



**ON SOME FEATURES OF THE FORMATION OF THE  
KARAKALPAK STORY OF THE 30S - EARLY 50S OF THE XX  
CENTURY**

Amanova Aysultan Abdirazakovna

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

Department of Russian Language and Literature,

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh,

Nukus, Republic of Karakalpakstan

**ABSTRACT**

This article discusses the problem of the development of the Karakalpak story of the 30s - early 50s of the twentieth century, the formation of literature focused on new European artistic principles in their specific Soviet version.

**KEYWORDS**

The Karakalpak story, determinism, motivated narration, normativism, themes, plot, narration, figurative and speech means.

The study of the Karakalpak story is of great importance in the 30s - the first half of the 50s in terms of its poetics, and the study of fundamental provisions for Karakalpak literature. Many estimates and conclusions made by the famous literary critic M.K. Nurmukhamedov (1959) and other researchers retain their value, but more than once they happened to unconsciously, and sometimes consciously, clearly overestimate some estimates.

Karakalpak prose as a written, printed literature was in the process of formation. The Karakalpak story originated in the late 1920s, no doubt, under the influence of the literatures of other peoples of the USSR, mainly Russian Soviet literature. Until the 1950s, it remained, in essence, the only more or less established prose genre: only excerpts from planned major works were printed, which usually were never completed.

The Karakalpak story of the 1930s underwent significant changes, many of its features turned out to be stable, being most often the result of the ongoing process of the formation of literature focused on new European artistic principles in their specific Soviet version.

Realistic tendencies (determinism, motivated narration) penetrated into the stories of Karakalpak writers spontaneously, under the influence of realistic works of other developed national literatures. These tendencies were combined with spontaneous naturalistic features (in the sense of simple "pictures", "writing off" from reality) and mainly with ideologically conditioned normativism. Only a few works were completely or predominantly realistic and, as a result, more integral in their poetics and more artistically perfect (not just because of the advantages of realism, but because of the sustained artistic "logic").

These tendencies were manifested in the interpretation of both society and man, personality. Man acted, in fact, as a function of his social position. In the stories of the 1930s, social tops and bottoms were sharply contrasted: the first were carriers of all kinds of filth, the second - high virtues. Accordingly, the former, unhappy life of the poor and the new, happy one were sharply contrasted (The stories "Blood" by J. Zakhiriy, "Daughter-in-law of the village council", "Red Star", "For the collective farm" by N. Kuzembaeva, etc.).

The revolution brought instant happiness. True, in the best writers, in the best stories, reality presented itself with quite reliable signs of it. A happy life in such cases was proclaimed at the level of declarations. Somewhat later, the place of the gloomy past in the stories began to be occupied by its remnants. In fact, the psychology of "pests" also acted as such (The stories "Prosperous Life" (1936) Almas (D. Nazbergenov), about the shepherds Gulzhan and Kalmurat, who later became "Stakhanovists". In the story "Orkenli omir", the girl Gulzhan promises to marry Kalmurat if he behaves and works well. The stories "Ears like shields" (1936) by M. Daribaev and "Bibish" (1938) by Dali (D. Nazbergenov) are about overcoming the remnants in the minds of the older generation, etc.)

The Karakalpak prose writers also had problems with the subject, plot, organization of the narration, with the use of figurative and speech means.

The first Karakalpak writers mastered a very diverse subject. Changes in life were great and attracted the attention of creative people. On the other hand, certain themes and motifs were definitely avoided. There was also a necrosis, an extreme schematization of the subject matter.

The plot was given to Karakalpak prose writers with great difficulty. Even in short stories, episodes are often "joined" to each other without any special plot logic proper. Most stories are divided into small chapters or sections: many writers seem to be unable to publish a whole story "in one breath", skillfully tie storylines in it and release the plot material "in portions". There are contradictions and inconsistencies in the very first stories. Event clichés were used, different writers repeated generally the same situations. Almost always, plot endings were programmed. The prose narrative in the Karakalpak literature had no national roots, and the clichés, which were archaic in origin, prevailed in poetry. Hence the weakness of the plots of the stories.

Along with this, experiments with the organization of the narrative were carried out in the very first stories. In this regard, the principles of the new European narrative were assimilated exceptionally quickly. It was also not without difficulty, not without contradictions in the texts, but almost immediately Karakalpak writers began to master the narration in the first person, the methods of changing narrators and silence, direct speech (including dialogues) with signs of a depicted "foreign" word, improperly direct speech, conveyed the characters' inner speech. As for the author's speech itself and the speech of the characters close to it, purely national features were stubbornly preserved in it, including cases when it would be more natural to abandon them. For example, both Russians and even Germans are called "dzhigits".

The language of the first Karakalpak stories has not gone far from folklore. We found that various figurative and speech means, features of artistic syntax, often coming from folklore and everyday speech, are quite widely represented in the stories. Sometimes the authors coordinate these means with the theme, plot, images of the characters in their stories, sometimes the external forms of speech decoration are more autonomous.

Thus, the development of artistic prose in Karakalpakstan fell on an extremely unfavorable period for this.

The 1930s - the first half of the 1950s were the time of totalitarianism, the time of Stalinism in all the republics of the Soviet Union. Influencing other national literatures, Russian Soviet literature, despite all the zigzags of its history, has generally degraded over this period. But even in its then version, it was European-type literature, and it helped to Europeanize literature or literature in those republics in which there were no works at all or almost that corresponded to the principles of modern poetics.

In the 1930s, the Karakalpak story achieved certain successes, but the repressions at the end of the decade undermined the strength of all literature, which was barely getting on its feet. During the Second World War, she could not replenish personnel; opportunities and conditions for creative work were extremely limited. However, the new colossal experience also gave positive consequences for it; apparently, the immanent laws of the development of literature also had an effect, because the authors of the stories accumulated experience not only in life, but also in art. After the war, there are comparatively many stories, and only a few artistic successes.

“Mature” Stalinism turned out, as elsewhere, to be especially destructive for the quality of literary works. At the turn of the 50s and 60s, Karakalpak writers had to reacquire what was achieved in the best works of the 30s and the first half of the 40s in order to make domestic literature modern not only in the chronological sense. But this is a special period and a special topic (Bakhadyrov. S., 1970).

## The List of Used Literature

1. Bakhtin M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.
2. Bakhadyrov S. Modern Karakalpak story. (1957-1967). Abstract of diss ... cand. philol. Sciences. Nukus, 1970
3. Volkov I.F. Creative methods and artistic systems. M., 1978.
4. Davkaraev N. Complete collection of works. Nukus, 1970.
5. Esemuratov G., Davkaraev N. (Davkaraev N. Complete collection of works. Nukus, 1970. T.I. C.19).
6. Nurmukhamedov M. Pre-war Karakalpak prose. N, 1959.
7. Kormilov S.I. Towards a general theory of artistic and historical literature. Phil-science. 1979. No. 4, pp. 3-10.
8. Niyetullaev S., N. Davkaraev (History of Karakalpak Soviet Literature). Under. ed. Z.S. Kedrina. Tashkent. 1981. pp. 245-246.
9. Nurmukhamedov M. Karakalpak prose of the period of the Great Patriotic War. Nukus. 1961.
10. Abduraxmanovna, K. Z. "Effective methods of teaching and learning architecture and construction terminology in higher education." *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 11.3 (2021): 1733-1737.
11. Ajimuratovna, U.Z. "The importance of modern methodologies in teaching in teaching Russian language to students." *ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW* ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 7.603 11.05 (2022): 77-79.
12. Saloydinova N., Ahmedov O., and Zakirova H. "Diachronic study of Uzbek and English architectural construction terms." *Ilkogretim Online* 20.3 (2021).