

Contents

1 Reasoning by Consequences: Applying Different Argumentation Structures to the Analysis of Consequentialist Reasoning in Judicial Decisions	1
Flavia Carbonell	
2 On the <i>Argumentum ad Absurdum</i> in Statutory Interpretation: Its Uses and Normative Significance	21
Thomas Bustamante	
3 Why Precedent in Law (and Elsewhere) Is Not Totally (or Even Substantially) About Analogy	45
Frederick Schauer	
4 Fallacies in <i>Ad Hominem</i> Arguments	57
Christian Dahlman, David Reidhav, and Lena Wahlberg	
5 The Rule of Law and the Ideal of a Critical Discussion	71
Harm Kloosterhuis	
6 Strategic Maneuvering with the Argumentative Role of Legal Principles in the Case of the “Unworthy Spouse”	85
Eveline T. Feteris	
7 Legal Argumentation and the Normativity of Legal Norms	103
Carlos Bernal	
8 Weighing and Balancing in the Light of Deliberation and Expression	113
Bruce Anderson	
9 Construction or Reconstruction? On the Function of Argumentation in the Law	125
Jaap Hage	

10 The Argument from Psychological Typology for a Mild Separation Between the Context of Discovery and the Context of Justification 145
Marko Novak

11 Constitutive Rules and Coherence in Legal Argumentation: The Case of Extensive and Restrictive Interpretation 163
Antonino Rotolo and Corrado Roversi

12 Is Balancing a Method of Rational Justification *sui generis*? 189
Jan Sieckmann

13 Arguing on Facts: Truth, Trials and Adversary Procedures 207
Giovanni Tuzet

About the Authors 225

Name Index 229

Subject Index 231