

***'A BADGE OF EUROPEANNESS': SHAPING IDENTITY THROUGH THE EU'S
INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE ON MULTILINGUALISM***

ABSTRACT

This paper contributes to the advancement of the established body of literature on language and identity by ascertaining how discursive representations of multilingualism at an institutional level have interplayed with the construction and the definition of European identities. Using the Discourse Historical Approach (Wodak 2001), the analysis focuses on a corpus of official speeches given by the European Commissioner for Multilingualism to identify discursive strategies and linguistic devices and link them to wider socio-political and historic dynamics. Findings suggest that the institutional construction of Europeanness has primarily occurred through macro discourses predicated on cultural, civic and economic dimensions of multilingualism with some inherent tensions in contrasting representations of 'diverse' and multilingual EU-rope. It is suggested that through heterogeneous representations of multilingualism torn between identity politics and commodification, European identities emerge as hybrid and fragmented constructs in between national, post national and global dimensions.

Keywords: European identities, multilingualism in EU discourses, institutional representations of language and identity, Discourse Historical Approach.

1. Introduction: Language and European Identity ¹

Language has always been a major source of identity for individuals and groups (Edwards 2009; Joseph 2004) and such powerful relation has often been

harnessed and 'naturalised' in political discourses (Hobsbawm 1997; Wodak et al. 2009). In particular modern Europe has seen languages being instrumentally used to define the boundaries of 'national' collectivities along monist ideologies in the construction of nation-states (Wright 2000).

The EU represents a *sui generis* political construct aimed at bringing 'the peoples of Europe' together under a supranational umbrella that would supersede national divides. Therefore, on the face of it, since its inception the EU has ideologically rejected any rhetorical mobilization of language based on the 'national' model by recognising instead the official languages of individual member states as 'all equal'. Whilst for some time this multilingual setup primarily concerned organizational practices (i.e. the internal translation machine) the adoption of a specific agenda on cultural policies in the mid 1990s marked the following decade as the most active in the EU's external promotion of multilingualism² culminating with the introduction of a Commissioner for Multilingualism³. Similarly, issues of 'European identity' did not feature prominently in institutional discourses⁴ for many years after the EU was created. In the past few decades, however, the quest to identify the 'Europeans' and their relation with the EU institutions has intensified considerably in relation to issues of legitimacy and the debated question of the EU's 'democratic deficit' (Cerutti and Lucarelli 2008). After the Treaty of Maastricht the EU thus engaged with a social agenda promoting human rights, democracy and diversity in addition to 'free market' policies (Kraus 2011). Moreover, the troubled process of having the Lisbon Treaty ratified by all member states, led the Commission to launch a series of initiatives to close the 'communication gap' with citizens. Attempts to reconnect European institutions and demos were thus articulated amidst discourses of the search for a 'European soul' (Weiss, 2002). In this respect Weiss (2002) has suggested that the EU's (re)construction process at the beginning of the new millennium has seen institutions seeking "legitimation through idea" drawing on discourses of identity, history, culture and "legitimation through procedure" which has discursively relied on themes of participation, democracy, efficiency. Weiss therefore recognises *ideational* and *organizational* dimensions respectively as two major aspects that have shaped institutional talks about Europe and its identity. Finally, one must also consider

the significant impact of the EU's biggest enlargement in 2004 as it brought into the EU political arena increasingly diversified conceptualisations of Europeanness which were to be (re)negotiated and which shifted the traditional notion of 'the East' as 'Europe's other' (Šarić et al. 2010). It is in the broad context of all these changes and situated within wider discourses on multiculturalism and globalisation that 'diversity' "became a central concept in the Union's normative discourse" (Kraus 2011, 19) resulting, inter alia, in the active promotion of the multilingual ideology.

2. Aims and objectives

The scenario outlined above offers an interesting standpoint to analyse the interplay between institutional discourses of identity and language(s) in a postnational context. How has European identity been constructed in the Commission's discourses of multilingualism? What is the role of languages envisaged by the institutions and how are they related to European identity?

The institutional discourse on European identity has been investigated in several strands of interdisciplinary research and from a variety of approaches including historical, socio-political, discursive and cultural perspectives (Delanty 2006; Ifversen 2002; Kraus 2008; Krzyzanowski 2010; Malmberg and Strath 2002; Millar and Wilson, 2007; Mole 2007; Wodak 2004, 2011). At the same time multilingualism in the EU context has attracted the interest of many scholars, across disciplines (cf. Mar-Molinero and Stevenson, 2009; Rindler-Schjerve and Vetter, 2012; Weber and Horner, 2012, Wodak, 2010). Critical linguists for example have criticised the EU's multilingual regime for reproducing the 'national' pecking order of languages (Gal 2010) and for its hegemonic practises (Krzyzanowski and Wodak 2010; Krzyzanowski and Wodak 2011). Furthermore Krzyzanowski and Wodak (2010; 2011) suggest that, in the EU's vision, multilingualism has represented a polysemic construct that has semantically shifted in time, in most cases to fit functionally into the EU's wider discourses informed by political and economic macro-strategies such as the Lisbon strategy

where multilingualism was recontextualised as “a necessary skill” for economic competitiveness.

Among these studies, however, the interplay between language and Europeanness in the institutional representations of multilingualism remains unexplored. This paper addresses this gap in the literature by offering insights on the discursive construction of supranational identities through the lens of discourses on multilingualism. From this stance this paper’s aim is to ascertain whether and how this relation is played out in the discourses produced by the Commission, the supranational organ of the EU. In this paper the term European ‘identities’ is used in the plural assuming the multiplicity of representations and “different constructions and images of Europe” (Wodak and Weiss, 2005p. 128). The focus of this paper, however, is on the linguistic production process rather than the reified product and, in this study, therefore language represents both the object (with identity) and the tool of investigation.

The following questions will be addressed:

- How has the EU’s Commission discourse on multilingualism contributed to the construction of Europeanness?
- What linguistic and discursive strategies are employed to construct ‘Europeanness’ in institutional discourses of multilingualism?

The next section outlines the theoretical and analytical framework used in this study and it discusses the methodology and the quality of data analysed. The following section engages with a multi-level linguistic analysis of arguments, and strategies deployed in discourse and critical conclusions are drawn in the final section.

3. Data

Data was derived from a database publicly available online at the EU's press release website ⁵. 23 official speeches given by the Commissioner for Multilingualism between 2007 and 2009 were selected and analysed. This time frame was chosen because following the creation of a separate Commission's Portfolio on Multilingualism under L. Orban, it represents the period of the EU's most intense activity in promoting the multilingual ideology. These speeches refer to a variety of institutional events in which the Commissioner addresses both internal (e.g. the Culture Committee in the European Parliament) and external (translators, academics and business people) audiences. Although speeches were delivered in different contexts they all relate to events with significant levels of formality (such as meetings, conferences, public lectures and official celebrations). As no further information on the contexts of production of these speeches was available there are some limitations in treating these texts somewhat at 'face value' for example seeing the Commissioner as the 'principal' speaker in Goffman's (1981) sense. However, whenever possible, background information on the site of 'consumption' of these speeches (e.g. the event) and the intended addressee audience of the text was taken into account to contextualize the analysis and guide the interpretation. Of all speeches analysed 12 were delivered in Brussels, 5 to 'western European' and 6 to 'eastern European' audiences. The public archive consulted did not provide further information about in which language each speech was delivered, however whilst all speeches were consistently available in the English version, only some of the speeches were also available in a few additional languages. In total ten Romanian, nine French, eight German, two Polish, one Italian, one Dutch and one Latvian version(s) were found in addition to the 23 English versions. Whilst in the case of the Italian, Polish and Latvian versions the availability appears correlated to the place of delivery (i.e. Rome, Warsaw, Riga), in other cases no such correlation existed. Furthermore all speeches delivered in Brussels were available in either English only or any other inconsistent combination of English, French, German and Romanian (which might suggest the tendency to use the Commission's three working languages as well the Commissioner's first language). After due consideration, all speeches were therefore analysed in the English version as the only version that allowed for a methodologically consistent corpus analysis

although this points to the obvious issue of the Commission's 'hegemonic' interpretation of multilingualism criticized by Krzyżanowski and Wodak (2010) and raises very important questions that unfortunately cannot be dealt with within the scope of this article. A table detailing the official theme of the speeches, audience, date, and place of delivery, as well as languages available is provided in Appendix 1.

4. Theoretical and analytical framework

The theoretical framework used in this paper is largely based on the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) developed by Wodak (2001). DHA assumes "a dialectical relationship between particular discursive practices and the specific fields of action [...] in which they are embedded". (ibid, p. 66). From this perspective DHA treats official speeches as a specific subgenre of political language pertaining to the 'field of action' concerned with forming "public attitudes, opinions and will" (Reisigl 2008, 248). Whilst addressing identified audiences for persuasive, rhetorical and legitimisation purposes (Chilton 2004), official speeches can therefore contribute to represent states of affairs, influence public ideology and be ultimately instrumental in creating the social structure amidst which identities are performed, negotiated or challenged (Bourdieu, 1991, Heller 1995, Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). Consequently, the general view taken here is that social identities are not something that we intrinsically have but rather they represent dynamic constructs realised, inter alia, in and through discourses of inclusion/exclusion, legitimisation, etc. (Tryandafillydou and Wodak, 2003). Furthermore, taking into account DHA call for a social, historical and political approach to the analysis and interpretation of texts, the institutional notion of European identity is here understood, to a large extent, as the historical product of ongoing political discourses on the 'meaning of Europe' (Strath, 2010) and ultimately a context-dependent and culturally bound discursive construct.

Notably, DHA recognises the need for a multidimensional approach of the analysis that filters any text through narrow-to-broad levels of contextualization (see Wodak, 2001, p. 67 for details) In line with the DHA proposed by Wodak (2001) and further elaborated by Krzyzanowski (2010), in this study therefore the ‘thematic analysis’ has mapped out the content of texts and identifies macro propositions, main themes and sub-themes. The linguistic analysis has then been taken further ‘in-depth’ to investigate the main discursive strategies deployed by the speakers and the *topoi* upon which strategies rely. However, Wodak et al (2009, 33) suggest the use of strategies is often context-dependent and “[a]lthough analytically distinguishable from one another, [...] strategies occur more or less simultaneously and are interwoven in concrete discursive acts”. Consequently, a taxonomy of strategies has not been assumed *a priori* but approached critically, allowing for specific (sub)categories to emerge. Adhering to Wodak et al.’s (2009) model, the analysis of strategies has been guided by *topoi*, i.e. standardised argumentation schemes characterised by an implicit justification of the argument. Just like strategies, *topoi* are often context-dependent, thus requiring interpretive work to unpack their specific “discourse-pragmatic aspect” (Krzyzanowski 2010, 85) through multi-level contextualisation (see above). Finally, at the micro linguistic level the analysis identifies those elements which link utterances with *topoi* and functionally support strategies, such as tropes, metaphors, as well as temporal, spatial and personal deictics (Chilton 2004) as these elements can be strategically deployed in their inclusive/exclusive inference to define group boundaries.

5. Findings

5.1 Thematic analysis: Representations of Europeanness

A number of distinct representations of European identity linked to multilingualism emerged, at the ‘entry-level’ examination. By and large, these representations can broadly be conflated into the ideational and the

organisational dimensions proposed by Weiss (2002). It must be emphasized, however, that the elements of these two macro representations (summarised in table 1) are traceable intertextually and interdiscursively rather than existing as congruous aggregates. Whilst representations related to the *ideational* dimension are mainly predicated on *topoi* of shared heritage, kinship and history, which traditionally have been associated with discourses of the '*culture nation*', representations referring to the *organisational* dimension typically rely on *topoi* such as social cohesion, equality, citizenship which emphasise Europe as a specific political project shared by a community regardless their cultural background, thus evoking the '*civic nation*'⁶. On the whole therefore Europeanness emerges both as a given, essentialist feature of the European 'in-group' and as a dynamic component of the process of 'making Europe'. These distinct representations are constructed through overarching narratives in which identity features are both 'brought along' in and 'brought about' by the narration⁷. Therefore the relation between multilingualism and European identity is often linguistically realised through a 'past/future' temporal dimension highlighting a 'common history' on the one hand (i.e. something that *has been there*) or, on the other, constructing a 'common finality' (i.e. something that *is being developed/will emerge*). In both cases the Commissioner's discourses of multilingualism (primarily conceptualised as linguistic diversity) are instrumental in underpinning the two distinct visions of European identity as illustrated by the following extracts:

[1] *"Our main strength is our diversity. Crystallised in different forms, from cultural, to linguistic and social diversity, it represents the very core of the European identity, which combines the different pieces of specificity in the well-joined European puzzle"* (Rome, 24/3/2007)

[2] *"I am convinced linguistic diversity will help us developing [sic] a European identity"* (Brussels, 3/10/2007)

Extract [1] depicts Europeanness as a static and rather essential state. This notion is linguistically conveyed by the lexeme *crystallised* which suggests a permanent and definite structure/shape that has been preserved in time and is 'brought along' in the narration of the continuity of a

‘European identity’. In this context linguistic diversity is represented as ‘heritage’, that is “*an essential feature*” that must be preserved, cherished, celebrated, etc. This contrasts with a more fluid representation in [2] where European identity is depicted as a process involving transformation and change (conveyed through the linguistic choice of *developing*). One should also note the agentive and inclusive connotation in [2] where *us* arguably refers to the dynamic role of the EU institutions since, in this speech, the Commissioner addresses the Cultural Committee in the European Parliament. Crucially, whilst in [1] ‘diversity’ is represented as the “very core of European identity”, the functionality of this correlation is reversed in [2] where linguistic diversity is construed as a *tool* to ‘develop a European identity’ rather than one of its ‘natural’ expressions.

Table 1. Macro representations of Europeanness in the Commissioner’s speeches analysed

ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE ‘IDEATIONAL’ DIMENSION	ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE ‘ORGANISATIONAL’ DIMENSION
Representations based on ‘cultural’ topoi	Representations based on ‘civic’ topoi
Identity as a ‘common history’	Identity as a ‘common finality’
Essentialist and relatively static representations of Europeanness	Constructed and dynamic representations of Europeanness
Linguistic diversity as <i>heritage</i>	Linguistic diversity as <i>strategy</i>
Representations of <i>De facto</i> European Multilingualism	Representations of <i>De jure</i> European Multilingualism
Discourses realised through Past-oriented temporal dimension (‘brought along’ in narration)	Discourses realised through Future-oriented temporal dimension (‘brought about’ by narration)
Primarily realised through Strategies of assimilation and ‘historicization’	Primarily realised through Strategies of singularisation, legitimation and transformation

Along with 'civic' and 'cultural' representations of European identity, the Commissioner also constructs an economic dimension of multilingualism through arguments of economic benefits, competitiveness and mobility which are clearly related to the wider discourses generated by the Lisbon Strategy. Such economic dimension of multilingualism is important in defining certain features of Europeanness, for example by representing mobile multilingual Europeans able *"to freely circulate, with just languages as their passport"* (Piran, 17/9/2007) or to *"capitalise on the EU enlargement"* (Bucharest, 9/3/2007). Crucially, the overall construction of Europe as a 'multicultural, diverse enterprise' (see below) portrays multilingualism as a skill that is required by the (linguistic) market and, in this context, therefore European identity emerges as the individual ability to create a functional and marketable 'added value' through language learning rather than being predicated on civic or cultural premises.

5.2 Analysis of Strategies

A number of strategies were utilized to construct (and transform) European identity in the Commissioner's discourses on multilingualism. These are summarised in table 2. Before discussing these in detail in the following section, however, a few considerations can be made in relation to the distribution of strategies. Whilst the analysis found that different strategies often co-existed within each speech, the audience addressed by the Commissioner or the context of the event represented key variables in the different emphasis placed on different sets of strategies. Thus for example a higher number of strategies of dissimilation than any others were realised in speeches addressing translators possibly aimed at validating the contribution of their work by highlighting the uniqueness of 'polyglot' Europe. Similarly, economic aspects of multilingualism were unsurprisingly brought to the fore by the Commissioner when he addressed business audiences (such as National Chamber Of Commerce in Warsaw) through a frequent use of strategies of 'single-marketization' and corporate-style talk. On the other hand strategies of legitimisation emerged consistently across a variety of speeches and audiences. What appears

distinctive to each audience or event though were the specific *topoi* or stances that these strategies were realised through. In the case of the speeches delivered to minority-speaking communities in Gorizia and Rennes, for instance, legitimisation was primarily achieved representing the Union as a democratic institution committed to the protection of linguistic diversity in the face of globalisation. By contrast legitimisation was primarily predicated on *topoi* related to the ‘civic’ role of languages (that is allowing dialogue with institutions) when speeches were delivered to internal audiences or in more ‘celebratory’ contexts (e.g. the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome). Finally, in the realisation of strategies, different stances taken by the Commissioner in relation to whom legitimisation was sought for could be recognized. For instance when addressing the Cultural Committee in the European Parliament legitimisation was primarily sought for either his own office or the ‘we-Commission’ for setting up a multilingual agenda whilst, when addressing external audiences, legitimisation was mainly sought for the EU as a whole.

5.2.1 Assimilation

Overall, in the Commissioner’s speeches, the *strategy of emphasizing in-group sameness* relied on implicit conceptualisations of Europeans as an ‘extended family’ living in a ‘common house/building’. The metaphors of FAMILY and CONSTRUCTION have been much exploited in political, media and public discourses about the EU (see for example Chilton and Ilyin 1993; Musolff 2001) to strategically mediate, inter alia, cognitive entailments of ‘neighbours’ ‘safety’ and ‘enlargement’. In the data analysed, the Commissioner often draws upon specific features of the CONSTRUCTION source domain (in particular ‘bridges’ and ‘doors’) when discussing the diverse functions that he envisages for multilingualism:

[3] *“Languages are the open doors through which the institutions and the citizens can keep in touch Languages are not obstacles, but opportunities; they are not barriers, but bridges.” (Brussels, 3/10/2007)*

In a few instances the representation of a ‘European family’ is realised by the Commissioner by drawing explicitly on the *topos* of *European kinship* to convey

the idea of Europeans as a related group (FAMILY) and to reiterate how multilingualism can reinforce and validate such relationships:

[4] "Languages build dialogue and understanding between people. They deepen our sense of community and European kinship" (Brussels, 10/9/2008).

Here the Commissioner is suggesting that the intercultural dimension of languages (that is understanding others through linguistic exchange/awareness) has an impact on 'European kinship'. In this context, the notion of kinship is left semantically 'open' and it can be differently interpreted from strictly genealogical ties to looser historical and cultural ones. Crucially, though, by arguing that intercultural dialogue would add qualitatively (*deepen*) to European kinship the speaker has implicitly already established the existence of a kinship relation between Europeans as related members of the same group (foregrounding the historic dimension). At the same time one can recognize the agentive role ascribed to languages by the Commissioner's discourse whereby they dynamically and positively consolidate and generate new ties. A different representation of kinship, however, is also constructed by the Commissioner:

[5] "Europe's founders wanted to create solidarity, for 'a coming together of the nations of Europe'. Building a sense of solidarity, of European kinship, is still a guiding principle for Europe." (NatoLin, 6/3/2008)

In this case the Commissioner refers to kinship as the relation of 'the nations of Europe' that came together to realize a common vision thus highlighting the socio-political dimension of Europeanness rather than implying a common descent. The European kinship that is invoked here by the Commissioner is that that fuelled the creation of the EU (the shared vision of post-war French, German, Italian and Benelux governments) and which, according to the Commissioner, 'still represents a principle' for the expanded Union (the speaker is here addressing an audience in Poland, the latter being a recent member state). In this case, unification is created by appealing to the 'ideational' dimension of Europe at is by reinforcing a sense of a community involved in its construction (BUILDING metaphor) and on a path towards a common destiny (JOURNEY

metaphor). It is however interesting to note that, although in [5] the conceptualisation of kinship is primarily political, the strategy of unification is realised through the *topos of the founding fathers* (the statesmen who created the first economic union) and is therefore still informed by a ‘family’ narrative. Furthermore, such narrative is implicitly promoted by Mr. Orban when, in reference to *language diversity*, he draws upon topoi of *heritage* and *wealth*:

[6] “[Days of Language] celebrate our linguistic diversity, one of the greatest assets of the European heritage”. (Brussels, 26/9/2007)

[7] “I am convinced that Europe's abundance of mother tongues is a source of wealth” (Brussels, 10/9/2008)

In these utterances multilingualism (constructed as the *de facto* historical coexistence of many different languages spoken in Europe) is represented as part of the ‘European heritage’, that is as a cultural asset owned and preserved by the ‘European family’ to be passed down to future generations. Through this linguistic strategy, whilst avoiding any explicit ethnocentric arguments called upon by kinship, the Commissioner therefore still manages to convey a sense of groupness through the implication of Europeans as members of a group sharing an asset and with a ‘moral’ duty to preserve it (see below).

Emphasizing the in-group sameness is also frequently achieved by the Commissioner through specific strategies of *temporalisation* and *territorialisation* (Weiss, 2002). In particular, ‘historicizing’ multilingualism - that is stressing the temporal continuity of linguistic diversity in Europe (the latter defined along shifting geo-political lines)- is a strategy often used by the Commissioner to create a ‘common past’ for the Europeans:

[8] “Language is the most direct expression of culture; it is what makes us human and gives each of us a sense of identity. The existence side by side of many different languages has been a constant feature of our European continent. We have always been aware of this multilingual reality in Europe” (Brussels, 23/10/2009)

In [8] the Commissioner first acknowledges the ‘anchoring’ function of language for one’s identity and highlights the linguistic and cultural diversity of

Europe (here represented in its wider-inclusive geographical inference, i.e. the 'European continent'). In the last two sentences of this extract Mr. Orban creates a sense of historic continuity through past tenses ('has been/have always been') and the lexical choice ('a constant feature'). Importantly the continuous existence of multilingualism as a practice (*'The existence ... of many different languages '*) – that is a historic fact - is mirrored in the next sentence by the historic 'awareness' of such 'reality'. This clearly presupposes the self-understanding of Europeans as a 'we-group', a prerequisite condition for some emotional investment in the meaning of any group identity that, otherwise, would constitute a mere external ascription (Jenkins 2008). Moreover, through the possessive 'our continent', the speaker uses a strategy of territorialisation to define an in/out European space thus reinforcing the spatial dimension of the 'we-group' to comprise the whole of geographical Europe (and not restricted to the current political Union).

In some cases however the historicization of multilingualism is achieved discursively by overlapping and converging *Europe* and the *Union* as illustrated by the following extract:

[9] "Today I would like to talk to you about multilingualism in this new Europe of ours. As Commissioner with responsibility for this portfolio, I won't surprise you when I insist that this is an essential feature we must hold on to at all costs.... We may sometimes have the impression that one common language would help us understand each other better. But the very notion of a common language is contradicted by our history. Europe has always been multilingual. Think of Latin. Once it was the common language imposed by an empire, but it had to adapt to the complexity of the peoples of Europe. Out of one single tongue grew many of the different languages that give us our cultural richness today. The founders of the EU understood well that this diversity was a source of richness. The very first regulation adopted by the European Economic Community gave parity to the official languages of the six founding members. And we have maintained that principle and the practice ever since Parity of treatment was an absolute, then. 50 years on, can we still apply lessons from history to our

modern globalised world? I am convinced that we not only can – we must! ”. (Natolin, 6/3/2008)

In this case the history of multilingualism that the Commissioner appeals to conflates distinct narratives. At the start, Mr. Orban highlights the institutional dimension of his narrative. This is signalled by the emphasis on his institutional role ('As Commissioner') and, above all, by the expression 'this new Europe of ours' which, in the context of this speech has to be interpreted as the history of the political Union. This speech addresses the College of Europe in Natolin (Warsaw) which was originally set up in Bruges but which is now shared between Poland and Belgium following the 2004 Enlargement. The Commissioner gives an account of the history of the European Union before extract [9]. The utterance "This new Europe of ours" should thus be inferred as the political project of the Union which has now expanded East. However, subsequently the speaker engages with a wider narrative of European history that would see the multilingualism of 'the peoples of Europe' continuously evolving and resulting in the current 'richness' (i.e. language diversification). This narration portrays the EU 'naturally' and insightfully taking over such heritage (through the founders who 'understood well' the value of diversity) and becoming the 'guardian' of it. As such, it is imperative now that the institutions 'must hold on to this essential feature' and 'must apply lessons from history' to preserve this, thus appealing to a strategy of political continuity, tying in with the journey imagery. Obviously, the 'selected' institutional version of multilingualism (Gal 2010; Krzyżanowski and Wodak 2010) is not necessarily representative of the linguistic variety in the European continent/society at large. Nevertheless a strategy of discursively assimilating *Europe* and the *Union* (in this case through historic narratives) allows the Commissioner to 'claim' and legitimise what 'has always been culturally European' as part of the 'new civic Europeanness' and to convergence conceptualisations of the European group as both a political collectivity and a wider cultural aggregate.

5.2.2 Dissimilation

A strategy of singularisation predicated on the *uniqueness* of Europe and aimed at positioning Europe vis-à-vis other groups was clearly traceable in the data analysed. This strategy appears to rely primarily on civic rather than cultural *topoi*. Crucially, more than referring to the *de facto* linguistic heterogeneity of the European continent, it is the political significance of the multilingual ideology promoted by the EU (therefore its normative or *de jure* aspect) that is often invoked by Mr. Orban to define the distinctiveness of Europe. Such political salience is clearly inferable from the following extracts:

[10] *"We were able to more than double the language coverage over the past three years from 11 to the present 23. We are probably the only part of the world that ensures such diversity in unity" (Brussels, 27/2/2007)*

[11] *"I am well aware, of course, that linguistic diversity is not unique to Europe: many more languages are spoken in other countries and on other continents. Rather, what makes the European Union special is its explicit decision to recognise that all the languages of its Member States have equal dignity in communication between the European institutions and citizens." (Rome, 23/3/2007)*

As in [10] Mr Orban is addressing the Culture Committee in the Parliament reporting on the progress made so far with linguistic policies, 'we' has clearly to be inferred in reference to the EU institutions. However the claim of uniqueness is enacted in spatial terms through the expression "*the only part of the world*" and thus it emphasizes the geographical dimension of the Union (albeit leaving the borders of that 'part of the world' rather vaguely defined). Through convergence of physical Europe and the Union and invoking the 'united in diversity' motto, the Commissioner places the EU on the global 'geo-political map' as a *sui generis* actor achieving dissimilation through singularisation.

Similarly, in [11], the Commissioner claims uniqueness for the institutional policy that allows citizens to communicate with Brussels in any of the EU's official languages, through a metaphorical personification of languages 'having equal dignity' before institutions (see legitimation strategies below). Such a claim of uniqueness has to be interpreted as a rhetorical distancing from

linguistic discriminations previously occurred in Europe under the 'one-language, one-state' ideology typically adopted by nation states. However, in this case the Commissioner operates a clear distinction between Europe and the European Union. In the first sentence of [11] Europe is clearly constructed as a geographical entity simply compared to 'other countries and other continents'; the uniqueness of its *de facto* linguistic diversity is downplayed (in contrast to the strategies of assimilation analysed in the previous section). This premise gives the speaker the background against which, he is then able to single out the Union as a unique actor responsible for validating multilingualism *de jure*. In this case therefore we can recognise a strategy of singularisation operated through a contrast between Europe (the continent) versus EU (the institution). On another level, the discourse of multilingualism as an ideological choice allows the Commissioner to position such ideology vis-à-vis other ideologies as exemplified by the following passage:

[12] *"Our deepest aspirations [are] not to make a monolith or a melting pot, where our differences are rendered down but rather, to create a mosaic of difference, where difference is celebrated"*
(Brussels, 6/11/2008)

Here the 'melting-pot' metaphor (which is also found in other EU's policy documents and discourses) is used in reference to the US assimilationist ideology of the 1960s and 1970s. Likewise, the 'monolith' metaphor is similarly utilized to reject the communist ideology of the Soviet state. By rejecting both models, the Commissioner effectively uses a strategy of *differentiation* to construct ideological (as well as spatial and temporal) group boundaries that allow him to position the Europeans vis-à-vis Americans and Russians as a distinct group. The multicultural ideology symbolised by the 'mosaic' (that is a whole in which each piece retains its own distinctiveness whilst contributing to construct the bigger picture) however is not necessarily exclusive to the EU but it has also been claimed, inter alia, by Canada and South Africa (the latter in the form of the 'rainbow nation') whilst even the American model has seen a discursive and ideological shift from the 'melting pot' to the 'salad bowl'. The Commissioner's strategy of dissimilation therefore appears primarily realised

along a temporal dimension which differentiates between past assimilationist approaches of nation-state building and the EU's current ideology with a positive emphasis on the latter. Such temporal dimension is also signalled by the 'creation' of a mosaic seen by the Commissioner as a desired outcome of the institutional 'aspiration' thus suggesting the prospective dimension of Europeanness.

The positive emphasis on Europe's distinctiveness and the 'design' dimension of Europeanness are also illustrated by the following example extracted from a speech where the Commissioner addresses 'The Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue' that will advise him on how to achieve his strategic plan for promoting multilingualism:

[13] *"We have an enormous wealth of languages in today's European Union. I want to turn this linguistic diversity, this richness, into something that unites us in Europe as members of a large community, a badge of Europeanness, if you like"* (Brussels, 29/6/2007)

In this excerpt one can recognise the use of different strategies. Firstly, by using the trope 'a badge' to refer to Europe's linguistic variety, Mr. Orban highlights the cohesive function that he envisages such a 'badge' ideally performing in future (that is to *unite the European community*) in a clear strategy of *unification* informed by the *topos* of Unity in Diversity. At the same time, it is also possible to recognize a strategy of *transformation* - signaled by the verb 'to turn' - aimed at harnessing the linguistic diversity for a defined identity project and which appears to be driven by the individual agency of the Commissioner ('I want'). Finally a *strategy of singularisation* is also present as, through the 'badge', the Commissioner reinforces the idea of Europe's uniqueness constructing a symbolic 'in-group' marker for the Europeans that should make them identifiable vis-à-vis other groups.

5.2.3 Accommodation

Whilst the Commissioner's discourse appears concerned with dissimilating and singularizing Europe vis-à-vis other group identities one

could also recognize a strategy aimed at reconciling and accommodating Europeanness within them. This strategy is achieved through the general conceptualization of identities as multiple and mutually compatible constructs (*topos of non-zero sum*):

[14] *“The role of European languages in shaping the identity of our nations is commonly discussed. What could be their role in shaping the European identity– an identity that should not replace, but rather complement our pre-existing national ones? When I say that, I am convinced that languages should be bridges between the peoples of Europe.” (Brussels, 26/9/2007)*

[15] *“[learning languages helps] consolidate a sense of European identity, a European citizenship, alongside our other identities – self, regional, national” (Brussels 29/6/2007)*

In both statements the *topos of non-zero sum* allows the speaker to assert Europeanness vis-à-vis other identities in a manner that one does not take away from the other. In [14] the Commissioner reiterates the institutional vision of European identity as an additional feature of the ‘non-replaceable’ national identification. In this case the verb *complement* suggests the additional role of Europeanness vis-à-vis the ‘core’ function of national identity. Furthermore the ‘pre-existence’ of national identities suggests a historical embeddedness of identities making this conceptualization somewhat consistent with the ‘Russian doll’ model (Herrmann et al, 2004) in which Europeanness constitutes the ‘outer layer’ that accommodates inner and possibly more salient identifications. However, the modals ‘could’ and ‘should’ and the adverb ‘rather’ also suggest this is a preferable interpretation but somewhat open to more dynamic constructions of Europeanness which will have to emerge (highlighting therefore the prospective dimension) ‘between the peoples of Europe’. Indeed the spatial representation of European identity ‘alongside’ other identities in [15] seems to allow for such wider and less hierarchical interpretation, more in line with the ‘marble cake’ model (Risse 2010) which sees multiple identities inter-penetrated rather than evenly stratified. Furthermore, in both extracts one can infer a semantic convergence of the notions of European identity and European

citizenship which is crucial in consolidating the civic dimension of Europeanness. Whilst in [15] such convergence is directly invoked by the Commissioner ('*a sense of European identity, a European citizenship*'), in [14] this is linguistically achieved by his echoing of Art. 8 of the Lisbon Treaty⁸ and through a metonymy that equates identity with the institutional recognition of citizenship status. This aspect will be discussed further in the next section.

5.2.4 Legitimation

In relation to the construction of national identities, legitimation has historically represented a process of reciprocal validation between institutions and citizens typically based on the recognition of citizenship rights (and duties) (Habermas 1992). Although EU citizenship represents a 'weak'⁹ version of the state-citizens allegiance, we can nevertheless regard EU discourses of citizenship informed by macro strategies of legitimation. Whilst the EU aims to construct a *demos* of Europeans by legitimising 'its people' as citizens, through strategies of legitimation it also seeks to strengthen its own legitimacy especially in the light of what has been discussed in the introduction. Unsurprisingly, in the data analysed, legitimation strategies appear primarily predicated on 'civic' arguments related to the *topos of democracy* and the generally defined 'EU values'. In particular, two arguments emerge frequently in the Commissioners' discourses relating (*de jure*) multilingualism with the *topos of democracy*: one is the ability of European citizens to participate in the political life of the EU and to communicate with institutions and the second is that of linguistic equality. Whilst in the former multilingualism is represented as a tool that enables citizens to engage with the civic life, in the latter multilingualism is discursively promoted as a direct reflection of the EU democracy. Extract (16) exemplifies how these two arguments merge discursively:

[16] "*Languages are a fundamental part of our identity. By communicating in the languages of their choice, the Union proves that all citizens are equal in dignity, independently of the number of speakers or of the status of that language.*" (Rome, 23/3/2007)

Here the speaker constructs his argument building on the premise that languages are an expression of cultural identity and that the citizens' freedom to choose a language to communicate with the EU institutions (as granted by the EU legislation) makes all citizens equal in dignity (freedom and equality being two of the main tenets of modern democracies based on the French revolution ideals). This premise allows him to present the statement about the equality of EU citizens as a factual proposition foregrounding the EU institutions as the agent of this democratic process ('The Union proves'). This argument however rests on the misrepresentation of the term 'languages of choice' which in fact means any of the 23 official languages recognised by the Union (thus effectively restricting the choice to 'national' languages). In this context therefore the main rhetorical device used in the Commissioner's discourse is the synecdochical use of 'languages' which aims to represent the 23 official languages of the EU as the whole gamut of languages spoken by the EU citizens (*totum pro parte*) but which does not take into account for example regional, minority and non native languages. Furthermore, drawing on the principle that 'all [23 official] languages are equal' (as enshrined in the Treaty), the speaker is able to present his argument that *all citizens are equal* through a metonymy that replaces the languages for the individuals (linking into and sustained by the premise on *identity*). Whilst effectively validating the existing pecking order of languages, the Commissioner's discourse overall anchors the multilingual dimension of European identity into the reproduction of national languages and national identities. This highlights the prominent 'national' component of European identity, a dimension further compounded by the fact that the legal status of being a EU citizen is dependent on being a national of a member state in the first place.

5.2.5 (Single) Marketization

On the whole, the construction of 'economic' Europeanness is often realised through strategies of (single) marketization or in other words, by weaving discourses of the single market and globalisation into discourses of (cultural)

diversity. This, for example, is achieved through a representation of Europe as an enterprise as exemplified by [17]:

[17]“The context for languages and business – European diversity; skills; competitiveness ...today’s Europe of 27 is a multicultural, diverse enterprise – the result of enlargements, of the single market, of easier movement between countries, of migration and globalisation. But it’s neither a meaningless jumble ... nor a featureless melting-pot ... It’s a common home, where diversity is cherished. In the words of the European motto, this is ‘unity in diversity’ (Brussels, 21 September 2007).

In this extract the Commissioner is clearly recontextualising the most common rhetorical discourses/representations of cultural Europe (the ‘melting pot’ and the ‘common home’ metaphors, the ‘unity in diversity’ motto) into wider discourses of the EU economic integration (the single market), of globalisation, and of mobility. The conflation of these discourses constructs Europe as a “multicultural, diverse enterprise”, therefore a large business where language diversity is adapted to the necessity of the market. In this sense, multilingualism is frequently referred to as an ‘essential skill’ that all Europeans should have if they are to cope with the competitiveness of the integrated labour market or to perform their ‘consumer identity’ by reaping the potential benefits of the single economic area. Whilst multilingualism can thus be a resource that gives the European enterprise ‘a competitive advantage’ in the globalised market, it is often the globalised (linguistic) market that determines the value of the European workforce linguistic skills as illustrated in the following extract:

[18] “There is still much work needed to create a fully integrated single market. Barriers ... arise also from language Our companies as well as our citizens need language skills to cope with the challenges ... of globalization. Russian, Chinese or Arabic languages are more and more needed and Europeans learn them.” (Rome, 24/3/2007)

Unlike extract [3] where languages are portrayed as facilitating communication between citizens and institutions, in [18] languages are represented as potential barriers to a fully integrated market and thus to the role of 'enterprise Europe' on the global scene. In this context therefore European citizens need to be skilled in the most desirable languages (in this case identified as Russian, Chinese or Arabic) 'to cope with the challenges of globalisation' that is with the emergence of new economically powerful actors. This argument adds an 'external' dimension to European multilingualism which constructs Europeans as language learners for instrumental reasons in contrast to the 'internal' vision of multilingualism that sees European identity as a 'celebration of diversity'.

From a linguistic perspective it was noticeable how the realization of 'single marketization' (and more generally economic) strategies was often sustained by 'corporate-style talk' when the Commissioner addressed external business audiences. This, for example, was conspicuous in the "Languages mean business" conference (Brussels, 21/09/2007) where the speaker often engaged in what appeared as 'economically sensible' arguments by appealing to statistics and figures and other factual propositions to present the case for languages as "business opportunities to be seized". Such business register, further instantiated in expressions such as "supply and demand of languages" and "to earn the payback for Europe that investing in languages will bring" was arguably adopted to provided empathic alignment between the speaker and his audience and clearly tally with the logic of 'enterprise Europe' whilst contributing to the commodification of languages.

TABLE 2 Summary of macro discursive strategies identified in the Commissioner's discourses analysed

MACRO STRATEGY	OBJECTIVE	TOPOI	LINGUISTIC REALISATION
ASSIMILATION	EMPHASIZING INTERNAL SAMENESS	Diversity as heritage/ asset Kinship History	'Family', 'House', 'Construction' and 'Journey' metaphors Inclusive personal deictics (we, us) Semantic ambiguity and overlapping of 'kinship'
	CONVERGING EU-ROPE	Cultural/political continuity of EU-rope	Semantic ambiguity and overlapping of 'European history' Adverbs of time denoting continuity (e.g. 'always') Quoting the 'founding fathers' Present continuous verbal forms (e.g. 'Europe has always been multilingual')
DISSIMILATION	EMPHASIZING EXTERNAL DIFFERENCES DISTANCING THROUGH SPATIAL/TEMPORAL SINGULARISATION	Lessons from history Normative uniqueness of the EU Melting pot vs. Mosaic	Lexical choices (only, unique, different) Tropes ('badge') 'Melting Pot' metaphor Metonymy ('Monolith' for Russia)
ACCOMODATION	MAKING EUROPEANNESS COMPATIBLE WITH OTHER IDENTITIES	'Russian doll' model (nesting) 'Non-zero sum'	Lexical choices ('complement', 'rather') Paraphrasing official documents Deontic modals ('should')
LEGITIMATION	VALIDATING EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP	Democracy Equality of languages Communication EU as 'civic nation'	synecdochical use of 'languages' for 23 official languages (<i>totum pro parte</i>) Choice of 'factual' verbs ('to prove', 'to demonstrate')
TRANSFORMATION	DEVELOPING A NEW IN-GROUP IDENTITY	Europeans 'United in Diversity'	Lexical units denoting change ('developing', 'to turn into')
(SINGLE) MARKETIZATION	CONSTRUCTING MULTILINGUALISM AS A MARKETABLE SKILL	Competitiveness Globalisation	Business jargon (e.g. 'a win-win process') 'Corporate talk'; Presentation of 'facts' and figures Trope of 'Enterprise Europe'

6. Conclusions

This paper has explored the top-down discursive construction of 'European identity' from the standpoint of discourses on multilingualism. In particular, by looking at political speeches given by the Commissioner for Multilingualism during his office, the analysis was aimed at revealing the interplay between language(s) and (supra-/post-) national identity(ies) in the Commission's vision.

Findings suggest that, at a macro level, such interplay was characterized by the articulation of discourses oriented towards both *ideational* and *organisational* dimensions of Europe (Weiss, 2002) and that most discourses on multilingualism were typically predicated on cultural, civic, and economic macro propositions. These different dimensions of multilingualism enabled the Commissioner to construct Europeanness through different strategies and overall macro strategies of assimilation, dissimilation, accommodation, legitimization, transformation and 'single marketization' were identified. As pointed out earlier, discursive strategies weaved into narratives of European identity and were deployed in discourses of multilingualism in heterogeneous ways. Whilst different strategies often co-existed within each speech, the emphasis placed on different sets of strategies (or different *topoi* used) appeared often related to specific micro-variables (i.e. the audience addressed by the Commissioner or the event of the speech). In this respect, thus, the findings in this study corroborate previous research on the discursive construction of collective identities in public discourses (for example Wodak 2009) that highlighted the context-dependency and multiplicity of identities.

As a consequence of the heterogeneity of discourses on multilingualism, European identity emerged throughout the data as a polysemic construct relating to multilingualism in tense and, at times, conflictual ways (for example in opposite representations of language as 'cause' and 'effect' of identity). It was possible however to recognize that in the Commissioner's discourses on multilingualism, cultural and civic narratives of Europeanness were primarily

organized along a past/future (legacy/project) axis and mostly realised through strategies of assimilation and dissimilation. Thus, whilst in cultural representations multilingualism was primarily conceptualised as the *de facto* linguistic variety of the European society at large and constructed as a 'heritage' feature of the European 'in-group', by contrast the *de jure* salience of the multilingual ideology was foregrounded in civic representations as the distinctive institutional commitment to the development of a civic European society. From this premise, strategies of assimilation were deployed through the 'historicization' of multilingualism (that is through representation of the *de facto* historical linguistic diversity but also of the political continuity of EU-rope). At the same time, highlighting the political significance of the multilingual ideology was used in strategies of dissimilation through which the Commissioner was able to claim, inter alia, uniqueness for the 'in-group', to position Europeans vis-à-vis other (political) identities and to legitimize the EU institutions and the EU project.

Alongside cultural and civic representations, an economic dimension of Europeanness was also clearly traceable in the Commissioner's discourses which constructed Europe as an 'enterprise' and commodified multilingualism as an 'added-value', 'essential' skill needed by all Europeans independently of cultural or civic connotations. In this context languages were construed as instrumental tools that should enable the European group to act as a key player in the globalised economy and this was discursively achieved through strategies of 'single-marketization' that tied Europe into worldwide transnational scenarios.

On the whole various tensions emerged between national and post-national representations of identity and language in the data analysed. This paper has shown that, on the one hand, in many respects the Commissioner's discourses reproduced and reinforced 'national' discourses, for example through strategies of accommodation of national identities into representations of Europe as the 'sum of its parts'. Even more crucially the historical linkage between nation-states and 'national' languages was reasserted and legitimized in the representation of multilingualism as a hierarchical system embedded in

European identity/citizenship. To achieve these aims the Commissioner's construction of Europeanness has primarily relied on the recontextualisation of established institutional discourses (such as the 'house/family/construction' metaphors as well as the echoing of policies as they are formulated in official documents). On the other hand, the Commissioner's strategies were also clearly aimed at recontextualising discourses of languages and identities into narratives that moved away from the national paradigm predicated on civic or cultural arguments. Instead, a dynamic transformation of discourses was traceable towards a (re)construction of languages as marketable commodities decoupled from identity in what Heller (2012) regards as the postnational commodification of languages and identities occurring in modern globalized societies.

In sum, the analysis has highlighted tensions and antinomies in contrasting representations of 'diverse' and multilingual EU-rope which overall contribute to construct Europeanness as a proposition torn between identity politics and commodification. The heterogeneity of discourses of multilingualism analysed in this study leaves us thus with 'hybrid' and 'fragmented' representations of European identities in-between national, post national and global dimensions. This paper thus offers further evidence that 'European identity' constitutes a dynamic discursive construct reflecting on-going social transformation and which, at the same time, is shaped by macro discourses driven by the EU political and economic agenda.

Of course the analysis presented in this article must acknowledge the limitations of focusing on selected data and further investigation is needed, in particular to illuminate how Europeanness is constructed at grassroots level in the civil society and how top-down and bottom up discourses of Europeanness are reproduced negotiated and challenged. Finally the limitations and contradictions of speeches on multilingualism that were found to be consistently available only in English have been highlighted, and indeed they suggest the need for further research in this direction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Earlier versions of this paper were presented at various international conferences and workshops. I am grateful to all participants who made comments and suggestions on those occasions. I am also grateful to Dr. Lisa Atalianis and Dr. Melani Schroeter for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper. Finally I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments.

Appendix 1. List of Speeches analysed

SPEECH N.	DATE AND PLACE OF ISSUE		TITLE	EVENT/AUDIENCE	LANGUA GE(S) (*)
07/61	02/02/2007	BRUSSELS	"ISSUES RELATING TO INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATION"	4TH MEETING OF THE HIGH LEVEL GROUP ON MULTILINGUALISM	EN
07/104	27/02/2007	BRUSSELS	"MULTILINGUALISM IS IN THE GENETIC CODE OF THE UNION"	MEETING WITH THE CULTURE COMMITTEE	EN
07/138	9/3/2007	BUCHAREST	CAPITALISING ON EU ENLARGEMENT	EAST CAPITAL SUMMIT	EN
07/173	23/03/2007	ROME	"THE ROLE OF MULTILINGUALISM IN COMMUNICATING WITH EU CITIZENS"	ACCADEMIA DI ROMANIA/UNIVERSITA' LA SAPIENZA	EN IT
07/174	24/03/2007	ROME	"EUROPE IN A CHANGING WORLD "	50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF ROME	EN
07/351	01/06/2007	SIBIU	"THE EUROPEAN UNION AND NEW MEMBER STATES CONTRIBUTION TO ITS FUTURE"	LUCIAN BLAGA UNIVERSITY LECTURE	EN RO
07/385	08/06/2007	MADRID	FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE EU, BALANCE AND PROSPECTS"	SEMINAR UNDER THE GERMAN PRESIDENCY	EN FR

07/448	29/06/2007	BRUSSELS	"LANGUAGES ARE A BRIDGE FOR INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE"	THE GROUP OF INTELLECTUALS FOR INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE	EN FR DE RO
07/529	14/09/2007	GORIZIA	"TOWARDS A LINGUA FRANCA OF THE MEDITERRANEAN? MULTILINGUALISM IN EUROPE"	LECTIO MAGISTRALIS FOR THE XIII INTERNATIONAL SUMMER SCHOOL	EN
07/534	17/09/2007	PIRAN	"CULTURAL PROGRAMME ON BILINGUALISM"	OPENING OF A "CULTURAL PROGRAMME ON BILINGUALISM"	EN
07/559	21/09/2007	BRUSSELS	"LANGUAGES MEAN BUSINESS"	BUSINESS CONFERENCE	EN FR DE RO
07/565	26/09/2007	BRUSSELS	"THE MULTILINGUALISM ALLOWS EU CITIZENS TO EXERT THEIR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS"	EUROPEAN DAY OF LANGUAGES	EN FR DE RO
07/566	26/09/2007	BRUSSELS	"LANGUAGES - AS A GAME..."	EUROPEAN LANGUAGES DAY	EN FR DE NL RO
07/590	03/10/2007	BRUSSELS	"EUROPE'S CULTURE A REVERSIBLE FABRIC"	EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT -CULTURAL COMMITTEE	EN FR DE RO
07/694	08/11/2007	BRUSSELS	" EU ACTORS: AN IMPORTANT LINK IN BUILDING AND COMMUNICATING THE EUROPEAN UNION"	EURACTIV CONFERENCE: EU ACTORS: HOW TO INTERACT WITH EU CAPITALS?	EN
08/83	15/02/2008	BRUSSELS	"WHY AND WHERE DO LANGUAGES MATTER? TOWARDS A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR MULTILINGUALISM"	MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE ON "PROMOTING MULTILINGUALISM: A SHARED COMMITMENT"	EN RO
08/132	06/03/2008	NATOLIN (WARSAW)	"NATOLIN - 'MULTILINGUALISM - ESSENTIAL FOR THE UNITY IN DIVERSITY OF THE EU"	DEBATE AT THE COLLEGE OF EUROPE, NATOLIN	EN PL RO DE FR
08/133	07/03/2008	WARSAW	"LANGUAGES BOOSTING COMPETITIVENESS"	NATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	EN PL RO DE FR
08/368	03/07/2008	RIGA	"THE LATVIAN LANGUAGE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION - MULTILINGUALISM IN PRACTICE"	TRANSLATORS' CONFERENCE	EN DE FR LV RO

08/414	10/09/2008	BRUSSELS	BRUSSELS DEBATE ON "MULTILINGUALISM - A BRIDGE OR A BARRIER FOR INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE?"	DEBATE FOR THE 2008 EUROPEAN YEAR FOR INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE	EN RO DE FR
08/587	06/11/2008	BRUSSELS	"TRANSLATION, THE LANGUAGE OF EUROPE"	LUNCH-DEBATE ON CULTURE AND TRANSLATION	EN
09/495	23/10/2009	BRUSSELS	THE BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN EUROPE	THE LAUNCH OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY PLATFORM	EN
NA	07/12/2009	RENNES	"IS THERE A FUTURE FOR LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN EUROPE?"	CONFERENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF RENNES	EN FR DE RO

(*) This column indicates the language version(s) in which the speech is available. Most of the speeches analyzed which were retrieved from the EU press release website (<http://europa.eu/rapid>) are also available from the Commission's website (http://ec.europa.eu/archives/commission_2004-2009/orban/news/news_en.htm). As in some cases the language availability is inconsistent between the two sources, the languages indicated in this column refer to the highest number of language versions available as reported from either source.

References

- Auer, Peter. 1992. "Introduction: John Gumperz's approach to contextualization." In *The contextualization of language*, ed. by J.C.P. Auer and A. di Luzio, 1-39. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Baynham, Mike. 2011. "Identity: brought about or brought along?" Key Note speech delivered at the *Doctoral School Identity and Interculturality: Research Methods*. 4-8 July 2011, Roskilde University.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Cerutti, Furio, and Sonia Lucarelli. 2008. *The search for a European identity: values, policies and legitimacy of the European Union*. New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, Paul A. 2004. *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, Paul, and Mikhail Ilyin. 1993. Metaphor in Political Discourse: The Case of the 'Common European House'. *Discourse & Society*. 4 (1):7-31.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2006. "The quest for European identity." In *Making the European polity: reflexive integration in the EU*, ed. by E.O. Eriksen, 127-142. New York, London: Routledge.
- Edwards, John. 2009. *Language and Identity: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- European Council. 2000. Presidency Conclusions. Lisbon European Council 23-24 March 2000.

- Fairclough, Norman, and Wodak, Ruth. 1997. "Critical discourse analysis". In *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 2*. Ed. by Teun Van Dijk, 258-84. London: Sage.
- Gal, Susan. 2010. "Linguistic regimes and European diversity". Keynote Speech delivered at the *Conference 'New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe'*, Dubrovnik, 12 April 2010.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1992. Citizenship and National Identity. *Praxis International* . 12 (1):1-19.
- Heller, Monica. 1995. "Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination." *Language in Society* 24:373-405.
- . 2012. "Linguistic commodification: Multilingualism in the Globalized New Economy". Key note speech delivered at *Multilingualism in the Public Sphere - 2nd Linee Conference*. Dubrovnik, 5 May 2012.
- Herrmann, Richard K., Thomas Risse-Kappen, and Marilynn B. Brewer. 2004. *Transnational identities: becoming European in the EU*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. 1997. *Nations and nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ifversen, Jan. 2002. "Europe and European Culture: A Conceptual Analysis " *European Societies* no. 4 (1):1-26.
- Jenkins, Richard. 2008. *Social identity*. London: Routledge.
- Joseph, J.E. 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- King, Lid, Nick Byrne, Imke Djouaddj, Joseph Lo Bianco, and Maria Stoicheva. 2011. *Languages in Europe Towards 2020. Analysis and Proposals from the LETPP Consultation and Review*. London: LETPP Consortium.
- Kraus, Peter A. 2008. *A Union of Diversity: Language, Identity and Polity-Building in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011. "Neither United Nor Diverse? The Language issue and Political Legitimation in the European Union." In *Linguistic Diversity and European Democracy*, ed. by A.L. Kjaer and S. Adamo, 17-34. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Krzyżanowski, Michał. 2010. *The Discursive Construction of European Identities: A Multi-level Approach to Discourse and Identity in the Transforming European Union*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Pub Inc.
- Krzyżanowski, Michał, and Ruth Wodak. 2010. Hegemonic multilingualism in/of the EU institutions: An inside-outside perspective on the European language policies and practices. In: *Mehrsprachigkeit aus der Perspektive zweier EU-Projekte: DYLAN Meets LINEE*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Pub Inc.
- Krzyżanowski, Michał, and Ruth Wodak. 2011. Political strategies and language policies: the European Union Lisbon strategy and its implications for the EU's language and multilingualism policy. *Language Policy* no. 10 (2):115-136.
- Malmberg, Mikael af, and Bo Strath. 2002. *The meaning of Europe: variety and contention within and among nations*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Mar-Molinero, Claire, and Stevenson, Patrick. 2009. *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

- Macmillan.
- Millar, Sharon, and John Wilson. 2007. *The discourse of Europe: talk and text in everyday life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.
- Mole, Richard C.M. 2007. *Discursive constructions of identity in European politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2001. "The Metaphorisation of European Politics: Movement on the Road to Europe." In *Attitudes towards Europe: Language in the Unification process*, ed. by Musolff et al., 179-200. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, and Adrian Blackledge. 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2008. "Rhetoric of political speeches." In *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, edited by R. Wodak and V. Koller, 243-269. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Rindler-Schjerve, R., & Vetter, E. (2012). *European multilingualism: current perspectives and challenges*. Bristol; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Risse, Thomas. 2010. *A Community of Europeans?: Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Šarić, Ljiljana, Andreas Musolff, Stefan Manz, and Ingrid Hudabiunigg. 2010. *Contesting Europe's Eastern Rim: Cultural Identities in Public Discourse*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Stråth, Bo. 2010. *Europe and the Other and Europe As the Other*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Triandafyllidou, Anna, and Ruth Wodak. 2003. "Conceptual and Methodological Questions in the Study of Collective Identities: An Introduction." *Journal of Language and Politics*. 2 (2):202-225.
- Weber, J. J., & Horner, K. (2012). *Introducing multilingualism : a social approach*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Weiss, Gilbert. 2002. "Searching for Europe: The problem of legitimisation and representation in recent political speeches on Europe." *Journal of Language and Politics*. 1 (1):59-83.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The discourse-historical approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. by R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, 63-94. London: Sage.
- . 2004. "National and Transnational identities: European and Other Identities Constructed in Interviews with EU Officials." In *Transnational identities: becoming European in the EU*, ed. by Herrmann et al. , 97-128. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2010. "Communicating Europe: Analyzing, interpreting, and understanding multilingualism and the discursive construction of transnational identities." In *Globalization, Discourse, Media: In a Critical Perspective*, edited by R. Wodak, 17-60. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press.
- . 2011. *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Karlin Liebhart. 2009. *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wodak, Ruth, and Gilbert Weiss. 2005. "Analyzing European Union discourses: Theories and applications." In *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, ed. by R. Wodak and P. Chilton, 121-133. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Wright, Sue. 2000. *Community and communication: the role of language in nation state building and European integration*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Notes

¹ In this paper the terms 'European identity' and 'Europeanness' will be used interchangeably as synonyms. With these terms I refer to the top-down vision of 'being European' rather than the EU's organizational identity (although the two sometimes overlap –see below).

² As with most cultural and education policies, the EU is only responsible for emanating guidelines and recommendations leaving the implementation onus to individual member states or individual initiatives. For further details see King et. al, 2011.

³ In 2004, multilingualism became part of the Commissioner for Education and Culture's portfolio to be separated in 2007 as a stand-alone Commission portfolio under L. Orban. This office was eventually reintegrated back into the Education and Culture portfolio under the Second Barroso Commission in December 2009 and is currently held by A. Vassilou. The post of Commissioner for Multilingualism as such does not exist anymore.

⁴ The term 'discourse' is used here in line with the general paradigm of CDA (Fairclough and Wodak 1997) for which language use constitutes and reflects a form of social practice. I also use the term 'institutional discourse' to mean discourses produced by an institution (in this case the EU) to achieve its governmental goals.

⁵ <http://europa.eu/rapid>

⁶ See Wodak et. al. (2009), pp. 18-21.

⁷ I borrow these terms from Auer (1992) and other sociolinguistics literature for example Baynham (2011). In general such literature have emphasized how the enactment of identities in discourse can be accounted for by elements that are generated or 'brought about' by the narrative itself as well as more stable features that are 'brought along' in the narration. Whilst the latter could thus constitute the more 'essentialist' dimensions of identity the former emerges from the co-constructive process of discursive interaction.

⁸ Art. 8 of the Lisbon Treaty states that "Every national of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to national citizenship and shall not replace it".

⁹ EU citizenship is not validated directly by the EU institutions and relies on individuals being nationals of a member state in the first place.

Author's address

Franco Zappettini
Room 1.04
School of Management
Royal Holloway, University of London
Egham, Surrey
TW20 0EX

franco.zappettini@rhul.ac.uk

About the author

Franco Zappettini is a Researcher in Organizational Identities in the School of Management, Royal Holloway, University of London. He is completing his Doctoral thesis “The discursive construction of Europeanness from transnational and bottom-up perspectives” in the Department of Applied Linguistics, Birkbeck College, University of London. He has published, as a single and joint author, on the discursive construction of political, linguistic, and organizational identities.