Metaphor: Poetry, Philosophy, Rhetoric
Metáfora: poesía, filosofía, retórica

Jonathan Locke Hart
School of Translation Studies
Shandong University
180 Wenhua Xilu. Weihai, 264209. P. R. China
jonathan_hart@harvard.edu
Orcid ID 0000-0002-2518-5123

RECIBIDO: 11 DE ENERO DE 2021
ACEPTADO: 2 DE MARZO DE 2021

Resumen: Este artículo procede retrospectivamente, contextualizando la explosión de estudios sobre la metáfora en la perspectiva de Platón y Aristóteles, de manera que podemos distinguir los contornos de la metáfora en relación con la poética, la retórica, la filosofía y la política, así como las cuestiones críticas y teóricas surgidas en el presente, incluyendo el tratamiento por Zoltán Kövecses, Northrop Frye, Paul Ricœur, Hegel, Shakespeare, Tomás de Aquino y otros. El quid de la cuestión es si la metáfora nos permite llegar al núcleo de la filosofía –verdad, justicia, belleza, la vida buena– o si nos desvía o distrae (o ambas cosas). Mi propuesta es que la ambivalencia vale tanto para Platón como, incluso, para Aristóteles, aunque este es menos severo que aquel para con la poesía y la mimesis. La fricción entre los mundos reales y ficcionales puede resolverse o al menos acercarse en el ámbito de lo posible.

Palabras clave: Metáfora. Poesía. Filosofía. Retórica. Northrop Frye. Paul Ricœur.

Abstract: This article works backwards by contextualizing the metaphorical explosion of metaphor, especially in the last century or so, and works back to Plato and Aristotle, who help us to see the outlines of metaphor in relation to poetics, rhetoric, philosophy and politics, as well as the critical and theoretical issues arising subsequently down to the present age, including the views of Zoltán Kövecses, Northrop Frye, Paul Ricœur, Hegel, Shakespeare, Thomas Aquinas and others. The nub of the matter is whether metaphor helps us get at the core of philosophy, that is truth, justice and beauty, the good life, or whether it deflects and deludes or both. My argument is that they do both for Plato and even for Aristotle, who is less severe on poetry and on poetic mimesis than is Plato. This friction between actual and fictional worlds might be resolved or at least meet in the possible.

Keywords: Metaphor. Poetry. Philosophy. Rhetoric. Northrop Frye. Paul Ricœur.

RILCE 38.2 (2022): 666-94
ISSN: 0213-2370
DOI: 10.15581/008.38.2.666-94

Northrop Frye is an accomplished critic and theorist who does avoid what he calls "dead prose" and has a poetic and metaphorical sensibility, but he is not alone, as one key aspect of literary criticism and theory derives from Plato and Aristotle, who are no slouches at the analysis and use of myth and metaphor (Frye 2008, 986).[1] Plato and Aristotle understand, as Blake does, that metaphor is a unity of subject and object and not a "cloven fiction", as Frye says, alluding to Blake, on whom Frye wrote his first book (Frye 2008, 986; see Frye 1947). For Frye, others use metaphors, but poets are the primary and primitive metaphorical writers. They "think" in images. David Tacey argues for reading myth and metaphor as a way of understanding religion: he says that the "scriptures were written primarily as myth and have been misunderstood as history" (xi) and that "if we regain respect for metaphors and myths, we are able to rediscover a spiritual life for ourselves and civilization" (xii; see Soskice). Poetry, according to Matthew Arnold, will replace philosophy and religion or is – what Frye called romance – a secular scripture (Arnold 161-62; see Frye 1976).

Although I am most interested in metaphor in poetry, I am also considering it in terms of poetics, which philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle help to create in their discussions of poets and poetry, and in relation to other fields like rhetoric and philosophy. For Plato, as we shall see, philosophers understand language, word and world, and use it to determine truth, justice and beauty in search of the good, that is the good person in service of the good polity or republic. Plato, the poetic philosopher, is suspicious of language that gets carried away or carries the soul away by its ravishing, seductive and illusory beauty (see Plato, *Republic*, book X). Metaphor and images are ways to create myths that move people from virtue to vice and away from being just and good (see Eberle). Rhetoricians, for Plato, can mean skilled orators like Pericles, as discussed in *Phaedrus*, or like Gorgias, as portrayed in *Meno* (Gorgias taught Meno): in the negative case, someone can persuade the audience to emotion and not to reason, to whatever end the rhetor or orator seeks and not to truth itself (see, for instance, Plato,

1. See Hart 1994, xiii-xv, 1; Turbayne; Ricœur 1991. Besides, see in Albaladejo (2016; 2019) the notion of a "motor metafórico" ('metaphorical engine') that involves cultural and rhetorical components as exemplified in Cervantes and Lorca. On metaphor, irony and rhetoric, see Booth; on metaphor, see Khatchadourian; Boyle; Cohen/Margalit; T. Cohen; D. Davidson; on social theory as metaphor, see R. Brown; in social aspects, see Sapir; on imagery, see S. Brown; Fainsilber/Kogan; on moral experience, see Denham.

Phaedrus 260c, 269d-e, 271d, 272d). Plato mentions the cognates of the word "rhetoric" many times in his complete works and "poetry" and its cognates even more often. The orator is, especially in antiquity, a political speaker. According to Plato and Aristotle, philosophy is greater than poetry, but Aristotle is systematic and seeks to know and understand as many fields as possible, including poetry, rhetoric and politics, not to mention history, physics, metaphysics and much else (see Plato, *Republic*, book X; Aristotle, *Poetics*, chapter IX). With their own brilliance, Plato and Aristotle consider metaphor in poetry and related fields like rhetoric. Aristotle becomes especially important in the understanding of metaphor, particularly in his discussion in *Poetics*.

Metaphor is, then, an ancient concern of poets, philosophers, rhetoricians and historians as well as speakers and audience, writers and readers. Metaphor was, among the ancient Greeks, something important to poetics, rhetoric, philosophy and politics. Since the Greeks, metaphor has become a topic of many coats: in recent decades, there have been studies of metaphor in chess, cognition, cognitive science, psychoanalysis, psycholinguistics, psychology, linguistics, organizational behaviour, education and much else in actual, fictional and virtual worlds.[2] Elena Penskaya and Joachim Küpper edit a volume that investigates "the potential of the metaphor of life as theater for literary, philosophical, juridical, and epistemological discourses from the Middle Ages through modernity proper, with a focus on traditions as manifold as those of France, England, Spain, Italy, Russia, Germany, and Latin America" (1). Life and art, theatre and world are metaphors in theatrical texts and performances that have implications for other discourses (see Turner 1974). Metaphor in Shakespeare, according to Maria Fahey, relates theatre and society: "Metaphor assumed particular significance during Shakespeare's time, when the

2. See Anderson; Barker; Loewenberg 1975; Carroll/Thomas; Malgady/Johnson; Marschark/Hunt; Marschark/Katz/Paivio; Matthews; Ralph Miller; Steven Miller; Neisser; Ortony 1975, 1976, 1979; R. Davidson; Ortony *et al*. 1978a and 1978b; Osgood; Paivio/Clark; Petrie; Shibles; Shinjo/Myers; Sternberg; Tourangeau/Sternberg; Verbrugge/McCarrell; Vosniadou/ Ortony/ Reynolds/Wilson; Williams; Gardner; Gardner/Winner; Winner 1979, 1988; Elbers; G. Evans; Evans/Gamble; Evans/Evans; Winner/Leekam; Winner/McCarthy/Gardner; Winner/Rosenstiel/ Gardner; Winner/Wapner/Cicone/Gardner; Winter/Matlock; Gentner 1982, 1988; Gentner/ Clement; Gentner/Falkenhainer/Skorstad; Gentner/Grudin; Gentner/Stuart; Gerrig/Healy; Gibbs/Gerrig; Gibbs/O'Brien; Glucksberg/Gildea/Bookin; Glucksberg/Keysar; Harris; Harris/ Lahey/Marsalek; Haynes 1975, 1978; Hoffman/Kemper; Honeck/Riechmann/ Hoffman; Inhoff/ Lima/Carroll; Michael Johnson/Malgady; Katz 1976, 1989; Katz/Paivio/ Marschark/Clark; Keil; Koen; Kogan/Connor/Gross/Fava; Vosniadou.

Church of England had rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and Reformation theologians throughout Europe continued to rethink the Eucharist" (xiv). In 1978, Ralph Berry had discussed Shakespearean metaphor, especially its possibilities: in the 1970s, when metaphor was still a key topic in the humanities, Frye, Ricœur and others were approaching it from different angles. In 1972, Terence Hawkes had made apt and succinct observations: "Metaphor is traditionally taken to be the most fundamental form of figurative language", which "is language which doesn't mean what it says" (1). Metaphor is and is not even itself.

This article will work backwards by contextualizing a few aspects of this metaphorical explosion of metaphor, especially in the last century or so, then will examine aspects of the work of Paul Ricœur, G. W. F. Hegel and Thomas Aquinas on metaphor and then will discuss Plato and Aristotle, who will help us to see the outlines of metaphor and the critical and theoretical issues arising subsequently down to the present age. The nub of the matter is whether metaphor helps us get at the core of philosophy, that is truth, justice and beauty, the good life, or whether it deflects or deludes or both (see Binkley; Loewenberg 1973; Mladenov; Mooij; Johnson 1981). My argument is that they do both for Plato and even for Aristotle, who is less severe on poetry and on poetic mimesis than is Plato. This friction between actual and fictional worlds might be resolved or at least might meet in the possible. Metaphor mediates between actual and possible or fictional worlds. Plato's utopian thought as well as Homer's and Shakespeare's might converse in the possible even if Plato might claim that his putative republic is in service of the good while Homer's poetic imaginings take readers away from the good. Having begun with Frye, I will further contextualize some current and recent views of metaphor, including that of Paul Ricœur, and will move backward through Hegel and Aquinas to Plato and Aristotle. The sharp focus will be on whether metaphor is good or bad or both and on the tensions among fields of knowledge such as poetry, philosophy and rhetoric. In other words, the article will concentrate first on the traces, ghosts and hauntings of Plato and Aristotle on metaphor in texts now and work back to the originals to understand the ground of metaphor. The comparison should help a historical understanding of metaphor in Plato and Aristotle by reading the history of metaphor backward, a historicising of the theory of metaphor and a theorizing of the history of metaphor, or at least some strands of each.

Recent developments in the theory of metaphor

There are many ways to examine metaphor. Here, I shall give a brief overview of some of the developments. They are positive approaches to the study of metaphor, but here they serve as negative definition, that is they sharpen what it is I am not doing with metaphor. These approaches to metaphor may have grown out of the work of Plato and Aristotle but they have gone their own ways. As a poet, historian and literary scholar, I am most interested in style and beauty, which is hard to separate from truth and content, the work that metaphor especially does in poetry, the kind of metaphor that Plato, Aristotle and Frye are considering and that Frye sees as important for poets and for himself as a critic. Mark Johnson claims that there were great advances in research into metaphor during the 1980s and 1990s, especially more sophisticated methods in the empirical studies and the discovery that metaphor is not simply linguistic, but "a conceptual and experiential process that structures our world", so that we have gained insights into the manners "in which our conceptual system and all forms of symbolic interaction are grounded in our bodily experience and yet imaginatively structured" (Johnson 1995, 157; see Fauconnier; Turner 1987, 1991; Lakoff/Turner; Olson). It seems that these empirical studies confirm the bodily nature of rhythm as Plato and Aristotle discuss, as we shall see. Zoltán Kövecses examines the widespread view that literature and the arts are the "«real» source of metaphor" and "that it is the creative genius of the poet and the artist that creates the most authentic examples of metaphor", but from the vantage of "cognitive linguistics, we will find that the idea is only partially true, and that everyday language and the everyday conceptual system contribute a great deal to the working of the artistic genius" (2002, 43). This makes sense. Even poets grow up in everyday language before they can speak or write. They transform and add to quotidian words, learned from their mothers, families and communities. Poets create memorable language from the basic building blocks. Kövecses concludes and elaborates on the point he made, and one with which I agree:

> Do literary metaphors constitute a special set among metaphors? Sometimes they do, but most of the time poets and writers use the same conceptual metaphors that ordinary people do. Nevertheless, we feel that literary metaphors are somehow special. This is because ordinary conceptual metaphors are regularly transformed by poets and writers in a number of ways: by (1) extending, (2) elaboration, (3) questioning, and (4) combining. (2002, 53)

Thus, even though my emphasis is not on cognitive linguistics, the conclusions of Kövecses dovetail with my interest in metaphor in poetry. The poets use everyday speech in deft and memorable ways. Kövecses has a wide range in his studies of metaphor, for instance, linguistics: "In the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain" (2002, 4). He also relates metaphor to universality and culture, something that Aristotle, in *Poetics*, did in ancient Athens (see Kövecses 2005, 1-5). In addition to metaphor in literature and linguistics, Kövecses also discusses other contexts: "a dozen commonly occurring contextual factors that seem to play a role in the creation of metaphors in real discourse. The contextual factors can be grouped into a number of larger types: situational, linguistic, conceptual-cognitive, and bodily factors" (2015, 176). Context, which is multiple, matters in metaphor.

This past decade there have been other discussions of metaphor that are more literary, cultural and political in nature. Denis Donoghue discusses metaphor in terms of literature and literary criticism: "A metaphor, according to I. A. Richards, is «a shift, a carrying over of a word from its normal use to a new use». That definition is good enough: the root meaning is to transfer a word from one place to another: μεταφέρειν. It supposes that there is an ordinary word that could have been used but hasn't been: instead, another word is used that drives the statement in an unexpected direction" (1; see Richards 1929, 221; Ritchie; Semino/Steen). The carrying over of the ancient Greek becomes *translatio* in Latin, which is related to translation. Having discussed metaphor historically but also in a contemporary context, including metaphor in classical antiquity, East and West, public, text, psychoanalysis, the uncanny, difference, untranslatability, postcolonialism, example and limits, David Punter concludes:

> Metaphor is what metaphor has been taken to be at various times and in various cultures. Nevertheless, we cannot leave the concept in this unsatisfactory condition. We can say that the term "metaphor" has usually been used to denote a peculiarity, or perhaps better an innate property, of language. This property is one of constant excess or dissemination. The simplest of words (head, home, animal) have metaphorical ramifications which cannot be simply denied or evaded, although it is possible, to a limited extent, to select among them in a contextual way. Metaphor is perhaps the principal sign that words do not stand in isolation; so long as they have histories – and all words do, even ones that appear newly coined – then they will have a metaphorical field of their own. (144)

Punter sees metaphor in historical and cultural contexts, that words have histories and metaphorical fields. Metaphors carry over from one word to another, one time to another. We shall see this range of metaphor as word, sentence, text or discourse (like a poem), cultural context, something that Paul Ricœur also emphasizes (see also Lakoff/Johnson; Lakoff/Turner). Aristotle saw metaphor in a number of contexts, poetry but also rhetoric and, by extension, oratory or the public speech of politics, something still discussed. In a recent study, for instance, Jonathan Charteris-Black says: "Within all types of political system leaders have relied on the spoken word to contrast the benefits that arise from their leadership with the dangers that will arise from that of their opponents" (1). All these views of metaphor have roots or analogues in the classical past – that includes in Ricœur, who also wrote on Frye – and helps us to work our way back to Plato and Aristotle (see Ricœur 1991).

Paul Ricœur on metaphor

In 1971, Paul Ricœur gave a course at the University of Toronto that built on courses he had given at Louvain then Paris X and the University of Chicago in which Ricœur began with classical rhetoric, moved through semiotics and semantics and ended with hermeneutics (see Levin 1977; 1988). Although a philosopher, Ricœur holds a view of metaphor that starts with rhetoric: "The rhetoric of metaphor takes the *word* as its unit of reference. Metaphor, therefore, is classed among the single-word figures of speech and is defined as a trope of resemblance. As figure, metaphor constitutes a displacement and an extension of the meaning of words; its explanation is grounded in a theory of substitution" (1977, 1; see Genette). This succinct definition helps to remind us of the intricacy of metaphor, which may appear simple on the surface, as metaphor is an identification of two sides of a yoking or comparison, A is and is not B because in figurative language they can be joined but literally they are not identified. In an observation that sheds light on Ricœur, Eva Feder Kittay (140) sees metaphor as relating to the literal and the figurative and observes that often people value the metaphorical use of language more than the literal use because they consider it more interesting (see Lakoff; Keysar). Like Frye, Ricœur sees the centrality of metaphor, and he stresses the importance of Aristotle in the first study of his course of this public version of it: "«Between Rhetoric and Poetics» [...] is devoted to Aristotle. It is he who actually defined metaphor for the entire subsequent history of Western thought, on the basis

of a semantics that takes the word or the name as its basic unit" (1977, 2). The meaning of words becomes central in the history of thought or ideas in the West. Poetics, rhetoric, philosophy and other fields make words the foundation of the analysis of meaning. My own interest is focused more on metaphor in poetry, but Ricœur makes some significant observations that will take us back to Plato and Aristotle and the language of poets.

Rhetoric is a focus for Ricœur. In the second study of the course, "The Decline of Rhetoric: Tropology", Ricœur examines the last texts on rhetoric in Europe, especially in France, for instance Pierre Fontanier's *Les Figures du discours*, written between 1821 and 1830. He demonstrates "that rhetoric terminates in classification and taxonomy, to the extent that it focuses on the figures of *deviation*, or tropes, in which the meaning of a word departs from its lexically codified usage" and he wishes to demonstrate "that while a taxonomic viewpoint is adequate for a static account of figures, it fails to explain the production of meaning as such, of which deviation at the level of the word is only the effect" (1977, 2). Ricœur seeks out the configurations of metaphor in philosophy and rhetoric and sees the differentiation between the points of view of the semantic and the rhetorical when metaphor is put into a sentence.

His third study, "Metaphor and the Semantics of Discourse", begins provisionally by setting in "radical opposition" "a theory of the statement-metaphor and a theory of the word-metaphor" (Ricœur 1977, 2). In making the semantic, in which the sentence is the minimum carrier of the whole meaning (calling attention to the French linguist Émile Benveniste), collide with semiotics, "where the word is treated as a sign in the lexical code", Ricœur adds to the framework (drawing on I. A. Richards, Max Black and Monroe Beardsley) and, among other things, he examines "the creation of meaning", and seeks evidence in "newly invented metaphors" (1977, 2-3; see Benveniste; Richards 1929, 1936; Black; Beardsley 1958, 1962). For Ricœur, here is the heart of the matter: "What is vital, then, is to show how metaphor, which is produced at the level of the statement as a whole, «focuses» on the word" (3). Ricœur wishes to resolve tension and substitution, word and sentence.

In the fourth study, "Metaphor and Semantics of the Word", Ricœur appeals to Saussurean linguistics, particularly to the works of Stephen Ullmann. By halting at "the threshold of structuralism" Ricœur demonstrates that a linguistics that does not differentiate between the semantics of the word and of the sentence has to attribute changes in meaning "to the history of word usage" (Ricœur 1977, 3; see Ullmann). Here is where Frye and I differ from

Ricœur because our view of metaphor grows out of an analysis of poetry or literature and is not simply imported from rhetoric or philosophy. Aristotle analyzes Homer and the tragic poets to examine metaphor to develop his analysis or theory. Ricœur seems to be more deductive in his method while, like Aristotle and Frye, I tend to be more inductive. Through contrast, Plato and Ricœur, help us to express and understand a view of metaphor anchored in poetry and one that is induced from the poetry itself.

Ricœur's fifth study, "Metaphor and the New Rhetoric", continues to engage with French structuralism in terms of a "«new rhetoric» that applies the rules of segmentation, identification, and combination to figures of speech, rules that already have been applied with success to phonological and lexical entities" (1977, 3; see Derrida 1978; 1982). In this discussion, Ricœur concentrates on figure and deviation and claims that the new rhetoric "overlooks the specificity of the statement-metaphor and limits itself to confirming the primacy of the word-metaphor" (4). The core of Ricœur's work is to resolve metaphors expressed in sentences with those represented in a word. His studies approach this tension or problem from different angles. Linguistics and rhetoric are keys to his philosophical method and those philosophers he draws on.

Ricœur shifts from semantics to hermeneutics in the sixth study, "The Work of Resemblance", and takes up again from his third study, that is the problem "of semantic innovation or creation", by refuting the position of Roman Jakobson that resemblance is connected to substitution theory by demonstrating that resemblance is also required in tension theory (Ricœur 1977, 4; see Jakobson). To bolster his case, Ricœur calls on one of the original sources: "«To metaphorize well», said Aristotle, «implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilars». Thus, resemblance itself must be understood as a tension between identity and difference in the predicative operation set in motion by semantic innovation" (4). One of the elements I stress is similarity and difference, and here Ricœur calls on Aristotle to do just that. Ricœur would like to see imagination move beyond the image to, echoing Wittgenstein, an aspect of the "semantic operation consisting in seeing the similar in the dissimilar" (5; see Wittgenstein). I might add that metaphor also shows the dissimilar in the similar in the sense that a bold and innovative metaphor makes the familiar unfamiliar as well as the unfamiliar familiar. There is, then, a mutual operation between the similar and dissimilar as an excess of "the similar in the dissimilar".

In the sixth and seventh studies, Ricœur centres on semantic innovation. In analyzing metaphor, Ricœur moves from word to sentence to discourse, which he sees as a "passage to the *hermeneutic* point of view", the discourse being "poem, narrative, essay" and the like (1977, 5). Ricœur is interested in the connection between semantics and hermeneutics, sense and reference, language and reality. For Ricœur, metaphor is a "strategy of discourse" that preserves and develops "the creative power of language" that does the same for "the *heuristic* power" that fiction yields (5). Metaphor in fiction helps to explore, express and know. If metaphor in poetry seems self-referential and does not refer to the world, does it collide with metaphorical reference to the world, or is it that poetry does not refer literally to the world or reality but does so figuratively? This is the terrain – metaphorical reference – that Ricœur, along with Jakobson, explores and that Nelson Goodman examines in a theory of denotation in *Languages of Art* and is related to Max Black's idea of kinship in metaphor in the arts and sciences in *Models and Metaphors*. For Ricœur, Goodman and Black, the relation on a heuristic plane is the main argument of the "hermeneutics of metaphor" (5; see Jakobson; Goodman; Black). In 1979, in examining science and metaphor, Thomas Kuhn also discusses Black, Kripke, Putnam, Boyd, and asks a number of questions, including: "Is what we refer to as «the world» perhaps a product of a mutual accommodation between experience and language?" (542; see Sunstein/Anderson). Metaphor collides word and world and is a way of mediation, framing and thinking. In poetry, the image and metaphor embody the thought and are a primal and primitive and beautiful way of thinking. Science uses metaphor but in the service of analysis that tests a hypothesis through experiment and other evidence. Where Frye and I differ from Ricœur, who is admirable in his analysis, is that he roots his analysis in rhetoric (something that Plato does not do), whereas our view is through poetry. Even Aristotle, who discusses metaphor in different places, including in *Rhetoric*, as we shall see, centres his analysis in *Poetics* (see Hart 2019, 15-17, 22-23). Ricœur continues to set out a rhetorical framework, which he calls his "most important theme" – "metaphor is the rhetorical process by which discourse unleashes the power that certain fictions have to redescribe reality" (1977, 5). Aristotle examines metaphor as a figure that poetry and rhetoric share but does not make it a "rhetorical process". Sometimes it might be a matter of terminology because Ricœur then appeals explicitly to Aristotle: "By linking fiction and redescription in this way, we restore the full depth of meaning to Aristotle's discovery in the *Poetics*, which was that the *poiêsis* of

language arises out of the connection between *muthos* and *mimesis*" (5-6). Whereas Frye sees myth and metaphor as being connected, Ricœur views metaphor as leading to a connection between myth and mimesis (representation, imitation). All this, despite the differences in terminology and emphasis, leads Ricœur to see that metaphor is not the name or sentence or discourse but is "the copula of the verb *to be*" and to assert, quite sensibly, that in metaphor the "is" is also "is not" and "is like" and that constitutes "metaphorical truth" (6).

By connecting metaphor with reality and truth, Ricœur wishes to elucidate metaphorical philosophy in his eighth study, "Metaphor and Philosophical Discourse". In Ricœur, we arrive at the ancient split between poetry and philosophy, which is found in Plato but also, although to a lesser degree, in Aristotle, who even if he, like Plato, places philosophy above poetry at least gives some scope to poetry and analyzes Homer and the tragic and other poets. Ricœur seems to be part of the desire of philosophers, from Plato, to displace poets in education, and not part of what Stanley Cavell sees as an engagement of philosophy with literature (what some call the "litrification" of philosophy) in recent decades, something that was, of course, an aspect of the Enlightenment, for instance in figures such as Voltaire and David Hume (see Cavell 1976, 1987; Voltaire; Hume). Ricœur says that his last study "is essentially a plea for the plurality of modes of discourse and for the independence of philosophical discourse in relation to the propositions of sense and reference of poetic discourse" (1977, 6). Philosophy has long tried to displace poetry, so, unless Ricœur thinks there is a poetic strain or hegemony in Western culture or philosophy, his statement here is curious. Then Ricœur curbs poetry: "No philosophy proceeds directly from poetry: this is shown through what appears to be the most difficult case, that of Aristotelian and medieval analogy" (6; see Vickers; Vosniadou/Ortony). Analogy, which is related to the comparison it shares with metaphor, is something that Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and others explored, so the question is if metaphor leads to questions of reality and truth, how does it differ from analogy. It seems that metaphorical truth does not, according to Ricœur, proceed from poetry, which Aristotle says is a key source of metaphor. Ricœur elaborates on this limiting of poetry vis-à-vis philosophy: "Nor does any philosophy proceed indirectly from poetry, even under cover of the «dead» metaphor in which the collusion between metaphysical and metaphorical, denounced by Heidegger, could take place" (1977, 6; see Heidegger; Traugott). Poetry cannot, for Ricœur, be the ground of philosophy, and, it seems, whether metaphor is dead

or alive (wanted or not). Poetry is supposed to enliven and make creative metaphors, and the wearing out or deadening of metaphor is something everyday speech can do over time. Ricœur seems to imply that "is" is a matter of being, which, after all, is existence, and perhaps the existentialism of Sartre, Camus and others might be something Ricœur has in mind when trying to limit poetry or the figure of poetic philosophy or "poet-philosophers", such as Sartre and Camus, although he does not name them here (see Sartre; Camus). According to Ricœur, "the discourse that attempts to *recover* the ontology implicit in the metaphorical statement is a different discourse. In this sense, to *ground* what was called metaphorical truth is also to *limit* poetic discourse. Poetic discourse is justified in this manner within its own circumscription" (1977, 6). The paradox is that to ground metaphorical truth is to limit poetry, a kind of ironic limitation of the poetic. Ricœur's view is that philosophy does not proceed directly or indirectly from poetry. It is as though Ricœur, a philosopher, imagines that philosophy, a discipline that has often sought to displace, suppress or limit poetry, needs to be rescued from poetry, as an origin. Plato tried to declare independence for philosophy from Homer and poetry, and thousands of years later, even in a pluralistic world with "a plurality of modes of discourses", are we in need of Ricœur's declaration of independence of philosophy from poetry?

Ricœur modifies this sense of displacement of one field. His work "does not seek to replace rhetoric with semantics and the latter with hermeneutics, and thus have one refute the other, but rather seeks to justify each approach within the limits of the corresponding discipline and to demonstrate the systematic continuity of viewpoints by following the progression from word to sentence and from sentence to discourse" (1977, 6; see Sweetser). Perhaps each field has its limits, so philosophy has limitations as does poetry and all that Ricœur enumerates in this sentence. He wishes to show the limitations of theories and to move his argument along (6-7). Here, I am giving an outline of the method and scope of one of Ricœur's fullest and most important books: he is key to the study of metaphor. Like his volume, my consideration of other views is a way to clarify the matter of metaphor and my approach from poetry and not in any way to downplay those of others. Like Frye, I focus on metaphor in poetry, but I have no interest in placing poetry above any other field. Here, I am interested in the beauty and operation of poetry, as can be seen through metaphor, but realize that there are many ways to examine metaphor, including the work of Hegel on metaphor in lyric poetry.

From Hegel to Aquinas

A philosopher who examines art, poetry and aesthetics, Hegel discusses the lyric in the West and the East. He gives an overview:

> The real image merely places before us the fact in the reality it possesses. The expression of the poet's imagination, on the contrary, does not restrict itself to the object in its immediate appearance; it proceeds to depict something over and above this, by means of which the significance of the former picture is made clear to our mind. (60)

For Hegel, the paradox of representation is that the poet sees the image in reality but goes beyond the appearance and makes the real clear to the mind. More particularly, he says: "Metaphors, illustrations, similes become in this way an essential feature of poetic creation" (60). The metaphorical is essential to the creation of poetry, which he amplifies: "We have thereby a kind of veil attached to the content, which concerns us, and which, by its difference from it, serves in part as an embellishment, and in part as a further unfolding of it, though it necessarily fails to be complete, for the reason that it only applies to a specific aspect of this content" (60). Hegel uses the metaphor of the veil to describe the relation of metaphor to content. He illustrates his observation: "The passage in which Homer compares Ajax, on his refusing to fly, to an obstinate ass is an illustration" (60). Like Aristotle, Hegel uses Homer as a positive illustration of metaphor (Plato being less sanguine about Homer).

According to Hegel, the poetry of the East is even more illustrative:

> To a pre-eminent degree oriental poetry possesses this splendour and wealth in pictorial comparisons. There are two main reasons of this. First, its symbolic point of view makes such a search for aspects of affinity inevitable, and in the universality of its centres of significance it offers a large field of concrete phenomena capable of comparison. (60-61)

Eastern poetry creates affinity in the comparison between the symbolic and the phenomenal. In his extended discussion of the second reason for "pictorial comparisons" in Eastern poetry, Hegel maintains: "The belief in the world as we apprehend it with the vision of ordinary common sense is converted into a belief in the imagination, for which the only world that verily exists is that which the poetic consciousness has created" (61). Poetry, through its consciousness, makes the world real. Hegel's analysis is intricate, for he adds: "Conversely we have the romantic imagination, which is ready enough to ex-

press itself in metaphor, because in its vision what is external is for the essentially secluded life of the soul only accepted as something incidental, something that is unable adequately to express its own reality" (61). The metaphorical is for the metaphorical. Hegel's Romantic poet uses metaphor to create emotion that transforms "unreal externality" and absorbs it to the life of the soul and that "this elaboration and self-reflection of its creation" is "its own source of delight" (61). Metaphor brings together the physical and spiritual for meaning and delight.

Hegel also looks at the history of the lyric. He concludes his discussion: "If we look more closely at form of expression in this type of poetry, we shall find that it is mainly the *metaphor*, the image and the *simile* which are favoured" (237). Metaphor, image and simile are central to lyric poetry. These figures of representation provide possibility for the poet as Hegel sees it: "For, in the first place, on account of the fact that he is not himself wholly free to express his own personal life, the poet can only disclose himself in something else, something external to himself, with the aid of life that can compare with himself" (237). Through metaphor, and the analogy and comparison within it, life and art, word and world, the external and the internal interact. This is a complex process: "These metaphors, images, and similes, however, in which the individual soul, as it asserts itself, is exclusively identified almost to the point of visibility, are not the actual feeling and spiritual state itself, but rather a mode of expression which is wholly personal and of the poet's composition" (238). Metaphor is part of the personal expression and composition of the poet. Hegel distinguishes the lyric of the Greeks and Romans from Eastern lyrics and Romantic lyrics. Metaphor is a means of self-expression in the lyric: "All that it communicates, in short, of the views and maxims of life and wisdom, despite all the penetration of its general principle, nevertheless does not dispense with the free individuality of independent thought and conception. It expresses itself less in the wealth of image and metaphor, than directly and categorically" (239). Traditional culture and received wisdom balance with independent ideas. The Romantic lyric seems to try to go beyond metaphor in self-expression.

Thomas Aquinas also talks about comparison and analogy. A couple of examples show his interest, so this topic has not been extinguished from classical antiquity through the Middle Ages into the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In his *Summa Theologica*, Aquinas raises questions and provides objections and replies. Here, I am interested in what contexts he

discusses metaphor and not in how he resolves the question, which to explore at length would take another study. For instance, Aquinas asks: "Whether the word «person» should be said of God?". In the second objection, Aquinas provides a context from Attic theatre:

> Further, Boethius says (De Duab. Nat.): *The word person seems to be taken from those persons who represented men in comedies and tragedies. For person comes from sounding through* (personando), *since a greater volume of sound is produced through the cavity in the mask. These 'persons' or masks the Greeks called* πρόσωπα, *as they were placed on the face and covered the features before the eyes*. This, however, can apply to God only in a metaphorical sense. Therefore the word person is only applied to God metaphorically. (31)

Aquinas is making a distinction between the divine and human, the literal and figurative or metaphorical and does so through his notions of ancient Greek theatre and how the mask or persona becomes a synecdoche for the whole person or being. Ancient Greek poetry informs theology.

Discussing the plurality of persons, Aquinas says: "But we say that numeral terms predicated of God are not derived from number, a species of quantity, for in that sense they could bear only a metaphorical sense in God, like other corporeal properties, such as length, breadth, and the like; but that they are taken from multitude in a transcendent sense" (45). God contains a "metaphorical sense" of quantity and "corporal properties" and not a literal sense. Metaphor is important to the theology of Aquinas, who asks: "Whether this name «father» is properly the name of a divine person?" (74). The third objection highlights metaphor: "Further, a metaphorical term cannot be the proper name of anyone. But the word is by us metaphorically called begotten, or offspring; and consequently, he of whom is the word, is metaphorically called father. Therefore the principle of the Word in God is not properly called Father" (74). The logic and the problem hang on the logic of metaphor. Aquinas frames his reply to the third objection thus: "In human nature the word is not a subsistence, and hence is not properly called begotten or son. But the divine Word is something subsistent in the divine nature; and hence He is properly and not metaphorically called Son, and His principle is called Father" (75). Aquinas distinguishes between property and metaphor, what is and what is said to be.

Another aspect, in the context of the person of the Son, is embodied in the question: "Whether *Word* in God is a personal name?" (Aquinas 83).

Aquinas proceeds to the first article and the objection: "It would seem that *Word* in God is not a personal name. For personal names are applied to God in a proper sense, as *Father* and *Son*, but *Word* is applied to God metaphorically, as Origen says on (Jo. I.1), *In the beginning was the Word*. Therefore Word is not a personal name in God" (83). So, the Word is a metaphor for God and not his name. In the reply to the first objection, Aquinas argues for a connection between word and thing: "But supposing Word to be said metaphorically of God, we must still admit Word in its strict sense. For if a thing be called a word metaphorically, this can only be by reason of some manifestation; either it makes something manifest as a word, or it is manifested by a word" (85). What is manifested by a word, what is metaphorical, is. Elaborating, Aquinas concludes: "Therefore, although Word may be sometimes said of God metaphorically, nevertheless we must also admit Word in the proper sense, and which is said personally" (86). The Word is a metaphor for God but is also "in the proper sense" and expressed "personally".

In the discussion of the person of the Holy Ghost, metaphor comes up again in the reply ("Reply Obj. 5"): "The Word in God is not taken after the similitude of the vocal word, whence the breath (*spiritus*) does not proceed; for it would then be only metaphorical; but after the similitude of the mental word, whence proceeds love" (Aquinas 105). The breath as metaphor is key. The Word is not in the similitude of "the vocal word", which does not produce breath, but from that of "the mental word", "whence proceeds love" (105). Metaphor and similitude are at the heart of the matter.

Aquinas also explores the following question: "Whether the notional acts proceed from something?" (168). Part of Aquinas' answer includes an addressing of metaphor: "That certain creatures made by God out of nothing are called sons of God is to be taken in a metaphorical sense, according to a certain likeness of assimilation to Him Who is the true Son" (170). For Aquinas, "a metaphorical sense" means those created by God are sons like Jesus, the true Son. Aquinas seems to be implying a distinction between simile and metaphor in this theological matter.

Plato and Aristotle

Briefly, I shall discuss metaphor in Aristotle and Plato, especially in relation to poetry but also in connection with style, something rhetoric and poetics share. Book III of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* contains a discussion of style, which includes

metaphor – i.e., literary criticism or theory –, and is related closely to his *Poetics* (see Hart 2019, 15). Both in *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, Aristotle examines clearness and propriety, and he stresses, in prose and poetry, the natural and recommends that metaphors in prose should be in common use. Thus, metaphor is important to the examination of style.

As Aristotle shows, metaphor is a transference, a movement or application (*epiphora*) of alien names, from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy (see Hart 2019, 16). George Kennedy notes these connections, as does Ricœur in his discussion of Aristotle on metaphor and its difference in poetics and rhetoric. In this context, Ricœur views *allotrios* as assimilating deviation, borrowing and substitution (see Kennedy 222-23n25; Ricœur 20). For Aristotle, metaphor is a gift not learned from others (*Poetics* XXII; *Rhetoric* III.2; Kennedy 223n29). Moreover, Aristotle sees the source of metaphor as being something beautiful. Something important to my argument here, as Aristotle studied with Plato, is that he refers to the discussion of verbal beauty in Licymnius, whom Plato mentions in this regard in *Phaedrus* (267c2; see Kennedy 225n34). Thus, Aristotle's connection with Plato and others even bears on his views of style and metaphor. Aristotle discusses frigidities (*ta psykhra*) and considers compound words to be poetic. As Kennedy points out, Aristophanes makes fun of these compounds (*Frogs* 830-94; see Kennedy 226n42). Metaphor, *parabole* and simile, or *eikon*, share comparison and likeness. Aristotle discusses similes here in *Rhetoric*; he does not do so in *Poetics* (see Kennedy 229).

Aristotle also examines metaphor from analogy, another form of comparison, something he also explores at *Poetics* XXI, and a notion that also comes forth in Thomas Aquinas (see Kennedy 230n63). Aristotle refers in *Rhetoric* to his earlier work on poetics: "It has already been stated, as we have said, in the *Poetics*, what each of these things is, how many kinds of metaphor there are, and that it is most important both in poetry and in prose" (*Rhetoric* III.2.7). In *Poetics* XXI and XXII, Aristotle examines different types of words and the various kinds of metaphor and connects poet and orator through the perspicuity and pleasure of metaphor, poetry having more (see Aristotle, *Rhetoric* III.2.8; Hart 2019, 38); he talks about invention and what is appropriate in metaphor in *Poetics* XXII, and in *Rhetoric* III.2.9-10 as well.

Briefly, I will show how carefully and seriously Aristotle examines metaphor in poetry. The detail with which Aristotle considers metaphor and poetry is admirable and ground-breaking, a philosopher helping to move aes-

thetics and literary criticism and theory forward. Aristotle helped to give a language for poetry and metaphor and their analysis. He sees poetry and discusses how it works, and here we shall witness his treatment of metaphor in poetry. Metaphor is a gift that the poet uses: "But much the greatest asset is a capacity for metaphor. This alone cannot be acquired from another, and is a sign of natural gifts: because to use metaphor well is to discern similarities" (Aristotle, *Poetics* 1459a4-9). Metaphor is the heart of poetic creativity and cannot be learnt from others. Aristotle places metaphor in specific contexts: "Of word types, double forms particularly suit dithyramb, loan words suit epic, and metaphors suit iambic verse. In epic, everything mentioned has some use, but in iambic verse, because of the very close relation to ordinary speech, suitable words are those one would also use in prose – namely, standard terms, metaphors, ornaments" (1459a10-14). Diction, metre and genre become the framework for this discussion of metaphor. Although Aristotle argues for philosophy or poetry as universal, over and above history, which is particular, he bases his examination on Greek language, metre and poetry and metaphor as part of this analysis: "As for metre, the hexameter has proved apt by experience. If one were to compose a narrative mimesis in some other metre, or in several, the incongruity would be plain, since the hexameter is the most stately and dignified of metres (hence its great receptivity to loan words and metaphors)" (1459a30-35). Metaphor is a carrying over as is translation. Ancient Greek metre differs from that of other languages, so that, English, for instance, cannot represent or transport metaphor in the same way. Greek is so specific that metre joins form and content, so that hexametre is better for metaphor in narrative mimesis.

Plato also relates metaphor to art. In Book II of Plato's *Laws*, the Athenian pays close attention to metaphor in music:

> But music is a matter of rhythm and harmony, and involves tunes and movements of the body; this means that while it is legitimate to speak of a "rhythmical" or a "harmonious" movement or tune, we cannot properly apply to either of them the chorus-masters' metaphor "brilliantly colored". But what is the appropriate language to describe the movement and melody used to portray the brave man and the coward? (655a-b)

Here, the Athenian criticizes a metaphor and looks for appropriate language to describe melody and movement. As for Aristotle after him, for Plato, metaphor can relate to rhythm.

At the conclusion of *Laws*, Plato has the Athenian set a context for the founding of the state and the use of metaphor: "And if, my good companions, if this wonderful council of ours can be formed, then the state must be entrusted to it, and practically no modern legislator will want to oppose us" (655a). The Athenian then says: "We thought of our combined metaphor of head and intellect, which we mentioned a moment ago, as idealistic dreaming – but it will all come true, provided the council members are rigorously selected, properly educated, and after the completion of their studies lodged in the citadel of the country and made into guardians whose powers of protection we have never seen excelled in our lives before" (Plato 968b-c; see 961d and 964e-965a). In response, Megillus suggests that Clinias ask the Athenian to stay to help found the state. Plato's Athenian can use a "combined metaphor of head and intellect" to found the state and not simply "as idealistic dreaming". Metaphor can be a good thing, but is not something explicitly part of Plato's critique of poets, who skew mimesis, most famously set out in Book X of *Republic*. There the Platonic Socrates criticizes poets, most notably Homer, for representing reality from three removes and for seducing the soul from the good, true and just, both for the individual and the republic. Throughout the dialogues, Plato mentions Homer and the Homeric many times.

Conclusion

Metaphor, as we saw by reading it backward in different moments and texts from the present through Ricœur, Hegel and Aquinas to Aristotle and Plato, is a vital aspect of language, poetry, rhetoric (oratory and politics), philosophy and other fields. As we observed, the tension among philosophy, poetry and rhetoric occurred in ancient Athens and persists. The study of metaphor has been the case of a thousand flowers blooming. After beginning with Frye, who saw himself as a critic and theorist thinking metaphorically like a poet, the article discussed some other views of metaphor. It then explored Ricœur's rich and multiple idea of metaphor, while noting his attempt to curb poetic metaphor, thereby showing a tension between philosophy and poetry even still. The examination of key instances of Aquinas' discussion of metaphor included those used in relation to the Trinity. From Aquinas, the article moved to Aristotle, whom he called The Philosopher, who, despite preferring philosophy as being more universal and just in mimesis than poetry, led the way in a critical and analytical view of poetry, including mimesis and metaphor, the focus of this

article. Plato, like his student, Aristotle, prefers philosophy to poetry but is more critical of poetry than is Aristotle. In *Laws*, Plato does discuss metaphor briefly, but in relation to music (analogous to poetry but not poetry itself) and to the founding of the state, the head and intellect of the body politic.

The "is" and "is not" of metaphor have so many ramifications and implications. Metaphor is the yoking of word and world, of this and that. Poetry uses metaphor in this comparative and analogical identification of a bold yoking of two things (often a person and something natural, a personification) that might be apparently disparate. Like metaphor in poetry, metaphor in politics, philosophy, rhetoric, theology and other fields is central to debates about the nature of those disciplines and of reality and the world. Language matters. Poetry matters. Aristotle, Hegel, Frye and others take metaphor in poetry seriously. It is easy to dismiss poetry because, to the worldly, it seems useless, impractical and without power. Poets since Homer have used metaphor and have subsequently been dismissed. For Plato and for Hegel, poetry is a matter for the soul, and that is something for the state and world. Poets think metaphorically, and so do philosophers and theorists like Hegel and Frye. The recognition of poetry is vital but so is that of literary criticism and theory. Metaphor helps us to recognize that recognition.

References

Albaladejo, Tomás. "Cultural Rhetoric: Foundations and Perspectives". *Res Rhetorica* 3.1 (2016): 16-29.

Albaladejo, Tomás. "El motor metafórico y la fundamentación retórico-cultural de su activación". *Castilla: estudios de literatura* 10 (2019): 559-83.

Anderson, C. C. "The Psychology of the Metaphor". *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 105 (1964): 53-73.

Aquinas, Thomas. *The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, Part I, QQ. XXVII.-XLIX.* Trans. Fathers of The English Dominican Province. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, [1921].

Aristotle. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Ed. John Henry Freese. London: William Heinemann, 1926.

Aristotle. *On Rhetoric*. Trans. with an Introduction and Notes by George Kennedy. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell. Loeb Classical Library 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. 27-141.

Arnold, Matthew. "The Study of Poetry". *The Complete Prose Works*. Vol. 9. Ed. Robert Henry Super. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1968. 161-88.

Barker, Philip. *Psychotherapeutic Metaphors: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. Bristol, PA: Brunner/Mazel, Inc., 1996.

Beardsley, Monroe C. *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1958.

Beardsley, Monroe C. "The Metaphorical Twist". *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 293-307.

Benveniste, Émile. "La forme et le sens dans le langage". *Le Langage (Actes du XIIIe congrès des sociétés de philosophie de langue française)*. Neuchâtel: La Baconnière, 1967. 27-40.

Benveniste, Émile. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Trans. Mary Elizabeth Meek. Coral Gables, Florida: Miami UP, 1971.

Berry, Ralph. *The Shakespearean Metaphor: Studies in Language and Form*. 1978. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Binkley, Timothy. "On the Truth and Probity of Metaphor". *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33 (1974): 171-80.

Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1962.

Booth, Wayne. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1974.

Boyd, Richard N. "Realism, Underdetermination and a Causal Theory of Evidence". *Nous* 8 (1973): 1-12.

Boyle, Robert R. "The Nature of Metaphor". *Modern Schoolman* 31 (1954): 257-80.

Brown, Richard Harvey. "Social Theory as Metaphor". *Theory and Society* 3 (1976): 169-98.

Brown, Stephen J. *The World of Imagery*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1927.

Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*. Trans. Justin O'Brian. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Carroll, John M., and John C. Thomas. "Metaphor and Cognitive Representation of Computing Systems". *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics* 12 (1982): 107-16.

Cavell, Stanley. *Must We Mean What We Say?* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

Cavell, Stanley. *Disowning Knowledge: In Six Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Cohen, L. Jonathan, and Avishai Margalit. "The Role of Inductive Reasoning in the Interpretation of Metaphor". *Semantics of Natural Language*. Eds. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1972.

Cohen, Ted. "Notes on Metaphor". *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34 (1976): 249-59.

Davidson, Donald. "What Metaphors Mean". *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 31-47.

Davidson, R. E. "The Role of Metaphor and Analogy in Learning". *Cognitive Learning in Children*. Eds. Joel R. Levin and Vernon L. Allen. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Denham, Alison E. *Metaphor and Moral Experience*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Retrait of Metaphor". *Enclitic* 2 (1978): 5-33.

Derrida, Jacques. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy". 1971. *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1982. 207-71.

Donoghue, Denis. *Metaphor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2014.

Eberle, Rolf. "Appendix: Models, Metaphors and Formal Interpretations". *The Myth of Metaphor*. Ed. Colin Murray Turbayne. Rev. ed. Columbia: South Carolina UP, 1970. 219-33.

Elbers, Loekie. "New Names from Old Words: Related Aspects of Children's Metaphors and Word Compounds". *Journal of Child Language* 15 (1988): 591-617.

Evans, Gerald E. "Metaphors as Learning Aids in University Lectures". *Journal of Experimental Education* 56 (1988): 91-99.

Evans, Mary Ann, and Dianna Lynn Gamble. "Attribute Saliency and Metaphor Interpretation in School-age Children". *Journal of Child Language* 15 (1988): 435-49.

Evans, Roberta D., and Gerald E. Evans. "Cognitive Mechanisms in Learning from Metaphors". *Journal of Experimental Education* 58 (1989): 5-19.

Fahey, Maria Franziska. *Metaphor and Shakespearean Drama: Unchaste Signification*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Fainsilber, Lynn, and W. N. Kogan. "Does Imagery Contribute to Metaphoric Quality?". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 13 (1984): 383-91.

Fauconnier, Gilles. *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985.

Fontanier, Pierre. *Les Figures du discours*. Paris: Flammarion, 2009.

Frye, Northrop. *Fearful Symmetry: A Study of William Blake*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1947.

Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1976.

Frye, Northrop. *Interviews with Northrop Frye*. Ed. Jean O'Grady. Toronto/Buffalo: Toronto UP, 2008.

Gardner, Howard. "Metaphors and Modalities: How Children Project Polar Adjectives onto Diverse Domains". *Child Development* 45 (1974): 84-91.

Gardner, Howard, and E. Winner. "Attitudes and Attributes: Children's Understanding of Metaphor and Sarcasm". *Perspectives on Intellectual Development. The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology* 19. Ed. Marion Perlmutter. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1986. 131-52.

Genette, Gérard. "La Rhetorique des figures". Introduction to Pierre Fontanier. *Les Figures du discours*. Paris: Flammarion, 1968. 3-17.

Gentner, Dedre. "Are Scientific Analogies Metaphors?". *Metaphor: Problems and Perspectives*. Ed. David S. Miall. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982. 106-32.

Gentner, Dedre. "Metaphor as Structure Mapping: The Relational Shift". *Child Development* 59 (1988): 47-59.

Gentner, Dedre, and Catherine Clement. "Evidence for Relational Selectivity in the Interpretation of Analogy and Metaphor". *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 22. Ed. Gordon H. Bower. New York: Academic Press, 1988. 307-58.

Gentner, Dedre, Brian Falkenhainer and Janice Skorstad. "Viewing Metaphor as Analogy". *Analogical Reasoning: Perspectives of Artificial Intelligence, Cognitive Science, and Philosophy*. Ed. David H. Helman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1988. 171-78.

Gentner, Dedre, and Jonathan Grudin. "The Evolution of Mental Metaphors in Psychology: A Ninety-year Retrospective". *American Psychologist* 40 (1985): 181-92.

Gentner, Dedre, and Patricia Stuart. *Metaphor as Structure-mapping: What Develops?* Champaign, ILL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign/ Cambridge, MA: Bolt Beranek & Newman, 1983.

Gerrig, Richard J., and Alice F. Healy. "Dual Processes in Metaphor Understanding: Comprehension and Appreciation". *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 4 (1983): 667-75.

Gibbs, Raymond, and Richard Gerrig. "How Context Makes Metaphor Comprehension Seem Special". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 3 (1989): 145-58.

Gibbs, Raymond, and Jennifer O'Brien. "Idioms and Mental Imagery: The Metaphorical Motivation for Idiomatic Meaning". *Cognition* 36 (1990): 35-68.

Glucksberg, Sam, Patricia Gildea and Howard Bookin. "On Understanding Nonliteral Speech: Can People Ignore Metaphors?". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 21 (1982): 85-98.

Glucksberg, Sam, and Boaz Keysar. "Understanding Metaphorical Comparisons: Beyond Similarity". *Psychological Review* 97 (1990): 3-18.

Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.

Harris, Richard J. "Memory for Metaphors". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 8 (1979): 249-65.

Harris, Richard J., Mary Ann Lahey and Faith Marsalek. "Metaphors and Images: Rating, Reporting and Remembering". *Cognition and Figurative Language*. Eds. Richard P. Honeck and Robert R. Hoffman. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980. 163-81.

Hart, Jonathan. *Northrop Frye: The Theoretical Imagination*. London/New York: Routledge, 1994.

Hart, Jonathan. *Aristotle and His Afterlife: Rhetoric, Poetics and Comparison*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2019.

Hawkes, Terence. *Metaphor*. 1972. London/New York: Routledge, 2018.

Haynes, Felicity. "Metaphor as Interactive". *Educational Theory* 25 (1975): 272-77.

Haynes, Felicity. "Metaphoric Understanding". *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 12 (1978): 99-115.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of Fine Art by G. W. F. Hegel*. Trans. Francis Plumptre Beresford Osmaston. Vol. 4. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1920.

Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. 1954. Trans. Albert Hofstader. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Hoffman, Robert R., and Susan Kemper. "What Could Reaction-times Tell Us about Metaphor Comprehension?". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 2.3 (1987): 149-86.

Honeck, Richard P., Paul Riechmann and Robert R. Hoffman. "Semantic Memory for Metaphor: The Conceptual Base Hypothesis". *Memory & Cognition* 3 (1975): 409-15.

Hume, David. *Essays: Moral, Political, Literary*. Ed. Eugene F. Miller. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1985.

Inhoff, Albrecht, Susan D. Lima and Patrick J. Carroll. "Contextual Effects on Metaphor Comprehension in Reading". *Memory & Cognition* 12.6 (1984): 558-67.

Jakobson, Roman. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics". *Style in Language*. Ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960. 350-77.

Johnson, Mark. *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1981.

Johnson, Mark. "Introduction: Why Metaphor Matters to Philosophy". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10.3 (1995): 157-62.

Johnson, Michael G., and Robert G. Malgady. "Toward a Perceptual Theory of Metaphoric Comprehension". *Cognition and Figurative Language*. Eds. Richard P. Honeck and Robert R. Hoffman. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980. 259-82.

Katz, Albert Norman. *Verbal Concept Identification: Disentangling the Dominance Effect*. 1976. University of Western Ontario, PhD dissertation. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/digitizedtheses/952/>.

Katz, Albert Norman. "On Choosing the Vehicles of Metaphors: Referential Concreteness, Semantic Distances, and Individual Differences". *Journal of Memory and Language* 28 (1989): 486-99.

Katz, Albert Norman, Allan Paivio, Mark Marschark and Jim Clark. "Norms for 204 Literary and 260 Nonliterary Metaphors on 10 Psychological Dimensions". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 3 (1988): 191-214.

Keil, Frank. "Conceptual Domains and the Acquisition of Metaphor". *Cognitive Development* 1 (1979): 73-96.

Kennedy, George. Introduction and Notes. Aristotle. *On Rhetoric; A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George Kennedy. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.

Keysar, Boaz. "On the Functional Equivalence of Literal and Metaphorical Interpretations in Discourse". *Journal of Memory and Language* 28 (1989): 375-85.

Khatchadourian, Haig. "Metaphor". *British Journal of Aesthetics* 8 (1968): 227-43.

Kittay, Eva Feder. *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Koen, Frank. "An Intra-Verbal Explication of the Nature of Metaphor". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 4 (1965): 129-33.

Kogan, Nathan, Kathleen Connor, Augusta Gross and Donald Fava. "Understanding Visual Metaphor: Developmental and Individual Differences". *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development* 45 (1980): 1-78.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Kövecses, Zoltán. *Where Metaphors Come From*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015.
Kuhn, Thomas S. "Metaphor in Science". *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 533-42.
Lakoff, George. "The Meaning of Literal". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 1 (1986): 291-96.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1980.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1989.
Levin, Samuel R. *The Semantics of Metaphor*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1977.
Levin, Samuel R. *Metaphoric Worlds*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.
Loewenberg, Ina. "Truth and Consequences of Metaphors". *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 30-46.
Loewenberg, Ina. "Identifying Metaphors". *Foundations of Language* 12 (1975): 315-38.
Malgady, Robert G., and Michael G. Johnson. "Modifiers in Metaphors: Effects of Constituent Phrase Similarity on the Interpretation of Figurative Sentences". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 5 (1976): 43-52.
Marschark, Marc, and R. Reed Hunt. "On Memory for Metaphor". *Memory & Cognition* 13 (1985): 413-24.
Marschark, Marc, Albert N. Katz and Allan Paivio. "Dimensions of Metaphor". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 12 (1983): 17-40.
Matthews, Robert J. "Concerning a «linguistic theory» of Metaphor". *Foundations of Language* 7 (1971): 413-25.
Miller, Ralph M. "The Dubious Case for Metaphors in Educational Writing". *Educational Theory* 26 (1976): 174-81.
Miller, Steven I. "Some Comments on the Utility of Metaphors for Educational Theory and Practice". *Educational Theory* 37 (1987): 219-27.
Mladenov, Ivan. *Conceptualizing Metaphors: On Charles Peirce's Marginalia*. London/New York: Routledge, 2006.
Mooij, J. J. A. *A Study of Metaphor*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1976.
Neisser, Ulric. "Computers as Tools and as Metaphors". *The Social Impact of Cybernetics*. Ed. Charles Dechert. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame UP, 1966. 71-93.
Olson, David R. "On What's a Metaphor For?". *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 3 (1988): 215-22.

Ortony, Andrew. "Why Metaphors are Necessary and Not Just Nice". *Educational Theory* 25 (1975): 45-53.

Ortony, Andrew. "On the Nature and Value of Metaphor: A Reply to My Critics". *Educational Theory* 26 (1976): 395-98.

Ortony, Andrew. "Beyond Literal Similarity". *Psychological Review* 86 (1979): 161-80.

Ortony, Andrew, Ralph E. Reynolds and Judith A. Arter. "Metaphor: Theoretical and Empirical Research". *Psychological Bulletin* 85 (1978a): 919-43.

Ortony, Andrew, Diane L. Schallert, Ralph E. Reynolds and Stephen J. Antos. "Interpreting Metaphors and Idioms: Some Effects of Context on Comprehension". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 17 (1978b): 465-77.

Osgood, Charles E. "The Cognitive Dynamics of Synesthesia and Metaphor". *Cognition and Figurative Language*. Eds. Richard P. Honeck and Robert R. Hoffman. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980. 203-38.

Paivio, Allan, and James M. Clark. "The Role of Topic and Vehicle Imagery in Metaphor Comprehension". *Communication and Cognition* 19 (1986): 367-88.

Penskaya, Elena, and Joachim Küpper. "Introduction". *Theater as Metaphor*. Eds. Elena Penskaya and Joachim Küpper. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2019. 1-8.

Petrie, Hugh G. "Metaphorical Models of Mastery: Or How to Learn to Do the Problems at the End of the Chapter in the Physics Textbook". *Proceedings of the Philosophy of Science Association, 1974*. Eds. Robert S. Cohen, C. A. Hooker, A. C. Michalos and J. W. van Evra. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1976. 301-12.

Plato. *Complete Works*. Eds. John M. Cooper and D. S. Hutchinson. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 1997.

Punter, David. *Metaphor*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Richards, I. A. *Practical Criticism: A Study of Literary Judgment*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford UP, 1936.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1977.

Ricœur, Paul. "Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*, or the Order of Paradigms". *A Ricœur Reader: Reflection and Imagination*. Ed. Mario J. Valdés. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1991. 242-55.

Ritchie, L. David. "Metaphors in Literature". *Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 186-200.

Sapir, J. David. "The Anatomy of Metaphor". *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*. Eds. J. David. Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1977. 3-32.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. "Camus's *The Outsider*". 1947. *Literary and Philosophical Essays*. Trans. Annette Michelson. New York: Collier Books, 1962. 26-44.

Semino, Elena, and Gerard Steen. "Metaphor in Literature". *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. 232-46.

Shibles, Warren A. *Metaphor: An Annotated Bibliography and History*. Whitewater, WI: Language Press, 1971.

Shinjo, Makiko, and Jerome L. Myers. "The Role of Context in Metaphor Comprehension". *Journal of Memory and Language* 1 (1987): 226-41.

Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Sternberg, Robert J. *Metaphors of Mind: Conceptions of the Nature of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Sunstein, Bonnie S., and Philip M. Anderson. "Metaphor, Science, and the Spectator Role: An Approach for Non-scientists". *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 16 (1989): 9-16.

Sweetser, Eve. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: The Mind-as-body Metaphor in Semantic Structure and Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Tacey, David. *Religion as Metaphor: Beyond Literal Belief*. 2015. London/New York: Routledge, 2017.

Tourangeau, Roger, and Robert J. Sternberg. "Aptness in Metaphor". *Cognitive Psychology* 13 (1981): 27-55.

Traugott, Elizabeth Cross. "«Conventional» and «dead» metaphors". *The Ubiquity of Metaphor*. Eds. Wolf Paprotté and René Dirven. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin, 1985. 17-56.

Turbayne, Colin Murray. *Myth and Metaphor*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1962.

Turner, Mark. *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1987.

Turner, Mark. *Reading Minds: The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991.

Turner, Victor W. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1974.

Ullmann, Stephen. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.

Verbrugge, Robert R., and Nancy S. McCarrell. "Metaphoric Comprehension: Studies in Reminding and Resembling". *Cognitive Psychology* 9 (1977): 494-533.

Vickers, Brian. "Analogy versus Identity: The Rejection of Occult Symbolism, 1580-1680". *Occult and Scientific Mentalities in the Renaissance*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984. 95-163.

Voltaire. *Selections*. Ed. Paul Edwards. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Vosniadou, Stella. "Children and Metaphors". *Child Development* 58 (1987): 870-85.

Vosniadou, Stella, and Andrew Ortony, eds. *Similarity and Analogical Reasoning*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Vosniadou, Stella, Andrew Ortony, Ralph Reynolds and R. P. T. Wilson. "Sources of Difficulty in Children's Understanding of Metaphorical Language". *Child Development* 55 (1984): 1588-606.

Williams, Patrick S. "Going West to Get East: Using Metaphors as Instructional Tools". *Journal of Children in Contemporary Society* 20 (1988): 79-98.

Winner, Ellen. "New Names for Old Things: The Emergence of Metaphoric Language". *Journal of Child Language* 6 (1979): 469-91.

Winner, Ellen. *The Point of Words: Children's Understanding of Metaphor and Irony*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.

Winner, Ellen, and Sue Leekam. "Distinguishing Irony from Deception: Understanding the Speaker's Second-order Intention". *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 9 (1991): 257-70.

Winner, Ellen, Margaret McCarthy and Howard Gardner. "The Ontogenesis of Metaphor". *Cognition and Figurative Language*. Eds. Richard Honeck and Robert Hoffman. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980. 22-32.

Winner, Ellen, Anne K. Rosenstiel and Howard Gardner. "The Development of Metaphoric Understanding". *Developmental Psychology* 12 (1976): 289-97.

Winner, Ellen, W. Wapner, M. Cicone and H. Gardner. "Measures of Metaphor". *New Directions for Child Development* 6 (1979): 67-75.

Winter, Bodo, and Teenie Matlock. "Primary Metaphors Are Both Cultural and Embodied". *Metaphor: Embodied Cognition and Discourse*. Ed. Beate Hampe. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2017. 99-116.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell, 1953.