Agreement over a definition of environmental law has proved elusive. Likewise, there has been ongoing intellectual dissatisfaction with the state of the subject. This has led to a situation in which there is little in the way of a constructive discourse about the nature and potential of environmental law. In this paper I argue that such a discourse could be developed by asking a different question – what expertise is required so that someone can be called an environmental lawyer? Answering that question requires the recognition of two different types of expertise – contributory legal expertise and interactional interdisciplinary expertise. I discuss the nature of each of these types of expertise and discuss how their identification provides a firmer intellectual footing for the subject.