

Review of: "Grice's Café – Coffee, cream, and metaphor comprehension"

Ella Wehrmeyer¹

¹ North West University South Africa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A thought-provoking paper considering the topic from various angles. It provides a thorough philosophical, mathematical and linguistic analysis of the basic tenets of Grice's metaphor model, which the author supports by reporting empirical data on metaphor processing. (I hope the author soon publishes his own empirical findings in the near future.) I was impressed by the literature consulted, covering both 'sides' of the discussion. Thus on the whole, I recommend the article for publication. I think it fills a much-needed niche and counter-argument to the propositions of Relevance Theory.

However I do have some concerns. First, and probably most importantly, I find myself saying "so what?" The author needs to make clear what the contributions of his paper are, and whom they will benefit, especially in the light of the multidisciplinary insights represented in the paper. It seems that the paper is written for a very narrow academic audience (psycholinguists with adequate grasp of philosophical and mathematical principles?) and therefore its contributions to the broader academic community (linguists, translators) need to be made more explicit. Second, there is just too much relegated to the end-notes. In particular, because of the popularity of Relevance Theory, I think the author's contributions to critiquing their tenets justifies tackling them head-on in the text, and that everything that needs to be said should be said there. The author's argument and article structure is logical, but requires effort to follow, in which case detours offered by bulky end-notes are distracting. Fourth, the language does need some editing (for example, "it's" only means "it is" and does not denote the possessive). The style also varies from very colloquial to very formal, and I also recommend that the author choose a style that is appropriate for his intended audience.

In all fairness, Grice developed his metaphor theory way back in 1975, in the light of the literary theory of his period, and therefore could not be expected to have the current depth of insight that we have. (For example, this could be stated in the paragraph where you say "—of course, we can't expect him to have covered everything!") [Note to the general editor - it would be lovely if the manuscript lines could be numbered.] I think this needs to be stated in the beginning of the chapter, and some of the statements mitigated in this respect. For example, the comment "A third problem is the vagueness of Grice's account of figuration more generally." This is, in our post-postmodern eyes, true. But what was there back in 1975? I suggest adding a short contextualization of Grice's thoughts in the light of the contemporary literary theory of his time.

The author notes that "Elsewhere. Author (Year) has developed a broadly Gricean project with these intuitive structures in mind." Accepting this pending publication, it would nevertheless be good for the author, in his conclusion, to summarize for readers the key points of his 'adapted' Gricean model. (Alternatively, propose his own model based partially on Grice and

others.) One can see an alternative model developing in the arguments, and the author should seize the opportunity to leave the reader with at least a proposed model, if not a robust theory.