

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 reprint, *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):

STEVENS, KATHARINA (2026). *The Ethics of Argumentation*. New York: Routledge. ISBN 9781041073420. 200 pp.

Current normative approaches to argumentation do not treat ethics as an integral part of argumentation theory. This is at least in part due to a methodological commitment not to address internal states of the arguers, such as intentions and beliefs, which makes moral theorizing about argumentation difficult. This book presents three arguments for why ethics ought to be a central element in normative theorizing about argumentation. Through these arguments it shows, first, that ethics is needed for providing normative argumentation theory with its foundation and for offering arguers reliable guidance for decision-making, both about which norms ought to govern their arguing and how they should shape each argument they make. Second, it addresses some of the most persistent problems faced by currently dominant normative approaches to

argumentation, most notably that they are only reliable under the assumption that unrealistic background conditions are fulfilled. Finally, it provides the groundwork for a systematic ethics of argumentation. It does so by showing how a function of argumentation can be justified via moral reasons and by providing the outlines for both an applied ethics of (meta-level) normative argument design and an applied role-ethics of object-level arguing.

MORA-MÁRQUEZ, ANA MARÍA &, GUSTAVO FERNÁNDEZ WALKER (2025). *Revisiting Medieval Dialectics*. Argumentation Library. Springer Cham. ISBN 9783031944604. xi, 255pp.

This book presents a collection of essays by prominent young researchers and established scholars on the medieval reception of Aristotle's Topics in the Latin, Arabic and Hebraic traditions, as well as on its late-ancient sources in Alexander of Aphrodisias and Boethius. The book thus provides a fruitful engagement with the late-ancient to medieval reception of the Topics, a tradition that has been understudied in recent scholarship. The collected contributions revisit the reception of the Topics focusing on historical analyses of dialectics as a general method of argumentation and as a scientific method. The authors studied in this book range from well-known figures such as Alexander, Boethius, Buridan and Avicenna, to the lesser-known Radulphus Brito, Judah ben Shlomo ha Kohen, and Ibn Tumlus.

SCHUMANN, JENNIFER (2025). *The Pragmatics of Straw Man Fallacies: An Experimental Approach*. Argumentation Library. Springer Cham. ISBN 9783031940934. xii, 274pp.

This open-access book provides the first experimental pragmatic investigation of the straw man, uncovering a variety of factors that increase or decrease the acceptability of this fallacy. The book starts with an overview of the primarily theoretical frameworks on argumentation/fallacies and the straw man. The aim is to provide a synthetic review of the research conducted in argumentation and the study of fallacies with a strong focus on modern approaches and the role of language within these approaches. It is followed by an overview of the

empirical methods in argumentation, which leads the reader to the core part of the book, i.e., the experimental pragmatic approach to the straw man fallacy. This part of the book presents several original studies assessing the role of different linguistic factors in the perception of straw men.

MARRAUD, HUBERT. (2025). *Argumenta Dialectics: The Place of Reasons in Logic*. Argumentation Library. Springer Cham. ISBN 9783031929892. ix, 246pp.

This book is a systematic exposition of Argument Dialectics (AD). Despite its name, argument dialectics is a logical approach to argumentation theory. AD stands out among theories of argument because of three unusual features: it is reasons-based, holistic and particularistic. This implies that AD conceives of logic as a theory of the dialectical construction of reasons, not as a theory of inferences. Consequently, contrary to other logical approaches, AD focuses on the study of inter-argumentative relations, especially those of opposition and weighing. The book makes an extensive use of the theory of reasons, a branch of metaethics that has been a very valuable quarry of intuitions and concepts for the elaboration of a reason-based theory of argument. The oppositions generalism-particularism and atomism-holism, proposed by Jonathan Dancy, which play a central role in the book and in the development of AD, have been adapted from the theory of reasons, and the same can be said of the distinction between different statuses of reasons that AD associates with different kinds of counterarguments. Conceiving of the theory of argument in terms of reasons has the effect of situating the paradigm of argumentation in practical argumentation/reasoning “about what to do” rather than in theoretical argumentation “about what to believe”, as inference-based theories do. Hence, this book is of interest to argumentation theorists, communication theorists, epistemologists, linguists, moral philosophers, and philosophers of law.

FREEMAN, JAMES B. (2025). *Adequate Connections: Assessing Argument Ground Adequacy*. Argumentation Library. Springer Cham. ISBN 9783031764769. xiii, 179pp.

The book first assesses the warrant or inference rule connecting the premises to the conclusion. To analyze this, the author asks a series of

questions such as - should the warrant be evaluated by conclusive or defeasible standards? Does the argument require that its premises, if acceptable, guarantee that the conclusion is acceptable also or does it allow the premises just to present a body of relevant evidence? Is the inference rule backed or supported a priori or a posteriori? These distinctions form four categories of warrants: conclusive a priori, defeasible a posteriori, defeasible a priori, and virtually conclusive a posteriori. The warrants in each category are evaluated differently for how strongly the premises support the conclusion of arguments instantiating those warrants. After presenting the rationale for this division and discussing our nonprobabilistic approach, the author analyzes the connection adequacy for each of these types of warrants. This book is of interest to scholars of argumentation theory.

HESS, AARON, and JENS E. KJELDSEN. Editors (2025). *Ethos, Technology, and AI in Contemporary Society The Character in The Machine.* New York: Routledge. ISBN 9781032671499. 368 pp.

Recent advancements in technology, including the development of digital technologies, the growth of algorithmic machine learning and artificial intelligence, and the circulation of disinformation in social media, necessitate a re-evaluation of ethos. To explore the rhetorical concept of ethos, which is the perceived character of a speaker, contributors theorize how ethos is enabled, constrained, and constituted through new communication technologies. In this edited collection, chapters address key philosophical questions concerning the rhetorical capacities of modern communicating machines such as ChatGPT, Midjourney, or other digital platforms. Through case studies, new theorizing, and critical inquiry, contributors contemplate the changing relationship between humans and technology in rhetoric and ethos, revealing contemporary tensions and insecurities regarding issues including authenticity and authorship.

MAURICE A. FINOCCHIARO (2023) *The Fallacy of Composition: Critical Reviews, Conceptual Analyses, and Case Studies.* Studies in Logic and Argumentation, Vol. 100. London: College Publications. x + 224 pp.

This is the first book-length study of the fallacy of composition. It focuses on arguments from parts to whole, from micro to macro, and from some to all, discussing both their structures and the conditions of their correctness. The topic is approached through a series of critical reviews, conceptual analyses, and case studies. The critical reviews elaborate interpretations and evaluations of works by distinguished philosophers, economists, and political sociologists. The conceptual analyses clarify notions such as argument vs. fallacy of composition, composition vs. division, hasty generalization, flawed argument from analogy, fallaciousness vs. incorrectness, and meta-argumentation. The case studies explain issues such as the geocentric-geostatic argument from natural motion, the design argument for the existence of God, the iron law of oligarchy, the paradox of thrift, the argument from private to public debt, bank creation of money, the paradox of the bumper harvest, and current arguments for global warming.

Marko Novak (2024) *The Logic of Legal Argumentation: MultiModal Perspectives*. Routledge. xi + 166pp.

Multi-modal argumentation with its logical, emotional, visceral and kisceral arguments is an important addition to logical argumentation, especially when real-life situations are considered. It adds other modes of argumentation to the logical, to emphasize the realistic environments of communication. In this sense, the multimodal theory is important for the area of legal argumentation. This book presents a comprehensive analysis of this informal logic in legal argumentation and its practicality within the law. It argues that by building on the dialectical and rhetorical models of legal argument, the multi-modal theory of legal argumentation brings together logic and psychology in a holistic or integral perspective.

CHRISTIAN KOCK & MARCUS LANTZ (2023) *Rhetorical Argumentation: The Copenhagen School*. Windsor Studies in Argumentation. 458pp. Open access:
<https://windsor.scholarsportal.info/omp/index.php/wsia/catalog/book/240>

Aristotle taught us that rhetoric is centered around deliberation and emphasized that we may only deliberate about things that we can in fact undertake. Rhetorical argumentation is, in essence, the bedrock of such deliberation: It provides the reasons for and against various choices, which we exchange when, in some human collective, we decide on a course of action. Not all rhetoric is argumentation; but all deliberative discourse uses rhetoric, and in this rhetorical argumentation is central (and should be). Hence, we present a collection of work that revolves around the conception of rhetorical argumentation just outlined and asserts the centrality of that notion in any theory of argumentation.

DIMITRIS SERAFIS (2023) *Authoritarianism on the Front Page: Multimodal Discourse and Argumentation in Times of Multiple Crises in Greece*. John Benjamins. xiv + 181pp.

This volume offers a critical discursive-argumentative framework scrutinizing the discursive construction and argumentative justification of authoritarian attitudes on newspaper front pages in highly polarized times of multiple ‘crises’ in Greece. It also aspires to outline novel research avenues in the fields of critical discourse and argumentation studies, multimodality, and communication studies, going beyond the study of the meaning potential of multimodal artifacts and focusing on the study of the argumentative inferences that are triggered by multimodal discourses in polarized contexts. Methodologically, it draws on multimodal critical discourse analysis, integrating principles and tools from social semiotics and (multimodal) argumentation studies with a particular focus on inference in argumentation.

MICHELLE BOLDUC AND DAVID A. FRANK (2023) *The Intellectual and Cultural Origins of Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca’s New Rhetoric Project: Commentaries on and Translations of Seven Foundational Articles. 1933-1958*. Brill. ix + 228pp.

Chaïm Perelman, alone, and in collaboration with Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, developed the New Rhetoric Project (NRP),

which is in use throughout the world. Sir Brian Vickers, in his historical survey of rhetoric and philosophy for the *Oxford Encyclopaedia of Rhetoric*, states that the NRP is “one of the most influential modern formulations of rhetorical theory.” This book provides the first deep contextualization of the project’s origins, offers seven original translations of the writings of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca from French into English, and details how their collaboration effectively addresses the philosophical problems of our age.

LEWINSKI, MARCIN AND MARK AAKHUS (2022) *Argumentation in Complex Communication: Managing Disagreement in a Polylogue*. Cambridge University Press. xiii + 256pp.

Argumentation is predominantly conceptualized as two parties arguing pro and con positions with each other in one place. This dyadic bias undermines the capacity to engage argumentation in complex communication in contemporary, digital society. This book offers an ambitious alternative course of inquiry for the analysis, evaluation, and design of argumentation as polylogue: various actors arguing over many positions across multiple places. Taking up key aspects of the twentieth-century revival of argumentation as a communicative, situated practice, the polylogue framework engages a wider range of discourses, messages, interactions, technologies, and institutions necessary for adequately engaging the contemporary entanglement of argumentation and complex communication in human activities.

EEMEREN, FRANS H. VAN, BART GARSSEN, SARA GRECO, TON VAN HAAFTEN, NANON LABRIE, FERNANDO LEAL, AND PENG WU (2022) *Argumentative Style*. John Benjamins. X + 332pp

Argumentative Style discusses the ways the defence of a standpoint is given shape in argumentative discourse. Situated in the theoretical framework of pragma-dialectics, argumentative style means that the choices involved do not only concern the

presentational dimension, but also the topical selection and the audience adaptation of the strategic manoeuvring in the discourse. In identifying the functional variety of argumentative styles utilised in different domains, the point of departure is that argumentative styles manifest themselves in the discourse in the argumentative moves that are made, the dialectical routes that are chosen, and the strategic considerations that are brought to bear.

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 syllogism 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. 1371.

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. (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.’

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. Bringing together expert rhetorical theorists and technologists, this book explores our current understanding of, and attitudes toward, ethos, credibility, and trust in today's changing technological landscape.