

**4<sup>th</sup> Argumentation & Language conference (ARGAGE2024), University of Fribourg, 25-27 June 2024**  
**Special theme: 'Pragmatics and Argumentation'**

**Call for Papers**

**Rationale.** The CoRRéA (Collectif Romand de Recherche en Argumentation – Universities of Fribourg, Lausanne and Neuchâtel) in collaboration with the Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), organises every three years, since 2015, a conference devoted to the topic of argumentation, approached from the perspective of the language sciences. The 2015 edition of this bilingual international conference was held in Lausanne, the 2018 edition in Lugano, and the 2021 edition in Neuchâtel. The 4<sup>th</sup> edition of the conference will take place in Fribourg, Switzerland.

While ARGAGE2024 is primarily aimed at researchers in language and communication sciences, it welcomes contributions from other disciplines, with the understanding that the description of the linguistic functioning of argumentation significantly permeates their research. Researchers are invited to submit proposals for papers in at least one of the following four areas:

a) Speech acts in argumentation

Recent work at the interface of speech-act-theoretic pragmatics and argumentation studies (e.g., Bermejo Luque & Moldovan, 2021; Lewiński et al., 2023) has reinvigorated now classical research on the role of speech acts in argumentation (see van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 2004), with important implications for the description of argumentative practices and for the assessment of normative aspects of argumentation. In parallel, corpus linguistic and computational approaches to argumentation with speech-act-theoretic foundations (such as Inference Anchoring Theory, see e.g., Budzynska & Reed, 2011; Hautli-Janisz et al., 2022; Visser et al., 2018) are now applied at large scale and yield robust accounts of pragmatic phenomena in argumentation (e.g., conventional implicatures, rephrase, questions, etc.). We invite contributions which discuss philosophical and empirical aspects of argumentation and which draw on pragmatic models, such as speech act theory.

b) Pragmatic inference in argumentation and rhetoric

Pragmatic inference and argumentative inference have much in common, even though the former is meant to deliver an interpretation of speaker meaning and the latter an evaluation of a justificatory relationship. Even if their complex articulation is not yet fully accounted for (see e.g., Macagno & Walton, 2013; Oswald, 2018; Oswald et al., 2020), rhetoric has long assumed a strong link between the communicative resources speakers resort to in argumentation and their effects on audiences. In recent years, experimental approaches to argumentation have started to study the perlocutionary impact of pragmatic phenomena in argumentation (e.g., de Oliveira Fernandes & Oswald, 2022; Koszowy et al., 2022; Schumann et al., 2019, 2020; Younis et al., 2023). Thus, we welcome contributions which assess either the role of pragmatic inference in argumentation or the role of argumentative inference in pragmatics, in particular those which seek to elucidate questions with significant rhetorical import.

c) Semantic and pragmatic meaning-making resources in argumentation

Semantic and pragmatic resources for meaning have received sustained attention from argumentative, linguistic and rhetorical scholarship. Descriptive and normative approaches to argumentation, ranging from francophone traditions (e.g., Anscombre & Ducrot, 1983; Doury, 2021; Jacquin, 2014; Plantin, 1989) to pragma-dialectics (e.g., van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 2004) and informal logic accounts (e.g., Tindale, 1992, 2015, 2022), have resorted to linguistic and

pragmatic models of language use to enrich their accounts, and nowadays these considerations have extended beyond verbal communication to include multimodal phenomena (e.g., Kjeldsen, 2015; Tseronis & Forceville, 2017; Tseronis & Pollaroli, 2018). We invite contributions which specifically consider the role of, broadly speaking, meaning-making resources, such as discourse markers, connectives, evidential and epistemic markers, multimodal resources, rhetorical figures, syntactic constructions, etc., in argumentation. This also includes empirically-driven investigations of these phenomena.

d) Conversational dynamics of argumentation

Pragmatic research, over the years, has developed into several sub-fields, depending on various research questions and methodological choices. Conversational approaches to communication, in particular, have yielded fundamental insights into the way conversations unfold (see e.g., Sacks et al., 1974; Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Several scholars pursuing argumentation-theoretic research programmes have adopted such conversational perspectives to illuminate the nature and features of our naturally occurring argumentative encounters (see e.g., Jacobs et al., 2022; Jacobs & Jackson, 1982, 1992; Jacquin, 2017; Luginbühl et al., 2021). The conference thus also welcomes contributions which adopt such conversational strands of pragmatic research.

Given the above rationale, the organising committee will:

- give priority to proposals which make their methods and analytical categories explicit and which privilege linguistic and pragmatic objects of study, as well as the description of empirically gathered data or data collected in corpora
- select received submissions on the basis of anonymised abstracts.

**Keynote speakers.** The organising committee is delighted to announce the confirmed participation of the following scholars:

- [Francesca Ervas](#), University of Cagliari, Italy
- [Jean Goodwin](#), North Carolina State University, USA
- [Annette Hautli-Janisz](#), University of Passau, Germany
- [Christopher Tindale](#), University of Windsor, Canada
- [Sandrine Zufferey](#), University of Bern, Switzerland

**Local organizing committee (UNIFR).** Steve Oswald (conference chair), Jennifer Schumann, Daniel de Oliveira Fernandes, Ramy Younis

**Conference website:** all information can be found on <https://events.unifr.ch/argage2024>

**Types of contributions.** ARGAGE2024 invites 2 types of original contributions

1) Individual presentation

Individual presentations will last 20 minutes, followed by a 5-minute question session. Contributors are required to link their submission with one or two of the conference themes, as described above. Abstracts should not be more than 400 words and must:

- i. clearly state the research question
- ii. include a brief description of the theoretical framework and of the methodology adopted by the author and
- iii. highlight the originality of the proposal

**The submission deadline for individual presentation abstracts is 31 October 2023**

2) Panel

Panels are 2 hour long thematic sessions. They are divided in three 30-minute presentations and are followed by a 30-minute discussion slot (to take place at the end of the panel or in its course). Panel convenors are responsible for the organisation of both the thematic coherence and the practical organisation and internal scheduling of the panel in order to ensure that it fits the general orientation of the conference. Panel proposals will contain a general description and the abstracts of the three papers to be presented.

The general description of the panel and the abstracts should not exceed 400 words each. As for individual presentations, they must:

- i. clearly state the research question
- ii. include a brief description of the theoretical framework and of the methodology adopted by the authors and
- iii. highlight the originality of the proposal.

**The submission deadline for Panel proposals is 30 September 2023**

**Submission procedure.** Please submit your anonymised abstracts on the [Easychair platform \(https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=argage2024\)](https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=argage2024) by the deadline according to your type of contribution (individual paper vs. panel).

**Languages.** The conference “Argumentation and Language” encourages scientific exchanges between French and English speaking scholars. In this spirit, we want to offer you the possibility of presenting your paper in one language and to prepare supporting material (handouts or visual presentation) in the other language. Please let us know upon submission if this is indeed an option for you.

**Important deadlines**

30 September 2023:	deadline for submission of panels
31 October 2023:	deadline for submission of individual presentations
15 January 2024:	notification of acceptance / rejection for individual papers

## References

- Anscombe, J. C., & Ducrot, O. (1983). *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Editions Mardaga.
- Bermejo Luque, L., & Moldovan, A. (Eds.). (2021). Speech acts and argumentation [Special issue]. *Informal Logic*, 41(3). [https://informallogic.ca/index.php/informal\\_logic/issue/view/649](https://informallogic.ca/index.php/informal_logic/issue/view/649)
- Budzynska, K., & Reed, C. (2011). *Whence inference*. University of Dundee Technical Report.
- de Oliveira Fernandes, D., & Oswald, S. (2022). On the Rhetorical Effectiveness of Implicit Meaning—A Pragmatic Approach. *Languages*, 8(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010006>
- Doury, M. (2021). *Argumentation: Analyser textes et discours observations et analyses, méthodologie pratique, exercices corrigés* (2e éd). Armand Colin.
- Hautli-Janisz, A., Budzynska, K., & Reed, C. (2022). Conventional Implicatures in Argumentation. *Languages*, 8(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010014>
- Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1982). Conversational Argument: A Discourse Analytic Approach. In J. Cox & C. Willard (Eds.), *Advances in argumentation theory and research* (pp. 205–237). Southern Illinois Univ. Press.
- Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1992). Relevance and digressions in argumentative discussion: A pragmatic approach. *Argumentation*, 6(2), 161–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00154323>
- Jacobs, S., Jackson, S., & Zhang, X. (2022). What Was the President's Standpoint and When Did He Take It? A Normative Pragmatic Study of Standpoint Emergence in a Presidential Press Conference. *Languages*, 7(2), 153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020153>
- Jacquín, J. (2014). *Débatte: L'argumentation et l'identité au coeur d'une pratique verbale*. De Boeck-Duculot.
- Jacquín, J. (2017). Chapter 9. Embodied argumentation in public debates: The role of gestures in the segmentation of argumentative moves. In A. Tseronis & C. Forceville (Eds.), *Argumentation in Context* (Vol. 14, pp. 240–262). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aic.14.10jac>
- Kjeldsen, J. E. (2015). The Study of Visual and Multimodal Argumentation. *Argumentation*, 29(2), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-015-9348-4>
- Kozowoy, M., Oswald, S., Budzynska, K., Konat, B., & Gygax, P. (2022). A Pragmatic Account of Rephrase in Argumentation. Linguistic and Cognitive Evidence. *Informal Logic*, 42(1), 49–82. <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v42i1.7212>
- Lewiński, M., Cepollaro, B., Oswald, S., & Witek, M. (Eds.). (2023). Norms of Public Argument: A Speech Act Perspective [Special Issue]. *Topoi*. <https://link.springer.com/collections/cgfiiciech>
- Luginbühl, M., Mundwiler, V., Kreuz, J., Müller-Feldmeth, D., & Hauser, S. (2021). Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in Conversation Analysis: Methodological Reflections on a Study of Argumentative Group Discussions. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift Zur Verbalen Interaktion*, 22, 179–236.
- Macagno, F., & Walton, D. (2013). Implicatures as Forms of Argument. In A. Capone, F. L. Piparo, & M. Carapezza (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pragmatics and Philosophy* (pp. 203–225). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01011-3\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01011-3_9)
- Oswald, S. (2018). Pragmatic inference and argumentative inference. In S. Oswald & D. Maillat (Eds.), *Argumentation and Inference: Proceedings of the 2nd European Conference on Argumentation, Fribourg 2017* (Vol. 2, pp. 615–629). College Publications.
- Oswald, S., Greco, S., Miecznikowski, J., Pollaroli, C., & Rocci, A. (2020). Argumentation and meaning. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, 9(1), 1–18.
- Plantin, C. (1989). *Argumenter: De la langue de l'argumentation au discours argumenté*. Centre national de documentation pédagogique.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
- Schumann, J., Zufferey, S., & Oswald, S. (2019). What makes a straw man acceptable? Three experiments assessing linguistic factors. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 141, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.009>
- Schumann, J., Zufferey, S., & Oswald, S. (2020). The Linguistic Formulation of Fallacies Matters: The Case of Causal Connectives. *Argumentation*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-020-09540-0>
- Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tindale, C. (1992). Audiences, relevance, and cognitive environments. *Argumentation*, 6(2), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00154324>
- Tindale, C. (2015). *The philosophy of argument and audience reception*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tindale, C. (2022). Utterer Meaning, Misunderstanding, and Cultural Knowledge. *Languages*, 7(3), 172. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7030172>
- Tseronis, A., & Forceville, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Multimodal Argumentation and Rhetoric in Media Genres* (Vol. 14). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aic.14>
- Tseronis, A., & Pollaroli, C. (Eds.). (2018). Pragmatic insights for multimodal argumentation [Special issue]. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 10(2). <https://brill.com/view/journals/irp/10/2/irp.10.issue-2.xml>
- van Eemeren, F., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Foris publications.
- van Eemeren, F., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

- Visser, J., Koszowy, M., Konat, B., Budzynska, K., & Reed, C. (2018). Straw Man as Misuse of Rephrase. In S. Oswald & D. Maillat (Eds.), *Argumentation and Inference: Proceedings of the 2nd European Conference on Argumentation, Fribourg 2017, Vol. 2* (pp. 941–962). London: College Publications.
- Younis, R., de Oliveira Fernandes, D., Gygax, P., Koszowy, M., & Oswald, S. (2023). Rephrasing is not arguing, but it is still persuasive: An experimental approach to perlocutionary effects of rephrase. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 210, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.03.010>