

# METASTANCE IN THE ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE: CASE STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

ANDRA VASILESCU

**Abstract.** The article presents three case studies on the Romanian traditional Parliamentary Discourse (one discourse given by Titu Maiorescu, 1877 and two discourses given by Nicolae Iorga, 1908, 1919, respectively) and aims at identifying correlations between stancetaking, metastance and persuasion. The analysis revealed objective metastance based on logic in Maiorescu's discourse vs. subjective metastance based on ethos and pathos in Iorga's discourses. Beyond differences in metastance and persuasion, some culturally shared values were traced in the three samples. Metastance activities in Parliament are consistent with the intense face work activities in Romanian every day conversations.

**Keywords:** Parliamentary discourse, Romanian traditional Parliamentary discourse, stancetaking, metastance, persuasion, case studies (Titu Maiorescu, Nicolae Iorga).

The present study is part of a larger research<sup>2</sup> that aims at revealing specific aspects of stancetaking in the traditional Romanian Parliamentary discourse<sup>3</sup>. The theoretical framework is provided by Englebretson (2007) and Bayley (2004); also, it integrates the concept of metastance as defined in Driscoll (1983).

<sup>1</sup> This work was supported by CNCISIS-UEFISCU, project number PN II – IDEI code 2136/2008.

<sup>2</sup> The research on stancetaking in the Parliamentary discourse is being developed in the frame of the CNCISIS Research Grant 2136/2009–2011.

<sup>3</sup> I call *traditional Romanian Parliamentary discourse* discourses held in the „Old Parliament” between 1866 (when the Constitution defined and regulated Parliamentary activities in accordance with the European Parliaments) and 1938 (when the Royal Dictatorship of Carol II drastically diminished the role and attributions of the Parliament). In 1948 the Parliament was reorganized as the Great National Assembly, whose formal activities were controlled by the Communist Party. After the Revolution in December 1989, the Constitution in 1991 reestablished the „New Parliament”, representing the post-communist, pluralist, democratic regime.

RRL, LV, 4, p. 365–380, București, 2010

The discourses under analysis were given in the Romanian Parliament by Titu Maiorescu<sup>4</sup> (*Discourse no.77*, 1887) and Nicolae Iorga<sup>5</sup> (*To defend myself*, 1908; *A personal matter*, 1919). The case studies identify types of metastance as outcomes of specific correlations between stance enactment and persuasion.

## 1. THE PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSE

The Parliament is an institution governed by principles and rules generated within the constitutional frame of a state, according to its political system and culture. Beyond all differences, the Parliament is, everywhere in the world, an institution dedicated to speech, shaped as a sequence of monologues, interconnected by contextuality and intertextuality, aimed at promoting personal and group agenda and inviting deliberations of the Assembly. Speaking in Parliament means adopting a communicative conduct consistent with a mental pattern which is part of the context itself, marked as a set of discursive prototypical, nonexclusive features that become manifest on different linguistic levels (phonetic, grammatical, lexical, discursive). The Parliamentary discourse has a global purpose (“to make politics”) and several local purposes (to criticize, to interpellate, to debate, etc.). The interactants’ roles are multilayered and interconnected: communicative roles (speaker – listener), interactional roles (promoter - opponent), ideological roles (reflecting the political affiliation of each speaker/listener). This special type of linguistic activity, institutionalized as the most formal variety of the political language, has outcomes in the real world (Bayley 2004).

The Parliamentary discourse pertains to the deliberative genre: the speaker delivers a speech in front of an Assembly in order to persuade it in favor of a future decision on public affairs. Indexing relations of solidarity and power between Self and Others, the speaker constructs ideology that might underlie decision making

<sup>4</sup> Titu Maiorescu (1840–1917): Romanian literary critic, professor, lawyer, esthetician, philosopher, essay writer, and politician. Founder of the literary circle “Junimea”, where the most representative writers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century read their literary works; co-founder of the Romanian Academy. He held important academic, public and political positions at very young ages: university professor at the age of 22, dean and rector at the age of 23 (University of Iași), academician at the age of 27, deputy in the Romanian Parliament at the age of 30, minister of Public Instruction at the age of 34. In politics he was a conservative; president of the Conservative Party (1913–1914). Deputy and senator in the Romanian Parliament. He held several public positions: minister of Public Instruction (1874–1876; 1889; 1889–1891), Minister of agriculture, industry, and commerce (1888), Minister of public affairs (1889–1891), Minister of justice (1900–1901), Minister of foreign affairs (1910–1913), Prime minister (1912–1914).

<sup>5</sup> Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940): Romanian historian, literary critic, playwright, poet, university professor and politician. Member of the Romanian Academy. He authored 1003 volumes, 12755 articles, 4863 review articles. In politics he was the co-founder of the National Democratic Party; 1931–1932, Prime minister and Minister of education. Elected, several times, member of the Romanian Parliament.

(Ochs 1992; Hodge and Kress 1988: 123; Fairclough 2003; Ilie 2004). Ideology, understood as a shared system of values and beliefs, is articulated through acts of stancetaking, among others.

## 2. STANCETAKING

During verbal interactions humans evaluate the world and their interlocutors, express emotions, beliefs, and desires, claim or disavow authority, align or disalign with others. These complex activities accomplished through language have been labeled “stancetaking”, and are assumed to motivate linguistic options and shape interactional structures at different levels. Stancetaking has been addressed from a variety of interrelated fields like linguistics, psychology, sociology and anthropology, emerging as a domain of cross-disciplinary research.

### 2. 1. Updates

Phenomena of projecting self in discourse have been defined and investigated in various frameworks. Benveniste (1966: 258) noticed that “language is deeply marked by the expression of *subjectivity*” and Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1980) devoted a study to the mechanisms of what she called “*L'énonciation de la subjectivité dans le langage*”. From a cognitive perspective Langacker (1985) stated the inherent role of *subjectivity* in construing a scene and profiling various aspects of it. Lyons (1994: 13) focused on “*self-expression* in the use of language”. Thompson and Hunston (2000: 5) used *evaluation* as a cover term for the writer’s attitudes, viewpoint, feelings about the propositions (s)he is talking about.

A term that encompasses a wide range of phenomena related to the projection of the self in discourse is “stancetaking”. Biber and Finegan (1989: 92) point out the subjective and evaluative nature of stance, reflecting “attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message”. Alike, Biber et al. (1999: 966) refer to stance as “personal feelings, attitudes, value judgments or assessments”. A comprehensive definition is to be found in Du Bois (2007: 163): stance taking is “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others) and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the socio-cultural field”. Ochs (1996: 420), like Bucholtz and Hall (2005), researched the interplay between stance and the wider social discourses and stereotypes involved in stancetaking activities. Benwell and Stokoe (2006) investigated how stancetaking indexes social identities, and Precht (2003) demonstrated the cross-cultural differences and the historical nature of stancetaking. To sum up: stancetaking is situated, pragmatic, interactional

(dialogic) and emergent in discourse; it indexes culturally meaningful styles and identities and accounts for how particular linguistic choices accomplish particular social and rhetorical actions.

Generic definitions like those mentioned above frame several phenomena, interrelated in various classifications, partly overlapping, partly divergent. Biber and Finegan's classification (1989) includes evaluations (value judgments, assessments, and attitudes), affect (personal feelings) and epistemicity (commitment to the truth value of a statement). Berman et al. (2002: 258) and Berman (2005: 107) present three interrelated dimensions of text-construction: orientation (the relationship between sender, text, recipient), attitude (epistemic, deontic, affective), generality of reference and quantification (specific vs. general, i.e., how relatively general or specific reference is to people, places, and times mentioned in the text – personal, specific vs. generic vs. impersonal). Conrad and Biber (2000, ap. Englebretson 2007: 71) discuss epistemic, attitudinal and style stance, while Johnstone (2007: 51) classifies stances into evidential (certainty), interpersonal (friendliness, intensity, deference, attitude and affiliation) and social (like apologies or identity markers). For Hunston (2007: 32-35), stances are positive or negative, general or particular, with an external or an internal source of authority. Du Bois (2007: 141) describes phenomena of stancetaking by assertion or by inference, discriminates between objective, subjective and intersubjective stance and elaborates the "stance triangle": the evaluating subject 1, the evaluating subject 2 and the object of evaluation. Within the triangle, three stancetaking activities emerge: evaluation (the process whereby a stancetaker orients to the object of stance and characterizes it as having some specific quality or value, either affective or epistemic); positioning (the act of situating a social actor with respect to responsibility for stance and for invoking socio-cultural values); alignment (calibrating, overtly or covertly, the relationship between two stances and, by implication, between two stancetakers). Scheibman (2007: 113) classifies stance into subjective, individual (construed as relevant to a speaker's position in discourse), intersubjective, i.e., interactive (relevant to local discourse activities) and sociocultural (relevant to general beliefs of people as members of communities), respectively. Englebretson (2007: 69 ff) identifies three types of meaning encoded in stance: (i) identity, (ii) epistemicity (evidentiality – the source of knowledge of the current utterance, i.e., words of another, general inference or direct perception; assessment of interactional relevance – the degree of value a speaker places on the utterance, usually regarding its role in the ongoing interaction; affect – the speaker's mental or emotional attitude) and (iii) positioning (positioning self to knowledge, i.e., as an authority, an expert or a novice).

## 2.2. Stancetaking strategies

Starting from the definitions and classifications above, I advance an integrative perspective on stancetaking, according to the type of information

indexed. The classes presented and defined bellow will be assumed to be strategies of projecting self in discourse.

(a) According to orientation, stance appears to be:

- Objective: the author does not project self in the text; (s)he records facts, events, dialogues objectively
- Subjective/individual: the author projects self as part of an interactional process that leaves traces in discourse
- Intersubjective: the dialogical dimension of textualization becomes manifest; the author records voices from outside the text

(b) In subjective / individual stance, several strategies of projecting self can be identified:

- Projection of personal identity: the author provides information about himself (ethnicity, class, gender, personal beliefs, tastes and attitudes, etc.)
- Projection of modality: the author provides information about his assessment of the propositional content in terms of epistemic values (i.e., along the continuum true – probable – possible – false; epistemic modality) or deontic values (i.e., along the continuum volition – permission – obligation; deontic modality); in epistemic modality the source of knowledge (evidentiality) may be external (external observers) or internal (direct perceptions of the speaker)
- Projection of evaluations: the author provides information about his commitment to the propositional content or to the source of information evaluated in terms of what is desirable/undesirable, good/bad
- Projection of attitudes: the author provides information about his/her degree of affiliation or non-affiliation with the propositional content or its source (in terms of accepting, denying, doubting, confirming, subscribing, crediting, legitimizing)
- Projection of emotions: the author provides information about his/her emotions concerning the propositional content or his/her interlocutor(s)
- Projection of responsibility: the degree at which the author engages in stancetaking activities: low (stancetaking shared with a source of authority), moderate (personal commitment to a certain degree), high (generalizations)

(c) In intersubjective stance, several strategies of projecting self can be identified:

- Projection of the interactional identity of the interlocutors:
  - evaluations of the interactional relevance of information
  - alignment or disalignment with the interlocutors
  - interpersonal relationships (friendship, deference, distance, domination, etc.)

- social acts consequent to the performance of a speech act (declaratives, excuses, promises, commitments, etc.)
- style (the author's comments upon his/her style of interaction with his/her interlocutors)
- Projection of the socio-cultural identity shared by the interlocutors

### 2.3. Stance and stancetaking markers

Stancetaking activities leave traces in discourse. Devices used by writers/speakers to project self in discourse and thus personalize their contributions are called discourse markers of stance. They are currently classified according to the level on which they occur: lexical markers, syntactic structures, phonological features, discourse patterns (Hunston 2007: 31; Biber 2007: 112; Kärkkäinen 2007: 184).

Lexical markers are words that pertain to different grammatical classes: nouns (*idea, argument, evidence, possibility, comment, proposal, hope, reason, opinion, etc.*), evaluative adjectives (*outrageous, sad, disgraceful, disgusting, annoying, disappointing, joyful, promising, etc.*), pronouns (the use of the 3 grammatical persons, singular and plural), determiners (the use of *this* and *that*, of *my* and *their* etc.) and quantifiers (degree of generalization), verbs (*think, believe, consider, deliberate, add, exemplify, act, intrude, change mind, compromise, disturb, trespass, lean, rely, inform, tell, spy, seem, appear, allow, etc.*), adverbials (*obviously, unfortunately, hopefully, probably, apparently, certainly, surprisingly, frankly, no doubt, truly, predictably, etc.*), connectives (*also, nevertheless, at the same time, though, etc.*). Some of these words can be grouped across categories, according to their inherent meaning: modals (*possible, possibility, possibly*), diminutives, non-factives, etc.

Some syntactic markers are closely related to lexemes that determine specific structures like: subject-clauses (*It is important that, It is obvious that, It is easy to, It is dangerous to, It seems to, It appears that, etc.*), predicative-clauses (*Fact is that, The problem is that, etc.*), attributive clauses with antecedents (*the assumption that, the importance of, the intention that, etc.*), complement clauses (*I suggest that, I think that, I am afraid of, I am annoyed that, I would prefer to, He urged that, They warned that, etc.*), incident clauses and phrases (*I guess, In my opinion, To my mind, As expected, etc.*). Others are the outcome of systemic interactions between syntax and morphology: voice, tense, aspect. Few phenomena are purely syntactic in nature, like cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions (*This is what really matters, He is the one I love, etc.*), tag questions (*He is smart, isn't he?, You are not guilty, are you?, etc.*), negative questions (*Aren't you the manager?, etc.*), topicalization (*As for me, I'm not going to say anything, etc.*), word order.

Discourse patterns sometimes function as stance markers: code switching, repetition of other's utterances, hedging, quoting, adjacency pairs like question-answer, etc.

In addition, in spoken interactions, phonological (intonation, voice quality, speech speed, sound repetition, sound symbolism) and non-verbal stance markers (postures, gestures, facial expressions) occur.

#### **2.4. Stance and metastance in the parliamentary discourse**

In the Parliamentary discourse, stancetaking is a three-fold activity: the speaker takes stance to the topic under negotiation, to the audience - members of the Parliament who are supposed to deliberate, and to the previous / next speakers on the same topic / on related topics. Also, it is part of persuasion: the speaker projects self in discourse in order to construct a competent, trustworthy, powerful professional identity that can influence deliberative and decision making processes. Unlike in everyday conversation, where stancetaking is a trace of the discourse production activities, in the Parliamentary discourse it is an intentional, planned, goals driven activity, a constitutive part of the discourse itself. Since ideology determines decision making, stancetaking functions as a force of political control (Fairclough 2003; Hodge and Kress 1998).

Quite often, as part of their interventions on various topics, or in special discourses ("on personal matters"), the members of the Parliament take stance to Self: they explain and evaluate personal actions and words, correct what they consider misunderstandings of their deeds, words or intentions, reject accusations or criticisms. This is metastance. Metastance, as defined by Driscoll (1983), is the vantage a character gains as (s)he steps back to observe the self and its initial states, the point from which one is able to gain a fuller view of oneself. It is the outcome of interpretations of personal stance and the expression of the ruling conceptions of the individual about him/herself.

Metastance occurs in various forms of communication: in intrapersonal communication (when the person recalls, evaluates, (re)interprets events and plans future activities), in psychotherapy, in literature or in literary journals or it is part of various speech acts that occur in everyday conversations (like boasting, taking pride in oneself, self-criticism, confessions, etc.). In the Parliamentary discourse metastance is part of constructing ideology and interpersonal power.

### **3. CASE STUDIES**

In what follows I will investigate metastance strategies in three Parliamentary speeches delivered at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, respectively, by two famous personalities of the Romanian culture and



politics (see notes 1 and 2), Titu Maiorescu (one discourse) and Nicolae Iorga (two discourses).

The three discourses are “on personal matters” and enact metastance. Yet, they differ in several respects: local purpose, orientation, hierarchy of metastance strategies, textual structures and modes of persuasion, violations of the deliberative genre constraints.

### 3.1. Titu Maiorescu (1887)

Maiorescu’s speech is a response to the minister of justice who, in his discourse, had brought him several accusations. Maiorescu builds the metastance of a professional, objective, law oriented person in a speech whose local and explicit purpose is “to explain and set facts right”, making strict reference to his “political” self (488).

The speaker enacts objective metastance through a problem oriented discourse. He identifies three issues which he focuses in three distinct subparts of his speech: (i) actions taken against a possible conspiracy at Mazar Paşa, (ii) the possibility of joining the Government, (iii) and the accusation of having attacked the king in the magazine whose editor in chief he was.

For reasons of objectivity, Maiorescu adopts an external vantage point. To his audience he takes a cultural stance, claiming the procedural right of each member of the Parliament to talk on personal matters concerning his political activities: “the procedure ought to be followed”, “I have the right to answer”, “minister’s interventions ought to be followed by discussions”, “we all should insist on giving the floor to everybody who had been invoked in another speaker’s discourse”, “we should all listen patiently to a speaker who defends his position because this is part of good Parliamentary practice” (Maiorescu: 487–488). In the framework of culturally shared values (both speaker and hearers are members of the Romanian Parliament), deontic modalization functions as an indirect strategy of dominance and gaining power over the audience. To the issue, Maiorescu takes an epistemic stance and documents the truth value of his assertions in terms of factual information. Firstly, he presents himself as part in the decision of forbidding a public reunion in the open space in deliberative terms, with arguments based on the Constitution. He backs up his speech with a quotation from the Constitution, with an accurate description of events meant to prove that they fell under legal restrictions, with meta comments (“we asked ourselves”) and dubitative questions (“was that garden an open space or not? It had a fence; what was that, a roof, as mentioned by the minister? Under these circumstances, I consider our decision consistent with the law”). Secondly, Maiorescu rejects the minister’s claim that he had declined the invitation of joining the ministerial team; he supports his denial in terms of the outcome of personal rational evaluations previously communicated to the prime minister himself, who can testify for the truth of his assertion, and in



terms of Constitutional procedures – the vote of the Parliament needed. Thirdly, he makes a thorough linguistic analysis in order to reject accusations by proving the malicious grammatical ambiguity in the minister of justice's statement, intended to imply that Maiorescu, who had often advocated in Parliament for the rights of the Romanian press, would have been one of those who had attacked the king in his journal; Maiorescu firmly dissociates his journal from what he honestly admitted to have been exaggerations of some newspapers, making immediate reference to laws which regulate press activities.

In his speech Maiorescu does not take stance explicitly to his opponent; he develops a solid argumentation against the minister's accusations which functions, metonymically and/or antiphrastically, as stancetaking to the minister himself: "I would very much like that all documents issued by the present Government be clearly and honestly based on the official interpretation of a law text, as I did it myself" (Maiorescu: 491); all interpretations "are fallacious" (Maiorescu: 492); "I wish that the minister of justice and his colleagues can make the same political declaration as I can make today for everything that I have ever written" (Maiorescu: 493).

The text of the speech is highly elaborated and follows the classical structure. Each of the three issues addressed is built on: *exordium*, with *captatio* (generally, it is important for a democracy that the minister gets responses from the audience) and *propositio* (the speaker's particular purpose is to establish facts as they truly occurred); *narratio* (objective, brief presentation of events); *argumentatio*, with *probatio* (factual and constitutional proofs; witness and procedural proofs; linguistic and textual proofs of his sound judgment, honest behavior, and ethical conduct, respectively) and *refutatio* (he refutes his opponent views assertively); *peroratio*, with *recapitulatio* (the speaker insists on the factual arguments in his demonstration) and *affectus* (a declaration of his lawful actions, either in a pathetic manner or as a joke). The speech is highly focused: ideas are disposed on a deductive pattern (the problem identified at the beginning of the speech is further detailed); direct speech acts prevail; the speaker explains the relevance of his addressing each of the three topics; each of the three issues is clearly highlighted by discourse markers used as planning strategies (the first issue..., the second issue..., the third issue) or pragmatic connectors (*thus, also, so, etc.*); emphatic syntactic structures are used (argumentative *because* clauses, purpose adverbials and clauses, oppositions expressed as affirmative – negative coordinated sentences, adversative sentences or *although* clauses, *if...than* clauses). The textual progression is dynamic, based on a linear sequence of arguments and stance frequently marked on verbs (*ought to, explain, can, I will not accept it, know, assume*), adverbs (*politically, irrefutably, legally, honestly, officially*), and sometimes participles (*I am forced to...*). Passive constructions used to present objective facts are balanced with active voice first person verbs that indicate the speaker's assuming responsibility. Most speech acts are representatives, and the

speech as a whole functions as a representative macro speech act: “Here is a demonstration of my professionalism as a member of the Parliament”. Dual politeness strategies are at work: on the one hand, Maiorescu uses negative politeness strategies to take stance to the minister by interposing texts and arguments between himself and the person referred to; on the other hand, he resorts to positive politeness strategies to take stance to the audience, by constructing a political space of shared democratic values. The attack strategy of his communicative behavior is supported by a consistent appeal to logic.

With this design, the discourse crosses the border of the deliberative genre to the forensic genre: Maiorescu acts like a lawyer who pleads in front of a professional homogenous public, in a solemn, energetic and dignified style; accusations are rejected by proving the actual state of affairs.

Metastance is indirectly constructed: the speaker does not need to assert his metastance because the speech itself has the power to characterize its author in front of the audience.

### 3.2. Iorga (1908)

One of Iorga’s speeches “In self defense” follows the “insults” of the prime-minister, who had accused him of having written a text against the national interests of the country and of doing that in a foreign language so that his compatriots might not understand it. In this context, Iorga aims at building the metastance of a historian of international reputation who, in time, has proved both his patriotism, and scientific probity. As the speaker says himself: “I came in front of you to defend my reputation, which is my most precious fortune” (Iorga 1908: 182).

The speaker enacts subjective metastance through a self-centered discourse. He aims at proving his good faith through extensive quotations from his work, directly claiming his authority and expertise in the field. This makes his speech be interrupted several times by the president, who considers it a complaint against the prime-minister, to be kept for the record as such, but irrelevant for the ongoing activities of the Parliament.

Unlike Maiorescu, Iorga takes an internal vantage point. He takes for granted his right to defend his reputation in front of the Parliament; that is why he almost ignores his audience to which he only makes reference, periodically, in routine forms of address with phatic function (“Gentlemen, if you gentlemen allow me”). Moreover, he presumes that the audience is willing to listen to his self-defense speech, and he goes on speaking despite the President’s attempts to interrupt him; it is only when he is on the verge of being taken the right to talk that he asks for the Assembly to be consulted, implying that only the President would be against his continuing the speech (“You want to take my right to speak?”, Iorga 1908: 185). While Maiorescu asserts, at the very beginning of his speech, every Parliament member’s constitutional right to self defense, he being one of them, Iorga claims

his right to speak only to defend his right to speak: he makes a comparison with another deputy, who, under comparable circumstances, has been allowed to talk (Iorga 1908: 182), he mentions that he “owed this answer” (Iorga 1908: 184) or he claims his rights tautologically (“[these digressions] are my right”, Iorga 1908: 185). The subjective, individual stance Iorga takes relies on personal identity credentials, evaluations and emotions. In constructing metastance Iorga invokes his position as a member of the Parliament, his international reputation as a historian and professor, his scientific drive. He supports his points of view with digressive analogies and narratives of the following kind: “accusing me of treason is like accusing a lawyer of making arrangements with both parts, or like accusing a doctor of treating his patients in such a way as to make their illnesses longer or to cause them death” (Iorga: 181–182); he argues that his being a member of the Chamber is in itself a guarantee for morality, or otherwise he wouldn’t have been elected “like Wilson, the French president’s son in law, who is said to have made certain compromises in awarding some decorations, and who was not imprisoned, but could never get a place in the Chamber, because everybody avoided him, and in the end he was forced to leave the political life” (Iorga 1908: 182); he invokes his collaboration with “Lamprecht, one of the greatest historians of the world, who wrote to me and asked me to write a history of the Romanians for the most important European book on universal history” (Iorga 1908: 183). Iorga makes direct evaluations of his works and patriotism: “By doing that, I think, I served my country [...]. I think that the pages I dedicated to Mihai Viteazul show that no one could have better proved his veneration for the past, his love for our great hero than I did in my work. [...] Allow me to read a few words which prove, beyond doubt, my love for our great ancestor”. The speaker voices emotions directly (“I could not stand in front of you if I were dishonest, and you must be convinced that I am a man who loves his country and who deserves to play a role in the life of this country, as a professor and a political man who loves it and respects its past”) and indirectly, reading quite extensive quotations from his work, written in the same pathetic tone, with many figures of speech (metaphors, epithets, comparisons, enumerations, repetitions). The key words, repeated several times throughout the discourse, express the negative emotions of the speaker: *blame, accusation, traitor*.

In taking stance to his opponent, the prime-minister who had accused him, Iorga is conflictive. He rhetorically praises the former (“a venerable man in his eighties, who has the authority of his age [...], an educated man of culture, our best scientist in numismatics, a man who had himself authored very appreciated works in history, a man who enjoys the solid grounded reputation of being in touch with the latest works in the field”, Iorga 1908: 181), but he indirectly casts doubt through an antithesis (“[according to this man] I would be a traitor of my people, driven by bad passions, I would have aimed at denigrating my country, its past and its future”, Iorga 1908: 181) and a speech act that places himself in a position of moral superiority (“I did not take the floor today to compete in harsh words and in

tough words with anybody. I am still young and I respect the elder, and I know that my first duty is to respect a man twice my age, and a man who plays a fairly important part in the contemporary events, so I can forgive the offence he might bring to whoever”, Iorga 1908: 182).

Unlike Maiorescu’s, this text does not have an argumentative structure. It is rather a sequence of opinions on events and persons in the Romanian history, personal convictions and pathetic words backed by quotations from the speaker’s own work, meant to emphasize personal commitment to honesty and loyalty; the factual evidence is “a leaflet he poses on the minister’s desk” (Iorga 1908: 184) meant to impose conclusions. The discourse pattern is inductive: several examples lead to a conclusion, drawn indirectly through an antiphrasis (“These are the words of a calumniator...”, Iorga 1908: 184) and a rhetorical question (“[what do you want me to read] if those words do not exist in my work?”, 184). The textual progression is based on redundancy (the same point is supported by declarations and quotations of the same kind, and ideas are periodically repeated or rephrased). Stance is preferably marked on nouns and adjectives, assertions are hedged by the passive voice or by hypothetical conditionals, superlatives are syntactically intensified through comparisons (“no other more serious accusation than this one could ever exist”, Iorga 1908: 181, 182; “there can be no other solid proof than the one I brought here”, Iorga 1908: 182). As a whole, the discourse stands for an expressive macro speech act: the speaker voices his frustration when faced with an unfair accusation which he perceives to attack his work and good faith. Politeness strategies are used aggressively: speech acts directed to the negative face of the prime-minister are actually used to dissociate from the interlocutor and to make reproaches; speech acts directed to the positive face of the members of the Parliament, implying shared values of patriotism, put pressure on the audience and tend to violate their space. Iorga’s aggressive defense strategy appeals to pathos.

The discourse crosses the border of the deliberative genre to the epideictic genre: the author praises his own work and moral values bringing them in front of an audience assumed to have ignored them so far.

In such a discourse, metastance is directly constructed: the speaker asserts his merits and resorts to tautological, emotional strategies of persuasion using his own previous words and activities as arguments.

### 3.3. Iorga (1919)

Another discourse “On a personal matter”, delivered by Iorga in Parliament is the following:

- (1) “I subject to the judgment of the whole Chamber, members of the majority and the minority, as well, if, taking into account my position in the political life, the peaceful way in which I try to chair this Assembly, the respect, I think, younger persons, and even those who are my age or older than me, owe me, if I deserve to be addressed by Mr. Duca, here present, the words: ”You’d better listen to that”. I deplore that in this country, political mores can make human nature go wild to such an extent as a man I once stood by, to whom I’ve been not only fair, but also showed friendship and brotherly love, can now disregard the status of this Assembly to such an extent as to use such words to insult its president. (Prolonged applause)  
I will not allow such incivilities: as I won’t allow them there, I won’t allow them here either!” (Applause.)<sup>6</sup> (Iorga 1919: 7)

The speaker builds the metastance of a civil, intransigent person who defends personal values and status as part of the Parliamentary ones. The discourse is relationship centered: on the one hand, the speaker points to his position in the Romanian Parliament and the common values institutionally shared with the other members; on the other hand, he points to his relationship with Mr. Duca and the latter’s unfair treatment. Accordingly, he takes an ambivalent vantage point: an external vantage point to the Parliamentary etiquette, but an internal vantage point to his relationship to Duca. The text is built on the antithesis between Iorga’s ethical approach and Duca’s unethical attitude, between self-praise and the blame for the opponent, showing a relatively high degree of conflict. The speech is short but prolix, with long sentences, appositive and enumerative structures, lexical and syntactic intensifiers, fuzzy terms. Deontic evaluations prevail. The first paragraph stands for a declarative macro speech act, while the second paragraph stands for a commissive. Speech acts are performed bald on record, no politeness strategies are used. The text starts as deliberative, but after the first lines, shifts to the epideictic genre. In terms of persuasive strategies, the speaker appeals to ethos.

Metastance is directly built on the explicit antithesis between praise of the self and blame of the other.

<sup>6</sup> „Supun judecății întregii Camere și acelor din majoritate și acelor din minoritate, dacă prin situațiunea pe care o ocup în viața politică, dacă, prin liniștea cu care caut să presidez această Adunare, prin respectul care mi se cuvine, cred, de la oamenii mai tineri decât mine și chiar de la aceia cari sânt de o vârstă cu mine, sau mai mare ca mine, dacă merit să mi se adreseze de către d. Duca, aici de față, cuvintele: „Să faci bine să auzi”. Deplor că în această țară moravurile politice pot sălbătici firea omenească într’atâta, încât un om cu care am stat alături și căruia i-am arătat nu numai dreptate, dar prietenie și iubire frățească, să poată coborî până într’atât nivelul Adunării încât să găsească astfel de cuvinte cu care să insulte pe președintele ei. (Aplause prelungite și îndelungate)

Nu permit aceste necuviințe: cum nu le permit acolo, nu le permit nici aici. (Aplause)”

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

In the Parliamentary discourse, along with stancetaking activities, metastance construction occurs and prevails in talks given “on personal matters”. The three case studies revealed two strategies of metastance enactment: an indirect strategy (in Maiorescu’s discourse) and a direct strategy (in the two discourses of Iorga).

In Maiorescu’s discourse, the speaker takes an external vantage point. Metastance is constructed indirectly through a well structured text, based on the rules of classical argumentation and appeal to logic; the discourse is problem oriented, very close to the forensic genre, stands itself for the speaker’s objective metastance. Objectivity of metastance is acquired by intersubjective stance (culturally shared values and procedures shared in the Romanian Parliament and democracy), epistemic modalization and factual evidence, a consensual communicative attitude to the members of the Parliament, an attack strategy, a deductive pattern of the text construction, high degree of focalization, direct speech acts, linear progression of the text, stance marked preferably on the verb phrase (verbs and adverbs), dual politeness strategies. As a whole, the discourse stands for a representative macro speech act.

In Iorga’s first discourse, the speaker takes an internal vantage point. Metastance is constructed directly through a self-centered, highly emotional discourse. Persuasion is based on pathos and figures of speech used rhetorically, implying personal identity credentials, evaluations and emotions. Personal, subjective stance prevails, built especially on the noun phrase (nouns and adjectives). The defensive and conflictive strategy adopted by the speaker is achieved through a redundant textual progression, hedged assertions, and aggressive politeness strategies. As a macro speech act, the text functions as an expressive. It is on the border line between the deliberative and the epideictic genre.

In Iorga’s second discourse, the speaker takes an ambivalent vantage point. Metastance is constructed directly through a relationship-centered, emotional discourse. The speaker induces conflict through an antithesis between praise of the self and blame of the other. The text is prolix, deontic evaluations are preferably marked on noun phrases, intensifiers add emotions to a persuasive strategy that appeals to ethos. The text includes two macro speech acts: a declarative speech act and a commissive one. It is on the border line between the deliberative and the epideictic genre.

A comparison between the two discourses of Iorga point to some common features: an inclination to the epideictic genre, a conflictive drive, a defensive and emotional attitude to the opponent, a preference for subjective stance marked on the noun phrase. This type of Parliamentary metastance discourse is opposite to Maiorescu’s objective, argumentative one.



Despite differences between the two speakers, some culturally shared values can be identified in all the three discourses: honorability and reputation, importance of social status, valorization of old persons perceived as wise. Metastance activities in Parliament are consistent with intense activities of face work in everyday interactions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayley, P., 2004, *Cross-cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse*, Amsterdam Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Benveniste, E., 1966, "De la subjectivité dans le langage", in: *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 1, Paris, Gallimard, 258–266.
- Berman, R. A., 2005, „Developing discourse stance across adolescence”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 2, p. 103–274.
- Berman, R.A., H. Ragnarsdóttir, S. Strömqvist, S., 2002, „Discourse Stance”, *Written Language and Literacy*, 5, 2, 255–290.
- Benwell, B., E. Stokoe, 2006, *Discourse and identity*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Biber, D. E., Finegan, 1989, „Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect”, *Text*, 9, 1, 93–124.
- Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, E. Finegan, 1999, *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London, Longman.
- Bucholtz, M., K. Hall, 2005, „Identity in interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach”, *Discourse Studies*, 7, 4–5, 585–614.
- Conrad, S., D. Biber, 2000, „Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing”, in: Hunston S., G. Thompson (eds.), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*, New York, Oxford University Press, 56–73.
- Driscoll, P., 1983, *The Shakespearean Drama. Identity in Shakespearean Drama*, Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, London and Toronto, Associated University Presses.
- Du Bois, John W., 2007, “The stance triangle”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 139–182.
- Englebretson, R. (ed.), 2007, *Stancetaking in discourse: subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Englebretson, R., 2007, “Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 1–26.
- Fairclough, N., 2003, *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, London, Routledge.
- Hodge, R., G. Kress, 1988, *Social Semiotics*, Cambridge, Polity.
- Hunston, S., 2007, “Using a corpus to investigate stance quantitatively”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 27–48.
- Ilie, C., 2004, “Insulting as (un)parliamentary practice in the British and Swedish parliaments: A rhetorical approach”, in: P. Bayley (ed.), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, 45–86.
- Johnstone, B., 2007, “Linking identity and dialect through stancetaking”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 49–68.
- Kärkkäinen, E., 2007, “The role of *I guess* in conversational stancetaking”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 183–220.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C., 1980, *L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage*, Armand Colin, Paris.
- Langacker, R.W., 1985, „Observations and speculations on subjectivity”, in: J. Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 109–150.



- Lyons, J., 1994, „Subjecthood and subjectivity”, in: M. Yaguello, (ed.), *Subjecthood and subjectivity: Proceedings of the Colloquium The Status of the Subject in Linguistic Theory*, Paris, Ophrys, 9–17.
- Ochs, E., 1992, “Indexing gender”, in: A. Duranti, C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 335–358.
- Ochs, E., 1996, “Linguistic resources for socializing humanity”, in: J. Gumperz, S. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 407–438.
- Precht, K. 2003, “Stance moods in spoken English: evidentiality and affect in British and American conversation”, *Text*, 23, 2, 239–257.
- Scheibman, J., 2007, “Subjective and intersubjective uses of generalizations in English conversations”, in: R. Englebretson (ed.), 2007, 111–138.
- Thompson, G., S. Huntson, 2000, „Evaluation: An Introduction”, in: S. Hunston, G. Thompson (eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial Stand and the Construction of Discourse*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1–27.

#### SOURCES

- Titu Maiorescu, *Discursuri parlamentare cu priviri asupra dezvoltării politice a României sub domnia lui Carol I*, vol. 3, București, Editura Librăriei Socec, 1899, p. 487–493.
- Nicolae Iorga, *Discursuri politice*, vol. 1, partea I, București, Bucovina, 1939–1940, p.181–185.
- Nicolae Iorga, *Discursuri politice*, vol. 3, București, Bucovina, 1939–1940, p. 7.