

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)

Index

- Abelson, R. P., 171
- Ad ignorantiam* fallacy, 146, 149–50, 196
- Aims, 153, 179
- Alexy, R., 32, 38
- Allen, R. J., 173, 174, 210, 250–2, 280–1
- American Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE), 143
 - relevance defined, 140–1
 - rule 301, 280
 - rule 403, 140–1
- Anderson v. Griffin*, 74, 207
- Anglo-American trial, 39–40
- Antagonist, 43–6, 62, 255
- Antiques Roadshow Case, 191–3
- Argument
 - convergent, 115, 160
 - defeated, 71
 - diagram, 4, 26, 77, 97, 100
 - linked, 87, 110, 115, 159–61
- Argument from appearance
 - argumentation scheme for, 135–6
 - critical questions for, 136
- Argument from commitment, 231, 260, 264, 265
- Argument from consequences, 226, 229
 - argumentation scheme for, 222
 - critical questions for, 222
 - fallacy, 221
 - negative consequence, 222, 226, 268
 - positive consequences, 51, 222
 - relevance of, 223
- Argument from expert opinion, 24, 30, 142, 243
 - argumentation scheme, 19, 23, 27, 93, 119, 122
 - burden of questioning in, 25
 - critical questions for, 23
 - defeasible, 30, 278
 - mapped, 28
 - strength of, 209
 - undercutter to, 31
- Argument from ignorance, 99, 117, 177, 190–1, 193, 196, 251
 - argumentation scheme for, 10, 191–2, 194, 197, 198, 199
 - characteristic of, 195, 199
 - critical questions for, 192, 195, 198
 - defeasible, 195, 196, 199
 - epistemic
 - argumentation scheme for, 194
 - fallacy of, 15, 149, 164, 195–6, 282
 - increasing popularity of, 6–8
 - problem with, 199, 205
- Argument from lack of
 - knowledge, 193
 - argumentation scheme for 193
- Argument from negative evidence, 145, 196, 199
- Argument from negative value, 234
 - argumentation scheme for, 228
- Argument from perception, 137
 - argumentation scheme for, 135, 138
 - critical questions for, 135

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)

298

Index

- Argument from positive value
 - argumentation scheme for, 227
- Argument from witness testimony, 44, 127–8, 133, 159, 161
 - argumentation scheme for, 74, 75, 78–80, 123, 124, 135–8, 140
 - critical questions for, 122, 136, 137, 138, 140
 - undercut, 82
- Argumentation
 - chain of, 35, 80, 86, 110, 218, 269, 270, 273, 275
 - conversational, 114, 246, 248–9, 252–4, 268
- Argumentation schemes (*See also* individual arguments), 25, 26, 87, 97, 101, 119
- Argumentum ad ignorantiam* (*See* Argument from ignorance)
- Aristotle, 13–14, 32, 237
- Artificial Intelligence (AI), 38, 47, 83, 113, 164–5
 - argumentation development in, 38, 219
 - formal models in, 104
 - modeling burden of proof in, 86, 94, 118, 123, 134, 152
 - protocols, 153
 - rule in 114
- Ashford, H. A., 107
 - on presumption, 85
- ASPIC+ system, 47, 83, 209, 281
- Assertion, 13, 101, 117, 144, 147, 151, 167, 169, 174, 274
 - burden of proof for, 158, 255, 276
 - challenged, 98, 150, 152, 157, 166
 - characteristics of, 166
 - commitment to, 167, 170
 - defense of, 13
 - described, 14, 120, 147, 165, 166
 - dialectical model of, 166
 - restrictive model of, 166
- Assertive, 98
- Assumption
 - closed world, 195, 198, 199, 205
 - embedded, 129
- Atkinson, K., 227, 235
- Backtracking, 282
- Backup evidence theory (BE), 25–6
- Bailey, R., 215
- Ballistics example, 119–20
- Bench-Capon, T. J. M., 38–9, 180, 227, 235
- Bex, F. J., 206, 207, 210
- Bias, 24, 27, 75–6, 128, 137–8, 143, 200
 - allegation of, 125, 139
 - witness, 44, 76, 96, 123, 129–31, 140
- Bicycle example, 21, 94–7, 100
- Black, E., 36, 237
- Brainstorming phase, 213, 217
- Brandom, R., 14, 150
- Brewka, G., 179
- Bugs Bunny study, 129
- Burden on the opposing side, 108
- Burden of persuasion, 56, 73, 143, 155, 243, 250, 251, 264
 - allocation of, 50–1, 64, 67
 - characteristics of, 54, 88
 - described, 12, 21, 52–4, 57, 64–7, 108, 167, 247
 - fixed, 22, 54, 61, 65, 88
 - fulfilled, 63, 68, 77, 96, 111
 - in law, 20, 24, 49, 64, 74, 76, 95, 97, 152, 200, 251
 - initial, 56, 86, 152
 - setting, 62–4, 84, 88, 125, 192, 233, 239, 270–1
 - shifting, 65, 68, 69
- Burden of producing evidence (*See* Burden of production and Evidential burden)
- Burden of production, 18, 64, 69, 84, 96, 152, 251
 - allocation of, 67
 - described, 12, 64–5, 73, 251, 272
 - failure to meet, 208
 - fixed, 22
 - for self-defense, 20
 - fulfilled, 72, 97
 - in law, 20, 51–3, 61, 66–8, 74, 79, 251
 - judging, 272
 - shifting, 55, 63, 69, 81, 96, 110–11, 125, 200

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)*Index*

299

- Burden of proof, 46, 69, 115, 224
 - ambiguity of, 12, 52
 - characterized, 8
 - contextual, 241
 - described, 274
 - dispute about, 177, 181, 184, 203
 - distribution of, 122
 - elements of, 59
 - evaded, 146, 150, 162
 - for admissibility, 123, 134, 139
 - functions of, 58–9
 - global (*See also* Burden of persuasion),
 - 35, 84, 151, 204, 230, 235,
 - 274, 275
 - impasse, 182
 - impossible, 215
 - initial placement, 14
 - interpreting, 187
 - legal disputes about, 176
 - local (*See also* Burden of production),
 - 35, 61, 151, 204, 275
 - shifting, 49
 - management of, 143
 - necessity of, 98
 - related to presumption, 18
 - reversal of, 99, 195
 - rule for, 148, 246–7
 - setting, 99, 192
 - shift, 3, 9, 55, 63, 101, 117, 149, 162,
 - 188, 276
 - tacit shift of, 7, 84
 - tracking, 28, 31
 - undefined, 10, 58
- Burden of proof metadialogue, 64, 190,
 - 203, 205
- Burden of providing evidence, 200
- Burden of questioning, 14, 24–5
- Bursting bubble theory, 118

- Canadian House of Commons, 10, 177
- Car sale example, 55
- Carneades Argumentation System,
 - 77–8, 123, 126, 133, 136, 141,
 - 180, 184, 189, 222
- argument nodes, 125
- argument relationship in, 30
- bias in, 138
- burdens in, 139
- counterarguments in, 125
- critical question in, 25, 26, 124
- entanglement, 125
- feature of, 78, 260
- methodology, 26, 27–8, 125, 210
- proposition represented in, 79
- refutation in, 229
- standards of proof in, 60
- tracking shifts, 31, 82
- ultimate conclusion in, 77
- undercutters in, 81, 125, 185, 267
- weights in, 125
- CB1 dialogue system, 168–70
 - why question in, 172
- CB1CK, 164, 170–1, 172
- Challenge, 255
- Challenger space mission disaster
 - case, 7
 - argument from ignorance in, 7
- Circular argumentation, 78, 237
- Civil cases, 104
 - standard of proof, 68, 205
- Claim, 88
 - input claim, 59
 - ultimate claim, 75, 189
- Commitment
 - binding, 37
 - described, 146, 165
 - explicit, 167–8
 - implicit, 167–8
 - inconsistent, 37
 - retractions, 37, 165–6
 - rules, 168–9
- Commitment set (store)
 - common knowledge set, 171
 - described, 32, 165, 166, 239
- Common law systems, 24, 251
 - chaotic, 256
 - evidence in, 41
 - nesting aspect, 41
 - persuasion dialogue in, 41–2
 - trial stages, 41
- Concession, 167
- Conclusion
 - ultimate, 103
- Conditional statement, 90, 114

- Continuity, 255
- Contract law, 55
- Contraposition, 157
- Criminal case
 - burden of persuasion in, 20, 68
 - burden of production in, 20
 - exceptions in, 73
 - evidence standard in, 174
 - presumption of innocence, 190
 - proof standard, 20, 68
- Criteria, 238
- Critical discussion
 - complex version, 43
 - confrontation stage, 255
 - formal model of, 45–6, 62
 - goal of, 35, 246
 - procedural rules of, 35
 - rules for, 201, 202, 246–7
 - simple version, 43
 - stages of, 98
 - standpoint, 43–4, 151
 - winning, 43
- Critical questions, 274, 278
 - bias, 123, 137
 - consistency, 27
 - exceptions, 25, 30
 - supporting, 25
 - trustworthiness, 24, 26, 29, 30, 137
- Cumulativeness, 237, 238
- Dark stairway example, 102–3, 111
 - conclusion in, 105
 - inferential structure, 112
 - reasoning in, 104
- Debatepedia, 218–19
- Default challenge norm, 14
- Defeasible logic,
 - described, 156–7
- Defeater, 27, 29, 128
 - in/out, 70–2
- Defense norm, 14
- Deliberation dialogue, 36, 155, 211, 249
 - burden of proof in, 241
 - described, 36, 212, 213, 219–20, 232
 - imbedded with, 217
 - global burden of proof, 232
 - goal of, 212–13, 217, 221, 232
 - persuasion dialogue shift, 211
 - property of, 217
 - proposals in, 226
 - purpose of, 233
 - shift in, 211
 - stages of, 36, 155, 216, 217, 220
 - types of, 230–1
- Demonstration, 237
- Dialectical egalitarians, 13
- Dialectical foundationalists, 13
- Dialectical models of
 - argumentations, 32
 - pluralism or, 33
- Dialectical shift, 179
 - described, 36–7
 - illicit, 37, 211
- Dialogue, 148
 - blockage of, 205
 - defined, 34–5, 178
 - formal, 18, 31–2, 166
 - goals in, 33
 - reasoned, 254
 - rules, 153
 - symmetry in, 45
- 3-tuple, 34, 153
 - types of, 34, 98, 154
- Dialogue game, 187–8
- Dialogue on tipping example, 256
 - argument from commitment in, 265
 - burden of proof in, 264, 266
 - Carneades modeling of, 267
 - moves in, 258–9
 - ultimate thesis, 259
- Dialogue rules, 34, 35, 61
- Dialogue system specification (DSS), 155–6, 165
- Dialogical theory, 85–6, 107, 114–15, 118–20, 280
- Discovery dialogue, 238
 - burden of proof in, 239
 - formal system for, 239
 - stages of, 34, 238
- Dispute, 204, 271
 - described, 42, 100
 - symmetry of, 43
- Dissent, 204
 - asymmetry of, 43
 - described, 42, 100

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)*Index*

301

- Dung-style abstract argumentation, 188
- Dutch Law, 13, 77, 95
 - dismissal in, 13, 183–4
 - manslaughter in, 21–2, 73, 75, 78
 - possession in, 21, 55, 94
- Dutch murder case, 73, 76–8, 81
- Duty of producing evidence, 52, 53, 65
- e-mail vote case, 89, 90
- Embedding, 143
 - described, 37
 - metadialogue, 176
- Entanglement, 125
- Environmental deliberation, 231
- Evidence
 - beyond a reasonable doubt, 58, 60, 235
 - convincing, 57, 60
 - defeasible
 - described, 87
 - forensic, 133
 - indirect, 253
 - lack of, 251
 - misleading, 128
 - negative, 194
 - preponderance of, 57, 59, 60, 68, 104, 111, 201, 232, 235, 270
 - relevant, 140
 - reliability of, 140
 - rule of, 205
 - scintilla, 57, 59, 60, 235, 236
 - sufficiency of, 63
 - witness testimony, 128, 140
- Evidential burden, 12, 18, 65, 84, 86, 88–9, 96, 113–14, 249, 263, 277
 - decisions regarding, 264
 - described, 21–2, 54
 - fulfilling, 268, 277
 - related to presumption, 280
 - shift, 22, 47, 54, 105, 113, 120, 266
- Evidential legal reasoning, 5–6
- Evidential onus, 108
- Examination dialogue, 141
 - levels in, 142
- Expertise
 - imbalance of, 13
- Explanation, 210
- Eyewitness identification, 122
 - critical questioning of, 141
 - estimator variables, 129–30
 - system variables, 130–1
 - variables effecting, 129
- Facts, 156, 273
- Farley, A. M., 58–9, 60
- Fleming, J., 52, 63
- Florida
 - evidence code, 91
 - Supreme Court, 87–9
- Forensic debate, 203, 245, 253, 256, 281
 - burden of proof in, 47, 281
 - rules in, 256
 - standards of proof, 270
- Foundationalism, 13, 137, 237
- Freeman, K., 20, 58–9, 158, 170
- Gaskins, R. H., 3, 6–8, 191, 196, 246, 250–3, 280
- Generalization, 110, 114, 156, 161
 - defeasible, 107, 170
 - described, 114, 273
 - factual, 106
 - implicit, 120
 - qualified universal, 102
 - universal, 90, 102
- Global warming example, 4, 215, 218, 219, 242–3
- Goal, 32–4, 88, 153, 173, 211, 216, 218
 - collective, 27, 153
 - described, 153
 - dialogue, 36, 42, 110, 117, 232, 239
 - evaluation of, 227
 - opposed, 250
 - proponent/opponent, 59, 88
 - retraction, 228
 - trial, 39, 86, 143
 - ultimate, 143, 154
- Godden, D. M., 14
- Goldberg, S. H., 102, 191, 200
- Golf ball example, 206
- Gordon, T. F., 26, 41, 60, 93, 94
 - pleadings game, 39
 - proof standards, 72, 234–5
- Gottfried, J., 58

- Grice, H. P., 115, 248, 282
 Grootendorst, R., 42
 dialectical rules, 201, 202, 246, 247
 on burden of proof, 150
 on critical discussion, 42–3, 154, 157, 170, 204, 254–5
 Ground level dialogue, 178, 180–2, 206
- Hage, J. C. 39
 Hahn, U., 3, 243, 246–8
 local burden of proof, 154
 Hamblin, C. L., 32–3, 147, 158, 163, 168
 commitment store, 166
 dialogue models, 152–3, 155, 157
 initiative, 152, 164
 metadialogues, 176
 three responses rule, 148, 160, 164
 Why-Because System with Questions, 145–6, 150, 153, 172
 Hansen, H. V., 17–18
 Hasty transference, 3–4, 246, 248, 280
 criticism of, 280
 Hierarchical argument system, 179
 Hitchcock, D., 212, 216–18
 Houtlosser, P., 59, 98
 Hunter, A., 36, 237
 Hybrid model of evidential reasoning, 206–7, 209–10
- Implication
 defeasible, 87
 Inconsistency, 33, 147
 Inference, 86, 106, 120
 deductive, 105
 defeasible, 106, 108
 defined, 105
 inductive, 105
 nonmonotonic, 106
 pattern of, 92
 premise of, 105
 presumptive, 93, 108
 eight requirements of, 110–11
 steps of, 112–13
 Inference from silence to consent, 90
 Inference system (IS), 95, 96, 103
 Inference to the best explanation, 142, 207
- Information-seeking dialogue, 13
 embedded, 217
 goal of, 243–4
 Initial plausibility value, 270, 271
 Innocence Network, 122, 131
 Inquiry dialogue, 238
 aim of, 241
 argument inquiry dialogues, 36, 237
 burden of proof in, 239, 275
 classified, 36
 described, 34, 35, 239
 failure of, 276
 goal of, 35, 154, 241
 negative aim of, 237
 presumption, 275
 property of cooperativeness, 35–6, 154
 property of cumulativeness, 35
 warrant inquiry dialogues, 36
 Irrelevance, 223, 253
- Justification, 9, 14, 51, 110, 117, 155, 164, 172, 204, 233, 250
 burden of, 234
 legal, 39
- Karacapilidis, N., 235
 Kauffeld, F. J., 3, 14–15, 19
 social expectations, 15
 Kerwin, A., 194
 Kiralfy, A., 2–3, 57–8
 Knowledge, 9
 base, 5, 23, 192, 194–5, 198–9, 209
 common, 157–8, 164, 170–2, 175, 200, 206, 209, 266, 267
 defined, 5
 evidence based, 4
 Krabbe, E. C. W., 37–8, 168, 195, 212
 demarcation problem, 181–2, 205
 formal model, 43, 45, 69
 inductive definition, 44
 metadialogue, 176, 181–2
 PPD system, 150
 presumption, 278–9
 regress, 182
- Lack of evidence argument, 99, 193
 argumentation scheme for, 192
 critical questions for, 192

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)

Index

303

- Lascher, E. L., 213
 Laudan, L., 58, 173
 Legal argumentation
 assertions in, 21
 burden of proof in, 61–2, 196, 205
 shifting, 63
 dialogue structure of, 114
 goal of, 246
 historical analysis, 38–9
 judicial notice in, 158
 litigation, trait of, 251
 presumptions in, 200
 procedural rules in, 256
 terminology in, 2
 fact presumed, 85
 fact proved, 85
 reasonable doubt, 57
 third-party trier, 247, 248
 Legal dialogue rules governing
 moves, 38
 Legal reasoning, 180–1
 presumption in, 21, 90
 Legal trial, 191
 argument stage, 56, 61
 burden of persuasion in, 12, 20–2, 24,
 49, 52–6, 64, 74, 76, 95, 97, 120,
 125, 152, 200, 251
 burden of production in, 152
 components of, 86–7
 concluding stage, 61
 defendable argument in, 59
 evidence in, 141
 framework of, 245, 281
 modeled, 21
 opening stage, 69, 84
 process, 53
 rules, 40
 setting burdens in, 61
 stages, 51–2, 86
 Leonard, D. P., 102, 191
 Letter example, 90–1, 101–3, 118
 Locution (*See also* Speech acts), 32
 ask-justify, 233
 ask and tell, 240
 described, 32, 147
 rules, 168
 Lodder, A. R., 39
 Loftus, E. F., 128–9
 Los Gatos/Holland America case, 13,
 178, 183–7
 Macagno, F., 194, 200, 227
 Maxims, 58
 politeness, 282
 rhetorical, 253
 McBurney, P., 34, 36, 179, 181, 212,
 216–18, 227, 235, 238, 239
McCormick on Evidence, 3, 12
 burden of proof, 52
 burden of persuasion, 53
 examples from, 89–90
 preponderance of evidence, 57
 presumption, 20, 89, 92, 102, 114
 of innocence, 56
 reasonable doubt, 57
 Medical dialogue, 36, 194, 237
 Metadialogue, 151, 176, 178, 181
 Mexican war example, 221–4
Modus ponens (MP),
 characteristics of, 87
 defeasible *modus ponens* (DMP), 87,
 93, 95, 102–4, 107, 109, 120, 160,
 163, 164, 210
 described, 156
 inference, 102, 109, 111–13, 156
 strict *modus ponens* (SMP), 87, 161,
 163, 164
 described, 156
Modus tollens, 157
 defeasible *modus tollens*, 197
 Morgan-McCormick theory, 118
 Murder trial, 49, 67, 69, 73–5, 78–9,
 81, 250
 burden of production in, 66, 74, 76
 burden of proof in, 20
 evidential burden in, 120
 rebuttals in, 67
 self-defense case, 20, 68, 69,
 73, 180
 Negotiation dialogue, 33, 120–1,
 204, 232
 burden of proof in, 240
 described, 36
 shift to, 37, 183
 New evidence scholarship, 4–5

- No-fault insurance example (Rhode Island Assembly), 213, 224–5, 229
 burden of proof in, 226
 consequences in, 228
 goal of, 225, 228
- Normal default rule, 64, 178, 188, 204
 described, 246
 exceptions to, 12, 50, 51
 in law, 11–13, 50
- Oaksford, M., 3, 243, 246–8
 local burden of proof, 154
- Obligation, 52, 86, 98, 100, 167, 170, 196, 214, 232, 250–1
- Olbrecht-Tyteca, L., 9
- Open mind common sense system (OMCS), 18, 170
- Oregon Supreme Court, 122–3, 131, 134, 139–40, 143–4
- Overseas pharmaceutical case, 214
- Pardo, M. S., 174
- Park, R. C., 102, 191
- Parliamentary debate, 10
 Canadian rules for, 10
- Parsons, S., 34, 179, 181, 212, 217–18, 235, 238, 239
- Perelman, C., 9, 39
- Persuasion, 173
 achieved, 88
- Persuasion dialogue (*See also* Dispute and Dissent), 143
 aim of, 241
 burden of persuasion, 243
 burden of producing evidence, 242
 described, 155, 173, 219–20
 embedded, 234
 mitigating competitiveness, 25
 nature of, 35, 154
 participants aim in, 154
 permissive persuasion dialogue (PPD), 38, 150–2, 167, 247
 rigorous persuasion dialogue (RPD), 38
 stages of, 204, 220
- Picture hanging case, 37
- Plausible reasoning, 206–7
- Pleadings game, 39
- Political debate, 178, 195, 199, 205
- Pollock, J. L., 29, 123–4, 125, 135
 terminology of, 128
 practical inference
 argumentation scheme for, 226–7
- Practical reasoning, 226
 argumentation scheme for, 229
 instrumental practical reasoning, 227
- Prakken, H., 13, 69, 115, 134, 183
 ASPIC+ systems, 83, 209, 281
 burden of proof, 22, 64, 73, 120, 187–8, 209, 249
 logical model of, 70–1, 75, 189–90
 shifting, 54–6, 67
 formal system, 180
 on presumptions, 72, 94
 proof standards, 72
 theory, 21, 97, 101
- Prakken and Sartor theory, 21, 84, 94–5, 101, 103–4, 113, 119, 120–1, 155, 180, 184
 IS model, 95–6, 103
- Precautionary principle, 214–15, 231
- Premises, 180
 assumption, 25, 26, 124
 conditional, 119
 exceptions, 26, 124
 implicit, 161
 ordinary, 26
- Presidential debate, 245
- Pressing ground, 13, 183–5
 negation, 185, 187, 189
- Presumption, 91, 115, 118, 120
 characterized, 94
 components of, 18, 107–8
 defined, 108–9, 113, 276, 279
 described, 1, 19, 92, 100
 defining principle for, 93
 dialogue conditions for, 17, 117–18
 everyday, 92
 function of, 115, 117
 historical origins, 1–2
 in law, 92, 94, 106
 mislabeled, 56
 in law, 92, 94
 plausibility of, 19
 putting forward a, 277
 regulation of, 17
 related to burden of proof, 18, 99
- Presumption of death, 1, 115, 117

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)

Index

305

- Presumption of innocence, 19, 52, 56–7, 190, 200
- Presumption of mailing, 1–2
- Presumptive argumentation schemes, 120
- Probability
 - Baconian, 5, 197–8, 207
 - Bayesian, 4–5, 174
 - Pascalian, 5, 209
- Probative burden, 18, 65
- Prolog, 219–20
- Proof standard of, 22, 104
 - best choice, 234, 235
 - civil case, 68
 - criminal trial, 20, 53–4
 - effect on burden of proof, 72
 - probable cause, 57
- Proponent
 - goal of, 59
- Propositions, 63
 - basic, 13–14
- Protagonist
 - role of, 43, 62
- Quarrel, 37, 256
 - burden of proof in, 244
 - procedural, 182
- Question
 - governing, 212
 - side effects, 227
 - why-question, 147–50, 162–4, 172, 174, 200
 - ambiguous, 175
- R. v. Ching*, 57
- Rake theft example, 149–50, 159–61, 162
 - burden shifting question, 163
- Rational connection test, 107
- Rationale, 123, 135–6
- Reasoning
 - defeasible, 9, 56
 - normal inferential, 112
 - probability based, 9
- Rebuttal, 125
 - defined, 118
- Rebutting arguments, 59
- Rebutting the arguments, 59
- Rebutting defeaters, 29, 128
- Red light example, 29
- Reed, C., 13, 155, 155, 165, 183, 187–8, 228
 - dialogue specification system, 165
- Refutation, 119, 150, 161, 163, 180, 197, 229
- Reiter, R., 195–6, 199
- Relevance, 60, 144
 - defined, 188
 - fallacy of, 21, 282
- Reliability, judgments of, 240
- Rescher, N., 207
 - argument from consequences, 221
 - on presumption, 18–19, 93
 - on rules, 33
- Rescorla, M., 14, 166
- Relevance, 60, 144
- Retractions (*See also* Commitments), 237, 278
 - eliminating, 237
- Risinger, D. M., 107
 - on presumption, 85
- Risk of nonpersuasion, 11, 52–4, 65, 84, 247, 249
- Roman medals example, 194, 197
 - lack of evidence argument, 193
- Rule
 - AI, 114
 - commitment, 168
 - Commitment to Premises (CtP), 149, 155
 - conversational, 248
 - default, 21, 94–5, 97
 - defeasible, 19, 119, 156, 273
 - defined, 93–4, 273
 - dialectical, 201
 - dialogue, 153, 168, 169
 - judicial notice, 158
 - locution, 168
 - of law, 103
 - pre- and postcondition, 168
 - premise, 110
 - representations of, 95
 - standard burden of proof, 148
 - strategic, 168
 - strict, 156
 - termination, 168, 169
 - turn-taking, 170

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-04662-7 - Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

Douglas Walton

Index

[More information](#)

306

Index

- Sartor, G., 69, 115, 134, 155
 burden of proof, 22, 64, 67, 120, 209, 249
 logical mode of, 70–1, 75, 189–90
 shifting, 21
 on presumptions, 72
 theory, 97, 101
- Schank, R. C., 171
- Schum, David, 4–5
- Science of proof, 4, 6, 40
- Scientific inquiry, 194, 275
- Script, 171
 described, 175, 206
- Shifting (of burden of proof), problematic, 9–10
- Shifting initiative theory (SI), 25, 26
- Ship bilge case, 215
- Shooting witness case, 44–5
- Sidgwick, Alfred
 on presumption, 15
- Smets, P., 194
- Snake case, 91–2
- Socrates is mortal, 105
- Speech acts (*See also* locutions), 32
- Standard for soundness and completeness, 237
- Standards of proof, 22
- State of Oregon v. Lawson*, 126–9, 131, 137, 143–4
 argument map for, 133
 witness testimony in, 134
- State v. Classen*, 126, 131, 133, 137
 argument map for, 127
 unreliable testimony in, 133
- Straw man fallacy, 256
- Strong J. W. (*See McCormick on Evidence*)
- Sufficiency, 60, 63, 109
- Tactical burden of proof, 21–2, 51, 54, 101, 152, 208, 249, 263, 277
 allocation of, 67
 described, 64, 65, 88
 in a murder trial, 67, 74
 inducing, 96–7
 shifting of, 22, 65, 67, 69, 84, 208, 209, 266–7, 269
- Tillers, P., 58
- Tot v. United States*, 107
- Toulmin, S., 9, 237
- Tweety bird example, 21, 87, 95, 106, 156
- Twining, W., 40
- Ullman-Margalit, E., 15, 18, 92–3, 110
 on presumption, 15–16
- Ultimate *probandum*, 22, 55, 63, 67, 111, 141, 274–5
 elements of, 21
 root proposition, 125
- Undercutter, 29–31, 77, 81, 125, 128, 167, 187, 255, 262, 263, 267
 described, 29
 sequence of, 268
- Undercutting arguments, 59, 186
 described, 75
- United States v. New York*, 50–1
- Uranium embargo case, 10, 177, 195, 199
- van Eemeren, F. H., 42, 59
 on burden of proof, 98, 246
 on critical discussion, 42, 43, 154, 157, 202, 204, 246–7, 254–5
- Verheij, B., 87
- Walton, D., 13, 14, 17, 18, 37–8, 137, 164, 183, 212, 218, 222
 argument from expert opinion, 23, 26
 argument from ignorance, 10, 99, 194, 196
 argument from witness testimony, 136
 bias, 137
 burden of proof, 13, 18, 94, 100, 183, 187–8, 254
 deliberation dialogue, 213, 221
 dialogue framework, 98, 164
 modus ponens, 87
 negative evidence, 194, 200
 PPD dialogue system, 38, 150–1, 247
 proof standards, 72, 210
 RPD dialogue system, 38
 presumption, 14, 16–18, 278–9
 rules, 168, 169
- Weast v. Schaffer*, 12–13, 50–1, 178

Whately, R., 19	presumption of innocence, 56
burden of proof placement, 14	risk of nonpersuasion, 11
on presumptions, 15, 278	science of evidence, 280
Whinery, L. H., 106	science of proof, 40
Why-Because System (WB System), 149,	Wigmore's property investment case,
156, 157–8	11, 249–50
burden of proof in, 158	Wigmore's purse case, 213–14, 229–30
described, 148	Williams, C. R., 49, 54, 65, 120
managing arguments, 164	Witness testimony, 96–7, 124, 132, 140,
Why-Because System with Questions,	144, 149
153, 156	admissibility, 127, 144
described, 145, 146, 150	attacked, 5
rules for, 148, 155	bias, 123, 131, 137–8
Wigmore, J. H., 2, 5–6, 11, 250, 280	reliability, 44, 129, 130, 133
burden of proof distinctions, 2, 40,	Witte, C. L., 194
52–4, 214, 250	Witte, M. H., 194
charts, 4, 63	Wooldridge, M. J., 179, 181
laws of pleading and procedure, 250	
on legal terminology, 2	Zero-sum game, 154
on trial rules, 40–1	Zombie argument, 70