



DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2023-20-1-168-178

EDN: VFFRYB

Research Article

The Semiosphere of Argumentation as Speech and Thought Activity

Galina M. Kostyushkina , Natalia A. Sverdlova ✉, Elena P. Mariasova 

Irkutsk Scientific Center of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
134, Str. Lermontova, Irkutsk, 664033, Russian Federation

✉ nsverdlova@yandex.ru

Abstract. The systemic nature of semiosphere organization correlates with the systemic nature of argumentation as human speech and thought activity. Argumentation is a part of semiotic continuum of human speech and thinking, forming complex subsystems of semiosphere. The paper aims at constructing the semiosphere of argumentation by identifying different approaches to its study. The authors conclude that argumentation as a logical-communicative process can be reviewed most clearly when analyzed in terms of S. Toulmin’s classification from logical, dialectical, rhetorical research perspectives. The functions of persuasion and the significance of the addressee are in this case prioritized. The pragma-dialectical approach used by the authors and its integrated nature of studying of argumentation as a speech-thought activity, made it possible to transfer from logics and dialectics to cognitive-oriented research. Axioms (12), underlying approaches to the study of argumentation, were analyzed and classified according to the principles of action, practice, and activity, as applied to language, which has a speech-thought-activity character. Argumentation as a component of human thinking semiosphere is the most complex phenomenon given its multidimensional and multisystemic nature.

Key words: argumentation, research approaches to argumentation, semiosphere, speech and thought activity, S. Toulmin’s classification, systematicity

Article history: Received 18.11.2022; Accepted 04.01.2023

Conflict of interests: none

For citation: Kostyushkina, G.M., N.A. Sverdlova, and E.P. Mariasova. 2023. “The Semiosphere of Argumentation as Speech and Thought Activity”. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 20 (1), 576–586. DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2023-20-1-168-178

© Костюшкина Г.М., Сverdлова Н.А., Марьясова Е.П., 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Семиосфера аргументации как речемыслительной деятельности

Г.М. Костюшкина , Н.А. Свердлова ✉, Е.П. Марьясова 

Иркутский научный центр Сибирского отделения Российской академии наук,
Российская Федерация, 664033, г. Иркутск, ул. Лермонтова, 134
✉ nsverdlova@yandex.ru

Аннотация. Системный характер организации семиосферы коррелирует с системностью аргументации как речемыслительной деятельности человека. Аргументация входит в семиотический континуум речевой и мыслительной деятельности человека, образуя сложные подсистемы семиосферы. Статья нацелена на построение семиосферы аргументации в результате выявления различных подходов к ее изучению. Авторами сделан вывод о том, что аргументация как логико-коммуникативный процесс наиболее отчетливо может быть рассмотрена в контексте анализа классификации С. Тулмина, его логической, диалектической, риторической перспектив исследования. Функции убеждения и значимости адресата оказываются в этом случае в приоритете. Использованный авторами прагма-диалектический подход, его интегрированный характер изучения проблемы аргументации как речемыслительной деятельности, позволил сделать переход от логики и диалектики к когнитивно-ориентированным исследованиям. Проанализированные авторами аксиомы (12), лежащие в основе подходов к изучению аргументации, классифицированы по принципам действия, практики, деятельности, применительно к языку имеющей речемыслительно-деятельностный характер. Аргументация как компонент семиосферы мыслительной деятельности человека представляет собой наиболее сложное явление с точки зрения своего многоаспектного и мультисистемного характера.

Ключевые слова: семиосфера, аргументация, подходы к изучению аргументации, речемыслительная деятельность, классификация Тулмина, системность.

История статьи: дата поступления в редакцию: 18.11.2022; дата принятия к печати: 04.01.2023

Конфликт интересов: отсутствует

Для цитирования: Костюшкина Г.М., Свердлова Н.А., Марьясова Е.П. Семиосфера аргументации как речемыслительной деятельности // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики. 2023. Т. 20. № 1. С. 168–178. DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2023-20-1-168-178

Introduction

This article aims to reveal the multidimensional content of the semiosphere of argumentation as human speech and thought activity and to clarify the stages of the development of argumentation theory. The notion of semiosphere, introduced into scientific usage by J.M. Lotman [1], has both non-systemic and systemic character. In the first case, the semiotic universum is a set of closed individual texts and languages, which are like the individual bricks of a building. We are interested in the second aspect of the semiosphere, which is its systematicity. In systematic approach all semiotic space appears as one living semiotic organism, the primary link of which is not a separate brick (elementary sign), but a whole

system called semiosphere. Lotman assumes that all unambiguous systems cannot exist independently; they are within the semiotic continuum filled with semiotic formations of various types and at different levels of organization [1. P. 12–13]. This semiotic continuum is the space and condition of sensemaking; without it the interpretation of the cultural text is impossible.

We see argumentation as an integral part of the speech and thinking activity of a rational human being (*Homo sapiens*), it is also systemic [2]; and it enters the semiotic continuum of human speech and thinking activity as its integral part, thereby participating in the formation of its semiosphere.

Let us briefly consider the main aspects and approaches in the study of argumentation in the linguistic tradition to come closer to its cognitive interpretation as an inherent component of the more global semiosphere of human speech and thought activity.

Current review

The logical and philosophical approaches to the study of argumentation have the lengthiest history among other approaches. In logical terms, argumentation is a procedure for presenting information as the result of analysis, with reference to a kind of formal system or logic, with conclusions drawn from previously accepted assumptions. The study of the multidimensional phenomenon of argumentation moved beyond the bounds of logical and philosophical knowledge long ago. Currently, the theoretical and practical potential of argumentation is actively involved in diverse fields such as rhetoric, pedagogy, legal linguistics, psychology, conflictology, cognitive science, medical deontology, and others. The article our is rather focused on argumentation as a linguistic phenomenon.

The logico-methodological approach that emerged in the 1970s, known as “formal dialectics,” developed a more sophisticated analysis involving an evaluation of means of persuasion, methods of proof, the dynamics of discussion, the introduction of the notion of “burden of proof,” and an analysis of possible logical fallacies [3]. The interpretation and reconstruction of argumentation has an established paradigm of study. The reconstruction of an argumentative statement in such studies helps to understand how it is interpreted.

Linguistic argumentation theory is a major trend in modern pragmatics and one of the logical extensions of the *pragmalinguistic approach* to argumentation theory, originated by the Oxford School philosophers J. Austin and J. Searle [4; 5]. This direction was developed as part of speech act theory and was continued in the works of Stalnaker, Strawson, Gordon and Lakoff [6–8]. As a natural step forward, the speech act theory was criticized. Among the main weaknesses noted were ignoring the dynamic nature of communication, limiting to the speech act as the basic unit of analysis, disregarding the creative nature of interpersonal communication and the communicative function as such [9].

O. Ducrot, in critical response to the basic postulates of the speech act theory, offers a *pragmatic analysis* of linguistic means. O. Ducrot considers the preservation of the informative component in the meaning of an utterance to be the main drawback of the theory of speech acts. He insists that reality cannot be described by the terms “truth” and “falsehood” and proposes to abandon the notions of propositional content and truth conditions of an utterance [10]. The linguistic aspect of argumentation is a relatively recent field of study. We can identify several aspects in this area of research.

The Rhetorical Aspect. Certain rhetorical laws are associated with the category of linguistic argumentation. As A.A. Volkov notes, the latter, being different from scientific proof, can be structured in different ways and on different bases. The author gives as examples a system of tops, the construction of a certain verbal series, the ratio of the scheme, top and the verbal series of the argument [11. P. 227–234]. He gives a classification of rhetorical arguments, which can be divided into three types: arguments from the audience (appeal to the people), arguments from authority (appeal to authority), and arguments from real life [ibid.] The distinction of rhetorical laws from the rules of proof and rebuttal explains the fact that informal, content-related fallacies are characteristic of everyday, spontaneous argumentation. Some of the common violations are substitution of the thesis, argument against the man, argument from authority, and argument from consequences.

The communicative-interactive aspect. Considering argumentation as an activity in the communicative and interactive aspects, most scholars emphasize its social nature, suggesting the interpretation of argumentation as a form of language designed to persuade the acceptability or unacceptability of a certain opinion. Many researchers bypass even native speakers, not taking into account their communicative roles [12. P. 18]. M.A. Gilbert agrees with this, noting that a dialectical understanding of argument requires a reconsideration of the usual approach to critical reasoning. One of the problems of the latter is an almost complete focus on the argument as some artifact and a lack of focus on the people involved in critical reasoning [13. P. 42]. Gilbert agrees with this, noting that a dialectical understanding of argument requires a reconsideration of the usual approach to critical reasoning. One of the problems of the latter is an almost complete focus on the argument as some artifact and a lack of focus on the people involved in critical reasoning [13. P. 42].

Through argumentative interaction communicants are able to identify each other’s communicative goals and find common ground in order to reach consensus. Thus, the essence of argumentation is to understand and comprehend a viewpoint that contributes to finding joint solutions, rather than to affirm or refute that viewpoint.

Argumentative interaction needs to be analyzed, with all aspects of communication taken into account, logical aspect being only one of them. This is a systemic approach to argumentation, for argument cannot be viewed

as an isolated and independent phenomenon. Indeed, argument is a linguistic representation of opinion, feelings and emotions, and personal relations, in other words, a certain semiotic system where content finds a certain linguistic expression.

An extended interactive aspect. E. Barth and E. Krabbe propose an expanded approach, introducing the notions of the speech act, the stages of dialogue, citing the characteristics of the participants of the discussion [14; 15]. In a debate, the main postulate is not truth or falsehood (In the logical sense proper), but the participants' agreement or disagreement a) with the truth or falsehood of their respective judgments or b) with the method proposed by one of them to achieve this agreement. Dialogue, consistent with E. Barthes and E. Krabbe's view, is a method of resolution of a difference of opinion.

In speech practice, argumentation appears as a natural phenomenon, the study of which in speech / communication has a long tradition. The reference to the connection of dialogue with reasoning can be found in Aristotle, according to which in relation to each thesis one should consider the arguments for and against. In this way, it is possible to learn to ask questions and give answers at the same time. And if there is no one else with whom one can reason, then one must practice on one's own [16. P. 529].

However, this idea was not fully grasped theoretically until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This was largely due to the renewed practical interest in argumentation in the United States, which reflected in the fact that debate, used as a means of practical instruction for students in law, government, and politics, became an important source for the theory of argumentation. The earliest publications included rules on public speaking, cooperation, and logic; later publications contained instructions on debate preparation, speech structure, and rebuttal (see [12. P. 194–195] for a review of the works).

In the 1960s and 1970s, debate came to be seen as a means of collaborative problem solving through cooperation, and later as a form of implementing adversarial discourse. The understanding of the connection between argumentation and debate led to the latter being treated not only as situations that can be described on the basis of an interpretation of argumentation, but also as a process that contributes to the theory of argumentation in some way. For example, the concept of the German logicians K. Lorenz and P. Lorenzen, known as "*dialogic logic*" [17; 18], was aimed at developing such formal systems that could guarantee the discovery of proofs and refutations for correctly formulated utterances. According to the scientists' ideas, dialogue is a model of the procedure of proof, argumentation: a thesis is put forward, which is then discussed, and attempts are made to refute or confirm it. Various models of discussion were proposed: the model of political debate, the model of hypothesis testing, the model of discussion in jurisprudence, and formal games. Today, from an understanding of argumentation in informal

communication by C. Jackson and S. Jacobs [19] we proceeded to the study of argumentative communication in various communicative situations and in everyday communication [2].

The diversity of approaches to the study of argumentation makes it somewhat difficult to use. Various factors matter here: 1) the field of knowledge on the basis of which the concepts of argumentation are developed; 2) adherence to a particular scientific school; 3) the problematics under research. S. Toulmin's view [20] seems to be the most systematic and quite complete. He offers three perspectives of the study of the latter: “geometrical” (logical), 2) critical (dialectical), anthropological (rhetorical).

Focusing on the perspectives of argumentation theory studying

Adherents of the first perspective pay much attention to the conjunction of argumentation with rationality, logics, logical connections, and the philosophical category of truth [21–23]. The “geometry” of argumentation, as they see it, is the combination of premises and conclusions when using one or another formal system, one or another logical correctness criterion. The study of schemas and structures in this case is a major theoretical and practical objective of argumentative analysis.

The principles of rational discussion and, more extensively, argumentation in communication are covered in the second perspective (critical / dialectical) [14; 15; 18]; here issues of inference within argumentative interactions are raised [24; 25]; the focus on the audience is emphasized; strategies of argumentation and rebuttal [20; 26]; communication strategies and tactics, as well as rational strategies of dialogue are studied [27].

The third perspective (anthropological / rhetorical) treats argumentation as a human activity, examines the effectiveness, persuasiveness of arguments, fallacies of argumentation. Besides, it and analyzes the rhetorical aspect as a theoretical study of practical techniques of persuasion. The concept of strategic maneuvering in argumentative interaction is being developed [28–31].

The function of persuasion and the significance of the addressee are prioritized in the process of argumentation, which is a logical and communicative process. As a result, the addressee accepts a differing or new opinion, or changes his or her viewpoint and the views of the communication partner(s). The notion of audience is regarded in research more than just a source of consent and approval. The audience is presumably thought to play an active role as addressee, possessing the right to accept or reject a viewpoint or opinion. The listener in this case evaluates the argumentation, determining its ability to change one's beliefs. This is related to the purpose of argumentation, which is to influence the listener's beliefs through argumentative speech.

Methods

Based on the above discussion, we employed some general research methods for scientific literature review to follow and identify the steps of argumentation theory development: problem analysis technique to explore the subject and specify the object of the research; comparative to explore and compare key findings in the substantive analysis of argumentation; hypothetic-deductive to test conclusions. This way of research works dated last few years should allow us to obtain a comprehensive overview of argumentation theory in its new semiotics understanding.

Results and discussion

In the process of the formation and strengthening of modern approaches to the study of speech and thought activity, the theory of argumentation has been filled with new implications significant for the consideration of its semiotic character. The modern cognitive approach opens up new avenues for the study of argumentation. Various studies show the need to study the cognitive foundations of argumentation [2; 22; 29; 30; 32] and cognitive modeling of argumentation [33].

In the cognitive approach, linguistic studies of argumentation are part of studies of communicative models of human consciousness. A.N. Baranov defines argumentation as a set of procedures over the models of the world of the participants of the communication situation [34]. In this case, the most important factor in knowledge transfer from one communicator to another is the influence on the choice of the addressee. We find a similar idea in the understanding of argumentation by H. Perelman and L. Olbrecht-Tyteca [35]. Here, argumentation is a modification of the status quo, which results in a change of attitudes, judgments, evaluations that form hierarchies of values. Such a modification is organic for a person, “(it) does not contradict the human essence, on the contrary, it corresponds to the philosophical principle of dual perception of the surrounding world” and is necessary to frame the picture of the world. “This process seems quite natural for humans, since the human brain is organized as a binary mechanism and is no stranger to such transformations” [36. P. 605]. According to the Belgian scholars [35], the study of argumentation is the prerogative of psychology, thereby rejecting the role of logic.

The pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation outlined in the studies of F.H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst [28] marked an important stage in the development of argumentation theory. In the works by N. Barebina, G. Kostyushkina and others, the ideas of dialectal logics and formal dialects of the aforementioned theory have been applied in solving the problems of argumentative discourse [30; 37].

The study of argumentation from a dialogic perspective is a trend that has greatly enriched argumentation theory with methods for modeling

the argumentative speech- thinking process. Such studies typically treat argumentation as a rational-heuristic phenomenon. Whereas the conclusions of demonstrative argumentation are binding, thereby forcing one to agree with them, those of heuristic argumentation are permissive and therefore allow for the choice of alternatives.

Exploring the problems argumentation, N.S. Barebina concludes that all approaches to the study of argumentation operate with a finite number of axioms, among which the author considers the following to be the main ones: 1) the purpose of argumentation is to justify or refute some opinion; 2) argumentation is a logical action that presupposes that the addressee is reasonable and able to accept or challenge arguments; 3) argumentation is a strongly targeted action; 4) argumentation depends on the social practices in which it is implemented; 5) argumentation is directly linked to language use; 6) argumentation is a social activity; 7) argumentation is dialogic, as it involves an active response of the other party; 8) argumentation is a deliberate activity of influencing someone's beliefs; 9) the elements of argumentation are linked to the concept of truth; 10) argumentation is subject to logical rules; 11) there are right and wrong arguments; 12) the above characteristics form a specific type of discourse. [30. P. 124–125].

These basic axioms turn out to be employed in different interpretations of the concept of argumentation. All twelve axioms, explicitly or implicitly, are used in different theoretical and practical approaches to argumentation. Some of the axioms are more manifested in particular scientific strands. For example, axioms nine through eleven are enacted by logic. The fifth, sixth, and twelfth axioms are most actively engaged in linguistic (communicative) approaches to argumentation. And the first four axioms and the seventh are embodied in the interactive approach and social interaction. What links them all is the idea of action, practice, activity, which, when applied to language, has a speech-and- thought- activity character.

Conclusions

Modern approaches to the study of argumentation theory allow us to create a semiosphere of a systemic picture — to explore the phenomenon from different angles and integrate the various data into a holistic systemic representation. Argumentation is a speech and thought activity being one of the many possibilities of speech influence on human consciousness, where the goal is the internal acceptance of the argumentator's thesis by the recipient. The twofold process of considering argumentation — as a formal procedure for adopting a position and as a speech-thought activity — points to the importance of persuasiveness. It is for the sake of persuasiveness that the speaker organizes the utterance so as to influence the recipient through certain linguistic means, thus forcing the recipient to share the speaker's point of view, agree with

it and, as a result, commit certain actions. In different speech / communicative situations, argumentation acquires relevant specific features, both linguistic (the choice of speech means) and mental (mental, logical), using certain cognitive constructs and logical structures.

Having investigated different approaches, we should recognize that argumentation is a multidimensional phenomenon and has an interdisciplinary character. It includes linguistic, speech (communicative), social, rhetorical, psychological, and many other characteristics, each of which forms its own system, though far from being autonomous. These systems rather overlap to form a special semiosphere of human speech and thought activity.

References

1. Lotman, Y.M. 1992. Semiosfera Izbrannye stat'i v trekh tomakh. [Semiosphere Selected articles in three volumes.]. Tallin : Aleksandra publ. Vol. 1. Pp. 12–13. Print. (In Russ)
2. Kolmogorova, A.V. 2006. Yazykovoe znachenie i rechevoi smysl: funktsional'no-semiologicheskoe issledovanie prilagatel'nykh-oboznachenii svetlogo i temnogo v sovremennykh russkom i frantsuzskom yazykakh [Linguistic meaning and speech meaning: Experience of a functional semiological study of adjectives denoting light and dark in modern Russian and French]. Doctoral diss. ... on Philology, Novokuznetsk. Print. (In Russ)
3. Aarnio, A. 1987. "The rational as reasonable: a treatise on legal justification" Dordrecht; Boston: D. Reidel; Norwell, MA, USA.
4. Austine, J.L. 1986. Slovo kak dejstvie. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. [original: How to do things with words]. Moscow: Progress. publ. No 17. P. 22 –129. Print. (In Russ)
5. Searle, J.R. 1986. Klassifikatsiya illokutivnykh aktov [original: A classification of illocutionary acts]. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike.: Teoriya rechevy'x aktov. Moscow: Progress publ. No 17. Pp. 170–194. Print. (In Russ)
6. Gordon, D., Lakoff G. 1971. Conversational postulates onversational. Papers from the Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society.(7):18–31.
7. Stalnaker, R.C. 1985. Pragmatika. [Pragmatics]. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Moscow. Progress. publ. Pp. 419–438. Print. (In Russ.)
8. Strawson, P.F. 1986. Namerenie i konvencija v rechevyh aktah. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. [Intention and Convention in Speech Acts. New in Foreign Linguistics]. Moscow: Progress. Pp. 130–150. Print. (In Russ.)
9. Franck, D. 1986. Sem' grekhov pragmatiki: tezisy o teorii rechevykh aktov, analize rechevogo obshcheniya, lingvistike i ritorike [The seven sins of pragmatics: abstracts on speech act theory, speech communication analysis, linguistics, and rhetoric]. Novoe v zarubezhnoi lingvistike. Moscow. 423 p. Pp. 363–373. Print. (In Russ)
10. Ducrot, O. 1996. Slovenian lectures: argumentative semantics // Conferences Slovenes / ed. by I. Ž. Žagar. Ljubljana: ISH. Pp. 241–253.
11. Volkov, A.A. 2009. Teoriya ritoricheskoi argumentatsii [Theory of rhetotical argumentation]. Moscow: Moscow State University publ. 398 p. Print. (In Russ)
12. Eemeren, F.H. van, Grootendorst R., Johnson R.H., Plantin Ch., Willard Ch.A., et al., 1996. Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
13. Gilbert, M.A. 1997. Coalescent Argumentation. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
14. Barth, E.M., Martens J.L. 1983. Argumentation. Approaches to theory formation. *Lingvisticae Investigationes*. 7(1):195–195 e-journal. URL: <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/15699927/7/1> (date of access: 11.12.21.)

15. Krabbe, E.C. W., van Laar J.A. 2011. The ways of Criticism. *Argumentation* no 25(2):199–227.
16. Aristotel' [Aristotle], 1978. *Topika. Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh*. [Topica. Collected Works in Four Volumes]. Moscow: Mysl' publ. Vol. 2. Pp. 347–531. Print. (In Russ.)
17. Lorenzen, S. 1978. Postembryonalentwicklung von Steineria- und Sphaerolaimidenarten (Nematoden) und ihre Konsequenzen für die Systematik. *Zool. Anz., Jena*. 200 (1/2):53–78.
18. Lorenz, K. 2009. *Dialogischer Konstruktivismus*. Berlin, Walter De Gruyter.
19. Jackson, S., Jakobs S. 1982. The collaborative production of proposals in conversational argument and persuasion: A study of disagreement regulation // *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. (18):77–90.
20. Toulmin, S.E. 2003. *The Uses of Argument*. London, Cambridge University Press.
21. Harman, G. 1986. *Change in view: principles of reasoning*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
22. Bryushinkin, V.N. 2009. Kognitivnyi podkhod k argumentatsii. [Cognitive approach to argumentation]. Web. URL: <http://www/ratio.albertina.ru./Ratio.ru/archive/20091>, (date of access 2022/01/16). (In Russ)
23. Ivin, A.A.: Logics. [Logika]. Web. URL: <https://urait.ru/bcode/431850>. (date of access 2022/01/1).
24. Grinenko, G.V. 2016. Kognitivnyi dissonans v argumentatsii. Logiko-filosofskie shtudii. [Cognitive dissonance in argumentation. Logical and philosophical studies]. *Logiko-filosofskie shtudii*. 13 (2). Pp. 209–210. Print. (In Russ)
25. Naess, A. 2005. Spinoza and the Deep Ecology Movement. *The Selected Works of Arne Naess*. Springer, Dordrecht, Pp. 2662–2687. Web. URL: https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-1-4020-4519-6_121.pdf. (date of access 10.10.2022).
26. Apothéoz, D., Brandt, P., & Quiroz, G. 1993. The function of negation in argumentation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (19):23–38.
27. Kostyushkina, G.M. 2017. Kontseptual'naya sistematika argumentatsii [Conceptual systematics of argumentation]. Moscow. Flinta-Nauka publ. Print. (In Russ).
28. Eemeren, F.H. van, Grootendorst R. 2003. *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The pragmadialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Kostyushkina, G.M., Barebina, N.S. 2017. Argumentatsiya i kontseptual'naya sistematika rechi i rechevoy deyatel'nosti. [Argumentation and conceptual systematics of speech and speech activity]. Moscow. Flinta-Nauka. publ. Pp.10–69. Print. (In Russ)
30. Barebina, N.S. 2020. Argumentatsiya kritiki v nauke o yazyke (ehkolingvisticheskii aspekt). Diss. dokt. filol. nauk. [Argumentation of criticism in the science of language (ecolinguistic aspect) Dr. Sci. (Philology) thesis]. Irkutsk, Print. (In Russ)
31. Lisanyuk, E.N., Hamidov A.A., 2021. *Argument k neznaniiyu i argument ot tishiny*. [Argument to ignorance and argument from silence]. *Diskurs*. 7(1), Pp. 5–16. Print. (In Russ)
32. Oswald, S., Herman Th.J. 2018. *Argumentation and Language-Linguistic, Cognitive and Discursive Explorations*. *Argumentation Library*. Springer International Publishing. 32:1–25.
33. Bryushinkin, V.N. 2007. Sistemnaya model' argumentatsii dlya fragmenta filosofskogo teksta // Modeli rassuzhdenii [Systemic argumentation model for a fragment of a philosophical text]. *Modeli rassuzhdeniy* (1). *Logika i argumentatsiya*. Kaliningrad: Kant University publ. Pp.126–144. Print. (In Russ)
34. Baranov, A.N. 1990. Argumentatsiya kak yazykovoi i kognitivnyi fenomen // Rechevoe vozdeistvie v sfere massovoi kommunikatsii [Argumentation as a linguistic and cognitive phenomenon. Speech impact in mass communication]. *Nauka* publ. Pp. 40–52. Print. (In Russ.)
35. Perelman, C., Olbrechts-Tyteca L. 2000. *Traité de l'argumentation: La nouvelle rhétorique*. Bruxelles. Université de Bruxelles.
36. Sverdlova, N.A. 2019. *Germenevticheskie aspekty bilingvizma: rol' mezhyazykovoy interferentsii* [Hermeneutical aspects of bilingualism: the role of interlanguage interference]. In *Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia*. Moscow. 10(3). Pp. 602–609. Print. (In Russ)

37. Barebina, N.S., Kostyushkina, G.M., Zhiyong, Fang. 2021. “Vektory argumentativnoi orientatsii v izuchenii dinamiki yazykovykh aspektov politicheskogo mediadiskursa” [Vectors of Argumentative Orientation in the Study of the Dynamics of Linguistic Aspects of Political Media Discourse] In *Izvestiya Baikal'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta Proceedings*, Irkutsk, 31(1), Pp. 98–102. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.17150/2500-2759.2021.31\(1\).98-102.Print](https://doi.org/10.17150/2500-2759.2021.31(1).98-102.Print). (In Russ)

Bio Notes:

Galina M. Kostyushkina is a Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of Foreign languages and Philosophy, ISC SB RAS. E-mail: kostushkina@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-7673-2441

Nataliya A. Sverdlova is a Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate professor, Head of the Department of Scientific, Education Activity and Expertise, Head of Department of Pedagogy and Expertise, ISC SB RAS. E-mail: nsverdlova@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5315-6266

Elena P. Mariasova is a Junior research assistant, Postgraduate, Department of Foreign languages and Philosophy, ISC SB RAS. E-mail: mariaselena@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-3504-9416

Сведения об авторах:

Костюшкина Галина Максимовна — доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры иностранных языков и философии Иркутского научного центра СО РАН. E-mail: kostushkina@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-7673-2441

Свердлова Наталья Александровна — кандидат филологических наук, доцент, начальник отдела научно-образовательной деятельности и экспертной оценки, заведующий кафедрой педагогики и экспертной оценки Иркутского научного центра СО РАН. E-mail: nsverdlova@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5315-6266

Марьясова Елена Петровна — младший научный сотрудник, аспирант кафедры иностранных языков и философии Иркутского научного центра СО РАН. E-mail: mariaselena@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-3504-9416