Katarina G. Rasulić[1]
*University of Belgrade,
Faculty of Philology*

"HIDING BEHIND BOLOGNA": METONYMY, METAPHOR AND CONCEPTUAL BLURRING IN THE BOLOGNA PROCESS DISCOURSE[2]

This paper presents a cognitive linguistic account of metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction in the English language discourse related to the ongoing higher education reform process in Europe widely known as "the Bologna process". The analysis of the non-literal uses of the toponym *Bologna* in the pertinent discourse shows that the conceptualization and the discursive construction of the contemporary European higher education are significantly shaped by metonymic mappings in which *Bologna* serves as a "catch-all" metonymic vehicle with a range of often indeterminate target concepts, and by metaphoric mappings in which the conceptual complex BOLOGNA (FOR X) is structured in terms of various (and often inconsistent) source domains (MOTION, SPACE, BUILDING, MACHINE, PLANT, PERSON, ORGANIZED GROUP, ECONOMY/TRADE, FOOD/COOKING), which results in unclear referential meaning and yet predominantly negative associative meaning. The theoretical considerations concern the benefits of the interdisciplinary dialogue between cognitive linguistic, (critical) discourse analysis, and relevance-theoretic approaches to meaning.

Key words: Bologna, Bologna process discourse, metonymy, metaphor, cognitive linguistics

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past fifteen years, i.e. since the "Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education convened in Bologna on 19 June 1999", the word *Bologna* – the name of a renowned Italian city – has developed a special meaning in the academic community, especially in Europe. An informal small-scale survey among the teachers and students at the University of Belgrade conducted in the autumn of 2013 showed that the meaning of *Bologna* that first comes to mind is that of '(negative) university reforms'. This paper addresses the issue of such semantic shift from a cognitive linguistic perspective, by examining the metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction in the English language discourse related to the ongoing higher education reform process in Europe widely known as "the Bologna process".

---

1 k.rasulic@fil.bg.ac.rs, ekv@eunet.rs
2 This paper is based on a broader research that I presented under the title "Metaphor, Metonymy and Meaning Making in the Bologna Process Discourse" at the 10th Conference of the Association for Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM), *Metaphor in Communication, Science and Education*, Cagliari, Italy, June 20-23, 2014.

"The Bologna process", i.e. the process of "integration and harmonisation of higher education systems within Europe, aimed at creating the European Higher Education Area", has been met with praise and criticism. The discourse related to it has attracted scholarly attention from different theoretical perspectives (e.g. Keeling 2006, Liesner 2006, Fairclough and Wodak 2008, Fejes 2008), whereby one of the main points of criticism concerns the issue of "the commodification/marketization of higher education".

This paper, set against the theoretical background of the cognitive linguistic conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory and its elaborations in the field of discourse studies, has the following aims: (i) to shed light on the metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction emerging in the discourse on the European higher education reforms process, based on an analysis of the pertinent non-literal uses of the toponym *Bologna*; (ii) to critically examine the role of the identified metonymic and metaphoric mappings in the overall understanding of the ongoing higher education reforms; and (iii) to provide a theoretical contextualization of the descriptive findings within the current metaphor and metonymy research.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The point of departure is the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor and metonymy as conceptual mappings (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999, Panther and Radden 1999, Kövecses 2002). On this view, metaphor and metonymy are primarily a matter of thought, with linguistic realizations in lexis, grammar and discourse.[3] Metaphor provides understanding of one conceptual domain, which is typically abstract or less known ("target domain") in terms of another, typically concrete, more familiar and experientially grounded conceptual domain ("source domain"), as, for instance, when thinking and talking about LIFE in terms of JOURNEY, KNOWING in terms of SEEING, IMPORTANCE in terms of SIZE, MORALITY in terms of CLEANLINESS, etc. In metonymy, the mapping occurs between concepts within the same domain: one salient concept ("vehicle" or "source") provides mental access to another concept ("target") associated with it within a conceptual structure containing both of them, as, for instance, when CAPITAL refers to GOVERNMENT, AUTHOR to his/her WORK, CONTAINER to its CONTENT, DATE to the EVENT that happened on that date, etc.[4]

---

3   The essence of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor and metonymy as conceptual phenomena is presumed to be generally known and hence it is only sketched here for expository purposes, without further considerations of its complexities. Occasional reference to "the conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory" in literature should not obscure the fact that it is not a unified theory, but rather a combination of converging streams of profuse research inspired by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) initial insights, whereby the notion of conceptual metaphor has received much more attention than conceptual metonymy. For an overview of the development, critical assessment and elaborations of the conceptual metaphor theory, see Fusaroli and Morgagni 2013; for a global insight into the contemporary metaphor research within and beyond cognitive linguistics, see Gibbs 2008; for an overview of current cognitive linguistic research on metonymy, see Barcelona *et al* 2011.

4   Following the conventions of cognitive linguistics, SMALL CAPITALS are used for conceptual metaphors and metonymies, as well as for the conceptual domains and

One aspect of conceptual metaphors and metonymies important for the present account concerns the multiplicity of domains i.e. concepts involved in cross-domain (metaphoric) and intra-domain (metonymic) mappings. Thus in metaphor a single source domain can be mapped onto a range of target domains (e.g. JOURNEY can be the source domain for LIFE, LOVE, CAREER, ARGUMENT, LECTURE, etc.), and vice versa, a single target domain can be structured by a range of source domains (e.g. LOVE as the target domain can be conceptualized in terms of JOURNEY, PHYSICAL FORCE, MAGIC, MADNESS, UNITY, etc.) (cf. Kövecses 2002: 79–120, Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 70–71). Similarly, though with different constraints, in metonymy a single concept can serve as a vehicle providing access to a range of target concepts (e.g. PLACE can metonymically refer to PEOPLE, ORGANIZATION, EVENT, etc.), and vice versa, different metonymic vehicles can provide access to a single target concept (e.g. PEOPLE can be metonymically referred to via BODY PARTS, CLOTHING, OBJECTS USED, PLACE THEY INHABIT/OCCUPY, etc.) (cf. Rasulić 2010; see also Langacker 1993 for the related broader notion of dominion, a conceptual region or set of entities which a particular reference point affords mental access to). Consequently, metaphors and metonymies both highlight and hide certain aspects of the target (for the notion of metaphorical highlighting and hiding, see Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 10–13).

Another important aspect of metaphors and metonymies concerns their functioning in discourse. As aptly formulated by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 156), "Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such action will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense, metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies."

Recent years have seen an increased interest in the interdisciplinary dialogue between cognitive linguistics and discourse studies, especially in the area of metaphor research (e.g. Cameron 2003, Charteris-Black 2004, Musolff 2004, Semino 2008, Musolff and Zinken 2009). Thereby discourse scholars appropriately emphasize the significance of empirically observable variation in actual metaphorical language use, which has largely been unattended by proponents of conceptual metaphor theory. As a result, there has been an increasing tension between discourse-centered and cognition-centered approaches to metaphor (cf. Musolff and Zinken 2009, Steen 2011, Gibbs 2011). In the ensuing discussion I will argue that the gap between the two is not necessarily as deep as it appears to be and that it can be bridged by paying more systematic attention to the dynamics of the two-way traffic between conceptualization and language use. In doing so, I take into account (i) the discourse dynamics approach to metaphor (Cameron and Deignan 2006, Gibbs and Cameron 2008, Cameron *et al* 2009), which treats metaphor as

---

entities involved, and *italics* are used for pertinent linguistic expressions. Conceptual metaphors are conventionally stated in the form TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN (e.g. KNOWING IS SEEING), and metonymies in the form VEHICLE FOR TARGET (e.g. CAPITAL FOR GOVERNMENT), or, more generally, in the form SOURCE/VEHICLE → TARGET (e.g. SEEING → KNOWING; CAPITAL → GOVERNMENT).

multidimensional discursive socio-cognitive activity (integrating linguistic, social, cognitive, affective, cultural, physical etc. dimensions), and (ii) the recent convergence between the cognitive linguistic conceptual metaphor theory and the pragmatic relevance theory (Gibbs and Tendahl 2006, Tendahl and Gibbs 2008, Tendahl 2009, Wilson 2011, Musolff 2012), whereby the complementarity of the two perspectives is acknowledged insofar that, although the former sees metaphors as having roots in cognition rather than communication, while the latter treats it as a form of loose use of language arising naturally in communication and requiring adjustment in online processing, both see metaphor as linking two conceptual domains, which provides a common ground for seeking evidence of how such cross-domain mappings may arise ad-hoc in language and get entrenched in thought. Concerning metonymy in discourse, which has generally received much less systematic attention than metaphor, I take into account Panther and Thornburg's (2004) treatment of metonymies as natural inference schemas, i.e. easily activatable associations among concepts that can be used for inferential purposes, Biernacka's (2013) application of the discourse dynamics approach to the study of metonymy and Halverson's (2012) findings concerning the emergent vagueness accompanying metonymic uses of place names in newspaper discourse.

3.   *DATA AND ANALYSIS*

The analysis is based on the English language data collected from a variety of texts representative of the Bologna process discourse. The corpus of data (henceforth marked as BPDC) comprises the following constitutive and interpretive texts, written in "EU English", British English and American English, and varying in degrees of formality:

a)   Official documents adopted by ministers of education from European countries participating in the process: *Bologna Declaration* (1999), *Prague Communiqué* (2001), *Berlin Communiqué* (2003), *Bergen Communiqué* (2005), *London Communiqué* (2007), *Leuven/Louvain–la-Neuve Communiqué* (2009), *Budapest/Vienna Declaration* (2010), *Bucharest Communiqué* (2012).

b)   The European Commission, 2012. *The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna Process Implementation Report*, Brussels: Eurydice.

c)   Froment, E., Kohler, J., Purser. L. and Wilson, L. (eds), 2006. *European University Association Bologna Handbook: Making Bologna Work*, Berlin: RAABE.

d)   Adelman, C. 2009. *The Bologna Process for U.S. Eyes: Re-learning Higher Education in the Age of Convergence.* Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

e)   The National Unions of Students in Europe / European Students' Union reports on the implementation of the Bologna process: *Bologna with Student Eyes,* 2003 (Bergen: ESIB), 2005 (Bergen: ESIB), 2007 (London:

ESIB), 2009 (Leuven: ESU), 2012 (Brussels: ESU).

f) The National Unions of Students in Europe, 2005. *The Black Book of the Bologna Process*, Bergen: ESIB.

g) A selection of British newspaper/magazine articles dealing with the Bologna Process.

h) A selection of Internet blogs and forums discussing various aspects of the Bologna process.

The focus of the analysis is on the non-literal uses of the toponym *Bologna* and on the resulting metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction. The BDPC has been manually checked for instances of non-literal uses of *Bologna*, based on the contextual meaning of syntagmatically related expressions, as illustrated by the example *Hiding behind Bologna* from the title of this paper. The first part of the analysis deals with the discourse-specific proliferation of metonymic uses of *Bologna* and the accompanying variety and under-specification of associated target concepts. The second part deals with metonymy-metaphor interaction, examining the discursive metaphorical structuring in which the metonymic association BOLOGNA FOR X as a whole features as a metaphorical target domain drawing on a variety of source domains. The descriptive findings are critically evaluated and discussed in view of their conceptual impact, whereby it is shown that the discourse-emergent metonymic and metaphoric mappings are vague and inconsistent to the extent that they result in conceptual blurring, thus undermining overall understanding of the European higher education reform process.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. *The metonymic uses of* Bologna

As evident from the very label *Bologna process,* the toponym *Bologna* features prominently in the discourse related to the European higher education reforms. And as is common in the semantics of place names, it is used metonymically to refer to the associated event – in this case, the higher education reform process initiated by the signing of the well-known declaration of the European ministers of education in Bologna in 1999 – e.g. *Bologna with Students' Eyes* or *Bologna beyond 2010*. What is remarkable, however, is the discourse-specific proliferation of *Bologna* as a metonymic vehicle with a broad range of targets and the resulting dynamics of meaning construction.

To test the observation that the metonymic uses of the toponym *Bologna* multiply extensively in the discourse on European higher education reforms, their frequency was checked in a sample of the BPDC (*The Bologna Process for US Eyes*) in comparison to two general corpora (*British National Corpus* and *Corpus of Contemporary American English*). The figures in Table 1 show

the extent of discourse-specific proliferation of metonymic uses of *Bologna* in terms of the number of pertinent metonymic occurrences, their percentage in relation to the total number of occurrences and the density of metonymic occurrences per 1000 words:

Bologna	Total number of occurrences	Metonymic reference to the European higher education reform process		
		Number of occurrences	Percentage	Density per 1000 words
BNC (100.000.000 words)	195		0%	0.000000
COCA (450.000.000 words)	600	22	3.67%	0.000049
BPDC sample (~100.000 words)	707	589	83,31%	5.890000

Table 1. The frequency of metonymic uses of *Bologna* in BPDC vs. BNC and COCA

Furthermore, the metonym *Bologna* manifests not only the strikingly increased discourse-specific frequency, but also, and more importantly, an array of emergent discourse-specific metonymic senses. Representative of the multiple target concepts involved in the discernible metonymic shifts are the ones shown in examples (1)–(4):

(1) If *Bologna* were to fail, it is hard to imagine any other process which could take its place in the near future.
   BOLOGNA → THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM PROCESS IN GENERAL

(2) *Bologna* in the humanities at the University of Vienna is completely different from *Bologna* in law at the same university.
   BOLOGNA → THE WAY IN WHICH THE HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM IS CARRIED OUT IN A PARTICULAR CASE

(3) These initiatives started before *Bologna* was signed.
   BOLOGNA → THE EUROPEAN EDUCATION MINISTERS' DECLARATION

(4) Grading systems before and after *Bologna*
   BOLOGNA → THE BEGINNING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM

In fact, the range of such metonymic shifts goes far beyond the standard patterns of place name metonymization found in literature (cf. Markert and Nissim 2006), and the target concepts involved are often not clearly discernible. Rather, the toponym *Bologna* turns out to serve as a "catch-all" metonymic vehicle with underspecified and indeterminate target concepts (often discursively interchangeable with equally indeterminate *Bologna process, Bologna declaration* or *Bologna reforms*), as shown in (5)–(12):

(5) Is *Bologna* in a crisis?

(6)   Spanish students protest against *Bologna*.

(7)   One way to promote obstructionism without attracting attention is to hide behind *Bologna*.

(8)   Doing public relations work and marketing for *Bologna*.

(9)   *Bologna* has made us realize how important the social dimension is.

(10)   We get a glimpse of why *Bologna* is at the same time respected, blamed, loved and hated by academic communities and governments alike.

(11)   An ideal university would aspire to imbibe the spirit of *Bologna*.

(12)   Is adopting *Bologna* a technical or political process?

In sum, the abundance of discourse-specific metonymic uses of *Bologna* turns out to result in increased indeterminacy of meaning, to the extent that more often than not it is far from clear what the intended target concept should be.

4.2. Bologna *goes metaphoric*

To make things more complicated, the proliferation of *Bologna* as a metonymic vehicle goes hand in hand with metaphorical mappings in which the conceptual complex BOLOGNA FOR X features as a target domain. Namely, BOLOGNA, i.e. the (indeterminate) range of concepts that it metonymically refers to, gets further metaphorically structured in terms of a variety of source domains, including MOTION (JOURNEY or RACE), SPACE, BUILDING, MACHINE, PLANTS, PEOPLE, ECONOMY/TRADE etc. An overview of common metaphorical sources for BOLOGNA (FOR X) as the target domain, with illustrative examples, is provided in Table 2:

BOLOGNA (FOR X) – metaphorically structured in terms of:	Examples
JOURNEY – GOAL	(13) Germany: *The long road to Bologna* (14) *Towards Bologna*: the Hungarian Universitas Program
JOURNEY – MOVING ENTITY	(15) With *the advent of Bologna*, just about everything is modularized. (16) When *Bologna came along*, its entire portfolio was seen "as a process of quality enhancement".
RACE	(17) *Bologna at the finish line* (18) Some of these additions *pushed up the hurdles of the Bologna race* beyond the immediate reach of a number of participants.

EXTENT OF SPACE	(19) But private higher education is otherwise a minor phenomenon in *the Bologna territory*. (20) These institutions are not considered "tertiary" education in Europe, and are not part of *the Bologna universe*.
BUILDING/HOUSE	(21) The aim is to investigate how *the fundamental building blocks of Bologna* are shaping the strategic challenges to British universities. (22) *Opening the Bologna door* for Belarus will facilitate better social exchange
MACHINE/TOOLS	(23) How does *Bologna operate*? (24) The implementation of *key Bologna mechanisms*
PLANTS	(25) So *Bologna had a very different landscape in which to sprout and grow* than would have been the case in the 1960s (26) The Sorbonne Declaration contains most of *the seeds of Bologna*.
PERSON	(27) *Bologna is the usual suspect* that students blame for their problems. (28) There is no question of *what Bologna had in mind* by a Euro-centered mobility.
TEACHER	(29) *Bologna* as *Global Teacher* (30) These systems are setting an example for serious *learning from Bologna*.
ORGANIZED GROUP	(31) ECTS is a condition of membership in *the Bologna club*. (32) The current assessment of *the Bologna community*… (33) An issue concerning many *Bologna member states*…
AUTHORITY/RULE	(34) Testing the implicit *authority of Bologna*… (35) A survey of European countries' *compliance with Bologna* (36) The three cycle system adopted *under Bologna*
ECONOMY/TRADE	(37) All *Bologna stakeholders* and their international partners (38) The latest *Bologna stocktaking report*

Table 2. Common metaphorical sources for BOLOGNA (FOR X)

As can be seen from this overview, the multiple metaphors for BOLOGNA (FOR X) are not only varied, but they also manifest significant conceptual inconsistencies (cf. Goatley's 2002 findings concerning conflicting metaphors in the Hong Kong educational reform proposals). Thus BOLOGNA (FOR X) is metaphorically structured both as an animate and inanimate entity (of different kinds), in both static and dynamic terms, and even within the same source domain, that of JOURNEY, it is structured both as a goal and as a moving entity.

It should be noted that similar multiple and partly inconsistent metaphors are not peculiar to the conceptual complex BOLOGNA (FOR X) as a metaphorical target, but are also commonly exploited for other abstract concepts characteristic of the Bologna process discourse, such as EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA), EUROPEAN CREDIT TRANSFER AND ACCUMULATION SYSTEM (ECTS), EUROPEAN QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORK (EQF), etc. As an illustrative case in point, consider the variety of metaphorical sources for EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA), which in itself is a metaphorical concept making use of the spatial concept AREA:

EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA) – metaphorically structured in terms of:	Examples
JOURNEY – GOAL	(39) *Progress towards the EHEA* (40) The Bologna Process is leading universities *to reach the EHEA.*
JOURNEY – MOVING ENTITY	(41) We, the ministers responsible for HE in the countries participating in the BP, met in Budapest and Vienna on March 11 and 12, 2010, *to launch the EHEA.* (42) Does the Bologna Process have enough synergy *to keep the EHEA moving ahead*?
EXTENT OF SPACE	(43) A report evaluating the overall progress of the Bologna process *across the EHEA* since 1999 (44) Is ECTS understood in the same way *throughout the EHEA*?
BUILDING/HOUSE	(45) *The foundations of the EHEA* are now in place. (46) We continue the work towards *building a true EHEA.*
MACHINE/TOOLS	(47) *The EHEA operates* in a global, continuously internationalizing environment. (48) The national policy frameworks under which *the EHEA tools* could be implemented
ORGANIZED GROUP	(49) Countries party to European Cultural Convention shall be eligible for *membership in the EHEA.* (50) In December 2011, the Republic of Belarus officially applied to become *a member of the EHEA.*
ECONOMY/TRADE	(51) A vision of *an internationally competitive and attractive EHEA* (52) The European University Association looks for opportunities to create a more transparent *EHEA market.*

Table 3. Common metaphorical sources for EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA (EHEA)

However, the case of BOLOGNA is particularly noteworthy, because metaphorical inconsistencies combine with the indeterminate range of concepts that BOLOGNA metonymically refers to and thus additionally blur overall understanding of the higher education reforms.

Moreover, in addition to the source domains that are common in the metaphorical structuring of other target concepts in the Bologna process discourse, the conceptual complex BOLOGNA (FOR X) as the metaphorical target activates additional mappings drawing on the source domain of FOOD/COOKING, as in (53)–(55):

(53) In Portugal, *Bologna is being served to students as a fast-food dish.* In the best cases students are presented with *the cooked Bologna dish* and are asked if they like it....

(54) This change of paradigm will only happen if the students are included in *the slow-food process of cooking the Bologna dish.*

(55) *Bologna not to the taste of* German critics.

This kind of metaphorical ramification rests on the overall background knowledge associated with the toponym *Bologna*, renowned (among other things) for its cuisine.[5] It spreads further to include RESTAURANT MENU or BOLOGNESE SAUCE as pertinent metaphorical sources, as in (56)–(59). Thereby the positive associations that may otherwise be linked to the Bologna cuisine are lost in the metaphorical mappings, which foreground negative associations (parts as opposed to whole, undefined mixture etc.):

(56) *Bologna* is still "*Bologna a la carte*" in many countries.

(57) Critics mock reforms with such witticisms as "*study alla bolognese*".

(58) *A taste of academia bolognese*

(59) *Universities in Europe: Bolognese sauce*

Thus, in effect, the overall metaphoric and metonymic portrayal of BOLOGNA in the discourse on European higher education reforms results in unclear referential meaning and yet in predominantly negative associative meaning (especially in the informal discourse), so that the overall understanding of higher education reforms seems to be "lost in the Bologna labyrinth".

---

5 Cf. the traditional Italian nicknames of Bologna: *la Dotta* 'the learned one' (with reference to the oldest university in the Western world), *la Grassa* 'the fat one' (with reference to the rich cuisine), *la Rossa* 'the red one' (with reference to the colour of the medieval roofs in the historic centre). The encyclopedic knowledge related to the Bologna cuisine is also responsible for the PLACE FOR PRODUCT metonymic sense extension manifest in *bologna* 'a cooked and smoked sausage made of finely ground beef and pork'.

4.3. By way of conclusion: *The curious case of* Bologna *and the dynamics of metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction in discourse*

The multitude and complexity of non-literal uses of the toponym *Bologna* and the emergent metonymic and metaphoric meaning construction in the Bologna process discourse are instructive not only with respect to the way they relate to the understanding of the European higher education reform process, but also, on a more general plane, with respect to the dynamic interplay between conceptual and linguistic aspects of metaphor and metonymy in discourse. At least two noteworthy aspects of such interplay are highlighted by the descriptive findings presented above.

The first concerns the discursive inversion of the role of metonymy as a conceptual and linguistic shortcut, manifest in the overextension of metonymic uses of *Bologna* with underspecified and indeterminate target concepts. This phenomenon appears to be characteristic of place name metonymies (cf. Halverson's 2012 findings concerning the vagueness of metonymic uses of place names *Schengen* and *Kyoto* in Norwegian newspaper discourse, and Rasulić, in preparation, for the proliferation and indeterminacy of the metonymic uses of *Belgrade* and *Priština* in Serbian political discourse on Kosovo) and could provide a fruitful platform for a more systematic study of metonymy in discourse.

The second aspect concerns the discursive evolvement of a metonymic concept into a metaphorical target and the resulting target-induced activation of "dormant" metaphorical source domains, manifest in the FOOD/COOKING metaphors for BOLOGNA (FOR X). This phenomenon is closely related to "topic-triggered" metaphors, i.e. metaphors that use some aspect of the topic under discussion as source domain (Koller 2004, Semino 2008), but it further points to the role of metonymy-metaphor interaction in the metaphorical source domain activation, which also merits a more detailed and systematic investigation.

Furthermore, the discourse-specific *Bologna*-related metonymic and metaphoric mappings are indicative of how metonymic and metaphoric links arise and spread in discourse as an integral part of the evolving conceptualization of a novel abstract complex system, bearing witness to the remarkable flexibility and multifacetedness of both metonymy and metaphor as general cognitive mechanisms in actual language use. In view of recent theoretical debates between discourse-centered and cognition-centered approaches to metaphor (cf. Musolff and Zinken 2009, Steen 2011, Gibbs 2011), the descriptive findings presented above suggest that there is no principled reason to insist on the gap between discourse metaphors and conceptual metaphors (whereby the latter tend to be interpreted exclusively as pre-existing cognitive schemata). The same would apply to metonymy, which has received much less attention in such debates so far. Rather, discourse metaphors and metonymies inevitably involve conceptual mappings (which are not fixed, but dynamic), whereby they may both draw on the entrenched conceptual links or establish new conceptual links that may or may not become entrenched in a linguistic community. In that respect, the emerging dynamic

view of metaphor (and metonymy) as a discursive socio-cognitive activity incorporating linguistic, social, cognitive, affective, cultural etc. dimensions (Cameron and Deignan 2006, Gibbs and Cameron 2008, Cameron et al. 2009, Biernacka's 2013) and the recent dialogue between cognitive linguistics and relevance theory (Gibbs and Tendahl 2006, Tendahl and Gibbs 2008, Tendahl 2009, Wilson 2011, Musolff 2012) seem to provide a fruitful ground for new developments in metaphor and metonymy research. Thereby metonymy (and its dynamic interaction with metaphor) definitely merits more attention in the interdisciplinary dialogue between cognitive linguistics, (critical) discourse analysis and relevance theory. Given the large-scale spread of the Bologna process, the discourse related to it could provide a useful platform for a systematic cross-linguistic and cross-cultural investigation of the functioning of metaphor and metonymy in discourse.

REFERENCES

Barcelona *et al* (eds) 2011: A. Barcelona, R. Benczes, F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics. Towards a Consensus View*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Biernacka 2013: E. Biernacka, A discourse dynamics investigation of metonymy in talk. PhD Dissertation, The Open University, UK.

Cameron 2003: L. Cameron, *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*, London and New York: Continuum.

Cameron, Deignan 2006: L. Cameron, A. Deignan, The emergence of metaphor in discourse, *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 671–690.

Cameron *et al* 2009: L. Cameron, R. Maslen, Z. Todd. J. Maule, P. Stratton, N. Stanley, The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 24(2), 63–89.

Charteris-Black 2004: J. Charteris-Black, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fairclough, Wodak 2008: N. Fairclough, R. Wodak, The Bologna Process and the knowledge-based economy: A critical discourse analysis approach, in: B. Jessop, N. Fairclough, R. Wodak (eds), *Education and the Knowledge-Based Economy in Europe,* Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers, 109–126.

Fejes 2008: A. Fejes, Standardising Europe: The Bologna Process and new modes of governing, *Learning and Teaching – The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 25–49.

Fusaroli, Morgagni (eds) 2013: R. Fusaroli, S. Morgagni, Conceptual Metaphor Theory: Thirty Years After, *Journal of Cognitive Semiotics* (special issue), V(1–2).

Gibbs 2011: R. W. Gibbs, Evaluating conceptual metaphor theory, *Discourse Processes*, 48(8), 529–562.

Gibbs (ed) 2008: R. W. Gibbs, *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, Cameron 2008: R. W. Gibbs, L. Cameron, The socio-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance, *Cognitive Systems Research*, 9, 64–75.

Gibbs, Tendahl 2006: R. W. Gibbs, M. Tendahl, Cognitive effort and effects in metaphor comprehension: Relevance theory and psycholinguistics, *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 379–403.

Goatly 2002: A. Goatly, Conflicting metaphors in the Hong Kong special administrative region educational reform proposals, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 17(4), 263–294.

Halverson 2012: S. Halverson, Metonymic extension and vagueness: *Schengen* and *Kyoto* in Norwegian newspaper discourse, in: G. Andersen (ed), *Exploring Newspaper Language: Using the Web to Create and Investigate a Large Corpus of Modern Norwegian*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 285–306.

Keeling 2006: R. Keeling, The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Research Agenda: The European Commission's expanding role in higher education discourse, *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), 203–223.

Koller 2004: V. Koller, Businesswomen and war metaphors: 'possessive, jealous and pugnacious?', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 8(1), 3–22.

Kövecses 2002: Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, Johnson 1999: G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, Johnson 1980: G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker 1993: R. W. Langacker, Reference-point constructions, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4(1), 1–38.

Liesner 2006: A. Liesner, Education or service? Remarks on teaching and learning in the entrepreneurial university, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), 483–495.

Markert, Nissim 2006: K. Markert, M. Nissim, Metonymic proper names: A corpus-based account, in: A. Stefanowitsch, S. T. Gries (eds), *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 152–174.

Musolff 2012: A. Musolff, The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(3), 301–310.

Musolff 2004: A. Musolff, *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Musolff, Zinken (eds) 2009: A. Musolff, J. Zinken, *Metaphor and Discourse*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Panther, Thornburg 2004: K.-U. Panther, L. Thornburg, The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction, *Metaphorik.de*, 6, 91–116.

Panther, Radden (eds) 1999: K.-U. Panther, G. Radden, *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rasulić 2010: K. Rasulić, Aspekti metonimije u jeziku i mišljenju, *Theoria*, 53(3), 49–70.

Rasulić (in preparation): K. Rasulić, Turning the heart into a neighbour: (Re)framing Kosovo in Serbian political discourse. (Paper presented at the *Fifth International Conference on Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, September 2014.)

Semino 2008: E. Semino, *Metaphor in Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steen 2011: G. J. Steen, The contemporary theory of metaphor – now new and improved!, *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 9(1), 26–64.

Tendahl 2009: M. Tendahl, *A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor: Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tendahl, Gibbs 2008: M. Tendahl, R. W. Gibbs, Complementary perspectives on metaphor: Cognitive linguistics and relevance theory, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, 1823–1864.

Wilson 2011: D. Wilson, Parallels and differences in the treatment of metaphor in relevance theory and cognitive linguistics, *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 177–196.

Katarina G. Rasulić

„SKRIVANJE IZA BOLONJE": METONIMIJA, METAFORA I POJMOVNO ZAMAGLJIVANJE U DISKURSU BOLONJSKOG PROCESA

Rezime

U radu se na teorijskoj podlozi kognitivne lingvistike, na materijalu iz engleskog jezika, razmatra metonimijsko i metaforičko građenje značenja u diskursu vezanom za dugogodišnji proces reformi visokog obrazovanja u Evropi koji je poznat pod nazivom *Bolonjski proces*. Analiza nedoslovnih značenja toponima *Bolonja* u predmetnom diskursu pokazuje da u konceptualizaciji i diskurzivnom oblikovanju savremenog evropskog visokog obrazovanja važnu ulogu imaju metonimijska preslikavanja u kojima se ovaj toponim vezuje za različite, često neodređene ciljne pojmove, kao i višestruka, često nedosledna metaforička preslikavanja u kojima se pojmovni kompleks BOLONJA (ZA X) strukturira pomoću različitih izvornih domena (KRETANJE, PROSTOR, GRAĐEVINA, MAŠINA, BILJKA, OSOBA, ORGANIZOVANA GRUPA, TRGOVINA, HRANA/KUVANJE), što kao rezultat ima nejasno referencijalno značenje ali preovlađujuće negativno asocijativno značenje. U razmatranju teorijskih implikacija ističe se potreba i značaj interdisciplinarnog dijaloga između kognitivne lingvistike, (kritičke) analize diskursa i pragmatičke teorije relevancije.

Ključne reči: Bolonja, diskurs Bolonjskog procesa, metonimija, metafora, kognitivna lingvistika