ROXANA PATRAŞ
Romanian Academy – Iaşi Branch, Post-PhD Fellow SOP HRD/ 159/ 1.5/ 133675 Project

THE SUBLIME OF LIFE OUTSIDE PARLIAMENT: OCCASIONAL SPEECHES IN ROMANIA AT THE END OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Abstract:[1] *The present paper aims to expand the analysis of political speeches – already assumed, within the institutional limits drawn in by Parliament, by scholars such as Paul Chilton, Paul Bayley, and Teresa E. Carbo – to the domain of extra-parliamentary life specific to Romania at the end of 19th century. By this we define the political periphery, located into the party premises, hotel conference rooms, academia, public squares, as well as its communal manifestations such as cultural circles, political clubs, professional leagues and associations, or spontaneous public gatherings in funeral or jubilee moments. The basic distinction between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary productions will be followed by a typological analysis grounded on the specificity of peripheral gatherings, whose dominant tone is surely political, yet mingled with a series of contextual tunes; the support for the present analysis is the funeral or augural speech used in highly emotional situations such as the Lascăr Catargiu's burial or the ceremony on the erection of Alexandru Lahovary's statue. These speeches and the places they are delivered in show that the political oratory – chiefly the extra-parliamentary oratory, maintains latently a tension against present time and facts and preserves an artistic aspiration, which grants the speaker's personality with an institutional autonomy. Our conclusion is that extra-parliamentary speeches and peripheral politics underscore the best what they owe to art, that is, a sense of liberty.*

Keywords: Parliamentary speech, Extra-parliamentary speech, Portrait, Eulogy, Panegyric, Orator.

I. Parliamentary and extra-parliamentary speech. A typology of extra-parliamentary speech

The exemplary items of the 19th century political eloquence can be separated according to their institutional domain and public response, into two categories: parliamentary and extra-parliamentary speeches, that is, inside and outside the Houses of the Romanian Parliament. Since the Romanian Parliament and its coextensive political protocols were established only in 1864, this primary distinction enables the researcher to put some order into the massive textual corpus. On the one hand, the institution takes over, accommodates and – what is most important, formalises a set of oratorical expressions that pre-exist its foundation year, from times when political debate was happily married with literary and law-making ambitions. Here I refer to the wordy impetus of 48' revolutionaries gathered beforehand in students' societies and leagues established abroad – in Paris, for instance, where the Romanian students praised as patrons Edgar Quinet and Alphonse de Lamartine[2]. On the

[1] ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: This paper is supported by the Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and by the Romanian Government under the contract number POSDRU/ 159/ 1.5/ 133675***

[2] Refer to my articles on this topic, Roxana Patraş, *Political Oratory and Literature. A Case of Discursive Crossbreeding and Contamination in 19th century Romania*, in *Studies on Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue*, Section: Language and Discourse, Iulian Boldea (ed.), 'Arhipelag XXI' Publishing

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

other, the habits formed inside the Romanian Parliament reflect a growing process of formalisation and institutionalisation of oratorical practices, especially when taken into consideration several types specific to 19th-century Romanian reality: 1. The speech on personal matters (‘*în cestiune personală*’) which comprise, as subcategories, *the right of reply* and *interpellation*; 2. The etiquette speech, which is usually labelled as *answer to the Crown's Message* (‘*Răspuns la Mesajul tronului’*) or *opening/ closing session* (‘*deschiderea/închiderea sesiunii parlamentare*’); 3. The thematic speech, chiefly focalised on social, economic, political, and cultural facts, whose topic ranges from proposals of law changes to foreign policy issues and budgetary accounts; 4. The doctrinarian speech, conceived as a programme and ideology refiner in cases of ideological compromise or of party-switching.

My aim is to initiate a research on those speeches that do not go through such institutional processes. I shall trim out those instances of 19th century public display (with emphasis on the discursive pieces produced between 1864 and 1899), where the eminent Romanian orators allow themselves all the liberties that can be afforded by the discourse of power. The slicing of this outer-parliamentary domain was inspired by recent endeavours made by Constantin Sălăvăstru (1999, 2009), Paul Chilton& Christina Schäffner (2002), Paul Bayley (2004), Gheorghe Buzatu (2006, 2010), Cornelia Ilie (2010), Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Melania Roibu &Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu (2012). While this bibliographic package applies Teresa E. Carbo's intuition on the Mexican Parliament (1996) by focalising almost exclusively on the features of parliamentary speech the question of extra-parliamentary speaking remains unaddressed. Therefore I have searched for utterances issued in the outskirts of the Romanian Parliament and found there is a variegated material for analysis. These may be located into places such as party premises, hotel conference rooms, academia, public squares, but they may also be attached to communal manifestations such as cultural circles, political clubs, professional leagues and associations, or spontaneous public gatherings in funeral or jubilee moments. Recently, Cornelia Ilie proposed a model of contrastive analysis (*Analytical perspectives on parliamentary and extra-parliamentary discourses*, 2010), which aims at showing the degree of discursive formalisation and the rhetoric mutations occurred when the accent bounces from parliamentary to extra-parliamentary settings.

The following considerations have been cropped up after a close reading of several oratorical texts delivered in the last decade of the 19th century. For illustration, I have chosen a cluster of occasional orations by Take Ionescu, Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Alexandru Lahovary, Gheorghe Grigore Cantacuzino and Dimitrie A. Sturdza. The reason of my choice originates, by and large, into generic correlations. All speeches are forms of eulogy (funeral orations) pertaining to epideictic genre and, thence, all of them rely on portrait techniques: Take Ionescu's speeches on occasion of Alexandru Lahovary's and Lascăr Catargiu's burial ceremonies (1897, 1899); Dimitrie A. Sturza's discourse on the national burial organised for I. C. Brătianu (1891); Gh. Gr. Cantacuzino's words two hours after Lascăr Catargiu's death; Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea' s diatribe against Charles the First of Romania, containing an account of I. C. Brătianu's agony and dying.

However, genre characteristics – as recorded by treatises of rhetoric, could not articulate my analysis since the prevalent tonality of these speeches comes from the political domain. I noticed that, due to acceptance of issue-diversity and to manipulative disposition, these eulogies may interact and alloy with other species and styles of oratory. Barbu

House, Tg. Mureş, 2013, pp. 191-201; Roxana Patraş, *Religious Elements in the Romanian Political Oratory: from 1848' Spring of Nations to 1877's Independence War*, in *Text şi discurs religios*, vol. 5, 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' Publishing House, Iaşi, 2013, pp. 301-312.

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

Ștefănescu Delavrancea and Take Ionescu retrieve the juridical sources of classical eloquence. Alexandru Lahovary gets closer to French academism. Dimitrie A. Sturdza, following a whole tradition of Romanian Liberals, reverts to religious oratory. In the same way, one can identify (guided by Tully's *De oratore*) Delavrancea's, Sturdza's and Lahovary's style as 'sublime', whereas Take Ionescu's is 'tempered' and Cantacuzino's is, squarely put, 'simple'.

II. The aesthetic immediacy: places and spaces for talking politics

Before going to the core of the question, we have to make a few preparatory notices on the concrete settings that used to host various semi-formal political gatherings. Among them, one can spot the fanciest places of Bucharest and Iași, namely 'Dacia' Hall[3], 'Ioji' Hall[4], 'Slătineanu' Hall[5], 'Herdan' Hall[6], 'Orfeu' Hall[7], the lecture theatres of 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' University[8]; then, meetings were also held at the richest private palaces and houses such as Prince Grigore Sturdza's[9], Gr. Băleanu's[10] or V. Pogor's place[11]; last but not least, gatherings were called in the new city plazas, purposefully sketched as gathering places around the statues of a famous statesmen (Stephan the Great's statue of Iași, Alexandru N. Lahovary statue of Bucharest and so on) or around monuments financed by rich people involved in politics. 'Herdan' Hall for instance – named as such after the owner, is said to be the most expensive location from the whole capital of Romania. On the ground floor of the hotel there was also the famous bookstore "Alcalay", a centre for literary gatherings and intersections as attested by memoirs of the time. The exquisite residence is actually the first that introduces modern hygiene facilities (current water), which classes it among the most appreciated accommodation and conference places. One can just imagine that the political world in the second half of the 19th century was pretty well accustomed to comfort and, with a few exceptions, extra-parliamentary meetings enjoyed the visual beauties and maybe the aesthetic refinement of upper-classes interiors. Gone were the times when the revolutionary leaders would speak on the Field of Islaz, as Ion Heliade Rădulescu, or in large Cathedrals, as Simion Bărnuțiu! Developed outside the Parliament premises, semiformal politics was deeply involved with a lavish lifestyle. It also noteworthy that around 1890 the two parties had been taken over by leaders who were not associated with ordinary people but with enterprising aristocracy (Dimitrie A. Sturdza and Gheorghe Grigore Cantacuzino), and who had accrued enormous wealth and kept high living standards. It is said that Gh. Gr. Cantacuzino, the owner of three stupendous palaces that challenged the king's own residence, would not quit his chamois yellow gloves for anything in the world, even though social situations imposed

[3] Alexandru Lahovary's Speech on 'Ghenadie' Issue, October 27th 1896 (Alexandru Lahovary, 1905: 179-190),); Take Ionescu's Speech on 'Ghenadie' Issue, May 26th 1896 (Take Ionescu, 1903: 10-36); The Whites and the Reds, Nicolae Filipescu's speech delivered on occasion of the elections for the House of Commons, August, 28th 1894 (Nicolae Filipescu, 1912: 93-111).

[4] Alexandru Lahovary's Speech Delivered at the Meeting of the United Opposition, February 24th 1886 (Alexandru Lahovary, 1905: 71-93).

[5] I. C. Brătianu's Political Past, February, the 3rd 1869 (I.C. Brătianu, 1938, I: 94-103).

[6] Alexandru Lahovary's Speech at the Conservatives' Public Meeting, April 11th 1882 (Alexandru Lahovary, 1905: 17-26).

[7] Toast-programme of I. C. Brătianu at the Liberals Banquet in January, the 8th 1869 (I.C. Brătianu, 1938, I: 1-13).

[8] Nicolae Filipescu's Speech on 'Ghenadie' Issue, November, the 10th 1896 (Nicolae Filipescu, 1912: 215-226); Take Ionescu's Speech on 'Ghenadie' Issue, November, the 10th 1896 (Take Ionescu, 1903: 10-36), 'Junimea' Public Lectures (Cassian Maria Spiridon, Antonio Patraș, Liviu Papuc & Constantin Dram (eds.), 2009: 37-60)

[9] The Petition of Iași, attributed to Grigorie Sturdza, 1871 (Titu Maiorescu, 2006: 42-50)

[10] Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu's Speech on the 'Stroussberg-Bleichroder' Issues, December, the 5th , 1871 (B. P. Hasdeu, 2007: 1497-1507)

[11] The Gatherings of Junimea Circle.

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

occasional handshaking. The anecdotic detail arrested my attention because Walter Pater is believed to have worn a similar pair of gloves of 'palest yellow' as George Moore accounts. The public would fashion both the politician and the literate under the same dandified figure.

III. Fancy conference halls and splendid talk: the portrait as aesthetic eruption and as ideological vector

What brings together all these forms of political language is a set of indulged liberties. A pragmatic examination, pursuing matters of both performance and purpose, should bring to light that the discourse of power (oral expressions as well) is disputed between a set of liberties and limitations. Achieved by welcoming in 'problematic wideness', 'maximal procedural opening' and 'manipulative possibilities' (Sălăvăstru, 2009: 22), the liberty of extra-parliamentary oratory enhances in absence of protocol and etiquette limitations. Moreover, if doctrinarian constraints are still in force, they occur within a friendly environment, without the simultaneous and collocated presence of opposition. Briefly, the polemical substrata that can be easily represented within parliamentary contexts as 'protagonist-antagonist' situations lose inner dynamics and bring to the open a one man's show, which internalises the whole political scene. Activated by extra-parliamentary lavish settings, the orator gets closer to the hypostasis of an actor whose due is to live, eventually, the life of his own words. Assuredly, this superficial posture draws the talented orator nearer to the 'dandy', an icon of evanescent perfection that haunts the mentality of 19th century audiences (Barbey d' Aurevilly, 1995: 59-68).

Once the utterances belong to both orator and public, and once they realise being in the same boat, this allows enough time to try one's art in sampling panegyric or eulogy. Circumscribed to the category of construction tropes, these sequences are meant for the party leader who patronises the gathering, alive or dead, and they serve as arguments *ad verecundiam*. Anyway, the portrait must be categorised among the specific techniques of extra-parliamentary eloquence, since the speaker is pressed neither by adversaries nor by circumstances; he can take his time to make literature and propose novel tropes, most of them courageously extended to the risky limits of boredom and inadequacy. Besides, he can use eulogy or panegyric so as to slice the political reality into exemplary icons, which are proposed under the double regime of tenses; through their greatness they belong to historical past, while through their humanity they belong with the present, and with the troubled political present. Thus, the portrait functions, by appealing to an emotional distribution of arguments (Sălăvăstru, 2010: 241-273), as a trigger of present states and ideological re-settlements.

Such seems to be the case of Conservative reunions, led by Lascăr Catargiu, the undisputable epitome of the party's history along 40 years. Even though not really a gifted orator, Lascăr Catargiu's name is mentioned in the expository lines of his younger colleagues' speeches. Called in to speak on the 'Ghenadie' Issue, Alexandru Lahovary starts by an argument of authority, practically giving credit to old boys from 48' generation, who witnessed great social commotions and the foundation of Hohenzollern Dynasty: "*Venerabilul nostru şef – bătrân, dar nu îmbătrânit, căci nu e îmbătrânit nici la minte, nici la suflet – v'a spus pentru ce ne-am adunat aci. Ne-am adunat ca să ne consfătuim frăţeşte, creştineşte, asupra unei chestiuni care atinge sentimentele noastre cele mai intime – ne-am adunat ca să ne adresăm Regelui să facă dreptatea pe care o refuză guvernul-complice şi magistratura îngenunchiată*" (Alexandru Lahovary, 1905: 179-190). Even though a carrier of obsolete political speaking – as most of his liberal comrades of 48' Revolution were, Lascăr Catargiu is taken as a guarantee of experience and endurance. However, the threefold accent on

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

'oldness' ('*venerabil*' - 'venerable', *bătrân* - 'old', '*îmbătrânit*' - 'timeworn'/ 'age-old') signals, unconsciously, a weak point of the Conservatives. As it has been always, in 1896 the latent public debate stressed on the need to refresh and rejuvenate the political world. After C.A. Rosetti and I.C. Brătianu had died (in 1885 and, respectively, 1891), the Liberals changed their icons, bringing names and faces without a marked historical significance. Contrariwise, the Conservatives failed to do the same because their leader Lascăr Catargiu kept on being associated with the 48' revolutionary movement.

As a matter of fact, Take Ionescu muses on the image of the old Patriarch that Lahovary had launched. The name of his beloved chief is exploited when associated with the martyrized image of Archpriest Ghenadie, who had just been chased away from his Metropolitan Seat by the Liberals and their head, Dimitrie Sturdza, now charged of abusive treatment of Orthodox high prelates: "*Dar cu pripă, cu zor, s'a dat sentinţa sf. Sinod în numele Sfântului Duh. Ei bine cine a executat'o? Jandarmii, procurorii, procurorii cari atât erau de ameţiţi, că au făcut somaţiunile ce se fac pe uliţă la atrupamente, le-au făcut Mitropolitului, om bătrîn, în odaia lui, de faţă cu d. Lascar Catargiu.*" (Take Ionescu, 1903: 15). Consequently, the Liberal PM and Government awaken the Biblical imagery of demons, the embodied figures of Evil, whereas the Conservative Party, led by a mild saint, stands for God's chosen ones.

This is why Ionescu's talents are chosen to serve the farewell speech on behalf of the Conservative Party at Lascăr Catargiu's funerals in 1899. Take Ionescu marches on with a package of sainthood figures collected into a beautified literary portrait. It opens with the typical *ecce homo*, the speaker turning himself into a witness of the saint's presence in this world: „*Mi s'a dat dureroasa cinste să spun cea din urmă vorbă lângă resturile pământeşti ale marelui Lascar Catargiu, de sigur fiindă am fost cel din urmă al lui secretar, fiindcă şeapte ani şi jumătate am trăit din viaţa lui, am trăit o vreme care va rămâne cea mai dulce a vieţei mele, oricare mi-ar fi ursita.*

L-am văzut de aproape şi l-am înţeles pe iubitul nostru mort; l-am văzut de aproape şi am stat uimit de atâta mărire, cum stau pironit în faţa unei astfel de pierderi [...] Şi energic şi blând, şi hotărât şi cuminte, şi neînfrânt în contra răului şi covârşit de bunătate, şi voinic ca un erou antic şi înduioşat ca o femee, şi pătrunzător pănă în adâncul firei oamenilor şi naiv ca un copil, Lascar Catargiu a dus o viaţă de sfânt în mijlocul valurilor patimelor lumeşti, a rămas pururea liniştit în mijlocul bătăliilor celor mai duşmănoase" (idem: 647-651).

The speaker enlarges upon a pair of psychological and moral hypotheses (kindness, simplicity and equilibrium), which function as the underlying plaster of all his tropes: "*Taina acestei firi fără pereche este tocmai desăvârşitul lui echilibru. De tânăr el şi-a avut o concepţie a vieţei, foarte simplă şi foarte curată şi toată viaţa s'a supus acelei concepţii, fără nici o îndoială, fără nici o şovăire, fără nici o luptă lăuntrică*" (idem: 647-651). What is provocative in this sequence is the speaker's unusual way of drawing the portrait lines not with assertions, but with negative features; the simple and unsophisticated conception of life is supported by Lascăr Catargiu's 'lack of doubt' ('*fără nici o îndoială*'), 'lack of hesitation' ('*fără nici o şovăire*'), finally, his 'lack of inner struggle' ('*fără nici o luptă lăuntrică*'). Even though minted as a solemn funeral oration, this speech hides the secret crevices of antiphrasis. The orator's true message on the Conservative leader's personality can be summarised as follows: Catargiu was a man without personality, who succeeded to make a political career rather by fortunate strikes and immense simplicity; furthermore, if the dead man was exempted of doubt, hesitation and inner struggle, then who might have been the one that was still bothered by these nagging dispositions? Of course, the answer cannot be but Take Ionescu himself.

Lahovary's own death in 1897 had brought great turmoil and threw the seeds of dissension in the midst of Romanian Conservatives. This time too, it was Take Ionescu's the

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

voice that spoke at the funeral. It is crystal clear that whereas the Catargiu is perceived as a simple-minded person, the other head of the Conservative Party gets the maximum of standing ovation, as a bright and hearty fellow (‘*comorile de minte şi de inimă*’), as an excellent master of Romanian eloquence (‘*maestrul vorbei*’), as a passionate and fiery fighter (‘*frământat de patimă, de patima nobilă a binelui*’, ‘*para cea nestinsă*’), as a man with prominent personality (‘*era făptură, făptura lui Lahovari!*’), as a hero of the tribune, inspired by a supernatural force (*acea putere tainică*): “*Pe el, mai fericit decât alţii, soarta l-a scutit de căutările îndoelei. Din ziua dintâi el a ştiut de ce parte trebuia să-şi pună cu care îl înzestrase firea, ca să slujească mai bine şi adevărului, şi ţărei. Treizeci şi doi de ani stătu el neclintit, căci treizeci şi doi de ani au trecut de când, pentru întâia oară, a fulgerat glasul lui cel puternic, şi aşa a fulgerat încât, de a doua zi, a şi fost osândită de stăpânirea de atunci de la tribuna Ateneului, la care Lahovari se suise. Treizeci şi doi de ani a fost el la locul de primejdie şi în această lungă vreme, niciodată n'a şovăit, niciodată nu s'a desnădăjduit, nici o clipă nu s'a îndoit. În timpuri de slavă, ca şi în ceasurile cele negre, mâinele lui zdravene au stat aşa de încleştate pe steagul conservatismului român, încât conştiinţa publică nu mai poate să deosebească steagul de stegar, şi astăzi lacrămile care ne podidesc, curg şi pe unul şi pe altul.*

[...] Făptura toată şi-a juruit-o Alexandru Lahovari pentru binele obştesc. Şi era făptură, făptura lui Lahovari! N'am să înşir aici faptele lui cele mari. Ele stau tipărite pe fiecare foaie din cartea istoriei; fără ele, istoria celor treizeci şi doi de ani din urmă nu se poate scrie.

Îmi stă înainte acum numai Alexandru Lahovari, maestrul vorbei. Ce maestru!

Nimeni, nimeni înainte de dânsul, şi desigur nimeni după dânsul, n'a slăvit şi nu va slăvi ca dânsul graiul românesc.

Cât va trăi limba aceasta, vor trăi şi cuvintele lui. În el strănepoţi de nepoţi d-ai noştri vor găsi, întocmai ca şi noi, nu numai urmele celui mai curat şi mai luminat patriotism, dar şi modelele cele mai săvârşite de frumuseţe. Căci nimeni n-a tâlmăcit gândirea românească în icoane mai măreţe decât dânsul, nimeni n-a îmbrăcat-o în podoabe mai bogate şi mai strălucite. [...] ceea-ce era mai mare şi mai frumos în elocinţa lui, era el. Era omul frământat de patimă, de patima nobilă a binelui, dar de patimă. Era omul pe care atât îl mistuia para cea nestinsă, încât vorba lui dogorea. Era omul mânat de acea putere tainică, care pe cei ca dânsul îl zmulge din frământările vieţei trupeşti, şi îl ridică în sfere aşa de înalte, încât pentru ei orizontul se cufundă cu infinitul, şi se simt intraţi în armonia universală”

Tremendously influent in the 19th century, Carlyle’s theory on ‘Great men’ spreads echoes in Take Ionescu’s funeral oration as well. Lahovary belongs to the legion of extraordinary figures – the heroes with ‘a thousand faces’, as Joseph Campbell named them (1949, 1968, 2008) – that should be honoured and praised not only for his humane qualities (physical strength, intelligence, eloquence, loyalty, courage), but also for his adherence to ‘higher Spheres’, to ‘Infinite’ or ‘Absolute’, to ‘Universal Harmony’. Beforehand, the emphasis on ‘heroic’ traits had been used by Dimitrie A. Sturdza at the burial of I. C. Brătianu: “*După secoli de groasnice suferinţe, tu, cel întâiu, ai încălzit şi ai însufleţit poporul românesc. Erou al neamului nostru eşti, căci în toată viaţa ta, de dimineaţă până în seară, ai muncit şi te-ai trudit pentru dânsul, de dimineaţă până în seară ai urmărit necontenit acelaşi lucru, — îndeplinirea tuturor datoriilor tale. Erou al neamului nostru! Tu ai fost şi vei rămânea în veci expresiunea cea mai pură a geniului românesc*” (Dimitrie Sturdza, in I.C. Brătianu, 1938: XI-XVII). Likewise, writing an epitaph article right after Mihai Eminescu’s death (in ‘Constitutionalul’ Newspaper, June the 20th), Caragiale dresses up the same idea; heading to the state of ‘Nirvana’, great men and great souls maintain an open channel to the other world. Take Ionescu will develop the exceptionality thesis into a speech delivered in 1901 and occasioned by the unveiling of Alexandru Lahovary’s statue. It is the perfect time to

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

pinpoint, helped by the 'hurricane' metaphor, the hero's exquisite eloquence and his elemental forces (Take Ionescu, 1905: XXXVIII-XLVIII)

After Catargiu's sudden death in March 1899 – an event that convulsed the Romanian world drawing near to the turn of the century, Lahovary's encomiastic allusion, expanded into Take Ionescu's antiphrastic portrait, travels along all the speeches delivered by the following head of the Conservative party, Gheorghe Grigore Cantacuzino. He prefers to underscore the foretelling talents of the new-made saint; Catargiu is supposed to have prophesied not only the future glory of the Conservative Party, but also the legitimacy of his successor, established in a highly charged political atmosphere, only two hours after the death of the former leader (Ion Bulei, 1987: 202). Hence, the orator frames the former's portrait into an argument of his own oncoming authority: „*Mă simt fericit că mă aflu în mijlocul d-voastră, reprezentanţii partidului conservator din ţara întreagă. Fericirea mea ar fi şi mai deplină, dacă nu mi-aşi aduce aminte că aceasta este prima noastră întrunire după nespusa pierdere pe care am suferit-o. Gândul nostru cel dintăi fie pentru memoria lui Lascar Catargiu. Patruzeci şi doi de ani dus-a dânsul destinele partidului conservator. Şi în vremurile cele grele ca şi în cele de belşug, tot cu cinste, cu măreţie şi cu folos pentru ţară ţinut-a el în mâinele lui vânjoase steagul falnic al conservatismului român. In veci memoria lui fie binecuvântată şi faptele lui să slujească drept pildă şi nouă şi urmaşilor noştri!*

În orice vreme este grea povara de a conduce soarta unul partid politic. Când însă trebue să urmezi lui Lascar Catargiu, sarcina este înzecit mai grea.

Am avut, d-lor, acest simţiment în momentul în care d-voastră cu glas unanim m'aţi ales să succed lui Lascar Catargiu. Aşi fi stat la îndoială – vă fac această mărturisire – să primesc o aşa grea însărcinare, dacă nu mi-aş fi amintit că în vremurile din urmă ilustrul nostru şef arătase în chipul cel mai neîndoios hotărârea sa de a mă asocia cu dânsul la conducerea partidului. Nădăjduia şi el, şi mai ales nădăjduiam noi toţi, vedzându'l aşa de verde la trup şi aşa de tânăr la inimă, că mulţi ani încă nu va veni ceasul despărţirei. Ursita neîndurată a făcut ca în loc de tovarăş să-i devin urmaş" (Gr. C. Cantacuzino, qtd. in Take Ionescu, 1904: 3-12). Unfortunately for the orator, Cantacuzino's speech would undertake not only the sainthood icon, but also the age tropes ('*verde la trup şi aşa de tânăr la inimă*' - 'so hale and hearty') – that is, the controversy on the imperative need for rejuvenation and change.

An excellent case of what Pamela Hobbs calls 'metaphorical foreshadowing of policy shifts' (2008: 29-56) is Dimitrie Sturdza's oration delivered at the funeral of I. C. Brătianu in 1891. Compared to the other funeral or ceremonial orations, what strikes us most in this speech is its outspoken aesthetic claims, even greater than the other eulogies that have been chosen for analysis. However, this artistic emergence does not lead to the famous 'catharsis' effect; on the contrary, it carries out a bit of uneasiness as if the speaker's intention would be to hide behind words or to hide someone else behind him:

"*Mare şi nepătrunsă-i taina morţii; dar cununa vieţii şi-a asigurat-o numai acela, care a fost până la moarte credincios poruncilor lui Dumnezeu. Plinirea poruncilor lui Dumnezeu însă este, după cum zice Apostolul Pavel, dragostea, - dragostea cea din inimă curată, dragostea cea din conştiinţă tare, dragostea cea din credinţă nefăţarnică.*

Pe această temelie largă şi solidă, pe această temelie creştinească, Ion Brătianu a clădit frumosul şi măreţul edificiu al vieţii sale.

Din inima cea mai curată, din conştiinţa cea mai tare, din credinţa cea mai nefăţarnică au pornit faptele lui, inspirate, animate, pătrunse de o dragosete aprinsă şi nestrămutată, care nu s-a desminţit niciodată.

Această dragoste l-a înzestrat cu două mari şi nepreţuite calităţi, greu de întâlnit la acelaşi om: blândeţea şi energia, care amândouă au dat acestui mare bărbat puterea lui fermecătoare şi irezistibilă.

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

Această dragoste l-a înarmat cu ochiul acel ager, care-i desfăşura într-o clipeală inima şi cugetările altora şi-l făcea să pătrundă cele viitoare cu o siguranţă, care este dată numai celor aleşi ai lui Dumnezeu.

Această dragoste a făurit într-însul acea bună credinţă, care se aşează temeinic numai în inima şi cugetarea celor curăţiţi de orice egoism, de orice interes personal.

Din această dragoste a pornit acea simplicitate cu totul antică, acea modestie rară, acea repulsiune de orice fast şi onoruri, care caracterizează pe acest mare bărbat al neamului românesc.

Această dragoste l-a însufleţit în întreg traiul lui pământesc, l-a condus în îndeplinirea datoriilor sale, îl face un model vrednic de urmat în cercul intim al vieţii de familie, ca şi în acţiunea cea întinsă a vieţii publice.

Această dragoste l-a înălţat la un tip rar de perfecţiune omenească, atingând spre dânsul acea încredere, dându-i lui acea autoritate, care l-a pus nu numai între fruntaşi, ci în capul fruntaşilor poporului român.

Această dragoste l-a alipit de geniul Neamului românesc, căruia Ion Brătianu i-a închinat întreaga muncă a vieţii sale, căruia el i-a fost neclintit credincios din tinereţe până în bătrâneţe şi până la mormânt.

Această dragoste l-a ridicat, ca să devie conducătorul necontestat de nimeni al Poporului românesc, când sunase ora faptelor mari şi decisive" (Dimitrie Sturdza, in I.C. Brătianu, 1938: XI-XVII)

This introductory sequence relies on gradation as a figure of thought (Olivier Reboul qtd. in Sălăvăstru, 2009: 292, 301). In its turn, the effect of amplification is achieved by using an elaborated trope, that is, anaphora, which gives a multiple definition for an abstract word. Maybe it is worth mentioning that I.C. Brătianu distinguished himself as a great master of anaphora, a literary manner that is emulated by his successor. Indeed, 'love' (initially identified as Saint Paul's Christian love) is characterised by a cluster of I.C. Brătianu's personal qualities such as 'kindness/gentleness' and 'energy' ('*două mari şi nepreţuite calităţi [...] blândeţea şi energia*'), 'trust/ honesty' and 'good faith' ('*bună credinţă*'), 'simplicity/ candour' and 'modesty' ('*acea simplicitate cu totul antică, acea modestie rară*'), devotion both in 'family life' and 'public life' ('*cercul intim al vieţii de familie [...] acţiunea cea întinsă a vieţii publice*'), 'human perfection' granting 'authority' and 'leadership' ('*un tip rar de perfecţiune omenească [...] autoritate*'), the racial genius of the Romanian folk ('*alipit de geniul Neamului românesc*').

J.D Rayner notices that political speaking allots greater importance to characterisation than to evaluation of actions and procedures (Rayner qtd. in Hobbs, 2008: 47). Therefore, Dimitrie Sturdza props his eulogy on double or triple epithets: '*generosul său tată şi pe duioasa sa mumă*' – his generous father and his tender mother; '*cuvinte puternice şi clare*' – strong and clear words; '*dar sfânt*' – blessed bestowal; '*puterea cea mare şi convingătoare a graiului său*' – the great and convincing power of his speaking; '*viţă românească curată şi nestricată*' – pure and unspoiled Romanian offspring; '*luptătorul lui cel mai înţelept, cel mai prevăzător, cel mai neobosit*' – the wisest, most cautious and most untiring fighter; '*acea activitate neîntreruptă, totdeauna egală*' – that incessant activity, always equal; '*naţiunea românească cea mică, uitată, urgisită*' – the Romanian nation, small, forgotten, and oppressed; '*lupta uriaşă, fără repaos*' – the huge fight, without stand; '*lucrare comună şi energică*' – common and energetic work; '*desvoltări sigure şi neîntrerupte*' – sure and unstopped developments; '*acel avânt energic şi plin de entuziasm*' – that energetic impetus and full of enthusiasm; '*acea demnă şi energică intrare în sânul Congresului*' - that dignified and energetic entrance into the Congress [of Paris]; '*impulsiune nouă şi necunoscută*' – new and unprecedented impulsion; '*administraţiunea onestă şi inteligentă a averii publice*' – the honest and intelligent management of public wealth; '*multe şi nenumărate rele*' – many and

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

countless evils; '*cu adevărată şi nesmintită credinţă şi dragoste*' – with true and unaltered faith and love (Dimitrie Sturdza, *qtd. work*).

Unnatural for the ordinary talk-flow and, to a point, a fluency drawback, multiple epithets really awaken perplexity. Not their novelty, but their excessive crowding in Sturdza's speech alerts the contemporary reader (of these formerly oral productions) that there is something wrong. Apparently, the elocutionary and the performativity requirements of classical oratory – *elocutio* and *actio* – are one and the same thing. Under the circumstances, we can imagine the following scene: the speaker duly read a speech written by someone else. One cannot but guess. The unknown person is involved in literary business because he is pretty aware of the distinction between 'fiction' and 'reality'; even though not much of a reader, Dimitrie Sturdza professes – maybe advised by his elocution counsellor – that Romania should not be 'a moment's fiction', but 'a long-lasting reality' ('*România să nu apară numai ca o ficţiune a momentului, ci să fie o realitate durabilă*').

A family air, a similar sublime-embellished style, emanates from Barbu Şt. Delavrancea's speech from 1894 (*Regimul personal - The Personal Regime*), three years after Sturdza's funeral show. Though, it serves both the diatribe against Charles the First of Romania and the eulogy for I.C. Brătianu. Here, the gifted orator would raise Ion C. Brătianu's flag against the Crown's colours. Easily noticeable, the emphasised rhetoric interrogation stands for a "disguised" assertive utterance that is looking for unconditional approval: "*Cine a uitat acea înfăţisare luminoasă, acea frunte senină, acel ochi pătrunzător, acea privire de vultur, acea minte într-adevăr mai presus decât mintea tuturora? […] Era cel mai sfânt moment din viaţa unui geniu [înmormântarea lui I. B. Brătianu, n. n.], căci era ultimul în care cei covârşiţi de pietate mai puteau să privească imagina cea mai mare şi mai luminoasă a secolului nostru […] Prometheul nostru care a răpit Divinităţii focul sacru pentru a aprinde viaţa unui popor întreg*" (Barbu Şt. Delavrancea, 1894: 1-35). Scholars have already pointed out the assertive value of interrogations within the political speech (Pierre Fontanier qtd. in Sălăvăstru, 2009: 275-278), a feature that is actually "augmented" by the massive usage of other aesthetic liberties (idem: 283). Delavrancea enhances his questions – better said, disguised assertions, through the aggregation of plastic epithets ('*luminoasă*' – 'illuminated'/ 'light', '*senină*' – 'serene'/ 'smooth', '*pătrunzător*' – 'piercing'/ 'visionary', '*privire de vultur*' – 'eagle-eye look) and hyperbolic definition ("genius"). Even though the epithet is not exactly a figure that could arise a high level of perplexity in the midst of audiences (idem: 290), Delavrancea's is a climactic construction, aiming to blend the image of the 'genius' with that of the national hero.

No wonder that Delavrancea's speech from 1894 ends with a picture of his own generation, a generation of young people: "*Noi ne-am născut când ţările române îşi exprimau aspiraţiunile lor în divanurile ad-hoc – am spus primele cuvinte când se făcea unirea ţărilor – am început să ne gândim când s-a răsturnat acela care nu respectase libertăţile publice – şi am scris primele rânduri cu entuziasm când armata se întorcea victorioasă, aducând ţării independenţa şi regelui Coroana de oţel […] Jurăm ca, în fruntea ei [*a ţării, *n.n], vom muri sau vom învinge*" (Barbu Şt. Delavrancea, 1894: 35). Arrived just here, one may compare Lahovary's sub-textual strive to get rid of 'obsolescence' accusations and Delavrancea's secret intention to style his self-portrait 'as a young man' right into the core of the brand-new liberal picture. The stylistics of self-enhancement becomes apparent once we are aware of the speaker's virulence against the king who is represented in the fiery tyrant's robe. Fashioned after Demosthenes' *Philippics* or, even closer, after Tully's *Catiline Orations*, the ruthless attack committed by the young liberal against Charles the First of Romania ends, meaningfully, with a slogan that echoes Mihail Kogălniceanu's well-known dictum, traditionally related to his speech on occasion of the Union of Romanian Principalities in 1859: "*La vremuri noi, oameni noi*" (*New times, new people*). The slogan should have –

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

rhetoricians avert us – a good loading of originality, a trait that shows out the communicator's individuality (Gabriel Thoveron qtd. in Sălăvăstru, 2009: 267). In this precise case, Delavrancea finds a way to convey his self-portrait as a young star of the Liberal Party by illustrating the ascending steps of his timely formation and by squeezing an innuendo on courage and sacrifice, frequently epitomised by young people.

V. The portrait of the orator as 'standard-bearer', 'eagle', and 'Golden Mouth'

Recent research has shown that, when used in political talk, novel metaphors are meant to displace common-sense or prejudice, to tease the public's lazy attention or to introduce new conceptual models (Chilton & Ilyin qtd. in Hobbs, 2008: 41). But 'novelty' – and the perplexity it awakens, can be a criterion for each and every trope occurred in political speech, from the most insignificant epithet to oxymoron, simile and personification. Generally, aesthetic aspirations embedded in a strictly communicational context may stir a bewildered state of reception. But, if acknowledged and accepted, they can decide the ultimate ideological victory.

Extra-parliamentary life seems to be the most exposed to literary 'trespasses', especially because it admits the liberties of epideictic genre (eulogy, panegyric, toast, manifest and so on). Whatever their marked differences, there are two approaches that actually share what oratory and literature share in general: the interest in a common set of tropes prevails either while grasping the literary sources of oratory or while searching the oratorical/oral model of literature. Yet, my intention is not to give a smart list of figures and to point at their novelty or lexicalisation. The speeches I have selected made me realise that whereas the portraits of party leaders are designed as if belonging to present facts, the other illustrative techniques (such as quotation, dictum, and intertext) are assumed with greater caution by 19th century speakers. While the beloved chief's icon draws also to self-legitimisation, excerpting a large sequence from the forerunners' political talk does not seem exactly the best option. Their wealth of thought must be presented in a compressed and, if possible, embedded form. For instance, Dimitrie Sturdza 'chooses' to act I. C. Brătianu's words from 1857, but he extracts no less than 200 words! This proves once more that a literate, well-accustomed with cut-paste mechanics, was standing behind the Liberal Leader.

In 1897, Take Ionescu uses the metaphor of the standard-bearer, embedded in a larger image: the party's standard-bearer who identifies with the standard/flag (*În timpuri de slavă, ca şi în ceasurile cele negre, mâinele lui zdravene au stat aşa de încleştate pe steagul conservatismului român, încât conştiinţa publică nu mai poate să deosebească steagul de stegar*). Even though we expect him to be so, he is by no means original. Six years before, Dimitrie Sturdza avails himself by the same trope: the revolutionaries of 1848 are also named 'standard-bearers' (*Grea a fost lupta stegarilor din 1848, dar ei au învins*). Two years after Take Ionescu, Gh. Gr. Cantacuzino restores the metaphor, but gives it a circumstantial, almost ridiculous, meaning: now he is styling himself as 'the standard-bearer' of Romanian Conservatism. What Pamela Hobbs calls a 'novel metaphor challenged by a historical metaphor' (2008: 50) resides here under the umbrella of the same trope ('the standard-bearer'). The variations of oratorical styles do not transfer into literary originality. Whereas Take Ionescu endorses a previous phrase so as to breach the present circumstances with a sense of tradition and literary liberty, Cantacuzino abridges the tradition to his own person.

The same applies to the zoomorphism 'eagle'-orator, which is imported, in all likelihood, from Victor Hugo. In 1888 at a Conservative meeting where he mercilessly attacks I.C. Brătianu and his Liberal team, Alexandru Lahovary mentions the image of the eagle that flaps its wings on a pile of garbage: "*Aşadar, cum zice un mare poet francez, graţie îm-prejurărilor, graţie vitejiei armatei noastre, o oarbă victorie a adumbrit cu aripele sale*

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

fruntea unor nemernici: astfel câteodată o acvilă se zbate pe un morman de gunoi" (Alexandru Lahovary, 1905: 118-136). Then, the trope changes its referent and tempts the talents of eminent speakers from the opposed Liberal stand. For Delavrancea (1894) and Sturdza (1891) it is I.C. Brătianu the real 'eagle' of the Romanian tribune and not the Conservatives. The truth is that Hugo himself was counting on the established moral symbol when he would use it. Anyway, the conservative Lahovary preserves the polemical tension encapsulated in the oxymoron 'eagle-garbage', while the liberals use it only for ornament purposes. In 1901, Take Ionescu accesses the metaphor in order to characterise Lahovary's speaking talents as 'the flight of the eagle' that leaves behind and below the terrestrial realities (Ionescu, 1905: pp. XXXVIII-XLVIII).

Anyway, Take Ionescu and Alexandru Lahovary can do better than that. They really know how to paraphrase quotations, rephrase anecdotes and hide influences. The process is one of personal assumption and discourse absorption. Cut out from their original source, the 'literary' isles turn into clichés and common places; they are floating aesthetic unities and their freedom becomes problematic for the core message of the political speech. One can only guess how much Ionescu's speech from April 26th 1896 had been influenced by Lahovary's art; in 1882, the older party colleague mentions three types of tyrants (the bloody, the terrible and the ridiculous one), while in 1896 the apprentice illustrates the categories with cultural references (August, Tiberius, Caligula). Sometimes, the intertext is barely traceable as in Take Ionescu's funeral oration on his absolute model, Alexandru Lahovary. A 'poet', thus a literate, is invoked as a source of authority; the quotation refers to the idea that God leaves the greatest mark of His creation in the human being: "[Să zicem] împreună cu poetul 'să ne plecăm frunţile dinaintea marelui Ziditor, care a vrut să tipărească în el o urmă şi mai vastă a spiritului său creator'" (Take Ionescu, 1903: 651).

'Eagle' or 'standard-bearer', the master of tribune would always wage an erosive war with time. Take Ionescu believes that even if Lahovary's excellent words had been engraved, recorded or written, the future generations would not have been able to catch the temperature of his oratorical shows (Take Ionescu, *qtd. work*). By practicing public speaking and by addressing its tradition through emulation, he becomes perfectly aware of this art's evanescence. Once passed onto a written version, the oral production loses a series of elements and presents itself as a deceivingly imperfect art. Wherefore, the recurrence of 'evanescence' tropes in all the meta-discursive sequences contained in the selected texts: 'He (Alexandru Lahovary) shined like no other in the most ungrateful of all arts, since eloquence does not count on the words that stand, but on their movement, on the voice and, especially, on the mysterious bond between the one who speaks and those who listen, which gives the orator the most precious command: the command of souls, even if only for an instant' ("*A strălucit ca nimeni în cea mai ingrată dintre arte, în aceea care piere o dată cu artistul, pentru-că elocinţa nu stă în şirul de vorbe care ne râmâne, ci în mişcare, în glasul şi mai ales în acea legătură misteriosă dintre cel care vorbeşte şi cei cari îl asculta, care dă oratorului cea mai preţiosă dintre stăpâniri: stăpânirea peste suflete, fie măcar pentru o clipă*", Ionescu, 1905: pp. XXXVIII-XLVIII).

Nevertheless, fierce 'passion' represents the secret key for attaining excellent eloquence skills. Oratory is not only an evanescent, if not defective, art, but also a way to free the political man from the chains of present pressures, whether ideological or factual. The dramatic image of the tormented orator, carried out by his ideas, figures out a spatial definition of *persona*. While putting his mind into words, the speaker becomes a scene where passion gets staged and, consequently, he embodies an autonomous world, severed from history, like Leibniz's monad. At the end of 19th century, the autonomy given by one's own talent and ability to freeze present issues into aesthetical frames becomes a strong point of speeches on the art of political oration. It recurs with greater poignancy in Take Ionescu's

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

solemn speech occasioned by the inauguration of Lahovary's statue. Risking a cultural comparison – with Demosthenes, Cicero, and Mirabeau, the speaker insinuates that the environment and the political events do not bear particular significance for an absent public, formed of forthcoming readers. Only here and now, the 'divine word' could turn mere facts into gold.

It is noteworthy that Take Ionescu himself enjoyed, on John Chrysostom's model, the reputation of a 'golden-mouth'. As resulting from the previous illustration, his own perception of his nickname (*Tăchiță Gură-de-aur – Little Take Golden-Mouth*) does not rely on the discourse's polemical power, but on its power to abstract from polemics. Consequently, once abstracted from reality and history, the voice that utters the golden words can claim its own political autonomy, if not its sovereign right to cross the floor, to switch sides and create dissident factions. The 19th-century history of Romanian political parties proves it without the shadow of a doubt: eloquence is a sharp two-edged sword; it can draw blood from both political enemies and friends. Beyond facts and immediate determinations, the gifted orator turns aesthetical liberty into political autonomy and self-containment. He is the alternative to state institutions such as Parliament; he is the real institution of extra-parliamentary life.

References

***, *Anul una mie opt sute patruzeci şi opt în Principatele Române. Acte şi documente publicate cu ajutorul documentului pentru ridicarea monumentului lui Ion C. Brătianu*, vol I-VI, Carol Gobl, Bucureşti, 1902-1910.

Bayley, Paul, *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, Johns Benjamins Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 2004.

Beard, Adrian, *Language of Politics*, Routledge, London and New York, 2000.

Brătianu, Ion C., *Acte şi cuvântări*, editate de G. Marinescu şi C. Grecescu, Vol I, Partea I, Cartea Românească, Bucureşti, 1938.

Bulei, Ion, Sistemul politic al României moderne, 'Editura Politică' Publishers, Bucharest, 1987.

Buzatu, Gheorghe, *Discursuri şi dezbateri parlamentare (1864-2004)*, 'Mica Valahie' Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.

Buzatu, Gheorghe, Dobrinescu, Valeriu Florin & Dumitrescu, Horia, *Diplomaţie şi diplomaţi români*, vol. 1, 'Tipo Moldova' Publishing House, Iasi, 2010.

Campbell, Joseph, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1968.

Caragiale, Ion Luca, *In Nirvana*, http://ro.wikisource.org/wiki/%C3%8En_Nirvana.

Carlyle Thomas, On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic History, http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1091/1091-h/1091-h.htm.

Chilton, Paul& Schäffner, Christina, *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 2002.

D'Aurevilly Barbey, *Dandysmul* (The Dandysm), translated in Romanian, prefaced and selected by Adriana Babeți, Iași, Polirom Publishing House, 1995.

Delavrancea, Barbu Ştefănescu, Regimul personal, Tipografia "Voinţa naţională", Bucureşti, 1894.

European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse strategies and interaction practices (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture), edited by Cornelia Ilie, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 2010.

Goia, Vistian, *Oratori şi elocinţă românească*, Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1985.

Haneş, Vasile, *Antologia oratorilor români*, Socec, Bucureşti, 1944.

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)

Hobbs, Pamela, 'Surging ahead to a new way forward: the metaphorical foreshadowing of a policy shift', in *Discourse & Communication,* Vol 2(1): 29–56.

Ionescu, Take, *Discursuri politice*, vol I-IV, publicate prin îngrijirea lui Cristu S. Negoescu, Bucureşti, Storck, 1897-1903.

Lahovari, Alexandru, *Discursuri poltice 1881-1896*, cu o notiţă biografică asupra lui Lahovary, Bucureşti, Cucu, 1905.

Mapping Ideology, edited by Slavoj Žižec, Verso, London & New York, 1995

Parliamentary Discourses across Cultures: Interdisciplinary Approaches, edited by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Melania Roibu &Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne, GB, 2012.

Patraș, Roxana, *Political Oratory and Literature. A Case of Discursive Crossbreeding and Contamination in 19th century Romania*, in *Studies on Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue*, Section: Language and Discourse, Iulian Boldea (ed.), 'Arhipelag XXI' Publishing House, Tg. Mureş, 2013, pp. 191-201.

Patraș, Roxana, *Religious Elements in the Romanian Political Oratory: from 1848' Spring of Nations to 1877's Independence War*, in *Text şi discurs religios*, vol. 5, 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' Publishing House, Iaşi, 2013, pp. 301-312.

Rancière Jacques, *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible*, translated with an Introduction by Gabriel Rockhill, Continuum, London& New York, 2006.

Sălăvăstru, Constantin, *Discursul puterii. Încercare de retorică aplicată*, Bucharest, 'Tritonic' Publishing House, 2009.

Sălăvăstru, Constantin, *Mic tratat de oratorie*, ediţia a II-a, Editura Universităţii „Alexandrui Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2010.

Žižec, Slavoj, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Verso, London & New York, 2008 (first printed in 1989).

Žižec, Slavoj, *The Supposed Subjects of Ideology*, Critical Quaterly, vol 39, no. 2, pp. 39-59, July 1997.

BDD-A21810 © 2014 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-24 02:02:25 UTC)