

Index

- Abductive reasoning, 17, 33, 100, 122, 146, 241, 248 *See also* Inference to the best explanation.
 - described, 136, 140
- Abductive revision, 135, 140
- Abelson, R.P., 111
- Academic skepticism, 240
- ACCEPTER
 - described, 110
- Action, 12, 21
 - described, 162–163
 - penultimate, 130
- Action-based alternating transition system, 136, 157
- Actos example, 50–51, 89
- Ad baculum*
 - argumentum ad baculum*, 261
 - fallacy, 261
- Ad hominem*
 - attack, 205, 206
 - Argumentum ad hominem*,
 - circumstantial *ad hominem* argument, scheme for, 204
 - described, 205
- Adversarial exchange, 204, 270
- Advertisements,
 - deceptive, 55–56
 - problem-solution strategy, 39
 - target audience, 65
 - visual, 60, 61
- Advice-seeking intervals, 152
- Advising dialogue, 224–226
 - requirements for, 227
 - stages of, 228
- Advocacy, 223 *See also* Burden of advocacy.
 - requirements of, 223
- AeroVelo example, 249
 - ultimate goal, 250
- Agent
 - assumptions by, 135
 - capability of criticism, 29
 - characteristics of, 12–13, 29, 34–35, 252
 - communication by, 12
 - communication systems, 135
 - described, 1, 12
 - goals of, 3, 251, 252
 - plurality of, 20
 - intelligence of, 29
 - rational, 2, 234
 - requirements on, 15
- Agent reasoning, 134
- Akrasia*. *See* Weakness of will.
- Ambiguity, 132, 133, 230, 272
- Anchored narrative, 139–140
- Antagonist, 179
- Appeal
 - irrational, 61
 - to emotion, 62
- ArguMed, 68, 72–74
- Argument, 251, 255
 - definition, 104
 - determination of, 120
 - purpose of, 103, 104
- Argument construction, 246
- Argument defense, 68–71
- Argument diagram, 39, 78
- Argument framework, 69
- Argument from consequences, 160
 - critical questions for, 25–26
 - negative consequences, 25, 50, 103, 127, 202
 - scheme for, 50, 126

- Argument from consequences (cont.)
 - positive consequences, 25
 - premise in, 130
- Argument from correlation to cause
 - critical questions for, 43
 - scheme for, 43
- Argument from evidence to a hypothesis, 144
- Argument from expert opinion, 78
 - critical questions for, 83–84
 - defeasible, 244
 - scheme for, 83, 85
 - undercutter to, 210
- Argument from ignorance, 184
- Argument from inconsistent commitment,
 - scheme for, 204, 205
- Argument from instrumental practical reasoning (new version)
 - scheme for, 93–94
- Argument from motive to intention, 142
- Argument from negative value
 - scheme for, 26
- Argument from positive value, 124
 - scheme for, 26
- Argument from value-based practical reasoning
 - scheme for, 92–93
- Argument graph, 82, 157
 - defined, 78
- Argument mapping tools, 63–64
 - described, 39
- Argumentation schemes, 39, 173, 178
 - defeasible, 40
- Aristotle, 233, 263–264
 - BDI model, 9–10
 - deliberation, 263
 - on practical reasoning, 1
 - practical inference, 3–4, 239
 - chaining of, 5
 - practical wisdom (*phronesis*), 238, 251
 - rationality (*episteme*), 238
- Araucaria*, 39, 43, 64, 67, 87–89
 - refutation in, 49, 50, 74
- ASPIC+, 68
 - characteristics, 69
- Assertion, 107, 179
- Assumption, 72, 265
 - closed world, 32, 41, 95–96, 184
 - implicit, 54
 - of intentions, 132
 - justified, 76
- Atkinson, K., 21, 31, 92, 136, 157, 162, 195, 270
- Audi, R., 7–8, 237
- Audience, 39, 80–82, 204, 207
 - determination of, 215
 - target, 269
- Battle of the experts, 79
- Belief, 10, 106
 - described, 9
- Belief-desire-intention model (BDI), 8, 132
 - described, 9
 - framework, 136
 - problem for, 11
 - problem with, 147
- Bench-Capon, Trevor, 20, 21, 31, 91, 92, 136, 157, 162
- Bex, F. J., 105, 136, 139, 144, 146
- Bias, 234
 - expert, 84
 - unbiased, 226
 - unbiased source, 62
- Birdsell, D. S., 57, 60
- Black, E., 246
- Blocks world, 95, 191
- Brainstorming, 156, 183
- Bratman, M., 10, 11, 15, 239
- Budzynska, K., 105
- Burden of advocacy, 196, 221, 224
- Burden of proof, 231
 - deciding on, 84, 196
 - global, 35, 217, 231
 - changed, 200
 - lack of, 196, 217, 223
 - problem, 231
 - rule, 268
 - shift, 84, 221
- Caduet example, 51
- Carneades Argumentation System (CAS), 68, 77, 138
 - additional features, 81
 - argument from expert opinion, 85
 - audience notion, 207
 - critical questions in, 85
 - flagpole example, 125–126
 - modeling in, 78,
 - policy modeling, 157, 158, 199
 - procedural view of inquiry in
 - proof standards in, 233
 - proposition in, 80

- real estate example, 154
- refutation in, 88
- social progress example, 208–210, 212–214
- future expectations of, 229
- Catskills example, 7
- Cawsey, A., 110
- Chainsaw example, 6
- Chaining, 87, 236, 251
 - forward, 5
- Cicero, 241
- Claim, 26, 48, 56, 75, 104, 107, 142, 203, 210, 216
 - denied, 71
 - factual, 130
 - principle, 20
 - ultimate, 25, 137
 - unsupported, 58
- Clarke, D. S., 8, 237
- Cohen, C., 102
- Collective intentionality, 14–16
 - four requirements on, 15
- Collingwood, R., 100–101
- Commissive, 168–169
- Commitment, 106
 - described, 9, 40
 - retraction, 9, 13, 16
- Commitment rules, 120
- Commitment store, 13, 33, 107, 179
- Commitment-based argumentation,
 - described, 9
- Completeness problem, 32, 187
- Compromise, 185
- Conclusion
 - implicit, 44
 - negation, 159
 - ultimate, 44, 72, 127, 142, 208
 - defeated, 73
- Conditional projection, 13, 257
- Conflict
 - of opinions, 218
 - resolution, 173
- Consequence
 - negative, 141, 202, 224, 257
- Contraindications, 53, 54, 56
- Contrariness function, 71
- Convergent argument
 - described, 79
- Copi, I. M., 102
- Counter-argument, 159, 165
- Critical discussion, 41, 105–106, 261
 - stages of, 179
- Critical questions, 40, 84, 165, 173
 - consistency question, 84
 - evidence question, 84
 - expertise question, 83
 - field question, 83
 - function of, 30
 - opinion question, 83
 - trustworthiness question, 83, 84
 - why question, 107, 176, 216, 221, 223
 - ambiguity of, 230
 - protocol for responding to, 219, 230–231
- Crombag, H. F. M., 139
- Cumulativeness, 246
- Cymbalta advertisement example
 - negative consequence of, 23–24
 - negative side effects critical question, 2
- Decision-making, 14, 149, 161, 167, 182, 188, 191, 220
- Deductive-nomological (DN) model, 99, 115
 - inductive-statistical (I-S) type, 100
- Defeasible modus ponens (DMP), 76, 82, 175
- Defeaters, 70, 71
- DefLog, 68, 72, 76
- Deliberation dialogue, 41. *See also* Individual subtypes.
 - adversarial, 204, 271
 - closing, 185–187, 193, 258
 - collaborative, 204
 - criteria for success, 187, 190
 - empirical modeling, 176–177
 - evaluated, 190
 - failure in, 183
 - formal model of, 156, 175, 216
 - goal of, 61, 170
 - information exchange in, 176, 178
 - informed, 165
 - participant's goal in, 197
 - persuasion dialogue intervals in, 195
 - practical reasoning in, 231
 - premise of, 170
 - proposal, 221
 - relevance in, 187
 - resource-bounded procedure, 155
 - rules in, 175
 - solitary, 152
 - speech acts in, 169–170, 173, 175, 222
 - stages of, 171–172, 180
 - structure of, 173
 - subtypes, 191
 - why question in, 219, 230

- Desire, 8–11, 21, 31, 33–34, 133, 140, 252
- Dialectical negation, 76–77
- Dialectical shift, 41, 61, 164, 182, 195, 202
 - gradual, 207
 - illicit, 61
- Dialogue
 - context of, 40
 - multi-agent, 161
 - sequence of, 163
 - stages of, 40–41, 163
 - types of, 33, 40–41, 267
- Dialogue rules, 42. *See also* Protocols.
 - procedural rules, 222
- Dialogue structure, 65–66
- Direct to consumer health products
 - advertisement example (DTCA), 23, 61, 182, 206. *See also* Individual examples.
 - central persuasion structure, 38
 - failure of, 58
- Directive, 4, 168–169
- Dispute, 217
- Dissent, 217
- Dragoni, A. F., 135
- Dray, W., 101
- Dung, P. 76
- Economist, The*, 200, 207, 210, 215, 232, 254, 270
- Embedding, 60, 61, 164, 198, 272
 - everyday language, 134, 148
 - nature of, 228
- Enthymemes, 64
 - described, 39–40
- Epistemology of scientific evidence (ESE), 245
- Eristic dialogue, 33, 272
- Error correction, 234
- Errors of judgment, 234
- Evidence, 268
 - characteristic of, 210
 - circumstantial, 137
- Evidence-based epistemology (EBE), 245
- Examination, 139
- Exception, 72
- Explanadum*, 99
- Explanation, 255
 - argumentation combination, 119
 - casual, 255
 - defined, 110
 - described, 100, 109
 - determination of, 120, 128–129
 - historical, 100–101
 - provisional, 101
 - purpose of, 103–104
 - scientific, 121
 - stages of, 110
- Explanation scheme, 99
- Facts (described), 163
- Falsifiability, 244
- Fallacy, 260
- Fallacy of affirming the consequent, 56–57
- Fallacy of jumping to a conclusion, 64, 165
- Fallacy of omission, 58, 59, 62
- Fallacy of relevance, 58
- Feedback, 13, 105, 112
- Felicity condition, 169
- Flagpole example, 123, 145–146
 - argument from positive values, 124
 - value in, 131
- Formal dialectic, 105
- Framing the issue, 197, 214–215
- Generalization, 13, 114, 121, 237, 239
 - defeasible, 114–115
- Gilbert, M., 15–16
- Giorgini, P., 135
- Girle, R., 36
- Goal, 12, 14, 165
 - conflicting, 172, 232, 266
 - connected to means, 128
 - consistency, 27
 - described, 163, 248
 - ethical, 22
 - identified, 33, 215
 - implicit, 54
 - impeded, 177
 - individual, 178, 219
 - multiple, 17
 - primary, 17
 - priorities, 28
 - compared, 28
 - shared, 54
 - subsidiary, 167
 - ultimate, 129–131
- Goal-directed reasoning, 46
- Gordon, T. F., 161
- Governing questions, 41, 163
- Grice, H. P.
 - conversational principle, 262
- Groarke, L., 56–58, 60

- Habitable hut example, 8
- Hamblin, C.L., 105–107
 - rules of, 108
- Hastie, R., 139
- Hawk example, 117–118, 151
 - reasoning in, 119
- Heated metal example, 115–116
- Hempel, C., 100
- Hitchcock, D., 9, 36, 41, 162, 164
 - MHP model, 148, 163
- House purchase example, 168–169, 183–185
- Hume's law, 20
- Hunter, A., 246
- Hypothesis
 - provisional, 101
- Inconsistency, 27, 139, 202–203, 238, 257, 259
 - apparent, 205
 - practical inconsistency, 254
 - pragmatic inconsistency, 258
- Inference
 - abductive, 140
 - deductive, 236
 - lack of knowledge, 183–184
 - means-end, 130
- Inference from an appearance to a conclusion, 241
- Inference to the conclusion, 137
- Inference to the best explanation (IBE), 17, 135, 140, 141, 256. *See also* Abductive reasoning.
 - criminal case, 144
 - critical questions for, 136, 140–141
 - scheme for, 136
- Inferential link, 30, 64, 69, 80, 137, 170–171
 - attacked, 71
- Information-seeking dialogue, 152, 226, 271
 - embedded, 60
 - standard of proof in, 271
- Innuendo, 205
- Inquiry dialogue, 217, 267
 - aim, 240
 - argument inquiry, 246
 - model, 246
 - nature of, 246
 - standard of proof, 267, 271
 - warrant inquiry, 246
- Instrumental practical reasoning, 21, 37
 - scheme for, 124–125
- Integrity, 205
- Intent, 10, 15, 33, 132, 256
 - ascription of, 122, 256
 - defined, 133–134
 - described, 9
 - imputation of, 132, 138
 - principle of double effect, 143
- Irrationality, 260, 262, 266, 272
- Jackson v. Virginia, 144
- Josephson, J. R., 140
- Josephson, S. G., 140
- Jumping to a conclusion, 96
- Karacapilidis, N. I., 161
- Kass, A., 111
- Kauffeld, F. J., 169, 216–217
- Knowledge
 - base, 180–181, 242
 - closed, 258
 - open, 149, 178, 189, 222, 232, 234
 - common, 189
 - discovery, 241
 - evidence-based model, 243
 - evidence relationship, 268
 - fallibilistic, 234, 235, 241, 243
 - of circumstances, 242
 - scientific, 240
 - transmission of, 244
 - veristic, 241
- Kok, E., 175, 181, 216, 221
- Krabbe, E. C. W., 61, 105–106, 246
- Kukafka, R., 59
- Labellings, 70
- Lap-band example, 53–56, 87
- Legal argumentation
 - circumstantial evidence, 143
 - intention in, 122
 - standards of proof
 - beyond reasonable doubt, 217
 - clear and convincing evidence, 217
 - preponderance of the evidence, 217
 - scintilla of evidence, 218
 - substantial evidence, 218
 - trials
 - burden of persuasion, 218
 - evidential burden, 218
- Leonard, D. P., 137, 141, 142
- Linked argument, 80, 92
 - described, 79

- London train examples, 21
 Lunesta example, 46–48, 57, 86–87
- McBurney, P., 21, 31, 36, 41, 92, 162, 164
 MHP model, 148, 163
- Means
 described, 7
- Means-end reasoning, 1, 192, 239
- Medical investigations, 246
- Memory, 1, 13, 111
- MHP dialogue model, 156, 167, 191–192
 cell phone case, 168
 dialectical shifts in, 182
 extended, 178
 failure of, 166
 governing question, 181
 revisions, 181, 192–193
- Miller, K., 15
- Moore, J.D., 110
- Motive, 137, 141, 142, 146, 231
 described, 133
 imputation of, 138
- Mucinex example, 48–50, 57, 74–75, 87–88
- Multi-agent systems, 135
- Murder example, 137
- Nakamoto, K., 58, 62
- Natural language
 negative terms, 202
- Necessary condition, 7–8, 248
 scheme, 7, 18
- Negotiation dialogue, 262
 shift to, 185
- Network of argumentation, 154
- Norman, T. J., 172–174, 176, 178, 181, 219, 222, 230, 232
 computational framework, 187
- Parmenides System, 162
- Parsons, S., 36, 162, 164
 MHP model, 148, 163
- Peirce, C. S., 240
- Pennington, N., 139
- Perception, 12, 62, 207, 219
- Persuasion, 41, 146, 270
- Persuasion dialogue, 217, 271
 adversarial nature of, 271
 framing, 180
 goal of, 167
- Plan(s), 10, 173
 alternative, 174
 conflict of, 218
 modification, 179
- Plavix example, 50–53, 57
- Policy
 debate, 148–149, 156
 modeling tool, 157
- Political rhetoric, 200
- Pollock, J.L.
 undercutters, 94
- Popper, K., 244
- Positivism, 101
- Post hoc* fallacy, 44–45
- Practical inconsistency, 203, 254
- Practical inference
 scheme for, 7–8
 structure of, 6–7
 three basic components of, 1–2
- Practical irrationality, 254, 258, 266–267
- Practical reasoning, 161, 212, 214
 abductive use of, 6
 attacked, 75
 critical questions for, 30, 171
 defeasible, 24, 29, 57, 58
 described, 7–8, 39, 237, 238, 250–252
 ethical notion of, 22
 methods of criticizing, 29–30
 problem with, 17
 projective use of, 5, 6
 requirements of, 35
 scheme for, 48, 136
 solitary notion of, 14
 value-based variant, 185, 199, 212
 with several alternative actions, 16–17
- Practical reasoning for evidence to motive, 142
 scheme for, 138
- Prakken, H., 68
- Premise, 68
 accepted, 210
 attacks, 64, 72
- Premise types
 alternatives premise, 18
 enthymematic, 54
 explicit, 53, 56
 goal premise, 18, 22, 44, 53
 implicit, 53, 64, 129
 implicit value, 55
 means, 65
 practicality premise
 selection premise
 side effects premise, 18
 values premise, 92

- Presumption, 32, 72, 86, 191
 Principle of rational mutual inquiry, 167
 Printer example, 160, 196–197, 215, 226, 247,
 264, 265, 266, 271
 closure in, 197
 explained, 149–151
 Problem solving, 10, 14, 34, 117–118, 123,
 149, 151, 191, 203
 deliberation, 220, 264
 everyday, 117–118
 goal based, 206
 value-based, 23
 Procrastination, 165, 183
 Proleptic argumentation, 50
 described, 48
 Proponent, 105, 227
 goal of, 228
 Proposal, 199, 215–217
 attacked, 195
 evaluated, 211
 requirements of, 216
 retracted, 216
 structure of, 170
 Proposing, 165, 168–169
 characteristics of, 169
 defined, 169
 Protagonist, 179
 Protocols, 179 *See also* Dialogue rules.
- Radiators example, 111–114, 116,
 119, 121
 Rationality, 247, 262, 272
 classical model of
 weakness of, 20
 defined, 235, 247–248, 250
 described, 260
 epistemic, 234, 235, 239, 269
 characteristics of, 244–245
 defined, 245
 epistemic scientific, 239
 defined, 246
 practical, 234, 269
 characteristics of, 263
 defined, 235, 248
 described, 252
 paradigm of, 269
 syllogistic, 239
 theoretic, 234
 Real estate example, 160–161, 198, 226,
 264, 265
 explained, 153
- Reasoning
 backward, 140, 146
 chain of, 268
 deductive, 233, 251
 defeasible, 184, 235
 described, 250–251
 evidential, 122, 137, 141, 144
 epistemic, 238, 241, 271
 modeled, 144
 inductive, 233
 legal, 139
 theoretical, 236–237
 Rebuttal, 50, 75, 79, 95, 159
 described, 30
 Rebutters
 described, 71
 Red light example, 71, 77
 Refutation, 49, 50, 74
 of a refutation, 89
 Reframing the issue, 200
 Rescher, N., 19, 235, 240
 Respondent, 227
 goal of, 228
 Retraction, 290, 239, 246
 Riesbeck, C. K.,
 Rubinelli, S., 58, 61, 62
- Satisficing, 17
 Schulz, P. K., 58, 62
 Script. *See also* Story.
 described, 99, 109, 121, 139
 Searle, J. R., 10, 11, 96
 classification of speech acts, 168–169, 216,
 226–227
 on collective intention, 15
 on Hume's law, 20
 on reasons, 33–34
 Schank, R. C., 110, 111
 Serafini, L., 135
 Schafer, B., 136, 141
 Shared agency, 11
 Scientific inquiry, 235
 Side effects argument, 89
 Side effects critical question, 25
 negative, 171
 Skewed income distribution example,
 201–202
 Slade, C., 57
 Smart car example, 21, 90
 premises in, 91
 value based reasoning in, 22

- Social progress example, 208
 - ultimate conclusion in, 212, 214
 - ultimate goal in, 214
- Socrates, 241
- Solutions, 10, 214, 231
 - inconsistent, 205
- Speech acts
 - rules governing, 135
 - turn-taking, 175
- Standards of proof, 59, 95, 188, 233, 268, 271.
 - See also* Legal argumentation.
- State space explosion, 2, 29, 36, 147, 195
- Statement
 - goal statement, 22
- Story. *See also* Script.
 - judging, 139
- Straw man fallacy, 40
- Sufficient condition, 7
 - scheme, 7–8, 18
- Sufficient condition value-based practical
 - reasoning scheme
 - critical questions for, 31
- Sycara, K., 172–174, 181
- Teleological explanation, 120
- Theory of reasons for action, 33–34
- Threat, 261, 262
- Toniolo, A., 172–174, 176, 178, 181, 219, 222, 230, 232
 - computational framework, 187
- Town hall meeting example, 160, 199, 264, 265
- Train to Arnhem example 4, 7
- Trial and error, 265
- Truth, 240
- Tuomela, R., 15
- Ultimate *probandum*
- Umbrella example, 8
- Undercutter, 73, 75, 145
 - described, 30, 71, 94, 160
- Underlying argument, 63,
- Understanding, 120
- Universal quantifier, 99–110
- Vagueness, 132
- Value based practical reasoning, 37, 68, 207–208
 - critical questions for, 158, 159–160
 - goal, 157
 - scheme for, 21, 28–29, 125, 157, 158, 199
- van Koppen, P.J., 139
- Veracity principle, 240
- Veristic principle, 243
- Verheij, B., 72, 76
- Vodka ad example, 56–58
- Von Wright, G.H., 7–8
- Wagenaar, W.A., 139
- Walton, D., 6, 61, 141, 174, 176, 178, 219, 222, 230, 232
 - agent's mental state, 136
 - argument from expert opinion, 83
 - argumentation scheme, 18
 - commitment model, 8
 - complications of practical reasoning, 17
 - computational framework, 187
 - critical questions, 84
 - dialogue system for explanation, 107
 - dialogue types, 246
 - IBE, 144
 - on goals, 16
 - on stories, 139
 - real estate example, 154
- Warning
 - requirements of, 226–227
- Water supply example, 174, 176, 178
- Weakness of will, 11, 254, 263
- Why² Dialogue System, 98, 107, 120
 - speech acts in, 108
- Why-Because System with Questions, 106
- Wigmore, J. H., 133, 141
- Wooldridge, M., 192
- Yogurt example, 42–46, 55, 89
 - premises in, 43
- Zeno argumentation framework, 162