describe how propositions are inferred from semiotic content regardless multimodal communication. Secondly, I employ multimodality researcn to I draw on the idea of propositions within speech act theory to adjust it to pressed in various modes into the meta-language of propositions. Firstly, dairy research. The model allows the analyst to translate the reasoning ex-(MAR), which merges speech act theory, pragma-dialectics, and multimo-In this paper, I propose a multimodal argument reconstruction model

**CESENKOMICS** 

Argumentative Artifacts: Introducing MAR Multimodally Expressed Propositions in

Towards a Method of Reconstructing

claims for the product.

guage, sound, music) are orchestrated to promote positive, argumentative now source-rarger mappings across modes (visuals, written/spoken lanapproach to multimodal metaphor analysis to reconstruct and interpret pased on a corpus of 15 advertisements, we apply a cognitive-linguistic mercials function as persuasive strategies in mass-media communication. This talk discusses how visual and multimodal metaphors in iPhone com-

> All newgnilgnadZ Charles FORCEVILLE

> > uyor

sive Strategies in iPhone Commercials Visual & Multimodal Metaphor as Persua-

body of richly annotated multimodal German news reports. mentation. This will be explored with the help of examples from a large rather differently motivated structures proposed within theories of arguwill be to consider to what extent such structures may correlate with the buted by any semiotic modes participating. The focus of the presentation deuetsfind discourse structures over blended discourse semantics contrithe interpretation of multimodal communication operates by abductively

Our current model of multimodal semiotics is premised on the idea that

Audiovisual News Reporting Structure and Argumentation Structure in

Relations between Multimodal Discourse

**NAM**3TA8

Multimodal In Everyday Argumentation Conversation & the Media:

11th & 12th of December om 4 102 SALZBURG 4th Floor

hensive procedural system and highlight the difficulties to be overcome. and relevant meme conventions. We discuss the advantages of a compre-Argumentation (CAPMA), alongside an analysis of the rhetorical content Arguments (PIA) and Comprehensive Assessment Procedure for Natural interpretation and evaluation procedure, based on the Periodic Table of political scene in the US. We illustrate how we can apply elements of an sider both static visual/textual memes and videos, emanating from the Our presentation deals with memes as multimodal arguments. We con-

key component tables, and the propositional, prescriptive, and emotional

luation, argument schemes, "proto-arguments", rhetorical considerations,

I will discuss critical thinking, the epistemic goals of logic, argument eva-

single advertisement. In a manner that invites comments and criticisms,

dal argument that is grounded in logic as a discipline, I will focus on a

I will illustrate an approach to the analysis and assessment of multimo-

truct visual arguments and what their approaches reveal about the practi-

analysing some survey responses, we explore how average viewers recons-

tion examines how non-academic audiences approach reconstruction. By

premises. But how is reconstruction typically carried out? Our presenta-

coursely conveyed propositions and translating them into conclusions and

in propositional terms. For visual arguments, this involves identifying pic-Reconstruction is the process of making an argument's structure explicit

Visual Argument

Multimodal Argumentation in Everyday Conversation and the Media: Putting Methods to the Test

> 11th and 12th of December 2025

20min (Q&A)

Department of

Unipark Nonntal, Erzabt-Klotz-Straße 1, 4. Stock, Raum 4.102

45min = 25min (presentation) +

Janina Wildfeuer, Jana Pflaeging

**English and American Studies** 

Hartmut Stöckl, Jan Albert van Laar,

Date

Location

Presentation Slots

University of Salzburg

Organization

Multimodal Argumentation

Logic (Formal and Informal) Meets

Expert and Lay Reconstructions of

Do People See an Argument?

Weronika OLKOWSKA

aspects of arguments as logic understands them.

A. KOCZOROWICZ

Martin HINTON

**GROARKE** 

ce of reconstruction.

Lotte VAN POPPEL

Bita HESHMATI

A First Sketch Procedures for Interpreting

Multimodal Argumentation:

Analysing Social

Argumentative Discourse Janina WILDFEUER ILUOAO AstiseN Marta MARCORA

to advance interdisciplinary methodological insights.

Actors and Actions in

and, ultimately, to the development of possible tools for their evaluation.

the process from their identification to the proposal of analytical models

Hinton, 2024). This paper offers an overview of auditory arguments, tracing

employs elements of sound to express or support its inference" (Kišiček &

ve discourse. An auditory argument can be defined as "any argument that

portant, and at times even crucial, component of multimodal argumentati-

Over the past decade, sound has been increasingly recognized as an im-

Auditory Arguments:

From Identification to Evaluation

lity and reproducibility of each approach across static and dynamic media

sponding argumentative reconstruction. Our goal is to test the transferabi-

analysing the representation of social actors and actions, and the corre-

sbectively designed for factual (online news) and fictional (film) texts - for

dia. Specifically, we will explore the use of two distinct frameworks - re-

modal representation of characters can be effectively applied across me-

In this talk, we examine how different analytical approaches to the multi-

example (Groarke) and the Dragonfly example (Stöckl).

examples from the viewpoint of these two disciplines.

TIP, this talk will apply the method to two examples: the Neuschwanstein sed. Io facilitate a discussion of the advantages and challenges of the MAclassified independently of the mode(s) in which their elements are exprestation. One of the key features of this method is that the argument can be re (MALIP) takes a parametric approach to analysing multimodal argumen-The recently developed Multimodal Argument Type Identification Procedu-

tion recognition and critical thinking? We explore this issue by analysing

ning. Can multimodal, nonverbal, communication trigger persuasive inten-

ment only when it invites the addressee to critically reflect on the reaso-

a persuasive intention. Dialectical approaches qualify reasoning as argu-

communication. In the case of argumentation, this includes recognising

For cognitive pragmatics, intention recognition is central to successful

and Critical Thinking

as Invitations to Inference

Multimodal Arguments

SezylenA elqmex3 owT: 91TAM Analysing Multimodal Arguments with the

the visuals and their semantic relations to the ad copy. simple and creates uncertainties. It requires constant engagement with reconstructing contextually cogent commercial arguments is far from online comprehension of multimodal arguments. The results indicate that the persuasiveness and likeability of the ads, we sought insights into the

asking questions about ad message, argument, role of image and about

Argumentation To assume a simple division of labour (image as reasons – text as claim) overlooks how mode interplay creates argumentative meaning. In this presentation, I examine the discourse semantics of semiotic modes and their combination logics to show how they afford multiple inferential processes which can guide the interpretation and analysis of multimodal argumentation. I illustrate how these inferential processes inform the different steps of the identification, interpretation, reconstruction, and evaluation of multimodal argumentation communicated in a variety of canvases and media.

study on current multimodal travel ads. Taking eye-tracking measures and The presentation reports selected results from a small pilot reception-Multimodal Argument Comprehension?

Assimakis

Keynote

**TSERONIS** 

What Can Reception Studies Tell us about "I Don't Know the Argument."

Hartmut STÖCKL Верекчр МЕСЕИЕВ

Revisiting the Division of Labour between

Interpretation and Analysis of Multimodal

Image and Text: The Logics of Modes in the

ULAWZO 9v9JZ

AAAJ NAV .A nbl

WAGEMANS

Jesu

tures situated along a continuum and its implications for the commitments artefact. Furthermore, the degree of salience of implicatures and explicatempt to track the commitments that can be derived from the multimodal integrate insights from Peircean semiotics into explicature theory in an attrom static postings in public controversies. The method of analysis will tion of multimodal arguments by extracting explicatures and implicatures This presentation will take an initial step towards the analysis and evalua-

A Semiotic Approach in Public Controversies:

Eda I. SUKAN

Bernardo RILLA

Keynote

Gabrijela KISICEK

in dialogue will be explored.

Multimodal Arguments Coffee Breaks Start & End Lunch Breaks

Thursday	Thursday	Thursday	Thursday 19:00
09:15 → 17:00	11:45 → 13:00	14:35 → 15:15	Casa Antonio
Friday	Friday	Friday	Friday 18:00
10:00 → 17:30	11:40 → 13:00	14:35 → 15:15	Castellani

Thursday 09:15 → 10:00	Sound Multimodal Argumentation	01
Thursday 10:05 → 10:50	Multimodal Metaphor	02
Thursday 11:00 → 11:45	Semiotics Pragmatics	03
Thursday 13:00 → 13:45	Cognitive Pragmatics Dialectics	04
Thursday 13:50 → 14:35	Argument Interpretation Evaluation	05
Thursday 15:15 → 16:00	Pragma-Dialectics Speech Act Theory	06
Thursday 16:05 → 16:50	Argumentation Character Representation	07
Friday 10:00 → 10:45	Modal Logic Discourse Semantics	08
Friday 10:55 → 11:40	Discourse Structure Argument Structure	09
Friday 13:00 → 13:45	Informal Logic	10
Friday 13:50 → 14:35	Multimodal Argument Types	11
Friday 15:15 → 16:00	Argument Reconstruction Comprehension	12
Friday 16:05 → 16:50	Argument Reception Comprehension	13
	09:15 → 10:00  Thursday 10:05 → 10:50  Thursday 11:00 → 11:45  Thursday 13:00 → 13:45  Thursday 13:50 → 14:35  Thursday 15:15 → 16:00  Thursday 16:05 → 16:50  Friday 10:00 → 10:45  Friday 10:55 → 11:40  Friday 13:00 → 13:45  Friday 13:50 → 14:35  Friday 13:50 → 14:35  Friday 13:50 → 14:35  Friday 15:15 → 16:00  Friday	$09:15 \rightarrow 10:00$ Thursday $10:05 \rightarrow 10:50$ Thursday $11:00 \rightarrow 11:45$ Semiotics Pragmatics  Thursday $13:00 \rightarrow 13:45$ Cognitive Pragmatics Dialectics  Thursday $13:50 \rightarrow 14:35$ Thursday $15:15 \rightarrow 16:00$ Pragma-Dialectics Speech Act Theory  Thursday $16:05 \rightarrow 16:50$ Argument Interpretation Character Representation  Friday $10:00 \rightarrow 10:45$ Modal Logic Discourse Semantics  Friday $10:55 \rightarrow 11:40$ Friday $10:55 \rightarrow 11:40$ Friday $13:00 \rightarrow 13:45$ Informal Logic  Friday $13:00 \rightarrow 13:45$ Friday $13:00 \rightarrow 14:35$ Multimodal Argument Types  Friday $13:50 \rightarrow 14:35$ Friday $13:50 \rightarrow 14:35$ Friday $15:15 \rightarrow 16:00$ Argument Reconstruction Comprehension  Friday

