"UNITY IN DIVERSITY". THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF LANGUAGE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

UDC 81'246.3 (4-672EU)   81'373.612.2

Tatjana Đurović

Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade

Abstract. *The paper aims to find out how multilingualism, as one of the major issues on the European agenda, is perceived in the European Union, i.e. what metaphors the EU officials use when they talk about LANGUAGE. The small-scale study is based on press releases and speeches of the EU Commissioner for Multilingualism, as well as on several reports on the issue, which provides a broader institutional backdrop against which the metaphors are set in. On the basis of selected metaphorical expressions, several conceptual mappings, such as LANGUAGE IS A CONSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE IS BUSINESS, LANGUAGE IS A PERSON are identified and discussed regarding their potential pragmatic role in a sense that metaphors are used persuasively to convey certain socio-political evaluations. The aim of this study is to try to identify whether verbal evidence derived from metaphorical expressions may constitute some ideas whose potential implications we are not aware of.*

Key words: *multilingualism, EU discourse, conceptual metaphors*

1. INTRODUCTION

The identification and analysis of linguistic metaphors used to represent the issue of multilingualism and language policy in EU public discourse are central objectives of this paper. We are particularly interested in the ways of arguing for language diversity and equality of official EU languages via language itself which has taken on some characteristics of the promotional language. A key object of that promotion is multilingualism, and the use of metaphors, some of which are highly conventional, is aimed at mobilizing the general public to learn foreign languages thus actively, not declaratively, contributing to strengthening the issue of European identity. The paper is divided into five parts: what follows in this introductory part is a short background regarding the European Union, particularly in the light of unequal representation of languages in the Union. In the second part we will briefly describe the theoretical framework of our small-scale analysis, i.e. the basic tenets of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis. This

is followed by literature review referring to metaphors that have been identified in European public discourse. In the fourth part we will provide examples of metaphors and their metaphorical expressions collected for this purpose and discuss their possible implications. The last part comprises conclusion which summarises our analysis.

The European Union, founded as the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951, has undoubtedly marked a "big bang" in any sense - political, economic, and cultural. It primarily rests on the European member states' resolution to join the project of political unification and economic integration. However, the contemporary European scene seems to be dominated by two rather contestable stances. Apart from undivided enthusiasm of EU officials and policy makers popularly called Euro-zealots or Europhiles, who are trying to spread and implement their vision of the EU as a combination of national and supranational system which is to bring benefits to each and every member state by way of their separate contribution to the EU, there is a growing army of those labelled as Euro-sceptics or Europhobes, who think that integration of the European nations will eventually lead to serious restrictions in the field of their autonomy and overall national self-esteem.

A particularly sensitive issue of defining the European identity pertains to language as the most valuable heritage of each member state. The common official stance has been taken up - languages are the European identity card.[1] Although the single currency serves as the most notable example of economic and monetary integration, languages, not a single language, as well as preservation and enhancement of cultural and linguistic diversity lie, according to the Union's officials, at the core of the European Union, leading to building up the European integration. This means that all languages spoken in the member countries deserve to be heard and represented on an equal footing – "there cannot be double standards, say, between big and small countries or between those with well-known and lesser-known languages" ("Many tongues, one family. Languages in the European Union"[2], 2004: 17). Translated in numbers this means that the EU language chart encompasses "23 official languages; some 60 regional and minority languages; and some 175 migrant languages."[3] In other words, the European identity should be recognizable by multilingualism and two interrelated concepts – unity in diversity.

Still, the situation on the ground is not quite in compliance with proposals and guidelines of EU language policy makers. According to the aforementioned publication issued by the European Commission in 2004 "English is spoken by about one third of EU citizens as their first foreign language, putting it well ahead of German, French and others as the most widely used language of the European Union. German and French are each spoken as a first foreign language by about 10% of the EU population" ("Many tongues, one family. Languages in the European Union", 2004: 5). Even more so, "English is probably the only natural language today, and certainly the only major language, with (far) less native speakers than people who learned it as a second language" (Van Parijs 2003: 9).

---

[1] According to the title of the speech, "Languages – the European Identity Card.", delivered by the European Commissioner for Multilingualism, Leonard Orban, at the Vilnius Book Fair. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/orban/news/docs/speeches/080221_speech_Vilnius/Languages_the_European_Identity_Card_EN.pdf
[2] Retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/publications
[3] See the following link:
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/orban/news/docs/speeches/081205_VUB_speech/Speech_VUB_05_Dec_2008_EN.pdf

Rogerson-Revell also states that "The spread of English is commonly seen as a 'language problem' threatening to engulf and replace indigenous European languages." (2007: 106).

Thus, on the one side there is a noticeable language imbalance with English which will surely remain a *lingua franca* for some time, and the commitment of relevant EU bodies to multilingualism and active promotion of using and learning all EU official languages equally. Fears that proclaimed insistence on equal dispersion of national languages at the supranational level will lead to new Babel seem to be far-fetched and the growing rise of English as a *lingua franca* accompanied by French and German as two most widespread official languages is dominating the very backdrop of linguistic diversity.[4] Therefore, "(…), it is not so clear how far the largely symbolic promotion of diversity at the supranational level is, or can be, consonant with the robustly centripetal pressures of standardization and homogenization at the national level" (Stevenson and Mar-Molinero 2006: 2).

In pursuit of reconciling these two opposing processes and emphasizing the need for increasing language learning, EU language policy makers tend to view particular languages and cultures as trademarks of some EU nation state which in this modern era of globalization are undergoing a process of becoming goods. As is the case of any goods or products - in order to be known worldwide they need to be promoted. Magistro (2007: 53) writes that "identity is among the entities that are frequently commodified in the globalised world", so by inference language/languages as inherently European are being transformed into the most potent commodity of that identity. Therefore, this paper serves to show how EU officials, as conveyors of European discourse, via language i.e. conventional metaphors they use in press releases and speeches try to spread the idea of Europeanization and multilingual learning and teaching, striving to vote for equal diffusion of national languages which shape the common European space. More precisely, we will try to argue that the use of highly conventional metaphors has not only the persuasive function of arguing for the inclusion of many EU languages in EU public discourse, but also a cohesive function of addressing the traditionally shared values regarding the equal importance of any language, no matter the number of its speakers. The traits of promotional genre in selected official documents indicate the intention of language policy makers both to raise awareness of EU citizens regarding language learning and persuade them to show that languages in the EU do not just co-exist but co-operate as well.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As we have already said in the introduction, this small-scale analysis is set in a theoretical framework which takes into account the claims of both Cognitive Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. One of the key issues in Cognitive Linguistics, metaphor, i.e. conceptual metaphor, introduced and elaborated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), is regarded as a set of correspondences or mappings of a source ("donor") domain onto a tar-

---

[4] However, the following sentence taken from Orban's speech at Vrije Universiteit Brussels on 5th December 2008 indicates that EU language policy makers are aware of the potential difficulties of using so many different languages equally. "We have also come to appreciate it [multilingualism] as source of richness in itself. As George Steiner said, Babel **is not a burden**; it is a "**mysterious and immense blessing**." Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/orban/news/docs/speeches/081205_VUB_speech/Speech_VUB_05_Dec_2008_EN.pdf

get ("recipient") domain. In this process, the source domain, which is more concrete and physical, maps its knowledge structure onto a more abstract target domain, so that we talk and reason about the target in terms of the conceptual (and inferential) structure of the source. One of the basic tenets of the cognitive theory of figurativeness is that metaphor plays a pivotal role in our cognition and overall experience, while its role in language is subsidiary. Thus, when contemporary metaphor theorists use the term *metaphor* they refer to *conceptual metaphor*, or rather conceptual mappings as a way of decoding the metaphorical connection that exists between the two domains, the source domain and the target domain. On the other hand, what was previously thought of as a metaphor is designated now as a *metaphorical expression*, to refer to an individual, surface linguistic expression, sanctioned by conceptual mapping. So, metaphor, as a phenomenon, involves both conceptual mappings and individual linguistic expressions. Metaphor is endowed with another important aspect - a highly persuasive power, since it tends to impart strong evaluative meaning and prompt receivers to form different value-judgements. This arises from one of the most significant functions of metaphors – highlighting or foregrounding one aspect of a concept in terms of another, which necessarily leads to hiding or leaving other aspects of the concept in the dark. Hence, by choosing via metaphors what aspects of a concept they will emphasise, text producers more or less consciously reveal their value-judgements, which in turn may expose their ideological stance.

On the other hand, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) "sees language as 'social practice' and considers the context of language use to be crucial" (Wodak 2007: 209). CDA is "primarily interested in and motivated by pressing social issues which it hopes to better understand through discourse analysis" (Van Dijk 1993: 280). A crucial idea in CDA is discourse as the use that people make of language to convey their thoughts and beliefs within a social context. Hence "texts should not be studied as documents which are isolated entities discussing something, but rather as discourse which is part of a network of relations of power and identity – as discourse that is part of ongoing societal struggles" (Retzlaff and Gänzle 2008: 68-69). In this paper, however, we are more interested in the area of CDA which accounts for the cognitive realities involved in language use, i.e. discourse (e.g. Chilton and Ilyin 1993, Chilton and Lakoff 1995). Thus one of the main goals of CDA is *selection* made in constructing texts which in turn causes that "*all* utterances are *potentially* constrained – and, indeed, determined – by the social relations that exist between participants" (Charteris-Black 2004: 30). Metaphors, as one of the discursive means, also become one of the conscious linguistic choices. Opting for one metaphor over another may conceal or reveal a potentially conscious intention which may ask for metaphor interpretation. Lakoff and Johnson also argue that metaphor's "central role [is] in the construction of social and political reality" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 159) which can be related to CDA's primary concern with social problems and the way language reflects "the power to control discourse" (Koller 2003: 57). The corollary is that our social experiences and conceptualizations are organized and perceived in terms of metaphors. Thus, metaphors in this paper are regarded as a discursive means which aids in understanding certain social issues, more specifically the issue of multilingualism and language policy in EU public discourse.

3. Metaphoric Imagery of the European Union

In this section we will give a brief overview of some studies which have dealt with the issue of metaphoric imagery of the European Union. Although they may be divided into two groups, i.e. studies which deal with EU discourse inside the EU, and those relating to EU discourse outside the EU boundaries, a significant conceptual overlapping has been noticed which indicates that the so called Euro-jargon or Euro-speak has given rise to a common metaphor pool prevalent in the cognitive modelling of the EU.

The most comprehensive account of metaphors deployed in the discourse about the EU is provided by Musolff (2000, 2004, 2006) who has researched Western cultural models relating to metaphors encountered in British and German press. He has compiled two corpora, EUROMETA I and EUROMETA II, which cover the period from 1989 – 2001, and analysed metaphorical expressions regarding European politics. On the basis of available data Musolff has identified several source domains, the following four being the main ones to conceptualise the EU – LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY, PATH-MOVEMENT-JOURNEY, LIFE-BODY-HEALTH and BUILDING-HOUSING source domains. The overall conclusion that can be drawn from Musolff's studies is that not only source domains are common to both national samples of texts, but also certain cultural biases, such as "solidarity, male-centeredness, and family-membership as a privilege that conveys rights and duties" (Musolff 2006: 32). What divides these two corpora are different British and German cognitive models which rest on different perceptions of their views on the European integration process and the role of these two countries in it, emphasized by different metaphor scenarios and the argumentative use of metaphors. Thus e.g. marriage problems of the French-German couple, as a conceptualization of the MARRIAGE metaphor, are depicted in the British press in a favourable light dwelling on the idea of a possible breakdown of this partnership, while the German press sees the same issue "as a worrying threat that must be combated and averted" (Musolff 2006: 35). The HOUSE and BUILDING metaphors in the EU discourse whose main role is to help the public reason about different European policy issues also support previous findings. Different conceptualizations of Europe as a (common) HOUSE[5], i.e. positive connotations of BUILDING metaphors in the German press (at least until the beginning of difficulties that Chancellor Kohl's government had in fulfilling the EMU criteria), unlike rather negative ones in the British press such as "*a building without fire-escapes: no escape if it goes wrong, a burning building with no exits*" (Musolff 2000: 225), account for two different attitudes towards the project of the EU – Euro-scepticism versus moderate Euro-enthusiasm, i.e. "contrasts in British and German political culture toward European integration" (Musolff 2006: 35) Similar conclusions may be derived from Musolff's study (2004) which analyses the HEART metaphor. The metaphorical expression "*being at or in the heart of Europe*" goes beyond its geopolitical implication and takes on more significance, becoming a cultural, political or economic privilege and HEART being conceptualized as OBJECT OF VALUE. This dual conceptualisation is present both in the British and German press, when some countries, although they do not closely belong to the central part of Europe, are said to be in the heart of Europe (e.g. former Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland), which reflects their impor-

---

[5] The metaphorical expression "*the House of Europe*" was first introduced by Winston Churchill in a speech in the 1950s, but its later reintroduction as "*our common European house*" by Mikhail Gorbachev, in his speech to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution in 1987, was definitely more influential in terms of its subsequent implications in different contexts.

tance in the geopolitical sense. But while in the German media coverage, the HEART OF EUROPE concept seems to be identified as a German one, the British press foregrounds scenarios of HEART ILLNESS or HEART FAILURE which serve to rationalize their scepticism towards further political and economic integration.

In their study of the Czech conception of the European Union Drulák and Königová (2007) reveal that Czech civil servants conceptualise the EU in terms of three metaphors — CONTAINER, EQUILIBRIUM and MOTION, which is in line with the distinction between national, supranational and functional identities. For example, while the Czech Government officials use the EQUILIBRIUM metaphor, thus identifying themselves as representatives of the nation state, officials from Ministry of Foreign Affairs tend to use the MOTION metaphor, which revels their functional identities, i.e. their perception of the EU which goes beyond the dichotomy of supranational and national identities. Supranational identities which make Czech civil servants feel they belong to a single European whole are consistent with the CONTAINER metaphor. The results have shown that the CONTAINER metaphor is the least significant, while the EQUILIBRIUM metaphor, according to which the EU consists of several containers, i.e. its members, is more significant than the MOTION metaphor for Czech civil servants. However, these results are somewhat contrary to those presented in Drulák (2004). Namely, the analysis of European institutional discourse has revealed that the metaphor THE EU IS MOTION/THE EU IS THE MOVEMENT OF STRANGE OBJECT dominates the discourse. This metaphor is followed by the metaphors of CONTAINER and EQUILIBRIUM, respectively. Apart from simply identifying what metaphors prevail in the EU internal discourse, it is more important what they imply. Thus Drulák thinks that the change of the EU institutions "is likely to be conventional rather than radical going in the direction outlined by the CONTAINER metaphor which prevails over the EQUILIBRIUM." (2004: 23).

PATH and MOVEMENT metaphors are very common in discourses of many European countries. This equally refers to those already belonging to the EU and those in the process of becoming the EU member countries. Zbierska-Sawala (2004) has investigated metaphorical expressions in Polish political discourse concerning the EU and Poland's integration. She has found that Polish political discourse is rife with PATH, UP-DOWN, LINK and PART-WHOLE conceptual domains, which lends support to previous studies that investigated EU public discourse. On the one hand, her findings show that the EU is shaped by mostly established, conventional metaphors shared equally by their creators in the primary discourse and by the media and ordinary citizens. On the other hand, in their adoption by a particular discourse community, metaphors have a tendency to convey meanings characteristic of that community. For example, in Polish public discourse Poland is conceptualised as the "*traveller*" who arrives at the "*doorstep*" with the "*baggage*", i.e. with their historical sensitivity to different kinds of invasion, and who expects that the EU, as the prospective "*host*", should understand this (Zbierska-Sawala 2004: 410).

Sabaté Dalmau (2005) has compared Musolff's corpus, EUROMETA II, which comprises LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY metaphors to the one she has compiled, EUROMETA III, made up of examples of the Catalan public discourse. Her analysis has confirmed that the Catalan press similarly to the British press shares the conceptual metaphor EUROPE IS A MARRIAGE as well as corresponding domains, such as LOVE, KINSHIP, THE RELATIONSHIP, SEPARATION etc. In spite of the noted differences between the two cultures and different ways of conceptualising some EU policy issues, such as e.g. the already mentioned French-German relationship conceptualized in the British press as MARRIAGE and

in the Catalan press as FRIENDSHIP, Sabaté Dalmau has shown that both cultures share deeply entrenched gender divisions, which seem to be the part of the same general model – the Western cultural model.

The studies mentioned so far belong to those which investigate EU metaphoric imagery within the boundaries of EU member states. What follows is a very short account of three studies which deal with the conceptualization of the EU outside the EU. Rasulić (2008) examines key conceptual mappings by which the concept of the EU is structured in Serbia, i.e. in a country that geographically belongs to Europe, but is still not a member of the EU. Apart from identifying some of the previously mentioned metaphors such as THE EU IS A CONTAINER, THE EU IS A PERSON, or THE EU IS A MOVING OBJECT, the study also emphasizes the discursive power of metaphoric and metonymic framing (EUROPE FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION) of institutional discourse within and outside the EU.

Both studies that have investigated media coverage of the EU in two distant geopolitical regions, such as Australasia (Chaban et al 2007) and Canada (Retzlaff and Gänzle 2008), put in the forefront rather negative conceptualizations of the EU and what that may mean for the future relations between the EU and these regions. Chaban's study has corroborated Musolff's findings relating to the HOUSE and BUILDING metaphor. For example, both Australian and New Zealand's press negatively conceptualise the HOUSE metaphor as "*fragile architecture*" whose "*doors*" are only "*half-opened*" for new candidates. Opting for either negative or ambiguous implications of exploited metaphors, media creators in Australia and New Zealand contribute to strong reservations as to future economic relations with the EU in general, and investment in particular EU member states.

Eventually, Retzlaff and Gänzle (2008) have investigated the discursive strategies used to depict the perception of the EU in Canadian print media on the occasion of EU's 50th anniversary in 2007. The analysis hinges on several topics identified by authors in the Canadian newspapers such as "EU's alliance is made of countries that used to wage wars against each other", "EU is anti-American", "EU citizens do not know what it means to be European (national vs. European identity)", etc. Although metaphors are just one of the discursive means used to study the reception of the EU in Canada, what matters is that the issue of the EU is represented through different ideological spectacles of newspapers, which may affect bilateral relations between Canada and the EU and perception of the EU in the eyes of ordinary Canadian citizens. The overall conclusion that may be derived on the basis of these selected studies is that metaphors, *inter alia*, present a very powerful tool of discourse since they are not only socially shaped but they also actively shape the society, thus shedding a particular light on the discourse in question.

4. METAPHORIC CONCEPTUALIZATION OF LANGUAGE IN EU DISCOURSE

The title of our paper contains the motto on which the whole concept of multilingualism in the EU is based - "Unity in diversity". In an official document issued in Brussels on 22nd November 2005 it is stated that "The European Union is founded on 'unity in diversity': diversity of cultures, customs and beliefs - and of languages".[6] The importance of raising language learning awareness in the EU, especially in the light of the most re-

---

[6] Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism, 2005. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/languages/servlets/Doc?id=913.

cent enlargement which encompasses 27 member states and 23 official languages, with potential implications it may have for would-be candidate countries, has intrigued us to find out how EU language policy makers via language they use try to vote for the importance of foreign language learning in diverse member states. More precisely, we have tried to detect metaphors the EU officials use when they talk about LANGUAGE with regard to promoting learning of those languages which do not belong to major ones such as English, German, French or Spanish. As we have already mentioned in the section on theoretical background, metaphors in this paper are set within the framework of traditional Conceptual Metaphor Theory and they reflect Lakoff and Johnson's view that metaphors are ubiquitous when it comes to both our everyday talk and specialized registers and genres. If metaphors are an indispensable part of our conceptual system, then they can reveal how what we say or what we are told affects the way we think or reason about it. A good deal of metaphorical expressions in this presentation belong to a very "common source domain" of metaphors (Kövecses 2002: 15) or "root analogies" (Goatly 1997: 41). We are of the opinion that they have been rather consciously used in the selected texts, particularly press releases, to provide the common experiential ground between the sender and the recipient of the metaphor in order to convey the idea in an easier way. In other words, aiming at getting the message across the EU, to the grassroots, metaphor producers have to transmit their sometimes contestable ideas by way of rather universal language, i.e. highly conventional metaphors. Rendering concrete the complex issue of the EU through metaphors eases communication both top-bottom and bottom-top. Therefore, conceptual metaphors with their main role of decoding the meaning of the abstract target domain via mappings or correspondences with the concrete source domain may facilitate reaching a consensus about rather sensitive social issues. In addition, according to Jacobs (1999) the press release includes "pre-formulation" which serves to "objectify" the content of the release and by doing so make it more authoritative. Hence the metaphors used in these press releases have a constitutive role of this particular form of genre.[7]

The analysis in this paper is conducted on a small data collection of written EU texts, which primarily deal with the issue of language policy in the EU and whose main purpose is to invoke images and notions of EU identity and unity. Our data collection consists of the press releases and speeches of the EU Commissioner for Multilingualism, and several reports on the multilingualism issue in the period of 2005-2008.[8] The representative sample presents the on-line version of EU discourse intended for the general public, thus written in a style which should reach a large audience. This paper offers no precise quantitative data for two reasons: firstly, we operate with a relatively small number of texts (80) which prevents us from giving any substantial statistical data, and secondly, we are more interested in the exemplification of the abstract concept of LANGUAGE as such and its contextual usage than in a statistical analysis of calculating e.g. frequency ratio of some metaphorical expressions. Our main focus is on the qualitative analysis of metaphors relating to LANGUAGE within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics and CDA.

---

[7] Is the press release a genre or not, see Lassen (2006).
[8] The examples have been collected from the official site of the EU, http://europa.eu/, as well as the following links: http://europa.eu/languages/; http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/; http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/orban/keydoc/keydoc_en.htm; http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/orban/news/news_en.htm.

Therefore, our collection of texts provides us with a broader institutional backdrop against which the metaphors are set in and open to particular interpretations.

The main metaphoric conceptualizations of LANGUAGE we will deal with are the following: LANGUAGE IS A CONSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE IS BUSINESS and LANGUAGE IS A PERSON.[9]

4.1. Language is a construction

The largest number of metaphorical expressions belong to the LANGUAGE IS A CONSTRUCTION metaphor. Let us provide some examples:

1. What can we do so that our citizens can take advantage of the European space we have created? What can we do to make languages *a bridge and not a barrier* in our immediate environment?

2. Languages are the *open doors* through which the institutions and the citizens can keep in touch.

3. First, the equality of all official languages is and has to remain *a building block of the European construction*.

4. For me, this [multilingualism] is the *foundation stone* on which we base an inclusive Europe.

5. We must help unveil the potential of languages in our communities – we must let down *the drawbridge*, turn the *barrier* into a *bridge*.

6. *To build* a multilingualism policy that reflects the reality of an EU with 450 million citizens, 23 official languages and over 60 different mother tongues, we need to know their needs.

All the metaphorical expressions above that belong to CONSTRUCTION or BUILDING metaphor are intended to mobilize the EU nations to learn more languages apart from English (considered *de facto lingua franca)* and German or French (two most widespread official languages), as well as to foster the ties between diverse European nations by urging them to learn the so called *personal adoptive language,* which, as it has been stated in one of the documents, "would in no way be a second foreign language but, rather, a sort of second mother tongue".[10] The CONSTRUCTION or BUILDING metaphor is very rife in the literature on conceptual metaphors. Some of these examples in which the concept of BUILDING is the source domain are: ARGUMENTS/THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS, A COMPANY IS A BUILDING, CAREERS ARE BUILDINGS, etc.[11] According to Charteris-Black "Metaphors from this source domain carry a strong positive connotation because they express aspiration towards desired social goal" (2004: 70). The EU supranational drive for language learning is for sure a highly desirable social issue, thus the prevalent use of the CONSTRUCTION metaphor should have a double function – LANGUAGE as a *bridge* should be a connection not only among people in different

---

[9] There are also some other metaphors in collected texts coupled with their metaphorical expressions, such as LANGUAGE IS A TOOL/OBJECT (e.g. Secondly, multilingualism is the *tool* for creating bridges between people rather than seeing division.), LANGUAGE IS A TANGIBLE MATTER (e.g. Languages are the *substance* this *fabric is woven from*.), LANGUAGE IS A JOURNEY/MOTION (e.g. Multilingualism …will make the *journey* easier for those who will follow and will help them to avoid pitfalls and *sidetracks*.), etc. Since their appearance in texts lags far behind the CONSTRUCTION, BUSINESS and PERSON metaphors, they will not be analysed in this paper.

[10] "A Rewarding Challenge. How The Multiplicity Of Languages Could Strengthen Europe". Brussels, 2008. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/maalouf/report_en.pdf

[11] See Kövecses (2002: 108-109).

and diverse nation states, but also a connection between nation states and EU institutions that will cater for all the needs of the member states. This is exemplified by the metaphorical expression *open doors* in example 2, which means providing mutually beneficial opportunities and having access to them. Examples 3 and 4 (though example 3 talks about the equality of all official languages, not primarily about the process of language learning), conceptualise LANGUAGE as a *building block* or *foundation stone* of the European *construction*. The implications of these two examples are manifold. One line of reasoning is that the EU as a *construction* has not been finished yet. If LANGUAGE i.e. learning languages is one of the main building materials of that CONSTRUCTION, then completing the EU *construction* as well as alerting people in the EU to learn more languages is analogous to the process of building, which is time-consuming, needs a lot of work and considerable sacrifices. Furthermore, if national languages are perceived as *building blocks* or *foundation stones* of the European *building*, the implications are that they contribute to the strength and durability of the European foundation, so the metaphors employed are instrumental in rationalization of the whole idea of multilingualism. Following Kövecses (2002: 111), if we regard LANGUAGE as a COMPLEX SYSTEM then the central mappings of the conceptual metaphor COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS are CREATION/CONSTRUCTION OF AN ABSTRACT SYSTEM IS (THE PROCESS OF) BUILDING, ABSTRACT STRUCTURE OF A COMPLEX SYSTEM IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE, and ABSTRACT STABILITY/LASTINGNESS IS PHYSICAL STRENGTH OF THE STRUCTURE TO STAND. In addition, if LANGUAGE is a *building block* then all nations of the EU are *architects* and *builders* no matter how diverse they are in terms of different nationalities, cultures, religion. They are united together with a common worthwhile social goal – the process of *building* the common European *construction* (*house*), which correlates to the worthwhile goal of recognizing and reaffirming the need for learning languages of the member states. Thus the EU nations are united by the common perception of striving for the desired objective – the heightened awareness of the necessity for wider and more diverse foreign language representation. If we incorporate our additional knowledge about BUILDING, as a CONSTRUCTION which should stand in an upright position, no matter whether it is completely finished or not, then another underlying metaphorical schema is at work here - GOOD IS UP. If CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING IS UP (because of our general knowledge of buildings) and if LANGUAGE (LEARNING) IS A CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING (exemplified by metaphorical expressions such as *bridge, drawbridge, doors, building block, foundation stone*), it follows that LANGUAGE LEARNING IS UP, since it is positively evaluated. Therefore, LANGUAGE IS A CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING via GOOD IS UP.

Let us look at some examples below which also belong to LANGUAGE IS A CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING metaphor.

7. Languages are not *obstacles*, but opportunities; they are not *barriers*, but bridges.

8. Languages should not be a *barrier to divide* us *from* each other, but a bridge towards each other.

9. We must help unveil the potential of languages in our communities – we must *let down the drawbridge*, turn the *barrier* into a bridge.

10. Surveys show that lack of adequate language skills is the main *obstacle* which *holds* citizens *back* from planning a career abroad. It *stands in the way* of workers and their families alike.

Although the prevalent metaphorical expression in these sample sentences is *barrier*, it is used not to introduce negative evaluation of the idea of multilingualism, but to make it more prominent. The physical barrier is a tangible object which stands in the way of progressing further in space in order to reach the desired point or destination. Thus metaphorical *barrier*, i.e. inability to perceive how important language learning is in terms of bridging the differences between people and reaping multiple benefits, and its repetitive use in the same context, where positively valued metaphorical expressions are used (*bridge*, in particular), is aimed at calling for active participation in the sense of breaking down barriers. An interesting example is sentence 9 which contains the following expression, "… we must *let down the drawbridge*…", where *drawbridge* may be both negatively and positively valued. Drawbridge is a convertible construction which when pulled up should let people (or, vessels) pass but also prevent them from entering a construction (i.e. a building). Thus, metaphorical *drawbridge* again invokes the image of the separate EU member states whose people should gather around the common goal – *letting down the drawbridge* - that is, learning languages of EU member states and removing all the *barriers*, i.e. misconceptions and fears that people have of sharing the multilingual environment. According to Charteris-Black "…'barrier' is the only sort of structure that is not positively evaluated … and therefore should be forcibly removed. If the action of building the house or a bridge is the prototype of a worthwhile activity the destruction of a barrier is also a worthwhile activity" (2004: 98). What follows is that both the BRIDGE and BARRIER sub-metaphors belong to a wider A WORTHWHILE ACTIVITY IS A CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING metaphor.

4.2. Language is business

The prevalent use of the CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING metaphor should highlight only the positive mappings, i.e. striving for reaching a vital social goal which implies overcoming possible misunderstanding due to inadequate knowledge of foreign languages that shape the European identity. However, what this metaphor hides are various costs entailed in building, in terms of material, people, time. In order to suppress possible negative connotations, the EU officials for language matters use the LANGUAGE IS BUSINESS metaphor to highlight the economic aspect of the policy which needs to be implemented. So, the negatively valued implications of the CONSTRUCTION/BUILDING metaphor are bypassed by introducing and emphasizing positive connotations of the LANGUAGE IS BUSINESS metaphor.

11. *"*Far from being *an unwelcome cost* to doing business", European Commissioner for Multilingualism, Leonard Orban, said*,* "investing in language skills can dramatically improve a company's business opportunities."

12. To this end, we recently staged in Brussels a conference entitled "*Languages mean business*" on the subject of languages as *a competitive asset* for Europe.

13. The aim of the Forum will be to identify how companies can make operational use of *language management* when seeking to maximise their economic performance.

14. 'What is the best language to do business in?' is 'My *customer's language'*.

15. Languages are not *interchangeable*, none is *dispensable*, none is *superfluous*.

16. One economist judiciously remarked that a man speaking only one international language could always buy what he wanted anywhere in the world; but if that man

wanted to sell rather than buy then it would be better for him to know the language of the prospective purchaser.

17. We need to go further, and tap into *the language resources* that exist, but are often hidden, in a multicultural workforce.

18. But we can see from this brief survey that Europe can gain considerably from maximising its *languages added-value*.

19. We discussed how languages are *a competitive strength for Europe* and how businesses, individuals and education systems could build up and benefit from this strength.

The use of the BUSINESS metaphor is aimed at another target group within the EU – the wide business community. Therefore, metaphors used to indicate the necessity of speaking some other language besides English characterize the rhetoric of treating LANGUAGE itself as a *resource*. For example, the EU officials speak about *the language resources, language management, languages added-value, competitive asset* etc. In other words, corporate discourse permeates EU institutional discourse and language becomes one of public goods. Magistro also emphasizes that "governments are currently appropriating approaches that are largely used by corporations" and she cites Cameron's words that nations are now usually discussed in a way similar to marketing consumer goods (2007: 52). Since the EU Commissioner for Multilingualism never fails to point out that the European identity rests on the idea of diversity of, *inter alia*, languages, national languages have thus become brands which need to be advertised and sold. Selling of goods leads to increase in company profits, so "selling" of languages as branded goods is meant to contribute to the EU's "profit", i.e. strengthening of European identity and inner integration. Equating LANGUAGE with the concept of RESOURCE underlines again a high value of language learning as a social goal. If LANGUAGE is a RESOURCE, then we can use it (similar to a literal resource) to increase not only our wealth in terms of our knowledge, but also our material wealth in terms of what that knowledge can bring. Resources can heap up, so opportunities of multilingualism may be increasingly augmented. The BUSINESS metaphor by using only the positive connotations conforms to the basic characteristic of metaphor, i.e. by choosing what to represent via language, metaphor creators consciously or unconsciously hide other possible correspondences. In pursuit of emphasizing positive evaluations of LANGUAGE (learning) as BUSINESS, authors keep other legitimate connotations hidden, like the fact that some resources are scarce, that some are non-renewable or may be depleted. All these connotations have been removed from the BUSINESS metaphor since they may bring unfavourable valuation to those languages whose number of speakers is scant in comparison to English, French, German or Spanish. Hence foregrounding only the positive correlations with LANGUAGE as a RESOURCE, metaphor producers trade on creating the desire to learn diverse languages. Promotional language of the press releases and the use of traditional metaphors buttress the ideas of arousing interest in some foreign language, creating desire for learning it and calling for an active process of learning. In the world of global business, knowledge of foreign languages has become a must, thus metaphors used in these press releases and reports serve as cohesive instruments of imparting positive social values perceived as such by their producers.

4.3. Language is a person

The LANGUAGE IS A PERSON metaphor is a prime example of the notion of embodiment of metaphors. The human body is, as Kövecses says "an ideal source domain" (2002: 16), since we think we understand metaphorical meaning best if we have an access to something we know very well. The LANGUAGE IS A PERSON metaphor may be illustrated by the following examples:

20. "Multilingualism is in *the genetic code* of the Union".
21. This will benefit our communication with citizens and stakeholders, but will also benefit our languages, helping to keep them in *good shape* and avoiding our in-house usage becoming a mumbo jumbo, a jargon accessible only to the initiated. Our languages are a rich heritage and we are proud of this contribution to their *healthy* development.
22. There is a Czech saying which says "You live a new life for every new language you speak. If you know only one language, you only live once."
23. With the Commission under President Barroso, multilingualism *has come of age*.
24. …indeed these languages could thus stem their decline and begin *a vigorous new lease of life*.
25. The latter need to feel that their languages, their literature, their cultures are known and appreciated by the societies in which they live, and we feel that the approach based on the "personal adoptive language" could help to dispel this *malaise*.

The selected metaphorical expressions not only use a PERSON (or, organism) as the source domain, but also "humanify" language by ascribing to it qualities usually associated with humans. The significance of the whole idea of multilingualism becomes particularly profound by the metaphorical expression *genetic code* which originally introduces the idea of the PERSON as a complete and unique system (of information which makes up any human being), besides the conventional images of using the various parts of the HUMAN BODY as source domain. Recalling another conventional metaphor which practically stems from our previous sentence, that of THE STATE IS A PERSON, and by conceptualizing the EU as one state, composed of many diverse states, LANGUAGE, which stands for all national languages of the EU and is conceptualized as a *genetic code*, becomes the common denominator which brings unity and is passed from generation to generation. Therefore, the emphasis on the need for inclusion of other EU languages, besides those that currently dominate the EU communication, and on spreading the idea of multilingualism across the EU, will lead to national languages being in *good shape*, *healthy* and having *a vigorous new lease of life*. Furthermore, all the activities undertaken so far as well as future endeavours in this regard are viewed as the prevention of *malaise* of languages and their becoming *unhealthy*. "Behind this conception of language is the idea that language has an autonomous life of its own, that it can influence us, or even more, possess us and think through us. As a consequence, language can have the same qualities as human beings" (Goatly 1997: 76-77). We may also reason that if LANGUAGE (or, learning of languages) IS HEALTHY, and if BEING HEALTHY IS UP, then similarly to the CONSTRUCTION metaphor, analysed before, there is again the underlying UP image schema, which forms the basis of the host of these examples referring to multilingualism in the EU, and contributes to overall positive evaluation of this project via metaphors used. Example 22 above, which contains traits of emotive language in the form of proverbial expression, conveys truth which should contribute to the universal appeal of the whole metaphor.

5. CONCLUSION

To sum up, this paper may be regarded as additional evidence which shows that our cognitive system is determined by conventional metaphors, some of which are deeply embodied. The universal concept such as LANGUAGE produces mainly universal metaphors and the plea for increasing learning and use of diverse national languages of the EU should be articulated in a straightforward manner. However, as we have seen, the same abstract concept, LANGUAGE, can be metaphorically conceptualized in different ways, which in turn raises the issue of covert implications by making the guided choices of metaphorical mappings. Foregrounding only the positive evaluations of all the metaphors used should provide the pool of values around which all the EU nations may gather. These findings may be extremely promising not only to present member states but also to those yet to join the EU, since they are frequently united by fear of losing their national identities.

REFERENCES

1. Chaban, N. et al. (2007), "Under Construction: Images of the Enlarging EU in the Australasian News Media". *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1(2): pp. 79-95.
2. Charteris-Black, J. (2004), *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke and New York.
3. Chilton, P. and M. Ilyin (1993), "Metaphor in Political Discourse: The Case of the 'Common European House'", *Discourse and Society* 4 (1): pp. 7-31.
4. Chilton, P. and G. Lakoff (1995), "Foreign policy by metaphor". In: Schäffner, C. and A. I. Wenden (eds.) *Language and Peace,* Ashgate, Aldershot: pp. 37-60.
5. Drulák, P. (2004), "Metaphors Europe Lives By: Language and Institutional Change of the European Union". EUI Working Paper SPS No. 2004/15, European University Institute, Florence.
6. Drulák, P. and L. Königová (2007), "Figuring Out Europe: EU Metaphors in the Minds of Czech Civil Servants". *Perspectives. Central European Review of International Affairs* 28: pp. 5-23.
7. Goatly, A. (1997), *The Language of Metaphors*, Routledge, London and New York.
8. Jacobs, G. (1999), Preformulating the News. An Analysis of the Metapragmatics of Press Releases, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
9. Koller, V. (2003), Metaphor Clusters in Business Media Discourse: A Social Cognition Approach. PhD thesis. University of Vienna, Vienna.
10. Kövecses, Z. (2002), *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
11. Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980), *Metaphors We Live by*. University of Chicago, Chicago.
12. Lassen, I. (2006), "Is the Press Release a Genre? A Study of Form and Content". *Discourse Studies* 8 (4): pp. 503-530.
13. Magistro, E. (2007), "Promoting the European Identity: *Politeness* Strategies in the Discourse of the European Union". *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1(1): pp. 51-73.
14. Musolff, A. (2000), "Political Imagery of Europe: A *House* Without *Exit Doors*?" *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21(3): pp. 216-229.
15. Musolff, A. (2004), "The Heart of the European Body Politic. British and German Perspectives on Europe's Central Organ". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 25 (5&6): pp. 437-452.
16. Musolff, A. (2006), "Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse". *Metaphor and Symbol* 21(1): pp. 23–38.
17. Phillipson, R. (2003), English-only Europe? Challenging Language Policy. Routledge, London.
18. Rasulić, K. (2008), "On the Conceptualisation of the European Union Across EU Boundaries". *ELLSSAC Proceedings*, Vol. 1, Čigoja štampa, Belgrade: pp. 315-329.
19. Rogerson-Revell, P. (2007), "Using English for International Business: A European Case Study". *English for Specific Purposes* 26: pp. 103–120.
20. Sabaté Dalmau, M. (2005), "*The Iron Lady* versus *La Dama de Ferro:* Western Male-centred Metaphors about Europe in the British and the Catalan Public Discourse". Retrieved from: http://www.dur.ac.uk/andreas.musolff/eurofamily.pdf

21. Stevenson, P. and C. Mar-Molinero (2006), "Language, the National and the Transnational in Contemporary Europe". In: Mar-Molinero, C. and P. Stevenson (eds.) *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices. Languages and the Future of Europe*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
22. Van Dijk, T. (1993), "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse and Society* 4 (2): pp. 249-283.
23. Van Parijs, P. (2003), "Europe's Three Language Problems". In: Bellamy, R. et al. (eds.) *Multilingualism in Language Politics*, Hart, Oxford. Retrieved from: http://www4.soc.unitn.it:8080/poloeuropeo/content/e64/e385/e398/vanparijs.europethreelanguageproblems_ita.pdf
24. Wodak, R. (2007), "Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis. A Cross-disciplinary Inquiry". *Pragmatics and Cognition* 15 (1): pp. 203-225.
25. Zbierska-Sawala, A. (2004), "The Conceptualisation of the European Union in Polish Public Discourse, 2002-2003". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 25 (5&6): pp. 408-423.

"JEDINSTVO U RAZLIČITOSTI".
KONCEPTUALIZACIJA JEZIKA U EVROPSKOJ UNIJI

Tatjana Đurović

U radu se, kroz analizu metafora koje evropski zvaničnici koriste kada govore o pojmu JEZIKA, obrađuje višejezičnost, kao jedno od glavnih pitanja u Evropskoj Uniji. Korpus primera na kojima se rad zasniva čine saopštenja za štampu, izveštaji i govori Evropskog Komesara za multilingvizam, što predstavlja širi institucionalni okvir unutar kojeg su smeštene metafore. Na osnovu izdvojenih metaforičkih izraza, analizira se nekoliko pojmovnih mapiranja, poput JEZIK JE GRAĐEVINA, JEZIK JE POSLOVANJE i JEZIK JE OSOBA, u pogledu njihove potencijalne pragmatičke uloge, tj. ubeđivačke funkcije metafora kako bi se izrazili određeni društveno-politički vrednosni sudovi. Cilj ovog rada je da pokuša da ustanovi da li metaforički izrazi kao jezički izrazi pojmovnih metafora mogu obrazovati određene ideje čijih potencijalnih implikacija nismo svesni.

Ključne reči*: višejezičnost, diskurs Evropske Unije, pojmovne metafore*