

DOI: 10.7311/tid.11.2018.19

Magdalena Zyga (Szczecin)

Is God nothingness or blackness? – literature as a platform for integration of religious discourse(s) and the discourse of (natural) sciences

The aim of the paper is to show how conceptual metaphors and metonymies, combined with other factors, enable literature to integrate specialized discourses, in accordance with the theory of Jürgen Link (1983) and his notion of interdiscourse (ger. *Interdiskurs*). We posit that in our research material, i.e. selected poems and lyrics, elements of two kinds of religious discourses – the discourse of Christian apologetics and atheist or anti-theist discourse – are linked together with the elements of the discourse of (natural) sciences, especially with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of persuasion. As the method of analysis the DIMEAN (linguistic multi-level discourse analysis) model (Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008) is used, which has hitherto been applied almost exclusively to analyse German-language discourse.

Key words: conceptual metaphors and metonymies, discourse analysis, interdiscourse, poems and lyrics

Czy Bóg to nicość czy czern? – literatura jako platforma dla integracji dyskursu/ów religii i dyskursu nauk (przyrodniczych)

Celem artykułu jest pokazanie jak metafory i metonimie konceptualne w połączeniu z innymi czynnikami umożliwiają literaturze integrację dyskursów specjalistycznych, zgodnie z teorią Jürgena Linka (1983) i jego ideą interdyskursu (niem. *Interdiskurs*). Wychodzimy z założenia, że w naszym materiale badawczym, tj. wyborze wierszy i tekstów piosenek, dwa rodzaje dyskursów religijnych – dyskurs chrześcijańskiej apologetyki oraz dyskurs ateistyczny czy antyteistyczny – połączone zostają z elementami dyskursu nauk przyrodniczych w celu wzmocnienia efektu perswazyjnego. Metodą badawczą jest model DIMEAN (wielopoziomowa lingwistyczna analiza dyskursu; Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008), która do tej pory używana była niemal wyłącznie do analizy dyskursu niemieckojęzycznego.

Słowa kluczowe: metafory i metonimie konceptualne, analiza dyskursu, interdyskurs, wiersze i teksty piosenek

Ist Gott das Nichts oder Schwärze? – Literatur als Ort der Verbindung der religiösen Diskurse und des Diskurses der (Natur-)Wissenschaften

Mit dem Beitrag soll veranschaulicht werden, wie konzeptuelle Metaphern und Metonymien in Verbindung mit anderen Faktoren die Belletristik dazu befähigen, Fachdiskurse im Sinne von Jürgen Links Theorie (1983) und seinem Konzept des Interdiskurses zu verknüpfen. Wir nehmen an, dass in unserem Untersuchungsmaterial, d. h. in den ausgewählten Gedichten und Songtexten, Elemente von zwei Arten des religiösen Diskurses – der Diskurs der christlichen Apologetik und der atheistische bzw. anti-theistische Diskurs – mit Elementen des (natur-)wissenschaftlichen Diskurses verbunden werden, um insbesondere die persuasive Wirkung zu erhöhen. Als Untersuchungsmethode wird das DIMEAN-Modell (Diskurslinguistische Mehr-Ebenen-Analyse; Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008) zugrunde gelegt, das bis jetzt fast ausschließlich zur Analyse deutschsprachiger Texte angewendet wurde.

Schlüsselwörter: konzeptuelle Metaphern und Metonymien, Diskursanalyse, Interdiskurs, Gedichte und Songtexte

1. Introduction

Literature, although according to Foucault a specific discourse type in its own right (cf. Link/Link-Heer 1990: 91), can be perceived as “‘Sprache’ des interdiskursiven Blocks menschlicher Totalerfahrungen” [a ‘language’ of interdiscursive block of human gross experience”] (Link 1983: 13) by which other specialized discourses are interconnected. The aim of this paper is to present how literature in various languages can provide a platform for integration of *specialized discourses* (germ. *Spezialdiskurse*) (Link/Link-Heer 1990: 92, 99; Link 2006: 10; cf. Jäger/Maier 2009: 46), highlighting the role of conceptual metaphors/metonymies in the integration process. The importance of conceptual metaphors/metonymies in combination with other factors in strengthening of the persuasive force of the analysed literary texts is also to be focused on.

2. Terminology

The term *interdiscursivity* was introduced to Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough in 1992 to refer to the mixing of various discourses in a single text (cf. Wu 2011: 96). While the name might be relatively new, the notion is in fact not, as interdiscursivity can be conceived of as recontextualized Bakhtinian *heteroglossia*, i.e. the presence of more than one voice in a text (cf. Bakhtin 1981: 291). By ‘voices’ we mean “explicit or implicit elements of other sources” (Wu 2011: 98). Heteroglossia in turn is an instantiation of a broader phenomenon of

dialogicality according to which texts are not isolated entities but are to be interpreted as standing in relation to, or ‘in dialogue’ with, other texts on similar topics (cf. Wu 2011: 98). The term which shall be used in this paper is *interdiscourse* (germ. *Interdiskurs*), which is to be defined as the totality of discursive elements which are not specific for only one type of discourse but are shared by many discourses (cf. Link 1983: 16; Link/Link-Heer 1990: 92), and which draws on Kristeva’s notion of *intertextuality*, i.e. playful conveyance of various types of discourse in a literary text (cf. Wu 2011: 99).

We are aware that the notion of *discourse* is rather vague and that the term has plethora of definitions depending on the concrete linguistic or literary theory or school of thought. In the belief that for the purpose of our analysis it is expedient to delve into controversies surrounding this topic we shall only state that in our view discourse consists of texts as linguistic manifestations of discursive practices (cf. Link/Link-Heer 1990: 90). The flow of discourse can be further divided into *discourse strands* (germ. *Diskursstränge*) according to the common topic dealt with in a set of texts or discourse fragments (cf. Jäger/Maier 2009: 46 f; Jäger/Jäger 2010: 30). What is more, discourse strands can be entangled with each other in a given text since one text can contain discourse fragments from various discourse strands (cf. Jäger/Maier 2009: 47). It is important to note that texts are situated in a particular linguistic and extra-linguistic context (cf. Spitzmüller 2010: 59, 66).

In the light of the above, literature can be considered a discourse type, a part of interdiscourse – since interdiscourse is heterogenous and can be divided into different types – and poems on religious topics would belong to one discourse strand. Religious discourse and discourse of sciences are, on the same token, discourse types, parts of specialized discourse, and apologist or anti-theist discourse, as well as discourse of physics or botany, constitute specific discourse strands. Literature as an interdiscourse type can (re-)integrate knowledge dispersed among specialized discourses (cf. Link/Link-Heer 1990: 93). This can be achieved, among others, by deployment of what Link/Link-Heer refer to as *collective symbols* (germ. *Kollektivsymbole*), “die gleichzeitig mehrere Spezialdiskurse (bzw. Wissensmengen) konnotieren” [“which connote several specialized discourses (or portions of knowledge) at the same time“] (1990: 96), which include conceptual metaphors/metonymies. Conceptual metaphors/metonymies are a relevant factor, especially in a text-world-oriented analysis. They can form an entire *metaphorical undercurrent* (Werth 1994: 80) or *megametaphor* (Werth 1994: 96), which can be conceived as an extended conceptual metaphor sustained through a whole text (cf. Werth 1994: 80 *et passim*).

Since comprehending and interpreting a text, especially a literary text, can be conceived as a (re)construction of a world from a text (cf. Semino 1997: 1),

the notion of *text-world* should also be briefly presented here. A text-world can be described as “a scenario or type of reality that is evoked in our minds during reading and that (we conclude) is referred to by the text” (Semino 1997: 1). The reconstruction of this textual reality, since it takes place in the mind of a reader, – who is the one to conclude what sort of reality it is, what it is furnished with, what the relations between the world-building elements are, and what further inferences can be drawn, – is enabled by the *knowledge frames* (see Werth 1994: 90 *et passim*) or *cognitive schemata* (see: Semino 1997 *passim*) at a given reader’s disposal. Hence, readers who possess different cognitive schemata can arrive at different interpretations, i.e. they might (re-)construct a given text-world in various ways (cf. Werth 1994: 90 *et passim*; Semino 1997: 192). The interpretations of the poems and lyrics presented here are, accordingly, only selected some out of many possible. They constitute only a small set of those in which interdiscursive links can be potentially created by contemporary readers, mainly by their knowledge (frames) activated by some triggers (i.e. certain lexical items) in the texts. These links don’t have to be present in the texts *per se* and placed there intentionally by the authors. In the analyses presented here the focus shall not be on a superordinate meaning at the highest level of abstraction/schematicity nor on what Freemann calls *the emergent structure of meaning* (cf. Freemann 2000: 265; Freemann 2006: 118).

With respect to metaphor identification, in the analysis of the research material the five-steps procedure proposed by Steen (2002, 2007), which is aimed at increasing the awareness of the analyst striving to recognize metaphors in a given text, was applied. The procedure consists in the identification of:

(1) Metaphorical focus, i.e. metaphorically used words “which are somehow indirect or incongruous in context” (Steen 2007:17);

(2) Metaphorical propositions, i.e. concepts, which are used metaphorically

(3) Metaphorical comparison, i.e. the separation of the incomplete propositions from the two domains to make similarities between them visible, e.g. in the case of the line of the poem *Now sleeps the crimson petal* the comparison consists in noticing that there is some activity F and some entity y for which there exist a similarity between petals doing F and y’s sleeping (cf. Steen 2007: 17, 18), which can be summarized by the formal notation:

(ΣF)(Σy) {SIM[F (PETAL), SLEEP (y)]} (Steen 2007: 17);

(4) Metaphorical analogy, i.e. making the propositions complete, in our example by determination of the activity F as being inactive (by analogy to sleeping) and of y as being a person, the formal notation being:

{SIM [INACTIVE (PETAL), SLEEP (PERSON)]} (Steen 2007: 17);

(5) Metaphorical cross-domain mapping, i.e. transformation of the analogical structure from step 4 into an explicit mapping with further correspondences

(cf. Steen 2007: 19), e.g. being inactive – sleep, crimson petal – person, the function of being inactive – the function of being asleep (=resting), etc. (cf. Steen 2007; 17).

3. A linguistic multi-level analysis model DIMEAN

Within the framework of discourse analysis, Warnke/Spitzmüller (2008: 3–54) propose a multi-layered model of analysis DIMEAN (**D**iskurslinguistische **M**ehr-**E**benen **A**nalyse), which comprises three main levels: intratextual level, the level of actors, and transtextual level with the sub-levels within each of these. With their model the authors seek to limit and order the methodological pluralism in discourse analysis. Distinguishing all the sub-levels described in the model, however, does not mean that all of them need to be examined in detail in every analysis. Identifying and listing various categories and phenomena in the model should enable the analyst to make informed choices as to which (sub-)level(s) should be focused on and which aspects of the studied discourse can be omitted depending on the purpose of a given analysis (cf. Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008: 24).

Warnke/Spitzmüller propose to start an analysis of a discourse from the intratextual level. The next of the three main levels is the level of discursive actions (=the level of actors), subdivided into three sub-levels. The highest level of analysis is the transtextual level, with which we actually move from text linguistics to discourse-oriented analysis, in other words to the level which distinguishes text linguistics from discourse analysis (cf. Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008: 3–54). The schema below gives an overview of the model:

Schema 1: Overview of the DIMEAN model
(cf. Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008: 44; adapted by M.Z.)¹

Transtextual level ¹		Discourse-oriented analysis	Intertextuality/Intermediality Schemata (frames/scripts) Discourse figures Topoi Social symbols Historical background Ideology/mentality Social/political debates
Level of actors (=level of discursive actions)	↑ Discourse rules ↓ Discourse shaping	Interactional roles	Author Anticipated addressees
		Discursive positions	Social stratification/power Discursive community Ideology brokers Voice
		Mediality	Medium Forms of communication Areas of communication Textual patterns
Intratextuel level	Text-oriented analysis	Visual text structure	Layout/design Typography Text-image relation Text-carrier
		Macro-structure: topic of the text	Lexical fields Metaphoric fields Lexical oppositions Development of the topic Textual strategies/functions
		Meso-structure: topics of the passages	Text genres
	Propositions-oriented analysis	Micro-structure: propositions	Syntax Rhetorical figures Metaphoric lexical items Social, expressive, deontic meaning Presuppositions Implicatures Speech acts
	Word-oriented analysis	Multi-word items	Keywords Stigma words Names
One-word items		Ad-hoc items	

¹ With the notion of transtextual level Warnke/Spitzmüller seem to build on Genette's idea of transtextuality presented in his work *Palimpseste* of 1982. According to him, transtextuality encompasses: 1) intertextuality, i.e. the effective presence of one text in another text in the form of quotation, plagiarism or allusion; 2) paratextuality, i.e. links to such elements as title, preface etc. which, although not a part of a work *sensu stricto*, guide the reception of a given text; 3) metatextuality, i.e. relation between a text and a commentary on it in the form of e.g. a review; 4) hypertextuality, i.e. reference to an underlying (hypotext) or a subsequent text (hypertext); 5) architextuality, i.e. references to genre-specific structural characteristics (c.f. Münkler 2011: 18 f).

Despite the fact that the DIMEAN model does not *expressis verbis* list a component such as conceptual metaphor nor mentions a source or target domain, this does not mean that the model is at variance with the cognitive theory of metaphor as posited by Lakoff/Johnson (1980) or Lakoff (1993). In the detailed explanations of the model Warnke/Spitzlmüller agree that metaphors as basic cognitive operations play an important role in the comprehension of reality and that they are not to be described at the word-level only (cf. 2008: 28). In the model they are just analytically divided into components: metaphoric lexical items, metaphoric fields and topoi or social symbols. This seems to draw awareness to the complexity of the conceptual metaphor phenomenon and to the interrelations between the levels mentioned in the model.

4. The analysis

The texts under analysis presented here are ordered from most affirmative with respect to God and His existence to the ones negating His existence. All the translations of Spanish and German quotations were done by the author of this paper.

a. Miguel de Unamuno y Jugo “La oración del ateo” [Prayer of an atheist]²

We posit that in the poem by de Unamuno discourses of physics and the one of Christian apologetics are coupled. This coupling is made possible by the employment of conceptual metaphors. The use of the words *Dios* [God], *ateo* [atheist] and of the verb *to exist* in indicative mood and in the subjunctive as well as the choice of the genre, i.e. prayer, are indicative of religious discourse. The speaker in the poem asks the non-existent God to take the speaker’s complaints into His nothingness [org. nada], thus referring in common parlance to the notion of void, of dark energy stemming from physics, which means “what would be left after removing all galaxies, stars and particles” (Greene 2011, *unpaginated*). Nothingness here is conceptualized as a kind of space, which can be seen as a indicative of the metaphor STATES ARE BOUNDED REGIONS IN SPACE (or LOCATIONS), which Lakoff (1990) lists as one of the event structure metaphors. The metaphorical analogy could be noted as: {SIM[NARROW, EXPANDABLE (NOTHINGNESS), BOUNDED (REGION IN SPACE)]} Further in the poem the speaker also uses the BOUNDED-REGION-metaphor with respect to reality in that he

² The text of the poem is available for reading online at: https://es.wikisource.org/wiki/La_oraci%C3%B3n_del_ateo (dostep 25.01.2018).

remarks that reality is too narrow, “muy angosta” (Unamuno 1959: 59), however much it expands, “por mucho que se expande” (Unamuno 1959: 59), to include God, “para abarcarte” (Unamuno 1959: 59). The employment of these conceptual metaphors is a precondition for a comprehensible development of the topic.

Moreover, it should be noted that the utterance of a directive act, presupposing that the addressee exists, directed towards the not-existent God – “Oye mi ruego Tú, Dios que no existes” [Listen to me, God, who do not exist] (Unamuno 1959: 59) – might seem to the recipient as referring him/her to the idea of superposition of states from quantum mechanics. Otherwise the development of the text, a plausible elaboration of the topic can seem hardly possible. The aforementioned idea is best explained by (at the transtextuel level) the thought experiment referred to as Schrödinger’s cat. If we put a cat in a steel box with a device containing a tiny bit of radioactive substance, one atom of which might (or might not) decay in the course of one hour – in which case hydrocyanic acid is released –, then to the universe outside the box after an hour the cat is both alive and dead until the box is open (cf. Schrödinger 1935: 812). In the poem by de Unamuno it is only when the existence verbs in the subjunctive appear in the last verses that the steel box gets opened and the true textual strategy and the intention of the speaker is revealed. By uttering the sentence “pues si Tú existieras/existiría yo también de veras” [because if you existed/I would really exist as well] (Unamuno 1959: 59) and in this way drawing the parallel between his ontological status and the ontological status of God the speaker construes the relationship between God and the human as dialectic. Thus the idea of God’s non-existence – constituting the starting point of the poem – is reduced *ad absurdum*.

Moving on to the level of actors we can state that the text is uttered from the “I”-perspective. The author of the poem does not try to construct the speaker as an authority. The tone of the text is rather confessional: it contains references to emotions, e.g. “Suffro yo a tu costa” [I suffer on your account] (Unamuno 1959: 59) or personal experiences like listening to fairy tales, “las plácidas consejas” (Unamuno 1959: 59), in childhood. It is also to be noted that the speaker initially seems to position himself in opposition to God by employment of the discourse figure Self vs. the Other, which appears to be evoked owing to the activation of conceptual metaphors. Since NOTHINGNESS AS A BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE is described as God’s realm into which – i.e. away from the speaker – he should gather the speaker’s complaints “en tu nada recoge estas mis quejas” (Unamuno 1959: 59), and since God is said to move away from the speaker’s mind “tú de mi mente más te alejas” (Unamuno 1959: 59), the event structure metaphor NONEXISTENCE IS LOCATION AWAY – a concretization of the metaphor STATES ARE LOCATIONS – can be triggered in the recipient’s mind, as well as its counterpart EXISTENCE IS LOCATION HERE. Thus via the opposition here

vs. away the opposition I (us) vs. you (God) can potentially be materialized. The addressee of the poem, however, is more difficult to identify. While on the surface it seems that the speaker addresses God, the way in which the argument, the chain of thought is constructed suggests that the poem is targeted at the reader, who explicitly is assigned the role of a bystander. This seems plausible in the light of the words of Ribeiro/Hoyle, who are of opinion that unaddressed recipients “may well be taken into consideration by speakers and may in fact be the target of the message” (2009: 79). The lack of references to any particular texts or events at the transtextual level implies that the recipient of the poem is not required to be a follower of any religion in particular – what he/she needs to be familiar with is the concept of God.

Table 1 summarizes the elements stemming from both discourse types and metaphors/metonymies used:

Religious (apologist)	metaphors	physics
Oración (genre), Dios, ateo, existes, existieras, existiría	STATES ARE BOUNDED REGIONS IN SPACE (or LOCATIONS) NOTHINGNESS (NON-EXISTENCE) IS LOCATION AWAY (EXISTENCE IS LOCATION HERE) REALITY IS A BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE	Oye [directive act]... Dios que no existes, nada, te alejas, angosta, se expande para abarcarte

Tab. 1. Integration of discourses (Miguel de Unamuno)

b. Manic Street Preachers “Some kind of nothingness”³

Apparently intertextually linked to the poem by de Unamuno are the song lyrics “Some kind of nothingness” by Nicky Wire (the song is performed by Manic Street Preachers), for which “La oración del ateo” can potentially provide with

³ The text of the lyrics is available for reading online at: [https://www.google.pl/search?biw=1523&bih=744&ei=JpqvWtLYGeqy6AS1o6nADQ&q=manic+street+preachers+some+kind+of+nothingness&oq=Manic+Street+Preachers+some+kin&gs_l=psy-ab.1.0.0i19k112.62432.67922.0.69842.31.15.0.16.16.0.170.1458.8j7.15.0....0...1c.1.64.psy-ab.0.31.1622...0j0i131k1j0i67k1j0i131i67k1j0i22i30k1j0i22i30i19k1.0.zWOZcOwYTnl \(dostep 25.01.2018\).](https://www.google.pl/search?biw=1523&bih=744&ei=JpqvWtLYGeqy6AS1o6nADQ&q=manic+street+preachers+some+kind+of+nothingness&oq=Manic+Street+Preachers+some+kin&gs_l=psy-ab.1.0.0i19k112.62432.67922.0.69842.31.15.0.16.16.0.170.1458.8j7.15.0....0...1c.1.64.psy-ab.0.31.1622...0j0i131k1j0i67k1j0i131i67k1j0i22i30k1j0i22i30i19k1.0.zWOZcOwYTnl (dostep 25.01.2018).)

its notion of nothingness the transtextual context, at least in the recipient's mind, as a component of reader's knowledge. If we start to examine the song at the intratextual level, what draws our attention is an ostensible lack of any elements of religious discourse at the word level. However, if we move on to the analysis of propositions and to the level of the text, we notice that the piece abounds in references to religious notions, which are replaced by notions of natural sciences.

The speaker in the lyrics expresses hope that his dead friend has found peace in the afterlife: "Some peace at last so don't be sad" (Wire 2010). This assumption presupposes speaker's belief in the existence of some supernatural entity or force, or alternative space. Nonetheless, instead of such terms as 'heaven' or 'God' the speaker makes use of such notions as 'nothingness': "Will you find some kind of nothingness" (Wire 2010), or 'stars': "Laid yourself out under the stars" (Wire 2010). The latter can be interpreted as metonymic grounding of the conceptual metaphor LIFE AND DEATH ARE PERIODS OF THE DAY (=24 hours), entailing that DEATH IS NIGHT. Such recontextualization of physical and astronomical terms seems indicative of the discourse of agnosticism or atheism with its exploitation of metaphorical – AFTERLIFE/HEAVEN IS NOTHINGNESS – or metonymic – CREATION FOR THE CREATOR (here stars can possibly stand for God and/or for the night of death) – links (some of which can be triggered in the recipient's mind albeit not intentionally placed in the text by the speaker) between the domains of abstract religious notions/phenomena and phenomena accessible to humans by experience, often with the will to deny the verity or existence of the former. This observation is corroborated when the level of actors and the transtextual level are taken into consideration. The author of "Some kind of nothingness", Nicky Wire (actually: Nicolas Allen Jones), is in fact an agnostic and his brother, Patrick Jones, is an atheist, who in his poem "moment of light" says: "today/i have become a born again/atheist (...) sing to a star not an invisible man in the sky" (Jones 2009; written version at http://www.patrick-jones.net/section182120_56725.html).

c. Paul Celan "Psalm"⁴

The very title of the poem by Celan, indicating the genre of the text, signals the presence of religious discourse. Other lexical items which allow us to position the text within the transtextual religious context are *Staub* [dust], which creates an intertextual connection to the Bible: "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt

⁴ The text of the poem is available for reading online at: <https://books.google.pl/books?id=WJ7uMIY9-ogC&pg=PA140&dq=Celan+Psalm&hl=pl&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjj9-b-mfjZA-hVpCZoKHSfnB5QQ6AEIJzAA#v=onepage&q=Celan%20Psalm&f=false> (dostęp 25.01.2018).

return” (Genesis 3:19), *Purpurwort* [word of purple], which might be read as an allusion to the purple robe worn by Christ preceding his crucifixion, as well as two occasional neologisms *seelenhell* and *himmelswüst*. The meaning of the former could be explained as ‘bright as soul’, whereas the latter is rather ambiguous and can be interpreted as ‘deserted like heaven’, ‘heavenly deserted’ or ‘devoid of anything but heaven’. The reference to God and the Bible is also created at the level of propositions by the sentence: “Niemand knetet uns wieder aus Erde und Lehm“ [No one kneads us again from soil and clay] (Celan 1970: 85). God is from the beginning of the poem referred to as *Niemand* [No one] but the utterance of the declarative act “Gelobt seist du, Niemand” [Blessed be you, no one] (Celan 1970: 85) presupposes the addressees existence, thus, similarly to the poem by de Unamuno, God both exists and does not (the idea of superposition of states). Moreover, by stating that men were, are and will remain nothing or no-one’s rose a parallel is drawn between the ontological status of the (collective we-) speaker and God: “Ein Nichts/waren wir, sind wir, warden/wir bleiben, blühend:/ die Nichts-, die/Niemandsrose” (Celan 1970: 85). Additionally by using the verb ‘to be’ in past, present and the verb ‘to remain’ in the future tense the eternal existence of God is addressed.

To enhance the effectiveness of the poem’s message, to strengthen its persuasive force, elements of biological discourse are present. The discourse of botany provides here the source domain for conceptual metaphors which are used in religious context. Since people in the poem are described as roses, at the level of lexis we can find such words as *blühen* [to bloom], *Rose* [rose], *Griffel* [style (female flower part)], *Staubfaden* [filament (male flower part)], *Krone* [corolla], *Dorn* [thorn]. The application of the metaphor PEOPLE ARE ROSES as concretization of the metaphor LIFE IS A VEGETATIVE CYCLE OF PLANTS entails as a consequence the metaphor GOD IS A GARDNER. What is more, the presence of the German word *Krone* together with the word *Dorn*, by virtue of the fact that the former also means *crown*, evokes the image of Christ wearing the crown of thorns. This in turn, by activation of the knowledge that Jesus Christ was so of God, can be evocative, albeit at the conceptual level rather than at the level of language *sensu stricto*, of the metaphor GOD IS A FATHER. Moreover, Christ’s crown is described as red, which metonymically stands for blood. In this way a parallel is being drawn between people and the suffering Son of God, the inference being twofold. The first one can be that by allowing for suffering of Christ and of people (during e.g. Holocaust) the gardener-father God is cruel and hence it is better to believe that he does not exist. Alternatively, bearing in mind that Christians believe that Christ resurrected, God can be seen as a loving father whose will we do not fully comprehend. Once again, like in “La oración del ateo”, the relationship between the deity and the human is construed as dialectic.

In the poem by Celan, similarly to the one by de Unamuno, the explicitly addressed entity is God, which is consistent with the characteristics of the genre. The actual target, albeit on the surface assigned the role of and unaddressed recipient, seems to be in fact the reader. The evidence for this is the choice of the we-perspective by the speaker, by which an in-group relationship, a community feeling is created. The references to the Bible, the Passion to be exact, at the transtextual level, presupposes a recipient familiar – at least at a basic level – with the Scripture and the Christian religion.

Table 2 summarizes the elements stemming from both discourse types and metaphors/metonymies used:

religious	Metaphors/metonymies	Biology (botany)
Psalm (genre), knetet uns ... aus Erde und Lehm [kneads us from soil and clay] (intertextuality: Bible), Staub [dust] seelenhell, himmelswüst, Ppurwort gelobt seist du, Niemand [Blessed be] (declarative act), waren wir, sind wir, werden wir bleiben (ideology: eternal nature of God) Krone	LIFE IS A VEGETATIVE CYCLE PEOPLE ARE FLOWERS (ROSES) GOD IS A GARDNER FATHER IS A GARDNER GOD IS A (CRUEL?) FATHER of people just as of Christ RED FOR BLOOD (metonymy)	blühh, die Nichts-, die Niemandrose, Griffel [style = female flower part], Staubfaden [filament=male flower part], Krone [corolla], Dorn

Tab. 2. Integration of discourses (Paul Celan)

d. Florence and the Machine “No light, no light”⁵

First of all, in the case of these lyrics it seems essential to justify the inclusion of the piece into the research material by referring to the transtextual level before we start analysing it at the intratextual level. What makes it possible to place “No light, no light” within religious discourse is the video clip accompanying the song with its setting in and in the vicinity of a church, the images of the cross and the church choir (responsible for the backing vocals), and the scene of a girl in black falling

⁵ The text is available for reading online at: https://www.google.pl/search?q=Florence+and+the+machine+no+light&source=lnms&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj79daln_jZAhVKSZoKHZuBAAtUQ_AUICSgA&biw=1523&bih=744&dpr=1.25 (dostęp 25.01.2018).

into the church in a beam of light at the background of the cross. If this context is disregarded, the lyrics can be interpreted as constitutive of a love song voicing regret due to the lover's absence without any religious message. The non-religious interpretation, shall not, however, be elaborated on in the analysis presented here.

At the level of lexis again – like in the poem by Celan – the word *God* is not mentioned. The reader can, however, place the piece in the stream of religious discourse owing to such items as *revelation*, *resolution*, as well as the phrase “bright blue eyes” (Welch/Summers 2011), which can be interpreted as referring to some popular pictorial representations of Christ. The word *you* can be read as signifying God since it appears in multiple statements starting with “you are”. At the level of propositions these sentences seem to convey the idea of God's omnipresence⁶ by naming various forms of existence of the ‘you’, e.g.: “You are the hole in my head/You are the space in my bed/You are the silence in between (...)/You are the night, time fear/You are the morning when it's clear” (Welch/Summers 2011). What is more, the statement “you can choose what stays and what fades away” (Welch/Summers 2011) seems to suggest God's omnipotence. Thus identified religious discourse is coupled with the discourse of natural sciences by employment of the notion of light stemming from the latter, which provides source domain for conceptual metaphors used in the text. The conventional metaphors GOODNESS IS LIGHT and EVIL IS THE ABSENCE OF LIGHT⁷ are, however, strategically being questioned by putting them in the context of paradoxes and conceptual clashes. The speaker namely states that there is “no light, no light/in your bright blue eyes” (Welch/Summers 2011) while *bright*, besides strong in colour, also means full of light. One can ask why the speaker wants the addressee to stay: “I'll do anything to make you stay” (Welch/Summers 2011), if she sees evil in his eyes. Furthermore, daylight is described as violent, i.e. as unpleasantly bright, although at the same time the metaphor UNDERSTANDING or KNOWLEDGE IS LIGHT is touched upon since the speaker mentions “a revelation in the light of day” (Welch/Summers 2011). The revelation and resolution – standing metonymically for knowledge or understanding (EFFECT FOR CAUSE) – seem to be awaited but can be interpreted as failing to materialize: “but it's a conversation/I just can't have tonight” (Welch/Summers 2011), since the darkness of the night is the opposite of daylight used in the above-mentioned UNDERSTANDING-metaphor. The speaker also utters a request (a directive act) with this respect: “tell me what you want me to say” (Welch/Summers 2011). In the light of the above, the integration of discourses (religious and the one of natural sciences) in the text can serve to express doubt in the existence of God.

⁶ Or how important the loved one is for the speaker.

⁷ The absence of light may also be indicative of death of the loved one.

At the level of actors, we notice the “I”-perspective of the speaker, which, similarly to the poem by de Unamuno, creates a non-authoritative, confessional and emotional atmosphere: “I was crying out”, “I was disappearing in plain sight/heaven help me/I need to make it right” (Welch/Summers 2011). Just as in the texts by de Unamuno and Celan, God is addressed *expresis verbis* while the targeted but unaddressed recipient seems to be the reader, who, if unaware of the religious context at the transtextual level, can be unable to (fully) grasp the religious message.

Table 3 summarizes the elements stemming from both discourse types and metaphors/metonymies used:

religious	metaphors	Natural sciences
You are (God’s omnipresence), revelation, you can choose what stays and what fades away, heaven; Bright blue eyes (reference to pictorial representation of Christ); images in the video (church, choir of boys), resolution	GOODNESS IS LIGHT EVIL IS THE ABSENCE OF LIGHT UNDERSTANDING/KNOWLEDGE IS LIGHT (a revelation in the <u>light of day</u> ; but it’s a conversation/I just can’t have <u>tonight</u>)	Light, daylight

Tab. 3. Integration of discourses (Florence and the Machine)

e. Wolfdietrich Schnurre “Gospel”⁸

A poem, which like the lyrics “No light, no light” employs the notion of light and its absence to enhance the persuasive force of the religious message, is an antitheist text “Gospel” by Wolfdietrich Schnurre. Here, in contrast to “Some kind of nothingness”, “Psalm” or “No light, no light”, the word *Gott* [God] appears a number of times throughout the poem, as well as the verb *beten* [to pray]. Already in the first line we find the following assertions: “Gott ist Schwarz./Nichts ist schwärzer als Gott;/alles, was Schwarz ist,/hat seine Schwärze von ihm” [God is black./Nothing is blacker than God;/Anything that is black/takes its blackness from him] (Schnurre 1970: 17). Thus, from the very beginning the metaphorical projection of BLACKNESS onto the domain of negative phenomena/events is

⁸ The text of the poem is available for reading online at: <http://www.deine-songtexte.com/lyrics/extramensch/gospel-478013> (dostep 25.01.2018).

recognizable, which uses the notion (blackness as the absence of light) stemming from natural sciences as the source domain. God represented as blackness/darkness in the analysed text can be interpreted as metonymy for religion, since the state of the lack of knowledge in the atheist discourse is sometimes ascribed to religion and religious people, hence the metaphorical (albeit based on metonymy) analogy: {SIM[LACK OF KNOWLEDGE (RELIGION), ABSENCE OF LIGHT (DARKNESS/BLACKNESS)]}. The BLACKNESS-metaphor seems further reinforced by the use of metonymy, i.e. naming negative phenomena and black objects with negative connotations: “Die Trauer,/Ruß im Lampenzylinder,/die Nacht” [mourning,/soot in the chimney on an oil lamp,/night].

Further in the poem we find three requests, whose presence is common for the genre (i.e. gospel) representative of religious discourse. Especially the (directive) speech act is noteworthy in which the speaker asks for protection: “Bewahr uns vor Blendwerk und Schein”, where an antitheist message is communicated by the use of ambiguous words alluding to the notion of the lack of light (natural sciences). The lexeme (compound) *Blendwerk* can namely mean ‘deception’ but it should be borne in mind that it comes from the verb *blenden*, meaning ‘to glare, to shine too brightly’. Also the lexeme *Schein* signifies either an illusion or glow, brightness, which in the recipient’s might can potentially activate the metaphor KNOWLEDGE IS LIGHT. The implication of the afore-mentioned request is that the evil God, standing for religion, bars us from experiencing goodness or knowledge represented metaphorically as light. The BLACKNESS-metaphor is further developed or specified as EVIL FORCES ARE SHADOWS, by the presence of which the idea of God’s omnipresence can be addressed, albeit re-interpreted as a negative phenomenon. This is observable in the lines: “Und die Schwärze folgt uns als Schatten,/der uns niemals verläßt“ [And the blackness follows us as a shadow/which never abandons us] (Schnurre 1970: 17). The idea of negative omnipresence is additionally linguistically reinforced by the recurrence of words *Schwärze* [blackness] or *schwarz* [black] together with the lexem *Gott* and the repetition of the lines: “Gott ist schwarz“ [God is black], “Nichts ist schwärzer als Gott” [Nothing is blacker than God] and “Wir beten zu seiner Schwärze” [We pray to his blackness].

The afore-mentioned metaphors and metonymies reveal the true Trojan-horse-strategy of the text and the identity of the speaker, his discourse position. He feigns one thing by the choice of the genre while trying to achieve just the opposite, similarly to de Unamuno in whose prayer of the atheist the speaker can be in fact perceived as a Christian apologist. The choice of the “we”-perspective is indicative of the intention to persuade since in this way the targeted reader, who is assigned the role of a bystander, should develop a feeling of being included in the group of those deceived by the evil black God, possibly standing for irrational

religion. The adopted strategy of choosing God’s existence as a point of departure and of presenting it as undesirable – just the opposite of the textual strategy in “La oración del ateo” or “Psalm” – hence suggesting that God does not exist is not something exceptional. Patrick Jones, for instance, in his poem “10 Million Christs” aims to prove the harmfulness of absurdity of believing in God – most salient in the concluding lines: “how many more christs/until we are all crucified” (Jones 2008 at <http://www.myspace.com/patrickjoneswriter/blog>) – by exploiting the idea of multiplicity.

Table 4 summarizes the elements stemming from both discourse types and metaphors/metonymies used:

Religious (antitheist)	Metaphors/metonymies	Natural sciences
Gospel (genre), Gott, beten, Bewahr uns vor ... [request]	EVIL IS BLACK(NESS) LACK OF KNOWLEDGE IS ABSENCE OF LIGHT Trauer, Ruß, Nacht as black objects stand for negative phenomena EVIL FORCES/ENTITIES ARE SHADOWS (Schatten)	Schwarz, Schwärze, Blendwerk [1. Deception; 2. From: blenden – to glare, to shine too bright- ly], Schein [1. Illusion; 2. glow, brightness]

Tab. 4. Integration of discourses (Wolfdietrich Schnurre)

f. Patrick Jones “christmas lights in january”⁹

A poem, in which God’s non-existence is clearly proclaimed and not merely by suggesting that he is evil is “christmas lights in january” by Patrick Jones, first published in 1997 in the volume *mute communion*. At the word level we find items characteristic for religious discourse such as *soul, worship, Jesus upon Calvary* and items stemming from the discourse of natural sciences: *rain, dolphinned, cold, sun*. Already in the first line of the text the two discourses are intertwined, as the speaker utters an emotional request (directive as well as expressive act): “rain beat my soul/empty me in/drizzling distances heart sedated” (Jones 2007: 42). Rain here seems to metonymically stand for water and to be the base for the metaphor *SPRITUAL CLEANSING IS WASHING OF THE BODY*, which is

⁹ The text of the poem is available for reading online at: <https://teifidancer-teifidancer.blogspot.com/2011/01/christmas-lights-in-january-patrick.html> (dostep 25.01.2018).

connected to the conceptual metaphor SOUL IS BODY.¹⁰ Another manifestation of the emotional state of the speaker, besides the wish for intense (maybe violent) cleansing of the soul and subsequent peace of mind, are his tears signifying “a dolphinned silence” (Jones 2007: 42). The occasional neologism, a past participle in the function of an adjective, seems to be metonymically linked to the substantive *tears*: the silence could be described in this way since it is concurrent with the action of crying. Thus, we can observe the notion of H₂O from natural sciences – water in common parlance or folk models of the world – employed and coupled with religious ideas such as e.g. that of soul and spirituality.

When the lines: “cold as worship/bleeding colour over sun denied streets” (Jones 2007: 42) are reached, the recipient can sense that the text is not going to be an apologist one. From this point on the idea of God’s non-existence is elaborated. Similarly to the lyrics “No light, no light” the metaphor EVIL IS THE ABSENCE OF LIGHT seems to be deployed in the description of the streets as sun denied. In the subsequent lines the recipient of the poem finds out that this something or someone who is cold and emits red colour (likened to blood in the text) also watches and waits “like Jesus upon Calvary” (Jones 2007: 42). The next stanzas not only help to identify the *designatum* of the anaphora “they” between which and the Crucified a parallel is being drawn but also reveal the discourse position of the speaker and the ideology referred to at the transtextual level. Jesus and the “they” namely wait “to be/dragged down/and/put away//until/until//another/sense/of/belonging//occurs” (Jones 2007: 42 f). By mentioning the need for “another sense of belonging” (Jones 2007: 43) after Jesus Christ’s death, the speaker is apparently negating the idea of resurrection and thus indirectly the divinity of Jesus. If the identity of the speaker, his being atheist, is considered, it becomes clear why the initial request for spiritual cleansing in the poem is directed to rain (natural sciences) rather than to some deity (religious discourse). It should also be noted that by use of the phrase ‘to drag down’ the conceptual metaphor BAD IS DOWN seems to be addressed, which is reinforced by the choice of the verb with a rather negative connotation instead of the neutral variant ‘to pull’. Coming back to the “they”, in the light of the description as cold, emitting red colour and having reached the moment to be “dragged down/and/put away” (Jones 2007: 42) the *designatum* seems to be the eponymous Christmas lights in January. The use of the pronoun rather than the eponymous phrase in the course of the poem, as well as the adoption of the confessional “I”-perspective and the choice of conceptual metaphors, is apparently motivated by the intention of the speaker/author to lend his text persuasive force. It seems that a parallel

¹⁰ This metaphor can be considered, according to Radden (cf. 2000: 97), a metonymy-based metaphor exploiting the relationship of complementarity BODY PLUS SOUL.

between Jesus Christ and Christmas lights in January – i.e. an unneeded object, out of place at a given time – uttered *expressis verbis* is avoided since the target of the poem, who is assigned the role of a bystander, are Christians, for whom such comparison could be considered blasphemous.

Table 5 summarizes the elements stemming from both discourse types and metaphors/metonymies used:

Religious (antitheist)	Metaphors/metonymies	Natural sciences
soul, worship, Jesus upon Calvary	SOUL IS BODY SPIRITUAL CLEANSING IS WASHING OF THE BODY EVIL IS THE ABSENCE OF LIGHT BAD IS DOWN	Rain, dolphinned (reference to water), cold, sun

Tab. 5. Integration of discourses (Patrick Jones)

5. Conclusions

In the analysed research material one can notice, owing to the examination according to the DIMEAN model, integration of discourses at various levels. Not only do we find lexemes and phrases referring to notions, ideas and events pertinent to religion and to natural sciences at the transtextual level but also speech acts which cannot be (fully) comprehended if read with only one type of discourse, e.g. directive acts presupposing the existence of the addressee aimed at non-existent God in the poems by de Unamuno or Celan. The salient role of conceptual metaphors/metonymies should also not be overlooked. Without them either the conceptual universe of the analysed texts could not be created or their persuasive force would be weaker. Without the BOUNDED-REGION-metaphors, i.e. NOTHINGNESS IS A BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE (or LOCATION) and REALITY IS BOUNDED REGION IN SPACE the textual world of “La oración del ateo” could not be conceived of. The combination of LIFE IS A VEGETATIVE CYCLE OF PLANTS and its entailments together with the metaphor GOD IS A FATHER enhances the message of “Psalm”. The BLACKNESS and LIGHT-metaphors make the textual strategy of creating doubt (“No light, no light”) and especially of aiming to prove God’s non-existence from the starting point of His existence (“Gospel” and “christmas lights in january”) possible and potentially effective. It is also noteworthy that notions of natural science such as ‘stars’ or

‘rain’ standing in metonymic relationship to religious notions or placed in a given text with a recognizable aim to replace religious notions are to be found in atheist/anti-theist texts.

Furthermore, our analysis shows that the DIMEAN model allows to identify other factors which, combined with conceptual metaphors, enhance the persuasive force of the researched texts. The use of ambiguous lexemes at the word level, for instance, plays an important role in activation of conceptual metaphors in the mind of the recipient and intentionally putting them into question at the same time. One can also notice two strategies typical to make the recipient believe or stop believing in God. In attempt to convince that God exists poets can start from God’s non-existence reducing it *ad absurdum* in the course of the text (de Unamuno, Celan). Atheist authors in turn can choose God’s existence as a point of departure (Schnurre) or existence of Christ as a human being with the denial of His divinity in the course of the poem (Jones). As far as the level of actors is concerned, it is to be noted that in all the texts subject to the analysis presented here – except for “Some kind of nothingness” which is not designed to persuade and where the reflexion concerning religion is only incidental – the speaker is by no means transparent or, in Langacker’s terms, subjectified or remaining offstage (cf. 2006: 18). The speaker adopts either a confessional “I” or an inclusive “we”-perspective thus remaining onstage, becoming a part of an objectified scene (cf. Langacker 2006: 18). His/her discourse position – as apologist, doubting or atheist – is always clear, albeit not always from the very beginning. The reader in turn, although in fact a target, is always assigned the role of a bystander while *expressis verbis* God or an entity replacing Him is addressed (with the exception of the song by Manic Street Preachers).

The analysis and its results presented above corroborate our initial hypothesis concerning the role of conceptual metaphors/metonymies in integration of discourses in literary texts and in enhancing their persuasive force. The DIMEAN model, which allows for a more conscious and ordered analysis, also reveals other factors present in the researched texts for the purpose of persuasion. Therefore, we believe that our case study could be an impulse for further research on literature as interdiscourse (type) and the use of poetry to persuade.

References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981): *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin.
- Celan, Paul (1970): Psalm. In: Stein, Oswald (ed.): *Literatur*. Bd. 1. *Dichterische Texte*. Frankfurt am Main: Hirschgraben-Verlag, p. 85.
- Freeman, Margaret H. (2000): Poetry and the scope of metaphor: Toward a cognitive theory of literature. In: Barcelona, Antonio (eds.): *Metaphor and Metonymy at the crossroads*. Berlin and New York, pp. 253–281.

- Freeman, Margaret H. (2006): Art, science, and Ste. Emilie's sunsets: a Haj-inspired cognitive approach to translating an Emily Dickinson poem into Japanese. In: *Style* 40.1–2, pp. 109–127.
- Greene, Brian (2011): Nothingness: Why nothing matters. In: *New Scientist* 2839, online: <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg21228391.300-nothingness-why-nothing-matters.html> (29.12.2012).
- Jäger, Margarete/Jäger, Siegfried (2010): Wie kritisch ist die Kritische Diskursanalyse? In: Lipczuk, Ryszard/Schiewe, Jürgen/Westphal, Werner/Misiek, Dorota (eds.): *Diskurslinguistik – Systemlinguistik. Theorien – Texte – Fallstudien*. Hamburg, pp. 23–29.
- Jäger, Siegfried/Maier, Florentine (2009): Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In: Wodak, Ruth/Meyer, Michael (eds.): *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, pp. 34–61.
- Jones, Patrick (2007): christmas lights in january. In: Jones, Patrick (ed.), *fuse*. Cardigan, pp. 42–43.
- Jones, Patrick (2008): 10 Million Christs: <http://www.myspace.com/patrickjoneswriter/blog> (16.02.2013).
- Jones, Patrick (2009): moment of light: In: Jones, Patrick. *tongues for a stammering time* (CD). Anhrefn Records; online: http://www.patrickjones.net/section182120_56725.html (16.02.2013).
- Lakoff, George/Johnson, Mark (1980): *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago.
- Lakoff, George (1993): The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In: Ortony, Andrew (ed.): *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge, pp. 202–251.
- Lakoff, George (1990): The Invariance Hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image schemas? In: *Cognitive Linguistics* 1 -1, pp. 39–74.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2006): Subjectification, grammaticization, and conceptual archetypes. In: Athanasiadou, Angeliki et al. (eds.): *Subjectification*. Berlin, pp. 17–40.
- Link, Jürgen (1983): *Elementare Literatur und generative Diskursanalyse*. München.
- Link, Jürgen/Link-Heer, Ursula (1990): Diskurs/Interdiskurs und Literaturanalyse. In: *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 77, pp. 88–99.
- Link, Jürgen (interview with Diaz-Bone, Rainer) (2006): Operative Anschlüsse: Zur Entstehung der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse in der Bundesrepublik. In: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, Volume 7, No. 3, Art. 20, pp. 1–17.
- Münkler, Marina (2011): *Narrative Ambiguität*. Göttingen.
- Radden, Günter (2000): How metonymic are metaphors? In: Barcelona, Antonio (ed.): *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads*. Berlin/New York, 93–107.
- Ribeiro, Branca Telle/Hoyle, Susan M. (2009): Frame analysis. In: Brisard, Frank/Östman, Jan-Ola/Verschueren, Jef (eds.): *Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 74–90.
- Schnurre, Wolfdietrich (1970): Gospel. In: Stein, Oswald (ed.): *Literatur*. Bd. 1. Dichterische Texte. Frankfurt am Main, p. 17.
- Schrödinger, Erwin (1935): Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik. In: *Naturwissenschaften*, 23. Jahrgang, Heft 48, pp. 807–812.
- Semino, Elena (1997): *Language and world creation in poems and other texts*. London and New York.
- Spitzmüller, Jürgen (2010): Wege zum Diskurs. Methodische und methodologische Überlegungen zur diskurslinguistischen Praxis. In: Lipczuk, Ryszard/Schiewe, Jürgen/Westphal, Werner/Misiek, Dorota (eds.): *Diskurslinguistik – Systemlinguistik. Theorien – Texte – Fallstudien*. Hamburg, 53–74.
- Steen, Gerard J. (2002): Identifying Metaphor in Language: a cognitive approach. In: *Style* 36.3, pp. 386–406.

-
- Steen, Gerard J. (2007): Finding Metaphor in Discourse: Praggeljaz and Beyond. In: *Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación/Culture, Language and Representation* 5, pp. 9–25.
- Unamuno, Miguel (de) (1959): La oración del ateo. In: de Cossío, José María (ed.): *Antología poética*. Madrid, p. 59.
- Warnke, Ingo H./Spitzmüller, Jürgen (2008): Methoden und Methodologie der Diskurslinguistik – Grundlagen und Verfahren einer Sprachwissenschaft jenseits textueller Grenzen. In: Warnke, Ingo H./Spitzmüller, Jürgen (eds.): *Methoden der Diskurslinguistik*. Berlin/New York, pp3–54.
- Welch, Florence/Summers, Isabella (2011): No light, no light. In: *Florence and the machine. Ceremonials* (CD). Universal Island Records.
- Werth, Paul (1994): Extended metaphor – a text-world account. In: *Language and Literature* 3 (2), pp. 79–103.
- Wire, Nicky (2010): Some kind of Nothingness. In: *Manic Street Preachers. Postcards from a young man* (CD). Sony Music Entertainment UK Ltd.
- Wu, Jianguo (2011): Understanding Interdiscursivity: A Pragmatic Model. In: *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2–3, pp. 95–115.

dr Magdalena Zyga
Uniwersytet Szczeciński
Instytut Filologii Germańskiej
Al. Piastów 40b, 71–065 Szczecin
E-mail: magdalena.zyga@usz.edu.pl