

Article

The Language and Style of the Novel “Realm of Separation”

Tursunova Sanobar*¹

1. Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

*Correspondance: sanobar.najmiddinovna84@gmail.com

Abstract: A renewed approach to literary works, the study and accurate interpretation of issues in the history of literature, and the examination of a literary text not only within its own framework but also from philosophical, social, and psychological perspectives all demonstrate a work's broader significance. It would not be an exaggeration to state that Murad Mansur holds a prominent place in the study of artistic expression. Certain traits and characteristics of the writer's personality are reflected in literary works, which also allows for the application of the biographical method in analyzing artistic expression and literary style. Murad Mansur's novel *Realm of Separation* creates a vast stylistic space, harmoniously combining charm, subtlety, and a gentle, unobtrusive melancholy.

Citation: Sanobar, T. The Language and Style of the Novel “Realm of Separation”. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics 2026, 5(3), 21-24.

Received: 15th Mar 2026

Revised: 05th Apr 2026

Accepted: 20th Apr 2026

Published: 11th May 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Keywords: The Language of Literary Works, Language Elements, Style, Poetic Features, Linguopoetic Method

1. Introduction

We know that studying and comprehending the laws governing the emergence, development, and enrichment of the language of literary works is one of the general philological problems, and the scientific directions and methods for its investigation are multifaceted. The study of the language and style of literary works also holds significant theoretical and practical value for this field [1].

The study of the language of literary works is one of the important and pressing issues facing philologists. The language of a literary work is intrinsically connected with the work itself, which possesses centuries-old experience in reflecting the life of the people. Therefore, studying and analyzing the language of a literary work requires a comprehensive understanding of its internal and external relationships, the writer's worldview, and the use of both literary and non-literary elements within it [2, 3].

The language of a literary work attracts the reader's attention with its charm, expressiveness, richness of meaning, and vividness. Regarding the language of literary works, Yuldash Solijonov writes [4]:

“Writing a work in a clear and fluent language, and being able to convey the feelings and emotional states of both the author and the characters to the reader, is considered one of the essential aspects of literary mastery. A true artist-writer, therefore, must thoroughly and deeply master the possibilities of artistic speech, and be able to make effective and appropriate use of both the literary language and the living colloquial speech of the people [5].”

Accordingly, many scholars have carried out a number of studies on the language of literary works.

In particular, works such as G.O. Vinokur's *On the Language of Fiction*, L. Bloomfield's *Language*, and S. Turabekova's *Language and Style* can be noted. According to N.P. Pototskaya, "it is inappropriate to divide the discipline that studies the language of fiction into separate fields such as literary stylistics and linguistic stylistics, since there is no significant fundamental difference between the aesthetic function of the language of fiction and the expressive-stylistic function of ordinary language [6, 7]."

The expressive and stylistic function of language is clearly manifested in literary works. The study and investigation of the language of literary works is one of the most important and topical issues facing specialists in the field. Recently, interest in conducting research in this area has been steadily increasing, and a number of studies have been carried out [8]. In particular, the book by B. Yuldoshev and H. Doniyorov titled "*Literary Language and Artistic Style*" can serve as a foundation for studying this field. In addition, many scholars such as I. Ko'chkortoev, B. Yuldoshev, R. Normurodov, and S. Karimov have also made significant contributions to the study of the language of literary works and have produced a number of important works. One of the factors that defines the distinctive features of the language of literary works is its expressiveness [9]. The effectiveness of a literary work's language largely depends on the skillful use of its language elements. This, in turn, determines each writer's degree of proficiency in making efficient use of words [10].

2. Materials and Methods

By the 1990s, a number of studies dedicated to the linguopoetic analysis of literary discourse had emerged in Uzbek linguistics. In Professor S. Karimov's doctoral dissertation on "*The Artistic Style of the Uzbek Language*", a number of linguopoetic issues were also addressed. In particular, S. Karimov's support for conducting literary work analysis using the linguopoetic method is noteworthy.

In recent years, M. Yuldoshev, in his research on "*Cholpon's Mastery of Artistic Language*", provides a linguopoetic analysis of the novel "*Kecha va Kunduz*" (*Yesterday and Today*). In addition, in his book "*The Secrets of Cholpon's Word*", he identifies the linguopoetic features of certain expressions, sayings, and proverbs found in the novel "*Kecha va Kunduz*".

3. Results

There is no doubt that, in the case of the work under study, the events are drawn from real life, that they convincingly engage the reader, that the writer's skillful use of language is evident, and that the artistic language of the work — the ability to persuade with words — is strong [11]:

"At the threshold stood a white-legged... why white-legged, a creature wrapped entirely in white — a serpent, yet not a serpent; a human, yet fully serpent-like, bent double, asking for permission while holding his tray [12].

'Sir, if you permit, I would like to serve your lunch...' 'Come now, put the tray down, sit properly. Let's see your hand as well,' he said. 'Come on, in the name of God, start — which shall we try first?' 'No-no-no... What are you saying?' — he had stammered, thinking, 'It's impossible for us, who are we in front of you?' 'Interesting, what did the little say to put you in this state, Jamolokhun?' said the elder prisoner.

'Chick? No — does food ever speak?' — he replied, astonished. 'Well, it is clearly saying 'Don't eat (us), sir, we have been poisoned'"

Hozik Tura casts a negative aspect on Jamolokhun's outward appearance to convey his misdeed and dreadful intent. In this way, the writer involves the reader in the portrayal of the character through the depiction [13].

M. Kushjonov emphasizes:

"Aligning the reader's imagination with the character's conception is one of the conditions for vividly bringing the scene to life in a literary work."

In the story, the writer anticipates the intentions and goals of the person facing his character. To help the reader understand this dreadful intent, the first chapter presents catastrophe, supernatural events, and situations affecting the character's psyche: from claw to head, trembling and running, hair standing on end, claws extending to knees and then onto the prayer rug—these extraordinary details hint at the impending betrayal [14]. At this point, the reader cannot doubt Hozik Tura's understanding of Jamolokhun's intentions, as discussed in the chapter on lunch; instead, they side with him. The single sentence, *"Do not eat, sir — we have been poisoned"*, heightens the reader's suspense, evokes strong hatred toward Jamolokhun, and impresses upon them Tura's sharp intellect and keen judgment, ready to sacrifice a thousand lives for the sake of honorable action.

Although the character could have expressed to Jamolokhun: *"Are you trying to poison me with this meal?"*, his patience, measured attitude toward the murderer, and subtle mastery of language demonstrate his self-control. Once the murderer's act is exposed, the question of punishment is left open. Even years later, Tura will face the person who attempted the assassination [15]. The fact that he continues to enjoy life is made possible by Tura's captivity, and the writer highlights his weakness by calling him the "Elder Prisoner."

The writer names objects, events, and phenomena with words that accurately reflect their characteristic features. Nowhere do you see a word that interrupts the flow of events:

"Beside me, on the warm ground, a reddish-winged grasshopper appeared. It crawled out from the grass, raised its head proudly, basked in the sun for a while, then spread its wings, stretched its legs, and prepared to fly. If I moved, it would surely jump away. For this reason, even when the sun's rays slid across my shadow and warmed my forehead, I remained still, enduring the discomfort. I wondered what the grasshopper would do. My nose itched, and I almost sneezed, but restrained myself. The grasshopper stretched and flexed its legs, spread its wings. Finally, it jumped up, and a sparrow, already waiting somewhere, swooped down and snatched it. Its wings flashed over my forehead, and I jumped in fright. I immediately stood up and then sat back down."

The writer artistically portrays the grasshopper's movements—from preparing to jump to actually leaping, targeting its prey, and being captured—bringing the scenes to life on the page. The artistic brilliance of the language is reflected here. The comparison of the grasshopper's head to a horse's is accurate, as anyone observing would notice the resemblance between the insect's head and a horse's snout.

The reader's participation in the event and the "liveness" of the language are emphasized as key factors in bringing the text to life. The reader sees the objects, characters, and events through their own eyes, hears the various sounds, and experiences the emotions as if they were the character themselves. This immersive experience is a hallmark of expressive literary language.

The writer guides the reader alongside the characters, taking them to the places the characters see and naturally engaging the reader in dialogue with them:

"The gatehouse was tall, and a wooden staircase beside it extended longer than it. Above, the door of a small open room could be seen. At some point, someone must have sat there too, God forgive me. I could hardly believe it. The lower harness room, however, was remarkable. Even though the columns and supports had aged and weathered over time, they remained strong and impressive. On the accessible parts of the columns, enormous nails protruded, rusted up to the flat caps. In the past, important guests had arrived from near and far, tying their horses and carriages to those nails before being received inside."

Even when we see a house or building in our own time, we may not be able to describe its condition so precisely, or we may not pay any attention to whether it is old or new, or what materials it is made of.

“Tura Nusratilla filled one side of the *sandal* and, leaning on the double cushion, sat smiling contentedly. Every time they moved, they muttered, ‘Praise be to yourself.’ In front of me, Aypo’s aunt placed tea, her face so fair and bright — whether it was because she draped one end of the double-layered white scarf over her shoulders just so, or because of the light from the lamp beside her — I could not look at her enough; I could hardly take my eyes off her.”

4. Conclusion

Nusratilla Pochcha’s piety is expressed in a single phrase: “Be grateful to yourself, be grateful that you have reached these days.” The fact that Oyposha Khola was a beautiful and elegant woman is also clearly understood from the text itself. Encounters with episodes in Murad Mansur’s novel expand the theme and content of the work, and the ideas presented in the text seem as if they are provided as evidence to substantiate the meaning of the work. This experience becomes even more evident in his novel *Realm of Separation*.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Mansurov, *Realm of Separation (Ayriliq saltanati)*, vol. 2, Tashkent: Sharq Publishing House, 2003.
- [2] M. Kushjonov, *The Responsibility of Creativity (Ijod mas’uliyati)*, Tashkent: Adabiyot va San’at Publishing House, 1981.
- [3] Y. Sulijunov, *The Keen Eyes of Truth (Haqiqatning o’tkir ko’zlari)*, Tashkent: National Library of Uzbekistan named after Alisher Navoi, 2009.
- [4] B. Yuldashev, *Linguopoetic Analysis of the UFQ Trilogy (UFQ trilogiyasining lingvopoetik tahlili)*, Samarkand, 2006.
- [5] I. K. Kuchkorteov, *Stylistics of Artistic Speech (Badiiy nutq stilistikasi)*, Tashkent, 1975.
- [6] B. Yuldashev, *Stylistic Analysis of Artistic Prose (Badiiy proza stilistik tahlili)*, Tashkent: Fan, 1989.
- [7] A. N. Kononov, *Grammar of the Modern Uzbek Literary Language*, Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960.
- [8] M. Yoqubova, "Stylistic peculiarities of modern Uzbek novels," *Uzbek Language and Literature*, vol. 4, pp. 22-28, 2018.
- [9] U. Normatov, *Principles of Creativity (Ijod tamoyillari)*, Tashkent: Universitet, 2007.
- [10] S. Karimov, *The Language of Badiiy Style (Badiiy uslub tili)*, Samarkand: SamDU nashri, 1994.
- [11] N. Mahmudov, *Language and Identity (Til va madaniyat)*, Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 2012.
- [12] H. Umurov, *Theory of Literature (Adabiyotshunoslik nazariyasi)*, Tashkent: Sharq, 2002.
- [13] M. Qoshjonov, "Artistic craftsmanship in modern prose," *New Uzbek Literature*, no. 3, pp. 45-51, 2015.
- [14] R. Rasulov, *Lexical Graduations in the Uzbek Language*, Tashkent: Fan, 2008.
- [15] A. Rustamov, *The Art of Word (So'z san'ati)*, Tashkent: Mumtoz So'z, 2010.