

Contents

Preface	page ix
Acknowledgments	xiii
1 Argument as reasoned dialogue	1
1.1 Types of argumentative dialogue	3
1.2 Components of argumentative dialogue	9
1.3 Persuasion dialogue (critical discussion)	11
1.4 Negative rules of persuasion dialogue	16
1.5 Some major informal fallacies	19
1.6 The critical perspective	23
2 Questions and answers in dialogue	27
2.1 Presuppositions of questions	28
2.2 Complex questions	31
2.3 Have you stopped beating your spouse?	35
2.4 Reasonable dialogue	39
2.5 Arguments from ignorance	43
2.6 Replying to a question with a question	49
2.7 Begging the question	52
2.8 Question–answer rules in dialogue	54
3 Criticisms of irrelevance	60
3.1 Allegations of irrelevance	61
3.2 Global irrelevance	64
3.3 Question–answer relevance	67
3.4 Setting an agenda for a discussion	71
3.5 Varieties of criticisms of irrelevance	75
3.6 Summary	77
4 Appeals to emotion	82
4.1 <i>Argumentum ad populum</i>	84
4.2 The argument from popularity	87

4.3	Problems with appeals to popularity	90
4.4	Threatening appeals to force	93
4.5	Further <i>ad baculum</i> problems	97
4.6	Appeals to pity	101
4.7	Overt, pictorial appeals to pity	103
4.8	Summary	105
5	Valid arguments	108
5.1	Deductive validity	108
5.2	Identifying arguments	110
5.3	Validity as a semantic concept	114
5.4	Valid forms of argument	117
5.5	Invalid arguments	121
5.6	Inconsistency	124
5.7	Composition and division	128
5.8	Summary	131
6	Personal attack in argumentation	134
6.1	The abusive <i>ad hominem</i> argument	135
6.2	The circumstantial <i>ad hominem</i> argument	141
6.3	The attack on an arguer's impartiality	149
6.4	Nonfallacious <i>ad hominem</i> arguments	154
6.5	Replying to a personal attack	159
6.6	Critical questions for an <i>ad hominem</i> argument	163
6.7	Important types of error to check	165
6.8	Some cases for further discussion	168
7	Appeals to authority	172
7.1	Reasonable appeals to authority	173
7.2	Three common errors in citing expert opinions	178
7.3	Expert testimony in legal argumentation	181
7.4	How expert is the authority?	184
7.5	Interpreting what the expert said	189
7.6	Argumentation scheme for appeal to expert opinion	192
7.7	Critical questions for the appeal to expert opinion	194
8	Inductive errors, bias, and fallacies	198
8.1	Meaningless and unknowable statistics	200
8.2	Sampling procedures	204

8.3	Insufficient and biased statistics	206
8.4	Questionable questions and definitions	208
8.5	The <i>post hoc</i> argument	212
8.6	Six kinds of <i>post hoc</i> errors	215
8.7	Bias due to defining variables	222
8.8	<i>Post hoc</i> criticisms as raising critical questions in an inquiry	224
8.9	Strengthening causal arguments by answering critical questions	228
8.10	Summary	234
9	Natural language argumentation	239
9.1	Ambiguity and vagueness	240
9.2	Loaded terms and question-begging language	243
9.3	Equivocation	250
9.4	Arguments based on analogy	253
9.5	Argumentative use of analogy	256
9.6	Criticizing arguments from analogy	260
9.7	Slippery slope arguments	263
9.8	Subtle equivocations	269
9.9	Variability of strictness of standards	274
9.10	Conclusions	277
	Bibliography	282
	Index	287