

**BEKIR CHOBANZADE'S RESEARCHES OF THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE****Ayten Mushkiyeva**

Postgraduate Student, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Azerbaijan and World Literature,  
Ganja State University, Azerbaijan

e-mail: rahimr@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0003-4950-9302

**Summary**

Professor Bakir Vahab oglu Chobanzadeh (1893-1937), one of the prominent figures in the field of humanities in Azerbaijan in the twentieth century, was a graduate of the school of Turkology with great traditions. He acquired modern thinking and political knowledge through European-style higher education on the one hand, and constant self-improvement on the other. He was able to grow up as a person who synthesized the West and the East, to have a new way of thinking. Bakir Chobanzadeh's research on the history of literature included three directions:

- 1) Theoretical issues of literature;
- 2) Problems of literary history and literary historiography;
- 3) Today in the history of Azerbaijani literature.

It should be noted that despite the leading linguistic factor in the work of Bakir Chobanzadeh, he was also engaged in the history of literature, and expressed valuable scientific and theoretical views on it. Many of these ideas played an important role in the formation of a new literary historiography. Issues such as the origin and development of literature, the tandem of form and content, the fact that literature is a science, the chronology of the history of literature, its educational significance, etc. were first theoretically studied in the works of Bakir Chobanzade.

**Keywords:** Bekir Chobanzade, literature, research, creativity, periodization.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5133>

**1. Introduction**

It is known that Bekir Chobanzadeh's work "Turkish language and literature teaching method" is divided into two parts. The first part is devoted to the Turkish language and its teaching methods, and the second part is devoted to Turkish literature and its teaching methods. In this work, the author expresses Azerbaijani literature either as "Turkish" or "Turkish-Tatar" literature. When teaching literature, he tries to give information about its origin. While researching the origin of Azerbaijani literature, Chobanzadeh rightly refers to the Orkhon inscriptions and shares the opinion that the Turkish people were not only nomads, but also able to irrigate the land and create towns and trade.

**2. Discussion**

In the literature, the issue of form and content, their relationship to each other was also one of the objects of Bakir Chobanzadeh's research. This is a purely theoretical issue. Considering the relationship of form and content, the role of the work of art as one of the most important factors, the author defends the idea of the solidity of the literary work, based on theoretical

literature, as well as the views of writers and critics such as I. Goethe, V. Belinsky, I. Turgenev. Referring to the views of the theorist G. Pospelov, Bakir Chobanzadeh came to the following correct conclusion:

"In order to change the form, we need to change the content. Because form and content are two sides of a poem and a single work, both of which have a special nature and cannot be repeated or imitated in the same way. Basically, the form is created along with the content" (*Chobanzadeh, 2007:199*).

According to the theorist, the fact that the form becomes more important in terms of its content, or that the editors and writers pay attention only to the form, is always under the influence of certain social relations. When new eras come and new classes come to power, content becomes more important than form. Poets of the new era, who had new ideas and imaginations, often had to use the old form.

Bakir Chobanzadeh cites Demyan Bedni as an example and praises his expression of new content in the old form. If we consider that D. Bedni was supported by the ideology of the time, then the purpose of the theorist can be understood. At these points, the author did not ignore the ideological content, but preferred it. In our opinion, Bakir Chobanzadeh speaks from the ideological position of the time. However, the researcher's conclusions about the content of the picture can be summarized as follows:

1. Form and content are always equal in origin and development.
2. The image of form and content is always determined by the social relations of time.
3. When a literary historian studies a literary work or trend and period, s/he must keep in mind both the form and the content.
4. Form and content should be taught together, and the reasons that make them up, as well as the factors that regulate the relationship with each other, should be studied.

In Bekir Chobanzadeh's research "Is literature a science?", he considers literature to be a science, and draws attention to the fact that literature, like history, has a subject and content. According to him, while the natural sciences study man as a part of nature, the humanities and social sciences approach him in terms of his own feelings, thoughts, and actions, and study him from this point of view. He wrote:

"A literary historian struggles to establish the literary currents, literary tastes and styles of a certain period and their relationship to class relations. He tries to show first the real life of the poets and artists of that time, and then to explain how the real life of a certain period was seen and imagined. No written text is equally important to the historian and literary historian" (*Chobanzadeh, 2007:209*).

This opinion of Bekir Chobanzadeh is confirmed in one way or another by later literary theorists and literary critics.

In the matter of the history of literature, Bakir Chobanzadeh went a step further than his predecessors and proposed the creation of a new history of literature. According to him, "The history of Azeri literature cannot be created without separate researches and monographs on various issues. The works that will emerge without such preparatory work cannot be deeper or higher than the works created in the old Eastern style" (*Chobanzadeh, 1930:4*).

It also seems that the history of literature that Bakir Chobanzadeh wanted to create was not in the Eastern style, but in the history of literature close to the European style. Evaluating Chobanzadeh's literary history, literary critic N. Shamsizadeh writes: "... the literary histories of his time known to him did not satisfy Professor Bakir Chobanzadeh. Such literary histories really existed at that time" (*Shamsizade, 1986:15*).

The issue of periodization of literature also occupies an important place in Bakir Chobanzadeh's research. Thus, no literary historian and theorist before B. Chobanzadeh has expressed such a theoretical approach to the problem of chronology. Looking at the history of the problem, the theorist draws certain conclusions by digging into the issue of literary historiography in medieval Europe. The researcher draws attention to the fact that the history of Europeans beginning to study literary works goes back to antiquity. An example of this is the initiative to collect Homer's works in Greece, such as the Iliad and the Odyssey. Or look at the collection of books in many special places in the 5th century BC. The best example of this is Aristophanes' commentary on The Frogs in Aristotle's Poetics. Also, in "Rhetoric", the prose writer analyzes the style and style of the editors and refers to the study of literature. It comparatively analyzes the advantages of later European literary histories.

Concerning the problem of the study of Eastern literature, he concludes that the study of literature after Islam was based on the Arabs and the Greek examples they studied. He sees the beginning of the study of literature in two directions: the divans or collections of poets, their biographies, that is, tazkire-slogans. However, the researcher does not consider these examples to be very reliable and states that they are "very" far from the essence of criticism and analysis. Considering the 18th-19th centuries as an important period in the study of European literature, Bakir Chobanzadeh praised the researches of such scholars as Wingelman, Lessing, Herder, Grimm brothers, Bachler, Friedrich Schlegel, Hervinus, St. Bev. However, Hippolytus emphasizes the role of Ten in the study of the problem. "Only through one work can he recognize the author, and through a small fragment he can revive an entire cultural system," Tenin said. This idea reminds him of the claim of modern naturalists that "they can create the whole skeleton and the nature of the animal to which it belongs" through a single bone (Chobanzadeh, 2007:226).

It is known that the issue of division and periodization of literature has been developed in our literary criticism since the 1920s. A.Abid, A.Musakhanli, A.Nazim and others can be mentioned about it. Chobanzadeh's research also retains its theoretical significance. Literary critic Nazif Gahramanli wrote:

The problem of chronology has been variously covered in the research of "Soviet" literary critics. For example, we can say that the similarity of positions of Amin Abidin, Bakir Chobanzade and Atababa Musakhanli in relation to chronology is noteworthy (approach to the history of literature in terms of language and ethnicity) (Gahramanli, 2004:26). In our opinion, the closeness of this position stated by N. Gahramanli was to evaluate the literature in accordance with the requirements of the time or to write it by the European method of analysis. This can be seen in the further development of our literary criticism.

Bakir Chobanzadeh often refers to the views of European and Russian scholars on the division of literature into periods. Thus, the division of literature into periods has already taken place in Europe. Looking at the nature of chronology, the literary critic also points out that literary historians cannot agree on this point. B. Chobanzadeh tries to reveal the essence of words such as "age", "period", "epoch" and to determine their place in chronology. Referring to M.F.Köprülü while studying periodization in Turkish literature, the author comments on his division into three periods: "Islamic period", "European period", and "Pre-Islamic period". However, at the same time, the researcher uses such terms as "palace period", "Ibrahim pasha period", "Sufi period" due to the lack of an unambiguous view of these terms. According to the researcher, if we say "period", "epox" to one of them, "age" to another, "period", we do not confuse the two very different concepts. Or, in Russian literary criticism, no one accepts concepts such as "30s", "forties" in a mathematical sense.

Bakir Chobanzadeh supports the separation of periods according to principles. Therefore, it considers several principles in chronology. It states that political, economic and social features predominate among these principles. According to the author, in all cases, these principles are intended to study and apply the literature as a system:

"The principle of systematizing and dividing the history of literature in this way, that is, according to its specific features, is very important, but also very difficult to apply."

It is clear from Bekir Chobanzadeh's research on the new period in the history of Azerbaijani literature that he had a clear idea and studied this period well from a scientific and theoretical point of view. Because the author appealed to M.S. Grigoriev's book "Literature and Ideology" and tried to strengthen his theoretical views. At the same time, he analyzed the works of his time and spoke about the ideology of the time. In some parts of the work, the influence of the ideology of the time is obvious. According to the ideology of the time, the literary critic prefers to connect everything to the 1905 revolution. Analyzing the press of the time, he described it as "the embodiment of bourgeois ideology" (*Chobanzade, 1929:90*). According to the author, the literature of this period should also be called "feudal bourgeois literature." He called the literature before the February Revolution "Musavat literature".

Opposing the national tendency in literature, Ahmad Javad analyzes the poem "O soldier" from the book of poems "Dalga" as an example of the national tendency:

Dağa-daşa sancağını öpdürüb,  
 Duman kibi bu dağları bürüdün  
 Dənizlərə salam rəsmi yapıdırıb,  
 Göylərdəki bulud kimi yürüdün.  
 (You made mountain kiss your pin,  
 You covered these mountains like fog  
 You made sea greet you,  
 Walked like a cloud in the sky.)

Arsaln kibi saldırdığın düşmana,  
 Ər oğlu ər olduğunu göstərdin!  
 Fələk bu gün uyğun sənə deyir ki,  
 Türk əsgəri sən böyləmi istərdin (*Javad, 1914:29-30*).  
 (To the enemy you attack like a lion,  
 you showed that you are brave!  
 Falak tells you today that  
 Turkish soldier, would you like that)

Bakir Chobanzadeh called Ahmad Javad a "patented poet" of Musavat and sharply criticized his nationalist position. Amin Abid's nationalist poems are analyzed from the same perspective. It is clear that the more objective his theoretical views on the history of literature, the more he has to submit to ideological barriers in the evaluation of modern literature.

In his analysis, the literature of the 1920s is called "October period literature" by Bakir Chobanzadeh and is based on the directives of the party and ideology. He has a positive attitude to the revolutionary theme in Azerbaijani poetry.

Speaking about young poets, Nazim Hikmet also refers to his work. The researcher is right in this appeal. Although Nazim Hikmet was not an Azerbaijani poet, he was very close to the Azerbaijani literary process and felt himself in this literary process. Considering this, the critic writes:

"Nazim Hikmet is not an Azerbaijani poet. However, since his works were published in Azerbaijan and had a very strong influence on the young proletarian poets here, it is necessary to give him the position he is right when talking about today's Azeri proletarian literature" (*Chobanzadeh, 1930:57*).

At a time when the name of Azerbaijani literature was not yet fully formed, Bakir Chobanzadeh called his literary history "a new era of Azeri literature." It is known that before that the literary histories of Firidun bey Kocharli and Ismail Hikmet were published under different names. F. Kocharli's work was called "Historical materials of Azerbaijani literature", and I. Hikmet's work was called "History of Azerbaijani literature". However, since F. Kocharli's work was published after his death, it would not be correct to say that the name of the work belongs to him. If we take into account that Firidun bey Kocharli's book contains more practical issues than theoretical ones, then it is clear why the word "materials" is included there. Although Chobanzadeh uses the name "Azeri literature" in the title, he uses the combination "Azeri Turkish literature" inside, which shows a different approach to the issue. Although the main object of research of the literary critic in this work is modern literature (early twentieth century), he also expresses his attitude to classical literature. Literary critic Gazi Burhanaddin, Nasimi, and Fuzuli are among the classical Azerbaijani poets who were presented as representatives of Ottoman literature:

Finally, until the middle of the 19th century, Azeri literature developed in terms of form and content as "Ajam Violation". Finally, from the end of the 19th century, the tendency to interpret Azeri Turkish literature as a primitive Provençal form of Ottoman literature and to record the most important Azeri poets in the Ottoman classical poets' book was strengthened. "Everyone knows that Gazi Burhaneddin, Nasimi, Fuzuli and other Azeri poets achieved this "honor"" (*Chobanzade, 1929:3*).

These mistakes made by Bakir Chobanzadeh at that time were corrected in the later stages of our literary criticism. Gazi Burhaneddin, who was not included in the history of Azerbaijani literature for a long time, began to be included in our literary history only in the 80s.

Bekir Chobanzadeh's "Turkish Literature" examines the Orkhon Yenisei monuments and the problem of the origin of our literary history. It is clear from this that Chobanzadeh considered Azerbaijani literature to be a part of all-Turkic literature, regardless of its name.

### 3. Conclusion

Thus, it is clear that Bakir Chobanzadeh's views on the history of Azerbaijani literature and literary historiography differed from each other. If a literary critic makes certain correct decisions based on a theoretical concept in the history of literature, he prefers an ideological position in the analysis of contemporary literature and appreciates proletarian literature and partisanship. This shows that the prominent literary critic could not overcome the ideological barriers of the time in contemporary literature, and gave an ideological assessment of both the national literary movement of the early twentieth century and the proletarian movement of the 1920s. However, in all cases, B. Chobanzadeh's views on the history and historiography of literature theoretically represent a new trend and play an important role in the formation of a new history of literature.

### References

1. Chobanzade B. (2007). *Selected works. In 5 volumes, III volume, Baku: East-West, 344 p.*
2. Chobanzade B. (1930). *New period of Azeri literature. Baku, ADETI publishing house*
3. Chobanzade B. (1929). *Turkish literature. Baku: Azerneshr*
4. Gahramanli N. (2004). *Page of our literary historiography (Foreword). F.Agayev's Ismail Hikmet and Azerbaijani literature. Baku: Nurlan, pp. 3-5*
5. Javad A. (1914). *Wave. Baku, pp.29-30*
6. Shamsizade N. (1986). *Literary disputes. Baku: Writer; 179 p.*