Alphabetical Bibliography

Aakhus, M. (2003). Neither naïve nor critical reconstruction. Dispute mediators, impasse and the design of argumentation. *Argumentation, 17*(3), 265–290.

Aakhus, M. (2011). Crafting interactivity for stakeholder engagement. Transforming assumptions about communication in science and policy. *Health Physics, 101*(5), 531–535.

Aakhus, M., & Lewinski, M. (2011). Argument analysis in large-scale deliberation. In E. T. Feteris, B. Garssen, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics. In honor of Frans H. van Eemeren* (pp. 165–184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Aarnio, A. (1987). *The rational as reasonable. A treatise on legal justification*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Abbott, D. (1989). The jurisprudential analogy. Argumentation and the new rhetoric. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 191–199). Lanham: University Press of America.

Abderrahmane, T. (1985). *Essai sur les logiques des raisonnements argumentatifs et naturels* [A treatise on deductive and natural argumentation and its models] Vol. 4. Doctoral dissertation, Sorbonne Univerisity, Paris.

Abderrahmane, T. (1987). *Fī Uṣūl al-Ḥiwār wa Tajdīd 'Ilm al-Kalām* [On the basics of dialogue and the renovation of Islamic scholastics]. Beirut: Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī. (3rd ed. 2007).

Abdullatif, I. (2012a). *Istratijiyyāt al-Iqnā' wa al-Ta'thīr fi al-Khitāb al-Siyāsi: Khutab a-Ra'iīs al-Sadāt Namūthajan* [Persuasion strategies in political discourse. President Sadat's speeches as a model]. Cairo: al-Hay'a al-Misriyya al-'Āmma lil-Kitāb.

Abdullatif, I. (2012b). *Albalāgha wa Ttawāsul 'Abr al-Thaqāfāt* [Rhetoric and cross-cultural communication]. Cairo: al-Hay'a al-'Āmma li Quṣūr al-Thaqāfa.

AbdulRaof, H. (2006). *Arabic rhetoric. A pragmatic analysis*. London-New York: Routledge.

Abelson, R. (1960–1961). In defense of formal logic. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 21*, 333–346.

Aberdein, A. (2006). The uses of argument in mathematics. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 327–339). Dordrecht: Springer.

Aczél, P. (2009). *Új retorika* [New rhetoric]. Bratislava: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.

Aczél, P. (2012). *Médiaretorika* [Media rhetoric]. Budapest: Magyar Mercuris.

Adam, J.-M. (2004). Une approche textuelle de l'argumentation. "Schema", sequence et phrase périodique [A textual approach to argumentation. "Scheme", sequence, and periodic sentence]. In M. Doury & S. Moirand (Eds.), *L'argumentation aujourd'hui. Positions théoriques en confrontation* [Argumentation today. Confrontation of theoretical positions] (pp. 77–102). Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Adam, J.-M., & Bonhomme, M. (2003). *L'argumentation publicitaire. Rhétorique de l'éloge et de la persuasion. L'analyse du divers aspects du discours publicitaire* [Argumentation in advertising. Rhetoric of eulogy and persuasion. The analysis of different aspects of advertising discourse]. Paris: Nathan. (1st ed. 1997).

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

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer

Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Adelswärd, V. (1987). The argumentation of self in job interviews. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Analysis and practices. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 327–336). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Adelswärd, V. (1988). *Styles of success. On impression management as collaborative action in job interviews*. Linköping: University of Linköping: Linköping Studies in Arts and Science.

Adelswärd, V. (1991). The use of formulations in the production of arguments. A study of interviews with conscientious objectors. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990* (pp. 591–603). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Adelswärd, V., Aronsson, K., & Linell, P. (1988). Discourse of blame. Courtroom construction of social identity from the perspective of the defendant. *Semiotica, 71*, 261–284.

Adeodato, J. M. (2009). *A retórica constitucional (sobre tolerância, direitos humanos e outros fundamentos éticos do direito positivo)* [Constitutional rhetoric (about tolerance, human rights and other ethical foundations of positive law)]. São Paulo: Saraiva.

Adler, J. (2013). Are conductive arguments possible? *Argumentation, 27*(3), 245–257.

Adler, J. E., & Rips, L. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Reasoning. Studies of human inference and its foundations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adrian, T. (2011). *El uso de la metáfora en Rómulo Betancourt y Hugo Chávez* [The use of metaphor in Rómulo Betancourt and Hugo Chávez]. Madrid: EAE Editorial Academia Española.

Aikin, S. F. (2008). Perelmanian universal audience and the epistemic aspirations of argument. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 41*(3), 238–259.

Ajdukiewicz, K. (1965). The problem of foundation. In K. Ajdukiewicz (Ed.), *The foundation of statements and decisions. Proceedings of the international colloquium on methodology of sciences held in Warsaw, 18–23 September 1961* (pp. 1–11). Warszawa: PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers.

Ajdukiewicz, K. (1974). *Pragmatic logic*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel & PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers. (Original work published in 1965). [English trans. by O. Wojtasiewicz of *Logika pragmatyczna*, Warsaw: PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers].

Alaoui, H. F. (Ed.). (2010). *al-Ḥijāj. Mafhūmuhu wa Majālātuhu* [Argumentation. The concept and the fields]. Irbid: ʿAlam al-Kutub al-ḥadith.

Albert, H. (1969). *Traktat über kritische Vernunft* [Treatise on critical reason] (2nd ed.) Tübingen: Mohr. (1st ed. 1968, 2nd ed. 1975, 5th improved and enlarged ed. 1991).

Albert, H. (1975). *Traktat über kritische Vernunft* [Treatise on critical reason] (2nd ed.) Tübingen: Mohr. (1st ed. 1968, 5th improved and enlarged ed. 1991).

Alburquerque. (1995). *El arte de hablar en público. Seis retóricas famosas* [The art of public speaking. Six famous rhetorics]. Madrid: Visor Libros.

Alcolea Banegas, J. (2007). Visual arguments in film. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 35–41). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Al-Dahri, A. (2011). *Al-Ḥijāj wa Binā' al-Khitāb* [Argumentation and the structure of discourse]. Casa Blanca: Manshūrāt al-Madāris.

Alekseyev, A. P. (1991). *Argumentacia, pzonaniye, obsheniye* [Argumentation, cognition, communication]. Moscow: Moscow University Press.

Aleven, V. (1997). *Teaching case-based reasoning through a model and examples*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Aleven, V., & Ashley, K. D. (1997a). Evaluating a learning environment for case-based argumentation skills. In *Proceedings of the sixth international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 170–179). New York: ACM Press.

Aleven, V., & Ashley, K. D. (1997b). Teaching case-based argumentation through a model and examples. Empirical evaluation of an intelligent learning environment. In B. du Boulay & R. Mizoguchi (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence in education. Proceedings of AI-ED 97 world conference* (pp. 87–94). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Alexandrova, D. (1984). *Античните извори на реториката* [Antique sources of rhetorics]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
Alexandrova, D. (1985). *Проблеми на реториката* [Problems of rhetoric]. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
Alexandrova, D. (1997). Реторическата аргументация – същност на продуктивния диалог в обучението [The rhetorical argumentation – a basis of productive dialogue in teaching]. *Pedagogika, 5*, 37–45.
Alexandrova, D. (1999). Хаим Перелман и неговата „Нова реторика" или Трактат по аргументация [Chaim Perelman and his "New Rhetoric" or Treatise on argumentation]. *Filosofski alternativi, 3–4*, 29–46.
Alexandrova, D. (2006). *Метаморфози на реториката през XX век* [Metamorphoses of rhetoric in the twentieth century]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
Alexandrova, D. (2008). *Основи на реториката* [Fundaments of rhetoric]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
Alexy, R. (1978). *Theorie der juristischen Argumentation. Die Theorie des rationale Diskurses as Theorie der juristischen Begründung* [A theory of legal argumentation. The theory of rational discourse as theory of juridical justification]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. (Spanish trans. by M. Atienza and I. Espejo as *Teoría de la argumentación jurídica*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1989).
Allen, D. (1990). Critical study. Trudy Govier's *Problems in argument analysis and evaluation*. *Informal Logic, 12*(1), 1990.
Al-Shaba'an, A. (2008). *Al-Ḥijāj bayna al-Minwāl wa al-Mithāl* [Argumentation between theory and practice]. Tunis: Maskilyāni Publishers.
Álvarez, G. (1996). *Textos y discursos. Introducción a la lingüística del texto* [Texts and discourses. Introduction to textual linguistics]. Concepción: Universidad de Concepción.
Álvarez, J. F. (2007). The risk of arguing. From persuasion to dissuasion. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 65–71). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Álvarez, N., & Sánchez, I. (2001). *El discurso argumentativo de los escolares venezolanos* [Venezuelan students' argumentative discourse]. *Letras*, *62*, 81–96.
Amestoy, M. (1995). *Procesos básicos del pensamiento* [Basic processes of thinking]. Mexico: Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México.
Amgoud, L. (2009). Argumentation for decision making. In I. Rahwan & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Argumentation in artificial intelligence* (pp. 301–320). Dordrecht: Springer.
Amgoud, L., Cayrol, C., Lagasquie-Schiex, M. C., & Livet, P. (2008). On bipolarity in argumentation frameworks. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 23*(10), 1062–1093.
Amjarso, B. (2010). *Mentioning and then refuting an anticipated counterargument. A conceptual and empirical study of the persuasiveness of a mode of strategic manoeuvring*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
Amossy, R. (1991). *Les idées reçues. Sémiologie du stereotype* [Generally accepted ideas. Semiology of the stereotype]. Paris: Nathan.
Amossy, R. (2001). *Ethos* at the crossroads of disciplines. Rhetoric, pragmatics, sociology. *Poetics Today, 22*(1), 1–23.
Amossy, R. (2002). How to do things with doxa. Toward an analysis of argumentation in discourse. *Poetics Today, 23*(3), 465–487.
Amossy, R. (2005). The argumentative dimension of discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Argumentation in practice* (pp. 87–98). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Amossy, R. (2006). *L'argumentation dans le discours* [Argumentation in discourse]. (2nd ed.). Paris: Colin.
Amossy, R. (2009a). Argumentation in discourse. A socio-discursive approach to arguments. *Informal Logic, 29*(3), 252–267.
Amossy, R. (2009b). The new rhetoric's inheritance. Argumentation and discourse analysis. *Argumentation, 23*, 313–324.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Amossy, R. (2010). *La présentation de soi. Ethos et identité* [Self-presentation. Ethos and identity]. Paris: Colin.

Amossy, R. (Ed.). (1999). *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos* [Self-images in discourse. The construction of ethos]. Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestle.

Amossy, R., & Herschberg Pierrot, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Stéréotypes et clichés. Langue, discours, société* [Stereotypes and clichés. Language, discourse, society] (3rd ed.). Paris: Colin.

Anderson, J. R. (1972). The audience as a concept in the philosophical rhetoric of Perelman, Johnstone and Natanson. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 38*(1), 39–50.

Andersson, J., & Furberg, M. (1974). *Språk och påverkan. Om argumentationens semantik* [Language and practice. The semantics of argumentation]. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonnier. (1st ed. 1966).

Andone, C. (2010). *Maneuvering strategically in a political interview. Analyzing and evaluating responses to an accusation of inconsistency*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Andone, C. (2012). Review of Lilian Bermejo-Luque (2009) *Giving reasons. A linguistic-pragmatic approach to argumentation theory*. *Argumentation, 26*, 291–296.

Andone, C. (2013). *Argumentation in political interviews. Analyzing and evaluating responses to accusations of inconsistency*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (Revised version of Andone, 2010).

Andriessen, J. E. B., Baker, M. J., & Suthers, D. (2003). Argumentation, computer-support, and the educational con tekst of confronting cognitions. In J. Andriessen, M. J. Baker, & D. Suthers (Eds.), *Arguing to learn. Confronting congnitions in computer-supported collaborative learning environments* (pp. 1–25). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Andriessen, J. E. B., & Schwarz, B. B. (2009). Argumentative design. In N. W. Muller Mirza & A.-N. Perret-Clermont (Eds.), *Argumentation and education. The foundation and practices* (pp. 145–164). Berlin: Springer.

Angenot, M. (1982). *La parole pamphlétaire. Contribution à la typologie des discours modernes* [Contribution to the typology of modern discourses]. Paris: Payot.

Angenot, M. (2004). *Rhétorique de l'anti-socialisme* [Rhetoric of anti-socialism]. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Anscombre, J. C. (1994). La nature des topoï [The nature of the *topoi*]. In J. C. Anscombre (Ed.), *La théorie des topoï* [The theory of the *topoi*] (pp. 49–84). Paris: Kimé.

Anscombre, J. C., & Ducrot, O. (1983). *L'argumentation dans la langue* [Argumentation in language]. Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.

Anscombre, J.-C., & Ducrot, O. (1989). Argumentativity and informativity. In M. Meyer (Ed.), *From metaphysics to rhetoric* (pp. 71–87). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Antonelli, G. A. (2010). Non-monotonic logic. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Summer 2010 ed. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/logic-non-monotonic/.

Antoniou, G., Billington, D., Governatori, G., & Maher, M. (2001). Representation results for defeasible logic. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic, 2*(2), 255–287.

Apel, K. O. (1988). *Diskurs und Verantwortung* [Discourse and responsibility]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Apeltauer, E. (1978). *Elemente und Verlaufsformen von Streitgesprächen* [Elements and proceedings of disputations]. Doctoral dissertation, Münster University.

Apostolova, G. (1994). Моделиране на диалога [Modelling the dialogue]. *Philosophski Alternativi, 3*, 112–122.

Apostolova, G. (1999). *Убеждаващата комуникация. културната традиция и прагматичните императиви* [Persuasive discourse. Cultural tradition and pragmatic imperatives]. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo.

Apostolova, G. (2011). *Английският философски текст. интерпретация и превод* [The texts of English philosophy. Interpretation and translation]. Blagoevgrad: BON.

Apostolova, G. (2012). *Култури и текстове. Интернет, интертекст, интеркултура* [Cultures and texts. Internet, intertext, interculture]. Blagoevgrad: SWU Publishing House.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Apothéloz, D., Brandt, P.-Y., & Quiroz, G. (1991). Champ et effets de la négation argumentative. Contre-argumentation et mise en cause [Domain and effects of argumentative negation. Counterargumentation and calling into question]. *Argumentation, 6*(1), 99–113.

Åqvist, L. (1965). *A new approach to the logical theory of interrogatives, I: Analysis*. Uppsala: Filosofiska föreningen.

Åqvist, L. (1975). *A new approach to the logical theory of interrogatives. Analysis and formalization*. Tübingen: Narr.

Aristote. (1967). *Topiques. Tome I: Livres I-IV* [*Topics. Vol. I: Books I-IV*]. Text ed., trans., introd., and annotated by J. Brunschwig. Paris: Les belles lettres.

Aristote. (1995). *Les réfutations sophistiques* [*Sophistical refutations*]. Trans., introd., and annotated by L.-A. Dorion. Paris: Vrin & Quebec City: Laval.

Aristote. (2007). *Topiques. Tome II: Livres V-VIII* [*Topics. Vol. II: Books V-VIII*]. Text ed., trans., introd., and annotated by J. Brunschwig. Paris: Les belles lettres.

Aristotele. (2007). *Le confutazioni sofistiche* [*Sophistical refutations*]. Trans., introd., and with comment by P. Fait. Rome: Laterza.

Aristoteles. (2014). *Over drogredenen. Sofistische weerleggingen* [*On fallacies. Sophistical refutations*]. Trans., introd., and annotated by P. S. Hasper & E. C. W. Krabbe. Groningen: Historische uitgeverij. (To be published).

Aristotle. (1984). *The complete works of Aristotle. The revised Oxford translation*. 2 volumes. J. Barnes (Ed.). Trans. a.o. by W. A. Pickard-Cambridge (*Topics* and *Sophistical refutations*, 1928), J. L. Ackrill (*Categories* and *De interpretatione,* 1963), A. J. Jenkinson (*Prior analytics*), and W. Rhys Roberts (*Rhetoric,* 1924). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Aristotle. (1997). *Topics. Books I and VIII with excerpts from related texts*. Trans. with a commentary by R. Smith. Oxford: Clarendon Press (*Clarendon Aristotle Series*).

Aristotle. (2012). Aristotle's *Sophistical refutations*. A translation (P. S. Hasper trans.). *Logical Analysis and History of Philosophy/Philosophiegeschichte und Logische Analyse, 15,* 13–54.

Arnauld, A., & Nicole, P. (1865). *The Port-Royal logic* (T.S. Baynes Trans.) *La logique ou l'art de penser* (6th ed.). Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. (1st ed. 1662).

Arnold, C. C. (1986). Implications of Perelman's theory of argumentation for theory of persuasion. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 37–52). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Ashley, K. D. (1989). Toward a computational theory of arguing with precedents. Accommodating multiple interpretations of cases. In *Proceedings of the second international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 93–102). New York: ACM Press.

Ashley, K. D. (1990). *Modeling legal argument. Reasoning with cases and hypotheticals*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Atayan, V. (2006). *Makrostrukturen der Argumentation im Deutschen, Französischen und Italienischen. Mit einem Vorwort von Oswald Ducrot* [Macrostructures of argumentation in German, French and Italian. With a preface of Oswald Ducrot]. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Atkin, A., & Richardson, J. E. (2007). Arguing about Muslims. (Un)reasonable argumentation in letters to the editor. *Text and Talk, 27*(1), 1–25.

Atkinson, K. (2012). Introduction to special issue on modelling Popov v. Hayashi. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 20*, 1–14.

Atkinson, K., & Bench-Capon, T. J. M. (2007). Practical reasoning as presumptive argumentation using action based alternating transition systems. *Artificial Intelligence, 171*, 855–874.

Atkinson, K., Bench-Capon, T. J. M., & McBurney, P. (2005). A dialogue game protocol for multi-agent argument over proposals for action. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems, 11*, 153–171.

Atkinson, K., Bench-Capon, T. J. M., & McBurney, P. (2006). Computational representation of practical argument. *Synthese, 152*, 157–206.

Auchlin, A. (1981). Réflexions sur les marqueurs de structuration de la conversation [Reflections on markers of conversational structure]. *Études de Linguistique Appliquee, 44*, 88–103.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Ausín, T. (2006). The quest for rationalism without dogmas in Leibniz en Toulmin. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 261–272). Dordrecht: Springer.

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). In J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (1st ed. 1962).

Azar, M. (1995). Argumentative texts in newspapers. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), III* (pp. 493–500). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Azar, M. (1999). Refuting counter-arguments in written essays. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 19–21). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Azzawi, A. B. (1990). *Quelques connecteurs pragmatiques en Arabe littéraire. Approche argumentaire et polyphonique* [Some pragmatic connectors in literary Arabic. An argumentative and polyphonic approach]. Lille: A.N.R.T. Doctoral dissertation, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

Azzawi, A. B. (2006). *Al-Lugha wa al-Ḥijāj* [Language and argumentation]. Casablanca: al-Aḥmadiyya. Beirut: Mu'assast al-Riḥāb al-Ḥadīthah). (2nd ed. 2009).

Azzawi, A. B. (2010). *Al-Khitāb wa al-Ḥijāj* [Discourse and argumentation]. Casablanca: Al-Aḥmadiyya. 2nd ed. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Riḥāb al-Ḥadīthah. (1st ed. 2007).

Bachman, J. (1995). Appeal to authority. In H. V. Hansen & R. C. Pinto (Eds.), *Fallacies. Classical and contemporary readings* (pp. 274–286). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Bacon, F. (1975). *The advancement of learning.* In W.A. Armstrong (Ed.). London: Athlone Press. (1st ed. 1605).

Baesler, J. E., & Burgoon, J. K. (1994). The temporal effects of story and statistical evidence on belief change. *Communication Research, 21*, 582–602.

Bakalov, G. (1924). *Ораторско изкуство за работници* [Public speaking for workers]. София: Edison. Library Nov Pat 8.

Baker, G. P. (1895). *The principles of argumentation*. Boston: Ginn.

Baker, G. P., & Huntington, H. B. (1905). *The principles of argumentation*. Revised and augmented. Boston: Ginn.

Baker, M. J. (2009). Argumentative interactions and the social construction of knowledge. In N. W. Muller Mirza & A.-N. Perret-Clermont (Eds.), *Argumentation and education. The foundation and practices* (pp. 127–144). Berlin: Springer.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination. Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, trans.). In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balthrop, V. W. (1989). Wither the public sphere? An optimistic reading. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 20–25). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Baranov, A. N. (1990). *Linguisticheskaya teoriya argumentatsii (kognitivny podhod)* [Linguistic theory of argumentation. A cognitive approach]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Moscow.

Barilli, R. (1969). *Poetica e retorica* [Poetics and rhetoric]. Milan: Mursia.

Barnes, J. (Ed.). (1995). *The Cambridge companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnes, J., Schofield, M., & Sorabji, R. (1995). Bibliography. In J. Barnes (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Aristotle* (pp. 295–384). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baroni, P., Caminada, M., & Giacomin, M. (2011). An introduction to argumentation semantics. *Knowledge Engineering Review, 26*(4), 365–410.

de Barros, D. L. P. (2011). *Preconceito e intolerância. Reflexões linguístico-discursivas*. [Prejudice and intolerance. Linguistic-discursive reflections]. São Paulo: Editora Mackenzie.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Barth, E. M. (1972). *Evaluaties. Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van gewoon lector* in *de logica met inbegrip van haar geschiedenis en de wijsbegeerte van de logica in haar relatie tot de wijsbegeerte in het algemeen aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht op vrijdag 2 juni 1972* [Evaluations. Address given at the assumption of duties as profssor of logic including its history and philosophy of logic in relation to philosophy in general at the University of Utrecht on Friday, 2 June 1972]. Assen: van Gorcum.

Barth, E. M. (1978). Arne Næss en de filosofische dialectiek [Arne Næss and philosophical dialectics]. In A. Næss (Ed.), *Elementaire argumentatieleer* (pp. 145–166). Baarn: Ambo.

Barth, E. M. (1980). Prolegomena tot de studie van conceptuele structuren [Prolegomena to the study of conceptual structures]. *Algemeen Nederlands tijdschrift voor wijsbegeerte, 72,* 36–48.

Barth, E. M. (1982). A normative-pragmatical foundation of the rules of some systems of formal$_3$ dialectics. In E. M. Barth & J. L. Martens (Eds.), *Argumentation. Approaches to theory formation. Containing the contributions to the Groningen conference on the theory of argumentation, October 1978* (pp. 159–170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barth, E. M., & Krabbe, E. C. W. (1982). *From axiom to dialogue. A philosophical study of logics and argumentation*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Barth, E. M., & Martens, J. L. (1977). Argumentum ad hominem. From chaos to formal dialectic. The method of dialogue-tableaus as a tool in the theory of fallacy. *Logique et analyse, 20*, 76–96.

Barth, E. M., & Martens, J. L. (Eds.). (1982). *Argumentation. Approaches to theory formation. Containing the contributions to the Groningen conference on the theory of argumentation, October 1978*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barthes, R. (1970). L'ancienne rhétorique. Aide mémoire [The old rhetoric. A compendium]. *Communications, 16*, 172–223.

Barthes, R. (1988). *The semiotic challenge* (trans.: R. Howard). New York: Hill and Wang.

Bartley, W. W., III (1984). *The retreat to commitment* (2nd ed.). La Salle: Open Court. (1st ed. 1962).

Bassano, D. (1991). Opérateurs et connecteurs argumentatifs. Une approche psycholinguistique [Operators and argumentative connectives. A psycho-linguistic approach]. *Intellectia, 11*, 149–191.

Bassano, D., & Champaud, C. (1987a). Argumentative and informative functions of French intensity modifiers *presque* (almost), *à peine* (just, barely) and *à peu près* (about). An experimental study of children and adults. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive, 7*, 605–631.

Bassano, D., & Champaud, C. (1987b). Fonctions argumentatives et informatives du langage. le traitement des modificateurs d'intensité *au moins*, *au plus* et *bien* chez l'enfant et chez l'adulte [Argumentative and informative functions of language. The use of intensifiers (*at least*, *at the most* and *well*) by children and adults]. *Archives de Psychologie, 55*, 3–30.

Bassano, D., & Champaud, C. (1987c). La fonction argumentative des marques de la langue [The argumentative function of discourse markers]. *Argumentation, 1*(2), 175–199.

Battersby, M. E. (1989). Critical thinking as applied epistemology. Relocating critical thinking in the philosophical landscape. *Informal Logic, 11*, 91–100.

Beardsley, M. C. (1950a). *Practical logic*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Beardsley, M. C. (1950b). *Thinking straight. Principles of reasoning for readers and writers*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Becker, C. (1983). The Japanese way of debate. *National Forensic Journal, 1*, 141–147.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M. (2003). Persuasion in practical argument using value-based argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 13*(3), 429–448.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., Araszkiewicz, M., Ashley, K., Atkinson, K., Bex, F., Borges, F., Bourcier, D., Bourgine, D., Conrad, J. G., Francesconi, E., Gordon, T. F., Governatori, G., Leidner, J. L., Lewis, D. D., Loui, R. P., McCarty, L. T., Prakken, H., Schilder, F., Schweighofer, E., Thompson, P., Tyrrell, A., Verheij, B., Walton, D. N., & Wyner, A. Z. (2012). A history of AI and Law in 50 papers. 25 years of the international conference on AI and Law. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, I, 20*(3), 215–319.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., & Dunne, P. E. (2007). Argumentation in artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence, 171*, 619–641.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., Freeman, J. B., Hohmann, H., & Prakken, H. (2004). Computational models, argumentation theories and legal practice. In C. A. Reed & T. J. Norman (Eds.), *Argumentation machines. New frontiers in argument and computation* (pp. 85–120). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., Geldard, T., & Leng, P. H. (2000). A method for the computational modelling of dialectical argument with dialogue games. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 8*, 233–254.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., Prakken, H., & Sartor, G. (2009). Argumentation in legal reasoning. In I. Rahwan & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Argumentation in artificial intelligence* (pp. 363–382). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bench-Capon, T. J. M., & Sartor, G. (2003). A model of legal reasoning with cases incorporating theories and values. *Artificial Intelligence, 150*, 97–143.

Bengtsson, M. (2011). Defining functions of Danish political commentary. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21* (pp. 1–11). Windsor, ON. (CD rom).

Benoit, P. J. (1981). The use of argument by preschool children. The emergent production of rules for winning arguments. In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Dimensions of argument. Proceedings of the second summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 624–642). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Benoit, P. J. (1983). Extended arguments in children's discourse. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 20*, 72–89.

Benoit, P. J., & Benoit, W. E. (1990). To argue or not to argue. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation. Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 43–54). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bentancur, L. (2009). *El desarrollo de la competencia argumentativa* [The development of argumentative competence]. Montevideo: Quehacer Educativo.

van Benthem, J. (2009). One logician's perspective on argumentation. *Cogency, 1*(2), 13–26.

Berger, F. R. (1977). *Studying deductive logic*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Berk, U. (1979). *Konstruktive Argumentationstheorie* [A constructive theory of argumentation]. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Berman, D., & Hafner, C. (1993). Representing teleological structure in case-based legal reasoning. The missing link. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 50–59). New York: ACM Press.

Bermejo-Luque, L. (2006). Toulmin's model of argument and the question of relativism. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 71–85). Dordrecht: Springer.

Bermejo-Luque, L. (2007). The justification of the normative nature of argumentation theory. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 113–118). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Bermejo-Luque, L. (2011). *Giving reasons. A linguistic-pragmatic approach to argumentation theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Besedina, Y. V. (2011). *Argumentativnyj diskurs kognitivno-slozhnyh i kognitivno-prostyh lichnostej* [Argumentative discourse of cognitively-complex and cognitively-simple individuals]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Besnard, P., & Hunter, A. (2008). *Elements of argumentation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Beth, E. W. (1955). *Semantic entailment and formal derivability*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1955 (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afdeling letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, 18). Reprinted in J. Hintikka (Ed.) (1969), *The philosophy of mathematics* (pp. 9–41). London: Oxford University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Beth, E. W. (1959). Considérations heuristiques sur les méthodes de déduction par séquences [Heuristic considerations concerning methods of deduction by sequents]. *Logique et analyse, 2*, 153–159.

Beth, E. W. (1970). *Aspects of modern logic*. In E. M. Barth & J. J. A. Mooij (Eds.). (D. H. J. de Jongh & S. de Jongh-Kearl, trans.). Dordrecht: Reidel. [Trans. of *Moderne logica,* first published in 1967].

Bex, F. J. (2011). *Arguments, stories and criminal evidence. A formal hybrid theory*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Bex, F. J., van Koppen, P., Prakken, H., & Verheij, B. (2010). A hybrid formal theory of arguments, stories and criminal evidence. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 18*(2), 123–152.

Bex, F. J., Prakken, H., Reed, C., & Walton, D. N. (2003). Towards a formal account of reasoning about evidence. Argumentation schemes and generalisations. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 11*, 125–165.

Bex, F. J., & Verheij, B. (2012). Solving a murder case by asking critical questions. An approach to fact-finding in terms of argumentation and story schemes. *Argumentation, 26*(3), 325–353.

Biesecker, B. (1989). Recalculating the relation of the public and technical spheres. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 66–70). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Bigi, S. (2011). The persuasive role of ethos in doctor-patient interactions. *Communication and Medicine, 8*(1), 67–76.

Bigi, S. (2012). Evaluating argumentative moves in medical consultations. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 1*(1), 51–65.

Bird, O. (1959). The uses of argument. *Philosophy of Science, 9*, 185–189.

Bird, O. (1961). The re-discovery of the topics: Professor Toulmin's inference warrants. *Mind, 70*, 534–539.

Birdsell, D. S. (1989). Critics and technocrats. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 16–19). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Birdsell, D. S., & Groarke, L. (1996). Toward a theory of visual argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33*(1), 1–10.

Biro, J. I., & Siegel, H. (1992). Normativity, argumentation and an epistemic theory of fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 85–103). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Biro, J., & Siegel, H. (1995). Epistemic normativity, argumentation, and fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation* (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), Vol. II (pp. 286–299). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Biro, J., & Siegel, H. (2006a). In defense of the objective epistemic approach to argumentation. *Informal Logic, 26*(1), 91–101.

Biro, J., & Siegel, H. (2006b). Pragma-dialectic versus epistemic theories of arguing and arguments. Rivals or partners? In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 1–10). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Biro, J., & Siegel, H. (2011). Argumentation, arguing, and arguments. Comments on giving reasons. *Theoria, 72*, 279–287.

Bitzer, L. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1*, 1–14.

Bitzer, L. F. (1999). The rhetorical situation. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory. A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.

Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (1990). *The rhetorical tradition. Readings from classical times to the present*. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Björnsson, G., Kihlbom, U., & Ullholm, A. (2009). *Argumentationsanalys. Färdigheter för kritiskt tänkande* [Argumentation analysis. Dispositions for critical thinking]. Stockholm: Natur & kultur.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Black, M. (1952). *Critical thinking. An introduction to logic and scientific method* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. (1st ed. 1946).
Blair, J. A. (1987). Everyday argumentation from an informal logic perspective. In J. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices. Proceedings of the fifth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 177–183). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
Blair, J. A. (1996). The possibility and actuality of visual arguments. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 33*(1), 23–39.
Blair, J. A. (2000). Review of C. W. Tindale (1999), *Acts of arguing. A rhetorical model of argument*. *Informal Logic*, *20*(2), 190–201.
Blair, J. A. (2004). Argument and its uses. *Informal Logic, 24*(2), 137–151.
Blair, J. A. (2006). Pragma-dialectics and *pragma-dialectics*. In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 11–22). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Blair, J. A. (2009). Informal logic and logic. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric, 16*(29), 47–67.
Blair, J. A. (2011a). *Groundwork in the theory of argumentation*. New York: Springer.
Blair, J. A. (2011b). Informal logic and its early historical development. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric, 4*(1), 1–16.
Blair, J. A. (2013). Govier's "Informal Logic". *Informal Logic, 33*(2), 83–97.
Blair, J. A., & Johnson, R. H. (1987). Argumentation as dialectical. *Argumentation, 1*, 41–56.
Blair, J. A., & Johnson, R. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Conductive argument. An overlooked type of defeasible reasoning*. London: College Publications.
Bobzien, S. (1996). Stoic syllogistic. In C. C. W. Taylor (Ed.), *Oxford studies in ancient philosophy* (Vol. XIV, pp. 133–192). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Boethius (1978). *De topicis differentiis* [On topical distinctions]. In E. Stump (Ed.), *Boethius's De topicis differentiis* (pp. 159–261). Ithaca-London: Cornell University Press.
Boger, G. (2004). Aristotle's underlying logic. In D. M. Gabbay & J. Woods (Eds.), *The handbook of the history of logic* (Greek, Indian and Arabic logic, Vol. 1, pp. 101–246). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Bolzano, B. (1837). *Wissenschaftslehre. Versuch einer ausführlichen und größtentheils neuen Darstellung der Logik mit steter Rucksicht auf deren bisherige Bearbeiter* [Theory of science. Attempt at a detailed and in the main novel exposition of logic with constant attention to earlier authors writing on this subject], Vol. 4. Sulzbach: Seidel.
Bolzano, B. (1972). *Theory of science. Attempt at a detailed and in the main novel exposition of logic with constant attention to earlier authors.* (R. George, ed. & trans.). Oxford: Blackwell. (English trans. and summaries of selected parts of *Wissenschaftslehre: Versuch einer ausführlichen und größtentheils neuen Darstellung der Logik mit steter Rucksicht auf deren bisherige Bearbeiter.* (2nd ed.). Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1929–1931.
Bondarenko, A., Dung, P. M., Kowalski, R. A., & Toni, F. (1997). An abstract, argumentation-theoretic approach to default reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence, 93*, 63–101.
Bonevac, D. (1987). *Deduction. Introductory symbolic logic*. Mountain View: Mayfield.
Bonevac, D. (2003). Pragma-dialectics and beyond. *Argumentation, 17*(4), 451–459.
Bonhomme, M. (1987). *Linguistique de la métonymie* [Linguistics of metonymy]. Bern: Peter Lang.
Bonhomme, M. (1998). *Les figures clés du discours* [The key discourse figures]. Paris: Le Seuil.
Bonhomme, M. (2005). *Pragmatique des figures du discours* [The pragmatics of discourse figures]. Paris: Champion.
Bonhomme, M. (2006). *Le discours métonymique* [Metonymical discourse]. Bern: Peter Lang.
Borel, M.-J. (1989). Norms in argumentation and natural logic. In R. Maier (Ed.), *Norms in argumentation. Proceedings of the conference on norms 1988* (pp. 33–48). Dordrecht: Foris.
Borel, M.-J. (1991). Objets de discours et de représentation [Discourse and representation entities]. *Languages, 25*, 36–50.
Borel, M.-J. (1992). Anthropological objects and negation. *Argumentation, 6*(1), 7–27.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Borel, M.-J., Grize, J.-B., & Miéville, D. (1983). *Essai de logique naturelle* [A treatise on natural logic]. Bern-Frankfurt-New York: Peter Lang.

Borges, H. F. (2005). *Vida, razão e justice. Racionalidade argumentativa na motivação judiciária* [*Life, reason and justice. Argumentative rationality in judicial motivation*]. Coimbra: Minerva Coimbra.

Borges, H. F. (2009). Nova retórica e democratização da justiça [New rhetoric and democratizationof justice]. In H. J. Ribeiro (Ed.), *Rhetoric and argumentation in the beginning of the 21st Century* (pp. 297–308). Coimbra: Coimbra University Press.

Bose, I., & Gutenberg, N. (2003). Enthymeme and prosody. A contribution to empirical research in the analysis of intonation as well as argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 139–140). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Bostad, I. (2011). The life and learning of Arne Næss. Scepticism as a survival strategy. *Inquiry. An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy, 54*(1), 42–51.

Botha, R. P. (1970). *The methodological status of grammatical argumentation*. The Hague: Mouton.

Botting, D. (2010). A pragma-dialectical default on the question of truth. *Informal Logic, 30*(4), 413–434.

Botting, D. (2012a). Pragma-dialectics epistemologized. A reply to Lumer. *Informal Logic, 32*(2), 269–285.

Botting, D. (2012b). What is a sophistical refutation? *Argumentation, 26*(2), 213–232.

Bowker, J. K., & Trapp, R. (1992). Personal and ideational dimensions of good and poor arguments in human interaction. In F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 220–230). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van den Braak, S. W., Vreeswijk, G. A. W., & Prakken, H. (2007). AVERs. An argument visualization tool for representing stories about evidence. In *Proceedings of the 11th international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 11–15). New York: ACM Press.

Braet, A. (1979–1980). *Taaldaden. Een leergang schriftelijke taalbeheersing* [Speech acts. A curriculum on writing and reading]. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Braet, A. (1987). The classical doctrine of status and rhetorical theory of argumentation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 20*, 79–93.

Braet, A. (1995). *Schrijfvaardigheid Nederlands* [Writing skills in Dutch]. Bussum: Coutinho.

Braet, A. (1996). On the origin of normative argumentation theory. The paradoxal case of the Rhetoric to Alexander. *Argumentation, 10*, 347–359.

Braet, A. (1999). *Argumentatieve vaardigheden* [Argumentative skills]. Bussum: Coutinho.

Braet, A. (2004). Hermagoras and the epicheireme. *Rhetorica, 22*, 327–347.

Braet, A. (2005). The common topic in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Precursor of the argumentation scheme. *Argumentation, 19*, 65–83.

Braet, A. (2007). *De redelijkheid van de klassieke retorica. De bijdrage van klassieke retorici aan de argumentatietheorie* [The reasonablenes of classical rhetoric. The contribution of classical rhetoricians to the theory of argumentation]. Leiden: Leiden University Press.

Braet, A., & Schouw, L. (1998). *Effectief debatteren. Argumenteren en presenteren over beleid* [Debating effectively. Policy argumentation and presentation]. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Brandon, E. P. (1992). Supposition, conditionals and unstated premises. *Informal Logic, 14*(2&3), 123–130.

Branham, R. J. (1991). *Debate and critical analysis. The harmony of conflict*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Branting, L. K. (1991). Building explanations from rules and structured cases. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies, 34*, 797–837.

Branting, L. K. (2000). *Reasoning with rules and precedents. A computational model of legal analysis*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bratko, I. (2001). *PROLOG. Programming for artificial intelligence* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Pearson. (1st ed. 1986).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Bregant, J., & Vezjak, B. (2007). *Zmote in napake v argumentaciji. Vodič po slabi argumentaciji v družbenem vsakdanu* [Fallacies in argumentation. A guide through bad argumentation in everyday life]. Maribor: Subkulturni azil.

Breivega, K. R. (2003). *Vitskaplege argumentasjonsstrategiar* [Scientific argumentation strategies]. Oslo: Norsk sakprosa.

Breton, P. (1996). *L'argumentation dans la communication* [Argumentation in communication], (Coll. Repères). Paris: La Découverte.

Breton, P., & Gauthier, G. (2011). *Histoire des théories de l'argumentation* [History of argumentation theory]. Paris: La Découverte.

Brewka, G. (2001). Dynamic argument systems. A formal model of argumentation processes based on situation calculus. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 11*, 257–282.

Brinton, A. (1995). The *ad hominem*. In H. V. Hansen & R. C. Pinto (Eds.), *Fallacies. Classical and contemporary readings* (pp. 213–222). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Briushinkin, V. (2000). *Sistemnaya model arguementacii* [Systematic model of argumentation]. In *Trancendental anthropology and logic. The Proceeding of International worshop 'Anthropology from a modern stand'* (pp. 133–155). 7th Kantian Symposium. Kaliningrad: Kaliningrad University Press.

Briushinkin, V. (2008). Argumentorika. Ishodnaya abstrakciya b metodologiya [Argumentoric. Initial concept and approach]. In V. Briushinkin (Ed.), *Modelling reasoning-2. Argumentation and rationality* (pp. 7–19). Kaliningrad: Kaliningrad University Press.

Briushinkin, V. (2010). O dvoyakoi roli ritoriki v sistemnoi modeli argumentcii [On twofold role of rhetorics in the systematic model of argumentation]. *ratio.ru*. [web-journal], *3*, 3–14.

Brockriede, W. (1992a). The contemporary renaissance in the study of argument. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 33–45). Berlin-New York: Foris.

Brockriede, W. (1992b). Where is argument? In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 73–78). Berlin-New York: Foris.

Brockriede, W., & Ehinger, D. (1960). Toulmin on argument. An interpretation and application. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 46*, 44–53.

Browne, M. N., & Keeley, S. M. (2004). *Asking the right questions. A guide to critical thinking* (7th ed.). Boston: Prentice Hall/Pearson. Chinese trans. 2006.

Brumark, Å. (2007). Argumentation at the Swedish dinner table. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 169–177). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Brummett, B. (1999). Some implications of 'process' or 'intersubjectivity'. Postmodern rhetoric. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory. A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.

Brutian, G. A. (1991). The architectonics of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference of argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA) at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990, 1A* (pp. 61–63). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Brutian, G. A. (1992). The theory of argumentation, its main problems and investigative perspectives. In J. Pietarinen (Ed.), *Problems of philosophical argumentation* (Reports from the Department of Practical Philosophy Kätytánnöllisen Filosofian Julkaisuja, Vol. 5, pp. 5–17). Turku: University of Turku.

Brutian, G. A. (1998). *Logic, language, and argumentation in projection of philosophical knowledge*. Lisbon: Grafica de Coimbra.

Brutian, G. A., & Markarian, H. (1991). The language of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference of argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA) at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990, 1A* (pp. 546–550). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Brutian, G. A., & Narsky, I. S. (Eds.). (1986). *Problemy filosofskoi argumentatsii* [Problems of philosophical argumentation]. Yerevan: Armenian SSR Publishing House.

Brutian, L. (1991). On the types of argumentative discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference of argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA) at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990, 1A* (pp. 559–563). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Brutian, L. (2003). On the pragmatics of argumentative discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 141–144). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Brutian, L. (2007). Arguments in child language. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 179–183). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Brutian, L. (2011). Stylistic devices and argumentative strategies in public discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 162–169). Amterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Buckingham Shum, S., & Hammond, N. (1994). Argumentation-based design rationale. What use at what cost? *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 40*(4), 603–652.

Budzynska, K. (2011). Structure of persuasive communication and elaboration likelihood model. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Proceedings of OSSA 2011. Argumentation, cognition & community*. (CD rom).

Budzynska, K. (2012). Circularity in ethotic structures. *Synthese*. doi:10.1007/s11229-012-0135-6.

Budzynska, K., & Dębowska, K. (2010). Dialogues with conflict resolution. Goals and effects. In P. Łupkowski & M. Purver (Eds.), *Aspects of semantics and pragmatics of dialogue* (pp. 59–66). Poznań: Polish Society for Cognitive Science.

Budzynska, K., Dębowska-Kozłowska, K., Kacprzak, M., & Załeska, M. (2012). Interdyscyplinarność w badaniach nad argumentacją i perswazją [Interdisciplinarity in the studies on argumentation and persuasion]. In A. Chmielewski, M. Dudzikowa & A. Grobler (Eds.), *Interdyscyplinarnie o interdyscyplinarności* [Interdisciplinarity interdisciplinarily] (pp. 147–166). Kraków: Impuls.

Budzynska, K., & Kacprzak, M. (2008). A logic for reasoning about persuasion. *Fundamenta Informaticae, 85*, 51–65.

Budzynska, K., Kacprzak, M., & Rembelski, P. (2009). Perseus. Software for analyzing persuasion process. *Fundamenta Informaticae, 93*(1–3), 65–79.

Budzynska, K., & Reed, C. (2012). The structure of ad hominem dialogues. In B. Verheij, S. Szeider, & S. Woltran (Eds.), *Frontiers in artificial intelligence and applications. Proceedings of 4th international conference on computational models of argument (COMMA 2012)* (pp. 410–421). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Burger, M. (2005). Argumentative and hierarchical dimensions of a broadcast debate sequence. A micro analysis. In M. Dascal, F. H. van Eemeren, E. Rigotti, A. Rocci, & S. Stati (Eds.), *Argumentation in dialogic interaction* (Special issue Studies in Communication Sciences, pp. 249–264). Lugano: Università della Svizzera italiana.

Burger, M., Jacquin, J., & Micheli, R. (Eds.). (2011). *La parole politique en confrontation dans les médias* [Political language in confrontations in the media]. Brussels: de Boeck.

Burger, M., & Martel, G. (Eds.). (2005). *Argumentation et communication dans les medias* [Argumentation and communication in the media]. Québec: Nota Bene.

Burke, K. D. (1966). *Language as symbolic action. Essays on life, literature, and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burleson, B. R. (1979). On the analysis and criticism of arguments. Some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 15*, 137–147.

Burleson, B. R. (1980). The place of nondiscursive symbolism, formal characterizations, and hermeneutics in argument analysis and criticism. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 16*, 222–231.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Bustamante, T. R. (2012). *Teoria do precedente judicial. A justificação e a aplicação das regras jurisprudenciais* [Theory of judicial precedent. The justification and application of legal rules]. São Paulo: Noeses.

Butterworth, C. E. (1977). *Averroes' three short commentaries on Aristotle's "Topics", "Rhetoric", and "Poetics"*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Caffi, C. I., & Janney, R. W. (1994). Toward a pragmatics of emotive communication. *Journal of Pragmatics, 22*, 325–373.

Calheiros, M. C. (2008). Verdade, prova e narração [Truth, proof and narration]. In *Revista do Centro de Estudos Judiciários*, *10*, 281–296.

Camargo, M. M. L. (2010a). A prática institucional e a representação argumentativa no Caso Raposa Serra do Sol (primeira parte) [The institutional practice and argumentative representation in the Raposa Serra do Sol case (1st part)]. *Revista Forense, 408*, 02–19.

Camargo, M. M. L. (2010b). A prática institucional e a representação argumentativa no Caso Raposa Serra do Sol (segunda parte) [The institutional practice and argumentative representation in the Raposa Serra do Sol case (2nd part)]. *Revista Forense, 409*, 231–269.

Caminada, M. (2006). Semi-stable semantics. In P. E. Dunne & T. J. M. Bench-Capon (Eds.), *Computational models of argument Proceedings of COMMA 2006, September 11-12, 2006, Liverpool, UK* (Frontiers in artificial intelligence and applications, Vol. 144, pp. 121–130). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Campbell, G. (1991). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. In L. Bitzer (Ed.). Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press. (1st ed. 1776).

Campbell, J. A. (1993). Darwin and *The origin of species*. The rhetorical ancestry of an idea. In T. W. Benson (Ed.), *Landmark essays on rhetorical criticism* (pp. 143–159). Davis: Hermagoras Press.

Campos, M. (2010). La schématisation dans des contexts en réseau [The schematization in network contexts]. In D. Miéville (Ed.), *La logique naturelle. Enjeux et perspectives* (pp. 215–258). Neuchâtel: Université de Neuchâtel.

Canale, D., & Tuzet, G. (2008). On the contrary. Inferential analysis and ontological assumptions of the a contrario argument. *Informal Logic, 28*(1), 31–43.

Canale, D., & Tuzet, G. (2009). The a simili argument. An inferentialist setting. *Ratio Juri, 22*(4), 499–509.

Canale, D., & Tuzet, G. (2010). What is the reason for this rule? An inferential account of the ratio legis. *Argumentation, 24*(3), 197–210.

Canale, D., & Tuzet, G. (2011). The argument from legislative silence. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 181–191). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Canary, D. J., Brossman, B. G., & Seibold, D. R. (1987). Argument structures in decision-making groups. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 53*, 18–38.

Canary, D. J., & Sillars, M. O. (1992). Argument in satisfied and dissatisfied married couples. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 737–764). Foris: Berlin-New York.

Canary, D. J., Weger, H., & Stafford, L. (1991). Couples' argument sequences and their associations in relational characteristics. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55*, 159–179.

Cantù, P., & Testa, I. (2006). *Teorie dell'argomentazione. Una introduzione alle logiche del dialogo* [Theories of argumentation. An introduction into the dialogue logics]. Milano: Bruno Mondadori.

Cantù, P., & Testa, I. (2011). Algorithms and arguments. The foundational role of the ATAI-question. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 192–203). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat.

Carbonell, F. (2011). Reasoning by consequences. Applying different argumentation structures to the analysis of consequentialist reasoning in judicial decisions. *Cogency, 3*(2), 81–104.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Cárdenas, A. (2005). *Patrones de argumentación en alumnos de enseñanza media superior* [Argumentative patterns of secondary school pupils]. Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.
Cardona, N. K. (2008). *Yo lo sabía cuando era pequeño. Discurso argumentativo en niños de dos a cuatro años* [I knew it when I was little. Argumentative discourse in children of two to four years old]. Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.
Carel, M. (1995). *Pourtant*: Argumentation by exception. *Journal of Pragmatics, 24*, 167–188.
Carel, M. (2001). Argumentation interne et argumentation externe au lexique. Despropriétés différentes [Argumentation that is internal and argumentation that is external to the lexicon. Different properties]. *Langages, 35*(142), 10–21.
Carel, M. (2011). *L'entrelacement argumentatif. Lexique, discours et blocs sémantiques* [The argumentative interlacing. Lexicon, discourse and semantic blocks]. Paris: Honoré Champion.
Carel, M., & Ducrot, O. (1999). Le problème du paradoxe dans une sémantique argumentative [The problem of the paradox in argumentative semantics]. *Langue Française, 123*, 6–26.
Carel, M., & Ducrot, O. (2009). Mise au point sur la polyphonie [A clarification on polyphony]. *Langue Française, 4*, 33–43.
Carlson, L. (1983). *Dialogue games. An approach to discourse analysis*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Carnap, R. (1950). *Logical foundations of probability*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Carney, J. D., & Scheer, R. K. (1964). *Fundamentals of logic*. New York: Macmillan.
Carrascal, B., & Mori, M. (2011). Argumentation schemes in the process of arguing. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 225–236). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Carrilho, M. M. (1990). *Verdade, suspeita e argumentação* [Truth, suspicion and argumentation]. Lisbon: Presença.
Carrilho, M. M. (1992). *Rhétoriques de la modernité* [Rhetorics and modernity]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Carrilho, M. M. (1995). *Aventuras da interpretação* [Adventures of interpretation]. Lisbon: Presença.
Carrilho, M. M. (Ed.). (1994). *Retórica e comunicação* [Retoric and communication]. Porto: Asa.
Carrilho, M. M., Meyer, M., & Timmermans, B. (1999). *Histoire de la rhétorique* [History of rhetoric]. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.
Carroll, L. (1894). What the tortoise said to Achilles. *Mind, 4*, 278–280.
Carvalho, J. C., & Carvalho, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Outras retóricas* [Other rhetorics]. Lisbon: Colibri.
Castaneda, H. N. (1960). On a proposed revolution in logic. *Philosophy of Science, 27*, 279–292.
Castelfranchi, C., & Paglieri, F. (2011). Why argue? Towards a cost-benefit analysis of argumentation. *Argument and Computation, 1*(1), 71–91.
Cattani, A[delino]. (1990). *Forme dell'argomentare. Il ragionamento tra logica e retorica* [Forms of arguing. Logical and rhetorical aspects of reasoning]. Padova: Edizioni GB.
Cattani, A[delino]. (1995). *Discorsi ingannevoli. Argomenti per difendersi, attaccare, divertirsi* [Deceitful reasoning. Arguments for defending, attacking and amusing]. Padova: Edizioni GB.
Cattani, A[delino]. (2001). *Botta e risposta. L'arte della replica* [Cut and thrust. The art of retort]. Bologna: Il Mulino.
Cattani, A[delino]., Cantù, P., Testa, I., & Vidali, P. (Eds.). (2009). *La svolta argomentativa. Cinquant'anni dopo Perelman e Toulmin* [The argumentative turn. Fifty years after Perelman and Toulmin]. Naples: Loffredo University Press.
Cattani, A[nnalisa]. (2003). Argumentative mechanisms in advertising. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 127–133). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Cattani, A[nnalisa]. (2007). The power of irony in contemporary advertising. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 223–231). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Cattani, A[nnalisa]. (2009). *Pubblicità e retorica* [Advertising and rhetoric]. Milano: Lupetti.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Cavazza, N. (2006). *La persuasione* [Persuasion] (2nd ed.). Bologna: Il Mulino. (1st ed. 1996).
Cayrol, C., & Lagasquie-Schiex, M. C. (2005). On the acceptability of arguments in bipolar argumentation frameworks. In L. Godo (Ed.), *Symbolic and quantitative approaches to reasoning with uncertainty. 8th European conference, ECSQARU 2005* (pp. 378–389). Berlin: Springer.
Centre National Belge de Recherches de Logique (1963). *La théorie de l'argumentation. Perspectives et applications* [The theory of argumentation. Perspectives and applications]. Louvain-Paris: Nauwelaerts.
Charaudeau, P. (1992). Le mode d'organisation argumentatif [The argumentative way of organising]. In *Grammaire du sens et de l'expression* [A grammar of meaning and utterance] (pp. 779–833). Paris: Hachette.
Charaudeau, P. (2008). L'argumentation dans une problématique d'influence [Argumentation in a problematic case concerning influence]. *Argumentation et Analyse du Discours, 1*. [on line].
Chateauraynaud, F. (2011). *Argumenter dans un champ de forces. Essai de balistique sociologique* [Arguing in a field of force. Essay on sociological ballistics]. Paris: Pétra.
Cherkasskaya, N. (2009). *Strategii i taktiki v apelliativvnom rechevom zhanre* [Strategies and tactics in the appellative speech genre]. Doctoral dissertation, Udmurt State University.
Chesebro, J. W. (1968). The comparative advantages case. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 5*, 57–63.
Chesebro, J. W. (1971). Beyond the orthodox. The criteria case. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 7*, 208–215.
Chesñevar, C., McGinnis, J., Modgil, S., Rahwan, I., Reed, C., Simari, G., South, M., Vreeswijk, G. A. W., & Willmott, S. (2006). Towards an argument interchange format. *Knowledge Engineering Review, 21*(4), 293–316.
Chesñevar, C. I., Simari, G. R., Alsinet, T., & Godo, L. (2004). A logic programming framework for possibilistic argumentation with vague knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 20th conference on uncertainty in artificial intelligence* (pp. 76–84). Arlington: AUAI.
Cicero, M. T. (1949). *De inventione. De optimo genere oratorum. Topica*. In H. M. Hubbell (Ed.). London: Heinemann.
Cicero, M. T. (2006). *On invention, Best kind of orator, Topics* (Trans.: H. H. Hubbel). Cambridge, MA-London: Harvard University Press.
Clark, H. (1979). Responding to indirect requests. *Cognitive Psychology, 11*, 430–477.
Coelho, A. (1989). *Desafio e refutação* [Challenge and refutation]. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
Cohen, H. (1994). *The history of speech communication. The emergence of a discipline, 1914–1945*. Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
Cohen, J. L. (1992). *An essay on belief and acceptance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Cohen, M. R., & Nagel, E. (1964). *An introduction to logic and scientific method*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (1st ed. 1934).
Collin, F., Sandøe, P., & Stefansen, N. C. (1987). *Derfor. Bogen om argumentation* [Therefore. A book on argumentation]. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.
Collins, J. (1959). The uses of argument. *Cross Currents, 9*, 179.
Comesaña, J. (1998). *Lógica informal, falacias y argumentos* [Informal logic, fallacies and arguments]. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.
Conley, T. M. (1990). *Rhetoric in the European tradition*. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.
Constantinescu, M., Stoica, G., & Uţă Bărbulescu, O. (Eds.). (2012). *Modernitate şi interdisciplinaritate în cercetarea lingvistică. Omagiu doamnei profesor Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu* [Modernity and interdisciplinarity in linguistics. A festschrift in honour of Professor Liliana Ionexcu-Ruxăndoiu] (pp. 227–241). Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
Conway, D. (1991). On the distinction between convergent and linked arguments. *Informal Logic, 13*(3), 145–158.
Cooley, J. C. (1959). On Mr. Toulmin's revolution in logic. *Journal of Philosophy, 56*, 297–319.
Copi, I. M. (1953). *Introduction to logic*. New York: Macmillan.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Copi, I. M. (1961). *Introduction to logic* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan. (1st ed. 1953).
Copi, I. M. (1972). *Introduction to logic* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan. (1st ed. 1953).
Copi, I. M. (1982). *Introduction to logic* (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan. (1st ed. 1953).
Copi, I. M. (1986). *Introduction to logic* (7th ed.). New York: Macmillan. (1st ed. 1953).
Corcoran, J. (1972). Completeness of an ancient logic. *Journal of Symbolic Logic, 37*, 696–702.
Corcoran, J. (1974). Aristotle's natural deduction system. In J. Corcoran (Ed.), *Ancient logic and its modern interpretations. Proceedings of the Buffalo symposium on modernist interpretations of ancient logic, 21 and 22 April, 1972*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Corgan, V. (1987). Perelman's universal audience as a critical tool. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23*, 147–157.
Cosoreci Mazilu, S. (2010). *Dissociation and persuasive definitions as argumentative strategies in ethical argumentation on abortion*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bucharest.
Costello, H. T. (1934). Review of Ch. Perelman, *De l' arbitraire dans la connaissance*. *The Journal of Philosophy, 31*, 613.
Cowan, J. L. (1964). The uses of argument – An apology for logic. *Mind, 73*, 27–45.
Cox, J. R. (1989). The die is cast. Topical and ontological dimensions of the *locus* of the irreparable. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 121–139). Lanham: University Press of America.
Crable, R. E. (1976). *Argumentation as communication. Reasoning with receivers*. Columbus: Charles E. Merill.
Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2005). "The issue" in argumentation practice and theory. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Argumentation in practice* (pp. 11–28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2009). Framing discourse as argument in Appellate Courtrooms. Three cases on same-sex marriage. In D. S. Gouran (Ed.), *The functions of argument and social context. Selected paper from the 16th biennial conference on argumentation* (pp. 46–53). Washington, DC: NCA.
Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (Eds.). (1983). *Conversational coherence*. London: Sage.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1946). The obstinate universal. *Polemic, 2*, 14–21.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1947). *The comforts of unreason. A study of the motives behind irrational thought*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1948). Epilogue. In A. Koestler et al. (Eds.), *The challenge of our time* (pp. 72–78). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1951). Equivocal confirmation. *Analysis, 11*, 73–79.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1957). *Methods and criteria of reasoning. An inquiry into the structure of controversy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1968). Two intellectual temperaments. *Question, 1*, 17–27.
Crawshay-Williams, R. (1970). *Russell remembered*. London: Oxford University Press.
Crespo, C. (2005). La importancia de la argumentación matemática en el aula [The importance of mathematical argumentation in the classroom]. *Premisa. Revista de la Sociedad Argentina de Educación Matemática, 7*(23), 23–29.
Crespo, C., & Farfán, R. (2005). Una visión de las argumentaciones por reducción al absurdo como construcción sociocultural [A vision of reduction to absurd argumentation as socio-cultural construction]. *Relime, 8*(3), 287–317.
Crespo, N. (1995). El desarrollo ontogenético del argumento [The ontogenetic development of argument]. *Revista Signos, 37*, 69–82.
Cronkhite, G. (1969). *Persuasion. Speech and behavioral change*. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill.
Crosswhite, J. (1989). Universality in rhetoric. Perelman's universal audience. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 22*, 157–173.
Crosswhite, J. (1993). Being unreasonable. Perelman and the problem of fallacies. *Argumentation, 7*, 385–402.
Crosswhite, J. (1996). *The rhetoric of reason. Writing and the attractions of argument*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Crosswhite, J., Fox, J., Reed, C. A., Scaltsas, T., & Stumpf, S. (2004). Computational models of rhetorical argument. In C. A. Reed & T. J. Norman (Eds.), *Argumentation machines. New frontiers in argument and computation* (pp. 175–209). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cuenca, M. J. (1995). Mecanismos lingüísticos y discursivos de la argumentación [Linguistic and discoursive mechanisms of argumentation]. *Comunicación, lenguaje y educación, 25*, 23–40.

Culioli, A. (1990), *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations et représentation, tome 1* [Towards a linguistics of the utterance: operations and representation, Vol. 1]. Paris: Ophrys.

Culioli, A. (1999), *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Formalisation et opérationsde repé rage, tome 2* [Towards a linguistics of the utterance. Formalisation and identification operations, Vol. 2]. Paris, Ophrys.

Cummings, L. (2002). Justifying practical reason. What Chaïm Perelman's new rhetoric can learn from Frege's attack on psychologism. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 35*(1), 50–76.

Cummings, L. (2005). *Pragmatics. A multidisciplinary perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cunha, P. F., & Malato, M. L. (2007). *Manual de retórica & direito* [Handbook of rhetoric & law]. Lisbon: Quid Juris.

Cunha, T. C. (2004). *Argumentação e crítica* [Argumentation and criticism]. Coimbra: Minerva Coimbra.

D'Agostini, F. (2010). *Verità avvelaneta. Buoni e cattivi argomenti nel dibattito publico* [Poisoned truth. Good and bad arguments in the public debate]. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.

D'Agostini, F. (2011). Ad ignorantiam arguments, epistemicism and realism. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat (edemo1@xs4all.nl CD rom).

D'Avila Garcez, A. S., Lamb, L. C., & Gabbay, D. M. (2009). *Neural-symbolic cognitive reasoning*. Berlin: Springer.

Damele, G. (2011). Rhetoric and persuasive strategies in High Courts' decisions. Some remarks on the Portuguese Tribunal Constitucional and the Italian Corte Costituzionale. In M. Araszkiewicz, M. Myška, J. Smejkalová, J. Šavelka, & M. Skop (Eds.), *Argumentation 2011. International conference on alternative methods of argumentation in law* (pp. 81–94). Brno: Masaryk University.

Damele, G. (2012). "A força das coisas". O argumento naturalista na jurisprudência constitucional, entre a impotência do legislador e a omnipotência do juiz ["The force of things". The naturalistic argument in constitutional case-law, between legislator's powerlessness and judge's omnipotence]. *Revista Brasileira de Filosofia, 239*, 11–34.

Damele, G., Dogliani, M., Matropaolo, A., Pallante, F., & Radicioni, D. P. (2011). On legal argumentation techniques. Towards a systematic approach. In M. A. Biasiotti & S. Faro (Eds.), *From information to knowledge. On line access to legal information. Methodologies, trends and perspectives* (pp. 105–118). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Danblon, E. (2002). *Rhétorique et rationalité. Essai sur l'émergence de la critique et de la persuasion* [Rhetoric and rationality. Essay on the emergence of criticism and persuasion]. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université Libre de Bruxelle.

Danblon, E. (2004). *Argumenter en démocratie* [Arguing in democracy]. Brussels: Labor.

Danblon, E. (2005). *La function persuasive. Anthropologie du discours rhétorique. Origins et actualité* [The persuasive function. Anthropology of rhetorical discourse. Origins and actuality]. Paris: Armand Colin.

Danblon, E. (2009). The notion of pseudo-argument in Perelman's thought. *Argumentation, 23*, 351–359.

Danblon, E. (2013). *L'homme rhétorique. Culture, raison, action* [The rhetorical man. Culture, reason, action]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Dascal, M. (1993). *Interpreting and understanding*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (Portuguese trans. as *Interpretação e compreensão*). São Leopoldo: Editora da Unisinos, 2006).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Dascal, M. (1994). Epistemology, controversies, and pragmatics. *Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Historia da Ciência, 12*, 73–98.

Dascal, M. (1998). Types of polemics and types of polemical moves. In S. Cmejrkova, J. Hoffmannova, O. Mullerova, & J. Svetla (Eds.), *Dialogue analysis, I* (pp. 15–33). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Dascal, M. (2001). How rational can a polemic across the analytic-continental 'divide' be? *International Journal of Philosophical Studies, 9*(3), 313–339.

Dascal, M. (2005). Debating with myself and debating with others. In P. Barrotta & M. Dascal (Eds.), *Controversies and subjectivity* (pp. 31–73). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (Portuguese trans. as 'O auto-debate é possível? Dissolvendo alguns de seus supostos paradoxos'. *Revista Internacional de Filosofia*, *29*(2), 319–349, 2006).

Dascal, M. (2007). Traditions of controversy and conflict resolution. In M. Dascal & H. L. Chang (Eds.), *Traditions of controversy*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dascal, M. (2008). Dichotomies and types of debate. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 27–49). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dascal, M. (2009). Dichotomies and types of debates. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation* (pp. 27–49). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dascal, M., & Boantza, V. D. (Eds.). (2011). *Controversies in the scientific revolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dascălu Jinga, L. (2002). *Corpus de română vorbită (CORV). Eşantioane* [Corpus of spoken Romanian (CORV). Samples]. Bucharest: Oscar Print.

Dauber, C. E. (1988). Through a glass darkly. Validity standards and the debate over nuclear strategic doctrine. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 24*, 168–180.

Dauber, C. E. (1989). Fusion criticism. A call to criticism. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 33–36). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Dearin, R. D. (1982). Perelman's concept of "quasi-logical" argument. A critical elaboration. In J. R. Cox & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Advances in argumentation theory and research* (pp. 78–94). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dearin, R. D. (1989). The philosophical basis of Chaïm Perelman's theory of rhetoric. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 17–34). Lanham: University Press of America.

Dębowska, K. (2010). Model pragma-dialektyczny a rozumowanie abdukcyjne [The pragma-dialectical model and abductive reasoning]. *Forum Artis Rhetoricae, 20–21*(1–2), 96–124.

Deimer, G. (1975). *Argumentative Dialoge. Ein Versuch zu ihrer sprachwissenschaftlichen Beschreibung* [Argumentative dialogue. An attempt at linguistic description]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Demaître-Lahaye, C. (2011). *De la représentation discursive à la communication dissuasive. Perspectives pragmatiques en matière de prévention du suicide* [From discursive representation to dissuasive communication. Pragmatic perspectives on the prevention of suicide]. Saarbrücken: Éditions Universitaires Européennes.

DeMorgan, A. (1847). *Formal logic*. London: Taylor & Walton.

Depperman, A., & Hartung, M. (2003). *Argumentieren in Gesprächen* [Argumentation in conversation]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dias, A. (2008). *O discurso da violência – As marcas da oralidade no jornalismo popular* [The discourse of violence – The tokens of violence in popular journalism]. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.

Dichy, J. (2003). *Kinâya*, a tropic device from medieval Arabic rhetoric, and its impact on discourse theory. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 237–241). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Dignum, F., Dunin-Kęplicz, B., & Verbrugge, R. (2001). Creating collective intention through dialogue. *Logic Journal of the IGPL, 9*(2), 305–319.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA. A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Dimiškovska Trajanoska, A. (2001). *Прагматиката и теоријата на аргументацијата* [Pragmatics and argumentation theory]. Skopje: Djurgja.

Dimiškovska Trajanoska, A. (2006). Логиката, аргументацијата и јазикот. помеѓу аналитиката и дијалектиката [Logic, argumentation and language. Between analytics and dialectics], *Филологические заметки/Филолошки студии/Filološke pripombe*, *1*(4), Пермский государственный университет, Россия, Институт за македонска литература, Скопје, Македонија, Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenija, Пермь-Skopje-Љубљана, 103–119.

Dimiškovska [Trajanoska], A. (2009). Субверзијата во аргументативниот дискурс и стратегии за справување со неа [Subversion in argumentative discourse and strategies for dealing with it]. *Философија, 26*, 93–111.

Dimiškovska [Trajanoska], A. (2010). The logical structure of legal justification: Dialogue or 'trialogue'? In D. M. Gabbay, P. Canivez, S. Rahman, & A. Thiercelin (Eds.), *Approaches to legal rationality* (pp. 265–280). Dordrecht: Springer.

Dimiškovska [Trajanoska], A. (2011). Truth and nothing but the truth? The argumentative use of fictions in legal reasoning. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 366–378). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Diogenes Laertius. (1925). *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of eminent philosophers, I: Books 1–5, II: Books 6–10*. (R. D. Hicks, trans.). London: William Heinemann. (*Loeb classical library 184, 185*).

Discini, N. (2008) Paixão e éthos [Passion and ethos]. In *Anais do III Simpósio Internacional sobre análise do discurso: emoções, éthos e argumentação, III* (pp. 1–9). Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.

Djidjian, R. (1992). Transformational analysis and inner argumentation. In J. Pietarinen (Ed.), *Problems of philosophical argumentation, II, special problems*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.

Dolinina, I. B. (1992). Change of scientific paradigms as an object of the theory of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 73–84). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Dolinina, I. B. (2007). Arguments against/pro directives. Taxonomy. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 337–342). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Douay-Soublin, F. (1990a). Non, la rhétorique française au 18^{e} siècle n'est pas "restreinte" aux tropes [No, French rhetoric in the 18th century was not "restricted" to tropes]. *Histoire Episté mologie Langage, 12*(1), 123–132.

Douay-Soublin, F. (1990b). "Mettre dans le jour d'apercevoir ce qui est." Tropologie et argumentation chez Dumarsais ["Bring to light the world as it is." Dumarsais's tropology and argumentation]. In M. Meyer & A. Lempereur (Eds.), *Figures et conflits rhétoriques* [Figures and rhetorical conflicts] (pp. 83–102). Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.

Douay-Soublin, F. (1994a). Y-a-t-il renaissance de la rhétorique en France au XIXe siècle? [Is there a revival of rhetoric in France in the 19th century?]. In S. IJsseling & G. Vervaecke (Eds.), *Renaissances of rhetoric* (pp. 51–154). Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Douay-Soublin, F. (1994b). Les figures de rhétorique. Actualité, reconstruction, remploi [Rhetorical figures. Topicality, redevelopment, re-use]. *Langue Française, 101*, 13–25.

Doury, M. (1997). *Le débat immobile. L'argumentation dans le débat médiatique sur les parasciences* [The immobile debate. Argumentation in the media debate on the parasciences]. Paris; Kimé.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Doury, M. (2004a). La classification des arguments dans les discours ordinaires [The classification of arguments in ordinary discourse]. *Langage, 154*, 59–73.

Doury, M. (2004b). La position de l'analyste de l'argumentation [The position of the argumentation analyst]. *Semen, 17*, 143–163.

Doury, M. (2005). The accusation of *amalgame* as a meta-argumentative refutation. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The practice of argumentation* (pp. 145–161). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Doury, M. (2006). Evaluating analogy. Toward a descriptive approach to argumentative norms. In P. Houtlosser & M. A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 35–49). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Doury, M. (2009). Argument schemes typologies in practice. The case of comparative arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Pondering on problems of argumentation* (pp. 141–155). New York: Springer.

Doury, M., Plantin, C., & Traverso, V. (Eds.). (2000). *Les émotions dans les interactions* [Emotions in interactions]. Lyon: PUL/ARCI.

Doury M., & Traverso, V. (2000). Usage des énoncés généralisants dans la mise en scène de lignes argumentatives en situation d'entretien [The use of generalizing utterances in the production of lines of argument in a conversational context]. In G. Martel (Ed.), *Autour de l'argumentation. Rationaliser l'expérience quotidienne* [Around argumentation. Rationalising everyday experiences] (pp. 47–80). Québec: Editions Nota Bene.

Drop, W., & de Vries, J. H. L. (1974). *Taalbeheersing. Handboek voor taalhantering* [Speech communication. Handbook of speech management]. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Ducrot, O. (1980). *Les échelles argumentatives* [Argumentative scales]. Paris: Minuit.

Ducrot, O. (1984). *Le dire et le dit* [The process and product of saying]. Paris: Minuit.

Ducrot, O. (1986). *Polifonía y argumentación* [Polyphny and argumentation]. Cali: Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de Cali.

Ducrot, O. (1990). *Polifonia y argumentacion* [Polyphony and argumentation]. Cali: Universidad del Valle.

Ducrot, O. (2001). Critères argumentatifs et analyse lexicale. *Langages, 35*(142), 22–40.

Ducrot, O. (2004). Argumentation rhétorique et argumentation linguistique [Rhetorical and linguistic argumentation]. In M. Doury & S. Moirand (Eds.), *L'Argumentation aujourd'hui. Positions theorique en confrontation* [Argumentation today. Confrontation of theoretical positions] (pp. 17–34). Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Ducrot, O., Bourcier, D., Bruxelles, S., Diller, A.-M., Foucquier, E., Gouazé, J., Maury, L., Nguyen, T. B., Nunes, G., Ragunet de Saint-Alban, L., Rémis, A., & Sirdar-Iskander, C. (1980). *Les mots du discours* [The words of discourse]. Paris: Minuit.

Dufour, M. (2008). *Argumenter* [Arguing]. Paris: Armand Colin.

Dufour, M. (2010). Explication scientifique et explication non scientifique [Scientific and non-scientific explanation]. In E. Bour & S. Roux (Eds.), *Lambertiana* (pp. 411–435). Paris: Vrin.

Dumarsais, C. C. (1988). *Des tropes, ou des différents sens* [About tropes or about the different meanings]. In F. Douay-Soublin (Ed.). Paris: Flammarion.

Dunbar, N. R. (1986). Laetrile. A case study of a public controversy. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 196–211.

Dung, P. M. (1995). On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in non-monotonic reasoning, logic programming and *n*-person games. *Artificial Intelligence, 77*, 321–357.

Dung, P. M., & Thang, P. M. (2010). Towards (probabilistic) argumentation for jury-based dispute resolution. In P. Baroni, F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Computational models of argument – Proceedings of COMMA 2010* (pp. 171–182). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Dunin-Kęplicz, B., Strachocka, A., Szałas, A., & Verbrugge, R. (2012). A paraconsistent approach to speech acts. In P. McBurney, S. Parsons & I. Rahwan (Eds.), *Proceedings workshop on argumentation in multi-agent systems*, (pp. 59–78). Valencia: IFAAMAS.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Dunin-Kęplicz, B., & Verbrugge, R. (2010). *Teamwork in multi-agent systems. A formal approach*. Chichester: Wiley.
Dunlap, D. D. (1993). The conception of audience in Perelman and Isocrates. Locating the ideal in the real. *Argumentation, 7*, 461–474.
Dunne, P. E. (2007). Computational properties of argument systems satisfying graph-theoretic constraints. *Artificial Intelligence, 171*(10), 701–729.
Dunne, P. E., & Bench-Capon, T. J. M. (2003). Two party immediate response disputes. Properties and efficiency. *Artificial Intelligence, 149*(2), 221–250.
Dutilh Novaes, C. (2005). Medieval *obligationes* as logical games of consistency maintenance. *Synthese, 145*(3), 371–395.
Dutilh Novaes, C. (2012). Medieval theories of consequence. In: *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consequence-medieval/
Dworkin, R. (1978). *Taking rights seriously. New impression with a reply to critics*. London: Duckworth.
Eabrasu, M. (2009). A reply to the current critiques formulated against Hoppe's argumentation ethics. *Libertarian Papers, 1*(20), 1–29.
Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Ebbesen, S. (1981). *Commentators and commentaries on Aristotle's* Sophistici elenchi. *A study of post-aristotelian ancient and medieval writings on fallacies,* Vol. 3. Leiden: Brill.
Ebbesen, S. (1993). The theory of loci in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. In K. Jacobi (Ed.), *Argumentationstheorie. Scholastische Forschungen zu den logischen und semantischen Regeln korrekten Folgerns* [Theory of argumentation. Scholastic investigations of the logical and semantic rules of correct inference] (pp. 15–39). Leiden: Brill.
Eco, U. (1987). Il messaggio persuasivo [The persuasive message]. In E. Mattioli (Ed.), *Le ragioni della retorica* [The reasons of rhetoric] (pp. 11–27). Modena: Mucchi.
Ede, L. S. (1989). Rhetoric versus philosophy. The role of the universal audience in Chaïm Perelman's *The new rhetoric*. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 141–151). Lanham: University Press of America.
van Eemeren, F. H. (1986). Dialectical analysis as a normative reconstruction of argumentative discourse. *Text, 6*(1), 1–16.
van Eemeren, F. H. (1987a). Argumentation studies' five estates. In J. W. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices. Proceedings of the fifth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 9–24). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
van Eemeren, F. H. (1987b). For reason's sake. Maximal argumentative analysis of discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation, 1986* (pp. 201–215). Dordrecht: Foris.
van Eemeren, F. H. (1990). The study of argumentation as normative pragmatics. *Text. An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 10*(1/2), 37–44.
van Eemeren, F. H. (2001). Fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory* (pp. 135–164). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
van Eemeren, F. H. (2002). Democracy and argumentation. *Controversia, 1*(1), 69–84.
van Eemeren, F. H. (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [trans. into Chinese (in preparation), Italian (2014), Japanese (in preparation), & Spanish (2013b)].
van Eemeren, F. H. (2012). The pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation in discussion. *Argumentation, 26*(4), 439–457.
van Eemeren, F. H. (2013a). In what sense do modern argumentation theories relate to Aristotle? The case of pragma-dialectics. *Argumentation, 27*(1), 49–70.
van Eemeren, F. H. (2013b). *Maniobras estratégicas en el discurso argumentativo. Extendiendo la teoría pragma-dialéctica de la argumentación*. Madrid/Mexico: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC)/Plaza & Valdés. Theoria cum Praxi. (Spanish transl. by

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

C. Santibáñez Yáñez & M. E. Molina of F. H. van Eemeren (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins).

van Eemeren, F. H. (2014). *Mosse e strategie tra retorica e argomentazione*. Naples: Loffredo. (Italian transl. by S. Bigi & A. Gilardoni of F. H. van Eemeren (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins).

van Eemeren, F. H. (Ed.). (2009). *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 115–130). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (2009). The fallacies of composition and division revisited. *Cogency, 1*(1), 23–42.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (2010a). *In varietate concordia* – United in diversity. European parliamentary debate as an argumentative activity type. *Controversia, 7*(1), 19–37.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (2010b). Linguistic criteria for judging composition and division fallacies. In A. Capone (Ed.), *Perspectives on language use and pragmatics. A volume in memory of Sorin Stati* (pp. 35–50). Munich: Lincom Europa.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (2011). Exploiting the room for strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Dealing with audience demand in the European Parliament. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Exploring argumentative contexts*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., & Meuffels, B. (2009). *Fallacies and judgments of reasonableness. Empirical research concerning the pragma-dialectical discussion rules*. Dordrecht etc.: Springer.

van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., & Meuffels, B. (2012a). Effectiveness through reasonableness. Preliminary steps to pragma-dialectical effectiveness research. *Argumentation, 26*(1), 33–53.

van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., & Meuffels, B. (2012b). The disguised abusive *ad hominem* empirically investigated. Strategic maneuvering with direct personal attacks. *Thinking & Reasoning, 18*(3), 344–364.

van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., & Wagemans, J. (2012). The pragma-dialectical method of analysis and evaluation. In R. C. Rowland (Ed.), *Reasoned argument and social change. Selected papers from the seventeenth biennial conference on argumentation sponsored by the National Communication Association and the American Forensic Association* (pp. 25–47). Washington, DC: National Communication Association.

van Eemeren, F. H., de Glopper, K., Grootendorst, R., & Oostdam, R. (1995). Identification of unexpressed premises and argumentation schemes by students in secondary school. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 31*, 151–162.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions. A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Dordrecht-Cinnaminson: Foris & Berlin: de Gruyter (trans. into Russian (1994c) & Spanish (2013).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1988). Rationale for a pragma-dialectical perspective. *Argumentation, 2*, 271–291.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1989). A transition stage in the theory of fallacies. *Journal of Pragmatics, 13*, 99–109.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1990). Analyzing argumentative discourse. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation. Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 86–106). Prospect Heights: Waveland.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1991a). The study of argumentation from a speech act perspective. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Pragmatics at issue. Selected papers of the International Pragmatics Conference, Antwerp, August 17–22, 1987, I* (pp. 151–170). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1991b). [Chinese title]. Beijing: Peking University Press. (chinese trans. of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992a). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum. (trans. into Bulgarian (2009), Chinese (1991b), French (1996), Romanian (2010), Russian (1992b), Spanish (2007)).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992b). [Russian title]. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press. L. Chakoyah, V. Golubev & T. Tretyakova of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a). Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1993). The history of the *argumentum ad hominem* since the seventeenth century. In E. C. W. Krabbe, R. J. Dalitz, & P. A. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical logic and public debate. Essays in honour of Else M. Barth* (pp. 49–68). Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1994a). Argumentation theory. In J. Verschueren & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 55–61). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1994b). Rationale for a pragma-dialectical perspective. In F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Studies in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 11–28). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1994c). *Rechevye akty v argumentativnykh diskusiyakh. Teoreticheskaya model analiza diskussiy, napravlennyh na razresheniye konflikta mneniy*. (Russian transl. by E. Bogoyavlenskaya, Ed. L. Chakhoyan, of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions. A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Dordrecht/ Cinnaminson: Foris & Berlin: de Gruyter).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1995). Perelman and the fallacies. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 28*, 122–133.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1996). *La nouvelle dialectique*. Paris: Kimé. (French transl. by S. Bruxelles, M. Doury, V. Traverso & Chr. Plantin of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1999). From analysis to presentation. A pragma-dialectical approach to writing argumentative texts. In J. Andriessen & P. Coirier (Eds.), *Foundations of argumentative text processing* (pp. 59–73). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2002). [Chinese title]. Beijing: Peking University Press. Chinese trans. by Zhang Shuxue of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (2004). A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma-dialectical approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (trans. into Bulgarian (2006), Chinese (2002), Italian (2008) & Spanish (2011)).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2006). *Системна теория на аргументацията (Прагматико-диалектически подход)*, Sofia: Sofia University Press. (Bulgarian transl. by M. Pencheva of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).)

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2007). *Argumentación, comunicación y falacias. Una perspectiva pragma-dialéctica*. Santiago: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile. (1st ed. 2002). (Spanish transl. by C. López & A. M. Vicuña of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a), *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2008). *Una teoria sistematica dell'argomentazione. L'approccio pragma-dialettico*. Milan: Mimesis. (Italian trans. by A. Gilardoni of F. H. van

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentatin. The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2009). *Kak da pechelim debati (Argumentacia, komunikacia I greshki. Pragma-dialekticheski podhod), II*. Sofia: Sofia University Press. (Bulgarian transl. by D. Alexandrova of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. The pragma-dialectical approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2010). *Argumentare, comunicare şi sofisme. O perspectivă pragma-dialectică*. Galati: Galati University Press. (Rumanian transl. by C. Andone & A. Gâţă of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1992a). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2011). *Una teoría sistemática de la argumentación. La perspectiva pragmadialéctica*. Buenos Aires: Biblos Ciencias del Lenguaje. (Spanish transl. by C. López & A. M. Vicuña of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2013). *Los actos de habla en las discusiones argumentativas. Un modelo teórico para el análisis de discusiones orientadas hacia la resolución de diferencias de opinión*. Santiago, Chile: Ediciones Universidad Diego Portales. (Spanish transl. by Chr. Santibáñez Yáñez & M. E. Molina of F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions. A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris & Berlin: de Gruyter).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1993). *Reconstructing argumentative discourse*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1978). *Argumentatietheorie* [Argumentation theory]. Utrecht: Het Spectrum. (2nd enlarged ed. 1981; 3rd ed. 1986). (English transl. (1984, 1987).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1981). *Argumentatietheorie* [Argumentation theory] (2nd enlarged ed.). Utrecht: Het Spectrum. (1st ed. 1978; 3rd ed. 1986). (English transl. (1984, 1987)).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1984). *The study of argumentation*. New York: Irvington. (Engl. trans. by H. Lake of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & T. Kruiger (1981). *Argumentatietheorie* (2nd ed). Utrecht: Het Spectrum. (1st ed. 1978)).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1986). *Argumentatietheorie* [Argumentation theory] (3rd ed.). Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff. (1st ed. 1978, Het Spectrum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1987). *Handbook of argumentation theory. A critical survey of classical backgrounds and modern studies*. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris. (English transl. by H. Lake of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & T. Kruiger (1981). *Argumentatietheorie*. Utrecht etc.: Het Spectrum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Meuffels, B. (1984). Het identificeren van enkelvoudige argumentatie [Identifying single argumentation]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, 6*(4), 297–310.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Meuffels, B. (1985). Gedifferentieerde replicaties van identificatieonderzoek [Differentiated replications of identification research]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, 7*(4), 241–257.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Meuffels, B. (1987). Identificatie van argumentatie als vaardigheid [Identifying argumentation as a skill]. *Spektator, 16*(5), 369–379.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Meuffels, B. (1989). The skill of identifying argumentation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 25*(4), 239–245.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Meuffels, B. (1990). Valkuilen achter een rookgordijn [Pitfalls behind a smokescreen]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, 12*(1), 47–58.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum. (trans. into Albanian (2006a), Armenian (2004), Chinese (2006b), Italian (2011), Japanese (in preparation), Portuguese (in preparation), Russian (2002b), Spanish (2006c)).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2002b). *Argumentaciya. Analiz, proverka, predstavleniye*. (L. Chakhoyan, T. Tretyakova & V. Goloubev, Trans.). St. Petersburg: Faculty of Philology, St. Petersburg State University. Student Library. (Russian trans. by L. Chakhoyan, T. Tretyakova & V. Goloubev of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2004). [Armenian title]. Yerevan: Academy of Philosophy of Armenia. (Armenian trans. by L. Brutian of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2006a). *Argumentimi. Analiza, evaluimi, prezentimi*. Tetovo, Macedonia: Forum for Society, Science and Culture 'Universitas'. (Albanian trans. by V. Memedi of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2006b). [Chinese title]. Beijing: New World Press. (Chinsese trans. by Minghui Xiong & Yi Zhao of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2006c). *Argumentación. Análisis, evaluación, presentación*. Buenos Aires: Biblos Ciencias del Lenguaje. (Spanish trans. by R. Marafioti of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2011). *Il galateo della discussione (Orale e scritta)*. Milan: Mimesis. (Italian trans. by A. Gilardoni of F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (2002a). *Argumentation. Analysis, evaluation, presentation*. Mahwah: Routledge/Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Snoeck Henkemans, A. F., Blair, J. A., Johnson, R. H., Krabbe, E. C. W., Plantin, C., Walton, D. N., Willard, C. A., Woods, J., & Zarefsky, D. (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory. Handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. Mawhah: Lawrence Erlbaum. (transl. into Dutch (1997)).

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F., with Blair, J. A., Johnson, R. H., Krabbe, E. C.W., Plantin, C., Walton, D. N., Willard, C. A., Woods, J., & Zarefsky, D. (1997). *Handboek Argumentatietheorie*. Groningen: Nijhoff. (trans. by F. H. van Eemeren & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans of F. H van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans, with J. A. Blair, R. H. Johnson, E. C. W. Krabbe, C. Plantin, D. N. Walton, C. A. Willard, J. Woods, & D. Zarefsky (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory. Handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments*. Mawhah: Lawrence Erlbaum).

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (1999). William the silent's argumentative discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 168–171). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2000a). Rhetorical analysis within a pragma-dialectical framework. The case of R. J. Reynolds. *Argumentation, 14*(3), 293–305.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2000b). The rhetoric of William the silent's apologie. A dialectical perspective. In T. Suzuki, Y. Yano, & T. Kato (Eds.), *Proceedings of the first Tokyo conference on argumentation* (pp. 37–40). Tokyo: Japan Debate Association.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2002a). Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse. Maintaining a delicate balance. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.),

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Dialectic and rhetoric. The warp and woof of argumentation analysis (pp. 131–159). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2002b). Strategic maneuvering with the burden of proof. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 13–28). Amsterdam-Newport News: Sic Sat/Vale Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (Eds.). (2002c). *Dialectic and rhetoric. The warp and woof of argumentation analysis*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2003a). A pragmatic view of the burden of proof. In F. H. van Eemeren, A. F. Snoeck Henkemans, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 123–132). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2003b). Strategic manoeuvring. William the silent's *apologie*. A case in point. In L. I. Komlósi, P. Houtlosser, & M. Leezenberg (Eds.), *Communication and culture. Argumentative, cognitive and linguistic perspectives* (pp. 177–185). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2007). Seizing the occasion. Parameters for analysing ways of strategic manoeuvring. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 375–380). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2008). Rhetoric in a dialectical framework. Fallacies as derailments of strategic manoeuvring. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Dialogue and rhetoric* (pp. 133–151). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, F. H., Houtlosser, P., Ihnen [Jory], C., & Lewiński, M. (2010). Contextual considerations in the evaluation of argumentation. In C. Reed & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *Dialectics, dialogue and argumentation. An examination of Douglas Walton's theories of reasoning and argument* (pp. 115–132). London: King's College Publications.

van Eemeren, F. H., Houtlosser, P., & Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2007). *Argumentative indicators in discourse. A pragma-dialectical study*. Dordrecht: Springer.

van Eemeren, F. H., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (2010). Argumentation. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (Chapter 5). London: Sage.

van Eemeren, F. H., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (2011). Argumentation. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies. A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 85–106). Los Angeles: Sage.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Kruiger, T. (1987). Identifying argumentation schemes. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches* (pp. 70–81). Dordrecht: Foris.

van Eemeren, F. H., Meuffels, B., & Verburg, M. (2000). The (un)reasonableness of the argumentum ad hominem. *Language and Social Psychology, 19*(4), 416–435.

Egly, U., Gaggl, S. A., & Woltran, S. (2010). Answer-set programming encodings for argumentation frameworks. *Argument and Computation, 1*(2), 147–177.

Ehninger, D. (1970). Argument as method. Its nature, its limitations, and its uses. *Communication Monographs, 37*, 101–110.

Ehninger, D., & Brockriede, W. (1963). *Decision by debate*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

Eisenberg, A., & Ilardo, J. A. (1980). *Argument. A guide to formal and informal debate* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. (1st ed. 1972).

Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2009). *The aspiring thinker's guide to critical thinking*. Dillon Beach: Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Elhadad, M. (1995). Using argumentation in text generation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 24*, 189–220.

Engdahl, E., Glang, M., & O'Brien, A. (2011). The rhetoric of store-window mannequins. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21*. Windsor (CD rom).

Engelhardt, H. T., & Caplan, A. L. (Eds.). (1987). *Scientific controversies. Case studies in the resolution and closure of disputes in science and technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Ennis, R. H. (1962). A concept of critical thinking. *Harvard Educational Review, 32*, 81–111.
Ennis, R. H. (1982). Identifying implicit assumptions. *Synthese, 51*, 61–86.
Ennis, R. H. (1987). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. In J. Baron & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *Teaching thinking skills. Theory and practice* (pp. 9–26). New York: W. H. Freeman.
Ennis, R. H. (1989). Critical thinking and subject specificity. Clarification and needed research. *Educational Researcher, 18*(3), 4–10.
Ennis, R. H. (2006). 'Probably'. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 145–164). Dordrecht: Springer.
Eriksson, L. (1998). *Traditions of rhetorical proof. Pauline argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund.
Eubanks, R. (1986). An axiological analysis of Chaïm Perelman's theory of practical reasoning. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 53–67). Dordrecht: Reidel.
Eveling, H. S. (1959). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *Philosophical Quarterly, 9*, 188–189.
Evers, J. (1970). *Argumentationsanalys för jurister* [Argumentation analysis for lawyers]. Lund: Gleerups.
Fadely, L. D. (1967). The validity of the comparative advantages case. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 4*, 28–35.
Fahnestock, J. (1999). *Rhetorical figures in science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Fahnestock, J. (2009). Quid pro nobis. Rhetorical stylistics for argument analysis. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 131–152). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Fahnestock, J. (2011). *Rhetorical style. The uses of language in persuasion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis. A method for advanced students*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. London: Longman Group Limited.
Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). London: Longman. (1st ed. 1989).
Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
Falappa, M. A., Kern-Isberner, G., & Simari, G. R. (2002). Explanations, belief revision and defeasible reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence, 141*(1–2), 1–28.
Faria, A. A. M. (2001). Interdiscurso, intradiscurso e leitura. O caso de Germinal [Interdiscourse, intradiscourse and reading. The case of Germinal]. In H. Mari, R. de Mello & I. L. Machado (Eds.). *Análise do discurso. Fundamentos e práticas* [Discourse analysis. (Foundations and practices)]. Belo Horizonte: Núcleo de Análise do discurso – Faculdade de Letras da UFMG.
Farrell, T. B. (1977). Validity and rationality. The rhetorical constituents of argumentative form. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 13*, 142–149.
Farrell, T. B. (1986). Reason and rhetorical practice. The inventional agenda of Chaïm Perelman. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 259–286). Dordrecht: Reidel.
Farrell, T. B. (1999). Knowledge, consensus and rhetorical theory. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory. A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.
Fearnside, W. W., & Holther, W. B. (1959). *Fallacy. The counterfeit of argument*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Feldman, R. (1994). Good arguments. In F. F. Schmitt (Ed.), *Socializing epistemology. The social dimensions of knowledge* (pp. 159–188). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
Feldman, R. (1999). *Reason and argument* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall. (1st ed. 1993).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Fenton, N. E., Neil, M., & Lagnado, D. A. (2012). A general structure for legal arguments using Bayesian networks. *Cognitive Science*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12004

Ferrari, A., & Manzin, M. (Eds.). (2004). *La retorica fra scienza e professione legale. Questioni di metodo* [Rhetoric between science and the legal profession. Methodological questions]. Milan: Guffrè.

Ferraz Jr, T. S. (1997a). *Direito, retórica e comunicação* [Law, rhetoric and communication] (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Saraiva.

Ferraz Jr, T. S. (1997b). *Teoria da norma juridical. Ensaio de pragmática da comunicação normativa* [Theory of legal norm. An essay on pragmatics of normative communication]. (3rd ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense.

Ferreira, A. (2008). On the role of pragmatics, rhetoric and dialectics in scientific controversies. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 125–133). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ferreira, A. (2009). On the role of pragmatics, rhetoric and dialectic in scientific controversies. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation* (pp. 125–133). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ferreira, I., & Serra, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Rhetoric and mediatisation, I. Proceedings of the 1st meeting on rhetoric at UBI*. Covilhã: LabCom Books.

Ferreira, L. A. (2010). *Leitura e persuasão. Princípios de análise reórica* [Reading and persusasion. Principles of rhetorical analysis]. São Paul: Contexto.

Ferreira, L. A. (Ed.). (2012). *A retórica do medo* [The rhetoric of fear]. Franca: Cristal.

Feteris, E. T. (1989). *Discussieregels in het recht. Een pragma-dialectische analyse van het burgerlijk proces en het strafproces als kritische discussie* [Discussion rules in law. A pragma-dialectical analysis of civil lawsuits and criminal trials as a critical discussion]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Feteris, E. T. (1999). *Fundamentals of legal argumentation. A survey of theories on the justification of judicial decisions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. (trans. into Chinese (2005), Spanish (2007)).

Feteris, E. T. (2002). A pragma-dialectical approach of the analysis and evaluation of pragmatic argumentation in a legal context. *Argumentation, 16*(3), 349–367.

Feteris, E. T. (2005). [Chinese title]. Beijing: Law department University of Central Finance and Economy. (Chinese trans. by Qi Yuhan of E. T. Feteris (1999). *Fundamentals of legal argumentation. A critical survey of theories on the justification of judicial decisions*. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer Academic).

Feteris, E. T. (2007). Fundamentos de la argumentación jurídica. Bogotá: Universidad Externado de Colombia. (Spanish trans. of Fundamentals of legal argumentation. *A survey of theories on the justification of legal decisions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic).

Feteris, E. T. (2009). Strategic maneuvering in the justification of judicial decisions. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 93–114). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Filliettaz, L., & Roulet, E. (2002). The Geneva model of discourse analysis. An interactionist and modular approach to discourse organization. *Discourse Studies, 4*(3), 369–393.

Finnegan, C. A. (2003). Image vernaculars. Photography, anxiety and public argument. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, A. C. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 315–318). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Finocchiaro, M. A. (1974). The concept of *ad hominem* argument in Galileo and Locke. *The Philosophical Forum, 5*, 394–404.

Finocchiaro, M. A. (1980). *Galileo and the art of reasoning. Rhetorical foundations of logic and scientific method*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Finocchiaro, M. A. (1987). Six types of fallaciousness. Toward a realistic theory of logical criticism. *Argumentation, 1*, 263–282.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Finocchiaro, M. A. (1989). *The Galileo affair. A documentary history*. Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Finocchiaro, M. A. (1996). Informal factors in the formal evaluation of arguments. In J. van Benthem, F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, & F. Veltman (Eds.), *Logic and argumentation* (pp. 143–162). Amsterdam: North-Holland. (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, verhandelingen, afd. letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, 170).
Finocchiaro, M. A. (2005a). *Arguments about arguments. Systematic, critical and historical essays in logical theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Finocchiaro, M. A. (2005b). *Retrying Galileo, 1633–1992*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Finocchiaro, M. (2006). Reflections on the hyper dialectical definition of argument. In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 51–62). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Finocchiaro, M. A. (2010). *Defending Copernicus and Galileo. Critical reasoning in the two affairs*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Fisher, A. (1988). *The logic of real arguments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fisher, A. (2004). *The logic of real arguments* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1st ed. 1988).
Fisher, W. R. (1986). Judging the quality of audiences and narrative rationality. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 85–103). Dordrecht: Reidel.
Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
Fitelson, B. (2010). Pollock on probability in epistemology. *Philosophical Studies, 148*, 455–465.
Focas, J. D. (2010). A ética do discurso como uma virada linguística [The ethics of discourse as a linguistic turn]. *Revista Litteris, 4*, 1–12.
Fogelin, R. J. (1985). The logic of deep disagreements. *Informal Logic, 7*(1), 1–8.
Fogelin, R. J., & Duggan, T. J. (1987). Fallacies. *Argumentation, 1*, 255–262.
Føllesdal, D., Walloe L., & Elster J. (1986). *Rationale Argumentation. Ein Grundkurs in Argumentations- und Wissenschafstheorie* [Rational argumentation. An introduction in the theory of argumentation and science]. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
Fontanier, P. (1968). *Les figures du discours* [The figures of discourse]. (Combined ed. of the *Manuel classique pour l'étude des tropes,* 1821 and *Des Figures du discours autres que les tropes*, 1827). Paris: Flammarion.
Forchtner, B., & Tominc, A. (2012). On the relation between the discourse-historical approach and pragma-dialectics. *Journal of Language and Politics, 11*(1), 31–50.
Foss, S. K., Foss, K., & Trapp, R. (2002). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press. (1st ed. 1985).
Foster, W. T. (1908). *Argumentation and debating*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
Fowler, R., & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 185–214). London: Routledge.
Fox, J., & Das, S. (2000). *Safe and sound. Artificial intelligence in hazardous applications*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Fox, J., & Modgil, S. (2006). From arguments to decisions. Extending the Toulmin view. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 273–287). Dordrecht: Springer.
Frank, D. A. (2004). Argumentation studies in the wake of the new rhetoric. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 40*, 276–283.
Frank, D. A., & Bolduc, M. K. (2003). Chaïm Perelman's *First philosophies and regressive philosophy*. Commentary and translation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 36*(3), 177–188.
Frank, D. A., & Driscoll, W. (2010). A bibliography of the new rhetoric project. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 43*(4), 449–466.
Freeley, A. J. (1993). *Argumentation and debate. Critical thinking for reasoned decision making*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2009). *Argumentation and debate. Critical thinking for reasoned decision making*. Boston: Wadsworth.

Freeman, J. B. (1985). Dialectical situations and argument analysis. *Informal Logic, 7*, 151–162.

Freeman, J. B. (1988). *Thinking logically. Basic concepts for reasoning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Freeman, J. B. (1991). *Dialectics and the macrostructure of arguments. A theory of argument structure*. Berlin-New York: Foris/de Gruyter.

Freeman, J. B. (1992). Relevance, warrants, backing, inductive support. *Argumentation, 6*, 219–235.

Freeman, J. B. (2005a). *Acceptable premises. An epistemic approach to an informal logic problem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, J. B. (2005b). Systematizing Toulmin's warrants. An epistemic approach. *Argumentation, 19*, 331–346. (Also in D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.). (2006). *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 87–102). Dordrecht: Springer).

Freeman, J. B. (2006). Systematizing Toulmins warrants. An epistemic approach. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 87–101). Dordrecht: Springer.

Freeman, J. B. (2011a). *Argument structure. Representation and theory*. Dordrecht-New York: Springer.

Freeman, J. B. (2011b). The logical dimension of argumentation and its semantic appraisal in Bermejo-Luque's *Giving reasons. Theoria, 72*, 289–299.

Frege, G. (1879). *Begriffsschrift, eine der arithmetischen nachgebildete Formelsprache des reinen Denkens* [Concept-script, a formalized language of pure thought, modelled upon that of arithmetic]. Halle: Nebert.

Fritz, G. (2008). Communication principles for controversies. A historical perspective. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 109–124). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Frixen, G. (1987). Struktur und Dynamik natürlichsprachlichen Argumentierens [Structure and dynamics of everyday argumentation]. *Papiere zur Linguistik, 36*, 45–111.

Frumeșelu, M. D. (2007). Linguistic and argumentative typologies of concession. An integrating approach. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 425–431). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Frydman, B., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Chaïm Perelman (1912–2012) – De la nouvelle rhétorique à la logique juridique* [Chaïm Perelman (1912–2012) – From the new rhetoric to the legal logic]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Fuentes, C., & Kalawski, A. (2007). Toward a 'pragma-dramatic' approach to argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 433–436). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Fuhrmann, M. (2008). *Die antike Rhetorik* [Antique rhetoric]. Düsseldorf: Patmos.

Gabbay, D. M., Hogger, C. J., & Robinson, J. A. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, 3. Non-monotonic reasoning and uncertain reasoning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gabbay, D., & Woods, J. (2001). Non-cooperation in dialogue logic. *Synthese, 127*, 161–186.

Gabrielsen, J. (2003). Is there a topical dimension to the rhetorical example? In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 349–353). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Gabrielsen, J. (2008). *Topik. Ekskursioner i den retoriske toposlaere* [Topica. Excursions into the rhetorical doctrine of topos]. Åstorp: Retoriksforlaget.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Gabrielsen, J., Just, S. N., & Bengtsson, M. (2011). Concepts and contexts – Argumentative forms of framing. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 533–543). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Gage, J. T. (Ed.). (2011). *The promise of reason. Studies in the new rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ganea, A. (2011). Strategically manoeuvring with reporting in the argumentation stage of a critical discussion. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 544–552). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat.

Ganea, A. (2012). *Evidentialité et argumentation. L'expression de la source de l'information dans le discours* [Evidentiality and argumentation. Expressing the source of information in discourse]. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Ganea, A., & Gâţă, A. (2009). On the use of evidential strategies in Romanian. The case of *cum că*. *Interstudia 2. Language, Discourse, Society, 2*, 50–59.

Ganea, A., & Gâţă, A. (2010). Identification and terming. Dissociation as strategic maneuvering in the Romanian public space. In S. N. Osu, G. Col, N. Garric & F. Toupin (Eds.), *Construction d'identité et processus d'identification* [Identity building and process(es) of identification] (pp. 109–121). Bern: Peter Lang.

Garavelli, M. B. (1989). *Manuale di retorica* [Handbook of rhetoric]. Milan: Bompiani.

García, A. J., & Simari, G. R. (2004). Defeasible logic programming. An argumentative approach. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming, 4*(2), 95–138.

Gardner, A. (1987). *An artificial intelligence approach to legal reasoning*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Garssen, B. J. (1997). *Argumentatieschema's in pragma-dialectisch perspectief. Een theoretisch en empirisch onderzoek* [Argument schemes in a pragma-dialectical perspective. A theoretical and empirical study]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Garssen, B. J. (2001). Argument schemes. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory* (pp. 81–99). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Garssen, B. J. (2002). Understanding argument schemes. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 93–104). Amsterdam-Newport News: Sic Sat &Vale Press.

Garssen, B. (2009). Book review of *Dialog theory for critical argumentation* by Douglas N. Walton (2007). *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*, 186–188.

Garssen, B., & van Laar, J. A. (2010). A pragma-dialectical response to objectivist epistemic challenges. *Informal Logic, 30*(2), 122–141.

Garver, E. (2000). Comments on rhetorical analysis within a pragma-dialectical framework. *Argumentation, 14*, 307–314.

Gaspar, A. (1998). *Instituições da retórica forense* [Institutions of forensic rhetoric]. Coimbra: Minerva.

Gâţă, A. (2007). La dissociation argumentative. Composantes, mise en discours et ajustement stratégique [Argumentative dissociation. Constitutive elements, discourse structuring, and strategic maneuvering]. In V. Atayan & D. Pirazzini (Eds.), *Argumentation. théorie – langue – discours. Actes de la section Argumentation du XXX. Congrès des Romanistes Allemands Vienne, septembre 2007* [Argumentation theory – language – discourse. Proceedings of the section Argumentation of the 30th Congress of German Romanists in Vienna, 3–18 September 2007] (pp. 3–18). Frankfurt am Main-Vienna: Peter Lang.

Gâţă, A. (2010). Identification, dissociation argumentative et construction notionnelle [Identification, argumentative dissociation, and notional construction]. In S. N. Osu, G. Col, N. Garric & F. Toupin (Eds.), *Construction d'identité et processusd'identification* [Identity building and process(es) of identification] (pp. 469–482). Bern: Peter Lang.

Gattico, E. (2009). *Communicazione, categorie e metafore. Elementi di analisi delDiscorso* [Communication, categories and metaphors. Elements of discourse analysis]. Cagliari: CUEC Editrice.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Gauthier, G. (2004). L'argumentation autour de l'élection présidentielle française de2002 dans la presse québécoise. L'application d'une approche analytique de l'argumentation [The argumentation concerning the French presidential elections of 2002 in the Quebec press. The application of an analytical approach to argumentation]. In P. Maarek (Ed.), *La communication politique française après le tournant de* 2002 [French political communication after the turning-point of 2002] (pp. 187–201). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Gelang, M., & Kjeldsen, J. E. (2011). Nonverbal communication as argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 567–576). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

van Gelder, T. (2007). The rationale for Rationale. *Law, Probability and Risk, 6*, 23–42.

Gelfond, M., & Lifschitz, V. (1988). The stable model semantics for logic programming. In R. A. Kowalski & K. A. Bowen (Eds.), *Logic programming. Proceedings of the fifth international conference and symposium* (pp. 1070–1080). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Gentner, D. (1983). Structure-mapping. A theoretical framework for analogy. *Cognitive Science, 7*, 155–170.

Gentzen, G. (1934). Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen [Investigations into logical deduction]. *Mathematische Zeitschrift, 39*, 176–210 and 405–431. English trans. in M. E. Szabo (Ed.), *The collected papers of Gerhard Gentzen* (pp. 68–131). Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1969.

Gerber, M. (2011). Pragmatism, pragma-dialectics, and methodology. Toward a more ethical notion of argument criticism. *Speaker and Gavel, 48*(1), 21–30.

Gerhardus, D., Kledzig, S. M., & Reitzig, G. H. (1975). *Schlüssiges Argumentieren. Logisch Propädeutisches Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* [Sound arguing. Logical pre-school text book]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Gerlofs, J. M. (2009). *The use of conditionals in argumentation. A proposal for the analysis and evaluation of argumentatively used conditionals.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Gerritsen, S. (1999). *Het verband ontgaat me. Begrijpelijkheidsproblemen met verzwegen argumenten* [The connection escapes me. Problems of understanding with unexpressed premises]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Nieuwezijds.

Gerritsen, S. (2001). Unexpressed premises. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory* (pp. 51–79). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Gil, F. (Ed.). (1999). *A ciência tal qual se faz* [Science as it is made]. Lisbon: Ministério da Ciência e da Tecnologia/Edições Sá Costa.

Gilardoni, A. (2008). *Logica e argomentazione. Un prontuario* [Logic and argumentation. A handbook] (3rd ed.). Milan: Mimesis. (1st ed. 2005).

Gilbert, M. A. (1997). *Coalescent argumentation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gilbert, M. A. (2001). Ideal argumentation. A paper presented at the 4th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation. Windsor, Ontario.

Gilbert, M. A. (2005). Let's talk. Emotion and the pragma-dialectical model. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Argumentation in practice* (pp. 43–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gill, M. L. (2012). *Philosophos. Plato's missing dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ginsberg, M. L. (1994). AI and non-monotonic reasoning. In D. M. Gabbay, C. J. Hogger, & J. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, 3. Non-monotonic reasoning and uncertain reasoning* (pp. 1–33). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Girle, R., Hitchcock, D. L., McBurney, P., & Verheij, B. (2004). Decision support for practical reasoning. A theoretical and computational perspective. In C. A. Reed & T. J. Norman (Eds.), *Argumentation machines. New frontiers in argument and computation* (pp. 55–83). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Goagh, J., & Tindale, C. W. (1985). 'Hidden' or 'missing' premises. *Informal Logic, 7*(2&3), 99–107.

Godden, D. M. (2005). Deductivism as an interpretive strategy. A reply to Groarke's recent defense of reconstructive deductivism. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*(3), 168–183.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Goddu, G. C. (2001). The 'most important and fundamental' distinction in logic. *Informal Logic, 22*(1), 1–17.

Goddu, G. C. (2003). Against the "ordinary summing" test for convergence. *Informal Logic, 23*, 215–256.

Golden, J. L. (1986). The universal audience revisited. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 287–304). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Golden, J. L., & Pilotta, J. J. (Eds.). (1986). *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Goldman, A. I. (1994). Argumentation and social epistemology. *Journal of Philosophy, 91*, 27–49.

Goldman, A. I. (1999). *Knowledge in a social world*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Goloubev, V. (1999). Looking at argumentation through communicative intentions. Ways to define fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 239–245). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Golubev V. (2001). American print media persuasion dialogue. An argumentation recipient's perspective. In *Pragmatics in 2000. Selected papers from the seventh international pragmatics conference, 2* (pp. 249–262). Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.

Golubev, V. (2002a). The 2000 American Presidential TV debate. Dialogue or fight? In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 397–402). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Golubev, V. (2002b). Argumentation dialogue in the American newspaper. An interdependence of discourse logical and communicative aspects. In G. T. Goodnight (Ed.), *Arguing communication and culture, 2. Selected papers from the twelfth NCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 75–83). Washington, DC: National Communication Association.

Golubev, V. (2007). Putin's terrorism discourse as part of democracy and governance debate in Russia. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 471–477). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Gómez, A. L. (2003). *Argumentos y falacias* [Argumentation and fallacies]. Cali: Editorial Facultad de Humanidades Universidad de Valle.

Gómez, A. L. (2006). *Seis lecciones sobre teoría de la argumentación* [Six lectures on argumentation theory]. Cali: Editorial Alego.

Gomez Diaz, L. M. (1991). Remarks on Jean-Blaise Grize's logics of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990, 1A/B* (pp. 123–132). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Gómez Lucero, M., Chesñevar, C., & Simari, G. (2009). Modelling argument accrual in possibilistic defeasible logic programming. In *ECSQARU '09 Proceedings of the 10th European conference on symbolic and quantitative approaches to reasoning with uncertainty* (pp. 131–143). Springer: Berlin.

Gómez Lucero, M., Chesñevar, C., & Simari, G. (2013). Modelling argument accrual with possibilistic uncertainty in a logic programming setting. *Information Sciences, 228*, 1–25.

Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of art. An approach to a theory of symbols* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis: Hackett. (1st ed. 1968).

Goodnight, G. T. (1980). The liberal and the conservative presumptions. On political philosophy and the foundation of public argument. In J. Rhodes & S. Newell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the [first] summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 304–337). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Goodnight, G. T. (1982). The personal, technical, and public spheres of argument. A speculative inquiry into the art of public deliberation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*, 214–227.

Goodnight, G. T. (1987a). Argumentation, criticism and rhetoric. A comparison of modern and post-modern stances in humanistic inquiry. In J. W. Wenzel (Ed.), *Argument and critical practices. Proceedings of the fifth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 61–67). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Goodnight, G. T. (1987b). Generational argument. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 129–144). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Goodnight, G. T. (1991). Controversy. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *Argument in controversy. Proceedings of the seventh SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 1–13). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Goodnight, G. T. (1993). Legitimation inferences. An additional component for the Toulmin model. *Informal Logic, 15*, 41–52.

Goodnight, G. T. (2006). Complex cases and legitimation inference. Extending the Toulmin model to deliberative argument in controversy. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 39–48). Dordrecht: Springer.

Goodnight, G. T. (2012). The personal, technical, and public spheres. A note on 21st century critical communication inquiry. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(4), 258–267.

Goodnight, G. T., & Gilbert, K. (2012). Drug advertisement and clinical practice. Positing biopolitics in clinical communication. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Exploring argumentative contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goodnight, G. T., & Pilgram, R. (2011). A doctor's *ethos* enhancing maneuvers in medical consultation. In E. Feteris, B. Garssen, & F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics In honor of Frans H. van Eemeren* (pp. 135–151). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, D. (1991). Distinction, argumentation, and the rhetorical construction of the real. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 27*, 141–158.

Goodwin, D. (1992). The dialectic of second-order distinctions. The structure of arguments about fallacies. *Informal Logic, 14*, 11–22.

Goodwin, J. (1999). Good argument without resolution. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 255–259). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Goodwin, J. (2005). Designing premises. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Argumentation in practice* (pp. 99–114). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goodwin, J. (2007). Argument has no function. *Informal Logic, 27*(1), 69–90.

Gordon, T. F. (1993). The pleadings game. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 2*(4), 239–292.

Gordon, T. F. (1995). *The pleadings game. An artificial intelligence model of procedural justice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Gordon, T. F., & Karacapilidis, N. (1997). The Zeno argumentation framework. In *Proceedings of the ICAIL 1997 conference* (pp. 10–18). New York: ACM Press.

Gordon, T. F., Prakken, H., & Walton, D. N. (2007). The Carneades model of argument and burden of proof. *Artificial Intelligence, 171*, 875–896.

Göttert, K. H. (1978). *Argumentation. Grundzüge ihrer Theorie im Bereich theoretischen Wissens und praktischen Handelns* [Argumentation. Theoretical and practical characteristics of argumentation theory]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Gottlieb, G. (1968). *The logic of choice. An investigation of the concepts of rule and rationality*. New York: Macmillan.

Goudkova, K. (2009). *Kognitivno-pragmatichesky analiz argumentatsii v analiticheskoy gazetnoy statye* [Cognitive-pragmatical analysis of argumentation of the analytical newspaper article]. Doctoral dissertation, St. Petersburg State University.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Goudkova, K. V., & Tretyakova, T. P. (2011). Binary oppositions in media argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 656–662). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Govier, T. (1980). Assessing arguments. What range of standards? *Informal Logic Newsletter, 3* (1), 2–13.

Govier, T. (1985). *A practical study of argument*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Govier, T. (1987). *Problems in argument analysis and evaluation*. Dordrecht/Providence: Foris.

Govier, T. (1992). *A practical study of argument* (2nd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth. (1st ed. 1985).

Govier, T. (1999). *The philosophy of argument*. Ed. by J. Hoaglund with a preface by J. A. Blair. Newport News: Vale Press.

Govier, T. (2010). *A practical study of argument* (7th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth. (1st ed. 1985).

Grabnar, B. (1991). *Retorika za vsakogar* [Rhetoric for everyone]. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Grácio, R. A. (1993). Perelman's rhetorical foundation of philosophy. *Argumentation, 7*, 439–449.

Grácio, R. A. (1998). *Consequências da retórica. Para uma revalorização do múltiplo e do controverso* [Consequences of rhetoric. Towards a revaluation of the multiple and the controversial]. Coimbra: Pé de Página.

Grácio, R. A. (2010). *A interacção argumentativa* [The argumentative interaction]. Coimbra: Grácio Editor.

Grácio, R. A. (2011). *Para uma teoria geral da argumentação. Questões teóricas e - aplicações didácticas* [Towards a general argumentation theory. Theoretical questions and didactic applications]. Braga: Universidade do Minho. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minho.

Grácio, R. A. L. M. (1993). Perelman's rhetorical foundation of philosophy. *Argumentation, 7*, 439–450.

Graff, R., & Winn, W. (2006). Presencing "communion" in Chaïm Perelman's new rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 39*(1), 45–71.

Grasso, F. (2002). Towards computational rhetoric. *Informal Logic, 22*, 195–229.

Grasso, F., Cawsey, A., & Jones, R. (2000). Dialectical argumentation to solve conflicts in advice giving. A case study in the promotion of healthy nutrition. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 53*(6), 1077–1115.

Grasso, F., & Paris, C. (2011). Preface to the special issue on personalization for e-health. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction, 21*, 333–340.

Graver, H.-P. (2010). *Rett, retorikk og juridisk argumentasjon. Keiserens garderobe og andre essays* [Justice, rhetoric, and judicial argumentation. The emperor's new clothes and other essays]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gray, G. W. (1954). Some teachers and the transition to twentieth-century speech communication. In K. R. Wallace (Ed.), *History of speech education in America. Background studies* (pp. 422–446). New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts.

Greco Morasso, S. (2009). *Argumentation in dispute mediation. A reasonable way to handle conflict*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Greco Morasso, S. (2011). *Argumentation in dispute mediation. A reasonable way to handle conflict*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Green, N. (2007). A study of argumentation in a causal probabilistic humanistic domain. Genetic counseling. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 22*, 71–93.

Green-Pedersen, N. J. (1984). *The tradition of the topics in the Middle Ages. The commentaries on Aristotle's and Boethius' 'Topics'*. Munich-Vienna: Philosophia.

Green-Pedersen, N. J. (1987). The topics in medieval logic. *Argumentation, 1*, 401–417.

Grennan, W. (1994). Are 'gap-fillers' missing premises? *Informal Logic, 16*(3), 185–196.

Grennan, W. (1997). *Informal logic. Issues and techniques*. Montreal & Kinston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Grewendorf, G. (1975). *Argumentation und Interpretation. Wissenschaftstheoretische Untersuchungen am Beispiel germanistischer Lyrikinterpretationen* [Argumentation and

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

interpretation. Investigations in the philosophy of science on the basis of Germanistic interpretations of lyric poetry]. Kronberg: Scriptor.
Grewendorf, G. (1980). Argumentation in der Sprachwissenschaft [Argumentation in linguistics]. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik, 38*(39), 129–51.
Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, III* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
Grinsted, A. (1991). Argumentative styles in Spanish and Danish negotiation interaction. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation (organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990)* (pp. 725–733). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Grize, J. B. (1982). *De la logique à l'argumentation* [From logic to argumentation]. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
Grize, J.-B. (1986). Raisonner en parlant [Reasoning while speaking]. In M. Meyer (Ed.), *De la metaphysique à la rhétorique* (pp. 45–55). Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
Grize, J.-B. (1996). *Logique naturelle et communications* [Natural logic and communications]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Grize, J.-B. (2004). Le point de vue de la logique naturelle. Démontrer, prouver, argumenter [The point of view of natural logic. Demonstrating, proving, arguing]. In M. Doury & S. Moirand (Eds.), *L'argumentation aujourd'hui. Positions théoriques en confrontation* [Argumentation today. Confrontation of theoretical positions] (pp. 35-44). Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.
Groarke, L. (1992). In defense of deductivism. Replying to Govier. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 113–121). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Groarke, L. (1995). What pragma-dialectics can learn from deductivism, and what deductivism can learn from pragma-dialectics. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), II* (pp. 138–145). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Groarke, L., & Tindale, C. W. (2012). *Good reasoning matters!* (5th ed.). Toronto: Oxford University Press. (1st ed. 1997).
Gronbeck, B. E. (Ed.). (1989). *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation*. Annandale: SCA.
Grootendorst, R. (1978). Rationele argumentatie en drogredenen. Een formeel-dialectische analyse van het *argumentum ad hominem* [Rational argumentation and fallacies. A formal-dialectical analysis of the *argumentum ad hominem*]. In *Verslagen van een symposium gehouden op 13 april 1978 aan de Katholieke Hogeschool te Tilburg* [Proceedings of a symposium on April 13th 1978 at the Catholic University of Tilburg] (pp. 69–83). Enschede: VIOT/KH Tilburg.
Grootendorst, R. (1987). Some fallacies about fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 331–342). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris. Publications.
Gross, A. (1990). *The rhetoric of science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gross, A. G. (1999). A theory of the rhetorical audience. Reflections on Chaïm Perelman. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85*, 203–211.
Gross, A. G. (2000). Rhetoric as a technique and a mode of truth. Reflections on Chaïm Perelman. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 33*(4), 319–335.
Gross, A. G., & Dearin, R. D. (2003). *Chaïm Perelman*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Groupe μ. (1970). *Rhétorique générale*. [A general rhetoric]. Paris: Éditions Larousse.
Groupe μ. (1981). *A general rhetoric* (English trans. of *Rhétorique génerale* 1970, Paris: Éditions Larousse). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Groupe μ. (1992). *Traité du signe visuel. Pour une rhétorique de l'image* [Treatise on the visual sign. Towards a rhetoric of the image]. Paris: Le Seuil.

Gruber, H. (1996). *Streitgespräche. Zur Pragmatik einer Diskursform* [Arguments. On the pragmatics of a form of discourse]. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Guimarães, E. R. J. (1987). *Texto e argumentação, semántica do acontecimento e história da semántica* [Text and argumentation, semantic of the event and history of semantic]. Campinas: Pontes.

Gullvåg, I., & Wetlesen, J. (Eds.). (1982). *In skeptical wonder. Inquiries into the philosophy of Arne Næss on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gulotta, G., & Puddu, L. (2004). *La persuasione forense. Strategie e tattiche* [Forensic persuasion. Strategies and tactics]. Milan: Giuffrè.

Gunnarsson, M. (2006). *Group decision making. Language and interaction*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics, 32.

Guseva, O. A. (2006). *Ritoriko-argumentativnyje harakteristiki politicheskogo diskursa* [Rhetorical-argumentative characteristics of political discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Gutenberg, N. (1984). *Hören und Beurteilen* [Hearing and judging]. Frankfurt/Main: Scriptor.

Gutenberg, N. (1987). Argumentation and dialectical logic. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 397–403). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Gutenplan, S. D., & Tamny, M. (1971). *Logic*. New York: Basic Books.

Guthrie, W. (1954). Rhetorical theory in colonial America. In K. R. Wallace (Ed.), *History of speech education in America. Background studies* (pp. 48–79). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

de Haan, G. J., Koefoed, G. A. T., & des Tombe, A. L. (1974). *Basiskursus algemene taalwetenschap* [Basic course in general linguistics]. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Haarscher, G. (1986). Perelman and the philosophy of law. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 245–255). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Haarscher, G. (2009). Perelman's pseudo-argument as applied to the creationism controversy. *Argumentation, 23*, 361–373.

Haarscher, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Chaïm Perelman et la pensée contemporaine* [Chaïm Perelman and contemporary thought]. Brussels: Bruylant.

Haarscher, G., & Ingber, L. (Eds.). (1986). *Justice et argumentation. Autour de la pensée de Chaïm Perelman* [Justice and argumentation. On the philosophy of Chaïm Perelman]. Brussels: Éditions de Université de Bruxelles.

Habermas, J. (1971). Vorbereitende Bemerkungen zu einer Theorie der kommunikativen Kompetenz [Preparatory remarks on a theory of communicative competence]. In J. Habermas & H. Luhmann (Eds.), *Theorie der Gesellschaft oder Sozialtechnologie; Was leistet die Systemforschung?* [Theory of society or social technology. Where does system research lead to?] (pp. 107–141). Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1973). Wahrheitstheorien [Theories of truth]. In H. Fahrenbach (Ed.), *Wirklichkeit und Reflexion. Festschrift für Walter Schulz zum 60. Geburtstag* [Reality and reflection. Festschrift for Walter Schulz in celebration of his 60th birthday] (pp. 211–265). Pfullingen: Günther Neske.

Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns* [A theory of communicative action] (Vols. I and II). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action* (Vol. 1), *Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston: Beacon. (English trans.; original work in German 1981).

Habermas, J. (1991). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. (English trans. of *Moralbewusstsein un kommunikatives Handeln*, 1983, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Habermas, J. (1994). Postscript to Faktizität und Geltung [Postscript to between facts and norms]. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 20*(4), 135–150.
Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms* (W. Rehg, trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hage, J. C. (1997). *Reasoning with rules. An essay on legal reasoning and its underlying logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Hage, J. C. (2000). Dialectical models in artificial intelligence and law. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 8*, 137–172.
Hage, J. C. (2005). *Studies in legal logic*. Berlin: Springer.
Hage, J. C., Leenes, R., & Lodder, A. R. (1993). Hard cases. A procedural approach. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 2*(2), 113–167.
Hahn, U., & Hornikx, J. (2012). Reasoning and argumentation. Special issue *Thinking and Reasoning, 18*(3), 225–416.
Hahn, U., Oaksford, M., Bonnefon, J.-F., & Harris, A. (2011). Argumentation, fallacies and reasoning biases. In B. Kokinov, A. Karmiloff-Smith, & N. J. Nersessian (Eds.), *European perspectives on cognitive science. Proceedings of the European conference on cognitive science*. Sofia: New Bulgarian University Press.
Haidar, J. (2010). La argumentación. Problemática, modelos operativos [Argumentation. Problems, operative models]. *Documentacion en Ciencias de la Comunicacion ITESO-CONACYT, 1*, 67–98.
Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. R. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies, 44*, 936–957.
Hall, R. (1967). Dialectic. In P. Edwards (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of philosophy, 2* (pp. 385–388). New York: Macmillan.
Hamblin, C. L. (1970). *Fallacies*. London: Methuen. Reprinted in 1986, with a preface by J. Plecnik & J. Hoaglund. Newport News: Vale Press.
Hamblin, C. L. (1971). Mathematical models of dialogue. *Theoria: A Swedish Journal of Philosophy, 37*, 130–155.
Hamby, B. (2012). Toulmin's "Analytic Arguments". *Informal Logic, 32*(1), 116–131.
Hample, D. (1977a). Testing a model of value argument and evidence. *Communication Monographs, 44*, 106–120.
Hample, D. (1977b). The Toulmin model and the syllogism. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 14*, 1–9.
Hample, D. (1978). Predicting immediate belief change and adherence to argument claims. *Communication Monographs, 45*, 219–228.
Hample, D. (1979a). Motives in law. An adaptation of legal realism. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 15*, 156–168.
Hample, D. (1979b). Predicting belief and belief change using a cognitive theory of argument and evidence. *Communication Monographs, 46*, 142–146.
Hample, D. (1980). A cognitive view of argument. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 16*, 151–158.
Hample, D. (1981). The cognitive context of argument. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*, 148–158.
Hample, D. (1992). A third perspective on argument. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 91–115). Berlin-New York: Foris.
Hample, D. (2003). Arguing skill. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 439–477). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Hample, D. (2005). *Arguing. Exchanging reasons face to face*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Hample, D. (2007). The arguers. *Informal Logic, 27*(2), 163–178.
Hample, D., & Benoit, P. (1999). Must arguments be explicit and violent? A study of naïve social actors' understandings. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 306–310). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Hample, D., & Dallinger, J. (1986). The judgment phase of invention. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 225–234). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Hample, D., & Dallinger, J. M. (1987). Cognitive editing of argument strategies. *Human Communication Research, 14*, 123–144.

Hample, D., & Dallinger, J. M. (1991). Cognitive editing of arguments and interpersonal construct differentiation. Refining the relationship. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June, 19-22, 1990* (pp. 567–574). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hample, D., Paglieri, F., & Na, L. (2011). The costs and benefits of arguing. Predicting the decision whether to engage or not. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 718–732). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Hample, D., Warner, B., & Young, D. (2009). Framing and editing interpersonal arguments. *Argumentation, 23*, 21–37.

Hannken-Illjes, K. (2006). In the field. The development of reasons in criminal proceedings. *Argumentation, 20*(3), 309–325.

Hannken-Illjes, K. (2007). Undoing premises. The interrelation of argumentation and narration in criminal proceedings. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 569–573). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hannken-Illjes, K. (2011). The absence of reasons. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 733–737). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hansen, H. V. (1990). An informal logic bibliography. *Informal Logic, 12*(3), 155–181.

Hansen, H. V. (2002a). An exploration of Johnson's sense of argument. *Argumentation, 16*(3), 263–276.

Hansen, H. V. (2002b). The straw thing of fallacy theory. The standard definition of fallacy. *Argumentation, 16*(2), 133–155.

Hansen, H. (2003). Theories of presumption and burden of proof. *Proceedings of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA). Windsor, ON: OSSA*. (CD rom).

Hansen, H. V. (2006). Whately on arguments involving authority. *Informal Logic, 26*, 319–340.

Hansen, H. V. (2011a). Are there methods of informal logic? In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation, cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21, 2011* (pp. 1–13). Windsor: OSSA. (CD rom).

Hansen, H. V. (2011b). Notes on balance-of-consideration arguments. In J. A. Blair & R. H. Johnson (Eds.), *Conductive argument. An overlooked type of defeasible reasoning* (pp. 31–51). London: College Publications.

Hansen, H. V. (2011c). Using argument schemes as a method of informal logic. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD-rom).

Hansen, H. V., & Pinto, R. C. (Eds.). (1995). *Fallacies. Classical and contemporary readings*. University Park: Penn State Press.

Hansen, H. V., & Walton, D. N. (2013). Argument kinds and argument roles in the Ontario provincial election, 2011. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 2*(2), 225–257.

Harada, E. (Ed.). (2011). *Pensar, razonar y argumentar* [Thinking, reasoning, and arguing]. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Hardin, C. L. (1959). The uses of argument. *Philosophy of Science, 26*, 160–163.

Hardin, C. L. (1960). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *Philosophy of Science, 27*, 319–320.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Harman, G. (1986). *Change in view. Principles of reasoning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hart, H. L. A. (1951). The ascription of responsibility and rights. In A. Flew (Ed.), *Logic and language* (pp. 171–194). Oxford: Blackwell. [Originally Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, 1948–1949].
Hasanbegović, J. (1988). *Perelmanova pravna logika kao nova retorika* [Perelman's legal logic as new rhetoric] (pp. 1–118). Beograd: Biblioteka Izazovi.
Hasper, P. S. (2013). The ingredients of Aristotle's theory of fallacy. *Argumentation, 27*(1), 31–47.
Hastings, A. C. (1962). *A reformulation of the modes of reasoning in argumentation*. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston.
Hatim, B. (1990). A model of argumentation from Arabic rhetoric. Insights for a theory of text types. *Bulletin (British Society for Middle Eastern Studies), 17*(1), 47–54.
Hatim, B. (1991). The pragmatics of argumentation in Arabic. The rise and fall of a text type. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 11*(2), 189–199.
Hazen, M. D. (1982). Report on the 1980 United States debate tour of Japan. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 5*, 9–26.
Hazen, M. D., & Hynes, T. J. (2011). An exploratory study of argument in the public and private domains of differing forms of societies. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 750–762). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Healy, P. (1987). Critical reasoning and dialectical argument. *Informal Logic, 9*, 1–12.
Hegselmann, R. (1985). *Formale Dialektik. Ein Beitrag zu einer Theorie des rationalen Argumentierens* [Formal dialectic. A contribution to a theory of rational arguing]. Hamburg: Felix Meiner.
Hendricks, V. F. (2007). *Tal en tanke* [Language and thought]. Copenhagen: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur.
Hendricks, V. F., Elvang-Gøransson, M., & Pedersen, S. A. (1995). Systems of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation, III* (pp. 351–367). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Hepler, A. B., Dawid, A. P., & Leucari, V. (2007). Object-oriented graphical representations of complex patterns of evidence. *Law, Probability & Risk, 6*, 275–293.
Herbig, A. F. (1992). *'Sie argumentieren doch scheinheilig!' Sprach- und sprechwissenschaftliche Aspekte einer Stilistik des Argumentierens* ["You are arguing hypocritically!" Linguistic aspects of a stylistics of argumentation]. Bern: Peter Lang.
Herman, T. (2005). L'analyse de l'ethos oratoire [The analysis of oratorical ethos]. In P. Lane (Ed.), *Des discours aux texte. Modèles d'analyse* [From discourse to text. Models of analysis] (pp. 157–182). Rouen-Le Havre: Presses Universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.
Herman, T. (2008a). Narratio et argumentation [Narratio and argumentation]. In E. Danblon (Ed), *Argumentation et narration* [Argumentation and narration]. Brussels: Université Libre de Bruxelles.
Herman, T. (2008b). *Au fil du discours. La rhétorique de Charles de Gaulle (1940–1945)* [As the discourse unfolds itself. The rhetoric of Charles de Gaulle (1940–1945)]. Limoges: Lambert Lucas.
Herman, T. (2010). Linguistique textuelle et logique naturelle [Textual linguistics and natural logic]. In D. Miéville (Ed.), *La logique naturelle. Enjeux et perspectives*. (Actes du colloque Neuchâtel 12–13 septembre 2008) [Natural logic. Challenges and perspectives] (pp. 167–194). Neuchâtel: Université de Neuchâtel.
Herman, T. (2011). Le courant du Critical Thinking et l'évidence des normes. [The Critical Thinking movement and the self-evidence of norms]. *A Contrario*, 2(16), 41–62.
Hess-Lüttich, E. W. B. (2007). (Pseudo-) argumentation in TV-debates. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 1360-1370.
Hicks, D., & Eckstein, J. (2012). Higher order strategic maneuvering by shifting standards of reasonableness in cold-war editorial argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Exploring argumentative contexts* (pp. 321–339). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Hietanen, M. (2002). Profetian är primärt inte för de otrogna. En argumentationsanalys av 1 Kor 14:22b [Prophecy is primarily not for the unbelievers. An argumentation analysis of 1 Corinthians 14:22b]. *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, 67*, 89–104.

Hietanen, M. (2003). Paul's argumentation in Galatians 3.6-14. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 477–483). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hietanen, M. (2005). *Paul's argumentation in Galatians. A pragma-dialectical analysis of Gal. 3.2–5.12*. Doctoral dissertation, Abo Akademi University.

Hietanen, M. (2007a). *Paul's argumentation in Galatians. A pragma-dialectical analysis*. London: T&T Clark.

Hietanen, M. (2007b). Retoriken vid Finlands universitet [Rhetoric in Finnish universities]. *Finsk tidskrift, 9–10*, 522–536.

Hietanen, M. (2007c). The gospel of Matthew as an argument. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 607–613). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hietanen, M. (2010). Suomalainen työläisretoriikka Kaurismäen mukaan – puhe- ja argumentaatiokulttuuri Varjoja paratiisissa [Finnish working-class rhetoric according to Kaurismäki. The culture of argumentation in Shadows in paradise]. *Lähikuva, 23*(2), 68–82.

Hietanen, M. (2011a). 'Mull' on niinku viesti jumalalta' – Vakuuttamisen strategiat Nokia Missionherätysretoriikassa ['I have like a message from God'. Persuasive strategies in the revival rhetoric of Nokia Missio]. *Teologinen aikakauskirja, 116*(2), 109–122.

Hietanen, M. (2011b). The gospel of Matthew as a literary argument. *Argumentation, 25*(1), 63–86.

Hintikka, J. (1968). Language-games for quantifiers. In N. Rescher (Ed.), *Studies in logical theory* (American Philosophical Quarterly: Monograph series, 2, pp. 46–72). Oxford: Basil Blackwell. An expanded version was republished in J. Hintikka (1973), *Logic, language-games and information. Kantian themes in the philosophy of logic* (pp. 53–82). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hintikka, J. (1973). *Logic, language-games and information. Kantian themes in the philosophy of logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hintikka, J. (1976). *The semantics of questions and questions of semantics. Case studies in the relations of logic, semantics, and syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Hintikka, J. (1981). The logic of information-seeking dialogues. A model. In W. Becker & W. K. Essler (Eds.), *Konzepte der Dialektik* [Concepts of dialectic] (pp. 212–231). Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

Hintikka, J. (1985). A spectrum of logics of questioning. *Philosophica, 35*, 135–150. Reprinted in J. Hintikka (1999), *Inquiry as inquiry. A logic of scientific discovery* (pp. 127–142). Dordrecht: Kluwer (*Jaakko Hintikka selected papers, 5*).

Hintikka, J. (1987). The fallacy of fallacies. *Argumentation, 1*(3), 211–238.

Hintikka, J. (1989). The role of logic in argumentation. *The Monist, 72*, 3–24. Reprinted in J. Hintikka (1999), *Inquiry as inquiry. A logic of scientific discovery* (pp. 25–46). Dordrecht: Kluwer (*Jaakko Hintikka selected papers, 5*).

Hintikka, J. (1997). What was Aristotle doing in his early logic, anyway? A reply to Woods and Hansen. *Synthese, 113*(2), 241–249.

Hintikka, J. (1999). *Inquiry as inquiry. A logic of scientific discovery*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hintikka, J., & Bachman, J. (1991). *What if . . .? Toward excellence in reasoning*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Hintikka, J., & Hintikka, M. B. (1982). Sherlock Holmes confronts modern logic. Toward a theory of information-seeking through questioning. In E. M. Barth & J. L. Martens (Eds.), *Argumentation. Approaches to theory formation. Containing the contributions to the Groningen conference on the theory of argumentation, October 1978* (pp. 55–76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hintikka, J., & Kulas, J. (1983). *The game of language. Studies in game-theoretical semantics and its applications*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Hintikka, J., & Saarinen, E. (1979). Information-seeking dialogues. Some of their logical properties. *Studia Logica, 38*, 355–363.

Hirsch, R. (1987). Interactive argumentation. Ideal and real. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 434–441). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Hirsch, R. (1989). *Argumentation, information and interaction*. Gothenburg: Department of Linguistics, University of Göteborg.

Hirsch, R. (1991). Belief and interactive argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation (organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990)* (pp. 591–603). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hirsch, R. (1995). Desiderata for the representation of process and product in face-to-face interactive argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), II* (pp. 68–78). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Hitchcock, D. L. (1980a). Deduction, induction and conduction. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 3*(2), 7–15.

Hitchcock, D. L. (1980b). Deductive and inductive. Types of validity, not of argument. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 2*(3), 9–10.

Hitchcock, D. L. (1985). Enthymematic arguments. *Informal Logic, 7*(2&3), 84–97.

Hitchcock, D. L. (1998). Does the traditional treatment of enthymemes rest on a mistake? *Argumentation, 12*, 15–37.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2001). John L. Pollock's theory of rationality. In C. W. Tindale, H. V. Hansen & E. Sveda (Eds.), *Argumentation at the century's turn*. Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation. (Proceedings of the 3rd OSSA conference, 1999). (CD rom).

Hitchcock, D. L. (2002a). Pollock on practical reasoning. *Informal Logic, 22*, 247–256.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2002b). The practice of argumentative discussion. *Argumentation, 16*, 287–298.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2002c). Sampling scholarly arguments. A test of a theory of good inference. In H. V. Hansen, C. W. Tindale, J. A. Blair, R. H. Johnson, & R. C. Pinto (Eds.), *Argumentation and its applications*. Windsor: OSSA (CD rom).

Hitchcock, D. L. (2002d). Stoic propositional logic. A new reconstruction. Presented at "Mistakes of Reason," a conference in honor of John Woods, University of Lethbridge, Alberta, 19-21 April 2002. Accessible at the digital commons of McMaster University, Ontario (*Philosophy Publications,* Paper 2), http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/philosophy_coll/2

Hitchcock, D. L.(2003). Toulmin's warrants. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 69–82). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2005a). Good reasoning on the Toulmin model. *Argumentation, 19*, 373–391. (Reprinted in D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.). (2006), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 203–218). Dordrecht: Springer).

Hitchcock, D. L. (2005b). The peculiarities of Stoic propositional logic. In K. A. Peacock & A. D. Irvine (Eds.), *Mistakes in reason. Essays in honour of John Woods* (pp. 224–242). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2006a). Good reasoning on the Toulmin model. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 203–218). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hitchcock, D. L. (2006b). Informal logic and the concept of argument. In D. Jacquette, (Ed.), *Philosophy of logic*, *5* of D. M. Gabbay, P. Thagard, & J. Woods (Eds.), *Handbook of the philosophy of science* (pp. 101–129). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Hitchcock, D. L. (2011a). Arguing as trying to show that a target-claim is correct. *Theoria, 72*, 301–309.
Hitchcock, D. L. (2011b). Inference claims. *Informal Logic, 31*(3), 191–228.
Hitchcock, D. L., & Verheij, B. (Eds.). (2006). *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Hoaglund, J. (2004). *Critical thinking* (4th ed.). Newport News: Vale press. (1st ed. 1977).
Hodges, W. (2001). *Logic*. (2nd ed.). London: Penguin Books. (1st ed. 1977).
Hoeken, H. (1999). The perceived and actual persuasiveness of different types of inductive arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 353–357). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Hoeken, H. (2001). Anecdotal, statistical, and causal evidence. Their perceived and actual persuasiveness. *Argumentation, 15*, 425–437.
Hoeken, H., & Hustinx, L. (2009). When is statistical evidence superior to anecdotal evidence in supporting probability claims? The role of argument type. *Human Communication Research, 35*, 491–510.
Hoeken, H., Timmers, R., & Schellens, P. J. (2012). Arguing about desirable consequences. What constitutes a convincing argument? *Thinking & Reasoning, 18*(3), 225–416.
Hoffnagel, J. C. (2010). *Temas em antropologia e linguística* [Topics in anthropology and linguistics]. Recife: Bagaço.
Hofstadter, D. (1996). *Metamagical themas. Questing for the essence of mind and pattern*. New York: Basic Books.
Hohmann, H. (2002). Rhetoric and dialectic. Some historical and legal perspectives. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Dialectic and rhetoric. The warp and woof of argumentation analysis* (pp. 41–52). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Holmquest, A. H. (1989). Rhetorical gravity. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 37–41). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
Holmström-Hintikka, G. (1993). Practical reason, argumentation, and law. In G. Haarscher (Ed.), *Chaïm Perelman et la pensée contemporaine* [Chaïm Perelman and contemporary thought] (pp. 179–194). Brussels: Bruylant.
Hołówka, T. (2005). *Kultura logiczna w przykładach* [Logical culture in examples]. Warsaw: PWN.
Hommerberg, C. (2011). *Persuasiveness in the discourse of wine. The rhetoric of Robert Parker*. Gothenburg: Linnaeus University Press. Linnaeus University dissertations 71/2011.
Hoppmann, M. (2012). Review of Harald Wohlrapp's 'Der Begriff des Arguments'. *Argumentation, 26* (2), 297–304.
Hornikx, J. M. A. (2005). *Cultural differences in persuasiveness of evidence types in France and the Netherlands*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nijmegen.
Hornikx, J., & de Best, J. (2011). Persuasive evidence in India. An investigation of the impact of evidence type and evidence quality. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 47*, 246–257.
Hornikx, J., & Hoeken, H. (2007). Cultural differences in the persuasiveness of evidence types and evidence quality. *Communication Monographs, 74*(4), 443–463.
Houtlosser, P. (1995). *Standpunten in een kritische discussie. Een pragma-dialectisch perspectief op de identificatie en reconstructie van standpunten* [Standpoints in a critical discussion. A pragma-dialectical perspective on the identification and reconstruction of standpoints]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
Houtlosser, P. (1998). Points of view. *Argumentation, 12*, 387–405.
Houtlosser, P. (2001). Points of view. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory* (pp. 27–50). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Houtlosser, P. (2003). Commentary on H. V. Hansen's 'Theories of presumption and burden of proof'. *Proceedings of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), Windsor 2003*. (CD rom).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

van den Hoven, P. J. (1984). *Het formuleren van een formele kritiek op een betogende tekst. Een uitgewerkt voorbeeld van een procedureconstructie*. [Formulating a formal critique of an argumentative text. An elaborated example of the construction of a procedure]. Dordrecht: Foris.

van den Hoven, P. J. (2012). The narrator and the interpreter in visual and verbal argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Topical themes in argumentation theory. Twenty exploratory studies* (pp. 257–272). Dordrecht: Springer.

Hovhannisian, H. (2006). Yerevan School of Argumentation on the threshold of the 21st century. The problem of foundation. *News and Views, 12*.

Howell, W. S. (1940). The positions of argument An historical examination. In D. C. Bryant (Ed.), *Papers in rhetoric* (pp. 8–17). Saint Louis: Washington University.

Hu, Z. (1995). An evidentialistic analysis of reported argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), I* (pp. 102–119). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Huerta, M. (2009). *Diagnóstico de las representaciones estudiantiles en textos escritos, construcción del otro en alumnos del Plantel Naucalpan del CCH. Propuesta didáctica para abordar el texto argumentativo* [Diagnosis of students' representations in written texts, construction of the Otherness in students of Plantel Naucalpan of CCH. Didactic proposal to analyze the argumentative text]. Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Hultén, P., Hultman, J., & Eriksson, L. T. (2009). *Kritiskt tänkande* [Critical thinking]. Malmö: Liber.

Hultzen, L. S. (1958). Status in deliberative analysis. In D. C. Bryant (Ed.), *The rhetorical idiom. Essays presented to Herbert A. Wichelns* (pp. 97–123). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hunter, A. (2013). A probabilistic approach to modelling uncertain logical arguments. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, 54*(1), 47–81.

Hunter, A. (Ed.). (1990). *The rhetoric of social research*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hunter, A., & Williams, M. (2010). Qualitative evidence aggregation using argumentation. In P. Baroni, F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Computational models of argument – Proceedings of COMMA 2010* (pp. 287–298). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Huth, L. (1975). Argumentationstheorie und Textanalyse [Argumentation theory and text-analysis]. *Der Deutschunterricht, 27*, 80–111.

Hymes, D. (1972). *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hynes, T. J. (1989). Can you buy cold fusion by the six pack? Or Bubba and Billy-Bob discover Pons and Fleischmann. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 42–46). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Ieţcu, I. (2006). *Discourse analysis and argumentation theory. Analytical framework and applications*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Ieţcu-Fairclough, I. (2008). Branding and strategic maneuvering in the Romanian presidential election of 2004. A critical discourse-analytical and pragma-dialectical perspective. *Journal of Language and Politics, 7*(3), 372–390.

Ieţcu-Fairclough, I. (2009). Legitimation and strategic maneuvering in the political field. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 131–151). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ieţcu-Preoteasa, I. (2006). *Dialogue, argumentation and ethical perspective in the essays of H.-R. Patapievici*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Ihnen Jory, C. (2010). The analysis of pragmatic argumentation in law-making debates. Second reading of the terrorism bill in the British House of Commons. *Controversia, 7*(1), 91–107.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Ihnen Jory, C. (2012a). Instruments to evaluate pragmatic argumentation. A pragma-dialectical perspective. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Topical themes in argumentation theory. Twenty exploratory studies* (pp. 143–159). Dordrecht: Springer.

Ihnen Jory, C. (2012b). *Pragmatic argumentation in law-making debates. Instruments for the analysis and evaluation of pragmatic argumentation at the Second Reading of the British parliament*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat/Rozenberg. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Ihnen Jory, C., & Richardson, J. E. (2011). On combining pragma-dialectics with critical discourse analysis. In E. Feteris, B. Garssen, & F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics. In honor of Frans H. van Eemeren* (pp. 231–243). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ilie, C. (1994). *What else can I tell you? A pragmatic study of English rhetorical questions as discursive and argumentative acts*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ilie, C. (1995). The validity of rhetorical questions as arguments in the courtroom. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Special fields and cases. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), IV* (pp. 73–88). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Ilie, C. (2007). Argument refutation through definitions and re-definitions. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 667–674). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Ilie, C., & Hellspong, L. (1999). Arguing from clichés. Communication and miscommunication. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 386–391). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Inbar, M. (1999). Argumentation as rule-justified claims. Elements of a conceptual framework for the critical analysis of argument. *Argumentation, 13*(1), 27–42.

Ionescu Ruxăndoiu, L. (2008). Discursive perspective and argumentation in the Romanian-parliamentary discourse. A cased study. *L'analisi linguistica e letteraria, 16*, 435–441.

Ionescu Ruxăndoiu, L. (2010). Straightforward vs. mitigated impoliteness in the Romanian parliamentary discourse. The case of *in absentia* impoliteness. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* [Romanian journal of linguistics], *4*, 243–351.

Ishii, D. (1992). Buddhist preaching. The persistent main undercurrent of Japanese traditional rhetorical communication. *Communication Quarterly, 40*, 391–397.

Isocrates. (1929). *Isocrates, Volume II: On the peace, Aeropagiticus, Against the sophists, Antidosis, Panathenaicus*. Trans.: G. Norlin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Itaba, Y. (1995). *Reconstructing Japanese rhetorical strategies. A study of foreign-policy discourse during the pre-Perry period, 1783–1853*. Twin cities: University of Minnesota Press.

Iten, C. (2000). The relevance of argumentation theory. *Lingua, 110*(9), 665–699.

Iversen, S. M. (2010). *Logik og argumentationsteori* [Logic and argumentation theory]. Aarhus: Systime.

Ivie, R. L. (1987). The ideology of freedom's 'fragility' in American foreign policy argument. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 24*, 27–36.

Ivin, A. (1997). *Osnovy teorii argumentatsii* [The basics of argumentation theory]. Moscow: Vlados.

Iwashita, M. (1973). *The principles of debate*. Tokyo: Gakushobo.

Jackson, S. (1983). The arguer in interpersonal argument. Pros and cons of individual-level analysis. In D. Zarefsky, M. O. Sillars, & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Argument in transition. Proceedings of the third summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 631–637). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Jackson, S. (1992). 'Virtual standpoints' and the pragmatics of conversational argument. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 260–269). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Jackson, S. (1995). Fallacies and heuristics. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation, II* (pp. 257–269). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1980). Structure of conversational argument. Pragmatic bases for the enthymeme. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66*, 251–265.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1982). The collaborative production of proposals in conversational argument and persuasion. A study of disagreement regulation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*, 77–90.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (2006). Derailments of argumentation. It takes two to tango. In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 121–133). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jacobs, S. (1987). The managment of disagreement in conversation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 229–239). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Jacobs, S. (1989). Speech acts and arguments. *Argumentation, 3*, 345–365.

Jacobs, S. (1998). Argumentation as *Normative Pragmatics*. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth ISSA conference on argumentation* (pp. 397–403). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Jacobs, S. (2000). Rhetoric and dialectic from the standpoint of normative pragmatics. *Argumentation, 14*(3), 261–286.

Jacobs, S., & Aakhus, M. (2002). How to resolve a conflict. Two models of dispute resolution. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 29–44). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1981). Argument as a natural category. The routine grounds for arguing in natural conversation. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*, 118–132.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1982). Conversational argument. A discourse analytic approach. In J. R. Cox & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Advances in argumentation theory and research* (pp. 205–237). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1983). Strategy and structure in conversational influence attempts. *Communication Monographs, 50*, 285–304.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1989). Building a model of conversational argument. In B. Dervin, L. Grossberg, B. J. O'Keefe, & E. Wartella (Eds.), *Rethinking communication* (pp. 153–171). Newbury Park: Sage.

Jacquin, J. (2012). *L'argumentation de Georges Pompidou face à la crise. Une analyse textuelle des allocutions des 11 et 16 mai 1968* [George Pompidou's argumentation during the crisis. A textual analysis of the speeches given between 11 and 16 May 1968]. Sahrbrücken: Éditions Universitaires européennes.

Jakobovits, H., & Vermeir, D. (1999). Robust semantics for argumentation frameworks. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 9*(2), 215–261.

Jansen, H. (2003). *Van omgekeerde strekking. Een pragma-dialectische reconstructie van a contrario-argumentatie in het recht* [Inverted purpose. A pragma-dialectical reconstruction of *e contrario* argumentation in law]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.

Jansen, H. (2005). *E contrario* reasoning. The dilemma of the silent legislator. *Argumentation, 19* (4), 485–496.

Jaśkowski, S. (1934). On the rules of suppositions in formal logic. *Studia Logica, 1*, 5–32. Reprinted in S. McCall (Ed.), *Polish logic, 1920–1939* (pp. 232–258). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Jaśkowski, S. (1948). Rachunek zdań dla systemów dedukcyjnych sprzecznych [Propositional calculus for contradictory deductive systems]. *Studia Societatis Scientiarum Torunensis, Sect. A. 1, 5*, 57–77. [English trans. in *Studia Logica, 24* (1969), pp. 143–160].

Jelvez, L. (2008). Esquemas argumentativos en textos escritos. Un estudio descriptivo en alumnos de tercero medio de dos establecimientos de Valparaíso [Argumentative schemes in written texts. A descriptive study of third-grade pupils of two Schools in Valparaíso]. *Cyber Humanitatis, 45,* http://www.cyberhumanitatis.uchile.cl/index.php/RCH/rt/printerFriendly/5951/5818

Jenicek, M., Croskerry, P., & Hitchcock, D. L. (2011). Evidence and its uses in health care and research. The role of critical thinking. *Medical Science Monitor, 17*(1), 12–17.

Jenicek, M., & Hitchcock, D. L. (2005). *Evidence-based practice. Logic and critical thinking in medicine*. Chicago: American Medical Association.

Jensen, F. V., & Nielsen, T. D. (2007). *Bayesian networks and decision graphs*. New York: Springer.

Johannesson, K. (1990). *Retorik – eller konsten att övertyga* [Rhetoric – or the art of persuasion]. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Johansen, A., & Kjeldsen, J. E. (2005). *Virksomme ord. Politiske taler 1814–2005* [Working word. Political speeches 1814–2005]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Johnson, K. L., & Roloff, M. E. (2000). The influence of argumentative role (initiator vs. resistor) on perceptions of serial argument resolvability and relational harm. *Argumentation, 14*(1), 1–15.

Johnson, R. H. (1980). Toulmin's bold experiment. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 3*(2), 16–27. (Part I), *3*(3), 13–19 (Part II).

Johnson, R. H. (1981). Charity begins at home. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 3*(3), 4–9.

Johnson, R. H. (1990). Acceptance is not enough. A critique of Hamblin. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 23*, 271–287.

Johnson, R. H. (1992). Informal logic and politics. In E. M. Barth & E. C. W. Krabbe (Eds.), *Logical and political culture*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Johnson, R. H. (1995). Informal logic and pragma-dialectics. Some differences. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation, 2* (pp. 237–245). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Johnson, R. H. (1996). *The rise of informal logic*. Newport News: Vale Press.

Johnson, R. H. (2000). *Manifest rationality. A pragmatic theory of argument*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johnson, R. H. (2003). The dialectical tier revisited. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation*. Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer.

Johnson, R. H. (2006). Making sense of informal logic. *Informal Logic, 26*(3), 231–258.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1977). *Logical self-defense*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1980). The recent development of informal logic. In J. A. Blair & R. H. Johnson (Eds.), *Informal logic. The first international symposium* (pp. 3–28). Inverness: Edgepress.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1983). *Logical self-defense* (2nd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson. (1st ed. 1977).

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1991). Contexts of informal reasoning Commentary. In J. F. Voss, D. N. Perkins, & J. W. Segal (Eds.), *Informal reasoning and education* (pp. 131–150). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1994). *Logical self-defense* (U.S. edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (2000). Informal logic. An overview. *Informal Logic, 20*(2), 93–107.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (2006). *Logical self-defense* (reprint of Johnson & Blair, 1994). New York: International Debate Education Association. (1st ed. 1977).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1957–1958). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Review, 18*, 553–554.
Johnstone Jr., H. W. (1958–1959). New outlooks on controversy. *Review of Metaphysics, 12*, 57–67.
Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1959). *Philosophy and argument*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1968). Theory of argumentation. In R. Klibansky (Ed.), *La philosophie contemporaine* [Contemporary philosophy] (pp. 177–184). Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice.
Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1970). *The problem of the self*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1983). Truth, anagnorisis, and argument. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 16*, 1–15.
Johnstone, Jr., H. W. (1993). Editor's introduction. *Argumentation, 7*, 379–384.
Jørgensen, C. (1995). Hostility in public debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Special fields and cases. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), III* (pp. 363–373). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Jørgensen, C. (2003). The Mytilene debate. A paradigm for deliberative rhetoric. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 567–570). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Jørgensen, C. (2007). The relevance of intention in argumentation. *Argumentation, 21*(2), 165–174.
Jørgensen, C. (2009). Interpreting Perelman's 'universal audience'. Gross versus Crosswhite. *Argumentation, 23*, 11–19.
Jørgensen, C. (2011). Fudging speech acts in political argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 906–913). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).
Jørgensen, C., & Kock, C. (1999). The rhetorical audience in public debate and the strategies of vote-gathering and vote-shifting. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 420–423). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Jørgensen, C., Kock, C., & Rørbach, L. (1994). *Retorik der flytter stemmer. Hvordan man overbeviser I offentlig debat* [Rhetoric that shifts votes. How to persuade in public debates]. Ödåkra: Retorikforlaget. (2nd ed. 2011).
Jørgensen, C., Kock, C., & Rørbach, L. (1998). Rhetoric that shifts votes. An exploratory study of persuasion in issue-oriented public debates. *Political Communication, 15*(3), 283–299.
Josephson, J. R., & Josephson, S. G. (Eds.). (1996). *Abductive inference. Computation, philosophy, technology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Journal of the American Forensic Association. (1982). *18*, 133–160. (Special forum on debate paradigms).
Jovičič, T. (2003a). Evaluation of argumentative strategies. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 571–580). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Jovičič, T. (2003b). New concepts for argument evaluation. In J. A. Blair, D. Farr, H. V. Hansen, R. H. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *Informal logic @ 25. Proceedings of the Windsor conference*. Windsor: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.
Ju, S. (2010). The cultural relativity of logic. *Social sciences in China, 31*(4), 73–89.
Jungslager, F. S. (1991). *Standpunt en argumentatie. Een empirisch onderzoek naar leerstrategieën tijdens het leggen van een argumentatief verband* [Standpoint and argumentation. An empirical research concerning learning strategies in making an argumentative connection]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
Just, S. (2003). Rhetorical criticism of the debate on the future of the European Union Strategic options and foundational understandings. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, &

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 581–586). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Juthe, A. (2005). Argument by analogy. *Argumentation, 19*(1), 1–27.
Juthe, A. (2009). Refutation by parallel argument. *Argumentation, 23*(2), 133–169.
Kahane, H. (1969). *Logic and philosophy*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
Kahane, H. (1971). *Logic and contemporary rhetoric. The use of reasoning in everyday life*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
Kakkuri-Knuuttila, M.-L. (1993). *Dialectic and enquiry in Aristotle*. Doctoral dissertation, Helsinki School of Econmics.
Kakkuri-Knuuttila, M.-L. (Ed.). (1998). *Argumentti ja kritiikki. Lukemisen, keskustelun ja vakuuttamisen taidot* [Argument and critique. The skills of reading, discussing and persuading]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus. (7th ed. 2007).
Kalashnikova, S. (2007). *Lingvisticheskiye aspekty stiley myshleniya v argumentativnom diskurse* [Linguistic aspects of thinking styles in argumentative discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.
Kamiński, S. (1962). Systematyzacja typowych błędów logicznych [A classification of typical logical fallacies]. *Roczniki Filozoficzne, 10*(1), 5–39.
Kamlah, W., & Lorenzen, P. (1967). *Logische Propädeutik oder Vorschule des vernünftigen Redens* [Logical propaedeutic or pre-school of reasonable discourse] (revised ed.). Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut (Hochschultaschenbücher, 227).
Kamlah, W., & Lorenzen, P. (1973). *Logische Propädeutik. Vorschule des vernünftigen Redens* [Logical propaedeutic. Pre-school of reasonable discourse] (2nd improved and enlarged ed.). Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut (Hochschultaschenbücher, 227). (1st ed 1967).
Kamlah, W., & Lorenzen, P. (1984). *Logical propaedeutic. Pre-school of reasonable discourse*. (H. Robinson, trans.) Lanham, MD: University Press of America (original work published in 1973). [Trans. of *Logische Propädeutik. Vorschule des vernünftigen Redens*]
Kanke, T. (2007). Reshaping Emperor Hirohito's persona. A study of fragmented arguments in multiple texts. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 733–738). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Kanke, T., & Morooka, J. (2011). Youth debates in early modern Japan. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 914–926). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).
Kaplow, L. (1981). Rethinking counterplans. A reconciliation with debate theory. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 17*, 215–226.
Karacapilidis, N., & Papadias, D. (2001). Computer supported argumentation and collaborative decision making. The HERMES system. *Information Systems, 26*, 259–277.
Karon, L. A. (1989). Presence in the new rhetoric. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 163–178). Lanham: University Press of America.
Kasyanova, J. (2008). *Strukturno-semanticheskij analiz argumentatsii v monologicheskom diskurse* [A structural-semantic analysis of argumentation in a monological discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Udmurt State University.
Kauffeld, F. J. (1998). Presumption and the distribution of argumentative burdens in acts of proposing and accusing. *Argumentation, 12*(2), 245–266.
Kauffeld, F. (2006). Pragma-dialectic's appropriation of speech act theory. In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 149–160). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Kauffeld, F. J. (2009). What are we learning about the pragmatics of the arguer's obligations? In S. Jacobs (Ed.), *Concerning argument. Selected papers from the 15th biennial conference on argumentation* (pp. 1–31). Washington, DC: NCA.
Keith, W. (Ed.). (1993). Rhetoric in the rhetoric of science. *Southern Communication Journal*, *58*, 4. (Special issue).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Kellner, H. (1989). *Language and historical representation*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Kennedy, G. A. (1994). *A new history of classical rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Kennedy, G. A. (1999). *Classical rhetoric & its Christian and secular tradition. From ancient to modern times* (2nd revised & enlarged ed.). Chapel Hill-London: The University of North Carolina Press.
Kennedy, G. A. (2001). Historical survey of rhetoric. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *Handbook of classical rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (pp. 3–41). Brill: Leiden.
Kennedy, G. (2004). *Negotiation. An A Z guide*. The Economist.
Kertész, A., & Rákosi, C. (2009). Cyclic vs. circular argumentation in the conceptual metaphor theory. *Cognitive Linguistics, 20*, 703–732.
Kienpointner, M. (1983). *Argumentationsanalyse* [Argumentation analysis]. Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 56.
Kienpointner, M. (1991). Argumentation in Germany and Austria. An overview of the recent literature. *Informal Logic, 8*(3), 129–136.
Kienpointner, M. (1992). *Alltagslogik. Struktur und Funktion vom Argumentationsmustern* [Everyday logic. Structure and function of prototypes of argumentation]. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
Kienpointner, M. (1993). The empirical relevance of Ch. Perelman's new rhetoric. *Argumentation, 7*(4), 419–437.
Kienpointner, M. (1996). Whorf and Wittgenstein. Language, world view and argumentation. *Argumentation, 10*(4), 475–494.
Kindt, W. (1988). Zur Logik von Alltagsargumentationen [On the logic of everyday argumentation]. *Fachbericht 3 Erziehungswissenschaftliche Hochschule Koblenz*.
Kindt, W. (1992a). Organisationsformen des Argumentierens in natürlicher Sprache [The organisation of argumentation in everyday speech]. In H. Paschen & L. Wigger (Eds.), *Pädagogisches Argumentieren* [Educational argumentation] (pp. 95–120). Weinheim: Deutscher Studienverlag.
Kindt, W. (1992b). Argumentation und Konfliktaustragung in Äusserungen über den Golfkrieg [Argumentation and conflict resolution in statements on the Gulf War]. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft, 11*, 189–215.
King-Farlow, J. (1973). Toulmin's analysis of probability. *Theoria, 29*, 12–26.
Kirschner, P. A., Buckingham Shum, S. J., & Carr, C. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Visualizing argumentation. Software tools for collaborative and educational sense-making*. London: Springer.
Kiseliova, V. V. (2006). *Varyirovaniye verbalnyh reaktsij v argumentativnom diskurse* [Variability of verbal reactions in argumentative discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Udmurt State University.
Kišiček, G., & Stanković, D. (2011). Analysis of fallacies in Croatian parliamentary debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 939–948). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).
Kjaerulff, U. B., & Madsen, A. L. (2008). *Bayesian networks and influence diagrams*. New York: Springer.
Kjeldsen, J. E. (1999a). Visual rhetoric From elocutio to inventio. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 455–463). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Kjeldsen, J. E. (1999b). Retorik i Norge. Et retorisk øy-rike [Rhetoric in Norway. A rhetorical island-kingdom]. *Rhetorica Scandinavica, 12*, 63–72.
Kjeldsen, J. E. (2002). *Visual rhetoric*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen. Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2007). Visual argumentation in Scandinavian political advertising. A cognitive, contextual, and reception oriented approach. *Argumentation & Advocacy, 42*(3/4), 124–132.

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2011a). Visual argumentation in an Al Gore keynote presentation on climate change. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21* (pp. 1–11). Windsor, ON. (CD rom).

Kjeldsen, J. E. (2011b). Visual tropes and figures as visual argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Topical themes in argumentation theory. Twenty exploratory studies*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kjeldsen, J. E., & Grue, J. (2011). The study of rhetoric in the Scandinavian countries. In J. E. Kjeldsen & J. Grue (Eds.), *Scandinavian studies in rhetoric* (pp. 7–39). Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.

Klein, J. (1987). *Die konklusiven Sprechhandlungen. Studien zur Pragmatik, Semantik, Syntax und Lexik von Begründen, Erklären-warum, Folgern und Rechtfertigen* [Conclusive speech acts. Studies of the pragmatic, semantic, syntactic and lexical aspects of supporting, explaining why, concluding, and justifying]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kline, S. L. (1995). Influence opportunities and persuasive argument practices in childhood. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation* (pp. 261–275). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kloosterhuis, H. T. M. (2002). *Van overeenkomstige toepassing. De pragma-dialectische reconstructie van analogie-argumentatie in rechterlijke uitspraken* [Similar applications. The pragma-dialectical reconstruction of analogy argumentation in pronouncements of judges]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.

Kloosterhuis, H. (2006). *Reconstructing interpretative argumentation in legal decisions. A pragma-dialectical approach*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg & Sic Sat.

Klopf, D. (1973). *Winning debate*. Tokyo: Gakushobo.

Kluback, W. (1980). The new rhetoric as a philosophical system. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 17*, 73–79.

Kluev, E. (1999). *Ritorika. Inventsiya, dispozitsiya, elocutsiya* [Rhetoric. Invention, disposition, elocution]. Moscow: Prior.

Klujeff, M. L. (2008). Retoriske figurer og stil som argumentation [Rhetorical figures and style as argumentation]. *Rhetorica Scandinavica, 45*, 25–48.

Klumpp, J. F., Riley, P., & Hollihan, T. H. (1995). Argument in the post-political age. Emerging sites for a democratic lifeworld. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation. Special fields and cases* (pp. 318–328). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kneale, W. (1949). *Probability and induction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kneale, W., & Kneale, M. (1962). *The development of logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kneupper, C. W. (1978). On argument and diagrams. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 14*, 181–186.

Kneupper, C. W. (1979). Paradigms and problems. Alternative constructivist/interactionist implications for argumentation theory. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 15*, 220–227.

Koch, I. G. V. (1984). *Argumentação e linguagem* [Argumentation and language]. São Paulo: Cortez.

Kock, C. (2003a). Gravity too is relative: On the logic of deliberative debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 628–632). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kock, C. (2003b). Multidimensionality and non-deductiveness in deliberative argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 157–171). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Kock, C. (2006). Multiple warrants in practical reasoning. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 247–259). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kock, C. (2007a). Is practical reasoning presumptive? *Informal Logic, 27*, 91–108.

Kock, C. (2007b). Norms of legitimate dissensus. *Informal Logic, 27*(2), 179–196.

Kock, C. (2007c). The domain of rhetorical argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 785–788). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kock, C. (2009a). Arguing from different types of speech acts. In J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument cultures. Proceedings of the 8th OSSA conference at the University of Windsor in 2009.* . Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Kock, C. (2009b). Choice is not true or false. The domain of rhetorical argumentation. *Argumentation, 23*(1), 61–80.

Koetsenruijter, A. W. M. (1993). *Meningsverschillen. Analytisch en empirisch onderzoek naar de reconstructie en interpretatie van de confrontatiefase in discussies* [Differences of opinion. Analytical and empirical research concerning the reconstruction and interpretation of the confrontation stage in discussions]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Kolflaath, E. (2004). *Språk og argumentasjon – med eksempler fra juss* [Language and argumentation – with examples from law]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Komlósi, L. I. (1990). The power and fallability of a paradigm in argumentation. A case study of subversive political discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19-22, 1990* (pp. 994–1005). Amsterdam: Sic Sat/ISSA.

Komlósi, L. I. (1997). *Inferential pragmatics and cognitive structures. Situated language use and cognitive linguistics*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.

Komlósi, L. I. (2003). The conceptual fabric of argumentation and blended mental spaces. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck-Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 632–635). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Komlósi, L. I. (2006). Rhetorical effects of entrenched argumentation and presumptive arguments. A four-handed piece for George W. Bush and Tony Blair. In F. H. van Eemeren, M. D. Hazen, P. Houtlosser, & D. C. Williams (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on argumentation. Views from the Venice argumentation conference* (pp. 239–257). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Komlósi, L. I. (2007). Perelman's vision. Argumentation schemes as examples of generic conceptualization in everyday reasoning practices. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 789–796). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Komlósi, L. I. (2008). From paradoxes to presumptive fallacies. The way we reason with counter-factual mental spaces. In J. Andor, B. Hollósy, T. Laczkó, & P. Pelyvás (Eds.), *When grammar minds language and literature* (pp. 285–292). Debrecen: Debrecen University Press.

Komlósi, L. I., & Knipf, E. (1987). Negotiating consensus in discourse interaction schemata. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches* (pp. 82–89). Dordrecht: Foris.

Komlósi, L. I., & Tarrósy, I. (2010). Presumptive arguments turned into a fallacy of presumptuousness. Pre-election debates in a democracy of promises. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 957–972.

Konishi, T. (2007). Conceptualizing and evaluating dissociation from an informal logical perspective. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 797–802). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Kopperschmidt, J. (1975). Pro und Contra im Fernsehen [Pro and contra on television]. *Der Deutschunterricht, 27*, 42–62.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1976a). *Allgemeine Rhetorik. Einführung in die Theorie der persuasiven Kommunikation* [General rhetoric. Introduction to the theory of persuasive communication]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1976b). Methode statt Appell. Versuch einer Argumentationsanalyse [Method instead of appeal. An attempt at argument analysis]. *Der Deutschunterricht, 28*, 37–58.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1977). Von der Kritik der Rhetorik zur kritischen Rhetorik [From criticism of rhetoric to a critical rhetoric]. In H. F. Plett (Ed.), *Rhetorik. Kritische Positionen zum Stand der Forschung* [Rhetoric. A critical survey of the state of the art] (pp. 213–29). Munich: Fink.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1978). *Das Prinzip vernünftiger Rede* [Principles of rational speech]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1980). *Argumentation. Sprache und Vernunft, 2* [Argumentation. Language and reason]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1987). The function of argumentation. A pragmatic approach. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 179–188). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1989a). *Methodik der Argumentationsanalyse* [Methodology of argumentation analysis]. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1989b). Öffentliche Rede in Deutschland [Public speaking in Germany]. *Muttersprache, 99*, 213–30.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1990). Gibt es Kriterien politischer Rhetorik? Versuch einer Antwort [Do criteria for political rhetoric exist? A tentative answer]. *Diskussion Deutsch, 115*, 479–501.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1995). Grundfragen einer allgemeinen Argumentationstheorie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung formaler Argumentationsmuster [Fundamental questions for a general theory of argumentation arising from an analysis of formal patterns of argumentation]. In H. Wohlrapp (Ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung* [Roads of argumentation research] (pp. 50–73). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Kopperschmidt, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Rhetorik, 1. Rhetorik als Texttheorie* [Rhetoric, 1. Rhetoric as a theory of text]. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft.

Kopperschmidt, J. (Ed.). (1991). *Rhetorik, 2. Wirkungsgeschichte der Rhetorik* [Rhetoric, 2. A history of effective rhetoric]. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft.

Kopperschmidt, J. (Ed.). (2006) *Die neue Rhetorik. Studien zu Chaim Perelman* [The new rhetoric. Studies on Chaim Perelman]. Paderborn-Munich: Fink.

Koren, R. (1993). Perelman et l'objectivité discursive. Le cas de l'écriture de presse en France [Perelman and discursive objectivity. The case of the French press]. In G. Haarscher (Ed.), *Chaïm Perelman et la pensée contemporaine* [Chaïm Perleman and contemporary thought] (pp. 469–487). Brussels: Bruylant.

Koren, R. (2009). Can Perelman's NR be viewed as an ethics of discourse? *Argumentation, 23*, 421–431.

Koren, R., & Amossy, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Après Perelman. Quelles politiques pour les nouvelles rhétoriques?* [After Perelman. Which policies for the new rhetorics?]. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Körner, S. (1959). The uses of argument. *Mind, 68*, 425–427.

Korolko, M. (1990). *Sztuka retoryki* [The art of rhetoric]. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

Korta, K., & Garmendia, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Meaning, intentions and argumentation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Koszowy, M. (2004). Methodological ideas of the Lvov-Warsaw School as a possible foundation for a fallacy theory. In T. Suzuki, Y. Yano, & T. Kato (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Tokyo conference on argumentation and social cognition* (pp. 125–130). Tokyo: Japan Debate Association.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Koszowy, M. (2011). Pragmatic logic. The study of argumentation in the Lvov-Warsaw School. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1010–1022). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Koszowy, M. (2013). The methodological approach to argument evaluation. Rules of defining as applied to assessing arguments. *Filozofia nauki, 1*(81), 23–36.

Kowalski, R. A. (2011). *Computational logic and human thinking. How to be artificially intelligent*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1978). The adequacy of material dialogue-games. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, 19*, 321–330.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1982a). Essentials of the dialogical treatment of quantifiers. In E. C. W. Krabbe (Ed.), *Studies in dialogical logic* (pp. 249–257). Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1982b). *Studies in dialogical logic*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1985). Noncumulative dialectical models and formal dialectics. *Journal of Philosophical Logic, 14*, 129–168.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1986). A theory of modal dialectics. *Journal of Philosophical Logic, 15*, 191–217.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1987). Næss's dichotomy of tenability and relevance. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, C. A. Willard, & J. A. Blair (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the Conference on Argumentation 1986* (pp. 307–316). Dordrecht: Foris.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1988). Creative reasoning in formal discussion. *Argumentation, 2*, 483–498.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1992). So what? Profiles of relevance criticism in persuasion dialogues. *Argumentation, 6*, 271–283.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1993). Book review [Review of Woods & Walton (1989)]. *Argumentation, 6*, 475–479.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1995). Appeal to ignorance. In H. V. Hansen & R. C. Pinto (Eds.), *Fallacies. Classical and contemporary readings* (pp. 251–264). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1996). Can we ever pin one down to a formal fallacy? In J. van Benthem, F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, & F. Veltman (Eds.), *Logic and argumentation* (pp. 129–141). Amsterdam: North-Holland. (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Verhandelingen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel 170).

Krabbe, E. C. W. (1998). Who is afraid of figure of speech? *Argumentation, 12*, 281–294.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2001). The problem of retraction in critical discussion. *Synthese, 127*, 141–159.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2002). Profiles of dialogue as a dialectical tool. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 153–167). Amsterdam-Newport News: Sic Sat/Vale Press.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2003). The pragmatics of deductive arguments. In J. A. Blair, D. Farr, H. V. Hansen, R. H. Johnson & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *Informal Logic at 25. Proceedings of the Windsor conference*. (CD rom), Windsor: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation. (Proceedings of the 5th OSSA conference, 2003.)

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2006). Dialogue logic. In D. M. Gabbay & J. Woods (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of logic, 7. Logic and the modalities in the twentieth century* (pp. 665–704). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2007). Review of Freeman (2005a). *Argumentation, 21*(1), 101–113.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2008). Beth's impact on the theory of argumentation. In J. van Benthem, P. van Ulsen, & H. Visser (Eds.), *Logic and scientific philosophy. An E. W. Beth centenary celebration* (pp. 46–49). Amsterdam: Evert Willem Beth Foundation.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2009). Cooperation and competition in argumentative exchanges. In H. Jales Ribeiro (Ed.), *Rhetoric and argumentation in the beginning of the XXIst century* (pp. 111–126). Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2010). Arne Næss (1912–2009). *Argumentation, 24*, 527–530.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2012a). Aristotle's *On sophistical refutations*. *Topoi, 31*(2), 243–248. doi:10.1007/s11245-012-9124-0.

Krabbe, E. C. W. (2012b). Formals and ties. Connecting argumentation studies with formal disciplines. In H. J. Ribeiro (Ed.), *Inside arguments. Logic and the study of argumentation* (pp. 169–187). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Krabbe, E. C. W., & van Laar, J. A. (2013). The burden of criticism. Consequences of taking a critical stance. *Argumentation, 27*, 201–224.

Krabbe, E. C. W., & Walton, D. N. (1994). It's all very well for you to talk! Situationally disqualifying *ad hominem* attacks. *Informal Logic, 15*, 79–91.

Krabbe, E. C. W., & Walton, D. N. (2011). Formal dialectical systems and their uses in the study of argumentation. In E. T. Feteris, B. J. Garssen, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics. In honor of Frans H. van Eemeren* (pp. 245–263). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kraus, M. (2006). Arguing by question. A Toulminian reading of Cicero's account of the enthymeme. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 313–325). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kraus, M. (2007). From figure to argument. Contrarium in Roman rhetoric. *Argumentation, 21*(1), 3–19.

Kraus, M. (2012). Cultural diversity, cognitive breaks, and deep disagreement. Polemic argument. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Topical themes in argumentation theory. Twenty exploratory studies*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kraut, R. (1992). Introduction to the study of Plato. In R. Kraut (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Plato* (pp. 1–50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kunz, W., & Rittel, H. (1970). *Issues as elements of information systems* (Tech. Rep. 0131). Universität Stuttgart, Institut für Grundlagen der Planung.

Kurki, L., & Tomperi, T. (2011). *Väittely opetusmenetelmänä – Kriittinen ajattelu, argumentaatio ja retoriikka käytännössä* [Debate as a teaching method. Critical thinking, argumentation and rhetorics in practice]. Tampere: Niin &Näin/Eurooppalaisen filosofian seura.

Kusch, M., & Schröder, H. (Eds.). (1989). *Text – Interpretation – Argumentation*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Kutrovátz, G. (2008). Rhetoric of science, pragma-dialectics, and science studies. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 231–247). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kutrovátz, G. (2010). Trust in experts. Contextual patterns of warranted epistemic dependence. *Balkan Journal of Philosophy, 1*, 57–68.

Kvernbekk, T. (2003a). Narratives as informal arguments. In J. A. Blair, D. Farr, H. V. Hansen, R. H. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *Informal logic @ 25: Proceedings of the Windsor conference*. Windsor: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.

Kvernbekk, T. (2003b). On the argumentative quality of explanatory narratives. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 651–657). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kvernbekk, T. (2007a). Argumentation practice. The very idea. In J. A. Blair, H. Hansen, R. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *OSSA proceedings 2007*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Kvernbekk, T. (2007b). Theory and practice. A metatheoretical contribution. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 841–846). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Kvernbekk, T. (2009). Theory and practice. Gap or equilibrium. In J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument cultures. Proceedings of the 8th OSSA conference at the University of Windsor in 2009*. Windsor, ON: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Kvernbekk, T. (2011). Evidence-based practice and Toulmin. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21*. Windsor, ON (CD rom).

Kyburg, H. E. (1994). Uncertainty logics. In D. M. Gabbay, C. J. Hogger, & J. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, 3. Non-monotonic reasoning and uncertain reasoning* (pp. 397–438). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

van Laar, J. A. (2003a). *The dialectic of ambiguity. A contribution to the study of argumentation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen.

van Laar, J. A. (2003b). The use of dialogue profiles for the study of ambiguity. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 659–663). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Laar, J. A. (2008). Pragmatic inconsistency and credibility. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 163–179). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lambert, K., & Ulrich, W. (1980). *The nature of argument*. New York-London: Macmillan/ Collier-Macmillan.

Labrie, N. (2012). Strategic maneuvering in treatement decision-making discussions. Two cases in point. *Argumentation, 26*(2), 171–199.

Lanzadera, M., García, F., Montes, S., & Valadés, J. (2007). *Argumentación y razonar. Cómo enseñar y evaluar la capacidad de argumentar* [Argumentation and reasoning. How to teach and evaluate the argumentative capacity]. Madrid: CCS.

Laughlin, S. K., & Hughes, D. T. (1986). The rational and the reasonable. Dialectical or parallel systems? In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 187–205). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Lausberg, H. (1960). *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* [Handbook of literary rhetoric]. Munich: Max Hueber.

Lausberg, H. (1969). *Elementi di retorica* [*Elements of rhetoric*]. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Lausberg, H. (1998). *Handbook of literary rhetoric. A foundation for literary study*. Forword by G. A. Kennedy. (trans.: M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, & D. E. Orton. Ed. by D. E. Orton & R. D. Anderson. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill. (1st ed. in German 1960 as *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*).

Laycock, C., & Scales, R. L. (1904). *Argumentation and debate*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Lazerowitz, M. (1958–1959). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 9*, 68–70.

Leal Carretero, F., Ramírez González, C. F., & Favila Vega, V. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Introducción a la teoría de la argumentación* [Introduction to argumentation Theory]. Guadalajara: Editorial Universtaria.

Leeten, L. (2011). Moral argumentation from a rhetorical point of view. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1071–1075). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Leff, M. C. (2000). Rhetoric and dialectic in the twenty-first century. *Argumentation, 14*, 241–254.

Leff, M. (2003). Rhetoric and dialectic in Martin Luther King's 'Letter from Birmingham Jail'. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 255–268). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Leff, M. (2009). Perelman, ad hominem argument, and rhetorical ethos. *Argumentation, 23*, 301–311.

Leff, M. C., & Mohrmann, G. P. (1993). Lincoln at Cooper Union. A rhetorical analysis of the text. In T. W. Benson (Ed.), *Landmark essays on rhetorical criticism* (pp. 173–187). Davis: Hermagoras Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Leitão, S. (2000). The potential of argument in knowledge building. *Human Development, 6*, 332–360.

Lenk, H. (1970). Philosophische Logikbegründung und rationaler Kritizismus [Philosophical justification of logic and rational criticalism]. *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung, 24* (2), 183–205.

Leroux, N. R. (1994). Luther's "Am Neujahrstage". Style as argument. *Rhetorica, 12*(1), 1–42.

Lessl, T. M. (2008). Scientific demarcation and metascience. The National Academy of Sciences on greenhouse warming and evolution. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 77–91). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Levi, D. S. (2000). *In defense of informal logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Levinson, S. C. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 66–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewinski, J. D., Metzler, B. R., & Settle, P. L. (1973). The goal case affirmative. An alternative approach to academic debate. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 9*, 458–463.

Lewiński, M. (2010a). Collective argumentative criticism in informal online discussion forums. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 47*(2), 86–105.

Lewiński, M. (2010b). *Internet political discussion forums as an argumentative activity type. A pragma-dialectical analysis of online forms of strategic manoeuvring with critical reactions*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Lewiński, M. (2013). Debating multiple positions in multi-party online deliberation. Sides, positions, and cases. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 2*(1), 151–177.

Lewiński, M., & Mohammed, D. (2013). Argumentation in political deliberation. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 2*(1), 1–9.

Liang, Q., & Xie, Y. (2011). How critical is the dialectical tier? Exploring the critical dimension in the dialectical tier. *Argumentation, 25*(2), 229–242.

Lichański, J. Z. (1992). *Retoryka od średniowiecza do baroku. Teoria i praktyka* [Rhetoric from medival times to baroque. Theory and practice]. Warsaw: PWN.

Lichtman, A. J., Garvin, C., & Corsi, J. (1973). The alternative-justification affirmative. A new case form. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 10*, 59–69.

Lichtman, A. J., & Rohrer, D. M. (1980). The logic of policy dispute. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 16*, 236–247.

Lima, H. M. R. (2011). L'argumentation à la Cour d'Assises brésilienne. Les émotions dans le genre du rapport de police [Argumentation at the Brazilian trial court. Emotions in the genre of police report]. *Argumentation et analyse du discours, 7*, 57–79.

Lippert-Rasmussen, K. (2001). Are question-begging arguments necessarily unreasonable? *Philosophical Studies, 104*, 123–141.

Lisanyuk, E. (2008). *Ad hominem* in legal discourse. In T. Suzuki, T. Kato, & A. Kubota (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Tokyo conference on argumentation. Argumentation, law and justice* (pp. 175–181). Tokyo: Japanese Debate Association.

Lisanyuk, E. (2009). Silnykh argumentov net [There are no *ad baculum* arguments]. In V. Briushinkin (Ed.), *Modelling reasoning, 3* (pp. 92–100). Kaliningrad: Baltic Federal University Press.

Lisanyuk, E. (2010). Pravila i oshibki argumentacii. [Argumentation. Rules and fallacies]. In A. Migounov, I. Mikirtoumov, & B. Fedorov (Eds.), *Logic* (pp. 588–658). Moscow: Prospect Publishers.

Lisanyuk, E. (2011). Formal'naya dialektika i ritorika [Formal dialectics and rhetoric]. In V. Briushinkin (Ed.), *Modelling reasoning, 4. Argumentation and rhetoric* (pp. 37–52). Kaliningrad: Baltic Federal University Press.

Lisanyuk, E. (2013). Cognitivnye kharakteristiki agentov argumentacii [Argumentation and cognitive agents]. *Vestnik SPBGU, 6*, 1. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press.

Little, J. F., Groarke, L. A., & Tindale, C. W. (1989). *Good reasoning matters*. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Livnat, Z. (2009). The concept of 'scientific fact'. Perelman and beyond. *Argumentation, 3(2)*, 375–386.

Livnat, Z. (2014). Negotiating scientific ethos in academic controversy. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 3*(2).

Lo Cascio, V. (1991). *Grammatica dell'argomentare. Strategie e strutture* [A grammar of arguing. Strategies and structures]. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Lo Cascio, V. (1995). The relation between tense and aspect in Romance and other languages. In P. M. Bertinetto, V. Bianchi, I. Higginbotham, & M. Scartini (Eds.), *Temporal reference, aspect and actionality* (pp. 273–293). Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Lo Cascio, V. (2003). On the relationship between argumentation and narration. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 695–700). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lo Cascio, V. (2009). *Persuadere e convincere oggi. Nuovo manuale dell'argomentazione* [Persuading and convincing nowadays. A new manual of argumentation]. Milan: Academia Universa Press.

Locke, J. (1961). Of reason. In: *An essay concerning human understanding, Book IV, Chapter XVII, 1690*. Ed. and with an introd. by J.W. Yolton. London: Dent. (1st ed. 1690).

Lodder, A. R. (1999). *DiaLaw. On legal justification and dialogical models of argumentation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

López de la Vieja, M. T. (2010). *La pendiente resbaladiza* [The slippery slope]. Madrid: Plaza y Valdés Editores.

López, C. (2007). The rules of critical discussion and the development of critical thinking. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 901–907). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

López, C., & Vicuña, A. M. (2011). Improving the teaching of argumentation through pragma-dialectical rules and a community of inquiry. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1130–1140). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lorenz, K. (1961). *Arithmetik und Logik als Spiele* [Arithmetic and logic as games]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Kiel. Selections reprinted in P. Lorenzen & K. Lorenz (1978), *Dialogische Logik* [Dialogical logic] (pp. 17–95). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lorenz, K. (1968). Dialogspiele als semantische Grundlage von Logikkalkülen [Dialogue games as semantic foundation of logical calculi]. *Archiv für mathematische Logik und Grundlagenforschung, 11,* 32–55 and 73–100. Reprinted in P. Lorenzen & K. Lorenz (1978), *Dialogische Logik* [Dialogical logic] (pp. 96–162). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lorenz, K. (1973). Rules versus theorems. A new approach for mediation between intuitionistic and two-valued logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic, 2*, 352–369.

Lorenzen, P. (1960). Logik und Agon [Logic and agon]. In *Atti del XII congresso internazionale di filosofia (Venezia, 12–18 settembre 1958), 4: Logica, linguaggio e comunicazione* [Proceedings of the 12th international conference of philosophy (Venice, 12–13 September 1958), 4: Logic, language and communication] (pp. 187–194). Florence: Sansoni. Reprinted in P. Lorenzen & K. Lorenz (1978), *Dialogische Logik* [Dialogical logic] (pp. 1–8). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lorenzen, P. (1961). Ein dialogisches Konstruktivitätskriterium [A dialogical criterion for constructivity]. In *Infinitistic methods. Proceedings of the symposium on foundations of mathematics, Warsaw, 2–9 September 1959* (pp. 193–200). Oxford: Pergamon Press. Reprinted in P. Lorenzen & K. Lorenz (1978), *Dialogische Logik* [Dialogical logic] (pp. 9–16), Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lorenzen, P. (1969). *Normative logic and ethics* (Hochschultaschenbücher, Vol. 236). Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Lorenzen, P. (1984). *Normative logic and ethics*. 2nd annotated ed. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut. (1st ed. 1969).

Lorenzen P. (1987). *Lehrbuch der konstruktiven Wissenschaftstheorie* [Textbook of constructive philosophy of science]. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.

Lorenzen, P., & Lorenz, K. (1978). *Dialogische Logik* [Dialogic logic]. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lorenzen, P., & Schwemmer, O. (1973). *Konstruktive Logik, Ethik und Wissenschaftstheorie* [Constructive logic, ethics, and philosophy of science]. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.

Lorenzen, P., & Schwemmer, O. (1975). *Konstruktive Logik, Ethik und Wissenschaftstheorie* [Constructive logic, ethics, and philosophy of science]. 2nd improved ed. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut. (1st ed. 1973).

Loui, R. P. (1987). Defeat among arguments. A system of defeasible inference. *Computational Intelligence, 2*, 100–106.

Loui, R. P. (1995). Hart's critics on defeasible concepts and ascriptivism. *The fifth international conference on artificial intelligence and law. Proceedings of the conference* (pp. 21–30). New York: ACM. Extended report available at http://www1.cse.wustl.edu/~loui/ail2.pdf, 10 July 2012.

Loui, R. P. (1998). Process and policy. Resource-bounded nondemonstrative reasoning. *Computational Intelligence, 14*, 1–38.

Loui, R. P. (2006). A citation-based reflection on Toulmin and argument. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 31–83). Dordrecht: Springer.

Loui, R., & Norman, J. (1995). Rationales and argument moves. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 3*, 159–189.

Loui, R., Norman, J., Altepeter, J., Pinkard, D., Craven, D., Linsday, J., & Foltz, M. A. (1997). Progress on room 5. A testbed for public interactive semi-formal legal argumentation. In: *Proceedings of the sixth international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 207–214). New York: ACM Press.

Łoziński, P. (2011). An algorithm for incremental argumentation analysis in Carneades. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric, 23*(36), 155–171.

Łoziński, P. (2012), *Wnioskowanie w logikach argumentacyjnych zależne od kontekstu* [Context-dependent reasoning in argumentative logics]. Doctoral dissertation, Institute of Computer Science, Warsaw University of Technology.

Lucaites, J. L., & Condit, C. M. (1999). Introduction. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory. A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.

Lüken, G.-L. (1991). Incommensurability, rules of argumentation, and anticipation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990* (pp. 244–252). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lüken, G.-L. (1992). *Inkommensurabilität als Problem rationalen Argumentierens* [Incommensurability as a problem of rational argumentation]. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Lüken, G.-L. (1995). Konsens, Widerstreit und Entscheidung. Überlegungen anlässlich Lyotards Herausforderung der Argumentationstheorie [Consensus, dissent, and decision. Thoughts on Lyotard's challenge to argumentation theory]. In H. Wohlrapp (Ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung* [Roads of argumentation research] (pp. 358–385). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Łukasiewicz, J. (1957). *Aristotle's syllogistic from the standpoint of modern formal logic*. 2nd enlarged edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (1st ed. 1951).

Łukasiewicz, J. (1967). On the history of the logic of propositions. In S. McCall (Ed.), *Polish logic: 1920–1939* (pp. 67–87). Oxford University Press: Oxford. (a German version appeared as "Zur Geschichte der Aussagenlogik" in *Erkenntnis, 5* (1935), 111–131).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Lumer, C. (1988). The disputation. A special type of cooperative argumentative dialogue. *Argumentation, 2*, 441–464.

Lumer, C. (1990). *Praktische Argumentationstheorie. Theoretische Grundlagen, praktische Begründung und Regeln wichtiger Argumentationsarten* [Practical theory of arguments. Theoretical foundations, practical foundations, and rules of important argument types]. Braunschweig: Viehweg.

Lumer, C. (1991). Structure and function of argumentation – An epistemological approach to determining criteria for the validity and adequacy of argumentations. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, 19-22 June, 1990* (pp. 89–107). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lumer, C. (2000). Reductionism in fallacy theory. *Argumentation, 14*, 405–423.

Lumer, C. (2003). Interpreting arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 715–719). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lumer, C. (2005a). Introduction. The epistemological approach to argumentation. A map. *Informal Logic, 25*(3), 189–212.

Lumer, C. (2005b). The epistemological theory of argument-how and why? *Informal Logic, 25*(3), 214–232.

Lumer, C. (2010). Pragma-dialectics and the function of argumentation. *Argumentation, 24*(1), 41–69.

Lumer, C. (2011). Probabilistic arguments in the epistemological approach to argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1141–1154). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lumer, C. (2012). The epistemic inferiority of pragma-dialectics. *Informal Logic, 32*(1), 51–82.

Lundquist, L. (1980). *La cohérence textuelle. Syntaxe, sémantique, pragmatique* [Textual coherence. Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics]. Copenhagen: Arnold Busck, Nyt Nordisk Forlag.

Lundquist, L. (1983). *L'analyse textuelle. Méthode, exercises* [Textual analysis. Methods, exercises]. Paris: CEDIC.

Lundquist, L. (1987). Towards a procedural analysis of argumentative operators in texts. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 61–69). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Lundquist, L. (1991). How and when are written texts argumentative? In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation (organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990)* (pp. 639–646). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Lunsford, A., Wilson, K., & Eberly, R. (2009). Introduction. Rhetorics and roadmaps. In A. Lunsford, K. Wilson, & R. Eberly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of rhetorical studies* (pp. xi–xxix). Los Angeles: Sage.

Łuszczewska-Romahnowa, S. (1966). Pewne pojęcie poprawnej inferencji i pragmatyczne pojęcie wynikania [A notion of valid inference and a pragmatic notion of entailment]. In T. Pawłowski (Ed.), *Logiczna teoria nauki* [Logical theory of science] (pp. 163–167). Warsaw: PWN.

Lyne, J. (1983). Ways of going public. The projection of expertise in the sociobiology controversy. In D. Zarefsky, M. O. Sillars, & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Argument in transition. Proceedings of the third summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 400–415). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Macagno, F., & Walton, D. (2010). Dichotomies and oppositions in legal argumentation. *Ratio Juris, 23*(2), 229–257.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Machamer, P., Pera, M., & Baltas, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Scientific controversies. Philosophical and historical perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Mack, P. (1993). *Renaissance argument. Valla and Agricola in the traditions of rhetoric and dialectic*. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill.
Mack, P. (2011). *A history of Renaissance rhetoric 1380–1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Mack, P. (Ed.). (1994). *Renaissance rhetoric*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1979a). Question-begging in non-cumulative systems. *Journal of Philosophical Logic, 8*, 117–133.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1979b). How to stop talking to tortoises. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic, 20*, 705–717.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1984). Begging the question in dialogue. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 62*, 174–181.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1985). No logic before friday. *Synthese, 63*, 329–341.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1987). I guess. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 65*, 290–300.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1988). Distinguo. The response to equivocation. *Argumentation, 2*, 465–482.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1989). Reasoning and logic. *Synthese, 79*, 99–117.
Mackenzie, J. D. (1990). Four dialogue systems. *Studia Logica, 49*, 567–583.
Mackenzie, J. D. (2007). Equivocation as a point of order. *Argumentation, 21*, 223–231.
Mackenzie, J. D. (2011). What Hamblin's book *Fallacies* was about. *Informal Logic, 31*(4), 262–278.
Macoubrie, J. (2003). Logical argument structures in decision-making. *Argumentation, 17*, 291–313.
Maier, R. (1989). Natural logic and norms in argumentation. In R. Maier (Ed.), *Norms in argumentation. Proceedings of the conference on norms 1988* (pp. 49–65). Dordrecht: Foris.
Maillat, D., & Oswald, S. (2009). Defining manipulative discourse. The pragmatics of cognitive illusions. *International Review of Pragmatics, 1*(2), 348–370.
Maillat, D., & Oswald, S. (2011). Constraining context. A pragmatic account of cognitive manipulation. In C. Hart (Ed.), *Critical discourse studies in context and cognition* (pp. 65–80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Maingueneau, D. (1994). Argumentation et analyse du discours. L'exemple des *Provinciales* [Argumentation and discourse analysis. The example of the *Provinciales*]. *L'Année Sociologique, 3*(44), 263–280.
Maingueneau, D. (1996). Ethos et argumentation philosophique. Le cas du *Discours de la methode* [Ethos and philosophical argumentation. The case of the *Discours de la methode*]. In: F. Cossutta (Ed.), *Descartes et l'argumentation philosophique* [Descartes and philosophical argumentation] (pp. 85–110). Paris: PUF.
Makau, J. M. (1984). The Supreme Court and reasonableness. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*, 379–396.
Makau, J. M. (1986). The contemporary emergence of the jurisprudential model. Perelman in the information age. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 305–319). Dordrecht: Reidel.
Makinson, D. (1994). General patterns in non-monotonic reasoning. In D. M. Gabbay, C. J. Hogger, & J. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, 3. Non-monotonic reasoning and uncertain reasoning* (pp. 35–110). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Malink, M. (2006). A reconstruction of Aristotle's modal syllogistic. *History and Philosophy of Logic, 27*(2), 95–141.
Malink, M. (2013). *Aristotle's modal syllogistic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Mandziuk, R. M. (2011). Commemoration and controversy. Negotiating public memory through counter memorials. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1155–1164). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Maneli, M. (1978). The new theory of argumentation and American jurisprudence. *Logique et Analyse, 21*, 19–50.
Maneli, M. (1994). *Perelman's new rhetoric as philosophy and methodology for the next century*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Manfrida, G. (2003). *La narrazione psicoterapeutica. Invenzione, persuasione e tecniche retoriche in terapia relazionale* [Pyschotherapeutic narration. Invention, persuasion and rhetorical techniques in relation therapy]. (2nd ed.). Milan: Franco Angeli. (1st ed. 1998).
Manicas, P. T. (1966). On Toulmin's contribution to logic and argumentation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 3*, 83–94.
Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory. Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text, 8*, 243–281.
Manolescu, B. I. (2006). A normative pragmatic perspective on appealing to emotions in argumentation. *Argumentation, 20*(3), 327–43.
Manzin, M. (2012a). A rhetorical approach to legal reasoning. The Italian experience of CERMEG. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Exploring argumentative contexts* (pp. 135–148). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Manzin, M. (2012b). Vérité et logos dans la perspective de la rhétorique judiciaire. Contributions perelmaniennes à la culture juridique du troisième millénaire [Truth and logos from the perspective of legal rhetoric. Perelmanian contributions to the legal culture of the third millenium]. In B. Frydman & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Chaïm Perelman. De la nouvelle rhétorique à la logique juridique* [Chaïm Perelman. From new rhetoric to legal logic] (pp. 261–288). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
Manzin, M., & Puppo, F. (Eds.). (2008). *Audiatur et altera pars. Il contraddittorio fra principioe regola* [Hear the other side too. The crossexamination between principle and rule]. Milano: Giuffrè.
Marafioti, R. (2003). *Los patrones de la argumentación* [The patterns of argumentation]. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
Marafioti, R. (2007). Argumentation in debate. The parliamentary speech in critical contexts. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 929–932). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Marafioti, R., Dumm, Z., & Bitonte, M. E. (2007). Argumentation and counter-argumentation using a diaphonic appropriation in a parliamentary debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 933–937). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Marafioti, R., Pérez de Medina, E., & Balmayor, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Recorridos semiológicos. Signos, enunciación y argumentación* [Semiological paths. Signs, enunciation and argumentation]. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.
Marciszewski, W. (1969). *Sztuka dyskutowania* [The art of discussing].Warsaw: Iskry.
Marga, A. (1992). *Introducere în metodologia şi argumentarea filosofică* [An introduction to philosophical methodology and argumentation]. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.
Marga, A. (2009). *Raţionalitate, comunicare, argumentare* [Rationality, communication, argumentation]. 2nd enlarged and revised ed. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Grinta.
Marga, A. (2010). *Argumentarea* [Argumentation]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
Margitay, T. (2004). *Az érvelés mestersége* [The art of reasoning]. Budapest: Typotex.
Marinkovich, J. (2000). Un intento de evaluar el conocimiento acerca de la escritura en estudiantes de enseñanza básica [An attempt to evaluate the knowledge about writing among primary school students]. *Revista Signos, 33*(47), 101–110.
Marinkovich, J. (2007). La interacción argumentativa en el aula. Fases de la argumentación y estrategias de cortesía verbal [Argumentative interaction in the classroom. Stages of argumentation and verbal courtesy strategies]. In C. Santibáñez Yáñez & B. Riffo (Eds.), *Estudios en argumentación y retórica. Teorías contemporáneas y aplicaciones* [Studies in argumentation

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

and rhetoric. Contemporary theories and applications] (pp. 227–252). Concepción: Editorial Universidad de Concepción.

Marques, C. M. (2010). *A argumentação oral formal em contexto escolar* [The formal oral argumentation in school context]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Coimbra.

Marques, M. A. (2007a). Discordar no parlamento. Estratégias de argumentação. [Disagreement in parliament. Argumentation strategies]. *Revista Galega de Filoloxía, 8*, 99–124.

Marques, M. A. (2007b). Narrativa e discurso político. Estratégias argumentativas [Narrative and political discourse. Argumentative strategies]. In A. G. Macedo & E. Keating (Eds.), *O poder das narrativas, as narrativas do poder. Actas dos Colóquios de Outono 2005–2006* [*The power of narratives, the narratives of power. Proceedings of the 2005–2006 autumn colloquium*] (pp. 303–316). Braga: Universidade do Minho.

Marques, M. A. (2011). Argumentação e(m) discursos [Argumentation in/and discourse(s)]. In I. Duarte & O. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Português, língua e ensino* [Portuguese, language and teaching] (pp. 267–310). Porto: Porto Editorial.

Marras, C., & Euli, E. (2008). A 'dialectic ladder' of refutation and dissuasion. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 135–147). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Marraud, H. (2013). *¿Es lógic@? Análisis y evaluación de argumentos* [Is it logic(al)? Analysis and evaluation of arguments]. Madrid: Cátedra.

Martel, G. (2008). Performance. . .et contre-performance communicationelles. Des stratégies argumentatives pour le débat politique télévisé [Communicational performance and counter-performance. Argumentative strategies in political television debate]. *Argumentation et analyse du discours, 1* [on line] http:www.revues.org/index2422.html

Martin, J. (1974). *Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode*. [Antique rhetoric. Technique and method]. Munich Beck.

Martínez Solis, M. C. (2005). *La construcción del proceso argumentativo en el discurso* [The construction of the argumentative process in discourse]. Cali: Artes gráficas, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad del Valle.

Martínez [Solis], M. C. (2006). *Las dimensiones del sujeto discursivo. Prácticas en Módulos 1, 2 y 3 del curso virtual para el desarrollo de estrategias de comprensión y producción de textos* [The dimensions of the discursive subject. Practices in modules 1, 2 and 3 of the virtual course for the development of comprehension strategies and text production]. Cali: Education for All section of www.unesco-lectura.univalle.edu.co, Universidad del Valle.

Martínez [Solis], M. C. (2007). La orientación social de la argumentación en el discurso. Una propuesta integrativa [The social orientation of argumentation in discourse. An integrative approach]. In R. Marafioti (Ed.), *Parlamentos. Teoría de la argumentación y debate parlamentario* [Parliaments. Argumentation theory and parliamentary debate]. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

Marttunen, M. (1995). Practicing argumentation through computer conferencing. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24), III* (pp. 337–340). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Marttunen, M. (1997). *Studying argumentation in higher education by electronic mail*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research. Doctoral dissertation, University of Jyväskylä.

Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (1999). Learning of argumentation in face-to-face and e-mail environments. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 552–558). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (2007). Collaborative learning through chat discussions and argument diagrams in secondary school. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 40*(1), 109–126.

Marttunen, M., Laurinen, L., Hunya, M., & Litosseliti, L. (2003). Argumentation skills of secondary school students in Finland, Hungary and the United Kingdom. In F. H. van Eemeren,

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 733–739). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Maslennikova, A. A., & Tretyakova, T. P. (2003). The rhetorical shift in interviews. New features in Russian political discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 741–745). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Mason, D. (1961). The uses of argument. *Augustinianum, 1*, 206–209.

Massey, G. J. (1975a). Are there any good arguments that bad arguments are bad? *Philosophy in Context, 4*, 61–77.

Massey, G. J. (1975b). In defense of the asymmetry. Questions for Gerald J. Massey. *Philosophy in Context, 4*(Supplement), 44–56.

Massey, G. J. (1981). The fallacy behind fallacies. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy, 6*, 489–500.

Mates, B. (1961). *Stoic logic* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press (1st ed. 1953).

Mates, B. (1967). Communication and argument. *Synthese, 17*, 344–355.

Mates, B. (1972). *Elementary logic* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. (1st ed. 1965).

Matlon, R. J. (1978). Report on the Japanese debate tour, May and June 1978. *JEFA Forensic Journal, 2*, 25–40.

Mavrodieva, I. (2010). *Виртуална реторика. От дневниците до социалните мрежи* [Virtual rhetoric. From the diary to the social web]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.

Mazilu, S. (2010). *Dissociation and persuasive definitions as argumentative strategies in ethical argumentation on abortion*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bucharest.

Mazzi, D. (2007a). The construction of argumentation in judicial texts. Combining a genre and a corpus perspective. *Argumentation, 21*(1), 21–38.

Mazzi, D. (2007b). *The linguistic study of judicial argumentation. Theoretical perspectives, analytical insights*. Modena: Il Fiorino.

McBurney, J. H. (1994). The place of the enthymeme in rhetorical theory. In E. Schiappa (Ed.), *Landmarks essays on classical Greek rhetoric*. Davis: Hermagoras Press.

McBurney, P., Hitchcock, D. L., & Parsons, S. (2007). The eightfold way of deliberation dialogue. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 22*, 95–132.

McBurney, P., & Parsons, S. (2001). Chance discovery using dialectical argumentation. In T. Terano, T. Nishida, A. Namatame, S. Tsumoto, Y. Ohsawa, & T. Washio (Eds.), *New frontiers in artificial intelligence* (pp. 414–424). Berlin: Springer.

McBurney, P., & Parsons, S. (2002a). Games that agents play. A formal framework for dialogues between autonomous agents. *Journal for Logic, Language and Information, 11*, 315–334.

McBurney, P., & Parsons, S. (2002b). Dialogue games in multi-agent systems. *Informal Logic, 22*, 257–274.

McBurney, P., & Parsons, S. (2009). Dialogue games for agent argumentation. In I. Rahwan & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Argumentation in artificial intelligence* (pp. 261–280). Dordrecht: Springer.

McCarty, L. (1977). Reflections on TAXMAN. An experiment in artificial intelligence and legal reasoning. *Harvard Law Review, 90*, 89–116.

McCarty, L. (1995). An implementation of Eisner v. Macomber. In *Proceedings of the fifth international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 276–286). New York: ACM Press.

McCloskey, D. N. (1985). *The rhetoric of economics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

McKeon, R. (1987). Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. In M. Backman (Ed.), *Rhetoric Essays in invention and discovery* (pp. 121–166). Woodbridge: Ox Bow.

McKerrow, R. E. (1977). Rhetorical validity. An analysis of three perspectives on the justification of rhetorical argument. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 13*, 133–141.

McKerrow, R. E. (1982). Rationality and reasonableness in a theory of argument. In J. R. Cox & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Advances in argumentation theory and research* (pp. 105–122). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

McKerrow, R. E. (1986). Pragmatic justification. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 207–223). Dordrecht: Reidel.
McPeck, J. (1981). *Critical thinking and education*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
McPeck, J. (1990). *Teaching critical thinking. Dialogue and dialectic*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.
Measell, J. S. (1985). Perelman on analogy. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 65–71.
Melin, L. (2003). *Manipulera med språket* [Manipulate with speech]. Stockholm: Nordstedts ordbok.
Melo Souza Filho, O. (2011). From polemical exchanges to dialogue. Appreciations about an ethics of communication. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA)* (pp. 1248–1258). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Memedi, V. (2007). Resolving deep disagreement. A case in point. *SEEU Review, 3*(2), 7–18.
Memedi, V. (2011). Intractable disputes. The development of attractors. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1259–1265). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).
Mendelson, M. (2002). *Many sides. A Protagorean approach to the theory, practice, and pedagogy of argument*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Mengel, P. (1991). The peculiar inferential force of analogical arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990* (pp. 422–428). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Mengel, P. (1995). *Analogien als Argumente* [Analogies as arguments]. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang.
Mercier, H. (2011). Looking for arguments. *Argumentation, 26*(3), 305–324.
Mercier, H. (2012). Some clarifications about the argumentative theory of reasoning. A reply to Santibáñez Yáñez (2012). *Informal Logic, 32*(2), 259–268.
Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 34*, 57–111.
Metzing, D. W. (1976). Argumentationsanalyse [Analysis of argumentation]. *Studium Linguistik, 2*, 1–23.
Meyer, M. (1976). *De la problématologie. Philosophie, science et langage* [On problematology. Philosophy, science, and language]. Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.
Meyer, M. (1982a). *Logique, langage et argumentation* [Logic, language, and argumentation]. Paris: Hachette. (English trans. 1995).
Meyer, M. (1982b). Argumentation in the light of a theory of questioning. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 15*(2), 81–103.
Meyer, M. (1986a). *De la problématologie. Philosophie, science et langage* [On problematology: Philosophy, science, and language]. Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.
Meyer, M. (1986b). *From logic to rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (trans. of M. Meyer. 1982a. *Logique, langage et argumentation*. Paris: Hachette, 1982).
Meyer, M. (1988). The rhetorical foundation of philosophical argumentation. *Argumentation, 2*(2), 255–270.
Meyer, M. (Ed.). (1989). *From metaphysics to rhetoric* (Trans. of *De la métaphysique à la rhétorique*. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1986). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Meyer, M. (2008). *Principia rhetorica. Une théorie générale de l'argumentation*. [*Principia Rhetorica*. A general theory of argumentation]. Paris: Fayard.
Meyer, M. (2000). *Questionnement et historicité*. Paris: Puf.
Meza, P. (2009). *Las interacciones argumentativas orales en la sala de clases. Un análisis dialéctico y retórico* [Oral argumentative interactions in the classroom. A dialectic and rhetorical analysis]. Doctoral dissertation, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Michalos, A. C. (1970). *Improving your reasoning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
Micheli, R. (2010). *L'émotion argumentée. L'abolition de la peine de mort dans le débat parlementaire français* [Well-argued emotion. The abolition of the death penalty in French parliamentary debate]. Paris: Le Cerf.
Micheli, R. (2012). Arguing without trying to persuade? Elements for a non-persuasive definition of argumentation. *Argumentation, 26*(1), 115–126.
Mickunas, A. (1986). Perelman on justice and political institutions. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 321–339). Dordrecht: Reidel.
Migunov, A. I. (2002). Analitika i dialektika. Dva aspekta logiki [Analytics and dialectics. Two aspects of logic]. In *Y. A. Slinin and us. To the 70th anniversary of Professor Yaroslav Anatolyevich Slinin*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press, St. Petersburg Philosophical Society Publication
Migunov, A. I. (2004). Teoriia argumentatcii kak logiko-pragmaticheskoe issledovanie argumentativnoi' kommunikatcii [Theory of argumentation as logical-pragmatic research of argumentative communication]. In S. I. Dudnik (Ed.), *Communication and education. The collection of articles*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press.
Migunov, A. I. (2005). *Kommunikativnaia priroda istiny i argumentatciia* [Communicative nature of truth and argumentation (Logical-philosophical studies, Vol. 3). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press.
Migunov, A. I. (2007a). *Entimema v argumentativnom diskurse* [Enthymeme in an argumentative discourse] (Logical-philosophical studies, Vol. 4). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press. St. Petersburg Philosophical Society Publication.
Migunov, A. I. (2007b). *Semantika argumentativnogo rechevogo akta* [Semantics of the argumentative speech act] (Thought. The yearbook of the Petersburg Philosophical Society, Vol. 6). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press.
Migunov, A. I. (2009). *Argumentologiia v kontekste prakticheskogo povorota logiki* [Argumentology in a context of the practical turn of logic] (Logical-philosophical studies, Vol. 7). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press.
Migunov, A. I. (2011). Sootnoshenie ritoricheskikh i argumentativnykh aspektov diskursa [A relationship of discourse rhetorical and argumentative aspects]. In V. I. Bryushinkin (Ed.), *Models of reasoning, 4. Argumentation and rhetoric*. Kaliningrad: Kaliningrad University Press.
Mill, J. S. (1970). *A system of logic ratiocinative and inductive, being a connected view of the principles of evidence and the methods of scientific investigation*. London: Longman. (1st ed. 1843).
Miller, J. M., Prosser, M. H., & Benson, T. W. (Eds.). (1973). *Readings in medieval rhetoric*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Mills, G. E. (1964). *Reason in controversy. An introduction to general argumentation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Miovska-Spaseva, S., & Ačkovska-Leškovska, E. (2010). *Критичкото мислење во универзитетската настава* [Critical thinking in university education]. Skopje: Foundation Open Society Institute – Macedonia.
Miranda, T. (1998). *El juego de la argumentación* [The game of argumentation]. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
Miranda, T. (2002). *Argumentos* [Arguments]. Alcoy: Editorial Marfil.
Mitchell, G. (1998). Pedagogical possibilities for argumentative agency in academic debate. *Argumentation and advocacy, 35*(4), 41–60.
Mochales Palau, R., & Moens, S. (2009). Argumentation mining. The detection, classification and structure of arguments in text. In *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on artificial intelligence and law (ICAIL 2009)* (pp. 98–107). New York: ACM Press.
Modgil, S. (2005). Reasoning about preferences in argumentation frameworks. *Artificial Intelligence, 173*(9–10), 901–934.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Moeschler, J. (1985). *Argumentation et conversation* [Argumentation and conversation]. Paris: Hatier.

Moeschler, J., & de Spengler, N. (1982). La concession ou la réfutation interdite. Approche argumentative et conversationelle [Concessions or the prohibition of refutations. An argumentative and conversational approach]. In *Concession et consécution dans le discours. Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 4* (pp. 7–36). Geneva: Université de Genève.

Mohammed, D. (2009). *"The honourable gentleman should make up his mind". Strategic manoeuvring with accusations of inconsistency in Prime Minister's Question Time*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Mohammed, D. (2011). Strategic manoeuvring in simultaneous discussions. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Prodeedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21, 2011*. Windsor. (CD rom).

Mohammed, D. (2013). Pursuing multiple goals in European parliamentary debates. EU immigration policies as a case in point. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 2*(1), 47–74.

Monteiro, C. S. (2006). *Teoria da argumentação jurídica e nova retórica*. [Theory of legal argumentation and new rhetoric] (3rd ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris.

Monzón, L. (2011). Argumentación. Objeto olvidado para la investigación en México [Argumentation. The forgotten object in Mexican research]. *REDIE, 13*(2), 41–54.

Moore, B. N., & Parker, R. (2009). *Critical thinking* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. (Chinese trans. 2007).

Moraux, P. (1968). La joute dialectique d'après le huitième livre des *Topiques* [The dialectical joust according to the eighth book of the *Topics*]. In G. E. L. Owen (Ed.), *Aristotle on dialectic: The Topics. Proceedings of the third symposium aristotelicum* (pp. 277–311). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morresi, R. (2003). La "Nouvelle rhétorique" tra dialettica aristotelica e dialettica hegeliana [The "new rhetoric" between Aristotelian dialectic and Hegelian dialectic]. *Rhetorica, 21*(1), 37–54.

Morrison, J. L. (1972). The absence of a rhetorical tradition in Japanese culture. *Western Speech, 36*, 89–102.

Mosca, L. L. S. (Ed.). (2006). *Discurso, argumentação e produção de sentido* [Discourse, argumentation and making sense] (4th ed.). São Paulo: Associação Editorial Humanitas.

Moss, J. D., & Wallace, W. A. (2003). *Rhetoric & dialectic in the time of Galileo*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Mral, B., Borg, N., & Salazar, P.-J. (Eds.). (2009). *Women's rhetoric. Argumentative strategies of women in public life. Sweden & South Africa*. Åstorp: Retoriksförlaget.

Muraru, D. (2010). *Mediation and diplomatic discourse. The strategic use of dissociation and definitions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bucharest.

Murphy, J. J. (2001). *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A history of the rhetorical theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Medieval and renaissance texts and studies, Vol. 227; MRTS reprint series, Vol. 4). Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies .

Murphy, J. J. (Ed.). (1983). *Renaissance eloquence. Studies in the theory and practice of Renaissance rhetoric*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nadeau, R. (1958). Hermogenes on 'stock issues' in deliberative speaking. *Speech Monographs, 25*, 62.

Næss, A. (1947). *En del elementære logiske emner* [Some elementary logical topics]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. (1st published 1941 (mimeographed). Oslo).

Næss, A. (1953). *Interpretation and preciseness. A contribution to the theory of communication*. Oslo: Skrifter utgitt ar der norske videnskaps academie.

Næss, A. (1966). *Communication and argument. Elements of applied semantics*. (A. Hannay, trans.). London: Allen and Unwin. (English trans. of *En del elementære logiske emner*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1947).

Næss, A. (1968). *Scepticism*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Næss, A. (1978). *Elementaire argumentatieleer. Met een inleiding in de filosofie van Næss door E. M. Barth* [Elementary theory of argumentation: With an introduction into Næss's philosophy by E. M. Barth]. (S. Ubbink, Trans.). Baarn: Ambo (Dutch trans. of the 11th ed. of *En del elementære logiske emner*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1976).

Næss, A. (1992a). Arguing under deep disagreement. (E. M. Barth, trans.). In E. M. Barth, & E. C. W. Krabbe (Eds.), *Logic and political culture* (pp. 123–131). Amsterdam: North-Holland (English trans. selections from *Wie fördert man heute die empirische Bewegung? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Empirismus von Otto Neurath und Rudolph Carnap* [How can the empirical movement be promoted today? A discussion of the empiricism of Otto Neurath and Rudolph Carnap] (mimeographed). Oslo: Institute for Philosophy and History of Ideas, Oslo University & Universitetsforlaget, 1956.).

Næss, A. (1992b). How can the empirical movement be promoted today? A discussion of the empiricism of Otto Neurath and Rudolph Carnap. (E. M. Barth, trans.). In E. M. Barth, J. Van Dormael, & F. Vandamme (Eds.), *From an empirical point of view. The empirical turn in logic* (pp. 107–155). Gent: Communication & Cognition (English trans. of *Wie fördert man heute die empirische Bewegung? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Empirismus von Otto Neurath und Rudolph Carnap* (mimeographed). Oslo: Institute for Philosophy and History of Ideas, Oslo University & Universitetsforlaget, 1956.).

Næss, A. (1993). "You assert this?" An empirical study of weight-expressions. In E. C. W. Krabbe, R. J. Dalitz, & P. A. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical logic and public debate. Essays in honour of Else M. Barth* (pp. 121–132). Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.

Næss, A. (2005). *The selected works of Arne Næss*. In H. Glasser (Ed.), (Vols. 1–10). Dordrecht: Springer

Naqqari, H. (Ed.). (2006). *Al-Taḥājuj.Tabī'atuh wa Majālātuh wa Waẓā'ifuh* [Argumentation. Its nature, contexts and functions]. Rabat: Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Mohammed V University.

Natanson, M., & Johnstone, H. W., Jr. (1965). *Philosophy, rhetoric, and argumentation*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Navarro, M. G. (2009). *Interpretar y Argumentar* [Interpreting and arguing]. Madrid: Plaza y Valdes Editores.

Navarro, M. G. (2011). Elements for an argumentative method of interpretation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1347–1356). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Nelson, J. S., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D. N. (Eds.). (1987). *The rhetoric of the human sciences. Language and argument in scholarship and public affairs*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Nettel, A. N. (2011). The enthymeme between persuasion and argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1359–1365). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Nettel, A. N., & Roque, G. (2012). Persuasive argumentation versus manipulation. *Argumentation, 26*(1), 55–69.

Newell, S. E., & Rieke, R. D. (1986). A practical reasoning approach to legal doctrine. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 212–222.

Newman, R. P. (1961). *Recognition of communist China? A study in argument*. New York: Macmillan.

Nielsen, F. S. (1997). *Alfred Sidgwicks argumentationsteori* [Alfred Sidgwick's argumentation theory]. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums forlag.

Nikolić, D., & Tomić, D. (2011). Employing the Toulmin model in rhetorical education. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1366–1380). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Nimmo, D., & Mansfield, M. W. (1986). The teflon president. The relevance of Chaïm Perelman's formulations for the study of political communication. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 357–377). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Noemi, C. (2011). Intertextualidad a partir del establecimiento de *status*. Alcances sobre la relación entre contenido y superestructura en los discursos de juicios orales. [Intertextuality from status. Notes about the relationship between content and superstructure in oral trial discourses]. *Signos, 44*(76), 118–131.

Nølke, H. (1992). Semantic constraints on argumentation. From polyphonic microstructure to argumentative macro-structure. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 189–200). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Nosich, G. (1982). *Reasons and arguments*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Nosich, G. (2012). *Learning to think things through. A guide to critical thinking across the curriculum* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall. (1st ed. 2001).

Novani, S. (2011a). Thought experiments in criminal trial. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1782748 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1782748.

Novani, S. (2011b). The testimonial argumentation. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1785266 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1785266.

Nuchelmans, G. (1973). *Theories of the proposition. Ancient and medieval conceptions of the bearers of truth and falsity* (North-Holland linguistic series, Vol. 8). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Nuchelmans, G. (1976). *Wijsbegeerte en taal. Twaalf studies* [Philosophy and language. Twelve studies]. Meppel: Boom.

Nuchelmans, G. (1993). On the fourfold root of the *argumentum ad hominem*. In E. C. W. Krabbe, R. J. Dalitz, & P. A. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical logic and public debate. Essays in honour of Else M. Barth* (pp. 37–47). Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.

Nute, D. (1994). Defeasible logic. In D. M. Gabbay, C. J. Hogger, & J. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, 3. Non-monotonic reasoning and uncertain reasoning* (pp. 353–395). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oakley, T. V. (1997). "The new rhetoric" and the construction of value. Presence, the universal audience, and Beckett's "Three dialogues". *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 27*(1), 47–68.

O'Connor, D. J. (1959). The uses of argument. *Philosophy, 34*, 244–245.

Oesterle, J. A. (1952). *Logic. The art of defining and reasoning*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A. (1949). *The meaning of meaning. A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism* (10th ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (1st ed. 1923).

Öhlschläger, G. (1979). *Linguistische Überlegungen zu einer Theorie der Argumentation* [Linguistic considerations concerning a theory of argumentation]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Okabe, R. (1986-1988). Research conducted by grant of the Japanese Government [An analysis of the influence of Western rhetorical theory on the early Meiji era speech textbooks in Japan]. http://kaken.nii.ac.jp/d/r/40065462.ja.html

Okabe, R. (1989). Cultural assumptions of East and West. Japan and the United States. In J. L. Golden, G. F. Berquist, & W. E. Coleman (Eds.), *The rhetoric of Western thought* (4th ed., pp. 546–565). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Okabe, R. (1990). The impact of Western rhetoric on the east. The case of Japan. *Rhetorica, 8*(4), 371–388.

Okabe, R. (2002). Japan's attempted enactments of Western debate practice in the 16th and the 19th centuries. In R. T. Donahue (Ed.), *Exploring Japaneseness. On Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness* (pp. 277–291). Westport-London: Ablex.

O'Keefe, B. J., & Benoit, P. J. (1982). Children's arguments. In J. R. Cox & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *The field of argumentation. Advances in argumentation theory and research* (pp. 154–183). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

O'Keefe, D. J. (1992). Two concepts of argument. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 79–90). Berlin-New York: Foris.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion. Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage (1st ed. 1990).

O'Keefe, D. J. (2006). Pragma-dialectics and persuasion effects research. In P. Houtlosser & M. A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 235–243). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

O'Keefe, D. J., & Jackson, S. (1995). Argument quality and persuasive effects. A review of current approaches. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Argumentation and values. Proceedings of the ninth Alta conference on argumentation* (pp. 88–92). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Okuda, H. (2007). Prime Minister Mori's controversial "Divine Nation" remarks. A case study of Japanese political communication strategies. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1003–1009). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Okuda, H. (2011). Obama's rhetorical strategy in presenting "A world without nuclear weapons". In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1396–1404). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1963). Rencontre avec la rhétorique [Encounter with rhetoric]. In Centre National Belge de Recherches de Logique, *La théorie de l'argumentation. Perspectives et application* [The theory of argumentation. Perspectives and applications] (pp. 3–18). Louvain-Paris: Editions Nauwelaerts.

Oliver, J. W. (1967). Formal fallacies and other invalid arguments. *Mind, 76*, 463–478.

Olmos, P., & Vega, L. (2011). The use of the *script* concept in argumentation theory. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1405–1414). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Omari, M. el (1986). *Fī Balāghat al-Khiṭāb al-Iqnā'ī. Madkhal Naẓarī wa Taṭbīqī Li Dirāsat a-Khiṭābah al-'Arabīyah: al-Khiṭābah fī al-Qarn al-Awwal Namūdhajan* [The rhetoric of argumentative discourse. A preface to the theoretical and applied study of Arabic oration. Oration in the first Hijra Century as an example]. Rabat, Morocco: Dār al-Thaqāfah. (2nd ed. 2002. Casablanca: Ifrīqiya-al-Sharq).

Ong, W. J. (1958). *Ramus, method, and the decay of dialogue. From the art of discourse to the art of reason*. Cambridge, MA-London: Harvard University Press.

Oostdam, R. J. (1991). *Argumentatie in de peiling. Een aanbod- en prestatiepeiling van argumentatievaardigheden in het voortgezet onderwijs* [Argumentation to the test. A test of material and achievements relating to argumentative skills in secondary education]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Orlandi, E. (2000). *Análise do discurso. Princípios e procedimentos* [Discourse analysis. Principles and procedures]. Campinas: Pontes.

Orlandi, E., & Lagazzi-Rodrigues, S. (2006). *Discurso e textualidade* [Discourse and textuality]. Campinas: Pontes.

Ortega de Hocevar, S. (2003). Los niños y los cuentos. La renarración como actividad de comprensión y producción discursiva [Children and tales. Renarration as an activity for discoursive comprehension and production]. In *Niños, cuentos y palabras. Colección 0 a 5. La educación en los primeros años.*[Children, tales and words. *0 to 5* Series. Education in the first years.] Buenos Aires: Ediciones Novedades Educativas.

Ortega de Hocevar, S. (2008). In M. Castilla (Ed.), *¿Cómo determinar la competencia argumentativa de alumnos del primer ciclo de la Educación básica?* [How to determine argumentative competence in primary school students?]. Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Oshchepkova, N. (2004). *Strategii i taktiki v argumentativnom diskurse*. *Pragmalingvisticheskij analiz ubeditelnosti rassuzhdeniya* [Strategies and tactics in argumentative discourse. A pragmalinguistic analysis of the persuasiveness of reasoning]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Osorio, J. (2006). Estructura conceptual metafórica y práctica argumentativa. [Metaphorical conceptual structure and argumentative practice]. *Praxis, 8*(9), 121–136.

Oswald, S. (2007). Towards an interface between pragma-dialectics and relevance theory. *Pragmatics and Cognition, 15*(1), 179–201.

Oswald, S. (2010). *Pragmatics of uncooperative and manipulative communication*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

Oswald, S. (2011). From interpretation to consent. Arguments, beliefs and meaning. *Discourse Studies, 13*(6), 806–814.

O'Toole, R. R., & Jennings, R. E. (2004). The Megarians and the Stoics. In D. M. Gabbay & J. Woods (Eds.), *The handbook of the history of logic* (Greek, Indian and Arabic logic, Vol. 1, pp. 397–522). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Paavola, S. (2006). *On the origin of ideas. An abductivist approach to discovery*. Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki, 15. Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.

Padilla, C. (1997). *Lectura y escritura: Adquisición y proyecciones pedagógicas* [Reading and writing. Acquisition and pedagogical projections]. San Miguel de Tucumán: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán.

Padilla, C., & López, E. (2011). Grados de complejidad argumentativa en escritos de estudiantes universitarios de humanidades [Degrees of argumentative complexity in written texts of humanities college students]. *Revista Praxis, 13*(20), 61–90.

Paglieri, F., & Castelfranchi, C. (2006). Arguments as belief structures Towards. a Toulmin layout of doxastic dynamics? In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 356–367). Dordrecht: Springer.

Paiva, C. G. (2004). *Discurso parlamentar. Bases para elaboração ou como é que se começa?* [Parliamentary discourse. Basis for the elaboration, or how we start it?]. Brasília: Aslegis.

Pajunen, J. (2011). Acceptance. Epistemic concepts, and argumentation theory. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1428–1437). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Palczewski, C. (1989). Parallels between Japanese and American debate. A paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Annual Conferecen in Kansas City, Missouri, April 14.

Palczewski, C. H. (2002). Argument in an off key. Playing with the productive limits of argument. In G. T. Goodnight (Ed.), *Arguing communication and culture* (pp. 1–23). Washington, DC: NCA.

Palczewski, C. H., Fritch, J., & Parrish, N. C. (Eds.). (2012). Forum. Argument scholars respond to Mercier and Sperber's argumentative theory of human reason. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(3), 174–193.

Paliewicz, N. S. (2012). Global warming and the interaction between the public and technical spheres of argument. When standards for expertise really matter. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(2), 231–242.

Palmieri, R. (2009). Regaining trust through argumentation in the context of the current financial-economic crisis. *Studies in Communication Sciences, 9*(2), 59–78.

Parodi, G. (2000). La evaluación de la producción de textos escritos argumentativos. Una alternancia cognitivo/discursiva [The evaluation of written argumentative texts production. A cognitive/discoursive alternation). *Revista Signos, 33*(47), 151–16.

Parsons, S., Sierra, C., & Jennings, N. R. (1998). Agents that reason and negotiate by arguing. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 8*, 261–292.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

de Pater, W. A. (1965). *Les topiques d'Aristote et la dialectique platonicienne. La méthodologie de la definition* [Aristotle's *Topics* and platonic dialectic. The methodology of definition] (Etudes thomistiques, Vol. 10). Fribourg: Editions St. Paul.

de Pater, W. A. (1968). La fonction du lieu et de l'instrument dans les *Topiques* [The function of commonplace (*topos*) and instrument in the *Topics*]. In G. E. L. Owen (Ed.), *Aristotle on dialectic: The Topics. Proceedings of the third symposium aristotelicum* (pp. 164–188). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Patterson, J. W., & Zarefsky, D. (1983). *Contemporary debate*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Paul, R. (1982). Teaching critical thinking in the strong sense. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 4*, 2–7.

Paul, R. (1989). Critical thinking in North America. A new theory of knowledge, learning, and literacy. *Argumentation, 3*, 197–235.

Paul, R. (1990). *Critical thinking*. Rohnert Park: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique.

Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking. Tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life*. Upper Saddle River: Financial Times Press. (Chinese trans. 2010).

Pavčnik, M. (1993). The value of argumentation theory for the quality of reasoning in law. In G. Haarscher (Ed.), *Chaïm Perelman et la pensée contemporaine* [Chaïm Perelman and comtemporary thought] (pp. 237–244). Brussels: Bruylant.

Pearce, K. C., & Fadely, D. (1992). Justice, sacrifice, and the universal audience. George Bush's "Address to the nation announcing allied military action in the Persian Gulf". *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 22*(2), 39–50.

Pearl, J. (1988). *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems. Networks of plausible inference*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.

Pearl, J. (2000/2009). *Causality. Models, reasoning, and inference* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1st ed. 2000).

Pedersen, S. H. (2011). Reasonable non-agreement in discussions. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1486–1495). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Peón, M. (2004). *Habilidades argumentativas de alumnos de primaria y su fortalecimiento* [Argumentative skills and their reinforcement in primary school students]. Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Pera, M. (1991). *Scienza e retorica* [Science and rhetoric]. Bari: Laterza.

Pera, M. (1994). *The discourses of science* (trans. of *Scienza e retorica*. Bari: Laterza, 1991). Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.

Perdue, D. E. (1992). *Debate in Tibetan Buddhism*. New York: Snow Lion Publications.

Pereda, C. (1992a). *Razón e incertidumbre* [Reason and uncertainty]. México: Siglo XXI.

Pereda, C. (1992b). *Vértigos argumentales. Una ética de la disputa* [Argumentative Vertigos: An ethics of dispute]. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Perelman, C. (1933). *De l'arbitraire dans la connaissance* [On the arbitrary in knowledge]. Brussels: Archives de la Societé Belge de Philosophie.

Perelman, C. (1963). *The idea of justice and the problem of argument*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Perelman, C. (1968). Recherches interdisciplinairs sur l'argumentation [Interdisciplinary research on argumentation]. *Logique et analyse, 11*(44), 502–511.

Perelman, C. (1969). *Le champ de l'argumentation* [The field of argumentation]. Brussels: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles.

Perelman, C. (1970). The new rhetoric. A theory of practical reasoning. *The great ideas today. Part 3: The contemporary status of a great idea* (pp. 273–312). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Perelman, C. (1971). The new rhetoric. In L. F. Bitzer & E. Black (Eds.), *The prospect of rhetoric* (pp. 115–122). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Perelman, C. (1974). Perspectives rhétoriques sur les problemes sémantiques [Rhetorical perspectives on semantic problems]. *Logique et analyse, 17*(67–68), 241–252.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Perelman, C. (1976). *Logique juridique, nouvelle rhétorique* [Judicial logic, new rhetoric]. Paris: Dalloz.

Perelman, C. (1977). *L'empire rhétorique. Rhétorique et argumentation* [The realm of rhetoric. Rhetoric and argumentation]. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin. (Portuguese trans.: R. A. Grácio and F. Trindade as *O império retórico. Retórica e argumentação*, 1992. Porto: Asa.). (Spanish trans.: A. L. Gómez as *El imperio retórico. Retórica y argumentación*. Bogota: Norma, 1997).

Perelman, C. (1979a). La philosophie du pluralisme et la nouvelle rhétorique [The philosophy of pluralism and the new rhetoric]. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie, 127*(128), 5–17.

Perelman, C. (1979b). *The New Rhetoric and the humanities*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Perelman, C. (1979c). The rational and the reasonable. In C. Perelman (Eds.), *The new rhetoric and the humanities. Essays on rhetoric and its applications* (pp. 117–123). With an introduction by Harold Zyskind. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Perelman, C. (1980). *Justice, law, and argument. Essays on moral and legal reasoning*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Perelman, C. (1982). *The realm of rhetoric*. Trans.: W. Kluback. Introduction by C. C. Arnold. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perelman, C. (1984). The new rhetoric and the rhetoricians. (trans.: R. D. Dearin) *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*, 199–196.

Perelman, C. (1992). *O império retórico. Retórica e argumentação*, 1992. Porto: Asa. (Portuguese trans. by R. A. Grácio and F. Trindade of C. Perelman (1977). *L'empire rhétorique. Rhétorique et argumentation*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin).

Perelman, C. (1997). *El imperio retórico. Retórica y argumentación*. Bogota: Norma. (Spanish trans. by A. León Gómez of C. Perelman (1977). *L'empire rhétorique. Rhétorique et argumentation*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation* [The new rhetoric. Treatise on argumentation]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles). (trans. into Italian (1966), English (1969), Portuguese (1996), Romanian (2012), Spanish (1989)).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1966). *Trattato dell'argomentazione. La nuova retorica* [Treatise on argumentation. The new rhetoric]. Turin: Einaudi. (Italian trans. of C. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles)).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric. A treatise on argumentation* (Trans.). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. (English trans. by J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver of C. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles)).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1989). *Tratado de la argumentación. La nueva retórica*. Madrid: Gredos. (Spanish trans. by J. Sevilla of C. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles)).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1996). *Tratado da argumentação. A nova retórica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes. (Portugese trans. by M. E. G. G. Pereira of C. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles)).

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (2008). *Traité de l'argumentation* [Treatise on argumentation]. Preface by Michel Meyer. Brussels: Éditions de Université libre de Bruxelles.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (2012). *Tratat de argumentare. Noua Retorică*. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza". (Romanian trans. by A. Stoica of C. Perelman & L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958). *La nouvelle rhétorique. Traité de l'argumentation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (3rd ed. Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles)).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Perelman, C., Zyskind, H., Kluback, W., Becker, M., Jacques, F., Barilli, R., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L., Apostel, L., Haarscher, G., Robinet, A., Meyer, M., Van Noorden, S., Vasoli, C., Griffin-Collart, E., Maneli, M., Gadamer, H.-G., Raphael, D. D., Wroblewski, J., Tarello, G., & Foriers, P. (1979). La nouvelle rhétorique – The new rhetoric. Essais en hommage à Chaïm Perelman. Special issue *Revue Internationale de Philosophie, 33, 127–128*.

Pernot, L. (2005). *Rhetoric in antiquity* (W. E. Higgins, trans.). Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Pery-Borissov, V., & Yanoshevsky, G. (2011). How authors justify their participation in literary interviews. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1504–1514). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Peters, T. N. (1989). On the natural development of public activity. A critique of Goodnight's theory of argument. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 26–32). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986a). *Communication and persuasion. Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. New York: Springer.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986b). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 19*, pp. 123–205). San Diego: Academic Press.

Piaget, J. (1923). *Le langage et la pensée chez l'enfant* [Language and thinking of children]. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé.

Piaget, J., & Beth, E. W. (1961). *Epistémologie mathématique et psychologie. Essai sur les relations entre la logique formelle et la pensée réelle* [Mathematical epistemology and psychology. Study on the relation between formal logic and natural thought] Paris: PUF, EEG XIV.

Piazza, F. (2004). *Linguaggio, persuasione e verità. La retorica del Novecento* [Language, persuasion and truth. The rhetoric of the twentieth century]. Rome: Carocci.

Piazza, F. (2008). *La retorica di Aristotele. Introduzione alla lettura*. [The rhetoric of Aristotle. An introduction]. Rome: Carocci.

Pietarinen, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Problems of argumentation, I & II* (p. 5). Turku: Reports from the Department of Practical Philosophy.

Pike, K. L. (1967). Etic and emic standpoints for the description of behavior. In D. C. Hildum (Ed.), *Language and thought. An enduring problem in psychology* (pp. 32–39). Princeton: Van Norstrand.

Pilotta, J. J. (1986). The concrete-universal. A social science foundation. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 379–392). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Pinborg, J. (1969). Topik und Syllogistik im Mittelalter. [Topics and syllogistic in the Middle Ages]. In F. Hoffmann, L. Scheffczyk, & K. Feiernis (Eds.), *Sapienter ordinare. Festgabe für Erich Kleineidam* [*Sapienter ordinare*. Present for Erich KLeineidam] (Ehrfurter Theologischen Studien, Vol. 24, pp. 157–178). Leipzig: St. Benno.

Pineda, O. (2004). *Propuesta metodológica para la enseñanza de la redacción de textos argumentativos. Revisión del programa de taller de lectura y redacción II del Colegio de Bachilleres* [A methodological proposal for teaching argumentative texts writing skills. A revision of the program of the workshop on reading and writing II of Colegio de Bachilleres]. Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Pinto, R. (2006). *Argumentação em géneros persuasivos – um estudo contrastivo* [Argumentation in persuasive genres – a contrastive study]. Lisbon: Universidade Nova de Lisbon. Doctoral dissertation, New University of Lisbon.

Pinto, R. (2010). *Como argumentar e persuadir? Prática política, jurídica, jornalistica* [How to argue and persuade? Political, legal and journalistic practice]. Lisbon: Quid Juris.

Pinto, R. C. (1994). Logic, epistemology and argument appraisal. In R. H. Johnson & J. A. Blair (Eds.), *New essays in informal logic* (pp. 116–124). Windsor: Informal Logic.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Pinto, R. C. (2001). *Argument, inference and dialectic. Collected papers on informal logic with an introduction by Hans V Hansen*. Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer.
Pinto, R. C. (2006). Evaluating inferences. The nature and role of warrants. *Informal Logic, 26*(3), 287–327. (Reprinted in D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays on argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 115–144). Dordrecht: Springer.
Pinto, R. C. (2007). Review of Maurice Finocchiaro, *Arguments about arguments. Argumentation, 21*, 93–100.
Pinto, R. C. (2009). Argumentation and the force of reasons. *Informal Logic, 29*(3), 263–297.
Pinto, R. C. (2010). The uses of argument in communicative contexts. *Argumentation, 24*(2), 227–252.
Pinto, R. C. (2011). The account of warrants in Bermejo-Luque's *Giving reasons. Theoria, 72*, 311–320.
Pinto, R. C., & Blair, J. A. (1989). *Information, inference and argument. A handbook of critical thinking*. Internal publication University of Windsor.
Pinto, R. C., & Blair, J. A. (1993). *Reasoning. A practical guide*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Plantin, C. (1990). *Essais sur l'argumentation. Introduction à l'étude linguistique de la parole argumentative* [Essays on argumentation. Introduction to the linguistic study of argumentative speech]. Paris: Éditions Kimé, Argumentation et sciences du langage.
Plantin, C. (1995). L'argument du paralogisme [The fallacy argument]. *Hermes, 15*, 245–262.
Plantin, C. (1996). *L'argumentation* [Argumentation]. Paris: Le Seuil.
Plantin, C. (1997). L'argumentation dans l'émotion [Argumentation in the emotion]. *Pratiques, 96*, 81–99.
Plantin, C. (2002). Argumentation studies and discourse analysis. The French situation and global perspectives. *Discourse Studies, 4*(3), 343–368.
Plantin, C. (2003). Argumentation studies in France. A new legitimacy. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view. Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 173–187). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Plantin, C. (2004a). On the inseparability of emotion and reason in argumentation. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Emotions in dialogic interactions* (pp. 265–275). Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.
Plantin, C. (2004b). Situation des études d'argumentation. De délégitimations en réinventions [The situation of argumentation studies. From de-authorization to reinvention]. In M. Doury & S. Moirand (Eds.), *L'Argumentation aujourd'hui. Positions théoriques en confrontation* [Argumentation today. Confrontation of theoretical positions] (pp. 160–181). Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.
Plantin, C. (2005). *L'argumentation. Histoire, théories, perspectives* [Argumentation. History, theories, perspectives]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. (transl. into Portuguese (2008)).
Plantin, C. (2008). *A argumentação. História, teorias, perspectivas*. São Paulo: Parábola. (Portuguese trans. by M. Marcionilo of C. Plantin (2005). *L'argumentation. Histoire, théories, perspectives*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).
Plantin, C. (2009a). Critique de la parole. Les fallacies dans le procès argumentatif [Criticism of what is said. The fallacies in the argumentative process]. In V. Atayan & D. Pirazzini (Eds.), *Argumentation. Théorie – Langue – Discours. Actes de la section 'Argumentation' du XXX. Deutscher Romanistentag, Vienne, Septembre 2007* [Argumentation. Theory - language - discourse] (pp. 51–70). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
Plantin, C. (2009b). A place for figures of speech in argumentation theory. *Argumentation, 23*(3), 325–337.
Plantin, C. (2010). Les instruments de structuration des séquences argumentatives Argumentatives [Instruments for the structuring of argumentative sequences]. *Verbum, 32*(1), 31–51.
Plantin, C. (2011). *Les bonnes raisons des émotions. Arguments, fallacies, affects* [The good reasons of emotions. Arguments, fallacies, affects]. Bern: Peter Lang.
Plantin, C., Doury, M., & Traverso, V. (2000). *Les émotions dans les interactions* [Emotions in interactions]. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Plantinga, A. (1993). *Warrant and proper function*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Plato. (1997). *Complete Works*. Ed. by J. M. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson. Indianapolis-Cambridge, MA: Hackett.
Plug, H. J. (1999). Evaluating tests for reconstructing the structure of legal argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 639–643). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Plug, H. J. (2000a). Indicators of *obiter dicta*. A pragma-dialectical analysis of textual clues for the reconstruction of legal argumentation. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 8*, 189–203.
Plug, H. J. (2000b). *In onderlinge samenhang bezien. De pragma-dialectische reconstructie van complexe argumentatie in rechterlijke uitspraken* [Considered in mutual interdependence. The pragma-dialectical reconstruction of complex argumentation in pronouncements of judges. Amsterdam: Thela Press. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
Plug, H. J. (2002). Maximally argumentative analysis of judicial argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 261–270). Amsterdam-Newport News: Sic Sat/Vale Press.
Plug, H. J. (2010). Ad-hominem arguments in Dutch and European parliamentary debates.Strategic manoeuvring in an institutional context. In C. Ilie (Ed.), *Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates* (pp. 305–328). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Plug, H. J. (2011). Parrying ad-hominem arguments in parliamentary debates. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1570–1578). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).
Poblete, C. (2003). *Relación entre competencia textual argumentativa y metacognición* [The relationship between textual argumentative competence and metacognition]. Doctoral dissertation, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso.
Pollock, J. L. (1987). Defeasible reasoning. *Cognitive Science, 11*, 481–518.
Pollock, J. L. (1989). *How to build a person. A prolegomenon*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Pollock, J. L. (1994). Justification and defeat. *Artificial Intelligence, 67*, 377–407.
Pollock, J. L. (1995). *Cognitive carpentry. A blueprint for how to build a person*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Pollock, J. L. (2006). *Thinking about acting. Logical foundations for rational decision making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Pollock, J. L. (2010). Defeasible reasoning and degrees of justification. *Argument & Computation, 1*(1), 7–22.
Polya, G. (1968). *Mathematics and plausible reasoning, 2, Patterns of plausible inference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Poole, D. L. (1985). On the comparison of theories. Preferring the most specific explanation. In *Proceedings of the ninth international joint conference on artificial intelligence* (pp. 144–147). San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann.
van Poppel, L. (2011). Solving potential disputes in health brochures with pragmatic argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1559–1570). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).
van Poppel, L. (2013). *Getting the vaccine now will protect you in the future! A pragma-dialectical analysis of strategic maneuvering with pragmatic argumentation in health brochures*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
van Poppel, L., & Rubinelli, S. (2011). 'Try the smarter way'. On the claimed efficacy of advertised medicines. In E. Feteris, B. Garssen, & F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics. In honor of Frans H. van Eemeren* (pp. 153–163). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Popper, K. R. (1972). *Objective knowledge. An evolutionary approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Popper, K. R. (1974). *Conjectures and refutations. The growth of scientific knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Posada, P. (2010). *Argumentación, teoría y práctica. Manual introductorio a las teorías de la argumentación* [Argumentation, theory and practice. Introductory handbook of argumentation theories] (2nd ed.). Cali: Programa Editorial Univalle.

Povarnin, S. I. (1923). *Iskusstvo spora. O teorii i praktike spora* [The art of argument. On the theory and practice of arguing]. Petrograd: Nachatki znanii.

Prakken, H. (1993). *Logical tools for modelling legal argument*. Doctoral dissertation, Free University Amsterdam.

Prakken, H. (1997). *Logical tools for modelling legal argument. A study of defeasible reasoning in law*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Prakken, H. (2005a). A study of accrual of arguments, with applications to evidential reasoning. In *Proceedings of the tenth international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 85–94). New York: ACM Press.

Prakken, H. (2005b). Coherence and flexibility in dialogue games for argumentation. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 15*, 1009–1040.

Prakken, H. (2006a). Artificial intelligence & law, logic and argument schemes. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 231–245). Dordrecht: Springer.

Prakken, H. (2006b). Formal systems for persuasion dialogue. *The Knowledge Engineering Review, 21*(2), 163–188.

Prakken, H. (2009). Models of persuasion dialogue. In I. Rahwan & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Argumentation in artificial intelligence* (pp. 281–300). Dordrecht: Springer.

Prakken, H. (2010). An abstract framework for argumentation with structured arguments. *Argument and Computation, 1*, 93–124.

Prakken, H. (2013). *Argumentación jurídica, derrotabilidad e Inteligencia artificial* [Legal argumentation, defeasibility and artificial intelligence]. Santiago: Universidad Diego Portales.

Prakken, H., & Sartor, G. (1996). A dialectical model of assessing conflicting arguments in legal reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 4*, 331–368.

Prakken, H., & Sartor, G. (1998). Modelling reasoning with precedents in a formal dialogue game. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 6*, 231–287.

Prakken, H., & Sartor, G. (2007). Formalising arguments about the burden of persuasion. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 97–106). New York: ACM Press.

Prakken, H., & Sartor, G. (2009). A logical analysis of burdens of proof. In H. Kaptein, H. Prakken, & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Legal evidence and proof. Statistics, stories, logic* (pp. 223–253). Farnham: Ashgate.

Prakken, H., & Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (2002). Logics for defeasible argumentation. In D. Gabbay & F. Guenthner (Eds.), *Handbook of philosophical logic* (2nd ed., Vol. IV, pp. 219–318). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Pratt, J. M. (1970). The appropriateness of a Toulmin analysis of legal argumentation. *Speaker and Gavel, 7*, 133–137.

Prelli, L. J. (1989). *A rhetoric of science. Inventing scientific discourse*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Prian, J. (2007). *Didáctica de la argumentación. Su enseñanza en la Escuela Nacional Preparatoria* [Argumentation didactics. Its teaching in the *Escuela Nacional Preparatoria*). Doctoral dissertation, National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Pseudo-Scotus. (2001). Questions on Aristotle's Prior analytics. In Yrjönsuuri (Ed.), *Medieval formal logic* (pp. 225–234). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Puchkova, A. (2011). *Rechevoj zhanr 'kantseliarskaya otpiska'. Lingvo-argumentativnyj analiz* [The speech genre 'bureaucratic runaround'. A linguo-argumentative analysis]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Puckova, Y. V. (2006). *Argumentativno-lingvisticheskij analiz diskursa oproverzhenij* [An - argumentative-linguistic analysis of refutation discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.
Puig, L. (2012). Doxa and persuasion in lexis. *Argumentation, 26*(1), 127–142.
Purtill, R. L. (1972). *Logical thinking*. New York: Harper.
Putnam, L. L., Wilson, S. R., Waltman, M. S., & Turner, D. (1986). The evolution of case arguments in teachers' bargaining. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23*, 63–81.
Quine, W. V. (1970). *Philosophy of logic*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
Quintrileo, C. (2007). Análisis como reconstrucción en la discusión parlamentaria. Una aproximación desde el enfoque de la pragma-dialéctica [Analysis as reconstruction in parliamentarian discussion. An approach from the pragma-dialectical perspective]. In C. Santibáñez Yáñez & B. Riffo (Eds.), *Estudios en argumentación y retórica. Teorías contemporáneas y aplicaciones* [Studies in argumentation and rhetoric. Contemporary theories and applications] (pp. 253–272.). Concepción: Editorial Universidad de Concepción.
Quiroz, G., Apothéloz, D., & Brandt, P.-Y. (1992). How counter-argumentation works. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 172–177). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Raccah, P-Y. (2006). Polyphonie et argumentation. Des discours à la langue (et retour) [Polyphony and argumentation. From discourse to language (and back)]. In Z. Simonffy (Ed.), *L'un et le multiple* [The one and the multiple] (pp. 120–152). Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
Raccah, P.-Y. (2011). Racines lexicales de l'argumentation [The lexical roots of argumentation]. *Verbum, 32*(1), 119–141.
Radeva, V. (2000). *Реторика* [Rhetoric]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
Radeva, V. (2006). *Реторика и аргументация* [Rhetoric and argumentation]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.
Radi, R. al (2010). *Al-Ḥijāj wa Almughālatah. Min al-Ḥiwār Fī Al'Akl ilā Al'Akl fī al-Ḥiwār* [From dialogue to reason to reason in dialogue]. Beirut: Dar al-Kitāb al-jadīd.
Rahwan, I., & McBurney, P. (2007). Argumentation technology. Guest editors' introduction. *IEEE Intelligent Systems, 22*(6), 21–23.
Rahwan, I., Ramchurn, S. D., Jennings, N. R., McBurney, P., Parsons, S., & Sonenberg, E. (2003). Argumentation-based negotiation. *Knowledge Engineering Review, 18*(4), 343–375.
Rahwan, I., & Simari, G. R. (Eds.). (2009). *Argumentation in artificial intelligence*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Rahwan, I., Zablith, F., & Reed, C. (2007). Laying the foundations for a world wide argument web. *Artificial Intelligence, 171*(10–15), 897–921.
Rambourg, C. (2011). *Les* topoi *d'Aristote,* Rhetorique *II, 23. Enquête sur les origins de la notion de lieu rhétorique* [The *topoi* in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* II, 23. An examination of the origins of the notion of a rhetorical topic]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Paris XII.
Rao, A., & Georgeff, M. (1995). BDI agents. From theory to practice. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on multi-agent systems* (pp. 312–319). San Francisco: AAAI Press/ Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Rapp, C. (2002). *Aristoteles. Rhetorik* [Aristotle. Rhetoric]. (trans. with a commentary by C. Rapp). 2 Volumes. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
Rapp, C. (2010). Aristotle's rhetoric. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy (Spring 2010 Edition)*. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/aristotle-rhetoric/
Ray, J. W. (1978). Perelman's universal audience. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 64*, 361–375.
Reboul, O. (1988). Can there be non-rhetorical argumentation? *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 21*, 220–223.
Reboul, O. (1990). Rhétorique et dialectique chez Aristote [Aristotle's views on rhetoric and dialectic]. *Argumentation, 4*, 35–52.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Reboul, O. (1991). *Introduction à la rhétorique. Théorie et pratique* [Introduction to rhetoric. Theory and practice]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Reed, C. A. (1997). Representing and applying knowledge for argumentation in a social context. *AI and Society, 11*(3–4), 138–154.

Reed, C. A. (1999). The role of saliency in generating natural language arguments. In: *Proceedings of the 16th international joint conference on AI (IJCAI'99)* (pp. 876–881). San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann.

Reed, C. A., & Grasso, F. (2007). Recent advances in computational models of natural argument. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 22*, 1–15.

Reed, C. A., & Norman, T. J. (2003). A roadmap of research in argument and computation. In C. A. Reed & T. J. Norman (Eds.), *Argumentation machinescv. New frontiers in argument and computation* (pp. 1–12). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Reed, C. A., & Norman, T. J. (2004). A roadmap of research in argument and computation. In C. A. Reed & T. J. Norman (Eds.), *Argumentation machines. New frontiers in argument and computation* (pp. 1–13). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Reed, C. A., & Norman, T. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Argumentation machines. New frontiers in argument and computation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Reed, C. A., & Rowe, G. W. A. (2004). Araucaria. Software for argument analysis, diagramming and representation. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools, 13*(4), 961–979.

Reed, C. A., & Rowe, G. W. A. (2006). Translation Toulmin diagrams. Theory neutrality in argumentation representation. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 341–358). Dordrecht: Springer.

Reed, C. A., & Tindale, C. W. (Eds.). (2010). *Dialectics, dialogue and argumentation. An examination of Douglas Walton's theories of reasoning*. London: College Publications.

van Rees, M. A. (1989). Het kritische gehalte van probleemoplossende discussies [The critical quality of problem-solving discussions]. In M. M. H. Bax & W. Vuijk (Eds.), *Thema's in de taalbeheersing* [Themes in speech communication research] (pp. 29–36). Dordrecht: ICG Publications.

van Rees, M. A. (1991). Problem solving and critical discussion. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 281–291). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Rees, M. A. (1992a). The adequacy of speech act theory for explaining conversational phenomena. A response to some conversation analytical critics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 17*, 31–47.

van Rees, M. A. (1992b). Problem solving and critical discussion. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 281–291). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Rees, M. A. (1994a). Analysing and evaluating problem-solving discussions. In F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Studies in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 197–217). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Rees, M. A. (1994b). Functies van herhalingen in informele discussies [Functions of repetitions in informal discussions]. In A. Maes, P. van Hauwermeiren & L. van Waes (Eds.), *Perspectieven in taalbeheersingsonderzoek* [Perspectives in speech communication research] (pp. 44–56). Dordrecht: ICG.

van Rees, M. A. (1995a). Argumentative discourse as a form of social interaction. Implications for dialectical reconstruction. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation, III* (p. 159/167). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

van Rees, M. A. (1995b). Functions of repetition in informal discussions. In C. Bazanella (Ed.), *Repetition in dialogue* (pp. 141–155). Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.

van Rees, M. A. (2001). Review of R. H. Johnson, *Manifest rationality. A pragmatic theory of argument. Argumentation, 15*, 231–237.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

van Rees, M. A. (2003). Within pragma-dialectics. Comments on Bonevac. *Argumentation, 17*(4), 461–464.

van Rees, M. A. (2005). Dissociation. A dialogue technique. In M. Dascal, F. H. van Eemeren, E. Rigotti, S. Stati & A. Rocci (Eds.), *Argumentation in dialogic interaction* (pp. 35–50). Special issue of *Studies in Communication Sciences*.

van Rees, M. A. (2006). Strategic maneuvering with dissociation. *Argumentation, 20*, 473–487.

van Rees, M. A. (2009). *Dissociation in argumentative discussions. A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Regner, A. C. (2007). The polemical interaction between Darwin and Mivart. A lesson on refuting objections. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1119–1126). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Regner, A. C. (2008). The polemical interaction between Darwin and Mivart. A lesson on refuting objection. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 51–75). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Regner, A. C. (2009). Charles Darwin versus George impart. The role of polemic in science. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 51–75). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Regner, A. C. (2011). Three kinds of polemical interaction. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA)* (pp. 1646–1657). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Rehbein, J. (1995). Zusammengesetzte Verweiswörter in argumentativer Rede [Composite anaphora in argumentative speech]. In H. Wohlrapp (Ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung* [Roads of argumentation research] (pp. 166–197). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

Reidhav, D. (2007). *Reasoning by analogy. A study on analogy-based arguments in law*. Lund: Lund University.

Reinard, J. C. (1984). The role of Toulmin's categories of message development in persuasive communication. Two experimental studies on attitude change. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 20*, 206–223.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination. Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). London: Sage. (1st ed. 2001).

Reiter, R. (1980). A logic for default reasoning. *Artificial Intelligence, 13*, 81–132.

Renko, T. (1995). Argument as a scientific notion. Problems of interpretation and identification. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994, III* (pp. 177–182). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Rescher, N. (1959). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *Modern Schoolman, 36*, 237–238.

Rescher, N. (1964). *Introduction to logic*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Rescher, N. (1977). *Dialectics. A controversy-oriented approach to the theory of knowledge*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rescher, N. (2007). *Dialectics. A classical approach to inquiry*. Ontos: Frankfurt am Main.

van het Reve, K. (1977). Hoe anders is de Sowjetmens [How different, these people from the Soviet Union]. *NRC Handelsblad*, 11–3–1977, 8.

Reygadas, P. (2005). *El arte de argumentar* [The art of arguing]. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México.

Reygadas, P., & Guzman, J. (2007). Visual schematization. Advertising and gender in Mexico. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth*

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (pp. 1135–1139). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Ribak, R. (1995). Divisive and consensual constructions in the political discourse of Jews and Palestinians in Israel. Dilemmas and constructions. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Special fields. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), IV* (pp. 205–215). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Ribeiro, H. J. (Ed.). (2009). *Rhetoric and argumentation in the beginning of the XXIst century*. Coimbra: Coimbra University Press.

Ribeiro, H. J. (Ed.). (2012). *Inside arguments. Logic and the study of argumentation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ribeiro, H. J. (Ed.). (2013). Aristotle and contemporary argumentation theory. *Argumentation, 27* (1), 1–6.

Ribeiro, H. J., & Vicente, J. N. (2010). *O lugar da lógica e da argumentation no ensino filosofia* [The place of logic and argumentation in the teaching of philosophy]. Coimbra: Unidade de I&D LIF.

Rieke, R. D. (1986). The evolution of judicial justification. Perelman's concept of the rational and the reasonable. In J. L. Golden & J. J. Pilotta (Eds.), *Practical reasoning in human affairs. Studies in honor of Chaïm Perelman* (pp. 227–244). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Rieke, R. D., & Sillars, M. O. (1975). *Argumentation and the decision-making process*. New York: Wiley.

Rieke, R. D., & Stutman, R. K. (1990). *Communication in legal advocacy*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Rigotti, E. (2009). Whether and how classical topics can be revived within contemporary argumentation theory. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Pondering on problems of argumentation* (pp. 157–178). New York: Springer.

Rigotti, E., & Greco [Morasso], S. (2006). *Topics. The argument generator*. Argumentum e-learning Module. www.argumentum.ch

Rigotti, E., & Greco Morasso, S. (2009). Argumentation as an object of interest and as a social and cultural resource. In N. Muller-Mirza & A. N. Perret-Clermont (Eds.), *Argumentation and education* (pp. 9–66). New York: Springer.

Rigotti, E., & Greco Morasso, S. (2010). Comparing the argumentation model of topics to other contemporary approaches to argument schemes. The procedural and material components. *Argumentation, 24*(4), 489–512.

Rigotti, E., & Rocci, A. (2005). From argument analysis to cultural keywords (and back again). In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Argumentation in practice* (pp. 125–142). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rigotti, E., & Rocci, A. (2006). Towards a definition of communicative context. Foundations of an interdisciplinary approach to communication. *Studies in Communication Sciences, 6*(2), 155–180.

Rissland, E. L., & Ashley, K. D. (1987). A case-based system for trade secrets law. In *Proceedings of the first international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 60–66). New York: ACM Press.

Rissland, E. L., & Ashley, K. D. (2002). A note on dimensions and factors. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 10*, 65–77.

Ritola, J. (1999). Wilson on circular arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 705–708). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Ritola, J. (2003). On reasonable question-begging arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 913–917). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Ritola, J. (2004). *Begging the question. A study of a fallacy*. Turku: Paino-Salama. Reports from the Department of Philosophy, 13. Doctoral dissertation, University of Turku.

Ritola, J. (2007). Irresolvable conflicts and begging the question. In J. A. Blair, H. Hansen, R. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *OSSA Proceedings 2007*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Ritola, J. (2009). Two accounts of begging the question. In J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument cultures. Proceedings of the 8th OSSA conference at the University of Windsor in 2009*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Ritola, J. (Ed., 2012). *Tutkimuksia argumentaatiosta* [Studies on argumentation]. Turku: Paino-Salama. Reports from the Department of Philosophy, 24.

Ritoók, Z. (1975). Zur Geschichte des Topos-Begriffes [On the history of the concept of *topos*]. In *Actes de la XIIe conférence internationale d'études classiques* [Proceedings of the 12th international conference on classical studies] "Eirene," Cluj-Napoca, 2–7 October 1972 (pp. 111–114). Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*, 155–169.

Rivano, E. (1999). *De la argumentación* [On argumentation]. Santiago: Bravo y Allende Editores.

Rivano, J. (1984). *El modelo de Toulmin* [The Toulmin model]. Manuscript.

Riveret, R., Rotolo, A., Sartor, G., Prakken, H., & Roth, B. (2007). Success chances in argument games. A probabilistic approach to legal disputes. In A. R. Lodder & L. Mommers (Eds.), *Legal knowledge and information systems (JURIX 2007)* (pp. 99–108). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Rocci, A. (2008). Modality and its conversational backgrounds in the reconstruction of argumentation. *Argumentation, 22*, 165–189.

Rocci, A. (2009a). Manoeuvring with tropes. The case of the metaphorical polyphonic and framing of arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 257–282). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rocci, A. (2009b). Manoeuvring with voices. The polyphonic framing of arguments in an institutional advertisement. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining Argumentation in Context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 257–283). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Rodrigues, S. G. C. (2010). *Questões de dialogismo. O discurso científico, o eu e os outros* [Questions of dialogue. The scientific discourse, the I and the others]. Recife: Editora Universitária da UFPE.

Roesler, C. (2004). *Theodor Viehweg e a ciência do direito* [Theodor Viehweg and legal science]. Florianópolis: Momento Atual.

Roesler, C., & Senra, L. (2012). Lei de anistia e justiça de transição. A releitura da ADPF 153 sob o viés argumentativo e principiológico [Amnesty law and transitional justice. Re-reading the ADPF 153 from an argumentative and principiological point of view]. *Seqüência, 64*, 131–160.

Roesler, C., & Tavares da Silva, P. (2012). Argumentação jurídica e direito antitruste. Analise de casos [Legal argumentation and antitrust law. Analysis of cases]. *Revista Jurídica da Presidência da Republica, 14*(102), 13–43.

Rogers, K. (2009). *Tibetan logic*. New York: Snow Lion Publications.

Rolf, B., & Magnusson, C. (2003). Developing the art of argumentation. A software approach. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 919–925). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Roque, G. (2008). Political rhetoric in visual images. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Dialogue and rhetoric* (pp. 185–193). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Roque, G. (2010). What is visual in visual argumentation? In J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument cultures. Proceedings of the 8th OSSA conference at the University of Windsor in 2009*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Roque, G. (2011a). Rhétorique visuelle et argumentation visuelle [Visual rhetoric and visual argumentation]. *Semen, 32*, 91–106.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Roque, G. (2011b). Visual argumentation. A reappraisal. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1720–1734). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Roth, B. (2003). *Case-based reasoning in the law. A formal theory of reasoning by case comparison*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maastricht.

Roulet, E. (1989). De la structure de la conversation à la structure d'autres types de discours [From the structure of conversation to the structure of other types of discourse]. In C. Rubattel (Ed.), *Modèles du discours. Recherches actuelles en Suisse romande* (pp. 35–60). Bern: Peter Lang.

Roulet, E. (1999). *La description de l'organisation du discours* [The description of the organization of discourse]. Paris: Didier.

Roulet, E., Auchlin, A., Moeschler, J., Rubattel, C., & Schelling, M. (1985). *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain* [The organization of discourse in contemporary French]. Bern: Peter Lang.

Roulet, E., Filliettaz, L., Grobet, A., & Burger M. (2001). *Un modèle et un instrument d'analyse du discours* [A model and an instrument for the analysis of discourse]. Bern: Peter Lang.

Rowell, E. Z. (1932). Prolegomena to argumentation, II. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 18*, 238–248.

Rowland, R. C. (1992). Argument fields. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 469–504). Berlin-New York: Foris.

Rowland, R. C. (2012). Spheres of argument. 30 years of influence. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(2), 195–197.

Rozhdestvensky, Y. (2000). *Prinzipy sovremennoy ritoriki* [The principles of modern rhetoric]. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.

Ruan, S. (1991–1992a). Lectures on informal logic. (1) The rise of informal logic. *Logic and Language Learning, 10*(4), 9–11.

Ruan, S. (1991–1992b). Lectures on informal logic. (2) The evaluation of argument. *Logic and Language Learning, 10*(5), 7–10.

Ruan, S. (1991–1992c). Lectures on informal logic. (3) Presupposition. Cooperative principle and implicit premises. *Logic and Language Learning, 10*(6), 9–10.

Ruan, S. (1991–1992d). Lectures on informal logic. (4) Informal fallacies. *Logic and Language Learning, 11*(3), 8–11.

Ruan, S. (1991–1992e). Lectures on informal logic. (5) Constructing argument. *Logic and Language Learning, 11*(5), 7–9.

Rubinelli, S. (2009). *Ars topica. The classical technique of constructing arguments from Aristotle to Cicero* (Argumentation library, Vol. 15). Dordrecht-Boston: Springer.

Rubinelli, S., Nakamoto, K., & Schulz, P. J. (2008). The rabbit in the hat. Dubious argumentation and the persuasive effects of direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription medicines. *Communication and Medicine, 5*(1), 49–58.

Rubinelli, S., & Zanini, C. (2012). Using argumentation theory to identify the challenges of shared decision-making when the doctor and the patient have a difference of opinion. *Journal of Public Health Research, 2*(1), e26.

Ruchkina, Y. (2009). *Linvo-argumentativnyye osobennosti strategij vezhlivosti v rechevom konflikte* [Linguo-argumentative peculiarities of politeness in speech conflict]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Rudanko, J. (2009). Reinstating and defining *ad socordiam* as an informal fallacy. A case study from a political debate in the early American republic. In J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument cultures. Proceedings of the 8th OSSA conference at the University of Windsor in 2009*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Rühl, M. (2001). Emergent vs. dogmatic arguing. Starting points for a theory of the argumentative process. *Argumentation, 15*, 151–171.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Russell, B. (1956). On denoting. In B. Russell, *Logic and knowledge. Essays 1901–1950* (R. C. Marsh, Ed.) (pp. 41–56). London: Allen & Unwin. (Rirst published in *Mind, n.s. 14* (1905), 479–493).

Russell, B. (1961). *History of western philosophy and its connection with political and social circumstances from the earliest times to the present day*. London: Allen & Unwin. (1st ed. 1946).

Ryle, G. (1954). *Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ryle, G. (1976). *The concept of mind* (5th ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin. (1st ed. 1949).

Saarinen, E. (Ed.). (1979). *Game-theoretical semantics: Essays on semantics by Hintikka, Carlson, Peacocke, Rantala, and Saarinen*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics of the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696–735.

Saim, M. (2008). Reforming the Jews, rejecting marginalization. The 1799 German debate on Jewish emancipation in its controversy context. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 93–108). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sainati, V. (1968). *Storia dell' 'organon' aristotelico I: Dai 'Topici' al 'De interpretatione'* [History of the Aristotelian *Organon* I: From the *Topics* to *De interpretatione*]. Florence: Le Monnier.

Sajama, S. (2012). Mikä on oikeudellisen argumentaation ja tulkinnan ero? [What is the difference between judicial argumentation and interpretation?]. In R. Ritola (Ed.), *Tutkimuksia argumentaatiosta* [Studies on argumentation] (pp. 83–97). Turku: Paino-Salama. Reports from the Department of Philosophy, 24.

Sălăvăstru, C. (2003). *Teoria şi practica argumentării* [Theory and practice of argumentation]. Iaşi: Polirom.

Salminen, T., Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (2003). Grounding and counter-argumentation during face-to-face and synchronous network debates in secondary school. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 933–936). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Salminen, T., Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (2010). Visualising knowledge from chat debates in argument diagrams. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 26*(5), 379–391.

Salminen, T., Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (2012). Argumentation in secondary school students' structured and unstructured chat discussions. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 47* (2), 175–208.

Salmon, W. C. (1963). *Logic*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Saltykova, Y. A. (2011). *Funktsionirovaniye inoskazatelnyh frazeologicheskih yedinits v argumentativnom diskurse* [Functioning of allegorical phrasal units in argumentative discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Sammoud, H. (Ed.). (1999). *Ahamm Nathariyyāt al-Ḥijāj fī Attaqālīd al-Gharbiyya min Aristu ilā al-Yawm* [The main theories of argumentation in the Western tradition from Aristotle until today]. Tunis: Manouba University.

Sanders, J. A., Gass, R. H., & Wiseman, R. L. (1991). The influence of type of warrant and receivers' ethnicity on perceptions of warrant strength. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19-22, 1990, 1B* (pp. 709–718). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Sandig, B., & Püschel, U. (Eds., 1992). *Stilistik, III. Argumentationsstile. Germanistische Linguistik* [Stylistics, III. Styles of argumentation. German linguistics]. Hildesheim: Olms.

Sandvik, M. (1995). Methodological implications of the integration of pragma-dialectics and conversation analysis in the study of interactive argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation, III* (pp. 455–467). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Sandvik, M. (1999). Criteria for winning and losing a political debate. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 715–719). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Sandvik, M. (2007). The rhetoric of emotions in political argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1223–1226). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2010a). ¿Retórica, dialéctica o pragmática? A 50 años de *Los usos de la argumentación* de Stephen Toulmin [Rhetoric, dialectics or pragmatics? 50 years of *The uses of argument* of Stephen Toulmin]. *Revista Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación, 42*, 91–125.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2010b). La presunción como acto de habla en la argumentación [Presumption as speech act in argumentation]. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada RLA, 48*(1), 133–152.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2010c). Metaphors and argumentation. The case of Chilean parliamentarian media participation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(4), 973–989.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2012a). Mercier and Sperber's argumentative theory of reasoning. From the psychology of reasoning to argumentation studies. *Informal Logic, 32*(1), 132–159.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2012b). Relevancia, cooperación e intención [Relevance, cooperation and intention]. *Onomazein. Revista de Lingüística y Filología, 25*, 181–204.

Santibáñez Yáñez, C. (2012c). Teoría de la argumentación como epistemología aplicada [Argumentation theory as applied epistemology]. *Cinta de Moebio, 43*, 24–39.

Santos, C. M. M., Mafaldo, M. P., & Marreiros, A. C. (2003). Dealing with alternative views. The case of the Big Bad Wolf and the Three Little Pigs. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 937–941). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Sartor, G. (2005). *Legal reasoning. A cognitive approach to the law, 5. Treatise on legal philosophy and general jurisprudence*. Berlin: Springer.

de Saussure, L. (2010). L'étrange cas de *puis* en usages discursifs et argumentatifs [The strange case of 'puis' [next, moreover] in discursive and argumentative uses]. In C. Vetters & E. Moline (Eds.), *Temps, aspect et modalité en français* (pp. 261–275). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

de Saussure, L., & Oswald, S. (2009). Argumentation et engagement du locuteur. Pour un point de vue subjectiviste [Argumentation and speaker's commitment. Towards a subjectivist point of view]. *Nouveaux Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 29*, 215–243.

Schank, G., & Schwittala, J. (1987). *Konflikte in Gesprächen* [Conflicts in conversation]. Tübingen: Narr.

Schanze, H. (Ed.). (1974). *Rhetorik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16.–20. Jahrhundert* [Rhetoric. Contribution to its history in Germany from the 16th to the 20th century]. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Fischer.

Schellens, P. J. (1979). Vijf bezwaren tegen het Toulmin-model [Five objections to the Toulmin model]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* [Journal of speech communication], *1*, 226–246.

Schellens, P. J. (1985). *Redelijke argumenten. Een onderzoek naar normen voor kritische lezers* [Reasonable arguments. A study of norms for critical readers]. Dordrecht-Cinnaminson: Foris.

Schellens, P. J. (1991). De argumenten *ad verecundiam* en *ad hominem*. Aanvaardbare drogredenen? [The *ad verecundiam* and the *ad hominem* argument. Acceptable fallacies?]. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing, 13*, 134–144.

Schellens, P. J., & de Jong, M. (2004). Argumentation schemes in persuasive brochures. *Argumentation, 18*, 295–323.

Schellens, P. J., & Verhoeven, G. (1988). *Argument en tegenargument. Een inleiding in de analyse en beoordeling van betogende teksten* [Argument and counter-argument. An introduction to the analysis and evaluation of argumentative texts]. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.

Scherer, K. R. (1984). Les émotions. Fonctions et composantes [Emotions. Functions and components]. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive, 4*, 9–39.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Scheuer, O., Loll, F., Pinkwart, N., & McLaren, B. M. (2010). Computer-supported argumentation. A review of the state of the art. *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 5*, 43–102.
Schiappa, E. (1985). Dissociation in the arguments of rhetorical theory. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 72–82.
Schiappa, E. (1989). 'Spheres of argument' as *topoi* for the critical study of power/knowledge. In B. E. Gronbeck (Ed.), *Spheres of argument. Proceedings of the sixth SCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 47–56). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
Schiappa, E. (1990). Did Plato coin the term *rhêtorikê*? *American Journal of Philology, 111*, 460–473.
Schiappa, E. (1993). Arguing about definitions. *Argumentation, 7*, 403–418.
Schiappa, E. (2001). Second thoughts on critiques of Big Rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 34*(3), 260–274.
Schiappa, E. (2002). Evaluating argumentative discourse from a rhetorical perspective. Defining 'person' and 'human life' in constitutional disputes over abortion. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *Dialectic and rhetoric. The warp and woof of argumentation analysis* (pp. 65–80). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Schiappa, E. (2012). Defining marriage in California. An analysis of public and technical argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(2), 211–215.
Schiappa, E., & Swartz, O. (1994). Introduction. In E. Schiappa (Ed.), *Landmarks essays on classical Greek rhetoric*. Davis: Hermagoras Press.
Schiffrin, D. (1990). The management of a co-operative self during argument. The role of opinions and stories. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk* (pp. 241–259). Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press.
Schipper, E. W., & Schuh, E. (1960). *A first course in modern logic*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Schmidt, S. J. (1977). Argumentationstheoretische aspekte einer rationalen Literaturwissenschaft [Argumentation theoretical aspects of a rational theory of literature]. In M. Schecker (Ed.), *Theorie der Argumentation* [Theory of argumentation] (pp. 171–200). Tübingen: Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 76.
Scholz, H. (1967). *Abriss der Geschichte der Logik* [Outline of the history of logic]. (3rd ed.). Munich: Karl Alber. (1st ed., *Geschichte der Logik* [History of logic] 1931).
Schopenhauer, A. (1970). Eristische Dialektik [Eristic dialectic]. In A. Hübscher (Ed.), *Der Handschriftliche Nachlass, III: Berliner Manuskripte (1818–1830)* (pp. 666–695). Frankfurt am Main: Berliner Manuskripte. (1st ed. 1818–1930).
Schreiber, S. G. (2003). *Aristotle on false reasoning. Language and the world in the Sophistical refutations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Schreier, M. N., Groeben, N., & Christmann, U. (1995). That's not fair! Argumentative integrity as an ethics of argumentative communication. *Argumentation, 9*(2), 267–289.
Schuetz, J. (1991). Perelman's rule of justice in Mexican appellate courts. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990* (pp. 804–812). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Schulz, P. (2006). Comment on 'Constrained maneuvering. rhetoric as a rational enterprise'. *Argumentation, 20*(4), 467–471.
Schulz, P. J., & Rubinelli, S. (2008). Arguing 'for' the patient. Informed consent and strategic maneuvering in doctor-patient interaction. *Argumentation, 22*(3), 423–432.
Schwarz, B. B., Neuman, Y., & Biezuner, S. (2000). Two wrongs may make a right... If they argue together! *Cognition and Instruction, 18*(4), 461–494.
Schwarz, B. B., Neuman, Y., Gil, J., & Ilya, M. (2003). Construction of collective and individual knowledge in argumentative activity. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12*(2), 219–256.
Schwed, M. (2003). 'I see your point' – On visual arguments. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings*

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation (pp. 949–951). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Schwed, M. (2005). On the philosophical preconditions for visual arguments. In D. L. Hitchcock (Ed.) *The uses of argument. Proceedings of a conference at McMaster University* (pp. 403–412). Hamilton: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.

Schwemmer, O., & Lorenzen, P. (1973). *Konstruktive Logik, Ethik und Wissenschaftstheorie* [Constructive logic, ethics and theory of science]. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.

Schwitalla, J. (1976). Zur Einführung in die Argumentationstheorie. Begründung durch Daten und Begründung durch Handlungsziele in der Alltagsargumentation [Introduction in the theory of argumentation. Foundation based on data and foundation based on action goals in everyday argumentation]. *Der Deutschunterricht, 28*, 22–36.

Schwitalla, J. (1987). Common argumentation and group identity. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 119–126). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Scott, R. L. (1967). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal, 18*, 9–16.

Scott, R. L. (1999). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. In J. L. Lucaites, C. M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), *Contemporary rhetorical theory. A reader*. New York: Guilford Press.

Scripnic, G. (2011). Strategic manoeuvring with direct evidential strategies. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1789–1798). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat.

Scripnic, G. (2012a). *Communication, argumentation et médiativité. Aspects de l'évidentialité en français et en roumain* [Communication, argumentation, and evidentiality. Aspects of evidentiality in French and Romanian]. Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Scripnic, G. (2012b). Médiativité, mirativité et ajustement stratégique [Evidentiality, mirativity, and strategic maneuvering]. In G. Hassler (Ed.), *Locutions et phrases. Aspects de la pré dication* [Phrases and sentences. Aspects of predication] (pp. 108–116). Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Scriven, M. (1976). *Reasoning*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Scult, A. (1976). Perelman's universal audience. One perspective. *Central States Speech Journal, 27*, 176–180.

Scult, A. (1985). A note on the range and utility of the universal audience. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 84–87.

Scult, A. (1989). Perelman's universal audience. One perspective. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 153–162). Lanham: University Press of America.

Seara, I. R. (2010a). L'épistolaire de condoléances. Une rhétorique de la consolation [The epistolary art of condolences. A rhetoric of comfort. In L.-S. Florea, C. Papahagi, L. Pop, & A. Curea (Eds.), *Directions actuelles en linguistique du texte. Actes du colloque international 'Le texte: modèles, méthodes, perspectives', II* [Current trends in linguistics. Proceedings of the international colloquium 'The text: models, methods, perspectives, II'] (pp. 213–222). Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Seara, I. R. (2010b). Le blog: Frontières d'un nouveau genre [The blog: borders of a new genre]. In *Actes du XXVe Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes (Innsbruck, 3–8 septembre 2007)* [Proceedings of the XXVth international conference on romance linguistics and philology (Innsbruck, September 3-8, 2007)] (pp. 243–252). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Seara, I. R., & Pinto, R. (2011). Communication and argumentation in the public sphere. *Discursul specializat – teorie şi practică, 5*(1), 56–66.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning. Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. London: Penguin.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Seech, Z. (1993). *Open minds and everyday reasoning*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
Segre, C. (1985). *Avviamento all' analisi del testo letterario* [Introduction to the analysis of literary texts]. Torino: Einaudi.
Seibold, D. R., McPhee, R. D., Poole, M. S., Tanita, N. E., & Canary, D. J. (1981). Argument, group influence, and decision outcomes. In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Dimensions of argument. Proceedings of the second summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 663–692). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.
Seigel, J. E. (1968). *Rhetoric and philosophy in Renaissance humanism. The union of eloquence and wisdom, Petrarch to Valla*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Selinger, M. (2005) Dwa pojęcia prawdy w świetle logiki i erystyki [Two notions of truth in logic and eristics]. In B. Sierocka (Ed.), *Aspekty kompetencji komunikacyjnej* [The aspects of communicative competence]. Wrocław: Atut.
Selinger, M. (2010). *Ogólna forma argumentu* [General form of argument]. In W. Suchoń, I. - Trzcieniecka-Schneider & D. Kowalski (Eds.), *Argumentacja i racjonalna zmiana przekonań* [Argumentation and the rational change of beliefs] (pp. 101–117) (DiaLogikon, Vol. XV). Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.
Selinger, M. (2012). Formalna ocena argumentacji [Formal evaluation of arguments]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria, 1*(81), 89–109.
Sentenberg, I. V. & Karasic, V. I. (1993). Psevdoargumentatsia. Nekotorye vidy rechevykh manipulyatsii [Pseudo-argumentation. Some types of speech manipulations]. *Journal of Speech Communication and Argumentation, 1* (pp. 30–39). St. Petersburg: Ecopolis and Culture.
Seppänen, M. (2007). The quality of argumentation in masters theses. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1257–1264). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Serra, J. P. (2009). Persuasão e propaganda. Os limites da retórica na sociedade mediatizada [Persuasion and propaganda. The limits of rhetoric in the mediatised society]. *Comunicação e sociedade, 16*, 85–100.
Sextus Empiricus (1933-1949). *Sextus Empiricus, I: Outlines of Pyrrhonism* (1933)*, II: Against logicians* [*Adversus mathematicos* VII, VIII] (1935)*, III: Against physicists* [*Adversus mathematicos* IX, X], *Against ethicists* [*Adversus mathematicos* XI] (1936)*, IV: Against professors* [*Adversus mathematicos* I-VI] (1949) (R. G. Bury, trans.). London: William Heinemann (*Loeb classical library 273, 291, 311, 382*).
Shaw, W. C. (1916). Systematic analysis of debating problems. *Journal of Speech Education, 2*, 344–351.
Shi, Xu. (1995). Beyond argument and explanation. Analyzing practical orientations of reasoned discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21–24, 1994), I* (pp. 16–29). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Shi, Xu., & Kienpointner, M. (2001). The reproduction of culture through argumentative discourse. Studying the contested nature of Hong Kong in the international media. *Pragmatics, 11* (3), 285–307.
Siegel, H. (1988). *Educating reason. Rationality, critical thinking and education*. New York: Routledge.
Siegel, H., & Biro, J. I. (1997). Epistemic normativity, argumentation, and fallacies. *Argumentation, 11*, 277–292.
Siegel, H., & Biro, J. I. (2008). Rationality, reasonableness, and critical rationalism. problems with the pragma-dialectical view. *Argumentation, 22*(2), 191–202.
Siegel, H., & Biro, J. I. (2010). The pragma-dialectician's dilemma.Reply to Garssen and van Laar. *Informal Logic, 30*(4), 457–480.
Sigrell, A. (1995). The persuasive effect of implicit arguments in discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Analysis and Evaluation. Proceedings of the third ISSA conference on argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21-24, 1994, II* (pp. 151-157). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Sigrell, A. (1999). *Att övertyga mellan raderna. En retorisk studie om underförståddheter i modern politisk argumentation* [To convince between the lines. A rhetorical study of the implicit in modern political argumentation]. Åstiro: Rhetor förlag. Doctoral dissertation, University of Umeå. (2nd ed. 2001).

Sigrell, A. (2003). Progymnasmata, pragmadialectics and pedagogy. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 965–968). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Sigrell, A. (2007). The normativity of the progymnasmata exercises. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1285–1289). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Siitonen, A., & Halonen, I. (1997). *Ajattelu ja argumentointi* [Thinking and argumentation]. Porvoo Helsinki Juva: WSOY.

Sikora, J. J. (1959). The uses of argument. *New Scholasticism, 33*, 373–374.

Sillars, M. O. (1981). Investigating religious argument as a field. In G. Ziegelmueller & J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Dimensions of argument. Proceedings of the second summer conference on argumentation* (pp. 143–151). Annandale: Speech Communication Association.

Silva, J. V. (2004). *Comunicação, lógica e retórica forenses* [Communication, logic and forensic rhetoric]. Porto: Unicepe.

da Silva, V. A. (2007). Legal argumentation, constitutional interpretation, and presumption of constitutionality. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1291–1294). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

da Silva, V. A. (2009). O STF e o controle de constitucionalidade. Deliberação, diálogo e razão pública [The Supreme Federal Court and judicial review. Deliberation, dialogue and public reason]. *Revista de Direito Administrativo, 250*, 197–227.

da Silva, V. A. (2011). Comparing the incommensurable. Constitutional principles, balancing and rational decision. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 31*, 273–301.

Simari, G. R., & Loui, R. P. (1992). A mathematical treatment of defeasible reasoning and its applications. *Artificial Intelligence, 53*, 125–157.

Simmons, E. D. (1959). Methods and criteria of reasoning. *New Scholasticism, 32*, 526–530.

Simonffy, Z. (2010). *Vue. De la sémantique à la pragmatique et retour. Pour une approche argumentative des rapports entre langue et culture. From semantics to pragmatics and back.* [Towards an argumentative approach of the relationships between language and culture]. Saarbrücken: Éditions universitaires européennes.

Simons, H. W. (1990). The rhetoric of inquiry as an intellectual movement. In H. W. Simons (Ed.), *The rhetorical turn. Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry*. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.

Simpson, P. (1993). *Langage, ideology and point of view*. London: Routledge.

Sitri, F. (2003). *L'objet du débat. La construction des objets de discours dans des situations argumentatives orales* [The subject of the debate. The construction of discourse entities in oral argumentative situations]. Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Sivilov, L. (1981). Споровете за предмета на диалектическата логика [The disputes on the subject of dialectical logic]. *Filosofska misal, 1*, 30–43.

Sivilov, L. (1993). *Новата реторика (Програма за обучението по реторика)* [The new rhetoric (training program in rhetoric)]. *Philosophy, 3*, 55–58.

Škarić, I. (2011). *Argumentacija* [Argumentation]. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Skouen, T. (2009). *Passion and persuasion. John Dryden's The hind and the panther (1687)*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Skulska, J. (2013). *Schematy argumentacji Douglasa Waltona w świetle toposów w retoryce Arystotelesa* [Walton's argumentation schemes and topoi in Aristotelian rhetoric]. Doctoral dissertation, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw.

Slomkowski, P. (1997). *Aristotle's Topics*. Leiden: Brill.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Slot, P. (1993). *How can you say that? Rhetorical questions in argumentative texts*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Smirnova, A. V. (2007). Why do journalists quote other people, or on the functions of reported speech in argumentative newspaper discourse. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1305–1307). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Smith, E. E., & Medin, D. L. (1981). *Categories and concepts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, R. (1995). Logic. In J. Barnes (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Aristotle* (c. 2, pp. 27–65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (1992). *Analysing complex argumentation. The reconstruction of multiple and coordinatively compound argumentation in a critical discussion.* Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (1994). Review of Freeman (1991). *Argumentation, 8*, 319–321.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (1995a). *Anyway* and *even* as indicators of argumentative structure. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation* (Vol. III, pp. 183–191). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (1995b). But as an indicator of counter-arguments and concessions. *Leuvense Bijdragen, 84*, 281–294.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2001). Argumentation structures. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Crucial concepts in argumentation theory* (pp. 101–134). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2005). What's in a name? The use of the stylistic device metonymy as a strategic manoeuvre in the confrontation and argumentation stages of a discussion. In D. L. Hitchcock (Ed.), *The uses of argument. Proceedings of a conference at McMaster University 18-21 May 2005* (pp. 433–441). Hamilton: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2009a). Manoeuvring strategically with rhetorical questions. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Pondering on problems of argumentation. Twenty essays on theoretical issues* (pp. 15–23). Dordrecht: Springer.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2009b). The contribution of *praeteritio* to arguers' confrontational strategic manoeuvres. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Examining argumentation in context. Fifteen studies on strategic maneuvering* (pp. 241–255). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2011). Shared medical decision-making. Strategic maneuvering by doctors in the presentation of their treatment preferences to patients. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1811–1818). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Solmsen, F. (1929). *Die Entwicklung der aristotelischen Logik and Rhetorik* [The development of Aristotelian logic and rhetoric]. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Sorm, E., Timmers, R., & Schellens, P. J. (2007). Determining laymen criteria. Evaluating methods. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1321–1328). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

de Souza, W. E., & Machado, I. L. (Eds.). (2008). Análise do discurso. *Ethos*, emoções, ethos e argumentação [Discourse analysis. *Ethos*, emotions and argumentation]. Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

Spade, P. V. (1982). Obligations: B. Developments in the Fourteenth Century. In N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, & J. Pinborg (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy* (pp. 335–341). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spassov, D. (1980). *Символна логика* [Symbolic logic]. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo.

Sperber, D. (2000). Metarepresentations in an evolutionary perspective. In D. Sperber (Ed.), *Metarepresentations. A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 117–137). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Sperber, D. (2001). An evolutionary perspective on testimony and argumentation. *Philosophical Topics, 29*, 401–413.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance. Communication and cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Spranzi, M. (2004a). *Le "Dialogue sur les deux grands systèmes du monde" de Galilée. Dialectique, rhétorique et démonstration [The "Dialogue concerning the two Chief world systems" of Galileo. Dialectics, rhetoric, and demonstration]*. Paris: PUF.

Spranzi, M. (2004b). Galileo and the mountains of the moon. Analogical reasoning, models and metaphors in scientific discovery. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 4*, 451–484.

Spranzi, M. (2011). *The art of dialectic between dialogue and rhetoric. The Aristotelian tradition* (Controversies, Vol. 9). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Stati, S. (2002). *Principi di analisi argomentativa: Retorica, logica, linguistica* [Principles of argumentation analysis. Rhetoric, logic, linguistics]. Bologna: Pàtron.

Stcherbatsky, F. T. (2011a). *Buddhist logic, I*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing. (original ed. published in 1930).

Stcherbatsky, F. T. (2011b). *Buddist logic, II*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing. (original ed. published in 1930).

Stefanov, V. (2001). *Доказателство и аргументация* [Evidence and argumentation]. *Philosophy, 2*, 22–29.

Stefanov, V. (2003). *Логика* [Logic]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.

Stefanova, N. (2012). *Реторическа аргументация в италианския политически дебат от края на XX век* [Rhetorical argumentation in the Italian political debate since the end of the twentieth century. The transition from first to second Italian republic. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sofia, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Rhetoric.

Strecker, B. (1976). *Beweisen. Eine praktisch-semantische Untersuchung* [Prove. A practical-semantic examination]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Stump, E. (1982). Obligations: A. From the beginning to the early Fourteenth Century. In N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, & J. Pinborg (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of later medieval philosophy* (pp. 315–334). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stump, E. (1989). *Dialectic and its place in the development of medieval logic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Suchoń, W. (2005). *Prolegomena do retoryki logicznej* [Prolegomena to logical rhetoric]. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.

Sukhareva, O. (2010). *Zapadnaya ritoricheskaya traditsiya i problema ubeditelnosti monologa* [Western rhetorical tradition and the problem of monologue persuasiveness]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Suthers, D. (1999). Representational support for collaborative inquiry. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Hawaii international conference on the system sciences (HICSS-32)*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE).

Suthers, D., Weiner, A., Connelly, J., & Paolucci, M. (1995). Belvedere. Engaging students in critical discussion of science and public policy issues. In *Proceedings of the 7th world conference on artificial intelligence in education (AIED '95)* (pp. 266–273). Washington.

Suzuki, M., Hasumi, J., Yano, Y., & Sakai, K. (2011). Adaptation to adjudication styles in debates and debate education. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1841–1848). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Suzuki, T. (1989). Japanese debating activities. A comparison with American debating activities and a rationale for the improvement. An MA thesis submitted to the Graduate School and Department of Communication Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Suzuki, T. (2001). The cardinal principles of the national entity of Japan. A rhetoric of ideological pronouncement. *Argumentation, 15*, 251–266.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Suzuki, T. (2007). A fantasy theme analysis of Prime Minister Koizumi's "Structural reform without sacred cows. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1345–1351). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Suzuki, T. (2008). Japanese argumentation. Vocabulary and culture. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 45*, 49–53.

Suzuki, T. (2012). Why do humans reason sometimes and avoid doing it other times? Kotodama in Japanese culture. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*, 178–180.

Suzuki, T., & van Eemeren, F. H. (2004). "This painful chapter". An analysis of Emperor Akihito's apologia in the context of Dutch old sores. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*, 102–111.

Suzuki, T., & Kato, T. (2011). An analysis of tv debate. Democratic Party of Japan leadership between Hatoyama and Okada. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1849–1859). Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Suzuki, T., & Matsumoto, S. (2002). English-language debate as business communication training in Japan. In J. E. Rogers (Ed.), *Transforming debate. The best of the International Journal of Forensics* (pp. 51–70). New York-Amsterdam-Brussels: International Debate Education Association.

Swearingen, C. J., & Schiappa, E. (2009). Historical studies in rhetoric. Revisionist methods and new directions. In A. A. Lunsford, K. H. Wilson, & R. A. Eberly (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of rhetorical studies* (pp. 1–12). Los Angeles: Sage.

Sycara, K. (1989). Argumentation. Planning other agents' plans. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international joint conference on artificial intelligence* (pp. 517–523). Detroit: Morgan Kaufmann.

Szymanek, K. (2001). *Sztuka argumentacji. Słownik terminologiczny* [The art of argument. A terminological dictionary]. Warsaw: PWN.

Szymanek, K. (2009). *Argument z podobieństwa* [Argument by similarity (analogy)]. Katowice: University of Silesia Press.

Szymanek, K., Wieczorek, K., & Wójcik, A.S. (2004). *Sztuka argumentacji. Ćwiczenia w badaniu argumentów* [The art of argument. Exercises in argument analysis]. Warsaw: PWN.

Talbott, W. (2011). Bayesian epistemology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Summer 2011 ed. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/epistemology-bayesian/

Tans, O. (2006). The fluidithy of warrants. Using the Toulmin model to analyse practical discourse. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 219–230). Dordrecht: Springer.

Tarnay, L. (1982). A game-theoretical analysis of riddles. *Studia Poetica, 4*, 99–169.

Tarnay, L. (1986). On dialogue games, argumentation, and literature. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the first international conference on argumentation, 3B. Argumentation. Analysis and practice* (pp. 209–216). Dordrecht: Foris.

Tarnay, L. (1990). Az irodalmi interpretáció argumentatív szerkezete [The argumentative structure of literary interpretation]. *Studia Poetica, 9*, 67–86.

Tarnay, L. (1991). On vagueness, truth, and argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19-22, 1990* (pp. 506–514). Dordrecht: Foris.

Tarnay, L. (2003). On visual argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1001–1006). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Taroni, F., Aitken, C., Garbolino, P., & Biedermann, A. (2006). *Bayesian networks and probabilistic inference in forensic science*. Chichester: Wiley.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Tarski, A. (1995). *Introduction to logic and to the methodology of deductive sciences*. New York: Dover Publications.

Tarski, A. (2002). On the concept of following logically (M. Stroińska Aristotle (1965). *On sophistical refutations*. (E. S. Forster, trans.). In Aristotle, *On sophistical refutations. On coming-to-be and passing-away; On the cosmos*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press & London 1965. (1st ed. 1955).

Tchouechov, V. (1993). *Teoretiko-istoricheskie osnovania argumentologii* [Theoretical historical foundations of argumentology]. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University Press.

Tchouechov, V. (1999). Totalitarian argumentation. Theory and practice. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 784–785). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Tchouechov, V. (2011). Argumentology about the possibility of dialogue between new logic, rhetoric, dialectics. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1860–1869). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Teufel, S. (1999). *Argumentative zoning. Information extraction from scientific articles*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Thagard, P. (1992). *Conceptual revolutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, S. N. (1973). *Practical reasoning in natural language*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Thomas, S. N. (1986). *Practical reasoning in natural language* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. (1st ed. 1973).

Thurén, L. (1995). *Argument and theology in 1 Peter. The origins of Christian paraenesis*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Tindale, C. W. (1996). From syllogisms to audiences. The prospects for logic in a rhetorical model of argumentation. In D. M. Gabbay & H. J. Ohlbach (Eds.), *Practical reasoning. Proceedings of FAPR 1996* (pp. 596–605). Berlin: Springer.

Tindale, C. W. (1999). *Acts of arguing. A rhetorical model of argument*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tindale, C. W. (2004). *Rhetorical argumentation. Principles of theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tindale, C. W. (2006). Constrained maneuvering. Rhetoric as a rational enterprise. *Argumentation, 20*(4), 447–466.

Tindale, C. W. (2010a). *Reason's dark champions. Constructive strategies of sophistic argument*. Columbia: South Carolina Press. (in tekst als 2010).

Tindale, C. W. (2010b). Ways of being reasonable. Perelman and the philosophers. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 43*(4), 337–361.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1985). *Argumentative text structure and translation* (Studia Philologica Jyväskyläensia, Vol. 18). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1987). Argumentation in English and Finnish editorials. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 373–378). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Tokarz, M. (1987). Persuasion. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic, 16*, 46–50.

Tokarz, M. (1993). *Elementy pragmatyki logicznej* [Elements of logical pragmatics]. Warsaw: PWN.

Tokarz, M. (2006). *Argumentacja. Perswazja. Manipulacja* [Argumentation. Persuasion. Manipulation]. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne. Warsaw: PWN.

Tomasi, S. (2011). Adversarial principle and argumentation. An outline of Italian criminal trial. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1870–1879). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Tomic, T. (2002). *Authority-based argumentative strategies. Three models for their evaluation*. Uppsala: Uppsala University. Doctoral dissertation, Uppsala University.

Tomic, T. (2007a). Communicative freedom and evaluation of argumentative strategies. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1365–1372). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Tomic, T. (2007b). Information seeking processes in evaluating argumentation. In J. A. Blair, H. Hansen, R. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *OSSA proceedings 2007*. Windsor: University of Windsor. (CD rom).

Tonnard, Y. M. (2011). *Getting an issue on the table. A pragma-dialectical study of presentational choices in confrontational strategic maneuvering in Dutch parliamentary debate*. Doctoral dissertation University of Amsterdam.

Tordesillas, A. (1990). Chaïm Perelman. Justice, argumentation and ancient rhetoric. *Argumentation, 4*, 109–124.

Torkki, J. (2006), *Puhevalta. Kuinka kuulijat vakuutetaan* [Power of speech. How the listener is convinced]. Helsinki: Otava.

Toshev, A. (1901). *Ръководство по риторика и краснореч*ие [Guide of rhetoric and eloquence]. Plovdiv: Hr. G. Danov.

Toulmin, S. E. (1950). *An examination of the place of reason in ethics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Updated ed. 2003).

Toulmin, S. E. (1972). *Human understanding*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Toulmin, S. E. (1976). *Knowing and acting. An invitation to philosophy*. New York: Macmillan.

Toulmin, S. E. (1990). *Cosmopolis. The hidden agenda of modernity*. New York: Free Press.

Toulmin, S. E. (1992). Logic, rhetoric and reason. Redressing the balance. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 3–11). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Toulmin, S. E. (2001a). *Os usos do argumento*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes. (Portuguese trans. by R. Guarany of S. E. Toulmin (1958). *The uses of argument* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Updated ed. 2003)).

Toulmin, S. E. (2001b). *Return to reason*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument* (Updated ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (1st ed. 1958; paperback ed. 1964).

Toulmin, S. E. (2006). Reasoning in theory and practice. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 25–29). Dordrecht: Springer.

Toulmin, S. E., & Janik, A. (1973). *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Toulmin, S. E., Rieke, R. D., & Janik, A. (1979). *An introduction to reasoning*. New York: Macmillan. (2nd ed. 1984).

Trapp, R. (1990). Arguments in interpersonal relationships. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation. Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 43–54). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Trent, J. D. (1968). Toulmin's model of an argument: An examination and extension. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54*, 252–259.

Tseronis, A. (2009). *Qualifying standpoints. Stance adverbs as a presentational device for managing the burden of proof*. Utrecht: LOT. Doctoral dissertation Leiden University.

Tuominen, M. (2001). Ancient philosophers on the principles of knowledge and argumentation. *Reports from the Department of Philosophy, University of Helsinki, 2*.

Tuţescu, M. (1986). *L'argumentation* [Argumentation]. Bucharest: Tipografia Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Tuţescu, M. (1998). *L'Argumentation. Introduction à l'étude du discours* [Argumentation. Introduction into the study of discourse]. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Üding, G., & Jens, W. (Eds.). (1992). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, 1* [Historical dictionary of rhetoric, 1]. Tübingen: Niemeyer/Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Üding, G., & Jens, W. (Eds.). (1994). *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, 2* [Historical dictionary of rhetoric, 2]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ungerer, F. (1997). Emotions and emotional language in English and German newsstories. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The language of emotions. Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation* (pp. 307–328). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Urbieta, L., & Carrascal, B. (2007). Circular arguments analysis. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1395–1400). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Valenzuela, R. (2009). *Retórica. Un ensayo sobre tres dimensiones de la argumentación* [Rhetoric. An essay concerning three dimensions of argumentation]. Santiago: Editorial Jurídica de Chile.

Valesio, P. (1980). *Novantiqua. Rhetorics as a contemporary theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Vapalahti, K., Marttunen, M., & Laurinen, L. (2013). Online and face-to-face role-play simulations in promoting social work students' argumentative problem-solving. *International Journal of Comparative Social Work, 1*, 1–35.

Vasilyanova, I. M. (2007). *Osobennosti argumentatsii v sudebnom diskurse* [Peculiarities of argumentation in court discourse]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Vasilyeva, A. L. (2011). Argumentation in the context of mediation activity. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1905–1921). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vasilyeva, A. L. (2012). Shaping disagreement space in dispute mediation. In T. Suzuki, T. Kato, A. Kubota, & S. Murai (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Tokyo conference on argumentation. The role of argumentation in society* (pp. 120–127). Tokyo: Japan Debate Association.

Vas(s)il(i)ev, K. (1989). *Красноречието. Аспекти на реториката* [Eloquence. Aspects of rhetoric]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.

Vassiliev, L. (1994). *Argumentativnyje aspekty ponimanija* [Argumentation aspects of comprehension]. Moscow: Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press.

Vassiliev, L. G. (1999). Rational comprehension of argumentative texts. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 811–801). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vassiliev, L. G. (2003). A semio-argumentative perspective on enthymeme reconstruction. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1029–1031). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vas(s)ili/yev, L. G. (2007). Understanding argument. The sign nature of argumentative functions. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1407–1409). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vaz Ferreira, C. (1945). *Lógica viva* [Living logic]. Buenos Aires: Losada. (1st ed. 1910).

Vedar, J. (2001). *Реторика* [Rhetoric]. Sofia: Sofia University Press.

Vega, L. (2005). *Si de argumentar se trata* [If it is about arguing]. Madrid: Montesinos.

Vega, L., & Olmos, P. (2007). Enthymemes. The starting of a new life. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1411–1417). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vega, L., & Olmos, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Compendio de lógica, argumentación y retórica* [Handbook of logic, argumentation, and rhetoric]. Madrid: Trotta. (2nd ed. 2012).

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Verbiest, A. E. M. (1987). *Confrontaties in conversaties. Een analyse op grond van argumentatie- en gesprekstheoretische inzichten van het ontstaan van meningsverschillen in informele gesprekken* [Confrontations in conversations. An analysis based on insights from argumentation theory and conversation theory about the origin of differences of opinion in informal conversations]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Verbiest, A. E. M. (1994). A new source of argumentative indicators? In F. H. van Eemeren & R. Grootendorst (Eds.), *Studies in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 180–187). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Verhagen, A. (2007). *Constructions of intersubjectivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Verheij, B. (1996a). *Rules, reasons, arguments. Formal studies of argumentation and defeat*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maastricht.

Verheij, B. (1996b). Two approaches to dialectical argumentation. Admissible sets and argumentation stages. In J.-J. C. Meyer & L. C. van der Gaag (Eds.), *NAIC'96. Proceedings of the eighth Dutch conference on artificial intelligence* (pp. 357–368). Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Verheij, B. (1999). Automated argument assistance for lawyers. *Proceedings of the seventh international conference on artificial intelligence and law* (pp. 43–52). New York: ACM.

Verheij, B. (2003a). DefLog. On the logical interpretation of prima facie justified assumptions. *Journal of Logic and Computation, 13*(3), 319–346.

Verheij, B. (2003b). Dialectical argumentation with argumentation schemes. An approach to legal logic. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 11*(1–2), 167–195.

Verheij, B. (2005a). Evaluating arguments based on Toulmin's scheme. *Argumentation, 19*, 347–371. [Reprinted in D.L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.). (2006), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 181–202). Dordrecht: Springer].

Verheij, B. (2005b). *Virtual arguments. On the design of argument assistants for lawyers and other arguers*. The Hague: T. M. C. Asser Press.

Verheij, B. (2006). Evaluating arguments based on Toulmin's scheme. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 181–202). Dordrecht: Springer.

Verheij, B. (2007). A labeling approach to the computation of credulous acceptance in argumentation. In M. M. Veloso (Ed.), *IJCAI 2007, Proceedings of the 20th international joint conference on artificial intelligence* (pp. 623–628). Hyderabad, India.

Verheij, B. (2012). Jumping to conclusions. A logico-probabilistic foundation for defeasible rule-based arguments. In L. Fariñas del Cerro, A. Herzig & J. Mengin (Eds.), *Logics in artificial intelligence. 13th European conference, JELIA 2012. Toulouse, France, September 2012. Proceedings (LNAI 7519)* (pp. 411–423). Springer, Berlin.

Verheij, B., Hage, J. C., & van den Herik, H. J. (1998). An integrated view on rules and principles. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 6*(1), 3–26.

Vicente, J. N. (2009). *Educação, retórica e filosofia a partir de Olivier Reboul. Subsídios para uma filosofia da educação escolar* [Education, rhetoric and philosophy according to Olivier Reboul. Contributions to a philosophy of school education]. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra. Doctoral dissertation, University of Coimbra.

Vicuña Navarro, A. M. (2007). An ideal of reasonableness for a moral community. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1419–1423). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Vignaux, G. (1976). *L'argumentation. Essai d'une logique discursive* [Argumentation. Essay on discursive logic]. Geneva: Droz.

Vignaux, G. (1988). *Le discours, acteur du monde. Argumentation et énonciation* [Discourse, actor in the world. Argumentation and utterance]. Paris: Ophrys.

Vignaux, G. (1999). *L'argumentation* [Argumentation]. Paris: Hatier.

Vignaux, G. (2004). Une approche cognitive de l'argumentation [A cognitive approach to argumentation]. In M. Doury & S. Moirand (Eds.), *L'argumentation aujourd'hui. Positions thé*

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

oriques en confrontation [Argumention today. Confrontation of theoretical positions] (pp. 103–124). Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Vincent, D. (2009). Principes rhétoriques et réalité communicationnelle. Les risques de la concession [Rhetorical principles and communicative reality. The risks of concessions]. In V. Atayan & D. Pirazzini (Eds.), *Argumentation. Théorie – langue – discours* [Argumentation. Theory – language – discourse] (pp. 79–91). Berlin: Peter Lang.

Vincze, L. (2010). *La persuasione nelle parole e nel corpo. Communicazione multimodale e argomentatione ragionevole e fallace nel discorso politico e nel linguaggio quotidiano* [Persuasion by means of words and the body. Multimodal communication and reasonable and fallacious argumentation in political discourse and in everyday language]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Rome.

Viskil, E. (1994). *Definiëren. Een bijdrage aan de theorievorming over het opstellen van definities* [Defining. A contribution to the theorizing about the construction of definitions]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Visković, N. (1997). *Argumentacija i pravo* [Argumentation and law]. Split: Pravni fakultet u Splitu.

Volkova, N. (2005). *Vysmeivanie i argumentirovanie. Problema vzaimodeystvia rechevyh zhanrov* [Mocking and argument. The problem of interaction of speech genres]. Doctoral dissertation, Kaluga State University.

Volquardsen, B. (1995). Argumentative Arbeitsteilung und die Versuchungen des Expertenwesens [The division of argumentative labour and the trial of experts]. In H. Wohlrapp (Ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung* [Roads of argumentation research] (pp. 339–350). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann Hozboog.

Vorobej, M. (1995). Hybrid arguments. *Informal Logic, 17*(2), 289–296.

Voss, J. F. (2006). Toulmin's model and the solving of ill-structured problems. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 303–311). Dordrecht: Springer.

Voss, J. F., Fincher-Kiefer, R., Wiley, J., & Ney Silfies, L. (1993). On the processing of arguments. *Argumentation, 7*(2), 165–181.

Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (1993). *Studies in defeasible argumentation*. Doctoral dissertation, Free University Amsterdam.

Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (1995a). Formalizing nomic. Working on a theory of communication with modifiable rules of procedure (Tech. Rep. CS 95-02), Vakgroep Informatica (FdAW), Rijksuniversiteit Limburg, Maastricht. http://arno.unimaas.nl/show.cgi?fid=126

Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (1995b). The computational value of debate in defeasible reasoning. *Argumentation, 9*, 305–342.

Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (1997). Abstract argumentation systems. *Artificial Intelligence, 90*, 225–279.

Vreeswijk, G. A. W. (2000). Representation of formal dispute with a standing order. *Artificial Intelligence and Law, 8*, 205–231.

Wagemans, J. H. M. (2009). *Redelijkheid en overredingskracht van argumentatie. Een historisch-filosofische studie over de combinatie van het dialectische en het retorische perspectief op argumentatie in de pragma-dialectische argumentatietheorie* [Reasonableness and persuasiveness of argumentation. A historical-philosophical study on the combination of the dialectical and the rhetorical perspective on argumentation in the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation]. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Wagemans, J. H. M. (2011a). Review of M. A. Finocchiaro, *Defending Copernicus and Galileo. Critical reasoning in the two affairs*. *Argumentation, 25*, 271–274.

Wagemans, J. H. M. (2011b). The assessment of argumentation from expert opinion. *Argumentation, 25*(3), 329–339.

Walker, G. B., & Sillars, M. O. (1990). Where is argument? Perelman's theory of fallacies. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation. Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 134–150). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Wallace, K. R. (1989). Topoi and the problem of invention. In R. D. Dearin (Ed.), *The new rhetoric of Chaïm Perelman. Statement & response* (pp. 107–119). Lanham: University Press of America.
Wallgren-Hemlin, B. (1997). *Att övertyga från predikstolen. En retorisk studie av 45 predikningar hållna den 17:e söndagen efter trefaldighet 1990* [Persuading from the pulpit. A rhetorical study of 45 sermons given on the 17th Sunday after Trinity]. Gothenburg: Göteborg Universitet. Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg.
Walton, D. N. (1985). *Arguer's position. A pragmatic study of ad hominem attack, criticism, refutation, and fallacy*. Westport: Greenwood.
Walton, D. N. (1987). *Informal fallacies. Towards a theory of argument criticisms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Walton, D. N. (1989a). *Informal logic. A handbook for critical argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walton, D. N. (1989b). *Question-reply argumentation*. New York: Greenwood Press.
Walton, D. N. (1991a). *Begging the question. Circular reasoning as a tactic of argumentation*. New York: Greenwood Press.
Walton, D. N. (1991b). Hamblin and the standard treatment of fallacies. *Philosophy and Rhetoric, 24*, 353–61.
Walton, D. N. (1992a). *Plausible argument in everyday conversation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Walton, D. N. (1992b). Rules for plausible reasoning. *Informal Logic, 14*(1), 33–51.
Walton, D. N. (1992c). *Slippery slope arguments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Walton, D. N. (1992d). Types of dialogue, dialectical shifts and fallacies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation illuminated* (pp. 133–147). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Walton, D. N. (1996a). *Argumentation schemes for presumptive reasoning*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Walton, D. N. (1996b). *Arguments from ignorance*. University park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Walton, D. N. (1996c). *Argument structure. A pragmatic theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Walton, D. N. (1997). *Appeal to expert opinion. Arguments from authority*. University park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Walton, D. N. (1998a). *Ad hominem arguments*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
Walton, D. N. (1998b). *The new dialectic. Conversational contexts of argument*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Walton, D. N. (1999). Profiles of dialogue for evaluating arguments from ignorance. *Argumentation, 13*(1), 53–71.
Walton, D. N. (2002a). [Russian title]. Moscow: Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. (Russian trans. of D. N. Walton (1998a). *Ad hominem arguments*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press).
Walton, D. N. (2002b). *Legal argumentation and evidence*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Walton, D. N. (2006). *Fundamentals of critical argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walton, D. N. (2007a). *Dialog theory for critical argumentation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Walton, D. N. (2007b). Evaluating practical reasoning. *Synthese, 157*, 197–240.
Walton, D. N. (2008a). *Informal logic. A pragmatic approach* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1st ed. 1989).
Walton, D. N. (2008b). *Witness testimony evidence. Argumentation, artificial intelligence and law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Walton, D. N. (2010). Types of dialogue and burden of proof. In P. Baroni, F. Cerutti, M. Giacomin, & G. R. Simari (Eds.), *Computational models of argument. Proceedings of COMMA 2010* (pp. 13–24). Amsterdam: IOS Press.
Walton, D. N., & Krabbe, E. C. W. (1995). *Commitment in dialogue. Basic concepts of interpersonal reasoning*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Walton, D. N., & Krabbe, E. C. W. (2013). *Compromisos en los diálogos. Conceptos básicos del razonamiento interpersonal*. Santiago: Universidad Diego Portales. (Spanish trans. of D. N. Walton & E. C. W. Krabbe (1995), *Commitments in dialogues. Basic concepts of interpersonal reasoning* by M. E. Molina, C. Santibáñez Yáñez & C. Fuentes. Albany: State University of New York Press).
Walton, D. N., Reed, C. A., & Macagno, F. (2008). *Argumentation schemes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walton, P.-A. (1970). *ABC om argumentation* [The ABC of argumentation]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
Walzer, A., Secor, M., & Gross, A. G. (1999). The uses and limits of rhetorical theory. Campbell, Whately, and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca on the Earl of Spencer's 'Address to Diana'. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 21*, 41–62.
Wansing, H. (2010). Connexive Logic. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy (Fall 2010 edition)*. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2010/entries/logic-connexive/
Warnick, B. (1981). Arguing value propositions. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*, 109–119.
Warnick, B. (1997). Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's contribution to the new rhetoric. In M. Meijer Wertheimer (Ed.), *Listening to their voices. The rhetorical activities of historical women* (pp. 69–85). Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
Warnick, B. (2001). Conviction. In T. Sloane (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of rhetoric* (pp. 171–175). New York: Oxford University Press.
Warnick, B. (2004). Rehabilitating AI. Argument loci and the case for artificial intelligence. *Argumentation, 18*, 149–170.
Warnick, B., & Inch, E. S. (1989). *Critical thinking and communication. The use of reason in argument*. New York: Macmillan.
Warnick, B., & Kline, S. L. (1992). The new rhetoric's argument schemes. A rhetorical view of practical reasoning. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 29*, 1–15.
Wasilewska-Kamińska, E. (2013). *Myślenie krytyczne jako cel kształcenia w USA i Kanadzie* [Critical thinking as an educational goal in the USA and Canada]. Doctoral dissertation University of Warsaw.
Weddle, P. (1979). Inductive, deductive. *Informal Logic Newsletter, 2*(1), 1–5.
Weger, H. (2001). Pragma-dialectical theory and interpersonal interaction outcomes. Unproductive interpersonal behavior as violations of rules for critical discussion. *Argumentation, 15*(3), 313–329.
Weger, H. (2002). The relational consequences of violating pragma-dialectical rules during arguments between intimates. In F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 197–214). Newport News: Vale.
Weger, H. (2013). Engineering argumentation in marriage. Pragma-dialectics, strategic maneuvering, and the "fair fight for change" in marriage education. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 2*(3), 279–298.
Weinstein, M. (1990a). Towards an account of argumentation in science. *Argumentation, 4*, 269–298.
Weinstein, M. (1990b). Towards a research agenda for informal logic and critical thinking. *Informal Logic, 2*, 121–143.
Weinstein, M. (1994). Informal logic and applied epistemology. In R. H. Johnson & J. A. Blair (Eds.), *New essays in informal logic* (pp. 140–161). Windsor: Informal Logic.
Weinstein, M. (2002). Exemplifying an internal realist theory of truth. *Philosophica, 69*(1), 11–40.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Weinstein, M. (2006). Three naturalistic accounts of the epistemology of argument. *Informal Logic, 26*(l), 63–89.
Wellman, C. (1971). *Challenge and response. Justification in ethics*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
Wenzel, J. W. (1987). The rhetorical perspective on argument. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Across the lines of discipline. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 101–109). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.
Wenzel, J. W. (1990). Three perspectives on argument. Rhetoric, dialectic, logic. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation. Essays in the honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 9–26). Prospect Heights: Waveland.
Wenzel, J. W. (1992) Perspectives on argument. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 121–143). Berlin-New York: Foris.
Whately, R. (1936). *Elements of logic. Comprising the substance of the article in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana. With additions &c*, New York: W. Jackson. (1st ed. 1826).
Whately, R. (1963). *Elements of rhetoric. Comprising an analysis of the laws of moral evidence and of persuasion, with rules for argumentative composition and elocution*. (D. Ehninger, Ed.). Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press. (1st ed. published in 1846).
Widdowson, H. G. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 136–151.
Wieczorek, K. (2007). Dlaczego wnioskujemy niepoprawnie? Teoria modeli mentalnych P. N. Johnsona-Lairda [Why do we reason incorrectly? The theory of mental models by P.N. Johnson-Laird]. *Filozofia Nauki, 70*.
Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Emotions across languages and cultures. Diversity and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wiethoff, W. E. (1985). Critical perspectives on Perelman's philosophy of legal argument. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 22*, 88–95.
Wigmore, J. H. (1931). *The principles of judicial proof* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little Brown & Company. (1st ed. 1913).
Wilkins, R., & Isotalus, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Speech culture in Finland (2009)*. Lanham: University Press of America.
Will, F. L. (1960). The uses of argument. *Philosophical Review, 69*, 399–403.
Willard, C. A. (1976). On the utility of descriptive diagrams for the analysis and criticism of arguments. *Communication Monographs, 43*, 308–319.
Willard, C. A. (1983). *Argumentation and the social grounds of knowledge*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
Willard, C. A. (1989). *A theory of argumentation*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
Willard, C. A. (1992). Field theory. A Cartesian meditation. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 437–467). Berlin-New York: Foris.
Willard, C. A. (1996). *Liberalism and the problem of knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Willard, C. A. (Guest Ed.). (1982). Special issue, symposium on argument fields. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, *18*, 191–257.
Williams, D. C., Ishiyama, J. T., Young, M. J., & Launer, M. K. (1997). The role of public argument in emerging democracies. A case study of the 12 December 1993 elections in the Russian Federation. *Argumentation, 11*(2), 179–194.
Winans, J. A., & Utterback, W. E. (1930). *Argumentation*. New York: Century.
Windes, R. R., & Hastings, A. C. (1969). *Argumentation and advocacy*. New York: Random House. (1st ed. 1965).
Wintgens, L. J. (1993). Rhetoric, reasonableness and ethics. An essay on Perelman. *Argumentation, 7*, 451–460.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Wisdom, J. (1991). *Proof and explanation. The Virginia lectures*. Ed. by S. F. Barker. Lanham: University Press of America.
Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Wlodarczyk, M. (2000). Aristotelian dialectic and the discovery of truth. *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy, 18*, 153–210.
Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action. Politics as usual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Woerther, F. (2012). *Hermagoras. Fragments et témoignages* [Hermagoras. Fragments and testimonies]. Paris: Les belles lettres.
Wohlrapp, H. (1977). Analytische und konstruktive Wissenschaftstheorie. Zwei Thesen zur Klärung der Fronten [An analytic and constructive theory of science. Two theses to clarify the positions]. In G. Patzig, E. Scheibe & W. Wieland (Eds.), *Logik, Ethik, Theorie der Geisteswissenschaften* [Logic, ethics, theory of the humanities]. Hamburg: Meiner.
Wohlrapp, H. (1987). Toulmin's theory and the dynamics of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation. Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the conference on argumentation 1986* (pp. 327–335). Dordrecht-Providence: Foris.
Wohlrapp, H. (1990). Über nicht-deduktive Argumente [On non-deductive arguments]. In P. Klein (Ed.), *Praktische Logik. Traditionen und Tendenzen* [Practical logic. Traditions and trends] (pp. 217–235). Göttingen: Van den Hoeck & Ruprecht.
Wohlrapp, H. (1991). *Argumentum ad baculum* and ideal speech situation. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference on argumentation organized by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation at the University of Amsterdam, June 19–22, 1990* (pp. 397–402). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
Wohlrapp, H. (1995). Argumentative Geltung [Argumentative validity]. In H. Wohlrapp (Ed.), *Wege der Argumentationsforschung* [Directions of argumentation research] (pp. 280–297). Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
Wohlrapp, H. (2009). *Der Begriff des Arguments. Über die Beziehungen zwischen Wissen, Forschen, Glauben, Subjektivität and Vernunft* [The notion of argument. On the relations between knowing, inquiry, believing, subjectivity and rationality]. 2n ed. supplemented with a subject index. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
Wolf, S. (2010). A system of argumentation forms in Aristotle. *Argumentation, 24*(1), 19–40.
Wolrath Söderberg, M. (2012). *Topos som meningsskapare. Retorikens topiska perspektiv på tänkande och lärande genom argumentation* [Topoi as meaning makers. Thinking and learning through argumentation – a rhetorical perspective]. Ödåkra: Retorikförlaget.
Woods, J. (1980). What is informal logic? In J. A. Blair & R. H. Johnson (Eds.), *Informal logic. The first international symposium* (pp. 57–68). Inverness: Edgepress. Reprinted in J. Woods & D. N. Walton (1989), *Fallacies: Selected papers 1972–1982* (pp. 221–232). Dordrecht: Foris.
Woods, J. (1991). Pragma-dialectics. A radical departure in fallacy theory. *Communication and Cognition, 24*(1), 43–54.
Woods, J. H. (1992). Public policy and standoffs of force five. In E. M. Barth & E. C. W. Krabbe (Eds.), *Logic and political culture* (pp. 9–108). Amsterdam: KNAW.
Woods, J. (1993). *Secundum quid* as a research programme. In E. C. W. Krabbe, R. J. Dalitz, & P. A. Smit (Eds.), *Empirical logic and public debate. Essays in honour of Else M. Barth* (pp. 27–36). Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
Woods, J. (1994). Sunny prospects for relevance? In R. H. Johnson & J. A. Blair (Eds.), *New essays in informal logic* (pp. 82–92). Newport News: Vale Press.
Woods, J. (1995). Fearful symmetry. In H. V. Hansen & R. C. Pinto (Eds.), *Fallacies. Classical and contemporary readings* (pp. 274–286). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Woods, J. (1999a). Files of fallacies: Aristotle (384–322 B.C.). *Argumentation, 13*(2), 203–220.
Woods, J. (1999b). File of fallacies. John Stuart Mill (1806–1873). *Argumentation, 13*, 317–334.
Woods, J. (2004). *The death of argument. Fallacies in agent based reasoning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Woods, J. (2006). Pragma-dialectics. A retrospective. In P. Houtlosser & A. van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics. A festschrift for Frans H. van Eemeren on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (pp. 301–311). Mahwah-London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Woods, J. (2008). Book review *Arguments about arguments* by Maurice A. Finocchiaro. *Informal Logic, 28*(2), 193–202.

Woods, J., & Hansen, H. V. (1997). Hintikka on Aristotle's fallacies. *Synthese, 113*(2), 217–239.

Woods, J., & Hudak, B. (1989). By parity of reasoning. *Informal Logic, 11*, 125–140.

Woods, J., & Irvine, A. D. (2004). Aristotle's early logic. In D. M. Gabbay & J. Woods (Eds.), *The handbook of the history of logic* (Greek, Indian and Arabic logic, Vol. 1, pp. 27–99). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Woods, J., & Walton, D. N. (1978). Arresting circles in formal dialogues. *Journal of Philosophical Logic, 7*, 73–90. Reprinted in J. Woods & D. N. Walton (1989), *Fallacies. Selected papers 1972–1982* (pp. 143–159). Dordrecht: Foris.

Woods, J., & Walton, D. N. (1982). Question-begging and cumulativeness in dialectical games. *Noûs, 16*, 585–606. Reprinted in J. Woods & D. N. Walton (1989), *Fallacies. Selected papers 1972-1982* (pp. 253–272). Dordrecht: Foris.

Woods, J., & Walton, D. N. (1989). *Fallacies. Selected papers 1972–1982*. Berlin-Dordrecht-Providence: de Gruyter/Foris.

Woods, J., & Walton, D. N. (1992). Critique de l'argumentation. Logique des sophismes ordinaires. [Critique of argumentation. The logic of ordinary fallacies]. Paris: Kimé. (trans. into French by M.-F. Antona, M. Doury, M. Marcoccia & V. Traverso, coordinated by Chr. Plantin of various papers published by Woods & Walton in English between 1974 and 1981).

Wooldridge, M. (2009). *An introduction to multiagent systems*. Chichester: Wiley.

Wreen, M. J. (1994). Look, Ma! No Frans! *Pragmatics & Cognition, 2*(2), 285–306.

Wu, H. (2009). *An introduction to informal logic*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.

Wunderlich, D. (1974). *Grundlagen der Linguistik* [Foundations of linguistics]. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch.

Xie, Y. (2008). Dialectic within pragma-dialectics and informal logic. In T. Suzuki, T. Kato, & A. Kubota (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Tokyo conference on argumentation. Argumentation, the law and justice* (pp. 280–286). Tokyo: Japan Debate Association.

Xie, Y. (2012). Book review *Giving reasons.*A linguistic-pragmatic approach to argumentation theory by Lilian Bermejo-Luque. *Informal Logic, 32*(4), 440–453.

Xie, Y., & Xiong, M. (2011). Whose Toulmin, and which logic? A response to van Benthem. In F. Zenker (Ed.), *Argumentation. Cognition and community. Proceedings of the 9th international conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), May 18–21*. Windsor, ON. (CD rom).

Xiong, M. (2010). *Litigational argumentation. A logical perspective on litigation games*. Beijing: China University of Political Science and Law Press.

Xiong, M., & Zhao, Y. (2007). A defeasible pragma-dialectical model of argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1541–1548). Amsterdam: International Center for the Study of Argumentation.

Yanal, R. J. (1991). Dependent and independent reasons. *Informal Logic, 13*(3), 137–144.

Yanoshevsky, G. (2009). Perelman's audience revisited. Towards the construction of a new type of audience. *Argumentation, 23*, 409–419.

Yanoshevsky, G. (2011). Construing trust in scam letters using ethos and ad hominem. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. J. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 2017–2031). Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat. (CD rom).

Yaskevich, Y. S. (1993). Nauchnaia argumentatciia. Logiko-kommunikativnye parametry [Scientific argumentation. Logical and communicative aspects]. *Journal of Speech Communication and Argumentation, 1*, 93–102.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Yaskevich, Y. (1999). On the role of ethical and axiological arguments in the modern science. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 900–902). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Yaskevich, Y. (2003). Political risk and power in the modern world. Moral arguments and priorities. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fifth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1101–1104). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Yaskevich, Y. (2007). Moral and legal arguments in modern bioethics. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1549–1552). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Yaskorska, O., Kacprzak, M., & Budzynska, K. (2012). Rules for formal and natural dialogues in agent communication. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on concurrency, specification and programming* (pp. 416–427). Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Yates, F. A. (1966). *The art of memory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Yost, M. (1917). Argument from the point of view of sociology. *Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, 3*, 109–127.

Young, M. J., & Launer, M. K. (1995). Evaluative criteria for conspiracy arguments. The case of KAL 007. In E. Schiappa (Ed.), *Warranting assent. Case studies in argument evaluation* (pp. 3–32). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Yrjönsuuri, M. (1993). Aristotle's Topics and medieval obligational disputations. *Synthese, 96*, 59–82.

Yrjönsuuri, M. (1995). *Obligationes. 14th century logic of disputational duties* (Acta Philosophica Fennica, Vol. 55). Helsinki: Societas Philosophica Fennica.

Yrjönsuuri, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Medieval formal logic. Consequences, obligations and insoluble*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Yunis, H. (Ed.). (2011). *Plato. Phaedrus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zafiu, R. (2003). Valori argumentative în conversaţia spontană [Argumentative values in spontaneous conversation]. In L. Dascălu Jinga & L. Pop (Eds.), *Dialogul în româna vorbită* [Dialogue in spoken Romanian] (pp. 149–165). Bucharest: Oscar Print.

Zafiu, R. (2010). Ethos, pathos şi logos în textul predicii [Ethos, pathos, and logos in othodoxsermons]. In A. Gafton, S. Guia & I. Milică (Eds.), *Text şi discurs religios* [Religious text and discourse], *II* (pp. 27–38). Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza".

Žagar, I. Ž. (1991). Argumentacija v jeziku proti argumentaciji z jezikom [Argumentation in the language vs. argumentation with the language]. *Anthropos, 23*(4/5), 172–185.

Žagar, I. Ž. (1995a). *Argumentation in language and the Slovenian connective pa*. Antwerp: IPrA Research Center. [in tekst als 1995, net als volgende].

Žagar, I. Ž. (1995b). Argumentation in language opposed to argumentation with language. Some problems. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Reconstruction and application. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation* (IIIth ed., pp. 200–218). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Žagar, I. Ž. (1999). Argumentation in the language-system or why argumentative particles and polyphony are important for education. *The School Field, 10*(3/4), 159–172.

Žagar, I. Ž. (2000). Argumentacija v jeziku. Med argumentativnimi vezniki in polifonijo: Esej iz intiuitivne epistemologije [Argumentation in the language. Between argumentative connectives and polyphony. An essay in intuitive epistemology]. *Anthropos, 32* (1/2), 81–92.

Žagar, I. Ž. (2002). Argumentation, cognition, and context. Can we know that we know what we (seem to) know? *Anthropological Notebebooks, 8*(1), 82–91.

Žagar, I. Ž. (2008). Topoi. Argumentation's black box. In F. H. van Eemeren, D. C. Williams, & I. Ž. Žagar (Eds.), *Understanding argumentation. Work in progress* (pp. 145–164). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

Žagar, I. Ž. (2010). Pa, a modifier of connectives. An argumentative analysis. In M. N. Dedaič & M. Mišković-Luković (Eds.), *South Slavic discourse particles* (pp. 133–162). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Žagar, I. Ž. (2011). *Argument moči ali moč argumenta? Argumentiranje v Državnem zboru Republike Slovenije* [Argument of power or power of argument? Argumentation in the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia]. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut/Digital Library. http://193.2.222.157/Sifranti/StaticPage.aspx?id=103

Žagar, I. Ž. (Ed.). (1996). *Slovenian lectures. Introduction into argumentative semantics*. Ljubljana: ISH.

Žagar, I. Ž., & Grgič, M. (2011). *How to do things with tense and aspect. Performativity before Austin*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Žagar, I. Ž., & Schlamberger Brezar, M. (2009). *Argumentacija v jeziku* [Argumentation in the language-system]. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut/Digital Library. http://www.pei.si/Sifranti/StaticPage.aspx?id=67

Załęska, M. (2011). Ad hominem in the criticisms of expert argumentation. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & G. Mitchell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th conference on argumentation of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 2047–2057). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Załęska, M. (2012). Rhetorical patterns of constructing the politician's ethos. In M. Załęska (Ed.), *Rhetoric and politics. Central/Eastern European perspectives* (pp. 20–50). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Załęska, M. (Ed.). (2012). *Rhetoric and politics. Central/Eastern European perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Zanini, C., & Rubinelli, S. (2012). Teaching argumentation theory to doctors. Why and what. *Journal of Argumentation in Context, 1*(1), 66–80.

Zarefsky, D. (1969). The 'traditional case'-'comparative advantage case' dichotomy: Another look. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 6*, 12–20.

Zarefsky, D. (1980). Lyndon Johnson redefines 'equal opportunity'. The beginnings of affirmative action. *Central States Speech Journal, 31*, 85–94.

Zarefsky, D. (1982). Persistent questions in the theory of argument fields. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18*, 191–203.

Zarefsky, D. (1986). *President Johnson's war on poverty*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1990). *Lincoln, Douglas, and slavery. In the crucible of public debate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1992). Persistent questions in the theory of argument fields. In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample, & P. J. Benoit (Eds.), *Readings in argumentation* (pp. 417–436). Berlin-New York: Foris.

Zarefsky, D. (1995). Argumentation in the tradition of speech communication studies. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair, & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Perspectives and approaches. Proceedings of the third international conference on argumentation, I* (pp. 32–52). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Zarefsky, D. (2006). Strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions. Implications for dialectic and rhetoric. *Argumentation, 20*(4), 399–416.

Zarefsky, D. (2009). Strategic maneuvering in political argumentation. In F. H. van

Zarefsky, D. (2012). Goodnight's "speculative inquiry" in its intellectual context. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 48*(2), 211–215.

Zeleznikow, J. (2006). Using Toulmin argumentation to support dispute settlement in discretionary domains. In D. L. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.), *Arguing on the Toulmin model. New essays in argument analysis and evaluation* (pp. 289–301). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zemplén, G. A. (2008). Scientific controversies and the pragma-dialectical model. Analysing a case study from the 1670s, the published part of the Newton-Lucas correspondence. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy*

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)

analysis with argumentation theory (pp. 249–273). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zemplén, G. A. (2009). Scientific controversies and the pragma-dialectical model.Analysing a case study from the 1670s, the published part of the Newton-Lucas correspondence. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Controversy and confrontation. Relating controversy analysis with argumentation theory* (pp. 249–273). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zemplén, G. A. (2011). The argumentative use of methodology. Lessons from a controversy following Newton's first optical paper. In M. Dascal & V. D. Boantza (Eds.), *Controversies in the scientific revolution* (pp. 123–147). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zenker, F. (2007a). Changes in conduct-rules and ten commandments. Pragma-dialectics 1984 vs. 2004. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 1581–1589). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Zenker, F. (2007b). Pragma-dialectic's necessary conditions for a critical discussion. In J. A. Blair, H. Hansen, R. Johnson, & C. W. Tindale (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA)*. Windsor: OSSA. (CD rom).

Zidar Gale, T., Žagar, Ž. I., & Žmavc, J. (2006). *Retorika. Uvod v govorniško veščino. Učbenik za retoriko kot izbirni predmet v 9. razredu devetletnega osnovnošolskega izobraževanja* [Rhetoric. An introduction to the art of oratory. A textbook for rhetoric lessons in the ninth grade of elementary school education]. Ljubljana: i2.

Ziembiński, Z. (1955). *Logika praktyczna* [Practical logic]. Warsaw. PWN: Polish Scientific Publishers.

Zillig, W. (1982). *Bewerten. Sprechakttypen der bewertenden Rede* [Asserting. Speech act types of the assertive mode]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ziomek, J. (1990). *Retoryka opisowa* [Descriptive rhetoric]. Wroclaw: Ossolineum.

Žmavc, J. (2008a). Ethos and pathos in Anaximenes' Rhetoric to Alexander. A conflation of rhetorical and argumentative concepts. In F. H. van Eemeren, D. C. Williams, & I. Ž. Žagar (Eds.), *Understanding argumentation. Work in progress* (pp. 165–179). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Žmavc, J. (2008b). Sofisti in retorična sredstva prepričevanja [The Sophists and rhetorical means of persuasion]. *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo, 36*(233), 23–37.

Žmavc, J. (2012). The ethos of classical rhetoric. From epieikeia to auctoritas. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Topical themes in argumentation theory. Twenty exploratory studies* (pp. 181–191). Dordrecht: Springer.

de Zubiria, J. (2006). *Las competencias argumentativas. Una visión desde la educación* [Argumentative competences. A vision from education]. Bogota: Magisterio.

Zukerman, I., McConachy, R., & Korb, K. (1998). Bayesian reasoning in an abductive mechanism for argument generation and analysis. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth national conference on artificial intelligence (AAAI-98, Madison)* (pp. 833–838). Menlo Park: AAAI Press.

BDD-B442-3 © 2014 Springer
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 01:19:20 UTC)