

# Contents

<b>Prologue – Marginalia on European Law</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Part I – Law at the Margins</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>European Union and European Identity: Theoretical Approaches in Juridical Logic</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Preliminary notes	9
2. The Ship of Theseus, Leibniz, Hobbes and Alan Gibbard's contingent identity	16
3. The problem of fungibility and European implications of Brexit	24
4. The Lacanian „stade du miroir“ and its implications on European identity	30
5. Identity as becoming and European law	35
6. Conclusions	42
<b>The Perils of a Legal Mind</b>	<b>47</b>
1. Preliminary notes	47
2. Kelsen's distinction between causality and attribution	49
3. From attribution to causality. A genealogy	52
4. Attribution in law and beyond	60
4.1. Attribution within law	61
4.1.1. Roman and private law	61
4.1.2. Objective liability in modern European law	65
4.2. Attribution beyond law	70
4.2.1. Animistic cultures	70
4.2.2. The revival of natural law	74

4.2.3. The hypertrophy of attribution	78
4.2.4. Between law and culture and back	85
5. The discipline and perils of attribution	88
<b>Jure et Haeresi: a Genealogical Analysis</b>	
<b>of Dual sanctions in Law and Religion</b>	<b>96</b>
1. Preliminary notes	96
2. Forms of power: sovereign, pastoral, disciplinary, and biopolitical rationalities	98
2.1. Foucault's typology of power	98
2.2. The early structure and techniques of pastoral power	102
2.3. The concept of heresy	106
3. The Council of Nicaea and the emergence of dual sanctioning	107
3.1. Theoretical analysis of religious and legal sanctions	107
3.2. The historical context of the Council of Nicaea	110
3.3. The emergence of dual sanctioning	113
4. Contradictions of the dual sanction of heresy	117
4.1. Effects of dual sanctioning – jure et haeresi	117
4.2. Structural contradictions of transcendent and immanent sanctions	119
4.3. The crisis of faith in transcendent sanctions	125
5. Conclusions	127
<b>The Exteriority of Law: Phenomenology</b>	
<b>of Interruption and Lived Synecdoche</b>	<b>133</b>
1. Introduction	133

---

2. Law and meaning: from structure to experience	137
2.1. Structural conditions of exteriority	137
2.1.1. Kelsen: law as abstract and autonomous order	137
2.1.2. Luhmann: law as code and autopoietic system	140
2.2. Meaning from exteriority	142
2.2.1. The limits of legality for lived meaning	142
2.2.2. The empty form of a legal life	145
2.3. Encountering exteriority: the double movement across distance	155
2.3.1. The phenomenology of interruption	155
2.3.2. The lived synecdoche	162
3. Exteriority and its jurisprudential critics	168
3.1. Hart: the internal point of view	168
3.2. Dworkin: integrity and principle	171
3.3. Fuller: the inner morality of law	175
3.4. The persistence of distance	178
4. Nietzsche: genealogy, aesthetics, and exteriority	181
4.1. Law within a wider normative horizon	181
4.2. Ressentiment: master–slave morality	183
4.3. Law and the triumph of reactive life	185
4.4. The reinscription of exteriority	188
5. Closing the circle	190
5.1. The return of normativity	190
5.2. The inevitability of exteriority	193
6. Conclusions	195

## **Part II – Forms of Legal Reasoning \_\_\_\_\_ 205**

### **Legal Logic, Aporia and Structured Openness:**

#### **Reframing Interpretation in Law \_\_\_\_\_ 205**

1. Introduction \_\_\_\_\_ 205
2. Divergent theories and traditional legal methods  
of interpretation \_\_\_\_\_ 212
  - 2.1. Structured legalism: Hans Kelsen and  
interpretation as normative derivation \_\_\_\_\_ 213
  - 2.2. Iterative hermeneutics: Jacques Derrida and  
interpretation as creative rearticulation \_\_\_\_\_ 216
  - 2.3. Theoretical assumptions of traditional legal  
methods of interpretation \_\_\_\_\_ 220
3. Legal logic: mediating aporias in interpretation \_\_\_\_\_ 226
  - 3.1. Reframing traditional interpretive methods  
by the two divergent theories \_\_\_\_\_ 226
  - 3.2. Legal logic as a meta-theoretical framework \_\_\_\_\_ 234
  - 3.3. Formal logical instruments for modeling legal  
interpretation \_\_\_\_\_ 240
4. Conclusions \_\_\_\_\_ 249

### **The Defeasible Judicial Syllogism I:**

#### **A First-Order Logic Integration of**

#### **Non-Monotonicity in Adjudication \_\_\_\_\_ 258**

1. Introduction \_\_\_\_\_ 258
2. Logical analysis of deductive inferences  
or reasoning \_\_\_\_\_ 261
  - 2.1. Hypothetical deductive inferences \_\_\_\_\_ 263
  - 2.2. Disjunctive deductive inferences \_\_\_\_\_ 265
  - 2.3. Categorical deductive inferences \_\_\_\_\_ 269
3. The judicial syllogism \_\_\_\_\_ 275

4. The grounding of judicial syllogism and non-monotonic logic _____	280
4.1. The grounding of the major premise _____	281
4.2. The grounding of the minor premise _____	282
4.3. Qualifying the minor premise _____	283
4.4. Non-monotonic logical steps for developing the judicial syllogism _____	285
5. Conclusions _____	288

## **The Defeasible Judicial Syllogism II: Qualification**

### **Gates and Priority in an Engine-Neutral, Finitely**

<b>Grounded Non-Monotonic Logic _____</b>	<b>292</b>
1. Preliminary notes _____	292
2. Framing the problem _____	296
2.1. The blind spot in the judicial syllogism _____	296
2.2. Why the judicial syllogism needs defeasibility _____	300
3. Semantics and notation _____	305
3.1. Semantic stance _____	305
3.2. Notational conventions _____	307
4. The judicial syllogism revisited _____	310
4.1. Formal schema and defeasible reading _____	310
4.2. Qualification gate (admissibility) _____	313
4.3. Jørgensen's dilemma and a hybrid resolution _____	315
5. From premises to applicability: where non-monotonicity enters _____	320
5.1. Grounding the major premise _____	321
5.2. Grounding the factual base (the dynamic minor): evidence and procedural constraints _____	324

---

5.3. Qualification and defeaters: subject status, conduct match, and undercutters _____	325
5.4. Integrating non-monotonic reasoning: priority, defeat, and dynamic conclusions _____	326
5.5. Worked example: Force majeure in contract law _____	331
6. Conclusions _____	334
<b>Presumptions in the Architecture of Legal Logic _____</b>	<b>340</b>
1. Introduction _____	340
2. The legal logic of presumptions _____	341
3. Elements of classical formal logic applicable to presumptions _____	347
4. Elements of probability logic applicable to presumptions _____	355
4.1. Applying probability logic _____	357
4.2. Bayes' Theorem and presumptions _____	358
4.3. Examples _____	359
4.4. Case law illustration _____	360
5. Conclusions _____	363