INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
Impact Factor: 9.58 Volume I Issue III

TEXT STYLISTICS WITHIN THE PARADIGM OF NEOSTYLISTICS

Usarov Ibroximjon Kurpashayevich
Tashkent University of Applied Sciences
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Acting Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences
Phone: +998 90 346 19 69
E-mail: ibroximjonusarov069@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0007-2638-0186
Science ID: FAN-0426-0082

ARTICLE INFO:
Received:08.11.2026
Revised: 09.11.2026
Accepted:10.11.2026

KEY WORDS:
text stylistics, neostylistics, styleme, multimodality, reader response

ABSTRACT:

This conceptual study proposes a neostylistic model linking linguistic form, context, culture, multimodality and reception. It defines the styleme, distinguishes functional configurations and separates textual observation from interpretation and reader-response evidence. Constructed microtexts illustrate the model, providing criteria for subsequent corpus and reception studies.

INTRODUCTION

Textual style emerges from linguistic choices and their functions in communication. In fiction, rhythm, viewpoint and imagery shape interpretation; in digital messages, typography, images, emoji and comments also contribute. The central problem is to coordinate evidence from these different layers. This article develops a working definition of neostylistics and testable analytical criteria. Its contribution lies in explaining functional relations between stylistic resources while distinguishing observable features, interpretive claims and evidence of reader response. Here, "paradigm" denotes a coordinated set of research principles.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Uzbek stylistics systematically describes expressive linguistic resources [1], while G. Leech and M. Short connect linguistic choice with textual function [2]. These traditions already acknowledge context and interpretation. M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan explain grammatical and lexical cohesion [3]; Sh. Safarov relates language to communicative purposes and conditions [4]. Together, they support analysis of how a feature such as repetition can create cohesion, emphasis or rhythm.

Cognitive stylistics addresses conceptualisation and viewpoint [5], whereas corpus stylistics examines recurring patterns through contextual reading [6]. Multimodal analysis [7], cyberpragmatics [8], cultural linguistics [9] and research on online affiliation [10] extend the range of relevant evidence. Reception studies connect foregrounding with reading time, strikingness and affect [11] and investigate the cognitive, affective and neural bases of literary reception [12]. Such findings require a distinction between a text's potential effects and readers' observed responses.

The study combines theoretical comparison, conceptual clarification and contextual-functional analysis. Sources were selected for their contribution to specific parts of the model. Author-constructed microtexts and variant substitution illustrate possible functions; they are not naturally occurring corpus data. Corpus analysis and reader experiments are proposed as subsequent validation procedures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Working definition and stylistic organisation

We define neostylistics as an integrative research paradigm that studies stylistic meaning arising from the selection of verbal and nonverbal signs and their interaction with text, discourse, cognition, culture, emotion, technological media and reception. Stylistic meaning concerns a sign's contribution to evaluative tone, imagery, rhythm or relations with the addressee. Integration requires methods appropriate to the research question; every layer need not be applied to every text.

A styleme is a verbal or nonverbal unit that produces a stylistic distinction in context. It may comprise a word, a syntactic construction or a combination of signs. Its identification requires an alternative expression, a contextual function and supporting evidence. Salience alone is insufficient: ordinary pronouns and conjunctions can also organise viewpoint.

In the author's analytical terminology, *monostylemic* organisation involves one dominant mechanism, *bistylemic* organisation links two mechanisms, and *polystylemic* organisation combines three or more in a shared function. Mechanisms must be functionally distinguishable: labelling one construction both metaphor and personification does not establish two mechanisms. A *paremiostyleme* concerns a proverb's contextual stylistic function. Digistylistics, ethnostylistics, aesthetostylistics and psychostylistics identify overlapping digital, cultural, aesthetic and reception-related dimensions; multiple labels alone do not constitute a finding.

Analytical criteria and evidence

The model is an analytical framework, not a mathematical index. Analysis records genre, audience, situation and relevant variants, identifies features and their interaction, and specifies the evidence needed to test each interpretation. Table 1 summarises the principal criteria.

Table 1. Criteria for neostylistic analysis

Analytical layer	Observable features	Validation
Linguistic and compositional	Choice, repetition, order, rhythm	Context and alternative wording
Cognitive and pragmatic	Viewpoint, evaluation, indirect meaning	Situation and competing interpretations
Cultural and intertextual	Symbols, proverbs, allusions	Cultural sources and usage context
Multimodal and digital	Relations among text, image, graphics and emoji	Variants under comparable conditions
Reception and corpus	Reader judgements, frequency, distribution	Experiments or comparable corpora

"The sentence contains three repetitions" is an observation; "repetition intensifies anxiety" is a functional interpretation; "readers rated this version as more anxious" requires empirical evidence. High corpus frequency likewise does not directly measure emotional impact. Keeping these levels separate makes the basis and limits of each conclusion explicit.

Applications and limitations

The first constructed microtext reads: *"Shahar uyg'ondi, ammo ko'chalar hali ham kechaning sovuq xotirasini ko'tarib turardi; derazalar yorishar, odamlar esa o'z ichidagi qorong'ilikni berkitishga urinardi."* ["The city awoke, but the streets still carried the cold memory of the night; windows lit up, while people tried to conceal the darkness within."] External light and internal darkness form the main contrast. Personification, metaphorical imagery and adversative syntax work together, supporting a polystylemic interpretation.

The contrastive elements *ammo* ("but") and *esa* ("while") connect the imagery to the sentence structure. In a neutral variant, "The city awoke. Windows lit up, and people hurried to work", the narrative remains but the external–internal opposition disappears. This comparison supports an analytical hypothesis. Measuring its emotional effect would require controlled variants that isolate particular features rather than change several factors simultaneously.

The second microtext is: *"Bugun ham reja ko'p. Vaqt-chi? 0%. #deadline."* ["Plenty of plans today, too. What about time? 0%. #deadline."] The short question and numerical answer compress the mismatch between plans and available time. "0%" may function as hyperbole rather than literal measurement; the hashtag signals deadline pressure without establishing the writer's profession or group membership. A smiling emoji could suggest humour, mitigate discomfort or convey irony. Its interpretation therefore requires conversational context and comparison with an emoji-free version under the same conditions.

Different claims require different evidence: cultural interpretations need contextual sources, habitual stylistic patterns need comparable texts, and emotional effects need reader data. For AI-assisted texts, prompts, variants and human editing should be documented; formulaic wording alone cannot establish provenance. The examples illustrate the framework, while its applicability across genres remains an empirical question.

CONCLUSION

Neostylistic analysis connects linguistic choice, context and semiotic resources through explicit evidence requirements. The styleme links individual resources to contextual functions, while mono-, bi- and polystylemic configurations depend on the independence and interaction of mechanisms. The model's principal methodological value is the separation of observation, interpretation and reader-response evidence. Validation requires consistent annotation across genres, comparison between analysts and direct investigation of reader responses.

REFERENCES

1. Shomaqsudov A., Rasulov I., Qo'ng'urov R., Rustamov H. O'zbek tili stilistikasi [Stylistics of the Uzbek Language]. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1983.

2. Leech G., Short M. Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.

3. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. London: Longman, 1976.

4. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika [Pragmalinguistics]. Tashkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008.

5. Semino E., Culpeper J., eds. Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. DOI: 10.1075/lal.1.

6. Mahlberg M. Corpus Stylistics and Dickens's Fiction. New York; London: Routledge, 2013.

7. Bateman J. A., Wildfeuer J., Hiippala T. Multimodality: Foundations, Research and Analysis – A Problem-Oriented Introduction. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017. DOI: 10.1515/9783110479898.

8. Yus F. Cyberpragmatics: Internet-Mediated Communication in Context. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.213.

9. Sharifian F. Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2017. DOI: 10.1075/clscc.8.

10. Zappavigna M. Discourse of Twitter and Social Media: How We Use Language to Create Affiliation on the Web. London: Continuum, 2012.

11. Miall D. S., Kuiken D. Foregrounding, Defamiliarization, and Affect: Response to Literary Stories. Poetics. 1994;22(5):389–407. DOI: 10.1016/0304-422X(94)00011-5.

12. Jacobs A. M. Neurocognitive Poetics: Methods and Models for Investigating the Neuronal and Cognitive-Affective Bases of Literature Reception. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience. 2015;9:186. DOI: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00186.