

PREFACE

This volume is a tribute to Professor Marinela Burada, her academic career and her contributions in the field of linguistics. It was made possible because many of Marinela's closest colleagues, collaborators, and former students that we reached out to gladly agreed to share their research. This project was conceived in secrecy as a surprise, and is the result of the collective efforts of three of Marinela's former students and current colleagues, Oana Tatu, Alexandra Stan, and myself. Our aim was to gather contributions reflecting the research interests of colleagues, from Romania and from abroad, who have known and worked with Marinela over the years.

My academic relationship with Marinela started over 20 years ago, during which we have co-edited volumes, co-authored articles, worked in projects, and participated in conferences together, exchanging ideas on various professional topics, especially in the field of lexicography. Having known her since my B.A. years, I can say that our relationship has expanded over my entire professional career. I feel very fortunate and extremely grateful for her guidance and support throughout the years. Although mentoring is not necessarily common practice in academia nowadays, I consider myself her mentee, a role which taught me a great deal.

The following paragraphs are meant to be a roadmap to this volume and at the same time a brief overview of Marinela's career and research activity, highlighting some of its most important points.

Professor Marinela Burada is a graduate of "Vasile Alecsandri" University of Bacău. She holds a Master's degree in education from the University of Manchester (UK) and a PhD in Philology from the University of Bucharest (Romania). She has been a professor at Transilvania University of Braşov since 1991. During her career, Marinela was involved in various projects and established many collaborations which we attempted to reflect through the list of contributors to this volume.

She remains attached to her alma mater, as evidenced by the fact that several colleagues from Bacău have answered our call for papers, including Doina Cmeciu, Nadia-Nicoleta Morăraşu, Mihaela Culea, and the late Professor Ioan-Lucian Popa. Their contributions deal with cultural issues, discussing the results of a questionnaire-based approach to the changes in the perception of Britishness in the post-Brexit period in the UK ("Reflecting the Shifting Perception upon Britishness in Post-Brexit

UK”); linguistic issues, namely the way in which Scots and Scottish Standard English varieties are used by Irvine Welsh in *Trainspotting* (“Linguistic Variety and Behaviour in Irvine Welsh’s *Trainspotting*”); and literature, more specifically an analysis of the lexemes *wit*, *worth*, *will*, *anatomy* used in Shakespeare’s poetic discourse (with an emphasis on *Troilus and Cressida* and *Sonnets 134-136*) to refer to the performative dimension of the Renaissance artist’s use of language (“W_{it}, W_{orthiness}, W_{ill}, or the *anatomy of an identity*”).

A milestone in Marinela’s career is represented by her doctoral studies under the supervision of Professor Lucia Wald, whom she has always considered her mentor. Her thesis “The Latin Elements in the English Language Repertoire and Structure” (*Elementele latine în inventarul și structura limbii engleze*, in the original) in the general field of Indo-European linguistics resulted in a monographic study published in 2001 under the title “The Place and Role of Latin Elements in the History of the English Language” (*Locul și rolul elementului latin în istoria limbii engleze*, in the original). Her relationship with Professor Lucia Wald is mentioned by Victor Celac (“Despre funcția metalingvistică (în cazul limbajul uman și în alte sisteme de comunicare)”), another one of the professor’s students, in his contribution about the metalinguistic function of the human language and of other communication systems.

While responding to the demands of faculty administration, first as vice-dean and then as head of department, Marinela has remained a prolific scholar and researcher. She coordinated the national research project “Competitiveness and efficiency in specialized intercultural communication by optimizing online resources” (*Competitivitate și eficiență în comunicarea interculturală specializată prin optimizarea resurselor online (LEXICA)*, in the original), delving into the field of lexicography to which she has remained attached in the years that followed, as evidenced by the books *Research and Practice of Lexicography* (2016, co-author), *A Local Perspective on Lexicography. Dictionary Research, Practice and Use in Romania* (2020, co-editor), and by several published articles.

As coordinator of the M.A. programme *Language Studies for Intercultural Communication* (in English) since 2004 and PhD supervisor since 2016, Professor Marinela Burada has worked closely with many M.A. and PhD students in different areas of linguistics. Some of them have contributed to this volume. Ewa Wala (“Silesian: The Curious Case of Language Maintenance”) revisits the topic of her dissertation by overviewing the efforts aimed at the standardisation and popularisation of the Silesian language in the region of Upper Silesia, raising the question of

its status: for some it is a dialect of Polish, for others a language in its own right. Also as a result of her M.A. research, Maiara Halmenschlager França Benjamim (“Analysing Rhetoric in Advertising Between the 1960s and the 2010s: A Case Study of Coca-Cola Print Ads”) proposes an examination of rhetoric in advertising, the way it has been used, developed, and changed over the last six decades as illustrated by a case study of Coca-Cola advertisements. Starting from her doctoral thesis supervised by Professor Marinela Burada, Gabriela Tutunea (“Technical and Non-Technical Approaches to ICT”) offers a detailed presentation of the literature on the technical and non-technical approaches to Information and Communication Technology (ICT), highlighting the functions and emerging possibilities of technology in shaping modern life both in the professional and the personal sphere. At the beginning of her doctoral studies, Tünde Dimény (“Evaluative Language in Academic Discourse: A Genre-Based Approach”) adopted a genre-based approach in her attempt to determine the quantity and quality of evaluative language (i.e. stance markers and engagement expressions) in texts belonging to three academic genres: academic book review, peer review, and riposte. Also a graduate of Transilvania University of Braşov, our colleague Alexandra Stan (“An Overview of Epistemic Modality in English and Romanian”) provides in her contribution a contrastive analysis of modality in English and Romanian aiming to identify the sub-systems of epistemic modality in both languages.

The above mentioned contributions are connected to some of Marinela’s research interests, including contrastive rhetoric, as she is the author of *Rhetorical Features in Student Persuasive Writing: Towards a Contrastive Approach* (2002), which provides empirical evidence to illustrate some discursal and linguistic discrepancies between Romanian and English. She has also dealt with text linguistics and academic literacy, as shown by her work on academic English for doctoral students, the use of citations in PhD theses in Romanian, citation practices in academic writing across different disciplines, the issue of multi-authorship in research articles, again from a cross-disciplinary perspective.

Throughout her career, Marinela has devoted a lot of her efforts to research in linguistics, aiming to facilitate the access to this area for students and specialists. In this respect, it is worth mentioning that she is the co-author of the volume “Issues in Linguistics. Theory and applications” (*Probleme de lingvistică. Teorie și aplicații*, in the original), published in 2015, but also of the translation into Romanian of Uriel Weinreich’s book *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems* (1953), which was published under the title *Contactul dintre limbi. Constatări și*

probleme in 2013. In this line, several contributions to this volume deal with various aspects of translation. Oana Tatu (“Evaluating Current Possibilities of AI and Automated Processes in the Translation of Literary Texts”) compares and contrasts human and AI-generated translations of literary texts, while Attila Imre (“A glimpse into Translating Culture-specific Terms. The Case of *Designated Survivor*”) and myself (“Subtitling for Television: Diverging from the Norm”) delve into audiovisual translation, from the perspective of the transfer of cultural elements from English into Romanian in subtitling, on the one hand, and from the point of view of subtitling rules and their implementation in television programmes, on the other.

I would also like to mention Marinela’s involvement in the Erasmus+ programme. As contact person for various universities in the Russian Federation, she encouraged a closer collaboration with colleagues who shared her interest in linguistics (as underlined in the text by Olga Mikhanova), especially those from Ogarev Mordovia State University. The text authored by Elena Babenkova and Natalia Burenina (“Functional Features of Metaphor”) brings to the fore the different types and functions of cognitive metaphor identified in the genre of inauguration discourse and of literary discourse, while Maria Mosyagina (“Connotative and Stylistic Shifts in Media Texts and Their Lexicographical Reflection”) explores the dynamics of changes in the connotation and stylistic values of words in media texts and looks at how these changes are reflected in both traditional and modern online dictionaries. In their contribution, Irina Korovina and Elena Grosheva (“Stable Grammatical and Lexical Errors in Russian-Speaking Students’ Written Speech in English”) focus on the description of stable grammatical and lexical errors that Russian-speaking students make when learning English, as a result of both interlingual and intralingual interference. The same area of language teaching is approached by Olga Safonkina and Polina Nekipelova (“The Olympiad Approach: Evaluating Communicative Competence in English Language Education”) who evaluate English language Olympiads as instruments for assessing communicative competence; more exactly they explore how English language Olympiad tasks assess skills in comparison to international standardized tests, such as the Cambridge English exams.

Finally, very dear to Marinela is also the collaboration with Oturu University of Commerce, Japan, in a blended learning project that led to the organisation of the *Summer School Globalization and Tradition in Braşov* (2018-2019), during which a number of Japanese students had the opportunity to visit Braşov and learn more about its culture and traditions. Among Marinela’s closest collaborators in this project, Daniela Caluianu

(“On Stage and Off Stage: Inner Speech in the Work of I.L. Caragiale”) proposes in her contribution to this volume a methodological approach to inner speech, comparing representations of inner speech in on-stage and off-stage works authored by the Romanian writer I. L. Caragiale. Shawn M. Clankie (“Coming Full Circle: The Increasing Use of Symbols in Place of Language. Modern Brand Representation and a Potential Challenge for Lexicographers”) focuses on the relationship between image, text, and names in advertising signage, highlighting different stages, such as the development of image in place of text, followed by image in addition to text, and then by a return to image alone once again, which appears to be increasingly occurring at present. Kan Sasaki (“On the Origin of the Dative Case Enclitic in Kantō Dialects of Japanese”) focuses on the etymological source of dative case enclitics in the Kantō region, exploring two hypotheses which have been proposed so far.

To conclude, we dedicate this volume to Professor Marinela Burada, to her distinguished academic career that spans more than three decades and to her accomplishments in the field of linguistics. Although those who have met and worked with her know that she is not one to seek the accolades of her peers, the editors’ intention was to honour Marinela, who has been a mentor and a guide for all of us, at one time or another, as well as a steady friend and adviser, for which we are grateful to her.

Raluca Sinu
Braşov

References

- Burada, M. 2001. *Locul și rolul elementului latin în istoria limbii engleze*. C2 Design.
- Burada, M. 2002. *Rhetorical Features in Student Persuasive Writing: Towards a Contrastive Approach*. Braşov: Editura Universităţii Transilvania.
- Burada, M. 2016. *Research and Practice in Lexicography*. Editura Universităţii Transilvania din Braşov.
- Burada, M. and Sinu, R. (eds.) 2020. *Local Perspective on Lexicography. Dictionary Research, Practice and Use in Romania*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Burada, M., Tatu, O., and Sinu, R. 2015. *Probleme de lingvistică. Teorie și aplicații*. Editura Universităţii Transilvania din Braşov.

Weinreich, U. 2013. *Contactul dintre limbi. Constatări și probleme*, translation and foreword by M. Burada. Brașov: Editura Universității Transilvania din Brașov.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS **(in alphabetical order)**

Elena BABENKOVA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Natalia BURENINA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Daniela CALUIANU
Otaru University of Commerce, Japan

Victor CELAC
Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian
Academy, Romania

Doina CMECIU
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Shawn M. CLANKIE
Otaru University of Commerce, Japan

Mihaela CULEA
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Tünde DIMÉNY
Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania (alumnus)

Raluca-Andreea DONICI (NECHIFOR)
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Elena GROSHEVA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Maiara HALMENSCHLAGER FRANÇA BENJAMIM
Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania (alumnus)

Attila IMRE
Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania, Romania

Irina KOROVINA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Olga MIKHANOVA
Penza State University, Russian Federation

Nadia-Nicoleta MORĂRAȘU
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Maria MOSYAGINA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Noemi NECONESNIC
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Polina NEKIPELOVA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Ioan-Lucian POPA
“Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, Romania

Olga SAFONKINA
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russian Federation

Kan SASAKI
Ritsumeikan University, Japan

Raluca SINU
Transilvania University of Brașov, Romania

Alexandra STAN
Transilvania University of Brașov, Romania

Oana TATU
Transilvania University of Brașov, Romania

Gabriela TUTUNEA
Transilvania University of Brașov, Romania (alumnus)

Ewa WALA
Transilvania University of Brașov, Romania (alumnus)

PART I

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, CULTURE

ON STAGE AND OFF STAGE: INNER SPEECH IN THE WORK OF I.L. CARAGIALE*

Daniela CALUIANU

Abstract: This study explores a novel approach to examining inner speech – silent self-talk – through a comparative analysis of dramatic and narrative works by the same author. The underlying premise is that the varying role of the audience in these two literary genres may facilitate the identification of speech elements that are influenced by the presence of a listener, as opposed to those that are inherently monologic. The research focuses on the Romanian writer I.L. Caragiale, comparing representations of inner speech in his on-stage and off-stage works. The observed differences align with established features in the literature on inner speech, indicating that this method holds promise for further investigation.

Keywords: inner speech, aside, soliloquy, predicated syntax, speech rate

1 Introduction

This article aims to explore the representation of linguistically expressed thoughts in the works of the Romanian writer I.L. Caragiale. Two questions come to mind: why focus on the representation of thought rather than spoken discourse and why select Caragiale as the subject of this investigation?

Inner speech is defined as the subjective experience of language without overt and audible articulation. It is widely recognized that individuals spend approximately one-quarter of their waking hours engaged in verbal thinking. The literature offers various terms for this phenomenon, including inner speech, self-talk, self-directed speech, subvocal or covert speech, speech-for-self, self-verbalizations, internal dialogue, and internal monologue (Morin 2012). The term preferred in this article is “inner speech”, although other labels may be used

interchangeably to avoid redundancy, with no intended theoretical implications.

The significance of inner speech as a primary function of language is underscored by the substantial portion of waking hours it occupies. Yet, it remains a poorly understood linguistic phenomenon, largely due to the inherent challenges in data collection. While individuals have direct access to their own inner speech and presume that others engage in similar silent linguistic activities, we lack access to the inner speech of others. Research methods for studying inner speech have traditionally included introspection, questionnaires with predefined self-statements about inner speech, elicited speech that externalizes internal monologues during specific activities, literary testimony from journals, diaries, and literary works, observation of children's so-called egocentric speech, and the study of the effects of articulatory suppression. However, these methods are fraught with difficulties and offer limited reliability. Korba (1990) deplors the inaccuracy of subjects' recall and the threat to the validity of cognitive studies while, at the same time, pointing out the essential role such testimony retains: "Physiological instrumentation is far more accurate and reliable than self-report techniques, yet these methodologies can only detect the neurological and skeletal muscle responses of the cognitive and somatic systems. Elliptical inner speech may be detected through electrochemical impulses and neuromuscular depolarization, but it can only be expressed through subjects' self-report" (Korba 1990, 1045). Several other technological approaches, such as electromyographic recordings and brain imaging, are being developed, but the attempts are still in an incipient stage and present their own difficulties. Given the inefficacy of current methods, looking for an alternative seems a worthwhile goal.

Caragiale, unlike authors such as James Joyce, who are particularly interested in exploring inner speech, had no specialized training in psychology and did not aim to exploit inner speech in his writings. In fact, he overtly expressed his disapproval for the use of internal monologue in the 19th century romantic literature (Mancas 1978). The rationale for selecting Caragiale's work for this study resides in the fact that he wrote both plays and stories, providing an opportunity to observe his treatment of inner speech both on-stage and off-stage. On-stage speeches, even when intended to convey a character's thoughts, are designed for an audience. In contrast, in a story, the audience is absent, and I will argue that the presence of the future reader is akin to the alter ego or imagined addressee of inner speech, differing from the physical audience in a theater.