



Marek Hetmański

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0003-2062-9802

e-mail: marek.hetmanski@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

What is Specific in the Semantics of Metaphor

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/RF.2019.027>

Introduction

The semantics of metaphor has been discussed by numerous theoretician¹ who approached the problem from the perspective of general sign theory (semiotics) but also in relation to other subfields thereof – syntactics and pragmatics. Such positioning of analyses pertaining to metaphors is also evoked by Urszula Żegleń whose monographic study *Wprowadzenie do semiotyki teoretycznej i semiotyki kultury* [Introduction to Theoretical and Cultural Semantics]² raises the issue of the specificity of

¹ Cf. Jerzy Pelc, *O użyciu wyrażeń* [On the Usage of Expressions] (Wrocław: Osolineum, Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne, 1971); Marian Przełęcki, “O metaforze w filozofii” [“On Metaphor in Philosophy”], in: *Moralność i społeczeństwo: Księga jubileuszowa Marii Ossowskiej* [Morality and Society] (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1970), 9–26; Michael Reddy, “Semantyczne ujęcia metafory” [“Semantic Aspect of Metaphor”], *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXXIV, 2 (1983): 307–320; Jan Srzednicki, “O metaforach” [“On Metaphors”], in: Jan Srzednicki, *Kłopoty pojęciowe* [Troubles with Concepts] (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993), 193–205; Marcin Będkowski, “Kilka uwag w sprawie metaforyczności zdań niereistycznych. Na marginesie rozważań Jerzego Pelca i Mariana Przełęckiego” [“Some Remarks on Metaphoricity of Non-Reistic Sentences: On Margins of Jerzy Pelc and Marian Przełęcki’s Considerations”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria* 27, 2 (106) (2018): 185–203.

² Urszula Żegleń, *Wprowadzenie do semiotyki teoretycznej i semiotyki kultury* [Introduction to Theoretical Semantics and Cultural Semantics] (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2000).

iconic signs which are commonly classified in parallel to strictly linguistic ones (i.e. phrases, sentences). "Peirce extended the aforementioned division of iconic signs (into figurative and structural, differing in terms of the sign's similarity to the original referent) by the addition of metaphor which (understood broadly) relates to its object by way of some sort of comparison. A more valid proposition, however, seems to be the one represented today by e.g. Paul Ricoeur, whereby a metaphor is related to symbolic signs".³ The author assumes that although the relationship between iconic signs and their referents can vary significantly in terms of the diversification and gradeability of their mutual resemblance, metaphor is primarily a symbolic sign, i.e. the property of linguistic utterance whose symbolic character is determined not by similarity but rather by certain linguistic and paralinguistic principles. In this perspective, metaphor as a symbol, or more specifically a phraseme (syntagma), is characterized by a high degree of conventionality as well as openness to interpretation.

When commenting on Peirce's classification of signs which differentiates between symbols, icons, and indices, Urszula Żegleń observes that the placement of metaphor under any one of those categories is hardly incontestable. Shortly speaking, metaphor is a sign that refers to its object through similarity in terms of some common trait shared with the represented referent. As a sign, metaphor both denotes and connotes its object, in other words, in the former case it indicates its referent (be it a real, unreal or fictional object), and in the latter, the distinctive features of the same. Similarity as such, despite being the foundation on which metaphor is established and operates, is not enough to warrant its classification as either a symbolic or iconic sign, as both of the same assume, albeit to a varying extent, a certain similarity between the sign and its referent. "Although iconic signs are thus distinguished from symbolic signs," writes Żegleń, "they remain nonetheless related thereto. Many symbolic signs display certain elements of iconic signs. To put it differently: many symbolic signs, when read relative to their primary layer, include elements of iconic signs (...)"⁴ The similarity between a symbol and its referent is more complex than in the case of icons and is strongly dependent on the adopted convention. On the other hand, the similarity between an iconic sign and its referent is (or at least appears to be) less problematic and simpler to establish. This was the assumption made by Peirce when classifying metaphor as an iconic sign, i.e. one whose similarity to the referent is figurative (rather than structural) in nature. This approach is not beyond contestation. Urszula Żegleń who did not subscribe to Peirce's interpretation, adopted instead the concept proposed

³ Ibidem, 54.

⁴ Ibidem, 55.

by Paul Ricoeur, where metaphor is discussed as a symbolic as well as a figurative sign.

The matter is worth analysing from both perspectives, as proposed by the two cited classics. They consider the status of the respective semantic categories and subject-object relations emerging in a metaphorical structure as sign, phrase, and language. In particular, they discuss the categories comprised within a metaphor, including reference, name-referent relations, referring, domains of name/term, denoting-connoting relations, meaning, interpretant, etc.

Peirce and Ricoeur on Metaphor

In his concept of metaphor as an iconic sign, Charles S. Peirce concludes that a metaphor is a type of sign with a triadic structure, where (1) the *object* to which it pertains and which it represents is (2) presented in a certain way, as “something else”, its meaning, or more specifically (an American logician’s term) its *interpretant* established in relation to (3) a general *thought, an idea*, which ultimately determines the specific representation of the object by the metaphorical sign in question. As viewed by Peirce, this property is characteristic of all types of signs. “Namely, a sign is something, *A*, which brings something, *B*, its *interpretant* sign determined or created by it, into the same sort of correspondence with something, *C*, its *object*, as that in which itself stands to *C*”.⁵ A metaphor is a sign which has its interpretant resulting from a similarity it recognizes and takes advantage of by relying on the resemblance of objects in terms of a certain general thought (concept). In other words, a metaphor is a sign that recognizes not only an initial resemblance between two domains of objects, but also the similarity of their structural elements, functions and results, referring to them in parallel, i.e. thorough mutual reference, always in some respect, thus establishing a new cognitive perspective. Peirce describes this triadic structure of a metaphorical sign in its function of *representing* something (i.e. similarity of objects) through something else (signs) as follows: “metaphors represent the representative character of an object representing a parallelism in something else”.⁶ A metaphorical sign is thus the representation of its objects as they are both similar in “something else”, which, as observed by the logician, enhances the metaphor’s cognitive value. In summary, Peircean metaphor, due to its creative character, is able to create its own symbolic referent (i.e. target domain in the latter, cognitive linguistics’

⁵ Charles S. Peirce, *Carnegie Institution Correspondence*, 1902, NEM 4: 20–21.

⁶ Idem, *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*, ed. N. Houser, Ch. Kloesel, vol. 2 (Bloomington–Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998), 277.

terminology) which consists of similar connoted elements metaphorically unified in the target domain.

In turn, Paul Ricoeur, when referring to the relational theory of metaphor, points to the contextual understanding of metaphorical meanings which is dependent on the users' cognitive competence. In this sense, his semantic analyses are related to pragmatics without which the understanding of a metaphor cannot be complete. Metaphor treated as a linguistic utterance (rather than merely Peirce's iconic sign) is a phraseme which entails not only replacement of literal expressions and phrases with metaphorical ones (as per Aristotle's concept) but also, indeed primarily, replacement of the meanings thereof, establishing a new, general meaning of the metaphorical statement as a whole. Ricoeur writes: "[W]e can say that the metaphor holds together within one simple meaning two different missing parts of different contexts of this meaning. Thus, we are not dealing any longer with a simple transfer of words, but with the commerce between thoughts, that is, a transaction between contexts. If metaphor is a competence, a talent, then it is a talent of thinking. Rhetoric is just the reflection and translation of the talent into a distinct body of knowledge".⁷ The formation, communication and receipt of metaphors is a process in which semantic modification takes place not only due to linguistic manipulation and enrichment of meaning, but also through the linguistic and communicational abilities of the participating subjects – the originators, recipients and interpreters of the metaphor. The transactional character of establishing new metaphorical meanings is closely related to the rhetorical and communicational character of activities through which the significant metaphor emerges. This way, the semantics of metaphor as portrayed by Ricoeur is, through association with classical rhetoric, correlated to pragmatics.

The Interactive Semantics of Metaphor

Important solutions in terms of the semantics of metaphor were proposed under the relational (interactive) theory of metaphor whose preliminary outline was developed by Ian A. Richards. In his rejection of the Aristotelean comparison (substitutive) theory of metaphor (under which metaphor entails substitution of a simple word/utterance with another, more complex one), Richards proposed that the essence of the metaphoric character of language ought to be sought in the creative and active *relationship* between the general expression (i.e. tenor,

⁷ Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 80.

target) and the specific expression (i.e. vehicle, source). Their mutual relations (interactions) entail a significant modification to their meanings. For instance, the metaphor "time is a river" adds new meanings to the characterisation of its main target through a semantic interaction with the elements of the source domain; the qualities of the stipulated source (e.g. fluidity, dynamism but also a certain persistence) are transposed onto the characteristics of the primary subject, thus attributing new sense and meanings thereto (e.g. the single-directionality of time without any direct intervals). "In the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or perhaps, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction".⁸ Under the interactive theory of metaphor, as well as other concepts drawing upon the same, the main focus is placed on the cognitive function of metaphorical utterances, be it in colloquial, scientific, literary or poetic contexts, which stems from the semantic properties inherent to every linguistic utterance, metaphors included. Due to the above, one could therefore suggest the existence of interactive metaphor semantics. The new meaning of the metaphor's primary subject emerges from confrontation with the meanings of terms derived from the source domain, some of which may potentially carry different, mutually exclusive or even contradictory meanings. The diversity of such meanings does not impede the establishment of the new metaphorical meaning, indeed the very cognitive and persuasive potential thereof may actually stem from the same.

Building upon the interactive theory, Max Black approaches the fundamentally semantic dimension of metaphor by accentuating its performative aspect – the creative character of *metaphorical utterances* rather than merely phrasemes. He also acknowledges the value of analyses pertaining to the cultural context of metaphor. Metaphor emerges in the act of utterance wherein the speaker or author modifies the literal meaning of the expressions used, thus conveying new meanings to his or her listener or reader. New metaphorical meanings emerge from the conjunction – by way of connotations and associations which constitute a kind of interaction between the two domains under the relational model of metaphor – of meanings from the source domain (to which Black refers as the "secondary subject") with the level of the target domain ("primary subject"), often through deliberate opposition or even contradiction. A metaphorical utterance, despite its departure from grammatical and logical rules, offers a considerable cognitive potential. "The metaphorical utterance works by 'projecting upon' the primary subject a set of 'associated implications', comprised in the implicative complex, that are

⁸ Ian A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), 93.

predicable of the secondary subject".⁹ It requires cognitive activity on both sides, in particular the linguistic capacity to create and recognise the old (literal) and new (metaphorical) meanings. Through such interaction, new "semantic content" (or as Black calls it "metaphoric-theme") emerges and starts to function as a set of newly established meanings, independent (objective) of the original meanings of the respective expressions and phrases from which it is derived. "[S]emantic content can be described, referred to, and discussed at any time: consequently, what by definition seems to be subjective, as produced by particular speaker or thinker, has an *import*, as one might say, that is sufficiently stable or objective – in spite of violating the background conventions to be available for subsequent analysis, interpretation, and criticism".¹⁰ Every creative metaphor opens new cognitive perspectives, in its semantically innovative content it refers to a broad model (understood linguistically) of its particular meanings. "Every implication-complex supported by a metaphor's secondary subject (...) is a *model* of the ascriptions imputed to the primary subject".¹¹ The metaphor is "the tip of a submerged model". Its understanding, as concluded by Black, is conditional upon the sociocultural context of the metaphorical utterance which contributes to certain significant elements of its semantic value.

The Semantics and Pragmatics of Metaphor

Irena Bellert proposes considering metaphor as a linguistic *symbol* belonging to the category of sentence formed from expressions (names) and phrasemes constructed in accordance with specific syntactic and semantic principles. A metaphorical sentence from which a metaphorical text is created displays all the characteristics of a linguistic expression, as defined in the context of semiotics and formal logic. Metaphor is a statement with a propositional context within which one can distinguish between its *intension* and a certain quality of the sentence on the one hand, and *extension* determining the scope of name/sentence, i.e. the scope of designates thereof, on the other. It is also a language utterance formulated with the intention of communicating a certain state of affairs in a non-literal, parabolical, i.e. distinctly metaphorical manner. The semantic analysis of metaphor as a symbol entails, firstly, the identification of the *intension* of a metaphorical expression reflected in those traits of the source domain that are perceived as the most sig-

⁹ Max Black, "More about Metaphor", in: *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. A. Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 28.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, 40.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, 30.

nificant and thus determine the *sense* of the utterance; intension of metaphorical symbol is its propositional content, in other words, a content of belief one can have about declared feature of the objects in the source domain. Secondly, as proposed by Bellert, a metaphor understood as a sentence/text is also characterised by specific extension, i.e. the target scope of linguistic application. The extension of metaphor comprises a set of an infinite number of actual and potential states of affairs. The meaning of a metaphor is in turn a class of consequences derived from its intension, in other words, class of inferences one can derive from the propositional content of the metaphor's intension.

In actual terms, a metaphorical text contains a number of hypothetical *conjectures* created by the author and interpreted by the recipient of the metaphor. Metaphors also allow for the existence of counterfactual states of affairs which have to be, nevertheless, somehow adjusted. Bellert suggests that analysis of a metaphorical text should be conducted in accordance with the principles of, as she herself metaphorically puts it, Sherlock Holmes' *interpretation*. This means searching for the sense of a metaphorical sentence/text beyond the contradiction which often stems directly from its extension but is not of the most crucial importance. The extension of a metaphor with contradictory literary interpretation is in fact an empty set. Bellert's interpretation assumes elaboration on the meanings and sense of the intensional qualities emphasized in the source domain of the metaphorical text. It is therefore necessary to identify the subset of possible and non-contradictory traits of the respective states of affairs, which will attribute a particular sense and cognitive positive value to the metaphor. "Non literal interpretation of metaphorical text demands then (...) selection of a certain non contradictory subset from the contradictory (in a set theory meaning) sum of the two sets".¹² The same refers to a subset that would: (1) be non-contradictory, i.e. having an explicit extension; (2) convey *new* correlations between propositions and their contents, therefore constituting a set of conclusions (assumptions) stemming from none of the existing, conventional interpretations; and (3) include in its extension some *partial* reference to the real world, or in other words, at least one intentional judgement pertaining to a quality of the source domain must be true. "One cannot create a successful metaphor which would say nothing true about the world or human beings, their feelings, experiences etc."¹³ In this case the reference of metaphor is an actual or potential state of affairs to which the user of

¹² Irena Bellert, "Interpretacja tekstów metaforycznych metodą Sherlocka Holmesa: Twórcze użycie znaków językowych" ["Interpretation of the Metaphorical Texts through the Sherlock Holmes' Method: Creative Use of the Linguistic Signs"], *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXXV, 2 (1984): 298.

¹³ *Ibidem*.

the same intends to refer in truth. The altered and extended reference of metaphor is not constant, it fluctuates depending on the text itself and is influenced by its cultural context. The Sherlock Holmes method of interpreting metaphors, as proposed by Bellert, ultimately suggests a far greater complexity of semantic phenomena within the sphere of metaphorical texts than is usually assumed, as well as their considerably greater pragmatic depth.

Certain conclusions valuable in developing the semantics of metaphor can be derived from literature studies and cultural studies, where metaphor is treated as more than merely a logical and grammatical pattern of linguistic expression or stylistic condition of prosaic or poetic value. Henryk Markiewicz proposes a definition of metaphor understood as *denotative* as well as *connotative peripheral seme*, i.e. the minimal linguistic meaning of any metaphorical utterance. The value of metaphor is expressed by way of free and creative conjunction within its structure between particular qualities of things or events, mainly through confrontation and opposition. As observed by Markiewicz, said process can be guided either by obligatory (conventional) or facultative (more creative) principles. The meaning of a metaphor's primary subject is enriched predominantly by confronting it with the qualities of the source subject, which allows the creation of confrontational and relevant metaphors. The vehicle, in respect to a target, is more privileged and superior in the process of indicating a set of semes becoming a reality through a metaphor".¹⁴ Within a metaphorical seme, meaning is created and communicated between users of a metaphor as part of a sophisticated game undertaken at the level of semantic changes to the source domain. The process takes place in "a field of semiotic community", in the course of active and creative interaction between elements derived from the two objective domains. Thus, the metaphor benefits from better stylistic and persuasive quality, as well as greater cognitive value. Under certain conditions it can become a "bold metaphor" in which despite (or possibly due to) the narrowing of the semiotic field, we observe that although the facultative connotative semes decrease in frequency, they simultaneously gain considerably greater value in terms of not only the discovered but also created meaning.

¹⁴ Henryk Markiewicz, "Uwagi o semantyce i budowie metafory" ["Remarks on Semantics and Construction of the Metaphor"], in: Henryk Markiewicz, *Wymiary dzieła literackiego* [*Dimensions of the Literary Work*] (Kraków–Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984), 48.

Contradiction within the Limits of Metaphor

Contradiction is one of the most commonly discussed properties of metaphorical utterances. Metaphor in expressions derived both from the source and target domains refers to objects and their qualities which are either contradictory or, at the very least, mutually exclusive; these include phrases such as “cold as fire” or “cunning as a fox” whose literal objects are ontologically either contradictory or ambiguous. Literal interpretation of a metaphorical expression leaves us with a sentence that is intrinsically inconsistent or (if considered from the grammatical and stylistic perspective) linguistically incorrect. The thus understood *contradictory* character of metaphors – in logical, ontological, or grammatical terms – is not considered a cognitive flaw, in fact many researchers interpret the same as a considerable advantage. Self-contradiction of metaphorical utterances would constitute a disadvantage, should it denote objects and qualities that are exclusively inconsistent, fully incompatible with the ontology of the actual or a potentially possible world. However, if a metaphor primarily emphasises their *connotative* function, i.e. points towards certain *interpretable* qualities, the contradiction proves to be superficial while at the same time serving desirable cognitive and heuristic functions.

Numerous semioticians, logicians, and epistemologists have commented on these issues in their studies on the semantics of metaphor. They usually propose abandoning the question of contradiction in favour of other ontological and logical qualities of objects and traits emphasised by metaphorical utterances. Nelson Goodman perceives metaphorical self-contradiction (particularly in the context of literature and poetry) as fundamentally desirable and describes the same as the “surprising quality of metaphor”. “[G]ood metaphor is satisfying because it is surprising”, both for the author and the recipient.¹⁵ It is therefore cognitively significant as well as stylistically interesting. A similar understanding of metaphorical contradiction is expressed by Monroe Beardsley.¹⁶ He points to a “tension that is difficult to describe or analyse between the meaning and sense” of expressions comprised in a metaphorical structure. The essence and cognitive goal of metaphor is to modify the meaning of certain key expressions, which is made possible by the seemingly contradictory conjunction of key traits and qualities; in itself, it is not the most important element but when read literally, it invokes a sense of

¹⁵ Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art* (Indianapolis–New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968), 79.

¹⁶ Monroe Beardsley, “Metaphor”, in: *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. P. Edwards, vol. 5 (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 284–289.

exactly such contradiction. Contradiction does not hinder the analysis of the cogni-logical “tension” between specific meaning and the general sense of a metaphor; when analysing metaphors, it is important to correctly identify and attribute its connotative features, concludes Beardsley. “[A] metaphorical attribution is not merely an odd conjunction, for it is intelligible. In nonsense combinations, the oddity is there, but the opening-up of meaning is not”.¹⁷ What matters more than contradiction or paradox of a metaphorical structure is the novelty of the meaning it offers. A metaphor can be derived from logical contradiction, even assume the same for strictly stylistic and rhetorical reasons, but still steer clear of implying contradictory cognitive effects.

Paul Ricoeur proposes a far broader perception of the contradiction in the context of metaphorical semantics when he approaches the same not from the level of contradictory expressions but rather the sense of the metaphorical utterance taken as a whole. Even if contradiction does appear at the level of individual phrases (although in such a case incompatibility seems to be a more accurate word), it is absent in the metaphorical utterance which remains consistent despite its apparent ambiguity or paradox. A metaphor is not merely a linguistic phrase but also, most of all in fact, a *statement* in a discourse (an element of “parole” as understood by Ferdinand de Saussure) and is therefore subject to the rules of not only logic (which exclude contradiction) but also pragmatism. One of the pragmatic rules applicable to the creation and interpretation of metaphors is, in Ricoeur’s opinion, the competent, creative *modification* of meanings which he describes as “innovative interpretation”. This entails, among other elements, transforming a blatantly contradictory statement into one that acquires a new, less absurd meaning. “Metaphorical interpretation consists in converting an urgent self-destructive inconsistency into a meaningful inconsistency. (...) Thus, metaphor appears as an answer to a certain lack of consistency in a literally interpreted statement. It would be better to call this discrepancy – to use more convenient and comprehensible expression than inconsistency or absurdity – ‘semantic inappropriateness’”.¹⁸ It is not the act of altering the meanings of phrases themselves, but rather of interpreting utterances in their entirety; consequently, the semantics of metaphor is linked to its pragmatics. The role of pragmatic analysis of metaphorical speech and discourse is considerably more important than its grammatical, stylistic or rhetorical analysis wherein a contradiction would indeed constitute a theoretical and practical hurdle.

¹⁷ Ibidem, 285.

¹⁸ Paul Ricoeur, “Biblical Hermeneutics”, *Semeia* 4 (1975): 78

Conclusions

Studies on the semantic character of not just metaphorical expressions as such (analysed in terms of grammar, syntax, or style) but also metaphorical utterances (constituting discourse elements) suggest the applicability in such analyses of notions and categories derived from semiotics, e.g. reference, denotation and connotation, intension and extension, or meaning. Individual phrases as well as entire metaphorical phrasemes create referential connections not merely to objects as such but rather to the innovatively described and interpreted qualities of things, processes, and events which are reflected both in the source domain and the target domain of any metaphor. The connotative character of such expressions outweighs their denotative aspect as every metaphor emphasises qualities and traits of objects and phenomena which, if read literally, would suggest either linguistic incorrectness of the metaphorical utterance or ontologically troublesome contradictory, or at least paradoxical, character thereof. However, most semioticians (Black, Ricoeur, Bellert, Markiewicz) suggest approaching contradiction within a metaphorical expression or utterance as a matter of epistemological and pragmatic significance. It is suggested that a metaphorical utterance, through its structure of conjugation and confrontation of connotative traits within the source domain, creates a cognitively significant effect in the context of the target domain, where although the exclusive or paradoxical qualities of new phenomena may be reflected, new cognitive perspectives are simultaneously revealed. The basis for this process is found in the operation of modifying and interpreting the meanings of the connotated qualities of things and phenomena appearing in seemingly self-contradictory metaphors, also by accounting for their linguistic and paralinguistic contexts. Interpreted in this way, metaphor serves important functions that are not only stylistic and persuasive but also cognitive and prognostic in nature; its semantics is closely related to epistemology and pragmatics.

Bibliography

- Beardsley Monroe. 1967. "Metaphor". In: *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. P. Edwards. Vol. 5. 284–289. New York: Macmillan.
- Bellert Irena. 1984. "Interpretacja tekstów metaforycznych metodą Sherlocka Holmesa: Twórcze użycie znaków językowych" ["Interpretation of the Metaphorical Texts through the Sherlock Holmes' Method: Creative Use of the Linguistic Signs"], *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXXV, 2: 287–311.

- Będkowski Marcin. 2018. "Kilka uwag w sprawie metaforyczności zdań nie-reistycznych. Na marginesie rozważań Jerzego Pelca i Mariana Przełęckiego" ["Some Remarks on Metaphoricity of Non-Reistic Sentences: On Margins of Jerzy Pelc and Marian Przełęcki's Considerations"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria* 27, 2 (106): 185–203.
- Black Max. 1993. "More about Metaphor". In: *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. A. Ortony. 19–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman Nelson. 1968. *Languages of Art*. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merril.
- Markiewicz Henryk. 1984. "Uwagi o semantyce i budowie metafory" ["Remarks on Semantics and Construction of the Metaphor"]. In: Henryk Markiewicz. *Wymiary dzieła literackiego [Dimensions of the Literary Work]*. 43–59. Kraków–Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Peirce Charles S. 1902. *Carnegie Institution Correspondence*, NEM 4: 20–21.
- Peirce Charles S. 1998. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Ed. N. Houser, Ch. Kloesel. Vol. 2. Bloomington–Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Pelc Jerzy. 1964. "Zastosowanie funkcji semantycznych do analizy pojęcia metafory" ["Usage of Semantic Functions into Analyses of the Metaphor Concept"]. In: Jerzy Pelc. *Rozprawy logiczne: Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora Kazimierza Ajdukiewicza* ["Logical Considerations"], 123–153. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Pelc Jerzy. 1971. *O użyciu wyrażen [On the Usage of Expressions]*. Wrocław: Ossolineum. Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne.
- Przełęcki Marian. 1970. "O metaforze w filozofii" ["On Metaphor in Philosophy"]. In: *Moralność i społeczeństwo: Księga jubileuszowa Marii Ossowskiej [Morality and Society]*. 9–26. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Reddy Michael. 1983. "Semantyczne ujęcia metafory" ["Semantic Aspect of Metaphor"]. *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXXIV, 2: 307–320.
- Ricoeur Paul. 1975. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press.
- Ricoeur Paul. 1975. "Biblical Hermeneutics". *Semeia* 4.
- Richards Ian A. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Srzednicki Jan. 1993. "O metaforach" ["On Metaphors"]. In: Jan Srzednicki. *Kłopoty pojęciowe [Troubles with Concepts]*. 193–205. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Żegleń Urszula. 2000. *Wprowadzenie do semiotyki teoretycznej i semiotyki kultury [Introduction to Theoretical Semantics and Cultural Semantics]*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

Summary

The article addresses the semantic aspect of metaphor, formulated on the basis of Ch. Peirce's classification of signs and I. Richard, M. Black, and P. Ricoeur's relational theory of metaphor, which most researchers analysing the referential character of metaphors tend to invoke. In particular, the text considers the problem of the structure of metaphorical phrasemes and parabolic utterances which contain expressions that are either contradictory or refer to fictional objects and events. Based on the concepts of H. Markiewicz, I. Bellert, and M. Beardsley, the author suggests a possible solution to the problem of contradiction in metaphor. Furthermore, the article discusses the relationship between the semantic and pragmatic aspects of metaphors as utterances displaying both persuasive and cognitive (revealing, prognostic) character.

Keywords: metaphor, semantics of metaphor, reference, meaning, connotation, intension of metaphor, pragmatics of metaphor

Streszczenie

Na czym polega semantyczna specyfika metafory?

W artykule analizowany jest problem semantycznego aspektu metafory w oparciu o klasyfikację znaków Ch. Peirce'a oraz relacyjną teorię metafory I. Richarda, M. Blacka i P. Ricoeura, do których odnosi się większość badaczy analizujących referencyjny charakter metafory. W szczególności opisany jest problem struktury metaforycznych zwrotów językowych, w których funkcjonują wyrażenia albo sprzeczne, albo odnoszące się do fikcyjnych obiektów i zdarzeń. W oparciu o koncepcje H. Markiewicza, I. Bellerta i M. Beardsleya ukazany jest związek semantycznych zagadnień metafory z jej pragmatycznym aspektem jako wypowiedzi o poznawczym i perswazyjnym charakterze.

Słowa kluczowe: metafora, semantyka metafory, referencja, znaczenie, intensjonalne cechy metafory, pragmatyka metafory