

*Н.Д. Давлатзода (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)*

### **Контраст как лингвистическое и стилистическое понятие**

*Аннотация:* В данной статье используются понятия лингвистического и стилистического контекста. Это различие не ново: в теории контекста ему предшествует различие между репродуктивным контекстом, который воплощает значение как факт языка и языковой системы, и генеративным контекстом, который ведет в область индивидуального вербального творчества, относительно зависящего от языковой системы.

*Ключевые слова:* понятие, лингвистический и стилистический контекст, различие между репродуктивными контекстами, языковая система

---

*N.D. Davlatzoda (Khujand, Tajikistan Republic)*

### **Contrast as a Linguistic and Stylistic Concept**

*Abstract:* The given article uses the concepts of linguistic and stylistic context. This distinction is not new: in the theory of context, it is preceded by a distinction between reproductive context, which embodies meaning as a fact of language and the linguistic system, and generative context, which leads into the realm of individual verbal creativity, which is relatively dependent on the linguistic system.

*Key words:* concept, linguistic and stylistic context, distinction between reproductive contexts, linguistic system

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Contrast is a sharply expressed opposition of traits, qualities, or properties of a human character, object, or phenomenon. The principle of contrast is a complex and multifunctional phenomenon. It has scientific foundations and is examined in disciplines such as philosophy, logic, aesthetics, and literary studies [10; 11]. Figures of contrast also play a significant role in linguistic systems. Scholars have studied contrast, i. e., the principle of antagonism, opposition, or polarity, since ancient times. For instance, the ancient philosopher Heraclitus viewed contrast as “contradiction, becoming, unity, and struggle of opposites.” The philosophical dictionary characterizes opposition as “interdependent and mutually exclusive contradictions, each being one of the two moments of a concrete, i. e., dialectically contradictory, identity” [9].

## 2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

This study employs a theoretical analysis and synthesis of existing linguistic literature on context and contrast. The materials include foundational works on context theory (N.N. Amosova, B.P. Ashrapov), stylistic context (I.V. Arnold, I.A. Bannikova), antonymy (V.N. Komissarov, L.A. Novikov), and text structure (Yu.M. Lotman, Yu.K. Lekomtsev). The methodology involves comparing and contrasting different theoretical approaches to define and delineate the linguistic and stylistic dimensions of contrast.

## 3. MAIN RESULTS

### 3.1. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF CONTRAST

So, the peculiarity of the linguistic context of contrast lies in the fact that it realizes the meaning of opposition, of difference, for which the interaction of two semantically polar units A and A<sup>1</sup> or A and B is necessary [2]. Consequently, the linguistic context of contrast, unlike the traditional interaction of a word and its environment, represents an interaction of two semes based on the principle of repulsion.

The meaning of opposition can be realized at the morphological level within a single word: did – did not do.

The linguistic context of contrast can be autonomous and represent a dual-nucleus context. Unlike contexts consisting of a combination of a nucleus and an indicative minimum, a contrastive context contains two equal nuclei, one of which serves as the indicative minimum for the other [12; 13].

According to G.V. Andreeva, “the linguistic context can also represent a combination of potentially contrast-capable words that realize the meaning of opposition only in the presence on the syntagmatic axis of antonyms, negation, or adversative conjunctions serving as an indicative minimum” [2].

The autonomous type of context includes antonymic contexts, identified in English by V.N. Komissarov and supplemented for Russian by L.A. Novikov.

Antonymic contexts represent only one variety of contrast context.

In his works, L.A. Novikov argues that antonymy, regardless of the presence of explicit opposition in the contrastive context, is part of a word’s lexical meaning; therefore, the presence of both components in the linguistic context is not strictly necessary [7: 74].

G.V. Andreeva notes that “the obligatoriness of a two-component linguistic context of contrast is its essential structural characteristic and is conditioned by the fact that the contrasting set may include not only linguistic antonyms but also other varieties of contrast-capable lexical units that do not possess the status features of antonyms and, consequently, cannot unambiguously imply the contrasting component” [2: 145]. In such cases, the need arises for a broader linguistic indicative minimum, such as a sentence, and the mandatory presence of grammatical markers of contrast. These can be negation (with or without the negative particle “not”), or an adversative syntactic connection using conjunctions like “but” or “however”.

In this section, the linguistic context of contrast represents a mixed-type context, analogous to what N.N. Amosova defines as “lexico-syntactic” context [1: 15].

An important characteristic of the context of contrast is the concept of equivalence. According to I.V. Arnold, “equivalence is understood as a relationship between linguistic units where they possess some common properties allowing them to perform the

same function” [3: 12]. Pavlov notes that “linguistic means expressing equivalent relations in a text are connected to systemic groupings of lexical units and can be defined in terms of a gradation of degrees of their semantic proximity” [8: 26].

Antonyms, conversives, equonyms, genus-species correlates, and synonyms are arranged between the polar points of “lowest degree – highest degree” of semantic proximity in ascending order. Thus, antonyms, conversives, equonyms, hyponyms, hyperonyms, and synonyms are united on a descending scale based on the feature of semantic dissimilarity or opposition.

The concept of linguistic context used in this work allows for the investigation of the linguistic nature of contrast in abstraction from conditions of semantic complication, from establishing the maximum of contextual links, and from means ensuring stylistic effectiveness in text. However, it is insufficient for an exhaustive and adequate description of this phenomenon at the text level. To describe the mechanism of contrast in a text, it is necessary to introduce the concept of stylistic context.

### 3.2. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE STYLISTIC CONTEXT OF CONTRAST

This section adopts the theory of stylistic context as interpreted by I.V. Arnold and I.A. Bannikova, who characterize context as a factor determining the change in a word’s semantic volume and carrying additional information. According to their theory, stylistic context can be compared to a generative one, as it reveals the maximum of contextual links, creates contextual meanings, and leads to the strengthening of some semes and the neutralization of others.

In the works of I.V. Arnold and I.A. Bannikova, essential factors of stylistic context are considered to be:

- repetitions and contrasts (at the lexical-semantic level), i. e., the repetition of identical or semantically similar words, or conversely, antonymic words, as well as words possessing identical or opposite evaluative connotations;
- equivalence of elements in equivalent positions and the resulting mutual influence, i. e., contextual convergence (or, in contrast, repulsion) of words in meaning or connotation due to their proximity in the text;
- transposition at various levels, including the use of words with unusual denotative reference (semantic level), violation of usual combinability (lexical level), and use in an unusual syntactic function (syntactic level) [3; 4].

Stylistic context manifests itself as a background against which, primarily through contrast but sometimes through similarity, the expressiveness of a stylistic device emerges, more often than of contextual foregrounding. Stylistic context is capable of integrating stylistic devices that create a unified imagery system within the whole text or a part thereof. Its limits are not confined by direct syntactic links but include all types of links and relations aimed at realizing a stylistic function. Consequently, stylistic context depends on the features of the stylistic function and the text’s structure.

Contrast is a frequent phenomenon in texts. In this regard, Yu.M. Lotman asserts that “all the diversity of constructive text formations can be reduced to two principles, namely, the co- and counter-positioning of textual elements from different levels” [6]. The latter constitutes the basis of contrast.

Unlike a stylistic device, for example, antithesis, which typically belongs to a single level and is examined either only in paradigmatics or only in syntagmatics, contrast encompasses several linguistic levels and requires analysis of both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Contrast reflects both the dynamics and statics of text structure,

whereas a stylistic device is generally static. Contrast creates a hierarchy of forms and meanings, with the dominant role of contrastive semantics, while a stylistic device is not correlated with the idea of hierarchy. Contrast is structurally symmetrical and organizes the text.

Yu.K. Lekomtsev writes: “The system of antonyms underlying a given text, and perhaps an even broader system of oppositions – in the terms of this work, considered as contrast – determines the text to a greater extent than the plot structure does” [5: 100].

Thus, by the totality of its characteristics, contrast goes beyond the bounds of a stylistic device and approaches a system of means of contextual foregrounding. G.V. Andreeva writes that “contrast can be attributed to a special variety of stylistic context, because:

1. contrast creates semantic and structural orderliness of the text;
2. it stimulates the emergence of information of a second kind (implied information);
3. it employs linguistic elements from different levels, as well as depictive and expressive means of language, to fulfill its stylistic function” [2: 145].

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The analysis presented in this study allows for a deeper understanding of the dual nature of contrast as both a linguistic and stylistic phenomenon. The distinction between linguistic and stylistic contexts of contrast, while grounded in established theoretical frameworks, reveals significant implications for how opposition is structured and perceived in text.

##### 4.1. THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN LINGUISTIC AND STYLISTIC CONTEXTS

The findings indicate that the linguistic context of contrast operates as a fundamental, system-based mechanism. Its autonomous, dual-nucleus structure, requiring the interaction of semantically polar units, aligns with the observations of Andreeva [2] and the antonymic frameworks developed by Komissarov and Novikov [7]. The necessity of grammatical markers such as negation or adversative conjunctions in certain cases underscores that linguistic contrast is not merely a lexical phenomenon but often requires syntactic support to achieve unambiguous opposition. This supports the characterization of such contexts as “lexico-syntactic,” as proposed by Amosova [1].

However, a key insight from this study is the inherent limitation of the purely linguistic approach. While it successfully describes the structural conditions for contrast at the word and sentence level, it cannot account for the broader semantic and aesthetic effects contrast generates within a complete text. This gap is precisely where the stylistic context becomes indispensable. The stylistic context, as articulated by Arnold [3] and Bannikova [4], acts as a generative force. It does not simply register opposition but actively creates new meanings, foregrounds specific elements, and integrates them into a cohesive artistic whole. The transition from the reproductive nature of linguistic context to the generative capacity of stylistic context mirrors the theoretical progression from language-as-system (*langue*) to speech-as-creation (*parole*).

##### 4.2. CONTRAST AS AN ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE OF TEXT

The discussion confirms that contrast transcends the status of a mere stylistic device like antithesis. As Lotman [6] and Lekomtsev [5] suggest, contrast functions as a fundamental organizing principle of text structure. Unlike a localized device, contrast operates hierarchically, creating symmetry and order across multiple linguistic levels. This multi-level operation, requiring analysis of both paradigmatic (choice) and syn-

tagmatic (combination) relations, distinguishes it from simpler figures of speech. The binarity inherent in contrast – its reliance on two opposing elements – provides a structural backbone for the text, enabling the construction of complex systems of meaning, character, and theme.

This perspective resolves a potential contradiction: while linguistic context demands explicit two-component structures for contrast to exist, stylistic context allows contrast to emerge from the implicit clash between textual elements, a character's actions, or broader conceptual spheres. The stylistic context, therefore, broadens the scope of what can be considered contrastive, moving beyond strict antonymy to include a wider range of "contrast-capable" units that gain oppositional meaning through their placement and function within the text's overall design.

#### 4.3. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Viewing contrast as a special variety of stylistic context, as advocated by Andreeva [2], opens several promising avenues for investigation. First, it challenges researchers to more precisely define the boundaries of linguistic antonymy, distinguishing it from the broader, context-dependent oppositions generated stylistically. Second, it necessitates a closer examination of the mechanism by which "potentially contrast-capable" lexical units – words not inherently antonymous – acquire oppositional force within a specific stylistic context. Understanding this mechanism is key to explaining the creative and dynamic nature of literary language. Finally, this framework allows for a systematic analysis of the conditions that amplify stylistic expressiveness, exploring how factors like repetition, transposition, and equivalence interact to heighten the perceptual and emotional impact of contrast on the reader. The mobility of contrast's boundaries – from a simple phrase to an entire text – suggests that future studies should adopt a holistic, text-linguistic approach to fully appreciate its role in shaping meaning and aesthetic value.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

A comprehensive examination of contrast as a special kind of stylistic context, organized by the principle of contrast, appears highly promising. Such an approach could help resolve certain debatable issues, such as defining the boundaries of linguistic antonymy and the boundaries of the context itself; identifying the special status and examining the mechanism of formation of potentially contrast-capable lexical units; and clarifying the conditions that contribute to enhancing the stylistic expressiveness of the context.

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Амосова Н.Н.* Слово и контекст // Очерки по лексикологии, фразеологии и стилистике. Л., 1958. С. 3–23. (Учен. зап. ЛГУ им. Жданова. № 243. Вып. 42).
2. *Андреева Г.В.* Актуализация категории противоположности в художественном тексте // Языковая картина мира. Кемерово, 1995. С. 145–148.
3. *Арнольд И.В.* Эквивалентность как лингвистическое понятие // Иностранные языки в школе. 1976. № 1. С. 11–18.
4. *Банникова И.А.* Контекстные характеристики семантически осложненных слов в современном английском языке: Автореферат дисс. ...канд. филол. наук. Л., 1974. 35 с.
5. *Лекомцев Ю.К.* Антонимический текст. М.: Наука, 1983. 205 с.

6. *Лотман Ю.М.* Структура художественного текста. Серия семиотических исследований по теории искусства. М.: Искусство, 1970. 102 с.
7. *Новиков Л.А.* Антонимия в русском языке (Семантический анализ противоположности в лексике). М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1973. 197 с.
8. *Павлов В.В.* Языковые средства выражения эквивалентных отношений в тексте: Автореферат дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Киев, 1983. 40 с.
9. *Философский словарь.* М.: Политическая литература, 1968. 422 с.
10. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis // *Stephanos*. 2026. № 1(75). P. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.
11. *Ashrapov B.P.* The Level of Usage of Some Measure Words Quantifying Time and Distance in Tajik, Chinese and English // *Stephanos*. 2025. № 2(70). P. 19–24. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-30-4-19-24; EDN UKPMFM.
12. *Ashrapov B.P.* A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-Syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition On and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese // *Stephanos*. 2025. № 3(71). P. 24–33. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Modal Particles and Their English Equivalents // *Stephanos*. 2025. № 6(74). P. 21–30. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-74-6-21-30; EDN VLOVQZ.

## REFERENCES

1. Amosova N.N. Word and Context. In: *Essays on Lexicology, Phraseology, and Stylistics*. Leningrad. 1958, pp. 3–23. (Uchenye Zapiski LSU im. Zhdanov. No 243. Issue 42).
2. Andreeva, G.V. Actualization of the Category of Opposition in a Fiction Text // *Language Picture of the World*. Kemerovo. 1995, pp. 145–148.
3. Arnold I.V. Equivalence as a Linguistic Concept. *Foreign Languages at School*. 1976. No 1, pp. 11–18.
4. Bannikova I.A. (1974) Contextual Characteristics of Semantically Complex Words in Modern English: Abstract of a Cand. Sci. (Philological Sciences) Dissertation. Leningrad. 35 p.
5. Lekomtsev Yu.K. (1983) Antonymatic Text. Moscow. Nauka Publ. 205 p.
6. Lotman Yu.M. (1970) The Structure of the Fictional Text. A Series of Semiotic Studies on the Theory of Art. Moscow. Iskusstvo Publ. 102 p.
7. Novikov L.A. (1973) Antonymy in Russian (Semantic Analysis of Opposition in Lexicon). Moscow. Moscow State University Press. 197 p.
8. Pavlov V.V. (1983) Linguistic Means of Expressing Equivalent Relationships in the Text: Abstract of Cand. Sci. (Philology). Kyiv. 40 p.
9. *Philosophical Dictionary.* Moscow. Political Literature Publ. 1968. 422 p.
10. *Ashrapov B.P.* On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Interjections and Their English and Chinese Equivalents: A Comparative Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis. *Stephanos*. 2026. No 1(75), pp. 20–27. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2026-75-1-20-27; EDN MFWABE.
11. *Ashrapov B.P.* The Level of Usage of Some Measure Words Quantifying Time and Distance in Tajik, Chinese and English. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 2(70), pp. 19–24. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-30-4-19-24; EDN UKPMFM.

12. Ashrapov B.P. A Comparative Analysis of the Morpho-Syntactic Peculiarities of English Preposition On and Its Equivalents in Tajik and Chinese. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 3(71), pp. 24–33. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-71-3-24-33; EDN FDSQYD.
13. Ashrapov B.P. On the Issue of the Usage of Certain Tajik Modal Particles and Their English Equivalents. *Stephanos*. 2025. No 6(74), pp. 21–30. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-74-6-21-30; EDN VLOVQZ.

*Сведения об авторе:*

Наргис Давлат Давлатзода,  
капитан полиции, ст. преподаватель  
кафедра социальных наук факультета №4  
Академия Министерства внутренних дел  
Республики Таджикистан

Nargis D. Davlatzoda,  
Police Captain, Senior Lecturer  
Social Sciences Department, Faculty No 4  
Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs  
of the Republic of Tajikistan