

THE FUNCTION OF ANTITHESIS AND CHIASMUS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK COMPLEX SENTENCES: A STYLISTIC APPROACH

Ibrohimjon Usarov

National Pedagogical University of Uzbekistan named after Nizami,
Department of English Language Theory and Methodology
Associate Professor, PhD in Philology
E-mail: ibrohimusarov11@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper explores the stylistic and semantic functions of *antithesis* and *chiasmus* within English and Uzbek complex sentences. Both devices embody structural and conceptual symmetry that strengthens textual expressiveness and logical-emotional contrast. The study adopts a comparative stylistic approach to demonstrate how these figures contribute to rhythm, intensity, and cognitive harmony in literary discourse. The analysis shows that English employs antithesis and chiasmus to achieve rhetorical persuasion and intellectual precision, while Uzbek uses them to evoke emotional depth and moral reflection.

Keywords: antithesis, chiasmus, stylistic figure, complex sentence, parallelism, cognitive contrast, rhetorical symmetry.

1. Introduction

The study of syntax in modern stylistics goes beyond formal grammar and focuses on the expressive potential of sentence structure. Among syntactic figures, *antithesis* and *chiasmus* play a special role in creating aesthetic and psychological tension within the text.

Antithesis juxtaposes contrasting ideas in parallel structures, while *chiasmus* arranges them in a mirrored order (A–B–B–A). Both figures establish rhythmic symmetry and logical opposition that highlight the author’s perspective and emotional stance.

For example:

“*Many are called, but few are chosen.*” (Biblical expression)

“*Ko‘pi ketib, ozi qoldi.*”

These sentences display clear binary opposition, forming balance through contrast.

This paper aims to reveal the stylistic significance of antithesis and chiasmus in English and Uzbek complex sentences, showing how they reflect cultural thinking patterns and rhetorical traditions of both languages.

2. Methods

2.1. Research Corpus

The research corpus consists of:

- 50 English literary texts (Shakespeare, Dickens, Orwell, Hemingway, Kennedy speeches);
- 50 Uzbek literary works (Cho‘lpon, Oybek, O‘tkir Hoshimov, Abdulla Qahhor).

2.2. Analytical Approach

The following methods were applied:

1. **Comparative stylistic analysis** — to identify formal and semantic parallels between English and Uzbek constructions;
2. **Cognitive interpretation** — to reveal the conceptual nature of opposition and symmetry;
3. **Contextual-discursive analysis** — to determine stylistic function within literary and rhetorical contexts.

Each example was analyzed according to:

- syntactic configuration,
- type of opposition (logical/emotional/moral),
- stylistic impact, and
- rhythm and intonation.

3. Results

3.1. Antithesis as a Stylistic Device

Antithesis operates through *semantic opposition in structural parallelism*. It emphasizes contrast between two ideas or qualities within one composite sentence.

English examples:

“*To err is human; to forgive, divine.*” (Pope)

“*Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven.*” (Milton)

Uzbek examples:

“*Yomon do‘stdan yaxshiroq yomon yo‘q.*”

“*Kechirgan yengadi, kechirmagan yengiladi.*”

In both languages, antithesis organizes meaning through contrast. English tends to frame opposition in *moral or intellectual terms*, while Uzbek often relies on *emotional and ethical polarity*.

Antithesis enhances *clarity, logic, and memorability* by creating tension that resolves within the reader's perception. It thus operates as both a *cognitive* and *aesthetic* tool.

3.2. Chiasmus and Mirrored Symmetry

Chiasmus, derived from the Greek *χίασμα* ("crossing"), rearranges syntactic elements in reverse order, producing a pattern A–B–B–A. This inversion builds *semantic interdependence* and *aesthetic equilibrium*.

English examples:

"Ask not what your country can do for you — ask what you can do for your country." (J.F. Kennedy)

"Fair is foul, and foul is fair." (Shakespeare)

Uzbek examples:

"Sen hayot uchun yashaysan, hayot esa seni sinaydi."

"Men seni kutdim, sen esa meni unutding."

In both languages, chiasmus intensifies *psychological reflection* and highlights *reciprocal causation*. While English uses it to achieve rhetorical emphasis, Uzbek employs it to express *philosophical cyclicality* — the idea that human emotion and fate are intertwined.

3.3. Interaction of Antithesis and Chiasmus in Complex Sentences

The combination of antithesis and chiasmus generates *double symmetry* — contrast in meaning coupled with balance in structure.

Example (English):

"He lost in victory, and he triumphed in defeat."

Example (Uzbek):

"Yig'lab kuldi, kulib yig'ladi." (Cho'lpon)

Such constructions reveal the *dialectic nature of experience*: opposite states coexist and reflect each other. This structural paradox is deeply tied to both languages' artistic logic — *rational dualism* in English and *emotional unity of opposites* in Uzbek.

4. Discussion

Antithesis and chiasmus serve as syntactic reflections of cultural mentality. In English stylistic thought, opposition functions as a *means of reasoning*, highlighting precision and intellectual debate. In Uzbek discourse, opposition is *aesthetic and moral*, emphasizing empathy, fate, and emotional resonance.

Chiasmus in English rhetoric often produces *argumentative strength*, while in Uzbek literature it expresses *spiritual balance* and *psychological harmony*.

For instance, in Shakespeare's "Macbeth," "*Fair is foul, and foul is fair*" symbolizes moral ambiguity, whereas in Uzbek poetry, "*Yomonlikdan yaxshilik tug'ilar*" expresses the unity of good and evil in human destiny.

Therefore, both figures serve as universal yet culturally adapted tools of stylistic expression, bridging thought and emotion through structural artistry.

5. Conclusion

1. Antithesis and chiasmus represent core stylistic mechanisms in the structure of English and Uzbek complex sentences.
2. Both create symmetry and tension, enriching the semantic depth and aesthetic rhythm of discourse.
3. English tends toward logical, rhetorical precision; Uzbek reveals emotional and philosophical nuances.
4. The comparative study demonstrates that syntactic figures mirror national styles of thinking, thus linking stylistic form with cultural cognition.
5. These devices confirm that style is not merely linguistic decoration but a reflection of human perception and worldview.

References

1. Galperin I.R. *Stylistics*. – Moscow: Higher School, 1981.
2. Leech G. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. – London: Longman, 1969.
3. Jakobson R. *Linguistics and Poetics*. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960.
4. Ashurova D.U. *Stylistics of the English Language*. – Tashkent: Universitet, 2012.
5. Usarov I. *Comparative Stylistics and National Identity in Language*. – Tashkent: NMPU, 2024.
6. Cho'lpon A. *Tanlangan asarlar*. – Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing House, 2012.
7. Shakespeare W. *Macbeth*. – Oxford: OUP, 1993.
8. Kennedy J.F. *Inaugural Address*. – Washington, 1961.