

## Some Notes of Literary-Critical Problems in the Uzbek Literature



### Literature

**Keywords:** literal critics, publicism, article, investigator, translator, translation, author, novel, gazal (form of a poem), tuyuq (form of a poem), Navoi, Pahlavon Makhmud, Agahi.

Gaipova Hulkar Kuzibaevna

PhD student of Urganch State University. City Urganch, Uzbekistan.

### Abstract

Criticism on literary article is one of the important genres in the publicism of Matnazar Abdulkhakim. It was spoken about the author's literal-aesthetic views, certain literal works of writers and other issues related with literal atmosphere in the article. This issue was illustrated in two directions – by learning the examples of oriental classic literature and in the aspect of analyzing modern literal works from ideal and literal view points. Matnazar Abdulkhakim firstly criticized his own creation and impartially admitted the lacks in some of his poems and their translations. The expression of this peculiarity was narrated in the article as in the examples of his collections “Tiniq tonglar (Clear mornings)” (1982), “Bir Quchoq gul (A Bunch of Flower)” (1997) and his critical views on the translation of As-Saolibiy's poetic work. The article with the theme “Til topishgan dillar” shows that the author is theoretically and practically aware of the translations connected with Uzbek, Russian and Persian languages. In the article there are discussions on the Russian translation of Agakhi's poems in the collection “Agakhi. Selected, Tashkent. 1984”. R. Morgan and N. Gribnev's translations were considered as the object in the article. In it the speech goes on thoroughly about the translations of Agakhi's gazelles and tuyuqs (form of a poem) and the Morgan's versions were considered as elevated. Positive and negative features in the translations of the gazelles “So'z” and “Ustina” by Agakhi were proved and it was stressed in the conclusion that both translators had reached their certain success in rendering Agakhi's creation into Russian. Generally, this article is worth attention with the illustration that the author's literal-critical thought is broad and thematically deep and he is an educated scientist in literature.

Article genre which is widely used in publicism is a phenomenon covering several internal looks in itself as a form of creation. One of them is “literary-critical article” and it plays a great role and widely used in the part of literal science which is called “literal critics”. The base of such article consists of literal-aesthetic view points and there is spoken about creation of writers, leading factors of special works, aesthetic position, outlook and ability of a creator, generally about the problems of literal processes and there are made concrete conclusions. Here naturally we can see thinking power and degree of mastering, teaching and evaluating the role of literal creation of a journalist-critic. The following special points lie in the opinions about Matnazar Abdulkhakim about it:

1) Matnazar Abdulkhakim carries on his works as a scientist of literature, not as a critic. Because he has been busy with learning and translating mainly Eastern classical literature and its rare examples.

2) Literal-critical article plays the second role in Matnazar Abdulkhakim's researches as it is usually devoted to analyzing literal process and works of its representatives and critical view of him are often come across in his other articles as brief ideas, comments, insignificant objections and special proposals and wishes. But it doesn't mean that the author's thinking is free from critical ideas. (The articles “Qosh ham aziz, ko'z ham aziz (Both eyebrows and eyes are dear)” and “Til topishgan dillar (Agreed hearts)” can be the basis for it).

Matnazar Abdulkhakim tries to analyse and promote firstly positive sides, sociable-aesthetic essence, life-long ideas and great literality from literal values and poets' creative heritages as researcher and translator of the past literature. Although he luckily manages this complex task he does not consider his ideas as a concrete last conclusion, he researches considering others' various ideas either.

The main point is that the critical view of M. Abdulkhakim began with the touch on his own creation. He tried to express sensitively the meaning and aim of each of his works effectively in order his works should be admired by readers and in this way he often fairly narrated the lacks and polished them. The following examples approve this idea:

The poet writes as following about the poem collection named "Tiniq tonglar (Clear mornings)" which was published in 1984 in Tashkent: "My first collection appeared not perfectly. As there were not enough poems, not so good poems were included to the book". (From the newspaper "Uzbekiston adaboyoti va san'ati", August 29, 2008). It can be seen that the poet admits his frail poems saying "not so good".

So, some points which the poet admits as undone among his works belong to translation. "It was written in press that I know Persian language well. But it is not real. I know Persian language in the degree of understanding with the help of dictionaries", and he said about his translations like this, "I passed along the literal qualities of translation. I only have the right to pay attention to the lacks and they are a great deal". ("Tafakkur chorahalarida," P.320.) Such admissions can be the expression of deep understanding the responsibility of creation by the author. Thus he doesn't hide that his pencil had no enough power to translate the works of Khoezmian poets with Arabian language from the anthology "Yatimat ad-dahr" by As-Saolibiy into Uzbek in the form of a poem. (Newspaper "Turkistan". January 31, 2004)

One more characterized example: "M. Abdulkhakim didn't add his 45 poems which were included to the collection "Bir quchoq gul" published in 1997 in two thousand copies (Urgench, publishing house "Khorezm") into his next collection, besides into the selected "Javzo tashrifi", because those poems were in pure Khorezm dialect and they were difficult to read and understand by the poem readers of other territories.

It is necessary to stress that Matnazar Abdulkhakim's critical approach, responsibility, tendencies of openly narrating shortcomings of his creation can be seen in the author's views towards the works of other creators. One of such literal-critical articles is named "Qosh ham aziz, ko'z ham aziz" [1, p. 329-335]. The novel "Maxmud kanatoxodek" which is devoted to Pahlavon (heroic) Makhmud by Uzbek writer with Russian language Komil Ikromov was analysed [3]. It was written in Russian language and this work, which had been published in Tashkent and Moscow, was spoken about in the article of writer and poet E. Samandar named "Tarix va talqin" in the journal "Sharq yulduzi" in the 1<sup>st</sup> number of 2003 and in the article of Matnazar Abdulkhakim named "Tazarru" in the newspaper "O'zbekiston adabiyoti va san'ati" published in

May 16, 2003. Literal scientist B. Rahimova briefly paid attention to the considerations of the above mentioned authors about the novel in her Ph.D. dissertation [4, p. 77-79].

The article of Matnazar Abdulkhakim was firstly published with the name “Tazarru” and later this article was published in the newspaper “Diydor” (Urgench) in April 16, 2008 with that headline and this article was added to the next collection with a little shortened beginning part but with fully kept meaning. There was a logical base of the author’s approach to the novel with huge interest (published three times). Since, as a translator and researcher of Pahlavon Makhmud’s rubai (form of a poem) collections, he couldn’t keep himself from caring about any information or writings about the wise poet. Secondly, the possibility of imagining the approaches and the difference between the ideas of his own and the author of the novel which was published forty years before the article and generally the article is important as it is a special testing of his critical ability.

The novel was created at the end of 60s and the beginning of 70s of the last century. During that period the author had to conform the events to the examples of modern ideology and incline to materialism as it was prohibited to write the truth about past governors, great historical images, prominent figures of religion in literal creation which was considered as the weapon of politics. Besides, his disagree and offended mood towards the state’s oppressions was very strong as his father, famous Uzbek statesman Akmal Ikromov, had unjustly been the victim of the slaughter. As there was not any possibility to openly express them, he often touched the disorders of his time with the help of sarcastic remarks, ironical hints and hidden and background meaning tones. M. Abdulkhakim emphasized this peculiarity in the article: “The author expressed his own sufferings into his book about our great ancestor (Pahlavon Makhmud). And it is certainly one of worth attention services of the author that he made up his mind to blacken the diseases of worshipping for a person which had become a spot in the history of mankind.”(Page 334). But this “worthy service’s” expression is not observed.

Ideological content was considered as the principal scales in marking the essence of the work. The author connects the novel with the scales of modern literal-critical thinking acknowledging his conception “let alone which period was written about in the work there can be seen the benefits of the time, location and the creator of the work”. Even at the beginning of the article M. Abdulkhakim denied that Pahlavon Makhmud had been a tightrope walker and considers it that as over limited false. But the phenomenon “dorboz (tightrope walker)” covers the author’s literal wish, leading idea of the novel – the motive of being a savior to unjustly punished persons. Therefore it is not unfounded that the word “dorboz” was taken as a name of the book.

It is right that there was nothing said the Pahlavon Makhmud had been a tightrope walker in the information we knew. But the novel is not a historical yearbook; it is a literal work, isn’t it! The author has the right to use creative and woven elements. Secondly, in the past people were busy with both bravery and tightrope walking as they were nearest professions. Thirdly, the view of tightrope walking was logically approved. This was demanded by the possibility of saving the life of non-guilty people arrested in a minaret only in such way. And this is important with the

peculiarity of one more profession in the multi-faceted activity of Pahlavon Makhmud as a poet, maker of fur coats and a brave hero.

The claim of the article's author as "there was not seen any man who was faithful to Islamic religion in the work. Everyone in the work is atheist and swindler." (Page 331) is unsubstantiated. In the novel such kind of faithfulness firstly hiddenly seen in Pahlavon Makhmud, i.e. besides the physical power, divine faithfulness is a factor which helped him with strong willpower in battling against despicable men, with the high abroad influence in defeating enemies. Not people, but the representatives of superstition blamed Pahlavon Makhmud on doubting in religion. And this is a common motive with other works about the past scientists either.

The journalist found a shortcoming also in not using classical sources in which a real appearance of Pahlavon Makhmud was shown as "qutb – ul avliyo (very famous strong hero)" generally as a dearest person in the novel. In this point "Nasoim ul-mukhabbat" of Navoi and Agahi's information kept is being kept in Khiva museum are being considered. But those sources were not known in science at the time when the novel was written, were they! They were only appeared and published later, definitely during the independence. So, the idea as "the writer had no opportunity both to read and to understand those works" is only an imagination.

So the author's idea as "the writer must have been based on the information in the book "Sufiyskaya literatura" by an orientalist scientist Z. Bertels which was known to him" is also discussable. Because there was not spoken about Pahlavon Makhmud, secondly, the stories about his like-minded persons were not enough to create a perfect image of the poet as the owner of multi-faceted creation and profession.

The following idea is based on assumption: "Sayyid Alouddin was a master of Pahlavon Makhmud. That's why our great poet willed like the following: "If somebody wants to circumambulate me, he or she firstly should circumambulate my master"" (Page 331) and this master is commented as a prototype of historical Aladdin. It is noted that the writer fully blackened him. In this point it is not difficult to feel the influence of wide spread information in oral tradition about Said Aloviddin. Since, differentiating the historical scientist master from negative Said Aloviddin in the novel makes some confused peculiarities clear. It is right that it was shown in the writings on the grave of Sayid Aloviddin in Khiva that he had died in 1303. But there was no any source written about that he was a master to Pahlavon Makhmud, their relations and about the poet's above will. And it was not shown in the manual about the saints of Khorezm which is being kept in the fund of the museum reserve Khiva "Ichankala" that in which historical source this will was mentioned, it was only supposed like "the majesty Palvan master sais like this" [5, p. 58]. So, the will is based on oral information. secondly, it is possible to believe that the writer considers the historical Aloviddin in the novel. Therefore, the personification of the head of some despicable representatives of religion was wovenly shown in the description of Alouddin as a main religious leader of Khorezm (historical Aloviddin was not in that position). The historical Aloviddin is fully opposite to this and he was honorable person with religious foreknowledge. We

can come across some information about it in the anthology “Nafohat al-uns” by A. Jomiy and in the work “Nasoyim ul-mukhabbat” by Navoi.

So, the author’s following idea in the article is not allowable: “Komil Ikromov was a smart writer. His lack is that he wrote an unfair book with the meaning which he himself didn’t know”. Because it will be possible to believe that he knows the theme well after thoroughly analysing the book.

From the above negative ideas M. Abdulkhakim comes to the following fair conclusion: “During the years in which Komil Ikromov wrote the book most of our mood and worldview was similar to the writer’s. If the author of “Makhmud Darbaz” were alive at present when the world views are finding their designation, we believe that he would fairly illustrate our great poet’s image. That’s why our ideas about this work should be our repentance on a special degree (Pages 334-335). In truth, each period leaves its stamp in a literary work on a special degree. Some peculiarities of the literary works which were created before may be felt a little strange later. The essence of the tendencies of the relation between the creator’s worldview and the period is expressed in that idea and they are considered as the main measure in the evaluation of the literary works about Pahlavon Makhmud created in different periods.

One of literal-critical articles of Matnazar Abdulkhakim is named as “Til topishgan dillar (Agreed Souls)” [1, p. 120-125]. In the article the Russian versions of the poems by Agahi in the collection “Agahi, Izbrannoe (Selected) T. 1984” were discussed and it is natural that there were reflected the ability of the author on translation theory and practice. It is right that there was not aimed to discuss and evaluate all translations fully in the article. But only there were narrated some ideas about the translations of selected examples of “gazel” and “tuyuq” genre poems which plays an important role in the poetic heritage of Agahi. Besides, the translations belonging to R. Morgan and N. Gribnev were taken as the main object.

The general peculiarity of the article is that the author fairly approaches the goals and lacks of translation considering the difficulties in translating classical text into a non-related language and aimed includes his subjective views being based on his own practice. The journalist stresses that he likes not the art of translation and clarity of meaning, but the semantic clarity and spiritual harmony and he shows the translator R. Morgan’s follow to this demand in the translation of the following poem:

**Esib gar soridek bo’stonlar ichra ruhparvar yel,**

**Mosiho mo’jizidin har nafas urgusi dam safo.**

**Translation:**

**Мессия будто снизошел и даже на чужбине**

**Повеял нежный ветерок, и к нам незла пустыня.**

In this point the journalist fully agrees with the meaning “Personal salvation dropped to the Earth and winter has blown even in Muslim lifestyle, the desert is not angry with us” which was expressed in word by word translation. And he shows the right way of using the term “Мессия” which hints to “religious return” and the word “чужбина” for translating the words “musofirlik (being a stranger in a strange land)”, “g’urbat (exile)” in the life of Jesus in order not to destroy the essence of the original text (Page 192).

Besides there paid attention in the article that word by word translation is not always the right way to translate and it may cause vague peculiarities in some poems. The author who pointed to the idea “the translation of poetry must always be free” comes across such situation in the translation of the poem “So’z (Word)” by Agahi. He offered the following translation of the original “behayo, nodon odamga so’zni ma’qul qilmoq jahondagi barcha ishdan qiyindir (to explain something to shameless and ignorant people is the most difficult job in the world)” as an example to this lack:

**Что ты не скажешь, Агахи, невежд не услышит,**

**Пуст даже в ухо затрубит сильнее карная слова.**

According to the spoken idea although the word “qattiq” in Uzbek was emphasized with the word “karnay” the semantic clarity was not reached (Page 121).

So, it is considered that the translator wanted to make impression trying to translate the two couple lines at the beginning of this poem as if Agahi wrote them in Russian and he only shortly reached his aim.

In the article the author separately mentions about translator-poet N. Gribnev’s contribution in delivering Agahi’s poetry to Russian readers. Especially, his peculiarity in translating “tuyuq” and “gazel” genre poems and his creative approach to the originality are clearly seen. The translation of the “tuyuq” beginning with the words “**G’am yuki to qomatim yo qilmadi**” is offered as an argument to this idea. The ability of the translator can be clearly seen in rendering such a poem which was written on the basis of the words whose forms are the same but the meanings are different and fulfilling the translation with the help of equivalent elements. The journalist comes to the following conclusion comparing the texts of the “tuyuq” in the two languages: “The translation seriously differs from the originality. But if you read this translation in Russian language the same feeling wakes up in your soul as in the narration of the original text and at the result the differences in the translation is to be considered as nothing” (Page 123).

Besides, the expression of meaning was stressed in the translations of lots of gazals and there can be either a little seen signs of literality and poetic beauty or they were put aside. In the article it was mentioned that this peculiarity was commented by the characters of each language and nationality of expressing opportunities and this idea was approved with the translation of a famous poem “Ustina”. The word “nas” from the Arabian alphabet in the second line of the poem (“Mushkin qoshining hay’ati ul chashmi jallod ustina, qatlim uchun “nas” keltirur, “nun” eltibon

“sod” ustina”) comes with meaning “order, decree” and hints to kill the poetic hero. But here the translator couldn’t reflect the meaning effectively. Although he couldn’t he narrated in Russian like the following:

**Две брови черные над выгбами глаз,  
Как начали, которы дан меня убить приказ.**

At the end of the article the author came to the following conclusion: “There is no doubt that a Russian reader fills the emptinesses which are impossible to translate with the help of his or her knowledge and with the evaluative information which they had taken from additional literatures” and this idea is one of important sides in his literary-critical views.

### **References**

- Adulhakim M. Tafakkur chorrahalarida. Urganch. “Xorazm”, 2013.  
Abdulhakim M. Mangulik jamoli. Maqolalar. Xiva: Ma’mun akademiyasi, 2009.  
Ikromov K. Mahmud konotoxodeq. Toshkent. M. “Deskaya literature”. 1973.  
Rahimova B. O‘zbek adabiyotida Pahlavon Mahmud obrazi talqinlari. Fil. fan. nom.diss. 2007.  
Xudayberganov K. Yozuvlarga yashiringan tarix. Xiva: Xorazm, 1996.