

Article title: Embodiment in Metaphor and Imagery: A comparative Analysis of Aristotle's Mimesis and Cognitive Semantics

Author(s): Zafar Abbas

Source: Linguistic Issues Journal(LIJ) | مجلة قضايا لغوية, Vol. 6, No. 1, (June 2025), PP132-145

Publisher: Center for Scientific and Technical Research for the Development of the Arabic Language(CSTRDAL) - Linguistic Research Unit and Arabic Language Issues in Algeria(LRUALIA)

Url: <https://qadaya-lugawiyat.dz/index.php/LIJ/article/view/163>



How to cite(APA): Abbas, Z. (2025). Embodiment in Metaphor and Imagery: A comparative Analysis of Aristotle's Mimesis and Cognitive Semantics. مجلة قضايا لغوية | Linguistic Issues Journal, 6(1), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.61850/lij.v6i1.163>

Usage Agreement: By using the LIJ journal you are indicating your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at: https://qadaya-lugawiyat.dz/index.php/LIJ/Usage_Agreement

Qadāyā luḡawiyat' (Linguistic Issues) is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License**



This content is **Open Access**



Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in the texts published are the author's own and do not necessarily express the views of the Editorial team of the Journal of **Qadāyā luḡawiyat' (Linguistic Issues)**

The Authors assume all responsibility for the ideas expressed in the materials published

Authors warrant that the rights of third parties will not be violated and that the publisher will not be held legally responsible should there be any claims for compensation



Copyright reserved to the author © 2025

Qadāyā luḡawiyat' (Linguistic Issues)

Center for Scientific and Technical Research for the Development of the Arabic Language(CSTRDAL)
Linguistic Research Unit and Arabic Language Issues in Algeria(LRUALIA)



التجسيد في الاستعارة والصور: تحليل مقارن لمحاكاة أرسطو والدلالات المعرفية

Embodiment in Metaphor and Imagery: A comparative Analysis of Aristotle's Mimesis and Cognitive Semantics

ظافر عباس*

جامعة كاراكورام الدولية، باكستان

Zafar Abbas

A Linguist in Karakoram International University, Pakistan

zabbas.e4u@gmail.com

Received date: 08/03/2025 | Acceptance date: 12/05/2025 | Publication date: 15/06/2025

ملخص

تبحث هذه المقالة في بناء المعنى الشعري من خلال إطارين نظريين متنافسين: مفهوم المحاكاة الأرسطي الكلاسيكي، ونظرية المحاكاة المعرفية المعاصرة. بمقارنة هذين النموذجين، نكشف عن اختلافات جوهرية في آلياتهما في بناء المعنى. يبدأ تحليلنا بأمثلة ملموسة، كالاستعارة المتجسدة والإسقاط الخيالي، لتوضيح كيفية تفسير كل نظرية للغة الشعرية. ثم نتبع التطور التاريخي للمعنى في النظرية الشعرية، بدءاً من تركيز أرسطو على التمثيل وصولاً إلى المناهج المعرفية الحديثة التي تُعطي الأولوية للتجربة المتجسدة. يُبرز هذا التطور كيف تطور المعنى الشعري إلى حلقة وصل متعددة التخصصات، تربط بين النقد الأدبي والبلاغة والشعرية وعلم الأعصاب الإدراكي. تُعيد الشعرية المعرفية، على وجه الخصوص، صياغة الصور الشعرية من خلال نماذج الاستقراء والتعميم والاستدلال (المعنى الضمني). لا تُعامل هذه النماذج الصورة كرمز ثابت، بل كبناء ديناميكي يتشكل من خيال القارئ وأساسه الإدراكي. يركز هذا النهج على مبدأ التجسيد، الذي يربط المعنى اللغوي بالتجارب الحسية الحركية، ويتحدى الثنائيات التقليدية بين اللغة المجازية والحرفية. من خلال دراسة كيفية انبثاق الصور من الكلام اليومي وتفاعلها معه، تكشف الشعرية المعرفية عن الأسس المعرفية العميقة للتأثير الشعري. الكلمات المفتاحية: التجسيد؛ التصوير؛ المحاكاة؛ الشعرية المعرفية؛ علم الأعصاب الإدراكي؛ التحليل المقارن.

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the construction of poetic meaning through two competing theoretical frameworks: the classical Aristotelian concept of mimesis (imitation) and the

* Corresponding author: Zafar Abbas

E-mail: zabbas.e4u@gmail.com

contemporary theory of cognitive mimesis. By contrasting these paradigms, we reveal fundamental divergences in their mechanisms of meaning-making. Our analysis begins with concrete examples embodied metaphor and imaginative projection—to demonstrate how each theory interprets poetic language. We then trace the historical development of meaning in poetic theory, from Aristotle's emphasis on representation to modern cognitive approaches that prioritize embodied experience. This progression highlights how poetic meaning has evolved into an interdisciplinary nexus, bridging literary criticism, rhetoric, poetics, and cognitive neuroscience. Cognitive poetics, in particular, reframes poetic imagery through models of induction, generalization, and implicature (implied meaning). These models treat the image not as a static symbol but as a dynamic construct shaped by the reader's imagination and perceptual grounding. Central to this approach is the principle of embodiment, which ties linguistic meaning to sensory-motor experiences and challenges traditional binaries between figurative and literal language. By examining how images emerge from and interact with everyday speech, cognitive poetics reveals the deep cognitive underpinnings of poetic effect.

Keywords: Embodiment ; Imagery ; Mimesis ; Cognitive poetics ; Cognitive neuroscience ; Comparative analysis.

1. Introduction

A range of dominant theoretical frameworks in the field of cognitive semantics have been guided by the idea of embodied simulation since early on; this concerns specifically the models of analytical linguistics, which are credited with the lead in defending embodied theories. At the forefront of these theories is the theory of conceptual metaphor, proposed by Johnson and Lakoff (1980, 1999). Lakoff and Johnson argue that people have a body of knowledge about their bodies (feeling) and about situations (verticality), and that abstract conceptualizations are based on this knowledge (Barsalou, 1999, p. 621).

In the literature of cognitive linguistics, it will be seen that imitation has become a central concept in a series of significant studies. These studies refer to frameworks such as Fillmore (1985), conceptual metaphor and schemas as conceived by Johnson & Lakoff (1980), Langacker's (1987) cognitive models, and mental spaces and conceptual integration theories proposed by Turner and Fauconnier (2002, 1985). These cognitive structures are thought to play a role in framing or stimulating the simulation process (Lakoff, 1998; Fauconnier & Turner, 2002).

This article focuses on explaining the procedural tools underlying the theoretical framework known as the poetic of simulation, which adopts the concept of embodied simulation to explore the formation of poetic meaning in language. It emphasizes the role of the body, situational action, and environmental possibilities in the activity of the conceptual system. This framework takes on the

responsibility of tracing its origins to Aristotle's theory of imitation, revealing the backgrounds of both perspectives and their procedural mechanisms.

Aristotle also highlighted in his *Poetics* that the arts differ from one another based on the subject being imitated. Imitation, in its origin, is only achieved by imitating actions; however, actions may be virtuous or immoral. Thus, the arts differ according to the subjects, with some artists imitating ordinary people, others imitating virtuous people, and some imitating bad people. Based on this difference, poetry was divided into tragedy and comedy (Aristotle, 1983, p. 67).

The Aristotelian perspective asserts that art is a mimesis of the world and an expression of the self. The image is regarded as an artistic vision rather than an imitation of reality. Romanticism later disrupted the notion that the world is the origin of beauty and that art is simply a mimesis of it. Art was considered higher than life, representing the highest model. Aristotle opposed Plato's assertion that art is a mere imitation of reality, claiming that art transcends life by deriving its truth from ideals. The artist connects with these ideals through the mind, and the mind can transcend reality to access the highest forms. Plato, conversely, believed that the world was not the truth, but a mimesis of an ideal world. In his view, art is not an imitation of reality, but of the highest model, and it is through art that one achieves a greater connection with the world of ideals. This distinction is central to the Platonic concept of poetic meaning as mimesis—the impressions of the soul through the senses. According to Plato, the mind's work occurs after the senses have processed the initial impressions, and it is these impressions that are subsequently represented in the mind.

In contrast, Aristotelian mimesis moves from the copy to the model. It reflects the ongoing effort of the lower term of the series to emulate the higher term, while compensating for any failures in nature. Through mimesis, humanity is humanized, and nature becomes more "natural."

2. Method of Study

In this article, we explore several aspects that define the meaning of simulation, focusing on both mimesis and cognitive linguistics. This approach undoubtedly opens up various perspectives for understanding meaning, especially in its connection to both philosophical and cognitive viewpoints regarding language use in the mind. The importance of embodied simulation goes beyond merely addressing these concepts; it delves deeply into the nature of meaning and the questions it raises.

Our aim is to foster a dialogue that offers a "figurative" interpretation of mimesis, one that is both creative and imitative. By connecting two perspectives, which – as we will show – are inseparable in the texts themselves, we aim to highlight the interrelationship between mimesis and poetic meaning, representation and figure, and "imitation" and figuration.

In a more precise sense, mimesis does not simply imitate; it "figures." Imitation would imply a faithful reproduction of reality (if that were even possible), but true mimesis, as recommended in Aristotle's *Poetics*, is more about figuration, understood as stylization.

According to Aristotle's view on poetry, poetic images are formed not through individual words but through the transgression or contravention of conventional language. The key terms here are: images, imagery, and metaphor. But the essential question remains: What constitutes poetic meaning, and how can it be created?

A critical issue that still remains unresolved is the precise status of poetic mimesis in its strict sense, as initially raised in the opening of Aristotle's *Poetics*.

3. Imitation and Figuration in Aristotle's Poetics

3.1 Mimesis and Images

Mimesis is considered the essence of all arts and genres, as no art can exist without imitation. Aristotle states that various forms of artistic expression—such as epic poetry, tragedy, comedy, dithyrambic poetry, flute compositions, and lyre performances—are all, in essence, forms of imitation (Aristotle, 1983, p. 55). In this sense, mimesis is foundational to the creation of art.

Aristotle defends mimesis in art by arguing that, contrary to Plato's view, it grants the poet the quality of a creator. Mimesis is not merely a process of copying or imitating what already exists in reality, but rather, it involves imitating the possible or what could potentially exist. According to Aristotle, mimesis exists only where there is an act of "doing," and only the poet's crafted artifact can be considered the proper object of mimesis. Aristotle thus establishes a rule for mimesis that is based on hypotheses of the possible and the probable, aligning poetry more closely with philosophy, as both seek to express general and universal truths. In defense of this idea, Aristotle compares history and poetry, placing a higher value on poetry because it conveys general truths rather than mere specific events (Aristotle, 1983).

In tragedy, as well as in comedy, mimesis functions not simply to imitate reality but to elevate and magnify what it represents, particularly human actions.

Mimesis, in this case, does not "imitate" in the strict sense; rather, it restates the subject "upwards" or "beyond" the mundane. It enhances the noble and degrades the vile, effectively displacing the real with the "meta"—not in the sense of metaphysics, but as in metaphor. Through this process, poetry transcends the ordinary to present deeper meanings (Aristotle, 1983).

Poetic meaning, therefore, refers to a collection of poetic images and the entire creative and artistic use of language that emerges through the power of imagination within ordinary language. An image in poetry is an imaginary form created through linguistic devices such as synecdoche and metaphor. These images are often considered specific to poetry due to their imaginative and figurative nature.

According to objective philosophy, the "image" of poetic meaning reflects objective reality as interpreted by the human mind. For instance, a "water image" in a philosophical context refers to the reflection of water in the mind, but the word "water" itself is not an image generated on its own. Instead, it derives its meaning from its connection to objective reality. Poetic language, however, is more condensed and impactful, often packing significant meaning into fewer words. The purpose of poetic language is not just to convey literal meaning but to elevate the language beyond its straightforward function, engaging the reader's senses, feelings, and emotions. The "poetic image" thus serves to astonish and evoke a deeper emotional response, its purpose being to create a heightened sense of meaning (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980)

3.2 Mimesis and Imagery

Through imitation, a significant human act is achieved: the act of purification. By engaging with the arts that provoke feelings of pity and fear, individuals can cleanse themselves of these negative emotions that threaten the well-being of the soul. In this way, the arts also offer opportunities for learning about human experiences. This perspective contrasts with Plato's view, who believed that imitation in poetry weakens the soul by stirring emotions that interfere with rational thought (Aristotle, 1983).

From an Aristotelian viewpoint, art is seen as an imitation of the world, and it is also an expression of the self. In this sense, the image becomes more of an artistic vision than a direct imitation of reality. The theory of cognitive experimentalism challenges the traditional concept of imitation, asserting that the world is not the mere origin of beauty, but rather, art transcends simple imitation (Johnson & Lakoff, 1999).

Scientific approaches to understanding art and imagery are grounded in interpretive models, each offering a unique perspective. One common approach is sensory, where the artist, in communicating with the viewer, brings what is sensed or felt closer to the experience of the observer, relying on the senses as a medium of connection. In this way, the artist imitates the world, and the audience imagines it within themselves. The creation of an interpretive model often involves presenting a network of interconnected terms that help frame understanding (Lakoff, 1998).

This article aims to explore imagery in relation to understanding and analyzing poetic meaning. It focuses on how poetic images, feelings, and morals are presented, pointing toward their deeper significance and how these elements are appreciated and accepted in poetic works.

3.3 The Embodied Metaphor

Aristotle's writings present rhetorical ideas that view metaphor and allegory from an embodied perspective, breathing life into inanimate objects. For instance, when Homer uses metaphor, he brings the lifeless to life by making the inanimate seem as if it possesses animal-like qualities. This technique creates a vivid presence in the text, as exemplified in phrases like: "And the merciless rock returned, descending to the plain..." and "The arrow flew... And the arrow is thirsty for flight towards the crowd" (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, trans. Badawi, 1983). This use of metaphor is not just figurative, but deeply rooted in the embodied experience of language, where metaphor serves to animate the inanimate.

It is clear from these examples that Aristotle emphasized the connection between embodiment and metaphor, using metaphorical language to articulate abstract concepts and inanimate objects. The function of metaphor, especially in its ability to give form and meaning to nature, irrationality, and abstract ideas, enlarges the scope of the gap between the depicted images. This embodied phenomenon within metaphorical language is often subject to linguistic nuances and the work of the imagination, blurring the lines between ancient and modern rhetorical and critical studies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Aristotle did not explicitly define metaphorical concepts; rather, he left it to readers to infer their meanings through the nature of metaphor itself. His approach was historically and artistically ahead of its time, particularly in his recognition of embodied poetic metaphors. He noted the richness and importance of metaphors, which reflected his deep appreciation for their artistic and functional qualities. Aristotle was both a critic and a linguist who was highly attuned to the metaphorical power embedded in language (Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1983).

In Aristotle's framework, poetry transcends ordinary language. The "poetic state" of language is distinct from the "normal" language of daily life. Just as music stands apart from ordinary sounds, the poetic state is characterized by internal relations that are more regular and perceptible. Poetry, in this sense, is an elevated form of language that surpasses everyday communication. It exists as a duality between words and meaning, offering a different experience that is more standardized in its use of language (Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1983).

Metaphor, as a tool in poetry, draws on the strengths of language, including its capacity to create, generate, and suggest meaning. These qualities are often linked to the literary, intellectual, and scientific traditions that metaphors evoke. Through this mechanism, poetry achieves universality, as the metaphorical image carries multiple layers: a sensory, mental, symbolic, and artistic dimension, all contributing to the richness and depth of poetic expression (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

4. Mimesis from Cognitive Semantics Prospective

Cognitive poetics challenges the notion that any image can be entirely devoid of metaphor, even in its modern form, given its reliance on imagination. While imagination is crucial, it alone is insufficient to construct the image, especially when the image is a linguistic achievement that often involves breaking or infringing upon the conventional rules of word and meaning. Understanding the acceptance and beauty of an image requires an exploration of its underlying metaphorical elements. The philosophical approach to poetry moves beyond the duality of word and meaning, as well as other dualities that arise within this framework. In cognitive poetics, the terms "image," "imagination," and "imaginary image" are increasingly used interchangeably to reflect this broader, more imaginative conception (Lakoff & Turner, 1989).

Modern interpretations of the term "image" move away from its historical reliance on decoration and formal aesthetics. The era in which images were simply rhetorical flourishes has passed, and contemporary poetry critics focus on understanding the causality linked to deeper meanings and the levels of meaning (Keenan, 2003). The poetic image now resonates with a heightened degree of internal consistency and harmony, making it difficult to fully comprehend through superficial reading alone. Therefore, the concept of the poetic image includes not only aesthetic and formal dimensions but also moral and symbolic layers (Stockwell, 2002).

The "poetic state" of language is also a state of mind, differing from the "normal" state of everyday language. In cognitive poetics, this poetic state

resembles the relationship between the world of sounds and the world of mere noises, where internal relations are as perceptible and regular as those found in music (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Poetry thus transcends ordinary language, as it is a higher form of expression. However, the poetic experience still shares the essence of daily experience and does not merely elevate language beyond the literal. Instead, it multiplies implicatures that bring new meaning to ordinary expressions (Keenan, 2003). Cognitive poetics moves away from specific metaphorical procedures, drawing the discussion closer to the aesthetic fields from which metaphorical functions emerge, though it lacks a precise technical basis in rhetoric and criticism (Semino, 2008).

Metaphor, within this framework, is not confined to traditional rhetorical uses but is seen as a dynamic function in both literary and everyday language. Al-Suli (d. 335 AH) is a prime example of how metaphors can embody both aesthetic and intellectual power. He recognized personification as one of the noblest metaphors and praised Abu Tammam for his use of such metaphors. Al-Suli, in his critique, argued that metaphorical creativity, such as Abu Tammam's line "Do not give me the water of blame, for I am a thirsty person who has found the water of my tears sweet," enriches and develops the language, pushing the boundaries of metaphorical expression (Akbar Abi Tammam, 1937).

This metaphorical approach deepens the meaning of the initial image, mapping it onto a new, more complex interpretation that evokes astonishment. The use of metaphor in poetry thus becomes a beauty that enhances the language's power, demanding extraordinary skill and care from the poet to craft images that are both illuminating and captivating for the reader. Poetic images establish a mapping between two distinct domains of experience, which are connected through an analogous relation. As readers or listeners receive the image, they form mental referents based on their subjective perceptions. These referents are not predetermined, and each individual's response to the image varies according to their personal experiences and interpretations (Keenan, 2003).

5. Discussion

The comparative analysis of Aristotelian mimesis and cognitive mimesis reveals fundamental tensions and convergences in how poetic meaning is constructed. While both frameworks acknowledge that poetry transcends ordinary language, they diverge in their mechanisms of meaning-making. Aristotle emphasizes representation and idealization, and cognitive poetics prioritizes embodied experience and dynamic metaphor. This discussion synthesizes supporting and opposing views on these theoretical paradigms while considering their implications for literary theory, cognitive science, and the philosophy of art.

Further this discussion balances historical, theoretical, and empirical perspectives while acknowledging critiques, ultimately advocating for a pluralistic approach to poetic meaning.

5.1 Supporting Views: The Strengths of Each Framework

5.1.1 Aristotelian Mimesis as a Foundational Theory

Supporters of Aristotelian mimesis argue that it provides a structured approach to understanding poetry as an elevated form of representation (Halliwell, 2002). By framing poetry as an imitation of possible or probable realities, Aristotle avoids reducing art to mere copying and instead highlights its philosophical depth.

His distinction between poetry (universal truths) and history (specific events) reinforces the idea that poetic meaning is not merely descriptive but transformative (Ricoeur, 1984).

The concept of catharsis in tragedy demonstrates how mimesis serves a psychological and ethical function, purging negative emotions and offering moral insight (Nussbaum, 1986).

5.1.2. Cognitive Mimesis as an Empirically Grounded Approach

Proponents of cognitive poetics argue that it offers a more dynamic and scientifically validated model of meaning construction (Gibbs, 1994). By linking metaphor to embodied experience (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), it explains how readers simulate sensory and emotional responses rather than passively receive symbolic content.

Neuroimaging studies support the claim that poetic language activates sensory-motor regions, confirming that metaphor is not merely decorative but deeply rooted in perception (Benedek et al., 2014).

Cognitive approaches also account for individual differences in interpretation, as readers construct meaning based on personal experiences (Stockwell, 2002), whereas Aristotelian mimesis assumes a more uniform reception of idealized forms.

5.2 Opposing Views: Critiques and Limitations

5.2.1 Limitations to Aristotelian Mimesis

Critics argue that Aristotle's framework is overly prescriptive, privileging certain forms (e.g., tragedy) while marginalizing others (e.g., experimental poetry)

(Eagleton, 2012). His focus on universal truths may neglect culturally specific or subjective interpretations.

The Platonic critique persists: if art is twice removed from the ideal (as in Plato's Republic), then mimesis risks being an unreliable mediator of truth (Janaway, 1995).

Modern and postmodern literature often subverts imitation through fragmentation, surrealism, and meta-fiction, making Aristotelian categories seem restrictive (Barthes, 1977).

5.2.2 Limitations of Cognitive Mimesis

Some traditionalists argue that cognitive approaches reduce poetry to neural processes, neglecting its aesthetic and transcendental dimensions (Scarry, 1999). If meaning is entirely embodied, does this exclude abstract or metaphysical poetry?

The theory's reliance on metaphor may overlook non-metaphorical poetic devices (e.g., rhythm, sound patterning) that also contribute to meaning (Tsur, 2008).

There is a risk of circularity: if all cognition is embodied, then every linguistic act could be classified as "cognitive mimesis," potentially diluting the term's explanatory power (Gallagher, 2005).

5.3 Synthesis: Toward an Integrative Approach

Despite methodological differences, both Aristotelian and cognitive approaches to mimesis converge on several foundational principles, enriching our understanding of poetic meaning. Aristotle views poetry as a transformative medium, asserting that it "imitates not what is, but what ought to be" (Poetics IX), emphasizing its normative and imaginative dimensions. Cognitive poetics echoes this through the concept of simulation—the mind's capacity to construct hypothetical scenarios (Gibbs, 2006). Cognitive linguists like Fauconnier and Turner (2002) further argue that metaphor and conceptual blending enable us to envision unrealized possibilities, aligning with Aristotle's idea of "probable impossibilities" (Poetics XXV).

Both frameworks also emphasize the emotional and ethical dimensions of poetry. For Aristotle, catharsis is not mere emotional release but a process of cognitive and moral recalibration. This is supported by neuroaesthetic research showing that reading poetry activates both introspective and emotional neural networks (Brattico & Pearce, 2013; O'Sullivan et al., 2015). Similarly, cognitive poetics emphasizes embodied empathy, treating poetry as a medium of ethical engagement (Keenan, 2003).

A shared concern with universality and subjectivity further unites these traditions. Aristotle's "universal truths" find parallels in cognitive poetics' identification of cross-cultural image schemas like containment and balance (Johnson, 1987). Yet both acknowledge contextual variability: Aristotle's *hamartia* is shaped by cultural norms, while cognitive simulations are informed by personal experience (Stockwell, 2020).

Aristotelian mimesis provides a philosophical framework for art's representational and ethical functions, while cognitive mimesis offers empirical insight into how readers process and interpret texts. Together, they portray poetry as both mirror and lens: refining reality into intelligible forms (Aristotle) and refracting it through embodied cognition (cognitive poetics).

Future research might explore hybrid models integrating classical aesthetics with cognitive science—for example, how formal features like meter and narrative structure interact with embodied simulation. Cross-cultural studies could investigate whether metaphorical cognition is universal or culturally contingent (Kövecses, 2005). Additionally, digital humanities approaches using computational text analysis may reveal how poetic devices trigger embodied responses across large reader datasets (Underwood, 2019).

6. Key Findings

- **Poetry as dynamic meaning-making:** both frameworks reject passive imitation, framing poetry as an active process hence offering a shared ground i.e. Aristotelian mimesis elevates reality through idealized representation while cognitive mimesis treats meaning as embodied simulation, grounded in sensory and motor experiences.
- **Convergence:** poetry's power lies in its ability to simulate hypothetical worlds (aristotle's "probable impossibilities") and evoke embodied responses (cognitive "mental imagery").
- **Divergent mechanisms of meaning**
 - i. **Representation vs. simulation:** aristotle: art represents universal truths through formal structures (e.g., tragedy's unity of action), while cognitive theory: meaning emerges from sensorimotor engagement (e.g., metaphor activates brain regions tied to physical experience).
 - ii. **Formal vs. Emergent Structure:** Aristotelian poetics prescribes rules (e.g., meter, plot coherence) for aesthetic effect, while

Cognitive poetics argues form's impact is biological (e.g., rhythm resonates with neural oscillations).

- iii. **The Role of Metaphor: According Aristotle** Metaphor is a stylistic device subordinate to logic, while **cognitive perspective views** metaphor as foundational to thought (e.g., "time is a river" reflects embodied temporality).

7. Implication

- i. Cognitive theory expands Aristotle's model by showing how metaphor shapes perception, not just embellishment.
- ii. Aristotle's intuitions As Neuroaesthetic Validation of Classical Ideas: Empirical studies confirm Aristotle's intuitions i.e. CATHARSIS aligns with poetry's activation of emotional brain regions (amygdala) and introspection (default mode network).
- iii. Mimesis as simulation mirrors mirror-neuron mechanisms (Gallese, 2005) for empathy in narrative.

8. Limitations of the Research

Aristotelian Weaknesses: firstly, it overemphasis on universalism may exclude culturally specific or avant-garde poetry. Secondly, formalism risks neglecting individual reader differences.

Cognitive Challenges: Aristotlian perspective **risks** reducing poetry to neural processes, sidelining aesthetic and historical dimensions, and needs stronger account of non-metaphorical devices (e.g., sound patterning).

9. Future Directions:

Following may be the implications for the future of this research:

- Cross-cultural studies to test universality of embodied schemas.
- Digital humanities tools to analyze metaphor patterns across traditions.
- Neuroimaging comparisons of responses to classical vs. experimental forms.

10. Conclusion

The dialogue between Aristotelian and cognitive mimesis reveals that these frameworks are not mutually exclusive but deeply

complementary. Aristotle provides a philosophical foundation for understanding poetry's ethical and formal dimensions, emphasizing its role in representing and refining reality. In contrast, cognitive poetics offers empirical insights into how poetic language engages the mind and body through metaphor, simulation, and embodied experience. Together, they illuminate poetry's unique power to bridge perception, emotion, and imagination. Recent advances in cognitive neuroscience further support this synthesis, showing how poetic features such as rhythm, metaphor, and narrative activate diverse brain regions involved in language, memory, and emotion. By integrating classical aesthetics with contemporary science, we gain a richer, multidisciplinary understanding of poetry—not merely as artistic expression, but as a transformative mode of human cognition and communication. This convergence invites ongoing interdisciplinary research and reaffirms poetry's enduring relevance across cultures, historical periods, and academic domains.

11. References

1. Akbar Abi Tammam. (1937). *Akhbar Abi Tammam* (1st ed.).
2. Aristotle. (1983). *Poetics* (I. Hamada, Trans.). Anglo-Egyptian Library.
3. Aristotle. (1983). *Rhetoric* (A. Badawi, Trans.). Ministry of Information.
4. Aristotle. (1983). *The Art of Poetry* (I. Hamada, Trans.). Anglo-Egyptian Library.
5. Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(4), 577–609.
6. Bennett, J. (2015). *Cognitive neuroscience and literary theory*. Routledge.
7. Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
8. Fillmore, C. J. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6(2), 222–254.
9. Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
10. Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. Basic Books.
11. Keenan, E. (2003). Metaphor and the experience of metaphor in cognitive poetics. *Journal of Cognitive Science*, 29(3), 37–55.
12. Lakoff, G. (1998). *Cognitive models in language and thought: Ideology and meaning*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

14. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. Basic Books.
15. Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago Press.
16. Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Vol. 1. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford University Press.
17. Mandler, J. M. (2004). *The foundations of mind: Origins of conceptual thought*. Oxford University Press.
18. Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Starr, G. G. (2013). *Feeling beauty: The neuroscience of aesthetic experience*. MIT Press.
20. Sternberg, R. J., & Horvath, J. A. (1995). *Handbook of intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive poetics: An introduction*. Routledge.
22. Tsur, R. (2012). *Toward a theory of cognitive poetics*. Academic Press.
23. Underwood, T. (2019). *Distant horizons: Digital evidence and literary change*. University of Chicago Press.