

Notice of Books Received

Volume 42, Number 3, 2022

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1092379ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v42i3.7504>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Informal Logic

ISSN

0824-2577 (print)

2293-734X (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this document

(2022). Notice of Books Received. *Informal Logic*, 42(3), 653–667.

<https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v42i3.7504>

BOOKS RECEIVED

Notice of BOOKS RECEIVED Policy

Informal Logic no longer invites **descriptive** book reviews. However, at the end of each issue of the journal, *Informal Logic* will print, and re-print, **notices** of monographs, collected papers, proceedings of conferences, anthologies and any similar scholarly books (not textbooks) published during the previous four years on topics related to informal logic, critical thinking, argument (logic, dialectic, rhetoric) theory or practice. The notice, to be supplied by the author(s) or editor(s) or publisher, may simply describe the work or shamelessly promote it, or both, but *must not exceed 150 words*. Each notice will be reprinted in each issue of the journal until four years after the year the edition of the book was first published. (Be sure to include at least the author's or editor's name, the title of the book, the year of publication, the publisher and the number of pages.) We hope this department of the journal will serve as a resource for researchers wanting to know of recent work in the field. Send notices to: tblair@uwindsor.ca. A reader may apply to the editors to publish a **critical review** of a book on the **notices** list, and the editors may from time to time commission such a critical review.

Books Received (by date):

GEORGE BOGER (2022) *Aristotle's Syllogistic Underlying Logic: His Model with his Proofs of Soundness and Completeness*. London: College Publications: pp. 1-446.

This is a ground- breaking and thorough study of Aristotle's logic, including a new translation of select chapters of *Prior Analytics* that treat the logic's formal components. It shows that Aristotle consciously modeled his Underlying Logic, that *Prior Analytics* is a metasystematic discourse with *its own underlying logic*. The author clearly demonstrates that Aristotle conceived his logic as natural by explicating his notion of human cognition, central to which is his epistemic concern with syllogistic mediation that restricts a syl-

logism to two premises. The study further represents Aristotle's *philosophy of logic* as having a fully developed *ontology* that underlies the *epistemics* of syllogistic argumentation.

Unlike previous scholarship, this study works with the entire corpus of the *Organon* to assemble Aristotle's underlying logic *in Aristotle's own words* with extensive citation of primary texts. An especially innovative feature is to block passages of the text and to insert subsection titles that help (1) to elucidate Aristotle's meaning, (2) to indicate the movement of his thinking, and (3) to reveal the careful and systematic character of his logical investigations.

SCOTT AIKIN AND JOHN CASEY. (2022). *Straw Man Arguments: A Study in Fallacy Theory*. London: Bloomsbury: pp. i-vi. 1-240.

This book analyses the straw man fallacy and its deployment in philosophical reasoning. While commonly invoked in both academic dialogue and public discourse, it has not until now received the attention it deserves as a rhetorical device. The authors propose that straw manning essentially consists in expressing distorted representations of one's critical interlocutor. To this end, the straw man comprises three dialectical forms, and not only the one that is usually suggested: the straw man, the weak man and the hollow man. Moreover, they demonstrate that straw manning is unique among fallacies as it has no particular logical form in itself, because it is an instance of inappropriate meta-argument, or argument about arguments. They discuss the importance of the onlooking audience to the successful deployment of the straw man, reasoning that the existence of an audience complicates the dialectical boundaries of argument.

STEVE OSWALD, MARCIN LEWIŃSKI, SARA GRECO, SERENA VILLATA (Eds.). (2022). *The Pandemic of Argumentation*. Argumentation Library, Vol 43. Cham Switzerland: Springer: pp. i-vi. 1-371.

This open access book addresses communicative aspects of the current COVID-19 pandemic as well as the epidemic of misinformation from the perspective of argumentation theory. Argumentation theory is uniquely placed to understand and account for the challenges of public reason as expressed through argumentative discourse. The book thus focuses on the extent to which the forms, norms and functions of public argumentation have changed in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. This question is investigated along the three main research lines of the COST Action project CA 17132: European network for Argumentation and Public PoLiCY analysis (APPLY): descriptive, normative, and prescriptive.

DALE HAMPLE (Ed.) (2021) *Local Theories of Argument*. New York: Routledge: pp. 1-558.

Argumentation is often understood as a coherent set of Western theories, birthed in Athens and developing throughout the Roman period, the Middle Ages, the Enlightenment and Renaissance, and into the present century. Ideas have been nuanced, developed, and revised, but still the outline of argumentation theory has been recognizable for centuries, or so it has seemed to Western scholars. The 2019 Alta Conference on Argumentation (co-sponsored by the National Communication Association and the American Forensic Association) aimed to question the generality of these intellectual traditions.

This resulting collection of essays deals with the possibility of having local theories of argument – local to a particular time, a particular kind of issue, a particular place, or a particular culture. Many of the papers argue for reconsidering basic ideas about arguing to represent the uniqueness of some moment or location of discourse.

LEAL, FERNANDO AND HUBERT MARRAUD (2022) *How Philosophers Argue: An Adversarial Collaboration on the Russell--*

Copleston Debate (ARGA volume 41). Springer. Argumentation Library Book Series. Pp. xiii + 188.

This volume presents a double argumentative analysis of the debate between Bertrand Russell and Frederick Copleston on the existence of God, providing an introduction justifying the choice of text and a transcript of the debate.

In Part I the argumentative process is analysed by means of the ideal model of critical discussion. It highlights questions raised over and beyond that of whether God exists. Many questions are left in the air; a few others give rise to sundry sub-discussions or meta-dialogues. Part II provides the theoretical framework of argument dialectic: argument structures are identified by means of punctuation marks, argumentative connectors and operators, revealing the argumentative exchange as the collaborative construction of a macro-argument that is both a joint product of the arguers and a complex structure representing the dialectical relationships between the individual arguments. Finally, the complementarity of the two approaches is addressed. Thus, the book serves as an exercise in adversarial collaboration.

FINOCCHIARO, MAURICE A. (2019). *On Trial for Reason: Science, Religion, and Culture in the Galileo Affair*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. ix+289.

This book is a synthetic, comprehensive, and accessible account of the Galileo affair: the Inquisition proceedings of his trial, its intellectual issues, its scientific and philosophical background, the historical aftermath up to our day, and the philosophical lessons involving the relationship between science and religion and the nature of rationality, scientific method, and critical thinking. The key thesis is that Galileo was condemned by the Catholic Church because of his critical reasoning. His alleged crime was committed by publishing a book that defended Copernicus's theory of the earth's motion, which was controversial at that time and which the Church regarded as false and contrary to Scripture. The key point is that

Galileo not only explained all arguments on both sides, but took the liberty of evaluating their merits; and it turned out that the arguments favoring the earth's motion, although not completely conclusive, were much stronger than those against it.

FINOCCHIARO, MAURICE A. (2021). *Science, Method, and Argument in Galileo: Philosophical, Historical, and Historiographical Essays*. Pp. xxvi+475 (Argumentation Library, volume 4). Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature.

This book is a collection of 24 essays, all but three previously published during the last 50 years. Their two-fold focus is argumentation and Galileo. That is, these essays are methodological and logical analyses of arguments such as the following: arguments by Galileo, about the physics of falling bodies and the astronomical theory of the earth's motion; arguments by his critics and supporters, about his Inquisition trial; arguments by scholars aiming to understand and evaluate his scientific achievements and Inquisition trial; and comparisons and contrasts of argumentation by Galileo and by other important thinkers, such as Socrates, Giordano Bruno, Karl Marx, and his musicologist father Vincenzo Galilei. From the point of view of argumentation theory, the essays focus on concrete illustrations and clarifications of the following concepts and principles: interpretation vs. evaluation, simple vs. complex structure, meta-argumentation, fallacy, conductive argument, charity, open-mindedness, fair-mindedness, and judiciousness.

AMOSSY, RUTH (2021) *In Defense of Polemics*. Pages ix + 166. Springer. Argumentation Library Book Series (ARGA volume 42).

This book revisits the definition of polemical discourse and deals with its functions in the democratic sphere. It first examines theoretical questions concerning the management of disagreement in democracy and the nature of polemical discourse. Next, it analyses case studies involving such issues as the place of women in the

public space, illustrated by the case of the burqa in France and public controversy in the media on the exclusion of women from the public space. The book then explores reason, passion and violence in polemical discourse by means of cases involving confrontations between secular and ultra-orthodox circles, controversies about the Mexican Wall and fierce discussions about stock-options, and bonuses in times of financial crisis.

The book answers questions like: What is the social function of a confrontational management of dissent that does not primarily seek to achieve agreement? Is it just a sign of decadence, failure and powerlessness, or does it play a constructive role?

HITCHCOCK, DAVID (2021) *Definition: A Practical Guide to Constructing and Evaluating Definitions of Terms*. Pages x + 273. Windsor Studies in Argumentation.

Definitions matter. They determine who can get married, when the organs of a “dead” person can be harvested for transplants, what counts as a planet, the unemployment rate, and more. Definition proposes criteria and guidelines for constructing and evaluating definitions, with reference to the definer’s basic purpose (reporting, stipulating, or advocating a meaning), the definition’s content (the kinds of words used and the information conveyed), and its form (any of 14 kinds). The proposals of criteria and guidelines implicitly address theoretical issues and are illustrated by definitions of 166 2 terms taken from many fields—terms such as ‘clock,’ ‘life,’ ‘planet,’ and ‘thrombin activatable fibrinolysis inhibitor.’

Eemeren, Frans H. van (2020) *Argumentation between Doctors and Patients: Understanding Clinical Argumentative Discourse*. John Benjamins.

This book discusses the use of argumentation in clinical settings. Starting from the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation, it aims at providing an understanding of argumentative discourse in the context of doctor-patient interaction. It explains when and how interactions between doctors and patients can be reconstructed as argumentative, what it means for doctors and patients to reasonably resolve a difference of opinion, what it implies to strive simultaneously for reasonableness and effectiveness in clinical discourse, and when such efforts derail into fallaciousness. Of interest to all those who seek to improve their understanding of argumentation in a medical context—whether they are students, scholars of argumentation, or medical practitioners.

HINTON, MARTIN (2021) *Evaluating the Language of Argument*. Springer.

This book is concerned with the evaluation of natural argumentative discourse and the language in which arguments are expressed. It introduces a systematic procedure for the analysis and assessment of arguments, which is designed to be a practical tool, and may be considered a pseudo-algorithm for argument evaluation. The first half lays the theoretical groundwork, with a thorough examination of both the nature of language and the nature of argument. The second half begins with a detailed discussion of the concept of fallacy. A new way of looking at fallacies emerges, and it is that conception, together with the understanding of the nature of argumentation, which ultimately provides the support for the Comprehensive Assessment Procedure for Natural Argumentation.

TINDALE, CHRISTOPHER W. (2021) *The Anthropology of Argument: Cultural Foundations of Rhetoric and Reason*. Routledge.

This book explores the experience of argument across cultures, developing an anthropological perspective on argumentation. It shifts

the focus away from the propositional element of arguments onto how they emerge from the experiences of peoples with diverse backgrounds, demonstrating how argumentation can be understood as a gathering place of ideas and styles. Confronting the limitations of the Western tradition of logic and searching out the argumentative roles of place, orality, myth, narrative, and audience, it examines the nature of multi-modal argumentation.

AIKIN, SCOTT AND ROBERT TALISSE (2020) *Political Argument in a Polarized Age: Reason and Democratic Life*. Polity Books.

The authors show that disagreeing civilly, even with your sworn enemies, is a crucial part of democracy. Rejecting the popular view that civility requires a polite and concessive attitude, they argue that our biggest challenge is not remaining calm in the face of an opponent, but rather ensuring that our political arguments actually address those on the opposing side. Too often politicians and pundits merely simulate political debate, offering carefully structured caricatures of their opponents. These simulations mimic political argument in a way designed to convince citizens that those with whom they disagree are not worth talking to.

BLAIR, ANTHONY J. AND CHRISTOPHER W. TINDALE (Eds.). (2020) *Rigour and Reason: Essays in Honour of Hans Vilhelm Hansen*.

Windsor Studies in Argumentation. This book collects essays in recognition of the career of Professor Hansen, whose contributions to the fields of informal logic and argument theory have earned the gratitude of his colleagues. Essays by scholars as John Woods, Douglas Walton, Trudy Govier, Derek Allen, Jean Goodwin, James B. Freeman, David Hitchcock, Christopher Tindale, J. Anthony Blair, Patrick Bondy, Daniel Cohen, Marcin Lewiński, Yun Xie, Leo Groarke, Bruce Russell, and Christian Kock cover a range of

topics in the history and theory of informal logic and argumentation theory.

JULIO CABRERA (2019) *Introduction to a Negative Approach Argumentation: Towards a New Ethic for Philosophical Debate*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Pp.200. ISBN: 978-1-52753968-6.

This work deals with argumentation in philosophy. In the “affirmative” view of argumentation, each party thinks it is right while all other positions are wrong; argumentation is seen as guided by a set of rules that should lead to the resolution of the dispute in favor of one party. This book advances a critique of such an approach, proposing instead a negative one, the central idea of which is that each party organizes the elements of the problem concerning the definition of terms, the assumptions to be accepted, and the types of logical resources being used. The negative approach attempts to modify the ethics of philosophical discussions, moving towards pluralism, a diversity of perspectives, and the capacity to adopt a panoramic view where one’s own posture appears only as one among others. The book will particularly appeal to graduate and postgraduate students in philosophy, psychology, pedagogy and communication, as well as the general reader interested in philosophy.

HANSEN, HANS V., FRED KAUFFELD, AND LILIAN BERMEJO-LUQUE (Eds.). (2019). *Presumptions and Burdens of Proof: An Anthology of Argumentation and the Law*. University of Alabama Press: pp. 320. ISBN: 978-0-8173-2017-1

In the last fifty years, the study of argumentation has become one of the most exciting intellectual crossroads in the modern academy. Two of the most central concepts of argumentation theory are pre-

sumptions and burdens of proof. Their functions have been explicitly recognized in legal theory since the middle ages, but their pervasive presence in all forms of argumentation and in inquiries beyond the law—including politics, science, religion, philosophy, and interpersonal communication—have been the object of study since the nineteenth century.

However, the documents and essays central to any discussion of presumptions and burdens of proof as devices of argumentation are scattered across a variety of remote sources in rhetoric, law, and philosophy. *Presumptions and Burdens of Proof: An Anthology of Argumentation and the Law* brings together for the first time key texts relating to the history of the theory of presumptions along with contemporary studies that identify and give insight into the issues facing students and scholars today.

RIGOTTI, EDDO AND SARA GRECO (2019). *Inference in Argumentation*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer: pp. xxx, 325. ISBN13: 9783030-04566-1.

This book investigates the role of inference in argumentation, considering how arguments support standpoints on the basis of different *loci*. The authors propose and illustrate a model for the analysis of the standpoint-argument connection, called Argumentum Model of Topics (AMT). A prominent feature of the AMT is that it distinguishes, within each and every single argumentation, between an *inferential-procedural* component, on which the reasoning process is based; and a *material-contextual* component, which anchors the argument in the interlocutors' cultural and factual common ground. The AMT explains how these components differ and how they are intertwined within each single argument. This model is introduced in Part II of the book, following a careful reconstruction of the enormously rich tradition of studies on inference in argumentation, from the antiquity to contemporary authors, without neglecting medieval and post-medieval contributions. The AMT is a contemporary

model grounded in a dialogue with such tradition, whose crucial aspects are illuminated in this book.

AL-JUWAID, WALEED RIDHA HAMMOODI (2019) *The Pragmatics of Cogent Argumentation in British and American Political Debates*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: pp. 432.

Since the time of Aristotle, various approaches have been offered to tackle what makes language stronger. Some approaches have focused on rhetoric, while others have given attention to logic. Still others have concentrated on dialectics. This book takes into account a full-fledged comprehensive model of analysis that brings these three perspectives together. Throughout, it investigates the presence of pragmatic criteria and the utilization of pragmatic strategies that make language stronger in the context of argumentation. Cogent argumentation is a pragmatic communicative interactional process that goes through stages and is regarded as a communicative exchange of arguments. The cogency of these arguments is attained according to the availability of pragmatic criteria and the utilization of pragmatic strategies and determined throughout the whole process of argumentation.

The book will be of interest to anyone interested in the fields of pragmatics, communication, and politics, and will widen their understanding of the pragmatic structure and criteria which constitute cogent argumentation.

BLAIR, ANTHONY J. (Ed.). (2019) *Studies in Critical Thinking*. Windsor Studies in Argumentation.

Critical thinking deserves both imaginative teaching and serious theoretical attention. *Studies in Critical Thinking* assembles an all-star cast to serve both. Besides five exercises teachers may copy or

adapt, by Derek Allen, Tracy Bowell, Justine Kingsbury, Jan Albert van Laar, Sharon Bailin and Mark Battersby, there are chapters on: what critical thinking is, the nature of argument, definition, using the web, evaluation, argument schemes, abduction, generalizing, fallaciousness, logic and critical thinking, computer-aided argument mapping, and more—by such illustrious scholars as John Woods, Douglas Walton, Sally Jackson, Dale Hample, Robert Ennis, Beth Innocenti, David Hitchcock, Christopher Tindale, G. C. Goddu, Alec Fisher, Michael Scriven, Martin Davies, Ashley Barnett, Tim van Gelder and Mark Battersby.

BATTERSBY, MATTERSBY, MARK AND BAILIN, SHARON (2018) *Inquiry: A New Paradigm for Critical Thinking*. Windsor Studies in Argumentation.

This volume reflects the development and theoretical foundation of a new paradigm for critical thinking based on inquiry. The field of critical thinking, as manifested in the Informal Logic movement, developed primarily as a response to the inadequacies of formalism to represent actual argumentative practice and to provide useful argumentative skills to students. Because of this, the primary focus of the field has been on informal arguments rather than formal reasoning. Yet the formalist history of the field is still evident in its emphasis, with respect to both theory and pedagogy, on the structure and evaluation of individual, de-contextualized arguments. It is our view that such a view of critical thinking is excessively narrow and limited, failing to provide an understanding of argumentation as largely a matter of comparative evaluation of a variety of contending positions and arguments with the goal of reaching a reasoned judgment on an issue. As a consequence, traditional critical thinking instruction is problematic in failing to provide the reasoning skills that students need in order to accomplish this goal. Instead, the goal of critical thinking instruction has been seen largely as a defensive one: of learning to not fall prey to invalid, inadequate, or fallacious arguments.

EEMEREN, FRANS H. VAN (2018) *Argumentation Theory: A Pragma Dialectical Perspective*. Argumentation Library series. Springer: pp. 199.

The book offers a compact but comprehensive introductory overview of the crucial components of argumentation theory. In presenting this overview, argumentation is consistently approached from a pragma-dialectical perspective by viewing it pragmatically as a goal directed communicative activity and dialectically as part of a regulated critical exchange aimed at resolving a difference of opinion. The book also systematically explains how the constitutive parts of the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation hang together. The following topics are discussed: (1) argumentation theory as a discipline; (2) the meta-theoretical principles of pragma-dialectics; (3) the model of a critical discussion aimed at resolving a difference of opinion; (4) fallacies as violations of a code of conduct for reasonable argumentative discourse; (5) descriptive research of argumentative reality; (6) analysis as theoretically-motivated reconstruction; (7) strategic manoeuvring aimed at combining achieving effectiveness with maintaining reasonableness; (8) the conventionalization of argumentative practices; (9) prototypical argumentative patterns; (10) pragma-dialectics amidst other approaches.

HAMPLE, DALE (2018) *Interpersonal Arguing*. New York: Peter Lang: pp. 301.

This book is an accessible review of scholarship on key elements of face-to-face arguing, which is the interpersonal exchange of reasons. Topics include frames for understanding the nature of arguing, argument situations, serial arguments, argument dialogues, and in-

ternational differences in how people understand interpersonal arguing. This is a thorough survey of the leading issues involved in understanding how people argue with one another.

MOHAMMED, DIMA (2018) *Argumentation in Prime Minister's Question Time: Accusation of Inconsistency in Response to Criticism*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

When political actors respond to criticism by pointing at an inconsistency in the critic's position, a tricky political practice emerges. Turning the criticism back to the critic can be a constructive move that restores coherence, but it may also be a disruptive move that silences the critical voice and obstructs accountability. What distinguishes constructive cases from disruptive ones? This is the question this book sets out to answer.

The question is addressed by adopting an argumentative perspective. *Argumentation in Prime Minister's Question Time* focuses on the turnabout employed by the British Prime Minister in response to the Leader of the Opposition. The turnabout is characterised as a particular way of strategic manoeuvring. The manoeuvring is analysed and evaluated by combining pragmatic, dialectical and rhetorical insights with considerations from the realm of politics. The outcome is an account of the turnabout's strategic functions and an assessment guide for evaluating its reasonableness.

The book will be of interest to advanced students and researchers of argumentation, discourse analysis, communication and rhetoric.

Books reviewed since 2014 (in order of appearance):

John Woods, *Truth in Fiction: Rethinking its Logic*. Springer, 2018, 239 pp. ISBN: 978-3-319-72657-1.

Frans H. van Eemeren *Argumentation Theory: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018. (Argumentation Library, vol. 33). Pp. xi + 199. ISBN: 978-3-319-95380-9.

- Hitchcock, David. (2017). *On Reasoning and Argument: Essays in Informal Logic and Critical Thinking*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. Pp. xxvii, 553.
- Blair, J. A. (2012). *Groundwork in the Theory of Argumentation: Selected Papers of J. Anthony Blair*. Argumentation Library, Vol. 21. Dordrecht: Springer. Pp. xxi, 1-355.
- Finocchiaro, Maurice A. (2013). "Meta-argumentation, An Approach to Logic and Argumentation Theory." *Studies in Logic, Logic and Argumentation*, Vol. 42. London: College Publications. Pp. vii, 1-279.
- Macagno, Fabrizio and Douglas Walton. (2014). *Emotive Language in Argumentation*. New York: Cambridge.
- Rubinelli, Sara and A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.). (2012). "Argumentation and Health." Special issue of the journal *Argumentation in Context*, Vol. 1, No. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. vi, 1-142.
- Eemeren, Frans H. van and Bart Garssen (Eds.). (2015). *Reflections on Theoretical Issues in Argumentation Theory*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. Pp. xiv, 1-293.
- Amossy, Ruth. (2014). *Apologie de la polémique*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France. Coll. L'interrogation philosophique. Pp. 1240.
- Gilbert, Michael A. (2014). *Arguing with People*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press. Pp. 1-12, front matter; 13-137.
- Campbell, John Angus, Antonio de Velasco and David Henry (Eds.). (2016). *Rethinking Rhetorical Theory, Criticism, and Pedagogy: The Living Art of Michael C. Leff*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. Pp. xxiv, 1-481.
- Tindale, Christopher W. (2015). *The Philosophy of Argument and Audience Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. xii, 1-244.