
Online Library A Systematic Theory Of Argumentation The Pragma Dialectical Approach

Right here, we have countless ebook **A Systematic Theory Of Argumentation The Pragma Dialectical Approach** and collections to check out. We additionally provide variant types and then type of the books to browse. The pleasing book, fiction, history, novel, scientific research, as skillfully as various extra sorts of books are readily within reach here.

As this A Systematic Theory Of Argumentation The Pragma Dialectical Approach, it ends stirring creature one of the favored books A Systematic Theory Of Argumentation The Pragma Dialectical Approach collections that we have. This is why you remain in the best website to see the incredible book to have.

CSKRVT - MAYA DONNA

"This dissertation is a systematic analytical study of the argument scheme of argumentation by analogy. The dissertation adopts the framework of the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation and proposes improved methods for interpretation, reconstruction, and evaluation of argumentation by analogy. The dissertation also provides a general framework for argumentation that explains the concepts of validity and inference in a unified way. It gives an account of how to understand complex analogy argumentation that is consistent with the pragma-dialectical understanding of argument schemes and argument structures, as well as providing a unified and comprehensive account of the counterarguments that can be used against analogy argumentation."--Samenvatting auteur.

The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction is an invaluable reference work featuring contributions from leading global scholars, available both online and as a three-volume print set. The definitive international reference work on a topic of major and increasing importance, in a new series of sub-disciplinary international encyclopedias Provides state-of-the-art research for scholars in a highly interactive and accessible format, available both online and as a three-volume print set Covers key research topics in the field with contributions from a team of experienced, global editors Successfully brings into a single source, explication of all of the fascinating and groundbreaking Language and Social Interaction work developing globally and across subjects Part of The Wiley Blackwell-ICA International Encyclopedias of Communication series, published in conjunction with the International Communication Association. Online version available at Wiley Online Library

This volume presents 50 contributions on the themes of reasonableness and effectiveness and their connections, which are central issues in argumentation theory. It discusses van Eemeren's views on the study of argumentation; the approach to argumentation adopted in pragma-dialectics; pragma-dialectical perspectives on the dialectical and pragmatic dimensions of argumentative discourse; the notion of strategic maneuvering; the pragma-dialectical method of analyzing argumentative discourse; the treatment of fallacies as violations of rules for critical discussion; pragma-dialectical views on context, the role of logic, verbal indicators of argumentative moves and argument schemes; and the process of writing and rewriting argumentative texts. The pragma-dialectical quantitative approach to empirical research on argumentative discourse is illustrated by reporting on selected, illustrative experimental studies, as well as qualitative studies of historical cases.

Scare Tactics, the first book on the subject, provides a theory of the structure of reasoning used in fear and threat appeal argumentation. Such arguments come under the heading of the argumentum ad baculum, the 'argument to the stick/club', traditionally treated as a fallacy in the logic textbooks. The new dialectical theory is based on case studies of many interesting examples of the use of these arguments in advertising, public relations, politics, international negotiations, and everyday argumentation on all kinds of subjects. Many of these arguments are amusing, once you see the clever tactic used; others are scary. Some of the arguments appear to be quite reasonable, while others are highly suspicious, or even outrageously fraudulent. In addition to the examples taken from logic textbooks, other cases treated come from a variety of sources, including political debates, legal arguments, and arguments from media sources, like magazine articles and television ads. The purpose of this book is to explain how such arguments work as devices of persuasion, and to develop a method for analyzing and evaluating their reasonable and fallacious uses in particular cases. The book shows how such arguments share a common structure, revealing several distinctive forms of argument nested within each other. Based on its account of this cognitive structure, the new dialectical theory presents methods for identifying, analyzing, and evaluating these arguments, as they are used in specific cases. The book is a scholarly contribution to argumentation theory. It is written in an accessible style, and uses many colorful and provocative examples of fear and threat appeal arguments that are suitable for classroom discussions. The matters treated will be of interest to professionals and students in law, critical thinking, advertising, speech communication, informal logic, cognitive science, rhetoric, and media studies.

The book offers a compact but comprehensive introductory overview of the crucial components of argumentation theory. In presenting this overview, argumentation is consistently approached from a pragma-dialectical perspective by viewing it pragmatically as a goal-directed communicative activity and dialectically as part of a regulated critical exchange aimed at resolving a difference of opinion. As a result, the book also systematically explains how the constitutive parts of the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation, which are discussed in a number of separate publications, hang together. The following crucial topics are discussed: (1) argumentation theory as a discipline; (2) the meta-theoretical principles of pragma-dialectics; (3) the model of a critical discussion aimed at resolving a difference of opinion; (4) fallacies as violations of a code of conduct for reasonable argu-

mentative discourse; (5) descriptive research of argumentative reality; (6) analysis as theoretically-motivated reconstruction; (7) strategic manoeuvring aimed at combining achieving effectiveness with maintaining reasonableness; (8) the conventionalization of argumentative practices; (9) prototypical argumentative patterns; (10) pragma-dialectics amidst other approaches. *Argumentation Theory: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective* is clearly written and makes argumentation theory understandable to all scholars and advanced students interested in argumentation research.

This book provides a new, linguistic approach to Argumentation Theory. Its main goal is to integrate the logical, dialectical and rhetorical dimensions of argumentation in a model providing a unitary treatment of its justificatory and persuasive powers. This model takes as its basis Speech Acts Theory in order to characterize argumentation as a second-order speech act complex. The result is a systematic and comprehensive theory of the interpretation, analysis and evaluation of arguments. This theory sheds light on the many faces of argumentative communication: verbal and non-verbal, monological and dialogical, literal and non-literal, ordinary and specialized. The book takes into consideration the major current comprehensive accounts of good argumentation (Perelman's New Rhetoric, Pragma-dialectics, the ARG model, the Epistemic Approach) and shows that these accounts have fundamental weaknesses rooted in their instrumentalist conception of argumentation as an activity oriented to a goal external to itself. Furthermore, the author addresses some challenging meta-theoretical questions such as the justification problem for Argumentation Theory models and the relationship between reasoning and arguing.

The present volume assembles a relevant set of studies of argument by analogy, which address this topic in a systematic fashion, either from an essentially theoretical perspective or from the perspective of it being applied to different fields like politics, linguistics, literature, law, medicine, science in general and philosophy. All result from original research conducted by their authors for this publication. Thus, broadly speaking, this is an exception which we find worthy of occupying a special place in the sphere of the bibliography on the argument by analogy. In effect, most of the contexts of the publications on this topic focus on specific areas, for example everyday discourse, science or law theory, while underestimating or sometimes even ignoring other interdisciplinary scopes, as is the case of literature, medicine or philosophy. The idiosyncrasy of this volume is that the reader and the researcher may follow the development of different theoretical outlooks on argument by analogy, while measuring the scope of its (greater or lesser) application to the aforementioned areas as a whole.

It is somewhat surprising to find out how little serious theorizing there is in philosophy (and in social psychology as well as sociology) on the nature of social actions or joint act. ons in the sense of actions performed together by several agents. Actions performed by single agents have been extensively discussed both in philosophy and in psycho~ogy. There is, accordingly, a booming field called action theory in philosophy but it has so far strongly concentrated on actions performed by single agents only. We of course should not forget game theory, a discipline that systematically studies the strategic interaction between several rational agents. Yet this important theory, besides being restricted to strongly rational acting, fails to study properly several central problems related to the conceptual nature of social action. Thus, it does not adequately clarify and classify the various types of joint action (except perhaps from the point of view of the agents' utilities). This book presents a sys-

tematic theory of social action. Because of its reliance on so-called purposive causation and generation it is called the purposive-causal theory. This work also discusses several problems related to the topic of social action, for instance that of how to create from this perspective the most central concepts needed by social psychology and sociology. While quite a lot of ground is covered in the book, many important questions have been left unanswered and many others unasked as well.

This book constitutes the thoroughly refereed post-proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems held in Utrecht, Netherlands in July 2005 as an associated event of AAMAS 2005, the main international conference on autonomous agents and multi-agent systems. The 10 revised full papers presented together with an invited paper were carefully reviewed and selected from 17 submissions. The papers are organized in topical sections on foundations, negotiation, protocols, deliberation and coalition formation, and consensus formation.

This book brings together essays by one of the pre-eminent scholars of informal logic.

This book is the edition of the Proceedings of the International Colloquium "Rhetoric and Argumentation in the Beginning of the XXIst Century" which was held at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Coimbra, in October 2-4, 2008, and was organized by Henrique Jales Ribeiro, Joaquim Neves Vicente and Rui Alexandre Grácio. The main purpose of the Colloquium was to commemorate the publication in 1958 of the books *La nouvelle rhétorique: Traité de l'argumentation*, and *The Uses of Arguments*, by, respectively, C. Perelman/L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, and S. Toulmin. But another important goal was to take stock of the state of rhetoric and argumentation theory at the beginning of a new century. It was a unique event, without parallel in Portugal and worldwide - considering its theme and its aims -, which gathered some of the World's most renowned rhetoric and argumentation theorists: Alan Gross, Douglas Walton, Erik Krabbe, Frans V. Eemeren, F. Snoeck Henkemans, Guy Haarscher, John Anthony Blair, Marianne Doury, Oswald Ducrot, Ruth Amossy. The book includes a variety of very important contributions to rhetoric and argumentation theory, ranging from those that naturally fall within the subject matter, to the areas of philosophy, linguistics, communication theory, education theory and law theory. The "art", as it was called in the Medieval curricula, is no longer a discipline amongst others and has become, according to the view of some specialists and largely owing to Perelman and Toulmin influences, a "new paradigm" of rationality for our age, which auspiciously encompasses all fields of knowledge and culture. The book is divided into five parts: I- Historical and philosophical studies on the influences of Perelman and Toulmin; II- Studies in argumentation theory; III- Linguistic approaches to argumentation theory; IV- Rhetoric; and communication theory / education theory approaches to argumentation; and V- Law theory approaches to argumentation.

In this book two of the leading figures in argumentation theory present a view of argumentation as a means of resolving differences of opinion by testing the acceptability of the disputed positions. Their model of a 'critical discussion' serves as a theoretical tool for analyzing, evaluating and producing argumentative discourse. This is a major contribution to the study of argumentation and will be of particular value to professionals and graduate students in speech communication, informal logic, rhetoric, critical thinking, linguistics, and philosophy.

Argumentation theory is a distinctly multidisciplinary field of inquiry. It draws its data, assumptions,

and methods from disciplines as disparate as formal logic and discourse analysis, linguistics and forensic science, philosophy and psychology, political science and education, sociology and law, and rhetoric and artificial intelligence. This presents the growing group of interested scholars and students with a problem of access, since it is even for those active in the field not common to have acquired a familiarity with relevant aspects of each discipline that enters into this multidisciplinary matrix. This book offers its readers a unique comprehensive survey of the various theoretical contributions which have been made to the study of argumentation. It discusses the historical works that provide the background to the field and all major approaches and trends in contemporary research. Argument has been the subject of systematic inquiry for twenty-five hundred years. It has been graced with theories, such as formal logic or the legal theory of evidence, that have acquired a more or less settled provenance with regard to specific issues. But there has been nothing to date that qualifies as a unified general theory of argumentation, in all its richness and complexity. This being so, the argumentation theorist must have access to materials and methods that lie beyond his or her "home" subject. It is precisely on this account that this volume is offered to all the constituent research communities and their students. Apart from the historical sections, each chapter provides an economical introduction to the problems and methods that characterize a given part of the contemporary research program. Because the chapters are self-contained, they can be consulted in the order of a reader's interests or research requirements. But there is value in reading the work in its entirety. Jointly authored by the very people whose research has done much to define the current state of argumentation theory and to point the way toward more general and unified future treatments, this book is an impressively authoritative contribution to the field.

Written by experts in the field, this volume presents a comprehensive investigation into the relationship between argumentation theory and the philosophy of mathematical practice. Argumentation theory studies reasoning and argument, and especially those aspects not addressed, or not addressed well, by formal deduction. The philosophy of mathematical practice diverges from mainstream philosophy of mathematics in the emphasis it places on what the majority of working mathematicians actually do, rather than on mathematical foundations. The book begins by first challenging the assumption that there is no role for informal logic in mathematics. Next, it details the usefulness of argumentation theory in the understanding of mathematical practice, offering an impressively diverse set of examples, covering the history of mathematics, mathematics education and, perhaps surprisingly, formal proof verification. From there, the book demonstrates that mathematics also offers a valuable testbed for argumentation theory. Coverage concludes by defending attention to mathematical argumentation as the basis for new perspectives on the philosophy of mathematics.

The Handbook Argumentation Theory provides an up to date survey of the various theoretical contributions to the development of argumentation theory for all scholars interested in argumentation, informal logic and rhetoric. It describes the historical roots of modern argumentation theory that are still an important theoretical background to contemporary approaches. Because of the complexity, diversity and rate of developments in argumentation theory, there is a real need for an overview of the state of the art, the main approaches that can be distinguished and the distinctive features of these approaches. The Handbook covers classical and modern backgrounds to the study of argumentation, the New Rhetoric developed by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, the Toulmin model, formal ap-

proaches, informal logic, communication and rhetoric, pragmatic approaches, linguistic approaches and pragma-dialectics. The Handbook is co-authored by Frans H. van Eemeren, Bart Garssen, Erik C.W. Krabbe, A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, Bart Verheij and Jean Wagemans, who are a coherent and prominent writing team whose expertise covers the whole field. The authors are assisted by an international Editorial Board consisting of outstanding argumentation scholars whose fields of interest are represented in the volume.

A vital contribution to legal theory and media and civic discourse In the 1860s, northern newspapers attacked Abraham Lincoln's policies by attacking his character, using the terms "drunk," "baboon," "too slow," "foolish," and "dishonest." Political argumentation has steadily increased since then and the argumentum ad hominem, or personal attack argument, has now been carefully refined as an instrument of "oppo tactics" and "going negative" by the public relations experts who design political campaigns at the national level. In this definitive treatment of one of the most important concepts in argumentation theory and informal logic, Douglas Walton presents a normative framework for identifying and evaluating ad hominem or personal attack arguments. Personal attack arguments have often proved to be so effective, in election campaigns, for example, that even while condemning them, politicians have not stopped using them. In the media, in the courtroom, and in everyday confrontation, ad hominem arguments are easy to put forward as accusations, are difficult to refute, and often have an extremely powerful effect on persuading an audience. Walton gives a clear method for analyzing and evaluating cases of ad hominem arguments found in everyday argumentation. His analysis classifies the ad hominem argument into five clearly defined subtypes—abusive (direct), circumstantial, bias, "poisoning the well," and tu quoque ("you're just as bad") arguments—and gives methods for evaluating each type. Each subtype is given a well-defined form as a recognizable type of argument. The numerous case studies show in concrete terms many practical aspects of how to use textual evidence to identify and analyze fallacies and to evaluate argumentation as fallacious or not in particular cases.

This book investigates the role of inference in argumentation, considering how arguments support standpoints on the basis of different loci. The authors propose and illustrate a model for the analysis of the standpoint-argument connection, called Argumentum Model of Topics (AMT). A prominent feature of the AMT is that it distinguishes, within each and every single argumentation, between an inferential-procedural component, on which the reasoning process is based; and a material-contextual component, which anchors the argument in the interlocutors' cultural and factual common ground. The AMT explains how these components differ and how they are intertwined within each single argument. This model is introduced in Part II of the book, following a careful reconstruction of the enormously rich tradition of studies on inference in argumentation, from the antiquity to contemporary authors, without neglecting medieval and post-medieval contributions. The AMT is a contemporary model grounded in a dialogue with such tradition, whose crucial aspects are illuminated in this book. CLARIN, the "Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure", has established itself as a major player in the field of research infrastructures for the humanities. This volume provides a comprehensive overview of the organization, its members, its goals and its functioning, as well as of the tools and resources hosted by the infrastructure. The many contributors representing various fields, from computer science to law to psychology, analyse a wide range of topics, such as the tech-

nology behind the CLARIN infrastructure, the use of CLARIN resources in diverse research projects, the achievements of selected national CLARIN consortia, and the challenges that CLARIN has faced and will face in the future. The book will be published in 2022, 10 years after the establishment of CLARIN as a European Research Infrastructure Consortium by the European Commission (Decision 2012/136/EU).

This book is an updated and revised edition of *Fundamentals of Legal Argumentation* published in 1999. It discusses new developments that have taken place in the past 15 years in research of legal argumentation, legal justification and legal interpretation, as well as the implications of these new developments for the theory of legal argumentation. Almost every chapter has been revised and updated, and the chapters include discussions of recent studies, major additions on topical issues, new perspectives, and new developments in several theoretical areas. Examples of these additions are discussions of recent developments in such areas as Habermas' theory, MacCormick's theory, Alexy's theory, Artificial Intelligence and law, and the pragma-dialectical theory of legal argumentation. Furthermore it provides an extensive and systematic overview of approaches and studies of legal argumentation in the context of legal justification in various legal systems and countries that have been important for the development of research of legal argumentation. The book contains a discussion of influential theories that conceive the law and legal justification as argumentative activity. From different disciplinary and theoretical angles it addresses such topics as the institutional characteristics of the law and the relation between general standards for moral discussions and legal standards such as the Rule of Law. It discusses patterns of legal justification in the context of different types of problems in the application of the law and it describes rules for rational legal discussions. The combination of the sound basis of the first edition and the discussions of new developments make this new edition an up-to-date and comprehensive survey of the various theoretical influences which have informed the study of legal argumentation. It discusses salient backgrounds to this field as well as major approaches and trends in the contemporary research. It surveys the relevant theoretical factors both from various continental law traditions and common law countries.

In "Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse," Frans H. van Eemeren "brings together the dialectical and the rhetorical dimensions of argumentation by introducing the concept of strategic maneuvering. Strategic maneuvering refers to the arguer's continual efforts to reconcile aiming for effectiveness with being reasonable. It takes place in all stages of argumentative discourse and manifests itself simultaneously in the choices that are made from the topical potential available at a particular stage, in adaptation to audience demand, and in the use of specific presentational devices. Strategic maneuvering derails when in the specific context in which the discourse takes place a rule for critical discussion has been violated, so that a fallacy has been committed. Van Eemeren makes clear that extending the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation by taking account of strategic maneuvering leads to a richer and more precise method for analyzing and evaluating argumentative discourse."

This volume gives a theoretical account of the problem of analyzing and evaluating argumentative discourse. After placing argumentation in a communicative perspective, and then discussing the fallacies that occur when certain rules of communication are violated, the authors offer an alternative to both the linguistically-inspired descriptive and logically-inspired normative approaches to argu-

mentation. The authors characterize argumentation as a complex speech act in a critical discussion aimed at resolving a difference of opinion. The various stages of a critical discussion are outlined, and the communicative and interactional aspects of the speech acts performed in resolving a simple or complex dispute are discussed. After dealing with crucial aspects of analysis and linking the evaluation of argumentative discourse to the analysis, the authors identify the fallacies that can occur at various stages of discussion. Their general aim is to elucidate their own pragma-dialectical perspective on the analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse, bringing together pragmatic insight concerning speech acts and dialectical insight concerning critical discussion.

Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory brings together twenty exploratory studies on important subjects of research in contemporary argumentation theory. The essays are based on papers that were presented at the 7th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA) in Amsterdam in June 2010. They give an impression of the nature and the variety of the kind of research that has recently been carried out in the study of argumentation. The volume starts with three essays that provide stimulating theoretical perspectives on argumentation. Subsequently, some views are explained on the intriguing topics of 'dissensus' and 'deep disagreement'. After a discussion of three different approaches to the treatment of types of argumentation some classical themes from antique argumentation theory are revisited. The new research area of visual argumentation is explored in the next part. The volume concludes with three reports of experimental studies concerning argumentative discourse. The volume starts with three essays that provide stimulating theoretical perspectives on argumentation. Subsequently, some views are explained on the intriguing topics of 'dissensus' and 'deep disagreement'. After a discussion of three different approaches to the treatment of types of argumentation some classical themes from antique argumentation theory are revisited. The new research area of visual argumentation is explored in the next part. The volume concludes with three reports of experimental studies concerning argumentative discourse. The volume starts with three essays that provide stimulating theoretical perspectives on argumentation. Subsequently, some views are explained on the intriguing topics of 'dissensus' and 'deep disagreement'. After a discussion of three different approaches to the treatment of types of argumentation some classical themes from antique argumentation theory are revisited. The new research area of visual argumentation is explored in the next part. The volume concludes with three reports of experimental studies concerning argumentative discourse.

Educational researchers are bound to see this as a timely work. It brings together the work of leading experts in argumentation in science education. It presents research combining theoretical and empirical perspectives relevant for secondary science classrooms. Since the 1990s, argumentation studies have increased at a rapid pace, from stray papers to a wealth of research exploring ever more sophisticated issues. It is this fact that makes this volume so crucial.

The goal of this book is to ascertain Lessing's views on argumentation and rhetoric. I intend to establish that these views constitute a systematic and coherent theory and to argue that for Lessing rhetoric in argument can yield philosophical truth. Analysis of Lessing's views also sheds light on the general significance of rhetoric in the 18th century. The denial that rhetoric has claims to truth is a long-standing prejudice of Western thought. This position is evident in Kant's rejection of rhetoric in philosophical discourse. But in my view, the situation in the 18th century in Germany was somewhat

more complex. Rhetoric did not die a quiet death but was very much alive in polemical tracts, and Lessing was a pivotal figure in a culture dominated by argument and disputation. I asked myself why and how this polemical age came to an end and how does the rejection of polemics by the 19th century affect our understanding of the 18th century? In the Introduction, I address some of these questions and establish a historical framework for the development of polemics in the 18th century. Another reason this polemical age has traditionally been seen as problematic for the scholars of the period is because argument, disputation and debate cannot be submitted to the same easy analysis as the systematic treatises produced at the end of the century.

In this book two of the leading figures in argumentation theory present a view of argumentation as a means of resolving differences of opinion by testing the acceptability of the disputed positions. This is a major contribution to the study of argumentation.

"Examining Argumentation in Context: Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering" contains a selection of papers on strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Starting point of all of these contributions is that a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of strategic maneuvering is possible only if the argumentative discourse is first situated in the communicative and interactional context in which it occurs. While some of the contributions present general views with regard to strategic maneuvering, other contributions report on the results of empirical studies, examine strategic maneuvering in a particular legal or political context, or highlight the presentational design of strategic maneuvering. "Examining Argumentation in Context" therefore provides an insightful "view of recent developments in the research on strategic maneuvering, which is currently prominent in the study of argumentation.

J. Anthony Blair is a prominent international figure in argumentation studies. He is among the originators of informal logic, an author of textbooks on the informal logic approach to argument analysis and evaluation and on critical thinking, and a founder and editor of the journal *Informal Logic*. Blair is widely recognized among the leaders in the field for contributing formative ideas to the argumentation literature of the last few decades. This selection of key works provides insights into the history of the field of argumentation theory and various related disciplines. It illuminates the central debates and presents core ideas in four main areas: Critical Thinking, Informal Logic, Argument Theory and Logic, Dialectic and Rhetoric.

This volume identifies and analyses English words and expressions that are crucial for an adequate reconstruction of argumentative discourse. It provides a systematic set of instruments for giving a well founded analysis that results in an analytic overview of the elements that are relevant for the evaluation of the argumentation. By starting from everyday examples, the study immediately connects with the practice of argumentative discourse.

This work deals with argumentation in philosophy. In the "affirmative" view of argumentation, each party thinks it is right while all other positions are wrong; argumentation is seen as guided by a set of rules that should lead to the resolution of the dispute in favor of one party. This book advances a critique of such an approach, proposing instead a negative one, the central idea of which is that each party organizes the elements of the problem concerning the definition of terms, the assumptions to be accepted, and the types of logical resources being used. The negative approach attempts

to modify the ethics of philosophical discussions, moving towards pluralism, a diversity of perspectives, and the capacity to adopt a panoramic view where one's own posture appears only as one among others. Argumentation is a ubiquitous matter; professionals of all areas will have to argue to support their positions, in diplomacy, medicine or religion and in everyday life. In any of these contexts, the distinction between an affirmative and a negative approach to argumentation matters. The book will particularly appeal to graduate and postgraduate students in philosophy, psychology, pedagogy and communication, as well as the general reader interested in philosophy.

In *Fallacies and Judgments of Reasonableness*, Frans H. van Eemeren, Bart Garssen and Bert Meuffels report on their systematic empirical research of the conventional validity of the pragma-dialectical discussion rules. The experimental studies they carried out during more than ten years start from the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation developed at the University of Amsterdam, their home university. In these studies they test methodically the intersubjective acceptability of the rules for critical discussion proposed in this theory by confronting ordinary arguers who have not received any special education in argumentation and fallacies with discussion fragments containing both fallacious and non-fallacious argumentative moves. The research covers a wide range of informal fallacies. In this way, the authors create a basis for comparing the theoretical reasonableness conception of pragma-dialectics with the norms for judging argumentative moves prevailing in argumentative practice. *Fallacies and Judgments of Reasonableness* provides a unique insight into the relationship between theoretical and practical conceptions of reasonableness, supported by extensive empirical material gained by means of sophisticated experimental research.

This book provides a systematic analysis of many common argumentation schemes and a compendium of 96 schemes. The study of these schemes, or forms of argument that capture stereotypical patterns of human reasoning, is at the core of argumentation research. Surveying all aspects of argumentation schemes from the ground up, the book takes the reader from the elementary exposition in the first chapter to the latest state of the art in the research efforts to formalize and classify the schemes, outlined in the last chapter. It provides a systematic and comprehensive account, with notation suitable for computational applications that increasingly make use of argumentation schemes. This book approaches the topic of argumentation from the perspective of audiences, rather than the perspective of arguers or arguments.

Pondering on Problems of Argumentation is a collection of twenty essays brought together for anyone who is interested in theoretical issues in the study of argumentation. This collection of papers gives the reader an insightful and balanced view of the kind of theoretical issues argumentation theorists are currently concerned with. Because most of the perspectives on argumentation that are en vogue are represented, this volume provides a multidisciplinary and even interdisciplinary outlook on the current state of affairs in argumentation theory. Some of the contributions in *Pondering on Problems of Argumentation* deal with problems of argumentation that have been recognized as theoretical issues for a considerable time, like the problems of fallaciousness and identifying argumentation structures. Other contributions discuss issues that have become a focus of attention only recently or regained their prominence, such as the relationship between dialectic and rhetoric, and the strategic use of the argumentative technique of dissociation. In five separate sections papers are included dealing with argumentative strategies, problems of norms of reasonableness and fallacious-

ness, types of argument and argument schemes the structure of argumentation and rules for advocacy and discussion.

This book presents reflections on the relationship between narratives and argumentative discourse. It focuses on their functional and structural similarities or dissimilarities, and offers diverse perspectives and conceptual tools for analyzing the narratives' potential power for justification, explanation and persuasion. Divided into two sections, the first Part, under the title "Narratives as Sources of Knowledge and Argument", includes five chapters addressing rather general, theoretical and characteristically philosophical issues related to the argumentative analysis and understanding of narratives. We may perceive here how scholars in Argumentation Theory have recently approached cer-

tain topics that have a close connection with mainstream discussions in epistemology and the cognitive sciences about the justificatory potential of narratives. The second Part, entitled "Argumentative Narratives in Context", brings us six more chapters that concentrate on either particular functions played by argumentatively-oriented narratives or particular practices that may benefit from the use of special kinds of narratives. Here the focus is either on the detailed analysis of contextualized examples of narratives with argumentative qualities or on the careful understanding of the particular demands of certain well-defined situated activities, as diverse as scientific theorizing or war policing, that may be satisfied by certain uses of narrative discourse.