

‘(IM)POLITENESS’ FROM AN EMIC PERSPECTIVE. ILLUSTRATIONS FROM PRESENT-DAY ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

MIHAELA-VIORICA CONSTANTINESCU

University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters
mihaelaviorica.constantinescu@litere.unibuc.ro

Keywords: *(im)politeness, metacommunicative comments, metadiscursive comments, institutional setting, evaluation.*

Cuvinte-cheie: *(im)politețe, comentarii metacomunicative, comentarii metadiscursive, cadru instituțional, evaluaare.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In present-day research on politeness and impoliteness, the emic perspective is central: the terms used to label socially (in)appropriate behaviour, the perspective, the interpretations, and the conceptualisations of the lay speakers represent key aspects (Watts *et al.* 1992; Eelen 2001; Haugh 2012, etc.). This article focuses on metacommunicative and metadiscursive comments regarding ‘(im)politeness’ (we use the single quotes for the lay terms) that are made by members of the Romanian Parliament. The aim is to construe the institutional and cultural perspective on ‘(im)politeness’ in present-day sittings. Although there are studies concerning a pragmatic and cultural perspective on present-day, but also nineteenth century Romanian (im)politeness (Vasilescu 2007; Hoinărescu 2007; Constantinescu 2016, etc.), the studies dedicated to (im)politeness in Romanian communities of practice are nevertheless rare (Măda 2009; Radu 2010; Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 2014, 2018). As a community of practice, the Parliament is an interesting arena for investigating the way ‘(im)politeness’ is framed and commented on. While there are collaborative types of communication (the deliberative side), the defining types of parliamentary communication are confrontational and conflictual (i.e., eristic).

Parliamentary debates deal with inherent disagreement, negotiating existing interpersonal relationships and solving issues (Kotthoff 1993; Angouri and Locher 2012; Vasilescu 2018a,b). As a community of practice, the Parliament is perceived as “a highly competitive institutional setting” (Ilie 2004: 53), thus a setting in which (im)politeness could be frequently manifested. Parliamentary debates involve an “adversarial and confrontational political process” (Harris 2001: 451; cf. also Ilie 2001: 259). Within a community of practice as the Parliament (Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 2014), the members (MPs) are aware of the existing norms and discursive repertoire,

adversarial forms included. The political polarisation within the Parliament (government-opposition) influences the standpoints, the evaluations, and the stance of the members (Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 2011): thus, there are expectations regarding communicative behaviours (see, for example, Ștefănescu 2010b, 2011 on conceptual tropes) and interpretative mechanisms.

In this paper *(im)politeness* refers both to the theoretical concept studied in pragmatics, anthropology, cultural history, etc., and to the evaluative label used by lay persons (as a component of the metacommunicative dimension of social interaction). The analysis (which can be seen as a part of metapragmatics; see Verschueren 2000) focuses on the lay persons’ awareness about verbal and nonverbal behavioural adequacy in parliamentary interaction.

The area of ‘(im)politeness’ metapragmatics includes the metacommunicative and metadiscursive dimensions (Kádár and Haugh 2013). Metacommunicative aspects cover what Eelen (2001) called „classificatory” politeness, i.e. different interpretations, evaluations, including the use of the ‘(im)politeness’ lexicon (Kádár and Haugh 2013: 186–187); metadiscursive aspects (overlapping Eelen’s 2001 metapragmatic aspects) reveal the way lay persons comment on others’ desirable behaviour, express their expectations according to social norms (Kádár and Haugh 2013: 187, 200). In the present analysis, the label *metacommunicative* will cover the parliamentarians’ evaluations of verbal/nonverbal (in)appropriate behaviour (which partially illustrate the present-day Romanian ‘(im)politeness’ lexicon), while *metadiscursive* will be applied to the parliamentarians’ comments on their fellow MPs’ desirable behaviour and to the way of expressing expectations according to social or institutional norms. The analysis is a qualitative one, but it is supplemented, when needed, with some quantitative observations (obtained via the search engine available on the Chamber of Deputies official website, <http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.cautare?leg=&idl=1>).

The structure of the paper is the following: a brief theoretical introduction, presenting the approaches to ‘(im)politeness’ (next section); the presentation of the corpus and some comments on methodology; the data analysis; concluding remarks.

2. APPROACHES TO (IM)POLITENESS

Diachronically, *(im)politeness* is a relatively recent linguistic and cultural acquisition (Kádár and Haugh 2013: 160; Kádár and Culpeper 2010; Kádár 2013), following *courtesy* or *civility* (to name only some key concepts from medieval and premodern Europe).

Launched by Watts, Ide and Ehlich (1992) and reaffirmed by Eelen (2001), the distinction between the first order and second order approaches to (im)politeness has gradually gained researchers’ attention. First order approaches focus on the way lay persons label, perceive, and comment a behaviour as (im)polite, (in)appropriate, or (in)adequate. The second order approaches (theoretical constructs) see (im)politeness as a concept related to a theory of use

and social behaviour (Watts, Ide and Ehlich [1992] 2005: 3). Some of the core elements connecting these approaches conceptualise politeness as “strategic conflict-avoidance” and “social indexing” (Eelen 2001: 21) in what appears to be a universal communicative pattern. Another way to oppose (im)politeness₁ and (im)politeness₂ theories is to view one as reflecting participants’ perspective and the other as reflecting a scientific perspective.

The analysis proposed here derives from the discursive theories of (im)politeness, as it favours the participants’ perspectives and stances, but it adds the researcher’s technical perspective; thus, it partly belongs to the third wave of approaches, often called “sociological/interactional approaches” (Grainger 2011: 171). Some parameters, important in a discursive and third wave approach, will be frequently used in the analysis: a) *face*, in a Goffmanian line of thought (see also Spencer-Oatey 2007); b) the *ethical dimension* ((in)adequacy to social order, to the moral dimension, or to the moral order, see Werkhofer [1992] 2005; Culpeper 2008; Haugh 2013, 2015); c) participants’ *uptake* (“the interactants’ perceptions of communicators’ intentions”, Locher and Watts 2008: 80); and d) participants’ *evaluative judgements*, modelled by certain beliefs (Spencer-Oatey 2005) or by the co-constructed identities of the participants (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2010: 551). The ethical dimension needs further clarification: Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2014) mention epistemic, deontic, and emotional “facets” belonging to the participants’ “momentary relationship”; these facets are labelled “orders” by Haugh (2013, 2015). The epistemic dimension “denotes the issues that the participants have rights and obligations to know relative to their co-participants”, the deontic dimension “refers to the participants’ entitlements to impose actions on their co-participants”, while the emotional dimension “concerns the emotions that the participants are allowed or expected to express to their co-participants” (Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2014: 186). To these three facets/orders, Haugh (2015) adds benefactive and moral orders; moral order is superordinate, covering all the others. Stevanovic and Peräkylä (2014: 186) view the epistemic, deontic, and emotional facets/orders as intertwined in interaction; at some point, any of them could become more prominent than the others. Every type of order involves a participant’s *status* and *stance*. Epistemic status entails a participant’s position to knowledge, while epistemic stance entails the way knowledge is displayed; deontic status entails expectations to actions (power, control, agentivity, rights, obligations), while deontic stance entails the way to exhibit power or rights; emotional status entails expectations of experiencing or exhibiting emotions, while emotional stance entails verbal, nonverbal, or paraverbal emotion display (Stevanovic and Peräkylä 2014: 187–194; Haugh 2015: 307–313). Benefactive status entails expectancies regarding costs or benefits to actions, while benefactive stance entails the distribution of benefits or costs (Haugh 2015: 309). Moral status conveys participants’ expectations while moral stance conveys the interactional achievement of rights and obligations. These parameters (a-d) have been frequently discussed by researchers in comparing some key aspects from (im)politeness₁ and (im)politeness₂ approaches.

In this approach on the emic perspective (metacommunicative and metadiscursive comments) of the Romanian members of present-day Parliament (MPs), following Ehlich ([1992] 2005), politeness is seen as a product of the social structure, variable according to the standards of different groups (and even different individuals), generated by the tension between the limits a social group establishes and the actions that go beyond behavioural expectations.

3. THE ROMANIAN GENERAL POLITICAL CONTEXT (2012–2017)

3.1. The present-day Romanian Parliament

The Romanian Parliament, with a 4-year mandate for the MPs, is bicameral: the Senate is the upper house, the Chamber of Deputies is the lower house (for the characteristics of the present-day Romanian Parliament and of the parliamentary debate in general see Ilie 2010). Each chamber of the Romanian Parliament, as well as the common sittings have their own standing orders. There are two annual sessions and extraordinary sessions for both Chambers. Each Chamber has a President (a Speaker) – elected by the MPs by secret vote, his/her mandate is for the duration of the Chambers' mandate, a Standing Bureau, parliamentary committees, and parliamentary political groups (which have their leaders). One important attribution of the Presidents of the Chambers concerns the communicative activity within the proceedings: the President (Speaker) gives the floor to the MPs in accordance with the time limit imposed to each parliamentary group, he/she moderates the debates, summarises the topics raised, decides the order of voting, announces the results of the votes. In conducting the proceedings, the president is assisted by two secretaries.

The regulation of the common sessions of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, in the section dedicated to the unfolding of the sittings mentions some communicative interdictions (for example, to proffer insults or to engage in dialogue with the audience). Different studies have shown that these rules are frequently broken by the MPs (for the study of insults see Ștefănescu 2010a; Roibu and Constantinescu 2010). Cornelia Ilie (2010: 201) mentions the *co-performance* or *co-act* within Romanian debates: the MPs engage quite frequently in dialogues with their colleagues/opponents from the audience.

3.2. Parliamentary party-political groups

In the following analysis, the examples are excerpted from the Romanian parliamentary debates, pre-electoral and even post-electoral disputes. The corpus is represented by sittings of the Romanian Parliament (the Chamber of Deputies, the Senate, common sessions) from December 2012 – December 2016, January – April 2017. During this period, the majority in the Parliament belongs to the Social Democratic Party (in or without political alliances), its leader holding the prime-minister office until November 5th, 2015.

In the elections held in December 2012, the Social Liberal Union (Rom. Uniunea Social Liberală), the alliance of the Social-Democratic Party (Rom. Partidul Social Democrat, henceforth PSD) and the National Liberal Party (Rom. Partidul Național Liberal, henceforth PNL), led by Prime Minister Victor Ponta, in office since May 2012, won the majority in both the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. The wining coalition had internal regroupings that concluded with its breaking up in February 2014. The Social-Democratic Party and its allies hold the parliamentary majority, while the National Liberal Party entered in opposition. The 2014 presidential elections saw the Social-Democratic Party and its allies and the National Liberal Party together with the Democratic Liberal Party (Rom. Partidul Democrat Liberal) in competition, supporting two opponents in the second round: Victor Ponta, the Prime Minister in office, and Klaus Iohannis (who won the elections).

From November 2015 to December 2016, the Romanian government is mainly a technocratic government. 2016 is a pre-electoral year, the elections for the new Parliament taking place on December 11th, 2016. The sittings from 2017 are influenced by massive protests in February 2017 (the protests are against a government's ordinance – Emergency Ordinance no.13/2017 for the amendment and the addition of some laws on the Criminal Code and on the Criminal Procedure Code). This time frame was chosen as it covers tensioned debates and different regroupings within former coalitions, which favour conflictual communication. Within this context, comments on '(im)politeness' are expected to be frequent.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

As already stated, the analysis focuses on the metacommunicative and metadiscursive aspects of '(im)politeness', revealing the way it is labelled, referred to, and interpreted by Romanian MPs. Scrutinising the unfolding of the debates, the comments are divided according to the focus on self- or other-communicative behaviour (a matter of *face* and rapport management); at the same time, both the direct and indirect evaluations, as well as the ironical uses of the '(im)politeness' lexicon are also distinguished (these are subordinate aspects of the evaluative judgements and of the ethical dimension/moral order). The direct evaluation implies a straightforward appraisal of self/other using a term from the '(im)politeness' lexicon; indirect evaluations imply using terms from the '(im)politeness' lexicon without explicitly connecting them to self/other (the connections are made via implicatures).

Therefore, several significant sequences have been selected for the analysis. They reveal, on the one hand, metacommunicative comments with (direct/indirect) self-/other-reference, and on the other hand metadiscursive comments conveying stereotypical projections of the MPs on the others' behaviour, as well as mentioning the interactional, social, or philosophical value of (im)politeness. In this paper, as already mentioned, the label *metacommunicative* refers to MPs' evaluations (which partially illustrate the present-day Romanian '(im)politeness'

lexicon), while *metadiscursive* concerns the MPs' comments on others' desirable behaviour and the way of expressing expectations according to social or institutional norms.

The selection of fragments is not based on a study regarding the frequency of the terms within the '(im)politeness' lexicon (in present-day Romanian or in Romanian parliamentary discourse research such a quantitative study does not exist), although the terms which appear are frequently used, but rather on their representativity for parliamentary verbal interaction. The qualitative analysis is supplemented with some observations concerning the frequency of some terms from the '(im)politeness' lexicon in the debates spanning from December 2012 to December 2016 (the inventory is based on a previous study on '(im)politeness' in 19th century Romanian, Constantinescu 2016).

In general, considering the importance of the moment of evaluation (as part of the uptake), researchers have used in their analysis *in situ* (Locher and Watts 2005), and *post hoc* (Grainger 2011) evaluations. A third type is added here, the *ante hoc* evaluation which stands for the framing of '(im)politeness' before the actual interaction (an anticipative frame). Thus in this article, three labels are used: the *in situ* label stands for an evaluation of the communicative behaviour of a fellow MP or of the speaker him/herself within the ongoing dialogue, as well as for participants' expressing opinions concerning the desirable behaviour or their expectations during an interaction; the *post hoc* label applies to the retrospective evaluation of a behaviour belonging to the speaker or to a fellow MP (reporting it to a norm or set of expectations included); the *ante hoc* label covers the situations in which the evaluative term frames a future communicative behaviour (emphasising the need for 'politeness' or the avoidance of 'impoliteness', for example, or projecting a type of desired behaviour). The three temporal frames of evaluation apply both to metacommunicative and metadiscursive comments.

4.1. Self-reference in metacommunicative comments

In MPs' speeches there are comments regarding the speakers' previous discourses or institutional actions including the Romanian adverb *politicos* 'politely' as a metacommunicative element. In a discourse in the Chamber of Deputies, Mrs. Ana Birchall refers to the activity of a commission she is part in. At the time of the speech, Mrs. Birchall, a PSD deputy, was the president of the parliamentary Committee for European Affairs. The EU document she refers to is the Country Report for 2016 (assessment of prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, SWD (2016) 91 (PH CD 47/2016), as it appears on the parliamentary agenda).

- (1) Doamna Ana Birchall: O scurtă precizare. Tocmai de aceea noi am criticat, în opinia noastră, că datele care au fost prezentate în forma inițială a raportului de țară trebuie actualizate. [...] Și, în opinia noastră, *am recomandat politicos, dar ferm*, ca, pe viitor, Comisia Europeană să își verifice și să își diversifice sursele de informare, tocmai pentru ca să reflecte

realitățile. (Ședința Camerei Deputaților, 20.04.2016, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7660&idm=14&idl=1)

Mrs. Ana Birchall: A brief explanation. That is why we had a critical reaction as the data presented in the initial country report needed to be updated. [...] And, in our opinion, we *have politely, but firmly*, recommended that, in the future, the European Commission should check and diversify its information sources, to accurately reflect the reality.

The reaction of the parliamentary committee to a report of the European Union leads to recommending “politely, but firmly” better sources of information. The phrase involves a metastance on the part of the MP (*post hoc* realisation of the self-evaluation): projecting adequacy and resolution on the response, as a way to boost the speaker’s image and the image of the group she represents. The example illustrates the emphasis on the deontic stance – the entailment of parliamentary agentivity in accordance with the international institutional norms (the MP emphasises the role of the committee she presides). The emotional stance entails the control of the committee’s members over their verbal reactions (not driven by emotions). The collective self of the MP is targeted: representative of both a commission and the parliamentary institution, which could lead to an indirect enhancement of the relationship with the group (a positive rapport management).

In other cases, the evaluation appears in an interaction, for example the interaction between Petru Gabriel Vlaşe, the Chair of the sitting, and Nicușor Daniel Dan, a member of the opposition, thus *in situ* realisation. The following excerpt shows tension during the parliamentary sitting: the interaction takes place on February 1st, 2017, one day after the adoption of the ordinance 13 by the government. The leader of one of the opposition parties tries to put on the agenda the topic of the ordinance. The agenda of the day contains, at that point of the sitting, announcing (possible) modifications within the parliamentary groups with regard to membership (both numeric and nominal), as well as leadership.

- (2) Domnul Nicușor Daniel Dan: Stimați colegi,
Cred că nu e corect să ne prefacem că nu s-a întâmplat nimic noaptea trecută... (Aplauze, rumoare, fluierături.)
Domnul Petru Gabriel Vlaşe: Domnule lider...
Domnul Nicușor Daniel Dan: ... și...
Domnul Petru Gabriel Vlaşe: Domnule lider... (Vociferări.) Vă rog, nu... nu suntem la declarații politice, vă rog să respectați regulamentul. V-am invitat la cuvânt să dați citire propunerilor... vă rog...
Domnul Nicușor Daniel Dan: Am un apel, și nu o să fie lung, către colegii noștri de la putere. (Vociferări.)
Stimați colegi,
Este... (Vociferări.) ...ce s-a întâmplat noaptea trecută este foarte grav...
Domnul Petru Gabriel Vlaşe: Domnule Nicușor Dan... (Vociferări.)
Domnul Nicușor Daniel Dan: Cred că nu sunteți conștienți că prin ce ați făcut... (I se întrerupe microfonul. Rumoare.)

Domnul Petru Gabriel Vlas: Domnule lider de grup, vă rog... *v-am rugat respectuos* să respectați regulamentul. Nu suntem la declarații politice. (Rumoare.) (Ședința Camerei Deputaților, 1.02.2017, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7729&idm=3&idl=1)

Mr. Nicușor Daniel Dan: Esteemed colleagues,
I think it is not right to pretend that nothing happened last night... (Applause, murmur, whistles)

Mr. Petru Gabriel Vlas: Mister leader...

Mr. Nicușor Daniel Dan: ... and...

Mr. Petru Gabriel Vlas: Mister leader... (Shouts). Please, don't.... it is not the moment of political declarations, please respect the regulations. I invited you to read your proposals... please...

Mr. Nicușor Daniel Dan: I want to make an appeal, and it is not going to be a long one, to our colleagues in power. (Shouts)

Esteemed/honourable colleagues,
It is... (Shouts) ... what happened last night is extremely serious...

Mr. Petru Gabriel Vlas: Mister Nicușor Dan... (Shouts)

Mr. Nicușor Daniel Dan: I think that you are not aware of the fact that following what you have done... (The microphone is turned off. Murmur.)

Mr. Petru Gabriel Vlas: Mister group leader, please... *I've respectfully asked you* to observe the regulations. It is not the moment for political declarations. (Murmur.)

The MP chairing the sitting (a vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies, a PSD deputy) repeatedly tries and succeeds to block the intervention that refers to an act adopted by the government: the Emergency Ordinance no.13/2017 for the amendment and addition of some laws on the Criminal Code and on the Criminal Procedure Code. Since Nicușor Dan, leader of an opposition political party (USR), does not comply with the rules of the debate, explicitly invoked by the Chair ("it is not the moment of political declarations, please respect the regulations. I've invited you to read your proposals"), the microphone is turned off, and the MP loses his right to speak. The Speaker appraises his own behaviour as complying with the norms (*in situ* self-evaluation): "I've *respectfully* asked you to observe the regulations. It is not the moment for political declarations". The evaluative adverb *respectfully* could be used as a means of boosting the image of the Chair, showing his commitment to the adequacy of social and institutional interaction. As emotional stance is concerned, the intervention could be considered a way to express a positive attitude towards the interlocutor; the Chair could try to enhance the interpersonal relationship notwithstanding the action of blocking the interlocutor's intervention. The example also illustrates the emphasis on the deontic order – the entailment of the Chair's agentivity in accordance with the parliamentary norms. The Chair's relational self is emphasised, as his institutional position is superior to that of the interlocutor. In the debates that have been analysed, the adverbs *politicos* or *respectuos* 'politely'/'respectfully' appear in collocations with verbs like *a ruga* 'to (kindly) ask' or *a recomanda* 'to recommend', which mitigate the directive illocutionary force.

In some cases, self-appraisal reinforces the positive evaluation of ‘politeness’ while acknowledging its negative counterpart. The speech of an MP concerns a declaration of the Parliament following a decision of the Constitutional Court of Romania. Ensuing the government’s ordinance 13, the President and the High Council of the Magistrates have referred the matter to the Constitutional Court. The decision of the Constitutional Court ruled that the government could issue that type of ordinances. As a result, the Parliament (dominated by the PSD-ALDE coalition, the coalition that governs) wants to reaffirm its institutional mission and to emphasise the different roles of the President, Government, and Judiciary Power. The parliamentary opposition accuses the PSD-ALDE majority that it misinterprets in the text of the declaration the attributes of the president (the president in office is the former head of the PNL) and those of the judiciary power.

- (3) Domnul Traian Băsescu: [...] De aceea, propunerea mea este: dacă se simte nevoia unei astfel de declarații – deși este proba de slăbiciune a instituției, simte nevoia să se afirme cine e ea, când îi spune Constituția – dacă se simte nevoia unei astfel de declarații, propunerea mea este să fie revizuit foarte serios textul. Altfel, pe acest text, PMP va vota împotriva.

Dar, repet, *din politețe, pentru că nu vreau să fiu conflictual*, recomandarea este să fie revizuită această declarație și pusă în parametri constituționali corecți, recunoscând tuturor instituțiilor drepturile lor. (Ședința comună a Camerei Deputaților și Senatului, 8.03.2017, <http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7757&idm=5&idl=1>)
Mr. Traian Băsescu: [...] Thus my proposal is the following: if the need of such a declaration is felt – although it is a proof of the institution’s weakness, as it feels the need to claim its identity, even though it is stated in the Constitution – if the need of such a declaration is felt, my proposal is that the text should be thoroughly revised. Otherwise, based on this text, PMP will vote against it.

But, I repeat, *out of politeness, as I do not want to be conflictive*, the recommendation is to revise this declaration and to put it within the correct constitutional parameters, acknowledging to all the institutions their rights.

The speaker is Traian Băsescu, the former President of Romania (for two terms, 2004–2009, 2009–2014), two times suspended from office by the Parliament (in 2007 and 2012, respectively). Băsescu is known for his tense relationship with the Parliament from his presidential mandate. In his speech, he emphasizes the fact that the Constitution already mentions the attributes of all the state powers. Băsescu considers the fact he repeats the recommendation (the text of the declaration needs revision) a sign of politeness (*in situ* self-evaluation). It is interesting that the MP continues admitting a possible negative appraisal of his intervention – “I do not want to be *conflictive*” (a presumable other-evaluation). The phrase could be interpreted as an *in situ* evaluation or even as an *ante hoc* evaluation, if seen as a possible projection of the appraisal from the part of the

parliamentary majority. The cognitive representations of 'politeness' and conflict seem to emphasise lack of negotiation with the audience, a stance imposed by the speaker (the former president takes a distance from his fellow MPs, boosting his image by contrast with the parliamentary majority). The example shows the embedding of different types of orders: the MP's deontic status entails exhibiting power (as a leader of an opposition party and former president), the epistemic status highlights the participant's certainty (his political knowledge and expertise), while the epistemic stance is marked by the reference to the Constitution (as authoritative argument; quoting the Constitution is used to attest knowledge and expertise). Last, but not least, the emotional and benefactive orders are also at play: conflict entails a negative emotional state and costs to parliamentary actions (in this case conflict is presented as being avoided). Self-appraisal emphasises the individual self of the locutor.

Having in mind these examples, with *post hoc* and *in situ* evaluations, a broader image of the key terms is needed. Using the search engine offered by the site of the Chamber of Deputies, the key words *politicos* and *respectuos* (adverbs/adjectives) were retrieved 16 times (*politicos*), 77 times respectively (*respectuos*) for the legislature 2012–2016. Although *politicos* (< Ngr. *politikós*) is the older word in Romanian, it appears less frequently in the sittings. Concerning their distribution, while *politicos* has a rather balanced occurrence both in declarations and in debates (7 tokens in written/oral declarations, 9 in the debates), *respectuos* occurs mainly in written/oral declarations (less interactional genres). If *politicos* is used approximately with the same frequency in self- and other-targeted evaluations, *respectuos* is used, in the majority of cases, in self-targeted evaluations. The most frequent collocations with the adverb/adjective are the following: *a ruga respectuos* 'to ask/pray respectfully', *a solicita respectuos* 'to demand respectfully', *a mulțumi respectuos* 'to thank respectfully', *a spune respectuos* 'to say respectfully', *a anunța respectuos* 'to announce respectfully'; *apel respectuos* 'respectful appeal', [*persoană*] *respectuoasă* 'respectful person'. Considering the collocations with the verbs mentioned above, we hypothesise that *respectuos* is mainly an enhancing or a mitigating device of the illocutionary force, the 'politeness' meaning appears as bleached. The important aspect is that *respectuos* could be instrumental in constructing and promoting a positive self-image.

It should be mentioned that *respect* (<Fr. *respect*, Lat. *respectus*) and *respectuos* (its derivative) are not synonyms with *politețe* (< Fr. *politesse* 'politeness') and *politicos* 'polite'. *Respect* covers a cognitive-affective domain (it is internal), while *politețe* is connected to a certain behaviour abiding by social norms and expectations (thus external). As an evaluative, *politicos* relates both a symmetric and a asymmetric relationship between the participants to an interaction; due to its cognitive-affective dimension, *respectuos* implies asymmetry.

The key word *politețe* 'politeness' was retrieved 10 times in the legislature 2012–2016, while *respect* and the verb *a respecta* ('to respect', 'to abide by') appear almost 4000 times. Among the 10 results for *politețe*, 1 token appeared in a discourse of a British official, 4 tokens in political declarations (from which 2 where only in writing, not presented in the assembly). It leaves only 5 tokens in

interventions during the debates in the four years. At the same time, the verb *a respecta* (used with various paradigmatic forms) and the postverbal noun *respectare* have approximately 3000 tokens; the rest of the tokens are of the noun *respect*, alone or in different collocations (*cu respect* ‘with respect’, *lipsă/lipsit de respect* ‘lack of/lacking respect’, *fără respect* ‘without respect’). In many cases, the ‘politeness’ meaning is bleached, or the meaning of the word no longer has a connection with the frame of ‘politeness’ (for example, *a respecta o lege* ‘to abide by the law’). The situation of *respect* requires a lengthy analysis on its own, this is why this key word is not discussed in the present study.

In this section, the examples illustrate self-reference metacommunicative comments, with positive evaluation, *post hoc* or *in situ*. In the first two cases, the deontic and the emotional orders are prominent: the speakers exhibit their agentivity and emotional control. In the third example, the epistemic order appears emphasised: the orator is firm, knowledgeable, he uses authoritative arguments; anticipating a possible negative appraisal of his intervention, the orator presents his approach as a way of avoiding interactional costs.

4.2. Other-reference in metacommunicative comments

The questions addressed to the government reveal a stereotypical projection on the addressee’s desired behaviour. Speakers use a term which usually has an evaluative value: *amabilitate* ‘courtesy’, ‘kindness’. It should be mentioned that *amabilitate* was retrieved 64 times in the legislature 2012–2016, appearing only in other-targeted evaluations, mostly in the debates and in the interpellations addressed to the government. The most frequent use implies a(n) *in situ* or *post hoc* reaction; if the term is used before the target’s communicative reaction, it offers to a new deontic value, implying an *ante hoc* reaction: how a person ought to behave. The deontic value could force the target or the interlocutor to behave in a manner that abides by the expectations the speaker created.

The main use of *amabilitate* will be presented firstly. Some of the MPs thank the deputy ministers (*in situ* evaluations are present) for their answers. The locutor’s reaction enhances the interpersonal relationship and the individual self of the interlocutor is on focus, his image being boosted:

- (4) Doamna Natalia-Elena Intotero: Vă mulțumesc, doamnă președinte de ședință.
Stimată doamnă secretar de stat [Corina-Silvia Pop, secretar de stat, Ministerul Sănătății],
Vă mulțumesc pentru amabilitatea și pentru răspunsul dumneavoastră. Așteptăm cu mare interes demararea acestor programe extrem de necesare pentru toate femeile din România. (Interpelarea nr.3198B/27-09-2016, interpelarea nr.3199B/27-09-2016)
Mrs. Natalia-Elena Intotero: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Esteemed Madam Deputy Minister [Corina-Silvia Pop, Ministry of Health],

I thank you for your kindness and for your answer. We look forward for the beginning of these extremely necessary programs for all the women in Romania.

The example presents the reaction of Mrs Natalia-Elena Intotero, vice-leader of the PSD parliamentary group. The interpellation concerns a programme for the prevention of breast cancer. Since the MP is not a member of a parliamentary health committee, the topic of interpellation could reflect her political role as vice-leader of the parliamentary group (collective self in focus), but also her private role as a woman (an aspect connected to the individual self – see the phrase “We look forward for the beginning of these *extremely necessary* programs for *all the women* in Romania”), showing concern for a serious health problem. The reply may reflect a stereotypical (‘bleached’) use of *amabilitate* (see also question nr. 10529A/10-10-2016 belonging to the same MP). The interventions illustrate a specific (cultural) emotional and benefactive orders: the speaker entails his/her interlocutor’s cooperative attitude (Vasilescu 2007: 166 considers that Romanian culture is mostly consensual), while in the cost-benefit distribution the government representatives seem to have made (appreciated) efforts in answering the questions (this positive rapport management could be reinforced by the fact that both the deputy minister and the MP are women).

The deontic value of *amabilitate* is illustrated next, in the interpellations of an MP belonging to PSD. Only one example is offered here, but there are many other situations, almost identical (interpellations nr. 3126B/22-06-2016 and nr. 3277B/11-10-2016). The speaker, vice-president of the Committee for Education, Science, Youth and Sport, belongs to a parliamentary group which is critical of the government led by D. Cioloș.

- (5) Domnul Sorin-Avram Iacoban: [...] Având în vedere toate cele precizate, *vă rugăm să aveți amabilitatea să răspundeți la următoarele întrebări:* [...] (Interpelarea nr. 2880B/22-03-2016, <http://www.cdep.ro/interpel/2016/i2880B.pdf>)
Mr. Sorin-Avram Iacoban: [...] Considering all of the above, please (lit. we ask you to) have the *courtesy* of answering the following questions: [...]

The evaluative term projected is *amabilitate* ‘kindness/courtesy’; the stereotypical nature of the intervention resides not only in the phrasing, but also in using a ‘bleached’ evaluative term, since the answers of the government’s members are mandatory. *Amabilitate* in Romanian means ‘goodwill, friendliness, amiable behaviour’. The speaker entails his and his party’s cooperative attitude, while in the cost-benefit distribution the government representatives seem to have more to gain in answering the opposition’s questions. The formal use of the collocation including the evaluative term could suggest an enhancement of the relationship between the parliamentary majority and the government. Thus, the example could illustrate specific (cultural) emotional and benefactive orders in a metadiscursive

comment: in collectivistic societies (like the present-day Romanian society), emotions could be construed as a form of group experience, a result of the interpersonal relationships' dynamics within a group (Vasilescu 2007: 44).

The ironical comments of politicians sometimes exploit the metacommunicative 'politeness' lexis, especially in a highly adversarial setting like that of debating a censure motion against the government (in this case, a motion against the government led by Victor Ponta, who ran for president in the November 2014 elections):

- (6) Domnul Ludovic Orban: Uitați că deja nu mai avem prim-ministru. Îi mulțumesc domnului Ponta pentru *dovada de maximă politețe pe care o are* - (Aplauze.) - nu față de mine, când vorbesc, ci față de dumneavoastră, ca Parlament al României, că a părăsit sala. Dar, probabil, se aștepta că urmez eu la cuvânt și are oareșce motive ca să părăsească sala. Eu sper sincer că, după ziua de astăzi, va părăsi și conducerea Cabinetului. (Ședința comună a Camerei Deputaților și Senatului, 22.09.2014, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7409&idm=4&idl=1)
Mr. Ludovic Orban: Look, we do not have a prime minister anymore. I thank mister Ponta for leaving the assembly, the *proof of maximum politeness he has* – (Applause) – not towards me, when speaking, but towards you, as Romanian Parliament. Probably he knew I was the next speaker, and he had his reasons for leaving. I sincerely hope that, after today's motion, he will also leave his office.

The speaker is an important opposition MP (member of PNL). He ironically thanks the Prime Minister (member of PSD) for leaving the assembly during the censure motion. In an antiphrasis, the Prime Minister's gesture is labelled as *proof of politeness (in situ evaluation)*. The implicature, as part of the epistemic order, is the lack of consideration not only at an interpersonal level (private sphere, the individual self in focus), but also at a more general level, connected with the relationship between the head of the government and the Parliament (institutional sphere, the collective self in focus). The irony would allow the MP to gain temporary power over the Prime Minister, since the opposition is a minority in the assembly, and the motion has little chance to pass (the benefactive and emotional orders suggest a temporary symbolic victory). The example shows a negative rapport management between the speaker and the target of his speech.

The role of the audience is crucial for humorous performance: the audience encourages, evaluates, sanctions, emphasises the speaker's performance (Norrick 1993: 80–81). In the example above, a part of the audience reacts by applauding, a reaction showing the support offered to the speaker, the agreement with the message, and the appreciation of the performance: the applauding MPs understand the ironical use of 'politeness' in the discourse and agree to take a distance from Prime Minister Ponta; thus, they show solidarity with the speaker and enhance their interpersonal relationship. Conversational humour allows not only sharing of attitudes and promoting an interpersonal relationship, but also the manifestation of a type of personality (*ethos*) that is valued in the Parliament as a community of practice (at least in Romanian culture, a ludic ethos of the Romanian MPs is a

necessary quality for a skilful orator, Constantinescu 2008, 2010, 2018; Săftoiu 2009; Vasilescu 2018b; for other cultures, see Tsakona and Popa (eds.) 2011). The forms taken by the parliamentary humour depend on a customary joking relation (Norrick 1994), developed within a "joking culture" (Fine and de Soucey 2005).

Romanian MPs seem to prefer indirect reference to the hostile audience, as in the example below. The excerpt is taken from a common sitting of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies on September 19th, 2016, on the occasion of the Government's activity presentation by the Prime Minister Dacian Cioloș. With a few exceptions (some MPs from the PNL), the audience (dominated by the PSD parliamentarians) is highly critical to the government:

- (7) Doamna Alina-Ștefania Gorghiu: [...] Nu PNL a avut cele mai multe voturi la susținerea Guvernului Cioloș, despre care astăzi se spune că este al domnului Iohannis. PSD-ul a dat cele mai multe voturi pentru acest Guvern, dar în realitate sprijinul transparent, onest, al acestui Guvern a venit de la Partidul Național Liberal. (Vociferări.)
 Acum, stimați colegi, fiți calmi, nu..., fiți calmi, fiți calmi, că am suficient timp și răbdare la *orice fel de mârłanie și mitocănie*. [...] N-aș vrea să vă deranjeze dialogul dintre noi, astăzi. Aș vrea să știți că atunci când PSD critică și țipă la cineva înseamnă că acel cineva își face treaba cum trebuie. (Ședința comună a Camerei Deputaților și Senatului, 19.09.2016, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno2015.stenograma?id=7694&idm=3&idl=1)
 Mrs Alina-Ștefania Gorghiu: [...] It was not PNL who had the most votes for supporting government Cioloș, government whom they say today belongs to President Iohannis. It was PSD who gave this government most of the votes, but in fact the transparent, honest support came from the National Liberal Party. (Shouts.)
 Now, esteemed colleagues, stay calm, don't..., stay calm, stay calm, as I have enough time and patience to *any kind of rudeness and boorish behaviour* [...] I would not like you to be disturbed by our dialogue today. I would like you to know that when PSD critics and shouts at someone it means that that someone is doing a good job.

As already mentioned above, the PSD leader Ponta stepped down from office at the beginning of November 2015, after street protests that followed a tragedy in a nightclub. After Victor Ponta's resignation, President Iohannis designated the former EU Commissioner for Agriculture Dacian Cioloș to form a government. His government, formed by mainly politically unaffiliated members, ensured the transition to a new government which resulted after the general elections of December 11th, 2016. From November 2015 until December 2016, PSD was the most critical voice against Cioloș's Government.

During the debate from which the fragment is excerpted, Mrs. Gorghiu, at that time president of the PNL (since December 2014, when Klaus Iohannis became president of Romania), defends the government's activity and accuses the former government party (PSD) of dishonest behaviour. The reaction of the audience is intense, as shown by the official records (PSD holds the majority of

seats in the Parliament). The MP repeatedly asks for calm and then adds that she has “enough time and patience (to reply) to any *boorishness* and *rudeness*” (used as a strategy to boost her personal image by contrast with the image of her opponents). Thus, the behaviour of the audience (the shouting) is indirectly labelled as boorish and rude (*in situ* evaluation). The example illustrates the uptake of the MP – the adversarial reaction of the fellow MPs is considered inappropriate, leading to a negative appraisal (with loaded evaluative terms). The MP distances herself from the behaviour of her fellow MPs. The emotional status entails the speaker’s (claimed) expectations for a lack of emotional display (hence her appeal to calm), but the emotional stance reveals, via the loaded evaluative terms, a negative emotional state of the speaker produced by the reactions from the assembly.

It is not very frequent in parliamentary debates for an MP to evaluate *in situ* or *post hoc* another MP or member of the government using some terms from the lexicon of ‘impoliteness’. Still, there are some cases in which the perceived inappropriate behaviour of the target triggers the use of ‘loaded’ evaluative terms:

- (8) Doamna Eleonora-Carmen Hărău: [...] Este *inadmisibil*, ca la această şedinţă, domnul Ghimpău, Aurelian Ghimpău, să vină, anunţându-ne, din capul locului, că e ziua Domniei Sale, să răspundă unui demnitar-femeie, care pune întrebări concrete legate de situaţia viitoare din iarna aceasta a cetăţenilor judeţului Hunedoara, că are suficiente probleme cu nevasta care-l bate la cap acasă, şi să răspundă fără niciun fel de competenţă, ba, dimpotrivă, *în vârful buzelor* şi cu *impertinenţă* tuturor întrebărilor adresate de către primarii implicaţi în această problemă [...]. Este motivul pentru care domnul Adrian David, preşedintele Consiliului judeţean Hunedoara, pune diagnostic de incompetenţă şi *nesimţire*, în ceea ce-l priveşte pe acest domn. (Şedinţa Camerei Deputaţilor, 7.09.2015, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7546&idm=2,005&idl=1)
Mrs Eleonora-Carmen Hărău: [...] It is *unacceptable* in this session for mister Ghimpău, Aurelian Ghimpău, to come announcing from the start that it is his birthday, to answer a women official – asking concrete questions about the citizens from Hunedoara county’s future situation this winter – that he has enough problems at home with his wife nagging him, to answer with no competence, moreover *from the tip of his lips* and *impertinently* to all the questions addressed by the mayors involved in this issue [...] It is the reason why mister Adrian David, president of the Hunedoara county council diagnoses this gentleman as suffering from incompetence and *rudeness*.

The Liberal MP (from Hunedoara), Eleonora Carmen Hărău, comments on the behaviour of a deputy minister and president of an energetic complex in Hunedoara County (Aurelian Ghimpău). Eleonora Carmen Hărău is the vice-president of a Special Parliamentary Committee investigating two energy-supplying complexes, in Hunedoara and Oltenia. The MP mentions the inappropriate discourse of the target during the hearings in the special committee, but also a more general attitude exhibited by that person in his county (*post hoc* evaluations, both internal and

external). First of all, the MP considers inappropriate the presentation of a private event (birthday party) in an official answer in Parliament. Secondly, the MP emphasises a gender issue: as an official representative, her question should have been answered, but the target seems to disregard the question addressed by a woman, evoking another private aspect – his marital problems (“he has enough problems at home with his wife nagging him”). The MP’s intervention highlights the fact that gender should not be in focus in an institutional setting; moreover, the relational self is also neglected, as the target of the MPs’ evaluations disregards the actions of state officials he considers hierarchically inferior (deontic stance in focus). The emotional stance is illustrated by the phrasing, the lexical choices, the choice of quotations, etc., showing the speaker’s negative emotions, provoked by the reactions of the target. Thirdly, the way Ghimpău reacts to other local officials is catalogued as impertinence (“to answer [...] *impertinently* to all the questions”). Two of the *post hoc* internal evaluations (*inadmisibil* ‘unacceptable’, *cu impertinență* ‘impertinently’), of high language register, are doubled by another evaluative term, quoted from a local authority (*post hoc* external evaluation), this time of low language register (*nesimțire* ‘rudeness’). The fact that the speaker also chooses to quote another person – the appeal to the *post hoc* external evaluation – shows an enhancement of the interpersonal relationship with the representatives of her county, a coalition against the evaluated person.

MPs appeal to negative evaluative terms in order to appraise the communicative behaviour of their opponents, including terms from the ‘impoliteness’ lexicon. Considering the examples from this section (nouns only), their frequency in the 2012–2016 legislature debates was checked, using the search engine provided by the Chamber of Deputies. The key words searched for are: *obraznicie* ‘rudeness’ (an old evaluative in Romanian, one of the most resilient in the lexicon of ‘impoliteness’), *impertinență* ‘impertinence’ (a modern loan-word from French), *nesimțire* (‘rudeness’, but also ‘insensitivity’, ‘coldness’), *mitocănie* and *mărlănie* (‘boorishness, rudeness’). The first three terms are not synonyms, but *obraznicie* and *impertinență* have rather close meanings (stylistic register apart), *mitocănie* and *mărlănie* are synonyms. The results are the following: 8 tokens for *obraznicie*, all of them in written/oral declarations, all of them in other-targeted evaluations; 12 tokens for *impertinență*, 11 of them in written/oral declarations, the majority in other-targeted evaluations (in two cases, the term appears in self-targeted evaluations, ironical usage); 34 tokens for *nesimțire*, in 24 sittings (30 tokens in 19 written and 11 oral declarations, 1 token in an interpellation, 3 tokens in the debate of a motion against the government); 4 tokens each for *mitocănie* and *mărlănie* (3 occurrences in written declarations, and one in the debates), all used in other-targeted evaluations. The majority of tokens appear in written/oral declarations, only very few in debates; the frequency is high in the less interactional parliamentary genres (negative evaluation resides mainly in political declarations, a parliamentary genre that could be only written, not necessarily presented from the rostrum), which reduces the conflictive potential of the evaluative term.

The examples from this section reveal metacommunicative and metadiscursive comments with reference to others' behaviour, with positive and negative evaluations. Positive evaluation implies the use of the 'bleached' *amabilitate* (in situ metacommunicative and *ante hoc* metadiscursive comments, examples (4)–(5)). Positive evaluative comments emphasise the emotional and benefactive orders: the importance of institutional cooperation. Negative evaluations are more diverse: ironical use of a term belonging to the 'politeness' lexicon (example (6)), indirect, obtained via implicatures (example (7)), or direct, evaluations belonging to the speaker or quoted (usually a token of adhesion) by the speaker (example (8)). Negative evaluative comments reveal the prominence of the negative emotional stance of the speakers.

4.3. Comments on the interactional and social value of 'politeness'

Several interventions reflect the metadiscursive aspects of 'politeness', namely comments on the desirable behaviour of others and the attitudes or expectations in different interactional settings. The following example is taken from the debate of a simple motion against the government; *politeness* is presented as a social interactional value:

- (9) Domnul Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Mulțumesc. Mergem mai departe, Proiectul de Hotărâre privind modificarea... Domnul Cernea, că dânsul n-a vorbit la deputați, după care doamna Andreea Paul și după care doamna deputat Liliana Mincă. Domnul Cernea, vă rugăm frumos, sunteți top model, vă rugăm, aveți cuvântul. Explicarea votului.
Domnul Remus-Florinel Cernea: Mulțumesc, domnule președinte. *Le-aș fi lăsat pe doamne înainte, din politețe*, însă a fost decizia dumneavoastră. (Ședința Camerei Deputaților, 22.10.2013, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7312&idm=17,001&idl=1)
Mr. Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Thank you. We continue, the Project of Law concerning the modifying... Mr Cernea, as he has not spoken in the Chamber, and then Mrs. Andreea Paul and then Mrs. Deputy Liliana Mincă. Mr. Cernea, please, you are a top model, please, you have the floor. The explanation of the vote.
Mr. Remus-Florinel Cernea: Thank you, mister speaker. *I would have allowed the ladies to speak first, out of politeness*, but that was your decision.

In interaction, politeness relates to some rules of speaking that involve, at some point, a certain type of (old-fashioned) gender biased turn-taking: according to good manners, inspired by courteous behaviour (of Western Europe influence), women ought to be allowed to express their opinions in a conversation before men do. Evoking this norm, the MP (member of the Committee for Human Rights, Cults, and National Minorities Issues) is nevertheless aware that in institutional settings the norm does not apply (the deontic and epistemic orders are prominent), as the turn-taking in parliamentary debates abides by different rules

(the type of debate, the allocated time for each political party, the order in which the MPs ask for their right to speak, etc.). The interventions are an example of teasing: the Chair of the sitting (PSD member) has explicitly evaluated Cernea (former PSD deputy, at that time unaffiliated) as “top model”, a label that has little to do with parliamentary or political activity. The Chair might have appraised the physical aspect of the MP or might have alluded to his private life. The MP does not react to this comment, but he responds by alluding to the Speaker’s presumed lack of politeness towards the female MPs.

Teasing involves two components: joking and sending a serious message (usually a negative appraisal of the target) or a provocation and a game; the target of the teasing has to choose a type of response based on a complicated calculus of the ‘seriousness’, of the appraisal’s weight, of the interpersonal relationship, etc. (Norrick 1993, 1994; Hay 2001). On the other hand, teasing corresponds to a group of communicative actions with multiple functions: interpersonal solidarity, in-group solidarity, mitigating face threatening acts, conflict management, exhibiting power, direct expression of aggression or impoliteness, assuming or attributing an identity, etc. (Haugh 2010). In the above example, the Chair of the sitting tries to exhibit his power and to assign an (professional) identity to the MP, while the MP selects an indirect response to the tease, the indirect expression of a social critique: the Chair lacks manners. The type of appraisal made by the Chair could fall under the label ‘jocular mockery’, a type of ludic, playful teasing (Haugh 2010): the real emphasis is on the interpersonal relationship between the Chair and MPs, not on the participants themselves (Dynel 2008).

In another situation revealing a metadiscursive comment, a deputy tries to comment on one of his interventions or gestures during a sitting concerned with his validation as member of the Parliament:

- (10) Domnul Petre Roman: Bună ziua! Mulțumesc, domnule deputat. Întâi vă mulțumesc pentru înțelegere, cred că se cuvine să dau o explicație, pentru că ...

Domnul Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Domnule deputat, vă rog frumos să depuneți jurământul cu mâna pe Biblie sau, dacă vreți, cel puțin pe Constituție. Nu suntem la ora la care să facem explicații.

Domnul Petre Roman: Vroiam să dau o explicație pentru acest... *gest de politețe, da...*

Domnul Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Vă rog frumos să depuneți jurământul! (Ședința Camerei Deputaților, 21.12.2012, www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=7189&idm=10&idl=1)

Mr. Petre Roman: Good day! Thank you, mister deputy. First, I want to thank you for your understanding, I believe that an explanation is required, because...

Mr. Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Mister deputy, please take the oath with your hand on the Bible or, if you want, at least on the Constitution. It is not the time for explanations.

Mr. Petre Roman: I wanted to explain this... *gesture of politeness*, but...

Mr. Valeriu Ștefan Zgonea: Please take the oath!

In this exchange, there seems to be a misunderstanding between the MP and the Chair. The Chair (PSD member) wants to abide by the rule, since the moment of the sitting involves the validation of the MP (from PNL): the validation takes place as soon as the MP takes the oath. The MP is more concerned with addressing his colleagues (it should be noticed that the MP is not an unexperienced politician, he is a former prime-minister and party leader, deputy between 1990–1992, 1992–1996; senator between 1996–2000, 2000–2004), for him the validation is a mere formality. Thanking and explaining are conceived by the MP as *gestures of politeness*, thus norms of general communicative behaviour (prominence of the deontic order); the comment reveals the need of the MP to enhance his interpersonal relationship with his fellow MPs (the collective self is on focus) – prominence of the benefactive order. In the particular moment of the sitting, the behaviour does not comply with the parliamentary protocol that the Chair follows (a mismatch between general interaction and institutional interaction). On the other hand, by explicitly stating the protocol and not allowing the MP to continue, the Chair exhibits his interactional power (see also example (2)).

The search engine from the website of the Chamber of Deputies retrieved 6 tokens for *deferență* ‘deference’ in the legislature 2012–2016. The term designates mainly ‘politeness’ as a social value; *deferență* appears in written declarations and in the debates, with a balanced distribution between self- and other-targeted evaluations.

The metadiscursive comments from this section are rather diverse, ranging from interactional aspects, clearly indicating the difference between social and institutional rules to appreciations of ‘politeness’ as a social and personal value. The interactional aspects show the prominence of the deontic (common to examples (9) and (10)), epistemic and benefactive orders, while the comments regarding ‘politeness’ as a value display the prominence of the benefactive (common to examples (11)–(12)), deontic and epistemic orders. When ‘politeness’ is stated as a value, there is also the mentioning of a threshold of ‘politeness’ – over-politeness or lack of politeness are negatively connoted.

5. FINAL REMARKS

In the sphere of ‘politeness’, self-reference and positive self-evaluation seem frequent. Romanian MPs show a tendency to stereotypical projections or metacommunicative reactions on/to the others’ behaviour or discourse. The comments on the interactional value of ‘politeness’ (examples (3), (9), (10)) are rather precise. For Romanian MPs, the interactional value of ‘politeness’ can trigger a tension between the social, general norms, and the institutional norms (examples (9)–(10)): in some cases, the social norms are evoked in order to sanction a previous intervention perceived as inadequate (although the social norms are irrelevant to the institutional turn distribution, for example) or to explain a behaviour contravening the parliamentary regulations (ignored by the MPs).

In the sphere of ‘impoliteness’, indirect reference to the target seems to be the norm (see example (7)). The direct reference is less frequent (see example 8), as it

could lead to institutional sanctions or to eristic dialogues. Nevertheless, there are interventions that could be labelled "jocular mockery". The 'politeness' lexicon is ironically used in interventions to sanction a political behaviour/discourse *in situ* (example (6)).

Although 'impoliteness' is considered a type of behaviour more prominent than 'politeness' in parliamentary interactions, in this data negative evaluations using 'impoliteness' lexicon are produced mostly indirectly or via an ironical use of the 'politeness' lexicon or in less interactional genres. This fact supports the idea of the salience of 'impoliteness' and reflects the necessity of avoiding explicit disagreement or interactional conflict within a community of practice. 'Politeness' is an important tool of building a personal image or an institutional identity, circumscribing items that reveal different aspects: the words *politețe* or *politicos* cover the realm of adequate, neutral behaviour, learned or reproduced through interaction, observing social and institutional norms; most of the times, *amabilitate* seems to illustrate an innate type of adequate behaviour, perhaps this favours its stereotypical use by Romanian MPs.

The excerpts discussed in this paper display a rather varied lexicon of 'politeness' and 'impoliteness'. Among the Romanian metacommunicative items there are the nouns *politețe* 'politeness' (sometimes ironically used), *amabilitate* 'kindness/courtesy', *respect* 'respect', *bună-cuviință* 'propriety', *deferență* 'deference', the adverbs/adjectives *politicos* 'polite(ly)' and *respectuos* 'respectful(ly)', the verb *a respecta* 'to respect'. *Politețe* appears in self-reference comments, with quantitative determiners (*too much* politeness, *too little* politeness), exhibiting a scale that the lay persons have in mind when they evaluate a type of behaviour, in series (with *respect*, *bună-cuviință*, *deferență*), conveying subtle distinctions within the field of 'politeness', but also in ironical contexts (other-reference). These terms often appear in metadiscursive comments, illustrating the social value of 'politeness'. As a personal characteristic, the distribution is rather balanced between the self- and other-targeted evaluations. The 'impoliteness' lexicon in the Romanian parliamentary examples is represented mainly by nouns: *mărlănie* 'boorishness', *mitocănie* 'rudeness', *obraznicie* 'impertinence', *impertinență* 'impertinence', *nesimțire* 'rudeness/impudence'. The vast majority of the examples reveal other-targeted evaluations (the self-targeted evaluations being ironical), with a preference for the less interactional parliamentary genres (written/oral declarations).

Self-reference metacommunicative comments, with positive evaluation, *post hoc* or *in situ*, display prominence of the deontic and emotional orders: the speakers exhibit their agentivity and emotional control (examples (1)–(2)). The epistemic order could also appear emphasised (example (3)): a firm and knowledgeable orator, who uses authoritative arguments and anticipates a possible negative appraisal of his intervention.

The metacommunicative and metadiscursive comments with reference to others' behaviour show both positive and negative evaluations. Positive evaluation implies the use of the 'bleached' *amabilitate* (*in situ* metacommunicative and *ante hoc* metadiscursive comments, examples (4)–(5)). Negative evaluations are more varied: ironical use of a term belonging to the 'politeness' lexicon (example (6));

indirect, obtained via implicatures (example (7)); or direct, evaluations belonging to the speaker or quoted by the speaker (example (8)). The positive evaluative comments emphasise the emotional and benefactive orders: the importance of institutional cooperation. The negative evaluative comments reveal the prominence of the negative emotional stance of the speakers.

The metadiscursive comments ranging from interactional aspects to appreciations of ‘politeness’ as a value display: the difference between social and institutional rules (with the prominence of the deontic (common to examples (9) and (10)), epistemic, and benefactive orders), ‘politeness’ as a social or individual norm (with the prominence of the benefactive, deontic, and epistemic orders), involving also the attention to the threshold of ‘politeness’.

When Romanian MPs appeal to ‘politeness’ or ‘impoliteness’, not all the elements of the moral order are emphasized at the same time. The deontic order entails parliamentary/MP’s agentivity in accordance with institutional norms. The emotional order entails positive emotional states, cooperative attitudes as far as ‘politeness’ is concerned, and negative emotional states, communicative blockage, for ‘impoliteness’. The benefactive order entails costs to parliamentary actions (in this case of ‘impoliteness’) and benefits for the interpersonal and institutional interactions (in the case of ‘politeness’). The emotional and benefactive orders could be influenced more by the Romanian cultural profile than by the parliamentary institution as a community of practice: Romanian MPs’ comments display the importance of cooperation and the way emotions are construed as a form of community experience, which could be explained as a reflex of the collectivistic features of the Romanian culture.

REFERENCES

- Angouri, J., M. A. Locher, 2012, “Theorising Disagreement”, *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (12), 1549–1553.
- Constantinescu, M. N., 2008, “Ethosul ludic al parlamentarilor”, in G. Pană Dindelegan (coord.), *Limba română. Dinamica limbii, dinamica interpretării*. București: Editura Universității din București, 267–274.
- Constantinescu, M. N., 2010, “Comunicarea bona-fide vs. non bona-fide în discursul parlamentar românesc din secolul al XIX-lea”, *Analele Universității din București. Seria Limba și literatura română* LIX, 69–79.
- Constantinescu, M-V., 2016, *Principatele române între Orient și Occident: dinamica modelelor culturale ale politicii și impoliticii în secolul al XIX-lea*. București: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române.
- Constantinescu, M-V., 2018, “Forme și strategii ale umorului”, in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938). O perspectivă pragma-retorică*. București: Editura Universității din București, 361–384.
- Culpeper, J., 2008, “Reflections on Impoliteness, Relational Work and Power”, in D. Bousfield, M. Locher (eds.), *Impoliteness in Language. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 17–43.
- Dynel, M., 2008, “No Aggression, Only Teasing: The Pragmatics of Teasing and Banter”, *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 4.2, 241–261.
- Eelen, G., 2001, *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

- Ehlich, K., [1992] 2005, "On the Historicity of Politeness", in R. J. Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 71–106.
- Fine, G. A., M. De Soucey, 2005, "Joking Cultures: Humor Themes as Social Regulation in Group Life", *Humor – International Journal of Humor Research* 18 (1), 1–22.
- Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P., 2010, "Introduction: The Status-Quo and Quo Vadis of Impoliteness Research", *Intercultural Pragmatics* 7 (4), 535–559.
- Goffman, E., 1967, *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Grainger, K., 2011, "'First Order' and 'Second Order' Politeness: Institutional and Intercultural Contexts", in *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 167–188.
- Harris, S., 2001, "Being Politically Impolite: Extending Politeness Theory to Adversarial Political Discourse", *Discourse & Society* 12 (4), 451–472.
- Haugh, M., 2010, "Jocular Mockery, (Dis)Affiliation, and Face", *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (8), 2106–2119.
- Haugh, M., 2012, "Epilogue: The First-Second Order Distinction in Face and Politeness Research", *Journal of Politeness Research* 8 (1), 111–134.
- Haugh, M., 2013, "(Im)politeness, Social Practice and the Participation Order", *Journal of Pragmatics* 58, 52–72.
- Haugh, M., 2015, *(Im)politeness Implicatures*. Berlin/Munich/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Hay, J., 2001, "The Pragmatics of Humor Support", *Humor – International Journal of Humor Research* 14 (1), 55–82.
- Hoinărescu, L., 2007, "Aspecte ale politeții pragmatice în româna contemporană vorbită", in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Interacțiunea verbală (IV II). Aspecte teoretice și aplicative. Corpus*. București: Editura Universității din București, 129–169.
- Ilie, C., 2001, "Unparliamentary Language: Insults as Cognitive Forms of Ideological Confrontation", in R. Dirven, R. Frank, C. Ilie (eds.), *Language and Ideology: Descriptive Cognitive Approaches*, vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 235–263.
- 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*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 45–86.
- Ilie, C., 2010, "Managing Dissent and Maximising Interpersonal Relations in Parliamentary Discourse", in C. Ilie (ed.), *European Parliaments under Scrutiny: Discourse Strategies and Interaction Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 193–221.
- Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L., 2011, "Strategii ale impoliteții în discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938)", in O. Chelaru-Murăruș, M. Cvasnii Cătănescu, C. Ene, C. Ușurelu, R. Zafiu (eds.), *Text și discurs. Omagiu Mihaela Mancaș*. București: Editura Universității din București, 283–292.
- Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L., 2014, "Discursul parlamentar ca formă specifică de interacțiune instituțională", in A.-C. Halichias, Th. Georgescu (coord.), *Sapientia et scientia. In honorem Luciae Wald*. București: Editura Universității din București, 277–285.
- Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L., 2018, "Discursul parlamentar ca formă specifică de interacțiune instituțională", in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938). O perspectivă pragma-retorică*. București: Editura Universității din București, 55–70.
- Kádár, D. Z., 2013, "Historical Politeness", *Handbook of Pragmatics Online*, <https://benjamins.com/online/hop/>.
- Kádár, D. Z., J. Culpeper, 2010, "Historical (Im)Politeness: An Introduction", in J. Culpeper, D. Z. Kádár (eds.), *Historical (Im)politeness*. Bern: Peter Lang, 9–36.
- Kádár, D. Z., M. Haugh, 2013, *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kotthoff, H., 1993, "Disagreement and Concession in Disputes: On the Context Sensitivity of Preference Structures", *Language in Society* 22 (2), 193–216.
- Locher, M. A., R. J. Watts, 2005, "Politeness Theory and Relational Work", *Journal of Politeness Research* 1 (1), 9–33.

- Locher, M. A., R. J. Watts, 2008, "Relational Work and Impoliteness: Negotiating Norms of Linguistic Behaviour", in D. Bousfield, M. A. Locher (eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on Its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 77–99.
- Măda, S., 2009, *Comunicarea în mediul profesional românesc*. Braşov: Editura Universităţii Transilvania din Braşov.
- Norrick, N. R., 1993, *Conversational Joking. Humor in Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Norrick, N. R., 1994, "Involvement and Joking in Conversation", *Journal of Pragmatics* 22 (3–4), 409–430.
- Radu, I.-C., 2010, *Aspecte ale comunicării conflictuale în româna actuală*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
- Roibu, M., M. N. Constantinescu, 2010, "Verbal Aggressiveness in the Romanian Parliamentary Debate. Past and Present", *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 4, 353–364.
- Săftoiu, R., 2009, "Acţiune şi interacţiune umoristică în dezbateră parlamentară românească", in R. Zafiu, G. Stoica, M. N. Constantinescu (eds.), *Limba română. Teme actuale. Actele celui de al 8-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de limba română (Bucureşti, 5–6 decembrie 2008)*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 405–415.
- Spencer-Oatey, H., 2005, "(Im)Politeness, Face and Perceptions of Rapport: Unpackaging their Bases and Interrelationships", *Journal of Politeness Research* 1 (1), 95–119.
- Spencer-Oatey, H., 2007, "Theories of Identity and the Analysis of Face", *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (4), 639–656.
- Ştefănescu, A., 2010a, "Emoţie şi impoliteţe în discursul şi interdiscursul condamnării trecutului comunist totalitar din România", in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L. Hoinărescu (eds.), *Dialog, discurs, enunţ. In memoriam Sorin Stati*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 73–100.
- Ştefănescu, A., 2010b, "Remarks on the Conceptual Tropes of the Political Act of Union in Mihail Kogălniceanu's speech in Parliament", *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 4, 381–396.
- Ştefănescu, A., 2011, "Conceptual Metaphors and Flexibility in Political Notions in Use in 19th Century Romanian Parliamentary Discourse", in F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, G. Mitchell (eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg/Sic Sat, 1828–1840.
- Stevanovic, M., A. Peräkylä, 2014, "Three Orders in the Organization of Human Action: On the Interface between Knowledge, Power, and Emotion in Interaction and Social Relations", *Language in Society* 43 (2), 185–207.
- Tsakona, V., D. E. Popa (eds.), 2011, *Studies in Political Humour: In between Political Critique and Public Entertainment*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vasilescu, A., 2007, *Cum vorbesc românii. Studii de comunicare (inter)culturală*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
- Vasilescu, A., 2018a, "Construcţia discursivă a identităţii parlamentare", in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938). O perspectivă pragma-retorică*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 281–304.
- Vasilescu, A., 2018b, "Metapозиţionarea: trei studii de caz", in L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Discursul parlamentar românesc (1866–1938). O perspectivă pragma-retorică*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 305–319.
- Verschueren, J., 2000, "Notes on the Role of Metapragmatic Awareness in Language Use", *Pragmatics* 10 (4), 439–456.
- Watts, R. J., S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.), [1992] 2005, *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, second revised and expanded edition, with a new introduction by R. J. Watts. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Werkhofer, K., [1992] 2005, "Traditional and Modern Views: The Social Constitution and Power of Politeness", in R. J. Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 155–199.

**'(IM)POLITEȚEA' DIN PERSPECTIVĂ EMICĂ.
ILUSTRĂRI DIN DEZBATERILE PARLAMENTARE ROMÂNEȘTI ACTUALE**

Rezumat

Articolul evidențiază comentarii metacomunicative și metadiscursive realizate de membrii Parlamentului României cu privire la '(im)politețea' comportamentului propriu și al colegilor. Elementele metacomunicative acoperă cu precădere lexiconul evaluativ al '(im)politeții', în timp ce elementele metadiscursive se referă la comentariile interactanților legate de comportamentul dorit sau de așteptările conforme normelor sociale. Obiectivul articolului este să prezinte, într-o abordare calitativă, perspectiva instituțională și culturală asupra '(im)politeții' în dezbaterile parlamentare actuale. Fiind o comunitate de practică, Parlamentul reprezintă un spațiu interesant pentru investigarea modului în care '(im)politețea' se construiește și se comentează.

**'(IM)POLITENESS' FROM AN EMIC PERSPECTIVE.
ILLUSTRATIONS FROM PRESENT-DAY ROMANIAN PARLIAMENTARY
DEBATES**

Abstract

The paper focuses on metacomunicative and metadiscursive comments made by members of the Romanian Parliament with regard to the '(im)politeness' of their own and their fellow members' behaviour. The metacomunicative elements cover mainly the evaluative '(im)politeness' lexicon, while the metadiscursive elements refer to the interactants' comments on desirable behaviour and to the way of expressing expectations according to social norms. The aim of the paper is to construe, in a qualitative research, the institutional and cultural perspective on '(im)politeness' in present-day parliamentary sittings. As a community of practice, the Parliament is an interesting arena for investigating the manner in which '(im)politeness' is framed and commented on.