

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 8

Jun 3rd, 9:00 AM - Jun 6th, 5:00 PM

Reply to my Commentator - Roque

Georges Roque

Centre national de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris

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



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Roque, Georges, "Reply to my Commentator - Roque" (2009). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 166.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA8/papersandcommentaries/166>

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.

Reply to my Commentator

GEORGES ROQUE

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris
Centre de Recherches sur les arts et le langage, EHESS
96 Bd. Raspail
75006 Paris
France
roque@ehess.fr

Thank you very much for your kind and generous comments on my paper.

Let me briefly reply to the main point you make. When I wrote that

Instead of taking as a starting point one of the many definitions of verbal argument, what we need is rather to start from the level of the visual world and examine how a visual argument works,

all I wanted to stress is the fact that it is important to study the visual as such instead of making it a province of the verbal. In fact, I had in mind what happened in the field of visual rhetoric. In this case, the first step was to find out that a visual rhetoric was possible, or more exactly that most tropes or figures of verbal rhetoric could also work in the visual field. Then the second step was to refuse the paradigm of verbal rhetoric and look instead for the way rhetoric works in images independently of verbal rhetoric. Something similar is happening for visual argumentation. Part of your pioneer work in this field perfectly illustrates the first step, when you showed that most verbal arguments and fallacies had an application in the field of the visual (Groarke 1996). Then the second step we need would be to look at the visual as such, in order to understand how a visual argument works independently of its relation to a verbal argument.

Now this doesn't mean that no comparison is possible between the verbal and the visual, but that we have to dislodge the verbal from its hegemony. In my view, arguments are not verbal in essence. Even if I agree that this claim leaves open the issue of the nature of arguments, my main point was to stress that argument and verbal are not one and the same thing.

[Link to commentary](#)

[Link to paper](#)

REFERENCE

Groarke L. (1996). Logic, art and argument. *Informal Logic*. 18-2/3, pp. 105-129.

Roque, G. (2009). Reply to my Commentator. In: J. Ritola (Ed.), *Argument Cultures: Proceedings of OSSA 09*, CD-ROM (p. 1), Windsor, ON: OSSA.
Copyright © 2009, the author.