

## INTRODUCTION

JANET BOWKER

UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA “LA SAPIENZA”

This Special Issue of *Lingue e Linguaggi* is the product of a Colloquium held from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2019, at the Faculty of Economics, Sapienza University of Rome. The theme for the event was “*Exploring the Discursive Creation of Argumentation and Ideology in Evolving Specialized Knowledge Domains*”. It was hosted by the Rome Sapienza Unit (Coordinator Rita Salvi) of a National Research Project (PRIN) entitled “*Knowledge dissemination across media in English: continuity and change in discourse strategies, ideologies and epistemologies*” (2015TJ8ZAS, 2015-2017), financed by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research: the other Research Units belonging to the project included Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Università degli Studi di Bergamo, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Libera Università di Lingue e Comunicazione, Milano (Iulm), Università degli Studi di Milano, Università degli Studi di Pisa. Directory Board Members of the research group CLAVIER, *Corpus and Language Variation in Language Research*, also extended their invitation to scholars to participate in the event. The Keynote Speakers for the occasion were Susan Hunston, University of Birmingham, UK, and Srikant Sarangi, University of Aalborg, Denmark.

The interface between argumentation, ideology and discourse proved to be a fruitful ground for discussion throughout the two days of presentation and debate. The Rome 2019 Colloquium gathered research experiences and findings on these topics over a range of specialized knowledge domains, as this collection of papers demonstrates. The research reported in this volume includes synchronic, diachronic, comparative, multimodal, interlinguistic and intercultural perspectives. Similarly, a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches and tools were called into play in exploring these themes, highlighting both connections and contrasts in conceptual and explanatory frameworks. Some of these will be commented on briefly here.

A first reflection concerns the transformation of ‘information’ into ‘knowledge’ through authorial or agentive mediation in a process of what has been called ‘authentication’ (see Gloria Origgi, philosopher, social science epistemologist, 2017), and the attendant attribution of value to ideas. While it

is undeniable that a great many people have immediate access to a potentially infinite amount of information, at all times and from virtually anywhere, it is also true that complex dynamics of change and adaptation, both material and cognitive, are involved in this transformation of information into 'knowledge'. What an audience or an individual considers 'useful' or 'usable' will depend on the value they ascribe to the knowledge available, in accordance with their ideological makeup, understood in the very broad sense of the summation of beliefs, values, and social positionings which underlie group behavior. By analysing the linguistic and pragmatic indexicality and patterning of argumentation, on the other hand, we can identify the bids made by text producers to have their knowledge claims accepted as both 'reasonable' and 'right'. Part of this process of authentication is the assessment of the quality of information and its use in argument, a competence essential for building viewpoints, opinions, beliefs, and value systems. Evaluation of argumentative procedures involves critical appraisal, the ability to spot where evidence is absent or manipulative, the lack of coherent substantiation for a position, faulty reasoning, circularity of argument, speciousness and the mendacious use of facts, false premises, and so on.

The papers collected here all refer more or less explicitly to a series of descriptive and explanatory linguistic models of direct relevance to discourse analysis and the investigation of the socio-cognitive processes described above. The major underlying conceptual framework remains essentially the Hallidayan theoretical model of 'Language as Social Semiotic' (Halliday 1978), in which sets of semantico-grammatical resources create the 'meaning potential' for language users. In his model, three macro-functions interact: the textual, the ideational/propositional, and the interpersonal/interrelational. This is still the most significant scaffolding for the discourse analysis reported here, the exploration of how the illocutionary functions of 'informing' and 'persuading' take discursive form. In practice, what seems to emerge is that the functions are mutually supportive and interwoven: 'to inform' becomes dependent on how and whom 'to persuade', requiring textual selection and adaptation for audience, and obversely, 'to persuade' conditions how and what information is selected in order 'to inform'.

Moving forward into a more detailed description of the application of discourse theories and models to the chapters in the volume, Susan Hunston remarks, in the Endnote to this volume, that Halliday's later theory of 'Systemic-Functional Linguistics' (Halliday 1994), provided a significant framework for 'Critical Discourse Analysis' (henceforth CDA), (Fairclough 1995; van Dijk 1998, 2004; Wodak, Meyer [2001] 2009), enabling an investigation into the links between the pragma-linguistic features of texts and genres, together with their ideological purposes for specific audiences in

specific contexts of use. CDA has its grounding in a social-constructionist perspective: language is seen to be both determined by social structure as well as contributing to stabilizing, creating or changing it. The noted critical discourse linguist, Teun van Dijk has made further connections between social structures, cognitive representations and discourse in his socio-cognitive model, which goes some way to explaining the processes of individual authentication, subjectivization and, at the same time, the construal of group ideology:

[...] Language use and discourse always presuppose the intervening mental models, goals and general social representations (knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms, values) of the language users. [...] These socially shared perceptions form the link between the social system and the individual cognitive system, and perform the translation, homogenization and coordination between external requirements and subjective experience. (van Dijk 2004, p. 26)

The key constitutive concepts of CDA remain, nonetheless, power and solidarity, ideology and social critique. A number of the chapters in this volume draw on this descriptive framework in order to interpret their data: for example, Degano, Incelli, Nikitina examine newspaper editorials and news reports to explore evaluative standpoints, opinions and ideologically-charged journalistic discourse on a variety of topics: Brexit, economic inequality, and the medical science of human-gene editing, respectively. Prosperi Porta looks at the argumentative strategies used by the EU law-enforcement agency, *Europol*, to promote legitimization for its security practices and to boost its institutional authority and reputation. Drawing on a branch of CDA, the discourse-historical Approach (Reisigl, Wodak 2009), Mottura analyses Chinese political discourse in a diachronic perspective, tracing changes in the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China*, which convey powerful ideological messages to the Chinese people.

Another feature which emerges from the studies grouped here is that of intertextuality (Bakhtin 1981, 1986), interdiscursivity (Bhatia 2010) and textual embeddedness (Bazerman 2004; Blommaert 2005). A number of papers observe texts ‘in motion’, and attempt to see how the dynamics of recontextualization, rescripting and remediation of information affect the ongoing construction of ideology and argumentation, in accordance with changing audiences and communicative purposes. The noted philosopher of language and literary critic, Bakhtin (1986), articulates a fundamental perception about the multi-voicedness of discourse:

Any speaker presupposes not only the existence of the language system he is using, but also the existence of preceding utterances, his own and others – with which his given utterance enters into one kind of relationship or another. [...]

Any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances. (Bakhtin 1986, p. 69)

Different kinds of intertextuality are illustrated in the collection. For example, Bowker describes the reconceptualizations taking place through a set of vertical and hierarchically-organized texts. The analysis traces the embedding of the language used in the legislation of international trade treaties and its recontextualization in the language of legal specialist critique, and then contestation in the public knowledge domain via campaigning group websites. Moschini describes the wide variety of socio-cultural, historical referencing and allusion at work in Mark Zuckerberg's 2017 *Facebook* post, his subsequently dubbed *Manifesto*, to promote the use of the platform as the most important social infrastructure for civic participation in the future. She also uses a Critical Multimodal Approach to trace movement across visual and verbal modes and the impact of composite semiotic resources on ideological messaging. Mottura compiles a corpus consisting of legal, political, and media texts in the Chinese language, which she designates a 'genre set'. Tessuto analyses the similarities and contrasts in the use of metadiscursive features and patterns between two different social scientific disciplines, economics and law. Here the comparison is across two parallel sets of data, both representing the same distinctive generic text type, the academic research article.

A final area of theoretical description used by the research papers included here in their elaboration of the links between argumentation, ideology and discourse is that of 'Appraisal Theory' (Martin, White 2005), together with the study of 'Evaluation' (Hunston 2011; Hunston, Thompson 2000). The appraisal framework, developed by Martin and White and colleagues in the 1990s and 2000s, allows the analysis of positive and negative textual meanings which are discursively conveyed through the author's personal, evaluative involvement and the adoption of a particular stance, and consequent assessment of the phenomena being discussed. The pragmatic resources used to convey these attitudinal meanings are described in the framework in the form of complex typologies of superordinate and subordinate categories organized into three broad subtypes: emotional reactions, 'affect'; reference to ethics/morality, 'judgement'; reference to social value, 'appreciation'. These are then further sub-divided to allow for a more finely-tuned analysis, and the linguistic assessment of dimensions such as authorial 'directness', 'force', 'focus', 'intensification', 'mitigation', and so on. The framework provides a valuable matrix for discourse analysts to identify and interpret scales of attitudinal and evaluative meaning through the linguistic indexicality in data collected in specific communicative settings and instances of use.

What is important for our purpose here in considering the research papers in this collection is, firstly that the language activating attitudinal meanings are not textually fixed, but determined by combinations and clusters in particular co-textual settings: the same term or epithet can be associated with different attitudinal meanings in different settings. Secondly, the Bakhtian dialogic element in the expression of attitudinal meaning is key: the authorial voice is positioned alongside a diversity of other ‘external voices’, and ‘sideways glances’, which may have been previously expressed or could potentially make themselves heard in the future, opening up dialogic space for potentially alternative viewpoints. The significance of this will be seen later in the brief summary of individual chapters.

The appraisal and evaluation theory described above can now be applied to the volume’s main theme of attempts to connect argumentation, ideology and discourse. It allows us to explain the simultaneous operation and interconnectivity between Halliday’s ideational and interpersonal macro-functions. The creators of the sources of information, knowledge, ideas, beliefs and opinions discursively construe specific authorial identities and *personae*, individually or collectively, in order to imbue their positions with credibility, legitimacy and authority. This is part of the process of authorial and audience authentication described initially. At the same time, persuasive power is directed towards their audiences on an ideological level: discourses reflect and reinforce shared assumptions, values and practices, and are instrumental in the creation, maintenance and restoration of consensus across community participants, societal membership and grouping.

All the papers contained in this volume describe the role of evaluative language, authorial stance, and attitudinal meaning in the creation of identity and an image of credibility, authenticity, and trustworthiness for the agentive source of information and ideas: this is true whether the text producer is an individual (a journalist, an academic researcher, a scientist), a national newspaper, the co-founder of a social media platform, the legislators of an international trade treaty, a campaigning non-profit organization, an EU institutional agency, a national political party, or even a nation, as these papers will later show.

So far we have looked at the theoretical linguistic models, schools of research, approaches and descriptive frameworks which anchor a great deal of discourse analysis, in general, and which have guided the studies included in this volume, in particular. It is now time to consider the field of argumentation studies to the extent that they have demonstrated relevance and have directly informed some of the work reported here, but, as importantly, in order to identify the areas which are of potential use in forging further integration between the two fields in the future.

Argumentation studies have developed considerably over time, drawing on a very wide variety of disciplines, interests and fields: to name the main ones, classical and modern rhetoric, formal and informal logic, philosophy and psychology, as well as those more directly related to discourse analysis – linguistics and pragmatics. The approaches, descriptive and explanatory frameworks and methodological tools used in this field are equally varied. The mainstream of research informing the studies contained in this volume, however, and which presents interesting points of convergence with and relevance to discourse analysis, is that of pragma-dialectical theory and its application, developed by Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst and colleagues at the University of Amsterdam (van Eemeren 2018, 2019; van Eemeren, Grootendorst 1984, 1992). According to its authors, the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation

enables the analyst of argumentative discourse to make a theoretically motivated reconstruction of the discourse that results in an ‘analytical overview’ that is pertinent to a ‘Critical Discussion’ [...] in which standpoints are critically tested. (van Eemeren, Grootendorst 1984, p. 17)

Initially the focus of the theory was on the ‘reasonableness’ of an argument, ‘the best way to argue’, *per se*, in a formal, normative perspective, but the later ‘extended’ version incorporated more fully the modern rhetorical dimension, moving from the evaluation of the mere ‘quality’ of argument to its ‘effectiveness’ in achieving particular pragmatic purposes in different contexts, producing distinctive forms of argumentation (van Eemeren, Garssen 2012).

A variety of typologies of argumentation have been produced by theorists. The categorization applied in several of the papers included here is van Eemeren’s differentiation between ‘symptomatic’, ‘comparative’, and ‘causal’ types of argument: the establishment of relations of likeness and similarity; correlation and contrast; or cause and effect, between the argument at stake and the position that is supported (van Eemeren, Grootendorst 1992, pp. 94-102).

Pragma-dialectical theorists have produced numerous sets of ‘argument schemes’ and ‘argument frames’, constituting series of argumentation structures that can be used to identify the relationships between argumentative moves (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca 1958; Walton *et al.* 2008). At the broadest level of generality, four discussion stages can be identified: ‘the confrontation’ stage (introducing the standpoints at issue), the ‘opening’ stage (defining the divergence of opinion), the ‘argumentation’ stage (producing reasoning itineraries and advancing arguments) and the ‘concluding’ stage (presenting the outcome of the process), (van Eemeren, Grootendorst 1984, pp. 85-88).

The constituent parts of an argument, its components, are typically described by theorists in the form of complex, abstract schemes and sub-schemes, following a sequence of steps, the ‘moves’, that are taken in the resolution of the ‘critical argument’. This can be reconstructed, according to pragma-dialectical theory, in terms of a general standpoint, ‘premises’ (major, minor, explicit or unexpressed), the ‘datum’ (the evidence used to substantiate the argument), and a conclusion. The process is seen as consisting of moving from a premise to a conclusion through a reasoned path of logical inference.

The progression of the argument through these sets of moves is further refined into the identification of pragma-dialectical itineraries, ‘reasoning paths’, which construct a chosen ‘dialectical route’ (van Eemeren 2018, p. 74) through a process of ‘strategic maneuvering’. In the extended version of pragma-dialectical theory, greater importance has been placed on this dimension, involving the incorporation of ‘topicalization’, the dimension of context of use, audience, and so on, which aligns it more clearly with the concerns of discourse analysis. Argumentative analysis can now also help to identify and describe the interpersonal use of language, namely the attitudinal, evaluative and interactive functions of discourse, together with the pragmatic, rhetorical strategies used in texts. Presently many scholars are investigating ‘prototypical patterns of reasoning’ and ‘argumentative style’, those typical of a particular field, communication activity or genre (van Eemeren 2019). This is increasingly a promising approach for the integration of the two fields of argumentation and discourse analysis. It also opens up space for linking discourse strategies more closely with illocutionary uptake.

The study of argumentation in discourse and the adoption of a socio-discursive approach to arguments is not without its problems and challenges. Although the broader typologies of argument types described above are intuitively useful, the formalized schemes of logic and the abstract terminology of analysis can be off-putting to discourse analysts who do not have a grounding in formal logic (for the most part of us, I hazard to guess), as Degano (this volume) notes. Not only, much is left out in argumentation theory and its application, as Ruth Amossy, *Critical Argumentative Discourse* scholar explains. She points out that there are many different forms of argument, that, anyway, “argumentativity constitutes an inherent feature of discourse”, that “a mere series of arguments does not account for how polemical discourse actually works”, that often there are no overt signals of argument retrievable, materially, or that they are distributed in ways that are hard to identify or connect, linguistically (Amossy 2009, pp. 2-4). Yet Amossy sees the value of a theoretical framework to reconcile these difficulties. She believes it is possible to investigate, at the same time, both the role of language and the underlying modes of reasoning which model opinions and attitudes, and how “verbal exchanges co-construct ways of

seeing, interpreting and experiencing the surrounding world” (Amossy 2009, p. 2). For this, she adds, a ‘cultural’ framework is needed, which incorporates the situation of discourse, dialogical interdiscursivity, and ideological adherence. This socio-discursive approach is illustrated very clearly in the research documented in this volume.

As we will see in the brief synopses of the individual chapters described later, the authors draw on argumentation theory to varying extents and in different ways. Two researchers, Bowker and Degano, draw directly on the pragma-dialectical theory, comparing and contrasting argumentation types and models, and the attendant use of logico-structural analysis and analytical itineraries. The other authors use pragma-dialectal routes and procedures in their analysis, what we may classify as argumentative and strategic manoeuvring paths: these include semantic patterning, topicalization, metaphor-metonym usage and cultural allusion, metadiscursive function, the semantico-pragmatic force of clausal structure (concur/concede-counter patterns, concessive rhetoric, propositional similarity, and polarization structures) being the main ones.

A word should be spent on the methods, topics and sources of the contributions. As Susan Hunston mentions in the Endnote to this volume, corpus linguistics models and methods are used by most authors, in combination with other approaches and methodological tools: in Bowker, Incelli, Mottura, Nikitina, Prosperi Porta, Tessuto, the quantification of linguistic features is qualitatively interpreted backwards and forwards across co-texts of varying length, each person drawing on parts of the frameworks described earlier (Critical Discourse Analysis, Appraisal and Evaluation Theory, Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity). On the other hand, Degano, assisted by textual search engines, uses manual quantification in her identification of *topoi* and key propositions, while Moschini uses a socio-cultural interpretative approach which is not dependent on linguistic quantification. All authors describe in detail their choice of methods, the criteria for their corpus selection and compilation, and their research focus, design and objectives.

The volume illustrates research in a variety of discourse domains and areas of specialized knowledge: Bowker examines international trade legislation and campaigning organizations worldwide; Degano, Mottura, Prosperi Porta discuss political and institutional discourse, using different sources (the British media; an EU law enforcement agency’s annual reports; Chinese legal, political and media texts, respectively). Incelli looks at political economy and economic policy as they are incorporated in British newspapers; Moschini uses a single, pivotal, 6,000-word message posted by Facebook’s co-founder, Mark Zuckerberg, for her detailed analysis of social media and socio-political community spaces; Nikitina deals with the medical sciences,

bio-science, in particular, as reported in the British press; Tessuto has compiled a corpus consisting of academic research articles in two social science disciplines, Economics and Law. This Introduction will now finish with a brief synopsis of the individual papers.

The volume begins with **Janet Bowker's** chapter on the nature of 'entextualization' over three intersecting, vertically-organized sets of data pertaining to the controversial topic of international trade agreements, the spread of neo-liberal commercial policies, and the de-regularization of services worldwide. The process of 'entextualization' is realized through the various discourses—from the normative codification of legislation, on to the detailed specialist exposition and critique from legal experts, and over to the affectively-charged discourse of resistance and protest in the public domain. A series of discursive indicators were identified, using corpus analysis textware, in order to reconstruct the argumentative patterning at work over the three sub-corpora: these aimed at describing semantic profiling, topicalization, and verbal usage. Applying these linguistic features, it has been possible to distinguish the ideological positioning of the protagonists, the distribution of their dialectical roles, and the strategic itineraries they follow in the construal of their arguments. The study concluded by observing that the three sub-corpora implement different argumentative schema (symptomatic, causal and comparative), comprising distinctive features: respectively, the role of implicit, unexpressed premises, the articulation of a formal logical scheme, and the use of argument based on persuasive appeal to *pathos* and *ethos* rather than *logos*.

The second chapter, by **Chiara Degano**, also explores argumentation models and formal, logical schema. Degano addresses discourses produced around Brexit in UK editorials and comment articles, with a focus on the inferences that justify the transition from premises to conclusions in arguments recurrently used during the referendum campaign and in the aftermath of Leave's victory. Building on a previous study co-authored by Degano, in which a number of Brexit-related topoi were identified adopting the content-based criteria typical of the Discourse-Historical Approach, this chapter moves towards greater formalization, interfacing them with argument schemes attested in the argumentation literature. After illustrating the notions of topoi and schemes as procedural accounts of the premise-to-conclusion transition inference, Degano reconstructs two of the previously identified, content-based, topoi following the conventions of influential contemporary models: pragma-dialectics and the Argomentum Model of Topoi. In doing so, she considers their pros and cons for discourse analysis, showing that each model in its own respect favours a principled analysis that draws attention to implicit, but crucial, components of argumentation. The selection of a given topos plays an important role in the expected outcomes of the argumentation.

With specific regard to Brexit, one of the two topoi reconstructed in the chapter had very little chance of winning new consensus to the Remain cause, playing mostly a role of strengthening the conviction of fellow Remainers, while the other was potentially more suited to engaging an audience of undecided voters.

Chapters, 3, 4 and 5 also deal with the British press and how journalists construct argumentation and ideological positions around controversial topics through their use of linguistic resources. In chapter 3, **Ersilia Incelli** explores the discursive construction and representation of economic inequality in the British press in the period 2016-2019. She does this through a compiled corpus of selected newspaper articles from three online newspapers *The Guardian*, *The Telegraph* and *The Daily Mail*. A comparative analysis shows not only how the newspapers differ on the lexico-semantic and grammatical level in the discursive construction of key clusters around economic inequality, but also on the ideological argumentative level, in the way journalists position their ideas and engage their readers in order to defend and legitimize arguments. The newspapers' representation of economic inequality, which emerges from linguistic and argumentation analyses, also reveals whether they are aligned with the government, and as such broadly welcome greater wealth inequality, or whether, they actually resist current government policies. The main aim is to show how UK national newspapers have a double function in both reporting information, and also in construing an argument and aligning the reader to accept that argument. The methodological approach combines Corpus Linguistics (CL) with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), informed by theories on epistemological and ideological positionings as forms of pragma-dialectical argumentation.

**Jekaterina Nikitina**, in chapter 4, analyses knowledge mediation dynamics and clashing viewpoints in media coverage in the case of the first gene-edited twins. The study uses a combination of insights from Appraisal Theory, Critical Discourse Analysis and Argumentation Theory to describe and explore the linguistic realisation of (alternative) evaluative standpoints, opinions and potentially ideologically charged messages in British tabloid and broadsheet news reports and editorials covering the case. The analysis is carried out at two levels: at the level of headlines – acting as semantic macro-structures (topics) prepping the readers for a specific response and perception of the event – and at the level of local structures. Predictably, most news reports and editorials passed negative evaluative messages at both levels. Specifically, negative judgment and negative affect were used in the headline, whereas the texts of news reports and editorials demonstrated overlapping sequences of evaluation and argumentation. News reports tended to provide the reader with a more explicit yet depersonalised evaluation of the event, as the responsibility for the opinion expressed is shifted to third parties through

the mechanism of attribution. Besides heavy attributions to multiple sources, Nikitina identifies a peculiar lack of full quotes of the scientist who generated the twins, which arguably left him in a downgraded position against the overall heteroglossia. Confirming previous research, Nikitina pinpoints a specific pattern for editorials only, used to concede with one position and to counter it within the same utterance (concur-counter patterns).

Chapters 5 and 6 both have a specific focus on discourse genre and the attendant medium of communication, albeit in two very different fields of discourse, academic research articles, and a leading social media platform. They share a research objective of exploring the linguistic construal of authorial reputation, authority and legitimacy.

In chapter 5, **Girolamo Tessuto** examines metadiscursive analysis, which offers a valuable means of comparing the rhetorical choices of different academic discourse communities and explicating the social and communicative situations in which linguistic choices are made. The present paper examines the argumentative patterns of interactional metadiscourse use in the disciplines of Economics and Law, and draws from Hyland's analytical framework of metadiscourse markers along with other integrative frameworks in a representative corpus of social science empirical research articles in the chosen fields. Both distributional and functional analyses of metadiscourse resources show that there are similarities as well as differences between the two disciplines in terms of how writers structure their texts and present arguments to their readers, and how they draw on their understandings of these resources to report the results of their original study to their readers. It is argued that metadiscoursal use is underpinned by the epistemologies behind the existing qualitative and quantitative methods of empirical research. Together these provide the regulating mechanisms for argumentative forms, ideological assumptions and knowledge structures in text production. This study aims to provide a greater understanding of metadiscourse in the discipline-specific writing practices of the genre of academic research articles.

**Ilaria Moschini**, in chapter 6, investigates the discursive construction of the message “Building Global Community” posted by Zuckerberg in February 2017 from a multimodal critical discourse analysis perspective to understand how verbal and visual resources shape the image of Facebook (Fb) as a space for civic engagement. Since its publication, the post has been considered a “manifesto” that is, a public declaration of policy and aims. From an ideological standpoint, it is where Fb's CEO and founder envisions for the platform the role of the “social infrastructure” for the global community of tomorrow. Rhetorically, all the argumentative strategies adopted concur to describe Fb as the technological enabler of civic participation, starting from the constant exploitation of the semantic

ambiguity of the term “social”. At discourse level, the textual structure of the post is more similar to a political declaration than to a status update on social media in terms of length, informativity, lexical density and layout. The visual component contributes to the construal of the post as a “manifesto” with information ‘packaged’ to highlight the informative components making use of bullet points and typographical emphasis that suggests a preferred reading of the contents. In addition, the main picture represents Zuckerberg while publicly addressing an audience in Fb’s headquarters, thus framing the verbal text as a public speech.

The final two chapters introduce international and intercultural perspectives in the realms of political and institutional discourse. In chapter 7, **Chiara Prosperi Porta** explores the role of trust and credibility in the dissemination of security discourse and formation of a ‘security identity’ (Waever 1995) by the law-enforcement agency Europol within the EU context, through the release of annual reports. The relationship between law-enforcement discursive practices, the legitimation of identity and the categories of trust, ideology and ethics is analysed, as well as the various ways in which these are strategically mediated in discourse. Corpus-assisted (Partington 2004, 2010) quantitative exploration of data has shown how the lexical salience of some words has textually marked the agency’s ideology, encompassed ethics and promoted a trustworthy institutional identity. Analogously, examining qualitative findings related to argumentation, it has been possible not only to discover the shaping of a two-fold dimension of a ‘security identity’ (e.g. supranational law-enforcement leading role *v.* national authorities coordinated cooperation), but also the institutional use of polarisation strategies (van Dijk 2000), when positively representing Europol’s *ingroup* as associated to trust, security and legality, as opposed to the incomparable but still threatening capabilities of the criminal forces’ *outgroup*. The exploration of these strategies has also revealed Europol’s frequent intent to discursively tone down the insidious dangers of the criminal counterpart, to propagandise institutional *self* superiority and the ideal of ethical behaviour, in order to legitimise the ‘war on terror’ (Jarvis 2009) and manipulate the audience’s acceptance of ever so often controversial control measures.

The final chapter in the volume, authored by **Bettina Mottura**, focuses on a new ideological formulation introduced in 2018 in article 1 of the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China. Considering discourse as both a product of the social context and a tool to bring about change in society, and the particular status of the constitutional text in China, the contribution aims at studying the discursive strategy in which the item is embedded and through which it is promoted between 2013 and 2019. In order to better define the boundaries of the discourse-building effort associated with the introduction of

the new ideological formulation, a corpus of texts in the Chinese language has been selected from different fields of action following the rationale of intertextuality. All texts displayed an explicit reference to the 2018 amendment wording, and they were all realizations of genres belonging to the genre repertoire of contemporary Chinese politics. The linguistic data – collected in three sub-corpora rooted in legal, political and journalistic languages – could thus be considered tools for political cadres' action in China. Drawing on the discourse-historical approach of critical discourse analysis, on the basis of selected examples, the chapter shows how the discursive strategy performs a synergic action to disseminate the new ideology formulation by addressing two sub-topics, namely a renewed centrality of the Chinese Communist Party in national politics, and the promotion of ideological loyalty and cohesion within the elite group. In parallel, it will demonstrate how the texts intentionally – but indirectly – and with a persuasive intent, promote two main macro-topics of Chinese political discourse: the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party to govern the country, and the stability of the political system.

To conclude, the Keynote Speakers at the Rome 2019 Colloquium, Susan Hunston and Srikant Sarangi, presented detailed reflections on the nature and problematics of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research which involves the linguistic sciences working with other areas of investigation. This volume has explored the multidisciplinary nature of argumentation and discourse studies, together with the opportunities and challenges of cross-fertilization and points of contact in the immediate future. The contributions illustrate the potential for the multi-models and blended methodologies which can usefully be employed in order to better track the linguistic representations of argument, along with the socio-construction of ideology, and the complex interface between the three dimensions. The eminent argumentation scholar, Frans H. van Eemeren, has expressed the need for more empirical discourse-based research in order to explore developing fields such as argumentative style and prototypical patterning (van Eemeren 2019, pp. 168-170). At the same time, corpus-discourse linguists can fruitfully broaden their horizons of investigation and tackle the complexities of multi and trans-disciplinarity through coordination with scholars of argumentation.

The significance of this collection of papers that emerges, however, goes beyond the realm of linguistic studies. In the digital era, characterized by information-dense, hyper-connected communities, the rights, needs and obligations of participants are changing. The distinctions between the public and the private knowledge sphere are being eroded, and clear demarcations between specialist and non-specialist knowledge are becoming blurred. The research described here attempts to track the creation, elaboration and

dissemination of what can be called new ‘strategic texts’ in the global knowledge sphere. Moreover, it is indeed a paradox, that in the splendor of the ‘Information Age’, our time is characterized by uncertainty and flux on so many fronts, and often accompanied by serious ideological confusion, and that people risk being not only *uninformed*, but *misinformed* and, possibly, all too often, *disinformed*. Our critical faculties are put to the test daily—to identify seemingly simple gaps in information or deliberate manipulation of the world we live in, through the instrument of language. The research collected in this volume serves an important purpose: it recognizes the need to strive for a more precise awareness about the linguistic and discursive construction of argument and its pragma-ideological correlations. The trade-off may be more than academic, and is arguably part of a wider collaboration and sharing of such interests among educators, professionals, and a host of cultural mediation channels: the critical evaluation of information, ideas and positions needs to be prioritized as an essential citizen competence so as to guarantee a healthy and democratic participation in ‘The Knowledge Society’, whatever the field of action may be, academic research, education provision, media communication and journalism, or otherwise.

## References

- Amossy R. 2009, *Argumentation in discourse: A socio-discursive approach to arguments*, in Ritola, J. (ed.), *Argument Cultures: Proceedings of OSSA 09*, CD-ROM, pp. 1-12.
- Bakhtin M.M. 1981, *The Dialogic Imagination*, University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.
- Bakhtin M.M. 1986, *The problem of speech genres*, in *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays*, transl. McGee V. W., University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. 60-101.
- Bazerman C. 2004, *Intertextuality: how texts rely on other texts*, in Bazerman C. and Prior P. (eds.), *What Writing Does and How It Does It. An Introduction to Analysing Texts and Textual Practices*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence, pp. 83-96.
- Bhatia V.K. 2010, *Interdiscursivity in professional communication*, “Discourse and Communication”, 4 [1], pp. 32-50.
- Blommaert J. 2005, *Discourse, A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fairclough N. 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman, London.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1978, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*, Edward Arnold, London.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1994, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Edward Arnold, London.
- Hunston S. and Thompson G. (eds.) 2000, *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hunston S. 2011, *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: Phraseology and Evaluative Language*, Routledge, London.
- Martin J.R. and White P.R.R. 2005, *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Origi G. 2017, *La reputazione. Chi dice che cosa a chi*, transl., Holmes S. and Arikha N., *Reputation: What It Is and Why It Matters*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Perelman C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca L. 1958, *La Nouvelle Rhétorique: Traité De L'argumentation*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, transl. Wilkinson J. and Weaver P., *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise On Argumentation* 1969, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana.
- Reisigl M. and Wodak R. 2009, *The Discourse–Historical Approach*, in Wodak R., and ? Meyer M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London (2nd revised edition), pp. 87-121.
- van Dijk T.A. 1998, *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, Sage, London.
- van Dijk T.A. 2004, *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- van Eemeren F.H. 2018, *Argumentative Theory. A Pragma-dialectic Perspective*, Springer, Dordrecht.
- van Eemeren F.H. 2019, *Argumentative style: a complex notion*, in “Argumentation” 33, pp. 153-171.
- van Eemeren F.H. and Garssen B. (eds.) 2012, *Exploring Argumentative Contexts*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- van Eemeren F.H. and Grootendorst R. 1984, *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions: A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed Towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion*, Floris Publications, Dordrecht.
- van Eemeren F.H. and Grootendorst R. 1992, *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies. A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence.

- Walton D., Reed C. and Macagno F. 2008, *Argumentation Schemes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wodak R. and Meyer M. [2001] 2009, *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology*, in Wodak R. and Meyer M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London, pp.1-33.