

CONTEXTUALIZATION VS RECONTEXTUALIZATION. THE IMPLICIT MESSAGE OF COMMUNICATION

Mina-Maria RUSU¹

¹Associate Professor, PhD, Apollonia University of Iași
Corresponding author: minarusu@gmail.com

Abstract

Interception of a message assumes re-creation of its meaning from the perspective of receiver's conscience. That is way, any transmitter should be aware that not all he wanted to communicate has been received as such, so that he should organize his discourse within a dialogue-type context, in which change of roles is essential in configurating the space of communication. As a matter of fact, any dialogue is a modality of practising the exchange of ideas between transmitter/transmitters and receiver/receivers, a reality favorising modification of their initial conception, either by modelling the initial one, or even by its abandonment and consideration of another, new one, taken over from the other persons participating to the dialogue. Sometimes, the transmitter feels a sort of aggression from the part of the receiver/receivers in relation with the ideas he intended to transmit, when the latter one/s "understands" something different from the intended communication. Such a perception upon the co-participation to the realization of the meaning brings into discussion the implicit message of communication and the manifestation of a recontextualization process, which activates the theme – rheme relation in building up the meaning.

Keywords: *communication, contextualization, recontextualization, thematization, rethematization*

Interrogative by nature, the spirit of a conversant speaker of Romanian feels himself attacked, in relation with its entire semantic logics, by the stereotypes applied in the process of controlled assimilation of the language. Construction of meaning is a fundamental element, assuring a correct understanding of the message and, implicitly, realization of an efficient communication, by creating a coherent and productive linguistic space, within which sociocultural inter-relationing appears as a reflex of language efficiency. Logically and philologically, communication is built around a topic proposed by the transmitter and agreed upon by the receiver; syntactically, this aspect is

materialized in the relation between **subject** and **predication**, reflected in **thematization**. Consequently, the **theme** includes the piece of information known by both transmitter and receiver – namely, the **subject** of communication – to which the new, descriptive-type piece of information – give by the **rheme** – is added during construction of the message. At syntax level, the enunciation is studied by means of the two modalities of construction: as sentence and as phrase, by means of **communication units**.

From this perspective, communication appears as *a fundamental mode of psycho-social interaction of persons, achieved by means of articulated language or by other codes, for transmitting some information, for attaining stability or for some behavioural modification at individual or group level.*¹ Extending this perspective to religion, namely to the spiritual dimension of our being, the dictionary makes mention of the concept of communication of characteristics, with the significance of benefic contamination, by means of behavioural modifications:

*Communication of characteristics = (in Christology) consequence of the union of the two natures – the human and the divine one – in the person of Jesus Christ, involving their transfer from one to another, yet without fusion and confusion between them.*² Taking advantage of the above definitions, the linguistic component should be placed at the basis of the communicative dimension of our personality.

Observance of the norm should be a conscious one, felt as necessary exclusively for checking up the quality of the mode of expression, and not for censoring its message. Assimilation of the Romanian language as a mother tongue should create the pleasant feeling of easily finding the

suitable words and of granting their meaning through contextualization, of discovering their expressive potential through **thematization** and **rhematization**, considered as complementary actions, in relation with the communication intention of each of the actors involved in the process. The incorrect mode of "cloning" in communication, involving an exaggerated obedience and faithfulness to the pattern applied by the observance of norms, gained ground, so that the pupil who communicates is inhibited, corseted and threatened by possible errors. The pupil should understand that the discourse he produces impacts on the uniqueness of his affective being, in the same manner in which each individual is biologically unique. The variant applied for the assimilation of the Romanian language in schools is nowadays based on the *Basic Grammar of the Romanian Language*³, an abbreviated edition for scholar use of the *Grammar of the Romanian Language*⁴, edited by the Romanian Academy. Starting from the traditional grammar of the Romanian language, the study proposes a semantic-pragmatic manner of approaching communication, while considering the conditions in which the dynamics of utilization required modifications and adjustments of the norms in force.

The applicative character – most clearly presented – aims not only at assimilating the new functional communicative pattern, but also at its conscious practising. Involved here is a new positioning of the speaker in language and a reconsideration of roles in the process of communication. In such a context, the present handbooks apply the principles of traditional grammar in a too obedient and unproductive manner, thus encouraging an unsuitable learning, which generates the fear of word and, consequently, reduces the semantic level of the enunciation. On the other hand, it ignores the rigour necessary for establishing the context.

An example of philological "stammering" generated by some major deficiencies in the development of communication competence, manifested at institutionalized level, refers to the semantic relation between the **theme** and **rheme** of the enunciation: *What disturbs me is the difficulty of turning over*. Included in a fragment⁵ about an e-book utilization, the enunciation has

a high potential of risk in relation with the correct understanding of the communication intention of its author. The contraction might solve the ambiguity of **theme** identification and thus, by simplification, the aspect of the phrase may be substituted by a sentence-type one: *My discomfort involves the difficulty of turning over*. In this way, **the theme** of the initial enunciation is built up on the semantic nucleus of noun *discomfort*, as a declared condition of a performant reader of classical books.

The reference text is extracted from the memories of Ion Vianu, **Kindle**, published in **Dilemateca**⁶. To identify the meaning, the context does not permit modification of the enunciation topics and, implicitly, rethematization, as the communication intention is to present the discomfort of turning over, and by no means the difficulties encountered when using such a reading instrument. That is why, the subordinate sentence *What disturbs me* is obviously subjective in the given context. The quality of the predicative sentence might be correct only if modifying the topics, which would replace the theme with the rheme: *The difficulty/difficulties of turning over is/are what disturbs me*. Utilization of the plural form of the copulative verb (**is/are**) generated by the plural form of the noun placed in its right side (**difficulty/difficulties**), which would observe the rule of the grammatical agreement within the S+P structure, would completely reverse the originary meaning of the enunciation and support the idea that modern reading, by the e-book technique, has no perspective for the young generations of today, appearing as harmful and in full contradiction with reality. Stress might be laid on **difficulty**, and not on **discomfort**, modifying the significance of the message transmitted, of its subjective charge, grammatically rendered by the personal pronoun "me".

The difficulty of a correct option in the given context is justified by a stereotypical learning, devoid of logic arguments and of valorisation of the expressive valencies of semantic nature.

The freedom of the speaker, incorrectly understood in relation with the linguistic expression of a situation of communication, alters the meaning and affects understanding, which is fundamental for a successful

communication. For attaining elucidation in relation with the norms in force, the following examples, provided by GBLR⁷, should be compared with the example proposed for analysis:

GBLR, edition 2010	enunciation proposed for analysis
What disturbs me (SB)/ is indifference / What it is absurd (SB)/ is/ that he abandoned the struggle (PR).	What disturbs me (SB)/ is the difficulty (Np) of turning over.

The second example offered by GBLR refers to the situation in which the predicative is expressed by subordinate PR: *that he abandoned the struggle*. Contraction of this subordinate leads to the following phrase: What it is absurd/is **abandon** of the struggle, comparatively with the given phrase: What disturbs me/is the **difficulty** of turning over. The situation is illustrative for the effects of the cutting up off the context upon the semantics of the message, as a practice causing modification of the meaning. Comparatively with the intention of communication, the variations of topics may provoke semantic side-slippings which negatively affect communication.

A different perception of the message from the part of its receivers is an obvious sign of the recontextualization operated by them upon the message and, consequently, a manifestation of the condition of co-participant to the construction of its meaning from the perspective of roles in communication. Extension of such a phenomenon is to be found, once again, in the understanding of the belletristic text, according to the *opera aperta* pattern, thus becoming a virtue of the reader.

References

1. Guțu Romalo V. (2008) *Gramatica limbii române- I Cuvântul, II Enunțul*. București, Editura Academiei Române.
2. Pană Dindelegan G. (2010) *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*. București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 421.
3. Vianu I. *Kindle*, Dilemateca.
4. <http://dexonline.ro>

Endnotes

1. Cf. (<http://dexonline.ro> - definiții specializate)
2. Ibidem
3. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, coordonator: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan; colectiv de autori: Adina Dragomirescu, Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Marina Rădulescu Sala, Rodica Zafiu; București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2010.
4. *Gramatica limbii române- I Cuvântul, II Enunțul*, coordonator: Valeria Guțu Romalo, București, Editura Academiei Române, primul tiraj: 2005, al doilea tiraj, revizuit: 2008.
5. Ion Vianu, *Kindle*, în revista *Dilemateca*
6. *De Crăciun mi-am făcut cadou un e-book**. [...] *Cred că am fost victima publicității și a ușurinței cu care poți cumpăra acest model. Dar cu proxima* ocazie îmi voi procura și dispozitivul rival [...], care-mi va da acces la cărțile franceze sau românești. Am făcut cumpărătura, sfidând avertismentele amicilor mei care arătau cel mai mare dispreț pentru acest tip de lectură. [...] Au dreptate, într-un anumit fel, cei care m-au disprețuit fiindcă mi-am cumpărat e-bookul. [...] Dar nu pot să spun că au în întregime dreptate. [...] E ușoară cât cea mai ușoară carte de buzunar. Ecranul [...], citit la lumină reflectată ca orice pagină, este extrem de lizibil. Nu lucește, poți potrivi tu dimensiunea caracterelor. **Ceea ce mă jenează este dificultatea răsfoirii**. Chiar dacă există mijloace auxiliare de regăsire a unui pasaj, ele sunt mai laborioase ca răsfoirea. În schimb, ce lucru minunat, ești conectat la un dicționar și regăsești instantaneu definițiile cuvintelor. [...]* Iată că, printr-un șiretlic al tehnicii, caracterul ludic* al lecturii este reinventat. Creează spații noi, timpuri noi, emoții noi. [...] Sunt foarte fericit să știu că lectura mai are timp în fața ei.
7. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, coordonator: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan; București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2010, p. 421