

ANDRA VASILESCU, MIHAELA-VIORICA CONSTANTINESCU, GABRIELA STOICA, JONATHAN RUSSELL WHITE (eds), *Exploring Discourse Practices in Romanian*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Publishing Scholars, 2020, 480 p.

Exploring Discourse Practices in Romanian is a comprehensive collection of fifteen studies on contemporary Romanian language and discourse from a mainly synchronic point of view. Andra Vasilescu, Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu and Gabriela Stoica, specialists in discourse analysis and pragmatics, alongside the sociolinguist Jonathan Russell White bring forward a coherent and multidimensional approach of contemporary Romanian discourse. Their volume comprises of in-depth analyses carried out at several Romanian research and universities (București, Brașov, Alba-Iulia, Cluj-Napoca). As the editorial highlights, these studies display a diversity of methodological approaches and research foci.

The fifteen studies are organized thematically into five areas of scientific interest: identity building through discourse, discursive poliphony, stance-taking and emotion, conceptual metaphors and, last but not least, the relationship between grammaticalization and context. The diversity of topics shows the wide array of theoretical and methodological approaches to contemporary Romanian discourse. This volume is a well-devised research instrument as well, since it contains an index of subjects and a note on the authors. Each of the five parts is coherently organized, a result of the relation between individual chapters on key-problems in the field. The overarching theoretical concept of the volume is that of discursive practices, which covers the diverse uses of Romanian in context, from political to non-native Romanian learners' discourse.

The volume is prefaced by an introduction to the current problems of pragmatics, written by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, one of the early researchers that embraced this field in 1970s Romania. Her introductory chapter (*Paradigm Changes in Present-Day Linguistic Research*, pp. 1–15) is a review of the problems and theoretical advances in international and Romanian pragmatics. It also highlights the three future directions of research, in her opinion: an interdisciplinary approach to language and discourse that will infuse current research methods, the growth of historical pragmatics and, lastly, the further development of pragmatic politeness research.

Identity-building is the focus of the first part of the volume, including three case studies of political discourse, media communication and, respectively, specialized discourse. Răzvan Săftoiu (*A Diachronic Perspective on Romanian Festive Political Discourse*, pp. 16–37) analyses festive addresses of four former Presidents of post-1989 Romania in order to narrow down the pragmatic strategies of identity-building for speaker and audience. An interesting idea consists in selecting the specific manners of addressing the audience in the case of each president, correlating them with the overall perception of the speaker's ethos: *dear Romanians*, *dear fellow citizens*, *dear Europeans* or *dear friends* contribute to building distinct political personae. TV conflictual communication is the focus of Carmen-Ioana Radu's chapter (*Conflictual Communication in Romanian TV Talk-Shows*, pp. 38–63). The author proposes a theoretical framework operating on three parameters, in order to measure the degree in which interaction is conflictual: aggressiveness, assertiveness and argumentation. Verbal aggression is triggered by certain topics (politics, for instance) and is harnessed by the format of the talk-show. Andra Vasilescu (*Mitigation Strategies in Linguists' Professional Interactions*, pp. 64–96) analyses oral interaction between linguists in order to pin-point the strategic functions of mitigating devices. Such a prominent function consists of protecting the "academic" face of the speaker in face-threatening contexts, like invalidating an opinion or discussing research outcomes in scientific debates.

The polyphonic architecture of discourse is the focus of the second part of the volume. This part consists of two studies that focus on media discourse and diaristic texts (memoirs), respectively. Some of the phenomena that are discussed by both chapters are, among others, direct and indirect quoting in dialogic contexts, the anticipation of the interlocutor's discourse or even projections of the speaker's own discourse. Margareta Manu Magda (*Romanian Online Press News: A Space for Hyperbolisation in the Construction of Journalistic Headlines*, p. 98-119) underlines the importance of hyperbolic strategies in titles of online news. Grabbing the reader's attention is correlated, of course, with higher involvement and economic success of the media outlets. This is exacerbated by the Internet, as the author suggests. Changing the discourse genre, Cezar Bălăsoiu (*Looking for the Perfect Reader: Free Direct Speech and Prospective Dialogism in Memoirs*, p. 120-144) compares two diaries in terms of discursive practices within a polyphonic text. The author explores the ideal reader's capabilities of filling up dialogic spaces in the case of intertextuality (N. Steinhardt, *Jurnalul fericitii*) or interlocutive play within the diarists' narrative voice (Lena Constante, *Evadarea tăcută*).

The third part of the volume is dedicated to verbal expressions of emotion and attitude, as it may be seen in contemporary or past media discourse, correspondence, or oral interaction. Stanca Măda (*A Pragmatic Analysis of Political Cartoons*, pp. 146-167) looks at political caricatures in current humoristic press, underlining the necessity of simultaneously decoding the verbal and visual dimensions of the multimodal object. Romanian 19th century and early 20th century humoristic press is analysed by Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu (*The Role of Paratext in the Humoristic Press*, pp. 168-204) from pragmatic and rhetoric standpoints. The well-articulated analysis of the writer's ethos indicates an intricate and subliminal construction of the writer's ethos, which can be seen especially in the paratextual information of intertextual titles or ludic pseudonyms. Moreover, cognitive or conceptual metaphors contained in the titles of journals, sometimes expressed multimodally as well (*via* special fonts or visual elements) contribute to a view of humour as *something which stings (Urzica)* or *something demonic*. The declaration of love in the forms of royal correspondence, diaries or handbooks is analysed by Gabriela Stoica, through a semantic and contextual approach (*Patterns of Pathemisation in the Declaration of Love*, pp. 205-233). The author applies Charadeau's concept of patemisation (the process through which emotion is expressed discursively) in order to assess the different approaches to pathos as a rhetorical strategy of persuasion. The study presents an innovative approach to emotion, as it compares prescriptive strategies of 19th century manuals on writing love letters (among others) with authentic texts produces in letters and diaries. One main conclusion of the article points to the opposition between a conventional cognitive metaphor of *love is fire* (prescriptive texts) and *love is madness* (authentic, quasi-spontaneous texts). Another study of emotions focuses on self-deprecating speech acts, analysed by Oana Chelaru-Murăruș on a small, oral corpus (*Self-Deprecation and Self-Directed Insults in Colloquial Romanian*, pp. 234-266). The author comments on the ambiguity of phrases like Rom. *Sunt un prost!*, Engl. *I'm a fool!* between assertive and expressive speech acts. The analysis is informed by psychological and rhetorical stances on self-addressed insults. The author puts forward a typology of self-deprecating acts based on criteria such as syntactic construction of the phrase or its place in dialogic contexts.

The second to last part of the volume looks into modern applications of the conceptual metaphor theory, proposed by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson in their seminal work of 1980. The first chapter of this part is signed by Ariadna Ștefănescu and focuses on philosophical discourse (*An Analytic Approach to the Use of Metaphors in a Philosophical Essay: Andrei Pleșu's Minima Moralia*, pp. 268-302). The baroque architecture of conceptual metaphors is situated, as the author suggests, at the intersection of scientific and essayistic language and discourse. The theoretically dense article explores different examples of bridge-terms in *Minima Moralia*, which connect the source-domain and the target-domain, having both linguistic and philosophical implications. Liliana Hoinărescu (*Conceptual Metaphors in Romanian Media Political Discourse*, pp. 303-335) and Teodora Popescu (*Conceptualisations of Company Communications in British and Romanian Business Journals*, pp. 336-352) add to the conceptual metaphor framework two other theories: Critical Metaphor Analysis and metaphor universality theory, respectively. On one hand, political

discourse employs several metaphors that are ideologically and historically articulated, i.e. the state as an organism, the state as a machine, politics as gambling. Liliana Hoinărescu's subtle analysis underlines the role of metaphorical discourse in shaping presidential ethos or dehumanizing political adversaries (in the case of animal metaphors). On the other hand, Teodora Popescu demonstrates, on the basis of quantitative analysis, how Romanian and British companies are conceptualized distinctively in business journals. As the author suggests, in Romanian business discourse the *companies are machines* metaphor is being used more than in similar British publications. The author attributes this difference to historical discrepancies.

The final section of the volume is opened by Liana Pop's chapter on polyfunctional constructions of deictic realization in oral situations (*Fuzzy Deictics in Oral Narratives*, pp. 354–379). The author analyses small corpus of oral interactions, including monologues and dialogues. Gabriela Biriş proposes the concept of conversational interjection and its typology, using a corpus of spontaneous oral conversations (*Interjections as Discourse Particles in Face-to-Face Interactions*, pp. 380–400). The conversational interjection is phonetically reduced and semantically empty (Rom. *ei, ma, o, mda*) and fulfills various pragmatic and discursive functions. According to the author, interjections may be: conative (*ma, hei*), concessive (*mhm, eh*), oppositional (*mde, aș*), epistemic (*a, aha*), and evaluative (*ei*). The last chapter, written by the above-mentioned author, together with Carmen Mîrzea-Vasile and Irina Nicula Paraschiv (*Learning Romanian as L2: Skidding and Failing*, pp. 401–444), presents the pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic failures in the acquisition of the Romanian language. This is revealed through the analysis of language in partially controlled situations of interaction (examinations, various exercises). Stylistic and contextual inadequacies of non-native speakers of Romanian refer to, among others, erroneous assessments of the illocutionary force (especially with regard to directive speech acts), inappropriate uses of discourse markers derived from verbal sources (rom. *știi, auzi, ascultă*, eng. *you know, hear, listen*). Sometimes, successfully employing the Romanian politeness pronoun system may be problematic, but the authors suggest that, in this case, the error is not being perceived as pragmatic impoliteness by native speakers. The study draws attention, among other things, to the imperative of developing pragmatic competence in Romanian language courses dedicated to non-native language acquisition.

Each chapter of the volume presents a well-articulated theoretical framework, followed by predominantly qualitative analyses, applied to the Romanian language corpus chosen for the discussed issue. In addition to the interdisciplinary treatment of the Romanian language corpora, we salute the use of very recent methodologies in the analysis of various types of discourse in context, as well as the theoretical construction of some new objects of study from the sphere of discursive practices. We highly recommend this collection of studies as a handbook of Romanian discourse practices in various contexts.

REFERENCES

- Charaudeau, P., 2000, "Une problématisation discursive de l'émotion", in C. Plantin, M. Doury, V. Traverso (eds), *Les émotions dans les interactions*, Lyon, Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 125–155.
- Lakoff, G., M. Johnson, 1980, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago/London, The University of Chicago Press.

Bianca Alecu
Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest

IMKE MENDOZA, SANDRA BIRZER (eds), *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 2022, 305 p.

This volume gathers some contributions presented at the “Diachronic Syntax and the Slavonic Languages 3. Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax” conference, held at the University of Salzburg in November 2017. The rationale of such a complex research, involving many Slavonic languages in different stages, and old prestige languages, such as Latin, Greek, and Old Church Slavonic, is explained in editors’ *Introduction* (pp. 1–8): the impact of language contact on syntactic change is visible not only in direct contact situations (i.e. direct bilingualism), but also via the so-called “literacy contact”, which played an essential role in the history of the Slavonic languages (Middle Ages to the early 19th century). Greek, Latin and Church Slavonic represented, via written texts, models for the emergence of literary varieties based in Slavonic vernaculars. The introduction to the volume contains a section devoted to *literacy contact*, which is a very well documented synthesis on the short history of this concept: the term was first introduced in Slavonic historical linguistics by Verkholtantsev (2008¹: 136–137), then it was redefined by Rabus (2013)² as a type of contact resulting not from face-to-face interaction, but from transmission, reception, and translation of written texts. In terms of language acquisition, *literacy contact* involves a different setting of language acquisition that might later become the source language; the target language is acquired as first language (L1), whereas the source language is usually a second language (L2), and is acquired via formal instruction; it involves at least basic knowledge of morphology and syntax, and ideally also of certain features of L2’s formal, bookish registers. When speaking about literacy contact in Slavonic, the starting point is represented by Dobrovsky’s (1822)³ work; he noticed that Old Church Slavonic was modelled after Greek. Moreover, there are certain areal differences, determined by a clear-cut cultural divide between *Slavia Romana*, where Latin was widely used as a written or literary language, and *Slavia Orthodoxa*, where Church Slavonic was used for ecclesiastical purposes (liturgy, bible translations, etc.), heavily influenced by Biblical Greek. In later periods, this distinction becomes less relevant, as the spheres of influence of Latin and Church Slavonic frequently overlapped. However, the influence of Church Slavonic was stronger in *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

The volume is organized in four parts, the first three ones dealing with the contact patterns already mentioned, whereas the fourth one is a more general review, based on corpus study, of the syntactic phenomena discussed in the other parts.

Part I, *The influence of Latin on Slavonic vernaculars* (pp. 9–129), opens up with Anna Kisiel and Piotr Sobotka’s study on “The paths of grammaticalization of North Slavonic connectors. An interface point of Slavonic, Greek and Latin” (pp. 11–36). They present Slavonic connectors derived from a preposition and a demonstrative pronoun with a prosentential value, such as Rus. *potom* ‘after’, derived from *po* ‘after’ and *tom* ‘this.LOC’, Pol. *zatem* ‘therefore, thus’, derived from *za tym* ‘behind this’, etc., and analyse this phenomenon as a case of lexicalization. The next study, authored by Agnieszka Słoboda, is “The influence of Latin on the syntax of Old Polish numerals” (pp. 37–52); she investigates the class of numerals, which emerged very late in the development of Slavonic languages; in Proto-Slavonic numerical expressions belong to the class of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives. The author takes into account the internal factors (analogy, competition, etc.) and external

¹ Verkholtantsev, J., 2008, *Ruthenica Bohemica. Ruthenian Translations from Czech in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland*, Wien, Berlin & Munster: Lit.

² Rabus, A., 2013, *Die Rolle des Sprachkontakts für die slavischen (Standard-)Sprachen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des innerslavischen Kontakts)*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Freiburg. <https://www.slavistik.uni-freiburg.de/personal/univ-prof-drachim-rabus/RabusHabil.pdf>.

³ Dobrovsky, J., 1822, *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris*, Vindobona, Schmid.

factors (literacy and the influence of syntactic and morphological patterns from various foreign languages, mainly Latin, German, and Czech), and concludes that the Polish numerals were strongly influenced by Latin, especially by Roman notation of numbers, via translations and bilingual texts, in the medieval period. The Latin pattern determined the elimination of dual forms, the change of the syntactic hierarchy of elements in NPs (the noun becomes the head of the phrase, given that the morphological information is absent), and imposed a new agreement pattern between the cardinal numeral and the noun. In what follows, Pavel Kosek, Radek Čech, and Olga Navrátilová analyse “The influence of the Latin Vulgate on the word order of pronominal enclitics in the 1st edition of the Old Czech Bible” (pp. 53–80). They focus on the study of the pronominal forms *mi* ‘me.DAT’, *sě* ‘REFL.ACC’, *tě* ‘you.ACC’, enclitics to finite verb forms in modern Czech, but either enclitics or proclitics in the Old Czech Bible, most probably as an influence of the word order of the Vulgate. The conclusion of their analysis is that whereas for *mi* and *tě* the Latin influence is obvious, for the form *sě* this is less clear, given that in most of the cases there is no Latin counterpart of this reflexive. Further on, Sanja Perić Gavrančić presents a study entitled “The *accusativus cum infinitivo* in 16th–19th century Croatian texts. Contact-induced and internally motivated syntactic change” (pp. 81–105). The ACI syntactic pattern in Croatian writings has been observed in texts translated directly from Latin, occurring after *verba sentienti* and after the verb ‘make’; however, this construction was also adopted in original Croatian writings. This extension is explained as an externally motivated syntactic change, influenced by sociolinguistic circumstances. Finally, Barbara Sonnenhauser and Marisa Eberle deal with “Relative coordination. *Kateri-/koteri*-relatives in 18th century Slovene and Kajkavian” (pp. 107–129). The varieties under scrutiny present a larger range of relative clause constructions introduced by the interrogative-based pronouns *kateri-/koteri*- than in more recent sources, for which Latin might have served as model.

Part II, *The influence of Greek on Church Slavonic* (pp. 131–198), starts with Anna Pichkhadze’s paper, “Blocking of syntactic constructions without Greek counterparts in Church Slavonic” (pp. 133–162). The author brings into discussion restrictions or even prohibitions on the use of genuinely Slavonic syntactic constructions that had no support from Greek counterparts, which had an important role in establishing the syntactic norm of Church Slavonic. Such constructions are: participle and infinitive clauses (participles functioning as predicates in indirect questions and relative clauses), the reduction of usage frequency for light-verb constructions, and the placement of enclitics according to Wackernagel’s law. Afterwards, Jürgen Fuchsbauer’s study is devoted to “The article-like usage of the relative pronoun *iže* as an indicator of early Slavonic grammatical thinking” (pp. 163–178). Given that the Greek definite article has no lexical correspondent in Old Church Slavonic, starting with Constantine the Philosopher’s translations, *iže* is used as the equivalent of nominalizing Greek articles. As in other cases discussed in the book, the article-like usage of *iže* was not restricted to translations, but extended also in non-translated writings, such as Euthymius of Tarnovo’s *Life of Parasceva of Epibatai*. The last paper of this part is authored by Simeon Dekker and it deals with “Past tense usage in Old Russian performative formulae. A case study into the development of a written language of distance” (pp. 179–198). This research is based on the Old Russian corpus of Novgorod birchbark letters, which has an intermediate position between orality and literacy, witnessing the adaptation of Church Slavonic norms to secular texts and an adaptation of vernacular oral habits to the written medium. The corpus study shows that whereas in early texts the use of the perfect in performative formulae is due to persisting patterns of oral formulation, in later texts the aorist emerges in performative formulae, due to Church Slavonic influence and the development of a *language of distance*.

Part III, *The influence of Latin on Church Slavonic* (pp. 199–251), starts with Vittorio S. Tomelleri’s study, “When Church Slavonic meets Latin. Tradition vs. innovation” (pp. 201–231). The author analyses the late Russian Church Slavonic translation of a medieval Latin compilation, Bruno’s commented Psalter (11th century), done in Novgorod in the 16th century by the translator Dmitrij Gerasimov and identifies an increasing use of *Accusativus cum infinitivo* and participial constructions, due to the influence of the Latin model. The more general conclusion is that Old Church Slavonic, departing from local dialects, progressively became more flexible and permeable to

syntactic calques and that certain syntactic changes might have had typological consequences. The other study of this part belongs to Ana Šimić and deals with “Non-strict negative concord proper and languages in contact. Translating Latin into Croatian Church Slavonic and Greek into Old Church Slavonic” (pp. 233–252). Whereas Croatian Church Slavonic, Old Church Slavonic, and Greek are non-strict negative concord languages, Latin, as a source of many Croatian Church Slavonic texts, does not exhibit negative concord at all. The author analyses the *Second Beram breviary*, a Croatian Church Slavonic manuscript from the 15th century containing texts translated from Latin or revised according to Latin source texts and noticed that the majority of sentences with a preverbal negative pronoun/adverb do not exhibit negative concord; in contrast, negative concord is the preferred option in *Codex Marianus*, an Old Church Slavonic manuscript translated from Greek. Therefore, for such cases, the influence of Latin consists of the choice of one of the two available structures, a phenomenon described as *narrowing*.

Part IV, *In lieu of a conclusion* (pp. 253–302), contains only Hanne Martine Eckhoff’s study, “First attestations. An Old Church Slavonic Sampler” (pp. 255–302). The author proposes a corpus statistical study on the PROIEL/TOROT treebanks (based on *Codex Marianus*) concerning phenomena investigated in other chapters of the book (AcI, absolute constructions, deverbal nouns, prepositional phrase connectors, the syntax of numerals, the ordering of pronominal clitics, the use of tenses in performative clauses, relative clauses), and investigates, for each case, the possibility of influence from Greek.

By closely investigating different Slavonic syntactic phenomena influenced by prestigious languages, such as Latin, Greek, and Church Slavonic, this volume implicitly underlines the importance of *written contact* (linguistic contact via translations) for syntactic change. Although previously criticised for imposing unnatural syntactic structures from the source language to the target language, contact via translations appears more recently as an important source for syntactic change: in many cases presented in this book, an innovation which emerged via translations extends to original texts and progressively becomes less artificial; moreover, syntactic changes resulting from translations can, to a certain extent, influence the typological shape of the target language, which is often genetically unrelated to the source language; finally, certain syntactic changes can have multiple sources, either two or more external sources, or an external source and internal one.

Adina Dragomirescu⁴

“Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics/
University of Bucharest

⁴ This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-1097, within PNCDI III.