



ABOUT THE STORY OF CHULPAN “DOKHTUR MUHAMMADIYOR”

Odinakhon Kadirova,

ASU, Uzbek literary studies chair teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14186130>

Abstract: this article talks about the textual study of the story “Dokhtur Muhammadiyor”, the first story of Chulpan, the strong representative of jadid literature.

Key words: jadid, prose, textual study, scientific-critical text, story, abstracts, copy of text, graphic formation.

A strong representative of Jadid literature is “Dokhtur Muhammadiyor”, the first story of Chulpan, published in 1914 in the Sadoi Turkestan newspaper 24-, 30-, 34-, 45-, 46-, 47- published in issues. The story is announced with the signature “Abdulhamid Sulaymaniy”[1.5]. The story was also adapted from Abdurahman Saadi's textbook “Uzbek bourgeois literature” in 1934 during his Chulpan life. So, during the life of adib, two copies of this story were published. In addition the story was included in Volume II of the Chulpan Works Volume III, published in 1994, as well as Volume II of Volume IV, published in 2016. So, there are 4 copies of this story, which we can conditionally divide into the following groups:

1. The first source as the main base copy is a copy printed in the Sadoi Turkestan newspaper in 1914.
2. As a base copy, we define a copy that takes its place from Abdurahman Saadi's textbook “Uzbek bourgeois literature”.
3. As an auxiliary copy, we get current editions, which were published in volumes published in 1994 and in 2016.

We preferred to name these copies with their years of publication in the coming places. We mainly focus on the graphic formulation of this story, taking into account the size of our work.

When we cross-compare the existing copies of this story, we can take as an initial difference in its graphic formation the genre record, which is considered the element of the frame. Because the copies of the story, published in 1914 and 2016, give the compound “imaginary story” as a genre cream, while the copies of 1934 and 1994 have omitted the element of this frame. It seems to us that in this place it is desirable that the genre note is given.

In all but the 1934 published copy of the story of “Dokhtur Muhammadiyor”, the word “faxshxona” is in the style of “faxshxona”, only in the 1934 copy “...the room” is given in the form of a, i.e. the word “faxsh” is dropped and replaced by two dots on its side [2.106]. Another early version, “... some were interested in the beauty of Muhammadiyor with a unique monthly asking for mirza and mahramlikg’a”, omitted the word “mahramlikg’a” from the 1934 edition. It seems to us that these differences in copies are due to the fact that they are given to schoolchildren as a textbook: in this place, the young character of students seems to be taken into account.

It should also be noted that in the copies of the copy and the current edition published at the time of the Steppe life of 1914, the allocation to abstracts is almost identical, but in the copy of the textbook "Uzbek bourgeois literature", published during the Steppe life of 1934, there are many discrepancies with other copies. In addition to the 1914 Chulpan copy published during his lifetime and the large-large sentences and even whole-entire abstracts present in the copies of the current edition were completely omitted in his 1934 copy. It should also be mentioned that many variations are also observed when dividing existing texts into paragraphs. We will try to identify these differences with consistency.

In order for us to compare the copies of this story with each other and understand that they are correctly assigned to abstracts, it is advisable to first briefly dwell on the issue of correctly assigning texts in Uzbek to abstracts. In this regard, the following points are found in the books of linguistics:

"The division of the text into abstracts is done on the basis of a clear logical requirement, each of which helps to express a common (internal) single goal-the subject in its entirety. This is how the internal logical integrity of the stressed style is expressed in written speech by the way of leaving a little open space from the beginning of the line"[4.53].

There is also such information about abzas: "The division of text into paragraphs is a stylistic method that is carefully thought out and consciously applied by the author, without being accidental. New abzas means to switch to a new thought"[4.53].

Linguist M.Khakimov touched upon an important feature of abzas, arguing that it prevents thoughts from becoming entangled[5.25].

In the 1934 copy, the first 3 sentences are separated into a separate paragraph, but not all other copies observe this. We are here too A.Sa ' we think it's right to divide Dee into abzas. The reason is, although a later opinion statement mentions one of the heroes of the story – Haji Ahmad, i.e. tema (the greek thema – what is the basis) is Haji Ahmad, while rema (rheme – information, commentary) is changing the part that comes after the theme and expresses the content of the new message that the speaker wants to tell[5.25]. Because from the 4th sentence, the history of when and in what condition the hero of the work received the annotator "haji" is told.

In a 1934 copy, 4 sentences starting with sentence 9 are separated into a separate paragraph, but not all other copies have this. Now in this place A.Saadi's we can't agree with Dee's decision. Because even from the content of Proposition 8, the goal of Haji Ahmad teaching his son Muhammadiyar was being realized. From the 9th sentence to the 20th sentence of the story, the dream of teaching his son in a teacher who had been studying at the High School of Ufa Madrasai and the efforts of an ardent father who had done it for his realization were embodied. In addition, the 1934 copy has another new paragraph allocation, starting with sentence 13 of the story. It will not be difficult for us to notice that the topic of thoughts in sentences has never changed if we pay close attention to the content of previous sentences. So, it is understood that the authors of the copy and copies of the current edition, published at the time of the Steppe life of 1914, did the right thing in this place without allocating it to abzas.

Proposition 18-19 of the story was made into a separate abzas in a 1934 copy, while in current copies a new abzas began starting with proposition 18, but this abzas continued continuously until proposition 26. These sentences came as part of abzas 1 in a copy published at the time of the steppe life of 1914. In our opinion, sentences 18-19 are the last

sentences of paragraph 2. Because in sentences 15-16-17, Haji Ahmad is given the say'-effort he made to give his only son to a teacher who graduated from Madrasai Aliyah, while in sentence 18-19, this idea is encouraged by the teacher, that is, this topic is logically continued.

By comparing the text of the story with copies in this way, we can determine its differences, but this does not correspond to the size of our article. Therefore, we can draw conclusions that are inherent in the grinding.

As a result of our comparative study of the text of this story with all its copies, we came to the conclusion that, first of all, in what form the author of the story divided the work into parts, abstracts, in subsequent publications, the form should be left in exactly the same way, since in graphic formation it can undermine a certain creative purpose of the Punctuation marks in base source texts and reprints should be approached creatively in the case of differences in hand-to-hand, arising from the current basic punctuation rules. Textual errors associated with textual discrepancies in the tabdil of words and vocabulary should be completely eliminated. It is darcor not to overlook the many linguistic and spelling changes that have taken place in the creation of the scientific-critical text of the works of Jadid creators. There are a number of problems listed above when republishing the works of the creators of the years of repression, but the commitment to this painstaking work is an unquenchable duty of every intellectual.

References:

1. Абдулҳамид Сулаймоний. Дўхтур Муҳаммадиёр // Садои Туркистон. 1914. 24- 30- 34- 45- 46- 47-сонлари.
2. А.Саъдий. Ўзбек буржуа адабиёти. Тошкент: Ўзбекистон давлат нашриёти, 1934. – Б. 106.
3. Қуронов Д. Чўлпон насри поэтикаси. Филол. фан. д-ри... дисс. – Т., 1998. – Б. 280.
4. Мамажонов А., Abdupattoyev M. Matn tilshunosligi. Farg'ona, 2021. – Б. 114.
5. Хакимов М. Ўзбек тили матнининг синтакматик ва парагматик хусусиятлари. НДА. Тошкент, 1993. – Б. 175.
6. Қуронов Д. Чўлпон ҳаёти ва ижодий мероси. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1997. – Б. 80.
7. Чўлпон. Асарлар. 4 жилдлик. II жилд – Тошкент: Akademnashr (Нашрга т-чи: Н.Каримов), 2016. – Б. 374.