06.
Defining Metaphor. Aristotle, Hermogenes of Tarsus, and the *Stereoscope-* Metaphor of Metaphor

Modern philosophical accounts on metaphoric language typically do not contain strict and elaborated, if any, *definitions* of metaphors. The classical definition of metaphor by Aristotle in his *Poetics* is widely being considered as reduced to transference of *lexical items* and thus misleading with respect to the deeper, conceptual aspect of metaphor. Since Nietzsche, as is generally assumed, metaphors have been understood as a general character both of language and of thought, and not only as a linguistic phenomenon *within* language. Later on, in a curious continuity with this *transferential* line in interpreting both the origin and the constitution of meaning, which goes back to the often ignored semiotic view on the sign-character of thoughts in the so-called Herder-Circle[1], in cognitive linguistics and, partly, in the analytic philosophy of language, metaphors have been generally understood as the very structure of how we conceptualize the world, i.e. as *conceptual* phenomenon underpinning the language itself. As a result, what readers of modern philosophical literature on metaphors in recent decades find, instead of definitions, are theoretically various approaches to the issue of metaphor in a wide range of views about metaphoric character of language and thought, about knowledge and truth, and more specific explanations of "how metaphors work".[2]

This clear and programmatic change of theoretical perspectives from so-called "mere linguistic" analysis of metaphors towards metaphors as "conceptual structures" is an achievement of the classic contemporary work on metaphors by cognitive linguists.[3]

1 For earlier sources of Nietzsche's assumption in the 18th-century ideas on language and thought, especially in G. Ch. Lichtenberg and in the semiotic conception of mind in Hamann's and Herder's notion of 'metacritique', see see my discussion in chapter 11 and in Mikulić (2020), with extensive further references.

2 Contrary to this development, Jacques Derrida, in his "Le retraît de la métaphore" (1987), thought of metaphors, in a clear Nietzschean gesture, as being nothing but 'philosophems', i.e. the very means of thinking, not apt of being theoretical *objects*.

3 See Lakoff and Johnson (1981). For their later application of this conceptual metaphor theory on central notions of Western metaphysics, including Aristotle's theory of literal meaning and metaphoric uses of language, see Lakoff and Johnson (1999). See MacCormac (1990) and Indurkhya (1992, 1994) for epistemological contributions to conceptual and cognitive analysis of metaphor. See also Baldauf (1997) for a more linguistic elaboration of the every-day aspect of metaphor within cognitive linguistics.

Nevertheless, despite universalisation, or even totalization, of metaphors to an every-day phenomenon, the early 1980s contributions to conceptual analysis of metaphor seem to contain some dramatization about the difference between linguistic and conceptual analysis. For such privileging of metaphors over literal language use has not remained undisputed even among "friends of metaphors": it contains, as the linguist Eva F. Kittay (1987) observed, a tacit reduction of metaphors in general, including those with high poetic quality, to the *katachretic* type. Kittay herself brought again into discussion the early linguistic work on metaphors in the small but inspiring book *A Grammar of Metaphor* by Christine Brooke-Rose (1958). More recent works are concerned not only with theories about the nature and the limits of literal language and the depths of non-literal language, but also entered new domains of research as they were developing with cognitive and computational linguistics or with epistemology of science.[4]

Revolutionizing Metaphor Theories: Stanford and the 'Stereoscope'

One of few theoreticians among modern authors on metaphor who has given us a definition of metaphor in the proper sense is the famous Irish classicist William Bedell Stanford.[5] He was the first among historians of literature to programmatically overcome the traditional, lexicographer method of dealing with the metaphor issue towards a more conceptually oriented explanation based on a semantic approach to poetical discourse and literary theory. On that ground, he met other modern accounts on style such as Coleridge's as well as the linguistic account by Gustaf Stern (1932), and, as even a more important point of reference, the rhetoric-based literary criticism by Ivor Richards (1936).[6]

Stanford can be qualified thereby as one of the pioneers—if not the most important one—of the so-called *interaction* theory of metaphor, as opposed to the *substitution* theory that was traditionally (and wrongly!) ascribed to Aristotle. The new interaction theory became famous later in the 20th century with Max

---

4 For a wide range of discussions see my critical review in Mikulić (1999).

5 Stanford (1972), 101

6 Richards (1936), especially important to Stanford and later interactionists because of his connection of metaphor with the sentence level.

Black's early essay on metaphor and even more with the appraisal of Stanford by Paul Ricœur.[7] What we generally encounter in later authors on metaphor, referring to Stanford's contribution (including authors like Black and Ricœur but also their more recent followers), is not as much Stanford's proper theory or definition of metaphor as mere citations of a *figurative explanation* by Stanford of how metaphors work. It is his famous and much cited *stereoscope* metaphor of metaphor.[8] Stanford himself calls it a "metaphorical definition" being quite aware that this way of putting the difficult issue of metaphor is the most delicate and inconclusive method.

For Stanford's selfunderstanding as a metaphor theoretician it is fundamentally important that he made, as he clearly puts it, a *historical* discovery in the field of literary theories. Despite acknowledging the importance of Aristotle's account of 'style' in Ch. 21 of the *Poetics* and in *Rhetoric* (III, 1–11), Stanford suggests that Aristotle's belief in the literal use of language as the fundamental one had been criticized and overcome by the ancient rhetorician Hermogenes of Tarsus, but only for a short period of time.[9] At the very introduction of Aristotle's definition Stanford declares himself "disappointed" with Aristotle's preceding description of concrete metaphors as well as with the abstract character of his word definition in *Poetics* whereas, for him, as a contrast, Hermogenes appears as one who "rebels against the barren formulas of the orthodoxy". It was this most influential writer on types of style who, in Stanford's opinion, gave us a quite *modern* account of metaphor that radically differs from the Aristotelian definition, prevailing before and after the time of Hermogenes, in two principal features. First, instead of emphasizing metaphor as a matter of 'diction' (*léxis*), Hermogenes would have defined metaphor as a matter of meaning (*diánoia*); second, with Hermogenes, metaphor was no more conceived of as mere transference of names (or substitution of proper names for foreign names) but rather as a *dynamic* word-unity referring *at once* to *both* related things. In short, according to Stanford, Hermogenes seems to have delivered a *wholly new* approach to

7   Black (1962); Ricœur (1976).

8   Stanford (1972), 105: "Only one metaphor of mine will I venture to repeat: metaphor is the stereoscope of ideas".

9   On Hermogenes of Tarsus (160–225 A.D.) see also Kennedy (2003), xii, 73, and Kennedy (1994).

the theory about metaphors (*tropé*), which Stanford himself takes as the starting point for his own view.

Notwithstanding Stanford's fate of being himself the unacknowledged true patriarch of the modern, widespread and pre-dominant interaction theory of metaphor (thus repeating Hermogenes' fate of not being recognized in ancient times), it seems worth to reassess his appreciation of Hermogenes' metaphor account not merely for historical reasons. As contrasted explicitly with the Aristotelian conception of metaphor, the account by Hermogenes could be of some systematic interest if we examine how two presumed different positions—the modern interaction-based and the traditional, presumably reductive one—relate to each other within ancient metaphor theories, with respect to their essential linguistic and epistemological features. In other words, re-examining the two ancient definitions of metaphor calls for, at least as one part of the job, a discussion on the modern struggle between interactionists and substitutionalists in metaphor theories and its role in the theoretical discourse. This appears even more urgent if we take into account apparent contradictions in modern thereticians. Thus, although Paul Ricœur, in his influential book on "living metaphor", was the first to defend Aristotle against the so-called *substitution* theory of metaphor, based on *comparison* of pre-existing similarities, which he detects in Quintilian (Ricœur 1976, 35), he too, like the conceptualists Lakoff and Johnson, reproaches Aristotle for treating metaphors as one-word units. But neither substitution of words nor one-word basis of metaphors is true of Aristotle's theory. Or, at least, this hasn't remained undisputed in contemporary discussions. Contrary to such mainstream misinterpretations of Aristotle's metaphor account, there are non-reductive, sentence-oriented views on his semantics and linguistics in general.[10]

In order to examine modern and contemporary readings of Aristotle's ill-reputed definition of metaphor I will juxtapose it with Hermogenes' account as found in Stanford and in standard academic sources. In his book *Perì léxeōs* Hermogenes of Tarsus writes:

[10] See diCesare (1981) for a sentence-based approach to Aristotle's semantics. For new integral views of both linguistics and theory of science in Aristotle see Eco (1990), Lacks (1994).

Τροπὴ ἔστι τὸ μὴ ἔξ ὑποκειμένου πράγματος ἀλλοτρίου δὲ σημαντικὸν ὄνομα θεῖναι, κοινὸν εἶναι δυνάμενον καὶ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου καὶ τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἐμφαινουμένου, ὅ καλεῖται καὶ μεταφορὰ παρὰ τοῖς γραμματικοῖς, οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι λέγουσι τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀψυχῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμψυχα, καὶ τὸ ἀνάπαλιν, καθόλου γὰρ ἡ ῥετορικὴ πολυπραγμονοῦσα μηδὲν τοιοῦτον.[11]

"It is Oblique Language when a term not relevant to the subject matter but signifying some extraneous object of reference is introduced into a sentence so as to unite in its significance both the subject at issue and the extraneous object of reference in a composite concept; this is also called Metaphor by the grammarians, but it should not be considered, as they aver, as a transference from lifeless to alive etc., for rhetoric entirely avoids busying itself with such details."[12]

Hermogenes' definition of 'oblique language' (*tropê*) appears, at least at the first sight and inspite of Stanford's rather paraphrasing than accurately translating the stylish Greek text, more complex in form and content. It is synthetic and more literary-like sounding than the dry-styled Aristotelian definition:

Μεταφορὰ δὴ ἐστὶν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορὰ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴδους ἐπὶ τὸ γένος ἢ κατὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον.[13]

"Metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy".[14]

On this background, Hermogenes' definition really seems, in its very wording, to reveal something of the presumed "secret" beyond that what 'grammarians' called 'metaphor' but analyzed

---

11 L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, Vol. II, 254, Leipzig: Teubner, 1854. Cf. Stanford (1972), 14, n. 3.

12 Stanford (1972), 14 (§ 5). The first translation of the whole treatise by Hermogenes' into modern languages is the English translation by Wooten (1987).

13 Aristotle, *De arte poetica liber*, rec. R. Kassel, Oxford UP, 1965, ch. 21, 1457b7-9. The Greek text in Stanford (1972), 10 (§ 4, n. 1) corresponds to Kassel's edition.

14 See Aristotle, *Poetics,* translated by Ingram Bywater, in: The Works of Aristotle, transl. into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross, vol. XI, Oxford 1946.

in a wholly wrong direction and what modern theoretician like Stanford seem to have been searching since forever. In the same context Stanford provides a review of theoretical and interpretive work on literary use of metaphor by ancient authors and of modern views on language, such as Coleridge, and by linguists and philosophers, such as G. Stern and R. Ogden and I. Richards.[15] Although his extensive account on Hermogenes' definition of metaphor appears illuminating for the historical discovery of a genuine rhetoric "rebel against grammatical orthodoxy"[16], his interpretation of Hermogenes' is, in its explanative and evaluative aspects, not only inspired by but dependent on Coleridge's romanticist enthusiasm about "words as living things" and "not just shadows of things".[17] This seems to explain why Stanford remains unaware, as I assume, of a deeper and closer *logical* relation between the two accounts by Aristotle and Hermogenes. It persists despite Hermogenes' explicit criticism towards post-Aristotelian 'grammarians'.[18] This criticism, as I would like to show, did not have a deep impact on his relationship to Aristotle's metaphor theory but seems to blind Stanford, as a modern interactionist, for the Aristotelian basis of Hermogenes' account.

Hermogenes' definition, though giving no doubt a new and appealing idea of *common* name, i.e. for a simultaneous *double* reference of *one* name for *two things,* which in themselves are clearly differentiated both from logical and topic point of view (*allótrion, éxōthen*), appears nevertheless as a more familiar theoretical frame than Stanford would have wanted. As the very first common feature, Hermogenes approach focuses at the very beginning of the definition on ónoma sē*mantikón,* just like Aristotle. But Stanford describes Hermogenes' new achievement merely in terms of reference and omits mentioning the really new element in Hermogenes' definition: it is his display of *tropé* as the *linguistic action* (or more exactly as a *turn* or *twist*) in the language by which the presumed double reference of the name comes about in the first place. More precisely, this linguistic action is a name *setting* (ónoma theînai), which implies, first, that it borrows the

---

15 See the whole chapter V, especially §§ 3–6.

16 Stanford (1972), 14–19 (§ 5).

17 See Stanford (1972), 17 (the same § 5).

18 Stanford (1972), at the end of § 4. For a more recent discussion on Hermogenes' role in rhetoric see the translation and commentary of Hermogenes' work by Heath (1995).

'common name' (ónoma koinón) from *another* thing (*toû allotríou prágmatos*) and, second, that *only through this action* the name becomes capable of being (*dynámenon eînai*) one-and-common name for both things.

In the linguistic perspective of reference, one cannot but see, first, that this description of *tropé* presents metaphor not only as oblique language in general but also as *occurrence* or *event* in language. Second, its very wording represents an exact re-formulation—though a wholly new in approach—of the Aris-totelian idea of transference of name *from* one outer object *to* the subject at issue. Both theoreticians—Aristotle not less than Hermogenes—clearly privilege the "subject at issue" as the standpoint of their definition-oriented discourse on metaphors, and both clearly emphasize the "foreignness" of the transferred name. But significantly enough, Aristotle's *epiphorá* as *genus proximum* is in Hermogenes *substituted* by the expression 'ónoma theînai'; it designates in a more clear way the linguistic action of *naming* than does Aristotle with his uncovering of concept levels and logical procedures which underpin the name transference. In re-formulating *transference* of names to *setting* of names (new ones, borrowed from *other* things) Hermogenes provides strategically, both linguistically and conceptually, a different—generic and not logically descriptive—*stance* towards the theoretical issue of metaphoric speech. He does not define metaphor, as does Aristotle, by an explicit formula of *transference* process of *thought* through *words,* which is visible through the very structure of Aristotle's definition. Hermogenes takes, instead, metaphor from a different point of view which, in a clear polemic gesture, neglects details about logical areas or ways through which names come, and focuses only on the very act (or, rather, fact) of naming. But since, for Hermogenes, it is naming of a subject with a *foreign* word *from without* the subject, this means nothing more or less than that Hermogenes' definition of metaphor *implies* the linguistic and logical analysis by Aristotle while denying it, by the very wording of the definition, any relevance for rhetorical purposes.[19]

---

[19] As the citation above shows, Hermogenes refers himself critically not to logical areas of transference but to "alive and lifeless, and vice-versa", which is a further elaboration of Aristotle's account by 'grammarians' (Theophrastus, Demetrius, Quintilian). For more detailed differences, see the philological and historical works by Kennedy (1991, 1994, 2003), Heath (1995), and Wooten (1987).

It is true, as Stanford says, that Hermogenes meant of the common name as a dynamic unit. Nevertheless, he describes it as 'common' in a more common sense—and less dramatically—as *potentially* one common name for two things. But the very assumption by Stanford of a common name with a double reference raises, nevertheless, new theoretical problems which Stanford clearly tends to mystify by pleading for a "vividness" of words apart of their being "mere signs" for things. He ignores, first, that such a dynamic (potential) word-unit, does not signify two different things but—being previously a signifying name of another thing from without—is *set* to be the name for the subject at issue. The assumption of a double reference of a term "so as to unite in its significance" two different things is not by itself distinctive enough to distinguish metaphors from other types of bipolar reference, such as homonyms which are not metaphorical. As a consequence, Stanford fails to interpret what, in Hermogenes' account, it means for a word to have meaning (to be ónoma sē*mantikón*)—except, first, to signify some object, and, second, to signify two objects at once. Instead of providing a deeper analysis of the reference issue Stanford pleads for a Coleridgean "living" word-thing, independent of world-things and, thus, independent of the sign-function for other things. Nevertheless, this refined romantic account of what words "really" are raises questions which, in the meantime, have led among the interaction theoreticians to ontological and semantic controversies as to what might be the linguistic, logical and ontological status of the "new", the "synthetic" and the "dynamic" *meaning* of a metaphoric expression. For if taken in the sense of an "average" semantic content of two "metaphorically crossed" items and not "merely" in the sense of a *common name* for these two different things, the assumption of a new, independent metaphorical meaning seems to lead necessarily to the assumption of independent linguistic entities, like *katachrêseis*, and ontological entities like *werewolves*.[20]

Thus Stanford's conclusion in favor of Hermogenes' definition of metaphor, and against Aristotle's account, seems not only enthusiastic about a wholly new perspective but theoretically questionable. Inspite of the differences between the two definitions

---

20 It was Black (1962) to first introduce the idea of a *new* meaning in metaphoric expressions (more elaborated in Black (1979, repr. 1986). See the contentions by Davidson (1984) and arguments against Davidson in Kittay (1987); also in Steinhardt and Kittay (1994).

of metaphor both accounts, the referential one by Hermogenes and the analytical one by Aristotle, relate closely on another level, which Stanford does not examine. This is provided by the fact that the Aristotelian account of metaphor, displaying the metaphor as a process of transference on two different levels, the linguistic-lexical one and logical-conceptual one[21], is grounded upon the *explicit assumption* that metaphors are "meaningful names" (ὄνομα σημαντικόν), just as Hermogenes calls them. The names themselves, as parts of language, are defined by Aristotle both in *Poetics* (Ch. 20) and in *Perì hermeneías* (Ch. 2–4) as "compound, meaningful articulation by voice" (φωνὴ σημαντικὴ συνθετή). Hence, to say, as Hermogenes does, that *tropé* is a 'meaningful name' is, if seen from Aristotele's point of view, a non-informative statement. It is non-pleonastic only in that part of the definition in which Hermogenes insists on metaphor's nature of being a linguistic action of setting one name for two different items. One cannot address this aspect only through the bipolar structure of reference. Otherwise metaphors would remain mere homonyms and a part of *léxis*. Since the rhetorician Hermogenes too takes the linguistic level of *names* as the starting point for his account of metaphor, just as Aristotle does, and the only clear difference seems to make Hermogenes' insistence on the name as *common*, a more differentiated view of the relation between the two definitions seem to be needed. I tend to consider Hermogenes' approach to metaphor as one that, through the idea of a *double* reference, opens up other perspectives on metaphors reaching beyond the struggle between linguistic and conceptual understanding. It raises a series of typical questions about metaphors of which I can address here only a few.[22]

No doubt, there is in Hermogenes' idea of metaphor a new element with respect to Aristotle's basic linguistic account of metaphors and a generic explanation of how metaphoric expressions

---

21 It is precisely that what Hermogenes rejects with 'grammarians': four types of 'metaphor' or transference of names between *eidos* and *eidos*, *eidos* and *genus*, *genus* and *eidos*, and 'according to analogy'.

22 One of interesting special questions would address the meaning of the very term 'common' and its implications for the problem of "metaphoric symmetry". However, because Hermogenes defines metaphor as a linguistic action of "setting" a significant name that is "able of being common to two different things", his conception clearly pleads for far more than a double-sided reference analysis. It seems susceptible also of a speech act account of metaphor, as given by Searle (1979).

come about. In this point Hermogenes goes clearly beyond the level of post-Aristotelian metaphor accounts—starting with Theophrastus, through Demetrius of Phaleron till Cicero and Quintilian[23]—which maintained all restrictive view points in Aristotle's theory and, thus, more conservative than Aristotle himself.[24] Nevertheless, Hermogenes' approach is semantic and *relying* on Aristotle's linguistics, which means, it grounds on the two parts of Aristotle's analytical account. The linguistic one, displayed in Ch. 20 of *Poetics*, contains definitions of words as elements of language, culminating in an explanation of sentence. The tropologic one, displayed in Ch. 21, starts with a semantic theory of compound words in general (ónoma in the general sense of word or expression conveying meaning). Precisely this part of Aristotle's account makes up an important link between the conception of sentence (*lógos*) and a semantic theory of compound names with an "autonomous" (non-literal) meaning with respect to the (literal) meaning of their components. Though hardly recognized by modern authors, this passage is central to Aristotle's theory of metaphor.

Aristotle's account of metaphor is embedded in an explanation of word meaning, which is conceived of as complex and autonomous with respect to the meaning of its morphological constituents like in the proper name 'Theodor'.[25] The meaning of such compound and purportedly meaning-evocative words is for Aristotle not constituted or defined by the meaning of its elements but only by its linguistic *function.* It constitutes one object by naming it without obliging itself to the strict semantic value of its components. Thus, metaphor, though being classified under "names", is not to be taken for a single or isolated word like other instances of "prevailingly" used names (*kyríōs legómena*), but rather as a complex expression whose meaning arises from their new function and differs from the meaning of their components. Just like a compound proper name, that is linguistically operative

---

23 See the historical presentation in Kennedy (1994).

24 As for comparative reductionism in simile and metaphor theories, see Tirrell (1991), and my exended discussion of the comparison-marker 'like' in chapter 8. See also Fogelin (1994).

25 See the more extensive discussion on Aristotle's linguistics in chapter 7 (in German). The name itself seems to convey a dose of Aristotle's humor. From his *Rhetoric* it is clear that the name, as a linguistic sample (1404b22), is borrowed from none less than the rhetorician Theodor, much appreciated by Aristotle (1412a26-35, 1414b14).

because of being cut off of its "primary" meaning, metaphor is to be understood primarily as a *sentence-like* structure with strong a assertional commitment and based on a preclusion of literal meaning.[26] This is a paradoxical double-sided syntactic basis of a semantic complexity that differs in status from the meaning of word elements, which constitute it. Nevertheless, one can analyze metaphoric expressions more properly as sentence-like structured units of speech because, as Aristotle himself says, the "oneness" (semantic and discursive unity) of an expression is not dependent on the pre-defined (or, rather, pre-interpreted) meaning of its syntactic elements, but on other functions of *lógos* as assertive form of speech and of language in general.[27]

Hermogenes and the 'Stereoscopic' Twist

On this background, a relevant, though not necessarily radical, difference between the Hermogenes' and Aristotle's perspectives on metaphor must have a different basis than it has been supposed by proponents of interaction theory. This difference concerns the very theoretical kernel of how both Aristotle and Hermogenes consider the *status* of metaphors *within* language. Though Hermogenes' definition is formulated in an essentialist way as to *what* metaphor is, just like Aristotle's[28], his identification

26 It is, then, more than a coincidence or a question of mere taste that Aristotle considered the metaphorical expressions with a *suspended* semantic content, such as 'the wineless cup of Dionysos' (φιάλη ἄοινος, *Poetics* 1547b32-33) as intellectually and rhetorically most exciting type of metaphor. We see, however, that they disclose, in form of a metaphor or paradigmatically, as it were, the condition of the very possibility of both metaphorical and literal use of language. It is the very principle of semanticity consisting in the sublation of the immediate identity of meaning and reference. Of the same type is Anaximander's 'apeiron', as Aristotle implies in his commentary to the 'well conceived' formula of *arché* as 'limitless limit' in *Physics* (203b7): τοῦ δὲ ἀπείρου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ· εἴη γὰρ ἂν αὐτοῦ πέρας.

27 *Poetics* 20, 1457a28-30: εἷς δέ ἐστι λόγος διχῶς, ἢ γὰρ ὁ ἕν σημαίνων ἢ ὁ ἐκ πλειόνων συνδέσμῳ.

28 In this respect Stanford's generic translation "Oblique Language is when a name is introduced into sentence…" is not only extended into a paraphrase (using more terms, like 'sentence' or 'unite in its significance', which do not occur in respective Greek texts) but also totally misleading. For Hermogenes, just like Aristotle, uses only the copula 'esti' and a term for *genus proximum*: in Aristotle, it is ἐπιφορὰ ὀνόματος (*transference of the name*) whereas in Hermogenes it is ὄνομα θεῖναι (*setting the name*). Symptomatic of this is also Aristotle's more frequent use of the verbal expression *metaphoreîn* than the substantive *metaphorá*, except in the definition.

of metaphor with *naming* as an linguistic action seems to establish metaphors more radically as part of *actual* language: it is a double referring in the very *act* of naming and not a pre-established bipolar reference of a word. Nevertheless, Aristotle's account in chapters 20–21 of *Poetics* informs us that—although he classifies metaphors as "words" among other types of words in the range from usual expressions (*kyrion ónoma*) and foreign words (*glóttai*) to neologisms, poetic and onomatopetic words (*pepoiēména*)— there are *no genuine* metaphors *within* language as established lexical corpus. Instead, for Aristotle, metaphors are words only by virtue of a suspension of word-meaning and name-transference which occurs in an *action with standard* expressions and, at once, in a move of thought between different logical levels (as *species* and *genus*) or areas (as in analogy between *genus* and *genus*). Thus, again, metaphors are—or exist only insofar as they are— nothing but a *common* word (*kýrion*) which, first, have undergone transference in the sense of a re-direction of reference, and, second, have become common—now with Hermogenes' term (*koinón*)—of two *formerly* (i.e. outside the language act) unrelated things by the common understanding which uses standard word interpretations. In this respect, Aristotle's understanding of metaphor is not only not radically different in linguistic conception from the Hermogenes' one but, despite the difference in their rhetoric and linguistic approaches— rather con-current in the double sense of the word (similar in linguistic presuppositions and substitutive in its aim). Even more, Hermogenes' generic definition of metaphor as an *act* of renaming and as a *new event* within speech seems to be rather a better formulation of what really constitutes a metaphor from a rhetorical point of view than classifications of regions of transference by grammarians, which he rejects as irrelevant (thus deserving apparently his surname "purifier').

However, Hermogenes' account sheds light also on another, unexpected theoretical "twist" in Aristotle's definition. Just because metaphors are linguistically nothing else than (common) words in a "foreign" area, one must consider them as a matter of meaning-production and not just of exchange of "mere names". For *transference* itself occurs, in Aristotle's account, as a process between *names* (*onómata*) and not just verbal expressions (*léxeis*). Which means, as transference of *notions* or, more precisely, as exchange of *thought contents within* and *beyond* the confines of the framework of species and genus. Thus, differently

from Hermogenes' delightful but theoretically not unproblematic formulation that metaphors are cases of double reference, because they must additionally be differentiated from other cases of bipolar reference, Aristotle's account gives us not a less sophisticated—though perhaps less stylish and rhetorically appealing—linguistic, logical and also epistemological hint of "how metaphors work". He provides us with the hardly dispensable information, mentioned above, that metaphors are in themselves meaningful *onómata produced* by language use from ordinary words (*kyria*), and that, paradoxically, just because metaphors not merely *are* but *occur* in the language, they must be a matter of language *competences* such as capacity for re-constitution of word *forms* and word *meanings*. The so-called "mere diction" (*léxis*) is not only style, but designates also the lexical part of language as system; it is an indispensable and necessary (though not sufficient) precondition for metaphors. They *stem* from *léxeis*, designating a corpus of standard words, and they *occur as* léxis, designating diction or style. Therefore, *léxis*—being itself a case of double-referring term—is a higher language process, namely meaning-*production* using the *semiotic material*, which is characteristic of language (expressions or *léxeis*). For Aristotle, it is the most basic language process that he calls *hērmeneía*, which is one of the most general—defining and not defined—terms in Aristotle's work.[29]

At this point, it seems worth mentioning that, contrary to these evidences of *synthesis* and *production* aspects in Aristotle's understanding of language and thought, Lakoff and Johnson characterize Aristotle's conception of linguistic representation as just another *instance* of the *correspondence* relation between cognition and a mind-independent world of things.[30] As such, it is, according to them, the very base of his literal meaning (and metaphor) theory as well as of the scientific thinking in general: "Terms used in their proper literal senses are necessary for demonstrative reasoning via syllogisms and thus are necessary for communicating scientific knowledge. Scientific knowledge, on Aristotle's view, cannot be communicated if terms are not used in their proper literal senses". The authors seem, however, to entirely ignore, on one side, that Aristotle's 'prohibition' of metaphors in hist

---

29 Cf. *Poetics*, Ch. 6, 1450b13 sq.: λέγω δὲ λέξιν (εἶναι) τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἑρμενείαν.

30 See the whole section in Lakoff and Johnson (1999), 382–386.

Posterior Analytics (97b37) is clearly related to definitions and demonstrative procedures whereas metaphors are, at once, present not only in Aristotle's explanatory discourse of the science but also—just like in Lakoff and Johnson—in the very grounds of knowledge, namely in the building proces of *archaí* via *epagōgé*. As a natural cognitive process, *epagōgé* is for Aristotle different from, and prior to, demonstration and "reliable enough" (*An. Po.* 90b14). Likewise, Lakoff and Johnson seem to ignore that if they themselves analyse the metaphoric structure of our world *concepts* as object of theory, it does not imply that their own scientific method itself is metaphoric despite their conceptual totalization of metaphor. To declare all concepts metaphorical is not to make a whole theory metaphorical but, quite contrary, to make metaphors standard and unmetaphorical. Or, as they themselves put it, to let metaphors make "proper literal senses".

The fact that Aristotle did not display his account of metaphor as definition of a word-unit, and not even defined metaphor as name-giving, but rather as a *thought process* which, occurring through words, is also a linguistic process, may be taken as an implicit claim that such a kind of "words" exist only in the language as *process*. Explicitly, for Aristotle, the only kind of words *within* language which are capable of meaning *two* things *at once*, are *amphíbola* (such as *homónyma*), and they also are just standard words (*kyria*). What Hermogenes arrives at with his definition of metaphor based on double-referring names must be therefore a hardly explicable oxymoron if taken strictly in terms of linguistic meaning, and not in terms of language use and meaning-production. If taken in the way Stanford takes it, namely as a 'stereoscope', it appears to be a strange kind of a synonymic homonym, one name standing for two or even more different items in different reality domains. We should, nevertheless, not overview that, in Hermogenes' formulation, the double reference brings about a new meaning—as is supposed by the interaction theoreticians of metaphor—only by virtue of the linguistic capacity of words for double or multiple reference (cf. 'dynámenon eînai koinón') to different things in the world, be it live, lifeless or abstract. Hence, it seems sufficiently clear that, both in Hermogenes and in Aristotle, the supposed new meaning is contextual and pragmatic in nature though neither Hermogenes nor Aristotle theorize on such issues in language like speaker.

Thus, inspite of being, at least at its surface, clearly a more pragmatic than a theoretical definition of metaphor, Hermogenes' account has been widely appreciated as a more advanced theoretical achievement on the ground that for him a metaphor designates a *dynamic semantic* entity in which two *different* things in the world find themselves "unified". Nevertheless, *tropé* or metaphor is in Hermogenes' account still focused on single *name*, i.e. on a *linguistic* unit with designative and referring function, just as the tradition ascribed it to Aristotle. But just as Hermogenes' account is bound to an action within *actual* language, i.e. speech, his idea of metaphor as *setting a foreign name for a subject* seems to call for a higher level of linguistic analysis than that of single words with double reference. Although Stanford in his translation of Hermogenes' definition uses the term 'sentence', which does not occur in Hermogenes' expression, the only information about which higher linguistic level we deal with is given by Aristotle's analytic—and "disappointing" in Stanford's eyes—account of metaphor. Because Aristotle conceived of metaphors both as a *thought* process across different logical levels and procedures (moving between *eídos* and *génos* and according to analogy) and as a *language* process of transferring names, metaphor is for him an *assertive procedure.* Namely, as Aristotle puts it with more emphasis in his *Rhetoric* than in *Poetics,* metaphor is always founded on a *tacit predication* telling us "that something is something" or "that something is *like* something".[31] Therefore, for Aristotle, metaphor belongs to the general structure of assertive language, which he explains with his famous formula *tì katà tinós.* It is, by consequence, capable of truth-value.

Against this background, Stanford's objection that with Hermogenes, unlike Aristotle, there is "no suggestion of adding 'to xenon' [strangeness] to the meaning (*diánoia*) as well as to the

---

[31] Cf. *Rhetoric* III. 10, 1411b17 sq., esp. b19. As to my knowledge, the only author to recognize the propositional character of Aristotle's account on metaphor is George A. Kennedy (1991), 245 (n. 114): "Aristotle, unlike later classical rhetoricians, thus implies that metaphor is a form of predication, a major contention of Paul Ricœur in *The Rule of Metaphor*". However, the above quotation from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* by Kennedy shows clearly that Aristotle does not just "imply" a form of predication but rather fully and explicitly asserts it. Moreover, as I have already shown, it is prepared in Aristotle's "more abstract" linguistic account in *Poetics*, Chs. 20–21.

diction (*léxis*) of its context", turns out to be fully mistaken.[32] It might have become clear so far that for Hermogenes—and even more so for Aristotle—metaphor is a matter of re-making things meaningful with astonishing, unusual linguistic operations such as transferring, setting and borrowing other, foreign, strange names for things "from without", from other things. Therefore, metaphor is essentially a *thought* process just the same as it is a linguistic one. How could it otherwise provide cognition of *tò homoîon*, which is the kernel of both the empirical and the theoretical knowledge, as Aristotle proclaims in *Poetics* (Ch. 22) and in *Rhetoric* (III. 10). One must, however, bear in mind that he in *Posterior Analytics* (Ch. 3. 1–3) explicitly forbids the use of metaphors in definitions, becaus of their being general in character and demanding clarity of streight and not evasive speech.[33] Though Lakoff and Johnson also acknowledge that for Aristotle "the ability to find real similarities was necessary for being a good scientist" they completely ignore that the act of *noetic grasping the similarity* (which they take for an "intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilars")[34] cannot in Aristotle be correctly accounted for, as they want it, on the assumption of a direct correspondence relation between things, ideas, and expressions. *Noûs* is an inherent agent within the natural cognition process called *epagōgé*, which in Aristotle is explicitly responsible for the cognitive and, by this, conceptual-lingustic *production* (*empoiía*) of *commons* and *universals* (*tò koinón* and *tò kathólou*), which means: *making principles*.[35] Furthermore, the authors seem to be blind to their own interpretation, when they say: "Aristotle chose similarity as the most general consistent basis for a metaphorical use of language. For him, the most general reason for using the name of one kind of thing to designate another kind of thing is to point out some similarity between the kinds of things." It is not clear how it should be possible for Aristotle, or anyone, to point out similarity *between* things if not through transferring structures *from* one conceptual domain *to* another (gender-species, gender-gender), which is, more exactly, a reference by Aristotle to *analogy* as a framework for metaphor explanation and not, as Lakoff and Johnson's tacitly assume, to similarity of mere things.

32 Stanford (1972), 18.

33 See the whole passage in An. Po. 97b25-37.

34 See for this and the next quotation Lakoff and Johnson (1999), 383–386.

35 *An. Po.* B. 19, 100b4; cf. EN VI. 3, 1139b28.

If we look more closely, the drama about this issue consists in the fact that, according to Aristotle, we grasp the "whole thing" by *observing the simile* between things ('theōreîn tò hômoîon') and not by knowing all existing instances. This appears to be a necessary reason for Aristotle to discriminate sufficiently metaphoric language from definitions. However, on the other side, we know that he discusses and evaluates metaphors in most delicate theoretical contexts as underlying most basic procedures of grasping, naming and explaining the most abstract things. Even more, his use of metaphor in scientific theorizing about different things on different levels is quite excessive. One among many topics is the famous explanation of how perception produces *tò koinón* (the common or general notion, *tò kathólou*, be it species or gender) by re-organizing particular percepts through induction (*epagōgê*). In going further from the level of mere perception through *empeiría* to more general notions of species, and then to the level of still more abstract notions of genders, he does not increase at once the abstract character of explanation itself but introduces, instead, the metaphor of the battle (*máchē*): namely, just as the strategic *arché* comes about in a battle out of disorder when one stands firmly, and then others stand to him one by one, this is also the way how perception produces first principles (universals) out of many particulars, through memory and *empeiría*, with means of *epagōgé*.[36]

Therefore, though contemporary interactionists as well as conceptualists have suspected Aristotle's notion of 'homoîon' of being a "metaphysical" notion of similarity, which can not provide "any new and fresh insights" beyond the narrow framework of logically related realms, this does not appear to be the case just as the assumption of one-word primacy in Aristotle's account of metaphor has proven wrong. Namely, at this point it seems clear enough that, for Aristotle, 'theōreîn tò homoîon' contains conceptually much more than Ricœur appreciates in Aristotle while excepting him from later comparatists in metaphor theory like Quintilian. But Ricœur does not seem to recognize that the issue of similarity in Aristotle's account of metaphor is closely related to his *tì katà tinós*-analysis of speech, which is conceptual and propositional and not just sentence-based. This seems to be the reason why Ricœur believes that the lack of a *sentence analysis*

---

36 *An. Po.* B. 100a5-6: ἐκ παντὸς ἠρεμήσαντος τοῦ καθόλου ἐη τῇ ψυῇῇ, ἐκ ἑνὸς παρὰ τὰ πολλὰ (...). For the battle see a12–13.

in Aristotle's metaphor theory makes him not only inapt for a translation into Max Black's interactionist theory but also not useful for modern investigations on metaphors' constitutive role in scientific discourse.[37]

If we do not recognize such dynamic conceptual aspects in Aristotle's account on metaphor, then too the 'koinón' in Hermogenes' definition begs the same question. It is, as a 'common name', first, still a name—and just a name. Moreover, it belongs originally to *one* of two things, namely to the "subject without". Second, it is a common name for a thing in common only because both related thing have 'always' been sharing it in some way. We saw that Hermogenes did not discuss any other ways of sharing but the one by means of linguistic action of "setting one name for two different things". Hence, if Hermogenes neglects explicitly the logical analysis of metaphors or the one based on related background knowledge, one can consider it only implicitly as an original creation by the speaker. There is, however, no such pragmatic and speaker-oriented theorization of the metaphoric phenomenon neither in Hermogenes nor in Aristotle despite their interest in rhetoric. Therefore, a common or double-referring name does not by itself necessarily bring about a *new* meaning in common which would not have existed before the metaphoric action itself. In order to approach such a possibility, one must rethink the very notion of a double reference beginning from the context of linguistic action, which includes not only the object of reference (or two of them) but a linguistic agent too. Both theoreticians seem, while speaking of objects, to circle around the agent's place as tacit subject of the enounciation.

There are, as I might have shown sufficiently clear, enough reasons to assume that both Aristotle's *homoîon* (similar) and Hermogenes' *koinón* (common) are clearly conceived of as dynamic elements, be it as effects of a transference process of concepts to things or of a dynamic tension in the name itself due to its double reference. This is confirmed by the usage of the term *epiphorá* in Aristotle's

---

37 For a broader historical context of metaphor both in ancient and in modern *philosophies of science* see Lloyd (1987). For recent developments in the philosophie of science towards a universalization of metaphor and a re-evaluation of induction in modern discussion on science, I refer to the influential (but not undisputed) work by Mary Hesse (1963, 1974, 1988) upon which Black relies. Further discussions on theoretical consequences of this development for scientific and literary discourses are to be found in Hirsch (1985) and, more recently, Rentetzi (2005).

definition of metaphor as the defining notion indicating—just as in Hermogenes—that the real point of view in his account is the linguistic *action* (by the speaker), a movement through thought, language and the world from an object without to the very subject of speech.[38] The thing towards which the movements goes, the *epì*, or "subject at issue", the *hypokeímenon*, is the very stance of the discourse where the so-called subject at issue, in the sense of object, turns out to be the speaker "at issue". As we can see, such a subject reveals himself only through the linguistic *action* of "metaphorizing" (or "common name setting", as in Hermogenes) through introducing "strangeness" into the established linguistic order. One could say—against and in favor of Stanford—just like Hermogenes, the rebel and 'purifier' of grammarians' orthodoxy. Strangeness is necessary for metaphor, but it depends on how far the "subject" goes without the subject.

To conclude this aspect of the "issue", it seems quite correct to consider Hermogenes' definition of metaphor as a new view in the history of discussion on metaphor in which an interaction-ist taste for dynamic aspects of metaphor seems fully satisfied. However, it does not appear true to assume that Hermogenes gives metaphoric words a semantic independency. Even less true is that metaphors were to Aristotle "mere shadows of things" (as Stanford borrows from Coleridge). Since for Aristotle too words are primarily a meaningful sounding (*phōnè sēmantiké*), it makes not much sense to assume that for him transference is about mere names because a so-called "mere name" is always-already a name-concept (ónoma as different from *phōné* and also from *léxis*); it is the unity of signifying words, ónomata, where Aristotle (and Plato too) distinguished two levels (*léxis-diánoia*). Moreover, in a closer analysis, Hermogenes' focusing on metaphor as meaningful *word* through a double reference turns out to be rendered *possible* only through Aristotle's account on transfer-ence of names as *whole concepts*, yet with the difference that to Aristotle metaphors are not linguistically *independent* words at all. (Nor are they independent for Hermogenes; they are for him, just as for Aristotle, just 'common' to two things that are previously understood as different.)

38 Cf. also the very formulation *apó-epí* in the second part of Aristotle's definition as well as by the expression τὸ ἔξωθεν ἐμφαινόμενον ("the phaenomenon from without") in Hermogenes' definition.

As has already been emphasized above, in chapters 20–21 on *léxis* of Aristotle's *Poetics,* which deal with literary style, metaphors are described on two levels, as a phenomenon within *léxis,* in the broader sense of the language style, and, at once, as transference of concept-names within *diánoia* by means of *léxis,* in the narrower, material sense of expression part of words. Therefore, they are only conceivable as effects or virtual linguistic units, stemming from thought-building procedures within and by virtue of capacity to use language as a performing means to do things with language. In order to appreciate Aristotle's contribution in a more appropriate way, it is not necessary to suppose that metaphors build up meanings as *independent* semantic word-things (among other world-things). For Aristotle too, no less than for Hermogenes, metaphors can be seen as events, for they *occur* within language by being exhibited through *actions* with words and thought processes.

'Saying New Things' by 'Good Metaphorizing'

But despite the apparent close relation and continuity between Aristotle's and Hermogenes conception of metaphors, a clear advantage of Hermogenes' account of metaphor is that he, unlike Aristotle, explicitly rejects any analysis of species to gender transference, or vice-versa, and of analogy relation for metaphoric items. Instead, his definition asserts clearly that *tropé* grounds simply—and necessarily—on the reference of a name which *becomes common* by being set (*theînai*) from without to re-designate the subject of which one speaks. By this it is clearly implied that a *tropé* is rendered meaningful not just through a double reference, as Stanford insists, but through a *mode* of reference which must be, by its very occurrence, already *understood* as conveying at once, with the foreign name, a set of properties from the foreign thing in order to say something about something. This means not only that Hermogenes' definition of metaphor implies, just as Aristotle's, a sentence-oriented understanding of metaphoric language, which is to be found more direct in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* than in his word-based analysis in *Poetics*. It means rather—and that seems to be a truly original contribution of Hermogenes— that the so-called double reference of a borrowed name must, as a matter of fact, be understood as an *act of reference* which *produces* a *common* name of two things. Therefore, the "other" reference is produced and not given.

Thus, besides the supposed dynamic (twofold, stereoscopic) character of metaphor in Hermogenes the consequence of his account is that the entire set of issues related to understanding, producing, accepting and evaluating metaphoric expressions must be analyzed not by reference itself but by the *capacity* of referring. This means, in other words, that one must take a metaphoric expression for a natural thought process within language and not for an exclusive, sophisticated logical construction of analogical relations between the subject topic and the predicate modifier of the expression. In other words, Hermogenes' definition calls rather for *producing metaphors* directly than for understanding them via analogies, as we might thing of Aristotle's "logical" account of metaphor.

This is easily to understand by the very fact that Hermogenes, as a rhetorician, was rather interested in explaining the simple pattern of production and the impact of metaphors on listeners than in systematic descriptions of metaphors. Aristotle, though too interested in rhetoric, was obviously more interested in issues of understanding via *logical explanation* and linguistic systematization of metaphors but also of their good quality ('eú metaphérein') within particular discursive contexts (poetical, rhetorical, or even philosophical).[39] This seems to explain his search for deeper thought patterns of metaphoric expressions. But it is by no means a random quality of Aristotle's metaphor account that it leads so far as to explicitly—but quite without drama—affirm that metaphoric expressions are essentially forms of a different linguistic thought-processing. They are peculiar instances of predication, of saying that something *is* something, but also of comparing and naming things, and of ordering actions etc. Hence, the linguistic and logical analysis in Ch. 21 of *Poetics* represents in fact only a display of the logical frame of proportion as well as the intellectual background of common believes and common knowledge which, in Aristotle's opinion, is responsible of the possibility that speakers of a language make and understand metaphors. Thus, beyond the acknowledgement that Aristotle's account provides us with a display of metaphor as a complex pattern of thought-processing through language

---

39 For a more recent systematic discussion on analogic thinking, similarity and aesthetic aspects of thought, see a wide range of contributions in Vosniadou and Ortony eds. (1989). A more recent appreciation of analogy in Gabriel (1997).

rather than of constitution of a single language unit, it has to be remembered that his analytic pattern is more directly related to the intellectual *background* against which metaphors might be understood than to its linguistic means.

In this sense, Aristotle's account, while defining metaphors as a thought-process through language and not as single word transference, seems theoretically broader than the one provided by Hermogenes', though Hermogenes' idea of *tropé* as *producing* a common name out of one opens up new and unparalleled levels of linguistic metaphor analysis. Nevertheless, as I suggested above, both accounts are continuous with each other because Hermogenes, focusing on metaphoric expressions as instances of double-sided reference, emphasizes just that aspect of the metaphor theory which in Aristotle's approach remained implicit and, in consequence, less explanative with respect to other revolutionary insights into metaphors by Aristotle, such as metaphor's capacity of "saying new things", "bringing about learning" and, in consequence, bringing about truth.[40] The capacity of a metaphoric expression to bring about the truth is grounded in the peculiar linguistic function of saying something about something. Therefore, the function of Aristotle's grammatical and logical analysis of metaphors in Ch. 21 of *Poetics* is, and can only be, to provide general categories (species and genera) and thought patterns (analogies) for analytic purposes of *understanding* particular metaphoric expressions, be they one-word-based or sentence-based.

By this, however, it is not asserted that to provide background conditions for understanding metaphors is to define at once, on one side, their poetic value or, on the other side, to find out the truth conditions of their (presumed) proposition, and to determine their truth value, as Davidson (1984) assumes. Understanding metaphors by transference between genus and species or by analogy is not already accepting them under veridical or aesthetic aspects. Only few metaphors aim *explicitly* at a truth-value and they have the form of logos or sentence, whereas much more of them have another surface structure (be it verbal, attributive, nominal, or elliptic expression) conveying *prima facie* an aesthetic and emotional claim rather than a cognitive or veridical one.

---

40 *Rhetoric* III. 11, 1412a11sq; a20-26 (with references to Theodor, the rhetorician).

Hence, understanding metaphors remains a general precondition for accepting (or not accepting) them—be it as true, illuminating, convincing, adequate or "merely" inspiring or emotionally and aesthetically taking etc. Moreover, it is this twofold aspect of metaphors, which at once explains the so-called prescriptive character of Aristotle's metaphor theory. Namely, the analogical analysis proceeds as defining conditions of understandability and provides thereby the indispensable pre-condition for any further procedure of determining its acceptability, be it either the truth value of a metaphorical proposition (if any is given), or aptness for a pragmatic speech act or just for an aesthetic pleasure. It is also this twofold aspect of metaphor that explains also a philologically relevant fact, namely that Aristotle, while displaying in Ch. 21 of *Poetics* the logical frame of understanding metaphors points at issues like truth value and other types of discourse efficiency of metaphors only where dealing with the issue of a good realization (*areté*) of the *léxis*. For Aristotle, this virtue belongs not only to the beauty of poetry but is also a sign of the genius in philosophical thinking and in our cognitive capacity in general.

Despite their appreciation of these lines in Aristotle, Lakoff and Johnson declare their deepest disappointment (another one in the line Stanford-Ricœur-Black) with Aristotle's account of metaphor in following words:

> "Aristotle's theory of metaphor could not allow him to see his own conceptual metaphors. His theory could not allow him to look into his own cognitive unconscious and see that he was using conceptual metaphors, that is, mappings across conceptual domains. Blind to his own metaphors, he was forced by his own consistent application of his metaphors to a theory of metaphor that was inadequate to describe either his own metaphors or anyone else's."[41]

However, as I tried to show, the difference between alleged "cognitive unconscious" of Aristotle's and Lakoff and Johnson's own "cognitive conscious"—with which they aim to save philosophy's capacity to understand "its own nature and its own rational structure"—consists precisely in conscious and explicit aspects of Aristotle's account on "good metaphorizing": transference of names, which is conceived of as a synthetic *conceptualizing* out of cognitive and linguistic material and not just as a transference

[41] Lakoff and Johnson (1999), 376, 382sq.

of ready-made structures, schemes or "maps" across domains. If one takes these dynamic aspects of Aristotle's theory into account, there is no room for wondering why Lakoff and Johnson's disappointment with Aristotle appears, itself, disappointing in the final triviality:

> "(...) given his central metaphors and the overall conceptual structure of his philosophy, he could not have come up with anything like the contemporary theory of conceptual metaphor that we have been using."

At this point of the analysis of Aristotle's and Hermogenes' definitions of metaphoric language, new tasks my arise. One task could—and perhaps should—be a closer, more positive and more synthetic, i.e. less negative and differential analysis, like the one presented here, of possible relations between Aristotle's insights into the structure of metaphoric language and its function in poetical, rhetorical and scientific discourse and modern writers on philosophy and science theory like Ricœur, Black, Hesse and others. Another line of a more special investigation would certainly include more detailed analysis of relations between Aristotle's rhetoric and the interactionist theories of rhetoric and literary discourse in the line from Hermogenes through Stanford and Richards to more recent positions. But this task would heavily exceed the scope of this paper aiming at a contrastive analysis of two ancient conceptions of metaphor as they have been formulated in respective definitions.   ●