May 22nd, 9:00 AM - May 25th, 5:00 PM

Response to my commentator

Chiara Pollaroli
University of Lugano, Institute of Argumentation, Linguistics and Semiotics

Response to my Commentator

CHIARA POLLAROLI

Institute of Argumentation, Linguistics and Semiotics
University of Lugano
Via Giuseppe Buffi 13- 6900 Lugano
Switzerland
chiara.pollaroli@usi.ch

1. INTRODUCTION

The following sections will respond to some of Plumer's points.

2. NON-VERBAL ARGUMENTATION

Plumer claims that images are not arguments because they are non-propositional but only representational and they can be only used as evidence for claims. I see little difference between presenting evidence in support of a claim and arguing for that claim. AMT shows that evidence operates as a datum that combines inferentially with an endoxon, thanks to a maxim functioning as inference license. In order to feed the inferential mechanism the datum needs to have a propositional form. Is a picture a fully propositional representation? No. But even verbal utterances used without the enrichment of contextual pragmatic processes of interpretation often do not convey a fully-fledged proposition (Sperber and Wilson 1986). We should rather ask: can the display of a picture be used to communicate a proposition? I believe that yes: pictorial communication often works weakly conveying a series of potentially relevant propositions.

3. ADVERTISING ARGUMENTATION

Buy product X was not intended to represent a command. A more transparent phrasing of the practical standpoint could have been *Product X is worth buying*. The way it is formulated is of minor importance. What I would like to point out is that product advertisements advance reasons in order to persuade a potential consumer that a product is worth buying. As for the practical reasoning of advertising argumentation what I meant to say is that the generic practical standpoint *Product X is worth buying* is supported by a form of means-ends argumentation where the expediency of buying a product is inferred from the desirability of the product advertised. This move from the desirability of the product to the generic practical standpoint *Buy product X* is implicit in most ads. Most ads advance evaluative standpoints in order to argue for the desirability of the product.

Mohammed, D., & Lewiński, M. (Eds.). *Virtues of Argumentation. Proceedings of the 10th International Conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA), 22-26 May 2013.* Windsor, ON: OSSA, pp. 1-2.

4. METAPHOR

The rhetorical advantage of the combination of different semiotic modes within Nike ad and of the presence of a pictorial metaphor is that the verbal text narrows down the range of implicatures the pictorial metaphor suggests. Metaphor is a blend of frames, not a narration of a believable story. Metaphor results from projecting features of two or more frames onto a new frame which depicts an unusual and unbelievable situation. The metaphor holds thanks to a property – the functional genus – that the frames share. Metaphor brings new concepts and situations to the eyes of the addressee. According to Relevance Theory metaphor is an economical way to invite the addressee to access specific implicatures. The addressee is invited to interpret the metaphorical text consistently with the principle of relevance, that is, in advertising with the principle of advancing argument in support of the evaluative standpoint and proving the desirability of the product. Of course there is a certain degree of indeterminacy regarding implicatures but deriving the most salient ones is not speculation.

REFERENCES

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.