Katarzyna Pawłowska   https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8945-6781
University of Białystok

Interdiscursive Revitalization of the Red Plague Metaphor in Archbishop Jędraszewski's 2019 Sermon: A Critical Analysis

Abstract

The paper aims at demonstrating the creative perlocutionary potential of interdiscursive production and interpretation of conceptual metaphor used in socio-political persuasion, simultaneously interpreted as mental phenomenon and discursive practice that is historically entrenched and highly ideological.

The Critical Metaphor Analysis model is used to investigate the interdiscursive application of two PLAGUE metaphors (COMMUNISM IS A PLAGUE and LGBT IS A PLAGUE) as an example of deliberate transcending of genre boundaries in the increasingly intertextual and interdiscursive world of both socio-political and religious discourses. The empirical part provides a qualitative study of the historical background, structure and persuasive effects of the *rainbow plague* metaphor (Pol. *tęczowa zaraza*), publicly used by the Archbishop of Cracow, Marek Jędraszewski, in reference to the LGBT community in Poland, conducted in relation to the original text on which it draws, namely the more historically entrenched *red plague* (Pol. *czerwona zaraza*) metaphor made popular by the Polish poet Józef Szczepański in his poem composed during the Warsaw Uprising 1944.

Keywords

Critical Discourse Analysis, intertextuality, interdiscursivity, discourse metaphor, Critical Metaphor Analysis

Abstrakt

Celem artykułu jest ukazanie opiniotwórczego potencjału metafory konceptualnej stosowanej w perswazji społeczno-politycznej, interpretowanej zarówno jako mechanizm poznawczy, jak i wysoce zideologizowane narzędzie dyskursywne. W części teoretycznej

analizowane są zagadnienia interdyskursywności i intertekstualności w Krytycznej Analizie Dyskursu. Część empiryczna zawiera przeprowadzone na podstwie modelu Krytycznej Analizy Metafory jakościowe studium struktury i efektów perswazyjnych metafory *tęczowej zarazy*, publicznie użytej przez arcybiskupa Marka Jędraszewskiego w odniesieniu do środowiska LGBT w Polsce, będącej przykładem świadomego przekraczania granic gatunkowych w komunikacji społeczno-politycznej i religijnej. W odniesieniu do oryginalnego tekstu, z którego czerpie określenie wykorzystane przez arcybiskupa krakowskiego w jego kontrowersyjnym kazaniu, a mianowicie bardziej zakorzenionej historycznie metafory *czerwonej zarazy*, spopularyzowanej przez polskiego poetę Józefa Szczepańskiego w wierszu skomponowanym w czasie powstania warszawskiego w 1944 roku, analizowane są interdyskursywne i intertekstowe korelacje między dwiema metaforami ZARAZY (KOMUNIZM TO ZARAZA i LGBT TO ZARAZA).

Słowa kluczowe
Krytyczna Analiza Dyskursu, intertekstualność, interdyskursywność, metafora dyskursywna, Krytyczna Analiza Metafory

Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) investigates discourses spanning the fields of politics, religion, economy, education, entertainment, media and promotional culture and, as a programmatically interdisciplinary model, it is often used by specialists from different fields in their heterogeneous research areas. In its current state, it offers an integrated multidisciplinary model in which discursive factors are studied in relation to those that are social and cognitive. As one of the major CDA pioneers and proponents, Fairclough (2001: 231) sees "social life as interconnected networks of social practices of diverse sorts (economic, political, cultural, family, etc.). (...) Every practice is an articulation of diverse social elements within a relatively stable configuration, always including discourse."

Discourses are realised in different forms that might be impossible to spot and investigate in isolation and they are "almost always multimodal", which means that "different semiotic modes (...) are combined and integrated in a given instance of discourse or kind of discourse" (van Leeuwen 2015: 447). Though various modes, for instance gestures and images, are analysed as discursive devices, and discourse analysis is not limited to an explicit account of linguistic forms *per se*, the multimodal approach does not suggest that the importance of verbal communication is being downplayed. On the contrary, it is principally language that performs the function of persuading the audience and arousing their emotional response, and for this reason critical discourse analysts predominantly concentrate on verbal forms of discourse and methodically scrutinise the interdependence between language and social structure. For instance, Fairclough (1989: 14–15) explains his view

of this unitary system in the following manner: "(…) language connects with the social through being the primary domain of ideology, and through being a site of, and a stake in, struggles of power."

Consistent with the premises of CDA, the investigation of discursive practices cannot be reduced to the analysis of linguistic forms, not even to the analysis of the relation between linguistic forms and resulting actions. On the contrary, discursive practices should be studied in the wider socio-political and cultural context of use. Consequently, considering both local as well as global socio-cultural contexts of production and interpretation of metaphor is crucial in Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) practice, and a reliable critical analysis of discursive metaphor should take into account the interface of linguistic structure, cognitive mechanisms, and the specific culture-dependent context of use. Critical Metaphor Analysis is a paradigm that basically brings together mind, discourse, and socio-cultural context. It is defined as an "integration of cognitive, semantic and pragmatic approaches that is based on corpus evidence" (Charteris-Black 2004: 13).

Technically, the model consists of three steps: description, interpretation, and explanation, which are argued "to work in a complementary fashion, with each step motivating the next one" (Maalej 2007: 152). At the description stage the metaphor analyst "seeks to discover a potential frame, explicit or implicit, to which metaphoric processing and/or processing metaphor are applied in view of writing the conceptual metaphors behind discourse" (Maalej 2007: 152). Interpretation consists of spelling out the elements of the mapping (involving two types of governing correspondences: ontological and epistemic) and making the necessary inferences that constitute a system of entailments. As a cognitive-pragmatic step, explanation "is captured through two pragmatic functions of metaphor, namely, evaluation and persuasion, which relate the conceptual, individual part of the mind to its shared, social one – or social/cultural cognition" (Maalej 2007: 149). At this stage, in all probability the most interesting aspect for a critical analyst, is that the main intentions and objectives of political actors are explained.

The position that metaphorical language is applied to communicate objective facts, but also to express subjective beliefs and values, attitudes and hopes as well as emotions, has gained widespread acceptance in scientific circles (e.g., Charteris-Black 2004, 2005; Chilton 2004; Hart 2008; Kövecses 2005; Lakoff 2009; Maalej 2007, 2011; Mio 1997; Musolff 2004, 2010, 2014, 2019; Perrez et al. 2019; van Teeffelen 1994; Zinken 2003). The CMA approach most usefully takes into consideration the issue of intentionality as ingrained in the use of metaphors in political communication. Essentially, socio-political discourse participants frame social transformation acts by means of metaphorization in order to hide their own drawbacks and highlight the

consequences of their opponents' negative actions and in this way activate political participation. They use metaphors to foster the processes of *othering* and *polarisation*, consistent with one of the most common strategies of "ideological control in discourse," widely-known as the 'ideological square' (van Dijk 1998). The *ingroup-outgroup polarisation*, which serves to self-represent the ingroup, organise its social practices and promote the interests of its members vis-à-vis other social groups, is one of the fundamental underpinnings of different ideologies (van Dijk 2006, 2011).

It is important to observe that one of the major advantages of qualitative case studies of metaphors is that they allow for the inclusion of most categories and details of context models, many of which are not explicitly expressed. However, in the case of such analyses, the tendency of seemingly critical and neutral researchers to express subjective opinions and judgments may come to the fore, dominating all reasoning and argumentation. With regard to objectivity, the main challenge is to purge biases and presuppositions of researchers and counterbalance their personal views, a task worthy of effort but particularly difficult in the case of qualitative investigation, yet hopefully one that is achievable.

1. Discourse metaphors as manifestation of socio-cultural situatedness

Metaphor production and processing are habitual only to some degree and not in all cases. In particular, the type of metaphors identified as "discourse metaphors" require an active, committed understanding that goes beyond automatic access to conceptual domains and cross-domain mappings and they should be studied as both a cognitive phenomenon, resulting from bodily experience, but also as a manifestation of 'socio-cultural situatedness', a term put forward by Zinken et al. (2008: 366), who declare that "(...) unlike Lakoff and Johnson, who seem to embrace what some call an "unsituated view of embodiment (...), we think metaphors based on such schemas need to be explored in the cultural context in which they are used." The researchers show that this type of "situatedness" is a crucial factor in the functioning and dynamics of metaphor in discourse and they postulate the complementation of a focus on embodiment in metaphor analyses by a focus on 'enculturation', a term used to describe "the adoption of certain metaphorical patterns for thinking about the world, acting in the world, for imagining the past and future and for framing current crises" (Zinken et al. 2008: 379).

Zinken and colleagues (2008: 363) define discourse metaphor as "a relatively stable metaphorical projection that functions as a key framing device

within a particular discourse over a certain period of time." The researches focus on both diachronic as well as synchronic aspects of discourse metaphors to demonstrate that "the meanings of discourse metaphors coevolve with the cultures in which they are used. Conceptual metaphors are considered universal, independent of time while discourse metaphors change with the ongoing discourses" (Zinken et al. 2008: 368, see also Musolff 2004, 2010). The level of time stability of discursive metaphors may vary. Some remain stable in the long term, while others develop and get adjusted to changing socio-political circumstances as well as reverberate in different discourses, topics and at different times; and this type of reverberation is often a measure of the metaphor's persuasive success.[1] "Discourse metaphors reflect the cultural and social preoccupations of the time. New topics and events are often discussed in terms of cultural and mythical commonplaces; the target domain of the metaphor may be new while the source domain is much older" (Zinken et al. 2008: 368).

Discourse metaphors have different degrees of relevance, recognition and prominence in particular discourse communities and in particular contexts. Various discourse communities use distinct metaphors or highlight different aspects of the same or related metaphor in reference to the same object. Discourse metaphors are a function of pragmatic preferences of social actors, who deliberately use particular metaphors to frame topics in a way that is beneficial for them. Such "made-to-order" metaphors are obviously more than the sum of the elements of the mapping – they are unique and first and foremost adapted to a discursive context. Because CDA examines the ideological and persuasive aspects of "language in use" from the perspective of its interaction with historically conditioned social reality, consistent with the premises of the model, contextual variability in metaphor should be viewed as rooted in socio-cultural experience and historical memory. Essentially, discourse metaphors are very often contingent upon historical facts. It should be noted, however, that the same component of social reality is considered by some to be consistent with historical facts, while for others at most, it illustrates historical myths.

Contextual applications of metaphor may over time lead to its entrenchment and conventionalization. Conventionalization of a given metaphorical mapping in discourse practice should be perceived as a result of both socio-cultural processes and cognitive operations. Maalej (2007: 137) argues that in its varied manifestations, discourse guides us to old and new conceptual

---

[1] Zinken et al. (2008: 370) discuss the BOOK OF LIFE metaphor which "has moved diachronically from the Bible to modern sciences and to the genome, in particular from gene sequencing to genome annotating, and from lexical to semantic structures" as an example of "resonance over time, across topics and across different domains of use in society."

metaphors and "linguistic metaphors that trigger old conceptual metaphors are of the conventional kind, and do not require a lot of cognitive processing". Consistent with the premises of the Career of Metaphor Theory (Bowdle and Gentner 2005), a shift in the mode of processing takes place when metaphors become conventionalized: while conventional metaphors are processed by means of categorization, novel metaphors are processed via comparison.

In his 2019 survey-based study of metaphors used in British political discourse, Musolff (2019: 35) casts serious doubt on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory view of metaphor receivers "as understanding and automatically accepting the conceptual frame and, together with it, an ideological bias of the metaphors they are presented with". The researcher argues that "metaphorical frame-building emerges in the discursive process rather than 'underlying' it *a priori* but once started, it can develop a dynamic of its own" (Musolff 2019: 23). The results of this quantitative research demonstrate that "situational variation in metaphor use can over time create a semantic-pragmatic drift that changes the dominant meaning of a conventional metaphor expression" (Musolff 2019: 23). According to Musolff, novel metaphors are "a special sub-group of figurative expressions that require a "deliberate" cognitive and communicative effort on the part of the speaker and a corresponding interpretative effort on the part of the hearer/reader" (Musolff 2019: 24).

Ng and Koller's (2013) study demonstrates that instead of causing radical conceptual changes, deliberate metaphors may also strengthen and develop existing conceptualisations, especially when they are highly conventional in a particular discursive context. Steen et al. (2017: 2862) observe that "[w]hen a specific concept is repeatedly used figuratively, people become familiar with the intended meaning of the metaphor, and the metaphor becomes conventional. The investigators acknowledge the positive influence of such metaphors on message comprehension and they argue that conventional mappings "make a text more concrete, clear, and easy to understand" (Steen et al. 2017: 2863). Then again, Steen and colleagues argue that novel metaphors have more potential to increase attractiveness and imaginativeness of the message because "recipients enjoy it when a message allows them a new insight into something familiar" (Steen et al. 2017: 2863). Due to the underlying mechanism of 'affective text perception', novel metaphors can affect people's issue viewpoints and thus positively influence affective responses to a communicated message (Steen et al. 2017: 2863). Through the way they are communicated, deliberate metaphors aim at, "shift(ing) the perspective of the addressee from the local topic of a message to another conceptual domain from which that local topic is to be re-viewed" (Steen 2008: 224).

Early proponents of CMT were mainly interested in the use of novel metaphors in literary and poetic works, arguing that the most innovative metaphors are creative extensions of existing conceptual mappings (Kövecses 2002; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Turner 1989). However, *rainbow plague* is not an instance of poetic language – it is not an "elaboration" or "extension" of the conventional metaphor in the sense proposed by Lakoff and Turner (1989), who claim that elaboration and extension are characteristic of metaphors created in literary works, mainly in poetry, and are used for artistic, often purely aesthetic purposes. It is an example of an expression used deliberately in a specific communication situation, in a specific context and for a specific persuasive purpose. Therefore, the research model used for its analysis should primarily take these elements into account. Furthermore, this metaphor and its persuasive effects can and should be examined as an example of intertextual and interdisciplinary transfer, because its processing requires simultaneous decoding and recontextualisation of cultural knowledge available through participation in a specific socio-cultural group.

2. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in CDA

Very important in critical analysis is the correlation between text, its production as well as interpretation, and context. In CDA, text is used to represent the basic unit of communication, whereas discourse is studied as part of wider movements in society. The role of the link between the two is filled by social practices, represented by 'orders of discourse' defined as "networks of social practices" that control the social organization and linguistic variation (Fairclough 2003: 24). These "relatively stabilised form(s) of social activity," to use Fairclough's words (2001: 231), include, for example, the ways in which school classes are managed, medical interviews are conducted, news is broadcast, sermons are preached, and so on.

Fairclough, who defined text as a product rather than a process and discourse as the process of social interaction, developed a three-dimensional framework of study, in which three separate forms of analysis are combined: analysis of (spoken or written) language texts, analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution and consumption) and analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice (Fairclough 1989, 2003). More technically, Fairclough's model is a combination of micro-, meso- and macro-level interpretation. At all these levels of analysis, much attention is paid to the issues of intertextuality and interdiscursivity.

By and large, CDA studies intertextuality and interdiscursivity in non-literary texts with the aim of understanding social processes and conducting

reliable critical investigation. The role attributed to these two important phenomena by this already diversified research model deserves serious examination (see e.g., Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 1992, 2013; Koller 2008; Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wu 2011). Nonetheless, because it would have to transcend by far the scope of the present analysis, let me hopefully provide an informative presentation as concise as possible, of these complex issues.

Because intertextuality and interdiscursivity are often used almost interchangeably, Wu (2011: 87) proposes the following solution to the terminological dichotomy: "(…) the difference between these two concepts is that intertextuality refers to actual surface forms in a text, "borrowed" from other texts; whereas interdiscursivity involves the whole language system referred to in a text. In this sense, interdiscursivity is more complicated because it is concerned with the implicit relations between discursive formations rather than the explicit relations between texts." Bhatia (2004, 2010) identifies intertextuality with borrowing, mixing and embedding of resources across texts, usually representing the same genre. In comparison, interdiscursivity is understood as the function of the appropriation of generic resources across the contextual and text-external boundaries of different genres, practices and cultures (Bhatia 2010: 35–36). In Bhatia's model, intertextuality tends to be conventionalized and standardized whereas interdiscursivity is often characterized by more innovative mixing, embedding and bending of generic norms. Additionally, interdiscursivity is a more complicated phenomenon, because interdiscursive appropriations can be exploited by expert members of discourse communities "to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purposes" (Bhatia 2010: 35–36).

Fairclough (1992: 84) defines intertextuality as "the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth", and discusses "manifest" intertextuality and "constitutive" intertextuality as its major subtypes. According to Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 90), "intertextuality means that texts are linked to other texts, both in the past and in the present. Such connections are established in different ways: through explicit reference to a topic or main actor; through references to the same events; by allusions or evocations; by the transfer of main arguments from one text to the next, and so on". Wang (2016) proposes the four-step analytical framework of intertexuality that covers the explicit intertextual presentation, i.e., direct and indirect quotation, summary, and synthesis, arranged in a hierarchical form inserted into assimilated materials. 'Textual integration' is used in Wang's model as an indicator of the degree of blended material introduced through the use of paraphrase or by direct quoting.

As far as interdiscursivity is concerned, it basically stands in CDA for "the mixing of diverse genres, discourses, or styles associated with institutional and social meanings in a single text" (Wu 2011: 96). Referring to Bakhtin's (1986) work on heteroglossia, Fairclough (1992: 200–224) draws attention to its "ideological flavor" and essential implications for social practice and discusses interdiscursivity as reflecting three interrelated tendencies of contemporary public discourse; namely, the "democratization", the "commodification" (or "marketization") and the "technologization" of discourse. The researcher argues that interdiscursive analysis of texts, which includes linguistic and semiotic investigation of text features, "allows the analyst to assess the relationship and tension between the causal effects of agency in the concrete event and the causal effects of practices and structures, and to detect shifts in the relationship between orders of discourse and networks of social practices as these are registered in the interdiscursivity (mixing of genres, discourses, styles) of texts" (Fairclough 2013: 359–360).

Particularly in Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), interdiscursivity is examined as a highly complex phenomenon. In this model, it is viewed as united to both historical change and transformational 'recontextualization', understood as "the process of transferring given elements to new contexts (...): if an element is taken out of a specific context, we observe the process of de-contextualization; if the respective element is then inserted into a new context, we witness the process of recontextualization" (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 90). As a result of transformation, "the element (partly) acquires a new meaning, since meanings are formed in use" (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 90).

Wu (2011: 104) argues that although the CDA approach pays appropriate attention to the "dynamics of communication" and "the data in CDA are rather empirical and are tied more closely to real language use in that they are mainly collected from the authentic non-literary discourse", the standard paradigm deserves criticism for not taking enough notice of cognitive factors involved in interdiscursivity. Quoting Widdowson (1998), who argued that CDA should take account of discussions with the *producers* and *consumers* of texts instead of just relying on "the analyst's view of what a text might mean alone," Wu disparages the critical approach in its original form as "unilateral" and "partial" (Widdowson 1998). As an alternative, he promotes the model which aims to bring together both production and interpretation and is based on the view of interdiscursivity as a particular kind of linguistic phenomenon "closely related to the cognitive, social, and cultural factors of language use" (Wu 2011: 105). Consistent with Wu's 'pragmatic model', interdiscursivity is 1. "the result of choice making," 2. "the product of dynamic negotiation," and 3. "a means of linguistic adaptation." Firstly, interdiscursivity "involves the continuous making of linguistic choices in both

formal and strategic aspects", e.g., for the purposes of "information-and-persuasion" or "telling-and-selling" (Wu 2011: 108–109). Likewise in the process of reception and comprehension, the interpreter usually chooses certain kinds or parts of interdiscursive texts, such as specific interdiscursive elements, linguistic structures as well as interpreting tactics, according to his/her interests or purposes of consumption. Secondly, the communicators produce or interpret the interdiscursive texts "on the basis of flexible principles with the efforts paid to meet the communicative needs. There is no interdiscursive form-function association and all choices can be permanently negotiated; therefore, the functioning of interdiscursivity in communication is a highly dynamic process of constant negotiation" (Wu 2011: 110). Thirdly, within the category of adaptation, "the choice of interdiscursivity originates from the communicator-internal motives, either psychological motivations or emotions, etc." (Wu 2011: 110).

In Wu's approach, interdiscursivity primarily functions as a means of linguistic adaptation. In essence, it is produced so as to adapt to variables of the physical world, variables of the social world, and variables of the mental world. Within this process, both the producer's and the interpreter's influence adapt to each other dynamically. "If the producer's intention is correctly interpreted or traced by the interpreter, the producer's communicative goal(s) are realized and the communicative event is brought to success. During this dynamic process, various kinds of communicative functions are realized as well" (Wu 2011: 113). Comprehension of an interdiscursive text lies not in the text itself, but in the complex interaction between the producer and the receiver, whose intents and qualifications must fit together. Successful interpretation depends on the producer's ability to encode his/her goals and on the receiver's capability of decoding them. Moreover, the receiver should be acquainted with the implied contextual correlates of the interdiscursive text in order to interpret them in agreement with the producer's intentions.

In consideration of these arguments, interdiscursivity is a phenomenon deeply rooted in the cultural, historical and linguistic traditions of a given discourse community, therefore both production and reception of interdiscursive texts depend to a large extent on specific conceptual and cultural discursive traditions. "The interdiscursive texts are aspects of culture, interconnected elements and systems of meaning located in the social world. An interdiscursive text, with its elements rooted in particular institutions, is not individual and idiosyncratic but part of a shared cultural world" (Wu 2011: 105). Against this background, interdiscursive texts are also the outcome of the producers' individual choices, preferences and styles – in the sense advocated by Fairclough (2003) – an expression of the agent's identity.

Essentially, both intertextual and interdiscursive elements can be deliberately used for some strategic purposes of producers of an individual text. For instance, Bhatia (2010: 37) studies intertextuality and interdiscursivity as strategic "appropriations" of semiotic resources (textual, semantic, sociopragmatic, generic and professional) across texts, genres, social practices and cultures. Intertextual and interdiscursive appropriations are often employed by members of discourse communities "to achieve private intentions within the framework of socially recognized purposes" (Bhatia 2010: 36). By analyzing intentional usage of other texts and genres in professional communication, the researcher demonstrates that both text-internal and text-external appropriations "widely used in the recontextualization, reframing, resemiotisation or reformulations of existing discourses and genres into novel or hybrid forms" operate concomitantly at all levels of discourse "to realise the intended meaning" of the discourse producer (Bhatia 2010: 25). Interdiscursivity is rooted in "shared generic or contextual characteristics across two or more discursive constructs and some understanding of these shared features is a necessary condition to an adequate understanding of the new construct" (Bhatia 2010: 24). In Bhatia's approach, the examination of the text-external context of production and reception is essential for understanding the mechanism of interdiscursive variation (Bhatia 2004, 2010, 2012).

Referring to Bhatia's findings, Wu (2011: 113) also claims that interdiscursivity is usually a result of a conscious choice. However, the level of intentionality of particular "appropriations" may differ: some are highly motivated while others are virtually automatic. "When a producer of interdiscursivity is involved in communication, he/she is either highly motivated, with specific communicative purposes in mind, or virtually automatic, adjusting himself/herself to certain communicative circumstances. In order to approach particular communicative goal(s), he/she has to make choices at various possible levels, including the choice of linguistic forms and strategies. During this process, the choices are not made mechanically or statically but rather dynamically in a negotiable manner" (Wu 2011: 113) .

3. Interdiscursive exploitation of the *red plague* – a critical pragmatic analysis

In the sphere of socio-political discourse, metaphorical expressions may be reused – directly or implicitly quoted, alluded to, recontextualised and reinterpreted by individual or collective agents, in order to communicate their stances on specific issues. According to Musolff (2019: 29), "repeated reformulations, allusions, and meta-communicative comments" of metaphors are

a means of 'keeping them alive'. Kövecses (2009: 91) claims that the use of related metaphors may ensure the coherence of discourse that is basically of two major types: intratextual and intertextual. "This means that the same conceptual metaphor or metaphorical analogy can make a single discourse (intratextual) or a number of different discourses (intertextual) coherent" Kövecses 2009: 91). "It is a common practice that a particular metaphor in one dominant form of discourse is recycled in other discourses" (Kövecses 2014: 27). Kövecses argues that in some special cases of intertextuality, intertextual coherence is achieved through inheriting and using a partticular conceptual metaphor in different historical periods. To illustrate how "a metaphor can provide coherence across a variety of discourses, both historically and simultaneously," as one of the best examples of this phenomenon, the researcher analyses biblical metaphors that have been recycled over the ages (see Kövecses 2014: 27–28).

Appreciating both the creative and persuasive potential of interdiscursive use of metaphors, Kövecses (2009: 91) draws attention to the potential risk associated with this practice: "(…) we are often not aware of potential further 'usurpations' of the metaphor against our original intentions. This situation has its dangers and can be the source of other people turning a metaphor against us in a debate over contentious issues." As a particularly accurate illustration of this phenomenon, Kövecses refers to Semino's 2008 study in which the researcher analysed Tony Blair's *car without reverse gear* metaphor and the BBC journalist's remark *when you're on the edge of a cliff it is good to have a reverse gear* used against its original producer in a political debate over the invasion of Iraq (Kövecses 2009: 91).

Despite the fact that more recent studies propose relatively clear definitions of intertextuality and interdisciplinarity, it may not always be easy to distinguish between these phenomena in some particular linguistic examples. It happens that even in small-scale expressions, these phenomena occur together, and they are also often deliberately mixed up in order to produce the intended effect planned by the author of the discourse. The *rainbow plague* metaphor is a representative example of such a combination.

In the Polish language, the word *plague* (Pol. *zaraza*) has a wide range of applications and apart from its literal meaning, it may stand for trouble that should be avoided (*Słownik języka polskiego PWN*, definition 2 (https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/zaraza.html)). It can also be used as a swear word or a label referring to a person who is annoying, burdensome and contagious in the sense that they can negatively affect others (*Słownik języka polskiego PWN*, definition 3 (https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/zaraza.html)). Given that as a concept, PLAGUE possesses a flexibility which allows it to be applied to a vast number of situations and circumstances, in cultural representations

it plays a role in metaphorization of various other concepts based on the related concept of CONTAGION. Metaphors of CONTAGION are based on the idea that there is a point of CONTACT through which a transfer of harmful germs takes place. Such metaphors are often applied in reference to computers, the Internet, but also to talk about imitating certain types of conduct as well as to communicate our comprehension of the ways in which certain ideas influence people, their views, behavior and actions.

However, though the source domain of PLAGUE is mapped onto a wide variety of target domains, including people, entities and events, the *red plague* metaphor, has a relatively constant set of associations and connotations to it. It was initially used in Polish to imply the Bolsheviks and their ideology, and later the Soviets and the way they invaded and controlled Poland and other countries in Europe after the Second World War. The expression is relatively entrenched in Polish and part of commonplace public communication in this language. Actually, the national corpus (Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego (www.nkjp.pl)) provides nine different uses of this expression that appear in different literary and journalistic genres – all of them used in reference to the Soviet invasion of Poland in 1944 and the subsequent communist rule. The discourse-historical extension has modified the metaphor's reception as an "echoic" representation recollected as a 'once famous' idea which evokes strong historical associations for many Poles. The *red plague* is an example of metaphorical expression in the interpretation of which a precise recognition of historical conditions is very important, if not necessary. In this case, we clearly see that discursive metaphors are indeed constituents of socio-cognitive models common to members of a particular discourse community.

The cultural entrenchment of the *red plague* metaphor should be first and foremost attributed to the last poem by Józef Szczepański, a 22-year-old Warsaw insurgent. Szczepański wrote the poem titled *Czerwona zaraza* (Eng. *The red plague*) on August 29, 1944, just a few days before his death. The author expressed the defenders' anger and desperation resulting from the awareness that the only way to save anything from the total ruin was to surrender the capital of Poland to the country's most loathed enemy, one that was responsible for its numerous historical misfortunes, including partitions in the eighteenth century, one who attacked Poland in 1920 and later in 1939 with the aim of spreading the communist revolution in Europe and one that could have helped in 1944, but chose not to.[2] By describing the mood surrounding the destruction of the city, the poet articulated his own premonition

---

[2] During the Warsaw Uprising, instead of entering the city and helping the Polish clandestine army to fight the Germans and defend the citizens, the Red Army troops stood idly by on the Eastern side of the Vistula, waiting for the annihilation of Warsaw.

of the country's plight in the face of imminent disaster. Let me quote an excerpt from the poem.

> *We're waiting for you, red plague*
> *To save us all from the black death:*
> *Waiting for a salvation*
> *To be welcomed with disgust*
> *By a country that's already been hanged and quartered* [3]

Due to its anti-Soviet message, the publication of the poem and its popularization, or even possession was forbidden in the Polish People's Republic. However, it became an inspiration for artists. Andrzej Wajda, an Oscar-winning Polish film director created the movie *Kanał* partly based on the tragic story of the generation poetically depicted by Szczepański. Polish rock music bands used fragments of the poem in their albums, e.g., *Myśmy Rebelianci* (Eng. *We – the rebels*) by *De Press* (2009) and *Powstanie Warszawskie* (Eng. *Warsaw Uprising*) by *Lao Che* (2005). In his 2017 book *Czerwona zaraza* (Eng. *The red plague*), Dariusz Kaliński gave a detailed picture of the occupation of Poland's territory after the Second World War by the Red Army, whose armed support was used to establish the country's dependence on the Soviet Union, which resulted in serious political, demographic and socio-economic changes currently described as a national tragedy.

Reviewing the historical development and application of the expression, we can characterize the *red plague* metaphor as a focus of public debate that has been 'kept alive' by repeated allusions and reformulations. And in August 2019, Marek Jędraszewski added a heavily invested personal extension to it: "Luckily, the red plague is not spread all over our land, but this does not mean there is no new danger attempting to enslave our souls, hearts and minds. Perhaps neither Marxist nor Bolshevik, but born of the very same spirit" (tran. KP).[4]

The Metropolitan Archbishop of Cracow delivered his much discussed sermon during the 75th anniversary of the outbreak of the Warsaw Uprising in St. Mary's Basilica in Cracow, which coincided with a rise in rhetoric by the governing party condemning LGBT activities as threatening the Polish nation and its longstanding Christian standards. The peaks in anti-LGBT

---

[3] The first stanza of Szczepański's poem translated by Anna Nolan, used as a personal motto in Maria Szubert's book *Between Black Death and Red Plague* (2014).

[4] Jędraszewski's original words: "Czerwona zaraza już po naszej ziemi całe szczęście nie chodzi, co wcale nie znaczy, że nie ma nowej, która chce opanować nasze dusze, serca i umysły. Nie marksistowska, bolszewicka, ale zrodzona z tego samego ducha". The whole text of Jędraszewski's sermon is available at: www.radiomaryja.pl/multimedia/homilia-ks-abp-marka-jedraszewskiego-wygloszona-w-kosciele-mariackim-z-okazji-75-rocznicy-wybuchu-powstania-warszawskiego.

rhetoric were noted in spring and summer 2019 when politicians were campaigning for European and parliamentary elections. The high-ranking clergyman said that he felt obliged to speak in public, as the voters against "LGBT ideology" were either silent or discriminated against; which, according to him, has nothing to do with tolerance or concern for the quality of public debate. In his passionate sermon Jędraszewski criticised the initiatives such as *LGBT Charter* (signed in February 2019 by the Mayor of Warsaw Rafał Trzaskowski) as involving public institutions and demanding the spending of public money on practices that, according to him, contribute to the depravity of children by promoting gender-based sex education.

In order to present the LGBT community in a new light, Jędraszewski skilfully resuscitated a recognisable metaphorical construct. The *rainbow plague* metaphor is a novel and creative language unit based on the far more conventional and use-entrenched phrase. It is applied with the purpose of confronting a contemporary society with the emerging social problems related to the issues of collective identity, the nation's history and values propagated and perpetuated by older discourses. The more conventionalized, historically-rooted and use-entrenched metaphorical expression, applied interdiscursively in a new context, provides the source for the process of interpretation. This transfer would not work, either conceptually or socially, were the audience unable to make a direct connection. The original metaphor has strong historical association for many Poles, both residing in the country and those who live outside the contemporary territorial borders of Poland. In this sort of discursive shift an expression from a different context, namely *the red plague*, was overtly referred to in new socio-historical circumstances as *the rainbow plague*. This kind of explicit allusive transfer places the specific text in a new context, where it acquires new meanings, the nature of which cannot be predetermined, but is rather the result of a context-induced alteration of the expression rooted in the collective historical consciousness of the audience.

Both expressions, which belong to various not necessarily historically related discourses, are examples of the elaboration of the NATION IS A BODY metaphor, lexicalized in English as *body politic* (see e.g., Chilton and Lakoff 1995; Musolff 2010) and in Polish as *ciało polityczne* (Kantorowicz 1957/2007). The *body politic* metaphor is based on the abstract connection between the conceptual domain of BODY and the concepts of NATION and SOCIETY in which the BODY domain interacts with the socio-political functioning of a certain national community. Social actors, especially politicians, often use and greatly appreciate the NATION IS A BODY metaphor as its structure offers many opportunities for linguistic realizations that can be relevant and highly productive in reference to various socio-political issues.

This metaphor allows for emphasizing the relation but also the boundary be-tween the inside and the outside of the BODY, between the self and the oth-ers. As a result, the driving force behind this underlying mapping is the pos-sibility of polarizing between oneself and one's opponents, consistent with the principles of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (discussed in the introductory section).

Jędraszewski's sermon is intertextually and interdiscursively linked with Szczepański's poem by means of the common source of their central metaphors, namely PLAGUE. Ontological correspondences are a result of the perceived similarities between immoral and dangerous ideologies and contagious diseases: COMMUNISM IS A PLAGUE and COMMUNISM IS A PLAGUE, as demonstrated in the table below.

Table 1. Structural correspondences between COMMUNISM IS A PLAGUE and COMMUNISM IS A PLAGUE

	red plague	*rainbow plague*
Source: **PLAGUE**	Target: **COMMUNISM**	Target: **LGBT**
Fighting epidemic →	defending national identity and Christian values	defending national identity and Christian values
Bacteria →	communists and/or acts promoting communism	LGBT community members and/or acts promoting LGBT ideology
Becoming immune →	closing off, tightening social group and family boundaries	closing off, tightening social group and family boundaries
Remedies →	activities of the government-in-exile, the Catholic Church and Polish clandestine army	actions of the right-wing government and conservative clergy

Although the *red plague* came from the East and the *rainbow plague* threatens from the West, both types of *plague* are driven by enormous ideo-logical fervor. In the analysed *plague* metaphors, the BODY's immune sys-tem is compared to the national identity. Consistently, preserving traditional values should be viewed as a strategy of survival in the face of the invasion threatening from the outside, which is one of the most productive inferences drawn from the underlying mapping. In both cases, the PLAGUE frame is used to emphasise the lethal nature of the spreading ideology and the re-lated CONTAGION frame is used to talk about how certain dangerous ideas influence people. CONTAGION happens by CONTACT and in the sphere of socio-political discourse, CONTACT is understood as a movement between

and within social groups. In the *red plague* metaphor, the Soviets together with their ideology correspond to the infected victims who, by spreading disease, may ruin both the physical as well as the mental health of the nation under attack. The only way to avoid infection is to prevent contact with the already infected.

Consistent with the structure of the given mapping, in a vein similar to communism, the "LGBT ideology" can be viewed as a transmissible disease that has entered the body of society, causing a deterioration in quality of life. The re-contextualised PLAGUE offers the opportunity to expose interesting details in the given frame. Behind most infectious diseases there is always the fear of an epidemic: the fear that a dangerous disease may infect a substantial part of the collective body and lead to its destruction. In this sense, an EPIDEMIC is viewed as a mass KILLER who has malevolent intentions. The PLAGUE thus metaphorically has come to stand for diseases that affect a considerable number of people, or, maybe even more importantly, instigate a certain degree of massive (or even global) concern.

As we can see, the two analysed expressions have a major common semantic feature of infectivity, on the basis of which Jędraszewski smartly created a coherent conceptual cluster. This coherence is a result of an intertextual and interdiscursive nature of the well-planned shift. The question which appears at this point and is in all probability the most interesting for a CMA researcher, is why the analysed phrase had been selected by the speaker. Instead of being arbitrary or accidental, it appears to be the outcome of a deliberate choice made by the orator who recognizes the intellectual capacities, ideological beliefs and inclinations of the recipients of his message. He also appreciates the power of historical and cultural rooting of the metaphor which parallels the communist ideology and that of an infectious disease. The explanation, viewed as a cognitive-pragmatic step in CMA, "is captured through two pragmatic functions of metaphor, namely, evaluation and persuasion, which relate the conceptual, individual part of the mind to its shared, social one – or social/cultural cognition" (Maalej 2007: 149). Actually, the short expression fulfils the main communicative functions of sociopolitical persuasion. The ideational function is realised by reference to the knowledge supposedly possessed by the audience of the sermon, i.e., the knowledge of the meaning, origins and cultural value of the expression. The emotional function is realized both on the producer's and the receivers' part: by expressing his own concerns about the future of the nation, Jędraszewski evokes the emotions of the listeners, he wants to arouse fear towards the dangerous ideology that may harm the healthy organism of conservative heterosexual society. In this way the archbishop encourages the audience to

remain faithful to their values and avoid contact with what he believes may threaten those values.

The overall persuasive goal of the orator was to highlight the negative assessment of the LGBT movement and the "ideology" accompanying this movement. Universally, all connotations of PLAGUE are negative, a point that first and foremost needs to be taken into account when analysing its use as metaphor. In the process of intertextual and/or interdiscursive shift, the primary metaphorical expression that a speaker introduces partially or as a whole can be slightly but significantly changed. Re-contextualisation of a particular metaphor may also change its evaluative connotations. However, the *rainbow plague* did not change the evaluative character of its *red plague* donor phrase. The reason for this is that the negative axiological charge of the original expression is the major component of its nucleus, a carrier of inherent information, its DNA, to employ another metaphorical concept, which preserves and protects the fundamental and distinctive characteristics, regarded as unchangeable in this particular case.

The considerable persuasive and evaluative potential of the *red plague* was used by Archbishop Jędraszewski most probably inconsistently with or even against the creator's intentions. Referring to Kövecses' warning referred to in the second paragraph of this section, the metaphor's implications were reversed due to interdiscursive developments that were beyond the control of its initiator. The deliberately re-contextualised and re-framed phrase, when used in a new specific context, obtained new meaning, as a result of discursive "appropriation," or even "usurpation" of Szczepański's original expression. In this particular case, the late poet's brother publicly protested against the use of the words of the poem for current political purposes. The conflicting worldviews led to the opposing interpretations of the metaphor and sharply divergent reception of Jędraszewski's sermon, which intensified the atmosphere of socio-political conflict in Poland before the parliamentary elections in autumn 2019.

Conclusions

The dynamics of discourse may be a result of combining, mixing and modifying texts and genres according to the requirements of both global and local contexts. Texts used in socio-political persuasion often combine inconsistent or even contradictory discourses and genres. Especially in times of social transformation, their authors not only reflect, but creatively and dynamically rework various discursive resources, including metaphors, in distinctive and potentially novel ways. The critical analysis of texts carried out on different, often intermingling levels (discourses, genres, styles) which are

intentionally interconnected or separated or hidden, allows the critical analyst to position the investigated item in relation to other texts on which it draws by studying the explicit and implicit correlations that a text or utterance has with other – prior, contemporary and even future texts.

Apart from being cognitive or heuristic devices, metaphors are used by social actors with precise strategic aims, e.g., to construct and promote certain ideological paradigms by fabricating worldviews and reinforcing subjective judgments. The analysed *rainbow plague* metaphor was deliberately used by Jędraszewski to evoke an emotional reaction of fear that would serve to legitimize the anti-LGBT policy of the conservative right. In order to achieve his aims, the Archbishop of Cracow referred to an expression of great persuasive power and enormous emotional charge ascribed to it by Polish society; specifically, the part of the population that can be regarded as predetermined or potential recipients of the priest's sermons. The critical rhetorical point of the oration was the overtly interdiscursive shift performed in the form of a deliberate inventive reconstruction of the *red plague* donor expression.

References

Bakhtin Mikhail M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bhatia Vijay K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Bhatia Vijay K. (2010). Interdiscursivity in professional communication. *Discourse & Communication* 21(1), 32–50.

Bhatia Vijay K. (2012). Critical reflections on genre analysis. *Iberica* 24, 17–28.

Bowdle Brian F., Gentner Dedre (2005). *The career of metaphor*. Psychological Review 112(1), 193–216.

Charteris-Black Jonathan (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black Jonathan (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton Paul (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Chilton Paul, Lakoff George (1995). Foreign policy by metaphor. In *Language and Peace*, Christina Schäffner, Anita L. Wenden (eds.), 37–60. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Chouliaraki Lilie, Fairclough Norman (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dijk Teun van (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

Dijk Teun van (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), 115-140.

Dijk Teun van (2011). Discourse and ideology. In *Discourse Studies. A Multidisplinary Introduction*, Teun van Dijk (ed.), 379–407. London: Sage.

Fairclough Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough Norman (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough Norman (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus* 14 (2), 231–242.

Fairclough Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London/New York: Routledge.

Fairclough Norman (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Hart Christopher (2008). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: Toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies* 5(2), 91–106.

Kantorowicz Ernst H. (1957/2007) *Dwa ciała króla. Studium ze średniowiecznej teologii politycznej*. Jerzy Strzelczyk (ed.). Warszawa: PWN.

Koller Veronika (2008). *Lesbian Discourses: Images of a Community*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.

Kövecses Zoltán (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses Zoltán (2005). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses Zoltán (2009). Aspects of metaphor in discourse. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies* 1, 81–96.

Kövecses Zoltán (2014). Creating metaphor in context. *International Journal of Language and Culture* 1(1), 21–41.

Lakoff George (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In *Metaphor and Thought*, Andrew Orthony (ed.), 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff George (2009). *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*. New York: Penguin.

Lakoff George, Turner Mark (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leeuwen Theo van (2015). Multimodality. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), 447–461. London: Wiley Blackwell.

Maalej Zouheir (2007). Doing critical discourse analysis with the contemporary theory of metaphor: Towards a discourse model of metaphor. In *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Studies: Application and Theory*, Christopher Hart, Dominik Lukeš (eds.), 132–158. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Maalej Zouheir (2011). Ideological and non-ideological metaphors: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective. In *Metaphor and Cognition*, Khalid Berrada, Ali Jehfa (eds.), 97–122. Morocco: Laboratory Publications: Linguistics and Communication Labs.

Mio Jeffrey S. (1997). Metaphor and politics. *Metaphor and Symbol* 12(2), 113–133.

Musolff Andreas (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Musolff Andreas (2010). *Metaphor, Nation, and the Holocaust: The Concept of the Body Politic*. New York: Routledge.

Musolff Andreas (2014). Metaphorical parasites and "parasitic" metaphors. Semantic exchanges between political and scientific vocabularies. *Journal of Language and Politics* 13(2), 218–233.

Musolff Andreas (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Musolff Andreas (2019). Metaphor framing in political discourse. *Mythos-Magazine. Politisches Framing* 1, 1–10.

Ng Carl J.W., Koller Veronika (2013) Deliberate conventional metaphor in images: The case of corporate branding discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 28(3), 131–147.

Perrez Julien, Reuchamps Min, Thibodeau Paul H. (eds.) (2019). *Variation in Political Metaphor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Reisigl Martin, Wodak Ruth (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edition, Ruth Wodak, Martin Meyer (eds.), 87–121. London: Sage.

Semino Elena (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steen Gerard J. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol* 23(4), 213–241.

Steen Gerard J., Boeynaems Amber, Burgers Christian, Konijn Elly A. (2017). Impact of conventional and novel metaphors in news on issue viewpoint. *International Journal of Communication* 11, 2861–2879.

Szczepański Józef (1944). *Czerwona zaraza*. Retrieved from: https://wolnelektury.pl

Teeffelen Toine van (1994). Racism and metaphor: The Palestinian–Israeli conflict in popular literature. *Discourse and Society* 5(3), 381–405.

Wang Wei (2016). Intertextual practices in academic writing by Chinese ESL students. *Applied Linguistics Review* 7(1), 53–72.

Widdowson Henry G. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 19 (1), 136–151.

Wu Jianguo (2011). Understanding interdiscursivity: a pragmatic model. *Journal of Cambridge Studies* 6 (2–3), 95–115.

Zinken Jörg (2003). Ideological imagination: intertextual and correlational metaphors in political discourse. *Discourse and Society* 14(4), 507–523.

Zinken Jörg, Hellsten Iina, Nerlich Brigitte (2008). Discourse metaphors. In *Body, Language and Mind. Volume 2*: *Sociocultural Situatedness*, Roslyn M. Frank, René Dirven, Tom Ziemke, Enrique Bernárdez (eds.), 363–385. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Katarzyna Pawłowska
Instytut Neofilologii
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku
ul. Świerkowa 20B, 15-328 Białystok
k.pawlowska[at]uwb.edu.pl