| A | from effect to effect, 430 |
|--|---|
| Abstract argumentation, 627–633 | from example, 429 |
| admissible sets of arguments, 628 | from external circumstances, 88 |
| labelling arguments, 631–633 | from position to know, 404 |
| Abstractors, 312 | from sign, 19, 430 |
| Abusive ad hominem, 165, 173, 581 | Argumentation, 1, 3–7, 18–21, 272–284, 616 |
| Academic domain, 586 | artificial intelligence, 616 |
| Accent, 80 | based on coexistential relation, 277 |
| Acceptability, 188–189 | based on combination of sequential and |
| Accident, 81, 122, 168 | coexistential relations, 279 |
| Ad baculum, 169 | based on contradictions, 273 |
| Ad consequentiam, 170 | based on (perfect or partial) identity, 274 |
| Addressivity, 414 | based on relation part-whole, 273 |
| Adequate, 195 | based on sequential relation, 276 |
| Ad fallacy, 25, 142, 168 | based on structure of reality, 275 |
| Adherence, 262 | based on transitivity, 274 |
| Ad ignorantiam, 165 | by comparison, 275 |
| Adjudication, 558 | by example, 280 |
| Ad misericordiam, 169 | by illustration, 280 |
| Ad populum, 169 | by model, 281 |
| Ad verecundiam, 165 | by the probable, 275 |
| Affirming the consequent, 171, 547 | by/from analogy, 281, 429 |
| Amphiboly (fallacy) 79, 548 | claiming a logical relation, 273–274 |
| Analytical research, 11, 522 | claiming a mathematical relation, 273–274 |
| Analytic argument, 209-212, 225-227 | establishing structure of reality, 279 |
| Analytic function, 529 | from authority, 278 |
| Analytic overview, 522, 536 | process, 3, 6 |
| Answerer, 56, 62–65, 72–74, 78 | product, 3, 6 |
| Antagonist, 520, 525, 537, 546 | Argumentation dialogues, 642–643, 645 |
| Araucaria system, 656 | in AI and law, 643 |
| Arbiter, 330 | in multi-agent systems, 645 |
| Argument, 375–376, 387, 390, 393, 398–400, | Argument(ation) scheme, 19–21, 270, |
| 402–404, 429–430, 435, 438, 447, 467 | 376, 381, 403–407, 409, 411, |
| acceptability, 375, 400, 402-403 | 537, 640–642 |
| analysis, 375, 388, 393, 398 | Argumentation stage, 529–530 |
| evaluation, 390 | Argument(ation) structure, 21–24, 399–403, |
| field, 213-214, 245, 448 | 536–537, 633–635, 637–638 |
| form, 148, 151, 157 | arguments and classical logic, 637 |
| frame, 467 | combining support and attack, 638 |
| | |

F.H. van Eemeren et al., $Handbook\ of\ Argumentation\ Theory,$ DOI 10.1007/978-90-481-9473-5,

979

| Argument(ation) structure (cont.) conclusive force, 634–636 premise-conclusion model, 399 prima facie assumptions, 636–637 specificity, 633–634 standard model, 400 Toulmin model, 400 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Argumentational integrity, 546 Backing, 219, 223, 241 Balance-of-consideration argument, 409 Balk, 362 Bandwagon argument, 169 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 evading the burden of proof, 546–547, 550 |
|--|
| premise-conclusion model, 399 prima facie assumptions, 636–637 specificity, 633–634 standard model, 400 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Toulmin model, 400 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 Bias ad hominem, 165 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Balk, 362 Bandwagon argument, 169 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| prima facie assumptions, 636–637 specificity, 633–634 standard model, 400 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Toulmin model, 400 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 Bias ad hominem, 165 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| specificity, 633–634 standard model, 400 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Toulmin model, 400 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| standard model, 400 Toulmin model, 400 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Bayesian epistemology, 662 Begging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| Toulmin model, 400 Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Beging the question, 84, 168, 172, 547 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| Argumentation support software, 655, 657, 659 Bias ad hominem, 165 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Belvedere system, 657 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| 657, 659 argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Bias ad hominem, 165 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| argument diagramming, 656–658 argument evaluation, 660–661 integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Big Rhetoric, 34, 446–447 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| argument evaluation, 660–661 Integration of rules and argument schemes, 659–660 Blanket assumption of existential import, 98, 101 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| integration of rules and argument schemes, 98, 101 659–660 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| 659–660 Burden of proof, 545–546, 549, 661 |
| - |
| |
| • • |
| Argumentational strategy, 556 shifting the burden of proof, 546 |
| Argumentative activity type, 562, 585 |
| Argumentative means and criticism, 560 |
| Argumentative orientation, 492 C |
| Argumentative question, 499 Canons of rhetoric, 60, 117, 128 |
| Argumentative strategy, 556 Case studies, 665 Case studies, 665 |
| Argumentative theory (of human reasoning) Case-based reasoning, 391, 650–653 |
| 695–698 Categorical assertion, 331 |
| Argumentative turn in cognitive psychology, Categorical statement, 97, 98, 101 |
| 678, 695–698 Categorically provised assertion, 331 |
| Argument mark-up language (AML) 656 Causal argumentation/reasoning, 234, 430, |
| Argument scheme rule, 544, 547, 549, 552 537–538, 547 |
| Argument strength, probability and other Cautious assertion, 331 Captiously provided assertion, 322 |
| quantitative approaches, 662–663 Cautiously provisoed assertion, 332 |
| Argumentum ad baculum, 546 Chain of arguments, 341 |
| Argumentum ad consequentiam, 548 Challenger, 213, 216, 248 |
| Argumentum ad hominem, 164–165, 173–174, Circle game, 356 |
| 431, 546, 564–565 Circular reasoning, 168, 172, 547 |
| Argumentum ad ignorantiam, 165, 546, 548 Circumstantial ad hominem, 165 |
| Argumentum ad misericordiam, 546 Civility, 694 Claim 14, 212, 216, 247 |
| Argumentum ad populum, 431, 546, 548 Claim, 14, 212, 216, 247 Claim, 14, 212, 216, 247 Classical dialoctic 15, 27, 53, 58, 61, 04 |
| Argumentum ad verecundiam, 165, 172–173, Classical dialectic, 15, 27, 53–58, 61–94 |
| 546, 548, 552, 564 Classical dialogue game, 320 |
| Argumentum model (of topics) 505 Classical rhetoric, 23, 27, 31, 37, 58–61 Arrangement, 60, 72, 117, 126–127 Code of conduct (for reasonable discussants) |
| |
| |
| Assertion, 317, 326, 328 Cogency-centred empirical research, 522 Assertive, 531 Collection, 56 |
| Assertive, 531 Collection, 56 Assertive move, 327 Commissive, 531–532 |
| Associated conditional, 111, 537 Commitment, 335, 350–351, 363 |
| |
| Association, 270 to assertions, 364 Atomic sentence, 146 to concessions, 364 |
| Attitude change, 459 rules, 350–351 |
| Audience, 260, 262–264, 286, 414, 436, Common topoi, 120, 126 |
| 444, 449 Communication studies and rhetoric, 43 |
| Audience demand, 554 Communication studies and metoric, 43 Communication studies and metoric, 43 Communication studies and metoric, 43 |
| Authoritative argumentation, 236 Communicative activity type, 537–538, Solve argumentation, 236 Solve 560, 565, 566 |
| Authority argument, 564, 566 Authority argument, 564, 566 Communicative domain, 557, 581 |
| Axiom, 349 Communicative admant, 357, 381 Communicative rationality, 710 |
| Communicative facionality, 710 |

| Communion-seeking, 558 | Correctness condition speech act, 524 |
|---|--|
| Company, 176, 196 | Correctness, 179, 187 |
| Comparison argumentation, 548 | Counterattack, 337, 339 |
| Competent judge, 313 | Counterconsiderations, 409 |
| Complex/compound statements, 311, 314–345 | Counterexample, 151, 156–159 |
| Composition, 59, 79, 91, 121, 170, 547, 549 | Counterinterpretation, 157 |
| Concession, 328, 335 | Countermodel, 157 |
| Conciliatio, 557 | Criteria, 213, 215 |
| Concluding Rule, 544, 548 | Critical discourse analysis, 678–683 |
| Concluding stage, 529–531 | Critical discussion, 521, 527–533 |
| Concluding strategy, 556 | Critical linguistics, 681 |
| Conclusion, 14, 145, 151, 154, 156, 158, 181 | Critical question(s) 19, 233, 381, |
| Conditional, 93, 110, 147, 149, 229, 232, 315 | 404–405 |
| Conditional relevance, 464 | Critical rationalism, 193 |
| Conductive reasoning, 392, 409 | Critical thinking, 378, 394 |
| Confirmationism, 330 | Critical-rationalist philosophy of |
| Conflict of avowed opinions, 336 | reasonableness, 593 |
| Confrontation stage, 529 | Cultural keyword, 509–511 |
| Confrontational strategy, 579, 583 | , |
| Conjunction, 110, 149, 153, 315 | |
| Connective, 491 | D |
| Consequentiae, 153 | Dark-side commitments, 364 |
| Consequential inconsistency, 358 | Data, 216–217, 230, 247–248 |
| Consequent, 83, 93 | Debate, 433 |
| Constructive dialogue game, 320 | Debate proposition, 14, 428 |
| Constructive formal dialogue game, 322 | Declarative, 532 |
| Context, 167, 177, 538, 565 | Declaring a standpoint sacrosanct, 552 |
| discursive, 538 | De-dichotomization, 686 |
| intertextual, 538 | Deducibility, 155 |
| macro, 538, 565 | Deductive argument, 428 |
| meso, 538 | Deductive move, 327 |
| micro, 538 | Deductive validity, 150, 152, 377, 390 |
| Contextual criterion, 177 | Deductivism, 390 |
| Contextual domain of relevance, 568 | Deep disagreement, 6, 687, 739 |
| Contradictories, 70, 97, 102 | Defeasible reasoning, 622–623, |
| Contra-position, 338 | 626–627 |
| Contraries, 69, 97 | deductive reasons, 624 |
| Contrarium, 711 | forms of argument defeat, 626 |
| Controversy, 175–183, 684 | induction, 625 |
| Conventional criteria, 176, 181 | memory, 625 |
| Conventional validity, 182, 196, 527 | origins, 622 |
| Conventionalization of communicative activity | perception, 624–625 |
| type, 557 | statistical syllogism, 625 |
| Convergent argument, 22, 380, 401 | undercutting and rebutting, 623 |
| Conversation analysis, 463, 502 | Definite description, 312 |
| Convertible, 98 | Definition, 71, 88, 91, 313 |
| Convincingness, 580 | Deliberation, 406–407, 413, 558 |
| Coordinative(ly compound) argumentation, 22, | Deliberative genre, 119, 123 |
| 569 | Demonstrative (argument) 111 |
| complementary coordinative | Denying an accepted starting point, 552 |
| argumentation, 569 | Denying an unexpressed premise, 546–547, |
| cumulative coordinative argumentation, | 552 |
| 569 | Denying the antecedent, 171, 547 |
| | |

| Deentie Ionie 140 | E |
|---|---|
| Deontic logic, 149 | |
| Derailments of strategic manoeuvring, | Effectiveness (research) 456, 575 |
| 563–567 | Elaboration likelihood, 462 |
| Derivationally valid, 151, 159 | Elementary rule, 338 |
| Descriptive (empirical) dimension, 7–9, 35 | Elementary statement, 311 |
| Descriptive standpoint/thesis, 7, 191 | Elementary truth table, 147 |
| Determiner, 331, 335 | Emic perspective, 526 |
| Dialectic, 184, 302 | Emotion, 501 |
| Dialectical clue, 568 | Empirical criterion/criteria, 176–178 |
| Dialectic(al) dimension, 520, | Empirical logic, 388 |
| 522, 587 | Empirical research, 11, 39, 521–522 |
| Dialectical profile, 367, 570 | Empragmatic speech, 310 |
| Dialectical strength, 461 | Endoxon, 63, 507 |
| Dialectical system, 348 | Enthymeme, 17, 118–120, 443 |
| Dialectical tier, 385 | Entitlement-preserving argument, 398 |
| Dialectification, 526–527 | Enunciator, 495–496 |
| Dialogical clue, 569 | Epicheireme, 31, 125, 237 |
| Dialogical model of argumentation, 499 | Epistemic approach to fallacies, 175 |
| Dialogical shift, 375, 406 | Epistemic dimension, 595–600 |
| Dialogical tableaux, 309 | Epistemic logic, 149 |
| Dialogically valid, 151, 159 | Epistemological approach, 375, 394 |
| Dialogue, 265, 308, 317, 339, 349 | Epistemology, 211, 242 |
| attitude, 339 | Equivocation, 79, 548 |
| game, 309 | Eristic debate, 56, 66, 73 |
| rule, 318, 350 | Eristics, 406–407 |
| Dialogue type, 406–407, 409, 413, 560 | Ethical (ethotic) fallacy, 168 |
| deliberation, 406–407, 413 | Ethical (means of persuasion) 117, |
| information-seeking, 406–407 | 125–126 |
| inquiry, 406–407 | Ethos, 432, 503, 542, 546, 585 |
| negotiation, 406–407 | Ethotic fallacy, 546 |
| persuasion, 406–407, 410 | Etic perspective, 526 |
| Dichotomization, 686 | Euler diagram, 212 |
| Difference of maximal propositions | European Predicament, 583 |
| (differentia) 92–93 | Evaluation, 374–376, 381, 390, 393, |
| Difference of opinion, 2, 6, 8, 15, 24, 38, | 397–398, 409 |
| 520–521, 524 | Evaluative function, 522 |
| | Evaluative function, 322 Evaluative standpoint, 7 |
| Direct proof, 102, 104 | |
| Directive, 531 | Evidence, 661, 663 |
| Discourse analysis, 503 | burden of proof, 661 |
| Discourse component of relevance, 568 | inference to the best explanation, |
| Discourse entity, 483 | 663 |
| Discursive context, 538 | Examples, 118, 124–125 |
| Discussion vs. debate, 265 | Exhibiting genre, 119, 123 |
| Discussion strategy, 556 | Exigence, 444 |
| Disjunction, 110, 147, 149, 316 | Existential statement, 318 |
| Dissociation, 271, 282, 287, 573 | Explicitization procedure, 540 |
| Distinction, 363 | Expressive, 532 |
| Distorting an unexpressed premise, 546–547 | Expressive design, 454–455 |
| Divergent argument, 380 | Extended theory, 552 |
| Division, 57, 80, 121, 170, 547, 549 | Extension, 98, 125, 130 |
| Double hierarchy argumentation, 279 | External loci, 88 |
| Doxa, 504 | Externalization, 525–526 |
| Dynamic dialectics, 342–343 | Extrinsic difference, 93 |
| | |

| \mathbf{F} | Н |
|---|---|
| Facts, 267, 275, 277, 279 | Hasty generalization, 548 |
| Fallacy, 21–27, 39, 43, 76–85, 120–121, | Health domain, 581 |
| 163–175, 545–552 | Hermes system, 657 |
| Fallacy of ambiguity, 168 | Heuristic function, 529 |
| Fallacy of relevance, 168 | Higher-order conditions/rules, 346, 583 |
| Fallacy (theory) 375, 380, 397, 408 | Historical controversy analysis, 678, 683–688 |
| False, 147, 156, 163 | Historical-political analysis, 439 |
| False analogy, 168, 548 Falsely presenting a premise as self-evident, | Hunch, 362 |
| 547, 552 | |
| Falsely presenting something as a common | I |
| starting point, 547, 552 | Ideal speech situation, 528 |
| Falsificationism, 330 | Ideas in themselves, 154 |
| Field-independency, 232 | Identification procedure, 539 |
| Field-invariance, 213–214, 222, 246 | Identity condition speech act, 524 |
| Force, 213, 215 | Idol, 163 |
| Form of expression, 80, 121 | Ignoratio elenchi, 77, 82–83, 166, 168–169, |
| Formal, 302–303, 305–306, 334–336, 344 | 546 |
| criterion, 334 dialectical system, 303, 306, 348 | Illative core, 384 Image, 484 |
| logical system, 302 | Immediate consequence, 359 |
| Formal approach, 31, 33 | Immediately inconsistent, 359 |
| Formal dialectic, 25–26, 32, 38, 42, 305–306, | Immunizing a standpoint against criticism, 552 |
| 336–337, 348 | Indeterminate statement, 178 |
| Formal validity, 207, 210, 224 | Indirect argumentation, 575 |
| Formally valid, 151, 153, 158 | Indirect proof, 102, 104 |
| Four terms, 166 | Individual constant, 318 |
| Free floating forms of reasoning, 234–235 | Inductive argument, 429 |
| Freedom Rule, 542, 545 | Inference claim, 232, 412 |
| Functional design, 454–455 | Inference licence, 230 |
| Functionalization, 523–524 | Inference procedure, 540 |
| Fundamental move, 331 | Inference rule, 250 |
| Fundamental norm, 338, 340 | Informal logic, 23, 33, 34, 41–42, 373–376, 381–387, 390–394, 399, 406, 410–413 |
| | argument diagramming methods, 399 |
| G | Blair and Johnson's contributions, 381–387 |
| Game of inductive generalization, 349 | conceptions of, 373–376 |
| General dialogue rule, 320, 322 | epistemological approaches, 394–399 |
| constructive dialogue game, 320 | fallacy theory, methods, and key concepts, |
| constructive formal dialogue game, 322 | 408–410 |
| General principle of communication, 538 | Finocchiaro's historical and empirical |
| General principle of interaction, 538 | approach, 387–390 |
| General soundness criterion, 544, 565 | Govier's critical analysis, 390–394 |
| General term, 96–97 | Hitchcock's contributions, 410–413 |
| Genre of communicative activity, 557 | movement, 376–381 |
| Genres, 118–119, 121 | Information-seeking, 406–407 |
| Genus, 58, 71 | Information-seeking dialogue, 326–329 |
| Geometrical model of validity, 206–207 | Inherent interactional (perlocutionary) effect, 580 |
| Gnostic criteria, 396 Good reasoning, 411 | Initial move, 366 |
| Greek game, 349 | Initial move, 500 Initial situation, 560 |
| Ground, 215, 229 | Inquiry, 406–407 |
| Ground, 213, 227 | 111quily, 400–407 |

Institutional point, 558 Logical validity, 150-151, 163, 182, 196 Institutional precondition, 562 Logician's conditionals, 359 Intellectio, 123-124 Logico-discursive operation, 489 Intension, 98 Logico-intellectual language problem, 194 Intermediate difference, 94 Logos, 236, 433, 546 Internal loci, 88 Interpersonal argumentation, 463 Interpersonal verification, 314 M Macro level, 216 Interpretation function, 157 Interpretational counterexample, 157 Major term, 99 Interpretation, 157, 186 Making an absolute of the success of the Interrogative move, 327 defense, 548, 552 Intersubjective validity, 195, 577 Many questions (fallacy), 84, 167–168, 172, Intrinsic difference, 93 Introduction by means of examples, 312 Material criterion, 335 Invalid, 156-157 Material dialogue game, 321 Invention, 60, 121, 123-126 Material implication, 110 Ipse dixisti! remark, 341 Materially valid, 153 Irrelevant argumentation, 546 Maximal proposition, 91–94 Medical domain, 585–586 Memorizing, 68, 128-129 Message content, 460, 689 Judicial genre, 119, 123 Message structure, 459, 689 Justifying force, 190 Method of collection and division, 57-58 Method of hypothesizing, 57 Method of semantic tableaux, 149, 195 L Method of truth tables, 149, 195 Language Use Rule, 544, 548 Methodological formulation, 182 Law of identity, 182 Methodological necessity, 182, 195 Law of non contradiction, 182 Methodological statement, 177 Legal domain, 582–583 Micro argument, 233, 239 Middle term, 99 Lekton, 106-107 Linked argument, 22, 380, 400, 402 Minor term, 99 Local discussion, 340 Mixed conflict under complete opposition, 337 Locality, 414 Modal logic, 149 Local thesis, 340 Modal qualifier, 218, 241 Modal terms, 213, 215 Loci, 87-94, 269 Locus, 86, 88, 91, 506-507 Modality, 488, 510 Locus a genere, 90 Mode of strategic manoeuvring, 566 Locus ex comparatione, 90 Model, 157 Locution rules, 350 Modus (ponendo/tollendo) ponens, 113-114 Locutor, 495 Modus ponens, 237 More acceptable than, 188 Logical axiom system, 159 Logical calculus, 213 More precise than, 188 Logical constant, 145-146, 153, 309, 314, 318 Motivational argumentation, 236 Logical convention, 196 Multiple argumentation, 23, 537, 569 Münchhausen trilemma, 193 Logical criteria, 176 Logical fallacy, 166 Myself, 324 Logical (means of persuasion), 59, 117-118, 125 Logical minimum, 537 Logical semi-convention, 196 Narrativity, 442 Logical type, 213, 245, 447 Natural deduction, 160, 163

| Natural language argument, 374–375, 377, 390, 393, 407, 409 | Particular vs. universal audience, 264, 266 Partium enumeratio, 88 |
|---|--|
| Natural logic, 37, 43, 481 | Party, 340–341 |
| Nature, 324 | Pathetical fallacy, 168, 546 |
| Necessary premise, 72 | Pathetical (means of persuasion) 118 |
| Necessary signs, 118 | Pathos, 432, 542 |
| Necessitation, 151–152 | Perfect inference, 153 |
| Negation, 147, 149, 317 | Performance, 129 |
| Negotiation, 406–407 | Permissive persuasion dialogue, 364 |
| New rhetoric, 20, 31–32, 34, 40, 260 | Personal attack, 564 |
| Non sequitur, 169 | Personal sphere, 451 |
| Non-analytic thinking, 261 | Persuasion dialogue, 354 |
| Non-cause, 84, 121 | Persuasion research, 16, 30, 44, 459–462, |
| Non-empirical statement, 180 | 678, 689 |
| Non-logical constant, 146 | Persuasion, 384, 395, 406-407, 410, 428, 459 |
| Non-logical fallacy, 166 | Persuasive vs. convincing, 264, 487 |
| Non-monotonic logic, 618–622 | Persuasiveness, 580 |
| default rules, 618–619 | Petitio principii, 168, 172, 547 |
| impact of, 621–622 | Philosophical research, 9, 521 |
| logic programming, 619–620 | Plausibilist criteria, 396–397 |
| themes in, 620–621 | Point of departure of argumentation, 12, |
| Norm of reasonableness, 9–11, 690 | 266–270, 571 |
| Normative (critical) dimension, 9, 38 | Point of view, 14 |
| Normative pragmatic research program, 520–523 | Political domain, 583–585 |
| Normative pragmatics, 9, 454–459, 520 | Polyphony, 494–497, 500 |
| Normative thesis, 191 | Possible world, 156 |
| Notatio, 89 | Post hoc ergo propter hoc, 169 |
| , | Practical research, 11–12, 522–523 |
| 0 | Pragma-dialectical theory, 22, 26, 38, 43, 175, 520, 583 |
| Objects of agreement for argumentation, | Pragmatic argumentation, 276 |
| 267, 270 | Pragmatic clue, 569 |
| Objective criterion, 177 | Pragmatic concept of validity, 150, 344 |
| Objectively better than, 195 | Pragmatic dimension, 588–589 |
| Objective validity, 195 | Pragmatic optimum, 537, 547 |
| Obligation game, 349 | Pragmatics, 9, 506 |
| Obligation to Defend Rule, 542 | Precision, 179 |
| Officia oratoris, 60 | Precization, 186–187, 195 |
| One-sided message, 460 | Predicables, 69 |
| Opening stage, 529–530 | Predicate, 97, 99 |
| Opening strategy, 556 | Predicate logic, 149 |
| Operator, 488 | Predicator rules, 312 |
| Opponent, 315, 318, 331 | Predicator, 311 |
| Orderly dialectics, 342 | Premise, 145, 154, 156 |
| Ortholanguage, 310 | Premise-conclusion model, 399 |
| Ostensive/deictic act, 311 | Premises relating to preferable, 267 |
| Outcome of the discourse, 560 | Premises relating to real, 267 |
| outcome of the discourse, 500 | Prescriptive standpoint, 7 |
| | Presentational device, 554 |
| P | Presentational transformation, 537 |
| Pancritical rationalism, 193 | Presumption, 267, 402 |
| Paralogism, 76 | Presupposition, 167 |
| Partially convertible, 98 | Primitive definition, 349 |
| | |

| Principal objective of theoretical logic, 194 | Reasoning from comparison, 235 |
|---|--|
| Principle of conditionalization, 111 | Reasoning from criteria to a verbal |
| Principle of (moderate) charity, 392 | classification, 235 |
| Principle of Reasonableness, 563 Principle of (verbal) externalization of | Reasoning from definition to characteristics, 235 |
| dialectics, 340 | Reasoning from example to a descriptive |
| Pro-aut-contra survey, 189 | generalization, 235 |
| Probabilities, 118 | Reasoning from sign to unobserved event, 235 |
| Problematology, 719 | Rebuttal, 218, 243 |
| Problem-solving validity, 195, 527, 545, 592 | Reconstruction, 534–539 |
| Procedurist, 713 | Reconstruction transformation, 535 |
| Pro-et-contra survey, 189 | Reductio ad absurdum/impossibile, 54, 84, 94, |
| Profile of dialogue, 366–367, 570 | 102, 160, 431 |
| Proof, 102, 111 | Reflection-minded practical research, 523 |
| Property, 71 | Refutation, 55, 76 |
| Proponent, 318, 320, 331 | Relational respect of relevance, 568 |
| Proposition, 2–3, 107–111, 125, 147, 154, 338 | Relevance, 168, 191, 381–382, 385, 400–401, |
| Propositional constants, 146 | 415, 568 |
| Proposition(al content) 2 | analytic relevance, 568 |
| Propositional logic, 146, 148, 151 | evaluative relevance, 568 |
| Propositional question, 327 | interpretive relevance, 568 |
| Prosbatic criteria, 396 | Relevance, acceptability, sufficiency (RAS) |
| Protagonist, 537 | criteria, 381–382, 384, 393 |
| Protasis, 63 | Relevance Rule, 542 |
| Protective defence, 339 | Representation, 485 |
| Public sphere, 450, 453 | Research program, 9–10, 36 |
| Purpose (of making a statement) 177 | Respondent, 331, 350 |
| rupose (or making a statement) 177 | Resolution-oriented analysis, 522 |
| | Responsibilist criteria, 396 |
| Q | Rewarding dialectics, 341–342 |
| Quality notion, 690 | Rhetoric, 7 |
| Quasi-logical argumentation, 272–275 | Rhetorica ad Alexandrum, 61, 236 |
| Questioner, 55, 62, 79 | Rhetorical analogue of dialectical aim, 554 |
| Questioner, 55, 62, 79 | Rhetorical approach, 395, 413–416 |
| | Rhetorical criticism, 426, 439 |
| R | Rhetorical dimension, 553, 555 |
| Radical argumentativism, 37, 43, 490–494 | Rhetorical situation, 445 |
| Ratio cognoscendi, 444 | Rhetorical theory, 443, 447 |
| Ratio essendi, 444 | Rigorous persuasion dialogue, 364 |
| Rational judge, 5, 40, 259 | Room 5 system, 657–658 |
| Real disagreement, 187–188 | Rule for critical discussion, 539–552, |
| Realistic dialectics, 340 | 545, 564–565, 577 |
| Reason, 13, 18, 22 | Rule of communication, 538 |
| Reasonable judge, 5–7, 313 | Rule-based reasoning, 647–650 |
| Reasonable(ness) 9–10, 259, 518, 563 | Rules of conversion, 98, 104 |
| anthropological perspective, 9 | Rules of inference, 231 |
| critical perspective, 9 | Rules of inference, 231 |
| geometrical perspective, 9–10 | |
| Reasoning from analogy, 235 | S |
| | Schematization, 487 |
| Reasoning from authority, 235 Reasoning from cause to effect, 235 | Scientific controversy, 387 |
| Reasoning from circumstantial evidence to | Scientific dialectics, 722 |
| hypothesis, 235 | Second order condition, 541 |
| 11) politoio, 200 | Second order condition, 5-1 |

Secundum quid, 82, 168, 548 Stereotype, 503 Self-deliberation, 265 Stoc-issue, 432 Semantic block, 497–498 Strategic maneuvering, 552–557 Semantic concept of validity, 150 Strategic maneuvering triangle, 554 Semantics, 489-490 Straw man, 170, 550 Strictly constructive dialogue game, 320 Semantic tableau, 309 Semi-conventional principle, 196 Strong distinction, 333 Semi-conventional validity, 196 Structural rules, 350 Sentence, 145 Stylistics, 447 Sentence form, 148 Sub-discussion, 540 Sentential constant, 146 Subjective thought, 154 Serial argument, 22, 380 Subject, 87, 96 Side payment, 328 Subordinative(ly compound) argumentation, 23, 537 Sign triangle, 186 Signs, 107-109, 118 Substantial argument, 209–212 Simple (pure) conflict, 338 Substantive argumentation, 236–237 Substitutional counterexample, 157, 158 Simply valid, 154 Single argumentation, 574 Sufficiency, 381–383, 385 Situational counterexample, 156 Syllogismos, 94 Situationally valid, 159 Syllogistic, 27, 41, 94-105 Symptomatic argumentation, 547 Slippery slope, 170, 548 Social and cultural critique, 447 Syntactic concepts of validity, 150, 159–163 Socialization, 524–525 System H, 349-352 Socratic refutation debate, 55-56 System of classical rhetoric, 121-123, 128 Solution, 75, 84 Systematic dialectics, 340 Sophism, 163 Sophistical refutation, 73, 78 Т Soundness, 10, 29, 31 Soundness criteria, 566 Tasks of the speaker, 60, 117, 121 general soundness criteria, 566 Technical (means of persuasion) 117 specific soundness criteria, 566 Technical sphere, 451 Ten Commandments, 541 Special topoi, 120 Specific soundness criteria, 566 Tenability, 189 Speech act, 464, 518, 523, 538 Tense logic, 149 Term, 311 Speech event, 558 Sphere of argumentation, 447–453 Testing procedure, 540 Stage, 340 Thema, 112 Standard model, 400 Theoretical research, 7, 39-40, 521 Standard of reasonableness, 690 See also Norm Theory of argumentation in the language, of reasonableness 497-498 Standard theory, 552 Theory of inquiry, 446 Standard Treatment, 25, 142, 166–175 Thesis, 14, 309, 322, 330, 336 Standoffs at force five, 687 Thetical reason, 708 Standpoint, 2, 4–5, 7, 13–16, 21, 31, 542 Third order condition, 541 Standpoint Rule, 542 Thoroughgoing dialectics, 342 Starting point, 560 Topical potential, 554 Starting Point Rule, 543, 547 Topics, 505 Stasis, 432 Topos, 20, 68-72, 120-121, 493 Stasis/status theory, 121, 124 Toulmin model, 31–32, 35, 42 Status coniecturalis, 124 Trivium, 131 Status definitionis, 124 True, 147 Status qualitatis, 125 Truth, 267, 377, 382, 385, 395 Status translationis, 125 Truth preservation, 231

Truth-preserving argument, 398
Truth table, 147, 149
Truth-value, 146
Tu quoque, 165
Turn-taking, 464
Two-sided message, 461
Type of argumentation, 19–21, 24

U

Undemonstrated arguments, 112–113 Unexpressed premise/standpoint, 17–18, 20, 537 Unexpressed premise rule, 543, 546 Unexpressed standpoint, 546 Universal context, 179 Universal statement, 317–318

v

Valid, 148, 153 Valid as for now, 154

Usage declarative, 532

Unclearness fallacy, 548

Validity, 17, 26, 40, 42, 99, 102–103, 142, 144, 148, 150–163, 206–210, 222, 245 logical validity, 17, 26, 42, 150 pragmatic validity, 40 Validity Rule, 543, 547 Value hierarchies, 268 Values, 268 Values and audiences, 654–655 Variable, 148, 157 Verbal disagreement, 188 Verbal reasoning, 234

W

Warrant, 216–217, 222–223, 229–230, 240, 250, 398, 400, 401, 403, 410–411
Weak distinction, 332
Wh-question, 327
Why-Because system with questions, 349
Winning rule, 320, 322
Winning strategy, 344
Woods-Walton approach, 175, 355–358
Woods-Walton dialogue-segment, 357
Wording, 128