

## PREFACE

In 1999 we invited a small number of colleagues to take part in a colloquium devoted to the analysis of argumentative discourse from two kinds of perspective: a dialectical and a rhetorical perspective. Our intention was to start a thorough discussion on the commonalities and differences between the two approaches. In this way we hoped to promote the development of analytic tools for dealing with argumentation in which, in some way or other, the merits of both approaches are combined. The colloquium took place at the University of Amsterdam. In 2000 it was followed by a second colloquium at New York University, and in 2001 by a third one at Northwestern University. We are grateful to all three universities for giving us the chance to organize three exciting and fruitful meetings and we thank Eugene Garver, Eveline T. Feteris, M.A. van Rees, Ralph Johnson, A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, José Plug, Bart Garssen, and Leah Polcar, who took part in the discussions but are not represented in this volume, for their critical and useful contributions.

*Dialectic and Rhetoric: The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis* is based on papers that were presented at the aforementioned colloquiums. It contains essays by J.A.E. Bons, Erik C.W. Krabbe, Hanns Hohmann, Michael Leff, Edward Schiappa, Jean Goodwin, Fred J. Kauffeld, Scott Jacobs, and Frans H. van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser. Each essay explains a certain view on the role that dialectic, rhetoric, or a combination of the two, plays or has to play in conceptualizing and analyzing argumentative discourse. The authors may describe their own view or the views of others the authors report about. We hope that the collection of essays as a whole will be an inspiration to those who share our interest to express their own ideas on the matters concerned, thus giving more substance to the work in progress.

It goes without saying that the essays presented here could not have been written, let alone published, if there had not been a large international group of argumentation scholars who take a keen interest in the problems involved in analyzing argumentative discourse and in any proposals that are made to solve them. The International Society for the Study of Argumentation (ISSA), the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), and the American Forensic Association (AFA) have organized conferences that offered the authors of this book a stage from which they could expound their views to a larger, and well-informed, audience. The various reactions received at these conferences have without any doubt been a great help in further developing their ideas.

Last but not least, we would like to thank Jacqueline Bergsma, editor of Kluwer Academic, for her encouragement, and our colleague Paul Nagtegaal for his invaluable technical assistance.

Frans H. van Eemeren  
Peter Houtlosser

Amsterdam  
March 27, 2002