

Joachim Grzega ♦ Bea Klüsener

**Preface to
Papers from the 2nd Eurolinguistics Conference
at Europäisches Haus Pappenheim**

Europe is getting closer and closer to people's everyday life. Unfortunately, we are living in times where the east-west peace promoted first by Willy Brandt, later by Helmut Kohl, François Mitterrand, Mikhail Gorbachev and others is at stake. We are looking at Ukraine and we have to admit that one cause of the problem is the EU way of communicating with and about Russia, predominantly the communicative behavior by politicians, lobbyists and journalists, who do not know about the power of words and or who consciously misuse words to demonstrate the spirit of competition where the spirit of cooperation would be more appropriate. If Russians wanted to react the same way, can this be of surprise? We are living in times where solidarity is getting less and less important. The way some EU politicians, lobbyists and journalists talk about countries proves this. Some use the term *government debt crisis*, although at the outbreak of the crisis, Spain's and Ireland's government debts were much lower than Germany's debts. Even within some EU states, solidarity no longer plays the role it once used to. In the late 1990's it was also the Germans who promoted a target inflation for the Euro of close to, but under 2 percent; however, by 2012, the only countries to stick to the target inflation rate were France and Austria. Most countries were above, a few like Germany clearly below the line. But some politicians, lobbyists and journalists have managed to render missing the target on the one side bad, but missing it on the other side, their side, good. This has to do with language: The negative image of the word *inflation* thus promotes a policy that rather bares the risk of leading to deflation, in other words: recession. Due to linguistic manipulation, people are often not aware that economic goals are not nature-given. *Economic success* is normally defined as a change in the gross domestic product or the gross national product. But this definition is not self-evident at all. Words can be given new meanings and thus change the world (just as the re-definition of *the unemployed* has improved the unemployment figures). These are but a few examples that show the close connection between linguistic issues and non-linguistic issues. Therefore it seems only apt to have a look at how linguists, non-linguists and the people in Europe can benefit from each other.

The *Europäisches Haus Pappenheim* as an official research center for Eurolinguistics seems an appropriate place to do that. From 4 to 6 April 2014, the Europäisches Haus Pappenheim (<http://www.ehp-online.eu>), an institute of Europe-related research and training, hosted its second Eurolinguistics Conference. While last year's conference was dedicated to semantics and pragmatics (mostly neglected linguistic domains when it comes to Eurolinguistics), this conference was entitled "Interdisciplinary Eurolinguistics". When we look back onto the history of academic progresses, it seems that larger steps in acquiring knowledge can be made where disciplines overlap, where people try to connect their knowledge from different disciplines or where experts from different disciplines work together. The stranger the combination of disciplines and approaches, the more surprising and eye-opening results may turn out to be.

Still facing the low presence of true Eurolinguistics in European studies programs, one goal of the Europäisches Haus Pappenheim (EHP) is to give students a platform for doing Eurolinguistics. Therefore, two participants presented their recently completed B.A. thesis and M.A. thesis,

respectively. Furthermore, the topic of two on-going M.A. theses was presented. Beyond that, we involve students in research going on at the EHP and give them a chance to carry out and present seminar projects to a larger audience. This year, shortly before the EU elections, for instance, students of the seminar “Effects of Language Contact in Europe” at the University of Eichstätt, presented analyses of international manipulative media language on several European topics; earlier this year, Eichstätt university students participating in a Shakespeare seminar offered a Shakespeare afternoon, including linguistic aspects. In a third event, other students mentored by ourselves presented youth protests in Europe, again including linguistic aspects. All three events were organized like a tour through a film studio: there were several stations, and visitors could just listen or actively participate in tasks. This also shows that the EHP aims at bringing Eurolinguistics closer to a lay audience. Therefore, also the 2014 conference, just as the preceding one, contained one part reserved for the general public. Apart from a book presentation and posters designed by students mentored by us, visitors could hear and discuss the research results by conference participants, who had transferred, just a few hours before, their core findings into a style that was also accessible to laypeople. Just like the year before, the audience was very much interested in the different topics and gave us positive feedback. Our thanks to all conference participants who engaged in this attempt to make detailed research results interesting for non-experts.

Again, before the start of Eurolinguistic studies, a definition of the terms *Eurolinguistics* and *European* is appropriate. The EHP aims to follow Norbert Reiter’s original definition of *Eurolinguistics*: according to him the term should refer to the study of the commonalities among European languages. We would like to remind readers that there are various possibilities.

1. *Europe* can be defined geographically, politically or cultural-anthropologically.
2. *European feature* may be defined as common only in Europe or it may also occur in other parts of the world.
3. *European language* may be defined only as an indigenous language or also encompass migrant languages. It may refer only to varieties of these languages within Europe or also to the varieties brought to other areas. It may refer only to the standard or also to non-standard varieties.
4. In the strict sense of the word, a study that is termed *Eurolinguistic* needs to investigate the commonalities among all European languages (e.g. Reiter 1991, 1999). It may be seen as an unrealistic goal to collect comparable data from all European languages, but we should strive for coming to this goal as close as possible. A representative Eurolinguistic selection could therefore be defined as covering at least one member of each subgroup in one of the following groups of languages and cultures:
 - (a) referring to historical-anthropological-cultural parameters, with structures in circles: more central as well as more peripheral countries;
 - (b) referring to the geographical parameters: northern, western, southern and eastern countries;
 - (c) referring to historical-linguistic parameters: members of all major Indo-European language groups (Germanic, Romance, Balto-Slavic) and the major non-Indo-European language family (Finno-Ugric);
 - (d) referring to synchronic linguistic parameters: members of Western European languages (Standard Average European), East-Central European languages, the Balkan languages, and, potentially, Russian.

At the conference, contributions came from Germany, Austria, Italy, France and Algeria. This volume of the *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* offers a selection of the contributions. They connect

Eurolinguistic aspects with geometry, translation studies, literary studies, economics, politics, learning psychology and pedagogy/didactics:

- Jacques François: “Language and Geometry: A Method for Comparing the Genealogical and Structural Relatedness between Pairs of European Languages” (p. 4ff.)
- Wolfgang Pöckl: “Eurolinguistik und Translationswissenschaft” (p. 14ff.)
- Bea Klüsener: “Racism in Literature for Young Europeans? A Discussion of *Robinson Crusoe*” (p. 25ff.)
- Joachim Grzega: “Word-Choice and Economic Performance in European Countries: Methodological Comments and Empirical Results” (p. 34ff.)
- Nora Hanusch: “From Words to War: Eine Analyse des metaphorischen Sprachgebrauchs internationaler Printmedien vor Ausbruch des Irakkrieges 2003” (p. 44ff.)
- Jan Kruse: “Sprachenpolitik – Eigenständigkeit und Kohärenz” (p. 51ff.)
- Erhard Steller: “Sprechen wir europäisch? Die Empfehlung einer Sichtweise” (p. 60ff.)
- Joachim Grzega / Claudia Sand / Sandra Schwehofer: “The Language Emergency Doctor (*Sprach-Not-Arzt*) for Migrants: An Innovative Teaching Method for *Deutsch als Fremdsprache (DaF)* and Other Languages with Linguistically Heterogeneous Beginners” (p. 74ff.)
- Joachim Grzega / Nora Hanusch / Claudia Sand: “Qualitative und quantitative Studien zur Sprachworkout-Methode (Language Workout)” (p. 90ff.)

The organization of the conference was supported by Wilma Vogel, whom we would like to thank for this. Financial help came from the town of Pappenheim and its mayor, Uwe Sinn, as well as the European Union. For assistance in the editing process, we would like to thank Denise Denk.

Pappenheim, 8 December 2014

*Joachim Grzega (EHP Director) &
Bea Klüsener (EHP Ambassador)
Europäisches Haus Pappenheim
Marktplatz 1
DE-91788 Pappenheim
grzega@pappenheim.de*