



# Metaphors of Globalization

Doina BUTIURCA

George Emil Palade University of Târgu Mureș  
Faculty of Sciences and Letters  
butiurcadoina@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** The organization and function of human society in the global economy is, in the current discourse, part of epistemology, developed on the broader link of social sciences with scientific creativity and artistic imagination. The “chaotic” synergy of globalization has developed on a conceptual network where the logic of conceptual metaphor and cognitive scenario are integrative and circular. It is this assertion we start from in the research on the interdisciplinary character of the metaphor of globalization, with special attention paid to *the metaphors of the organic, of space, of movement* (the spiral formula, the loop, centre-periphery, the metaphor of the nebula, man as a sum, etc.). The research method (contrastive, functional, analytical) has in view the interdisciplinary and dynamic character of metaphors that highlight the conceptual system beyond the research. The conclusion of the study is that the role of interdisciplinary metaphors is to fuse with the text and arguments of an entire conceptual system it generates.

**Keywords:** cognitive metaphor, globalization, interdisciplinary, analytical, conceptual system

## 1. Introduction

The nature of specialized metaphor in the field of social and political sciences generally repeats the nature of language, at another dimension, if we have in view the cognitive essence of metaphor, as well as its finality – the creation of new content. It is necessary, before all else, to delimit the area of research: the nature of specialized metaphor, be it only partially, the “experiential” essence of metaphors in the field of study, the nature of terminological/conceptual metaphor in the sphere of “hard” sciences. Being neutral under the aspect of utterance expressivity, specialized metaphor is extraordinarily productive in the creation of new significance, firstly due to its experiential nature. Our research partially follows the cognitivist theory developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) according to which the organization of linguistic content is realized following

a preconceptual pattern known from experience and expressed metaphorically. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 124), “our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities”.

## 2. Experiential essence of the cognitive metaphor in economic sciences

In the epistemology of social and political sciences, metaphoric competence is partially grounded in the elements of everyday life, existing in thinking and in action, organized on scenarios: human behaviour has generated one of the fundamental scenarios of traditional microeconomics – the scenario of *Homo Oeconomicus*. Another feature of human behaviour is play. What are *economic* and *political plays* if not conceptual metaphors, forms of expansion of group and/or collective experience, as well as superior knowledge coming from this experience?

We shall not dwell on this context of biological, cultural, spiritual, or autonomous bases of play (cf. Huizinga 2003) but on its rules. On the metaphor of play, the 20<sup>th</sup> century developed the *competition scenario*, engaging numerous interdisciplinary metaphors in political sciences (political play, underground political games, strategy games), in the economic field (referee, game – economic play, the play of economic actors, the play of offer and demand, theory of play, play in null sum, the rules of the economic game (Butiurca 2014)), in arts and culture. Far from having become a worn-out representation, the metaphor of the game is in fashion in the epistemology of current political models, in the theory of globalization: globalization has “the consistency of a constructivist process with institutional architecture, based on non-conflict rules (non-violent), of calculated risk and anthropic and ecological post-efficiency criteria, with post-industrial, post-corporatist creative systems” (see Dinu 2006). Understanding globalist theories seems to be more accessible through the scenarios of “rules of the game”. Comparing the scenario of the competition, developed on the general metaphor of game in the economic field, with the “rules” scenario from the speeches on the topic of globalization, we cannot fail to observe the mutations in conception and philosophy: *Homo Oeconomicus* is an integral part of the competition, the 21<sup>st</sup>-century man (co)participates in the “rule” imposed by the “game of globalization”.

The competition scenario, at least at the level of metaphoric constructs, is doubled by the *rules of the game* scenario, in a century of globalization.

In the process of denomination, the reinvigoration of specialized vocabulary occurs also on the basis of moral experience, also living the religious mysteries. As we pointed out on a different occasion, in Latin mythology, *moneta* was used as an epithet with the acceptance of “councillor” to define one of the

attributes of goddess Juno (the mint of Rome was in Juno Moneta's temple), the term circulating in current economy (in Italian: *moneta bassa*). In international terminology, the doublet *moneda/moneta* circulates – the first having a Greek etymon, the second a Latin one. Both forms have led to the same metaphorical concept: an instrument of payment. *Moneta* has maintained its metaphoric construct status in derivatives, compounds, poly-lexical constructs, etc. In Pan-Latin terminology, there are approximately 17 metaphoric constructs, formed by expansion, based on the preconceptual model [*monedă comercială* 'commercial currency' (Fr. *monnaie commerciale*; Sp. *moneda comercial*); Ro. *monedă fără valoare*; Ro. *monedă din aur și argint* (Fr. *monnaie en or et argent*; Sp. *moneda de oro y plata*, etc)]. In English, the concept of *money* has developed from the same Latin model *moneta* (Skeat 2007: 307).

Situated at the conceptual level, metaphor as a totality of possible realizations plays a fundamental role in defining exchange, the economic process, at the particular level of the economic field. The way in which a metaphor / a metaphor system works within a cognitive scenario reflects above the particular concrete phenomenon of the general doctrine, the superior organization model and function of a social and political reality. The capacity of the generic metaphor "moneta" to develop specialized senses is given by its interdisciplinary status in general; the capacity of the construct to transcend the designation of the particular case is in close relationship with the social, political model, which works at a macro-systemic level. Compare cognitive constructs: *monedă națională* 'national currency' (ubiquitous in the economic language of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and not only!) with *monedă comună* 'common currency', *monedă mondială* 'world currency', *monedă globală* 'global currency' (see Gălățeanu 2012), *internaționalizare monetară* 'monetary internationalization' (fundamental concept in discourses referring to financial globalization in the 21<sup>st</sup> century). The finality of the interdisciplinary socio-political metaphor goes beyond the boundaries of language, but also beyond the strict boundaries of one scientific domain or another, justifying itself above them at the high level of thinking and configuring concrete and/or theoretical models of organizing human experience.

What is more, as Kiseleva and Trofimova (2017: 233) point out:

Metaphorization is considered not as a juxtaposition of isolated properties of conceptual metaphor, but as a complex one – a mental operation with holistic mental structures. The environment of metaphorization is a conceptual sphere of representation of knowledge, as voluminous as cognitive models, frames and pattern schemas. The image serves as the basis for operations that facilitate understanding metaphors and images by activating the corresponding relationship with the sensory experience, regulating the deployment of imaginative schemas.

### 3. The cognitive scenario in the sciences of ideology theorization/orientation

It is necessary to delimit informational and epistemological indices of the cognitive scenario of social disciplines from the type of information totalled in the scenario/specialized metaphor in other scientific fields.

The cognitive scenario follows a logical and objective path in general in the field of sciences. In spite of this, adaptation to the type of information and appropriation of the vocabulary to the message can decisively influence the textual organization techniques, making the necessary differences. In no other field do the cognitive scenarios, developed based on conceptual metaphor, have a bigger impact on the message and its reception than in the sphere of socio-human and political sciences. It is this reasoning for which the texts from these fields only partially eliminate the participative/subjective implication of the author/emitter.

Another feature that individualizes sociological hermeneutics in relation to the sphere of “hard” sciences is the fact that through the cognitive scenario developed on the basis of metaphoric constructs, the emitter does not name *objects/concepts* but *mental representations* of the objects/concepts, representations that are not individual creations. One such scenario abides by an algorithm of selection of certain elements of knowledge (scientific concepts, ideas) and information, in consonance with the theoretical, ideological, political model that is to be promoted. They are elements doubled by representations, by rhetoric markers able to meet the demands of the authentic cooperative principle between *emitter* and *receiver* (see Grice 1975).

The numerous cognitive constructs in the field of *globalization*, for example, develop as eclectic scenarios under the aspect of the preconceptual model, being different as a way of representing concepts from one author to another: the scenario of redemption (the Supernational is not redemption, states Dinu in 2006: 44), the scenario of the haunted space, the scenario of the wedding, etc.

The process of globalization is often represented through the metaphor of the entity in motion. There are only a few interconnected cognitive representations, illustrative for the significance of creation technique having as justification the orientation of the discourse towards the receiver on the one hand and abiding by the adversity logic of national, trans- or supernational on the other hand. The excerpted examples are illustrative from the point of view of cognitivist orientation, according to which the metaphoric construct “allows for the understanding of something (and its experimentation) in terms of something different” (Lakoff–Johnson 1980/1985: 15): *the history of nations* is *neurosis*, *the end of nations* preceding globalization is *redemption*, etc. It is easy to observe how the *creation of significance* is seconded by the *vehiculation of significance* in sociological texts, a technique that serves best the purpose of communication in the field.

The transition from “national” to “supernational” and globalization is represented as a scenario of the Apocalypse (“the world to give the answer to the question above is one that has to exit the logic of the national, even if that means an identity crisis of apocalyptic type” (Lakoff–Johnson 1980/1985: 15). Applying one of Lakoff’s schemes (1980: 285), the elements of this scenario are: 1. *the initial situation*: exhaustion of the “national”; 2. *event*: the nation-state and the appearance of a supernational power, of rules for international order, development of a phenomenology of adversity, propagation of the globalization ideology, etc.; 3. *final situation*: acceptance of fundamental social, ideological existential change by the citizen. Globalization is represented by an eschatological scenario of the second degree/interdisciplinary, a scenario derived from a primary representation of the end of the world, religious in source.

#### 4. The metaphor of globalization: Classification criteria

Conceptualization in the lexis of institutions and in the future structure of the social organization of the world is a highly complex aspect. The analysis criteria of the metaphorization sources are varied, and we shall only dwell on a limited number. As Schlanger (1997: 97) points out, specialized metaphors have “cultural density and history”.

Analysed according to the criterion of the *source domain*, the metaphors from the sphere of globalization come from various cultural domains, among which we mention religion (metaphor of redemption), economy (agent / international actant), theatre (actors of globalization), culture (history of traditional nations is neurosis), connected sciences (physics, mathematics), etc.

The terminology of general economy is interested in ontology (from the viewpoint of the organization of the living world), whose structure is reflected at the abstract level of theorizations, by assemblies and subassemblies of concepts. Unlike the metaphors of the economic vocabulary, characterized by *ontological density* (banking products are objects, money is an organism), the metaphors of globalization have *anthropological density*. The anthropological metaphor is especially productive and is distinguished through a high degree of creativity: globalization is an entity on the move, the nation-state, parties, national companies are actors on the move; common currency is represented as a human being in need of protection; post-national evolutions are entities experiencing tragedies of the death of values such as sovereignty, independence.

The anthropocentric perspective in the terminology of contemporary sociology/economy implies, both conceptually and under the aspect of the philosophy of language, the human being with every specificity (relationships, events, body parts, feelings, perception), as a model of representation of the abstract. There

are three conceptual subsystems that the anthropocentric model develops in research: a. sensations: evolutions are experienced as death tragedies; the traditional history of nations is neurosis (“globalization brings a new order which attempts to make it impossible for old historical neurosis to exist”, cf. Dinu 2006: 29); b. body parts (see the metaphor of the “invisible hand”, arm, head); c. events and relationships (globalization is a wedding).

*Mână* ‘hand’ is a quasi-universal metaphoric construct, coming from the Greek–Latin languages and maintaining its status as a preconceptual model in most specialized fields, as well as its status of term in English and Romance languages: Rom. *manufactura* (Fr. *manufacture*; Sp. *manufactura*; Engl. *manufacture*); Rom. *manuscris* (Fr. *manuscrit*; Sp. *manuscrito*; Engl. *manuscript*), etc. – in marketing the *management* conceptual metaphor (cf. Engl. *management*; Fr. *management*; Sp. *management*) developed *in nuce* on the model of *manus*.

The anthropocentric perspective in the representation of features, concepts of science goes beyond univocal anatomic references. Unlike figurative language (anthropomorphizing/personification), conceptual metaphors in the category meet the criteria of univocity. Anthropomorphizing is an aesthetic procedure, and anthropocentrism is a conceptual, methodological and linguistic philosophy perspective, foreign to rhetoric. Anthropomorphizing implies, in our conception, all the dimensions of the human, from the biological to the psychological and the spiritual. We consider the anthropocentric perspective in terminology to be an epistemological method that implies the human being as a model of representation of the abstract.

An important source of conceptualization in the terminology of the socio-human field is the mineral universe and the elements of the cosmos, where scientists have found models of knowledge and representation of the abstract. The metaphor of the ostrich, the metaphor of sand (supernational is sand), the metaphor of the space capsule, of the rift are part of the class of the so-called organic metaphors (together with the metaphors of the human) and have become a topic in representation techniques of concepts in texts about globalization: the supernational and the national are *spill spaces* (for neuroses, illusions, ambitions, risks).

## 5. The epistemological metaphor: The space capsule

Unlike the sphere of spatial economy, international commerce, where conceptual content has developed on the basis of numerous agglomeration theories, the physical, concrete space (theory of location, theory of spatial equilibrium, cf. Alonso 1965; the centre-periphery model, cf. Krugman 1991), in the language of social sciences, *space* has ontological and epistemological dimensions. Conceptual representations of *space* are plurivalent. As Kövecses (2010: 202) highlights:

Spatial relations are commonly understood as parts of the human body (e.g. the head means up, and the feet means down).

These conceptual metaphors and the large-scale processes they underlie are global design features of modern humans' brain/mind. They represent global metaphoric potentialities, or principles, of a cognitively fluid brain. It seems to be clear at this point that commonality in human experience is a major force shaping the metaphors we have. It is this force that gives us many of the metaphors that we can take to be near-universal or potentially universal. But commonality in human experience is not the only force that plays a role in the process of establishing and using metaphors.

There are also countervailing forces that work against universality in metaphor production.

On the one hand, we have dematerialized, open space (frequent in expressions such as "accessible space"), cognitive representation of human conscience (open space = innovative conscience). It is – in the metaphoric sense – the privileged space of high ideas, beliefs, and skills. On the other hand, there is a closed space of spilling obsolete ideas, vices of man, of nations and society. Between the two cognitive dimensions, there is no communication channel, a fact that metaphorically suggests the necessity for fundamental changes at the level of consciousness, accepting individual and macrosocial evolution. The fundamental characteristic of conceptual space is discontinuity, unlike poetic representation, for instance, where epic space is continuous and time is infinite.

We are referring to the *space capsule* in the language of social sciences, sometimes multiplied (space capsule of the new space capsule doctrine / space capsule of old ideologies) and/or organized according to a bivalent logic, in a binary system. The only one capable of neutralizing opposition is human conscience by relation to one system of ideas or another. Other metaphors of space capsule are: the cage (ahistorical resources = cage), precariousness zones, space haunted by fantasies, ghosts (traditional nations are haunted, uninhabited spaces), the metaphor of nested hexagons (Launhardt 1887, W. Cristaller 1933). Representations of the space capsule are not the result of arbitrary choices if we have in view certain aspects: a theoretical system highlights not only the profile of the theorist but also the extended cultural and intellectual identity of the epoch, the general context where the system was elaborated. The scientific text, discourse then has a logical purpose – consisting in understanding new "experience", a new world, whose rules cannot remain foreign to the Other.

In the sciences of theorizing/orienting ideology, the theorist and receiver meet: the theorist to make a content of the researched discipline known and/or to persuade using arguments and conceptual representation, the receiver to acquire information necessary for their own knowledge. Specialized metaphor and the

metaphoric scenario are, if only partially, cognitive elements of the rhetoric of current discourse, illustrative of the persuasive feature of language.

## 6. Conclusions

The style of ideology theorization/orientation, of the economy, of sociology is far from being sober, concise, lacking creative expression. Scientific rigour, objectivity claims are, if in part, doubled by subjective marks, manipulative and creative. Specialized metaphor (cognitive and linguistic in nature) and the cognitive scenario (apocalypse, competition, *homo oeconomicus*, etc.) are representations of abstract concepts. Interconnected cognitive scenarios, ontological metaphor, metaphors of the organic, and epistemological metaphor are relevant for the doctrine theorist's recurring manner of thinking.

Interdisciplinary metaphor in the field of social sciences is in close relation of dependency with the conceptual components/semantics of the scientific field, which it transcends: the emitter does not name objects/concepts but the mental representations of objects / abstract concepts – representations that are not individual creations. The interdisciplinary and dynamic character of metaphors highlights the conceptual system they spring from, their role being to fuse with the text and arguments of an entire conceptual system they generate.

## References

- Alonso, W. 1965. *Location and land use*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Butiurca, Doina. 2014. *Fundamentele lingvistice ale terminologiei economice*. *Studia Philologica* 16/2014. Petru Maior University of Târgu-Mureș.
- Christaller, W. 1933. *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland. Eine ökonomisch-geographische Untersuchung über die Gesetzmäßigkeit der Verbreitung und Entwicklung der Siedlungen mit städtischen Funktionen*. Darmstadt, 1980 (1ère édition: Jena, 1933).
- Grice, Paul. 1979. *Logique et conversation*. *Communications* 1979/30: 57–72.
- Huizinga J. 2003. *Homo ludens*. Transl. from Dutch by H. R Radian, foreword by Gabriel Liiceanu. Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Kiseleva, S. V.–Trofimova, N. A. 2017. Metaphor as a device for understanding cognitive concepts. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Especificos* 23(2): 226–246.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. Metaphor and culture. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 2(2): 197–220.
- Krugman, P. 1991. *Geography and trade*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

- Lakoff, G.–Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [French transl.: *Les métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*. Minuit Paris. 1985].
- Launhardt, W. 1887–1888. *Theory des Tassierens*, 2 vol. I–II. Hanover. [English transl. by Bewley, A. [1900<sup>R</sup>–1902<sup>R</sup>], *The theory of the trace: Being a discussion of the principles of location*; [1900<sup>R</sup>], Part I: *The commercial trace* [1902<sup>R</sup>], Part II: *The technical tracing of railway*. Madras: Lawrence Asylum.
- Schlanger, J. 1991. La pensée inventive. In: Stengers, Isabelle–Judith Schlanger, *Les concepts scientifiques*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Searle, J. R. 1990. Metaphor. In: Martinich, A. P. (ed.), *The philosophy of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 408–429.
- Semino, E.–Culpeper, J. (eds.). 2002. *Cognitive stylistics. Language and cognition in text analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Skeat, Walter W. 2007. *The concise dictionary of English etymology*. London: Wordsworth Edition.

### Online resources

- Dinu, M. 2006. Modelul explicativ al globalizării. Available at: <http://store.ectap.ro/suplimente/globalizarea%20modelulexplicativ.pdf> (downloaded on: 15.08.2018).
- Gălățeanu, O. 2012. Opinii asupra procesului de globalizare și a efectelor lui față de ființa umană. *Annals of “Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu Jiu, Letters and Social Sciences* 2012/2. <https://alss.utgjiu.ro> (downloaded on: 15.08.2020).