ways. For example, most semantic ambiguity – in the sense of divergent meanings based on different contexts – is readily resolved by the surrounding text of a legal document; language users are not even aware that there is an ambiguity in the first place. Thus, we know that “bank deposits” almost certainly does not refer to something found near a river bank as long as the statute deals with financial institutions rather than the environment.

3. Contemporary issues. The third catch-all definition (referring to any uncertainty in meaning) is unfortunate because it blurs many different sources of textual uncertainty – such as semantic and syntactic ambiguity, vagueness, open-ended texts, and generality. The better catch-all phrase is linguistic “uncertainty.” See Entry: Ch. 1 – Uncertainty about meaning.

*William D. Popkin, A Dictionary of Statutory Interpretation 11 (Carolina 2007).*

---

**INTERNATIONAL CALLING CARD — THE ANSWER**

Pictured above is the answer to the question we asked on page 154 of the Winter issue. Look for more about the International Judicial Relations Committee in future issues.