legal Study Regarding the Responsibilities of Notaries in Providing Social Services in Accordance with the Implementation of their Position. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(8), e1435–e1435. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i8.1435>
- Al-Fatih, S. (2021). Interpretation of Open Legal Policy by the Constitutional Judges in Judicial Review of Parliamentary Thresholds. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 6(2), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.6.2.2021.231-246>
- Andrianto, F. (2020). Kepastian Hukum dalam Politik Hukum di Indonesia. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 3(1), 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v3i1.114-123>
- Anthony, J., & Adiasih, N. (2022). Argumentasi Hukum Hakim dalam Putusan Nomor: 29/Pdt.Sus-PKPU/2020/PN.Niaga.Jkt.Pst. Terhadap Kasus Perdamaian Kembali pada Proses Kepailitan. *Jurnal Hukum PRIORIS*, 10(2), 139–162. <https://doi.org/10.25105/prio.v10i2.17017>
- Arafat, M. R. (2020). Penerapan Bantuan Hukum dalam Proses Penyidikan dengan Prinsip Accusatoir. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 18(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v18i1.1085>
- Ashari. (2016). Implikasi Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 14/PUU-XI/2013 tentang Pemilihan Umum secara Serentak. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 4(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v4i1.275>
- Batubara, R. (2024). Peranan Interpretasi Hukum dalam Praktik Peradilan di Indonesia. *El-Sirry: Jurnal Hukum Islam Dan Sosial*, 2(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.24952/ejhis.v2i1.11384>
- Faizien, M., Hairullah, H., Karimah, S., Lahmudinnur, L., & Efendy, N. (2025). Pentingnya Legal Drafting dalam Penyusunan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Jurisprudence, Economic and Legal Theory*, 3(2), 1327–1336. <https://doi.org/10.62976/ijijel.v3i2.1117>
- Fitriah, R., & Yusuf, H. (2024). Penerapan Teori-teori Kriminologi dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia: Sebuah Analisis. *Jurnal Intelek Dan Cendekiawan Nusantara*, 1(2), Article 2.
- Gunawan, P. P., Jaezah, M. E., & Rusliansyah. (2020). Argumentasi Hukum Pasal 131 UU Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 Tentang Narkotika Terhadap Seseorang Yang Tidak Mengetahui Adanya Peredaran Narkotika Dalam Satu Rumah Perspektif Keadilan. *Lex Suprema; Jurnal Ilmu hukum*, 2(2), 348–360.
- Hafizhah, A., Leviza, J., & Mulhadi, M. (2024). An Overview of the Principle of Legality: Common Law VS Civil Law. *Ikatan Penulis Mahasiswa Hukum Indonesia Law Journal*, 4(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ipmhi.v4i1.76875>
- Harini, M., & Rahmat, D. (2025). Peran Hakim pada Proses Penemuan Hukum sebagai Upaya Penegakan Keadilan Berdasarkan Kode Etik Hakim. *Journal Evidence Of Law*, 4(1), 207–230. <https://doi.org/10.59066/jel.v4i1.1097>

- Ishak, S. (2023). Logika dan Penalaran Dalam Ilmu Hukum dan Ilmu Hukum Islam. *Jurnal Al-Mizan*, 10(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.54621/jiam.v10i1.581>
- Latif, A. (2010). Tafsir Hakim Terhadap Unsur Melawan Hukum Pasca Putusan MK atas Pengujian UU PTPK. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 7(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk732>
- Lubis, A. E. N., & Fahmi, F. D. (2021). Pengenalan Dan Definisi Hukum Secara Umum (Literature Review Etika). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 2(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v2i6.622>
- Mesah, W., Darma, F. E., & Lawalata, M. (2024). Memahami Logika Berpikir Sebagai Landasan Membangun Argumentasi Yang Kuat. *Jurnal Teologi Injili Dan Pendidikan Agama*, 2(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jutipa.v2i3.330>
- Muhtadi, M. (2015). Problematika Yuridis Sistem Alokasi Hukum dalam Pengawasan Hakim. *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v9no2.596>
- Ningrum, T. (2020). Dinamika Interpretasi Hakim dalam Menetapkan Penetapan Pengangkatan Anak. *Khuluqiyya: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Studi Islam*, 2(1), 108–122. <https://doi.org/10.56593/khuluqiyya.v2i1.42>
- Poernomo, S. L. (2019). Standar Kontrak dalam Perspektif Hukum Perlindungan Konsumen. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 19(1), 109. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2019.V19.109-120>
- Putra, D. R. A., Masyitoh, S., & Huda, U. N. (2024). Relevansi Tantangan Paradigma dan Konsep dalam Penelitian Hukum Kontemporer. *Qanuniya: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 1(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.15575/qanuniya.v1i1.815>
- Qamar, N., & Rezah, F. S. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Hukum: Doktrinal dan Nondoktrinal*. CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn).
- Rahmah, A., & Lubis, F. (2024). Analisis Strategi Hukum dalam Mempercepat Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Putusan Hakim Perdata. *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, 5(02), Article 02. <https://doi.org/10.54209/judge.v5i02.569>
- Sari, R. R. W., Tarigan, A. A., & Nasution, M. S. A. (2023). Ragam Putusan Hakim Tentang Harta Bersama: Analisis Kepastian Hukum Terhadap Putusan Pengadilan Agama Mengenai Harta Bersama di Indonesia. *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum*, 4(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.22225/juinhum.4.2.7569.269-277>
- Setiawan, M. A., & Widowaty, Y. (2024). Justice Collaborator Implementation with Law Effectively Approaches in Indonesia. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 23(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v23i1.3714>
- Sholeh, M. I. S. (2023). Relevansi dan Tantangan Implementasi Hukum Islam dalam Konteks Sosial Masyarakat Modern. *As-Salam: Jurnal Studi Hukum Islam & Pendidikan*, 12(1), 21–57. <https://doi.org/10.51226/assalam.v12i1.484>
- Silalahi, A. D., Mustansyir, R., & Tjahyadi, S. (2025). Rethinking Constitutional Interpretation through Joseph Raz's Analytical Jurisprudence. *Constitutional Review*, 11(1), 233–268. <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev1118>
- Ummah, K. (2004). Pengembangan Konstruksi Metodologi Hukum Islam bagi Perubahan Masyarakat Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, 11(25), Article 25. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol11.iss25.art9>

Zhafarina, A. N., & Ayutama, O. A. (2021). Identifikasi Bentuk Sanksi yang Dijatuhkan Hakim terhadap Penyalahguna Narkotika bagi Diri Sendiri (Studi terhadap Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Yogyakarta dan Pengadilan Negeri Sleman). *Old Website of Jurnal Mimbar Hukum*, 32(3), 346–364. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.46604>