



THE ISSUE OF AESTHETICS IN FITRAT'S RESEARCH

Hamroyeva Orzigul Jalolovna

DSc, assistant professor

TSU of Uzbek language and literature named after Alisher Navoi

arguvon87@mail.ru

Article history:

Received: 8th January 2025

Accepted: 6th February 2025

Abstract:

In classical literature, a creator's skill was assessed not by what they depicted but by how they depicted it. Thus, an artist's talent was closely tied to their style of expression. Abdurauf Fitrat, a scholar well-versed in classical poetics, not only studied the theoretical foundations of *aruz* (classical prosody) and traditional rhyme but also presented his own perspectives on aesthetics (*badi'*) and its role in literary works. In his textbook *Rules of Literature*, he addresses artistic devices and their function in literary texts as part of the creator's unique style.

Keywords: Abdurauf Fitrat,

INTRODUCTION

In classical literature, a creator's skill was assessed not by what they depicted but by how they depicted it. Thus, an artist's talent was closely tied to their style of expression. Abdurauf Fitrat, a scholar well-versed in classical poetics, not only studied the theoretical foundations of *aruz* (classical prosody) and traditional rhyme but also presented his own perspectives on aesthetics (*badi'*) and its role in literary works. In his textbook *Rules of Literature*, he addresses artistic devices and their function in literary texts as part of the creator's unique style.

Fitrat emphasizes that artistic devices serve as tools of style for the artist, including devices like qualification, simile, metaphor, irony, allegory, personification, questioning, exaggeration, exclamation, contrast, repetition, cut, and twist. He explains each of these through verses. Notably, Fitrat preferred to use Turkic terms over Arabic and Persian ones, renaming these stylistic elements based on their characteristics and providing clear definitions.

METHODS

While discussing qualification as a distinctive artistic device, Fitrat states that "to depict something, you must sequentially present its characteristics and conditions, creating an image in the reader's mind." He offers a sample verse from his work:

Kuchsiz, titrak, oppoq, kichik tomchilar
Turmay, tinmay tuproq uzra yog'adir.
(Weak, trembling, pale, small droplets
Fall unceasingly upon the soil.)

Here, the words *kuchsiz*, *titrak*, *oppoq*, and *kichik* vividly portray the droplets, and "unceasingly" conveys the intensity of their fall.

Fitrat follows the classical tradition of explaining simile (*tashbih*) with its four components, as found in Arabic, Persian, and Turkic treatises. These elements were traditionally derived from Quranic verses and

hadith, later adapted to the changing expressions in literary texts. Fitrat continues this tradition by defining these literary devices based on the possibilities in the Turkic language. Specifically, he substitutes the term "simile" with "similarity" (*oxshatish*) and simplifies the four elements as follows: the one resembling (Ahmad), the compared (lion), the simile particle (like, such as), and the quality (bravery).

For example:

Arslunday yurakli,
Tog' kabi gavdasi,
Olovdek so'zi,
Temir o'xshash qo'li,
Ko'zgu singari ko'ngli bordir.
(Brave as a lion,
Body like a mountain,
Words like fire,
Hand like iron,
Heart like a mirror)

Through this verse, Fitrat demonstrates how these components of simile contribute to the depth of meaning.

Fitrat demonstrates how each element contributes to the effect of the simile. For example, in "*Ahmad is as brave as a lion*," all four elements of the simile are present: the subject (Ahmad), the object (lion), the simile particle (like), and the quality (bravery). Variations in these elements alter the meaning. In "*Ahmad is a lion in bravery*," the simile particle is omitted, and in "*Ahmad is a lion*," both the particle and the quality are absent. Fitrat asserts that the fourth form, without both particle and quality, has the strongest impact. He advises against forced, artificial comparisons and cites examples from Komil Khorezmi and Navoi where similes disrupt the reader's experience.

For instance, Fitrat critiques these verses:



*Alifdek tuz qad-u nundek qoshing
hijronidin har dam,
Tafakkur birla gah nundir qadim, gah
o'ylakim yodur.*

*(Like the letter Alif is her stature, like Nun her
eyebrow,*

*Sometimes I think it is "nun", sometimes I think it is a
"yo".)*

Here, comparing the beloved's stature to Alif and her eyebrow to Nun creates an artificial impression, dulling the emotional impact. In his analysis, Fitrat critiques certain similes used by Komil Khorezmi and Navoi, suggesting that overly elaborate comparisons can detract from a poem's natural beauty. For example, Khorezmi's description of a lover compares her stature to the letter "alif," her eyebrow to "nun," her mouth to a spring, and her beauty mark to a crow. Fitrat finds such comparisons somewhat excessive, stating that they dull the emotional impact by overemphasizing artificial details rather than evoking a natural, relatable image.

Similarly, he criticizes Navoi's verse:

*Ermash uchug, shakarga yopishmas chibin biri,
Iki labim bila oni olsam dudog'ingdan.*

*(It's not the fly that doesn't cling to sugar,
If only I could take it from your lips with my own.)*

Fitrat views this simile as awkward and unappealing, arguing that literary comparisons should be both natural and pleasant, enhancing the imagery without causing discomfort to the reader. For him, a well-crafted simile or metaphor should seamlessly contribute to the work's beauty without feeling forced or exaggerated.

Fitrat also delves into metaphor (*istiora*), which he defines as using a word to convey a meaning other than its literal one. Although metaphors often derive from similes, Fitrat explains that metaphors omit elements like the object and the subject's resemblance. He categorizes metaphors into two types: open and hidden. In open metaphors, the compared element is directly referenced, as in "*U shayton bilan mening hech ishim yo'q (I have nothing to do with the devil)*" where both the subject and the resemblance are apparent. In hidden metaphors, only the resembling element is present, with the metaphorical connection implied rather than stated explicitly.

In the verse

*Borliqning chokini so'kma,
Kel, emdi "yashnab" o'saylik.*

*(Do not tear the fabric of existence;
let us now 'grow and thrive')*

the wind is personified, indirectly likened to a human. Fitrat explains that such stylistic devices, including simile and metaphor, are present in both poetry and prose, drawing examples from modern prose works like Chulpon's *Tulip in the Snow* ("Qor qo'ynida lola") and Saidali's *Spring in Nature* ("Tabiatda bahor").

Fitrat introduces personification under the term *jonlantirish* (animating), using examples from Elbek and Chulpon's poetry to demonstrate its effectiveness in syllabic verse. In the following lines, for example:

*Bir zamon ko'klarga qanot qoqqan bu,
Sevgili, muhtasham haybatli bino.*

*Yemrilish soatin kutganday bo'lub,
Ko'runur ko'zga qayg'ulig'ina.*

*(This once-mighty, majestic building,
Seems to await its hour of ruin,
Appearing sorrowful to the eye.)*

In this analysis, Fitrat discusses Elbek's poetic passage where an imposing building is described as if it could "spread its wings," attributing a non-human quality to it, thus personifying or "animating" the structure. This technique of attributing human-like or lively characteristics to inanimate objects brings the imagery to life, creating a vivid picture for the reader.

Fitrat also highlights an exquisite example of personification in the epic *Layli and Majnun*. In a scene where Majnun collapses at Layli's feet and later regains consciousness, the surrounding garden—its flowers, nightingales, and trees—are depicted as sharing in his sorrow, as though they too are mourning with him. This poetic description captures the garden's deep empathy, illustrating personification beautifully:

*Bulbul boshi uzra nag'mapardoz,
Ahvolig'a navha aylab og'oz.*

*Gul holig'a chun nazora aylab,
Gulgun yaqosini pora aylab....*

(The nightingale mourns above its

head,

Expressing grief in its song.

*The rose, seeing his sorrowful state,
Rips its crimson collar in sorrow.)*

Fitrat sees this as a powerful use of personification, as the garden itself appears to suffer alongside Majnun, enhancing the emotional depth and connection in the scene.

40

Similarly, Fitrat explores other rhetorical devices. In classical texts on poetics, the device *tajohuli arif* (feigned ignorance) is known as *so'rash* (questioning) by Fitrat. For example:



*Boqmas menga janona, ajab holat
emasmu?*

*Bo'ldi yana begona, ajab holat
emasmu?*

*(Does my beloved not look at me? Is it not strange?
Has she become a stranger again? Is it not strange?)*

Fitrat also analyzes the exclamatory device (*undash*), noting how emotions intensify through a "cry for attention." For instance:

*Ey zoli zamona, dod, faryod,
Atfolingg'a necha zulfi bedod.*

*Bu haynikim halok etarsan,
O'z bag'ring erurki, chok etarsan.
(Oh cruel world, enough of your injustice!
How many children suffer under your merciless
grip!*

*The one whom you destroy today
Is none other than your own heart.)*

The address in "Oh cruel world" creates a vivid exclamation, drawing attention to the speaker's despair. Fitrat emphasizes that such devices enhance the emotional impact when used effectively, helping convey deeper sentiment through evocative language.

In *Rules of Literature*, Fitrat examines two specific techniques: *tazod* (contrast) and *ruju'* (repetition). He defines these terms and provides analytical examples from both contemporary and classical works. To explain contrast, he references the poet Botu, showing how opposing words in his verse create a vivid image:

*Yorug'likni sevaturg'on bizning tinuq
ko'nglimiz,*

*Qachong'acha qorong'ular ichra qolar
bo'g'ulub.*

*(Our clear hearts love light;
How long shall they suffocate in darkness?)*

In this verse, the words "light" and "darkness" establish contrast. Fitrat also discusses similar uses of contrast in Babur's poetry, highlighting how these oppositions contribute to the poem's overall meaning.

Fitrat identifies two other techniques, *kesish* (cut) and *burilish* (twist), as devices that amplify meaning. He explains that *kesish* occurs when the creator pauses due to a lack of words to express a thought fully, while *burilish* is when the writer shifts direction mid-description or narrative, providing an unexpected turn.

Fitrat discusses the categorization of artistic devices by Atoullloh Husayniy, who divides them into *lafziy* (verbal), *ma'noviy* (semantic), and *mushtarak* (mixed) arts. Although Fitrat does not strictly categorize these in

Rules of Literature, he distinguishes between devices that affect meaning and those based on wordplay, preferring the term "play" for the latter. According to Fitrat, these verbal devices emerged under the influence of Arabic and Persian literature. He presents his scholarly conclusions, asserting that while Persian poets often indulged in artificial wordplay, Uzbek-Chagatai poets did not reach the same heights. Fitrat criticizes excessive wordplay, seeing little benefit for literature, and he refers to poets who devoted themselves to it as having "wasted their literary talent."

He especially criticizes the practice of *ta'rikh* (chronogram), where poets would record dates of significant events, like the construction of a madrasa or palace, through complex numerical wordplay. Fitrat argues that this has little relevance to the essence of poetry. He values unique artistic styles that emphasize meaningful content over form and avoids devices that merely embellish the text without adding depth to the message.

Fitrat delves into various forms of wordplay, providing examples from genres like *tajnis* (paronomasia), *laff va nashr* (conflation and separation), *saj'* (rhymed prose), *ta'rikh* (chronogram), and *muammo* (riddle). He highlights the potential of these devices for artistic expression, especially focusing on *saj'*, or rhymed prose. Fitrat traces *saj'* back to its roots in Arabic literature, where it was initially tied to Quranic verses, later influencing Persian and Turkic literary traditions. He cites passages from Alisher Navoi's *Mahbub ul-qulub* and Amir Umar Khan's *Divan*, noting the impact of end-of-sentence rhyme.

However, Fitrat cautions against overusing *saj'*, arguing that an entire work written in rhymed prose can disrupt the natural flow of the style, as seen in some Arabic and Persian compositions. Instead, he believes that sparing use of rhyme in select lines enhances its effect, illustrating this with lines from the epic *Alpomish*. Fitrat values this tradition in folk epics, viewing it positively as it brings emphasis without overwhelming the text.

CONCLUSION

As a prominent scholar of literature, Fitrat conducted detailed research on classical poets, examining their sources, the structure of their texts, and the poetic analysis of literary works. He paid close attention to metrics, rhyme schemes, and aesthetic elements in their works, contributing to theoretical insights on the science of aesthetics and poetics.

REFERENCES



1. Фитрат. Танланган асарлар. 4 жилдлик. 1-жилд. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2000. – 188 б.
2. Фитрат. Танланган асарлар. 4 жилдлик. 2-жилд. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2000. – 208 б.
3. Фитрат. Танланган асарлар. 4 жилдлик. 3-жилд. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2003. – 256 б.
4. Фитрат. Танланган асарлар. 4 жилдлик. 4-жилд. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2006. – 254 б.
5. Seyhan, T., & Jalolovna, H. O. (2023). FITRAT-TEXTOLOGIST (Based on the complex" Examples of Uzbek literature"). Academia Science Repository, 4(5), 1083-1087.
6. Hamroyeva, O. J. (2022). CLASSIFICATION OF FINE ARTS IN" HADOYIQ US-SIKHR". Scientific reports of Bukhara State University, 2022(1), 47-56.
7. Jalolovna, H. O. PIECES FROM "BOBURNOMA" IN ABDURAUFG FITRAT'S COLLECTION.
8. Jalolovna, H. O. CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SCIENCE OF RHYME AND THE SCIENCE OF BADE'. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY, 181.