

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910781426603321
Autore	Walton Douglas N
Titolo	Informal fallacies : towards a theory of argument criticisms / / Douglas N. Walton
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Amsterdam ; ; Philadelphia : , : J. Benjamins Pub. Co., , 1987
ISBN	1-283-35890-5 9786613358905 90-272-7890-3
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (x, 336 pages)
Collana	Pragmatics & beyond companion series ; ; 4
Disciplina	165
Soggetti	Fallacies (Logic) Logic
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliography and indexes.
Nota di contenuto	<p>INFORMAL FALLACIES Towards a Theory of Argument Criticisms; Editorial page; Title page; Copyright page; Acknowledgements; Table of contents; CHAPTER 1: A NEW MODEL OF ARGUMENT; 1. Introduction to the Fallacies; 2. Some More Fallacies; 3. Fallacies Combined in Realistic Dialogues; 4. What is an Argument?; 5. Criticism as Challenge and Response; 6. Basic Categories of Argument Study; NOTES; CHAPTER TWO: HOT RHETORIC AND ARGUMENT; 1. Appeals to Popular Sentiment; 2. Appeals to Force; 3. Appeals to Pity; 4. Overly Personal Argumentation; 5. The Rhetorical Debate 6. Case Study: Parliamentary Debate 1. THE ECONOMY MEASURES TO MAINTAIN EMPLOYMENT; 2. BANKS AND BANKING; 7. Conclusion; NOTES; CHAPTER 3: THE LOGIC OF PROPOSITIONS; 1. Deductive Validity; 2. Formal Logic; 3. Classical Propositional Calculus; 4. Applying Deductive Logic to Arguments; 5. Invalidity and Fallaciousness; 6. Relevance and Validit; 7. Subject-Matter Relatedness; 8. Relatedness Logic; 9. Semantics and Pragmatics; 10. What is a Fallacy?; NOTES; CHAPTER 4: LOGICAL DIALOGUE-GAMES; 1. Different Approaches to Formal Dialogues; 2. The Ad Ignorantiam Fallacy; 3. Fallacies of Question-Asking 4. The Fallacy of Many Questions 5. Demanding Direct Answers to Questions; 6. Misconception of Refutation; 7. Case Studies of Political</p>

Debates; 8. A Game with Dark-Side Commitments; NOTES; CHAPTER 5: ENTHYMEMES; 1. The Tradition of Enthymemes; 2. The Objectives of Dialogue; 3. Veiled Commitment-Sets; 4. Strategy and Plausibility; 5. The Problem Resolved; 6. Order of the Premisses; 7. Multiple Premisses in Complex Arguments; NOTE; CHAPTER 6: LONGER SEQUENCES OF ARGUMENTATION; 1. Sequences of Argumentation; 2. Graphs of Arguments; 3. Case Study: Argument on Sex Education 4. Case Study: Circular Argumentation 5. Plausibility Conditions on Arguments; 6. The Missing Links; 7. Conclusions on Circular Arguments; NOTES; CHAPTER 7: FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS FROM AUTHORITY; 1. How Appeals to Authority Can Go Wrong; 2. Plausible Argument; 3. Where Experts Disagree; 4. Expertise and Legal Dialogue; 5. Dialogue and Expertise; 6. Conclusions; NOTE; CHAPTER 8: VARIOUS FALLACIES; 1. Inductive Fallacies; 2. Deductive and Inductive Arguments; 3. Post Hoc Arguments; 4. Slippery Slope; 5. Equivocation; 6. Amphiboly; 7. Composition and Division CHAPTER 9: ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PERSON 1. Poisoning the Well; 2. The Sportsman's Rejoinder; 3. Evaluating Ad Hominem Disputations; 4. Four Types of Circumstantial Ad Hominem; 5. Rhetorical Context of Ad Hominem Attacks; 6. Positional Defensibility; 7. Conclusion; NOTES; CHAPTER 10: EQUIVOCATION; 1. What is Equivocation?; 2. Vagueness and Criticisms of Equivocality; 3. The Problem of Subtle Equivocations; 4. Deep Deception and Equivocal Dialogue; 5. Many-Valued Logic for Equivocators; 6. Priest's System LP; 7. Applying LP to the Fallacy of Equivocation; 8. R-Mingle as a Logic for Equivocators; 9. RM and Equivocation

Sommario/riassunto

The basic question of this monograph is: how should we go about judging arguments to be reasonable or unreasonable? Our concern will be with argument in a broad sense, with realistic arguments in natural language. The basic object will be to engage in a normative study of determining what factors, standards, or procedures should be adopted or appealed to in evaluating an argument as "good," "not-so-good," "open to criticism," "fallacious," and so forth. Hence our primary concern will be with the problems of how to criticize an argument, and when a criticism is reasonably justified.
