

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
1.1	A Roadmap . . . . .	1
1.2	Hart and Dworkin on Communication in Law. . . . .	4
1.3	The History of Linguistic Pragmatics . . . . .	6
1.4	Some Remarks Concerning Current Interdisciplinary Approaches to Philosophy of Language, Law and Mind. . . . .	11
	References. . . . .	14
<b>2</b>	<b>The Strategic Principle and the Maxim of Selectivity</b> . . . . .	15
2.1	Outline of the Classical Gricean Project . . . . .	15
2.2	The Cooperative Principle and the Maxims. . . . .	16
2.3	Conversational vs. Conventional Implicatures. . . . .	19
2.4	Intention . . . . .	21
2.5	Generalized and Particularized Conversational Implicatures . . . . .	25
2.6	Some Features of Conversational Implicatures . . . . .	26
2.7	Applying the Classical Gricean Project to the Legal Realm . . . . .	27
2.7.1	The Cooperative Principle in Law . . . . .	29
2.7.2	Strategic Speech. . . . .	29
2.7.3	The Strategic Super-Maxim of Selectivity. . . . .	34
2.7.4	The Clash of the Maxims. . . . .	50
2.7.5	The Strength of Implicature. . . . .	50
2.7.6	Why ‘What Is Said’ Is Not Always Said? . . . . .	51
	References. . . . .	53
<b>3</b>	<b>Post-Gricean Implicature Theories and Their Relevance for the Legal Realm</b> . . . . .	55
3.1	Relevance Theory. . . . .	56
3.2	Relevance Theory and the Legal Discourse. . . . .	61
3.2.1	The Amendments to the Classical Gricean Picture . . . . .	61
3.2.2	Why RT Cannot Be a Sufficient Theory of Legal Pragmatics . . . . .	65

3.3	The Q and R Principles . . . . .	70
3.4	The Q and R Principles in Legal Discourse. . . . .	74
3.5	Q and I Heuristics . . . . .	79
3.6	The Canons of Construction . . . . .	82
3.7	Conclusion . . . . .	87
	References. . . . .	87
<b>4</b>	<b>Propositionalism and the Law . . . . .</b>	<b>89</b>
4.1	The Completeness of Legal Propositions. . . . .	89
4.1.1	Why Is ‘What Is Said’ Not Said?. . . . .	90
4.2	What Can a Theorist of Legal Language Learn from the ‘Border Wars’?. . . . .	100
4.2.1	The Separation of Powers Principle. . . . .	100
4.2.2	The Consequences of Choosing a Stance in the Debate on Propositionalism for the Separation of Powers Principle . . .	103
4.3	Some Famous Examples of Pragmatic Enrichment in the Law. . . .	108
4.4	Baum-Levenbook’s Set of Ordered Norms . . . . .	112
4.5	Conclusion: Strategic Speech and Pragmatic Enrichment. . . . .	115
	References. . . . .	118
<b>5</b>	<b>The Meaning of Law . . . . .</b>	<b>121</b>
5.1	Intention in Natural Language . . . . .	122
5.1.1	The Reductive Program of the Internalist . . . . .	123
5.1.2	The Program of the Externalist . . . . .	126
5.2	Meaning Versus Pragmatics: Some Terminological Clarifications . . . . .	127
5.3	The Gricean Theory of Meaning . . . . .	136
5.4	More Internal Projects . . . . .	137
5.5	More External Projects . . . . .	139
5.6	A Theory of Meaning for Legal Discourse . . . . .	141
5.6.1	Grice on the Meaning of Law . . . . .	141
5.6.2	The Meaning of Legal Texts Is External . . . . .	144
5.6.3	Institutional Intentions Are Not Reducible to Collective Intentionality . . . . .	148
5.6.4	The Functionalist Account of Institutional Intentions . . . . .	152
5.6.5	Externalism in Disguise. . . . .	153
5.7	Conclusion . . . . .	157
	References. . . . .	159
<b>6</b>	<b>The Exchange Between Legislature and Courts: Examples of Strategic Behavior from the Polish Legal System . . . . .</b>	<b>161</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	161
6.2	Criminal Law . . . . .	162
6.3	Civil Law . . . . .	167

Contents	ix
6.3.1 Incapacitation . . . . .	167
6.3.2 Oral Wills . . . . .	169
6.4 Conclusions . . . . .	169
References . . . . .	170
<b>7 General Conclusions . . . . .</b>	<b>171</b>