

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30049898>

Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse

Article in *Metaphor and Symbol* · January 2006

DOI: 10.1207/s15327868ms2101_2

CITATIONS

336

READS

3,490

1 author:



Andreas Musolff

University of East Anglia

163 PUBLICATIONS 2,538 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Project

Pragmatics of Quotation [View project](#)



Project

Pandemic and Crisis Discourse: Communicating COVID-19 and Public Health Strategy [View project](#)

Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse

Andreas Musolff

*School of Modern Languages and Cultures
Durham University*

This article investigates structural aspects of source domains in metaphorical mappings with regard to their manifestation in public discourse data. Specifically, it analyses the organization of source concepts into mininarratives or “scenarios” that dominate the discourse manifestations of source domains. The material consists of examples from a bilingual corpus of British and German public debates about the “European Union.” The data show that while the two national samples share some basic mappings between the source and target domains, they each are characterised further by specific scenarios that provide focal points for conceptualizing the target topic. The scenarios can also be shown to carry evaluative and attitudinal biases that are related to particular political dispositions and preferences of the respective national discourse communities. In conclusion, it will be argued that the analysis of scenarios is a necessary complement to the study of source domains and of domain-mappings in metaphorical language use.

(1) Is the “*Franco–German couple*” really the “heart of the European Union”, as [Chirac] said during the [election] campaign, or are Britain’s Conservatives right to imagine they have found a *fellow-sceptic to flirt with?* (*The Guardian*, 18 May 1995; italics here and in following examples by AM)

(2) [...] every time, over the past decade, that a new president or prime minister has taken over in France, he briefly [...] *flirts* with the Euro-sceptical British, only to *fall back in relief on the old liaison* with Germany. (*The Economist*, 5 December 1998)

(3) Seit [...] ihrem EU-Treff in Stockholm, scheint die *vertrackte Partnerschaft* zwischen Chirac, Jospin und Schröder nun doch zu retten. [...] Vorerst schwört der Kanzler nur *Treue: Keine Seitensprünge mehr mit Tony!* (*Die Zeit*, 29 March 2001)

[Since the EU meeting in Stockholm the *troublesome partnership*, Chirac—Jospin—Schroder, looks as if it might be saved after all. For the moment, the Chancellor only promises *marital fidelity: no more dalliance with Tony.*]

(4) An adviser to Chirac says *the Franco–German marriage* remains fundamental to French European policy; many Germans agree. So long as they stick to *the marriage metaphor*; this makes Tony Blair either *lover or mistress*. That’s a good reason for abandoning the metaphor, *not the threesome*. (*The Guardian*, 19 February 2004)

These quoted passages are part of a bilingual corpus of metaphorical texts from the British and German press, which have the politics of the European Union (EU) as their topic. Conceptually, they can all be related to a broad, common source domain, that is, that of *LOVE–MARRIAGE–FAMILY*—but what is the nature of this relationship? Are all the parts of a conceptual domain equally important and equally represented in discourse? Or do certain domain elements enjoy special prominence? Does a domain, as represented in discourse, consist of quasi-“atomic” conceptual elements or do they combine with each other and perhaps form conceptual clusters? What are the structural characteristics of such clusters? These questions are at the center of the following analysis, which proposes to foreground the cognitive role a specific subdomain category, that is, that of “scenario,” in the analysis of metaphorical language use.

In classical versions of cognitive theory (Croft, 2003; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Langacker, 1987; Taylor, 1995), metaphoric texts instantiate specific “extensions” of more basic “mappings” between source and target domains. The basic mapping in the previously quoted text passages could, for instance, be expressed by the proposition *COOPERATION BETWEEN STATES IN MARRIAGE*, which presupposes a whole hierarchy of more general mappings (e.g., at a superordinate level, *A NATION STATE IS A PERSON* and the knowledge that leaders of states can metonymically represent their countries (hence the exchangeability of politicians’ proper names and names of states in the examples). The quoted examples also share a specific conceptual constellation, that is, that of a *ménage à trois* between three member states: Britain, France, and Germany. The latter two are seen as a *married couple* and Britain is seen as the outside participant that *disturbs their marriage*. In example (1) it is the British conservatives—then in government—who allegedly look for an opportunity to *flirt* with the French *partner* of the *Franco–German couple*. In (2) the French president is depicted as the active (but unreliable) party of such a *dalliance*, while in (3) it is the German chancellor who is seen as the culprit that has to renew (and keep) his *marriage oath*. In the last passage, written by the historian and political scientist T. G. Ash, a *threesome* is endorsed in practice, but in his additional metadiscursive comment Ash highlights a problematic implication of viewing France and Germany as the established *couple*, that is, that it condemns Britain to being the *lover or mistress*.

While the categorization of conceptual specifications, such as the *ménage à trois* constellation, as “extensions” of general mappings that underlie a whole domain may be unproblematic from the point of view of theoretical coherence, it raises important questions for the analysis of discourse data, that is, metaphors in (documented) use. Are all conceivable aspects of a source domain to be thought of as being implicit in all uses or only a specific subset? If the latter is the case, how can its scope be delimited? How rich is the ontological structure of the subset of source concepts? Can one domain include contrastive conceptualizations? Lakoff (1996, 2004) distinguishes, for instance, two opposing systems of extensions of the *FAMILY* metaphor in conceptualizations of the nation in U.S. politics. The basic mapping, *A NATION IS A FAMILY*, provides a frame of reference, which, in Lakoff’s words, “allows us to reason about the nation on the basis of what we know about a family” (1996, pp. 154–155). However, political thought and discourse in the United States, he finds, are in fact dominated by two competing versions of this general mapping, that is, the *STRICT FATHER* and a *NUTURANT PARENT* “models,” which “induce” two corresponding moral belief systems and thus underpin conservative and liberal worldviews (1996, pp. 37, 155; 2004, pp. 7–12, 20–22). Lakoff stresses that people often operate combinations and subvariants of the two basic models but he maintains that the two models are at the center of all such conceptual variations (1996, pp. 14–16, 283–321).

Lakoff thus seems to allow for the *FAMILY* “source domain” to accommodate two diametrically opposed versions of its basic concept, that is, the *PARENT(S)–CHILD(REN)* relationship. This effectively leads to a subdifferentiation of the category of “domains,” which calls for further explication, as the *domain* category is of fundamental importance for cognitive theory. Its “conceptual unity” is an essential prerequisite to “impose semantic coherence on an utterance” (Croft, 2003, p. 201), and thus its structural characteristics, such as the apparent possibility of contrastive submodels, influence all types of domain mappings and therefore need to be taken into account at the level of empirical research and at the level of cognitive theory. In the following sections we shall introduce a modified version of the category of “scenario” to capture this subdomain level of conceptual configurations in metaphoric mappings.

FAMILY SCENARIOS FOR THE EU

The *FAMILY* metaphors to be analyzed do not target a single nation state (as in Lakoff’s examples) but a group of states, that is, the “EU” (before 1993, “European Community” [EC]). The data originate from a bilingual corpus, called *EUROMETA*, which was based initially on a pilot corpus of 2,110 texts from 28 British and German newspapers and magazines covering the period 1989 to 2001 (a reduced version of the pilot corpus—*EUROMETA I*—is freely accessible on the

Internet at: www.dur.ac.uk/odern.languages/depts/german/Arcindex.html). It was later complemented by searches in two general corpora, that is, the COBUILD “Bank of English” at the University of Birmingham and the “COSMAS” corpus at the Institute for German Language in Mannheim (Germany), covering press texts from 1989 to 2004. The resulting corpus, called EUROMETA II, consists of more than 19,000 metaphorical text passages (amounting to about 2.8 million words).

The quantitative increase of data made it possible to confirm the representativeness of the pilot corpus and allowed frequency comparisons (Musolff, 2004, pp. 63–69; for the methodology of combining small and large corpora see Cameron & Deignan, 2003 and Charteris-Black, 2004, pp. 30–34). Crucially, the EUROMETA II data also give a more comprehensive impression of the range of conceptual variation within domains, and of the degree of overlap between them. The tokens for conceptual source elements were grouped, on the basis of patterns of collocation and intertextual cross-references, into 12 broad domains: *BUILDING*, *CLUB-(SOCIAL) CLASS*, *ECONOMY-BUSINESS*, *GAMES-SPORTS*, *GEOMETRY-GEOGRAPHY*, *LIFE-HEALTH-STRENGTH*, *LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY*, *NATURE-WEATHER*, *PERFORMANCE-SHOW*, *SCHOOL-DISCIPLINE*, *WAR-FORTRESS-BATTLE*, and *WAY-MOVEMENT-SPEED*. The hyphenated labels indicate that some domains tend to overlap, that is, the tokens for their conceptual elements collocate and combine with each other so frequently that it makes good sense to group them into a merged domain, such as that of *LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY* (for a comprehensive overview of its conceptual elements and their lexical manifestations see the Appendix).

Once these discourse-based domains were established, it became evident that the conceptual elements combined to whole mininarratives, that is, of *COURTSHIP*, *MARRIED LIFE*, and *FAMILY-BUILDING*. It is this narrative structure that seems to make the configurations of domain elements prime sources for conceptualizations of large-scale political processes involving whole nations or international communities. Thus, France and Germany (or, metonymically, their chief politicians), which figured in the first quotations as *marriage partners*, are also often depicted as the *parents* of the EU’s most prominent integration project during the 1990s, that is, the currency union:

(5) In the long *gestation* of Europe’s Economic and Monetary Union—*conceived* in Maastricht 1991, to be *delivered* in Frankfurt 1999—it suddenly seems likely this week that *the anxious parents*, Germany and France, are expecting a *soft baby euro*. (*The Guardian*, 30 May 1997)

(6) Der Euro kam [...], von François Mitterrand und seinem konservativen *Partner* am Rhein kurzerhand *in die Welt gesetzt*, um die Bindung und Widerstandsfähigkeit der Europäischen Union [...] zu kräftigen [...] (*Die Zeit*, 16 January 2003) [The euro arrived, *brought into this world* by François Mitterrand and his conservative *partner*

in Bonn [Helmut Kohl], to strengthen the cohesion and resilience of the European Union.]

The source schema of these two examples, *MARRIAGE PARTNERS = PARENTS OF CHILD*, may be simple, but the characterization of the participants in terms of their roles, intentions, and states of minds, as well as the assessment of their actions in terms of chances of success, are in fact highly specified. The readers are not only provided with a general schematic frame to understand the order of events and a few causal links between them, but rather with a whole little scene, complete with the presumed “interests” and “biases” on the part of the participants and an evaluative interpretation. Even though the interpretation in these and the earlier examples is not as morally loaded as Lakoff’s *STRICT FATHER* and *NURTURANT PARENT* models, they do have a “moral” meaning in the sense of a comment on the purpose and the likely outcome of the depicted actions.

To capture this level of subdomain conceptual structures, I propose to use the category of “scenario”, building on Charles Fillmore’s notion of a conceptual “scene” as “any kind of coherent segment of human beliefs, actions, experiences or imaginings” that can be associated with an underlying conceptual “frame” (Fillmore, 1975, p. 124) as well as on Lakoff’s definition of “scenario” as a subtype of “idealized cognitive models” (ICMs) that have a comparatively rich ontology: scenarios are “structured by a SOURCE–PATH–GOAL schema in the time domain” and consist “typically of people, things, properties, relations and propositions”; among the relations are “causal relations, identity relations” and a “purpose structure” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 285–286). Turner and Fauconnier (2003) also speak of “scenarios” with regard to conceptual blendings, as in the saying “If Clinton were the Titanic, the iceberg would sink”. Here, the target–topic of President Clinton’s political survival during the public investigation of his sexual scandals and the historical tragedy of the Titanic are blended into the “complex counterfactual scenario in which the Titanic sinks the iceberg” (Turner & Fauconnier, 2003, p. 470–471). The scenario in this case is a complex dynamic schema that is “run” in the mental space created by the blending.

Scenarios have *stereotypical* status in the sense established by Hilary Putnam, that is, they include conventionally required assumptions, which may be revealed by experts to be empirically wrong but are still the default expectations that underlie the folk-theories held by nonexperts (Putnam, 1975, p. 148, 249–250). In the case of metaphors, this folk-theoretical knowledge is based primarily on the source concept, from which the respective target concepts are derived. To model such rich mappings for their Artificial Intelligence program of metaphorical reasoning, “ATT-Meta,” Barnden, Glasbey, Lee, and Wallington (2003) have developed the notion of “View Neutral Mapping Adjuncts” (VNMAAs), that is, aspects such as “causation and ability, event shape, value-judgements” that attach by default to any “view-specific” metaphorical mappings. They list 15 such VNMAAs, of which the *Mental/Emotional States* and *Value-Judgement* VNMAAs as well as the *Uncertainty* and *Modality*

VNMA would appear to be of greatest relevance to the evaluative aspect of metaphorical reasoning based on scenarios. It is important to bear in mind that VNMA are not ontological qualities of domains but rather mapping principles that allow rich inferencing about mental states ascribed to the scenario participants and about levels of goodness, certainty, necessity, and probability of situations in the source domain.

Building on these various approaches, we can characterise a “scenario” as a set of assumptions made by competent members of a discourse community about “typical” aspects of a source-situation, for example, its participants and their roles, the “dramatic” storylines and outcomes, and conventional evaluations of whether they count as successful or unsuccessful, normal or abnormal, permissible or illegitimate, etc. These source-based assumptions are mapped, according to VNMA-like principles, onto the respective target concepts. If we apply this enriched concept of “scenario” to our initial examples of Euro-metaphors, we can say that they not only present action-schematic accounts of *MARRIAGE*, *BIRTH*, etc. derived from the source domain, but that they include narrative-cum-normative assumptions about the possible success of *extramarital flirts* by one of the partners in the *Franco–German couple* (examples 1–4), and about the *parents’* expectations for their *Euro-child* (examples 5 and 6). The meta-discursive explanation of the “marriage metaphor’s” implications in example (4), that is, Blair’s possible role as “either lover or mistress,” also relies on presumptive “knowledge” about marriages and *ménage à trois* (i.e., that the status of *lover* or *mistress* is inferior to that of a *spouse* and therefore less desirable).

How common and how important are these highly specified source scenarios in public discourse? On the basis of the EUROMETA data as well as other corpus-based metaphor studies (Charteris-Black, 2004; Dirven, Frank, & Ilie, 2001; White, 2003; Zinken, 2003) it appears that they are ubiquitous and constitute an essential feature of metaphor use in public discourse registers. Scenarios appear to dominate public discourse not just in terms of overall frequency but also in that they help to shape the course of public debates and conceptualizations of political target topics by framing the attitudinal and evaluative preferences in the respective discourse communities. To explore this aspect further, we shall look at two central source scenarios from the *LOVE–MARRIAGE–FAMILY* domain in EUROMETA II, that is, *PARENT(S)–CHILD(REN) RELATIONSHIP* and *MARRIAGE*.

MARRIAGE AND PARENTHOOD SCENARIOS FOR THE EU

In the initial examples, the number of parents was reduced to two—that is, the *couple* of France and Germany—which fits the source concept but does not tally with the actual number of referents (member states) at the target level (up to 15 nation states during the 1990s, 25 states by 2005). There are, however, also examples that

are factually correct in terms of target-level information but override the standard *TWO MARRIED PARTNERS = PARENTS + CHILD(REN)* source concept of a “nuclear family” (two married partners = parents + child[ren]). We thus find *engagements, marriages, and conceptions* by more than two *partners* in both national samples of the corpus:

(7) The reality behind the *will-they-won't-they, pre-nuptial dances* among aspirant members of Europe’s monetary union club is that as long as the [...] economic slow-down doesn’t turn into a full-blown recession the project will probably go ahead. (*The Guardian*, 27 January 1996)

(8) Die *Währungssehe, welche die elf Partner eingehen werden, hätte einer längeren “Verlobungszeit” bedurft*. Diese war ihr nicht vergönnt. Hoffentlich rächt sich diese Hast nicht. (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 27 February 1998). [The *economic marriage that the eleven partners are about to embark upon would have needed a longer engagement period*. This was not to be. Let’s hope this marrying in haste does not lead to regrets at leisure.]

(9) While Europeans from 11 other countries *celebrated the birth of a single European currency*, an ICM poll found Brits unmoved by the euro’s launch [...]. (*The Economist*, 9 January 1999)

The source scenario of an *ELEVEN-FOLD LOVE STORY/MARRIAGE* culminating in the *birth of a baby of multiple parents* that underlies these examples serves as the source input to a “blended” conceptual space. The implausibility of the source level constellation when considered in its own terms does not inhibit the understanding of the mapping, for it is complemented by the input from the target topic (currency union), and the blend serves to explain specific, newsworthy aspects of that target topic (i.e., the uncertainty about which and how many states would eventually “adopt” the new currency and the self-imposed exclusion of Britain).

Again, the rich ontology of the source scenarios is more than just an extension of a basic schema. The detailed scenario aspects of *PRENUPTIAL DANCES*, (prolonged) *ENGAGEMENT*, and *BIRTHDAY CELEBRATIONS* are at best marginal facets of standard *MARRIAGE* or *BIRTH*-schemas. But in the actual texts they play an essential part in explicating the journalists’ conclusions about the alleged political indecision among prospective Euro-candidates, about the perceived advantages of an extended preparation period and the dangers resulting from its avoidance, as well as about Britain’s apparently unperturbed outsider position. Within an AI-modeling of the respective mappings, *mental/emotional states* and *value-judgment* VNMA’s would be required to (re-)construct the inferential relationships between default assumptions regarding these source-aspects and the mapping inferences at the target level.

An alternative to conceptualizing the EU either as a *family with multiple parents* or as a union of equals (in which two nations, i.e., the *Franco–German couple*, are more equal than the others) lies in the scenario of all member states constituting the *Euro-family's children*, on the assumption that a supranational EU-authority fulfils the role of the *parent(s)*. This scenario has the advantage of being maximally flexible with regards to changes in the number of *family members*: at any time, new or future member states of the EU can be introduced as *additional children*. Furthermore, existing member states' dealings with each other and with the EU as a whole can be conceptualized either as relationships among *siblings* or *child(ren)–parent* relationships:

(10) [...] how Western Europe's *grown-up* democracies treat the *foundling-states* appearing on their eastern doorstep. (*The Economist*, 7 December 1991)

(11) Britain's European Union partners yesterday feted the new government's return to Brussels with a warmth which would not have disgraced *the biblical welcome accorded the prodigal son*. (*The Guardian*, 6 May 1997)

(12) Die Slowakei bleibt das *Sorgenkind der europäischen Familie*. (*Die Welt*, 13 March 1998) [Slovakia remains the *problem child* of the European family.]

(13) Man mag das Verhältnis zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich durchaus als *brüderlich* bezeichnen. Aber es besteht kein Zweifel daran, *wer sich in dieser Familie als der große Bruder mit den älteren Rechten fühlt*. Bonn hat Paris in diesem Gefühl aus gutem Grund jahrzehntelang bestrkt. (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 5 May 1998) [One may well describe the relationship between Germany and France as fraternal, but there is no doubt *who in this family regards himself as the bigger brother with older rights*. Over decades the government in Bonn has supported this feeling in Paris, and with good reason.]

(14) *In Europe-as-family the Commission played the role of mama, the great dispenser of favours*. Plainly the southern Europeans saw little wrong with a Commission that created networks of allegiance [...]. (*The Guardian*, 17 March 1999)

In examples (10) and (12), Eastern European countries are deemed to have become the responsibility of the Western *grown-up* states – it is left open whether the latter are conceptualized as *parents* or *older siblings*. In example (11), it is an existing member state, Great Britain, that is being *readmitted into the family* on account of the election of a more Euro-friendly government, with an explicit reference to the Biblical parable–scenario of the *prodigal son returning to his father* (Luke, 15). In example (13), the *Franco–German couple* are transmuted into a *pair of brothers*, with France as the elder, and in (14) the EU commission, on account of its per-

ceived favoritism, is seen in the *role of mama*, with a specific group of member states—governments as the recipients of her favors, that is, as her favorite *children*.

The evaluative aspects of this scenario can be related to norms of solidarity and obligations within a family that show some affinity to the ethical and moral issues that Lakoff (1996, 2004) discusses. However, there is no contest here between *STRICT FATHER* and *NURTURANT PARENT* values: the *European family* is in all these cases depicted as a nurturant, benevolent institution that *welcomes its children back in its bosom, cares even for problem children and has a place for each of them*. If anything, the central *family authority* may be seen as being too generous, that is, as an overindulgent *MOTHER*-figure (cf. example 14). But EU *FATHER* figures are also usually regarded not as strict authorities but instead as venerable political visionaries:

(15) [...] the great dream of the *founding fathers* of the original European communities [...]. (*The Independent*, 24 April 1990)

(16) Former prime minister Ted Heath, praised by ECB president Wim Duisenberg as *one of the founding fathers of the EU* [...]. (*The Guardian*, 1 July 1998)

(17) Von allen *Gründervätern*, die [...] die Währungsunion aushandelten, hat er als einziger politisch überlebt. Im Kreise der EU-Mächtigen gilt der Deutsche längst *als Patriarch, als Pate, als Paterfamilias*. (*Die Zeit*, 29 April 1998) [Of all the *founding fathers* who negotiated EMU [Economic and Monetary Union], he (the then German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl) is the only one who has survived politically. Among EU-leaders, the German [chancellor] is acknowledged as *the patriarch, the godfather, the head of the family*.]

The phrase *founding fathers* (as well as its German loan translation *Gründerväter*) is borrowed from American English where it refers to the founders of the Constitution at the time of the American Revolution. In British and German debates on the EU, the phrase is used to cast prominent EU politicians in a similarly favourable light, as far-sighted political founder-figures. It is part of a strongly positively slanted *BENEVOLENT FATHER* scenario, which, with 45 tokens, clearly eclipses the notion of *EU-MOTHERHOOD*, which only has 3 tokens and is presented as being at best ambivalent (see example 14). The reasons for the greater popularity of this positive *FATHERHOOD* scenario probably lies in the powerful traditions of male-centred ideologies of political agency in Western culture, which also have given rise to Latin-based lexical subfields in various languages, for example, English *patriot, patriotic, patriotism*, French *patriote, patriotisme*, etc., German *Patriot, Patriotismus*, and loan translations such as *fatherland, Vaterland* (Kluge, 1995, p. 617; Polenz, 1991–1999, vol. 2, p. 391–394; Robert, 1977, p. 1378–1379; Skeat, 1993, p. 335).

How productive the underlying stereotypes still are in modern debates on European politics can be gleaned from an article in the weekly quality broadsheet *Die Zeit*, which used the German idiom *zu etwas kommen wie die Jungfrau zum Kind* (or, to become responsible for something unknowingly, literally: “like a virgin having a child”), to contrast the EU unification process with the allegedly uncontrollable event of German unification:

(18) Während die deutsche Einigung von Kräften ermöglicht wurde, die Politiker niemals willentlich anstoßen konnten [...], wird die europäische Einigung das Ergebnis eines puren, bewussten und zielstrebig eingeleiteten Willensaktes sein. *Zur deutschen Einheit kam die Politik wie die Jungfrau zum Kind. Zur europäischen Einigung kommt die Politik wie der Vater zum Sohn.* (*Die Zeit*, 8 January 1998). [Whilst German unification was driven by forces that politicians could never have unleashed intentionally, European integration will be the result of a well-planned, consciously willed act. *German unity caught the politicians unawares* (lit. ‘like a virgin’), but European unification is the son that they, as fathers, can expect.]

Here, the sexist stereotype inherent in the phraseologism of “getting a child as a virgin,” which in some contexts might be regarded as having paled due to lexicalization, is reemphasised by the foregrounding of its contrast to *reproduction in the male lineage* as a result of will and conscious planning. The source scenario of a *FATHER–SON* lineage as the ideal or preferred form of family structure, which would be socially unacceptable at target level in mainstream public discourse today, seems to be not only permissible but even self-explanatory enough as a metaphorical source input to support strong political evaluations that can be mapped onto the target topic of EU politics.

METAPHOR SCENARIOS AND POLITICAL ATTITUDES

The *LOVE–MARRIAGE–FAMILY* scenarios we have analyzed so far are common to both national samples and so are their cultural biases: solidarity, male-centeredness, and family-membership as a privilege that conveys rights and duties. However, there seem to be two scenarios that are characteristic for attitudinal differences between the British and German discourse communities. One of these scenarios depicts the relationship between a nation state and the EU in terms of a *love relationship*, the other concerns the *Franco–German couple* and its *marriage problems*, which we already encountered in the initial examples. The first scenario looks innocuous enough at a general level: potential membership candidates, as well as established member states that are about to join an integration project, such as EMU, are viewed as the *lovers* or *beloved* of the EU:

(19) [...] the euro, symbol of *Italy's romance with the European Union* [...]. (*The Independent*, 15 June 1998)

(20) Turkey must now be *wooed* to accept EU membership. (*The Independent*, 11 December 1999)

However, when it is their own nation's or national government's relationship to the EU that is depicted as a *LOVE-* or *MARRIAGE-*relationship, the British sample includes a substantial number (20 tokens = 10%) of negative versions of such a relationship and even dramatic *SEPARATION* scenarios:

(21) The possibility that Britain's *separation* from the European exchange rate mechanism will end in *divorce* may have increased yesterday [...]. (*The Financial Times*, 4 January 1993)

(22) The Government's hopes of a prolonged *honeymoon* in Europe were dashed last night as the Chancellor, Gordon Brown, fought a losing battle against exclusion from the new single currency policy-setting group. (*The Guardian*, 2 December 1997)

(23) Labour's *honeymoon with the EU* appeared to have come to an abrupt end after a day of sharp exchanges between Mr Blair and President Chirac [...]. (*The Daily Telegraph*, 13 December 1997)

(24) *Labour's honeymoon with Europe* was under strain last night after France and Germany demanded an end to Britain's and other countries' veto on European tax decisions. (*The Times*, 2 December 1998)

The *END-OF-HONEYMOON* depiction of the British Labour government's relationship with the EU/EMU, and the *SEPARATION* scenario are used across the political spectrum of British media, from the Euro-friendly *Guardian* and *Financial Times* to the Euro-skeptical *Daily Telegraph*. They thus seem to represent no specific party or Euro-political bias but rather a general British attitude of disbelief in their own country's chances of a *successful LOVE-RELATIONSHIP* with Europe. This is in contrast to the *RETURNING-INTO-THE-FAMILY* scenario, which is viewed as applicable to Britain in a positive sense (see example 11).

In the German sample, however, *SEPARATION* scenarios targeting any one nation's relationship to the EU do not occur at all. The only *SEPARATION* scenarios that are discussed are potential "worst-case scenarios" concerning the outcome of the *Franco-German couple's marital woes*. However, according to the German press, such a case is to be avoided at all cost, either by renewed *faithfulness*—see example 3: *no more dalliance with Tony*—or by *starting fresh all over again*:

(25) *Das Paar ist wieder auferstanden. Wie oft hatte man es in den letzten Jahren fast aufgegeben, stets schien es am Rande einer Nervenkrise: Entfremdet, zerstritten, zerrüttet, geschieden. Nun wollen Bundeskanzler Schröder und Präsident Chirac der Welt demonstrieren, dass ihre Länder in einer untrennbaren Schicksalsgemeinschaft verbunden sind [...]. (Der Spiegel, 22 January 2003) [The couple has risen from the dead. How often had we lost almost all hope over the last few years, for the partners seemed to be continuously on the brink of a nervous breakdown: they seemed estranged, at odds with each other, divided, even divorced. Now, Chancellor Schröder and President Chirac want to demonstrate to the world that their nations are united in a partnership of destiny.]*

British media, however, view the *break-up* of the *Franco–German marriage* indeed as imminent—either caused by *extramarital flirts* and an Anglo-Franco-German *ménage à trois* (see the initial examples) or constituting a complete sham, which is not worth disturbing or bothering much about:

(26) *Like a couple whose relationship is on the wane, these two partners [France and Germany] feel that they have to reassert their love for each other ever more frequently in order to bridge the growing gulf between them. (The Times, 8 September 1994)*

(27) *Do we want to get into bed with two countries whose recent record has been so retrograde [...]?* (*The Daily Telegraph*, 19 February 2004)

While the evaluative conclusions drawn from the *MARRIAGE CRISIS* and *SEPARATION* scenarios (and the emotive “load” attached to them) differ across the two national discourse communities, one fundamental presupposition is common to both discourses. This is the assumption that the EU has been based mainly on the bilateral relationship between France and Germany, possibly complemented by Britain as a third partner. It exposes the notion of an egalitarian status for all members of the *EU family*, which features prominently in official discourse, as a diplomatic sham.

In principle, of course, the *MARRIED PARTNERS* scenario is applicable to any bilateral international relationship; it is therefore significant that no other EU-states seem eligible to be part of the *Euro-couple* to the British and the German public. In *EUROMETA II*, there is a single instance of a British newspaper proudly announcing an “Anglo–German love-in” (*The Guardian*, 21 March 1998), and the German sample has one other solitary reference to the Spanish and Polish governments as *strange bed-fellows* (*die tageszeitung*, 16 January 2004: “*Seltsame Bettgenossen*”). In both cases, the target concept was the temporary partnership for a specific political initiative. Judging from the lack of any follow-up in the public debates, these relationships seem to have been just *one-off flirts*, not *long-lasting affairs*.

CONCLUSIONS

The *LOVE–MARRIAGE–FAMILY* source concepts of metaphorical texts in EUROMETA II build up to a narrative of *LOVE-RELATIONSHIPS*, ranging from *FLIRT* and *ENGAGEMENT* to *MARRIED LIFE*, *CHILDBIRTH–PARENTAGE*, *MARRIAGE CRISIS*, *ADULTERY/MÉNAGE-À-TROIS*, and in the worst case, *SEPARATION* or *DIVORCE*. This general finding can be interpreted as evidence of the strongly stereotyping, “folk-theoretical” knowledge employed in metaphors of nonexpert, everyday discourse (Leezenberg, 2001, p. 281, 289). At this broader level of general domain structure, British and German Euro-debates show little difference. They share a male-centred bias in their conceptualization of the *EU-family*, which fits in with long-standing traditions of patriarchal conceptualizations of political entities and power-relationships. They also share the presupposition that in the *parent–children* relationship solidarity is of prime importance: Consequently, there are no examples describing *children leaving* or *being deliberately excluded from the family*, whereas *MARITAL SEPARATION* concepts are not infrequent.

To capture attitudinal preferences and discursive trends that are characteristic for particular discourse communities, we need to look beyond the domain-level and focus on specific scenarios and their argumentative uses. At this more specific level, the data show that within the *LOVE–MARRIAGE* scenario, British media often comment almost triumphantly on apparent *marriage problems* of the Franco–German *couple*, which may lead to a *breakdown of the partnership* and provide Britain with a chance to establish a *ménage à trois*. The German press, on the other hand, see the Franco–German *marriage problems* as a worrying threat that must be combated and averted. British media tend to emphasize the possibilities of their own national government’s *divorce* or *separation* from or an *end of the relationship* with the EU, whereas even the most Euro-skeptical mainstream German press speak more cautiously, for example, in terms of a *prolonged engagement* as regards the introduction of the *Euro* currency.

These differences in the frequency of use and in the argumentative exploitation of metaphor scenarios reflect and contribute to the well-documented contrasts in British and German political culture toward European integration (Baker & Seawright, 1998; Good, 2001; Grosser, 1998). It is thus at the level of scenarios, rather than at general domain-level, that attitudinal biases and political preferences of discourse communities become discernible. The main reason for this seems to be that scenarios provide a sufficiently rich conceptual structure to be argumentatively and rhetorically exploitable. The notions of *ENGAGEMENT* and *MARRIAGE*, of *A CHILD’S BIRTH* or *RETURN INTO THE BOSOM OF THE FAMILY*, of *MÉNAGE À TROIS* or *DIVORCE* carry with them normative assumptions concerning the intentions, states of minds, and emotions of the scenario participants, and concerning the chances of success and social acceptability of the

“scenes” they are “enacting”. The source assumptions are an integral part of the “conceptual package” that is mapped onto the target concepts, allowing matching inferences about the participants and courses of action at the target level. These inferences are too richly loaded with encyclopedic and socioculturally mediated information to be deduced from general schematic domain structures. Consequently, the normative and evaluative biases of scenarios are not binding in a logical sense and may in principle be overturned, for example, by way of meta-discursive comments as in example 4. Their high degree of conceptual adaptability and flexibility is “paid for,” as it were, by lesser logical stringency.

However, even if they are nondeducible, the scenario-based presuppositions are needed to understand the inferences suggested in the texts. Scenarios enable the speakers to not only apply source to target concepts but to draw on them to build narrative frames for the conceptualization and assessment of sociopolitical issues and to “spin out” these narratives into emergent discourse traditions that are characteristic of their respective community. The analysis of source scenarios as focal areas of source domains provides a platform to link the conceptual side of metaphor to its usage patterns in socially situated discourse. Further work is needed to specify the categorial relationship between general domain and specific scenario levels as well as to make the latter amenable to rigorous statistical analysis.

AUTHOR NOTE

All examples are drawn from a special corpus (EUROMETA), which was collected from searches of the automated general corpora at the University of Birmingham (COBUILD) and the Institute for German Language (COSMAS) in Mannheim, Germany. The research included the retrieval of newspaper titles and dates but not of all article titles or authors’ names. A pilot version of the EUROMETA corpus is freely accessible at “<http://www.dur.ac.uk/modern.languages/depts/german/Arcindex.htm>” (with specific reference to examples from FAMILY metaphor scenarios at: “<http://www.dur.ac.uk/modern.languages/depts/german/eurometa/eurometa-love&family.htm>”).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this article was supported by a research leave grant (1350/13067) from the UK Arts and Humanities Research Board. I am greatly indebted to John Barnden, Maria Sabaté Dalmau, Sheila Glasbey, Peter Lutzeier, Josephine Tudor, and Jörg Zinken for generous advice on previous versions of this article as well as to the editor, Raymond Gibbs, and to the anonymous reviewer for their very helpful comments. Any errors or gaps in the theoretical scenario are, of course, my responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Baker, D., & Seawright, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Britain for and against Europe: British politics and the question of European integration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnden, J., Glasbey, S., Lee, M. G., & Wallington, A. (2003). Domain-transcending mappings in a system for metaphorical reasoning. *Conference Companion of the 10th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL 2003)*, 57–61.
- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2003). Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol 18*, 149–160.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Croft, W. (2003). The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. (pp. 161–205). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Dirven, R., Frank, R. M., & Ilie, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Language and ideology. Volume II: Descriptive cognitive approaches*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1975). An alternative to checklist theories of Meaning. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 1*, 123–131.
- Good, C. (2001). The European debate in and between Germany and Great Britain. In A. Musolf, C. Good, P. Points, & R. Wittlinger (Eds.), *Attitudes towards Europe: Language in the unification process*. (pp. 151–178). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Grosser, A. (1998). *Deutschland in Europa*. [Germany in Europe] Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.
- Kluge, F. (1995). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* [Etymological Dictionary of German] (E. Seebold, Ed.). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don't*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate: The essential guide for progressives*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Leezenberg, M. (2001). *Contexts of metaphor*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Musolf, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse. Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Polenz, P. V. (1991–1999). *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. [History of the German Language from the late Middle Ages to the present day], (3 vols.). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Putnam, H. (1975). *Mind, language and reality: Philosophical papers, Vol. II*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, P. (1977). *Dictionnaire alphabétique & analogique de la langue française* [Alphabetical and Analogical Dictionary of the French Language] (A. Rey & J. Rey-Debove, Eds.). Paris: Société du Nouveau Littré.
- Skeat, W. W. (1993). *The concise dictionary of English etymology*. Ware, UK: Wordsworth Editions.
- Taylor, J. R. (1995). *Linguistic categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, M., & Fauconnier, G. (2003). Metaphor, metonymy, and binding. In R. Dirven & R. Pörings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. (pp. 469–487). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.
- White, M. (2003). Metaphor and economics: The case of growth. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*, 131–151.

Zinken, J. (2003). Ideological imagination: Intertextual and correlational metaphors in political discourse. *Discourse & Society* 14, 507–523.

APPENDIX LOVE–MARRIAGE–FAMILY Metaphors in EUROMETA II

| <i>Conceptual Elements</i> | <i>English Lexemes</i> | <i>German Lexemes</i> |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| LOVE | <i>love</i> (n. + v.), <i>love-in</i> , <i>love-affair</i> , <i>love at first sight</i> , <i>love-rat</i> , <i>honeymoon</i> , <i>partnership</i> , <i>sleep/get into bed with</i> , <i>court</i> (v.), <i>courtship</i> , <i>flirt</i> (v.), <i>romance</i> , <i>woo</i> | (sich ver-)lieben, Liebe, Jawort, Liaison, Frischverliebte, Annäherung, Beziehungsdrama, Verhältnis, Minne |
| ENGAGEMENT | <i>engagement</i> | Verlobungszeit, -phase, Ehe ohne Treuebeweis |
| MARRIAGE | <i>couple</i> , <i>marry</i> , <i>marriage</i> (of <i>convenience</i>), <i>arranged</i> <i>marriage</i> , <i>happy union</i> , <i>shotgun marriage</i> , <i>wedding</i> , <i>nuptials</i> , <i>prenuptial dances</i> , <i>tie the knot</i> | (Euro-)Ehe, Hochzeit, <i>Flucht</i> <i>nach Gretna Green</i> , <i>heiraten</i> , <i>Zweckehe</i> , <i>Braut</i> , <i>Bräutigam</i> , <i>Paar</i> , <i>Paarbeziehung</i> , <i>Drum</i> <i>prüfe</i> , <i>wer sich ewig bindet ...</i> [proverbial phrase, based on a poem by F. Schiller; translation by Josephine Tudor: 'Then scan thyself, if thou would'st wed!'] |
| ADULTERY | <i>ménage à trois</i> , <i>love triangle</i> | Seitensprung, Seitenblick |
| SEPARATION/DIVORCE | <i>separation</i> , <i>divorce</i> | Scheidung |
| FAMILY | (<i>European</i>) <i>family</i> , <i>family</i> <i>photograph</i> | (europäische) Familie, Familienfrieden, Kleinfamilie, Großfamilie, Verwandte, Familienfoto, Familienvergrößerung |
| PARENTS | <i>parents</i> | |
| GODPARENTS | <i>godparents</i> | Pate, Patenrolle |
| FATHER(S) | (<i>founding</i>) <i>father(s)</i> | <i>Vater</i> , <i>Väter</i> , <i>Patriarch</i> , <i>Paterfamilias</i> [sic], <i>Gründerväter</i> |
| MOTHER | <i>mother</i> , <i>mama</i> | Mutterwährung |
| CHILD | <i>child</i> , <i>baby</i> , <i>orphan</i> , <i>foundling</i> , <i>bouncer</i> | Kind(er), Sorgenkind(er), Sohn, laufen lernen, getauft werden |
| BROTHER | | Bruder, brüderlich |
| COUSINS | <i>cousins across the channel</i> | |

Note. EUROMETA II includes 203 (93 English and 110 German) text passages, which contain 403 (198 English and 205 German) tokens of these conceptual elements.

Copyright of Metaphor & Symbol is the property of Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.