«Deborah Frances Tannen (1990) characterizes the speech of men as «status talk» (demonstration of status), and the speech of women as «rapport talk» (establishment of emotional connection). Gender (eng. gender is a social construct created by society through cultural, political and social practices and norms that define the roles of women and girls, men and boys, as well as through social definitions of masculinity and femininity.

Currently, «theoretical aspects of discourse and gender communication» are a very relevant field in linguistics, cultural studies, and communication science. These scientific directions connect language and society in the era of globalization. The comparative relationship of gender communication in the works of Akhmet Baitursynov, Kudaibergen Zhubanov, and Ybyray Altynsarin is analyzed. Theoretically, this field is related to sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and feminist linguistics. Also, the theoretical aspects of gender communication are considered not only from the point of view of behavior and speech manner, but also from a religious point of view.

Keywords: gender communication, discourse, theory, aspect, feminism, science, pragmalinguistics.

Yazar Bilgileri

Mubarakova Saliha Erzhanovna – Alikhan Bokeikhan University doktora öğrencisi, Kazakistan Cumhuriyeti, Semey, e-posta: mubarakova_saliha@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4107-3099.

Автор туралы мәлімет

Мубаракова Салиха Ержановна – Alikhan Bokeikhan University докторанты, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей, e-mail: mubarakova_saliha@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4107-3099.

Сведения об авторе

Мубаракова Салиха Ержановна – докторант Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Республика Казахстан, Семей, e-mail: mubarakova_saliha@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4107-3099.

Information about the Author

Salikha Mubarakova – PhD student at Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey, e-mail: mubarakova_saliha@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4107-3099.

Gönderim 29.07.2026
Revizyon sonrası gönderim 17.08.2026
Kabul 28.09.2026

https://doi.org/10.53360/3080-3861-2026-3(7)-18
IRSTI: 17.07.00

K.A. Aubakirova
Shakarim University,
071412, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey, 20 A Glinka Str.
ORCID: 0000-0002-1872-9591
e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com

LITERATURE AND IDEOLOGY: NATIONAL DISCOURSE IN THE WORKS OF ALASH AND MALADNYAK WRITERS

Abstract. This article examines the development of Kazakh and Belarusian literature in the first quarter of the twentieth century through a comparative analysis of the intellectual and literary legacies of the Alash movement and the Maladnyak literary association. The study explores how national consciousness, language, historical memory, cultural autonomy, and individual freedom were represented by Kazakh and Belarusian intellectuals operating within comparable socio-political contexts, while identifying similarities and differences in their relations with Soviet

ideology. Methodologically, the research combines comparative literary, historical-contextual, typological, and interpretative analyses. Alash and Maladnyak are approached not only as national literary phenomena but also as intellectual formations shaped by the imperial and Soviet transformations of the early twentieth century. The findings show that both movements emphasized the preservation of native language and national culture, the reconstruction of historical consciousness, and the social role of literature. However, their relationship with political power differed significantly. Alash intellectuals associated national revival with autonomy and political self-determination, whereas early Maladnyak writers sought to develop Belarusian literature and language within the framework of Soviet cultural policy. The subsequent strengthening of ideological control increasingly restricted their creative autonomy, while several representatives became victims of political repression. The study contributes to comparative literary scholarship by placing Kazakh and Belarusian experiences of national literary revival within a shared analytical framework and conceptualizing literature as a space for constructing national identity, preserving cultural memory, and articulating intellectual responses to political pressure.

Keywords: Kazakh literature; Belarusian literature; Alash; Maladnyak; national identity; Soviet ideology; political repression.

Introduction

The first quarter of the twentieth century was a period of profound transformation in the development of national literatures across the Eurasian space, as literary experimentation unfolded alongside far-reaching political and ideological change. The collapse of the Russian Empire, the revolutions of 1917, the Civil War, and the subsequent consolidation of the Soviet political system fundamentally reshaped the social and intellectual functions of literature. Previously associated primarily with cultural expression, historical memory, and the articulation of collective identity, literature increasingly became a site of ideological contestation and public mobilization. Although these transformations developed under different historical and political conditions in Kazakhstan and Belarus, the trajectories of the two national literatures reveal significant typological parallels that provide a productive basis for comparative analysis. Examining the literary experience of Alash intellectuals alongside that of the Belarusian Maladnyak association therefore offers an opportunity to reconsider the complex relationship between literature, national consciousness, and political ideology.

The revival of Kazakh literature in the early twentieth century was closely connected with the socio-political, cultural, and educational activities of the Alash movement. For Alash intellectuals, literature was not merely a sphere of aesthetic expression; it also constituted an intellectual space in which national consciousness could be articulated, historical memory reconstructed, the public status of the native language strengthened, and society mobilized toward cultural and social modernization.

In the works of Akhmet Baitursynuly, Alikhan Bokeikhan, Mirzhakyp Dulatuly, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Zhusupbek Aimauytuly, and their contemporaries, questions of education, land, language, national autonomy, cultural independence, decolonization, and national statehood were closely interconnected. Kazakhstani scholars such as M. Koygeldiev [1], K. Nurpeis [2], and D. Kamzabekuly [3] have examined the Alash movement as an important stage in the development of the idea of national statehood, the emergence of a new culture of political thought, and the broader process of national revival. Subsequent research has further demonstrated the close relationship between the renewal of national consciousness and the conceptualization of national statehood within Alash intellectual thought. Research on the representation of the Alash idea in literary translation has also shown how concepts of national self-determination, education in the native language, and cultural preservation could be articulated and transmitted through translation [4].

The literary dimensions of the Alash phenomenon have likewise received considerable scholarly attention. D. Kamzabekuly [3], B. Omaruly [5], A. Sharip [6], and other researchers have examined national literature in relation to historical memory, traditional mentality, national worldview, and processes of modernization. Their scholarship provides a basis for approaching early twentieth-century literature not simply as an illustration of political history but as an autonomous intellectual discourse involved in the construction of national subjectivity. From this perspective, national discourse in Alash literature cannot be reduced to a collection of individual patriotic motifs. Rather, it can be understood as an integrated conceptual framework in which language, historical memory, territory, education, cultural autonomy, social responsibility, and statehood acquire interconnected meanings.

A distinctive literary movement oriented toward national cultural renewal also emerged in Belarus during this period. Founded in 1923, the Maladnyak literary association brought together a new generation of Belarusian writers and rapidly became an influential institution in the literary and cultural life of the country [7]. The association was connected with the creative activities of Mikhas Charot, Adam Babareka, Ales Dudar, Yazep Pushcha, Kuzma Chorny, Kondrat Krapiva, Uladzimir Dubouka, and other writers. One of the distinctive features of Maladnyak was its attempt to reconcile the project of Belarusian national cultural revival with the discourse of revolutionary and Soviet social transformation. Consequently, interpreting Maladnyak solely as a «Soviet literary organization» risks obscuring the national and cultural dimensions of its early development [8].

In her analysis of the literary journals and associations Polymia, Maladniak, and Uzvyšša, Gun-Britt Köhler demonstrates the close interaction between literary production, party interests, and cultural politics in the Belarusian literary sphere of the 1920s [7]. Her approach suggests that literary periodicals of this period should be understood not merely as publication venues for individual texts but as institutional spaces in which literature and cultural politics interacted. This perspective is particularly relevant to the present study, since it makes it possible to examine the national discourse associated with Maladnyak not only through individual literary works but also through the broader institutional environment of journals, literary associations, and cultural policy.

Larisa Dovnar approaches the Belarusian national revival of the 1920s through the interconnected issues of book culture and national identity, identifying the period from 1918 to 1929 as a particularly productive phase in the cultural development of the Belarusian nation. Her research emphasizes the importance of books, education, and the national language as central mechanisms in the formation and consolidation of national identity. In a later comparative study, Dovnar characterizes the years 1921-1929 as a particularly favorable period for education and publishing in national languages in the Byelorussian SSR, while also demonstrating how these opportunities progressively narrowed toward the 1930s [9].

The political framework underlying these developments was the Belarusian manifestation of the Soviet policy of korenizatsiya, commonly associated with Belarusization. Contemporary scholarship treats Belarusization not merely as a language policy but as a broader historical process involving the development of national cultural institutions, education, and national identity. A. Marková argues that the institutional promotion of the Belarusian language contributed to the consolidation of Belarusian national identity [10]. Within this context, national cultural development and Soviet ideology should not be approached as entirely separate or inherently incompatible forces in the early history of Maladnyak. During the 1920s, their relationship was characterized by a complex combination of interaction, adaptation, and internal contradiction.

It is precisely this tension that makes a comparison between Alash and Maladnyak analytically productive. Both intellectual and literary environments assigned considerable importance to the development of the national language and culture, the formation of a new readership, the dissemination of education and knowledge, and the strengthening of national consciousness. Their relationships with political authority, however, differed substantially. The intellectual foundations of Alash were closely connected with questions of national autonomy, political subjectivity, and statehood, whereas the early programmatic orientation of Maladnyak was based on the possibility of pursuing national cultural development within the framework of the Soviet revolutionary project. Thus, apparently comparable discourses of national revival developed distinct political meanings and ideological strategies.

Against this background, the present study aims to examine the formation and transformation of national discourse in the works of Alash and Maladnyak writers during the first quarter of the twentieth century from comparative-historical and discursive perspectives. Particular attention is given to the similarities and differences in the ways these two literary environments negotiated the relationship between literature, national ideas, and political ideology.

The contribution of the study lies in bringing these two intellectual and literary environments into a shared comparative framework without treating their political positions as equivalent. Instead,

the analysis employs a set of common historical and typological categories–including national language, historical memory, cultural revival, political subjectivity, censorship, and ideological transformation – to identify both structural parallels and historically specific differences between the Kazakh and Belarusian cases.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What artistic and discursive strategies were employed by Alash and Maladnyak writers to articulate ideas of national identity, language, historical memory, and national revival, and what similarities and differences can be identified between the two literary environments?

2. How did the differing relationships of the Alash and Maladnyak literary circles with political authority and dominant ideology shape the evolution of national discourse, their artistic strategies, and the expression of authorial positions?

Addressing these questions makes it possible to move beyond treating Alash and Maladnyak as isolated episodes in two separate national literary histories. Instead, they can be examined within a comparative literary-historical framework that illuminates the complex relationships between literature and political power, national culture and ideology, and artistic autonomy and political control during the first decades of the twentieth century. Such an approach broadens the study of Kazakh-Belarusian literary relations while demonstrating that the modernization of national literatures within the emerging Soviet space followed neither a uniform trajectory nor a single ideological model. Rather, each literary environment articulated the national idea through distinct discursive strategies shaped by its own historical experience, institutional conditions, and relationship with political authority.

Materials and Methods

The methodological framework of the study integrates comparative literary analysis, historical-contextual analysis, typological comparison, discourse analysis, and interpretative textual analysis. This combined approach makes it possible to examine Kazakh and Belarusian literature of the first quarter of the twentieth century not merely as two separate national literary traditions but as distinct intellectual and cultural formations that developed amid the disintegration of the imperial order, the rise of national revival movements, and the consolidation of the Soviet ideological system. The central methodological principle is to compare the literary environments of Alash and Maladnyak without assuming the equivalence of their political orientations. Instead, the comparison is structured around a set of shared historical and typological categories: national identity, native language, historical memory, cultural autonomy, enlightenment, political subjectivity, authorial freedom, censorship, and ideological transformation.

The research corpus was organized into two principal groups. The first comprised the literary, journalistic, and educational writings of Kazakh intellectuals associated with the Alash movement. Particular attention was given to representations of national language, historical consciousness, enlightenment, national autonomy, and cultural independence in the works of Akhmet Baitursynuly, Mirzhakyp Dulatuly, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Zhusupbek Aimauytuly, and other figures belonging to this intellectual milieu. The second group consisted of literary works and materials relating to the cultural activities of Belarusian writers associated with Maladnyak, including Mikhas Charot, Adam Babareka, Ales Dudar, Kuzma Chorny, Maxim Goretsky, and others. Texts were selected not solely on the basis of an author's formal affiliation with a particular literary organization but also according to their relevance to the central analytical categories of the study, including national revival, language, historical memory, individual freedom, and ideological pressure.

The comparative-historical method was employed to contextualize the socio-political conditions that shaped the emergence and development of the two literary environments while preserving their historical specificity. Accordingly, the formation of Alash in the context of the colonial policies of the Russian Empire and the development of ideas concerning national autonomy and statehood were examined as one historical trajectory, while the emergence and evolution of Maladnyak within the context of Belarusization and Soviet cultural policy during the 1920s were

treated as another. This distinction was essential to avoid reducing historically different intellectual movements to superficially similar models of national revival.

Typological comparison was used to identify ideological and artistic parallels between Kazakh and Belarusian literary works in the absence of direct literary influence or demonstrable genetic connections. The primary units of comparison were therefore not biographical similarities between individual writers but recurring semantic and conceptual categories, including the native language, the fate of the nation, historical memory, knowledge and enlightenment, freedom, the preservation of national culture, and the relationship between the individual and political power. This approach enabled the study to identify both convergent and divergent literary responses to comparable forms of historical and ideological pressure.

Discourse analysis was employed to approach literary texts not only as aesthetic structures but also as forms of intellectual communication through which national and political meanings were articulated within particular historical contexts. The analysis focused on the semantic functions of key concepts such as «nation», «language», «land», «freedom», «culture», «individual», «knowledge», and «power», as well as on the ways in which authorial positions were expressed and transformed under changing ideological conditions. Particular attention was paid to the shift from the revolutionary optimism evident in the early discourse of Maladnyak to the increasingly constrained articulation of national cultural aspirations as political control intensified. These transformations were examined through both explicit journalistic statements and indirect literary devices, including symbolism, metaphor, allegory, and other forms of figurative expression.

Interpretative and textual analysis was applied to the ideological and aesthetic structures of individual works. Character systems, narrative strategies, symbolic imagery, recurring motifs, thematic patterns, and significant artistic details were examined in relation to the historical and ideological contexts in which the texts were produced. Particular care was taken not to assign political meanings automatically to symbolic or figurative elements. Instead, their interpretative significance was assessed through their function within the text, their relationship to the work's broader semantic structure, and the historical circumstances surrounding the author and the production of the work. This principle is particularly important when interpreting texts created under conditions of censorship, where indirect forms of expression may acquire additional ideological significance but should not automatically be reduced to political allegory.

Bibliographic and documentary analysis was used to broaden the source base of the study. The research drew on materials from Belarusian libraries and archival collections, scholarly works on the history of Belarusian literature, literary publications, biographical sources, and works by the writers under consideration. When working with Belarusian texts that remain relatively unfamiliar to Kazakh readers, translation was additionally employed as an interpretative research instrument. Particular attention was paid to preserving the semantic core of the original, culturally specific concepts, and literary meaning, with semantic equivalence serving as the primary principle of interpretation.

The research proceeded in several stages. First, relevant historical and literary materials were collected and the research corpus was established. Second, the selected texts were classified according to the principal analytical categories of national identity, language, historical memory, cultural autonomy, political subjectivity, and ideological pressure. Third, the Kazakh and Belarusian materials were analyzed independently in order to preserve the historical and cultural specificity of each literary environment; the findings were subsequently incorporated into a comparative analytical framework. Finally, the identified similarities and differences were reassessed and interpreted within their respective historical and political contexts. The methodology was therefore designed not to confirm predetermined parallels between Alash and Maladnyak, but to establish the historical conditions, literary strategies, and ideological constraints through which each literary environment articulated and transformed the national idea.

Results and Discussion

A comparative analysis of Kazakh and Belarusian literary processes during the first quarter of the twentieth century reveals that, despite certain structural similarities in their development, the two national literatures articulated national revival through distinct political and ideological frameworks. The principal typological parallel between Alash and Maladnyak lies in the expansion of literature beyond its purely aesthetic function. In both intellectual environments, literature became a means of articulating national consciousness, strengthening the public role of the native language, reconstructing historical memory, and shaping public thought. The mechanisms through which these objectives were pursued, however, differed substantially. The most productive basis for comparison, therefore, lies not in assuming similarity between the political programs of Alash and Maladnyak, but in examining the different strategies through which national literature was preserved, institutionalized, and redefined under conditions of profound political transformation.

These differences become particularly apparent when the historical contexts of the two movements are considered. Alash literary and intellectual discourse developed during the decline of the imperial order, when questions of national autonomy, land, education, language, and political subjectivity had become central to Kazakh public thought. For Alash intellectuals, cultural revival was consequently inseparable from the broader question of national self-determination. In the literary, journalistic, and educational activities of Akhmet Baitursynuly, Mirzhakyp Dulatuly, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Zhusupbek Aimauytuly, and their contemporaries, the development of national language and literature was understood as a prerequisite for the emergence of the nation as an autonomous historical subject. Within this discourse, the concept of the nation extended beyond an ethnographic or cultural category to encompass territory, language, historical memory, cultural continuity, and political agency.

Maladnyak followed a different initial trajectory. Founded in 1923 within the emerging Soviet institutional order, the association initially sought to reconcile revolutionary renewal with the development of Belarusian national culture. Its representatives did not necessarily perceive Soviet power as inherently incompatible with national cultural aspirations. Under the policy of Belarusization in the 1920s, opportunities emerged for expanding the public use of the Belarusian language, developing education and publishing, and establishing national literary institutions. These conditions enabled Maladnyak writers, at least temporarily, to articulate national cultural aspirations within the discourse of revolutionary transformation [7].

One of the central findings of the comparison is therefore that the apparent similarity between the national discourses of Alash and Maladnyak should not be interpreted as evidence of ideological equivalence. In the Alash intellectual environment, national revival was closely associated with political subjectivity and aspirations toward national autonomy. In the early Maladnyak context, by contrast, national cultural development was initially conceived as achievable within the existing Soviet political framework. Literature thus performed different political functions: in the Alash context, it contributed to a discourse of national political self-determination, whereas Maladnyak initially sought to reconcile national cultural development with the institutional possibilities created by the new Soviet order.

Language as a Marker of National Subjectivity

The most visible typological parallel between the two literary environments concerns the significance attributed to the native language. For Kazakh intellectuals of the early twentieth century, language constituted one of the principal foundations of national identity. Questions concerning schools, textbooks, the press, literary production, and scientific terminology in Kazakh emerged as interconnected aspects of a broader cultural project. Language therefore functioned not simply as a means of communication but as a cultural code through which historical continuity and collective identity could be maintained.

A comparable process can be observed in the Belarusian literary environment. In the literary and public activities of Maladnyak writers, the expansion of the expressive and institutional capacities of the Belarusian language became a significant cultural objective. Literary evenings, journals, collections, and other forms of public literary activity contributed to the formation of a new readership and strengthened

the position of Belarusian as a modern literary language. In this context, literature acquired an institutional function: it participated actively in establishing the national language within the broader social and cultural sphere. The significance of literary journals as institutional spaces during this period is also demonstrated by studies of *Maladniak*, *Polymia*, and *Uzvyšša* [7].

The political meanings attached to language, however, differed considerably. For Alash intellectuals, linguistic preservation was closely connected with questions of national autonomy, cultural self-determination, and liberation from colonial dependence. In the Belarusian context of the 1920s, by contrast, the institutional development of the national language temporarily coincided with Soviet nationality policy. The Belarusian language thus became a point of intersection between the aspirations of the national intelligentsia and the institutional framework of Belarusization. As Soviet cultural policy subsequently changed, however, this relationship became increasingly unstable. What had initially been institutionally encouraged as national cultural development could later become politically suspect. The changing status of language therefore illustrates the extent to which the meaning of national cultural practices depended upon transformations in the surrounding political order.

Historical Memory and the Interpretation of the Past

Historical memory constitutes a second major analytical category linking the Alash and Maladnyak literary environments. Literary reinterpretations of the national past enabled writers to connect historical experience with contemporary social and political concerns. Historical memory in this sense is not simply the recollection of past events; it functions as a means through which communities negotiate questions of collective identity, historical experience, and future development.

Within Alash discourse, engagement with the past frequently served as a framework for interpreting the contemporary condition of the nation. The recovery of national history and cultural heritage was not presented as incompatible with modernization. On the contrary, knowledge of historical and cultural traditions provided an intellectual basis for participation in modern social and political life. The relationship between memory and modernization was therefore complementary rather than oppositional: the adoption of new knowledge, institutions, and cultural forms was understood as compatible with the preservation of linguistic and historical subjectivity. Research on memoir discourse in Kazakh literature similarly demonstrates the role of literary texts in connecting individual memory with collective historical consciousness [12].

The relationship between past and present acquired a different complexity in Belarusian literature. Revolutionary discourse encouraged a break with the old social order, whereas the development of a national literary tradition necessarily depended upon language, folklore, historical experience, and cultural memory. The tension between these impulses contributed to the internal dynamics of Belarusian literature during the period.

The work of Maxim Goretsky is particularly revealing in this respect. In *Two Souls*, individual psychological ambivalence can be read in relation to the wider experience of a society situated at a historical crossroads. The protagonist's confrontation with competing worlds—old and new, rural and urban, inherited tradition and social transformation—raises broader questions of identity under conditions of modernization. The motif of «two souls” can therefore be interpreted not only as a representation of individual psychological division but also as an artistic expression of the instability of collective identity during periods of rapid historical change.

The comparison between Mirzhakyp Dulatuly and Maxim Goretsky is particularly productive when it moves beyond biographical parallels. In both cases, literary prose provides a means of representing the condition of a national community through individual experience. The fate and psychological conflicts of the protagonist can consequently acquire broader historical significance, transforming personal crisis into an artistic model through which the crisis of the community itself becomes intelligible.

The Social Function of the Writer

The materials examined also demonstrate the expanded social function of the writer in both literary environments. The writer of the early twentieth century frequently operated simultaneously as an author, educator, publicist, translator, teacher, and public intellectual. Such multifunctionality

was particularly characteristic of national literary cultures undergoing processes of institutional formation and modernization.

In the Alash context, literary activity cannot easily be separated from broader cultural and social engagement. The development of alphabets and textbooks, newspaper publishing, literary production, educational activity, and participation in public debate constituted interconnected dimensions of a larger project of national modernization. Separating literary texts entirely from these activities would therefore obscure an important dimension of their historical meaning.

A comparable expansion of the writer's social role can be observed within Maladnyak. Literary associations, journals, collections, public readings, lectures, and other forms of organized cultural activity transformed literature into an institutional force capable of participating directly in social change. Nevertheless, an important distinction remained. Whereas Alash intellectuals increasingly connected cultural and educational activity with the formation of national political subjectivity, Maladnyak initially approached national cultural development as a component of socialist modernization. Its early national discourse was therefore not fundamentally anti-systemic but represented an attempt to establish a Belarusian national cultural space within the emerging Soviet institutional framework.

This distinction makes a direct political equivalence between the two movements methodologically inappropriate. At the same time, it constitutes one of the most productive dimensions of the comparison, since it demonstrates how broadly comparable national cultural objectives could generate different literary strategies under different political conditions.

Ideological Transformation and the Maladnyak Experience

An analysis of Maladnyak requires a distinction between its early development and the subsequent period of increasing political and ideological control. During the 1920s, the expansion of Belarusian-language education and publishing and the establishment of literary organizations created conditions favorable to national cultural development. National cultural aspirations and Soviet revolutionary discourse could therefore coexist, although not without tension.

As political control intensified, this relative balance became increasingly difficult to maintain. Stronger ideological expectations concerning the social function of literature restricted the thematic and aesthetic possibilities available to writers. Under such conditions, the relationship between direct public expression and indirect literary representation acquired particular significance. Symbolism, metaphor, allegory, and other forms of figurative expression could provide writers with alternative means of articulating positions that could not always be expressed directly.

This relationship should nevertheless be interpreted cautiously. The presence of symbolism or allegory in a literary work cannot in itself be treated as evidence of censorship or political resistance. Figurative language is also an autonomous aesthetic phenomenon. Its possible political or ideological significance must therefore be established through close textual analysis, the writer's creative development, publication history, and the specific historical context. What can be observed, however, is a broader relationship between the contraction of opportunities for direct public expression and the increasing importance of indirect modes of literary communication.

This transformation illustrates a broader tension in the relationship between literature and ideology. As political institutions increasingly seek to incorporate literature into official ideological communication, authorial discourse may move toward accommodation with official language, indirect encoding of alternative meanings, or various intermediate strategies. The departure of a number of writers from Maladnyak and their search for alternative literary environments can also be understood in this context. Such organizational transformations reflected not merely personal or institutional disagreements but a deeper debate concerning the purpose and autonomy of literature.

Awakening, Renewal, and Political Subjectivity

The relationship between Alash writers and political authority developed according to a different historical logic. Questions of national autonomy, land, language, education, and statehood connected Alash discourse with political subjectivity from an early stage. Consequently, the national idea expressed through literature extended beyond the protection of cultural rights.

The concept of «awakening" occupies a particularly important place within this discourse. It develops from the literal image of awakening into a broader metaphor for the transformation of national consciousness. Education, preservation of the native language, awareness of historical circumstances, and participation in public life become interconnected dimensions of this process. Enlightenment in Alash discourse should therefore not be understood exclusively as a pedagogical project. The educated individual is also imagined as a socially responsible subject capable of understanding the relationship between language, land, history, rights, and collective responsibility.

The concept of renewal in Maladnyak literature similarly involves the transformation of the individual, but its initial political orientation differs. The «new person" is primarily imagined as an active participant in revolutionary social transformation. Both discourses thus seek to transform the passive individual into an active social subject, but the political direction of that transformation is not identical. In Alash discourse, awakening contributes to the political and cultural subjectivity of the national community; in early Maladnyak discourse, renewal is connected with participation in revolutionary social construction while maintaining a Belarusian national cultural identity.

The Individual, Censorship, and Cultural Memory

Another point of convergence concerns the relationship between the individual and the historical system. The political transformations of the early twentieth century complicated the position of the writer: the intellectual could simultaneously function as a representative of national culture and become an object of institutional and ideological control.

Maxim Goretsky's work illustrates this tension in Belarusian literature. His treatment of moral choice, individual responsibility, and psychological division demonstrates that literary experience cannot be reduced to political slogans. In *Two Souls*, internal division has both psychological and axiological dimensions, raising the question of how individual moral integrity can be preserved amid radical social transformation.

Comparable concerns are present in Kazakh literature. Psychological complexity in the prose of Zhusupbek Aimauytuly, the relationship between spiritual freedom and national destiny in Magzhan Zhumabayev's poetry, and the theme of social responsibility in Mirzhakyp Dulatuly's writing all connect individual experience with the historical fate of the national community. In both traditions, national revival is therefore inseparable from questions concerning the formation of an intellectually independent and morally responsible individual.

Censorship constitutes an important analytical category in understanding these processes. Its effects extend beyond decisions concerning whether a text may be published. Over time, censorship may influence subject matter, vocabulary, narrative strategy, figurative language, and the writer's relationship with the reader.

The Belarusian literary experience provides an important example. The editorial and censorial history of Yakub Kolas's *Symon the Musician* demonstrates the methodological importance of considering different textual versions and publication histories. Where manuscripts, editorial revisions, correspondence, later editions, or other documentary evidence are available, comparison between these materials can reveal dimensions of a work's semantic history that may not be visible in the final published version alone.

Political repression similarly affected the subsequent reception and canonization of Alash literature. The removal of works from public circulation disrupted the continuity of literary memory. Repression should therefore be considered not solely in terms of the personal tragedy experienced by individual writers but also as a process capable of disrupting the mechanisms through which cultural memory is transmitted. Research examining the relationship between the Alash idea and censorship likewise demonstrates the significance of ideological restrictions for the public representation of national ideas [13].

A comparable process occurred in Belarusian literature. Political repression altered not only the lives of individual writers but also the structure of national literary memory through the restriction of texts, the exclusion of authors from official literary histories, and interruptions in the circulation and reception of their works. Its literary consequences can therefore be considered at

three interconnected levels: the restriction or destruction of individual creative agency, the disruption of textual circulation, and the restructuring of how subsequent generations encountered and interpreted the national literary past.

The functional parallels between Kazakh intellectuals such as Akhmet Baitursynuly and Belarusian writers such as Maxim Goretsky should therefore be understood as responses to comparable historical challenges rather than as evidence of direct personal or ideological equivalence. During periods of national literary transformation, the establishment of linguistic norms, the development of educational materials, the preservation of cultural heritage, and the formation of new readerships may emerge simultaneously as intellectual priorities. Typological similarity between national literatures does not necessarily presuppose direct influence; comparable historical problems can generate comparable cultural and intellectual functions in different national contexts.

Two Models of National Literary Discourse

The comparative analysis makes it possible to identify two analytical models of national discourse. These models should be understood as interpretative frameworks rather than rigid classifications.

The first may be defined as a discourse of national subjectivity, most clearly represented by the Alash literary and intellectual environment. Its central components include language, land, historical memory, education, cultural autonomy, national self-determination, and social responsibility. Literature within this model participates in the formation of the national community as a conscious historical and political subject.

The second may be described as a discourse of national-cultural renewal within an existing political system, characteristic of the early Maladnyak period. Its central features include the development of the Belarusian language, the modernization of national literature, the formation of a new readership, and attempts to reconcile national cultural aspirations with revolutionary social transformation. The subsequent transformation of the second model constitutes an important finding of the study. As political centralization and ideological control intensified, the earlier compatibility between national cultural development and Soviet institutional structures became increasingly unstable. Literary discourse responded through several strategies, including accommodation to official ideological language, indirect or figurative articulation of alternative meanings, and the pursuit of greater literary autonomy.

The historical trajectories of Alash and Maladnyak therefore converge at certain points while originating from substantially different political positions. Alash intellectual discourse articulated questions of national political subjectivity from an early stage, whereas Maladnyak initially operated on the assumption that Belarusian national culture could develop within the Soviet project. Subsequent political centralization and ideological regulation, however, increasingly restricted the possibilities for autonomous national intellectual discourse in both literary environments.

Conclusion

A comparative-historical and discursive study of the works of Alash and Maladnyak writers of the first quarter of the twentieth century has demonstrated that the processes of national revival in Kazakh and Belarusian literature, despite a number of typological similarities, were characterized by significant differences arising from their specific historical and political contexts. The findings indicate that these two literary environments cannot be regarded as direct political or ideological equivalents. Nevertheless, their comparison through such shared analytical categories as national language, historical memory, cultural autonomy, enlightenment, individual freedom, and the social function of literature provides a deeper understanding of their distinctive characteristics. From this perspective, the similarity between the Alash and Maladnyak phenomena lies primarily not in the correspondence of their specific political programs, but in the transformation of literature into a space for national self-understanding, cultural preservation, and the revival of national communities under conditions of profound historical change.

The first research question sought to determine the artistic and discursive strategies through which ideas of national identity, language, historical memory, and national revival were articulated

in the works of Alash and Maladnyak writers, as well as to identify the similarities and differences between these strategies. The analysis demonstrated that, in both literary environments, the native language, historical memory, education, and cultural revival constituted the principal semantic foundations of national identity. During this period, literature functioned not merely as a cultural sphere producing aesthetic value but also developed into an intellectual institution capable of shaping and transforming public consciousness.

In the works of Alash writers, the native language emerged as a fundamental marker of national identity and as a means of preserving the historical subjectivity of the people. The question of language formed an integrated conceptual system together with the ideas of education, land, historical consciousness, cultural independence, and national statehood. Consequently, the national discourse of Alash literature cannot be adequately understood as a collection of separate patriotic motifs. Rather, it functioned as an intellectual model that interconnected the historical past, the contemporary condition of the nation, and its future trajectory. The development of national literature, the establishment of education in the native language, the revival of historical memory, and the strengthening of social responsibility were ultimately directed toward the formation of the nation as a conscious historical and political subject.

The revival of the native language and national culture was likewise among the central values articulated in the works of Maladnyak writers. The publication of literary periodicals and collections, the involvement of new writers in the literary process, the expansion of the expressive and artistic capacities of the Belarusian language, and the formation of a new readership strengthened the role of literature as a national cultural institution. However, the political semantics of national revival within Maladnyak developed differently from those of Alash. Its early representatives did not perceive national culture as being in absolute opposition to the Soviet project of revolutionary renewal. On the contrary, under the conditions of Belarusization in the 1920s, they sought to make use of the institutional opportunities created by the new political order for the development of the national language and literature.

This distinction highlights one of the important conclusions of the study: although similar concepts and categories were employed within the two literary environments, their political meanings were not identical. Whereas national revival in Alash discourse was associated with political subjectivity, autonomy, and national self-determination, early Maladnyak discourse regarded national revival as an opportunity to develop national culture within the framework of the emerging Soviet social order. Thus, in response to the first research question, the principal factor uniting the works of Alash and Maladnyak writers was their common emphasis on the formation of national identity through language, historical memory, and literature, while the principal distinction between them lay in their different understandings of the political prospects and institutional frameworks of that national identity.

The second research question sought to determine how the differing relationships of the Alash and Maladnyak literary circles with political authority and dominant ideology influenced the evolution of national discourse, artistic strategies, and forms of authorial expression. The findings demonstrate that this factor constituted one of the principal distinctions between the two literary environments.

Within Alash intellectual discourse, the national question acquired a socio-political dimension from the outset. The close connection of language, education, land, culture, and literature with ideas of national autonomy and statehood transformed literary creativity itself into a space for the formation and articulation of political subjectivity. In this context, literature functioned not merely as an observer or reflection of social change but also as an intellectual force that contributed to the people's recognition of themselves as historical subjects. The idea of enlightenment likewise acquired a political dimension: an educated individual was understood not simply as a literate person, but as a socially and civically conscious subject capable of recognizing national and social responsibilities.

The initial situation of Maladnyak was different. The attempt of its representatives to pursue national cultural development alongside revolutionary renewal contributed to the relatively open character of its early creative discourse. During the period of Belarusization, the expansion of the

public use of the Belarusian language and the development of national literary institutions provided writers with a new cultural space. The materials examined in the study demonstrate that, during this period, Maladnyak, while operating within and recognizing the Soviet political framework, sought to develop Belarusian national culture. This constituted one of its fundamental differences from the Alash intellectual and literary environment.

However, subsequent political centralization exposed the internal contradictions of this model. The intensification of ideological control disrupted the earlier relative balance between national cultural autonomy and the political system. As literary production was increasingly expected to conform to official ideological requirements, the artistic freedom of writers became progressively restricted.

The subsequent political repression experienced by representatives of both Alash and Maladnyak created another historical parallel between the two literary environments. Nevertheless, the significance of repression cannot be reduced solely to the tragic personal destinies of individual writers. Its consequences also affected the structure and continuity of national literary memory: the removal of works from public circulation, the exclusion of authors' names from official literary history, and restrictions on the republication and dissemination of texts disrupted the continuity of cultural transmission. Political repression can therefore be understood as a phenomenon that produced simultaneous ruptures at the personal, textual, and institutional levels of literary history.

The overall findings of the study demonstrate the necessity of approaching literature in the first quarter of the twentieth century not as a supplementary element of national culture, but as one of the intellectual institutions actively involved in the formation of the nation. In the experiences of both Alash and Maladnyak, literature participated in the consolidation of linguistic norms, the reconstruction of historical memory, the dissemination of social and cultural values, the formation of new readerships, and the conceptualization of the individual's place within society. Literary texts, therefore, did not merely reflect an already established national identity; they actively participated in its production, articulation, and transformation within specific historical circumstances.

From this perspective, the scholarly contribution of the present study lies not in presenting Alash and Maladnyak as direct equivalents, but in identifying different political trajectories of national literary revival by examining their literary and intellectual experiences through a shared set of analytical coordinates. Such a comparative perspective makes it possible to reveal both the typological proximity and the historical specificity of the two literary environments and, more broadly, to demonstrate how national literature could develop different strategies of cultural preservation, intellectual self-definition, and engagement with political power under the changing ideological conditions of the first quarter of the twentieth century.

References

1. Koygeldiev M. Alash movement: an auxiliary textbook. – Almaty: Sanat, 1995. – 368 p.
2. Nurpeyisov K. Alash and Alashorda. – Almaty: Atatek, 1995. – 256 p.
3. Kamzabekuly D. Alash arch: research. L. N. Gumilev. Eurasian National University, «Alash» Institute of Culture and Spiritual Development... – Almaty: Kazakh Encyclopedia, 2017. – 405 p.
4. Yerdembekov B., Kassymova A., Aubakirova K., Tulebayeva K. Implementation of the Alash Idea in Literary Translations (On the Example of Contemporary Kazakh Literature) // Open Cultural Studies. 2025. – Vol. 9, No. 1. – Article 20250052. – DOI: 10.1515/culture-2025-0052
5. Omaruly B. Contemporary poetry: genesis, typology, poetics. – Almaty: Obrazom, 2000.
6. Sharip A. The art of speech and the national spirit: a textbook. – Astana: Pedagogical Press, 2010. – 240 p.
7. Kohler G.B. Literary Journals From the Perspective of Paratext: Considerations on Conceptualization and Database-Driven Investigation of Literary Periodicals Using the Examples of «Polymia», «Maladniak» and «Uzvyšša» // Studia Białorutenistyczne. 2019.
8. Dovnar L. Belarusian Bibliography and National Revival in 1920s // Knygotyra. 2007. – Vol. 48. – P. 53-66. – DOI: 10.15388/kn.v48i0.8111.

9. Dovnar L. A Non-Governmental Language in the Book Publishing of Western and Soviet Belarus (1921-1939): An Attempt of Comparative Analysis // Knygotyra. 2016. – Vol. 66. – P. 129-147. – DOI: 10.15388/kn.v66i0.10021.
10. Marková A. The Belarusians as a Nation? «The Belarussization Episode» of the 1920s and the Issue of National Identity // The First International Congress of Belarusian Studies. Working Papers. – Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University Press, 2011. – Vol. 1. – P. 171-175.
11. Dovnar L. Belarusian book as a universal of national culture // Knygotyra. 2010. – Vol. 54. – P. 161-172. – DOI: 10.15388/kn.v54i0.3580.
12. Aubakirova KA, Karimkhan Z., Kassymova A. The evolution of memoir prose: from ancient Turkic writings to the present day // Keruen. 2024. – Vol. 85, No. 4. – DOI: 10.53871/2078-8134.2024.4-06
13. Aubakirova KA, Yerdembekov B., Saidyrakhman U. The idea of Alash and censorship // Society and era. 2024. – Vol. 2, No. 82. – DOI: 10.52536/2788-5860.2024-2.05

Қ.Ә. Әубәкірова
Шәкәрім университеті,
071412, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей қ., Глинка к-сі, 20 А
ORCID: 0000-0002-1872-9591
e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com

ӘДЕБИЕТ ЖӘНЕ ИДЕОЛОГИЯ: АЛАШ - МАЛАДНЯК ҚАЛАМГЕРЛЕРІНІҢ ШЫҒАРМАШЫЛЫҒЫНДАҒЫ ҰЛТТЫҚ ДИСКУРС

Аңдатпа. Мақалада XX ғасырдың бірінші ширегіндегі қазақ және беларусь әдебиетінің дамуы «Алаш» қозғалысы мен «Маладняк» әдеби бірлестігі өкілдерінің интеллектуалдық және әдеби мұрасын салыстырмалы талдау негізінде қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – ұқсас әлеуметтік-саяси жағдайларда қызмет еткен қазақ және беларусь зиялыларының шығармаларында ұлттық сана, тіл, тарихи жады, мәдени автономия және жеке тұлға еркіндігі идеяларының қалай көрініс тапқанын анықтау, сондай-ақ олардың кеңестік идеологиямен қарым-қатынасындағы ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды айқындау. Әдіснамалық тұрғыдан зерттеуде салыстырмалы әдебиеттану, тарихи-контекстік, типологиялық және интерпретациялық талдау әдістері ұштастырылады. «Алаш» пен «Маладняк» тек ұлттық әдеби құбылыстар ретінде ғана емес, XX ғасырдың басындағы империялық және кеңестік трансформациялар жағдайында қалыптасқан интеллектуалдық құрылымдар ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеу нәтижелері екі әдеби ортада да ана тілін және ұлттық мәдениетті сақтау, тарихи сананы жаңғырту және әдебиеттің қоғамдық рөлін күшейту идеяларының маңызды орын алғанын көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар олардың саяси билікпен қарым-қатынасында елеулі айырмашылықтар байқалды. «Алаш» зиялылары ұлттық жаңғыруды автономия және саяси өзін-өзі айқындау идеяларымен байланыстырса, «Маладняк» өкілдерінің бастапқы шығармашылық стратегиялары беларусь әдебиеті мен тілін кеңестік мәдени саясат аясында дамытуға бағытталды. Кейін идеологиялық бақылаудың күшеюі олардың шығармашылық еркіндігін шектеп, бірқатар өкілдерінің саяси қуғын-сүргінге ұшырауына әкелді. Зерттеу қазақ және беларусь әдебиетіндегі ұлттық жаңғыру тәжірибесін ортақ салыстырмалы модель аясында қарастырып, әдебиетті ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыратын, мәдени жадты сақтайтын және саяси қысымға интеллектуалдық жауап білдіретін кеңістік ретінде тұжырымдау арқылы салыстырмалы әдебиеттануға үлес қосады.

Тірек сөздер: қазақ әдебиеті, белорус әдебиеті, Алаш, Маладняк, ұлттық бірегейлік, кеңестік идеология, әдеби репрессия.

К.А. Аубакирова
Шәкәрім университет,
071412, Республика Казахстан, г. Семей, улица Глинка, 20 А
ORCID: 0000-0002-1872-9591
e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com

ЛИТЕРАТУРА И ИДЕОЛОГИЯ: НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ДИСКУРС В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ ПИСАТЕЛЕЙ АЛАШ и МАЛАДНЯК

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается развитие казахской и белорусской литературы первой четверти XX века на основе сравнительного анализа интеллектуального и литературного наследия движения «Алаш» и литературного объединения «Маладняк». Цель исследования – выявить, каким образом идеи национального самосознания, языка, исторической памяти, культурной автономии и личной свободы были представлены в творчестве казахской и белорусской интеллигенции, действовавшей в сходных социально-политических условиях, а также определить сходства и различия в их отношениях с советской идеологической системой. Методология исследования объединяет сравнительно-литературный, историко-контекстуальный, типологический и интерпретативный анализ. «Алаш» и «Маладняк» рассматриваются не только как явления национальных литератур, но и как интеллектуальные формирования, сложившиеся под воздействием имперских и советских трансформаций начала XX века. Результаты исследования показывают, что в обеих литературных средах особое значение придавалось сохранению родного языка и национальной культуры, реконструкции исторического сознания и общественной роли литературы. Вместе с тем были выявлены существенные различия в их взаимоотношениях с политической властью. Интеллектуалы «Алаша» связывали национальное возрождение с автономией и политическим самоопределением, тогда как ранние творческие стратегии представителей «Маладняка» были направлены на развитие белорусской литературы и языка в рамках советской культурной политики. Последующее усиление идеологического контроля ограничило их творческую автономию, а ряд представителей объединения подвергся политическим репрессиям. Исследование вносит вклад в сравнительное литературоведение, рассматривая казахский и белорусский опыт национального литературного возрождения в рамках единой аналитической модели и интерпретируя литературу как пространство формирования национальной идентичности, сохранения культурной памяти и выражения интеллектуальной реакции на политическое давление.

Ключевые слова: казахская литература, белорусская литература, алаш, маладняк, национальная идентичность, советская идеология, литературные репрессии.

About the author

Karlygash Aubakirova – PhD in Philology, Shakarim University, Senior Lecturer, Department of Kazakh Philology, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey city, e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1872-9591.

Автор туралы мәлімет

Әубәкірова Қарлығаш Әділханқызы – филология ғылымдарының PhD докторы, Шәкәрім университеті, «Қазақ филологиясы» кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей, e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1872-9591.

Сведения об авторе

Аубакирова Карлыгаш Адилхановна – доктор PhD, Шәкәрім университет, старший преподаватель кафедры «Казахская филология», Республика Казахстан, Семей, e-mail: kz.aubakirova@gmail.com , ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1872-9591.

Received 15.07.2026
Accepted 27.09.2026