Джафарова Улькер Ариф гызы, преподаватель,
Азербайджанский университет языков
Jafarova Ulkar Arif, Lecturer,
Azerbaijan University of Languages

«ЗАМЕЩЕНИЕ» И «ПОВТОР» КАК СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ПРИЕМЫ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНОГО АНАЛИЗА АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКОГО И АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)
"SUBSTITUTION" AND "RECURRENCE" FUNCTIONS AS STYLISTIC DEVICES (BASED ON A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE AZERBAIJANI AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES)

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются понятия замещения и хиазма на основе сопоставительного анализа азербайджанского и английского языков. В лингвистике текста замещение определяется как грамматический прием, при котором предшествующая языковая единица заменяется другой формой, в то время как хиазм характеризуется как синтаксическая стилистическая фигура, основанная на перекрестном или инвертированном расположении параллельных элементов. Цель исследования – определить роль данных приемов в обеспечении связности текста, создании смысловых акцентов и усилении коммуникативного воздействия. В работе используются описательный, контекстуальный и функционально-сопоставительный методы анализа. Примеры на азербайджанском и английском языках, приведенные в статье, составлены автором исключительно в иллюстративных целях; они не являются цитатами из художественных произведений или результатами корпусного анализа. Проведенный анализ показывает, что замещение и хиазм представляют собой самостоятельные понятия, относящиеся к разным теоретическим уровням: первое может играть важную роль в обеспечении грамматической связности текста, тогда как второе функционирует в рамках стилистической организации синтаксической структуры. Это разграничение служит терминологической основой для данного сопоставительного исследования.

Abstract. This article examines the concepts of substitution and chiasmus based on a comparative analysis of the Azerbaijani and English languages. In text linguistics, substitution is defined as a grammatical device that replaces a preceding linguistic unit with another form, while chiasmus is described as a syntactic stylistic figure in which parallel elements are arranged in a crossed or inverted sequence. The objective of this study is to determine the contribution of these devices to textual cohesion, semantic emphasis, and communicative impact. The research employs descriptive, contextual, and functional-comparative analytical methods. The examples in Azerbaijani and English provided in the article have been constructed by the author primarily for illustrative purposes; they are not presented as citations from literary works or as findings derived from a corpus. The analysis demonstrates that substitution and chiasmus are distinct concepts belonging to different theoretical levels: the former may play a significant role in the grammatical cohesion of a text, whereas the latter functions within the stylistic organization of syntactic structure. This distinction forms the terminological basis for the comparative study.

Ключевые слова: Substitution, chiasmus, reversal, textual cohesion, syntactic stylistics, comparative analysis.

Keywords: Замещение, хиазм, инверсия, связность текста, синтаксическая стилистика, сопоставительный анализ.

The selection of linguistic units serves not merely to convey information; it also influences the coherence of a text, the emphasis placed on ideas, and the impression formed by the reader. In

text linguistics, “substitution” is studied as a mechanism whereby a unit previously introduced in the context is replaced by a different linguistic form. In stylistics, “chiasmus” is described as a syntactic figure created by arranging elements of parallel structures in a crossed or inverted sequence.

The terms “substitution” and “geridönmə” (reversion/inversion) – which appeared in the article’s initial title – are retained here as stylistic devices. However, it should not be assumed that "geridönmə" is the established, standard Azerbaijani equivalent for "chiasmus." In this article, “chiasmus” is used as the primary international term, while “geridönmə” is noted as a working term derived from the original title. For the final version submitted for publication, this equivalent must be verified against sources in Azerbaijani linguistics and in consultation with the academic supervisor.

The objective of this research is to explain the nature of the concepts of “substitution” and “chiasmus”, to distinguish their functions within a text, and to conduct a comparative analysis using examples drawn from the Azerbaijani and English languages. The objectives of this study are to clarify the terminological framework, identify the structural characteristics of both devices, analyze their stylistic and pragmatic functions, and outline directions for future empirical research.

The methodological basis employs descriptive, contextual, and functional-comparative analysis. This stage of the article is theoretical and example-oriented; it does not present statistical findings or corpus-based generalizations.

1. The Concept of Substitution

Halliday and Hasan (1976) distinguish the following categories among the devices that ensure textual cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. In this model, substitution refers to the replacement of a specific unit within a text with another grammatical form. In English, typical examples include “one/ones” for nominal substitution, “do” for verbal substitution, and “so” or “not” for clausal substitution. By maintaining a link to the preceding context, these devices can reduce the need to repeat the full expression.

Substitution is not the same as synonymy. Synonymy is a semantic relationship between lexical units, whereas substitution involves the representation of a unit by a substitute form within a specific textual and grammatical structure. At the same time, it is distinct from substitution reference and ellipsis: reference involves one unit pointing to another referent, whereas ellipsis refers to the omission of an element that can be recovered from the context. Nominal substitution in English: “I need a pen. Do you have one?” Here, “one” replaces the noun phrase “a pen” from the preceding sentence. Verbal substitution in English: “She sings better than I do.” In this sentence, “do” replaces the content of the verb “sing” mentioned earlier. Clausal substitution in English: “Will the meeting be cancelled? I hope so.” Here, “so” replaces the content expressed in the previous sentence.

In the Azerbaijani language, the same textual function is not always realized through the same type of substitute form. Depending on the grammatical structure of the language, this may involve the omission of a repeated element, the encoding of person and tense information within the verb form itself, or the use of lexical repetition. Therefore, in cross-linguistic comparison, the focus should be on functional correspondence rather than formal identity. An illustrative example in Azerbaijani: “Mənə qələm lazımdır. Səndə də varmı?” (I need a pen. Do you have one too?) The fact that the word “qələm” (pen) is not repeated in the second sentence is understood from the context. This example is not a perfect grammatical equivalent to the English “one”; rather, the mechanism of omission and recovery from the context must be taken into account. Comparative example: “She sings better than I do.” – “O, məndən yaxşı oxuyur.” In English, “do” functions as a substitute form, whereas in Azerbaijani, there is no need to restate the verb.

Thus, the stylistic significance of substitution is not limited merely to reducing repetition. It preserves the coherence of the text, facilitates the concise presentation of information, and establishes grammatical links between sentences. However, not every instance of substitution can automatically be classified as an expressive stylistic device; at times, it serves as a grammatical and text-structuring mechanism.

2. Chiasmus and the terminological issue of “reversal” (“geridönmə”)

Chiasmus is a syntactic stylistic device based on the arrangement of two or more parallel elements in a reversed or crisscross sequence. In Galperin’s classification of English stylistics, this phenomenon is presented under the heading “Chiasmus (Reversed Parallel Construction).” Consequently, while the use of the term “reversal” (“geridönmə”) for chiasmus may have been the author’s initial choice for translation, the terminological status of this equivalent requires further verification.

The defining feature of chiasmus is not merely the repetition of the same word, but a crisscross reversal in the sequence of elements. In a simple schematic, this can be represented as A–B / B–A. However, in actual instances, the syntactic and semantic relationships can be more complex; analysis must account for both the forms of the words and the semantic connections between the clauses. An example in English is: “We shape our choices, and our choices shape us.” In the first part, “we” functions as the subject and “our choices” as the object; in the second part, “our choices” acts as the subject, while “us” serves as the object. This crisscross structure illustrates the logic of chiasmus. An example in Azerbaijani is: “Man changes society, and society changes man.” In the first part, the human influences society, whereas in the second part, society is presented as the entity influencing the human. Another English example is: “We do not live to work; we work to live.” The arrangement of the elements “live” and “work” in reverse order highlights their reciprocal relationship. An adapted example in Azerbaijani is: “We do not live life for the sake of work; we work for the sake of our lives.” Here, the positions of the concepts “life” and “work” are crossed. Chiasmus may be related to antithesis, but these concepts are not identical. Antithesis involves the presentation of opposing or contrasted ideas side by side, whereas chiasmus is primarily characterized by a crisscross (chiastic) structure. A single instance may exhibit features of both chiasmus and antithesis; however, for this to be the case, both structural and semantic contrast must be distinctly present.

Furthermore, chiasmus should not be confused with anadiplosis, anaphora, or epiphora. In anadiplosis, a unit appearing at the end of one segment is repeated at the beginning of the next; anaphora involves the repetition of the same unit at the beginning of successive segments, while epiphora involves its repetition at the end. In these figures, the position of the repeated element is the defining feature, whereas in chiasmus, the crisscross arrangement of elements is the primary criterion.

1. Substitution and Chiasmus: Theoretical Distinctions

A significant distinction between substitution and chiasmus lies in their theoretical classification. In text linguistics, substitution is described as a mechanism for establishing cohesion, whereas chiasmus is a stylistic figure based on a specific organization of syntactic structure. Consequently, treating them as parallel members of the same category may be theoretically contentious. Nevertheless, the impact of both on the structure of a text and on the reader’s perception of information can be examined through a comparative approach.

Table 1

Criterion	Substitution	Chiasmus
Theoretical level	Textual cohesion / grammatical connection	Syntactic stylistic figure
Basic mechanism	Presentation of a unit in an alternative form	Cross or reverse sequencing of elements
Typical indicator	one, do, so, not (in English)	A–B / B–A structure
Contribution to the text	Reducing repetition, maintaining coherence	Emphasis, symmetry, memorability, and contrast
Main risk	Confusing it with synonymy, reference, or ellipsis	Mistaking any form of repetition or antithesis for chiasmus

The distinctions presented in the table do not constitute an exhaustive classification covering every possible application of these two devices; rather, they summarize the primary theoretical differences addressed in the article.

1. Stylistic and pragmatic functions

The fundamental function of substitution is to represent previously mentioned content using a different grammatical form, while maintaining a connection to the original meaning. This contributes to textual conciseness and intersentential cohesion. In certain contexts, the choice of a substitute form helps speech sound more natural by reducing repetition. However, not every instance of substitution carries a specific emotional impact; its function depends on the genre of the text and its communicative purpose.

The stylistic power of chiasmus, by contrast, stems from the symmetry, element of surprise, and emphasis generated by its crisscross structure. It can be used to frame ideas in a memorable way – whether in aphoristic expressions, journalistic discourse, or literary texts. This crisscross structure highlights the interdependence between two concepts or a shift in the relationship between them. An example in English: “A good reader shapes a book, and a good book shapes its reader.” By altering the position of the recurring "reader/book" elements, the interaction between the reader and the book is emphasized. An example in Azerbaijani: "A good teacher develops a student, while a good student develops their teacher." This sentence presents the reciprocal interaction between teacher and student through a chiastic (cross-patterned) structure.

These examples have been constructed for illustrative purposes and are not attributed to any specific author. If actual literary or journalistic texts are used in a scholarly article, the precise source and page number of the quotation must be provided.

2. Methodological Framework for Comparative Analysis

When comparing the Azerbaijani and English languages, one cannot rely solely on word-for-word translation. Regarding substitution, it is necessary to identify the formal devices in both languages that replace preceding content, as well as the grammatical category of these devices and their specific roles within the context. The use of forms such as "one," "do," or "so" in English may not have a direct equivalent in Azerbaijani; in some cases, ellipsis (omission), the use of specific verbal morphological markers, or lexical repetition may achieve a similar communicative effect. In the analysis of chiasmus, one must determine the syntactic structure of the two parts, the positioning of the elements, the degree of cross-correspondence, and the semantic relationship between them. The following questions may serve as a basis for the analysis of a given example: which elements appear in the first part; how does their sequence change in the second part; how does this shift affect semantic emphasis; and does the example also contain antithesis or repetition?

For future empirical research, it would be appropriate to select Azerbaijani and English texts belonging to the same genre, identify instances using consistent criteria, and compare the findings. Without collecting corpus data, it is not possible to draw quantitative conclusions regarding whether these devices are used more or less frequently in one language compared to the other.

This article provides a comparative explanation of the distinct nature and stylistic potential of the concepts of substitution and chiasmus. In text linguistics, substitution functions as a means of grammatical replacement and cohesion, whereas chiasmus is a syntactic stylistic figure based on a crossed arrangement of elements. In English, substitution can be expressed through forms such as “one”, “do”, “so”, and “not”, while in Azerbaijani, similar textual functions may be realized through different grammatical means. For this reason, a comparative study should focus on functional relationships rather than merely formal correspondence.

In both languages, chiasmus can enhance interrelationships, emphasis, and memorability through a crossed structure. However, chiasmus should not be conflated with all forms of repetition; its specific structural criteria must be clearly defined. While the term "geridönmə" (reversion/turning

back) – used in the initial heading – may serve as a working translation for chiasmus, its validity as a formal scientific term would require verification from an authoritative source.

Thus, a comparison of substitution and chiasmus reveals how linguistic units contribute to the coherence and stylistic organization of a text. Future systematic analysis of examples drawn from actual texts will allow for a more precise determination of how these devices function across different genres.

References:

1. Galperin, I. R. (1977). Stylistics. Moscow: Higher School. (Nəşr və səhifə məlumatlarını istifadə edilən nüsxəyə əsasən yoxlamaq lazımdır.)

2. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

3. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

4. Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (2007). Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.

5. Wales, K. (2011). A Dictionary of Stylistics (3rd ed.). Routledge.