

## Views of Uzbek and Foreign Scholars on the Works of Abdurauf Fitrat

*Usmonov Giyosiddin Murotjonovich*

*Assistant Teacher of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute*

### ABSTRACT

*This article discusses the attitude and analysis of Uzbek and foreign scholars to the works of Abdurauf Fitrat, one of the representatives of the literature of the XX century, especially the brilliant representative of Jadid literature, who translated the works of our writers into English, German, French and other languages.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Jaded, jadedism, study of Fitrat's works, enlightenment, historical, Turkistan, Jaded literature.*

In the beginning of XX century the literature of Turkic world left as a sample heritage to many peoples of the world. The culture of Central Asia which was encouraged with these sources gained highness with the name of Jadid literature at that time. It's known for everybody that the term of Jadid is originated from Arabic, means "new" and "modern". But the end of XIX and the beginning of XX centuries modernism appeared in all the developed European countries as well as modernism took place in the countries of Turkistan.

In the beginning of XX century the political-social events in Turkistan seriously influence on the Uzbek Literature. Because of the Soviet censorship lasted for 70 years, the real essence at the base of the literary works by the writers such as Chulpan, Kodiriy, Fitrat, Behbudiy, who were the leaders in national development, that is, the social-political ideas about freedom were completely refused and considered with a negative attitude and meanwhile, American scholars were first to begin promoting the real essence of these truths. It is necessary to say that they told such free ideas in the abroad was the basis for their willing to tell the truth. But that's a pity, we analyzed these foreign scholars' researches on the basis of not original sources, but the wrong translations in Russian, and we considered their ideas as the misdeeds and slanders, the operation of Bourgeoisie. In the 50–70s of XX century the literary works based on the history or the truth of the era didn't find their exact and objective analyze because of the ideological principles dominated in the both countries (Uzbekistan and America). But learning the researches made from 90s up to now from the point of view of syncretism linked with the literary process of social-political life in Turkistan shows deep analytic approach to the literary work relying on the objective laws of the time. For many years an American scholar E. Allworth has been widely studying the biography, literary works of Fitrat, the foundation and formation of the ideas of freedom and independence in Central Asia, especially, in Turkistan. His book named "Fitrat's first creation and activity; a jaded from Bukhara: the analysis and order of Fitrat's works" was published in Berlin. In his research he made some additions to the bibliography of Fitrat's works which was made by H.Boltaboev, I. Ganiev, N. Yuldashev and a Turkish scholar Yusuf Ovchi. He presented the first complete form of the alphabetical bibliography of Fitrat's works. Although the bibliography made by the Uzbek and Turkish scholars is considered as the primary source, according to E. Allworth, it cannot be accepted as the only one.

"Though the historical documents and the primary sources give a certain information about the youth

of Abdurauf Fitrat and his political-social activity, they are not enough to give a full impression of him”.

Some Uzbek scholars, such as Ozod Sharofitdinov emphasized that the sources concerning Fitrat’s youth and his biography, his activity in Istanbul are not quite reliable, there are some questions demanding further studies and researches about it.

Considering the varieties dependent on the chronology of the publications of Fitrat’s works, these points of Uzbek and American scholars’ are worthy. For example, there are sufficient confusions about the publication of Fitrat’s first work “Munozara”(Debate). While B. Kosimov notes that “Munozara”(Debate) was published in 1909, the scholar H. Boltaboev notes that it was finished in 1909 and published in 1911. Such kind of confusions can be met in the secondary sources such as the researches of foreign scholars.

On the other words, such problems concerning Fitrat’s activity are not important in indicating his position in social-political and literary movement.

But in any case, fully indicating the order of every part of the writer’s works, their classification, chronology and coming to firm conclusions provide the following questions to become clear: first, to divide the reformer – writer’s activity in social-political and cultural changes into periods, and to denote the developing level and steps; second, to determine the connection level of his point of view towards the society psychology of the society and political-social condition in which he is living; third, to indicate the evolution of “ideological tendency in the writer’s psychology” of that time; fourth, to determine the reflection of every detail or picture related to the events of the time in the literary movement and synthesize it in the reformer-writer’s mind; and fifth, to fairly express the commentaries about the formation of the personality and worldview of the writer, the rise and changes in his work, the history of his certain work.

The American scholar classifies Fitrat’s activity related to the political, social and cultural questions dividing into three periods. According to him, in each period Fitrat wrote several works connected with culture and politics. The author’s works are reflected in the culture of Central Asia and in some cases in the development of its political history.

According to E. Allworth’s conclusions concerning Abdurauf Fitrat’s creative activity, we can accept Abdurauf Fitrat as the cultural marker of his time. Cultural markers are the main tool of the society tightly linked with language, traditions, religion, motherland, social life, economics, politics, history and the past of the nation. They play an important role in saving the nation in any difficult cases, and in bringing our cultural inheritance to the future generation. Also, they are the persons who took the main responsibility in developing the nation’s self-consciousness and lightening the process of reconstruction of the society.

In his book “Fitrat’s first creation and activity; a jaded from Bukhara: the analysis and order of Fitrat’s works” he pays a great attention to Fitrat’s autobiography, every political-social event happened in his life. He tries to describe the history of his works, the situations and events caused to create them. For example, he illustrates the history of Fitrat’s work “Kiyomat (Ressurrection)” with Fitrat’s hate to Bolsheviks’ wrong government system in Central Asia. This work was made in the time Fitrat was banished from Bukhara.

Fitrat’s moral agony is directly reflected in his work “Kiyomat (Ressurrection)”. The author describes his ideological purpose in a different way. He apprehends the accounting process on the doomsday in his own way. Though the work is acknowledged to be an imaginary story, on the basis of the facts known to himself the author describes the pictures, characters and the guises close to the public psychology impressively.

As the scholar B. Kosimov notes “the main purpose of the story is not to describe the events of the next world, but also to describe sarcastically the troubles and misfortunes of this world, the ignorance and conservativeness that fettered Turkistan’s hand and foot”.

In this place we should note that Fitrat’s political-social and literary activity cannot be studied separately.

In his researches dedicated to Fitrat’s proses “Munozara(Debate)”, “Hind sayyohi bayonoti” (Tales of an Indian traveler), “Kiyomat”(Ressurrection), “Bedil bir majlisda” (Bedil in a meeting), “Sahytonning Tangriga isyoni”( Satan’s mutiny against the Lord), “Abulfayzkhan”, the poem “Mirrikh yulduziga” (To the Mirrikh Star), and Makhmudkhuja Behbudi’s drama “Padarkush” (Father killer) E. Allworth analyzed the literary work in the principles of historicalness and on the basis of principles of literary studies and exposed the real logics and inner meaning of the literary work.

It should also be mentioned that Edward Allworth is not limited only with analyzing the models of the Uzbek literature, but also he translated them into English.

In conclusion we can say that the scholars with western thoughts researched the eastern worldviews which are completely unfamiliar to them in the principles of historicalness. Their original conclusions provide the definite analysis and right value of historical truth. Such synchronic and statistic analysis in Allworth’s research and his particular approaches to Abdurauf Fitrat’s activity and works serve as a little source in deeply understanding Fitrat, clarifying our imagination about him, deciding on the confusions in his publications and especially, in entirely realizing the truth about Fitrat.

## REFERENCES

1. N. Karimov. XX asr adabiyoti manzaralari. –Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2008. –B. 8.
2. Mirzayeva Z. I. Abdurauf Fitrat faoliyatining o‘rganilishi: o‘ziga xos yondashuv va qarashlar /O‘zbekiston tarixining dolzarb masalalari yosh olimlar tadqiqotlarida: asosiy yo‘nalishlar va yondashuvlar.Respublika yosh olimlarining an’anaviy ikkinchi ilmiy konferensiyasi materiallari to‘plami. – Toshkent: Fan, 2010. – B. 187.
3. Edward Allworth. Modern Uzbeks. From the fourteenth century to the present / A Cultural history.- Californiya: Hoover Institution Press Stanford University, 1190 , Edward Allworth. “Uzbek litrary politics” London-Paris. 1964
4. Bahodir Karim “Abdulla Qodiriy”.Toshkent. “Fan” 2006 yil . 203-221 betlar
5. Ingeborg Baldauf. Some thoughts on making of the UzbekNation. Berlin 1991. Vol 32 n 1 79 -96
6. Mustafa Cho‘qay. Turkistan Milliy adabiyoti haqida Frantsuz ziyoliysi nima deydi Yap turkistan 1931
7. Beningsen A. Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay. La presse et le moument national ches les Musilmans 1920. Moution 1964: Souper John Two banned Uzbek writers to be republished Ankara 1997
8. Zaki Validi. Bugungi Turkli Turkistan va yaqin turkiston. Istanbul:1981