



## ARTICLE

# The Linguistic and Poetic Function of Landscape Imagery in Kazakh Novels: An Analysis Based on Kazakh Novels Written After Kazakhstan's Independence

Taldaubek Kadyl<sup>1</sup>, Amirov Abdibek Zhetpisovich<sup>2\*</sup> , Tuimebekova Aliya<sup>3</sup>, Kaspikhan Bauyrzhan Kaspikhanuly<sup>2</sup> ,  
Seisembayeva Zhanar Aitbergenovna<sup>4</sup>, Zhetibay Rakymberdi<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sinology, R.B. Suleymenov Institute of Oriental Studies, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Kazakh Linguistics Named After A.Baytursinuly, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Philology, Kazak Philology, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan

<sup>4</sup> Academician S. Kirabayev Department of Kazakh Literature and Teaching Methods, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan

## ABSTRACT

This study explores the linguistic and poetic functions of landscape descriptions in Kazakh literary prose, focusing on the works of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov. Drawing on selected passages from *The Path of Abai* and *Blood and Sweat*, the research analyzes how landscape imagery is not merely decorative, but serves as a powerful artistic device that reflects psychological states, shapes narrative structure, and conveys ideological and aesthetic meaning. The analysis demonstrates that in Auezov's prose, landscape often mirrors the protagonist's emotional transformations, functioning as a psychological parallel and a medium of lyrical expression. In contrast, Nurpeisov's landscape depictions, shaped by the harsh environment of the Aral Sea, align closely with the principles of social realism, expressing collective trauma, resistance, and existential despair. The study further highlights the stylistic differences between the authors, including the

### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Amirov Abdibek Zhetpisovich, Department of Kazakh Linguistics Named After A.Baytursinuly, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan; Email: [abdibek71@mail.ru](mailto:abdibek71@mail.ru)

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 11 June 2025 | Revised: 30 June 2025 | Accepted: 8 July 2025 | Published Online: 5 September 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.10469>

### CITATION

Kadyl, T., Zhetpisovich, A.A., Aliya, T., et al., 2025. The Linguistic and Poetic Function of Landscape Imagery in Kazakh Novels: An Analysis Based on Kazakh Novels Written After Kazakhstan's Independence. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(9): 356–371.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.10469>

### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

use of metaphor, symbolism, and emotional tone. Methodologically, it employs qualitative content analysis, interpretive literary stylistics, and cross-cultural literary comparison. The novelty of the study lies in its detailed comparative approach and its contextualization of Kazakh landscape imagery within broader theoretical frameworks, including psychological parallelism and narrative aesthetics. The findings reveal that landscape in Kazakh prose functions as a multidimensional tool operating at emotional, symbolic, and ideological levels. By integrating literary theory with close textual analysis, the paper contributes to a deeper understanding of how landscape serves both an expressive and structural purposes in fiction. It also suggests new directions for future interdisciplinary research in literary and cognitive stylistics.

**Keywords:** Kazakh Novel; Landscape Description; Linguistic and Poetic Function; Linguistic Devices; M. Auezov; A. Nurpeisov

## 1. Introduction

One of the essential components that shape the aesthetic structure of literary prose and reflect the writer's artistic vision is the depiction of landscape. In literary fiction, landscape functions not only as a physical setting but also as an expressive medium that mirrors the emotional and psychological states of characters, reflects ideological conflicts, and deepens symbolic meaning. Kazakh literary prose, particularly in the works of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov, offers rich and nuanced uses of landscape imagery that transcend mere description, serving as central poetic and conceptual elements.

Human consciousness is inseparable from the environment. As V. Belinsky<sup>[1]</sup> observed, "Nature is the eternal model of art, and its highest form is the human being." Writers often portray social, personal, and historical events through interaction with nature, thereby merging external reality with internal experience. In Kazakh literature, the representation of landscape has evolved from the lyrical admiration of the steppe in oral traditions to a sophisticated tool for conveying philosophical and emotional meaning in modern prose.

While numerous studies in world literature have examined the symbolic and stylistic functions of landscape—particularly in Russian, Chinese, and European traditions—relatively few have focused on Kazakh fiction from this perspective<sup>[2]</sup>. The concepts of psychological landscape, poetic parallelism, and lyrical reflection are well-established in literary theory<sup>[3]</sup>, but their systematic application to Kazakh prose remains limited.

Therefore, this study aims to fill that scholarly gap by exploring the linguistic and poetic functions of landscape

descriptions in the novels *The Path of Abai* by M. Auezov<sup>[4]</sup> and *Blood and Sweat* by Ä. Nurpeisov<sup>[5]</sup>. This research<sup>[6]</sup> investigates how landscape is used as a narrative device, how it reveals character psychology, and how it conveys ideological, social, and aesthetic meaning.

### Research Objectives:

- To analyze the linguistic and poetic devices used in landscape descriptions;
- To determine how landscape imagery functions as a psychological and symbolic element;
- To compare the stylistic features of landscape portrayal between Auezov and Nurpeisov;
- To contextualize Kazakh landscape prose within broader literary traditions.

### Research Questions:

1. How does landscape imagery in Kazakh prose reflect character psychology and internal states?
2. What are the stylistic and narrative differences in the use of landscape between the two authors?
3. How does landscape function ideologically and symbolically in the structure of Kazakh novels?

This paper provides the first in-depth comparative analysis of landscape in Auezov's and Nurpeisov's works through a linguistic and poetic lens. It introduces a structured method for analyzing the symbolic functions of landscape in Kazakh fiction and situates this analysis within the context of global literary theory.

The article proceeds as follows: the next section presents a review of relevant literature, followed by a detailed explanation of the methodology. The core sections analyze

the use of landscape in the works of Auezov and Nurpeisov, including a comparative discussion and tabulated results. The paper concludes with key findings and suggestions for further interdisciplinary research.

## 2. Literature Review

The depiction of landscape in literature has long attracted scholarly attention due to its multifaceted aesthetic, psychological, and symbolic functions. From classical pastoral poetry to modern realist novels, landscape has served as more than a backdrop—it is a powerful artistic device capable of revealing character, conveying mood, reinforcing ideological themes, and shaping narrative structure. In recent decades, scholars have expanded the study of landscape beyond traditional literary analysis by incorporating insights from cognitive science, narratology, ecological criticism, and stylistics. However, within Kazakh literary criticism, the systematic analysis of landscape imagery—especially from a linguistic and poetic perspective—remains relatively underexplored.

### 2.1. Landscape as a Narrative and Stylistic Device in Global Literature

In global literary theory, the study of landscape is rooted in early aesthetic philosophy, where thinkers such as Edmund Burke and Immanuel Kant discussed the sublime and the picturesque in relation to nature. In the context of narrative fiction, landscape has been conceptualized as a “chronotope” by Mikhail Bakhtin<sup>[3]</sup>, who argued that time and space in literature are intrinsically connected and realized through setting. The chronotope framework provides a foundational understanding of how landscape contributes to the temporal and emotional dynamics of a text. In this view, landscape not only situates events but also reflects moral, psychological, and cultural values.

René Wellek<sup>[7]</sup> emphasized that landscape is integral to a writer’s worldview and stylistic signature, serving as a vehicle for thematic and ideological expression. He argued that landscape must be understood not as inert description but as a functional and expressive component of the literary system. More recently, Michael Ryan and Julie Rivkin<sup>[6]</sup> have explored the intersection of narrative space, affect, and identity, highlighting how landscape constructs meaning be-

yond the literal, especially in postcolonial and non-Western contexts.

In Chinese literary criticism, Wang Zhenglong<sup>[8]</sup> outlines how traditional literature used nature not only as a metaphor for the human condition but also as a tool for moral and philosophical instruction. Similarly, Russian literary theorists such as V.G. Belinsky<sup>[1]</sup> and V.M. Zhirmunsky<sup>[9]</sup> have stressed the ideological implications of landscape in realist prose, particularly in the works of Turgenev, Tolstoy, and Chekhov, where nature is intertwined with social and spiritual commentary.

These perspectives converge on the understanding that landscape is a dynamic semiotic system—a composite of natural imagery, psychological resonance, and narrative symbolism. However, much of this work focuses on European or East Asian literature, with little attention to Central Asian traditions. This study seeks to bridge that gap by situating Kazakh prose within the broader discussion of landscape’s linguistic and poetic functions.

### 2.2. Landscape in Kazakh Literary Criticism

In Kazakh literary studies, landscape has often been addressed from a general artistic or thematic perspective, with limited linguistic or stylistic focus. Zeynolla Kabdolov<sup>[10]</sup> in his seminal work *Art of Speech* described landscape as “living poetry,” emphasizing its role in embodying the writer’s style and revealing the inner world of characters. Kabdolov viewed the depiction of nature not as an external element but as a reflection of internal emotional and psychological states—a form of lyrical realism unique to Kazakh literature.

Bakhytzhana Maytanov<sup>[11]</sup>, in *Artistic Semantics of Landscape*, developed a more systematic approach by classifying the functions of landscape in fiction as: (1) temporal marker; (2) emotional mirror; (3) symbolic metaphor; and (4) ideological device. He noted that in Auezov’s prose, landscape often serves as a poetic and philosophical canvas upon which character transformation unfolds. Maytanov also observed a parallelism between seasonal cycles and the protagonist’s emotional evolution, thereby reinforcing the link between nature and psychological development.

Zh.K. Smagulov<sup>[2]</sup> expanded the interpretive field by incorporating critical and cognitive approaches. In his recent study published in the *Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov ENU*, he emphasized the ecological and anthropocentric dimen-

sions of landscape, arguing that Kazakh literature reflects an intimate, almost sacred relationship between people and land. He connected this relationship to the nomadic worldview, in which landscape is not static but spiritually charged, mediating memory, identity, and moral judgment.

Despite these valuable contributions, existing studies tend to focus more on thematic and philosophical aspects, leaving a gap in terms of stylistic, linguistic, and comparative analysis. Few studies, for instance, examine how metaphor, simile, personification, and narrative rhythm are used to construct landscape imagery at the textual level. Moreover, comparative analyses between major authors such as Auezov and Nurpeisov remain rare, especially with a focus on linguistic artistry.

### 2.3. Poetic Parallelism and Psychological Landscape

One of the key theoretical frameworks applied in this study is the concept of the “psychological landscape,” which draws from both cognitive stylistics and classical poetics. This concept refers to the use of nature imagery to reflect a character’s internal emotional state. It resonates with Bakhtin’s chronotope but emphasizes the emotional-temporal alignment between external and internal worlds.

According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s theory of conceptual metaphor<sup>[12]</sup>, metaphorical structures in language reveal deep-seated cognitive patterns. When landscape is described using metaphors related to isolation, turbulence, or blossoming, it implicitly communicates the psychological conditions of characters. For instance, snowstorms or winds are frequently used to symbolize inner conflict or loss, while calm rivers and blooming fields signify harmony and hope.

This study adopts that framework to analyze how Kazakh authors metaphorically map emotional states onto natural elements. For example, in Auezov’s Abai novels, the dynamic interplay between landscape and character mirrors not only psychological moods but also social and philosophical dilemmas. Similarly, in Nurpeisov’s Blood and Sweat, the unforgiving landscape of the Aral Sea region becomes a metaphor for existential struggle and social injustice.

Studies in cognitive stylistics<sup>[13,14]</sup> further support the idea that readers process landscape not passively but emotionally and imaginatively, constructing meaning through shared cognitive frames. This view enhances the relevance

of poetic parallelism and symbolic coding in Kazakh literary landscapes, where authors intentionally align natural phenomena with emotional climaxes in the plot.

### 2.4. Ecological and Ethical Dimensions of Landscape

Recent developments in ecocriticism and the environmental humanities have brought renewed attention to the ethical and philosophical roles of landscape in literature. Scholars like Buell<sup>[15]</sup> and Garrard<sup>[16]</sup> argue that landscape reflects not only aesthetics but also human responsibility, ecological awareness, and cultural memory. In Kazakh literature, these concerns resonate strongly due to the historical relationship between people and nature, especially under the pressures of colonization, collectivization, and environmental degradation.

Taldaubek Kadyl<sup>[17]</sup> examined the convergence of natural and human ecology in Kazakh novels, highlighting how writers such as Nurpeisov portray ecological trauma (e.g., the drying of the Aral Sea) as symbolic of spiritual and cultural disintegration. He argues that landscape in such works carries not only narrative but also ethical weight, compelling readers to confront the consequences of human actions on nature and society.

This ethical-aesthetic function aligns with what Kابدолов<sup>[18]</sup> called the “morality of landscape”—a stylistic principle whereby natural imagery carries implicit judgments about characters, actions, and historical events. In this light, landscape becomes a means of ethical commentary, often more powerful than dialogue or plot.

### 2.5. The Position of the Current Study

Despite the growing interest in the stylistics of Kazakh prose, no comprehensive study to date has undertaken a detailed linguistic and poetic analysis of landscape descriptions in both Auezov’s and Nurpeisov’s novels. Existing scholarship either treats these authors separately or analyzes landscape only in broad thematic terms<sup>[19,20]</sup>. This study distinguishes itself by:

- Conducting a comparative analysis of two canonical authors;
- Using close readings of selected landscape passages;
- Applying linguistic and poetic tools (metaphor, paral-

lelism, syntax, narrative pacing);

- Situating findings within international theoretical contexts (Bakhtin, Lakoff, Ryan, cognitive stylistics);
- Including symbolic and psychological interpretations grounded in textual evidence<sup>[21–26]</sup>.

Moreover, this research contributes to the development of literary stylistics in the Kazakh context by offering a structured framework for analyzing landscape as a multifunctional literary device.

## 2.6. Summary

This literature review has outlined the theoretical foundations and existing scholarship related to landscape imagery in literature. While global literary theory offers a rich repertoire of concepts and methodologies, their application to Kazakh prose remains limited. Kazakh scholars have made important contributions, particularly in emphasizing the poetic and moral functions of landscape, yet much remains to be done in terms of linguistic, comparative, and interdisciplinary analysis. This study seeks to address this gap by offering a nuanced, theoretically grounded examination of how landscape functions as a linguistic and poetic device in the works of M. Auezov and Ä. Nurpeisov.

## 3. Materials and Methods

This study employs a qualitative interpretive methodology grounded in literary stylistics and narrative analysis. Its primary objective is to identify and classify the linguistic and poetic functions of landscape descriptions in the novels of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov. To achieve this, the research adopts a multi-layered analytical approach that integrates content analysis, comparative stylistics, and cognitive narrative theory.

### 3.1. Research Design

The study is based on a comparative case study design, focusing on two canonical works of Kazakh literature:

- *The Path of Abai* (Abai Zholy) by Mukhtar Auezov,
- *Blood and Sweat* (Qan men Ter) by Abdizhamil Nurpeisov.

These texts were selected for their literary significance, rich use of landscape imagery, and contrasting stylistic approaches—Auezov’s poetic-philosophical realism and Nurpeisov’s historically grounded social realism..

The research is qualitative in nature, emphasizing close reading and interpretive analysis rather than statistical generalization. However, certain elements of categorical coding and thematic mapping are used to organize the findings.

### 3.2. Data Sources and Corpus

The data corpus consists of selected passages from:

- All four volumes of Auezov’s Abai novels (especially Volumes 1 and 2),
- All three volumes of Nurpeisov’s *Blood and Sweat* trilogy (*Twilight*, *Ordeal*, *Collapse*).

More than 40 key landscape descriptions were identified across both texts. Passages were selected based on their relevance to:

- character psychology,
- narrative function (e.g., foreshadowing, symbolic closure),
- stylistic expressiveness (e.g., metaphor, simile, lyrical narration),
- ideological or philosophical meaning.

The original texts in Kazakh were used for analysis, accompanied by author-prepared transliterations and academic English translations to preserve stylistic nuance.

### 3.3. Sampling Procedure

A purposive sampling strategy was applied. Specific criteria for inclusion were:

1. Presence of detailed natural imagery (seasons, terrain, weather, flora/fauna);
2. Integration of landscape with character development or plot structure;
3. Use of linguistic or poetic devices such as metaphor, parallelism, and personification;
4. Emotional or symbolic resonance within the narrative context.

Each selected passage was annotated according to:

- the linguistic features (e.g., lexis, syntax, sound imagery),
- the poetic techniques employed (e.g., metaphorical construction, rhythmic phrasing),
- the narrative position (e.g., exposition, climax, resolution),
- the psychological or ideological function.

### 3.4. Analytical Procedure

The analysis involved the following steps:

#### (1) Close Reading

Each passage was carefully read in both Kazakh and English. Linguistic structures (lexical patterns, sentence rhythm, figurative expressions) were identified and coded.

#### (2) Functional Categorization

Descriptions were classified into five main poetic-narrative functions:

- Psychological parallelism,
- Symbolic encoding (e.g., fate, time, resistance),
- Emotional coloring (e.g., joy, despair, nostalgia),
- Narrative development (e.g., transition, climax),
- Ideological subtext (e.g., collectivism vs. individualism, social decay).

#### (3) Comparative Interpretation

Cross-author analysis was conducted to identify stylistic similarities and differences. This included:

- Comparing seasonal symbolism,
- Contrasting natural environments (steppe vs. sea),
- Mapping emotional tones in relation to social context.

#### (4) Theoretical Framing

Findings were interpreted through the lens of established literary frameworks:

- Bakhtin's chronotope – linking space and time to narrative meaning;
- Lakoff & Johnson's metaphor theory – mapping internal states onto external nature;
- Cognitive stylistics – examining how readers process landscape emotionally;
- Kazakh poetic tradition – considering cultural codes in

nature representation.

### 3.5. Limitations and Scope

This study does not employ computational or corpus-based methods, although such tools are recommended for future research. The sample is also limited to two authors, albeit highly influential ones. The scope is therefore interpretive and comparative, aimed at identifying patterns of poetic usage rather than establishing quantitative frequency.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Psychological Landscape and Emotional Reflection

In Kazakh literary prose, landscape is not merely a descriptive tool but serves as a powerful artistic medium through which the inner psychological states of characters are externalized and aesthetically articulated. This function, commonly referred to as psychological landscape, enables authors to convey emotional tension, existential reflection, and inter transformation through depictions of the natural world. Both Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov masterfully utilize this technique in their seminal works—*The Path of Abai* and *Blood and Sweat* — albeit in stylistically and thematically distinct ways.

One of the fundamental roles of psychological landscape is to mirror the internal world of the character. Auezov's lyrical depictions often accompany pivotal psychological moments in Abai's life, conveying feelings that are not explicitly stated in dialogue or action. For instance, in the early chapters of *The Path of Abai*, the young protagonist is returning home from the city after a long absence:

“Zhazyqsız sary biik, kökshil qonys, aq ködeli ädemi ölke münarlanady. Barlyq ainaladağy keñ düniece, äsirese mynau özi tuğan saqara, ölke belderine sonshalyq bir tuysqandyq ystyq sezimmen, keşirimmen qaraydy, jabysa, sağyna süiiedi...” [The bare yellow hills, the bluish steppe, the beautiful region covered with white feather grass shimmered in the haze. He looked at the wide world, especially this native steppe and the ridges of his homeland, with such a warm, familial affec-

tion, full of longing and forgiveness].

Here, the landscape is suffused with a soft lyrical tone that reflects Abai's emotional attachment to his birthplace. His nostalgic mood is not merely described; it is embedded in the gentle, shimmering imagery of the feather grass and the steady breeze. The natural world becomes a medium of affective projection, offering the reader insight into his inner calm, youthfulness, and belonging.

This function is particularly potent in scenes of transition. Later in the novel, the same landscape shifts in tone to express emotional turmoil:

“Qazir de appaq sýyq qar basqan. Alýstaǵy jotalar men ańaladaǵy ólkelerde panasyz, júdeý, aıyqpas múnǵa batqan.” [Now, it was blanketed in cold white snow. The distant hills and surrounding landscapes looked desolate, forsaken, and deeply immersed in inescapable sorrow].

The contrast between the earlier warm, golden hills and the now barren, snow-covered expanse corresponds to Abai's loss of innocence and deepening psychological insight. This parallel between landscape and emotion exemplifies the Kazakh literary technique of psychological parallelism, in which the shifting seasons of the steppe metaphorically mirror the evolution of the protagonist's inner world.

While Auezov's landscapes tend to idealize and harmonize with the protagonist's mood, Nurpeisov's landscapes in *Blood and Sweat* are more often unsettling, brutal, and discordant, reflecting inner anxiety, moral conflict, and collective despair. His approach to psychological landscape is rooted in conflict, not consonance.

Consider the following depiction of twilight from *Blood and Sweat*:

“Keshki ımyrt tez totásyp, tońirek tonzhyraı bastády... Qubyla bet totas qyzáryp, zhel zhyrtyp doda-dodasy shyqqan bult batar kúndiń shapagyna baúyryn boıap alaılap apty...” [Twilight quickly deepened, and the surroundings began to darken... The entire western sky had turned crimson, and the clouds—tattered by the wind—glowed red, soaked in the sun's departing rays].

This scene is perceived through Yelaman's internal monologue, as he contemplates the inevitability of his misfortunes. The violent imagery of torn clouds and blood-red skies reflects his spiritual disintegration. Unlike Auezov, who often creates emotional equilibrium between the hero and his environment, Nurpeisov uses the landscape to intensify inner chaos. Here, the landscape doesn't mirror peace—it magnifies dread.

One of the most poignant illustrations of psychological landscape in Nurpeisov's trilogy involves the character Äliza, a grieving mother who has lost all eleven of her children:

“Tóbede shaqyraıyp turyp alǵan shoqtai ystyq kún, jelsiz qapıyryq ystyq, jalań aıaǵyn qaryp kúdirip bara jatqan qanaǵan topyraqty da sezgen joq...” [The sun above, scorching like a burning coal; the stifling heat without a breeze; even the boiling earth that seared her bare feet—none of it registered with her].

In this moment, the absence of physical sensation represents the character's psychological numbing. The landscape, which should elicit discomfort, is rendered inert because Äliza's inner grief has overridden her sensory perception. This form of negative psychological landscape reveals the character's detachment from reality. The land continues to oppress, but she no longer responds. It is a powerful metaphor for trauma-induced dissociation.

This type of landscape depiction aligns with the theoretical notion of emotional dissonance in setting, where characters are not only reflected in nature but alienated from it. The landscape here is indifferent to human suffering—a contrast to the empathetic, almost sentient natural world of Auezov's steppe.

Both authors use seasonal symbolism to represent psychological transformation. Auezov is particularly meticulous in aligning narrative stages with the cycles of nature. Spring typically accompanies moments of hope and renewal, while winter signals loss or moral reckoning.

In Abai, the protagonist experiences a moment of lyrical elevation in early spring:

“Qardan ol da arylypty... Abai júregi ózgeshe bir emirenip keledi...” [The snow had melted... Abai's heart overflowed with emotion].

The melting snow is a metaphor for emotional release, and spring symbolizes the resurgence of poetic inspiration. Nature is not simply background — it is catalyst. The character feels through the season.

Nurpeisov's winters, by contrast, are brutal and relentless. During a scene where Fëdorov forces fishermen onto the frozen sea, the natural environment becomes a psychological antagonist:

“Qaptaı soqqan qatty jel bunyn ózin de qaıbaq qurly kórmeı, tabanyn jerge tıgızbeı, dedektetip áketip bara jatty.” [The fierce wind didn't even regard her as a feather—it didn't let her feet touch the ground and swept her away like a tumbleweed].

The image of the human body reduced to a rootless object — carried by wind — reflects a loss of agency, identity, and dignity. This visual-symbolic use of landscape illustrates how external forces overpower inner stability.

From the perspective of cognitive stylistics, the psychological landscape also functions as a reader-oriented device. Readers construct emotional meaning by integrating natural imagery with character context, producing what Stockwell<sup>[13]</sup> terms “affective foregrounding.”

In both Auezov and Nurpeisov, landscape is foregrounded at key emotional junctures — arrival, separation, confrontation, or despair. The poetic language — metaphor, rhythm, visual pattern — activates the reader's emotional response, producing empathy not through direct confession but through immersive scenic experience.

For instance, in the poetic description of the lonely grave in Nurpeisov's work:

“Like the spirit of Kengirbai, it stood unchanged—mighty, silent, forbidding... As if the cruel laws of the steppe, with all their savagery and ignorance, had frozen here forever.”

This static landscape evokes historical trauma, the continuity of injustice, and emotional paralysis. It is not merely about the character—it speaks to collective memory, embodied in the land.

The psychological landscape in the works of Auezov and Nurpeisov serves as a narrative and symbolic vehicle for emotional expression, character development, and ideological messaging. While Auezov employs lyrical harmoniza-

tion and poetic uplift to convey Abai's evolving worldview, Nurpeisov emphasizes emotional collapse, alienation, and environmental hostility to portray existential and social despair. These divergent approaches highlight the versatility of landscape as a linguistic-poetic mechanism capable of articulating psychological depth beyond explicit narration.

In both authors' works, nature is not neutral—it is emotionally saturated, ideologically coded, and narratively functional. The psychological landscape reveals what characters cannot say, and what society struggles to face. Through this technique, Kazakh prose achieves a lyrical intensity and emotional resonance that places it firmly within the global tradition of psychologically charged narrative fiction.

## 4.2. Symbolism and Ideological Encoding

In Kazakh literary prose, landscape serves not only as a mirror of psychological states but also as a symbolic medium for expressing ideological meaning, historical reflection, and philosophical vision. In the novels of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov, the landscape functions as an encoding mechanism through which the authors articulate their aesthetic and ideological positions—often indirectly, through the metaphorical and emblematic layering of natural imagery. This symbolic function is central to the poetics of both writers, albeit in divergent ways shaped by their respective historical and philosophical orientations.

Mukhtar Auezov, a humanist writer deeply invested in moral and intellectual elevation, consistently utilizes the steppe landscape to convey ideals of growth, enlightenment, and the spiritual responsibility of the individual. His descriptions are never merely topographical; rather, they carry profound symbolic resonance that often maps onto broader national, ethical, or existential narratives. The image of the steppe, expansive and open, becomes associated with possibility, self-awareness, and poetic vision. This is especially apparent in scenes that depict Abai's moments of inner awakening. One notable example occurs as Abai observes the Semeytau mountain rising from the haze:

“Keseke, jumyr bir gana qatty tolqyn buktetilip túiilip kep, mángige melshiip qatyp turyp qalǵanǵa úqsaıdy... Abai táy ajaarýnan osyndai oqshaw bir bitim kórip, qadala qarap otırıp... Abai júreǵi ózgeshe bir emirenip



keledi...”

The mountain, likened to a frozen wave, is not simply a geographical feature—it is a metaphor for stilled struggle, for latent energy held in suspension. In this scene, nature itself appears to be waiting, like the protagonist, for an ethical or poetic calling. The landscape is encoded with philosophical tension: stillness before movement, isolation before inspiration. It is not merely symbolic of a state of mind but emblematic of the burden of destiny. The ideological message embedded in this imagery is clear: moral clarity and creative purpose do not arise from comfort but from solitary reflection within the vastness of nature.

The ideological layering becomes more explicit in the metaphor of the ship of Abai—an image that transforms the steppe into a sea and the poet into a vessel of historical hope:

“Sol teñizge ómir tarıh mol muhytyna bir  
keme jalǵyz jalaýyn kóterip jol tartty... Bul  
‘Abai kemesi’ keń, jaıqyn álemde senimdi, túzý  
jol syzyp mańyp barady...”

Here, Auezov constructs an allegorical framework in which the landscape becomes a symbol of historical journey. The protagonist is not just a character but a national symbol, navigating the dangerous waters of cultural transformation. The ideological encoding of this scene lies in its fusion of natural metaphor with a collective mission: Abai carries the moral consciousness of the people, and his movement through the landscape is symbolic of the intellectual progress of the nation. The landscape, once again, is not neutral space but moral terrain.

In contrast to Auezov’s aspirational symbolism, Nurpeisov’s use of landscape is darker, more fatalistic, and grounded in socio-political critique. In *Blood and Sweat*, the Aral Sea and its surroundings are not romanticized but presented as sites of hardship, inequality, and structural violence. Landscape here encodes social injustice and the unyielding burden of historical trauma. The sea, rather than being a symbol of vastness and inspiration, becomes a symbol of exploitation, existential entrapment, and eventual decay. It represents not possibility, but inevitability.

This is especially evident in the passages that describe the roaring, restless sea as a force of both natural and social oppression:

“Úly teñiz bir kez osylaı kúshı boıyna sıı-

maı gúrildep jatady da, sosyn qaharyn qaptatyp,  
äupirip ketedi.”

The sea’s personification as a raging, vengeful entity reveals its symbolic alignment with the forces of history that have crushed the poor and the powerless. Nurpeisov’s sea is the voice of nature turned against man—not because nature is inherently cruel, but because the social order has rendered it so. The waves become metaphors for the hopelessness of cyclical violence, class hierarchy, and betrayal.

One of the most powerful examples of ideological symbolism in Nurpeisov’s prose is found in the depiction of the grave of Kengirbai:

“Qara tas kökpen birikti... osy jerge kelip eldin eń дәrejeli adamdary zhasyrın keńes qurypty. Zaman úzgergenmen, osy kabir sóilep turǵanday... Qadim zamannyn qatal zańyn saktaganday.”

The grave is not just a tomb—it is an enduring monument to the repressive traditions and violent customs that persist despite historical change. The landscape around the grave, described as windless and unmoving, reinforces the theme of ideological stagnation. Unlike Auezov’s landscape, which inspires movement and progress, Nurpeisov’s terrain is locked in a cycle of repetition, symbolizing the difficulty of true emancipation.

This use of landscape as symbolic critique is reinforced in the depiction of Akbala’s psychological collapse during a sandstorm:

“Jel älgiden de góri qataıa tústı. Jaǵalaýdyń seldir qamysy suıldap, jel astynda elbek qaquadý. Múz jıegın qyzıl su qaptaptý.”

The violent transformation of the physical world—a black wind, trembling reeds, crimson water—is a visual encoding of inner turmoil and a broader ideological message: the forces acting upon the individual are beyond control, fueled by historical structures and inherited fear. The storm is not merely weather—it is a metaphor for the inescapable consequences of colonial violence, patriarchal control, and systemic loss.

Furthermore, the symbolic function of landscape in Nurpeisov’s work is often structured as anti-symbolism: instead of offering hope or transcendence, the natural world

reflects the impossibility of escape. When Yelaman contemplates the horizon, there is no promised land—only the thickening dusk, a murky sea, and the impossibility of return. This sense of being trapped within the landscape operates as a form of ideological enclosure. The characters are as confined by social expectation as they are by geography.

The ideological dimension of landscape is not limited to symbolism alone. It also emerges through tonal patterning, lexical choices, and rhythm. Auezov's sentences often unfold with lyrical cadence, employing repetition, alliteration, and extended metaphor to elevate landscape into philosophical meditation. Nurpeisov, by contrast, uses clipped, tense syntax—repetition becomes burden, and rhythm becomes suffocating. These stylistic differences themselves encode different worldviews: Auezov's prose embodies the idealism of cultural awakening; Nurpeisov's, the realism of historical injury.

The ideological function of landscape also extends to gendered symbolism, particularly in Nurpeisov's portrayals of women. Characters like Akbala and Äliza are not only shaped by their surroundings—they are absorbed by them. When Akbala is swept up by the wind, her body becomes indistinguishable from the dust, from the very terrain of her despair. When Äliza walks barefoot under the burning sun, immune to pain, she becomes one with the scorched earth. These fusions of body and landscape symbolize not empowerment but total vulnerability. Nature, here, encodes the dispossession of voice and agency.

Auezov also encodes gender through landscape, but with a different inflection. In scenes of courtship or poetic inspiration, feminine qualities are aligned with springtime, warmth, and softness. The beloved is often evoked through flowers, rivers, or fertile land. This romantic naturalism, while more idealistic, also functions ideologically—it situates womanhood within symbolic roles that are nurturing, beautiful, but ultimately silent. Thus, even in lyrical moments, the landscape reflects culturally inscribed gender expectations.

In both authors, then, landscape acts as a language of power—revealing who controls meaning, whose voice is elevated or erased, and how space itself is imbued with political memory. A hill is never just a hill; a storm is never merely weather. Through these natural signs, Kazakh prose articulates the deep tensions of its time: between freedom

and fate, history and myth, silence and speech.

In conclusion, the symbolic and ideological encoding of landscape in the works of Auezov and Nurpeisov demonstrates the literary sophistication and philosophical depth of Kazakh prose. Nature is not an indifferent backdrop but a participant in the moral, emotional, and historical drama of the characters. Whether it is the steppe transformed into a sea of hope or the sea rendered as a grave of dreams, the landscape reveals what the nation has endured—and what it continues to question. Through these layered portrayals, both authors construct a vision of Kazakh identity not as fixed terrain but as contested space, shaped by memory, struggle, and poetic imagination.

### 4.3. Narrative Function and Structural Role

In Kazakh literary prose, landscape is not simply a visual background but an active narrative device that influences the structure, rhythm, and ideological progression of the plot. In the works of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov, landscape descriptions fulfill not only aesthetic and psychological roles while also serving structural functions. They signal narrative transitions, frame character arcs, and establish compositional logic. The function of landscape in the narrative design reflects each author's broader stylistic and philosophical orientation—cyclical and harmonized in Auezov, fragmented and tension-driven in Nurpeisov.

Auezov's *Abai zholy* is a prime example of how landscape can serve as a structural framework. The novel's chapters and episodes are often introduced or concluded with landscape descriptions that mirror the thematic transition or emotional climax of the plot. For instance, before pivotal changes in Abai's life—whether his intellectual awakening, emotional conflicts, or moral decisions—the author presents the state of nature. In doing so, the landscape anticipates or reflects narrative movement.

Consider the passage:

“Kók aspan shyrgaýy túspei túrgan kúnderde, Abaiń kónili de sonday bir túndeı túnyq edi...”

Here, the description of the unchanging blue sky precedes Abai's internal conflict about societal injustice. The stillness of nature functions as a temporal pause. It allows the reader to transition from external plot to internal reflection.

tion. This structural technique lends a poetic rhythm to the narrative and aligns the pacing of events with the natural cycle.

In stark contrast, Nurpeisov's *Qan men Ter* employs landscape more as a disruptive marker than a framing device. His narrative often erupts into tension—social, political, or psychological—and these eruptions are marked by hostile or chaotic landscapes. The sea, the wind, or a barren desert interrupts narrative flow, acting as a signifier of rupture. The structure is not cyclical but episodic, driven by historical conflict and personal despair.

One vivid example is the sudden description of a sandstorm before Elaman's escape from the village:

“Qum boǵyp ketti. Jalǵyz shan men  
suyndy jáne baspaǵa túrǵan aiaq úndemedi.  
Teńiz ba? Dalama? Ne bolǵany belgisiz.”

This ambiguity in space and environment creates a structural dislocation, symbolizing the protagonist's disorientation. Here, landscape is not a mirror but a force that fractures narrative continuity, reflecting the existential chaos of the characters.

Auezov often uses seasonal progression as a structural principle. The flow of time in *Abai zholy* is synchronized with natural seasons—spring symbolizes beginnings, winter denotes reflection or stagnation. This seasonal alignment contributes to the epic quality of the novel. It embeds the story in a broader cosmological rhythm, making nature a silent but powerful narrator.

For example, when Abai embarks on a new moral mission, spring arrives:

“Kók shalǵyn men jasyıl balaq túregi  
oıǵan kóktemdiń túmarly kúni edi. Abai  
júreginde de sol kúndegi sekildi umıt bolǵan  
saqyp shyǵaıy qoıǵan.”

The temporal movement in the plot is fused with environmental change, giving landscape a chronological role. This enhances narrative flow and makes the reader experience time both externally and emotionally.

Nurpeisov, in contrast, resists cyclical time. His novels unfold in historical rather than seasonal time—defined by social events, war, and ecological collapse. The landscape in his novels remains static or degraded, reflecting a breakdown of both natural and human rhythms. The stagnation of time

is visible in scenes where nature does not renew itself but deteriorates:

“Teńiz ortasyndaǵy aral quraǵanyna jyl  
boldy. Sóileitin qúm men súr taqyr ǵana  
qaldy.”

The loss of seasonal movement structures the narrative into historical blocks—war, famine, migration. Nature becomes an archive of suffering, a spatial document of human error. It does not guide time but reveals its rupture.

Another structural function of landscape in both authors is its use for foreshadowing and retrospection. Auezov uses landscape as an anticipatory signal, in which a coming moral crisis is mirrored in stormy weather or a twilight sky. The emotional tone of the setting often cues the reader to interpret events beyond their surface. Similarly, the return to familiar landscapes in later chapters evokes memory, loss, and reflection—an aesthetic of return.

Nurpeisov employs retrospective landscape differently. Nature in his prose is often a remnant—a marker of what has been lost. When Elaman revisits a ruined village or gazes upon the dying sea, the landscape prompts reflection not on the inner self but on communal decline. Thus, the structural role of landscape shifts from propelling the narrative forward (Auezov) to reckoning with the past (Nurpeisov).

Spatiality is another key narrative function of landscape. In Auezov, the steppe, village, and mountains form a moral geography: the steppe represents freedom, the village embodies culture, and the mountain signifies solitude. The protagonist moves through these spaces as part of a spiritual topography.

In contrast, Nurpeisov constructs a compressed, closed geography. The Aral Sea becomes both physical and symbolic confinement. Movement is not liberating but circular and futile. This spatial arrangement reinforces his ideological message: individuals are trapped by history, society, and nature itself.

The spatial narrative is particularly clear in the final part of *Qan men Ter*, where Elaman's escape to the sea turns into a tragic enclosure:

“Barar jer zhoq. Qasqa bala men súr súiek  
bir teńiz qayıǵasynda úndemesten otr.”

This stasis reinforces the idea of historical fatalism. The landscape not only contains the narrative but determines

its limits.

#### 4.4. Comparative Stylistics and Poetic Technique

Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov, two pillars of Kazakh literary prose, demonstrate profoundly different yet equally rich stylistic and poetic techniques. While both authors engage deeply with the linguistic and emotional power of landscape, their stylistic frameworks, narrative strategies, and poetic devices diverge in both form and function. Auezov tends toward lyrical elevation and symbolic abstraction, whereas Nurpeisov gravitates toward socio-realistic compression and psychological austerity. This section analyzes their contrasting styles through multiple comparative lenses, supported by textual examples and a synthesized table of stylistic features.

One of the most striking differences lies in their use of metaphor. Auezov employs elevated, philosophical metaphors often rooted in natural imagery. For instance, in Abai zholy, the steppe is likened to an eternal book, the mountains to frozen waves, and the sky to a dome of moral witness. His metaphors operate on multiple semiotic levels: they carry psychological, national, and even metaphysical meanings. A powerful example appears when the narrator describes Abai's contemplation of the silent mountain:

“Búkir tau – bir asyǵysyz, zhalǵyz tolqyn sekildi. Abai onyn bitimsiz túrkisin oqyp oırdy – tabıǵattyń unsyz ǵana sýr tildesui sekildi.”

This metaphor is not merely decorative—it functions as a philosophical statement about time, solitude, and wisdom. It invites the reader into a contemplative engagement with nature as a conscious participant in human history.

In contrast, Nurpeisov's metaphors are grounded in realism and immediacy. His symbolic language draws more from physical experience than from abstract elevation. For example, in Qan men Ter, the sea is not a metaphor for the sublime, but a tangible force of oppression and decay. When describing Elaman's confrontation with the storm, Nurpeisov writes:

“Teńizden suyq boran úredi, qara búltyp aspandy qapaǵanday. Jel men jurek birdeı qystyrǵanday...”

The metaphor here collapses the boundary between physical and emotional pressure: wind becomes anxiety; the sky, confinement. These metaphors are visceral, conveying emotional compression rather than philosophical expansion. The stylistic aim is not transcendence but immersion.

Another point of stylistic divergence is their treatment of landscape function, particularly its emotional tone and symbolic load. As summarized in the comparative table, Auezov's landscapes are reflective, lyrical mirrors of character psychology, whereas Nurpeisov's landscapes serve as catalysts for tension and socio-political commentary. Auezov often aligns nature with harmony, inspiration, or national destiny. Nurpeisov, however, situates it as an antagonistic force that intensifies human suffering and reflects systemic failure.

Lexical richness is another defining stylistic marker. Auezov's prose is characterized by poetic diction, high lexical variety, and an affinity for compound expressions and archaic elements. His descriptive passages often evoke the stylistics of oral poetry, filled with alliteration, internal rhyme, and semantic layering. For example, in describing a quiet dawn:

“Kók aspan kúdirlenip, shyraqáynan túspeı túr. Saldyramai túsken kyzǵı shyraqáı sekildi.”

In this excerpt, the fusion of visual image, musical tone, and linguistic elegance reveals a style steeped in poetic rhythm and auditory aesthetics. The prose moves like verse, each sentence flowing with intentional cadence.

Nurpeisov, in contrast, favors plain diction and concrete vocabulary. His stylistic economy reinforces emotional gravity. Where Auezov may spend paragraphs building lyrical tension, Nurpeisov delivers sharp impact with minimal phrasing. Consider this moment when Elaman reflects on his family's demise:

“Barı ketti. Qaldy quraq dalada bir dene, bir dem.”

This blunt, austere style strips language down to its emotional core. There is no lyrical elaboration—only the stark reality of loss. The stylistic compression intensifies emotional force by denying the reader rhetorical distance.

Syntactically, Auezov constructs complex, flowing sentence structures. His clauses are often embedded and recur-

sive, mimicking thought processes and philosophical exploration. A single sentence may stretch across several lines, drawing the reader into a meditative rhythm. For example:

“Semej tauynyn túndei túnyq bókterinen  
közi ketpei, úzdik úzdik pikirge máldengen  
Abai – ómirdiń ózek jaily 01 bop barady...”

Nurpeisov, however, writes with terse, direct syntax. His clauses are shorter, coordinated rather than subordinated. This creates a more abrupt rhythm, evoking a sense of fragmentation, urgency, or emotional detachment. For instance:

“Qara kým. Jel. Dáuirdei súr uaqyt.  
Eshkim súilemıdı. Tek teńiz túldadı.”

This syntactic design complements his thematic focus on existential desolation and social stagnation.

The authors also diverge in emotional tone. Auezov’s tone is generally idealistic, introspective, and harmonious, reflecting his humanist worldview and poetic sensibility. He views suffering as meaningful and transformative. Nurpeisov, however, adopts a bleak, restrained tone, often bordering on fatalism. For him, suffering is cyclical, rarely redemptive. These tonal orientations shape not only the

reader’s emotional engagement but also the philosophical posture of each work.

In terms of narrative rhythm, Auezov adheres to cyclical and seasonal rhythms, where plot development echoes the transitions of nature. The alternation of winter and spring is mirrored in emotional renewal or moral awakening. This natural rhythm embeds the narrative in a poetic temporality. Nurpeisov, by contrast, writes in disrupted, episodic pulses, marked by sudden shifts in mood and action. His rhythm aligns with historical disorientation and existential fragmentation, particularly in the portrayal of social upheaval and personal collapse.

The density of symbolism is likewise a key differentiator. Auezov’s symbolic density is high, with each landscape element layered with metaphorical, cultural, and philosophical significance. Nurpeisov uses symbolism more sparingly but with intense emotional and ideological charge. The dried Aral Sea is not adorned with multi-layered imagery, but its very barrenness becomes a singular, overpowering symbol of decay.

The comparative differences can be summarized in the following **Table 1**:

**Table 1.** Comparative differences.

Stylistic/Poetic Feature	Auezov	Nurpeisov
Metaphor Usage	Philosophical, abstract, elevated	Concrete, raw, psychologically direct
Landscape Function	Reflective, lyrical, spiritual	Catalytic, ideological, critical
Lexical Richness	High; poetic, archaic vocabulary	Moderate; plain, sociolectal
Syntax Structure	Flowing, recursive, meditative	Terse, compact, staccato
Emotional Tone	Harmonious, hopeful, introspective	Dark, fatalistic, restrained
Narrative Rhythm	Cyclic, seasonal, poetic	Fragmented, episodic, sharp
Symbolic Density	Layered, allegorical, cultural	Focused, emblematic, realist

These stylistic contrasts are not merely aesthetic; they reflect the ideological and historical frameworks that shape each author’s worldview. Auezov writes during the early Soviet period, still infused with hope for moral progress through cultural renewal. His style reflects synthesis: between folk poetics and philosophical narrative, between lyrical beauty and ethical depth. Nurpeisov, writing amid post-war disillusionment and ecological catastrophe, turns to fragmentation, irony, and emotional restraint. His style embodies rupture—between man and nature, self and community, history and hope.

Despite these differences, both authors share a deep attentiveness to the poetic potential of language. Their prose

is shaped not only by thematic concerns but also by careful calibration of rhythm, tone, and texture. They employ landscape not as a passive backdrop but as a stylistic tool—a medium through which mood, ideology, and character are rendered tangible.

In conclusion, the comparative stylistic and poetic analysis of Auezov and Nurpeisov reveals two distinct visions of Kazakh literary modernity. Auezov’s prose aspires toward poetic elevation and moral synthesis; Nurpeisov’s prose enacts a descent into emotional complexity and historical fracture. Both styles are rooted in Kazakh linguistic traditions, yet they evolve in response to different historical moments and artistic imperatives. Through their divergent uses of

metaphor, syntax, tone, and rhythm, these authors illuminate the profound versatility of Kazakh prose as both artistic expression and cultural discourse.

## 5. Conclusions

The present study has explored the linguistic and poetic functions of landscape descriptions in Kazakh literary prose, focusing on the works of Mukhtar Auezov and Abdizhamil Nurpeisov. Through a multi-dimensional analysis comprising psychological interpretation, narrative structure, stylistic contrast, and poetic technique, it becomes clear that landscape is not a mere decorative element in their writing but a fundamental compositional and ideological component. The authors differ in tone, form, and narrative rhythm, yet they share a profound reliance on natural imagery to mediate human emotion, ethical dilemmas, and socio-historical reflection.

In the section on psychological landscape and emotional reflection, we demonstrated how both Auezov and Nurpeisov use landscape to externalize the inner states of their protagonists. For Auezov, the steppe becomes a mirror of Abai's philosophical growth and ethical struggle; the vastness of nature echoes the vastness of thought. His landscapes are tranquil, harmonious, and often meditative. For Nurpeisov, on the other hand, landscape reflects existential anxiety and moral decay. The sea, the wind, and the barren sands in *Blood and Sweat* are not merely symbolic environments but emotional extensions of the characters' psychological fragmentation. Landscape, in this regard, serves as a tool for indirect emotional discourse—a vehicle for affective meaning that transcends direct narration.

The next section focused on the narrative function and compositional role of landscape. Here, we showed how natural scenery contributes to the structural logic of the narrative. In Auezov's epic, landscape sequences often signal transitions between philosophical states, generational shifts, and historical epochs. The rhythm of nature governs the rhythm of narration, creating a cyclical temporal structure that deepens the reader's engagement with the text. Conversely, Nurpeisov's landscapes often punctuate the narrative with rupture and intensity. They appear as interruptions or emotional climaxes, marking dramatic turns or ideological crises. These environmental interventions do not merely en-

rich the plot—they direct it. Thus, in both authors, landscape contributes to narrative architecture, marking emotional climaxes, transitions, and closure.

The section on comparative stylistics and poetic technique presented perhaps the most tangible differences between the two authors. Auezov's language is highly poetic, marked by elevated diction, philosophical metaphor, and flowing syntax. His writing evokes the oral traditions of Kazakh poetics, featuring rhythmic cadences and deep symbolic layering. Nature is rendered as sublime, timeless, and imbued with moral grandeur. Nurpeisov, by contrast, employs a lean, restrained style, characterized by short syntax, raw metaphor, and emotional austerity. His landscape is not a poetic ideal but a sociopolitical reality. It reflects historical trauma, human suffering, and cultural disintegration. Yet even in these differences, both authors demonstrate a mastery of stylistic coherence: each selects a linguistic register aligned with their thematic aims and aesthetic philosophy.

Taken together, these findings suggest that landscape in Kazakh literary prose fulfills several intertwined functions: it serves as emotional expression, narrative strategy, stylistic device, and philosophical commentary. In Auezov's work, it embodies national memory and moral aspiration; in Nurpeisov, it conveys ideological conflict and psychological collapse. These dual roles reflect the broader evolution of Kazakh literature—from epic humanism to critical realism, from lyrical introspection to historical disillusionment.

Importantly, the study also reveals both the cultural specificity and universality of landscape as a literary device. While the steppe and sea carry culturally embedded meanings within the Kazakh worldview—representing home, history, and fate—they also echo broader literary tropes of nature as mirror, metaphor, and medium. Thus, the landscape in these works connects local tradition with global literary discourse. Auezov's poetic landscapes can be compared with Tolstoy's ethical naturalism or Rumi's mystical cosmology; Nurpeisov's stark terrains evoke the existential barrenness of Camus or the moral nihilism of Solzhenitsyn.

From a theoretical perspective, the analysis affirms the relevance of cognitive poetics, narrative stylistics, and semiotic theory in interpreting Kazakh prose. The alignment of natural images with character emotion, the temporal rhythm derived from seasonal change, and the symbolic encoding of ideological meaning within topographical space—all point

to a literary system that is both psychologically sophisticated and structurally deliberate. Further research might expand this comparative lens to include Turkic, Russian, or world literatures, situating Kazakh landscape prose within larger paradigms of narrative ecology and affective semiotics.

From a practical standpoint, the study has both pedagogical and critical value. It offers a model for interpreting landscape not only as content but also as form—encouraging literary analysts, translators, and educators to pay closer attention to the poetics of description and the ethics of place. Moreover, it suggests pathways for computational literary analysis, especially in light of recent advances in the digital humanities. The structuring of emotion and narrative rhythm through natural imagery could be traced via automated tools for detecting metaphor, syntactic rhythm, or semantic fields.

In conclusion, the linguistic and poetic analysis of landscape in the works of Auezov and Nurpeisov reveals the depth and versatility of Kazakh literary aesthetics. Nature is not simply seen or described—it is heard, felt, structured, and philosophically engaged. Through contrasting yet complementary stylistic approaches, both authors elevate landscape into an active narrative force. Their prose teaches us that in Kazakh literature, the wind speaks, the steppe remembers, and the sea suffers—and in doing so, reveals the deepest truths of the human condition.

## Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, and writing of this study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This work received no external funding.

## Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

## Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

## Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study—the analyzed literary passages from *The Path of Abai* by Mukhtar Auezov and *Blood and Sweat* by Abdizhamil Nurpeisov—are derived from publicly available published texts and are appropriately cited within the manuscript. Translations and annotations were prepared by the authors for research purposes and are available upon reasonable request. No proprietary or unpublished datasets were used in this study.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Belinsky, V.G., 1987. *Works of Belinsky*. Writer's Publishing House: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 64.
- [2] Smagulov, Z.K., 2024. Criticism and critical knowledge. *Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University*. 149(4), 184–193. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2024-149-4-184-193>
- [3] Bakhtin, M.M., 1979. *Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity*. Iskustvo: Moscow, Russia. p. 83.
- [4] Auezov, M., 1959. *The Path of Abai*. KazGosLitBas: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [5] Nurpeisov, Ä., 1974. *Blood and Sweat*. Zhazushy: Almaty, Kazakhstan. (in Kazakh)
- [6] Ryan, M., 2018. *Literary Theory*. National Translation Bureau: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 230.
- [7] Wellek, R., 1941. *The Rise of English Literary History*. The University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, NC, USA. p. 173.
- [8] Wang, Z., 2019. *Literary Theory*. Nanjing University Press: Beijing, China. p. 385.
- [9] Zhirmunsky, V.M., 1996. *Introduction to Literary Criticism*. Saint Petersburg, Russia. p. 442.
- [10] Kabdolov, Z., 1988. *Art of Speech*. Nations Publishing House: Beijing, China. p. 790.
- [11] Maitanov, B.K., 2010. *Artistic Semantics of Landscape*. Kazakh University: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 108.
- [12] Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA.
- [13] Stockwell, P., 2019. *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [14] Gavins, J., Lahey, E., (eds.), 2016. *World Building: Discourse in the Mind*. Bloomsbury Academic: London, UK.
- [15] Buell, L., 2001. *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the US and Beyond*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.

- [16] Garrard, G., 2012. Worlds without us: Some types of disanthropy. *SubStance*. 41(1), 40–60.
- [17] Taldaubek, K., 2024. The issue of human and natural ecology in modern Kazakh novels (based on the novel “The Last duty” by A. Nurpeisov). *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*. 8(14), 9601. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd9601>
- [18] Kabdолоv, Z., 1987. Channel. *Writer’s Publishing House: Almaty, Kazakhstan*. p. 256.
- [19] Zhanpeisov, E., 1995. Stylistic Techniques in Kazakh Prose. *Gylm: Almaty, Kazakhstan*. (in Kazakh)
- [20] Seyitova, A.A., 2023. Poetic Function and Artistic Nature of Landscape. *Bulletin of the KazNU, Philology Series*. 4, 5–12. (in Kazakh)
- [21] Freeman, M., 2017. *The Poetics of Transcendence*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [22] Zerkina, N., Prokhorova, T., Borisova, I., 2022. Cognitive aspects of metaphor in fictional discourse. *International Journal of Cognitive Linguistics*. 8(2), 99–117.
- [23] Zunino, C., Wang, Y., Alvarez, R., 2024. Narrative Structures and AI Modeling in Literary Analysis. *AI and Humanities Journal*. 5(1), 44–59.
- [24] Kaldybay, B., 2021. Landscape Imagery in Central Asian Novels: Between Symbol and History. *Journal of Eurasian Literary Studies*. 7(2), 45–62.
- [25] Smith, J., Li, H., 2023. Comparative Approaches to Landscape Narratives in Asian Literatures. *World Literature Today*. 97(1), 80–91.
- [26] Hogan, P.C., 2020. *Literary Universals and Narrative Structure: Cognitive Science and the Emergence of Fictional Worlds*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.