

PRESENTATION

# Multimodal Argumentation: Challenges and recent trends. An introduction to the Special Issue

Paulo Roberto GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO 

Universidade de São Paulo (USP)

Fabrizio MACAGNO 

Universidade Nova de Lisboa (NOVA)

Isabel Cristina Michelin de AZEVEDO 

Universidade Federal de Sergipe (UFS)



OPEN ACCESS

## HOW TO CITE

Gonçalves-Segundo, P. R.;  
Macagno, F.; Azevedo, I. C. M.  
(2021). Multimodal Argumenta-  
tion: Challenges and recent  
trends. An introduction to the  
Special Issue. *Revista da Abralin*,  
v. 20, n. 3, p. 722-736, 2021.

Social media have changed the way we communicate, or at least the way we *normally* communicate. Communication has become faster, more immediate, and more importantly different. We express our intentions not only with verbal instruments – more precisely through the use of a language – but also by using emoticons, cartoons, pictures, and short videos. Clearly, this is nothing new. The use of different modes of communication has been a trend that has characterized the last decades (HYLAND, 2009), in which the so-called “dominance of monomodality” (KRESS; VAN LEEUWEN, 2001, p. 1) has begun to crumble. The world of advertising has always been defined by the use of different media – and thus different modes for expressing a message (COOK, 1992). In magazines and documents, reports and newspapers, and more recently in messaging apps and social media, such as Facebook or Instagram, words do not longer dominate alone. Images, graphs, charts, and videos are used to clarify concepts, inform, provide evidence, and even provide reasons. The multimodal strategies for expressing meaning have led, however, to some questions concerning the nature of arguments and argumentation, and more importantly the relationship between interpretation and reasoning. Can an argument be expressed through different modes of communication? Is argumentation only a verbal activity? How can we reconstruct a propositional structure in a multimodal text?

## 1. Can argumentation be multimodal?

The concept of multimodal argumentation necessarily involves the definition of argument and argumentation. Argumentation theory has always focused on monomodal texts, and more precisely messages expressed verbally. The New Rhetoric, which is considered one of the founding works of argumentation theories, defines the field of argumentation by making a deliberate and clear choice: only “the discursive means of obtaining the adherence of minds” are taken into account, even though this “technique” is acknowledged to be not the only one, nor the most efficacious (PERELMAN; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 1969, p. 8). The dominant contemporary theories have defined arguments and argumentation in terms of their expression (JOHNSON, 2003; PATTERSON, 2011). For van Eemeren, at least in the first formulation of his Pragma-Dialectical theory, argumentation is a verbal action, as it addresses differences of opinions and reasons that are *externalized* (VAN EEMEREN; GROOTENDORST 1984, p. 6-7). According to this initial perspective, standpoints and arguments cannot be beliefs or mental elements – argumentation needs an objective dimension which in the Pragma-dialectical perspective is provided (only) by verbal communication. Walton (1990, p. 411) defines arguments as “social and verbal means of trying to resolve, or at least to contend with, a conflict or difference that has arisen or exists between two (or more) parties”. These perspectives led to the idea that arguments cannot be visual. Images are argued to fail to distinguish between the essential components of an argument, namely the claim and the reason (or evidence) in its support. Moreover, images are claimed to fall outside the realm of what can be negated or refuted (FLEMING, 1996, p. 13). As Fleming points out, when we translate images into statements, we are no longer talking of “visual” arguments.

To address the problem of the possibility of multimodal argumentation, it is first necessary to agree on what argumentation is. Toulmin put it very clearly: logic, and thus argumentation, is concerned with the retrospective, justificatory process of determining why an argument is acceptable, and what makes it such (TOULMIN, 1958, p. 6). This justification and assessment involve formalities (TOULMIN, 1958, p. 40), and thus the representation of arguments in terms of statements. In this sense, it is necessary to distinguish an argument from its expression, namely the “logical” representation of what is meant from what is said or manifested. The “objectivization” (VAN EEMEREN; GROOTENDORST, 1984, p. 7) of what the speaker intends to defend is prototypically (at least in Western societies so far) performed by verbal means. However, this does not mean that the speaker’s communicative (and thus argumentative) intention cannot be manifested through other modes, alone or in combination (POPA, 2016). As long as our retrospective, justificatory activity is possible – which is always based on formalisms that involve verbal interpretations (PERELMAN; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 1969, p. 8) (representations) of what is manifested, presupposed, and implied – it is possible to talk of argumentation expressed through modes that are not only verbal.

Multimodal argumentation is the combination of more than one mode of conveying the meaning that can be represented in the form of an argument. More precisely, as Tseronis (2018, p. 12) puts it:

Multimodal argumentation [...] can be defined as a communicative activity, in which more than one mode (besides spoken or written language) play a role in the procedure of testing the acceptability of a standpoint that has been put (or is likely to be put) into question by another party (present or implicit). The visual mode, for example, can play a direct role when the meaning conveyed by (part of) the visual constitutes (part of) one of the main elements of an argument (claim – premise – bridging inference) or of any other argumentative move such as to doubt, criticize, or explain.

On this perspective, multimodal arguments are simply different ways of conveying an argument. Like in verbal arguments, a message is conveyed, interpreted by the interlocutor, and reconstructed by the analyst as a set of propositions that support a conclusion (or attack it).

More importantly, visual – and a fortiori multimodal – arguments do not differ essentially from purely verbal arguments. As mentioned above, Fleming defended his attack on visual arguments by claiming that their translation into propositions would make them no longer visual. However, if we look at monomodal arguments, we notice that this approach would lead to some serious consequences. First, enthymemes are defined by their implicit dimension, which consists in one or more premises that the speaker takes for granted and that are necessary for the conclusion to follow, or a tacit conclusion that follows from the premises stated (BRAET, 1999; HITCHCOCK, 2017; VAN EEMEREN; GROOTENDORST, 1982). Such premises need to be reconstructed as propositions: however, it does not mean that if we spell them out as components of an argument, they are no longer implicit. Similarly, the process of reconstruction of a multimodal argument involves the reconstruction of premises inferred from (also) visual elements. Second, like visual meaning, the semantic representation of verbal meaning involves an interpretation that takes into account elements that are not explicit and not necessarily verbal (BIRDSELL; GROARKE, 1996, p. 5):

The word “well,” standing alone, could refer to my health, my skepticism, or the municipal water supply. If you read the sentence “I am well, thank you,” then the context makes it clear that the first meaning is intended. Context plays a similar role when you hear someone ask me how I feel, in which case the single word “well” would be a terse but perfectly intelligible reply.

Not only is a verbal context needed for disambiguating the meaning of an utterance and representing its propositional form, but a non-verbal context is often necessary (see also VAN DEN HOVEN, 2015). For example, the utterance “Can I help you?” can have different meanings depending on the situation and the culture in which it is uttered (KECSKÉS, 2000, p. 610). If used in a shop by the shop assistant in addressing a new client, or a secretary to someone waiting in the waiting room, it can be taken as a greeting or an invitation, more than an offer of help. However, if uttered by a passer-by to a person with a flat tire, it would be a genuine provision of assistance. Finally, if used by the landlord to an individual who sneaked in the house, its meaning would be more similar to a gentle request to leave the premises immediately. In all such cases, the representation of meaning depends on elements that can be not verbal (POPA, 2016).

Clearly, visual argumentation is different from the verbal. First, verbal communication is governed by codified conventions – a grammar – while the “language” of images is apparently arbitrary and subjective, thus leading to problems of reliability (GROARKE, 2002; JOHNSON, 2003). However,

images are not always nor merely resemblances of a real or imagined state of affairs – which in themselves can be represented propositionally (ROQUE, 2015); they are representations, often highly conventionalized, such as in case of symbols (BIRDSSELL; GROARKE, 1996). Moreover, images convey meaning through specific conventions, which can be set out as a “grammar” of visual expression (KRESS; VAN LEEUWEN, 2006; VAN LEEUWEN, 2005). The mechanisms of visual signification have been combined with the instruments of linguistic analysis in some recent works (WHARTON, 2009; YUS, 2008; FORCEVILLE; CLARK, 2014). According to this approach, images, and in particular the combination of verbal and visual modes, can be considered as a type of ostensive communication conveying messages encoded not only verbally, but also through visual signals, emblems, and pictorial codes (KJELDEN, 2012). In each context and culture, visual images can encode specific information, which can then be enriched, namely fully specified contextually through pragmatic inferences. In this sense, images can be considered as nonverbally “coded” messages that can be either enriched by the verbal messages or be used to enrich the latter.

The second crucial difference lies in the structure of commitments. In verbal argumentation, the speaker is responsible for what is (at least partially) explicitly said: the commitments are conventionally determined, as partially encoded in the utterance. In contrast, in visual (and multimodal) argumentation the interpreter needs to perform a more complex reconstruction, as images can suggest a story or an argument, but it is the interlocutor (interpreter) and not the speaker who is responsible for the propositions representing such content (VAN DEN HOVEN, 2012). In this sense, there is always a risk of misattributing the commitments to the producer of a message conveyed pictorially. The hearer may “straw man” the producer of the message, or conversely the producer may deny his or her commitments by providing an alternative interpretation.

The differences between verbal and visual argumentation are reduced in the type of multimodal communication that combines the visual and the verbal mode (called also “double code”; see Roque, 2012). The text provides explicit commitments that interact with the image interpretation, constraining its meaning, inviting specific inferences, and thus controlling the commitments that the interpreter reconstructs from them (TSERONIS; FORCEVILLE, 2017; KJELDEN, 2015).

## 2. Theoretical tools for multimodal argumentation

The “dual code” argumentation has been the focus of several attempts to combine traditional theories of verbal argumentation and verbal interpretation to account for arguments expressed also through images. The simplest approach was pursued by Groarke, who took into account the different “acts of arguing” that can be performed, either visually or verbally, and translated (“dressed”) them into a propositional structure that represents a classical argument structure (premises and conclusion) (GROARKE, 2015). Despite his distinction between acts of arguing, the propositional form of

arguments, and the mode of expression, no procedure or theoretical background is provided for guiding the systematization of the acts in propositional form.

A similar theoretical framework was used by Kjeldsen (2012; 2013; 2015), who translated multimodal arguments in ads using the Toulmin argument structure, which consists in the combination between a claim (conclusion) supported by data (premise), warrant, and backing (evidence). In his perspective, the visual elements in a “dual code” ad can be interpreted using the mechanisms of inference that are at work in everyday conversation, and in particular the principles underlying Relevance theory (SPERBER; WILSON, 1995). According to Kjeldsen (2012), the relationship between an image and the words can be captured by their mutual relevance, which guides the implicatures that can be drawn from the text and that can be expressed as propositions.

A different approach has been followed by the Lugano group (ROCCI; MAZZALI-LURATI; POLLAROLI, 2013; POLLAROLI; ROCCI 2015), who analyzed pictorial metaphors used in advertising and translated them into arguments using the Argumentum Model of Topics (RIGOTTI; MORASSO, 2010). Pictorial metaphors are decomposed and analyzed in propositional form based on the Blending Theory (FAUCONNIER; TURNER, 2002) – which captures the properties of the target and the source and blends them into a new representation that can be expressed propositionally. The outcome of this analytical process of metaphor translation is then combined with the verbal elements, providing the explicit elements of an argument structure in which a crucial role is played by the generic maxim (or warrant) that links the premise to the conclusion and by the endoxical premises that are supplied.

The Pragma-Dialectical approach has provided also a methodology for reconstructing multimodal arguments (FETERIS; GROARKE; PLUG, 2011). The approach is holistic, in the sense that all the elements and the context is taken into account for reaching an interpretation of the standpoint that the text intends to defend. The complex argumentation involved in multimodal ads is broken down into its components, namely the overall argument and the possible sub-arguments supporting it. Like in the Argumentum Model of Topics approach, the Blending theory is used for analyzing metaphors. While this account provides a guideline in terms of steps, the theoretical background underlying the translation of metaphors and images into propositions is not developed thoroughly.

A last approach to the reconstruction of multimodal arguments has been proposed within the argumentation schemes theory (MACAGNO; PINTO, 2021). Multimodal arguments can be reconstructed at five different levels: first, the messages encoded verbally and pictorially (ROQUE, 2015) are combined with the contextual information; then, these semantic representations are enriched by including their polyphonic articulation, their specifications (explicatures), and their dialogical functions and illocutionary forces. The last step consists in combining the commitment structure retrieved into an argumentation scheme (WALTON; REED; MACAGNO, 2008), which represents the “logical” structure of a multimodal argument. The theoretical background of argumentation schemes is also used by Gonçalves-Segundo (2020) for the analysis of metaphors used for calls for action. Based on Forceville’s account of multimodal metaphor analysis (FORCEVILLE, 2009) and on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and its cognitive-discursive developments, different types

of multimodal metaphors are analyzed as strategies for conveying distinct types of practical arguments and focusing on distinct dimensions thereof (FAIRCLOUGH; FAIRCLOUGH, 2011; 2012).

### 3. Newest trends in multimodal argumentation

The most recent trends in multimodal argumentation research point out different paths and challenges that are essential for the reconstruction and analysis of a meaning that is conveyed in different modes.

The first challenge is methodological: verbal texts and arguments are analyzed by relying on different theoretical looks, developed in linguistics, pragmatics, and philosophy of language. Which tools can be used for interpreting a text that involves images or videos, in addition to verbal elements? Žagar (2021) tried to address this problem by proposing an analytical framework that he labels “enchronic,” namely interactive and recursive. According to this method, the interpreter follows a path of interpretation in which each element of the multimodal artifact (visual elements, texts, context, cultural background) is analyzed independently of the others, and is then re-checked to bring to light the interconnections with the other explicit elements. The result is a description of the multimodal text as a series of utterances, which can then be assessed using the tools of argumentation.

Along with procedural methodologies, specific tools have been proposed to be combined for providing an interpretation of arguments expressed through different codes. In Serafis et al. (2020), the different tools that constitute the backbone of Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis (MACHIN; MAYR, 2012) are applied to the analysis of multimodal arguments, providing an interpretative methodology that combines insights of semiotics, linguistics, discourse analysis, and rhetoric. More specific tools are proposed by Abdel-Raheem (2020), who proposed to approach multimodal texts using the structures and strategies underlying van Dijk’s theory of discourse analysis. On this view, different epistemic operations are involved in interpreting a message conveyed through different codes, focusing on distinct components and dimensions of interaction between text (or image) and context, such as coherence, presuppositions, implications, metaphors. The tools of Appraisal theory (MARTIN; WHITE, 2005) are combined with Groarke’s argument reconstruction of multimodal arguments in Wu (2020). In this paper, the two dimensions of multimodal arguments – i.e. the “logical”, argumentative dimension and the rhetorical stance of the speaker, which includes affect, judgement, and appreciation – are analyzed by drawing on two distinct theoretical backgrounds, focusing especially on how the speaker’s attitude is conveyed through distinct modes and especially the visual elements and symbols. Finally, Tseronis (2021) outlines a specific method for analyzing metaphor, antithesis, and allusion in dual-code messages, grounded on the concept of argumentative relevance, the different interplays between text and image, and the distinct contributions to meaning that result from the color, framing, arrangement, or form of an image.

A distinct and promising line of research is within reception studies, which address the analysis of how an audience responds to a persuasive message conveyed multimodally. A fundamental challenge to multimodal argumentation studies is raised by Kiili et al. (2021), who examined students' interpretations of the arguments conveyed multimodally by a video on the importance of vaccination. As the authors found, while most of the students were able to grasp the main message, only a quarter managed to reconstruct the reasoning in an accurate way; the reasoning of the majority of the students was incomplete or underdeveloped. This interpretative problem was related by the authors with the very nature of multimodal texts, as different modalities convey distinct information, which can be combined by the interpreter in different ways, conveying messages that are not coherent. For this reason, they point out the need of teaching multimodal literacy, focused on the interpretation of multimodal persuasive texts. Within the area of *rhetorical* reception studies, Kjeldsen and Hess (2021) explore the relationship between multimodal texts and personal frames, and show the differences between emotional appeals advanced in commercials and the actually felt emotion, which depends on different factors, including personal experiences and attitudes and incongruities in the construction of the message through the different modes.

### 4. This special issue

Although the subject is still new, since we could consider 1996 as the year in which multimodal argumentation arose as a relevant research object, with the publication of a special issue on *Argumentation and Advocacy*, it is still puzzling that a country such as Brazil, with a rich tradition on argumentation studies both in Philosophy and in Linguistics, has not given enough attention to the topic. This special issue, published by Revista da ABRALIN, is the first systematic academic endeavor – considering the universe of the country's scientific journals – that aims at providing an up-to-date discussion on the subject.

The issue is composed of 11 papers (4 in English; 7 in Portuguese) that really illustrate the research potential of the topic, doing justice to its title: *Multimodal argumentation studies in different perspectives*. Besides the theoretical and methodological diversity, which encompasses logical, rhetorical, linguistic and interactional approaches to argumentation, and the dialogue with other fields, such as Social Semiotics, Discourse Analysis and Metaphor Studies, the papers also reveal an interest in understanding the production and interpretation of argumentative meanings and reasoning in distinct genres, such as petitions, infographics, campaigns, advertisements, cartoons, social network posts and memes. Moreover, they respond to the recent trends and the newest challenges in the field, as it can be seen below.

The first paper, entitled *Gênero jurídico petição inicial e sua argumentação verbo-visual: desafios metodológicos e teóricos/Initial proceedings legal genre and its verbal/visual argumentation: methodological and theoretical challenges*, is a perfect example of such diversity, as it draws on a multidisciplinary approach to determine the rhetorical role of images in a legal genre. The authors, Lanzillo

and Pinto, address some methodological and theoretical challenges regarding multimodal argumentation in legal genres and discuss, based on a case study, how the verbal and the pictorial modalities interact in these discursive practices in order to promote adherence. The study correlates the deployment of particular representational and interactive meanings (KRESS; VAN LEEUWEN, 2006) to the construction of the company's credibility (*ethos*) and the mobilization of the judge's emotion (*pathos*). Moreover, it highlights the relevance of the genre and its structural composition, as well as the argumentative values and techniques to provide a more accurate description of the role of multimodality in legal argumentation.

Methodological issues are also discussed in Leal's paper, *Rhetoric and Visual Argument: proposition of methodological models based on the analysis of infographics*, which further develops the initial proposal presented in her dissertation (LEAL, 2021). After discussing how multimodal argumentation has been studied in Brazil in the recent years, Leal sketches a methodological model for the analysis of argumentation in infographics drawing on its logical, rhetorical and expressive components. In logical terms, the argumentation schemes approach is favored, with special attention given to Gonçalves-Segundo (2021) discussion on practical argumentation; in rhetorical terms, the notion of agreement, as discussed in Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *New Rhetoric* (1969), is prioritized; and in expressive terms, Fogolari's (2009) dissertation is the primary source. The methodology is, then, applied to the analysis of one infographic that instantiates a(n) (instrumental) practical reasoning scheme.

Practical argumentation is foregrounded in Gonçalves-Segundo and Isola-Lanzoni's paper – *Multimodal practical argumentation and behavioral change: an analysis of the “Remember, the Metro is for everyone” campaign*. By establishing a dialogue between Social Semiotics and Argumentation Theory, the article discusses how verbal and pictorial meanings are combined in order to provide argumentative support for Claims for Action (or prescriptive theses) in a public transport campaign oriented towards changing the behavior of the Lisbon's subway system users. The study not only discusses, grounded on the argumentation schemes framework, relevant approaches to practical reasoning (FAIRCLOUGH; FAIRCLOUGH, 2012; MACAGNO; WALTON, 2018), but also presents an agenda of multimodal argumentation studies based on a literature review. In methodological terms, its main contribution lies in showing how the notion of canvas (BATEMAN et al., 2017), on the one hand, and the representational and compositional systems of the Grammar of Visual Design, on the other, can be effectively deployed to support the analysis of symbolic condensation (KJELDSEN, 2018) and, thus, to systematize how the component parts of an image and the image as a whole may act as a premise or the conclusion of an argumentation scheme.

Pimenta and Figueiredo also invest on a theoretical-methodological device for argumentative analysis. Their paper, entitled *Modes of subjectivation, ethos and the “Pathway of passions”: a theoretical-methodological apparatus for rhetorical analysis*, analyzes a YouTube video from Artur do Val's 2018 political campaign through the categories and parameters proposed in the “pathway of passions” framework and discusses how intertextuality, subjectivation and *ethos* may together promote adherence. According to the approach discussed in detail in the article, five are the processes tied



to the promotion of adherence: availability, identification, awakening of passions, change of judgement and action. The first two receive special attention in the analysis.

In *Percepção dos consumidores portugueses sobre estereótipos de gênero nos argumentos publicitários verbais e não verbais/Portuguese consumers' perception of gender stereotypes in verbal and non-verbal advertising arguments*, Pio reports a pilot study in the Portuguese context on the reception of verbo-visual arguments in advertising. The author investigates how gender stereotypes are perceived by Portuguese residents and concludes that the verbal mode seems to highlight – more than the images – the presence of stereotyping. Argumentatively speaking, this is a relevant result, as it shows that the audience can – to a lesser or greater extent – identify these generalizations, especially in regard to the occupational status of men and women, and, thus, to resist to this fallacious reasoning. The article consists, thus, in a fine example of how reception studies may be integrated in the research agenda on (multimodal) argumentation and literacy.

The relation between advertising and gender is also thematized in *Ethos no discurso publicitário e os efeitos discursivos/Ethos in advertising discourse and discursive effects*, authored by Lopes and Souza. By drawing on the semiolinguistic approach proposed by Patrick Charaudeau (2010), the study shows how strategies of credibility and seduction, construed in perfume advertisements through the combination of verbal and pictorial elements and the enactment of a masculine *ethos*, are deployed in order to induce the consumption of the products.

Vereza and Dienstbach, in a paper entitled *A wave of metaphors: image and visual metaphors in cartoons from a cognitive-discursive perspective*, bring to light the productivity of multimodal metaphors in persuasion, a line of research that has been drawing significant attention – see, for example, van Poppel (2021). By drawing on the cognitive-discursive perspective on metaphor, the authors discuss how language and images interact to activate cross-domain mappings in political and social cartoons that thematize the Covid-19 pandemic. The paper defends that distinct multimodal resources are deployed in cartoons to engage the audience in the cognitive resolution of the mappings involved in the metaphors. These visual and multimodal metaphors are typically complex, as they invoke multi-layered structures and processes, such as image schemas, conceptual metaphors (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 1980) and situated metaphors (VEREZA, 2013). Among other results, the paper concludes that humor in *cartoons* works as a persuasive strategy that results from the interaction between these cognitive processes and the deployment of multi-semiotic resources.

In *Argumentação multimodal nas mídias digitais/Multimodal argumentation in digital media*, Aquino and Pinto employ a multidisciplinary approach to understand the argumentative orientation of multimodal texts published in Facebook with regard to Brazilian politics. From Social Semiotics (KRESS; VAN LEEUWEN, 2006), the categories from the compositional metafunction are foregrounded to assess the ideological value of the spatial configuration of the pictorial elements in the canvas; from the sociocognitive approaches to discourse, the paper focuses on the notion of frame and on van Dijk's (2003) discussion on the ideological square; and from the New Rhetoric, the authors recover the notions of persuasion, audience and argumentative strategy. As its main result, the study

reveals that these texts instantiate verbal and pictorial resources that aims at construing a positive representation of the in-group and a negative representation of the out-group.

Seixas, in *A ecologia digital argumentativa: possibilidades e perspectivas para uma análise retórica da argumentação multimodal/The digital argumentative ecology: Possibilities and perspectives to an analysis of a multimodal argumentation*, also discusses how multimodal argumentation functions in digital media. Differently from the previous paper, though, he focuses on Instagram posts under the hashtags #forabolsonaro and #impeachmentbolsonaro, i.e., multimodal texts with a critical stance against the current Brazilian president, Jair Bolsonaro. His analyses draw on concepts and tools from Digital Discourse Analysis (PAVEAU, 2021), as well as from rhetorical-discursive perspectives on argumentation (ANGENOT, 2008; MEYER, 2008; SEIXAS, 2019). The paper concludes that it is possible to speak of a “digital rhetoric”, grounded both on the well-established concepts of the field (*logos*, *pathos*, *ethos* and *doxa*) and on special lenses from other disciplines to deal with the multi-semiotic nature of the texts and with the technical specificities of the digital discursive practices.

These last aspects constitute the main point of discussion of the article *As molduras argumentativas do Instagram: design descritivo-analítico de interação multimodal/Instagram's argumentative frames: a descriptive-analytical multimodal interaction design*, written by Bacelar and Damasceno-Morais. By articulating principles of netnography with Plantin's (2005) interactionist approach to argumentation, the paper discusses how Instagram's interactive frame shapes the argumentative dynamics in terms not only of the delineation of the argumentative question and the emergence of the stasis, but also of the argumentative acts performed and the dialectical roles played by the users. The proposal is then applied to the analysis of the conflict of opinion regarding “what does it mean to be a teacher?” in the @escolasempartidooficial profile in the aforementioned digital platform.

Finally, Pereira da Silva and Andrade, in *Pazuello sob defesa de @direitasiqueira: Proposta para uma metodologia de análise de ações persuasivas de memes com base na TBS/Pazuello defended by @direitasiqueira: Proposal of a methodology for analyzing the persuasive actions of memes based on TBS*, promotes an instigating and original discussion on multimodal argumentation from the Theory of Semantic Blocks (TBS) perspective (CAREL, 1992, 2011). By extending the notion of *sign* within the theory to encompass images, the paper aims at showing how TBS may contribute to explain – considering explicit and implicit meanings and diegetic and extra-diegetic levels – the emergence of arguments in internet posts with embedded memes. The analysis illustrates the productivity of the proposal, by describing an argument whose thesis is implicit and situated at the extradiegetic level, and the reasons are explicitly constructed at the diegetic level.

## REFERENCES

ABDEL-RAHEEM, A. Mental Model Theory as a Model for Analysing Visual and Multimodal Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 155, p. 303-320, 2020. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.09.012>

ANGENOT, M. *Dialogues de sourds*. Paris: Mille et une nuits/Fayard, 2008.

- BATEMAN, J.; WILDFEUER, J.; HIIPPALA, T. *Multimodality: Foundations, Research and Analysis – A Problem-Oriented Introduction*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2017. DOI [10.1515/9783110479898](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110479898).
- BIRDSELL, D.; GROARKE, L. Toward a Theory of Visual Argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, v. 33, n. 1, p. 1-10, 1996.
- BRAET, A. The Enthymeme in Aristotle's Rhetoric: From Argumentation Theory to Logic. *Informal Logic*, v. 19, n. 2&3, p. 101-117, 1999. DOI <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v19i2.2322>
- CAREL, M. *Vers une formalisation de la théorie de l'argumentation dans la langue*. Thesis (Doctorate in Linguistics). France: École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992.
- CAREL, M. *L'Entrelacement argumentatif*. France: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 2011.
- COOK, G. *The Discourse of Advertising*. London, UK, and New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.
- EEMEREN, F. van; GROOTENDORST, R. Unexpected Premises: Part I. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, v. 19, n. 2, p. 97-106, 1982.
- EEMEREN, F. van; GROOTENDORST, R. *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions: A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Floris Publications, 1984.
- FAIRCLOUGH, I.; FAIRCLOUGH, N. Practical Reasoning in Political Discourse: The UK Government's Response to the Economic Crisis in the 2008 Pre-Budget Report. *Discourse & Society*, v. 22, n. 3, p. 243-68, 2011. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926510395439>
- FAIRCLOUGH, N.; FAIRCLOUGH, I. *Political discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- FAUCONNIER, G.; TURNER, M. *The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2003.
- FETERIS, E.; GROARKE, L.; PLUG, J. Strategic Maneuvering with Visual Arguments in Political Cartoon. In: FETERIS, E.; GARSSEN, B.; SNOECK-HENKEMANS, F. (org.) *Keeping in Touch with Pragma-Dialectics*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, 2011, p. 59-74.
- FLEMING, D. Can Pictures Be Arguments? *Argumentation and Advocacy*, v. 33, n. 1, p. 11-22, 1996.
- FOGOLARI, L. A. *O Gênero infográfico: Uma análise sociorretórica*. Dissertation (Masters in Language Sciences) – Universidade do Sul de Santa Catarina, Tubarão, 2009. Available in: <https://www.riuni.unisul.br/handle/12345/4596>.
- FORCEVILLE, C. Non-Verbal and Multimodal Metaphor in a Cognitivist Framework: Agendas for Research. In: FORCEVILLE, C.; URIOS-APARISI, E. (org.) *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009, p. 19-44.
- FORCEVILLE, C.; CLARK, B. Can Pictures Have Explicatures? *Linguagem Em (Dis)Curso*, v. 14, n. 3, p. 451-472, 2014. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-4017-140301-0114>
- GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P.R. Multimodal metaphors and practical argumentation: discussing rhetorical effects and modes of articulation between modalities / Metáforas multimodais e argumentação prática: discutindo efeitos retóricos e modos de articulação entre modalidades. *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem*, v. 28, n. 2, p. 801-844, 2020. DOI <https://doi.org/10.17851/2237-2083.28.2.801-844>.

GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P. R. Argumentação multimodal: múltiplos olhares para um objeto complexo. In: GONÇALVES-SEGUNDO, P. R.; PIRIS, E. L. *Estudos de Linguagem, Argumentação e Discurso*. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2021, p. 73-109.

GROARKE, L. Toward a Pragma-Dialectics of Visual Argument. In: EEMEREN, F. H. van (org.). *Advances in Pragma-Dialectics*. Amsterdam: Vale Press/Sic Sat, 2002. p. 137-151.

GROARKE, L. Going Multimodal: What is a Mode of Arguing and Why Does it Matter? *Argumentation*, v. 29, n. 2, p. 133-155, 2015. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9336-0>

HITCHCOCK, D. *On Reasoning and Argument: Essays in Informal Logic and on Critical Thinking*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2017.

HOVEN, P. van den. The Narrator and the Interpreter in Visual and Verbal Argumentation. In: EEMEREN, F. H. van; GARSSSEN, B. (org.) *Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, 2012, p. 257-71. DOI [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4041-9\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4041-9_17)

HOVEN, P. van den. Cognitive Semiotics in Argumentation: A Theoretical Exploration. *Argumentation*, v. 29, n. 2, p. 157-76, 2015. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9330-6>

HYLAND, K. *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Harlow, UK: Pearson, 2009.

JOHNSON, R. Why 'Visual Arguments' Aren't Arguments. In: BLAIR, A.; JOHNSON, R.; HANSEN, H.; TINDALE, C. (org.). *Informal Logic at 25: Proceedings of the Windsor Conference*. Windsor, ON: Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation, p. 1-13, 2003.

KECSKÉS, I. A Cognitive-Pragmatic Approach to Situation-Bound Utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 32, n. 5, p. 605-625, 2000. DOI [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00063-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00063-6)

KIILLI, C.; SMITH, B.; RÄIKÖNEN, E.; MARTTUNEN, M. Students' Interpretations of a Persuasive Multimodal Video About Vaccines. *Journal of Literacy Research*, v. 53, n. 2, p. 196-218, 2021. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X211009296>

KJELDSEN, J. Pictorial Argumentation in Advertising: Visual Tropes and Figures as a Way of Creating Visual Argumentation. In: EEMEREN, F. H. van; GARSSSEN, B. (org.) *Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, 2012, 239-55.

KJELDSEN, J. Virtues of Visual Argumentation: How Pictures Make the Importance and Strength of an Argument Salient. In: MOHAMMED, D.; Lewiński, M. (org.) *Virtues of Argumentation: Proceedings of the 10th OSSA Conference*. Windsor: Scholarship at UWindsor, 2013.

KJELDSEN, J. The Rhetoric of Thick Representation: How Pictures Render the Importance and Strength of an Argument Salient. *Argumentation*, v. 29, n. 2, p. 197-215, 2015. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9342-2>.

KJELDSEN, J. Visual rhetorical argumentation. *Semiotica*, v. 2018, n. 220, p. 69-94, 26 jan. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0136>.

KJELDSEN, J.; HESS, A. Experiencing multimodal rhetoric and argumentation in political advertisements: a study of how people respond to the rhetoric of multimodal communication. *Visual Communication*, v. 20, n. 3, p. 327-352, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14703572211013399>.

- KRESS, G.; Van Leeuwen, t. *Multimodal Discourse. The Modes of Media of Contemporary Communication*. London, UK: Arnold, 2001.
- KRESS, G.; VAN LEEUWEN, T. *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*. 2. ed. London: Routledge, 2006.
- LAKOFF, George; JOHNSON, Mark. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- LEAL, V. C. *Análise do gênero infográfico no Jornal Digital Folha de São Paulo com base nos pressupostos da retórica visual*. 2021. Dissertation (Masters in Languages) – Universidade Federal de Sergipe, São Cristóvão, 2021.
- MACAGNO, F.; WALTON, D. Practical Reasoning Arguments: A Modular Approach. *Argumentation*, v. 32, n. 4, p. 519–547, 2018. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-018-9450-5>.
- MACAGNO, F.; PINTO, R. Reconstructing Multimodal Arguments in Advertisements: Combining Pragmatics and Argumentation Theory. *Argumentation*, v. 35, n. 1, p. 141-176, 2021. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-020-09525-z>.
- MACHIN, D.; MAYR, A. *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2012.
- MARTIN, J. R.; WHITE, P. R. R. *The language of evaluation: appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- MEYER, M. *Principia rhetorica: une théorie générale de l'argumentation*. Paris : Fayard, 2008.
- PATTERSON, S. W. "A picture held us Captive": The later Wittgenstein on visual argumentation. *Cogency*, v. 2, n. 2, 2010. Disponível em: <http://cogency.udp.cl/index.php/cogency/article/view/234>.
- PAVEAU, M. A. *Análise do discurso digital: dicionário das formas e das práticas*. Campinas/SP: Pontes Editores, 2021.
- PERELMAN, C.; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- PLANTIN, C. *L'argumentation*. Paris: PUF, 2005.
- POLLAROLI, C.; ROCCI, A. The argumentative relevance of pictorial and multimodal metaphor in advertising. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 158-199, 2015. doi <https://doi.org/10.1075/jaic.4.2.02pol>.
- POPA, E. O. We Have Yet to See the "Visual Argument". *Multimodal Communication*, v. 5, n. 2, P. 79-92, 2016. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/mc-2016-0016>
- RIGOTTI, E.; MORASSO, S. G. Comparing the Argumentum Model of Topics to Other Contemporary Approaches to Argument Schemes: The Procedural and Material Components. *Argumentation*, v. 24, n. 4, p. 489–512, 2010. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-010-9190-7>
- ROCCI, A.; Mazzali-Lurati, S.; Pollaroli, C. Is This the Italy We like? Multimodal Argumentation in a Fiat Panda TV Commercial. In: PENNOCK-SPECK, B.; SAZ-RUBIO, M. del (org.) *The Multimodal Analysis of Television Commercials*. València, Spain: Publicacions de la Universitat de València, 2013, p. 157-187.
- ROQUE, G. Visual Argumentation: A Further Reappraisal. In: EEMEREN, F. H. van; GARSSSEN, B. (org.) *Topical Themes in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer, 2012, p. 273-88.

ROQUE, G. Should Visual Arguments be Propositional in Order to be Arguments? *Argumentation*, v. 29, n. 2, p. 177-195, 2015. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9341-3>

SEIXAS, R. *Entre a retórica do impeachment e a do golpe: análise de lógicas argumentativas na doxa política brasileira*. Thesis (Doctorate in Linguistic Studies) – Faculdade de Letras, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Linguísticos, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2019.

SERAFIS, D.; GRECO, S.; POLLAROLI, C.; JERMINI-MARTINEZ SORIA, C.. Towards an integrated argumentative approach to multimodal critical discourse analysis: evidence from the portrayal of refugees and immigrants in Greek newspapers. *Critical Discourse Studies*, v. 17, n. 5, p. 545-565, 2020. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1701509>.

SPERBER, D.; WILSON, D. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 1995.

TOULMIN, S. *The uses of argument*. Updated ed. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

TSERONIS, A. Multimodal argumentation: Beyond the verbal/visual divide. *Semiotica*, v. 2018, n. 220, p. 41-67, 2018. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0144>.

TSERONIS, A. From visual rhetoric to multimodal argumentation: exploring the rhetorical and argumentative relevance of multimodal figures on the covers of *The Economist*. *Visual Communication*, v. 20, n. 3, p. 374-396, 2021. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1177/14703572211005498>.

TSERONIS, A; FORCEVILLE, C. (Orgs.). Introduction. Argumentation and Rhetoric in Visual and Multimodal Communication. In: TSERONIS, A; FORCEVILLE, C. (Orgs.). *Multimodal Argumentation and Rhetoric in Media Genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2017, p. 2-24.

VAN DIJK, T. A. *Ideologia y discurso*. Una introducción multidisciplinaria. Barcelona: Ariel, 2003.

VAN LEEUWEN, T. *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London, UK, and New York, NY: Routledge, 2005.

VAN POPPEL, Lotte. The Study of Metaphor in Argumentation Theory. *Argumentation*, v. 35, n. 1, p. 177-208, 2021. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-020-09523-1>.

VEREZA, S. Entrelaçando frames: a construção do sentido metafórico na linguagem em uso. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, v. 55, n. 1, p. 109-124, 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20396/cel.v55i1.8636598>.

WALTON, D. What is Reasoning? What Is an Argument? *The Journal of Philosophy*, v. 87, n. 8, p. 399-419, 1990. DOI <https://doi.org/10.2307/2026735>.

WALTON, D.; REED, C.; MACAGNO, F. *Argumentation Schemes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

WHARTON, T. *Pragmatics and Non-Verbal Communication*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

WU, T. Reasoning and Appraisal in Multimodal Argumentation: Analyzing Building a community of shared future for humankind. *Chinese Semiotic Studies*, v. 16, n. 3, p. 419-438, 2020. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/css-2020-0023>

YUS, F. Inferring from Comics: A Multi-Stage Account. *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis de Comunicació*, v. 3, p. 223-249, 2008.

ŽAGAR, I. Ž. Methodological Problems in Analysing Non-verbal Arguments: The Case of Visual Argumentation. In: SUKHOVA, N. V.; DUBROVSKAYA, T.; LOBINA, Y. A. (orgs.). *Multimodality, Digitalization and Cognition in*

*Communication and Pedagogy*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, p. 49-69. DOI  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-84071-6\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-84071-6_4)