

UCLA

UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology

Title

Metaphor

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4z62d3nn>

Journal

UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology, 1(1)

Author

Di Biase Dyson, Camilla

Publication Date

2017-04-10

Copyright Information

Copyright 2017 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

UCLA ENCYCLOPEDIA *of* EGYPTOLOGY

METAPHOR

الإستعارة (المجاز)

Camilla Di Biase-Dyson

EDITORS

WILLEKE WENDRICH
Editor-in-Chief
University of California, Los Angeles

JACCO DIELEMAN
Editor
University of California, Los Angeles

ELIZABETH FROOD
Editor
University of Oxford

JULIE STAUDER-PORCHET, ANDRÉAS STAUDER
Area Editors Language, Text and Writing
Swiss National Science Foundation & University of Basel, EPHE Paris/PSL Research
University

JOHN BAINES
Senior Editorial Consultant
University of Oxford

Short Citation:
Di Biase-Dyson, 2017, Metaphor. *UEE*.

Full Citation:
Di Biase-Dyson, Camilla, 2017, Metaphor. In Julie Stauder-Porchet, Andréas Stauder and Willeke Wendrich (eds.), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, Los Angeles.
<http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002kcbfm>

3279 Version 1, April 2017

<http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002kcbfm>

METAPHOR

الإستعارة (المجاز)

Camilla Di Biase-Dyson

Metapher
Métaphore

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.

عندما نتتبع تطور الدراسات الخاصة بالاستعارة في علم المصريات، ما يمكننا ملاحظته هو التغيير من منظور نمطي (نموذجي)، والذي يهدف إلى تصنيف (ترتيب) كلا من الأفكار (الموضوعات) والنماذج المجازية، إلى منظور أكثر إدراكا، والذي كان مهم أكثر في العمليات التي تكمن خلف الظواهر اللغوية. خلال السنوات القليلة الماضية كان هناك أيضا اهتمام متزايد في (موضوع) تطور الاستعارات من خلال مجموعة متنوعة من النصوص، وفي استخدام الاستعارات ومداهها في كل الظواهر، مثل النص، وأصغر وحدة كتابية "graphemic"، وحتى وسائل الإعلام التصويرية.

Metaphor is a trope used for aesthetic and rhetorical purposes (Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1457b; Fyfe, ed. 1932) although, as Aristotle himself pointed out, metaphorical language is also, and predominantly, a pervasive feature of natural discourse (*Rhetoric*, 3.2.6; Freese, ed. 1926). This very pervasiveness, evident in discourse and extending to language, as well as cognition (Cameron and Deignan 2006: 676-677; Steen 2008: 213, 221), may indeed explain its great effectiveness in literary works. Via metaphor one “speak[s] of something as though it were another” (Richards 1936: 116) or, more technically, one establishes a *similarity* relation between two entities. This can be done either “directly” with a simile or “indirectly” via a metaphor (Steen et al. 2010: 32-33).

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 ʿnh* “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”: *hn 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) p3 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 *šms=j sw m Hr-rsj* “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), *t3 h.t rkh{.t} m h.t=f* “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.

Metaphor Types

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>=f sht m ᵑnh.yw n ᵑd3 . . .

“If he gains (lit. **catches with a net**) on the basis of false oaths . . .” (*Amenemope* 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 ḥmw n t3 r-ḏr=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:

p3 ḥt gws ḥ3ᵑ m sh.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 t3.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 p3 jwdn r'=f ᵑ(3)=f sw ᵑm=f <s>w

“The **ground opens its mouth** and it levels it and it swallows it up” (*Amenemope* 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 p3y=f jb m th

“His heart/understanding is **the plummet** (of the scales)” (*Amenemope* 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 šᵑy n wdb.w km=sn ḥh.w

“Its [the temple’s] cattle are **like riverbank sand**: they number [in the] millions” (stela of the construction program of Amenhotep III, CG 34025 = JE 31408, 7-8; Helck, ed.: *Urk. IV*: 1649.14-15).

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

tw=k ḥpr 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:

ḥb3.n=f sj m 3.t šr(j).t mj m3j ḥz3

“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 Rᵑ(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 *Lebensmüder*

to end his life:

*jw m(w)t m hr=j {m} mjn <mj> snb mhr mj
prj.t r-hnt r-s3 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 mtn nb ntj nh3-hr m šfn

“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:

*šm=k{w} jw nn n=k {tjw} <tbw> 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:

*prr jn(j)=j sr.t n mh 1 hr m̄ <n> t3h mn ʿ 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., *jt(j) n(j) nmḥ(w)* “father of the orphan” (*Peasant* B1 93; Parkinson 2005: 18), to potentially novel, e.g., *kzn.y n(j) bw-ḥwr.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 *kzn.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; Chantraine 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 *mꜣj ḥꜣꜣ* “the wild lion” (Karnak hypostyle of Seti I: Hittite Campaign, W side of N wall, 12; Kitchen, *Ramesseum Inscriptions I*, 17.16), but following a verb or an adverbial predicate the simile is usual: *jw ḥm=f m-sꜣ=sn mj mꜣj ḥꜣꜣ* “his majesty was after them like a wild lion” (Ramesseum: Battle of Kadesh relief inscription = R2, W wall of 2nd court, 17; Kitchen, *Ramesseum 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: *pꜣ nḏm m r'=j sw mj sh.w n ꜣpd.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 Osing 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 ägyptischen 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).

More recent lexically based approaches to metaphor include that of Ludwig Morenz (2006: 52-53; 2008: 128-129), who considers the intersection of lexical and visual metaphor, Di Biase-Dyson (2012; fc. b), who looks at the development of metaphors in diachronic perspective, Daniel Werning (2012: 324; 2014), who focuses on the semantics of body parts and provides a list of body part terminology and its figurative usages (2014: 147-154), and Elisabeth Steinbach (2015), who analyzes the semantics of perception verbs.

Metaphor and cognitive approaches

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

simultaneously by studies of classification, made its way into the analysis of Egyptian language via prototype theory (Rosch 1978; cf. Goldwasser 2002), lexical semantics (Traugott and Dasher 2002: 27ff.), Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980), and cognitive linguistics in general (see Croft and Cruse 2004: 193ff.; also Nyord 2015).

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 *rꜣf* "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 *ḥm* "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. Chantraine 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 (Chantraine 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.*) 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-Imentet and “the Peak” (*t3 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 *t3 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.

Bibliographic Notes

The *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (Gibbs, ed. 2008) provides a general overview of all key issues in metaphor research. Poetic metaphor is addressed by Lakoff and Turner (1989), as are cultural manifestations of metaphor by Kövecses (2005). Fauconnier and Turner (2002) examine the blending of domains. The development of metaphor is explored by Bowdle and Gentner (2005). Crucial work on metaphor identification has been carried out by the Praggeljaz Group (2007) and also by Steen et al. (2010). For the consideration of metaphor in pan-textual perspective, the work of Semino (2008) is very useful. Notable Egyptological literature to date includes principally Grapow (1983 [first published 1924]), Goldwasser (1995), and Nyord (2009). For a new focus on metaphor identification see Di Biase-Dyson (2016a).

References

- Allon, Niv
 2007 Seth is Baal: Evidence from the Egyptian script. *Ägypten und Levante* 17, pp. 15-22.
 2013 The writing hand and the seated baboon: Tension and balance in Statue MMA 29.2.16. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 46, pp. 93-112.
- Altenmüller, Hartwig
 1991 Zum möglichen religiösen Gehalt von Grabdarstellungen des Alten Reiches. In *Ernten, was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Dwight Daniels, Uwe Gleßner, and Martin Rösel, pp. 21-35. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Angenot, Valérie
 2011 A method for ancient Egyptian hermeneutics (with application to the small golden shrine of Tutankhamun). In *Methodik und Didaktik in der Ägyptologie, Ägyptologie und Kulturwissenschaft IV*, ed. Alexandra Verbovsek, Burkhard Backes, and Catherine Jones, pp. 255-286. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- Aristotle
 1926 *The art of rhetoric*. Translated by John Freese. Loeb Classical Library 193, Aristotle Volume XXII. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; and London: Heinemann Ltd.
 1932 *The poetics*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library 199, Aristotle Volume XXIII. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann Ltd.
- Barsalou, Lawrence
 1983 Ad hoc categories. *Memory and Cognition* 11(3), pp. 211-227.
- Blumenthal, Elke
 1970 *Untersuchungen zum ägyptischen Königtum des Mittleren Reiches*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 61.1. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bowdle, Brian, and Dedre Gentner
 2005 The career of metaphor. *Psychological Review* 112, pp. 193-216.
- Brunner, Hellmut
 1975 Bildliche Ausdrücke und Übertragungen. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. I (columns 805-811), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Eberhard Otto. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1977 Herz. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. II (columns 1158-1168), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Cameron, Lynne, and Alice Deignan
 2006 The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics* 27(4), pp. 671-690.

Cannuyer, Christian

- 2010 *La giraffe dans l'Égypte ancienne et le verbe ꜥꜣꜣꜣ: Étude de lexicographie et de symbolique animale.* Acta Orientalia Belgica, subsidia 4. Brussels: Société Belge d'Études Orientales.

Chantrain, Gaele

- 2014 The use of classifiers in the New Kingdom: A global reorganization of the classifiers system? *Lingua Aegyptia* 22, pp. 39-59.

Chantrain, Gaele, and Camilla Di Biase-Dyson

- fc. Making a case for multidimensionality in Ramesside figurative language. In *Crossroads: Whence and whither? Egyptian-Coptic linguistics in comparative perspectives, February 17-20, 2016*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica, ed. Frank Kammerzell, Tonio Sebastian Richter, and Daniel Werning. Hamburg: Widmaier.

Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse

- 2004 *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David, Arlette

- 2000 *De l'infériorité à la perturbation: L'oiseau du "mal" et la catégorisation en Égypte ancienne*. Classification and Categorization in Ancient Egypt 1; Göttinger Orientforschungen IV. Reihe: Ägypten 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 2004 Composés attributifs exocentriques, hypallage et métaphore. *Lingua Aegyptia* 12, pp. 45-51.
- 2007 Ancient Egyptian forensic metaphors and categories. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 134, pp. 1-14.
- 2011 Devouring the enemy: Ancient Egyptian metaphors of domination. *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 22, pp. 83-100.

Derchain, Philippe

- 1976 Symbols and metaphors in literature and representations of private life. *Royal Anthropological Institute News* 15, pp. 7-10.

Di Biase-Dyson, Camilla

- 2012 A diachronic approach to the syntax and semantics of Egyptian spatio-temporal expressions with *ḥꜣ-t* "front": Implications for cognition and metaphor. In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 247-292. Hamburg: Widmaier.
- 2016a Spatial metaphors as rhetorical figures: Case studies from wisdom texts of the Egyptian New Kingdom. In *Spatial metaphors: Texts and transformations*, Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 39, ed. Fabian Horn and Cilliers Breytenbach, pp. 43-65. Berlin: Edition Topoi.
- 2016b Wege und Abwege: Zu den Metaphern in der ramessidischen Weisheitsliteratur. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 143(1), pp. 22-33.
- fc. a Metaphor in *The Teaching of Menena*: Between rhetorical innovation and tradition. In *Proceedings of the conference "(Re)productive Traditions in Ancient Egypt," Université de Liège, 6.-8. February 2013*, Aegyptiaca Leodiensia 10, ed. Jean Winand, Stéphane Polis, and Todd Gillen. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.
- fc. b The figurative network: Tracking the use of metaphorical language in Ramesside literary texts. In *The Ramesside Period in Egypt: Studies into cultural and historical processes of the 19th and 20th dynasties: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Heidelberg, 5th to 7th June, 2015*, Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo 41, ed. Sabine Kubisch and Ute Rummel. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Eaton-Krauss, Marianne, and Erhart Graefe

- 1985 *The small golden shrine from the tomb of Tutankhamun*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.

Erman, Adolf, and Hermann Grapow (eds.)

- 1926- *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache (WB)*, 13 Vols (1926 – 1963). Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner

- 2002 *The way we think*. New York: Basic Books.

- Faulkner, Raymond O.
1956 The man who was tired of life. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 42, pp. 21-40.
- Fecht, Gerhard
1970 Stilistische Kunst. In *Literatur*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I: 1.2, ed. Hellmut Brunner, pp. 19-51. Leiden and Cologne: Brill.
- Frandsen, Paul
1997 On categorization and metaphorical structuring: Some remarks on Egyptian art and language. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 7, pp. 71-104.
- Franke, Detlef
1998 *qrh.t*-Geschöpf des “Ersten Tages”: Eine Assoziationstechnik zur Staturerhöhung in der 10. und 11. Dynastie. *Göttinger Miszellen* 164, pp. 63-70.
- Galán, José
1999 Seeing darkness. *Chronique d'Égypte* 74(147), pp. 18-30.
- Gardiner, Alan
1957 *Egyptian grammar: Being an introduction to the study of hieroglyphs*. Third edition, revised. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. (ed.)
2008 *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2011 Are “deliberate” metaphors really deliberate? A question of human consciousness and action. *Metaphor and the Social World* 1(1), pp. 26-52.
- Gillen, Todd
2007 “His horses are like falcons”: War imagery in Ramesside texts. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists*, Studia Aegyptiaca 18, ed. Kata Endreffy and András Gulyás, pp. 133-146. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
2009 *Narrative, rhetoric and the historical inscriptions of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Goatly, Andrew
2011 *The language of metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Goldwasser, Orly
1980 Hekanahte and the “Boat Metaphor.” *Göttinger Miszellen* 40, pp. 21-22.
1992 The Narmer Palette and the “triumph of metaphor.” *Lingua Aegyptia* 2, pp. 67-85.
1995 *From icon to metaphor*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 142. Freiburg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
1999 The determinative system as a mirror of world organization. *Göttinger Miszellen* 170, pp. 49-68.
2002 *Prophets, lovers and giraffes: Wor(l)d classification in ancient Egypt*. (With an appendix by Matthias Müller.) *Göttinger Orientforschungen IV. Reihe: Ägypten* 38/3 = Classification and Categorization in Ancient Egypt 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
2005 Where is metaphor? Conceptual metaphor and alternative classification in the hieroglyphic script. *Metaphor and Symbol* 20, pp. 95-113.
2006 A comparison between classifier language and classifier script: The case of ancient Egyptian. In *A Festschrift for Hans Jakob Polotsky*, ed. Gideon Goldenberg, pp. 16-39. Magnes Press: Jerusalem.
- Goldwasser, Orly, and Colette Grinevald
2012 What are “determinatives” good for? In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 17-53. Hamburg: Widmaier.
- Grapow, Hermann
1983 *Die bildlichen Ausdrücke des Ägyptischen: Vom Denken und Dichten einer altorientalischen Sprache*. (First published 1924 by Hinrichs.) Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Grice, Paul
1991 *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- Grimal, Nicolas
 1994 Le sage, l'eau et le roi. In *Les problèmes institutionnels de l'eau en Égypte ancienne et dans l'antiquité méditerranéenne: Colloque AIDEA Vogüé 1992*, ed. Bernadette Menu, pp. 195-203. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Guglielmi, Waltraud
 1983 Eine "Lehre" für einen reiselustigen Sohn (Ostrakon Oriental Institute 12074). *Welt des Orients* 14, pp. 147-166.
 1986a Stilmittel. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* VI (columns 22-41), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1986b Vergleich. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* VI (columns 986-989), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 1996 Der Gebrauch rhetorischer Stilmittel in der ägyptischen Literatur. In *Ancient Egyptian literature: History and forms*, ed. Antonio Loprieno, pp. 465-497. Probleme der Ägyptologie 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Haikal, Fayza
 1994 L'eau dans les métaphores de l'Égypte ancienne. In *Les problèmes institutionnels de l'eau en Égypte ancienne et dans l'antiquité méditerranéenne: Colloque AIDEA Vogüé 1992*, ed. Bernadette Menu, pp. 205-211. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Hampe, Beate (ed.)
 2005 *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Helck, Wolfgang (ed.)
 1955 *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie (Urk. IV): Heft 17*. Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
 1957 *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie (Urk. IV): Heft 20*. Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Herrmann, Siegfried
 1954 Steuerruder, Waage, Herz und Zunge in ägyptischen Bildreden. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 79, pp. 106-115.
- Hsu, Shih-Wei
 2013 Figurative expressions referring to animals in royal inscriptions of the 18th Dynasty. *Journal of Egyptian History* 6, pp. 1-18.
 2014a The images of love: The use of figurative expressions in ancient Egyptian love songs. *Orientalia* 83(4), pp. 407-416.
 2014b The use of figurative language concerning the death of the king. *Archiv Orientalni* 82, pp. 201-209.
- Jones, Lara L., and Zachary Estes
 2006 Roosters, robins, and alarm clocks: Aptness and conventionality in metaphor comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 55, pp. 18-32.
- Kammerzell, Frank
 2011 Anhang 2: Auszug aus dem Abschlußbericht des deutsch-israelischen Kooperationsprojekts "Typologie und Gebrauch der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift." In *Die Prinzipien der Klassifizierung im Altägyptischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV; Reihe: Ägypten 38/6 = Classification and Categorization in Ancient Egypt 6, ed. Eliese-Sophia Lincke. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kessler, Dieter
 1986 Zu den Jagdszenen auf dem kleinen goldenen Tutanchamunschrein. *Göttinger Miszellen* 90, pp. 35-43.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A.
 1975 *Rameside inscriptions: Historical and biographical I*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 1979 *Rameside inscriptions: Historical and biographical II*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 1980 *Rameside inscriptions: Historical and biographical III*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Köhler, Ines

2011a *Rage like an Egyptian: Prototypensemantik in der altägyptischen Sprache am Beispiel des Wortfeld [WUT]*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Freie Universität Berlin.

2011b *Rage like an Egyptian: The conceptualization of anger*. In *Current research in Egyptology 2010: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium, Leiden University, The Netherlands, January 2010*, ed. Maarten Horn, Joost Kramer, Daniel Soliman, Nico Staring, Carina van den Hoven, and Lara Weiss, pp. 81-96. Oxford: Oxbow.

Kövecses, Zoltán

2002 *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

2005 *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kubisch, Sabine

2008 *Lebensbilder der 2. Zwischenzeit: Biographische Inschriften der 13.-17. Dynastie*. DAIK Sonderschrift 34. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Laisney, Vincent P.-M.

2007 *L'Enseignement d'Aménémopé*. Studia Pohl: Series Maior 19. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson

1980 *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George, and Zoltán Kövecses

1983 *The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English*. Berkeley: Linguistics Department, University of California at Berkeley.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner

1989 *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Landgráfová, Renata

2008 Breaches of cooperative rules: Metaphors and parody in ancient Egyptian love songs. In *Sex and gender in ancient Egypt: "Don your wig for a joyful hour,"* ed. Caroline Graves-Brown, pp. 71-82. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Landgráfová, Renata, and Hana Navrátilová

2009 *Sex and the golden goddess I: Ancient Egyptian love songs in context*. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.

Lange, Hans O., and Heinrich Schäfer

1902 *Grab- und Denksteine des Mittleren Reiches I*. Catalogue Générale des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Berlin: Reichsdruckerei.

Lincke, Eliese-Sophia (ed.)

2011 *Die Prinzipien der Klassifizierung im Altägyptischen*. Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV. Reihe: Ägypten 38/6 = Classification and Categorization in Ancient Egypt 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Lincke, Eliese-Sophia, and Frank Kammerzell

2012 Egyptian classifiers at the interface of lexical semantics and pragmatics. In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 55-112. Hamburg: Widmaier.

Lincke, Eliese-Sophia, and Silvia Kutscher

2012 Motivated sign formation in hieroglyphic Egyptian and German sign language (DGS): Towards a typology of iconic signs in visual linguistic systems. In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 113-140. Hamburg: Widmaier.

Maspero, Gaston

1877 *Le Papyrus Mallet. Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes* 1(2), pp. 47-59.

Mathieu, Bernard

- 1999 L'univers végétal dans les chants d'amour égyptiens. In *Encyclopédie religieuse de l'univers végétal: Croyances phytoreligieuses de l'Égypte ancienne* 1, ed. Sydney H. Aufrère, pp. 99-106. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier III.
- 2008 *La poésie amoureuse d'Égypte ancienne: Recherches sur un genre littéraire au Nouvel Empire*. Bibliothèque d'étude 115. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

McDonald, Angela

- 2007 A metaphor for troubled times: The evolution of the Seth deity determinative in the First Intermediate Period. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 134, pp. 26-39.

Meyer-Dietrich, Erika

- 2006 *Senebi und Selbst: Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 216. Freiburg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 2009 Der Tempel als Körper: Das Verhältnis zwischen architektonischer und religiöser Praxis. In 7. *Ägyptologische Tempelagung: Structuring Religion, Königtum, Staat und Gesellschaft früher Hochkulturen* 3,2, ed. René Preys, pp. 173-190. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Moers, Gerald

- 2001 *Fingierte Welten in der ägyptischen Literatur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.: Grenzüberschreitung, Reisemotiv und Fiktionalität*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 19. Leiden: Brill.

Morenz, Ludwig

- 2004 *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen: Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 205. Freiburg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 2006 Der "Fisch an der Angel": Die hieroglyphen-bildliche Metapher eines Mathematikers. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 133, pp. 51-55.
- 2008 *Sinn und Spiel der Zeichen: Visuelle Poesie im Alten Ägypten*. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag.

Müller, Cornelia

- 2008 *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and waking: A dynamic view*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 2011 Are "deliberate metaphors" really deliberate? A question of human consciousness and action. *Metaphor and the Social World* 1(1), pp. 61-66.

Nyord, Rune

- 2009 *Breathing flesh: Conceptions of the body in the ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*. CNI Publications 37. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- 2012 Prototype structures and conceptual metaphor: Cognitive approaches to lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian. In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 141-174. Hamburg: Widmaier.
- 2015 Cognitive linguistics. In Julie Stauder-Porchet, Andréas Stauder, Willeke Wendrich (eds.), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, Los Angeles.
<http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002k44p6>
- fc. Analogy and metaphor in ancient medicine and the ancient Egyptian conceptualization of heat in the body. In *The comparable body: Imagination and analogy in ancient anatomy and physiology*, Studies in Ancient Medicine, ed. John Wee. Leiden: Brill.

Ogdon, Jorge

- 1987 A hitherto unrecognized metaphor of death in Papyrus Berlin 3024. *Göttinger Miszellen* 100, pp. 73-80.

Osing, Jürgen

- 1977 Gleichnis. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. II (columns 618-624), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Otto, Eberhard

- 1975 Abstraktionsvermögen. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. 1 (columns 18-23), ed. Wolfgang Helck and Eberhard Otto. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Parkinson, Richard
 2005 *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*. (First published 1991 by Griffith Institute.) Oxford: Griffith Institute Publications.
 2012 *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant: A reader's commentary*. *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 10. Hamburg: Widmaier.
- Peust, Carsten
 2006 Die Syntax des Vergleichs mit *mj* "wie" im Älteren Ägyptisch. In *jn.t dr.w: Festschrift für Friedrich Junge*, ed. Gerald Moers, Heike Behlmer, Katja Demuß, and Kai Widmaier, pp. 485-519. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie.
- Pragglejaz Group
 2007 MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1), pp. 1-39.
- Quack, Joachim
 1994 *Die Lehren des Ani: Ein neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld*. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 141. Freiburg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Radden, Günter, and Zoltán Kövecses
 1999 Towards a theory of metonymy. *Metonymy in Language and Thought* 4, pp. 17-60.
- Ragazzoli, Chloé
 2010 Weak hands and soft mouths: Elements of a scribal identity in the New Kingdom. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 137, pp. 1-14.
- Richards, Ivor
 1936 *The philosophy of rhetoric*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Rosch, Eleanor
 1978 Principles of categorization. In *Cognition and categorization*, ed. Eleanor Rosch and Barbara Lloyd, pp. 27-48. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rummel, Ute
 2016 Der Leib der Göttin: Materialität und Semantik ägyptischer Felslandschaft. In *Gebauter Raum: Architektur - Landschaft – Mensch: Beiträge des fünften Münchner Arbeitskreises Junge Ägyptologie (MAJA 5), 12.12. bis 14.12.2014*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV; Reihe: Ägypten 62, ed. Susanne Beck, Burkhard Backes, I-Ting Liao, Henrike Simon, and Alexandra Verbovsek, pp. 41-74. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schwarz, Sandro
 2005 *Schiffe und Schiffsteile als Klassifikatoren in der ägyptische Hieroglyphenschrift*. Unpublished Masters thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
- Semino, Elena
 2008 *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sethe, Kurt (ed.)
 1907 *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie (Urk. IV): Heft 11*. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Smoczyński, Wawrzyniec
 1999 Seeking structure in the lexicon: On some cognitive-functional aspects of determinative assignment. *Lingua Aegyptia* 6, pp. 153-162.
- Steen, Gerard
 2007 *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: A methodological analysis of theory and research*. *Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research* 10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 2008 The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol* 23, pp. 213-241.

- Steen, Gerard, A.G. (Lettie) Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and Trijntje Pasma
2010 *A method for linguistic metaphor identification*. Converging Evidence in Language and Communication Research 14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steinbach, Elisabeth
2015 “Ich habe seinen Anblick geschmeckt . . .”: Verben der Wahrnehmung und die semantischen Beziehungen zwischen Perzeption und Kognition. In *Text: Wissen - Wirkung – Wahrnehmung: Beiträge des vierten Münchner Arbeitskreises Junge Ägyptologie (MAJA 4), 29.11. bis 1.12.2013*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, IV; Reihe: Ägypten 59, ed. Gregor Neunert, Henrike Simon, Alexandra Verbovsek, and Kathrin Gabler, pp. 209-225. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Steynor, Linda
2011 The function of metaphor in *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*: Preliminary considerations. In *Current research in Egyptology 2010: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium, Leiden University, the Netherlands, January 2010*, ed. Maarten Horn, Joost Kramer, Daniel Soliman, Nico Staring, Carina van den Hoven, and Lara Weiss, pp. 157-173. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Sweetser, Eve
1990 *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae
<http://aaw.bbaw.de/ta>, accessed 03.2016.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Richard Dasher
2002 *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vinson, Steve
2014 Go figure: Metaphor, metonymy and the practice of translation in the *First Tale of Setne Khaemwas*. In *A good scribe and an exceedingly wise man: Studies in honour of W. J. Tait*, ed. Aidan Dodson, John J. Johnston, and Wendy Monkhouse, pp. 305-321. London: Golden House.
2016 Behind closed doors: Architectural and spatial images and metaphors in ancient Egyptian erotic poetic and narrative literature. In *Sex and the golden goddess II: The world of the love songs*, ed. Hana Navrátilová and Renata Landgráfová, pp. 1-23. Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.
- Vittmann, Günther
1999 *Altägyptische Wegmetaphorik*. Beiträge zur Ägyptologie 15. Vienna: Veröffentlichungen der Institute für Afrikanistik und Ägyptologie der Universität Wien.
- Werning, Daniel
2012 Ancient Egyptian prepositions for the expression of spatial relations and their translations: A typological approach. In *Lexical semantics in ancient Egyptian*, *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 9, ed. Eitan Grossman, Stéphane Polis, and Jean Winand, pp. 293-346. Hamburg: Widmaier.
2014 Der “Kopf des Beines,” der “Mund der Arme” und die “Zähne des Schöpfers”: Zu metonymischen und metaphorischen Verwendungen von Körperteil-Lexemen im Hieroglyphisch-Ägyptischen. In *Synthetische Körperauffassung im Hebräischen und den Sprachen der Nachbarkulturen*, *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 416, ed. Andreas Wagner and Katrin Müller, pp. 107-161. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Westendorf, Wolfhart
1967 Bemerkung zur “Kammer der Wiedergeburt” im Tutanchamungrab. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 94, pp. 139-150.
1973 Zur Entstehung übertragener und abstrakter Begriffe. *Göttinger Miszellen* 6, pp. 135-144.
- Windus-Staginsky, Elka
2006 *Der ägyptische König im Alten Reich: Terminologie und Phraseologie*. Philippika 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Zandee, Jan

1963 Seth als Sturmgott. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90, pp. 144-156.

Zehnder, Markus

1999 *Wegmetaphorik im Alten Testament: Eine semantische Untersuchung der alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Weg-Lexeme mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer metaphorischen Verwendung*. Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 268. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Janne Arp-Neumann and Eliese-Sophia Lincke, as well as the anonymous reviewers, for their insightful commentary on drafts of this contribution.