



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDES TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF ABDURAUUF FITRAT'S LITERARY WORKS

Usmonov Giyosiddin Murtjonovich
Kokand state pedagogical institute
Assistant-teacher of the Department of
English Language and Literature
e-mail: gusmonov@gmail.com
Tel: +998999988852
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4198-8097

Abstract This article is devoted to a comparative analysis of scientific relations to the English translations of Abdurauf Fitrat's artistic works. It is discussed in the article that Abdurauf Fitrat's artistic works were translated abroad by foreign scholars, including Shawn Thomas Lyons, a professor at the University of Virginia in America, Adib Khalid, a professor at Carleton University in America, and Salih Beshakci, a Turkish scholar into various languages, including English with great interest, and analyzed in depth. Also, in the article we try to analyze comparatively how they showed their own scientific attitudes towards them. Sometimes, the ideological content, artistic features of Fitrat's works have also been drawn to a comparative analysis of the works of foreign writers.

Key words: drama, tragedy, translator, historical parallel, quasi-soviet, empiric, debate, Young Bukharans Abulfayzhan, reformer, Bolsheviks.

INTRODUCTION

Abdurauf Fitrat was known to have been and worked in many countries throughout his life. In particular, he was one of the jadid students who were educated abroad. He wrote and published several famous works during his four years of study in Istanbul, Turkey until 1914. When he returned to Bukhara, he aimed to achieve cultural development in the political field in the country. We don't have much information about Fitrat's activities during this period, but thanks to the internet opportunities created during the independence, we can be aware of the analysis of Fitrat's life and work abroad.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

Shawn Thomas Lions, a professor of Virginia university of America, was one of the foreign scholars who gave earnest dedication to the work of Abdurauf Fitrat. He approached with a special attention to the analysis of the jadid writer's drama "Abdulfayzhan". Lions gave the analysis of the drama in his article titled "Abdurauf Fitrat's Modern Bukharan Tragedy" and published it in the 5th edition of the international magazine on Central Asia in 2000.¹

¹ Shawn Tomas Lions. Abdurauf Fitrat's Modern Bukharan Tragedy // International Journal of Central Asian Studies. – Volume 5. – 2000.



The author writes the followings first as he describes the work: *“Abulfayzkhon, a historical drama written by the Uzbek author Abdurauf Fitrat in 1924, will be examined as a rein vocation of the native past against Soviet colonialism. We will consider this drama as a historical parallel. How Abulfayzkhon represents historical reality is not suspended from the process or representing Soviet colonialism in Bukhara, an ancient Central Asian emirate that was transformed into a quasi-Soviet protectorate after the last amir was overthrown by the Bolshevik military in 1920”*.

The passage quoted, shows that, first of all, Abdurauf Fitrat wrote his historical drama “Abulfayzkhan” about the past of his motherland in 1924, which was against the colonial policy of that period. Therefore, the researcher suggested regarding this drama as a “historical parallel”. He stated that although Abulfayzkhan was a historical person, he didn’t take part in the processes in Bukhara during the Soviet colonialism, but he was the ruler of ancient Central Asia, and after the last ruler of Central Asia was overthrown by the Bolsheviks in 1920, this drama about him came out. By this, the author tried to explain how and why the historical events related to Abulfayzkhan was written. It was stated that after the last amir was overthrown by the Bolshevik military in 1920, this territory became the protectorate of the quasi-Soviet, where there had been Central Asian emirate since ancient times. No matter how they stood against creating such works in Bukhara, this situation cannot stop it from expressing it.

This idea shows how well Lyons knows about not only the work and its creation, but also the history of Turkestan. In fact, this work of Fitrat was about Abulfayzkhan, that is, a brother of Ubaydullakhan, the khan of Bukhara. He did not have any real government, and was a “puppet” ruler in the hands of emirs and nobles whose power and influence were increasing day by day in the life of the country. Muhammad Hakimbiy, who was the founder of the Manghit state, the representative of this tribe, had an influential power at that time. He spent his time on entertainment and was keen on drinking. He had seven children. When he was drunk, he condemned them to death. Only Abdulmumin, still a baby, was hidden under the throne and survived. Khan almost didn’t control the state affairs. In this way, the government of khanate finished in Bukhara. The weakening of the central government further enhanced the feudal scattering. This situation allowed the outer enemies to invade Movarounnahr. During Abulfayzkhan’s reign, mutual conflicts increased, and the country had undergone deep economic and political degradation. At that time, the situation reached such level that the khan’s decrees did not go out



of the palace. As a result of marching of the troops of Nadirshakh over Movarounnahr, Abulfayzkhan was overthrown from the throne. By the command of Muhammad Rahimbiy, Abulfayzkhan was executed in one of the chambers of Mir Arab Madrasa in 1447.

In 1924, Abduraf Fitrat wrote his drama “Abulfayzkhan” dedicated to him.

According to Sh.T. Lyons, the characters and images in the drama “Abulfayzkhan” were created on the basis of the events happened only in Bukhara and the prototype of historical figures. Fitrat described Bukhara as it was in the revolution period. The author gave these points in the following lines;

Abulfayzkhan functions not only at the empirical level of historical drama, but re-historicizes and re-realifies by interacting with the "audience's awareness that it is witnessing the enactment of its own past and by assimilating that public knowledge of the past and present in the text. The scene of Bukhara, forever, oppressed by competing oriental despots, a land of intrigue, conspiracy, cruelty and corruption, persists in continuous time, always encompassing the present. Similarly, Amir Said Alimkhan, a victim of the domestic conspiracies of native reformers and the Bolshevik invasion, would be dethroned, separated from his family and forcibly exiled in 1920”.²

The tragedies of the Bukhara region, which was oppressed forever by the two competitor tyrants of the east, and turned into the land of intrigue, oppression, and instigation, were taken onto the scene in the drama. Depending on it, Lyons stated his personal opinions that Amir Said Alimkhan was a victim of his countrymen’s intrigues, and was overthrown his throne by the reformers and Bolsheviks, separated from his relatives and forcibly deported from his homeland in 1920 as a reluctantly departure. According to him, the enemies against Nadirshakh and Abulfayzkhan were similar to whom against Said Alimkhan: the noblemen who joined the Bolsheviks against the Emir of Bukhara were the prestigious religious and commercial elites of the palace. The author gave these points in the following lines: “*And the duplicitous friends who conspire with Nodir Shah against Abulfayzkhan parallel those of Amir Said Alimkhan: those prominent court, religious and mercantile elites who would join the Bolsheviks against the last Bukharan amir*”.

Thus, the analysis of Sh.T. Lyons puts a number of tasks in front of the Uzbek philologists in the future to compare these two individuals on this issue.

² Shawn Tomas Lyons. “Abdurauf Fitrat's Modern Bukharan Tragedy” International Journal of Central Asian Studies. – Volume 5. – 2000.



Adib Khalid's translation of Abdurauf Fitrat's work "*The Debate between a Teacher from Bukhara and an European*" is the greatest translation of the scholar. Adib Khalid writes about Abdurauf Fitrat in the preface: "*Abdurrauf Fitrat (Bukhara, 1886-1938) was the most prominent modernist figure in Russian Central Asia, The son of a prosperous merchant, Fitrat received a traditional Islamic education in Bukhara before being sent to Istanbul by a Bukharan benevolent society in 1909, The four hectic years Fitrat spent in Istanbul were formative of his worldview, He returned to Bukhara in 1914 and became involved in cultural and educational activities. In 1917, when the Russian revolution opened up possibilities for political action, Fitrat emerged as one of the main leaders of the Young Bukharans, as the reformist intellectuals began to style themselves. When the Bukharan People's Soviet Republic was proclaimed in 1920, Fitrat served as the chief economic advisor and minister of education. Fitrat's political stance of Bukharan nationalism proved unpalatable to the Soviet regime in Moscow, and he was ousted from public office in 1923. He spent the rest of his life as a scholar of the Turkic cultural heritage of Central Asia, publishing numerous works on the language, literature, and music of Central Asia*".³

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

It is obvious from the given evidence the author's respect for Abdurauf Fitrat and his life was very high. This can also be seen from Adib Khalid's description of Fitrat. In particular, A. Khalid says that he has read Fitrat's works in the Uzbek language with a great love and interest and was greatly impressed by him. "*The Debate between a Teacher from Bukhara and a European* (published in Istanbul in Persian, 1911), excerpted here, was the most popular work of Muslim reformism in Central Asia before 1917, for the new-method schools defended by Fitrat here",

With those impressions, the scholar translated Abdurauf Fitrat's this drama into English and published it. He gave footnotes what sources he had he used when he translated the work. First of all, he focused on those who worked on the language of this drama and studied the works of jadid and Fitrat. They are:

1. *Abdurrauf Fitrat Bukharayi, Munazara[-yi] Mudarris-i Bukharayi ba yak Nafar Farangi dar Hindustan dar barah-yi Makatib-i Jadida (Debate between a Teacher from Bukhara and a European in India about New Schools). (Istanbul, Ottoman Empire: Matba'a-i Islamiyya-i Hikmat, 1911-1912), pp. 30-53. Translation from Persian by William L. Hanaway. Introduction 'by Adeeb Khalid.*

³ Adeeb Khalid. *Jadidism in Central Asia*. – California University press, 1998

* <https://www.vestnik-kafu.info/journal/6/210/>



2. Hisao Komatsu. *Kakumei no Chuo Ajia: aru Jadiido no shozo (Revolutionary Central Asia: Portrait of a Jadid)* (Tokyo, Japan: Tokyo University Press, 1996).

3. Stephane A. Dudoignon. "La question scolaire a Boukhara et au Turkestan russe". (The Education Question in Bukhara and Russian Turkistan), *Cahiers du monde russe (Annals of the Russian World)*, volume 37, 1996, pp. 133-210.

4. Adeb Khalid. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

5. Edward A. Allworth. *The Preoccupations of 'Abdurauf Fitrat, Bukharan Nonconformist: An Analysis and List of His Writings* (Berlin. Germany: Das Arabische Buch, 2000).

Turkish scholar Salikh Beshakchi is one of the foreign scholars who studied Abdurauf Fitrat. Salikh Beshakchi analyzed Fitrat's works such as "Munozara" (The Debate), "Hind ikhtilolchilari" (Indian Revolutionaries) and "Chin sevish" (True Love) as a researcher and a fan of Abdurauf Fitrat. In addition, he also looked through Fitrat's works abroad and in his own country and made a list of the changes in his works. For example: "Actually, the progress of his nation concept was following a line similar to the watan. But Fitrat was stressing the foreign domination over Muslim nations and especially his nation. Perhaps, the notions of liberty and liberation in Fitrat's ideology were inspired by the Young Turk circles during his stay in Istanbul".

In fact, Fitrat didn't like the rule of the foreign invaders in our country. Salikh Beshakchi proved his words by translating the following poem of Abdurauf Fitrat:

Actually, the watan concept of Fitrat was as innocent as an infant's cry to its mother. Fitrat later expressed his feelings regarding to watan in verses of Sayha:

Oh my dear mother,
Oh land of Bukhara
My Pride with you,
And my trust is with you...

In another poem he says:

Begin to blow about my homeland in the morning
Oh, did I say homeland, rather the place where
I prostrate my body and soul
Both my safe place of rest, my honor and glory
And my ka'ba, my qibla, and my garden.



In the process of translation, the translator gave the words vatan/watan, Ka'ba/Ka'ba, qibla/qibla, the same, in the method of transliteration. The name of the poem "Sayha" and the name of the place "Bukhara" (Sayha, Bukhara) were also given in the method of transliteration.

In addition, the author gives excerpts from the work "Munozara" of Fitrat and states on how the issue of the Motherland is expressed in it. The following lines prove it: *"The evolution of the concept of homeland generated the 'liberation' notion. Fitrat explained the occupation of Muslim lands by the ignorance of Muslims. He wrote that "300 million of Muslim population was under the domination of infidels" in the Munâzâra . Fitrat defined his notion with three terms: homeland, nation and liberation; all which are vital to build a state. His concept of homeland started with Bukhara-i Sherif, then developed to include the Emirate of Bukhara, and finally a more comprehensive area including Turkestan"*.

When Salikh Beshakchi speaks about Fitrat's works "Chin sevish" (True Love) and "Hind ixtilolchilari" (Indian revolutionaries), he gives the following information related to them to the public: *"Fitrat first wrote "Chin Sevish" (True love), which has a plain plot compared to Hind Ikhtilâlchilari (Indian Revolutionaries. After Chin Sevish, Fitrat completed Hind Ikhtilâlchilari with more complicated plot and casting. However, Fitrat hesitated to publish it in the political atmosphere of Republic of Bukhara. The play was published in Berlin in 1923 by students of Fitrat who had been sent to Germany for higher education. The Hind Ikhtilâlchilari was one of the subsequent works of Fitrat. Its literal quality was high and its aim was to preach to the public; perhaps it was written for the stage, but records about the staging of this play have not been found. In the Chin Sevish and Hind Ikhtilâlchilari, Fitrat exemplified the liberation of India in the form of an imaginary revolution against the colonial British rule. Fitrat's preliminary homeland concept just covered Bukhara, but this perception expanded to Turkestan in the Hind Ikhtilâlchilari. The interest of Fitrat in India stemmed from the historical commercial and cultural relations of Central Asian people with India. One also believes that as a colony of the British Empire, India was a comparable example to Bukhara in the context of colonialism"*.

In addition, the author compares Fitrat to the Turkish writer Namik Kemal who was born in Turkey in 1840. He studied in different countries of the Ottomans because of his father. He started his first job in the newspaper "Tasviri-efkar". He went away from his homeland due to the persecution of high-ranking people and studied human rights at London and Paris Institutes. His first work "Vatan yoxud



Silistre” (Homeland or Silistra), which was highly welcomed by the public and in 1873 was staged at the Gedepasha Theater. Namik Kemal was a patriotic writer too like Abdurauf Fitrat.

Salikh Beshakchi compared Fitrat’s drama “Hind ixtilolchilari” (Indian revolutionaries) with Namik Kemal’s work “Vatan yoxud Silistre” (Homeland or Silistra). While comparing the author focused on the following aspects: *“The Hind Ikhtilâlchilari (Indian Revolutionaries) and Vatan yahut Silistre (The Homeland or Silistra) had a lot of common points. Perhaps, it was the result of Fitrat’s education in Istanbul and his relations with the Young Turk circles. In both dramas, Fitrat and Namik Kemal are trying to show the love of homeland. Both playwrighters were citizens of a multi-ethnic state. The drama of Namik Kemal takes place within the borders of the Ottoman Empire while Fitrat’s drama takes place in India, which is not his homeland. Mainly, the pressure of the Emir of Bukhara on the Young Bukharans and the Russian colonial domination affected his writing. He might have thought that it was more appropriate to project the plot into other state. India was certainly the most suitable example in his mind, with its cultural and historical ties to Bukhara, and its multi-ethnic and multi-religious character. Namik Kemal was a Young Ottoman, therefore, he was mainly propagating Pan-Ottomanism in his drama, which is apparent in his final slogan, “Viva Ottomans!” However, Fitrat ends his drama as; “Viva Future!”, “Viva India”. Perhaps, it would be appropriate to interpret “Viva Future!” as prayer for the future of the Turkestani peoples, as well as the Emirate of Bukhara. With a glance at the chronology, it would be possible to see that the period that the Hind Ikhtilâlchilari appeared was in sequence with the revolution of the Young Bukharans in Bukhara and the bombing of the Russian forces in 1920. Therefore, it was a wish for the future of Bukhara and Young Bukharans.*

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the literary works by Abdurauf Fitrat have been translated abroad into different languages including English with great interest. Also, a number of scientists, such as Sh.T.Lyons, Adib Khalid as well as Salikh Beshakchi showed their own scientific attitudes towards them. Sometimes, the ideological content, artistic features of Fitrat’s works have also been drawn to a comparative analysis of the works of foreign writers.

REFERENCES

1. Shawn Tomas Lyons. Abdurauf Fitrat's Modern Bukharan Tragedy // International Journal of Central Asian Studies. – Volume 5. – 2000.



2. Adeeb Khalid. *Jadidism in Central Asia*. – California University press, 1998
3. Adeeb Khalid. *Debate between a Teacher from Bukhara and a European in India about New Schools*. (Istanbul, Ottoman Empire: Matba'a-i Islamiyya-i Hikmat, 1911-1912), pp. 30-53. Translation from Persian by William L. Hanaway. Introduction 'by Adeeb Khalid
4. Abdurauf Fitrat. Selected works, Volume I, drama "Abylfayzkhan", "Manaviyat" publishing house, Tashkent - 2000
5. Xudayberganov Yodgorbek Satimboyevich. Interpretation of historical images in fitrat's drama "Abulfayzxon". International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology [IJIERT] ISSN: 2394-3696, Website: www.ijiert.org, May, 2020. p.229-233.
6. Hisao Komatsu. *Kakumei no Chuo Ajia: aru Jadiido no shozo (Revolutionary Central Asia: Portrait of a Jadid)* (Tokyo, Japan: Tokyo University Press, 1996).
7. Stephane A. Dudoignon. "La question scolaire a Boukhara et au Turkestan russe". (The Education Question in Bukhara and Russian Turkistan), *Cahiers du monde russe (Annals of the Russian World)*, volume 37, 1996, pp. 133-210.
8. Adeeb Khalid. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
9. Edward A. Allworth. *The Preoccupations of 'Abdurauf Fitrat, Bukharan Nonconformist: An Analysis and List of His Writings* (Berlin. Germany: Das Arabische Buch, 2000).