



The Role of Matyakub Kushjanov in Uzbek Literal Studies

Shukurova G.H.

PhD, Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan

Email: guli_k_h@mail.ru

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v5i11.790>

Abstract

The present article covers creativity and analytical skills of one of the brightest representatives of Uzbek literal studies and critics M. Kushjanov. A writer separately studies issues of character, plot, composition and conflict in his works. Main genres of M. Kushjanov – review, articles, supervisions, interviews, sketches, essays, previews, letters, monographs among which a main place is given to articles, sketches and essays.

Keywords: *Review; Publicity; Character; Plot; Composition; Conflict; Language; Style; Method and Skills*

Introduction

In world literature, not only the creative laboratory of poets and writers, but also the creative laboratory of the scientist, the history of scientific and artistic–publicist works, in particular, the scientific, artistic, factual and documentary nature of the author’s biography, childhood, past life is of particular importance. The harmony of artistic and journalistic interpretation in the nature of memories about the path plays a special role in the detailed study of the life and creative history of the creative person.

Results and Discussions

“Majolis un–nafois” Alisher Navoi, is separately distinguished from among significant and awesome works of Alisher Navoi with its specifics and scientific–art originality. Being the main literal–critical work of that period, this work contains short, but very important information and opinions on life, activities and behavior of 459 poets of his contemporaries. Describing the above, Alisher Navoi, as a great poet, wise thinker, acute critic, draws a parallel between the identity of a poet and his creation, briefly and clearly states peculiarities of works, gives examples, points out defects and gives an impartial assessment (we can also see such short and clear assessment in “Baburname”). Having read the literal–critical collection “Majolis un–nafois” – we come to know that in the second half of the XV century in Maverannah, particularly, in the period of regimen of Husein Boykaro, huge attention was paid to a social situation, literature, art, criticism which led to their wider development. As a proof to this fact we can point out “Badoyi us–sanoye” by Ataulloh Husain, written under the auspices of Alisher Navoi, as well as a book of a great poet Voiz Koshifiy, of the contemporary – they played an important role in literal–art and

criticism of the XV century. According to “History of the Uzbek literal criticism”, Koshifiy’s book is also an important source in illumination of science of criticism of Orient, whereas Chapter 1 is devoted to literal art and Chapter 2 – to the science, that is the literal criticism. Koshifiy perfects this science – his book clearly mentions dictionary and terminological concepts as well as the functions of the present science: “Nazm aytmoq bayonidakim uni naqd ilm derlar va adabiy ilmlarning biri deb bilurlar va naqd lugatda “saralamoq” va “sof” tangani qalbaki tangadan ajratmow degan. The term “naqd” herein is used for nomination of a science to distinguish the best poems among bad ones as if “Tanga nakkodi” can distinguish a fake coin from a real one, as the owner of this science (a critic) has to allocate the brightest and best works among others” [1, – p. 5].

More than three centuries later, another great poet – Pushkin writes that the “Condition of criticism just shows the level of enlightenment of the literature, whereas criticism is a science to identify incidents and deficiencies in art and literature” [2, – p. 280]. These words are the proof of the importance of the literal-art criticism in social life. Saying this, great poet kept Belinsky and his followers in his mind – those who wrote sharp, bright and direct works about him and his colleagues.

Critic creates another critic, a specific word is put down by a literary critic. The interesting period for us in this context – examining the history and development of critics in the second half of the XX century, we can underline Izzat Sultan and Homil Yakubov, Ozod Sharafiddinov and Matyakub Kushjanov, Laziz Kayumov and Umarali Nomatov, Naim Karimov and Ibrohim Gafurov, Nuriddin Shukurov and Begali Kasimov, Bakhtiyor Nazarov and Abduqapur Rasulov, Yuldosh Solijonov and Kozokboy Yuldoshev (the list goes on), and many others, who lived and worked in the regions of Uzbekistan and its capital, and devoted themselves entirely to this area. While the above-mentioned literal critics may also be called writers or men of letters (a wide coverage of the sphere is well-known), we mean literal theory of their works and issues of modern literary process.

The following three types of people as mostly engaged in the literal critics: professional critics; writers, poets; readers, representatives of different specialties. From our side it is advisable to call articles, reviews, discussions and other researches as samples of literal criticism. The majority of professional critics are scientists. If a scientist mainly works by discussions, then criticism of writers and poets – is a union of logical discussions and creative thinking (for example, critics by Kadiry and Chulpon, Oybek and Abdullah Kahhor, Askar Mukhtar and Pirmkul Kodirov, Erkin Vohidov and Abdulla Oripov).

Critics by readers and representatives of various professions may not be that detailed, but their criticism is characterized by its sincerity, directness, fairness from “Diplomacy”. Examples of such criticism is occasionally appeared in Press and Media. We think that it is important to pay attention to the following:

In “Majolis un-nafois” by Alisher Navoi, in research of Belinskiy and Dobrolyubov, analyzing the works of art, writer’s personality is always under the center of attention (Alisher Navoi makes it shorter while Belinskiy pays rather more attention (remember “Letter to Gogol”). It is natural and logical as it is impossible to analyze the work separately from the writer. Some critics of Uzbek literature of the XX century less attention was paid to the work itself, in particular, to the ideology, class, party, artistic peculiarities, even more – to the writer and his personality, as a result, articles, critics, letters happened to be jagged and incomplete.

It is a fact that that in the 30s and 40s of the last century some articles and publications contained stipulations, unpleasant and even offensive opinions, sometimes reached up to awarding certain letters, “delicate” sayings and warnings as if “author did not even think about it”, “author had not said a word on it” – it was more like twitching and interference into the personality of the author, rather than the research of the writer’s personality.

The Second half of the 50–s and early 60s of the last century evidenced a revival in Uzbek literal criticism, change of the quality, combination of an imaginative literature in harmony with the author’s personality, as well as its analysis that stands out in the research of symmetric analysis of the period in the works by Ozod Sharafiddinov, Matyakub Kushjanov, Umarali Normatov Naim Karimov and Ibrokhim Gafurov.

One of the scientists who have made significant contributions to the development of Uzbek literal criticism during the half a century is Matyakub Kushjanov. One of his first articles in media was devoted to the novel “Sacred Blood” and was called as “Character formation”, which was published in “Zvezda Vostoka” (Orient Star) in 1957 (according to the critic, his first article was dedicated to the analysis of the novel “Sisters” by Askad Mukhtar and was published in “Zvezda Vostoka” magazine in 1957).

At that time Izzat Sulton, in his article devoted to assessment of the works by young literal critics, noted M. Kushjanov’s review as an exemplary event. In the article “Jasorat” (Courage), written on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of academician Matyakub Kushjanov (1998), Izzat Sultan writes: “We need Matyakub today also ... precisely we need a lot of Kushjanovs. As existence of such a wise and loyal admirers like Kushjanov is a happiness of our literature and culture” [3, – p. 334].

Let us pay attention – a favorite writer of confidently entered literal critic was Oybek, while the critic himself was observed and warmly spoken by men of letter Izzat Sulton (M. Kushjanov had dedicated dozens of books to Oybek’s activity, published many articles then wrote numerous of books and researches about A. Kadiri, A. Kahhor and other Uzbek writers and critics, published a number of articles and researches about Izzat Sulton and his followers, which were published in Moscow and Tashkent in Uzbek and Russian languages).

A soldier and a scholar Matyakub Kushjanov (1918–2005) had faithfully served to the literature during his long life. Doctor of Philology, Professor, Honored Scientist of the Republic of Uzbekistan, academician, holder of Order “El – yurt hurmati uchun” (For the respect of the people) and other medals, laureate of many credentials, published about 50 books, trained many students – candidates of science, doctors of science, created a peculiar school of criticism, chaired Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan for more than 10 years, demonstrated administrative skills.

According to the researchers, a major and meaningful achievement of Matyakub Kushjanov in literature and literal criticism is a new, strict and reasonable sentence. He achieved this throughout detailed, full-length, balanced and comprehensive analysis of the issues of a character and a conflict, subject matter and composition, justice and equality, language and style, techniques and skills – all based on harmony of contents and form, concept and complexity, border line and coincidence. Titles of books themselves do verify this (“Life and skills”, “Character formation”, “Concept and Assessment”, “Soul and Layout”, “Life and delicacy”, “Skills of Oybek”, “Figurative Art of Abdulla Kahhor”, “Generosity of a talent”, “Skill education class”, “Plot–line and character”, “Discussions on compositions of literal works”). Particularly, chapter titles of the book “Concept and Assessment”, published in 1947 by Gafur Gulyam Literature and Art publishers, which consists of three chapters, can serve as a proof of our words: “Research of our prose”, “Story Conclusions”, “We need to locate the meaning in the history”, “Follow good, learn from bad”, “Author, editor and critic. Needs and requirements”, “Spotlight of an Artist”, “Placement of titles”, “Imaginative compliances and non-compliances” and “Art edges”, “Writer’s last novel”, “Useful creature”, “Theoretical plotlines – unity of form and contents, imagery, essay, novels and monologues”. As it can be seen from the titles, chapters are devoted to the theoretical issues and bonds of mastery, including to the specific writers and works and they are described in theoretical terms. This situation is typical for almost all the scientific researches.

We know that the literature is a comprehensive, multi-layered and multi-genre sector – whereas it is complicated to cover entirely, analyze and write works on them. Some pay attention to poetry, some to prose, another to drama, others to folklore, criticism, publicity – and write a lot of good works in that field. In the beginning of his career Matyakub Kushjanov focuses on prose – advanced genres of the literature, and writes many works in the genre of short stories, tales, novels, sketches and essays – it is enough to recall his major works and researches, dedicated to the prose of three great representatives of our literature as Abdulla Kadiri, Oybek and Abdulla Kahhor. For example, there was not a single work in the 60s up to the 90s of the last century that would be left through, evaluated and analyzed by Matyakub Kushjanov – those are stories, tales, novels, sketches and essays (during last years of his life due to deterioration of his eyesight he could not read and asked his descendants to read aloud and write articles and books – isn't it a courage). “If there such names as as Kadiri, Oybek, Kahhor in the history so that there is Matyakub Kushjanov, who had made an invaluable contribution in their oeuvre” [5].

Scientist also wrote on poetry as well, a genre which plays an important role in our literature, comparably less, but precise. He would know and follow that if not to refer to a poetry related to a genre being researched, if not to provide comparisons and examples, if not to analyze – a research would be somehow narrow and unfinished. We have already mentioned that before writing novels as “Navoi”, “Sacred Blood” – he gained experience by composing several poems and dostons (epics), and sank into the period atmosphere. It is also known that he wrote specific articles and peculiarly, “kushjanov-like” analyzed the works of Navoi, Gafur Gulam, Kuddus Mukhammadiy, Kudrat Hikmat, Hamid Gulom, Erkin Vohidov, Abdulla Oripov, Erkin Samandar and others. Not limiting by writing an article on “Sheriyat maydonida” (In the field of poetry) dedicated to Abdulla Oripov, he publishes a book on “Onajonim, sheriyat” (Mater poetry) in collaboration with his disciple Suvon Meli. For example, there is a logically complete article named “Sheriyatda junlik – qusur, chigallik-chi?” within his book “Qalb va qiyofa” (Soul and Layout) published in 1978 – in which he analyzed features and imperfection of poetry created at that period. One can provide a plenty of such examples.

Scientist would reiteratively underline that sketch and publicity is the fastest and emissary genre of the literature – its “light cavalry”, most of the writers had begun their oeuvre from this genre, some of them had entirely dedicated to it; he would also justifiably and comparatively specify that it is a seed for articles, sketches, causerie, essay further for large stories, novels epics and dramas. He himself was fond of travelling to various region of Uzbekistan, mostly to Horezm area and return back writing sketches and articles, to compare and make conclusions from reality and literature, real people in life with imaginative characters. Scientist's articles and sketches dedicated to painter Abdulhak Abdullaev, ophthalmologist Mukhammadjon Komilov, singer Komiljon Otaniyozov, composer Yunus Rajabiy, eminent representatives of natural science and liberal arts as Obid Sodikov, Ibromkhon Muminov, Izzat Sulton, Jura Musaev, Rashid Nabiev, Goyib Nafasov, Iso Jabborov and others, eminent statesmen Sharof Rashidov, Nuritdin Mukhitdinov, his essay-books devoted to the President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov on “Elim deb, yurtim deb...” (To my nation, to my homeland) are among this. It is worth attention that alike his colleague Ozod Sharafiddinov, Matyakub Kushjanov during last ten-fifteen years of his life had dedicated himself most to publicity and published books as “Tepki bosildi”, “Alam”, “Dagish”, “Diydor”, “Jayhun jilolari” and “Armon”.

It is natural and logical that Academician Matyakub Kushjanov's favorite sphere-literal studies was under the spotlight of criticism. It is adequate to recall him to be a Chair and organizer at Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Science of the Republic of Uzbekistan, to remind him being awarded credentials, being admired, as well as publishing and co-editing books, collections, monographs and dictionaries on sphere history and literal process. His conclusions on oeuvre, books and researches by man of letters and researchers as Izzat Sulton, Homil Yokubov, Vohid Zokhidov, Vokhid Abdullaev, Abdukodir Hayitmetov, Ozod Sharafuddinov, Naim Karimov, Umarali Normatov, Ibromkhon Gafurov,

Ibrohim Hakkulov, Tura Mirzaev, Norboy Hudoyberganov, Abdugafur Rasulov, Bahtiyor Nazarov, Suvon Meli and others is well known in Uzbek scientific and literal circles.

M.Kushjanov's first article named as "Harakter shakllanishi" (Character formation) published in the magazine "Svezda Vostoka" (Orient Star) dedicated to Oybek's oeuvre was accepted by the society in its totally different style – in alternative shape. It was warmly accepted. What was that allogenic, dissimilar to the previous ones? This was specified by the scientist himself in his books and conversations.

In the chapter "Uqublatli izlanishlar" of his book "Armon" author recounts opinion on preparation towards analysis – this is worth following example for all the researchers, especially, youth like as we are: "... have started researches. First started to scrupulously study works of Belynskiy on Russian poets and writers. My learning was in such a way that I would have memorized eminent scientist's each work, then reiteratively read works analyzed by him and compare with the conclusions of the academician. The most important for me was to clarify what which aspects of Russian poets and writers was aimed and accepted as vital and frivolous by the men-of-letters. Shortly the way he approached to the text was important for me. I am talking about men-of-letters style. The result of my study of the critic's experience was that if I happen to read critic's article on any work, i would 2–3 times better and clearly understand the concept and contents of the text analyzed rather than reading it. This had indicted me the role of the critic in analysis of any work. Particularly, critic's article on Lermontov's "Geroy nashego vremeni" (Hero of nowadays) had really impressed me. I have read "Geroy nashego vremeni" several times, but after reading Belinskiy's article I understood that I did not realize Lermontov's secrets aimed within his work fully. I comprehended that V. Belinskiy had clearly, precisely and brightly revealed the peculiarity of "Geroy nashego vremeni" as if skilled painter. After that I had envied V. Belinskiy. If only your servant also could reveal imaginative works with their all tinges – this thought would seized me" [4, – p. 40].

References

1. O'zbek adabiy tanqidi tarixi (History of Uzbek literary criticism). Tashkent. Publisher: "Tafakkur qanoti", 2012.
2. Pushkin A.S. Selected works. – T., 1982.
3. Kushjonov M. "Diydor". "Sharq", HMAK. – T., 2004.
4. Nazarov B.Sabrgul. "Uzbekiston adabiyoti va san'ati" (Literature and arts of Uzbekistan), August 19, 2005.
5. Qushjonov M. "Armon", "Sharq" HMAK. – T., 2007.
6. Журбина Е.В. Теория и практика художественно–публицистических жанров. – М.: Мысль, 1969. – с. 399.
7. Черепанов М.С. Таинство мастерства публициста. – М.: Мысль, 1984. – с. 150.
8. Учёнова В.В. У истоков публицистики. – М.: МГУ, 1989. – с. 214.
9. Кайда Л.Г. Композиционная поэтика публицистики. – М.: Наука, 2006. – с. 144.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).