

Paper submissions are invited for the special issue/collection of *Topoi* on the Special Issue “*Philosophical Discussions with Pragma-Dialectics*”.

Special issue article publications often bring higher citations and visibility than regular papers and attract more relevant readership due to its scope. *Topoi* is indexed in the Web of Science, currently with an IF of 1,4 and CiteScore of 2,8 and its editorial team is led by Prof. Fabio Paglieri and Prof. Marcin Lewiński.

Guest Editors

Constanza Ihnen Jory, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile [email](#), [website](#)

Jan Albert Van Laar, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands [email](#), [website](#)

Marcin Lewiński, NOVA University, Lisbon, Portugal [email](#), [website](#)

DEADLINE: Please submit your paper by 31st January 2024. Should you not be able to meet this deadline, please contact the Guest Editor (contact details below).

SUBMISSION: Please use the journal’s Online Manuscript Submission System, accessible here [Editorial Manager®](#). Please note that paper submissions via email are not accepted.

DESCRIPTION: On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the publication of van Eemeren and Grootendorst’s *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions* (Foris, 1984) and the 20th anniversary of *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation* (CUP, 2004), the issue aims to foster a lively debate on the core philosophical commitments and consequences of the pragma-dialectical theory in its standard and extended version. Pragma-dialectics is today one of the most influential theories of argumentation. At the heart of the theory is the model for a “critical discussion”, a two-party discursive procedure for resolving differences of opinion in a reasonable way, designed to provide a heuristic, analytical, and critical framework for the study of argumentative discourse. Underlying the model there is a set of interrelated philosophical commitments concerning the idea of argumentative reasonableness and the pragmatic rules and principles that can best describe and explain argumentative practices.

The pragma-dialectical core commitments are explicitly presented and extensively justified in *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions [SAAD]* and *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation [STA]*. In *SAAD*, the emphasis is placed on the development of a linguistic approach that characterizes argumentative discussions as an orderly exchange of speech acts instrumental in the rational resolution of a difference of opinion. This pragmatic conception of argument is based on a critical assessment and partial modification of the “standard version” of speech act theory, as developed by John L. Austin and John Searle, as well as on an adaptation of Paul Grice’s theory of conversational rationality. In turn, *STA* builds on the pragmatic insights developed in *SAAD* and elaborates on the dialectical conception of reasonableness underlying the model. According to this conception, a difference of opinion is reasonably resolved if,

and only if, the parties reach a joint conclusion as a result of putting the acceptability of the standpoints at issue to the test by applying criteria that are problem-valid and intersubjectively valid. This approach is inspired by critical rationalists and other analytic philosophers, such as Karl Popper, Hans Albert, and Arne Naess, and by formal dialogical logicians, such as Charles Hamblin, Paul Lorenzen, Else M. Barth and Erik C. W. Krabbe.

The pragma-dialectical theory has played a decisive role in the development of contemporary argumentation studies. Not only has the theory produced an impressive amount of literature applying it to a wide variety of contexts, it has also been key to students of argument in a more profound sense: it has created a set of opportunities for argument, a “disagreement space” (Jackson, 1992; van Eemeren, Grootendorst, Jackson & Jacobs, 1993), prompting high-level discussions on the philosophy of argument, and it has stimulated new insights in the field of argumentation within and outside of the pragma-dialectical framework.

Debates over pragma-dialectics date at least from the early 80’s and last up to the present day. Critical contributions have addressed a wide range of topics, such as the epistemological theories (e.g., Siegel & Biro, 2008; Garssen & van Laar, 2010) and the philosophy of language (e.g., Kauffeld, 2006; Bermejo-Luque, 2011; Lewiński, 2021) underpinning pragma-dialectics; the relation of pragma-dialectics to logic (e.g., Bonevac, 2003; Johnson, 2006); the definition of the function of argumentation as that of convincing or achieving consensus (e.g., Lumer, 2010); the preference for a dialectical conception of reasonableness over a rhetorical one in the account of fallacies (Tindale, 1996); and the suitability of a critical discussion model as a standard for political debate (Kock, 2007). Recent philosophical debates include the questions of the normativity of speech acts (Bermejo-Luque & Moldovan, 2021; Lewiński et al., 2023), of adversariality (Stevens & Casey, 2021; Aikin & Casey, 2022), and of disagreements in argumentation (Godden & Bondy, 2021). Contributors to these debates explicitly or implicitly dialogue with the philosophical tenets of the pragma-dialectical theory by challenging, revising, or reinforcing their merits.

The theory has also motivated several contributions aimed at complementing van Eemeren and Grootendorst’s proposals. Thus, besides the long list of publications relating to the notions of “strategic maneuvering”, “communicative activity types”, “argumentative patterns” and “argumentative styles,” developed within the pragma-dialectical framework, there are a number of contributions pointing at the relation between political legitimation and argumentation in political discourse (Ietcu-Fairclough, 2008; Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012), establishing parallels between the pragma-dialectical rules for a critical discussion and Habermas notion of “rational discourse” and “ideal speech situation” (Rehg, 2009; Corredor, 2018), efforts at reconciling the notion of complex polylogues within dialectical theories, such as pragma-dialectics (Lewiński & Aahkus, 2023), attempts at reconciling informal logic with pragma-dialectics (Johnson, 2000; Freeman, 2006), and applications of the concept of strategic maneuvering to analyze persuasive definitions (Zarefsky, 2006). Further, the theory has an impact on the theory of dialogue types, including the idea of dialogue shifts (Walton & Krabbe,

1995), and its subsequent integration in Walton's "new dialectic" (Walton, 1998), and in computational approaches to argumentation (Prakken, 2006).

The aim of this special issue is to bring together high-quality research addressing some of the key issues raised by the pragma-dialectical theory in light of the latest thinking in the philosophy of argument, and in the related fields of the philosophy of language, philosophy of logic, philosophy of science, epistemology, philosophy of rhetoric, moral philosophy, political philosophy, and legal philosophy. What are the chances and prospects of the pragma-dialectical approach, and what are the problems that need to be addressed?

Possible topics of interest include but are not limited to:

- Reasonableness and rationality in pragma-dialectics and argumentation theory
- Speech acts constituting and regulating argumentative discussions
- Role of commitments and beliefs in the extended pragma-dialectics
- Philosophy of rhetoric and pragma-dialectics
- Role of disagreement and consensus in argumentation, including feminist responses to pragma-dialectics
- Rational reconstruction of argumentation (enthymemes, charity, "maximal strategies" of pragma-dialectics)
- Pragma-dialectics and the philosophical tradition of argumentation (Socratic method, Aristotle's dialectic and rhetoric, mediaeval disputations)
- Formal logic and pragma-dialectics
- Many-valued logic and pragma-dialectics
- Defeasible argument schemes and pragma-dialectics
- Fallacies and pragma-dialectics
- Formal dialectic and dialogical logic as related to pragma-dialectics
- The weight of arguments and pragma-dialectics
- Justification of normative and evaluative standpoints in pragma-dialectics

- Epistemic value of argumentation and pragma-dialectics
- Political value of argumentation, especially within the deliberative theories of democracy, and pragma-dialectics
- Ethical considerations regarding the roles of arguers and arguments in pragma-dialectics
- Pragma-dialectics and “grand” theories of argumentation, public sphere, and public reason (Habermas, Rawls)
- Pragma-dialectics and legal philosophy (Alexy, MacCormick, Atienza)
- Inferentialism (Brandom), normative pragmatics and pragma-dialectics

AUTHOR SUBMISSION’S GUIDELINES: Authors are asked to prepare their manuscripts according to the journal’s standard [Submission Guidelines](#). When uploading your paper in Editorial Manager, please select “S.I.: Philosophical Discussions with Pragma-Dialectics (Ihnen/Van Laar/Lew)” in either the drop-down menu “Article Type” or through SI selection in the Author’s Questionnaire.

EDITORIAL PROCESS: All papers will undergo the journal’s standard review procedure (double-blind peer-review), according to the journal’s [Peer Review Policy, Process and Guidance](#) and reviewers will be selected according to the [Peer-Reviewer Selection](#) policies.

Once papers are accepted, they will be made available as [Online first articles](#) publications until final publication into an issue and available on the [Collections](#) page.

CONTACT: For any questions, please contact the Guest Editor(s): Constanza Ihnen Jory [email](#) directly.