

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 10

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

Response to my commentator

Robert C. Pinto

University of Windsor, Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Pinto, Robert C., "Response to my commentator" (2013). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 140.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA10/papersandcommentaries/140>

This Reply is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences and Conference Proceedings at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in OSSA Conference Archive by an authorized conference organizer of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

Response to my Commentator

ROBERT C. PINTO

Centre for Research on Reasoning, Argument and Rhetoric
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
Canada
pinto@uwindsor.ca

In his thoughtful comments Scott reads me as holding an “ecumenical epistemic theory of argument” on two fronts.

First, from the fact that I formulate the issues that arise in epistemic approaches to argument in terms of the concept “reasonable” rather than in terms of “epistemic justification” he concludes I hold that

the contentious issue of the nature of epistemic justification needn't be inherited by [my] epistemic theory of argument.

Such a reading of my view is, I think, misleading. Much of what I've written in the last 7 years has been devoted to spelling out in detail when and why it is reasonable to adopt one or another cognitive attitude toward a propositional content – a task that is quite analogous to that of addressing “the contentious issue of the nature of epistemic justification.” For example, Pinto (2006) attempts to develop a detailed account of argument evaluation and of the warrants to which such evaluation must revert: it defends a qualitative version of evidence proportionism that does not to my knowledge repeat anything else that has appeared in the epistemological literature to date. Again, Pinto (2009) is an extended account of what makes something a *reason*, and suggests (p. 291) that that, *if we can deal with the threat of an infinite regress of reasons, we might equate its being reasonable to adopt an attitude A toward a propositional content with having a good reason all things considered to adopt that attitude*. Moreover, the paper suggests (in notes 26 and 27 on p. 290) how certain “internalist” moves suggested in Pollock (1995) and Pryor (2005) might enable us to deal with the threat of infinite regress.

Secondly, Aikin suggests my view is “is ecumenical with the other theories of argument”. He writes:

Given that argument may have a variety of goals and our evaluation of it may take on the breadth of that variety, epistemic objectives with argument are the ones Pinto holds are “most interesting,” but are nevertheless [just one] among other objectives.

Aikin is quite correct that my view is “ecumenical” in this respect.

REFERENCES

- Pinto, R. C. (2006). Evaluating inferences: The nature and role of warrants. *Informal Logic*, 26(3), 287-327. Reprinted in: D. Hitchcock & B. Verheij (Eds.) (2006), [*Arguing on the Toulmin model: New essays on argument analysis and evaluation*](#) (pp. 115-144) Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pinto, R. C. (2009). Argumentation and the force of reasons. *Informal Logic*, 29(3), 263-297.
- Pinto, R. C. (2010). The uses of argument in communicative contexts. *Argumentation*, 24, 227-252.
- Pollock, J. L. (1995). *Cognitive Carpentry: A Blueprint for How to Build a Person*. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Pryor, J. (2005). There is immediate justification. In Steup and Sosa, eds., *Contemporary Debates in Epistemology*. Oxford: Blackwell. Link to draft 9. final draft of this paper, can be found on Pryor's Web at <http://www.jimpryor.net/research/index.html>.