

Conceptual EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION Metaphors in the Language of the Press: a Contrastive Analysis

Inga Dervinytė

Abstract. The study aims at investigating conceptual EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION metaphors and their linguistic manifestations in the British and Lithuanian press articles. The investigation has been carried out in the framework of the conceptual metaphor theory as well the frequency count principle and cross-linguistic comparison have been applied. Of the five types of cross-linguistic conceptual metaphors, the most common source domains include: NATURAL FORCE relating to FLUID and WAR. Language-specific realization of EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION metaphors manifested some interesting culture specific peculiarities. When conceptualising immigration, English seems to give preference to linguistic metaphors implying inflow of water. Lithuanian linguistic metaphors, on the other hand, have revealed the conception of emigration in terms of water flowing outwards. Moreover, Lithuanian data have demonstrated the tendency to foreground the problem of the scope of emigration through a whole spectrum of source domains (e.g. FASHION, REBUS). Overall, the results have demonstrated a strong tendency towards metaphorical reasoning about both emigration and immigration, which allows concluding that these metaphors are well entrenched in both Lithuanian and British press.

Key words: *conceptual metaphor theory (CMT); conceptual EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION metaphor; linguistic metaphor; source domain; target domain; experiential basis.*

Introduction

Cognitive linguistics has evolved as a competing framework to the generative view, which treated language as an autonomous mental faculty (see Fauconnier, 1999). Namely, cognitivists introduced the approach to language which erased the boundaries between language and thought, language and human experience. Rather than depending on the view that metaphor is a matter of mere language and metaphorical concepts are non-existent (see Davidson, 1996; Martinich, 1996), cognitive linguists acknowledged the existence of metaphor as pervasive in everyday life, and have offered an account that emphasizes the role of metaphor as a tool for understanding (Croft and Cruse, 2004; Lakoff and Johnson, 2003; Lakoff, 1991; Kövecses, 2002). Moreover, a more specific branch within the framework of cognitive linguistics, the conceptual metaphor theory (henceforth CMT), has introduced the approach to metaphor as a complex consisting of a variety of parts that interact with each other (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003; Fauconnier, 2002; Kövecses, 2002).

One of the central tenets of the CMT is that human conceptual system is largely metaphorical in nature. The research by a number of scholars has shown that metaphors structure our understanding of political, economic and social issues (Cienki, 2005; Lakoff, 1991). Kövecses has identified the most frequent source domains for politics, such as games, business, and war; economy is often conceptualised via plants, buildings and journeys (2002, p.22). Thus, the research into conceptual metaphors has proved their pervasiveness and cognitive role in various spheres of human activity and discourse.

Another major claim of the CMT relates to the concept of experiential basis, thus, opposing the view that metaphors are arbitrary or innate (see Boers, 1999; Lakoff and Johnson, 2003). Conceptual metaphors arise due to our experience

in the world, hence, are not isolated to the linguistic system. The experiential basis of metaphors may be illustrated by such conceptual metaphors as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR and a number of others (Kövecses 2002, pp.16-25; Lakoff and Johnson 2003, pp.4-24). Namely, we conceive difficulties in life in terms of obstacles on our way, we defend our opinion in an argument as we fight against belligerents and defend ourselves in war. Our experience with the physical world, which is entrenched in conceptual metaphors, serves as a natural and logical foundation for the comprehension of more abstract domains.

On the basis of the claim that metaphor is a matter of cognition and thinking rather than language, cognitive linguists have introduced the terms crucial for the study of conceptual metaphors. Namely, linguists working on the theory of metaphor posit that it is through linguistic expressions, which provide a window to cultural-cognitive systems, that conceptual metaphors are recognised. For example, a well-known metaphor RATIONAL ARGUMENT IS WAR is realized linguistically by such metaphorical expressions as (1) *Your claims are indefensible*; (2) *He attacked every point in my argument* etc. (Kövecses 2002, p.16). In other words, conceptual metaphors, which are revealed by linguistic metaphorical expressions in a language, disclose the way people think.

Cognitive linguists responded to the question of *how* metaphors could be understood, which was posed and discussed by philosophers and traditional linguists (see Martinich, 1996). Namely, in addition to *linguistic* and *conceptual metaphors*, cognitivists have provided some other methodological notions for interpreting metaphors. Assuming that metaphors function as cognitive tools based on basic human experience, cognitive linguists have introduced the idea that metaphors consist of two conceptual domains, one of which is structured in terms of another. The source domain that is more concrete

and specific, hence, more suitable for metaphoric categorization since it provides metaphorical expressions for understanding the more abstract domain, i.e. the target domain. The notion of mappings, or correspondences between the two domains was introduced into the analysis of metaphors. For example, an extensively researched metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY is characterized by systematic set of correspondences between love and journey. Hence, in the metaphorical linguistic expression (3) *We aren't going anywhere*, the expression *go somewhere* indicates traveling to a destination, in this particular case, a journey which has no destination (Kövecses 2002, p.6).

It should be noted that Fauconnier and Turner (1995; 1999; 2002) have expanded the notions of the source and the target domain in order to get a better understanding of the way metaphors emerge, which resulted in the conceptual blending theory. The approach posits that in interpreting metaphors hearers or readers construct conceptual structures, i.e. blends, which are richer than the two-domain pattern. Yet the conceptual blending theory has been criticised as it seems to result in overgeneralization. Moreover, the scholars (Grady, et al, 1999; Ritchie, 2004) tend to agree that the blending theory introduces complexity into the analysis of metaphors which lend themselves easily to the two-domain approach.

The cognitive approach to meaning has enabled linguists to study the universal and culture-specific character of conceptual metaphors. Given the fact that conceptual metaphors are based on the basic human experience, it seems plausible that the same metaphorical patterns are found across languages. This observation has been proved by a number of researchers (Boers, 1999; Cibulskienė, 2005; Kövecses 1995, mentioned in Boers 1999; Grady, 1999; Vaičenonienė, 2002). The anthropocentric perspective accounts for the fact that a number of conceptual metaphors have the biological basis or are grounded in physical experience. However, people grow up and live in different cultural backgrounds, under different political systems or in the countries of different economic development. For example, Musolff's research (2000) has shown that, as a linguistic reflection of the political situation in 1980s in Europe, the metaphorical expressions representative of the conceptual metaphor EUROPE AS A HOUSE/ BUILDING have prevailed in public discourse. Thus, culture-specific background may influence the way of reasoning, which is reflected via the use of linguistic metaphors.

1. EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION metaphors: a niche for research

Given that metaphors are pervasive in everyday life, it is understandable that the research on metaphors has been abundant. However, it has been restricted to studying political discourse, the speeches of election campaigns and has largely been devoted to English. Some researchers (Arcimavičienė, 2005; Urbonaitė and Šeškauskienė, 2007; Vaičenonienė, 2002) have, however, conducted a cross-linguistic analysis of metaphors in English, Lithuanian and Russian. Among the studies which suggested some implications relevant for the present research, Turton (2003) has focused on the way the notion of forced migration is understood, making a few claims about the conceptualisation of migration in public discourse. However, the scholar (Turton, 2003) focused

more on the social dimension of migration and the notion of forced migration. Hence, however abundant into some types of metaphor, it seems that no research has been devoted to analysing the way the phenomenon of *migration*¹ is conceptualised via metaphors, let alone contrastive studies.

This paper sets out to examine the frequencies of the metaphorical expressions of MIGRATION² as well as disclose cross-linguistic and culture-specific conceptual system and the models this system consists of, which are used to structure the abstract phenomena of emigration and immigration. This will be done in line with the general principles of the CMT. More specifically, MIGRATION metaphor is a metaphor whose target domains are emigration and immigration. A few studies have shown (see Kövecses, 2002; Boers, 1999) that abstract phenomena are frequently comprehended in terms of human body, health and war. Accordingly, it was hypothesised that these source domains may also be utilised in the understanding of emigration and immigration.

The paper sets out to accomplish the above objectives, as well as prove or disprove the hypotheses. The initial research question is that the results of the frequency count might point to a smaller number of metaphorical expressions in Lithuanian as compared to English. This hypothesis is supported by the research which has demonstrated that the Lithuanian press tends to be less inclined to metaphorical reasoning in comparison to the English press tradition (see Arcimavičienė, 2005; Cibulskienė, 2005; Urbonaitė and Šeškauskienė, 2007). The paper also intends to analyse to what extent metaphors from English have influenced the Lithuanian metaphorical language, as well as how they have moulded or whether they have influenced the Lithuanians' perception of emigration and immigration. Moreover, the research aims to identify whether it is the impact of English on the Lithuanian metaphorical language or rather the general anthropocentric parameter that has greater influence on the Lithuanian-specific linguistic metaphors.

2. Data and methods

The data for the analysis was collected from two quality papers and two magazines in English and Lithuanian, namely *The Financial Times (FT)*, *The Economist (E)*, *Verslo žinios (VŽ)* and *Veidas (V)*. To make the corpus reliable, 150 articles were collected in English and 100 in Lithuanian, so the total corpus consisted of 250 articles. The sub-corpus of the English data consisted of ca. 89,250 words. The Lithuanian sub-corpus did not differ significantly from English, i.e. constituted ca. 84,000 words.

There were three main criteria applied when compiling the corpus. First, while selecting the articles, the topic was the main criterion, i.e. emigration and immigration. Second, all the articles taken for analysis were published between the years 2004 and 2008. The time span of four years was chosen in order to collect a representative amount of data. Therefore, it was predicted that there would be more articles on migration in the Lithuanian data since the year

¹ The notion of migration is understood in this paper as a wider notion for both emigration and immigration.

² The term conceptual MIGRATION metaphor is used in the research as an umbrella term for both EMIGRATION and IMMIGRATION metaphors.

2004 when the country accessed the European Union, hence, came up with the issue of migration. The third criterion, which had to be met when collecting the sample data, was the fact that the articles which are translations into Lithuanian were excluded.

Situated within the framework of the CMT, the procedure of investigation consisted of several stages. First, the frequency count of the metaphorical expressions was carried out. Second, the linguistic metaphors were classified according to the conceptual categories they belong to. Third, the investigation focused on identifying culture-intersecting and culture-specific metaphorical expressions of MIGRATION. Overall, the methodology of research included qualitative and quantitative parameters as well as hypothetical deduction and cross-linguistic analysis.

3. Results of investigation: overall frequencies

This subsection focuses on the quantitative analysis of the metaphorical expressions of MIGRATION. The overall frequency of metaphorical expressions in the whole corpus of data will be presented. In addition, the number of items per article and per 1,000 words will be provided. Finally, the frequency of metaphorical expressions in English as compared to Lithuanian will be commented on.

One of the objectives of the research was to find out whether there is a tendency to employ metaphorical language for conceptualising migration in both English and Lithuanian press. The research has led to an interesting discovery and proved a relatively high frequency of the metaphorical expressions of MIGRATION. The overall number of metaphorical expressions in 250 articles (150 in English and 100 in Lithuanian) amounted to 520 instances, which yielded 2.1 items per article and 2.9 expressions per 1,000 words (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. Frequency of the metaphorical expressions (ME) of MIGRATION in the corpora (EN and LT)

| | Total number of ME (percentage) | ME per article | ME per 1,000 words |
|--------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| EN | 280 (54%) | ~1.9 | ~3.1 |
| LT | 240 (46%) | ~2.4 | ~2.9 |
| Total | 520 (100%) | ~2.1 | ~2.9 |

Language-specific quantitative results have shown that approximately 1.9 items occurred per article in English, and 2.4 in Lithuanian. Since the Lithuanian articles tended to be longer (cf. 840 words in Lithuanian and 595 words in English), the number of metaphorical expressions per 1,000 words would demonstrate more comparable results. The number of items per 1,000 words was 3.1 items in English and 2.9 expressions in Lithuanian. Thus, both languages seem to be equally inclined to metaphorical reasoning about migration.

4. Types of MIGRATION metaphors in English and Lithuanian

In accordance with the CMT, the analysis was accomplished on the conceptual level, i.e. linguistic expressions were

systematised according to the conceptual categories they belong to. This method was of primary importance in the sequence of the research, as it helped to disclose and systematically organise the metaphorical mappings. Therefore the classification of linguistic metaphorical expressions into conceptual metaphors is an open-ended process. Thus, the set of conceptual metaphors analysed was arrived at during the process of content analysis.

The data has shown that speakers of English and Lithuanian resort to several source domains in understanding migration. A number of metaphorical expressions appeared to fall under the same higher-order conceptual structures in both English and Lithuanian. The distribution of the most common types of conceptual MIGRATION metaphors in both languages is given in Table 2 below. The table below provides not only the types of conceptual metaphors, but also their frequencies in each corpora – English and Lithuanian. English translations of the Lithuanian examples are provided in brackets.

Table 2. Types of MIGRATION metaphors (EN and LT)

| Types of MIGRATION metaphors: Examples (EN and LT) | ME (EN) | ME (LT) |
|---|------------------|-----------------|
| 1. MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE (4) <...> <u>high inflows of immigrants</u> (FT, Jan 23, 2007) | 136 (48%) | 96 (40%) |
| 2. MIGRATION IS WAR (5) <...> <u>kovoiant su nelegalia migracija</u> (VŽ, 2007 06 18) (E: <...> fighting with illegal migration) | 53 (19%) | 44 (18%) |
| 3. MIGRATION IS THE CONTROLLER OF THE COUNTRY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION (6) <...> countries have turned to <u>immigrants to contribute to economic growth.</u> (FT, Feb 19, 2007) | 48 (17%) | 45 (19%) |
| 4. MIGRATION IS MOTION (7) <u>The massive arrival of illegal immigrants to the EU</u> (FT, Sep 8, 2006) | 38 (13%) | 30 (13%) |

Both English and Lithuanian conceptual MIGRATION metaphors are strikingly similar (See Table 2). The absolute majority of MIGRATION metaphors tend to conceptualise migration in terms of NATURAL FORCE. There has also been a tendency to conceptualise migration in terms of what we understand more readily, i.e. physical fight or WAR (the second class in frequency in both English and Lithuanian) and motion. Therefore, the causal relation between migration and the source as well as the target country's³ socio-economic situation tends to be conceptualised metaphorically quite commonly. Hence, not only in the frequency of items but also on the conceptual level the types of metaphors in both languages show striking similarities.

Another objective of the research was to find whether there exist any language and culture-specific tendencies of

³ The term 'source country' is used in the paper to refer to the country of emigration, i.e. Lithuania, while the 'target country' refers to the country of immigration, i.e. Britain.

metaphorical reasoning. In Lithuanian, the problem of emigration, its scope is revealed through the discrepancy between the notion of emigration and the description of this phenomenon in terms of FASHION, which relates a popular style in society. The seriousness and difficulty to control emigration via legal measures is foregrounded by EMIGRATION IS PUNISHMENT or EMIGRATION IS A REBUS conceptual metaphors. Only one type of conceptual metaphor, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMMIGRANTS AND THE TARGET COUNTRY IS LOVERS IN A HONEYMOON PERIOD, was English-specific. As far as the expressions representative of these metaphors did not appear numerous, but rather scarcely represented, their occurrence might be explained by the journalist's pragmatic or stylistic considerations rather than being restricted to a particular linguistic and cultural background.

It is worth analysing the types of conceptual metaphors separately in terms of the implications and inferences. Due to the limited scope of the present paper, the analysis of two most revealing linguistic instances will be presented.

4.1. Migration is a natural force

The most obvious consistency observed was the fact that a significant number of metaphorical expressions in both languages fell under the complex conceptual metaphor MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE, which relates to the image of water. The items representative of this metaphor amounted to 136 cases in English, and 96 cases in Lithuanian. Even though there is cross-cultural similarity on the level of the complex metaphor, two primary metaphors representative of this complex metaphor have been identified: (1) IMMIGRATION IS INFLOW and (2) EMIGRATION IS WATER RUNNING OUTWARDS.

As already mentioned, the metaphorical expressions having the image schema of a NATURAL FORCE refer to the concept of the flow of water as the source domain. Especially frequent were linguistic metaphors containing the concepts of *influx*, *wave*, *surge*, *flood*, *curbs* and one case with the item *spring* was found. Lithuanian linguistic manifestations of this metaphor employ the following vocabulary: *srautai*, *plūsti*/*antplūdis* and *banga*. Consider the following metaphorical expressions of the NATURAL FORCE metaphor:

- (9) *The **immigrant flood** has dramatically changed the complexion of a country <...> (FT, Feb 20, 2007)*
- (10) *The constant **stream** of desperate African immigrants to the Canary Islands has created alarm <...>. (FT, Feb 20, 2007)*
- (11) *„**imigrantų iš Rytų**“ **srautai** gali pasisukti būtent į jas. (V, 2004 02 12)*
(E: *immigrants' from the East flows may change its course right into them*)⁴
- (12) *Devintoji **emigracijos banga** [headline] (V, 2004 01 08)*
(E: *The ninth wave of emigration [antraštė]*)

The metaphorical expressions in examples (9)–(12) contain the source domains of *flood*, *stream*, *srautai* and *banga*, which are presented as entities. Namely, the flow of water can *change the complexion of a country*, *create alarm* or *change its course* (*gali pasisukti*). In this case, we conceive migration in terms of an active doer or entity. As suggested by Kövecses, “ontological metaphors enable us to see more sharply delineated structure where there is very little or none” (2002, p.34). The aspect of the inability to control and sometimes predict the flow is utilized in the metaphorical comprehension of migration.

Once the abstract experience, migration, received the status of a thing through an ontological metaphor, the experience so conceptualised can further be structured and given specific features. Consider the examples:

- (13) ***Migration** <...> but today's waves are bigger than before. (FT, Jan 23, 2007)*
- (14) *Kai žmonės tik gauna galimybę emigruoti, visuomet **srautai būna dideli** (VŽ, 2007 09 13)*
(E: *When people have the possibility to emigrate, the flows are always big*)

If we conceptualise migration in terms of an object – *waves*, *inflow*, *influx*, we can provide more structure for it by means of describing it with the lexical items such as *bigger* or *large*. From the examples presented it follows that there has been a tendency to highlight the difficulty of controlling migration by using linguistic expressions that are representative of the LACK OF CONTROL OVER MIGRATION IS UP metaphor. This metaphor operates along the vertical line of human experience. The most frequent were linguistic expressions with the word *rise*, *increase* or its derivatives. The lexical item *high* pointed to the increase in upwards orientation, thus, was a clear instance of the LACK OF CONTROL OVER MIGRATION IS UP metaphor, which draws on the UP-DOWN image schema. For example,

- (15) *<...> there are signs of growing concern among Spaniards that their government's relaxed policy **will allow the immigrant population to surge beyond manageable levels** (FT, Feb 20, 2007)*
- (16) *Šis sprendimas buvo pristatytas kaip savotiškas apsauginis skydas, kad Olandijos darbo rinka nebūtų **užtvindyta**. (V, 2004 02 12)*
(E: *The decision has been delivered as a possible protection shield so that Holland's labour market wasn't submerged*)

As Kövecses (2002, p.36) and Lakoff (1990, p.435) point out, upward orientation tends to go together with positive evaluation, while downward orientation seems compatible with a negative evaluation. However, as the data show, the metaphorical source domain of the increase in vertical quantity focuses on the negative aspect or the lack of control over migration. The UP-DOWN schema, as Taylor observes (1995, p.137), is applied to a non-numerical scale of intensity. Namely, the metaphor highlights the aspects such as when the number of immigrants increases, it is more difficult to control those people as well as the social and economic effect they have on the target country. Similarly, as more people leave the country, i.e. emigrate, the source country loses part of its labour force.

⁴ Translations of the Lithuanian examples into English are provided in brackets.

The examples analysed have proved the cross-linguistic aspect of the NATURAL FORCE metaphor, which can be explained by human experience. This metaphorical pattern foregrounds the intensity of the situation, difficulty to control it and the view towards migration as a social catastrophe. However, as suggested by Boers (1999, p.48), cultures may vary by virtue of the more specific imagery for conceptual metaphors. The types of primary metaphors in English and Lithuanian carry interesting implications.

It should be noted that some linguistic manifestations point to cross-linguistic differences of the complex MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE metaphor. Namely, the primary metaphor EMIGRATION IS WATER RUNNING OUTWARDS has been restricted to the Lithuanian data. The findings might be explained by the cultural and political differences. After accessing the European Union, the Lithuanian government faced the problem of people emigrating to other countries, most often to Britain, which, on the other hand, came up with the issue of a number of people entering the country. Accordingly, it is these political and social realities that the conceptual metaphors (1) IMMIGRATION IS INFLOW and (2) EMIGRATION IS WATER RUNNING OUTWARDS capture. Consider the example:

- (17) *šiandien praktiškai nėra priemonių, kaip spręsti žmonių <...> "nutekėjimo" problemą* (V, 2004 07 15)

(E: there are almost no measures today to cope with the problem of people's "outflow")

As opposed to immigrants "flowing" into the country, conceptualised by the lexical items *influx* and *inflow*, the linguistic manifestation in (17) implies flow outwards, and the focus is on the problem of people leaving the source country, i.e. emigration. Thus, it is by focusing on different directions of the flow of water that different aspects of the complex metaphor MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE are highlighted. As Kövecses suggests, we cannot expect the exact metaphors in all languages, but we cannot expect metaphors that contradict basic human experience either (2002, p.76). Furthermore, as Shore points out: "<...> the internalization of cultural models is based on more socially constrained experiences than is the case of idiosyncratic models" (1996, p.47 quoted in Gibbs and Steen, 1999, p.189). Hence, the metaphorization patterns are based on socially determined experiences.

The analysis of the MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE metaphor has shown that mostly the image of water prevails in conceptualising migration and the investigation has led to two important points. Firstly, the metaphorical language poses the understanding of migration as some kind of natural event, 'an inexorable process with its own logic and force' (Turton, 2003, p.5). Therefore, the aspects of migration which are highlighted include its imminence and force. Accordingly, it justifies the view towards emigrants and immigrants as a threat, even as enemies and requires people to think of it as something which the country has to defend itself against. The second important conclusion rests on the assumption that the NATURAL FORCE metaphor foregrounds thinking about migrants as some undifferentiated mass. The metaphorical language of migration as some substance makes it possible for the source and target countries to respond to migrants not as individual human beings, but as

anonymous and dehumanised masses. It seems that understanding migrants as molecules in a liquid depersonalizes and dehumanizes migrants. Hence, the conception of migrants in terms of the NATURAL FORCE phenomenon draws the picture of migrants as passive victims of circumstances, carried along in flows, streams and waves.

4.2. Migration is war

Another major group of conceptual metaphors, whose expressions imply the attitude towards migration as a threat, is MIGRATION IS WAR. The research by Lakoff (1991) and Vaičėnienė (2002) has shown that military concepts are relatively frequently employed when referring to political subjects. Migration is conceptualised as a belligerent who is combated and strategies are launched in order to defeat it. In other words, the metaphorical model of migration as an enemy in war is systematic in both languages and examples contain a number of literal attributes of a typical war.

The conceptual domain of war that was used as a source domain includes putting up a fight, setting targets, using weapons as well as the participants of war, i.e. a victim and an enemy. In the majority of metaphorical expressions, migration receives its structure through an ontological metaphor. Conceptualised as an entity, it can be given features and characterized as *illegal*. The identification of migration as a wrongdoer justifies the victim's actions against it. Consider the examples in both languages:

- (18) *These candidates also lumped illegal immigrants together with terrorists* <...>. (FT, Nov 9, 2006)

- (19) <...> *prašys bendradarbiauti kovojant su narkotikų prekyba ir nelegalia migracija* (VŽ, 2007 06 18)

(E: <...> will ask to cooperate when fighting the drug traffic and illegal migration)

Illegal and *nelegalus* conceptualise migrants as criminals, as if they were wrongdoers. Those who break the law have to be punished. The conception of immigrants as criminals is exemplified by the metaphorical expression *lumped illegal immigrants together with terrorists*, i.e. immigrants are thus likened to terrorists who have to be punished. In general, the analysis has led to the observation that the discussion of migration is frequently adjacent to the discussion of crime and terrorism. Following Turton's observation (2003, p.4), it can be concluded that the metaphorical language of migration is spoken from a sedentary or state-centric perspective. In other words, the source and the target country impose their own conception of migration as illegal action.

As already shown, the conceptual domain of war includes victims, which/ who are often seen as heroes, and enemies. The linguistic metaphorical expressions seem to provide evidence for Lakoff's fairy-tale scenario. As the scholar suggests (1991), "the most natural way to justify a war on moral grounds is to fit the fairy tale structure to a given situation". Whenever the lexical item specifying military action against the enemy is used, it is most often the target country that is personified and acts as a victim. For example:

- (20) *America is not the only country wrestling with immigration* (E, May 3, 2006)

- (21) *Sausio gale prie imigracijos iš Rytų Europos išsigandusių šalių prisidėjo ir Olandija* (V, 2004 02 12)

(E: *At the end of January Holland also joined the countries scared of immigration from Eastern Europe*)

- (22) *Barroso urges EU unity on immigration* [headline] (FT, Sep 8, 2006)

In example (20) the target country is conceptualised as a person engaging in a battle against immigration. To account for the meaning of the metaphorical expression *wrestling with immigration*, we need several domains. The blended space results from the juxtaposition of elements from two inputs: the domain of war and the domain of sports. In the blended space, opponents in sports competitions are likened to belligerents in war. Moreover, countries are seen as having the properties of a participant in war, i.e. being scared of the belligerent, e.g. *imigracijos išsigandusios šalys*. Thus, the hero, i.e. the country of immigration, undergoes difficulties and engages the villain, i.e. immigration, in a battle. Example (22) makes reference to the allies in war, i.e. the victim/ hero and its supporters conceptualised by the item *unity*. Once the hero and its allies defeat the villain, the moral balance is restored. It is through the fairy-tale scenario that the ways of dealing with migration are viewed as justifiable.

Furthermore, the source domain of war includes other aspects, such as planning actions or strategies and setting the target. Consider the following examples:

- (23) *<...> the EU relaunched a mission to tackle the biggest challenges of the day: <...> immigration*. (FT, Feb 7, 2007)

- (24) *Vyriausybė rengia plačias ir sudėtingas strategijas emigracijos problemoms spręsti* (V, 2006 06 01)

(E: *The Parliament is arranging extensive and complicated strategies for solving the problems of emigration*)

Once immigration and emigration are viewed as entities through an ontological metaphor, they are further conceptualised as targets, which are set. A *strategy* is planned to deal with the target. Therefore, having identified the purpose, actions conceptualised by the item *mission* are taken. Instead of using the notions of law or politics, the item *strategies*, which refers to ideas of employing national power, is used to metaphorise the way of dealing with migration. Thus, a scheme, which is introduced to seek migrants, helps to conceptualise them as both targets and enemies, and the action of dealing with emigrants and immigrants is viewed as a military operation.

Generally, the WAR metaphor is quite consistent in its mappings: the source and the target countries are personified and they encounter a serious problem, which is why military actions often seem unavoidable. Later, when the war has been waged, the strategies are chosen, weapons are prepared and used. It seems that the WAR metaphor is used as justification for political sanctions against migrants. As Lakoff comments: 'they [war metaphors] were invented by the Bush administration to strike terror into the hearts of Americans and to justify the invasion [into Iraq]' (Lakoff, 1991). On the basis of Lakoff's observation it might be concluded that the metaphorical language of war justifies the strict control on immigrants entering the country, and

moulds the public opinion about migrants as potential criminals.

Conclusions

The present cross-linguistic research as well as quantitative analysis have confirmed the general hypothesis that emigration and immigration are complicated and problematic issues, which are often comprehended via metaphorical language. This might lead to the conclusion that metaphors are deeply entrenched in the cognition and reasoning about emigration and immigration despite the language analysed.

The underlying conceptual metaphor in both the Lithuanian and the English languages is the NATURAL FORCE metaphor relating to flow of water. The complex MIGRATION IS A NATURAL FORCE metaphor has, however, revealed different linguistic realisations, thus, focusing on different problems related to migration in Lithuania and Britain. Lithuanian seemed to conceptualise the problem of EMIGRATION rather than immigration via metaphors, which have the source domain of water flowing outwards. While a considerable number of IMMIGRATION (rather than emigration) metaphors implying the flow inwards was identified in the English data. Accordingly, it might be concluded that, despite language-specific realisation, the general experience with the destructive power of masses of water is fundamental for the generation of metaphors in both languages.

The tendency of conceptualising migration in terms of an entity, which is threatening to the social and economic stability of the country, is revealed by the metaphorical expressions that involve militaristic lexis. More specifically, the WAR metaphor establishes the superiority of the target country's perspective over *illegal entrants*, *invading migrants*, or immigration, which has to be eliminated. The linguistic metaphors representative of the WAR metaphor in Lithuanian foreground the seriousness of the problem of emigration, which has to be stopped. Fighting against emigrants as if they were criminals means treating them as unpatriotic and weak. War is defined as the possible way to defend the nation in both Lithuanian and English. Thus, the analysis of the WAR metaphor has complemented to the main claims of the embodiment hypothesis, illustrating that the bigger role some segment of the human experience plays in our lives, the more widely it is accepted in the categorisation of abstract concepts.

Although the attitude towards emigration and immigration as a threat which has to be stopped prevails in both cross-linguistic and language-specific metaphors, Lithuanian-specific metaphorical instances point to a distinctive cultural feature – metaphorical expressions radiating social irony. Irony arises through the discrepancy between the comparison of emigration to a popular phenomenon (FASHION), which is valued in society, and implying the conception of emigration as a social catastrophe (PUNISHMENT). Thus, what the metaphorical expressions restricted to the Lithuanian data have in common is the tendency to disclose the conception of emigration as a social catastrophe through irony.

In contrast to the Lithuanian data, English-specific linguistic metaphors did not appear numerous (1 instance in comparison to 12 in Lithuanian), which suggests that the experiential

basis rather than the influence of the English language serves as foundation for the emergence of Lithuanian-specific metaphors.

Thus, the cross-linguistic analysis has confirmed the claims of the embodiment hypothesis as well as culture specific parameter of metaphorisation (different realisations of the NATURAL FORCE metaphor). The cross-cultural similarity might be explained not only by the influence of English onto the Lithuanian language but, most importantly, in line with the main principles of the CMT, mainly the universal anthropocentric perspective, i.e. our reasoning about emigration and immigration is grounded in our physical experience with uncontrollable flow of water which has destructive force and physical fighting in order to protect ourselves. However, the scope of this research did not allow an in-depth analysis of more metaphorical expressions collected. Further research may be conducted in exploring MIGRATION metaphors in other languages as well as other academic (textbooks), public (live TV interviews) discourses or even the metaphorical language of legal texts on migration.

References

1. Arcimavičienė, L., 2005. Cognitive Domains of HIV/AIDS in Lithuanian, English and Russian Languages. *Kalbotyra*, nr. 54 (1), pp.17-31.
2. Boers, F., 1999. When a Bodily Source Domain Becomes Prominent: the Joy of Counting Metaphors in the Socio-Economic Domain. In: R. W. Gibbs and G. Steen, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp.47-56.
3. Cibulskienė, J., 2005. Konceptualioji kelio metafora Lietuvos rinkimų diskurse *Kalbotyra*, nr. 54 (1), pp.51-64.
4. Cienki, A., 2005. *Researching Conceptual Metaphors that (may) Underlie Political Discourse*. Available at: <http://eis.bris.ac.uk/~potfc/Granada/Papers/Cienki.pdf> [Accessed 16 February 2006].
5. Croft, W. and Cruse A., 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
6. Davidson, D., 1996. What Metaphors Mean. In: A. P. Martinich, ed. *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: OUP, pp.415-425.
7. Fauconnier, G. and Turner. M., 1995. *Conceptual Integration and Formal Expression*. Available at: <http://philosophy.uoregon.edu/metaphor/turner.htm> [Accessed 10 May 2007]
8. Fauconnier, G., 1999. Introduction to Methods and Generalizations. In T. Janssen, and G. Redeker, eds. *Scope and Foundations of Cognitive Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter. Cognitive Linguistic Research Series. Available at: http://cogweb.ucla.edu/Abstracts/Fauconnier_99.html [Accessed 10 May 2007]
9. Fauconnier, G., 2002. *Conceptual integration*. Available at: <http://www.ifi.unizh.ch/ailab/people/lunga/Conferences/invited/FauconnierGilles.pdf> [Accessed 7 June 2007]
10. Gibbs, R. W. and Steen, G. eds., 1999. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
11. Grady, J. E., Oakley, T., Coulson, S., 1999. Blending and Metaphor. In R. W. Gibbs and G. Steen, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
12. Kövecses, Z., 2002. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
13. Lakoff, G., 1990. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp.269-303.
14. Lakoff, G., 1991. *Metaphor in Politics*. Available at: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~uophil/metaphor/lakoff-l.htm> [Accessed 16 February 2006]
15. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
16. Martinich, A. P., 1996. A Theory for Metaphor. In A. P. Martinich, ed. *The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: OUP, pp.427-439.
17. Musolff, A., 2000. Political Imagery of Europe: A House without Exit Doors? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, no. 21 (3), pp.216-229.
18. Ritchie, D., 2004. Lost in "Conceptual Space": Metaphors of Conceptual Integration. *Metaphor and Symbol*, no. 19 (1): pp.31-50. Available at : <http://web.pdx.edu/~cgrd/Metaphors%20of%20Conceptual%20Integration.html> [Accessed 10 May 2007]
19. Taylor, J. R., 1995 *Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: OUP, pp.130-141.
20. Turton, D., 2003. Conceptualising Forced Migration. Available at: <http://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/PDFs/workingpaper12.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2007]
21. Urbonaitė, J., Šeškauskienė, I. (2007) HEALTH Metaphor in Political and Economic Discourse: a Cross-linguistic Analysis, *Kalbų studijos*, no. 11, pp.69-73.
22. Vaičenonienė, J., 2002. Metaphor in Political Language, *Kalbotyra*, no. 51 (3), pp153-162.

Inga Dervinytė

Konceptualiosios emigracijos ir imigracijos metaforos periodikoje: lyginamoji anglų ir lietuvių kalbų analizė

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos konceptualiosios emigracijos ir imigracijos metaforos lietuvių ir britų periodikoje, remiantis konceptualiosios metaforos teorija. Pirma, atlikta statistinė analizė parodė, kad tiek lietuvių, tiek britų spaudo linkusi vartoti metaforinius pasakymus, kai kalbama apie migraciją, t.y. buvo surinkta 280 metaforinių pasakymų straipsniuose anglų ir 240 lietuvių kalba. Taigi analizė paneigė hipotezę, įrodytą ankstesniuose tyrimuose, kad lietuvių periodikoje mažiau linkstama vartoti metaforas nei britų. Vėliau metaforiniai pasakymai buvo klasifikuojami į konceptualiųjų metaforų grupes. Didžiausią metaforų dalį sudaro metaforiniai pasakymai, suponuojantys požiūrį į emigraciją ir imigraciją kaip grėsmę ar net priešą. Šią tendenciją galima pagrįsti GAMTOS REIŠKINIO konceptualiąja metafora, kurios leksinė realizacija atskleidžia, kad migracija suvokiama kaip neišvengiama gamtos stichija, o išvykstantys ar atvykstantys į šalį žmonės kaip vientisa masė, srautas ar potvynis. Dažni KARO METAFORA suponuojantys pasakymai atskleidžia tokius aspektus, kaip norą *susidoroti su migracija, pažaboti imigrantų srautą* ar sukurti *strategiją prieš emigrantus*, norint sumažinti išvykstančių iš Lietuvos žmonių skaičių. Tai, kad tik vienai kalbai būdingi metaforiniai pasakymai sudarė vienetinius atvejus, rodo, kad jų vartojimas galėtų būti publicisto subjektyvus pasirinkimas, pragmatiniai interesai ar stiliaus ypatybės. Galima būtų teigti, kad tyrimas patvirtina kognityvistų teiginį, jog metafora yra pažinimo priemonė, atskleidžianti mūsų mąstymą apie migraciją, nepriklausomai nuo kalbos.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2009 03

Parengtas spaudai 2009 05

About the author

Inga Dervinytė, MA (English Linguistics), assistant lecturer at the Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Lithuania.

Research interests: cognitive linguistics, contrastive linguistics, ELT.

Address: Department of English Philology, Vilnius University, Universiteto Str. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.

E-mail: idervinyte@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.14.43336