

About the Authors

Bruce Anderson's published work has focused on the discovery process in legal reasoning. Recently he has been investigating connections between visual art and law. He is a Professor of Business Law at Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Flavia Carbonell Bellolio is professor of Legal Theory and Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law, University Alberto Hurtado, Chile. She is Director of the Law Department. She is a member of the board of the Chilean Association of Legal and Social Philosophy. She holds a LLM from the Centre for Political and Constitutional Studies, Spain, and a Master in Public Law from the Universidad Carlos III, Madrid, as well as a specialization in Legal Argumentation from the Universidad de Alicante, Spain. Among Carbonell's publications are "Coherence and post-sovereign legal argumentation", In. Menéndez, A. & Fossum, J. (eds.), *Law and Democracy in Neil D. MacCormick's Legal and Political Theory*, Springer, 2011, pp. 159–182; F. Carbonell, R. Letelier, "Principios jurídicos e interpretación democrática del derecho" ("Legal Principles and Democratic Interpretation of Law"), In. F. Carbonell, R. Coloma, R. Letelier (eds.), *Principios Jurídicos. Análisis y Crítica* (Legal Principles. Analysis and Criticism), Santiago, Abeledo Perrot, Thomson Reuters, 2011, pp. 155–184.

Carlos Bernal is a senior lecturer at Macquarie Law School (Sydney, Australia). He has research interests in the fields of jurisprudence, torts, theory of action and constitutional theory. He has published widely in all these fields in seven different languages. His qualifications include a LL.B. from the University Externado of Colombia (Bogota) (1996), a S.J.D. from the University of Salamanca (Spain) (2001) and a M.A. (2008) and a Ph.D. in Philosophy (2011) from the University of Florida (U.S.A).

Thomas Bustamante is a Tenured Adjunct Professor of Legal Theory at the Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil, and a member of the research programme on Legal Theory and Legal Philosophy at the Law School of the same university. From 2008 to 2010, he has been a Lecturer at the University of Aberdeen,

UK, where he still holds an honorary position. Amongst Prof. Bustamante's key publications are his books *Argumentação Contra Legem: A Teoria do Discurso e a Justificação Jurídica nos Casos mais Difíceis* [Contra Legem Legal Arguments: Discourse Theory and Legal Justification in the Hardest Cases], *Teoria do Direito e Decisão Racional: Temas de Teoria da Argumentação Jurídica* [Legal Theory and Rational Decision-Making: Essays on Legal Argumentation], and *Teoria do Precedente: O peso da Jurisprudência na Argumentação Jurídica* [A Theory of Precedent: The Weight of the Case Law in Legal Argumentation].

Christian Dahlman (professor in jurisprudence), **David Reidhav** (assistant professor in jurisprudence) and **Lena Wahlberg** (assistant professor in jurisprudence and medical law) teach legal argumentation at the faculty of law at Lund University (Sweden). They are currently conducting a research project on ad hominem arguments, funded by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet).

Eveline T. Feteris received her Ph.D. in Humanities at the University of Amsterdam. She is an Associate Professor at the Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric and a member of the research programme Argumentation and Discourse and the research school of the International Learned Institute of Argumentation Studies (ILIAS). She is director of the research masters's programme Text and Communication. She is a member of the editorial board of the journal *Argumentation*, the journal *Argumentation in Context* and the journal *Language, Law and Interdisciplinary Practice*. She is a member of the editorial board of the series *Argumentation in Context* of John Benjamins. Among Feteris key publications are *Fundamentals of Legal Argumentation: A Survey of Theories of Justification of Judicial Decisions*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands 1999; E.T. Feteris, H. Kloosterhuis, H.J. Plug, *Argumentation and the application of legal rules*, Amsterdam: Sic Sat, 2009. Address: Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rethoric, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam, Netherlands. Email: e.t.feteris@uva.nl.

Jaap Hage Department Foundations and Methods of Law, University of Maastricht, Maastricht, Netherlands.

Harm Kloosterhuis studied Argumentation Theory (MA and PhD) and Law (LLM). He is lecturer and researcher at the Erasmus School of Law Rotterdam and lecturer at the University of Aruba. His main areas of research are legal argumentation theory, legal theory and speech act theory. His publications include *Reconstructing Interpretative Argumentation in Legal Decisions* (2006) and *Argumentation and the Application of Legal Rules* (2009, co-edited with E.T. Feteris and H.J. Plug). His articles on legal theory and argumentation theory have been published in *Argumentation*, *Ratio Juris* and *Artificial Intelligence and Law*.

Marko Novak is an associate professor of legal theory and constitutional law at the Faculty of Law in Nova Gorica, where he is director of the Legal Theory Department and Vice-Dean for Student Affairs. His major publications in the area of legal argumentation include: *The Promising Gifts of Precedents*. In *Changes in Culture and Techniques of Judicial Decision-Making*. 2003. Priban, J, Roberts, P.,

Young J. (Eds.). Ashgate, Dartmouth Publishing; *Limiting Courts: Toward Greater Consistency of Adjudication in the Civil Law System*. In *Logic, Argumentation and Interpretation*. 2005. Joseph Aguilo-Regla (Ed.). Nomos, Franz Steiner Verlag; *Three Models of Balancing (in Constitutional Review)*. 2010. *Ratio Juris*. Vol. 23, No. 1; *Pravna argumentacija v praksi [Legal Argumentation in Practice]*. 2010. Ljubljana: Planet GV.

Antonino Rotolo CIRSFID, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

Corrado Roversi CIRSFID, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

Frederick Schauer IS David and Mary Harrison Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of Virginia. He is also Frank Stanton Professor of the First Amendment, Emeritus, at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, where he taught from 1990 to 2008, served as Academic Dean and Acting Dean, and also taught at the Harvard Law School. Previously he was Professor of Law at the University of Michigan, and has also been Fischel-Neil Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Chicago, Morton Distinguished Visiting Professor of the Humanities at Dartmouth College, Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Toronto, Distinguished Visitor at New York University, and Eastman Professor and Fellow of Balliol College at Oxford University. A Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and former holder of a Guggenheim Fellowship, Schauer is the author of *The Law of Obscenity* (1976), *Free Speech: A Philosophical Enquiry* (1982), *Playing By the Rules: A Philosophical Examination of Rule-Based Decision-Making in Law and in Life* (1991), *Profiles, Probabilities, and Stereotypes* (2003), and *Thinking Like a Lawyer: A New Introduction to Legal Reasoning* (2009). He was founding co-editor of the journal *Legal Theory*, has served as chair of the Section on Constitutional Law of the Association of American Law Schools and of the Committee on Philosophy and Law of the American Philosophical Association. In 2006 Schauer was author of the Foreword to the Harvard Law Review's Supreme Court issue, and has written numerous articles on freedom of speech and press, constitutional law and theory, evidence, legal reasoning, and the philosophy of law. His books have been translated into Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Turkish, and his scholarship was the subject of a book (*Rules and Reasoning: Essays in Honour of Fred Schauer*, Linda Meyer, ed., Hart Publishing, 1999) and special issues of the *Notre Dame, Connecticut, and Quinnipiac Law Reviews*, *Politeia*, and the *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*.

Jan Sieckmann is Professor for Public Law at the University of Erlangen and Visiting Professor for Constitutional Law and Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law of the University of Buenos Aires. Among Sieckmann's key publications are *Regelmodelle und Prinzipienmodelle des Rechtssystems, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 1990*; *Modelle des Eigentumsschutzes, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 1998*; *El modelo de los principios del derecho, Bogotá, Univ. Externado de Colombia, 2006*; *Recht als normatives System, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 2009*. Also he edited various books on the theory of principles and of balancing, in particular *J. Sieckmann (ed.)*,

Die Prinzipientheorie der Grundrechte. Studien zur Grundrechtstheorie Robert Alexys, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 2007; L. Clérico/J. Sieckmann (Hg.), Grundrechte, Prinzipien und Argumentation. Studien zur Rechtslehre Robert Alexys, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 2009; J. Sieckmann (ed.), Legal Reasoning: The Methods of Balancing, ARSP-Beiheft 124, Stuttgart, Steiner Verlag, 2010.

Giovanni Tuzet is Assistant Professor in Philosophy of Law at Bocconi University. He studied law and philosophy in Turin and Paris and wrote his Ph.D. thesis on Peirce's theory of inference. Formerly post-doc researcher at the universities of Lausanne, Switzerland, and Ferrara, Italy, he teaches at Bocconi Philosophy of Law, Legal Hermeneutics and Legal Argumentation.

He is a member of the editorial board of the series "Argumentation in Context" (John Benjamins). His publications include the book *The Rules of Inference. Inferentialism in Law and Philosophy* (edited with D. Canale, Milan: Egea 2009) and several papers on legal reasoning and legal argumentation in journals like *Ratio Juris*, *Informal Logic*, *Argumentation* and *Analisi e diritto*.

Name Index

A

Alexy, Robert, 23, 27, 31–33, 35, 41, 72, 104, 107, 110, 113, 114, 117–121, 135, 153, 156, 189, 190, 192, 193, 198

B

Bench-Capon, Trevor, 181, 184, 187
Bengoetxea, J., 2–5
Bobbio, Norberto, 29, 33, 38
Boella, Guido, 175
Briggs-Myers, I., 148, 155

D

Daube, David, 22, 24, 25, 28, 33
Dworkin, Ronald, 2, 26, 34, 86, 104, 127, 132, 136, 142, 189, 190, 211

F

Frank, Jerome, 150, 158, 213, 219
Furlan, Boris, 158

G

Gilbert, Margareth, 165
Golding, Martin, 23, 33
Governatori, Guido, 172–174
Grootendorst, Rob, 9, 10, 58, 59, 66, 89
Grossi, Davide, 187
Guastini, Riccardo, 24, 29, 33, 211

H

Hage, Jaap, 135, 139–142, 187, 196
Hart, H.L.A., 35, 105, 129, 153, 163, 180
Houtlosser, P., 80, 81, 87

I

Iguartua Salaverria, Juan, 29, 33

J

Jansen, Henrike, 27, 28, 33
Jung, C.G., 148, 154, 155

K

Kloosterhuis, Harm, 23, 37, 86, 88, 89

L

Lagerspetz, Eerik, 130, 165

M

MacCormick, Neil, 2, 3, 5–7, 12, 24, 27, 34, 37, 71, 72, 75, 77, 107, 121, 130, 147, 153, 156, 160, 163, 166
Maximiliano, Carlos, 24, 29, 39

N

Nino, 29, 33
Novak, Marko, 113, 114, 117
Nowak, Leszek, 30, 33, 38

P

Peczenik, Aleksander, 72, 107, 173, 175, 180, 181
Perelman, Chaïm, 3, 6, 30, 41, 196
Prakken, Henry, 184, 187, 196

R

Ross, Alf, 104, 167
Rotolo, Antonino, 32, 57, 172–175
Roversi, Corrado, 32
Ruiter, Dick, W.P., 130, 165

S

Sartor, Giovanni, 167, 170, 171, 173, 180, 181,
184, 186, 214
Searle, John, R., 31, 104, 131, 164, 165, 171,
186

T

Tuomela, Raimo, 131, 165

V

van der Torre, Leendert, 175
vanEemeren, F.H., 9, 10, 58, 59, 66, 74, 87, 89

W

Wróblewski, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 23

Subject Index

A

- Ad hominem argument
 - negative, 61, 63, 66
 - positive, 61, 66
- Ad hominem fallacy
 - abusive, 63
 - circumstantial, 58
- Adversarialism (and adversary procedures), 212, 213, 221, 222
- Advocacy, 61, 209, 212, 221
- American Legal Realists (ALR), 146, 149–152, 154, 158
- Argumentation in judicial decisions, 5, 73, 75, 82, 174
- Argument form, 23, 30, 62
- Argument referring to consequences, 3, 5, 16, 18
- Argumentum ad absurdum, 21–41
 - context, 22, 27–28, 41
 - foundations, 28–32
 - as instrumental rationality, 38
 - normative significance, 21–41
 - practical requirements, 33–40
 - as a pragmatic argument, 21–40
 - rules of interpretation
 - strictly formal sense, 22, 23
 - structure, 21, 23
- Authority, 5, 31, 33, 34, 41, 58, 66, 78, 95, 103, 108, 149, 151, 203
- Authority argument, 58, 66
- Autonomy, 105, 151, 157, 192, 203

B

- Balancing, 4, 11, 15, 17, 104, 106, 109–111, 113–123, 189–205
- Best theory, arguments to, 184–186

C

- Cognitive functions
 - auxiliary function, 148
 - evaluation, 155
 - inferior function, 148
 - intuition
 - creative intuition, 148, 156, 160
 - hunch, 145, 153, 157, 158, 160
 - instrumental intuition, 148, 156, 160
 - recognition, 156, 158
 - perception, 148, 151, 153, 155–157, 159–161
 - superior function, 148
 - tertiary function, 155
 - thinking, 28, 47, 52, 104, 114, 131, 141, 147–149, 152, 153, 155–158, 160
- Competence, 4, 7, 108, 202, 213, 217
- Concepts, legal and ordinary, 151
- Conceptual holism, 168–170
- Consequentialist arguments, 2, 3, 7, 9–14, 16, 18, 22, 26–27
- Consequentialist reasoning, 1–18, 41
- Constitutive rules, 163–187
- Constructivism, 126–130, 132–143
- Context, 1, 22, 27–28, 38, 41, 53, 63, 64, 71–73, 75, 77, 78, 87, 89, 90, 94, 97–99, 113, 117, 120–123, 145–161, 165, 169, 170, 173, 174, 176, 179–181, 184–187, 193, 209, 211, 216, 221
- Correctness, 7, 16, 18, 32, 41, 46, 48, 52, 59, 74, 103, 107, 109, 116, 127, 128, 132, 158, 192, 195, 203–205, 219
- Counter argument, 17, 57, 58, 61, 62, 66–69, 73, 174, 184, 190, 200, 201, 216
- Credibility, 60, 61, 65, 66, 69
- Critical discussions, 9, 71–82, 89, 91, 93

Critical Legal Studies, 146, 149–150
 Cross-examination, 210, 212, 217, 222

D

Deduction, 6, 189, 190, 192, 194
 Defeasibility, 142, 168–170, 172
 Dialectical analysis, 88–94, 99, 100
 Dialectical goal, 90, 95
 Discovery context, 145–161
 psychology of decision-making, 145, 153

E

Easy cases, 125–127, 133, 140–142, 160, 223
 Evidence, 40, 41, 76, 108, 115, 143, 154, 209,
 212, 213, 215–222
 Expression, 3–6, 8, 12, 15, 113–123, 139, 149,
 156, 174, 204, 216
 Extensive interpretation, 163, 182
 Extra-legal consequences, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13–18

F

Factual claims, 209, 214, 216, 220, 223
 Fallacy, 57–60, 62–70
 Fallibilism, 210, 220–223

H

Hard cases, 5, 126
 Hunch, 150, 156, 158, 160

I

Ignoratio elenchi, 66, 68
 Institutional facts, 80, 169
 Institutional theory of law, 130–133, 142
 Internal justification, 23, 108, 156, 223
 Irrationality
 negative irrationality, 159
 postive irrationality, 159

J

Judgment, 23, 24, 26, 47, 61, 67, 74, 115–117,
 122, 154, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195,
 203–205
 Judgments of value, 113–123, 211
 Juridical consequences, 6, 24, 27, 37, 41
 Justice (substantive), 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 24, 26, 30,
 32, 34–36, 39, 41, 47, 49–51, 53,
 76, 93, 96, 127, 128, 151, 156, 158,
 209, 210, 212–214, 216–221

Justification

deductive justification, 113, 156
 external justification, 16, 23, 156, 223
 internal justification, 23, 108, 156, 223
 second-order justification, 5, 156

Justification context, 159

L

Law as open domain, 137, 138
 Legal consequences, 2–5, 8, 12, 14, 15, 35,
 105, 108, 110, 111, 125–133, 135,
 136, 140–143, 193, 211
 Legal goals, 17, 18
 Legal normativity, 103–111
 Legal norms, 103–111
 Legal principle, 4–6, 11, 72, 85–101, 109, 117,
 131, 136, 148, 156, 158
 Legal proof, 216
Lex commissoria, 35, 36

M

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, 148

N

Nuremberg trials, 67

O

One right answer, 132
 Open texture, 18, 163

P

Poisoning the well, 65
 Postmodernism, 149, 152
 post-postmodernism, 146, 152–154
 Power, normative, 31
 Practical reflective insights, 113, 114, 116–123
 Pragma-dialectical approach, 16, 72–75, 77, 82
 Pragma-dialectical school, 58
 Pragma-dialectical theory, 9, 73, 79, 82, 87,
 89, 95
 Process of deliberation, 116, 117
 Psychological typology
 argument from psychological typology,
 145–161

Q

Questioning, 2, 200

R

- Rationality
 - empirical rationality, 147, 148, 159
 - intellect, 147, 149
 - intuitive rationality, 147, 148
 - ratio, 147–149
 - rational reconstruction, 119–121, 123
 - reason
 - practical reason, 7, 23, 123, 147
 - theoretical reason, 147
 - test of rationality, 118
- Reasonableness and fairness, 85, 86, 88, 91, 92, 94–100
- Recognition, 7, 8, 156, 158
- Red herring, 66
- Regulative rules, 165, 166, 172–176, 180
- Reliability, 58–69, 119
- Restrictive interpretation, 163–187
- Rhetorical goal, 87, 90
- Rule of law, 6, 12–15, 37, 71–82, 217

S

- Scientific inquiry, 209
- Separation between discovery and justification
 - mild separation, 145–161
 - rigid separation, 146, 154
- Speech acts, 32, 33, 41, 75, 78–81, 89, 215
- Statement, 9, 10, 16, 22, 23, 28, 30, 33, 34, 78, 86, 91, 92, 94, 98, 99, 104, 108, 165, 167, 195, 198, 200, 201, 204, 211, 215, 216, 223
- Strategic maneuvering, 85–101

- Subsumtion, 104, 108–111, 121, 189–192, 194, 207

T

- Teleological reasoning, 180, 187
- Testimony, 57, 58, 63, 65, 70, 213, 217
- Theory construction, 1, 127
- Theory revision, 185
- Trial, 57, 128, 166, 209–217, 221, 223
- Truth (and the distinction between Substantive and Formal Truth), 216–220
- Tu quoque, 58, 67

V

- Validity
 - definitive, 197–199, 202, 203
 - objective, 195
 - prima facie, 104
 - in principle, 8
 - procedural, 190, 200–202
 - pro tanto, 198
 - subjective, 195
 - substantive, 200, 201, 205

W

- Weighing and balancing, 113–123
- Weight, abstract, 119, 192
- Weight formula, 118–120, 190, 192
- Witness, 57–62, 65, 68, 70, 76, 151, 217