Contents

Introduction xiii
Mathieu CARPENTIER

Part 1. Methods of Legal Theory 1

Chapter 1. Methodology in Legal Philosophy 3
Julie DICKSON

1.1. Introduction: methodology in legal philosophy 3
1.2. The nature of law? 5
1.3. Changing questions: diversity and development 13
1.4. Directly evaluative legal philosophy versus indirectly evaluative legal philosophy 19
1.5. Conclusion 28

Chapter 2. The Methodology of Analytic Jurisprudence 31
Pierluigi CHIASSONI

2.1. Foreword 31
2.2. The principles of an analytic approach to jurisprudence 32
2.3. The statute of analytic jurisprudence 38
2.4. Two sets of analytic tools 41
2.4.1. Tools for the analysis of legal discourses 42

2.4.2. Tools for the refinement of extant juridical terminological and conceptual apparatuses . . . 48
2.4.3. The tools of analytic jurisprudence and conceptual analysis . . . 52
2.5. Vindicating a modest and reconstructive variety of conceptual analysis . . . 53
2.6. Vindicating the analytic approach (and the principle of simplicity) against "essentialist" jurisprudence . . . 58
2.7. References . . . 68

Chapter 3. Methodology for Theorizing About the Nature of Law and About Doctrinal Areas of Law . . . 75
Brian H. BIX

3.1. Introduction . . . 75
3.2. Theories of the nature of law . . . 75
3.2.1. Increasing philosophical sophistication . . . 76
3.2.2. Hans Kelsen . . . 77
3.2.3. H.L.A. Hart . . . 78
3.2.4. Ronald Dworkin . . . 79
3.2.5. Joseph Raz . . . 80
3.2.6. John Finnis . . . 81
3.2.7. Frederick Schauer . . . 81
3.2.8. Brian Leiter . . . 82
3.2.9. Mark Greenberg . . . 83
3.3. Theories of doctrinal areas . . . 83
3.3.1. Descriptive, prescriptive and neutral . . . 84
3.3.2. Purposes . . . 85
3.3.3. Universal versus parochial . . . 85
3.3.4. The subject of explanation (the data) . . . 86
3.3.5. Justice and autonomy or efficiency . . . 86
3.4. Conclusion . . . 87
3.5. References . . . 87

Chapter 4. Empirical Complexity as a Conceptual Claim: Reappraising Hart's Account of Law as a Complex Social Practice . . . 93
Gregory BLIGH

4.1. Introduction . . . 93
4.1.1. No place for empirical science in Hartian jurisprudence . . . 94

4.1.2. Hart's object: "characterizing" the "complexity" of the legal system . . . 96
4.1.3. Two key sources of influence: J.L. Austin and P.F. Strawson . . . 99
4.1.4. Do the (linguistic) twist . . . 101
4.2. Hart's Austinian account of the quotidian empirical statement . . . 106
4.2.1. A critique of reductive sense-data empiricism . . . 106
4.2.2. Accounting for the complexity of experience . . . 112
4.3. Rejecting the descriptive fallacy . . . 115
4.3.1. A critique of Russell's theory of meaning . . . 116
4.3.2. A rejection of the descriptive fallacy carried over into Hart's jurisprudence . . . 122
4.4. The empirical relevance of the conceptual scheme in *The Concept of Law* . . . 126
4.4.1. "Descriptive metaphysics" and "linguistic phenomenology" . . . 127
4.4.2. Empirical complexity and presupposition in *The Concept of Law* . . . 135
4.5. Conclusion . . . 140
4.6. References . . . 142

Chapter 5. Authoritative Disagreement: Meta-Legal Theory and the Semantics of Adjudication . . . 149
Andrej KRISTAN and Giulia PRAVATO

5.1. Introduction . . . 149
5.2. Explananda . . . 150
5.2.1. Authoritative disagreement in fact-oriented interpretation . . . 150
5.2.2. Authoritative disagreement in text-oriented interpretation . . . 151
5.3. Meta-theoretic demarcation . . . 154
5.3.1. Rule-skeptical legal positivism . . . 155
5.3.2. Conventionalist legal positivism . . . 155
5.3.3. Interpretivist legal antipositivism . . . 156
5.4. Semantic explanations . . . 157
5.4.1. Semantic invariantism . . . 158
5.4.2. Expressivism . . . 159
5.4.3. Indexical contextualism . . . 161
5.4.4. Non-indexical contextualism . . . 164
5.4.5. Dialetheism . . . 164
5.4.6. Content relativism . . . 165
5.4.7. Assessment relativism . . . 166
5.4.8. Truth-value indeterminism . . . 168

5.5. Conclusion 169
5.6. References 170

Chapter 6. Jeremy Waldron, the Legitimacy of Judicial Review and *Political* Political Theory 179
Charles-Maxime PANACCIO

6.1. Introduction. 179
6.2. The first Waldron 180
6.2.1. The circumstances of politics 180
6.2.2. *Political* political theory 181
6.2.3. Rights 182
6.2.4. CRJR 182
6.3. Reviews of the first Waldron 184
6.3.1. The nature of disagreement 184
6.3.2. Substance and results versus process and procedure 185
6.3.3. CRJR 187
6.4. The second Waldron 187
6.5. Conclusion 191
6.6. References 192

Part 2. Metatheory of Legal Science 195

Chapter 7. Metatheory of an (Empirical) Legal Science 197
Eric MILLARD

7.1. General framework: theory, metatheory and metascience 197
7.1.1. Theory and metatheory. 197
7.1.2. A theory of legal science as a metascience 200
7.1.3. A theory of (empirical) legal science 201
7.1.4. A theory of (empirical legal) science as applied metatheory. . . . 205
7.2. (Meta)theoretical theses of an (empirical) legal science. 206
7.2.1. Epistemological thesis 208
7.2.2. Meta-ethical thesis 209
7.2.3. Methodological thesis 212

Chapter 8. Legal and Social Sciences: What are the Links?. 215
Véronique CHAMPEIL-DESPLATS

8.1. Social sciences, a factor in redefining legal sciences 218

8.1.1. Epistemological movements: the positioning of legal sciences between exact, physical and natural sciences and social sciences 218
8.1.2. Heuristic movements: the reinvigoration of legal sciences by the social sciences 221
8.2. The modalities of disciplinary articulations 225
8.2.1. Difficulties and pitfalls 225
8.2.2. Interdisciplinary experiences and the pragmatism of interweaving knowledge 228
8.3. References 231

Chapter 9. A Hermeneutic Reading of Law and Legal Theory: Regarding Paul Ricœur 235
Xavier BIOY and Thomas ESCACH-DUBOURG

9.1. The outcome of a long journey, from the interpretive method to a general epistemology 237
9.1.1. A philosophy of interpretation 237
9.1.2. A hermeneutic of symbols as a propaedeutic of a grand philosophy: the symbol suggests 243
9.2. Hermeneutic and textual disciplines 247
9.2.1. The conceptual break brought about by textual hermeneutics: the paradigm of textuality 248
9.2.2. The methodological break brought about by textual hermeneutics: reading and textual interpretation 253
9.3. Law as a hermeneutical discipline 257
9.3.1. Interpretation of the law: quoting the law and understanding it are one and the same thing 257
9.3.2. Interpretation by law and interpretation in law 260

Chapter 10. Legal Science According to the Pure Theory of Law . . 265
Thomas HOCHMANN

10.1. The negation of legal science (Sander) 267
10.2. The defense of legal science (Merkl) 270
10.3. Legal science pushed into the background (Kelsen) 276
10.3.1. Absence of denial of legal science 277
10.3.2. A theory of law, not of legal science 278
10.3.3. An interest in decision, not knowledge 279
10.3.4. A regression: the theory of the tacit alternative clause 281

Chapter 11. Axiological Neutrality, Oppositional Thinking and Knowledge 285
Jean-Baptiste POINTEL

11.1. The three aspects of a theory 285
11.1.1. Pascal's wager, a textbook case 286
11.1.2. A scientific theory of law 288
11.1.3. A factual analysis of "ought to be" 289
11.2. "Hume's Guillotine", a false foundation for axiological neutrality . . 290
11.2.1. The definition of "Hume's Guillotine", an error of interpretation 290
11.2.2. The meaning of "Hume's Guillotine", explaining its motivations 291
11.2.3. The consequence of "Hume's Guillotine", a return to argument 292
11.2.4. Purity or axiological neutrality, a return to Max Weber. 293
11.2.5. Language acts in John L. Austin, the inevitable fusion between descriptive and prescriptive 294
11.2.6. Platonic reductionism, a problematological repression 295
11.2.7. The importance of the implicit, a more scientific approach . . . 296
11.3. Oppositional commitment to the theory 298
11.3.1. The critical eye, connecting analysis to policy 298
11.3.2. Scientific purity, a political program 299
11.3.3. Methodological anarchism, a basis for research 300
11.3.4. The archaeology of knowledge, a critical method 302
11.3.5. Example: the concept of state tyranny 303
11.3.6. Oppositional knowledge in law, a program to be defined. 304
11.4. A new disciplinary ethics, but for which academic field? 305
11.5. References. 306

Chapter 12. Legal Science and Its Roles in Legal Reasoning 311
Fábio Perin SHECAIRA

12.1. The concept of a source of law. 311
12.1.1. Explicit reference in legal practice 312
12.1.2. Prescriptions that serve as content-independent reasons 313
12.2. Arguments from authority 314
12.3. Types of scholarly authority 316
12.3.1. Describing and prescribing. 316
12.3.2. Can legal science really serve as practical authority? 319
12.3.3. A note on legitimate and de facto authority 323

12.4. Implications for jurisprudence 324
12.5. Conclusion 327
12.6. References. 327

Chapter 13. Inference to the Best Explanation in Legal Science; on Balancing Contrastive Hypotheses 329
David DUARTE

13.1. Normative propositions in legal science 329
13.2. Inference to the best explanation 337
13.3. Speculative (hypothetical) normative propositions and inference to the best explanation 343
13.4. Contrastive hypotheses in balancing 346
13.5. References. 353

List of Authors 359

Index 361