

THE STUDY OF 20TH CENTURY UZBEK LITERATURE IN UZBEKISTAN (1940–2018)*

1. INTRODUCTION

After the complete establishment of the Soviet rule, literary criticism became one of the main weapons to publicize benefits of the Communist Party. All scientific schools except the Marxist method were heavily labelled as “bourgeois reaction.” In the 1920s–1930s, the interpretations based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology destroyed a number of writers’ lives who were representatives of “Jadids,” “nationalists,” and “petit bourgeois” and led them into trouble.

In the 1940s, the investigations concerning the analysis of the problems of spiritual depiction were also seriously criticized as aesthetic-cosmopolitanism. Even aesthetic thoughts of literature such as beauty, tragedy, spiritual perfectness, and lowliness were studied from the point of communist ideology. Those objects based on the policy of “might makes right” were brought to create writings in decided shapes and to smother free creativity. As a result, schematism, utopian ideas of false humanism, and a tendency to analyze from the point of view of the social classes were developed in literary works. Objectiveness and possibilities of literary critics in analysis were limited, and criticism was declared as the main power of the Communist Party. Literature and literary critics became one focal point of the ideological struggle.¹ However, it is important to emphasize that some literary critics such as Ozod Sharaffidinov and Matyoqub Qo’shjonov car-

ried out important research related to the 20th century literature, which managed to renew literary critical ideas and critical thought from 1960 to 1985. Yet, these kinds of investigations were not enough to pressure vulgar socialist methods and create a new methodology of Uzbek literature in that period.

After 1990, with a change of political regime, literary politics also remained in the bottom of history with its own creator—colonial system, and a huge vacuum appeared between the old and new periods of Uzbek literary criticism. Bound to the old approaches, some Uzbek scholars openly continued to follow the old methodological tendencies, while others waited for a “prepared methodological model” for the new Uzbek literary process.

In the next stage of literary criticism, the independence period, a basic reinventing process appeared in literary thought and in literary works, which can be termed “modern.” It became clear that it was impossible to understand and realize the essence of a new literary process through old literary criteria, although each period had its own leading views. Even for the leaders of Uzbek literary criticism, it was hard to accept the new literary phenomenon. As a result, uncompromising struggles between new and old methodological approaches appeared from 1995 to the 2000s.

In the current article, I will systematically analyze the duration of the study of the 20th century Uzbek literature. I will identify specific features of each period and show how Soviet realism impacted Uzbek literary criticism. In addition, I will reveal the main essence of paradoxical approaches in reinvented literary art, and show fundamental factors of conflicts in creating a new tendency of methodology of Uzbek literary criticism in the transitional period.

2. THE STUDY OF UZBEK SOVIET LITERATURE (FROM THE 1940S TO THE FIRST HALF OF THE 1980S)

Uzbek literature of the Soviet period played, on the one hand, an important role in the development of national literature by its wider coverage of ideological and artistic content and artistic complexity of all spheres of social life and development of genres. Abdulla Qodiriy, Abdulhamid Sulaymon o‘g‘li Cho‘lpon, Abdurauf Fitrat, Muso Toshmuhammad o‘g‘li Oybek, Abdulla Qahhor, and many other Uzbek writers played a significant role in the emergence, formation, and development of Uzbek realistic literature of the 20th century despite terrible repressions. Even within the context of Soviet literature, there appeared such great novels as “Navoiy” by M. T. Oybek, “Treasures of Ulugh Bek” (Ulug‘bek xazinasi) and “The Old

World” (Koʻhna dunyo) by Odil Yoqubov, and “Starry Nights” (Yulduz litunlar) and “The Pass of Generations” (Avlodlar dovoni) by Primqul Qodirov. Despite the prevalence of the method of socialist realism and communist ideology in literary studies, such scholars as M. Qoʻshjonov, O. Sharaiddinov, Umarali Normatov, Naim Karimov, and Bakhtiyor Nazarov in some research based their ideas on scientific observations and logical (gnoseological) approach. On the other hand, even in theoretical and textological studies,² the influence of the ideology of the epoch could clearly be seen. Even though Uzbek scholars tried to submit new ways of studying Uzbek Soviet literature from the 1940s to 1970s, it was impossible for them to get rid of the impact of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The method of socialist realism was a dominant one in studies of Uzbek Soviet literature during that period. As a result of literature becoming the most trusted servant of the Soviet government, there appeared thousands of literary writings that were completely ideological and political by nature, and shallow and poor by artistic value, portraying a false picture. Many artists fell victim to social, political, and ideological views, and many more became the eyes, ears, and voices of the Communist Party in the field of fiction. “From tribunes, Soviet writers promised that they would write ‘according to the command of the heart.’ And their hearts said that they wholly belonged to the party” [Rasulov 2002: 52].

After the resolution of Russia’s Communist Party on June 18, 1925 “On the policy of the party in literature,” literary criticism became “a devastating struggling force in literature against counter-revolutionary forces” [*Russkaya Sovetskaya literaturnaya kritika* 1981: 83] and many scholarly studies appeared to show that literature was a supporter of the party and the people [Mamajonov 1962, 1964; Qoʻshjonov 1962, 1974; *Oʻzbek Sovet adabiyoti tarixi* 1967, 1971; Nazarov 1977, 1979; Normatov 1982].

The principle of social analysis—analysis of a literary work from the social point of view—initiated by Georgiy Valentinovich Plekhanov (1856–1918) at the end of the 19th century and continued through the beginning of the 20th century, served as a guideline for Uzbek literary critics.

In fact, social analysis or sociological method is based on studies of literary works and facts related to literature in close connection with the social life. To be more precise, regarding literature and arts as a social phenomenon starts with Plato’s “Republic.” The value of the sociological analysis is in its ability to produce scientifically valid conclusions through studying a literary text considering the notions of “the epoch,” “the spirit of the nation” (the cultural level and tradition achieved at the time the text is created), and “the environment” (nature, climate, social circumstances). However, unfortunately, this method not only was taken as the basis for

Soviet literary studies, but also made absolute. As a result, the understanding of the focus of literary studies and the range of issues of its interest narrowed and was explained from this relatively narrow point of view. To be more precise, sociology became more vulgar. That is, its main principles listed above were applied in a distorted way. As a result, readers were distracted, and writers were repressed. Analysis of literary works from a purely social point of view, based on the principles of the ideology of the party and “closeness to peoples,” taking into consideration only the current issues, politics, and ideology of the epoch, led to the situation where novels such as “Days Gone By” (O‘tkan kunlar) and “A Scorpion from the Altar” (Mehrobdan Chayon) by A. Qodiriy or “Night and Day” (Kecha va Kunduz) by A. S. Cho‘lpon, as well as works of those who wrote during the Soviet rule like M. T. Oybek or Asqad Muxtor were labeled as not good. Those scholars, writers, or artists who did not glorify the party in their works or who defended their own point of view were executed or repressed. The social concept of beauty based on Marxist theory was developed in Uzbek Soviet literature and literary criticism and had its impact on the literature of the 1940s–1960s.

Literary characters who “found their fortune through labor” such as Yulchi in Oybek’s “Sacred Blood” (Qutlug‘ qon), Gofir in Hamza Hakimzade Niyazi’s “The Rich and the Servant” (Boy ila xizmatchi), Kukan in Gafur G‘ulom’s “Kukan batrak” (Kukan the hired worker) or Zaynab in Hamid Olimjon’s “Zaynab and Omon” (Zaynab va Omon) were praised as ideals by Uzbek literary critics. A song “People of labor” (Mehnat ahli) to the lyrics of Akmal Pulat was broadcast by radio at least once a day as “a perfect song with perfect music,” and the communist ideology made this song an unofficial anthem of working Uzbekistan [Rasulov 2002: 73].

In the 1940s–1950s, directors on literary policy, outlined in the resolutions and other documents of the Communist Party, defined the functional tasks of Soviet literature and literary criticism. All the issues regarded as urgent by the government (e.g. national opposition, the Basmachi movement (*basmachilik*), World War II, collectivization of agriculture, etc.) had to be reflected in literature, and leading scholars monitored and checked the progress of KGB’s (in Russian Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti; State Security Committee) functional tasks reflected in literature [Normatov 1981, 1982].

Starting from the second half of the 1950s, attempts to rigorously follow the guidelines of the method of socialist realism and to describe the revolutionary development of life began both in literature and literary criticism. One of the main requirements of socialist realism was to produce works of literature national in terms of the form and socialist in terms of

the contents, and these works had to meet the following requirements:

1. Depiction of past Turkic nations, including Uzbeks, only in black colors;
2. Depiction of the Basmachi (after independence they were called “representatives of national movement”) as the worst enemies;
3. Defense of a “modern Soviet woman” who struggled against a husband with feudal outlooks;
4. Depiction of the happiness of people after the October Revolution;
5. Total rejection of religious beliefs and national identity linked with ancestors and heroes of the past;
6. Creation of a “new man” who was the active builder of a communist society and who lived such a happy life;
7. Depiction of a “new man” or a “new hero” who was characterized as having such virtues as “communist attitude, ... humanism, internationalism, communist principality, honesty, ability to truly understand the beauty of life, optimism” [Sharafiddinov 1962: 4], and as one from the lower levels of society like servant, and of course raised under the influence of a Russian hero;
8. Depiction of “the revolutionary nature of changes in life” and regarding the history of societies as a “struggle between social classes,” which required the presence of a negative character (antagonist) along with the positive character (protagonist), with their inevitable fight like rams [Tog‘aev 1970; Kattabekov 1996].

Uzbek scholars, literary critics, and intelligentsia had to theoretically and scientifically support the conceptual ideas in works written according to the principles of socialist realism, and analyze such works according to the social, ideological, cultural, and aesthetic needs of the Communist Party.³ Based on the examples from Uzbek Soviet literature⁴ such conceptual ideas were put forward as literature serving the principles of the Communist Party, representing the impossibility of separating literature from ideology and ideology being reflected in the correct portrayal of social classes. In this process, such literary critics as M. Qo‘shjonov, O. Sharafiddinov, Laziz Qayumov, Norboy Xudoyberganov, To‘xta Boboey, U. Normatov, B. Nazarov, Salohiddin Mamajonov, N. Karimov, and others played a significant role in the development of the 20th century’s Uzbek literary criticism. They participated actively, sometimes willingly and sometimes under strong ideological pressures.

As a response to the tasks outlined by the Soviet government, there

appeared such short stories, novellas, and novels as “Sacred Blood” and “A Great Path” (Ulug‘ yo‘l) M. T. Oybek, “Ferghana until Dawn” (Farg‘ona tong otguncha), “A Torch”(Mash‘al), “Khorezm” (Xorazm), “A Song of Freedom” (Erk qo‘shig‘i), “Dawn” (Subhidam), “Netay”, and “A Watch” (Soat) by G. G‘ulom, “A Park of Amusements” (Tomoshabog‘) by A. Qahhor, or “The Sisters” (Opa Singillar) by A. Muxtor. The requirement to portray the reality in the revolutionary development led to the appearance of artificial conventions in literature. For instance, literary characters of Russian people, such as Petrov in “Sacred Blood,” Yefim Danilovich Nadezhdin in “The Sisters,” Stokgulov in “A Park of Amusements,” a journalist woman Novikova in “The Lights of Kosh-chinar” (Qo‘schinor chiroqlari), Stepan in “A Karakalpak Poem” (Qoraqalpoq qissasi), Ivanov in “A Torch,” and many others were in most cases⁵ chosen based on the requirements of the party or the policy of Russification (Russianization). The works of writers who did not show the revolutionary progress through the image of a Russian person were heavily criticized in preliminary discussions, and the authors had to rewrite their works to artificially introduce a Russian character.⁶

In analyzing literary works based on the principles of socialist realism, the main focus of literary critics was:

1. Depiction of the life and struggle of the Uzbek people before the October Revolution;
2. Depiction of the revolutionary mood starting to awaken in the minds of people: the dynamics of “new people” and “new heroes” and positive changes in their minds, the development of the revolutionary mind and the impact of Russian people on this;
3. Making “historic changes” serve “the spiritual changes in the minds of Soviet people”;
4. Idealizing “inimitable ladies”—“Soviet women,” “whose mind was full of communist and democratic ideas” [Boboev 1978a: 75], “modern women” such as Zaynab in “Zaynab and Omon” (H. Olimjon, 1938), Saida in “A Small Bird” (Sinchalak; A. Qahhor, 1958), or Oyqiz in “Stronger than a Storm” (Bo‘rondan kuchli; Sharof Rashidov, 1958), who refused to obey their husbands, who were innovators and creators, free from any dogmatism and having courage to fight against unjust marriages, and who were shaped under the influence of the revolution and great historical changes that happened in the 1930s;
5. Scientific and theoretical validation of the commitment of the authors to ideas of the Communist Party and their attempts to sup-

port the theory and ideology of the party.

The center of Uzbek literary criticism in the 1960s as one of the best classical examples of socialist realism was “Sacred Blood” (1940) by M. T. Oybek, a novelist, poet, translator, and critic [Qo‘shjonov 1962, 1973; Boboev 1976; Nazarov 1977, 1979, 1985; Rasulov 1978]. Much research based on socialist method had appeared which focused on depicting revolutionary consciousness. For instance, an Uzbek literary critic T. Boboev in his book *Epoch and Hero* (*Zamon va qahramon*) published in 1976, showing his attitude towards the character of Petrov—a Russian person in Oybek’s “Sacred Blood,” notes that it would be impossible to understand the essence of deep qualitative changes in Yulchi, the main character of the novel, without Petrov. According to him, there were deep qualitative changes in Yulchi’s behavior, feelings, and way of thinking, and it was Petrov who played a significant role in these changes [Boboev 1976: 53]. According to Abdug‘afur Rasulov, another Uzbek scholar, “the struggle of the people against exploiters was shown through the main character, Yulchi, and other characters. Yulchi is a typical representative of a new person with a strong fighting personality and character” [Rasulov 1978: 7].

One of the leading critics of the 20th century Uzbek literature, B. Nazarov confirms that “Oybek was a typical example of his colleagues with his works showing the profound development of the principles of democracy and partyhood in the pre-Great World War. For instance, in his writings such as “Dilbar is a Daughter of the Period” (*Dilbar, davr qizi*; 1932), “Revenge” (*O‘ch*; 1932), and “Baxtigul and Sog‘indiq” (*Baxtigul va Sog‘indiq*; 1934) are first of all a part of the point of depicting the events and heroes in high party position” [Nazarov 1985: 63]. It becomes clear that in analyzing “Sacred Blood,” (in other works also written in the method of socialist realism) the guiding principle that Uzbek scholars relied on was the significance of Russian culture, history, and people in creating ideal characters who could support the author’s ideas and goals. At the same time, despite the fact that Oybek’s “Sacred Blood” was praised as the best example of socialist realism and was rewritten several times by the author as a response to heavy criticism of literary scholars to meet the ideology requirements of the time, the novel was also criticized by some critics [Mirzaeva 2017: 126].

Along with M. T. Oybek, other writers including A. Qahhor, H. Olimjon, and G. G‘ulom were also under such a subjective approach. Moreover, the method of “dirty nail clipping” became an unpleasant tradition in the Soviet literary criticism in the 1940s–1970s. Along with the genres of the prose, the increase of the party spirit and the creative approaches to the

principles of socialist realism led the way in lyric poems as well. The party urged poets to sing about “public interest, social motives, thoughts about the fate of the people, the challenges of time, and the ideas that have engulfed millions.” Religion, philosophy, and age-old values were ignored, and the dominant social moods of the time were reflected or were forced to reflect. All writings and literary studies which successfully served the interests of the Communist Party, Marxism, Leninism, and socialist realism were praised as the best writings of the epoch. For instance, in 1979 B. Nazarov was awarded for his book *Leninist Doctrine and Uzbek Criticism* (Lenincha ta’limot va O‘zbek tanqidchiligi) [Nazarov 1977].

Even in intimate poems, the main emphasis was on social. For example, in the analysis of intimate lyric poems by H. Olimjon, “Spring” (Bahor) and “Love” (Muhabbat), social problems served as the primary motives. Evaluating David Montgomery’s study of Olimjon published in Canada in 1975, L. Qayumov summarized it as an attempt to falsify the poet’s work [Qayumov 1981: 59]. This is because of Qayumov’s concept that if Olimjon’s poems did not reflect the Soviet reality, their value would diminish. Therefore, Qayumov accused Montgomery of distorting the meaning of Olimjon’s poetry and emphasized that “Olimjon was in the correct position, aligned with the Communist Party” [Mirzaeva 2015: 279]. N. Karimov, one of the most fruitful critics in the 20th century Uzbek literature, also emphasized “Hamid Olimjon’s loyalty to Lenin’s idea” while studying his poems [Karimov 1980: 4].

Later, research focused on criticizing the negative impact of the cult of personality in Soviet literature had appeared. In many studies of the 20th century Uzbek literature, it was criticized that many works of Uzbek writers overpraised Stalin’s personality and diminished the deeds of the people and the party. It was noted that the link between the writers and people’s lives weakened at that period, and there were fears of depicting reality as it was, with all the existing complexities and contradictions, and telling the truth.

Another characteristic of the Soviet literary criticism was the rise of attention to biographies of the writers in analyzing their works. A very important factor in deciding the fate of works of literature was their authors’ social background and their “correct” attitude towards the dominant ideology. The subjectivity of the biographical approach slowly lowered the “biography” into a “reference” [Rasulov 2002]. According to Qurdosht Qahramonov, a literary critic, the works of some government officials during the Soviet era were protected from criticism, and even an insignificant criticism of their works was viewed as a bias [Qahramonov 2011: 113].

Foreign studies in the 1950s–1970s were also one of the major prob-

lems of Uzbek Soviet literary criticism. Since these years were the culmination of the search for “literary and political opponents,” literature served as an ideological battleground of the camps of “foreigners” (Edward Allworth, Alexander Beningsen, and others) and “Soviets” (Marat Nurmuhamedov, L. Qayumov, Sherali Turdiev, and others). While efforts of foreign scholars to find anti-Soviet writers and writings in examples of the Uzbek Soviet literature were somewhat artificial, local intellectuals who wrote about foreign studies tried to follow the programs, resolutions, and directions of the party and the government and theoretical scientists from the main cities of the Soviet Union, and by this, to analyze issues from the point of view of a “Soviet ideologist.” The search for “literary-political opposition” divided scholars, translators, writers, and publicists into the camps of “Soviets” and “foreigners,” and both sought, to some extent, to find the “black spots” in the history of literature.

Thus, in the 1940s–1960s, the study of literature only for ideological and political purposes created subjective interpretations. As a result of the distorted analysis of the principles of social studies, some of the best works of Soviet literature were repressed.

New interpretations of works of literature started to emerge in the 1970s, like the depiction of attempts of the Soviet people to build the foundations of the new society after the October Revolution, and the hidden continuation of the struggle of social classes in A. Muxtor’s “Sisters,” “Chinor,” and other Uzbek writings.

3. FROM MARXISM TO PLURALISTIC THOUGHT: REINVENTION PROCESS OF UZBEK LITERARY STUDIES (FROM THE SECOND HALF OF THE 1980S TO THE 1990S)

Although Glasnost and Perestroika in the 1980s greatly influenced the development of artistic and aesthetic thinking, Uzbek literature and Uzbek literary criticism were still under the Soviet censorship, and conflicts between free aspirations of intellectuals and hegemonic ideology were still going on. A group of writers and literary critics took an active part in the processes of “the renewal of socialism during Perestroika” [*Sovet Ittifoqi* 1988: 31]. Some researched issues were “the new features of socialist realism” [Sultonov 1980: 375], “builders of communism,” “what is Uzbek Soviet literature’s role in developing socialist realism” [Xudoyberganov 1988], “How the literature performs the Communist Party’s charges” [Qo’shjonov 1982; Normatov 1987], “the necessity to base literary criticism on the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism” [*O‘zbek Sovet adabiy tanqid* 1987: 10], events

of the “new era,” and “new heroes of the period.”

Scholars such as R. Abdullaeva and M. Vaxobov strongly criticized historical novels and biographies, such as “Starry Nights” (Yulduz litunlar; 1979) by P. Qodirov of idealizing the history of the Uzbek nation, in particular Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur’s personality, and in their analysis of works of literature, followed the vulgar socialism methods that were dominant back in the 1940s–1950s [Vaxobov 1986]. In the analyses of such works of literature as “The Opened Virgin Land” (Ochilgan qo‘riq) and “Human Fate” (Inson taqdiri) by Mikhail Sholokhov, “The Blacksmith Jura” (Temirchi Jo‘ra) by M. T. Oybek, “Jontemir” by Uygun, and “As If There Were Blessings in the Storms” (Bo‘ronlarda bordek halovat) by A. Muxtor, Uzbek scholars kept focusing on positive characters—the image of selfless communists and the impact of such negative tendencies as bribery, careerism, and nepotism on the economy of the republic and on people’s spiritual lives. The characteristic features of a “Soviet woman”—a creative heroine and an active carrier of the communist ideology—were still idealized in this period too.

At the same time, from 1979 through the 1980s, there appeared such works as “White Birds, Snow-White Birds” (Oqqushlar oppoqqushlar) by Odil Yoqubov, “The Abyss” (Girdob) and “Handcuffs” (Kishan) by O‘ktam Usmonov, “The Lightning on the Edge of the Chasm” (Jar yoqasida chaqmoq) by A. Muxtor, “Between Entrance and Exit” (Ikkieshi korasi), “The Affairs of the World” (Dunyoning gishlari) by O‘tkir Hoshimov, and “The Birthday of Otoy” (Otoyning tug‘ilgan yili) by Erkin A‘zam, which depicted an array of the complex issues of the nation, including fierce struggles between truth and injustice, and these works became favorite writings of the common people. A television drama based on the novel “The Abyss” was a hit. The first reason for this situation was that the society had had enough of the dry absurdities of socialist realism method, and needed works of literature with heroic characters, who were morally rich, pure, honest, and courageous, and exhibited a variety of moral and ethical posits. Secondly, readers were tired of works written under the influence of socialist realism with its one-sided approach to life, portraying characters only as purely positive or negative and with an inadequate idealization of Soviet people. On the contrary, portrayal of individuals from different sides in the works mentioned above, including “The Abyss” and “Between Entrance and Exit,” appealed to the reader. Although characters in these books were Soviet people, the social features of the human life were intertwined with their identity, and overgeneralization, a common characteristic of Soviet Literature, was avoided.

Works that reflected the artistic interpretation of the issues of the cult

of personality and a difficult path of the nation from that cult and *zastoy* (an epoch of stagnation) to Glasnost and Perestroika, including “A Field of Tulips” (Lolazor) by Murod Muhammad Dost and “Silence” (Jimjitlik) by Said Ahmad, were acclaimed as among the best novels and were at the center of analyses of literary scholars in the 1980s.

In fact, the ideas related to national identity didn’t stop even after the Jadid movement had completely been eradicated by the Soviet Empire. For instance, the mood of national awakening in Jadid literature could be observed in Rauf Parfi, Mukarrama Murodova, and Dilorom Tojieva’s poems in the 1960s [Allworth 1967: 149]. They would depict their own views on freedom through ambiguity and symbolic images [Mirzaeva 2017: 60, 64]. Censorship made it impossible for Uzbek critics to reveal such risky ideas—in this case, despite the fact that Uzbek scholars knew the real meaning, they either missed analyzing the work or tried to artificially seek the Soviet ideology even if the works are completely out of the communistic ideology.

In the 1980s, M. M. Dost, Togay Murod, Xurshid Do’stmuhammad, Nazar Eshanqul, A. Muxtor, Yo’ldosh Eshbek, Cho’lpon Ergash, Abduvali Qutbiddin, and Fakhriyor created works with “open texts” [Rasulov 2002: 129].⁷ They differed from traditional works of art in terms of language, style, and expression. There was little research devoted to analyses of specific, original writings, except a few studies by N. Karimov, No‘mon Rahimjonov, Suvon Meliyev, and Ulug‘bek Hamdamov. It might have been that the forms of traditional approach, the emergence of denials, the confusion in the literary criticism of the transitional period, the different interpretations which led to the chaos, and many other subjective reasons, prevented the analysis of “open text” artistic works. Moreover, changes in the society, inability to fully comprehend the essence of the novelty of literature, and inability to abandon the utopian ideas that prevailed for more than sixty years forced some literary scholars to stay in a neutral position or out of the processes of renewal in literature.

In addition, during these years, analysis of social relationships of heroes related to their thoughts, feelings, outlook, and psychology served as the main factor in the study of literary works [O‘zbek Sovet adabiyoti masalalari 1979: 150–155]. To be more precise, in the 1970s and 1980s, a synergistic approach based on ideological and poetic analysis emerged in Uzbek literary criticism.

Reinventing the conception in literary criticism including thoughts on the adverse effects of socialist realism which appeared in Europe, internal and external factors such as critics individuality, outlook, intuition, skill, critic’s “me” [Qahramonov 2011: 20], and changes in the social life in Uzbekistan, modern literary process and other different kinds of variations

led Uzbek scholars such as O. Sharafiddinov, Ibrahim G'afurov, N. Karimov, B. Nazarov, to re-study Uzbek Soviet literature, to reveal the truth that they "were unable to tell" [Karimov 1996], that "remained in their hearts" [Qo'shjonov 2006: 9] because of pressures of the Soviet censorship. At the same time, they began to fight against supporters of socialist realism [Karimov 1988: 9], made attempts to prove that socialist realism was a dry idea and an abstract notion that poisons the minds [Sharafiddinov 1989: 162; G'afurov 1993; Kattabekov 1996], and started to speak of the need to modernize the methodology of literary criticism. In addition, they began to suggest that "the literary works should be analyzed not based on the communist ideology, but first and foremost, on universal values and universal criteria" [Nazarov 1990] and in harmony with world literary thinking [G'afurov 1984: 106; Normatov 1995a].

In general, reassessment processes in Uzbek Soviet literature in the late 1980s and 1990s went on under fierce conflicting views and discussions. A group of literary critics and scholars "would try to judge the works of Oybek, Qahhor, G'ulom, and Olimjon based on the communist motives in their works, while others would try to justify them, considering that they were made to write such "modern" works under the requirements of the hegemon ideology" [Qahramonov 2011: 141, 142]. Both sides tried to bring scientific facts to prove their opinions. In addition, the following issues were dominant in the synergistic research discussed above.

1. Selecting works of literature of the Soviet period that would meet artistic, aesthetic, and ideological requirements; based on the archive materials, reviewing and reprinting works which had been repressed by Soviet criticism, and objectively reviewing them through the biographical, creative genetics, and ontological, structural, semiotic, as well as hermeneutic approaches.

Along with the works of the representatives of Uzbek Jadid literature, those of such authors such as M. T. Oybek, A. Qahhor, G. G'ulom, and others were put under a scrutinized analysis on the basis of archive sources, and this became the main event of the criticism of the transitional period of the late 1980s and 1990s. In this process, M. Qo'shjonov, O. Sharafiddinov, N. Karimov, Nabijon Boqiy, and Rahmon Qo'chqor actively participated in research and presented new ideas, which were quite different from the views that appeared in the 1950s–1960s. The new views began to spread mainly with the publication of small articles, roundtables, and small genre materials. Leading newspapers and magazines in Uzbekistan, such as *Oriental Star* (Sharq Yulduzi), *Dialogue* (Muloqot), *Uzbek Language and Literature*

(O‘zbek Tili va Adabiyoti), and *Literature and Art of Uzbekistan* (O‘zbekiston Adabiyoti va San’ati) played an important role in this process of reinvention of Uzbek literary criticism.

It should be mentioned at this point that in the process of re-studying and evaluating Jadid and Soviet literature of the 1980s, there also appeared works that described lives of political prisoners, the subject of Gulag [Rasulov 2002: 95]. Shukrullo’s “Buried without Shroud” (Kafansiz ko‘milganlar) and “Living Souls” (Tirik ruhlar), K. Ikramov’s “My Father’s Case” (Otamning tergovishi), “The Last Days of Qodiriy” (Qodiriyning so‘nggi kunlari) of Habibulla Qodiriy, son of A. Qodiriy, and N. Boqiy’s “Execution” (Qatlnoma) were works related to the repression of Uzbek intellectuals. The repression in these works was not only about the repression of the Jadids in the 1930s, but also about the victims of the movement of “political cleansing” that happened from the 1930s to 1980s (in the 1930s—nationalists, in the 1960s—repression against scientists, and in the 1980s—“The Uzbek’s Case”).

In the documentary story “Execution” (Qatlnoma) by N. Boqiy, which made a bombshell among Uzbek intelligentsia, and in the articles published under the heading “Executioners of Uzbek Intellectuals” (O‘zbek ziyolilarining jallodlari), scholars began to openly speak about several Uzbek intellectuals who were “active” in the repression process. For example, N. Karimov in his articles such as “Only I Know” [Karimov 1991] and “Oybek: Stone Is My Head” [Karimov 1992] provided convincing facts about the involvement of Uzbeks like Q. Boboev in the massacre and the repression.

There were also articles and roundtables in national transitional media that called for the repentance of those who caused the death of innocent victims [Tavbadan tozarishga 1990: 13].

Since the research which focused on discovering a role of Uzbek intelligentsia, or even contributions of prominent figures in the years of repression, have increased, the government banned publication of such articles after years of the crackdown. The task was to create a new history without condemning the past and invoking the dignity of generations [Tavbadan Tozarishga 1990: 13].

2. Abandoning materials based on utopian ideas, views, and attitudes of the Soviet ideology, and forming a new attitude in the interpretation. The problems “how the ‘new approaches’ will be formed?” “what criteria ‘new interpretations’ are based on” [Do‘stmuhammad 1990; Mirzaev 1995], “what methods the novel, such as “Sacred Blood”

which “was a beautiful example of socialist realism” are now to be studied?” became one of the most important issues in the literary criticism of the 1980s and 1990s.

The synergetic approach also played an important role in these views. Yet, “Stability Chaos,” which underlies the theory of synergetic—relationships between balance and imbalance, order and disorder—was defined as one of the most important features of literary criticism of the 1980s and 1990s [Qahramonov 2011: 142].

3. In the first years of independence (1990–1993), the question of “what literature of independence should be” rose to the level of a political question. A number of scholars and literary critics tried to form a new methodological basis for the literature and literary criticism of the independence. A new methodology “should be free from any totalitarian ideology, and based on democratic principles, embedded in human and national values” [Istiqlol va adabiyot 1993]. Most of the works created at the beginning of the independence period were dedicated to glorifying the freedom of Uzbekistan, famous historical figures of the Uzbek nation such as Ibn Sino (Ibn Sīnā), Beruniy (al-Bīrūnī), and Amir Timur. At the same time, novels and short stories which strongly criticized the Soviet period (for example “Dinosaur” (Dinozavr; 1996) by Shukur Xolmirzaev, “Destination of Justice” (Adolat manzili; 1998) by O. Yoqubov, “Lives in the Dream” (Tushda kechgan umrlar; 1994) by O‘. Hoshimov) described problems in the lives of Uzbeks in colonial times as well as difficulties of the transitional period (1991–2005). “The Equilibrium” (Muvozanat; 2003) by U. Hamdamov were the most popular novels in Uzbek Literature in the independence period. Hamdamov’s novel receiving both positive and negative comments was studied and translated into various languages in foreign countries.

Starting from this period, the study of the artistic works from the point of view of the ideology of independence (patriotism, religious tolerance, respect for national values, and so on) and attempts to discover themes of freedom and national liberation movements (i. e. Basmachi movement) from the examples of “modern” Uzbek Soviet literature also sparked. Occasionally, a study of the nature of subjectivism in the pursuit of violent national liberation movements, searching the ideas of freedom from any literary works, could also be observed in 1990–2005.

It is interesting to note that quite a different attitude appeared towards the works which were interpreted as the best examples of socialist realism

in the Soviet period, such as “Sacred Blood” (which was discussed in the previous section). Scholars started to claim that “Oybek was forced to add a Russian character, Petrov, to the novel by Soviet critics that was so artificial and against artistic reality” [Karimov 1999]. Moreover, there appeared articles which tried to reveal national features and symbolic expressions related to the national identity, which were said to be hidden in the essence of the text of “Sacred Blood” [Rizaev 2013]. M. Qo‘shjonov also changed his position regarding the novel that he had adopted in 1979 saying that “Oybek presents the evolution and shaping of the characters as a result of an intense conflict of struggle. The meeting of the main hero—Yulchi—with the Russian character Petrov was the culmination of an earlier psychological process that the writer intended” [Qo‘shjonov 1979: 93–132]. B. Nazarov and O. Sharafiddinov had also said M. Qo‘shjonov skillfully confirmed that “the novel was one of the classic examples of Uzbek Soviet literature in the light of the revival of the revolutionary consciousness of the Uzbek people, and the rise of Yulchi’s [protagonist] revolutionary consciousness is closely connected with the revolutionary views reflected in the author Oybek’s personality” [Sharafiddinov 1976: 57; Nazarov 1977: 138]. N. Karimov tried to justify M. Qo‘shjonov’s position and said “M. Qo‘shjonov knew that Oybek was forced to bring the Russian character into the novel but could not openly say anything about it because of the serious repression of the period” [Karimov 1999: 1].

In a time of changes in ideological principles and the political regime in Uzbekistan after the 1990s, M. Qo‘shjonov confirmed that Oybek had made Petrov’s character stronger in the latest versions of the novel against his will. If Oybek had not followed “advice” by Soviet critics, he would not have been able to get through the knob stick of the totalitarian ideology of the period. Despite the fact that Yulchi’s expelling to Siberia and meeting with Petrov, a Russian revolutionary, was deceptive and out of the text, Oybek had to include it [Qo‘shjonov 2006: 21].

It is not clear what M. Qo‘shjonov felt when he interpreted “Sacred Blood” from the point of view of the Soviet ideology, but reading his further research carried out on Oybek and his writings, I can say that Qo‘shjonov was not satisfied with his previous thoughts and a new status in Uzbekistan gave great opportunities for him to say his latest words on Uzbek Soviet literature.

U. Normatov relied on his own experience of the creative process for the transition when he wrote: “The transition from one system to another is not an easy process. I personally can relate to the events that I have witnessed, as well as my own experience. Writers themselves felt pains as well as admirations in this process. One might understand this from articles and

essays such as “Will Literature Die” by Shukur Xolmirzaev, “Why I Changed My Trust” by O. Sharafiddinov, and my own article called “Some Lessons from the Past” written in 1990s” [Normatov 2011: 3].

IV. PLURALISTIC VIEW AS THE MAIN FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UZBEK LITERARY CRITICISM (FROM THE 2000S TO THE PRESENT)

From the 2000s different new studies based on world literary theory, such as systematic approach which focused on social, philosophical, ideological, and poetic analyses, or structural approach which one of the most famous American structuralist Jonathan Culler applied in a number of his researches, are also seen in Uzbek literary critics. For instance, a book of M. Qo‘shjonov and S. Meliyev [Qo‘shjonov and Meliyev 2000], A. Rasulov’s “The Star Lighting at Night” [Rasulov 2005], U. Normatov’s “Architect of Personality” [Normatov 2005b] which was dedicated to the study of the works of Oybek, and Abdulla Oripov’s works were all written based on a systematic approach.

From 2008 to the 2010s the study of Uzbek literature in a structural method can be observed in the books of Dilmurod Quronov [1998] and A. Rasulov [2007], and small articles by Xamidulla Boltaboyev [1993], S. Meliyev [2008], and Q. Qahramonov [2009], published in leading journals and magazines of Uzbekistan such as *Uzbek Language and Literature* and *Literature and Art of Uzbekistan*. In the aforementioned researches, scholars present structuralism to readers as a new method. Its significance, poetic opportunities, and evolutions can be seen in M. T. Oybek’s “Sacred Blood,” A. Qahhor’s short stories, A. Oripov’s poems, and the works of T. Murod, U. Azim, Fakhriyor, and U. Hamdamov.⁹ Yet these new approaches have not evolved in recent years in studying the 20th century Uzbek literature although they have played an important role in the emergence of new perspectives on Uzbek literary studies.

The main reason for not evaluating new approaches, including systematic and structural, is to restrict functional missions of literature by some Uzbek scholars—more precisely, to accept it only as a means of aesthetic pleasure. In addition, difficulties in accessing original materials concerning world literary theory written in English and implementing them to Uzbek literature prevented Uzbek literary criticism from reaching the international standard.

Studying the literary works as an aesthetic phenomenon and rejecting its pragmatic nature dramatically increased after the 2000s [Yo‘ldoshev

2007]. Yet those who think of literature as pragmatic and aesthetic phenomenon tried to justify their view with clear facts and details [Hamdamov 2002: 13–14; Quronov 2006: 21]. They think “it is wrong to look for a social meaning pointing to political ambition of the literature from every author’s word, while it isn’t correct to study literature behind its ideological conception, out of space and time (makon va zamon)” [Qahramonov 2011: 50].

After the release of Uzbek literature from the Soviet ideology, it opened the way to free creativity. Among the works of the traditional direction, there are the works of the original character in terms of content, form, expression, and poetic scope. Meanwhile, along with colorful “isms,” works of modernism and postmodernism have been created, which are full of complex observations and symbolic expressions that seek to fully explore the human and the human spirit. Methods inherent in the flow of modernism—“signature, the experience of self-discovery in a variety of ways, the inclination to ambiguity, and a strong desire to shake” [Mirzaeva 2011: 238]—are reflected more in poetry. But it emerged as a new stream of world literature at the beginning of the 20th century. There was no warm reaction on the part of the actual representatives of traditional realism to Uzbek modern poetry, as modernism which appeared in Uzbek literature was allegedly created under the influence of Joyce, Sartre, Kafka, Prust, and Camou. Many of the series of articles on the nature of the debate between realists and modernists on whether modern literature is needed has been regularly published in the leading newspaper *Literature and Art of Uzbekistan*.

The critical views were reflected in the articles of realists such as Sh. Xolmirzaev’s “I’m Sorry, Mr. Carpenter, I Have Little Time...” [2000], E. A’zam’s “The Awakening Movement” [1992], S. Meliev’s “The Original Literature Should Serve for Goodness” [2000], Ergash Ochilov’s “Will You Recite Poem or Scare People...?” [2004], Qozoqboy Yo’ldoshev’s “Uzbek Modern Literature” [2004], and other many works of the principles of modernism and postmodernism reproduced in Uzbek literature. The traditional poets and writers who strongly criticized modernism and modern poets argued the following three points:

1. Concerning problems of modern poets in the choice of words, in the example of modernist poetry, the word does not serve the artistic expression of poetic content. It is not read with pleasure, enthusiasm, and curiosity, and lacks spiritual nourishment;
2. This stream is not so much a national spirit as it originated in the West; modernist works cannot be considered original, and they

- are simply regarded as imitations of Western literature;
3. Modernism is not entirely new to national literature, but some of its manifestations are the creative legacy inherited from our classical literature.

Another group of Uzbek scholars, including modernist poets, made a serious counterargument against those articles which are so critical by nature. Bahrom Ruzimuhammad, one of the most famous representatives of modernist poetry, has become very active in this criticism. He reacted to almost all critical points of view, pointing to a positive charm of modernism, that “reading poetry should not only be for pleasure but the poem should reflect all aspects of human spirit such as exultation, depression, and notional cases—all what they have and can do” [Ruzimuhammad 2004b]. Ruzimuhammad emphasized that language isn’t so important in making the work interesting and readable, and what is essential is its meaning and essence. For instance, although James Joyce violated the English grammar a little bit in his language style, his works became popular over the world and he concluded that “modernist literature inevitably finds its readers.” Some representatives of the old generation including O. Sharaffidinov and U. Normatov actively participated in this discussion and challenged Uzbek intelligentsia to be more dispassionate in accepting modernism and modernist literature since modernism and postmodernism is not a simple phenomenon [Sharafiddinov 1996: 26; Normatov and Boltaboyev 2008] and it is not an imitation of Western literature [Normatov 2000b: 6].

Although there was not positive reaction towards modernism and postmodernism in the 2000s–2010s, this literary form has become one of the most important parts of contemporary Uzbek literature. At the same time neorealism which mixes up realism with national myth, images of Zoroastrianism, religious legends, and mythology is about to replace traditional realism. Precisely saying, modern writers are primarily interested in depicting reality in the way of “miraculous realism” which is based on a specific analytical psychology symbolism. However, the study of modern Uzbek literature has not developed as successfully as expected. One of the oldest representatives of Uzbek Soviet criticism, U. Normatov, says “works that are being created at present, are quite different from traditional literature, which are able to renew artistic thinking. But unfortunately, modern literary criticism can’t afford to discover those new thoughts represented in modern Uzbek literature. Today’s criticism [Uzbek criticism—author] is staying behind the literary process” [Normatov 2007]. Supporting Normatov’s view, I would kindly like to add the other reasons for this problem. First, today in most cases literary works are still being studied for aesthetic

pleasure and for getting the pragmatic feature of literature. Second, world literary theory is strictly rejected; scholars who have kept the traditional approach (based on aesthetic feature) say “it is impossible to analyze Uzbek literature with European ‘special terms’ and ‘European theoretical views and approaches’ as long as they developed under the Western view” without taking into account the globalization process and its impact on Uzbek writings. The language restrictions in the representatives of middle and old generations and the impossibility to access original materials regarding world literary theory and to implement it to national literature are also a cause for these subjective conclusions made without understanding the real essence of world literary theory. Third, although there have been significant changes in social, political, and literary life, most scholars still read the writings from the point of socialist ideology.

Moreover, as I mentioned above, modern Uzbek literature is still in search of new tendencies, directions, and methods. In this process world literature is also playing a key role in forming contemporary national literature. So, if we cannot access world literary theory, it is impossible to successfully analyze today’s modern Uzbek literature based on the international standard. Furthermore, the level of national literature cannot be determined only by reflection in the mirror of national criticism. All layers of meaning are embodied in it through the attitudes of scientists, with diverse views and attitudes. Because of those subjective approaches modern Uzbek literary criticism cannot be reaching the international level.

CONCLUSION

From our scientific observations of the study of Uzbek literature of the 20th century in Uzbekistan, it is clear that the study of Uzbek literature has undergone the following stages, and socio-political changes in the period as well as vicissitudes in the creative or critical thinking of the intelligentsia played an important factor in the Uzbek literary critics’ progress.

1. The Soviet period from the 1940s to the 1960: New beginning and developing ideological pressure;
2. The Soviet period from the 1980s to the 1990s: Decreasing ideological pressure in the Perestroika;
3. The period of independence: The formation and development of a free mental outlook and pluralistic thought.

Uzbek Soviet literature was the most trusted servant of the Soviet govern-

ment and it strongly followed the functional “tasks” defined by the Communist Party. A number of writings which were completely ideological and political by nature, and shallow and poor by artistic value, had appeared in the 1940s–1950s. Starting from the second half of the 1950s, the analysis of Uzbek Soviet literature from the Marxist and Leninist points of view theoretically and scientifically support the conceptual ideas in works written according to the principles of socialist realism. The evaluation of Uzbek Soviet literature according to the social, ideological, cultural, and aesthetic needs of the Communist Party confirmed that a certain literary creativity, national in terms of the form and socialist in terms of the contents, was the main task before Uzbek scholars, literary critics, and intelligentsia who were closely related to literature. Despite the fact that in the 1950s–1960s the research based on scientific reasoning and logical (gnoseological) approaches also appeared, one could easily see the impact of communist ideology in such studies. The “dirty nail clipping” method also became an unpleasant tradition in Soviet literary criticism in the 1940s–1970s because the mission of the intelligence service (KGB) was to lead Uzbek writers to the repression and to destroy them as nationalists.

In the 1980s Glasnost and Perestroika greatly influenced the development of artistic and aesthetic thinking. Writers such as M. M. Dost and T. Murod created works quite different from the traditional works of art in terms of language, style, and expression. Works that reflected the artistic interpretation of the issues of the cult of personality and a difficult path of the nation from *zastoy* to Glasnost and Perestroika, including “A Field of Tulips” by M. M. Dost and “Silence” by S. Ahmad, were acclaimed as among the best novels and were at the center of analyses of literary scholars in the 1980s. It is now the primary factor that not only analyzes artistic works from a social point of view, but also exposes the social relationships of the heroes of the work to their interconnectedness, their thoughts and feelings, and the psychology of the characters. More precisely, in the late 1970s and 1980s, Uzbek literary criticism began to be viewed as an ideological and poetic analysis of the work of art, that is, the synergistic approach. Along with the works of the representatives of Uzbek Jadid literature, those of such authors such as M. T. Oybek, A. Qahhor, G. Gʻulom, and others were put under a scrutinized analysis on the basis of archive sources, and this became the main event of the criticism of the transitional period of the 1980s and 1990s. In this process, M. Qoʻshjonov, O. Sharfaddinov, N. Karimov, N. Boqiy, and R. Qoʻchqor actively participated in research and presented new ideas, which were quite different from the views that appeared in the 1950 and 1960s.

Because of the reinvention process in social and cultural life in Uzbeki-

stan, internal and external factors such as critics' individuality, outlook, intuition, and skill were the main point on which the re-studying and re-evaluation of Uzbek Soviet literature evolved based on primary sources including archives in biographical, genetic, ontological, structural, semiotic, and hermeneutic approaches. In the articles published under the heading "Executioners of Uzbek Intellectuals," scholars began to openly speak about several Uzbek intellectuals who were "active" in the repression process.

In the 1980s and 1990s the re-studying of Uzbek Soviet literature was formed by the discussions, including denial and confirmation. A group of literary critics and scholars would try to judge the works of M. T. Oybek, A. Qahhor, and G. G'ulom based on the communist motives in their works, while others would try to justify them, considering that they were made to write such "modern" works under the requirements of the hegemon ideology. Both sides tried to bring scientific facts to prove their opinions. Because of the inability to avoid the thinking shaped under the sixty-year utopian ideas, and to understand changes happening in the social life and literary study, some scholars had to remain in a neutral position or be out of renewing the literary process.

In the early years of independence, the question "What should be the literature of the period of independence" was raised at the political level. A group of literary critics and writers created new methodological foundations of literature and literary criticism of independence. The study of literature from the point of view of an ideology of independence (patriotism, religious tolerance, respect for national values, etc.) as well as the attempt to discover the ideas of national identity from Uzbek Soviet literature increased from 1995 through to the 2000s.

From the 2000s a new, systematic, and structural approach which mostly focused on pragmatic functions of literature appeared in the national criticism. However, these new methods have not been developed.

In the 2000s there appeared new uncompromising struggles between realists and modernists on whether Uzbek literature needs modernism and postmodernism. Although the representatives of traditional literature strictly rejected modernism as an imitation of Western literature, today it became one of the main directions of modern Uzbek literary art. To put it more precisely, while modernism was only originally expressed in poetry in the beginning of the 21st century, a number of novels and short stories are written by Uzbek writers in the way of modernism at present. Some critics tried to prove that literature, including Uzbek, cannot be out of changes on a global scale, and to be more dispassionate in accepting modernism and postmodernism since it is not a simple phenomenon.

Current Uzbek literary criticism fall short of the international standard of modern literature as long as: some leading scholars of Uzbek literary studies strongly keep traditional approaches (in most cases accepting the literature as a means of aesthetic pleasure); they hold wrong imaginations on world literary theory because of language restrictions and impossibility to access original materials in English; the writings are read from the viewpoint of socialist ideology; the perspective of thoughts presented by new generations are not acknowledged or tolerated. Because of those subjective approaches modern Uzbek literary criticism cannot reach the international level.

NOTES

- * In fact, 20th century literary criticism starts in the 1910s. I will not cover the Jadidism period in this article. For more information about Jadidism, see [Abdirashidov 2014].
- 1 For further information on ideological struggle, see [Mirzaeva 2015].
- 2 Qo'shjonov and Sharafiddinov developed literary criticism based on the analysis of the text. Later, Karimov, Qosimov, Turdiyev, Muminov, Rahimjonov, and Dustqorayev based their literary criticism on the analysis of the authentic literary text.
- 3 According to some sources, from 1890 to the end of the 20th century, more than 250 literature lovers, journalists, specialists, and officials wrote literary criticism, and had some contribution in the history of Uzbek literary criticism by their short- or long-term activities and by their writings of varying degrees of importance, from high to medium and low. See [Rasulov 2002].
- 4 Numerous writers and poets share their own contributions in developing the 20th century Uzbek literature. Yet we tried to identify the main tendencies of Soviet literary critics by analyzing the main figures such as G. G'ulom, M. T. Oybek, A. Qahhor, and H. Olimjon, whose writings were the center of Uzbek criticism in the 1950s–1970s.
- 5 As Qayumov pointed out, some American scholars of Soviet literature suggested as early as the 1960s that the reasons for the introduction of European and Russian characters in Uzbek Soviet literature were purely political, under pressure. See [Qayumov, et. al. 1985: 36]. The British scholar of the history of Central Asian nations, G. Dakhshleiger, regards such characters in literature as ethnic groups and attempts to evaluate them as colonialists. See [Dakhshleiger 1969: 249–250]. However, in our view, such harsh conclusions must have come from the ideological struggles between the two regimes at that time. In our view, to say that all such characters in Uzbek literature are completely influenced by politics is, to a certain ex-

tent, inconsistent with the requirements of historical facts and logical reasoning. Because, from the point of view of that time or the present, the social, political, and cultural life allowed the local population to interact more closely with Russians. From this point of view, the issue of the transfer of relations to artistic thinking should be viewed as a very natural process. In addition, we should not underestimate the influence of the literature of European and fraternal peoples on the development of enlightenment and Jadid literature in Turkestan. It seems that in evaluating the characters of the educated intellectuals that can be encountered in the works of the 1920s and beyond, we should follow not only the path of rejection, but also take into account such factors.

- 6 According to N. Karimov, all new works written by Uzbek authors were discussed by members of the Writers' Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Uzbekistan (at present UYW) before publishing. However when the first version of "Sacred Blood" by M. T. Oybek was under discussion, only five Russians (neither Uzbek writers nor Uzbek members of the Union) took part in this debate. Oybek and his novel "Sacred Blood" were seriously criticized for failing to respond to the method of sociological realism. Two main things were at the center of this discussion: 1. Oybek missed the Russian character who had to play a crucial role as the main hero, and Yulchi's dynamics positively impacted on his revolutionary views; 2. Mirzakarim boy's reaction had not widely been referred in the novel. Then Oybek had to rewrite the novel and added a Russian hero, Petrov.
- 7 Open text is understood as a work of art, with different layers of meaning, stylistically sophisticated, and devoid of language.
- 8 Rachel Harrel, an American scholar, studies "The Equilibrium" as bravely depicted chaos of Uzbekistan in the transitional period, that is 1990–1995. For more information, see: Rachel Harrel, Uzbek literary voices in transition: The case of Ulugbek Hamdam's "Muvozanat," A paper presented at the 8th Annual Central Eurasian Studies Society Conference Program HC-01 Crossing Cultural Borders, 2007, and my first book [Mirzaeva 2011: 206–215].
- 9 Christopher Murphy, an American scholar, was the first to study Uzbek literature, particularly A. Qodiriy's works in structural method. For further information, see [Murphy 1980].

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdirashidov, Z. 2014. Study of Jadidism in independent Uzbekistan. *Asian Research Trends New Series* 9: 47–73.
- Aliev, A. 1978a. *Sotsialistik realizm* (Social realism). Tashkent: Bilim. 24 p.
- _____. 1978b. *Yangi zamon, yangi qahramon* (New period is a new hero).

- Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 136 p.
- _____. 1997. *Istiqlol va adabiy me'ros* (Independence and literary heritage). Tashkent: O'zbekiston. 272 p.
- Allworth, E. 1964. *Uzbek literary politics*. The Hague: Mouton and Co. 366 p.
- _____. 1967. An old mood returns to Central Asian literature. *Literature: East and West* 2: 5–17.
- A'zam, E. 1992. Uyg'onish taraddudi (Awakening movement). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati* (Literature and Art of Uzbekistan), October 18.
- Battersby, H. 1971. Asqad Mukhtor: An Uzbek writer and his works. *Central Asian Journal* 15-1: 55–74.
- Boboev, T. 1976. *Zamon va qahramon* (Epoch and hero). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 53 p.
- _____. 1978a. *O'zbek adabiyotining milliyligi va internatsionallik xususiyatlari haqida: Adabiyotshunoslikka oid tadqiqotlar* (On features of nationality and internationalism in Uzbek literature: Studies on literature). Tashkent: Fan. 120 p.
- _____. 1978b. *G'oyaviylik adabiyotimiz qalbi* (Ideology is our literature's heart). Tashkent: Fan. 72 p.
- _____. 2002. *Adabiyotshunoslik asoslari* (Fundamentals of literary study). Tashkent: O'zbekiston. 560 p.
- Boltaboyev, X. 2007. Modernizm va yangi O'zbek she'riyati (Modernism and new Uzbek poetry). *Jahon Adabiyot* (Journal of the World Literature) 2: 149–159.
- Boqiy, N. 1992. Qatlnoma (Execution). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 208 p.
- Dakhshleiger, G. 1969. *The theme of the friendship of peoples in Soviet historical research: Asia in Soviet studies*. Moscow: Nauka Publishing. 1250 p.
- Do'stmuhammad, X. 1990. Konsepsiyani yangilash uchun... (For renewing the conception...). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, February 16.
- _____. 2004. Harakatdan to'xtagan jarayon qissasi (A story of process that stopped). *Hurriyat*, February 11.
- Do'stqoraev, B. 1989. *O'zbek Sovet tanqidchiligi tarixi* (The history of Uzbek Soviet critics). Tashkent. 88 p.
- G'afurov, I. 1984. *She'riyat izlanish demak* (Poetry means search). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 221 p.
- _____. 1987. *O'ttiz yil izhori* (A statement of thirty years). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 399 p.
- _____. 1993. Hujayradagi suvratlar (Pictures in the cellule). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, January 1.
- _____. 2000. Hayot tajribalari va hayol chig'iriqlari (Life experiences and trials presumptions). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, August 11.
- Hamdamov, U. 2002. *Badiiy tafakkur tadriji* (The evolution of artistic thinking). Tashkent: Yangi Asr Avlodi. 199 p.
- _____, eds. 2014. *Istiqlol, adabiyot, tanqid*. (Independence, literature, critics). Tashkent: Turon-Zamin. 380 p.
- Istiqlol va adabiyot (Independence and literature). 1993. *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti*

- va *San'ati*, August 6.
- Karimov, N. 1964. *Hamid Olimjonning poyetik mahorati* (Poetic skill of Hamid Olimjon). Tashkent: Fan. 160 p.
- _____. 1980. *Baxt va shodlik kuychisi* (The singer of happiness and joy). Tashkent: Fan. 39 p.
- _____. 1985a. *Oybek: Mashhur O'zbek adibining hayoti va ijodidan lavhalar* (Oybek: Pictures from the life and work of the famous Uzbek writer). Tashkent: Yosh Gvardiya. 198 p.
- _____. 1985b. *Ajoyib kishilar hayoti: Oybek* (About wonderful people's life: Oybek). Tashkent: Yosh Gvardiya. 196 p.
- _____. 1985c. *Oybek gulshanida qolgan g'unchalar* (The buds left in Oybek's garden). Tashkent: Fan. 77 p.
- _____. 1988. *Qayta qurish va adabiy tanqid: Adabiy tanqidiy maqolalar* (Reconstruction and literary criticism: Literary critical articles). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 160 p.
- _____. 1989. *Hamid Olimjon lirikasi* (Lyrics of Hamid Olimjon). Tashkent: O'zbekiston. 30 p.
- _____. 1991. Bitta o'zim bilaman (Only I know). *Sharq Yulduzi* (The Star of the East) 5: 137–145.
- _____. 1992. Oybek: tosh ekan boshim (Oybek: Stone is my head). *Fan va Turmush* (Science and Life) 7: 7–14; 8: 8–24.
- _____. 1993. XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti taraqqiyotining o'ziga xos xususiyatlari va milliy istiqloq mafkurasi (The peculiarities of the development of Uzbek literature of the 20th century and the ideology of national independence). Dissertation of doctor of science (philology). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 304 p.
- _____. 1995. Oybek nomli cho'qqi (The peak called Oybek). *Til va Adabiyot Ta'limi* (Language and Literature Education) 1: 8–13.
- _____. 1996. Oybek va jadidchilik (Oybek and Jadidism). *Muloqot* (Dialogue), April 4.
- _____. 1997. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti* (20th century's Uzbek literature). Textbook for 11 grade, 2nd ed. Tashkent: O'qituvchi. 352 p.
- _____. 1999. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti tarixi* (The history of 20th century's Uzbek literature). ed. N. Karimov. Tashkent: O'qituvchi. 543 p.
- _____. 2002. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti* (20th century's Uzbek literature). Textbook for 11 grade, 3rd ed. Tashkent: O'qituvchi. 448 p.
- _____. 2004. Kelajakka atalgan she'rlar (Poems devoted to the future). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, July 23.
- _____. 2005. *Istiqloq davri she'riyati* (The poetry of the independence period). Tashkent: Zarqalam. 79 p.
- _____. 2007. *Istiqloq davri nasri* (The prose of the independence period). Tashkent: Zarqalam. 96 p.
- _____. 2008. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti manzaralari* (Views of 20th century's Uzbek literature). Tashkent: O'zbekiston. 536 p.
- Kattabekov, A. 1996. Tarixiy haqiqat va badiiy talqin (Historical truth and lit-

- erary interpretation). *Tafakkur* (Thinking) 1: 5–17.
- Mamajonov, S. 1962. *Kommunizm va adabiyot* (Communism and literature). Tashkent: Fanlar Akademiyasi. 135 p.
- _____. 1964. *Adabiyotning partiyaviyligi va xalqchilligi* (Loyalty of literature to the party and the people). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 126 p.
- _____. 1974. *Shoir dunyosi* (The poet's world). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 220 p.
- _____. 1981. *Saylanma* (Collection). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 486 p.
- Meliev, S. 2000. Asl adabiyot ezgulikka xizmat qilsin (The original literature should serve for Goodness). *Yozuvchi* (Writer), August 18.
- _____. 2008. Strukturalizm va structural tahlil haqida (On structuralism and structural analysis). *O'zbek Tili va Adabiyoti* (Uzbek Language and Literature) 2: 12–20.
- Mirvaliev, S. 1993. *Milliy uyg'onish* (National revival). Tashkent: Universitet. 127 p.
- _____. 2000. *O'zbek adiblari: XX asr O'zbek adabiyoti* (Uzbek writers: 20th century's Uzbek literature). Tashkent: Yozuvchi. 276 p.
- _____. 2006. *Mustaqillik davri adabiyoti* (Literature of the independence period). Tashkent: Matbaa Nashriyot Uyi. 287 p.
- Mirzaev, T. 1995. Yangi mezonlar qanday bo'lmog'i kerak. (How new criteria should be). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, March 3.
- Mirzaeva, Z. 2011. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyotni Amerikada o'rganilishi* (Studies of the 20th century Uzbek literature in America), vol. 1. Tashkent: Fan. 263 p.
- _____. 2015. Criticism as war: The ideological battlefield of Uzbek literary studies from the 1950s to the 1990s. *Cahiers d'Asie Centrale* 24: 267–291.
- _____. 2017. *XX asr O'zbek adabiyotni Amerikada o'rganilishi* (Studies of the 20th century Uzbek literature in America), vol. 2. Tashkent: Akadem-nashr. 222 p.
- Murphy, Ch. 1980. The relationship of Abdulla Qodiriy's historical novels to the earlier Uzbek literary traditions. Ph.D. dissertation. Washington: Washington University. 210 p.
- Nazarov, B. 1977. *Lenincha ta'limot va O'zbek tanqidchiligi* (Leninist thought and Uzbek criticism). Tashkent: Fan. 160 p.
- _____. 1979. *O'zbek adabiy tanqidchiligi* (Uzbek literary criticism). Tashkent: Fan. 286 p.
- _____. 1983. Formirovaniye istanovleniye metodologicheskix prinsipov Uzbekskoy Sovetskoy literaturnoy kritiki (The formation and evolution of the methodological principles of Uzbek Soviet literary criticism). Abstract of dissertation of doctoral science (philology). Tashkent: The Language and Literature Institute. 48 p.
- _____. 1985. *Hayotiylik bezavol yangilik* (Reality is a harmless news). Tashkent: Fan. 220 p.
- _____. 1990. Zamon va adabiyot (Epoch and literature). *O'qituvchi* (Teacher), September 22, 26, 29; October 3, 6.

- _____. 1999. *Istiqlol samarasi / Jadidchilik: Islohot, yangilanish, mustaqillik, va taraqqiyot uchun kurash* (The repercussions of Independence / Jadidism: Struggle for the reformation, renewal, independence, and Progress). Tashkent: Universitet. 320 p.
- _____. 2004. *G'afur G'ulom olami* (The world of Gafir Gulam). Tashkent: O'z. Fan. Akademiyasi. 179 p.
- Nazarov, B, et al. 2012. *O'zbek adabiy tanqidchiligi tarixi* (The history of Uzbek literary critics). Tashkent: Cho'lpon. 432 p.
- Normatov, U. 1981. *Adabiyot va zamon: Sovet Ittifoqi Kommunistik Partiyasining shonli XX–XXVII s'ezdiga bag'ishlanadi* (Literature and epoch: Dedicated to the glorious 20th–27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 399 p.
- _____. 1982. *Kommunizm bunyodkori adabiyotimizning bosh qahramoni* (Builder of communism is the main hero of our literature). Tashkent: O'zbekiston. 39 p.
- _____. 1987. *Davr tuyg'usi: KPSS XXVII s'ezdi va hozirgi O'zbek adabiyoti taraqqiyoti masalalari* (Perception of the period: 27th Congress of the Communist Party and development of modern Uzbek literature). Tashkent: O'qituvchi. 96 p.
- _____. 1995a. Haqiqat taqozasi (The need for truth). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*. February, 17
- _____. 1995b. Adabiy jarayondagi g'aroyib robitalar (Strange links in the literary process). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, November 3.
- _____. 2000a. *Qahhorni anglsh mashaqqati* (The difficulties of realizing Qahhor). Tashkent: Universitet. 51 p.
- _____. 2000b. *Umidbaxsh tamoyillar* (Hopeful principles). Tashkent: Ma'naviyat. 109 p.
- _____. 2005a. *Tafakkur yog'dusi* (Thinking effulgence). Tashkent: Fikr-media. 119 p.
- _____. 2005b. *Personaj me'mori* (Architect of personality). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, February 11.
- _____. 2007. *Ijod sehri* (The magic of creativity). Tashkent: Sharq. 351 p.
- _____. 2011. *Badiiyat ko'zglasida millat taqdiri* (The fate of the nation in literary mirror). *Sharq Yulduzi* 3: 116–122.
- Normatov, U., and Boltaboev, H. 2008. Yangi nazariy tamoyillar (New theoretical principles). *Jahon Adabiyoti* 3: 154–164.
- _____. 2010. *Nafosat gurunlari* (Graceful conversations). Tashkent: Muharir. 385 p.
- Ochilov, E. 2004. Siz she'r aytasizmu, yo odam qo'rqitasiz...? (Will you recite poem or scare people...?). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, September, 17. *O'zbek adabiyoti masalalari* (Issues of Uzbek literature). 1979. Tashkent. 159 p.
- O'zbek Sovet adabiyoti tarixi* (History of Uzbek Soviet literature). 1967. Vol. 1 in 2 vols. ed. Y. Sulstonov and B. Ismoilov. Tashkent: Fan. 417 p.
- O'zbek Sovet adabiyoti tarixi* (History of Uzbek Soviet literature). 1971. Vol. 2

- in 2 vols. ed. H. Yoqubov and S. Mamajonov. Tashkent: Fan. 677 p.
- O'zbek Sovet adabiy tanqidi* (Uzbek Soviet literary critics). 1987. Vol. 1 in 2 vols. 1. Tashkent: Fan. 345 p.
- Qahramonov, Q. 2009. Adabiy tanqidda structural metod talqini (Interpretation of structural method in literary criticism). *O'zbek Tili va Adabiyoti* 5: 34–38.
- _____. 2011. Istiqlol davri O'zbek tanqidchiligi (Uzbek criticism of the independence period). Dissertation of doctor of science (philology). Tashkent: Tashkent State Pedagogical University. 284 p.
- Qayumov, L. 1972. *Zamondoshlar* (Fellows). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 287 p.
- _____. 1981. *O'zbek adabiyoti va uning chet ellik "tanqidchilari" / Adabiyot va zamon: Maqolalar, adabiy o'ylar va suhbatlar* (Uzbek literature and its foreign "critics" / Literature and epoch: Articles, literary thought, interviews). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 220 p.
- Qayumov, L., et al., eds. 1985. *G'oyaviy kurash va O'zbek adabiyoti* (Ideological struggle and Uzbek literature). Tashkent: Fan. 124 p.
- Qo'chqorov, R. 1989. *Iste'dod qadri* (The value of talent). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 105 p.
- _____. 1998. *Men bilan munozara qilsangiz...* (If you have a discussion with me...). Tashkent: Ma'naviyat. 94 p.
- Qo'shjonov, M. 1962. *Hayot va mahorat* (Life and talent). Tashkent: Badiiy Adabiyot Nashriyoti. 201 p.
- _____. 1965. *Oybek mahorati* (Oybek's skill). Tashkent: Badiiy Adabiyot Nashriyoti. 355 p.
- _____. 1973. *Ijod saboqlari* (Lessons of creativity). Tashkent: Yangi Avlod. 190 p.
- _____. 1974. *Ma'no va mezon* (Meaning and measure). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 354 p.
- _____. 1979. *Hayot va qahramon* (Life and hero). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 366 p.
- _____. 1981. *Ijod mas'uliyati* (Creative responsibility). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 342 p.
- _____. 1982a. *Hayot haqiqati va badiiy haqiqat: Kommunistik Partiyaning XXVI s'ezdi va O'zbek adabiyotining taraqqiyoti masalalariga doir* (The reality of life and the artistic reality: On the issues of the 26th Congress of the Communist Party and the development of Uzbek literature). Tashkent: Fan. 60 p.
- _____. 1982b. *Saylanma* (Selected works). Vol. 1 in 2 vols. Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 384 p.
- _____. 1985. *Hayot adabiyot ko'zgusida* (Life is in the mirror of literature). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 245 p.
- _____. 2006. *Ko'ngilda qolib ketgan gaplar* (The words left in my heart). Tashkent: Ma'naviyat. 46 p.
- Qo'shjonov, M., and Meliev, S. 2000. *Abdulla Oripov* (Abdulla Oripov). Tash-

- kent: Ma'naviyat. 135 p.
- Qo'shjonov, M., and Normatov, U. 1968. *Mahorat sirlari* (Secrets of the skill). Tashkent: Badiiy Adabiyot. 220 p.
- Quronov, D. 1998. Cho'lpon poyetikasi: Nasriy asaralari misolida (Cho'lpon's poetics: In the examples of his prose). Dissertation of doctor of science (philology). Tashkent: Andijan State University. 284 p.
- _____. 2004. *Cho'lpon nasri poyetikasi* (Poetics of Cholpon's prose). Tashkent: Sharq. 288 p.
- _____. 2006. *Adabiyotshunoslikka kirish* (Introduction to literature). Tashkent: Xalq Merosi. 222 p.
- Rahimjonov, N. 2007. *Mustaqillik davri O'zbek she'riyati* (Uzbek Poetry of the independence period). Tashkent: Fan. 258 p.
- Rahmonov, B. 2004. *O'zbek adabiy tanqidchiligi: Qo'llanma*. (Uzbek literary critics: Textbook). Tashkent: Yangi Asr Avlodi. 237 p.
- Rasulov, A. 1978. *Yangi zamon, yangi qahramon* (New epoch and new hero). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 135 p.
- _____. 1985. *Tanqidchilik ufiqlari* (Critical perspectives). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 149 p.
- _____. 2002. *Hozirgi O'zbek tanqidchiligida tahlil va talqin muammosi: XX asrning 80–90 yillari materiallari asosida* (Problems of analysis and interpretation in modern Uzbek literary criticism: On the materials of the 1980s–1990s). Dissertation of doctor of science (philology). Tashkent: Uzbekistan National University. 275 p.
- _____. 2005. *Tunda chaqnagan yulduz* (The star lighting at night). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, May 27.
- _____. 2006. *Tanqid, talqin, baholash* (Criticizm, interpretation, evaluation). Tashkent: Fan. 231 p.
- _____. 2007. *Badiiylik bezavol yangilik* (Artificiality is a harmless news). Tashkent: Sharq. 334 p.
- _____. 2009. *Betakror o'zlik* (Unusual self-esteem). Tashkent: Mumtoz So'z. 286 p.
- Rizaev, Sh. 2013. *Oybek haqida so'z* (A word about Oybek). *Jahon Adabiyoti* 1: 191–192.
- Russkaya Sovetskaya literaturnaya kritika, 1917–1935: Xrestomatiya* (Russian Soviet literary critics, 1917–1935: Chrestomathy). 1981. Moscow: Prosvesheniye. 83 p.
- Ruzimhammad, B. 2004a. *Tanqid yaxshinarsa ammo...* (Criticism is a good but...). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, October 8.
- _____. 2004b. *Post modernizmi nima deymiz? Yohud taqlidmi ta'sirlanish* (What do we call postmodernism? Is that impression or imitation). *O'zbekiston Adabiyoti va San'ati*, August 8.
- Sharafiddinov, O. 1962. *Zamon, qalb, poyeziya* (Epoch, soul, poetry). Tashkent: Badiiy Adabiyot Nashriyoti. 230 p.
- _____. 1976. *Iste'dod jilolari* (Glossiness of skill). Tashkent: Adabiyot va San'at. 227 p.

- _____. 1978. *Tanlangan asarlar* (Selected works). Tashkent: Fan. 297 p.
- _____. 1985. *Goʻzallik izlab* (Seaching beauty). Tashkent: Adabiyot va Sanʼat. 222 p.
- _____. 1989. *Haqiqatga sadoqat* (Loyalty to the truth). Tashkent: Adabiyot va Sanʼat. 414 p.
- _____. 1996. Inson yoʻl izlaydi (A man searches way). *Oʻzbekiston Adabiyoti va Sanʼati*, March 26.
- _____. 2004. *Ijodni anglsh baxti* (The happiness of understanding creativity). Tashkent: Sharq. 237 p.
- Sovet Ittifoqi Kommunistik partiyasi XIX Butunittifoq konferensiyasining materiallari* (Proceedings of the 19th All-Union Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). 1988. Tashkent: Oʻzbekiston. 31 p.
- Sultonov, I. 1980. *Adabiyot nazariyasi* (Literary theory). Tashkent: Oʻqituvchi. 375 p.
- Tavbadan tozarishgacha (From confession to refinement). 1990. *Oʻzbekiston Adabiyoti va Sanʼati*, March 13.
- Togaev, O. 1970. *Kurash va qahramon* (Struggle and hero). Tashkent: Adabiyot va Sanʼat. 197 p.
- Vaxobov, M. 1986. Pravde istorii vopreki (Opposite towards the historical truth). *Pravda Vostoka* (Eastern Truth), December 4.
- Xolmirzaev, Sh. 2000. Kechirasiz, janob Karpenter, vaqtim ziqroq... (I'm sorry, Mr. Carpenter, I have little time....). *Oʻzbekiston Adabiyoti va Sanʼati*, July 27.
- Xudoyberganov, N. 1988. *Ishonch* (Trust). Tashkent: Adabiyot va Sanʼat. 247 p.
- Xudoyberganov, N., and Rasulov, A. 1990. *Oʻzbek Sovet adabiyoti tanqidchiligi* (Uzbek Soviet literary criticism). Tashkent: Oʻqituvchi. 168 p.
- Yoʻldoshev, Q. 2004. Oʻzbek modern adabiyoti: Ildizlar, prinsiplar va xususiyatlar (Uzbek modern literature: Roots, principles, and features). *Filologiya Masalalari* (Philological Issues): 4–12.
- _____. 2007. *Yoniq soʻz* (Brighten word). Tashkent: Yangi Asr Avlodi. 546 p.