

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