

<http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/kw.2016.20.33>

SZIR ha-SZIRIM. Image-Depicting Via Sacrum and Profanum Metaphor on the Example of Song of Songs – a Cognitive Analysis

Renata Łukiewicz-Kostro

Song of Songs, included in the Old Testament Book of Wisdom is a passionate erotic poem, a prototype of love lyrical poetry which expresses perennial, fascinating, sensual sensations and human desires. The text has been the subject of numerous interpretations in various perspectives, among others: natural (pastoral), cult and mystical, allegorical or theological. It also stimulated quite provocative radical interpretations as it is a text one cannot go by indifferently. The aim of this paper is to analyze briefly a selected Sacrum/profanum metaphor via cognitive approach and indicate there is no dualism but rather mutual overlapping of those two spheres.

Keywords: Song of Songs, Sacrum/profanum metaphor, sacrofanum, image-depicting, embodied experience, cognitive approach

SZIR ha – SZIRIM, *Song of Songs*, in the Latin version of the Bible – “Cantium canticorum” is included in the Old Testament in the *Book of Wisdom*, the Book of Solomon.

It is a passionate erotic poem, a prototype of love lyrical poetry that expresses perennial, fascinating and sensual bodily and spiritual sensations and desires. *Song of Songs* is a specific mystery play of love and courtship between a man and a woman – in the shape of a song. It is a unique, multi-sensory love image on the two levels: profanum and Sacrum, but in fact, the real level is somewhere “in-between” those two dimensions.

The image is constructed through metaphoric language, and it can be stated, also metaphorically, that the text becomes a vivid, dynamic picture

RENATA ŁUKIEWICZ-KOSTRO, senior lecturer, The Centre of Teaching and Certification of Foreign Languages, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University; address for correspondence: The Centre of Teaching and Certification of Foreign Languages UMCS, ul. Radziszewskiego 18, PL 20-031 Lublin; e-mail: renata.lukiewicz-kostro@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

“painted with words”, or even like “a Persian rug” woven with verbal elements tangled with action/movement.

Song of Songs has been approached via numerous and various interpretations, among others: natural, cult and mystical, allegorical, theological, pastoral, etc. Generally speaking, LOVE is a multidimensional topic of research and, therefore, is so frequently found in diversified areas of explorations: humanities, philosophy, sociology, psychology, theology, and even... medical studies (sic!). It has also inspired, and still does, other areas, like: poetry, Fine Arts or music.

For many centuries the text has been interpreted as an allegorical poem about love relationship between Jahwe (the male Beloved) and Israel (the female Beloved) – on the sacred level (*Sacrum*) with the Transcendental dimension predominantly.

However, other research, e.g. in anthropology and cultural studies on the mutual relation between *Sacrum* and *profanum* has been indicating for some time that the division between those two spheres is not distinct, and dualism between the two is more and more frequently replaced with a conviction of the liminal character of *Sacrum/profanum* boundary¹.

Cross-cultural studies owe the term *Sacrum* to Rudolph Otto, a philosopher who described it as a mysterious secret phenomenon that cannot be comprehended with our senses only. A human, when faced with *Sacrum* feels fascinated but threatened at the same time. The definition of *Sacrum* as opposed to everyday, common, profane experiences, i.e. *profanum* was completed by another philosopher, Mircea Eliade. The definitions were the tools that helped organize the research. Needless to say, the *Sacrum – profanum* opposition used in the studies of religious texts, and other, has been quite common and convenient. But one needs to observe such an approach seems inadequate from the point of view of Christianity which claims that everything was created by God and is sanctified with the presence and permeation of the Holy Spirit². Following this concept one cannot separate the Creator from creation. Any physical substance is deeply enrooted, submerged, so to speak, in the Spirit of God. So, the very presence of the Divine element in the material, physical world raises *profanum* in a way to give it the *Sacrum* aspect, in other words, *profanum* transcends to *Sacrum*, therefore the author uses a question mark with the term *profanum* later on.

¹ M. Budzyńska, „Żebractwo”, „Święte uzależnienie” i „duchowy prysznic” – o przenikaniu się *sacrum* i *profanum* w metaforycznym języku dominikanina o. Jana Góry, „Kwartalnik Językoznawczy” 2012, vol. 4 (12).

² *Duch Święty w naszej codzienności*, ed. by K. Guzowski, Gaudium, Lublin 2010.

Let us point contemporary understandings of those two terms. Generally speaking, *profanum* refers to the physical level and means “something lay/profane”. It is just here that all everyday, common life events occur. In a way, it is an area for the profane. *Sacrum* means the Sacred/ Divine/sacral sphere for the elite. Religious practices are thought to belong here, among others. The sphere of *Sacrum* is meant for those chosen, initiated, more sophisticated. The latest research introduced an interesting term suggested by a Polish researcher Michał Buchowski, i.e. *sacrofanum* which seems much more adequate for the study of religious texts of any kind, and is understood as mutually overlapping spheres of *sacrum* and *profanum*³. *Sacrum* is said to wander around. Interestingly from the linguistic point of view the verb “wander around” implies quite relaxed action with no specific aim or purpose but with pleasure. As a consequence, one sphere appropriates the other one. The researcher speaks of “appropriateness” (zawłaszczanie) but it somehow implies that one sphere dominates upon the other. For this reason, holiness can be experienced in a lay/profane way, and vice versa, *profanum* is sacralized⁴.

Later, in my paper I wish to illustrate that in a highly religious text of *Song of Songs*, we deal rather with “permeation” (przenikanie), and not “appropriateness” (zawłaszczanie) of those two spheres. *Sacrophanum*, in my view, is a much better term but should be understood and defined rather than “permeation” (a theological term), overlapping rather than mapping – following the cognitive way of thinking. Here, I need to emphasize that the difference between those three terms, however minute is quite valid, in my opinion. “Permeation” is a term used in theology, especially the studies of the Holy Spirit and it means “soaked in” with no clear boundaries whatsoever.

Can similar changes be observed in other religious texts? The language of worshippers (in church ceremonies, community gatherings, homilies) generally avoids the profane language. However, biblical texts, prophetic language and the literature of the mystics show that there are specific linguistic structures that express the sacral/sacred issues through lexical items typical for the lay sphere. Also, the language widely used by charismatic religious speakers, both among clergymen (the above quoted Rev. Jan Góra, a Polish Dominican or even a recently widely known another Dominican Polish monk, Rev. Adam Szustak) among lay people speaking publically of their religious deep and intimate relation with God. Here, the worshippers in the Holy Spirit Renewal communities seem to be a good example, as well.

³ J. Sieradzan, *Sacrum i profanum czy sacrofanum? Przemiany w rozumieniu sacrum we współczesnym świecie*, [in:] „Lud” 2006, vol. 90, p. 16.

⁴ M. Budzyńska, „Żebractwo”, „Święte uzależnienie” ..., op. cit.

Song of songs is generally thought to have been finally edited in the 2nd century B.C. It is undoubtedly a highly religious text, at least for the reason that it belongs to the *Book of Wisdom* in the Old Testament, no doubt a religious text! It is an Ancient text, however, at a closer look extremely modern and in line with contemporary language expression by the charismatic worshippers and speakers. Also, in agreement with the findings of cognitivism nowadays, in the 21st century! So, as to speak, the text may be conveying the eternal, universal truth about humans, the Deity and the relationship between humans and the Creator, not only in the direction from a man searching the Divine, but also, in the other direction, the Creator searching His creation to become ONE again? Return to EDEN?

What is Cognitive Linguistics?

Cognitive linguists are predominantly interested in connections between cognition as such and language, relations between the language people use and their way of thinking. Those researchers explore the process of meaning-making that is being constructed while linguistic processes that take place during the four major skills of writing, talking, reading and listening.

Cognitive metaphor study began at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, so it is quite a recent approach. One of the first scholars to study metaphors via this cognitive perspective were Georg Lakoff and Mark Johnson whose cognitive theory of metaphor seems much more adequate for the study of religious/sacred texts than other, nowadays. Then, their theory was developed and supplemented by an American biblical scholar and professor in Judaic Studies, Marc Zvi Brettler who researches biblical metaphors and the post-biblical reception of the Hebrew Bible, including the New Testament. He founded and co-ordinates a circle of scholars who integrate critical and traditional methods of studying the Holy Scripture. His awarded book, in co-operation with A. Berlin, *The Jewish Study Bible* is highly inspiring for all those who wish to look at the Word of God from different perspectives⁵.

Then, interest in the analysis of religious texts via cognitive approach was re-inspired in 2006. It was when a Society of Biblical Literature started a project lasting three years under the name "The Use of Cognitive Linguistics in Biblical Interpretation". The project was established with the major purpose to apply cognitive linguistics to biblical studies. The programme was focused on how language makes meaning, but also, which is especially valuable, how contemporary readers interact with ancient and sacred texts. The

⁵ M. Brettler, A. Berlin, *The Jewish Study Bible*, The Jewish Publication Society, 2015.

focus here is not so much on the understanding of the text, but rather, the “interaction” of religious texts with the readers, the process of comprehending sacral texts by humans nowadays. Such an approach is in line with the main concept among biblical researchers who claim that the Holy Scripture is a LIVE, UNIVERSAL text and should not be treated only as an Ancient, outdated text, but also the LIVING WORD of the LIVING GOD speaking constantly to His children in a mutual dialogue regardless time and place. So, the process of interaction between God and the reader via the WORD, the Scripture is also a field of study.

For very recent scholars it seems quite clear and obvious that cognitive linguistics delivers new perspectives on ancient and sacred texts and equips researchers with adequate tools with which they can survey the studied texts⁶.

For cognitive analysts any metaphor is very closely connected to sensual perception which is possible via human body and those two spheres: concrete/literal/physical and metaphorical are constantly confronted with each other (in close neighbourhood). In this approach there is no dualism of the metaphorical and colloquial language. A metaphor is a linguistic structure referring to simple, primary, concrete matters known to the language-user from their personal, individual, subjective, therefore, one’s own experience, something they are familiar with. Through the use of a metaphor we acquire expansion of the meaning via transgression from a physical to mental space. Further, those two renowned cognitive linguists, Georg Lakoff and Mark Johnson claim that a human body is the main source of experiential data which, in turn, constitute the most important factor of organization and structuralization of knowledge. So, the grounding of all cognition is embodied in human experience⁷.

Many modern linguists and philosophers – obviously G. Lakoff, M. Turner, and M. Johnson- have adopted a new approach to metaphors. They claim the metaphor is more than just a rhetorical figure of speech but rather a mental process that helps us understand daily conceptual domains (target domains) via other more familiar conceptual domains (source domains).

Metaphor is persuasive in our everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature⁸.

⁶ *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*, ed. by B. Howe, J. B. Green, De Gruyter, Boston, 2014.

⁷ G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh*, Basic Books, New York, 1999.

⁸ G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago–London 1980, p. 3.

Generally speaking, metaphor is omnipresent (accessible), conventional (part of daily language, unconscious and automatic), irreplaceable (helps to define concepts that no other modes of thought can)⁹.

Metaphorical Mapping Structure

Lakoff and Johnson defined metaphor as mapping between two conceptual domains: a target domain and a source domain. Metaphors are used, in their opinion, to map certain aspects of the source domain onto the target domain so that a new, wider understanding of the target domain is acquired. And they are interested in how it is done, how it happens. They described this mapping as a structure consisting of three parts: two end-points (the source and target domain) and a bridge between them which they called mapping. They considered the metaphorical mapping as unidirectional, i.e. occurring in one direction only, from the source domain to the target one, not vice versa. It allows the less concrete and vague concepts, like, for example, emotions, feelings, or abstracts to be structured in terms of comprehensible and more concrete ones because they are closer to our physical and individual experience. For this reason they are more adequately categorized through corporized schemes (space orientations and objects). They distinguished three types of metaphors according to the domain of experience they refer to: structural, orientational and ontological metaphors. They understand and describe a structural metaphor as a metaphor in which one concept is expressed in terms of another structured and well-defined concept. One commonly cited and researched in texts nowadays example is the LOVE is a JOURNEY metaphor. The second type, orientational metaphor, they say, organizes a whole system of concepts in terms of spatial orientations. Abstract concepts, like states or emotions and feelings are oriented to an imaginary space, e.g. the widely quoted metaphor MORE is UP, LESS is DOWN ("the salaries *fell*"). They are grounded in our body and its interaction with the physical environment, as our bodies have front and back parts, a top and a bottom part, they take different positions in action. The third one, ontological metaphor allows an abstraction (activity, emotion, idea) to be materialized, or in other words turned into an entity and is used as if it was an object. Briefly speaking, people categorize unstructured events, activities, ideas and emotions as concrete entities that are much easier to be grasped and comprehended. Here, the scholars speak of four sub-types of metaphors: container, entity, substance and personification metaphors. Ontological metaphors are also used to understand events, actions, activities and states. They

⁹ G. Lakoff, M. Turner, *More than a Cool Reason*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1989.

allow us to comprehend wordly phenomena in more comprehensible, “friendly” so to speak, human terms¹⁰.

Lakoff and Turner claimed that cognition plays a crucial role in the interpretation of metaphors of all kinds in order to structure and understand a target domain through a source domain and they were interested in this process of cognition. It is essential that a person, in order to comprehend must have adequate knowledge of the source domain¹¹. They also stated that cognitive models can be acquired in two ways: one – through direct experience, and the other – through culture because metaphors cohere with our cultures and personal individual experience. Here, one needs to be aware that individuals vary in terms of their cultures (environment) and personal experiences. For this reason people have various metaphorical groundings for the same concepts. Those groundings are also a motivating field of analysis. Direct subjective experience is mediated by our bodies, and the interaction with the outside world via our body in experiencing is called “**embodiment**”¹².

*People’s subjective felt experiences of their bodies in action provide part of the fundamental grounding for language and thought. Cognition is what occurs when the body engages in the physical, cultural world and must be studied in terms of the dynamical interactions between people and the environment. Human language and thought emerge from recurring patterns of embodied activity that constrain ongoing intellectual behavior*¹³.

Among all models there is the ‘container’ scheme, like the human body – it has an interior part, a limit/boundaries and an exterior part. The human body and its experience constitute the source of the two types of metaphors: orientational and ontological.

Lakoff and Johnson claim that in a metaphor reason and imagination are combined, metaphor is “imaginative rationality”, as they call it. It means there is no division between reason and imagination. We understand the outside world via interaction with it and we categorize through our individual subjective experience. The new categories are open, vague, so, in this way, meaning is somehow enlarged, widened. This is what cognitive semantics deals with at present.

¹⁰ G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, op. cit.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 65–66.

¹² G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *More than a Cool Reason*, op. cit., p. 74.

¹³ R. W. Gibbs, *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2006, p. 9.

Recent studies on language and thought have revealed the influence of language on the process of conceptualization of the outside world and cognition¹⁴. Simply speaking, the language we speak also influences our way of thinking and conceptualizing the world, i.e. language is a tool not only to express thinking but also to shape our thinking.

Taking the so far attitudes one can state that this is a mutual interaction: language we speak reveals what we think and how we conceptualize, but also language we speak influences the way we think and conceptualize – it goes in both directions, the language being “an intermediary”, it goes in-between this process.

Cognitive Linguistics in Biblical Studies

Both the Old Testament and the New Testament are abundant with loads of metaphors to express the relationship between a human being/humans and the Deity. Scholarly research in such metaphors has received major interest for various reasons. One of the main reasons is that God is a UNIVERSAL but an inexpressible concept. Therefore, humans are unable to experience or understand God fully, however probably have “an inborn” (from times immemorial) desire to connect to the Deity. Even, in the case when a person has a certain, limited experience of the Divine, it is hardly possible to be expressed verbally – it, so to speak, transcends their verbal expression. Metaphoric language has always been used by people to talk about what is inexpressible. A crucial argument for the aptness/adequacy of metaphor use in religious texts is the fact that even those researchers who are rather in favour of the literal truth and meaning of the sacred texts use themselves metaphor such as God is Father, King, Provider, Providence, etc. They tend to agree that metaphoric statements in the Bible express profound eternal, universal truths. The biblical texts, both the Old and the New Testament are written by humans, real people of blood and flesh in their languages and are, therefore, permeated by metaphor.

Lakoff and Johnson also interestingly claim that everyday metaphoric language expresses statements which are not only symbolic, or fictional, but those that **can be true** – so they are at least potentially true. In other words, metaphors are used for saying things that are not literally true to express what **is true** or **can be true**. Following this kind of thinking the biblical metaphors at least **can** express the truth, even **do** speak about the truth. Both scholars and their followers indicate that metaphors map between a more

¹⁴ J. A. Lucy, *Language Diversity and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.

concrete meaning (literal/physical) and a more abstract one. Therefore, metaphor can be seen as a primary element of a language describing religious experience of different people, not only worshippers', mystics' and prophets', but also all the people while referring to God, especially in their spontaneous, uncontrolled and uncensored even unconscious flow of speech.

Generally speaking, the human experience of the Deity is quite intersubjectively inaccessible i.e. it has a very individual, subjective, intimate dimension that cannot be transmitted fully and adequately to another person or other humans verbally. It cannot be described in the way it can be understood as the same by others. For this reason, rich and abundant metaphoric models are created and constructed to embrace and express this intersubjectively inaccessible experience, its meaning, richness, complexity, but also importance and meaning to the individuals who experience it.

In the cognitive approach religious metaphors are perceived and understood as cognitive structures. Two cognitivists studying religious texts, Mary Therese Des Camp and Eve Sweetser claim that from the point of view of cognitive linguistics "the concept of God exhibits an impoverished non-metaphorical reality". They assert that the non-metaphorical, i.e. literal idea of God is very rarely, if ever, expressed in concrete terms. Abstract concepts (God) are understood and conceived mainly in metaphorical structures¹⁵.

Here, my perspective is that religious, biblical texts and the writings of the mystics' can be perceived as conveying truths on these two levels simultaneously, i.e. God is not only sought by humans, but also allows humans to be seen, understood through our daily events, our primary human experience. In other words, God shares Himself with humans and, therefore, the Bible is not only the Book of and for Scholars but the Book of human experience in which the Divine is always present, the Deity is the source of every human experience. The experience in all dimensions: individual, social, primary and simple, but also intellectual and sophisticated, both physical and spiritual – in fact there are no divisions whatsoever. Following this line one can say that in the Bible the Creator speaks to His creation and is present in all their circumstances despite their character. So, the Bible is not the Bible of Aristotle but the Book of human experience of all humankind across ages, races, cultures, etc. The use of metaphoric language makes it lively, vivid and dynamic. The reader constructs his/her own meanings with reference to

¹⁵ E. Sweetser, M. T. DesCamp, *Motivating Biblical Metaphors for God. Refining the Cognitive Model*, [in:] *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*, ed. by B. Howe, J. B. Green, DeGruyter, Boston, 2014, p. 7–23.

his/her particular subjective experience, so, in a way, the Creator is in constant dialogue/two-way mutual interaction with humans. Maybe, the Bible is much simpler, “humane” and universal than we tend to think?

Let us look at the text of *Song of Songs* which explicitly expresses physical, sexual relations which have a long tradition in research of being interpreted as the Divine – human relationship. Physical passion, sexual pleasure and emotional yearning are abundantly present in the language of both lovers and make a clear implication that God and humans passionately desire and yearn each other. It is a mutual, deep, engaging, lasting and intimate relationship in which they find real and true pleasure. Such an approach maps very well the experience of the Divine among mystics’ and visionaries’. In “fiance mystique” (mistyka oblubieńcza) the relationship between the Deity and the mystic is the source of extreme, inexpressible pleasures, not only spiritual but also... physical (ecstasies of St. Teresa of Avila, Clare of Assisi, Catherine of Sienna, Faustyna Kowalska – who were cloister nuns, but also lay mystics, like Julian of Norwich or Emily Dickinson, an American poet called a Hermit of Amherst).

Sexual love is a particularly adequate metaphor for mystical experience for a few reasons. First, sexual act is extremely emotional and very intersubjectively inaccessible. It means one’s sexual sensations are not easily shared or explained with either the partner, or other people as they arise from a very intimate, personal, individual, subjective experience that cannot be expressed verbally in the adequate form fully reflection the meaning. One’s emotions and feelings, sensations (both physical and spiritual, I daresay) are not available to others through verbal language. And, what is more, the sexual sensations felt in the sexual act are highly personal and extreme and different to be communicated both to the lover and to others. Exactly the same can be said about mystical experiences, especially that of already mentioned “fiancé mystique” which are similarly private, individual, intimate, very emotional and deeply pleasurable, both spiritually and physically (ecstasies), each time described by the mystics as ineffable – it means they are so intersubjectively inaccessible that they cannot be fully and truly expressed verbally, maybe not only verbally, but cannot be expressed in any way. They always show intimate relationships, even physical/spiritual union with the Deity and are abundant in physical, erotic, sexual imagery.

Metaphors, especially the ones that are of high importance to humans are “experience-driven”, i.e. basic, primary, bodily experiences. The result of such deeply embodied metaphors is transferred to an abstract level. Those intersubjectively inaccessible experiences – among them religious ones (that

of worshippers', mystics' prophets', ordinary people) are commonly understood metaphorically by means of more intersubjectively accessible frames or models of experience.

Here, it is noteworthy to make an observation that while common metaphors for the Divine-human relationship among worshippers' tend to avoid sexual models (maybe it is a kind of autocensorship?), yet mystical and prophetic texts are rich in sexual metaphors and can also be encountered in charismatic utterances of laymen. Interestingly enough, cloister nuns also used such metaphorical language implicitly referring to sexual erotic sensations, yet as consecrated virgins they were deprived of such an experience in reality.

While reading an ancient religious text we need to be aware of not only linguistic but also cultural differences. Obviously, Ancient Near Eastern models were not the same as Roman-era frames. Modern European or American models also remain different. Other cultures have their own models. For example, social or cultural models of Parenthood (God is Father) never have the same meaning to different populations across ages. Simply speaking, modern models are not modeled on ancient daily experience. That is why, metaphors can be perceived as a certain "living drive or propulsion" as they are constantly changing for the main reason – source domain permanently change in real life along history and across cultures. As a result, ancient texts can be much more easily comprehended by a contemporary reader via metaphoric language.

Here, it should be accentuated that among various kinds of experiences, the sexual/physical/bodily experience belongs to the most primary, basic and probably most common across ages, cultures, sexes, races from times immemorial! So, the sexual sensations are the ones that are universally shared, probably most intersubjectively accessible, however verbally inexpressible! No wonder *Song of Songs* is basically a bodily, sexual description of what is both physical and spiritual.

The abstract and difficult to conceptualize motion of LOVE in *Song of Songs* is conceptualized through the use of *Sacrum* and *profanum* metaphors where both physical (profane) and spiritual (sacred) aspects are interrelated or mutually permeated. Here, erotic love is a basic, core element. There is **no division between soul and body and sexuality is a bodily expression of the Divine Spirit present in a human body**. Love is a sensual (physical) and spiritual interplay of all senses. The intimate atmosphere is created through language expressing subtleness, sensuality, passion, tenderness, desire, enhancement and yearning of the beloved. Physical love (*profanum*?) is ex-

pressed in a very literal and naturalistic way and, but somehow through metaphor is raised to the highest rank of the most important and meaningful mystery of the Divine Love (Sacrum). *Sacrum* and *profanum* spheres are not distinct nor separate nor even separable but they intermingle and create a common/shared sphere of **sacrofanum** (the term particularly adequate here). Both spheres correlate and *Song of Songs* becomes a unified, homogenous, communicatively persuasive text. It expresses the beauty and... holiness of a human body and human love between two people, a sexual act between a woman and a man who love each other reaches a mystical, transcendental dimension. It is not only an individual but a human couple loving each other tied physically and spiritually who were created to “the image and likeness of God Himself”. The very sexual/spiritual act can be compared to the Act of Creation when God created the world and everything was GOOD and God found pleasure in what He created (the motif that “everything is GOOD” is found in the writings of Julian of Norwich). The very process of Creation was pleasing to God himself, not only the final outcome, i.e. creation. The English word “likeness” conotates not only that humans are “like” God (resemble God), but also that God liked what He created, God found pleasure in His Creation, and in the process of Creating.

A human body through the presence of God’s Spirit (the Holy Spirit) acquires the high rank of a temple (*Sacrum*). An unbreakable tie (not division) between spirituality and physicality is expressed via reference to the sensual bodily experience and image.

Czesław Miłosz’s Remarks on “*Song of Songs*”

For the purpose of this publication I decided to use a translation of *Song of Songs* by Czesław Miłosz, a Polish Noble prize winner in literature. First, I wish to share with the reader some of the Miłosz’s own remarks on *Song of Songs*. He says the text has received so many interpretations that it is impossible for the translator to remain objective. According to his overall comprehension of the text the interpreter must select the meaning of particular words and verses. Miłosz claims that *Song of Songs* may be rightly called a symbolic poem and, as such, can be read on a few levels at the same time (sic!) that do not harm one another, just on the contrary, strengthen and enrich one another¹⁶. I dare say, such a view is very near to, or in line with, the cognitive approach! In his opinion *Song of Songs* touches the biggest secret which is an analogy between an erotic relationship between a man and God. Well, it is obvious from the Spanish mystics’ documents (Teresa of Avila, John

¹⁶ Cz. Miłosz, *Księgi biblijne*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2003, p. 385.

of the Cross) that those two loves were interwoven into UNITY. *Song of Songs* reflects human-God UNITY before Greek philosophy. Czesław Miłosz says, despite the *profanum* element we deal here, following Rabbi Akiba, with the most sacred Book of all!¹⁷.

Introduction to the Analysis of the Material

Here, we are faced with the question whether the described changes in *Sacrum, profanum, sacrofanum* are also observed in the language of *Song of Songs*. Is there something like a “religious “ language, in substance different from the ordinary language? Or, do the characters talk about “religious” matters through the use of a lay, profane language, typical for everyday events and experiences? Is there a conflict between colloquial and sacral language? Or, do they naturally overlap and refer to the same human reality of the Divine permeating the common? Or, maybe, it is such a *sacrofanum* language? Can we speak of desecralization of a religious language nowadays, at all, or does the language of embodied experience show the real and true nature of the Divine-human relationship which requires both spiritual and physical aspects? The scope of this article does not allow to answer all the questions settled here but they are a challenging start for my future explorations, I dare say.

As it was stated before, in the cognitive linguistic approach language and cognition are interconnected and cognitive linguistics delivers methods that can be applied for the analysis of texts to see how it is done. There is a range of cognitive linguistic methods, like: conceptual metaphor analysis, cognitive grammar, the mental space blending and Basic Communicative Spaces Network models and other. Cognitive linguistic perspectives on metaphor offer biblical scholars to receive an understanding of language that is firmly grounded in the embodied nature and social-relational contexts of languages, cognition and interpretation. Various methods and a vocabulary for describing and analyzing these dynamic interactions are delivered.

Taking the so far attitudes one can state that this is a mutual interaction: language we speak reveals what we think and how we conceptualize, but also language we speak influences the way we think and conceptualize – it goes in both directions, the language being “an intermediary”, it goes in-between.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 386.

Sample Analysis

So, one can see clearly that metaphors can be approached in numerous ways. I am going to look at *Song of Songs* according to Lakoff and Johnson's cognitive approach to metaphor but the scope of the article does not allow for a thorough analysis, I am selecting one type only, the *Sacrum/profanum* metaphor, the BODY is TEMPLE metaphor and looking upon the bodily lexical items mainly. The metaphoric language of *Songs of Songs* is profoundly rich. For the purpose of this article I am concentrating to show that there is no separate religious (*Sacrum*) language in this sacred text but rather lay, profane (*profanum*) language is used to express the sacred issues. And, on the contrary, the sacral language describing the physical experience converts it into a sacred, holy experience, the sexual act between a man and a woman in love acquires a sacral, mystic dimension.

The metaphors in *Song of Songs* are concentrated around a human body, both male and female, and contain elements directly referring to human body parts. Let us look at the samples of the BODY is TEMPLE metaphor from the text:

The lexical items denoting the *profanum* (?) and the *Sacrum* sphere are highlighted in bold print.

twoje **oczy** za twoją **zastłoną** – your **eyes** behind your **veil**
twoje **policzki** za twoją **zastłoną** – your **cheeks** behind your **veil**
twoja **szyja** jest jak **wieża Dawidowa** zbudowana ku obronie, tysiąc **tarcz** wisi na niej, **wszystka broń wojowników** – your **neck is the tower of David** built as a **fortress**, hung round with a thousand **bucklers**, and each **the shields of a hero**
serce moje **czuwa** – my **heart is awake**
moje **ręce** opłynęły **myrrą** – **myrth** ran off my **hands**
twoja **postać** podobna jest **palmie** – in **statue like the palm tree**
z moich **palców myrra** kapła – **pure myrth** off my **fingers**
głowa jego **szczerozłota** – his **head is golden**
jego **ręce** toczone **ze złota**, wysadzone **kamieniami...** – his **hands are golden, purest gold**
jego **brzuch**, **rzeźba z kości słoniowej**, wykładana **szafirami** – his **belly, a sculpture of ivory** covered with **sapphires**
nogi jego, **słupy marmurowe**, osadzone na **cokołach szczerozłotych** – his **legs are alabaster columns** set in **sockets of pure gold**
twój **pępek**, **czasza okrągła** – your **navel is a bowl well rounded**

*twój **brzuch**, bróg pszenicy obsadzony **liliami** – your **belly** a heap of wheat surrounded with **lilies***

*twoje **oczy**, **stawy w Heshbonie** – your **eyes** the **pools of Heshbon***

*ja jestem **murem**, piersi moje **wieżami** – I am **a wall**, and my **breasts** represent its **towers***

One can clearly see linguistic permeation of *Sacrum* and profanum lexical domains. The names of human body parts belong to the primarily basic sphere of human experience, they accompany people from their childhood. They are simple, straightforward and direct. They constitute a part of common, everyday knowledge that is individually known and shared with others. Across ages, cultures and languages people learn to name their body parts very early in their lives. Yet, by the juxtapositioning the body parts with lexical items belonging to the sphere of *Sacrum*, human body acquires the features of a sacred object, a temple, an altar. BODY is a TEMPLE, and a temple is a sacred place devoted to the celebration of religious ceremonies and cults of the transcendental dimension.

*Zasłona (veil), tarcza (shield), rzeźba (sculpture), słupy (columns), cokoły (sockets), czasza (bowl), wieże (towers) – all those lexical items belong to the *Sacrum* world. Also, *lilie (lilies), stawy (ponds), mirra (myrra)* denote gardens surrounding the temples, or palaces that are made of the rare and most precious material: *szczerozłoty (pure gold), z kości słoniowej (ivory), wykładany szafirami (covered with sapphires), wysadzone kamieniami (covered with stones), ze złota (golden, gold)*.*

The metaphors quoted are concentrated mainly around lexical items directly denoting human body parts (head, fingers, hands, nose, cheeks, posture) and, at the same time, architectonic objects (columns, towers, sculptures), natural world (myrth, gardens, ponds, lilies, palm tree), precious items (ivory, sapphires, gold), inaccessible places (fortress, tower) – known from the familiar environment. Other metaphors, not illustrated here, refer to ordinary people (shepherds) and, at the same time, high-rank people (King, Pharaon) or “initiated” people (guard, watchmen, hero).

The language of *Song of Songs*, undoubtedly a religious text in the Book of Wisdom, contains lexical items from semantic spheres not associated by contemporary readers with religion, at all. On one hand, the perspective of a material, physical human body has neutral value, yet, on the other hand, the metaphor changes its value from neutral to sacral.

Song of Songs is “a mine” of various other metaphors: structured, orientational and ontological. One can also convey an analysis of cognitive gram-

mar structures, mental space blending, Basic Communicative Spaces Network here. The text is a treasury of “hidden meaning” and delivers abundant material for the study by different methods of cognitive linguistics and the interpretations used in other disciplines. The present article meant only to illustrate the *Sacrum/profanum/sacrofanum* spheres with the example of the BODY is TEMPLE metaphor, not even analysed thoroughly because of the limitations of the publication. The author is aware that the very metaphor could have been analysed much more thoroughly and deeply, from many other angles. Therefore, the analysis requires further, more detailed study that the author is planning to continue in the near future, especially that the text of *Song of Songs* can be explored without limits! The text is worthy an interdisciplinary project from various perspectives, including the cognitive approach if we wish to discover the mystery of WISDOM underlying this ancient biblical text edited long ago before Christ, yet, in my opinion, underpinning the Old and New Testament!

Conclusions

1. The language of the BODY is a TEMPLE metaphor in *Song of Songs* reveals the presence of the two spheres: *Sacrum* and *profanum*, however, they are not separate but, rather, we deal here with *sacrofanum*, the two spheres permeating each other – such overlapping surface is obtained through the use of the *Sacrum and profanum* metaphor.

2. *Sacrum* and *profanum*, in general understanding are connected to setting values. The use of the BODY is a TEMPLE metaphor, human body acquires the highest rank. It becomes a sacred object devoted to the Divine.

3. Following this thought, human bodily actions, like a sexual act between a man and a woman in love, can also be seen as sacred and having the transcendental, mystic dimension. Physical love between a man and a woman is a sacred ceremonial act, raised to the transcendental level as the two are enjoying the interplay of their minds and bodies in the Divine Spirit. It brings a very positive image of sexuality, which is quite in agreement with the theology of body as proposed by Karol Wojtyła (John Paul II).

4. It shows deep humanness of the Biblical text, interestingly enough included in the Book of Wisdom edited approximately two centuries before Christ – the Son of God who incarnated Himself into a human body of Mary and came to the world in the shape of a human body under the name of Jesus.

5. *Song of Songs* is an illustration that the Holy Scripture refers to basic, primary human experiences that are not “profane” but have the sacred/sacral value through the presence of the Divine.

6. On the first glimpse, combining the naturalistic, physical bodily sphere with the world of Sanctus may seem provocative and even shocking. But, one should rather see the Bible as a text that refers to experiences of our daily lives. The Bible puts light to the reality in which we are living, can be read in universal terms, across ages and cultures. But, it does not lose the individual dimension. Maybe, the Bible is simpler than we tend to think?

7. *Sacrum* comes from the above and permeates *profanum*, so *profanum* is lifted up to *Sacrum*. There is no dualism of the two. If HUMAN BODY is a SACRED TEMPLE, then physical act of human sexual act of between a man and a woman who love each other is a sacral act on which the Creator unifies with His creation.

8. We do not have to choose between what is literally true and the non-literal. Despite the fact that *Song of Songs* is an Ancient biblical text, it conveys the themes described by real people, the cloister mystics, both male and female, young and old and lay mystics (e.g. Julian of Norwich, Emily Dickinson), and also charismatic speakers while talking about their individual, subjective, spiritual experiences. I dare say, those experiences were equally bodily sensations as the metaphors clearly and straightforwardly describe the physical aspect of the mystic's experience.

Here, one can go back to Czesław Miłosz's remark that our contemporary resources have not been much enlarged, what makes us reflect on the unchangeable through millennia universal laws of human physicality.

Zohar cited by Miłosz states that *Song of Songs* contains all that is, all that has been and all that will be. It is an extremely universal text beyond languages, cultures, ages.

Finally, let me add that a contemporary trend in theology, Christian personalism, and especially, the theology of body initiated by Karol Wojtyła (John Paul II) reveal similar viewpoints. I daresay, *Song of Songs* and other biblical texts invite interdisciplinary, cross-cultural and various, also cognitive explorations in the near future.

9. *Song of Songs*, an Ancient biblical text seems to reveal the Sacred and Profane Ambivalence being discovered in the 21st century! Shall we seek WISDOM rather than pure KNOWLEDGE and REASON?

Bibliography

The Song of Songs Polish quotations for the analysis were taken from:

Miłosz Cz., *Księgi biblijne*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2003.

The English equivalents of the quotations were taken from: The Jerusalem Bible. Popular Edition, Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1974.

- Budzyńska M., „Żebractwo”, „Święte uzależnienie” i „duchowy prysznic” – o przenikaniu się sacrum i profanum w metaforycznym języku dominikanina o. Jana Góry, „Kwartalnik Językoznawczy” 2012, vol. 4 (12).
- Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies, ed. by B. Howe, J. B. Green, De Gruyter, Boston 2014.
- Gibbs R. W., Embodiment and Cognitive Science, Cambridge University Press, New York 2006.
- Goatley A., The Language of Metaphors, Routledge, London – New York 1997.
- Hiraga Masako K., Metaphor and Iconicity. A Cognitive Approach to Analyzing Texts, Palgrave, MacMillan UK, New York 2005.
- Jan Paweł II, Mężczyznę i niewiastą stworzył ich, Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin 2011.
- Duch Święty w naszej codzienności, ed. by K. Guzowski, Gaudium, Lublin 2010.
- Guzowski K., Duch dialogujący. To Dialegomenon Pneuma. Zarys pneumatologii dialogalnej, Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin 2016.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M., Metaphors We Live By, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago–London 1980.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M., Philosophy in the Flesh, Basic Books, New York 1999.
- Lakoff G., Turner M., More than a Cool Reason, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1989.
- Lucy J. A., Language Diversity and Thought, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.
- Sieradzan J., Sacrum i profanum czy sacrofanum? Przemiany w rozumieniu sacrum we współczesnym świecie, [in:] „Lud” 2006, vol. 90.
- The Jewish Study Bible, ed. by M. Brettler, A. Berlin, The Jewish Publication Society, 2015.

Recommended for further reading

- Goatley A., The Language of Metaphors, Routledge, London – New York 1997.
- Hiraga Masako K., Metaphor and Iconicity. A Cognitive Approach to Analyzing Texts, Palgrave, MacMillan UK, New York 2005.
- Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible, ed. by P. Hecke, Leuven University Press 2005.
- Ortony A., Metaphor and Thought, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1993.

Streszczenie

SZIR ha-SZIRIM (pieśń najpiękniejsza). Obrazowanie za pomocą metafory Sacrum i profanum na przykładzie „Pieśni nad pieśniami – analiza kognitywna

Pieśń nad Pieśniami zawarta w starotestamentowej księdze mądrościowej Salomona to namiętny erotyk, prototyp liryki miłosnej, który wyraża odwieczne, fascynujące, zmysłowe doznania i pragnienia człowieka i ...Boga. Tekst doczekał się licznych interpretacji w różnych nurtach, m.in. interpretacja naturalna, kultowo-mityczna, alegoryczna, czy też teologiczna. Celem artykułu jest pokazanie unikatowego, wielosensorycznego obrazowania miłości pomiędzy mężczyzną a kobietą w wymiarze fizyczno-duchowym za pomocą metafory ucieleśnionego doświadczenia Sacrum i profanum i wykazanie, że nie

istnieje dualizm tych dwóch wymiarów, a jedynie wzajemne przenikanie. Autorka dokonuje analizy wybranych metafor i metonimii tekstu w przekładzie Czesława Miłosza z zastosowaniem metody kognitywnej G. Lakoffa i M. Johnsona.

Słowa kluczowe: Pieśń nad pieśniami, metafora i metonimia, Sacrum/profanum, obrazowanie, ucieleśnione doświadczenie

Zusammenfassung

SZIR ha-SZIRIM (Das schönste aller Lieder). Die Veranschaulichung mit Hilfe der Metapher Sacrum und Profanum am Beispiel des Hoheliedes – eine kognitive Analyse

Das im alttestamentarischen Buch der Weisheit Salomos enthaltene Hohelied ist ein leidenschaftliches erotisches Liebesgedicht, das Prototyp der Liebeslyrik, das uralte, faszinierende, sinnliche Empfindungen und Wünsche von Mensch und ... Gott ausdrückt. Der Text hat zahlreiche Interpretationen in unterschiedlichen Strömungen erfahren, u.a. natürliche, kultisch-mythische, allegorische oder auch theologische Interpretation. Der Artikel verfolgt das Ziel, die einzigartige, multisensorische Veranschaulichung der Liebe zwischen Mann und Frau in körperlich-seelischer Dimension mit Hilfe der Metapher einer verkörperten Erfahrung von Sacrum und Profanum aufzuzeigen und zu beweisen, dass es keinen Dualismus dieser zwei Dimensionen gibt, sondern nur gegenseitige Beeinflussung. Die Verfasserin führt eine Analyse ausgewählter Metaphern und Metonymien des Textes in der Übersetzung von Czesław Miłosz unter Verwendung der kognitiven Methode von G. Lakoff und M. Johnson durch.

Schlüsselwörter: Hoheslied, Metapher und Metonymie, Sacrum/Profanum, Veranschaulichung, verkörperte Erfahrung

Informacja o autorze:

RENATA ŁUKIEWICZ-KOSTRO, starszy wykładowca, Centrum Nauczania i Certyfikacji Języków Obcych, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie; adres do korespondencji: Centrum Nauczania i Certyfikacji Języków Obcych UMCS, ul. Radziszewskiego 18, 20-031 Lublin, e-mail: renata.lukiewicz-kostro@poczta.umcs.lublin.pl

