

Interality Hierarchy in Metaphors: *Chuang Tzu* Revisited

Xianting Cheng & Ying Yuan
Soochow University, China

Abstract

Among the increasing inquiries into the relation of “interality” with various disciplines, interality and rhetoric have rarely been connected directly. This essay attempts to examine interality in rhetorical figures by focusing on how interality works in metaphor under the two criteria of openness and negotiation so as to establish an interality hierarchy. This assumed metaphor interality hierarchy is justified as Form 3 (vehicle present, tenor implied) > Form 2 (tenor present, vehicle implied) > Form 1 (tenor and vehicle both present). By applying this interality hierarchy to analyzing metaphors in the imaginative classic of *Chuang Tzu*, we find that its rich metaphors in all three forms are well weaved to generate appropriate interality, leaving readers in the adequate and comfortable space of poetry and eloquence. This research is expected not only to theorize the specific nature and function of interality in metaphor, but offer implications for exploring interality in other rhetorical figures as well.

Keywords: interality, metaphor, Chuang Tzu

1. Introduction

The concept of “interality” (间性) was put forward by Shang (2012), as distinguished from “substance” in the tradition of ontology. It is referred to as “the emptiness

around, within, and between objects, which both constitutes them and connects them with one another” (Shang, 2015, p. 68). “Intersubjectivity” is the English origin of interality, though the latter is more philosophically inclusive than the former. According to Zhang (2015), the Chinese origin of interality is “聞”, which has later evolved into “聞” and finally into “间”. “Interality” involves “a number of senses, including interplay, relationality, reciprocity, resonance, interzone, interval, wiggle room, blank space, nothingness, emptiness, unfinishedness, coolness, betweenness, and alliance” (ibid., p. 101). Among the increasing inquiries into the relation of interality with East Asian cultures (esp. Taoism and Chan Buddhism), Western philosophies, and media ecology, interality and rhetoric have rarely been connected directly. Although in the same article, Zhang claimed that “Many figures of speech rely on interality to work” (ibid., p. 94), he only provided a long list of active figures headed by metaphor, without specific illustration, as figurative interality is not the major concern of his article.

We thus attempt to make a focused inquiry on interality and metaphor by addressing the following unattended questions: Are all metaphors of equal interality? If not, how different is the interality degree between the metaphor types or what is the interality hierarchy in metaphors? As to the major criteria of interality, we select from the above multidimensions—space/openness and alliance/negotiation¹, which are more closely associated with metaphor. This assumed metaphor interality hierarchy is to be established first, and then applied to investigating metaphors in *Chuang Tzu*, with the hope of revealing their unique characteristics and functions in light of openness and negotiation.

2. Metaphor: Openness and Negotiation

In this part, we try to establish a significant relation between interality and metaphor from two dimensions: openness and negotiation. Through reviewing the studies of metaphor in the domains of rhetoric, poetics, linguistics and philosophy, we find that these two characteristics—openness and negotiation, have already been, more or less, touched upon in the inquiry into the creation and interpretation of metaphor, though expressed in different ways.

The idea of openness is prominently clarified in Genette’s (1982) definition of rhetorical figure as the form in the gap/space between the letter and the meaning by

saying,

We see that here, between the letter and the meaning, between what the poet has written and what he thought, there is gap, a space and like all space, it possesses a form. The form is called a figure, and there will be as many figures as one can find forms in the space that is created on each occasion between the line of the signifier (“la tristesse s’envole”—sorrow flies away) and that of the signified (“le chagrin ne dure pas”—sadness does not last), which is obviously merely another signifier offered as the literal one. (p. 47)

It is noteworthy that this space in the gap is not empty and rather on each occasion it contains a particular mode of eloquence or poetry.

In addition, Ricoeur (1978), based on the thought of semantic clash, points out the emergence of new meaning in metaphor, which implies the openness for meaning conflict, transformation and rebirth, in his saying that,

In other words, metaphorical meaning does not merely consist of a semantic clash but of the *new* predicative meaning which emerges from the collapse of the literal meaning, that is, from the collapse of the meaning which obtains if we rely only on the common or usual lexical values of our words. (p. 144)

Moreover, Lyotard (2011) argues that the power of metaphor is rooted in the excess of meaning and “excess” exactly points to such a fact that there is space whereby excessive meaning may exist.

The phantasy of seeing-being-seen, with its aspects of taboo—represented by the monster’s threat issued against the bridge’s trespassing—does indeed seem to be the matrix in which the elements of this metaphor come to be pulverized, unrealized, and reorganized. Moreover, the power of this metaphor is certainly due to the fact that it exceeds the personal phantasies of the poet who overturns it and presents it as metaphor of metaphors. (p. 286)

As Culler (2005) summarizes, between the two ways of pondering on the relation between the literal and the metaphorical—the *via philosophica* and the *via rhetorica*, “the first locates metaphor in the gap between sense” (p. 225), whereas the

latter “locates metaphor not in the gap between sense and reference but in the space between what is meant and what is said: between a literal or proper verbal expression and a periphrastic substitute” (p. 227). These inquiries into metaphor, though with different foci, reflect such a common recognition that there exists a gap in metaphor—openness for eloquence and poetry, or new meaning emergence, or meaning excess.

The idea of negotiation, even earlier than that of openness, is extensively discussed in the mainstream of metaphor investigation. Cohen (1978) and Booth (1978) put much emphasis on exploring the complex and magic process of readers’ interpretation of metaphor, in which the communication between author and reader is ongoing. According to Cohen (1978), metaphor is endowed with the capacity to cultivate intimacy and the detailed process of the cultivation is exhibited as follows:

- (1) the speaker issues a kind of concealed invitation;
- (2) the hearer expends a special effort to accept the invitation; and
- (3) this transaction constitutes the acknowledgement of a community. All three are involved in any communication, but in ordinary literal discourse their involvement is so pervasive and routine that they go unmarked. The use of metaphor throws them into relief, and there is a point in that. (p. 6)

In a similar vein, Booth (1978), when discussing the problem of evaluation of metaphor, argues:

In short, the question is not whether we will judge the character of metaphorists and the societies that produce and sustain them. We are all forced to do that all the time, as the responses to Mailer illustrate. To understand a metaphor is by its very nature to decide whether to join the metaphorist or reject him, and that is simultaneously to decide whether to be shaped in the shape his metaphor requires or to resist. The only question is thus whether to attempt reasoned critical discourse about such judgments. (p. 63)

Later Booth (1983) further explores the secret communion between author and reader in three respects: the pleasure of deciphering, the pleasure of collaboration and a sense of private communication. For us, both the interaction view and the communion

process partially support our view of negotiation characteristic of metaphor.

Besides, under the influence of Kant's (1999) philosophical judgment of interaction between simultaneous substances, Richards (1965) regards the essence of metaphor as interaction of meaning and says,

In the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction. ... We find, of course, when we look closer that there is an immense variety in these modes of interaction between co-present thoughts, as I will call them, or, in terms of the context theorem, between different missing parts or aspects of the different contexts of a word's meaning. (p. 93)

To sum up, these studies concerning the relation of metaphor to the internal working mechanism and to the audience, to some extent, mirror the characteristics of openness and negotiation. Openness can be understood as such a trait that in metaphor exists the space or gap between the literal and the metaphorical for extra meaning to emerge and poetic feeling to permeate. Then negotiation can be summarized as a resultant trait of openness that when interpreting a metaphor the reader conducts an intimate communication with the author to decipher the interactive process of literal meaning and metaphorical meaning, giving full play to his imagination.

3. Metaphor: Interality Hierarchy

According to openness and negotiation, we attempt to make an appropriate judgment of the interality hierarchy of metaphor. Though the issue of hierarchy has not been mentioned in the previous studies, Richards' (1965) concept of "tension" presupposes its existence:

As the two things put together are more remote, the tension created is, of course, greater. That tension is the spring of the bow, the source of the energy of the shot, but we ought not to mistake the strength of the bow for the excellence of the shooting; or the strain for the aim. (p. 125)

The degree of tension is similar to the hierarchy of interality, which we hope to justify by virtue of metaphor taxonomy. In the scholarship there is no general consensus on the classification of metaphor. We here choose the tenor-and-vehicle-based taxonomy raised by Perrine (1975) for Wellek and Warren's (1949) belief of metaphor as a unity of form and content, and also for better analysis feasibility. Besides, we reduce the number of types from four to three because the last type in which both tenor and vehicle are absent merely appears in a fairly limited number of distinctively obscure poems.

Based on the underlying assumption that both tenor and vehicle of a metaphor are expressible as substantives, metaphors can be classified according to whether tenor and vehicle are respectively stated or implied. Basically, there are two categories: (1) visible metaphors, in which both tenor and vehicle are present, and (2) invisible metaphors, in which either tenor or vehicle is absent. More specifically, invisible metaphors can be further divided into two subcategories: one kind only with the tenor present while the absent vehicle is implied by a semantically related expression such as a verb in most cases, and the other kind only with the vehicle present while the absent tenor can be inferred from the context. Thus, there are altogether three kinds of metaphor: Form 1 (both tenor and vehicle present); Form 2 (tenor present, vehicle implied); and Form 3 (vehicle present, tenor implied). In addition, there are considerable variations of each form because of syntactic variety in the actual use. The table below gives a more comprehensive illustration of this refined taxonomy.

Table 1. The refined taxonomy of metaphor

Categories	Subcategories	Formula	Examples
Visible metaphors	Form 1	Tenor present, Vehicle present	(a). Variation 1: X is Y <u>All the world's stage</u> , And all the men and women merely players. Shakespeare: <i>As You Like It</i>
			(b). Variation 2: Y of X The <u>Bird</u> of <u>Time</u> has but a little way To flutter—and the Bird is on the Wing. FitzGerald: <i>The Rubaiyat</i>
			(c). Variation 3: X, Y O <u>wild West Wind</u> , thou <u>breath of Autumn's being</u> . Shelley: <i>Ode to the West Wind</i>
Variation n: ...			
Invisible metaphors	Form 2	Tenor present, Vehicle implied by ...	(d). Variation 1: X, Y implied by verb Sheathe thy <u>impatience</u> ; throw cold water on thy <u>choler</u> . Shakespeare: <i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> (vehicle implied: a sword; fire)
			(e). Variation 2: X, Y implied by adjective Pride, like that of the morn, When the headlong <u>light</u> is loose. Yeats: <i>The Tower</i> (vehicle implied: an animal, probably a horse)
Variation n: X, Y implied by ...			
	Form 3	Tenor implied by context, Vehicle present	(f). Variation: X implied by context, Y Look, love, what envious streaks Do lace the severing clouds in yonder East: Night's <u>candles</u> are burnt out, and jocund day Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops. Shakespeare: <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (tenor implied: stars)

Note: denoting tenor; ~~~~~ denoting vehicle

Regarding this refined taxonomy, we now can analyse the interality hierarchy of metaphors of these three forms. The previous studies concerning openness and negotiation of metaphor shed light on our judgment.

Comparison of openness comes first. In examples of (a), (b) and (c), the tenor and the vehicle: *all the world and stage*, *Bird and Time*, and *wild West Wind and breath of Autumn's being* are all respectively present in the text, which means that the boundaries of these metaphors are clearly established. That is to say, in each of these visible metaphors, the space for the gap that these two lines form is thus to a larger extent limited. In example (d) and (e), however, the vehicles—a *sword* and *fire*, and *an animal*—are absent in the text. In example (f), the tenor—*stars*—is absent. Therefore, the boundaries of these three metaphors are not completely set. In other words, the space for the gap is in some way more open. Consequently, apart from other potential factors, there is more possibility for meaning reconstruction in invisible metaphors and thus we judge that invisible metaphors are typical of more openness than visible metaphors.

Based on the above judgement of openness hierarchy, we conduct comparison of negotiation. Here we have to isolate other factors at play in the interpretation of metaphors such as similarity between tenor and vehicle even though they are of critical importance. Because of the disparity of openness, the process and effect of negotiation varies among metaphors. In examples (a), (b) and (c), the interpreter expends less effort to figure out what the writer wants to express, and to construct their own proper understanding, for the tenors and vehicles are both explicitly provided. Less effort means that their pleasure of deciphering also decreases. Examples (d), (e) and (f), however, are different. Due to the absence of either vehicle or tenor, the interpreter has to exert more effort to collect more information from the context, to guess what the writer wants to express and to evaluate their own understanding. In some way, there is more negotiation in the interpretation and the interpreter is more likely to have pleasure in deciphering the metaphorical meaning. In the further comparison among examples of (d), (e) and (f), the securing of the absent tenor, *stars*, in (f) demands that the reader probe deeper into the poem, extend richer imagination and evaluate the understanding more cautiously. It is not uncommon that reader may miss this metaphor because *night's candles* is acceptable in literary language as well. So, we believe that in the scale of negotiation there exists a hierarchy of Form 3 > Form 2 > Form 1.

In conclusion, combining the judgement of metaphors upon openness and negotiation, we can prove that the interality hierarchy of metaphors appears as follows: metaphor with vehicle present but tenor implied (Form 3) > metaphor with tenor present but vehicle implied (Form 2) > metaphor with both tenor and vehicle present (Form 1).

4. Analysis of Metaphors in *Chuang Tzu*

In comparison with other classical works, *Chuang Tzu* enjoys such a reputation that “No single work of any other school of [early Chinese philosophical] thought can approach the *Chuang Tzu* for sheer literary brilliance” (Watson, 1962, p. 161). Crandell as well asserts that portions of *Chuang Tzu* “bespeak the most commanding authorial presence in early Taoism” (1983, p. 101). It is noteworthy that it is abundant in various metaphors, whereby Chuang Tzu’s profound naturalism, philosophical subtlety and sophisticated humor can be experienced by readers. For these stylistic features, we select *Chuang Tzu* as our analysis material. Among traditional recordings of this work, Inner Chapters (the first seven chapters) have been generally acknowledged to be the achievements of Chuang Tzu himself. Outer Chapters (from eight to twenty-two) and Miscellaneous Chapters (from twenty-three to thirty-three), however, have been considered to be written by the followers of Chuang Tzu due to some contradictions in language, style and thoughts. Therefore, taken as samples for analysis are seven Inner Chapters, which are the heart of the book and have higher consistency of language, style and thoughts. Seven essays constitute the specific content of Inner Chapters: “Free and Easy Wandering” (《逍遥游》), “Discussion on Making All Things Equal” (《齐物论》), “The Secret of Caring for Life” (《养生主》), “In the World of Men” (《人间世》), “The Sign of Virtue Complete” (《德充符》), “The Great and Venerable Teacher” (《大宗师》), and “Fit for Emperors and Kings” (《应帝王》).

Since 1881, there have been eight complete translations, five translations of Inner Chapters and eleven translations of selected chapters. In 1968, Watson provided a complete edition—*The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* which was finished under the reference of Liu’s *The Supplements and Corrections of Chuang Tzu* (1980). By virtue of fluent language and poetic style, Watson’s version has been ubiquitously regarded as one of the excellent translations and collected into the United Nations Educational

Scientific and Cultural Organization. Hence, from different English editions of *Chuang Tzu* is Watson's translation selected for reference².

After the verification of metaphors according to the refined taxonomy, we find that there is a disproportion in the number of metaphors among these three forms. In agreement with Form 1 wherein both tenor and vehicle are present, we locate nineteen samples. Despite the least interality of Form 1, it is not surprising that Chuang Tzu utilizes this form frequently, probably due to the difficulty in illuminating profound philosophical wisdom through language. In order to enlighten the reader in a convenient way, Chuang Tzu has to clearly point out both tenor and vehicle, thus establishing a space with clear boundaries for interpretation and decreasing the challenge in properly understanding what he wants to convey. Illustrated below are two representative examples of Form 1 (metaphor with both tenor and vehicle present).

1. Chinese version: 未成乎心而有是非，是今日适越而昔至也。（《齐物论》）

English version: But to fail to abide by this mind and still insist upon your rights and wrongs—this is like saying that you set off for Yüeh today and got there yesterday. (Discussion on Making All Things Equal)

This example is taken from Chapter 2 “Discussion of Making All Things Equal” (《齐物论》), which embodies Chuang Tzu's philosophy that Tao is the matter of all things in the world and all things are equal while right and wrong are relative. By means of this metaphor, Chuang Tzu intends to persuade readers to get rid of conforming to stereotypes usually rooted in the majority of people. The tenor “to fail to abide by this mind (the mind a man is given) and still insist upon your rights and wrongs (未成乎心而有是非)” is so complicated and abstract a state in personal experience, with which readers are actually not acquainted, that it is difficult to state clearly what it is. Correspondingly, for illuminating the tenor, Chuang Tzu must state explicitly the concrete vehicle “that you set off for Yüeh today and got there yesterday (今日适越而昔至)” to help the reader negotiate with himself, know the absurdity of having no idea before action and then realize the necessity of establishing one's own idea first.

2. Chinese version: 自其异者视之，肝胆楚越也；自其同者视之，万物皆一也。

(《德充符》)

English version: If you look at them from the point of view of their differences, then there is liver and gall, Chu and Yüeh. (The Sign of Virtue Complete)

This example is taken from Chapter 5 “The Sign of Virtue Complete” (《德充符》) which is concerned with such a statement that if only they have a high virtue and preserve in Tao, men will become models for other people even if they are deformed. As Confucius’ reply to Ch’ang Chi’s confusion about Wang T’ai’s “leaving things to themselves and sticking to the essential Tao”, this metaphor is intended to explain the degree of difference in the eyes of those who look at things from the point of their differences. Chuang Tzu, through Confucius, juxtaposes the tenor, *liver* (肝) and *gall* (胆), which are conventionally similar, and the vehicle, *Chu* (楚) and *Yüeh* (越), which are conventionally different. It is this juxtaposition of two pairs of unrelated things that describes exactly though in a slightly exaggerated way the great degree of difference. It is possible that the absence of either tenor or vehicle will undermine the clarity of illumination.

We find two examples meeting the Form 2 (tenor present, vehicle implied) metaphor criteria. They are to be illustrated as below.

3. Chinese version: 人莫鉴于流水而鉴于止水。(《德充符》)

English version: Men do not mirror themselves in running water—they mirror themselves in still water. (The Sign of Virtue Complete)

This example is also from “The Sign of Virtue Complete” (《德充符》). As Confucius’ reply to Ch’ang Chi’s request for the reason for things to gather around Wang T’ai, this metaphor is intended to emphasize the necessity of pursuing the state of stillness. Here, instead of clearly pointing out the vehicle “mirror”, Chuang Tzu, through Confucius, employs “鉴”, a verb implying the vehicle—mirror, to connect the reader with a more concrete and dynamic scene. Situated in this scene, the reader has to exercise more imagination to interpret the meaning of this metaphor. With the assistance of the context, he or she, finally, will be conscious of the intention of Chuang Tzu and gain the understanding of stillness.

4. Chinese version: 夫尧既已黥汝以仁义，而劓汝以是非矣。（《大宗师》）

English version: Yao has already tattooed you with benevolence and righteousness and cut off your nose with right and wrong. (The Great and Venerable Teacher)

This example is taken from Chapter 6 “The Great and Venerable Teacher” (《大宗师》) which indicates that with Tao as their master, people can attain Tao if they mingle themselves with nature, ignore life and death, deal with the world in quietude, and forget about the world. This metaphor works as Hsü Yu’s attack on Yao’s teaching to Yi Erh-tzu. Here, instead of clearly pointing out vehicles: tools for tattooing and cutting off noses, Chuang Tzu, through Hsü Yu, implies them by using the closely associated expressions *tattoo penalty* (黥) and *rhinotomy* (劓). It is obvious that these verbs are of more power in sparking the reader’s imagination to conjure up the cruel image. Upon conjuring up the image, the reader will realize the cruelty of adhering to narrow codes of ethics such as *benevolence*, *righteousness*, *right* and *wrong* and then refuse to be confined by these fixed beliefs.

Compared with Form 2, Form 3 (vehicle present, tenor implied) metaphor is more various and takes two shapes in the text. The first shape, as evidenced in Example 5, appears in the similar way as above, while the other—allegory—deserves more attention.

5. Chinese version: 闻之曰：“鉴明则尘垢不止，止则不明也。久与贤人处则无过。”（《德充符》）

English version: But I’ve heard that if the mirror is bright, no dust settles on it; if dust settles, it isn’t really bright. When you live around worthy men a long time, you’ll be free of faults. (The Sign of Virtue Complete)

This example is taken from Chapter 5 “The Sign of Virtue Complete” (《德充符》). As Shen-t’u Chia’s reply to the conceited provocation of Tzu-ch’an of Cheng, the description of no dust settling on the bright mirror promotes the reader to probe deeper into the dialogue between these two persons. What does Shen-t’u Chia want to express with this phenomenon? In negotiating with Shen-t’u Chia’s intention, the reader can get more pleasure in deciphering this metaphor: worthy men are bright mirrors, and thus understand Shen’s satire of Tzu-ch’an.

In line with Crisp’s (2008) definition of allegory as an extended or “super-extended” metaphor, here we identify 42 allegories in all seven Inner Chapters. Table 2 displays allegories (with the main characters) in Chapter 1 “Discussion on Making All Things Equal” (《齐物论》).

Table 2. Allegories in “Discussion on Making All Things Equal”

Chinese version:	鯤与鹏，蜩与学鸠 汤与棘 宋荣子与列子	尧与许由 肩吾与连叔 惠子与庄子
English version:	K’un and P’eng, cicada and little dove T’ang and Ch’i Sung Jung-tzu and Lieh Tzu	Yao and Hsü Yu Chien Wu and Lien Shu Hui Tzu and Chuang Tzu

This chapter is written to express the idea that people should break free of the bondage of the mundane world and strive after absolute spiritual freedom. In these allegories, tenors—people of different groups—are absent while vehicles are present in the complete plot with detailed description. Thus, there is more openness or space for Chuang Tzu to illuminate his meaning and for readers to reconstruct their understanding. At the same time, readers are undergoing a more active negotiation with these allegories themselves as well as their creator, so as to secure a reasonable and coherent interpretation.

6. Chinese version: 北冥有鱼，其名为鯤。鯤之大，不知其几千里也。化而为鸟，其名为鹏。鹏之背，不知其几千里也。怒而飞，其翼若垂天之云。是鸟也，海运则将徙于南冥。南冥者，天池也。背负青天而莫之夭阏者，而后乃今将图南。蜩与学鸠笑之曰：“我决起而飞，抢榆枋而止，时则不至，而控于地而已矣，奚以之九万里而南为？”（《逍遥游》）

English version: In the northern darkness there is a fish and his name is K’un. The K’un is so huge I don’t know how many thousand li he measures. He changes and becomes a bird whose name is P’eng. The back of the P’eng measures I don’t know how many thousand li across and, when he rises up and flies off, his wings are like clouds all over the sky. When the sea begins to move, this bird sets off for the southern darkness, which is the Lake of Heaven.

Only then can he mount on the back of the wind, shoulder the blue sky, and nothing can hinder or block him. Only then can he set his eyes to the south.

The cicada and the little dove laugh at this, saying, “When we make an effort and fly up, we can get as far as the elm or sapanwood tree, but sometimes we don’t make it and just fall down on the ground. Now how is anyone going to go ninety thousand li to the south!” (“Free and Easy Wandering”)

In the allegory of K’un and P’eng, and cicada and little dove, the images of K’un and P’eng, cicada, and little dove, and the contrast between them among size, flight and action always promote the reader to ponder over what Chuang Tzu wants to convey with them. There are so many elements in the space for imagining and thinking that the reader will gain richer and more profound understanding through the active negotiation. In this sense, allegory, a special type of Form 3, is endowed with the most interality due to its vast space opened for imagination and active negotiation required between the reader and the author.

To sum up, the disproportion of the three metaphor forms arises from Chuang Tzu’s evaluation of various elements in the rhetorical situation. In order to clarify his complicated views, he has no choice but to employ a considerable number of metaphors in Form 1 with limited interality. However, this deficiency of interality is effectively balanced by the large-scale imaginative use of allegories, a unique type of the highest metaphor interality, Form 3. Generally speaking, the rich and varied metaphors in *Chuang Tzu* have exhibited intriguing and approachable interality.

5. Conclusion

Our investigation, upon the proper understanding of “interality”, first proves that there is indeed a close link between this notion and metaphor, due to the shared dimensions of openness and negotiation. According to these two criteria and a major metaphor taxonomy based on visibility, we have justified that the hierarchical interality of the three metaphor forms is as follows: Form 3 (vehicle present, tenor implied) > Form 2 (tenor present, vehicle implied) > Form 1 (tenor and vehicle both present). By

applying this interality hierarchy to analyzing metaphors in the imaginative classic of *Chuang Tzu*, we find that its metaphors of different kinds are well weaved to generate appropriate interality, leaving readers in the adequate and comfortable space of poetry and eloquence.

Notes

- 1 Cf. You, X. L., & Zhang, P. (2015). Interality in Heidegger. *China Media Research*, 11(2), 104-109. While examining Heidegger's work, they believed that Heidegger's interpretation of "clearing" supported the associations of interality with "openness, throughness, play, and freedom". "Openness" here can be seen as synonym of "space", as "negotiation" can be seen as "alliance".
- 2 In order to avoid confusion some clarification for the examples has to be made. The ground for identifying and classifying metaphors is based on the Chinese version. All of the English version samples with *like* and *as* should not be misunderstood as similes; actually, in the original Chinese version, these samples (with no comparative words) fall into the category of metaphor.

Acknowledgements

We thank very gratefully, Prof. Peter Zhang for affirming the feasibility of this inquiry, which has greatly motivated our writing of this essay, and Prof. Geling Shang for the generous sharing of his own articles on interality. We also owe Yingxing Zhou thanks for her close reading and beneficial comment on the initial draft. This research has been supported by Chinese National Social Science Fund Project: "On Argumentative Textual Functions of Major Tropes and Schemes" (15BYY178).

References

- Booth, W. C. (1978). Metaphor as rhetoric: The problem of evaluation. In S. Sacks (Ed.), *On metaphor* (pp. 47-70). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction* (2nd ed.). London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chuang Tzu. (1968). *The complete works of Chuang Tzu* (B. Watson, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, T. (1978). Metaphor and the cultivation of intimacy. In S. Sacks (Ed.), *On metaphor* (pp. 1-10). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Crandell, M. M. (1983). On walking without touching the ground: "Play" in the *Inner Chapters* of the *Chuang-tzu*. In V. H. Mair (Ed.), *Experimental essays on Chuang-Tzu* (pp. 101-123). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Culler, J. (2005). *The pursuit of signs*. London: Routledge.
- Genette, G., Sheridan, A., & Logan, M. R. (1982). *Figures of literary discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kant, I. (1999). *Critique of pure reason* (P. Buyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, W. D. (1980). 《庄子补正》 [*The supplements and corrections of Chuang Tzu*]. Kunming: Yunnan People's Publishing House.
- Lyotard, J. F. (2011). *Discourse, figure* (J. Mowitt, A. Hudek & M. Lydon, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Perrine, L. (1975). Four forms of metaphor. In W. R. Winterowd (Ed.), *Contemporary rhetoric: A conceptual background with readings* (pp. 319-336). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Richards, I. A. (1965). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1978). The metaphorical process as cognition, imagination, and feeling. In S. Sacks (Ed.), *On metaphor* (pp. 141-158). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shang, G. L. (2012). 道通与间性 [Dao tong and interality]. 《哲学分析》 [*Philosophical Analysis*], (5), 146-155.
- Shang, G. L. (2015). Interality shows through: An introduction to interalogy. *China Media Research*, 11(2), 68-79.
- Watson, B. (1962). *Early Chinese literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wellek, R., & Warren, A. (1949). *Theory of literature*. London: Cape.
- You, X. L., & Zhang, P. (2015). Interality in Heidegger. *China Media Research*, 11(2), 104-109.
- Zhang, P. (2015). The human seriousness of interality: An East Asian take. *China Media Research*, 11(2), 93-103.

(Copy editing: Alexander Brandt)

About the authors

Xianting Cheng (18860921172@163.com) is an MA student in the Department of English at the School of Foreign Languages, Soochow University, China. Her research

interests are mainly in tropes and comparative rhetoric. This paper was initially prepared for “Interliteraturality, Interculturality: The 3rd International Symposium on Interality Studies” (June 17th-18th 2019, Nanning, Guangxi), and later finalized with further reading and revising.

Ying Yuan (szyuanying@sina.com) is Professor of English at the School of Foreign Languages, Soochow University. She received her PhD in Western Rhetoric from Shanghai International Studies University and completed Postdoctoral Fellowship at Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Her research interests are mainly in theory of rhetoric, comparative rhetoric, and rhetorical criticism. Her books include *Towards a New Model of Rhetorical Criticism* (2012), *Readings in Western Rhetoric* (2013), *Western Rhetoric: A Core Concept Reader in Chinese Translation* (2017).

Errata

[James Oladunjoye Faleye & Eunice Olatokunbo Fajobi, “A Prosodic Analysis of English Sermons of Selected Pastors in Southwest Nigeria”, published in the autumn 2019 issue (Vol. 5 No. 3) of *Language and Semiotic Studies*, pp. 111-133]

In the tenth line of Section 2.1 on page 85, “Adegoju (2002)” should be removed. The vowel symbols in SN 4-5 and the last column of Table 5 on page 97 should end with the long vowel symbol. We apologize for the errors.