

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindsor

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 12

Jun 4th, 11:01 AM - 12:00 PM

Commentary on: "Diversity in Argumentation Theory" (by Claudio Duran & Eva Hamamé)

Dimitris Serafis

USI - Università della Svizzera italiana

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



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Serafis, Dimitris, "Commentary on: "Diversity in Argumentation Theory" (by Claudio Duran & Eva Hamamé)" (2020). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 20.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA12/Thursday/20>

This Commentary 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.

Commentary on: “Diversity in Argumentation Theory” (by Claudio Duran & Eva Hamamé).

DIMITRIS SERAFIS

Institute of Argumentation, Linguistics and Semiotics

USI – Università della Svizzera italiana

Via Buffi 13, 6900, Lugano, Switzerland

dimitrios.serafis@usi.ch

The paper at hand, follows Michael Gilbert’s Theory of Multi-Modal Argumentation in order to offer an in depth investigation of the “relations between logic, intuitions, emotions and physicality in cases of argumentation” (p. 1). The paper is well-written and well-structured and the authors present in a clear way their perspective. My comments aim to help the authors illustrate some points that, in my view, remain obscure in the present version of the paper.

The authors draw on the seminal work of Laclau & Mouffe on *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* in order to provide us with a view of the unequal, power relations (ethnic, gender, and so on) existing in social processes. They clearly underline that power relations and dichotomies between dominant and oppressed groups result in “structures of domination” (p. 1). As they claim, their aim is to show how reasoning functions within the aforementioned structures. In order to do so, they follow Gilbert’s Theory of Multi-Modal Argumentation. The presentation of the different modes (logical, emotional, visceral, kisceral) is clear. However, the paper lacks an integration of Gilbert’s Theory and Laclau & Mouffe’s perspective. In other words, the authors do not explicate how their work, belonging to argumentation studies, may contribute to examine the different modes in which reasoning may contribute to backup power inequalities in social processes. Moreover, what remains opaque in the present version of the paper is how, through this work, social inequalities can be mitigated (as stated in the final section of the paper). I think that an example of an argumentative text or discourse, coming from a real context, could be useful in order to see how this integration works.

Additionally, the authors pay particular attention to the emotional mode of argumentation (pp. 5-9). They refer to the approach of Machenzie & Alba-Juez in *Emotions in Discourse* in order to give a definition of how emotion is understood in real texts and discourses. They claim that emotions can lead to fallacious argumentation in contexts of everyday life. However, my first point here is that this contributions lacks a clear reference to studies that examine how emotions work from an argumentative perspective. This is a quite flourishing area in argumentation studies (see for example the special issue of *Informal Logic* entitled as “Rhetoric and Language: Emotions and Style in Argumentative Discourse”). Moreover, the authors highlight the notion of context as a crucial point of reference in this investigation on the emotional mode. However, and in addition to my previous comment, they do not clarify how their argumentative analysis may integrate the contextual components in which they refer. Again an example of analysis would be crucial for the authors to illustrate their claims. A final comment on that section is the following one: the authors claim that “emotion is synthetical [...] emotion is global and therefore tends to bring together instead of dividing” (p. 9). Is that so? To my knowledge, there are studies that have shown how emotions in discourse can be employed in order to facilitate perspectives that (re)produce and disseminate structural inequalities in contemporary societies.

All in all, the present paper offers us a presentation of Gilbert’s work on Multi-Modal Argumentation. The authors clearly develop a step-by-step presentation of the significance of the aforementioned work for Argumentation studies. However, the paper, in its present version, lacks a synthesis, at a theoretical level, that would made the integration of Gilbert’s work and Laclau & Mouffe’s perspective more visible and a methodological input from studies that focus on the

analysis of each mode of argumentation (see my comments on the emotional mode). Moreover, the claims need to be illustrated in terms of examples of analysis coming from contexts and cases of real life argumentation.