

Aleksandra Salamurović

Metonymy and the conceptualisation of NATION in political discourse

<https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2020-0011>

Abstract: This paper discusses the role of metonymy, especially PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE, in current constructions of national identity. The corpus consists of ten political speeches (commemoration and election speeches) from Germany, Montenegro and North Macedonia used to detect and examine different levels of variation: from text type to cross-linguistic differences in the use of metonymies. The analysis showed that the most frequent metonym in two Western Balkan countries is the country name, referring to both the speaker as representative of an institution, and population. By contrast, the country name is rarely used in German speeches due to particular communicative and cultural factors. At the pragmatic level, metonymies perform a number of functions, such as legitimization, collectivization and evaluation. Moreover, they are used also as euphemisms and argumentation topos.

Keywords: metonymy, nation, political speeches, Western Balkans, Germany

1 Introduction

According to Martin Reisigl, “a nation is a mobile army of metaphors, personifications, metonymies and synecdoches which after a long, persistent use by a group of people seem canonical and binding” (2007: 262; my translation). This statement, a metaphor itself, points to the apparently inherent connection between the concept of NATION¹ and several distinct cognitive and linguistic devices used to convey it in (political) text and talk. While there is a vast amount of literature on the nexus between NATION and metaphors (for the latest overview see Šarić & Stanojević 2019), the research on the link between NATION and metonymies is still

¹ In order to emphasize the conceptual nature of the lemma „nation“, which is of primary importance here, I will use small caps throughout the article.

scarce. This exploratory study aims to provide an outlook for studying metonymy in the political discourse of “nationhood” (Wodak 2009: 22).

Although metonymy is a universal cognitive and linguistic device, there is significant variation in particular usage (Brdar 2006: 261). This variation can be prompted by cultural-conceptual factors (e.g. prevailing metonymy CLOTHING-FOR-PERSON in Chinese over HEAD/BRAIN-FOR-PERSON in English: Zhang 2016), discourse specific factors (e.g. different frequencies of particular metonymy in media, politics, economy discourse), and discourse type genres (e.g. different text types within political discourse). Moreover, metonymy variation can be attributed to some factors mirroring grammar and language typology (“salient political sentences“ with specific syntax and pragmatics, such as campaign slogans: Klein 2017, Trost 2020; replacement of metonymic NPs by metonymic locative PPs in pro-drop languages: Brdar 2015) etc.

Following a discourse-based approach to metonymies (Brdar 2015: 83), I will concentrate on variation on the level of political discourse genres, and particularly variation in political speeches. I will focus especially on two countries in the Western Balkans, North Macedonia and Montenegro, in which the nation-building processes based on the dialectic relation between the Self and Other are not yet completed (Brković 2013; Džankić 2014; Soldić 2012; Takovski & Marković 2017).² In addition to speeches delivered in Montenegro and North Macedonia, political addresses from Germany will also be contrasted, in order to test the hypothesis on cross-cultural variation. I will explore the use of the metonymy PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE and first try to answer which metonyms are used to construe NATION and which are their targets, and second, which pragmatic functions these metonymies can fulfil in analysed political discourse.

In the following, I will briefly introduce the theoretical and methodological framework in Section 2, followed by the corpus in Section 3. In Section 4 I will present the results of the analysis and, finally, offer some conclusions in Section 5.

2 Theoretical and methodological framework

Since Benedict Anderson’s seminal work (1983), the viewpoint on NATION as a social construction, mental model and cognitive structure that make up the core of the “imagined communities” (cf. de Cillia & Reisigl & Wodak 1999; Bieber 2018, 2019;

² This holds for the Republic of North Macedonia even non-metaphorically since the official state name change after the referendum in September 2018, and its implications (name change as identity problem, Macedonian language not acknowledged by Bulgaria etc.) are still vehemently debated over.

Perak 2019) is accepted (although not exclusively) both within the scholarly and broader public discourse. However imagined these communities might be, one deals with the material consequences of many aspects of NATION in everyday life, not least because this is still one of the dominant organisational principles of the world (Malešević 2013). Discussing the current “rise” of nationalism as a nation-based ideology, Bieber emphasized inclusion and exclusion as two main principles of constituting NATION (Bieber 2018: 521), operating on both an individual and collective level.³ The inclusion and exclusion principle is also one of the core elements of identity, defined broadly as the “social positioning of self and other”, which is brought about in social and linguistic interaction (Bucholtz & Hall 2005: 586).

Communication, encompassing participants, immediate context, communicative genres, and their effects, and discursive and linguistic means deployed in interaction, are essential in nation-(re)building processes (cf. Wodak et al. 2009, Angermüller & Maingueneau & Wodak 2014; Hart & Cap 2014). Besides the propensity for the usage of personal pronouns (cf. Petersoo 2007, Íñigo-Mora 2004), generic noun phrases such as “people” (cf. Truan 2019) or ethnonyms, a pivotal role is attributed to the usage of metaphors and metonymies within political discourse in general, and discourses on NATION in particular:

In modern political discourse, in what Gibbs (1994: 140) calls “a figurative nature of political thought”, metaphor and metonymy are an indispensable cognitive tool for making abstract and complex concepts, that language-wise tend to be quite elusive, more accessible to the general public and sometimes even to the politicians themselves. (Gradečak-Erdeljić & Milić 2011: 149)

Stanojević and Šarić (2019: 10) specified three features of metaphor significantly influencing the nationhood discourse: their function in framing, historical development, and sociocultural embeddedness. Thus, they have characterized NATION as “a constructed metaphorical complex”, a sort of definition which emanates from the cognitive and discursive nature of both concepts (ibid. 12).⁴

As regards metonymy, Littlemore (2015) underlined its function of strengthening social relationships by invoking shared knowledge (Littlemore 2015: 1). This shared knowledge is an essential part of shared pragmatic resources which are indispensable in pragmatic inferencing (Panther & Thornburg 2003: 9). Within studies of national identity, shared pragmatic resources are referred to as

³ These are of course principles operating since the emergence of nation states or even earlier.

⁴ The metaphor NATIONS ARE FAMILIES illustrates this definition in a nutshell: not only that it is one of the oldest ones, but it plays into the hands of the political proponents of nationalism, “an ideology which attempts to transcend the public/private dichotomy by casting social organizations in the image of kinship and friendship networks” (Malešević 2013: 14). The same can be stated for the usage of metonymically motivated lexem “homeland”.

“systems of cultural representations” (Hall 1994: 200) or as “collective memory” (Halbwachs 1985).

In political discourse, metonymy is often used to emphasize positive traits of the in-group and to develop certain argumentation patterns (ibid 101f.). This is due to the pragmatic function (in the sense of Fauconnier, 1997) within the metonymic mapping between source and target, but also due to several cognitive and communicative (discursive) factors which motivate selection of a particular source and target (Radden & Kövecses 1999: 44; Barcelona 2019: 58). In my case study, this point is particularly relevant for the ongoing metonymic use of MACEDONIA (within the metonymy COUNTRY-FOR-PEOPLE) even after the state had changed its name.⁵

Beyond these rather indirect attempts (via observable discursive functionality) to approach the nexus between NATION and metonymy, there is another theoretical take on this subject presented in Perak (2019). Based on the paradigm of social ontology and the system theory, Perak defines NATION as “...an iterative, hierarchical, emergent process of establishing aggregated entities in meronomic relations that form in-class relations, with increasing relational complexity and decreasing structural stability of the aggregated entities” (ibid. 230). Some of these entities are LAND⁶, ECO-SYSTEMS, ORGANISM and their psychological abilities of PERCEPTION, AFFECT and COGNITION, FAMILY and KINSHIP, RITUALS, COMMUNICATION, historical NARRATIVES, NORMS and RULES etc. (ibid. 232). Metonymic profiling (mapping) is, according to Perak, derived from the profiling of ontological congruence between those aggregated entities which are part of NATION as he defines it. (ibid. 244).⁷ This profiling can be captured in many morphosyntactic

5 According to the Prespa Agreement between FYROM and Greece from June 2018, which resolved the 20 years old name dispute, the appellative “Republic of North Macedonia“ should be used *erga omnes* (Art 1/3a). Variants of the lemma “makedonsk*” are partly accepted in their existing form: in collocations with information on nationality in travel documents, and language (Art 1/b,c), and when reference is made to the territory and people and their attributes, with their own history, culture, and heritage “distinctly different from those referred to under Article 7 (2)”, that is, when referred to the Hellenic civilization (Art 7/3). <https://vlada.mk/sites/default/files/dokumentni/spogodba-en.pdf>, retrieved on May, 10th 2020.

6 Small caps are set in original.

7 Perak differentiates between three basic cognitive processes of conceptualization which are derived from correspondent ontological relations: categorization from classification, metonymy from ontological congruence, and metaphor from ontological incongruence (ibid). One of his examples for metonymic profiling is the adjective modifier construction “proud nation“ which he analyses as a PART-FOR-WHOLE metonymy: proud HUMAN MEMBERS OF NATION FOR a proud NATION. This corresponds to MEMBER OF A CATEGORY FOR THE CATEGORY metonymy in the typology by Radden & Kövecses (1999: 34).

relations of the lemma *nation*, as Perak has shown in his corpus-based analysis using Croatian web corpus hrWaC 2.2. with 1.9 billion tokens (ibid. 236). Following Perak, the lemma *nation* itself is an instance of ontological metonymy (as well as metaphor), since its collocates, both nominal and verbal, can activate some elements of meronomic relation between entities within particular syntactic-semantic constructions. Perak's approach operationalizes which elements of the concept NATION are the usual metonymic targets of many metonymies occurring very productively within political discourse.

Methodologically, my study makes use of an annotation tool developed by Markert & Nissim (2002, 2006), differentiating literal, metonymic, and mixed readings level (Markert & Nissim 2002: 1388). In addition, the types and subtypes according to the annotation scheme for location names (Markert & Nissim 2006: 159) were extracted. Moreover, I looked at all other possible devices used as replacement for metonymy. As Brdar demonstrated (2009: 64; 2015: 89), the metonymy replacement with some other lexemes which are not metonymic can perform some distinct syntactic and/or communicative-pragmatic function. This can be of particular importance when dealing critically with language use in political discourse, especially in discourses of nationalization.

3 Corpus

The corpus comprises ten speeches from two fields of political action, as defined by Reisigl & Wodak (2017: 90). The first of these fields is functionally described as the field of formation of public attitudes, opinion and will and encompasses commemorative and jubilee speeches, whilst the second one is the field of political advertising, which, among other, includes election speeches (ibid.: 91).

The main social and political purpose of the commemorative speeches is to constitute agreement, solidarity and identification through inter-subjective (re)evaluation of historical and political data, events and personalities (Reisigl 2008: 254). In addition, conceptual temporality is important since the commemorating of the past is discursively communicated as relevant for the present and it has to mobilize an audience for some actions in the imagined future (Ensink & Sauer 2003; Reisigl 2007; Wodak & de Cilia 2007).

The goal of the election speeches is to formulate and promote particular political interests, to mobilise followers and to facilitate obtaining political power, that is, a particular political position (Reisigl 2008: 246). These basic differences in pragmatic goals of these two speech genres could influence the frequency and types of metonymies.

The corpus was compiled from the official websites of political figures holding the position of president and/or prime minister of the country.⁸ The speakers, the date, the main topic/occasion, and the length of the speech are illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1: Speeches in the corpus

	Speaker/Date	Topic/occasion	Field of action	Length
S 1	Milo Đukanović 13.07.2019 President of Montenegro	Statehood day	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 549 Types: 378
S 2	Milo Đukanović 12.4.2018 President of Montenegro	Final election convention	Political advertising	Tokens: 1,685 Types: 946
S 3	Milo Đukanović 18.05.2006 Prime Minister of Montenegro	Final referendum convention on independence	Political advertising	Tokens: 893 Types: 743
S 4	Nikola Gruevski 08.09.2011 Prime Minister of FYROM ⁹	20 years of independence	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 4,622 Types: 1605
S 5	Djordje Ivanov 02.08.2011 President of FYROM	Commemoration of National holiday Ilinden	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 841 Types: 428
S 6	Zoran Zaev 16.09.2018 Prime Minister of FYROM	Final referendum convention on name change	Political advertising	Tokens: 2,828 Types: 881
S 7	Zoran Zaev 02.08.2019 Prime Minister of North Macedonia	Commemoration of National holiday Ilinden	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 1,433 Types: 577
S 8	Angela Merkel 21.09.2013 Chancellor	Final election convention	Political advertising	Tokens: 3,841 Types: 739
S 9	Angela Merkel 03.10.2019	Commemoration of Unity Day	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 3,022 Types: 830
S 10	Frank-Walter Steinmeier 29.01.2020 President	Commemoration of victims of National Socialism in Bundestag	Formation of public attitudes	Tokens: 2,102 Types: 586

⁸ For the German examples the corpus of German political speeches compiled by Adrien Barbaresi (<https://adrien.barbaresi.eu/corpora/speeches/#description>) was used to identify all occurrences of the lemma “Deutschland“ between 2006 and 2017 and then to narrow the selection.

⁹ At that time now Republic of North Macedonia held the official name “Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia“ or FYROM.

4 Results and discussion

As mentioned in the methodology section, the annotation tool for metonymies developed by Markert & Nissim, differentiating literal, metonymic, and mixed readings level for location names was used. Location names, especially the country name, proved to be relevant for the discursive construction of NATION. In commemorative speeches they occur frequently because of the very aim of this text genre. In election speeches they are often used as a connection between the election slogan and the speech in order to coherently link these two and emphasize the overall political message (Trost 2020: 246; Stepanov 2015: 297).¹⁰

In all the speeches I have analysed, the place name is the most frequent metonym. There are only a few instances in commemorative speeches from Montenegro and North Macedonia where certain dates are used to refer metonymically to events and people respectively. The commemoration of Ilinden is a typical example¹¹:

1. Денес, кога прославуваме 108 години од ПРВИОТ, 67 години од ВТОРИОТ ИЛИНДЕН, во годината кога славиме две децении од ТРЕТИОТ ИЛИНДЕН, не можеме а да не го погледнеме нашиот историски изоден пат со искрена почит и достоинство, со силна посветеност и нескриено чувство на гордост и решителност. (S5)

Today, when we celebrate 108 years from the FIRST, 67 years of the SECOND ILINDEN, and in the year when we celebrate two decades of the THIRD ILINDEN, we cannot but look at our historical path with sincere respect and dignity, with a strong commitment and a clear sense of pride and determination.

¹⁰ The correlation between the use of the country name in the election slogan and subsequently in the election speech, and the conservative/nationalistic political ideology, is still to be tested. Trost (2020) verified the statistically relevant occurrences of *Deutschland* in the CDU/CSU and AfD election material from 2017. In Austria, however, liberal and social democratic parties were also using *ÖSTERREICH* in their slogans (ibid). Demata (2019) traced no significant differences between Democrat and Republican USA presidents in their use of *AMERICA*. The same holds for several parties of different political ideology in Serbia (Stepanov 2015) and for the leader of Social-democratic party Zoran Zaev in North Macedonia.

¹¹ St. Elijah's Day, August 2nd, 1903, marks the uprising against the Ottoman reign (the first Ilinden), the first meeting of the Anti-fascist Council for the Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM) on August 2nd 1944 (second Ilinden), and the day of the independence proclamation from Yugoslavia in 1991 (the third Ilinden). "Ilinden continuum" is described as: "a mythical unbroken symbolic chain of modern Macedonian nationhood inscribed with myths of suffering and revolution" (Soldić 2012: 193).

These metonymies are subsumed under the category “metonymies total”. In the category PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE, only those instances of metonymic use of location names that refer both to the population and the government and/or president as a speaker are annotated. The reason for this inclusive annotation was that in many occurrences no clear distinction between two subtypes (PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT/INSTITUTION and PLACE-FOR POPULATION) could be made.¹²

Although the compiled corpus is too small to derive statistically relevant findings, the comparison of relative frequencies (per 1,000 words) between several categories can offer some insights, as illustrated in Table 2:

Table 2: Relative frequencies of metonymies, metonymic synonyms and place names used literally in individual speeches

	metonymies total (per 1,000 words)	place-for-people (per 1,000 words)	meto_synonym ¹³ (per 1,000 words)	place_literally used (per 1,000 words)
S 1	34,61	21,85	14,57	10,92
S 2	12,46	10,68	10,68	8,30
S 3	39,19	23,51	17,91	8,95
S 4	6,06	5,19	6,05	1,51
S 5	20,21	10,70	9,51	23,42
S 6	23,69	7,77	4,59	8,84
S 7	25,81	9,76	2,79	8,37
S 8	8,59	5,72	4,16	3,38
S 9	4,63	3,30	10,25	3,30
S 10	6,66	2,85	4,75	1,90

The analysis suggests that shorter speeches stimulate greater use of metonymies, regardless of the speech genre (cf. S1, S3, S 5). This can be explained by the property of metonymy to reinforce the cohesion and coherence in the communication process in an extremely efficient manner (Brdar 2009: 65). Although the processing effort can be considerable, due to the polysemic nature of metonymic phrases, the use of metonymy will foster large contextual effects. However, numerous metonymies are used even in longer speeches, such as S6 and S7. This finding is explained by particular communicative-pragmatic and cultural factors. When NATION is contested, i.e. when it has to be (re)invented in specific manner,

¹² The subtype PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT was annotated as such only in unambiguous cases.

¹³ The category “meto-synonym” comprises lexical means which could have been replaced by the metonym COUNTRY/PLACE.

the occurrence of metonymy with the location name as a metonym will rise. The speeches by Zoran Zaev, the first one held at the final convention prior to the referendum on name change in 2018 (S6), and the second one held on the most important national holiday Ilinden, for the first time after the contested name change in 2019 (S7), illustrate this. This comes to the fore especially in comparison with the speeches held by German political actors. In German speeches the relative absence of the metonym GERMANY as well as more frequent use of the metonym EUROPE is a result of communicative-pragmatic and cultural factors, too:

2. Fast siebzig Jahre Frieden – das gab es über Jahrhunderte in EUROPA nicht. (S8)
Almost 70 years of peace – this has not been the case in EUROPE for centuries.
3. EUROPA ist ökonomisch wichtig, ja, aber EUROPA ist ja weit mehr als das. (S8)
EUROPE is important from an economic point of view, yes, but EUROPE is much more than that.

In addition, individual variation (speeches by Angela Merkel) could play an important role, based on the frequencies of meto_synonyms. However, more data is needed to corroborate this finding.

Within the type PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE, half of all instances had to be annotated as mixed occurrences, meaning that those examples can be read both literally (country as a political entity) and metonymically (COUNTRY-FOR-PEOPLE):

4. Vratili smo zemne ostatke kralja Nikole i kraljevske porodice na Cetinje. Ali sve dok nijesu, a još nijesu, poništene odluke podgoričke skupštine nijesmo im vratili čast. A bez časti Petrovića Njegoša nema ni časti CRNE GORE. (S3)
We returned the remains of King Nikola and the royal family to Cetinje. But until the decisions of the Podgorica Assembly are annulled, and they have not been annulled yet, we will not return the honour to them. And without the honour of Petrović Njegoš, there is no honour of MONTENEGRO.
5. Ние не сме согласни со тоа што вие мислите за МАКЕДОНИЈА. Ние не можеме да правиме политика, ниту да дозволиме други да прават политика со МАКЕДОНИЈА. (S4)
We do not agree with what you think about/want for MACEDONIA. We cannot bargain, nor can we allow others to bargain with MACEDONIA.
6. Und ich persönlich bitte die Menschen in Deutschland, mich auch mit einem starken Mandat auszustatten, damit ich weitere vier Jahre DEUTSCHLAND dienen kann, für alle Menschen Politik machen kann, für ein starkes DEUTSCHLAND, für ein Land, das in Europa respektiert ist... (S8)

And I personally want to ask the people in Germany to provide me with a strong mandate so that I can serve GERMANY for another four years, to make a politics for everyone, for a strong GERMANY, for a country, which is respected in Europe...¹⁴

Mixed readings indicate a conceptual link between the country as a political entity and its inhabitants (CONTAINER FOR CONTENT), of which politicians (who want to “lead” the country and address citizens as entities who have to be “led”) make use of and/or construct in their speeches. This is often misused as an issue of an ideological stance provoking the critical question of who belongs to this state, i.e. nation (who is German, Montenegrin, Macedonian). Especially in the case of the now North Macedonia, the use of the potential metonym North Macedonia in this sense would produce “North Macedonians” as the population of the country.¹⁵ In a more general sense, these mixed occurrences provide evidence for the lower prototypicality, that is, the weaker contact between source and target.

Content words which could have been replaced by the metonym COUNTRY/PLACE for the targets PEOPLE, GOVERNMENT, EVENT, INSTITUTION were annotated as *meto_synonym*. The most recurrent lemmas are: state (PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT), country (PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT/PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE), homeland (PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE), citizens (PLACE-FOR-POPULATION), people (PLACE-FOR-POPULATION), politics (PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT), administration (PLACE-FOR-GOVERNMENT). Furthermore, the adjective use of place names (European, Montenegrin etc.) followed by content words were also annotated as *meto_synonyms* (cf. Brdar 2015: 91): European political scene (PLACE-FOR-INSTITUTION), European civilization (PLACE-FOR-PROPERTY), Macedonian citizens (PLACE-FOR-POPULATION) etc. Except one speech in the corpus (S9), the *meto_synonyms* are not used more often than metonymies. Some of them are conventionalized lexemes for the discourse type (e.g. administration, political scene, state), but others can point to a particular evaluation, i.e. ideological stance, like the alternation between *citizens* and *people* (relevant in the Western Balkan countries, where the lemma *narod* often

14 In this example the first occurrence of *Deutschland* is literal, the second one only metonymical (PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE) and the third one mixed. The occurrence of the indefinite article can function as a linguistic marker to metonymic reading (cf. Brdar 2009: 63). However, the subsequent phrase *für ein Land* would suggest that *Deutschland* is conceptualized here as a state, that is, political entity.

15 This is one of the reasons the new state name has been disputed, as the latest case of a public turmoil over the job form on the NATO webpage shows. On the webpage a double denomination „Macedonian/Citizen of North Macedonia“ was displayed causing the reaction of the Minister of Foreign Affairs: <https://twitter.com/NDimitrovMK/status/1264252145597132810/photo/1>, retrieved on 27 April 2020.

cooccurs with history, language, identity, ethnicity), or the alternation between *state* and *homeland*.

Finally, I will point to some pragmatic functions that the metonymies used in analysed speeches perform. As previously mentioned, in political speeches there is a substantial number of the metonymy PLACE-FOR-PEOPLE referring to both the speaker and the audience. This reflects different proximation levels from the deictic centre. The speaker can thus position themselves either as a part of institution, as a part of population, or as a non-part of the opposition. In doing so, they can include and/or exclude (un)favoured members of a community. This is used as a legitimisation strategy (Wieczorek 2008), especially in speeches which aim at mobilising the audience to act upon a particular political position, i.e. in election speeches (ex. 7). The positioning of the speaker as a part of the population enhances collective identification even in election speeches (ex. 9). Additional alternation between the speaker as an individual person, holding powerful deontic status (Van De Mieroop & Clifton 2020: 496), and population, links collective identity with authoritarian leadership (ex. 8). Finally, based on the property of metonymy to instantiate personification (Dorst 2011), euphemism is invoked (ex. 10):

7. Na pragu 21. vijeka, CRNA GORA pred Evropom i svijetom polaže ispit svoje civilizacijske zrelosti. Ja znam da će CRNA GORA položiti taj istorijski ispit. (S3)

On the threshold of the 21st century, MONTENEGRO is taking the test of its civilizational maturity in front of Europe and the world. I know that MONTENEGRO will pass that historical exam.

8. Danas pozivam onu drugu manjinsku CRNU GORU i našu opoziciju da se otarasi uloge Trojanskog konja i posveti se CRNOJ GORI. (S2)

Today, I call on that other minority MONTENEGRO and our opposition to get rid of the role of the Trojan Horse and to dedicate themselves to MONTENEGRO.

9. Na temeljima CRNE GORE 2006. i njenim savremenim evropskim tekovinama koje su dostignuće ove generacije – samo je tamo snažna vizija nove CRNE GORE. Zato drugi predsjednički kandidati na ovim izborima ne mogu ni pobijediti. (S2)

On the foundations of MONTENEGRO from 2006 and its modern European achievements that are the achievement of this generation - only at this place there is a strong vision of a new MONTENEGRO. That is why other presidential candidates cannot even win this election.

10. Дилеми не смеете да имате, излезете да ја завериме нашата независност. Излезете затоа што зависи само од вас и од никој друг. Ставете белег, ставете ваша тула градејќи ја иднината на МАКЕДОНИЈА.

30 -ти септември е ден за избор, 30-ти септември е ден за акција, 30-ти септември не е ден за седење дома, 30-ти септември е ден за гордост, 30-ти септември е ден за среќа, 30-ти септември е ден за испишување историја, 30-ти септември е ден за европска МАКЕДОНИЈА. Излези за европска МАКЕДОНИЈА! (S6)

You must not have dilemmas, go out [to vote] and certify our independence. Vote because it is up to you and no one else. Put a mark, put in your brick building the future of MACEDONIA. September 30th is a day of choice, September 30th is a day of action, September 30th is not a day to sit at home, September 30th is a day of pride, September 30th a day of happiness, September 30th is a day for writing history, September 30th a day for European MACEDONIA. Go out and vote for European MACEDONIA.

Metonymies PLACE-FOR-EVENT and PLACE-FOR-PROPERTY are mostly accompanied by attributes (adjectives, nouns, adjectives based on metonymies) and used for the evaluation of the uttered content: united Europe, antifascist Montenegro, Montenegro of Njegoš, European Montenegro, European Macedonia. They also foster collective memory, (re)producing thus a prevailing and/or privileged ideological stance, like in the Macedonian case with commemorative speeches on Ilinden. The referendum speech by Zaev instantiated the novel metonymy *европска Македонија* (European Macedonia) which was used both in the election slogan and in most speeches of Zaev and other political representatives in power since 2018 as an argumentation topos for the country's name change (if you vote for the name change, the country will enter EU).

5 Conclusion

Applying the discourse-based approach to metonymies the analysis of ten political speeches from two text genres, commemoration and election speech, has shown that the most frequent metonym used to discursively construe NATION in North Macedonia and Montenegro is the country name. The targets of COUNTRY-FOR-PEOPLE metonymy are mostly both the speaker as the representative of the institution, and the population, that is, addressee (within multiple addressing: primary, secondary and tertiary audience). Concomitant linguistic means such as the personal pronoun “we” and the alternation between the speaker as individual and member of community reinforce collective identification, but also legitimization. Metonymic targets that are events and/or properties lead to an evaluation and (re)production of the prevailing ideological stance. In addition, those metonymies convey particular argumentation patterns. Cross-linguistical differences

could be traced due to communicative and cultural factors. German speakers employ the country name only sporadically, using the metonym EUROPE instead. However, more data is needed in order to detect possible individual variation concerning speakers, especially since no significant variation in text genre could be detected.

Acknowledgment

This publication is a part of the research project “Between the Nation and Europe: A Discourse Linguistic Account of the Communication in the Public Sphere in the Western Balkans” funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Angermüller, Johannes, Dominique Maingueneau & Ruth Wodak (eds.). 2014. *The Discourse Studies Reader. Main Currents in Theory and Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Barbaresi, Adrien. 2018. A corpus of German political speeches from the 21st century. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018), European Language Resources Association (ELRA)*, 792–797.
- Barcelona, Antonio. 2019. The tripartite typology and the Córdoba Metonymy Database. In Marianna Bolognesi, Mario Brdar & Kristina Despot (eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in the digital age: Theory and methods for building repositories of figurative language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bieber, Florian. 2020. *Debating Nationalism. The Global Spread of Nations*. London/New York/Sydney/New Delhi: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Bieber, Florian. 2018. Is Nationalism on the Rise? Assessing Global Trends. *Ethnopolitics* 17 (5). 519–540. doi: 10.1080/17449057.2018.1532633.
- Brdar, Mario. 2006. Metonymies we live without. In Klaus-Uwe Panther, Linda L. Thornburg & Antonio Barcelona (eds.), *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*, 259–274. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brdar, Mario. 2009. Metonymy-induced polysemy and the role of suffixation in its resolution in some Slavic languages. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7(1). 58–88. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.7.03brd>.
- Brdar, Mario. 2015. Metonymic Chains and Synonymy. *Fluminensia* 27 (2). 83–101.
- Brković, Čarna. 2013. Ambiguous notions of ‘National Self’ in Montenegro. In Ulf Brunnbauer & Hannes Grandits (eds.) *The Ambiguous Nation. Case Studies from Southeastern Europe in the 20th Century*. 131–149. München: De Gruyter.

- Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4–5). 585–614.
- De Cillia, Rudolf, Martin Reisigl & Ruth Wodak. 1999. The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse & Society* 10(2). 149–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002002>.
- Demata, Massimiliano. 2019. ‘The State of our Union is strong.’ Metaphors of the nation of the Union addresses. In Ljiljana Šarić & Mateusz-Milan Stanojević (eds.), *Metaphor, Nation and Discourse*. 201–227. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dorst, G. Alletta. 2011. Personification in Discourse: Linguistic Forms, Conceptual Structures and Communicative Functions. *Language and Literature*, 20(2). 113–135.
- Džankić, Jelena. 2014. Reconstructing the Meaning of Being “Montenegrin”. *Slavic Review* 73(2). 347–371.
- Ensink, Titus & Christoph Sauer. 2003. A discourse analytic approach to the commemorative speeches about the Warsaw uprising. In Titus Ensink & Christoph Sauer (eds.), *The Art of Commemoration. Fifty Years after the Warsaw Uprising*, 19–40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.7.03ens>
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1997. *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1985. *Das kollektive Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt: Fischer.
- Hall, Stuart. 1994. *Rassismus und kulturelle Identität. Ausgewählte Schriften 2*. Hamburg: Argument.
- Hart, Christopher & Piotr Cap (eds.). 2014. *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Gradečak-Erdeljić, Tanja & Goran Milić. 2011. Metonymy at the crossroads. A case of euphemisms and dysphemisms. In Réka Benczes, Antonio Barcelona & Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.), *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics. Towards a consensus view*. 147–166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Íñigo-Mora, Isabel. 2004. On the Use of the Personal Pronoun We in Communities. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3(1). 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.3.1.05ini>.
- Littlemore, Jeanette. 2015. *Metonymy: Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Thought and Communication*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Klein, Josef. 2017. Saliente Sätze. In Kersten Sven Roth, Martin Wengeler & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Handbuch Sprache in Politik und Gesellschaft*. 139–165. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Malešević, Siniša. 2013. *Nation-States and Nationalisms: Organization, Ideology and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Markert, Katja & Malvina Nissim. 2006. Metonymic proper names: A corpus-based account. In Anatol Stefanowitsch & Stefan Th. Gries (ed.), *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, 152–174. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Markert, Katja & Malvina Nissim. 2002. Towards a corpus annotated for metonymies: the case of location names. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC02)*. Spain: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Linda L. Thornburg. (eds). 2003. *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Perak, Benedikt. 2019. The role of metonymy and metaphor in the conceptualization of the Nation: An emergent ontological analysis of syntactic-semantic construction. In Ljiljana Šarić & Mateusz-Milan Stanojević (eds.), *Metaphor, Nation and Discourse*. 227–259. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Petersoo, Pille. 2008. What Does 'we' Mean?: National Deixis in the Media. *Journal of Language and Politics* 6(3). 419–436. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.6.3.08pet>.
- Radden, Günter & Zoltán Kövecses. 1999. Towards a theory of metonymy. In Klaus-Uwe Panther & Radden Günter (eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought*, Vol. 4: 17–60, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.4.03rad>.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2007. *Nationale Rhetorik in Fest- und Gedenkreden*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag Brigitte Narr GmbH.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2008. Rhetoric of political speeches. In Ruth Wodak & Veronika Keller (eds.), *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 4, 243–269. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Reisigl, Martin & Ruth Wodak. 2009. The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. 87–121. Sage (2nd revised edition).
- Soldić, Marko. 2012. Ilinden. Linking a Macedonian past, present and future. In Ljiljana Šarić, Karen Gammelsgaard & Kjetil Ra Hange (eds.), *Transforming National Holidays. Identity Discourse in the West and South Slavic countries, 1985–2010*. 191–212. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.47.13sol>
- Stepanov, Strahinja. 2015. Serbian presidential (pre-)election slogans: textual and illocutionary Aspect. In Biljana Mišić Ilić & Lopičić Vesna (eds.), *Jezik, književnost, diskurs - Jezička istraživanja*. 295–313. Niš: Filozofski fakultet.
- Šarić, Ljiljana & Stanojević Mateusz-Milan (eds). 2019. *Metaphor, Nation and Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Takovski, Aleksandar & Nenad Markovikj. 2017. Macedonia Outside 'Macedonia'. Denying Name, Silencing Identity and Obliterating Presence. *Journal of Language and Politics* 16 (5). 731–750.
- Trost, Igor. 2020. Die „kurzen Formen“ im deutschen Bundestags- und im österreichischen Nationalratswahlkampf 2017 am Beispiel der Konstruktionen ‚(x) für x‘ und ‚(x) Zeit x‘. In Anne-Laure Daux-Combaudon & Anne Larrory-Wunder (eds.), *Kurze Formen in der Sprache: syntaktische, semantische und textuelle Aspekte. Formes brèves de la langue: aspects syntaxiques, sémantiques et textuels*. 245–262. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- Truan, Naomi. 2019. The discursive construction of the people in European political discourse: Semantics and pragmatics of a contested concept in German, French, and British parliamentary debates. In Zienkowski, Jan & Ruth Breeze (eds.), *Imagining the Peoples of Europe. Populist discourses across the political spectrum*. 201–228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van De Mieroop, Dorien & Jonathan Clifton. 2020. Investigating the Interplay Between Formal and Informal Leaders in a Shared Leadership Configuration: A Multimodal Conversation Analytical Study. *Human Relations*, 73(4). 490–515.
- Wieszorek, Anna Ewa. 2008. Proximitisation, Common Ground, and Assertion-Based Patterns for Legitimation in Political Discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, <http://cadaad.org/ejournal>, ISSN: 1752-3079, 2 (1). 31–48.
- Wodak, Ruth & Rudolf de Cillia. 2007. Commemorating the Past: the Discursive Construction of Official Narratives about the 'Rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic'. *Discourse & Communication* 1(3): 337–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307079206>.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl & Karin Liebhart. 2009. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Second edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Zhang, Weiwei. 2016. *Variation in Metonymy. Cross-linguistic, historical and lectal perspectives*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

