

## ARGUMENTATION THEORY IN THE 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY: A RETURN TO THE ORIGINS OF LOGIC, DIALECTICS, RHETORIC

**Nataliia Kolotilova**, *Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Logic Department Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7450-2981>, email: [nataliakolotilova@knu.ua](mailto:nataliakolotilova@knu.ua)

**Keywords:** *argumentation theory, logic, dialectics, rhetoric, informal logic, pragma-dialectics, new rhetoric.*

### Introduction

Logic, dialectics, and rhetoric in the European context of their development are quite ancient disciplines, the object of study of which was initially argumentation as a specific type of activity, that combined the factors of justification and persuasion. In the current view, the argumentation theory combines the efforts of scholars from different fields of knowledge. Although many concepts in it were formed primarily under the influence of the Aristotelian triad “analytics (logic) – dialectics – rhetoric”. In this regard, some scientific interest is the question of the extent to which the interpretation of these disciplines in the period of formation of the argumentation theory in the 20th century correlated with their original significance in antiquity.

### Methodology

To establish the specific features of the interpretation of logic, dialectics, and rhetoric in the context of modern argumentation theory were used primarily historical and comparative methods, as well as generalization and systematization as approaches of scientific knowledge.

### Findings

Actually, the beginnings of dialectics, logic, and rhetoric are not clearly marked (Eemeren et al., 2014, p.58). This is due, firstly, to the fact that Aristotle himself did not use the term “logic”, he wrote about

“analytics”; secondly, rhetoric did not belong to the corpus of his logical works; thirdly, the Stoics, for example, included logic in dialectics. On the other hand, all these sciences are interconnected by what they have as their subject “such things as come, more or less, within the general ken of all men” (Rhetoric I.1 1354a 1). This common subject is “syllogism”, or “deduction” in analytics (Prior Analytics I.1 24a 13); “dialectical deduction” (Topics I.1 100a 23); “enthymeme” as rhetorical deduction (Rhetoric I.2 1356b 1-5) and “induction” (Prior Analytics II. 23 68b 14-15), “induction in dialectic”, “example” as rhetorical induction (Rhetoric I.2 1356b 1-5).

These sciences have undergone significant changes in further development. Logic eventually emerged as a strict formal discipline, more precisely as a set of formal theories of classical logic and theories that are alternatives or extensions of classical logic. The current state of development of formal logic is clearly represented in Gabbay and Guenther (2001-2018). Whereas in modern argumentation theory logic appears as an informal discipline. At the same time, informal logic does not contradict formal logic, but only emphasizes that the rigor of formal logic does not fully cover the structure of all arguments (Johnson & Blair, 2000, p.102).

In the 19th century, dialectics was associated mainly with the work of Hegel, in which it acted as a certain philosophical method, the basis of which Hegel himself saw in Plato (Hegel §81). Eemeren et al. (2014, p.55) note that Plato's dialectic had three interpretations: the form of the “Socratic refutation debate”, the form of the “method of hypothesizing”, the form of the “method of collection and division”. The first two forms are closely related to dialectics as the art of discussion, which is close to the interpretation of dialectics in modern argumentation theory. The third form of Plato's dialectical method involves collecting various things: collecting them into one common kind and being able to cut up each kind according to its species along its natural joints (Phaedrus 265d-e). It is close to Hegel's dialectic, in which even at the level of understanding as thinking “the dialectic is far more the proper, true nature of the determinations of the understanding, of things, and of the finite in general” (Hegel §81). So the activity of the understanding consists of separating and abstracting (§80).

In the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation, the model of a critical discussion, during which a difference of opinion on the merits is being resolved, is developed (Eemeren et. al., 2014, p.527). At the same time, the long gap between dialectics as a field of science and

rhetoric as a field of literature is bridged due to the concept of strategic manoeuvring, which allows “at diminishing the potential tension between jointly pursuing the “dialectical” aim of reasonableness and the “rhetorical” aim of effectiveness” (Eemeren, 2009, p.65). Programmatic for the argumentation theory work “New rhetoric” is devoted to argumentation and its subject's connection with the ancient tradition of Greek rhetoric and dialectic (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p.1).

The political peculiarities of the development of democracy in the 20th century, as well as the demands of education, have led to the fact that argumentative issues were increasingly attracting the attention of scholars from different fields of knowledge. The basis for the formation of the argumentation theory in the 20th century became the above-mentioned triad of logic, dialectics, rhetoric in their original interpretation, which was most evident in informal logic, pragma-dialectics, and rhetoric as the art of persuasion. Even more, the initial blurring of the criteria of logical, dialectical, and rhetorical has led to the possibility of their combination within the modern search for scholars in the argumentation theory. Thus, despite significant changes in logic, dialectics, and rhetoric during the long historical development, their interpretation in the argumentation theory in the 20th century indicates a return to the origins.

## References

- Barnes, J., ed. (1984). *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, Volumes I and II, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, J.M., ed. (1997). *Plato: Complete Works*, Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Eemeren, F.H. van, Garssen, B., Krabbe, E.C.W., Snoeck Henkemans, A.F., Verheij, B. and Wagemans, J.H.M. (2014). *Handbook of Argumentation Theory*. Springer Science + Business Media Dordrecht.
- Eemeren, F.H. van. (2009). Strategic manoeuvring between rhetorical effectiveness and dialectical reasonableness. In Ribeiro, H.J ed. *Rhetoric and Argumentation in the Beginning of the XX1st Century*. Coimbra University Press. P.55-72.
- Gabbay, D.M. and Guenther, F., eds. (2001-2018). *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*. 2nd ed. Kluwer – Springer, Vol. 1-18.
- Hegel, G.W.F. (2010). *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline. Part 1: Logic*, translated and edited by K.

- Brinkmann and D.O. Dahlstrom, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, R.H. and Blair, J.A. (2000). Informal Logic: An Overview. *Informal Logic*, Vol. 20, №2, pp.93-107.
- Perelman, Ch. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated from French by J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.