THE COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS IN STYLE

GÁBOR TOLCSVAI NAGY

Abstract

The paper discusses the complexity of linguistic style in the cognitive linguistic framework. The complexity of style is approached in three complex domains: the stylistic potential of language, the socio-cultural factors and the stylistic structure. The socio-cultural factors are maintained by the community and its culture, attributing cultural meaning to linguistic formation types, but they do not come directly from the inherent features of the language system. The paper gives a theoretical approach to socio-cultural factors in style compared to the stylistic potential, in relation with the emergent nature of society (community in general) and culture, within the dynamic linguistic interaction with the joint attentional and referential scenes, with the self-creative and self-reflexive nature of the interlocutors and their social relations. The characteristic variability of Hungarian cultural groups and language varieties are also treated, from the perspective of stylistic socio-cultural factors. The last section deals with the main functions of the stylistic socio-cultural factors, pointing to the subjectified character of linguistic formation.

Keywords: community, culture, linguistic interaction, self-creation, self-reflection, socio-cultural factors, stylistic potential, subjectification

1. Introduction

The functional approaches to languages definitely state the connection between language system and usage, and the inseparable nature of the two. It is also a fundamental functional empirical and theoretical assertion that the participants in a linguistic interaction treat their knowledge in a dynamic way, whereby schematic knowledge is adjusted to the processed discourse space during instantiation. The continuous updating of the adjustment in the course of the linguistic activity proves to be an important factor, based on conventions, via processes of negotiation, not a simple adjustment to an 'objectively' given situation. Language use is the basis for linguistic variability, in the modes of construal. A third factor is added to language system and language use: the language community, existing in its culture generated and continually recreated by itself. The community elaborates, makes successful or omits such schemas in the everyday practice that are directly represented in the system of linguistic forming, or more precisely that are action forms accomplished in a linguistic frame. That is, they directly affect the history of the linguistic system, particularly its subsystem of formation, style. In this respect, one question is central: how the cultural norms and behaviour patterns of the language community are integrated into the systemic use of language, or how the cultural norms and

behaviour patterns form part of the speakers' knowledge and how the conventionalized forms become the authentic part of dynamic meaning generation. To put it in a still more usage based frame: how is linguistic interaction formed by cultural norms and behaviour patterns, and, on the other hand, how does current linguistic usage events affect cultural norms and behaviour patterns? The question put this way is articulated in the contacting domains of traditional European stylistics (style theory), sociolinguistics and functional grammar.

German stylistics prefers the category of style as a system of relations instantiated in the linguistic interaction and the on-line semantic processing of discourse. Though starting from the traditional aesthetic function, these theories of style point out the complex dynamic meaning generation function of style (see e.g. Sandig 2005). On the other hand, Anglo-Saxon style theories start out from the relation between the vernacular ('dialect') and the register (see Halliday 1968, 1978), or Labov's (1966) sociolinguistic model of a formal—informal scale, for the re-interpretation of this model see Eckert—Rickford eds. (2001). These theories elaborate sociolinguistic and socio-psychological frames of style theory, concentrating on the expression of individual and collective identity, community relations and interpersonal actions (see e.g. Bell 1984, Biber—Finegan 1994, Coupland 2007). For the Hungarian language and culture, some recent works have been published. Bartha—Hámori (2010) gives an overview from a mainly sociolinguistic perspective, Simon (2012) sets up a stylistic viewpoint, while Domonkosi (2010) uses sociolinguistic and stylistic factors jointly.

Other theories concentrate on the cognitive relations of style, processing and comprehension, starting out from literary hermeneutics as well as cognitive linguistics (cf. Gumbrecht 1986, van Peer 1986, van Peer—Renkema eds. 1984, Semino—Culpeper eds. 2002, Brône—Vandaele eds. 2009).

In what follows, I sketch the overlapping domains from the joint perspective of stylistics and grammar in a cognitive linguistic framework, as an improvement of Tolcsvai Nagy (1996, 2005). The mode of saying in a linguistic interaction functions as a factor of meaning generation. The system of formation factors emerging in the on-line processing of the discourse comes simultaneously from cultural factors of community origin and from the linguistic potential, during the joint attentional and referential scenes, usually based on schemas (cf. Verschueren 1999, Tomasello 1999 Sandig 1986, 2005). The participants of the linguistic interaction focus their attention on a third entity, the object of their discourse and its linguistic representation, all aware of acting as intentional beings, using linguistic structures, exploiting the linguistic potential.

2. The stylistic justification of socio-cultural factors

The intersubjective and interactive nature of style can be grasped in its complexity. According to the functional cognitive interpretation, style functions in discourse, emerging in a joint attentional and referential scene, in the processed discourse space, by the current functions of linguistic formation. Three sources of linguistic formation can be defined: the linguistic potential, the socio-cultural factors and stylistic structure.

The linguistic potential exists, besides other functions, as the partly open system of the stylistic potential of the language system. This system of linguistic potential is not exposed to the historical changes in language communities and culture. The language system changes

certainly, but it proves to be more stable than the system of socio-cultural factors. For instance, the stylistic potential of the noun, the verb or the adjective is great, but their schematic semantic and syntactic features work as variational constraints, too. The socio-cultural factors are maintained by the community and its culture, attributing cultural meaning to linguistic formation types, but they do not come directly from the inherent features of the language system. For example, politeness shows universal features, but the instantiation of these features may vary according to historical periods, because a community can change the linguistic expressions of politeness in a relatively short time. The ways and degree of exploiting the linguistic potential as stylistic potential varies according to historical periods and cultures.

The three sources of style can be determined as a methodological procedure; in linguistic practice they are not divided. Nevertheless, the linguistic potential functions rather in planned and written monologue discourses, while the socio-cultural factors have their role more in spontaneous spoken dialogues, in everyday informal communication. In each case, the other source types function in the background. The two characteristic discourse groups are highly differentiated from within. There is not too much space for the stylistic variability of linguistic potential in a judicial resolution or an administrative notice, while advertisements, private letters and messages or works of literature can utilise this potential.

I give one characteristic example for both the systemic linguistic potential and the socio-cultural factors in their salience and profiled nature. The systemic linguistic potential as stylistic potential can be demonstrated by T. S. Eliot's The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock:[1]

> (1) […]
> Let us go, through certain half-deserted streets,
> The muttering retreats
> Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels
> And sawdust restaurants with oyster-shells;
> Streets that follow like a tedious argument
> Of insidious intent
> […]
> The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window-panes,
> The yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle on the window-panes,
> Licked its tongue into the corners of the evening,
> Lingered upon the pools that stand in drains,
> Let fall upon its back the soot that falls from chimneys,
> Slipped by the terrace, made a sudden leap,
> And seeing that it was a soft October night,
> Curled once about the house, and eall asleep
> […]

One of the most fascinating features of Eliot's poetry is the presence and effect of "objective correlatives", as the poet himself consciously constructed his objective lyrics with the help of these elements. Eliot himself gives a widely used and discussed definition of this phenomenon: "The

---

[1] The source of T. S. Eliot' poem is: T. S. Eliot: The Complete Poems and Plays. London: Faber and Faber. 2004 [1969].

only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an 'objective correlative'; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience are given, the emotion is immediately evoked" (Eliot, 1950: 124—125; the original 1919).

In Prufrock the reader finds "a set of objects", which objects stand rather for themselves without any clear intention of giving an all-round description of the scene. The scenes (one of urban streets and one of a party) are indicated by these objects that seem to emerge rather accidentally, one by one as fortuitous parts of a whole but only partially known complex seen by the man (the persona) speaking in the monologue. The short analysis presented here concentrates only on these objects named in the text (sky, patient, table, street, hotel, restaurant, oyster shell, fog, window, smoke, corner, pool, muzzle, drain, tongue, soot, chimney, terrace, face, back, hands, etc).

The accidentally mentioned objects as perceived by the lyrical ego (the persona) in his monologue represent the world around him, creating the basic space-time continuum. The objects stand out of it (in the semantic space in a profile—base relation). Partly connected (semantically or by the same schemes) to each other they create first the urban scene, then the five o'clock tea scene and parallel with it the scene of human body and clothing, aging in the end. The objective correlatives here can be classified semantically in the following groups: urban street scene, five o' clock tea, human body, clothes. All correlatives are prototypes of their own type and all are basic level categories (between superordinate and subordinate categories; cf. Rosch, 1977, Lakoff, 1987: 46ff).

The correlatives are cognitive units (cf. Langacker, 1987: 57ff), but their semantic ranges change according to their frequency and joint quantity. As one of the most prominent components of the poem the lyrical ego makes observations on him but always with interruptions. These objective correlatives remain rather separated in the text representing an always new and sudden fragment of information about growing old in the linearity of the text.

In this case, one element, the noun designating things is profiled, more specifically the nature of the archetypical thing as such, by its lexical naming. Socio-cultural aspects are backgrounded.

Example (2) demonstrates the importance of socio-cultural factors in style. The dialogue is an excerpt from a live radio program. Listeners could directly phone in to join by phone the conversation led in the studio, sharing their opinions on the necessary number of shopping centres to be built in Budapest. The short excerpt quoted here is part of an about two minute dialogue between a pensioner lady (B) and the host of the program (A):

(2) 8 (B): Dehát ez nem olyan, hogy az ember a napi szükségleteit ilyenbe végezze, és hiába olcsóbb ott a tejföl, nem fogom a fél várost beutazni, még ha kocsim lenne, akkor is, akko[r] a benzin... költséggel... lenne azzal több, amennyivel ott olcsóbb a tejföl, tegyük |föl.

9 (A): |Világos, ez teljesen érthetô, valószínûleg akkor éri meg kocsival mond- juk elmenni egy messzebb fekvô üzletbe, hogyha az ember egy hónapra vásár|ol.

10 (B):|Nade hát énnekem nincs kocsim persze, a másik... és a másik,

11 (A) Aha

10 (B): hogy miért vásároljak én egy hónapra, kaját az ember nem vesz egy hónapra, nincs akkora lónagy fridzsiderem, és higgye el, a magyar háztartások többségében nincsen|,

12 (A) |aha
10 (B): és egyebet meg mit vásároljon az ember, másra a mi nyugdíjunk-
ból nem telik, min[t] valami kis kajára, az is az is a minimum, úgyhogy egy
hónapban egyszer hús és semmi több,

> (Szerintem. Kossuth Rádió. 01.08.1997. 15—16h.)

8 (B): But this is not so that one supplies her daily needs in such [shopping
centres], and it does not matter that sour cream is cheaper there, I won't go
through half the town, even if I got a car, then, then with the gas … expenses
… would make up for how much cheaper it is, let's suppose.
9 (A): Right, this is completely comprehensible, probably it is worth going,
let's say, by car to a far away shop, if one shops for a month.
10 (B): But I don't have a car, of course, and the other… the other
11 (A): I see
10 (B): is that why should I do shopping for a month, one doesn't buy grub
for a month, I don't have a refrigerator big as big a horse, and believe it, the
majority of Hungarian households don't do,
12 (A): I see
10 (B): And what else should one buy, we pensioners can't afford anything
else than some little grub, and that is that is the minimum, so meat once a
month and nothing else,

Through the first turns the pensioner states her views on shopping centres: she dislikes them
and does not want to have many of them. During the reasoning, she changes topic and begins to
talk about the poverty of pensioners. In turn 10 she uses expressions from different registers
with different stylistic effects, built into the average neutral colloquial style of the discourse:

> a) *kaja* 'grub', *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse'
> b) *a magyar háztartások többsége* 'the majority of Hungarian households'

The Hungarian expression *a magyar háztartások többsége* 'the majority of Hungarian households'
functions as a statistical and sociological expression, with relatively high frequency beyond its
professional use. It is an objective, descriptive term with neutral or somewhat formal style. On the
other hand, *kaja* 'grub' and *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse' are informal, colloqui-
al, even slang lexical units. The noun *fridzsider* 'refrigerator' was used by middle-class members
before 1945 and was replaced by *hûtôszekrény, hûtô* 'refrigerator' coined from a Hungarian stem.
The adjective *lónagy* 'big as a horse', literally 'horsebig' has a rustic or folksy, and slang-like effect
with its exaggerating content, and expresses the pensioner's temper over her poverty. The pen-
sioner construed her own role and the situation in diverse ways by these expressions. On one hand,
she contributed to the formal style of the radio program and also the dialogue between strangers.
On the other hand, starting out from her own social status and her everyday colloquial speech, she
moulded the direct, informal situation of statement (the expression of an opinion), whereby emo-
tions determine attitude, overwriting the stylistically neutral way of talk. The stylistic functions,
the stylistic effect of the expressions in the radio dialogue analyzed here (*a magyar háztartások*

többsége 'the majority of Hungarian households', *kaja* 'grub' and *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse') emerge first of all by such factors that are attributed to them by the Hungarian language community. The first one (*a magyar háztartások többsége* 'the majority of Hungarian households') has the attributes objectivity, distance keeping neutrality, technical language, while the second ones (*kaja* 'grub' and *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse') has the attributes informality and emotion saturation. Their stylistic effect does not come from their phonological, lexical, semantic or grammatical feature. Rather, it is the result of the stylistic value attributed to them by the speakers in speech situations, more generally in the current culture. The adjective of *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse' expresses a negative value and derogatory emotional tension, and these features do not come directly and absolutely from the conventional meaning of the expression; the meaning of the expression may be just the opposite in another context. In this case socio-cultural factors have their evident stylistic function while the linguistic potential is not foregrounded. Such syncretic heterogeneity with stylistic effects occurs frequently in spontaneous dialogues, thus it is less salient and is considered to be less contradictory.

In the next sections the stylistic significance of socio-cultural factors will be addressed.

3. Theoretical background

When describing style, the categories language system, language use, linguistic community and culture should be harmonised in a coherent theoretical framework. Earlier style interpretations based on rhetoric and structuralism did not complete this harmonising task. These theories seemed to be satisfied with a static approach to the linguistic system, autonomous in itself according to the theoretical premises, comprising the fixed stylistic value of the linguistic expressions. Also, these theories were related to important social and cultural theories. One of the main questions of every social theory is the definition of the origin and character of social order. The classic answer is given — as Luhmann (1998: 316) notes — by some references to normative conditions. Such a normative system may come from natural right, a social contract or some kind of conventional morals. Modern social theories are rather built on the normative sense of codes and common symbolic values. These descriptions have functional foundations, not disclaiming the existence of norms. Such functional social theories start out not from the expected picture of an ideal society, i.e. they are empirically based theories, not teleological systems, they intend to describe society by means of data, and do not expect anything. Society or every kind of human community proves to be a highly complex system, existing temporally, continuously reshaped by the active members. Such a network is emergent, i.e. the output, the complete network as a temporary result cannot be predicted completely from its parts, in the case of linguistic acting from the attitudes and acts of the members of the linguistic community.

In this respect linguistics has theoretical difficulties. The classical, logical-empirical, formal philosophy of science uses the fundamental principle of predictability. Contrary to this metascientific dogma, linguistic variability, the systemic and not completely closed network of variability in language use, is realised in the domain of style with even less predictability compared to syntax or semantics. Functional cognitive linguistics aims at a harmony and balance of the tension relation between description and theory in its framework (Langacker 1987). Language does not reflect or mirror the objective world, the speaker (the conceptualizer) construes one part of the world in linguistic expressions, on a semantic basis, from her/his perspective.

The fundamental principles of cognitive linguistics are as follows (Langacker 1987, Lakoff 1987, Kemmer—Barlow 2000, Geeraerts—Cuyckens eds. 2007):

1) Language can be described in relation to scientific knowledge about the brain and the mind.
2) Language is both system and use. Linguistics works with the balanced tension relation between description and theory.
3) Linguistic expressions are construed via probability schemas by the interlocutors. Discourse is emergent, processed in the comprehended situation.
4) The linguistic system is to be described from the perspective of the speaker.
5) Linguistic expressions should be described in their supporting matrix (i.e. their prototypical context), not autonomously.

4. The general motivation of the socio-cultural factors

Members of a modernised society form highly complex systems with communication processes. These systems are not imposed on the given communities from outside, but communities are created just by themselves forming such complex communication systems. The realisation of the emergent nature of society carries consequences: the scientific description of society constitutes part of that society, the two cannot be separated (Luhmann 1998: 16—35).

One basic feature of every community is autopoiesis, self-creation (Luhmann 1998). For the individual born into a society the "ready-made", given nature of society is considered to be evident. Nevertheless, human communities do exist and function by continuous self-creation. A clear factor of autopoiesis is manifested in everyday actions, on diverse levels of convention and awareness.

The community decides for itself in what respect and to which degree it separates itself from other communities. At the same time, detachment forms and comprises the features belonging to the given community, identification. The community always makes references to itself and also to its environment by everyday actions with cultural content. The social and cultural references and self-references are mostly replications: roughly identical contexts prompt roughly identical attitudes. Norms are actions with social validity, the conventionalized schemas of successful actions (Bartsch 1985). They are orientational patterns formed through intentions and expectations of actions in self-referential and self-creating processes, with certain degrees of probability (Luhmann 1998: 190).

As for the individual, the process of socialisation goes on with the emergency of networks. The importance of the individual (subiectum) and the social network organized around the individual has increased in the European cultures during the last two centuries. This change is one factor in the individualisation processes of European cultures, placing the individual's self-creating and self-reflexive processes in the foreground. As the consequence and condition at the same time, individual motivational factors have become more significant, providing more space for emergence in linguistic interactions.

All these developments serve the expression of self-identification or audience design only partly. They rather serve the interactional positioning of the speaker, the forming of the intersubjective relation and the reference to the conventions, with the actual use of the linguistic potential (the

stylistic potential) and the demonstration of the competence for linguistic creativity. The speaker's perspectival vantage point (the referential centre) becomes part of the linguistic interaction to a more definite extent, from the viewpoint of linguistic formation, too. The historical processes are emergent: interlocutors are not conscious about the final outcome of their actions. The growth of learned knowledge and access to information, and also the increase of focusing on the individual result in the growth of cultural and social variability. Since "the more information yields fewer acceptances" (Luhmann 1998: 316), i.e. more knowledge about the variability of the world, human communities and individuals brings in not only passive knowledge but also an initiating force to realise and strengthen the separation of the particular, for difference as a forming factor.

All these developments take place within social, national or group variety, wherein the cultural functions are operational factors. Culture is the essence of the community's self-creating and self-reflexive activities. The interlocutors refer to themselves and the community (their environment) by linguistic formation (style). Within this general framework (see Tolcsvai Nagy 2005: 33), style appears in the case when the formations of certain expressions are foregrounded, i.e. drawn in the focus of attention as figures. Formation is the processing of the phonological, the semantic and the schematic structures of a linguistic expression of whatever size. The formation is foregrounded (i.e. it becomes figure) against the ground of other formations in simple or complex cognitive domains. The foregrounding of the formation of certain linguistic expressions contributes to the sense of the discourse/text. Stylistic meaning or function is more indeterminate than meaning originating from semantic structures; it is determined by several factors. Thus style is defined as a factor in the construing of the sense of the discourse, based on linguistic formation, in the mood it can function in a culture, by the interlocutors. This is why style is not a mere ornament, because it establishes and expresses at the same time the variability of the community in the flow of its activities.

In a modernised, self-creating and self-reflexive society the individual and the community, and also their relations are continuously re-interpreted, partly along cultural, linguistic: semantic and stylistic factors. The coherent description of system and use is a basic theoretical and methodological challenge. A language system in the strict sense is a network of conventionalised, decontextualised linguistic structures, i.e. symbolic structures of semantic and phonological structures with prototype effects. A system exists and functions as the interlocutors' knowledge in construal processes and dynamic meaning generation. Knowledge is activated in the process of
linguistic interaction (Langacker 1987, Verschueren 1999, Tomasello 1999, Tátrai 2011).

The main factors of a linguistic interaction are as follows:
- joint focusing of attention,
- the current discourse space (discourse world, 'speech situation') processed by the interlocutors,
- temporality (processing time): attention focusing and discourse space have a temporal, on-line processing nature.

The joint attention is focused on:
- the joint referential scene (joint reference to the third participant, i.e. the topic of the discourse),
- the main active participants of the attention focusing: the speaker and the hearer.

The linguistic interaction as part of the attention focusing is realised by the on-line processing of:
- the joint referential scene,
- the factors of the social relations and the broader context.

The on-line processing of the factors of the social relations and the broader context definitely has a culture specific character. This process is completed with the continuous evaluation of the factors by intentions attributed to others and the speakers themselves via social cognitions (cf. Fiske—Taylor 1991). The factors of the attentional scene are accomplished by the interlocutors currently, on-line, through entrenched and activated attitude schemas (sanctioned by these schemas or conflicting with them). Although the attitude schemas go back to universal principles perhaps in most cases, their historical development has many culture-specific features. Evaluative attribution (i.e. processing, interpretation from personal perspective) is attained by:
- the intentions attributed to the speaker or the expected norm realized by the hearer,
- the relation between the intention realised by the speaker and the norm attributed to the hearer.

The linguistic interaction is part of the social cognition. People are intentional beings; they try to influence their surroundings. The influence on the social environment is two-way: an actor gives and gets feedback.

Besides everyday practice, communities make reflections on everyday linguistic practice with analysing processes. The (self-)reflexive analysis is not confined to science (e.g. linguistics or rhetoric); it is a component of culture, based on the community's semantics.

5. Cultural groups and language varieties

Since style is evidently related to linguistic variability, and variability has a historical character both in its system and functions, i.e. style changes, it seems to be useful to give an overview of linguistic variability, in a socio-cultural framework, concentrating on the Hungarian language community.

The division of the Hungarian language community and culture intensified during modernisation, not later than from the end of the 18th century. The groups and regions formed by the network of village communities with rustic traditions were hit by political and military shocks and were transformed by social developments. Urbanisation and the urban popular culture and language varieties produced new types of social groups and regions with more fuzzy edges than earlier. Shaping factors are: ethnological features (canonised and taught knowledge, way of life, work, family and marriage, literature, music, orientation in the world, media, material culture, the stable or changing character of these factors), geographical and travel circumstances, settlement types, communication networks and scenes. The dialectological, sociolinguistic features are closely related with the general cultural factors mentioned above. The cultural factors are instantiated with prototypical co-occurrences, i.e. in typical cultural groups with characteristic language use and linguistic self-reflection. The most important groups are as follows.

1) Rural (peasant and craftsman) dialectal groups, networks and regions with the following features:

- cumulative culture is based on the preservation of traditions, by way of replication;
- the region has a static network form with more dense contacts between neighbouring settlements (by religion and church, marriage, market), less intense contacts with administrative, cultural and economic centres;
- individuals get into contact with strangers through the identity of their (usually single) group membership, i.e. their belonging to the village community; certainly in some cases with broader relations and strong affection for the region.

2) Popular groups, networks and regions of (or believed to be of) urban origin with the following features:
- cumulative culture is based on the innovative (not replicative) attitude towards tradition and convention;
- language contacts are influenced in a growing extent by individual mobility, migration, travel;
- individuals belong to several speech communities (individually centred networks), identity is formed by the system of the vernacular and the other learned language varieties with a high degree of self-reflexivity.

3) Standard speaker groups, networks and regions with the following features:
- cumulative culture is based on the preservation and cultivation of the codified language variety, albeit including innovation;
- the cultivation, codification and implementation of the standard language variety is completed in networks, partly with a centrally directed institutional background, though high culture and its language variety (or varieties) do not belong to one region (not even the capital, Budapest);
- the most reflexive and the most effectively self-reflexive type in defining itself and its environment.

The three types outlined above overlap with each other, and also there is great variability within each of them. The Hungarian language community and linguistic region in the Carpathian Basin shows a characteristic picture. The following systems subsist simultaneously: 1) a network of groups and regions based on organic development and dialectal, rural and urban traditions; 2) artificial regions created by the Trianon treaty in 1920, cutting through many regions and groups of the first system; 3) the dynamic, ever changing networks of the communication society not bounded to geographical places or regions, open and ready to accept innovations and newcomers. Domains of art (literature, particularly), science and some other branches of culture join the everyday language varieties with highly elaborated and reflexive language use.

6. The main functions of socio-cultural factors

As mentioned above, the complexity of style is approached in three complex domains. These are:

1. the stylistic potential of language: some aspects of the formation of a symbolic structure as a process can be foregrounded on their own, that is, they demonstrate their stylistic

potential in relation to the cognitive possibilities of construal and conventionality, leaving the stylistic meaning itself maximally open to understanding (partially constrained by socio-cultural factors and text structure),

2. socio-cultural factors: some aspects of the formation of a symbolic structure can be foregrounded with respect to socio-cultural factors, and

3. stylistic structure: some aspects of the formation of a symbolic structure can be foregrounded in the stylistic structure of discourse/text, in relation to other foregrounded processes within the discourse/text.

The stylistic meaning of a symbolic structure is determined partly by such factors that can be derived from social and cultural values. These values refer to the formation of a symbolic structure of any size or a text/discourse with respect to a communicative situation. The term "social" covers the universal features of cognition and communication in community, and the term "cultural" refers to the culture-specific factors of cognition and communication. The role of socio-cultural factors in style was emphasised and worked out in detail first by M. A. K. Halliday in his register theory (cf. Halliday 1968, 1978, 1994).

The socio-cultural factors have a complex role in stylistic functions. These factors constrain the stylistic potential in relation to the current discourse space, more specifically both to the scene put on stage within a viewing frame and to the ground. In other words, the socio-cultural-factors specify the activated stylistic functions relative to the speaker and the hearer within the verbal interaction.

The model presented here differentiates only the important cognitive domains, others may be added. The following cognitive domains as socio-cultural factors of style are identified in the present model.

- The domain of attitude
- The domain of situation
- The domain of value
- The domain of time
- The domain of language varieties

The domain of attitude conceptualises the speaker's attitude towards the formation of linguistic structures, texts, in the interpretation of the recipient. It is not the attitude of the speaker directed immediately towards the recipient.

The domain of situation conceptualises the speaker's representation of the current communicative situation in relation to the formation of linguistic symbolic structures, texts. It is certainly not the objective depiction of the given situation.

The domain of value conceptualises the speaker's evaluation of the scene and the participants, entities, actions involved, through the formation of linguistic symbolic structures, texts.

The domain of time conceptualises the speaker's perspective towards the formation of linguistic symbolic structures, texts. It is not the time of the actual verbal interaction, but the historical relations of the symbolic structures in the text.

Although language varieties are not manifestations of style in themselves, they have a certain function among the socio-cultural factors, mainly by their prestige and typical co-occurrences of subdomains within the first three socio-cultural domains.

In all the domains, it is important to note that the socio-cultural factors in figure—ground relations are strictly constrained in the sense that they are represented within their scope in language. That is, not attitude in general has its partial role in representing style, but attitude towards the formation of linguistic symbolic structures, texts.

The domains form different types of continua, and in each continuum certain subdomains may be separated, where the concentration of realisations are more dense than in other regions of the continuum. Subdomains overlap at the edges, i.e. their edges are fuzzy. In four of the enumerated domains there is a neutral subdomain. Neutrality does not mean something without style, but something that has no foregrounded (figured) component in that domain. Defined more precisely, neutrality means that the neutral subdomain is the central subdomain in the sense that a linguistic unit conceived as neutral in some respect needs no other symbolic structure in order to make a comparison and thus to relate two symbolic structures to establish their style with respect to each other in one of the socio-cultural factors of style. In establishing a non-neutral subdomain, the neutral subdomain is always needed within the same domain.

The socio-cultural factors map (at least partly) the social, personal and relational components of the linguistic interaction or interpret the linguistic potential according to social parameters. The factors are instantiated mostly in an implicated, subjectified way (subjectification understood in the sense of Langacker 2006). These factors are directly related to the core part of the discourse space, the ground, i.e. the interlocutors, their current time-space continuum and their temporary activated knowledge. The ground in Langacker's term is not a component of the objectively construed scene (e.g. in a clause). A speaker seldom announces that "I will speak to you in a coarse/gentle/official mood". Rather, the speaker much more frequently construes her/his references to her/his own attitude, the dynamically created discourse space and the formation conventions by implicated, subjectified linguistic formations, besides the objectified semantic content of the discourse. "An entity is said to be objectively construed to the extent that it goes "onstage" as an explicit, focused object of conception. An entity is subjectively construed to the extent that it remains "offstage" as an implicit, unselfconscious subject of conception. At issue, then, is the inherent asymmetry between the conceptualizer and what is conceptualized, between the tacit conceptualizing presence and the target of conceptualization. The asymmetry is maximal when the subject of conception lacks all self-awareness, being totally absorbed in apprehending the onstage situation, and the object of conception is salient, well-delimited, and apprehended in great acuity" (Langacker 2006: 18, cf. also Traugott 1989, Traugott—Dasher 2000, Athanasiadou—Canakis—Cornillie eds. 2006, Verhagen 2007).

Style, and the system of socio-cultural factors in particular, are only partially objectified, they are subjectified to a high degree. Within the joint attentional and referential scene, the cultural factors are profiled, i.e. they are foregrounded and function as meaningful elements. A profiled stylistic element becomes the focus of attention with other related stylistic elements in the background within their category, and is contrasted to stylistic elements of other stylistic categories. This process counts as objective. On the other hand, stylistic profiling comprises an important component of subjectification. The speaker expresses contents by stylistic formation in a covert mood, designating her/his attitude towards the topic, the situation, the value of the topic and other socio-cultural factors through implicated linguistic formation. In example (2) above, *lónagy fridzsider* 'refrigerator as big as a horse' expresses overtly the size of the refrigerator: there are extremely big refrigerators, in the pensioner's knowledge. On the

other hand, she expresses her opinion and emotions about poverty, the living standard of pensioners in Hungary in 1996 in an indirect, implicated way, by subjectification. Her linguistic formation is covert, without direct self-reference, but highly effective with the semantic exaggeration. From this perspective, socio-cultural factors have the features as follows.

The socio-cultural factors function in relation to the ground (the speaker, the hearer, their space-time continuum and their currently activated knowledge), their function originates from one participant of the ground as source.

The communicative act of the speaker without the overt attention directed towards her-/himself as a communicative being comprises the vantage point of the speaker (the referential centre in the viewpoint structure). It expresses that 'I say what is said', 'I decide the perspective'. But that is not what is construed as the centre of the overtly expressed contents. This is so even when the speaker her-/himself is participant of the objectified scene. The hearer comprehends this effect intention during the joint attention focusing, within her/his expectations, more or less identical to the speaker's intentions.

The speaker originates the stylistic content with social validity from her-/himself as the conceptualizer by the implicit designation of the vantage point. She/he assumes that she/he decides about the use of the stylistic element, her/his effect intention prevails in the current use. As the conceptualizer, she/he designates implicitly, without overt self-reference the validity of this perspective. At the same time, this process is comprehensible for the hearer: she/he attributes the stylistic effect made on her-/himself to the speaker, and not exclusively to the linguistic forms. This process proves to be the one where the linguistic usage event becomes complete, by the approaching of two interlocutors to each other. The interlocutors usually create the joint comprehension, i.e. meaning generation via negotiations.

7. Summary

The paper argued that socio-cultural factors do have a significant role in the functional system of linguistic style. The socio-cultural factors are maintained by the community and its culture, attributing cultural meaning to linguistic formation types, but they do not come directly from the inherent features of the language system. The paper gave a theoretical approach to socio-cultural factors in style compared to the stylistic potential, in relation with the emergent nature of society (community in general) and culture, within the dynamic linguistic interaction with the joint attentional and referential scenes, with the self-creative and self-reflexive nature of the interlocutors and their social relations. The characteristic variability of Hungarian cultural groups and language varieties were also treated, from the perspective of stylistic socio-cultural factors. The last section dealt with the main functions of the stylistic socio-cultural factors, pointing to the subjectified character of linguistic formation.

References

Athanasiadou, Angeliki — Canakis, Costas — Bert Cornillie (eds.) 2006. *Subjectification. Various paths to subjectivity*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bartha Csilla — Hámori Ágnes 2010. Stílus a szociolingvisztikában, stílus a diskurzusban. [Style in sociolinguistics, style in discourse.] *Magyar Nyelvőr* 298—321.

Bartsch, Renate 1985. *Sprachnormen: Theorie und Praxis*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Bell, Allan 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 145—204.

Biber, Douglas — Finegan, Edward (eds.) 1994. *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register*. Oxford: Oxford Unversity Press.

Brône, Geert — Vandaele, Jeroen (eds) 2009. *Cognitive poetics. Goals, gains and gaps*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Coupland, Nikolas 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Domonkosi Ágnes 2010. *A stílus fogalma a szociolingvisztikában*. [The category of style in sociolinguistics.] Kézirat. [Manuscript.]

Eckert, Penelope — Rickford, John R. (eds.) 2001. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eliot, Thomas S. 1950. *Selected essays*. New York: Harcourt, Brace

Fiske, Susan T. — Taylor, Shelley E. 1991. *Social cognition*. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Geeraerts, Dirk — Cuyckens, Hubert (eds.) 2007. *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich 1986. Schwindende Stabilität der Wirklichkeit. Eine Geschichte des Stilbegriffs. In: Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich — Pfeiffer, Ludwig K. (Hg.): *Stil: Geschichten und Funktionen eines kulturwissenschaftlichen Dis- kurselements*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 726—788.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1968. The users and uses of language. In: Fishman, J. A. (ed.): *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hangue: Mouton. 139—169.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1978. *Language as a social semiotic. The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London, Baltimore: University Park Press.

Halliday, Michael A. K. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold. Second edition.

Kemmer, Suzanne — Barlow, Michael 2000. Introduction: A usage-based conception of language. In: Barlow, Michael — Kemmer, Suzanne (eds.): *Usage-based models of language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. vii—xxviii.

Labov, William 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC: Center for Apllied Linguistics.

Lakoff, George 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Volume I. Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2006. Subjectification, grammaticalization, and conceptual archetypes. In: Athanasiadou, Angeliki — Canakis, Costas — Cornillie, Bert (eds*): Subjectification. Varoius paths to subjectivity*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 17—40.

Luhmann, Niklas 1998. *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Rosch, Eleanor 1977. Human categorization. In: Warren, Neil (ed.): *Studies in cross-cultural psychology*. Vol. I. London: Academic Press. 1—49.

Sandig, Barbara 1986. *Stilistik der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Sandig, Barbara 2005. *Textstilistik des Deutschen.* Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Semino, Elena — Culpeper, Jonathan (eds.) 2002. *Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simon Gábor 2012. A stílus szociolingvisztikai meghatározásáról. [About style definitions in sociolinguistics.] *Magyar Nyelv* 18—39.

Tátrai Szilárd 2011. *Bevezetés a pragmatikába. Funkcionális kognitív megközelítés*. [Introduction to pragmatics. A functional cognitive approach.] Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor 1996. *A magyar nyelv stilisztikája*. [The stylistics of Hungarian.] Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.

Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor 2005. *A cognitive theory of style*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.

Tomasello, Michael 1999. *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic meaning. *Language* (65) 31—55.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs — Dasher, Richard B. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Peer, Willie 1986. *Stylistics and psychology: Investigations of foregrounding*. London: Croom Helm.

van Peer, Willie — Renkema, Jan (eds.) 1984. *Pragmatics and stylistics*. Leuven: Acco.

Verhagen, Arie 2007. Construal and Perspectivization. In: Geeraerts, Dirk — Cuyckens, Hubert (eds.): *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 48—81.

Verschueren, Jef 1999. *Understanding pragmatics*. London, New York, Sydney, Auckland: Arnold.