

# Legal Argument



# Legal Argument

The Structure and Language of Effective Advocacy

THIRD EDITION

James A. Gardner

Christine P. Bartholomew



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2020  
James A. Gardner and Christine P. Bartholomew  
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Gardner, James A., 1959- author. | Bartholomew, Christine P., author.  
Title: Legal argument : the structure and language of effective advocacy / by James A. Gardner, Christine Bartholomew.  
Description: Third edition. | Durham, North Carolina : Carolina Academic Press, LLC, [2020]  
Identifiers: LCCN 2020009514 | ISBN 9781531017279 (paperback) | ISBN 9781531017286 (ebook)  
Subjects: LCSH: Trial practice--United States. | Communication in law--United States.  
Classification: LCC KF8915 .G28 2020 | DDC 347.73/52--dc23  
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020009514>

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, North Carolina 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

# Table of Contents

Online Materials	xiii
Preface to the Third Edition	xv
Preface to the Second Edition	xvii
Introduction	xix

## PART I

### The Basic Method

<b>Chapter 1 · The Syllogism Model</b>	<b>3</b>
Synopsis	3
§ 1.1 Introduction	3
§ 1.2 Syllogisms	4
§ 1.3 The Power of Syllogistic Reasoning	5
§ 1.4 Legal Arguments as Syllogisms	7
§ 1.5 The Incompleteness of the Analogy Approach	8
<b>Chapter 2 · Determining Your Conclusion from Your Position</b>	<b>11</b>
Synopsis	11
§ 2.1 What Should I Argue?	11
§ 2.2 The Elements of a Presumptive Position	12
§ 2.3 The Adversary System: A Sorting Mechanism	13
§ 2.4 Determining Your Presumptive Positions	14
§ 2.5 Actual Positions	16
§ 2.6 The Core Position: Relief	17
[2.6.1] Ultimate Relief in the Case	17
[2.6.2] Relief Sought in a Motion	17
§ 2.7 Converting Positions into Syllogisms	18
§ 2.8 The Need to Commit to a Position	19

<b>Chapter 3 · Building the Premises</b>	<b>21</b>
Synopsis	21
§ 3.1 Introduction	21
§ 3.2 The Premises Must Yield the Desired Conclusion	22
§ 3.3 All Terms Must Match	22
§ 3.4 The Specification of Any Two Terms Specifies the Third	24
§ 3.5 The Premises Must Be True	25
§ 3.6 A Recursive Process	26
§ 3.7 The Indeterminacy of Law	29
<b>Chapter 4 · Grounding the Premises</b>	<b>31</b>
Synopsis	31
§ 4.1 The Requirement of Grounding	31
§ 4.2 Directly Grounded Premises	32
§ 4.3 Indirect Grounding through Nested Syllogisms	33
§ 4.4 Multiple Grounding	37
§ 4.5 Grounding in Controversial First Principles	38
PART II	
<b>Elements of Persuasive Legal Argument</b>	
<b>Chapter 5 · Read to Build</b>	<b>43</b>
Synopsis	43
§ 5.1 Introduction	43
§ 5.2 Instrumental Reading	44
§ 5.3 Active Reading	47
[5.3.1] Attend to Context	47
[5.3.2] Keep First Impressions Provisional	49
[5.3.3] Self-Challenge	50
§ 5.4 The Ultimate Skill: Active Instrumental Reading	50
<b>Chapter 6 · The Major Premise</b>	<b>53</b>
Synopsis	53
§ 6.1 Introduction	53
§ 6.2 The Basic Strategy	54
§ 6.3 Establishing Certainty of Authoritativeness	55
[6.3.1] Sources of Authority	55
[A] Binding Authority	55

[B] Hierarchies of Binding Authority	55
[C] Non-Binding Authority	56
[6.3.2] Direct Grounding in Targeted Authority	56
[A] Quote Statutes or Cite Their Interpretations	57
[B] Cite Case Authority	58
[C] Use Multiple Sources of Authority	59
[6.3.3] Indirect Grounding of the Major Premise	61
§6.4 Establishing Certainty in Content	63
[6.4.1] Using Tests	64
[6.4.2] Using Step Analysis	66
[6.4.3] Using Factor Analysis	66
[A] Multifactor Analysis	66
[B] Spectrum Tests	67
[C] Balancing Tests	68
§6.5 A Factor Analysis Can Always Be Extracted	70
<b>Chapter 7 · The Minor Premise</b>	<b>73</b>
Synopsis	73
§7.1 Introduction	73
§7.2 Establishing Certainty of Authoritativeness	74
[7.2.1] Ground Factual Assertions in Evidence	74
[7.2.2] Types of Evidence	76
[7.2.3] Appeals to Common Sense	77
§7.3 Establish Certainty of Content by Using Brute Facts	78
[7.3.1] Brute Facts and Compound Facts	78
[7.3.2] Break Down Compound Facts into Brute Facts	79
§7.4 Elaborate Key Legal Terms	81
[7.4.1] Legal Aspects of the Minor Premise	81
[7.4.2] Identify the Key Terms	81
[7.4.3] Tell the Judge: “Here’s How You Know It When You See It”	82
§7.5 A Warning: Conclusory Arguments	85
[7.5.1] The Problem of Conclusory Arguments	85
[7.5.2] How to Cure Conclusory Argument: The “Why? Why? Why?” Test	86
§7.6 A Grounded Minor Premise Guides Factual Development	87
<b>Chapter 8 · Summary of the Method</b>	<b>89</b>

## PART III

**Putting It All Together**

<b>Chapter 9 · Building a Complete Argument</b>	<b>95</b>
Synopsis	95
§9.1 Introduction: What Do I Think, and Why?	95
§9.2 Example 1: Opposing a Rule 15(a) Motion	96
[9.2.1] The Problem	96
[9.2.2] The Facts	96
[9.2.3] The Law	97
[9.2.4] The Argument	99
§9.3 Example 2: Endangered Species Act Violation	104
[9.3.1] The Problem	104
[9.3.2] The Facts	104
[9.3.3] The Law	105
[9.3.4] The Argument	107
§9.4 Troubleshooting	112

## PART IV

**Writing a Legal Argument**

<b>Chapter 10 · Writing a Legal Argument</b>	<b>117</b>
Synopsis	117
§10.1 A Formula for Writing Arguments	118
§10.2 Elements of the Formula	119
[10.2.1] The Set-Up	119
[A] Identification of the Target	119
[B] State the Conclusion	120
[10.2.2] Setting Out the Law	121
[A] Identify and Introduce the Relevant Doctrine or Provision	121
[B] Explicate the Law	121
[C] Set Out the Controlling Test, Step Analysis or Factor Analysis	122
[10.2.3] Apply the Law to the Facts	123
[10.2.4] Bolster with Analogous Precedent	125



§ 10.3 Clarity Always Takes Precedence	128
§ 10.4 An Example of Reducing an Argument to Writing	128
[10.4.1] The Outline	128
[10.4.2] The Brief	129
<b>Chapter 11 · Don't Forget the Story</b>	<b>133</b>
Synopsis	133
§ 11.1 Writing an Argument: A New Enterprise	133
§ 11.2 Tell a Good Story	135
[11.2.1] Begin at the Beginning	135
[11.2.2] Introduce Things before Discussing Them	136
[11.2.3] Give the Basic Facts	136
[11.2.4] Use Detail to Paint a Vivid Picture	138
[11.2.5] Better to Say Too Much than Too Little	138
[11.2.6] When Clarity Is Persuasion	139
<b>Chapter 12 · Common Problems of Written Legal Advocacy and How to Avoid Them</b>	<b>141</b>
Synopsis	141
§ 12.1 Problems of Storytelling	142
[12.1.1] Stress What Is, Not How We Know	142
[12.1.2] Poor Quoting Practices	144
[12.1.3] Give a Roadmap in the Introduction	146
[12.1.4] Explain Changes of Subject or Focus	147
§ 12.2 Lack of Structure ("String of Beads")	148
§ 12.3 Conclusory Argument	150
[12.3.1] What Is Conclusory Argument?	151
[12.3.2] Where Can an Argument Be Conclusory?	152
[12.3.3] Recognizing Conclusory Arguments in Context: The Problem of "Heft"	153
[12.3.4] The Basic Fix: Take Your Time	154
[12.3.5] An Example of Unpacking a Conclusory Argument	156
[12.3.6] Avoid Overcompression	158
[12.3.7] Don't Rush Analogies	158
[12.3.8] You Have Enough Pages	159

## PART V

**Advanced Techniques of Persuasive Legal Argument**

<b>Chapter 13 · Special Problems of Legal Advocacy</b>	<b>163</b>
Synopsis	163
§ 13.1 The Big Case	163
§ 13.2 No Controlling Authority	165
[13.2.1] The Nature of the Problem	165
[13.2.2] Grounding the Argument in First Principles	166
[13.2.3] Justice, Morality, and Policy	167
<b>Chapter 14 · Responding to Arguments</b>	<b>169</b>
Synopsis	169
§ 14.1 Affirmative and Responsive Arguments	169
§ 14.2 Treat Your Opponent’s Arguments Respectfully	171
§ 14.3 Three Ways to Respond	172
[14.3.1] Denial	172
[14.3.2] Shifting Ground: Confession and Avoidance	174
[14.3.3] Ignoring Arguments	175
§ 14.4 Avoid Passivity	176
[14.4.1] Failure to Take Charge	176
[14.4.2] Reluctance to Accuse	178
[14.4.3] Passive Language	178
§ 14.5 Organizing Responses	179
<b>Chapter 15 · Common Tactics and Rhetorical Techniques of Effective     Written Advocacy</b>	<b>181</b>
Synopsis	181
§ 15.1 Presenting the Law	182
[15.1.1] Backing Up Legal Contentions	182
[A] Pile It On	183
[B] Show Stability through Recency and Consistency	186
[C] Universal Consensus	187
[15.1.2] Calling Attention to the Legal Standard	188
[15.1.3] Exceptions to Controlling Rules	189
[15.1.4] Providing the Court with an Escape Route	191
§ 15.2 Ways of Talking and Framing	192
[15.2.1] Use a “Hook”	192
[15.2.2] Get There First	193

[15.2.3] Don't Ask Questions, Give Answers	194
[15.2.4] The "Shared Struggle"	194
[15.2.5] Use the Language of Fallback Arguments	195
[15.2.6] Stretch or Contract the Facts to Suit Your Purpose	196
[15.2.7] Build Up to Tear Down	198
§ 15.3 What to Emphasize	200
[15.3.1] Allocate Space Proportional to Importance	200
[15.3.2] Don't Write a Treatise	201
[15.3.3] Don't Make an Argument So Brief It Seems Like an Afterthought	202
[15.3.4] Don't Make the Other Side's Case	202
[15.3.5] Stress I Win, Not You Lose	203
[15.3.6] Don't Stress Anticipatory Rebuttals	204
[15.3.7] Don't Concede, Just Move On	205
<b>Chapter 16 · Professionalism in Advocacy</b>	<b>207</b>
Synopsis	207
§ 16.1 Maintain Your Own Credibility	208
[16.1.1] Show You're Not Making It Up	208
[16.1.2] Be Accurate: Check Your Work	209
[16.1.3] Deliver What You Promise	210
[16.1.4] Maintain Stamina throughout the Brief	210
§ 16.2 Be Fair and Generous toward the Opponent	211
§ 16.3 Never Attack a Court or a Judge	212
§ 16.4 The Author Does All the Work (Not the Court)	213
<b>Chapter 17 · The Ethical Limits of Argument</b>	<b>215</b>
Synopsis	215
§ 17.1 The Ethical Dilemma	215
§ 17.2 Official Constraints	216
§ 17.3 Good Faith	217
[17.3.1] Bad Faith: It's False	217
[17.3.2] Bad Faith: No One Could Believe It	217
[17.3.3] Good Faith: Winners and Losers	218
[17.3.4] Maintaining Your Sense of Good Faith	219
§ 17.4 The Settlement Option	220
<b>Index</b>	<b>221</b>



# Online Materials

Additional content for *Legal Argument: The Structure and Language of Effective Advocacy* (Third Edition) is available on Carolina Academic Press's *Core Knowledge for Lawyers* (CKL) website.

*Core Knowledge for Lawyers* is an online teaching and testing platform that hosts practice questions and additional content for both instructors and students.

To learn more, please visit:

[coreknowledgeforlawyers.com](http://coreknowledgeforlawyers.com)

Instructors may request complimentary access through the “Faculty & Instructors” link.



# Preface to the Third Edition

In the twenty-seven years since *Legal Argument's* initial release, legal education has changed—as have the students we educate. Few professors still adhere to the traditional format of the law school class, with its purely Socratic lectures and single exam at the term's end. Instead, law schools are integrating more experiential, skills-based teaching. Incremental assessments, recursive learning, and opportunities for feedback are increasingly the hallmarks of a well-designed law class. Partly, this change in legal education stems from a differing student population. Few of today's first year law students come armed with a wealth of experience in logic, rhetoric, or analysis. Most do bring, though, a healthy willingness to work hard and learn.

We revised *Legal Argument* with these changes in mind. The third edition remains true to its initial design: it still is intentionally short and focused squarely on argument construction. It retains the five-part structure from the second edition, which starts by introducing syllogistic reasoning and then builds on that core structure to address principles of argument development and advanced persuasive writing.

The revisions flesh out this structure. We added a chapter on critical reading skills, to provide students a solid starting point for building legal arguments. We expanded the examples and explanations throughout to aid students in making the connections necessary to construct complex legal arguments.

Perhaps most helpful, though, are the new supplements to the book. The third edition is now accompanied by an interactive online platform. This platform includes numerous exercise sets. Each set corresponds with a particular chapter. The exercises are self-paced and allow students to self-assess their skill development. This edition also includes a teacher's memo with additional exercises, PowerPoint slides, and supplemental materials. These materials offer more fodder for hands-on experience with argument development.

Finally, with the third edition comes a new co-author. We have spent countless hours over the last decade talking about teaching. This revised edition reflects many of those conversations. It has been a pleasure working with and learning from Jim.

Jim and I are indebted to many people who assisted in this redesign. Thank you to our colleagues who offered ideas and feedback throughout this process. Special thanks to our students from whom we constantly learn how to be better teachers. From our research assistants (Ben Holwitt, Andrew Kij, and Nicolas Pistory), who kindly agreed to serve as guinea pigs for the online platform exercises, to the thousands of students we have taught, thank you.

More personally, thank you most to Mark, Clara, and Hank. You make life better.

CPB  
Buffalo, NY  
2020



# Preface to the Second Edition

In the fifteen years since I wrote the first edition of this book, a new generation of law students has appeared, with different strengths, weaknesses, and outlooks than their predecessors. Teaching these students how to litigate has forced me to alter my own approach to teaching legal argument, and has convinced me that a new edition of this book is now necessary.

The cohort of students for whom I originally developed this material seemed to need help mainly with the construction of legal arguments. Many of them got stuck right at the starting line, but once they got over the initial hump by jump-starting an argument, they often could take things from there. Today's students still often get stuck at the same initial point, but I also find them getting hung up more than their predecessors at another point in the advocacy process: at the point where it comes time to translate their conceptual arguments into well-written briefs.

Consequently, this edition of *Legal Argument* retains at its core the syllogistic method of argument construction as the basic vehicle of instruction. However, because today's students need more direct instruction in how effectively to present in writing a well-constructed legal argument, the main changes I have made in this edition are directed primarily at providing more information and instruction concerning how to write a good legal argument once it has been constructed.

Those who have used the book before will find the first eight chapters virtually unchanged from the first edition, except that Chapter 8 now includes an additional example of how to construct a complete argument, this one drawn from a complex statutory scheme, the Endangered Species Act. The formula for and extended example of briefwriting likewise remain the same, and are now contained in Chapter 10.

The new material appearing for the first time in this edition is designed to supplement the account of how to build an argument by providing much more information about how to write an argument. Chapter 9 openly and expressly distinguishes the enterprise of constructing an argument from the enterprise of writing it, a subject that was treated in the first edition mainly through implication, and goes on to offer direct, easily digested advice on how to tell a good story. Chapter 11 contains substantial new advice on how to avoid the most common problems of briefwriting. Chapter 14 also is new, and deals with several advanced techniques of legal writing including how to present the law persuasively, how to frame issues effectively, and what to emphasize (or not) in the course of a written argument. Finally, Chapter 15 deals with maintaining professionalism in advocacy, a topic that anyone who has taught legal writing to law students in the last five or ten years knows requires separate and emphatic presentation.

Many people have helped me in ways too numerous to recount with the development of the material in this book, but I owe by far the biggest debt of gratitude to the hundreds of students who over the years have taken my classes in Litigation Practice, Federal Litigation, and Environmental Litigation. They, more than anyone else, taught me how to teach this subject.

JAG  
Buffalo, NY  
July 17, 2007

# Introduction

*“So you want to be a lawyer? It’s easy. Here’s a problem. Go out and do the research. Then come up with some arguments. Then write them down in a brief. Have a nice day.”*

If this is how you experience law school, you are not alone. Many students experience their legal education primarily as a disjointed series of exposures to apparently unconnected bodies of substantive law, threaded together badly, or not at all, by haphazard exposure to some unarticulated common methodology. There is *something* we do in all those classes that is the same—but what is it? Nobody ever seems to come right out and identify or explain the common enterprise.

But just what is it that law students aren’t being taught? By the end of the first year most law schools have done a reasonably creditable job of teaching students how to read legal materials and extract from them the relevant rules of law. Most law schools also do a good job of teaching students how to perform research in legal materials; within a few months students usually can navigate online legal sources and do basic research. Law schools also give students at least some early exposure to the practice of legal writing. So what’s missing?

For students who feel confused by their legal education, the missing part often lies in the middle. These students can read and understand cases and statutes, and they can write up and defend sound legal arguments. The difficulty lies in *producing* the arguments. I can read and understand the cases,

they say to themselves, and I would be delighted to write a brief making the best possible arguments, but what are those arguments? How do I identify them? How do I build an argument that is sound, and persuasive, and well-fortified against attack? Cases and statutes don't yield this information. Once you have assembled them, they just lie there, inertly, on the desk. How, the ambitious law student wants to know, do I make those little suckers stand up and dance?

If you are with us so far, then this book is for you. The book has two main purposes. The first is to explain how lawyers construct legal arguments. In this regard, the book is meant to be a purely practical guide to the seemingly mysterious process by which lawyers take the raw materials of litigation—cases, statutes, testimony, documents, common sense—and mold them into instruments of persuasive advocacy. The book's second purpose is to explain how to take a well-constructed legal argument and present it, in writing, in a way that legal decision makers will find persuasive. The book, in other words, is concerned with how to (1) build and (2) present winning legal arguments.

We must stress immediately that these are two very different skills. *Building* an argument is a feat of architecture and craftsmanship. The goal of argument-building is to construct something that is solid and well-made, that sits on stable foundations, that will weather harsh conditions, and which can therefore be used with confidence. *Writing* arguments, in contrast, is a task of salesmanship; its goal is to persuade a judge to rule for your client. There is no necessary connection between the skills of construction and sales. In most lines of work, designers do not also sell their products: architects build houses and realtors sell them; engineers design cars for sale by dealers. The capable lawyer, in contrast, must master both kinds of skills.

There is, however, one important connection between building and writing arguments, between construction and sales: it is easier to sell a well-made product. Someone who has a quality product can sell it simply by showing it, clearly and honestly, to the buyer; the seller has nothing to hide and everything to reveal. When the buyer is knowledgeable—like a judge—a truly fine product sells itself. The seller of an inferior product, in contrast, must conceal poorly constructed features, direct the buyer's attention away from the product's weaknesses, and rely on puffing and other forms of deception to close the deal. Consequently, this book emphasizes heavily the construction of arguments that are not flashy and clever, but merely coherent and solidly grounded—arguments that plod on, point by point, clearly and relentlessly, to the finish line. Such arguments are the true workhorses of legal practice.

But what about those flashy arguments—the clever one-liners, the brilliant, discussion-stopping retorts? The truth is that they don't exist. Our combined decades of teaching have convinced us that many students make their way through law school suffering from a fundamental misimpression of what successful legal argument is all about. They seem to believe that winning is simply a matter of finding just the right argument—that out there in the universe of all possible arguments lies the one argument that, if only they can find it, will by its mere utterance, in a single, satisfying blow, utterly devastate the other side and thereby win the case. This, some students seem to believe, is what law professors really know, and what they are hiding from their students.

This belief is false, though the impulse to believe is understandable. Wouldn't we all like to know, like Harry Potter, the incantation for a spell that paralyzes our opponents, or to be able, like Mr. Spock on the old *Star Trek* television show, to pinch people's necks so that they slump instantly into unconsciousness? Once we acquire knowledge of this sort we become unbeatable. Who wouldn't want to be initiated into such mysteries? In the actual practice of law, however, as in most areas of life, disputes are almost never settled by the delivery of a decisive, knockout blow. Legal fights usually go the distance, and are won on points. The winner is the contestant who is fitter, better prepared, and more determined, and who lands the most good blows. That is why this book focuses on craft—the craft of constructing legal arguments that are sound, sturdy, and coherent. Those are the kinds of arguments that persuade judges and win cases.

The centerpiece of the book is a step-by-step method, based on the construction of syllogisms, designed to walk the advocate through the process by which such a winning argument may be crafted. Before introducing this method in Part I, however, we need to issue a warning lest the reader misconstrue the book's method as the very kind of magic bullet we have just claimed does not exist. Unlike a spell or secret grip, the book's method does not save the user work, thereby making effective advocacy easier. On the contrary, it *creates* work, making advocacy harder, though in the end more effective. It does this by forcing advocates to think through issues that they might not otherwise consider, and to do so thoroughly and systematically. In doing this, the method enforces a kind of discipline to which all good advocates inevitably must adhere, though many of them do it intuitively rather than by following a protocol laid out in the pages of a book.

So just what issues does this protocol force people to contemplate that they might otherwise overlook? It forces advocates to conduct a kind of research *within themselves*. It forces them, in other words, to figure out *what they think*.

Law schools invest substantial time and resources in teaching students directly and explicitly how to conduct research in case law, statutes, administrative regulations, and other legal materials. This is research students conduct outside themselves, as it were, to assemble information for use in legal advocacy. But there is another resource in which advocates must do substantial research before they can mount a good legal argument: they must look, carefully and deeply, within themselves to figure out what they think about the legal question under investigation, and, more importantly, why they think it. It is easy enough to blurt out what you think, and every advocate must do so. It is quite another thing, however, to know *why* you think what you think, and it is the ability to analyze and effectively defend the subterranean infrastructure of one's beliefs that in advocacy distinguishes the good from the mediocre. The students who get most roughed up in a Socratic law school class—and the lawyers who get most roughed up in court—are the ones who know what they think, but not why they think it. These are the people who can always answer the first question, but never the second.

The method of argument construction set out in this book is nothing more than a heuristic that forces advocates to do the necessary internal research. Indeed, the entire first seven chapters of this book amount to nothing more than an elaborate exhortation to advocates to keep asking themselves “Why do I think that?” over and over, until the question eventually becomes pointless and can no longer be answered. If you already know how to do this—to ask yourself “why?” until you reach the absolute end of the line—then you probably don't need to read any further.

For those who choose to read on, the book is organized into five parts. Part I sets out a general methodology for constructing legal arguments. This methodology centers on the use of syllogisms and the process of what we call “grounding” their premises. Part II focuses more closely on the construction of persuasive, well-grounded legal premises, and covers the effective integration of legal doctrine and evidence into the argument's structure. Part III shows how to put the method to work by giving two detailed examples of the construction of complete legal arguments from scratch.

The book then turns to a very different task: after you have done your research, both external and internal, how do you present it persuasively to a court? Part IV provides a detailed protocol for reducing well-constructed legal arguments to written form, along with a concrete illustration of that process. It also provides specific advice on how to recognize and avoid a host of common mistakes in the written presentation of legal arguments. Part V, the final part, moves from the basics into more advanced techniques of persuasive

legal argument. These include rhetorical tactics of framing and emphasis, how to respond to arguments, maintaining professionalism in advocacy, and the ethical limits of argument.

A final warning is in order. This book provides a methodology for constructing legal arguments, but no methodology, in this discipline or any other, can ever be more than a reliable rule of thumb. A methodology can provide highly useful guidance to the initiate and the expert alike, but it is never a substitute for practiced judgment based on real experience. The true master of a craft knows when to deviate from the rules as well as when to follow them, when to cut corners and when to proceed more strictly. The advice contained in this book should be taken in this spirit.

