

CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY, AND CULTURE

https://cajlpc.casjournal.org/index.php/CAJLPC

Volume: 07 Issue: 04 | October 2026 ISSN: 2660-6828

Article

Key Features of Suyima Ganieva's Research on The History of Uzbek Literature

Sohiba Umarova[1]

1. Alisher Navoi Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature, Doctor of Philological Sciences

Abstract: This article examines the key features of Suyima Ganieva's scholarly research on the history of Uzbek literature. It highlights her significant contribution to the study of classical Uzbek literature, particularly the literary heritage of Alisher Navoi and other representatives of Eastern classical literature. The study analyzes Ganieva's approaches to literary sources, textual criticism, manuscript studies, and the interpretation of historical and literary processes. Special attention is given to her role in identifying, systematizing, and introducing valuable literary and scholarly sources into academic circulation. The article also emphasizes the methodological significance of her research for the development of modern Uzbek literary studies and the preservation of national literary heritage.

Keywords: Suyima Ganieva, Uzbek Literature, Literary History, Alisher Navoi, Classical Literature, Textual Criticism, Manuscript Studies

Citation: Umarova S. Key Features of Suyima Ganieva's Research on The History of Uzbek Literature. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2026, 7(4), 63-67.

Received: 18th Jul 2026
Revised: 10th Aug 2026
Accepted: 25th Aug 2026
Published: 17th Sept 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Each researcher develops a distinctive professional framework, or, more precisely, a professional and scholarly ethic, over the course of many years. At the same time, a complex and often inexplicable relationship emerges between the researcher and the historical period or literary figure under investigation. The fact that Suyima G'aniyeva made the study of literary history her primary scholarly objective and adopted distinctive research approaches in this field is closely associated with such qualities as her conviction, respect, and intellectual pride. One of the first criteria underlying S. G'aniyeva's approach to the study of the history of classical literature, which clearly reflects her scholarly and literary views, is the study of tradition. In particular, she emphasizes the distinctive character of Eastern literature, which differs from the literary heritage of other peoples through its historical formation and exceptional poetic and artistic richness, and articulates her scholarly views on the basis of this criterion [1].

In the East, particular importance is attached to literary traditions, which have undergone creative development over the centuries and have provided a foundation for the flourishing of literature in subsequent periods. As S. G'aniyeva states, "Eastern literature is created, shaped, and developed within the framework of traditions."[2] In studying classical works and the lives and creative legacies of their authors, the scholar first approaches them as products of Eastern modes of thought. In her analysis of classical works, she pays particular attention to features characteristic of Eastern literature, including the predominance of poetics; the expression of profound meanings in Eastern poetry through wisdom and philosophical insight; the presence of symbolism in literary

works; and the creation of different original works within the framework of a common theme [2].

2. Materials and Method

Suyima G‘aniyeva particularly emphasizes the unity of form and content in classical ghazals, considering them an integrated product of literary creativity. She explains that poetic mastery and the individual style of a poet are revealed through symbolism as follows: “The zulma’nayn phenomenon characteristic of our classical literature—the interweaving of outward and inward meanings—is a distinctive feature of many ghazals written by Huvaydo. Beneath the apparent and metaphorical meanings of the poet’s lyrical and ghina-oriented poetry lies, with remarkable artistic mastery, an inwardly mystical mode of thought and an ‘irfani’ philosophy. Huvaydo’s poems such as:

Siynani sadpora qilding, ey pari qoshi qaro,

Tiyra mujgoning bila qilding yurak bag‘rim yaro...

Or:

Sening hajringda, ey dilbar, ajoyib xasta holim bor,

Yurakim quvvati ketti, yurarga **ne majolim bor**

are examples of such zulma’nayn poetry.”

Regarding the representation of the theme of *may* (wine) in Huvaydo’s poetry, S. G‘aniyeva writes: “The praise of wine in Huvaydo’s poetry and his call to drink it in youth should not be understood as an encouragement to consume wine literally, but rather as an expression of the Sufi doctrine that one should become intoxicated with the true wine of divine love in youth rather than in old age, and that the trust of God’s love is bestowed upon His servant in the tavern. This tavern is such a place of wine where one becomes free from worldly worries and concerns and burns solely with the love of Allah.”

3. Results and Discussion

Standard In addition to being written in a beautiful and accessible language, Huvaydo’s poetry is distinguished, as the scholar notes, by the expression of عاشiqona (romantic), orifona (mystical and contemplative), and rindona (free-spirited and spiritually detached) themes. Certainly, later representatives of literature sought to move beyond established traditions by creating new ideas and forms and introducing different literary principles [3]. In discussing such traditions and literary continuity in the East as *nazira* composition and *tatabbu‘* writing, the scholar provides a well-grounded response to various interpretations concerning Navoiy’s creative reworking of *Lison ut-tayr*: “It is more appropriate to understand Navoiy’s acknowledgment that he wrote his work in response to *Mantiq ut-tayr*, in the form of a *nazira*, as an observance of literary tradition. This is because the work has attained a level of originality [4]. This, in turn, demonstrates that during that period the practice of composing *naziras* was approached in an exceptionally broad and profound sense. Therefore, the epic *Lison ut-tayr* should not be regarded as a derivative or copied work; rather, it should be considered a work written under the influence of studying at the school of great masters and deriving inspiration from their works.” [5]

It is precisely the scholar’s notion of “studying at the school of great masters” that deserves particular attention. Through this statement, the scholar suggests that composing a *nazira* does not merely involve reproducing a theme; rather, it represents a process of reading, learning, creative engagement, and intellectual development [6]. Addressing this issue from a broader perspective, the literary scholar Sultonmurod Olimov writes: “In the 1920s, the prominent Orientalist Y. E. Bertels deliberately chose *Lison ut-tayr* to demonstrate scientifically that Navoiy was an original poet of equal standing...”

By this, the scholar intended to emphasize that even *Lison ut-tayr*, which is considered the closest among Navoiy's six epics to the work that exerted an influence on it, is an independent and original work of artistic creation. However, in the study written nearly a century ago, the author's primary objective remained largely focused on highlighting the differences and distinctions between Attar's and Faniy's works. The current task of literary studies, including translation studies, should therefore be to comprehensively and fully reveal the overall interconnectedness between Attar's and Faniy's epics, that is, to examine their relationship from all relevant perspectives [7]. Certainly, a thorough study of the interconnectedness and harmony between Navoiy and his predecessors makes it possible to reveal the poet's artistic mastery more completely [8].

The second criterion characteristic of Suyima G'aniyeva's scholarly approach is her objective and impartial treatment of errors and shortcomings in the publication of literary works. Throughout her scholarly career, S. G'aniyeva considered it necessary to identify, correct, and eliminate certain inaccuracies encountered in literary texts. For example, in the first edition of Huvaydo's six-couplet ghazal *Sabo, yetkur salomimni qadi sarvi ravonimg'a*, written in the *hazaj musammani salim* metre, the fifth couplet was published as follows [9]:

Oni dardi firoqi o'lguncha mandin judo bo'lmas,

Tirilmas jismima ondek tamomi ustuxonimg'a [10].

In a subsequent edition, however, the correction introduced by the scholar more accurately reveals the poet's intended meaning:

Oni dardi firoqi o'lguncha mandin judo bo'lmas,

Taralmish jismima jondek tamomi ustuxonimg'a [11].

The scholar's commitment to objectivity is also evident in her references and explanatory notes. When providing biographical information about a particular literary figure, she also presents how the same individual is characterized or portrayed in other literary sources. For instance, in the seventh *majlis* of *Majolis un-nafois*, we find the following description of Faridun Husayn Mirzo [12]:

"Faridun Husayn Mirzo—Faridun by name and Husayn by lineage. He possesses a dignified and venerable nature, while his character is marked by courtesy and respect. He is unrivalled in archery and an exemplary archer among the people of his age. He is inclined toward worship and piety and is a young man devoted to remembrance and recitation. He possesses a refined disposition and a gentle intellect. This opening couplet belongs to him [13]:

Garchi dar ko'i tu pomoli jafo gardidam,

Ba xudo gar sari mo'ye zi vafo gardidam.

This Turkish opening couplet is also his:

Ey sabo, yetkur manga sarvi ravonimdin xabar,

Pahm etib bergil manga oromi jonimdin xabar."

Although Navoiy praised this Timurid prince and primarily emphasized his positive qualities, S. G'aniyeva, drawing upon *Boburnoma*, also objectively highlights his weaknesses. She writes:

"Faridun Husayn Mirzo was the son of Husayn Bayqara. Regarding this prince, Babur writes: 'He drew the bow well and shot arrows skillfully. It is said that his bow weighed forty batmans. He himself was quite courageous, but he was not victorious in battle. Wherever he fought, he was defeated.' Faridun Husayn Mirzo was killed in one of the battles against Shaybani." [14]

Thus, the shortcomings of the prince that were not mentioned by Navoiy are explained by the scholar on the basis of *Boburnoma*. The information about the prince found in Fakhrī Hiravi's *Ravzat us-salotin* is also close to Navoiy's account [15].

The third criterion characteristic of S. G‘aniyeva’s scholarly work is the systematic collection and organization of information, particularly in presenting the life and creative legacy of a literary figure. Since a work such as *History of Literature* constitutes an important document reflecting the history of the nation, this process places considerable responsibility and scholarly obligation upon the researcher. The materials prepared by S. G‘aniyeva for the book *History of Uzbek Literature* were systematically organized according to established scholarly criteria and presented in a concise and precise manner.

In compiling *History of Uzbek Literature*, each section and each set of scholarly conclusions was entrusted to literary scholars who had conducted in-depth research on the respective topics. The scholars had predetermined the structure of the book and approached the task with considerable scholarly rigor. This methodology is described as follows:

“It was decided from the outset that the process of literary development, together with all its complexities and innovations, would be presented in the survey sections of the ‘History,’ while ideological and thematic issues, theoretical questions, artistic and aesthetic mastery, as well as related issues of tradition and innovation, would be discussed in separate chapters devoted to individual poets and writers. Thus, the volumes consisted of survey sections and monographic portraits.”

For this book, Suyima G‘aniyeva prepared the works of Gadoiy, Husayn Bayqara, and Navoiy for publication. Drawing upon previous editions and scholarly studies, she incorporated information concerning Alisher Navoiy’s works, including *Nazm ul-javohir*, *Lison ut-tayr*, *Mahbub ul-qulub*, *Majolis un-nafois*, *Holoti Sayyid Hasan Ardasher*, *Holoti Pahlavon Muhammad*, *Vaqfiya*, *Munshaot*, and *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*.

S. G‘aniyeva’s contribution to *History of Uzbek Literature* is distinguished by its scholarly rigor and systematic organization in terms of its structure, the scope of the materials covered, their arrangement, and their scholarly evaluation. The experience she accumulated through her work on *History of Uzbek Literature* subsequently demonstrated its value in the publication of the 20-volume *Complete Works of Alisher Navoiy*.

S. G‘aniyeva’s research studies, scholarly articles, and academic presentations related to the topics she selected are of considerable scholarly significance. Her contribution to this publication would be more accurately characterized not as direct participation, but rather as indirect and related scholarly involvement.

4. Conclusion

S. G‘aniyeva also prepared more than one hundred articles for various encyclopedic publications, including the *Uzbek Soviet Encyclopedia* (1971–1980), the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Literature*, and the *Encyclopedia of Turkish Literature*, drawing upon her extensive theoretical and scholarly knowledge and adhering to principles of systematic research. Based on an examination of Suyima G‘aniyeva’s scholarly activities, several methodological criteria that define her scholarly profile have been identified, including adherence to tradition, systematicity, evidential rigor, conciseness, and a continuous aspiration toward innovation. Under the direction of the scholar, manuscript sources of *Majolis un-nafois* were collected, the oldest surviving manuscript copy of the *tazkira* was identified, and a scholarly-critical text was prepared. Throughout her entire scholarly and literary career, Suyima G‘aniyeva succeeded in establishing a distinctive scholarly school of her own. This school may be characterized as the **“Comprehensive Study of the History of Classical Literature”**.

REFERENCES

[1] Alisher Navoiy, *Majolis un-nafois*, Mukammal asarlar to‘plami, vol. 13. Tashkent: Fan.

[2] S. G‘aniyeva, *Shoir haqida so‘z. Huvaydo. Ko‘ngil dardi*. Tashkent: “MERIYUS,” 2009.

[3] A. Hayitmetov and S. G‘aniyeva, “Ko‘p tomlik ‘O‘zbek adabiyoti tarixi’ni yaratish tajribasidan,” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, no. 4, 1986.

[4] Huvaydo, *Ko‘ngil dardi*, prepared for publication and with an introduction by S. G‘aniyeva. Tashkent: “MERIYUS,” 2009.

[5] B. Tukhliev and I. Ismailov, “The image of Iskandar in Turkic sources,” *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1195–1200, 2020.

[6] I. Ismoilov, “About the talismans of Iskandar (Alexander) by Alisher Navoi,” *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 139–145, 2021, doi: 10.21744/ijllc.v7n3.1488.

[7] I. Ismoilov, “Nizomiy va Navoiy: bir mavzuning turfa talqini,” *O‘zbekiston: til va madaniyat. Adabiyotshunoslik*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 18–32, 2023.

[8] I. Ismoilov, “Alisher Navoiyning ‘Saddi Iskandariy’ dostoni debochasi badiiyati,” *Oltin bitiglar–Golden Scripts*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2021.

[9] I. Ismoilov, “Tafsirlarda Iskandar mavzusiga oid talqinlar,” *Oltin bitiglar–Golden Scripts*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2021.

[10] I. A. Ismoilov, “On the issue of literary influence and originality in the epic ‘Saddi Iskandari’,” *Иностранные языки в Узбекистане*, no. 3, pp. 220–226, 2020.

[11] I. Ismoilov, “Nizomiy ‘Iskandarnoma’sining o‘zbek adabiyotshunosligida o‘rganilishi,” *Uzbekistan: Language and Culture*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2019.

[12] I. Ismoilov, “Iskandar oynasi,” *Oltin bitiglar–Golden Scripts*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2019.

[13] I. Ismoilov, “The image of ‘The Mirror of Iskandar’ in the poetry of Alisher Navai and its comparative analysis.”

[14] I. Ismoilov, “‘Boburnoma’ as a literary source,” *American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Research*, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 128–130, 2025, doi: 10.37547/ajsshr/Volume05Issue11-32.

[15] M. Umurzoqova, “The gender factor in identifying linguistic personality in literary texts,” Uzbekistan: Language and Culture, vol. 4, no. 4, 2022. [Online].
Available: https://uzlc.tsuull.uz/index.php/uzlangcult/issue/view/21. Accessed: Jul. 16, 2026.