The volume *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use* has been released on the occasion of the 90th birthday of one of the most influential thinkers within the field of pragmatics, Jacob Mey.

An impersonal and detached review would call this volume a collection of essays and papers on pragmatics, but one cannot easily pass over the warm welcome note of the honoree himself (*Ante Festum: An Apologetic Welcome*, pp. vii–viii), put by the editors in the unusual situation of writing the preface of this volume. Nevertheless, with the humbleness, the quick-wittedness and the self-irony of a brilliant mind, the eminent scholar graciously surpasses the difficult task. This volume is not an *official festschrift*, but ‘a birthday present’, the authors take part to a virtual ‘birthday party-in-writing’, ‘a feast’ and the presents they bring are ‘their own products of love’. The honoree is too modest to call himself as such, but considers himself a ‘festee’, an attendee at the feast, and he is grateful to all his colleagues for their support (when all of them, if asked, would probably confess the state of affairs being the other way round).

This short glimpse into the delicacy of a great spirit opens ‘the feast’ – an impressive volume (914 pages) which gathers the remarkable contributions of some of the world-leading pragmicians. The key concept of discussion is that of *pragmeme*, a theoretical concept introduced by Mey in his seminal work from 2001 – *Pragmatics. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

The introductory study, ‘Introducing the Notion of the Pragmeme’ (pp. xv–xxiv) belonging to one of the editors, Alessandro Capone, is a pleading sprinkled with all types of arguments (pedagogical, philosophical, linguistic) and examples (real-life conversations/situations) that the view of language as embedded in a cultural context, and hence the concept of *pragmeme*, briefly and narrowly defined as a speech act embedded in culture, is a necessary, obvious and fruitful research direction. Pragmatics, from this perspective, opens to multidisciplinarity – the studies in this volume prove the connections and the implications of pragmatics into closely or, apparently, far related domains – syntax, semantics, social theory, politics, philosopphy, neurosciences and artificial intelligence. This perspective, equally shared by the editors and the contributors, ensures a unified approach – an integrative holistic pragmatic approach – to what is usually a heterogeneous collective, reverential volume.

The 44 contributions are divided into three sections, I. *Pragmemes: theoretical perspectives*, II. *Pragmemes and Cultural Analysis* and III. *Theories of Language Use*. Most of the contributions in the first part, but in the other parts as well, address theoretical pragmatics or the pragmatics – semantics fine border.

Ivan Kecskes, *Deliberative Creativity and Formulaic Language Use* (pp. 3–21) discusses the theoretical concepts of *deliberate creativity* and *formulaic language* addressing (actually not exactly from the same grounds) the Chomskyan syntactic assumption of the creativity of language. He adopts and argues for the position of the previous researchers that consider the most part of natural language (up to 80%, as proven) being formulaic (or prefabricated) and automatic, rather than creative or freely generated. According to this direction of thought, the formulaic language, also called the *idom principle* is the default processing strategy, while the *open choice principle* is activated in case the first principle fails. *Deliberate creativity* is a discourse level phenomenon and refers to the ability of combining prefabricated units and ad hoc generated items to express communicative intentions. The author pleads for the view of language as an alternation between conventional and new, while creativity itself as a phenomenon grading from more conventional and predictable to less conventional and unpredictable.

Fabrizio Macagno and Alessandro Capone, *Presuppositions as Cancellable Inferences* (pp. 45–69) discuss the complex problem of projection and suspension of presuppositions, a point of
interference between semantics and pragmatics. They discard a previous claim that syntactic and semantic information are essentially the point of departure for pragmatic processing and discuss a more holistic approach that regards semantic and pragmatic information interacting with syntax. The phenomenon of presupposition suspension is considered to be the trigger of a more complex process of meaning explanation at different levels. The concepts of presupposition, presupposition suspension, explicature, (non)-presumptive meaning polyphony are used as arguments to reconstruct the pragmatic structure of a sentence.

The meaning of questions seen mainly as a matter of pragmatics, the contribution of semantics being restricted is argued by Ferenc Kiefer, On the meaning of Questions (pp. 141–149).

Grazia Basile, Towards a Pragmatic-Semantic Continuum. The Process of Naming (pp. 287–305), aims to find the deep, profound connections between semantics and pragmatics considering what happens in the process of acquisition of mother tongue.

Mey, Why We Need the Pragmeme, or: Speech Acting and Its Peripeties (pp. 133–141) is a defense and a motivation for the term pragmeme, seen as a embodied realization of the pragmatic acts, technically coined as allopracts.

Starting from a culturally-embedded debate on the pragmatic dimension of truth, Mey, in Practs and Facts (pp. 239–249), accounts for the term pragmatic act or pract arising from the need to account for the relationship between situation and speech act.

The paper of Anita Fetzer, Pragmemes in Discourse (pp. 249–265), examines the dynamics of discourse from the perspective of discourse pragmatics. The author provides a theoretical argumentation for the pragmatic perspective on discourse and the pragmemes and practs in discourse and discusses the taxonomy of pragmemes according to their referential domain – the micro, meso and macro pragmeme.

Andra Vasilescu, Towards a ‘Theory of Everything’ in Human Communication (pp. 305–335), puts forward a theoretical proposal for a generative pragmatics to account for the whole process of speech acts produced in the mind, voiced by speakers, negotiated between interlocutors. This integrative framework would serve as a foundation for holistic interpretations of language usage.

Historical underpinnings of pragmatic theory are also captured in a few contributions.

Douglas Robinson, Benveniste and the Periperformative Structure of the Pragmeme (pp. 85–105) starts from the work of Benveniste and draws on Bahtin, Heidegger, Austin and Sedgwick to explore the ‘I-you-they’ structure of the pragmeme. The conclusion of this essay argues for the pragmeme as use of language rather than a linguistic structure.

Jacob Mey, in Pragmatic Seen Through the Prism of Society (pp. 105–133), gives a brief history of rise of pragmatics from the early seeds in the Socratic dialogues, to Saussure and Wittgenstein, and further to the pragmatic turn in linguistics, represented by Austin, Grice and Searle. The arguments head to the idea that the context of situation or of language use is the community, namely the society. And, being deeply connected to society, pragmatics should be consciousness- and awareness-raising. Mey’s pleading, based on the discussion of many social contexts is in defense of the emancipatory function of pragmatics.

Etsuko Oishi, Austin’s Speech Acts and Mey’s Pragmemes (pp. 335–351) compares and contrasts Austin’s speech acts theory and Mey’s pragmatic theory. The conclusion underlined by the two theories refers to the actively creation of speech acts not only into the physical, social or cognitive situation, but also into the discourse situation.

A syntax-oriented contribution belongs to Yan Huang, Aspects of Anaphora in Chinese and in Some Germanic, Romance and Slavic languages, the ‘Syntactic’ Versus ‘Pragmatic’ Language Typology, and Neo-Gricean Pragmatics (pp. 21–45). Syntactic issues like anaphora and long-distance reflexivisation, usually addressed by generative studies are discussed by the author, who introduces a new criterion for language typological classification. Based on intra-sentential anaphora tests, Huang distinguishes two classes of languages – syntactic (such as English, French, German) vs. pragmatic (like Chinese, Japanese, Korean). From the perspective of the neo-Gricean pragmatics, the author advances a theory of anaphora and analyses the long-distance reflexivisation in Chinese.
Another contribution that has a starting point in the grammatical system is Anna Wierzbicka’s *Terms of Address in European languages: A Study in Cross-Linguistic Semantics and Pragmatics* (pp. 209–239). The author discusses the terms of address in a few European languages (Italian, French, German) from the less studied aspect of meaning of the forms in various languages in the theoretical framework of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). Wierzbicka takes into account the polite terms in Italian, French and German and proposes semantic and pragmatic meaning components for each of them.

There are also contributors who rely on case studies to argue for the theoretical findings. Keith Allan, *The Pragmeme of Insult and Some Allopracts* (pp. 69–85) examines the complex aspects of the pragmeme of the insult: the contextual parameters, the perception of the insulter, of the victim and even of a side participant, the perlocutionary effect of the language used and compares insult to banter in order to distinguish them.

Narratives as representational speech acts are seen from the perspective of the pragmeme theory by N.R. Norrick, *Narratives in Conversation as Pragmemes* (pp. 149–167). The discussion centres on the co-narrated stories where polyphonic pragmemes are admitted.

Dennis Kurzon, in the paper ‘Tongue-tied’: Pragmemes and Prac ts of Silence in Literary Texts (pp. 265–287), discusses a special case of pragmeme in the context of silence. The author sets up a distinction between intentional and unintentional silence and applies the pragmatic model to three particular instances of silence in John Mortimer’s short play *Dock Brief* and Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*.

The contribution of pragmatics to understanding and structuring the social domain is explored into a few papers. Michael Haugh’s essay *Prompting Social Action as a Higher-Ordered Pragmatic Act* (pp. 167–191) refers to the contribution the pragmatic act theory promoted by Mey has to the understanding of social action, more than the traditional speech act theory.

Norman Fairclough, *Metapragmatics, Hidden Assumptions, and Moral Economy* (pp. 191–209), discusses the metapragmatic issue of hidden assumptions starting from the notion of ‘moral economy’. Metapragmatics is a term coined by Mey, seen in an extensional vs an intensional way. Economic analysis is a good example of a social issue that cannot sidestep discourse. Terms like evaluative statements, presuppositions and assumptions are the tools that help the researcher go into the political and economic discourse that shapes the moral dispositions and norms. The aim of the article is to prove, based on real pieces of discourse, that texts can work ideologically.

Andrea Pizarro Pedraza (pp. 351–375) defines and describes a pragmeme specific to sociolinguistic interviews – the extended polar answer and Alan Reed Libert (pp. 375–393) explores the possibilities and limitations of pragmemes in artificial language.

**Part two** relates pragmemes and cultural analysis. The contributions in this section are mainly case studies and corpora studies of various types of pragmemes identified in different historic / social / cultural media.

Jesús Romero-Trillo and Nancy Avila-Ledesma, in *The Ethnopragmatic Representation of Positive and Negative Emotions in Irish Immigrants’ Letters* (pp. 393–421) explore the conceptualization of positive and negative emotions (happy, glad, unhappy, sad) in Irish immigrants letters in the theoretical framework of Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM).

Leo Francis Paul Hoye, in *Situatedness and the Making of Meaning: Pragmatics, Pragmemes, and Modality. An Essay* (pp. 421–455), reflects on human communication as a way of making and conveying meanings addressing the concepts of situatedness and context, illustrating them in instances of poetry and prose and explaining modality in language as an inherently pragmatic phenomenon, concerned not with facts, but with attitudes. The argumentation leads to the concept of visual pragmatics and the relevance of pragmatic act for visual or multi-modal discourse in the sense that the image or the symbol does not mean by itself, but within a concrete situation.

The relationship between pragmatics and traductology, that is between pragmemes and (mis)translations is analysed by Pedro J. Chamizo-Dominguez, *Pragmatic Strategies When Reading (Problematic) Translated Texts* (pp. 455–477). The purpose of the article is to suggest some pragmatic strategies in order to re-build the original thought of an author within the translation process.
Vittorio Tantucci (pp. 477–493) proves in his article that the Mandarin Chinese written news are based on a recurring pattern that new information tends to occur as an assertive speech act, only subsequently marked as evidential. This standardized pattern is a conventionalized pragmeme that allows the writer to convey reportative evidentiality when a proposition occurs as a bare assertion. The demonstration is an occasion for the author to prove that the domain of evidentiality extends beyond the textual encoding and it is often multimodal.

*Expectations in Interaction* (pp. 493–505) are discussed by V. Escandell-Vidal for their role in behaviour and understanding situation as well as for their status as a link between the individual and the societal sides of interaction.

From a cultural linguistics perspective, Ferzard Sharifian (pp. 505–521) attempts to explore the cultural foundations of pragmemes. The author gives an integrative diagrammatic representation of the relationship between cultural pragmatic schemas, speech acts, pragmemes and practs.

Vahid Parvaresh, *Metapragmatic Pragmemes* (pp. 521–537) bring again into discussion the term *metapragmatics* and seeks to explain how Mey’s theoretical concepts can be applied to the analysis of metapragmatic disclaimers that have not been discussed into this perspective before.

Jock Wong, *The Culture of Language* (pp. 537–567) examines several English realizations of the interrogative-directive pragmeme (please, thank you, hypothetical questions, other related words and scripts) in order to focus on the importance of not separating the study of language from the study of culture.

In a different contribution, *The ‘emes’ of Linguistics* (pp. 567–585) Wong re-examines the core concepts of linguistic terminology (‘phoneme’, ‘morpheme’, ‘pragmeme’) in order to argue for both the analytical and pedagogical importance of ‘pragmeme’.

Luna Bergh, *Tatooing as Memorial Pragmemes* (pp. 585–601), studies a less expected, but as relevant as others, type of pragmeme – the social act of tattooing.

The third part of the volume is dedicated to theories of language use. Interdisciplinarity is at focus in this section.

On the much debated subject of pragmatic – semantic pre-eminence, Nathan Klinedinst, (pp. 601–625) gives a formal account of *Two Types of Semantic Presuppositions* – that can be suspended, or those that behave as entailments.

Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach and Sara Schatz, *Social Cognition and the Pragmatics of Ideology* (pp. 625–643) put forward a theoretical model of ideology based on the interaction of social and cognitive factors and make a cognitive-pragmatic analysis of authoritarianism versus democracy.

András Kertész (pp. 643–679) applies a new metatheoretical model of argumentation on the problem of good versus poor thought experiments and puts forward a different hypothesis from the ones proposed before.

Jan Nuyts, *What a personal Pronoun Can Do for You: The Case of a Southern Dutch Dialect* (pp. 679–703) analyses the grammatical system of subject pronouns in the Antwerp dialect in order to illustrate that the structural and functional sophistication they display is a consequence of their high pragmatic value. The peculiar feature of this dialect is that the grammatical system does not encode distinctions in terms of degrees of politeness, as in other languages (see Wierzbicka’s article, pp. 209–239), but encodes the emotional stance or attitude of the speaker with respect to the hearer or the referential content.

Marit Sternau, Mira Ariel, Rachel Giora and Ofer Fein, *A Graded Strength for Privileged Interactional Interpretations* (pp. 703–725), approach the three pragmatic levels of interpretation: explicature, strong implicature and weak implicatures, proposing a gradation of pragmatic interpretation strength directly related to the Privileged Interactional Interpretation theory.

Eduardo Lombardi Vallauri, *Implicits as Evolved Persuaders* (pp. 725–749) examines the persuasive function of implicits of content and implicits of responsibility based on experimental literature in psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics.

The inferential abilities and pragmatic deficits in subjects with autism spectrum disorder is viewed in a new theoretical perspective by Paola Pennisi (pp. 749–769). Pragmatic deficits of autistic subjects are linked to difficulties in integrating background knowledge in the context if they are not stored in visuo-spatial memory.
Alessandro Capone (pp. 769–791) reflects On the Tension Between Semantics and Pragmatics starting from the assumption that semantics – the stable and context-invariant meanings of the language – is amplified by pragmatics. The author exemplifies this tension with cases of excessive weight on semantics (legal documents) or on pragmatics (Tok Pisin pidgin). He hypothesizes the existence of a cycle of pragmatic extensions (somehow reminding of Jespersen’s cycle), where pragmatics was the primitive stage, then words were coined and, afterwards, pragmatic inferences become semantically, for another cycle to start again.

Pietro Perconti, An Epistemic Commitment in the Very Idea of ‘Speaker’s Intention’ (pp. 791–799) argues on the idea of speaker’s intention also including an epistemic commitment in addition to the real intentions. The epistemic commitment arises from the idea that there is an asymmetry between the speaker and the hearer is made up of two components: the privileged access of the speaker to his intentions and an independent mechanism for introspection which is the cognitive basis of this access.

Claudia Caffi (pp. 799–823) revisits the concept of metapragmatics, aiming to clarify metapragmatics in use and trying to answer questions like what are the objects involved in metapragmatic activities, and what are the prototypical metapragmatic expressions. The answer is provided by an analysis of a parliamentary debate.

Dorota Ziębińska, A Model of Categorization and Compositionality (Sense Determination) in the Light of a Procedural Model of Language (pp. 823–843) questions the traditional Aristotelian model of language that is not able to completely reflect the natural language categorization and compositionality and proposes a more adequate one, a procedural model based on selection and the communicative field.

Caterina Scianna, Reflections on Pragmeme: Towards the Development of Societal Neuropragmatics (pp. 843–861) uses the concept of pragmeme in the light of the improvements in neurolinguistics, where the investigation of the brain elaborating linguistic processes cannot neglect pragmatic phenomena.

Elvira Assenza (pp. 861–901) focuses on functional, psycholinguistic, socio-cultural and sociolinguistic aspects of asymmetric bilingualism and proposes a theoretical model – the Asymmetric Multi-Language Model – integrating these aspects within a cognitive-pragmatic perspective. This theoretical perspective aims to explain code-switching and takes into account both syntactic aspects and cognitive dimensions.

Kerstin Fischer, The Situatedness of Pragmatic Acts: Explaining a Lamp to a Robot (pp. 901–910), explores the domain of artificial intelligence and, based on the interactions with an artificial communication partner (iCub robot), investigates the effects of different degrees of situatedness on pragmatic actions.

The volume we briefly introduced here offers the most recent developments in the theory of pragmatics and puts forward new interdisciplinary advances with the intention of providing an integrative holistic approach, a ‘theory of everything’, as one of the articles proposes.

Andreea Dinică
“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest


The present volume is organized around the concepts of structure, system, and transformations and it brings together a collection of sixty-nine contributions by Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu (of which fifteen were originally written in French and six in English), dating back to the 1959–1980 period, i.e. articles, studies, reports on doctoral dissertations, and interviews devoted to structural and transformational linguistics, poetics, semiotics, pragmatics, and folklore. Some of the works (whose titles are marked by a star in the contexts) that are part of the present book have not
been published before. All the material stands as evidence of the author’s impressive ability to cover and approach a wide range of topics and of her scientific enthusiasm related to various domains dealing with linguistic phenomena.

The contributions follow in chronological order, which makes it easier to link the author’s activity to the general scientific background that has left its mark on her formation and education. The volume also includes a thematic summary in which the studies are grouped according to the area they focus on, i.e. Teorie și metodă [Theory and Method], Fonologie și morfofonologie [Phonology and Morphophonology], Gramatică [Grammar], Semiotică [Semantics], Stilistică și poetică [Stylistics and Poetics], Analiză contrastivă și psiholinguistică [Contrastive and psycholinguistic analysis].

In this descriptive presentation, we will follow the thematic summary and provide an overview of the main topics in order to give an account of the most important directions of research that were gaining ground at the time.

The articles are preceded by an autobiographical presentation in which the author brings to light the entire network of factors and persons which have shaped her interest in linguistics. Starting early on, she has been exposed to the study of more languages (either institutionally or by private lessons), which contributed significantly to her educational formation. Later, as a student of the Faculty of Letters in Bucharest, she took part in a great number of scientific events – seminars, language or folklore circles, colloquia – while her activity was carefully guided and supervised by professor Al. Rosetti. She began her linguistic career as a philologist at the Institute of Folklore of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, followed by the Institute of Phonetics of the same institution.

The first thematic section, Teorie și metodă [Theory and method], covers a large number of articles, reviews, reports on dissertations, and personal notes that are meant to underline the most influential developments and scientific theories that were circulating among international scholars and linguists at the time.

A series of contributions included in this section deal with the importance and novelties brought forth by the development of transformational grammar marked by the publishing of Noam Chomsky’s pioneering work Syntactic structures (1957). The author emphasizes the idea that the conceptual framework put forth by transformational grammar represents a great aid in pursuing automatic translation and also offers a more insightful investigation than the purely structural analysis. In the article Structura de suprafață și structura de adâncime în analiza sintactică [The Surface and the Deep Structure in the Syntactic Analysis] (pp. 180–192; first published in 1967), she emphasizes the importance of the dichotomy surface level – deep level used in the analyses and processing of natural language, which also allows a more accurate understanding of certain phenomena such as ellipsis or mostly oral phenomena such as anacoluthon. Using concepts such as hierarchy, dominance, concatenation, the author illustrates the rules and transformations taking place in the transition from the deep level to the surface level of the sentence and shows that the transformational approach can bring a more accurate interpretation of language phenomena than the traditional one.

The general enthusiasm for the new frameworks and paradigms flourishing in the area of linguistics is captured by Sanda Golopenția-Eretescu in her note on the development of American linguistics between 1969 and 1970 – Lingvistica americană: 1969–1970 [American Linguistics: 1969–1970] (pp. 311–315; originally published in 1970). She recalls the two annual congresses organized by the Linguistics Society of America at the time, as well as her experience as an intern at the Research Center for the Language Sciences (Bloomington, Indiana), where she was exposed to various linguistic theories through conferences, debates, and scientific dialogues.

Several articles tackle the language acquisition phenomenon. The article Gramatica vorbitorului și gramatica lingvistului [The Grammar of the Speaker and the Grammar of the Linguist] (pp. 586–591; initially published in 1971) deals with the relationship between language competence (the innate faculty of language) and language performance (the linguistic modelling of grammar, the theory which accounts for language functioning). The author also talks about the way in which the native grammar shapes and influences the acquisition of a non-native grammar.
In the article *Contrasted grammars* (pp. 394–402), the author explores the phenomenon of language acquisition by non-natives. By drawing a comparison between grammar 1 (the natural grammar of the speaker) and grammar 2 (the artificial grammar elaborated by the linguist), she identifies a so-called “state of tension” caused by processes such as “the modelling of a grammar in terms of another” or “the opposite tendency of keeping the grammars apart as distinct as possible” (p. 400).

The reference to Constantin Brăiloiu’s study on children’s speech rhythm (made up of pairs of bound syllables) – *La rythmique enfantine* – moves attention to the area of pragmatics. In the article *Constantin Brăiloiu et les universaux pragmatiques* [Constantin Brăiloiu and Pragmatic Universals] (pp. 535–540; initially published in 1979), the author formulates two theoretical ideas meant to reposition the opinion advanced by the ethnologist. Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu redefines the phenomenon of children’s speech rhythm as a linguistic game subordinated to the system of the spoken language, as a syllabification illocutionary game, based on the discovery of the syllable as a form of language organization. Its wide coverage can be explained by the universal nature of the syllable and of syllabification.

In the article *Domeniul tipologiei lingvistice* [The Domain of Linguistic Typology] (pp. 612–620; initially published in 1976), the author deals with methodological aspects related to the area of linguistic typology. Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu defends the idea that linguistic typology could be studied from a more accurate perspective by suggesting that human language should be redefined as a collection of individual linguistic systems (e.g. the language of states, the language of transformations, the language of actions, etc.).

The second thematic section is devoted to phonology and morphophonology and the perspective is descriptive and experimental. Alongside the individual or co-authored articles, the section also includes the reviews of two very influential works – Roman Jacobson, *Selected writings. I. Pronological studies* (1965), Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle, *The Sound Pattern of English* (1969) – as well as a short presentation of the International Conference of Phonetics and Phonology which took place in Bucharest in 1965. As the author herself mentions in the introduction, most of the descriptive contributions included in this section were part of larger projects, such as the realization of a dictionary of morphemes of the Romanian language (including all the stems, suffixes, and prefixes). A common feature of the analyses grouped in this section is the quantitative approach, which adds to the descriptive/theoretical perspective and can serve as a reference point for further investigations.

In these articles, the author tackles diverse issues such as: identifying the fundamental pitch-phonemes that Romanian displays and the ways in which these combine, inventorying and differentiating vocalic alternations present in stems and morphemes (suffixes and inflectional endings), or identifying the stems that belong exclusively to a certain “category of words” (such as exclusively noun roots, verbal roots, etc.). In the study *Alteranţe vocalice în gramatica transformaţională* [Vocalic Alternations in Transformational Grammar] (pp. 48–62; first version published in 1962), Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu adopts a more theoretical perspective, giving an overview of the factors triggering vocalic alternations in Romanian or, on the contrary, limiting their manifestations. She formulates several rules accounting for the manifestation of vocalic alternations in certain phonological and / or morphological conditions. Another important contribution deals with the phonological structure of one-syllable words in Romanian – *La structure phonologique des monosyllabes roumains* [The Phonological Structure of Romanian One-Syllable Words] (pp. 165–172; initially published in 1966). For 2384 one-syllable words excerpted from the Dictionary of Modern Language, the author identifies 38 distinct structural types with respect to the phonemic structure. There are other data relevant for the phonological structure of one-syllable words that are mentioned: the ratio of consonant-initial/final words, the possible number of phonemes combining in one syllable, etc.

The following section is made up of articles that touch on several issues examined in the paradigm of transformational grammar, which was gaining ground at the time. This part also hosts an interview with Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu and professor Emanuel Vasiliu on the occasion of publishing the work *Sintaxa transformaţională a limbii române* (1969), shortly after Noam Chomsky’s influential book *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965).
Two contributions – Delimitarea clasei numeralului [Delimiting the Class of the Numeral] (pp. 72–79; initially published in 1965) and Locul numeralului în structura grupului nominal [The Place of the Numeral in the Noun Phrase] make suggestions towards reconsidering the status of the units traditionally considered numerals. The author aims a more accurate delimitation of the inventory of forms that would properly be analyzed as numerals as well as finding valid arguments that would account for separating numerals from other word classes (nouns, adjectives, prouns). She shows that their distribution, forms, or usage are evidence for them to be included in other classes of words: nouns (fractional numerals, e.g. (o) cincime ‘(one) fifth’), adjectives (multiplying numerals, e.g. salariu întreit ‘three times a wage’), adverbs (distributive numerals), or pro-forms (forms such as unul ‘one’, primul ‘the first (one)’, ultimul ‘the last (one)’. She reaches the conclusion that a genuine numeral obligatory presupposes the relationship with a plural antecedent. The second article dealing with the class of numerals establishes their functions in the noun phrase: of heads (when they are linked to a plural antecedent ‘cinci copii au venit, trei lipsesc’) and modifiers (when they modify a noun), as well as their similarities with other classes of words (as heads, numerals resemble pronouns, whereas as modifiers, they resemble reference-modifying adjectives).

Most of the articles included in this thematic part deal with the findings and principles of transformational grammar. In Gramatica transformațională [Transformational Grammar] (pp. 110–111; first published in 1965), the author presents the general framework of transformational grammar, emphasizing its development alongside cybernetics, language theory, and mathematical logic. She also focuses on the differences that exist between traditional and transformational grammar. In the article Transformational Romanian Grammar (pp. 485–525; initially published in 1978 in a collective volume co-edited by the author herself and professor Al. Rosetti), Sanda Golopenția-Eretescu goes into greater detail by specifically pointing at the role that the international background played in Romanian linguistics. She makes a survey of the major Romanian contributions to the theory of transformational syntax, as well as of the most influential descriptions devoted to syntax, focusing on the types of rules and transformations emerging from this theory. The article Règles de structure de la phrase en Roumain actual [Rules of Sentence Structure in Current Romanian] (pp. 200–223; first published in 1968) presents the hierarchy characteristic of the grammatical forms and categories with which transformational grammar operates. Besides these contributions, the section also includes a fine-grained review of Gabriela Dindelegan’s major work Gramatica transformațională a grupului verbal în limba română [The Transformational Grammar of the Romanian Verb Phrase] published in 1974 (pp. 445–459).

The section also includes an article on the spoken language, in which the author investigates a series of folk tales from Oaș, collected in 1953 by a team of researchers working at the Institute of Folklore in Bucharest. She points to a special type of construction (dubbed “indirect speech with a direct intonation”) as part of the oral discourse, which combines the direct and indirect speech – a direct sequence converted into an indirect one, introduced by the complementizer că ‘that’ and keeping the intonation of the original sequence.

The semantics section includes only two articles and two publishing approval reports on the following works: Dumitru Chițoran, Elements of English Structural Semantics (1972) and Stephan Ullman, Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning (1962).

The article Semantica transformațională [Transformational Semantics] (pp. 193–199; first published in 1967) aims at defining the concept of “transformational semantics” as well as presenting the consequences that emerge from considering it a distinct component of transformational grammar. Merging the semantic component with the core syntactic component is shown to have a greater explanatory power which can be applied not only to the sentence, but also to larger linguistic units (texts, novels, etc.).

The article Semantica transformațională a limbii române [The Transformational Semantics of Romanian] is the abstract of the author’s doctoral dissertation, submitted in 1969 under the direction of professor Ion Coteanu. The general framework presented in the previous article is here resumed and applied to Romanian. The author makes an in-depth presentation of the method, formal
The fifth section covers several contributions that switch attention to stylistics and poetics. The author is mainly interested in the structure of the artistic (lyric) message. Her perspective further explains the linguistically-oriented approach.

In *Statistica and stilurile limbii* [Stylistics and Language Styles] (pp. 35–42; initially published in 1960), the author emphasizes the importance statistics has in the investigation of language styles. Parameters such as “word concentration” as well as the “richness of vocabulary” (the tendency of obtaining a wider variety of expressions) can be determined by using statistical formulas.

The article *Poetica matematică* [Mathematical Poetics] (pp. 246–249; initially published in 1969) is a short presentation of the relationship between poetics and mathematics, and the investigation tools emerging from the mathematics–poetics interface (i.e., mathematics modelling, transformational modelling, and the semiotic perspective). Using such devices in the analyses performed on (poetic) language will result in a more precise and refined observation of artistic message construction.

Several articles examine the construction of poetical/prose compositions from a mathematically-oriented perspective: *Reluarea motivului în poezia lui G. Bacovia* [Underlining Motives in G. Bacovia’s Poems] (pp. 112–164; initially published in 1967) is a statistical lexical analysis of the recurring motives in G. Bacovia’s symbolist poetry. The other two articles – *Limba și stilul lui Dimitrie Anghel* [The Language and Style of Dimitrie Anghel’s Literary Work] (pp. 224–236; first published in 1969, co-authored by Mihaela Mancș) and *Limba și stilul poezilor lui Şt. O. Iosif* [The Language and Style of Şt. O. Iosif’s Poems] – analyse the phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and vocabulary characteristics that pertain to Dimitrie Anghel’s both poetry and prose and to Şt. O. Iosif’s lyrical works.

The last section brings together several reports on doctoral dissertations devoted to various topics, such as the study of aphasic speech or the problems encountered by Romanian speakers in the process of acquisition of the morpho-syntax of French personal pronouns.

This section also hosts an article of contrastive analysis, originally published in 1978 – the investigation of intonation in English and Romanian – as well as a dialogue between the author and the interviewer I. Florian on the Contrastive Analysis Conference held at the University of Timişoara in 1973. The latter is important for disseminating the idea that contrastive linguistics is both useful and necessary in teaching foreign languages as it predicts the so-called “difficult areas” that non-native speakers of a certain language may come across in their study and it involves a more thorough understanding of the human semiotic strategies.

In conclusion, the studies included in this volume are essential for linguists interested in the development of theoretical linguistics in the last fifty years. The perspective of the linguist who experienced both the local exposure and the international ones serves to better determine the progress Romanian linguistics has made over the last half-century in terms of integrating internationally influential works and scientific paradigms.

Irina Nicula Paraschiv

“Iorgu Iordan” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest
University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters


The volume *Actiune, interacţiune, identitate. Studii de pragmatică lingvistică* [Action, interaction, identity. Studies in linguistic pragmatics], ‘a volume of continuity’ as the author herself describes it, comprises 50 valuable articles written both before and after 1989. The majority of them are recent articles that were previously published as contributions to different issues of linguistics.
journals or volumes of studies. The texts address both the specialists and the larger public due to the topics they approach. 22 articles are written in Romanian, 21 in French and 7 in English.

The volume is divided into six sections and each of them can be seen as a micro-volume in itself. The first section, Pragmatică, analiză contrastivă, etnolingvistică, geolinguistică [Pragmatics, contrastive analysis, ethnolinguistics, geolinguistics], contains 7 articles, all of them written in French. While some of them are texts of a general perspective (La pragmatique contrastive, « Les paysans n’ont pas de mots abstraits », Pour une typologie des informateurs), the others are more applied (De l’ethnobotanique à la pragmatique. À propos des noms de plantes dans l’ALIFO, Les noms de plantes en roumain – vers une typologie pragmatique, Dialectologie et pragmatique (à partir d’un atlas linguistique roumain), Lire les atlas: le lexique de l’action dans trois atlas du domaine d’oil). The articles in this section, whether they are theoretical studies or case studies, depict the relationship between linguistic pragmatics, contrastive analysis, geolinguistics and ethnolinguistics.

The second section, Acte de vorbire [Speech acts], is one of the most extensive in the book (15 articles and over 150 pages) and an extremely interesting one because it not only analyses speech acts as performed in rural or regional communities, but it also discusses concepts like sublanguage or language games further applied to traditional customs like christening and magical practices like love incantations.

The first article in this section, Observaţii asupra câmpului semantic al actelor de vorbire în lexicul românesc moştenit din latină [Remarks on the semantic field of speech acts in the Romanian vocabulary inherited from Latin] (pp. 149–159), analyzes a series of terms of Latin origin, naming the human being and the human body, excerpted from the chapter Lexicul [Vocabulary] in Marius Sala’s book De la latină la română [From Latin to Romanian]. What we find extremely innovative is the way the author regroups the terms from the point of view of the speech acts. Thus, she distinguishes between terms belonging to the vocabulary associated with locutionary and illocutionary acts, choosing not to analyze the terms associated with perlocutionary acts. The author enlarges the analysis by adding a series of terms of Latin origin that allow the extension of the suggested categories.

The text Acte de vorbire într-o comunitate rurală tradiţională [Speech acts in a rural traditional community] (pp. 160–166) dates from the period 1972–1975, but has not been published until the present volume. Again, the author focuses only on locutionary and illocutionary acts, in an attempt of adapting Austin’s theory of speech acts to the description of the ‘linguistic life’ from the Breb village. Sanda Golopenţia discusses some problems researchers might focus on when studying the locutionary acts. She notices that in this village people have the tendency of “talking in a nice manner”, which includes not only using a large number of diminutives, but also addressing the interlocutor in a polite manner. When referring to the illocutionary acts, the author highlights the fact that many illocutionary acts (i.e. a da o poruncă ‘to give a command’, a pune o întrebare ‘to ask a question’, a insulta ‘to insult’, a refuza ‘to refuse’, a eluda ‘to elude, to avoid’) have special forms in Breb: Du-te una fugă! „Du-te fuga!”, Că de iute meri? „Când pleci?” etc.

The material collected in Breb in the period 1970–1980 has also been valued in the article Acte de vorbire într-un sat maramureşean sau despre variaţia pragmatică [Speech acts in a Maramureş village or about pragmatic variation] (pp. 167–182). The village can be considered a representative for the diminutiveness phenomenon, which the author considers ‘extensive’, noticing at the same time the presence of ‘pragmatical agreement’ (bringing the text to the same diminutive level). Thus, there are diminutive suffixes attached to nouns and adjectives in cases where it is expected (lopecioră, olurele, ptititelucă, cumincioră), to nouns used in contexts of rejection where diminutives are not expected (batâ-vă focuţu, zălucă rele) and to adverbs, pronouns, prepositions, forms of past participle or verbal roots (amuietucă, dumnătăluică, deasupruţa, adăpătucă, rămănuţi). Sanda Golopenţia also analyses in this article the phenomenon of ‘ludic reference’ that she encountered in one of the subjects who used to invent different stories that could have been easily believed by the interlocutor. Two speech acts encountered in Breb: minjătitul (contesting the truth of
what the interlocutor says) and *tudumânitul* (asking for help which nobody can refuse) are also described in detail.

The article *Reflecţii asupra actelor de vorbire în franceza regională* [Reflections on speech acts in regional French] (pp. 183–191) uses a totally different type of corpus, *Dictionnaire des régionalismes de France* edited by Pierre Rézeau. In this article the author emphasizes the role of the dictionary as a main instrument that provides speech acts from regional communities in France (some of them are not known by the native speakers of French).

In the article *Actes de langage et théorie de l’action* (pp. 192–201) the author starts from the action theory and distinguishes, on the one hand, between notions such as act, activity and action and on the other hand, inside the notion of action, between base act and reaction act. There is also another important distinction between independent base acts, acts and activities and interactional base acts, acts and activities. Including other parameters such as Agent, Anti-Agent and Spectator (or Speaker, Listener and Hearer for the locutionary speech acts and Initiator, Interlocutor and Witness for the illocutionary speech acts), Austin’s classification of speech acts is refined to 16 different action types.

Speech acts are also related to sublanguages and language games in the article *Are sublanguages language games?* (pp. 202–206). Since sublanguages are specialized texts belonging to certain domains (no matter whether they are ‘double-cut’ or ‘single-cut’) and language games are primitive forms of language, the only resemblance between them is that they represent incomplete, simpler forms of language. The author provides a complete image of the book *Sublanguage: Studies of Language in Restricted Semantic Domains*, edited and published in 1982 by Richard Kittredge and John Lehrberger. She mentions the fact that sublanguage hadn’t been properly analyzed from the pragmatic dimension, especially since the speech act theories, which had only been referred to two times, could have offered an enlarged and useful perspective.

The next article in this section, *Buzele cele mute vorbesc pe tăcute* [Mute lips talk silently] (pp. 207–215), involves notions like making a language explicit and transmitting one. Taking into account the fact that one can make explicit a natural, quasi-natural or artificial language, there are some restrictions that still function: while making explicit a (quasi)-natural language is optional, it becomes compulsory for an artificial one (i.e. the mathematical language); the act of making a language explicit can only be achieved by means of metalanguage; the agent of such an act must be a specialist; the act of making a language explicit is an authority act; the initiative of making a language explicit belongs exclusively to the beneficiary. When it comes to transmitting, any language is transmitted while being in use. While transmitting a quasi-natural language is optional, transmitting a natural language is compulsory and artificial languages are not transmitted. We do not use any metalanguage when transmitting information and the act of transmitting is a symmetrical, bilateral and non-authoritative one. The author also presents a situation of ambiguity between making explicit and transmitting in the case of some Romanian proverbs.

The same linguistic material from Breb is analysed again from a slightly different perspective in the article *Les actes locutoires en tant qu’entités ethnolinguistiques* (pp. 216–229). This time, the author does not only appeal to the theory of speech acts, but also to semiotics, praxeology and ethnolinguistic observation. She refines Austin’s theory of speech acts, in terms of interpreting the locutionary component on two levels: praxeological and semiotic.

The article *Verbs for locutionary acts in Romanian* (pp. 230–253) is a semantic analysis dedicated to Romanian verbs that refer to locutionary speech acts. Sanda Golopenţia uses and distinguishes between notions like: sublanguage of communication, sublanguage of verbal communication, sublanguage of nonverbal communication, sublanguage of action, and sublanguage of nonverbal action. The central point of the analysis is the discussion of locutionary acts as part of a locutionary grammar. Using the corpus of *DLRM* (*Dicţionarul limbii române moderne* [Dictionary of Modern Romanian Language]), she establishes five different sets of verbs: animal noising, nonverbal human noising, phonic acts, phatic acts and rhetic acts, refining the analysis to a further more complex semantic categorization.

*Despre referirea opacă la practici magice în limba română* [On opaque reference to magical practices in Romanian] (pp. 254–271) is a text which develops a semantic analysis of various terms in
the series that refers to magical practices. In order to examine the examples of opaque reference in such terms, several dictionaries like Dicţionarul Academiei (DA, DLR) [The Academic Dictionary], Micul dicţionar academic (MDA) [The Small Academic Dictionary] and Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române (CDER) [The Etymological Dictionary of Romanian] were rigorously inspected. Furthermore, the author added information from other sources and examples from ethnology (the study of disenchantment). The research focused on verbs and their derived forms that refer to cases in which there is a contact of substances, objects or people with the ‘magical’ victim.

In the text On defining (pp. 272–280) Sanda Golopenţia discusses the act of giving a definition, analysing the entire pragmatic context, which involves a requester (R), a definer (D), a request for definition (r) and the definition itself (d). To this context, she applies 10 different constraints that are described in detail. The text was published in Revue roumaine de linguistique in 1971 and is extremely interesting because it anticipates Grice’s cooperative principle that was formulated later on in 1975.

Some felicity conditions are formulated in the text Christening speech acts (pp. 281–283). The author generally refers to the act of christening by means of which an Agent (A), not necessarily a priest or an official, ‘inserts in the discourse’ a designator (X) for an Object (O). There are two propositional content conditions (The christening speech act implies the act of uttering X; X is a rigid designator with two preparatory conditions, both compulsory; A and O are people; A is distinct from O); one essential condition (X christens O if X enters the subsequent discourse); and one sincerity condition (X christens O sincerely if A knows that O was not rigidly designated through X before).

The article Les présentations (pp. 284–300) has as a starting point the theories of Austin and Apostel. After presenting the theories in detail using formulae to illustrate them, the author focuses on the illocutionary force of the speech acts that introduce one person to another by means of a third participant. The analysis is enlarged to other presenting speech acts (i.e. insulting, giving somebody a title, awarding a decoration, dismissing somebody, etc.). Sanda Golopenţia reaches the conclusion that locutionary acts are observational acts or interactions, while the illocutionary acts are theoretical acts. At the same time, the illocutionary forces are interpretative rules and define the role of the protagonist.

In the text La lettre de Marie (pp. 301–314) the author analyses from a pragmatic point of view a letter found in the village of Breb in 1971. The letter was written by Maria Vişovan to her sister Ana in 1950, who left the village for a short period of time in order to go to work in Banat, in the south-west of the country. Since the theory of speech acts is the central point of the analysis, Sanda Golopenţia-Eretescu noticed that Maria built her epistolary message around three types of speech acts: the declaration, the information or indication and the request.

The last article in this section, Un text operatoriu: descântecul de dragoste [An operational text: the incantation of love] (pp. 315–321), refers to the magical incantation of love from the point of view of the operational text, that is a latent text that can be transposed in a unified sequence of verbal and nonverbal acts. The scenario of the incantation that is introduced to the reader was collected in July 1931 in Cornova, Basarabia. The formula of this incantation is one of the least complex: T1 (technique) – F1 (formula) – T2 (technique), that is a woman goes to the forest to pick up some weeds, utters a magic incantation and then she boils the weeds, has a bath in that water and places some objects under her pillow. In the case of this incantation, the person who performs both techniques and the person who utters the speech act of incantation are the same.

The third section of the book, Conversaţia şi mulţimii ei [Conversation and its multiples], is the largest (10 articles and 185 pages). It is a section that combines three articles written before 1980: Morfologia conversaţiei [The morphology of conversation], Conversaţia – un studiu de caz [Conversation – a case study] (a study that hasn’t been finished) and L’histoire conversationelle (I), with more recent articles: L’histoire conversationelle (I) (a draft text that hadn’t been published), Notaţia conversaţională ca revelator pragmatic [Conversational transcript as a pragmatic revealer], Towards a contrastive analysis of conversational strategy, Trois types de séries conversationnelles, Istoria conversaţională – un concept pragmatic [Conversational history – a pragmatic concept],
La politesse et la durée parlée and La parole intérieure et la durée parlée. The shift is from a more empirical conversation analysis largely influenced by the field research the author had been doing at that time, towards a more theoretical approach of the chains of conversations from real life.

The next two sections, Ipostaze pragmatice ale limbii române [Pragmatic hypostases of Romanian] and Limbă şi identitate, limbi invizibile [Language and identity, invisible languages] address, on the whole, a larger public because they approach less specialized topics of larger interest. All the texts in these sections are more recent texts. The fourth section starts with a large study, Româna globală [Global Romanian], a text that identifies and discusses in detail the problems that the Romanian language spoken in Romania and in Romanian communities all over the world faces in the beginning of the 21st century. The texts Pătimirea numelor [The sufferings of names], Limba minţii noastre [The language of our minds], Intotocerea vorbitorilor risipitori [The return of the prodigal speakers], Vorbitorii trec, limbă rămâne [Speakers pass, language endures] are essays that depict current problems of the Romanian language, but they are written from a linguist’s point of view. This section ends with reactions to some texts about the Romanian language written by Solomon Marcus.

The fifth section approaches two main topics: a variant of French spoken in Canada and in The United States of America (the articles Francophonie et identité franco en Nouvelle-Angleterre, Alteritatea asumată: franco-americanii din Noua Anglie [Assumed otherness: the French-Americans from the New England], Francophonie şi politică lingvistică în Québec [Francophony and linguistic politics in Québec], Prênom en vigueur parmi les franco-américains de Woonsocket) and the invisibility of the Romanian language and other Romance languages in the universities from The United States (Teaching Romance languages in the US: the invisible part). The text Le plurilinguisme est à vivre par le biais d’initiatives concrètes published in Observatoire Européen du Plurilinguisme suggests a possible solution for the visibility of some lesser used languages in the European Union: one of these languages should be studied as a foreign language together with one of the languages widely spoken in Europe, like English, French, German, Italian or Spanish. The section ends with a comment to a short text written by Acad. Solomon Marcus.

The final section contains two biographical syntheses: Émile Benveniste (for Encyclopedia of Modern French Thought) and Heyman Tiktin and two reviews: Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language (John Searle) and Cercetări asupra graiurilor româneşti de peste hotare [Research on Romanian subdialects from abroad] (Maria Marin, Iulia Mărgărit, Victorela Neagoe, Vasile Pavel).

The book is an extremely useful tool not only for linguists who are interested in pragmatics, dialectology, socio-linguistics, geo-linguistics or ethnolinguistics, but also for a larger public that includes students, other researchers of humanities and even politicians.

Carmen-Ioana Radu
“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest


Historical pragmatics, an innovative and active field of linguistics which deals with language use in past contexts and examines how meaning is made, has developed considerably over the last two decades. This can be explained in part by the resurgence of interest in the diachronic component of typological diversity and universals, as well as the adoption of a functionalist perspective in
accounting for linguistic changes. It is an empirical branch of linguistics, which focuses on authentic language use in the past (Taavitsainen and Fitzmaurice 2007: 13). *Historical pragmatics* comprises seven sub-areas: the pragmatic turn, the socio-cultural turn, the dispersive turn, the empirical turn, the digital turn, the discursive turn and the diachronic turn (Taavitsainen and Jucker 2015: 2).

In this respect, Mihaela Constantinescu’s book (very ambitiously) entitled *The Romanian Principalities between East and West: dynamics of the cultural models of politeness and impoliteness in the nineteenth century*, is the first comprehensive work of the literature that deals with the theme of *historical pragmatics* from an intercultural perspective, applied to Romanian language of the nineteenth century.

The work falls within the paradigm of *functional linguistics*, embracing the *historical sociopragmatics* perspective. The theme belongs to the field of linguistic *(im)politeness* and the analysis model is that of *function-form* type.

“The general purpose of the research is to find out how transformations in nineteenth century socio-cultural context have influenced communicative processes and social interaction, modifying the dynamics of (im)politeness strategies.” The author tries to emphasize “the way in which ‘the other’ is referred to (under the influence of Western models) in the nineteenth century: from the point of view of social norms and rights – the inferior, superior or equal socio-hierarchic position of a participant, that of representative of a certain social class or holder of an official capacity, as well as an individual with certain personal values – in accordance with the mentality of a changing society” (p. 9). Beyond strictly linguistic goals, the work also aims at drawing conclusions with *cultural, anthropological and sociological implications*.

Regarding the *methodology*, the study envisages the *function-form* mapping (in this case observations of the evolution of politeness), identifying various realizations of social practice. Specifically, the author focuses on the way in which the lexicon, the expression and conception of (im)politeness are instantiated in the nineteenth century and further develops comparisons among the 17th century, the beginning of the 18th century and the current period.

As the title suggests, the book examines the dynamics of the language in action (see the *functional perspective* of the work). The research aims to highlight (on the selected material) the variations in the cultural models that influenced Romanian culture – the Byzantine, the Ottoman, the Fanariot, and the Western European model (predominantly the French one), the Romanian context being a very special one.

The analysis is based on a *corpus of literary texts* (taken from the available critical editions and from anthologies) belonging to both the 1848 writers and those of other periods who register the pragmalinguistic stage of the late 19th century. The Corpus includes authentic correspondence, quantitatively reduced compared to fictional or memorial texts. Among the investigated works, which reflect the most direct way of communication in the epoch, priority was given to “works permeable to primary orality” (p. 32).

The research involves (according to the project which it closely follows) two main objectives (corresponding to the two parts in which the text is structured): the first part presents the basic theoretical problems related to (im)politeness in the frame of historical pragmatics; the second part, which is made up of four chapters, is particularly dedicated to the examination of the linguistic theories about (im)politeness and the selection of those which can provide an adequate analytical model, as well as to gathering a representative corpus of data whose analysis could validate the theoretical premises and hypotheses. The book also comprises an introductory chapter, an *Argument*, and symmetrically, the final chapter of *Conclusions*, followed by *Corpus, Bibliography*, and an *Abstract in English*.

The first part of the paper (*Chapter I, Theoretical and methodological aspects*) inventories some theoretical and methodological elements used in the analysis. The section opens with establishing the place of historical pragmatics in linguistics, referring to the data with which it works and the recurrent analysis methods. Then follows a presentation of recent theories in the field of (im)politeness (especially discursive approaches) and of the parameters relevant for the analysis in
progress (the relation between self-identity, emotions, evaluation, intentionality, morality, power). The chapter also includes a brief presentation of the socio-historical context and of the corpus. The configuration of the proposed frame of analysis ends this part of the book.

The second part, subdivided into four chapters, deals with the following aspects: Chapter II, Metacommunication aspects of (im)politeness, presents, diachronically, the lexicon assigned to (im)politeness in the Romanian language (and its discursive actualizations) and the relevant aspects from a meta-communicative point of view, having as reference the equivalent situation in- and outside European culture; Chapter III, Expressive politeness: speech acts, refers to expressive speech acts conventionally associated with the sphere of politeness (thanks, excuses, prayers, wishes, congratulations, compliments, greetings) and impoliteness (imprecations, threats, insults). The best-represented speech act in the investigated corpus is the compliment, but the identified situations are not confined to the sphere of politeness, the ironic compliments revealing, in some cases, indirect impoliteness (off record); Chapter IV, Expressive politeness: allocutive and delocutive formulas, describes some allocutive forms (of direct address) and delocutive forms (of referring) connected with the social status, family sphere and interpersonal relationships in rural and urban contexts, highlighting some changes that occurred between the 17th and 19th centuries, especially for the aristocratic and the middle class; Chapter V, Metacognitive aspects, structured in two sections, comprises, on the one hand, the comments and expectations related to behaviour that is adequate to the norms of social interaction, and on the other hand, it concerns conventional metaphorical conceptions of politeness and impoliteness; the Conclusions chapter summarizes the results of the research – pp. 225–254).

The analysis focuses on variations of the cultural models in the Romanian space. Polite behaviour in 19th century is influenced by a set of cultural models: the French model follows the Greek model in Eastern Europe. The examples indicate that the Principality's elite is favourable to foreign, adaptive and empathic cultural patterns, often considering the foreign model superior to the old tradition. The author speaks of a phenomenon of ‘cultural globalization’ during the nineteenth century (after 1821). The Romanian active elite orients itself towards Western values, succeeding to involve the entire society in changing the reference cultural model. The verbal behaviour enhancing or constructing self-image (for ego, alter or alius) depends on the tension between the old and the new forms of social practice. Within the feudal court formal interactions and ritual behaviours were doubled by a stereotype of lexical means of evaluation.

Mid-nineteenth century politeness lexicon suggests a continuum of appropriate and positively marked behaviour, but instantiated in different ways (depending on the type of interpersonal relation and situation), while the lexical sphere of impoliteness appears more constant in time. As linguistic behaviour, politeness reveals a parallel use of already existing resources with those belonging to the foreign model. The analysis focused only on stereotyped situations and on metacommunicative labels of the illocutionary and perlocutionary components. “When relational management is positively evaluated, speech acts are directly performed (indirect speech acts tend to be influenced, as means of realisation, by the new reference model)” (p.253).

The author identified several tendencies in performing expressive speech acts: for example, in the case of thanking, the realization involves a focus on the speaker (marked by the performative verb) and the appearance, under foreign model, of the interjection as an illocutionary force indicator; the hearer-based form (the hearer being attributed a quality) is abandoned. The direct contact with foreigners, the interactional urban diversity, the accentuated dynamics of the elite and middle-class versus rural conservatism, as well as the closed space explain the differences in addressing or referring formulae: in rural settings, these formulae are more stable, similar to the present-day ones, while in the world of the elite they are more diverse.

As regards metacognitive aspects, the corpus reveals some conventional conceptual metaphors similar to those circulating in other romance languages (at least). The recurrent way of conceptualizing politeness/civilization in the European space is to be found also in the Romanian world, as politeness is an aesthetic ideal in the Principalities as well. Conventional conceptual
metaphors reveal not only similar cognitive representations, but also the ideology of the dominant social groups, dynamic and influential at large in the European space. In the process of Westernisation there is a simplification of nonverbal behaviours and a diversification and increased complexity of verbal behaviours (the pronominal system, address forms), in order to compensate the diminished role of exterior ritual manifestations.

Considering the results of the analysis on Court interaction, it could be hypothesised that Romanian feudal politeness was discernment politeness. It is credible that mid nineteenth century illustrates a transition: sensitivity to social status (hierarchic deference), intimacy affectively marked among close friends or acquaintances, restraint and formality in relation to superiors or unknown participants.

Remarks: The title (very general) and the subtitle of the book do not refer to the actual subject of the research: linguistic (im)politeness. It would have been useful, both in the title and in the actual text of the study, which the title represents, to show that the sociopragmatic patterns of (im)politeness, as well as their linguistic indices, develop divergently in the Romanian Principalities (even up to the current period, despite the achievement of the Great Union). This fact affects some of the final results of the study.

On the documentation and on the corpus set, we mention the following:
– the text is extremely rich in information: theoretical information (see the thematically varied and very modern bibliography), empirical information (see the well-chosen exemplary material, appropriate to the rigorous behavioural patterns established for describing the verbal (im)politeness of the chosen time frame), comparative information, all make the book a reference contribution for understanding the relations between Eastern Romance and the Balkan languages;
– the results of the analysis would have gained by using a larger number of works in the Romanian literature of the field (especially of applied studies, quite numerous);
– taking into account the differences between the linguistic stereotypes specific to the different types of texts (prose / dramaturgy / memoirs and especially correspondence) is a “must” in the approach of the material, and it may lead to different conclusions after analysing the data.

On the descriptive plan of the linguistic indices, specific to the investigated categories of (im)politeness, the study allowed, on the one hand, the examination of the weight of the various sociopragmatic patterns in a synchronic cut (see the 19th century) and, on the other hand, the establishment of the stage reached by the competition of the various investigated forms. The refined analysis undertaken by the author would have gained relevance by eliminating the numerous heterogeneous references (and their use in the chapter of References), interposed with comments which fragment the text and make it difficult to read. At the same time, in the applicable area, the work would have gained by making a clearer distinction between the archaic forms in the process of disappearance, the prototypical forms for the investigated century, and the functional forms in present-day Romanian (literary or dialectal); we refer, especially to the forms of address, but not only.

On the comparative plan of the investigated phenomena, we consider that the aspects related to the “orientalism” of the polite linguistic behaviour are too little emphasized, compared to those belonging to the Western influence. Despite the unprecedented expansion of the latter, the “Balkan” patterns continue to have a distinctive role in this European area (especially in the “Old Kingdom” and less in Transylvania).

The research carried out by Mihaela Constantinescu is a valuable contribution, not only for the field of historical pragmatics but also for the field of cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics. A special quality of the study is the widely spread position, specific to the postmodern research, according to which the analysed formations are lexicalized diachronic achievements of a semantic continuum: “Linguistic reality is seen as a continuum, the diversification of the lexicon of politeness leads to the shaping of different ‘zones’ within a continuum of appropriate behaviour: from the expected appropriate behaviour to an appropriate behaviour, but marked in different ways, depending on the type of interpersonal relation and situation” (p. 65).

The above mentioned remarks do not diminish the author’s merits, since Mihaela Constantinescu’s book is a serious, high-quality study, which all the researchers interested in comparative linguistics can rely on.
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Her research experience includes projects at the Romanian Academy (*Micul dictionar academic* [The Short Academic Dictionary], 2002-2003; *Dicționarul limbii române* [The Dictionary of the Romanian Language], 2004-2005; *Tratatul de istoria limbii române* [The Handbook of Romanian Language History], 2004-2005, 2007 –2012; *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române* [The Etymological Dictionary of the Romanian Language], 2013-present) and the University of Bucharest (*Funcționare discursivă și gramaticalizare în limba română veche* [Discursive Function and Grammaticalization in Old Romanian Language], 2007-2008). She has published more than 40 scientific articles and book reviews in academic journals or collective volumes. Her PhD thesis (2011), entitled *Constituirea vocabularului afectivității în limba română* [The Evolution of Affectivity Vocabulary in Romanian Language] and published with the title *Afect și afectivitate. Conceptualizare și lexicalizare în română veche* [Affect and Affectivity. Conceptualization and Lexicalization in Old Romanian Language] (2012) was awarded the Prize of the Romanian Academy in 2014.

*Models of Affectivity in the Early Modern Romanian Culture (1780–1840)* represents the postdoctoral research of the author, and it can be read on the Romanian Academy’s website. Based on her PhD thesis, Gabriela Stoica continues to research the dynamics of the conceptualization of affectivity in Romanian, focusing on the Early Modern Romanian period (from the late 18th to early 19th centuries).

Starting from the premise that emotions should be considered a fundamental cultural marker which best reflects a cultural setting, the main objectives of this book are (1) the analysis of the conceptualization and lexicalization of emotions during the Old and the Early Modern Period, and (2) the identification of a cognitive model for emotions characteristic for the Romanian epoch of transition to modernity (p. 7).

The book consists of an Introduction and four chapters: Affectivity – cultural-historical and linguistic perspectives, Affectivity – conceptualization and lexicalization in the Early Modern
Romanian period, /Happiness/ – conceptualization and lexicalization in the Early Modern Romanian period, Final remarks.

In the first chapter, Affectivity – cultural-historical and linguistic perspectives (pp. 10–29), Gabriela Stoica describes the methodological background of her investigation and the main paradigms of research on affectivity. Taking an interdisciplinary approach to emotions, the author combines modern methods of linguistic analysis (cognitive and lexical semantics) with recent research on the anthropology of emotions. She takes cultural-anthropological, linguistic (lexical-semantic), and historical-anthropological perspectives into account. She also defines some key-concepts used in the book, like cultural model or the cultural model of affectivity.

The second chapter, Affectivity – conceptualization and lexicalization in the Early Modern Romanian period (pp. 30–122), presents some general characteristics of the cultural context of the Romanian premodern era of transition (Aspects of the cultural context) and of the lexicon of the Romanian literary language (The vocabulary of the Early Modern Romanian. Between tradition and modernity). Another matter Gabriela Stoica brings into discussion is the representative lexicon of affectivity in that epoch (The vocabulary of affectivity in the Early Modern Romanian), insisting on novelty and specificity elements, like calques, loan translations, lexical borrowings (and their glossing) with affective meaning, words with particular or generic affective meaning (pp. 53–102).

The third chapter, /Happiness/ – conceptualization and lexicalization in the Early Modern Romanian period (pp. 123–138), deals with the contextual-semantic analysis of the dynamics of the conceptualization and lexicalization of one of the prototypical dominant affects of the period, happiness. It is described as a hypercognitive affect, with various lexicalizations: fericire, fericit; norocire, norocit; mulțumire, mulțumat. Gabriela Stoica draws an essential comparison, /Happiness/ in the Old Romanian period (pp. 125–126) and /Happiness/ in the Early Modern Romanian period (pp. 126–127), allowing her to identify two basic dimensions of happiness in Early Modern Romanian: as an individual affect (pp. 127–132) and as a social-collective affect (pp. 132–137). According to the first conceptual-semantic dimension, happiness is conceptualized as a self-oriented, subjective-interiorized and maximally intensive feeling. The second dimension represents, indeed, a conceptual innovation. Happiness is conceived as a value, as a moral goal or as well-being, in the largest context of the cultural contacts with the European Enlightenment (p. 138).

In the last chapter, Final remarks (pp. 139–150), the author highlights the new cognitive model for emotions, described as a result of two overlapping major cultural models: (1) the old one, pre-existent, South-East European affective cultural model and (2) the new one, modern, which is a consequence of the West-European influence of the Enlightenment.

As Gabriela Stoica pointed out that “emotions are forms of cultural life” (p. 139), we strongly consider her book be seen as a major starting point for every researcher who studies the synchrony and the diachrony of the lexico-semantic field of affectivity, the vocabulary of affectivity across world languages, cultural anthropology, cultural history, history of mentalities or intercultural communication.
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