Rethinking Tradition in English Language and Literary Studies

Rethinking Tradition in English Language and Literary Studies

Edited by

Željka Babić, Tatjana Bijelić
and Petar Penda

Rethinking Tradition in English Language and Literary Studies

Edited by Željka Babić, Tatjana Bijelić and Petar Penda

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

ŽELJKA BABIĆ,
TATJANA BIJELIĆ,
PETAR PENDA

A dedication to establishing new approaches towards the study of relationship between tradition and contemporariness, brought together scholars in their personal endeavours to contribute to the topic. By providing an open forum for the exchange of ideas and experiences across the fields of English language and literary studies, editors insisted on putting the emphasis on cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary issues raised in the fields of literature, linguistics, culture, translation studies and applied linguistics. The title *Rethinking Tradition in English Language and Literary Studies* serves as a linking thread, which meticulously follows the authors' chosen paths in shedding a personalised light on problems the re-opening of certain topics and their research indubiously present. Bravely venturing into the rewriting of basic postulates in approaches to foreign language teaching practices, mediating between source and target language cultures and languages via questioning traditional postulates used in translation studies research, juxtaposing tradition and contemporariness in ideology, tradition, customs, norms or routines, the collection offers a critical evaluation of contemporariness and tradition, proposes new theoretical paradigms and focuses on the applicability of the proposed solutions. The essays are divided into two separate parts; one part deals with linguistics and methodological issues, and the other is more closely connected with literary and cultural topics. However, the separation, which only enhances the overall notion of separateness between the unnaturally created trichotomy among cultural, literary and linguistic issues is but an illusion, and the essays included in the collection call for a (re)thinking of current approaches towards research practices.

The investigation within the area of critical discourse analysis opens the first part of the collection dedicated to linguistic and methodological issues in the paper *How the Copenhagen Criteria Changed Europe: Perceptions from 'Both Sides of the Fence'* by Ljerka Jeftić. The paper

posits that inequalities of power affect some of the available ways of construing reality in language. In the case of the European Union (EU) enlargement, the particular way of construing reality is reflected in various policy papers, strategy reports, the enlargement agenda itself, etc. The analysis reveals potential contestation of the dominant discourse. One of Jeftić's analysis results points at the inculcation of new ways of being, new identities of European citizens, who are made to perceive themselves as being outsiders unless they are citizens of the EU, which is a change brought about by the implementation of the Copenhagen criteria.

Sanja Josifović-Elezović and Svetlana Mitić in their paper reciprocally entitled *Peer Learning for Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education at Banja Luka University,* propose a scheme adopted for foreign language methodology classes. The scheme exploits peer teaching and peer assessment used as a tool for developing and enhancing teaching practices and attitudes in general through the collaboration in teaching and lesson plan development and the mirroring of self-perceptions and perceptions of teaching abilities and teacher personalities. The findings of Josifović-Elezović and Mitić's research show that the benefits of the approach they have taken are not only seen through the enhancement of general and particular knowledge learned from the course but also in the fact that the learning of transferable skills through usage of various activities encourages social and personal development as well.

The historical review on bridging the gap in concepts of translators' liberty and text fidelity is the focus of research presented by Dalibor Kesić in his paper *Translation and Interpretation Conventions*. He provides a critical overview of theoretical postulates and patterns and their actual application in translational practice. The results of this elaboration lead to the conclusion that the role of translation ought to be looked at in quite a different light. For if he is seen mostly as an individual who merely does a job he is contracted to, and his only purpose is to provide a product which serves users' needs, there will exist a little chance of approaching both his work and skill differently than before. Kesić, making the parallel between culture and translation, concludes that if the dynamic state of the translation paradigm is applied to contemporary translation practices, it is only natural that the terminology, which it uses to depict its social determinants, should also retain the same dynamic state and be open and prone to changes.

Translation issues are also at the centre of Monika Kragulj's research. In the paper entitled *Strategies of Translating Culturally Challenging Texts,* she tackles various issues that emerge from the dichotomy created by the existence and non-existence of specific cultural concepts in the

source and target languages. She finds the basis for her approach in the posit that sometimes it is not enough to possess only linguistic knowledge to achieve an acceptable translational product, especially if we deal with literary translation. The paper hypothesises that it is the responsibility of the translator to know the cultural particularities of the target culture and to create an environment in the target text, which ought to provide the transfer of the source language text's effect. The obviousness of problems that arise from the acceptance of taking such a course in practice, leads to a loss of the text's universal value. The results of Kragulj's analysis show that text-focused shifts practically depend on clues used during the translation process whose result is the awaited textual coherence.

Danijela Kulić and Savka Blagojević propose a teaching model aimed at developing multiliteracies through a foreign language course in the paper entitled *A New Concept in FLT: Developing Multiliteracies through Language Skills Integration*. Their research establishes the presence of the need of modern people to express themselves through different modes of communication, for the traditional, verbal mode of communication proved to provide inadequate means in the information era for the majority of foreign language learners. The activities and procedures, which Kulić and Blagojević based on Neuro-Linguistic Programming and Multiple Intelligences theory, and presented in the form of an integrated skills lesson, highly motivated students to explore new techniques, which include movement, music and visual imaging. The conclusions undoubtedly show that even though, on the surface level, one is prone to deduce that the success of the model implementation is not achievable without students' drive for the introduction of innovative approaches, it still lies in the full commitment and enthusiasm of teachers and their willingness to apply and realise the model in practice.

Gabrijela Perišić's essay entitled *Lexis in Translations of Tony Parsons' Novels into the Serbian Language* focuses on the analysis of lexis as an intratextual element and the cultural influence comparison between the source and the target language text. The challenge with translators of literary texts written for a specific group of people is obvious. The language of Tony Parsons is modern, full of colloquial expressions, slang and jargon. This type of text asks for specific types of translation strategies to be used, and, at the same time, demands that the translator not only exhibits an in-depth knowledge of the terms used but also possesses tools for transferring them into the target language product. The result of the conducted contrastive analysis shows usage of different strategies in the translation of the lexical items, especially fixed expressions and idioms.

Emphasising the fact that as globalisation and social media use spread at an ever-increasing pace, Anita Selec, in her essay *Focusing on Facebook: Incorporating Social Media in English Language Teaching*, states that language teaching must perforce keep up. Venturing to explore how English educators incorporate Facebook into their foreign language course, the first conclusion leads to indecisive clues as to how exactly Facebook was used during the classes, which is important in regards to the hypothesis that the usage of social media in English teaching practices has expanded within the past five years. The primary disadvantage Selec notes is that of privacy, and, as far as the positive sides of using Facebook are concerned, they are primarily related to the possibility of global communication, familiarity with use and enthusiasm for using information technologies, which the majority of questionees expressed.

Jasna Trajić discusses the concept of inclusive education with specific focus on foreign language teaching in her essay *English Teaching Issues: Serbian Pupils with Special Education Needs*. The array of difficulties, starting from physical and emotional barriers up to inadequate facilities, lack of qualified staff and teaching materials and the absence of support, were noted as just the tip of the iceberg when teaching children with special education needs is concerned. The process of inclusive education is relatively new to researched foreign language teaching practices. Trajić proposes the inclusion of practices that are more welcoming, learner-friendly, and beneficial for a wide range of children, practices aimed at developing various strengths and gifts, as well as being suitable for adjustment according to the needs of children with special education needs.

The concluding essay of the linguistics and methodological part of the collection is *The Role of Language Adaptation in Cultural Identification* by Jelena Vojinović-Kostić. The exploration of language adaptation, a linguistic phenomenon which could be set in the middle of group identification, leads her to investigate changes in linguistic usage and the relation between language and identity of a specific refugee group through the prism of their linguistic choices. Findings show a relation between the usage of dialect and the age of the speaker and the level of education of individual questionees. As far as the role of identity is concerned, Vojinović-Kostić states that identity within the group is very important to them, and the most prominent characteristic is the usage of the dialectal language variant. They preserve their origin, past and cultural background through the language they use. On the other hand, the usage of local dialect is aimed at showing prestige and mingling in the wider group, thus demonstrating that the more distant from the original dialect they are, the

more distant they are also from their geographical, social and cultural identity.

The literary and cultural part of the collection is opened by Tatjana Dumitrašković's *Power and Authority – Two Critical Disturbing Forces within the Universe of Shakespeare's Coriolanus,* which offers a contexualised analysis of Coriolanus, the tragedy's main character based on the intriguing historical figure, investigating to what extent the highly acclaimed literary representation of the Roman leader reflects, clarifies, or even complicates the impact of the leader and ruler on the society over which his power and authority are exerted. Within a broader consideration of the play, Dumitrašković focuses on the relational dynamics between the powerful yet flawed and tyrannical leader and his submissive, underprivileged people. Although the notion of political wickedness can be used to insinuate Coriolanus' political shrewdness and rise in power, Dumitrašković recognises the trajectory that leads from open abuse and manipulation of people to the leader's downfall.

In the chapter titled *Doctorow's Disneyland,* Anida Hadžić sheds light on manifold interactions between the notions of narrative, history, representation and interpretation in *The Book of Daniel*, E. L. Doctorow's 1971 novel on the Rosenberg case. Drawing on Linda Hutcheon's claim that the past becomes a question of representing, Hadžić explores the possibility of accessing the past and understanding the trauma caused by loss. The space of Disneyland is at the same time accentuated as a complex meeting point and a platform where historical events are reduced and replaced by simulations denoting shallowness and encouraging consumerism. Hadžić offers a theoretically informed reading of Disneyland as a "social microcosm" where visiting masses are continually monitored, controlled, and manipulated.

In the chapter entitled *Do Androids Dream of a Modern Prometheus?* Mladen Jakovljević juxtaposes Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Philip K. Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep*? The first novel, generally viewed and recognised as a forerunner of science fiction that links classical mythology with a modern rendition of divine powers of creation, serves as an introduction to the other one, which deals with and depicts appropriations and abuses of advancing science and technology from a critical perspective. The chapter addresses contemporary moral dilemmas and anxieties about humans becoming sophisticated but dehumanised artefacts through their own creations, erasing essential differences between the creators and the created and thus blurring distinctions between the authentic and the constructed. Jakovljević also explores social and economic

conditions of dehumanisation as well as potential consequences of subject-object role reversals in the wake of posthumanism.

In *The Centre Cannot Hold: Civilisational Contents and Discontents in Bronte's Wuthering Heights, Gaskell's North and South and Forster's Howards End,* Branko Marijanović and Anđelka Raguž address the three novels' engagement with the concept of human progress through culture and civilisation. Basing its arguments on Darwinian and Freudian thinking, the article explores a trajectory of decadence that follows civilisational progress into "overcivilisation", probing the very essence of humanity, its primeval strength and vitality. Attempting to offer their own contribution to a universal discussion about the necessity of uncultured yet vital barbarism as an oppositional force to cultural progress, Marijanović and Raguž point at similarities between the three novels and W.B. Yeats's "The Second Coming", suggesting that "unnatural" figures or disfigured personalities found in the works in question may anticipate hybrid compositions of self and the other.

In *Mythology for England*, Bojan Međedović and Tanja Petrović explore the very foundations of J. R. R. Tolkien's process of creating new mythology aimed at representing England and its national identity. Acknowledging Tolkien's dissatisfaction with the already existing mythology that is replete with Christian elements and Norman influences, the authors of the article offer a fresh perspective on Tolkien's passionate engagement with early Anglo-Saxon tradition. Based on critically informed presentations of historical contexts and circumstances that influenced Tolkien's ideas and writings, the article links Tolkien's preoccupation with establishing a new mythological order to his personal and collective identification with the disastrous consequences of the First World War.

The chapter authored by Lena Petrović, *A Bend in the River: Transformation or Misinterpretation of Conrad's Tradition?,* discusses divergent critical views on V. S. Naipaul's literary indebtedness to Joseph Conrad. Whilst Naipaul's works are widely recognised as authentic interpretations of the Third World for a British and American readership, they are at the same time criticised for inaccurate representations of postcolonial Africa, which tends to classify Western-educated Naipaul as a purveyor of western myths of supremacy. Claiming that neither of the two perspectives is wholly tenable, and drawing upon Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism*, Petrović in her chapter argues for a crucial difference separating Conrad's from Naipaul's images of Africa. Reading Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* as a rare example of unequivocal condemnation of colonial presence in Africa, the author acknowledges Conrad's influence

on Naipaul, but she emphasises that Naipaul in *A Bend in the River* draws on the Conradian imagery of darkness only to *defend* the ongoing imperialist politics.

Olivera Petrović-Tomanić in her article entitled *Postmodern British Novel: Changing the Literary-National Paradigms – from the 'English Novel' to the Novel Written in English,* explores visible shifts in the treatment of literary and national identities as represented in the late 20th-century British novel. Referring to the works of writers such as Hanif Kureishi, Timothy Mo, and Kazuo Ishiguro, Petrović-Tomanić focuses on the concept of the other in contemporary British literature, discussing it through the prism of persistent stereotypes and prejudices perceivable not only in postcolonial and immigrant novels written in English, but also in contemporary British culture in general. Petrović-Tomanić claims that the non-English origin of the authors in question and their literary preoccupations help enrich and transform literary and cultural conventions in both academic and wider circles.

Drawing on Jean-Paul Sartre's understanding of socially engaged literature as having both aesthetic and utilitarian features and functions, Biljana Vlašković Ilić in her *Engaged Literature as Art, Prerogative, and Obligation* claims that socially engaged literature can be comprehended as art, which becomes a prerogative and an obligation of every human in achieving their humane goals. The very claim is elaborately justified through the author's detailed reading and interpretation of selected texts that deal with socially conditioned notions of truth, censorship, feminism, and education. In her references to the engaged art of Pinter, Rich, Orwell, and Huxley, to name but a few, Vlašković Ilić additionally offers a rather comprehensive portrait of the activist writer, whose responsibility of social engagement helps maintain sanity and balance in the destabilised contemporary world.

Dijana Zrnić in her chapter on *New Criticism and Legal Formalism* reviews New Criticism as a formalist movement in literary theory and an American school of formalist criticism that has counterparts in coherentist jurisprudence of legal formalism. The shared methods of literary and legal interpretation dispense with evidence of meaning other than the text itself, including the cultural background necessary for understanding the words and sentences, and the purposes of interpreting the text in question. Through her interdisciplinary reading of shared formalist or so-called "intrinsic" criticism, Zrnić identifies the ways in which New Criticism was committed to the close scrutiny of works of literature viewed as artefacts, paying particular attention to densely structured lyric poetry. Drawing parallels between methods of interpretation, the author claims that a

common trajectory of New Criticism and classic American legal formalism has, to a certain extent, preserved New Criticism as an interpretative inclination.

The collection offers insight into contemporary research and trends in various areas of English studies. Written in dynamic, appealing and cutting-edge language, it enables re-evaluation of traditional posits and adds its own layers of understanding of the whole array of issues investigated. The attraction of the topics chosen, the appeal of the approaches used and the contemporariness of research paths taken substantiate that the collection will attract not only readers who are closely interested in dealing with different areas of English studies but also scholars inclined to embrace interdisciplinarity as one of the main paths they pursue in their research.

PART ONE:

LANGUAGE STUDIES

HOW THE COPENHAGEN CRITERIA CHANGED EUROPE: PERCEPTIONS FROM 'BOTH SIDES OF THE FENCE'

LJERKA JEFTIĆ

1. Introduction

Ever since the pronouncement of Robert Schuman's "Declaration" in 1950, the main goal of which was to restore peace on the continent, European political and territorial order have been under construction. The dominant form the construction has taken over time is dubbed the "enlargement" of the European Union (EU), one interpretation of which may be – European countries joining together while shifting and/or erasing borders among themselves and conforming to the requirements, rules and/or procedures defined by various treaties and policy papers that the member countries of the EU have endorsed. One of the key landmarks within the EU enlargement process was the establishment of the criteria at the EU Summit in Copenhagen, in June 1993, when EU membership opened to "the Central and East European countries"[1]. The criteria have ever since been referred to as the "Copenhagen criteria" and are defined as being synonymous with the "accession criteria" in the EU glossary, thus implying (and assuming) existence of the volition on the side of the joining countries to "agree to do what people have asked you to do", that is, "to take a position of power" (CALD 2005, 6). The following information is provided on the EU official website under the entry "accession criteria"[2]:

> Any country seeking membership of the EU must conform to the
> conditions set out by Article 49 and the principles laid down in Article 6

---

[1] At: http://en.euabc.com/word/230. Accessed on 15 October 2014
[2] At: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhague_en.htm. Accessed on 15 October 2014

(1) of the Treaty on European Union. Relevant criteria were established by the Copenhagen European Council in 1993 and strengthened by the Madrid European Council in 1995. To join the EU, a new Member State must meet three criteria:
-   Political: stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities;
-   Economic: existence of a functioning market economy and the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union;
-   Acceptance of the Community acquis: ability to take on the obligations of membership, including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union.

For the European Council to decide to open negotiations, the political criteria must be satisfied. Any country that wishes to join the Union must meet the accession criteria.

Considering the presuppositions contained in the above quotation (the EU exists as an entity that speaks with one voice; there is inequality of power distributed between those within the EU and those outside the EU; the EU enjoys elite status and is in possession of power; there are countries that wish to acquire a position of rank or power by becoming an EU member; to acquire the position they are subjected to the process of conditionality, i.e. meeting conditions embodied in the Copenhagen criteria) we might characterise the EU as an economic and political "imaginary" (Wodak 2011, 30) that presupposes its own unity and power, granting privileged status for those inside the EU.

Twenty years after the establishment of the Copenhagen criteria, a conference was held in Copenhagen titled "Twenty Years that Changed Europe: The Copenhagen Criteria and the Enlargement of the European Union". The title presupposes that change had taken place in Europe over the twenty years, and that the change was triggered by the Copenhagen criteria affecting the EU enlargement. The title also presupposes the relation of synonymy between Europe and the European Union. The Conference report[3] contains transcripts of speeches of seven participants, four of which are analysed in this paper with the aim to identify strategies deployed by the speakers to legitimise this change, i.e. the particular, institutionalised way of construing reality in language, as well as those contesting it. For this purpose, speeches of the representatives of the EU

---

[3] The Conference Report can be found at: http://um.dk/da/~/media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Udenrigspolitik/Nyheder-og-publikationer/20%20Years%20that%20Changed%20Europe_UM.pdf Accessed in September 2014

member countries (the insiders) and non-member countries (the outsiders) have been included in the analysis: the then EU Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, Štefan Füle; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic, Miroslav Lajčak; the Deputy Prime Minister for European Integration of Serbia, Suzana Grubješic; the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nikola Poposki.

2. Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has proved to be an unparalleled theoretical-methodological framework within which to analyse political discourse. In the light of the fact that the EU is a political organisation, the discourse it generates about itself as well as the discourse generated about the EU by other organisations and institutions can be considered political. The political nature of the EU is evident in the strong influence it has had in the political structuring and/or contexts of both its member countries and the countries aspiring to become member countries. This paper postulates that in the case of the EU enlargement the dominant way, the institutionalised way, of construing reality in language is manifested within "the European discourse [which is] in constant becoming, activated by meaning production beyond resignificated and porous EU borders" (Belanger 2014). This paper draws from the CDA tenets that it is the inequalities of power that affect which of the available ways of construing reality in language become the dominant ones and that the inequalities of power reveal existence of power behind the discourse which is manifest in conventionalized ways of construing particular aspects of reality (Fairclough 2009). This does not mean that language incorporates specific resources uniquely earmarked for expressing power or dominance but that "language is […] a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power" (Habermas in Wodak and Meyer 2009, 10).

2.1. Legitim(iz)ation[4]

Drawing on Habermas' claim about the "strategic" use of language in politics, Chilton argues that "[i]t must be possible to characterize strategies

---

[4] Chilton, Wodak and Weiss, and Van Leeuwen use the terms "legitimization", "legitimization" and "legitimation" respectively with no difference in meaning. In the paper, legitimization and legitimation are used interchangeably.

by which utterers manage their interests" which are "are linguistically realized" (Chilton 2004, 45). He discusses three "strategic functions": "coercion; legitimization and delegitimization; representation and misrepresentation" (Chilton 2004, 45-46). He discusses the legitimization/ delegitimization function as follows:

> The legitimization function is closely linked to coercion, because it establishes the right to be obeyed, that is, 'legitimacy'. Why do people obey regimes that are very different in their policies? Reasons for being obeyed have to be communicated linguistically, whether by overt statement or by implication. The techniques used include arguments about voters' wants, general ideological principles, charismatic leadership projection, boasting about performance and positive self-representation. Delegitimization is the essential counterpart: others (foreigners, 'enemies within', institutional opposition, unofficial opposition) have to be presented negatively, and the techniques include the use of ideas of difference and boundaries, and speech acts of blaming, accusing, insulting, etc. (Chilton 2004, 46).

Wodak and Weiss hold that "[i]t is the interplay of […] three dimensions (ideational, organizational and geographical) with their respective goals (making meaning of Europe, organizing Europe and drawing borders)" that constitute "the present Europe-discourses", that is, "the specific form of the speculative talk on European identities as well as other policy processes in many areas" (Wodak and Weiss 2005, 131).

> With these three dimensions and goals three forms of legitimising the construction of the EU (and its enlargement) are connected:
> a. Legitimization through idea (identity, history, culture),
> b. Legitimization through procedure (participation, democracy, efficiency) and
> c. Legitimization through "standardization" (of humanitarism, of social standards, economic standards). (Wodak and Weiss 2005, 131)

Referring to Weber's much cited quote that "[e]very system of authority attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its legitimacy" (Weber in Van Leeuwen 2007, 91), Van Leeuwen claims that "[l]egitimation is always the legitimation of the practices of specific institutional orders" (Van Leeuwen 2007, 92). He distinguishes four major categories of legitimation:

- *Authorization*, that is, legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom and law, and of persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested.

- *Moral evaluation*, that is, legitimation by (often very oblique) reference to value systems.

- *Rationalization*, that is, legitimation by reference to the goals and uses of institutionalized social action, and to the knowledge society has constructed to endow them with cognitive validity.

- *Mythopoesis*, that is, legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish non-legitimate actions. (Van Leeuwen 2007, 92)

The reason to focus on legitimization strategies in the paper is found in Chilton's (2004, 199) claim that "[a]t the heart of what we call 'politics' is the attempt to get others to 'share a common view' about what is useful-harmful, [...], just-injust." The paper postulates that the (self)assumed power of the EU entitles it to impose the "common view" to be shared by those whose volition to "take a position of power" is also assumed. One way of doing this is to underline the legitimacy of its policies. With regards to those who are at the receiving end of this imposition (in the paper: the Republic of Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), one might not expect strong oppositional voices, that is, the presence of the delegitimation strategy (as defined by Chilton) given the officially stated position and actions taken by these countries towards eventual accession to the EU. However, considering their often voiced complaints about the long and complex procedure within the EU accession negotiations, this paper aims to identify linguistic means deployed to contest the legitimacy of the imposed conditionality.

3. Analysis

3.1. The Insiders' Perception

The overall legitimation strategy deployed in Štefan Füle's speech, titled "Copenhagen Criteria – the Backbone of EU Enlargement", is that of Mythopoesis, though in a rather stretched form of the category as described by Van Leeuwen. Namely, it is not a narrative *per se*, yet it is building up a picture of a successful outcome of the EU enlargement policy, hence the need for the continuation of the application of the Copenhagen criteria. What Füle is doing in his speech is sending a "promoting message" which is "understood by Wernick to be the one

which simultaneously 'represents [...], advocates [...], and anticipates [...]' whatever it is to which it refers" (Fairclough 2004, 113). Towards the end of his speech Füle claims:

> By extending Europe's zone *of peace, stability*, democracy and *prosperity,* enlargement is providing *benefits* to the EU as a whole. It is making the EU not only bigger, but politically and economically better positioned to address *global challenges*. This *effectiveness* of the enlargement process is largely the result of its solid backbone: the Copenhagen criteria. They have stood the test of time and, through improved application, continue today to provide the framework, guidance and inspiration for the enlargement policy. (CR[5], 11) (italics mine)

Words such as "peace" and "stability" do echo the promise of Schuman's Declaration to restore peace on the continent. However, "prosperity", "benefits", "effectiveness", "global challenges", belong to the language of what Fairclough calls "new capitalism" (Fairclough 2004, 125) and have become its commonsensical value assumptions. This is also one of the main features of the texts of new capitalism – their "performative power" to bring into being what they purport to (merely) describe (Bourdieu and Wacquant in Fairclough 2004, 113).

Füle highlights "three aspects" of how the Copenhagen criteria "delivered": "the process, the impact, and, last but not least, today's relevance" (CR, 9). With regards to "the process", he labels it as "strict and fair conditionality" and that the "Copenhagen criteria clearly set out the rules of the game, firmly anchoring conditionality in the accession process" (CR, 9). The prominence of the Authorization form of legitimation is identified in this part of Füle's speech. In his characterisation of legitimation "as an answer to the spoken or unspoken 'why' question – 'Why should we do this?' or 'Why should we do this in this way?'", Van Leeuwen advocates the type of answer "'because so-and-so says so'" where the authority is vested in 'so-and-so'" (Van Leeuwen 2007, 94). In our case, the authority is vested in the Copenhagen criteria, so we can speak of a particular subtype of the Authorization legitimation – Impersonal Authority, regardless of the absence of linguistic realisations identified by Van Leeuwen (2007, 96) for this sub-type ("verbal process clauses" and "the presence of nouns such as 'policy, 'regulation', 'rule', 'law' or their cognate adjectives and adverbs, e.g. 'compulsory',

---

[5] "CR" stands for "Conference report" throughout the text.

'mandatory', 'obligatory'"). Having been vested with authority, the Copenhagen criteria are:

> [1.] as relevant today to the countries of the Western Balkans and Turkey as they were in 1993 [...] (CR, 9)
> [2.] central to the renewed enlargement consensus of 2006, which forms the basis of the EU's enlargement policy today. (CR, 9)
> [3.] a safeguard for quality. (CR, 10)

Also,

> [conditionality] armed the accession process with objectivity and predictability [...] (CR, 9)
> Rigorous conditionality, stemming from the Copenhagen criteria, is the best guarantee that the enlargement process is not being rushed through. (CR, 10)

Moreover, given the relation of hyponymy between the Copenhagen criteria and the entire EU accession procedure, in Füle's part of the speech that reflects on the "process" aspect of the Copenhagen criteria we can speak of the presence of legitimisation through procedure, along the classification lines of Wodak and Weiss' (2005, 131).

Štefan Füle links the "impact" and the "relevance" aspects of how the Copenhagen criteria "delivered" with their "transformative power" and "same conditionality, new approaches", respectively, while deploying the combination of Rationalization and Moral Evaluation legitimation strategies:

> Enlargement is thus by definition a gradual process, based on solid and sustainable implementation of reforms by the countries concerned. This is where the impact of conditionality driven by the Copenhagen criteria comes into play. Within the framework of strict yet fair conditionality, the prospect of accession drives political and economic reforms, transforming societies and creating new opportunities for citizens and business. It reinforces the EU's political and economic strengths. (CR, 10)

Rationalization, in particular its subtype – Instrumental Rationalization – is legitimation by reference to "the utility of institutionalized action" (Fairclough 2004, 98) and in the example above we have "solid and sustainable implementation of reforms", "political and economic reforms" embodying the institutionalized action (the process of the accession to the EU) with the goal/ purpose being "the prospect of accession". Moral Evaluation is legitimation by reference to value systems and in the

example above we see that the purpose ("the prospect of accession"), given for the procedure of "strict yet fair conditionality", evokes the value system which "transform[ed] societies", "create[d] new opportunities for [...] business", and "the EU's political and economic strengths" are taken for granted. As Fairclough (2004, 99) argues

> [r]rationalization overlaps with Moral Evaluation, in the sense that the reasons and purposes given for the procedure evoke value systems which are taken for granted and constitute the 'generalized' motives which according to Habermas (1976) are now widely used 'to ensure mass loyalty'.

Unlike Štefan Füle, whose focus is on the Copenhagen criteria, Miroslav Lajčak (representative of the Slovak Republic, an EU member country) is more concerned in his speech with the enlargement process/policy and its positive outcomes:

> Our [the EU's] GDP is 50 per cent higher than the cumulated economic output of the BRIC countries.

> Its [enlargement] transformative power is well-proven in case of [...] Central and Eastern European countries that successfully integrated following the collapse of the Iron Curtain.

> [..] the enlargement is definitely a win-win story for each and every player. (CR, 13-14)

Furthermore, Lajčak's speech is titled "Being on Both Sides of the Fence: the Slovak Experience and Views on the EU Enlargement", which evokes the "Fortress Europe" (Wodak 2011) metaphor and provides room for Lajčak to use the first person plural pronoun "we" to explain the perceptions of both an insider and an outsider. When the "we" refers to the Slovak experience of joining the EU, the pervasiveness of the Mythopoesis strategy is evident in the sense that he is construing a narrative within which the outcome of his country's legitimate actions were rewarded with EU membership:

> Slovakia itself has jumped from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the average EU GDP in less than ten years.
>   In Slovakia, we remember well the difference between waiting outside and being inside. We have a fresh experience of being on both sides of the fence. More than two decades ago, when setting off for democracy, the rule of law and market economy, we were offered a vision – a vision to become part of a united, peaceful and prosperous Europe. We are pretty

aware of how important it is to keep this vision alive for the countries knocking on the EU's door. (CR, 14)

The successful outcome for Slovakia is a "moral tale" subtype within the Mythopoesis (Van Leeuwen 2007, 107) category of legitimation where good deeds lead to happy endings. There are also "cautionary tales" as a subtype of Mythopoesis which "convey what will happen if you do not conform to the norms of social practices" (Van Leeuwen 2007, 106). A rather stretched version of a cautionary tale is present in the following excerpt from Lajčak's speech in which he implicitly argues for the EU to finish its "business" in the Western Balkans so as to protect "the stability and security of Europe":

> It is, first of all, the Western Balkans where the EU *cannot leave its "business" unfinished*. The stability and security of Europe has always been interlinked with that region. *Anything happening there affects our vital interests in a positive or negative way, it is crucial for us to have the Western Balkans countries completely on board*. (CR, 14) (italics mine)

The "fence" in the title of Lajčak's speech, besides evoking the "Fortress Europe" metaphor also evokes the dichotomy within the EU – the old and new EU members. References to the "fears" (by means of presuppositions underlying the italicised elaboration of the "fears" in the quotation below) that the "old" EU members had prior to the "big bang" enlargement round enable him to corroborate the moral tale by stressing the benefits for all, which is also the example of Instrumental Rationalization legitimation:

> *Citizens of "old" Europe* have also benefited from the recent round of enlargement. *Fears* that the entry of ten poorer countries would pull money out of their pockets have proved groundless. There was no *reduction in the economic activity in older member states, their labor market was not awash by Eastern European plumbers and their welfare systems did not collapse*. On the contrary, the enlargement provided them with an enormous growth impulse thanks to new, unprecedented investment and business opportunities. They gained access to vibrant, unsaturated markets and favorable production capacities literally next door [...]. This helped Western companies strengthen their international competitiveness, while protecting domestic jobs. (CR, 13-14) (italics mine)

When the "we" refers to the EU in Lajčak's speech, it usually means the combination of Instrumental Rationalization and Moral Evaluation legitimation categories:

Being one of the EU's most successful policies, the enlargement has become a key tool *for enhancing democracy and the rule of law as well as maintaining security and stability across Europe*. (CR, 13)

The enlargement strengthens *our common voice* in world affairs and Europe is equipped better *to deal with its neighbours*. (CR, 13)

The enlargement has played a crucial role *in enhancing economic prosperity and growth in Europe*. (CR, 13) (italics mine)

Within the process of making meaning of the EU, the stage (the 20th anniversary of the application of the principle of conditionality) under analysis in this paper is construed by the two EU proponents as a reality in which, in order to achieve the ultimate goal (becoming an EU member country), a country (regardless of the nature of its existing political and economic structure) needs to be transformed and reformed through the process governed by the strict and fair conditionality for the purpose of creating new opportunities for business (and people) and contributing to the EU's political and economic strength. Furthermore, both Füle and Lajčak speak of the "European perspective" for Western Balkan countries as the incentive for them to pursue the reform agenda. As Bilbija (2011, 60) noted, this is the case of "(mis)use of conceptual metonymy" evident in "cognitive mixing of two different meanings of the adjective 'European'":

A) concept – VEHICLE = a whole in a <u>geographical</u> sense - Europe
+
B) concept – TARGET = the EU = a <u>political</u> whole, which is part of the geographical territory of Europe.

By deploying this tacit manipulation, the message sent to outsiders is that if they are not contained within the EU, they are not in Europe either. Consequently, conditionality is fully legitimised as being the justified tool to be deployed within the enlargement process.

3.2. The Outsiders' Perception

With regards to perceptions of change brought about by the Copenhagen criteria on the side of non-EU member countries, one can certainly not talk about deployment of delegitimation strategies as that would confront their governments' officially declared readiness to attain EU membership. Therefore, the following analysis of speeches focuses on the ways in which EU discourse legitimisation forms are contested.

In her speech, Suzana Grubješić, the then Deputy Prime Minister for European Integration of Serbia (the country which had been granted candidate status at the time of the Conference), is contesting EU legitimisation through procedure, i.e. the Authorisation legitimation which implies the consistency of the laws and tradition, or in the case of the EU enlargement, of the Copenhagen criteria. Namely, she explicates the alterations that followed the initial formulation of the Copenhagen criteria in 1993:

> This newly defined concept, dubbed the EU-Strategy on Conditionality, *was the first major alteration of the Copenhagen criteria,* aimed at addressing specificities of countries in question, and became the legislative embodiment of the carrot and stick approach of the EU structural policy towards the region.

> In order to be allowed to start negotiations on these bilateral agreements, *the countries of the region were given a new Ten Commandments:* (the list of ten requirements follows, author's comment)

> Furthermore, *a set of additional requirements was mandate to each country,* prejudicing that, unlike the Central and Eastern European ones, the countries of the region shall be joining the EU individually and upon their merits. (CR, 17-18) (italics mine)

Yet another way of contestation of the authority vested in the Copenhagen criteria is evident in the shift to Biblical register for rhetorical purpose. In addition to the ten commandments wording already mentioned, other biblical wording includes:

> [...] the manuscript for the EU's transformative power had been *enshrined* in the conclusions of the European Council of June 1993, setting what we call today the Copenhagen criteria.

> [...] *"transformative evangelism"*, while resting on these principles, soon took a more accommodating approach, especially when it comes to countries of what is nowadays known as the Western Balkans [...] (CR, 17) (italics mine)

This may be taken as an "extreme case formulation and intensification" (McCarthy and Carter 2004, 163), which is one of the cues to hyperbolic interpretation of the above-italicised examples. As Grubješić is using this rhetorical device for evaluative and affective purposes, that is, to emphasise the ontological character she feels is attributed to the authority

of the EU, she is voicing implicit criticism of the strictness and rigidity of the conditionality process.

Nikola Poposki, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (the country that had been granted candidate status at the time of the Conference), titled his speech "Building a Community of Stable and Prosperous States – the Unfinished 'Mission' of the EU in the Western Balkans". He is referring to the "geographical dimension" (Wodak and Weiss 2005, 131) of present EU discourse so as to corroborate his appeal for the "mission" from the title to be completed:

> In the last two decades, *the European family has embraced the countries from the East and from the South of Eur*ope.
> [...] it is a paradigm for the EU to finish the remaining task – *to fill in the political map of Europe with the new member states from the Western Balkans*. (CR, 21) (italics mine)

Like Grubješić, he is contesting the Impersonal Authority embodied in the Copenhagen criteria by explicating two different types of "conditionality":

> [...] in the case of the Western Balkans countries the EU has moved from *strictly defined "democratic conditionality"* to "*political conditionality"*, which targets specific issues in applicant countries. In the case of Macedonia, the imposed condition of 'good neighbourliness' has been "the gate keeper" for the EU membership *for too long*. (CR, 15)

This is also the case of contesting the "moral tale" subtype of Mythopoesis as Poposki is implicitly accusing the EU of departing from its own procedures and of the lack of willingness to deliver on its promises – signalled by the intensifier "too" ("for too long"). The same applies to his explication of the rules of the game (good deeds lead to happy endings) established by the EU:

> The Copenhagen criteria have given a clear guidance to where an aspirant country should be headed on its path to EU membership. That can be demonstrated through a simple math equation, which explains *the crux of the accession process: progress in meeting the Copenhagen criteria equals a move closer to EU membership. Aspirants must deliver on reforms and meet the criteria, but the EU must also deliver by pulling them closer to membership, based on their individual merits.* (CR, 22) (italics mine)

What the two speeches of the representatives of non-EU member countries have in common is that both opt for positive self-representation

to legitimise the actions the two countries have undertaken in compliance with the Copenhagen criteria. Grubješić explicates them as being the consequence of the stimulus coming from the EU:

> *The entry into force of the visa-free regime with the EU in December 2009 brought a new optimism to citizens of Serbia and reinvigorated decision-makers. Merely three days afterwards* Serbia submitted its application for the EU membership.
>
> *When the Commission's questionnaire for the avis on the membership application was handed over in November 2010*, it took less than five months for it to be sent back fully completed [...] (CR, 19) (italics mine)

Poposki elaborates on the achievements his country had made with regards to the reform agenda by providing the list of eight "latest achievements" introduced as follows:

> In order to pursue the reform agenda, a rather burdensome process of comprehensive and deep-rooted reforms aligned to the fulfilment of the Copenhagen criteria and EU acquis was implemented. (CR, 21)

Having listed the "latest achievements" (CR, 22) and, to that end, the "acknowledgement by the EU Commission" of the progress made by "the Republic of Macedonia in view of fulfilment of the Copenhagen [...] criteria [and] with regard to the overall political endeavor" (CR, 22), Poposki voices a complaint (by using the sentence modifier "still") thus contesting the moral tale subtype of Myhopoesis:

> *Still,* the political decision by the European Council to open accession negotiations with the Republic of Macedonia has not been taken. (CR, 22) (italics mine)

Interestingly enough, both Grubješić and Poposki speak of the "European future" and "common European future" for their respective countries. Fairclough (2014) defines this phenomenon as "the inculcation of new discourses":

> Discourses as imaginaries may also come to be inculcated as new ways of being, new identities. [...] Inculcation is a matter of people coming to 'own' discourses, to position themselves inside them, to act and think and talk and see themselves in terms of new discourses. A stage towards inculcation is rhetorical deployment: people may learn new discourses and use them for certain purposes [...] while at the same time self-consciously keeping a distance from them.

We could argue that the EU outsiders (Grubješić and Poposki) are in the "rhetorical deployment" stage due to their contesting the EU discourse, as shown in the analysis above. However, given their "un-self-conscious" adherence to the false cognitive metonymy in the use of the adjective "European", we can speak of their full "ownership" of the discourse within the process of inculcation which, as Fairclough (2014) argues, follows the "un-self-conscious rhetorical deployment".

4. Conclusion

We shall conclude by referring to the Wodak and Weiss' discussion on the interplay of three dimensions (and their respective three goals) connected to the forms of legitimising the political construction of the European Union and its enlargement. The goal of making meaning of the EU, which concerns its identity, is mainly legitimised through the idea of the EU linguistically realised by means of flag words such as "stability", "prosperity", "democracy", etc., which would be difficult to oppose due to their positive meanings. With regards to the goals of organising the EU and drawing borders, it is the legitimisation through procedure that is pervasively deployed. In other words, the policy of conditionality embodied in the Copenhagen criteria has taken on the role of the unquestionable, almost self-made authority which all are to comply with. Finally, in terms of the "change" announced in the title of the Conference, it is evident in the inculcation of the new ways of being, in the new identities of European citizens who are made to perceive themselves as being outsiders unless they are citizens of the EU.

References

Belanger, Marie-Eve. "It Walks like a State and Talks like a State but it's not a State: a Contribution to European Political Order Theory." Paper presented at the 3rd International Euroacademia Conference "The European Union and the Politicization of Europe", Lisbon, September 26-27, 2014.

Bilbija, Snežana. "Lingvističko tkanje ulaska u Evropsku uniju." In Zbornik radova *Nauka i politika, knjiga 5, tom 1*, edited by Miloš Kovačević and Milenko Pikula, 53-63. Pale: Filozofski fakultet Pale, 2011.

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Chilton, Paul. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Fairclough, Norman. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

—. "Language, reality and power." Accessed December2014. http://www.academia.edu/3809602/Language_reality_and_power_2009.

—. "Critical discourse analysis." Accessed October 2014. http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/staff/.../critdiscanalysis.doc.

McCarthy, M.J. and Carter, R.A. "'There's millions of them': hyperbole in everyday conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36 (2004): 149-184.

Van Leeuwen, Theo. "Legitimation in discourse communication." *Discourse & Communication, Vol 1(1)* (2007): 81-122.

Wodak, Ruth and Weiss, Gilbert. "Analyzing European Union Discourses: Theories and Applications." In *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity,* edited by Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton, 121-137. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 2005.

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael. "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology." In *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis (2nd revised edition)*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 1-33. London: Sage, 2009.

Wodak, Ruth. *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.