



CONTEMPORARY METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE THEORY OF INDIVIDUAL STYLE: LINGUOPOETIC, COGNITIVE, AND COMMUNICATIVE APPROACHES

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21327375>

Dovranjon Turg'unovich Khaydarov

Independent Researcher at Fergana State University, Fergana, Uzbekistan

Annotation: *This article examines the formation and development of the theory of individual style in Uzbek linguistics. It analyzes the scholarly views of Uzbek linguists on the phenomenon of individual style and highlights its linguostylistic, linguopoetic, communicative, and cognitive dimensions. Particular attention is paid to the concept of idiostyle as a reflection of the author's linguistic personality, artistic thinking, aesthetic vision, and national-cultural worldview. The study also discusses contemporary methodological approaches to the investigation of individual style and their significance in the linguistic analysis of literary texts.*

Keywords: *individual style, idiostyle, Uzbek linguistics, linguopoetics, stylistics, linguistic personality, literary text, communicative approach, cognitive approach, authorial style.*

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the concept of idiostyle has become increasingly prominent in the fields of linguistic stylistics and linguopoetics. As a linguistic term, idiostyle represents a shortened form of the phrase individual style and denotes a unique system of linguistic features that characterizes an author's distinctive manner of language use. This concept is widely employed in scholarly studies devoted to literary discourse, where it refers to the author's inimitable and original stylistic identity, manifested through an individual choice of linguistic means and a specific mode of expressing artistic thought. In this sense, idiostyle distinguishes one author's

creative expression from that of others by revealing unique lexical preferences, stylistic devices, and discourse organization.

The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Russian Stylistics interprets idiostyle as a comprehensive scientific category within the framework of general linguistics and stylistics. According to this source, idiostyle (individual style, idiolect) is understood as the totality of stylistic and textual characteristics inherent in the speech of a writer, scholar, publicist, or any individual language user. However, in our view, this definition does not fully reflect the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon. Restricting idiostyle to a collection of stylistic and textual features



overlooks its cognitive, communicative, and linguopoetic dimensions, which have become central to contemporary linguistic research.

Among modern scholars who have made a substantial contribution to the theoretical understanding of idiostyle, the works of Y.V.Starkova occupy a significant place. By synthesizing previous theoretical perspectives, Starkova argues that the study of idiostyle has evolved into several complementary methodological approaches rather than a single unified paradigm. According to the scholar, the complexity and multidimensional character of individual style cannot be adequately explained from one methodological perspective alone. Consequently, a comprehensive investigation of idiostyle requires an integrated analysis of the stylistic, semantic, communicative, cognitive, and linguopoetic properties of linguistic units. Such an interdisciplinary perspective makes it possible to reveal not only the author's linguistic individuality but also the conceptual, aesthetic, and communicative mechanisms underlying the creation of a literary text.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

In her comprehensive study of idiostyle, Y.V.Starkova distinguishes several fundamental methodological approaches that have significantly contributed to the development of contemporary idiostylistic research.

The stylistic-semantic approach regards idiostyle as a system through

which an author employs linguistic and stylistic resources that have evolved during a particular stage of literary development to realize individual aesthetic intentions. According to this perspective, idiostyle is manifested in the author's creative selection of lexical, phraseological, grammatical, and figurative means, the aesthetic reinterpretation of their semantic potential, and their systematic organization in accordance with the ideological orientation and artistic content of a literary work. Consequently, idiostyle is understood primarily as an author's distinctive strategy of selecting and employing linguistic units according to individual aesthetic principles.

Within the framework of the linguopoetic approach, idiostyle is interpreted as a coherent system of linguistic means that constructs the author's artistic world and embodies his or her aesthetic conception. Representatives of this approach argue that every writer's individual style reflects a unique mode of artistic thinking, an original system of imagery, poetic imagination, and a distinctive way of perceiving reality through language. Accordingly, linguopoetic investigations focus on the aesthetic functions of lexical, phraseological, grammatical, syntactic, and poetic devices employed in literary discourse, as well as on their interaction within the textual structure. From this perspective, the author's artistic universe, aesthetic ideals, and poetic worldview are revealed through the integrated



functioning of linguistic resources. Therefore, idiostyle is viewed not merely as a collection of language units but as a complex linguopoetic system that represents the author's creative individuality and artistic cognition.

The systemic-structural approach conceptualizes idiostyle as an integrated linguistic system formed through the author's consistent use of language resources. Proponents of this approach maintain that individual style cannot be reduced to an aggregate of isolated linguistic elements; rather, it emerges from the functional interrelations and structural organization of those elements within the literary text. In this sense, idiostyle constitutes a specific linguistic model of representing reality, reflecting the author's perception of the world, artistic consciousness, and aesthetic values across all linguistic levels. Consequently, this approach explains idiostyle as a functional system that unifies diverse representations of reality within a coherent artistic structure. The integrity of individual style is therefore determined by the interdependence of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and stylistic devices and by the aesthetic functions they perform in literary discourse.

The communicative-discursive approach investigates idiostyle from the perspective of the author's linguistic personality and the strategies employed to establish communication with the reader. Scholars working within this paradigm argue that individual style is determined

not only by the unique use of linguistic forms but also by the author's communicative intentions, discourse strategies, and pragmatic objectives as realized in the literary text. Consequently, particular attention is devoted to the interaction between author and reader, the pragmatic orientation of discourse, methods of information transmission, and the linguistic mechanisms through which aesthetic and emotional effects are achieved.

According to this approach, literary creation extends beyond the representation of reality; it is also a purposeful communicative act aimed at influencing the reader's cognition, emotions, and interpretation. Accordingly, idiostyle is regarded as a complex linguistic system through which the author realizes communicative strategies, artistic intentions, and individual patterns of verbal thinking. Thus, the communicative-discursive perspective interprets idiostyle as an integrated manifestation of the author's linguistic personality, communicative competence, and ability to establish effective interaction with readers through literary discourse.

The cognitive approach examines idiostyle in relation to the author's linguistic personality, conceptual thinking, and individual worldview as reflected in literary discourse. Grounded in the theoretical principles of cognitive linguistics, this approach interprets idiostyle as the linguistic manifestation of the writer's perception of reality,



conceptual knowledge, and cognitive worldview. Within this framework, a literary text is regarded as a linguistic representation of a "possible world" constructed in the author's consciousness. Every writer models an artistic universe based on personal experience, cultural values, aesthetic ideals, and conceptual knowledge, subsequently conveying this individualized worldview through language.

One of the defining characteristics of the cognitive approach is its emphasis on the conceptual content underlying linguistic forms rather than on their external structural properties. Consequently, such notions as concept, linguistic worldview, linguistic personality, cognitive model, and mental space occupy a central position in cognitive investigations of idiosyle. Although different scholarly traditions employ varying terminological frameworks, they are united by the common assumption that idiosyle represents the linguistic expression of the author's individual conceptual system and cognitive processes within literary discourse. From this perspective, the cognitive approach is considered one of the most promising methodological paradigms for revealing the internal essence and conceptual foundations of individual style.

The above discussion demonstrates that Starkova's classification provides a comprehensive methodological framework for investigating the multidimensional nature of idiosyle. The

proposed approaches enable scholars to examine individual style from stylistic-semantic, linguopoetic, systemic-structural, communicative, and cognitive perspectives. Rather than functioning as competing paradigms, these approaches complement one another and collectively establish an integrated methodological basis for contemporary studies of individual style.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The theoretical conception developed by V.V. Vinogradov occupies a pivotal position in contemporary studies devoted to individual style and linguopoetics. One of the scholar's most significant contributions lies in his assertion that the principles governing the artistic representation of the author's image should be sought within the literary text itself rather than in the writer's biography or personal life. According to Vinogradov, the author's image is not a direct projection of the writer's real-life experiences or psychological characteristics; instead, it constitutes a central aesthetic category that unifies the linguistic, semantic, stylistic, and compositional dimensions of a literary work into an integrated artistic system. This perspective has substantially influenced modern theories of literary discourse by shifting scholarly attention from extratextual interpretation toward the internal organization of the text.

From this standpoint, the interpretation of the author's image requires a comprehensive examination of all linguistic levels of the literary text,



including its lexical, grammatical, syntactic, compositional, and figurative structures. These linguistic components should not be analyzed separately but rather as functionally interconnected elements forming a unified artistic mechanism. It is through the interaction of these textual elements that the author's aesthetic vision, artistic worldview, creative thinking, and individual style become fully recognizable. Consequently, the linguistic personality of the author is reconstructed not through external biographical information but through the systematic organization of literary discourse and the functional relationships established among its constituent linguistic units.

Vinogradov further emphasizes that every linguistic unit employed in a literary text serves the realization of the author's artistic intention while simultaneously performing a particular aesthetic function within the overall textual structure. Lexical choices, syntactic constructions, figurative expressions, and stylistic devices collectively contribute to shaping the artistic integrity of the work. Therefore, the investigation of idiosyncrasy should extend beyond the identification of isolated linguistic features and instead focus on their semantic interaction, structural coherence, pragmatic significance, and contribution to the realization of the author's aesthetic conception. Such an analytical perspective enables scholars to uncover the internal organization of individual

style and to explain how diverse linguistic resources cooperate to create a coherent artistic effect.

Furthermore, Vinogradov's conception demonstrates that the author's image functions as the conceptual and structural center of literary discourse. It integrates all textual levels into a unified aesthetic system and ensures the coherence and consistency of the writer's idiosyncrasy. The integrity of individual style is therefore achieved through the harmonious interaction of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, and semantic components, each of which performs a specific function while contributing to the realization of the author's overall artistic strategy. This integrated organization distinguishes one author's linguistic creativity from that of another and forms the basis of his or her unique literary identity.

The significance of Vinogradov's theoretical framework extends beyond the study of literary style alone. His ideas have become one of the methodological foundations of modern linguistics, discourse analysis, text linguistics, and cognitive stylistics. Contemporary scholars increasingly recognize that an author's individuality cannot be adequately explained through isolated linguistic phenomena; instead, it should be understood as the result of the systematic interaction of multiple linguistic and cognitive factors operating within the literary text. Consequently, Vinogradov's conception continues to provide an effective methodological basis



for investigating the relationship between language, artistic cognition, and aesthetic communication.

The analysis presented in this study also confirms that Vinogradov's theoretical principles remain highly relevant to contemporary idiostylistic research. His text-centered approach makes it possible to investigate individual style as a multidimensional linguistic phenomenon reflecting the author's worldview, conceptual thinking, aesthetic ideals, and communicative intentions. Accordingly, the author's image should be regarded not merely as a literary category but as a linguopoetic construct through which artistic meaning is generated and interpreted. This methodological perspective offers broad opportunities for the comprehensive investigation of literary texts and serves as an essential analytical framework for revealing the unique linguistic individuality of writers in both classical and modern literature.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, individual style (idiostyle) should be regarded as a complex and multidimensional linguistic phenomenon that has emerged at the intersection of several branches of modern linguistics, including stylistics, linguopoetics, text linguistics, pragmatolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. The interdisciplinary nature of idiostyle reflects the intricate relationship between language, cognition, communication, and artistic creativity, making it one of the most significant

objects of contemporary linguistic inquiry.

The theoretical foundations of idiostyle have evolved through a long process of scholarly development. Originating from the principles of classical poetics and rhetoric in antiquity, the concept was subsequently enriched by the linguistic and philosophical ideas of such prominent scholars as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Ferdinand de Saussure, Charles Bally, Leo Spitzer, Viktor Vinogradov, and many other distinguished linguists and literary theorists. Their contributions have gradually transformed the study of individual style into a comprehensive methodological framework for investigating the author's linguistic personality, artistic cognition, aesthetic worldview, and creative strategies in literary discourse.

Contemporary linguistic research demonstrates that idiostyle cannot be adequately explained by isolated linguistic features alone. Rather, it represents a dynamic and integrated system in which lexical, grammatical, syntactic, stylistic, cognitive, and pragmatic elements interact to express the author's unique artistic identity. Consequently, modern approaches emphasize the necessity of combining stylistic-semantic, linguopoetic, communicative, systemic, and cognitive perspectives in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of an author's creative individuality.



Within Uzbek linguistics, the study of individual style has likewise developed into an independent and productive field of research through investigations conducted in stylistics, linguopoetics, and the linguistics of literary texts. These studies have significantly contributed to identifying the linguistic and aesthetic characteristics of Uzbek writers and poets, while also expanding the methodological foundations for analyzing artistic discourse. As a result, idiostyle has become an important theoretical criterion for revealing the interaction between linguistic form, artistic meaning, national cultural values, and the author's individual worldview.

Overall, the theoretical approaches discussed in this study provide a solid methodological basis for future linguopoetic investigations of literary texts. Their integrative application makes it possible to uncover the mechanisms through which authors construct their unique artistic worlds, organize linguistic resources, and convey aesthetic meaning. Therefore, the concept of idiostyle continues to occupy a central position in contemporary linguistic and literary scholarship and remains one of the most promising directions for further interdisciplinary research.

REFERENCES:

1. Yoʻldoshev B. Badiiy matnning lingvopoetik tadqiqi. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008.
2. Болотнова Н. С. Изучение идиостиля в современной коммуникативной стилистике художественного
3. Старкова Е.В. Проблема понимания феномена идиостиля в лингвистических исследованиях // <https://cyberleninka.ru>
4. Старкова Ю. В. Проблема понимания феномена идиостиля в лингвистических исследованиях // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Филологические науки. – 2015. – № 5 (360). – С. 163–168.
5. Стилистический энциклопедический словарь русского языка. Под ред. Кожиной М.Н. М.: “Наука”, 2006. – С. 95-96.
6. Shomaqsudov A., Qoʻngʻurov R., Rasulov I., Rustamov H. Oʻzbek tili stilistikasi. – Toshkent: Oʻqituvchi, 1983. – B. 256; Qoʻngʻurov R. Oʻzbek tilining tasviriy vositalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977. – B. 230.
7. Абдупаттоев М. Идиостиль – муаллифнинг окказионал ўзига хослиги // “Истиқлол даври ўзбек тилшунослиги, адабиётшунослиги ва фольклоршунослигининг долзарб масалалари” Республика илмий-назарий анжумани материаллари. – Т.: 2021. – Б. 117.