

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	xiii
Mathieu CARPENTIER	
<b>Part 1. Legal Theory Methods</b> . . . . .	1
<b>Chapter 1. Methodology in Legal Philosophy</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 2. The Methodology of Analytic Jurisprudence</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 3. Methodology for Theorizing About the Nature of Law and About Doctrinal Areas of Law . . . . .</b>	<b>75</b>
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
<b>Chapter 4. Empirical Complexity as a Conceptual Claim: Reappraising Hart’s Account of Law as a Complex Social Practice . . . . .</b>	<b>93</b>
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 <i>The Concept of Law</i> . . . . .	126
4.4.1. “Descriptive metaphysics” and “linguistic phenomenology” . . .	127
4.4.2. Empirical complexity and presupposition in <i>The Concept of Law</i> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 6. Jeremy Waldron, the Legitimacy of Judicial Review and <i>Political</i> Political Theory . . . . .</b>	<b>179</b>
Charles-Maxime PANACCIO	
6.1. Introduction. . . . .	179
6.2. The first Waldron . . . . .	180
6.2.1. The circumstances of politics . . . . .	180
6.2.2. <i>Political</i> 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
<b>Part 2. Legal Science Theories . . . . .</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>Chapter 7. Metatheory of an (Empirical) Legal Science . . . . .</b>	<b>197</b>
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
<b>Chapter 8. Legal and Social Sciences: What are the Links? . . . . .</b>	<b>215</b>
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
<b>Chapter 9. A Hermeneutic Reading of Law and Legal Theory: Regarding Paul Ricœur . . . . .</b>	<b>235</b>
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
<b>Chapter 10. Legal Science According to the Pure Theory of Law . .</b>	<b>265</b>
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

<b>Chapter 11. Axiological Neutrality, Oppositional Thinking and Knowledge</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 12. Legal Science and Its Roles in Legal Reasoning</b> . . . . .	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
<b>Chapter 13. Inference to the Best Explanation in Legal Science; on Balancing Contrastive Hypotheses</b> . . . . .	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
<b>List of Authors</b> . . . . .	359
<b>Index</b> . . . . .	361