

The “Embedding Metaphor”.

The Emotional and Sensitive Dimensions of Zygmunt Bauman’s Scientifical Metaphors

Ion Cosmovici^{*iv}

*Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Bucharest,
Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

This article analyses Zygmunt Bauman’s contribution, through the technique of the metaphoric writing, to finding some more innovative ways into the knowledge of the social and political contemporary phenomena. By analyzing eight of his writings, approaching especially the issue of globalization and its effects, the article highlights a complementary perspective to the ones already established, on the role of the metaphor in the social science; thus, we have identified in Bauman’s work a model of the „embedding metaphor”, a sort of metaphoric writing where the metaphor blends with the text and generates an original scientific discourse, able to capture the emotions and the sensitivity existing at the common sense level and coagulate them as knowledge.

Keywords: metaphor, zygmunt bauman, epistemology

^{iv} Corresponding author: Ion Cosmovici, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Bucharest, Panduri 90, Sector 5, 050663, Bucharest, Romania. Email: ioncosmovici@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

The subject of metaphor as a scientific instrument first appears in the second half of the 20th century, by progressively acknowledging the importance of the cognitive mechanisms encapsulated in the way a metaphor works; in the 80's, it became the subject of intense research, starting with the dissemination of Ricoeur's findings (Ricoeur, 1975) and also George Lakoff's writings on the conceptual metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1985, Lakoff 2004). Nevertheless, after 2000, once with Bauman, but also with other contemporary authors, the metaphor becomes more than a semantic issue or a matter of philosophy of science: it turns out to be a precise methodological response to the current methodological impasse, that of the conceptual mapping of the contemporary social and political world.

Bauman's metaphors have been dealt with in numerous articles and chapters, by authors who specialized in his work (Beilharz, 2000; Tester, 2004; Blackshaw, 2005; Elliott, 2007; Jacobsen, Poder, 2008; Davis 2010, 2013) and after 2010 they became a subject matter of intense exploration and dissemination, for instance in Davis (Davis, 2013) and in other contributions by Bauman himself, on this issue (Bauman, 2013, Bauman, 2016, Davis, 2013). Bauman's own perspective over metaphors, in the introductory chapter „Blurring Genres” to the Mark Davis's work on the Bauman's metaphors, is placed under the sign of a debate: „Science versus Art.” For Bauman, „metaphors come into their own whenever it comes to Gregory Bateson's *tertiary learning* situation: the need to dissemble the established conceptual network too dense or rare to capture novel phenomena in a new cognitive frame to make salient their otherwise unnoticeable traits” (Davis, 2013: 19).

On the other hand, just like many other authors in philosophy of science, Bauman considers that metaphors are a useful tool in advancing knowledge: „In the case of an unfamiliar experience which needs an adequate conceptual net to catch and examine it, metaphors render an enormously important service. They serve imagination and comprehension. They are the indispensable scaffoldings for imagination and perhaps the most effective tools of comprehension.” (Bauman with Jacobsen and Tester, 2013: 89). Bauman then recalls the permanent tendency of science to distinguish and separate itself from commonsensical knowledge, and the result is, for a good part of the academics and scientists, the elimination of metaphors (Bauman with Jacobsen and Tester, 2013: 85). Nevertheless,

Bauman notices, at the end of his contribution on metaphors in *What use is sociology*, that such an attitude started to be loosened and he proposes as an example the scientific model described by Upham in his article, „*Is economics scientific? Is science scientific?*” The latter uses Nancy Cartright's description of nature as „*tending to a wild profusion*” (Upham, 2005). Upham suggests that we should follow Cartright's prompt to exuberantly build, just like nature does, various (scientific) models to various (cognitive) purposes – namely what metaphors do, since no singular model fully serves to all purposes at once (Bauman with Jacobsen and Tester, 2013: 96-97).

To Jacobsen, one of the specialists in Bauman, metaphors are only a small part of the way Bauman, in all his writings, „consciously dissolves such artificial oppositions and collapses them into a unique, distinct and humanistically inspired hybrid sociological voice and in his whole way of diagnosing society and describing the plight of people inhabiting it, his work often comes closer to the novel than to the conventional and often prosaic sociological exposition ((Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 20). For Jacobsen, metaphors are used by Bauman with the purpose of defamiliarizing the reader, an useful process, he says, since we live in a society „which no longer recognizes any alternative to itself and therefore feels absolved from the duty to examine, demonstrate, justify (let alone prove) the validity of its outspoken and tacit assumptions” (Bauman in Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 21). But more importantly, the defamiliarization and the figures of speech such as the metaphor „may open up new and previously unsuspected possibilities of living one's life with more selfawareness, more comprehension” (Bauman in Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 23).

Taking this to another level, one could say that Bauman's metaphors „are intended to make us see and think more clearly not only what *is* happening, but also what *could* happen. His metaphors make us reconsider the world around us. They are inherently *moral*,” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 22). To Tony Blackshaw, the metaphor is the kind of rhetorical tool Bauman uses to defamiliarize the familiar and to shed a new light to reality. In fact, the metaphor is that part of the language that allows Bauman to produce a hermeneutics. Here, Bauman closely follows Rorty's vision, who admits that metaphorization is vital in order to develop new ways of sociological thought, building the foundation for what might be 'language games', in Lyotard's own words (Blackshaw, 2005: 76).

We may see here that the theoretical perspective still remains the one that has been

developed in the second half of the 20th century, at least in what concerns the issues of imagination and creativity in the social sciences, from Mills to Nisbet. Still, what is it that Bauman is bringing anew, what is specific to his metaphors? And also, is there any – in the success of his work and in the influence its work has had – explanation for the new writing style for the social sciences that happened after 2000? A new perspective – and we could say, a complete one – of the role that metaphors had in science appeared once with the research and studies on globalization and on the social and political contemporary phenomena, that are rapidly changing. Epistemologically, the challenge is, nowadays, to find the adequate concepts to analyse and integrate these metamorphoses, as well as a new way of imagining the direction of that change that currently presents itself as a social and political crisis and as a civilisational change. In this context, Bauman becomes really interesting, for his writing manner, as well as for the kind of metaphors he proposes.

This article will develop a chapter of my doctoral thesis on Bauman's metaphors that are to be found in his theoretical analysis of globalization, where he suggests an interpretive model of the 'embedding' metaphor, thus completing the other interpretive models of the British sociologist's work. The said model is interesting for psychology as well as for sociology, since it refers to the way our current social sciences, faced with the rapidly changing reality of globalization, need to turn precisely towards individual psychology and its emotional state and afterwards, they should come back to rebuilding the link between scientific knowledge and the individual commonsense. Moreover, the theoretical perspective of the 90's, that showed how the big narratives are obsolete (in Lyotard, for instance) comes back again, in science, via a process by which the abstract concepts of science are overtaken, to what we may call a real 'bewitching of science'. Namely, by undergoing a scientific process that uses the creative potential of the metaphor to make a type of science that would capture more thoroughly and more carefully the whole complexity of the social reality.

From a methodological standpoint, in order to isolate, analyze and interpret the specificity of Bauman's metaphors as scientific instruments, I chose to study the way he builds the metaphors of globalization, in a series of eight writings from the 2000. (*Globalization, the Human Consequences; In Search of Politics; Liquid Modernity; Community. Seeking Safety in an Insecure World; Society Under Siege; Wasted Lives. Modernity and its Outcasts; Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty;*

Identity). While reading them, I proceeded to a classification of his metaphors in five main categories: the metaphors of the liquid modernity (the fundamental metaphors), the control metaphors, the exclusion metaphors, the metamorphosis metaphors and the metaphors of the political decay. Afterwards, I came across the global, medium/average and limited metaphors and some of the fundamental techniques through which Bauman's metaphors work. Thus, almost all are built on dichotomies (such as the vagabond vs. the tourist, liquid vs. solid, etc.) and are also based on a permanent reference to the classical concepts in sociology. But even deeper than that, the metaphors are entailing some internal order of the text, underpinning whole paragraphs and even chapters – and all my notes on the internal order of the scientific-metaphoric discourse of Bauman's evolves towards a model of the 'embedding metaphor' that I will describe then contextualize and in the end, discuss below.

The model of the „embedding metaphor“

I am starting from some of the Bauman's analysts' notes on the way his metaphors are integrating meanings and dimensions specific to human experience, but difficult to explain through abstract concepts, such as pain, cruelty, solidarity – won or lost –, loneliness, solitude and isolation. Indeed, saying about an individual that he is a 'marginal' or 'marginalized' person, although it rationally explains an intelligible phenomenon, does not convey the same meaning and does not carry the same emotional charge of the situation as if it would, if we were to use the concept 'waste' or say about that person had a 'wasted life'. The 'waste' metaphor comprises a sense of a cycle of treating human waste and also the political control of excess population and explains quite properly the emotional situation of those populations; it also explicites that situation in a sensitive fashion. Or even more so, to talk about the 'control over individuals' or 'social surveillance' doesn't have the same bearing as the '*Reconnaissance Battles*' or the '*Planetary Frontier-land*' metaphors by Bauman referring to the control over individuals in the new globalized spaces (Bauman, 2001: 87-121).

Indeed, for Bauman the metaphors help capturing more thoroughly the known object (Bauman in Davis, 2013: 19). So they constitute in a solution for the new cognitive framework, thus capturing new phenomena. For Jacobsen, „The main purpose of his metaphors, as the metaphors of many equally prominent sociologists, is to try to capture the intricate connections between social structure and lived experience and by proposing metaphorical labels

poetically and poignantly mirroring such lived experience from the vantage-point of those human beings being described” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 20). And for Jacobsen, „what is being attempted is not a fusion of the literary and the sociological for the sake of grandiloquence alone; rather Bauman is attempting a kind of *humanization through metaphor*. Put simply, Bauman uses metaphors as a device to recall us of our common humanity, as a mean of reawakening our sense of responsibility for the Other and of human possibility” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 21). Bauman’s metaphors „are inherently moral, they give voice to the voiceless, they recall us of our inescapable human and moral responsibility for ‘the Other’ and point to the hidden possibilities behind the immediately observable reality, to a world not yet closed down by mechanical models, mathematical reasoning or rational argument, to a world capable of being re-enchanted and transformed” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 23).

As for the analysis of the *Wasted lives*, „Bauman’s writing here is intuitive as it shows the horror of the dark underbelly of capitalism in the liquid modern age. The effects of those lives lived as a human waste come reeling off the pages, forcing the reader to think the unthinkable, and the writing leaves the reader as it intends, both breathless and bruised. Nothing in sociology comes more visceral than this, short of the actual physical involvement. And if we don’t want to see the terrible consequences of modernity in the lives of others, less fortunate than us, we are made to feel it through Bauman’s sociology. Through the blizzards of metaphors he forces us to do what we cannot do in real life – enter the world of the Other.” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 23)

For Jacobsen, the metaphors are never neutral, actually: „In his descriptions and diagnoses of the social world, Bauman unperturbed blends the ethical with the aesthetical and blurs the line between descriptive prose and evaluative or conjunctive diagnosis.” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 23). „Metaphors – as part of a variety of fictional or literary strategies – are not merely clinical, cognitive or conceptual devices at the disposal of a deceptive or imaginative writer; they contain a clear moral dimension – at times through counterfactual analyses of how the real world actually looks, they hint at how it may, could or should look like; at other times through describing how the world may, could or should look like, they hint at how it actually looks” (Jacobsen, Poder, 2008: 23). Bauman’s metaphors are based on a form of ‘structure of feeling’: „In Bauman’s hands, the hermeneutic ‘method’ is artistic and represents a clear challenge to the dominant

vision of the ‘natural science of the social’, not merely because it is concerned with the intuitive interpretation of the ‘structure of feeling’ in Raymond Williams’s sense, as opposed to focusing its critical gaze on the cause and effect of positivistic regularities. Also it emphasises that actions, events and social processes must be understood and interpreted from the standpoint of their subjective meaning for the actors under consideration and from the standpoint of their specific historical and cultural context” (Blackshaw, 2005: 61). For instance, the metaphor of the divorce between the nation-state and the power, in the age of globalization, integrates a long list of affective states (or social sensitive situations) such as embarrassment, displeasure, new problematic situations, emotional blockages, frustrations, that again, are not that easy to view or capture through a rational discourse using abstract notions such as conflict, negotiation, adversity, etc., as they would be if presented through the divorce metaphor.

As a consequence, we may notice that the fundamental methodological issue is not questioning the fact that metaphors could be or not a concept useful for science as an abstract notion. The novel path in analysis, a consistent and original one, opened by Bauman’s metaphors, refers to the ‘knowledge gain’ metaphors which are encapsulating and also to the way they do so. Beyond the mere assertion of the fact, metaphors function as a ‘fictional redescription of reality’ (Ricoeur, 1975: 11). We will try to isolate epistemologically what could metaphors bring new and supplementary in the contemporary knowledge of globalization’.

The issue of whether the metaphors have a capacity of making scientific sense is overcome: at this level we may observe metaphors and also have the ability to capture the supra-rational, extra-rational content, which usually is emotional, and sensitive, of a studied reality. So we get to the assertion that, in contemporaneity, precisely what earlier seemed to be the weakness of the metaphor, as a tool for any positivist science (namely what it was different and excessive in it, coming over the rational part some concept might explain) got to become interesting and therefore extremely useful for science.

Furthermore, the impact of the emotional states on the life of an individual comes to be more and more cited in the contemporary works that are not stemming from psychology. For instance, “modernity effectively involves the institutionalisation of doubt”, as the sociologist Anthony Giddens puts it in the conclusions of his *The Consequences of Modernity*

(Giddens, 1990: 176). Let's recall that Giddens' perspective on late modernity is built on binary concepts such as security vs. danger, trust vs. risks, since, for him, „modernity has a double-edged character” (Giddens, 1990: 10). Here we can see that a state that generates emotions, such as uncertainty, with its subordinated list of emotions – anxiety, rejection, fear or that specific type of fear Bauman, as well as Giddens or Beck constantly bring on, can be ‘institutionalized’. By reminding the degrading psychological effects the uncertainty brings, when habits and routines are missing, effects that both Giddens and Sennett wrote about, we are coming close to considering a sort of contemporaneity where the emotional states become of a paramount importance for the daily lives of individuals, and even condition or determine their daily lives (one can open here a long list to show that states such as *mobbing*, *burn-out*, social phobias, discrimination, harrasment, stress, anxiety, fearing risks and violence, anxiety fear of missing out and other rather emotional and/or psychological states or situations are not mere accidents in the lives of individuals, but rather become their main concern on the course of a classical social or political action.)

In this context, my thesis is that Bauman's metaphoric writing captures reality, which, in our daily lives, becomes reason as well as feeling, and his analysis clears this rather complex content of reality and updates it, through an instrument he uses deliberately and with a precise purpose – and that is the metaphorizing comment. Indeed, although it's not a non-intelligible area, the logic of emotions differs from the logic of actions that are rationally and piramidally structured. So it's necessary to completely describe the social and political reality with an instrument which is both cognitive and open to emotion and imagination – and that is, for Bauman, the metaphorizing comment, with a psychological content, referring to the interdependence between emotions, feelings and senses. ‘The institutionalization of feelings’ is a multiple-consequences assumption, because the thesis we may get to represents a taking over and an integration of emotions, alongside with the cognitive and explanatory-cognitive content of an action as a part of what happens to the individuals. This integration is an essential fieldwork. Sociologist Anthony Giddens notices, just like Ulrich Beck, the bleak nature of the contemporary world.

Furthermore, we should emphasize how, in each of Bauman's works that we have mentioned, those ‘psychological comments’ appear, in various

paragraphs, where Bauman involves himself in the text and uses the plural of the first person. This psychological comment areas are precisely the descriptive ones and the ones where he generates the conclusions of the implicit metaphor in that sub-chapter. In the light of the psychological comment, we can integrate widespread paragraphs from Bauman that could not have been integrated otherwise. In fact, the presence of this sort of paragraphs seemed to me for a long time more difficult to explain than the metaphors themselves, as the more unusual element in Bauman's texts.

Indeed, there are three type of recurrent paragraphs in Bauman's works. There's a classical discourse, with abstract concepts and without any ‘deviation’ from the standard vocabulary of the classical analytical discourse of theoretical sociology. Then there are the metaphorizing comment areas, either explicit, or implicit. Finally, there are the psychological comments.

This article does not allow for a long quotation of such paragraphs, therefore I will only quote one of them, which has the quality to clearly contain all three kinds of texts present in Bauman's work: the first paragraph introduces the ‘Cloakroom communities’ metaphor, the second one develops the idea psychologically, in first person writing and the third concludes in a non-metaphorical language and places the arguments in the context of a chapter in his work on Identity:

“Hence the growing demand for what may be called 'cloakroom communities' - conjured into being, if in apparition only, by hanging up individual troubles, as theatregoers do with their coats, in one room. Any hyped or shocking event may provide an occasion to do so: a new public enemy promoted to number one position, an exciting football contest, a particularly 'photo-opportune', clever or cruel crime, the first showing of a heavily hyped film, or a marriage, divorce or misfortune of a celebrity currently in the limelight. Cloakroom communities are patched together for the duration of the spectacle and promptly dismantled again once the spectators collect their coats from the hooks in the cloakroom. Their advantage over the 'genuine stuff' is precisely their short lifespan and the pettiness of the commitment required to join and (however briefly) enjoy them. But they differ from the dreamt-of warm and solidary community in the way the mass copies on sale in a high-street department store differ from the haute couture originals...”

When the quality lets you down or is not

available, you tend to seek redemption in quantity. If commitments, and so also commitments to any particular identity, are (as the expert quoted above authoritatively proclaimed) 'meaningless', you are inclined to swap one identity, chosen once and for all, for a 'network of connections'. Once you have done it, however, entering a commitment and making it secure appear even more difficult (and so more off-putting, even frightening) than before. You now miss the skills that would or at least could make it work. Being on the move, once a privilege and an achievement, is then no longer a matter of choice: it now becomes 'a must'. Keeping up the speed, once an exhilarating adventure, turns into an exhausting chore. Most importantly, that nasty uncertainty and that vexing confusion, which you hoped to have shaken off thanks to your speed, refuse to go. The facility for disengagement and termination-on-demand does not reduce the risks; it only distributes them, together with the anxieties they exhale, differently.

In our world of rampant 'individualization', identities are mixed blessings. They vacillate between a dream and a nightmare, and there is no telling when one will turn into the other. At most times the two liquid modern modalities of identity cohabit, even when located at different levels of consciousness. In a liquid modern setting of life, identities are perhaps the most common, most acute, most deeply felt and troublesome incarnations of ambivalence. This is, I would argue, why they are firmly placed at the very heart of liquid modern individuals' attention and perched at the top of their life agendas" (Bauman, 2004, 31).

Last, but not least, sensitivity refers to the ability of empathising with someone and is simultaneously the most adequate name for this type of metaphors in Bauman's, that the critics above mentioned coined as 'humanizing'. These, in fact, are not only cognitive, but sensitive as well and get to capture or encapsulate, by what they transmit more meaning (and a more personalized one) than the one pertaining to an abstract notion. Sensitivity combines two simultaneous aspects; that makes a sensitive concept to possess a certain kind of transparency: it takes over more from the object under scrutiny and in the same time leaves a lot more to be extracted by the reader.

The 'blending concepts' theory, coined by Fauconnier and Turner (Fauconnier, Turner, 2002) demonstrates that there can be a mixture that inseparably contains imagination as well as a cognitive meaning. Through this theory we could come closer to the core of the metaphor analysis by Bauman. Thus, first, the metaphors are inserted in the text; then, they

remain present, in the paragraph or the text they are circumscribed to. Bauman doesn't just write using metaphors – he doesn't just writes metaphorically, but when he does, the place and role of the metaphorization is very clear. There are metaphor-free paragraphs, then paragraphs where there's a metaphor and right away there are the consequences, thoroughly argued, of inserting such a metaphor.

On the other hand, Bauman's metaphorical text goes way beyond a simple explanation of the notion he targeted, and this is a proof of the fact that the purpose of using such a metaphor is to produce a sort of scientific discourse that otherwise wouldn't have existed, and not a more literary account of the subject. We could even say that the metaphor's main purpose is not circumscribed to the artistic or cognitive effect of the metaphor, but to the occasion it produces to assert and bring forward a number of arguments and observations on the social and political reality, which would not be fit otherwise in the text or at least not in that order. Those arguments, referring directly to the social reality, perfectly fit that place, but would not have found their place there, if the metaphor would not have been introduced. The novelty of such kind of analysis is that it is not an explanation or a clarification of something that has already been asserted, but it is not that clear yet.

In Bauman's work, the metaphor is not used to clarify an unclear concept, but colaterally accompanies and also occasions the apparition of a scientific discourse on the reality under scrutiny. Also, the metaphor, although is introduced through the mechanism of condensed analogy it usually contains, does not remain a mere analogy, but represents a direct, concrete statement regarding the social and political reality. Bauman's metaphor is an extra-knowledge, produced by the fact the metaphor had been stated, but for which the necessary concepts it needed to introduce the arguments it produces were not available, previously.

Therefore, Bauman's thought is not metaphorical because he would think metaphorically, instead of thinking in a rational, logical way. It is metaphorical in the sense that his analysis is circumscribed to a metaphor which generates a scientific discourse. More precisely, the debate and the novelty do not refer to the fact he would use non-abstract concepts, but reside in the type of academic discourse he generates by insertion of a metaphor and blending it with other correlated scientific categories. The metaphor is, in a sense, the dome or the apse that gathers around it a chain of concepts and statements that

are still circumscribed to the classical academic discourse.

Summarizing all the above arguments, I will suggest a reading of Bauman's scientific metaphors through an explanatory model. I shall use the image contained in the embedding dis-embedding metaphor used by Giddens in his analysis of the late modernity, where he talks about the dis-embedding of time and space in the construction of the modernity (Giddens, 90: 21). My thesis is that Bauman's metaphor re-embeds, in a non-abstract form, both the meaning of the concept it stands for and to which it implicitly refers, and its emotional, sensitive and psychological content network that the concept sends out, in reality.

If we were to graphically represent an 'embedded' metaphor, we could use a living cell, that contains a nucleus, namely, the 'old' term we're having in mind, and around it, the network of relations that define it in reality: not only the obvious relations, that can be rationally expressed correlated to the old concepts, but also the emotional and psychological system it constitutes in this contemporary period. This system is present in the shorter or longer paragraphs of Bauman's analysis, which is an analysis generated by the metaphor itself. The metaphor, in itself, will then be rather the outer shell, the cell's membrane, which holds together the old concept and the new relations, in a blending idea-text that is contained in Bauman's analyses. The metaphor does not exist in the absence of the metaphorizing text. The metaphor Bauman suggest is, therefore, his entire metaphorizing comment, which contains the metaphor, and also his entire organic discourse thus generated, a discourse that cannot be separated by it.

II. A discussion and analysis of the model

Let's analyse, in what follows, the consequences of introducing such a model of an 'embedded metaphor' in reading Bauman's texts.

1. 'The embedding metaphor' integrates the statements underlying that Bauman's goal is that of 're-embedding the contemporary life'. It is not about a certain type of comment about things that pertain to the common sense, but it's about assuming in the most faithful manner the individuals' entire experiences.

2. As an explanatory model, this one takes over, from Deleuze and Guattari's rhizome model, a certain characteristic: that of abandoning the pyramidal, hierarchical explanatory system (Deleuze et Guattari, 1984). Also, a metaphor's conceptual map is a much richer one, although much more unpredictable than that of an abstract type of concept.

3. Furthermore, the core of the discussion

goes to an epistemological level: here, it's not just about the metaphors as artistic instruments, but it's also about concepts that have the power of re-embedding the contemporary human experience. The metaphor's specific function of analyzing globalization goes beyond assuming the existence of some 'blurred genres'. So it points towards the ability of some metaphorical terms of encapsulating more meaning and of better organizing knowledge than some terms already in use or than other abstract terms.

4. The model integrates Ulrich Beck's statements on the 'zombie categories'. These are the un-dead categories, as the German sociologist puts it, since they cannot capture around them anything that's alive, the whole anatomy of the experience they name. The classical, abstract categories are deducted one from the other, through a logic at an abstract level, while a metaphor is invented by an entirely organic imagination, directly from the observed material of human experience. The metaphorization process contains in itself a tension between the element that exists and the one that does not exist yet, and thus, it supposes a huge freedom of thought (Ricoeur, 1975, 312). In the process of inventing a metaphor, the metaphor itself will emerge from observing the experience and from searching a name for it, not from comparing the terms that already exist among themselves. Bauman's 'tourists' did not appear a term within the logic of some pre-existing terms and have no connection whatsoever with terms such as 'elits', 'cosmopolit elits' or 'the nouveau rich'. Instead, they emerged directly from the observed experience. Nobody can invent a metaphor by carefully considering a concept which already exists. Searching for scientific metaphors requires a greater freedom of choice and of inventiveness, and it also awards such a freedom, thus bringing a sort of novelty very visible in the academic discourse.

5. Maybe the most important consequence of this 'embedded metaphor' is the fact that it integrates and explains the way Bauman's scientific discourse functions. The metaphors are organizing the scientific discourse around emotions and their psychological/sensitive content. In other words, it generates a discourse whose internal logic is different of that of a discourse organized, traditionally, in a rational manner. Nevertheless, even if its order is not the one some pyramidal argumentation would generate, it still is logic, a different one, driven by emotion and sensitivity. As a result, those paragraphs that some identify as literary references or as an organized essay are, in fact, part of a type of discourse that, in

Bauman's, is and remains scientific.

6. Another aspect of Bauman's metaphors: they are not 'high brow', nor in any case pompous ones. They are stemming from the most simple and common sources: vagabond, liquid, fish, caravans, camping. And this is not due to the fact that he would want to simplify his discourse or to make it more accessible, but it highlights the perspective within which these terms Bauman uses are not metaphors in the Aristotelian sense (a mere substitution of some terms), nor in a Ricoeurian sense (as Ricoeur considers that, out of respect for the metaphors' productivity, using one should be different than the literary use of the term it substitutes). The simplicity of Bauman's metaphors points towards the fact that the creativity of the terms he uses is not, in fact, a metaphorical creativity, but one that uses the qualities of the metaphor in order to produce some creativity at the level of the scientific thinking. This creativity would be beneficial for the reality that is being studied and not for the language itself. In other words, Bauman takes over some qualities implicit to the metaphorization process in order to institute a sort of analysis adapted to the context of a major socio-political change, such as globalization.

In fact, Bauman's metaphor is not used *stricto sensu* as a metaphor. It is, in fact, *seen as* mechanism, identified by Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1975: 10), which is embedded in the metaphor and is being used as a means of leaving behind the reductionism of some abstract concepts and of opening new ways of analyzing the reality in its entire complexity. The metaphor, in its classical sense, is an alternative for addressing an issue and speaking about it. A better way. Instead, Bauman's metaphor is not the alternative, but precisely the way. And given the fact that this type of metaphor is stretched on whole chapters and even in whole texts, it becomes clear that, for Bauman, the metaphor is not an alternative, but his method of designating, describing and developing his knowledge on the social and political reality. Of course, this underlines his faith in the fidelity and also durability of the concept-metaphor.

7. Another consequence is that Bauman does not only make a vulgarization work, in order to get the scientific knowledge familiar to the unfamiliarized reader. He also targets sociologists and social sciences practitioners, gathering, in his work, an 'updated version' of his notes as a sociologist. His work thus functions as an intermediary between the academic sociology and the experiences of those unfamiliarized with it, where the social sciences practitioners could

find some materials which are already processed and ranked by Bauman, according to his view on the interdisciplinary area he places himself – between psychology, sociology and political studies. Thus, for Bauman, his inclination towards common sense and dialogue with the real, day-to-day experience of people is only a method, one that does not alter his action and his thought as a sociologist. And this is only due to the role of 'game master' that situates himself at the crossroads between the social reality (the social games) and the scientific knowledge and is successful. The game – in this case, the effects of globalization – is rapidly changing to maintain the game's underlying scenario, the reference to the classical sociology and the permanent updating of sciences, without demoting itself as a mere esseistic writing.

III. Conclusions

a. For Jacques Derrida, the metaphors are transforming into concepts through a process called *usure*. Namely, in and with the time (Derrida, 1972). The issue the authors who are trying to map the political contemporaneity are facing is quite a contradictory one: the concepts themselves are the ones that become rapidly 'used'. In this context, the metaphors introduced to the scientific knowledge contribute to slowing down this process of "using", since they recover that area of micro-social and micro-political change, the emotions, the attitudes, the individual conduct and reactions. This area which seems to be less 'scientific' than that of the abstract concepts, but which, in fact, changes slowly than the pace of the evolution of technologies, of practices and even of institutions that are being caught in the globalization process.

b. Usually, finding new concepts in social sciences is achieved through the Top-Down or Down-Top model; in other words, either upon an inductive logic, or a deductive one. The logic of concept-metaphors is an integrative, circular one. The metaphors are not the result of a reasoning process, but that of carefully observing some social reality or another, a process which is concluded by an integration of the elements that were discovered, into a new, carefully chosen concept. Thus, metaphors encapsulate a new discovery and an integration of what has already been discovered. This simultaneous advancement of knowledge, which is contained in the creative tension of the metaphor, is a very useful tool when we talk about the unknown that the social and political contemporary world represents for the scientific knowledge. We may notice that, under the apparent

futility (the esthetical, non-scientific character) or simplicity (familiar, non-abstract term) of the metaphor, there's a hidden cognitive mechanism not only extremely complex, but also especially adequate for the impasse the social sciences face, when confronted with a reality which is partly unknown, complex and undergoing continuous change, such as globalization.

c. Theoretically, what's interesting in Bauman's demarche of building some concepts to encapsulate emotions – and also, in his analysis on the omnipresence and the impact of feelings in the liquid modernity – is the perspective of an emotional (or sensitive) modernity on one hand, and that of an 'emotional' science on the other (the latter is not to be confounded with the 'sociology of affects' and is not circumscribed to any 'democracy of emotions, in Giddens's sense). The underlying idea is that Bauman's liquid modernity can be read firstly as an emotional modernity, meaning a sensitive-psychological one. And the perspective of a conceptual fieldwork of a sensitive modernity allows for a positive re-reading of postmodernism and its period. In the eighties-nineties, postmodernism was built, in an argumented and justified manner, as a refusal of the omnipotence of the universalizing reason and that of the 'great narratives'. But, in retrospect, the duality postmodernism is disputing, between ontology and the dictatorship of the 'great plan', on one hand, and the individual experience of living, on the other, can now be read in another key. Namely, insisting on the 'small narratives' and on the fact that reason only cannot explain everything is a perspective heralding that there's something else, the society, other than its own reason and logic. This 'something else' seems to appear to be, as a result of analyzing Bauman's work, the sensitive-emotional area, an area of human experience that cannot be explained with the help of the terms and according to the method used to explain rational processes.

In other words, postmodernism (even in Bauman's work on the postmodern period) made room for an alternative place for the supremacy of the totalizing reason (in fact, the place of the nothingness, of nihilism and of relativization) and that new place is a fundamentally different one; the research hypothesis is that that space is one of the emotions, of sensitivity, and, especially in this respect, a space of the 'small narratives' contrived by Lyotard (Lyotard, 1979) and of 'personalization', according to Lipovetsky (Lipovetsky, 1993).

d. In the end, we can apply Bauman's own analysis to his own 'gardening' metaphor. The weeds of the social reality that Bauman studies are emotions,

fear, trustlessness, inhibitions, apathy, anxiety and anguish. The essence of the bureaucratic rationality, according to the underlying thesis in *Modernity and the Holocaust* is the weeding of these, their extraction and throwing away. But Bauman's metaphors do not 'weed' these emotions, they let them grow alongside with the logical, classical-abstract statements. In this respect, Bauman is not only postmodern, in Robert Venturi's terms (for whom harmony is a process of unplanned, unprogrammed accumulation at the end of which beauty appears – Venturi, Scott-Brown, Izenour, 1988) but he can also be framed within the recent perspective on the philosophy of science, mentioned above by Upham Pineas. For him, science should follow the action course of nature – characterized by a 'wild exuberance' (Upham, 2005). Bauman does not destroy emotions and everything common sense contains as individual reactions; he integrates them, and the result is the measure of the efforts – over 60 works, making Bauman one of the most influential contemporary thinkers, and his works, a vast pool of contemporary social sciences epistemology that only begins to be studied.

References

- Bauman, Z. (1999). *In search of politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Community. Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2002). *Society under siege*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Wasted lives. modernity and its outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity: conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z., Jacobsen, H.M., Tester, K. (2013). *What use is sociology? Conversations with Michael Hviid Jacobsen and Keith Tester*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Blackshaw, T. (2005). *Zygmunt Bauman*. London: Routledge.
- Davis, M. Tester, K. (eds). (2010). *Bauman's challenge: sociological issues for the 21st century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davis, M. (2013). *Liquid sociology: metaphor in Zygmunt Bauman's analysis on modernity*. London: Ashgate.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (1984). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*, Volume II. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, J. (1972). *Mythologie blanche*. In *Marges de la philosophie*. Paris: Minuit.
- Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *The consequences of modernity*. Bucharest: Univers.
- Jacobsen, H.M, Poder, P. (eds.). (2008). *The sociology of Zygmunt Bauman: challenges and critique*. London: Ashgate.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1985). *Les métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*. Paris: Editions du Minuit.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lipovetsky, G. (1993). *L'ère du vide. Essais sur l'individualisme contemporain*. France: Gallimard.

Liotard, JF. (1979). *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Éd. de Minuit.

Ricoeur, P. (1975). *La métaphore vive*. Seuil: Paris.

Upham, P. (2005). Is Economics Scientific? Is Science Scientific? *Critical Review* (1-2), 117-132.

Venturi, R., Scott Brown, D., Izenour, S. (1988). *Learning from Las Vegas*. Cambridge: MIT Press.