

Review of: "[Research note] Semantic Systems Theory"

Pilar Zambrano¹

¹ University of Navarra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The author purports to deploy/describe "a new form of systems theory". I cannot say how new this semantic theory is in the field of natural sciences but, in the case of Law and social sciences generally considered, it is undoubtedly connected to Ronald Dworkin's theory of legal interpretation ("Law as Integrity", fully explained in Dworkin, R., (1986: *Law's Empire*, Harvard University Press.). Drawing on the critics that have been addressed against Dworkin's theory might be useful for identifying some of the main challenges to all forms of interpretativism. Among these, the most salient one is, perhaps, the obvious tautology consisting in using the system for identifying the role of each "agent-based contribution", and then using the latter for indentifying the former.
2. As Michael Moore has repeatedly marked, there seems to be no other way out of tautology than some kind of semantic realism (see Moore, M., (1985): «A Natural Law Theory of Interpretation», *Southern California Law Review*, 58: 288). The author seems to align with semantic realism, when he affords: "a concept of reality which differentiates between realized roles and their underlying, coherence-providing potential". seems to locate the author in the side of "semantic realism" –according to which the nature of reference takes priority over conventional meaning-. It would be very enlightening (specially for readers coming from the field of social sciences), to explicitly state whether this interpretation is valid or, if not, what other way out does he suggest (if any) to the named tautology.