IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 22 Issue 01 IYUN 2026

АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСКАЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРА XIX ВЕКА В ЛИТЕРАТУРНОЙ КРИТИКЕ 20-30-Х ГОДОВ XX ВЕКА

Мамедова Айнур Мамед гызы
Доктор философии по филологии
aynur252@mail.ru

Резюме

В литературной критике 20-30-х годов XIX веку уделяется особое внимание как составной части литературы нового периода. В литературе этого столетия критику привлекают два основных аспекта: проникновение европейских жанров в национальную литературную сферу и связанное с этим усиление общественного содержания литературы. Литературная критика акцентирует внимание на нарастании критических нот в литературе, а также на пропаганде и исследовании произведений критического содержания. В этом смысле для литературной критики XIX век в Азербайджане является «веком Мирзы Фатали».

Особый интерес к азербайджанской литературе XIX века в критике 20-30-х годов был обусловлен тем, что литература этого столетия воплощала в себе черты, характерные для «литературы нового периода». Именно в XIX веке азербайджанская литература вступает в систему нового художественного мышления.

Для критики 20-30-х годов литература XIX века была интересна, прежде всего, как литература социального содержания. Критика видела широкие возможности литературы XIX века в контексте главного требования политического режима — использования литературы как средства идеологической пропаганды. Хотя требование политического режима к литературе — «изучать классическое наследие по-ленински» (Али Назим) — было однозначным, и условия для изучения классического наследия создавались непосредственно в связи с этой установкой, литературно-критическая и теоретическая мысль подходила к историко-литературному процессу с более широких позиций.

В 20-30-е годы такие исследователи, как Ханафи Зейналлы, Амин Абид, Али Назим, Атабаба Мусаханлы, Абдулла Шаиг, Микаил Рафили, Гамид Араслы, Мамедали Мубариз и другие, наряду с различными историческими периодами нашей литературной истории, сумели представить серьезные труды и в области литературы XIX века. Следует отметить, что Салман Мумтаз проводил наиболее последовательную работу по изучению XIX века в истории азербайджанской литературы.

Ключевые слова: литературная критика, литература XIX века, советская идеология,

19TH CENTURY AZERBAIJAN LITERATURE IN LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE 20-30S OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Summary

Special attention is paid to the Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century in the criticism of the 20s-30s as an integral part of the literature of the new era. Two aspects in the literature of this century especially attract the attention of criticism: the penetration of European genres into the national literary sphere and the strengthening of the social content of literature in this regard. Literary criticism pays special attention to the strengthening of critical notes in literature and the

promotion and study of works with critical content. In this sense, the 19th century is the “century of Mirza Fatali” in Azerbaijan for literary criticism.

In the criticism of the 20s-30s, there was a special interest in the Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century. One of the main reasons for this is that the literature of this century contains the features of the “literature of a new era”. Azerbaijani literature enters the new system of artistic thought precisely in the 19th century.

In the criticism of the 1920s and 1930s, Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century was interesting, first of all, as literature with a social content. Criticism saw that 19th century literature provided ample opportunities for the main demand that the political regime placed on literature - the demand to use literature as a means of ideological propaganda. However, although the political regime's demand for an approach to literature - the demand to "study the classical heritage in Lenin's way" (Ali Nazim) - was unambiguous, and although the conditions created for the study of the classical heritage were directly related to this aspect of the issue, criticism and literary-theoretical thought approached the historical-literary process with a broader perspective. In the 1920s and 1930s, Hanafi Zeynalli, Amin Abid, Ali Nazim, Atababa

Musaxanli, Abdulla Shaig, Mikayil Rafili, Hamid Arasli, Mammadali Mubariz and others managed to publish serious works on various historical periods of our literary history, as well as on the literature of the 19th century. It should be noted that Salman Mumtaz conducted more consistent work on the history of Azerbaijani literature in the 19th century.

Keywords: literary criticism, 19th century literature, Soviet ideology, new era

Introduction. In the Soviet period, Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century was studied, as a rule, as an independent period in Azerbaijani literary criticism. The emergence of the Enlightenment movement as a typological quality that determined the literary independence of the period and the formation of enlightened-realist literature on the basis of this movement were taken as the basis. Professor Yashar Garayev, basing his fundamental research on the literature of the Eastern peoples, came to the conclusion that “in general, the 19th century in the Near and Middle East is considered the century of enlightenment and enlightened realism. It was at this time that the spiritual culture of the East decided on a new direction in the regularity of its internal development, and Azerbaijan is no exception in this sense” [9, p.63]. If you pay attention, it is not difficult to see that even in this approach, the 19th century is evaluated as the century of the beginning of a “new direction” in Eastern, including Azerbaijani literature. There is great truth here. Modern literary criticism considers it more scientifically sound to study the literature of the 19th century as “Azerbaijani literature of the new era”. However, national literary criticism does not limit the boundaries of the “new era” only to the 19th century, and the beginning of the 20th century is also studied as an integral part of this era or as its second stage. If we take into account that when we say “new era” in world literature, we mean “the period from the emergence of bourgeois societies (XVII-XVIII centuries) to the First World War (1914-1918)” [6, p.453], and that the emergence of bourgeois relations in Azerbaijan took place in the 19th century, and the process of their formation took place at the beginning of the 20th century, it is possible to accept the study of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century as a legitimate case as “new era Azerbaijani literature”.

In the criticism of the 20s-30s, there was a special interest in the Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century. One of the main reasons for this is that the literature of this century contains the features characteristic of a “new era literature”. Azerbaijani literature enters a new system of artistic thought precisely in the 19th century. It is precisely in this century that, along with the continuation of the Eastern artistic thought system, significant facts and events of the Western artistic thought system appear in Azerbaijani literature. The enlightened realism of the 19th century appears as the greatest literary and cultural event of Westernization in Azerbaijani

literature. Considering that the social content of literature in European literature strengthened precisely in the 19th century, we should remember the work of Mirza Fatali Akhundov as the greatest echo of this in Azerbaijani literature.

Main. In the criticism of the 1920s and 1930s, the 19th century Azerbaijani literature was interesting, first of all, as literature with a social content. Criticism saw that the 19th century literature provided ample opportunities for the main demand that the political regime put before literature - the demand to use literature as a means of ideological propaganda. However, although the political regime's demand for an approach to literature - the demand to "study the classical heritage in Lenin's way" (Ali Nazim) was unambiguous, and the conditions created for the study of the classical heritage were directly related to this aspect of the issue, criticism and literary-theoretical thought approached the historical-literary process with a broader perspective. If we involve the system of views of the criticism of this stage on the literature of the 19th century, in the broad sense of the word, in typological generalization, then it is possible to observe the dominance of two directions - two tendencies in the study of the classical heritage. The first direction: criticism tries to highlight only the socio-political content in the literature of the period in general, as well as in the work of individual artists. Literature is used as a means to form a critical, and at the same time, a denialist, view of the historical path taken by the people and the socio-political systems that emerged on this path. The 1920s and 1930s were a period in the history of the Soviet regime when atheism was rampant and a consistent struggle was waged to form the idea of godlessness, and therefore, in the work of artists, a critical attitude towards religious figures was emphasized, presented as the main ideological direction of the artist's work, and even in literature, a critical attitude towards religious figures was explained as a criticism of the foundations of religion. It must be admitted that the main political purpose of the increasing attention and care for the study of literary heritage was related to this trend.

At the same time, if we consider the scale of the work done in the literary-theoretical thought of the 20s-30s not only on the 19th century Azerbaijani literature (of course, also on the literature of the early 20th century), we will see that the work done was not unambiguously subordinated to the literary policy of the Soviet regime. That is, the second main direction of the work done by literary criticism was to create the history of the people's literature and to determine the place of the 19th century literature in this history on scientific-theoretical and factual grounds. In the 20s, creating the history of Azerbaijani literature was one of the leading tendencies of literary-theoretical thought, and an objective attitude to this history was also at the forefront. Ideological pressures could not seriously influence scientific thought in the 20s. In these years, the tendency to investigate and reveal the history of national literature in all its aspects was strong. It is true that towards the end of the 1930s and in the subsequent stages it was not possible to fully maintain this tendency, nevertheless, we must admit that the work done at the beginning of the 20th century towards creating the history of national literature was continued on a very large scale in the 20s-30s, and in any case, the fundamental foundation of our literary history was laid in these years.

In the 20s-30s, Hanafi Zeynalli, Amin Abid, Ali Nazim, Atababa Musaxanli, Abdulla Shaig, Mikayil Rafili, Hamid Arasli, Mammadali Mubariz and others managed to publish serious works on the literature of the 19th century, along with various historical periods of our literary history. It should be noted that Salman Mumtaz conducted more consistent work on the history of Azerbaijani literature in the 19th century.

As we have noted, although ideological control did not work at full strength in the 1920s, the study of classical heritage, the collection and publication of this heritage still faced strong resistance. In the 1920s, the problem of literary history was perceived as evidence of the national historical existence of the people, a problem of national memory, and therefore researchers demonstrated great determination. The criticism posed the issue as follows: “In order to write our

historical literature, we must search for our old literature with a different taste and publish and publish those works. Because, according to many, Azerbaijani literature, although ancient, consisted of Gumri and Dilsuz. And this is nothing but ignorance" [12, p.275].

In the words of Salman Mumtaz, was this attitude towards "our historical literature" simply a matter of "ignorance"? What was the essence of the idea that our literature consisted only of "Gumri and Dilsuz"?

It is known that Gumri and Dilsuz were great representatives of lament poetry in 19th-century Azerbaijani literature. The issue in denying our literary history was not the issue of Gumri and Dilsuz. First of all, the issue was that the existing ideological and artistic directions of our classical heritage were not accepted. Denialist approaches to the history of Azerbaijani literature, including 19th-century literature, were nourished by proletarian-cultist thinking and were calculated to deny the literary and cultural thought of the peoples, including the Azerbaijani people. The criticism of the 20s-30s saw this side of the issue, and although in some cases it was forced to retreat, it used every opportunity that arose, and carried out consistent work on all periods of our classical heritage. Salman Mumtaz summarized the difficulties that national literary criticism faced in this direction in the 1920s as follows: "I published many articles with the above title in the newspaper "Communist" published in 1923-1924. At that time, some of our writers had two beliefs. Along with those who were satisfied with those articles that I published in Peydarpey, there were also those who were dissatisfied.

Those who were satisfied wanted to read, criticize and analyze a new work. Those who were dissatisfied did not consider works written before 1920 as works and presented their own writings. They even dared to insult the great Vagif, the immortal representative of our literature, and his works, and even demanded that they not be read" [12, p.223].

Obviously, "not considering works written before 1920 as works" was based on proletarian thinking and was an expression of a nihilistic attitude towards the classical heritage. Nevertheless, the work done on 19th-century Azerbaijani literature in the 1920s and 1930s shows that criticism was able to break this resistance and approach issues with a national mindset. In his introduction to the book "Natavan Khurshid Banu" (Baku, Azernashr, 1928), which consists of the works of one of the famous representatives of 19th century Azerbaijani literature, "Natavan Khurshid Banu" (Baku, Azernashr, 1928), Hanafi Zeynalli says: "It is possible to note that the literature of this century is concentrated in three points," and distinguishes the work of Gasim bey Zakir, Mahammad bey Ashiq and others as "local classicism", M.F. Akhundov as "Europeanism", and Kh. Natavan and other "Majlisi-uns" poets as "ghazalism and arianism" [16, p. 265]. Hanafi Zeynalli's typological classification of 19th century literature seems interesting not for its perfection, but for the critic's initiative to distinguish typological trends in the literature of this period. It is interesting that in the literature of the 19th century, in the person of M.F. Akhundov as the bearer of European-type literature, G. Zakir as a prominent representative of the satirical school, and Kh. Natavan as a representative of the classical romantic tradition, the differentiation of trends in the literature of the 19th century is justified in terms of the most general directions. In the criticism of the 20s-30s, the attitude to these trends, and also a rather different attitude, is at the forefront. If we consider Hanafi Zeynalli's division and the picture of typological approaches to the literature of the 19th century in the criticism of the 20s-30s in the most general way, we must say that criticism, first of all, highlights the European trend in the literature of the period. In the second case, the satirical trend and the creativity of its representatives are of serious interest. In the third case, the 19th century picture of the classical romantic poetic tradition, and finally, literature with religious content, becomes the subject of analysis. Modern literary criticism puts the issue quite correctly, saying that "the literary criticism of the Soviet period focused its main attention on almost one branch of the 19th century - the direction of new literature" [11, p.3]. Literary criticism, which is calculated from the point

of view of studying the literature of the 19th century on the thought of the period of independence, quite correctly identifies as a problem that "when presenting the literary landscape of the 19th century, the tendencies that are most often denied in the histories of Soviet literature and are evaluated only from the point of view of criticism are sectarian poetry and religious resistance literature" [11, p.5].

The point is that the attitude of criticism of the 20s-30s to the issue differs from the subsequent stages. Of course, the literature of the 19th century was interesting for literary criticism and criticism, first of all, for its social content, as a carrier of literary tendencies that emerged in the new era. This "interest" was also reflected in critical thought. Literary criticism considered the study of 19th-century Azerbaijani literature to be more important from a "practical point of view" than in previous historical periods. Obviously, the "practical point of view" implied a stronger influence of 19th-century literature on public consciousness with its social content. The strong expression of a critical attitude to social events in 19th-century Azerbaijani literature on the basis of enlightenment provided serious material from the point of view of propaganda of Soviet ideology. It is in this sense that the main direction of Hanafi Zeynalli's critical attitude to Ismayil Hikmet's newly published "History of Azerbaijani Literature" should be understood.

Although literary criticism emphasizes the "practical" approach to the study of 19th century literature, it attracts our attention that in the practical activity itself, the tendency to present and study the history of the literature of the period with all its trends prevailed. It is interesting that in the studies that emerged after the 1940s, as literary critic T. Mammad rightly noted, "in the section on the 19th century of the "History of Azerbaijani Literature" published in 1960, as well as in F. Gasimzade's "History of 19th century Azerbaijani literature", religious literature was not allocated a separate direction and was not mentioned" [11, p. 3]. However, in the "Workbook on Literature" published in 1928, Seyid Azim Shirvani, Gasim bey Zakir, along with representatives of 19th century lament literature, detailed information was provided under the title "Elegy Literature and Its Features". The author of the essay, Hanafi Zeynalli, wrote: "If we were to get acquainted with Dilsuz from Iranian Azerbaijan, Dakhil, Raji and Shuai, Gumri and Purgham from Caucasians, among those famous for their lamentations, we would not know the general face of this school" [4, p.190]. In the "Workbook on Literature", "elegiac literature and its features" are presented as "the literary style of the reactionary-religious group in the pre-capitalist commercial era". It is clear that Gumri, Dilsuz, Raji and others did not complement the Soviet ideology with the ideological direction of their work. In other words, they stood at the opposite pole of this ideology. So, what was the purpose of allocating space to elegiac literature in a book intended for schoolchildren? If you pay attention, it is not difficult to see that elegiac literature is presented in the book as an independent "literary style", a "literary school". So, the existence of this style in the literature of the 19th century is confirmed and, since it exists, it is considered necessary to study it. It is clear that by presenting elegiacism as "the literary style of the reactionary-religious group", literary criticism expresses its critical attitude towards it and wants to show that it does not appreciate this style. However, the presentation of elegiac literature goes much further than this "critical" approach. The brief overview of the historical development of lament literature in the essay, the fact that lament is a historical branch of Turkish literature, that it later acquired a religious content and was connected with Islam, that it was mostly dedicated to the death of the martyrs of Karbala, the abundant presentation of examples from the laments of Gumri, Dilsuz, Raji, and Dakhil, and the attempts to analyze them from an ideological and artistic perspective clearly show that Hanafi Zeynalli considers lament literature to be an important trend in 19th century Azerbaijani literature. He writes: "Elegies are only one form of laments. The "sagu" (laments) that were popular among the Turkic peoples in the past were poems read in public gatherings or during mourning ceremonies together with

kopuzes" [4, p.185]. Hanafi Zeynalli's frequent reference to the ideas of M.F. Korpuluzadeh while expressing his opinions also shows that the concept of studying the history of our literature in the context of common Turkish literature had preserved itself even in the late 1920s. In fact, one of the main reasons for the critic's attention to lament literature is that the first examples of laments appeared as a product of common Turkish literature. Hanafi Zeynalli's considerations on the internal connection between lament literature and eulogy literature in his studies also seem quite reasonable. He believes that "it is completely logical for a poet who has died a saint to read eulogies to him during his lifetime, just as he would read eulogies to him during his death." In fact, the critic is right to consider lament literature as another face of eulogy: "...On the other hand, they kept the trend of eulogy alive by continuing a different type of eulogy" [4, p.189].

The fact that the creative work of the representatives of lament literature is presented in an organic connection with their works that appeared in other genres of classical poetry also proves that criticism attached serious importance to this trend, despite criticizing the petrified canons of lament poetry, in some cases insincerity, and traditionalism of language. It seems that Hanafi Zeynalli imagines the various literary trends in the literature of the 19th century as, in the words of Salman Mumtaz, "that chain that is worked out and extended by the hands of an artist - the delicate and golden rings of poetry" [12, p.23] and believes that there is a serious need for a comprehensive presentation of the literary landscape of the period in order to restore the connection between historical literary processes.

This view of Salman Mumtaz, Hanafi Zeynalli, as well as other representatives of criticism of the 20s and 30s, in relation to the history of literature, is scientifically justified.

"In addition to the lamentation of the speechless, his praise, satire and ghazal also appear," says Hanafi Zeynalli, creating a complete picture of his creative directions, and gives an example of one of his satires:

"I saw the roof he built on the people's property,
The mullah's cunning image became a slave.
The pilgrim, the tuxedo, is a worshiper of the dense shawl,
The Rovzakhans spit on each other's mane" [4, p.191].

There can be no doubt that this satire reminds Mirza Alakbar Sabir's satire "The Conversation of Twelve Men in a Meeting" both in terms of poetic form and in terms of the author's position and idea. So, the critics of the 20s-30s correctly imagined the factors that conditioned the development of the literary-historical process, and considered the possibility of obtaining truly objective scientific results by creating a correct picture of the creativity of each period, stage and representative of the history of literature.

During these years, while conducting research on the literature of the 19th century, the critics worked in several directions:

-first, to deepen research on artists who were known as representatives of 19th century literature until the 1920s, whose life path and creativity were studied in one way or another, and whose works were more or less known to the readership and the scientific and literary community, to obtain new facts and materials about their lives, activities and works and to convey them to the readership;

-second, to provide information about artists who lived and created in the 19th century, but whose lives and creativity have not been revealed, and whose works have not been published;

-third, to examine the activities of artists who are representatives of 19th century Azerbaijani literature in the context of predecessor-successor relations, as well as relations with their contemporaries. In other words, to deepen research in the context of the artist and the literary environment;

-fourth, to conduct more serious and comprehensive analyses of the artists' works, creative path, etc.

Among the works carried out in the first direction, the research conducted on Mirza Fatali Akhundov, Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Gasim bey Zakir is particularly noteworthy. Naturally, at this time M.F. Akhundov is perceived as a phenomenal phenomenon of 19th century Azerbaijani literature, and the attention of researchers is more focused on issues related to his activities. The first and most important reason for this, as mentioned above, was that he was the creator of European-style literature. Akhundov was, in his own words, the "founder-deceiver" of many directions in Azerbaijani literature, and this aspect of the issue could not be ignored. Hanafi Zeynalli called one of his articles about Akhundov "The Age of Mirza Fatali in Azerbaijan" [16, p.187] and when evaluating the creativity of 19th century artists – whether they lived before, during, or after M.F. Akhundov's time – he took M.F. Akhundov's work as a literary criterion. In this sense, the interest in M.F. Akhundov's work was completely natural.

One of the most fundamental works that criticism of the 1920s and 1930s did regarding Mirza Fatali Akhundov was to find and reveal his works that were unknown until the 1920s and to present them to a wide readership and literary community by providing detailed information about them in the press. Amin Abid's work in this direction should be specially noted.

In his article titled "Unknown Works of Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh" published in the 11th-12th issues of the "Revolution and Culture" magazine in 1930, Amin Abid wrote: "The works of Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh known to literary history so far are six plays (written in 1850-1855) and one story (written in 1857) and a work titled "Three Letters of the Indian Prince Kamal al-Dawla to the Iranian Prince Jalal al-Dawla and Jalal al-Dawla's Reply to Him" (written in 1865). However, based on our research, we managed to obtain twelve more works of Mirza Fatalih, both large and small, thanks to which the great role of his creative personality, which had remained unknown until then, was illuminated" [2, p. 5]. Amin Abid provided the first and most detailed information about M.F. Akhundov's literary-critical and philosophical articles, poetic works, and "works on the new alphabet" known to us. In his second article, he presented eight articles by M.F. Akhundov dedicated to the issue of the new alphabet, as well as his works "Babilism Beliefs" and "Nuskheyi-Kemaluddov's Appendix". This fundamental activity of Amin Abidin Mirza Fatali Akhundov has not been reported in any of the studies written on Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century, as well as in the "literary history" books of this period. However, the materials that Amin Abidin Mirza Fatali Akhundov uncovered and the analyses he gave to them, and the "Conclusion" section added to the end of both articles, prove that important work was done in the criticism of Akhundov in the 20s-30s.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, serious research on the life, social activities, and creative directions of M.F. Akhundov began to emerge in literary criticism. In this regard, we should especially mention Hanafi Zeynalli's articles "Literary and social activities of M.F. Akhundov" [16, pp. 172-176], "Ideology in the works of M.F. Akhundzadeh" [16, pp. 177-186], "The age of Mirza Fatali in Azerbaijan", Amin Abid's "Mirza Fatali Akhundov in Turkish literature", "Press conflicts of Mirza Fatali Akhundov", Salman Mumtaz's "Mirza Fatali (Sabuhi) and Jafargulu khan Nava" [12, pp. 223-227], "Mirza Fatali Sabuhi and Mirza Mahammad Katib" [12, pp. 252-264], "Mirza Fatali Sabuhi, Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Molla Abbas Asufta" [12, pp. 239-243]. These studies conducted on M.F. Akhundzade give us every reason to believe that the Akhundov studies branch of Azerbaijani literary studies was formed in the 1920s and 1930s. A careful study of these articles shows that many issues related to the life and work of M.F. Akhundov were clarified precisely in the 20s-30s (at least in the initial version). These studies give us reason to say that in some cases the criticism of these years is even ahead of modern Akhundzade studies.

One of the issues raised in the criticism of the 20s-30s regarding Mirza Fatali Akhundov and which found its scientific solution is the issue of the place of the great artist in world literature. The issue of the place of M.F. Akhundov in world literature was posed in the form of

the problem of “M.F. Akhundov and Moliere”, and the attitude to the issue was divided in the criticism of the 20s-30s. Some researchers have sought the issue of “M.F. Akhundov and Moliere” in the writing and creation of M.F. Akhundov under the influence of Moliere. In most cases, the expression “Azerbaijani Moliere” used about M.F. Akhundov was understood in the sense of literary influence. This tendency was also present in the criticism of the 20s-30s. M.K. Alekberli wrote in his study “Azerbaijani Literature”: “Akhundov is the first Turkish playwright. The emergence of Turkish theater is connected with his name. He brought Moliere, Ostrovsky, Gogol to the Turkish stage with his comedies. Undoubtedly, they had a certain influence on the great Turkish playwright” [5, p.16]. This way of putting the issue, comparing M.F. Akhundov’s dramatic work with Moliere’s dramaturgy and the issue of Akhundov’s influence on Moliere first took its place in Russian and European literary criticism, and then penetrated into national literary criticism.

An article published in the magazine “Revolution and Culture” (“Opinions about Mirza Fatali Akhundov in the European press”) and the article “Azerbaijani Moliere” by the playwright’s grandson Mahmanzar Gajar clarify that this expression was first used in the Russian press, and then passed to the European press. Mahmanzar Gajar writes: “At that time, Russian writers saw and noted such an original talent. For example, in 1853, an article dedicated to the works of M.F. Akhundov was published in the 8th issue of the newspaper “Russki invalid”. “P.L.” The writer, who wrote under his own name, noted that “a genius of drama, a Tatar Moliere, has emerged, whose name deserves to be famous even outside his small homeland” [10, p.99]. M. Qajar, deepening his attitude to the issue, reveals the specific history of the transfer of the comparison of Akhundov with Moliere from Russian researchers to the thoughts of European researchers: “...In 1889, Alfred Schiller published M.F. Akhundov’s comedies “The Vizier of the Khan of Lankaran” and “The Lawyers of the Trial” in Persian in Paris. The reviewer of this book, repeating the comparison made by the Petersburg writer 40 years ago, writes: “There are some things in the author of the Azerbaijani original that really remind us of Moliere” [10, p.100].

This approach, which Amin Abidin put into circulation, must be said to have gained more supporters in the national criticism of the 1930s and ultimately resulted in revealing typological differences between the dramaturgy of Akhundov and Moliere. The articles “Thoughts on Mirza Fatali Akhundov in the European Press” (author not mentioned) and Mammad Arif’s “Great Dramatist” published in the 6th-7th issues of the magazine “Revolution and Culture” in 1937 are particularly notable in this respect.

The criticism of the 1930s tried to identify with great courage the aspects that fundamentally distinguish the aesthetics of Akhundzadeh's dramaturgy from Moliere's work. If we summarize the ideas on this aspect of the issue in the article "Opinions on Mirza Fatali Akhundov in the European Press" and in M. Arif's article "The Great Playwright", the following scientific conclusions can be put forward:

Akhundzadeh is as brilliant an artist as Moliere, therefore he was able to escape from Moliere's influence and create completely original works of art.

Moliere could not escape from the influence of classicism, while Akhundzadeh's comedies are completely outside the laws of classicism. The freedom of time and space of classicism is fundamental in Moliere's work.

While Moliere's heroes appear as abstract carriers of the author's thoughts and ideas, Akhundzadeh's heroes are completely realistic types born from life observations.

Akhundzadeh's comedies show more qualities of Shakespearean realism than Moliere.

Between the comedies "Haji Kara" and "Xasis", which are more popular for comparing Akhundzadeh and Moliere, completely different aspects are observed in the nature of such artistic reflection methods and type creation.

The position of the criticism of the 30s, which explained the Akhundzadeh-Moliere relations as Akhundzadeh opening a completely new page in world dramaturgy after Moliere, was defended in the 40s as well. M. Huseyn opened a more comprehensive discussion on this issue in his article "Some Notes on the Dramaturgy of M.F. Akhundov" written in 1940 [8, p. 401]. Expressing his opinion on the issue, prof. T. Salamoglu writes that "M. Huseyn puts forward solid evidence that M.F. Akhundov's comedies emerged as an aesthetic phenomenon completely different from Moliere's comedies" [13, p. 182]. Lakin prof. T.Salamoğlu Axundzadə-Molyer əlaqələrinin bu istiqamətdəki təfsirini əsasən M.Hüseynin yuxarıda adı çəkilən məqaləsi ilə bağlayır. Halbuki yuxarıda haqqında söhbət açdığımız yazılar əsas verir deyək ki, Axundzadə-Molyer əlaqələrinin obyektiv elmi izahının əsası 30-cu illər tənqidində qoyulmuşdur. T.Salamoğlu 40-cı illərdən sonra Axundzadə-Molyer əlaqələrinin daha çox ədəbi təsir səviyyəsində izah edildiyini və bu məsələ ilə bağlı 30-40-cı illərdə əldə edilmiş qənaətlərin inkişaf etdirilməməsini, haqlı olaraq, yanlış hesab edir [13, s.181].

20-30-cu illər tənqidində Mirzə Fətəli Axundzadənin türk xalqları ədəbiyyatındakı yeri və bu ədəbiyyata təsiri məsələsi ciddi araşdıma mövzusu olmuşdur. Əmin Abid bu məsələni təfərrüatlı şəkildə tədqiq etmiş, nəticədə onun "Türk ədəbiyyatında Mirzə Fətəli Axundov" adlı iri həcmli məqaləsi ortaya çıxmışdır. Xüsusi vurğulamaq lazım gəlir ki, Əmin Abidin 20-ci illərdə qaldırdığı problem indi də öz aktuallığını saxlayır. Çünki Əmin Abiddən sonra Axundzadə və türk xalqları ədəbiyyatı problemi nəinki elmi cəhətdən işlənib dərinləşdirilməmiş, hətta bir problem kimi büsbütün arxa plana atılmışdır. Belə ki, XIX əsr Azərbaycan ədəbiyyatı üzrə görkəmli mütəxəssis F.Qasımzadə M.F.Axundzadənin Cənubi Azərbaycan və İran ədəbiyyatına təsiri məsələsini qabartmış, onun türk xalqlarının ədəbi inkişafındakı rolundan bəhs açmamışdır. Amin Abid, while setting the goal of investigating the place of M.F. Akhundzade in the literature of the Turkic peoples, initially poses the following scientific problem-question: "What influence did Mirza Fatali Akhundov have on the course of Turkish literature with his creative ability? What position did he gain for himself thanks to this influence?" [3, p.89]. Summarizing the literary facts and theoretical considerations he brought to the analysis regarding the questions and problems he posed, Amin Abid writes: "By establishing stage literature, laying the foundation of storytelling, being the first to start critical writing for the century, introducing the vernacular into literature, and conveying the analysis of social reality with a realistic perspective within all these molds, he brought the literature of the Eastern Oghuz Turks out of scholasticism" [3, p.105-106]. In the literary and historical development of the Turkic peoples, in terms of the seriousness of the influence on this literature, Emin Abid gives the place after Nasimi and Fuzuli to M.F. Akhundzade. What determines the scientificity of Emin Abid's interpretations is that he creates a general picture of Akhundzade's creativity, determines his role in the development of realistic literature (drama and prose), philosophical thought, and artistic language, and at the same time interprets his influence on the literature of both the northern and western Turks based on historical facts. One of the issues that became a subject of discussion in Akhundzade studies in the 20s and 30s is the issue of Akhundov's biography - biography. It is already known that the first detailed information about Akhundzade's biography was provided by F. Kocharli. F. Kocharli referred to the "biography" of the outstanding artist written by his own hand and published in the "Kashkul" newspaper. Salman Mumtaz was the first to determine that Akhundzadeh's "autobiography" written by his own hand was published in "Kashkul" in an abridged form. Salman Mumtaz wrote: "When Mirza Fatali published his autobiography in Persian in issues 43, 44 and 45 of the "Kashkul" newspaper published by Jalal Effendi Unsizadeh in Tbilisi during his lifetime, 37 lines from that work were deleted and omitted by the tsarist censor. 24 lines of these 37 lines were removed from the beginning of the work, and 13 lines from the end. In our opinion, those very important lines are the lifeblood of the work.

Kocharli, on the other hand, translated that defectively printed autobiography in a half-finished form and copied it into his book" [12, p.239].

In the version published in “Kashkul” and given in F. Kocharli’s book, there are no lines describing the meeting of the prominent writer with M.Sh. Vazeh. In that version, Akhundzadeh summarizes this issue as follows: “But another incident occurred that caused this intention to change.” S. Mumtaz poses the following question: “It is not clear what that “other incident” was and what it consisted of” [12, p.240]. It is clear from S. Mumtaz’s comments that the details of that “incident” are in the abbreviated part of the “biography.” Salman Mumtaz was the first to restore those abbreviated lines based on the “draft copy” in “Mirza Fatali’s grandson Fatali.” In that restored part, the author’s conversation with Mirza Shafi is reflected in detail. Although the dialogue between Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh and Mirza Shafi is not included in the "biography" he included in his book, Kocharli mentioned it in his essay. It seems that he was also familiar with the manuscript copy.

However, this aspect of the issue does not diminish the importance of the work done by Salman Mumtaz. Because the restoration of the "biography" and the comments given by S. Mumtaz to these parts have the power to shed light on the aspects of the Akhundzade - Mirza Shafi relationship that are still controversial in our literary studies. It should be noted with regret that this work done by Salman Mumtaz was not included in the scientific circulation in the later stages of our literary studies. The views of Amin Abid, who objected to the decisive role of the dialogue with Mirza Shafi Vazeh in the change of Akhundzade's worldview, were also not taken into account. Amin Abid wrote in his article “Mirza Fatali Akhundov in Turkish Literature”: “The fact that M.F. Akhundov became familiar with European culture under the guidance of a man named Mirza Shafi was first stated in our press by F. Kocharli (Azerbaijani Literature (Russian booklet. Tiflis, 1903). This claim has continued to be passed on from mouth to mouth among our editors until our time. How wrong Firidun Bey was in this claim has been clearly shown in an analysis we made with reference to the German documents we have received (see the album of the Mirza Fatali anniversary commission!)” [3, p.98].

Not only in Soviet Azerbaijan, but even in contemporary literary criticism, the studies of Amin Abid and Salman Mumtaz on the relationship between Akhundzade and Mirza Shafi have not been taken into account, so the reasons that conditioned the development of Akhundzade’s worldview have been explained one-sidedly.

In recent years, the research on the issue The one-sidedness of the explanation in literary studies has drawn attention, and the issue has once again become a subject of debate in Akhundzadeh studies.

Akhundzadeh scholar Sh. Shamioglu comes to the conclusion that “it is not correct to link Akhundzadeh’s worldview solely to the influence of M. Sh. Vazeh” [14, p. 116]. It is also completely logical for Sh. Shamioglu to conclude that “M. F. Akhundzadeh’s entry into the civil service in Tbilisi was a pre-planned affair” [14, p. 123], and to link this conclusion to the influence of the Russian socio-cultural environment on Azerbaijan. However, these conclusions reached by Sh. Shamioglu in recent years, at least in their initial form, and in some cases with more substantial considerations, were included in S. Mumtaz’s article “Mirza Fatali Sabuhi, Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Molla Abbas Asufta” published in 1935. The reason why Sh. Shamioglu repeated Salman Mumtaz's conclusions in one way or another after nearly 80 years is that he could not see Amin Abid and Salman Mumtaz among "all literary scholars" who studied Akhundzadeh's heritage - A. Saidzadeh, I.K. Yenikolopov, M. Rafili, F. Gasimzadeh, Z. Askerli, etc. Undoubtedly, the main reason for this was that those researchers were victims of the repression of the 1930s.

Sh. Shamioglu writes that "it is not clear why F. Kocharli referred to the newspaper "Keshkul" and not to the text written by M.F. Akhundzadeh himself" [14, p. 122]. In fact, S.

Mumtaz's research also sheds light on this issue. The researcher shows that the “lines erased from the end” of Akhundzadeh’s “biography” express Akhundzadeh’s sharp stance against Islam. S. Mumtaz writes: “There is no doubt that the above lines (“lines erased from the end” of the “biography” – A.M.) would not have been left out by the tsarist censor” [12, p.241]. Salman Mumtaz's logic leads to the fact that F. Kocharli was not inclined to publish what the censorship did not allow. S. Mumtaz also explains the use of the newspaper version of F. Kocharli's biography and even the censor's abridgement of the dialogue with M. Sh. Vazeh in this version. If the abridged part from the end of the biography worried the tsarist censorship from a political point of view, the abridgement of the Akhundzade - M. Shafi dialogue is not only related to a political point of view. Salman Mumtaz emphasizes the special role of A. Berge in the deletion of this dialogue. Salman Mumtaz's comments on this aspect of the issue sound quite logical: "Adolf Berge also had a great help in the Tsarist censor deleting these lines. Because, in collaboration with Bodenstedt, he helped Bodenstedt to appropriate Mirza Shafi's works, and in this regard, when he collected poems related to Azerbaijani poets and had them printed and published in 1868, he did not mention Mirza Shafi there. If Mirza Fatali had not removed the lines related to Mirza Shafi in his autobiography and had allowed it to be published as it is, there would have been a contradiction. Then the great betrayal and theft would have been revealed and would have become famous. Therefore, Berge, in order to prevent everyone from knowing about his own and Bodenstedt's vileness, used the book Kamaluddawla as an excuse (the "biography" reflects the anti-religious views written in this work - A.M.), He played a major role in the deletion of the story of Mirza Shafi from the autobiography. Berge's main point was the story of Mirza Shafi” [12, pp. 241-242].

The logical conclusion from Salman Mumtaz's writings is that the fact that Mirza Shafi's works, which are distributed all over the world, belong to F. Bodenstedt, not to Mirza Shafi, is a premeditated process. F. Bodenstedt influenced the tsarist censorship through A. Berge and had the part about Mirza Shafi removed from Akhundzadeh's "biography". It is no coincidence that F. Kocharli's "History of Literature" does not include an "essay" about M. Sh. Vazeh. S. Mumtaz puts the issue this way: if the "biography" had included information about M. Shafi, then Europe could have obtained information about his teacher M. Sh. Vazeh, along with Akhundov, whom he knew well. In other words, S. Mumtaz claims that F. Bodenstedt's idea of appropriating M. Sh. Vazeh's poems begins with the abridgement of the part about M. Sh. Vazeh in M. F. Akhundzadeh's "biography". Because, according to S. Mumtaz, the abridged lines "clarify many important points, which we note below: 1. That Mirza Shafi was not an imaginary personality. 2. That Mirza Shafi was from Ganja. 3. That he was famous in Germany due to his talent and intelligence. 4. That a work about Mirza Shafi's biography and virtues was written in Persian in Germany, also in verse. 5. The goal and objective-action of Mirza Fatali, etc. [12, p.241].

Therefore, the criticism of the 20s-30s seriously began to study the fate of M.Sh. Vazeh as an artist and tried to obtain irrefutable facts about his biography and creativity. The work carried out in this direction resulted in the publication of the 9th book “Mirza Shafi Vazeh” from the “Azerbaijan Literature” series by S. Mumtaz in 1926, as well as his article “Mirza Fatali Sabuhi, Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Molla Abbas Ashufta”, A.A. Seyidzadeh’s small-volume monograph “Mirza Shafi (Vazeh)”, which appeared as “The Experience of Studying the Life and Creativity of Mirza Shafi Based on Archival Materials”, and a series of articles by M. Rafili entitled “Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Friedrich Bodenstedt”.

As a result of these studies, the original poems of Mirza Shafi, which S. Mumtaz obtained from a collection compiled by Mirza Mehdi Naji in Ganja, as well as materials obtained by other researchers, especially A. A. Saidzadeh's searches for the poet, and the careful study of books published in Germany about Mirza Shafi and F. Bodenstedt, can prove that the author of the poems famous in Europe was not F. Bodenstedt, but M. Sh. Vazeh.

Although Mirza Shafi Vazeh's name is not mentioned in our first history of literature - F. Kocharli's book "Azerbaijani Literature", Mirza Shafi Vazeh takes his rightful place in the volumes of modern literary histories of the 19th century. It can be unequivocally noted that it was the criticism of the 20s-30s that refuted the extremely confusing, even legendary positions about Mirza Shafi Vazeh, denying his personality and creativity, and revealed him as an outstanding representative of 19th century Azerbaijani literature.

The fact that this is acknowledged in the most modern studies written about Mirza Shafi Vazeh today is irrefutable evidence of the work done in this direction by critics of those years. Professor Z. Askerli, in the introduction to the monograph “Mirza Shafi Vazeh” titled “A Few Words”, indicates that in his research on the artist’s life and work, he refers to the research of A. Saidzadeh, M. Rafili, etc. [7, p.4]. This approach itself proves that the foundations of Vazeh studies were laid in the 20s-30s.

The examples given from the works of 19th century poets in the books published by S. Mumtaz in the series "Azebaycan literature" on G. Zakir [12, pp. 116-149], M. Sh. Vazeh [12, pp. 150-152], Baba bey Shakir [12, pp. 160-164], Mirza Nasrulla bey Dide [12, pp. 189-194], as well as the inclusion of studies on their lives and creativity in these books, and the "Prefaces" written to "Selected Works" or collections allow us to imagine the scale of the work done by criticism and literary studies in the direction of studying 19th century Azerbaijani literature in the 20s-30s.

If we include S. Mumtaz's "Forgotten Leaves" series, we can see that the articles "Forgotten Leaves" [12, pp. 197-264], "Mirza Fatali Sabuhi, Mirza Shafi Vazeh and Molla Abbas Asufta", "Mirza Fatali Sabuhi and Mirza Mahammad Katib", "Gasim bey Zakir and Iliko Chavcavadze" [12, p. 264] contain sometimes concise and sometimes detailed information and analyses about Baba bey Shakir, Q. Zakir, Jani oglu Abdulla, Hasan Gara Hadi, Jafargulu khan Nava, Mirza Shafi Vazeh, Molla Abbas Asufta, Mirza Mahammad Katib, the study "My Thoughts on Abulqasim Nabati" [12, pp. 402-418] contains serious and comprehensive analyses about this poet, and the article "Azerbaijani Prose Writer a Hundred Years Ago" [12, p.384-392], “The life of Gutgashinli Ismayil bey, the editor of the story of Rashid bey and Saadat khanum” [12, p.393-401], considering that I. Gutgashinli, his story “Rashid bey and Saadat khanum” was mentioned for the first time in Azerbaijani literary criticism, and if we add to this the studies in “Book of Work from Literature”, and the studies of Amin Abidin and Hanafi Zeynalli mentioned above, we can clearly imagine that the literature of this period became the subject of analysis in all creative directions in the criticism of the 20s-30s. In these studies, many issues that were not included in the “history of literature” books after the 30s under the influence of ideology were included as the truths of the time. For example, in books on "literary history", the relationships between Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh and Jafargulu Khan Nava, Gasim bey Zakir and Jafargulu Khan Nava, and Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh and Hasan bey Zardabi are often reflected one-sidedly.

However, in the studies of criticism of the 20s-30s, we observe that these relations are complex. The main point is that the criticism of that period provides objective information about these relations. Therefore, it is important that these objective data take their place in the studies written about the 19th century, in the books of “literary history”. In general, the critical use of the conclusions reached by the criticism of the 20s-30s in writing the history of Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century appears as a requirement of the time.

Conclusion. If we summarize the conducted studies, we can come to the following conclusions: Special attention is paid to Azerbaijani literature of the 19th century in the criticism of the 20s-30s as an integral part of the literature of the new period. Two aspects in the literature of this century especially attract the attention of criticism: the penetration of European genres

into the national literary sphere and the strengthening of the social content of literature in this regard.

Literary criticism pays special attention to the strengthening of critical notes in literature and the promotion and study of works with critical content. In this sense, the 19th century is the "century of Mirza Fatali" in Azerbaijan for literary criticism.

In the criticism of these years, the work of M.F. Akhundzadeh becomes the criterion for evaluating literature in that century. Both the 19th century Azerbaijani literature before Akhundzadeh and the subsequent stage are studied in close connection with Akhundzadeh's work.

In the criticism of the 20s-30s, European-type realistic literature is not typologically distinguished, but is studied as a whole as a critical realistic literature.

In the semi-chapter, the clear and scientific conclusions of the criticism of this period in the direction of the problem of "Mirza Shafi Vazeh" are discussed in detail.

The reasons for the appropriation of Mirza Shafi's heritage by F. Bodenstedt, the mechanism of this appropriation, and the numerous facts and sources proving that the poems belong to Mirza Shafi are the subject of comprehensive analysis, as are the studies included in the criticism of the 20s-30s.

More objective considerations are made in the criticism of these years regarding the issue of Qasim bey Zakir and his contemporaries. The complex nature of the relations between Mirza Fatali Akhundzadeh and Jafargulu khan Nava, Qasim bey Zakir and Hasan bey Zardabi, as well as the literary personality of Hasan Gara Hadi, as well as more objective information and analysis about their personalities and literary activities are included.

In all subsequent stages of the Soviet era, literature with a classical romantic style and religious content is presented in literary history books in a superficial manner and is criticized and degraded in comparison with realistic literature. Modern research allows us to say that the criticism of the 20s-30s also had a critical attitude towards literature with religious content. However, the criticism of this period comprehensively examined works written in the classical romantic style, including religious-elegiac literature, and presented them in a more scientific manner, revealing their ideological and aesthetic characteristics and historical roots. In our opinion, there are serious points in this approach that will serve as a methodological example for literary criticism of the period of independence.

References:

1. Abid, A. Harmful criticisms // Revolution and culture. – 1929. – No. 10. – pp. 31–34.
2. Abid, A. Unknown works of Mirza Fatali Akhundov // Revolution and culture. – 1930. – No. 11-12. – pp. 45–49.
3. Abid, A. Selected works / A. Abid. – Baku: East-West, 2007. – 288 p.
4. Zeynalli, H., Shaig, A., Musaxanli, A. (et al.) Workbook from literature. – Baku: Azernashr, 1928. – 293 p.
5. Alekberli, M. K. Azerbaijani literature / M. K. Alekberli. – Baku: Azernashr, 1935. – 40 p.
6. Alishanoglu, T. 20th century Azerbaijani literature as a historical-typological unit // Issues of 20th century Azerbaijani literature: Book I. – Baku: Elm, 2006. – pp. 73–77.
7. Askerli, Z. Mirza Shafi Vazeh / Z. Askerli. – Baku: Elm, 2010. – 65 p.
8. Hüseyn, M. Literary battles / M. Hüseyn. – Baku: Azernashr, 1932. – 83 p.
9. Garayev, Y. Realism: Art and Truth / Y. Garayev. – Baku: Elm, 1980. – 260 p.
10. Mahmenzer. Azerbaijani position // Revolution and culture. – 1938. – No. 6-7. – pp. 99–100.
11. Mammad, T. 19th century Azerbaijani literature / T. Mammad. – Baku: Apastrof Printing House, 2010. – 162 p.

12. Mumtaz, S. Sources of Azerbaijani literature / S. Mumtaz. – Baku: Avrasiya Press, 2006. – 440 p.
13. Salamoglu, T. Portrait on the history of literary criticism - essays / T. Salamoglu. – Baku: Vatenoglu NPS LLC, 2014. – 332 p.
14. Shamioglu, Sh. Mirza Fatali Akhundzade / Sh. Shamioglu. – Baku: Science and Education, 2016. – 184 p.
15. Opinions about Mirza Fatali Akhundov in the European press // Revolution and culture. – 1938. – No. 6-7. – pp. 154–158.
16. Zeynalli, H. Selected works / H. Zeynalli. – Baku: Yazichi, 1983. – 319 p.