

Editorial

Editorial: Crossing Borders and Approaches

Fortunately, argumentation theory is developing in many regions, countries and communities. It is not only a domain of ABE Universities from North America or traditional European centers of research anymore, although the question is whether in fact our domain has ever been part of those mainstream groups. In any case, the good news is that the field has spread out in many senses. One can find interesting research in the south of Europe, in Latin America, China, or Australia. At the same time, young researchers are taking up the challenge of combining and extending the standard disciplines of argumentation theory with new information that comes from cognitive sciences or evolution theory. Also, there is less orthodoxy in using the main theories of the field (namely, informal logic, pragma-dialectics, Toulmin's model, Perelman's approach, just to mention a few).

An example of this extension is this issue of *Cogency*. For instance, De Angelis suggests ways of improving PDT; then, López deepens our understanding of Toulmin's philosophy of argument by tracing the influences of pragmatism in his work; while De Angelis criticizes PDT, Lo Presti defends the theory from epistemological objections, although Lo Presti is not part of the Amsterdam School; later Muñoz broadens our reflection on the notion of argument by considering the discussion on pragmatic inferences and, specifically, adding the function of metonymy to see the linguistic structure of pragmatic inferences; then von Radziewsky and Tindale argue in favor of the rhetorical theory of argument discharging Aikin's main attempts to show that the RTA is self-refuting; in an interesting and well discussed paper, von Radziewsky tries to answer how we should consider subjectivity within argumentative practice from a rhetorical point of view, reminding us of the role of judgment-systems in Quine's and Wittgenstein's vein; Romano in turn very closely follows PDT, applying its theoretical and methodological frame to a social discussion that we can see in many other

countries or societies; in the last paper of this selection, Sterrett discusses the renewed explanation of reasoning carried out by Mercier and Sperber, maintaining that the French theorists finally do not explain why we argue and, particularly, assume a rhetorical approach to sketch the epistemic success of what they call proper reasoning. Two book reviews end this volume of *Cogency*; in Popa's book review Plantin's last book about the importance of emotional discourse in argumentation theory is analytically commented on; in the second book review, Proietti's evaluation of Gratton's book is very positive, advising us to read this book.

In sum, 8 papers and 2 book reviews compose the present volume of *Cogency* that, once again, aspires to contribute to a field that is rapidly and continuously expanding.

Cristián Santibáñez Yáñez

Santiago, August 2012