# Metaphors for Metaphors

JUDIT FERENCZY
English Department
Kodolányi János College
Szabadságharcos út 59
Székesfehérvár 8000
Hungary

ABSTRACT

*This paper rises the issue of how rhe concept of metaphor is understood in three views of linguisrics and/or philosophical theorizing of meraphor. The theories to be considered are: the interaction rheory (as represenred by Black 1993). thepragmatic theory (as discursed by Searle 1993) and rhe cognitivist theory (as elaborated by Lakoff and Johnson 1980 and Lakoff 1993). The paper goes even further by taking into consideration rhe metaphorical ways in which the different authors talk about metaphor. The main findings of the study are the following: (1) scientific language is deeply metaphorical; (2) despite the radically different views on metaphor apressed by the three schools, the metaphorical ways of dealing with meraphor is strikingly similar; and (3) the methods used in cognitive linguistics prove successful even on this metalinguistic level.*

KEY WORDS: metaphor for metaphor, meta-metaphor, comparison theory, interaction theory, pragmatic theory, cognitivist theory

RESUMEN

*Este anículo plantea el rema de cómo el concepro de metáfora se percibe desde tres perspectivas de la lingüística y/o de la teoná filosófica de la metáfora. Las teorías a tratar son: la teoná de la interacción (representada por Black 1993). la teoría pragmática (planteada por Searle 1993) y la teoná cognitivista (elaborada por Lakoff y Johnson 1980 y Lakoff 1993). El anículo va más allá al tomar en consideración las formas metafóricas en las que los distintos autores hablan de la meráfora. Los principales hallazgos del estudio son los siguientes: (1) el lenguaje científico es profundamenre metafórico; (2) a pesar de los puntos de vista radicalmente opuestos con respecto a la metáfora apresados por estas tres escuelas, las formas metafóricas de tratar la metafora son notablemente similares; y (3) los métodos empleados en la lingüística cognitiva resultan ser eficaces incluso en este nivel metalingüístico.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: metáfora de metáfora, meta-metáfora, teona comparatista, teona de la interacción, teoría pragmática, teona cognitivista

## I. INTRODUCTION

The presupposition in connection with scientific language has long been that it has to be literal, because this is the only way reality can be described in a properly - precise and unarnbiguous, in one word - objective way. No tropes or other examples of figurative language are acceptable in a desirably testable characterization of the surrounding world. This paper is meant to prove that scientific language is much less literal than it is thought to be.

The most intriguing way to indicate this turned out to be the promising possibility of looking at the different theories of metaphor just to find that even when discussing metaphor the scientists cannot get rid of metaphorical expressions. To notice this we need a certain meta-linguistic attitude, which focuses not only on *what* is said but also on *how* it is conveyed.

As a foundation to my analysis, in the first part of my paper I will provide a short summary of three different theories of metaphor: the interaction theory (based on Black 1993), the pragmatic theory (based on Searle 1993 and Sadock 1993) and the cognitivist theory (based on Lakoff and Johnson 1980 and Lakoff 1993). In the second part I will present a detailed analysis of the metaphors used for metaphors - which I will call *meta-metaphors* - by the above mentioned linguists. The methods used in the analysis are cognitivist ones, an approach which I myself consider the closest to the nature of metaphor and the best to serve my purposes.

## II. METAPHOR AS A CONCEPT IN A VARIETY OF THEORIES

*The interaction theory*

It is true of all the theories I am going to discuss that they do not accept the traditional Aristotelian view of metaphor as grasping a similarity between two objects. In this so-called comparison theory metaphor is nothing more than a conuacted simile stating that an object resembles another in certain clear aspects. In this view the speaker could have as well formulated his description of the object in question in literal statements, which express exactly the same idea in a much more precise way. In other words, any metaphor can be paraphrased, that is, the figurative expression can any time be communicated in a down-to-earth literal way. The speaker's using tropological expressions is a mere whim, a deviation, an aberration, so metaphor is parasitic on 'normal usage'. Metaphors are vague, inessential frills, which can be appropnate for the purposes of politicians and poets, but not for 'serious people' like scientists.

The interaction theory - summarised by Black in his 1993 work (see bibliography) - leaves behind many axioms of the comparison theory while keeping others. For example, it considers metaphor to mediate some kind of analogy or structural correspondence between two concepts, saying that this is the correct insight behind the classical comparison view of metaphor as an ellipticated simile. But it continues by saying that «Implication is not the same as covert identity: Looking at a scene ihrough blue spectacles is different from *comparing* that scene with something else» (Black 1993:30). Moreover, metaphor in Black's view is not replaceable, by uttering it the speaker means just what he said and feels he had a 'flash of insight' rather than just a perception of a similitude.

The reason why the interaction theory is called so is that the focus is not placed on the resemblance between the two nodes of the metaphor but, on the contrary, upon the verbal opposition and interaction between the two semantic contents. The literal-figurative distinction, on the other hand, is still kept: in Black's view the tacit knowledge of the literal meaning induces a feeling of dissonance or tension between the literal and metaphorical interpretations of the metaphor.

Another important issue the interaction theory raises is the question of the so-called 'dead metaphors'. Black does not consider dead metaphors to be metaphors: «This [i.e. the trite opposition between 'dead' and 'live' metaphors] is no more helpful than, say, treating a corpse as a special case of a person: A so-called dead metaphor is not a metaphor at all, but merely an expression that no longer has a pregnant metaphorical use» (Black 1993:25).

The interaction theory also introduces the idea that metaphors are not necessarily only based on pre-existing connections between two concepts, but can also generate new knowledge and insight by changing relationships between the things designated. To illustrate how rnetaphors can actually create similarities Black uses a metaphor: he asks, 'Did the other side of the moon exist before it was seen?'. The answer is undoubtedly 'Yes'. To the question 'Did the view of Mount Everest from a point one hundred feet above its summit exist before anybody had seen that view?' the answer is again 'Yes', but only in a counterfactual way: If anybody had been in the position to view the mountain from the point specified, it would have looked the same as it does now frorn an aeroplane. If, then, we speak about views, it is logical that we also need viewers, and the view that is actually seen is a fact about the mountain as well as about the viewer. Therefore, metaphors are cognitive instruments indispensible for perceiving connections that, once perceived, are then truly present (Black 1993: 36-37).

In sum, the interaction theory views metaphor as the interaction between two semantic fields expressed by the two end-points of a metaphor; its special effect coming from the tension between the literal and the figurative meanings; rnetaphors have a strong raison d'etre since they are not replaceable and they can create new relationships between two concepts.

### The pragmatic theory

Just like interactionalists, pragmatists - primarily Searle 1993 and Sadock 1993 - also stan off by opposing their views to the traditional cornparison theory. In their view, too, metaphors are essentially not paraphrasable, because in most of the cases there is no literal expression that conveys exactly what we rnean, because «without using the metaphorical expression, we will not reproduce the semantic content which occurred in the hearer's comprehension of the utterance» (Searle 1993:111). If we try to paraphrase a metaphor, we either do not find a corresponding literal statement or, even if we do, it is somehow inadequate, something is lost in meaning. Similarity is viewed as a vacuous predicate, because any two things are similar in some respect or another, and how do we know exactly which respect the speaker has in mind when uttering a metaphor? (Searle's example is *Sally is a block of ice.* where there do not seem to be any literal similarities between objects which are cold and people who are unemotional.) But we still understand the speaker perfectly, and the way this is done is exactly what pragmatists are interested in.

Searle compares metaphors to irony and indirect speech acts in the respect that in all three cases there is a break between what the speaker says (i.e. sentence meaning) and what he means (i.e. utterance rneaning). The pattern to this is:

'S is P' means in fact 'S is R',

where the first, that is, the sentence meaning, is never metaphorical, while the second, the utterance meaning, can be metaphorical. The way metaphors are understood is the following: when the utterance is defective if taken literally, the hearer looks for an utterance meaning that differs from the sentence meaning and that is no longer defective (Searle 1993:103). To do this, speaker and hearer must share (i) certain principles that associate the P term with a set of possible values of R, and (ii) some strategies that enable them, given their knowledge of the S term, to restrict the range of possible values of R to the actual value, where oniy those possible values of R which determine possible values of S can be actual values of R (Searle 1993:107).

While Searle - although conceiving of metaphor as a 'roundabout' (1993:89) way of expression - insists that metaphors are intrinsically irreplaceable, Sadock sees metaphor as an indirect way of assening something which might have been communicated directly in terms of the conventions of language (1993:43). In explaining this, Sadock states that metaphor appears to be in conflict with the Gricean cooperative principle, therefore the hearer is forced to seek a figurative, but cooperative, intent behind the utterance (ibid.).

What made me list the two authors under the same heading is that both seem to push metaphor out of the realm of descriptive linguistics: Searle suggests that metaphor is not a question of language per se but one of language use; Sadock even risks the statement that all noniiteral speech falls outside the domain of synchronic linguistics, because the basis of, say, metaphor is a kind of indirection that is shared with nonianguage behavior (Sadock 1993:42). In this view, the problem of metaphor is strictly a pragmatic question.

Pragmatists, too, have something to say about dead metaphors: Sadock considers it a commonplace that they were «alive and kicking at some time in the past» (1993:44) (note that in formulating this he places the phenomenon in the realm of diachronic linguistics); Searle goes even further by saying oxymoronically that «dead metaphors have lived on» (1993:88). This means in his interpretation that they have become dead through continual use, but their continual use is a clue that they satisfy some semantic need.

To sum up, in the pragmatic theory metaphor is conceived as the relationship between what is said and what is meant to be said; it is not paraphrasable, but it is essentially not a question of language itself, but one of language use, therefore it is not a proper subject of traditional linguistics.

### The cognitivist theory

The most strikingly new idea of cognitive linguistics - represented by Lakoff and Johnson 1980 and Lakoff 1993 - is the falsity of the whole distinction between literal and figurative meaning (Lakoff 1993:205). In a thorough and detailed manner, Lakoff illustrates very convincingly in his 1993 article that a great many common concepts of ours are metaphorical and that metaphor is a fixed pan of our conceptual system (ibid.).

The cognitivist view takes over and develops many ideas of the theories described above while rejecting others. From the interaction theory it agrees with the idea that metaphors can create new similarities, and that there is a structural correspondence between the two concepts a metaphorical relationship is applied to. On the other hand, it drops the idea that dead metaphors are not real metaphors: conventional metaphors are considered especially interesting for the study of metaphor, because they reveal certain fundamental

processes of thinking, and fit into a whole range of correspondences also present in novel metaphors.

From the pragmatic theory cognitivists adopt the idea that metaphor can be interpreted as a nonlinguistic behaviour by saying that metaphor is not simply a matter of language but of thought and reason (Lakoff 1993:203). However, they reject the somewhat simplifying view that metaphor would just be a mere problem of language use. In the cognitive interpretation metaphor is a central part of synchronic linguistics because much of our semantic system is metaphorical (Lakoff 1993:239).

In the cognitivist view metaphor means understanding one domain of experience (i.e. target domain) in terms of a very different domain of experience (i.e. source domain). The pattern is:

$$\text{'A is B'}$$

where A is more abstract, less concrete, and B is less abstract, more concrete. Lakoff's 'A is B' is very much different from Searle's 'S is P', because 'S is P' is an actual statement expressing a metaphorical relationship between two actually appearing *objects* of the world, while 'A is B' is a metaphorical relationship between two *concepts,* which never appears like this in real-life statements but which has many different linguistic surface-manifestations which relate to each-other in a systematic way. For example, one never encounters the statement THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS - which is an 'A is B' relation - in actual real-life conversations, but one may very well hear utterances such as:

What is the *foundation* of your theory? The theory needs more *support*. We need to *construct* a *strong* argument instead of that *shaky* one. We have put together the *framework* of the theory.

These are surface manifestations of one and the same underlying *conceptual* metaphor (and note, none of them are of the structure 'S is P', but could be reformulated as such, if needed).

Cognitivists also noticed that metaphors have an inner structure called *mapping*, which is a set of ontological correspondences between the two domains of experience. In these mappings the so-called Invariance Principle rules: the mappings preserve the cognitive topology of the source domain, consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain (Lakoff 1993:215).

The insight which gives the cognitivist view great credibility and reliabilty is that these conceptual metaphors are not isolated, but *systematic*: separate metaphors are naturally grouped in our conceptual system and, together with relations based on other principles (like metonymy). they form so-called *idealized cognitive models* (ICMs), which structure our thinking and understanding of the world. Also, these metaphors do not float in the air, but are motivated by being grounded in nonrnetaphorical experiences.

To illustrate this, let us turn back to Searle's example of an 'S is P' relation: *Sally is a block of ice.* Searle correctly states that there is no literal similarity between objects that are cold and people who are unemotional, but does not give a plausible explanation for why the speaker would use this utterance to characterize Sally. Lakoff comes up with a very convincing one: he notices that there is a conceptual metaphor of the form 'A is B' that gives rise to a whole range of metaphorical expressions: AFFECTION IS WARMTH (and the

opposite INDIFFERENCE IS COLD) (Lakoff 1993:239).

> We received a *warm* welcome. Our friendship has come to be just *lukewarm*.
> She is absolutely *frigid*. She sent him an *icy* glance. He was *cool* to me today.

In sum, in the cognitivist approach metaphor is interpreted as understanding one (target) domain in terms of another (source) domain of experience in a way which is systematic and motivated, and which structures our conceptual system and helps us reflect our knowledge from more delineated concepts to less tangible ones in the understanding of the world outside.


## III. META-METAPHORS

From a theoretical account let us now turn to a more practical question: what are the metaphors linguists belonging to the above mentioned schools use when talking about metaphor? Is there a basic difference between the ways schools so different in nature use metaphors for metaphors? In seeking an answer to these questions I applied the cognitivist method of grasping the meta-metaphors in 'A is B' structures. In the fust unit of this part of my paper I am going to present meta-metaphors that appear in both the cognitivist and the non-cognitivist (interactional or pragmatic) approaches. The second unit will consist of meta-metaphors which only partially overlap in the two kinds of approaches, while the third unit will enumerate meta-metaphors which are totally different, sometimes even contradictory. The examples are taken from Lakoff and Johnson 1980 (hereafter LJ), Lakoff 1993 (hereafter L), Lakoff and Tumer 1989 (hereafter LT) and Black 1993 (hereafter B), Searle 1993 (hereafter Se), Sadock 1993 (hereafter Sa), Shibles 1971 (hereafter Sh), Kuhn 1993 (hereafter K), Van Noppen and Hols 1990 (hereafter VH) respectively. Groups of examples preceded by 'I.' are cognitivist examples, those preceded by 'II.' are non-cognitivist ones. The Arabic numerals following the abbreviations indicate page numbers.

### *Overlapping meta-metaphors*
The most general meta-metaphor suucturing the way linguists on both sides think about metaphors is METAPHOR IS A MEANS. This meta-metaphor is a manifestation of the more comprehensive event structure, which goes like this:

> States are locations (bounded regions in space).
> Changes are movements (into or out of bounded regions).
> Actions are self-propelled movements.
> Purposes are destinations.
> Means are paths (to destinations).
> Difficulties are impediments to motion. (...)
> Long term, purposeful activities are journies. (Lakoff 1993:220)

The metaphors we have to do with fit into this general structure like this: the two most basic human activities are conceptualized as 1) ACTIVITY IS WORK and 2) ACTIVITY IS MOTION. And since when using metaphors we are engaged in the activity

of understanding, along the above lines understanding can be conceptualized in the following way: (i) ACTIVITY IS WORK / UNDERSTANDING IS WORK / METAPHOR IS AN IMPLEMENT and (ii) ACTIVITY IS MOTION / UNDERSTANDING IS A JOURNEY /METAPHOR IS A PATH, where both IMPLEMENT and PATH are subcases of the concept MEANS. ( (ii) is discussed later.)

METAPHOR IS AN IMPLEMENT therefore is a common meta-metaphor in both camps of linguists:

I. Metaphors are *tools* / devices (LJ193) for understanding, they can be used / handled / applied and they *serve purposes* (LT xi). They are *mechanisms*(L202) (i.e. more sophisticated instruments). We understand abstract concepts by *means* of (LJ115) metaphor. Metaphors give us a *handle* (LJ124) on things.

II. Metaphors can be used (B22). They are versatile and *effective* (B25). They can be relatively dispensable (B26), or can lend *themselves* to elaboration (B26). Metaphor is a cognitive *instrument* (B31) which *functions / operates / works* (B22). Metaphors *express* (= press out) thoughts. They *satisfy* semantic needs (Sa48).

A subtype of METAPHOR IS AN IMPLEMENT is METAPHOR IS A VISUAL INSTRUMENT, which is pan of the very generally applied UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING metaphor mapped in the following manner:

| UNDERSTANDING | IS | SEEING |
|---|---|---|
| The person who tries to understand something | corresponds to | the person who makes use of his organ of sight |
| Ideas to be understood | correspond to | objects to be seen |
| METAPHORS | **ARE** | VISUAL INSTRUMENTS |

I. Metaphors give insight *in* vague concepts (LJ7). They *highlight* some aspects of concepts while hiding (I.e. casting shadow on) others (LJ61). Metaphors do not only *indicate* (LJ135) similarities, but also *reflect* (LJ46) correspondences.

II. Metaphorspresent insight (B21), *project* implications (B28), they are ontologically *illuminating* (B39), they focus on (B39) conceptual systems. Metaphors are often vague (Se96) and obscure (B20). Metaphor forces us to see (Sh16) reality in a certain way, it *clarifies* things (Sh20).

Note the slight difference between the two groups of examples: in the cognitivist one metaphors are always clear and bright, while in the noncognitivist one they are sometimes vague and obscure, a difference which iconically shows the degree of transparency of the

problem of metaphor in the two approaches.

Another meta-metaphor that can be found on both sides is THE CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM IS A BUILDING / METAPHOR IS ITS FRAMEWORK (with a structure of its own):

I. Metaphors are a *fixed part* (L208) of our conceptual system. They *arefundamental* (L229) in our thinking, we *base* our actions on metaphors which *underlie* everyday expressions (L204). The *system of metaphors is built into* (LJ64) the conceptual system, they *structure* our concepts (LJ46). Metaphors *establish* correspondences (LJ96), they are *grounded* (LJ64) in experience. The system of metaphors itself has a tight *inner structure* (L206), *internal consistency* (LJ43), with *portions* (LJ111). Metaphors need empirical *support* (L246), with which they can serve as the *basis* (LJ55) for novel metaphors, that is, *extensions*. Metaphors sharply *delineate* (LJ55) abstract concepts.

II. Metaphor has *grounds* and *relations to its grounding* (B19). Metaphors can be *affimed* (i.e. made firm) (B30). Metaphors have a *basis* of their own (Sa42) with *underlying principles* (Sa42). Is metaphor an *edifice* that *rests* on the *rock bottom* of literal similes (Se97)? Metaphor is *deeply embedded* (i.e. firmly fixed in a mass) in our mode of sensibility (Se99). Metaphors *arefundamental* to science and have a *wide bearing* (K538). Metaphor *establishes* links between language and the world (K539). Metaphors are *deep* in our communicative system (VH3).

We can easily observe that this is the most widely used meta-metaphor in both the cognitivist and the noncognitivist works, which on its pan again proves how 'deeply embedded' metaphor is in our way of thinking.

*Partially overlapping meta-metaphors*
In this subchapter I am discussing meta-metaphors which otherwise correspond to each-other in the case ot the two parties, but which have entailments or subtypes that are different and lead to imponant conclusions. The first very general meta-metaphor that appears is METAPHOR IS A HUMAN BEING. This has the following examples:

I. We think that *dead* metaphors are very much *alive* (LJ55). Metaphor is *robust*; it *embodies* generalizations (L205).

II. Metaphors can be *oíd* (B35) / *dead* / *alive and kicking* (Sa44) / *active* (B25).

A common subtype of this meta-metaphor is METAPHOR IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR:

I. Metaphors *sanction / justify / dictate / allow* actions, they *have power over* us (LJ142).

II. Metaphors *have power* (B21) / *force* (26) / an *effect* (Sa43) / *immunity to contradiction* (Sa49). Metaphors can be *successful / failed* (B22) / *prove rich* (B26)

/ *strike, seize* (B31) / be *feeble* or *strong* (Se87) /*achieve justification* (Sh1). Metaphor *commits* the speaker to **certain understandings** (Se99), *supplies* and *juxtaposes* things (K533), *captivates* us (Sh3), *determines* how and what we see (Sh9), and it *forces* us to see reality in a certain way (Sh16).

It is quite **striking** that this SOCIAL SUPERIOR metaphor has a lot more **examples** in the works of noncognitivists than in those of cognitivist authors. **This** can be interpreted as showing that the problem of metaphor is 'more superior' or 'has more power on' those **linguists** who **deal** with metaphor in a more traditional and less effective way than on those who represent a contemporary theory of metaphor.

Another subtype of the HUMAN BEING metaphor is METAPHOR IS A CREATOR / PROGENITOR:

I. Metaphor *gives* meaning to form, it *isproductive* (LM21) in the **sense** that it *creates* new understanding (LJ235).

II. Metaphorical use can be *pregnant* (B25). Metaphor can *generate* knowledge (B38), can be a *surrogate* for verbal **formulation** (B38). Metaphors *call forth / create* similarities (**K533**).

But the HUMAN BEING meta-metaphor has a subtype which **only turns** up in the works of cognitivist authors: METAPHOR IS AN ASSISTANT.

I. Metaphors *do the job* of understanding *for us,* they *help us* to perfonn certain actions (**LJ95**). They *provide* understanding (LJ154).

It is not surprising to find this, **because** metaphor poses a problem for noncognitivist writers, **and** difficulties are not helpful, they are **impediments** to motion, that is, to action, that is, to understanding (as we **have seen** in the event **structure** presented by **Lakoff in** above).

Previously I **have** discussed the very general meta-metaphor METAPHOR IS A MEANS, which had **two subtypes**: METAPHOR IS AN IMPLEMENT and METAPHOR IS A PATH. The **latter is part** of the **following** mapping:

| UNDERSTANDING | IS | A JOURNEY |
|---|---|---|
| The **person** who tries to understand something | corresponds to | the traveller. |
| The abstract concepts to be understood | correspond to | the destination. |
| The concepts and experiences we already possess | correspond to | the starting point. |

Judit Ferenczy

METAPHOR                    IS                    A  PATH

This meta-metaphor appears in the following forms:

I. Our *field* of  research (L219) is metaphor. Is it true that one *gets away from* concrete physical experience, *starts from* the literal meaning and *winds up / arrives at* a metaphorical interpretation (L205)? We understand abstract concepts by *way* of */ via* metaphors. The theory of metaphor can be *traced back* to Reddy (L204). The *locus* of metaphor is thought (L204). Metaphor *goes beyond the realm* of conventional language (LJ54).

II. Metaphor is a *way* of thinking (VH3). Metaphor is *open-ended* (Se96). Metaphor communicates in an *indirect way* what might have been communicated *directly* (Sa43). 'S is P' is *a roundabout way* of asserting that 'S is R' (Se89). Metaphor is sometimes regarded as a *deviation from the normal route* (Sh11).

It is worth noting that, although the meta-metaphor appears in both types of writings, the way it does is very much different: for cognitivists the metaphor-path is direct, easy to follow, for noncognitivists it is indirect, a roundabout way, or even a deviation. This, again, shows a basic difference in the attitudes of the linguists.
In the common METAPHOR IS A MEANS / UNDERSTANDING IS A JOURNEY meta-metaphor two almost contradictory subtypes occur. In the case of cognitivists it is METAPHOR IS A MAP:

I. A *spatial* type of metaphor is *orientational* metaphor (LJ14).
Metaphors are expressed in fixed *patterns* (L210) / *schemas* (L214) / *projections* (L229) / *templates* (L233), which *fit* (LJ83) experience and preserve the cognitive *topology* (L215) of the target *domain*. Metaphors are *guides* (LJ156) for future actions.

In the case of noncognitivists it is METAPHOR IS AN OBSTACLE:

II. Metaphor is sometimes a *stumbling block in the path* of the linguist (Sa51). Metaphor is the *locus of* semantic *change* (Sa57). There is a *boundary* between literally and noniiterally conveyed communication (Sa53), a *limit where* meaning *leaves off* and figuration *begins* (Sa51). There are also *intractable* cases of metaphor (Sa51).

No comment is needed to explain how these two meta-metaphors show the way the two parties deal with metaphor.

*Non-overlapping metaphors*
There is a number of meta-metaphors which oniy appear in the works of either the cognitive or the noncognitive authors. In the former group only one but very powerful meta-metaphor can be found, and this is METAPHOR IS A SUBSTANCE / RESOURCE:

I. Metaphors *pervade* (LJ3) our way of thinking (like **smells** or fluids). Cultural values are *deeply entrenched* (LJ23) in metaphors (like in ground). Metaphors *suffuse* our thoughts (like colour or moisture), they can be *applied* (like ointments or glue) (LJ103) and they won't *mix* (LJ95). Metaphor is *widespread* and it is a *matter* of thought (L202). Like air, metaphor is *omnipresent, accessible* to everyone, *irreplaceable* and *indispensable* (LT xi). It is a rich *source* of elaboration (LJ61).

For noncognitivists metaphor is understood in the following metaphorical ways:

METAPHOR IS A DIFFERENT LANGUAGE / TERMINOLOGY
Metaphors **have** to be *translated / interpreted / explained* (Se98).

METAPHOR IS **A** HIDDEN OBJECT
We **have** to *spot* metaphors. We are *on the look-out* for metaphors (Se103)

?METAPHOR IS **A** GAME / PLAY
Metaphor cannot *begin* until the *referents of game* have been established (K537). The S term *plays an important role* in metaphor (Se104).

?METAPHOR IS AN ACCIDENT / MISTAKE
Some metaphors are *fatal* for the simile thesis (Se98).


IV. CONCLUSIONS

The very **first** coniusion to be drawn is that scientific language is deeply metaphorical. The data enumerated in the above pages **speak** for themselves, and the fact that the reader **does** not **easily** notice them is not to be explained by saying that they are not metaphorical, but that they are so natural and conventional that a meta-linguistic consciousness is needed to throw light on them.

Moreover, metaphors for metaphors can not oniy be found in **the works** of cognitive linguists, who celebrate the phenomenon of metaphor, but **also** in the scientific discourse of more or less traditional **writers,** who regard metaphor as either **improper** in scientific writing or not a **subject** to be treated **in** synchronic linguistics at **all.** Why cannot they free themselves of metaphor even when dealing with metaphor **itself? Because** metaphor helps them **understand** and express new ideas, **it serves** as a **handle** when **walking** on **swampy** soil.

It is **true** that throughout the analysis **I have been** using the **methodology** of cognitive linguistics, but **this** in itself is not an **explanation** for the **clarity** of the results. If there is nothing to find, the most fantastic **methods** will **also** fail to reach anything. But the picture of meta-metaphors delineated in my **paper** meets **all** the requirements cognitive linguistics has of metaphors, the network of meta-metaphors **is** not **haphazard** but systematic, it brings understanding to an abstract concept (**i.e.** metaphor) by relating **it** to more concrete concepts (**i.e.** implements, human beings, paths, maps etc.), of which we **have** a much **clearer** understanding and more basic, cultural or bodily, experience. **The** system of meta-metaphors is not accidental but has strong **links** with other metaphors **commonly** used in our thinking (**e.g.** the event structure).

Regarding the two-way distinction of meta-metaphors, namely that of cognitivist and noncognitivist approaches, the most eye-catching finding is that most of the meta-metaphors are similarly used by both parties, as presented in II. Is it not strange, one would ask, that when putting forth a totally new theory of metaphors, the metaphorical system cognitive linguists use is not radically different from the one used by traditional writers? I do not consider this a failure of my research, on the contrary, I would put this the other way round: the way noncognitivist authors use meta-metaphors is in total correspondence with what cognitivists *say* about how meta-metaphors work! Despite their basically different views, interactionalists and pragmatists display the same metaphorical system as cognitivists do, in other words, what noncognitivists say and do in their writing is contradictory. On the other hand, what cognitivists say and do is consistent.

This is to say that cognitive linguistics throws light on certain metaphorical processes in scientific discourse, be it traditional or not, which were present in the scientific discourse of earlier authors, too, but in an unconscious way.

A smaller group of meta-metaphors used by the two parties is of those which are different. I regard them as iconically showing the linguists' attitude towards their own topic: for cognitive theoreticians metaphor is an assistant, a map to orient their quest, an aid and a resource to help and feed them mentally, for noncognitivists it is an obstacle in their way, a language or terminology that has to be decoded, a hidden object that has to be found, that is, a problem not very easy to solve and understand.

As a final conclusion, I find the cognitivist position and its methods successful in dealing with metaphors for metaphors and with the phenomenon of metaphor in general.

WORKS CITED

Black, M. (1993) «More About Metaphor* in A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 19-41.

Lakoff, G. (1993) «A Contemporary Theory of Metaphor» in A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 202-251.

Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson (1980) *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago and London: The U of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & M. Turner (1989) *More Than Cool Reason. A Field Guide To Poetic Metaphor.* Chicago and London: The U of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T.S. (1993) «Metaphor in Science» in A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 533-542.

Ortony, A. (1993) ~Metaphor,Language and Thought» in A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 1-16.

Sadock, J.M. (1993) «Figurative Speech and Linguistics» in A. Onony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 42-57.

Searle, J.R. (1993) «Metaphor» in A.Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 83-111.

Shibles, W.A. (1971) *METAPHOR: An Annotated Bibliography and History.* Whitewater, Wisconsin: The Language Press.

Van Noppen, J.P. & E. Hols (1990) *Metaphor II. A Classified Bibliography of Publications 1985 to 1990.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.