

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

Michael Pleyer¹

¹ Nicolaus Copernicus University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A very interesting contribution to the study of Grice, pragmatics and metaphor. The main argument, that Grice did not present a model of metaphor processing but specified processes that at some level must happen is convincing. Taking these specifications and trying to integrate them into a broadly Gricean (properly understood model) is also an intriguing research idea.

However, although the articles surveys an impressive range of psycholinguistic literature, there are some oversights that would help deepen the discussion. One particular paper that should be integrated is

Holyoak, K. J., & Stamenković, D. (2018). Metaphor comprehension: A critical review of theories and evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(6), 641. Indeed, it would be interesting to see how the author's categorization of metaphor models fits in the Holyoak & Stamenkovic's distinction of the "Analogy Position", the "Categorization Position" and the "Conceptual Mapping Position". They also discuss a wealth of neural evidence that might be fruitfully integrated into the author's discussion, including further meta-analyses such as

Bohrn, I. C., Altmann, U., & Jacobs, A. M. (2012). Looking at the brains behind figurative language—A quantitative meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies on metaphor, idiom, and irony processing. *Neuropsychologia*, 50, 2669–2683.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.07.021>

Rapp, A. M., Mutschler, D. E., & Erb, M. (2012). Where in the brain is nonliteral language? A coordinate-based meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. *NeuroImage*, 63, 600–610.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.06.022>

One further important point that Holyoak & Stamenkovic (2018) point out is that most studies on the processing of metaphor have dealt with simple nominal metaphors, so that it might indeed be

I was also somewhat surprised that Pylyshyn (1984) was cited, but that there was no reference to the different levels of explanation that Pylyshyn (1984) and most influentially Marr (1982) talk about and which have inspired a breadth of literature on the topic in cognitive science and the philosophy of mind. It seems that the arguments made by the author should be related to these discussions.

In this context, it would probably make sense to at least briefly discuss the Cognitive Linguistic contribution to the study of metaphor more explicitly, especially the work of Zoltán Kövecses on the one hand and the relation of embodiment and metaphor on the other.

Some more comments:

Generally, there are quite a number of typos/mistakes as well as some issues with clarity:

“A conversational implicature are carried by the saying of what is said; Grice tells us speakers do not say a metaphor” → needs to be rephrased. As does the entire first footnote as it does not really make the underlying concepts clear enough.

Footnote 3, without any references or some exemplary quotes it's difficult to know whether the claim that Grice anticipated empirical data allegedly undermining his views is warranted or speculative.

Footnote 5: what → that

in anyway → in any way

all it's details → all its details

“and that and”

Footnote 11: Probably some reference should be made to

Grady, J. E., Oakley, T., & Coulson, S. (1999). Blending and metaphor. In G. Steen & R. Gibbs (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 101-124). John Benjamins.

Who popularized the “this butcher is a surgeon” metaphor as an interesting case for linguistic analyses.

Overall, the text might have too much footnotes, with a total of 46 for a comparatively short text. The author might think about whether some information in the footnote can be integrated into the main text when important or in other cases whether some footnotes can be removed.