

Experimenting with emotive metaphors in argumentation

Francesca Ervas
University of Cagliari (IT)

Metaphors have a framing effect, which shapes our understanding of the world and influences how we evaluate arguments. This is why metaphors are often seen as potentially misleading in argument evaluation, sometimes resulting in fallacies of reasoning. However, the metaphorical framing effect can also provide unique insights and promote creative argumentation.

Likewise, emotions can sometimes contrast with rational thinking, but they can also serve as cognitive processes that shape how we perceive and evaluate situations, ultimately impacting our reasoning in significant ways. As a result, a double framing effect that involves both metaphorical and emotional aspects of metaphors can influence the way arguments are evaluated. This is particularly true for emotive metaphors, such as “that girl is a gem” or “this man is a derelict”, where specific positive or negative-valenced “emotive words” (gem, derelict) are used as vehicles.

The purpose of this talk is to discuss the findings of a series of experimental studies that examine the role of emotive metaphors in argumentation. It focuses on different types of fallacious arguments, such as *quaternio terminorum*, *ad misericordiam* arguments, and *ad hominem arguments*. Specifically, it aims to show that the evaluation of these arguments depends on the type of metaphor used (conventional vs. novel), the affective valence of the metaphor (positive vs. negative), and the type of argument employed.

Jeu. / Thu. 09:00-10:30, Auditoire C