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Abstract

The present study is on the axis of the history of communication and refers to incidental elements of the history of the concepts. The object of the research is the conception of Tatiana Slama-Cazacu (1920-2011) about the message as an individual linguistic fact. The methodical procedure of research used is meta-analytical and synthesizing. Firstly, Tatiana Slama-Cazacu's significant contributions to the development of Linguistics and Psycholinguistics are revealed; then, there are arguments to prove that she is the founder of communication research, of communication studies in Romania.

It highlights the research she has made about the message, the relationship between meaning, meaning, speech, speech and message. Finally, the joints of her thesis about the message as an individual linguistic fact are brought to light.
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1. Introduction

The most important Romanian contribution to the development of linguistics is Tatiana Slama-Cazacu's book “Language and Context” (1959); this book develops the “Principles of Adaptation in Contexts” previously formulated (Slama-Cazacu, 1956). It has been translated into several languages, including French (Slama-Cazacu, 1961) and cited hundreds of times.

Also, Tatiana Slama-Cazacu has a significant contribution in the world to the consolidation of psycholinguistics as a science and its introduction in Romania. His book “Introduction to Psycholinguistics” (Slama-Cazacu, 1968) was translated into French (Slama-Cazacu, 1972) and English (Slama-Cazacu, 1973) and is quoted by research from all continents; to highlight that it is quoted by one of the greatest contemporary specialists in T. A. Van Dijk (1997).

Thirdly, Tatiana Slama-Cazacu is a pioneer of research in the field of communication sciences in Romania (Slama-Cazacu, 1962; Slama-Cazacu, 1964; Slama-Cazacu & Bejat, 1973).

Four of his ideas on the message are of great relevance to understanding the functioning of communication processes:

a) the idea of using verbal messages in automation (Slama-Cazacu, 1964a; Slama-Cazacu, 1964b);

b) the idea that when multiple codes are used in the communication one can speak of a “mixed syntax” (Slama-Cazacu, 1973; Slama-Cazacu, 1976) and

c) the idea that in the work processes verbal messages acquire traits (Slama-Cazacu, 1963; Slama-Cazcu, 1964c);

d) the idea that the message is an individual linguistic fact (Slama-Cazacu, 1999).

2. Language and message

According to Tatiana Slama-Cazacu, the main function of language is communication. This function is accomplished by the finality of its two aspects, its issuing and reception. The moment of issuance, on the one hand, is not, in the
case of normal language, an unintended act, nor is it a free effort to express, but it has a precise purpose, to transform a psychic content into an objective fact, has a significantly coded value, clear to the other. This objective fact is passed to the interlocutor via the message (with everything that it contains as implicit and explicit elements). Reception, on the other hand, is manifested through an active attitude, not only of interest for what the emitter expresses, but also of an effort of understanding, which attempts to value what was externalized and what was implicit, unexpressed. The two partners have to solve the problem of adapting to each other.

The external medium through which agreement is made between the speaker and the auditor is the use, for the “message building” and for its decoding, of a common instrument, that is, of the language known by both interlocutors. A condition that is not enough, however. First of all, the transmitter and the receiver always operate a selection in the language system (in what they stored from it through the individual linguistic system), reworking at each moment original, original sequences in their entirety. But “a little more”, used in language, “language” becomes a concrete act (as we have seen, individual linguistic facts, messages) that acquires all the nuances or characteristics appropriate to the various circumstances in which it is used and the auxiliary means, non-verbal “(Slama-Cazacu, 1999, p. 103).

In the act of communication, any articulated movement represents (with the exception of emotional expressions or “parasitic”, etc., which can intervene at the same time) a certain intention to signify the transmitter coded by a certain system of signs. The message is not only composed of materialized forms (for example, sounds) that can be directly perceptible to the receiver, or simple articulation movements that the transmitter appears to produce automatically and without intermediate stations. A sequence of sounds does not constitute an “information” message for a transmitter unless it implies a meaning for it, that is, if it can be decoded completely. “The significance, says T. Slama-Cazacu, is not” added “by the receiver, the material forms being transmitted are not only
subsequently significantly complemented by the receiver. The message is thus materially constructed that it carries its meaning with itself, so the receiver also receives productive germs of meaning” (Slama-Cazacu, 1999, p. 104). That is why the process of issuing is much more complex than a simple articulation, and the reception exceeds the mere perception of some stimuli. Even in the process of articulating as such, there is the intention of signification, of conveying a meaning, of giving meaning to expression - an intention of signification with all that involves it.

Reception is a dynamic, active and complex process, it requires a rich, conscious activity, sustained attention, and even an effort - unobserved in general, in this case it has been banalized - to gather all the data necessary for the understanding of an expression. The receiver must be careful of all the information he could collect around him, he must select the message proper (isolated from the surrounding stimuli); he must also use additional clues (offered by voice, gestures, mimics, etc.) (Slama-Cazacu, 1999, pp. 108-109).

Even when it was perceived and "deciphered" a message, orally or in writing, in every element of it, it cannot be said that its total understanding was implicitly made (Frunza, 2018; Frunza & Sandu, 2018). In reception, the meaning is not “impersonal”, strictly denotative. The receiver reports - is obliged to do it - to the subjective, personal nuances, to the connotative meaning. At the moment of reception (as is the case at the time of expression), the meanings of the various perceived forms are now selected by the receiver, by his “personal baggage”, depending on the possible relationships between these meanings in the lexical systems, the receiver relying on an interpretation contextual (which corresponds to the contextual organization made by the emitter).

Reception implies a continuous “creation” by trying to recreate, around a nucleus, the meaning intended by the transmitter: the reception does not consist of passively accepting an “associated” value by virtue of the authority of the dictionary or a fixed ratio due to simultaneous occurrence, repeated and mechanical, sign and object. Understanding, in language activity, is not only to
accept someone's manifestation as a “fact of language”; it true value must be remembered: that is to say, to be properly captured by the organization, the explicit relations and, at the same time, the implicit ones (Ekaterina, 2016; Basic, 2018). A sign is always issued by someone at some point (Medveschi & Frunza, 2018; Chernov & McCombs, 2019). Understanding goes beyond, in order to achieve an optimum, the actual expression, because it relates to the entire personality of the transmitter (Siminica et al., 2017; Sandu et al., 2018). On the other hand, in expression (as in reception), signs are used, organized in an obvious system in the consciousness of each person and characteristic of each individual.

3. System and message

Professor T. Slama-Cazacu does not see this system as coming from the interchange of the “system” with the “norm”, and it seems necessary to introduce a fourth or even fifth notion in the Saussurian systemization (besides the language or language system, speech as passwords, and language), or rather, the dissociation in the concrete realization of the individual linguistic system and individual linguistic fact in “speech” as passwords, a phenomenon of some generality. The individual linguistic system is based on a selection, it is a selective organization of the components of the integral system of the language, having as a basis the common invariant system - with all their virtual possibilities - and is variable only within the limits allowed by the communication needs (which make SLI not to be able to distance itself too much from the common system), but adds the possibility of individual, concrete-concrete variation (in turn disciplined by being part of a system).

The facts of language are concrete achievements (individual linguistic messages or facts) and their psychic substrates. “The language activity, T. Slama-Cazacu explains, involves a technique applied to an interior material - the psychic state - and an external one - the system of signs of the language (in turn internalized)” (Slama-Cazacu, 1999, p. 125). Language activity involves a
technique applied to an inner material - the mental state - and an external one - the sign language system (in turn internalized) (Slama-Cazacu, 1999, p. 117).

3. Conclusion

It can be concluded that the message is a concrete act, a fact of individual language. It is made of material from an inner material (mental condition) and an outer material (the system is sign of the tongue). By asserting that the concrete meaning is the content of the message (which is at the limit of the meaning of meaning), Professor T. Slama-Cazacu tends to take a step forward. The tendency is canceled by claiming that the material of the message is the sign, the tongue. This is a lateral step that places this conception of message in the shadow of Saussure in the sign order, whose thesis is that the message lies at the level of the language, of a sign system.
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