UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Resistance to metaphor in parliamentary debates

Renardel de Lavalette, K.Y.

Link to publication

Chapter 6

Discussion and conclusion

6.1 Main findings

In this dissertation, I examined how politicians turn parliamentary debates into their favour by using metaphors in arguing, and how opposing parties resist these metaphors in an attempt at turning the discussion into their own favour. I carried out four studies, each focusing on the argumentative roles and functions fulfilled by metaphors and the resistance to metaphors at specific discussion stages in British Public Bill Committee (henceforth: PBC) debates to uncover the advantages that politicians can obtain by employing metaphors in the stages under examination. First, I studied metaphors expressing starting points and the different ways in which these metaphors were resisted in the opening stage of a discussion in *Chapter 2*. Then, I focused on the argumentative role of metaphors used in figurative analogy arguments in the argumentation stage of a discussion in *Chapter 3*, and on the ways in which figurative analogies were countered in *Chapter 4*. Finally, I dealt with the role of metaphor in clarifying argumentative discourse and the opposition to such metaphors in the confrontation, and argumentation stages of a discussion in *Chapter 5*.

To analyse the argumentatively employed metaphors and the resistance that these metaphors elicited, I proposed a novel perspective in which insights from the three-dimensional model of metaphor (Steen, 2017) were combined with insights from the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation (Van Eemeren, 2018). The three-dimensional model of metaphor offered the theoretical distinctions between various dimensions of metaphor, which allowed me to distinguish between diverging metaphor use in the debates under examination. The pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation offered the concepts and tools to analyse the argumentative functions fulfilled by the metaphors and the resistance that they elicited in the discussions under study. This dissertation presented an account of the ways in which politicians employed metaphors and resisted metaphors in parliamentary debates from both a metaphor-theoretical as well as an argumentation-theoretical perspective. In doing so, I revealed the advantages that politicians attempt to obtain by expressing their argumentative moves in metaphorical terms, and how opponents resist these metaphors in an attempt to turn the debate into their own favour.

In *Chapter 2*, I set out to answer RQ 1, which consisted of the following two sub-questions: (a) 'How are metaphors used to express starting points?'; and (b) 'How can metaphors be resisted in various ways to achieve diverging outcomes in the opening stage of the discussion?' The analysis of three argumentative exchanges in which metaphorically expressed starting points were resisted in British PBC debates distinguished three different uses and functions of the metaphors and of the opposition against them: (1) politicians can use metaphors in an attempt at establishing starting points that limit their argumentative responsibilities, and such metaphors can be resisted by critically extending them; (2) metaphors can be used in an attempt to establish the politicians' ideological commitments as a starting point for the debate, and such metaphors can be resisted by highlighting the differences between the concepts that are compared in the metaphor; and (3) metaphors can be used for expressing starting points without necessarily fulfilling a relevant argumentative role.

In the first case study under examination, Minister Grayling advanced the starting point that the Welfare Reform Bill and the debate on this bill should be about creating a framework for the new welfare system, and not about filling in the details of the ways in which the new welfare system would be implemented in practice. To introduce this starting point, Grayling compared the bill and the debate on the bill to building a bookcase, proposing that the bill and the debate on the bill were about building a bookcase and not about the detailed content of the books that would be put on the shelves of the bookcase. The metaphor functioned as a proposal for the starting point that the Committee should restrict the debate on the bill to discussing only the general framework of the new welfare system (i.e. the bookcase), while excluding the details specified in secondary legislation from the discussion (i.e. the books). Restricting the debate on the bill to the general framework of the new welfare system, while excluding debate on the details specified in secondary legislation, would lower the burden of proof for Grayling. He would only have to defend the acceptability of the general framework while deferring discussion on the details of the new welfare system.

In reply, opposition member Gilmore critically extended the bookcase metaphor by using the nature of the books it contains. She did so in order to offer the counterproposal that both the general framework as well as the details of the new welfare system should be discussed. After all, the Opposition is institutionally expected to scrutinise legislative proposals in their entirety, including the Government's intentions with regard to the details. In offering the counterproposal, Gilmore implicitly rejected the starting point proposed by Grayling to limit the discussion to only discussing the general framework of the bill.

The analysis of this case demonstrated how metaphors can be employed to explicitly introduce starting points that are aimed at limiting a politician's argumentative responsibilities, and how such a metaphor can be critically extended to offer a counterproposal, thereby rejecting the original proposal for a starting point. These findings show that metaphors can fulfil the argumentative function of expressing proposals for a starting point. Additionally, results demonstrate that metaphors elicit resistance, indicating that metaphors are not always as persuasive as is sometimes claimed by some metaphor scholars (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2004, Goatly, 2007; Thibodeau, 2016).

In the second case study, opposition member Timms accused the Government of proposing 'to plunder' the savings of the people on low incomes by suggesting to impose a savings cap on universal credit. Timms presented his accusation as if it is generally accepted – i.e. as a starting point for the debate – that the Government's proposal can be considered an act of plundering. By doing so, Timms aimed to establish a point of departure that is favourable to his standpoint that a savings cap should not be imposed.

In reply, government member Hollingbery explicitly rejected the proposal that introducing a savings cap should be considered an act of plundering. He supported this rejection by highlighting the differences between plundering, which involves taking money from people, and imposing a savings cap, which involves not giving money to people. The rejection of the metaphor altogether impeded further use of the metaphor in the subsequent discussion. In resisting the metaphor 'to plunder', Hollingbery aimed to create a point of departure that was in line with the Government's aim of justifying the introduction of a savings cap on universal credit.

This case showed that metaphors can be employed in an explicit attempt to establish a politician's ideological commitments as a starting point for the debate, and how such a metaphor can be resisted by highlighting the differences between the compared concepts, impeding further use of the metaphor. These findings constitute further empirical evidence that metaphors can fulfil the argumentative function of advancing a proposal for a starting point, and that metaphors are not always immediately and without further ado accepted, but elicit overt resistance.

The third case study of a metaphorically expressed starting point eliciting resistance showed that metaphors used to express starting points can also function as mere presentational devices. In a debate on the Education Bill, opposition member Hendrick asserted that the Government proposed to create a review panel without the power to be effective. Hendrick presented this starting point in metaphorical terms, describing the review panel as 'a watchdog that does not have

any teeth'. The metaphor 'watchdog' is conventionally used to talk about organisations working to stop people from doing illegal things, and the metaphor 'teeth' is conventionally used to talk about having the necessary power and authority to be effective. The metaphors constituted the type of language that people typically deploy to talk about the power of institutions to be effective or not. As such, the source domains of the metaphors (i.e. a dog used for guarding a house, and the hard white objects in your mouth, respectively) did not add any relevant content to the utterance, and the metaphors functioned as presentational devices.

In response, Minister Gibb rejected that the review panel would not have the power to be effective as a starting point. In doing so, Gibb repeated the term 'teeth', introduced by Hendrick, stating that 'the review panel has teeth'. In this case, the rejection of the metaphorically expressed starting point is aimed at refuting the non-metaphorical propositional content of Hendrick's proposal that the review panel would be ineffective.

This case demonstrated that metaphors used to express starting points for the debate can function as presentational devices. It also showed how resistance can be aimed at the non-metaphorical propositional content of a metaphorically expressed starting point. These findings show that while metaphors can constitute the argumentative move of proposing a starting point, this is not necessarily the case. They can also function as mere presentational devices.

In chapter 2, I presented a first empirical investigation of the ways in which politicians employ metaphors to express starting points that are favourable to them, and how opposing parties can resist such metaphors to establish a point of departure that is more beneficial to their own argumentative goals and interests. These findings yield important insights into the use of metaphors in political discourse by providing empirical support for the notion that metaphors can fulfil argumentative functions in discussions (see also, e.g., Garssen & Kienpointner, 2011; Oswald & Rihs, 2014; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958/2003; Reboul, 1989; Santibáñez, 2010; Van Poppel 2020a, 2020b; Xu & Wu, 2014). Specifically, the results in Chapter 2 reveal that metaphors are important strategies in parliamentary debates when starting points are established between discussion parties. Results with regard to the resistance elicited by the metaphorically expressed starting points provide empirical evidence that metaphors are not always immediately accepted, but that they can elicit overt resistance. These findings challenge the strong claims made by some metaphor scholars about the inherently persuasive power of metaphors (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2006; Musolff, 2017a; Thibodeau, 2016).

In parliamentary debates, metaphors are not only used to express starting points for the debate in the opening stage, they can also be employed in figurative analogy arguments in the argumentation stage of a discussion. In *Chapter 3*, I aimed to answer RQ 2a: 'How do committee members in British PBC debates argue by means of figurative analogy argumentation?' Specifically, I focused on the argumentative role of metaphor by focusing on cases of figurative analogy arguments that support pragmatic argumentation in British PBC debates.

The analyses of two cases in which arguments based on figurative analogy are employed demonstrated how politicians defended prescriptive standpoints for taking or not taking action by pragmatic argumentation highlighting the positive or negative consequences of the measures set out in the bill. In turn, the pragmatic arguments were supported by figurative analogy arguments in a coordinative argumentation structure. In such a coordinative argumentation structure, various mutually reinforcing arguments that are interdependent together support a standpoint (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p. 4). Specifically, this means that the figurative analogy argument and the pragmatic argument together supported the prescriptive standpoint.

In the argumentation put forward in the two case studies, the acceptability of what was stated in the pragmatic arguments was predicated on the acceptability of what was stated in the figurative analogy argument. Specifically, in the first case study the desirability of keeping the House of Commons updated on Government expenditure was predicated on the generally accepted practice of people dealing with bank statements informing their significant other about financial problems that might arise. Similarly, in the second case study the appropriateness of imposing a financial penalty on a school in response to the wrongful expulsion of a child was predicated on the fact that a similar practice is accepted in the case of a court imposing a fine on a person for stealing a television.

The results provide insight into the argumentative role of metaphor used in figurative analogy arguments. Figurative analogy arguments can be instrumental in supporting pragmatic argumentation in parliamentary debates, because they typically draw upon established values and judgements in a particular culture, thereby suggesting particular conclusions about appropriate action. These findings provide further empirical support for the view that figurative analogy arguments should be considered a type of analogy argumentation (e.g., Garssen & Kienpointner, 2011; Juthe, 2005, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958/2003; Reboul, 1989; Van Poppel, 2020a), and not be reduced to a presentational device used to express other types of arguments (e.g., Garssen, 2009; Van Eemeren & Garssen,

2014), or be discarded as an inherently fallacious type of argumentation (e.g., Lumer, 2000, p. 414).[1]

As distinct argumentative devices, metaphors in figurative analogy arguments can be opposed by means of argumentative criticisms. While a number of studies acknowledge that political metaphors can elicit resistance (e.g., Burgers et al, 2019; Flusberg et al., 2018; Hart, 2020; Musolff 2004, 2017b; Semino, 2008, 2020), the ways in which figurative analogy arguments are countered is understudied. To address this issue, *Chapter 4* aimed to answer RQ 2b: 'How are figurative analogy arguments countered in British PBC debates?' The analyses in this chapter focused on an extensive case study that comprised the use of several figurative analogies that were resisted in a number of different ways, either by attacking the comparison itself or by advancing criticisms directed at the target domain of the metaphor.

The reconstructions of the argumentative exchange examined in Chapter 4 revealed that the figurative analogy arguments implicitly expressed at the same time another type of argument, namely an argument from sign. Arguments from sign are presented "as if it is an expression, a phenomenon, a sign or some other kind of symptom of what is expressed in the standpoint" (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992, p. 2). In turn, the figurative analogies also functioned as support for the arguments from sign that they implicitly expressed. This gave rise to a subordinative argumentation structure in which each argument is in turn supported by another argument. In the cases at hand, the standpoint was supported by the implicit argument from sign, which, in turn, was supported by the figurative analogy that implicitly expressed the argument from sign (see Svacinová, 2014, for a similar reconstruction of figurative analogy argumentation). This result indicates that figurative analogy arguments can be employed to implicitly express another type of argument, but this is not necessarily the case, as the arguments in support of which figurative analogies are advanced can also be explicitly expressed (see, for example, the reconstructions of the figurative analogies in Chapter 3). The fact that figurative analogy arguments can be employed to implicitly express at the same time another type of argument provides opponents with various

---

[1] In this dissertation I refer to different articles by Garssen in which he discusses figurative analogies. The views regarding figurative analogy arguments proposed in these studies, however, are inconsistent. In Garssen (2009) and Van Eemeren & Garssen (2014), he argues that metaphors are a type of indirect language, and that figurative analogies should not be regarded as a type of analogy argumentation, but that they function as a specific type of presentational device used to express other types of arguments. In Garssen & Kienpointner (2011), by contrast, the authors argue that figurative analogy arguments are a type of analogy argumentation.

opportunities for resisting figurative analogies: they can address their criticisms at the comparison made in the figurative analogy, or they can advance criticisms pertaining to the target domain of the argumentatively employed metaphor while ignoring the metaphor itself.

I also demonstrated how the figurative analogies were resisted in various ways. First, the Opposition advanced a counter-analogy in response to the Government's figurative analogy. In doing so, the Opposition refuted the Government's argumentation in support of the standpoint that there should not be a check on the way in which the Secretary of State uses statistical data, while supporting its own standpoint that such a check should be introduced. Second, the Opposition's counter-analogy was resisted by the Government by putting forward counterarguments that pertained only to the target domain of the figurative analogy – i.e. the argument from sign - while ignoring the source domain. Third, the Government resisted the Opposition's counter-analogy by highlighting relevant differences between the concepts compared in the metaphor. The two counter-arguments refuting the counter-analogy undermined the Opposition's argumentation in favour of a check on the way in which the Secretary of State used statistical data, while supporting the Government's own standpoint that such a check should not be introduced. By showing that metaphors used in figurative analogy arguments can elicit resistance by means of argumentative criticisms, the findings of Chapter 4 further challenge claims made about the strong persuasive effects of metaphor made by some metaphor scholars (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2006; Santa Ana, 1999; Thibodeau, 2016), and support the more nuanced view advanced by other scholars that various factors affect the persuasiveness of metaphors, such as message and recipient characteristics (e.g., Boeynaems et al., 2017; Brugman et al., 2019; Landau et al., 2014; Reuchamps et al., 2018; Steen et al., 2014).

In Chapter 4, I have taken a first step in uncovering the complexities of the phenomenon of resistance to figurative analogies. I have shown how figurative analogies and the resistance that they elicit can be instrumental in refuting the standpoint of opposing parties, while supporting a discussant's own standpoint. As such, the results of this study contribute to our understanding of the phenomenon of resistance to metaphor, advancing our knowledge of the ways in which politicians may resist metaphors.

Finally, *Chapter 5* aimed to answer RQ 3, consisting of the following two sub-questions: (a) 'How do metaphors employed for clarifying argumentation feature in British parliamentary debates to establish a shared understanding of the issue under discussion?'; and (b) 'How does the resistance to clarificatory metaphors affect the continuation of the debate?' The analyses in this chapter

focused on a PBC debate on the Digital Economy Bill, which comprised the use of a number of clarificatory metaphors that were opposed. The debate was concerned with the powers that the age-verification regulator for pornographic websites in the UK should have for punishing websites that did not comply with age-verification measures.

The analysis revealed that metaphors can clarify either an argument or a standpoint. In the first case study presented in Chapter 5, I demonstrated how metaphors can be used to explain an argument in the argumentation stage of a discussion. Additionally, I showed how such a metaphor can be accepted as an accurate explanation by an opposing party, which subsequently uses the same metaphor to argue for an opposite standpoint. In the argumentative exchange under discussion, opposition member Matheson compared the age-verification regulator fruitlessly chasing after websites that do not comply with age-verification measures to a game of whack-a-mole, in which players have to hit toy moles that appear from different holes at random. The whack-a-mole metaphor functioned as an explanation of an argument by making more vivid and salient that without the right tools to tackle disobedient websites, the age-verification regulator would be chasing unsuccessfully after those websites.

In reply to Matheson, Minister Hancock accepted the whack-a-mole metaphor as an accurate explanation, but reinterpreted its significance for the question of whether the age-verification regulator needed additional tools for tackling websites providing pornographic content without age-verification measures. Hancock argued that acknowledging that it is hard to tackle disobedient online pornography providers meant that the Government should primarily deal with those providers that comply with the age-verification measures proposed in the bill, and that additional tools were consequently not needed.

By showing that the same metaphor can be used by two opposing parties in an attempt at explaining two opposing lines of argument, this case study demonstrates the importance of examining the communicative function and purpose of each instantiation of a particular metaphor. In investigating how a certain issue is conceptualised and reasoned about, metaphor studies typically examine the metaphors that are used to talk about that particular issue. These studies often count instances of linguistic metaphors related to a particular conceptual metaphor, and on the basis of such a count they make claims about how the topic under discussion is conceptualised (e.g., Joris et al., 2014; Wicke & Bolognesi, 2020). However, the results presented here demonstrate the importance of also taking into account the communicative function and purpose of specific instances of metaphor, because the same metaphor can be used for

different, and even opposing communicative purposes (see also Burgers et al., 2019).

In the second case study of a resisted clarificatory metaphor, I showed how a metaphor can be used to clarify a standpoint in the confrontation stage of a discussion, and how such a metaphor can be critically extended in an attempt to avoid misunderstandings. In this particular argumentative exchange, committee members did not understand the term ancillary service provider, whereas this was pertinent to forming an informed opinion on the acceptability of the amendments under discussion. To facilitate mutual comprehension, opposition member Debbonaire advanced a metaphor in which she compared the services involved in providing online pornographic content without age verification to the services involved in allowing children to see pornography in cinemas. In the source domain scenario of cinemas, the cinema and the ticket seller would be held responsible for allowing a child to see pornography, but not the bus driver driving the child to the cinema. As such, the cinema and ticket seller were considered to represent ancillary service providers, but not the bus driver.

In reply to Debbonaire, Government member Perry opposed the metaphor as an accurate clarification of what ancillary service providers are by arguing that in a scenario in which the bus driver would work for the cinema, he/she would also be considered an ancillary service provider. By critically extending the metaphor, Perry aimed to repair the misunderstanding of the term ancillary service provider displayed by Debbonaire in using the metaphor. By doing so, Perry furthered a shared understanding of the term ancillary service providers between committee members, enabling them to adopt a more informed opinion towards the proposition at issue.

This case study demonstrated that metaphors with clarificatory functions and the resistance that they elicit can be instrumental in clearly defining the difference of opinion in the confrontation stage of a discussion. As such, this case study provides further insight into the ways in which metaphors can constitute argumentatively relevant moves in parliamentary debates, not only as starting points or figurative analogies, but also by clarifying argumentation. In doing so, the findings obtained in this case study provide further evidence that metaphors can constitute relevant argumentative moves (see also, e.g., Oswald & Rihs, 2014; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958/2003; Santibáñez, 2010; Van Poppel 2020a, 2020b; Xu & Wu, 2014).

The third case study of a clarificatory metaphor demonstrated how two opposing parties can advance two different metaphors to explain an argument, each highlighting those features that reflect the politicians' beliefs about the issue

under discussion. In discussing the responsibility of search engines in providing online pornography, government back bench member Huddleston compared search engines to a library index to explain the argument that while search engines can be altered so that they do not return pornographic content, the content still exists and can be accessed in different ways. In reply, opposition member Debbonaire advanced a competing analogy, comparing search engines to directional signs. The metaphor was aimed at explaining the argument that search engines are part of the process of providing online pornographic content. The two metaphors each highlighted different characteristics of search engines; the comparison to a sign attributed a more active role, and greater responsibility in providing online pornography, than the library index metaphor. The two competing metaphors consequently framed search engines in such a way as to promote one standpoint, while criticising an opposing standpoint. The findings of this case study also challenge the claims made about the strong persuasive power of metaphor (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2006; Lederer, 2013), as they show that politicians do not always accept each other's metaphors, but advance competing metaphors in an attempt at framing the issue under discussion in diverging ways.

Chapter 5 presented a first empirical investigation of the ways in which metaphors and the opposition that they elicit enable a shared understanding of the ongoing argumentation in parliamentary debates. My analyses of the various cases in which clarificatory metaphors are opposed revealed the intricate ways in which these exchanges are entwined with the ongoing argumentation between committee members. The results demonstrate that metaphors are employed by politicians to clarify their standpoints and arguments, thus providing further insights into the ways in which metaphors can be employed argumentatively.

Together, the four chapters presented in this dissertation demonstrated how politicians attempted to turn parliamentary debates into their favour by using metaphors in arguing, and how opposing parties resisted these metaphors in an attempt at turning the debate into their own favour. The results of the four chapters demonstrated that metaphors can be relevant in argumentative discourse by fulfilling argumentative functions in parliamentary discussions. They can be employed for expressing proposals for starting points, as figurative analogy arguments, and for clarifying argumentative discourse. Additionally, I showed that in each of these three argumentative roles metaphors can elicit resistance by means of argumentative criticisms. This finding indicates that we should not assume that metaphors are inherently persuasive, but rather that different factors affect whether persuasive effects occur or not.

6.2 Implications for argumentation studies

This dissertation has laid the foundations for a nuanced view on the role of metaphor in argumentation. Specifically, the results have two important implications for argumentation studies concerned with metaphor. First, the findings demonstrate that metaphors can constitute various argumentative moves in a discussion, and as such, should be included in the argumentative analysis of discourse as instantiating such moves. Second, the fact that some metaphors constitute relevant moves in a discussion suggests that theories of argumentation should provide criteria for evaluating the reasonableness of such metaphors. This dissertation provides the basis for establishing such evaluation criteria. It has uncovered the argumentative functions that metaphors fulfil in parliamentary debates for which evaluation criteria should be formulated. Additionally, this dissertation has provided an argumentative characterisation of British PBC debates. The evaluation of argumentation requires attention to the context in which the argumentation takes place (Van Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2005). Having uncovered the rules and conventions regulating British PBC debates thus provides a starting point for the evaluation of the argumentatively employed metaphors employed by committee members.

Firstly, the results provide empirical evidence that different types of metaphor can fulfil various argumentative functions in a discussion, which indicates that analysts should include such metaphors in their argumentative analysis of discourse as instantiating particular argumentative moves. In a recent review of the literature on metaphor from an argumentation-theoretical perspective, Van Poppel (2020a) shows that, within argumentation theory, only a limited number of studies attribute some argumentative function to metaphor (e.g., Garssen & Kienpointner, 2011; Oswald & Rihs, 2014; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958/2003; Reboul, 1989; Santibáñez, 2010; Van Poppel, 2020a, 2020b; Xu & Wu, 2014). Additionally, many of these studies have a limited view on metaphor as only analogy arguments (e.g., Garssen & Kienpointner, 2011; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958/2003; Reboul, 1989; Xu & Wu, 2014), and they rarely integrate insights from metaphor theory in their argumentative analyses of metaphors (some exceptions are, e.g., Santibáñez, 2010; Van Poppel, 2020a, 2020b; Xu & Wu, 2014).

For a better account of the roles and functions that metaphors fulfil in argumentative discourse, I demonstrated through an integration of the three-dimensional model of metaphor (Steen, 2017) and the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation (Van Eemeren, 2018) that different types of metaphor can fulfil the argumentative functions of proposals for a starting point in the opening stage (see Chapter 2), figurative analogy arguments in the argumentation stage (see Chapter 3

and 4), and clarifications of argumentative moves in the confrontation and argumentation stages (see Chapter 5). The metaphors fulfilling such functions should be distinguished as instantiating argumentative moves in the argumentative analysis of discourse.

Secondly, the findings indicate that evaluation criteria should be established for judging the soundness of metaphors expressing (1) proposals for a starting point, (2) figurative analogy arguments, and (3) clarifications of the ongoing argumentation between committee members, respectively. Developing criteria for the evaluation of argumentatively employed metaphors in parliamentary debates allows analysts to judge whether these argumentative moves make a constructive contribution to the discussion or obstruct the discussion. In other words, such evaluation criteria are needed because they enable analysts to assess whether the difference of opinion in which politicians are involved proceeds reasonably or not.

In deciding whether an argumentative move is sound or not, it is crucial to take into account the specific context in which the move is advanced (cf. Van Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2005). Evaluation criteria need to be interpreted in the specific context of parliamentary debates, because the rules and conventions that regulate these debates affect argumentative discourse. For example, moves in the opening stage are sound when the politicians' aim to establish starting points that are opportune does not supersede the aim to remain reasonable. One way in which starting points could be considered unreasonable is when they are presented in such way as if the starting point was already accepted, while in fact, it was not. This is of special importance to parliamentary debates, because the right to dissent is laid down in the rules and practices of parliamentary debate (Finlayson, 2017; Ilie, 2010). The Government has the responsibility to defend a bill against criticisms, whereas opposition parties are institutionally expected to hold the Government to account and to challenge legislative proposals. This means that the Government should leave open the possibility for opposition parties to challenge a bill by refraining from strategies that would hinder opposition parties from doing so, and opposition parties should leave open the possibility for the Government to defend a bill. As example (6) in Chapter 2 demonstrates, indirect and conventional metaphors can be instrumental in framing starting points in a way as if they were accepted, while this is not the case. In this example, the Opposition framed the Government's proposal to impose a savings cap on universal credit as 'plundering' the people's savings. The comparison between imposing a savings cap and plundering was not explicitly made, and as such, the indirect metaphor enabled the Opposition to present the starting point as if it was uncontroversial, while it was

not. This example also demonstrates the value of employing the three-dimensional model of metaphor for analysing argumentatively used metaphors, as this model provides the theoretical distinctions between different types of metaphor (i.e., indirect vs. direct, conventional vs. novel, and non-deliberate vs deliberate metaphors).

Figurative analogies are typically evaluated by the critical questions relating to analogy argumentation. These critical questions could be further specified for the use of this type of argumentation in parliamentary debates. For example, the critical questions pertaining to figurative analogy arguments requires analysts to look for relevant similarities or differences between the concepts that are compared in the figurative analogy (Garssen & Kienpointner, 2011, pp. 44-46). These relevant similarities and differences could be related to the argument scheme of the argument in support of which a figurative analogy is advanced. I explained in Chapter 3 that the typical type of argument in parliamentary debates is pragmatic argumentation. As such, it could be asked whether the actions, results, and the causal relationship between the actions and results specified in the pragmatic argument and the figurative analogy argument are in some way comparable. In example (1) discussed in the Introduction of Chapter 4, for instance, the Government compared official warnings issued to a charity for minor breaches to yellow cards issued in football matches. As the Opposition pointed out, however, there are no immediate consequences for a football player receiving a yellow card, while charities may suffer rather detrimental consequences of an official warning, such as an impact on its ability to fundraise. In other words, in this example it was highlighted that the action proposed in the pragmatic argument (i.e., issuing official warnings to charities for minor breaches) had undesirable consequences, while the action to which it was compared in the figurative analogy (issuing yellow cards in a football match for minor offences) did not have such undesirable consequences. Consequently, the figurative analogy is unreasonable.

Finally, evaluation criteria should be formulated for judging the soundness of clarificatory metaphors. In British PBC debates, clarifications may be requested and provided in the confrontation, opening, and argumentation stages. One of the criteria that should be taken into account when evaluating the reasonableness of clarificatory metaphors is that argumentative moves should allow for any of the possible outcomes in a particular stage to be reached (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2009, p. 14). As each of the three stages in which clarification exchanges can occur has its own goal and outcomes, it might be that specific evaluation criteria should be developed for clarificatory metaphors at each of the three stages. In defining the difference of opinion in the confrontation stage, for

example, discussion parties should leave open the possibility for a discussion to result in a non-mixed difference of opinion, a mixed difference of opinion, or in ending the discussion (Andone, 2013, p. 103). Redefining a standpoint by advancing a clarificatory metaphor should hence be such that the opposing party can still criticise the redefined standpoint.

6.3 Implications for metaphor studies

I demonstrated that the role of metaphor is more complex and nuanced than is assumed by a number of metaphor scholars (e.g., Joris et al., 2014; Lederer, 2013; Thibodeau, 2016; Wicke & Bolognesi, 2020). The results have two important implications for metaphor studies. First, the findings show that metaphors can be used for different argumentative purposes. This indicates that metaphors do not have a singular meaning, but that the interpretation of particular instances of metaphors can be affected by the communicative purpose for which they are used (see also, e.g., Burgers et al., 2019; Flusberg et al., 2018). Second, the findings demonstrate that metaphors elicit resistance. This finding challenges the strong claims that are sometimes made about the "inherently persuasive power" of metaphors (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 44), and supports research that proposes that persuasion through metaphor is more complex (e.g., Boeynaems et al., 2017; Sopory & Dillard, 2002; Steen et al., 2014).

Firstly, to investigate the ways in which societal issues, such as immigration, Brexit, health care, and the economy, are conceptualised and reasoned about, metaphor scholars often examine the metaphors commonly used to talk or write about the topic under investigation (e.g., Arrese, 2015; Joris et al., 2014; Joris et al., 2015; Tóth et al., 2018; Wicke & Bolognesi, 2020). Such studies first identify relevant source-domain concepts, then compile a list of lexical units related to the metaphorical source domain that they are interested in, and subsequently count the individual instances of those lexical units used metaphorically in the corpus under investigation. On the basis of such a count, conclusions are drawn about how the topic under investigation is conceptualised and reasoned about. For example, in a recent study, Wicke and Bolognesi (2020) examined to what extent the war frame is used to talk about Covid-19 on Twitter. To this end, they compiled a list of lexical units associated with the war frame, such as fight, battle, and combat. Subsequently, they identified all separate instances of the war-related lexical units in their corpus of Twitter messages. On the basis of this count, they concluded that particular lexical units associated with the war

frame are relatively pervasive when talking about specific aspects of the Covid-19 pandemic, shaping public discourse about the pandemic.[2]

However, the results of the present dissertation show that metaphors can be transformed, and be used to fulfil different argumentative functions. Consequently, the meaning of a metaphor in context may differ from one instantiation to the next (see also Burgers et al., 2019; Flusberg et al., 2018; Musolff, 2006). An illustrative example has been discussed in Chapter 2, in which Minister Grayling and opposition member Gilmore both compare the debate on the Welfare Reform Bill to building a bookcase. While Grayling used the bookcase-metaphor to propose to restrict the debate to the general framework of the new welfare system, Gilmore extended the metaphor to suggest that both the general framework and the details of the new welfare system should be discussed. This example illustrates that taking into account the communicative function and purpose of specific instances of metaphor is important, as metaphors may be transformed (see also Burgers, 2016; Burgers et al., 2019; Musolff, 2017b), and be employed for different communicative functions. Various instances of metaphorical expressions in a text may belong to the same conceptual source domain, while they do not frame the topic under discussion in similar ways. By only identifying and counting linguistic instances of a particular conceptual metaphor, studies miss out on important information about how metaphors are used and for what purposes. Based on the findings of this dissertation, I argue that for a full understanding of the ways in which metaphors frame a topic, more detailed analyses are necessary in which not only linguistic instances of a specific conceptual metaphor for framing an issue are identified, but that also take into account the communicative function and purpose of these metaphors in discourse.

Secondly, a number of scholars examining political metaphor claim that metaphors are inherently persuasive, and affect people's opinions about policy issues, thereby shaping political reality (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2004, 2011; Goatly, 2007; Lederer, 2013; Musolff, 2017a; Santa Ana, 1999). Thibodeau (2016), for example, even proposes that extended metaphors "are the home runs of persuasion". It is argued that metaphors have these strong persuasive effects because they highlight particular relations between a source and a target domain, generating systematic patterns of inference (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). As such,

---

[2] Another issue with the analysis presented in this paper is that Wicke & Bolognesi (2020) identified all instances of war-related lexical units in their corpus, without examining whether all of these instances were used metaphorically or not. As the authors of the paper acknowledge, this means that some of the war-related lexical units identified by them may have been used literally instead of metaphorically.

metaphors affect how people reason about political issues (Mio, 1997; Thibodeau, 2016).

Scholars making these claims often seem to assume that metaphors are unproblematically and immediately accepted. As the results of this dissertation show, however, metaphors also elicit resistance. This suggests that metaphors are not always as persuasive as is oftentimes claimed. Consequently, the results argue in favour of a more nuanced view on the persuasiveness of metaphor. As suggested by various scholars (e.g., Boeynaems et al., 2017; Brugman et al., 2019; Hartman, 2012; Landau et al., 2014; Sopory & Dillard, 2002; Steen et al., 2014; Reuchamps et al., 2018), persuasion through metaphor is complex. These scholars argue that research into the persuasiveness of metaphor should not focus on the question of whether or not metaphors are persuasive, but rather under which conditions metaphors are persuasive or not. By examining the resistance that metaphors elicit in parliamentary debates, I provided further empirical evidence for the notion that we should indeed move away from the idea that metaphors are persuasive, and that we instead should investigate when and to whom metaphors are persuasive.

6.4 Implications for political discourse

The findings of the present dissertation also have an implication for political discourse. The studies presented here provided a first detailed analysis of the strategic uses of metaphor in British parliamentary debates in the opening and argumentation stages of a discussion, and for clarifying argumentative discourse in the confrontation and argumentation stages. Additionally, I examined the ways in which these argumentatively employed metaphors were resisted. The insights thus obtained can be used to raise a critical awareness amongst politicians and members of the public of the less desirable aspects of metaphors and to provide them with the tools to resist these metaphors. Resisting metaphors is of importance to the political domain, because politicians work on behalf of citizens, making laws, and debating the key issues of the day to reach well-informed decisions (UK Parliament, n.d.). As Van Eemeren argues (2002, p. 77), democracy should ideally aim for a critical discussion in which opponents aim to decide what is acceptable through a regulated argumentative exchange. As metaphors can be relevant to the arguing taking place in political debates, their acceptability should be critically tested to further a fruitful continuation of the debate and to come to well-informed decisions on the acceptability of government policy and legislation.

The analyses presented in this dissertation focused specifically on British PBC debates, but the findings presumably have wider applicability. In PBC debates, politicians take part in a discussion to try to convince each other and the general

public of their point of view with regard to the acceptability of the details of the bill. The findings can be assumed to also apply to other political debates, such as debates at the various legislative stages that a bill goes through in Parliament before becoming an Act, such as Second Reading and Report Stage, Westminster Hall debates, and emergency debates. These different types of debate have their own specific aims, rules, and conventions, but these most probably do not affect the argumentative use of metaphor or the resistance to metaphor differently.

Additionally, the findings may also be applicable to other activity types within the political domain in which discussants attempt to convince each other and/or an audience of their point of view. Political discourse comprises a wide array of activity types with different aims, in different modes of communication, and with different participants than parliamentary debates (Perrez et al., 2019; Van Dijk, 1997). Examples are political speeches, newspaper articles, television and radio interviews, and talk shows. Even though the specific aims, modes of communication, and participants may differ, the majority of activity types within the political domain, if not all, are ideally aimed at "preserving a democratic political culture by means of deliberation" (Van Eemeren, 2010, p. 140). More specifically, the majority of activity types within the political domain involve some form of argumentation about political issues in which discussants attempt to convince each other and/or their audiences of their standpoint. The specific aims, rules, and conventions of the different activity types in the political domain are not likely to affect the argumentative use of metaphor or the resistance to metaphor to a great extent. Example (1) in the Introduction of this dissertation, for instance, demonstrates that politicians also employ metaphors in figurative analogy arguments in radio interviews. Examples (2), (3), and (4) in the Introduction show that such metaphors can be resisted by members of the general public on Twitter and Facebook in similar ways as committee members resist metaphors in British PBC debates. As such, the findings presented in this dissertation most likely apply to a great extent to those activity types within the political domain in which discussants attempt to convince each other and/or an audience of their point of view.

6.5 Limitations and suggestions for future research
The results of this dissertation provide important insights into the argumentative use of metaphor in parliamentary debates, and how such metaphors are resisted, enhancing our understanding of the role of metaphor and the resistance to metaphor in political discourse. The findings of this dissertation also raise several issues that could be addressed in future research. This section discusses the most

important limitations of the current dissertation and provides suggestions for resolving these issues in future research.

First, this dissertation focused on analysing the argumentation taking place in British parliamentary debates as it contributes to discussing the acceptability of legislative proposals. Whereas discussing policy and legislative proposals is the main aim of parliamentary debates, another important goal is to appeal to the electorate and to inform them on government policy and legislative proposals (Finlayson, 2017). It would therefore be fruitful to examine how argumentatively employed metaphors and different types of critical responses to such metaphors are understood and appreciated by the general public. This can be done by means of qualitative research methods, such as interviews, in which participants are asked to reflect on politicians' argumentative use of metaphors and resistance to metaphors, by means of combining longitudinal corpus and survey analysis (e.g., Boukes & Hameleers, 2020), or by means of experimental studies (e.g., Landau et al., 2017). In setting up such studies, the findings presented in this dissertation may provide input for formulating and subsequently testing hypotheses about how metaphorically expressed argumentative moves, and the various ways in which these metaphors can be countered are appreciated and understood by the general public. For example, it could be examined whether clarifications of argumentative discourse are appreciated more and/or enhance understanding better when involving a conventional metaphor, a novel metaphor, or no metaphor, or it could be examined whether it is more convincing to resist a figurative analogy argument by critically extending the metaphor, highlighting differences between the two concepts compared in the metaphor, or by advancing an alternative metaphor. The results of such research may further our understanding of the argumentative use of metaphors and the resistance to metaphors in parliamentary debates.

Second, future research could focus on the persuasiveness of metaphors in arguing. It is often argued that metaphors abound in political discourse because of their persuasive power (e.g. Charteris-Black, 2004; Lederer, 2013; Musolff, 2017b; Santa Ana, 1999; Thibodeau, 2016). However, it remains unclear when and to whom the effects of metaphor use in political discourse are as persuasive as is oftentimes proposed (see Boeynaems et al., 2017; Sopory & Dillard, 2002). An aspect that has received little scholarly attention is the effect of the presence of metaphor on the persuasiveness of argumentative moves. The textual analyses presented in this dissertation can serve as a starting point for setting up experimental studies aimed at testing hypotheses about the ways in which the presence of metaphor affects the persuasiveness of argumentative moves. For

example, it could be investigated whether starting points are more easily accepted when presented in metaphorical terms than in non-metaphorical terms, or whether discussants evaluate arguments as being more or less reasonable when presented in metaphorical terms (e.g., Pilgram, 2020). Results of such research will uncover the effects that the presence of metaphor has on the ways in which discussants evaluate argumentative moves, and whether it is consequently instrumental to use metaphors in arguing or not.

Third, whereas this dissertation examined resistance to metaphor, it is also possible to resist by metaphor. All types of arguments, including figurative analogy arguments, can be used as counterarguments, aimed at attacking an opponent's argumentation. This has also been shown in chapter 4 of this dissertation, in which the analysed figurative analogy arguments functioned as refutational arguments. A specific type of counterargument in which metaphor likely plays a role is 'rebuttal analogy' (Colston, 1999, 2000; Colston & Gibbs, 1998; Govier, 1985; Juthe, 2009; Whaley & Holloway, 1997). According to Whaley and Holloway (1997), rebuttal analogy comprises two essential features, namely argument and social attack. They propose that rebuttal analogies function to challenge an opponent's argumentation, and to present an evaluation of the opponent itself. Specifically, rebuttal analogies dismiss an opponent's argumentation, as well as the opponent as ridiculous, stupid, illogical, or mistaken. Research into rebuttal analogies has examined various aspects of this type of arguing, such as its argument scheme (e.g., Govier, 1985; Juthe, 2009; Woods & Hudak, 1989), the role of irony in rebuttal analogies (e.g., Colston, 2000; Colston & Gibbs, 1998), the role of rebuttal analogies in political contexts as counterargument and as social attack (e.g., Whaley & Holloway, 1997), and testing its persuasiveness in political contexts (e.g., Barabas et al., 2020; Whaley et al., 1998; Whaley & Smith Wagner, 2000). These studies seem to indicate that rebuttal analogies are important argumentative strategies in political debates. As such, the analysis and evaluation of rebuttal analogies is important for a thorough understanding and critical assessment of the argumentation taking place in political debates. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, studies analysing and evaluating the use of rebuttal analogies in political debates from an argumentative perspective are missing. Future studies could aim to provide such an analysis and evaluation, providing insight into whether and when rebuttal analogies make a constructive contribution to political debates.

Finally, future studies could investigate the argumentative use of metaphors and the resistance to metaphors in other domains than the political domain. Communication in the political domain is typically aimed at deliberating

alternative courses for future action that should be taken to solve a particular societal problem (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012; Lewinsky & Mohammed, 2015). Other types of discourses, however, have their own specific aims, participants, and dominant modes of communication. Consequently, the use of and resistance to metaphor may vary from discourse domain to discourse domain. For example, metaphor and resistance to metaphor have been shown to be of great importance in the domain of – public – health communication (e.g., Hauser & Schwartz, 2015; Semino et al., 2015; Wackers et al., 2020). Wackers et al. (2020) show how violence-related metaphors for cancer are criticised in public discourse. The use of and resistance to these metaphors differ from the patterns found in this dissertation. The violence-related metaphors typically do not fulfil an argumentative function, but constitute the 'normal' way people talk about cancer. The resistance is given shape by discussants who put forward the evaluative standpoint that violence related metaphors for cancer are inaccurate, inappropriate or wrong, or the prescriptive standpoint that these metaphors should not be used (or a combination of the two, in which the standpoint that violence-related metaphors for cancer should not be used is supported by the argument that such metaphors are inaccurate, inappropriate, or wrong). Investigating different types of discourses will thus further uncover the complexity and richness of the phenomenon of resistance to metaphor.

To conclude, in this dissertation I showed how politicians attempt to turn parliamentary debates into their favour by using metaphors in arguing, and how opposing parties resist these metaphors in an attempt at turning the discussion into their own favour. The results of the four studies presented here demonstrated how metaphors are used for expressing various relevant argumentative moves in parliamentary debates. They are employed to express starting points, figurative analogy arguments, and to clarify the ongoing argumentation between politicians. These metaphors also elicit overt resistance by means of argumentative criticisms. A thorough understanding of metaphor's argumentative potential and of the resistance that these metaphor elicit enriches studies concerned with political metaphor and with political argumentation alike. I hope that the results of this dissertation will serve as a basis for further research investigating the argumentative uses of metaphor in political discourse, and of the resistance that metaphors elicit.

References

Andone, C. (2013). *Argumentation in political interviews: Analyzing and evaluating responses to accusations of inconsistency*. John Benjamins.

Arrese, A. (2015). Euro crisis metaphors in the Spanish press. *Communication & Society, 28*(2), 19-38. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.28.2.19-38

Barabas, J., Carter, B., & Shan, K. (2020). Analogical framing: How policy comparisons alter political support for health care reform. *American Politics Research, 48*(5), 596-611. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1532673X20926125

Boeynaems, A., Burgers, C., Konijn, E. A., & Steen, G. J. (2017). The effects of metaphorical framing on political persuasion: A systematic literature review. *Metaphor and Symbol, 32*, 118-134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2017.1297623

Boukes, M., & Hameleers, M. (2020). Shattering populists' rhetoric with satire at elections time: The effect of humorously holding populists accountable for their lack of solutions. *Journal of Communication, 70*(4), 574-597. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqaa020

Brugman, B. C., Burgers, C., & Vis, B. (2019). Metaphorical framing in political discourse through words vs. concepts: A meta-analysis. *Language and Cognition, 11*, 41-64. https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2019.5

Burgers, C. (2016). Conceptualizing change in communication through metaphor. *Journal of Communication, 66*(2), 250-265. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12211

Burgers, C., Jong Tjien Fa, M., & de Graaf, A. (2019). A tale of two swamps: Transformations of a metaphorical frame in online partisan media. *Journal of Pragmatics, 141*, 57-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.018

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2006). Britain as a container: Immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society, 17*, 563-581. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0957926506066345

Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Colston, H. L. (1999). The pragmatic functions of rebuttal analogy. *Metaphor and Symbol, 14*(4), 259-280. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1404_2

Colston, H. L. (2000). Comprehending speaker intent in rebuttal analogy use: The role of irony mapping, absurdity comparison and argumentative

convention. *Language and Speech, 43*(4), 337-354.
https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00238309000430040101

Colston, H. J., & Gibbs, R. W, Jr. (1998). Analogy and Irony: Rebuttal to "rebuttal analogy". *Metaphor and Symbol, 13*(1), 69-75.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1301_5

Dijk, T. A., van. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 11*, 11-52. https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij

Eemeren, F. H. van. (2002). Democracy and argumentation. *Controversia, 1*(1), 69-84.

Eemeren, F. H. van. (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse: Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. John Benjamins.

Eemeren, F. H. van. (2018). *Argumentation theory: A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Springer.

Eemeren, F. H. van, & Garssen, B. (2014). Argumentation by analogy in stereotypical argumentative patterns. In H. J. Ribeiro (Ed.), *Systematic Approaches to Argument by Analogy* (pp. 41-56). Springer.

Eemeren, F. H., van, & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication and fallacies: A pragma-dialectical perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Eemeren, F. H. van, & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Eemeren, F. H. van, & Houtlosser, P. (2005). Theoretical construction and argumentative reality. An analytic model of critical discussion and conventionalized types of argumentative activity. In D. Hitchcock & D. Farr (Eds.) *The uses of argument. Proceedings of a conference at McMaster University* (pp. 75-84). Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.

Eemeren, F. H. van, & Houtlosser, P. (2009). Seizing the occasion: Parameters for analyzing ways of strategic manoeuvring. In F. H. van Eemeren & B. Garssen (Eds.) *Pondering on problems of argumentation* (pp. 3-14). Springer.

Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis. A method for advanced students.* Routledge.

Finlayson, A. (2017). "What is the point of parliamentary debate?" Deliberation, oratory, opposition and spectacle in the British House of Commons. *Redescriptions, 20*(1), 11-31. http://dx.doi.org/10.7227/R.20.1.2

Flusberg, S. J., Matlock, T., & Thibodeau, P. H. (2018). War metaphors in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 33*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2018.1407992

Garssen, B. (2009). Comparing the Incomparable: Figurative Analogies in a Dialectical Testing Procedure. In F. H. van Eemeren, & B. Garssen (Eds.), *Pondering on problems of argumentation* (pp. 133-140). Springer.

Garssen, B., & Kienpointner, M. (2011). Figurative analogy in political argumentation. In E. Feteris, B. Garssen, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Keeping in touch with pragma-dialectics* (pp. 39-58). John Benjamins.

Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain: Metaphor and ideology*. John Benjamins.

Govier, T. (1985). Logical analogies. *Informal Logic, 7*(1), 27-33.

Hart, C. (2020). Animals vs. armies: Resistance to extreme metaphors in anti-immigration discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.20032.har

Hartman, T. K. (2012). Toll booths on the information superhighway? Policy metaphors in the case of net neutrality. *Political communication, 29*, 278-298. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2012.694983

Hauser, D. J., & Schwartz, N. (2015). The war on prevention: Bellicose cancer metaphor hurt (some) prevention intentions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*(1), 66-77. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0146167214557006

Ilie, C. (2010). Introduction European Parliaments under scrutiny: Discourse strategies and interaction practices. In C. Ilie (Ed.), *European Parliaments under scrutiny: Discourse strategies and interaction practices* (pp. 1-28). John Benjamins.

Joris, W., d'Haenens, L., & van Gorp, B. (2014). The Euro crisis in metaphors and frames: Focus on the press in the low countries. *European Journal of Communication, 29*(5), 608-617. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0267323114538852

Joris, W., Puustinen, L., Sobieraj, K., & d'Haenens, L. (2015). The battle for the Euro: Metaphors and frames in the Euro crisis news. In R. G. Picard (Ed.), *The Euro crisis in the media: Journalistic coverage of Economic crisis and European institutions* (pp. 125-148). I. B. Tauris.

Juthe, A. (2005). Argument by analogy. *Argumentation, 19*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-005-2314-9

Juthe, A. (2009). Refutation by parallel argument. *Argumentation, 23*, 133-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-008-9109-8

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Landau, M. J., Keefer, L. A., & Rothschild, Z. K. (2014). Epistemic motives moderate the effect of metaphoric framing on attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 53*, 125-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.03.009

Landau, M. J., Keefer, L. A., & Swanson, T. J. (2017). "Undoing" a rhetorical metaphor: Testing the metaphor extension strategy. *Metaphor & Symbol, 32*(2), 63-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2017.1297619

Lederer, J. (2013). 'Anchor Baby': A conceptual explanation for pejoration. *Journal of Pragmatics, 57*, 248-266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.007

Lewinsky, M., & Mohammed, D. (2015). *Argumentation in political deliberation*. John Benjamins.

Lumer, C. (2000). Reductionism in fallacy theory. *Argumentation, 14*(4), 405-423. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007809709996

Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and politics. *Metaphor and Symbol, 12*, 113-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1202_2

Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse: Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 21*(1), 23-38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2101_2

Musolff, A. (2017a). How metaphors can shape political reality: The figurative scenarios at the heart of Brexit. *Papers in Language and Communication Studies, 1*, 2-16.

Musolff, A. (2017b). Metaphor, irony and sarcasm in public discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 109*, 95-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.12.010

Oswald, S., & Rihs, A. (2014). Metaphor as argument: Rhetorical and epistemic advantages of extended metaphors. *Argumentation, 28*, 133-159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-013-9304-0

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (2003). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation* (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans.). University of Notre Dame. (Original work published 1958).

Perrez, J., Randour, F., & Reuchamps, M. (2019). De l'uniformité du discours politique: Analyse bibliométrique et linguistique de la catégarisation des discours politiques. *CogniTextes* [Online], 19. https://doi.org/10.4000/cognitextes.1337

Pilgram, R. (2020). *The effect of metaphor presence on argument evaluation: An experimental study of the perceived reasonableness of sound and fallacious arguments that contain metaphors as premises* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Linguistics, Leiden University.

Poppel, L., van (2020a). The study of metaphor in argumentation theory. *Argumentation*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-020-09523-1

Poppel, L., van (2020b). The relevance of metaphor in argumentation. Uniting pragma-dialectics and deliberate metaphor theory. *Journal of Pragmatics, 170*, 245-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.09.007

Reboul, O. (1989). The figure and the argument. In: M. Meyer (Ed.), *From metaphysics to rhetoric* (pp. 169-181). Springer.

Reuchamps, M., Dodeigne, J., & Perrez, J. (2018). Changing your political mind: The impact of a metaphor on citizens' representations and preferences for federalism. *Regional & Federal Studies, 28*, 151-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/13597566.2018.1433663

Santa Ana, O. (1999). 'Like an animal I was treated': Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society, 10*, 191-224. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0957926599010002004

Santibáñez, C. (2010). Metaphors and argumentation: The case of Chilean parliamentarian media participation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*, 973-989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.08.019

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Semino, E. (2020). "Not soldiers but fire-fighters"- Metaphors and Covid-19. *Health Communication, 36*(1), 50-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1844989

Semino, E., Demmen, J., Demjén, A., Koller, V., Payne, S., Hardie, A., & Rayson, P. (2015). The online use of 'Violence' and 'Journey' metaphor by cancer patients, as compared with health professionals: A mixed method study. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care*, 1-7. doi: 10.1136/bmjspcare-2014-000785

Sopory, P., & Dillard, J. P. (2002). The persuasive effects of metaphor: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research, 28*(3), 382-419. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00813.x

Steen, G. J. (2017). Attention to metaphor: Where embodied cognition and social interaction can meet, but may not often do so. In B. Hampe (Ed.). *Embodied cognition and multimodal discourse* (pp. 279-296). Cambridge University Press.

Steen, G. J., Reijnierse, W. G., & Burgers, C. (2014). When do natural language metaphors influence reasoning? A follow-up study to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2013). *PLoS One, 9*(12), e113536. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113536

Svacinová, I. (2014). Reconstruction of metaphors in argumentation: A case study of Lincoln's metaphor of "swapping horses while crossing a stream". *Cogency 6*(2), 67-89.

Thibodeau, P. H. (2016). Extended metaphors are the home runs of persuasion: Don't fumble the phrase. *Metaphor and Symbol, 31*, 53-72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2016.1150756

Tóth, M., Csatar, P., & Majoros, K. (2018). Metaphoric representations of the migration crisis in Hungarian online newspapers: A first approximation. *Metaphorik.de, 28*, 169-199.

UK Parliament. (n.d.). UK Parliament. Retrieved November 22, 2020, from https://www.parliament.uk/

Wackers, D. Y. M., Plug, H. J., & Steen, G. J. (2020). Violence metaphors for cancer: Pragmatic and symptomatic arguments against. *Metaphor and the Social World, 10*(1), 121-140. https://doi.org/10.1075/msw.19005.wac

Whaley, B. B., & Holloway, R. L. (1997). Rebuttal analogy in political communication: Argument and attack in sound bite. *Political Communication, 14*(3), 293-305. https://doi.org/10.1080/105846097199335

Whaley, B. B., Nicotera, A. M., & Samter, W. (1998). African American women's perception of rebuttal analogy: Judgments concerning politeness, likability, and ethics. *The Southern Communication Journal, 64*(1), 48-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/10417949809373117

Whaley, B. B., & Smith Stagner, L. (2000). Rebuttal analogy in persuasive messages: Communicator likability and cognitive responses. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*(1), 66-84. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0261927X00019001004

Wicke, P., & Bolognesi, M. M. (2020). Framing Covid-19: How we conceptualize and discus the pandemic on Twitter. *PLoS ONE 15*(9), e0240010. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240010

Woods, J., & Hudak, B. (1989). By Parity of Reasoning. *Informal Logic, 11*(3), 125-139.

Xu, C., & Wu, Y. (2014). Metaphors in the perspective of argumentation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 62*, 68-76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.12.004