Zeszyty **PRASOZNAWCZE**
Kraków 2020, t. 63, nr 2 (242), s. 11–30
DOI: 10.4467/22996362PZ.20.010.11900
www.ejournals.eu/Zeszyty-Prasoznawcze/

MEDIA STUDIES, CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION, AND THE HEART. CARING AND SHARING IN FRENCH, ENGLISH, CZECH, AND GERMAN

James William Underhill
orcid.org/0000-0002-3249-9905
English Department
Université Rouen-Normandie
France

ABSTRACT

This article seeks to establish to what extent we think with the heart and express ourselves with the heart in various European languages. Working with a wide media-based corpus bringing together electronic corpora, on-line resources, literary texts, and newspaper articles, as well as interviews with students, professionals, and academics, this article explores the working hypothesis that the way we communicate is related to the heart and heartfelt expression. Beyond the politics of media studies, communication studies and cultural theory, the concept of the heart is studied in a quarto-lingual cross-cultural study of English, French, Czech, and German. The heart may not be a *universal* in the terms Wierzbicka and Goddard define universals. Nonetheless, the various words used in French, Czech and German to designate what English-speakers refer to as *heart,* support the hypothesis that the heart remains a core value in European thought with a living tradition in all the four languages investigated. Rather than fading out as an anachronistic pre-modern notion, the heart continues beating throughout various fields of contemporary life in the four lingua-cultures explored, in sources ranging from literary texts, self-help works, newspaper articles and seminars to business and marketing discourse.

Keywords: media studies, cross-cultural communication, ethnolinguistics, *heart*, *coeur*, *Herz*, *srdce*

Speaking from the Heart and Studying the Heart

Truth may be a difficult notion to define, and we fight about whether we can ascertain the truth, or whether we ourselves can admit the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Nonetheless, most of us feel that the truth is important, essential. If the truth is 'the heart of the matter', surely it is because the truth lies close to our hearts, whether we are truthful in our heart of hearts, or not. Media manipulation, deceitful marketing, political propaganda, and day to day business negotiations and international talks may flout the truth and misrepresent 'the way things really stand', but these are generally viewed by objective observers and acting partners as perverted forms of transgression. So, ultimately, the tenet still holds true that we should all tell the truth. In this sense, language and speech are on the side of sincerity and understanding.

Over the course of the 20th century, the heart as a concept tended to go out of fashion within academic disciplines and in individual intellectual investigations. However, lexical study shows that the heart spreads out in many languages to weave a wide web of related terms, meanings, and expressions, and these all appear to be not only highly resistant to change, but also fundamental for communication, human expression, and workaday human relations. Working with electronic corpora, on-line resources, literary texts, and newspaper articles, as well as interviews with students, professionals, and academics, this article will explore the working hypothesis that the way we communicate is related to the heart and heartfelt expression. Beyond the politics of media studies, communication studies and cultural theory, the concept of the heart is studied in a quadrilingual cross-cultural study of English, French, Czech, and German.

Media Studies, Cross-Cultural Communication and Sharing Meanings

All media and media studies are ultimately about communication, and doesn't communication inevitably involve sharing? Not only sharing knowledge, information, and experiences, but also recognizing what we share as a human species, and what we can understand about each other as individuals and human beings. Whether we conceive of media and communication in terms of an exchange, a transmission of information, a form of bonding, or our mutual need to recognize and respect others, linguistics, media studies, and communication studies all take us to the heart of what it means to speak from the heart. This reminds us that the humanities should – by rights – be about studying the human in order to cultivate a humane relationship to the world and to others. Interpreters and translators know as well as journalists that striving to get your message across reminds you that we have always been, at some level, part of the same human species and part of a global community.

A cursory glance at contemporary scientific literature on media studies and cross-cultural communication makes it plain that these are dynamic, growing, and therefore, exciting fields of research. In their third edition of "Media Studies: A Reader", published in 2009, Sue Thornham, Caroline Bassett, and Paul Marris (2009) bring together a wide range of great thinkers such as Theodor W. Adorno, Marshall McLuhan, Jürgen Habermas, Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Edward Said, and Raymond Williams, who all explore the politics of communication and language use in society. But the editors also highlight the contributions made to media studies by less well-known thinkers and researchers such as David Morley, and Ien Ang. David Morley's "Nationwide Project", for example, investigates the 'potential disjuncture between the codes of those sending and receiving messages' through the mass media, and the way textual codes and social meanings are generated (Morely quoted by Thornham et al. 2009, p. 451). Focusing on engagement and defending the critical and methodological integrity of researchers working in media studies, Ien Ang, considers problems in studying mass audiences and 'mainstream' mass communication. Ultimately, she asks why we are interested in understanding audiences. Can media studies escape from the politics of interpretation? Or, as she puts it, doesn't advancing an interpretation 'insert it into a network of power relations?' (Ang quoted by Thornham et al. 2009, p. 437).

More recently, we see a further convergence between media, research and manipulation. Critique and production, the product and its appreciation, become increasingly entangled. Paul Long and Tim Wall in their second edition of "Media Studies, Texts, Production, Context", published in 2014, devote chapters and whole sections to global media production, media regulation and policy, the business of media, and the growing phenomenon of 'reality media' as an experience and a product.

As we can see, for cultural studies and media studies, the dynamics and power relations of the media and manipulation are political, ideological questions, whether you see this from the point of view of the consumer, the producer, or the creator. But communication in society and in the media is surely about more than manipulating feelings and creating needs, desires, and sustaining addictions. As a human capacity, it can be posited that communication is about expressing what is in our hearts when we truly get to the heart of the matter. Rather than being an out-dated, pre-scientific and subjective form of moralizing, it can be argued that the heart must animate any human enterprise. If this is so, then understanding the language of the heart is crucial to media and cultural studies and to cross-cultural communication in business or in international encounters.

Because the heart appears to be understood as the faculty of feeling and understanding and because it cannot be reduced to simple organ or concept, it will be argued that comparing the ways we translate *heart* into three other European languages may help us apprehend what is culturally specific and what is perhaps universal about this complex keyword. Learning to understand how four linguistic communities understand the heart may enable us to gain greater insight into ourselves and into our dealings with speakers of different languages, whether we are managing international concerns or 'having a heart to heart'.

Cross-cultural understanding is about getting your message across, about working together, generating a shared comprehension of a shared situation. Arguably it is not only practical and theoretical, it is also intuitive, since we do not always 'know' what we 'know', when we intuitively grasp that one line of argument, one way of dealing with people, one way of expressing ourselves, is somehow appropriate or inappropriate. When we communicate across cultures, we use our voices, our eyes, our bodies, our hands, and most of all, our ears. We listen to others, and understand them in their difference, speaking from another place that we have to try to 'enter into'. Only if we can meet those people in some mutually negotiated 'middle ground', can we hope to get a grasp of what they mean.

Contemporary research publications would seem to demonstrate that cross-cultural communication is of great importance in a vast range of everyday situations we have to deal with at work and in the street, and, increasingly, in our dealings with online media, often interactive media. More and more, cross-cultural communication has come to be seen as of vital necessity in managing global enterprises and negotiating in intercultural institutions. Authors such as Lewis (1999) and Maude (2011) have made the case that we can't forget about culture, when we want to get things done in the world today. Maude, for example, belongs to those who claim that traditional anthropology cannot stick to an objective outsider approach (an etic approach), it must also adopt an emic approach which starts from the experience of the insider. Cross-cultural communication is always about negotiating with different perspectives, and training key people to question their preconceptions, and change their own perspectives when circumstances require it.

Claudia V. Angelelli (2004), in her "Medical Interpreting and Cross-Cultural Communication", makes three essential points about her field of investigation: communicating across cultures is a question of health, and literally a question of life and death. It involves different cultures and different social classes, and finally, it involves that great proportion of people – all too often forgotten – who suffer from hearing impairments, and who live in the language of signs. These are, arguably, great steps taken in the right direction towards greater mutual understanding.

It would, however, be unfair to portray communication across cultures as something entirely new. The authors brought together in Mona Baker's and Gabriela Saldanha's "Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies", first published in 1998, and the authors included in Lawrence Venuti's Routledge "Translation Studies Reader" (Venuti 2004), make it plain that cross-cultural communication was already a major preoccupation of classical authors, and of strategic importance in Biblical translation from Saint Jerome onwards. All three editors recognize that we have often tried to get beyond simplistic modes of reducing different words and different ways of expressing ourselves to 'equivalent forms'. They equally recognize the fundamental importance of the writings of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), who developed in German the idea that we think in language, that language is the organ of understanding, and that individual languages constitute unique worldviews.

The recent crop of cross-cultural communication and media studies can, then, be seen to join a long tradition of thinking about how we deal with other cultures. Not all recent scholarship can be seen as an advance. Cross-cultural communication is not immune to stereotypes and reductive paradigms. Lewis, for example, gives only slight justification for her argument that the 'Dutch people are good at conveying facts' (Lewis 1999, p. 3), and that what is said at meetings by the Japanese is less important than the respect shown in communication (Lewis 1999, p. 8). And it might be argued that we are slipping into parody and prejudice when we read Lewis affirming that 'The French are well-trained orators who try to crush their opponents with icy Cartesian logic' (Lewis 1999, p. 8).

Nonetheless, recent publications indisputably show a healthy interest in cultural diversity and linguistic specificity. Moreover, these works have the advantage of stressing concrete situations. We are no longer in the textbook, no longer reaching across the centuries, trying to recreate the greatness of a dead author: we are dealing with living people engaged in negotiating here and now; or preparing to leave the negotiation table, as the case may be. All of these approaches share an interest in how we understand the world and everybody in it in language, with words. Contemporary authors such as Angelelli (2004) and Lewis (1999), translation scholars such as Venuti (2004), Baker and Saldanha (2011) and, perhaps most of all, the linguist-philosopher, Wilhelm von Humboldt, all care about how our languages help us to explore reality together. We explore our worlds in our own language. But we also do this when we speak other languages, just as other people cross over into a new linguistic system and system of values when they formulate their ideas and their feelings when they speak our languages. We translate our thoughts and feelings into other linguistic systems. And what does that mean?

It means building bridges. But our *bridges* do not always span the gap that divides cultures. For this reason, we often speak of language and cultural *barriers* in cross-cultural communication: significantly, the very words *cross* and *across* implicitly stress barriers that must be crossed, divides that must be bridged. So, in one sense, translating means breaking down barriers between languages, and crossing over to other cultures. But this is somewhat misleading, because to a great degree we all already live with other languages. Many of our words, our ideas, our key cultural texts, like the Bible, like the works of Aesop, Homer, and Aristotle, Cervantes and Neruda, Baudelaire and Montaigne, Lao Tzu and Confucius, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky come from other languages.

Similarly, the media has gone global. We share words, jokes, stories, and news narratives in globalized media. Only a few countries and cultures are still generating *the news* that is published in a handful of world languages, then translated into other languages (with often only very superficial reediting), before being published around the world on a daily basis. The Kenyans, the Dutch, the Australians, the Turks, and the four linguistic communities of Switzerland, and Canadians, whether they are French- or English-speakers are subjected to stories about Trump, Putin, Meghan & Harry, as soon as they wake up, or whenever they glance at their mobile phone. This might be couched by the producers and engineers of such media in terms

of *sharing*, *dialogue* and *exchanges*, and breaking down barriers between cultures, but who are they trying to kid? Few people are hoodwinked by such disingenuous arguments.

Arguably, it may prove more interesting, therefore, to speak in other metaphors when we come to communicating with multiple languages in play. Perhaps we should speak of networking in multilingual communities, playing the strings of various instruments on one great shared harp that resounds with the tones and timbres of a wide range of languages and cultures that each of us has, to a greater or lesser extent, assimilated, mastered, and made his or her own. This implies that we cultivate a multilingual sensibility even when we belong to a monolingual culture, since all languages are composite creations that have assimilated as much if not more from other languages and cultures than they have created.

How are we to speak of the contemporary sensibility to other cultures? With words like, *the brain*, *the mind*, or with *the heart*? This is what Naugle (2002) contends when he suggests that *heart* is universal. When it comes to communication, and comparing cultures, the heart would still appear to be a crucial question, and it shall be argued that the heart remains a useful paradigm for approaching the media and the complexity of cross-cultural encounters. Perhaps the heart opens up a space for us that concepts like the brain do not. Values, emotions, tastes and ideals certainly seem easier to conceive of, when we speak of the heart, the faculty of thinking and feeling. If this is true, then, it should prove interesting for media studies and useful to cross-cultural communicators, to summarize the findings that I have drawn from a quadrilingual study of English, French, German, and Czech, concerning *the heart*; a study based upon lexical research, corpus research, textual analysis and video interviews that I've been carrying out with speakers of various languages, recorded primarily in English and French. These findings shall be presented as the answers to eight key questions:

1. Is the heart as a working concept, for example, in newspapers and online media?
2. Is the heart a universal?
3. Is the heart a complex concept?
4. Is the heart an essential part of our traditions?
5. Is the heart a shared European value?
6. Who's afraid of the heart?
7. Is the heart used in work and business today?
8. Is the heart a useful paradigm for media studies, cultural studies and ethnolinguistics?

Does the Heart Function as a Working Concept in Language Today?

If we take a brief look at the newspapers today, we find that the heart is healthy, beating strongly in a wide range of contexts and usages. Let's take a fairly random look at two newspapers for English-speakers, and compare what we find to a German, a French and a Czech newspaper. *The Herald,* published in Glasgow (consulted 08.02.2020, https://www.heraldscotland.com), generated 74 751 references to *heart*. How was the word used? Of the first twenty references consulted, nine were clearly material, non-figurative medical usages, referring to either the Heart Foundation, or to medical disorders, treatments or hospital care. Three references related to bleeding hearts in the forms of flowers used to symbolize the heart of the Scottish nation, and the fact that, in the Brexit negotiations, Scotland felt itself to be European at heart. There was one reference to *the Girven Sacred Heart School*, a traditional reminder to the religious and spiritual meaning of the heart in education. One reference activated the intellectual or emotional idea of speaking 'heart to heart'. In his famous Oscar-winning retirement letter, the much-loved basketball player, Kobe Bryant announced: 'You asked for my hustle, I gave you my heart'. And in one original usage that ran counter to conventional narratives of the heart, a punk band sung of 'The Invasion of the Heart'. This inverts the idea of the heart as a container space that can be penetrated or pierced.

The New York Times (consulted 19.02.2020, https://www.nytimes.com) offered 970 692 references to *heart*. Among the first twenty references consulted, the articles tended to focus more on health, well-being and lifestyle. The heart was at the centre of debates on cardiovascular diseases, diet, and the ageing of the muscles, but it was also related to keeping fit, hair loss, healthy development in babies, long life, tea drinking, blood pressure, gender and health, and marathon running. And although the Pope was mentioned, it was not Francis, the present Pope, but "The Two Popes" of Netflix's highly successful 2019 series starring Anthony Hopkins (an actor also known for eating hearts as the infamous Hannibal Lecter in "The Silence of the Lambs", that came out in 1991). Clearly lifestyle, entertainment and the media were at the centre of such usages of the *heart* in this American newspaper.

How do these 'English hearts' compare with *das deutsche Herz?* In the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (consulted 19.02.2020, https://www.allgemeine-zeitung.de), far fewer references to *Herz* were found; only 3 917. Nonetheless, one article praised someone for having a heart in the title announcing 'Andreas Lied aus Alzey has a heart for children' (*hat ein Herz für Kinder*). The value of the woods (*der Wert des Waldes*) was celebrated and the heart was mentioned in an article on nature-loving. Jim Carrey's relationships were mentioned, but, in an inversion of emotional relationships, Carrey was quoted as having claimed to love his own isolation. References to the heart in relation to carnivals and football stressed the collective shared *hearty* experience of sport and recreation. Usages of *Herz* in articles related to beer, hash, and sex were less easy to analyse. But the political usages in one article featuring protesters with placards declaring 'Hate is no opinion' (*Hass ist kein Meinung*), made

it clear that well-intentioned liberal-minded citizens, felt sure that having a heart, and using your head were very much part of the same attitude for well-adapted human beings in Germany today. The welfare of the youth, young ecologists, and pregnancy also figured among the first twenty articles consulted.

In French, how did the *cœur* fare? *Le Monde* online (consulted 19.02.2020, https://www.lemonde.fr), did not give details of the number of usages of *heart*. It did, nonetheless, provide a wide range of fields in which *cœur* is used. Arguably, this proved the broadest range of fields. At any rate, the articles referred to urban living, the Paris centre and the greater Paris region, life in Algeria, media productions, such as "The Game of Thrones" series, the Prison at Réau, human rights abuses in Tunisia, the intimidation of civil society in Turkey, and refugees in Grenoble. The heart of 'stable' employees, came up in references to union negotiations (*au cœur du salariat stable*). References to the heart could also be found in articles on the arts; and in articles on exceptional women such as George Sand. In Paris, *le Musée de la vie romantique*, in the 9th arrondissement was exhibiting works by forty artists representing the expression of the heart's feelings and the state of love. The heart was also mentioned in relation to the collective memory and social media in Morocco. Biology and surgery also figured, but did not dominate in first twenty French references consulted, as they did in *The Glasgow Herald*.

The Czech heart (*srdce*) was also studied in the first twenty references that came up in the *Lidové Noviny* (consulted 19.02.2020, https://www.lidovky.cz). *Lidové Noviny* provided 11 330 references. The range of subjects covered when the heart came up was wide. Emotional, physical, and at the core of Czech experience, *srdce* appears to remain a key concept. On the physical side, references were made to cardiovascular problems, and these went hand in hand with sportive practices, as in one article that claimed that 70% of marathon runners suffered from heart-related problems after the race. Football articles evoked a heart of solidarity and hearty fun, the heart of fans and supporters. The heart of Czech skiers was won by the Italian ski destination, the Val de Fiemme, with its four resorts and 100 km of ski slopes. (*Italské Val di Fiemme si se svými čtyřmi středisky s více než 100 km sjezdovek získalo srdce už nejednoho českého lyžaře.*) The Czech football player, Tomáš Souček, did not leave his Prague club 'with a light heart' and believed he would return to the Slavia Club to play one day. (*Slavii neopouští s lehkým srdcem a věří, že se do pražského klubu jednou vrátí.*) Beyond sports, the heart figured in articles on politics, as in one article concerning the former New York City Mayor and big businessman Michael Bloomberg who declared that in early March he intended to run for office as the US President as the Democratic Party's candidate. Articles on diets and well-being at the end of winter (February) saw references to the heart. And the spatial dimension of the heart as the core was mentioned in the example of the wildfires that Bolivia was recovering from in the very heart of the South American continent. (*Srdce jihoamerického kontinentu. Bolívie se vzpamatovává ze zničujících požárů.*) Sports and health dominated in the first twenty examples found in the Czech articles in the *Lidové Noviny*. The wife of The President of the KDU-ČSL, died of a hidden birth defect in her heart, one article revealed, and the

oldest living patient to have received a heart transplant finally died, another Czech article announced.

What can we conclude from these examples? A mere hundred sources were consulted across languages. Certainly, it would be unwise to draw hasty conclusions as to the different ways the heart is conceived in these four languages and cultures from such a small number of examples. Nevertheless, these articles clearly demonstrate that the heart is very much a part of everyday usage in all four languages, and that the heart is complex and multi-faceted. The heart functions in different ways. It appears in both lexicalized expressions, couched in conventional narratives concerning relations, feelings, enthusiasm, shared experience, and spiritual traditions. But it can be reactivated and harnessed in innovative creative expression. The heart exists in the worldviews of these ligua-cultures, but it exists in various forms and ways.

Is the Heart a Universal?

The answer to this question would appear to be negative. Working with the Natural Semantics Method that he helped develop with Anna Wierzbicka, Cliff Goddard (2001) points out that in Malay, the thinking-feeling faculty, which includes the moral sense, is attributed to the *hati,* the organ of the liver. This is interesting because it indicates the way cultures understand bodies, and it reinforces the idea of a relationship between the body and the emotions. It takes into account the relations between the organ, and the feelings of the body as a whole. But as Goddard stresses, in Malay, those feelings, and our feelings for others in intimate and moral dealings, cannot be fully understood using the English concept of the heart. As Goddard puts it:

> Though the nearest English gloss for *hati* is 'heart' (in its emotional-moral sense) the two words are not semantically identical, if only because the Malay *hati* is significantly more active, and more cognitive, than the English *heart.* A more revealing, but still inadequate, gloss for *hati* would be 'the sensitive part of a person'. *Hati* has a high frequency in any discourse about human interaction – partly on account of its participation in dozens (if not scores) of fixed expressions concerning attitudes, moods, and personal traits, e.g. *susah hati* 'troubled, worried', *hati keras* 'deter-mined', *rendah hati* 'humble, modest', partly because the *hati* is the locus for feelings (especially feelings about other people), and partly because emotional reactions are often presented in terms of the *hati* 'speaking'. As one might expect, the word occurs frequently in traditional sayings and poems, and in popular song titles. It is no exaggeration to say that one cannot approach an understanding of Malay attitudes about human nature and about social life without understanding this quintessentially Malay concept. (Goddard 2001)

Goddard goes on to explicate 'the semantics of five common fixed expressions involving *hati,* all of which designate what we might term feeling-states or emotional reactions'. These include:

- *susah hati* 'troubled, worried',
- *senang hati* 'relaxed, easy at heart',
- *sakit hati* 'annoyed, offended',
- *puas hati* 'satisfied (with someone)',
- *kecil hati* 'feel hurt' (Goddard 2001).

What Goddard's paper eloquently demonstrates is two important points:

1. That the faculty of understanding and feeling is linked not only to the mind and the body, but also to the moral sense that is part of that capacity for feeling and understanding considered to be essentially 'human' in Malay. In this sense, the idea (advanced by Naugle 2002) of a universal capacity or faculty is not brought into question by Goddard's findings.
2. Neither is the second essential point: the fact that we seem to need to anchor moral, emotional or conceptual impressions in bodily experience. We seem to need to locate within the body a seat of emotions, a place in which to situate ideas, feelings, and emotions related to interacting with others in a moral or emotional way.

In my own videos, the body language of speakers proves fascinating. Gesticulation often appears not so much demonstrative as spontaneously compulsive. One Russian placed her hand on her heart when she spoke about it (сердце, *serdce*). In contrasting *heart* (*cœur* in French) with *soul* (душа, in Russian), she indicated душа as transcending the body, and belonging to, or opening up, another dimension.

Is the Heart a Complex Concept?

The heart would certainly appear to be a complex concept, judging from the findings drawn over the past two years from comparing and contrasting the way the *heart* in English, *coeur* in French, *Herz* in German, and *srdce* in Czech, are used. Interviews, lexical and corpus research, and textual analysis, and much debate and discussions with colleagues and students in classes and conferences and conversations with individuals from all walks of life throughout a number of European cities, have made it possible to formulate the following complex conceptual paradigm which breaks down into five facets or functions:

1. the heart as the vital organ, maintaining the body, and whose failure means death,
2. the sensitive heart that feels, the faculty that makes us 'human' or 'humane' in a variety of folk tales opposing men and demons, and men and animals,
3. the heart with its desires, dreams, lusts and pleasures,

4. the heart that can move, and combine with other hearts, the heart that can offer itself, attach itself, withdraw itself, but also win and keep the hearts of others, just as it can spurn or abandon them,
5. the heart as the second self, the inner self, or the true nature, the heart of the intuition that speaks to 'us': linked to the intellectual soul. Often this second self knows us better than we know ourselves. It can advise us. This heart of hearts reminds us that our overpowering desires are often only transient drives or fantasies, better resisted. Who speaks to us of this knowing heart? Political leaders, priests, and poets, but all too often also advertisers promoting health-care, yoga or holidays in spas and wellness centres.

As the examples below confirm, this five-facet paradigm proved valid for all four linguistic traditions, although of course, the individual narratives changed from language to language and from sector to sector in each society.

Organ	**Heart**	
	cœur	heart
	Herz	Heart
	srdce	heart
The Feeling Heart	**heartfelt**	
	de bon cœur	With a good/warm heart
	Aber ich fand den Film einfach herzzerreißend,	But I really found that film heart-rending
	Srdečne Vás vítame	Heartily, we greet you
The Desiring heart	**My heart longs for**	
	O mon Sauveur , mon cœur languit d'amour	Oh my Saviour, my heart longs for you lovingly.
	Ich geb mein Herz für dich	I (would) give my heart to/for you.
	Čekám tu na tebe, srdce mám na dlani, (Jakub Smolník)	Here I wait for you, my heart in the palm of my hand,
The Loving heart	**True heart**	
	Cœur fidèle	Faithful heart
	treues Herz / sein Herz schenken Herzchen	True heart To give your heart Little heart
	Hoj, má panenko, co děláš? / A zdalipak mě ještě znáš, / aneb jiného v srdci máš? Karel Erben, *Svatební košile* www.cist.cz/Poezie/Kytice/kosile.htm	Hi, my little doll, what are you doing? And do you still remember (know) me, Or do you have another in your heart? (Karel Erben, leading Czech Romantic poet, 1811–1870)

The Knowing Heart	My Heart Knows (*Christ Family,* Southern Gospel Music, YouTube)	
	Écoute ton cœur (TOP 10 des citations)	Listen to your heart
	Folge deinem Herzen	Follow your heart
	Poslouchej své srdce	Listen to your heart

The quotes chosen should illustrate some of the main spheres of life in which the heart proves to be a major actor. Often the heart animates religious prayer and songs, as we can see in the French references to our Saviour and to American gospel music; all four linguistic communities could provide broadly similar examples. In poetry, the heart longs for the absent lover, and the Czech example is a classic of the Czech revival romantic period in which Erben writes in a folk mode of the heart that longs for the soldier who returns as a ghost to escort his bride to his grave so the two lovers can become one in death.

Germans and Czechs both use diminutive forms for the 'little heart' (*Herzchen* and *srdéčko,* respectively). This is less the case of English and French. But it is interesting that the Czech reference found referred to a Czech translation of a French novel "Srdéčko" by Jean Violis, translated by Beatrice Bresková and published in 1920. A Czech film was also found with the title, 'Little Golden Heart' ("Zlaté srdéčko"), but this belonged to the period prior to the First Republic, coming out in 1916 in Prague that was then a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Wencke Myhre, famous for singing the German song, "Dein Herz, Mein Herz", is still going strong. Many youtube versions were found, one as recent as 2017, although the song first came out in the 1970s. Interestingly, Myhre is not German: she was born in Norway in 1947, but she is undeniably part of German popular culture, almost as much as ABBA are a part of English pop music. These examples prove one essential point: media is always on the move. Although grammar and languages may appropriate resources in different ways, each linguistic community shares a porous culture that endlessly exports and imports, consumes and shares the cultural works of other linguistic communities. Here we are dealing more with a single shared market place, or an open imagination, than with 'cross-cultural exchanges'.

In the same way, in his "Les Caractères", La Bruyère (1645–1696), imports into the French culture, the thoughts of Aristotle's student Theophrastus (c. 371–288). And the great French philosopher who scrutinized self-love (*amour-propre*), La Rochefoucauld (1613–1680), likewise exports his conception of the human heart that is perpetually generating competing passions in which one is supplanted only to be replaced by another, to various other European traditions, the English one included:

> Il ne faut pas juger des hommes comme d'un tableau ou d'une figure, sur une seule et première vue: il y a un intérieur et un coeur qu'il faut approfondir. Il y a dans

> le coeur humain une génération perpétuelle de passions, en sorte que la ruine de l'une est presque toujours l'établissement d'une autre. (La Rochefoucauld, *Maximes*[1])

You should not judge men as we judge a picture or a figure, on first sight: there is an inner self, and a heart you must reach into. In the human heart, the passions endlessly generate passions, which means that as one is exhausted, another almost always sets itself up in its stead. (my translation)

Is the Heart Difficult to Translate?

In fact, the word *heart* proves surprisingly easy to translate. Despite the complexity of the concept and its polysemy, the word translates easily in Bible translations, in literature, and in films, pop songs, and advertising. Even metaphors such as *hard-hearted* or *heart of stone* prove easy to translate. This is not true of its extensions: grammar and lexis do challenge translation, but as a keyword, the *heart* is easily transposed from one European language to another. This point can easily be established by comparing the various quotations in either the New or Old Testaments in the four languages of this study. Pop songs, novels, and films equally seem to encounter little or no difficulty in opting for a word for word translation for *heart*, *cœur*, *Herz*, or *srdce*. Given all that is usually lost in translation, this situation is somewhat perplexing.

Is the Heart an Essential Part of our Traditions?

The heart is a fundamental concern for God, mankind, and individual believers from the beginning of Genesis. Already in the eighth book of Genesis, God speaks to himself in his heart, and concludes that the heart of man is bad, from the beginning. The very desires of his heart, or rather, the inclinations of his imagination make his heart bad. Later, different biblical narratives tend to indicate that the heart is held to be something good, and something precious. This can be seen, for example, when God promises to take our hearts of stone and replace them with a heart of flesh, a heart to feel with (Ezekiel, 36:26).

Writings in all the four linguistic traditions show a prolific series of narratives involving the heart. Our novels and romances, our films, and, of course, our songs, would be unthinkable without stories of the heart. These stories do, however, include heartless people as much as they involve the desires of the heart. The false of heart are as present as the true of heart. And stories of the heart often involve negotiations over feelings and relationships. Temporal distinctions are also important:

---

1 François duc de La Rochefoucauld, "Reflections; or Sentences and Moral Maxims", http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/9105; 19.02.2020.

the heart is something that is lost, something that belongs to the past, something that is searched for in future encounters, or dreamed of in imaginary scenarios. Fiction, of course, fulfils this very function of inventing stories of the heart for the imagination in order to pull at our heartstrings.

Is the Heart a Shared European Value?

Judging from the findings drawn from novels, films, shared cultural texts, in advertising, and everyday discussion – and above all judging from the enormous online resources available on the major electronic corpora (COCA, BNC, Leipzig Wortschatz) – there seems little room for doubt that European cultures share a common concept of the heart. The following phrases will find equivalents in all four languages studied:

- But she was older now, with wisdom of how *false* a man's *heart* could truly be. (COCA)
- My *heart sank* into my boots like Granny's lumpy porridge as we made our way to Grindlewood for a day's dusting and polishing. ("Dandelion Days" by Bette Howell, 1991, in BNC)
- Mon cœur se fend quand je vois ça. (www.amnestyinternational.be, 2011, in Leipzig Wortschatz)
  - My heart breaks when I see that.
- Ich finde Deine Postings haben Herz. (Leipzig Wortschatz, 2011)
  - I find your posts have heart / are full of heart.
- Čekalo, čekalo srdce naše s radostí na návrat Váš.
  - Our heart waited, waited joyfully for your return.

Judging from my electronic corpus findings, I believe, the English examples would be just as easy to translate into French, German, or Czech, as the foreign examples are easy to translate into English. We should be careful not to overstep the mark, however. Our findings enable us to postulate that European languages may have a shared tradition involving a complex concept of the heart bound up in many intertwining narratives. But as my discussions with Goddard and other linguists working on the Aborignal languages of Australia demonstrate, we are dealing with the coinciding narratives of a European tradition, and not a universal concept. Nothing seems to contradict Wierzbicka's findings that *heart* is cultural. Heart does not belong among the universals.

Who's Afraid of the Heart?

There seems to be a general trend that emerges at the end of the 19th century to avoid the heart. The concept is just as fundamental for the 18th century Scottish moralist and economist, Adam Smith (1723–1790), as it is for the German founder of marxism, Karl Marx (1818–1883), in the 19th century. And at the turn of the

20th century, the American pragmatist philosopher, William James (1842–1910), still finds this keyword to be indispensable. Maupassant uses *le cœur* in French at the end of the 19th century, just as much as the English Romantics use *heart* at the beginning of the 19th century, and they use the concept in much the same way.

But as the social sciences – and especially economics and psychology – take on objectivist turn, 'heart' will tend to be avoided or even discarded. In English, the Google ngram viewer for English records roughly half as many uses of the term in 2000 compared with 1860: *hearty*, and *heartily* decrease sevenfold and eightfold respectively over the same period. And although *heartfelt* increased twofold from 1980 to 2000, the long-term trend certainly indicates a decline in usage. So, not only is the *heart* as a keyword in decline, its associated forms are also used less and less frequently.

Is the Heart Used in Work and Business Today?

The answer to this is paradoxical and appears not altogether innocent. In my study of the Factiva resources, very few references to the heart were found, and those that were found invariably referred to the centre, 'the heart of the city'. Comparisons of American, English, and Scottish English, using the BNC, COCA, online newspapers, and search engines, have not, as yet produced any substantial use of heart or affective discourse. The heart is however used in two forms of language associated with business. In advertising, and in the literature of management guides, the heart is frequently used. Appeals to emotional responses are commonplace. This seems to underline the fact that managers and businessmen must know about the heart and how to manipulate it. Such uses do not, however, indicate a humane or warm-hearted approach. Such writings tend to envisage an isolated individual working as an active force upon others, putting into practice supposedly scientifically proven means and methods of 'handling' the emotions of others. Such language takes us far from the heart to heart and into the 'management' of emotions. The following example is characteristic of this usage:

> **Motivation in the Workplace: Nurture, Praise**
> *By Roberta Matuson*
> How often do you ask yourself, "How do I get employees to do more than I'm asking?" The key ingredient to employee recognition is sincerity. Always speak from you heart when recognizing an employee's efforts and contribution.[2]

The moral-immoral dilemma has clearly been discarded here in favour of more modern pragmatic oppositions: efficient-inefficient, practical-impractical. The heart is a means to an end not an end in itself.

2 https://hiring.monster.com/hr/hr-best-practices/small-business/employee-motivation/motivation-in-the-workplace.aspx; 19.02.2020.

Aside from the general appeal to the overall good of the company, society, and nature, and beyond the celebration of teamwork as a means to an end, these discourses indicate no sincere interest in emotional sharing. The question is how to manipulate emotions in handling human resources. The heart is taken into account when creating needs in marketing and publicity, and when it becomes necessary to enter into the imagination of clients. Designing targets to increase the company's market share prompts marketing agents to speak of the heart. This is clearly flouting the Kantian moral principle that the human must always by an end and never a means.

Nevertheless, this has become such a widespread dogma of marketing and management that it appears to be neutral, scientific, efficient, and self-evident. Consequently, there is often a stark contrast between the end of year reports and the Mission Statements of companies like Starbucks, that adopt modern marketing and management principles on the one hand, but who wish to emotionally 'bond' with clients on the other, when they claim they aim to 'inspire and nurture the human spirit – one person, one cup and one neighborhood at a time.'

Starbucks' Mission Statement is worth quoting in full, not because it is particularly remarkable, but because it skilfully demonstrates the kind of 'pseudo-intimate' discourse that has become widespread in promoting a company's image. Starbucks Values:

> With our partners, our coffee and our customers at our core, we live these values:
> - Creating a culture of warmth and belonging, where everyone is welcome.
> - Acting with courage, challenging the status quo and finding new ways to grow our company and each other.
> - Being present, connecting with transparency, dignity and respect.
> - Delivering our very best in all we do, holding ourselves accountable for results.
>
> We are performance driven, through the lens of humanity.[3]

Starbucks is certainly a human endeavour; but whether it is a humane or humanitarian endeavour, is a question that would be better answered by its workers and its producers, rather than its management and its marketing department.

Is the Heart a Useful Paradigm for Media Studies, Cultural Theory and Ethnolinguistics?

In answering this question we come to the conclusion of this discussion of the importance of heart for cultures, languages and individuals. The way the heart was evoked in various discourses in the four languages studied was complex, compelling, and often contradictory. The heart is clearly a core concept in our European traditions. Despite the misgivings of the social sciences, many people appear to believe that

3 Starbucks' Mission Statement [https://www.starbucks.com/about-us/company-information/mission-statement; 16.01.2020].

the heart is not an outdated religious notion, as psychology and economics tend to treat it. In my video interviews – and I interviewed people from widely different walks of life, from barmaids to businessmen, from linguists to insurance agents, from teachers to builders – most of the people interviewed asserted that the heart was central, fundamental [see: Underhill (2017) and Underhill (2018), and the two conferences Translating Hearts and Homelands (2018) and Translating Hearts & Parts (2019)]. One young Australian lady suggested that the heart is 'Friends, family, everything!' (Underhill 2017). Young managers starting businesses in the FrenchTech centre in Petit Quévilly, near Rouen, Innopolis, claimed, you can't treat a company as a charity or NGO, but you can't run a company, without a heart: all human endeavours involve the heart, and have to take it into account as a vital factor, they agreed, when they were interviewed in small groups.

Initially – and somewhat naïvely – these interviews were intended for online publication. However, the volume of the interviews made this difficult for obvious reasons. Moreover, since interviewing speakers inevitably depended upon my presence in the linguistic community, it proved impossible to generate equivalent control study groups. Czech and German interviews were les numerous than English ones, while a much wider range of French students and workers of various ages were interviewed. Speakers of Russian, Polish, Slovak, Korean, and Chinese were also interviewed, but those interviews were smaller in number and served only to generate overall impressions and suggest what working hypotheses might be investigated in further studies by the appropriate specialists of such languages. In contradistinction to questionnaires, which tend to channel responses along preconceived lines, spontaneous interviews leave speakers at liberty to express themselves freely; and they often take us to unpredictable destinations. This, ultimately, is what makes them interesting, but the dangers of drawing direct conclusions from such material should not be underestimated. Like all textual study and corpus-based results, video interviews provide insights and impressions that are best verified in further more painstaking linguistic study.

It has not been possible, in an article of this length, to compare and contrast the fascinating differences between *cœur* in French, and *heart* in English, or between *Herz* in German and *srdce* in Czech. Differences do exist, and they are intriguing. They involve literary and cultural traditions, and they involve grammar; the way we put words together, and the way phrases become central focal points for cultures, keywords. The narratives of the heart would take us on intriguing political and poetical escapades. But we have no space to embark on those adventures here. What I have tried to stress, is ultimately something fairly simple: that in cultural communication in the global world of interacting, interpenetrating cultures, the heart is a good place to start.

If this is true, then truthful, heartfelt analysis of media, discourse, literary works, and artistic and literary creations should not only prove interesting and worthwhile, it should also be considered to be of crucial central importance for explaining how we live together. Is there a place of sincerity and hearty heartfelt communication? Among people and between cultures in the spaces we share in local and global

communication and in the relations we engage in at a personal to an interpersonal level, in monolingual and multicultural encounters? Let's hope so.

Bibliography

Angelelli C.V. (2004). Medical Interpreting and Cross-Cultural Communication. Cambridge.
Baker M., Saldanha G. (ed.). (2011). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. New York.
Goddard C. (2001). *Hati*: A key word in the Malay vocabulary of emotion. In: J. Harkins, A. Wierzbicka (eds.). Emotions in Cross-Linguistic Perspective (p. 167–195). Berlin.
Goddard C. (2008). Contrastive semantics and cultural psychology: English heart vs. Malay *hati*. In: F. Sharifian, R. Dirven, N. Yu, S. Niemeier (eds.). Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs Across Cultures and Languages. (Applications of Cognitive Linguistics 7). (p. 75–102). Berlin.
Harkins J., Wierzbicka A. (2001). Emotions in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Berlin.
James W. The Variety of Religious Experience (1901–1902); http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/621.
Lewis R.D. (1999). Cross-Cultural Communication: A Visual Approach. Riversdown, UK.
Long P., Wall, T. (2014). Media Studies, Texts, Production, Context. Second edition. London.
Maude B. (2011). Managing Cross-Cultural Communication, Principles and Practice. New York.
Naugle D. (2002). Worldview: The History of a Concept. Michigan.
Smith A. (1759). The Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759): Part VI: Of the Character of Virtue Consisting of Three Sections, https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/smith-adam/works/moral/part06/part6a.htm.
Thornham S., Bassett C., Marris P. (2009). Media Studies: A Reader. Third edition. New York.
Venuti L. (2004). Translation Studies Reader. London.
Wierzbicka A. (1996). Semantics: Primes and Universals. Oxford.
Wierzbicka A. (1997). Understanding Cultures through their Keywords. Oxford.

Corpora

BNC, https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/
COCA, https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/
Faactiva, https://www.dowjones.com/products/factiva/
Frantext, http://www.frantext.fr
Leipzig Wortschatz, http://corpora.uni-leipzig.de
My Personal Corpora (British English: 3 million words, American English: 3 million words)
Newspapers
Le Monde, https://www.lemonde.fr
Lidové Noviny, https://www.lidovky.cz
The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/uk
The Herald, Glasgow, https://www.heraldscotland.com

The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com
The Sunday Herald, http://www.heraldscotland.com/

Webography

de la Bruyère J. The Characters [http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/46633].
de la Rochefoucauld, *Réflections: Sentences ou maximes morales* [http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/14913; 19.02.2020].
de la Rochefoucauld, *Reflections: Sentences or Moral Maxims* [http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/9105; 19.02.2020].
Europa Website, English version [https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en; French version: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_fr; 19.02.2020].
Google ngram viewer [https://books.google.com/ngrams; 19.02.2020].
Matuson R., Motivation in the Workplace: Nurture, Praise [https://hiring.monster.com/hr/hr-best-practices/small-business/employee-motivation/motivation-in-the-workplace.aspx; 19.02.2020].
Starbucks website [https://www.starbucks.com/about-us/company-information/mission-statement; 16.01.2020]
Translating Hearts & Homelands, Canberra, Rouen, Paris (2018) [https://webtv.univ-rouen.fr/channels/#2018-homelands-and-heartlands-penser-et-traduire-le-coeur-de-notre-chez-soi; 19.02.2020].
Translating Hearts & Parts, Rouen, Paris, Belfast, Prague (2019) [https://webtv.univ-rouen.fr/channels/#2019-translating-hearts-parts; 19.02.2020].
Underhill J.W. (2017). Do Paradoxes have a Place in Worldviews? Conceptual Configurations of *heart* and their Contradictions in English and Other Languages [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Dv6Q-bKN1Y; 19.02.2020].
Underhill J.W. (2018). Commenter le coeur: les entretiens multiligues filmés. Une nouvelle ressource pour l'ethnolinguistique, Lublin [https://webtv.univ-rouen.fr/videos/06-06-2018-092052-partie-5/; 19.02.2020].

STRESZCZENIE

Nauka o mediach, komunikacja międzykulturowa i serce. Wyrażanie troski i dzielnie się uczuciami w języku francuskim, angielskim, czeskim i niemieckim

Artykuł ma na celu ustalenie, w jakim stopniu myślimy sercem i wyrażamy siebie za pomocą serca w różnych językach europejskich. Szeroko zakrojony materiał badawczy obejmuje m.in. zasoby elektroniczne, internetowe, teksty literackie i artykuły w gazetach, a także wywiady ze studentami, specjalistami i naukowcami, pozwalające zweryfikować hipotezę roboczą, że sposób naszej komunikacji jest związany z sercem i wyrazami płynącymi prosto z serca. Oprócz perspektywy medioznawczej oraz kulturoznawczej, tytułowe pojęcie jest

analizowane w czterojęzycznym międzykulturowym studium obejmującym teksty w języku angielskim, francuskim, czeskim i niemieckim. Według tego, jak Anna Wierzbicka i Cliff Goddard definiują uniwersalia, *serce* może nie jest „uniwersalne". Niemniej jednak różne słowa używane w języku francuskim, czeskim i niemieckim na określenie tego, co Anglicy i osoby anglojęzyczne nazywają *sercem*, potwierdzają hipotezę, że *serce* pozostaje podstawową wartością w myśli europejskiej, z żywą tradycją we wszystkich czterech badanych językach. Zamiast zanikać, jako anachroniczne przedmodernistyczne pojęcie, *serce* nadal bije w różnych dziedzinach współczesnego życia w czterech badanych kulturach językowych, co widać w materiale źródłowym obejmującym zarówno teksty literackie, poradniki, artykuły prasowe, zapisy seminariów i fragmenty zaczerpnięte z komunikacji biznesowej i dyskursu marketingowego.

Słowa kluczowe: nauka o mediach, komunikacja międzykulturowa, etnolingwistyka, *heart*, *coeur*, *Herz*, *srdce*