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When tracing the epistemological but also thematic development of metaphor studies in Egyptology, what can be seen is a change from a typological perspective, which sought to categorize both motifs and metaphor types, to a more cognitive perspective, which was more interested in the processes behind the linguistic phenomena. In the last few years there has also been increased interest in the development of metaphors in pan-textual as well as multimodal perspective and in the usage and extent of metaphors in all range of phenomena, such as textual, graphemic, and even pictorial media.

A similarity relation is argued to be established in thought (as opposed to, for example, language) when an essentially abstract entity, like “life” (called the target domain in Conceptual Metaphor Theory, cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980), is conceptualized in terms of a more concrete entity, like “a journey” (the source domain), on the basis of some similarity or analogy between the two entities (Goatly 2011: 16). (Conceptual metaphors, image schemas, and metonymic relations are represented here in small caps). For example, the Egyptian linguistic metaphor *mj.t n nḥ “path of life* (*Amenemope* L. = pBM EA 10474, 1.7; Laisney 2007: 325) most probably has its origin in the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY based on a similarity relation between paths and life progression. The domains surmised as lying behind these linguistic phenomena are to be
understood as conceptual structures that represent the coherent organization of experience (Kövecses 2002: 4; but see Sweetser 1990: 21 for a different interpretation of “domains,” which sets the “epistemic domain” against the “sociophysical domain”). The relation between the source domain and the target domain is scalar in terms of its degree of conventionality. In other words, the metaphor may be entirely fossilized, where the basic meaning is barely accessible, like pr(j), usually “to emerge” in the usage “unpolished, untreated”: ḫn pr(j) 4 “4 untreated animal skins” (pMallet = Louvre E 11006, 1.4; Maspero 1877: 47). The metaphor may alternatively be highly conventional, like the aforementioned “path of life” to refer to life choices, or completely novel, like jn(j) pA jH “Bring the ox!” to refer to inviting a person to one’s house (oDeM 303, 4; Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions III: 534.11)—or something in between. A metaphor can also be further defined at the conceptual level according to its degree of aptness, in other words, the degree to which the figurative meaning describes a relevant feature of the thing being described (Jones and Estes 2006: 19). Lastly, a metaphor is to be distinguished from a metonym, in that a metonym establishes a relationship not of similarity but of contiguity between two connected elements of a single domain, like CAUSE FOR EFFECT (Radden and Kövecses 1999: 19).

When a metaphor occurs in language, the more abstract concept, the topic (or tenor), is represented linguistically by the more concrete vehicle on the basis of characteristics common to both entities, identified as the ground (Richards 1936: 99, 117-118). The metaphor can emerge at the linguistic level via various parts of speech, even in names (e.g., Morenz 2004: 46, 79, 86), titles, and epithets (e.g., Blumenthal 1970; Franke 1998; Morenz 2004: 119; Windus-Staginsky 2006). At this linguistic level, we can furthermore differentiate a metaphor from a simile (called a “direct metaphor” in Steen et al. 2010: 26, 32-33), since in the latter case the noun or verb is likened to another thing or action via a construction with “like” or similar. In Egyptian this role is usually performed by mj “like,” although there also seems to have been an intermediate category between pure similes and pure metaphors, comprising metaphors formed with the “identificational” use of the preposition m “as.” Gillen points out that the form is metaphorical (2009: 183); I would nevertheless argue that the m marks the vehicle more than other metaphors. Although truly metaphorical phrases can be phrased in this way, this form is mostly used for statements in rhetorical-religious texts such as šms̀j sw m Ḩr-rṣj “I will follow him as the Southern Horus” (Stela of Amenemhet, Cairo CG 20040, x+6; Lange and Schäfer 1902: 50), which are in my opinion to be treated separately.

Metaphor can also be addressed as a communicative phenomenon, something that can in effect occur completely unconsciously but that can, even if the metaphor is entirely conventional, have attention drawn to it (Steen 2008: 224 calls this deliberateness; for reactions to this see Gibbs, ed. 2011 and Müller 2011, and for an Egyptological perspective, Di Biase-Dyson 2016 a and b).

According to Conceptual Metaphor Theory, a whole series of conceptual metaphors, irrespective of language or medium, are shared across cultures (Kövecses 2005: 3). Thus in theory every culture or language develops metaphors that are “universal” and others that are culture-specific (cf. Haikal 1994: 207). This being said, “universal” conceptual metaphors may manifest linguistically in culturally specific ways. For instance, an Egyptian version of a culturally well-represented conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER (Kövecses 2005: 68), tḥ h.t ṭḥb[.t] mh.t pobl “The fire rages in his belly” (Amenemope L = pBM EA 10474, 13.7; Laisney 2007: 342), is anchored in a specifically Egyptian complex of metonymically charged body parts (the belly is connected to both the heart, standing for UNDERSTANDING, and the tongue, standing for EXPRESSION). It must moreover be recognized that our knowledge of metaphor is undermined by the fact that analysts are external to the cultural system under investigation (Derchain 1976: 7). Although this is a remark pertinent for all
attempts to analyze ancient cultures, the access to intended meaning demanded by the study of metaphor amplifies the problem in this case.

Metaphors occur in a wide range of genres in Egyptian texts and are apparent already in the earliest language and iconography (cf. Goldwasser 1992, 1995). They appear in all manner of ways in the language, of which the list below gives a mere sample:

The verb of a sentence can be a metaphor vehicle, as in:

\[
wn < n > - sf sht m 'nh,yw n 'ds : 
\]

“If he gains (lit. catches with a net) on the basis of false oaths . . .” (Amememope L = pBM EA 10474, 7.18; Laisney 2007: 334).

Metaphors can also be nominal, appearing in what are known as “A is B metaphors,” wherein the first noun, the topic, is A, and the second noun, the metaphor vehicle, is B:

\[
(j)m(.j)-r'-pr-wr nb-j ntk hmw n ts r-dr-f
\]

“Oh High Steward, my lord! You are the steering oar of the entire land!” (Peasant B1 = pBerlin 3023, 298; Parkinson 2005: 37).

Some nominal metaphors present only the vehicle, rather than both topic and vehicle, which requires any inferencing of the nature of the metaphor to be based on the context. Here the teacher likens a poor student to a piece of wood too bent to be of any particular use:

\[
pA xt gwS xAa m sx.t
\]

“The crooked wood is left abandoned in the field” (Ani B = pBoulaq 4 r., 23.13; Quack 1994: 337).

Metaphors can also appear in adjectives, as we see, for instance, in metaphors for temperature that express emotional states (Di Biase-Dyson fc. b):

\[
kb r' hrw jg.w
\]

“calm (lit. cool) of speech and comforting of words” (stela of Ibi, Cairo JE 46200, 7, in Kubisch 2008: 235-236).

Another striking figurative phenomenon, closely tied to metaphoricity, is personification. Here the ground on which the stolen goods have been placed becomes animate and disposes the contraband:

\[
wn pi jwdn r'-sf ë(k)s-f sw 'm-f < s > w
\]

“The ground opens its mouth and it levels it and it swallows it up” (Amememope L 9.20; Laisney 2007: 336).

Metaphors “marked” with the m of identification form a category somewhere between simile and metaphor. Here an aspect of Thoth (in his manifestation as a baboon) is being described:

\[
jw pry-f jb m th
\]

“His heart/understanding is the plummet (of the scales)” (Amememope L 18.1; Laisney 2007: 348).

A simile (direct metaphor) creates an even more direct comparison, which can be further reinforced by other paralinguistic elements. In this case, we see a nominal simile (A is like B), followed by a clarifying subordinate clause:

\[
mnmn.t=s mj Say n wDb.w km=sn HH.w
\]


This use of clarification is particularly important in similes, which can otherwise be completely obscure due to the lack of cultural context:

\[
tw=k xpr mj wnb
\]

“You have become like a wnb-plant [?].” (Menena = oChicago OIC 12074 + oIFAO Inv. 2188, v. 12-13; Guglielmi 1983: 149).

Nominal similes can also appear in verbal constructions to highlight the nature of the action:

\[
hbZ.n-f sj m .t 5r(j).1 mj mj hž3
\]

“He [Amenhotep II] destroyed it instantly like a wild lion” (Memphis Stela of Amenhotep II, JE 86763, 4; Helck, ed.: Urk. IV: 1302.2).

Although mj is often used to directly precede verbs, as well as nouns, as in the case of mj wbn R’(w) “as when Ra shines” (Year 23 Inscription of Thutmose III at Wadi Halfa; Sethe, ed.: Urk. IV: 806.15), the results are seldom metaphorical (see Peust 2006). Nevertheless a poignant metaphorical example, with mj preceding an infinitive of the verb pr(j), describes the will of the Lebensmüber
to end his life:
\[ jw\ m(w)t\ m\ hr-j\ \{m\}\ mjn\ <mj>\ snb\ mhr\ mj\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ prj.t\ t-rnt\ r-ss\ jhm.t\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \]
"Death is before me today <like> the healing\ of a sick person, like going outside after suffering" (Lebensmüder = pBerlin 3024, 131; Faulkner 1956: 26).

Extended, text-based metaphorical phenomena are also prevalent in Egyptian literary texts, particularly in scribal encomia, wisdom texts, and love poetry—all rhetorically charged genres. We can measure metaphors across texts via the repetition of lexemes, as well as via the introduction of lexemes within the same semantic field in the course of a text. We see this, for instance, in The "Teachings" of Menena, whereby Menena admonishes his son Pai-iri by drawing on different path-based metaphors that serve to emphasise how his son has gone astray, figuratively speaking. In this way, the conventional metaphor of the "path of life," key to wisdom texts, becomes reactivated and brilliantly exploited for rhetorical purposes.

Menena starts by asserting to his son that he knows all too well where temptation, personified here by the underworld being "Fierce of Face," is to be found:
\[ mtr-j\ r\ mjn\ nb\ mnt\ nhs-hr\ m\ sfn\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \]
"I am informed/I have advised about every path where Fierce of Face is in the undergrowth" (Menena, r. 2-3; Guglielmi 1983: 148).

It is followed by another path metaphor relating to Pai-iri’s errant movements:
\[ \hat{s}n-k\{w\}\ jw\ nn\ n-k\ \{jw\}\ <jw>\ tm\ sr.t\ nb.t\ jn(j)-k\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \]
"You have gone off without sandals because you have not yet been brought (back) by a thorn" (Menena, r. 3; Guglielmi 1983: 148).

Although the text then expands into water-themed metaphors to emphasise Pai-iri’s deviancy, the father returns to his earlier metaphor of the thorn (which stands for the father’s intervention) later in the text:
\[ ptr\ jn(j)-j\ sr.t\ n\ mh\ \ hr\ mj<n>\ tsh\ mn*c\ n\ sh-s\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \]
"Look, I have brought a thorn a cubit long onto the submerged path, but there is no way of beating it in” (Menena, v. 5-7; Guglielmi 1983: 149).

Identifying Metaphors

Until very recently in Egyptology there seemed to be a tacit acknowledgement that a “transfer” of one thing to something else (based on Aristotle, Poetics, 1457b; Fyfe, ed. 1932) was something so commonly recognizable that there would be no need to be more explicit about the means by which metaphors are identified. This may in many cases be so, but when a metaphor is contentious, when the meaning is unclear, as is often the case, it may be expedient to have recourse to some kind of methodological framework.

A step forward in this direction was provided by Renata Landgráfová (2008), who, in order to identify metaphorical language in the love poems of the Egyptian New Kingdom, implemented the framework of pragmatics, specifically the “Cooperative Principles” of the language philosopher Paul Grice (1991: 28-30), which outline the conditions under which discourse is maximally comprehensible (quality, quantity, relation, and manner). When one of the communicative maxims is breached, a communicative implicature (a non-overt meaning, like metaphor) becomes involved. Thus, in the context of the erotic, the “house” of a woman can come to refer to her body (cf. Landgráfová 2008; Vinson 2016).

To date, the most explicit approach to metaphor identification has come from the author (Di Biase-Dyson 2016 a and b, fc. a and b), whose implementation of MIPVU (the Metaphor Identification Procedure VU Amsterdam, for which see Steen 2007: 9, 89; Steen et al. 2010) draws on corpus-based dictionaries to identify basic and contextual senses of lexemes. In this procedure, a metaphor is able to be identified when the contextual sense differs from the basic sense. More specifically, a conventional metaphor can be identified when that contextual sense is present in the lexicon. This may also be of use in finding metaphors that have become fossilized, by allowing for some kind of etymological reconstruction (Müller 2008: 11).
In this way, one can firstly consider the degree of metaphoricity of a lexeme and secondly make judgments about the metaphor’s conventionality. Metaphors range from conventional, e.g., jṭ(j) n(j) nmḥ(.w) “father of the orphan” (Peasant B1 93; Parkinson 2005: 18), to potentially novel, e.g., ksm.y n(j) bw-hwr.w “gardiner of meanness” (Peasant B1 294; Parkinson 2005: 37). As has been emphasized, the dictionary is key to ascertaining conventionality, but this being said, such analysis must be cross-checked with the corpus. For example, when the apparently figurative meaning of ksm.y “gardiner” in the dictionary (WB V 107.9) is cross-checked in the Belegstellen (and subsequently also in the Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae and the database of Projet Ramsès), the metaphorical meaning is revealed to be attested in only this case. Can it then be a conventional metaphor? This not uncommon occurrence underscores not only the necessity for a corpus perspective in metaphor research, but also advocates a scalar approach to metaphoricity: things need not be classified as “metaphorical” or “not metaphorical,” but rather as “more” or “less” metaphorical, as well as “more” or “less” conventional (cf. also Nyord fc.).

Egyptological Approaches to Metaphor

Although one can trace a sustained engagement with metaphor in Egyptological research in the last century, it is significant that little attempt has been made to define and describe metaphor as a phenomenon. Beyond preliminary movements towards categorization undertaken by several scholars in the Lexikon der Ägyptologie (as shall be discussed in more detail below), in general little explicit discourse has been conducted as to what constitutes a metaphor. Moreover, it is hard to identify specific strains of research into metaphor, given not only the hybridity of approaches adopted by scholars but also the reality that metaphor is multidimensional, occurring at many levels of text and image (Goldwasser 1995; Goldwasser and Grinevald 2012; Chantrain and Di Biase-Dyson fc.).

Motif-based approaches to metaphor

The most important early studies of metaphor were focused on collecting and grouping significant metaphorical cases across a range of text types, without an explicit research program to develop a means of identifying or investigating metaphorical language. We see this firstly in the work of Hermann Grapow, who contended that two factors determine the type of metaphor employed: the existence of sufficient common ground between the things being equated and the intentions of the producer (1983: 10). As his focus was exclusively on a typology of what we would now call “metaphor vehicles” (ibid.: 4), he placed little importance on the kind of metaphorical language used, whether simile or metaphor, as was pointed out by Waltraud Guglielmi (1986b: 986). In fact, Grapow (1983: 3) himself argued that the difference between simile and metaphor is “an sich gering und mehr formaler als inhaltlicher Art.” However, the ongoing empirical research by the current author, which considers the semantic environment of similes and metaphors, suggests that only conventional metaphor vehicles can appear interchangeably as either a simile or a metaphor, depending on the syntax. For instance, the metaphor is used for the king’s epithet msj ḫzsr “the wild lion” (Karnak hypostyle of Seti I: Hittite Campaign, W side of N wall, 12; Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions I, 17.16), but following a verb or an adverbial predicate the simile is usual: jw ḫmr-f ms-sn msj msj ḫzsr “his majesty was after them like a wild lion” (Ramesseum: Battle of Kadesh relief inscription = R2, W wall of 2nd court, 17; Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions II, 135.13-15). Where the metaphor is neither conventional nor apt at the conceptual level—in other words, neither well known nor easily comprehensible (Jones and Estes 2006: 19)—similes are employed. We see this, for instance, in the evocative and creative metaphorical language of the love poems: pꜳ nḥm m ḫw.t stw mj ṣḥw n ṣpd.w “the sweetness in my mouth [of wine], it is like the bile of birds” (Song 12 of pHarris 500, ro 5.2; Mathieu 2008: pl. 12). This is very likely because similes more distinctly mark a metaphor vehicle at the linguistic level, which in turn makes the
listener/reader more actively consider the comparison at the conceptual level (see Steen et al. 2010: 26). In more recent times, typological approaches to a range of metaphors have been attempted, such as the path (Vittmann 1999; Zehnder 1999; Di Biase-Dyson 2016 a and b), darkness/light (Galán 1999), and water (Ogdon 1987; Grimal 1994; Haikal 1994; Moers 2001).

Metaphorical motifs in generic perspective

Most recent approaches to metaphorical motifs have tended to study them in the perspective of a particular genre. For instance, Herrmann described a series of connected motifs in the wisdom tradition that represent human behavior: the ship, the scales, the tongue, and the heart (1954: 106-108). The cultural context of the motifs was then considered, such as the weighing of the heart in funerary conceptions (1954: 109-112). Such key metaphors in the wisdom corpus in turn influenced literary works, as can be seen in The Eloquent Peasant (Parkinson 2012), and provided impetus for motifs in the Ramesside genre of “scribal texts” (Ragazzoli 2010: 159-164 and Allon 2013: 110).

Ramesside love poetry has also engendered a range of motif-based studies. Mathieu (2008: 184) identifies 87 comparative structures (metaphors and similes) in the corpus, 69% of which come from the natural world, thus constituting a link to the theme of fecundity key to this genre (Mathieu 1999: 105-106; 2008: 247). The poetic strategies in this corpus have since then received fairly abundant attention (for which see Landgráfová and Navrátilová 2009; Hsu 2014a; Vinson 2016).

The use of animal imagery in pharaonic monumental texts has also had its share of scholarly attention (for which see, among others, Gillen 2007 and 2009; David 2011; Hsu 2013). Whereas Gillen considers the features from a discourse-analytical perspective (2009: 183), David (2011) emphasizes the connection between royal iconography and figurative language, and Hsu (2013: 15; 2014b) focuses on the relative distribution of metaphor and simile respective to the king and his enemies.

Typological approaches to metaphor

An analytical and classificational perspective on metaphor was posited, albeit briefly, by Gerhard Fecht (1970: 37) and taken up by several contributions to the Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Hellmut Brunner (1975: 805-808) considered the distribution of metaphor according to genre and epoch. Waltraud Guglielmi (1986a: 22-41; also 1996: 465-497), followed by Steve Vinson (2014), among others, provided an exhaustive typology of ancient Egyptian figurative language. In another contribution, Guglielmi considered the construction of similes and their distribution in comparison with metaphor (1986b: 986). Other key contributions integrating perspectives on metaphor are from Brunner on the conceptualization of the heart (1977), Eberhard Otto on abstraction (1975: 21), and Jürgen Oising on allegory (1977: 618-624).

Metaphor and lexical semantics

A preoccupation with lexical semantics has long been prominent in Egyptology, visible, for instance, in the attempts presented in the Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache to conceptualize ranges of meanings of single lexemes. Though not often explicitly tied to metaphor, the role of abstraction in polysemy is an additional long-standing concern in Egyptian lexicographical work (cf. Westendorf 1973).


Metaphor and cognitive approaches

Closely tied to the lexical semantic approach to metaphor is the cognitive one, which, adopted...

This trend was headed principally by Orly Goldwasser (1980, 1992, 1995, 2005) and Paul John Frandsen (1997), who shared an interest in the role of prototype categorization in metaphor production, both in Egyptian art and in written language. Their cognitive focus, which drew heavily on the models of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980), is applied more directly to textual material by Arlette David (2004: 48), Erika Meyer-Dietrich (2006: 232-233), Ines Köhler (2011 a and b), Rune Nyord (2009, 2012), and Steve Vinson (2014). Significant in Nyord’s research in particular is an awareness of cultural models (particularly tied to embodiment, a mapping of the CONTAINER image schema inside the human body) upon which speakers are presumed to have drawn in their use of metaphorical language (2012: 170; for image schemas see Hampe, ed. 2005).

Metaphor and written language

In recent times, several scholars have offered significant contributions to the field of metaphor in Egyptology from the perspective of metaphor in written language. In particular, Orly Goldwasser (1995: 40) considers metaphors from the graphemic level on through linguistic and visual levels. Goldwasser claimed that metaphors emerge in classifiers via associations that reflect ad hoc categories rather than stable semantic structures (for which she cites Barsalou 1983; cf. also Smoczyński 1999: 159-160; and additionally Goldwasser 1999 and 2006). Thus, an abstract verb like sr “to foresee” is classified with the giraffe (Gardiner’s Sign-list: E27) on the basis of an association between giraffes and THOSE WHO SEE AND KNOW BEFORE ALL OTHERS (Goldwasser 2002: 18). The lexical semantic basis of this example is rightly questioned by Christian Cannuyer (2010: 545, 601, 613).

Arlette David (2000) also considers the role of ad hoc categories on classification, showing how the semantic development of the lexeme nds from “smallness” to “inferiority” ensures that its bird classifier G37 can be applied, in an ad-hoc metaphorical transfer (“bad like the small bird”), to other negative lexemes by the First Intermediate Period (ibid.: 56-57). Sandro Schwarz (2005) follows this notion in his study of ship classifiers. The connection between metaphor and classifiers is further considered by David (2007 and 2011), Niv Allon (2007: 20–21), and, from a more lexical than cognitive perspective, Angela McDonald (2007, cf. Zandee 1963: 147).

Exception has been taken in recent times to the role of metaphor in classification strategies on the grounds that the relation of these lexemes to their classifiers is more likely to be metonymic than metaphorical. For instance, the bird G37 stands (as a prototypical member) for the category “to be small” (Lincke and Kammerzell 2012: 79). Metonymy, in a series of recent studies (Lincke, ed. 2011: 43-59; Kammerzell 2011; Lincke and Kutscher 2012: 19-22), has indeed been shown to be a dominant figurative strategy behind classification processes. We see it, for instance, in the duck classifier G39, for which the relationship to the lexeme is meronymic (PART FOR WHOLE) with respect to nouns, like rzf “the catch (of fowl and fish),” and metonymic with respect to verbs, showing the prototypical semantic role of agent of the verb in question, such as ḫm “to fly” (Lincke and Kammerzell 2012: 80).

This being said, there is still something to be gained by looking at metaphors in relation to classification, particularly if there is a concomitant focus on classification as a reflection of semantic change (cf. Chantrain 2014). It is possible that the systematization of classification apparent at the end of the New Kingdom, which seemed to have been carried out to reflect the semantic change of a number of lexemes, may have even been exploited by some scribes to mark metaphorical language across a text (Chantrain and Di Biase-Dyson: fc.).
Text-based approaches to metaphor

A more recent approach to metaphor has brought attention to metaphor patterns in whole texts. Linda Steynor takes a lexical and text-based approach (based on Goatly 2011) to the grain-based metaphors in The Eloquent Peasant and shows how these metaphors are tied to crucial points in the narrative (2011: 169). The current author (Di Biase-Dyson fc. a) has developed a means of analyzing pan-textual metaphor in Egyptian literary texts by applying a typology developed by Elena Semino (2008: 22-30) for English texts.

Visual metaphor

Visual metaphor is hard to qualify as a separate entity in the Egyptian record: it is often tied to metaphor in complementary modes, as a representation of a linguistic metaphor or as a complement (and perhaps precursor) of graphemic metaphor (Morenz 2004: 168; 2008: 74). The latter is argued for by Orly Goldwasser (1995: 11ff.), who analyzed the metaphoric elements relating to domination on the Narmer Palette and elsewhere (ibid.: 12-13). She contends that “domination” not only affected the language used to describe the king but also emerged in the classification system of terms describing pharaonic power (Goldwasser 1995: 58; cf. Frandsen 1997: 91-92; David 2011; Hsu 2013: 5-10).

However, not all visual-cum-language metaphors have their basis in political ideology. Some are tied to religious motifs or could be perceived as what Angenot (2011: 260) calls “cultural metaphors”: the tree goddess as shelter (Goldwasser 2002: 42), the depiction of a temple as the body of the god (Meyer-Dietrich 2009), or the portrayal of the western mountains as an embodiment of Hathor-Imenetet and “the Peak” (is dhn.t) (Rummel 2016: 48). Such metaphors are often multimodal: a scene of pouring water accompanied by sTj mw “pouring water” on the small golden shrine of Tutankhamun may be creating a “sexual metaphor” (Angenot 2011: 277) based on the double entendre of this phrase as “sowing semen” (Westendorf 1967: 141; Kessler 1986: 36; in relation to earlier artworks, Altenmüller 1991: 30-34, but cf. Eaton-Krauss and Graefe 1985).

It must be acknowledged, however, that the embeddedness of these motifs in the religious sphere may compromise the very metaphoricity of the “transfer” from one entity to another. More precisely, since the Egyptians believed that the western mountains were the goddess is dhn.t, and as such were ontologically committed to this transfer (see Nyord fc.), then either there is no metaphor as such—since metaphor relies upon there being a literal and a non-literal meaning—or we must vastly expand our definition of the term “metaphor” to encompass the Aristotelian sense of “transfer.” In the current author’s opinion, such a broad categorization would adversely affect the preciseness with which we can engage with other kinds of metaphor; thus I would plead for “religious figuration” to be consciously distinguished from mundane uses of figurative language, including metaphor.

Concluding Remarks

Egyptian textual and visual material from all time periods indicates that metaphor, like other modes of figurative expression, forms part of the very earliest means through which Egyptian culture was expressed. Metaphorical thinking is a kind of thinking key to world cultures: a necessity to represent the unrepresentable in tangible terms. We have seen via this overview the broad spectrum of applications of metaphor to all manner of media, from a wide chronological span and a variety of perspectives. While studies of metaphor have become increasingly sophisticated, much remains to be done, and the call for a more empirical basis for these analyses (Haikal 1994: 206) must be heeded. Moreover, more multimodal and multidimensional approaches to metaphorical representation will enable a more holistic understanding of this means of cultural expression.
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