

<u>INTRODUCTION.</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>1.1. GENEALOGY.</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>1.2 MAIN CONCEPTS.</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>1.2.1. ALGORITHM.</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>1.2.2. MACHINE LEARNING.</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>1.2.3. ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS.</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>1.2.4. DEEP LEARNING.</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>1.3. ROBOT-JUDGE: WILL MACHINE LEARNING BE THE NEW “BOUCHE DE LA LOI”?</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2. NON-CONTRACTUAL LIABILITY AND AI: CURRENT REGULATIONS.</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>2.1. LEGAL SUBJECTIVITY.</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>2.2. NON-CONTRACTUAL LIABILITY.</u>	<u>53</u>
<u>2.2.1. ARTICLE 2043: A MILESTONE.</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>2.2.2. COMPENSATION FOR THE DAMAGE.</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>2.3. ASKING FOR A ROBOTIC LEGAL STATUS.</u>	<u>63</u>

<u>2.4. AI AS A SENTIENT BEING IN ITALY: A MIRROR OF THE REGULATIONS INVOLVED.</u>	69
<u>2.4.1. ARTICLE 2047: DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE UNFIT TO PLEAD.</u>	70
<u>2.4.2. ARTICLE 2048: LIABILITY FOR PARENTS, TUTORS, PRECEPTORS AND MASTER CRAFTSMEN.</u>	73
<u>2.4.3. ARTICLE 2049: LIABILITY OF THE OWNERS AND THE PATRONS.</u>	79
<u>2.4.4. AI CONSIDERED AS “RES”. COULD WE BRING BACK ROMAN SLAVES’ REGULATIONS?</u>	82
<u>2.4.5. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS A PET, THE HYPOTHESIS OF ARTICLE 2052.</u>	86
<u>2.5. AI AS A PRODUCT: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE MIRROR.</u>	89
<u>2.5.1. ARTICLE 2050 AND THE LIABILITY FROM THE EXERCISE OF A DANGEROUS ACTIVITY.</u>	90
<u>2.5.2. ARTICLE 2051 AND THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY THINGS IN CUSTODY.</u>	96
<u>2.5.3 THE DISCIPLINE OF THE DEFECTIVE PRODUCT.</u>	100
<u>2.6. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS.</u>	113
<u>2.7. CASE STUDY: THE PHENOMENON OF THE <i>SELF-DRIVING</i> CAR.</u>	115
<u>CHAPTER 3. EUROPEAN REGULATIONS, WHERE DO WE STAND?</u>	120
<u>3.1 EUROPEAN STRATEGY.</u>	120
<u>3.2. EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION 20TH OCTOBER 2020.</u>	127

3.3. THE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT: PROPOSAL FOR A REGULATION.135

3.3.1. THE RISK-BASED APPROACH. 141

**3.4. THE NON-FINANCIAL LIABILITY: BETWEEN DEBATES AND
DISAPPOINTMENT. 142**

FINDINGS. 151

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 155