ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 7 JULY 2026

TWENTIETH-CENTURY UZBEK LITERATURE: LITERARY GENERATIONS, GENRE TRANSFORMATION, AND THE DYNAMICS OF TRADITION AND RENEWAL

Hamdamov Ulug'bek
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Leading Research Fellow, Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Email: ulugbek1968.68@mail.ru

DOI: 10.67620/sai.57c0008

ABSTRACT

This article offers a critical historical overview of twentieth-century Uzbek literature by examining the relationship among literary modernity, political transformation, genre formation, and continuity with earlier Eastern and Turkic-Persianate traditions. The study uses a narrative-review and historical-comparative approach, drawing on Uzbek literary histories, primary literary works, and scholarship on Jadidism, Soviet cultural institutions, socialist realism, and post-Soviet literature. Rather than treating literary generations as rigid chronological blocs, the article proposes four overlapping heuristic formations: the Jadid generation, the early Soviet generation that emerged in the 1920s and 1930s, the post-Stalin generation associated with the 1960s, and a late-Soviet formation extending from the 1970s through the 1980s. It then considers independence after 1991 as a new literary field rather than a single generation. In prose, Abdulla Qodiriy and Cho'lpon are interpreted as establishing complementary historical-realist and psychological-symbolic trajectories. In poetry, modern lyric forms developed through the interaction of reformist thought, print culture, Soviet institutions, and renewed attention to individual experience. In drama, Behbudiy's chronological priority and Hamza Hakimzoda Niyoziy's broader dramaturgical practice are treated as distinct but complementary foundations. The article concludes that twentieth-century Uzbek literature is best understood not as a sequence of total ruptures, but as a dynamic process in which national tradition, world literature, political institutions, and aesthetic experimentation continuously reshaped one another.

ACCEPTED

07.08.26

Keywords: *Uzbek literature, Jadidism, literary generations, prose, poetry, drama, socialist realism, independence, tradition, modernity.*

CC BY

Introduction

Uzbek literature entered the twentieth century with a deep classical inheritance and with rapidly changing institutions of education, print, politics, and cultural exchange. The period therefore cannot be described adequately as either a simple continuation of classical literature or a complete break with the past. A more accurate account must hold together at least four processes: the continuing authority of Turkic-Persianate literary traditions; the reformist and pedagogical projects associated with Jadidism; the reorganization of literary life under Soviet institutions; and the diversification of aesthetic positions before and after independence in 1991. The central argument of this article is that twentieth-century Uzbek

literature developed through repeated acts of selective continuity: writers adopted new genres and international forms while reworking inherited poetic, ethical, historical, and linguistic resources (Allworth, 1964, 1990; Khalid, 1998, 2015).

This revised formulation also avoids two problems that often distort literary-historical surveys. First, modernity should not be narrated as a one-directional movement from a supposedly dynamic West to a supposedly stagnant East. Jadid intellectual life was shaped by Russian colonial modernity, but also by dense exchanges with Tatar, Ottoman, Persianate, and broader Muslim intellectual networks (Khalid, 1998). Second, Soviet Uzbek literature should not be reduced to ideological compliance. Soviet cultural institutions constrained literary production, yet Central Asian writers also adapted imported genres, socialist-realist conventions, and national forms to local histories and aesthetic traditions (Fort, 2024; Roosien, 2026). These qualifications allow the literary history of the century to be read as a field of negotiation rather than as a sequence of simple ideological replacements.

The article addresses three questions. First, which historical transformations most clearly explain the development of modern Uzbek prose, poetry, and drama? Second, how useful is a generational model for organizing the century's literary history without turning fluid literary processes into rigid decades? Third, how did Uzbek writers negotiate the relationship among national tradition, political institutions, and world literary forms? The discussion remains selective rather than encyclopedic. Its purpose is to clarify a defensible framework for the general landscape of the century and to identify major lines of continuity and renewal.

Approach and Scope

Methodologically, this study is a critical narrative review combined with historical-comparative literary analysis. It synthesizes Uzbek literary histories and terminology with English-language scholarship on Central Asian reform, nation formation, Soviet cultural policy, socialist realism, and post-Soviet literature. The primary unit of analysis is not the individual text alone but the relationship among literary form, historical context, and institutional setting. The paper therefore uses representative authors and works to illustrate broader tendencies while avoiding the claim that any list is exhaustive.

The proposed periodization uses four criteria: shared historical experience, dominant institutional conditions, recurring aesthetic concerns, and patterns of generational succession. On that basis, four overlapping formations are distinguished: (a) the Jadid generation, active primarily from the turn of the century through the 1910s and early 1920s; (b) an early Soviet generation that entered literary life in the 1920s and 1930s; (c) a post-Stalin or '1960s' generation associated with the cultural thaw and renewed moral and aesthetic inquiry; and (d) a late-Soviet formation extending from the 1970s into the 1980s, when skepticism toward official ideological certainties and experimentation in prose and poetry became increasingly visible. This model deliberately treats the 1980s as a transitional zone rather than leaving them unexplained. Independence after 1991 is considered a new literary field in which multiple generations coexist.

The terminology of literary analysis follows contemporary Uzbek Latin orthography for names and titles. The paper uses such terms as psychologism, symbolism, realism, grotesque, and dramaturgy in their literary-critical senses (Quronov et al., 2010). Because this is a synthetic historical study, it does not claim to offer a complete canon, quantitative bibliometric analysis, or exhaustive archival reconstruction. Its conclusions should therefore be read as a structured interpretation of major tendencies rather than as a final classification of all twentieth-century Uzbek writers.

From Classical Inheritance to Jadid Literary Modernity

The most consequential transformation at the beginning of the twentieth century was the consolidation of a modern literary public around reformist education, journalism, print culture, theatre, and new prose forms. The Jadids sought to reform society through schooling, literacy, the press, and cultural debate, and their activity linked literary production to a broader project of social and intellectual renewal

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

(Khalid, 1998). In the revolutionary and early Soviet years, these debates also intersected with new ideas of nation, language, and political community; the modern Uzbek literary language and several modern genres took shape within this turbulent context (Khalid, 2015).

The importance of the Jadids therefore lies not only in individual talent but in the historical convergence between literary innovation and institutional change. Mahmudxo'ja Behbudiy, Abdurauf Fitrat, Hamza Hakimzoda Niyoziy, Abdulla Qodiriy, and Cho'lpon worked in different genres and intellectual fields, yet collectively they helped establish a literary culture in which drama, the novel, modern journalism, criticism, and new lyric forms could function as vehicles of social reflection. Uzbek literary scholarship has long treated the Jadid period as a foundational phase of modern Uzbek literature (Karimov et al., 1999).

Their biographies also require historical differentiation. It is inaccurate to collapse all of their deaths into a single category of Soviet repression. Behbudiy died in 1919 under the political order of the Emirate of Bukhara; Hamza was killed in Shohimardon in 1929 in a different context; Qodiriy, Fitrat, and Cho'lpon were executed during the Stalinist purges in 1938. What unites these fates is their tragic violence and their relationship to periods of intense political conflict, not an identical mechanism of repression. This distinction matters because literary history becomes less reliable when symbolic narratives of martyrdom replace specific historical contexts (Khalid, 2015; Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2025).

The relationship between national inheritance and world literature was equally complex. Jadid modernity did not amount to abandoning classical Eastern literature. Rather, new genres emerged through synthesis. Fitrat's intellectual work, Behbudiy's drama, Qodiriy's historical fiction, and Cho'lpon's lyric and prose writing demonstrate different forms of mediation between inherited aesthetic resources and modern genres. This dynamic of selective synthesis would remain central throughout the century.

A Heuristic Periodization of Literary Generations

The Jadid Generation

The Jadid formation is defined most clearly by the convergence of enlightenment, reform, national awakening, educational activism, and genre innovation. Its major representatives include Behbudiy, Fitrat, Hamza, Qodiriy, Cho'lpon, Abdulla Avloniy, Ishoqxon Ibrat, and others. These writers did not hold identical political positions, and their careers extended into different historical phases; nevertheless, their work shared a commitment to remaking cultural life through literature, education, language, and public debate (Khalid, 1998; Karimov et al., 1999).

The Early Soviet Generation

A second formation emerged in the 1920s and 1930s under rapidly changing Soviet institutions. Writers such as G'afur G'ulom, Oybek, Abdulla Qahhor, Hamid Olimjon, and Maqsud Shayxzoda entered a literary sphere increasingly organized by state publishing, writers' institutions, ideological campaigns, and eventually socialist realism. Their work cannot be understood simply as a replacement of Jadid aesthetics by Soviet ideology. Recent scholarship emphasizes that Central Asian socialist realism was itself adapted through local social categories, national narratives, Persianate legacies, and existing literary techniques (Fort, 2024; Roosien, 2026). The reorganization of literary institutions also unfolded alongside Soviet campaigns over gender, public culture, and social transformation, which profoundly reshaped everyday life in Central Asia (Kamp, 2006; Northrop, 2004). The early Soviet formation thus involved both coercive institutional reorganization and creative adaptation.

The Post-Stalin or 1960s Generation

The generation associated with the 1960s emerged after Stalin's death within a changed cultural climate. In prose, Odil Yoqubov, Pirimqul Qodirov, Shukur Xolmirzayev, and other writers broadened historical, ethical, and psychological inquiry. In poetry, Erkin Vohidov, Abdulla Oripov, Rauf Parfi, and Omon Matjon helped renew lyric diction, philosophical reflection, national memory, and individual voice.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

The label '1960s generation' should not imply that these authors began or ended their careers within a single decade. Rather, it identifies a shared moment in which post-Stalin cultural openings made new forms of moral questioning and aesthetic differentiation more visible.

The Late-Soviet Formation: 1970s-1980s

The late-Soviet formation includes writers who entered the literary field from the 1970s through the 1980s, among them Murod Muhammad Do'st, Xurshid Do'stmuhammad, Ahmad A'zam, Erkin A'zam, Xayriddin Sulton, Usmon Azim, Shavkat Rahmon, Xurshid Davron, and Halima Xudoyberdiyeva. This grouping is especially useful because it corrects the artificial gap created when literary history jumps directly from a '1970s generation' to independence. The 1980s were not empty years; they were a transition in which ideological certainty weakened, historical memory acquired new force, and aesthetic experiments anticipated some post-1991 developments.

The four-part model is therefore a heuristic, not a closed taxonomy. Writers such as Zulfiya, Said Ahmad, Asqad Muxtor, Shukrullo, and Shuhrat may intersect more than one formation. Generational identities are produced by institutions, reading communities, political events, and aesthetic affinities as much as by birth dates. The value of the model lies in making broad patterns visible while preserving overlap and transition.

Prose: Historical Narrative, Psychologism, and Formal Experiment

Modern Uzbek prose developed through multiple trajectories rather than a single line of succession. Two particularly influential early models are associated with Abdulla Qodiriy and Cho'lpon. Qodiriy's O'tkan kunlar established the historical novel as a major form for representing social memory, political disorder, domestic life, and moral conflict. The novel's publication history should be stated precisely: chapters appeared in the journal Inqilob in 1922, and its parts were published separately in book form between 1924 and 1926 (Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2025). For that reason, citing the work simply as '1924' obscures the distinction among composition, serialization, and book publication.

Qodiriy's historical fiction did more than reconstruct the nineteenth century. It made the past a medium for thinking about national consciousness, social responsibility, family relations, and political fragmentation. This capacity to connect historical reconstruction with contemporary ethical questions helps explain the novel's foundational status in Uzbek prose. Later historical novels, including works by Oybek, Odil Yoqubov, Pirimqul Qodirov, and O'tkir Hoshimov, developed different relationships to the past, but Qodiriy's example made the historical novel central to the modern canon (Allworth, 1964; Karimov et al., 1999).

Cho'lpon represents a different but complementary trajectory. His novel Kecha va kunduz, whose extant first part is commonly known in English as Night and Day: Night, combines social observation with psychologism, irony, symbolic patterning, and attention to the constrained lives of individuals under colonial and patriarchal structures. The English edition describes the work as an unfinished dilogy and emphasizes its complex treatment of Russian colonialism, resistance, gender, and authorial irony (Cho'lpon, 2020). Rather than defining Cho'lpon's prose only as 'symbolic-allegorical,' it is more accurate to see it as a flexible modernist-realistic mode in which psychological and symbolic techniques intensify social analysis.

These two trajectories - historical reconstruction and psychological-symbolic prose - continued to interact with later developments. The Soviet period added a powerful institutional demand for socialist realism, but the resulting literature was not aesthetically uniform. Central Asian writers combined official expectations with local histories, Persianate forms, Russian realism, and national narrative traditions (Fort, 2024). Roosien (2026) similarly shows that Soviet culture in Uzbekistan was produced through mediation: cultural actors implemented state directives while also reshaping them, exposing tensions and gaps within the Soviet cultural project.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Late-Soviet and independence-era prose intensified experimentation with interiority, fragmented narration, symbolism, grotesque, and philosophical ambiguity. Writers such as Murod Muhammad Do'st, Ahmad A'zam, Erkin A'zam, Xurshid Do'stmuhammad, Nazar Eshonqul, Isajon Sulton, Qo'chqor Norqobil, Abduqayum Yo'ldosh, Sobir O'nar, Luqmon Bo'rixon, and Zulfiya Qurolboy qizi illustrate the diversity of this field. It is preferable to describe these developments as successive and overlapping waves of experimentation rather than to identify a single date - whether the 1980s, 1990s, or 2000s - as the absolute beginning of renewal. Many post-independence innovations were prepared by aesthetic shifts already visible before 1991.

The broader theoretical point is that contemporary Uzbek prose rests on more than a binary opposition between national tradition and world literature. Those two categories are themselves historically entangled. Uzbek writers have repeatedly adapted foreign forms through local narrative expectations, while 'national tradition' has been reconstructed under changing political and institutional conditions. The most productive account therefore treats literary renewal as translation, adaptation, and refunctioning rather than imitation.

Poetry: Modern Lyric Voice, Ideology, and Interiorization

Twentieth-century Uzbek poetry underwent major changes in diction, form, thematic range, and the construction of the lyric subject. The 1922 collection O'zbek yosh shoirlari, which included poetry by Fitrat, Cho'lpon, Elbek, and Botu, symbolized the emergence of a new poetic atmosphere. Yet the transformation was not simply a rejection of classical poetics. Modern Uzbek poetry retained inherited meters, images, rhetorical strategies, and ethical concepts while also developing new civic, national, revolutionary, and personal modes of address.

The social context of this transformation should be described in terms of transregional modernity rather than a simple West-to-East diffusion model. Russian colonial rule, Jadid schools, newspapers and journals, translation, Tatar and Ottoman intellectual networks, and new forms of political organization all altered the circulation of texts and ideas in Turkestan (Khalid, 1998). These processes expanded the social functions of poetry. The poet increasingly addressed not only a conventional beloved or moral audience but also the nation, the citizen, the worker, the colonized subject, and the self under conditions of historical crisis.

Cho'lpon became one of the most influential modern lyric voices because he joined national and political urgency to a highly individualized poetic language. Later Soviet poets such as G'afur G'ulom, Oybek, Hamid Olimjon, Maqsud Shayxzoda, Zulfiya, and Asqad Muxtor wrote within different institutional and ideological conditions, but their work collectively expanded the range of modern Uzbek verse. The post-Stalin and late-Soviet periods then produced further differentiation. Erkin Vohidov and Abdulla Oripov renewed civic, philosophical, and national themes; Rauf Parfi intensified modernist density and subjective complexity; Omon Matjon, Halima Xudoyberdiyeva, Shavkat Rahmon, Usmon Azim, and Xurshid Davron contributed distinct lyric and historical idioms.

The generational model is especially visible in poetry because shifts in public language and lyric subjectivity often respond rapidly to political change. Nevertheless, ideological labels alone cannot explain poetic value. The same period may contain official public verse, intimate lyric poetry, philosophical meditation, historical memory, and formal experiment. Twentieth-century Uzbek poetry is therefore best understood as a continuing negotiation between public speech and private voice, inherited form and innovation, institutional expectation and individual poetics.

Drama: Behbudiy, Hamza, and the Formation of Modern Uzbek Dramaturgy

Modern Uzbek drama emerged from the interaction of Jadid reform, print culture, public performance, and new conceptions of theatre as social pedagogy. Here, historical precision is particularly important. Mahmudxo'ja Behbudiy's Padarkush was written in 1911 and published in 1913, a distinction

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

confirmed by recent textual scholarship on the first edition (Avazov, 2025). It is therefore reasonable to recognize Behbudiy's chronological priority in the emergence of modern Uzbek drama and theatre culture.

Hamza Hakimzoda Niyoziy, however, expanded the range and durability of Uzbek dramaturgy through a larger body of plays and through sustained theatrical activity. Works such as Zaharli hayot, Maysaraning ishi, and Paranji sirlaridan bir lavha yoki Yallachilar ishi demonstrate his engagement with social conflict, gender, satire, and popular performance. The earlier claim that Hamza should simply replace Behbudiy as 'the founder' of Uzbek drama (Hamdamov, 2018) is too categorical. A stronger formulation distinguishes different kinds of priority: Behbudiy holds chronological and pioneering importance, while Hamza's breadth of dramatic production and theatrical practice makes him a foundational figure in the consolidation of Uzbek dramaturgy.

This differentiated account is also more consistent with the evidence than an analogy based solely on Qodiriy's status in the novel. Literary genres do not necessarily have one founder, and criteria for 'foundation' may include chronological priority, formal maturity, institutional influence, performance history, and later canonization. In the case of modern Uzbek drama, Behbudiy and Hamza should therefore be understood as complementary foundational figures rather than as mutually exclusive claimants to a single title.

Hamza's lost or reconstructed works further demonstrate the difficulty of making categorical judgments from an incomplete archive. Some plays associated with the period survive only in fragments, notices, or later reconstructions. Such archival conditions require critical caution when comparing formal achievement across authors. They also remind scholars that the history of Uzbek drama is partly a history of textual loss, censorship, performance, and reconstruction.

In the later twentieth century, Uzbek drama expanded across comedy, social drama, historical drama, satire, and hybrid forms. Sharof Boshbekov is especially important for the late-Soviet and early post-Soviet stage because of his generic range and his experimentation with labels such as serious comedy, melancholy comedy, social comedy, and philosophical comedy. His plays demonstrate that modern Uzbek dramaturgy developed not only by adding new themes but also by testing the boundaries among dramatic genres.

Independence and Twenty-First-Century Continuities

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 transformed the institutional and ideological conditions of Uzbek literary life, but it did not erase Soviet literary inheritances or produce a single homogeneous 'independence generation.' For that reason, post-1991 literature is better treated as a field in which several generations, languages, institutions, and aesthetic programs coexist. The end of Soviet censorship and ideological monopoly opened new possibilities, but literature remained embedded in political, economic, and cultural institutions.

Post-Soviet literary studies increasingly interpret Central Asian writing through the overlapping categories of post-Soviet, postcolonial, and decolonial identity. Koplatadze (2025), for example, argues that literature from Central Asia and the Caucasus reveals forms of identity negotiation that cannot be explained fully by the 'post-Soviet' label alone. Such work is particularly useful for avoiding the earlier assumption that independence automatically removed literature from political tension. Instead, post-independence writing can be read as a space in which national canon formation, Soviet memory, global literary markets, migration, language choice, and new aesthetic experiments interact.

This perspective also clarifies why the prose transformations associated with the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s should be treated as connected rather than isolated. Late-Soviet skepticism, historical revaluation, and formal experimentation prepared part of the ground for post-independence literature. At the same time, independence changed what could be remembered, published, canonized, translated, and taught. The recovery of Jadid writers, the reinterpretation of Soviet literary history, and the expansion of transnational literary exchange became central features of the new period.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

The title 'twentieth-century Uzbek literature' therefore remains appropriate only if the article acknowledges these continuities into the early twenty-first century. The present study does so explicitly: its central chronological focus is the twentieth century, while references to the 2000s serve to identify the afterlives of transformations that began earlier. This approach avoids silently extending the scope beyond the title while still recognizing that literary periods rarely end at calendar boundaries.

Conclusion

Twentieth-century Uzbek literature constitutes a distinct stage in the long development of Uzbek and broader Turkic-Persianate literary culture, but its distinctiveness lies in synthesis rather than total rupture. The century introduced and consolidated modern drama, the novel, new forms of prose, transformed lyric poetry, mass print culture, professional literary institutions, and new relationships between literature and politics. At the same time, writers repeatedly reactivated older literary forms, historical memories, ethical concepts, and linguistic resources.

Four conclusions follow from this analysis. First, Jadidism represents the most important early-century institutional and aesthetic reorientation, but its modernity emerged from transregional exchange rather than from a simple West-to-East transfer. Second, a generational model is useful only when treated as heuristic: the Jadid, early Soviet, post-Stalin, and late-Soviet formations overlap, and the 1980s must be understood as an important transition rather than an empty interval. Third, modern Uzbek prose developed through multiple trajectories, especially the historical-realist model associated with Qodiriy and the psychological-symbolic modernism associated with Cho'lpon, both of which continued to influence later experimentation. Fourth, the emergence of modern Uzbek drama is best described through differentiated foundations: Behbudiy's Padarkush established chronological and pioneering priority, while Hamza's larger dramaturgical and theatrical practice helped consolidate the form.

After independence, these earlier trajectories did not disappear. They were reinterpreted within new national, post-Soviet, postcolonial, and global frameworks. Uzbek literature's modern history is therefore not a story of tradition being replaced by innovation, but of tradition itself being continually reconstructed through new genres, institutions, translations, political conditions, and aesthetic choices. That process of negotiated renewal provides the most coherent basis for understanding the general landscape of twentieth-century Uzbek literature.

REFERENCES

1. Allworth, E. (1964). *Uzbek literary politics.* Mouton.
2. Allworth, E. (1990). *The modern Uzbeks: From the fourteenth century to the present: A cultural history.* Hoover Institution Press.
3. Avazov, N. (2025). “Padarkush” dramasi: Dastlabki nashr va tabdillar tahlili [The drama Patricide: Analysis of the first edition and its adaptations]. *Philology Matters, 53*(3), 122–129. https://doi.org/10.36078/987655511
4. Cho'lpon, A. S. o'g'li. (2020). *Night and day: Night* (C. Fort, Trans.). Academic Studies Press. (Original work published 1934). https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1zjg8g6
5. Fort, K. (2024). The socialist realist novel in Central Asia. In K. Bowers & M. Vaysman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of global realisms* (pp. 485–510). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197610640.013.1
6. Hamdamov, U. (2018, March 17). *Hamza – yangi o'zbek adabiyoti asoschilaridan birimi? [Is Hamza one of the founders of modern Uzbek literature?]*. Xurshid Davron Kutubxonasi. https://kh-davron.uz/kutubxona/uzbek/ulugbek-hamdam-hamza-yangi-ozbek-adabiyoti-asoschilaridan-birimi.html
7. Kamp, M. (2006). *The new woman in Uzbekistan: Islam, modernity, and unveiling under communism.* University of Washington Press.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

8. Karimov, N., Mamajonov, S., & Nazarov, B. (1999). *XX asr o'zbek adabiyoti tarixi [History of twentieth-century Uzbek literature]*. O'qituvchi.
9. Khalid, A. (1998). *The politics of Muslim cultural reform: Jadidism in Central Asia.* University of California Press.
10. Khalid, A. (2015). *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, empire, and revolution in the early USSR.* Cornell University Press.
11. Koplatadze, T. (2025). *Postcolonial identities in Central Asian and Caucasian literature.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198974086.001.0001
12. Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2025, May 15). *XX asr o'zbek adabiyotining ulkan namoyandalaridan biri, o'zbek romanchiligi asoschisi Abdulla Qodiriy haqida [About Abdulla Qodiriy, a major representative of twentieth-century Uzbek literature and founder of Uzbek novel writing]*. https://gov.uz/oz/madaniyat/news/view/54219
13. Northrop, D. (2004). *Veiled empire: Gender and power in Stalinist Central Asia.* Cornell University Press.
14. Quronov, D., Mamajonov, Z., & Sheraliyeva, M. (2010). *Adabiyotshunoslik lug'ati [Dictionary of literary studies]*. Akademnashr.
15. Roosien, C. (2026). *Socialism mediated: The making of Soviet culture in Central Asia.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198971153.001.0001