

CONTRAST AND ANTITHESIS AS STYLISTIC DEVICES

Roya Yaver Aliyeva
candidate for a degree,
Azerbaijan University of Languages

Abstract

There are a number of stylistic devices in the literary language.

The stylistic devices that are observed in the literary language are similar as well as different from one another. Each stylistic device is known to have its own possibilities and points of development.

The article deals with the contrast and the antithesis as stylistic devices.

These stylistic devices are believed to have been relevant throughout history, and they have not yet been resolved, although there have been some attempts to differentiate these stylistic devices.

The aim of the article is to differentiate each of these stylistic devices.

Keywords: *contrast, antithesis, literary device, difference, similarity, concept*

The first pair that we are going to discuss is contrast and antithesis.

Some researchers have tended to interpret both terms as synonyms. They (researchers) claim that comparing these two notions there seem to be more similarities rather than differences between them. Therefore, both terms are possible to be used, and one of them may be bracketed. A.N. Gvozdev characterizing the stylistic role of these terms writes: "With their help, opposite characteristics of people, things and events are expressed by contrast" [Gvozdev, 1955, p.66].

From this point of view, it is possible to clarify two points. Both contrast and antithesis can be expressed by means of antonyms. Additionally, we clearly observe that contrast and antithesis are identified as stylistic devices.

M. N. Kojina is one of those linguists who interpreted contrast and antithesis as synonyms. She writes about it: "... repetitions (to be repeated), contrasts (dissimilarities), parallelism, gradation and other phenomena that ensure the communication of the text (in contrast to sentence syntax) are accepted as a stylistic tool [Kojina 1979, o.218].

Y.M. Skrebnev considers the concepts of contrast (or perceived as antithesis due to any of its signs) in the text, every contrast that is actively actualized as antithesis. From her point of view, it becomes clear that if every opposite concept is expressed by contrast, they can be interpreted as antithesis. Contrast and antithesis clarify essentially the same point. At the same time, stating the difficulty of clarifying the framework of the contrast, Y.M.Skrebnev believes that it is necessary to limit the interpretation of the contrast, which seems to be perceptibly clear, to the general definition of the antithesis [Skrebnev 1975, p.195].

Thus, we can consider that if we focus on the analysis of the definitions of both concepts in literature examples or in theory, we can clearly observe their similarities from some points of view: both content (relationships of contrasts between objects, concepts, words) and expression (concepts, words, relations of juxtaposition of events).

Although there are some similarities between contrast and antithesis, a number of researchers claim to differentiate these two notions. A number of linguists do not accept the point of identifying these two stylistic devices or using them as synonyms. Our point of view is that there may be some similarities between these notions, but it is not correct to equate them. I.R. Galperin is one of the linguists who accepted them to be different stylistic tools: As a stylistic tool "contrast" is a method of artistic description basing on the logical opposite position of reality though antithesis refers only to linguistic means of style" [Galperin 1977, p.223].

Analyzing I.R. Galperin's opinion, it becomes clear that he differentiates these stylistic devices according to two, artistic and linguistic stylistic ones. With the right line between contrast and contradiction, he justifies that they serve different directions.

In the book of "Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms" by L.I. Timofeyev and N.F. Vengerova, contrast is attributed to literary language as a stylistic tool, and antithesis is used to express opposite meanings. However, this approach is not unanimously accepted by all.

In the "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" (under the editorship of O.S. Akhmanova) contrast is defined to be a figure of speech, and its essence is explained as antonymization (confrontation, collision). At the same time, the term "contrast" is used to contrast images. Thus, among the researched works, the comparison of Eyvazli and Koroglu in the story of "Grammar of our mistakes" by K. Abdulla, the juxtaposition of the images of Topal Teymur (Lame Teymur) and Orkhan in H. Javid's "Topal Teymur" substantiates the point expressed by O.S. Akhmanova. In these two works, it is possible to observe two completely opposite characters. Both their inner world and the outer world contrast with each other. This approach can be observed in V.V. Vinogradov's article about the style of "The Blackjack". The antithesis of "The German and the happy young man" (Chaplitsky) [Vinogradov 1980, p.262].

Besides, in the preface of O. Henry's "Collection of Stories", the following phrase is read: "It can be assumed that O. Henry, being inspired by M. Twain's two dishonest greedy swindlers "king" and "duke" in the novel of "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn", created a unique positive contrast, that is, the images of two noble swindlers - Jeff Peters and Andy Tucker" [Shishinka 1977, p.24].

The contrasting comparison of A.F. Polyakov's images is presented as the contrast of individual characteristics (behavior, appearance, subtleties of thought) in "Quiet Don" along with the inner closeness and oneness of the characters, for example, Nagulnov and Razmetnov. The contrast of the images is shown by the sharp opposition of the characters and the contrast of their individual characteristics and inner essence [Polyakova 1962, p.31].

The next criterion for distinguishing contrast and antithesis is quantity. What does it mean? We can interpret it this way, some researchers emphasize the importance of distinguishing contrast and antithesis according to quantitative features, that is, they compare them according to "large" (chapter, section, whole work) and "small" (sentence, units, paragraph) contexts. Although there is no single opinion here either. Y.Q. Rizel believes that the contrast is also in the macrotext [Rizel 1974, p.254]. It is possible to agree with the opinion of L.M. Matviyevskaya that distinguishing contrast and antithesis basing on structural features is not convincing enough as it does not reflect the qualitative difference of those events [Matviyevskaya 1978, p.65]. Thus, it can be concluded that it is difficult to define the field of development of contrast and antithesis.

In this research paper, the distinction between the notions of "contrast" and "antithesis" is ambiguous. We believe that it is important to contrast the concepts of contrast and antithesis and the phenomena behind them both objectively and subjectively. In this case, we consider the sum of contrasts and their interrelationships in creating the main semantic counterposition of the text as the principle underlying the antithesis. As a result, "contrast" belongs to literary studies, and "antithesis" belongs to the field of linguistics.

References

1. Gvozdev, A.N. (1955). *Essays on the stylistics of the Russian language*. M.: Uchpedgiz, 1955, 463 p.
2. Kojina, M.N. (1979). *Stylistics in relation to the linguistics of the text*. In: *Theory and Practice of Teaching the Russian Language and Literature*. M.: Russian language, pp. 213-222.
3. Skrebnev, Yu.M. (1975). *Essay on the theory of stylistics*. Gorky: Gorkov Publishing House. State. ped. Institute of Foreign Languages, 175 p.
4. Galperin, I.R. (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow: Higher School, 332 p.
5. Vinogradov, V.V. (1980). *On the language of artistic prose*. M.: Nauka, 360 p.
6. Shishinka, T.N. (1977). *Preface*. In the book: O. Henry., *Selected Stories*. Moscow, Progress Publishers, pp.- 26.
7. Polyakova, A.F. (1962). *On the composition of a literary work*. V. Kn.: *Proceedings of the association of departments of literature of universities in Siberia and the Far East: Uchen. Zap. T.4, issue 2*, 58 p.
8. Rizel, E.G. (1974). *Text as an integral structure in the aspect of linguistic stylistics*. In: *Text Linguistics. Scientific materials. Conferences. Part II*. M., pp. 35-38.
9. Matviyevskaya, L.N. (1978). *Contrast and Antithesis*. *Russian language at school*, 1978, No. 5, pp. 65-67.