Parliamentary Discourses across Cultures:
Interdisciplinary Approaches

Edited by

Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu

in collaboration with Melania Roibu
and Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LILIANA IONESCU-RUXANDOIU

1. Preliminary Remarks

This volume includes a selection of papers presented at the International Conference on the parliamentary discourse held in Bucharest, on September 23-24, 2011. The conference was organized in connection with a research project in progress at that time at the Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, sponsored by the National Council for Scientific Research in the Higher Education System (Rom. CNCSIS).

The topic of the volume is in accordance with the growing interest of different specialists in the problems of the political discourse, in general, and of the parliamentary discourse, as one of its major sub-genres, in particular. The authors of the papers are concerned with exploring various issues, traditions and discourse styles in different national parliaments inside and outside Europe, as well as in the European Parliament.

The analyses regard not only the situation of some countries with old and solid parliamentary traditions, like Great Britain, but also the situation of some former communist countries, where parliaments were created quite late, in the second half of the nineteenth century, ceased to fulfil their normal functions after the Second World War, and were re-created after the political events of 1989.

Our main goal is to offer a deeper understanding of the diversity of parliamentary practices across space and time. The papers aim at highlighting the particular roles played by local social and historical factors, ideologies, collective mentalities, and social psychology in building up culture-specific traditions of political institutions.

At the same time, the role of certain institutional factors, like, for example, constitutional frameworks, functions of parliaments within different political systems or representativity (Bayley 2004, 6), is taken into account.

The papers examine a great variety of topics. Some of them deal with the implementation and the functioning of a system of rules or of particular strategic practices in the activity of different parliaments. Others

explore the substance of the parliamentary debates, looking for a contextual, ideological or personal motivation of certain largely manifested attitudes towards important issues of the moment, such as anti-Semitism, nationalism or discrimination against sexual minorities. The way the members of parliament (MPs) construe a generic identity for themselves, as well as their distinctive self-images are also discussed in the volume.

Most of the papers tackle specific aspects of the discourse organization proper, at both macro- and micro-structural levels, basic pragma-rhetorical strategies and techniques used by the speakers, as well as some main issues connected with argumentation.

Even if parliamentary debate is the main object of analysis, other forms of parliamentary activity (such as the political statement) are also investigated. Moreover, the communicative behaviour of some prominent MPs during the parliamentary sessions is compared with their behaviour as guests in different TV political debates.

Having quite different scholarly backgrounds, the authors approach all these topics from a large variety of theoretical perspectives. Their investigations are based on flexible, interdisciplinary, and multi-layered methodologies, able to offer an image of the multifaceted manifestations of the parliamentary debates. Accordingly, one can get a more comprehensive and realistic image of the object under investigation.

2. Remarks on Some Previous Researches in the Field

Parliamentary discourse has become an area of interest for the researchers quite recently. It started being investigated by historians, political scientists and linguists from different perspectives, involving specific aims, as well as a diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches.

Historians are interested in grasping the differences and changes in the meaning of some basic political and social concepts and in connecting them with specific temporal, spatial and ideological contexts.

Political scientists focus on the way the MPs' institutional identity, but also their party affiliation, connected with a particular ideology, influence their discourse. This involves explaining why the same major events can be divergently commented on and interpreted by different political actors.

Linguists take into account some extra-discursive parameters too, but their aim is to describe and analyse parliamentary speeches as a "form of talk" (Goffman 1981), by identifying its specific structural features and strategies.

Nevertheless, the progress of research in each of these fields brought forward the necessity of an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary collaboration, given the complexity of the object under analysis.

One can notice some facts. For example, the linguists' growing interest in the study of parliamentary discourse is closely connected with the development of pragmatics and discourse analysis, domains that are by definition open to interdisciplinarity.

At the same time, some general philosophical ideas are valorised in different fields, grounding similar, though specific approaches. For example, L. Wittgenstein's opinion that language is constitutive for the world lies at the basis of both contextualism, a modern orientation in the study of history, and critical discourse analysis (CDA), a variant of discourse analysis (DA) frequently used in social sciences.

We also add the fact that different disciplines can share a certain object of interest regarding parliamentary discourse. For example, argumentation focuses the attention of linguists, but also of political scientists, the exchange of their results being mutually beneficial.

It is not our intention to present an overview of the previous studies on parliamentary discourse. We content ourselves with mentioning several contributions in the field of linguistics that can be considered significant for the present-day configuration of the research interests. One of the pioneering works belongs to Teresa Carbo (1996), author of the two volume study *El discurso parlamentario mexicano entre 1920 y 1950 (Un estudio de caso en metodologia de andlisis de discurso).* It is relevant for having opened some directions of analysis, namely: the analysis of the discourse in a *national* parliament; the *diachronic* view on this discourse; the application of a particular *methodology {discourse analysis)* involving, among other aspects, the investigation of the interactional dimension of a discourse usually approached as monologic.

The volume edited by Paul Bayley (2004), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse,* is certainly one of the most influential works devoted to this discursive form. As intended by the editor, the nine papers in the volume provide possible topics and methodological models (Bayley 2004, 7) for the analysis of various aspects of parliamentary debates. Even if all the papers reflect the general theoretical perspective of functional linguistics, there is a remarkable diversity of methodological frameworks: beside the systemic functional linguistics proper, CDA and corpus linguistics are also used. The volume attempts to balance the aim of verifying the applicability of different approaches situated within the functionalist paradigm and that of testing the limits of the explanatory power of these approaches *{ibidem,* 6).

As mentioned in the title, another innovation of the volume is the cross-cultural perspective most of the papers adopt when analysing a certain subject. Particular aspects of the debates held in the British Parliament-as a constant term-are compared with the corresponding aspects from other national European parliaments in the idea of determining the extra-linguistic parameters influencing the discursive variability.

The most recent volume, *European Parliaments under Scrutiny,* edited by Cornelia Hie (2010), mirrors the current state and trends in the research of parliamentary discourse. The first remark concerns the diversity of theoretical models and analytical tools used by the authors. The largely acknowledged topics and procedures of the DA are complemented with relevant elements provided by modern rhetoric and argumentation theory. One can also notice the interest in different sub-genres of parliamentary discourse: besides the regular debates, some sub-genres reflecting the government control function of the parliament, such as the oral interpellations to the government or the presentation of the new government, are taken into account. As for the empirical data, they cover not only the traditional parliaments in Western Europe, but also the newly created parliaments in the post-communist Central- and East-European countries, as well as the European Parliament.

It is also worth mentioning some special issues of different journals, devoted to the analysis of parliamentary language and discourse. We have in view mainly *Journal of Language and Politics* 2003, 2 (1), opened by P. Chilton's substantial preface, and *Journal of Pragmatics* 2010, 42 (4), an issue edited and prefaced by Cornelia Hie, entitled "Pragmatic Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse". *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 2010, LV (4), can be also added. Under the title "The Romanian Parliamentary Discourse: Tradition and Modernity. A Pragma-Rhetorical Approach", it includes some results of the Romanian research project which is illustrated in this volume too.

A final remark concerns the fact that, starting with some remarks about parliamentary questions (Crystal 1995), *Parliamentary discourse* has nowadays become a special lemma in the linguistic encyclopedias (see, for example, Hie 2006).

3. The Theoretical and Methodological Framework of our Approach. Some Specific Aspects

The original contribution of this volume is that it brings together, in an attempt of a mutual accommodation, three main directions of examining parliamentary discourse, coming from different scientific areas. One, originating in sociology, is based on approaching parliament as a community of practice. The other one, coming from modern historiography, will be genetically called contextualism, even if usually one differentiates between the conceptualism of the German School and the contextualism proper of the so-called Cambridge School. The third research direction has in view the discourse *per se,* as a linguistic achievement, and involves adopting the pragma-rhetorical perspective in its analysis.

Each of these directions will be presented in the following.

3.1. Parliament as a Community of Practice

Usually, parliamentary debate is defined as a discursive form, whose distinctive features are closely connected with the specific institutional frame within which communicative interaction takes place.

According to P. Drew and J. Heritage (1992, 3-5), institutional interaction has some characteristics:

- it is task-related and goal-oriented in institutionally relevant ways;
- it represents the central medium through which the working activities of institutional agents are conducted in designated settings;
- participants make their institutional identities relevant to the activities performed;
- participants' conduct is shaped and constrained by their institutional orientation;
- the interaction determines some patterns of meanings, reference and action.

Even if this way of approaching institutional interaction captures some basic properties of the communication in an official context, it does not provide a convincing image of its dynamic character. The participants in interaction are given the rather passive role of complying with a system of institutional rules and constraints, not of direct involvement in construing it in accordance with their specific tasks and goals.

Understanding parliament as a *community of practice* seems to compensate for this shortcoming. The concept of community of practice represents a social construct enabling the researcher to explore the mutual relationship between the institutional practices and the individuals involved in these practices (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992, 464).

Introduced by J. Lave and E. Wenger (1991), the concept was largely used by P. Eckert and S. McConnell-Ginet (1992, 1998, 2007) in gender studies, and also invoked in connection with the analysis of

politeness/impoliteness phenomena (Bousfield 2008, Mills 2009). Referring to politeness in the adversarial political discourse, S. Harris (2001) approached the House of Commons in the British Parliament as a community of practice and convincingly proved the efficiency of this approach of the parliamentary debates.

As Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992,464) put it:

"A community of practice is an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor".

The basic difference between this concept and the traditional concept of community lays in assigning relevance not only to the membership, but also to the common activity in which a group of people is engaged. Accordingly, the legitimacy of membership appears as different. Traditionally, communities are conceived rather as taxonomic entities, distinguished by some observable features, such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc. Their members are assigned the passive role of recognizing their group affiliation. Instead, the community of practice is a more dynamic configuration, with an internal legitimacy given by its members' involvement in a certain endeavour.

Becoming a member of a community of practice raises the question of being selected (that is accepted) by other people on the basis of some individual qualities and/or skills. In the case of professional communities, the selection is made by a limited group of experts in the field, on the basis of a set of well-defined criteria (see job interviews). In the case of the parliament, selection means elections, that is the vote of all citizens, who have in view a great diversity of criteria, some of which of a subjective nature (such as being a charismatic or a good looking person).

The full membership in a community of practice involves a complex process of situated learning, enabling a person to gradually overstep the bounds of his/her initial condition of legitimate peripheral participant. Considering the particular case of the parliament, becoming an MP involves a major change in a person's previous professional and institutional affiliation. This means committing to new tasks and goals, learning a specific repertoire of negotiable resources and working on the individual and group images, in order to comply with the general expectations both of the other MPs and the voters (see Harris 2001, 453-454).

Unlike the other communities of practice, for the parliament, discourse is not only one of the necessary conditions to perform a specific activity, but a constitutive aspect of this activity. Learning the rules and the sets of discourse practices that are recognized as appropriate in a certain

parliament, at a certain time, is crucial for a new MP (Mills 2009, 1057-1058).

This patterned communicative behaviour of the MPs represents the background against which they identify themselves and are identified by the others as legitimate members of that community of practice. At the same time, following those patterns, MPs create a necessary interpretive framework. It allows the audience to identify the marks of spontaneity and originality in a certain speech and to assign them a certain meaning, as well as to distinguish between acceptable and non-acceptable aspects.

Within every community of practice, parliament included, the adequacy norms change in time, being continuously revised and co-constructed (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2007, *apud* Mills 2009, 1058-1059), as a result of the mutual influence between the individual, the group and the cultural practices active at a certain moment in a given society.

3.2. Contextualism

Parliamentary discourses are analysed in this volume in a synchronic, as well as in a diachronic perspective. The authors tried to exploit some modern views about writing history, widely open towards interdisciplinarity. Two main directions are particularly taken into account: the conceptualism of R. Koselleck's German School *(Begriffsgeschichte)* and the contextualism of the so-called Cambridge School, in the quite different versions presented by J.G.A. Pocock and Q. Skinner. The foundations of the scholarly thinking of the above-mentioned authors, as well as their basic theoretical and methodological way of approaching history were thoroughly analysed by Iain Hampsher-Monk (1998).

What connects the representatives of both these schools is the general idea of approaching history through the study of the basic concepts recurrently used in a certain epoch and place, i.e. through the study of then-linguistic expression and mainly of their specific meanings. This involves a careful reading of the texts produced by different political actors, in order to identify the linguistic means of expressing those concepts and, most of all, their specific meanings.

Accordingly, both conceptualism and contextualism could not avoid taking into account some major achievements of modern linguistics. Conceptualists adopt methods derived not only from traditional philological analysis of texts and hermeneutics, but also from linguistic semantics (semasiology, onomasiology, theory of semantic fields). R. Koselleck makes reference to F. de Saussure's well known dichotomy synchrony/diachrony. In his opinion, the link between synchronic events

and diachronic structures is analogous to that between "spoken speech", viewed synchronically, and "the diachronically pregiven language" (Koselleck 2002, 30).

Besides this dichotomy, in J.G.A. Pocock's writings, a special attention is given to another Saussurean dichotomy: language/speech *{languelparole)*. The author is mainly interested in the uses of language, that is in the discursive actualization of the system units. The meanings of these units, even if basically similar, are more or less variable from one discourse to another. These differences enable Pocock to delimit what he calls "paradigms" or "discourses", which sometimes occur within the same text.

The speech act theory-a major product of the modern philosophy of ordinary language-has an important place in Q. Skinner's studies. Approaching language through its capacity not of describing some state of affairs, but of affecting the world, Skinner tries to identify the discursive marks of the fight between the conventional and the innovative, conflictual or subversive uses of language at both the semantic and the communicative practice levels (Hampsher-Monk 1998, 42-44).

The scholarly differences in their theoretical background and traditions concerning the ways of approaching both language and history, as well as the differences in the political practices in Germany (before and after the unification) and the United Kingdom, resulted in different views of the above-mentioned authors concerning the relationship between the concepts and the realities they encode and express.

R. Koselleck (2002, 24) assigns a mediation function to language. Language enables people to act, understand, interpret, change and re-form societies *{ibidem,* 25). The history of concepts is a means to check the linguistically stored experience of a given society *{ibidem,* 37).

Concepts crystallize and store specific historical experiences (Richter 1990, 65-66) in a linguistic form. To express a concept, a word should encapsulate meanings from different technical languages in use in a certain epoch. Besides the "long in use" concepts, whose meaningful core has basically remained the same until now, Koselleck identifies a class of concepts whose earlier meanings have been effaced in time and should be reconstructed, as well as a class of concepts that appeared in the course of a social change process, directly affecting and shaping it *{ibidem,* 46).

Accordingly, concepts not only record the changes in a given society, but can also trigger and influence the evolution of these changes. Speaking about the Enlightenment epoch, for example, Koselleck distinguishes between compensatory concepts, reflecting no experience content when coined, orientative concepts, creating expectations and a certain urge to action, and concepts of empirical storing, in search of their junction with

the historical reality (Koselleck 2002, 292-294). It results that, regardless of their close connections, social and conceptual histories are viewed by Koselleck as being quite different. In his opinion, they do not have similar speeds of evolution *{ibidem,* 37). There are cases when the conceptualization of a certain aspect of reality can occur long after that reality had changed, and cases when the concepts can occur long before the new reality they are referring to had taken shape.

For British contextualists, language, as actualized in discourse, is not independent, but constitutive of the political reality. One cannot take the concepts out of the different synchronic contexts where they occur, in an attempt to identify their actual meanings, and then try to restore the system they belong to. Concepts take their meanings from the patterns of discourse where they function. Pocock considers that the different political languages he tries to identify (sometimes within the same discourse) entail particular linguistic conventions, constraining the conceptualization processes in specific ways (Richter 1990, 55). Skinner is more categorical in this respect, as for him speaking or writing is a goal-directed action. Each speaker or writer acts as an individual linguistic performer, who accepts, rejects or ignores the dominant linguistic conventions. Different ideologies result from the existence of sets of linguistic repertoires, meanings and practices, shared by a number of speakers *{ibidem,* 60).

Accordingly, linguistic actions can be more conventional or more original. What is important is to persuade the audience to accept the innovations. Skinner defines concepts as weapons or tools; they do not have a history of their own, but a history of their uses in argument *{ibidem,* 62). Different authors can assign different meanings to the terms used to express a certain concept, and can use the same concept to accomplish different actions, pursuing different goals. The presence of a new concept is closely connected with the creation of a new vocabulary in terms of which it is articulated and discussed.

As Melvin Richter notices, regardless of the important aspects that distinguish the views of the German and the Cambridge Schools, they cannot be considered as mutually incompatible, but rather complementary *{ibidem,* 70).

3.3. The Pragma-Rhetorical Perspective

Pragma-rhetoric provides a specific interdisciplinary theoretical and methodological framework for discourse analysis. The cooperation between the two disciplines (pragmatics and rhetoric) is legitimated not only by their common research object: language in use, but also by the

similarity of their perspective in approaching this object, that of the speaker's intention to produce a certain effect on the receiver. G. Leech (1983, 15) was the first one to characterize the approach to pragmatics as "rhetorical", as far as it focuses on a goal-oriented speech situation.

The modern attempts to redefine rhetoric brought closer the two disciplines under consideration. Traditionally, the domain of rhetoric was restricted to certain types of discourse (public speaking, literature) and the researcher was interested in the discourse itself and the author's art. Modern theories define rhetoric as "situated discourse" (Bitzer 1999, 215) and admit that, ultimately, any form of human discourse is rhetorical, as being produced in a particular situation. Accordingly, rhetorical activity is no longer understood as a one-way activity of an autonomous speaker, but as a special form of transaction, involving complex interactive processes between the speaker, the receiver(s) and/or the audience. Within these processes, participants construct and correlate their identities according to the circumstances *(ibidem,* 215).

There are some obvious analogies between pragmatics and modern rhetoric.

(a) Both use the concept of "situation": communicative situation, and rhetorical situation, respectively. Communicative situation includes not only a linguistic component, but also a sociological, as well as a cognitive and psychological one (Levinson 1983, X, 5). Each of these components has a specific impact on the structure and form of a discourse. Rhetorical situation is viewed as "the source and ground of rhetorical activity", the rhetorical discourse functioning as "a fitting response to a situation which needs and invites it" (Bitzer 1999,220).

(b) In pragmatics, one speaks of discursive genres (Bakhtin 1986), forms of talk reflecting those frames, schemes and scripts (Goffman 1974) which are identified as functional by the members of a given community. Parliamentary discourse is part of the more comprehensive genre of the political discourse. It has some specific sub-genres, corresponding to the basic forms of parliamentary activity (debates, motions, oral/written questions, interpellations, etc.).

One also speaks of three basic rhetorical genres: deliberative, forensic and epideictic. Basically, parliamentary discourse belongs to the first genre, but-as already noticed (Hie 2006, 190; 2010, 8)-h also includes certain features that, in some circumstances, bring it closer to the other two genres.

(c) Concerning the linguistic resources used to construct the discourse, there is a certain correspondence between some basic pragmatic and rhetorical structural categories. Pragmatics distinguishes between speaker-oriented, hearer-oriented, and neutral utterances. Their relationship with the three main discourse components traditionally recognized by rhetoric: ethos (connected with self-image), pathos (connected with the receivers' emotional reaction), and logos (connected with ideas and their logical concatenation) is quite obvious.

Pragmatic categories are defined according to the concrete mechanisms of the functioning of communicative processes, whereas rhetorical ones take into account the main levels involved in the process of conveying a certain content. Unlike pragmatics, which is mostly descriptive, rhetoric is mostly evaluative, as focused on the complex effects produced by the discourse.

If, for example, we consider the use of the pronominal and verbal person forms, pragmatics defines some uses as strategic, revealing their role in setting the discursive perspective, as well as their consequences for the general structure of the discourse. Rhetoric interprets the same forms in relation to their contribution to construing a certain image of the speaker and to the process of influencing the reaction of the audience in a deliberate manner.

Pragma-rhetoric is a possible form of approaching discourse within the framework of the generally acknowledged functional paradigm. It involves an analysis of the discourse at both its macro- and micro-structural levels. In the particular case of the institutional discourses, which include parliamentary discourses, the macro-structural level analysis has in view aspects such as:

- the general organization of the discourse: opening and closing sequences; basic sequences; dialogical sequences; local adjustments;
- the degree of observing/violating the institutional norms and constraints;
- the general orientation of the discourse towards consensus or confrontation; relative weight and forms of agreement and disagreement; possibilities and forms of mediation;
- the relative weight and forms of expressing rationality and emotion in the discourse structure;
- the general structure of argumentation.

The micro-structural level analysis takes into account the specific way the main actional and interactional discourse aspects, as well as aspects concerning the argumentative dimension are actualized in a particular speech. Among these aspects, one can mention:

- speech acts (direct and indirect acts; forms of indirectness);
- deixis (mainly, designations for the speaker and the addressees);
- the implicit; forms and strategies of implicitation;
- the split of the speaker's voice: polyphony and multivocality;
- politeness/ impoliteness strategies (on record/off record strategies);
- meta-communicative forms,

as basic actional aspects, and

- address forms and other forms of implicating the audience;
- forms of reaction from the audience;
- dialogic strategies,

as basic interactional aspects.

The micro-level aspects of argumentation include:

- sources and types of arguments;
- argumentative strategies;
- fallacies;
- argumentative connectives.

A pragma-rhetorical approach involves both the description of the structural and linguistic choices made by a certain speaker, and a complex interpretation of their effects. As the pragmatic, argumentative and rhetorical dimensions of any discourse are organically interwoven in the communicative reality, this kind of approach is meant to restore the genuine convergence of the effects produced on each dimension as a result of a basic unifying function (the persuasive function, for the political discourse).

For example, if we take into consideration the particular case of quotations, which are quite frequently used in the parliamentary speeches, some comments are possible. Quotations have an important role in setting the discursive perspective (pragmatic dimension). They involve a split of the speaker's voice into an asserting voice (that of the quoted person) and an interpreting one (speaker's own voice). These voices can provide convergent or divergent evaluations of a certain issue. In the first case, the mutual alignment of two subjective positions can also act as a means of enhancing the strength of an argument (argumentative dimension). At the same time, it can add a supplementary element to the speaker's positive image (rhetorical dimension-ethos). In the second case, by dissociating him/herself from the quoted voice, the speaker can bring forward the inconsistency of the position expressed by that voice and even add contra-arguments to reject the standpoint expressed in the quotation. If the other voice belongs to a political adversary, the contrast between their relative images will become stronger.

4. A Brief Overview of the Volume

The structure of this volume takes into account the diversity of topics and approaches connected with parliamentary discourse. Papers are grouped into four main sections. The first section includes two papers devoted to the analysis of certain parliamentary concepts, from two different perspectives: one, of the political science, and the other, of the conceptual history.

Teemu Hakkinerts, paper focuses on the concept of *royal prerogative,* which refers to the specific right of the British Government to decide about deploying military force abroad.

Following Q. Skinner, the author intends to offer an image of the state of the concept and its use in a particular historical moment: the beginning of the Gulf Crisis in 1990-1991. The debates held in the House of Commons have a more general relevance, brought forward by the analysis in the paper. They reflect the evolution of the views on the institutional relationship between Parliament and Government. The modern tendency to increase the role of Parliament, insisting on the sovereignty of its decisions, is manifest even in a typical constitutional monarchy.

Onni Pekonerts aim is to illustrate how specific historical and political conditions influenced the process of adopting European rules, practices and conceptual tools in the debates of the Finnish Parliament (the Eduskunta), in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

If Swedish models appeared as quite natural for the first Diet Act from 1869, given the previous more than five centuries of Swedish rule in Finland, the increasingly openness towards a diversity of European parliamentary systems was closely connected with the fight for autonomy.

The author analyses the changes in the meaning, as well as in the forms of expressing the concept of *parliamentary obstruction.* Originally designating a particular tactic used in the British House of Commons, the concept expanded in the Eduskunta to refer to other types of disputes between the minority and the majority. At the same time, beside the neologic designation, a Finnish equivalent was introduced in the early 1890s. The evolution of their meanings is thoroughly examined in the paper.

The papers gathered in the second section investigate the factors conditioning MPs' attitude towards a number of issues which animated the debates in specific historical circumstances, as well as their choice of arguments.

The paper of *Mathias Falter and Saskia Stachowitsch* is part of a larger research project in progress at the University of Vienna. The authors

analyse the debates on voting rights in the Austrian Parliament during the late Habsburg Empire (1861-1918), in a discourse-historical perspective. They focus on anti-Semitism, considered as a central discourse element in Austrian political culture before the First Republic. In their opinion, unlike anti-Semitism in some other contexts, parliamentary anti-Semitism functioned as an argumentative strategy closely connected with political, religious, and ethnic groups. It not only reflects the state of evolution of a certain society in a given period of time, but also has important consequences on the future evolution of that society.

The analysis of the anti-Semitic rhetoric in parliamentary discourse brings forward the meaning ambivalence of some basic concepts related to the definition of a democratic society, such as representation, citizenship or nationality. This fact proves the persistence of prejudice and discrimination, in spite of the changes produced in the general ideas concerning the legitimization of power.

Daniela Pastarmadzhieva takes into account the situation of a former communist country, Bulgaria, which became a parliamentary republic after 1989. The author tries to check MPs' attitude towards democracy using a series of 12 questions. Even if only 17 MPs answered her questions, the author was able to draw some preliminary conclusions. She suggests that although the MPs are familiar with the basic principles of democracy, as well as with the important role of the civil society in a democratic system, some non-democratic beliefs and attitudes are still persisting in the Bulgarian Parliament.

Further studies based on the answers of a larger number of MPs, representing all the political parties, should determine if such views reflect individual positions or are connected with a certain party ideology.

Manon Tremblay focuses on the debates in the Canadian Parliament that led to the official opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples (July 20, 2005). The author identifies two main sets of arguments used by the MPs, either in favour or against this decision: one related to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the other concerning the family.

The two conflicting positions expressed in the debates reflect the clash between the conservative views, centred on the concepts of tradition and cultural universality, on the one hand, and the more modern views, acknowledging the diversity and complexity of present-day societies, on the other hand. What puzzles the author is the absence of arguments related to feminism or the non-involvement of the State in the issues concerning marriage.

The papers in the third section focus on the parliamentary discourse proper, examining a large diversity of linguistic, as well as pragma-

rhetorical aspects within the comprehensive framework of the functional paradigm.

Coco Norm's contribution is part of a research project *(Europe en ligne)* examining the argumentative markers used by the members of the European Parliament in discourses held in French. It is a corpus based research, involving the semantic level, but aiming, at the same time, to extend the Scandinavian Theory of Linguistic Polyphony (ScaPoLine) to the discourse level.

The author focuses on the semantics of the French adverb *surtout* "above all" as a marker of increased argumentation. She also reveals some specific aspects of its functioning as an index of the focal point of an utterance in the parliamentary discourse.

Maria Svensson's paper is part of the same project *(Europe en ligne)* as Coco Noren's, using the same corpus of data. The author analyses the use of the French conjunction *si* " i f in concessive and adversative contexts, within the speeches of the French members of the European Parliament. She distinguishes this use of *si* from its use in conditional contexts. The differences regard both the formal and the text-organisational levels.

The concessive-adversative use of *si* is associated mainly with a definite form of the subject in *p* and occurs in the initial sequence of the speeches, whereas the conditional use is characterized by a greater diversity of the subject form in *p* and is recorded in the final sequence.

These features have important consequences on the argumentative role played by the two types of *si* constructions.

In her paper, *Maria Aldina Marques* examines, from an argumentative perspective, the discursive construction of emotions in a debate in the Portuguese Parliament. Considering that, given the conflictive nature of parliamentary discourse, negative emotions are prevalent, the author analyses the functioning of two basic emotions of this kind: indignation and irritation, as strategic devices in the argumentative processes. She comes to the conclusion that indignation triggers the amplification of disagreement, whereas irritation is mainly connected with the function of refutation. At the same time, concerning the interactional dimension, the author notices that the hetero-attributed emotion is negatively evaluated and enhanced, as opposed to the "convenient" self-attributed emotion.

Rodica Zafiu aims to investigate the place and role of the political statement, a sub-genre of the parliamentary discourse quite frequently actualized in the Romanian Parliament. The author identifies some structural and rhetorical characteristics that run counter to the defining features of the parliamentary discourse and reflect a strong influence of the mass media culture. In her opinion, political statements represent an

example of epideictic discourse, which illustrates three main discursive sub-types: celebration, polemic (and satiric) and action (decision)-oriented speeches.

Oana Chelaru-Murarus's paper explores, from a rhetorical and pragma-stylistic perspective, some speeches delivered in the Romanian Parliament by Corneliu Vadim Tudor, the President of the nationalistic party Greater Romania *(Romania Mare)*. Corneliu Vadim Tudor's speeches fully illustrate the main features of the nationalistic political discourse. They are cliche-based, pathos-oriented and emphatic. The speaker's strong subjectivity is reflected in his narcissism, and sometimes in his histrionic behaviour, as well as in a highly conflictive attitude towards his adversaries, manifested in his preference for an aggressive language, including insults, threats, abusive *ad hominem* fallacious arguments, etc.

Elena Albu's paper is situated in the linguistic sub-field of cognitive pragmatics. Based on the theoretical and methodological tools provided by the Relevance Theory, the author analyses the contribution of a particular negative structure: [not (x) but (x')], in configuring the politicians' self-image. Her corpus of data includes both parliamentary and TV political debates, as she intends to check the way the debate form acts upon the strategies used in the discursive actualization of the above-mentioned negative pattern. These strategies either highlight certain aspects of the politician's self, or define his image as opposed to that of his adversaries.

The last section of the volume includes some contributions of the Romanian researchers involved in the project *Tradition and modernity in the Romanian parliamentary discourse.* The main objective of that project was to highlight the complex phenomenon underlying the construing and evolution of the Romanian parliamentary discourse as an institutional discourse genre, starting from the second half of the nineteenth century and until the Second World War.

Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu analyses the way the concept of democracy was understood in the Romanian Parliament, in the second half of the nineteenth century, based on the speeches of four outstanding MPs. In an interdisciplinary approach, combining elements from linguistic semantics and discourse analysis, the author examines the uses of the concept at the system level and at the discourse level. In the final part, an outline of the temporal evolution of the concept is presented.

Andra Vasilescu's paper investigates the projection of self in the MPs' discourse, starting from 1866 and until 1923. In the author's opinion, parliamentary identity is construed at the intersection of four types of hierarchically ranked identities: national, institutional, professional and personal, national identity occupying the first position within this

hierarchy. The analysis of the parliamentary speeches from the considered period of time reveals a number of features defining MPs' identity, some of them still manifest in our times. Using the arguments provided by the texts, the author considers as relevant for the MPs' identity the fact that they present themselves as builders of a modern institution, representatives and teachers of the people, missionaries of the national ideal, members of the cultural elite, exponents of group morality, emotionally committed citizens and witty speakers.

Ariadna Stefanescu examines the accomplished fact (AF) as a strategy adopted by the Romanian political class in the process of constructing and consolidating a modern state in the second half of the nineteenth century. She has in view two particular cases: the establishment of a constitutional monarchic system under the reign of a foreign prince Charles (Carol) I, and the minting of the national currency. In the author's opinion, the AF policy has a component connected with action: *modus procedendi,* and a component connected with deliberation: *modus deliberandi.* The analysis is focused on the way several factors, such as communicative practices, legitimacy and time work together, in order to bridge the gap between the two aforementioned components.

Examining *de dicto* evaluation in the parliamentary discourse of the early twentieth century, *Oana Ufa Barbulescu* and *Melania Roibu* come to the conclusion that, unlike nowadays, interwar MPs prefer irony at the expense of direct attacks.

Irony is staged by the strategic use of praise, which provides a securing space for both the speaker (who announces his intention to diminish the damage caused to the other by the use of over-politeness, in order to protect his own image) and the opponent (who has to respond in a non-aggressive way, in order to avoid jeopardizing his image).

The rhetorical means designed to set up praise as a strategy of irony rely on elements located at various language levels, ranging from the careful selection of evaluative terms to construing discursive isotopies and over-politeness. The argumentative techniques, on the other hand, involve the creation of some complex causal relations (remained implicit, most of the times), as well as the appeal to two arguments turned into fallacies: the argument from verbal classification and the argument based on ethos.

Quotations, as argumentative means used in the parliamentary discourse, are analysed by *Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu,* from a pragma-rhetorical perspective. Her corpus covers the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. She notices the difference in the functioning of argumentation according to whether it presupposes quoting foreign sources or internal sources. If the

first set of sources is used as arguments of authority, the second set is given this role only when it comes to official documents (laws, conventions). Quoting an opponent, be him a fellow MP or a journalist supporting a different party, usually involves polemics and counter-argumentation. The possible manipulation of sources, sometimes turned into misquotations, can result in the derailment to fallacies, especially the *straw man* and the *ad hominem (circumstantial* or *tu, quoque)* ones and, consequently, trigger an intensification of the conflicts.

Silviu Hariton's paper investigates the legislative debates in the Romanian Parliament concerning the pensions granted by the state to its civil servants in modern Romania. The author aims at examining the parliamentary procedures used in debating and adopting these specific laws. Four turning moments in the history of public pensions in modern Romania are taken into account: 1868, 1889-1890, 1902 and 1925. They are relevant to the evolution of modern bureaucracy, as well as to the articulation of the defining features of the welfare state before the Second World War.

5. Final Remarks

To sum up, this volume is meant to offer a multifaceted image of the parliamentary discourse, involving both content and structural aspects, which have been approached from a great variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives. Our intention is to provide suggestions rather than models of analysis or final results, as research is based on limited corpora of data, selected in accordance with their relevance to a certain topic.

As compared to other volumes with the same general object, this volume innovates in two main directions: first of all, by taking into consideration the temporal dimension, which allows to observe not only some constants and variables of the parliamentary discourse, but also the relevance of certain situational and contextual parameters to the discourse organization. The other innovative direction regards a rather thorough approach of parliament as a community of practice, which creates new possibilities for understanding its activity.

It is our belief that the contributions gathered in this volume represent a practical demonstration of the benefits of interdisciplinarity for all the specialists sharing a certain field of investigation.

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. "The problem of speech genres." In *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays,* edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 60-102. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bayley, Paul (ed.). 2004. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. 1999. "The rhetorical situation." In *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader,* edited by John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill, 217-225. New York/London: The Guilford Press.

Bousfield, Derek. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Carbo, Teresa. 1996. *El discurso parlamentario mexicano entre 1920 y 1950. Un estudio de caso en metodologia de andlisis de discurso,* volumen I-II, Mexico: CISAS and Collegio de Mexico.

Crystal, David. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, Paul, and John Heritage. 1992. *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1992. "Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 461 -490.

—. 1998. "Communities of practice: where language, gender and power all live." In *Language and Gender: A Reader,* edited by Jennifer Coates, 484-494. Oxford: Blackwell.

—. 2007. "Putting communities of practice in their place." *Gender and Language* 1 (1): 27-38.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* New York/Hagerstown/San Francisco/London: Harper and Row.

—.1981. *Forms of Talk.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hampsher-Monk, Iain. 1998. "Speech acts, languages or conceptual history?" In *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspectives,* edited by Iain Hampsher-Monk, Karin Tilmans, and Frank van Vree, 37-50. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Harris, Sara. 2001. "Being politically impolite: Extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse." *Discourse and Society* 12(4): 451-472.

Ilie, Cornelia. 2006. "Parliamentary discourses." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics,* edited by Keith Brown, 2ⁿᵈ edition, volume 9, 188-197. Oxford: Elsevier.

—. 2010. *European Parliaments under Scrutiny. Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 2002. *The Practice of Conceptual History. Timing History, Spacing Concepts.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics.* London/New York: Longman.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mills, Sara. 2009. "Impoliteness in a cultural context." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 1047-1060.

Richter, Melvin. 1990. "Reconstructing the history of political languages: Pocock, Skinner, and the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe." History and Theory* 29 (\): 38-70.

PART I

SOME CONCEPTS IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

CHAPTER ONE

OLD FEUDAL ANACHRONISM?
THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,
THE ROYAL PREROGATIVE AND THE ROLE
OF PARLIAMENT IN THE GULF CRISIS
IN 1990-1991

TEEMU HAKKINEN

Introduction

The question of royal prerogative in the use of military force abroad has recently risen in relation to the Iraq War (2003-2009). There have been official suggestions that the Government's exercise of the right should be placed under parliamentary control[1]. This article[2] puts the use of the concept of "royal prerogative" in parliamentary language under historical examination in the context of the previous British major war against Iraq.

The research question is how the concept of "royal prerogative" was used in discussions about the Parliament's role in relation to the handling of the Gulf Crisis in the House of Commons. The use of force abroad is a specific area of foreign policy. The House of Commons' constitutional role in the decision to use force abroad is dependent on the right of royal prerogative. The British Government holds the royal prerogative right to deploy troops abroad, described as "deployment power" in official language. Going to war requires that deployed troops exist that are able to wage the war in question. The Prime Minister is considered to use this power personally[3].

For an understanding of this right and its use, and in order to understand the debate in Britain today in a proper context, it is important to consider the historical background of the right of royal prerogative. The Gulf Crisis constitutes the last major large-scale war that included its use before the wars in the twenty-first century. A time of crisis provided a

possible opportunity for debate on the use of the right and its proper political context. A case study of parliamentary debate can be expected to reveal more about the roles that existed in the aftermath of the Cold War.

Methodological Remarks and Sources

I approach the crisis as a political process that involves the run-up to war, military deployments to the region, diplomatic discussions, an escalation of the crisis towards war, wartime itself, and the aftermath. I examine this process as a set of opportunities used by members of Parliament (MPs) to express their opinions on the role played by the House of Commons and to introduce their hopes for change through parliamentary action. To find answers, I skimmed through parliamentary debates and committee papers in the time period under review (from August 1990 to March 1991).

In this paper, the concept of "royal prerogative" is used as a key concept, a factor of the political system. Reinhart Koselleck (1923-2006) saw the importance of a time of crisis in the formulation of meanings for the key concepts of political vocabulary. In fact, Koselleck approached time of crisis as an especially important moment for contestation and, hence, redefinitions of concept (Richter and Richter 2006, 345-346). Koselleck viewed conceptual change in terms of long-term change. Quentin Skinner, on the other hand, considered that change to be happening in a more individual sense; the concept is described by an evaluative term that would not normally be used in relation to the concept (Skinner 1999, 66-67). In the parliamentary environment, the individual use of these concepts for political purposes is noteworthy, due to its political nature: this aspect is important in order to grasp relevant ideas in the surrounding political system. Contextualization of these uses of concepts and opinions in a way that follows Quentin Skinner's work provides the basic ground for an understanding of the concept of "royal prerogative" and its contested nature: it is not about long-term semantic shifts in the meaning of the concept, but a reflection of the state of the concept and its meanings in specific moments of history (Skinner 1999, 64-66; see also Pocock 1973, 28-35).

When it comes to the role of Parliament in relation to the concept of "royal prerogative", it is most logical to trace the evolution of this role in terms of the essential concept marked by the role of Parliament and the definition of power held by the Crown-or, as in the Gulf Crisis, the Government as the executive. Jeffrey Goldsworthy points out that, for some historians, the idea of the sovereignty of Parliament means the power

of the two Houses to control the exercise of the Crown and its prerogatives (Goldsworthy 1999, 9). The concept of "sovereignty" does have links to the definition that I consider to define the "role"-or in more general terms, the ability-of the House of Commons to make decisions that relate to the use of force abroad.

The sovereignty of Parliament and the role of royal prerogatives were mainly established in the seventeenth century. By the nineteenth century, the sovereignty of Parliament, as a final legal authority, was no longer in question. Nevertheless, royal prerogatives still existed. Parliament was considered to have a part in the use of these rights, as they were transferred from the monarch to the executive branch of government (Goldsworthy 1999, 231-233). In his classic work *Parliament and Foreign Affairs* (1967), Peter G. Richards asserted that the role of Parliament was sufficient in the case of royal prerogatives, as the Government was still informing Parliament to a large extent; although the Suez Crisis in 1956 had created an exception, the situation was adequate. However, Richards concentrated on the declaration of war, which as an official diplomatic procedure can be considered a very rare phenomenon after the Second World War (Richards 1967, 37-40).

Before entering the next section, some necessary contextual information regarding the conflict needs to be presented. The Gulf War was a noteworthy conflict for a number of reasons. Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990. This act of aggression was widely condemned, with international pressure being led by the US and British leaderships. The end of the Cold War helped to establish a wide-range of international positioning, so that the United Nations Security Council should be able to issue several resolutions that levied economic sanctions and provided legal authority for the use of force if Iraq did not withdraw from Kuwait. Furthermore, Iraqi troops took Western citizens, including hundreds of Britons, as hostages. Iraq refused to comply and the UN Security Council placed a deadline for Iraqi withdrawal by January 15, 1991. When the deadline expired with no change, the war began soon after (Ochsenwald and Fisher 2004, 712-713; Tripp 2007, 244; Thatcher 1993, 826).

Findings: The Role of Parliament and the Royal Prerogative

The transcripts of parliamentary debates provide important information about the language used by the country's political elite. A search for the term "royal prerogative" in the Official Record (Hansard) reveals the limited use of this concept. Although the concept and its related meanings

are most important during decision-making about whether the country should go to war or not, the right itself was not used to the extent that one might imagine. It was not required to announce the use of the right by employing the concept. Hansard's search results show that the concept was used in relation to the Gulf Crisis only six times from August 1990 to March 1991, and this number included two Written Questions. There was also an answer to one Written Question that included the concept, but this particular use is not taken into account since the issue was raised by the question itself. The use of the concept "prerogative" without the word "royal" includes two other cases.

A historical comparison elicits certain noteworthy sources. Britain had its last full-scale war in the Falklands in 1982, and before this war, Britain intervened in the Suez Crisis in 1956 with substantial armed forces. Both operations were approved of through the use of the royal prerogative. Searching Hansard shows that in 1956, in relation to the Suez Crisis, the concept (or the shorter version of it, "prerogative") was mentioned only once, when Tony Benn (Bristol South-East, Lab.) asked a question about the Speaker's constitutional role. This question, presented on November 1st, pertained to how the Government would show its intentions about the threat of a military intervention[4]. In 1982, Enoch Powell (Down South, UUP.) made the only direct reference to the royal prerogative addressing the House of Commons: "We are the nation talking to the Government." Powell referred to the fact that the government's exercise of the prerogative required the confidence of the House[5]. The power of the royal prerogative was established and not questioned in these two military operations in which Britain was involved. The role of Parliament was not questioned, as the establishment of power was taken for granted.

The Gulf Crisis triggered more references to royal prerogative; one can notice a slight increase in the use of the concept. Parliament itself had to be active if it wanted to play a more considerable role, although this activity did not require the use of the concept. The need for engagement became clear shortly after the beginning of the invasion. After the main opposition had made an official request, Parliament was recalled from its summer recess to debate Gulf policy. Before this request there were several pleas to recall Parliament in order to debate the crisis, but a month passed without Parliament convening[6].

Reflection on the role of Parliament in relation to the royal prerogative began with the recall debate in September. Tony Benn (Chesterfield, Lab.) mentioned that that occasion would not be right "to deal with it", but he used the opportunity to stress the idea of representation that cannot be transferred to Government, regardless of the royal prerogative that could

be exercised solely by the Government[7]. Later, on November 7, 1990, during the first day of Debate on the Address after the Queen's Speech to Parliament, he reminded his fellows about its existence. Benn lamented the fact that, unlike Britain[8], the United States Congress had safeguards over the government's passing of war legislation.

December saw the escalation of the crisis. It now seemed evident that the war was approaching and the deadline for Iraqi withdrawal was set. The main opposition asked for debate on the Gulf Crisis at the beginning of December, and the debate was arranged on December 11th. This debate centred on the role of Parliament and the relation of power between Parliament and Government. Shadow Foreign Secretary Gerald Kaufman (Manchester Gorton, Lab.) publicly ruled out the Commons as the source of any decision, declaring that authority must work at the international level. This definition of the relation of power, made without any reference to the royal prerogative, crystallized the opinion of the main opposition party: the House of Commons, as the most important Chamber of the British Parliament, did not possess an authority which exceeded that of the United Nations. In terms of the role of Parliament, the use of royal prerogative was not necessary, since in the end, the question was not so much about the relation between Parliament and the executive branch, but rather to what extent the country was in support of the United Nations. The traditional Labour position on war emphasized the use of force as a last resort, and Kaufman considered that that applied here (Phythian 2007, 97).

In January, as the crisis escalated, Benn's rhetoric intensified. First, he declared his outrage that in the Gulf Crisis, for the first time in British history, Britain was entering war without hearing Parliament, and this was a war that could involve nuclear weapons. Although not included in the citation below, Benn compared the British Parliament to the US Congress, emphasizing the fact that the latter was able to vote, unlike in Britain, where the Government used the right of royal prerogative[9].

During the Gulf Crisis, the fear of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction was extremely high, since Iraq was known to possess at least biological and chemical weapons and the regime had used these weapons on several occasions during the 1980s. The new situation provided a reason for the re-evaluation of Parliament's role: for Benn, Parliament should have its say because the crisis could involve the use of these devastating weapons. A day later, Benn mentioned the concept again, showing his strong disapproval by calling it an "old feudal anachronism". This was not a new topic for Benn, as he had proposed changes to the system two years before the Gulf Crisis had taken place, based on the same argument that he would continue to use throughout the

1990s. This sort of metaphor was linked to the role of Parliament and its rights, namely that there was a gap in power rights that could be by-passed. As Benn would argue:

> I am talking about the effect of war on the British Parliament. We have seen—and we will see when British forces are sent into action—that it is the *royal prerogative* that allows the Government to go to war. That *old feudal anachronism* is wheeled out to bypass the House.[10]

Benn's comments on the royal prerogative received no direct reaction that related to the concept. In fact, Benn's comments in January seemed to receive more anger than support. In 1988, Benn had raised the issue of royal prerogative rights in the House of Commons through point of order. He emphasized that the existence of these rights reduced the power held by the House of Commons, and made no direct reference to the rights that related to waging war[11]. He had also introduced a Private Member's Bill in 1988 that would have limited the use of royal prerogatives and placed them under the control of the House of Commons, but the Bill was rejected[12]. In this sense, the situation in 1990-1991 shows how context provided a clear opportunity for the concept and its existing definitions to be contested in order to change the power rights. In fact, according to his published diaries, Benn started to work on his next attempt to change power rights in a form of Government of Britain Bill, only two weeks after the invasion of Kuwait, when public discussion about Parliament's recall was taking place. This new Bill proposal was a more holistic approach to the British political system (Benn and Winstone 1996, 627). For Benn, the reason to criticize the use of the royal prerogative could also be a result of his negative view on the reasons why the United States were moving towards war (Phythian 2007, 100).

Three other MPs made direct references to the existence of royal prerogatives and their implications. On November 21, 1990, the Armed Forces Bill was in its second reading. The debate included a reference by Menzies Campbell (Fife North-East, LibDem.) to the royal prerogative, though it was not linked to the occupation of Kuwait, but to the sovereignty of Parliament in a larger sense[13]. That there was no connection between the prerogative and the existing situation in Kuwait was not a great surprise, since the Liberal Democrats were in favour of compelling Iraq to withdraw with the use of force, if necessary.

Two references to "prerogative" in 1991 took place on January 15th and January 21st. In the latter case, Robert Rhodes James (Cambridge, Con.) used the concept as a reminder that the Conservative Party did not hold "prerogative to patriotism"[14].

Gerald Kaufman (Lab.) had stated the position of the Labour Party in December and returned to the issue on January 15th. His first reference to the concept in 1991 was the only one made by a front-bench spokesperson: the Government's right to use the prerogative as a policy had been going on for the entire autumn and winter; in this sense, the use of force would soon be accepted, since for Kaufman it was the last resort[15]. In the last debate before the war, Labour confirmed its position that it would not produce any last minute objections to the existing policy and that Parliament's role in its current form was working.

Furthermore, Graham Allen (Nottingham North, Lab.) asked two Written Questions about royal prerogative in 1991, after the Gulf War had begun. It is important to see Allen's actions in terms of their wider historical context: in 2002, he was very active in asking questions and making comments about the use of royal prerogative in the decision to deploy troops to war. In February 1991, Allen asked whether the Government would place the use of royal prerogatives under Parliament's control; the Prime Minister said it would not[16]. In January 1991, Allen posed a Written Question in which he demanded to know the prerogatives held by the Privy Council[17]. John Garret made a similar Written Question relating to the Privy Council, on February 6, 1991[18]. In this sense, due to its position in between Parliament and Government, the Privy Council-a group of Government advisers-became, through the use of the concept of royal prerogative, another potential threat to the sovereignty of Parliament. Nevertheless, it is important to note that, unlike Tony Benn, Graham Allen raised the issue of the role of Parliament with his direct questions about royal prerogative and Parliament's power.

As we have just seen, there were only sparse direct references to royal prerogative. The subject of the sovereignty of Parliament was only touched on briefly, in individual indirect references, by the critical anti-war group, which was small, and by the leftist wing of the Labour Party[19]. However, during the autumn of 1990, the debate on whether Britain should join the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM), with its plans for a common currency, raised more concerns about the sovereignty of Parliament[20].

The concept of royal prerogative was not used in the discussions about ERM. Hence an interpretation can be made: the sovereignty of Parliament was a more essential concept than the royal prerogative, although they were linked with each other, since the royal prerogative rights in general did affect the idea of joining the ERM[21]. The handling of the Gulf Crisis saw the discussion of only the latter. The ERM, being clearly a more important issue for Parliament, produced more discussion about Parliament's

actual rights: they were talked about in a broader sense, while the discussion of royal prerogative focused only to a minor degree on the larger issue of parliamentary sovereignty. In 1992, Tony Benn and another Labour critic of royal prerogatives, Enoch Powell, later, initiated a discussion about the sovereignty of Parliament: Powell disapproved of Benn's new Bill proposal, because the House of Commons was already able to take a role, if it so desired, regardless of formal power rights (Hennessy and Anstey 1992, 7). From the Prime Minister's point of view, the lack of a wider debate on "royal prerogative" and its role and meanings supported the current system, which gave priority to the Government at the expense of the House of Commons.

Conclusion

An examination of the role of Parliament in relation to the use of the concept of "royal prerogative" shows interesting results. The role of Parliament was touched upon to only a small degree through the concept. However, the role of Parliament was indeed under discussion because of the crisis. Tony Benn spoke of the concept with powerful critical language, but the crisis itself did not produce innovations in that sense, as Benn was continuing the same discourse that he had used earlier. Nevertheless, the crisis did precipitate a moment in which the meaning of the concept and the rights that it included were, in fact, brought under consideration, although the response to Benn's work was critical or indifferent. Furthermore, the vocabulary used when discussing the sovereignty of Parliament shows that the debate on E R M did not include any references to royal prerogatives.

To link the use of the concept with its proper historical context, the royal prerogative right was just one set of powers, while the debate about these powers dealt also with indirect references to and arguments about war aims, diplomatic solutions and the direction of British foreign policy. In 1990-1991, the House of Commons clearly did not desire to raise the issue as a direct assault to the right, but there were constant pleas for further debates and several pleas to vote; this was a means of increasing the role of Parliament in practice.

The political language shows that the House of Commons was indeed an active agent. While it sought an active role, however, it does not seem to have demanded any major strengthening of its constitutional role through the use of this key concept. Later, in the 1990s and in the 2000s, the concept of royal prerogative came under intensive discussion. In the latest British large-scale military operation in Iraq, Graham Allen (who

had already raised questions about royal prerogatives in January 1991) made several efforts to increase the role of Parliament and to put the royal prerogatives and their exercise under the control of Parliament.

The short debate on royal prerogative in 1990-1991 served to open the discussion, but the main debate about the role of Parliament in relation to royal prerogative when using force abroad was yet to come.

Notes

[1] House of Lords Select Committee on Constitution, *Waging War. Parliament's role and responsibility. Vol: 1 Report,* 15th Report of Session 2005-2006, HL Paper 236-1, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, July 27, 2006, 41. For example, Nigel D. White (2009, 20) argues that there is a strong view that the right to deploy forces or wage war "should be subject to democratic control".

[2] This paper is part of my dissertation project, in which I study the role of Parliament in three separate large scale military operations, in the period ranging from 1982 to 2003. My dissertation project is part of a research project called *Parliamentary Means of Conflict Resolution in Twentieth Century Britain,* which is being conducted at the University of Jyvaskyla. The project is funded by the Academy of Finland.

[3] House of Lords Committee 2006, 8.

[4] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, November 1, 1956, *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 5th ser., vol. 558 (1990-1991), col. 1622.

[5] Powell, Speech to the House of Commons, May 13, 1982. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 23 (1981-1982), col. 976.

[6] Nicholas Wood, "Thatcher has no plans to recall Parliament." *The Times,* August 20,1990; Editorial: "Democracy expects." *The Times,* August 18,1990.

[7] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, September 6, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 177 (1989-1990), col. 774-775.

[8] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, November 7, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 180 (1990-1991), col. 49.

[9] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, January 14, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser.,vol. 183 (1990-1991), col. 616.

[10] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, January 15, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 183 (1990-1991), col. 777-778.

[11] Benn, Speech to the House of Commons, January 26, 1988. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 126 (1987-1988), col. 178-180.

[12] The Bill was a Private Member's Bill with the title The Crown Prerogatives (House of Commons Control) Bill. Barnett (2004, 156-157).

[13] Campbell, Speech to the House of Commons, November 21, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 181 (1990-1991), col. 364.

[14] James, Speech to the House of Commons, January 21, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 184 (1990-1991), col. 68.

[15] Kaufman, Speech to the House of Commons, January 15, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 183 (1990-1991), col. 812.

[16] Allen, Written Question in the House of Commons, February 28, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 184, col. 374-5.

[17] Allen, Written Question in the House of Commons, January 25, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 184, col. 366W.

[18] Garret, Written Question in the House of Commons, February 6, 1991. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 185, col. 176W.

[19] For example, the division around the substantive motion on January 21, 1991 ended with a clear victory for the Government (the vote: 563-34). All who voted No were Labour MPs.

[20] See Griffiths, Speech to the House of Commons, October 23, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol 178 (1990-1991), cols. 265-268; Cash, Speech to the House of Commons, October 23, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 178 (1990-1991), cols. 233-235; Livingstone, Speech to the House of Commons, October 23, 1990. *Parliamentary Debates,* Commons, 6th ser., vol. 178 (1990-1991), cols. 253-256.

[21] For historical comparison, see Ihalainen (2010, 343-470).

References

Barnett, Hilaire. 2004. *Constitutional & Administrative Law.* London: Cavendish Publishing.

Benn, Tony, and Ruth Winstone. 1996. *The Benn Diaries.* Guernsey: The Guernsey Press.

"Democracy expects." Editorial. *The Times,* August 18, 1990.

Goldsworthy, Jeffrey. 1999. *The Sovereignty of Parliament. History and Philosophy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hansard Parliamentary Debates (1956, 1981-1982, 1990-1991), 5th-6th ser., vol. 558, 23, 126, 177-185. United Kingdom. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com.

Hennessy, Peter, and Caroline Anstey. 1992. *Jewel in the Constitution? The Queen, Parliament and the Royal Prerogative.* Glasgow: Department of Government, University of Strathclyde.

Ihalainen, Pasi. 2010. *Agents of the People. Democracy and Popular Sovereignty in British and Swedish Parliamentary and Public Debates 1734-1800.* Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Ochsenwald, William, and Sydney Nettleton Fisher. 2004. *The Middle East. A History.* Boston, Mass: McGraw-Hill. 6th Edition.

Phythian, Mark. 2007. *The Labour Party, War and International Relations, 1945-2006.* London and New York: Routledge.

Pocock, J.G.A. 1973. "Verbalizing a political act: Toward a politics of speech." *Political Theory* 1: 27-45.

Richards, Peter G. 1967. *Parliament and Foreign Affairs.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Richter, Melvin, and Michaela W. Richter. 2006. "Introduction: Translation of Reinhart Koselleck's 'Krise', in Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67 (2): 343-356.

Skinner, Quentin. 1999. "Rhetoric and conceptual change." *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought* 3: 60-73.

Thatcher, Margaret. 1993. *The Downing Street Years.* London: Harper Collins.

Tripp, Charles. 2007. *A History of Iraq.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

United Kingdom. House of Lords Select Committee on Constitution, *Waging War: Parliament's Role and Responsibility.* 15th Report of Session 2005-06, July 27, 2006, Vol. 1: Report, HL Paper 236-1. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldselect/ldconst/236/236i.pdf.

White, Nigel D. 2009. *Democracy Goes to War. British Military Deployments under International Law.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, Nicholas. 1990. "Thatcher has no plans to recall Parliament." *The Times,* August 20th.

CHAPTER TWO

FROM THE FOUR-ESTATE DIET
TO THE UNICAMERAL PARLIAMENT:
INTERNATIONAL MODELS
OF PARLIAMENTARY POLITICS IN FINLAND

ONNI PEKONEN

Introduction

In this article I examine the process by which international parliamentary rules and practices were adopted in the work of the Finnish Parliament, the *Eduskunta*. The transition to the unicameral Eduskunta in 1906 continued the learning of parliamentary procedures, which had already started in Finland in the nineteenth century. The role of the Finnish press was central in this process. Political groups and activists created a context for the Finnish reform, by presenting foreign parliamentary discussions in the newspapers. The lessons of international parliamentarianism have been applied in Finnish procedural debates from the 1860s on. The Finnish case illustrates the historically central role of international models in the procedural debates of new parliaments.

In the first part, I discuss how European parliamentary models were adopted, within a Swedish procedural framework, in the late nineteenth century Finnish debates. In the second part, I focus on the concept of parliamentary obstruction and demonstrate how Finnish interest in international parliamentary discussions influenced Finnish procedural debates and political rhetoric. The adoption and translation of international parliamentary concepts left a mark on the Finnish political language and led to innovative uses and renderings of the political vocabulary.

The Swedish Heritage and the Emergence of European Parliamentary Influences

The Parliamentary Reform of 1906 has been highlighted as a significant turning point in Finnish parliamentary life (see, for example, Seitkari 1958). In the Reform, Europe's last four-estate Diet was transformed into a unicameral parliament elected by universal suffrage. In view of representation, suffrage and unicameralism, the Reform's significance cannot be underestimated. However, in view of Eduskunta's procedures, the Reform of 1906 continued a learning process that had already started in Finland in the nineteenth century.

In 1809, the former Eastern part of Sweden, Finland, became a grand duchy of the Russian Empire. Under the reign of Sweden, Finland had had varying and modest representation in the *Riksdag of the Estates*. In 1809, the Finnish Estates were summoned by Tsar Alexander I for the *Diet of Porvoo*, but were not convened again for over fifty years. At the end of the Diet of 1863-1864, a Constitutional Law Committee was established to prepare a Diet Act that would set the procedures for the organization and readings of the Finnish Diet.

The first Finnish Diet Act of 1869 was based, to a great extent, on Swedish models. The Constitutional Law Committee was instructed by the Tsar to shape the Act mainly on Sweden's *Riksdag* Acts of 1617 and 1723, as well as on Riksdag law and practice after 1772 (Bergh 1884, 476-477). In its proposal, because of the given instructions and the existing political circumstances, the Constitutional Law Committee could not refer explicitly to any Swedish laws or practices instituted after 1809, when Finland was incorporated into Russia. The Committee was, however, able to circumvent that, by later adopting Swedish procedures, particularly those concerning the Riksdag Act of 1810, and tracing its legal roots to previous ones during the Swedish-Finnish era (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1981, 259). This was the case, for example, in § 46 of the Diet Act, which set limits on members' use of speech. The section was almost a word-for-word copy of § 50 of the Riksdag Act of 1810. As an example of the continuity of the Finnish procedures, the rules in the Diet Act on the use of speech were adopted in the Parliament Act of 1906 and have remained included in the Eduskunta's contemporary procedures in the Constitution Act of 2000 and the Rules of Procedure of 2000.

The Diet Act was seen in many respects as already obsolete at its implementation. In the late nineteenth century, Finnish members of the Diet, political groups and academia were showing increasing enthusiasm towards foreign parliamentary discussions. The interest in parliamentary topics was motivated by a desire to develop the Finnish system towards the principles and procedures of parliamentarianism, and consequently, to strengthen Finland's autonomy. Unfortunately for the Finnish reformists, Russian censorship impeded open discussions about adopting foreign parliamentary models into the Finnish system. For example, in the 1860s, books on foreign parliaments and constitutions were smuggled into Finland and secretly circulated (Krusius-Ahrenberg 1944, 236). Finnish newspapers began to follow foreign parliamentary politics regularly in the early decades of the nineteenth century, but after the Diets began to meet regularly in the 1860s, the interest in parliaments rose to a new level. Newspapers translated long sections of foreign parliamentary debates and presented parliamentary traditions and procedures in extensive series of articles. Presentations on foreign procedures were published concurrently with Finnish reforms and disputes. Newspaper articles on foreign parliaments were intentional moves designed to influence Finnish political discussions. Articles, foreign parliamentary debates and their translations introduced ideas, arguments and conceptual tools for the Finnish debates. By presenting and examining foreign parliaments, the debaters created a context for the Finnish reforms.

Even though Swedish precedents remained central in the interpretation of the Diet Act in the early Diets, more varied parliamentary influences were also adopted. From the 1860s, the lack of coherent and up-to-date procedures encouraged estates to formulate their own rules of procedure, of which the Nobility's Standing Orders was the most consistent and detailed manifestation (see *Ritarihuonejarjestys* 1869). The Estate rules and practices set sanctions and fines for unparliamentary language and conduct. Within the framework of the Diet Act, such regulations offered the Estates a possibility to include more detailed rules that brought the Diet practices closer to the foreign parliamentary models presented in the press.

In addition to the Diet, parliamentary procedures were applied and practiced in the 'mini-parliaments' of the University of Helsinki's student associations and various other voluntary associations and public meetings. In the parliamentary activities of the University Students' Union, Finland's future political elite became acquainted with parliamentary practices and debating styles. The town meetings in the countryside, on the other hand, played a central role in politically activating and educating Finnish peasants. International contacts were also utilized. Finnish reformists and parliamentarians made excursions to foreign parliaments and participated in international parliamentary conferences. Political groups were able to use their foreign contacts to learn about parliamentary procedures and how

to implement political agendas and ideologies in parliamentary work. Early liberals, in particular, such as those in the *Helsingfors Dagblad* group and the Young Finnish Party in the early Eduskunta, were eager to adopt and teach British parliamentary style of debate, conduct and standards of eloquence.

As described by E. G. Palmen (1910, 33-34), Professor of History, member of the Diet and the Eduskunta, the Diet Act of 1869 can be understood as a bridge that united two distant eras and offered guidelines for future endeavours. The Diet's early procedural debates demonstrate a common understanding that Swedish practices formed the basis on which to found Finnish procedures. At the turn of the twentieth century, the impact of the Swedish legacy on procedures was recognized in Finnish historical accounts, but in the context of the Parliamentary Reform of 1906, Swedish examples gave way to a more varied and explicit use of European parliamentary models, such as the British *House of Commons,* Norwegian *Storting,* French *Assemblee Rationale* and German *Reichstag.* Still, in the Parliament Act of 1906, the Swedish tradition lived on through the adoption and development of the sections of the Diet Act.

International Parliamentary Concepts in Finnish Debates- The Case of *Parliamentary Obstruction*

The emergence of the concept of *parliamentary obstruction* in Finland illustrates the interest and weight that were given to foreign parliamentary discussions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Parliamentary obstruction was adopted in the procedural debates of the Eduskunta, as well as in Finnish political disputes on the relationship between the minority and the majority.

Finnish is unusual among European languages in that its political vocabulary was systematically construed. Before the last third of the nineteenth century, Swedish was the language of government, politics and public debate. In the mid-nineteenth century, the pro-Finnish elite began to fight against the backwardness of the Finnish language by systematic adoption of European political and scholarly vocabulary (Hyvarinen *et al.* 2003). The admiration for foreign parliamentary models, which reached its peak during the formative years of the Finnish political language, left its mark on the vocabulary. The Finnish press formed an important arena where the Finnish debates came into contact with the foreign parliamentary models. In newspapers, parties and political groups continued and provided background for the debates of the Diet and the Eduskunta. As a result of deliberately juxtaposing the Finnish and the international

material, the work of the Diet and the Eduskunta was easily viewed in the light of foreign models. Newspapers were the only source for the public to get information about the Finnish parliamentary work. This way, Finnish newspapers had a crucial role in popularizing parliamentary topics and creating a vocabulary to describe them. Consequently, the press had a significant influence on the popular understanding of parliamentary business.

As Kari Palonen (2003, 16) noted, concepts are prone to alteration in translation, as translation is always a "transport" or "transfer" between contexts. During the transfer, it is possible that "something else" or something unintended creeps into the concept. Therefore, translation should be viewed as a selective process which seeks to regulate, but not necessarily eliminate, this "something else". In Finland, as the case of obstruction illustrates, the interest in parliamentary topics led not only to the adoption of foreign concepts in a relatively unchanged form, but also to their intentionally selective translation for partisan ends.

The *Fennomans,* a Finnish political movement that sought to improve the position of the Finnish language in relation to Swedish, found parliamentary obstruction, particularly its uses for a persistent minority, suitable for their political purposes. The Fennomans adopted the concept from Finnish newspaper reports on the Irish obstruction in the British House of Commons, in the late 1870s and the early 1880s. The Finnish press reported intensively on these tactics, as well as the House's procedural measures to fight against them. Initially, Finnish newspapers defined obstruction as a new parliamentary delaying tactic of intentionally prolonging debate so as to wear down the majority and government to the point of exhaustion. Since the Irish obstruction campaign continued, it was seen as threatening the whole future of parliamentary life. As its main instrument, the Irish nationalist minority exploited the House's unrestricted freedom of speech. The Finnish newspapers described speaking as the main form of obstruction, while showing less interest in other tactics, such as repetitive amendments, proposals and motions for adjournment. In 1881, the Irish managed to prolong a debate to five days and 41 consecutive hours. What made the Irish obstruction exceptional was its attempt not only to prevent the passing of the Irish Coercion Bill, but also to bring parliamentary work, as a whole, to a standstill. The obstruction resulted in drastic reforms to the British procedure, such as instituting mechanisms for the suspension of members, limitations on the right to speak, the Urgency Resolution, *cloture* and guillotine[1]. Following the Irish campaign, obstruction became popular in parliaments across Europe, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In the early 1880s, during the Irish campaign, the Fennomans began to use the ideas, arguments and vocabulary of obstruction to attack Finland's Swedish-speaking minority both inside and outside the Diet, wherever Fennoman ideas of progress and reform were being challenged. For example, in 1881, the newspaper *Uusi Suometar* responded to accusations of obstruction by emphasizing that obstruction was a weapon of the minority in the case of Finland, referring therefore to the Swedish-speaking Svecomans, not to the Finnish-speaking majority:

> As the newspaper *Dagblad* has dared to call our demands pure obstruction-the word is borrowed from the English Parliament's derisive name for the Irish minority-we would like to tell *Dagblad* what kind of obstruction is practiced in this country. (...) Obstruction is all the obstacles that are repeatedly used against furthering the cause of the Finnish language. (...) When attempts are made to block government reforms that would neglect representation of the people, these are not, at least elsewhere in the world, called obstruction ("Dagblad ja saatyjen anomus kouluasiassa" 1881, 1).

In the 1880s, the Finnish translations of obstruction *(obstruktio, obstruktioni)* followed their English model in spelling, but in the early 1890s a native Finnish term for parliamentary obstruction, *(parlamentaarinen) jarrutus,* was introduced. Before the Irish campaign, *obstruction, obstruktion* and *obstruktio* were used in Finland as terms to describe medical conditions. From the 1890s, *jarrutus* was used regularly in the Finnish press to refer to both foreign and domestic obstruction campaigns. In the Finnish language, the noun *jarru* and verb *jarruttaa* referred originally to brakes and the braking of vehicles. In the late nineteenth century political debates, they were used metaphorically, giving a sense of Fennoman progress as a steady and inevitable forward motion, which could only be slowed down, but not stopped (see the newspaper articles "Waalit porwarissaatyyn" 1893, 1; "Turun kaupungin waltiopaiwamieswaali" 1893, 3; "Sananenpuolueurheilujenjohdosta" 1901, 5).

The idea of playing with scarce time and using delaying tactics was in no sense new to the Finnish Diet at the time of the Irish campaign. The foreign examples did, however, give a greater understanding of obstruction, as a systematic tactic of the minority, and offered a useful rhetorical *topos.* The varied uses of the Finnish terms for "obstruction" illustrate the authority that was given to foreign models in the emergence of Finnish political vocabulary. Vague uses of the concept were disputed by referring to how obstruction was "correctly" used in foreign models. For example, in the Diet of 1904-1905, accusations of obstruction *{jarrutus, obstruktioni)* were challenged by referring to foreign obstruction

campaigns and pointing out differences between the Finnish and the foreign tactics (e.g. "Muut lehdet" 1905, 1). Academic articles on parliamentary obstruction were also published in order to diminish the ambiguity of the concept (e.g. Erich 1908).

At the turn of the twentieth century, the rhetorical focus of *jarrutus* moved away from the language issue and the Fennoman idea of progress towards new political divisions and policy disputes. In the debates preceding the Parliamentary Reform, the term *jarrutus* was used particularly by the Social Democrats to describe policies of the conservative and bourgeois minority, whom they saw as attempting to obstruct the will of the majority of the people. In newspapers, the accusation of *jarrutus* was aimed at proposals that supported limitations on suffrage, bicameralism over unicameralism, the Senate's unaccountability to the Diet, and procedures that gave the minority a possibility to obstruct reform.

In contrast to the debates in the Diet and in the press, the debates within the Parliamentary Reform Committee (which was responsible for formulating the Parliament Act of 1906) did not engage in demagoguery and vague rhetorical (mis)use of parliamentary concepts. The Committee worked more as a parliamentary committee than as a group of partisan representatives (see Paasikivi 1986, 158-184; Mylly 2006, 109-111). The discussions of the Committee indicate deep knowledge of foreign obstruction debates and their procedural arrangements (see *Eduskuntakomitea* 1906). In the Committee, obstruction, as a systematic parliamentary tactic of a minority, referred to interchangeably as *obstruktsioni* or *jarrutus,* was discussed as characterized by excessive and disorderly speech. Following a discussion on the Irish obstruction campaign, the Committee emphasized the need for the establishment and proper supervision of a rule on speaking to the point. Such a rule was laid down in the Parliament Act *(Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopdivdjdrjestys* 1906, § 48), as well as in the Eduskunta's first Rules of Procedure, which also clarified the Speaker's authority to remind a member that he has departed from the main issue *(Suomen eduskunnan tyojdrjestys* 1907, § 25). According to the Committee, the possibility to suspend members had also proven important in fighting obstruction in the House of Commons. As a result, the rule was set down in § 48 of the Parliament Act *(Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopdivdjdrjestys* 1906).

Regardless of concerns over the risks posed by obstruction, no limitations were set on the length or number of speeches that could not be made in the Eduskunta, nor was the Speaker given the right to end the debate. Even though the rule of speaking to the point saved time, it did not entirely eliminate skilful forms of obstruction. Thus, no specific measures

to fight obstruction could be found in the procedures. The reformists saw urdimited freedom of speech as important for parliament's status as a deliberative and representative assembly. The Reform Committee's majority repeatedly emphasized the importance of holding many-sided, rich and thorough discussions as a safeguard against immature, inconsistent or hasty decisions made by occasional majorities {*Eduskuntakomitea* 1906).

In 1907, the Eduskunta started its work in an atmosphere of high hopes. The great expectations faded away, however, as the first parliamentary sessions were characterized by deep party conflicts, Russian constraints and laborious task of learning the procedures. The urgency of social reforms and the scarcity of time, resulting from a heavy workload and the short ninety-day sessions, caused vivid disputes over obstructive tactics and the failure to prevent obstruction in the formulation of the Parliament Act.

In the early Eduskunta, the Social Democrats, the largest party in the parliament (80 members of 200, in the first elections of 1907), converted the concept of obstruction into a rhetorical weapon that they used not only against political opponents, but against parliamentary speech, debate and procedure as well. A major ingredient in the Social Democrats' rhetoric was *jarrutus,* which during its existence in the Finnish political vocabulary had gained a negative meaning, particularly among the Finnish-speaking majority. In their socialist rhetoric, speech and debate, which were described as the main instruments of *jarrutus,* were seen as maintaining the *status quo* and supporting the *ancien regime,* rather than promoting change, reform and democratization. Although no large-scale obstruction debates took place in the early Eduskunta, the Social Democrats repeatedly stated their frustrations over excessive speech and its lack of limitations. According to them, the parliament was a place for "real work" and decision-making, not for idle words and useless debate. The actual work of the Eduskunta was seen as taking place outside the plenary sessions, in committees, where problems and controversies were to be solved through clarifications and briefings (see e.g. the newspaper articles "Jarrutus eduskunnassa" 1907, 2; "Kunnallislain wiiwytys-havettawia aikeita" 1908, 1; "Jalleenko pettymys?" 1908, 1; "Eduskunta ja uudistuskysymykset" 1908, 2).

The Social Democrats compared the Eduskunta's work to the foreign obstruction campaigns and described excessive speech as "an inundation of words", "rage for speaking" and "verbal diarrhoea". Socialist newspapers described their conservative and bourgeois opponents as wasting time by speaking in "parliamentarily immature" ways, and statistics were published on who were the biggest consumers of

parliamentary time, based on the number and length of their speeches (e.g. "Ketka hidastuttiwat Eduskunnan tyota. Tilastoa Eduskunnassa kaytetyista puheenwuoroista" 1908, 4; "Puhetulwa eduskunnassa" 1907, 2). By systematically employing a vocabulary that had been used for decades in reporting on the harm caused by parliamentary obstruction abroad and comparing that to domestic die-hard obstruction of progress, the socialist rhetoric of *jarrutus* had a negative influence on the understanding of parliamentary speech and debate in the early Eduskunta.

Conclusions

The early debates on the procedures and work of the Eduskunta should be understood in the light of the international parliamentary discussions of the time. Even though the early procedural debates took place within the Swedish framework of the Diet Act, diverse European influences were also actively adopted. In the late nineteenth century, the interest in foreign parliaments fuelled Finnish discussions, in which new political vocabulary was constantly being created, refined and established or abandoned. The press was the main arena where the Finnish debates came into contact with the foreign parliamentary models.

The discussions conducted in the Diet, the Parliamentary Reform Committee and the early Eduskunta indicate that the Finnish actors were well aware of the obstruction campaigns abroad and their procedural arrangements. The concept of *parliamentary obstruction* was originally introduced in Finland in the Diet, but its use was soon expanded to other disputes between minorities and majorities. Finnish newspaper articles on foreign obstruction translated and standardized expressions concerning the misuse or excessive use of speech. The rhetoric of obstruction reached its peak in the vocabulary of the Social Democratic Party in the early Eduskunta. Even though the fear of obstruction did not result in radical procedural measures in the Eduskunta, such as limitations on the right of members to speak, the concept of parliamentary obstruction influenced the attitude towards and understanding of the work of parliament in Finland. During the early years of the Eduskunta, the repeated accusations of obstruction, as speaking nonsense and wasting time, had a negative effect on attitudes towards parliamentary speech and debate.

The adoption of the concept of parliamentary obstruction in Finland is linked to an international parliamentary current of thought in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, it is not a coincidence that the idea of obstructive speech found support in Finland. Long-awaited reforms on the status of the Finnish language and representation were

hindered by, for instance, an obsolete legal and electoral system, Russian rule, and the scarcity of parliamentary time. When the possibility for reform occurred, unanimous and swift decisions were argued as being necessities, instead of time-consuming debates and many-sided evaluations of alternatives. In this setting, parliamentary obstruction and its idea of excessive speech, was thought useful for consolidating a consensual understanding of politics. In Finland, the concept of obstruction reinforced a tradition of "silence is golden", in which speech was seen as opposite to action and work. Speech was described as obstructing what was right and inevitable, something which otherwise could be quickly determined by the majority. As a result, the learned parliamentary ideals of free and thorough debate were challenged.

Notes

[1] For detailed description of the Irish obstruction and its consequences for the procedures, see Redlich (1908,133-185) and May (1883, 380-384).

References

Bergh, Edvard. 1884. *Vdr styrelse **och** vara landtdagar. **Aterblick** pa Finlands **konstitutionella** utveckling under de sednaste tjugo dren af. Edv. Bergh. Forsta bandet. 1855-1867.* Helsingfors: G. W. Edlund.

"Dagblad ja saatyjen anomus kouluasiassa." *Uusi Suometar,* April 08, 1881.

Eduskuntakomitea. 1906. *Eduskunnanuudistamiskomitean pdytdkirjat 1905-1906.* Helsinki: Kansallisarkisto.

"Eduskunta ja uudistuskysymykset." *Tyo,* October 10, 1908.

Erich, Rafael. 1908. "N. s. parlamentaarisesta obstruktionista eli 'jarrutuksesta'." *Lakimies I:* 11-29.

Hyvarinen, Matti, Jussi Kurunmaki, Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen, and Henrik Stenius (eds.). 2003. *Kdsitteet liikkeessd. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin kdsitehistoria.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

"Jarrutus eduskunnassa." *Sosialidemokraatti,* June 18, 1907.

"Jalleenko pettymys?" *Kansan Tahto,* September 9, 1908.

"Ketka hidastuttiwat Eduskunnan tyota. Tilastoa Eduskunnassa kaytetyista puheenwuoroista." *Vapaus,* January 25, 1908.

Krusius-Ahrenberg, Lolo. 1944. "Fran grundlagskommitte till landtdagsordning." *Historiska **och** litteraturhistoriska studier* 20: 219-433.

—. 1981. "Vuoden 1869 valtiopaivajarjestys." In *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Toinen osa: Sddtyedustuslaitos 1850— luvun puolivdlistd 1870-luvun loppuun,* edited by Olavi Salervo *et al.,* 251-374. Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea.

"Kunnallislain wiiwytys-havettawia aikeita." *Sawon Tydmies,* September 29, 1908.

May, Thomas Erskine. 1883. *A Treatise upon the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament.* London: Butterworths. http://www.archive.org/details/treatiseonlawpriOOmaytrich

"Muut lehdet." *Turun Sanomat,* February 17, 1905.

Mylly, Juhani. 2006. *Edustuksellisen kansanvallan lapimurto.* Helsinki: Edita Prima.

Paasikivi, J. K. 1986. *Paasikiven muistelmia sortovuosilta (I).* Juva: WSOY.

Palmen, E. G. 1910. *Suomen valtiopdivdin historia.* Porvoo: WSOY.

Palonen, Kari. 2003. "Translation, politics and conceptual change." *Redescriptions: yearbook of political thought and conceptual history* 7: 15-35.

"Puhetulwa eduskunnassa." *Wiipuri,* September 22, 1907.

Redlich, Josef. 1908. *The Procedure of the House of Commons. A study of Its History and Present Form.* London: Archibald Constable. http://www.archive.org/details/procedurehousecOOredlgoog.

Ritarihuonejdrjestys Suomen Suuriruhtinanmaan Ritaristolle ja Aatelille. 1869. URL: http://www.histdoc.net/laki/rhj.html.

"Sananen puolueurheilujen johdosta." *Uusi Suometar,* April 17, 1901.

Seitkari, Olavi. 1958. "Edustuslaitoksen uudistus 1906." In *Suomen kansanedustuslaitoksen historia. Osa 5.1.* Helsinki: Eduskunnan historiakomitea.

Suomen eduskunnan tydjdrjestys ynnd mdardykset valtiopaivilld suhteellisen vaalitavan mukaan toimitettavista vaaleista. 1907.

Suomen Suuriruhtinaanmaan Valtiopdivdjdrjestys. 1906. URL: http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1906/19060026

"Turun kaupungin waltiopaiwamieswaali." *Aura,* October 6, 1893.

"Waalit porwarissaatyyn." *Uusi Savo,* August 12, 1893.

PART II

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES:
TOPICS AND ATTITUDES

CHAPTER THREE

ANTI-SEMITISM AS A POLITICAL STRATEGY
IN PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE:
DEBATES ON VOTING RIGHTS
IN AUSTRIA FROM 1861 TO 1918

MATTHIAS FALTER
AND SASKIA STACHOWITSCH

The history of modern parliamentarianism has mostly been told as institutional or legal history. Such historical accounts tend to neglect the manifold power struggles between different social and political actors, which have shaped the development of parliamentary institutions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. We argue for examining parliamentarianism as a process of political and social conflicts over participative rights (Ucakar 1985) and aim at showing how to grasp this process by analysing parliamentary discourse. Plenary debates on voting rights and electoral law provide a particularly well suited study object for investigating the evolution of parliamentary democracy and the assumptions and ideologies that were inscribed into its institutions and proceedings. The article demonstrates this statement in a case study of debates on suffrage that had been taking place in the Austrian Parliament during the late Habsburg Empire, examining the role of anti-Semitism as an argumentative strategy in these discourses'. We employ a political science approach to historical parliamentarianism, which emphasizes contextualization of parliamentary discourse not only within institutional settings, but also within broader historical, social and political contexts.

In the Austrian Parliament, anti-Semitism became an important argumentative strategy in political debates and was increasingly utilized as a means of political mass mobilization during the second half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Parliamentary culture was permeated by anti-Semitic agitation, which established a discursive connection between different social and political conflicts and the

constructed dichotomy between Jews and non-Jews (Kreisky, Falter and Stachowitsch 2010). Building upon traditional Christian anti-Judaic prejudice, modernized anti-Semitism became a code for different political conflict lines and dominated various policy fields, in which central social and political crises of the examined period became manifest. Electoral law and suffrage was such a field. Analysing anti-Semitic rhetoric in these parliamentary discourses on voting rights helps identify the ambivalences inherent in the limited and belated process of democratization in Austria. It highlights the competing concepts of *representation, citizenship* and *nationality,* and the inclusive and exclusive elements inherent in them. Thus, it provides evidence of the persistence of prejudice and discrimination in the establishment of European democracies and the inscription of inequalities into democratic processes and systems.

Parliamentary Research and the Analysis of Parliamentary Discourse

For understanding modern parliamentarianism as a dynamic social process (Nick and Pelinka 1984, 25, 51), it is important to consider the historical power struggles over participative rights which resulted from the increasing pressure on the legitimization of political power in the nineteenth and twentieth century (Ucakar 1985, 14). When the concept of monarchic legitimacy was being replaced by the idea of sovereignty of the people, the legitimization of power became tied to the notion of political participation. This shift led to democratization and the expansion of participative rights. Suffrage was a central instrument for gaining and executing this participation. Accordingly, the development of voting rights expresses the relationship between the need to legitimize power and the pressure to expand participation in the context of changing social power relations *(ibidem,* 14f.).

The plenary represents a field in which different political actors compete for hegemony over the interpretation and construction of social reality (Opp de Hipt and Latniak 1991). Thus, parliamentary discourse is a valuable source for grasping struggles for political representation and participative rights. Its analysis identifies the discursive strategies that are employed to legitimize different claims to power, gain recognition, and win votes. We shall discuss anti-Semitism as such a strategy, in a discourse-historical analysis which emphasizes the "role of discourse in the reproduction of power, dominance and inequalities" (Wodak 2001, 28). Plenary debates not only mirror social and political power relations, they also retroact upon social structures and institutions and thereby shape

political systems and processes (Bleses and Rose 1998, 13). Parliamentary debates on suffrage, therefore, provide insights into the development of the democratic state and the institutions of parliamentarianism. They also highlight the transformation of anti-Semitism, as a political strategy, in relation to structural and functional change of the political system and its reproduction in and through parliamentary institutions. The study of political debate, rather than policy outcomes, is particularly relevant for the analysis of political anti-Semitism, because no openly anti-Semitic laws were introduced during the Habsburg monarchy and the First Republic of Austria, while anti-Semitism was widespread in political culture and institutions.

Anti-Semitism as a Political Strategy

In her examination of the development of anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany, Shulamit Volkov describes anti-Semitism as a cultural code,

> "a sign of cultural identity, of one's belonging to a specific cultural camp. It was a way of communicating an acceptance of a particular set of ideas and a preference for specific, political and moral norms" (Volkov 1978, 34f).

Anti-Semitism, the author argues, became an expression of a "radical anti-modern mentality, rejecting liberalism, capitalism, socialism" *(ibidem,* 31). In the context of capitalist modernization and the establishment of the modern nation-state, anti-Semitism addressed Jews as representatives of modernity and its critical elements, such as secularization, industrialization, capitalism, "cultural decay", changing gender relations, etc. Such anti-Semitic ideas reduced complex social transformations and conflicts to the activities of an imagined, homogeneous, and exclusive group of people, who were considered an all-encompassing negative force endangering national groups and traditional social structures, while gentile communities were imagined as harmonic and stable in a hierarchic social order (Salzborn 2010,91).

These ideological elements are also detectable in parliamentary discourse in the Habsburg Empire: Jews were identified with Socialism and Liberalism, with Capitalism and Marxism, with modern culture and secularization. They were considered a menace to national and racial unity, interfering with the relations between the nationalities of the Empire and therefore considered as an international and even anti-national enemy (Holz 2001). Because of the central role of the parliament in political culture and law-making processes, this anti-Semitism not only functioned

as a "cultural code", but also as a political strategy. It became a political instrument of self-representation and de-legitimization of opponents, as well as a tool in the struggle for their recognition as legitimate representatives of "the people".

The Development of Austrian Parliamentarianism and Jewish Political Integration

The Austrian Constitution of 1861 established a centralist parliamentary system of privileges (Skottsberg 1940, 3If.), which was supplemented by a catalogue of civil rights in 1867 (Ucakar 1985, 138ff.). During the 1860s and 1870s, parliamentary influence on the government remained minimal. Corporative interests were the only ones to be represented and participation was mediated through regional representative bodies. Even the reform of 1873, which introduced direct suffrage, confined represented groups to upper classes, whose right to participate depended on their wealth and property ownership. Important land owners, the trade and commerce, as well as urban and German-speaking populations were favoured by this system. This sustained a liberal majority (Ucakar 1985, 164ff.), which supported the centralist constitution and the privileges it granted to elites. In regard to democratic participation, the liberals had thus basically become a conservative force *(ibidem,* 557).

With the introduction of civil rights in 1867, equality was granted to the Jews, as one step in the establishment of the modern constitutional state. Jews were included as citizens into the process of legitimizing power and the Jewish urban bourgeoisie became an important element in German liberalism and liberal parties in parliament. The democratization of suffrage (universal suffrage in 1897, and equal suffrage in 1907) diversified Jewish parliamentary representation: Polish-national, Socialist and Jewish-national representatives soon exceeded the number of Jewish liberals. The expansion of suffrage, however, did not only enrich Jewish representation in parliament. The same process also strengthened petty bourgeois conservatives and (German and other) nationalists, groups which targeted new voters who felt threatened by industrialization, economic modernization, and liberalization. To mobilize this electorate, they employed anti-Semitic populism (Ucakar 1985, 184f., 562). Some liberals also adopted a more nationalist course, in order to remain competitive with these new political forces (Pauley 1992, 43). In this context, anti-Semitism became a comprehensive framework for interpreting social transformations and political conflict lines.

Anti-Semitic Stereotypes and Argumentations in Parliamentary Discourse

Debates on voting rights featured a broad spectrum of anti-Semitic images and codes. One central stereotype was that of the "rich Jew", embodied in images of the exploitative Jewish speculator. This image featured prominently in the anti-liberal argumentations of Pan-Germans, Christian-Socials and Clericals. By employing this stereotype, these factions accused Jews of being responsible for the financial and economic crisis and, at the same time, defamed liberals as serving "the money nobility, the Freemasonry, and the Jewry"[2]. The imagined "illegitimate" wealth of the Jews was claimed to be protected by the liberals and contrasted with the economic decline of the "hard working common people"[3]. Such arguments were frequently accompanied by attacks on the "Jewish press" and conspiracy theories, which portrayed the Jews as not only rich, but also politically powerful. They were said to have infiltrated all political parties, the press and the government[4]. Such sentiments were not limited to conservative parties. Galician Social-Democrats used similar argumentations against the Polish establishment: Jews were portrayed as a "small clique" of German bankers, who conspired with the government, held the "power in the cities" and controlled "all sources of money"[5]. Jews were thus associated with the bourgeoisie and depicted as enemies of the working class[6].

Another set of stereotypes in debates on suffrage was connected with the rising conflicts between the nationalities of the empire. Nationalists perceived voting rights as an instrument of national rather than social integration. In this context, Jews were frequently portrayed not only as the enemies of various national groups, but also as instigators of conflicts between them[7]. Pan-Germans and German-Radicals accused the Jews of supporting the Slavs' claims to power[8]. In their imagination, the rise of Slavic nationalities could only be prevented by keeping the Empire free of "Jewish influences"[9]. Again, radical nationalists claimed that the Jews conspired with different political parties, from the Christian-Socials to the Socialists against the national interests of the Germans[10]. Universal suffrage was thus invoked as a measure to "protect" the German population[11]. These lines of argument also contained strong anti-liberal sentiments: German anti-Semites criticized the liberals for a lack of commitment to "the German cause" by claiming a "Jewish invasion" of their parties[12]. Likewise, Slavic parliamentarians also portrayed the Jews as the representatives of their national opponents: Czechs and Poles dissociated themselves from the Germans by equating them with Liberalism

and Judaism[13], and Ruthenians associated the Poles with the Jewish establishment[14]. Some Slavic parliamentarians, however, also followed the German-nationalist verdict, namely that the Jews were not "real Germans", but an oppressive counter-race[15].

Anti-Semitic projections were condensed in direct attacks on (allegedly) Jewish members of Parliament. Regardless of their religious affiliation or political practice, these parliamentarians were depicted as representatives of all supposedly negative implications of modernity. These strategies were extended to non-Jewish opponents in political debates, whose standpoints were delegitimized by referring to their (imagined) "Jewish heritage"[16]. By doing so, anti-Semites constructed themselves as the legitimate representatives of a "natural", nationally and racially defined community of gentiles, and the Jews (and Jewish politicians) as the representatives of exploitative group interests. In one glaring example, Social-Democrats were tagged as the "Jewish-Social-Democratic Party" who had only nominated "two humans among twelve Jews" for the upcoming election[17].

These different images and stereotypes were used to characterize Jews as the profiteers of the unequal voting system. It was claimed that they denied suffrage to the hard working population through their privileged status (and through election fraud[18]). Anti-Semitism was thus turned into an argument for democratization, denouncing liberal parliamentarianism as a "Jewish standpoint"[19]. As a consequence, radical anti-Semites demanded that Jews should be stripped off their active and passive voting rights. The anti-Semitic representative Ernst Schneider, for example, even proposed the deprivation of citizenship rights for "baptized" and "non-baptized" Jews, as well as their eviction to Palestine[20], thus clearly promoting a racial definition of being Jewish.

While most anti-Semitic speeches were accompanied by expressions of "amusement" and "laughter", some parliamentarians also spoke out against anti-Semitism. Schneider's speech, for example, was repeatedly interrupted by the Speaker of the House, who refused to accept "such statements against equal citizens" and dismissed Schneider's demand for repealing the Jews' suffrage as a "bad joke"[21]. In other instances, criticism of anti-Semitism was used as an argument against universal suffrage: the liberal and conservative elites claimed that more participative rights for lower social classes would lead to increased national and racial hatred, which could only be prevented by restraining voting rights[22]. Motivated by their fear of new political forces, they portrayed unequal representation as the only remedy against rising anti-Semitism.

positions of Jewish Parliamentarians on Voting Rights

Liberal Jewish representatives were by majority in favour of limited suffrage and only supported moderate and gradual expansion of voting rights. They feared that a more inclusive system would cause losses for their party and lead to gains for the "reactionaries"[23]. In Austria, they claimed, people's education was not advanced enough for universal suffrage and the voting system should thus strengthen the educated against the numerical majority of the unschooled[24]. After the 1890s, however, most liberals realized that this stance could not be maintained and many adopted a more positive view of democratization. Some even demanded universal, equal suffrage, as a measure to secure social peace . Others saw it as a way to strengthen the Empire against national chauvinism . However, the notion that the bourgeoisie had a right to be more strongly represented due to their "intelligence"[27] was never quite given up and even survived into the early years of the 1st Republic.

Democratization diversified factions and nationalities of Jewish representatives and thereby differentiated their standpoints on suffrage. Jewish Social-Democrats demanded a reform of electoral law as a "necessity for the working class", but also for the common good of the Empire. Women's suffrage and equality for all nationalities were important elements in this struggle[28]. During the 1st Republic, Jewish Social-Democrats played an important role in defending parliamentary democracy against authoritarian tendencies in constitutional law favoured by the Christian-Socials[29]. During the late monarchic period, another important Jewish movement for democratization was represented by Jewish-nationals, four of whom formed the "Jewish Club" in parliament between 1907 and 1911 (Falter and Stachowitsch 2009). They connected their advocacy for universal, equal suffrage with their struggle for the recognition of the Jews as a nationality[30]. By doing so, they proposed a new concept of Jewish representation, which targeted the Jewish masses and acted in opposition to the "privileged", assimilated Jews, who were mostly represented in liberal or nationalist factions[31]. The members of the Jewish Club particularly attacked the Jews of the Polish Club for opportunistically appealing to the religious Jewish establishment . They accused them of anti-Zionist activities and even of strategically allying with anti-Semites[33]. In this context, the question of participative rights became an issue of what being Jewish meant and brought to light inner-Jewish conflicts over who was entitled to represent "Jewish interests". Jewish-nationals were also the only ones to speak out openly against anti-Semitism in debates on voting rights. Before the rise of Jewish

nationalism, only a few Jewish liberals had criticized anti-Semitic attacks as populist delusion and as contradicting the anti-Semites' advocacy for universal suffrage[34]. For Jewish-nationals, however, the fight for a democratic electoral law was intrinsically tied to their struggle for national recognition which was, in turn, seen as a central counter-strategy to anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism as a Political Strategy in Debates on Voting Rights

Debates on voting rights are manifestations of social struggles for political participation. The transformation of anti-Semitism in an instrument used in these debates must therefore be analysed against the backdrop of struggles for social and national emancipation. The analysis of anti-Semitic rhetoric highlights different lines of conflict in the development of parliamentarianism and electoral law. With the rise of conservative and German nationalist forces in the 1880s, anti-Semitism was introduced into debates on suffrage. But only with increasing conflicts between clerical-conservative forces, the petty bourgeoisie and the workers in the 1890s and beyond, did anti-Semitism become an integral part of these discourses. Anti-Semitic speeches became more frequent and their contents more radical and racist. Different groups of actors used anti-Semitic rhetoric as an anti-liberal and anti-socialist political strategy to enforce various political, social, economic and regional interests. In debates on voting rights, anti-Semitism was employed to support demands for participative rights of socially or nationally defined clientele. More rights for the lower middle class electorate (petty trade, commerce, and peasantry) were promoted by equating these groups with the "honest, hard-working German people" and contrasting them with "Jewish capitalists".

German nationalists, such as the Pan-Germans and the German-radicals, were the most vehement advocates of anti-Semitic ideologies. They attacked Jewish parliamentarians directly and demanded the rescinding of Jewish emancipation. By denouncing liberals as unauthentic Germans and portraying themselves as the true representatives of the German middle classes, anti-Semitism was established as an anti-liberal argument for universal suffrage and a nationalist strategy in the context of rising nationality conflicts. The increased integration of Slavic nationalities into the political institutions of the monarchy was interpreted as a power loss to the Jews, building a bridge between demands for democratization, nationalist claims, and anti-Semitism. For Pan-Germans,

this anti-Semitic fight against the Slavic nationalities was also a fight against the concept of the multinational state. Due to the rise of these new movements in parliament, liberals also adopted an increasingly nationalist course, which inhibited offensive criticism of anti-Semitic tendencies.

Beginning in the 1890s, German-nationalist anti-Semitism was increasingly challenged by the Christian-socials, who promoted a new form of anti-Semitic populism. This mostly petty bourgeois movement was notorious for using anti-Semitism as an argument for more participatory rights for its clientele by refraining socio-economic crises in the course of industrialization processes as conflicts between Jews and non-Jews. Because Christian-social attitudes towards voting rights were shaped by their fear of being overtaken by the Socialists (Ucakar 1985, 561), anti-Semitism was increasingly used as an anti-socialist argument. In this context, it is important to note that Christian-socials not only subscribed to "cultural" or "economic" forms of anti-Semitism, as later claimed by their successor party, the OVP, but that they explicitly promoted a racial definition of Jewishness and demanded the expulsion and, in some cases, even the extermination of the Jews.

Around the turn of the century, Slavic nationalists also became central promoters of anti-Semitic ideologies in parliament. The vivid conflicts over the relative power of different nationalities in electoral law were often fought by employing anti-Semitic argumentations. The Jews were accused of weakening the Slavic nationalities against the Germans or against one another. Slavic socialists also used anti-Semitism as an anti-capitalist argument, associating the Jews with the (German) upper classes.

Conclusions

The parliament represents a field of power struggles over recognition as the legitimate representative of differently conceived political communities. In the context of various movements for national and social emancipation and increasing party competition, anti-Semitism became an instrument in these power struggles, through which factions distinguished themselves from political opponents and mobilized the electorate. Parliamentary anti-Semitism differs from anti-Semitism in other social contexts in its unique status as a strategy for the pursuit of different political, social, and economic interests. As parliament negotiates and shapes the legal and institutional framework of society, parliamentary anti-Semitism is not merely a reflection of social developments, but it also retroacted upon the transformations of democracy. The acceptance of anti-Semitism in parliament, therefore, represents a measure for the quality of

democracy. Hence, its analysis contributes not only to political discourse analysis and anti-Semitism research, but also to political and democratic theory.

The issue of anti-Semitic rhetoric in the plenary demonstrates the contributions that the analysis of parliamentary discourse can make to the research on historical parliamentarianism. Certain aspects of parliamentary history, such as the inscription of prejudice and discrimination into its central categories, can best be grasped by discourse-analytical approaches. The different layers of meaning in concepts such as *citizenship, participation, equality,* and even *democracy,* which are often neglected in conventional approaches, become visible. The analysed debates show that parts of the movement for democratic voting rights were anti-Semitic and promoted exclusionary, anti-pluralistic definitions of political community, based on racial heritage and ethnic descent. A multinational concept of the state was thereby delegitimized. Yet, anti-Semitism was not only "functional" for arguing different positions on the issue of suffrage, the expansion of suffrage was also explicitly invoked as a measure to discriminate against the Jews.

Though nationality conflicts and debates on suffrage abated in the 1st Republic, anti-Semitism remained a central discursive element in Austrian political culture. The spreading of anti-Semitic rhetoric across different policy fields made it a comprehensive political strategy for interpreting social and political relations. This helped to pave the way for the extreme forms of anti-Semitism promoted and executed by the National-socialists.

Notes

[2] Repr. Liechtenstein (CI), 452nd Meeting, XIst Session, 20.2.1896, 22649.
[3] Repr. Scheicher (CS), 478th Meeting, XIst Session, 20.4.1896, 24221.
[4] Repr. Lemisch (GPP), 391st Meeting, XVIIth Session, 13.3.1906, 35066.
[5] Repr. Daszynski (Soc), 5th Meeting, XIInd Session, 8.4.1897, 204.
[6] *Ibid.,* 211.
[7] Repr. Schlesinger (Ant), 238* Meeting, XIst Session, 24.10.1893, 11395.
[8] Repr. Schonerer (Lib/PanG), 445th Meeting, XVIIth Session, 7.11.1906, 39568.
[9] Repr. Stein (PanG), 448th Meeting, XVIIth Session, 12.11.1906, 39719.
[10] Repr. Sternberg, 443rd Meeting, XVIIth Session, 5.11.1906, 39459.
[11] Repr. Hauck (Ant), 242nd Meeting, XIst Session, 23.11.1893, 11547.

[12] Repr. Schonerer (Lib/PanG), 107th Meeting, IXth Session, 28.1.1881, 3772; Repr. Schlesinger (Ant), 238th Meeting, XIth Session, 24.10.1893, 11396.
[13] Repr. Koudela, 389* Meeting, XVIIth Session, 8.3.1906, 34905.
[14] Repr. Wassilko (Ruth), 453rd Meeting, XVIIth Session, 19.11.1906, 40034; Repr. Romanczuk (Y-ruth), 446th Meeting, XVIIth Session, 8.11.1906, 39605; Repr. Okuniewskij (Ruth), 4* Meeting, XII* Session, 7.4.1897, 148f.; Repr. Taniaczkiewicz (Ruth), 5* Meeting, XIIth Session, 8.4.1897, 218.
[15] Repr. Svozil (Old-cz/Y-cz), 486th Meeting, XIst Session, 30.4.1896, 24597f.
[16] Repr. Pickert (Lib), 20* Meeting, X* Session, 12.2.1886, 639.
[17] Repr. Schneider (Ant/CS), 486th Meeting, XIst Session, 30.4.1896, 24603.
[18] Repr. Lueger (Dem/CS), 452nd Meeting, XIst Session, 20.1.1896, 22673.
[19] Repr. Schlesinger (Ant), 238* Meeting, XIst Session, 24.10.1893, 11395; Repr. Pattai (Ant/CS), 240* Meeting, XIst Session, 27.10.1893, 11452.
[20] Repr. Schneider (Ant/CS), 486* Meeting, XIst Session, 30.2.1896, 24601.
[21] Pras. Chlumecky (Lib), ibid.
[22] Repr. Dzieduszcki (Pol), 480* Meeting, XIst Session, 22.4.1896, 24358.
[23] Repr. Jaques (Lib), 20* Meeting, Xth Session, 12.2.1886, 640f.
[24] Repr. Auspitz (Lib), 107th Meeting, IXth Session, 28.1.1881, 3779.
[25] Repr. Stransky (Y-cz), 394* Meeting, XVII* Session, 16.3.1906, 35346.
[26] Repr. Other (Lib), 355* Meeting, XVII* Session, 6.10.1905, 32245f.
[27] Repr. Other (GnP), 10* Meeting, Provisional National Assembly, 18.12.1918, 361.
[28] Repr. Adler (Soc), 446* Meeting, XVIIth Session, 8.11.1906, 39597f.; Repr. Ellenbogen (Soc), 254th Meeting, XVIIth Session, 10.12.1903, 23159ff.
[29] *ibid.,* 3479.
[30] Repr. Straucher (Jn), 391st Meeting, XVII* Session, 13.3.1906, 35109-35114.
[31] Repr. Straucher (Jn), 449* Meeting, XVII* Session, 13.11.1906, S. 39808.
[32] Repr. Straucher (Jn), 6* Meeting, XXIst Session, 27.7.1911, 371.
[33] Repr. Straucher (Jn), 7* Meeting, XXIst Session, 28.7.1911, 456.
[34] Repr. Menger (Lib), 480* Meeting, XIst Session, 22.4.1896, 24332.

References

Bleses, Peter, and Edgar Rose. 1998. *Deutungswandel der Sozialpolitik: die Arbeitsmarkt- und Familienpolitik im parlamentarischen Diskurs.* Frankfurt/M: Campus.

Falter, Matthias, and Saskia Stachowitsch. 2009. "Denn fur uns Juden erhebt sich keine Stimme. Parlamentarische Praxis des Judischen Klubs im Abgeordnetenhaus 1907 bis 1911." In *Die Judischnationale Partei in Osterreich 1906 bis 1938,* edited by Dieter Hecht, 7/2009, 42-66. Chilufim. Zeitschrift fur Jiidische Kulturgeschichte.

Holz, Klaus. 2001. *Nationaler Antisemitismus. Wissenssoziologie einer Weltanschauung.* Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

Kreisky, Eva, Matthias Falter, and Saskia Stachowitsch. 2010. *Antisemitismus und Judentum im osterreichischen Parlament 1861-1938,* project report, Zukunitsfonds der Republik Osterreich.

Nick, Rainer, and Anton Pelinka. 1984. *Parlamentarismus in Osterreich.* Vienna: Jugend & Volk.

Opp de Hipt, Manfred, and Erich Latniak (eds.). 1991. *Sprache statt Politik? Politikwissenschaftliche Semantik- und Rhetorikforschung,* Westdeutscher.

Pauley, Bruce. 1992. *From Prejudice to Persecution: A History of Austrian Anti-Semitism.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Salzborn, Samuel. 2010. "The politics of antisemitism." *Journal for the Study of Antisemitism 2* (1): 89-114.

Skottsberg, Brita. 1940. *Der Osterreichische Parlamentarismus.* Gdteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.

Ucakar, Karl. 1985. *Demokratie und Wahlrecht in Osterreich. Zur Entwicklung von politischer Partizipation und staatlicher Legitimationspolitik.* Vienna: Verlag fur Gesellschaftskritik.

Volkov, Shulamit. 1978. "Antisemitism as a cultural code. Reflections on the history and historiography of antisemitism in Imperial Germany." *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 23 (1): 25-46.

Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The discourse-historical approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis,* edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 63-94. London *et al.*: Sage Publications.

Abbreviations

Ant	Anti-Semites
CS	Christian-socials
Cl	Clericals
Dem	Democrats
GnP	German-national Party (1ʳ Republic)
GPP	German People's Party
Jn	Jewish-nationals
Lib	Liberals
Old-cz	Old-Czechs
PanG	Pan-Germans
Pol	Polish Club
Ruth	Ruthenians
Soc	Social-democrats
Y-cz	Young-Czechs
Y-ruth	Young-Ruthenians

CHAPTER FOUR

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE IN CANADA: AN ANALYSIS OF SOME PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

MANON TREMBLAY

Introduction

Canada is one of the few countries where civil marriage is open to same-sex couples. In fact, on July 20, 2005, Canada became the fourth country in the world—after the Netherlands (in 2001), Belgium (in 2003) and Spain (in June 2005)—to put an end to the exclusive access of heterosexual couples to common-law marriage, by opening it to same-sex couples. This victory may largely be interpreted as the consequence of a series of battles in judicial arenas regarding the constitutionality of limiting civil marriage to opposite-sex couples, in light of the equality rights stipulated in section 15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the Charter), rather than the consequence of broader and sustained mobilizations of the lesbian and gay movement.

This paper aims to shed light on the rationales behind supporting and rejecting lesbian/gay marriage. It analyses the debates of the second reading of Bill C-38, *An Act respecting certain aspects of legal capacity for marriage for civil purposes* (or the *Civil Marriage Act),* which had been taking place in the Canadian House of Commons from February to June 2005. The analysis focuses on the two most important sets of arguments that have animated the parliamentary debates on same-sex marriage: arguments concerning the Charter, on the one hand, and those concerning family, on the other hand.

Arguments Concerning the Charter

Arguments related to the Charter are, without any doubt, the most prominent in parliamentary discourses on same-sex marriage; this is not surprising, since the legislative debates responded to a series of court decisions that resulted in the exclusion of lesbian/gay couples from common-law marriage, being labelled as unconstitutional according to the equality rights stipulated in section 15 of the Charter.

Basically, arguments concerning the Canadian Charter, which are part of a larger discourse on human rights (Kollman 2009, Lalor 2011, Sanders 2002, Wintemute 2002), promote a liberal conception of citizenship, that includes a series of inalienable and intrinsic rights and freedoms belonging to every human being.

Members of Parliament (MPs) have used the rationale of the Canadian Charter to both support and reject same-sex marriage, while insisting on different rights and freedoms: the former gave priority to equality rights, and the latter to freedom of conscience and religion and, to a lesser extent, to freedom of expression.

Equality Rights

Section 15 of the Charter states that

[e]very individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

New Democratic Party MP Peter Julian interprets the opening of marriage to lesbian/gay couples as a way of putting an end to discrimination against lesbians and gays:

Now it is up to our country's highest political body, the House of Commons, to end discrimination in marriage against gay and lesbian Canadians. (April 5, 2005, 15:55)

Beyond this negative right approach (that is, the right not to be discriminated against), the leader of the Bloc Quebecois, Gilles Duceppe, brings together citizenship and equality, the latter being an attribute of the former:

The debate on same-sex marriage is, ultimately, a question of citizenship. No one can say that Quebec or Canada are just societies if the people of this country are not all treated equally. (February 16, 2005, 16:44)

According to this reading, equality means the application of the same rule to everyone, notwithstanding any other considerations. Making differences between people is seen as contrary to any citizenship based on equality, or as New Democratic MP Bill Siksay poses it:

Separate or new institutions or legal arrangements will not meet the test of the value of our citizenship. Civil union applied only to gay and lesbian couples is not an answer because separate is not equal. Separate water fountains, separate sections on the bus, separate beaches, none of these are acceptable in societies that value the full equality of their people. I and my party believe the same is true of civil marriage. (February 16, 2005, 17:19)

According to this view, the capacity of lesbians and gays to fit the heterosexual model, that is to say to "hetero-normalize" themselves, is the condition they must fulfil in order to be regarded as equal citizens.

House of Commons discourses rejecting lesbian and gay marriage have also employed the Charter. In fact, these MPs do not negate the equality rights that the Charter guarantees; neither do they reject the Charter itself (which would be a political suicide in Canada!). This point is developed by the Conservative MP Rona Ambrose:

I would like to begin my comments on a personal note and say that when I think of the people in my life who I love, some of whom happen to be gay and lesbian, I know clearly, both in my heart and in my mind, that 1 would never support a public policy position that violated their rights and in any way violated the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (February 21, 2005, 12:12)

Instead, these MPs contest the wider philosophical framework inspiring the Charter and its equality rights provisions-that is the human rights rhetoric and the argument that since the right to marry is a human right, then lesbians and gays have the right to marry. The leader of the Conservative Party of Canada (and current Prime Minister of Canada), Stephen Harper, illustrates this position with the following statement:

Fundamental human rights are not a magician's hat from which new rabbits can constantly be pulled out. The basic human rights we hold dear: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association, and equality before the law [...] are well understood and recognized around the world. [...] Same-sex marriage is not a human right. (February 16, 2005, 16:25)

While endorsing the Charter and its equality rights provisions, the MPs who are against the idea of lesbians and gays getting married argue that the reproductive nature of marriage justifies the prevention of lesbians and gays from accessing to this institution. Moreover, this exclusion cannot be interpreted as a form of discrimination against lesbians and gays, because it happens as a consequence of the laws of Nature. Conservative MP Jason Kenney explains that

> [...] social, cultural and historical evidence leads to one conclusion: that marriage is tautologically a heterosexual institution. It therefore cannot constitute, in my view, unjust discrimination to limit the application of the word "marriage" to those relationships which it essentially describes (February 21, 2005, 17:30)

In the same vein, the Liberal MP Rodger Cruzner argues that "we should treat all Canadians equally but not necessarily exactly the same" (April 21, 2005, 13:45).

In order to reconcile their support for the Charter and its equality rights provisions, on the one hand, and their opposition to the opening of marriage to lesbian/gay couples, on the other, these MPs promote a compromise: instead of opening civil marriage to same-sex couples, the House of Commons should warrant cohabiting same-sex couples the same rights and obligations that are attributed to *de facto* heterosexual couples. While recognizing and protecting the unique character of marriage (e.g., as an institution dedicated to reproduction), such a legal arrangement respects the equality rights of lesbians and gays, as guaranteed by the Charter. Conservative MP Rona Ambrose asks

> why the government is not following the lead of most Canadians and searching for a middle ground that will protect the rights of all Canadians equally, recognize homosexual unions and respect tradition at the same point. The government, after all, likes to talk about Canada's ability to broker resolutions. It likes to talk about Canadians as being the sort of people who search for compromise and search for the middle position (February 21, 2005, 12:20)

"The Charter, yes, but..." may capture the Charter related rationale of those rejecting lesbian and gay marriage. More specifically, by advocating a compromise between seemingly conflicting rights, these MPs support the "separate but equal" doctrine: different situations call for different responses, responses which are nevertheless equal in value. That said, while those who reject same-sex marriage argue that the Charter's equal rights provisions must be implemented with discretion, they also

vigorously plead for full respect of the Charter provisions regarding freedoms of conscience and religion.

Freedoms of Conscience, Religion, and Expression

Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the preamble of Bill C-38: the *Civil Marriage Act* first affirm "the Charter's section 2 freedom of conscience and religion guarantee", and second assert

> that the bill is without effect on that guarantee, with particular reference to the freedom of members of religious groups to hold their beliefs and that of officials to refuse to perform marriages that conflict with their beliefs[1].

MPs who oppose the adoption of Bill C-38 have justified their position by arguing that it does not sufficiently protect freedoms of conscience and religion. Several reasons are mentioned, the first of which is constitutional: Canadian federalism provides that the federal government has the responsibility to define who can marry, while the provinces and territories are entrenched with the "solemnization of marriage" statutes, that is

> the conditions precedent to marriage of a ceremonial nature, such as the issuance of licences, the publication of bans, the qualifications of celebrants and similar "formal" rules.[2]

Thus, some opponents to same-sex marriage have pointed out that the guarantees that Bill C-38 provides regarding freedoms of conscience and religion are void, because the federal government does not have power to solemnize marriage.

A second argument is that the protection of religious freedom requires more than the basic option for religious officials to refuse to perform marriages that conflict with their beliefs; this protection implies a larger array of practices:

> Protecting religious freedom goes far beyond just protecting the rights of churches and other religious bodies to maintain the traditional definition of marriage. It also means preserving the right of churches to publicly preach and teach their beliefs related to marriage. It means preserving the rights of religious schools to hire staff who respect their doctrines and practices. It means protecting justices of the peace and civil marriage commissioners who do not want to solemnize marriages that are not in accordance with their beliefs. It means preserving their charitable and other economic benefits as public institutions. It means preserving the right of any public official to act in accordance with his or her beliefs. (Myron Thompson, Conservative, April 21, 2005, 13:32)

According to this interpretation, freedoms of conscience and religion generate a larger set of rights and advantages, such as financial advantages. Furthermore, these rights and advantages may imply a capacity to publicly express convictions regarding lesbian and gay lifestyles that open the door to the possibility of libels against lesbians and gays under the cover of freedoms of conscience and religion.

Another argument suggests that in case of conflict between, on the one hand, equality rights for lesbians and gays and, on the other, freedoms of conscience and religion, the latter has to bow to the former:

> In case after case after case, when religious freedoms clashed with so-called gay rights, the courts in this country caved in to the gay rights lobby. (Pat O'Brien, Liberal, February 21, 2005, 15:25)

In sum, far from rejecting the Charter, the opponents of same-sex marriage have mobilized it, notably by arguing that the Bill C-38 does not efficiently protect freedoms of conscience and religion.

Few proponents of lesbian/gay marriage have focused on freedoms of conscience and religion. Essentially, proponents have argued that both Bill C-38 and the Charter adequately protect freedoms of conscience and religion. The leader of the Bloc Quebecois, Gilles Duceppe, put forward an outstanding interpretation of freedom of religion:

> [w]ith all respect, I must reaffirm that the religion of some should not become the law for others. While the right to freedom of religion exists and ought to remain a basic principle of our societies, religion must not impose its own principles on society at large and serve as the foundation for the law governing us all. (February 16, 2005, 16:46)

In other words, freedoms of conscience and religion imply that the life of one person is not regulated by the other's religious convictions. Here is a very strong position for the defence of secular societies, where different lifestyles (including heterosexual families) can coexist.

Arguments Concerning Family

Basically, this set of arguments focuses on the historical, anthropological and sociological meanings of marriage and family (Martos 1993, Polikoff 2008), which are interpreted in different ways, depending on whether MPs support or reject Bill C-38. For those who oppose the opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples, marriage is heterosexual by its very nature, that is to say, from time immemorial, everywhere around the world and in

all societies. Conservative MP Rob Moore explains that the traditional (i.e., heterosexual) definition of marriage

> has existed in Canada since Confederation and is universally known throughout cultures, countries, religions and communities. (February 21, 2005, 15:32)

Furthermore, heterosexual marriage constitutes the basic unit of societies, a unit primarily dedicated to reproducing and socializing human beings in order to perpetuate society. According to Liberal MP Pat O'Brien, these reproductive capacities of heterosexual couples are an asset same-sex unions are deprived of:

> [...] while there can be recognition in law for same-sex relationships, it is quite a stretch to suggest that a same-sex relationship, which can never result in procreation without the unnatural involvement of a third person, is as socially valuable to us as heterosexual relationships. (February 21, 2005, 12:44)

Continuing his argument, MP O'Brien considers that this essential quality justifies that the State provide preferential treatment to female/male unions, a special status which cannot be interpreted as discriminatory towards same-sex couples:

> [...] traditional marriage is a unique and vital relationship on which the future of humanity depends. As such, it does not offend the Charter to treat this special relationship in a preferential manner. True marriage results in the unifying act of sexual intercourse and is reproductive in type. (February 21, 2005, 13:49)

Some voices in support of same-sex marriage draw attention to the fact that not all heterosexual couples desire children or have them. Those who reject same-sex marriage reply that these opposite-sex couples without children are simply the exception that proves the rule:

> when we look at society around us, yes indeed there are couples who do not have children, some by reasons of sterility. I have spoken with such couples. We know their heartache and heartbreak. We know other couples where for reasons of choice, career or whatever, it does not allow for children in their particular lifestyles. Simple logic would tell us that those are the exceptions that prove the rule. (Maurice Vellacott, Conservative, February 21, 2005, 16:55)

In sum, opponents of same-sex marriage argue that traditional marriage and family are institutions firmly entrenched in human history. These

institutions play such important anthropological and sociological functions necessary to the preservation of societies, that opening civil marriage to same-sex couples would endanger the future of human societies.

Proponents of same-sex marriage point out that civil marriage can no longer be described only through the idyllic perspective put forward by those who reject lesbian and gay marriage. In fact, civil marriage has evolved and has changed over time, as argues Liberal MP and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Paul Harold Macklin:

> civil marriage is not immutable and has been extended over time to groups previously excluded. (February 21, 2005, 12:50)

Liberal MP Telegdi evokes the constitutional doctrine of a "living tree" to support his argument that the institution of marriage has not been defined once and for all:

> The Constitution is a living document and it evolves, just as our society has evolved. (February 21, 2005, 17:21)

Another argument put forward by those who support the opening of civil marriage to same-sex couples is that, by reclaiming the right to get married, lesbians and gays are not trying to challenge, weaken or even parody the significance of marriage. Instead, they seek the security that is intrinsic to marriage (see Riggle and Rostosky 2007; Riggle, Thomas and Rostosky 2005):

> This [the claim of same-sex couples to access to marriage] has not been an attempt to change our society's understanding of marriage. These are couples who sought to be included in marriage as we understand it today, not change its values, ideals or traditions. They have willingly and enthusiastically sought out its responsibilities, obligations and duties. They seek the stability it will allow for them, for their children and for their families. (Bill Siksay, New Democratic Party, February 16, 2005, 17:16)

At a later point in the debates, MP Siksay went one step further:

> These [lesbians and gays] are people who are willing to champion that institution and say that it is an institution that still has value, promise and possibility. They are the ones who are taking it into the future and who are strengthening marriage as we speak today. (February 16, 2005, 17:38)

Here is an excellent example of why a not so vocal, but active fringe part of the lesbian and gay movement opposes same-sex marriage because of its hetero-normalizing character. According to this reasoning, lesbians and gays qualify as full citizens as long as they mimic the heterosexual institutions of marriage and family. Thus, it is as though two types of lesbians and gays existed: the "good lesbians and gays", who are mature, responsible and engage themselves in an exclusive and long-term relationship, and the "bad lesbians and gays", whose lifestyle apparently does not correspond to this pattern (Auchmuty 2004, Ettelbrick 1997, Marso 2010, Platero 2007, Polikoff 1993, Richardson 2004, 2005, Young and Boyd 2006).

Other arguments have been developed by proponents of same-sex marriage, although they are much less present in the debates. For instance, some have argued that same-sex marriage acknowledges the diversity of the Canadian society and families. NDP MP Libby Davies questions her colleague, Conservative MP Jim Prentice as to

> why he is so intent on creating this little box and either one fits in it or one does not. It seems to me that marriage is also about diversity. It is about different kinds of relationships, whether it is between a man and a woman who have children or do not, or adopt children or whether it is between two women who have children or do not. Why can he not accept that? (February 21, 2005, 16:56)

Another argument deriving from this is that the opening of marriage to same-sex couples provides stability to children living in same-sex families:

> We as a society very much have an interest in promoting stability among couples. It is in our interest to be inclusive. It is also in our interest to accept the children of those parents who are in same-sex relationships. That provides a great deal of stability. (Andrew Telegdi, Liberal, February 21, 2005, 17:11)

In sum, there are two broad approaches to arguments concerning family and same-sex marriage: one is a plea to protect hetero-normative marriage (and family) in the name of tradition, cultural universality and the future of society, while the other envisions marriage as a much more fluid institution, notably because society is diversified and complex.

Conclusion

Since July 2005, lesbian/gay couples have been allowed to get married in Canada. Very few same-sex couples have chosen this option, yet it is important that marriage be open to lesbian/gay couples in order to fulfil the equality rights provision of the Charter. This analysis has shown that

parliamentary debates on the opening of marriage to same-sex couples have mobilized a limited number of rationales, with arguments related to the Charter and to family dominating the legislative discourses.

Further analysis of the parliamentary discourses on same-sex marriage in Canada should explore the absence of certain arguments. As a preliminary observation, it appears that the feminist rationale is completely absent from parliamentary debates. No MP—not even a female one—has questioned marriage as a hierarchical institution which crystallizes inequality between partners and favours dependency of what should be the union of two fully autonomous individuals. The libertarian rationale—leading for a complete retreat of State interventions in the field of marriage—is also absent from parliamentary discourses.

Research should also try to measure the impact of same-sex marriage on the acceptance of the lesbians and gays in Canadian society. For example, does same-sex marriage reduce suicide rates among the lesbian and gay communities in Canada? Is there less homophobia in Canada now that lesbians and gays can marry? What are the consequences of the opening of marriage to same-sex couples on the lesbian and gay movement in Canada, its unity, its projects, its relationships with governments? In sum, there is still much work to be done.

Notes

[1] See Parliament of Canada, Virtual Library, Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Bill C-38: The Civil Marriage Act (LS-502E) at http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/Parliament/LegislativeSummaries/Bills_ls.asp?ls=c38&Parl=38&Ses=l (accessed September 11, 2011).

[2] *Ibidem.*

References

Auchmuty, Rosemary. **2004.** "Same-Sex marriage revived: **Feminist** critique and legal strategy." *Feminism and Psychology* **14(1): 101-126.**

Ettelbrick, Paula L. **1997.** "Since when is marriage a path to liberation?" In *Same-Sex Marriage. The Moral and Legal Debate,* edited by Robert M. Baird and Stuart E. Rosenbaum, **164-168.** Amherst (NY): Prometheus Books.

Kollman, Kelly. **2009.** "European institutions, transnational networks and national same-sex union policy: When soft law hits harder." *Contemporary Politics* **15(1): 37-53.**

Lalor, Kay. **2011.** "Constituting sexuality: rights, politics and power in the gay rights movement." *International Journal of Human Rights* **15(5): 683-699.**

Marso, Lori Jo. **2010.** "Marriage and bourgeois respectability." *Politics & Gender* **6(1): 145-153.**

Martos, Joseph. **1993.** "Marriage." In *Perspectives on Marriage: A Reader,* edited by Kieran Scott and Michael Warren, **30-68.** New York: Oxford University Press.

Platero, Raquel. **2007.** "Love and the state: Gay marriage in Spain." *Feminist Legal Studies* **15(3): 329-340.**

Polikoff, Nancy. **2008.** *Beyond Straight and Gay Marriage: Valuing All Families under the Law.* Boston: Beacon Press.

—. **1993.** "We will get what we ask for: Why legalizing gay and lesbian marriage will not dismantle the legal structure of gender in every marriage." *Virginia Law Review 19(1):* **1535-1550.**

Richardson, Diane. **2004.** "Locating sexualities: From here to normality." *Sexualities* **7(4): 391-411.**

—. **2005.** "Desiring sameness? The rise of a neoliberal politics of normalisation." *Antipode* **37(3): 515-535.**

Riggle, Ellen D. B., and Sharon S. Rostosky. **2007.** "The consequences of marriage policy for same-sex couples' well-being." In *The Politics of Same-Sex Marriage,* edited by Craig A. Rimmerman, and Clyde Wilcox, **65-84.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Riggle, Ellen D. B., Jerry D. Thomas, and Sharon S. Rostosky. **2005.** "The marriage debate and minority stress." *PS: Political Science and Politics* **38(2): 221-224.**

Sanders, Douglas. **2002.** "Human rights and sexual orientation in international law." *International Journal of Public Administration* **25(1): 13-44.**

Wintemute, Robert. **2002.** "Religion vs. sexual orientation. A clash of human rights?" *Journal of Law & Equality* **1(2): 125-154.**

Young, Claire, and Susan Boyd. **2006.** "Losing the feminist voice? Debates on the legal recognition of same sex partnerships in Canada." *Feminist Legal Studies* **14(2): 213-240.**

CHAPTER FIVE

PARTY SUBCULTURES IN THE BULGARIAN PARLIAMENT AFTER 1989

DANIELA PASTARMADZHIEVA

1. Introduction

Throughout the last twenty years, Bulgaria has been establishing democracy in every area of life: politics, economy and social life. The normative change in the political regime and in economy takes place easier than the social transformation towards a democratic behaviour. Although there are still individuals who prefer the communism, the democratic orientations seem to prevail.

As individuals and researchers, we can react to the social conditions by recognizing the factors which lead to change, by understanding their nature in the light of knowledge and by creating new patterns of behaviour.

The Parliament is the setting where the democratic principles are transposed into laws. An anti-democratic reaction of a member of parliament (henceforth MP) is likely to influence the laws to be adopted and even worse, if such a reaction comes from a whole parliamentary group (a political party or a coalition).

Consequently, I wondered if one can identify an anti-democratic subculture in the Parliament of Bulgaria and, if so, whether it is typical of an entire party or not. Moreover, has this anti-democratic subculture been in the Parliament since 1989? These are questions that I shall try to answer in the present study, whose object is represented by the positioning of the members of the 41" Bulgarian Parliament in relation to the democratic political system.

My aim is to find out if there is an anti-democratic subculture in the Bulgarian Parliament and, if so, in which political parties it is apparent enough to eventually lead to their being labelled as belonging to an anti-democratic subculture.

Before presenting the empirical research, in the first part of this paper, I shall put forward a short theoretical presentation of the political culture and subcultures. The second part consists of a brief description of the Bulgarian political culture and subcultures, as well as of an overview of the research that has been done so far. The empirical research, its methodology and results are presented in the third part and summarized in the concluding remarks.

2. Political Culture and Political Subcultures

2.1. Political Culture

The interest in the concept of political culture revived throughout the 1950s and 1960s in the Western political science. Perhaps the most significant work of that time is Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba's *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (1963), followed by *American Federalism: A view from the states* (Elazar 1966), *Political Culture* (Rosenbaum 1975), *The Citizen and Politics: A Comparative Perspective* (Verba and Pye 1978), *Cultural Theory* (Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky1990), etc.

Certainly, this is not an exhaustive list of political scientists whose works influenced the theory of political culture, but the purpose of this study is not to present comprehensively the theory of the political culture, but to make a brief presentation of the works related to the aim of this paper.

The great interest in the political culture and the number of papers written on this topic might be the reasons why we lack a unified definition. The definition that best matches the aims and background of this study is the one proposed by Almond and Verba:

> "specific political orientations, attitudes towards the political system and its various parts, and attitudes towards the role of individuals in the system". (Almond and Verba 1963, 13)

Actually, this is the very object of my *paper-the attitudes of the parliament members towards the democratic political system and the role of individuals in this democratic system.*

2.2. Political Subcultures

The definitions of political subcultures can be split into two groups, according to the authors who understand subculture as either an exception

or a threat to the dominant political culture, or just as a part of the national culture, which does not threaten it.

The first group of authors uses the term subculture as a "counter culture", a phenomenon which endangers the existing order. In this sense, the subculture differs from the predominant national political culture and is a threat to it, since it opposes the dominant culture.

This view became popular in 1968, in connection with the protests of the youth. According to Walter Rosenbaum, subculture creates constant problems for the government and sometimes is even destructive for the system. Rosenbaum and other authors, who share this view, argue that political subcultures are set by individuals in a political system whose political orientations differ from the culture of the majority or, at least, from the cultural orientations that are prevalent in society (Tanev 2001, 236).

Within the same trend of thought, Dubet states that one of the meanings of the concept *subculture* refers to the "degraded or 'vulgar' forms of that culture" (Dubet 2001, 15247).

The second group of authors defines political subcultures as *subdivisions* of the national political culture or as its specific expression.

Daniel Elazar states that the American political culture is a "synthesis of three major political subcultures that jointly inhabit the country" (Elazar 1984, 114). According to Dennis Kavanagh, subcultures are different orientations towards the politics of different population groups (Kavanagh 1972, 20-24).

Tanev quotes Clifford Geertz, who uses the term *subculture* to designate a subdivision of the national culture, made of a combination of intermediate social positions, such as class status, ethnicity, region- rural or urban-which, put together, constitute a functional entity that has an integral impact upon social processes. According to Tanev, this view is shared by Aaron Wildavsky, who defines the national political culture as a system of ways of life. The individuals who are part of one of these categories are united by their subnational systems of values, called subcultures (Tanev 2001,235).

Tanev offers his own definition of subcultures, as groups which are brought together by specific value constellations, motivating their place and role in the political process, which on this basis can be easily politically mobilized (put into operation). According to him, subcultures are not systematic parts of the national culture, but its specific expressions and the sum of all subcultures does not cover the national political culture (Tanev 2001, 235).

In the context of this study, the term "political subculture" is used to designate specific beliefs and attitudes of the individuals towards the political system. These attitudes and beliefs differentiate them from the dominant political culture and make the individuals act similarly in a certain situation. The subculture may manifest itself either aggressively or not, but in both cases it may be destructive for the political system.

A subculture and a particular social group are not the same thing; they may coincide, but not necessarily.

3. Bulgarian Political Culture and Subcultures

According to a Bulgarian scientist, the roots of the Bulgarian political culture can be found in the Bulgarian Renaissance (eighteenth-nineteenth century) (Blagoeva-Taneva 2002,47). After the liberation from the Ottoman occupation in 1878, Bulgaria began to promote the principles of democracy. The first Bulgarian Constitution was one of the most democratic in Europe at that time.

During the communist regime, all democratic values were trampled, which affected the whole Bulgarian society and political culture. No studies on political culture from this period can be found.

After November 1989, there was a revival in the studies on political culture. The first articles on the topic were published in 1992: "Pluralism and Political Culture" (Todorov 1992); "The Mediterranean political culture and the Bulgarians" (Todorova 1992); "Do the Bulgarians have a political culture" (Grigorova 1992).

Yet, the first thorough examination of concepts such as *political culture* appeared as late as 2001 and was due to Todor Tanev (2001). Other studies dealing with the Bulgarian political culture were written by Plamen Georgiev (2000) and Blaga Blagoeva-Taneva (2002).

Blagoeva-Taneva describes the Bulgarian political culture in the process of transition to democracy as "becoming a culture" (Blagoeva-Taneva 2006, 124). She uses Almond and Verba's classification of the types of political culture (Participant, Subject and Parochial types) and defines Bulgarian political culture as a Subject-Participant type, from where the elements of the Parochial type are not completely removed and the elements of the Subject type of political culture still persist, but Participant orientations seem to become more frequent (Blagoeva-Taneva 2002, 136). Thus, the dominant political culture in the Bulgarian society can be described as a democratic one. Any anti-democratic attitudes can be defined as political subcultures, because they differ from and even oppose the prevailing political culture.

Overall studies on political subcultures in Bulgarian have not been written so far.

4. Political Subcultures in the Bulgarian Parliament

Political Parties in the Bulgarian Parliament

Bulgaria is a parliamentary republic, where Parliament is elected by the people and the Government is elected by the Parliament. The current Bulgarian Parliament was elected on 5 July 2009. It consists of 240 members, divided into six parliamentary groups, as follows: GERB-117 MPs; Coalition for Bulgaria-40 MPs; Movement for Rights and Freedoms-35 MPs; Atakha-15 MPs; The Blue Coalition-14 MPs; the Parliamentary group of independents-19 MPs.

The political party *GERB (Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria),* which is currently governing the country, was created in 2006.

GERB's program for European development of Bulgaria (2009) states that it is a centre-right party that shares and imposes the values of freedom, democracy and the rule of law by means of its policy.

This is GERB's first time in the Parliament. It is a member of the European People's Party and of its parliamentary group in the European Parliament.

Coalition for Bulgaria is a name that was first used in the local elections in 1999. It is an alliance, made by the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) and other parties whose doctrines are quite similar to its doctrine.

Coalition for Bulgaria has been in the Parliament under this name since 2001 (the 39th Parliament), but BSP, which is the main founder, has been represented in the Parliament since 1991, when the first democratic Parliament was elected. As listed on their website, the members of this coalition consider themselves as the successors of the Communist Party that ruled the country from 1944 to 1989, and most of their voters acknowledge them as such.

BSP is a member of the Party of the European Socialists, whose current president is Sergey Stanishev, the leader of BSP. In the European Parliament, the party is a member of the group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats.

The Blue Coalition was created in 2009, before the European Parliament elections. As a parliamentary group in the 41st Bulgarian Parliament, it consists of the following parties: The Union of Democratic Forces (UDF); Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria (DSB); United Agrarians; Bulgarian Social Democratic Party (BSDP); Radical Democratic Party in Bulgaria

(RDPB). The main parties of this coalition are UDF and DSB. UDF emerged in December 1989 as an anti-communist union, and was registered as a political party in 1998. By 2001, it had been recognized as the strongest democratic party and the only opposition to the communists (BSP). In 2001, it split and its former leader, Ivan Kostov, created DSB. Both DSB and UDF are right oriented political formations and so is the Blue Coalition.

The Democrats have been in the Parliament since 1991: in the 36th and 37th Parliament-as the Union of the Democratic Forces, in the 38th and the 39th Parliament-as the United Democratic Forces, in the 40th Parliament-as two democratic parties: the United Democratic Forces and DSB, and now, in the 41st Bulgarian Parliament-as the Blue Coalition.

Both UDF and DSB are members of the European People's Party and of its parliamentary group in the European Parliament.

Movement for Rights and Freedoms (MRF) defines itself as a centrist liberal party (2010). It was formed in 1990 to represent the interests of the ethnic Turkish minority in Bulgaria, but according to its members, the MRF goals expanded to embrace all matters related to human rights in Bulgaria.

MRF has been in the Bulgarian Parliament since 1991. It is a member of the European Liberal Democrat and Reform Party and of the Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe in the European Parliament.

The political party called *Atakha* (which means "attack") was created and officially registered in 2005. It describes itself as a patriotic and nationalistic political party. Atakha has been in the Bulgarian Parliament since 2005 (the 40th Bulgarian Parliament). Its representative in the European Parliament belongs to the parliamentary group of Non-attached Members.

5. The Empirical Research

The purpose of this empirical study is to find out if there is an anti-democratic subculture in the Bulgarian Parliament and, if so, to which political party the MPs displaying anti-democratic attitudes belong to.

The empirical study is based on a questionnaire' prepared for the purposes of the paper. It contains twelve closed questions which give the respondents the opportunity to provide their own answers. In the next paragraphs, I shall present a review of the survey: the questions, the options for answers and the purpose of the question.

The questions are divided in two groups:

The *first group* contains questions whose purpose is to determine the *parliamentary group membership, gender* and *ethnicity* of the respondents. Xhe information about the parliamentary group membership aims at identifying the party whose members display anti-democratic attitudes and beliefs. The answers to the questions about MPs' gender and ethnicity allow for further analyses.

The *second group* of questions is designed to provide information about MPs' opinion on *basic democratic principles.*

In *Question 4,* the MPs were asked about the frequency of their meetings with the voters. The purpose of this question is to check if the MPs have communication with their voters, so that they could hopefully meet them and learn about their expectations. If the MPs don't have that information, they cannot perform their democratic duty to represent the voters and they don't fulfil their role and responsibilities.

In the next four questions *(from 5 to 8),* the MPs were asked for their opinion about "the right to express an opinion and its distribution", "the role of the media", "the role of NGOs" and "the impact of claims, proposals and petitions sent by citizens". These are basic civil rights which underlie the very existence of the civil society. If an MP disregards their importance, s/he denies the right of the people to act upon the country's government and tries to escape any responsibilities towards them.

An important principle which distinguishes democracy from the totalitarian political regime is the political party pluralism *(Question 9).* In a country that has been governed by a single party for 45 years and has to apply political party pluralism, it is important to know the MPs' opinion about the political party system. Do they respect the political party pluralism or they prefer a one-party regime? For this reason, the MPs were asked for their opinion about the political party pluralism and their parliamentary representation of the political parties. The possible answers were: *hi* The more parties, the better; B/ A political system with no more than three parties represented in the Parliament; *CI* A pluralistic party system, with the government led by one party for a longer period, in order to ensure stability; D/ A single party to lead the government.

A significant democratic value is the economic freedom of citizens. A prerequisite of such freedom is the market economy. That is why the MPs were asked about their opinion concerning the relations between the state and the economy *(Question 10).*

The state's control over people, mostly by informants, was typical of the former Communist regime. It is unacceptable that the citizens of a democratic state be excessively controlled by the state. In order to find out if there are MPs who would support this type of control, they were asked

for their opinion about the state's control over citizens *(Question 11)*. The possible answers here are as follows: A/ Approve state's control over citizens by phone tapings, informants and in any other possible way; B/ Approve, if it is of national security interest; *CI* Disapprove, but agree to use special investigative techniques when there is suspicion of someone having committed a crime; D/ Disapprove, but agree to use special investigative techniques when there is enough evidence of someone having committed a crime.

The purpose of *Question 12* is to provide information about MPs' attitude towards the opposition, that is, if they would support opposition's proposals, bills or ideas. This questions is intended to provide information on whether MPs are loyal to the party or they are really responsible in front of the citizens, whether they are ready to achieve consensus with their opponents for the good of the state or not. The MPs have to choose among the following options: A/ If it matches my belief; B/ If it meets the interests of my party; *CI* If it is important to the state; *Dl* I do not think that the opposition can offer something good enough to be supported; E/ I would not.

Of all 240 MPs, 222 are members of a political party or coalition and were invited to participate in the survey. Yet, only 17 answered. Consequently, this result does not allow me to draw general conclusions about the whole parliament, but hopefully it is enough to convey some opinions and attitudes expressed by its members.

I received answers from MPs belonging to three parliamentary groups: GERB-nine; Coalition for Bulgaria-five; Atakha-three. No answers were received from the Movement for Rights and Freedoms and The Blue Coalition. Five of the respondents are women and twelve are men. All those who answered are of Bulgarian ethnicity.

Fifteen (GERB-8, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-3) of the respondents declared that they usually meet their voters weekly. One (GERB) declared that this happens every first Thursday of the month and whenever she is asked to. Another MP (Coalition for Bulgaria) states that he meets his voters 2-3 times a week.

As regards the right to express an opinion, the most frequent answer was: *Al* everyone has the right to express an opinion and can display it freely, if it doesn't prejudice the rights of other citizens. This answer was chosen by sixteen respondents (GERB-8, Coalition for Bulgaria-5, Atakha-3). One of the respondents from the political party GERB came with his own answer: the right to express an opinion, in itself, cannot violate anyone's rights, but actions related to improper opinion can.

Eleven (GERB-5, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-2) of the respondents think that media has a multifaceted role in establishing the principles of the civil society and the consolidation of democracy, in general. Four (GERB-2, Coalition for Bulgaria-1, Atakha-1) of them think that media is a tool for shaping public opinion and one (GERB) thinks that media has just an information function. One of the respondents from the political party GERB suggests that the multifaceted role of the media often goes beyond establishing the principles of the civil society and strengthening democracy in its entirety. According to him, sometimes, media does not realize the responsibility of its educational function, or even worse, is actively and deliberately used to manipulate the public in a way that is profitable to their owners. He concludes that, in an immature democracy, that could lead to a kind of cartel aimed at maintaining a manipulated society.

The majority of the respondents, fourteen (GERB-9, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-1), think that NGOs guarantee the democratic development of the state. An MP from Atakha believes that NGOs disturb the governing of the state. Another MP, from Coalition for Bulgaria, underlines that, in a real democracy, the society cannot function without strong NGOs. An MP from Atakha points to answer D/ None of these.

Fourteen (GERB-7, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-3) MPs declare that claims, proposals and petitions sent by citizens support the functioning of the state, as they focus attention on significant problems, and according to the other three (GERB-2, Coalition for Bulgaria-1), some of these claims, proposals and petitions are good.

The most frequent answer (nine: GERB-5, Coalition for Bulgaria-3, Atakha-1) to the question about the political party system shows a preference for *CI A* pluralistic party system with the government led by one party for a longer period, in order to ensure stability. Four (GERB-2, Coalition for Bulgaria-2) of the MPs think that the more parties exist and are represented in the Parliament, the better. Other three (GERB-1, Atakha-2) prefer a party system with no more than three parties represented in the Parliament. One of the respondents from the political party GERB provided his own answer: the same answer as the majority, but only if this party leads to the country's progress.

Fifteen (GERB-9, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-2) of all respondents see the relations between state and economy as follows: the state should set the framework by using a set of tools, in order to create a favourable environment for economic development. The other two (from Atakha and Coalition for Bulgaria) answered that the economy should be planned by the state.

Concerning the issue of national security, MPs agree that the state should use special investigative techniques if there is enough information (fourteen MPs)/suspicion (two MPs) that a person has committed or is preparing to commit a crime. A respondent from the political party GERB chose answer E (None of these).

The last question of the survey was if the respondent would support a proposal, bill or idea of an opposition party if his/her party were in power.

Eleven MPs (GERB-5, Coalition for Bulgaria-4, Atakha-2) said that they would, if this were important to the state. Three (GERB-2; Atakha-1) of them answered that they would, if it met the interests of their party. Two answered that they would, provided that it matched their own belief (GERB-1; Coalition for Bulgaria-1). According to a respondent from the political party GERB, if an MP chooses the first answer to the question (I would support it, provided that it matched my own belief), it would be an attempt to present him/herself in a favourable light.

6. Concluding Remarks

Abraham Lincoln once defined democracy as "Government of the people, by the people, for the people". Today's democracy requires active civil society in order for the people to be able to influence the governing of the country. Yet, in order for the civil society to be active, it has to fulfil some preliminary requirements. By adopting laws, the parliament sets the environment the citizens can act upon. The parliament consists of those who have set the framework of the people's rights. The MPs' attitudes and beliefs with respect to these rights are important, because their opinion will influence their vote in a certain situation.

The results of this empirical study cast some light on the beliefs and attitudes towards democracy, as expressed by three parties (whose members answered my questionnaire) of the Bulgarian Parliament.

The respondents are familiar with the principles of democracy and civil society and they do respect them. It is obvious that the MPs recognize these principles among the given answers and choose them. Of course, there are exceptions, too, but these are isolated cases.

It is worth pointing out that most of the MPs prefer one political party to govern the country for a longer period. This answer was included in the questionnaire in order to "trap" those MPs who prefer their party to govern the country independently, but do not feel comfortable to admit it. It is possible that the selection of this response be due to the totalitarian past of] Bulgaria and to the idea that a single party political system might ensure some comfort.

The main points of this study can be summarized as follows:
1. The study tackles the issue of political subcultures in Bulgaria, a topic that currently is not being very well investigated in the Bulgarian political sciences.
2. The study puts forward the hypothesis that, in the Bulgarian Parliament, one can identify some anti-democratic beliefs and attitudes which form an anti-democratic subculture. This hypothesis calls for the identification of its agents.
3. The results of this empirical research have contributed to indicate a trend which is manifest among some MPs in the 41" Bulgarian Parliament.

Notes

[1] The whole questionnaire is in the Annex.

References

Almond, Gabriel, and Sydney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

—. 1989. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. 2nd edition. Sage.

Blagoeva-Taneva, Blaga. 2002. *E-bJieapcxama nojiummecKa Kyjimypa. Tpaduuuu u cbepeMeuHocm* [The Bulgarian Political Culture], Sofia: Zaharii Stoianov.

—. 2006. *Lecture Notes on Political Culture*. Sofia: Zaharii Stoianov.

BSP. 2008. "History", http://www.bsp.bg/bg/pages/board

Dubet, Francois. 2001. "Sociology of subculture." In *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences,* edited by Neil J Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Amsterdam/New York: Elsevier.

Elazar, Daniel Judah. 1966. *American Federalism: A View from the States*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

1984. *American Federalism: A View from the States*. 3rd Revised edition. Longman Higher Education.

Georgiev, Plamen. 2000. *Bulgarskata politicheska kultura* [Bulgarian Political Culture]. Sofia: K & M .

Grigorova, Yulita. 1992 "Hiwa JIH nojiHTHHecica Kymypa S-bJirapHHtT" [Do the Bulgarians have a political culture]. *Ceo6odeu napod* [A free nation] 8: 10.

Kavanagh, Dennis. 1972. *Political Culture*. London: Macmillan.

MRF. 2010. "History", http://www.dps.bg/about/history.aspx

Program of the political party GERB for European development of Bulgaria, 2009.

http://www.gerb.bg/uf/pages/upr_programa_gerb_ 1 June.pdf

Rosenbaum, Walter A. 1975. *Political Culture.* New York: Praeger.

Tanev, Todor. 2001. *Political Culture.* Sofia: University Press St. Kliment Ohridski.

Thompson, M., Richard Ellis, and Aaron B. Wildavsky. 1990. *Cultural Theory.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Todorov, Angel. 1992. **"njrypajiH3tM н nojiHranecКa Kyjnypa"** [Pluralism and Political Culture]. *MeoKdynapodnu omuouieHUH* [International relations] 2: 37-41.

Todorova, Elka. 1992 "Сpe^**H3eMHOMopcКaTa nojiHTHiecКa Kyjnypa н** 6tJirapHTe" [The Mediterranean political culture and the Bulgarians]. *Couuo/io2uuecКu npo6jieMu* [Sociological problems] 4: 56-67.

Verba, Sidney, and Lucian W Pye. 1978. *The Citizen and Politics: A Comparative Perspective.* Stamford, Conn.: Grey lock Publishers.

Annex. Questionnaire

1. Which parliamentary group do you belong to?
A/GERB;
B/ Coalition for Bulgaria;
CI Movement for Rights and Freedoms;
D7 Atakha;
E/ The Blue Coalition;

2. What is your gender?
hi Man;
B/ Woman;
CI I don't want to answer.

3. Which ethnic group in Bulgaria do you belong to?
Al Bulgarian;
B/ Turkish;
C/ Roma;
D71 don't want to answer;
El Other:...

4. How often do you meet your voters?
Al Weekly;
B/ Monthly;
C/ Annually;
D/1 meet them only if they invite me;
E/1 don't have meetings with my voters;
F/ Other:..

5. Which of the following statements is closest to your attitude towards the freedom of opinion?
Al Everyone has the right to express an opinion and can display it freely, if it doesn't prejudice the rights of other citizens;
B/ Everyone has the right to express an opinion and can display it freely, regardless of the rights of other citizens;
CI Freely expressed opinion could damage the state and society;
D/ None of these;
E/ Other:..

6. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion on the role of the media as an element of the civil society?
Al The media is not relevant to the civil society;
B/ The media is a tool for shaping the public opinion;
CI The media has only an informational function;
D/ The media has a multifaceted role in establishing the principles of the civil society and the consolidation of democracy in general;
El None of these;
F/ Other:..

7. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion about NGOs?
Al NGOs disturb the governing of the state;
B/ NGOs guarantee the democratic development of the state;
CI I do not know what NGOs do;
D/ None of these;
El Other:..

8. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion on the impact of claims, proposals and petitions sent by citizens?
Al They create additional work and disturb the fulfillment of obligations;
B/ Some of them are good;
CI They focus attention on significant problems;
D/ I haven't read claims, proposals and petitions;
E/ None of these;
F/ Other:..

9. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion regarding the political parties and their representation in the Parliament?
AJ The more parties, the better;
B/ A political system with no more than three parties represented in the Parliament;
CI A pluralistic party system with the government led by one party for a longer period, in order to ensure stability;
D/ A single party to lead the government;
El None of these;
F/ Other:..

10. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion about the relationship between state and economy?
Al The economy should be planned by the state;
B/ The state should set the framework through a set of tools, in order to create a favourable environment for economic development;
C/ The economy is self-regulating, any government's intervention is unnecessary;
D/ None of these;
El Other:..

11. Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion about the state's control over the citizens?
Al Approve state's control over citizens by phone tapings, informants and in any possible way;
B/ Approve, if it is of national security interest;
CI Disapprove, but agree to use special investigative techniques when there is suspicion of someone having committed a crime;
D/ Disapprove, but agree to use special investigative techniques when there is enough evidence of someone having committed a crime;
El None of these;
F/ Other:..

12. Would you support a proposal, bill or idea of an opposition party if your party were in power?
Al If it matched my belief;
B/ If it met the interests of my party;
CI If it were important to the state;
D/ I do not think that the opposition can offer something good enough to be supported;
El I would not;
F/ None of these;
G/ Other:..

PART III

PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE: LINGUISTIC AND PRAGMA-RHETORICAL APPROACHES

CHAPTER SIX

INCREASING ARGUMENTATIVE FORCE
IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE.
THE EXAMPLE OF *Surtout* "ABOVE ALL"

C o c o NOREN

This article deals with the argumentative marker *surtout* "above all" and its ability to structure two or more elements, by presenting the latter as arguably superior to the others'. An utterance such as *Maria travaille surtout sur les connecteurs* "Maria works primarily on connectors" conveys not only the fact that Maria works on connectors, but that she works on other things too, albeit to a lesser degree.

Before delving deeper into the subject, I shall briefly present the project *Europe Online,* of which this study is a part, as well as the corpus *C-ParlEur.* This section will be followed by some methodological reflections and a presentation of the key concepts taken from previous studies of Ducrot and Nolke. Next, I shall define the concept of *markers of increased argumentation* (referred to as M I A henceforth). The major part of this paper concerns the semantics of *surtout* and the constraints of its use in parliamentary debate, which I shall discuss with the aid of examples from the corpus.

Europe Online, C-ParlEur and Genre

This study is a part of the project *Europe en ligne. L'argumentation des membres franqais du Parlement europeen*[2] "Europe Online. The argumentation of the French members of the European Parliament", which aims to illustrate the use of argumentative markers in the French discussions within the European Parliament. My objective is to discuss some questions from various epistemological perspectives. At the empirical level, I examine the use of certain argumentative markers in the debates taking place in the European Parliament. At the methodological level, I hope to show the advantage of an approach involving both

semantic, as well as discourse levels, to ascertain the use of the markers. Consequently, their argumentative discourse functions will be considered according to their particular semantic instructions. Finally, the objective at the theoretical level is to extend the *ScaPoLine-la theorie scandinave de la polyphonie linguistique* "the Scandinavian theory of Linguistic Polyphony" in the version of Nolke, Flottum and Noren (2004) to the discourse level, in order to account for the polyphonic coherence beyond the level of the utterance.

The project is based on the data provided by *C-ParlEur-Corpus de discours du Parlement Europeen* "Corpus of European Parliament discourse", a text corpus comprising 919 interventions held in the original language (French) during plenary debates between April 2006 and March 2008, which represents an approximate total of 460,000 words. The study is presently limited to the analysis of transcripts published by the European Parliament on the official website *www.europarl.eu*. They are not to be regarded as oral transcriptions, but as independent written documents, accessible to the general public and media professionals. The perspective is thus that of a reader-citizen consulting the archives of the European Parliament, and therefore includes neither questions from the oral version, nor the diamesia between speech and writing.

"Parliamentary discourse" is a concept that covers a wide range of communicative events. Looking more closely at plenary sessions, it shows that they consist of several quite different sub-genres that could be considered as parliamentary discourse, since they take place in the hemicycle, but some of them are perceived as more typical than others. The sub-genres characterized as political deliberation, as debates, are understood as synonymous with parliamentary discourse, while voting and presidential sequences organizing the activity seem marginal. Parliamentary debates represent an institutional genre which is strictly governed by mechanisms inherent to the parliamentary setting. Its institutional nature is apparent in the way that speeches are subject to a set of formal rules and informal conventions. They are strongly regulated in terms of topic, the framework of participants, the order of speakers, and the length of speeches. The president of the session intervenes forcefully if a speaker does not observe the allotted time. Studies on parliamentary language have been carried out mainly on speeches in national parliaments (Chilton 2004, 92-109, Bayley (ed.) 2004, Hie (ed.) 2010), in particular the British House of Commons. As Bayley (2004, 1-6) and Hie (2010a, 880) point out, representative assemblies differ in form and political function, even though they have an overall common political function.

There seems to be a specific European parliamentary discourse, although the MEPs rely on different national political traditions. It distinguishes itself by the fact that it is highly monologic, contrary to Ilie's (2010b, 886) observations on the English and Swedish national parliaments. In her studies of question-answer sessions, the genres represent interactional question-response sequences, which in turn represent default adjacency pairs, in the parlance of conversational analysis. However, it is difficult to judge to what extent national parliamentary traditions influence the European debate. It is a methodological challenge to carry out studies on the idiosyncratic linguistic features of European parliamentary discourse.

Methodological Reflections

The study of markers of increased argumentation (MIA) is divided into five stages. Once extraction has been performed from the corpus, the terms are formally classed according to their grammatical category and the syntactic functions of the components within the MIA-construction. I then proceeded with the qualitative analysis, in order to identify their salient functions in parliamentary debate. That involved examining the pragmatic and argumentative functions that occur and re-occur in the *C-ParlEur,* without claiming to cover every conceivable function and scenario on a linguistic level. At a later stage of the *Europe Online* project, the objective will be to derive a precise monosemantic value of each of these to then be able to compare them. Finally, I intend to illustrate the way their use in parliamentary debates contrasts with that of other types of discourse.

Key Concepts

Since it is impossible to summarize the semantic and enunciative theories that provide the basis for this study, I shall simply introduce the concepts and tools necessary for this paper.

As early as 1973, in *La preuve et le dire,* Ducrot observed that utterances convey an argumentative force *(force argumentative).* This study reappeared in 1980, under the title *Les echelles argumentatives.* Following Ducrot, one can define the concepts of argumentative class *(classe argumentative)* as a collection of arguments sharing the same conclusion and the same argumentative scale *(echelle argumentative),* which organizes the arguments in a hierarchical order.

The argumentative force is the force with which one can apply an argument for a conclusion, enabling the application of a scale. An

utterance such as *Maria a lu quelques articles de Ducrot* "Maria has read a few of Ducrot's articles" belongs to the same class of argument as *Maria a lu beaucoup d'articles de Ducrot* "Maria has read many of Ducrot's articles" and *Maria a lu la plupart des articles de Ducrot* "Maria has read most of Ducrot's articles", but they possess different argumentative strengths. These three utterances are therefore situated on different levels of the scale within this class. In order to refine the concept of scale, Nolke (1983, 43) introduced the distinction between qualitative and quantitative scale, notions which, unfortunately since then, do not appear to have been raised.

The argumentative force can be represented by three different types of linguistic expression. *Les connecteurs argumentatifs marquant I'orientation argumentative* "argumentative connectors which mark argumentative orientation" clarify the relation of the increasing or decreasing force of argument between the statements. *Les modificateurs argumentatifs* "argumentative modifiers" (Ducrot 1995) assign an argumentative force, but within an utterance. Finally, *les couples lexicaux relationnels* "lexical relational pairs" (Noren 1999, *84sqq.),* according to their own semantic instructions, occupy their place in order on the argumentative scale.

Markers of Increased Argumentation

An M I A marks the increasing argumentative orientation by indicating the superiority of one argument in relation to others, irrespective of whether they are implicitly or explicitly related. These expressions belong to various grammatical categories and each have their own semantic instructions, as well as their own particular conditions of use. The M I A category covers the following expressions: *mime* "even", *notamment* "notably" (323 occurrences in C-ParlEur), *surtout* "above all" (151), *en particulier* "in particular" (149), *particulierement* "particularly" (139), *plutot* "rather" (41), *specialement* "especially" (7). Superiority on the argumentative scale can be of a different nature. It can be a matter of argumentative force, in terms of semantic acceptability, or argumentative pertinence in a rhetorical sense[3]. In other words, the scale of a paradigm class defined by M I A can be both quantitative and qualitative.

(x) *surtout* y "(x) above all y": Construction and Syntax

The schematization of (x) *surtout* y symbolizes the existence of two elements, x and y, belonging to the same paradigm class. The element x can be present in the same utterance as y, but can also be indicated in the immediate context or remain implicit, in which case it is symbolized by being enclosed in brackets. If several elements of the same paradigm appear explicitly in the utterance, they are represented by x l, x2, x3, etc. It seems that *surtout,* without any restrictions, can link any part of speech, as well as any phrase or clause, and its flexibility allows it to be placed in any of the major syntactic breaks of an utterance.

However, the constructional variations offered by the language are not fully exploited in *C-ParlEur.* In the majority of cases, x appears explicitly in the same utterance as y, its use being classified as "conjunctive" by Nolke (2001, *292sqq). Surtout* is normally placed before y, thus introducing a clause (1) or a phrase (2-3) whose grammatical category depends on the nature of y. Indeed there is only one example (4) where the M I A is placed after y:

(1) Bref, $_{x1}$[on divise les nations], $_{x2}$[on installe la mefiance entre les peuples] et, *surtout,* $_y$[on les enregimente], ce qui est le cas de nos nations europdennes, helas, a l'Est comme a l'Ouest. Pourquoi? Lutte contre le terrorisme! (Couteaux070905)
In short, $_{x1}$[we divide nations], $_{x2}$[create mistrust between peoples] and *most of all,* $_y$[we browbeat them], which is what has happened in our European nations, alas, in East and West alike. Why? To fight terrorism[4].

(2) Pour leur part, les Etats peuvent egalement venir en aide $_x$[a Airbus], *surtout* $_y$[a ses sous-traitants]... (Deveyrac070314)
For their part, the Member States can also come to the aid $_x$[of Airbus], and *especially* $_y$[of its sub-contractors]...

(3) Afin d'eviter ce genre d'incidents, les Etats membres ont mis en place, depuis 2002, un systeme organise et performant d'echange d'informations sur les risques que represented $_x$[certains matchs], *surtout* y[certains supporters dangereux]. (Gaubert070328)
In order to prevent these kinds of incidents, the Member States have had an organised and effective system in place since 2002 to exchange information on the risks represented $_x$[by certain matches], and *especially* $_y$[by certain dangerous supporters].

(4) Monsieur le President, j'appelle $_x$[la Commission], d'abord, et $_y$[le Conseil], *surtout,* a faire preuve d'un minimum de decence et de modestie dans cette affaire, car le magnifique succes que Ton essaie de nous vendre ici cache mal une regression. (Onesta070711)
Mr President, I call on $_x$[the Commission], first of all, and $_y$[the Council], *in particular,* to show a bit of decency and modesty in this matter, for the magnificent success that they are trying to sell to us in this House does a bad job of disguising a declining state of affairs.

Even though the basic construction in language is (x) *surtout* y, its characteristic use in parliamentary debate is close to xl (x2, x3…) *surtout* y, where at least one x-element is explicit in the same utterance as y.

Surtout: **Semantic Instructions**

Nolke (1983, 109; 2001, 283) observes that the meaning of *surtout* can have three semantic readings (a)-(c), as illustrated by the example below:

(5) Maria travaille *surtout* sur les connecteurs.
   (a) Maria travaille sur les connecteurs. (pose)
   (b) Maria travaille sur autre chose que les connecteurs. (presuppose)
   (c) Maria travaille sur les connecteurs plus que sur autre chose, (pose)
   "Maria works *primarily* on connectors".
   (a) Maria works on connectors, (stated)
   (b) Maria works on other things than connectors, (presupposed)
   (c) Maria works more on connectors than on other things, (stated)

The utterance *Maria travaille surtout sur les connecteurs* "Maria works primarily on connectors", taken from the example of Nolke *(ibidem),* asserts the prepositional content (a), which states that Maria works on connectors. By using the word *surtout,* it presupposes the assumed existence of a paradigm class of Maria's research field, for example the simple past (preterite) and the position of the adjective. At the same time, the marker, according to its semantic instructions, enables a gradation where (a) dominates this paradigm class, i.e. Maria works on connectors more than on anything else.

It is not evident that a statement can have two stated prepositional semantic contents. However, the fact that (c) *Maria travaille sur les connecteurs plus que sur autre chose* "Maria works on connectors more than on anything else" is verified, according to Nolke, by the fact that *surtout* can be the object of a negation, without (a) *Maria travaille sur les connecteurs* "Maria works on connectors" being affected. The evidence can be found in the following sequence:

(6)   A: Maria travaille *surtout* sur le passe simple.
   B: Non, elle l'a fait un peu, mais elle prefere nettement les connecteurs.
   A: Maria works *primarily* on simple past.
   B: No, she has done that a little bit, but she clearly prefers connectors.

C-ParlEur provides two occurrences that reinforce the analysis of Nolke. First, in the example (7), *surtout* belongs to the actual assertion *je*

dirai surtout "I would say above all", which is not the case for the other MIAs, where it appears difficult to find or accept (8):

(7) [...] tout cela est positif, satisfaisant et honorant, pour les jeunes aussi, et je dirais *surtout.* (Daul070328)
A ll those things are positive and satisfying and do us credit in the eyes of the young and, I would say, of everyone [sic!].

(8) [...] tout cela est positif, satisfaisant et honorant, pour les jeunes aussi, et je dirais *Imemel Inotammentl Ten particulier.*
A ll those things are positive and satisfying and do us credit in the eyes of the young and, I would say ?even/?notably/?in particular.

Second, *surtout* can be the object of a modalisation, as illustrated in examples (9) and (10):

(9) Si, en revanche, il s'averait que la Commission a integr6 les exigences du Parlement dans sa nouvelle mouture du projet de directive, cela serait a la fois ₓ[un nouveau signe du poids grandissant de notre Assemblee dans le triangle institutionnel europeen] et aussi, et *peut-etre surtout,* ᵧ[la confirmation de l'effet structurant de l'irruption des citoyens dans le d6bat europeen, notamment depuis un certain 29 mai 2005]. (Wurtz060404)
If, on the other hand, it turned out that the Commission has included Parliament's demands in its new revised draft directive, ₓ[that would be both a fresh sign of the growing importance of our Assembly within the European institutional triangle] and also, and *perhaps most importantly,* ᵧ[this would be the confirmation of the formative influence of the citizens' sudden emergence in the European debate, especially since a certain 29 May 2005].

(10) Alors, ₓ[la solution tient peut-etre bien a une agence chargee d'explorer le continent cerebral], mais ᵧ[elle consiste *probablement surtout* a guerir nos dirigeants]. (Martinez060905)
Although ₓ[it may well require an agency responsible for exploring the continent of the mind], ᵧ[the solution *probably* consists *mainly* in curing our leaders].

The fact that *surtout* is capable of being modalised by the epistemic adverbs, such as *peut-etre* "perhaps" and *probablement* "probably", suggests asserted content, rather than presupposed content, given that a modalisation can only attain prepositional content.

As the examples above have shown, there is no clear cut correspondent in English. In C-ParlEur, *surtout* is translated by a wide range of English expressions: *above all, notably, in particular, particularly, most importantly, most of all, especially, primarily.* Among these, none is to be considered

as the natural choice, even though *above all* is morphologically the closest: *sur* "above" with *tout* "all".

Surtout: Semantic Constraints

The use of *surtout* is subject to three semantic constraints indicated by Nolke (1983, 113-119; 2001, *284sqq):* the co-orientation of x and y[5], the introduction of new information by y and the gradability of y.

According to Nolke, *surtout* compels y to introduce new information in relation to x. In my opinion, this implies that the scale set by *surtout* controls two elements that are not semantically hierarchical, and belong therefore to two different argumentative scales. There is no linguistic instruction in *Maria travaille sur les connecteurs* "Maria works on connectors" and *Maria travaille sur le passe simple* "Maria works on the simple past" that indicates which of the two utterances is stronger than the other, as would be the case in utterances like the ones outlined above: *Maria a lu beaucoup d'articles de Ducrot* "Maria has read many articles written by Ducrot" and *Maria a lu tous les articles de Ducrot* "Maria has read all of Ducrot's articles".

This explains why it is impossible to introduce a reinforcement in the form of an argumentative modifier, for example *tres* "very", where the difference is merely a question of argumentative force between x and y, and is not inherent in the nature of predicates expressed by x and y. Therefore, the following utterance seems unnatural: **Maria est efficace et surtout tres efficace* "*Maria is efficient and particularly very efficient", although with the use of the M I A *meme* "even/in fact" it is quite plausible to state: *Maria est efficace et mime tres efficace* "Maria is efficient, in fact she is very efficient".

It is the same for lexical relational pairs, where the terms only differ in their argumentative force, without adding substantially different semantic instructions, for example *gentil/adorable* "nice/adorable". It follows that the utterance **Maria est gentille et surtout elle est adorable* "*Maria is nice, above all she is adorable" stirs curiosity.

Instead of the constraint of new information, it is more accurate to consider it to be a constraint of semantic alterity, since it requires a lesser restriction or an addition by y. In such a context, the use of *surtout* is completely natural, as can be seen in (11) and (12):

(11) Les symboles europeens, le titre de ministre des Affaires etrangeres, le vote a la double majorite dans les delais rapides, tout cela nous le regrettons. Mais x[la politique], *surtout* y[la politique europeenne], c'est Part du compromis. (Daul070627)

The European symbols, the title of Foreign Affairs Minister, the double majority voting within short deadlines - we regret all of that. However, x[politics], and *especially* y [European politics], is the art of compromise.

(12) Nous etions en effet tout a fait conscients que la contribution des Etats membres serait insuffisante pour relever les grands defis d'une Europe desormais forte x[de vingt-sept Etats membres] *surtout* y[d'un demi-milliard de citoyens europeens]. (Griesbeck07121 lb)
We were in fact fully aware that the contributions by the Member States would not be enough to take up the major challenges facing an EU comprising x[27 nations] and, *notably,* y[half a billion citizens].

In (11), *surtout* introduces increasing argumentation, whilst stating that the art of compromise is more valuable for European politics than for politics in general. The restriction of the referent would thus satisfy the condition of semantic alteration, so that *surtout* could be used. Note that the two terms cannot be switched. **Mais la politique europeenne, surtout la politique, c 'est I 'art du compromis* "*But European politics, and above all/in particular/notably politics, is about the art of compromise".

In (12), the current referents of x and y can be considered identical, but the interpretation of relevant semantic instructions is distinguished by the reformulation operated by y. The strength of Europe lies in the increased number of citizens rather than in the number of member countries.

The last constraint indicated by Nolke is the fact that the semantic content of an utterance in the scope of the connector should be gradable, as in (13), where a level of appreciation can be measured at various degrees, in comparison to the fact of having arrived, which is barely gradable, according to Nolke.

(13) Maria a *surtout* apprecie la derniere presentation.
**Maria est *surtout* venue.
Maria has *especially* appreciated the last presentation.
**Maria has *especially* come.

Indeed, the examples that are suggested by Nolke create a curious effect, but in my opinion, that is not due to a lack of gradation. With x *surtout* y, it is not the gradation on the same argumentative scale that would organize similar types of predicate at various degrees of argumentative force, but a gradation between two different elements, where one is presented as rhetorically stronger than the other. Whether or not the predicate is gradable in itself, an utterance can still be placed on a scale relative to another.

When combined with *surtout,* x and y have propositional contents that respect the constraint of semantic alteration and also reflects the co-

existence of other processes or situations, given that *surtout* does not affect the truth conditions of x at all[6]. In the example *Maria est surtout venue* "*Maria has above all come*", there are three reasons for not using the MIA *surtout:* the specific aspect of the process, the action of the non-durative verb and the lack of expansion by supplementary information which could provide a focal point. That is not so much because one is unable to grade *venir* "to come" in relation to another activity, but rather because one cannot instantly recognize the co-existence of *est venu* "has come" with another activity in the same time interval.

Identifying the Focal Point y

Apart from its function as a marker of increasing argumentation, *surtout* operates a focalization, which points out, more or less univocally, the focus of the utterance. The difficulty of interpretation lies in identifying the focus within the syntactic area of focus. In the example *Maria travaille surtout sur les connecteurs concessifs* "Maria works especially on concessive connectors", the area of focus is *sur les connecteurs concessifs* "on concessive connectors". In fact, there is no linguistic indication that allows the focus to be identified, which could be understood as *les connecteurs concessifs* or *concessifs*. In the first example, the presumed paradigm is composed of every conceivable linguistic research field: the simple past, apposition or other. In the second example, the established paradigm is that of various types of connectors as opposed to concessive connectors.

In *C-ParlEur,* this does not pose any problem for the interpretation work, due to the presence of x. As the dominant construction is xl (x2, x3...) *surtout* y, the element x contributes to the identification of y, since these two elements are part of the same paradigm class. In fact, the elements x and y show, in the large majority of cases, a strong resemblance in many regards. At the formal level, there is a strong symmetry between these two elements, that is to say they belong to the same grammatical category, with the same syntactic function, with very few exceptions. The examples above are just some of the many examples of the dominant construction with x and y belonging to the same part of speech and fulfilling the same grammatical function: main clauses (1, 10), prepositional phrases as indirect objects (2), as complements of an adjective (12), noun phrases as subjects (3, 11), as direct objects (4), as predicatives (9). The resemblance often goes beyond that, since the clause or phrase structure of x and y are more or less identical or modified to a very insignificant degree. We have already seen such examples: [a

Airbus], *surtout* [a ses sous-traitants] (2), [certains matchs], *surtout* [certains supporters dangereux] (3), [la Commission], d'abord, et [le Conseil], *surtout* (4), to mention just a few.

Surtout is anteposed to y, except for clauses with verbs in composed tenses, in which case it is placed between the auxiliary and the main verb. Consequently, the identification of the focus is not obvious. In an utterance such as *Maria a surtout travaille sur les connecteurs* "Maria has primarily worked on connectors", the focus is *a travaille sur les connecteurs concessifs* "has worked on concessive connectors". In this instance, the focal point can be *connecteurs concessifs,* or simply *concessifs,* but equally *a travaille sur les connecteurs concessifs* "has worked on consessive connectors", in contrast to any other activity *a donne des cours de francais* "has given French lessons" or *a assure la coordination du project* "has been in charge of the project coordination".

Through the clarification of x, the focus can be identified as the variable element between x and y and consequently the interpretation does not present any difficulty, as shown by example (14):

(14) Pour etre efficace, ce depistage doit etre ₓ[gratuit], et doit *surtout* etre ^[bien mene], ce qui implique que l'on dispose d'un materiel de pointe sur tout le territoire de l'Union europeenne. (Grossetete061024)
In order to be effective, this screening must be ₓ[free], and *above all* must be ᵧ[well run], which requires the availability of up-to-date equipment throughout the European Union.

The area of focus of *surtout* is *doit etre bien mene* "has to be done properly", where ᵧ[bien mene] "well done" is the focus, which is easily understood due to the parallelism with ₓ[gratuit] "free".

There are, however, examples of *surtout* in *C-ParlEur* where x is absent, being referred to as "elliptic" use in the terminology of Nolke (2001, *292sqq).* One must therefore look at the broader context, in order to include the encyclopedic knowledge of the participants. The following example illustrates this problem:

(15) Ensuite je voudrais qu'on se penche veritablement sur le programme AENEAS pour le reorienter sur le seul aspect du d6veloppement, comme pour le programme qui lui succedera en 2007, mais on en est loin! Aujourd'hui, ce programme est *surtout* utilis6 pour des actions de protection des frontieres au Nord. En 2005, par exemple, sept seulement des trente-neuf projets finances concernent les pays du Sud. (CarlottiI060706a)
I would like us next to turn attention properly to the AENEAS programme with a view to reorienting it purely towards the

development aspect, and also the programme that will succeed it in 2007, but that is far away! At the moment, that programme is *above all* used for actions aimed at protecting the borders of the North. In 2005, for example, just seven of the thirty-nine projects funded are related to countries of the South.

In the area of focus *est utilise pour des actions de protection des frontieres au Nord* "is used as a method of protecting the borders of the North", there is no linguistic instruction to mark the focus within this statement, but only the delimitation of the focal area *est surtout utilise pour des actions de protection des frontieres au Nord* "is above all used for actions aimed at protecting the borders of the North". It is only the linking statement that tells us that *Nord* "North" is the focal point, on a prepositional level, since we have no other material to analyse.

Concluding Remarks

Taking as a starting point Nolke's analysis of the marker of increased argumentation *surtout,* my aim was to make a contribution to the analysis and understanding of this particular marker. The data provided are taken from the *C-ParlEur* corpus, covering French language interventions in debates that have taken place in the European Parliament. Apart from the prepositional content of the utterance, *surtout* displays two additional semantic components, one being the presupposed existence of a paradigm class and the other, the argumentative force which is superior to the relating term in this paradigm.

We have also seen that the semantic limitations imposed by *surtout y,* formulated by Nolke, are used accordingly in the *C-ParlEur*. Nevertheless, I have argued that that is not due to new information, but to the semantic alterity between x and y.

Finally, I emphasized that the problem of identifying the location of the exact focus in the focal area does not occur in the extracts from the *C-ParlEur* corpus, because of the high resemblance in structure of x and y. In fact, they are often more or less identical or just slightly modified.

There were, however, many questions that could not be addressed. A thorough study of *surtout* would require combinations with other connectors including the analysis of its use on a discursive level. One of the primary objectives of the *Europe Online* project, as I recall, is to illustrate the profitability of a method that functions at the semantic discourse level, in order to elucidate the way argumentative expressions are used.

Notes

[1] This article is a revised and translated elaboration of the study presented in H. Engel, G. Engwall, and F. Sullet Nylander (eds.) (forth.) *La linguistique dans tous les sens.*

[2] Corpus established under the direction of Noren, financed by The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities.

[3] For a discussion on the distinction between semantic argumentation and persuasion, see Ducrot (1992).

The translations of the examples are taken from the European Parliament's website and annotated according to the same conventions as the French text. When the translations differ substantially from the French original, comments will be put within parenthesis.

[5] This first constraint requires that *surtout,* in the case one or more members of the paradigm class, i.e. x1, x2, x3, etc, is/are explicitly mentioned. The second constraint implies that x and y should be argumentatively co-oriented, i.e. lead to the same conclusion. In *Beaucoup de gens etaient contents, surtout Maria* "Many people were happy, particularly Maria", both x and y could point to the conclusion "it was a very successful party", whereas **Peu de gens etaient contents surtout Maria* "*Few people were happy, above all Maria" has a contradictory effect.

[6] This is verified partly by the fact that *surtout* is often combined with the additive connectors *et* "and" or *aussi* "also" as well as the adversative *mais* "but", and not with the disjunctive *ou* "or", which can preceed other MIA, for instance *plutot* "rather".

References

Bayley, Paul (ed.). 2004. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice.* London/New York: Routledge.

Ducrot, Oswald. 1980. *Les echelles argumentatives.* Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.

—• 1992. "Argumentation et persuasion." In *Enonciation et parti pris. Actes du Colloque de TUniversite d'Anvers (5, 6, 7 Fevrier 1990),* edited by Walter De Mulder, Franc Schuerewegen, and Liliane Tasmowski, 143-158. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

  1995. "Les modificateurs derealisants." *Journal of Pragmatics* 24: 145-165.

Hie, Cornelia (ed.). 2010. *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2010a. "Analytical perspectives on parliamentary and extra-parliamentary discourses." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(4): 879-884.

—. 2010b, "Strategic uses of parliamentary forms of address: The case of the U.K. Parliament and the Swedish Riksdag." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(4): 885-911.

Noren, Coco. 1999. *Reformulation et conversation. De la semantique du topos aux fonctions interactionnelles.* Acta universitatis uppsaliensis, Studia Romanica, 60, Uppsala, Uppsala University Library.

Nolke, Henning. 1983. *Les adverbes paradigmatisants: Fonction et analyse,* Revue romane numero special 23. Copenhague: Akademisk Forlag.

—. 2001. *Le regard du locuteur II. Pour une Unguistique des traces enonciatives.* Paris: Editions Kime.

Nolke, Henning, Kjersti Flottum, and Coco Noren. 2004. *ScaPoLine. La theorie SCandinave de la POlyphonie LinguistiquE.* Paris: Kime.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONDITIONS FOR CONCESSION AND CONTRAST: CONCESSIVE AND ADVERSATIVE USE OF *Si "If"* IN FRENCH IN EUROPEAN UNION PARLIAMENT DEBATES

MARIA SVENSSON

1. Introduction

We shall present a study of how French MEPs use the French conjunction *si* " i f in concessive and adversative contexts in their speeches in the EU Parliament. We examine how concessive and adversative structures with *si* contribute to the argumentation of the French MEPs. We shall first present the object of this study, the concessive-adversative use of the French conjunction *si* that we have studied. We shall then present the aim, method and material of study, as well as previous studies our study is based upon. The introductory parts are followed by the analysis of some formal and text organisational features of *si* in concessive and adversative use in the EU Parliament.

1.1. Object of the Study

It is well known that *si* can be used in a concessive context in French, as in (1) below, where a possible conclusion of the first element is denied in the second:

(1) Le groupe PPE-DE est favorable au libre commerce, un libre commerce qui permette l'augmentation du pouvoir d'achat des plus pauvres et favorise la reduction des inegalites, tant a l'interieur des frontieres nationales qu'entre les pays. *Si* nous considerons que la

mondialisation peut etre une chance pour l'Europe, nous n'accepterons jamais, pour autant, un libre-echangisme debride. Il est de notre responsabilite de proteger les interets des plus vulnerables et de defendre notre modele social europeen. *(C-ParlEur* Daul080219)

The PPE-DE Group favours free trade, free trade of the type that allows the purchasing power of the poorest in society to increase, and helps to reduce inequalities both within national borders and between different countries. While we believe that globalisation can be an opportunity for Europe, we will never accept unbridled free-trade-ism. It is our responsibility to protect the interests of the most vulnerable among us and to defend our European social model.[1]

In (1), we could well conclude from *p* [we believe that globalisation can be an opportunity for Europe] that the speaker is in favour of unbridled free trade-ism. Yet, this conclusion is denied in *q,* where the speaker declares that the PPE-DE Group will never accept unbridled free trade.

Si can also be used adversatively, when a contrast is brought out instead. This contrast can be based on a formal opposition between the two interconnected elements, for instance between the presence and absence of negation. It can also, as in (2), be a question of lexical contrast:

(2) Le role de l'Europe consiste a fixer des objectifs communs de bonne gestion des forets avec une certaine souplesse car la foret mediterraneenne n'est pas la meme que la foret scandinave et, si les 6volutions climatiques aggravent la secheresse dans une region, elles engendrent, helas, des inondations ailleurs. *(C-ParlEur* Grossetete060904)

Europe's role is to set common objectives for good forest management, with a certain degree of flexibility, because the Mediterranean forest is not the same as the Scandinavian forest and, *if* climate change makes one region drier, it will, unfortunately, cause floods elsewhere.

In (2), there is a lexical contrast between *secheresse* "drought" and *inondations* "floods", as well as between *dans une region* "in one region" and *ailleurs* "elsewhere". However, these contrasts are not primarily about a conclusion from *p* that is denied in *q,* as concessive use is characterised.

Examples (1) and (2) show the difference in the argumentative value between these uses, but in the following we shall not separate the concessive use of *si* from the adversative one, as it is often very difficult to clearly distinguish between concessive and adversative values in specific occurrences of *si.* Even if in theory it seems easy enough to derive an adversative relation from a concessive[2] one, it is often, as Stage (1991, 191) points out, both a lexical contrast and a denied conclusion, at the same time. For this reason, we shall treat these two cases-s/ used in either

a concessive or adversative context-as one use, concessive-adversative, as distinguished from conditional, predictive, use.

When *si* is used concessively and adversatively, *p* is presented as factual, not hypothetical (see, e.g., Stage 1991, Corminboeuf 2009), as opposed to the conditional predictive use of *si,* in which *p* is presented as a hypothetical condition for the realisation of *q.* The difference in truth value between these two uses can be seen in (3), as compared with (1) and (2):

(3) L'Europe de demain n'aura plus d'industrie *si* on ne defend pas ses droits de propriete intellectuelle et son savoir-faire. *(C-ParlEur* Saifi 071213)

The Europe of tomorrow will no longer have any industry *if* we do not stand up for its intellectual copyrights and expertise.

In (1) and (2), *p* is about facts whose truth is presented as already established: it is presented as true that the PPE-DE Group believes that globalisation can be an opportunity for Europe, and that it is true that climate change makes drought worse in certain regions. In (3), however, *p* [we do not stand up for (Europe's) intellectual copyrights and expertise] is presented as hypothetical, and not as true, like in (1) and (2).

It is the non-hypothetical, concessive-adversative use of *si,* especially in comparison to its hypothetical, conditional use, that is the object of our study.

1.2. Aim and Hypothesis

A general hypothesis for our study was that the concessive-adversative use of *si* in French is subject to certain formal demands and that its use is characterised by certain formal features, in comparison to the conditional use. These characteristic features should, according to our hypothesis, be explainable through the truth value of *p* and the discursive function of the entire concessive-adversative sequence in which *si* occurs. Our hypothesis was also that the French members of the EU Parliament make use of the opportunity offered by concessive-adversative use to present certain information, which they take as their starting point in their debates in Parliament, as being true and already established.

The aim of this study was to specify certain formal and text-organisational conditions that make it possible to differentiate the concessive-adversative from the conditional use of *si.* More specifically, we have studied the form of the syntactic subject in *p* in both uses, to see if the concessive-adversative use of *si* can be distinguished from the conditional use, regarding the form of the syntactic subject in *p.* From a

text-organisational perspective, we have also studied the placement of the sequence containing *si* in relation to the context where the concessive-adversative or conditional construction occurs, to see if it is possible to observe different patterns concerning the position the two different uses tend to occupy. The overall objective of the study was to describe how sequences with *si* in concessive-adversative use contribute to the argumentation in the EU Parliament debates, as compared to its conditional use.

1.3. Method and Corpus

The study was based upon the material supplied by *C-ParlEur-Corpus de discours du Parlement Europeen*[i], a corpus established by Noren (2009), containing all debate speeches delivered in plenary in the EU Parliament by French MEPs, during a period ranging from April 2006 to March 2008. The French material comprises a total of 460000 words, distributed within 919 debates. In this study, only the written transcriptions of these speeches were used, not the video-recorded material.

To see what is specific to parliamentary discourse, which concessive-adversative use of *si* is involved, we compared the results of the analysis of the debates in *C-ParlEur* with the results from an analysis based on another corpus, *C-ParaFraSe-HumSam* (Svensson 2010), which consists of specialist texts in the fields of history, psychology, sociology and political science. For this study, we drew on 1.2 million words of that corpus.

2. Previous Studies

This particular use of *si* that was the focus of our interest has been discussed in comparison with the conditional value (Ducrot 1972, Corminboeuf 2009, Provot 2011, Provot-Olivier 2011) or with other concessive markers (Morel 1996). Some, like Provot (2011) and Achard-Bayle (2006), have tried to explain the different uses of *si* through a possible derivation from the monosemantic basic value of the word.

Two articles, in particular, focus in more detail on the concessive-adversative use of *si*. Stage (1991) suggests a categorisation of the non-hypothetical uses of *si*, while Monte (2009) studies the dialogical value of *p* in concessive and adversative structures in which *si* occurs.

In previous studies (Svensson, forthcoming), we have shown that the concessive-adversative use of *si* in parliamentary debate is characterised by the features highlighted by Stage (1991) and Monte (2009), among

others, as being typical of that use, by comparison with the conditional use. The most striking difference between the concessive-adversative and the conditional use of *si* lies in the placing of *p* in relation to *q*. In the former, the anteposition of *p* (the main clause beginning with si, followed by the subordinate clause) almost appears to be a necessary condition, with *p* standing before *q*, as in (1) and (2), in all occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use in *C-ParlEur*. In 58% of the occurrences of *si* in conditional use in *C-ParlEur*, *p* is also placed before *q*, but a postposition of *p*, where the subordinate clause is placed after the main clause, which is the case in (3), is almost as common.

Furthermore, in agreement with Stage (1991, 170), we noticed that in most of the cases (83% of the occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use in *C-ParlEur*), the same tense is used in *p* and *q* in the concessive-adversative use of *si*, unlike the conditional use, where different tenses are often used.

3. Analysis

3.1. Number of occurrences

Searches for *si* with the help of the corpus programme *Wordsmith Tools* provided a total of 612 hits in French debate speeches delivered in plenary in *C-ParlEur*. Many of these were not relevant for our study, for example *si* as the first element of an interrogative clause *(savoir si elle viendra* "know if she is going to come") or as an intensifying adverb *(si fort* "so strong"). These sorted out, we separated the occurrences of si in conditional use from those we interpreted as non-hypothetical and which were the proper object of our study.

After an analysis of the clause-introductory, non-interrogative occurrences of *si*, 65 occurrences of *si* have left that we interpreted as non-hypothetical, concessive-adversative uses in the French debates. As expected, there were more instances of the hypothetical conditional use of *si*, namely 346 occurrences. In the specialist texts in *C-ParaFraSe-HumSam*, we found 289 occurrences of *si* that we interpreted as concessive-adversative.

3.2. Subject in Definite Form

One hypothesis of our study was that the interpretation of *p* as hypothetical or factual (and thereby the discursive function of the concessive-adversative sequence) might be connected with the form of the

syntactic subject in *p,* above all with the determiner that introduced the nominal syntagm which functions as the subject in *p.* This hypothesis was based on a study by Corminboeuf (2010) of the nominal syntagm with hypothetical interpretation, such as *Un mauvais geste, et c'est la mort assuree* "One wrong move, and death is certain", where a nominal syntagm, and not an entire clause, such as *Si tu fais un mauvais geste* "If you make one wrong move", is interpreted as the condition for realisation of the second unit, *q.* Corminboeuf states that most of these cases contain a nominal syntagm with an indefinite article in *p,* because, as he claims, they entail an "undeveloped discourse object" ("un objet-de-discours non elabore") *(ibidem,* 44).

Corminboeuf's examples often involve a non-specific interpretation of an indefinite nominal syntagm, or *extraction aleatoire* "random extraction", corresponding to "any move whatever", to use Martin's (1983, 151-154) terminology, which is probably more rare with a conditional subordinate clause. Yet, the high frequency of indefinite nominal syntagms in Corminboeuf's material, leads us to wonder whether nominal syntagms with indefinite form, which involve something that has not yet been developed in the discourse, are typical of conditional constructions, in general, and not just of the nominal syntagm with hypothetical interpretation. Is it possible that concessive-adversative sequences with *si,* where *p* is presented as factual, prefer a syntactic subject with a definite article in *pi* This hypothesis was based upon the assumption that *p* in concessive-adversative use of *si* tends to repeat something that has already been mentioned in the discourse, which thereby is known, and which thereby can be prefaced more easily by a definite article or other determiners suggesting that the subject in *p* is already known.

In the debate material in *C-ParlEur,* syntactic subjects in *p* with the indefinite form proved to be so unusual in both uses (4.6% of the total number of occurrences of *si* that we interpreted as concessive-adversative use and 3% of all occurrences that we counted as conditional use), that it was impossible to infer anything about the differences in use.

On the other hand, in line with our hypothesis, subjects in the definite form-including nominal syntagms introduced by a definite article, a demonstrative pronoun or a possessive pronoun-were more common in concessive-adversative use (57% of all 65 occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use in *C-ParlEur'*) than in conditional use (33% of all 346 occurrences of *si* in conditional use in *C-ParlEur'*). In (4) below, the subject in *p, cet instrument* "this instrument", is a nominal syntagm introduced by the demonstrative adjective *cet:*

(4) *Si* cet instrument semble done repondre aux exigences d'efficacite de l'aide, il doit etre utilise sous certaines conditions. *(C-ParlEur* Saifi070214)
While this instrument therefore appears to meet the demands for effective aid, it must be used under certain conditions.

The use in (4) is concessive-adversative, as *p* [this instrument therefore appears to meet the demands for effective aid] could lead to the conclusion that the instrument could therefore be used without reservation, which is denied in *q* [it must be used under certain conditions].

In one third of the occurrences of *si* in conditional use in the speeches, the subject *p* thus took the definite form. Other forms of subjects that were common in this use in *C-ParlEur* were *on* "one, we" (16% of the occurrences of *si* in *C-ParlEur* that we interpreted as conditional use) and *nous* "we" (25% of the occurrences of *si* in *C-ParlEur* that we interpreted as conditional use). The frequent use of *nous* may reflect a characteristic of this kind of discourse, as a comparison with the specialist texts in C-*ParaFraSe-HumSam* showed that *nous,* as a subject in *p,* in both conditional and concessive-adversative use, was significantly more common in debate speeches than in the specialist texts. Example (5) represents a typical use of *nous* as the subject in *p* in the debates, with the conditional use of *si:*

(5) *Si nous* ne mettons pas cette question a l'ordre du jour, elle s'y imposera d'elle-meme sous peu. *(C-ParlEur* Wurtz 080116)
If we do not put this issue on the agenda, it will soon make its own way there.

Here, all MEPs are included in the subject *nous.* The frequent use of *nous* in both uses of *si* in the Parliament corpus is probably accounted for by the discursive character of the debates: the MEPs are arguing and trying to persuade each other and other participants in the debate to consider the consequences of their decisions as a group, using *nous* to include all the representatives. It is often the case, as well, that a group of MEPs present a common defence for a standpoint, or a report they have worked on together, and then *nous* refers specifically to the group the speaker is defending (for example, *nous* in (1), referring to the PPE-DE Group).

The tendency towards the definite form of the syntactic subject *mp* in concessive-adversative use was even more apparent in the specialist texts in our comparative corpus, *C-ParaFraSe-HumSam,* where almost two-thirds of the 289 occurrences of *si* in this use had a subject with the definite form in *p.*

We can conclude that the most common case in both concessive-adversative and conditional uses of *si* is that the subject in *p* takes on the definite form, but there is greater variation concerning the form of the syntactic subject in conditional use. In both corpora, the majority of the occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use have a subject with the definite form in *p*. This may indicate that the syntactic subject in/? is to a greater extent "referentially rooted" (see Corminboeuf 2010, 44) in the previous discourse in concessive-adversative use than in conditional use.

3.3. Placement in Speeches

In the previous sections, we noticed that it is common for the concessive-adversative *si* to appear in the initial position of a subordinate clause that has a syntactic subject in the definite form. The fact that *p* and its subject are known means that the speaker can use *p* as the starting point in his or her discourse. This is obvious not only when the speaker contrasts *p* with something new in *q,* i.e. in the relation between the subordinate clause and the superordinate clause, but also with regard to the debates in general, i.e. the entire structure of speeches.

If we split each speech into three components, beginning, middle and end, we can observe certain differences between the concessive-adversative '. use and the conditional one. In many cases, the concessive-adversative sequences with *si* occur at the beginning of the speeches, with *p* as the starting point of the entire speech. Such a placement underlines the function of this use, connecting it to something that has already been' treated in the discourse, in this case in previous debates. This way, the discursive, text-structural function of the concessive-adversative *si,* as discussed by Stage (1991, 179), stands out clearly in the debates.

In (6), where *si* is used in a concessive-adversative context, *p* [we must welcome the fact that President Sarkozy is becoming increasingly vocal and is not excluding boycotting the Olympic Games] repeats, at the beginning of the speech, a subject that has already been mentioned in the debate, namely whether or not politicians should participate in the opening ceremony at the Chinese Olympics:

(6) La r6action des autorites europeennes me revolte doublement. Premierement, *si* Ton doit se feliciter du haussement de ton du President Sarkozy qui n'exclut pas un boycott des Jeux olympiques, l'attitude de son ministre des affaires etrangeres est plus que douteuse. *(C-ParlEur* Louis 080326)
The reaction of the European authorities is doubly appalling. Firstly, *although* we must welcome the fact that President Sarkozy is becoming

increasingly vocal and is not excluding boycotting the Olympic Games, the attitude of his Foreign Affairs Minister is more than questionable.

The utterance takes as its starting point something known and previously mentioned, and then turns in *q* [the attitude of (Sarkozy's) Foreign Affairs Minister is more than questionable] to something new and the topic developed in this speech, where the speaker will claim that the Foreign Affairs Minister and many other European politicians have an over indulgent attitude towards China's relation with Tibet.

A similar case appears in (7), where the construction using *si* is placed in the very first sentence of the speech:

(7) Monsieur le President, je me felicite que le Parlement ait pris l'initiative de produire ce rapport car, *si* le role des femmes dans le secteur de 1'industrie est tout a fait crucial, leur situation professionnelle demeure globalement beaucoup plus precaire que celle des hommes. *(C-ParlEur* Lefrancois 080117)
Mr President, I welcome the fact that Parliament has taken the initiative of producing this report since, *if the* role of women in industry is utterly crucial, their professional situation overall remains much more precarious than that of men.

In (7), *p* repeats what has already been discussed by other MEPs in this debate, which is entitled "The Role of Women in Industry", namely that the role of women in industry is crucial. By repeating a previously discussed subject, we could say that the concessive-adversative construction using *si* adds to a common, or joint, construction of utterances. Monte (2009, 114) even speaks of co-utterances: "les systemes concessifs en 'si P, Q' ont ceci de caracteristique qu'ils construisent de la coenonciation"[6].

The occurrences of *si* in conditional use, on the other hand, tend to turn up at the end of the speech, like in (8), where the speaker sums up using a conditional construction in the last sentence:

(8) Voila simplement ce que je voulais dire en etant bref. *Si* nous reussissons a allier la force intrinseque du marche interieur et l'engagement des producteurs et des consommateurs dans cette politique, *alors* je pense que ce sera un vrai levier pour la prosp6rite, pour l'emploi et pour la preservation du modele social europeen en meme temps que de la force economique de l'acteur Europe sur la scene mondiale. *(C-ParlEur* Toubon 070904)
That was all I wanted to say in my brief speech. *If* we are successful in combining the inherent strength of the internal market and the commitment of producers and consumers to this policy, I think that will be a real boost for prosperity, employment and preservation of the European social model

and will, at the same time, give Europe a strong economic position in the world.

This tendency to use a construction with *si* towards the end of the speech seems to be specific to the conditional use of *si.* In concessive-adversative use of *si,* placement at the end of a speech is very unusual. Even if there are examples to support the contrary, there is a tendency for *si* to appear in concessive-adversative contexts at the beginning of a speech, rather than at the end, and to be used in a conditional context at the end rather than at the beginning.

On a discursive, argumentative level, one could say that the concessive-adversative use of *si* gives MEPs the opportunity to use the factual value *ofp* as an argumentative strategy, as they can refer back to something that has already been stated in the debate and take it as their starting point, since it has already been presented as fact. The members rely on a mention *ofp* as something known and accepted, which makes it difficult to negotiate the degree of truth *ofp.*

4. Conclusions

We have discussed different ways the concessive-adversative sequences containing *si* have been used in the debates of the EU Parliament. With *p* being presented as true, the MEPs can make the most of the concessive-adversative use of *si* as part of their argumentation, by taking as a starting point some information that has already been established. This is indicated both by the frequent use of the definite form of the syntactic subject of *p* and by the fact that the concessive-adversative sequence using si is often placed at the beginning of the speech.

In the majority of the occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use, /? has a subject in the definite form. In conditional use, there is greater variation as to the form of the subject in *p.*

On a text-structural level, we can conclude that the concessive-adversative sequences using si are often found at the beginning of speeches, while conditional use is more likely to be found at the end. Placement at the beginning of speeches stresses the discursive, text-binding function of the concessive-adversative si. The text-structural function of the concessive-adversative si emerges clearly in the debates, where one speech succeeds the other and the MEPs can use *si* concessively-adversatively in order to take previously discussed subjects as the starting point for their speeches.

Notes

[1] Translations in English of all French examples have been taken from the EU Parliament's website, www.europarl.eu, where all debate speeches from the *C-ParlEur* corpus are available in translation for all the languages of the EU.

[2] For examples of theoretical distinctions, see e.g. Gettrup and Nelke (1984, 6), who suggest a number of parameters that keep them separate: the concessive relation is defined as syntagmatic, asymmetrical and logical, while the adversative one is paradigmatic, symmetrical and material. According to Mossberg (2006, 34-5), both relations are characterised by a negative polarity *(polarite negative),* but the concessive relation is causal, while the adversative one is additive.

[3] Establishment of the corpus *C-ParlEur-Corpus de discours du Parlement Europeen* has been financed by the Swedish Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities.

[4] The remaining 43% of the 65 occurrences of *si* in concessive-adversative use in *C-ParlEur* were divided as follows: *je* "I" 12.3%, *nous* "we" 10.7%, *on* "one" 4.6%, *il/elle/ils/elles* "he/she/they" 4.6%, indefinite nominal syntagm 4.6%, indefinite pronoun 4.6%, *vous* "you, pi." 1.5%.

[5] The remaining 67% of the 346 occurrences of si in conditional use in *C-ParlEur* were divided as follows: *nous* "we" 25%, *on* "one" 16%, *il/elle/ils/ells* "he/she/they" 7%, *vous* "you, pi." 5%, *je* "I" 3%, indefinite nominal syntagm 3%, construction without a subject 3%, indefinite pronoun 2%, *tu* "you, sg." 1%, impersonal *il* "one" 1%, numeral 0.6%.

[6] "The concessive systems of 'si P, Q' are characterised by the fact that they construct co-utterance".

References

Achard-Bayle, Guy. 2006. "Si polysemique et si polyphonique." In *Le sens et ses voix. Dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours,* edited by Laurent Perrin, 407-34. Metz: Centre d'Etudes Linguistiques des Textes et des Discours Universite Paul Verlaine, Recherches linguistiques, 28.

Corminboeuf, Gilles. 2009. *L'expression de I'hypothese enfrancais. Entre hypotaxe etparataxe.* Bryssel: Duculot.

—. 2010. "Les structures nominales a interpretation hypofhetique. Format syntaxique et constantes semantiques." In *La Parataxe. Structures, marquages et exploitations discursives,* edited by Marie-Jose Beguelin, Mathieu Avanzi and Gilles Corminboeuf, Vol. 2: 29-46. Bern: Peter Lang.

Ducrot, Oswald. 1972, *Dire et ne pas dire. Principes de semantique linguistique.* Paris: Hermann.

Gettrup, Harald, and Henning Nolke. 1984. "Strategies concessives: Une etude de six adverbes francais." *Revue Romane* 19 (1): 3-47.

Martin, Robert. 1983. *Pour une logique du sens.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Monte, Michele. 2009. *"Si* marqueur d'alterite enonciative dans les *si* **P** extrapredicatives non conditionnelles." *Languefranqaise* 163: 99-119.

Morel, Mary-Annick. 1996. *La concession en franqais.* Paris: Ophrys.

Mossberg, Marie. 2006. *La relation de concession. Etude contrastive de quelques connecteurs concessifs en franqais et suedois.* Vaxjo: Vaxjo University Press.

Noren, Coco. 2009. "La Scapoline appliquee sur corpus. L'exemple du pronom *on." Langue franqaise* 164: 137-48.

Provot, Agnes. 2011. "Un invariant semantique du connecteur *si."* *Travaux du cercle beige de linguistique,* 6, http://webh01.ua.ac.be/ linguist/SBKL/ sbkl201 l/pro2011 .pdf.

Provot-Olivier, Agnes. 2011. *Le conditionnel en fran[ais et ses equivalents en allemand: le concept de referentiel temporel et I'analyse aspecto-temporelle et enonciative.* Paris: Universite Paris IV Sorbonne.

Stage, Lilian. 1991. "Analyse syntaxique et semantique de la conjonction dans les propositions factuelles." *Revue romane* 26 (2): 163-205.

Svensson, Maria. 2010. *Marqueurs correlatifs en franqais et en suedois. Etude semantico-fonctionnelle de* d'une part... d'autre part, d'un cote... de l'autre *et de* non settlement... mais *en contraste.* Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Romanica Upsaliensia, 79.

—. forthcoming. "Les emplois concessifs et adversatifs de *si* et de *om* dans le debat parlementaire europeen." In *Actes du XVIlf Congres des romanistes scandinaves Goteborg 9-12 aout 2011.*

CHAPTER EIGHT

EMOTIONS AND ARGUMENTATION
IN THE PORTUGUESE PARLIAMENT

MARIA ALDINA MARQUES

1. Introduction

The Parliament is a place of discourses[1]. More than the physical aspect, it is important to consider the political symbology of a place where power relations are at stake. The participants in the parliamentary debates, the deputies and the government have the symbolic legitimacy that results from the electoral acts which is not enough to play the political game. Imposing authority, discrediting the opponent and gaining influence are fundamental aspects of the political parliamentary activity performed in debates[2].

Parliamentary debates, in particular, are a way of monitoring the government's actions. We have selected the debate on the State of Nation, a sub-genre of parliamentary debates, which takes place at the end of each parliamentary term[3]. Thus, the parliament takes stock of the government's actions through the confrontation of the present political positions, in order to deepen disagreement. Without intending to propose an exhaustive approach to the theme, we analysed the debate on the state of Nation, which took place in the Portuguese Parliament on July 3, 2009, at the end of the 12th legislative term, under a socialist government[4].

For functional reasons, we have not taken the multimodal approach into consideration, despite regarding it as important, since our research is based on written texts, official reports of the parliamentary debates, published in the Portuguese parliamentary journal (DAR). We have therefore left aside the systematic consideration of the paraverbal and non-verbal, that is, the expression of emotion through the body[5]. In fact, besides the information provided by the punctuation, only some non-verbal information-applause, laughter, protests-are registered in the DAR.

We have focused, however, on the linguistic subject proper, together with the episodic indications related to the "extralinguistic"[6].

Our objective is to analyse the mechanisms by means of which one can construe emotions in the parliamentary debate, considering the hypothesis that a strong strategy of construing parliamentary speeches begins by expressing and attributing emotions.

The overall theoretical framework supporting our investigation is an interdisciplinary perspective of discourse analysis, specifically Amossy's and Maingueneau's theories of *ethos,* conversational analysis and argumentation in discourse.

This text is organized in three main parts. The first deals with the theoretical and methodological framework of the studies concerning the discursive construction of emotions. It is followed by the analysis of the expression of emotions in the Portuguese parliamentary debate. Finally, the most important conclusions of the study are presented.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Framework

2.1. Emotion and Discourse

According to Plantin (2004), a discourse without emotions is a pathological discourse[7]. The author makes this statement within the framework of the argumentative discourse and the function of emotion in this kind of discourse. As Amossy (2008) underlines, quoting Parret (1986), "la pensee meme est passionnelle […] et la rationalite necessairement affective".[8] Thus, emotions are an integral component of the discourse and abide by the discursive norms that regulate verbal interactions.

2.2. Emotion as a Discursive Construction

The notion *of pathos,* recuperated from the Aristotelian tradition, does not seem to respond to the theoretical and methodological demands of a discursive and interactional approach of emotion, even though, following Aristotle, *pathos* is considered in relation with *ethos.* The rhetorical tradition connects *pathos* and persuasion, focusing mainly on the effects of emotions (which Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2000 designates as *emotion aroused).*

We have analysed the discursive construction of emotions in Parliament, from the perspective of discourse analysis and argumentation. It is a descriptive analysis of the emotions represented in the discourse, as argumentative strategies used in the Portuguese parliamentary debate. This

theoretical frame of reference requires, as Kerbrat-Orecchioni *{ibidem,* 61) states, a distinction between

> *"emotion eprouvee* vs *exprimee* (celle qui constitue vraiment le lieu propre de l'investigation linguistique) vs *suscitee* (c'est le pathos aristotelicien, qui contrairement a l'ethos, se localise dans le seul auditeur)",

which implies, and we cite again Kerbrat-Orecchioni *{ibidem,* 49-50),

> "une adaptation a l'autre, et a la situation communicative dans son ensemble; et […] la mise en ceuvre incessante de mecanismes de regulation".

Discourse analysis has, therefore, felt the need to characterize emotion as a discourse category. The debate on this issue has been focusing on the mechanisms of representation of emotion in the discourse. Kerbrat-Orecchioni *(ibidem),* for example, proposes the *emotion expressed* as a specific object of discourse analysis.

Plantin (1999, 2011) refers to the emotional discourse[9], restraining its analysis to the verbal construction of emotions and he speaks of *emotion said,* "reperable dans l'organisation du materiel verbale, soit directement soit indirectement" (Plantin, Traverso, and Vosghanian 2008, 147). Micheli (2008, 8) synthesises the question, reassessing its terminological implications and, for the emotions in the discourse, he proposes the term *attribution of emotions,* instead of *expression of emotions.*

We resume these terms, but in order to define them in a different way. First, we shall be speaking of *the manifestation of emotions in the discourse* (characteristic of the discursive approach). And, as highlighted by the authors aforementioned, this terminology does not take sides about the sincerity of emotion.

The construction of emotions in the discourse is linked to the *ethos,* but also to the relation with the interlocutor, to the implication of the interlocutors in the enunciation and to the global interactional relation, which includes issues of management and regulation of interaction. This relation with the *ethos* is fundamental (it is indeed a recurring theme in the discursive analysis of emotion). Plantin (1998), for example, develops the concept of *psychological place of emotion,* closely connected to the question of *ethos,* in the context of a typology of emotions. The speaker builds the emotions in the discourse and, simultaneously, construes a certain *ethos,* which is referred by the author as the *pathemic structure of the ethos:*

"L'ethos a aussi une "structure pathemique" dans la mesure ou l'emotion […] manifestee dans le discours rejaillit forc6ment sur la source de ces manifestations".

Also, Eggs (2000, 22-23) underlines: "il faut, pour analyser les emotions, integrer l'ethos dans la description linguistique".

In accordance with the theory of *ethos* developed by Maingueneau (1999) and Amossy (1999), we consider the discursive category of emotion as *emotion said* and *emotion shown.* This is not a mere terminological detail; it is rather the theoretical framework of this subject. As Amossy (2008, 115-116) highlights, this theory "a elargi et repense la notion d'*ethos* en la reliant a la scene d'enonciation" in order to see

"comment elle s'elabore en conformite avec un type de discours […], a l'interieur de celui-ci un genre de discours […] et, dans ce cadre, une scenographie".

In fact, these are important theoretical and methodological consequences. Therefore, we propose the first categorisation of the *manifestation of emotion* in the discourse in *emotion said* and *emotion shown*[10].

We must add another category to this theory of emotions, which comes from the dialogal and dialogic character of the discourse". This is the *emotion attributed*[12], when the reference of the speaker to a certain emotion is the result of the resuming and of the interpretation that he makes of an anterior emotional discursive situation. Besides that, this emotion can be self-attributed or hetero-attributed and it is often accompanied by an evaluation commentary, due to its dialogic character. The argumentative function of this discursive procedure is evident. In a dialogal verbal interaction of the same kind as that represented by the parliamentary debates, marked by confrontation, the emotion of one is within the speech of the other[13]. The *emotion attributed* has a strong argumentative value of refutation.

2.3. Emotion and Discursive Genre

To approach emotions in the parliamentary discourse is to establish a principle of analysis that makes the concept of discursive or textual genre a basis for research, because it allows to describe the regularities of the strategic construction of emotion in discourses. This is what Eggs (2000, 29) underlines when he includes in the characteristics of the genre the rules related to the manifestation "juste et adequate des emotions". These characteristics point to a certain *genre style*[º], which determines in particular, which are the adequate emotions and how they should manifest

themselves in the discourse, particularly as far as the parliamentary genres are concerned (Marques 2008, 8). Returning to Plantin, cited above, we could speak of a *pathemic structure of genre.*

The monologal or dialogal discourse is an activity of communication governed by linguistic and contextual rules. Regarding the public speeches of which the political discourse is a part, the institutional place, the global objective and the participants are crucial. The analysis of the parliamentary debate highlights some interesting characteristics concerning these dimensions. In fact, this discursive genre attributes a privileged place to certain types of emotion, since it constitutes an exercise of monitoring and criticism of the government's actions. Therefore, one of the most frequently manifested emotions is indignation, a strong emotion, which appeals to a vehement attitude of judgment and simultaneously to the demonization of the opponent. Besides that, the deepening of disagreement, also envisaged by the debates, enables an aggressive interpersonal relation and, as a consequence, the manifestation of another type of emotion, irritation. In fact, these are regulated and controlled emotions that are part of the political game.

The dialogal structure of the debate is another aspect that should be underlined, since emotions manifest themselves at different levels of the interactional structure, with varied interactional and argumentative functions. If the turns and the themes of the debate are pre-determined, the occurrence of emotions in initiative and reactive interventions seems to be decisive. Similarly, the dialogic construction of argumentation, in discourse and counter-discourse, makes room for different emotions in each moment of the debate.

These mechanisms point to a possibility of construing a *map of emotions* within different discursive genres, which clarifies the manifestation of emotions as a result of the attention given to aspects such as the types of emotion manifested, the origin, the manifestation modes and the place in the structure of the interaction, as well as the discursive functions performed.

2.4. "An Object Difficult to Delimit"[15]. Linguistic Markers of Emotion

Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2000, 57) acknowledges the difficulty created by the insertion of affectivity in the discourse, above all, as far as the *emotions shown* are concerned, as a consequence of the non-existence of any explicit reference to the emotional state. Yet, she also underlines that, given a certain context, some linguistic characteristics, as interjections,

some lexical items or even suffixes and various mechanisms of intensification have a particular talent to carry a discourse of affectivity. The list she presents is not exhaustive, given that other syntactical and textual structures can become markers of emotion. The context, the theme, the interlocutors are fundamental to determine this emotional charge of discourse.

Besides these markers of emotion, in general, it is also necessary to take into consideration the markers that identify each emotion, in particular. Plantin (1999) and Plantin, Traverso and Vosganian (2008) highlight the importance of the organisation of the verbal material in the recognition of the discursive emotions, the *emotions said}*. We are dealing with discursive operations of construction and identification of the emotion to which Eggs (2008, 291) refers in this same work as a topics and a semiotics of emotions.

In the present work, we started from the dictionary definition, which comprehends globally these characteristic behaviour modes, which are part of the speakers' knowledge of the world.

3. The Emotions in the Parliamentary Debate. The Meaning of Emotions

3.1. Manifestations of Indignation

It is evident that emotions acquire meaning in the situation in which they are construed. That depends mainly on the status and the discursive functions of emotions manifested. We shall begin by expliciting the modes of manifestation of indignation in the parliamentary debate.

According to the dictionary of Portuguese language (2001), indignation is "a strong feeling of exaltation or anger caused by something regarded as unjust or incorrect". This definition includes semantic traces that entail the scenario of indignation schematised by Plantin (2011): "une situation provoquant l'indignation ; une victime ; un indigne, un indigne".

In this debate on the State of Nation, indignation aggregates the fundamental interventions of the government and the Socialist Party. It is manifested in the first interventions, which appear as turns marked by the previous elaboration of the speech.

The Prime Minister opens the debate with the construction of a dramatic scenario anchored in the economic world crisis which, from the represented point of view, should overdetermine the realization of the debate. The content of the intervention is organized on the basis of an emotional state of indignation, which subsists during all the interaction

and dominates the discursive chain. The speaker takes his interlocutors to a pathemic universe:

(1) O Parlamento debate hoje o estado da Nacao numa altura em que *o mundo vive a maior crise economica desde a II Guerra Mundial. [...] nao pode haver um debate serio sobre o Estado da Nacao que nao parta do reconhecimento da dificil situacao em que se encontra a economia mundial, com reflexos absolutamente inevitaveis [...] em todos os paises.* The Parliament will debate today the state of Nation in a time *in which the world has been living the major economic crisis since World War II. [...] There will not be a serious debate on the State of Nation that is not based on the acknowledgement of the difficult situation of the world's economy, with inevitable consequences [...]for all countries.*

It is by this scenario that the speaker emphasizes and intensifies the confrontational dimension of the debate, building a dysphoric orientation of the *ethos* of the opponent. The manifestation of indignation comes first through accusation acts supported by two opposed semantic coordinates, of an axiological nature, that of the demonization of the opponent, on the one hand, and the idealisation of the image of the Government, on the other hand. The strategy relies on resuming speeches which first surprise and then enhance indignation against an act of injustice of which the Government is the victim (victim and indignant coincide), whilst the Opposition is the unworthy indignant actor. It is an emotion shown in the discursive surface. Lexical items as *demagogy, insinuate, falsely,* the amplification by hypothetical counterfactual comparison-"as if'-, repetitions-"a small earthquake"-and exclamatory sentences-'imagine that!"-embed the discourse of a growing emotional tension:

(2) a *demagogia* de procurar diminuir a gravidade da crise internacional e dos seus efeitos em Portugal, apenas para *insinuar, falsamente,* [...] que a culpa e do Governo. Chegou-se [...] ao ponto de sustentar que a responsabilidade da crise internacional cabia por inteiro ao Governo portugues, *como se fosse plausivel que a culpa do Governo portugues tivesse como consequencia que os Estados Unidos, o Japao, a Russia e a Europa mergulhassem na recessao que hoje vivem. Agora, ouvimos ate dizer que a crise mundial nao passa—imagine-se!—de 'um abalozinho de terras'. Repito: 'um abalozinho de terras'!*
The *demagogy* of seeking to diminish the gravity of the international crisis and of its effects in Portugal, just in order *to insinuate, falsely, [...]* that the government is responsible. One went further [...] to state that the responsibility of the international crisis fully belonged to the Portuguese Government *as if it had been plausible that the guilt of the Portuguese Government could have resulted in the recession in the United States,*

Japan, Russia and Europe. Now we hear that the world crisis is only-imagine thatl-a small earthquake. I repeat 'a small earthquake'!

The conclusion that follows this denunciation is also important, because this debate precedes the electoral campaign. The parliamentary debates are deeply rooted in the political, social and economic situation of the country and overdetermined by wider movements and interests. Therefore, the speaker's conclusion focuses on the opponent's character, as a candidate in the legislative elections:

(3) *Esta nao e uma atitude seria e nao e uma atitude propria de quem possa merecer credibilidade.*
This is not a serious attitude and it is not an attitude of someone who would deserve some credibility.

It is in the distancing from the Opposition and this negative *ethos* that the speaker builds the image of credibility, efficiency and power of the Government:

(4) *A atitude do Governo e bem diferente.*
The attitude of the Government is very different.

The justification of this assertion, given in a very detailed manner, will end up in another moment of indignation, a noble indignation, prepared by the reference to a "hot" theme, filled with emotion (the investment in the social policies), presented in terms of the same strategy of radicalised confrontation and supported by self- and hetero-attribution of emotions. The terms of emotion, *pride* and *shame* are included in the two appreciative and antagonistic axes referred to above:

(5) A accao do Governo […] foi tambem dominada pela ambicao de um Pais mais justo […] uma das marcas deste Governo, que reivindica com *orgulho,* e o investimento nas politicas sociais. […] de um lado, estao os que defendem a privatizacao, parcial ou total, das funcoes sociais do Estado. […] Falam agora do 'Estado imprescindivel', e com isso apenas revelam a *vergonha* que tern de dizer aos eleitores […], que o que desejam realmente 6 um Estado minimo, com funcoes sociais minimalistas […]. *Sao outros os nossos valores, e outra a nossa opqao.*
The action of the Government […] was also dominated by the ambition of a juster country […] one of the marks this Government claims with *pride* is the investment in social policies. […] on the one hand, there are those who defend partial or total privatization of the social functions of the State […]. They now talk about the 'indispensable State', and by that they only prove *shame* for having to tell the people that what they really want is a minimal

State, with minimal social functions […]. *Our values are different and our option is also a different one.*

The indignation in the name of people incites to action[17]. That is not only to denounce the attitudes of the right wing (the traditional alternative to the socialist Government), but to defend the rights acquired by the people as a consequence of the "just" governmental policies . The speaker reinforces thus his *ethos* of legitimacy and power. In the construction of these discursive images, it must be highlighted that there is a shift in the addressing terms from "we" (Government, Socialist Party) to "I" (the government leader, prime minister) in a strategy close perhaps to a populist position marked in the discourse by the almost obsessive repetition (seven times) of "I am here to defend":

(6) *N6s* somos pelo Estado social […]. E que nao haja nenhuma duvida: *estou aqui para defender* os novos direitos e as novas medidas sociais que aprovamos e pusemos em pratica […] e que outros, a nossa direita, querem agora simplesmente *rasgar, rasgar, rasgar\...*
We are for the social State […]. And may no doubt exist / *am here to defend* the new rights and the new social measures that we approved and put into practice […] and that others on our right now want to simply *tear apart, tear apart, tear apartl*

The enumeration of the threatened rights, intensified by the syntactic parallelism of the nominal constructions and the repetition of the nuclear words "defend" and "tear", creates an effect of accumulation and a rhythm that support a committed vehemence, characteristic of indignation. The list of the citizens affected by this unjust attitude, the elderly, the children, the patients, the students, the unemployed, amongst others, dramatises the argumentation. And so, the theme of the debate departs from the questioning of Government's action to the attack against the Opposition.

This strategic enactment is resumed also in the initiative intervention of a socialist member of Parliament (a deputy) in a similar context of confrontation, marked by the same emotional register (the use of the same lexical items marks a continuous discursive line). In this case, indignation is built on the basis of a mechanism of question-answer that blames hyperbolically the opponent and intensifies the emotional tone of the debate. It is a (rhetorical) question about ten social measures implemented by the Government and always answered affirmatively by "voices" of the Socialist Party, following the classic image of the dramatic effects of a Greek choir:

(7) Os senhores [...] ao 'rasgarem' certas opcoes economicas e sociais, contrariamente as nossas op9oes, estao a 'asgar' a vida das pessoas *[...].Querem 'rasgar' o rendimento social de insergao ...?!*
Vozes do PS: *QueremX*
- Querem *'rasgar' o complemento solidariopara idosos ?!*
Vozes do PS: *Querem*
You [...] when 'tearing apart' certain economic and social options that run counter to our options, you are tearing apart people's lives [...]• *Do you want 'to tear apart' the social income of insertion?*
 PS Voices: *Yes, they do*
- Do you want *'to tear apart' the social income for old people!*
PS Voices: *Yes, they do!*

Indignation supports argumentation, serves the construction of the interlocutors' *ethos,* creates a new theme of debate and orientates the argumentation towards the amplification of disagreement.

3.2. Manifestations of Irritation

Irritation is also frequent in the parliamentary debate, but has a different discursive status. It is a sign of tension and even strong aggressiveness, but always a one-off episode. Unlike indignation, this is not a noble emotion. According to the dictionary of Portuguese language (2001), irritation is

"the state of a disturbed person by something that bothers him/her and is likely to manifest itself in an aggressive manner".

In relation to the collective *ethos* of politicians, as a social class, this emotion helps construct a kind of *anti-ethos.*

In terms of the discursive structure, irritation occupies a specific structural place, manifests itself essentially in the reactive interventions and has a preferential argumentative function of refutation:

(8) Mais extraordinario e que *tenha agora o desplante de vir dizer* aqui [...] que o computador *Magalhaes* foi adquirido pelo Governo! *O Sr. Deputado nao sabe nada do que esta a falarl*
What is more extraordinary is that *now you have the nerve to say here* that [...] the computer *Magalhaes* was bought by the Government! *Mr. Deputy, you don't know anything of what you are saying*

The occurrence in reactive interventions shows that irritation manifests itself in discourse contexts that have not previously been planned:

(9) Nao e preciso nenhum debate como este para se confirmar que usa sempre *duas caras na politico. [...]*
deixem de lado essa tirada parlamentar das "duas caras ", que, alias, e copiada do PSD, e nao Ihe flea nada bem.
We don't need a debate like this to confirm that you always use *"two faces " in politics. [...] you had better leave aside that parliamentary saying of the two faces, which is copied from the PSD, and which does not suit you at all.*

The parliamentary discourse allows for the manifestation of irritation in other kinds of interventions, besides talks, verbal and non-verbal interventions, marginal in relation to the structure and rules of the parliamentary debate. However, this reactive dimension, serving argumentative refutation, makes them important in order to understand the functioning of debates and emotions:

(10) *Is to nao e uma interpelagao! O senhor fale na sua vez!*
This is not an interpellation! Speak up when your turn comes'.

Irritation *shown* is recuperated from behavioural traces (mainly protests) described in D A R or marked linguistically in the interventions of the participants. The dysphoric words and certain syntactic constructions allow for the manifestation of irritation. The cleft sentences, signalling the resuming of the fact causing the irritation, the exclamatory sentences and, above all, the imperative sentences are frequent.

3.3. The Emotion of One is within the Discourse of the Other

The emotional dimension of the discourse is valorised above all if it can be used as a disqualification of the opponent. To question his/her emotions and to explore all the consequences is a fundamental issue, whereas to attribute an emotion is, after all, to evaluate it and simultaneously evaluate the person dominated by emotion, that is, the opponent:

(11) As expressoes que o Sr. Primeiro-Ministro utilizou, de "mentira" e "desonestidade", sao tristissimas. O Sr. Primeiro-Ministro tera a impressao pessoal que quiser sobre cada um dos seus adversarios [...], e respeito a sua *raiva* contra quern o critica.
The expressions you used-"lying" and "dishonesty"-are very sad. You will have the personal impression you want of each of your opponents [...], and I respect your *rage* against those who dare criticise you.

It is for this reason that the emotion of one is within the discourse of the other. The discursive chain, constituted by turns, is fundamental for the construction of the **emotion attributed;** the speaker in a reactive intervention interprets and evaluates the emotion he attributes to his/her opponent. The emotion becomes the object of discourse, it is an **emotion said.** In the parliamentary discourse, the emotion hetero-attributed is an emotion negatively evaluated and intensified when the speaker opposes it to a "convenient" **self-attributed** emotioa

4. To Conclude

We highlight six points as a conclusion:

1. Taking emotions as an object of analysis emphasizes the necessity and the importance of the theoretical framework, with respect to the emotions manifested, their mode of manifestation and the reference to the opponent's emotional speech.

2. The manifestation of emotions is part of the parliamentary style; it is not marginal to the discursive parliamentary practice.

3. The discursive genre determines the "adequate emotions" that have a fundamental role in the construction of the discourse of argumentation. In the parliamentary debate, indignation and irritation emerge as examples of parliamentary emotions with specific functions.

4. The global dialogal structure enables us to analyse the emotions in terms of a discourse and a counter-discourse. It is particularly important the way the interlocutors attribute emotions to each other. Since the parliamentary debate is a genre that highlights confrontation, the manifestation of emotions shows preferably the negative emotional orientation that the speaker attributes to the discursive behaviour of the opponent.

5. The discursive structure presents contexts of unequal argumentative and emotional pertinence. The initiative and reactive interventions are different structural places regarding the insertion of emotions in the discourse. They can also be distinguished because they have specific argumentative, counter-argumentative and refutation functions.

6. These functions and characteristics can contribute to a first draft of a map of emotions in the parliamentary debate.

Notes

[1] A first version of this text was presented at the seminar *Manipulation and Argumentation,* at the University of Porto, June 2010. I wish to thank Clara Oliveira for the translation of this text.

[2] The Portuguese Parliament is designated as "Assembleia da Republica" (Assembly **of** the Republic).

[3] Art. 228 of the *Regiment.*

[4] Despite analysing only one speech, the validity of the conclusions is reinforced by the fact that we are concerned with a strongly ritualized genre and, in this case, it presents, in relation to other speeches, prototypical characteristics of the genre.

[5] See Eggs (2000, 28): "Comme toute emotion est une facon d'avoir son corps dans un scenario donne, sa manifestation est toujours liee a des indices corporels".

[6] We are aware of these constraints. Yet, we think that they do not prevent us from analysing emotions in the parliamentary debate.

[7] This assertion is corroborated by neurological studies (Damasio 1996).

[8] A fundamental question concerns the very definition of emotion. Without further discussion, we have adopted Cosnier's definition (1994, 161): "un terme utilise dans un sens large pour designer les etats constitutifs de la vie affective".

[9] "On peut egalement parler […] de parole *emotionnee,* qui peut designer une parole traversee par n'importe quelle forme demotion" (Plantin 2000).

[10] We have adopted the definitions of *ethos dit* and *ethos montre.* Discussing the terms described/expressed, explicit/implicit, Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2000) proposes the pair denoted/connoted. This is, globally, the distinction we have established between *said* and *shown,* respectively, but we consider our proposal clearer and with other theoretical implications for its closeness to the theory of *ethos.* In a text from 2010, Kerbrat-Orecchioni states: "II convient de distinguer deux modes d'affichages de l'emotion […] le mode du dire (l'emotion est assertee, nommee, denotee), et celui du montrer (l'emotion est simplement connotee, c'est-a-dire manifestee de facon plus ou moins claire ou discrete par un certain nombre d'indices)" (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2010, 21). Finally, Plantin (1999) proposes *emotions said,* subcategorised in *emotions designated* and *emotions reconstructed.*

[11] The terms "dialogal" and "dialogic" refer to the structure of the interaction and the voices of discourse, respectively.

The expression *attribution of emotion* is used by Micheli (2008), but replacing the *expression of emotion,* that we designate simply as *manifestation of emotion.*

It is an expression used by Plantin, in a conference at the Universidade do Minho: *La norme du discours de I'un est dans le discours de l'autre.*

[14] Cf. Bakhtin (1992).

That is Kerbrat-Orecchioni's expression (2000, 58).

[16] The author uses the term in the sense of *emotion expressed.*

[17] "L'indignation semble deboucher sur une action revendicative (...). L'indignation 'incite a Taction'" (Charaudeau 2000, 127; 137)

[18] This situation is close to what Cosnier (1994) referred to as "interets sociaux declencheurs d'emotions".

References

Amossy, Ruth. 1999. *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de I 'ethos.* Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestle.

—. 2008. "Dimension rationnelle et dimension affective de l'ethos." In *Emotions et discours. L 'usage des passions dans la langue,* edited by Michael Rinn, 113-126. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Bahktin, Mikhail. 1992 [1979]. *Estetica da criaqao verbal.* Sao Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Charaudeau, Patrick. 2000. "Une problematisation discursive de l'emotion. A propos des effets de pathemisation a la television." In *Les emotions dans les interactions,* edited by Christian Plantin, Marianne Doury, and Veronique Traverso, 125-155. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

Cosnier, Jacques. 1994. *La psychologie des emotions et des sentiments.* Paris: Retz.

Damasio, Antonio. 1996. *O erro de Descartes: Emocao, Razdo e Cerebro Humano.* Sao Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Diciondrio da lingua portuguesa, 2001, Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa. Lisboa: Verbo.

Eggs, Ekkehard. 2000. "Logos, ethos, pathos: l'actualite de la rhetorique des passions chez Aristote." In *Les emotions dans les interactions,* edited by Christian Plantin, Marianne Doury, and Veronique Traverso, 15-31. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

—. 2008. "Le pathos dans le discours-exclamation, reproche, ironie." In *Emotions et discours. L 'usage des passions dans la langue,* edited by Michael Rinn, 291-320. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2000. "Quelle place pour les emotions dans la linguistique du X X ͤ siecle ? Remarques et apercus." In *Les emotions dans les interactions,* edited by Christian Plantin, Marianne Doury, and Veronique Traverso, 33-74. Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon.

—. 2010. "Pour une analyse multimodale des interactions orales: l'expression des emotions dans les debats politiques televisuels." *Cadernos de letras UFF-Dossie: letras, linguistica e suas interfaces* 40: 17-45.

Maingueneau, Dominique. 1999. "Ethos, scenographie, incorporation." In *Images de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos,* edited by Ruth Amossy, 75-100. Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestle.

Marques, Maria Aldina. 2008. "Arrogancia e construcao do *ethos* no discurso politico portugues", *Adas do III Simposio Internacional de Andlise do Discurso,* 1-10. Brasil: Belo Horizonte, UFMG.

Micheli, Raphael. 2008. "L'analyse argumentative en diachronie: le *pathos* dans les debats parlementaires sur l'abolition de la peine de mort", *Argumentation et analyse du discours* 1/2008, available since Septembre 18 ͭ ͪ, 2008 (Accessed April, 2010). URL: http://aad.revues.org/ index482.html.

Parret, Herman. 1986. *Les Passions: essais sur la mise en discours de la subjectivite.* Liege/Bruxelles: Mardaga.

Plantin, Christian. 1998. "Les raisons des emotions." In *Forms of Argumentative Discourse/Per un'analisi linguistica dell'argomentare,* edited by Marina Bondi, 3-50. Bologna: CLEUB.

—. 1999. "La construction rhetorique des emotions." In *Rhetoric and Argumentation. Proceedings of the International Conference (Lugano, April 22-23, 1997),* edited by Eddo Rigotti, in collaboration with Sara Cigada, 203-219. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag (Beitrage zur Dialogforschung 19).

—. 2000. "Se mettre en colere en justifiant sa colere." In *Les emotions dans les interactions,* edited by Chr. Plantin, V. Traverso, and M. Doury. Lyon : Presses universitaires de Lyon (CD-ROM).

—. 2004. *"Ad Passiones.* Affects et logique dans l'argumentation." In *Prdticas de investigacao em andlise linguistica do discurso/Research Practices in Linguistic Discourse Analysis* (Actas do II Encontro Internacional de Analise Linguistica do Discurso), edited by Maria Aldina Marques, Maria Emilia Pereira, Rui Ramos, and Isabel Ermida, 163-180. Braga: Universidade do Minho/CEHUM.

—. 2011. "L'indignation politique: une approche discursive." *Le discours politique portugais en perspective: approches plurielles,* Porto, 16 e 17 de junho 2011. http://icar.univ-lyon2.fr/ membres/cplantin/actualites.htm#conferences (Accessed September, 2011).

Plantin, Christian, Veronique Traverso, and Liliane Vosghanian. 2008. "Parcours des emotions en interaction." In *Emotions et discours. L'usage des passions dans la langue,* edited by Michael Rinn, 113-126. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

CHAPTER NINE

THE EPIDEICTIC DISCOURSE
IN A DELIBERATIVE CONTEXT:
POLITICAL STATEMENTS
IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENT

RODICA ZAFIU

1. Introduction

The *political statement* (henceforth PS) is an apparently marginal sub-genre of the parliamentary discourse, which can function as an indicator of the internal limits and vulnerabilities of the communicative interaction permitted by institutional frames. The aim of this paper is to investigate the place and role of this atypical sub-genre, surprisingly frequent in the Romanian Parliament (where it has been one of the current discursive practices; for a considerable number of MPs, the PSs produced exceed the number of interventions in legislative debates).

The PS that I shall deal with runs counter to the main features of the prototypical parliamentary discourse: ritualization/standardization, dialogic and deliberative character. Instead, it is a discourse form generally free from textual or register constraints, subjectively marked, monological, and self-sufficient. PS is an example of *epideictic discourse* (with a display, demonstrative function), i.e. a discourse centred on evaluative *(praise* or *blame)* acts, oriented towards self-representation and the consolidation of particular group values[1]. Unlike some traditional interpretations which equate the epideictic discourse with the ceremonial one, I consider that the former has a strong polemical component, which integrates it in an indirect controversial interaction. What distinguishes the epideictic genre, however, is the fact that, as a discourse dedicated to the consolidation of values and the manipulation of emotions, it has a feeble deliberative °nentation, i.e. it lacks the availability for debate.

Consequently, the case of the PS becomes relevant for a certain internal ambivalence and tension within parliamentary discourse. Recent research (Wodak and Van Dijk 2000; Hie 2003, 2004, 2006, 2010a, etc.) has stressed the interactional character, the debate quality of parliamentary discourse. However, Bayley (2004b, 7, 12) drew attention to the fact that parliamentary communication belongs to two institutional areas-politics and law-, which provides the discourse with a self-representational and promoting function, apart from the deliberative/legislative one. The proliferation of PSs can therefore be interpreted as a symptom of imbalance in parliamentary discourse, which moves from the legislative debate towards political campaigning, from dialogue and negotiation towards self-sufficient representation and blocking the dialogue[2]. One can then identify a tendency to undermine the deliberative function by means of the epideictic mode.

My research springs from examining the extension of the epideictic genre in parliamentary discourse in present-day Romanian parliamentary discourse. The analysis of this phenomenon is based on the PSs recorded during 2005-2011, which are publicly accessible (as transcripts and video recordings) on the sites of the two parliamentary houses (Chamber of Deputies, Senate). Of this extensive collection of texts, I have set up a more restrictive corpus consisting of PSs presented in particular sittings dedicated to this discourse type in the first four days of the yearly sessions 2008-2011. The corpus consists of **1442** statements (800,514 words), of which **1355** made in the Chamber of Deputies[3] and **87** in the Senate[4]. By using these data, I shall try to outline a PS typology and to indicate some of its epideictic features (the appeal to values and emotions; specific rhetorical strategies based on metaphor and/or irony). My hypothesis is that these come from a cultural tradition dominated by the prestige of literature and ornamental rhetoric and are subject to strong interferences from the discourses of the journalistic comment and the satirical (polemical) text-which are central to the public sphere in present-day Romania[5]. Apart from the potential cultural explanations, the weight of the epideictic discursiveness seems to be a symptom of the reduction in dialogic availabilities.

2. The Institutional Frame

PSs are part of the institutional communication[6] within the Romanian Parliament. The procedural rules *{Regulamente)* of the Chamber of Deputies and of the Senate explain the place of the PSs (also called

interventions) in the sessions as a whole (a), with respect to the time allotted for each political group (b), and the duration of every speech (c):

(a) "Every Tuesday, the first ninety minutes of the sittings shall be dedicated to the political statements of the MPs" (RCD, Art. 188, 1); "Every week, the Permanent Office allots a fixed quota of a sitting's time to the political statements or other interventions of the MPs" (RS, Art. 171);
(b) "The 90 minutes shall be distributed among the parliamentary groups of the majority, of the opposition and the MPs that do not belong to either of these two categories" (RCD, Art. 188, 2);
(c) "The intervention shall not exceed three minutes"[7] (RCD, Art. 188, 4).

The rules do not define the essence or the aim of the PSs, but contain indications about their content ("current issues", "anniversaries, commemorations", RCD, Art. 189) and about the responsibility of the speaker: the MP speaks in his/her own name or on behalf of the parliamentary group (RS, Art. 171, 2). There is also a description of the effects: the PS can be sent to the Government; the Senate accepts that the MPs have the right to reply (RCD, Art. 190, RS Art. 171,4)[8]. Anyway, the PSs are registered on the official page of every MP, as a specific activity, which may well be the reason behind their production.

In the Romanian Parliament, PSs are usually written in advance and read in the sitting; many of them are only submitted and copied as transcripts. For the PSs that are being read, the video recordings (available on the official site) show mainly a flat reading, with eyes fixed on the paper; the chamber is almost empty (a phenomenon noticed by Bayley 2004b, as being typical of the routine parliamentary activity)[9] and the speech is followed by very scarce applause. No TV channel broadcasts parliamentary debates and journalists are not interested in this part of the schedule, so it is barely likely that there exists any extra-parliamentary audience for the actual reading which is being performed.

The proliferation of the genre is favoured by the possibility of submitting written texts: for instance, in the Chamber of Deputies sitting of February 2, 2010, no less than 76 PSs were registered, only 13 of which were effectively read, because of the time limit. No rule prevents the multiplication of the written statements presented by the same MP; so, for the above-mentioned session, an MP registered 13 PSs, and another colleague-10.

There is a big difference, however, between the amount of PSs produced in the Chamber of Deputies and that of the PSs put in circulation •n the Senate. This reflects not only the ratio of the number of MPs (2.28 times more in the Chamber of Deputies), but also the differing institutional

practices. While the number of PSs increases in the Chamber of Deputies (from 272 in 2008, to 446 in 2011), the number of PSs presented in the Senate decreases (50 in 2008, 37 in 2009) and they are completely discarded in 2010 and 2011[10].

The themes of the PSs are extremely diversified and they range from the most concrete, local issues to very general, abstract ones: health, education, ecology, pension funds, unemployment, taxes, administration, internal conflicts in political parties, etc.

3. Epideictic Discourse vs. Deliberative Discourse

Following the traditional Aristotelian typology (the trichotomy of deliberative, forensic, and epideictic oratory, in Aristotle's *Rhetoric,* 1358), epideictic discourse produces praise and blame, based on evaluative judgments. Traditionally, the epideictic genre has been interpreted as merely ceremonial (Too 2001), literature oriented, aiming not so much at persuasion as at aesthetic performance. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958) have reinterpreted the epideictic mode, on the one hand, by emphasizing the importance of values (as means of establishing and negotiating the agreement with the addressee) in any argumentative text and, on the other hand, by acknowledging the argumentative force (in so far as it increases the agreement with and cohesion due to particular values) of the epideictic genre (Amossy 2006, 14-15). It is along these lines that research conducted in French-speaking countries has often assigned an important role to the epideictic discourse, even when it was considered (by Dominicy and Frederic 2001, for example) as being exterior to the debate, because it belongs to the preliminary consensus with the audience. Consequently, in the opinion of the above-mentioned authors, in the case of the epideictic discourse we would allegedly have to do with mere *value staging (mise en scene des valeurs)[11].*

However, the presumed consensus can be a rhetorical construction if expressed in a conflictive context: arguing about values can reinforce the group's stability, but has the effect of highlighting the hostility towards the adversary, too. Typically, epideictic discourse contains a large amount of pathos effects: the appeal to values produces positive or negative emotions. It is known that preference for some values and rejection of opposite ones lays at the basis of making decisions: therefore, there is a kind of continuum between the epideictic mode and the deliberative one. In short, by choosing the epideictic mode, the orator adopts a complex rhetorical strategy that can reinforce alliances, emphasize the adversity and even invite to action (through the force of the value-based emotions).

In fact, epideictic discourse oscillates between two functions: if it is really consensual (being delivered before a homogeneous audience), its effect is purely ornamental and aesthetic. If indirectly controversial, it can have an argumentative and persuasive role, but few chances of being felicitous: modifying the values of an adverse audience through discourse is a very improbable exploit[12]. PSs use emotions in order to express evaluative judgments. In a deliberative context such as the Parliament, their purely aesthetic function is inadequate and the argumentative function is useless, because of its debatable success.

3.1. Media Patterns

As written monologues, most of the PSs in our corpus are somewhat anomalous with respect to prototypical parliamentary talks, defined by dialogic interaction and deliberative character (cf. Hie 2006 etc.)[13]. As subjective monologues, evaluative in intention and rather colloquial in form, these texts are very similar to many contemporary newspaper articles.

Present-day Romanian newspaper discourse shows a strong inclination towards commentary and entertainment (at the expense of information). The most prominent features of this particular discourse are fictionalisation and sensationalism, the subjective bias and the hearsay mode. The subjective media discourse (especially opinion articles) aims at a persuasive effect by using a great deal of rhetorical, figurative means.

The titling strategy is the first mark of subjectivity and of the literary and journalistic pattern assumed by the PSs: the titles are very similar to current headlines. It is not insignificant that almost all of the PSs in our corpus have a (headline-like) title, and this is frequently rhetorically oriented and ambiguously ornate, rather than neutral and informative. Among the examples of ambiguous titles one can mention the metaphorical dilemmas (1), the non-transparent allusions (2) or the pseudo-philosophical interrogations (3):

(1) *Incarcatul carului intre dorinfa si putinfd* (CD, 5.02.2008)
Loading one's cart between desirability and ability

(2) *De la aspirina banald la aspirina Ferrari si papucii Louis Vuitton* (CD, 10.02.2009)
From the common aspirin to the Ferrari one and to the Louis Vuitton slippers (10.02.2009)

(3) *Viitorul depdseste existenfa noastrd?* (CD 2.02.2010)
Does future exceed our existence?

Some MPs, in particular, tend to propose literary-like, non-transparent] titles. One illustration which may be provided is that of an MP who] produced 122 political statements during the 4 years of his parliamentary; mandate (2005-2008). Most of his titles follow an identical one-word generic or metaphorical pattern: *Dicfionarul* [The dictionary] (CD 12.04.2005), *Oglinda* [The mirror] (CD 22.04.2005), *Jocul* [The game] (31.05.2005), *Surpriza* [The surprise] (CD 11.04.2006), *Metafora* [The metaphor] (CD 27.06.2006), *Umbra* [The shadow] (CD 17.04.2007), *Zeus* (5.02.2008), *Impresii* [Impressions] (CD 9.09.2008), etc.

Metadiscursive acts[14] can emphasize the "aesthetic" auctorial intention of subjectively manifested creativity:

(4) *Declaratia mea politico se intituleazd: "Cum ajutdm marii contribuabili?"* (CD 2.02.2010)
My political statement is called: "How do we help big contributors?"

(5) *Declaralia mea politica de astdzi este intitulatd "Pe ce drum mergem?"* (CD 2.02.2010)
My political statement of today bears the title "Which way are we taking?"

(6) *Declarafia mea de astazi am intitulat-o "Moldova ramdne in continuare izolatd"* (CD 2.02.2010)
My statement of today is called "Moldavia keeps being isolated".

By focusing on the addresser's message (Hie 2003), the above illustrated metadiscursive patterns reinforce the auctorial ethos: the message acquires autonomy and its producer acquires prestige.

Sensationalism and hyperbolic dysphemism, as expressed by many PS titles, are typical of the headlines in tabloid journalism[15] (sometimes with nationalistic accents, as in 9):

(7) *Craiova, din nou sub teroare* (CD, 5.02.2008)
The city of Craiova, under terror again

(8) *Romania seprabuseste* (CD, 5.02.2008)
Romania is cracking

(9) *Nimic nu mai este romanesc in Romania* (CD, 8.02.2011)
Nothing Romanian has left in Romania.

The repertoire of ornate rhetoric comprises periphrases and intertextual allusions (10-11):

(10) *Jara arde-n crizd, babele guverndrii se piaptdna*[ʷ] (S, 4.05.2009)
The country is burning in crisis, whereas the old ladies of the government are combing their hair

(11) *Europa nu crede in lacrimi*[11] (S, 22.06.2009)
Europe does not believe in tears.

The titles also abound in rhymes, puns, stylistic contrasts with slang elements, etc., just as in present-day media discourse.

Titles/headlines offer a privileged point for the observation of the evaluative rhetorical strategies. Yet, texts are strongly marked too, even if they assume an apparently informative role: subjective language features are numerous. Sensationalist style of the PSs uses various means in order to mark the exceptionality, even the uniqueness of a fact, through the epistemic surprise (12-13) or through emotional scenarios (14-15):

(12) *IncredibW.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
Incredible!

(13) *Nu cred cd mai existd vreo (ard europeand in care sd existe atdfi intelectuali cdrora sd le fie rusine de neamul lor* (CD, 5.02.2008)
I do not think there is another European country where so many intellectuals should feel ashamed of their people

(14) *Oamenii mor defoame* (CD, 5.02.2008)
People are dying of starvation

(15) *Murim defoame si defrig* (CD, 5.02.2008)
We are dying of starvation and cold.

Evaluators of emotivity and unexpectedness are considered two of the main parameters of appraisal in media discourse (Bednarek 2006, 45-49).

Media discourse is also famous for its use of hearsay markers and the appeal to rumours, to anonymous and less reliable sources. The same type of evidentiality can be found in PSs:

(16) *Din informafiile mele de ultima ord, se pare cd...* (CD, 5.02.2008)
According to my latest information, it seems that...

The examples cited above illustrate a particular form of interrelation between media discourse and political discourse: not only do

"political actors adapt their agenda and style to the requirements of media presence (...) and of media formats" (Busch 2009, 580),

but they imitate the journalistic evaluation strategies and the epideictic media genres.

3.2. Discourse Taxonomy

PSs can be classified into three main types of discourses: *celebration speeches, polemical and satirical speeches,* and *action (decision)-oriented speeches*. The first type (the celebration discourse) best corresponds to the epideictic genre, by fulfilling its basic function-the evaluative judgment-, with typical accessories: focalisation on the act of praise and on auditory consensus. Satirical discourses also serve to make evaluative judgements, but the act of blaming emphasizes the symbolic presence of the Adversary and the polemic nature of the argumentation. Action-oriented PSs have a dominant evaluative content, but they cross the fluid border between the epideictic and deliberative genres, deriving the necessity of one particular action from the values.

In our corpus, there are only 40 *celebratory discourses* (which represent 2.7 per cent). The following landmarks are celebrated, for instance: Veterans' Day (S 4.05.2009); Europe Day (S 4.05.2009); The International Day of the Mass Media (S 4.05.2009); a Festival dedicated to the national poet Lucian Blaga; 20 years since the creation of the Democratic Union of the Hungarians in Romania *(Uniunea Democraticd a Maghiarilor din Romdnia-UDMR)* (CD 2.02.2010); a national contest for the mastery of the Turkish language (CD 2.02.2010); "a new voice of the Tartaric literature in Romania" (CD 2.02.2010), "The January 6ᵗʰ Feast for the Horses' Baptism" (CD 2.02.2010), etc.

The discourses convey positive emotions and function as means of self-assertion and legitimation, being produced mainly by government representatives or by members of the minorities (which are automatically represented, by law, in the Romanian Parliament). The consensus of partial audiences is presupposed by the appeal to local or ethnic minority identities. The European identity is treated as a unifying factor, too, in the argumentation. Interestingly, national themes (of the ethnic majority) are present mainly through cultural subjects, especially in the literary domain. In fact, there are other great occasions for exhibiting the national theme: plenary sessions of the joint Chambers on the occasion of the National Day or other important festivities. Epideictic discourses pronounced in the latter context have a more important function of ideological self-promotion.

A great amount of the PSs are *polemical and satirical discourses,* aimed at deprecating the Adversary. These discourses, which represent

475 texts (33 per cent) in our corpus, voice aggressive speech acts: insult, reproach, criticism, accusation, etc. The discourse register is mainly colloquial, containing even slang elements. Models for this type of text seem to be offered by very subjective opinion articles that are frequently, published in popular newspapers and magazines. Political adversaries are characterized as:

(17) *santajisti de serviciu* (CD, 5.02.2008)
blackmailers on duty

(18) *ofosild si un latifundiar* (CD, 5.02.2008)
a fossil and a landowner

(19) *creaturi abjecte* (CD, 5.02.2008)
abject creatures.

Sometimes, the verbal attack uses excessive means, as in the example below, which illustrates the case of the extremely violent physical caricature, scattered with ethnic stereotypes. An MP presents a grotesque portrait of the adversaries of his political party:

(20) *echipa [...] usor de recunoscut dupd rotunjimea capului, fruntea ingustd, bombata, maxilarul proeminent, buzele cdrnoase, pofticioase, ndrile dilatate amusindnd a pradd, ochii triunghiulari, gat de lup imobil, ceafa bulgdreascd, masivd, statura bondocd, picioarele scurte, groase, comportament agresiv, gata sd sard la beregatd, tenul puternic vascularizat si congestionat din cauza sdngelui care, contrar legilor gravitajiei, circuld de jos in sus. Acest tip de humanoid are in sdnge vocafia luptei si moare cu adversarul de gat* (CD, 20.09.2005)
the team, which is easily recognizable [...] on roundheads, narrow protruding foreheads, prominent jaws, greedy fleshy lips, dilated nostrils sniffing for the prey, triangular eyes, immobile wolfish necks, squat, burly Bulgarian-like backheads, thick short legs, aggressive behaviour, ready to bounce at one's neck, with a red-veined, apoplectic complexion because of the blood circulation which defies the gravitational laws and runs from the bottom to the top. This kind of humanoid has the innate vocation for fight and dies clung to his enemy's neck.

The *action-* (or *decision-) oriented discourses* use evaluative means in order to recommend an action or to warn against it. They are a sort of intermediate zone, between the epideictic and the deliberative modes. Sometimes, the deliberative discursive mode is but a mask for the value judgment: the *pseudo-deliberative discourse* consists in an evaluation obtained or emphasized by means of an appeal to action; the change

required can be so vague and general, that it is ultimately the negative judgment that prevails:

(21) *Actualul Guvern trebuie sd schimbe abordarea nofiunilor si legilor* (CD, 2.02.2010)
The sitting Government must change its approach to notions and laws

(22) *Actualul Guvern trebuie sd isi revizuiascd politicile pentru a proteja cetdienii si nu doar propriile interese.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
The sitting Government should revise its policies in order to protect the citizens, too, not only its own interests.

In our corpus, there are 889 (61.6 percent) of action-oriented discourses. A more refined analysis could distinguish between decision-oriented and evaluation-oriented subtypes, but for the current needs of our approach, this has not proved necessary yet.

More informative discourses, which provide real information about the situation, represent the rest of the corpus (38, i.e. 2.6 percent) and can be integrated in the same class.

3.3. Values and Emotions

Epideictic argumentation is based on values, and their discursive staging (Hunston and Thompson 1999, Martin and White 2005)[18] generally involves the presence of emotions, either overtly expressed or implied (Plantin 2004, 2011).

The selection of values depends on party ideology, on the individual *ethos* and sometimes on the conjunctural political status (government vs. opposition). One important factor is the existence of common values, which can be turned in his/her favour by any MP. One of these ideas, shared by the adversary parties and the general public, is the negative image of politics, paradoxically fostered by politicians themselves:

(23) *Am infeles incd o data cd politicienii sunt din ce in ce mai necredibili din cauza incercdrilor perpetue de pdcdlire a oamenilor pentru a obfine voturi.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
I have understood once again that politicians are more and more uncreditable, because of their constant attempts to deceive people in order to gain votes.

The deprecatory attitude to politics is intended to produce agreement with the audience outside Parliament, namely with the wider public[19]. MPs who represent the opposition construe a rhetorical contrast between *people* and *politicians,* excluding themselves from the last category:

(24) *Doamnelor si domnilor ministri, acest mesaj este un mesaj pe care eu il transmit in numele tuturor romdnilor. [...] Lor trebuie sd le rdspundefi prin acfiunile dumneavoastrd.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
Ladies- and gentlemen-ministers, this is a message I convey on behalf of all Romanians. […] It is to them you have to answer through your actions.

On the other hand, the authority and importance of the Parliament are treated as positive values with a large potential of internal consensus (even if it is nearly indifferent to the large public). At the beginning of a new mandate, one could find a sort of lyrical ode to Parliament:

(25) *Parlamentul Romdniei este tribuna tuturor romdnilor. Aici reverbereazd ecoul tuturor problemelor, nevoilor si viselor noastre. Aici e locul ce pdstreazd nestinsa lumina candelei speranfelor, aici se fese dialogul dintre generatii, aici se manifestd spiritul unei culturi bine conturate si recunoscute.* (CD, 3.03.2009)
The Parliament of Romania is the forum of all Romanians. Here is the place where all our needs and dreams echo. Here is the place that keeps alive the light of the hope's candle, here is the place the dialogue between generations is woven, here is the place a full-fledged and fully acknowledged culture is made manifest.

Other unifying values are national identity, social solidarity, the value of life, etc.

The large number of satirical and polemical discourses in the corpus of PSs implies a clear predominance of negative emotions: indignation, fury (26), fear (27), etc.:

(26) *Ne afldm in faja unei situa{ii disperate [...]. In discufiile pe care le-am avut cu edilii primdriilor care se afld in aceastd situate, mi-am putut da seama de gravitatea problemei, simfind in glasul lor disperarea si neputinfa care ii macind.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
We are confronted with a desperate situation [...].During the discussions with the city administrators who are in this situation, I was able to realize how serious the problem was by sensing the despair and tantalizing impotence within their voices.

(27) *Printre noi circuld liber 49 de criminali, 46 de violatori, 213 tdlhari, 396 de escroci, 272 de hofi si 176 de conducatori auto pedepsifi pentru infracjiuni la regimul circulafiei. La care se adauga falsificatori, evazionisti, spdrgdtori de locuinfe, evadafi sou dezertori.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
There are 49 murderers, 46 rapists, 213 robbers, 396 swindlers, 272 thieves and 176 car drivers sentenced for infringing traffic rules circulating freely among us. To whom one can add forgers, tax dodgers, burglars, prison escapes or deserters.

Violent negative emotions seem not really adapted to the communicative context[20], in contrast with the monotonous reading of the MP and the indifference of the scarce audience.

The staging of values, in direct connection with the construction of emotions, relies on various discourse choices and rhetorical strategies, by stancetaking, by assuming or delegating the assertive responsibility, by using intensifiers (for simplification, polarisation, excess) or hedging. The speaker can assume values or express emotions through the presence of evaluative/emotional lexical terms in subjectively engaged allegations ("We are confronted with *a desperate situation",* in example 26); otherwise, the speaker can attribute emotions to the actors of a narrative scenario ("by sensing *the despair and tantalizing impotence in their voices", ibidem).*

As already noticed (see above, 3.1), some features are the result of a journalistic type of staging.

Frequently, the MP assumes a marked subjectivity (beliefs, preferences, etc.), which permits the direct statement of values (28-29) or the deduction of values via the choice of the discourse topic (30-31):

(28) *Eu cred in votul uninominal.* (CD, 5.02.2008)
I believe in the uninominal vote.

(29) *Mi-apldcut intotdeauna matetnatica.* (CD, 5.02.2008)
I have always liked mathematics.

(30) *Aduc in discufie pentru a nu stiu cdta oard un subiect care ma frdmantd.* (CD, 2.02.2010)
I bring in for the umpteenth time a subject that has been obsessing me.

(31) *Ma aflu astazi aid in faja dumneavoastra pentru cd situajia actuala nu mai poate continua* (CD, 2.02.2010)
I am standing in front of you today because the present situation cannot continue like that.

Cognitive metaphors transformed into emphatic stereotypes (32) and the use and abuse of irony, usually in the transparently aggressive form of sarcasm (33), are other rhetorical means of an epideictic staging of values and construction of emotion in PSs:

(32) *o ciumd [...] care s-a revdrsat devoratoare peste spiritul, via{a, valorile si tradifiile comunitdfii nafionale, pdrjolind totul cu minciunile politice indljate la rang de virtute* (CD 5.02.2008)

a devouring pest [...] that has spilt over the spirit, life, values and traditions of the national community, burning everything by political lies raised to the rank of virtue.

(33) *Niste lumind dacd avefi cumva sd ne dafi si dumneavoastra, doamna [...], sd ne luminafi sipe noi cum de afi reusit asemenea contraperformanfe in atdt de scurt timp?! Mai vedefi cumva luminifa de la capdtul tunelului?* (CD 8.02.2011)
Should you have some light to share with us, dear lady [...] to enlighten us about the way you managed to score such counter-achievements in such a short amount of time?!Can you still see the light at the other end of the tunnel?

The examples above show many characteristics of the epideictic discourse of blame, typical values shared by the speaker's political group and, presumably, by the larger audience: the adversary's total lack of merit *(pest,* in 32; *counter-achievements,* in 33), the negativity of the political domain *(political lies,* in 32) and the cohesive force of the national identity *(the values and traditions of the national community,* in 32). Typical attitudes and emotions are indignation and fear *(a devouring pest, burning everything in its way,* in 32), distrust and contempt (in 33).

Both the stereotyped metaphor and sarcasm represent forms of suspended ambiguity and ways of imposing an interpretation. Both block the negotiation of meanings and the debate.

4. Conclusions

The examples analysed, chosen from numerous similar ones, demonstrate how insistently the epideictic mode (especially the discourse of blame) insinuates and imposes itself in the parliamentary space: a discourse type which is both authoritarian (because its aim is to impose a unique image of reality) and fragile (because it is legitimated through literary and journalistic patterns, whereas it is rarely based on really aesthetic value).

Probably under the influence of the mass media culture, but showing a deficit in the rhetorical education for the debate, MPs resort to celebration ceremonies or (more frequently) to the spectacular effects of the aggressive satire. While it is true that it consolidates the group solidarity, confirming a conflictive situation (and blocking any real political dialogue), it is difficult to see any utility of this parliamentary genre. Rejected by the Adversaries and ignored by the electorate, most of the *political statements* are inefficient: they simulate a parliamentary activity, being a mere waste of energy.

Notes

[1] "From a rhetorical perspective, parliamentary discourse belongs to the *deliberative genre* of political rhetoric, which is defined as an oratorical discourse targeting an audience that is asked to make a decision by evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of a future course of action. Elements characteristic of the *forensic* and *epideictic genres* are also present, even if occasionally and to a lesser extent" (Hie 2006, 190). See also Ilie 2004, 46; Hie 2010b, 62. Sauer (2002) offers a sample analysis of an epideictic speech (a Prime Minister's ceremonial address).

[2] For the relationship between self-representation and real dialogue, see Ilie (2010b, 67-68): "Contrary to what might be expected in other communication settings, MPs are not engaged in a straightforward dialogue with each other, or in a genuine reasoning process or truth finding discussion. Undoubtedly, they all are fully aware of the fact that they cannot realistically hope to persuade political opponents of the justifiability of their ideas and beliefs. What they actually hope to do is to score points against political adversaries and thus enhance their public support".

[3] The PSs in the Lower House are distributed like this: **272** in the sittings of 5.02.2008, 12.02.2008, 19.02.2008, 26.02.2008; **235** on 10.02.2009, 17.02.2009, 24.02.2009, 3.03.2009; **402** on 2.02.2010, 9.02.2010, 16.02.2010, 23.02 2010- **446** on 8.02.2011, 15.02.2011,22.02.2011, 1.03.2011.

[4] The PSs in the Senate have the following distribution: **50** texts on 11 02.2008, 18.02.2008, 25.02.2008, 3.03.2008; **37** on 2.02.2009, 9.02.2009, 16.02.2009, 23.02.2009; none in 2010 and 2011.

[5] This influence could be explained by the fact that, as Bayley (2004b, 11) states, "the arena for political debate has shifted in the last fifty years from Parliament to the mass media".

[6] Rules for PSs are different from those specified for *asking questions* in the British Parliament, as they were described by Chilton (2004, 92-109). Nevertheless, there seems to be a certain resemblance between the speech acts performed by the PSs and those performed during the Question Time, since the latter often have an exclusively conflictual aim, too: "the form of a question which serves to challenge, embarrass, accuse and irritate" (Ilie 2010c, 339).

"In fiecare zi de marti primele 90 de minute ale sedinjei vor fi rezervate pentru declarajii politice ale deputa{ilor" (RCD, Art. 188, 1); "in fiecare saptamana, Biroul permanent aloca o anumita perioada de timp dintr-o zi de sedin{a pentru declara{ii politice sau alte interventti ale senatorilor" (RS, Art. 171); "impardrea celor 90 de minute se va face pe grupuri parlamentare ale majoritatii, opozijiei si pe deputaji care nu fac parte din acestea" (RCD Art. 188, 2); "Durata intervenfiei nu poate depasi 3 minute" (RCD Art. 188, 4).

The Lower House does not give the MPs the right to reply, which precludes all chance of dialogue. This omission is reinforced in practice, as can be seen from an intervention of the session speaker (in a period previous to the time-span of our corpus): *Please refrain from any dialogue with the audience. And nobody is entitled to reply to political statements* (Lower House, 7.02.2006). Rules for PSs

are hence very different from those of the *asking questions* in the British parliament, which are described by Chilton (2004, 92-109).

[9] "It is not uncommon to witness speeches being made to a practically empty chamber" (Bayley 2004b, 7).

[10] The period focused on in our corpus covers a partial change in parliamentary membership after the elections of November 2008; but the dynamic of the PSs does not seem to be influenced by it.

[11] "Produire un eloge ou un blame, c'est tenir ce qu'Aristote appelait un discours epidictique, qui situe le Bien comme le Mai dans le domaine de l'evidence sensible ou esth&ique, en amont de toute deliberation veritable. Le debat moral, avec ses inevitables incertitudes, cede alors la place a une *mise en scene des valeurs"* (Dominicy and Fr£denc 2001, 11).

[12] Similarly, the parliamentary interventions analysed by Ionescu-Ruxandoiu (2010, 344) have a self-promoting aim ("projecting a negative image of the target and indirectly-depending on the speaker's communicative ability-a positive self-image or group-image", in a context where "the possibility to negotiate opinions and to produce a change in the result of the final vote using strong arguments is excluded").

[13] An apparently similar parliamentary sub-genre enables us to notice important differences. Ilie (2006, 191) describes the "oral *ministerial statements"* in the following manner: "Their purpose is to announce new policies or to provide specific information about current or urgent political matters". On the contrary, the political statements of the MPs have a very poor informative content.

[14] For a global presentation of metadiscursive utterances in parliamentary talk, see Ilie 2003.

[15] As Bednarek (2006, 197) observes, "explicit evaluations of negative emotivity are clearly of the greatest significance in the tabloid text".

[16] The title paraphrases a proverb: *Jara arde si baba se piaptdnd* "The country is burning, whereas the old woman is combing her hair".

[17] The example paraphrases a movie title of the 80's *(Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears).*

[18] Studies about the language of evaluation are "concerned with the construction by texts of communities of shared feelings and values, and with the linguistic mechanisms for the sharing of emotions, tastes and normative assessments" (Martin and White 2005, 1).

[19] For the multiple audience of the parliamentary talk, see Ilie (2006,194).

[20] For the aggressive verbal acts in the Romanian parliamentary debate, see Roibu and Constantinescu 2010, Ionescu-Ruxandoiu 2010.

Sources

CD = transcripts of the plenary debates of the Lower House *(Camera Deputa(ilor),* www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.calendar?cam=2&an=2008 &idl=l

S - transcripts of the plenary debates of the Senate *(Senat),* www.cdep.ro/
pls/steno/steno.calendar?cam=l&an=2012&idl=l

RCD = Procedural rules of the Lower House, www.cdep.ro/pls/dic/
site.page?id=233

RS = Procedural rules of the Senate, www.senat.ro/pagini/reg_sen/
reg_senat.htm

References

Aristotle. 1954. *Rhetoric.* Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York:
Modern Library.

Amossy, Ruth. 2006. *L 'argumentation dans le discours,* 2th edition. Paris:
Armand Colin.

Bayley, Paul (ed.). 2004a. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary
Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2004b. "Introduction. The whys and wherefores of analysing
parliamentary discourse." In *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary
Discourse,* edited by Paul Bayley, 1-44. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:
John Benjamins.

Bednarek, Monika. 2006. *Evaluation in Media Discourse. Analysis of a
Newspaper Corpus.* London/New York: Continuum.

Busch, Brigitta. 2009. "Media, politics and discourse interactions." In
Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics, edited by Jacob L. Mey, 2nd
edition, 577-583. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice.*
London/New York: Routledge.

Dominicy, Marc, and Madeleine Frederic. 2001. "Introduction." In *La
mise en scene des valeurs. La rhetorique de I'eloge et du blame,* edited
by Marc Dominicy and Madeleine Frederic, 11-16. Paris/Lausanne:
Delachaux et Niestle.

Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson (eds.). 1999. *Evaluation in Text.
Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford
University Press.

Ilie, Cornelia. 2003. "Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary
debates." *Journal of Language and Politics* 1 (2): 269-291.

—. 2004. "Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and
Swedish Parliaments. A rhetorical approach." In *Cross-Cultural
Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse,* edited by Paul Bayley, 45-
86. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2006. "Parliamentary discourses." In *Encyclopedia of Language and
Linguistics,* 2nd edition, edited by Keith Brown, vol. 9, 188-197.
Oxford: Elsevier.

—. (ed.). 2010a. *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse
Strategies and Interaction Practices.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John
Benjamins.

—. 2010b. "Identity co-construction in parliamentary discourse practices."
In *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and
Interaction Practices,* edited by Cornelia Ilie, 57-78. Amsterdam/
Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2010c. "Speech acts and rhetorical practices in parliamentary Question
Time." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 333-342.

Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Liliana. 2010. "Straightforward vs. mitigated
impoliteness in the Romanian parliamentary discourse. The case of *in
absentia* impoliteness." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 343-
351.

Martin, James R., and Peter R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation.
Appraisal in English,* Houndmills-New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Perelman, ChaTm, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. 2000 [1958]. *Traite de
Targumentation.la nouvelle rhetorique,* 5th edition. Bruxelles: Editions
de l'Universite de Bruxelles.

Plantin, Christian. 2004. "On the inseparability of emotion and reason in
argumentation." In *Emotions in Dialogic Interactions,* edited by Edda
Weigand, 265-276. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2011. *Les bons raisons des emotions. Principes et methode pour
I'etude du discours emotionne.* Berne: Peter Lang.

Roibu, Melania, and Mihaela N. Constantinescu. 2010. "Verbal
aggressiveness in the Romanian parliamentary debate. Past and
present." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 353-364.

Sauer, Christoph. 2002. "Ceremonial text and talk. A functional-pragmatic
approach." In *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to
Political Discourse,* edited by Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffher,
111-142. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Too, Yun Lee. 2001. "Epideictic genre." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric,*
edited by Thomas O. Sloane, 251-257. Oxford/New York: Oxford
University Press.

Wodak, Ruth, and Teun A. Van Dijk (eds.). 2000. *Racism at the Top.
Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European Countries.*
Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.

CHAPTER TEN

STYLE AND RHETORICAL STRATEGIES
IN THE DISCOURSE OF A ROMANIAN
NATIONALISTIC PARTY.
A CASE STUDY:
CORNELIU VADIM TUDOR'S
PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES

OANA CHELARU-MURARUS

1. Aim, Method and Corpus

The aim of this paper is to explore, from the joint perspective of rhetoric and pragma-stylistics, a number of parliamentary speeches of Corneliu Vadim Tudor (CVT), one of the most prominent flag-bearers of Romanian nationalism over the last decades[1]. My paper attempts to outline an individual discursive model within the boundaries of an institutional genre, i.e. the Romanian parliamentary discourse, whose normal evolution deviated from its normal course during the communist regime (1947-1989).

On the one hand, the design of CVT's parliamentary discourses is shaped by the *routine rhetoric of the East-European nationalistic discourse,* based on a limited number of nation-oriented *cliches,* stereotypical thinking in construing the image of the Others, xenophobic aggressiveness, emotionalism and grandiloquence (series of rhetorical questions and repetitions, overstatements and hyperbolic exaggerations). On the other hand, CVT's speeches express his individual inclination towards *a highly confrontational discourse,* which exhibits the speaker's power, particularly by means of linguistic aggressiveness (frequent directive, commissive and expressive speech acts of command, interdiction or threat, insults, abusive *ad hominem* attacks, defamation,

informal/disrespectful lexical choices, etc.). Besides the general[1] adversarial character of the parliamentary debate, CVT's speeches display extra-individual pragma-stylistic features, typical of a conflictive kind of communication, whose goal is to silence the opponent and even to push i the verbal interaction to the limit of non-communication (Windisch 1986; Zafiu 2000, 103-111; Serbanescu 2002, 319-337). The speaker is always willing to launch extremely violent attacks against his adversaries, based on powerful negative emotions, to perform repeated face threatening acts (FTAs), and, at the same time, to defend his face, to overstate his standpoint or make self-pleasing comments. The result is *an ego-centred (narcissistic) type of discourse,* which resorts to rich use of person-centred deixis, frequent insertions of meta-stance, patronizing attitudes towards the addressee (who is subject to insistent speech acts of advising), histrionics (dialogue with the public or the press for effect), as well as to sustained strategies of face protection (argumentative fallacies of self-defence).

It is worth mentioning the *non-verbal* (gestures, mimics, posture, eye contact, facial expression, etc.) and *paraverbal elements of communication* (tone, pitch, voice volume, pacing, pauses, etc.), which express the speaker's determination to deliver an energetic and powerful speech, and to take over the total control of the verbal interaction: large gestures, loud voice, rapid pacing, etc.

The corpus of my research consists of 29 parliamentary discourses of CVT selected from the official site of the Romanian Parliament (www.cdep.ro)[2].

In the following sections, I shall briefly examine: (1) the text rhetoric against the background of nationalistic ideology overtly promoted by the author (2) the pragma-rhetorical strategies and stylistic traits typical of CVT's highly confrontational parliamentary discourse.

2. Rhetorical Aspects

2.1. Text Rhetoric and Nationalistic Ideology

The research on nationalism is impressively extensive, but a full presentation of this topic goes much beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, I shall content myself with presenting a few general preliminary considerations, and I shall focus my attention instead on certain discursive issues related to my specific case study.

The great majority of researchers associate the birth of nationalism with the age of modernity (Anderson 2000; Gellner 1997; Boia 2005), namely with the end of the eighteenth century (The French Revolution in

1789) and the beginning of the nineteenth century (starting with the liberal nationalism). Scholars make a current conceptual distinction between "the political nations"/"political nationalism" and "the ethnic nations"/"ethnic nationalism". The former is rooted in the tradition of the Enlightenment's civic ideology and is illustrative of Western Europe, whereas the latter originates in German Romanticism and values tradition, language, culture, organic cohesion of the ethno-cultural group, immortality of the so-called *Volksgeist (apud Balm* 2006, 98).

In Victor Neumann's opinion (2003, 59-65), the Central and East-European nationalisms are ethnic-oriented, continuing the superposition of *demos* and *ethnos,* as well as the *Volksgeist* perspective, to the detriment of social, political and judicial meanings of "nation" *(apud* Balan 2006, 98-99).

As the leader of Greater Romania *(Romania Mare)* Party (created immediately after the 1989 anti-communist revolution), CVT has promoted a radical type of ethno-nationalism, with more aggressive xenophobic accents in the 90's, slightly attenuated in the next decade. Many speeches delivered by CVT in the Romanian Parliament (including those selected in my corpus) bear the obvious impress of nationalistic ideology, in line with the journalistic texts written by the same politician, as I shall subsequently demonstrate.

2.2. Cliches of the Nationalistic Rhetoric in CVT's Parliamentary Discourses

CVT's speeches display a set of nation-oriented *cliches* (i.e. *loci communes* or *topoi),* specific to the rhetoric of nationalism, more exactly to some of its variants, such as territorial nationalism, ultra-nationalism or ethnocentrism.

The politician expresses an overt adhesion to the nationalistic doctrine, which he calls "the mother of all doctrines" (27/05/2002). The *national territory* is considered sacred, especially the interwar territorial variant known as "Romania Mare" (i.e. "Greater Romania"), name chosen by CVT as an emblem for his party[3], too. Invoking such a creed, the politician makes *territorial claims* in a loud voice:

> Never ever will a party like Romania Mare give up the Romanian territories east of the river Prut, and the international community has to understand that […] it is fair and moral that Romania should peacefully recover its natural borders. (27/11/1997)

CVT's speeches frequently use *mythical representations of the historical past,* of events or persons (such as the birth of the Romanian modern state on December 1, 1918 or the controversial figure of General Ion Antonescu, the state leader between 1940 and 1944, etc.), embodied in rhetorical tirades:

A divine miracle happened when the Romanian people resurrected after its century long crucifixion. This miracle seems to me the most convincing proof that God exists […] Oh, God, we should kneel in front of the icons to fully thank you for keeping us on the map at the crossroads of three greedy empires. (27/11/1997)

Ethnocentric and xenophobic at the same time, the discourses delivered by CVT tackle topics that are typical of the nationalistic ideology of the politician. For instance, he warns against *real or presumed enemies or threats to the survival or the welfare of the nation:*

Some people have been interested in depicting Romanians as a community of criminals for a long time now. We are a hunted people; the better, the more tolerant, the more humane we are, the more hunted we are. (02/04/2002)

President Emil Constantinescu was forced to resign from the political arena in July 2000 as a consequence of a phone call received from one of his bosses in New York. (20/05/2002)

The *xenophobic outbursts* occur frequently and they are part of the abusive *ad hominem* attacks performed by CTV, as I shall illustrate later:

Don't ever come here, you, all the foreigners and adventurers, to teach us lessons! We're fed up with such *gauleiters'*. This is the land of the Romanians, don't forget that! (10/04/2006)

The intolerant rejection of the Other goes hand in hand with intentional misinterpretations or exaggerations of the historical past, such as the *negation of the holocaust in Romania⁵* or the *exclusive blame cast on foreigners* for having imported the communist regime:

This is a blasphemy, a rudimentary mystification of our history. […] in Romania, there was no extermination camp, we did not send Jews to extermination camps in Germany or Poland […] in Romania there was no genocide, in Romania there was no holocaust. (02/04/2002)

You should tell us who led the party and the secret police during that barbarian epoch: most of them were Jews, Hungarians and Russians. (10/04/2006)

2.3. Emotionalism and Grandiloquence

The grandiloquent discourse appealing to feelings rather than *logos* is part of the routine rhetoric of nationalism in general, but, at the same time, represents an ideal verbal vehicle for a speaker who is very much preoccupied with the exhibition of his own Self, as it is the case of CVT. This pathos-oriented type of discourse resorts excessively to emphatic devices (esp. rhetorical questions, repetitions, hyperboles) in order to draw the public's attention. There are three favourite rhetorical devices that sustain this line of discourse:

(1) The *cascade of rhetorical questions* is used, generally, in making accusations against the opponents or nationalistic claims, and illustrates the preference of the speaker for extended patterns of 4 to 6 cumulative elements, in order to lay a strong emphasis on the emotional dimension of the discourse:

What is a disease? Do people die because of anti-Semitism? Is it a devastating trend? For God's sake! Don't we have the right usage of words? (23/03/2002)

Is there no community of historians left in Romania anymore? Are there no writers, are there no war veterans, and are there no fighters anymore? Is there no public consciousness, is there no national mentality and attitude anymore? (02/04/2002)

(2) *Anaphora* is a rhetorical device consisting in emphatic repetition of words/clusters of words in the initial position of neighbouring sentences/clauses. The frequency of anaphoras in persuasive discourses (political discourse included) is due to their placement in sentence-initial position, which is, from a cognitive perspective, a salient one. CVT chooses extended anaphoras, comprising between 3 to 7 repetitions, frequently associated with rhetorical questions:

He who participated in the execution of the Ceausescu couple, *he who,* on his way to Targoviste, in the helicopter, vomited all the time in a bucket, *he who* boasts that in Romania nobody is above him, except for God… (10/11/2003)

As long as corruption [...] *as long as* at the Cotroceni Palace [...] *as long as* the general prosecutor [...] *as long as* in the airplanes [...] *as long as* the big gangsters [...] *as long as* the secret services [...] *as long as* the most productive enterprises [...], well, we cannot be accepted in NATO and it would not be moral for us to be. (25/03/2002)

(3) C V T shows a special inclination towards exaggerated imagery| pathetic expression of feelings, overstatements, towards what I could call the *hyperbolic design of the figures of speech.* I shall illustrate eacl category with a few examples:

3.1. *Hyperbolic epithets:* barbarian betrayal in Yalta (10/04/2006); barbarian [communist] epoch (10/04/2006); infernal noise (10/04/2006); a nightmarish ceremony (17/02/2003); diabolic minds (23/09/2002); deafening campaigns (25/03/2002), etc.

3.2. *Hyperbolic comparisons:* a villa like a transatlantic ship (09/09/2002); Romania has been chopped like in a butcher's shop (27/05/2002); Fighting against corruption, shoulder to shoulder with Adrian Nastase, would be as if fighting against prostitution together with the famous Ciocciolina. (18/02/2002), etc.

3.3. *Hyperbolic metaphors:* No shark has been sent to jail yet. Only small fish [Rom. *plevusca si gingirica].* (27/05/2002); While N A T O is asking us not to steal, we greet them with the black flag of the pirates (25/03/2002); the capitalist jungle of the last 16 years (10/04/2006), etc.

3. Pragma-Stylistic Aspects

3.1. The Confrontational Nature of CVT's Parliamentary Discourses: From "Institutional Impoliteness" to a Personal Stylistic Attitude

The parliamentary debate represents a case of *confrontational discourse* governed by specific institutional rules, as several scholars have demonstrated (Hie 2003b, 2004, 2005,2010; Ionescu-Ruxandoiu 2010a, b, c). The MPs engage in the political battle performing attacks on the adversaries by means of a wide range of language strategies, subsumed under the general label of "institutional impoliteness" (Culpeper 2011, 245-252) or "strategic impoliteness", a form of motivated non-cooperative communication (Kienpointner 1997, 271-274) whose function is to defend the standpoints and interests of a certain group. For this purpose, parliamentary language can resort, to a certain extent, to several forms of *verbal aggressiveness* (informal terms of address, distortion of proper

names, irony, insults, abusive *ad hominem* attacks, informal register, etc.) (Harris 2001; Cabasino 2010; Roibu and Constantinescu 2010; Constantinescu and Roibu 2010; Ionescu-Ruxandoiu 2011; Milica 2011, etc.) varying in intensity or perlocutionary effect according to contextual and cultural constraints. Comparative studies have convincingly demonstrated that there are striking cultural differences in the manner in which parliamentarians address to one another or use irony and insults in accordance with the specific institutional traditions of the respective countries (Hie 2004,2010; Mocanu 2010)°.

The Romanian parliamentary discourse has aroused the interest of the researchers quite recently. The studies of the Romanian scholars dedicated to the evolution of this institutional genre reveal certain clear-cut differences in the use of (im)politeness strategies between the interwar and the postcommunist epochs. In her book dedicated to the Romanian political language, Zafiu (2007, 211-270) signals out the present-day tendency towards verbal violence, rudeness, oral style, and vulgarity. More specifically, Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Milica, Roibu, Constantinescu (see above) or Stefanescu (2010) focus their research on related phenomena, such as violence, verbal aggressiveness or impoliteness in the Romanian parliamentary discourse.

In the political landscape of present-day Romania, C V T has gained visibility due to his loud and aggressive public voice, both as a politician (MP) and a journalist. His parliamentary speeches are highly confrontational and conflictive, performing aggressive attacks on the adversaries in a manner that frequently overpasses the reasonable norms of the parliamentary discursive genre or the rules of public interaction.

3.2. Strategic Use of Terms of Address

Terms of address have been intensively analysed throughout different languages, starting with the wide-known study of Brown and Gilman (1973/1960)[7] and continuing with the fundamental book of Braun (1988), to mention just the start. Hie (2005, 2010)[8] discussed the specific use of address forms within the Swedish and British Parliaments. As for the Romanian Parliament, we owe a recent study on nominal address terms to Ionescu-Ruxandoiu (2011).

Addressing your opponent in a certain manner is an important step in gaining the discursive power, and C V T, as an experienced politician, pays attention to this initial moment. I shall not examine thoroughly the standard polite forms of address used by C V T in his speeches, because they are of little relevance to my research. In principle, the Romanian

parliamentary language lacks highly ritualized titles, but it uses addre
forms similar to those in everyday speech: i.e. the 2ⁿᵈ person of the
courtesy pronoun *dumneavoastrd* (comparable to Fr. *Vous)* or simple nou*,
phrases like: *Stimate domn* ("honourable sir"), *stimate coleg* ("honourable,
colleague"). Instead, I shall briefly present a few strategic uses of address!
terms by means of which the speaker tries to impose his verbal power.

3.2.1. Pronominal forms can easily be used in order to produce^
moderate FTAs on the adversary. The speaker can explore the two
possibilities of the Romanian courtesy pronominal system to create **an**
asymmetrical relation with the addressee. Besides the 2ⁿᵈ person personal \
pronoun *tu,* Romanian has two courtesy forms: *dumneata* (moderately]
polite, rather condescending or familiar), and *dumneavoastrd* (polite)]
(Niculescu 1968, 1970). Thus, CVT expresses a moderately asymmetrical **i**
relationship when using *dumneata* as a term of address towards an'
American official (a case of impoliteness *in absentia).* The pronoun
appears in a xenophobic hostile type of reproach:

> Romania is not a prostitute, Mr. Jackson, and you (Rom. *dumneata)* have
> no right to use such a Bronx or Harlem type of language when you speak
> about our country. (09/09/2002)

The speaker intentionally appeals to the singular and plural forms **of;**
the 2ⁿᵈ person personal pronoun *tu* and *voi,* which are not at all polite. In **a**
sort of a side dialogue, CVT offensively addresses the accredited
journalists in the Parliament in order to cast them off, using also a kind **of**
"sarcastic rudeness" (Kienpointner 1997, 264):

> You have no reason to get angry and leave the Chambers of Parliament.
> Feel free not to come again! What a loss (Rom. *ia uite, domnule),* I'll pity
> you (Rom. *voi).* (19/05/2003)

3.2.2. As I have already mentioned, nowadays the Romanian
parliamentary discourse is not particularly abundant in **ritualistic titles.**
CVT exploits the title inventory in a non-conformist or ironic manner,
using on purpose "inappropriate identity markers" (Culpeper 1996, 357 f.).
He makes use of a wide range of forms that can vary from a highly formal
to an ironic register. Along with institutional titles, like: *Mr. Chairman;
Honourable colleagues* (Rom. Onorati colegi/Stimati colegi) (22/09/2008),
or simply formal ones: *Honourable friends* (Rom. Stimati prieteni)
(27/05/2002); *Ladies and gentlemen* (10/04/2006), CVT intentionally
mixes ironic forms based on stylistic contrasts: *Honourable Intolerants*
(10/04/2006) (oxymoron); *Mr. Chairman and member of the
administration board of "Steaua" football club* (27/05/2002), etc.

3.2.3. The combination of ritualistic titles and **proper names** has
become obsolete or ridiculous in present-day Romanian parliamentary
language. Therefore, CVT does not miss the opportunity to use it
ironically, in order to belittle or to attack an opponent of Hungarian origin
or the controversial chief of the Romanian Information Service:

> Dear and distinguished poet and friend Marko Bela (18/02/2002);

> What other law violation is supposed to commit the honorable Mr. Virgil
> M&gureanu? (19/06/96) (referential use of the address term)

Nevertheless, one of the most effective ways to perform FTAs on an
adversary remains the symbolic attack on proper names. CVT excels in
this form of sarcastic rudeness, performing the following offensive acts:

o *Intentional confusion of names/persons* as a means of emphasizing
   CVT's offensive attitude of ignoring the other's presence:

> Who is judging me? ... The same *Bruce Jackson* or *Michael Jackson* ...
> Whatever his name might be! *Michael Guest.* I always take one for the
> other .... The ambassador of the USA ?! (23/09/2002)

o *Use of derogatory denominations* (nicknames):

> Where from has this *Mucea-Flaimucea* a villa that costs 5 billion lei?
> (09/09/2002)

o *Ironical wordplays on proper names:*

> *Mr. Flutur* (Rom. *flutur* "butterfly") may fly where his instinct pushes him.
> (20/12/2004)

o *Xenophobic speculations or comments on the ethnic origin of proper
names:*

> Vladimir Tismaneanu, called *Volodea.* What a nice Romanian name! He is
> the offspring of Leon Tismenitchi, a NKVD agent, called *the Crippled. [...]*
> Tismenijchi certainly thought of Lenin when he named his son...
> (10/04/2006)

> *Mr. Feldman,* you are ashamed of being a Jew. Why don't you use the
> Feldman name, why do you use only the abbreviation F.? (i.e. Radu F.
> Alexandra) What does that F. mean? (23/09/2002)

3.3. Irony Aimed at the Adversary

Irony is one of the classical weapons in the political battle. Analysing irony in political discourse is as complex an operation as in everyday speech, due to the contextual constraints to the understanding process. Since the multitude of approaches to irony cannot be presented within the , limits of this paper, I shall content myself with invoking the opinion **of** i| Sperber and Wilson (2007 [1992], 117) who, in their classical study, define irony at the crossroads of language, cognition, and pragmatic inferential processes°.

Irony is not such a frequent pragma-stylistic device, at least in CVT**'s** discourses selected in my corpus, since the politician usually resorts **to** more aggressive speech acts, such as insults, calumny, threats, etc. Nevertheless, CVT shows a certain preference for two rhetorical devices meant to trigger an ironic effect:

3.3.1. False praise of the adversary, based on insincere overstatements and hyperboles, is a typical source of sarcasm CVT frequently appeals to ("sarcasm politeness" according to Jonathan Culpeper's (1996, 356) classification). One cannot understand the following examples in the absence of shared knowledge between speaker and audience. The first example refers to Nicolae Vacaroiu, a former Prime Minister and President of the Senate, whose merits CVT obviously questions. The second makes a hyperbolic, ridiculous comparison between Ion Solcanu, a common contemporary politician, and Mihail Kogalniceanu, Prime Minister in the nineteenth century, one of the founding fathers of the Romanian modern state. The third formulates **an** insincere superlative appreciation of Oliviu Gherman for his being **a** faithful adherent to a doctrine which is negatively perceived in post-communist Romania:

No one can replace *such a titan* as Nicolae Vacaroiu. (23/09/2002)

I have delivered hundreds of speeches in my life, but perhaps *not so brilliant as those of this giant* named Ion Solcanu […] *Only Kogalniceanu had a similar staturel* (23/09/2002)

Oliviu Gherman, this *titan of Marxist thinking*. (27/05/2002)

3.3.2. Pretention is a wide-spread rhetorical device, which enables the speaker to emphasize the negative features or shortcomings of his adversary by pretending to leave them aside. It is one of the favourite manoeuvring techniques of the Romanian political discourse in general, and of the parliamentary discourse in particular, as Ionescu-Ruxandoiu

demonstrates in one of her studies (2009). Pretention is well illustrated in CVT's speeches too:

As regards Mr. Virgil Asztalos Magureanu, / *think it is beyond my dignity to pay any attention to him. Nevertheless,* I would like to say that […] he used to denounce us to the communist secret police... (10/11/2003)

/ *shall speak in a more than controlled and steady manner, but* I think I shall not offend Mr. Radu Ioanid if I call him an impostor. (20/04/2002)

/ *happen to find you* (i.e. Petre Roman, former Prime Minister) *quite nice, although* you have such a high self-esteem, that you don't need the appreciation of others. However, / *do find you nice* because you are an educated person, *although* there is a doorkeeper at the Athen6e Palace Hotel who speaks eight languages. What should we do? Should we make him Prime Minister? Should we make him the President of the Senate? (23/09/2002)

3.4. Insults

Insults are aggressive forms of verbal behaviour, performing a strong illegitimate/unjustified face attack in order to harm, injure or destroy the target. In general, a speaker resorts to insults when (s)he fails to persuade or manipulate the opponent, aiming at taking/maintaining the communicational control (Milner 1978; Ruwet 1992; Hie 2004; Ghiorghias 2004; Ionescu-Ruxandoiu 2010a; Roibu and Constantinescu 2010). Insults are motivated forms of non-cooperative rudeness (Kienpointner 1997, 269), inherently violent in nature.

There is a rich array of insults in CVT's parliamentary speeches, performed in a direct, on record manner. I have registered both instances of impoliteness, *in praesentia* and *in absentia,* since the offensive words and phrases refer to persons who are present or not in the communicative setting. It is also worth mentioning CVT's preference for the nominal pattern of the insults (in our corpus), in comparison to the prevailing verbal pattern in spoken Romanian (Ghiorghias 2004). This is probably due to the exclusive focus of the respective noun phrases on the negative features of the attacked persons. Here are a few examples selected from a longer list:

A new type of *boor* (Rom. *mitocan)* is visiting us periodically […] a Bruce Jackson, who is in charge of NATO on behalf of USA, or of USA on behalf of NATO. (09/09/2002)

The so-called trial which this *schizophrenic* journal pretends to have won against me is a *shameless* lie…. « Academia Cajavencu », *the shame of the Romanian press,* financed with dirty money by Sorin Ovidiu Vantu, a *mobster* (Rom. *mafiot),* Basescu's *cat's paw.* (22/10/2007)

These *sinister* practices of Traian Basescu reveal the mentality of an *African dictator.* (02/10/2006)

3.5. Directive and Commissive Speech Acts

The negative politeness strategies may also include performing certain directive speech acts, such as *to advise, to request, to command, to interdict,* and commissive speech acts, as *to threat* (Searle 1969), so that to express the superior/authoritative positioning of the speaker towards the addressee. A speaker willing to emphasize his/her verbal power is likely **to** condescend, to belittle the other, to dominate him/her, to frighten (Culpeper 1996, 357 *sqq.).* In CVT's parliamentary discourses, I have noticed three types of directive and commissive speech acts that have **a** high frequency of use.

3.5.1. The directive speech act of advising expresses a presumed asymmetry in ethos between speaker and addressee. CVT enjoys exhibiting condescending attitudes towards his adversaries, often bearing the impress of xenophobia or anti-feminism, as in the following example:

> *I shall give a piece of advice* to this girl, born in Oradea from a secret police agent and a Hungarian mother […] If you [Rom. *tu]* are so eager to hunt secret police agents […], why don't you start with your father, missy! (Rom. *fetifo,* i.e. Germina Naga{, chief of the Investigation Direction of the National Council for the Study of Secret Police Archives) (10/04/2006)

3.5.2. The directive speech acts of command or interdiction emphasize the asymmetry in power between speaker and addressee. By this authoritative direction or instruction, the speaker attempts **to** determine the speaker to do or not to do a certain thing. This recurrent strategic move in CVT's speeches reveals his determination to impose the management of communication. Here are a few violent addresses towards the representatives of the Hungarian minority in the Romanian Parliament:

> *Do not provoke us,* gentlemen, since you will get similar answers in return. Don't you like to live here? *Go to Hungary*.* It is the last time we speak nicely to you. (22/09/2008)

> Sir, I understand that you want to falsify the geography, but *we do not allow you* to falsify the history of Romania! (22/09/2008)

3.5.3. The commissive speech act of threat *(argumentum ad baculum),* like the previous one, represents a supreme attack on one's negative face wants, made by a speaker who is highly animated by negative emotions (resentment, hostility, anger, hatred, etc.). It has a strong perlocutionary effect on the addressee, who suffers from intimidation and fear. It is very unusual for a politician to perform direct threats in the Chambers of Parliament, without breaking the norms of the parliamentary behaviour. Such interventions spring from uncontrolled emotionalism, and can be associated, in principle, with the failure of argumentative strategies. CVT's parliamentary speeches illustrate this type of verbal behaviour. He pushes the parliamentary language far beyond its limits when performing indirect and direct threats against his opponents, be them representatives of an ethnic minority from Romania or even journalists:

> *I am telling you* (i.e. Hungarians) *that you will get what you were looking for.* He, who makes the wind blow, is swept by a tempest (Romanian proverb) (22/09/2008)

> This dog-hunting does not come to an end? *I shall drag them* (i.e. the journalists) to Berlin, as the Soviet soldier did with the German soldier. (11/10/2004)

3.6. Fallacies as Strategies of Attack

CVT's discourses comprise a number of fallacious argumentative patterns which are intentionally employed so that to silence the adversaries. Insofar as such arguments appeal more or less exclusively to emotions and not to reason, they are vicious or fallacious. Kienpointner (2009, 73) states that these arguments

> "become problematic and dubious if the opponent is overwhelmed with highly emotional appeals, which try to seal off the discussion".

Since CVT's discourses resort to a wide range of emotional argumentative fallacies, which I cannot discuss in detail within the limits of this paper[10], I shall focus my attention entirely on CVT's favourite manoeuvring strategy, namely the *argumentum ad hominem.* This emotional argument consists in attacking a person, so that to subvert his/her ideas or contest his/her position, instead of properly refuting his/her argumentation. I distinguish between *ad hominem attacks* and invectives, because the former are bound to an argumentative setting, whereas the latter are inherently violent words and expressions whose offensive meaning is not so much context-bound.

Out of the three possible variants of *ad hominem attack* **(a.** abusive, **b.,** circumstantial, and **c.** *tu, quoque),* CVT prefers the first and the third] types. **Abusive ad hominem fallacy,** CVT's favourite strategy, consists **in** *i* attacking the physical and moral deficiencies of the opponent, his/**herf** ethnic origin (ethnic stereotypes), his/her family, his/her personal,; biography, his/her presumed law violations, etc. I have selected just a few samples of *abusive ad hominem attacks* out of a rich production. The **i** stylistic manner used to sketch the negative portraits of the adversaries resembles the literary technique of caricature:

Ple\$u, this pot-bellied guy, with a Rasputin-like beard, has stolen the title of the book [...] from Th. Adorno [...] has stolen Ceausescu's shaving sets, all massive gold, [...] the chamber maid told me how it happened [...] And this guy is judging me? (11/10/2004)[11]

Because of his rudimentary mind, this Bruce Jackson [...] declares that I am a bad guy. I can't reply to this kind of language borrowed from the commercial movies with which America tries to downgrade the culture of Europe, and even to make it get stupid. (09/09/2002)

A variant of the *argumentum ad hominem,* with a possibly extended narrative structure and plenty of intentional misrepresentations (fictional elements) of the target is **calumny,** abundantly illustrated in the corpus. The sources invoked by CVT remain always obscure, despite the speaker**'s** insistence on their reliability:

This Vladimir Tismaneanu[12] is an absolute NVA (non-value added), although he pretends to be a professor in an American university. I know a lot of such teachers and dramatists who perform in garages, in front of a few losers (Rom. *ciumeii).* (10/04/2006)

The *tu, quoque* variant (appeal to hypocrisy) consists in accusing the opponent of being guilty of the same abuse (s)he invokes. In order to seem reliable, the politician tries to compensate the lack of concrete proofs by providing the audience with many pretended plausible details, such as the names of the secret police officers involved in the case:

They pretend that I was a pillar of the communist regime, that I have collaborated with the secret police... What these gentlemen do is political police... *They don't have the moral right [to judge me], they who worked for the secret police of the regime.* Plesu and Dinescu[13] made denouncements to the secret police, the first to major Vasile Malureanu, the latter to major Stana Cre|a and colonels Albu and Achim. (11/10/2004)

3.7. Informal Register

One of the possible features of conflictive discourse is the stylistic exploitation of the informal register (casual, familiar, colloquial speech). The presence of such oral resources within parliamentary discourse is possible in accordance with the stylistic norms of each language, on the one hand, and with the constraints of the politeness rules within the institution of the Parliament, on the other. In her book dedicated to the analysis of the Romanian political language, Zafiu (2007) has repeatedly pointed out its tendency towards orality and, sometimes, vulgarity, traits that tend to invade the Romanian contemporary press too.

CVT is no exception to the rule from this point of view, but he pushes the limits farther than others. Being both a politician and a journalist, he easily resorts to colloquialisms and, sometimes, to slang, whenever he wants to attack his opponent/audience. Such unconventional lexical choices violate both the standards of cultivated Romanian language and the institutional norms of parliamentary discourse. At the same time, the alternation between grandiloquence, which requires a highly elaborated, artificial use of language (see **2.2.),** and colloquial register represents one of the striking stylistic contrasts in CVT's discourses. The following examples (inherently imperfect translations) try to render into English the stylistic load of the Romanian colloquial/slang expressions. For accuracy, I shall indicate the Romanian original forms in brackets:

Don't *play the smart with us* (Rom. *Nu facefi pe destep{ii),* we're not impressed. (10/04/2006); Who is *mouthing off* (Rom. *face gurd)?; One fishy guy* (Rom. *unul cu bube in cap):* Ticu Dumitrescu (10/04/2006); That's what I had to say about the *highbinders* (Rom. *smecherii)* who *draw a red herring across the path* (Rom. *umbld cu cioara vopsita).* (10/04/2006); Ticu Dumitrescu *knocked* Quintus *off the perch* (Rom. *l-a dat in gat).* (10/04/2006); Mister, he *piped me down* (Rom. *mi-a luat maul),* mister! (17/09/2002); We aren't *such hicks* (Rom. *venifi cu pluta)* (27/05/2002)

3.8. EGO Promotional Strategies

Confrontational discourse requires, in principle, an energetic speaker, whose presence has to be visibly marked at the enunciation level. Besides the paraverbal and non-verbal traits that have been already mentioned (strong voice, high pitch, rapid pace, large gestures, etc.), the "voice" of such a dominant speaker is properly captured at the textual level.

The intense focus on EGO is a salient feature of CVT's speeches, which I shall briefly examine in the last subsections of my paper.

3.8.1. Person **deixis** is a relevant marker of the speaker's presence and text management. From this point of view, C V T's speeches display *t,* powerfully marked deictic subjectivity (Benveniste 1966, 251-266j Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1980; Mey (ed.) 1998, 200-205). He practices an EGO-centred type of discourse, based on the constant choice of the **1"** person singular personal pronoun *eu* (Engl. 7) in comparison to the **1*1** person plural personal pronoun *noi* (Engl, we) (460, to 155 occurrences! respectively, in our corpus). This choice could seem rather unexpected in al nationalistic type of discourse, where the collective *we* would have been! more likely to appear in order to express the group ideology.　　　　1

Moreover, if one takes into account two structural grammatical traits off Romanian, namely the non-obligatory use of personal pronouns in subject position and the paradigm of dative and accusative full pronominal forms and clitics, one can easily notice the intentional use of emphatic, constructions in C V T's discourses (the 1" person pronoun in subject position and pronominal doubling in object position):

> It was I who printed that, me and Eugen Barbu [...] this is due to me exclusively, Mr. Cioroianu. (Rom. *eu* tipaream, *eu* cu Eugen Barbu [...] asta *mi* se datoreazS *mie,* domnule Cioroianu.) (10/04/2006)

At the stylistic level, the politician uses plenty of clear-cut contrasts between deictic forms (subjective vs. non-subjective person) in order to emphasize both his ethos and his dominant position as a speaker:

> Which one of us participated in that fake of a trial and the assassination of Ceausescu on Christmas day in 1989? *Me or you* (Rom. *tu)?* (19/06/1996); I, even in my sleep talk, I am more gifted than you (Rom. *dumneata)* as a writer (23/09/2002); Who was the chief of a denouncers' network during the Stalinist period, and a secret police captain? *Me or you* (Rom. *dumneavoastrd)?* (10/06/1996)

3.8.2. Meta-stance. Stancetaking represents an act of self-positioning of the speaker within discourse, and covers a wide array of subjective and evaluative phenomena (attitudes, feelings, judgments, etc). Vasilescu (2010: 371) points out that in the political discourse, unlike in everyday conversation, stancetaking is intentional, planned, and that MPs often take stance to SELF. So is the case of C V T, who takes all possible opportunities to make self-pleasing comments or glorify himself in speech. There are numerous meta-discursive insertions (Ilie 2003a, 2003b) that express the speaker's appreciation towards his own intellectual (1), rhetorical (2), and moral (3) skills:

> (1) I don't know which his profession is, but / *have got a Ph.D. in history,* and / *have studied even in Vienna. [...] I have written hundreds of pages* about the Blaj Declaration, / *have written hundreds of pages* about the treaties between the Romanian and the Hungarian leaders. (22/09/2008); *I know* the history of the American people *even better* than many American officials. (23/09/2002)

> (2) / *have a good command of words.* From the two of us, *I am a gifted speaker,* Mr. Roman, whether you like it or not. [...] / *have delivered hundreds of speeches* in my life [...] you are talking to *a pamphlet writer, a polemist,* if I don't reply right away, I feel like I was having a stroke. (23/09/2002)

> (3) That is why I am an "extremist", because 7 *have the guts,* and / *am not afraid* of that part of the press... (11/10/2004); *It is hard to defeat a man like me* with such cheap lies, which cannot scare anybody, and *certainly not a man like me.* (10/11/2003)

4. Conclusions

The monographic study of C V T's speeches has attempted to outline an individual discursive pattern within an institutional genre. The design of C V T's parliamentary discourse is double-shaped by (1) the nationalistic ideology of the politician and (2) by the individual rhetorical and pragma-stylistic skills of the speaker.

In his parliamentary speeches, C V T uses common rhetorical *cliches* of the nationalistic discourse (ethnocentrism, ethnic stereotypes, xenophobic aggressiveness, etc.), and stylistic attitudes, such as emotionalism and grandiloquence (series of rhetorical questions and repetitions, overstatements and hyperbolic exaggerations). In sum, at this level, the discourse may be considered *stereotypical, pathos-oriented* and *emphatic.*

At the same time, beyond the general agonistic nature of parliamentary discourse, C V T's speeches display individual pragma-stylistic and rhetorical features typical of a highly *conflictive kind of communication.* The speaker launches violent FTAs on his opponents and enjoys exhibiting his verbal power and aggressiveness by means of directive and commissive speech acts of command, interdiction or threat, as well as by irony, insults, abusive *ad hominem* fallacy, defamation or violent lexical choices. Last, but not least, his *ego-centred* or even *narcissistic* discourses are based on emphatic use of person deixis, frequent insertions of meta-stance (self-glorifying comments), patronizing attitudes towards the addressee (the speech act of advising), histrionics (side dialogues with the public or the press), and sustained strategies of face protection.

Notes

[1] Corneliu Vadim Tudor is one of the most controversial politicians of present-**day** Romania, due to his aggressive manner of insulting or belittling his opponents. He is the founder (1991) of Greater Romania Party *(Romania Mare)* with a centre-left orientation and an overtly declared nationalistic ideology. He was vice-president **of** the Romanian Senate, between 2004 and 2008. Since 2009, he has been a member of the European Parliament (MEP). As a candidate in the Presidential elections] (1996, 2000, 2004), he achieved his best score in 2000 (33.17 %), then he! decreased in popularity, in 2004 (5.56 %). Combative journalist and polemist, he is] the founder of three newspapers: *Romania Mare, Tricolorul, Politico,* frequently accused of xenophobic attacks. Before 1989, he was an active journalist **at'** *Saptdmdna,* a review magazine responsible for the violent propaganda against **i** *Radio Free Europe,* and suspected to have had underground links with the secret • police of the communist regime. As a writer, he undersigned 10 volumes of poetry, theatre, etc., being one of the official poets of Ceausescu's family.

[2] The speeches were delivered on the following dates: 19/06/1996; 27/11/1997; 11/02/2002   18/02/2002;   25/02/2002   04/03/2002   25/03/2002   02/04/2002; 15/04/2002   20/05/2002;   27/05/2002   09/09/2002   17/09/2002   23/09/2002; 14/10/2002   17/02/2003;   10/03/2003   12/05/2003   19/05/2003   06/10/2003; 10/11/2003   11/10/2004;   09/05/2005   06/06/2005   19/09/2005   10/04/2006; 02/10/2006 22/10/2007; 22/09/2008.

[3] The *Greater Romania* refers to the territory of Romania between 1919 and 1940. In 1918, at the end of the First World War, Transylvania, Bukovina and Bessarabia united with the Romanian Old Kingdom (Wallachia and Moldavia).

[4] *Gauleiter* is an offensive term borrowed from the Nazi vocabulary.

[5] After 2004, CVT started to change his declarations referring to the holocaust in Romania.

[6] The above-mentioned studies of Hie propose a contrastive analysis of the address system and the use of unparliamentary language in the British and Swedish Parliaments. Whereas the British MPs prefer extremely formal address terms, inherited from a long tradition of practice, as well as a bold manner of verbal duelling, their Swedish counterparts are more relaxed and sometimes more inventive in exploring the possibilities of the address system, but quite prudent when they have to attack one another in a direct way.

[7] Regarding the basic concepts of "power" and "distance" launched by Brown and Gilman (1960), seethe viewpoint of Spencer-Oatey (1996).

[8] For a possible comparison between the use of address forms in parliamentary practice and political interviews, see Bull and Fetzer 2006; Rendle-Short 2007.

[9] "The recognition of verbal irony, and of what it communicates, depends on an interaction between the linguistic form of the utterance, the shared cognitive environment of communicator and audience, and the criterion of consistency with the principle of relevance" (Sperber and Wilson 2007 [1992], 117).

[10] These fallacies are *argumentum ad populum, argumentum ad verecundiam, fallacy of false cause, fallacy of false dilemma, hasty generalization,* etc. Fallacies

within the Romanian political discourse were studied by Salavastru (2009) and Ionescu-Ruxandoiu (2010c).

[11] Andrei Plesu is one of the most distinguished intellectuals in nowadays' Romania, former minister of Culture and minister of Foreign Affairs.

[12] Vladimir Tismaneanu is an political scientist of Romanian origin, political analyst, sociologist, and professor at the University of Maryland, College Park.

[13] Mircea Dinescu is an important Romanian contemporary poet, journalist, and a former dissident of the communist regime.

References

Anderson, Benedict. 2000. *Comunitdfi imaginate. Reflecfii asupra originii si raspdndirii na\ionalismului.* Translated by Roxana Oltean and Ioana Potrache, Bucuresti: Integral.

Balan, Dinu. 2006. "Etnie, etnicitate, natiune si nationalism. Cateva precizari terminologice." *Codrul Cosminului* 12: 93-117.

Benveniste, Emile. 1966. *Problemes de linguistique generate,* Paris: Gallimard.

Boia, Lucian. 2005. *Doud secole de mitologie nafionala.* Bucure§ti: Humanitas.

Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, Roger W., and Albert Gilman. 1973 [I960]. "I pronomi del potere e della solidarieta." In *Linguaggio e societa,* edited by Pier Paolo Giglioli, 301-330. Bologna: II Mulino.

Bull, Peter, and Anita Fetzer. 2006. "Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews." *Text & Talk* 26(1): 3-37.

Cabasino, Francesca. 2010. "Des formules rituelles de l'adresse au conflit verbal dans l'espace parlementaire." In *S 'adresser a autrui. Les formes nominates d'adresse en francais,* edited by Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 169-200. Chambery: Universite de Savoie.

Constantinescu, Mihaela N ., and Melania Roibu. 2010. '"Betia de cuvinte' grele in Parlamentul romanesc." In *Dialog, discurs, enunf. In memoriam Sorin Stati,* edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu and Liliana Hoinarescu, 101-114. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics 25:* 349-367.

—. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence.* Cambridge, New York, etc.: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1997. *Nafiuni si nationalism.* Oradea: Antet.

Ghiorghias, Iulia. 2004. "Structuri ale invectivei in romana actuals."
    Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii romdne actuate, edited by Gabriela Pa
    Dindelegan. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti
    (http://ebooks.unibuc.ro/ filologie/dindelegan/1 l.pdf).

Harris, Sandra. 2001. "Being politically impolite: Extending politene
    theory to adversarial political discourse." *Discourse and Society* 12 (4)^
    451-472.   "I

Ilie, Cornelia. 2003a. "Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary!
    debates." *Journal of Language and Politics* 1 (2): 269-291.

—. 2003b. "Histrionic and agonistic features of parliamentary discourse."
    Studies in Communication Sciences 3 (1): 25-53.

—. 2004. "Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and th&j
    Swedish parliaments. A rhetorical approach." In *Cross-Cultural\
    Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse* edited by Paul Bayley, 45-
    86. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2005. "Politeness in Sweden: Parliamentary forms of address." In;
    Politeness in Europe, edited by Leo Hickey, and Miranda Stewart,
    174-188. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.   *i*

—. 2010. "Strategic uses of parliamentary forms of address: The case of 2
    the U.K. Parliament and the Swedish Riksdag." *Journal of Pragmatics* <
    42:885-911.   ]

Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Liliana. 2009. "Sintaxa si functionare discursivS: i
    preteri{ia in discursul politic." In *Studii de gramaticd. Omagiu
    doamnei profesoare Valeria Gufu-Romalo,* edited by Rodica Zafiu,
    Blanca Croitor, Ana Maria Mihail, 105-108. Bucuresti: Editurai
    Universitatii din Bucuresti.

—. 2010a. "Straightforward vs. mitigated impoliteness in the Romanian,
    parliamentary discourse. The case of *in absentia* impoliteness." *Revue
    Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 343-351.

—. 2010b. „Impolite(ea *in absentia* in discursul parlamentar romanesc.
    Studiu de caz." In *Dialog, discurs, enunj. In memoriam Sorin Stati,*
    edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu and Liliana Hoinarescu, 59-72.
    Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

—. 2010c. "The *argumentum ad hominem* in a Romanian parliamentary
    debate." In *The Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Argumentation
    of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation,* edited **by ;**
    Frans H. van Eemeren, Bart Garssen, David Godden, and Gordon
    Mitchell, 875-880. Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat.

—. 2011. "Forme nominate de adresare in discursul parlamentar romanesc
    (sec. al XlX-lea-inceputul sec. al X-lea)." In *Limba romana. Ipostaze
    ale varia{iei lingvistice,* vol. II, *Pragmatica si stilistica,* edited **by**

    Rodica Zafiu, Camelia Usurelu, and Helga Bogdan Oprea, 271-280.
    Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 1980. *L 'enonciation de la subjectivite dans
    le langage.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Kienpointner, Manfred. 1997. "Varieties of rudeness: Types and functions
    of impolite utterances." *Functions of Language,* Volume 4, No. 2: 251-
    287. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

—. 2009. "Plausible and fallacious strategies of silencing one's opponent."
    In *Examining Argumentation in Context: Fifteen Studies on Strategic
    Maneuvering,* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren, 61-75. Amsterdam/
    Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mey, Jacob (ed.). 1998. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics.* Oxford:
    Elsevier.

Milica, loan. 2011. "Violenta de limbaj in discursul politic actual. Studiu
    de caz privind discursul parlamentar romanesc". *Sfera politicii,* vol.
    XIX, no. 10 (164): 32-42.

Milner, Jean-Claude. 1978. *De la syntaxe a ['interpretation. Quantites,
    insultes, exclamations.* Paris: Seuil.

Mocanu, Alexandra. 2010. "Ironical devices in Romanian and British
    parliamentary debates". *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of
    Brasov,* series IV, *Philology and Cultural Studies* vol. 3 (52): 175-184.

Neumann, Victor. 2003. *Neam, popor sau na\iune? Despre identitdfile
    politice europene,* Bucuresti: Curtea Veche.

Niculescu, Alexandru. 1968. "Fenomeni di diversificazione e interferenza
    nell'espressione pronominale della cortesia". *Actas del XI Congreso
    Internacional de linguistica y filologia romdnicas* (Madrid, 1965),
    1327-1339. Madrid.

—. 1970. "Sur interrelation des pronoms allocutoires reverenciels avec le
    systeme pronominal dans quelques langues romanes". *Actes du X-e
    Congres International des linguistes* (Bucarest 1967), 339-344.
    Bucarest: Editions de l'Academie de la Republique Socialiste de
    Roumanie.

Rendle-Short, Johanna. 2007. "<Catherine, you're wasting your time>:
    Address terms within the Australian political interview". *Journal of
    Pragmatics,* 39: 1503-1525.

Roibu, Melania, and Mihaela N. Constantinescu. 2010. "Verbal
    aggressiveness in the Romanian parliamentary debate. Past and
    present." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 353-364.

Ruwet, Nicolas. 1992. *Grammaire des insultes et autres etudes.* Paris:
    Seuil.

Salavastru, Constantin. 2009. *Discursul puterii.* Bucuresti: Tritonic.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in The Philosophy Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 1996. "Reconsidering power and distance."i *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 1-24.

Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 2007 [1992]. "On verbal irony. ^ *Irony in Language and Thought: a Cognitive Science Reader,* edited by Raymond W. Gibbs and Herbert L. Colston, 96-117. Taylor and Francis. Originally published in *Lingua* 1992, 87: 53-76.

Serbanescu, Andra. 2002. "Conflictul verbal (Studiu de caz si repere teoretice)." In *Perspective actuate in studiul limbii romdne,* edited by Gabriela Pana Dindelegan, 319-337. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Stefanescu, Ariadna. 2010. "EmoUe si impolitete in discursul **si** interdiscursul condamnarii trecutului comunist totalitar din Romania." In *Dialog, discurs, enunf. In memoriam Sorin Stati,* edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu and Liliana Hoinarescu, 73-100. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Vasilescu, Andra. 2010. "Metastance in the Romanian parliamentary discourse: Case studies". *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 365-380.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2000. "Limbajul agresivita|ii si al conflictului." *Revista Romdnd de Comunicare si Relatii Publice* 2-3: 103-111.

—. 2007. *Limbaj Şipolitico.* Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Windisch, Uli. 1986. *Le K.O. verbal. La communication conflictuelle.* Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE CONFIGURATION OF SELF-IMAGE: THE ROLE OF METAREPRESENTATIONAL NEGATION [NOT (X) BUT (X')]

ELENA ALBU

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to discuss the role of the metarepresentational negation[1] (MetNeg) [not (X) but (X')] in configuring and interpreting the politicians' self-image (SI). It is a comparative study of the manner in which the members of parliament (MPs) represent themselves in parliamentary debates, on the one hand, and in TV political debates, on the other. Our approach is based on the premise that the mental configuration of the negative structure (NS) strongly influences the manner in which SI is represented. We consider that the manner in which the MPs represent themselves is an essential feature that contributes to their identity and has deep consequences on their relationship with the other MPs, in general, and with the audience, in particular.

This paper represents a linguistic contribution situated in the subfield of cognitive pragmatics. The current approach uses mainly the tools and methods *of Relevance Theory* (RT) (Sperber and Wilson 1995).

We suggest a communicative and an argumentative analysis of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] in order to highlight its discursive individuality. The communicative part concerns the way in which this negative structure functions from a cognitive point of view, with an emphasis on the inferences that are being triggered and the cognitive effects that are being generated. The argumentative part illustrates the argumentative uses of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] in terms of the way credibility is achieved, which has a great influence on the process of opinion building. We are particularly interested in pointing out the prevalent elements in the configuration and interpretation of the MPs' SI, taking into account the

fact that even if the analysis is concentrated on the use of the same negative structure in the same situational context, the discursive effects and the generated conceptual representations are different.

The corpus of data consists of a set of parliamentary debates[2] that took place in the Senate in 2010, and of eight TV debates on political subjects[3], broadcast live throughout 2010. The examples analysed represent authentic Romanian data. In the attempt to remain faithful to the original material and not to lose any pragmatic or linguistic information, we have opted for a literal translation[4].

For the purposes of our argument, we shall proceed as follows: we start with some prefatory remarks about the concept of *self-image* and suggest a brief description of it in comparison with *face* and *identity*. In section 3, we discuss the particularities of parliamentary debates in relation to TV political debates. In section 4, we introduce MetNeg [not (X) but (X')], with an emphasis on its configuration and its constitutive elements. Section 5 is dedicated to the comparative study of the NSs which foster the politicians' SI. Conclusions are drawn in the last part.

2. Self-image—A Discursive Construct

There are three interrelated concepts: *face, image,* and *identity,* used in many domains with different meanings and designating various aspects.

The concept *of face,* first introduced by Goffman (1967), is a basic component in Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, indicating "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown and Levinson 1987, 61). In their approach, the authors dissociate between *negative face,* i.e. the basic claim to territories, personal preserves and rights to non-distractions, and *positive face,* i.e. the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' claimed by interactants *(ibidem,* 61).

Identity is an umbrella term, used throughout the social sciences, especially in psychology and sociology, to describe a person's conception and expression of their individuality or group affiliations. Spencer-Oatey (2007, 10) discusses the notion of *face* in comparison with the notion of *identity* and considers that, at the cognitive level, "both relate to the notion of 'self-image' and both comprise multiple self-aspects or attributes". In contrast, *face* concerns "attributes that are affectively sensitive to the claimant", always associated with "positively-evaluated attributes that the claimant wants others to acknowledge", on the one hand, and "with negatively-evaluated attributes that the claimant wants others NOT to ascribe to him/her", on the other hand *(ibidem,* 10).

Image is also a broad concept, comprising both face and identity, as it includes individual, relational and collective construals of self. In social and cognitive psychology, it includes items of objective investigation, but also items that a person has found out about him/her, either from personal experiences or based on others' judgments.

Identity has been approached broadly, which resulted in a variety of aspects, ranging from national identity, cultural identity, institutional identify to personal identity. Political and parliamentary identity have been extensively discussed in political studies, in general, and in various linguistic studies, in particular (Ionescu-Ruxandoiu 2006, Ilie 2006, 2010, van Dijk 2010, to mention just a few). For instance, when talking about parliamentary discourses, Ilie (2010, 58) defines identity as follows:

> "The term identity is used here to refer to the ongoing process of parliamentarians' defining their positions and roles: the way a parliamentary speaker is placed and self-placed in the societal system and its political parties/groups, the way a parliamentary speaker conceives of and addresses his/her interlocutors, and the way in which a parliamentary speaker is perceived, addressed and referred to by his/her fellow parliamentarians, and by a multiple audience".

According to the aforementioned definition, the construction of identity is considered to be one of the main features of the parliamentary interaction, encompassing the manner in which the politicians present themselves as part of society, as part of a group with which they identify, on the one hand, and the manner in which the relationships with various MPs and with the audience are established, on the other.

In rhetorical terms, SI contributes to the politicians' ethos. *Ethos* is concerned with developing a relationship between the speaker and his/her audience in terms of credibility. From an argumentative point of view, SI can be discussed in terms of effectiveness. Nevertheless, both credibility and argumentative effectiveness represent the consequences of the phenomenon of metarepresentation at the discursive level[5]. We believe that the mental configuration (i.e. the metarepresentational nature of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')]) plays an important role in creating and generating certain assumptions that can modify the audience's cognitive environment.

In this paper, we suggest a cognitively grounded account of SI. SI is used as a technical notion, standing for the *cognitive representation* the politician has or wants to create about himself/herself. Following Spencer-Oatey's threefold perspective regarding the delimitation between individual, relational and collective self, as well as Ilie's general definition of identity, our attention is focused on how the MPs present themselves in

light of personal identity and as individual politicians. Therefore, by SI **we** refer to the personal component comprised in the politicians' identitie We believe that a person's self-image involves answering the following-questions: 1. What does the person believe people think about him/her?! and 2. How does the person want people to see him/her?

SI is used and construed deliberately by the speaker during the on-, going parliamentary dialogue, in accordance with his communicative] goals, i.e. to win an argument, to impose his views and to persuade the] audience. Unlike van Dijk's (2010) political identities, which are' considered to have a more permanent character as social representations, we are interested in describing how SI is fostered at a micro-discursive level. We do not intend to start from a set of pre-established categories of SI and illustrate this concept by some examples identified in the corpus. On the contrary, our approach is discourse-based and, therefore, we suggest an interpretation of this construct, with an emphasis on the mental configuration of the strategies used by the speaker in his/her attempt to create a certain representation about himself/herself.

3. Political Debates

This section is dedicated to the description of parliamentary debates in comparison with TV political debates. As sub-genres of political discourse, the MPs' discursive interaction is constantly marked by their institutional role-based commitments, by the dialogically shaped institutional confrontation and by the awareness of acting in front of and for the benefit of a multi-layered audience (Hie 2006, 190).

Regarding the Romanian parliamentary debates⁶, one can say that the proceedings are conducted by the President of the Chamber, or, in his/her absence, by one of the vice-presidents, assisted by two secretaries. The Chamber of Deputies and the Senate carry on their activity in plenum, by parliamentary groups and committees, over the span of four consecutive days of the week. In order to discuss the issues on the agenda, the Deputies and Senators take the floor from the rostrum, according to the order of their names on the speakers' list. Any dialogue between the speaker at the rostrum and people in the audience is prohibited.

The 'TV political debate' is a common form of TV programme. The host invites certain guests, mainly politicians and journalists, to discuss about the daily political agenda and about the main political events. Although it is not a proper institutionalised setting, the politicians act and speak in accordance with their institutional position. They represent a certain political party, constantly defending an ideology and reacting in

favour of or against different opinions, laws, etc. Similarly to the parliamentary debates, the politicians pursue the same communicative goals: they aim at fostering a positive self-image by seeking the audience's agreement and acceptance of their beliefs and viewpoints, on the one hand, and at discrediting the political adversaries, on the other.

The debates in the Romanian Parliament are regulated in such manner that the speaker could hold the floor, and his or her interlocutors could not always interrupt the discourse. From this point of view, the interventions can be considered to be rather monologues. The interventions have a fixed duration and the speeches are usually elaborated in advance. In accordance with Ilie's considerations on the British Parliament (Hie 2003), the debate in the Romanian Parliament can also be described as a formal discussion on the existing political agenda.

In comparison with the parliamentary debates, we consider that the Romanian TV political debates are a hybrid form, between a talk show, due to the informality and lack of constraints, and a political debate, due to the seriousness of the subjects and the speakers' involvement in the topics. Moreover, the entertainment component is almost inexistent, the accent being placed on finding solutions to the existing problems.

4. Metarepresentational Negation [Not (X) But (X')]-A Dual Strategy

MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is a negative structure (i.e. it has a fixed configuration and a fixed interpretation) built on the mental actions of [rejection + correction], in accordance with the cognitive effect represented by "contradicting and eliminating an existing set of assumptions" (Sperber and Wilson 1995; Wilson and Sperber 2002). The components of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] are the discursive segments (X) and (X'), and the correlative pair *[not...but]*. (X) and (X') illustrate the linguistic representations that correspond to the [rejection-correction] inference. (X) is the representation that is rejected; it belongs to a different discursive entity and is always situated on a different discursive level. (X') replaces by correction the contradicted assumption. It is self-attributed, belonging to the actual speaker.

The relationship between (X) and (X') is emphasized by the correlative pair *[not... but]*. Although the presence of the negative operator *not* (Rom. *nu)* is compulsory, the *corrective but*ⁱ (Rom. *ci)* may not be explicitly expressed⁸. Its position and action are determined in the reconstruction stage, which triggers a pragmatic re-analysis. The relationship between

(X) and (X') in the case of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is always one **of** total substitution.

MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is a *dual strategy* that generates extra-cognitive effects and gives more argumentative force to the utterance. We believe that the duality results from the unitary use of the two segments. Therefore, using the discursive sequence ascribed to the mental act **of** *rejection,* the speaker rejects a representation outlining his perception **of** *how others see him/her.* The nature of this representation can be mental (thoughts), public (utterances) or abstract (linguistic properties), in RT terms (Wilson 2000). This means that it can target previous statements, but also thoughts and ideas the speaker anticipates or assumes the audience might have about a certain aspect. The third type, less illustrated in our corpus, is the rejection of a formal, linguistic feature of a previous representation.

On the other hand, by using the corrective segment ascribed to the correction act, the speaker suggests a new representation of *how he/she sees himself/herself or how he/she should be seen by the audience.* It can refer to the manner in which he/she characterizes himself/herself or he/she presents his/her political agenda and speaks of himself/herself in different situations. The result of this dual NS is the derivation of a new conceptual representation (CR) the speaker wants to popularise about himself/herself.

The mental configuration of MetNeg allows for different conceptualizations of different representations of SI. Particular attention is paid to the discursive organization of the lexical units encoded by the (X) and (X') segments. We believe that an approach based on the joint contribution of mental configuration and discursive display may offer a deeper and clearer understanding of the SI, both at the cognitive and discursive levels.

5. Contextual Analysis

In this section, we focus on the contribution of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] in fostering the MPs' SI. We take for granted the fact that all politicians are fully aware of their institutional role and have the political identity pre-ascribed. The analysis is focused on the mental configuration and the discursive organization of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X')]. We have tried to group the data in certain categories, according to the different conceptualizations and the various functions of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X*)]-

(a) The first category brings forward a SI situated in the paradigm of volition. The MetNeg is found in the cognitive domain of volition,

explicitly marked by the use of the lexical units: *desire, wish, want.* The first example corresponds to the glossing formula: *I desire to say [not (X) but(X')]-*

(1) Crin Antonescu: *Este de totald inactualitate acum sd ne impdrfim noi aceste lucruri. Acum de actualitate este ce protect pentru reformarea PNL este ales de cdtre congres. Cu cine si de ce. Asta-i tema mea. Nu cum ne asezdm noi intr-un soi de pozifie asa, imaginara.* Si daca Ludovic Orban nu a inteles ca nu mai este asta tema congresului o *spun incd o data. Eu nu doresc* acum la acest congres sa spunem cine va fi prim-ministru, cine va fi candidat la Presedinfie, *ci doresc* sS spun cum imi imaginez eu ca trebuie si ca putem sa facem din PNL un partid puternic dupa care sigur, cand vom face asta, va veni momentul sa discutam si cine o sa fie prim-ministru si cine o sa fie candidat la Presedintie. Eu nu sunt preocupat in acest moment deloc, dar deloc, de candidatura la Presedinfia Romaniei in 2014. (March 3, 2010, Stirea Zilei)

Crin Antonescu: *It is not of present interest to share these things. Now of present interest is what project for reforming PNL is chosen by the Congress. With whom and why. This is my topic. Not how we place ourselves in a certain imaginary position.* And if Ludovic Orban did not understand that the theme of the congress was not that anymore, *I shall say it one more time.* I *do not desire* now, at this congress, to say who is going to be prime minister, who is going to run for presidency, *but I desire* to say how I imagine we have to and how we can make of PNL a powerful party, after which of course, when we have done that, the moment to discuss who is going to be prime minister and who is going to run for presidency will come. At the moment, I am not at all, but not at all, interested in running for presidency of Romania in 2014.

In this example, the NS is generated by the discursive sequence *I desire to say* and is introduced as an embedded clause in a larger discursive segment. The segment corresponding to the act of rejection, i.e. the 'rejection segment', is represented by the linguistic material: *who is going to be prime minister, who is going to run for presidency,* while the segment corresponding to the act of correction (X') is represented by: *how I imagine we have to and how we can make of PNL a powerful party.* Both segments are complex linguistic representations, preceded by a reiterative sequence uttered by the same speaker, embedded in a conditional clause: *And if Ludovic Orban did not understand that the theme of the congress was not that anymore, I shall say it one more time,* used to emphasize the politician's firm opinion.

The new conceptual representation denotes the speaker's mental attitude towards a certain propositional content. Regarding the content of the new conceptual representation, one can say that the first person plural

(Rom. *sd spunem* "to say"), found in the (X) segment, triggers the! presupposition that somebody has uttered the assumption that is now being rejected. Who this person is can easily be recovered from the context, as the current dialogue is about the competition for the position of the National Liberal Party (Rom. PNL) leadership between the speaker, Crin Antonescu, and his opponent, Ludovic Orban.

By rejecting the public representation encoded in the (X) segment, the speaker qualifies the actions described as being inappropriate and outside his sphere of political interests. Although the segment is apparently generally attributed, the presuppositions and implicatures generated target his colleague and imply that Orban has done and said all the things of' which the speaker disapproves. Therefore, Orban is suspected to have asked for a decision regarding who is going to be prime minister and who is going to run for the presidency of the country. Moreover, Orban has omitted to mention the strategies according to which the party would become more powerful. At the implicit level, the speaker suggests that his opponent is more interested in the future distribution of the official positions. Among the implicated conclusions, the speaker intends to convey the following: Orban has hidden reasons, he is not involved in reforming the party and he does not want to act on its behalf.

The (X') segment is built on the alternation between the first person plural and the first person singular. The speaker uses the personal pronoun / in order to explicitly dissociate from some other members of his party: *but I desire to say how I imagine.* For the rest of the sequence, *we have to and how we can make of PNL a powerful party,* the speaker returns to the first person plural, thus creating the impression of speaking on behalf of his party, as a sign of the necessity of a common aim.

To sum up, the politician's SI is revealed by the use of the (X) and (X') segment. While the (X) segment characterizes the opponent's position regarding the political agenda of the party, (X') brings forward the speaker's vision, leading to the generation of a contrastive SI.

In Albu (2012), we argued that MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] contributes unitarily to the discourse. In other words, the argumentative use of the NS is interpreted as the result of the joint interaction of the two segments and not as separate contributions. Furthermore, more illocutions can be identified. We suggest talking about a primary illocutionary force, which in our case consists in the assertion regarding the politician's position, and about a secondary illocutionary force, represented by the indirect critique of his opponent. Although the attack does not have a direct, explicit argumentative force, the implicated premises and conclusions play an important part in the process of persuasion°. The speaker implies that his

opponent is not appropriate for the position he is running for and tries to disqualify him. The RT re-analysis points out how these effects are acquired and indicate the manner in which they influence the audience's cognitive environment.

Although apparently similar to example (1), built in the paradigm of desire, the next example presents a series of differences:

(2) Victor Ponta: *Eu nu vreau venituri mai mari la bugetul de stat prin taxa diferenfiata, eu vreau o distribuire mai corecta si mai echilibrata:* eel care are mai mult participa cu mai mult, eel care are mai pu{in participa cu mai putin sau chiar deloc si, sigur, eel care are nevoie trebuie sprijinit. Asta inseamna un partid de stanga, un mesaj, sigur, mult mai radical si pana la urma, mai iritant, mai enervant, dar este mult mai clar si mai simplu de inteles. (Marchl4, 2010, Romania politica)

Victor Ponta: *I do not want bigger incomes at the state budget through differentiated tax, I want a more correct and a more balanced distribution:* those who have more contribute more, those who have less contribute less or even at all and, of course, the person who is in need has to be supported. This is what a left wing party means, a message of course much more radical and eventually more annoying, but it is much clearer and easier to understand.

The glossing formula is represented by: *I want [NOT (X) but (X')],* where the rejection segment (X) is: *bigger incomes at the state budget through differentiated tax,* and the correction segments (X'): *a more correct and more balanced distribution.*

The semantics of the verbal group has an important influence on meaning derivation. The NS targets explicitly the politician's agenda and is built around technical notions. The combination between / *want* and the technical notions *(income, differentiated tax, state budget)* seems surprising at first sight. In the attempt to present his views, the speaker appears to become personally involved in some matters that concern the agenda of a political party.

What is negotiated in this situation is the aim of the differentiated tax. The MetNeg is used anticipatorily, as a clarification of a possible misinterpreted assumption. Moreover, the speaker refutes a set of possible accusations that may be generated by supporting this type of tax. The semantics of the adjectives used *(more correct* and *more balanced)* also determines an emotional reaction within the audience, who are deluded into believing that the existing tax is not the most adequate.

The following example, also situated in the paradigm of desire, is embedded in a contrastive sequence:

(3) Crin Antonescu: Sunt de acord cu tot ce spune Victor Ciutacu, numai ca-mi permit sa adaug ca asta-i doar o parte. *Da, eu doresc sd exercit din plin prerogative^ de presedinte al partidului dacd voi fi reales,* dar {nu [pentru a ma bucura in sine de aceasta situate], ci [pentru a schimba partidul]}. (March 3, 2010, Stirea Zilei)

Crin Antonescu: I agree to everything Victor Ciutacu is saying, but I dare add that this is just a part. *Yes, I want to fully exercise the prerogatives of the president of the party if I am chosen again,* but {not [to merely enjoy this situation] but [to change the party]}.

In this case, the rejection segment is represented by *to merely enjoy this situation,* and the correction segment, introduced by *to change the party™*.

The implicatures derived create the impression that other politicians usually do all those things and the implicated conclusion stresses the fact that this aspect is a current practice, a general habit of the politicians. Concretely, it is implied that most of the politicians exercise the prerogatives of the president of the party in order to enjoy the situation and to take advantage of their position. The communicated assumptions are presented as certain and seem to be generally attributed to the audience.

One can notice that the assumption in the correction segment is also presented as impersonal and marked by a high degree of certainty. Therefore, the speaker confirms the desire of being a president, but he disclaims some possible, presumed assumptions regarding his reasons. The nature of the representation is mostly mental, as it is a current belief attributed by the speaker to the audience, in general. Moreover, the MetNeg is used anticipatorily in the attempt to draw the people's attention to the assumed existing situation and to prevent some possible objections.

The new conceptual representation (CR) implies the idea that the speaker is different, by his constructive agenda, as opposed to other politicians. He does not attack the others directly, but he lets the audience infer it. It appears that no reply is innocent, since a lot of implicatures can be derived in order to discredit the other politicians, as follows: the presidents of parties enjoy the situation of being presidents, which means that they do not have adequate political agendas, but personal, hidden reasons, and therefore they are bad politicians.

This NS plays an important role in the process of persuasion, strongly influencing the cognitive environment of the audience. The main argumentative act consists in the speaker's motivation for his actions and statements, while the secondary act represents an indirect critique of other politicians.

On balance, fostering an SI situated in the paradigm of volition appears to be an efficient strategy. By means of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X')], a

contrastive SI is configured. The conceptual and formal dichotomies, such as "I vs. he/them", "normal vs. abnormal", "appropriate vs. inappropriate", "good vs. bad" contribute greatly to the personal image of the politician. Thus, credibility is achieved by means of the conceptual content of the dichotomies created, the semantics of the lexical units, such as *desire, want,* and the assertive character of the MetNeg, which commits the speaker to the truth of the assumptions he communicates.

This category of SI is absent from the parliamentary debates. The MPs never assume personally the political agenda, as they never dissociate from their political party.

(b) The second category of SI is situated in the paradigm of the epistemic judgment, marked by the explicit use of the verb *think.* It is worth mentioning that various accounts of the values and functions of this verb have been outlined in time. For instance, Hooper (1975) considers that *I think* is a weak assertive, while Jucker (1986) states that its function is to avoid commitment[11]. In our approach, we depart from these interpretations, and consider that *I think* is used in order to mark the speaker's belief. From this point of view, we adhere to Urmson's (1952) account, according to which *I think* is a parenthetical structure used for its signalling function, namely to indicate the degree of reliability that is being claimed. In other words, the speaker opts for expressing his beliefs, committing himself/herself to the acceptance of the communicated assumptions as true.

The following two examples are excerpted from the corpus of parliamentary debates:

(4) Radu Berceanu: Daca ne referim la cei 6742 de kilometri de drum national despre care PSD spune in aceasta strategic sau in acest document ca ar fi trebuit modernizati in ace§ti cinci ani, din 2005 in 2010, asta inseamna ca ar fi trebuit **sa** se modernizeze 1350 de kilometri anual, mult mai mult, de vreo sapte ori mai mult decat a reusit **sa** se modernizeze in perioada in care PSD a fost la guvernare. *Deci cred cd lucrurile acestea nu trebuie spuse doar asa, pentru deliciul spectatorilor, eventual neavizafi, ci cred cd trebuie sd ne aplecdm, poate impreund, mai ales asupra surselor de finanfare,* pentru ca, probabil, avand surse corespunz&toare §i av&ndu-le cunoscute pe o perioada ceva mai mare de timp, pentru ca **sa** se poata pregSti proiectele, chiar ca se pot face modernizari undeva, la cifrele acestea. Dar, altfel, r8man dorinte foarte departe de putinje. (April 12, 2010, Senate)

Radu Berceanu: If we refer to those 6742 kilometres of national road PSD is saying in this strategy or in this document that should have been modernized in these five years, from 2005 to 2010, this means that 1350 kilometres should have been modernized every year, a lot more, seven

times more than what PSD managed to do when it was in power. *So I think these things should not be said just like that, to the delight of the onlookers, possibly uninformed, but I think that we had better focus on the financial means, maybe together,* because having appropriate means and having known them for a longer period of time in order to be able to prepare the projects, it is possible to modernize around these figures. Yet, otherwise there are only hopes left, far from possibilities.

The mental configuration of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is represented by: *I think these things NOT [should be said just like that to the delight of the onlookers, possibly uninformed] BUT [we had better focus on the financial means].* One can notice that there is a discrepancy between the mental configuration of the negative structure and the discursive pattern. At first sight, it appears that the verb "to think" is found in the domain of the correlative pair [not.. .but]. At a closer look, the NS is found in the scope of the epistemic verb *to think,* reiterated in the correction segment. The NS is built in the paradigm of the modal *must,* indicating obligation, namely the collective obligation of doing what is right.

We consider that the discursive pattern is the result of the speaker's attempt to mark his belief and conviction regarding the communicated content. Therefore, the NS points out the speaker's judgment and position, as an individual politician.

The representation described in the (X) segment is meant to characterize the present situation, as the explanatory parenthesis shows: *as it is the situation now.* The (X') segment points out the speaker's position, by explicitly creating the dichotomy "they vs. I". We find the alternation between the pronominal forms very interesting. The verb *to think* is always used in the first person singular, while the content of the (X) and (X') segments is expressed differently, i.e. by means of the impersonal form ;/ *does not have to* and by the first person plural *to focus on* (Rom. *trebuie sa ne aplecdm),* respectively.

In sum, the speaker presents from his point of view, as an individual politician, the situation concerning the modernization of the national road, which involves more politicians and implies a confrontation between different political parties.

In comparison with the parliamentary debates, the situation is different in the case of the TV political debates. The combination between the paradigm of desire and the paradigm of epistemic judgment is prevalent. The following examples are illustrative:

(5) Victor Ponta: Daca nu credeam nu candidam. *Eu nu mi-am dorit neapdrat sa fiu presedintele PSD sa-mi pun si eu fotografia acolo, dupa*

domnul Adrian Nastase si domnul Mircea Geoana. Eu chiar am crezut, ca un om din generajia mea si din generajia dumneavoastra, ca intr-adevar dupa 20 de ani, un sistem e aproape de faliment si ca trebuie sd vii cu o schimbare fundamentald. (March 8, 2010, Sinteza zilei)
Victor Ponta: Had not believed (it) I would not have run. *I did not want by all means to be the president of PSD to put my photo there, after Mr Adrian Nastase and Mircea Geoana. I have really believed, as a man from my generation and from your generation, that after 20 years, a system is heading for bankruptcy and that one has to come with a fundamental change.*

The dichotomy between the paradigm of desire and the paradigm of epistemic state is explicitly outlined: / *did not want* vs. / *really believed.* In other words, what is being negotiated and questioned is the description of the speaker's mental state. We do not say that the propositional content does not play an important role, but we think it is subordinate to the first discursive elements, built around the verbs "desire" and "believe".

This discursive organisation and choice of concepts have deep implications, generating a rich set of implicatures with a strong emotional impact. The (X') segment strongly reinforces the politician's SI by stressing the genuine belief he has held about the adequate political agenda and about the functioning of the existing political discourse. The politician's SI is that he is aware of everything that is bad and situates himself in a world of deception and lies. Although the argumentative act has the form of a clarification of his actions, it also represents a serious accusation against other politicians.

The presence of the personal pronoun in the first person singular is also important; it gives the message argumentative and persuasive power, by bringing forward the speaker's commitment to the truth of the communicated content. Moreover, there are two extra-procedural elements: *by all means* and *really,* which enhance the argumentative force of the MetNeg, putting some extra-constraints on the inferences derived.

The new complex conceptual representation illustrates the description of the political system in terms of belief, of intention to do well, of having a positive contribution and not in terms of personal satisfaction.

A contrastive SI and different levels of configuration characterize the following example, as well:

(6) Victor Ponta: Sunt foarte clare. Si cred ca a{i remarcat pozijia mea cand a fost si cu procesul domnului Vantu. *Nu confundafi presedinfii PSD. Eu sunt presedinte. Nu am nicio treabd cu oamenii dstia, asa cum nu am nicio treabd cu patronul trustului dumneavoastra. Si daca am venit astd seard la dumneavoastra am venit sd vd spun si sa vd ardt, sd vd demonstrez, cd eu*

nu sunt ca Traian Basescu, eu nu vd impart in jurnalisti bunt si jurnalisti rdi, nu vd impart in public rdu si public bun, eu chiar cred cd trebuie sd vorbesc cu to(i oamenii, chiar si cu cei care nu sunt de acord cu mine, care sunt de acord cu Traian Basescu, macar, daca li fac sa ma asculte, nu stiu, pot sa vada pozijia mea. (September 27, 2010, Nasul)

Victor Ponta: They are very clear. And I think you have noticed my position on the occasion of Mr. Vantu's trial. *Do not confuse the PSD presidents. I am the president. I have nothing to do with these people, just as I have nothing to do with the leader of your trust. And if I came to you tonight, I did it in order to tell you and to show you that I am not like TB, I do not divide you in good journalists and bad journalists, I do not divide you in bad audience and good audience, I really believe I have to address all the people,* even those who do not agree with me, those who agree with TB, at least, if I manage to make them listen to me, I do not know, they can see my position.

We could identify a multitude of negative structures having several roles within this discursive sequence. The first structure is a piece of advice with a negative content, which serves as a clarification and, at the same time, as an indirect criticism. It is followed by a dismissal of some previous accusations, in order to re-accredit the speaker's image. The MetNeg is preceded by a negative definition, expressed through the use of a comparison: **7** *am not like Traian Basescu.* The rest of the sequence, built on the dichotomy "good vs. bad", plays the role of an explanation.

In the rejection segment, there are two clauses found in a coordinated relation. The information is presented as certain and cannot be questioned. The correction segment brings into discussion a mitigated formula targeting the speaker's mental state: *I really believe.* At the same time, the speaker takes responsibility for everything he is saying, making the message personal.

The conceptual representation enhances the politician's image of being the opposite, of cultivating different values in comparison with his adversaries.

(c) Apart from the Sis situated in the paradigm of desire and epistemic judgment, one could identify in the parliamentary debates situations where the speakers motivate their interventions and present themselves as individual politicians in an explicit manner. The following examples are representative for this category:

(7) Valer Marian: Avand in vedere gravele §i numeroasele abuzuri procesuale, precum $i presupusele acte de coruptie si de deturnare de fonduri semnalate, am decis **sa** sesizez, prin prezenta declarafie politica, Comisia pentru cercetarea abuzurilor, combaterea corupjiei si petifii din Senatul Romaniei, pentru a efectua o ancheta parlamentara cu privire la

acestea. *Demersul meu nu are drept scop esenjial si primordial apdrarea unui om, in spefd a unui coleg parlamentar, ci apdrarea ordinii de drept si apdrarea onoarei si reputafiei puterii legiuitoare si ale puterii judiciare.* (April 28, 2010, Senate)

Valer Marian: Taking into consideration the serious and numerous procedural abuses, as well as the alleged acts of corruption and defalcation of funds, I decided to inform, by the present political statement, the Commission for abuse investigation, the combat of corruption and petitions in the Senate of Romania to conduct a parliamentary inquiry. *My approach does not have the essential and foremost aim to defend a person, namely a parliamentary colleague, but to defend the order and the honour and reputation of the judicial and legislative powers.*

The MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is represented by *my approach has the essential and foremost aim NOT [to defend a person, namely a parliamentary colleague] BUT [to defend the order and the honour and reputation of the judicial and legislative powers].* The representation found in the domain of the negative operator highlights possible thoughts attributed by the speaker to the audience. Therefore, the (X) segment has an anticipatory function, representing the speaker's intention to disclaim a possible accusation. It generates a reversed reasoning: *it is incorrect to believe that I defend an MP colleague.* Unlike the previous examples, where the (X) segment brings forward a representation that characterizes the opponents, in this situation the rejection concerns the representation of how the speaker believes others may see him.

The (X') segment, on the other hand, indicates the alternative the speaker wants to suggest by resorting to moral rights and social values. The situation presented in this example is very interesting, as the SI is fostered directly. The speaker expresses his position and opinions regarding the mentioned political events and implicitly conveys the negative portrait of the political opponents by implicating the idea that they embody the exact opposite image.

In TV political debates, the politicians also choose to describe themselves:

(8) Crin Antonescu: *Nu sunt un expert; sunt un om care am niste informa(ii publice, nu* specw/e-astea le au altii. Eu vorbesc de... (October 22, 2010, Nasul)

Crin Antonescu: *I am not an expert; I am a man who has some public information, not special information-others* have these (pieces of information). I am talking about...

What has drawn our attention about this example is the fact that there are two MetNegs, a main structure and another one embedded in the

correction segment. The main structure is "A is [Not (X) {but} (X')]", while the second is (X'): [(Y) not (Y')].

This example highlights a new type of structure, with a distinct role. There is a type of description activated by the verb *to be,* i.e. a static description. The difference is that it refers to the politician's person and not to his actions. The intention is, in this case, to reject a compliment in the attempt to create a neutral image, by adopting a modest attitude. The representations presented are public, because the politician rejects **a** previous statement, made by the host of the debate.

At first sight, the speaker tries to create an objective image of himself, he apparently identifies with a politician, a man with ordinary skills and abilities. Yet, at a closer look, the example presents the opponents under **a** sharp attack, the use of the descriptive commentary "others have these (pieces of information)", making this aspect explicit. Based on the shared background knowledge about the existing political situation, the speaker virulently attacks Traian Basescu, the President of the country, who controls the secret services.

It is the same pattern of fostering the politician's SI: indirect and implicit accusation, followed by his isolation and dissociation from these kinds of activities. The speaker tries to foster his image by implementing the idea of being different, of promoting a constructive political agenda.

In the following example, the speaker uses the first person singular, and explicitly justifies his position:

(9) Marius Petre Nicoara: Va rog sa nu-mi luati in nume de rau decizia de a nu mai crede nimic din ceea ce mi se comunica din partea Guvernului. *Nu spun asta pentru ca reprezint un partid de opozifie, ci pentru ca de prea multe ori am primit dovada faptului ca nu se cautd cu adevarat solufii.*
(April 12, 2010, Senate)
Marius Petre Nicoara: Please do not be offended by my decision of not believing anything of what I am being communicated by the Government. *I do not say this because I represent an opposition party, but because I received the proof that solutions are not really looked for too many times.*

The speaker tries to depart from the fact of being a member of a certain political party and creates the impression that he is talking as a person who only wants what is best for the country.

If the representations used in the previous examples describe past actions, in this example the representations are used anticipatorily. The MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is represented by / *say this NOT [because I represent a party from the opposition] BUT [because I received the proof that solutions are not really looked for too many times]*. Although the accent seems to be put on the reasons of the speaker's statement, one can

notice that the representation found in the scope of the negative operator points out potential thoughts attributed to the audience. If the rejection segment is used to eliminate the possibility of a future accusation or to avoid misunderstanding, the (X') segment represents a description of the speaker found in the situation of being lied to and deceived. Although it is only the speaker's opinion, the message is marked by certainty. In this situation, the dichotomy "they vs. we/I" is left implicit.

The new conceptual representation implies that the speaker is different, by having a constructive agenda, as opposed to the rest of the politicians. This structure plays a very important role in the process of persuasion, strongly influencing the cognitive environment of the audience. The politician does not attack the opponents directly, but he lets the audience infer it. He implies that the things have to change, that the situation has reached a climactic point.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have tried to outline the contribution of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] in shaping the politicians' SI in parliamentary and TV political debates. We started from the premise that SI is a discursive construal that allows the speaker to express his/her views as an individual politician, dissociated from his party. Particular attention has been paid to the manner in which the MP presents himself/herself by means of the mental configuration and discursive organization of the MetNeg [not (X) but (X')]. We suggested that the NS is a dual strategy that brings forward the manner the others see the politician and the way he/she sees himself/herself or believes he/she should be thought of by the audience.

Although there are not many instances of MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] configuring the politicians' SI in our corpus of data, we can draw interesting conclusions. The first concerns exactly the reduced number of examples in both parliamentary debates and TV political debates. The discourses are concentrated on the opponents' image and especially on destroying the government and the President's credibility. The politicians' interventions are not focused on a constructive discourse, but rather on a destructive one. Moreover, all their replies and interventions include sharp and virulent attacks and accusations against the political opponents. These aspects are revealed by means of a relevance theoretic re-analysis that puts emphasis on the speaker's communicative intention, the inferential path the hearer is undergoing, and the effects generated in the communicative context.

MetNeg [not (X) but (X')] is an efficient strategy in configuring the politicians' SI due to its mental configuration and discursive organization. The duality of the segments allows the speaker to present himself/herself in opposition to his/her political opponents. Our findings pointed out that the (X) segment is used either to indicate how the opponents are described (and therefore the speaker rejects a representation of how he is not) or to reject a representation of how the speaker believes others see him. In contrast, the (X') is used to reinforce the speaker's SI.

The politicians' SI is permanently configured through a continuous antithetic reference to the others, to their actions, characteristics and attitudes. Therefore, there is a "dichotomized consistency" in terms of the image conveyed: the politician fosters an SI in terms of distinctiveness, of being different, but differently "good", of being the only solution for a damaged political system. We consider the meaning of the utterance is generated on spot, as a result of the interaction between linguistic information, semantic content and pragmatic intention.

We have identified more types of SI which are in direct correspondence with the format of the political debate. The SI situated in the paradigm of volition is prevalent in TV political debates, where the speakers represent themselves as individual politicians who act on behalf of the citizens. The format of this type of political debate allows them to express their opinions more freely. Sometimes, they present themselves as being personally involved, to create the impression of being close to the audience.

In contrast, in parliamentary debates, the MPs act and react on behalf of their party. As a consequence, a personal SI situated in the paradigm of volition is almost inexistent.

The second category is represented by SI situated in the paradigm of epistemic judgment, marked by the verb *to think*. We could identify this type of SI in both parliamentary and TV political debates. It is used to reflect the speaker's belief and to indicate his/her commitment to the truth of the communicated assumption. In comparison to the use of the verb *to think* in parliamentary debates, where it clearly dissociates the MP from the members of his party, in TV political debates it is preponderant in the (X') segment, meant to reinforce the speaker's position. One aspect has particularly drawn our attention, i.e. the reiteration of the verb *to think* in the (X') segment, indicating the fact that the MP explicitly and purposely emphasizes his/her opinion. Moreover, the epistemic judgment is contrasted with different paradigms used in the (X) segment, in order to clearly delimit between different politicians, colleagues or adversaries.

The third type of SI is represented by the instances where the speakers explicitly represent themselves as individual politicians. In this situation, there is no apparent connection between the fostered SI and the format of the debate. In both parliamentary and TV political debates, the speakers create a contrastive image of themselves, dissociating from the rest of the political class.

Notes

[1] In our PhD. thesis (Albu 2012), we propose two working hypotheses regarding the action the negative operator has on the material found in its scope, according to which descriptive negation (DN) is the actualization of descriptive use (DU), and metarepresentational negation (MetNeg) is the actualization of metarepresentational use, respectively. Unlike DN, MetNeg represents a second order interpretation, i.e. a higher order representation with a lower order representation embedded in it (Wilson 2000,411).

[2] We have collected the transcripts of the debates from the website of the Romanian Parliament: http://www.parlament.ro/index_en.html

[3] We have collected the debates from the political parties' websites and politicians' personal websites: www.psd.ro/transcripte.php and www.crinantonescu.ro/Public/cat/14/Noutati.html.

[4] We have kept the word order in the original material and we have expressed some linguistic elements and omitted others in accordance with the Romanian grammatical rules and patterns.
Our approach is based on the 'argumentative theory of reasoning' (Mercier and Sperber 2011), according to which reasoning contributes to the effectiveness and reliability of communication, by allowing communicators to argue for their claim and by allowing addressees to assess these arguments. From this point of view, the accent is not placed on the dichotomy sound argumentation vs. fallacious argumentation, but rather on persuasion and the process of opinion building.

[6] The information was collected from the website of the Romanian Parliament: www.parlament.ro/index_en.html

[7] Romanian has developed different linguistic expressions to mark the procedures encoded by the English *but:* Rom. *ci,* standing for the corrective Engl, *but,,* Rom. *dar,* standing for the Engl. *but₂* expressing the denial of expectations, and Rom. *iar,* marking the thematic contrast, standing for Engl. *but₃* (Zafiu 2005).

[8] We have identified three discursive patterns for the [rejection + correction] class of MetNeg. The first one is represented by the structure [not (X) but (X')], in which both elements of the correlative pair are explicitly expressed. The second pattern, and the richest in our corpus, is represented by [not (X) {but} (X')], where the *but* marker is omitted because of syntactic constraints. The third pattern is configured differently, the order of segments being reversed: [(X') not (X)].

[9] This MetNeg is preceded by another MetNeg in the same line, displaying a more complex discursive pattern: *It is not of present interest to share these things among us. Now of present interest is what project for reforming PNL is chosen by the*

Congress. With whom and why. This is my topic. Not how we place ourselves in a \ *certain imaginary position.* Unlike the first negative structure, this sequence aims l directly at the propositional content, the glossing formula being: *it is of current! interest [not (X) but (X')].* The rejection segment is repeated at the end of the*f structure, in order to emphasise the idea which is being conveyed. The discursive I organisation has a strong argumentative force and a powerful emotional impact, as \ the speaker stresses the negative aspects of the political system. He tries to; dissociate from everything that is bad, by suggesting a constructive agenda.

¹⁰ This example is illustrative for the two procedures encoded by the Eng. *but.* The first occurrence is represented by the contrastive *but,* while the second, by the corrective *but.*

¹¹ See Simon-Vandenbergen (2000), for a detailed account of the functions of/ *think.*

References

Albu, Elena. 2012. *The Pragmatics of Negative Structures in Political Discourse. A Relevance Theoretic Approach,* PhD dissertation.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour.* New York: Pantheon.

Hooper, J.B. 1975. "On assertive predicates." In *Syntax and Semantics,* edited by J.P. Kimball, 91-124. New York: Academic Press.

Ilie, Cornelia. 2003. "Histrionic and agonistic features of parliamentary discourse." *Studies in Communication Sciences* 3 (1): 25-53.

—. 2006. "Parliamentary discourses." In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics,* edited by Keith Brown, 188-196. Oxford: Elsevier.

—. 2010. "Identity co-construction in parliamentary discursive practices." In *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices,* edited by Cornelia Ilie, 57-78. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Liliana. 2006. "Prezentarea si negocierea identitafii in dezbaterea electorala", In *Limba romdnd-aspecte sincronice si diacronice,* edited by Gabriela Pana Dindelegan, 349-353. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Jucker, Andreas H. 1986. *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mercier, Hugo, and Dan Sperber. 2011. "Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 34: 57-111.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie. 2000. "The functions of / *think* in political discourse." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10 (1): 41-63.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2007. "Theories of identity and the analysis of face." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (4): 639-656.

Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Urmson, J.O.I952. "Parenthetical verbs." *MindLXl:* 480-496.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2010. "Political identities in parliamentary debates." In *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices,* edited by Cornelia Ilie, 29-56. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wilson, Deirdre. 2000. "Metarepresentation in linguistic communication." In *Metarepresentations: A Multidisciplinary Perspective,* edited by Dan Sperber, 411-448. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Deirdre, and Dan Sperber. 2002. "Relevance theory," *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 14: 249-287.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2005. "Conjunctiile adversative in limba romana: tipologie si niveluri de incidenta." In *Limba romana—structura si funcfionare,* edited by Gabriela Pan& Dindelegan, 243-258. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

PART IV

TRADITION AND MODERNITY
IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY
DISCOURSE

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE HISTORICITY OF DEMOCRACY

LILIANA IONESCU-RUXANDOIU

1. Introduction

1.1. Preliminary Remarks

This paper examines the way of understanding one of the concepts organically connected with the existence and activity of the parliament, namely, *democracy*. It takes as its starting point P. Chilton's (2004, 48) remark that:

> "The meaning of the word *democracy* is not waiting to be discovered in some objective realm; it is in the mind, or rather the interacting minds, of people in particular times and places".

Accordingly, we chose a corpus including speeches of four important members of the Romanian Parliament, from the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century[1]. The four MPs represent different political parties or factions: P.P. Carp was an emblematic personality of the Conservative Party (founded in 1880), Take Ionescu-the leader of an important faction of the same party, I.C. Bratianu-the leader of the Liberal Party (founded in 1875), and Armand Calinescu-a prominent member of the National-Peasant Party.

We intend to prove that, even if *democracy* is considered a typical "long in use" concept (Koselleck 2009[2006], 58-64; Richter 1990, 46), its understanding is quite variable. It depends on the parameters mentioned by Chilton: time (including the previous, as well as the ongoing events in a given area) and place (including the specific aspects of the history and culture of a certain country), but also on the political affiliation of the speakers (in relation to their audience and the power distribution).

1.2. Theoretical Background

Our theoretical and methodological approach is basically interdisciplinary, j It combines elements from two main sources: (a) the modern views about writing history by reconstructing the evolution of the political language, **as** actualized in the texts from a certain epoch (the German School **of** Reinhart Koselleck, Rolf Reichardt, Eberhard Schmidt *et ah,* and the **so-**called Cambridge School of John G. A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner) and (b) linguistic semantics and discourse analysis (a source that has already been taken into account by the above mentioned historians). Melvin Richter (1990, 67-68) maintained that, despite the differences between **the;** above-mentioned schools, "there are no major obstacles" to bringing! together their modes of approaching political language by historical| methods. They share a special kind of contextualism, trying to recover **the** meanings given to different concepts by those who produce the discourse \ in particular circumstances, and not to interpret them from the perspective **j** of the modern specialist.   \

Q. Skinner *(apud* Richter 1990, 64) claimed that understanding **a]** concept involves grasping the meanings of the terms expressing it, on **the** j one hand, and grasping the range of things that can be done with it, on **the*** other hand. This view roughly corresponds to the distinction between **the** i system and the use meanings made by the linguists. In the classic tradition, of the continental semantics and hermeneutics, R. Koselleck was mainly; concerned with the first group of problems, i.e. system meanings, whereas \ J. Pocock and Q. Skinner were more interested in use, as they **were** I influenced by the more modern philosophy of ordinary language. There **is ;** a certain complementarity of these two types of approaches: the first \ enables us to determine the inherent semantic core of a concept that makes; the communication possible; the second, connected with linguistic action . (i.e. with speaker's intentions and anticipated effects on the receivers),! takes into account the fact that identical denotata of certain words do not j necessarily involve identity of meanings. This is crucial for the political *i* communication, where ideology strongly influences the signifying] processes, changing the balance between the semantic components within] the definition of a concept. J. Pocock speaks of "the recurrent use of **the]** same words in similar though modified senses" *(apud* Richter 1990, 57) **as j** an important aspect delimiting what he calls paradigms or discourses,] sometimes even within the same text.   I

If we consider the diachronic perspective, we can notice that **the|** changes produced in the meaning of a certain concept, as well as in **its|** evaluation are the result of a dispute between different social and political] groups endorsing different ideologies.

In the following, we shall start with an analysis of the concept of democracy at the system level, trying to identify some local attempts at defining it, and an inventory of opposite, as well as of associated concepts. After that, we shall comment on the differences at the discourse level, i.e. on the differences in the use and understanding of the concept under consideration, trying to suggest an explanation of these differences and to find out the parameters influencing the variations in meaning.

1.3. Remarks on the Modernization Processes in Romania

As Reinhard Bendix (1967, 292) puts it, modernity and democracy are usually associated, as incompatible with the ideas of hereditary privileges and established authority, that is with the representation of a social hierarchy based on inherited positions.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the image of the Romanian society was, in all respects, typical of the Eastern Europe. It was the image of a dual society, vacillating between the traditional forms of the private life and the forms of a new social and political order. That society was characterized qualitatively by the deep gap and quantitatively by the disproportion between the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, the townsmen and the villagers (Bendix 1967, 333). Modernization involved a specific combination between the intrinsic changes produced as a result of a normal social evolution and the changes induced by the influence of West-European models *(ibidem,* 326).

In this growing process, the educated minority, representing, at the same time, the social, professional and political elites (Marton 2009, 44), played a major role (see also Bendix 1967, 327). Two well-known theories in the Romanian culture could be invoked in connection with the modernization process. One is the theory of "the forms without substance", elaborated in the second half of the nineteenth century by Titu Maiorescu, a great personality of the Romanian culture and, at the same time, an important conservative politician. He maintained that modern Romania was not the result of a normal progress of the society, based on a genuine development at all the levels of its structure, but the mere result of the imitation of the West-European societies at the formal level solely. It was the duty of the educated persons to help restoring the balance in favour of the "substance", helping people to choose what was really appropriate to the Romanian society.

The other theory, called the "theory of the synchronization with the West", was elaborated in the third decade of the twentieth century by a well-known aesthetician and writer, Eugen Lovinescu. In his opinion, the

countries whose modern development started quite late, given the historical conditions (Romania included), were not supposed to follow the evolution of the advanced countries. The synchronism of modern life necessarily imposes the forms of social and cultural life typical of the advanced countries. Accordingly, the evolution from the form towards the acquisition of the substance appears as normal.

Identifying the "reference society" (Bendix 1967, 334) in the advanced European countries, the intellectual elites tried to find adoptable "shortcuts to modernity" *(ibidem,* 332), i.e. functional equivalents or substitutes for a great number of elements. The solutions were not always appropriate to the local conditions, and the parliamentary debates reflect the difficulties and shortages that appear when skipping stages in the normal evolution of a society. One can also mention the inertness of the masses of people (in our case, the overwhelming majority of peasants), very conservative and loyal to the old social order. Yet, all these aspects are typical of the so-called "follower societies" *(ibidem,* 330).

Our analysis will try to bring forward some controversial aspects connected with this process of updating a traditional kind of society and, more specifically, of transforming ordinary people into citizens.

2. The Concept of Democracy

2.1. In the System

(a) *Definitions*

Each of the four MPs referred to in the beginning of this paper proposes a definition of the concept when discussing different issues. In a speech from 1881, I.C. Bratianu gives a new interpretation to the well-known Aristotelian triad: democracy, aristocracy, monarchy, considering democracy "a modern creation" and evaluating it as "superior to the aristocracy to whom it succeeds" (ICB: 250). The same opposition (democracy/aristocracy) is implicit in P.P. Carp's definition (1909):

Ce in{elegem noi prin democratic? […] prin democratic intelegem ca fiecare sa-si aiba locul lui in aceasta {ara, care il merits prin munca lui (PPC, 566).
What do we mean by democracy? […] by democracy we mean that everyone should have his place in this country, to which he is entitled by his work.

The speaker adds:

Daca el este fiu de boier sau este fiu de taran, nici fiul de boier, nici fiul de taran nu trebuie sa g&seasca loc daca nu munceste si daca nu serveste acestei tari (PPC, 567)
No matter if he is the son of a landlord or of a peasant, neither the son of a landlord, nor the son of a peasant should find a place unless he works or serves his country,

rejecting the possibility of hereditary privileges. One can also notice an indirect reference to the people's condition of citizens displaying a sense of their duties towards the community.

Other two definitions take into consideration a different aspect: the relationship between the government bodies and the ordinary people. In 1887, Take Ionescu (145) maintained that the new school of democracy has as its slogan the necessity to use the whole state power in order to improve the condition of a social class (he was referring to the peasants). In his view, citizens were given a passive role in the social life, making decisions being the exclusive prerogative of the official institutions. Several decades later, in 1931, the evolution of the Romanian society accredited a different idea: that of the representativity of the state bodies, assigning the citizens a different role. Pleading for some changes in the administration law, A. Calinescu said that democracy should offer the citizens the possibility to solve their local problems through the agency of power bodies elected by universal suffrage (AC, 142). The universal suffrage (still, restricted to men) introduced after the First World War, as well as the economic progress and a more active process of urbanization had an important impact on the general mentality. Besides the free expression of the voters' options, some of the procedures, as for example the deliberations within the elected local councils, gave the people a certain sense of power to decide about some important issues. A. Calinescu alludes to these facts, insisting on the idea that the state should equally represent the citizens (AC, 64) and that the nation should be freely consulted whenever necessary (AC, 30).

(b) *Opposite concepts*

As mentioned above, when discussing P.P. Carp's definition, *democracy* is implicitly opposed to the previous *aristocratic regime,* as an egalitarian system vs. a system based on class privileges.

In T. Ionescu's opinion, democracy is irreversible in Romania. Attacking the liberals, he says:

Trista idee [...] ca sa credett' ca tara aceasta este in stare sa se intoarca la
privilegii (TI, 144).

You have very little trust in *democracy* if you believe that someone is still
able to display his *aristocracy;*

It is a sad idea believing that this country is able to go back to privileges.

I. Bratianu maintains that any reference to "classes", the expression
"the governing classes" included,

nu este o reminiscenta a societajii *democratice,* ci a societatii aristocratice
(ICB, 252).

is not a reminiscence of the *democratic* society, but of the *aristocratic*
society.

Democrats are opposed to *reactionaries* (TI, 146), that is the
retrograde politicians, connected with the old regime.

With regard to the governing practices, democracy is opposed to the
"authoritarian tyranny" (TI, 231) or, in a more modern formula, to "the
regime of authority" or "of illegality" (AC, 171), based on abusive acts,
infringing the law and violating the already acquired civil rights (AC,
166).

(c) *Associated concepts*

A number of concepts are constantly associated with democracy in
different contexts, without being hyponyms proper of that hyperonym.
They designate some basic elements that function as signals of democracy.
Semantically, they are connected with several ideas: law and legality,
public institutions and authorities, and the condition of citizen, including
rights, freedoms and responsibilities.

Observing the laws is opposed to abuses, misuse of authority or
arbitrariness, which should be prevented in a democratic society. Large
references are made to the *Constitution,* whose role is explicitly defined by
I.C. Bratianu:

A garanta libertatea si demnitatea cetateanului, ca acesta s5 nu poata fi
strivit sub puterea unui singur om (ICB, 417).
To guarantee the liberty and dignity of the citizen, so that he would not be
crushed under the power of a single person.

The functioning of the constitutional mechanism secures the normal
alternative access to power of different parties (ICB, 425).

For the MPs, a constitutional regime is a parliamentary or a
representative regime (ICB, 285; AC, 37). The *Parliament* and other
institutions, the public authority are also invoked as important factors in

the functioning of democracy. I.C. Bratianu calls the Parliament "the
headquarters of the nation" (ICB, 49). The MPs should not simply
represent the nation, but understand its will and give the country useful
freedoms (ICB, 215).

The public, individual or *constitutional rights* of the citizens are
considered one of the most important achievements of the modern
Romanian society. As P.P. Carp puts it in 1884: "they were unknown in
Romania" before, but as stated by Thiers, whom he quotes, they are
"necessary to modern societies" (PPC, 183-184). In 1936, A. Calinescu
protested against the prolongation of the state of siege that affected
citizens' rights, expressing his concern that the evolution of the country
would be accordingly deviated from its normal (i.e. democratic) course
(AC, 339).

Quite often, speakers enumerate different public freedoms: freedom of
press, of assembly, etc., mentioning their recent character:

intr-o {ara ca a noastrS, unde libert5{ile sunt inca proaspete [...] (TI, 268)
In a country like ours, where the freedoms are still fresh [...]

said T. Ionescu in 1888. Yet, reference is also made to the more abstract
and general term *liberty:*

Ce este libertatea, domnilor? Este ea oare facultatea absolute de a face ce
voim? (PPC, 161)
What is liberty, gentlemen? Is it really the absolute faculty of doing
whatever we want?

asks P.P. Carp, providing himself a negative answer to these questions. In
his understanding, it is closely connected with a democratic attitude, since
the people in power should not benefit of an absolute liberty that can be
detrimental to the ordinary people (PPC, 161, 168). Similar views
expresses I.C. Bratianu, who-as mentioned before-assigns Constitution
the supreme role of protecting citizens' liberty and preventing the abuses
of the persons in power (ICB, 417).

The citizens should not content themselves with the rights given by the
Constitution, they should also exercise these rights. Speeches make
reference to the country or the people's will. MPs are responsible for their
deeds in front of the people, who have the final decision about bringing or
keeping them into power (PPC, 337-338; AC, 216).

The *public opinion* is an important factor both in the selection and the
evaluation of the people's representatives. It was first mentioned towards
the end of the nineteenth century (see, for example, P.P. Carp (1890),

Wᵒⁱ.Hˢ.wᴳ', 2 ᵐ ʰ * ᴾ ᶜ 2 ³³?)' ᵇ ᵘ ᵗ ᵇ ᵉ ᶜ ᵃ ᵐ ᵉ 1 ᵘ ⁱ ᵗ ᵉ   ᶠʳᵉ≤^   after the First
World War'(for example, in A. Calinescu's speeches).

2.2. In the Discourse

Despite the impression of a certain semantic homogeneity at the level of the conceptual system, there are important differences at the level of its use.

In the parliamentary speeches, the reference to democracy and the associated concepts becomes an important means of criticizing the political adversaries (that is an important means in the political fight) and, at the same time, an important means of influencing and controlling the public opinion.

The fact that the liberal and the conservative leaders define democracy in a quite similar way does not necessarily mean that they share the same views on that matter. Within the discourses they belong to, the definitions are not important *per se,* but as basic components of specific argumentative sequences. They provide the audience with contextualized explanations and clarifications, supporting conflicting standpoints (Hie 2007, 669).

As many conservative leaders, P.P. Carp represents the big landowners, more closely connected to the traditional social structures. He openly declares his adherence to the liberal Constitution, but advocates a different social organization (PPC, 95), of a rather paternalistic type, as brought forward in the following statement:

Eu admit instinctul la o na^iune, admit ca ea sa simta ca e un rau, precum fiecare om cand e bolnav simte ca-1 doare; dar nu admit ca bolnavul sa zica el: iata doctoria ce trebuie sa mi-o dea doctorul. Exista un rau in {ara [...]: atata e dator curentul sa ne arate; iar mijloacele suntem noi datori sa le aratam (PPC, 98).

I admit the existence of an instinct of a nation; I agree that it feels when something goes wrong, just like each person, when sick, feels that it hurts; but I don't allow the sick person to say: this is the medicine the doctor should give me. There is something wrong in the country [...] that is all the general spirit in the country ought to show us; yet, to show the means is our obligation.

Cultural elites should obey people's will only after coming to the conclusion that this will is not divergent from the right way. In this case, they should tell the people:

Nu merg dupa tine; tu ai facultatea de a simti raul, leacul ramane la mine sa-l indie, iar datoria ta este sS-l urmezi (PPC, 98).
I don't follow you; you have the faculty to feel the sickness, I shall indicate the cure and your duty is to follow it.

These statements open a way to a strong criticism of the liberal government, which is accused of having surrendered to the group protests taken as an expression of the "people's voice". This type of governing practices is declared unconstitutional by the conservatives (PPC, 445).

At the same time, Carp deplores the fact that, in Romania, democratization was realized from above, and considers that, "opening all gates", gave free way to personal ambitions (PPC, 128), allowing the access to power of certain people who used influence, protection and personal favours, instead of earning it by their own merits and education. This is also a means of attacking the liberals who were in power for a long time.

In a polemic answer, I.C. Bratianu does not consider the unorthodox access to power (criticized by P.P. Carp) as typical of the modern (i.e. democratic) society; in his opinion, it represents the remains of the past, implicating that these practices were not alien to the conservative groups. Bratianu distinguishes between the old Romanian aristocracy, closely connected-by feelings and interests-to ordinary people, and the new aristocracy of the Phanariot times, who ruined the true aristocrats (ICB: 250). Nevertheless, he considers that even if the aristocracy disappeared, there was still a reactionary party that wanted to live ignoring people's will, but taking advantage of the people (ICB, 35), alluding to Carp's conservative doctrine about the people's will.

Even if he speaks of the citizens' rights and freedoms, Bratianu maintains that liberty, like morality, is created by humans and, in certain conditions, it can be restricted. At the same time, unlike many politicians, including some from his own party, who considered that rural population was not prepared to exercise the civil rights, he considers that this exercise has been established since the time when ordinary people fought to preserve their national identity (ICB: 32).

3. Concluding Remarks

The previous analysis revealed the existence of a quite well-structured system of concepts gravitating around the concept of democracy, from the very beginning of the parliamentary life in Romania. This is not a sign of political maturity, since the new political and social structures were fundamentally different from the old ones, but a sign of what R. Koselleck

called "Verzeitlichung" *(apud* Richter 1990, 46): openness towards the insertion of modern political and social concepts. This is due to the elites, directly involved in the revolutionary changes that started in 1848, continued with the unification of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1859, and ended with the creation of the Parliament and the vote in favour of the liberal Constitution from 1866. These elites had an immediate contact with the political and social life in Western Europe.

If we take into account R. Koselleck's description (2009 [2006], 77-79) of the temporal evolution of concepts, one can notice that what is specific to Romania is a rather rapid dissemination of the new concepts (and of the associated vocabulary), in Koselleck's terms the democratization of their use. The concepts *(democracy* included) were quite soon incorporated in specific ideologies (basically liberal and conservative) and politicized. Their meanings were rather differently used and sometimes exploited, shaping a specific territory for parliamentary disputes.

Notes

[1] Romanian Parliament was created in 1866 and had a bicameral structure (the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate). It ceased its true functioning in 1938, when King Charles (Carol) II settled down a regime of personal authority. During the Second World War, Romania had a military dictatorship. In the communist epoch, the one Chamber parliament (the so-called Great National Assembly) had a mere formal existence, the ruling authority being the Romanian Communist Party. The bicameral parliament restarted fulfilling its tasks after the democratic elections from 1990.

Corpus

Bratianu, Ion C. 1930-1943. *Acte si cuvdntdri,* vol I, VII, VIII. Bucuresti: Cartea Romaneasca [ICB].

Carp, Petre P. 2000. *Discursuri parlamentare.* Bucuresti: Grai si Suflet. Cultura Nationals [PPC].

Calinescu, Armand. 1993. *Discursuri parlamentare.* Bucuresti: Quadrimpex [AC].

Ionescu, Take. 1897. *Discursuripolitice.\~o\.* 1-4. Bucuresti: Socecu [TI].

References

Bendix, Reinhard. 1967. "Tradition and modernity reconsidered." In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (3): 192-346.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice.* London and New York: Routledge.

Ilie, Cornelia. 2007. "Argument refutation through definitions and re-definitions." In *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation,* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren, J. Anthony Blair, Charles A. Willard, and Bart Garssen, 667-674. Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 2009 [2006]. *Conceptele si istoriile lor. Semantica si pragmatica limbajului social-politic.* Bucuresti: Art.

Marton, Silvia. 2009. *La construction politique de la nation. La nation dans les debats du Parlement de la Roumanie (1866-1871).* Iasi: Institutul European.

Richter, Melvin. 1990. "Reconstructing the history of political languages: Pocock, Skinner, and the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe." *History and Theory* 29 (1): 38-70.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

CONSTRUCTING THE PARLIAMENTARY IDENTITY:
THE ROMANIAN CASE (1866-1923)

ANDRA VASILESCU

The study investigates the projection of self in the discourses of the members of the Romanian Parliament between 1866 and 1923. The corpus analysis reveals the major features of the parliamentary identity the speakers co-constructed through discourse. The period under scrutiny represented the emergence of the modern Parliament in Romania, when speeches had a constitutive function. The portrait of the Romanian parliamentarian of the moment goes beyond historical interest to identify the features of the contemporary national parliamentary discourse rooted in the period under investigation, some of them preserved up to the present.

1. Theoretical Background: The Parliamentary Identity

A large number of studies have focused on the multifaceted and dynamic concept of identity from various theoretical perspectives (for a synthesis, see Du Gay, Evans, and Redman 2000; Simon 2004; Benwell and Stokoe 2006; De Fina, Schiffrin, and Bamberg 2006; Spencer-Oatey 2007). The plural, i.e. *identities,* rather than the singular, better reflects the complexity of the concept, and an integrative framework would better accommodate the multitude of aspects involved in the concept of identity (Vasilescu 2011). Van Dijk (2010, 30) considers that identities

> "need to be studied both in cognitive terms, e.g., as specific types of mental representations, as well as in social, political or cultural terms, that is, as properties of groups and communities that enable and control social practices, interaction and discourse".

A special interest has been shown in the political identity (Chilton and Schaffher **2002),** which can be viewed as a special subtype of the social identity from which it differs in point of ideological anchoring, social power, control and decision making processes, competitive attitudes, legitimization, and opposition activities (Van Dijk **2010, 30–41).** Although many studies on the political identity refer to the parliamentary identity, few of them investigated in depth this special type of professional identity (Van Dijk **2010, 37;** Hie **2010, 57-78).**

The parliamentary identity is contextual and transitory in nature, i.e. shaped by a temporal socio-political context, and is formed at the crossroads of several pre-existing identities: the national identity, the institutional identity, the professional identity, and the personal identity (Vasilescu **2011).** For the purpose of the present study, I define the national identity in terms of Hofstede's dimensions of cultural variation, i.e collectivism vs. individualism, femininity vs. masculinity, high vs. low uncertainty reduction, power distance (Hofstede **2001);** the institutional identity, as a set of rules that underlie the discursive contract of the actors in an "institution of speech", performing a deliberative discourse, which legitimates them as parliamentarians (see also Taylor and Cooren **1997;** Bayley **2004;** Benwell and Stokoe **2006;** Van Leeuwen **2007;** Hie **2010);** the professional identity as the performance in speech of excellence and expertise in a particular field of activity (economy, agriculture, culture, etc.); the personal identity as a set of attributes of personality that orients discourse options and strategies of self-presentation (Taylor and Cooren **1997).**

The case study I propose aims at identifying the basic traits of the Romanian parliamentary identity as it is projected in speeches compiled in a *Corpus¹* of discourses delivered in the Romanian Parliament between **1866** and **1923.**

2. The Historical Background

After the abdication of the Romanian prince Alexandru loan Cuza in **1866,** by the will of the majority of the liberals and the conservatives in the Romanian Legislative Assembly, a member of the European royal families, Charles (Carol) of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, cousin of Napoleon III and a relative of the king of Prusia, was appointed crown-prince of Romania, on May **10, 1866.** The Legislative Assembly became the Constitutive Assembly, which elaborated the modern Constitution of Romania on the model of the Belgian Constitution of **1831.** It was voted on July **1, 1866** and represented the birth certificate of the modern

Parliament of Romania, functioning in accordance with the European parliaments of the time. The first modern Constitution of the United Principality (later Kingdom) of Romania was in force until March **29, 1923,** when a new Constitution was approved following the extension of the national territory into Greater Romania, in **1918.**

3. The Analysis

Assuming discourse as the tool of staging the self (Amossy **2010),** the analysis reveals the following basic features of the Romanian parliamentary identity between **1866** and **1923:** builder of a modern institution, representative and teacher of the people, missionary of the national ideals, member of the cultural elite, representative of group morality, emotionally committed citizen, witty speaker.

3.1. Builder of a Modern Institution

The members of the Romanian Parliament were aware of their historical mission as builders of a modern institution. They often reiterated their pride:

> **Mister president, I am one of the few survivors of those who in 1866 have re-founded this [Parliamentary] tribune destroyed by a** *coup d'etat,* **and thus fulfilled one of the wishes of the ad hoc Assembly, bringing to the young throne of free Romania a foreign dynasty, meant to protect us against our endless ambitions and foolish rivalries. (Carp 1909)**

Loyalty to the Sovereign as a guarantee of modernity and constitutionalism was often voiced, both in personal name and in the name of the Parliament and of the people. Such declarations had an intrinsic factual argumentative function:

> **Gentlemen, the Crown stands by our nation and political parties and, above all of them, it stands as a sacred shield, intangible and inviolable by anyone from inside or outside, a shield of our state sovereignty. (Pella** 1919)

Along with self-pride, speakers voiced their respect to the outstanding personalities who had contributed to the Constitution. In conflictive situations, paying tribute to the predecessors contrasted with a rhetorical minimization of the contemporaries, called "epigones". The actions of the contemporaries were judged on the background of the glorious history of the country:

This tribune and our right to speak the way we do nowadays were erected on the work of past generations, on their sufferings, of those men who were warriors in times of war and diplomats in times of diplomacy, on their sacrifice. We did nothing to gain this right. (Ionescu 1915)

Discourses voiced a sharp sense of duty and responsibility, and a permanent concern for observing constitutional procedures and good practices based on Western European models. Speakers used to make comparisons with the Western Constitutions, to devote time to comment and interpret passages from the Romanian Constitution as compared to the foreign ones, to quote extended excerpts. For a long time, the Parliament has functioned as a school of constitutionalism:

There was a time when we were younger and so were our parliamentary careers, when we used to make comments on the Constitution, and bring volumes, and read to each other opinions of this or that author, of what Benjamin Constant or John Stuart Mill said, of what a German or a French author commented on the Constitution in general, and we strived to apply all that, better or worse, to our Constitution. In time, as we have all got used to our Constitution, we abandoned that practice and we didn't need foreign interpreters anymore, since we have all understood what our fundamental pact is. (Maiorescu 1892)

Commitment to constitutionalism was asserted in the name of the whole group and for the benefit of the people:

I'm telling you that in the name of our Constitution, as a fundamental pact which we all want to observe and to see observed [...]. It is us, not the foreigners, who are in charge of a constitutional reform [...]; the Chamber has worked as it thought it would be good for the nation, as you are all working today. (Maiorescu 1878)

In the idealistic atmosphere of the beginnings, good will was presumed, while group disharmony was criticized:

My opinion is that we should not show a sense of evil and revenge in our constitutional family. Since we are all beginners in constitutionalism, I think that we should treat each other with more indulgence. (Maiorescu 1879)

For argumentative purposes, speakers often backed their speeches with quotations from and references to the Constitution, the full correct knowledge of which was rhetorically invoked:

I have no doubt that the majority of you do know the Constitution of the country, or at least you should very well know the content of article 26 in the Constitution, which says [...]. (Maiorescu 1887)

Investing their speeches with a discourse constitutive function, the parliamentarians negotiated the rules of taking and maintaining the floor, as well as the content of their interventions. Taking the floor was negotiated in terms of constitutional rights, moral obligations, democratic actions and a duty to the public opinion:

I shall show you that I have the courage to speak out the truth. I'm asking the floor. (Kostaki 1879); I know I have the right to speak and ask you [...]. (Maiorescu 1887); I feel I am indebted to the public opinion to take the floor and calm spirits down. (Cristea 1921)

Interpellation is a personal right of a deputy. It is specified in the Constitution. The regulation of the Chamber might change regarding the forms of exercising this right [...], but a regulation could never infringe a principle clearly stated in the Constitution. (Maiorescu 1889)

In point of content, speakers and audience strictly evaluated interventions regarding their relevance as speeches in Parliament, rejecting personal matters, unless related to the personal ethos of the speaker and the topic under debate. This is why extensive parts of the parliamentary speeches had a meta-textual function, focusing on the topic of the speaker's intervention and floor taking procedures. The basic criteria for evaluating the speeches delivered by their colleagues in Parliament were sound reason and correct argumentation, although appeals to emotion and personal ethos generally prevailed in the majority of speeches. Explicit references to the rules of constitutionalism were frequent:

It is natural for a constitutional regime that parties alternate to power; if, unfortunately for you, a party with different views from yours takes the power, that is it, this is the constitutional play. (Maiorescu 1878)

A collectivistic view seemed to prevail over ideological differences. Most often, the representatives of the parties invoked "Romanianism" as a target of their actions; when they asserted ideological differences they did so in very abstract and metaphorical terms, which could be reduced to the common denominator of patriotism:

As I was telling you, political parties are not fictions, but they are the practical achievements of the work of time; they are the geological strata made of deposits accumulated in centuries [...]. A conservative party is that party which, beyond the ideals of equality and welfare, primarily

concerning a liberal party, is so committed to the great ideals of the people that it could make the sacrifice of appearing as unpopular (Filipescu 1899); Liberalism might have large bases, but conservatism aims at great ideals. (Filipescu 1905)

Consistency of action and ideological loyalty were desirable values for politicians, who were expected to have principle based behaviour. Nevertheless, political options were rather personal beliefs than ideological convictions, personal idiosyncrasies than total commitment to a political line:

Gentlemen, I declare that the argumentation I tried to develop in front of you is free of any party interests, and exclusively based on general state reasons. (Maiorescu 1873)

You have heard how witty Mr. Delavrancea spoke about sudden changes in political principles. I definitely join him in whipping all those who, as he said, move from one party to another, from one flag to another, and, I shall add, from one journal to another. (Filipescu 1894)

Whether consensual or conflictive in opinions and attitudes, the speakers expressed parliamentary pride as history builders. The word *solemn* was obsessively repeated in speeches:

Gentlemen, we are public persons, the words we utter in Parliament ought to be *solemn,* if we want to be professional and promote an honest policy. (Maiorescu 1879)

The strongest argument in favour of the Constitution was the national unity, which implied a general consensus about the topic under debate:

The Constitution is a guarantee of our will of national unity. (Carp 1879)

3.2. Representatives and Teachers of the People

Parliamentarians assumed a double role: representatives of the nation and tutors of the uneducated people.

On the one hand, the members of the Parliament used to present themselves as defending the simple, oppressed people, voicing their needs and desires:

I am not here to attack you and take your place, but to do my duty in front of those who sent me here. (Bratianu 1870); The electors elected us to be here [...]. I think that whenever **I** speak [in Parliament] I do it for the benefit of my country. (Kogalniceanu 1882)

Pathetic words expressed commitment, empathy and the endeavour to do what is right for the masses. "Good faith" was one of the most often invoked moral values of the parliamentarians, as servants of the nation.

I am convinced that it is for the dignity of any Parliament to believe and assert that any deputy works in good faith as a representative of the whole country [...]; we all contribute to enhance our actions [...] and bring benefits to those we represent here, the people of Romania, who do not care about personal and party disputes. (Maiorescu 1879); [The country] is waiting for its representatives to do their duty as good citizens. (Cristea 1923)

Speakers invoked their origins as proofs of good faith. Being the descendent of an educated family with cultural achievements, as well as the descendent of a simple peasant family, deeply rooted in the Romanian village life, were equal reasons of pride and guarantees of credibility:

Gentlemen, my father was a teacher, and my father's father was a peasant, and I am honoured to tell you that. (Maiorescu 1878)

At the same time, the comparison with the simple citizens was used to emphasize the importance of observing the law and as a proof of modesty. By pleading for modesty in relation to the people, the speakers attributed great achievements to the nation:

We must not monopolize for ourselves the great achievements of the nation; they are the achievements of the nation. (Codrescu 1869); I have always said and I am reasserting it today: an individual, no matter how brilliant or capable he might be, can achieve nothing by himself unless he is supported by the nation. So, gentlemen, be modest! (Bratianu 1869)

Internal conflicts were considered to produce a vicious atmosphere of false accusations and fraud, which affected the "atmosphere in the country". Exaggerations and idealizations of the past were frequent and had a persuasive function:

This is a calumny against this country [...] and it is not right to say that those centuries of glory and misfortune were stained with mourning and shame. (Lahovari 1888)

The members of the Parliament defined their activity as the first historical opportunity to synchronize with Western societies in terms of economic, social and cultural options:

When the public life of the state was introduced from top to bottom and almost all our life forms have been borrowed from the laws of several states of different cultures than ours, when in '48 we burnt the Organic Regulations [...] to fully open to the forms of the Western culture, then all I have to tell this people is: you have to qualify for the elementary rules of this culture, and if you are not able [...] because you are not fully aware of it yet [...], then I, a modern state, have to suspend this right of yours and give it to special judges. (Maiorescu 1874)

Some speeches were long and wordy, which made certain members of the audience urge for "deeds not words":

In order for our word to have the right weight and to be trusted, it had to be backed by facts. (Nistor 1920)

On the other hand, the parliamentarians used to present themselves as the tutors of those who were "illiterate" in democracy and constitutionalism:

For the uneducated strata of the population, if I am allowed to draw this comparison, we are like tutors for infants, and we have to show them the way of public life. This is one of the most generous role of the Chambers, that of not being only the representatives of the country, but also the illuminators of the public life of Romania. (Maiorescu 1879)

Direct communication with the electors was considered to be important:

Gentlemen, Mr. Racota suspects me of not having communicated with my electors. Well, he is wrong. Gentlemen, I was there, I went to Craiova because I was deeply interested in the opinions of my electors, who [...] are not used to such practices. (Bratianu 1870)

3.3. Missionaries of the National Ideals

The Parliament used to be a tribune for voicing the national ideals of political and cultural unity of all Romanians in all the historic provinces. The Latin origin and the Romance language were considered reasons of national pride and a source of determination in pursuing the ideal of Greater Romania:

I said, gentlemen, that we must have a national policy, we are a nation, we are a political state and our policy must be the policy of the nation, that is, all the interests of the Romanians must be satisfied [...] for the benefit of Romania solely and nobody else's. (Bratianu 1870)

We are a Latin people. We are empathetic with all the Latin nations, and with the French nation especially, due to our blood relationships, education, and gratitude. (Bratianu 1870)

There is one thing we are all thinking of: our cultural, scientific, and literary unity; we have a common language, and we want to share our aspirations to civilisation with all those who speak our language. (Maiorescu 1884)

Speakers expressed their pride as descendants of outstanding statesmen in the history of the country. Famous names in the national history were often pronounced for their intrinsic argumentative value.

The national identity came before the political identity of the parliamentarians, whose common purpose was to promote the Romanians' interests. Ideological differences faded out, when faced with the expression of patriotism and the reiteration of national interests:

The Government represents the country abroad, and irrespective of its political colour, it needs full prestige for the benefit of the country, so it did its patriotic duty to leave aside opposition matters [...]. (Maiorescu 1878).

Pathetic words uttered for evoking the national history functioned both as a commitment to right decisions for the benefit of the country, and as ardent appeals to responsible involvement in political actions. Filtered by emotion and national ethos, the argument of the past functioned as a factual argument, beyond rejection:

It has been almost 2000 years since our nation has been living in these fields and on these planes. Bitter centuries, centuries of fight, of sufferings and work have forged and built the ethnic soul of the Romanian people, the unity of its language and traditions. (Vaida 1919)

Points of view which seemed to favour electoral interests instead of national ones were sanctioned:

Today honourable Mr. Lahovary is more concerned with winning people's hearts than with pursuing the great interests of the country. (Bratianu 1869)

The rhetoric of parliamentary solidarity included a minimization of the role of the democratic power play and a sharp contrast between what was presented as mean domestic policy vs. high responsibility for decisions in foreign policy:

What is, for instance, this parliamentary debate on the Notification? Roughly speaking, it is a fight among parties, a contest to access to

governance, a means to enact one's ideas; a competition in front of the public opinion, an exaggeration of the mistakes committed by each side and promises for future actions. It is a fight among a group of people that aims at defeating another group of people from the same country.

What is the meaning of all these things compared to the great events we are taking part in? How mean, insufficient and ineffective all these forms are when intended to accommodate our debates about the most important decisions ever, the Romanian nation has to make in the middle of such events, the full consequences of which cannot be foreseen by any human being. (Ionescu 1915)

Speeches also expressed the frustrations of a nation who had been fighting for centuries to make its voice heard and its will enacted. Speakers presented their mission of foreign policy as one meant to prove the potential of Romania and the Romanians in front of the nations of Europe. There was a sort of national complex which actions and words were trying to heal:

We have to prove that we are a living nation, we have to prove that we are aware of our mission, we have to prove that we are able to make new sacrifices to preserve this country and its rights for our children [...]. (Kogalniceanu 1877)

Gentlemen, the duty of all conscious minds, the duty of all true patriots is to rise above the daily passions of the present and, with a bright vision of our patriotic duty, to contribute to the consolidation of Romania, built with so many sacrifices. (Duca 1922)

A sense of history and self-confidence animated the speakers who proclaimed their historical mission in a glorious moment:

For tens of years, it has never occurred a better moment for us to give our nation the position it deserves to fulfil its [national] ideal. (Cantilli 1916)

3.4. Members of the Elite

The members of the Parliament presented themselves as members of the elite. Expressing parliamentary pride, speakers often invoked the status conferred by the institution itself. Moreover, they enhanced their position as an elite asserting professional merits, expertise, and (political) erudition. Cultural references of various kinds were frequent, being used as proofs of education:

You [parliamentarians] are the flower of Romania (Maiorescu 1875)

This elite is the guarantee of success for a conservative party because it is only with its help that the party can base its politics on the glory of achievements. (Filipescu 1905)

The members of the Parliament overtly expressed their conception regarding the status conferred by the institution:

The position of a deputy is often more favourable in society than the position of an employed. (Bratianu 1869)

Earned status (by expertise in the professional field) and conferred status (by the position in Parliament) were negotiated during intense face-work activities.

3.5. Personal and Group Morality

During the parliamentary debates, the speakers tended to evaluate themselves and each other in point of morality, and, by doing so, to impose personal values to the group, as parliamentary values. The collective ethos co-constructed included, among others:

a prudent, moderate and peaceful [person] (Maiorescu 1884); political honesty, sincerity (Maiorescu 1879); a just and decent person (Maiorescu 1871); to vote frankly and loyally (Maiorescu 1874); generosity (Bratianu 1871); political loyalty (Bratianu 1882); rationality and Romanian feelings (Bratianu 1882); an energetic, determined, cold-blooded [person] (Carp 1879); political correctness (Marghiloman 1885).

Speakers pleaded for morality as the only way to success and rejected immoral political actions:

I have heard of a different kind of policy [...] the *raven's* policy, also called the *hyena's* policy. It is the policy of treating with both parties, to cheat either one or another, to watch without a moral compass, without knowing one's duty or what honesty involves, and after the battle has ended, in a way or another, to go for the final assault and ransack the pockets. Gentlemen, believe me, this kind of policy is shameful for a people who demonstrated so many virtues in its past, and, believe me, it is wrong because it never succeeds. (Ionescu 1915)

A very interesting concept was "the instinct of the people" (Ionescu 1915), used as an appeal to pathos in expressing the ideal of Greater Romania.

Face-work was intense. Speakers expressed a strong need for being acknowledged by their colleagues as honest, competent, well-intended,

sharing the values of the group. They often took the floor for "personal matters", to defend themselves against what they considered to be face threatens:

> I submit to the judgment of the whole Chamber, members of the majority and the minority, too, if, taking into account my position in the political life, the peaceful way in which I try to chair this Chamber, the respect, I think, younger persons owe me, as well as those who are of my age or even older, if I deserve to be addressed this way by Mr. Duca, here present: "You had better listen to that". I deplore that, in this country, political mores can make human nature go wild to such an extent that a man I once stood by, to whom I've been not only fair, but also showed friendship and brotherly love, could now disregard the status of this Assembly to such an extent as to use such words to insult its president. (Prolonged applause). I shall not allow such incivilities [...]. (Applause) (Iorga 1919)

Strategies of positive and negative politeness were exploited rhetorically, while impoliteness strategies expressed disapproval, blame, and strong negative emotions:

> Mister Boerescu has a lot of courage and audacity. I have never taken lessons from anybody before; and now he is coming in front of you, with his refined education, to teach me lessons of decency. (Bratianu 1878)

3.6. Emotionally Involved Citizens

Most often, argumentation went hand in hand with the direct expression of emotion. Some speakers relied on the appeal to reason, but used pathetic words to make their point. Other speakers constantly favoured the appeal to pathos instead of argumentation.

For example, Titu Maiorescu, a literary critic, professor, lawyer, aesthetician, philosopher, essayist, and politician, used to deliver problem oriented speeches, structured on the classical principles of argumentation, which combined features of the deliberative genre with features of the forensic genre. The attempt to an objective stance was backed by breaks of pathetic declarations, calls to reason, decency and honesty. Nicolae Iorga, a Romanian historian, literary critic, playwright, poet, University professor and politician, promoted a self-centred or relationship-centred discourse, highly emotional, abundant in figures of speech and appeals to ethos, placed at the crossroads of the deliberative and epideictic genres (Vasilescu 2010).

Reported thoughts and feelings were often integrated in argumentation. The argumentative nature of identity (Ullah 1990) interfered with what I shall call the emotional nature of identity: criticizing, justifying, arguing, declaring, naming, blaming were supported by representative speech acts of confessing emotions and thoughts, and by positive or negative expressive speech acts.

3.7. Witty Speakers

Speakers carefully tailored their speeches in such a way that to demonstrate verbal wit, which, contextually, was conceived as indirectness, ability to take part in verbal duelling and figurative language.

The preferred strategies of indirectness were allusive language, irony and humour:

> Mr. Ionescu warns us that the curses of our forefathers might reach us for the sin of having paid the debts of our country. I kindly ask Mr. Ionescu, who is in such good terms with the saints and with our forefathers, to pray for us to get rid of this curse. [...] But now it is too late. The curse has reached us. That's it (hilarity). Mr. Ionescu, clap-trap...this is your contribution. (Lahovari 1889)

Fables, anecdotes, personal narratives and narrated dialogues created the context for indirectly expressing a point of view:

> Soon after that, one day, finding myself at the Ministry of Justice, I dropped for a moment in the minister's office, as I was a friend of the late Vulpache, and, as soon as he saw me, he told me: how could you have refused to support me? I answered: I would say you have appointed Rosetti at the Commercial Court because he is a business professional. If you appointed Rosetti at the Commercial Court, in what capacity have you appointed me at the Criminal Court? No doubt, because I was in the defendants' box in Paris, so you appointed me at the Criminal Court of the country as a criminal. (Bratianu 1881)

Dialogues between the speaker and members from the audience were frequent and highlighted opposed attitudes and a conflictive drive. Parliamentarians resorted to verbal duelling as the final assault against their opponents:

> K: Voters elected us to be here. / D: We don't need this remark. / K: Yes, but only you can travel wherever you like without paying. / D: Your time has gone. / K: I admit, your time has come.; K: Junimea still supports me. / G: Not anymore (KogaJniceanu, Dimancea, Gheorghiu 1882)

K: This is refinement... /B: It is not refinement and if it were, I've learned
it from you.../ K: Not from me, since I do not possess such refinement.
(Kogalniceanu, Bratianu 1882)

The figurative language abounded in metaphors, epithets,
personifications, antitheses and comparisons, which were meant both to
enhance the persuasive force of the message and to construct the image of
a talented speaker:

At the dawn of our free life, I see the sun of freedom rising gloriously and
brightly, lightening the darkness of the Hell of sufferings and heating with
the heat of its rays the souls of the Romanians from the four corners, who
are working with ardour to fulfil the aspirations of the nation, to create
Greater Romania. (Cantili 1916)

Speeches combined the formal, solemn style with the informal,
colloquial style, revealing a double orientation: institution orientation and
person orientation:

When I asked our younger colleagues to accept the ad-interim position,
they answered: What am I, parsley, an ingredient that will do for all
dishes? (Bratianu, 1882)

4. Conclusions and Correlations

Fully aware of their historical mission as builders of a modern
institution, the Romanian Parliamentarians (1886-1923) were concerned
with establishing in-group rules as part of their institutional self-
legitimization. Consequently, extended parts of their speeches had a meta-
textual and meta-institutional function. Assuming the role of both
representatives and teachers of the masses, the members of the Parliament
expressed their commitment to deeds that might synchronize Romania
with Western Europe. The common denominator of speeches, irrespective
of the political identity of the speaker, was national pride and the mission
to promote the true image of Romania and Romanians-as descendants of a
noble people-, and to fulfil the aspiration to political, economic, and
cultural unity in a favourable context which must not be missed. The
members of the Romanian Parliament considered themselves the (cultural
and political) elite of the society and invoked both earned and conferred
status during face-work activities. Professional expertise was invoked as
credentials for the parliamentary competencies. Personal values were
generalized as group values, face-work was explicit in speeches, positive
and negative politeness strategies were rhetorically exploited and bald on

record acts of blaming and disapproving expressed strong negative
emotions. Emotional involvement was often voiced, either as breaks in
speeches based on logic or as the structuring principle in speeches based
on the appeal to pathos and/or ethos. Indirectness, verbal duelling,
figurative language and a mix of the formal and informal language were
the surface markers of the parliamentarians' intention to construct their
image of witty and talented speakers.

According to Hofstede, the Romanian culture is collectivistic,
uncertainty avoidant, large power distance, and feminine (http://geert-
hofstede.com/romania.html, accessed July 2012). The indexes for each
dimension might have changed in time, but, as a native Romanian, I
consider that the values of the four parameters have not changed
dramatically. The strategies of indexing the Parliamentary identity in the
period 1866-1923 seem to confirm them. Frequently, speaking as "we",
extending personal values to group values, intense face-work, appeal to
"brotherhood" and collective judgements in conflict situations, politeness
strategies used as in-group/out-group markers, relation orientation rather
than problem orientation are traits typical of collectivistic cultures.
Uncertainty avoidance probably correlates with the direct expression of
negative emotions, of frustration primarily, and with a tendency to show
off in order to heal a cultural complex. Power distance is projected in
forms of address, in asserting a privileged institutional position and in the
speakers' repeated calls for equality and justice for the oppressed people.
A relative balance between masculine values and feminine ones, between
reason and emotions, a conflictive drive and conflict avoidance can be
traced in the speaker's statements.

During the first period of the modern parliamentarianism, cultural
values were probably the strongest ones to shape the discourses, while
speakers' flexibility in adapting to institutional discourse standards, as
imitated from foreign models, largely depended on personal and
professional identity traits.

Between 1866 and 1923, the parliamentary identity was under
construction in an emerging institution where speeches had a constitutive
and legitimizing function. Following foreign models or personal standards,
the presentation of the self aimed at fitting the institutional constraints,
which are being co-constructed by carefully observing the Constitution.
The Constitution was often invoked in matters of procedures and rights;
foreign models were invoked in long quotations, comparisons, narratives
of personal experiences, and reductions to the absurd; meta-stance
discourses (Vasilescu 2010) formed the basis for generalizations regarding
a desirable parliamentary conduct. Speeches seemed to be planned rather

in point of rhetoric than argumentation, and often proved to be a mixture of genuine spontaneity and planned discourse.

In a hierarchy of identities, the national identity ranked first, followed by the professional and the personal identities, which the speakers were trying to harmonize in the parliamentary identity. The performance of identity began as culturally and professionally constrained personal identities and developed into a planned, co-constructed Romanian parliamentary identity. Although having been exposed to various changes and influences over time, some of the identity traits identified in the speeches delivered in the Old Parliament are still vivid in the speeches delivered in the contemporary Parliament.

Notes

[1] The *Corpus,* mss., has been compiled by a group of Romanian researchers (Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Melania Roibu, Ariadna Stefanescu, Oana U{a, Andra Vasilescu), within the frame of the CNCSIS Research Grant 2136/2009-2011.1 have also used the texts published in *Discursuri si dezbateri parlamentare,* edited by Gheorghe Buzatu. Bucuresti: Mica Valahie, 2006; Sanda Ghimpu, Alexandra Ticlea, 1992. *Retorica. Texte alese.* Bucuresti: Sansa.

References

Amossy, Ruth. 2010. *La presentation de soi. Ethos et identite verbale.* Paris: PUF.

Bayley, Paul (ed.). 2004. *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Benwell, Betham, and Elizabeth Stokoe. 2006. *Discourse and Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Chilton, Paul A., and Christina Schaffher (eds.). 2002. *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

De Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg (eds.). 2006. *Discourse and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Du Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans, and Peter Redman (eds.). 2000. *Identity: A Reader.* Sage: London.

Hofstede, Geert. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

—. http://geert-hofstede.com/romania.html, accessed July 2012.

Hie, Cornelia. 2010. *European Parliaments under Scrutiny. Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simon, Bernd. 2004. *Identity in Modern Society. A Social Psychological Perspective.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2007. "Theories of identity and the analysis of face." *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 639-656.

Taylor, James R., and Francois Cooren. 1997. "What makes communication organizational." *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 409^138.

Ullah, Phillip. 1990. "Rhetoric and ideology in social identification: The Case of second generation Irish Youths." *Discourse and Society* 1(2): 167-188

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2010. "Political identities in parliamentary debates." In *European Parliaments under Scrutinity. Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices,* edited by Cornelia Ilie, 29-56. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van Leeuwen, Theo. 2007. "Legitimation." *Discourse and Communication* 1 (1): 91-112.

Vasilescu, Andra. 2010. "Metastance in the Romanian parliamentary discourse: Case studies." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LV 4: 365-380.

—. 2011. „Constructia identitatii parlamentare." In *Limba romana: ipostaze ale variafiei lingvistice* (vol. II *Pragmaticd si stilistica),* edited by Rodica Zafiu, Camelia Usurelu, and Helga Bogdan Oprea, 305-316. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE POLICY OF THE *ACCOMPLISHED FACT* IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY ROMANIAN DISCOURSE

ARIADNA ŞTEFANESCU

1. Introduction

1.1. The Aim of the Research

This paper is an attempt to describe the accomplished fact (AF) as a political strategy, by taking into consideration two concrete situations placed at the beginning of the Romanian modern history. My assumption is that, within the structure of the AF, as a notion, political manoeuvring, in general, and political acts, protocols and extra-legal machinations, in particular, interact with communication. The discursive practices and communicative forms represent an extremely varied constellation, organised around the AF. Their classification is based on their official *vs.* confidential character, contemporary *vs.* non-contemporary character, discursive *vs.* communicative character-according to whether they appear in rumours and secret conveyances, for example-, and, of course, their functions. The series of discourse types involved in staging the AF as a macro-event includes: parliamentary debates, diplomatic letters, telegrams, pieces of news and press comments, historians' accounts, political propaganda texts, private letters, memoirs, official statements, private meetings, political acts, such as decrees, proclamations, notifications, acclamations, congratulations and, last but not least, pieces of advice, rumours and secret communication acts.

My attempt is to take into consideration a discursively pragmatic methodology to analyse the accomplished fact phenomenon. In this regard, I shall have in view:

(i) the structure of the AF and the weight of the communicative practices that participate in configuring it;

(ii) some legitimation techniques which confer durability to the AF, for example: the presence of an argumentative structure with pros and cons; an identifiable rhetoric reflecting the conceptual models of the epoch for the concepts of AF and crisis; the biased or incriminating denominations of the AFs;

(iii) the functions of the communicative practices employed while construing particular AFs: acceleration, protraction, description, instituting or legitimizing particular events.

Given the complexity of the phenomenon, the presentation which follows is inevitably incomplete.

1.2. The Corpus

Historical information serves for identifying relevant facts, dates, persons, documents and attitudes, so as to bridge the gap between the original, allusive and multi-voiced discourses, and the reality of that world (Carbo 2004).

The diversity of the sources is fundamental for establishing *the discourse strategies of the* AF. The policy of the AF is constitutive for verbal practices such as *negotiations, political debates, journalism, rumour, gossip, prognostication,* which results in greatly varied text types and oral discourses, and for *iconic representations,* like *laws, letters, newspaper articles, slogans, insignia* (effigies, the national emblem, etc.). All these verbal practices related to the topic contributed to the legitimization of the AF in the epoch, and, moreover, to its becoming endowed with durability (Salavastru 1999, 31-65; Lamizet 2011, 33-46).

Concerning the particular discourses referred to in this study, we had at our disposal two monographs published at the beginning of the twentieth century: one, written by D.A. Sturdza (1912)[1], documenting the establishment of the constitutional monarchy in Romania, and the other, regarding the issue of minting the national coin, written by D. Slavescu (1941).

2. Historical Circumstances

2.1. The Accomplished Fact (AF) and Its Policies

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the construction of the modern state became an urgent need for the Romanian political class, which was confronted with several difficulties such as: internal political instability, the lack of understanding towards the Romanian wishes from the past, manifested by the Russians-Romania's most powerful and influential neighbours-, as well as the vassalage to the Ottoman Empire. All these difficulties sprang from highly unstable and divergent coalitions between the Western Powers, Russia and the Ottoman Empire. These coalitions varied according to the changing economic interests.

The strategy of the AF, which is not accompanied (or, at least, not immediately followed) by a *discourse strategy,* is a brutal way of imposing one's arbitrary will and a way of cancelling political action.

Paradoxically, in the Romanian political space of that time, the decision to act according to this strategy was intimately linked with the efforts made for establishing modernity on firm foundations. As a rule, the AF must be accompanied by a particular discourse, meant to support the risky political decisions.

In ordinary life, resorting to the AF means avoiding persuasion. In the political space, the *ex abrupto* occurrence of an AF, on the one hand, implicitly indicates the distance between the dominant political discourse and the local political interests. The AF is a symptom of crisis and, at the same time, marks the climax of the crisis, which may lead to its end. On the other hand, by the policy of the AF, this distance is cancelled. The appeal to the AF policies bears witness to the validity of persuasion (Arendt 2005 [1972], 40) and may have the power of transforming the reckless act into a *legitimized political act.* The ability to prepare the political scene to include (and accept without immediate reprisals) a new state of affairs imposed by the weaker party *(viz.* the Principalities under the rule of the Ottoman Porte) is a proof of political quick wit, whose (other than linguistic) strategies testify to the use of persuasion and manipulation, wrapped in a whole range of illocutionary acts.

2.2. Some AFs and Their Context: The Establishment of the Constitutional Monarchy and the Minting of the National Currency

The AF covers a *de facto* situation produced by a series of events. In contradistinction to the current representations of AFs, any *fait accompli* has an underlying history that fails to manifest itself at once and presupposes the existence of an adequate context. Consequently, approaching an AF implies knowing the chronology of the underlying political and historical events.

From the point of view of the home affairs, the above mentioned AFs were perceived as acts of liberation and modernization. The discourse of the AFs had the function of legitimizing these acts, and of minimizing as much as possible their representation as arbitrary will acts.

Through the Treaty of Paris (1856) and the Convention of Paris (1858), the two Romanian Principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia, which were answerable to the Ottoman Porte as their suzerain, came under the collective protectorate of seven warranting powers (France, Britain, Prussia, Italy, and the Habsburg, Russian and Ottoman Empires) and were entitled to decide upon the form of their government. The stipulations of these international organisms reduced the suzerainty of the Porte to receiving the yearly tribute and investing the rulers (Hitchins 1998, 21).

In 1859, the two Principalities chose to be ruled by the same prince: A1. loan Cuza, despite the fact that the Convention of Paris (1858) had failed to mention the issue of the Union of the Principalities, a fiery wish of the Romanians. The ancient aspiration to the Union of Moldavia and Wallachia was acknowledged by the Romanian nation as a first step towards succeeding in gaining its independence from the Ottoman Empire. In the chronological order of events, Cuza's concerted election as Prince, which went beyond the stipulations of the two international treaties, took by surprise the Warranting Powers and, therefore, it emerged as the first AFOorga 2010 [1938], 214).

In February 1866, A1. I. Cuza abdicated under the pressure of a *coup d'etat,* which appointed a provisional government. Those who had seized the power struggled politically for the Union of the Principalities under the reign of a foreign prince. The reactions of the Ottoman and Russian Empires were aggressive and went as far as to suggest an armed intervention. These two powers only acknowledged the Union as a transient constitutional formula, valid during A1. I. Cuza's reign, and were adverse to the idea of a foreign prince. The Habsburg Empire had a

position similar to that of the other two Empires. The main supporter of the Romanians was France.

The provisional government (the princely lieutenancy), the Senate and the Elective Assembly (the Parliament) organized a plebiscite on April, 2-8, 1866. The population voted, almost unanimously, for bestowing the crown on Prince Charles (Carol) Hohenzollern, the second son of Prince Charles (Carol)-Anton von Hohenzollern, the military governor of Prussia. The plebiscite and incognito arrival of Charles (Carol) I, followed by the establishment of the latter's effective control, are considered the events underlying the second AF. The advent of Prince Charles (Carol) I cemented the Union of the Principalities and led to the establishment of a political regime of the constitutional monarchy type.

There were numerous political factions, opinions and struggles at the time. The contending parties included: those who backed up the Union under the rule of a foreign prince, those opposed to the Union, and the partisans of the single-ruler formula, with the country ruled by a national leader. The latter variant had also been stipulated by the Warranting Powers through the Conference of Paris, which had taken place the same year, during March and April, and whose purpose was to discuss „the Romanian question" (cf. the Protocols IV-X of the Conference at Paris, in D. A. Sturdza 1912).

During 1866 and 1872, Romania negotiated with the Ottoman Empire the right to mint a national (gold and silver) coin with the effigy of Charles (Carol) I, the Romanian king, bearing the inscription: *Carol, regele romdnilor* (Charles, king of the Romanians), but lacking any sign of vassalage; these words were later modified to *Carol, regele Romdniei* (Charles, king of Romania). During this period, the aforementioned gold and silver coins with the king's effigy were minted twice, in February 1870 and November 1872, without permission from the Porte. The first national coin, issued in February 1870, had to be withdrawn from the market. The second series remained in circulation. The first attempt at an AF was made under the following circumstances: (i) no permission for minting had been secured from either the Sublime Porte or the Western powers; (ii) the young state, whose first official name was "The United Principalities", was under direct Ottoman rule; (iii) the Sublime Porte had not approved of the name *Romania* yet; (iv) the inscription *Carol, regele romdnilor* (Charles, king of the Romanians) was considered politically undesirable and irredentist by Austro-Hungary, the ruler of Transylvania, a region with a Romanian majority; (v) Prince Charles (Carol) I threatened to abdicate; (vi) the Romanian state had just established the National Mint institution (Monetaria Nationala).

In the second instance, in 1872, the AF was complete. Coins were minted without the Porte's agreement this time, too. This can be considered the third AF. All three AFs occurred over a period of almost ten years.

The theoretical aspects of the political concept of the accomplished fact are based on the scrutiny of the second and third AFs briefly sketched above, i. e. the Union under a foreign prince, and the first attempt to mint national coins.

2.3.1. The (Symbolic) Significance of the Foreign Prince

On the political scene, agents have clear roles, which derive from their institutional function. In any AF scenario, however, there are always one or several important pawns or key non-human elements to which symbolical values can be attached. In the cases under discussion, Prince Charles (Carol) I was the political actor who triggered multiple significations and the coin with his effigy similarly acquired numerous symbolic connotations.

From the point of view of the political forces outside Romania, which were in favour of a foreign prince, Charles (Carol) I acted as the key agent for achieving the AF, providing he had enough personal force and involvement, namely providing "he was filled with enough energy and determination to achieve the deed by adopting this only applicable line" (colonel Rauch, *apud* Sturdza 1912, 54). In case the entire political project failed, Charles could become the protagonist of "an adventurous, piquant story in which he invested nothing worth too much for himself, as a very particular aside unofficially expressed by Bismarck put it, in an encounter between Bismarck and Charles on April 20, 1866, before the prince set out incognito for Romania (MERCI, 40). Bismarck's point of view was not shared in its entirety by Prince Charles, as testified by diplomatic addenda to his memoir, where one could read: "Certainly, the Prince could hardly see things in the same light" (MERCI, 40). According to his father, Charles was to be the founder of a new dynasty, taking advantage of that "opportunity" and "momentary conjunction of the stars" to metamorphose from Charles into Charles (Carol) I; he was to be a sacrificial victim, also, because only his descendants would enjoy the fruits of the new situation (Sturdza 1912, 18). For the pro-dynasty Romanians, he was about to become from the very beginning "The Elect", Carol I, the man entrusted with an important mission, the saviour. For historians, he was going to be one of the unifiers and agents of modernization, apart from being the liberator of Romania from the suzerainty of Turkey (Iorga 2010 [1938]).

For the contemporary opponents of the monarchy, he would turn into the foreigner, the German, the unorthodox man (Marton 2009, 70-75).

One can notice that almost all the *ethee* assigned to Charles (Carol) I are anticipative and they appear right before the historical narrative of the AF. They represent a basically propagandistic way of modelling future history. The image of Charles (Carol) I as the founder of the modern Romanian state is a retrospective *ethos,* attributed to him *post factum* by historians.

2.3.2. The Symbolic Significance of the National Currency

Besides its economic advantages, the national currency symbolized *autonomy, sovereignty, stability, unity, modernity, progress,* and even the *acceptance of the royal dynasty* and *loyalty to the king himself.* The first symbolic meanings of the national currency were specific for the currencies of all states, but the *symbolism of loyalty to a king* was unprecedented in the Romanian historical context. In his *Memoirs,* Charles (Carol) I confessed that the Romanians were "ungovernable", and soon after his accession, he was actually on the point of abdicating. By issuing the national currency with his effigy, the Romanian political elite could include the "stranger" in the national symbolic imagery of Romania. And this was a pressing need for internal stability.

2.4. Crisis as a Notion and its Relationship with the AF

The AF is a concept subordinated to the notion of crisis. It represents, we believe, the climax and denouement of a political crisis. If pleading, the political orators' dialectic inventiveness, diplomatic efforts, political propaganda, insistence, the exertion of influence and any other possible strategies fail to legitimate the AF, then the crisis becomes more serious.

R. Koselleck (2009 [2006], 176-189) shows that the notion of crisis has an intrinsic temporal dimension. The same is true about the AF as the denouement of a crisis, in our opinion. R. Koselleck (2009 [2006], 177) shows that *crisis* was originally a medical and theological term. Through its theological uses, the notion acquired eschatological meanings. *Crisis* penetrates the spheres of politics, economy, history, psychology, art and so on, and becomes widespread.

In the political domain, R. Koselleck (2009 [2006]) has identified three "semantic models" that govern crisis as a notion: (i) crisis represents a reality in process, because the function of history is judicial: it acts as a world court; (ii) crisis is a periodical and iterative reality whose evolution

involves the following moments: it becomes acute, it falls down, it enters a new state. In this conceptual frame, a crisis can be repeated and presupposes that the epochal threshold could be crossed by seeking new stability factors, which will generate progress; (iii) the eschatological model, based on the apocalyptic vision about the end of the world, construes crisis imaginatively, as the last provocation to mankind. In this conception, historical events are accelerated, as it were, by a process of apocalyptic compression of time preceding Doomsday. Human beings cannot escape the increasing pressure of time.

Another specification made by R. Koselleck (2009 [2006], 181) is that more often than not these models materialize as hybrid ones. It is possible to identify traces of the eschatological representation and of the iterative-evolutional model in the political discourse about the Romanian situation, which was already considered an AF at the time (see *infra* 4.1.2. (i)).

3. The AF Concept

The AF[2] concept and its linguistic expression circulate in politics, history and current life. The dictionaries define the AF as an irreversible accomplishment. To this brief definition, I can add that the irreversible accomplishment, in other words, the new *de facto* state of affairs, is obtained by violating the *de jure* state of affairs. This is why the AF has the capacity to polarize the society. In the discourses of the epoch, it comprises a wide range of denominations.

3.1. The Use and Stylistic Variation of the Term *Accomplished Fact*

The *accomplished fact* is a taxonomic designation and a technical term. In the epoch, this name circulated as such in the European languages, in connection with the above-described facts. In other words, it was included in the political jargon of the day. The political actors were aware of the inherent anti-deliberative nature of the term.

We have extracted from the texts of that time the words used to designate this concept, and we have noticed that there are lexical items marked by positive or negative connotations according to the two main ways in which the AF was regarded by its partisans and opponents.

The term was not excessively in use, though its uniform distribution, in foreign and home affairs, as well as in both the policy of assent and of dissent, proves that the accomplished fact as a notion was a political stereotype in the nineteenth century. The term which expressed it had an interesting distribution and its lexical variation was not random, as it encoded the intentions of the political actors. The accomplished fact as an expression, and its more bookish variant, the *fait accompli,* were used by all the political actors, irrespective of the favourable or unfavourable attitudes to the points in question. The designation *fapt implinit* was less frequently used by the Romanian politicians that favoured it, except for Mihail Kogalniceanu, who used it in 1870, and for the Romanian anti-royalist MP, Nicolae Ionescu, who used it in 1866 (Sturdza 1912, 94). Romanian politicians avoided it constantly and preferred periphrases, which sounded like propaganda at moments when the atmosphere was charged and everyone was active in manipulating things to provoke the respective events.

The designations *accomplished fact* or *fait accompli* appeared unofficially in letters addressed to individuals, in discourses held at the Conference of Paris and in private meetings. They circulated especially in off-stage politics. One occurrence was in a private discussion between Bismarck and Charles I (Sturdza 1912, 35, 37; MERCI, 41), another, in an address by the Minister Nothomb to King William (Wilhelm) of Prussia (MERCI, 39). It appeared in a communication of Colonel Rauch with Charles-Anton, the father of the future Romanian King (Sturdza 1912, 54), in Protocol V of the Conference of Paris (Sturdza 1912, 15), in a letter of the Baroness Franque to Charles I (MERCI, 41). It was used by the Turkish prime-minister, Ali Pasha (Penelea 1982, 38), in connection with the minting of coins, a few years later. The term migrated from politics to history and it is to be found in the works of the authors who wrote about this period, for example Iorga (2010 [1938]); Hitchins (1998); Neagoe (1992, *if.*

3.1.1. The Lexical Variation of the AF as a Concept in the Discourses of Foreigners

By studying the sources-Sturdza (1912), Slavescu (1942), MERCI (1992)-, I have identified the following lexical series: (periphrastic denominations) *such an extempore state of things* (Sturdza 1912, 15); *accomplished facts* (Sturdza 1912, 15) (the referential use of plural here points to the dissolution of the Parliamentary Assembly, ordered by the provisional government and followed by the establishment of a new assembly); (generic terms) *affair* (MERCI, 38); *business* (Sturdza 1912, 27); *combination* (Sturdza 1912, 7, 47-48); (rhetorical periphrases) *an immutable fact* (MERCI, 40), *the/a grand mission to fulfdl* (Sturdza 1912, 16); *the wish of the populations* (Sturdza 1912, 7); *popular aspirations*

(Sturdza 1912, 7); *the fulfilment of the popular aspirations* (Sturdza 1912, 12); (denominations with contextual connotations) *coup* (MERCI, 40); *spicy affair* (MERCI, 40); *a venture with no solid ground* (Sturdza 1912, 54); *a/the daring step forward* (Sturdza 1912, 54); *the secret* (MERCI, 43).

3.1.2. The Lexical Variation of the AF as a Concept in the Romanians' Discourses

The lexical variation noticed in the Romanians' discourses about the AF bears the mark of propaganda and involves the idea of legitimacy: *great deed* (Sturdza 1912, 55); *(the interest of) the cause* (MERCI, 43); (in the title of D. A. Sturdza's monograph) *a deed accomplished by people entitled to it; shield of nationality* (Sturdza 1912, 22); (with several occurrences) *the will of the nation, the national aspiration* or simply *aspiration; the deed of the nation itself, mission* and *patriotic mission* (Sturdza, 1912); (the periphrasis) *an Act in strict accordance with the stipulations that grant the Romanian people the freedom to exert his own right at home* (Sturdza 1912, 44); *noble duty* (MERCI, 65).

4. The Structure of the AF

There is no consensus about the AF. The partisans of the AF endow it with a reconciling function, as caused by political instability. For its detractors, the AF is seen as an abuse, which infringes conventions and laws, and is potentially threatening. It is not consensual, it polarizes the political forces and determines their permanent re-grouping. In connection with the national currency issue and the advent of Charles (Carol) I, the AF occurred as a result of the common interests of the Romanian political groups, who disagreed about most other issues.

The AF presupposes the existence of an event chronology, which triggers an extremely varied typology of discursive practices to convey it. The accumulation of events and discourse types the AF puts in circulation triggers a new *de facto* state, opposed to the *de jure* one. The modification of the real world obtains, as shown previously (see *supra* **2),** by infringing some standards. This introduces a discrepancy between the *de facto* situation and the legal standards of the world.

The AF is enabled to become a *political fact* due to the verbal practices and the dialectic creativity of its political actors. The AF is a structured political entity, despite the multitude of the strategies, the discourse genres, the speech acts and the actors which it articulates. Its structure

consists of two components: the *modus procedendi* and the *modus deliberandi.*

4.1. The AF Components

Only in passing can one mention that any human act is simultaneously accompanied by reflection under normal conditions. The unity of action and thinking is a universal standard. In the political sphere, this is probably best expressed by the *action* and *deliberation* pair, because here the act is conceived as an act that craves for permanence, being invested with authority and legitimacy, while replacing deliberation for spontaneous thinking in order to weight the alternatives and make a decision. This is why I think it is possible to find one's way in the complexities of the AF by following the dynamic of the two components, action and deliberation, which are constitutive for any social situation and which will be termed here the *modus procedendi* and the *modus deliberandi*, respectively.

The action-related components of any state of facts are taken to refer to the events proper that lead to a given situation and to the speech acts, known to be "ways to do things with words", which institute new realities. The deliberative component of a situation refers, then, to the forms of deliberation which explain, reflect, justify, and legally evaluate a state of affairs.

In the political sphere, the AF seems to be at first an incomplete, inapt state of affairs, because its deliberative component has been seriously impaired. During one of the private encounters between Bismarck and Charles (Carol) I, just before the latter arrived in Romania and acceded to the throne, chancellor Bismarck used the terms *accomplished fact, modus procedendi* and *spicy adventure* in referring to the discernible political situation. These expressions point to the by-passing of deliberation, of the law and, ultimately, to the loss of legitimacy. The opposite of the AF is dilemma (controversy), a situation that precludes action, because deliberation has not yet lead to a compromise or consensus, conducive to a decision, in its turn (Fritz 2008).

What we wish to demonstrate in the following pages is that the AF is structured along the *modus procedendi* and *modus deliberandi* lines; it points to a situation which does not lack political reflection, as it appears at first. This entitles us to argue that the political AF consists of a *modus procedendi* and a *modus deliberandi,* together with the discursive forms that make them manifest, as in any political situation.

There are some factors whose role can be to decrease and slow down the manifestation of the gap between the two *modi,* which are sometimes

opposed and set off in respect to each other: (a) the communicative practices, (b) legitimacy, and (c) the time factor and propaganda.

4.1.1. The Communicative Practices

The discourse types and communication practices specific to the political acts, and political deliberations inscribe them in "forms of stability and representation", granting them visibility and notoriety (Lamizet 2011, 33).

Both components of a situation (the one related to action and the one related to deliberation) allow *their being communicated,* namely they *are concretized through communication.* They favour particular forms of institutional and cultural discourse and particular communicative practices. Of the two components, *modus procedendi* is less discourse-bound, while discursive practices and communicative practices are absolutely necessary for the *modus deliberandi.*

The discourses delivered in connection with the *accomplished fact* represent, in my opinion, precisely what makes the AF durable and legitimate. By and large, I understand them as equivalent to the *modus deliberandi* of the AF. The AF policy could be partly assimilated with the institutional or private, official or off-stage discourses (such as the rumour, the secret encounter, the secret letter and secrecy in general); these are thematically connected to facts chronologically conducive to unexpected denouements, in some cases, or to desirable denouements, in others.

There are "mute events", sometimes "theatrical coups" or, more precisely, states of affairs, which either chance or the economy of the overall situation help become manifest. These "mute events" are very little dependent on communication[6].1 distinguish between, on the one hand, the "mute events" and, on the other hand, the institutional speech acts, which belong together with all the events that get reported and are *turned into discourse* or are reflected in communication, sometimes even through specific practices of communication, rumour, for example.

If we overlook "mute" events, the two components, the *modus procedendi* and *modus deliberandi* can be separated when regarded theoretically; in reality, they are inextricably connected in the texture of the discourses.

Communicative practices can be divided into three main classes, depending on their predominantly narrative, action-oriented (illocutionary) or deliberative character.

(i) Communicative practices which record reality and are expressed by discourses which render events: testimonies, diaries, chronicles, written histories, private letters, news reports, lists and minutes;

(ii) Political communication practices that model reality and are expressed in institutional texts produced from a position of authority and which have a coercive, legitimating function: decrees, laws[7], notifications, appointments to particular positions, resignations, sworn oaths (of the king), investitures in particular functions, acclaims, *Te Deums,* etc.

(iii) Discursive practices that promote reflection and deliberation: parliamentary debates, meetings, conference protocols, proclamations to the people, situational analyses, which are often sent in the mail, syntheses, reports, political prognoses, and so on. We also include here discourses which presuppose deliberation and, at the same time, represent a crystallized textual form of mobilization: recommendations, warnings, private advising, counselling issued from authority positions, appeals, propaganda and, last but not least, jokes.

Some of these discourse genres represent mainly the *modus deliberandi* component, others-the *modus procedendi* component.

The complexity of the communicative practices in the political sphere is, however, great. In the political arena, the action-deliberation binomial may get separated and each of its parts is separately "pronounced", in accordance with a particular protocol. For example, two documents were issued by the government on the same day of March 1866: *the decree* for calling the Plebiscite (Sturdza 1912, 21-22), which was a discursive form belonging to the *modus procedendi* sphere, and the *Proclamation to the People* (Sturdza 1912, 22-23), which appealed to people to unanimously vote for the foreign Prince Charles (Carol) I; in relation to the decree, the proclamation became a discursive form with a deliberative function.

Yet, a discourse from the political sphere quite frequently cumulates the action-oriented function with the deliberative one, depending on the interactions and adjacent relations it establishes with other discourses[8]. For example, political action and deliberation are simultaneously exerted, owing to the mobilization function of the proclamation; in other words, proclamation is a discourse type which can be classed either as *modus procedendi* or as *modus deliberandi.*

The mobilization function materializes through special pragmatic routines-acclamations and slogans- but it can be detected in certain deliberative discourses, for example addresses during parliamentary sessions or conferences, and proclamations. Discourses with a poignant mobilization function bring deliberation quite close to action. They help decision-making or generate manipulation settings.

4.1.2. Legitimacy

Legitimacy is a factor that boosts and smoothes the operation of the two components of the political situation. The relation of conformity between the *modus deliberandi* and the *modus procedendi* renders normal and balances a certain situation, by legitimizing it. Yet, its permanence is not granted. Between the *modus procedendi* and *modus deliberandi* there can appear differences, antagonisms even, which are indicative of a crisis. The *modus procedendi* of a situation that qualifies as a *fait accompli* is characterized by strategies, systematic actions, political speech acts, which modify the *status quo* so drastically that it no longer corresponds to a state of affairs.

The absence of correspondence between a *de facto* and a *de jure* state of affairs, which is characteristic of AFs, produces contrasting effects, which I consider symptomatic. These symptomatic effects are symmetrically distributed between the two competing camps. They are: (i) a sense that the *de jure* state of affairs is encroached upon as opposed to the sentiment that the Romanians were entitled to act in that spirit; (ii) the creation of a space of controversy; (iii) de-responsibilization, *i.e.,* 'we delegate our responsibility to you', as opposed to assuming responsibility, *i.e.* 'if you do not take responsibility for this action, we shall'; (iv) deceitful appearances; (v) concession; (iv) double legitimacy,

(i) Encroaching *versus* the right to encroach upon laws

The discussion about encroaching the *de jure* state of affairs was conducted within the *modus deliberandi.* In the dialogue of the political voices it turned into accusations about encroaching upon limits. This accusation is repeated in the course of time. We find it often invoked in 1866. The following statement is recorded:

"The provisional government of Bucharest worked without being entitled to" (Sturdza 1912, 5); "The Conference [of Paris] will communicate to Bucharest a declaration meant to set the limits to be observed by the people expressing their wishes" (Sturdza 1912, 49).

The political agents who made this accusation displayed similar sentiments: deep regret (which was voiced in Russia's address at the Conference of Paris) (Sturdza 1912, 5); the feeling that one does not know what course to take (conveyed in Italy's discourse at the Conference of Paris) (Sturdza 1912, 5); the affect of anger (conveyed in Prussia's address) (Sturdza, 1912, 5). Consequently, the notion of encroaching upon limits acquired sombre undertones.

The previous accusation was answered by two arguments. The first was a temporal argument, which invoked the fact that 'things evolve'; it was brought up by France, a tacit supporter of Romania:

"Since the stipulations of the Treaties [the Treaty of Paris and the Conventions of Paris], there have supervened accomplished facts and other international stipulations whose effects should be reckoned with." (Sturdza 1912, 51)

The second argument-invoked by the Romanian promoters of the A F - is a judicial one, and regards home legislation, enriched by being considered equivalent with the will of the nation as a whole, and proved by the almost unanimous vote in favour of the Union and of bestowing the Romanian crown upon Charles (Carol) I.

The same argument of the home legislation-devoid of pathos, since it did not refer to the participation of the masses-was taken up again a few years later, and again by the Romanian part, on the occasion of minting the coin with the king's effigy (Slavescu 1941).

Further connected, explicit or implicit theses were grafted on the argument of the popular will, and the success of this argument was due to the support it received from the 'nationalities' principle'. This principle was the element of modernity which dominated the political thought of the epoch. It was put into practice in the policy of Napoleon III. It is worth mentioning, in this respect, Max Dunker's statement about it in a letter addressed, on April 20 (the day of the United Principalities Plebiscite), to Charles (Carol)-Anton, the father of King Charles (Carol) I:

"Once and for all, The Emperor [Napoleon III] has founded his policies on the nationalities' principle. He constituted Italy by universal suffrage, he established his own throne on the universal suffrage and after he pressed Romania into the Union under Cuza's reign, he will press it to advance further, guided by the same system, until it gains its independence." (Sturdza 1912, 41)

By its referential and contextual expression, the argument of the nation's will involve the Union of the Principalities under the reign of a foreign ruler, who was to save the country from the Ottoman suzerainty. The independence argument was the last consequence of this series of AFs and is implicit rather than explicit. Further arguments that gravitated around the idea of the nation's will and of the Romanian coin bearing King Charles's effigy are: the argument of unity and stability; the argument of common advantages and the idea that this 'combination' represented the only way to put an end to the crisis.

In my opinion, the emergence of both the offensive and counter-offensive arguments is connected to the *modus deliberandi* of the A F . The most widely evoked argument is that of the nation's will. It is favoured by the conceptualization of the crisis as a process, at a time when the crisis had reached its peak and history, i.e. the nation, functioned as the world's court.

(ii) The formation of the controversial space represents one of the specific elements of the political sphere, in general, and of the state of crisis, too. The controversy around the AF represents a matter of deliberation in the constellation of factors which configure a political situation (Fritz 2008) and is worth studying in itself. We shall enumerate some of the components of the controversy which arose in connection with the two accomplished facts analysed, adding some brief illustrations. The historical precedent appeared in the debates about the foreign ruler (Sturdza 1912, 41) and about the minting of the national coin, when the cases of previous rulers who minted coins were invoked: Constantin Brancoveanu, Despot Voda, Michael the Brave, Stephen the Great (Kogalniceanu 1982,33).

The proliferation of distinctions represents another symptom of the controversy, apart from making an inventory of the alternatives (Dascal 2008). The pronouncement in absolute or in general terms was the issue concerning the foreign ruler and it was caused by the uncertainty about which "combination" was better: the one with an indigenous or the one with a foreign ruler (Sturdza 1912,14-15).

Contradictions in terms also represent an element which is likely to stimulate controversy. Article III of the 1858 Convention of Paris stipulated the indigenous ruler solution, but France recommended a foreign ruler in the very same year. In the issue of coins, the following divergence appeared: the Turks considered the national currency *an external matter,* while the Romanians-arc *internal* one (Slavescu 1942, 7).

In the controversy, artificial and strategic notional modifications occur. Normally, *the effigy of the king* is a mark of full sovereignty (which includes the idea of independence); in the Senate debate of November 1870, M. Kogalniceanu, a Romanian Member of Parliament, proposed a narrowing of its meaning. As an argument meant to empower Romanian politicians in their insistently maintaining of the effigy on their coins, despite the foreign political opponents, he suggested to consider it not as a sign of independence and of "full sovereignty":

Let us now consider that the effigy of the king is not the mark of full sovereignty. Let us construe the possibility of a state which can be independent and yet have no effigy of the king on the coins it mints, as is

the case in Turkey, whose coins bear a signature and no effigy on them [...] The Sublime Porte insisted: we oppose to the effigy because it connotes and demonstrates the full sovereignty of a country; which is why we should maintain that we are bent on having it. We should support this idea, at least until the green paper is issued: not until then shall we be able to see which theory of the two we had better admit. (Kogalniceanu, IV, 35)

We must add to all these the speech acts which express insistence, the strategic use of convenient presuppositions, ambiguities, fine distinctions-which go so far as to coin words- and concessions as forms of partial agreement.

(iii) Delegating responsibility is a phenomenon registered in connection with the issue of the foreign ruler. The Warranting Powers adopted an attitude of non-involvement shortly before the Plebiscite, invoking that they did not have enough information at their disposal:

"Being in ignorance about the reason for adopting this measure, the Conference bestows the full responsibility for this measure and for any consequences deriving from it on the provisional government." (Sturdza 1912, 14-15)

This way, the Powers did nothing short of giving the free hand to the Romanian political agents to manipulate matters; the latter actually felt strong enough to take matters in their own hands. This is the justification of the historians in connection with the AF of the foreign ruler: the non-implication of the Warranting Powers (Iorga 2010 [1938]; Neagoe 1992).

(iv) Deceitful Appearances-leaving the false impression that one obeys international decisions, the secret aura which enveloped the coming of the king to Romania by an incognito trip, the tacit assent (of the King of Prussia in respect to Charles's trip to Romania), and one can add rumours, confidential communications, pulling strings to the benefit of one's own favourites, all these are abundant signs of de-legitimation. Some are modes of behaviour which involve underhand communication, others are instances of communication proper. The common denominator of these *modi procedendi,* apart from the lack of unification, is the management of information meant to create deceitful implicatures. They represent clear cases of conscious manipulation of the truth and transparency principles, which also operate at the level of language and are known as the quality and quantity maxims of communication (Grice 2001 [1975]).

(v) Concession is a means of placing legitimacy in brackets and approving of a new state of affairs in the absence of a corresponding *de jure* situation. In this regard, concession belongs to the *modus procedendi* class. It is the solution for ending a crisis after performing an A F . Both the

AFs briefly described here were historically marked as caused by the concessions of the Warranting Powers, especially France and Turkey.

(vi) Double **legitimacy** is a particular fact connected to the establishment of monarchy in Romania. There are two forms of legitimation for the non-indigenous king and they appear in reversed order: the universal suffrage legitimation (the Plebiscite), then its validation by the Romanian Parliament's session (the Constitutional Assembly). It is paradoxical to validate the universal suffrage later, **by** parliamentary voting. There were Romanians who signalled it as such in the epoch. A Romanian MP, Christian Tell, argued in this line of thought and showed that, as a representative of the people, he could not validate or invalidate the popular vote of the nation at large (Sturdza 1912, 87-88). S. Marton (2009, 73-75) explains these political actions as a double gesture of confirmation for Charles (Carol) I, his double legitimation by popular and parliamentary vote. The Romanian political class appealed to the authority of two constitutional factors, which they considered momentarily sufficient to legitimate the situation. They went to the nation, *via* the Plebiscite, and to the Parliament, too-so as to be able to submit the proof to the Warranting Powers and ask for their approval. From a discursive perspective, we can supplement the explanation provided by S. Marton the observation that the parliamentary vote, added to the popular vote, increased the force of the Romanian legitimating act. Double legitimation indicates the keenly felt need to create a new justifying *de jure* situation, and represents a means to gain notoriety, to improve one's image. The imposition of a reversed order of events-first the popular vote, then the parliamentary vote and, finally, the approval of the Warranting Powers-resembles an attempt to turn back in time.

Concerning the analysis of our corpus, the most poignant significations identified here in connection with the concept of legitimation are the following: legitimation is tantamount to "lawfulness" and to "acknowledgment", and to "popular vote and parliamentary vote".

4.1.3. The Time Factor and the Propaganda

Together with the communicative practices and legitimation, time is yet another factor for relating the action-oriented and deliberative aspects of a political fact. In some political situations, the action-oriented and deliberative components are simultaneous. They do so, for example, in political speech acts, such as the offering and the acceptance of functions or of the crown. There are political protocols that indicate situations where the consecution of the two *modi* is established by norms and the

simultaneity of the action-oriented and the deliberative components is suspended. Normally, for example, the deliberation about laws precedes their enforcement, which means that the deliberative part is not in synchrony with the action-oriented part. We are entitled, therefore, to speak of delays and simultaneities between the *modi procedendi* and *deliberandi* of political events. This leads to the conclusion that any political situation has an underlying time structure.

The time structure of AFs is upset and the "rule of the thumb" that the *modus deliberandi* (debating legislation) be followed by the *modus procedendi* (enforcing legislation), which is applicable in normal political situations and projects, is no longer applicable. This is verified in the case of the double legitimation shown to occur *post factum* (see **(vi)** *supra*) and in the case of minting the national copper and silver coins, which occurred twice and involved their withdrawal from circulation, followed by another series of diplomatic letters and discourses in the Parliament sessions (Slavescu 1942). The procedural disorder caused by the time factor can be interpreted as a symptom of the first conceptual model of the crisis, in which history, as the world's tribunal, can overturn situations, encroach upon protocols and go against the grain of any antiquated literal meaning of laws. Yet, another conceptual representation that predominated in the first AF discussed there, the Union of the Principalities under the aegis of a foreign Prince, is that of Doomsday. It has been shown previously that one of the symbolic significations associated with Charles (Carol) I presents him as *one of the elect,* entrusted with a messianic role. The temporal structure of the eschatological representation of the crisis is characterized by the compression of time before the impending end (Koselleck 2009 [2006], 188). One can find specific symptoms of this mental representation in the case discussed here: (i) speeding up the rhythm of the events and a sense of urgency and restlessness, in contradistinction with the need to defer things and the sense of being taken unawares; (ii) ascribing irreversibility to the events.

(i) Acceleration vs. deferral

We encounter acceleration in the actions and discourses of the people who planned the AF, and deferrals among its opponents. The old Assembly was dissolved and

"The Constitutional Assembly-*wfo'c/z was constituted by elections and convened at record speed-worked with strenuous alacrity"* (MERCI, 9); „the decisions of the Conference [of Paris] are expected there [in Bucharest] with *utmost impatience* and […] should the Plenipotentiaries *delay* making a decision, there would be *imminent* trouble, great trouble. *It was pressing* to convene the Plenipotentiaries" (Sturdza 1912, 4).

Political rumours and forecasting became more intense in this atmosphere of haste; they had the function of speeding events up, too, as forms of communication:

„Today the Lieutenancy and the Ministry put up posters in the streets to announce the candidacy for the Romanian Throne of Prince Charles (Carol) I of Hohenzollern, under the name of Carol (Charles) I. There are rumours that the Prince is due to arrive one of these days." (MERCI, 36).

Telegrams containing dispositions, orders and congratulations (Sturdza 1912, 28), which are not sent in advance as a rule, and therefore arrive *ante factum,* represent another way of hasting things by employing an alternative form of discourse.

The Warranting Powers were aware of the fact that they „deferred the adoption of decisions" (Sturdza 1912, 5), and that „The Conference found itself *short of time* […] and *overtaken* by the course of events" (Sturdza 1912, 51). The strategy of the opposite camp was to go back in time. The retrogressive modelling of time can be detected in quite a large number of particular cases which configured the AF. For example, the months of March and April 1866 saw the Plebiscite and the Constitutional Assembly, which legitimized the monarchy and the foreign prince. At the same time, the Romanian political class sent a circular to the foreign councillors in Bucharest to announce them about the organization of the Plebiscite. Simultaneously, further circulars emitted at the Conference of Paris of the Warranting Powers were directed to Bucharest, to "refresh" the Romanians' memory about the stipulations in force and, especially, about the Article XIII of The Convention of Paris (1858), which laid down that the country be ruled by an indigenous prince (Sturdza 1912, 15-16). The Warranting Powers, then, systematically tried to press them back to the observance of the *status quo antes.* This syncopated dynamic was characteristic of the entire period.

Both the argument that there existed a historical precedent-concession -which presupposed the acceptance of the new state of affairs and the insistence on a particular argument were intimately connected with time as a notion.

(ii) The inscription of events in irreversibility occurred through special communication practices and discursive strategies (for example: optimistic political forecasting, made in a *wishful thinking* spirit, insinuating one's own commitments into the opponent's mental background *via* presuppositions and propaganda); they record the multitude of discursive achievements of this period. We shall refer to some discursive modalities for inscribing as irreversible the accomplished fact;

they were used in two almost identical acts, issued in April 1866: the two proclamations to the people, inviting them to vote in favour of the foreign prince (Sturdza 1912, pp. 22-23; 24-25).

The absolute quantification, explicitly or implicitly expressed, is a stylistic means of creating consensus.

"Each and every one of your affirmations was *applauded by all the nations, each* of your acts *was acknowledged and confirmed* by the Warranting Powers" (Sturdza 1912, 22); "Let Europe *as a whole repeat our unanimous* clamour" *(ibidem,* 23).

The optimistic forecast, stylistically encoded through certainty evidentials, is another way of suggesting irreversibility:

"It is proved as a fact verging on absolute certainty that those interests cannot let them allow that the mouths of the Danube be relinquished to a disjointed, truncated and weak nation" (Sturdza 1912, 23); *"We are confident* that this time the will of the nation shall be crowned by *full success* and submit the proclamation of Prince Charles (Carol) Ludovic of Hohenzollern as a Ruler over us, Romanians, under the name of Charles (Carol) I." *(ibidem)*

As means for the exclusion of any meanings suggestive of ill luck and failure, **acclamations** were used in triumphalist forecasting:

"Your unalterable commitment to being a great nation and a strong nation *[…] instils in us the creed that you will unanimously bestow the Crown upon Prince Charles (Carol) and will make Europe repeat our unanimous clamour: Long live Romania, one and undivided!" (ibidem)*

These discourses also made use of speech acts directed to making permanent such victorious forecasting as expressed, for example, by **oaths** and **exhortations** or by **gestures permeated by mystical signification:**

"Romanians! At this *sacred* moment, when the *heavens* open up favourably for Romania to record its *imperishable destiny* as a nation, we *swear before God* and Europe that Charles (Carol) I of the Romanians is warranted to lead Romania on the path of justice and liberty, being empowered to *fulfil the mission entrusted to him by Providence'"* (Sturdza 1912, 24); *"Get on your feet Romanians, now is the time to do so! The hour of your salvation has comer (ibidem)*

The search for **providential signs** is part of the same vision of the irreversible:

"Because Providence wanted to enlighten us through signs even, it so happened that on April 8 (20), when the Plebiscite was concluded, Charles (Carol) I turned 27. It was part of the providential design that the Danube, this big river to which we owe the protection of Europe, should have its fountainhead in the very country where Charles (Carol) I, Romania's King, was born. Vote, then, dear Romanians, in the light of your old faith, vote with Romanian strength, vote in unanimity and without even a second's hesitation and all the intrigues will melt into thin air! With the proclamation of our vote will the Being of the Romanian Homeland take inception and assert itself (Sturdza 1912, 25)

5. Conclusions

I have followed the details of two historical and political situations, termed as AFs in the epoch and afterwards. The details were excerpted from a number of different discourse genres of the epoch, such as parliamentary discourses, private letters, etc. Following these details and the historical events as such, weighing their dependency on speech acts and discourse, delivered through several communication practices, I managed to establish a possible structure of a political AF. The structure of a political AF consists of two *modi: modus procedendi* and *modus deliberandi.* These two components are synchronized by certain factors, such as: special communicative practices and strategies for gaining legitimacy, specific time patterns, out of which the inscription of the events in irreversibility is outstanding and which are implemented through propaganda.

In conclusion, we consider that the AF and the construction of a *policy meant to implement* /'/jointly form a construct which is not always a sign of political immaturity. I would contend that this is not in fact a sign of political immaturity, as has been regularly claimed, because such verbal political practices serve negotiation very well in turning political struggle and disagreement little by little into concession by a continuum of meaningful acts. In the current stage of analysis, we tend to consider potentially fallacious, adversarial, but globally innovative and concessive the discourse of the AF which has been presented here.

Notes

[1] The historian N. Iorga (1932, 9) characterizes D. A. Sturdza, who was also the secretary of King Charles (Carol) I, as the "scrupulous accountant of the possibilities".

[2] The Romanian phrase for the AF is *fapt implinit.*

[3] The registration of the designations of the concept and of the historical studies in which it occurs are not exhaustive.

[4] The use of the structural term *modus procedendi* in the corpus analysed, in one of the strategists' discourses, is, in my opinion, symptomatic, and represents a guarantee for present-day theorists.

[5] The allusion is to Austin (1962), which represents a basic reference for the theory of speech acts.

[6] An example of "mute event" is the *incognito* coming of Charles (Carol) to Romania, to take the throne.

[7] Cf. the law for the naturalization of the princely Hohenzollern family.

[8] There may exist massive intertextuality between different texts produced by the same political agent.

[9] Max Duncker was a distinguished professor of history and the director of the Archive of the Prussian Kingdom.

[10] Romania won its independence in 1877, under the rule of Charles (Carol) I.

References

Arendt, Hannah. 2005[1972]. *Fdgdduinfa politicii [The Promise of Politics].* Bucuresti: Humanitas.

Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Carbo, Teresa. 2004. "Parliamentary discourse when things go wrong: Mapping histories, contexts, conflicts." In *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse,* edited by Paul Bayley, 300-337. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fritz, Gerd. 2008. "Communication principles for controversies. A historical perspective." In *Controversy and Confrontation. Relating Controversy Analysis with Argumentation Theory,* edited by Frans F. van Eemeren and Bart Garssen, 108-124. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dascal, Marcelo. 2008. "Dichotomies and types of debate." In *Controversy and Confrontation. Relating Controversy Analysis with Argumentation Theory,* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren and Bart Garssen, 27-50. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grice, H. P. 2001 [1975]. "Logique et conversation." In *Pragmatique et Theorie de I'enonciation. Choix de textes,* edited by Vlad Alexandrescu, 422-438. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Hitchins, Keith. 1998. *Romania 1866-1947,* 2ⁿᵈ edition. Bucuresti: Humanitas.

Iorga, Nicolae. 1932. *Supt trei regi: istorie a unei lupte pentru un ideal moral si national. Romania contemporand de la 1904 la 1930.* Bucuresti: [s.n.].

—. 2010 [1938]. *Istoria romdnilor. Unificatorii,* vol IX, edited by Gheorghe Cliveti, Mihai Cojocaru, and Cristian Ploscaru. Bucuresti: Editura Enciclopedica.

Kogalniceanu, Mihail. 1982. *Opere IV. Oratorie II, 1864-1878,* edited by Georgeta Penelea. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 2009 [2006]. *Conceptele si istoriile lor. Semantica si pragmatica limbajului social-politic.* Translated by Gabriel H. Decuble and Maria Oruz. Bucuresti: Art.

Lamizet, Bernard. 2011. *Le langage politique. Discours, images, pratiques.* Paris: Elipses.

Marton, Silvia. 2009. *La construction politique de la nation. La nation dans les debats du Parlement de la Roumanie (1866-1871).* Iasi: Institutul European.

Memoriile regelui Carol I al Romdniei de un martor ocular. Volumul 1, 1866-1869, edited by Stelian Neagoe. Bucuresti: Scripta [MERCI].

Neagoe, Stelian. 1992. "Prefa(a." In *Memoriile regelui Carol I al Romdniei de un martor ocular. Volumul 1, 1866-1869,* edited by Stelian Neagoe. Bucuresti: Scripta [MERCI].

Penelea, Georgeta. 1982. "Introducere." In Mihail Kogalniceanu, *Opere IV. Oratorie II, 1864-1878,* edited by Georgeta Penelea, 5-28; 36-39. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania.

Salavastru, Constantin. 1999. *Discursul puterii. Incercare de retorted aplicatd.* Iasi: Institutul European.

Slavescu, Victor. 1941. *Recunoasterea dreptului de a bate moneta. Acfiunea diplomaticd a Romdniei intre 1866-1970.* Bucuresti: Fundatia Regele Carol I.

Sturdza, D. A. 1912. *Autoritatea faptului indeplinit. Executat in 1866 de cei indreptdfiti. [Analele Academiei Romdne,* seria II, vol. XXXIV, nr. 16. *Memoriile sectiunii istorice].* Bucuresti: Librariile Socec & Comp., C. Sfetea si Libraria Nationals.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

DE DICTO EVALUATION IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE OF THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

OANA UTA BARBULESCU
AND MELANIA ROIBU

1. Introductory Remarks

In comparison with the pre-war parliamentary discourse, on the one hand, and the contemporary discourse, on the other hand, the interwar discourse displays some characteristic features, both at the rhetorical-argumentative and pragmatic levels. Interwar MPs seem to benefit of a wider range of lexical, argumentative and rhetorical choices than their forerunners; yet, their resources are by far less rich than those of present-day parliamentarians. Explicit constraints (imposed through the Regulations' of the Chambers of the Parliament) and implicit ones[2] (unwritten, but observed-to different extents-by the members of the same community of practice) change from one epoch to another and their modification shapes the typological individuality of the parliamentary discourse.

In what follows, we shall try to grasp the manner in which certain sequences representing *de dicto* evaluations become the discursive vehicle of irony. In the cases under scrutiny, irony is staged by means of a complex discursive strategy, i.e. praise. We shall also take into consideration the way in which *de dicto* evaluation, re-contextualized by means of irony, is used at the argumentative level, involving appeals to both *ethos* and *pathos*. We put forward the hypothesis that the re-contextualization of *de dicto* evaluation proves that the interwar parliamentary discourse begins to gradually get rid of some (implicit)

constraints which, in the previous epoch, would have blocked the use of certain strategic argumentative moves, such as irony.

2. Aim of the Paper and Approach to the Topic

Our paper aims at analysing the cases where one of the most prominent MPs of the interwar epoch, Armand Calinescu[3], rejects the validity of the arguments invoked by his opponents, by labelling their discourse as "literature". This represents a discursive mark which individualizes Calinescu among the MPs of the interwar epoch. Such an intervention would have most probably been rejected by the famous orators of the pre-war epoch, as deviant from a meticulously organised argumentative discourse[4].

We propose a multidisciplinary approach to the topic, based on the joint perspectives of the discourse analysis, the pragma-dialectic theory of argumentation[5], as well as the one proposed by non-formal logic (see Walton, Reed and Macagno 2008; Walton 2002, etc.).

2.1. Structural Patterns of *DeDicto* Evaluation

Armand Calinescu's discourses display three structural patterns where *de dicto* evaluation is used in an ironical manner. Among the numerous examples identified in our corpus, we have focused on analysing the prototypical realizations of these patterns:

(a) Toata activitatea prefectoriaia s-a v5zut consemnata intr-un voluminos num3r al Monitorului judetean, care ar fi facut deliciile cititorilor, **dac&** un ordin venit la timp, mai de sus, nu ar fi interzis prefectului satisfac|ia de a-si vedea proza raspandita in comunele judeUilui. Am izbutit, insa, d-lor, **sa-**mi procur un exemplar din aceasta prefioasa lucrare, ramasa quasi-inedita, si il tin la dispoziha d-voastre. *(DP,* I, p. 12)
A1l prefectorial activity has been gathered within a voluminous issue of the local newspaper, which would have made the readers' delight, had it not been for a well-timed order come from "above", which deprived the prefect of the satisfaction of seeing his prose spread within the villages of the district. However, Gentlemen, I have managed to procure a copy of this precious work, which has remained quasi-unknown, and it will be at your disposal.

(b) Am cetit expunerea de motive. Poate ma insel eu, dar, judecand **dupa** stilul Tn care este redactata, am impresia **ca** se datoreste d-sale [ministrului lucrarilor publice] si, prin urmare, ea reda cu atat mai mult sentimentele d-lui ministru. *(DP,* I, p. 239)

I have read the motivation. **I** may be wrong, but judging by the style it displays, I have the impression that it is due to the Minister of Public Works and therefore it expresses the Minister's feelings.

(c) D. V. Valcovici, ministrul lucrarilor publice si al comunicatiilor: D-lor, eu va rog **sa** nu intrerupeti frumusetea expunerii d-lui deputat Calinescu, pe care eu o gust cu toata piacerea.
D. Eduard Mirto: §i noi, va promitem **ca** vom gusta frumusetea discursului d-voastra si nu va vom Tntrerupe.
D. Ar. M. Calinescu: Dati-mi voie, **va** rog, **sa** fiu in schimb de amabilitati cu d. ministru si **sa** declar cS, la randul meu, gust frumusetea scrisului d-sale, dovada ca !1 citez cu atata piacere. *(DP,* I, p. 246-247)
Mr. V. Valcovici: Gentlemen, I kindly ask you not to interrupt the beauty of MP Caiinescu's talk, which I fully enjoy.
Mr. E. Mirto: In our turn, we promise that we shall fully enjoy the beauty of your talk and shall not interrupt you.
Mr. A. Calinescu: Please, allow me to contribute to this relaxed atmosphere and declare that, in my turn, I enjoy the beauty of his writing, as proved by the fact that I quote him with so much pleasure.

The above-mentioned sequences have been selected from discourses delivered by Armand Calinescu between 1926 and 1932, when he was an MP from the Opposition part. When the National Peasant Party, which he represented, was in power, he seemed to have discarded this discursive strategy. The fact is worth mentioning, since when in power, Calinescu displayed a discursive behaviour where moves of offering and re-offering were prevalent.

2.2. Evaluation in Discourse and its Prototypical Realizations

The examples under consideration contain evaluations, which are to be found in any communicative activity, in general, and in the parliamentary discourse, as one of its sub-genres, in particular. In other words, parliamentary discourse is not only argumentative, but also profoundly evaluative (White 2006). Starting from this premise, we question the intellectualist and objectivist prejudice which states that language is essentially an instrument for the expression of propositional thought. Accepting such an opinion would trigger a negative definition of evaluation, equated with that part of the linguistic meaning which is *not* subject to the truth conditions. More precisely, *evaluation* refers to linguistic material that expresses the speaker's attitude towards what is (being) said and is more or less equivalent to *stance,* defined by Conrad and Biber (2000) as expressing "personal feelings, attitudes, value

judgments, or assessments" added to any communication of propositional content. Evaluation is a cover term for the expression of the writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about (Hunston and Thompson 2000, 5).

Our standpoint is that the vast majority of utterances have an evaluative potential[6]. One can assess events *(de re* evaluation), arguments *(de argumento* evaluation) or discourses *(de dicto* evaluation). The latter can comment on the certainty/doubt, reliability or limitations of a proposition, including comments on the source of information *(epistemic evaluation),* convey the speaker's attitude, feelings or value judgments towards what is being said *(attitudinal evaluation),* or describe the manner in which the information is being presented *(style evaluation).* Opinion can be expressed by grammatical choice (the *grammar of evaluation:* modality, agency/affectedness, etc) or by lexical choice *(evaluation lexis).* Yet, evaluation is parasitic on other resources and it is somewhat dispersed across a range of structural options shared with non-evaluative functions *(ibidem,* 74).

A. The previous examples represent tokens of the third type of evaluation, i.e *de dicto.* The three prototypical realizations have in common the fact that *de dicto* evaluation becomes the vehicle of irony. The re-categorization of evaluation in an ironical manner is achieved by the use of the same discursive strategy: the praise aimed at the literariness of a discourse which in essence is not and cannot be literary. The assessment of artefacts (discourses) in terms of how they are assigned value socially and politically is mediated by reference to their aesthetic qualities, in reverse ratio: the more literary a discourse, the more harmful, since inappropriate and ineffective.

Moreover, the more frequent the evaluative terms (originally, with positive connotations) used to describe the opponents' discourses, the more predictable is Calinescu's dis-alignment from the viewpoint expressed there. A first sign of the evaluation turned into irony is represented by the mismatch between the designation manner and the referent (the prefect's report is labelled as *prose* and is part of a *voluminous issue of the local newspaper;* the motivation of the Minister of Public Works is assessed in terms of a *style* which betrays the author's *feelings,* etc)[7]. The insistence on using evaluative words could be a proof that testifies to the reconfiguring of evaluation in an ironical manner.

B. Besides the common strategy previously discussed, the three sequences are characterized by a different pragma-rhetorical dynamic.

In example (a), a complex isotopy of the literary space is created, which does not lack direct reference to the author, work and audience. Calinescu's lexical choices are constrained by the need of inscribing them into the paradigm of the literary space, which leads to the actualization of some topoi, typical of this space. Thus, for example, the prefect's prose cannot be other than *precious* and the issue of the local newspaper cannot be other than *voluminous.* Yet, irony springs not only from Calinescu's lexical choices, but also from the means of asserting causality, by mixing the topoi with causes presented as real. The prefect's prose is *precious* because it is *rare* and it is rare because *a well-timed order come from "above"* had blocked its spreading (the initial causal relation represents a common place, whereas the secondary cause has not yet entered this category). It is also worth mentioning that, despite the absence of any explicit negative connotations, one can infer a less manifest negativity within the evaluative words that are being used.

The same is true for example (b), where the noun *style* acquires negative connotations which result from the opponents' discourses failing to adapt to the situational setting of the Parliament.

Strategies of mitigation and evaluation work together[8], as proved by the fact that the evaluative word *style* is preceded by a metacommunicative sequence containing modalization (/ *may be wrong).* Instead of verbal modality, the Romanian text uses an adverb with modal function-poate *(maybey-vMch* is backed by the syntagm *Am impresia (I have the impression)* which, in its turn, prefaces the second evaluative structure: the Minister's motivation displays *feelings.* Mitigation reflects Calinescu's attempt to present his message in reasonable terms, in order to prevent being accused of having exaggerated and consequently mistaken. The irony results from the contraposition of the completely non-evaluative initial sequence (/ *have read the motivation),* which generates certain expectations, with a completely evaluative one, presenting the referent in a light that does not meet the initial expectations. The evaluative words used to characterize the prefect's text are complemented by the mitigated manner in which one is introduced to the act of interpreting the respective text. On the one hand, one can speak of a text written *in style;* on the other hand, it is indirectly asserted the difficulty of grasping the real literary value of this text.

Example (c) has a complex structure, due to its dialogic character, as well as to the actualization of the over-politeness (mock politeness) strategy. The dialogic structure of the fragment results in the ironical

multiplication of an evaluative initial utterance. In fact, minister Valcovici responds to its discourse being labelled as "literature" (although he was speaking about the necessity of introducing a road law!), continuing thus the discursive isotopy instaurated by Calinescu's statement. In this case, one can identify an isotopy placed at the dialogic level, fulfilling interactional functions (as long as they signal the author's involvement within the verbal exchange).

Moreover, the turns in example (c) are based on repetition. Each of the three speakers makes use of overstatements at the discursive level, in order to protect his own image, simulating the attention paid to what is being asserted by the speaker, by keeping almost intact the isotopic core of the literary space. Dialogic repetition acquires interactional functions designed to emphasize the differences between the positions expressed by each speaker. All of them successively claim their perfect adaptation to the situational context, presenting themselves as the ideal interlocutor. Consequently, should agreement not be reached, the one to blame is the locutor, who makes literature. The discursive overstating combines with the over-politeness strategy. The speakers use polite formulas, typical of political rituals, assuming a polite conduct. Only when appearing as interlocutors do they accept to conceal the importance of their own point of view and to exaggerate, by contrast, the locutor's merits, while also invoking regulations meant to help the locutor express his point of view. Yet, concessions are usually placed solely at the declarative level, since they are not backed by a genuine intention of accepting the other's arguments.

3. *De Dicto* Evaluation in Relation to Irony

All the enunciative aspects which result from including *de dicto* evaluation within ironical sequences participate in the argumentative move and generate arguments targeted at the *ethos* and *pathos*.

3.1. Speaker's Ethos vs. Opponent's Ethos

When used ironically, *de dicto* evaluation allows to distinguish between the speaker's *ethos* and his opponent's *ethos*. By choosing this manner of presentation, Armand Calinescu projects a positive *ethos* of a speaker who observes the rules of the community of practice and who intends to express his viewpoint in a non-aggressive way (thanks to a strategy of disguising his statement as praise). The positive *ethos* of the speaker is opposed to that of his interlocutor's. Without directly attacking

the latter, Calinescu challenges his competence as a prefect, minister, etc., on the grounds of a unique argument: the opponent's talk is pure literature, with no connection to the real matters which are likely to be discussed in the Parliament; consequently, failing to understand the aim of the discussion, the opponent proves he has no competence whatsoever with regard to the state's problems. The fragments taken into consideration, despite having little to share with the *argumentum ad hominem,* function quite similarly from an argumentative perspective[9].

3.2. *De Dicto* Evaluation and Manipulation

At the same time, when resorting to such ironical evaluations, Calinescu manages to manipulate the audience's emotions, taking advantage of the group prejudices identifiable within a community of practice, such as the parliament (see also van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2010, 136-138). By appealing to pathos, the arguer forgets to provide the proofs to support the evaluation of his opponents' as literature. Although admitting to literature's qualities, Armand Calinescu states that it has nothing to do with the Parliament setting and points to the fact that any concession made in favour of literature would inevitably jeopardize an MP's identity within the respective community of practice.

3.3. *De Dicto* Evaluation and the Argument from Classification

Inside the same sequences, *de dicto* evaluation becomes the vehicle for the argument from classification. Calinescu does not provide concrete proofs to reinforce the evaluation of his opponents' discourses as literature. His whole demonstration is based on the argument from classification[10] which, in this particular case, is tantamount to saying that a label is enough to replace any argumentation. Depicting the discourse of his opponent as literature, the speaker questions the validity of the former's standpoint (since literature belongs to another discursive space and hence cannot permeate the Parliament setting, where serious issues are dealt with).

3.4. *De dicto* Evaluation as a Means of Delegating Responsibility and Avoiding the Burden of Proof

As expected, by resorting to such ironical evaluations, Calinescu avoids taking responsibility for *onus probandi* "providing proofs" (see also van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2010, 119-120). He asserts the literary

character of his opponents' discourses and this assertion lays at the basis of questioning their standpoints; the political adversaries are thus denied any political competence. When used that way, arguments function as mere sophisms.

4. Concluding Remarks

The analysis of examples (a)-(c) emphasizes the manner in which *de dicto* evaluation becomes the vehicle of irony, which lays emphasis on the existence of a mismatch between the quality attributed to a certain referent and the referent as such. Praise turns into a strategy subsumed under the larger term *irony,* as long as the arguer exploits the distance between the literal meaning of words or phrases and their secondary meaning, which is construed according to some rules of antonymic transformation and which is compatible with the context (situational setting) and the co-text (verbal setting). This is yet another feature which can be invoked in relation to all the three examples and which is achieved by means of discourse prosody, meant to indicate that the evaluative function results from merging an item with an atypical environment at a discourse-cohesive level. This way, the possible negativity of words is prosodically realised.

As a matter of fact, ironical praise *(mock politeness)* represents one of the most frequent strategies within the scope of the *off record impoliteness* (Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann 2003, 1546). It is also worth mentioning that, in the majority of cases, the resort to the off record strategies makes it possible to convey implicatures that are very offending to the target, yet disguised as a discourse that observes the rules. From this perspective, praise, as a strategy of irony, creates a securing space for the speaker (who announces his intention to diminish the damage caused to the other, by the use of over-politeness, which contributes to the preservation of his own image) and for the opponent too (who has to respond in a non-aggressive way, in order to avoid jeopardizing his image).

In most of the cases, *de dicto* evaluation is not neutral from an argumentative perspective. When included in ironical sequences, it participates in the argumentative move, permitting the contraposition of the positive ethos of the speaker and that questionable of the opponent, who is deprived of any competence and who, in addition, challenges the MP's status, by his lack of professionalism. As compared with their forerunners from the second half of the nineteenth century, the interwar MPs make abundant use of *de dicto* evaluation, mainly in its ironical variant. Yet, they are less inclined to resort to the *ad hominem* and *ad personam* arguments, which seem to be favoured by present-day MPs, in their talks.

The use of praise, as well as of different strategies of mitigation may be connected with the necessity of observing a certain parliamentary tradition, which required from the MPs to build a discursive identity characterized by benevolence, credibility, etc. The resort to evaluative words or structures to back some emotional scenarios that are used ironically represents a sign of MPs trying to break free from the (implicit) constraints which, in the pre-war epoch, would have been interpreted as inappropriate discursive behaviour. However, the manner of assessing artefacts (discourses) and-in doing so-human behaviour and reliability is still dominated by affects. Rhetorical skills cannot always conceal those affects and may lead to the risk that counter-discourse itself be turned into a discourse of the same kind like the one previously criticized for being literature.

Indirectness is still prevalent in the interwar epoch, as proved by the preference for *off record* impoliteness and the avoidance of the overt inscribing of authorial viewpoint, which is manifest in the use of provoking tokens. In such situations, the usually negative assessment of the opponent's talk is realized via metaphorical associations, antiphrasis and counter-expectations. These are but a few mechanisms by means of which inexplicit language can acquire the potential to position the interwar MP in relation to his opponents' talks, while also keeping the appearance of a polite verbal exchange.

Notes

[1] See, among others, the Internal Regulation of the Senate together with the debates (voted in the Session of January 29, 1925, and published in the Official Gazette No. 24, in January 31, 1925), 1926, Bucuresti: Imprimeriile Statului.

[2] Unlike explicit constraints, codified in writing, implicit ones are by nature more ambiguous, being based on the audience's assumptions and beliefs about the way the conduct of an MP ought to be throughout the whole length of his legislature. The assessment of MPs' conduct is made by reference to some systems of conventional/institutional norms (community of practice), which are voiced by different forms of institutional metadiscourse. Implicit constraints can thus be defined as (unwritten) norms which record the ideal verbal and non-verbal behaviour of an MP; they presuppose the existence of some prohibited behavioural forms that are to be avoided by the MPs and their coercive force varies according to the cultural, political, etc. background of each MP.

[3] Armand Calinescu (1893-1939) was a prominent member of the National Peasant Party, an MP representing the aforementioned party (starting from 1926) and Prime Minister of Romania, between March and September 1939 (in September

1939, he was assassinated by the members of the so-called Archangel Michael's Legion, the Romanian counterpart of the Nazi Party).

As a communicative activity, parliamentary discourse has an intrinsic argumentative component. For the whole discussion, see van Eemeren and Garssen (2012, 212), where the two authors point to the fact that, usually, "communicative activity types may be non-argumentative, but in these activity types more often than not-directly or indirectly-argumentation plays a part, whether structurally or incidentally, so that the communicative activity type concerned is partly or wholly argumentative. Whereas a parliamentary debate is inherently argumentative, a political interview argumentative in essence, and a love letter as a rule not argumentative, a prayer may be coincidentally argumentative when it tries to claim a favo(u)r and contains perhaps even supporting arguments".

[5] As it was formulated by van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2010).

[6] Evaluation is implied even where it is not directly realised (Martin 2003, 173).

[7] This proves that signification is primarily dependent on the process of communication.

[8] For the discussion about the functioning of the strategies of mitigation and evaluation in exordial sequences of Armand Calinescu's discourses, see Uta Barbulescu and Roibu (2011, 503-510).

[9] Walton, Reed and Macagno (2008, 140-142): "The argument from *ethos,* based on the credibility of the person, has two forms, a positive and a negative one. While the positive topic provides a good reason to accept the proposed position, the negative one is closely related to the generic *ad hominem* argument. Ethotic topoi are the link between arguments from commitment and personal attacks. The *ad hominem* argument is based essentially on two topics. One is that from the bad character of an arguer it is reasonable to infer his non-credibility, and hence the lack of worth of his argument. The other is that from incoherence in an arguer's actions or words it is possible to draw a conclusion to a serious ethical failure in the agent's character, and to take that as an impugning of his credibility".

[10] Walton, Reed and Macagno (2008, 67): "Arguments from classification are based on two main components: the description, or presentation, of the facts or events, and their classification, proceeding from properties presented in the definition itself. The classification may derive from a semantic aspect of the words used to describe the event: if x is classified as a terrorist, the implicit premise that terrorists are classified as enemies, stemming from the accepted meaning of the word 'terrorist', automatically leads to the conclusion that x is an enemy. Such verbal categorization is a speaker's choice, but it may also be backed by common or shared knowledge".

Corpus

Calinescu, Armand. 1993. *Discursuri parlamentare,* vol. I-II. Bucuresti: Quadrimpex [DP].

References

Conrad, S., and Douglas Biber. 2000. "Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing." In *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse,* edited by Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson, 56-73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield and Anne Wichmann. 2003. "Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1545-1579.

Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson (eds.). 2000. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R. 2003. "Introduction." *Text,* Special Issue on Evaluation *23* (2): 171-181.

U(a Barbulescu, Oana, and Melania Roibu. 2011. "Strategii de atenuare si de evaluare in secven(a exordiala din discursul parlamentar (Studiu de caz: discursurile lui Armand Calinescu)." In *Text si discurs. Omagiu Mihaelei Mancas,* edited by Oana Chelaru Murarus, Maria Catanescu, Claudia Ene, Camelia Usurelu, and Rodica Zafiu, 503-510. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

van Eemeren, Frans H, and Rob Grootendorst. 2010. *Argumentare, comunicare si sofisme. O perspectivd pragma-dialecticd.* Translated from English by Corina Andone and Anca Ga{a. Galati: Galati University Press.

van Eemeren, Frans H., and Bart Garssen. 2012. "Strategic manoeuvring in political argumentation. The plenary debate in the European Parliament as an argumentative activity type." In *Modernitate si interdisciplinaritate in cercetarea lingvistica. Omagiu doamnei professor Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu,* edited by Mihaela Constantinescu, Gabriela Stoica, and Oana U(a Barbulescu, 210-223. Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Walton, Douglas. 2002. *Legal Argumentation and Evidence.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Walton, Douglas, Chris Reed, and Fabrizio Macagno (eds.). 2008. *Argumentation Schemes.* Cambridge/New-York: Cambridge University Press.

White, P. R. R. 2006. "Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse—a new framework for analysis." In *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image: Ten Critical Studies,* edited by I. Lassen, I., 37-69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

THE USE OF QUOTATIONS IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE

MLHAELA-VLORICA CONSTANTINESCU

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to analyse the means of prefacing quotations in a discourse and their argumentative functions, from a pragma-rhetorical point of view. The corpus is represented by debates in the Romanian Parliament ranging from 1866 to 1938. Quotations are referred to both in a strict and in a broad sense: on the one hand, we shall analyse quotations proper, which are discursively actualised as reported speech, and, on the other hand, the references made to some authoritative figures or political ideologies. In analysing some parliamentary debates, one could not overlook the frequency of certain argumentative techniques, which seem to respond to both institutional and communicative goals, i.e. quotations are used not only to support the speaker's thesis, but also to counter-attack (counter-argumentation).

Our pragma-rhetorical approach uses some insights from different (and sometimes diverging) argumentation theories: the "classics" Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, Fr. van Eemeren (pragma-dialectics) and D. Walton (informal logic). We shall try to combine some theoretical suggestions regarding the argument *ex auctoritate* from Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca and Walton & Macagno. Pragma-dialectics represents the theoretical basis underlying critical discussion and activity types. Concerning the fallacies connected with the manipulation of quotations, we shall appeal to both pragma-dialectical and informal logic approaches. This theoretical background is detailed in the section below.

2. Theoretical and Methodological Background

2.1. The Deliberation

By definition, parliamentary debates represent the deliberative genre, but they also involve instances of other communicative genres (negotiation, consulting, etc.). The institutional and communicative reality leads to what Walton (2004, 135) called *functional embedding*.

There are several ways of interpreting the functions of parliament. We shall take into consideration here P. Bayley's abridged version:

"First, the legitimation of law-making; second, the recruitment, socialization and training of politicians; and finally, making decisions or influencing opinion. Thus the discourse of parliament may serve to provide a formal stamp of approval to legislation, an arena in which politicians are judged by their peers, and a site where interests are articulated" (Bayley 2004, 12).

In politics, the code of argumentative conduct entails "dealing institutionally with uncertainty" and offering a reasonable solution. The participants, not always prepared for critical scrutiny[1], are different as far as their abilities, institutional power and resources are concerned; external pressure limits the real resolution of political disagreement, sometimes forcing an "immediate settlement" (see van Eemeren 2010, 3-4). The debates usually have a clear protagonist and antagonist (two political leaders, two opposite parties claiming different standpoints). The goal of their critical discussion (a quasi-discussion, according to van Eemeren 2010) is to persuade the public, the undecided members of the Parliament (henceforth MPs).

Deliberation often derives from "largely implicit intersubjective rules and from both explicit and implicit concessions" *(ibidem,* 148) of the protagonist and antagonist. Parliamentary debates involve a certain argumentative behaviour-a type of strategic manoeuvring-obeying the institutional constraints *(ibidem,* 154); the parameters of this strategic argumentative behaviour include the results that could be reached through an argumentative movement, the course that could lead to those results, the institutional constraints, participants' commitments (van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2009, van Eemeren 2010). Institutional constraints are sometimes loose, but, in some cases, they are reminded explicitly, in metadiscursive and metacommunicative interventions, when some of the MPs refuse to observe the "protocol".

Within the parliamentary debate, deliberation favours the established democratic political cultures. A political culture reflects the fact that any

political community presents a frame constraining discourses and actions. This frame involves the community's beliefs, symbols, attitudes, behaviour, etc., created and shaped in time, validated through practice.

The functional similarity of parliaments could be contradicted or could reveal other similarities as regards linguistic and non-linguistic features: (im)politeness, abstract vs. concrete language, humorous devices, etc., which are culturally based (Bayley 2004, 14). From a functional linguistic perspective, we should consider the impact of the cultural and historical context on the communicative behaviour.

2.2. Quotations

Walton and Macagno (2011, 29) focus on two types of argumentative quotation. The first type explicitly or implicitly supports the standpoint of the protagonist-in this case, the *argument from authority (ex auctoritate)* could appear and commitment could be entailed; the second type involves the use of quotation to attack the antagonist (in fact, this type favours a fallacious use). We could add a third argumentative type, namely, quotation to entail authenticity, a strategy meant to enhance speaker's ethos in the narrative part of the discourse *(narratid).* We consider that this third type is argumentative and not ornamental (at least in the discourses we have analysed).

The argument from authority refers to the use of actions or opinions belonging to a person or group as a means of proving the validity of a standpoint (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008 [1958], 411). This type of argument could be abusively used, leading to what is called *argumentum ad verecundiam.* According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca *(ibidem,* 413), in many situations, speakers contest the authority invoked and not the use of the argument. The authoritative source could suffer a valorisation or a de-valorisation according to the argumentative goals of the speaker *(ibidem).* The argument from authority often appears as a complement of an autonomous argumentation. In the pragma-dialectic model, the argument from authority is a subtype of the general type of argumentation known as "symptomatic argumentation".

The authority quoted (for the attributes of the authoritative source, see Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008 [1958], 413-416; van Eemeren 2010, 202-204; Walton and Macagno 2011, 31) projects onto the argument a part of its aura ("shift of presumption") (Walton and Macagno 2011, 31). It is believed that the quotation has moral or epistemic authority, an authority which is transferred through the quoted words *(ibidem).*

The argument from authority could be valid, but could also derail from the rules of a critical discussion (van Eemeren 2010, 203). The critical evaluation depends on the concrete situation in which the argument *ex auctoritate* is used. In the initial phase of a critical discussion, the speakers should establish the starting points according to which they evaluate their standpoints. The argumentative reality shows, however, that there are extremely rare cases in which the participants explicitly establish the "expert" they appeal to. The participants in different communicative activities often take for granted the appeal to certain authorities, as van Eemeren noticed:

"the specific soundness criteria pertaining to the strategic maneuvering in a particular communicative activity type are supposed to be familiar to those engaging in it" *(ibidem,* 206).

The implicit character of this appeal to authority is determined by the primary and/or secondary socialization: MPs rely both on common knowledge, as individuals living in a certain culture, and on specialized knowledge, as educated professionals.

Considering parliament as a community of practice involving both primary and secondary socialization, one can rediscover certain internal, as well as external authoritative sources, some accepted without reserve, others questionable. Quotations are also used to enhance speaker's ethos, implying a good memory, the selection of valid sources, etc.

Manipulating quotations is considered a frequent tactic used in argumentation, as quotations are not mere reported speech, but "acts in a discourse aimed at pursuing a specific communicative goal", "reminders of past commitments" (Walton and Macagno 2011, 27-28) of the antagonist or the audience. At the same time, quoting from an authority does not entail commitment to the thesis expressed by that authority. A misquotation is a special speech act altering the communicative setting. This act could have perlocutionary efficiency when the interlocutor changes his initial position *(ibidem).*

In some cases, intentional quotations and misquotations could be seen as fallacies, such as *the straw man* (showing that the antagonist had previous standpoints opposed to those claimed at present; attributing the antagonist standpoints/commitments he has never expressed) and *ad hominem* (accusing the other of inconsistency). These fallacies could be considered dialogical tactics *(ibidem),* revealing the polyphonic character of the parliamentary argumentation.

Fallacies are considered inacceptable argumentative moves in a critical evaluation of the discourse (van Eemeren 2010, 187), and not logical errors in general. According to van Eemeren, fallacies are an "impediment to the resolution of a difference of opinion" *(ibidem,* 193). In relation to the strategic manoeuvring, fallacies are derailments, violating "one or more of the rules for critical discussion" *(ibidem,* 198); in order to evaluate an argumentative move as fallacious, one should appeal to the macro-level (the activity type), as well as to the micro-discursive level.

Walton and Macagno notice that *the straw man* fallacy could be connected to the relation between ethos and the discursive position. The authors state that the presupposition of agreement depends on the "hearer's trust in the speaker's ethos" (Walton and Macagno 2011, 32). Misattribution, misquotation, or "wrenching a proposition from context" ("suppression of evidence", Hurley 1991 *apud* Walton and Macagno 2011, 40), affecting the antagonist's reported affirmations, represent frequent fallacies. On the other hand, Walton and Macagno notice that accusing the other of wrenching a proposition from context could be a strategy of retracting opinions/commitments previously expressed *(ibidem,* 38). Previous commitments are not involved in the "present" argumentation, being hidden ("dark-side commitments"), more or less known to the public.

Quoting and the accusation of misquoting involve a possible shift in the *burden of proof.* Assertions connect the speaker to the content of the utterance, and the speaker needs to defend his standpoint. Quotations connect the interlocutor to the reported utterance; the interlocutor is forced to offer proves in order to show that he was misquoted. Misquotation implies invented commitments attributed to the interlocutor as previous or dark-side commitments *(ibidem,* 46). When the protagonist tries to shift the burden of proof to the antagonist, as a consequence of a misquotation/misattribution, two variants of the *ad hominem* fallacy are possible: *circumstantial* (the antagonist has a personal interest in the matter), and *tu, quoque* (the standpoint shows inconsistency with the antagonist's previous standpoints) (van Eemeren 2010, 231). Walton and Macagno (2011, 34) consider that allusions and irony are strategies meant to undermine the antagonist's credibility when direct, explicit inconsistency accusations cannot be made. On the other hand, explicit accusations of inconsistency could be based on the technique of misquotation (emphasising possible obscure commitments) *(ibidem,* 50).

Parliamentary debates usually reveal a mosaic of discourses "which are intertextually and contratextually interwoven as MPs respond to what has been said previously, not just in the House but elsewhere" (Bayley 2004, 24).

It is important to notice that through MPs' discourses an entire political culture could be scrutinised. Our goal is to present some frequent situations concerning quotations from the old Romanian Parliament. We have selected three types: (1) quoting foreign sources and the way the appeal to those sources represents an argument from authority; (2) quoting internal sources and the need to contest an argument from authority; (3) the manipulation of quotations and fallacies. These situations could also be seen in the present-day parliamentary debates, in different political cultures, with different authoritative sources invoked or contested.

3. Background Information about the Old Romanian Parliament

For centuries, the Romanian Principalities have had a complicated political situation. Once the Ottoman suzerainty and the Russian domination replaced by the tutelage of the Western powers (after the Crimean War), the former Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia decided to unite in 1859, under the name of Romania. The kingdom was proclaimed in 1881 (after the Independence War against the Ottoman Empire). In 1918, towards the end of the First World War, other Romanian historical provinces (Bessarabia, Bucovina, and Transylvania), parts of the former Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, decided to unite with Romania. The union achieved in 1918 (the last and most important event being Transylvania's decision to unite with Romania on December 1, 1918) is known in Romanian history as the "Great Union", to be distinguished from the 1859 union between Moldavia and Wallachia.

Between 1866 and 1938, Romania was a constitutional monarchy: the Constitution was adopted in 1866, revised in 1883 and in 1923, respectively. Romania was a unitary state. In Romania, the party/coalition winning the elections was the one to form the government. The king designated the prime-minister from this winning group. The electoral system was based on qualification up to 1918; after the First World War, Romania introduced the universal suffrage for men.

As P. Bayley (2004,3) noticed, unitary states

"tend to give complete sovereignty to parliament, even though many require qualified majorities for particular forms of legislation."

As regards the situation of the legislative and the executive powers, the debates usually present a conflict between government and opposition. Before 1916, there were two main parties (the Liberal and the Conservative Parties), as well as political factions, created by some

dissidents of the two parties; the politicians were gathered around some charismatic leaders (Marton 2009, 12). During the above-mentioned period, Romania's governments were controlled by a single party (either the Liberal or the Conservative Party), a situation similar to that in Great Britain (as presented in Bayley 2004, 4). Still, the parliament was not only an institution validating government's policy: the parliamentary arena was also a place of political mediation and negotiation between opposite groups. In Romania, the "voting machine" became visible during the interwar period.

Between the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century (up to 1938), one can speak of a liberal (in the broad sense) political culture in the case of the Romanian society.

4. The Argument from Authority: Quoting Foreign Sources

Western Europe-referred to as "Europe", "the great powers" or "the civilized countries"-and its political thinking and practices have been a constant reference and inspiration for Romanian politicians (and parliamentarians) since the early nineteenth century (Marton 2009, 30). Although some sources and external events are explicitly mentioned, other authoritative sources are not always prominent in the speeches. As S. Marton (2009, 41) puts it, "the aestheticism" of the speeches could render difficult the process of identifying political and intellectual references.

As far as the arguments from authority are concerned, in the old Romanian parliamentary debates we noticed the constant appeal to foreign political and parliamentary models. This appeal is a normal fact for a country with no democratic past. The persuasive force of an MP's argument is enhanced by the "credible or authoritative sources" quoted in that argument (Dibattista 2004, 162). Many of the MPs' speeches legitimize or justify a political action. As already noticed, in legitimizing discourses,

"certain elements may be represented in a positive fashion, while others may be backgrounded or even suppressed in order to persuade an audience of the rightness of those actions" *(ibidem,* 155).

The most frequently invoked political and parliamentary model is the British one, which is present when discussing both international relations (for example, The British Empire's hesitation in the 1877 Russian-Ottoman war, evoked by the Romanian prime-minister and MP Ion C. Bratianu, in February 1878), and internal political affairs. Important

political events in Britain are evoked to support an argument: the political and parliamentary activity of Gladstone and Disraeli (in a speech by N. Filipescu in June 1899) or Queen Victoria's active involvement in the political life, as a justification for King Charles' I (Carol I) implication in the Romanian political life, as shown by the following excerpt from I.C. Bratianu's speech:

> Si fiindca onor. d. Ianoli vorbea adineaori de Parlamentul englez, il rog sa citeasca scrisorile dintre principele Albert si doctorul Stockmann si se va convinge ca *chiar in Englitera Regina cea mai constitutionals, cea mai adoratd, are o mare inrdurire in afacerile Statului.* (I.C. Bratianu 29.10.1883)
> And as the honourable Mr. Ianoli was speaking a moment ago about the British [English] Parliament, I ask him to read Prince Albert's letters addressed to doctor Stockmann; he will thus convince himself that *even in England, the most constitutional and the most adored Queen has a great influence in State affairs.*

Other names that appear as foreign authoritative sources come from the French socio-political life. Such important French names are Saint-Marc Girardin (politician, professor and writer), whose phrase: "Abandon these republican ideas, as royalty is still strong in Europe", was quoted by I. C. Bratianu, in October 1883, Proudhon (a politician and philosopher) or Esmein (a professor of law). From the German political life, the most authoritative source seems to be Chancellor Bismarck. All these authoritative sources are validated through primary and secondary socialization: Romanians' admiration for Western powers, as well as the fact that the majority of the Romanian MPs studied abroad and tried to re-create Western socio-political models in their own country and to implement an institutional parliamentary system (taking England, the European state with the longest parliamentary tradition, as a model).

In some cases, there is a negotiation between the speaker and other MPs regarding the attribute of "authority" of an invoked personality:

> I.C. Bratianu: [...] Revin acum la Ambron. *Repausatul Proudhon, faimosul publicist...*
> V. Boerescu: A! ne aduceji *exemple socialiste.*
> I.C. Bratianu: *Nu era numai socialist, era un mare scriitor si mare critic, care face onoare secolului nostru.* (I.C. Bratianu, 4.03.1871)
> I.C. Bratianu: [...] Coming back to Ambron. *The late Proudhon, the famous publicist...*
> V. Boerescu: A! You bring forward *socialist examples.*
> I.C. Bratianu: *He was not a mere socialist, but a great writer and critic too, who honours our century.*

Ion C. Bratianu (a "radical liberal" at that time) introduces the source of quotation, "The late Proudhon, the famous publicist", but he is interrupted and does not manage to present the quotation. V. Boerescu (a "moderate liberal" at that time) rejects the authority of the French publicist by placing him as a hyponym under a negatively connoted hyperonym (at that *time)-socialist examples.* In his turn, I.C. Bratianu rejects V. Boerescu's rejection, thus maintaining his original evaluation of Proudhon as a valid authority in the field. I.C. Bratianu presented the authoritative source as validated (mainly) through primary socialization, while V. Boerescu's rejection concerned the secondary (political) socialization: at the end of the nineteenth century, the socialist ideology was considered dangerous, a "political sect". Bratianu maintains his initial evaluation (Proudhon is a famous publicist), emphasising other qualities of the French publicist, validated through primary socialization *(a great writer and critic too, who honours our century).* However, I.C. Bratianu implicitly admits that, as regards politics, his source belongs to a negatively perceived group.

Analysing interwar parliamentary discourses, one can notice that the argument from authority remains one of the most common strategies being used. Although in the Romanian interwar period MPs used this argumentative strategy, we have found an interesting reaction of rejection:

> D. Al. Otetelesanu: D-lor, dar acestea sunt *lucruri comune, banalitafi de drept public,* care nu au niciun fel de legatura cu chestiunea contestattei. (Zgomot, intreruperi). *Am trecut si noi prin facultdti, am citit si noi pe Esmein, nu avem nevoie sd ni se repete citate.* (Zgomot, intreruperi). Injeleg pe d. deputat de Arges, care singur a declarat ca pentru prima oara se gaseste Tn Parlament, astfel incat se explica de ce *se crede dator sd facd citafiuni din autori.* (intreruperi pe bancile opozitiei-unite). *Acest procedeu este inuzitat in Parlament.* (Zgomot). (A. Calinescu, 26.06.1926)
> Mr. Al. Otetelesanu: Gentlemen, these are *common things, banalities of common law,* which have nothing to do with contestation (Noise, interruptions). *We are university graduates ourselves, we have read Esmein, too, and we don't need being reminded quotations.* (Noise, interruptions). I understand the deputy of Argesh who declared himself that it was his first time in Parliament, which explains why he felt the need to quote various authors. (Interruptions from the benches of the united opposition). *This is not a practice in our Parliament.* (Noise)

What surprised us was the assessment at the end of the turn: *This is not a practice in our Parliament.* Al. Otetelesanu's reaction might have been provoked by the MP's inability to use authoritative quotations: "these are *common things, banalities of common law",* and by their irrelevance to the

current theme. In other words, it is not the appeal to the strategy that is actually rejected, but the communicative inability and the lack of relevance for the current debate. A1. Otetelesanu considers that only the unexperienced MPs use authoritative quotations, emphasizing the common background of the MPs; the person invoked as an authority is considered validated through secondary socialization: "We are university graduates ourselves, we have read Esmein, too, and we don't need being reminded quotations".

In Otetelesanu's intervention, it is obvious that the parliamentary discourse has its own ritual, involving traditions and rules the new MP have to observe (cf. Bayley 2004, 14). The new parliamentarian is criticized for having ignored this communicative tradition.

The quotations are supposed to be relevant to the theme of the debate, otherwise they could lack effectiveness:

> "The effectiveness of the quotation is reinforced by its thematic prominence; the choice of a marked theme shows the ability of the speaker to foreground the objective, authoritative value of the source in the use of a rhetorical strategy, further emphasised by the value of the repetition" (Dibattista 2004, 162).

The authoritative quotation of the new MP fails to meet the requirement of thematic prominence; the example could be invoked as a proof of inability to foreground and to background relevant information.

5. Contesting the Argument from Authority: Quoting Internal Sources

As for the internal authoritative sources, we notice that Romanian MPs quote extensively from existing laws, conventions, from their opponents' speeches (as they are published in the Official Gazette), and even from newspapers (the press is biased and each party has at least an official newspaper), especially from those supporting the opposite party. Quotations from texts of law/conventions usually support the speaker's standpoint, while simultaneously reminding the assembly of past commitments: as a result of deliberation and voting, the laws adopted had the support of the parliamentary majority. On the other hand, quoting an opponent or some opinions from the opposite party's newspapers usually signals a polemic intention.

There are some interesting situations involving polemics and counter-argumentation. Sometimes, the appeal to a source, considered authoritative or thought to be considered that way by the opponent, is carefully staged.

A similar situation is the appeal to a political figure whose authoritative status cannot be denied by the opponent without compromising his own thesis. The MPs bring forward an argument considered (or thought to be considered) an argument from authority by the antagonist. The strategy represents a means to prepare the counter-argumentation or to reveal the inconsistency of the person considered (or thought to be considered) an authority by the antagonist. This tactic could also imply a shift of presumption: since the alleged authority is inconsistent, the same is valid for the person that brings forward such an authority to support his standpoint.

In some cases, by means of a meta-communicative parenthesis, the MP announces that an authoritative quotation will be used; moreover, the MP makes a short characterization of the source, which is being presented as unquestionable:

> Si pentru ca sS v& probez ca astfel sta evolufiunea moderns, va rog sS-mi daji voe sS vS citesc ceeace *spunea un bdrbat de Stat romdn, a cdrui autoritate cred cd nici d. Grddisteanu nu o va contesta [...]. Astfel vorbea dl. Petre Carp la 1895;* si atunci mS intreb: de ce nouS nu ne-ar fi permis sS vorbim tot astfel la 1907? (ilaritate, aplauze) (Ion I.C. BrStianu, 21.12. 1907)
> And, to prove that that is how the modern evolution looks like, please allow me to read you *the words of a Romanian Statesman, whose authority not even Mr. Grddisteanu will dare contest [...]. That is what Mr. Petre Carp said in 1895;* and then I wonder: why wouldn't we be permitted to speak the same way in 1907? (Hilarity, applause)

In the example above, Ion I.C. Bratianu (from the Liberal Party) uses *affectation,* as he qualifies the quoted authority without mentioning the name: *a Romanian Statesman whose authority not even Mr. Grddisteanu will dare contest.* The authoritative source seems to be validated through both primary and secondary socialization. Both the source (i.e. P.P. Carp) and the antagonist (i.e. Gradisteanu) support the same ideology, belonging to the Conservative Party. The affectation mechanism (as a rhetorical procedure) offers the possibility of a strategic behaviour, blocking the shift of presumption from the source to the cited words. Therefore, the source is opaque and the words lack their usual "aura".

The same liberal MP, in the same speech, introduces an explicit evaluation of the authority invoked (i.e. P.P. Carp):

> Cand auzim asemenea teorii din partea d-lui Carp, le credem gresit concepute, le credem chiar primejdioase si socotim de datoria noastrS sS le oprim. *Aceasta insd nu md impiedecd de a recunoaste autoritatea omului*

care le expune. Din partea d-lui Gradisteanu, sa ma erte, nu cred ca emand aceeasi autoritate... (Ion I.C. Bratianu, 21.12. 1907)
When we hear such theories coming from Mr. Carp, we tend to consider them misconceived, even dangerous, and we believe it is our duty to stop them. *This, however, does not prevent me from admitting the authority of the man who presents them. As for Mr. Gradisteanu, I beg his pardon, I doubt he conveys the same authority...*

Carp's authority is explicitly acknowledged *{admitting the authority of the man presenting them),* but his opinions are rejected *(misconceived, even dangerous, and we believe it is our duty to stop them).* Simultaneously, the rejection of Gradisteanu's authority reveals the implicit rejection of any opinions belonging to this MP.

Another interesting situation is stating the authority of a political personality, while also emphasising his inconsistency:

[...] opiniunile, pe cari le voiu sustine astazi, sunt si au fost si opiniunile ale unor mari oameni de Stat, voiu pune astfel slaba mea autoritate sub scutul eel tare al autoritatii lor. [...] *nici chiar pe d-l Kogalniceanu, a cdrei autoritate este, o recunosc, superioard si trece peste competing noastrd a tuturor, care insd s 'a contrazis in dese rdnduri, incat putem mai totdeauna opune un Kogalniceanu de ieri unui Kogalniceanu de astdzi, care va fl combdtut de un Kogalniceanu de maine.* (Al. Lahovari, 17.02.1889)
[...] the opinions I shall present today are and have been the opinions of great Statesmen; I shall thus protect my weak authority with the strong shield of their authority. [...] *not even Mr. Kogalniceanu, whose authority is, I admit, superior to mine and exceeds our competence, but who contradicted himself quite often, so that one could always oppose a yesterday's Kogalniceanu to a today's Kogalniceanu, who is going to be contradicted by a tomorrow's Kogalniceanu.*

After praising M. Kogalniceanu (from the Liberal Party) as an undisputed authority (important politician: former prime-minister, former minister; historian, writer, president of the Romanian Academy), the triple antonomasia-a *Kogalniceanu-,* with temporal adverbial determination *(yesterday, today, tomorrow),* diminishes the authority of the source. Al. Lahovari, a conservative MP, emphasizes Kogalniceanu's inconsistency during his long political career.

If authority is conveyed by overtly quoted sources, it implies the legitimization and truth of the utterance. This concerns the authoritative sources meant to enhance the speaker's position. When a polemic is involved, the sources (i.e. an opponent) could be presented in a vague way, reducing "the authoritativeness and credibility of the source itself

(Dibattista 2004, 163). In fact, the main issue in using quotations is part of a "credibility strategy" *(ibidem)* that could also involve derailments.

6. Quotation and Fallacies

We shall now discuss the situations where the manipulation of quotations derails towards fallacies. As mentioned in the theoretical part of this paper, some "argumentatively targeted" quotations and misquotations could be seen as *the straw man* and *ad hominem* fallacies, usually an impediment to reaching agreement in a debate. More often than not, quoting and the accusation of misquotation bring a shift in the *burden of proof*.

6.1. The Straw Man Fallacy

Connected by Walton and Macagno (2011) to the relation between ethos and the discursive position, the *straw man* fallacy may have manifold manifestations: misattribution, misquotation, wrenching from context. We shall present some recurrent forms of the *straw man* fallacy taken from the Romanian corpus we analysed, which differ in results: misquotation followed by a retraction and an implicit recognition of the communicative "mistake" or misattribution and the manipulation of unexpressed premises that could entail an *ad hominem* attack.

6.1.1. Misquoting and Retracting

In the first example of this section, we present a case of misquotation. I.C. Bratianu (head of the Liberal Party and prime-minister) quotes M. Kogalniceanu (member of the Liberal Party, present at the debate), in the form of reported (indirect) speech:

I. C. Bratianu: Onor.d. Kogalniceanu zicea ieri: noi sa fun tamponul [intre Rusia si Austria]. [...] Ca sa putem ramane tampon nu trebue sa aratam ura contra niciunei puteri; nu trebue sa provocam pe nimeni sa ne apar&m drepturile noastre, dar sa nu provocam.
M. Kogalniceanu: Nici eu n'am zis aceasta; din contra, am zis sa nu fim agresivi niciodata.
I. C. Bratianu: Apoi, domnule Kogalniceanu, este mod si mod de a fi agresiv, este sa ne aparam si sa nu acuzam, caci si acuzarea este de multe ori cea mai mare provocare.
Domnilor, am zis ca unora le e teama de Rusia, altora de Austria...
M. Kogalniceanu: Noua sa ne fie teama de amandoua.
I. C. Bratianu: Asa este. (I.C. Bratianu, 2.05.1882)

I. C. Bratianu: The honourable Mr. Kogalniceanu said yesterday: we should be the buffer [between Russia and Austria]. […] in order for us to be able to remain the buffer, we must not display hatred towards either of these powers; we must not provoke anyone; we should defend our rights, but we should not provoke.
M. Kogalniceanu: I have not said that either; on the contrary, I said we should never be aggressive.
I. C. Bratianu: Well, Mr. Kogalniceanu, there are many ways of being aggressive; one of the ways of being non-aggressive is to defend oneself without accusing others, as accusation is often the biggest of provocations. Gentlemen, I said that some fear Russia, others-Austria...
M. Kogalniceanu: We should fear them both.
I. C. Bratianu: So we should.

M. Kogalniceanu explicitly rejects the attribution of a standpoint implied by the negations used in I.C. Bratianu's discourse: "we must *not* display hatred towards either of these powers; we must *not* provoke anyone; we should defend our rights, but we should *not* provoke"; the use of negation suggests that Kogalniceanu has had a positive standpoint, as "we must display hatred, we should provoke". M. Kogalniceanu affirms he supported an opposite thesis: "on the contrary, I said we should never be aggressive". In response, I.C. Bratianu tries to rephrase his affirmations: "one of the ways of being non-aggressive is to defend oneself without accusing others, as accusation is often the biggest of provocations", implicitly accepting that he had misquoted and attributed the wrong opinion to his fellow MP. The last lines prove that, in fact, there is not a genuine conflict of opinions, as the two MPs reach agreement.

6.1.2. Misattribution and Unexpressed Premises

There are also situations where an MP exploits the implicit meaning of the speeches held by different antagonists. In the example below, I.C. Bratianu assigns some opinions to two opposition leaders; both leaders reject the implicit meaning assigned to their interventions:

I.C. Bratianu: […] D-lor, daca credetf ca am compromis chestiunea, daca crede{i **ca** de?i am fost tari la mceput, dar acuma am **siabit** ?i **ca** trebue **sa** facem concesiuni, spuneji-o curat.
T. Rosetti: N'am zis aceasta.
I.C. Bratianu. Atunci d. L. Catargiu a zis.
L. Catargiu: Nici eu.
T. Rosetti: Nu ne atriburji cuvinte care nu sunt ale noastre.
I.C. Bratianu: D-l T. Rosetti, ca om care stie **sa** manieze cuvintele d-sale, n'a zis asemenea cuvinte, desi reies din discursul d-sale, dar *d. L. Catargiu*

nu are aceasta calitate de orator si de... i-a scdpat cuvdntul (ilaritate). (I. C. Bratianu, 29.04.1882)
I.C. Bratianu: […] Gentlemen, if you believe that we have compromised the issue, that-although strong at the beginning-, we have gradually weakened and ought to make concessions, say it overtly.
T. Rosetti: I have not said that.
I.C. Bratianu: Then it was Mr. Catargiu who said it.
L. Catargiu: Neither did I.
T. Rosetti: Do not attribute to us words we have not uttered.
I.C. Bratianu: Mr. T. Rosetti, as a man who knows how to control his words, did not say such words, although they are implied in his speech, but *Mr. L. Catargiu lacks the skill of an orator and oops!... the word slipped out of his mouth.* (Hilarity)

Since both T. Rosetti and L. Catargiu contradict I.C. Bratianu, he takes one step back, as he is not quite sure of the exact source. I.C. Bratianu tries to avoid Rosetti's accusation of misquotation/misattribution ("Don't put into our mouth words we haven't said") by attacking his opponents. T. Rosetti is praised for his oratorical skills, and this allows Bratianu to maintain his original assignment of unexpressed premises: "Mr. T. Rosetti, as a *man who knows how to control* his words, *did not say such words, although they are implied* in his speech". L. Catargiu's communicative skills are denied by means of an *ad hominem* attack, changing to a lower register: "Mr. L. Catargiu lacks the skill of an orator *and oops!... the word slipped out of his mouth*".

If we turn to the pragma-dialectic approach, this example could be seen as a violation of the unexpressed premise rule:

"A party may not falsely present something as a premise that has been left unexpressed by the other party or deny a premise that he himself has left implicit" (van Eemeren, Grootendorst and Snoeck Henkemans, 2002, 182-183).

As an antagonist, I.C. Bratianu is guilty of distorting an unexpressed premise in the reconstruction he produced ("if you think that we have compromised the situation, that-although strong at the beginning-, we have gradually weakened and ought to make concessions"); the speaker goes beyond the "pragmatic optimum", concerning the verbal and non-verbal context of the debate.

Another situation where the accusation of misquotation/misattribution combines with an *ad hominem* attack is illustrated by the example below:

D. Pamfil Seicaru: D-le Calinescu, daca imi dati voie, echilibrul bugetar, cu imprumuturi, nu poate continua la infinit, fiindca imprumutul are defectul acesta ca trebue sa-l platesti.
D. Profesor N. Iorga, presedintele Consiliului de ministri si ministrul instruc{iunii, al cultelor si artelor: Este vorba mai mult de echilibristica, decat de echilibru.
D. Ar. M. Calinescu: *Probabil ca am fost rau infeles.* Eu nu am spus ca imprumuturile au servit la echilibrarea bugetului, nu! Dar destinatia acelor imprumuturi a avut un caracter productiv, ?i au fost de natura sa se creeze valori noui...
D. Profesor N. Iorga, presedintele Consiliului de ministri si ministrul instrucdunii, al cultelor si artelor: *Productiv da, dar cui?* (Ilaritate).(A. Calinescu, 7.12.1931)
Pamfil Seicaru: Mr. Calinescu, if I may, the financial balance, with loans, cannot go on for ever; as the loaning system has this fault-namely, one has to pay it back.
Professor N. Iorga, Prime Minister and Minister of Education, Cults and Arts: It is more about performing on a tight rope than about maintaining the balance.
Ar. M. Calinescu: / *have probably been misunderstood.* I have not said that loans served to balance the budget! The loans in question had a productive character and were able to create new values...
Professor N. Iorga, Prime Minister and Minister of Education, Cults and Arts: *Productive indeed, but to whose benefit?* (Hilarity).

Armand Calinescu is not accusing the other MP or the Prime Minister of misquotation/misattribution; "misunderstanding" could involve the lack of intentionality in the wrong presentation of the opposite standpoint. The fact that the debated issue has a financial nature (the budget decisions in a situation of economic crisis) could favour such an interpretation as misunderstanding. On the other hand, N. Iorga's final intervention could be interpreted as wordplay, aimed at A. Calinescu: *productive* is exploited as a possible centre for a beneficiary-adjunct. Iorga's final remark implies that the former government's activity was for the benefit of its members, thus revealing an *ad hominem* attack, in the circumstantial variant.

6.2. Argumentum *Ad Hominem*

In the parliamentary debate, two variants of the *ad hominem* fallacy are frequent: the *circumstantial* and the *tu, quoque* variants. The abusive type is not allowed in an institutional setting. The circumstantial *ad hominem* argument could be linked to allusions and irony, strategies meant to undermine the antagonist's credibility if a direct, explicit inconsistency accusation-that is, a *tu, quoque-carmot* be made (Walton and Macagno

2011). On the other hand, explicit "accusations of inconsistency" could be based on the technique of misquotation (emphasising possible obscure commitments) *(ibidem,* 50).

The previous example showed that A. Calinescu's expertise, impartiality and/or credibility were challenged. There are many attacks of that kind in the Romanian parliamentary debates, but we shall content ourselves with presenting just one case. It is based on allusions and irony, questioning the impartiality of an MP or, because of his "novice" status, his credibility, by associating him with a negatively evaluated group (we consider this to be a circumstantial type of the *ad hominem* argument).

d. Gradisteanu, suindu-se aici, a zis ca si invaziunile au bunul lor, caci ne fac sa avem ura in contra strainilor. *Acesta-i un cuvdnt, un argument, adevarat de avocat. Dar, d-lui este si consecvent, fiindca are amici intimi, care s'au dus in Moldova de-au insofit pe Muscali in fara noastrd;* (ilaritate, aplauze); pana astazi nu stiam pentru ce-au facut aceasta; acum insa, dupa declararea d-lui Gradisteanu, injeleg, d-lor au adus pe Turci, pe Nenrji ?i pe Muscali in Jara, ca sa intareasca in d-voastra onoarea patriei si independent! (mari rasete, aplauze). (I.C. Bratianu, 3.02.1869)
From this parliamentary tribune, Mr. Gradisteanu said that invasions have their positive side, for they make us hate foreigners. These are genuinely lawyerly words and arguments. *But he is also consistent in what he does, as he has close friends that went to Moldavia to accompany the Russians into our country;* (hilarity, applause) Not until today did I find out why they had done that, but now, due to Mr. Gradisteanu's speech, I understand: they have brought the Turks, the Germans and the Russians into our country to enhance your sense of the country's honour and independence! (laughter, applause).

I.C. Bratianu (from the Liberal Party) attacks a young MP from the Conservative Party. Bratianu alludes to the 1848 events, when the Revolutions in the Romanian Principalities were defeated with the help of the foreign powers (Russia, The Ottoman Empire, and the Habsburg Empire). Foreign help was asked for by some important nobility's representatives, whose descendants or followers were present in the Conservative Party. In an ironical remark, Bratianu simulates understanding the intentions of Gradisteanu's "close friends" when appealing to foreign forces: "to enhance your sense of the country's honour and independence". He uses the *reductio ad absurdum,* provoking laughter in the assembly. The attack at Gradisteanu's standpoint is based on associating the antagonist with a group that, according to the protagonist, lacks political credibility (because of past experiences), but also with a professional group and expertise (lawyers are supposed to use different unorthodox means to attain their goal).

Conclusions

Western Europe's political thinking and practices provide a constant reference point and inspiration for Romanian parliamentarians. The constant appeal to West-European models represents a normal fact for a country like Romania in the second half of the nineteenth century. The most frequently invoked political and parliamentary model is the British one, both in international relations and internal affairs. Other foreign authoritative sources are French and German politicians or representatives of the socio-political life. Most (if not all) of these authoritative sources are validated through primary and secondary socialization: Western Europe (the "reference society") is a trendsetter in the economic, social and political life, admired by the Romanian society (a "follower society"- Bendix 1967, 330); Romanian politicians try to create institutions (including a parliamentary tradition) following this Western model.

The way quotations (in a strict or broad sense) are presented has a major importance, especially when a polemic argumentative dimension of the discourse is involved. The authoritative source could be frequently questioned, but the appeal to this authority is seldom criticized. Quotations could be used to support speaker's standpoint, reminding the assembly of past shared commitments. Quoting an opponent usually involves polemics and counter-argumentation. This situation is more complex than quotations supporting speaker's standpoint. The counter-argumentation mechanisms used to manipulate an authoritative source are staging and bringing forward a political figure whose authoritative status cannot be denied by the opponent without compromising his own thesis.

The manipulation of quotations sometimes derails towards fallacies (such as the *straw man* and *ad hominem),* which usually represent an impediment to reaching agreement in a debate. Misquotation or the supposed misquotation usually entails a reaction from the antagonist. The interactional and argumentative moves can be very complex: quotations are often intentionally inexact or wrong (a *straw man* is created), as the speaker aims to show the inconsistency of his opponent. At the same time, the opponent's reaction involves the necessity to reject the quotation (proving, eventually, the misquotation or misattribution) in order to avoid being a victim of an *ad hominem* attack. On the other hand, accusing the opponent of misquotation allows for a reformulation of the initial standpoint, changing the commitments. A successful rejection of misquotation shades a double blame on the opponent: creating a *straw man* and an unjustified personal attack.

Notes

[1] In the political domain, for instance, those who are involved in a disagreement generally enter a discussion without being prepared to subject their thinking to critical scrutiny, and more often than not they have a vested interest in a particular outcome (van Eemeren 2010: 4).

Corpus

Bratianu, Ion C. 1930-1943. *Acte si cuvdntari,* vol I, VII, VIII. Bucuresti: Cartea Romaneasca.

Calinescu, Armand. 1993. *Discursuri parlamentare.* Bucuresti: Editura Quadrimpex.

Carp, Petre P. 2000. *Discursuri parlamentare.* Bucuresti: Editura Grai si Suflet Cultura Nationals.

Lahovari, Alexandru. 1915. *Discursuri parlamentare,* 1888-1891. Published by Al. G. Florescu, Petre V. Hanes, Em. N. Lahovari. Bucuresti: Editura "Librariei Scoalelor" C. Sfetea.

References

Bayley, Paul. 2004. "Introduction. The whys and wherefores of analysing parliamentary discourse." In *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse,* edited by Paul Bayley, 1-44. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1967. "Tradition and modernity reconsidered." In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (3): 192-346.

Dibattista, Denise. 2004. "Legitimising and informative discourse in the Kosovo debates in the British House of Commons and the Italian Chamber of Deputies." In *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse,* edited by Paul Bayley, 151-184. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hurley, Patrick. 1991. *A Concise Introduction to Logic.* Belmont: Wadsworth.

Marton, Silvia. 2009. *La construction politique de la nation. La nation dans les debats du Parlement de la Roumanie (1866-1871).* Iasi: Institutul European.

Perelman, Chaim, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. 2008 [1958]. *Traite de I'argumentation: La nouvelle rhetorique,* 6th edition. Bruxelles: Presses Universitaires.

van Eemeren, Frans H. 2010. *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse. Extending the Pragma-dialectical Theory of Argumentation.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

van Eemeren, Frans H., Rob Grootendorst and A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. 2002. *Argumentation. Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation.* Mahwah/New Jersey/London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter Houtlosser. 2009. "Strategic manoeuvring: Examining argumentation in context." In *Examining Argumentation in Context. Fifteen Studies on Strategic Manoeuvring,* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren, 1-24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walton, Douglas. 2004. *Relevance in Argumentation,* Mahwah/New Jersey/London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Walton, Douglas, and Fabrizio Macagno. 2011. "Quotations and presumptions: Dialogical effects of misquotations." *Informal Logic* 31* 27-55.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

DEBATING STATE PENSIONS IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENT (1860–1920)

SILVIU HARITON

The Pension System as Part of the Public Policies in Romania

The principles, scope and impact of the welfare state were debated by political scientists throughout the last half of the twentieth century; yet, only a few historical studies were dedicated to its roots, transformation, as well as to its social and cultural consequences[1]. The post-war welfare state, based on the set of ideas coherently formulated in the Beveridge Plan, represented the last chapter of one hundred year history of controlling the society and its welfare, which started in Victorian Great Britain and took off in the Wilhelmine Germany and France of the Third Republic (Sigerist 1943 [1999]; Flora and Heidenheimer (eds.) 1981; Mommsen and Mock (eds.) 1981; Dernier 1998 [1996]).

The intervention of state authorities in the Danubian Principalities - later Romania-materialized in controlling the public space and the social organization of the society, covers a wide range of issues, some of which anticipate elements of a welfare state, an anticipation which represented the application of Western models to local sets of social problems. The intervention of state authorities in regulating and later directly taking over sections of the public welfare covered various aspects of the public sphere, ranging from controlling and eventually taking charge of the public hygiene and social assistance to regulating the working conditions and supervising a system of social insurance after 1912. Implemented forcefully or willingly, supervised or administered by the state or by private companies, one can notice different degrees of intervention from the part of the state authorities and support or opposition for any of them was, and still is, politically definable.

The control of the public hygiene was visible especially in the transformation of the urban areas, where the administration of the cemeteries and streets, the filtration of the drinking water and its distribution, as well as the hygiene of the industrial areas were taken over by the local municipalities, with the support of the state. Social assistance for orphans, invalids and different categories of elder people developed during the nineteenth century within the paradigm of philanthropy, before being taken over in its majority by the state, during the interwar period.

The regulation of the working conditions was one of the most debated areas of public policies before the First World War since, following especially French models, the political and institutional organization of modern Romania in the second half of the nineteenth century placed the male individual and his rights at its very centre. Guilds were dissolved on the grounds of limiting individual freedom of initiative and similarly different forms of common property were dissolved during the 1860s. Apparently inspired by the social legislation implemented in Germany, Petre P. Carp was the first to propose the regulation of the working conditions in the industrial enterprises. Despite opposing the idea for a long time, the liberals finally accepted the principle and implemented it in 1902 *(Legea Missirf.* The working conditions for men became a topic for every mining law after 1895, the working conditions for women and children were settled in 1906, an incipient form of organizing unions was introduced in 1909, the free Sunday was finally accepted in 1910, the right to strike had to wait until 1920, while the complete freedom of association was implemented as late as 1923 *(Legea Mdrzescu);* previously, each request had to be analysed and approved by the Parliament.

As a part of this process of settling the working conditions, different schemes of insurance for accidents and sickness were gradually implemented after 1902 and culminated in 1933 with the first law covering the whole Romania, now able to implement a single form of mutuality, supervised and administered by the state, for all the insured ones. The basic terminology underlying these sets of public policies very much resembles the French one, revealing thus the source of inspiration of those who debated it, especially during the nineteenth century[3].

When dealing with the sets of public policies debated and implemented in modern Romania, three main social and professional groups were addressed and therefore three themes were debated and legislated by the Romanian Parliament in the second half of the nineteenth century and in the first half of the next one. One group is represented by the public servants who received state pensions; they were the first whose well-being at the retirement age or in case of invalidity draw the attention of the

government and of the legislators. The second group is represented by industrial workers; the legislation concerning them was the topic of numerous articles and sections of books dealing with the Romanian politics, including those approaching the history of the parliament in Romania, even if an economic, social and eventually cultural history of social insurance in pre-communist Romania was still missing at the time (Ioanitescu 1919; Ancusa 1923; Pupeza 1936). The third group is represented by the war veterans, war widows and war orphans of the First World War, whose case I partially approached in a different study (Hariton forthcoming).

The history of the welfare policies before the Second World War usually referred only to the second group. This happened mainly because these studies were first conceived and appeared in countries where industrialization and urbanization knew the fastest and the most extensive expansion during the nineteenth century and therefore, by far, the largest number of people affected by these welfare policies was represented by the workers. In a country less urbanized and industrialized like Romania, the disproportion was less obvious. The number of the state pensioners grew from several thousands at the turn of the century to 42,000 in 1925, and 93,000 in 1937, the number of insured people including workers and private employees grew from about 100.000 in the first decade of the twentieth century to 500-600,000 people during the interwar period, while those physically affected by the First War World who received different forms of assistance during the interwar period represented at least 600,000 persons.

This chapter deals with the first group, the state pensioners, and the legislation concerning them is its main topic. The primary sources of information are represented by the parliamentary debates, published under the form of "the debates of the Chamber of Deputies" *(Dezbaterile Adunarii Deputafilor,* abbreviated to D A D in this chapter) and "the debates of the Senate" *(Dezbaterile Senatului,* abbreviated to DS in this chapter) and are identified with the help of the general repertoire of the Romanian laws, published between 1860 and 1940 (Alexianu (ed.) 1940-1941). This is not a historical study of the public system of pensions in Romania concerned with its tribulations in including various categories of public servants, the way their funds were gathered and distributed, what payments were made to whom and eventually what their social and cultural impact was. Instead, this chapter is a study of the manner in which the idea of pension was articulated and debated in the Romanian Parliament. It focuses on the main stipulations of these laws and especially on their debate in the Parliament; thus, the study ignores a great deal of

The Public Systems of Pensions in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century

Research for this chapter included comparative data on similar cases in Europe and the United States. However, except for Theda Skocpol's (1993) research on the military pensions following the Civil War, I was not able to find much information. Therefore, any comparative data included in this section of the chapter is based on the introduction of the Romanian pension law of 1925, authored by the Minister of Finances Vintila Bratianu, brother of Prime Minister Ionel Bratianu and a Prime Minister himself after the latter's death (1927-1928). This introduction summarized the research carried out in order to find the best solution for unifying the existing Romanian system of pensions with those from Transylvania, Bucovina and Bessarabia, designed by the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires before 1918.

Pensions started in late eighteenth century as an instrument for rewarding the growing bureaucracy in most of the major states of Europe. France was one of the first countries to introduce them on a regular basis during the French Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte's regime. Pensions for the military were regulated in 1831, while those for the public servants were systematized in 1853, when a retirement age of sixty and a period of service of thirty years for those who contributed to the pension fund were set as conditions. This law was replaced only in 1924 and included all those hired in the central bureaucracy, as well as the military; it did not include the ones working for the local administration and the municipalities. The same conditions were maintained and funds were administered independently, like an investment fund. While the French law of 1853 represented a source of inspiration for the Romanian law of 1868, the 1924 model of administering the funds was also adopted in Romania in 1925.

In the UK, pension laws were adopted in 1834, 1859, 1887, 1920 and 1924. No contributions were asked from the functionaries and therefore pensions were granted exclusively as rewards, the Treasury keeping the liberty of reducing or suspending them in case of necessity. The retirement age was also sixty and one had to have served at least ten years in order to receive a minimum pension. Forty years of service were demanded in order to gain the maximum amount of pension, which represented 50% of

the last paid salary. In Germany, pensions for public servants were introduced in 1873 through a law that was successively modified in 1881, 1886, 1897 and 1907. Military pensions were regulated in 1887, 1906 and 1907. The retirement age was sixty-five. For ten years of service, the pension represented 35% of the last salary. 2% of it added to the pension for every other year of service from ten to thirty years, while 1% added for every year served after the period of thirty years, under the condition that the maximum level should not exceed more than 80% of the last salary. No contribution was asked until 1907, when 3% of the salary was charged to those who wished that their pensions be transmitted to their families. In the United States, while pensions paid to those who fought in the Civil War and their families represented around a quarter of the federal budget in the decades up to the First World War, for public servants the retirement age was set at seventy years, through a law adopted in 1920, and they were charged 2.5 % in order to qualify for retiring.

Before the First World War, in Austria and Hungary pensions were not organized in a systematic way, different laws being granted for different professional categories, as it happened also in Romania between 1890 and 1902. Imperial dispositions have granted rewards since late eighteenth century and later pension schemes were organized differently for the public servants of the Austrian State, for the functionaries of each province, for those serving the municipalities, for the teachers, a common law for the Austro-Hungarian army, for those serving the railway company, etc. According to the Austrian law of 1896, the retirement age was set at sixty years, 40% of the last salary was granted for serving at least ten years and 2.4% for each additional year up to thirty-five years of service, the contributions paid for insuring the pension being 3.8%. In Hungary, while different regulations strived for a unitary system of pensions after 1867, the pension law of 1885 set the retirement age at sixty-five. This law, changed only in 1912, concerned the state's public servants, except for the military, the ones teaching in public primary schools and in the confessional educational structures, as well as the functionaries of the local and municipal administrations and the railway company, whose pension schemes were organized by a set of different laws. If one had served at least ten years in the state bureaucracy, one would have received 40% of the last salary. For each additional year of service up to forty years, 2% would have been added, for each additional year, teachers of secondary and higher education receiving 3% for each additional year of service. Similar conditions for retiring were established for teachers in 1875, the military and workers at the railway company in 1906. Interruptions in serving in state bureaucracy were not allowed and

they resulted in forfeiting the pension rights. In Bessarabia, pensions were granted through a law passed in 1864, which was modified in 1884 and 1896. Pensions varied from 86 rubles to 1143 rubles, depending on the class of pensions they belonged to. For twenty-five years of service, the pension represented half of the last salary, while for at least thirty-five years of service, the pension equated the last salary. These conditions for pensioning had been applied in the provinces of Transylvania, Bukovina and Bessarabia until they were taken over by the Romanian state in 1918-1919. Their conditions were less generous than the Romanian pension laws of 1902 and 1925.

By the turn of the century, most of the states had already subsidized their public systems of pensions with 2 to 6% of their public budgets[5]. Except for France, in all the other countries the pension budget was integrated in the general budget of the state and, therefore, most of the state pensions had never been charged before 1900. However, in Romania the pension budget was maintained as a separate budget, annually subsidized with a specially approved amount of money. When the resources available were lower than the amount to be paid, the pensions were reduced accordingly with a percentage that varied: 25% in 1881, 30% in 1884, 22% in 1886, 20% in 1891, 18% in 1901 and 23% in 1902 and from 4% to 14% until 1919, for different categories of public functionaries (DS, 1902,455).

Parliamentarianism in Modern Romania

There are only a few accounts of the parliamentary activity in modern Romania[6], even if recent approaches are more sophisticated conceptually, paying a greater attention to the body of the elected people, to how the voting system worked and to the main concepts that shaped the debates and unified or divided the numerous factions, sometimes gathered in parties (Marton 2009,2011; Preda 2011).

After 1866, voting was universal in theory, every male having the right to vote, but it was unequal in practice. According to the level of taxes paid, a voter was able to vote in one of the electoral bodies he qualified for. After 1884, the Senate had sixty members elected in the first electoral body, fifty in the second, eight members were the eight Orthodox bishops and the other two were elected by the professors of the Universities of Bucharest and Jassy. The Chamber of Deputies had seventy-five members elected in the first electoral body, seventy in the second and only thirty eight in the third electoral body, the latter including all those who did not qualify for the first two electoral bodies, fifty of them electing a

representative, who actually voted for the deputy. This way, the existing balance of power at the local level was respected and, at the same time, the system was flexible and liberal enough to allow further expansion and inclusion for dynamic and educated individuals. This system was perceived as one of the most liberal when it was implemented and the best solution for a country where about eighty per cent of the population was illiterate[7]. After several years of governmental instability during the 1860s, it became a rule that King Charles (Carol) I appoint alternatively liberals and conservatives to form a government that should organize elections which would offer a supporting parliamentary majority. After every election-and they were quite frequent-, every session started with the validation of the newly elected deputy or senator. This was a rather long process, since the electoral reports were to be confronted with contestations of those elections.

Most of the legislative projects belonged to the government. Still, before the First World War there were plenty of individual legislative initiatives, many times coming from the part of the opposition, which were debated and eventually adopted, especially if they came from former ministers, prime ministers or people acknowledged as competent in their field of activity. This suggests that politics was far from being a profession, even if only a few hundreds of individuals had access to the processes of adopting legislation and decision-making. An *ad hoc* appointed committee, which had nothing to do with the twentieth century specialized and permanent committees, discussed the proposed act of legislation and its chairman wrote a report, summarizing the main points of the discussions within the committee and the possible amendments. The proposed act of legislation together with this report were presented to the Chamber of Deputies by the chairman of the committee appointed *ad hoc,* usually in the presence of the government or at least of the ministry in charge with the respective field of activity. Both documents represented the basis of discussion which consisted of three parts, a first opening discussion on the principles of the act of legislation and the realities it was based upon or envisaged change, a separate discussion of every article of the proposed act of legislation, where new amendments were likely to be introduced, every article and amendment being adopted through vote, and a final vote of the entire act of legislation, as it resulted from being voted article by article. After being adopted by the Chamber of Deputies, the project went through the same process in the Senate and, if modified, it returned to the Chamber, which agreed on the changes, and if sanctioned by the King, the law was sent for publication in the Official Gazette *{Monitoml Oficiat).* Should the Chamber not agree on the changes

proposed by the Senate, the process would start again, but only a few and very important laws were in such a situation. After the First World War, equal vote for men was put in practice, after being seriously discussed for already two decades. The government usually became stronger, the bureaucracy expanded in comparison with the pre-war context, it became more specialized, while the level of specialization among the members of the Parliament decreased and therefore direct and real contestation of the acts of legislation proposed by the government diminished as well.

Pensions during the Period of the Organic Regulations in the Danubian Principalities (1830s-1850s)

Historical studies on the Romanian public administration have appeared quite recently, but none of them tackled the question of the state pensions, research on the Romanian case being no different from research on most of the European cases (Pippidi 2010; Sora 2006a, b, 2007). In approaching the topic, this chapter benefited from several historical and juridical contributions belonging to the period under consideration (Radulescu 1938; §eteanu 1912; Opreanu and Georgescu 1929)[8].

While subsidies were granted before the Organic Regulations in the two Danubian Principalities according to the local princes' arbitrary will, pensions of a permanent character were awarded after the 1830s, being considered rewards *(recompense)*. In Wallachia, if one had earned more than 200 lei on a monthly basis, at the age of fifty, a third of the previous salary was granted as pension after eight years of serving the state, and two thirds after sixteen years of service. A total amount of 1.5 million lei, valuing 555,555 lei after 1867, was granted from the state budget and pensions were awarded only within the limits of this budget, a new pension starting to be paid only after funds had become available through the ending of other pensions. In 1853, the ones earning less than 200 lei a month were also granted a pension, if they served at least fifteen years. In Moldavia, conditions were a lot more restrictive. One third of the salary was granted as a pension if the person served at least twenty years in the state bureaucracy, half for at least thirty years of service, and two thirds for at least forty years of service, the periods of service being reduced in 1851 to fifteen, twenty and twenty-five years of service. In 1850, teachers received more generous conditions for retiring, a third of the salary being granted for at least ten years of service, two thirds for fifteen years, and the equivalent of the entire salary provided they had served at least twenty-five years. In 1852, in Wallachia, pensions were charged *(refineri)* 5%, representing the basis for the later principle of contribution that would

represent the change of the right to pension from a simple reward to an entitlement, later debates on pensioners' rights being based on it. In 1863, all salaries and pensions started being charged with a tax *(refineri)* of 10% that was used as additional funds for the pension budget, and starting from 1864, those receiving a pension were no longer allowed to be active in the state administration, unless they accepted the suspension of the pension. During the entire period ranging from the 1860s to the 1940s, one had to choose between pension and salary in case of continuing to serve in the state bureaucracy even after the retirement age[9].

Debating the Pension Law of 1868

Romania, as a unitary administrative entity, was established in January 1862, after the election of Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza as ruler of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, on the 5 and the 24 of January 1859, due to the fact that the Paris Convention of 1858 allowed the inhabitants of the two principalities to hold public offices in any of them, a free market being already established in 1848. The state bureaucracy started to grow fast in correlation with the political, administrative and social reforms carried out by Cuza and his supporters (Stan 1983). A unitary system of state pension became a stringent need and, since the public budget was still reduced, the proportion of the pensions within the entire budget tended to get closer to 10% in the years prior to 1868, as Nicolae Ionescu suggested during the debates. Following several projects that were introduced in the discussions of the Chamber of Deputies, a project, signed by the Ministry of the Interior Ion C. Bratianu in 1867, and apparently inspired by the French pension law of 1853, was finally submitted to the Chamber of Deputies in early 1867. Debated in the Chamber during the spring of 1867, it had to wait for the next session to be taken into account by the Senate in February 1868, when it was also published. This suggests the relative minor importance given to the topic, which had been postponed and then expedited among many other law projects. The lack of quorum at the discussions also suggests this relative lack of proper attention given to the topic at the time.

According to the 1868 pension law, retirement age was set to sixty, for the civil servants, and fifty, for the military. In order to receive a pension equivalent to half of the average salary of one's last five years of service, a civil servant had to have served at least twenty years, and a military representative at least eighteen years, while for the equivalent of three quarters, the terms of service were at least thirty and twenty five years respectively. The yearly pension was limited to 18,000 lei. Both salaries

and pensions were charged 10%, and these charges represented the main source of income for the pension fund, which was administered by the state, but not included in the general budget. The state granted a yearly subvention of almost two million new lei and, if revenues were below the volume of pensions paid, the difference was to be supported proportionally by the existing pensioners, which led to actual charges of more than 20% in the following decades[10].

Besides the growing military structure, this law concerned the civil servants working in the central administration and the teaching body. Ecclesiastical servants were not defined, but most probably they represented the clergy directly dependent or subordinated to different state institutions, and possibly the members of the Holy Synod. Their terms of service were to be calculated as late as 1868. Parish clergy benefited from the provisions of 1891 pension law; starting with 1893, their retirement age was established at seventy. A series of other categories of public servants working in the local administration and a series of commercial activities taken over by the state in the following decade were not included.

The debate on the law of 1868 generated the first discussions on some of the basic principles of state pensions and their organization. Several issues that are relevant for this chapter were discussed[11]. The first one concerned the basic principle of state pensions:

> What is the foundation of the [state] pension? [...] Does the State have a duty to give pensions to its servants? [...] or is it only a matter of [public] utility so that they could fully devote their energies [to serving the state]?

asked deputy Apostoleanu, a member of the State Council, established in 1864 by prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza and dissolved in 1866. If the pension was to be only a reward and stimulant and not a duty, then why imposing such long periods of minimal service, like twenty or thirty years, and such an advanced retirement age, like sixty? Why not granting them pensions only on the basis of their contributions and allow them to withdraw the accumulated capital whenever they desire and therefore to transform the pension system into an insurance house system (DAD, 1867, 468).

Apostoleanu's questions were first answered by Ion Ghica, the chairman of the *ad hoc* appointed committee for the pension law, and by Vasile Boerescu, former vice-president of the State Council, during Cuza's rule. The former insisted that there is no state without pensions, while the latter pointed to the fact that the government's project was almost the same with the one elaborated by Cuza's State Council, both Apostoleanu and Boerescu used to be members of. Boerescu defended the idea of state

pensions on the grounds that the public servants were already charged 5% of their salaries in Moldavia and 10% in Wallachia, and if the right to pension was to be suspended entirely, why should the State intervene to oblige its functionaries to get insured, since insurance "depends entirely on the individuals' will and neither the State nor the legislators can have any say in such matter?" According to Boerescu, the project had two advantages: the state contributed only with a fix subvention, which was to cease to exist in time, and it offered a minimal financial security to public servants when retired (DAD, 1867, 468). Later on, when discussing the functionary's right to leave the pension system in order not to be charged, this idea was abandoned on the grounds of similarity with the insurance system. Thus, the pension became not only a reward, a stimulant and an entitlement, but also an obligation. In defining the pension as more of a reward or an entitlement, Gheorghe Costaforu argued that pensions were a reward granted by the state and only the right to retire in certain conditions was an entitlement, since the total amount approved according to any pension law could not constitute public debt, an argument that would be revisited when discussing the pension law of 1902.

Mihail Kogalniceanu asked for the application of the same conditions and advantages to all pensioners to be, irrespective of whether they came from Moldavia or Wallachia. Kogalniceanu was also answered by Vasile Boerescu, who argued that since the two principalities had different laws, known by the functionaries, they deserved to be treated differently; if so, any modification of this situation was against the principle of gained rights. In the end, Kogalniceanu's proposal was accepted.

Further, another discussion concerned the inclusion among the pensioners to be of the foreign citizens working for the Romanian government since the 1850s. Ion Ghica argued that since they came on a contract, they did not have the right to receive state pensions. Grigore Lahovary, Gheorghe Costaforu and Mihail Kogalniceanu argued for including them among the pensioners on the grounds that foreign citizens working for the Romanian state had their salaries charged like any other public servant. They were dismissed by vote and, in the end, pensions were to be granted only to those being given the Romanian citizenship. Longer discussions concerned the technical problem of proving one's age, since birth certificates had been introduced only thirty-three years before and they had been issued by the state for several years only. One's age was to be attested thought three testimonials under oath, but this offered the occasion for numerous abuses. In the Senate, the discussions were shorter, since adopting the project almost a year after being discussed in the Chamber of Deputies was already seen as a matter of urgency. Al. Orascu

pointed to the principle of equality, which had already been adopted by the Chamber, while C. Brailoiu underlined that priests could not be public servants, since they were servants of the (Orthodox) Church already (DS, 1868,225).

Debating the Pension Laws of 1889-1890

After a conservative government (1871-1876), Romania had a series of liberal governments, led by Ion C. Bratianu (1876-1888). During the liberal governing, the country successfully participated in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878, had its independence recognized by the Congress of Berlin (1878), became a kingdom (1881) and an associate of the Triple Alliance (1883). After that, the conservatives returned to power (1888-1895). The rise of Germany through its military power and the expansion of nationalism, militarism and colonialism in the arena of international relationships during the following decades led to a growing attention paid by the Romanian state to its military force and especially to its officer bodies[12]. Consequently, while Lascar Catargiu was the Prime Minister and General George Manu was the Minister of War, a pension law only for the military was adopted in 1889, their pension fund starting to be administered independently and to receive a separate subvention from the state budget. This led to the adoption of a separate pension law for the remaining civil functionaries in 1890, this time General George Manu being the Prime Minister and Menelas Ghermani the Minister of Finances, both trying to clarify not only their conditions of retirement, but also the administration of their funds and the subvention from the state budget.

According to the 1889 pension law, the retirement age was fifty for higher officers and civil functionaries working in the military administration, and forty-six for lower officers, provided they all served for at least eighteen years. If one had served at least thirty years, there was no inferior age limit for receiving pension. The pension was calculated as a percentage of the average salary received in the last two years and not five years, as it had been since 1868. If one had served for eighteen years, one received 50% of the average salary and if one had served twenty-five years, one received 75% of the average salary. For every additional year served between eighteen and twenty-five years of service, the percentage represented by the pension within the average salary increased with 1/30, whereas for every additional served year between twenty-five and forty years of service, the percentage increased with 1/60. A monthly pension was not to exceed 900 lei per month and charges were not to exceed 10%,

while the state subvention to the fund of military pensions was established at 400,000 lei, to be increased several years later at one million lei[13]. In 1895 there were 950 pensioners subject to this law, retired military representatives, widows and orphans of former military representatives receiving pensions ranging from several hundred lei, sometimes even less than a hundred, to over a thousand lei, which coasted the public budget about 260,000 lei a month[14].

According to the 1890 pension law, the retirement age for public servants was fifty-four, except for those who served for at least thirty years and did not have age restrictions for asking to retire. The period taken into consideration for the average salary used as a basis for calculating the pension was three years. If one had served for at least ten years, the pension was to represent 30% of the average salary; if one had served for at least fifteen years, the percentage increased to forty; for at least twenty years, the percentage increased to sixty; for at least twenty-five years, the percentage increased to seventy-five, while for thirty years, the pension was supposed to represent the entire average salary. Salaries continued to be charged 10%, while the charge for the pensions was settled at 18%.

In the case of the 1889 law for military pensions, when discussed in the Chamber of Deputies, the chairman of the committee, Ulysses Boldeanu, underlined the context and importance of the law:

> Today, when the entire Europe is concerned with expanding its military force, when enormous sacrifices, sometimes exceeding countries' resources, are made everywhere for getting weapons and training armies, it is not us who can lag behind; because our situation imposes, as a duty of our existence and as a responsibility for preserving our nationality, that we should be the first military power of the East; enormous sacrifices were made for providing weapons and insuring defence [...] therefore we can be proud of the progresses made by our army. It is therefore important to settle the social condition of the military [the officer bodies], because we cannot know what tomorrow may bring about and we must show to the military that they can solely devote to their career; that if they do so, if they are going to sacrifice entirely during times of peace to instruction and organization of the army according to the current progress of the military science, their social position [security] will be assured and when their forces weaken, they will get a secure and restful existence, in accordance to the position they had.[16]

Only one deputy, Nicolae Voinov, accused the discrimination of one category of public servants over all the others, while an important leader of the conservatives, Lascar Catargiu, was mainly concerned whether there were enough funds to cover the possible additional expenses. Most of the

discussions in the Chamber as well as in the Senate were rather technical, about who is going to qualify and how large the state subvention should be. In the Senate, the chairman of the *ad hoc* appointed committee was colonel Ion Logadi, who also insisted that "we cannot lag behind". Adopted by the Chamber, the project received technical changes in the Senate and returned to the Chamber. The law passed with seventy-six votes against one, in the Senate, and with eighty-two votes against seven, in the Chamber of Deputies, in May 1889.

In the case of the 1890 law for civil pensions, the chairman of the committee was Mihail Kogalniceanu, who insisted that the 1868 law was too restrictive in its conditions and that the new law was going to repair the injustice caused by the previous one[17]. The idea of pensions had already started to become popular among public servants. When deputy Tzoni talked about the petition of the fifty-eight engineers (contracted by the state to construct the railways, the harbours of Braila and Galati and the bridge of Cernavoda) who asked that their contributions be paid retroactively so that they could also get pensions when retiring, deputy Nicolae Voinov argued that:

> The pension law concerns only the permanent functionaries, those who devote entirely to their career through this contract, because the pension law is a contract between the State and its functionaries, a contract that offers a pension which will help them live when they are old; this in exchange for their continuous and permanent service and for the shares charged *(refineri)* from their salaries. (DAD, 1890, 1400)

Voinov was this time supported by the Minister of Finances, Menelas Ghermani, who argued that the engineers preferred to be contracted and not hired as public servants, when they started to work for the Romanian state. The same discussion followed in the Senate, Tzoni's argument being advocated by Petre S. Aurelian, with the same results. Also in the Senate, A1. Villner asked whether the law was to concern women too and if they could get hired as public servants. Getting a positive answer to his question, Villner proposed an earlier retirement age for women and men, forty-six for women and fifty-one for men, an amendment that was rejected.

Debating the Pension Law of 1902

After Romania went through a financial crisis during the conservative governments of 1899-1901, led by George Gr. Cantacuzino and Petre P. Carp, a new pension law was adopted in 1902 by a liberal government led

by Dimitrie A. Sturdza, to be modified later in 1904, 1906 and 1909, in order to unify and systematize the different categories of state functionaries. Separate pension schemes with different conditions and terms for retiring were gradually developed for those serving in the Romanian Railway Company in 1888, the postal-telegraph system in 1892, the sanitary system in 1893, the engineers working for the state in 1894, those working for the State Monopolies Trust *(Regia Monopolurilor Statului)* in 1896, those working for the districtual and local councils *(consilide judefene si comunale)* in 1897, each of them with a separate fund *(casa de pensii)* administering their contributions (Iosa 1983).

The public budget spent on pensions rose from two and a half million lei in 1868 to about eight million lei in mid 1870s, and stayed at this level until early 1890s. It rose again from ten million to fifteen million lei in 1898/1899, and to twenty million lei in 1903/1904, where it remained unchanged until 1909/1910, to rise to twenty-six million lei in 1914/1915. Until 1890, people retired according to the law existing in the moment of their entering public administration, 2507 retiring between 1868 and 1890 on the basis of the Organic Regulations and decrees of the period, and 402 on the basis of the 1868 law. During the 1890s, 939 people retired on the basis of the 1889 law, and 4406 people on the 1890 law. In the following decade and a half, their number increased to 1509 military and 6389 civil retired people, most of them after twenty to thirty years of service. Later, in 1925, there were 18,554 people retired on the basis of laws of the Old Kingdom and 24,224 people retired on the basis of the laws already existing in the recently added territories of Romania. Among the latter, 18,172 were from Transylvania, out of which 10,352 were Hungarians and 4198 were Romanians[18].

The rapid increase in the number of functionaries and pensioners over in the last decade of the nineteenth century, associated with a severe financial crisis in the years around the turn of the century, when public expenditure rose sharply, payments of salaries and pensions were threatened to be postponed, while the Romanian governments were in the need for seeking international loans. Therefore, a more severe control of public expenditure became a means of proving the country's ability to pay back the loans rapidly, while the projections based on recent increase in pensioners' number and their entitlements suggested that the system might become unsustainable in the following years. A project of unifying the pension system was already designed by Petre P. Carp, but it did not enter public debate because Carp had lost confidence within his own party. A number of pensioners, especially from the military field, who were claiming a special status for themselves, gathered in Bucharest and started

to protest against the new pension law and to write petitions to the state authorities and the Parliament, asking for the preservation of their favourable conditions for retirement and their entitlements.

According to the 1902 pension law, the retirement age increased again at sixty, as in 1868, which was to be further reduced to fifty-eight years in 1906 and to fifty-seven years in 1909. The retirement age for the ecclesiastical functionaries was seventy, while for the lower officers, fifty-five. In the case of the functionaries working in public services within the state administration, their serving period was multiplied with 35%, but for a period which should not exceed 5 years, while their retirement age was to be diminished with the equivalent of a third of their serving period. This was envisaged especially for those working in the railway company, whose consistent pension fund together with all the other pension funds was merged with the state pension fund. The period taken into consideration for the average salary used as a basis for calculating the pension increased again from three to five years, as in the 1868 pension law. For at least twenty years of service, one was to receive 50% of the average salary; for at least twenty-five years, one was to receive 65%, while for at least thirty-five years of service, one was to receive the equivalent of the entire average salary. For every additional year served, between twenty-five and thirty-five years of service, the percentage of the pension within the average salary was to increase with 3.5%. The maximum limit of a pension was reduced to 9,000 lei a year, while the state subvention for the pension fund was set at 7.3 million lei a year[19].

In the series of pension laws presented in this chapter, the one issued in 1902 generated the most extensive debates, involving some of the most important Romanian politicians of the time; the liberal Prime Minister Dimitrie A. Sturdza, who defended the project, while conservatives, such as generals George Manu and Iacob Lahovary, opposed it[20]. The debates focused on the key words "reward" *(recompense)* versus "entitlement" *(drepturi)* in order to define the pensions and the pensioners' rights. The argumentation put forward by the liberal government defined pensions as rewards *(recompensd, ajutor)* granted by the state, while the argumentation of the conservative opposition, some of them military representatives, like generals Lahovary and George Manu, insisted on defining the pensions mainly as entitlements *(drepturi castigate, drepturi de crean{d, contract)*. This led to a further discussion about the relationship between the state, its functionaries and pensioners, which was heavily grounded on quoting the Constitution.

During the debates in the Chamber, liberal politician Vasile Lascar summarized the differences and the consequences of the two major

interpretations that were opposed to each other: the principle of entitlement *(dreptului de creanfa)* and the principle of the assistance provided by the state *(ajutorul dat de stat):*

> The supporters of the first principle put forward the idea that the state had contracted the functionary when hiring him, by assuming the obligation of paying his salary and, after a number of years, his pension. Once accepted the idea of "contract", this would bring about the impossibility of its being modified by just one of the contracting parties, i.e. the state. The functionary may invoke the theory of the rights gained *(teoria drepturilor castigate)*. Should the pension law be modified, only those hired after its passing and application are entitled to ask for the application of the new law. If the second interpretation is admitted, one could talk about public debt *(creanfd)* and rights gained *(drepturi castigate)*. If the state grants assistance *(ajutor)*, a reward (recompensa), a share of the salary when the functionary is not able to serve anymore, then the state is not obliged to grant it. It pays it as long it considers this necessary and within the limits of its financial resources. (DAD, 1902, 628)

Vasile Lascar was in favour of the government's project, on the grounds that no proper contract had been signed between the functionary and the state; moreover, the pension paid by the state during the retirement period exceeded by far the value charged during every year of service and included in the pension fund. Therefore, for him, as well as for all the liberals supporting the project

> The pension, gentlemen, is an old age insurance *(o asigurare a bdtrdnefilor func}ionarilor),* an insurance almost completely paid by the state, a reward given to the functionary for the faith he has proved by serving his country. (DAD, 1902, 628)

Lascar's discourse reinforced Dimitrie Sturdza's long discourse grounded on numerous statistical data, such as the quick growth of the number of pensioners, state subvention, projections of future payments to be made. Sturdza demonstrated that individually paid pensions represented most often ten times the equivalent of the value charged from the salary during one's service. Discussing the tension between the financial rights of the pensioners and the constraints of the public budget, Sturdza explained why he believed pensioners' interests could not prevail:

> I know one thing which is a law all over the world since it exists: *nobody can have rights at the expense of the state (drepturi castigate contra statului nu are nimeni)*. Such an assertion is outrageous, it is against the common sense, it is against the sentiment of patriotism that must lead us all, for it is the greatest and noblest human sentiment. No one has a

particular right at the expense of the state. The state makes our living possible; should anyone of us have a right at the expense of the state, this will lead human society to anarchy. The state alone has the right that every citizen should contribute to its welfare and this is not a right at the expense of the citizens, but a right for the good and prosperity of all citizens; because through the state the human being raises to the position of a citizen, which means co-worker for the higher aims of the society it belongs to. (DAD, 1902, 614)

In the Senate, discussions were focused not only on defining the pension as an entitlement or as a reward or assistance, the same arguments being presented again, but also-and especially-on discussing the particularities of the military career in relation to other more profitable careers, like engineering, law or medicine. Two of the most important representatives of the conservatives, generals George Manu and Jacob Lahovary, pleaded for the positive discrimination of the officers who should have benefited of more generous conditions in order for the military system to be able to attract intelligent people. In the end, the law passed with sixty-six votes against ten, in the Chamber of Deputies, and sixty votes against two, in the Senate.

Debating the Pension Law of 1925

After the establishment of Greater Romania, a final state pension law was adopted in 1925, as a part of a larger package of laws introduced by the liberal government led by Ion I.C. Bratianu, aiming at applying a unitary and uniform set of principles to all the citizens all over the Romanian territory; most of the times, in practice this meant extending the regulations and practices applied in the Old Kingdom to the recently added territories of Transylvania, Banat, Bukovina and Bessarabia. Yet, sometimes it involved serious additions from the practice of the local traditions, provided they were more advanced than those in the Old Kingdom (Rusenescu and Saizu 1979).

As mentioned above, the law was designed after a rather thorough and careful examination of the similar legislation adopted in Europe during the last decades of the nineteenth century that had been carried out by the Ministry of Finances Vintila Bratianu. According to this comparison, the criterion of the pension law in Romania was the most favourable of all at that time, in all its aspects. The existing set of laws and practices in the recently added territories was presented above, when placing the Romanian case in a comparative perspective, an important change introduced by the new law being that the patrimony of the existing pension

funds from these territories was transferred to the general pension fund administered by the Romanian state *(Casa generald de pensiuni).*

According to the pension law of 1925, the retirement age was maintained at fifty-seven, even if in no other country of the world was it lower than sixty, as it used to be in Austria, Hungary and Russia. The retirement age for ecclesiastical functionaries was lowered from seventy to sixty-five, while the military body could retire at a variable age (from fifty to fifty-six years, depending on their rank). In order to gain the right of retiring, one had to have served for at least ten years, uninterruptedly, like in Austro-Hungary, while for gaining the maximum level of pension, the period for serving was established at thirty-five years, as it was in the Old Kingdom (and not forty years, as it was in Hungary). The pension was calculated on the basis of the average level of the salary during the last three years of service, and not five, like before. For at least ten years of service, one was to receive 25% of this average salary, and for every additional year up to thirty-five years of service, three more per cents were added. The maximum yearly amount of pension rose from 15,000 lei in the Old Kingdom and 20,800 lei in Transylvania to 36,000 lei; however, most of the pensions paid monthly consisted in 500 lei[21].

If in 1902 the ideas of reward and assistance were emphasized in defining the idea of state pension without excluding its definition as an entitlement in certain conditions, when discussing the 1925 pension law the prevalent definition was that of a right and an entitlement *(dreptf*. As G. Ghibanescu was justifying his intervention in the general discussion of the law in the Senate:

> The principle of pension, sprung from the idea of *mercy (mila),* has turned into an entitlement of the functionary, so that in 1925, we could say that the pension is an entitlement the functionary has gained at the expense of the state, according to the period he had served the state and according to a certain retirement age. (DS, 1925, 1416)

This vision was to be inscribed in the envisaged equilibrium between the public finances and the functionaries' entitlements postulated in the motivation of the law ("the welfare of the functionaries is a prerequisite for the welfare of the state") and all speakers agreed upon or at least did not contest it during the debate. Besides technical discussions on different provisions of the law, the Chamber of Deputies hosted discussions concerning the situation of the non-Romanian functionaries from the recently added territories. An article of the law conditioned receiving the pension upon proving loyalty towards the Romanian state. Deputy Hans Hedrich complained that cases should be analysed individually by the

judicial system and not by local administration; people should not be accused collectively of lack of loyalty, which could only lead to an unreliable state of mind. Iacob Pistiner protested against the use of the word "servant" *(slujbas)* instead of functionary and asked Vintila Bratianu to sketch the profile of "good citizen" a functionary was supposed to be according to the law, and to suggest the ones who were to apply it. According to Bratianu, not only functionaries, but also pensioners were expected to display a certain public attitude:

> I am not asking the public servant to be a liberal or a conservative or a National Peasant Party supporter, but I ask the public functionary, because I entrust him with public authority, to maintain his prestige and refrain from making politics while serving [the Romanian state]. This is what I ask from him and since I ask it from the functionary, I ask it from the pensioner too. One should not get involved in actions against the state [...] I cannot approve of a pensioner going to the crowds and preaching against the Romanian state, as unfortunately some do, even after being given the Romanian citizenship. (DAD, 1925, 2081)

Deputy Iosif Sandor pointed to the uncertain situation of those functionaries who had accepted the Romanian citizenship, but because they did not know the language, they were likely to be considered disloyal. At the Senate, discussions were also concerned with the generous conditions offered by the law, on the one hand, and the difficult social and economic conditions of the years following the First World War, when the impact of inflation had turned the Romanian currency into an instable and devalued unit, which not only affected the real values of salaries and pensions, but also introduced a climate of insecurity and instability.

Conclusions

The development of bureaucracy and the articulation of public policies, and especially of the policies of social assistance, are all intricate aspects of the processes of state-mation-building, defining and redefining citizenship and public welfare during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. The emergence and expansion of the public systems of retirement and health contributions represent a nineteenth century process that documents the articulation of a social welfare system, on the one hand, and the stabilization and systematization of the modern state bureaucracy, on the other.

As a part of this larger framework, the debates concerning state pensions, which were conducted in the Romanian Parliament between 1866 and 1937, illustrate the array of conceptual associations in regard to the relationship between individuals, groups and the Romanian society at large. While state pensions were firstly introduced by the Organic Regulations governing the Danubian Principalities and began being applied since the 1850s, the laws taken into account for my analysis were published in 1868, 1888-1890, 1902 and 1925, several other laws introducing punctual changes of different sorts during the first decades of the twentieth century.

The pensions represented from the very beginning an instrument for stimulating certain areas of the state bureaucracy (e.g. the military field), on the one hand, and for rewarding the long-time serving functionaries of the state, on the other hand. Most of the debates concerned the retirement conditions, such as the various minimal periods necessary for qualifying for various amounts of pension or the minimal age or the cases of invalidity; the comparison of various sectors of state bureaucracy and the hardships arisen in their activity, in order to establish a coherent and eventually fair policy of retirement; the conditions to be met by widows and orphans in order to inherit their husbands' and parents' pension rights, as well as the levels of charging the salaries of the public servants and the pensions, the way these contributions were administered by the state and the level of the yearly state subvention for the pension fund.

Minimal criteria of being accepted as a public servant (e.g. education) varied and became more restrictive, on the one hand, while serving functionaries were charged in order to subsidize the existing retired persons, on the other hand. These two factors contributed to the association of the idea of state pension with the ideas of rights gained and entitlement, all part of an already existing juridical vocabulary and set of practices. While coexisting in their association to the idea of pension, emphasis of either reward or entitlement depended on a variety of factors, like the budgetary constraints, the interest of those proposing or rejecting a certain criterion, no gradual conceptual transformation from one (reward) to another (entitlement) being discernible, as I hypothesized when I started researching the topic.

Notes

[2] For the history of the two parties in Romania, the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, see Bulei 2000 and Radulescu-Zoner (ed.) 2000. There were governments led by the liberals during the years 1866-1871, 1876-1888, 1895-1899, 1901-1904, 1907-1910, 1914-1918, 1918-1919, 1922-1926, 1927-1928, 1933-1937, and governments led by the conservatives during the years 1871-1876, 1888-1895, 1899-1901, 1904-1907,1910-1913, 1918.

[3] While the French influence on the Romanian culture is well-known, the history of the political and institutional transfers from France to Romania with their conceptual instruments was explored only recently. A collection of relevant chapters are included in Jurcanu (coord.) 2006. An account of the institutional development in Romania is offered by Ciupala 2009.

[4] The laws and decrees related to the pension were also published in the following collections or annotated volumes: Seteanu and Penescu 1899; Zeuceanu 1905; Seteanu 1912; Opreanu and Georgescu 1929.

[5] In 1902, Romania subsidized the pensions budget with 7 million lei (3.2% out of 218.5 million lei), France 215 million (6.1% of 3.5 billion), Germany 70 million (2.9% of 2.33 billion), Austria without Hungary 58 million (3.5% of 15 billion), Belgium 25 million (5.1% of 489 million). D.A. Sturdza in his discourse defended the proposed project of pension law (DAD 1902, 618).

[6] The most extensive description of the parliamentary debates in Romania is Adaniloaie, Iordache, and Cancea (eds.) 1983, while Dragan 1991 is a comparative approach on how the Romanian Parliament actually worked. Shorter accounts of the parliamentary debates generated by governmental initiatives are to be found in Mamina and Scurtu 1994,1996.

[7] The ones voting for the Senate and for the first two electoral bodies of the Chamber of Deputies represented less than 2% of the total population, which increased from about four million people in the 1860s to six million in the 1910s. See Nicolescu 1903: for the Chamber of Deputies, those who had the right to vote were 68,000 in 1891, and 89,000 in 1901; those who voted were 37,000 and 57,000 respectively, with 1000 annulled votes in each case; for the Senate, those who had the right to vote were more than 16,000 in 1891, and more than 25,000 in 1901, while those who voted were 11,000 and 17,000 respectively.

[8] *Desbaterile Adunarii Nafionale Constituante a Deputafilor,* nr. 80-81, April 25-26, 1925, sessions of March 23-24,1925, 2017-2027.

[9] *Colecfiunea generald a legilor si regulamentelor civile, militare si ecleziastice de la anul 1831...,* 1899, 1-10; *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pand la 1905,* 293-304.

[10] *Monitoru. Diariu officiate allu Romdniei,* nr. 37, February 16/28, 1868, 223; *Colecfiunea generald a legilor si regulamentelor civile, militare si ecleziastice de la anul 1831...,* 1899, 10-14; *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pdndlal905,* 304-310.

[11] DAD, sessions of March 30 and April 3, 1867, *Monitorul. Jurnal Oficial al Romdniei,* nr. 77-78 and 81 of April 5/17, 6/18 and 9/21, 1867, 467-470, 477-479

and 492-493; DS, sessions of February 5 and 7, 1868, *Monitoru. Diariu officiate allu Romdniei,* nr. 36-37, February 15/27 and 16/28, 1868, 218-219 and 223-225.

[12] For the internal context, see Cancea 1983. For the increasing role of militarism before the First World War, see Berghahn 1981, 7-30.

[13] *Monitorul Oficial,* nr. 70, July 1, 1889, 1681-1684; *Colecfiunea generald a legilor si regulamentelor civile, militare si ecleziastice de la anul 1831...,* 1899, 24-34; *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pand la 1905,* 352-359.

[14] Directia Arhivelor Nafionale Istorice Centrale, "Parlament", dossier no. 954 (1890-1891), 75-88. General loan Emanuel Florescu received 1851.85 lei/month; Elena Locusteanu 185.18 lei/month; Irina Papasoglu 370.37 lei/month; Ion Logadi and Maria A1. Macedonschi 740.74 lei/month.

[15] *Monitorul Oficial,* nr. 30, May 10, 1890, 681-683; *Colecfiunea generald a legilor si regulamentelor civile, militare §i ecleziastice de la anul 1831...,* 1899, 34-50; *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pand la 1905,* 363-371.

[16] DAD, nr. 65-67, sessions of March 24-26, 1889, 1187-1202, 1204-1209 and 1212-1214; DS, no. 46 and 48-49, sessions of May 13, 22 and 24, 1889, 646-657, 663-675 and 677-680. Quotation from DAD, 1888-1889, 1187.

[17] DAD, no. 70-73 of April 22, 25-26 and 28, 1890, sessions of April 18-21, 1890, 1389-1417, 1419-1433 and 1438-1442; DS, no. 76, May 5, 1890, session of April 3, 1890, 737-747.

[18] DAD, 1901-1902, no. 41, February 24, 1902, session of February 14, 1902, 590-593; *Desbaterile Adunarii Nafionale Constituante a Deputafilor,* nr. 80-81, April 25-26, 1925, sessions of March 23-24, 1925, 1986, 2020-2021 and 2024-2027; further, according to Dimitrie A. Sturdza, the number of public functionaries in Romania, in 1902, was 47,761. Among them 36,107 were public servants in the state bureaucracy, leaving aside those working for the Romanian Railway Company, and 11,342 were working for the latter institution, developed and administered by the state. Out of the total number of functionaries, 28,083 were paid less than 96 lei a month, 14,236 were paid less than 300 lei a month, while 5,442 were paid more than 300 lei a month (see DAD, 1902, 631). In 1925, the number of pensioners was estimated by the Minister of Finances, Vintila Bratianu, as representing 12% of the number of public functionaries, which would indicate the latter's number at about 350,000 persons (see DAD, 1925, 2047). Senator G. Ghibanescu provided the following numbers of functionaries during the debates: 57,691 people worked for the Romanian Railways Company, 54,658 worked in the field of education, 23,078 were paid for providing religious services, 31,694 people worked for the army, and 18,975 for finances (DS, 1925, 1415).

[19] *Monitorul Oficial,* nr. 258, February 23, 1902, republished in *Monitorul Oficial* nr. 276, March 16, 1902; *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pand la 1905,* 1-290.

[20] DAD, 1901-1902, no. 41-43 and 45, February 24 and March 13-14 and 24, 1902, sessions of February 14-15 and 21, 1902, 583-633; DS, no. 42-45 of March 1, 15, 17 and 19, sessions of February 19-20,1902, 417-478.

Monitorul Oflcial, no. 85, April 15, 1925; *Codul general al Romdniei,* vol. XI-XII, *legi noui de unificare* 1922-1926, 440-458.
[22] *Desbaterile Adundrii Nafionale Constituante a Deputafilor,* no. 80-81, April 25-26, 1925, sessions of March 23-24, 1925, 1983-2093; *Desbaterile Adundrii Najionale Constituante a Senatului,* no. 67-69 of May 23, 26 and 30, 1925, sessions of April 3-4, 1925, 1414-1451.

References

Adaniloaie, Nichita, Anastasie Iordache, and Paraschiva Cancea. 1983. *Istoria Parlamentului si a viefii parlamentare din Romania pdnd la 1916.* Bucuresti: Editura Academiei.

Alexianu, George (ed.). 1940-1941. *Repertoriul General Alfabetic al tuturor codurilor, legilor, decretelor-legi, convenfiuni, decrete, regulamente, etc. 1 ianuarie 1860-1 ianuarie 1940. Publicate in Monitorul Oficial, colecfia Constantin Hamangiu, Consiliul Legislativ si in alte colecfii similare,* volumes I-II. Bucuresti: Monitorul Oficial si Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Centrals.

Ancusa, Victor. 1923. *Asigurdrile muncitoresti din Vechiul Regat si Ardeal. Studiu de legislate comparatd.* Cluj: Tipografia Dr. Sebastian Bornemisa.

Berghahn, Volker R. 1981. *Militarism. The History of an International Debate, 1861-1979.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bulei. Ion. 2000a. *Conservatori si conservatorism in Romania.* 2nd edition. Bucuresti: Editura Enciclopedica.

Cancea, Paraschiva. 1983. "Activitatea parlamentara dupa dobandirea independentei." In *Istoria Parlamentului si a viefii parlamentare din Romania pdnd la 1916,* edited by Nichita Adaniloaie, Anastasie Iordache, and Paraschiva Cancea, 252-277. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei.

Ciupala, Alin. 2009. *Istoria modernd a romdnilor. Organizarea statului si a sistemului institutional.* Bucuresti: Tritonic.

Dernier, Francis. 1998 [1996]. *Istoria politicilor sociale. Europa, secolele XIX-XX.* Iasi: Institutul European. Transaletd from French by Camelia Secareanu. Originally published as *Histoire des politiques sociales, Europe XDCe-XXe siecle.* Paris: Seuil. 1996.

Dragan. Tudor. 1991. *Inceputurile si dezvoltarea regimului parlamentar in Romania pdnd la 1916.* Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.

Flora, Peter, and Arnold J. Heidenheime (eds.). 1981. *The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America.* New Brunswick: Transaction books.

Hariton, Silviu. forthcoming. "Inceputurile asumarii politicilor sociale de catre stat in Romania? Cazul invalizilor, orfanilor si vaduvelor de razboi (IOVR) dupa Primul Razboi Mondial." In *Studii de istorie sociald. Noi perspective,* edited by Constantin Iordachi, Alin Ciupala, and Silviu Hariton, supplement of *Revista de Istorie Sociald,* Iasi.

Ioanijescu, Dumitru R.. 1919. *Istoricul legislafiunei muncii in Romania. Regimul muncei de la Regulamentul Organic pdnd in present.* Bucuresti: Tipografia Culture.

Iosa, Mircea. 1983. "Parlamentul in perioada 1895-1907." In *Istoria Parlamentului si a viefii parlamentare din Romania pdnd la 1916,* edited by Nichita Adaniloaie, Anastasie Iordache, and Paraschiva Cancea, 338-380. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei.

Mamina, Ion, and Ioan Scurtu. 1994. *Guverne si guvernanfi, 1866-1916.* Bucuresti: Silex.

—. 1996. *Guverne si guvernanfi, 1916-1938.* Bucuresti: Silex.

Marton, Silvia. 2009. *La construction politique de la nation. La nation dans les debats du Parlement de la Roumanie (1866-1871).* Iasi: Institutul European.

—. 2011. "'Faction'? 'coterie'? 'parti'? L'emergence des partis politiques roumains eu XIXe siecle." In *L 'Etat en France et en Roumanie aux XIXe et XXe siecles. Proceeding of the conference organized at the New Europe College-Institute for Advanced Studies (26-27 February 2010),* edited by Silvia Marton, Anca Oroveanu, and Florin Turcanu, 85-138. Bucuresti: New Europe College.

Mommsen, Wolfgang J., and Wolfgang Mock (eds.). 1981. *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany, 1850-1950.* London: Croom Helm on behalf of the German Historical Institute.

Nicolescu, George D. 1903. *1866-1901. Parlamentul romdn. Biografti si portrete. Partea a doua: Disposifiunile constitutional relative la representafiunea nafionala; legea electorala; statistica electorala; ministerele de la 1866-1903; sesiunile si presedinfii corpurilor legiuitoare; incheiere.* Bucuresti: L V . Socec.

Opreanu, Remus R., and Pascal Georgescu. 1929. *Legile depensiuni civile si militare in vigoare actualmente. Comentariu teoretic si practic.* Bucuresti: Tipografia Inspectoratului General al Jandarmeriei Rurale.

—. 1929. "Prefa^a." In *Legile de pensiuni civile si militare in vigoare actualmente. Comentariu teoretic si practic,* 1-19. Bucuresti: Tipografia Inspectoratului General al Jandarmeriei Rurale.

Pippidi, Andrei. 2010. "The development of an administrative class in South-East Europe." In *Ottomans into Europeans. State and Institutions Building in South-East Europe,* edited by Alina-Mungiu

Pippidi and Wim van Meurs, 111-134. New York: Columbia University Press.

Preda, Cristian. 2011. *Rumdnii fericifi. Vot si putere de la 1831 pand in prezent.* Iasi: Polirom.

Pupeza, Ion V. 1936. *Problema asigurdrilor sociale in Romania.* Foreword by D.R. Ioanijescu. Bucuresti: Tipografia penitenciarului Vacaresti.

Radulescu, Ion M. 1938. "Regimul general al pensiilor." *Enciclopedia Romdniei,* general editor Dimitrie Gusti, vol. I, 552-556. Bucuresti: Imprimeriile Statului.

Radulescu-Zoner, Serban (ed.). 2000. *Istoria Partidului National Liberal.* Bucuresti: All.

Rusenescu, Mihail, and Ion Saizu. 1979. *Viajapolitico in Romania, 1922-1928.* Bucuresti: Editura Politica.

Skocpol, Theda. 1993. "America's first social security system: the expansion of benefits for Civil War veterans." *Political Science Quarterly* 108 (1): 85-116.

Sigerist, Henry E. 1943 [1999]. "From Bismarck to Beveridge: developments and trends in social security legislation." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 13 (4): 365-388. Reprinted in *Journal of Public Health Policy* vol. 20 (4): 474-496.

Sora, Andrei-Florin. 2006a. "Les fonctionnaires publics en Roumanie: les sous-prefects (1866-1916)", *Revue des etudes sud-est europeennes* 44: 233-249.

—. 2006b. "L'institution prefectorale roumaine: un modele francais?" In *Modele francais et experiences de la modernization. Roumanie, 19-20* siecles,* edited by Florin Turcanu, 220-243. Bucuresti: Institutul Cultural Roman.

—. 2007. "Etre prefet en Roumanie, 1866-1916. Strategies de carriers." *Arhivele Olteniei,* new series, 21: 53-70.

Stan, Valeriu. 1983. "Parlamentul in perioada instabilitajii guvernamentale (1866-1871)." In *Istoria Parlamentului si a viefii parlamentare din Romania pand la 1916,* edited by Nichita Adaniloaie, Anastasie Iordache, and Paraschiva Cancea, 172-198. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei.

Seteanu, Mihail. 1912. *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd. Regulamentul de aplicare, istoricul dreptului de pensiune, formulare si instrucfiuni de procedurd.* Bucuresti: Institutul de Arte Grafice si Editura „Minerva".

Seteanu, Mihail, and L. Penescu. 1899. *Colecfiunea generald a legilor si regulamentelor civile, militare si ecleziastice de la anul 1831 pand in present insofita de diferite formulare de petifiuni si certificate ce trebuiesc urmate pentru facerea diferitelor acte neceresa in vederea regularei dreptului la pensiune.* Bucuresti: Tipografia Gutenberg, Joseph Gobi.

Jurcanu, Florin (coord.). 2006. *Modele franqais et experiences de la modernisation. Roumanie, lP^Of siecles.* Bucuresti: Institutul Cultural Roman.

Zeuceanu, Alexandra. 1905. *Legea generald de pensiuni comentatd si adnotatd urmatd de colecfiunea legilor, statutelor si regulamentelor de pensiuni de la 1831 pand la 1905.* Foreword by Nicolae Mandrea. Bucuresti: Tipografia „Speranta".

CONTRIBUTORS

Elena Albu was assigned a Ph.D. degree by the University of Bucharest. In 2012, she defended her thesis, entitled *The Pragmatics of Negative Structures in Political Discourse. A Relevance Theoretic Approach.* Research interest: cognitive pragmatics, negation and political discourse. Recent publications: "Descriptive and Interpretive Use in the Analysis of Negation" (forthcoming), in *Limba romdna: directii actuate in cercetarea lingvisticd,* Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti; "A Cognitive Approach to Negative Structures: *not just* and *not only...but also",* 2011, in *Limbaj si discurs. Cercetdri teoretice si aplicative,* edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Melania Roibu. Iasi: PIM.
Contact: elena_albu84@yahoo.com

Oana Chelaru-Murdrus is Associate Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters), Dean of the Faculty of Letters (since March 2012). She is one of the founding members of *CESI (Centrul de Excelenfd pentru Studiul Imaginii/The Excellence Centre for the Study of Image),* and an associate member of *Associazione Italiana di Romenistica.* Fields of interest: poetics, rhetoric, discourse analysis. Author of two books: *Nichita Stdnescu-Subiectivitatea liricd. Poetica enunfarii* [Nichita Stanescu-Lyrical Subjectivity. The Poetics of Enunciation], Bucuresti: Univers, 2000, and *Stereotipie si expresivitate-de la limba vorbitd la textul poetic* [Stereotypy and Expressivity-from Spoken Language to Poetic Text], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2007, and of a number of studies and articles in various collective volumes, scientific journals, as well as in the Romanian cultural press. Contact: oana.murarus@gmail.com

Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu is Assistant Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters). Teaching and research interest: pragmatics, stylistics, rhetoric, argumentation. Member of the research group dealing with the study of the Romanian parliamentary discourse (CNCSIS grant 2136/2008). Recent publications: Ph.D. thesis *Umorul politic romdnesc in perioada comunistd. Perspective lingvistice* [Romanian Political Humour during the Communist Regime. Linguistic Perspectives], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2012; "Re-presenting

argumentation in the traditional Romanian parliamentary debate", in *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation,* edited by Frans H. van Eemeren *et al.* Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat, 2011, "Verbal Aggressiveness in the Romanian Parliamentary Debate. Past and Present"-with Melania Roibu, in *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 2010 (4). Contact: mc_tinescu2000@yahoo.com

Matthias Falter is junior researcher and lecturer at the University of Vienna (Department of Political Science). Main research fields: political theory, anti-Semitism, right-wing extremism and Jewish Studies. Currently, he is writing his Ph.D. thesis dealing with basic concepts within the Austrian political discourse on right-wing extremism. Contact: matthias.falter@univie.ac.at

Teemu Hdkkinen, MA, is doctoral student at the University of Jyvaskyla (Department of History and Ethnology). He is currently working at his Ph.D. project on the role of the British Parliament as a foreign policy decision-maker. It focuses on the decisions to deploy forces abroad to three large-scale military conflicts. Contact: teemu.hakkinen@jyu.fi

Silviu Hariton is Ph.D. student in History at Central European University (Budapest, Hungary), fellow of New Europe College, Bucharest (2011). Research interests: state-mation-building in South Eastern Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; theories and methods in social and cultural history. Main publications: "Religion, Nationalism and Militarism in Nineteenth Century Romania", *Etudes Balkaniques,* Sofia, 2008 (4) and "Francophony and its Romanian Entanglements: A Review Article", *Balkanistica* 2011, 24. Contact: silviuhariton@gmail.com

Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu is Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters); Fulbright Professor (1990-1991), University of Washington (Seattle, USA); Visiting Professor, University of Vienna (1996-1999). Teaching and research interests: pragmatics, discourse analysis, rhetoric, argumentation. Main publications: *Narafiune si dialog in proza romdneascd. Elemente de pragmatica a textului literar* [Narrative and Dialogue in the Romanian Fiction. Elements of a Pragmatics of Literary Texts], Bucuresti: Editura Academiei, 1991; *Conversafia: structuri si strategii. Sugestii pentru o pragmatica a romdnei vorbite* [Conversation: structures and strategies. Suggestions for a pragmatics of spoken Romanian], Bucuresti: A11, 1995 (2nd edition 1999); *Limbaj si comunicare. Elemente de pragmatica lingvisticd* [Language and

communication. Elements of linguistic pragmatics], Bucuresti, A11, 2003. Editor of several volumes, such as: *Cooperation and conflict in ingroup and intergroup communication. Selected papers from the Xth Biennial Congress of the IADA,* Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2006; *Dialog, discurs, enunf In memoriam Sorin Stati* [Dialogue, discourse, utterance. In memoriam Sorin Stati], Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2010. Member of the board of International Association for Dialogue Analysis-IADA (2005-2012). Coordinator of several projects, among which a corpus of verbal interaction in present-day Romanian, and the project on Romanian parliamentary discourse (CNCSIS grant 2136/2008). Contact: lilianarux@gmail.com

Maria-Aldina Marques teaches Portuguese Linguistics at the University of Minho, Portugal. Teaching and research interests: discourse analysis, and specifically, argumentation and dialogism in Portuguese political discourse, in general, and in parliamentary debates, in particular. Author of a book on parliamentary discourse: *Funcionamento do discurso politico parlamentar,* Braga [PT], Universidade do Minho, Centro de estudos humanisticos, 2000. Contact: mamarques@ilch.uminho.pt

Coco Noren is Professor of French at Uppsala University and research fellow at The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (2008-2013). She has served as Director of Studies at the Faculty of Languages and is now president of the Academic Senate at Uppsala University. Research interests: argumentation and polyphony theory applied to a wide range of different genres: everyday talk, novels, broadcast media and, more recently, parliamentary discourse. She is, currently, the director of the project *Europe on Line. The argumentation of the French MPs in the European Parliament.* Major publications: Ph.D. thesis *Reformulation et conversation. De la semantique du topos aux fonctions interactionnelles,* Uppsala University, 1999; *ScaPoLine-La theorie SCandinave de la POlyphonie LinguistiquE,* with H. Nelke and K. Flottum, Kime, 2004; *ON-pronom a facettes,* with K. Flottum and K. Jonasson, Duculot, 2007. Contact: coco.noren@moderna.uu.se

Daniela Pastarmadjieva is Ph.D. student at the University of National and World Economy (Sofia), Department of Political Science, Faculty of International Economics and Politics. Her Ph.D. thesis is entitled *Political subcultures in Bulgaria in the process of transition to democracy.* Research interests: political culture, political subcultures, political behaviour, political

participation. She has a degree in law and her previous publications are related to law. Contact: daniela.pastarmadjieva@gmail.com

Onni Pekonen is Ph.D. student in Political Science at the University of Jyvaskyla. In his thesis, he examines the process by which international parliamentary rules and practices were/have been adopted in the Parliament of Finland, the *Eduskunta,* from the early nineteenth century on, by applying perspectives of conceptual history and rhetoric. Pekonen is member of the research team of Ph.D. candidates working on the project *Politics of Dissensus. Parliamentarism, Rhetoric and Conceptual History,* led by Professor Kari Palonen, member of the Finnish Academy. Pekonen has written about parliamentary freedom of speech, unparliamentary language, parliamentary obstruction, and free mandate in the Finnish procedural debates. Contact: onni.i.pekonen@jyu.fi

Melania Roibu is Assistant Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters). Ph.D. thesis: *Linguistic means of attaining meta-communicative function in Romanian.* Teaching and research interests: pragmatics, stylistics, rhetoric, argumentation, communication and meta-communication. Member of the research group dealing with the study of the Romanian parliamentary discourse (CNCSIS grant 2136/2008). Contact: melaniaroibu@yahoo.com

Saskia Stachowitsch is post-doctoral researcher at the University of Vienna (Department of Political Science), and Visiting Fellow at the University of Bristol (School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies). She is working in the fields of Jewish Studies and anti-Semitism research, as well as gender and military research. Recent publications: *Gender Ideologies and Military Labor Markets in the US,* Routledge, 2012. Contact: saskia.stachowitsch@univie.ac.at

Maria Svensson is Assistant Professor in French linguistics at Uppsala University. She currently serves as Director of French Studies in the Department of Modern Languages. Research interests: argumentation, text linguistics and semantics (with special focus on connectors) and contrastive linguistics. Publications: Ph.D. thesis *Marqueurs correlatifs en franqais et en suedois. Etude semantico-fonctionnelle de* d'une part...d'autre part, d'un cote...de l'autre *et de* non seulement...mais *en contraste,* Uppsala University, 2010; « Marqueurs correlatifs en francais et en suedois; l'exemple de *non seulement... mais* et *inte bara...utanv>,* in *Revue frangaise de linguistique appliquee, Numero special. Les*

connecteurs : description, traduction, apprentissage (2011) and « *D'une part...a"autre part, d'un cote...de l'autre* et leurs correspondants suedois », in *Arena Romanistica,* 1 (2007).
Contact: Maria.Svensson@moderna.uu.se

Ariadna Stefdnescu is Associate Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters). Research interests: pragmatics, stylistics, discourse and conversation analysis, rhetoric and argumentation. Main publications: *Conectori pragmatici* [Pragmatic Connectors], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2007, and *Aspecte pragmatice. Incursiuni in limba romdna actuald* [Pragmatic Aspects. Researches on present-day Romanian], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2007; studies concerning the discourse of the condemnation of communism in Romania ("Emotie si impolite(e in discursul si interdiscursul condamnarii trecutului comunist totalitar din Romania" in *Dialog, discurs, enunf. In memoriam Sorin Stati,* edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu and Liliana Hoinarescu, Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2010. Contact: ariadna.stefanescu@gmail.com

Manon Tremblay is Professor at the University of Ottawa (School of Political Studies). She was the Head of the Research Centre on Women in Politics (2000-2005) and the French co-editor of the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (2003-2006). Winner of the 2006 *Wilma Rule Award* for the best paper on "Gender & Politics" delivered at the 20th Congress of the International Political Science Association. Most recent books: *The Lesbians and Gays Movement and the State: Comparative Insights into a Transformed Relationship,* co-edited with David Paternotte and Carol Johnson, Ashgate, 2011; *Women in Executive Power: A global overview,* co-edited with Gretchen Bauer, Routledge, 2011; *Quebec Women and Legislative Representation,* UBC Press, 2010.
Contact: mtrembla@uottawa.ca

Oana Ufa Barbulescu is Assistant Professor at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters). Teaching and research interests: diachronic linguistics, stylistics, rhetoric, argumentation, communication, translation theory. Main publications: Ph.D. thesis *Latinis litteris operam navare. Despre traducerea surselor latine si integrarea lor in Istoria ieroglifica [Latinis litteris operam navare. On the translation of Latin sources and their integration into Hieroglyphic History],* Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2011; various articles in linguistic journals and collective works. Member of the research

group dealing with the study of the Romanian parliamentary discourse (CNCSIS grant 2136/2008). Contact: o_barbulescu@yahoo.com

Andra Vasilescu (Serbanescu) is Professor of Linguistics and Communication at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters) and researcher at the "Iorgu Iordan-Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics. Visiting Professor at the University of Antwerpen (1998) and University of Amsterdam (2000). Member of the International Association for Dialogue Analysis. Areas of interest: syntax-pragmatics interface, interpersonal communication, intercultural communication, writing, Romanian as a foreign language. Author and co-author of 6 books in linguistics and communication, 12 articles/chapters in collective works, 53 articles in different linguistic journals, as well as of several translations from English. Member in several Romanian and international research teams. Contact: vasilescu.andra@gmail.com

Rodica Zafiu is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Bucharest (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters) and researcher at "Iorgu Iordan-Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics. Research interests: rhetoric, stylistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, Romanian grammar. Author of the volumes: *Narafiune si poezie* [Narrative and poetry], Bucuresti: A11, 2000, *Diversitate stilistica in romana actuala* [Stylistic diversity in present-day Romanian], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2001; *Limbaj si politica* [Language and Politics], Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti, 2007; *101 cuvinte argotice* [101 slang words], Bucuresti: Humanitas, 2010, etc. Contact: rodica_zaflu@yahoo.com

INDEX OF NAMES

INDEX OF SUBJECTS