Summary

The purpose of this paper is to identify principles along which modern argumentation theory and the post-Gricean trends of pragmatics can be reconciled. Following a review of the relationship of argumentation theory and pragmatics which has been far from being free of contradictions and despite what the representatives of both fields claim, it becomes clear that (1) the pragmatic turn in argumentation theory has not been completed yet, and (2) the basic terms used in pragmatic theories have not been adequately adopted by argumentation theory.

To ensure the clear continuity of ideas in the paper, and to ensure that the research question can be answered, two well-known and commonly quoted theories have been chosen for the analysis from both sides: typology of argumentation schemes by Manfred Kienpointner on the one hand, and Stephen Levinson's theory of generalised conversational implicatures.

The paper will answer the main research question in five steps:

a) Step I: the author presents an analysis of the relationship between the two disciplines so far,

b) Step II: the paper gives an overview of the methodological and theoretical bases that have been used to address the problem of *argumentum ad hominem* until now,

c) Step III: a selected part of the corpus is analysed with Kienponter's model, and the limitations of applicability of the theory are described at the same time,

d) Step IV: the paper proposes a way to complete Kienpointer's model with Levinson's pragmatic theory,

e) Step V: with the help of case studies it is demonstrated how this completed model can be applied to the description of further arguments.