

Anna Hanus
Uniwersytet Rzeszowski
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5850-2511>
e-mail: ahanus@ur.edu.pl

Dorota Kaczmarek
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1469-5865>
e-mail: dorota.kaczmarek@uni.lodz.pl

Nomination and Predication as Profiling Tools in Media Discourse

Nominacja i predykcja jako narzędzia profilowania w dyskursie medialnym

Abstract

The article concerns the phenomenon of *profiling* as a cognitive concept and a research paradigm implemented in German discourse linguistics and used successfully in the linguistic discourse analysis. The contrastive analysis is carried out based on the Polish and German-language research corpus. The analysis aims to reconstruct the profiles of the controversial biographers in the press – Artur Domosławski (author of Kapuściński's biography), and Gerhard Gnauck (author of Reich-Ranicki's biography). In this approach, profiling in the media discourse is understood as a dynamic process, pointing to journalists' competing and mutually combating positions and points of view, embedded in different cultures. Based on the theoretical assumptions and the specificity of the corpus, important questions arise about who profiles whom, what perspective they adopt and what linguistic practices they use. The analysis will examine nominations (referential forms) and predications (predicative forms) in the context of their potential for profiling discourse actors. The selected tools will allow us to reconstruct the culturally specific profiles of both biographers.

Keywords: profiling, nomination, predication, media discourse, actor of media discourse, linguistic discourse analysis

Abstrakt

Artykuł koncentruje się na zjawisku profilowania jako koncepcji poznawczej i paradygmacie badawczym zaimplementowanym z obszaru badań kognitywistycznych do analiz z zakresu germanistycznej lingwistycznej analizy dyskursu. Celem artykułu jest zrekonstruowanie, w oparciu o polsko-niemieckojęzyczny korpus badawczy, profilowanych w prasie sylwetek dwóch kontrowersyjnych biografów – Artura Domosławskiego (autora książki

o Kapuścińskim) i Gerharda Gnaucka (autora książki o Reichu-Ranickim). W tym ujęciu profilowanie rozumiane jest jako dynamiczny proces konstruowania określonego wizerunku postaci poprzez konfrontację konkurencyjnych i często ścierających się ze sobą punktów widzenia dziennikarzy osadzonych w różnych kulturach. W oparciu o teoretyczne założenia i specyfikę korpusu istotne stają się pytania o to, kto profiluje kogo, jaką perspektywę przyjmuje i jakie praktyki językowe przy tym stosuje. W analizach zaprezentowanych w niniejszym tekście wykorzystano badanie nominacji (formy referencyjne) i predykcji (formy predykatywne) w kontekście ich potencjału do profilowania aktorów dyskursu, a co za tym idzie do dyskursywnego profilowania wiedzy. Wybrane narzędzia pozwolą na zrekonstruowanie nacechowanych kulturowo profili obu biografów.

Słowa kluczowe: profilowanie, nominacja, predykcja, dyskurs medialny, aktor dyskursu, lingwistyczna analiza dyskursu

1. Introduction

The concept of *profiling* and the process of *profile* construction are the subject of research in many linguistic strands. Langacker talks about profiling in detail, writing about it in the context of viewing which consists of specificity, focusing, prominence and perspective (Langacker 2008: 55). The researcher describes *profiling* as a process of exposing and distinguishing specific elements from structures that form a certain conceptual base (Langacker 2008: 66–70). The base constitutes the main semantic quantity (Evans 2009: 19; Pędzisz 2012: 243), while a given *profile* is the exposed substructure, and thus a ‘product’ of the profiling process. The meaning of a given displayed element emerges from the relationship between the aforementioned base and the profile that arises in the mental structure.

Below are the points of reference for our further considerations that emerge from the briefly presented assumptions of the cognitive approach to profiling. The study of profiling processes is based on the study of the processes of human cognition and description of the surrounding sector of reality, and thus its perception and conceptualization (Verbytska 2017: 50). The process of relating a profile to a conceptual base concerns, for example, the differentiation of grammatical categories (e.g. expressed in nouns and verbs), thanks to which, however, each given fragment of reality is profiled differently. This profiling of a segment of reality with concepts is important in discourse analysis (see below). The profiling process consists in distinguishing a specific element from a given conceptual database, and assigning a specific meaning/ importance to this element is dynamic. A given element gains importance in comparison/ relation to another, or others, which are removed to the background. The concept base is the necessary background to understand the selected profile. These processes do not occur

outside of language users. On the contrary, they result from their linguistic and extra-linguistic activities. Profiling should be treated as one of the strategies for constructing phenomena, or events, and for recognizing the features of these phenomena or events.

In linguistic discourse analysis, profiling is based on the cognitive paradigm as a kind of operationalization of cognitive assumptions. Generally speaking, it is understood as a process subject to and resulting from the perspectives that change in relation to phenomena, objects, or persons, and are represented by given social communities, and patterns of thinking construed by them in a given space-time that shape these communities and determine their linguistic and extra-linguistic activities (Busse and Teubert 1994). Many researchers have implemented profiling for linguistic discourse analysis using, among others, the concept of frames, the category of discourse topic profiling, categories of nomination or keywords [*Schlüsselwörter*] (see, inter alia, Ziem 2008; Czachur 2011; Gardt 2018; Ziem and Fritsche 2018; Hanus 2019; Pappert and Czachur 2019). Profiling serves as one of the tools of linguistic discourse analysis to reconstruct the clashing views of discourse actors, thus revealing the mechanisms of the so-called *semantic battles* (Germ. *semantische Kämpfe*) and sources of collective knowledge (see, inter alia, Felder 2006: 17; Konerding 2009: 174) as knowledge that is being constantly negotiated between the actors of discourse, and so of a dynamic and changing nature. Warnke speaks of knowledge that is *linguistically determined* (Germ. *aushandelbar*) between the sides of the discourse, and thus assumed to be non-consensual (Warnke 2009: 114).

2. Theoretical framework, goals and methods

Since our object of analysis are processes of profiling in discourse, understood as a space for negotiation by the actors of the discourse (publicists, journalists representing different editorial offices and, therefore, also different political and social views), of sense and meanings (see chapter 3), it will be indispensable to look at the ways the profiling phenomenon in linguistic discourse analysis is operationalized, so as to use the approaches or, possibly, methods proposed in it. Therefore, the authors of this article first of all aim to show who can profile whom, in what way, and with what language practices, using the example of collected empirical material, in different media cultures, and within a given discourse. Secondly, it is about reconstructing, based on a closed corpus, what profiles of controversial figures of discourse are constructed in press texts containing direct references to them, through

which prism does it happen, and what impact this may have on the creation of collective knowledge about specific figures. The article will first briefly present the concept of profiling in linguistic discourse analysis. The basic concepts in the field of German discourse analysis such as discourse, media discourse actors, and the concept of *semantic battles*, key to the assumptions of discursive analysis, will also be specified.

The material basis of the discourse analysis constitutes press articles selected on the basis of the thematic criterion which is extremely important in discourse analyses. The corpus has been narrowed down to print media and online texts published in the Polish and German-language press (from Germany, Austria and Switzerland), which were a reaction to certain discursive events, i.e. the publication of controversial biographies of two prominent figures in the field of culture. In the first case, it was a biography of the well-known Polish reporter, Ryszard Kapuściński, by Artur Domosławski, which, when it appeared in the Polish market, caused a great stir in both the Polish and German-language press. The second discursive event, with a comparable press response in both research areas, was the biography showing the Polish experience of the well-known German literary critic Marcel Reich-Ranicki, prepared by Gerhard Gnauck and published simultaneously in the Polish and German-speaking markets. The texts selected for analysis contain either explicit or indirect references to Gerhard Gnauck and Artur Domosławski. The corpus includes 97 articles on Kapuściński's biography (51 articles from the Polish press and 46 from the German-language press) and 79 articles on Gnauck's book (46 German and 33 Polish). Corpora, as far as the authors know, are all articles that appeared in the media as a reaction to the aforementioned discursive events (the media interest was limited in time). The subjects of the analyses are, in accordance with the principle of creating *tertium comparationis* in comparative studies of media profiling, the authors of the biographies, that is the method of their profiling in the Polish and German-language press.

The discursive tools that are the subject of our research are nomination and predication. Referring to the works of Grinth (1993), Herbig and Sandig (1994), Wodak (2005), Reisigl (2007, 2011), Miller (2014) and Pappert and Czachur (2019), let us consider as nominations all forms of reference, both evaluative and neutral, that is indicating selected, discourse-relevant elements of reality, involving naming and/or identifying specific individuals, elements of reality, or states of affairs. Nominations can be accomplished through various linguistic means. Among the most commonly used are nouns,

pronouns, and nominal phrases, including those with complex structures.¹ Predications, on the other hand, mean certain features assigned to both of the aforementioned biographers by media actors by means of predicates and, more precisely, predicative expressions (cf., among others Hanus 2019; Reisigl 2007).

3. The concept of *profiling* in linguistic discourse analysis

Langacker's concept of profiling, which was adopted by the Lublin School of Ethnolinguistics by Bartmiński (2009), was then used in an original way and operationalized on the ground of German contrastive discourse research by Czachur. The researcher proposed a concept of a dynamic profiling process that fits in with the research area of contrastive discourse analysis, introducing and developing the theory of the *discursive image of the world* (Germ. *diskursives Weltbild*). We perceive *discourse* similarly to Czachur (2011) and, following the theoretical assumptions of Busse and Teubert (1994), as a space for actors to act, demonstrate and stabilize power, create and negotiate meanings in relation to a specific thematic area. Discourse constitutes a space of clashing, and mutual complementation, that is the distinguishing and emphasizing of positions and points of view of certain discourse actors in relation to a specific (controversial) phenomenon, object, or person, while simultaneously pushing aside or even rejecting and excluding the positions of other discourse actors. In this approach, profiling is creating a subjective variant of an image from a specific point of view (Pol. „kreowanie subiektywnego wariantu obrazu [...] z określonego punktu widzenia”, Czachur 2011: 83), and also the evaluation process based on the values adopted by the speakers and their points of view (Pol. „proces wartościowania opart[y] na przyjętych przez mówiących wartościach i ich punkt[ach] widzenia”, Czachur 2011: 84). It should be noted here that this subjectivity does not mean that the profiling process takes place individually, but that it concerns knowledge resources, more or less *collectively agreed upon* (Ger. *geteilt*) between the actors of the discourse.

One should not ignore the fact, which is extremely important in linguistic discourse analysis, that profiling, as this collective process, is carried out

¹ The term *nomination* in linguistic research is often used inconsistently and can be understood in various, sometimes divergent ways. Heinemann wrote about the ambiguities and contradictions in the use of the term *nomination* as far back as in 1997 (cf. Heinemann 1997: 441–442).

in the media and thanks to the media, therefore it is necessary to take into account the aspect of media coverage and the categories co-creating the discourse of media actors (Spitzmüller and Warnke 2011: 172, 183–187). We understand the actor of media discourse after Spitzmüller and Warnke (2011: 172) as the central category that is determined by and determines the dynamics of discourse, i.e. is subject to the rules of discourse and decides which statements, and in what way, shape the discourse. Actors perform certain roles and, at the same time, assign them to other actors of the discourse (Adamzik 2002: 239), but the point is not to have a fixed arrangement of these roles, but their constantly changing constellation conditioned by the course of the discourse. Actors of media discourse can be journalists, publicists, commentators, but also editorial offices or media institutions (also Czachur 2011: 92), who, on the one hand, when addressing a specific topic compete with each other (one can say after Felder (2006): they „fight” with each other) about the superiority and legitimacy of the positions represented and properly justified by them. On the other hand, they influence the stabilization in the public opinion of certain knowledge resources on this subject. Hence, profiling in media discourse is associated with *evaluation*, i.e. the attribution by discourse actors of certain positive, negative, or neutral features to the profiled phenomena or persons. By exposing specific components of knowledge about them, actors always construct the center of discourse with the help of texts (Spieß 2011: 113–114), while other components of this knowledge are for some reason masked or concealed, and thus pushed to the periphery of the discourse.

Considering this perspective of capturing the discourse as well as profiling in the media discourse, there becomes visible the meaning-creating and meaning-carrying role of the media as ideologically characterized institutions co-creating and influencing the opinions and points of view emerging in the public sphere (cf. also Wojtak 2010: 18). The media (or, more precisely, editorial offices, columnists, commentators, etc.) play the role of discourse actors, profiling reality in an appropriate way and evaluating those elements of reality that are the subject of negotiation (Pappert and Roth 2016).

To sum up, *the discursive image of the world* is a discursively profiled – in other words, properly exposed by media actors – interpretation of a given fragment of reality, which influences the existing and constructs new knowledge resources. Warnke talks here about what was mentioned in chapter 1, on dynamic knowledge which is, each time, determined between the sides of the discourse, and linguistically constructed (cf. Warnke 2009: 114). Profiling is understood in discourse analysis as a linguistically realized process, which means that communication, negotiation, and

stabilization of various resources of knowledge by discourse actors takes place through language, i.e., specific linguistic strategies, using specific linguistic tools and means in texts.

4. Nomination and predication – contrastive analysis

The analysis of Artur Domosławski's value nominations which have been obtained from the Polish-language corpus has shown a clear balance in the number of positively and negatively loaded nominations. The positively loaded nominations referred mainly to the competences and personality of the biographer: *mistrz desk researchu* [*desk research master*], *nietuzinkowy dziennikarz* [*a remarkable journalist*], *wielki biograf* [*great biographer*], *znany i utalentowany dziennikarz* [*well-known and talented journalist*], but also often to his relationship with Kapuściński. They have also indicated a continuation of the reporter's thoughts and writing legacy: *duchowy spadkobierca Kapuścińskiego* [*Kapuściński's spiritual heir*], *uczeń Ryszarda* [*Ryszard's student*]. The negatively loaded nominations concerned mainly Domosławski's disloyalty and dishonesty towards the recently deceased master of reportage and the desire to obtain material benefits: *zdrajca*, [*traitor*], *hyena* [*hyena*], *mistrz marketing* [*marketing master*], *bezwzględny prokurator* [*ruthless prosecutor*]. Some of them were even distinguished by their distinct originality, testifying to the creativity of the author of the text: *zdradziecki klon agenta J-23* [*a treacherous clone of agent J-23*], *ojcóbójca* [*patricide*]. It should be noted here that negatively loaded nominations are distinguished by disproportionately greater suggestibility than positive ones, as evidenced by these very blunt and strongly stigmatizing terms used by media actors.

In the German-language discourse, by means of nominations, relations between the student and the master are most often expressed, such as: *Ziehsohn Kapuścińskis* [*Kapuściński's pupil*], *langjähriger Freund Kapuścińskis* [*a longtime friend of Kapuściński*], of positive value in the context of the text. A positive nomination is the term *renommierter Journalist* [*a reputable journalist*]. The low frequency of nominations relating to Domosławski in the German-speaking corpus is not surprising. This controversial biographer of an, admittedly, very highly rated publication in Poland „Gorączka latynoamerykańska” („Latin American Fever”), did not gain a reputation comparable to that enjoyed by Kapuściński. Few of his attributes can therefore be displayed by the journalists of regional newspapers, often published in remote corners of the German-speaking cultural circle.

In the German-language corpus nominations of the kind can also be found here and there: *Nestbeschmutzer* [*fouling his own nest*]. However, this is not Domosławski's profiling, but only German-speaking journalists' references to certain trends and moods in Poland in relation to the biographer himself.

Domosławski's profiling predications, obtained from the Polish-language corpus, expose public opinion views which were reflected in press articles with a variety of pronouncements on the actions that Domosławski decided to take after the death of his master. Positively loaded predications outweigh negatively loaded ones, if minimally. The biographer received praise mostly for his writing style and the amount of work he has done:

- (1) Ma lekkie pióro i choć pisze bez fajerwerków, to potrafi sprawnie przekazać swoją wiedzę [He has a light pen and, although he writes without fireworks, he is able to convey his knowledge efficiently];
- (2) Wykonał ogromną pracę researcherską [He has carried out a thorough research job];
- (3) Bardzo poważnie i rzetelnie podszedł do tematu [He approached the subject very seriously and honestly].

The second thematic thread is the courage of the controversial biographer in his attempts to portray, in his opinion, the real Kapuściński.

- (4) Mógł być przyjacielem autora, lecz na szczęście większą przyjaciółką była mu prawda [He may have been the author's friend, but, fortunately, truth was a more dear friend to him];
- (5) Nie bał się przeniknąć maski, jaką przywidział autor „Cesarza” i chyba mu się udało [He was not afraid to see through the mask the author of „The Emperor” has donned, and I think he succeeded];
- (6) Dąży do pokazania prawdy o autorze „Cesarza” [He aims to show the truth about the author of „The Emperor”].

The third group of media actors expose the biography positively, its author presented his master without coloration, and without paying heed to taboo topics, e.g.,

- (7) Napisał pierwszą polską biografię [He wrote the first Polish biography];
- (8) Wykroczył poza przyjęte w Polsce konwencje biografii [He went beyond the biographical conventions adopted in Poland].

What, according to Polish media actors, is commendable about Domosławski, is his desire and striving to present Kapuściński not as a lifeless statue, but as a man who also had the right to have and did indeed have his weaknesses and flaws. The well-known Polish journalist, Monika Olejnik, says directly that, in her opinion, Domosławski rightfully „deprived” Kapuściński of his monument, because the famous „Emperor of Reportage” did not deserve such a monument; he had been wrongly elevated to the rank of an ideal because he had never been an ideal at all.

Domosławski's negatively loaded predicates refer, similarly to the above-described nominations especially to the issue of betraying his own master and mentor:

- (9) Strąca z piedestału własnego nauczyciela [He's knocking his teacher off his pedestal];
- (10) Próbuje w aksamitnych rękawiczkach ściągnąć z piedestału króla reportażu [With his velvet gloves on, he's trying to pull the king of reportage off his pedestal].

Media actors expose their willingness to build a career on sensations from Kapuściński's life, which are not always true, by the way:

- (11) Ogrzeje się w ciepелku sławy oskarżonego [He will warm himself in the heat of the accused's fame];
- (12) Chciał za wszelką cenę wywołać sensację [He wanted to cause a sensation at all costs].

And accuse Domosławski of violating the reporter's intimate sphere

- (13) Wszedł z butami w prywatne życie reportera [He stuck his nose in the reporter's private life];
- (14) Naruszył godność żyjących w imię sensacji [He has violated the dignity of the living in the name of sensation].

In the German language part of Domosławski's profiling discourse, predicates create a completely different map of his assessments and opinions about him. We will not find any predicates referring to Domosławski directly here, whether positively or negatively loaded, and relatively few predicates referring to him indirectly. Similar observations can be made about his biography profiling.

Relatively numerous in the above-mentioned corpus are predicates that value Domosławski as an expert who discovered the whole truth about the fraudster Kapuściński, but through the prism of the persona of the Polish reporter Kapuściński as, e.g.,

- (15) Kapuściński soll manchmal eine nonchalante Einstellung gegenüber den Fakten gehabt haben [Kapuściński would sometimes have a nonchalant approach to facts];
- (16) Als ‚Legende‘ enthüllte er angebliche Bekanntschaft des Reporters mit Che Guevara oder Patrice Lumumba [His alleged acquaintance with Che Guevara or Patrice Lumumba turned out to be a ‚Legend‘].

In the next part of the empirical research, we will present the methods of profiling the second controversial biographer, Gerhard Gnauck. When analysing the German-language corpus, we notice several tendencies. On the line between the Austrian and Swiss press on the one hand versus the German press on the other, a kind of *demarcation line* can even be found in the way the

author of the biography's features are exposed. If we look at the nominations in the German-language press, then the slightest divergences concern the use of axiologically positive or negative nominations. The majority of media actors express themselves to the point, without additional value attributions, referring to the journalist as a correspondent of the daily newspaper „Die Welt” and a correspondent of „Die Welt” in Poland. In the German press, we will also find nominations that indicate Gnauck's determination in his research work, such as the one profiling him as *fleißiger Arbeiter* [a diligent worker]. These are formulated, in the context of the futile efforts of the researcher who, however, ironically, ultimately found nothing new about Reich-Ranicki. In contrast, in the Austrian and Swiss press, there are nominations emphasizing Gnauck's competences in his area of study: *der promovierte Historiker* [a historian with a doctoral degree], *der gelernte Historiker und Slawist* [historian and Slavist], as well as words of appreciation for his oeuvre, such as, e.g., *der renommierte deutsche Journalist* [the renowned German journalist]. Subsequent predications, formulated in the context of Gnauck's investigations in the Swiss and Austrian press, differ significantly in relation to the German press. Media actors emphasize the fact that the biographer, as a result of a detailed investigation, proved Reich-Ranicki's lies and confirmed his infamous deeds, e.g.,

- (17) ... fand heraus, dass Reich-Ranicki als Hauptmann des Geheimdienstes in der polnischen Botschaft in London versuchte, Spitzel anzuwerben [He found out that Reich-Ranicki, as the Captain of the Secret Service in the Polish embassy in London, tried to recruit informers];
- (18) ... entgegen dessen Behauptungen, in London hauptsächlich Konsulararbeit geleistet zu haben [Contrary to his claims to have done mainly consular work in London].

Journalists also point to the fact that in Reich-Ranicki's autobiography there are fragments that raise doubts, while Gnauck's book sheds a new, different light on his Polish years, e.g.,

- (19) ... zeigt nun, dass Reich-Ranickis Autobiographie definitiv geschönt ist [He now shows that Reich-Ranicki's autobiography is definitely embellished];
- (20) ... stellt diesen Zitaten [den aus der Reich-Ranickis Autobiografie, d. Verf.] – oft unkommentiert [He provides these quotations [the ones from Reich-Ranicki's autobiography] – often without a comment].

Media actors expose Gnauck's extremely tactful approach to Reich-Ranicki, e.g.,

- (21) Dichtung und Wahrheit des Feuilleton-Olympiers sollen bei Gnauck von viel Einfühlungsvermögen getragen werden. [The Olympian columnist's fantasy and truth are backed up by a great deal of Gnauck's empathy];
- (22) ... hat ein einfühlsames und zugleich kritisches Porträt geschrieben [He created an empathetic, but also critical portrait].

German journalists, on the other hand, undermine and belittle the results of Gnauck's investigative work, claiming that he is not really able to prove anything to Reich-Ranicki:

- (23) Beweise liefert Gnauck jedoch keine [However, Gnauck does not provide any evidence];
- (24) Dass er jemandem geschadet hat, kann Gnauck für diese Zeit nicht nachweisen [At this time, Gnauck cannot provide any evidence that he had harmed anyone during that time];

or, that what he has found is nothing new:

- (25) Bestätigt mehr oder weniger die bisher bekannten Behauptungen über das Wirken des polnischen Offiziers Reich [He confirms the more or less previously known claims about the work of the Polish officer Reich];
- (26) Gründliche Nachforschungen bringen noch einige weitere Details ans Licht, aber doch kaum neue Erkenntnisse [Thorough research brings a few more details to light, but little new knowledge].

Many media actors also accuse Gnauck of falsehood, or both:

- (27) Insinuiert immer wieder mal, dass Reich-Ranicki tiefer in die Geheimdienstarbeit verstrickt war, als er zugegeben hat [He repeatedly insinuates that Reich-Ranicki was more deeply involved in the Secret Service than he admitted];
- (28) Gnauck soll unter dem Decknamen ‚Platon‘ Berichte über Kollegen angefertigt haben [Gnauck suggests that he wrote reports on his colleagues under the pseudonym ‚Plato‘].

The Polish press, when profiling the image of Gnauck, reaches for almost analogous nominations, e.g.,

- (29) Korespondent dziennika „Die Welt” w Polsce [Correspondent of the daily „Die Welt” in Poland];
- (30) Czterdziestopięcioletni dzisiaj historyk i politolog, od 1999 roku korespondent „Die Welt” w Polsce i na Ukrainie [The forty-five-year-old historian and political scientist and, since 1999, a correspondent of „Die Welt” in Poland and Ukraine].

Some journalists and authors of articles that appeared in reaction to the publication of the biography, emphasize Gnauck's Polish roots:

- (31) Dziennikarz z rodziny polsko-niemieckiej, od lat mieszkający w Polsce jako korespondent dziennika „Die Welt” [A journalist from a Polish-German family who has lived in Poland for many years as a correspondent for the daily „Die Welt”].

Others, on the contrary, point to the biographer's German lineage:

- (32) Niemiecki historyk, dziennikarz, korespondent „Die Welt” nad Wisłą [A German historian, journalist, correspondent of „Die Welt” on the Vistula River];
- (33) Niemiecki dziennikarz od dziesięciu lat pracujący w Polsce [A German journalist working in Poland for 10 years].

The aim is, probably, to highlight the impartiality of the German biographer in relation to Polish matters. As a great expert on Polish history, he may have the right to make judgments on Reich-Ranicki's Polish years.

The analysis of the predications with which the image of Gnauck is profiled reveals such features as meticulousness and inquisitiveness:

- (34) Drażył temat, docierając do kolejnych dokumentów i świadków [He was exploring the topic, reaching more documents and witnesses];
- (35) Rzetelnie opisuje okres życia Reicha w Polsce [He diligently describes the period of Reich's life in Poland].

Polish journalists, in most cases, support and approve of the actions taken by the biographer, pointing to their importance:

- (36) Stawia wiele ważnych pytań i hipotez [He poses many important questions and hypotheses];
- (37) Stara się – oczywiście w miarę możliwości – wyciągnąć na wierzch prawdę o tamtych wydarzeniach [He tries – as far as possible, of course – to bring to the surface the truth about those events].

However, there are also a few more moderate opinions:

- (38) Jest ostrożny: tylko poszlaki i intuicja mogą sugerować, że tak było [He is cautious: only circumstantial evidence and intuition may suggest that this was the case].

Polish journalists also expose Gnauck's empathetic approach to Reich-Ranicki:

- (39) Autor, choć krytyczny wobec bohatera, nie występuje z pozycji oskarżyciela [The author, though critical of the protagonist, does not act as an accuser];
- (40) Próbuje zrozumieć motyw jego działania i wiernie odtworzyć kontekst, w którym ten się obracał [He tries to understand the motives of his actions and faithfully recreate the context in which he was operating].

The Polish press also highlights the important issue of Gnauck's efforts to honour the Gawins with the Righteous Among the Nations medal. The journalist and historian feels obliged to reward, even posthumously, the saviours of Reich-Ranicki:

- (41) W 2007 roku zgłosił kandydaturę Gawinów do medalu Sprawiedliwy wśród Narodów Świata – nie zrobił tego wcześniej sam ocalony [In 2007, he proposed the Gawin family for the Righteous Among the Nations medal – the survivor had not done it himself];
- (42) Reich wyparł te wspomnienia z pamięci – nigdy nie spotkał się z rodziną Gawinów, dopiero w roku 2006 podpisał petycję o uhonorowanie ich medalem „Sprawiedliwy wśród Narodów Świata”. Kandydaturę tę wysunął Gerhard Gnauck [Reich repressed these memories – he never met the Gawin family, and only in 2006 did he sign a petition for them to be honoured with the medal „Righteous Among the Nations”. The candidacy was put forward by Gerhard Gnauck].

It is necessary to mention also the individual voices:

- (43) Zrobił bardzo dużo, by poszukać na nie [nurtujące go pytania na temat Reich-Ranickiego, uwaga od aut.] odpowiedzi. Ale nie zrobił wszystkiego [He did a lot to search for answers to [bothering him questions about Reich-Ranicki, note ed. by authors]. But he did not do everything that could be done];
- (44) Odsłonił kilka nieznanych – lub mało znanych – kart życia wybitnego literaturoznawcy, lecz wciąż jeszcze pozostają takie, za którymi nie wiadomo co się kryje [He revealed a few unknown – or little known – pages of the life of the outstanding literary scholar, but there are still some which remain hidden],

saying that Gnauck did not do everything he could on that matter.

5. Discussion and conclusions

Summing up the results of the analyses of the two controversial biographers profiling, what comes to the foreground is the fact that in the Polish press, Domosławski's profile is constructed on the basis of the press discussion around the book, while in the German-language press, the image of Domosławski appears in the background, as the one who has revealed the truth about the *mountebank* Kapuściński. In the discourse around Gnauck's biography, profiling is similar; the biographer is shown through the prism of Reich-Ranicki. In the German-language discourse, however, there is a kind of stratification. The German press profiles both – the figure of Reich-Ranicki and the figure of Gnauck, with high precision. In contrast, in the Austrian and Swiss press, Gnauck is profiled, as in the Polish press, mainly through the image of Reich-Ranicki, as the one to whom we owe access to the truth about the literary critic.

Thanks to the indicated examples of nominations and predications, it was possible, in our opinion, to reconstruct the media profile of both Domosławski and Gnauck in individual media cultures. The analysis of Domosławski's profiles created in the Polish press, shows a polarized image of the biographer. On the one hand, he is a careerist who, for the price of fame and material benefits, betrays his own friend; he is unreliable, believes in rumours, and supports the judgements of those who speak to Kapuściński's disadvantage. On the other hand, he is an author who writes in a contemporary style, he is professional, and he is the one who dared to reveal the whole truth about his master. Domosławski's profile in the German-language press is less complex. Here, the author of the biography was recognized as an expert, a person who explored all of Kapuściński's professional and private threads, had comprehensive knowledge about the founder of the Polish school of reportage, and who, in no case, could be wrong.

We discover Gnauck's profile, as constructed by Polish media actors, mainly indirectly through the prism of criticism of Reich-Ranicki. The author of the biography appears in the media as a reliable researcher, consistent in his pursuit of truth, a historian who approached the outstanding figure objectively, as a man with a less glorious history, and an author who presents facts, and less often suggests judgements.

Gnauck is similarly profiled in the Austrian and Swiss press, where he is exposed as an expert who meticulously collected materials and reliably presented the story of Reich-Ranicki against the background of changing Polish-German relations. He is a biographer who does not judge but tries to understand. The situation is different in the German media. Here Gnauck is stigmatized for daring to criticize the outstanding writer, a victim of the Holocaust, who had suffered enough harm from the Germans, as well as for making insinuations and conjectures about the writer.

The ways of profiling both characters have revealed the knowledge that the actors of both media cultures tried to convey. Based on the conducted analyses, it should be concluded that media actors, using appropriate linguistic means and compositional measures, can beyond any doubt, create or even construct an image of reality which is then conveyed to their recipients. In this way, mediatized knowledge resources are created. Consequently, they will influence, either deliberately or unconsciously, the perception of a specific fragment of reality by the recipients.

The use of nominations and predications as tools for linguistic discourse analysis makes it possible to infer, and even reconstruct in a given discourse, the *collective knowledge* of a given community about selected characters, events or phenomena, and also to draw conclusions about the *profiling of controversial discourse characters*, depending on the level of cultural immersion. On this basis, we are also able to draw conclusions about the *power* of the media and of individual groups of media actors representing specific interest in the construction of reality perceived by the recipient and about the diversification of the image of reality depending on the cultural circle.

As a result of the semantic battles, played out in the media, which require from the actors certain linguistic strategies and linguistic means, certain images of reality become *binding*, i.e., they acquire the status of knowledge that has a chance to establish itself in a given area and in a given community. Profiling in discourse (shown here on the example of nomination and predication analysis), used in linguistic discourse analysis, understood as a dynamic process shaped in the course of semantic struggles, works well

as a research tool, and is not limited to purely linguistic analyses. In our opinion, it has a chance to be used more widely in the analysis of trends related to the linguistics of discourse.

Literature

- Adamzik K. (2002): *Interaktionsrollen. Die Textwelt und ihre Akteure*. [In:] *Texte, Diskurse, Interaktionsrollen*. K. Adamzik (ed.). Tübingen, pp. 211–55.
- Bartmiński J. (2009): *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin.
- Busse D., Teubert W. (1994): *Ist Diskurs ein sprachwissenschaftliches Objekt? Zur Methodenfrage der historischen Semantik*. [In:] *Begriffsgeschichte und Diskursgeschichte. Methodenfragen und Forschungsergebnisse der historischen Semantik*. D. Busse, F. Hermanns, W. Teubert (eds). Wiesbaden, pp. 10–28.
- Czachur W. (2011): *Dyskursywny obraz świata. Kilka refleksji*. „tekst i dyskurs – text und dyskurs” 4, pp. 79–97.
- Evans V. (2009): *Leksykon językoznawstwa kognitywnego*. M. Buchta trans. Kraków.
- Felder E. (2006): *Semantische Kämpfe. Macht und Sprache in den Wissenschaften*. Berlin–New York.
- Fleischer W. (1989): *Nomination und unfeste nominative Ketten*. „Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Sprache” 9, pp. 13–27.
- Gardt A. (2018): *Wort und Welt. Konstruktivismus und Realismus in der Sprachtheorie*. [In:] *Wirklichkeit oder Konstruktion? Sprachtheoretische und interdisziplinäre Aspekte einer brisanten Alternative*. E. Felder, A. Gardt (eds). Berlin–Boston, pp. 1–44.
- Girnth H. (1993): *Einstellung und Einstellungsbekundung in der politischen Rede. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung der Rede Philipp Jennings vom 10. November 1988*. Frankfurt am Main et al.
- Hanus A. (2019): *Linguistic structure of memory images in Polish and German language obituaries for Marcel Reich-Ranicki, as a media tool for the profiling of collective memory*. „Humanities and Social Science” 26(2), pp. 27–45.
- Heinemann W. (1997): *Zu Nominationsproblem im Bereich der Verwaltungskommunikation*. [In:] *Nominationsforschung im Deutschen. Festschrift für Wolfgang Fleischer zum 75. Geburtstag*. I. Barz, M. Schröder (eds). Frankfurt am Main u.a., pp. 441–457.
- Herbig A., Sandig B. (1994): *Das kann doch wohl nur ein Witz sein! Argumentieren, Bewerten und Emotionalisieren im Rahmen persuasiver Strategien*. [In:] *Überredung in der Presse. Texte, Strategien, Analysen*. M. Moilanen (ed.). Berlin–New York, pp. 59–98.
- Langacker R. (2008): *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford.
- Miller D. (2014): *Emotionalität und Wertung im Diskurs. Eine kontrastive Analyse deutscher und polnischer Presstexte zum EU-Beitritt Polens*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Pappert S., Czachur W. (2019): *Visueller Populismus: Eine Analyse multimodaler Praktiken anhand von Wahlplakaten aus Deutschland und Polen*. „Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie (OBST)” 95, pp. 103–127.
- Pappert S., Roth K.S. (2016): *Diskursrealisationen in Online-Foren*. „Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik” 65/1, pp. 37–66.
- Pędzisz J. (2012): *Diskursthema und Themen im Diskurs. Zur thematischen Profilierung der diskursiven Wirklichkeit*. „tekst i dyskurs – text und diskurs” 5, pp. 231–247.
- Reisigl M. (2007): *Nationale Rhetorik in Fest- und Gedenkeden. Eine Diskursanalytische Studie zum „österreichischen Millennium“ in den Jahren 1946 und 1996*. Tübingen.
- Reisigl M. (2011): *Analiza retoryki politycznej*. [In:] *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych*. R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (eds), D. Przepiórkowska trans. Warszawa, pp. 151–183.

- Spieß C. (2011): *Diskurshandlungen. Theorie und Methode linguistischer Diskursanalyse am Beispiel der Bioethikdebatte*. Berlin–Boston.
- Spitzmüller J., Warnke I.H. (2011): *Diskurslinguistik. Eine Einführung in Theorien und Methoden der transtextuellen Sprachanalyse*. Berlin–Boston.
- Verbytska A. (2017): *Metaphorical profile of distress in English media discourse*. „Topics in Linguistics“ 18(2), pp. 48–62, <<https://doi.org/10.1515/topling-2017-0010>>, accessed: 23.03.2023.
- Warnke I. (2009): *Die sprachliche Konstituierung von geteiltem Wissen in Diskursen*. [In:] *Wissen durch Sprache. Theorie, Praxis und Erkenntnisinteresse des Forschungsnetzwerks*. E. Felder, M. Müller (eds). Berlin–New York, pp. 113–140.
- Wodak R. (2005): *Sprache und Politik – Sprache in der Politik – Sprache/Sprechen über (Sprache in/und) Politik: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen diskursanalytischer Vorgehensweisen*. „Aptum“ 2, pp.135–153.
- Wojtak M. (2010): *Głosy z teraźniejszości. O języku współczesnej polskiej prasy*. Lublin.
- Ziem A. (2008): *Frames und sprachliches Wissen. Kognitive Aspekte der semantischen Kompetenz*. Berlin–New York.
- Ziem A., Fritsche B. (2018): *Von der Sprache zur (Konstruktion von) Wirklichkeit: Die konstruktivistische Perspektive der Kognitiven Linguistik*. [In:] *Wirklichkeit oder Konstruktion. Sprachtheoretische und interdisziplinäre Aspekte einer brisanten Alternative*. E. Felder, A. Gardt (eds). Berlin, pp. 243–276.