

Could Design be a “true insight into reality”, as Proclaimed by Paul Ricoeur?

Vera Lucia Nojima* and Licinio Nascimento de Almeida JR

Departamento de Artes e Design
Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio)
Brazil

*Corresponding author's email: nojima [AT] puc-rio.br

ABSTRACT — In “*The Rule of Metaphor*”, Paul Ricoeur puts forward the hypothesis that, in the diversity of manners of the discourses that extend from Philosophy, the metaphor is understood as the power to re-describe reality. Ricoeur’s “*Rule of Metaphor*” recognizes the power of promoting a ‘true insight into reality’. We understood that the rhetorical content of the argumentative strategies of Design corresponds to the plurality of indirect ways of using reality to produce meanings. Design is a creative activity that expands and synthesizes the culture of a society. This paper discusses as to whether Design is a fruitful field for the expression of Metaphors or whether, it itself, is a metaphorical recurrence.

Keywords — Design, Rhetoric, Metaphor, Language

1. THE RULE OF METAPHOR OF PAUL RICOEUR AND THE MANIFESTATIONS OF DESIGN

This paper is understood that the rhetorical content of the argumentative strategies of Design corresponds to the plurality of indirect ways of using reality to produce meanings. Design is a creative activity that expands and synthesizes the culture of a society, it is the discourse of a civilization, which establishes itself in the semiotics relationship among the construction of the language, the products designed and the processes of signification. Design products embody a semantic. In this semantic, denotative deviations are perceived that produce conceptions and ways of seeing the world.

Thus, Design reflects human aspirations, desires and needs. Could these yearnings, desires and needs be “true insights into reality”? Design is a means by which an idealization of human thought makes itself perceptible. Now, if this idealization is transferred and stabilizes itself in some body, manageable, palpable, a passage of meanings, of similarities, which previously existed only in the domain of thought, now embodies something sensitive, visible, kinesthetic. The transition from the domain of mental imagery to that of representation conjures up the transgression, the enigma, the surprise.

Umberto Eco (in Eco et.al.1994: 200) considers that to talk of the metaphor is to discuss the rhetorical activity in all its complexity. The Metaphor concept has an open dimension. And Eco questions

If the metaphor founds the language, one cannot speak of metaphor unless metaphorically. The whole definition of metaphor cannot then be anything but circular. If, on the contrary, there is first a theory of language that prescribes its ‘literal’ results, and in this theory the metaphor is something scandalous (or, in this system of rules, is a violation), then the theoretical metalanguage should speak about something for which no definition has been built. A denotative theory of language may indicate cases where the language is used incorrectly and, however, seems to say something: but hinders if you have to say what and why. Enough, therefore, of the tautological definitions of the type: “there’s a metaphor every time that something inexplicable happens that language users caution as a metaphor” (Eco, op.cit, p. 201).

This challenge signals the point at which, historically, the most diverse theoretical discourses are expanded about the place of Metaphor in language, in Semiotics, in Philosophy, in human practices in general. In any case, Eco points out that even though the “metaphor” having been so exploited throughout the ages, when the current dictionaries try to define it, they usually become muddled:

“Transferal of the name of an object to another object through the relationship of analogy” (but the relationship of analogy is precisely the metaphorical relationship); “Replacing a fitting term for a figurative term (the metaphor

being of the figure genus, the metaphor is defined as a synecdoche); “Abbreviated similitude...” We're always in classical settings (...); and for the rest there are the best typology cases of the various types of substitution, from animated to inanimate, from inanimate to animated, from animated to animated, from inanimate to inanimate, whether in a physical sense or in a moral sense; or replacements carried out on the name, adjective, verb, the adverb (...) (Eco, op.cit., p. 206).

Umberto Eco (op.cit., 201) also says that, on delineating a reflection, considering the historical trajectories, “(...) soon we realize that of the thousands and thousands of pages written about metaphor, few add anything to the two or three key fundamental concepts stated by Aristotle¹”.

Paul Ricoeur invites us to a reinterpretation of the metaphor and explains that Classical Rhetoric understood the metaphor only for the production of a lexical deviation, i.e. a paradigmatic shift; which did not constitute an error, but which described only the “effect of the meaning” at the level of the word, omitting the semantic production in terms of signification. He reasons that “(...) while it's true that the effect of the meaning is focused on the word, the production of the meaning is conveyed by the statement as a whole. In this way the theory of the metaphor depends on the semantics of the sentence” (Ricoeur, in Sacks, 1992: 147). He considers, thus, that “(...) the driver of the metaphorical sense is no longer the word but the sentence as a whole. The process of interaction does not consist merely in the substitution of one word for another word, of a name by another name – which in the strict sense, defines only metonymy – but in an interaction between logical subject and predicate” (ibid.). Ricoeur never abandons the thesis that the metaphor is some type of deviation, but this deviation, for him, should be described and explained in a new way, referring to the predicative framework itself: “metaphor, then, needs to be described as an altered predication rather than a changed denomination” (ibid.) and further poses:

As far as a first step, the work of similarity as such seems to be only halfway to a total understanding of the semantic innovation that characterizes metaphorical phrases or sentences, if we stress only the deviation aspect in the Metaphor, even leaving aside the non-semantic relevance that requires the lexical deviation of deviation itself, as described by Aristotle and all classical rhetoricians. The decisive characteristic is innovation semantics, thanks to which a new relevance, a new congruence, is established in such that the statement “makes sense” as a whole. The creator of Metaphors is this craftsman with the verbal ability which, from an inconsistent statement to an interpretation that deserves to be called metaphorical by generating the metaphor not merely as a deviation but also as acceptable. In other words, the metaphorical meaning does not reside merely in a semantic shock but in a new predicative meaning which arises from the collapse of the literal meaning, i.e. the collapse of that meaning obtained when we rely only on the usual or common lexical values of our words. The metaphor is not the enigma, but the solution of the enigma (Ricoeur, op.cit.).

In *The Rule of Metaphor*, Ricoeur (2005: 351) proposes that “(...) the sense of a metaphorical statement is caused by a failure of the literal interpretation of the proposition; through a literal interpretation, the meaning destroys its very self”. Thus, arises the idea that Metaphor is characterized by its semantic innovation, i.e. for its incongruity. “The self-destruction of meaning under the influence of semantic impertinence, is just the inverse of an innovation of the whole statement, an innovation obtained by the ‘twisting’ of the literal sense of the words. This innovation of meaning constitutes the living metaphor”, Paul Ricoeur contends (op.cit.).

So there is a tension between semantic congruence and incongruence. The metaphor inhabits this tension. Its role is, above all, to bring to light new information. This information, in principle, is untranslatable: what is gained by way of the metaphor, can only be gained through the metaphor.² In this sense, according to a plurality of modes of discourse that extend from poetry to philosophy, the metaphor is understood by Ricoeur as the power to redescribe reality. These are new approaches that are contrary to a previous categorization:

¹ In *Poetics*, Aristotle refers to four types of Metaphor, while, in *Rhetoric*, considers only the metaphor as an analogy (cf. Alexander Junior, in Aristóteles [384-322 b.C.], p. 47). About the metaphor by analogy, Aristotle, in *Poetics*, gives the following explanation: “I understand that there is a metaphor by analogy when the second term is to the first and the fourth is to the third; the fourth can be used in place of the second, and the second, in place of the fourth. On some occasions, the poets add to the substitute term something with which the replaced term relates (analogy): the Cup is to Dionysus as the shield is to Ares; Thus, it seems that the Cup is the shield of Dionysus, and the shield, the cup of Ares; old age is to life that which afternoon is to the day; Thus, the afternoon would be the old age of the day, while, as Empedocles would like, old age will be the evening of life, or the twilight of life. Sometimes one of the four terms of analogy; but even then, does one refrain from using the analogous; it is said, for example, *sow* the seed spread, but there is no term for spreading of the Sun in the same way as is done with the seed; for this reason one can say: “sowing the light created by the gods”. In addition to this way of using the metaphor, there is another, which is to employ the metaphorical term denying it something that is intrinsic, such as to call the shield *glass without wine* instead of *glass of Ares* (Aristóteles [384-322 b.C.], 2004, *Poetics*, XXI).

² cf. AUTOR (data:367-380).

This is what the idea of a semantic non-relevance or semantic incongruity preserves. In order that a metaphor is obtained, a previous incompatibility should continue to be identified through a new compatibility. A predicative assimilation involves, in this way, a specific type of tension that is not so much between the subject and a predicate as between semantic congruence and incongruence. The insight into the similarity is in the perception of the conflict between the previous incompatibility and the new incompatibility. The “distance” is preserved within the “proximity”. To see the similarity is seeing the same in spite of, and through, the difference. This tension between similarity and difference characterizes the logical structure of similarity (Ricoeur, in Sacks, 1992: 147).

When we think about semantics, we are immediately referred to a theory that traditionally explains the alignment between words and meanings. But in Ricoeur, the idea of semantics is related to how the language reaches reality.

The sense of a new metaphor (...) is the emergence of a new semantic congruence or relevance from the ruins of the literal sense shared by semantic incompatibility or absurdity. In the same way that the self-erasing of the literal meaning is the negative condition for the appearance of the metaphorical sense; the elimination of the reference due to common descriptive language is the negative condition for the emergence of a more radical way of seeing things, be this or not related to the disclosure of this layer of reality that phenomenology calls pre-objective and which, according to Heidegger, constitutes the horizon of all forms of coexistence with the world (Ricoeur, op.cit., p. 154).

Thus, the metaphor is accredited a cognitive value. However, to understand this, its cognitive value, it is supposed, in conformity with Ricoeur’s acceptations, a re-signification of what is “cognitive”. To know is to produce concepts. However, the cognition exposed here cannot be considered as a conceptual arsenal for the metaphor. In spite of the metaphor possessing a cognitive value, its aim is not to produce concepts, but rather conceptions, manners of seeing, ways of viewing, ways of facing. The cognitive result will not be stable. It will be an irreducible set of information. If such information be stabilized, resulting in the emergence of concepts, one has, then, the “death of the metaphor” – it is only from this breaking down that the metaphor may produce concepts. In this way, so that there is the occurrence of the metaphor, there must be deviation and also an affront – a tense trade of thoughts that are not solved, are not reducible and that does not reach a stage of conceptual truce or conceptual peace. In producing conceptual needs, but not concepts, the metaphor is an occasion of non-reducibility. Its amplitude is to “put on one’s eyes”. An opaque statement will gain visibility and, thus, the “living metaphor” of Ricoeur is that which has the pretension and that recognizes the power of promoting a “true insight into reality”. This insight into reality is alive, is not a hermetic, cognitive outcome, is not a concept, for if it slides back into a concept, it will die. The insight, therefore, is this non-decision. He does not deny that the metaphor engenders concepts, but the response to these concepts is the very death itself of the metaphor. The place of the living metaphor is, with this, the place where it cannot be reduced.

Given then that the “Living Metaphor” of Ricoeur recognizes the power of promoting a “true insight into reality”, could the field of Design be a fruitful one for metaphorical manifestations or could it be, in itself, a metaphorical recurrence? Putting this question on the table is like stirring up a hornet’s nest, mainly because Design, from its interdisciplinary characteristics does not encounter a theory/methodology of its own established with total notoriety. Design is art? Is it science? Is it technique or technology? What is its theoretical field of expertise? What is its object? The human being or the material culture? In this case, could an anthropological interface be encountered in Design? These are questions that, epistemologically, remain open since Design’s “institutionalization”, as an activity, in the Industrial Revolution³.

2. ABOUT DESIGN

Certainly, Design is a changeable discipline, permeating and “sewing” the most diverse areas of knowledge. Depending on the goals to be achieved, it enters into dialogue, for example, with Engineering and Ergonomics, to develop a technological product; with Marketing and Psychology, to do market research and consumer acceptance studies; with Chemistry, to understand the properties of metals and textile structures also for designing precious jewelry,

³ Gillo Dorfles (1989?: 12) considers that “(...) while in the past there were manually-created products, or with only partial mechanical interventions (ceramics, glass), intended for practical and utilitarian purposes and endowed with aesthetic qualities (cooking utensils, weapons, prehistoric instruments, agricultural tools, etc.), and numerous other modular elements, partially or even totally standardized, only in our days, i.e. after the advent of the industrial revolution, was the production of objects, of models, of threads, performed so as to be produced in series and in order to fulfil, in addition to a practical, utilitarian function, an aesthetic function. (...) From which we can conclude that what is required in order to consider that an object belongs to industrial design is: 1) its manufacture is in series; 2) its production by mechanical means; 3) the presence in it of an aesthetic quotient, due to the fact that it was initially designed and not a subsequent manual intervention. This is why it is not permissible to think of industrial design in relation to objects belonging to the times previous to the industrial revolution; and even less in relation to those (utensils, furniture, ornaments) from antiquity and even prehistory”. Currently, industrial design is part of a broader concept, Design. However, it remains pertinent to consider the Industrial Revolution as a historical landmark for the activity of Design.

simple adornments or to launch fashion clothing; with Medicine and Biology, to design new scalpels and surgical equipment or, further, with Semiotics, to construct the processes of signification of the engineered products.

In any case, Design, being a form of language, possesses a “generous grammar” which is undergoing constant improvement, diluted among the areas of knowledge, giving up and looking for spaces, aiming to achieve, in the form of products and services, an idealization of human thought. For these reasons, at first glance, an intervention held as merely interdisciplinary may reveal Design as something fragmented or cloudy, with no specific identity or guidelines. However, it is in transversality that Design finds its greatest virtue, its most powerful point. Having not constructed a famously conceived theory, it relates to so many others, not remaining outside of them, but rather, intertwining and binding with them.

It is therefore Design, in the form of objects/products, a means by which an idealization of human thought becomes perceptible. This idealization transfers itself and stabilizes itself in some manageable, palpable, physical body. A passage of meanings, of similarities then is established: that which beforehand existed only in the domain of thought, now embodies something sensitive, visible, kinesthetic. In this process, elements of similarity are appreciated and “borrowed”. In the transition from the domain of the mental image to the field of visual representations⁴, the transgression, the enigma, the surprise make themselves present. Time and space are transgressed in this semiotic relationship between dreams and reality, which in turn generates the enigma, the surprise. So, considering the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic dimensions⁵, that which hitherto was immaterial, fantasy, imagination, after a relationship of signal “presentification”, materializes itself as a Design object. In this semiotic action, formed by a “chain of associations”, there prevails, especially, the idea of “transport” of the senses, of “movements” of an analogy, from an origin point to another destination, rather like the happening of the metaphor. Following the extension of these aspects, could Design be, by nature, a form of Metaphor?

3. DESIGN AS A TRUE “INSIGHT INTO REALITY”

Bernhard E. Bürdek, in History, theory and practice of product design, states that:

With products we can have communication and a combination of diverse individual products lead to a mix of communication that can be seen as a construction of meaning (connotation), which can be interpreted (denoted) by various social groups, in different manners. This describes precisely the current procedure in design, where the principle of the “capacity for connections” has an important role (Bürdek, 2006: 290).

⁴For Santaella and Nöth (2005: 15), the world of images is divided into two areas: the first is the domain of images as visual representations; the second is the immaterial field of the images in our mind. In the field as visual representation, are: drawings, paintings, engravings, photographs and film and television images, holo and infographic. “Images, accordingly, are material objects, signs that represent our visual environment” (*ibid.*). In the immaterial domain, “images appear as visions, fantasies, imaginations, schemes, templates or, in general, as mental representations” (*ibid.*). According to the authors, because they are inextricably linked in its genesis, the two areas of the image cannot exist separately: “there are no images as visual representations which have not arisen from images in the minds of those who produced them, likewise there are no mental images that do not have some of their origin in the concrete world of visual objects” (*ibid.*). Basing themselves mainly on the theoretical foundations established by Peirce’s Semiotics, Santaella and Nöth (*op.cit.*) point out that “unifying concepts of the two areas of the image are the concepts of sign and representation”. And, in this way, “is in the definition of these two concepts that we re-encounter these two image domains, namely, its perceptible side and its mental side, unified in a third, which is that of the sign or of the representation” (*ibid.*).

⁵Charles Morris (1970), in his work *Foundations of theory of signs*, starting from the three co-related themes taken from Peirce, vehicle of the sign (that which acts as a sign), *designatum* (that to which the sign refers) and interpretant (effect on some interpreter) – derived the three dimensions of semiosis: syntactic, semantic and pragmatic. Lucy Niemeyer (2003: 46-50) explains the application of the dimensions outlined by Morris to design products: “the syntactic dimension covers the structure of the product and its operation. The structure consists of the parts and how they are connected to each other. The syntax of a product can be illustrated by technical drawings and models. The syntactic dimension includes as much the analysis of the construction technique of the product as the analysis of visual details such as joints, openings, holes, overlays, textures, designs and colors”. “The pragmatic dimension of a product is analyzed under a different point of view of its use - for example, from an ergonomic or sociological point of view (who uses the product, in what kind of situation the product is used). In a broad sense, the pragmatic dimension includes an entire life cycle, from the designer’s office to the waste bin”. “Expressive and representational qualities of a product are central aspects of the semantic dimension. The semantic dimension adds benchmark aspects to the syntactic and material dimensions, their descriptors. What does the product represent? How the goal of the product is expressed or represented? To what environment does the product look like it belongs?”

Bürdek (op.cit., p. 335) poses that, in the decade of 1980, Friedländer sought to prove through the use of “metaphors” that the products of Design “(...) should not only be bearers of practical functions, but that symbolic functions in them should gain in meaning”. Metaphors, for Friedländer, would have three sources: “historical metaphor, that reminds us of old objects”; “the technical metaphor, which includes elements of science and technology”; and “a natural metaphor, where shapes, movements or events of nature manifest themselves” (ibid.). According to Bürdek (op.cit.), “from these reflections resulted the earliest examples known as configuration projects called metaphorical or sensory-expressionist”, explaining that the method thus derived is called “semantic transfer” – “as an exercise of configuration words are translated in forms and in each time interpreted” (ibid., p. 337). This semantic transfer refers to the language employed in the design of a given product. Thus, “(...) the language of the products is not an end in itself but rather a fundamental argument in the product development process” (ibid., p. 321). The language of the products can be seen, in this case, “as a strategic tool, which can influence and define the expression of a product, in a manner so as to influence the relationship or acceptance by the user in a much more precise way” (ibid.).

Here are some directions that guide the transition from mechanical products to electrical or electronic products. They are indications that exemplify the “(...) connection of language and its aesthetic-formal visualization (representation, expression), so that the understanding is always subject to context, to the cultural background or to the user experience” (ibid., p. 320):

- Orientation towards the user.
- A minimum function where, for example, the user is given visual security in handling the product.
- Stability, which may be representations of product’s technical-physical normalities.
- Change and adjustment: the directions serve to emphasize and show the possibilities of change or adjustment.
- Handling: handling elements shall transmit to the users in detail how an appliance or equipment should be used – the isolated elements must be configured so that their operation is contained in handling (for example, pinch, rotate, push, with much or little strength).
- Accuracy: this deals with visualizing how precisely specific products must be handled such as measurement products, a camera or medical equipment, is always founded functionally, as these indicators used in sound equipment have a more symbolic nature.
- Relationship with the human body: it is not just a question of anthropometric adaptation of the product’s handling but also all its associative aspects (Bürdek, 2006: 320).

So that these particulars can be semantically expressed in a product, a set of analogies, within a socio-cultural context, must be sought. These analogies are based on complex associations and/or connections of similarities, which characterize that the language employed by Design, makes use of a “set” of metaphors. This set will be present throughout the product’s life cycle: from its conception as a project right up to the meanings acquired by manipulation of the user. That is, the product born of Design is always rewriting, and re-editing metaphors.

Messages and statements, published in different newspapers or magazines, can cause different effects in the most varied audiences. One person can find a device easy to use, while another user does not.

Inexplicably, for one person, a piece of jewelry is a symbol of status, to another, however, it is mere futility. A remote control can produce different statements: be a post-modern metaphor of technological practicality, a metaphor of convenience or a metaphor of laziness. At the same time, depending on the semantics expressed, the remote control can highlight the accuracy of its functions. It can also show if the appliance which it integrates has advanced technological attributes or not, friendly or complicated (Figure 1). In this way, the design work, in producing discourses, expresses a complex of metaphorical statements.



Figure 1: Remote controls

In this case, the manifestation of metaphorical statements in the remote control takes place, for example, through a set of conceptual characteristics, at times scattered, like: “technological advancement”, “post-modernity”, “comfort”, “lifestyle”. This is a set of features synthesized in the product “remote control”: we live in a postmodern world⁶, technologically advanced, which develops new lifestyles, with more convenience, so you do not have to get up off the couch to change the channel of your TV. Signifiers and meanings of these ideas are “diverted” to the product “remote control”, a connotative detour, which signifies a “semantic transfer” and, consequently, metaphorical occurrences.



Figure 2: PATEK PHILLIPE pocket watch, 1892.

A watch of centuries past (Figure 2), which belonged to the great-grandfather, is a prized object. It brings back memories that are restricted to a specific user, transcending time and space conditions (last century, antique, vintage, tradition). Other qualities can be inter-related to the personality of the great-grandfather, his physical appearance, the affection with his great grandson. These are memories that materialize analogously to the watch - a direct relationship that redraws the metaphorical sense of the identity of this watch to the great grandson.

Nike sneakers are another example (Figure 3). It's an expensive product, status symbol among young people. Through marketing strategies, an identity is created for the product, defining the target public and the forms of persuasion as sales tactics, i.e. a complex metaphor that symbolizes all these steps. In purchasing, the metaphorical characteristics

⁶ To understand and synthesize post-modernism is not a simple task. Generally speaking, the term “Post-modernism”, refers to a period characterized by *changes in paradigms*. These changes that present *historical ruptures, centered on technological progress*, and which symbolize a transition that influences the arts, economics, sciences, technologies, sociology, whatever, our way of thinking and living. “It may be that post-modernism, the post-modern consciousness, end up not being not much more than the theorization of its own condition of possibility, which consists primordially in a mere enumeration of changes and modifications. Modernism also worries compulsively with the New and trying to capture its emergence (...); the post-modern, however, seeks rupture, seeks events instead of new worlds, seeks the instant developer after which nothing more was the same, in search of a ‘when-all-changed’, (...) or better yet, seeks the offsets and irrevocable changes in the representation of the objects and how they change” (Jameson, 1997: 13).

are present, as they make up the identity of the sneakers. From there, another dimension to the same product will be built: a new pragmatic (in the strict sense of usage). The level of significance will be a new relationship between the Nike sneakers/statement – and the user/interlocutor.



Figure 3: Nike tennis shoes.

Other metaphorical relations are thus adopted. Each pair of Nike sneakers sold, even if they are the same model, is unique. Whoever buys it will produce a new proposition. If it was a birthday present, then it is the representation of that special moment; if it was the result of half of the wages of a young trainee, the meaning is another. And, if a product was acquired unlawfully, it's the result of a misdemeanor that was materialized through the metaphorical “appeals” the product carries (status, styling, worth, contemporaneity, etc.).

The covers of news magazines in the 2006 election period from Brazil (Figure 5) evidence, metaphorically, President Lula as a symbol in the context of Brazilian politics, translating this important event in national history in an approach as a milestone for the future, namely, conjecturing what would Brazil be like after the re-election of Lula.

The reports underscored the huge popular support that Lula won at the polls, including the new design of the Brazilian political scene, with a more ample parliamentary base than in the first term (more allied deputies and governors were elected) (cf. Simas Filho and Rodrigues, 2006; and Soares and Cabral, 2006).



Figure 4: Época, edition 442; IstoÉ, edition1933 e Veja, edition1981.

On the cover of *Época*, Lula holds his suit jacket over his shoulder. The photographic image conveys a narrative, an idea of the movement of “putting something on your shoulders”, something similar to the analogy about work – “rolling up one’s sleeves”. The caption “How will the next four years be”, although written in the affirmative, is questioning, posing the notion of doubt even without the question mark (?). This is an idea that can only be built by the proposed relationship with the photographic image.

In the publication *Isto É*, the photographic image of the figure is the serious profile of the same grizzled and thoughtful man. However, unlike in *Época*, there is no presaging narrative. The suit jacket is not over his shoulder, there is no hint of this movement. The man is still, static. As in *Época*, his gaze is to the infinite, however, his is not the look of

a “dreamer”, as if he were envisaging something “positive” for the future, there is no smile or lips parted. In IstoÉ, the pensive look is one of concern.

In *Veja*, there's a photomontage. The image of the President-candidate is frontal. Here, Lula is framed as if in a three by four photo. On this cover, the narrative effect is more prominent. The narrative is delivered not by the image itself, but by the way it is handled. In the compositional structure of the cover, there is a before and an after, present in the section of a photomontage and disposition of typographic images.

One notes that Lula's physiognomy does not change. The transformation is represented only by the metaphors of time. Old wallpaper is being replaced by new, with the same design. That is, for *Veja* magazine, there is no effective change in Brazilian politics. There was only a “repainting” of Lula; a new “makeup”. As if, four years on from the re-election landmark, the same image will be had once more, again in an aged state, being swapped. However, in this case, the character Lula will be changed for another, as a second re-election in the democracy of Brazilian Republic is not allowed; so, for this reason, the caption, in orange capitals, “LAST CHANCE”.

One sees in *Veja*, taking the positioning of the typographic images, that the structure, even though containing a large photomontage at the center, is more asymmetrical. The small titles are counterpoints to this structure. On the other hand, *Época* and *IstoÉ* resemble each other. There are blocks of text to the right and the photographic images on the left. These are more symmetrical compositions, in which the typographic images get more emphasis. *Época's* caption begins on Lula's line of sight; in *IstoÉ*, the entire textual is in front of the face of the character. Nevertheless, *Época* brings the idea of “dreaming”, of “glimpsing”, then nothing interrupts the character's vision. *IstoÉ* introduces the idea of “concern”, therefore the textual interrupts Lula's vision. In profile, he “reads” the title of the caption “NOW COMES THE HARD PART”. In *Época*, Lula's look is a dream metaphor; in *Isto É*, the look is the metaphor of concern; in *Veja*, the narrative constructed is the metaphor of transition. All of which are metaphors, constructed by Graphic Design, under the metonymy of the Brazilian political plot, President Lula.

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DESIGN AND METAPHOR

In an initial hypothesis, it is easier and verifiable to see Design not as a form of Metaphor, but as an activity or a language which uses the resources of the Metaphor, rather as an “epidermis” that clothes the products. Roman Jakobson (2005) notes that the metaphor is the place of the meta-language. It explains itself, it is metalinguistic⁷. However, despite being a language, the place of Design is not the meta-language. It does not self-style itself, rather seeks to make of the transversal activity⁸ which is peculiar to it, its theoretical, framework, as is the case of the Rhetorical, of the Metaphor.

One recognizes, therefore, that Design is also “alive”. Within it there exists, as proposed by Ricoeur, a relationship between language with reality, not just as a linguistic task, but of Philosophy, because the conditions of reference possibilities of signification of the entire language of Design depend on the relationship of this with that which exists around it.

Therefore, if it falls to Philosophy the responsibility for such task, through being its domain the “art of ordering the regulated multiplicities”, and according to the author; “it is in this spirit that it matters to found on the phenomenology of the semantic goals of each of the discourses a general theory of their interferences”, one can consider Design not only as a field fruitful for the manifestation of the metaphor, but also, a metaphorical recurrence in its very self. As, for Ricoeur, to signify things in acts would be to see these as unimpeded from happening, but see them as something which breaks out. It is in this critical interpretation that allied to Philosophy the practice of Design steps up.

⁷ Roman Jakobson corroborates the perelmanian idea of the excellence of the metaphor, because, for the author, unlike the nature of metonymy, metaphor is in its own way the place of meta-language. The metonymy does not have the same capacity as the metaphor to address language itself. The metaphor thus lends itself to the development of a theory: “the similarity of meanings relates the symbols of a meta-language to the symbols of the language to which it relates. The similarity relates a metaphorical term with the term which it replaces. Therefore, when the researcher builds a meta-language to interpret the tropes, he has more homogeneous means to wield the metaphor, while metonymy, based on a different principle, easily defies interpretation. That is why nothing comparable to the rich literature on the metaphor can be quoted with regard to the theory of metonymy” (Jakobson, 2005: 61).

⁸ The principle of transversality relies on intercommunication between the areas of knowledge. The transversality of knowledge offers new possibilities for spaces for the construction and circulation of knowledge where hierarchization will no longer be the basic structure, and where hitherto unsuspected situations may emerge (AUTOR, data).

5. REFERENCES

- [1] ALEXANDRE JUNIOR, Manuel. Introdução. In: ARISTÓTELES [384-322 b.C.]. *Retórica*. 2 ed., revista. Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2005.
- [2] AUTOR. *Design Gráfico e Retórica: abordagens e reflexões sobre processos de significação*. Rio de Janeiro, 2006. Monografia [Pesquisa apresentada como requisito de avaliação final para a disciplina LET 2240 – Tópicos em Teoria Lingüística / “Teorias da Metáfora”] – Departamento de Letras, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.
- [3] AUTOR. *Conjecturas para uma Retórica do Design [Gráfico]*. Rio de Janeiro, 2009. 2 v. Tese de Doutorado – Departamento de Artes e Design, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.
- [4] ARISTÓTELES [384-322 b.C.]. *Poética; Organon; Política; Constituição de Atenas*. Coleção Os Pensadores. Coordenação editorial: Janice Florido. Tradução: Baby Abrão, Pinharanda Gomes e Therezinha Monteiro Deutsch. São Paulo: Editora Nova Cultural, 2004.
- [5] BÜRDEK, Bernhard E. *História, teoria e prática do design de produtos*. Tradução: Freddy Van Camp. São Paulo: Edgard Blücher, 2006.
- [6] DORFLES, Gillo. *Introdução ao desenho industrial*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1989?
- [7] ECO, Umberto. *Metáfora*. In: ECO, Umberto et.al. *Signo – Enciclopédia Einaudi* 31. Lisboa: Casa da Moeda, 1994. pp. 200-245.
- [8] JAKOBSON, Roman. *Lingüística e Comunicação*. Tradução: Izidoro Blikstein e José Paulo Paes. 21 ed. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2005.
- [9] JAMESON, Fredric. *Pós-Modernismo: a lógica cultural do capitalismo tardio*. 2 ed. São Paulo: Ática, 1997.
- [10] MORRIS, Charles. *Foundations of the theory of signs*. volume 1. number 2. Twelfth impression. *Foundations of the Unity of Science. Toward an International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- [11] NIEMEYER, Lucy. *Elementos de semiótica aplicados ao design*. Rio de Janeiro: 2AB, 2003.
- [12] AUTOR. *A transversalidade como prática nas linhas e “entrelinhas” do Design*. 7º Congresso Brasileiro de Pesquisa e Desenvolvimento em Design (P&D Design 2006). Anais Eletrônicos (CD-Rom). Curitiba: Centro Universitário Positivo (Unicenp), ago. 2006
- [13] RICOEUR, Paul. *A metáfora viva*. Tradução: Dion Davi Macedo. 2 ed. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2005.
- [14] _____. *O processo metafórico como cognição, imaginação e sentimento*. In: SACKS, S. (org.). *Da metáfora*. São Paulo: Educ/Pontes, 1992.
- [15] SANTAELLA, Lucia. NÖTH, Winfried. *Imagem: cognição, semiótica, mídia*. 4 ed. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2005.
- [16] SIMAS FILHO, Mário; RODRIGUES, Alan. *A Vitória: Lula consegue mais quatro anos*. [Colaboração de Camilo Vannuchi, Chico Silva, Luciana Franca, Luiza Villaméa e Rudolfo Lago]. In: *IstoÉ*. edição n. 1933. 8 nov. 2006. Available: <http://www.terra.com.br/istoe/1933/brasil/1933_com_a_forca_do_povo_lula_consegur_mais_quatro_ano_s.htm>. Accessed: 28 jun. 2008.
- [17] SOARES, Lucila; CABRAL, Otávio. *A Encruzilhada*. *Veja*. n. 1981, 8 nov. 2006. Seção Brasil, pp.38-44.