A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF ORDUBADI'S DRAMA "SEVGİLƏR"

Taşkın İŞGÖREN*

Abstract

M. Said Ordubadi who started his literary career at the beginning of the 20th century was one of the pioneers of the contemporary Azerbaijani novel. He aimed to reach his readers didactically with his works. Ordubadi who wrote for the benefit of his people, is renowned for historical novels in Azerbaijani literature. However, he started with poetry and continued to write in other genres like short stories and novels too. He also wrote essays for a number of magazines and newspapers.

Some of his dramas were published in little books or journals when he was alive, some of them posthumously for the first time in "Əsərləri" in Baku, in 1964. Two of his dramas published in this book are in verse, and the other four dramas are in prose. "Sevgilər" and "Maral" are verse dramas.

This examination is a stylistic analysis of Ordubadi's poetic drama "Sevgilər". The intrinsic approach has been taken as the basis for this analysis. According to the available data, none of his dramas have ever been examined in terms of stylistics. So, the analysis based on some stylistic devices has aimed to show what sort of personal style Ordubadi tried to use to reach his audience or reader. This examination will provide the readers/audience with some concrete examples with reference to how Ordubadi deliberately used stylistic devices in the drama.

Keywords: Stylistics, Azerbaijani Literature, Ordubadi, Poetic Drama

ORDUBADİ'NİN "SEVGİLƏR" OYUNU ÜZERİNE STİLİSTİK BİR İNCELEME

Özet

Edebî kariyerine XX. yüzyılın başlarında başlayan M. Said Ordubadi, çağdaş anlamda Azerbaycan romanının öcülerindendir. Eserleriyle daima okurlarına ulaşmayı ve öğretici olmayı hedef edinmiştir. Halka yararlı olmak için yazan Ordubadi, Azerbaycan edebiyatında tarihî roman türüyle ünlüdür. Fakat edebiyata şiirle başlamış, kısa hikâye ve roman gibi türlerle devam etmiştir. Bazı gazete ve dergilerde de çeşitli yazılar yazmıştır.

Oyunlarından bazıları sanatçı hayattayken küçük kitaplar veya dergilerde yayımlanmış, bazıları ise sanatçı öldükten sonra 1964'te "Əsərləri" adlı kitapta Bakü'de basılmıştır. Bu kitapta basılan iki oyunu manzum, diğer dört oyunu ise mensurdur. "Sevgilər" ve "Maral", manzum olarak kaleme alınan oyunlarıdır.

Bu çalışma Ordubadi'nin "Sevgiler" adlı şiirsel oyununun stilistik bir analizidir. Analizde metin odaklı yaklaşım esas alınmıştır. Eldeki verilere göre sanatçının hiçbir tiyatro eseri stilistik olarak incelenmemiştir. Dolayısıyla çalışmada bazı stilistik unsurların esas alındığı analiz, Ordubadi'nin okur veya seyircilerine ulaşmak için nasıl bir kişsel üslup kullandığını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu inceleme, yazarın oyunda stilisitik unsurları nasıl kullandığına ilişkin somut örnekler sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Stilistik, Azerbaycan Edebiyatı, Ordubadi, Manzum Tiyatro

* Dr., MEB Sahne Tozu Tiyatrosu, e-posta: taskinisgoren@hotmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-8543-964X

Introduction

Mammad Said Ordubadi, as he stated, was born in Ordubad, which was steeped in turmoil with wars of religion and cult, in 1872. (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 24) He started writing poetry when he was a child in the school of Mirza Bakhsi, who was also keen on poetry. (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 29) According to Ordubadi's memories, his teacher Bakhsi was organizing a poetry competition between the students including Ordubadi and he was sharing out the money among the winners that students brought for the competition. Ordubadi stated that since he memorized all the poetry in the book "Bustan" written by Saadi, he was accustomed to poetry. So he won a competition about poetry when he had to find a verse starting with "z" and ending with "t". But he created a couplet by himself because he couldn't find one instantly with the required criteria. (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 29)

It is known that Mammad Said wasn't so eager to write poetry in Turkish in the beginning, since they were reading everything in Persian at school and they had also strictly a limited number of books to read in Turkish. (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 30) Consequently, he wrote his first couplet in Persian in the poetry competition. So, it is obvious that the talent of Mammad Said was mostly formed by Persian poetry. While he was working in the factory of Garabed Babayev, where a lot of Armenian girls were also employed, he loved two Armenian girls: Sophia and Varvara. Then he wrote his second couplet in Persian for Sophia. (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 32) He wrote his first Turkish couplet for Varvara:

> *Səfayi- gülşənə çıxma, bahara görsənmə*
>
> *O gül camalı qızıl gül görüb xəcalət olur.* (Axundlu, 1997, p. 14)

The general interpretation of the couple may be like that: "Do not seek the pleasure of the rose garden, don't be seen (or noticed) by spring. If those red roses see that rosy face, they will feel embarrassed." Ordubadi used some contextual compatibilities like *"səfayi- gülşən"* (the pleasure of the rose garden) and *"bahar"* (spring)*; "gül camal"*(rosy face) and *"qızıl gül"* (red rose) and it is also known that when people blush or get embarrassed, they become red and rosy. That was also used in the couplet on purpose. So here are three rhetorical devices at the same time in the second line: one personification (The roses in the rose garden see her and then an embarrassment appears), one contextual compatibility (because roses are already red, and they also see her rosy face and probably roses blush) and there is alliteration. Here the repetition of the consonant "l" (maybe for "g" too) is not gratuitous. When it comes to the first line, there is also a parallelism. Parallelism is a rhetorical device which, as Wales (2014) states, depends on *"the repetition of the same structural paraphrase pattern: commonly between phrases or clauses."* (p. 301) Ordubadi used the same grammatical structure on purpose: *"-ə çıxma"* and "*-a görsənmə*", which also rhymes here. There is another personification in the first verse: Spring notices her like a person. As can be seen from his first couplets both in Persian and Turkish, he was under the influence of the classical poetry of Persian literature. However, he changed his

content afterwards and started writing political or satiric poetry like *"Leninə"* (For Lenin - 1924), "*Günəşik biz*" (We are the Sun - 1926), "*Vətənimizə Bir Neçə Söz*" (A couple of words for our homeland -1907) "*Şiələr*" (Shias – 1923) etc. He also used some rhetorical devices in these poems.

Ordubadi began his literary career with Turkish poetry. He published his first Turkish poem in Shargi-Rus[1] in 1903. And since he was encouraged by his first publication, he continued with satiric poems in "Qeyrət"[2] established in Tbilisi. His critical poems caused very strong reactions even in his inner circle. In those years Ordubadi was quite critical of fanaticism, especially about religious fanaticism. In his memories, he stated that he was getting more enemies as he was working for Molla Nasraddin Magazine (Ordubadi, 2012, p. 50), which is a well-known periodical for the criticism of the mindset of fanaticism. However, in spite of various difficulties, he always kept writing about social issues. It is obvious that one of his greatest passions during the most productive period of his life was to work on social issues and contribute to society by writing about historical works. Some of them are "*Gizli Bakı*", "*Döyüşən Şəhər*", "*Dumanlı Təbriz*" and "*Qılınc ve Qələm*" novels based on historical events. Even though Ordubadi tried to use many historical facts in his works, his novels are not scholarly history books; but fictions in which some historical facts were used.

It can be said that there is only one book that includes Ordubadi's six dramas today. The book was printed in the Cyrillic alphabet and published with the title "Pyeslər və Romanlar" in Baku. When Ordubadi was alive, some of his dramas were published in various magazines or books, and some of them weren't published anywhere. Bakhtiar Asgarov (2013) said in his book "Məmməd Səid Ordubadinin Dramaturgiyası" published in 2013 that "*M. S. Ordubadinin M. Füzuli adına əlyazmalar İnstitutunda saxlanılan 30 dram əsəri verir. Hansı ki, bu qədər dram əsərinin yalnız 6-sı ədəbi ictimaiyyətə məlumdur. Ədəbiyyatşünaslıq elmi bu günə qədər M. S. Ordubadini bir dramaturq kimi yalnız 6 əsər səviyyəsində tanımışdır.*"[3] (Əsgərov, p. 65) And additionally it requires finding the text in an archive or library to reach the book today because, according to our research, it hasn't been republished again since 1964.

Since all his dramas haven't been published yet, it is difficult to know how many of them were written in verse or prose, but according to "Pyeslər və Romanlar", which is the only available book regarding his dramas, he wrote two dramas entirely in verse: "Sevgilər" and "Maral". In this article, the book in question has been used for examining the stylistic features of the drama "Sevgilər". The whole book was published in the Cyrillic alphabet by Azernashr in 1964. But we have

---

[1] The original name of the newspaper printed in Arabic alphabet: شرق روس

[2] "Qeyrət" was a printing house established in Tbilisi by Mirza Jalil and O. F. Nemanzadeh. The name means literally "endeavour" or "effort".

[3] *There are at least thirty dramas in the Institute of Manuscripts Named After Muhammad Fuzuli but only six of them have been known by the literary community. So the literary community has known Ordubadi as a dramaturg only with his six works so far.*" (Trasnlated by us)

transcribed the quoted verses and other proper names from the Cyrillic alphabet into the Modern Azerbaijani alphabet in use today. When it comes to language, the quotations in the article have been quoted in their original languages as published.

This article will dwell on Ordubadi's style and how he conveyed some ideas through the characters in the drama by monologues or dialogues. It is intended to reveal how he used figurative language and poetic devices. Stylistics is comprised of some levels of language which, according to Paul Simpson, (2004) are graphology, phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology, semantics and discourse analysis. (p. 5) And according to Simpson (2004) these levels "*interpenetrate and depend upon one another*" (p. 5). So, in this examination, we will also follow graphological features, phonological features, morphological features, grammatical features, lexical features and semantic features in order to demonstrate stylistic features in the drama.

Graphological Features

The denotation of the word "graphology", according to the Longman Dictionary, is a study of handwriting to figure out people's character.[4] But when it comes to stylistic analysis, Simpson (2004) describes it as "*the shape of language on the page*" (p. 5). And Katie Wales (2014) states that graphology also refers to "*the writing system of a language, as manifested in handwriting and typography; and to the other related features.*" (p. 194). In this respect, Mick Short (2013) also shows some examples of graphological deviations in his book "Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose" (p. 56). So graphological deviations are also important for him. Depending on graphological deviation, some syllables or words are pronounced divergently and it is inferred from Short's study that some graphological features are related to some phonetic features. (Short, 2013, p. 55)

This drama, first of all, was written in verse, like poetry. And its alphabet is Cyrillic which was the one used in the 1960s in Azerbaijan. Either the verses of characters are made up of some couplets that follow one another or one single verse of a character rhymes with the next verse of the other character like a couplet. So the whole rhyme scheme is actually a coupled rhyme (AA BB CC) where the lines rhyme in pairs successively. That probably allowed the writer to be more independent as he was conveying his ideas or thoughts through the characters since each couplet has its own rhyme consecutively. Yet it is possible to see some imperfect rhymes, like slant ryhmes involving consonance or assonance. Here "k" and "g" are used as similar consonants. Yet there is a slant rhyme involving the assonance "ə":

Söylə bu nə şikvə, bu nə küsmək?

---

[4] https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/graphology

İnsanların həpsi məncə yekrəng.[5](Ordubadi, 1964 p. 59)

or with the sounds "ü" and "i", it is possible to see the difference but there is a slant rhyme involving consonance "f":

Yox xarüqüladə bir təsadüf,

Həyrət yeri, yox gər olsan arif. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 56)

But except for a few examples, the "end rhyme", which is the most commonly one, is used in almost every couplet. There are many other types of rhymes used in the play, that are actually related to sound patterns, such as full rhyme, internal rhyme, head rhyme, etc. It is difficult to see any graphological deviations in the poetry since the poetry is quite ordinary in terms of graphological aspects. All units of verses are made up of couplets.

When it comes to capitalization and punctuation in the play, it seems that the writer capitalized the first letter of every line. Although one sentence is mostly made of a pair of consecutive lines, every line is capitalized in the couplets. But such rhyming couplets with capitalization can be seen in Shakespeare's plays, like Romeo and Juliet. So, capitalizing the first letter of lines in poetry is a common and conventional attitude in graphology. But not for some languages like Persian. Many poets wrote in couplets in Persian literature, like Rumi, Saadi and Hafez. Therefore, this is not a graphological deviation in this drama. It is also possible to see all modern punctuation accepted today in modern Azerbaijani literature.

Phonological Features

Phonological level, according to Paul Simpson (2004) is "*the way words are pronounced*" (p. 5). This is a general description. However, the intention of the phonological analysis is to determine and demonstrate the intentional use of sound patterns which are important in terms of stylistics. As a consequence, some segmental features made up of vowels and consonants have been treated in order to show alliteration, assonance, exclamation or onomatopoeia in this section. But suprasegmental features haven't been determined and shown in detail in this study.

It is obvious that the writer used alliterations. Alliteration here is accepted as Wales (2014) states: "*the repetition of the initial consonant in two or more words*." (p. 14). Since it is an "initial rhyme", these examples can be alliteration here:

Boş bir quyuda eyleyelim Yusifi pünhan,

Qalsın o qaranlıq quyuda, ölsün acından. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 53)

Qarışıb qumlara qayar bədənim,

---

[5] In the examples, we have transliterated the Cyrillic alphabet used in the book into the modern Azerbaijani alphabet.

Bir yanar oddan ibarət vətənim

*Sus **d**aha **d**inmə, **d**anışdınsa yeter!*

Bu işi vermə Yəhudaya xəbər.

Yalqız yaşama, get ara tap kəndinə yoldaş,

Misrin mədəni mülkünə at bircə vətəndaş

There is another example, which can also be a special kind of alliteration. There are three initial sounds, including one vowel repeated three times in a line that can be regarded as a reverse rhyme. As Wales (2014) points out that "*The repetition of initial consonant and vowel is termed reverse rhyme.*" (p. 372):

***Mən mən**səbə aldanmayıram, ölkə **mən**imdir,*

İğfal edəməm çünki bu yer öz vətənimdir. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 74)

It is possible to see four times of repetition of the initial consonant sounds:

Hər gördüyünü sevsə əgər dəhrdə nisvan,

***Q**almaz **q**adının hüsnünə **q**iymət **q**oyan insan*

But when it comes to the subject of alliteration, of which the initial consonant sounds repeat at least twice, so much more alliterations than we have shown could be found in the play. However, internal alliteration, where the medial consonant sounds repeat at least twice (Tamara O'Callaghan, 2006 Western World Literature), can be seen in almost every verse in the poetry. Because it is possible to see two of the same consonants in many verses. This is why, here, three or four amounts of repetitions of the same initial consonant sounds in a line have been shown as examples of some remarkable alliterations. Therefore, it would be accurate to state that the alliteration made up of the repetition of more than two initial consonant sounds is not actually commonly used in the poetry.

It is seen that the writer also used a lot of assonances, which is also accepted in this study as Wales (2014) describes: "*The same (STRESSED) vowel is repeated in words, but with a different final consonant*" (p. 35). So, the stressed syllables are the main point for assonance. In the play, the writer used assonance in some of his verses:

*İnti**qam al**mamış aram ol**mam***

*Öz qusurun**dan** utansın qoy a**tam**.*

*Mən bircə nə**fər** əsirü məhküm,*

*Hər fikir**də** , hər əməl**də** məhrum.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 53)

*Gər ver**sə** zərər mə**nə** bu sövda,*

*Olmaz sə**nə** **də** səa**də**t əsla* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 61)

In the drama, there are some examples of anaphora, which the writer probably aimed to achieve some effects with. Here are some examples of anaphoras from single lines or some rhyming couplets:

*Bilməm **bu nə** xulya, **bu nə** sərsəm, **bu nə** köftar?* (Ordubadi, 1964; 53)

***Sən** gözəllikdə, **sən** vəcahətdə,*

Az doğulmuş bizim vilayətdə

***Min** hiylələrin, **min** ixtilafın,*

***Min** iç üzü qanlı e'tilafın,*

...

***Bir** -birbirlərinə yox e'timadı,*

***Bir** parça kağızdır ittihadı.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 63)

This is another example of anaphora, where the repetition of the same word is at the beginning of different characters' lines:

*Zanşənsut: **Pulsuz** mələk olsa olmaz qəlbimə hakim,*

*Tadoxina: **Pulsuz** kişinin söylə görüm eşqi nə lazım?*

*Aponet: **Pulsuz** kişi gər etsə mənə varlığın ithaf, (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67)*

It is also possible to give some examples of epistrophe in the drama. Epistrophe, as Wales (2014) describes, is "*the last words in successive lines, clauses or phrases are repeated*" (p. 141). From this description, it can safely be said that there are two types of epistrophe here: The last words of some consecutive sentences in a line and the words at the end of both lines in a couplet are repeated in this example. At the end of the second act, Xadim says:

*Rədd **ol** buradan, çəkil! Kənar **ol**!*

*Hədyan demə, sus da, huşiyar **ol**!* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67)

*Ağlama bizdə sən şad **olarsan**,*

*Qüssədən, qəmdən azad **olarsan**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67)

*Sən bir kişisən məhəbbətin **yox**,*

*Biganəsən eşqə, ülfətin **yox**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 66)

Some more examples of epistrophe may be added. And there are also some examples of polyptoton in the drama. Since polyptoton is described as "*words are repeatedly derived from the same root*" (Wales, 2014, p. 329), some examples can be given regarding both Azerbaijani Turkish words and Arabic-origin words in Azerbaijani Turkish:

*Bunlar **nə**-çi-dir? **Nə**-dir bu bazar?*

Mən şad olamam bu yerdə naçar. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 60)

*Bu Züleyxa sənin öz **ana-**n-dır,*

***Ana-**n-dan da sənə məhribandır.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 64)

Sən bir ağasan hər işdə hakim,

***Məzlum** ilə olurmu **zalim**?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 60)

The words in the latter example depend on the same root (Ar. مصدر) in Arabic. These are "*məzlum*" (مظلوم) and "*zalim*" (ظالم) derived from the same root "*zulm*" (ظلم), which is also a morpheme. Since Arabic loanwords are very common in Azerbaijani Turkish, this inflection feature has been useful for writers to create some phonetical devices in stylistics.

In the poetry, there are some onomatopoeia and exclamations in the poetry. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the word exclamation is described as "*something you say or shout suddenly because of surprise, fear, pleasure, etc.*".[6] And since this is a script, exclamations are integral parts of how the actors build their characters. One can see some of its examples in the dialogues or monologues of the text:

Ərlik nə demək, nədir bu sözlər?

Mənzur deyil sevilməyən ər! (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 70)

Danma keçdi çobanlıkda yəyat,

Üzümüz gülmədi heyhat-heyhat! (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 50)

On the other hand, very few examples of onomatopeia can be seen in some verses:

Sakit ol, faidəsizdir bu səda,

*Yox **çığır**makda, **bağır**makda dəva.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 51)

Səndə de görüm nədir bu xulya,

*Nisvan nə üçün yaranmış **aya**?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 65)

These are actually very limited examples of lexical onomatopoeia which, as Simpson (2004) describes, "*draws upon recognised words in the language system*".(p. 67) There aren't any examples of nonlexical onomatopoeia in the text.

Morphological Features

The morphology of the Turkish language is very suitable to produce parallelism in poetry. Since Turkish is an agglutinative language, radifs mostly depend on bound morphemes. And most, if not all, of these radifs are made up of suffixes. And radifs which are either inflectional morphemes or derivational morphemes are

---

[6] https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/exclamation

preceded by rhymes. So, rhymes come first. This way of producing rhymes is very salient in Turkish poetry. In this drama, the writer used these devices in every couplet. Ordubadi used very similar sounds or some homonymic lexical morphemes to produce a wide range of rhymes at the end of the lines. And it is also possible to see many suffixes that have an identical function on a large scale, after the rhyme:

> *Bir gənc isə macərası ç**ox-dur.***
>
> *Satmaqdan əlavə çarə y**ox-dur*** (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 65)

In the following example, the first "m" is the first-person singular suffix, and the second "m" is the first-person singular possessive suffix. These have the same spelling and pronunciation, but they give different meanings to the conjugation. And the rest are similar sounds, so there is no radif but a perfect rhyme here:

> *Həp bir əbədiyyət his ed(ə)-r-di-**m**,*
>
> *Zira yox idi bir özgə <u>dərd-(i)</u>**m**. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 61)*

And it is possible to see different types of rhymes in the drama, like one inside the other: One-word rhymes with another word, which involves it at the end of the couplet:

> *Dün bir gül idim, bu günsə s**ol-du-m**,*
>
> *Gül yarpağıdək xəzankəş **ol-du-m**,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 58)

*Onlar düzəldib bizləri öz nəfsinə **alət***

...

*Ərlərdən imiş cümlə qadınlara sə**falət**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 69)

The other one is that he used some Arabic words in the same form to create some rhymes too. These examples are mostly without radif: *...**tə'yin**,/... **tə'min*** (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 63), *...**məftun**,/ **məmnun**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67), *...**məchul**, / ...**məqbul**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67)

It would be accurate to say there are barely any morphological deviations in this drama. But it must be limited even though we might have overlooked some examples unintentionally. We have just determined one in the drama:

> *"...*
>
> *Gər malik olam bu gül **cəmalə**,*
>
> *Min nifrət ola o mülkü **malə**."* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 62)

The word "deviation" is used here in the sense of the term that Wales (2014) describes: "*Deviation refers to divergence in frequency from a norm, or the statistical average.*" (p.110). The general norm here is the vowel harmony in the Turkish language. The dative case suffix (a bound morpheme) should be "*a*" at the end of the noun "*mal*" because of the vowel harmony in the Turkish language.

For instance, the same word was conjugated in the same way in one of Mücrüm Kərim's poems: *"... /Gəl güvənmə dövlətinə, malına, / **Mala**, mülkə, ömrə etibar olmaz."* (Əhlihan, İsrafil, Hüseyn, 2005, p. 284) However, in the drama, the suffix was used as "ə" in the conjugation in order to make it harmonious with the rhyme of the word "*cəmal*":

Grammatical Features

Simpson (2004) describes "syntax" under the branch of language study as "*the way words combine with other words to form phrases and sentences.*" (p. 5) under the level of language. In this part, grammatical analysis is based on sentence structure, including grammatical deviation, which is also a part of stylistics.

According to "A Dictionary of Stylistics" by Wales (2014), the aspect of syntax is "*concerned with the arrangement of words in clauses and sentences in particular, but also phrases.*" (p. 438), so the structure of sentences has been examined in the text. And one can clearly see the formal order of sentences and clauses used here. In the following example, there are two adverbial clauses, objects and verbs respectively:

> *Altun olsam da / məni / sevməyəcək,*
>
> *Yaşadıkca / məni / təhqir edəcək.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 49)

But this is very restricted. In the drama, since it was mainly paid so much regard to rhymes, radifs and sound harmony, it seems that the flexibility of syntax was used for that. However, since the word order variations are quite flexible in Azerbaijani Turkish, the poet used many variations and applied some deviations which are not common in literal language. As a consequence, the poet managed to keep the rhyme scheme in that way. The formal order of words in Azerbaijani Turkish is subject, object and verb respectively. And the vast majority of the couplets are not made up of regular sentences but inverted sentences, some of which could be regarded as grammatical deviations. In the following dialogue, Qiloğana conforms her verse to the previous one in order to adhere to the rhyme scheme. And they make one sentence together:

> *Aponet: Mən istədiyim olmasa bir gündə mühəyya,*
>
> *Qiloğana: Göydən düşə pulsuz kişi sevməm onu əsla* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 67)

The first verse is a conditional clause, and the second one completes it, so the formal sentence could be "*Mən istədiyim bir gündə mühəyya olmasa, pulsuz kişi göydən düşsə de onu əsla sevməm.*".[7] Mick Short (2013) explains these broken rules in the poetry of English like this: "*...would be corrected if it appeared in the writing of a student learning English. But we assume that poets have already*

---

[7] *"If what I want is not ready in one day, I will never love a penniless man even if he falls from the sky."*(Translated by us)

learnt the rules of their language, and so if they produce such 'errors' we construe them as purposeful." (p. 49) The same thing can also be seen here. There are some other inversions in the drama. For instance, some auxiliary verbs deviate from their grammatical orders, so some nouns and auxiliary verbs are inverted. Ordubadi broke the formal rules:

> *Çılpaqların əldə etsə fürsət,*
>
> **Eylər** *bu sönük həyata* **nifrət**. (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 65)

 In the above example, the compound verb that means "to hate" is actually "*nifrət eylə-*" or "*nifrət et-*", but it is broken, converted and separated in the verse. This deviation with the auxiliary verb "*eylə-*" is also seen in twenty different compound verbs in the drama *"eylər icad", "eyləsə övdət", "eyləsə söhbət?!", "eyləmə nöqsan", "eyləmə ... qurban", "eylərəm ... xidmət", "eyləmiş qanun", "eylə hörmət", "eylə əl'an", "eylərsə ... əhdi imza", "eylərsə ... ülfət", "eyləmişsən alət", "eylə istifadə", "eyləməz məhəbbət", "eyləsin ... isbat", "eyləmədim ... məsrur", "eylə ... azad", "eyləsə tə'yin", "eyləmədin ... mürüvvət"* and *"eylər ... xəyanət"*. This drama abounds with examples of converted auxiliary verbs. One of them is the verb "*et-*" which is used in more than twenty compound verbs. The other one is "*qıl-*" which is seen in at least eleven different compund verbs, like: *"qılan tamaşa", "qılmadın izhar", "qılma ... tovhin", "Qılmışdı ... ne'mət", "qıl ülfət", "qıl çarə", "qıl ... sərəfraz", "qılsan ... təslim", "qılsa məhəbbət", "qılsın ... Nil suyundan", "qıl ... teşkil"*. Examples can be multiplied with other compound verbs with nouns like "*çıx-*": "*Xulyaların artıq çıxacaq yadından.*", "*Mə'zur tutun, çünki çıxıb mənliyim əldən*" or "*sal-*" as in the examples: "*At fikrini, hifz etmə bunu, salma yolundan!*", "*Sal hicrə ki, hicranı sevir eşq ilə sevda*" or "*ver-*" as in the examples: "*Mən verməmişəm bunca fəlakətlərə meydan*", "*Şad olma əbəs, vermərik ol fürsətə imkan*" or "*düş-*", "*vur-*", "*qal-*" etc. So, the regular and compatible rhyme scheme accounts for these deviations.

In the drama, it is also possible to see different types of sentences, but since the drama is a poem that is made up of verses, a great many compound, complex and inverted sentences can be seen. Some couplets are comprised of only one sentence, but some of them are just two or more independent sentences:

> *Hər ailənin çəkdiyi qəm, gördüyü zillət,*
>
> *Daş qəlbinin fitnələrindən çıxar əlbət.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 73)

In the above couplet, two different verses construct a sentence. The first verse is the subject of the finite verb "*çıxar*", which is located in the second verse. In the following couplet, there is a complex sentence, which is actually conditional:

> *Cəmiyyətə hər kəs etsə xidmət*
>
> *Millət qoyacaq o zatə qiymət..* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 71)

Ordubadi made some couplets comprised of four independent clauses too. Here are four independent simple sentences:

> *Yekrəng deyil bəşər, yanılma,*
>
> *Xülyaya qapılma, səhv qılma!* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 60)

The poet didn't use the conjugation "*və*" (and) at all, but he used "*amma*" (but) just four times, "*ancaq*" (but) ten times and "*ilə*" (with) one time as a conjunction in the drama. It is also possible to see some other conjunctions. However, some asyndeton examples can be seen:

> *At fikrini, hifz etmə bunu, salma yolundan!* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 54)

 or

> *Kimsiz, nəçisiz, sizə nə lazım?*
>
> *Bu qafilə hansı səmtə azim?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 55)

It is possible to show many examples of asyndeton, but we will make do with these examples. Since Ordubadi didn't use conjugation very often, he preferred inverted, complex or compound sentences more frequently. Some examples can be seen regarding two subjects (nouns) are linked to the same finite verb:

> "*Sal hicrə ki, hicranı sevir eşq ilə sevda*" (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 70)

Yet it wouldn't be accurate to evaluate similar compatibilities as syllepsis examples. Because it is, as Corbett and Connors (1999) described "*use of a word understood differently in relation to two or more other words, which it modifies or governs.*" (p. 399) Besides, Ordubadi used verbs in almost every verse. That is why it is difficult to see syllepsis examples, but it is easy to see the opposite: The same subject (noun) is linked to two (or more) finite verbs:

> *Atamız bizdə rəqabətlər açar,*
>
> *Gələcək sülhə birər süngü saçar.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 50)

Lexical Features

This part is an outlook on the vocabulary and how Ordubadi used the words in the drama. As Simpson (2004) states, "*the vocabulary of a language*" (p. 5) is important in terms of stylistics. In this analysis, we are going to examine lexical features in the drama the way Mick Short (2013) did in his book "Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose" (p. 18). In this regard, we are going to dwell on "lexical repetition" and "lexical groupings" in the drama. We have also benefited from Dan McIntyre's examination[8] on this subject.

---

[8] Dan McIntyre, "An example of a stylistic analysis". Published at the website of Lancaster University: https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/sa1/example.htm

When it comes to lexical repetition, it is obvious that there are no repeated stanzas or verses. However, it is possible to see some repeated words, like "*bir*". In the following example the words "*bir*" are indefinite adjectives, except for the one in the second line, which is a noun. Other adjectives are all indefinite, like "one piece", "one battle" or "one conflict":

> ***Bir*** *parça kağız da ondan əfzəl.*
>
> ***Bir*** *-birbirlərinə yox e'timadı,*
>
> ***Bir*** *parça kağızdır ittihadı.*
>
> *Eylərsə bu gün **bir** əhdi imza,*
>
> ***Bir*** *hərb qılar yarı müyəyya.*
>
> ***Bir*** *fitnə çıxarsa* asimanda, (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 63)

There are also repeated phrases like "*bu ne*":

> *Bilməm **bu nə** xulya, **bu nə** sərsəm, **bu nə** köftar?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 53)

These lexical groupings can be seen in various places in the drama. The ones above consist of interrogative adverbs and demonstrative adjectives. And when it comes to taking a glance at the repeated words or phrases as conceptual groups, query words like "*kim*" (who) or "*nə*" (what) are quite abundant:

> ***Söylə bu nə*** *şikvə, **bu nə** küsmək?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 59)

…

> *Bu qafilə yüklənib **nə** yerdən?*
>
> *Etmiş **nə** üçün bu yerdə məskən?*
>
> *Kimsiz, **nəçisiz**, sizə **nə** lazım?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 55)

or

> *Söylə **kimədir** bu canfədalıq,*
>
> ***Kimdən*** *diləyirsən aşinalıq?*
>
> *Get sev **kimi** isteyirsən artq,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.70)

Words like "eşq", "sevda" are among the repeated words:

> *Verməz kişilər bir də sənin **eşqinə** mə'na,*
>
> *Sal hicrə ki, hicranı sevir **eşq** ilə **sevda**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.70)

Dan McIntyre examined lexical features under two titles: closed-class (grammatical) words and open-class words.[9] But even though determining open-class words or closed-class words might show the word choice of the drama, we

---

[9] Dan McIntyre, "An example of a stylistic analysis". Published at the website of Lancaster University: https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/sa1/example.htm

don't think this list of words would display the skill of how the poet applied stylistic devices with them. Yet it is useful, in terms of stylistics, to determine if the poet used "unusual words" and it is also necessary to display what kind of impression the verbs or nouns create as they are read. These are also what Dan McIntyre questioned in his examination.

In the drama, there are no unusual words but old words that are not in everyday use in modern Azerbaijani Turkish today like "*nigəhban*" *(Persian.* نگهبان *, watchman)*, "*vəcahət*" *(Arabic.* وجاهت *, dignity)*, "*təhəvvül*" *(Arabic.* تحول *, transformation)*, "*rəf'*" *(Arabic.* رفع *, removal)*. But it must be known that this kind of loanwords can be commonly seen in the literary works of many writers of his time. Concurrently, we see a wide range of Arabic and Persian loan words in Ordubadi's works. But some loanwords in the drama are very common. For instance, as is seen in the very first couplet of the drama, there are four Turkish-origin words, but five loan words. One of them is Persian (*atəş*) whereas the rest of them are Arabic-origin (*səma, cəhənnəm, hərarət* and *fəza*). These loanwords are actually very common not only in Azerbaijani Turkish but also in Turkey's Turkish dialect:

> *Qovurur beynimi **atəşli səma**,*
>
> *Bir **cəhənnəm** bu **hərarətlə fəza*** (Ordubadi, 1964, p.49)

All these words Ordubadi used are intertwined in the drama and Ordubadi used these worlds to produce the same or similar voices, so he created and strengthened the rhetorical expressions in this way.

Semantic Features

According to Simpson (2004), semantic analysis is defined as an analysis "*concerned with meaning*". (p. 7) In this section, we examine the figures of speech in terms of semantics. When it comes to figures of speech in rhetoric, figures in question are divided into two, as Wales (2014) states: "*Broadly figures are traditionally divided into SCHEMES and TROPES, of which schemes are by far the most frequent.*" (p. 162) Edward P. J. Corbett and Robert J. Connors also stated in their book "Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student" that "*We will use 'figures of speech' as the generic term for any artful deviation from the ordinary mode of speaking or writing. But we will divide the figures of speech into two main groups – the schemes and the tropes.*" (p. 379) And what we dwell upon here is the tropes which mean according to their definition: "*A trope (Greek tropein, to turn) involves a deviation from the ordinary and principal signification of a word.*" (p. 379) The remarkable distinction between those figures is clearly highlighted by them: "*Both types of figures involve a transference of some kind: a trope, a transference of meaning; a scheme, a transference of order.*" (p. 379) There are seventeen tropes in their study. We have determined some more figures

like anthropomorphism, epithet or meronymy in addition to what they listed. (p. 162)

It is possible to see some transference of meaning in the drama. One of them is anthimeria, which seems to be used rarely. The ones we have determined here are not the examples in which nouns become verbs or verbs become nouns, but adjectives become nouns. The latter can also be evaluated as a "functional shift" or an anthimeria according to Wales (Wales, 2014, p. 89). In the Turkish language, adjectives can also be used as substitutions for nouns. And this is a common functional shift. For instance,

"*Bilməm o ağılsız nə görübdür kişilərdən,*" (Ordubadi, 1964, p.72)

The word known as "mindless" or "foolish" and substituted for the character Züleyxa here is the subject in the line. And another example:

"*Bir gün bunu məncə biləcəkdir o pərivəş.*" (Ordubadi, 1964, p.72)

The word "*pərivəş*" (پری وش) borrowed from Persian, which was also used in the classical Turkish poetry in the Ottoman Empire means "like a fairy", "very beautiful". The word which is an adjective substitutes for the character Züleyxa. Turkish poetry abounds with such examples.

Another rhetorical device is hyperbole in the drama. Wales (2014) states that "*In drama, hyperbole is often used for emphasis as a sign of great emotion or passion*" (p. 202). We can list some hyperbole examples here. Yet we are going to make do with just a few. For instance,

Bir ne'mət olub sənin nəsibin,

Hazırda bütün cahan rəqibin (Ordubadi, 1964, p.65)

And apart from hyperbole, there is also a metonymy in the second verse. Züleyxa tells the protagonist, Yusif, that the whole world is his foe. And the other hyperbole example is about the situation of the world again. This time the protagonist exaggerates as he describes how terrible the situation of humanity is in the world. He describes the world as full of bowls of blood and likens it to a terrifying bloody school:

Qan kasəsidir cahan ləbaləb,

Pək qorxuludur bu qanlı məktəb. (Ordubadi, 1964, p.59)

The opposite of hyperbole is known as litotes. Litotes is purposely used to make a speech more impressive by understating it. It's fair to say that a very small number of examples of litotes are used in the drama. For instance, people around Yusif tell him that it is very difficult to see people around who are as beautiful as him, yet unfortunately, his manner is not perfect:

Sən gözəllikdə, sən vəcahətdə,

Az doğulmuş bizim vilayətdə.

> *Həyf ola tərbiyən deyil kamil,*
>
> *Surətin dilruba, özün cahil.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.58)

In the drama, there is an epithet. The character called "Fir'on" is the same as the term "pharaoh" used for the sovereign of ancient Egypt. But this is not a rhetorical device here.

It seems that Ordubadi applied antonymy and synonymy abundantly in the drama. Wales (2014) divided antonymy into three kinds: "gradable" / "ungradable", "relational opposites" and "contextual antonymy". (p. 26) And from this explanation it would be accurate to say that Ordubadi used all these types in the drama. This can be an example of a gradable antonymy: "*çox*" (much), "*az*" (little):

> *Biroğul **çox** sevilirsə, biri **az**,*
>
> *Belə bir ailə xoşbəxt olmaz.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.50)

In the drama, this can be an ungradable example: "*kölə*" (slave) and "*asilzadə*" (aristocrat):

> ***Köləyik** biz, o, **əsilzadə** sevir* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.49)

Or the verb "*öl-*" (to die) and "*yaşa-*" (to live) can be given as examples:

> *Min dəfə **öləm** vermaz ölüm qəlbimə dəhşət,*
>
> *Ancaq **yaşasam** eylərəm insanlığa xidmət.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.54)

Examples of relational opposites can be like that: Ordubadi used two Arabic loan words, which also make perfect rhyme with each other, "*ixilaf*" (*Arabic,* اختلاف *, controversy*) and "*e'tilaf*" (*Arabic,* ايتلاف*, agreement*):

> *Min hiylələrin, min **ixtilafın**,*
>
> *Min iç üzü qanlı **e'tilafın**,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.63)

And the other example can be given as a contextual antonymy with the words "dün" (yesterday) and "bu gün" (today). The protagonist says:

> ***Dün** bir gül idim, **bu günsə** soldum,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 59)

Such examples could be multiplied. When it comes to synonymy, we need to explain in what sense we use the term here. The term "synonymy", as Wales (2014) states, might be regarded as identical words in denotations and connotations. (p. 412) It is also possible to find some synonymous words used deliberately to enhance the impressiveness of the statement in the drama:

> *Yekrəng deyil bəşər, **yanılma**,*
>
> *Xülyaya qapılma, **səhv qılma**!* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 59)

Here, two conjugated verbs "*yanılma*" and "*səhv qılma*" both mean "make no mistake". One is Turkish and the other (a compound verb) is comprised of an

Arabic loanword. Those synonyms are used with a parallelism here. We will make do with this example since similar examples could be found and multiplied.

Another figure is irony here. It can be accurate to say that irony is not so common in the play. However, we can give an example of irony in one of the verses of Şəm'un. He says that his brother Yusif will be happy because of his dream. Şəm'un insinuates the opposite of his literal words since they are planning to remove their brother Yusif:

> *Çox etmə fəğan, şad olacaqsan bu yuxundan.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p. 52)

In the drama, meronymy can also be seen in some verses. But they are very few. Ordubadi used some words which are related to each other as parts of a whole. For instance, "*gül*" (rose) and "*yaprak*" (leafe); "*zimistan*" (winter) and "*xəzan*" (autumn) are used in a couplet:

> *Bir **güldü**, fəqət görüb **zimistan**,*
>
> ***Yarpaqları** məhv olub **xəzandan**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.57)

Metaphor and metonymy are other figures that are used in the drama. The drama starts with a metaphoric verse of Cad stating the sky of fire fries his brain:

> *Qovurur beynimi atəşli səma,*
>
> *Bir cəhənnəm bu hərarətlə fəza* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.49)

That he says his brain is fried by the sky of fire is applied to his sorrowful situation. Here "*ateşli sema*" is also a metaphoric usage. It is possible to see some metonomies or synecdoches too. It is known that these terms are difficult to distinguish from each other. If we take synecdoche as Corbett and Connors (1999) described: "*a figure of speech in which a part stands for the whole*" (p. 397), we can say that synecdoche is less than metonymy in the drama. The line in which a sword stands for a weapon can be given as an example of synecdoche. In this line, the writer says no policy will solve the problem but a sword:

> *Heç siyasət bir əlac etməyəcək,*
>
> *Müşgülü bircə qılınc həll edəcək!* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.51)

As for metonymy, the line in which the word "world" stands for people can be an example of metonymy. The wife of the pharaoh, Asnat, addresses the protagonist to work and grow the whole country so the world will remember him one day:

> *Sə'y eylə, çalış aylə bütün ölkəni bərpa,*
>
> *Bir gün gələcək yad edəcəkdir səni dünya..* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.74)

Examples of metonymy can be multiplied. For instance, we see the same metonymy example in another couplet. In the same couplet, there is an oxymoron as another figure. Oxymoron is not so commonly used in the drama as in the example of Shakespeare that Corbett and Connors (1999) mentioned in their book. (p. 407) The same example from Shakespeare is also mentioned in Wales's (2014)

dictionary. (p. 299) In this drama, Məm'un says he (referring to Yusif) is capable of deceiving the world because his poison is his sweet talk (style):

> *Aldatmağa müqtədir cahanı,*
>
> *Bir zəhr isə var şirin lisanı.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.57)

There are some other contradictory expressions in the drama, but all those expressions may not be regarded as oxymoron examples.

In the drama, there are many words that sound similar, but are different in meaning. Because the harmony of the drama is mainly based on similarity in sound. However, this is mainly in the form of rhymes like "*insaf*" / "*bir laf*", "*özündə*" / "*sözündə*" or "*kəs*"/ "*səs*" etc. But this similarity is not like puns. Because the aim of paronomasia in rhetoric, as Collins Dictionary describes, is this: "*to achieve a specific effect, as humor or a dual meaning; punning.*"[10] In that regard, we couldn't find any paronomasia or pun examples in the drama.

The other figure is circumlocution or periphrasis, which is not commonly used in the drama. Periphrasis, as Wales (2014) describes, is "*a statement or phrase which uses more words than are strictly necessary.*" (p. 312). There may be some practical reasons to apply periphrasis, like avoiding some inappropriate words or statements. But periphrasis can also be used for poetic effectiveness. For instance, Xəfra substitutes "ey nəhali-növrəs" for the protagonist:

> *Baxma yerə, ey nəhali-növrəs,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.61)

Xəfra likens Yusif to a newly growing sapling in the line. The words "*nehal*" (نهال) and "*növrəs*" (نورس) in the drama are Persian loanwords which can be seen in classical Turkish literature.

Two other tropes which are not common in the drama are personification and anthropomorphism. Personification, as Longman describes, is "*the representation of a thing or a quality as a person*".[11] So the writer presents some actions of non-human things as human traits or likens them to human characteristics. For instance, the protagonist in the drama says that a hundred nightingales turn out to be singers in front of him and they read poems to his beautiful face. The protagonist attributes the action of "singing" of birds to human traits. They also read poetry:

> *Yüz bülbül önümdə nəğməkirdar.*
>
> *Məhfuz idi varlığımla gülzar,*
>
> *Gül ruyimə söyləyirdi əş'ar.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.58)

Personification can be regarded as a kind of simile. Because in personification an action of a non-human thing is attributed to a human trait. But it doesn't suggest that all similes are personifications. As a result, we see more examples of simile

---

[10] https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/paronomasia
[11] https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/personification

than of personification in the drama. Anthropomorphism is ascribing human characteristics to non-human things. For instance, Nəfta says to Yusif, grabbing by his collar, that the moon and the sun will grovel to him:

> *Ay, gün edəcək indi sənə səcdə bu yerdə,* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.52)

It is also possible to see some polysemic words in the play. However, these words are not used here in rhetorical ways. And the same can be said for the homophonic words too. There are many homophonic words like "gül", which means both "rose" and "to smile", but these are not used on their own in rhetorical ways either. Because there is no ambiguity exploited in puns arising from polysemy or homophony. However, apart from all these, some words are exploited in rhyme in a similar way to homophony. But these are not a complete homography or homophony. As we mentioned before, one is a unit word here, whereas the other one is within another word:

> *Hər kimsədən olsa xalq **razı**,*
>
> *Mədyundur ona bizim **ərazı**.* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.71)

There are many rhetorical questions in the text. The rhetorical question is used as an effective device without expecting an answer. As Wales (2014) states, "*it really asserts something which is known to the addresser*" (p. 370). It seems the protagonist in the drama uses this device abundantly:

> *Sən bir ağasan hər işdə hakim,*
>
> *Məzlum ilə olurmu zalim?* (Ordubadi, 1964, p.60)

Conclusion

According to our research, this is the first time such a stylistic analysis has been carried out regarding Ordubadi's dramas. We couldn't encounter such a study on his dramas even in the extensive studies about him. The studies on M. Said Ordubadi are mostly about his novels or prosaic works like historical and social essays.

This drama was first published in 1927-28 in the Journal of "Maarif İşçisi" and then published in the book "Əsərləri" printed in Cyrillic script in 1964. Apart from the only copy of 1964, this drama doesn't have any other copies. His other dramas haven't been published, not even in the modern Azerbaijani alphabet either. Some writers in modern Turkish literature, like Şinasi or A. Hamid Tarhan wrote some plays to be read, not to be performed on the stage. This play may also be considered in this respect. Yet this still gives an overall impression of how much his plays are in demand.

In this study, a linguistic study has been applied to the field of literature. And this study has shown how Ordubadi applied stylistic devices in his drama. As similar studies are carried out more extensively and comprehensively, they will no doubt

give more detailed insights into Ordubadi's style and skills regarding how he used rhetorical devices.

In the study, the stylistic devices in the drama have been identified as much as possible and the levels of language like graphological, phonological, morphological, grammatical, lexical and semantic features have been followed in the process. And under these sections, some kinds of rhymes like perfect rhymes, imperfect rhymes, slant rhymes and reverse rhymes and some rhetorical devices like alliteration, assonance, anaphora, epistrophe, polyptoton, onomatopoeia, exclamations, morphological deviations, asyndeton, anthimeria, hyperbole, metaphor, simile, metonymy, synecdoche, litotes, epithet, antonymy, synonymy, irony, meronymy, oxymoron, periphrasis, personification, anthropomorphism, rhetorical questions have been determined and shown. And some compound, complex and inverted sentences have also been shown in the play. On the other hand, we couldn't determine any examples of puns (paronomasia), prevalently used in classical literature.

References

AXUNDLU Y. (1997). *Məmməd Səid Ordubadi (Həyatı, mühiti və yaradıcılığı)*, Bakı: Sabah.

AXUNDLU, Ə., ABBASLI İ and İSMAYILOV H. (2005). *Azərbaycan Aşıq Serindən Seçmələr*. Vol I/II. Bakı: Şərq-Qərb

CAMBRIDGE, (*Online Dictionary*). Web-address: Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus

COLLINS, (*Online Dictionary*). Web-address: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/

CONNORS, Robert J. and CORBETT, E. P. J. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric for The Modern Students*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LONGMAN, (*Online Dictionary*). Web-address: https://www.ldoceonline.com/

MCINTYRE, D. "*An example of a stylistic analysis*", https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/stylistics/sa1/example.htm

ORDUBADİ, M. S. (1964). *Əsərləri, Pyeslər və Romanlar*, Vol II , (ed. Bəzirova F.) Bakı: Azerbaycan Dövlet Neşriyyatı.

ORDUBADİ, M. S. (2012). *Həyatım və Mühitim (ed. İsa Həbibbəyli)* Naxçıvan: Əcemi.

SHORT, M. (2013). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*, USA: Routledge.

SIMPSON, P. (2004). *Stylistics*, USA: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

WALES, K. (2014). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, Third Edition, USA: Routledge.