Preface

The book contains a collection of historical and systematic studies on metaphors and related topics, in German and English, that were first drafted as initial elaborations of my research project on the historical and systematic philosophy of language at the University of Tübingen in two periods (1992–1994 and 1996–1999). About half of the essays have been published before in some form but for this edition they have been improved upon or revised to fit better with the book as a whole. The groundwork for this collection was laid in the mid-1990s by the first review paper, written in Croatian, that I devoted to the topic.[1]

Although originally meant to be chapters of a book to come, the individual parts in this volume build an organic whole by virtue of their thematic unity, mutual cross-references, and a common bibliography. All parts, whether previously published or not, have been improved upon—or so I hope—in their original theoretical goal, as well as developed in order to expand from a mere mechanical collection of ready-made essays into a more organized and comprehensive treatment that strives to be a unified monograph on metaphor from different philosophical perspectives.

The present framework, aimed to provide a higher degree of systematic unity than the original versions of individual papers did, sums up my overall view of metaphor and metaphoricity in the discourse of metaphilosophy, philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and philosophy of discourse in general that I have meanwhile acquired. The revisions have been made not only in order to lend unity and consistency to the volume but also to deepen and enlarge the field of sources while trying to reduce repetitions to a minimum. Nevertheless, the aim of avoiding repetitions has not been entirely achieved, some degree of repetition of arguments turned out to be unavoidable due to retreating related issues in different times and in different languages (English, German, and Croatian). As a consequence, reoccurrences of arguments take place in the volume but not repetitions or straight translations of passages from German into English or vice versa.

The papers collected in this volume are only in German and English, but not all my papers on this topic have been included.[2]

1   See Mikulić (1994), "Čemu još metafore?" [What are metaphors still for?]

2   See my review paper Mikulić (1999), "Der Abgesang der Metapher? Eine Übersicht der neueren philosophischen Metapher- und Modellforschung"

Grouped in sections, they do not represent different language versions of the same text but provide individual elaborations of interrelated topics in German or in English. Each begins with different problems of both historical and systematic nature and each ends, hopefully, by contributing new points to their respective topic. As a result, every chapter can be read either as an alternative to the paper it is paired with in the respective section or as a supplement to other texts, provided that some repetitions are tolerated by the reader. This is the case with the issue of difference between the notions of model and metaphor in the philosophy of science, as well as between comparisons, similes, and metaphors in the theory of figures of speech. The same also applies to such historical issues as Aristotle's real theory of metaphor and its linguistic background, on the one hand, and on the other, its undeniable relevance both for ancient and modern discussions despite continuous misinterpretations. Similarly, although the two papers on Plato are separated by a distance in time and space of writing (late 1990s and the present) and belong to different sections (practice of metaphor vs. theory), they form a continuous argument. Hopefully, these and other re-elaborations entail new perspectives on their respective topics.

The history of this collection reflects in a way the recent history of its subject matter, the last fifty years of which were characterized by the ebb and flow of interest in different fields of philosophy of science and language, linguistics and literary studies. In the past twenty years, since the early 2000s, the research of metaphor has proven to be one of the fastest-growing and important areas of language and thought and, most recently, it is beginning to be felt in different areas of applied linguistic studies. Nevertheless, this development is quite similar to the situation of the preceding two decades, beginning in early 1980s, when metaphor finally seemed to be recognized as central to language as system and as social practice. Moreover, these late 20th-century developments were themselves incited another twenty years earlier by Max Black's seminal 1959 essay on metaphor. Since then, a great amount of

[A Swan-Song of Metaphor? A Review of Recent Philosophical Research in Metaphors and Models]. Other papers in Croatian include Mikulić (2004), "Porečena metafora. Napomene o prevođenju *Levijatana* Thomasa Hobbesa" [Metaphor Denied. Observations On Translating Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*]; Mikulić (2017), "Atopija metafore. Programi u filozofskoj metaforologiji" [Atopia of Metaphor. Programs in Philosophical Metaphorology].

new literature on metaphors has been produced in ever new waves, and considerable changes in the research of metaphorical language and thinking have occurred. Individual parts of this collection of studies, no matter whether previously published or not, have been updated in light of more recent research. Several new topics—such as the notion of 'paradigm'— have also been introduced that were not represented in earlier versions. Unpublished parts of the book concerning empirical analyses of logical, semantic, and literary aspects of metaphoric expressions (predominantly in German, written alongside with one published study in English, from the same period), have now been revised for the purposes of this publication. Although more narrowly confined to linguistic and logical levels of analysis, they form a part equal to other historical, philological and philosophical essays in this volume.

In the introductory SECTION I. Paradoxes of recent metaphor appraisals, the Chapters 01. Reassessing the All-Pervasiveness Assumption of Metaphors (in English) and 02. Rationalität und Allpräsenz von Metaphern. Einige Fragen [Rationality and Ubiquity of Metaphor. Some Questions] (in German) contain different reflections on some shared theses concerning the revival of interest in metaphors and models in the late 20th-century philosophy of science, discourse, and language, which is wrongly assumed to originate in Nietzsche's dictum on the all-pervasive presence of metaphors in language and thought. In both introductory papers, I try to articulate a critical stance towards the 'all is metaphor' assumption, which is not only characteristic of new rhetoric, literary criticism, hermeneutics and neostructuralist discourse theories, but also accepted by some antipositivist analytic philosophers of science and language, as well as by cognitive linguists. The consequences of this assumption of the universality of metaphors for theories of human languages, especially for semantic theories, have been both immense and problematic. One of them is that the so-called literal meaning of terms and expressions turns out to be nothing but petrified metaphorical uses of language, and that not only is there no literal expression in any language that is not always already used metaphorically but that it also lacks any literal meaning. It is this feature of linguistic expressions which suggests that metaphorical procedures within language are more general and more essential to any language than the so-called literality. Or, to put it in more radical terms, nothing in

the world has ever been called by its proper name, but only and necessarily by an "improper" word. Words do not refer to things despite such evidence as obvious deictic acts.

Although I raise critical observations towards this assumption, my aim is not to revive the outdated idea of the priority of literal language over the metaphorical. The aim is rather to reassess the *external* difference between the metaphorical *origin* of language and a view of the *actuality* of language, which—as a pre-condition of its functioning—must entail an *internal difference* between the literal and non-literal, if only in a weak sense of 'already interpreted' and 'not yet interpreted' items of language. The assumption of the metaphorical origin of language, be it true or not, does not sufficiently support the unlimited universalisation of metaphoricity so as to eliminate literality in language and to open the door wide for an irreversible relativism without any truth commitment. This is what motivates me to pursue one of the goals of these studies—to better understand and reassess the revolutionary aspects of Aristotle's unfairly ill-reputed theory of metaphor in confrontation with contemporary accounts in their different variations, ranging from cognitive linguistics to the antipositivist philosophy of science, such as Thomas Kuhn's view of historically situated paradigms.

In SECTION II. **Practice of metaphor**, two case studies of metaphorical discourse are presented, one in everyday politics of our postmodern age and one in the classical high-culture form of philosophy. I consider these two essays, first drafted in the mid and late 1990s, as early anticipations of the ever-growing trends that are just beginning to be felt in applied cognitive and social linguistics.

In the first essay of this section, **Chapter 03. Metaphorizing Politics or How To Hide the Obvious** (in English), I try to reexamine the general *theoretical* assumption of contemporary accounts of metaphor, as put forth by different streams of late 20th-century philosophies of language and knowledge. These propose that metaphors are an irreplaceable means of conveying new aspects of meaning and knowledge about things and are therefore an important factor in our re-shaping of reality in such concrete circumstances as public discourse. I proceed by considering some characteristic examples of the allusive and indirect, more postmodern than modern, right-wing political discourse from the

1995 Austrian election campaign. On this background, I pursue the thesis that, if metaphor must not be trivial (i.e. replaceable by a literal meaning), its specific significance has to be examined by identifying discursive strategies and effects of metaphor. Thus, for metaphors to work, it is not required that they refer to commonly shared literal meanings but to build, through our general ability of understanding language, a psychologically and politically binding network of un-said messages that causes a paradoxical effect: enabling, with rational means, democratically transparent mobilization of people for ideologically regressive and politically illegitimate goals. Such a mass denial of forbidden political desires (neo-Nazism) appears possible without substituting rational procedures of the public political discourse for repressive and totalitarian ones. On this background, the paper serves as a case-study attempting to revisit the theoretical discussions on metaphors based on the pragmatics of language.

Chapter 04. 'Ins Wasser schreiben'. Platons Schriftkritik im *Phaidros* und ihre metaphorische Selbstauflösung (in German) [**Writing in Water. Plato's Critique of Writing in the *Phaedrus* and its Metaphorical Self-Dissolution**] deals with the so-called disavowal of writing in philosophy by Plato in the *Phaedrus* and the related hermeneutical controversy concerning the self-referentiality of this peculiar case of philosophical critique of culture and media in Plato's written work. The chapter aims to provide critical explanations and additional arguments to the debate on this controversy between the historical-hermeneutical Platonic studies of the Tübingen School and their philosophical-hermeneutical opponents. The specific arguments of both positions are confronted with detailed analyses of a series of Plato's metaphorical expressions in the final part of the *Phaedrus* that link his critique of writing with a generative conception of 'letters' and relate it to a theoretically more fundamental, sign-based account of the Soul in the *Theaetetus*. As I try to show, it is not only the excessive use of metaphors that makes up a typical rhetorical means of Plato's literary production, but rather his construction of metaphorical links that plays a crucial role in his arguments. They consist in linking different, apparently heterogeneous layers of Plato's theory that allows for resolving even such theoretical riddles as Plato's self-contradictory and allegedly self-destructive denial of writing in philosophy. The construction of extended metaphorical arguments seems to reach so far as to put in question

some enduring assumptions about Plato, such as the priority of the natural theory of naming over the conventional one and of the literal meaning of words over transference; the same goes for the postmodern assumption of the absolute priority of sounds over letters in Plato. It is evident, as I try to show, that Plato's linguistic practice in philosophy clearly anticipates different aspects of the late 18th-century semiotic and historical linguistic critique of Kant's 'purism of Reason' by the Romantics, including their reception by such structuralists as Hegel and his adversary Nietzsche, not to mention postmodern philosophers.

SECTION III. Identifying Metaphor, examines different ancient positions regarding philosophical theory of *transference* in epistemic discourses and their modern receptions.

Chapter 05. 'Theòs metaphérōn'. Literal Metaphors, Paradigms and the Dialectical Turn of Metaphysics in Plato (in English) starts from the obvious paradox that Plato, despite his excessive use of metaphors and a variety of transferential forms of discourse (allegories, myths, parables, legends, etc.) does not provide a theory of specifically *metaphorical* mode of expression. In a close reading of Plato's use of substituting terms for *metaphor* and of the notion *paradigm* in his later dialogues, as well as of Aristotle's criticism of the overall 'paradigmatic discourse' in Plato, the chapter tries to elaborate some new arguments, not included or insufficiently recognised in recent scholarly writing, for the position that Plato's conception cannot be reduced to the old-fashioned metaphysical pattern of the universal-particular relationship. He offers, instead, a dynamic model of dialectical cross-relations of genera, species and particulars that acts productively in several theoretical directions, aiming both at coherence and foundation of discourse. Although the chapter precedes the analysis of the status and the use of *paradigm* in modern and contemporary philosophies of science, as given in Chapter 11, it supplements the latter discussion by testing a Wittgensteinian solution to some enigmas of Plato's notion of ultimate paradigm at the highest 'metaphysical' level of his theory.

Chapter 06. Defining Metaphor. Aristotle, Hermogenes of Tarsus, and the *Stereoscope*-Metaphor of Metaphor (in English) discusses linguistic and epistemological presuppositions of the thesis, raised in the 1930s by the Irish classicist W. B. Stanford, that the rhetorician Hermogenes of Tarsus (ca. 170 A.D.) provided a proper

definition of metaphor—in contrast to Aristotle's "mere linguistic" description—with a radically new, dynamic and reference-based conception of metaphoric speech, which he called *tropé*. For Stanford, it was a historical pre-figuration of his own "stereoscopic" account of metaphor, which later on, with Max Black and Paul Ricœur, inspired the so-called interactionist view of metaphor in various areas of philosophy of language and science, as well as in linguistics. On this historically complex background, Hermogenes' idea of metaphor as a 'common name for different things'—in contrast to Aristotle's notion of 'alien name of another thing'—is related in the chapter to a three-level (linguistic, logical and epistemological) analysis of the notion of 'transference' in Aristotle's *Poetics* and other parts of his work. Either in extended comments or brief references, the chapter points to systematic relations between the two ancient theories of Aristotle and Hermogenes, on the one side, and certain contemporary, interactionist and cognitivist, contributions to the theory of metaphor (Ricœur, Lakoff and Johnson, Kittay), on the other. As a result, the supposed interactionist explanation of metaphor in Hermogenes turns out to be consistent with rather than hostile to Aristotle's analysis, which appears no less conceptual in character than linguistic. Moreover, both accounts clearly call for further analysis on more complex systematic levels, which modern writers on metaphor scarcely acknowledged either in Hermogenes or in Aristotle.

Chapter 07. **Die Wahrheit über** *Theodor*. **Zum linguistischen Prinzip von Aristoteles' Metaphertheorie** (**in German**) [**The Truth about** *Theodor*. **On the Linguistic Principle of Aristotle's Theory of Metaphor**] is a supplement, although written earlier, to the aforementioned study of Aristotle's definition of metaphor, extending it to a more linguistic approach. It deals with several misinterpretations by modern scholars of Aristotle's definition of metaphor as "transference of names" in his *Poetics*. The fundamental notions of *lexis, dianoia, logos* and *hermeneia* are examined in a close reading of the linguistic parts of the *Poetics* 19–22, *Peri hermeneias* 1–4 and *De anima* II. 8. The aim of the discussion is to provide a coherent argumentation against the assumption of "mere word-linguistics" in Aristotle's account of metaphor, to contribute to a more complex, sentence-based theory, as presented in *Rhetoric* III. 10, and to identify the semiotic character of Aristotle's notion of *hermeneia*. Special attention is paid to Aristotle's observations, otherwise scarcely discussed, on

semantically void proper names (such as *Theodor*) and their assumably central relevance as the linguistic pattern for his account of meaning in general. As I try to argue, it is not only that Aristotle does not see metaphors as a simple shift of names grounded on the assumption of primacy of literal language, as it is commonly believed. Quite to the contrary, both metaphorical and literal uses of words operate on a common ground consisting in the tacit suspension of any necessity in the connection between names and things, on the one hand, and between meaning and signifier, on the other, which is best exemplified by complex proper names: they function linguistically by not having the meaning they strongly imply. This allows, in my view, for a more dynamic conception of meaning formation in Aristotle, i.e. meaning results out of *linguistic actions*, such as naming, predicating, uttering etc., and not out of fixed reference. Literal language, however prevalent in speech, is structurally but a mode of speech, operating with already known interpretations. It doesn't determine the metaphorical speech any more than it can be twisted to (or by) the metaphorical mode. Both rely on the same mode of meaning by suspension of reference. If seen on this background, it is Aristotle's theory of transference that provides a key for understanding literal meaning (meaning in general use) and not vice versa. Thus, it not only opposes its reductive and falsifying readings by many leading contemporary researchers of tropes but appears capable of competing with them.

SECTION IV. Logic and Linguistics of Metaphor is concerned, unlike historical analyses, with contemporary systematic discussions on metaphoricity both in everyday language use and in the truth-committed discourses of philosophy and sciences in their different variations.

Chapter 08. Family Disturbances. Metaphors, Similes, and the Role of 'Like' (in English) scrutinizes the relationship between two specific forms of transference in speech, *metaphors* and *similes* (viz. *figurative* comparisons), that has been the main topic of theories of metaphor in philosophy of language, linguistics and theory of science for several decades from the 1970s onwards. The aim of the chapter is to work out reasons, omitted in the non-comparativist theories of metaphor, for the assumption that metaphors, though apparently closely related to simple predicative similes of the form 'X is like Y', are neither reducible to similes nor semantically explicable by them. The reason is

that these two tropes, while expressing different properties of the objects related, i.e., conveying different semantic content (*'being* something' and 'being *like* something'), serve different linguistic functions. The special concern of the chapter is to uncover the ambiguous effects of the semantic marker 'like' in both literal and figurative environments. In particular, I aim to show that irreducible ontological presuppositions, entailed in the semantic marker of similarity, preclude a continuous transition from similes to metaphors and require that the relationship between the two tropes be subverted so that metaphors can be viewed as logically antecedent to similes, and not vice versa. As a consequence, the similarity or likeness implication between things, though not irrelevant to the general understanding of metaphors, is not constitutive of their linguistic function and their meaning. Instead, metaphors appear to be more closely related to both the structure and assertional commitment of literal expressions than to that of figurative comparisons.

Chapter 09. Freche Prädikation. Zu Satzform, Bedeutung, Wahrheitswert und Interpretation von Metaphern (in German) [Bold Predication. On the Sentence Form, Meaning, Truth Value and Interpretation of Metaphors], previously unpublished, is an extensive supplement of the aforementioned analysis on the grammatical structure and the linguistic function of similes and metaphors. The chapter presents several analyses of metaphorical expressions typically used by contemporary theoreticians and researchers on metaphors, as well as of some additional examples of my own. The chapter not only critically examines standard controversies in contemporary linguistics, semiology, and epistemology of metaphor—such as one-word character vs. sentence-character of metaphor, reference vs. meaning, the so-called category mistake vs. truth value of metaphorical statements, as well as issues of speaker intention and limits of interpretability of metaphors—but aims, moreover, to illuminate certain borderline phenomena, such as the 'backward' application of metaphoric expressions to their original carriers, and their *systematic* relevance for our understanding of metaphors in general. The aim is to show that, and demonstrate how, such a self-application of metaphorical expressions to the source referent ends up not in annihilation of the metaphoric sense through such literal re-direction of reference, but, rather to the contrary, enhances the metaphorical value even further by forcing the literal language use to produce

more astonishing metaphorical effects *while remaining literal*. I also try to provide observations that are as explanatory in their intention as constructive in their critical character, aiming to elaborate elements for a modified interactionist theory that does more justice both to the metaphorical phenomenon and our intuitions about how metaphors function than previous theories did—including the so-called metaphor-friendly ones, which rely on the all-pervasiveness assumption. In conclusion, I sum up my critical results concerning previous systematic and historical investigations by formulating general features of metaphorical expressions as they have been identified by contemporary philosophical, rhetorical and linguistic literature.

SECTION V. Tropological Quarrels over Philosophy, Science, and Literature contains three papers written in pretty distant periods of research (1991, 2013, and 2022) that have been either updated and revised or significantly rewritten. They deal with general issues regarding types and genres of discourse within and outside philosophy, as well as in literature and science. The section starts with a discussion of the controversy over models and metaphors, proceeds with conceptions of paradigms, and, finally, recalls a controversy over postmodern levelling of genre differences between philosophy and literature. The aim of these papers is to reassess a number of systematic and historical issues in metaphilosophy, philosophies of science and literary discourse.

Chapter 10. Modelle oder Metaphern? Anmerkungen zur 'Übertragung' in Philosophie und Wissenschaft (in German) [**Models or Metaphors? Remarks on 'Transference' in Philosophy and Science**] deals anew, in a kind of retrospective, with the presumed universality of metaphor, discussed at the beginning of this collection, and focuses on its role in late 20th-century discourses in philosophy and science. The aim is to show, on the one hand, that this universalisation of metaphor has been operative in recent philosophy more as a tacit confusion of metaphors with models and analogies than as an elaboration of the presumed constitutive role of the so-called genuine ("strong") metaphor in rational discourse. On this ground, I try to provide, in the second and third part, additional and different arguments than those raised by 'the friends of metaphor' for locating the presumed 'irrationality' of metaphor. The arguments serve to re-examine the relevance of the difference between the literality of the underlying linguistic functions and the emphatic assertion of metaphorical expressions.

As a result, in the fourth part, a different model is proposed for assessing metaphors as universal, legitimate, and epistemically innovative in the rational discourse of philosophy and science. Such a view allows a conception of the presumed 'all-pervading' character of transference in language and thought as based on the universality of *linguistic functions* and yet allows for considering metaphors more modestly as what they actually are—a particular and peculiar, intra-linguistic phenomenon without which no insight into the differential and material character of language and speech seems to be possible at all.

Chapter 11. Paradigms and 'Little Nephews'. Some Lichtenbergian Re-Visions of Kuhn and Wittgenstein (in English) examines crucial historical instances of the notion *paradigm, metaphor* and *model* in their logical relations. Starting with Thomas Kuhn's silence on both ancient and modern accounts of *paradigm* in scientific practice and metadiscourses, the chapter focuses, on the one hand, on the 18th-century physicist Georg Ch. Lichtenberg's idea of language as a general paradigm of human thinking and acting and, on the other, on its later conceptual reduction to 'standard pattern' in Wittgenstein's notion of the language-game. Lichtenberg's ambiguous conception of paradigm—comprising rational and irrational aspects, such as the standard pattern and the metaphorical transgression, 'folk-metaphysics' and 'act of Liberty'—appears historically and conceptually as central in the development of the notion. Although only tacitly received by Nietzsche and Wittgenstein, Lichtenberg's idea of paradigm as 'truth-family' figures as an anticipation of the struggle between privileging literal language by the early 20th-century positivist philosophy of language and the rehabilitation of metaphoricity by later antipositivist philosophers of science, initiated by Max Black's 1959 paper on metaphor and adopted later by Th. Kuhn. On the other hand, Lichtenberg's idea appears as a clear reminiscence of the ambiguous notion of Plato's *parádeigma*, implying—as I show in chapter 5—not only the classical idealistic separation of ideas from particulars but the methodological appreciation of everyday examples, analogies and metaphors in the modern, non-metaphysical sense of paradigm.

Chapter 12. Literarität der Philosophie. Zu Habermas' Kritik an Derrida und der 'welterschließenden' Funktion der Sprache (in German) [**Literariness of Philosophy. On Habermas' Criticism of Derrida and the 'World-Disclosing' Function of**

Language] deals with tropological issues of metaphilosophy, literary genres and theories of rationality, and serves as a general discursive-theoretical afterword to this volume, despite the fact that it precedes the whole collection chronologically. Stemming from a 1991 conference paper on Wittgenstein and literature, it scrutinizes the famous critique by Jürgen Habermas of the so-called 'postmodern discourse of philosophy' that, in his view, flattens out all genre and type boundaries between the rational and truth-committed discourses of philosophy and science, on the one hand, and literature, on the other. While arguing that Habermas' criticism of Derrida relies more on the reception of Derrida's notion of deconstruction by American literary critics and theoreticians of discourse, rather than on Derrida's own writings, I try to provide a more systematic overview of how Habermas avoids the confrontation with the so-called 'world-disclosing' function of language, while simultaneously acknowledging the "productive" aspects of rhetoric that are, according to Habermas, built into 'everyday language'. As the pragmatist philosophy of everyday language provides the basis of his social theory, the only acceptable rhetoric for Habermas might just be the one that maintains the boundaries of genre and rationality approved by the pragmatic rationality of communicative actions. The real issue seems to be, however, whether this kind of rhetoric, controlled by pragmatic needs and rules, suffices when Habemas's idea of 'ideal projections' built into the rational procedures that constitute our communicative actions is taken into consideration. Or do these very 'ideal projections', if they are able to motivate and guide our actions, need more profound rhetorical resources than those satisfying pragmatic rules of rationality. Although addressing only partially the aspects of the controversy between postmodern and anti-postmodern theories of discourse, such as the issue of genre boundaries or "levelling" of the productive function of language to rhetoric of everyday language, the discussion provides insight into the working principles of some recent approaches to tropes in philosophy and science that unwittingly level innovative metaphors to explanatory models while glorifying their uniqueness and unparaphrasability. For these reasons, the final chapter may be read as the introductory one, revealing theories of discourse as the overall theoretical background of the seemingly parochial topic of metaphors. ●