

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 04 Volume: 84

Published: 30.04.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Yulduz Karimova

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute

Associate Professor,

candidate of philological sciences, Uzbekistan.

dokma@bk.ru

THE CONFLICT OF FREEDOM AND DUTY IN THE STORY OF "ERK"

Abstract: In this article, Pirimkul Kadyrov's story "Erk", which for the first time in Uzbek story-writing raises the issue of freedom and duty, which is a philosophical, ethical and legal issue, in all its complexity, is analyzed. The story explores the dialectical relationship between human freedom and duty through a convincing way and artistically captivating illumination through the lives and destinies of the heroes. The role and importance of the child's image in the solution of the work is also highlighted.

Key words: ethics categories, freedom, duty, love, ethics.

Language: English

Citation: Karimova, Y. (2020). The conflict of freedom and duty in the story of "Erk". *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 806-811.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-141> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.141>

Scopus ASCC: 1211.

Introduction

Putting the matter in this way seems to be more in line with the sciences of philosophy or law. In fact, it is. But the point is that scientific categories such as human will, duty, and dignity are studied by almost all the social sciences, and, of course, attention is paid to aspects that are relevant to this or that science. These problems become an artistic problem when they appear in the work of art, through the lives and destinies of literary heroes, and they can now be studied as such problems. Naturally, their interpretations in other social sciences are also called for help in this, which helps to take a broader and deeper look at the problem.

It is well known that in the science of philosophy there are two special categories, freedom and necessity, which are sometimes studied separately, often, together, in the dialectical unity of the two. There is also a popular philosophical idea that necessity becomes freedom only when it is realized. This term "necessity" in the field of philosophy includes the concept of "duty" in ethics, the science of ethics, and often referred by this word. After all, duty usually appears as a necessity. Necessity, on the other hand, is a set of actions that must be performed, as long as they are not performed, which will damage the human life. The necessary action must be taken, that's

all. Duty is equated with necessity in this sense.

"Duty" one of the main categories of ethics, involves a particular set of ethical relationships between people. "Duty is the understanding of a person's moral responsibility, the fulfillment of their obligations as an inner spiritual necessity. The category of duty arises in relation to ethical categories and concepts such as responsibility, self-awareness, conscience, and behavior. Because duty is a concept that describes a person's moral image. Duty is valid as a moral category only when it is chosen voluntarily" [7; 80.]

These philosophical-theoretical rules are expressed in human detail at the same time, finding their artistic expression in the story of "Erk". It is not surprising that in the book, for the first time in Uzbek storytelling, the problem of freedom and duty, which is both a philosophical, ethical and legal issue, is raised with all its complexity and contradiction.

Criticism had realized this in due course and noted it with depth. Therefore, the critic Umarali Normatov states in a conversation with the writer in 1979 that there are certain contradictions in the interpretation of the will and duty of the author in this story: "It must be the same vital truth and necessity, in the interpretation of your heroes, along with human dignity, freedom, pride, his sense of responsibility,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

duty plays an important role, but this feeling is gradually coming to the forefront in you. It is not difficult to see that there are certain internal contradictions in the interpretation of the sense of duty and freedom in your works, as well as certain contradictions. "[2; 328.] This is a testament to the philosophical depth of the content of the work, and the teacher-critic must have had the same idea in mind.

Typically, internal connection involves conformity and contradiction, and the fact that these two situations' occurrence together creates a true dialectical picture of the problem.

Doctor of Philological Sciences, prof. P. Shermuhammedov was absolutely right when he wrote that "no story of Pirimkul Kadyrov has caused as much controversy as the story of" Erk "[8; 27.]. The story was later analyzed in more detail in our literature. At the same time, of course, the main focus is on the problem of human freedom and duty in society and the family. In this book, P. Shermuhammedov pointed on the debates about the story. We use this book where appropriate to the way of our thoughts, and we consider it necessary to express our attitude to the opinions expressed in the debate, where it is needed.

Academician Matyokub Kushjanov considers misunderstandings between parents and children, that is, the issue of fathers and children, to be the main issue in "Erk": "The writer sees the reason of the conflict between Ayshakhan and Sattor in something else. This is due to the fact that some parents do not give a chance to their children fully to understand what family and love are, and rush to marry on the basis of their own desires, different interests, the various conflicts that arise on this basis are dramatic events, and finally tragedies... The author disagrees with this, he encourages dear father and mothers and young people to avoid it. In our opinion, this is the only way to understand the tragedy between Ayshakhan and Sattar in "Erk" [10; 23.]

There is a definite basis for this view. The "service" of the parents is also not absent in the emergence of the human disorders described in the story. But, in our opinion, this does not constitute the ideological center of the work. Therefore, we would like to agree with Umarali Normatov, who argued with M. Kushjanov. "Well, why just understand it in that way," U. Normatov said. - It is true that there are rumors in the play that Sattar and Ayshakhan got married not by their own will, but by the opinion of their parents, and that Sattor's mother is unaware of the torture in her son's heart. That's all about parents.

In my opinion, the information about the parents' opinion is just an excuse for the beginning of the conflict between Ayshakhan and Sattor. In the subsequent development of conflicts, parents are almost not involved, mainly because the conflicts develop and escalate on the basis of other factors. The main conflict actually arises from two different

approaches to the issues of love, family and freedom and responsibility in the family "[3; 145.]

We will use this idea later, and now we continue to follow the debates around the story and the ideas expressed in them. Well-known writer and critic Ibrahim Gafurov, speaking about the controversy over the work "Erk", in his article gives an idea of a place in the plot of a writer (the author does not say the name of the writer and we think it is not much necessary).

"A writer who had been silently listening to the debate came up with a thought that hastened everyone: I think, if the writer had thrown Aisha into the water and not rescued her from the river, this story would have had a completely different sense of power. The work was completed after Sattar took his wife, Aisha, to the shore as she was drowning in the river. The writer picked all the fruit from the tree he had planted, and now there was no need or place to show how the leaves began to fall. It is known how long a fruit-bearing tree will grow. The writer makes the most of the plot so far, but when the same heart-wrenching room arrives, he suddenly drops it, he doesn't take advantage of the vital plot, the fate of the protagonists, the complexity of the situation, it seemed to me that the rest of the story continued with inertia. »[11; 194.] Let us stop the passage here and try to express our reaction to the assumption made by the author. Because this, in our opinion, is directly related to the problem of the dialectic of freedom and duty posed in the chapter.

So, as the unknown writer, mentioned by I. Gafurov, said Oyshakhan would drown, first of all, the work, in the words of that writer, would have "a completely different look." To do this, the writer had to be ready for the "death" of Ayshakhan from the very beginning of the rhythm of such events, while he was cultivating the ideological intention in his brain. In it, the work would have begun in a completely different way and would have continued accordingly. However, the writer has long been fascinated by the rescue of Aisha (and by Sattar himself, his mastery of swimming was not previously emphasized in vain). Secondly, and most importantly, if Ayshakhan had drowned, the leading conflict in the play would have been suspended, and the problem of freedom would have become unnecessary and superfluous. The tense spring that holds the problem of freedom and duty would have fallen into a conflicting trinity in the realm of family and love, and in it a ring in the chain of Sattar-Rozia-Ayshakhan, the beloved girl, boy, and unloved wife. The "continuation with inertia" of the work described by that writer did not happen when Ayshakhan was alive, as in the play, but when he died.

Let's say Sattor and Rozia have been suffering mentally for a while, then they would have been together without any hindrance. It is true that it is natural that such happiness, which is achieved at the expense of someone's death, should not be tasted by such conscientious, honest people. But we should

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

repeat that the development of such a plot, the decision of the fate of Ayshakhan does not correspond to the ideological and artistic logic of the story.

We are far from believing that this writer came up with a completely unfounded idea. As I. Gafurov rightly pointed out in that article, "this issue cannot be solved and explained in one stroke, in two sharp words." Moreover, we believe that the conclusions drawn from the teacher's hypothesis are also very important for our literature. Here are those conclusions: "Indeed, a very remarkable problem is this: why did the writer choose the same path, and not another, why did he allow this fate to his heroes. Couldn't it have been different? It is here that we encounter points that distinguish one writer from another, that reveal only their unique aspects, that are deeply connected with the writer's heart, inner spiritual world, views, and personal life." [11; 194.] Hence, that writer. His hypothesis was effective in understanding the general literature, as well as in getting down deeper into the artistic content of the story "Erk".

In these debates, and later in the works devoted to the story, various opinions have been expressed about the story. But our scholars are almost unanimous about the main pathos of the story and its main conflict. According to U. Normatov, "The main conflict is love here and it arises from two different views on the issues such as freedom and responsibility within the family and taken from this" [3; 145.] According to the literary critic O. Nosirov, "we encounter the love of two very spiritually worthy souls, the conflict between freedom and duty (emphasis ours - Yu.K.)" [4; 124.]

Apparently, scientists put the problem right and make some progress in scientific research on it. That is, there is a scientific opinion that has been formed about "Erk". Consequently, the leading images in the story are carefully analyzed and an attempt is made to unravel their inner edges. Frequently asked questions will be asked.

Literary critic O. Nosirov writes: "Sometimes when thinking about "Erk", they say 'Sattor's freedom is in his own hands', 'he always strives and fights for freedom'." When "freedom is in his own hands," why does Sattar, who always strives for freedom, fight: "Freedom is in his own hands," why does he talk so much about freedom? In any case, it is necessary to consider" [4; 124.]

Indeed, these questions are well-founded and they encourage deep reflection. Freedom is such a multi-meaning and complex phenomenon that it is impossible to make it one-sided and definitive. Indeed, Sattar's freedom is in his own hands, he can do whatever he wants. But being able to do what he wants, on the other hand, there are many situations where his faith is crushed like a stone. It is therefore necessary to use here the dialectic, the scientific law of the unity and struggle of opposites: the freedom of

Sattor is in his own hands, and the freedom of Sattor is not in his own hands. At first glance, this seems like an illogical idea; neither in his hand nor in his hand. But on closer consideration, there is a certain aspect of truth in both opposing views. When the two opposing views, which seem to be struggling with each other, are considered together, a relatively complete truth, an objective knowledge of the problem of freedom on the ground of the story, can be obtained.

Almost all scholars who have written about the story of "Erk" are mainly talking about the freedom of Sattar and Rozia. O. Nosirov writes, "Roziya's freedom is at her will: it can be said that there is no power to prevent her from loving and marrying anyone she wants ... Both Sattor and Roziya prefer personal freedom and honor above all else, and always strive for freedom" [4; 126.]

These are correct and reasonable opinions. But, in our opinion, there is another important aspect of the issue. Freedom is a blessing for all human beings. Not only Rozia and Sattor have the freedom, but also that Aishahan. It is true that she is not active enough to have her freedom in her hands, but at least she has a constitutional freedom! In addition, Mukhtar, a four-year-old boy born from the legal marriage of Sattar and Ayshakhan, also has freedom. When we say "freedom", we mean freedom not only in the legal, but also in the legal and spiritual-moral sense.

Thus, in this case, in the story, in legal terms, the subjects of freedom are four: Roziya, Sattor, Ayshakhan, Mukhtar. In the play, the freedoms of individuals standing in the context of a life situation now collides with each other. This is where the question of vital necessity and duty arises. To respect the will of another, to acknowledge, is to limit one's own freedom to a certain extent, that is, a certain freedom.

For this reason, the active forces in the work, the freedom of Sattar and Rozia, are relatively passive forces, forced to be limited by the freedom of Ayshakhan and Mukhtar, to recognize the necessity and duty on their necks. This obligation that aggravates the final situation in the story, creates a kind of inaccuracy.

In order for a problem to arise in a work of art, two conditions must be met, especially if it is both a legal and a moral problem, such as freedom. First, a specific space unit, that is, the protagonists, the participants must reside in a town or village. Second, the unity of the situation, that is, the protagonists, must be interconnected within the whole life situation. Applying this general theoretical consideration to the story of "Erk", the following picture emerges:

Although all the participants united by the problem of freedom - Sattor, Roziya, Ayshakhan and Mukhtar - initially lived in different places, cities and villages, the author later moved them to the city, that is, to a single space. The unity of space is evident and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

bulging in one episode of the play. This is a surprise meeting in a taxi. All participants gather in a narrow space - in the car. "Since Ayshakhan moved in, such a big city has always seemed to be cramped for Rozia. Now how do they all (the four participants in the problem - Yu. K.) fit into this car with such complex emotions?" [9; 105.]

This is a rhetorical question, not just a thought, an emotion that has been going through Rozia's mind. There is also a certain share of the author's voice.

This meeting does not happen at the end of the story in vain. Roziya sees Ayshakhan, Ayshakhan sees Roziya. On top of that, Aishahan witnesses her husband Sattar's relationship with Rozia and sees with her own eyes his strong love for a strange girl.

"-Roziya, we didn't greet, are you all right?" There was a strange softness in Sattar's eyes as he looked at Rozia. His voice was so warm that Aishahan "suddenly" stared at the girl sitting next to her.[9; 107.]

It is not surprising that this meeting turned Ayshakhan's mind and made her think more deeply about life, about the complex situation in which they found themselves.

The drama in the story of "Erk" stems from the fact that the main characters, in particular Sattar and Rozia, and especially Rozia, is honest and pure-hearted person. As Professor P. Shermuhammedov wrote, "Sattar, after falling in love with Rozia, could have settled accounts with Ayshakhan and paid alimony for his son" [8; 32-33.]. And this very situation is often repeated in real life. But such a path does not correspond to the logic of the characters in the story, as mentioned above, the two active forces - Sattar and Rozia's high moral personality - did not allow it. Rozia's words, once firmly addressed to Sattar, define their spiritual image and action-life program: "Sattar, you promise me. We will not harm anyone!" [1; 78.] It can be said that such a strict moral norm is the main factor that makes the problem of human freedom the main pathos of the story. These words are similar to the words of Yusufbek Haji in our great novel "O'tgan Kunlar": "No one is dissatisfied with this house." And the roles they manage in both books are almost the same. If Yusufbek Haji was not such a spiritually high and pure person, it would not have been difficult to take Zaynab, whom her husband did not love, to her parents' house. Then Otabek and Kumush would live a happy life and live in peace. But we know that in the novel he does not take such drastic and cruel actions.

As we know from the history of philosophy, the absolute command of the great German philosopher I. Kant in ethics is a strict imperative that seems to be firmly rooted in the hearts of both Yusufbek Haji and Rozia.

We again state that, however, it is only then that the problem of freedom emerges and becomes the leading theme and ideological issue in the play.

So what makes Rozia's freedom? After all, Rozia, who was accidentally interfered (excluding the negative accent in this word) from the outside into a full-fledged family of a legitimate couple and children, seems to have no connection at all, and no freedom at all. But his mainstay is her love, the love she shares with Sattar, one of the members of this family. This is what gives her strength and freedom. To give up her love, it means that giving up Sattar, seems very difficult: "But to remind Sattar that he has a family, to separate everyone as married or unmarried, even though he is a real person, seems to Rozia a strange view now. The fact that she had been following her aunt's advice for a month and had been fleeing from Sattar seems to have given in to this heresy and suffocated her freedom in vain"[9; 77-78.]

There is another reason why Roziya does not rely on her own love, does not show up her freedom (the freedom that she gave for her love), and acts with honesty and conscience. This is also an important psychological argument. It is then clear that a single passage in the story is not included in vain, and that it is important in determining Rozia's behavior in the story. This is the fate of Rozia's aunt Sora Akromkhodjaeva.

According to the play, "Roziya's love for a married man is a very bad tragedy for Sorakhan" [9, 74.] A similar tragedy happened to Sorakhan a few years ago. Her husband falls in love with a young girl three years after their marriage and got married with that girl. Sorahon is left alone with her two children. "All of Rozia's relatives have got accustomed to that the ex-husband, who abandoned his two children and married another girl in love, is accused of being unscrupulous and dishonest. They also always hated a girl who started family with a married man. "She broke up someone's family, left his children without a father, and took away Sarakhan's husband. She was accustomed from childhood to look at such girls with disgust, even though Roziya had not seen her" [9; 74.]

Interestingly, her aunt Sorakhan's enemies - her ex-husband and that woman were in the place of Sattar and Rozia, this unfortunate incident, while the unknown poor woman Ayshakhan (who Sorakhan does not know, of course) was as victim as Sorakhan. This aggravated the situation in which Rozia had fallen, and Rozia "accustomed from childhood to look with disgust at such people" saw herself in the place of the girl who had taken her aunt's husband away,

This was another powerful factor limiting the freedom and duty of Rozia, a noble girl by nature. In this regard, the following words of Umarali Normatov clearly reveal the complex mental state of the hero: "Rozia's freedom is in her own hands, but she does not abuse it, her sense of responsibility to others does not allow it, she cannot be with Sattar leaving his child without father, at the same time she is not completely disappointed in Sattar, she cannot love anyone else" [2; 208.]

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Considering Sattor's situation, he, like most men, at first thought very crudely, thinking that he could solve the problem easily, as if pulling wool out of dough. "Sattor forgot that it is impossible to separate the nails from the skin without pain." [9; 99.]. His wife suicides herself after being unable to bear the "politely ugly" rumors of a good divorce, Ayshakhan shows Sattor that the issue of re-awakened childhood affection for his son Mukhtar, who was previously a stranger in the rescue and subsequent processes, is not just a matter- of- fact.

Sattar's freedom is always limited by his masculinity before his wife and his fatherly duty before his son. On top of that, his beloved one Rozia doesn't approve of him leaving them, she is not that kind of person.

As for Ayshakhan, he had never thought about freedom before. Shee has no idea about her rights. There is an usual dialogue in the play:

"Sattar looked at him sadly and:

"What can I do, that's life," he said. "Your freedom is in your hands, Aisha." You're still young, you were not happy with our marriage. Maybe someone else ...

-Stop! If a husband looks like you, I don't need a husband till the end" [9; 92.]

Ayshakhan does not hear the word about freedom or she does not understand the meaning and essence of the word "freedom". Ayshakhan gave all her freedom to those around her - her parents, mother-in-law and husband. When the time of trial comes, such a time of trial will surely come, that is, she will not be able to bear the cold words of her husband about the divorce without a quarrel, and will commit suicide in the form of involuntary rebellion. It was a very bold and primitive way of demonstrating the freedom that nature has given to every human being. Moreover, such a demonstration of freedom was taking the form of revenge. The mental state of Ayshakhan when she threw herself into the river is described as follows: "In her mind, revenge was like a mixed thought: " He will later regret it! Later sees! Yes, yes! .. »[9; 95.]

Only when Ayshakhan comes to Tashkent and takes up her favorite profession and actively participates in social life, she will be able to think seriously about freedom and duty. Until then, if the interpretation was correct, events would have passed over and over her without her consent. Now she has become the subject of events, that is, their equal and conscious participant. Therefore, the idea of an unknown writer at the beginning of the chapter about the death of Ayshakhan was inappropriate for the current version of the work, in which the absence of one of the four subjects of freedom - Ayshakhan - would have completely eliminated the problem of freedom.

As mentioned earlier, one of the participants who is united by the problem of freedom and most

importantly is the child Mukhtar. Scholars who have written about the story for some reason, do not pay much attention to this image. However, he is one of the protagonists who has an important ideological burden in the book. In the play, we witness a certain evolution of this image: "He had not seen his father for a long time and was very ashamed of him. The child also notices that there is some coldness between Sattor and Ayshakhan. This coldness seems to come more from his father, so Mukhtar does come closer to Sattor "[9; 56-57.]

The unfortunate and at the same time ending incident brings the parent closer. Little Mukhtar, a witness and participant in Ayshakhan's suicide scene: he was afraid and does not run for his mother but to back side he went: - Mummy!... mom! Mom! - He saw Sattar and opened his hands: Daddy! Mummy went! Mom..." [9; 95.]

In this, the exciting speech and condition of a four-year-old child is given very naturally. With these hasty words of Mukhtar, it is as if he is bringing the husband and wife closer again. The child's "Daddy, mom! on the one hand, it is a ring that reunites a broken family, on the other hand, it is a handcuff that limits Sattar's freedom. After Sattar rescued Ayshakhan, that is, his father rescues his mom from the inevitable death in front of him, Mukhtar became closer to his father: "He was walking around Sattar like a butterfly. It is as if he has just found his father. "[9; 99.]

At the end of the story, by stating Sattor's tired, depressed, heavy "sighing, the three participants in the problem of freedom will gather in another space - both an apartment and a text area of the play: "Today Ayshakhan through thin wall again heard that "sigh" and her heart was in pain. Embracing his son:

- What do we do now? She whispered. "How can we do it right?"

The little boy still doesn't understand these questions. His parents are still undecided.[9: 112]

At the same time, in the last lines of the story, the name Mukhtar is given without mentioning but by the name "little boy" and the common word "father" is used instead of Sattor and Aisha, and this is applied to the same child (his parents) emphasizes once again the role and importance of the child image in the story. This image has a certain degree of symbolism in the play.

Going back to the last lines, the eternal trio plays an important role in it - father, mother, child. Isn't that a perfect finish in itself? It's like that, but that perfection is cracked. There seems to be no solution to the problem of torturing heroes. But this vital inconsistency can be said to be the artistic solution of the story of "Erk".

The child at the end of the play is an image that unites parents and always reminds them of both their family and civic duty. While the child is on duty, is the force that balances adults and parent's sense of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHII (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

freedom.

As for the general ratio of freedom and duty in the story, they also resemble two phases of the scales. One rises, the other falls, and vice versa. It is not easy to balance them.

So, in the story "Erk" by our famous writer Pirimkul Kadyrov, the dialectical relationship between human freedom and duty is convincingly and artistically appealing through the lives and destinies of the heroes.

We have made the following general conclusions on the issue discussed in this article:

1. In the play, the problems of freedom and duty are presented in a dialectical unity, that is, in the form of mutually compatible and contradictory concepts,

which gives a deep vitality and philosophical vitality to the idea of the story.

2. In addition to the four active characters in the play - Sattor, Rozia and Ayshakhan, the image of a child (Mukhtar) plays an important role in the art of storytelling. The image of a child carries a symbolic meaning in the story, and from the point of view of this image, additional layers of meaning are discovered in the story.

3. In the story, the concept of freedom is interpreted not only as a legal and spiritual, but also as an ideological problem. Therefore, the vital indecision at the end of the work, or the omission of a vital problem, can in fact be taken as a kind of artistic solution.

References:

1. Karimov, N., Mamajonov, S., Nazarov, B., Normatov, U., & Sharafiddinov, O. (1999). *XX asr o'zbek adabiyoti tarixi*. -Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
2. Normatov, U. (1982). *Yetuklik* -Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti.
3. Normatov, U. (1976). *Go'zallik bilan uchrashuv*. -Toshkent: Yosh gvardiya.
4. Nosirov, O'. (1991). *Obrazlarda uslub jilolari*. -Toshkent, Fan.
5. Nosirov, U. (1981). *Ijodkor shaxs, badiiy uslub, avtor obrazi*. – Toshkent: Fan.
6. Sulstonov, I. (1980). *Adabiyot nazariyasi*. -Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
7. (2004). *Falsafa: qomusiy lug'at*. – Toshkent: Sharq.
8. Shermuhammedov, P. (1983). *Pirimkul Qodirov. Adabiy portret*. - Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti.
9. Qodirov, P. (1970). *Erk*. - Toshkent. G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti.
10. Qo'shjonov, M. (1971). *Qissaning ikkinchi hayoti*. Sharq yulduzi.
11. G'afurov, I. (1979). *Hayotning toza ko'zgusi*. Sharq yulduzi.