

# Defending our borders: Metaphor scenarios in Hungarian and Romanian political discourse on migration

Kinga KOLUMBÁN<sup>1</sup>

*Metaphor in political discourse has been described as a device for persuasion and providing legitimacy for political action. Besides these roles, however, Andreas Musolff draws attention to the dialogic potential of metaphors in public discourse when used as variations of universally accepted metaphorical frames applied and tailored in accordance with the specific ideologies, attitudes and values of the discourse community addressed. Such subcategories, named scenarios, not only convey the target domain in terms more familiar to the audience, but they also invite evaluation and assessment on the part of the audience. In this role, metaphors, and their subcategories, scenarios, allow expression of alternative viewpoints and particular perspectives within the frame of a public debate. This study proposes to track such reformulations in Hungarian and Romanian political discourse during the migrant crisis in 2015 concerning the CONTAINER metaphor. Conceptualizations of various discourse communities as containers are common in political discourse, circumscribing the in-group as homogenous and compact, entailing elements like boundaries and possibilities of approach or, on the contrary, keeping away outside elements. In the concrete situation of the migrant crisis, entailments like closing or opening borders or conditions on crossing that border are common features. The corpus is composed of declarations from Romanian President Klaus Iohannis and Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán related to events that occurred during the crisis, not only formulating attitudes and positioning towards the migrants, but also towards the European Union and its policies regarding the issue. The metaphor scenarios traceable in these speeches are means of self-presentation, defining the role and the position assumed by the two countries as members of the organization.*

Keywords: *metaphor, scenario, evaluation, self-presentation, migration*

## 1. Theoretical framework

### 1.1. Conceptual metaphors

The study of metaphorical language as a standard strategy in communication in order to express abstract concepts and ideas has flourished after the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). The fundamental idea of their

---

<sup>1</sup> Transilvania University of Braşov (PhD student), [kinga.kolumban@unitbv.ro](mailto:kinga.kolumban@unitbv.ro) and „Henri Coandă” Air Force Academy (Teaching assistant), [kolumban.kinga@afahc.ro](mailto:kolumban.kinga@afahc.ro)

theory is that metaphors are not primarily linguistic phenomena but conceptual ones, based on connecting two cognitive domains. This process implies the understanding and the explanation of a usually abstract and complex *target domain* with the elements of a more concrete *source domain* (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 3-6; Kövecses 2010, 5). Our minds perform a cognitive process that coordinates elements of the two domains by *mapping* the target domain through the cognitive frame of the source domain we are familiar with because it is based on '*our experiences with the physical world*' (Kövecses 2010, 7). Consequently, when we think and speak of the target domain we conceptualize it in the terms of the source domain. This analogy is not based on pre-existing similarities; it is established by the mapping itself, when we render conceptual correspondences from source onto the target domain and construe it with the elements of the source domain. Such a correspondence is almost never a simple linear one, where each element corresponds to one in the target domain. More often it is organized by several overlapping source domains covering an *experiential gestalt*, a cluster of elements constituting a coherent structure of experience. These events vary between the most fundamental physical experiences to more complex social ones. For example, in the case of the metaphor TIME IS MONEY our understanding of it may include subcategories like TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY or TIME IS A RESOURCE as overlapping clusters mapping the metaphorical concept. Our conceptualization of it is indicated by metaphorical expressions like '*wasting time*', '*spending time*' or '*running out of time*' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 9). Even if the whole, intricate system of mapping for a metaphorical concept is never entirely carried over in a text we understand its elements due to the underlying conceptual system that constitutes its cognitive frame. This frame is based on common sense and the experiential knowledge we have of that particular source domain and allows us to construe a metaphor through *entailments*, presuppositions and inferences we make based on that knowledge. Consequently, to return to the example above, our way of thinking about money shapes our perception and determines our actions related to time.

## **1.2. Metaphorical entailments in political discourse**

Entailments are involved in the source domain content and they can be mapped onto the target domain when conceptualized in discourse. These elements are mainly everyday knowledge, '*folk understanding*' (Kövecses 2010) that allow listeners to understand the implications of a lexical realization of the metaphor. Mapping the source domain onto the target domain that is, explaining elements of the target domain through the terms of the source domain does not happen

exhaustively, partly because not all elements of a source domain correspond to an element of the target domain's structure, partly because it would be counterproductive and impossible to produce all the elements of a metaphorical frame within a text. Lakoff and Johnson draw attention to the fact that entailments map their target domain partially, highlighting some aspects and hiding others. To use their example, even if a conventional analogy is established between time and money, time as a commodity cannot be returned or stored in a bank (1980, 13). Consequently, conceptual metaphors, even though they shape the way we perceive reality significantly, do not provide a complete mapping of the target domain but merely channel our perception according to more or less conventional patterns.

The characteristic of partial mapping that allows highlighting and hiding possible entailments gains special significance in political discourse as a tool for framing the public perception and attitude of political actors and events. Lakoff's famous example of STRICT FATHER vs. NURTURING PARENT illustrates the way two different variations of a metaphorical concept (The Nation Is a Family, The Government Is a Parent; The Citizens Are the Children) determine ways of political action, their influence extending even further, towards defining what 'conservative' and 'liberal' worldview means. The source of these two models is provided by alternative moral belief systems that operate in a family, with a lenient one, corresponding to liberal welfare measures and an authoritative model for conservative political practice (Musolff 2004, 2-3; 2006, 25). This proves the fact that metaphorical mapping realized through the source domain not only conveys coherence to our experience but also allows premises for future actions. By choosing a particular source domain and using a particular set of entailments to establish the analogies that explain the target concept, the frame provided by the source domain posits the necessity of a course of action as a logical, 'natural' reaction to the matter at hand.

### **1.3. Persuasion and argumentation through metaphors**

The characteristic of highlighting and hiding entailments and presenting them as logical correspondences between the two domains posits metaphors as excellent vessels for political persuasion and even manipulation. Charteris-Black (2011) identifies metaphors as essential tools of conveying justification and legitimacy to political action. Metaphors are instruments of 'intellectual seduction' (2011, 33) by conveying authority to the speaker on all levels of rhetorical efficiency. By explaining a complex political issue through a familiar domain a politician "gains the hearer's submission, and eventual compliance, by taking as a premise something that the hearer already believes in" (2011, 43). Metaphorical

argumentation achieves this by appealing to the listeners' intellectual and affective response and convinces them of the speaker's right intentions, establishing the speaker as a reliable source of authority.

According to Musolff (2004; 2016), political metaphors, contain 'aspects of argumentative reasoning' used to 'prove a contested issue' or 'legitimize a certain course of action' by the use of warrants: arguments that 'appear to give a valid justification for using particular premises in order to arrive at a certain conclusion'. These warrants, however, are not based on incontestable 'necessary conditions of truth' but on presuppositions which invite certain desired inferences on the part of the audience. It is through these presuppositions that the argument is reinforced and acquires a status as being 'logical' and reasonable (Musolff 2004, 32-33). The use of warrants in a line of argumentation relies on that particular background knowledge or folk understanding mentioned by Kövecses which evokes the necessary cultural and ideological content of the notions used as arguments but do not support it by actual objective data. Musolff (2004, 34) explains:

[T]he analogies implicit in these metaphors do not seem to lead to contentious conclusions, probably on account of their standard, clichéd presuppositions. But if we 'spice up' the supposed utterances by using more strongly evaluative formulations, the argumentative function of the presupposed analogies becomes evident.

In Musolff's example, calling a politician '*the father of European unity*' is a conventional analogical connection between the domain of FAMILY and the establishment of an institution but if we render to the FAMILY domain the characteristics usually associated with the role of the father (authority, respect, action), its argumentative content becomes explicit (A father must be treated with respect).

While speakers do rely on the immediate and effective impact of metaphorical concept used this way, Musolff emphasizes the diachronicity of the process. This perspective entails two important aspects of the use of metaphors in public discourse: it expands their analysis beyond the immediate context they have been uttered in and it entertains the possibility of a public dialogue among parties involved through highlighting the various aspects (entailments and scenarios) of a metaphorical source domain.

Musolff (2004, 17) uses the term scenario, "because it captures the fact that there are conceptual patterns and configurations, which include assumptions about typical participants, roles, courses of action in a sense that is comparable to its source meanings known from theatre and film terminology". In the context of metaphors, scenarios denote the ability to invoke conventional narrative structures

that the discourse community is familiar with, adapting a general source domain to the specific context through particular tokens. To use Musolff's example, if political relations among EU countries are expressed through the general source domain of LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY, then scenarios can vary between references to *founding fathers*, *single-parent families*, *premature child* or various problems that couples encounter in marriage: concrete situations that, through the presence of one or more tokens, can evoke a narrative schema explaining and expressing arguments or attitudes on the matter.

Using various scenarios of the same general source domain allows participants to the dialogue to adopt a particular point of view that can be expressed beyond the immediate real-time context of the utterance. Except for some genres like public debates, interviews or press conferences, face-to-face conversation is not a typical manifestation for political dialogue. Progress in discussing an issue happens through a gradual exchange mostly transmitted through the media. What makes a 'continuous and coherent public debate' is 'the whole ensemble of texts produced in public by politicians and media commentators' that may form a whole, 'as long as its participants agree that they are discussing within a shared discursive context and refer to each others' statements in order to advance their arguments" (Musolff 2004, 5). The role of metaphors in this 'virtual dialogue' is that while a certain source domain is accepted by the participants to the discussion, each party can contribute with his/her own personalized 'version' or highlight personally relevant entailments of the source domain in order to contribute with his/her point of view. Scenarios, therefore, not only allow the discursive realization of personal attitude but may reflect the speaker's engagement concerning the issue by allowing the formulation of political arguments within a common metaphoric frame but highlighting the specific aspects that assign the particular position of the speaker.

#### **1.4. Metaphor and evaluation**

As socio-culturally posited linguistic devices, the evaluative dimension of conceptual metaphors is conveyed through the contextual factors the communicative act is realized in (Díez-Prados 2016; Diaz-Peralta 2018; Cabrejas Peñuelas 2020). As previously discussed, conceptual metaphors provide a means of understanding abstract, complex phenomena through the cognitive frame of a more concrete source domain based on our experience of the physical world. Besides the cognitive process this involves, speaking about political actions and decisions, justifying them and persuading the audience of their legitimacy involves making moral judgments as well. Conceptual content, therefore, cannot be

separated from the evaluative one (Diaz-Peralta 2018). As Cabrejas Peñuelas phrases it, metaphors have '*a powerful persuasive force*' precisely because they hold the '*power of evaluation*': "we not only import entities from the source domain to the target domain, but we also carry over the way we evaluate the entities in the source domain" (2020, 78).

Martin and White (2005) locate metaphor among the discursive devices that convey attitude: positive or negative judgment and appreciation of the other players or the matter at hand. As opposed to affect, indicating individual feelings, judgment and appreciation are explained as the realm of '*institutionalized feelings*' that make up community values with the first pertaining to behaviour and rules about our public bearing and the latter referring to the value we attribute to things (2005, 45). A further classification of judgment is organized around the concepts of esteem and sanction, including positive and negative attitudes pertaining to normality (usual/unusual), capacity (able/unable), tenacity (resolute/irresolute) for the first and veracity (truthful/untruthful) and propriety (ethical/unethical) for the latter (2005, 52). Appreciation (Martin and White 2005, 56), the category including markers which evaluate objects and phenomena, classifies speakers' attitude as reaction (impact and quality assessment of the phenomenon), composition (in terms of balance and complexity), and valuation (the value attributed to the phenomenon). When they feature as elements of public speaking, metaphors communicate content that pertains to what is right or wrong, what are the adequate or appropriate measures to take or justify why such measures have been taken.

Ideational meaning conveyed by lexical metaphors indirectly realizes evaluation by *invoking* certain value content and intensifying its force. Use of metaphors *provokes* or *invites* the audience to align or distance itself from the content of the message (2005, 67); therefore, it may play a significant role in engaging the audience into actions or attitudes that are instrumental to the speaker's purposes.

### **1.5. Positive self-evaluation**

If persuasion is the key to a successful political discourse, then one means to accomplish that is certainly a positive self-presentation. This can be achieved through adhering to values and adopting attitudes similar to the community politicians are addressing. The strategy of positioning oneself as part of the in-group, then enumerating and discussing qualities that the community identifies with is a standard rhetorical device in politics (Van Dijk 2010).

Politicians also resort to presenting a positive picture of their political agenda when their goal is to justify their actions or to persuade their audience of the legitimacy of their deeds. As discursive devices that render abstract content into familiar source domains, metaphors may play a crucial role in the process of building rapport between speaker and audience. Cabrejas Peñuelas (2020) traces elements of positive appreciation (evaluation according to social value) and judgment (evaluation of ethical behaviour) in the metaphors occurring in politicians' electoral speeches by conveying the message of a caring government, a growing economy, or reduced deficit. In speeches analysed by Díez-Prados (2016), speakers frame the positive presentation of their electoral promises according to the NURTURING PARENT/STRICT FATHER scenario versions, in accordance with their ideological orientation.

Such a line of argumentation usually, but not necessarily, runs parallel with a presentation of alternative possible solutions – undertaken by political rivals - as inadequate ones. Establishing a – sometimes sharp – polarity between the qualities of the speaker's own measures and the flaws of their opponent's is a frequent method (Díez-Prados 2016; Diaz-Peralta 2018). In Diaz-Peralta's analysis (2018) of electoral discourse, delegitimizing previous political order is combined with the promise of a better future. The main argument of the discourse is based on metaphors that depict political practices of the past as BACKWARD MOVEMENT.

In the context of the migrant crisis another type of negative other presentation should also be mentioned that does not target political rivals but migrants, a typical out-group for our age. In the kind of – usually conservative - discourse that Van Dijk (1997) calls neo-racist, positive self-presentation/ other deprecation is present through the description of the speaker (and his party) as adhering to 'humanitarian' traditions, caring and showing sympathy to the plight of those forced to flee their homes. Othering, the negative and discriminatory presentation of the out-group, specifically asylum seekers, happens through attributing negative traits to them as exploiters, scroungers, liars (1997, 45).

This attribution is not a straightforward one. Speakers are careful to make a difference between true refugees, those who flee for political reasons, and 'fake' ones, the category seeking better living conditions elsewhere. Labelling asylum seekers as 'economic refugees' justifies the negative traits attributed to them and marks the 'natural wish to get a job and housing when one takes refuge in another country' as 'fraudulent intentions' (1997, 47). Attacks are usually directed toward 'illegal migration' and the middlemen who smuggle 'trusting' people into receiving countries and once they are in the countries of their destination arguments against them are formulated around their cultural 'incompatibility' with the in-group

(1997, 58). The general frame of the contrast this type of discourse creates between the two categories, Us and Them, is formulated along the line of general, stereotypical perceptions: the idealized, positive presentation of in-group culture is just as generalized and vague as the criticism brought against asylum seekers. However, as Van Dijk (1997) warns this discourse allows subtle allegations into institutional discourse and may become a standard frame to conduct discussions around this complex issue of our age.

## **2. Research design**

### **2.1. The identification of tokens**

The aim of this study is two-fold. First, it seeks to identify the conceptual elements of the container-metaphor, a typical domain in discourse on migrants (Musolff 2016; Charteris-Black 2011); second, to establish evaluative content in the identified metaphors, regarding the official position (extent of alignment or disalignment) and attitude (judgment and appreciation) of the two countries towards the migrant crisis and the European Union. What qualifies as relevant elements in this case are strategies of self- and other presentation (analysing both migrants and the European Union as 'other').

While metaphorical references and specific scenarios are developed in particular view of the position and attitude of each speaker representing the official position of their countries, the source domains used in both discourses coincide to a great extent with those established in political discourse for the last decades when discussing the structure of the European Union, its political conduct and relations between and among member states.

The process of identifying and delineating metaphorical domains has had some challenging aspects. In the two discourses the variety of source domains, entailments and scenarios constitute a complex system of reference combining and overlapping in the process of conveying meaning, therefore, may be difficult to delineate. One such domain is the BUILDING, as in Europe/country X is a building, providing a large part of the examples. This source domain provides mappings for both the building-as-a-container metaphor (Musolff 2016; Charteris-Black 2006; Chilton and Lakoff 2005) and the building-as-a-complex-system metaphor (Kövecses 2010). The latter has especially gained ground through the COMMON-EUROPEAN-HOUSE scenario that has been used extensively by politicians and the media in debates over policies and relationships among members in the last decades (Musolff 2004; Ilyn and Chilton 1993; Chilton and Lakoff 2005).



The samples relevant for this study are those mapping the container-metaphor. Other source domains are included only to the extent to which they participate to the structural mapping of the targeted concept. In the case of the Hungarian corpus, given the particular scenario of Hungary as (border) CASTLE Viktor Orbán uses in order to argue for his position, the BUILDING-as-container domain provides a metaphorical mapping of the migrant crisis together with the WAR source domain.

## 2.2. The identification of evaluative content

The second aim after the identification of the relevant tokens is to establish the extent to which they reveal the specific aspects of the two countries' involvement in the migrant crisis and their position towards European Union policies in the matter. Given the two countries' distinct involvement in the crisis, the two politicians' discourses were significantly different, both considering the amount of their declarations, as well as their position towards the crisis.

With a moderate but constant entrance of Middle Eastern and African asylum seekers into Europe Union territory in previous years, 2015 represented a peak<sup>2</sup> and brought about various disputes on migration policies and security in the region. The main gateway into the Union for the mostly pedestrian refugees towards Western European states where they were hoping to be received was the Southern border of Hungary, a Schengen border state. The arrival of a great number of migrants (around 1,300,000) disturbed regular procedures of refugee processing and prompted Hungarian authorities to place a fence on the border with Serbia and Croatia<sup>3</sup>. These events were also the trigger to Hungary's conservative ruling party, Fidesz, and its prime minister, Viktor Orbán to formulate a hard-line anti-migrationist discourse urging for defence against the islamisation of Europe and accusing the European Union of irresponsibility and disregard of the Schengen treaty. His arguments proved to be successful and attracted the endorsement of a large part of the population due to the striking number of people and the disturbance their arrival caused for the local population, as well as the fear for security such a discourse may have generated among them. In order to muster public support, the Fidesz launched a petition against the mandatory quota of receiving migrants by sending out a questionnaire to Hungarian citizens<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2016/08/02/number-of-refugees-to-europe-surges-to-record-1-3-million-in2015/#:~:text=Hungary%20received%20the%20second%20largest,of%20asylum%20applicants%20in%202015>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/06/18/hungarys-response-to-the-migrant-crisis-a-109-mile-long-13-foot-tall-fence/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://euobserver.com/migration/131394>

Subsequently, in 2016 a referendum was organized against the mandatory quota<sup>5</sup> that Viktor Orbán used to justify his actions.

The Hungarian point of view is organized within the frame of a conflict with the European Union where the Hungarian political position is formulated as defense on two frontlines, one against the incoming migrants, and, ultimately, the islamisation of Europe and the other against the European Union's irresponsible policies and failure to recognize the threat.

As Romania was not a Schengen country, the crisis did not directly affect it. Even though the media made ample comments on the events going on near the country borders and questions were routinely asked during press conferences, Romania's implication comprised of guarding the South-Eastern borders of the European Union, at the Black Sea, and participating to Union level debates on possible solutions, among them, the mandatory quota that Romania rejected along with other Eastern European countries<sup>6</sup>. Even if the conservative discourse on the threat of islamisation has reached Romania as well<sup>7</sup>, it never really caught on due to its small relevance for the majority of the population and the moderate, pro-European position of the Romanian government. For this reason, Romanian discourse on the migrant crisis is significantly more balanced.

The narrative of the Romanian discourse on the migrant crisis emphasizes the country's willingness to cooperate and find a solution to the problem alongside the other member countries. Concomitantly, declarations and political actions have been performed to demonstrate Romania's capability to act as a Schengen state. Metaphors and other type of discursive devices reflect the intention to cooperate and find a common solution.

The evaluative dimension of the declarations revolves around realizations of positive or negative attitudinal stances towards European Union policies and positive self-presentation emphasizing the two countries' qualities. Attitude is realized both through non-metaphorical explicit lexis and the implicit ideational meaning often conveyed by metaphors that invites attitudinal response. The evaluative aspects relevant for the functions of self-presentation, justification and criticism materialize through judgment (ethical evaluation of behaviour) or appreciation (evaluation of

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://europeanlawblog.eu/2016/09/21/hungarys-referendum-on-the-migrant-quota-a-no-sought-to-do-what/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.france24.com/en/20150911-germany-ecuropean-union-eu-migrant-quota>

<sup>7</sup> [https://adevarul.ro/locale/cluj-napoca/mesajul-halucinant-clujeanului-infiintat-pagina-fb-nu-islamizarii-romaniei--un-islamist-taie-gatul-unui-crestin-convingere\\_1\\_56114cc9f5eaafab2c4e33a7/index.html](https://adevarul.ro/locale/cluj-napoca/mesajul-halucinant-clujeanului-infiintat-pagina-fb-nu-islamizarii-romaniei--un-islamist-taie-gatul-unui-crestin-convingere_1_56114cc9f5eaafab2c4e33a7/index.html)

the phenomenon itself), realized on different levels of graduation that determines the impact of the metaphorical realization.

### **2.3. The organization of the findings**

Musolff (2016) identifies a small number of standard scenarios in migration discourses, three of which are relevant in our case and the samples are grouped according to this outline. In the space- container scenario the state/territory is conceptualized as a container or enclosure, with boundaries that separate those inside, from immigrants who are outside. In frequent conceptualizations this is a building with exits and entrances, but not exclusively so; in any case, this container has limited capacity and the danger of reaching a bursting point entails the necessity of a barrier (also, Charteris-Black 2006).

The movement-scenario usually presents migrants as a great body of water, acting as a large mass threateningly approaching and invading the container in question. The action-scenario, focusing on those inside the container, carries elements indicating actions taken to either bring immigrants inside the container, or keep them outside of it, depending on the perspective of the politician (Musolff 2016, 82-83).

To maintain the spirit of scripts and scenarios, it can be stated that the two analysed discourses are produced in two significantly different settings with three relevant actors in each. The discourse in both cases revolves around the relationship between the countries in question, Romania or Hungary, and the European Union. Conceptualization of the countries/the European Union as containers, the amount of pressure build-up or the degree to which they comply to allow or block entrance reveals the degree to which the countries align with European policies, expressing approval or criticism, specifying a common goal or, on the contrary, indicating an alternative way.

The movement-scenario focuses on the third 'actor' in this set-up, the collectivized and dehumanized category of the migrants, attributed destructive power by the Hungarian Prime Minister and nominalized as an abstract phenomenon by the Romanian President. Evaluation in this case is realized through graduation of the possible impact this out-group might have on the in-group.

The main issue for both countries is to demonstrate capacity to act as an independent and sovereign country and to impose their position within the European Union, with an emphasis, in both discourses, on the desired end-state of re-establishing order. This provides the elements for the action-scenario, in the present case, that of the defence of borders. While in Viktor Orbán's speeches the idea of defence is overwhelmingly present starting from the controversial decision,

in the spring of 2015, to build a fence along the southern borders of Hungary, Klaus Iohannis' press conferences include it only in September, when the European Union partly accepts the Hungarian point of view, and admits the necessity of a better control of the borders.

Although severely criticized in the European Parliament<sup>8</sup>, Orbán's uncompromising politics gained support from European conservative parties, especially the German CSU<sup>9</sup>. The breakdown of the Schengen agreement stipulating free movement among members was the most convincing argument of the Prime Minister and it prompted a reconsideration of the European Union's 'open door' policy.

In September 2015 Donald Tusk<sup>10</sup>, then president of the European Council, admits: *'one thing is clear, Prime Minister Orbán took action to strengthen the protection of the EU borders.'* and now solidarity is needed among member states. Urging for Europe to find a balance *'between solidarity and containment'*, he declares: *"we should seriously address the containment of the wave of migration by strengthening the borders and getting the keys to our Europe back from the hands of smugglers and murderers."* It signals the effectiveness of metaphors that this shift in European migration policy is discursively realized by a container metaphor, conceptualizing Europe as a building, and including a token of the common-European-house scenario (*'our Europe'*).

The metaphors have been identified by using the Pragglejaz method (2010, 167; Kövecses 2010, 5-6) consisting of the following steps. After reading the text for general meaning, lexical units have been identified within it. They were not necessarily one word; expressions, collocations, idioms were considered one item and their context has been examined as well, in order to locate possible connections with adjacent content. The next step required a comparison of the several meanings the lexical unit might have had. Often these words and expressions may have a variety of more concrete, basic and more abstract meanings or it can happen that the most often used meaning in a text or speech is not the basic one. If the located lexical unit has a more basic meaning in other contexts and the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning, it is most probably a metaphorical expression. After the identification of the metaphors in the discrete contexts, the possible connections have been analysed and it has been established to what extent it is the element of a new scenario or simply an entailment of the original source domain. It is possible that

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.rferl.org/a/verhofstadt-orban-chewed-out-viral-video/27030970.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.politico.eu/article/viktor-orban-bavaria-hardline-hero-seehofer-migration-borders/>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/09/03/tusk-meeting-prime-minister-orban/>

these elements combine in which case the scenario is considered to be the more important element.

The final procedure has involved the analysis of the evaluative content, focusing first of all on the way the scenario or entailment (circumscribed by a varying number of lexical units) conveys the attitude of the speaker and invites the response of the audience. The items in the context and the ideational meaning of the surrounding lexis convey evaluation more frequently, but single lexical units can also provoke attitudinal response.

#### **2.4. The corpus**

The selected samples originate from various declarations of the Romanian President and the Hungarian Prime Minister. The Romanian corpus is mainly constituted of 6 press conferences that took place during the peak of the crisis and the discussions around the mandatory quota, in September 2015. The statements included various public issues that were in the public eye at that time and the migrant crisis, even if it had no significant impact on national security, was one of them. As the texts contain various topics, only the relevant parts have been considered. The press conferences occurred as follows: September 7, 2015; September 14, 2015; September 16, 2015; September 17, 2015; September 23, 2015 and October 14, 2015.

In addition, two speeches that took place in a more formal environment have been added due to their relevance to the object of the study. These are a formal speech with a general topic on poverty uttered during a UNO meeting on September 27, 2015, and a meeting with representatives of foreign embassies containing a resume of the internationally relevant political events of 2015, as well as expectations in 2016. This speech took place on January 27, 2016.

The Hungarian Prime Minister has had numerous declarations on migrants, but the selected ones took place around the same period of time as the Romanian ones. These have a closer reference to the crisis itself, the quota and the possible solutions to this problem. The selection has also been made in accordance with the relevance of language used for the aims of this study. Due to the speaker's personal style, these samples contain numerous tropes, cultural references and anecdotes that draw a contrast with the Romanian President's austere discourse. The texts were selected so that they contain the metaphors and scenarios that have been typically used by Viktor Orbán when discussing the migrant crisis.

Declarations from four occasions have been selected. A Speech addressed to Hungarian Ambassadors worldwide, on September 7, 2015, an End of Year Report in the Parliament in 2015, a speech in the Hungarian parliament reporting on the

situation around the quotas and policies to be followed on September 21, 2015, and a press conference held in Bavaria together with representatives of the CSU (Christian Social Union), on the occasion of a visit on September 23, 2015.

### 3. Data analysis

#### 3.1. The space-container scenario: territories as containers

In the context of the migrant crisis the territories of Hungary, Romania and the European Union are mapped as enclosed spaces entailing the possibility of entrance/exit, a particular storage capacity, or the possibility of this enclosure to be sealed/opened.

Working within the domain of the CONTAINER metaphor, we can trace in both Hungarian and Romanian discourses a lexicalization which marks migrants as *outsiders*, seeking to *enter* the European Union, with conditions set to their acceptance *inside* and their *crossing* the border towards it.

##### 3.1.1. Hungarian corpus

In the Hungarian corpus, the Prime Minister discusses the difficulty of '*sending back those who have already entered*'<sup>11</sup> the region or the possible solution to the problem of setting up refugee camps '*outside the European Union, not within it*'<sup>12</sup>. In the following excerpt, a token of the container metaphor is combined with those of the JOURNEY domain:

- (1) We will achieve results step by step and I really hope that we will advance quickly to the moment when Hungary will be able to tell her German or Austrian friends that the southern borders of Hungary can be sealed airtight. (Meeting with the ambassadors)

[*Lépésről lépésre eredményeket fogunk elérni és nagyon remélem, hogy gyorsan haladunk majd, és előáll az a helyzet, amikor Magyarország azt tudja mondani a német vagy osztrák barátainak, hogy Magyarország déli határai légmentesen zárnak.*]

The ideal condition of an airtight seal on the container (the way the territory is mapped), that is, a complete lock on the country border, is reached 'step by step' or 'advancing quickly' towards the desired outcome, presented as achievement,

<sup>11</sup> *Aki egyszer bejött annak a visszakuldese – Meeting with the ambassadors*

<sup>12</sup> September 21, 2015

indirectly realised through positive judgment. It is not only the capacity of Hungary to defend its borders that is positively evaluated. The excerpt also illustrates proper attitude (propriety) towards its neighbours and the issue at hand.

While the above example represents an instance of moderate positive self-presentation, through its suggestion of collaborating with other European Union members, the following excerpt features an inside/outside set-up, this time with a clear charge of negative judgment:

- (2) The way things are right now (...) is that Brussels henceforward intends to let in, nay, wants to bring in illegal migrants into the territory of the European Union. To let in, to bring in, and then, forcibly, distribute. (Annual report)

*[Most úgy áll a helyzet, (...) hogy Brüsszel továbbra is be akarja engedni, sőt, be akarja szállítani az illegális migránsokat az Európai Unió területére. Beengedni, beszállítani, utána pedig kötelező erővel, kötelező módon szátosztani.]*

Negative evaluation is achieved through the enumeration of action verbs 'let in', 'bring in' and 'distribute', with the added graduation of the adverb 'nay'. Based on Musolff's scenario categories the mappings of this excerpt mark two overlapping scenarios: the space-container scenario ('in'), marking the European Union as an enclosure, and the action –scenario (marked by non-metaphorical lexis) in which the European Union is being criticized as facilitating illegal activity.

The negative attitude towards irresponsible European policy is realised in the following excerpt through the mapping of the European Union territory and organization through the BUILDING domain:

- (3) At the beginning of the year, there were signs already that this would not end well. Those who had eyes to see could realize that the migration pressure would escalate. More and more people have set out, human traffickers have created their routes effectively with the help of the authorities, and Europe has not only left its doors and windows wide open, but has even sent out invitations to immigrants. (September 21, 2015)

*[Már az év elején látszott, hogy ennek nem lesz jó vége. Akinek volt szeme a látásra, az láthatta, fokozódik a migrációs nyomás. Egyre többen és többen indultak útnak. Az embercsempészek gyakorlatilag hatósági segédlettel kiépítették az útvonalukat. Európa pedig nemhogy tárva-nyitva hagyta az ajtókat és ablakokat, még meghívókat is küldözgetett a bevándorlóknak.]*

The '*pressure*' of the large number of migrants, and the '*wide open*' entrance ways (doors and windows) are mappings of the CONTAINER-metaphor, but the reference to Europe allows both mappings as container and complex system. At the same time, personification allows negative judgment of a behavior against one's interests, by helping human traffickers. This latter element is a metaphorical realization of the action-scenario, that pertains to the negative evaluation of European Union migration policies through the entailment of open doors and windows. The image invokes negative judgment through propriety, ascribing an inappropriate behaviour to the organization.

### 3.1.2. Romanian corpus

The Romanian President informs the public about receiving '*1705 refugees who are already within the perimeter of the European Union and 80 more who will be relocated*'<sup>13</sup>. He claims '*solidarity within the European Union*'<sup>14</sup>. He reports about the '*tens of thousands of refugees who have entered the European Union*'<sup>15</sup>. The question of the mandatory quota, one of the main aspects of the crisis that involved Romania as well, generated a lot of discussion about the number of refugees Romania should receive or could have the *capacity* to cater for. During the press conferences that occurred during this time, the President was reassuring the public that '*in Romania there was not any kind of pressure due to a wave of migration*'<sup>16</sup>.

Since the events of the migrant crisis were nothing as dramatic as in Hungary that represented the main gateway for the migrants headed towards Western Europe, the Romanian President's discourse is significantly more balanced. Nevertheless, it still manages to convey the amplitude of this phenomenon:

- (4) Tens of thousands of people taking refuge have entered the European Union, problems of logistics, problems of principle have appeared because the Schengen Area has been breached, the so called Dublin norms have been disregarded, and these refugees have, practically, upset the whole European architecture. (September 7, 2015)

[Zeci de mii de oameni refugiați au intrat în Uniunea Europeană, au apărut probleme de logistică, probleme de principiu, fiindcă a fost încălcat spațiul Schengen, au fost încălcate normele așa-numite de la Dublin și acești refugiați, practic, au bulversat întreaga arhitectură europeană.]

<sup>13</sup> 1705 de refugiați care se află deja în perimetrul Uniunii Europene și 80 de refugiați care vor fi relocați – September 7, 2015

<sup>14</sup> suntem pentru solidaritate în interiorul Uniunii Europene – September 16, 2015

<sup>15</sup> Zeci de mii de oameni refugiați au intrat în Uniunea Europeană – September 7, 2015

<sup>16</sup> ... în România nu există niciun fel de presiune a unui val migraționist – September 7, 2015



The excerpt contains elements of the CONTAINER metaphor, mapping Europe as a physical enclosure these migrants *'are entering'*, more exactly, trespassing, as suggested by *'breach'* or *'disregard'*. These markers are not provoking as the ones in the Hungarian corpus; still, they indicate a disturbance that invites caution through the negative judgment (propriety) carried by the verbs. The token *'European architecture'* is a mapping of the BUILDING as complex system domain.

The following excerpt outlines his own country's position towards this phenomenon via spatial markers which state the factual details of Romania's status in the European Union:

- (5) Those migrants don't want to remain in Romania. (...) They want to be elsewhere. Romania is not in the Schengen Area and this is why, for them, we are marginal. (September 14, 2015)

[... *acei imigranți, de fapt, nu vor în România, (...) Ei vor în altă parte. România nu este în Spațiul Schengen și atunci, pentru ei, suntem marginali.*]

The excerpt marks *'the Schengen area'* as a container, with Romania's position as *'marginal'* in the migrant crisis, therefore, *outside* the issue.

### 3.2. The movement-scenario: representations of migrants

#### 3.2.1. Hungarian corpus

The tone of the Hungarian discourse is defined by the frame Viktor Orbán employs when discussing the phenomenon itself. The very definition he gives to the crisis is that of *'new age migration'* (*'jelenkori népvándorlás'*) in reference to the movement of a large body of people setting out towards Europe in the early Middle Ages (and which Hungarians were part of, ironically).<sup>17</sup>

A further frequent term used by Viktor Orbán to describe MOVEMENT during the events of 2015 is that of invasion, as in excerpts (6) and (7):

- (6) What is happening now is an invasion; we are actually being invaded. (September 21, 2015)

[*Ami most történik, az lerohanás, valójában lerohannak bennünket.*]

---

<sup>17</sup> The English term *'migration'* does not make a difference between that particular historical event and the general term used for *'movement of people to a new area or country in order to find work or better living conditions'* the same way Hungarian does. The general term in Hungarian corresponding to the English definition is *'migráció'* also used throughout the discourse.

- (7) And the army must be prepared, (...) even if it is not a war, only a civilian invasion, it is still threatening our borders... (Meeting with the ambassadors)

*[És a hadsereget is föl kell készíteni, a katonáinkat, (...) akkor is, ha nem háború van, csak egyszerű civil lerohanás, de az is fenyegeti a határokat...]*

In Hungarian, the term '*lerohanás*' used by the speaker is limited to a quick, blitzkrieg-like attack associated with military operations, closer to the WARFARE domain than the more general '*invasion*'. While excerpt (6) defines the situation as a threatening movement against the nation he represents (he is addressing the Hungarian Parliament), excerpt (7) contains some of the defensive actions, preparing the army, taken by those under attack (hence, pertaining to the action-scenario discussed below). Another token of the WAR domain refers specifically to medieval warfare:

- (8) In 2015, Hungary withstood the siege of migrants; thousands crossed illegally our borders on a daily basis. (2015 report to the Parliament)

*[2015-ben a migránsok ostroma alatt állt Magyarország, naponta ezrek lépték át illegálisan a határt.]*

The reference to the arrival of the migrants as a '*siege*' maps the CONTAINER metaphor with dramatic undertones and adds cultural specificity to the more general source domain. Its evaluative content invokes the scenario of medieval warfare with inhabitants of the castle heroically defending their territory from being overtaken. Viktor Orbán particularly favoured this scenario during his declarations on the migrant crisis due to its historical resonance among the Hungarian audience, evoking the heroic episodes of fighting against the Ottoman Empire. In all three excerpts (6, 7, 8), the references to the phenomenon of migration as 'invasion' or 'siege' provokes negative appreciation through valuation (by conveying opinion).

Evoking this formidable army and then presenting the migration as a similar event is a typical employment of '*proximization of threat*' (Cap 2014), the presentation of an alleged threat to the community in order to justify political action, as illustrated below:

- (9) The migrants are not only pounding on our door but are downright breaking it down. Not a few hundred, not a few thousand, but several hundred thousand, nay, millions of migrants are besieging the borders of Hungary and Europe. We cannot see its end. The reinforcements are plentiful; millions are getting ready for the road. (Meeting with the ambassadors)

[A bevándorlók már nemcsak dörömbölnek, de ránk is törnek az ajtót. Nem néhány százan, nem néhány ezren, hanem több százezer, sőt millió bevándorló ostromolja Magyarország és Európa határait. Nem látni, hol a vége. Az utánpótlás bőséges, milliók készülnek az útra.]

The metaphorical entailments of *'pounding'* and *'breaking down the door'* evoke a scenario of robbery and plunder and reinforce the siege narrative, along with the high numbers, suggesting a fearsome army. The tokens are also instantiations of the CONTAINER-metaphor, mapping Hungary and Europe as buildings, given the context, most likely a castle. The process of hyperbolized upscaling of the numbers results in a negative intensification which conveys evaluative content to the enumeration. Negative judgment (tenacity) is indirectly realised by describing the behaviour of the migrants but the enumeration itself leads to judgment through capacity by suggesting the scale of the impact. The physical proximity, the aggressive behaviour and the exaggerated numbers presents this crisis as an imminent and extraordinary clash of civilizations that may bring about the destruction of our world.

Another domain that realizes the movement-scenario is the representation of migrants as a LARGE BODY OF WATER, often combined with large numbers, quantifying the scale of the phenomenon. In his speech addressed to the Hungarian Parliament (September 21, 2015), the term *'flood of people'* used at one moment in reference to migrants forms a metaphorical system with the expression *'burst into our lives'*, from his introduction:

(10) The issue of illegal migration has burst into our lives with such force that I am now compelled to present my statement on it to the Honourable House.

[Az illegális bevándorlás kérdése olyan erővel tört be az életünkbe, hogy most erről kell jelentést tennem a tisztelt Háznak.]

The two entailments map the phenomenon onto a natural disaster scenario, invoking a narrative of European people being confronted with a large body of water breaking the dams (i.e. borders) of the territory (CONTAINER) creating an extraordinary, potentially dangerous, situation. The evaluative aspect of these metaphors is greatly enhanced by the proximization of threat, announcing the presence *'in our lives'* of this phenomenon, with verb *'burst'* suggesting both its large scale and the emergency it involves. In this scenario, negative attitude is

realised through appreciation (reaction), as it circumscribes the phenomenon and not the behaviour.

The main reason for criticism against European Union policies was the attempt to enforce the mandatory quota on member states. Viktor Orbán was arguing that the first measure should have been to stop the incoming migrants:

- (11) Before we manage to monitor our exterior borders we cannot tell how many people we need to distribute eventually. (...) Until we manage to defend the external borders of Europe, it does no good to maintain a discourse on the fate of those streaming in. (Meeting with Hungarian ambassadors – September 7, 2015)

*[Egész addig amíg nem ellenőrizzük a külső határainkat, nem tudjuk megmondani, hogy végül is majd hány embert kell szétosztanunk. (...) Amíg nem tudjuk Európa külső határait megvédeni, addig nem érdemes a beáramlók sorsáról diskurzust folytatni.]*

This excerpt maintains the ideational meaning of the elements of the natural disaster scenario (border-dam, Europe-container) but nominates the migrants as those who *'are streaming in'*. In Hungarian a present participle is used as a noun, for the category of the migrants. In the same speech, the Prime Minister argues that the migrants are *'flooding in'* because there is no *'physical structure'* on the border that could stop them:

- (12) [At the border] there is no physical structure that would force everybody to only cross the Hungarian border at the specially designated places. This is why they are flooding in. Because we cannot enforce this. (Meeting with Hungarian ambassadors)

*[... nincs fizikai építmény, amely kikényszerítené mindenkivel szemben, hogy márpedig átlépni a magyar határt csak a kijelölt határátkelő helyeken lehet. Ezért özönlenek be. Mert nem tudunk ennek érvényt szerezni.]*

The term, again, suggests the great number and force of those crossing Europe, using the WATER source domain with a higher degree of graduation as the previous *'are streaming in'*. As evaluative references to the scale and intensity of the phenomenon, the two verbs realise appreciation through composition, since it renders the perception of the phenomenon by the speaker (see Martin and White 2005, 57). The invoked scenario of the natural disaster serves as a supportive argument for the necessity of erecting a *'physical structure'* in order to stop the

migrants from crossing the border. This physical structure is, of course, the notorious fence built at the Southern border of Hungary with Croatia.

### 3.2.2. Romanian corpus

As opposed to the Hungarian discourse, in the Romanian declarations there was no exaggerated quantification in the representation of the migrants as the only numeral references were formulated in connection to the quota during discussions of the exact number of immigrants that Romania might host. There were figures revolving around 20,000 or 40,000 and at a given moment they came to 1785. These figures do not bear relevance to an analysis of evaluative content. However, a device of dehumanization is present in the President's discourse through the metaphor collectivizing migrants as A LARGE BODY OF WATER. Specialized literature records such references to immigrants in media or political discourse to suggest the great numbers, illustrate their movement towards their destination or imply threat through an analogy with a natural disaster (KhrosaviNik 2014; Charteris- Black 2006; Cabras Penuelas 2020).

In the President's declarations this conceptual metaphor (*flux, influx* or *wave*) appears as an element of institutional discourse with no further entailments and no evaluative content. The context of the declarations is varied, with different types of audience, and the metaphor itself functions as a nomination of the phenomenon by default. The lexicalization refers to both large quantity and movement with various devices of graduation.

(13) In Romania there isn't any kind of pressure of a migrational wave. We don't have a significant influx of refugees.

[... *în România nu există niciun fel de presiune a unui val migraționist. Nu avem un aflus semnificativ de refugiați.*]

This is a declaration of reassurance for the Romanian public by denial of alarming rumors about the possibly large quantity of refugees in the country. The terms '*wave*' and '*influx*' indicate quantity and movement, also suggesting transit through a territory (*influx*). In another declaration (September 27, 2015), the President mentions an '*immense influx*' (*aflus imens*) of refugees, the lexical item '*immense*' adding explicit graduation to the noun. In the October 14, 2015 press conference he speaks about identifying the source of the '*wave or waves of migrants*'<sup>18</sup>. In this case, graduation is added by the repetition of the plural form of the noun. In a

<sup>18</sup> *sursa acestui val sau acestor valuri de migrați – press conference, October 14, 2015*

speech addressed to UNO members (September 27, 2015) similar lexicalization is used and the evaluation of the phenomenon is provided by the context:

- (14) As we have been able to notice during the last months, hundreds of thousands of people have fled war in seeking a better life for themselves, entering Europe, often through perilous means. This increasingly larger flux of migrants from the Middle East and Africa has determined European states to make massive effort to cope with a massive humanitarian disaster.

*[După cum am putut observa în ultimele luni, sute de mii de oameni au fugit din calea războiului, în căutarea unei vieți mai bune, intrând în Europa, deseori prin mijloace riscante. Acest flux din ce în ce mai mare de migranți din Orientul Mijlociu și Africa a determinat țările europene să depună eforturi masive pentru a face față unui dezastru umanitar de proporții masive.]*

It should be noted that the lexicalization through the WATER metaphor occurs at the same time with the nomination of this group through plurals like *'people'*, *'refugees'* or *'migrants'* while the metaphorical concept marks the phenomenon through nominalization. This discursive gesture marks first of all the passivization of the category by deleting agency and rendering the group inanimate (Billig, 2008). Consequently, the positive evaluation indirectly provided by emphasis on their victimhood is counterbalanced by reducing the ordeal of their journey to an issue on the political agenda.

Evaluation is also provided by explicit lexis like *'flee war'*, *'seek a better life'*, *'massive effort'* and the warning of the *'humanitarian disaster'*, meant to draw attention to the scale and seriousness of the phenomenon. The mentioned number, nevertheless, is a moderate one (*hundreds of thousands*), suggesting an effort to maintain the report within the boundaries of factual evidence. Europe as a BUILDING/CONTAINER lexicalized through the verb *'enter'* is another metaphor used by default.

### **3.3. The action-scenario: defending borders**

The excerpts above have been tracking the structural elements of the narrative frame entailed by the CONTAINER source domain and compiling an inventory of metaphorical representations of the out-group, the migrants. This last set tackles the third structural element of the interaction between in-group and out-group,

that of the ACTION undertaken by those *within* the container, namely the *defense* of the territory. As in the case of the conceptualization of the territory starting from its concrete geographical coordinates, defence occurs on more levels, from the physical one of protecting borders, to that of preserving cultural values, identity or way of life.

Fewer metaphorical entailments can be traced in the case of this scenario, as the concrete actions undertaken for the '*defense of the borders*', that is, the measures taken to control and contain the migration are described through non-metaphorical lexis. Nevertheless, the symbolic aspect of the 'border' must be mentioned, as it not only represents a physical obstacle that regulates the migrants' entrance; it also regulates the status of the two countries by setting an administrative exclusion on Romania, a non-Schengen member of the Union. In the Hungarian case, the physical construction of the fence entails an ideological exclusion among the members who '*take turns in rebuking Hungarians*'<sup>19</sup> for its gesture of '*defending its statehood*'. These positions entail a specific discourse of justification for each country.

### 3.3.1. Romanian corpus

Romania's position as a non-Schengen country places it in the situation to prove itself. The border patrolling activities that Romania routinely undertakes on the Black Sea are emphasized as part of the border defence actions. Self-presentation as a '*provider of security*' on the Eastern border sends the message that Romania has diplomatic, political and military capacity to prove itself and become a full member *within* the European Union. While the capacity for defence is a significant part of Romania's discourse on migration, the very clearly circumscribed image of the migrants' movement as an invasion is absent from the Romanian one. The discussion on defence in this discourse is a statement of alignment along European policies and an affirmation of willingness and capability to fill in the role of a Schengen country:

---

<sup>19</sup> '*rotációban szidnak minket, magyarokat*' – September 21, 2015

- (15) I reaffirm the fact that Romania is solidary with the other European states and will continue to get involved in solving the refugee crisis. I further consider that the two questions are fundamental in this respect: acting over the causes that have led to this phenomenon and a process of securing European borders to which Romania is significantly contributing.

In the same context, today the Schengen area is questioned. Romania is already acting like a responsible state of the Schengen area and takes part in constructing the European policies of protecting and consolidating the frontiers of the Union. Beyond present circumstances, Romania is maintaining its objective to join this area. (Meeting with the foreign ambassadors, January 21, 2016)

*[Reafirm faptul că România este solidară cu celelalte state europene și va continua să se implice în rezolvarea crizei refugiaților. Consider totodată că două chestiuni sunt fundamentale în acest sens: acționarea asupra cauzelor care au condus la acest fenomen și un proces de securizare a frontierelor europene, la care România continuă să contribuie semnificativ.*

*În același context, astăzi spațiul Schengen este pus sub semnul îndoielii. România acționează deja ca un stat responsabil al spațiului Schengen și ia parte la construcția politicii europene de protecție și consolidare a frontierelor Uniunii. Dincolo de circumstanțele prezente, România își menține obiectivul aderării la acest spațiu.]*

The metaphorical and evaluative elements discursively place Romania in the position of a determined supporter of the ideal of the 'common European house', actively participating to 'constructing' and 'consolidating' European policies, part of which means 'securing borders'. The metaphorical conceptualization of defending the borders evokes the CONTAINER metaphor, with a scenario mapping Europe as a BUILDING. The excerpt presents Romania personified as an active agent, 'a significant contributor' to 'solving the refugee crisis'.

The positive connotation of building a house, and bringing a solution conveys in a similarly positive manner with the explicit 'solidary', Romania's position in this issue. This position is further emphasized by the explicit lexis conveying positive judgment (capacity). The organization of the first paragraph contrasts the negative 'causes that have led to this phenomenon' with the positive intervention of Romania 'securing borders' and 'consolidating frontiers'. It should be noted, that the attitudinal values marking capacity (Romania is able to contribute to the consolidation of European borders), gain an additional value of propriety (ethical conduct) in the context of notions like 'solidarity' and 'responsibility'. Romania is



not only an advocate of European policies but also a *'significant contributor'* to those. Maintaining its goal to adhere the Schengen area also suggests its optimism about the future of Europe.

### 3.3.2. Hungarian corpus

In all the analysed speeches of the Hungarian Prime Minister, the urgency of defending physical borders is associated with the necessity to observe the Schengen treaty obligations and this principle provides the main justification for the actions undertaken<sup>20</sup>. The metaphorical realizations of the idea of defence are entailments of the same domains as the elements of the space-container and movement-metaphors. In excerpt (7) above the counter-actions is preparation of the army. In the following excerpt another token of the WAR domain is used:

- (16) Turbulence, upheaval, crime, terrorist actions, fear: this is what the new age migration has brought to Europe. I am reporting to the Honourable House that Hungary managed to regroup on time and defend the country. (September 21, 2015)

[Zűrzavar, felfordulás, bűncselekmények, terrorakciók, félelem: ezt hozta Európának az újabkori népvándorlás, ezt hozták Európába a migránsok. Jelentem a Tisztelt Háznak, hogy Magyarországnak még időben sikerült rendeznie a sorokat és sikerült megvédenie az országot.]

The fragment is a typical method of justification of actions by outlining negative factors affecting the country to which the speaker brings his own positive solutions (Charteris-Black, 2011). The *'regrouping'* referred to in the fragment refers to a national scale questionnaire sent out to the population related to the issue of migration, as well as the building of the fence on the southern border.

A further example realizes positive self-presentation by the use of the WAR and BUILDING metaphors, evoking national pride and emphasizing the importance

---

<sup>20</sup> *It is not for fun that we have built and are building hundreds of kilometers of technical border lock. It was not for fun that we convened the Honourable House earlier for an extraordinary session to pass legislative amendments allowing us to curb mass migration and protect Hungarian citizens and their families. And it is not eccentricity which leads us to employ our own solutions: we are simply seeking to observe treaty obligations.* (September 21, 2015)

of a sense of duty which, in this context refers to the defence of Europe (the declaration is made in front of an international audience):

- (17) It was my duty to come here because Bavaria's southern borders are now defended by Hungary. (...) I was just telling the prime minister, that from a certain point of view I am one of the captains of their border castles and it is my duty to come here and report on the situation. (Press conference in Germany, with representatives of the CSU)

*[Kötelességem volt eljönni, mert Bajorország déli határait ma Magyarország védi. Az Európai Uniónak és a Schengeni egyezménynek köszönhetően az Önök déli határait nem Ausztria és Bajorország között, hanem a Schengeni külső vonalnál, vagyis Magyarország déli határánál lehet megvédeni. Mondtam a Miniszterelnök Úrnak, hogy bizonyos nézőpontból én vagyok az ő egyik végvári kapitánya, és kötelességem eljönni beszámolni a helyzetről.]*

Evoking border castles that have a special resonance for Hungarians<sup>21</sup> establishes again a parallel between the anti-Ottoman wars and the migrant crisis. Moreover, by placing himself in the position of the defender, the Prime Minister presents Europe (the European Union) as one unit, the members of which depend on each other. The metaphor conveys positive self-presentation and emphasizes the idea of a common goal, while the idea of dutiful (ethical) behaviour invokes positive judgment through propriety.

#### 4. Conclusions

Even if metaphors' realization happens through language, their nature is conceptual. Therefore, the lexical units indicating their presence in a text are manifestations on the textual surface of systems of a cognitive nature. According to Musolff (2004, 2016) metaphorical elements belonging to a limited set of domains usually constitute clusters of meaning called scenarios. They are associated to a particular public issue or social aspect and they may function as a means of expressing position and attitude towards a subject by participants to a public debate.

In the case of political discourse on migration one typical domain is that of the container which provides mappings for a limited set of scenarios. This

---

<sup>21</sup> Border castles were established on the southern border of the country (15-16. century) in order to defend the Hungarian kingdom from Ottoman attacks.

study has been organized around three relevant ones. The *space-container* scenario conceptualizes the territories of the European Union and the countries discussed as enclosures with in and out movement, borders and a certain capacity. The *movement* scenario focuses on conceptualizations of the migrants' journey towards Europe, as a large body of water or a threatening mass, with the specific realizations in the Hungarian corpus as a formidable army, attacking the enclosure represented by either Hungary or Europe. The *action-scenario* contains elements that pertain to possible actions taken by those inside the container, namely, measures taken for the defence of national or European Union borders.

These scenarios provide the evaluative frames for the speakers and contribute to the formulations of the official positions of the countries they represent. In the case of both discourses, positive self-presentation emerges from describing an ethical conduct (judgment: propriety) and an efficient approach (judgment: capacity) of the matter.

While positive self-presentation is essential in both Hungarian and Romanian discourses, the two are different in the degree of polarization established in the texts. Metaphorical content conveys criticism and disalignment with European migration policies through negative judgment (propriety) in the case of the Hungarian Prime Minister. The discourse of the Romanian President, on the other hand, is more low-key and its frame is determined by a general pro-European position. Klaus Iohannis avoids establishing any kind of positive/negative contrast between Romania and the other actors.

These very different positions are realized through a frequent association of the container-metaphor with the source domain of WARFARE, in the Hungarian corpus, positing migrants as the enemy through attitudinal markers of judgment (tenacity), meant to justify defensive measures. The idea of defence in the Romanian corpus is associated to the provision of safety rather than action against an enemy. Even if the scenarios typically used in discourse on migration are present in the Romanian corpus as well, their metaphorical realization is more reduced.

## References

- Billig, Michael. 2008. "The Language of Critical Discourse Analysis: the case of nominalization." *Discourse and Society* 19(6): 783-800.
- Cabrejas Peñuelas and Ana Belén. 2020. "Metaphor, metonymy and evaluation as political devices in American and Spanish parliamentary political discourse." *Ibérica* 40: 75-100.

- Cap, Piotr. 2006. *Legitimation in Political Discourse: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2006. "Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign." *Discourse and Society* 17(5): 563-581.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2009. "Metaphor and Political Communication." In *Metaphor and Discourse*, ed. by Andreas Musolff and Jörg Zinken, 97-115. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2011. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Chilton, Paul and George Lakoff. 1999. "Foreign policy by metaphor." In *Language and Peace*, ed. by Christina Schäffner and Anita L. Wenden, 37-60. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Díaz-Peralta, Marina. 2018. "Metaphor and ideology: Conceptual structure and conceptual content in Spanish political discourse." *Discourse and Communication* 12 (2): 1-21.
- Díez-Prados, Mercedes. 2016. "The use of metaphor and evaluation as discourse strategies in pre-electoral debates: Just about winning votes." In *Exploring Discourse strategies in social and Cognitive Interaction: Multimodal and Cross-linguistic Perspectives*, ed. by Manuela Romano and M. Dolores Porto, 215-244. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ilyin, Mikhail and Paul Chilton. 1993. "Metaphor in Political Discourse: The Case of the Common European House." *Discourse and Society* 4(1): 7-31.
- KhosraviNik, Majid. 2014. "Immigration Discourses and Critical Discourse Analysis: Dynamics of World Events and Immigration Representations in the British Press." In *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*, ed. by C. Hart and Piotr Cap, 501-520. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, James R. and Peter R.R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2006. "Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse." *Metaphor and symbol* 21(1): 23-38.

- Musolff, Andreas. 2015. "Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media." *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 3(1): 41-56.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2016. *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Musolff, Andreas, Jörg Zinken. 2009. *A Discourse-Centred Perspective on Metaphorical Meaning and Understanding*. In *Metaphor and Discourse*, ed. by Andreas Musolff and Jörg Zinken, 1-8. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Steen, Gerard J., Ewa Biernacka, Aletta G. Dorst, Anna A. Kaal, Irene López-Rodríguez, Trijntje Pasma. 2010. *Pragglejaz in practice: Finding metaphorically used words in natural discourse*. In *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World*, ed. by Graham Low, Zazie Todd, Alice Deignan, Lynne Cameron, 165-184. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1997. "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments." In *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*, ed. by Stephen Riggins, 31-64. Thousand Oaks California; London: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2010. "Political Identities in Parliamentary Debates." In *European Parliaments Under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*, ed. by Cornelia Ilie, 29-56. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

## Corpus sources

### Klaus Iohannis

September 7, 2015, press conference,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s8UzZhrTeGw&t=419s>

September 14, 2015, press conference,

<https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/declaratii-de-presa/conferinta-de-presa-palatul-cotroceni-sala-unirii>

September 16, 2015, press conference,

<https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/reforma-institutiilor-publice/mesajul-presedintelui-romaniei-domnul-klaus-iohannis-adresat-parlamentului-romaniei>

September 17, 2015, press conference,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uiLFkf3tyCo&t=3s>

September 23, 2015, press conference,

<https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/politica-externa/transcrierea->

conferintei-de-presa-sustinuta-de-presedintele-romaniei-domnul-klaus-  
iohannis

September 27 2015, UNO speech, <https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/politica-externa/interventia-nationala-a-presedintelui-romaniei-domnul-klaus-iohannis-sustinuta-in-cadrul-summitului-onu-pentru-adoptarea-agendei-de-dezvoltare-durabila>

October 14, 2015, press conference, <https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/politica-externa/declaratia-de-presa-a-presedintelui-romaniei-domnul-klaus-iohannis-sustinuta-cu-ocazia-participarii-la-consiliul-european-de-toamna>

January 21, 2016 –Meeting with the Representatives of Embassies in Bucharest, <https://www.presidency.ro/ro/media/agenda-presedintelui/intalnirea-anuala-cu-sefii-misiunilor-diplomatice-acreditati-la-bucuresti-palatul-cotroceni-sala-unirii>

### **Viktor Orbán**

Speech to the Ambassadors on September 7, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HMrdeQOmtfQ>

End of year report in the Hungarian Parliament in 2015, February 15, 2016, <https://2015-2019.kormany.hu/hu/a-miniszterelnok/beszedek-publikaciok-interjuk/orban-viktor-napirend-elotti-felszolalasa-20160215>

SPEECH IN Hungarian Parliament reporting on the situation, September 21, 2015, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TFP7\\_NCLh0o](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TFP7_NCLh0o)

Press conference with the CSU, September 23, 2015.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CCjmuWwd-oU&t=558s>