

Contents

1	An Approach to Argument Macrostructure	1
1.1	Introduction—Some Basic Preliminaries	1
1.2	The Standard Approach	3
1.3	Toulmin’s Layout of Arguments	10
1.4	Integrating the Standard Approach and the Toulmin Model	12
1.5	The Extended Standard Approach and the Toulmin Model	29
1.6	Concluding Remarks	29
	Appendix 1: Comparison with Wigmore’s Chart Method	31
	Appendix 2: Comparison with Pollock’s Inference Graphs	34
2	The Dialectical Nature of Argument	39
2.1	Dialogical Situations and Dialectical Situations	39
2.2	What Makes Dialectical Situations Dialectical?	40
2.3	The Basic Dialectical Situation as a Model for Argument	42
2.4	Some Other Dialectical Views on Argument	46
2.5	Two Possible Problems for Our Approach: Demonstrations and Inferences	48
2.6	But is Our Model Really Dialectical?	53
3	Toulmin’s Problematic Notion of Warrant	59
3.1	Warrants and Arguments as Process	60
3.2	What are Warrants?	62
3.3	Toulmin on Certain Syllogisms	63
3.4	Ryle on Conditionals	70
3.5	Mill on the Syllogism	76
3.6	Warrants as Always Implicit, if not Explicit in Arguments as Products	80
3.7	Some Problems With This View	83
4	The Linked-Convergent Distinction—A First Approximation	89
4.1	The Problem Encountered	89
4.2	Motivating the Linked-Convergent Through the Relevance-Ground Adequacy Distinction	94
4.3	Testing Our Account of the Distinction	96
4.4	Implication of Rebuttals for the Linked-Convergent Distinction	104

5	Argument Structure and Disciplinary Perspective: The Linked-Convergent Versus Multiple-Co-ordinatively Compound Distinctions	107
5.1	The Multiple-Co-ordinatively Compound Distinction	108
5.2	Contrast with the Linked-Convergent Distinction	112
5.3	Resolving Conflicting Accounts of the Linked-Convergent Distinction	113
5.4	Postscript—Modalities, Defeaters, Counter-Defeaters in Disciplinary Perspective	119
6	The Linked-Convergent Distinction—Refining the Criterion	129
6.1	Dependent Versus Independent Relevance Explicated	129
6.2	Tests for the Linked-Convergent Distinction on Walton's Systematic Presentation	141
6.3	Complementary Arguments—a Third Structure Beside Linked and Convergent?	148
6.4	Further Critiques, Clarifications, and Replies	149
6.4.1	Bassham's Challenging Example	150
6.4.2	Must We Admit an Additional Type of Structure?	150
6.4.3	Does Analysis Always Precede Evaluation?	154
6.4.4	Direct Criticisms of the Relevance Test	158
6.4.5	Should We Even Want to Make the Linked-Convergent Distinction?	164
7	Argument Structure and Enthymemes	173
7.1	Hitchcock's Challenge to the Notion of Non-Explicit Premises and His Alternative	175
7.2	Problems with Hitchcock's Analysis	183
7.3	A Middle Way: Discerning Inference Licences and Non-Explicit Premises	186
7.4	Advantages of This Middle Way	189
7.4.1	Our Procedure Avoids Reading Assumptions Into Arguments	189
7.4.2	Our Procedure Avoids "Deductive Chauvinism"	192
7.5	Enthymemes and the Borderline Between Argument Analysis and Evaluation	194
8	From Analysis to Evaluation	197
8.1	Convergent Arguments and Determining the Combined Weight of Premises	197
8.2	Premises, Uncountered Defeaters, and Conjunctions	200
8.3	Pollock's Inference Graphs and the Issue of Argument Evaluation	201
	References	205
	Index	209