



THE HARMONY OF INDIVIDUAL SPEECH AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE ERA IN QODIRIY'S NOVELS: A CASE STUDY OF MEHROBDAN CHAYON

Madirimov Baxram Abdullayevich

Lecturer at the Turtkul Faculty of Tashkent State University of Economics, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Abdulla Qodiriy's Mehrobdan Chayon (1929) stands at the crossroads of Uzbek literary modernism and traditional narrative, uniting the voices of vividly individualized characters with the polyphonic idiom of an era marked by reform-minded Jadid intellectuals and Soviet linguistic policy. This article investigates how Qodiriy achieves stylistic consonance between the speech peculiar to his protagonists and the socio-historical language environment of late-nineteenth-century Turkestan as retrospectively refracted through the 1920s. The findings contribute to Uzbek literary studies by offering a replicable method for tracing harmony between micro-speech and macro-language in historical novels, suggesting new avenues for comparative research on Central Asian realism.

Key words: Abdulla Qodiriy; Uzbek historical novel; individual speech; socio-linguistic harmony; Mehrobdan Chayon; Jadid movement; heteroglossia.

INTRODUCTION

The canon of twentieth-century Uzbek prose owes much of its thematic breadth and stylistic refinement to Abdulla Qodiriy (1894–1938), whose narrative experiments inaugurated realism in a region long dominated by poetic genres. His second major novel, Mehrobdan Chayon, completed in 1928 and first printed in Samarkand in 1929, dramatizes the turmoil of the “khanate times” while simultaneously encoding the linguistic anxieties of post-revolution Turkestan.

Previous scholarship has judged the work primarily for its plot and socio-political commentary, yet the intricate interplay between characters' individualized speech patterns and the broader language of their epoch remains underexplored. Studies on monologic strategies in Qodiriy's oeuvre (Tursunova, 2019) and recent psycholinguistic inquiries into his stylistic devices (Ishchanova, 2025) hint at this dimension without offering a systematic method for its analysis. The present article addresses this gap by posing two interrelated research questions:

How does Qodiriy differentiate the voices of his protagonists through idiolectal markers, and in what ways are those voices consonant with, or dissonant from, the collective language of late-imperial Turkestan as perceived in the 1920s?

What narrative techniques enable their seamless convergence into a stylistic harmony that advances the novel's thematic agenda?

Focusing on Mehrobdan Chayon, the discussion foregrounds harmony in a Bakhtinian sense, not as uniformity but as orchestrated heteroglossia that reflects social plurality while sustaining aesthetic coherence. By integrating close reading with corpus-assisted frequency profiling, the study contributes a replicable analytic protocol for Central Asian literary linguistics and enriches debates on the dialogism of historical fiction.

The primary text is the first Samarkand edition of Mehrobdan Chayon (1929), digitized and tokenised for computational inspection at the level of word-forms and bigrams. A reference corpus of contemporaneous Uzbek periodicals (1925–1930) totalling 300 000 words establishes baseline frequencies for administrative, religious, and Jadid neologisms. Character-delimited sub-corpora—Anvar (14 124 tokens), Ra’no (9 632), and the quasi-omniscient narrator (25 087)—were manually annotated for speech category, code-switching events, and pragmatic markers.

Qualitative analysis followed Leech and Short’s stylistic taxonomy, adjusted for Turkic morphology, to trace lexical deviation, syntactic compression, and discourse markers signalling direct versus mediated speech. Quantitative procedures employed log-likelihood calculations to identify over-represented lemmas in each sub-corpus relative to the period corpus, while concordance lines clarified context-sensitive semantics. Inter-annotator reliability, assessed on a 10 % sample, yielded a Cohen’s κ of 0.88, indicating robust coding consistency.

The results demonstrate a calibrated distribution of individual and era-bound language across narrative layers. Anvar’s speech cluster exhibits significant overuse of Persian-Arabic compounds denoting ethical abstract nouns (e.g., *adolat*, *mardum*), producing an elevated register aligned with his reformist aspirations. In contrast, Ra’no’s idiolect is marked by diminutive suffixation and colloquial Turkic particles (-ku, -da), reinforcing her social vulnerability yet imbuing dialogues with intimacy. Statistical analysis shows a log-likelihood value of 112.3 ($p < 0.001$) for Anvar’s elevated lexemes compared to period norms, whereas Ra’no’s colloquialisms surpass baseline by a value of 97.8 ($p < 0.001$).

Beyond individual vocabularies, Qodiriy integrates the language of the era through strategically placed administrative terms—*amlokdor*, *daroga*—and religious formulas—*bismillah*, *hamdolsun*—that recur in narrator commentary rather than in protagonist speech. These tokens maintain historical verisimilitude without diluting character specificity. Code-switching instances number 148, predominantly Arabic citations in legal contexts, functioning as anchoring devices that blend personal utterance with communal memory.

Narrative harmony culminates in dialogic seams where the narrator paraphrases folk proverbs immediately after character monologues. Such junctures convert oral wisdom into authorial metacommentary, thereby smoothing transitions between subjective voice and epochal discourse. Stylistically, syntactic cadence—alternation of paired clauses followed by a paratactic string—mirrors the rhythmic structure of *masnaviy* poetry, inserting an implicit cultural soundtrack that resonates across speech levels.

The evidence suggests that Qodiriy consciously choreographs lexical and rhythmic contrasts to harmonise individual speech with a collective linguistic backdrop. Characters do not merely inhabit history; their speech remixes temporal registers, reflecting a modernist impulse to negotiate continuity and rupture. Anvar’s reformist diction signals an aspirational projection into future civic discourse even as archaic juridical jargon tethers narrative events to the declining khanate. Ra’no’s colloquial patterning anchors emotional authenticity, preventing the historical canvas from subsuming personal agency.

The code-switching phenomena identified correspond with Bakhtin’s notion of centrifugal and centripetal forces within the novel: the Arabic citations exert a centripetal pull toward canonical authority, while idiolectal play pushes centrifugally toward individual expression. Qodiriy’s achievement lies in maintaining equilibrium; neither force overwhelms the other, and

the resulting textual harmony models a cultural negotiation crucial to Uzbek intellectual life of the 1920s.

Methodologically, blending close stylistics with corpus-assisted metrics proved instrumental in uncovering patterns concealed by anecdotal reading alone. The approach can be transferred to comparative studies of Jadid prose, where socio-linguistic layering is equally dense. Nevertheless, the present study is limited by reliance on a single novel and a reference corpus confined to periodicals; expanding the dataset to include contemporaneous legal documents and oral histories could refine the calibrations of era-specific lexis.

Mehrobdan Chayon exemplifies a dynamic harmony between the speech of individuated characters and the language currents of their time. Qodiriy orchestrates lexical strata, code-switching, and rhythmic design to weave a narrative fabric where personal voices echo, yet never distort, the polyphony of a society in transition. Recognizing and analysing this harmony deepens our appreciation of Uzbek literary realism and offers a template for investigating linguistic dialogues between self and society in historical fiction.

REFERENCES

1. Кадыри А. Мехробдан чаян. – Самарканд : Узфан, 1929. – 256 с.
2. Турсунова Ф. Г. Роль монологической речи в самораскрытии сатирического героя (по произведениям Абдуллы Кадыри) // International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation. – 2019. – Т. 17, № 2. – С. 170–173.
3. Рахимова И. Б. Лингвокультурные особенности речевых формул в переводах «Мехробдан чаян» А. Кадыри // Journal of Education and Linguistics Studies. – 2025. – № 3. – С. 45–53.
4. Ismailov S. Abdulla Qodiriy: Literary Heritage. – Tashkent : Fan, 2018. – 312 p.
5. Мирвалиев С. Абдулла Кадыри. – Ташкент : O'zbekiston, 2010. – 280 с.
6. Жалолов Ф. Эволюция узбекского исторического романа: от Кадыри до Аюбова // Вестник Национального университета Узбекистана. – 2024. – Т. 4, № 2. – С. 110–125.
7. Ishchanova M. Psycholinguistic Interpretation of Abdulla Qodiriy's Mehrobdan Chayon // Central Asian Dialectology. – 2025. – Т. 3, № 1. – С. 23–34.
8. Kudratov K. Individual Speech in Uzbek Prose of the 1920s. – Bukhara : BukDU Press, 2022. – 198 p.
9. Yusupova N. Harmonization of Authorial and Folk Language in Uzbek Jadid Literature // Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education. – 2024. – № 5. – С. 67–79.
10. Tokhtakhodjaeva Z. Dialogic Structures in Abdulla Qodiriy's Works. – Tashkent : Tashkent State University Press, 2021. – 210 p.