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Abstract: In this article four aspects of style are considered on the base of «language phenomena», differentiated by L.V. Scherba; the linguistic status of the communicative stylistics and its cognitive aspect on the base of administrative discourse are substantiated.
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Introduction: Stylistics is a whole scientific field, the history of the study of which has more than two thousand years. The potential irreducibility of all angles and aspects of stylistic research is due primarily to the state of discussion of the issue regarding the terminological status of its key concept - style.
Under the conditions of the modern scientific paradigm (confidently called communicative-cognitive along with anthropocentric, activity, human-oriented, etc.), which replaces the system-structural one, a logical terminological “revolution” takes place: firstly, new terms appear to indicate new categories (discourse, mental representation), for rethinking the former with subsequent terminological substitution (meaning - concept); secondly, terminological ambiguity (speech) is progressing and, finally, irrelevant (“non-anthropocentric”) category terms are forgotten. Among the latter turned out to be related style with its generally non-terminological fate. Currently, researchers are focused on problems related to categorization and conceptualization (including the cognitive development of traditional grammatical categories), and the popularity of discourse is growing.

**Literature review:** The opinion about the justification of the marginal position of stylistics, supplanted by studies in which discourse acts as the nominal subject, is hardly fair. When juxtaposing the discourse and style, J. Genette reproduced the aphoristic words of F. de Saussure “about the inseparability of the front and back of a sheet of paper”, and expressed the connection between style and discourse in the well-known formula: “there is no discourse without style, as well as style without discourse : whatever the discourse is, style is its aspect, and the absence of aspect is a clearly meaningless concept”[13.p.56]. G.O. Vinokur wrote that without the style "language is generally impossible"[9.p. 54].

The interdisciplinary aspirations of linguistics at the present stage of its development are associated primarily with the problems of the functioning of the language, which are caused not by linguistic (in the understanding of the language as a system) factors. The linguistics development perspective is seen, as A.A. writes. Zalevskaya, in the creation of an “integrative theory of language as a property of man”, which is fully related to linguistic stylistics[15. P. 488].

According to T.G. Vinokur, “the tendency to bring stylistic selection procedure closer to psycholinguistic categories has been quite persistent lately” [9.p. 63], and “the idea of the possibility of different tasks and different scales of the science of styles is becoming increasingly popular” [9.p. 17], despite the desire to take cognitive issues beyond linguistic stylistics because of the complexity of the consequences of combining
it with the communicative aspect, which is explained primarily by the inability to identify
the direct and immediate dependence of Theistic phenomena from cognitive structures.

We introduce some terminological refinements in the interpretation of the concept
of style and discuss the prospects of stylistics within the framework of the cognitive-
communicative scientific paradigm. Such a broad statement of the issue makes us turn to
a comparison of a number of terms: style — speech activity — discourse — text —
speech, which, for all the obvious and declared unequalities, are often used
interchangeably (N.N. Troshina, M. B. Rarenko, etc.), which leads to the crowding out
of the unpopular “link” and the assertion that all these scientific concepts “mean the same

Classification confusion, according to B.L. Borukhov, is the main reason for the
shortcomings of most definitions of style, which include the following: firstly, the term
style duplicates other well-established concepts (behavior, language); secondly, most
definitions suffer from "shop narrowness"; finally, in existing style definitions, as a rule,
“one side of the object is advanced to the detriment of the other” (for example, general or
individual) [6.p. 4].

Making an attempt to overcome these shortcomings and realizing the “vastness” of
the problems involved, we will build one of the possible, in our opinion, variants of the
correlation of concepts, without pretending to be exhausted and final. To this end, we turn
to the classical work of Academician L.V. Shcherba “On the triple aspect of linguistic
phenomena and on an experiment in linguistics” [18.pp. 24-39], which contains a number
of points of fundamental importance for clarifying this issue. As follows from the title of
the work, L.V. Shcherba distinguishes three aspects of linguistic phenomena: speech
activity - “processes of speaking and understanding”, linguistic material - “in the
language of linguists these are texts”, language system - “dictionaries and grammars of
languages”.

A systematization of the relationship between them with a consistent distinction
between process and product was proposed by A.A. Zalevskaya, who, specifying the
listed aspects, comes to the conclusion that L.V. Shcherba actually identified not three,
but four aspects of linguistic phenomena. It is emphasized that the speech organization of
an individual can be considered as a unity of a process (i.e., processing and streamlining of speech experience) and a product (i.e., a system of concepts and strategies for using them in the processes of speaking and understanding of speech). In other words, A.A. Zalevskaya drew attention to the fact that L.V. Shcherba clearly distinguished between the concepts of a mechanism (= speech organization or “readiness of an individual for speech”) and a process (= speech activity) [16. p. 89].

The process of speech activity is interpreted ambiguously. The terms discourse, speech activity, speech, text are in relation to the equipole opposition with a significant intersection field. In domestic linguistics, discourse is understood as coherent speech (G.G. Pocheptsov), speech flow, text (V.G. Borbotko), verbalized working consciousness (O.G. Revzina, O.V. Zhukova), current speech activity in this sphere (M.Ya. Dymarsky), a coherent text created in speech (V.P. Konetskaya), a unity realized as in the form of speech, i.e. in sound substance, and in the form of text, i.e. in writing (VV Bogdanov), a text created in the process of communication (A.E. Kibrik, A.S. Narignani); speech, immersed in life, a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic (pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological, etc.) factors (N.D. Arutyunova); “A text taken in an eventual aspect; speech, considered as a targeted social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes)”[1.pp. 136-137]; in the West - as a coherent speech (Harris), an actualized text as opposed to a text as a formal grammatical structure; the speech assigned by the speaker, the method of updating the language in speech (E. Benvenist, T.A. van Dyck), coherent text (I. Bellert), text designed by the speaker for the listener (Gillian Brown, George Yul), etc.

**Research methodology:** In general, interpreting discourse as a process of production and understanding of speech or actualization of language in speech (cf. the metaphor N.D. Arutyunova “speech immersed in life” and with an understanding of discourse dating back to the views of E. Benvenist and T.A. van Deyk), we recognize the ambiguity and insufficiency of such a preliminary definition. Clarifies the situation of the appeal to the aforementioned work of L.V. Shcherba, who writes that “speech activity is a social product” [16.p.25], and linguistic material is “the totality of everything spoken
and understood in a specific situation in this or that era of a given social group’s life” [16. p. 26]. It follows from this that the processes of production and understanding of speech cannot be considered in isolation from a “specific concrete situation”, from a “communicative-pragmatic space” (the term of I.P. Susov).

Therefore, discourse can be interpreted as a set of processes of production and understanding of speech in a communicative-pragmatic space or, “in a specific concrete situation” (according to L.V. Shcherba). Moreover, aspects of linguistic phenomena are “different aspects of the only speech activity given in the experience” [16. p. 26]. Here we proceed from the fact that, from the standpoint of the theory of speech activity, speech activity itself is a speech-thought process, which includes the motivational, target, executive side [17.p.26] and consisting of a system of speech actions. “Speech activity is taken taking into account all the objective and subjective factors that determine the behavior of a native speaker, which in its entirety determine its connections and the relations of the subject of activity to reality” [17.p. 18]. Based on this, a discourse with a certain amount of assumptions can be interpreted as the communicative activity of the individual, proceeding in the communicative-pragmatic space, which in turn represents one of the aspects of speech activity.

Assumptions of this kind include the following:

Firstly, the processes of production and understanding of speech imply not only verbal activity, but also non-verbal activity. The validity of this is evidenced by the terminology of I. A. Sternin verbal speech and non-verbal speech [18.p. 40].

Secondly, the totality of subjective and objective factors that determine the behavior of a native speaker (according to A.A. Leontiev) is correlated with the concept of communicative-pragmatic space, which is defined by I.P. Susov through the enumeration of its characteristics: 1) the utterance (text) is an element of communicative-pragmatic space; 2) communicants, between which communicative roles are distributed, enter the communicative-pragmatic space; 3) communicants have social statuses; 4) the subject of speech is a component of space; 5) time and place are important; 6) the speaker has a communicative intention (intention); 7) the communicative register is important
(communication style); 8) concomitant circumstances are taken into account (noise, the presence of strangers, etc.) [16.p. 37-38].

The proposed understanding of discourse is not original. It can be correlated with the interpretation of this concept, proposed, for example, by I. N. Borisova, I. P. Susov and others. Here we do not set ourselves the goal of thoroughly studying the existing concepts of discourse, which would lead us far to the side.

I.N. Borisova in the monograph “Russian Conversational Dialogue” defines discourse as “situational and socially determined communicative activity that proceeds in the real coordinates of space and time, one of the products of which is text” [5.p. 136].

I.P. Susov interprets the discourse as the processes of “language communication”, proceeding in the form of sequences of speech acts, “connected sequences of speech acts” [5.p. 40], and the text is interpreted as “the information trace” of the discourse that took place. In this concept, a speech act is considered as the unity, on the one hand, of the act of producing a statement and its transmission in a verbal and written form, and, on the other hand, of an act of perceiving and understanding this statement. The communicative act is a speech act included in the communicative-pragmatic space [5.p. 37]. Following V.V. Bogdanov’s texts are considered in the discourse as his “trace” [4.p. 12-18].

Based on the refined interpretation of the discourse, we can conclude that in the work of L.V. Shcherba speaks more about five aspects of linguistic phenomena: 1) speech activity - “processes of speaking and understanding”; 2) the speech organization of the individual, i.e. readiness of the individual for speech; 3) discourse - the processes of production and understanding of speech in a “specific concrete environment”, in a communicative-pragmatic space; 4) language material - “in the language of linguists these are “texts”; 5) the language system - “dictionaries and grammar of languages”.

Based on this, we can outline the grounds for distinguishing between the terms speech, discourse, and text. Speech - the processes of production and understanding of speech. Discourse - speech in the communicative-pragmatic space and in conjunction with it. Text - language material, the “trace” of discourse, the result (product) of speech. Various aspects of linguistic phenomena make it possible to highlight the corresponding aspects of style.
Analysis and results: The interpretation of the communicative style proposed in this publication brings to the fore the relevance of selection motivation instead of a mechanical analysis of the final, stylistically designed type of utterance and avoids mixing style with discourse, text, speech and speech activity.

Attention to the motivation for the selection of linguistic units in the process of speech activity provides a junction of style with psycholinguistics, cognitive science and pragmatics. As K.A. notes Dolinin, unfortunately, “it is precisely such a broad socio-psychological perspective that many stylistic works lack. Deprived of its socio-psychological base, linguistic style runs the risk of becoming a purely ascertaining discipline, unable to explain the reasons and meaning of what people say and write differently in different speech situations.

Style is a substantial aspect of speech, and the meaning expressed by it can be adequately described only in terms of sociology and psychology - social psychology and personality psychology”[11.p. 3] i.e. in dynamic units from the standpoint of the general theory of speech activity. In this regard, the purpose of stylistic analysis can be an explanation of not only “the choice of verbal implications in relation to the content” (which we do not deny), but also “the choice of substantial implications in relation to reality”, which is advisable to refer as a whole to the socio-psychologically determined plan speech activity. “This duty is specific for the stylictics, which is why it can be perceived as the closest and most obvious instance on the way to connecting a person and a language in speech behavior - the way of using the language as an expression of communicative needs and personality abilities, depending on the socio-psychological attitudes of the speaking collective” [9.p.79].

Communicative stylistics as a vector of a promising direction of linguistic stylistics as a whole is considered in the unity of three interdependent and interrelated aspects: analytical (systemic-structural), cognitive and pragmatic, which, mutually complementing each other, form a qualitatively new knowledge of style.

The task of the analytical aspect of communicative stylistics is to identify stylistically labeled units that form the stylistic field from the standpoint of the
functionality of the discursive continuum, due to the nature of the activities of the subjects of the discourse.

The pragmatic aspect of communicative stylistics focuses on the communicative effectiveness of stylistic choices.

The cognitive aspect of communicative stylistics is associated with the modeling of cognitive structures, as well as the processes and mechanisms of speech and cognitive activity associated with the implementation of the stylistic choice of language units.

Communicative style is formed not by arithmetic addition of the listed aspects, but by their sequential integration in order to exhaustively identify the mechanisms of action with the word. This is consistent with the thought of I.R. Halperin that “the task of stylistics is to some extent the study of the entire process of communication with linguistic methods” [10.p. 15].

The initial thesis is that cognitive categories “determine the functioning of any components of the language system” [2.p. 294]. Because of this, the problems of cognitive science find their application to linguistic stylistics.

A review of the theoretical problems of cognitive stylistics is contained in an article by N.M. Dzhusupov "Cognitive stylistics: current status and current research issues" [12.p. 65-76].

Referring to L.G. Luzin, the author characterizes the cognitive direction in stylistics as combining studies of two types: 1) studies that develop general principles of the theory of stylistics based on cognitive linguistics; 2) studies representing a cognitive justification for stylistic devices and constructions, expressive means of language, traditionally related to stylistics. It is noted that a few works on cognitive stylistics are mainly concentrated in the second direction and relate to the purely narrow problems of cognitive stylistics associated with artistic speech [Golubina 1998; Temyanikova 1999; Luzin 2000; Molchanova 2001, 2007; Ashurova 2005; Fomicheva 2006]. This state of affairs explains the doublet use of the terms cognitive stylistics and cognitive poetics [Tsur 1992; Turner 2002; Stockwell 2002; Semino, Culpeper 2002; Gavins, Steen 2003; Arlauskaite 2004]. The article emphasizes the need to expand the interests of cognitive styling by involving
in the circle of research problems “features of the representation of knowledge structures in texts of different functional styles” [12.p.74].

In the indicated logic of expanding the boundaries of cognitive stylistics, the perspective of cognitive modeling of the communicative style in relation to certain areas is considered taking into account the psycholinguistic models of speech generation and further verification of these models on discursive material.

Our interpretation of the stylistic choice of linguistic units as a need-motivated one makes us turn to the initial motivational-incentive phase of speech production in order to model the basic style-forming mechanisms. The developed model is considered as an explanatory basis for identifying stylistic registers in the discursive continuum and understanding the facts of language use.

Interpretative conceptualization of the situation determines the semantic interpretation of the communicative situation and the means of verbalization of a particular speech tactic (interactive frame) in tactical moves. Interpretative conceptualization is correlated with the “strategic motivational state” (the term of V.K. Vilyunas) of a person who, as a biological individual in the case of a “branching” instinct, is potentially ready to be concretized in tactical motives, in particular according to the formula “if ..., then ... "[7.p. 254]. An interpretative conceptualization of the situation is a certain vision, understanding of a communicative event (interaction), which is displayed and verbally finalized in an intentionally determined tactical course based on speech tactics. A tactical move is a verbal “product” of reflection on interaction.

In relation to managerial discourse, the model of the speech-thought process A.A. Zalevskaya, which is the original one, can be detailed and concretized by including the processes described by us in it. So, taking into account probabilistic experience is dependent on the installation fixation of conceptual opposition; interpretative conceptualization of the situation influences the formation of the model of the situation, including situational fixation of the conceptual opposition OWN - ALIEN. Then the model of the stage of constructing the image of the result of the action will take a different form, which is consistent with the statement of A. A. Zalevskaya that “the starting
moment can be both external and internal, that is, emanating from the individual himself” [15,p. 356].

**Conclusion:** An integrative approach to the study of the category of style is aimed at explaining the verbal manifestation of style as a need-motivated language choice by identifying the interconnectedness of the functioning of the language with cognitive structures that are “triggered” by the mechanisms of individual consciousness, as well as with the communicative-pragmatic context and with the features of the language as a system. It is in this complex interrelation that “the linguistic life of society is realized as a cultural-historical unity formed by human activity” [8. p. 37].
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