



folk/ed. Derg, 2022; 28(4)-112. Sayı/Issue -Güz/Autumn
DOI: 10.22559/folklor.2273

Araştırma makalesi/Research article

Creative Problems of Azerbaijani Prose of the 1960-1970s in Literary Criticism

1960-1970'lerin Azerbaycan Nesrinde Edebi Eleştirideki
Yaratıcı Sorunları

Terane Turan Rahimli*

Abstract

This research deals with directions of evaluation of 1960-70s prose in literary criticism, which considered one of crucial development stages of Azerbaijani literature, past in history with “new prose” event. As critique analyzes 1960-70s prose under influence of different ideologies in two different socio-political contexts-Soviet era and years of national independence, many of its ideas and conclusions lead to serious discussions, debates. And we followed connection of literary criticism with these years’ prose, process of their joint development as a whole in context of literature, time and we studied scientific-theoretical understanding of stage features of prose in criticism, its main creative problems-history and modernity, artistic hero, genre, style, plot, composition, literary-theoretical views on the literary language issues. I. Shikhli’s “Invincible Kura”, I. Huseynov’s “Mahshar”, M. Ibrahimov’s “Parvane”, F. Karimzade’s “Snowy

Geliş tarihi (Received): 2-05-2022 – Kabul tarihi (Accepted): 11-10-2022

* Doç.Dr./Assoc.Prof.Dr. Azerbaycan Devlet Pedagoji Üniversitesi / Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University.
terane.turan@gmail.com. ORCID 0000-0002-3640-0386

Pass”, etc. when evaluating the best prose works of the period, revealed errors of criticism arising from Soviet thinking disappeared in 1980-90s, replaced by more accurate, objective evaluation criteria, nationality was justified as main quality of prose. As a result, since 1970s, it was realized that criticism that focused on self-awareness, paid attention to the shortcomings, errors of prose analyzes eliminated them, evaluated 1960-70s prose from an objective scientific view.

Keywords: *Azerbaijan, history, modernity, prose, literary criticism*

Öz

Bu arařtırmada Azerbaycan edebiyatının önemli gelişme aşamalarından sayılan, “yeni nesir” hadisesi ile tarihe geçen 1960-70’li yıllar nesrinin edebi tenkit açısından konu edilmektedir. Bu merhalenin nesrinin Azerbaycan edebiyatı tarihindeki yerini belirlemede edebi tenkit önemli rol üstlenmiştir. Fakat tenkit 1960-70’li yıllar nesrini iki farklı sosyo-politik durumda – Sovyet dönemi ve bağımsızlık yıllarında farklı ideolojilerin tesiri altında değerlendirdiğinden onun birçok fikir ve kanaatleri ciddi müzakerelere, tartışmalara neden olmuştur. Bu amaç doğrultusunda makalede söz konusu yılların nesir eserleri ile edebi tenkidin ilişkisi ve gelişim süreci bir bütün olarak edebiyat ve zaman bağlamında izlenmiş, nesrin aşamalarının edebi tenkitten esas problemleri – tarihsellik ve çağdaşlık, kahraman, janr, tür, üslup, süje, konu, kompozisyon, dil meseleleri edebiteorik bakış açısından değerlendirilmiştir. Sovyet dönemi tenkidi ile bağımsızlık dönemi tenkidini karşılaştırmak, İsmayıl Şihli’nin “Deli Kür”, İsa Hüseyinov’un “Mahşer”, Mirza İbrahimov’un “Pervane” romanları, Ferman Kerimzade’nin “Karlı aşırım” kısa hikâyesi ve diğer eserlerle ilgili farklı fikir ve kanaatlerin bir araya getirilmesi konuya yeni bakış açısından bakmaya imkân tanımıştır. Edebi tenkidin, nesirde tarihsellik ve çağdaşlığa yaklaşımının doğrudan kahraman konteksti ile ilişkisi ispat edilmiştir. Bu değerlendirme zamanı tenkidin kendisinin de önemli ilmi-nazari yeniliklerle zenginleştiği ortaya çıkmıştır. Dönemin en iyi nesir eserlerini değerlendirdiğimiz zaman tenkidin Sovyet bakış açısının etkisinde ortaya çıkan yanlışlarının 1980-90’lı yıllarda ortadan kaldırıldığı, daha doğru ve objektif değerlendirme ölçütleri esasında değerlendirildiği, milliliğin bu nesrin esas özelliği olarak esaslandırıldığı görülmüştür. Nesrin “düşünen” kahramanları onun mahiyetini yenileyen esas nitelik olarak belirlenmiştir. Sonuç olarak XX. yüzyılın 70’li yıllardan itibaren milli kimliğe yönelen, nesirle ilgili tahlillerin eksiklerini, yanlışlarını arařtıran edebi tenkidin onları ortadan kaldırdığı, 1960-70’li yıllar nesrini objektif bilimsel açıdan değerlendirdiği belli olmuştur. 1980’li yıllarda genel olarak edebiyatın basmakalıp kahramanlardan uzaklaşması da bu değerlendirmeden kaynaklanıyordu. Arařtırmalarımız sonucunda elde edilen veriler Azerbaycan edebî tenkidinin ve nesrinin gelişim sürecini izlemek ve onun belli merhalelerinin değerlendirmek açısından edebiyat bilimine fayda sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar sözcükler: *Azerbaycan, nesir, tarihsellik, çağdaşlık, tenkit*

Introduction

The 1960-70s prose of Azerbaijan was remembered with new artistic examples that went beyond the themes and heroism of Soviet-period literature and the influence of ideology. Because after the XX Congress, the phenomenon of moral freedom of the “moderation” period, in which the Stalin era was denied, the cult of personality disappeared and a new social atmosphere was created, gave a stronger impetus to the development of prose than any other field of literature. It was prose that first rejected stereotyped fictional heroes and literary idols. However, despite this bold change in prose, the critique of the period was based on Soviet criteria in the analysis of the new prose. Paying attention to the explanation of modernity in prose by critique and its superficial attitude to historicity - another important problem of literature also stemmed from these criteria. Though the issue of history and the writer, firstly raised by Mehdi Huseyn as a fundamental issue in literary criticism in the 1940s, rose to the level of the problem of the historicity of literature in the 1960-70s, historicity could not become one of the primary problems of literature. In the 60-70s of the XX century, special significance was placed on the personality factor in our national prose, the growing interest in human psychology, the selection of fictional heroes “from the sphere of everyday life”, the flow of daily life, the gradual disappearance of traditional “positive-negative” image dimensions in their description and presentation, and the growing interest in autobiography, attracted the attention of critics. The critique of the 60s argued that “the problem of the novel is first and foremost the problem of the protagonist of the novel”, thus explaining the main success of all genres of prose, including the widest genre, with its concept of heroism.

Literary-theoretical ideas, which ignored the new protagonist of the prose in the early 1960s and equated him with the traditional labor hero who “built” the previous literary stages, are also included in the critical materials. Islam Ibrahimov writes about the hero of the new prose in the Soviet way of thinking: “The main protagonist of our literature is an active, standing on historically optimistic position, who lives in love with creation, a holy person, who sees creative work as a purpose of life, who fights for civic ideals” (Ibrahimov, 1962: 205).

In the early 1960s, the protagonist’s individual world, with all its subtle and complex manifestations, the absence of any extraordinary factors in its self-assertion, its very simple presentation, and its uniqueness, drew the attention of this new man to criticism. Of course, this type of hero, whom critique finds difficult to accept immediately, “painful, painful,” was not initially objectively evaluated. The denial of Nemat in Anar’s story “The White Harbor” and the connection of his existence with the writer’s “imperfect understanding of life” are clear indications of this.

However, despite this denial, starting from the late 50s of the XX century, the emphasis on the personality factor in our national prose, the strengthening of interest in its psychology, in the 60s and 70s, the deepening of attention to man, the emergence of “thinking” heroes as a whole was assessed in literary criticism as the main quality that characterizes the literature of this period. The main urgency of the problem is due to the fact that critical works on the concept of the protagonist of the prose in question are not studied systematically and from a polemical point of view.

The research mainly uses the possibilities of historical-comparative, typological, analysis-synthesis methods and the leading theoretical conclusions of modern literary criticism. Theoretical concepts of Azerbaijani and world (especially Russian) literary criticism on various problems of prose and criticism, important scientific conclusions of the history of Azerbaijani literature and critical studies are also taken as a methodological basis. The research provides a concrete theoretical conclusion on the principles of research and analysis in the criticism of fiction, which is of particular importance for research in this area. The practical significance of the work is that it is useful as an important theoretical source for philological students, masters and doctoral students, as well as useful in the teaching of seminars, special courses and elective courses.

1. The attitude of critique to the stage features, historicity and modernity problem of prose

The Azerbaijani prose of 1960-1970, distinguished by extraordinary artistic achievements, attracted attention with its new problems and shades of ideas, themes glorifying moral values, deep psychological analysis, a new way of looking at events, serious and thought-provoking artistic conflict starting with Isa Huseynov's "Telegram" story. The writer's penetration into the hidden layers of human spirituality, his emphasis on the personality factor in artistic thought in the example of the protagonist Zalimkhan, and his attention to the violation of the harmony between man and nature caused a great response.

This new prose generally opposes dogmas, all obstacles and barriers that do not correspond to the true freedom and intelligence of the individual, which is associated with a significant process in society, such as the expansion of democracy and human rights. (Huseynov, 1976: 197)

The creative pursuits of the "sixties" generation are especially noteworthy in the prose of this period, which is characterized as "multifaceted and multi-generational" prose. Later, the "sixties", who included the literary terms "New Prose" and "New Wave" in the scientific lexicon, brought great innovations to the national literary prose. Mehdi Hussein, a highly erudite critic who saw and appreciated this innovation in time, who observed that "our literary development is on the verge of a sharp leap" writes:

I can confidently say that we have entered a new stage in our prose and poetry. There is no need to hurry to claim that this stage has already taken a decisive position. The most important thing is that the whole literary community clearly feels the historical necessity of moving to that stage. (Huseyn, 1962: 10)

This innovation, which the articles and researchers wrote in the "hot start" in the criticism does not give an objective scientific assessment, and it is difficult to assess the essence of the whole, in the following decades, a clearer scientific and theoretical understanding of this stage as a whole, was realized in the 70s, as well as in the 80s and 90s, when the analytical interest in criticism and theoretical thinking increased, which is considered a stage of self-

awareness of criticism. In the criticism of these years, the concepts of “new prose”, “sixties” have found a clear scientific explanation, the literary process has been correctly classified in terms of genre, style and heroism. Criticism carefully observes the new creative qualities that are evident in the literature of the time, examines the factors that determine the aesthetic scope of prose, emphasizes that the literary process of young, talented writers, who entered the literary environment with new themes, characters, new styles and creative materials, enriched the literary process in new directions, provided its diversity within the genre, and opened wide opportunities for the future development of our national literature (Talibzade, 1994: 422).

Among the creative problems of literary and theoretical thought in the 1960s and 1970s, historicity and modernity are particularly noteworthy. During this historical period, literary criticism and the literary process were “active under the wings of the concept of modernity as a whole” (Elchin, 1997: 18) at the All-Union level, and modernity had a leading position in the system of problems of criticism and literature. Historicity, which deals with the national past and national identity, has been overlooked as an “anti-modernity issue”. Criticism, which for many years has not been able to see and appreciate the organic connection between these two important aesthetic categories, has misinterpreted history and modernity as creative issues that deny each other. The explanation of the philosophical and aesthetic essence of modernity directly related to history shows that the study of these two problems in isolation from each other, ignoring their relationship, at different times led to the creation of artificial obstacles to the development of literature and criticism.

Mehdi Hussein in his article, “Writer and History” in 1943, explains historicity with the concreteness of historical events and realities described in a work of art, and the ability to correctly understand and present the general nature of the historical period and environment, said, “it is a work of art that shows the differences that arise from this” (Huseyn, 1979: 422). Mammad Arif also approached the issue from this perspective, demanding that the writer create art boards and images that accurately reflect the meaning, spirit, and regularity of social development and do not distort the essence of the facts (Arif, 1968: 355).

Russian literary critic S. Zlobin made this logical conclusion in the 1950s, protesting against the opposition of history to modernity: “Now and in the past, these are not the opposite. History does not end yesterday to start again today. This is a single process” (Zlobin, 1957: 124). Azerbaijan’s literary-theoretical opinion was strengthened by confirming this idea in articles and researches analyzing the prose of the late 60s and 70s. The relevance of the problem of “history” in the early twentieth century in relation to the historical concept of national literature, the deepening of the attitude to the issue in the research of S. Vurgun, M. Hussein in the 1940s - the transition view of history from a class to a national one, resulted in increased criticism of the problem in the following decades. The formulation of the issue in the 70s in the form of “history, artist and modernity” the perception of history, the need to assess it from the level of modern spiritual and aesthetic requirements, the “movement of literary thought to the philosophy of history” in the 80s was a manifestation of the approach from different angles (Asadullayev, 1975: 175).

In the 1970s, critics came to the conclusion that the appeal to history, the re-objective perception of historical events, also contributed to the artistic perception of modernity. At this stage, the historian of criticism understands and evaluates not only the quality of works written on a historical subject, but also the principle of artistic perception of modernity, as a unit of aesthetic evaluation. In the work on history, in contrast to the 30s and 50s, when it is important to adhere to the historical chronology, it is necessary to understand the history of the 70s, to evaluate it on the basis of values. The critique of this stage focuses on the principle of the unity of Man, History and Time in artistic thought. Criticism emphasizes that the image of a historical figure in the work, where this principle is expected, is strong with its national and individual characteristics, evokes sympathy as a character, and has a universal scale and scope.

Critique of 70s tried to clarify the specifics of critical literary historicity as an aesthetic category, explaining it with the possibilities of the literary description of a writer who presented human destiny in a dialectical connection with the historical period and historical reality. During these years, criticism focused on the specificity of the manifestation of literary historicity in literature.

Azerbaijan's independence in the 1990s, the change in the political climate as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union, and freedom of expression made it necessary to return to the problem of "history." Theoretical thought, which broke the framework of seventy years of ideological and sociological constraints, led to fundamental research on this problem. Among them, Y.Garayev's research "History: near and far" (1996), Elchin's research "History and the problem of modernity in literature" (1997) were distinguished by a radical approach to the issue.

From the historical point of view, the attitude of criticism to I. Shikhli's novel "Violent Kur", which at this stage sounded completely new with its ideological and artistic content and resonated in the literary and scientific environment as an original work, is of special interest "Violent Kur" appeared as a work that contradicted the stereotypes of the time, destroyed the thematic standards of social realism, and reflected the strong ties to the ancestral, national-historical existence.

Criticism in the work was not sought in the "correctness and reality" of specific historical facts and events, but in the writer's ability to accurately present the characteristics of a particular epoch to a modern man.

Criticism observed that "the main merits of our great novels - the laws of development of society, the leading trends of history, the typical features of the period - are highlighted in this work, the dynamics, character, plot line, became the determining factor in the development of the subject" (Bayramov, 1988: 139). Due to these qualities, it was emphasized that the novel had a very strong influence on the search for modernity of our prose.

In general, the most critical articles and reviews were written in the 1960s and 1970s, and were included in research on prose was "Violent Kur". And in all these writings it is emphasized that the immeasurable talent of I.Shikhli, his unparalleled contribution to our literature and prose, the novel was valued as the greatest success of national prose at the present stage.

As Yashar Garayev wrote, “our article, which in recent years has deeply opened a work of prose such as “Violent Kur”, recreated “Violent Kur” in criticism, and its equal” image of criticism “has not yet been written” (Garayev, 1976: 115).

Compared to historicity, modernity as an aesthetic category in 1960-1970 gained a more active position in Azerbaijani literary criticism. There were factors that made criticism more important (sometimes even extreme) than modern problems of literature. At the All-Union level, the problem of modernity is the most serious task facing literature, and the XX-XVI Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party emphasized the importance of modernity in the field of art as much as “realism, partisanship and innovation.” In 1961, the plenum of the USSR Writers’ Union paid special attention to modernity among the tasks of literary criticism, linking its successes and shortcomings with it, and made specific demands against criticism. However, subjectivism was also allowed in these demands. It is impossible not to see that the demand that “the critic must study life as a writer and meet the heroes of future books in construction and in the field of labor” stems from the ideological dictation of the ruling system of the time (Aliyev, 1990: 117).

At this stage, modernity, as the first priority problem of literature, seriously engaged in literary-theoretical thought, and also had a great influence on artistic thought. A vigilant attitude to the realities of modern life, the understanding of its new issues and the artistic solution have made our writers think deeply since the second half of the 50s of the twentieth century. In those years, Mammad Arif, Mehdi Huseyn, Mammad Jafar, Jafar Jafarov, Mikayil Rafili, Kamal Talibzade, and others. In their research, critics have expressed a conceptual scientific approach to the problem of modernity. How did literary criticism in the 60s and 70s understand the concept of modernity, and what qualities did modernity require from a work of art? Although in these years, as well as in previous decades, modernity has been the main problem in Azerbaijani literature, its essence has often been misunderstood. In particular, from the 1930s to the 1960s, the Soviet era explained the concept of critical modernity mainly in terms of themes, proximity to time and space, and, most importantly, the extent to which socialist ideology was reflected in the work. In general, the critical modernity of the period was sought in the writer’s skill to deeply and fully reflect the individual characteristics, destiny, moral qualities of the people who built communism, he saw “true mastery” in writing “the main problems of the time.”

The search for modernity in appearance was criticized in the following decades as the most serious mistake of theoretical-aesthetic thought at this stage. Criticism often equates modernity with urgency, making it difficult to distinguish the essential differences between the different aesthetic categories.

As Elchin’s conceptual research shows, “many critics understand modernity in literature as relevance, and relevance only as economic innovation. they could not appreciate the manifestations and signs of novelty in their attitude, of freshness in the means of artistic expression.” (Elchin, 1997: 26)

Of particular interest is the attitude of literary criticism to the national factor as an important component of modernity. Nationalism, the content of which is conditioned by history, is the main quality that determines modernity as an aesthetic category. However, the extreme distortion of the concept of “nationality” in the aesthetics of the Soviet period has for many years hindered the understanding and interpretation of this concept in literary and theoretical thought. In this period, criticism puts nationalism as one of the main requirements in literature, nationalism, which contains the main essence and value of literature, is “melted” within nationalism, and could not be revealed as an important idea-aesthetic quality. “Nationalism” meant “provincialism” and “nationalism” meant the reality of multinational socialism.

In the 1970s, we observed that the aspect of the unity of nationality and humanity was included in research. The main value of art was explained by this quality. However, the Soviet era activated the concept of “nationalism” in the lexicon instead of the critical expression “nationalism”. When we say nationalism, we do not mean the values of a specific nation, but the multimillion-strong Soviet people. Therefore, nationality was valued as a human concept with no geographical boundaries, and it was concluded that national art was equally important to all, and that national identity was conditional in real literature. Criticism of the social roots of the nationalist factor in the literature of the 1980s penetrated into the depths of the problem, expressing a more conceptual, radical approach to the issue. Nationalism was perceived as the main criterion of ideological and socio-moral processes, and was considered the basis of socio-moral and ideological activity. Yashar Garayev’s article “The Factor of Nationality” (1988) draws attention in the literature as the most obvious example of the theoretical understanding of this issue. A new approach to the creative problems of literature in the 1990s is also characterized by a clear, final theoretical approach to the issue of “nationality”. Literary criticism and nationalism of the artist “to describe the life of the people in typical national specificity in typical and characteristic colors, socio-political and moral-psychological certainty”, “look at life through the eyes of his nation”, “image with national features - the greatness of dreams, breadth of thought, patriotism to revive with depth and purity of feeling” (Hajiyev, 1990: 56-57). Ismayil Shikhli’s “Violent Kur”, Farman Karimzadeh’s “Snowy Pass”, Isa Huseynov’s “Mahshar” (Apocalypse) novels were also evaluated in this context.

Literary theory, which substantiates the emergence of “Violent Kur” as a new prose phenomenon, first of all in this novel, changes the view of the historical subject, sees in the work a more original organic unity of history and modernity. From this point of view, it seems more logical that Tehran Alishanoglu evaluates the view of history in “Violent Kur” “as a continuation of modernity, as an integral part of it.” T.Alishanoglu’s analysis radically proves that history does not remain as history in the work, but also penetrates modernity (Alishanoglu, 1999: 46).

When we look at the criticism of the 90s, we see that in these years the poetics of the new prose has been more fully explained, the realities of life, the issues of the ideal directly serving modernity have been touched upon. Criticism proves that Azerbaijani prose has “brought the truth of life down from the ideological heavens” (Tehran Alishanoglu) since the 1950s with concrete examples - B.Bayramov’s “Leaves”, I.Huseynov’s “Burning Heart”, I.Efendiyev’s “Willow Ditch”.

2. Various angles of criticism of the protagonist's concept of fiction

The most characteristic features of the new Azerbaijani prose were related to the penetration of the human personality into the depths of the inner and spiritual world of man (Guliyev, 1988: 189). From this point of view, the concept of the protagonist of the prose is more critical in the literary field. Explaining the main success of the critical novel in the 1960s with its characters, linked the main achievements of all genres of prose with the concept of the hero (İbrahimov, 1962: 204). This prose struck a blow at the unshakable literary stereotypes of traditional prose, which artificially idealized man and always portrayed him as a hero of great sacrifices, an invincible conqueror, a symbol of pride and grandeur.

We also note that in criticism and literary criticism, the heroes of the new prose were originally called “small” people, and this “smallness” was ironically interpreted as weakness. Akif Huseynov comments on the issue with reference to the processes taking place in world literature. He argues that at a time when the character of the “little” people has changed, analogies with Western literature have never been fulfilled, and it is more accurate to call the heroes of national prose “simple, ordinary” people (Huseynov, 1980: 134).

Criticism in the early 1960s also includes literary-theoretical ideas that ignore the new protagonist of the prose, equating him with the traditional labor hero who “built” the previous literary stages, and it is impossible to agree with these views. İslam İbrahimov wrote about the hero of the new prose: “The main protagonist of our literature is an active, historical optimist, a person who loves to build, a holy person, who sees creative work as a purpose of life, who fights for civic ideals” (İbrahimov, 1962: 205). However, the individual world of the protagonist of the prose of the 60s with all its delicate and complex manifestations, the absence of any extraordinary factors in its self-assertion, its very simple presentation, and its uniqueness did not draw attention to this new man.

The fact that the focus of artistic thought was on man was directly related to the political events of the time. Criticism affirms that “the softness observed in the socio-political atmosphere after the twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party has to some extent saved the literary system” (Salamoglu, 2005: 8).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the search for heroes in fiction, its achievements in this field, and significant innovations became the main subject of criticism. Critical considerations of these years call for the creation of images with “only a high, bright ideal of life”, complaints about the lack of warriors, selfless, heroes with excess of organizing and propaganda power, sharp rebuke is more theoretical. Criticism emphasizes the “great need to move from a series of hateful, angry, regrettable themes, events, images to heroic themes, to a brilliant image of ideal devotees,” as an important necessity for literature.

Sometimes, on the contrary, criticism refutes the real picture of the prose of the 60s, equating its new protagonist with literary copies of previous decades to prove the fidelity of literature to the decisions of the party at a new stage. In this regard, Akif Aliyev's opinion is noteworthy: “In the emerging prose works, interest in socio-psychological conflicts has significantly increased, Azerbaijani writers have taken the initiative to create great human

characters in their novels and stories. The focus of such works was to show the image of party workers and fighters, their leading role, to describe them” (Aliyev, 1990: 119). Apparently, the protagonists of the prose, representing ordinary people, were misrepresented as “great men” and “party leaders.” At the same time, the conclusion about the creation of a militant image of party workers was wrong. Because back in the late 50s, starting from the image of Sultan Amirli in Isa Huseynov’s story “Burning Heart”, it was forgotten that the image of the ideal party worker of previous decades was abandoned in the prose.

When the critics emphasized the return of man to national and spiritual values, he realized that the heroes of the time were “far ahead of the heroes of the 1930s in their inner richness and cultural level, in their intelligence,” and in their “difficult struggle against injustice” (Khalilov, 1973: 217). From this point of view, the criticism is based on Ismayil Shikhli’s “Violent Kur”, Farman Karimzade’s “Snowy Pass”, Isa Huseynov’s “Mahshar”, “Telegram”, “Flute sound”, “Saz”, Mirza Ibrahimov’s “Parvana”, Anar’s “White Harbor”, Afgan’s “Gulyanag” evaluates his works as the most successful artistic examples, examples of high craftsmanship, in which he paid special attention to the explanation of the concept of a new hero, the factor of national identity.

3. Genre, plot, composition, style and language features of prose in literary criticism

1960-1970 Literary criticism of the artistic features of Azerbaijani prose, its other creative qualities, problems, concept of artistic hero, history, modernity, innovation, novelty of ideas and themes, etc. Although he did not think much about it, there are concrete theoretical conclusions on the issues of prose such as literary language, style, genre types, architecture, plot, composition. Criticism focuses primarily on the genre of prose. Searching for the conclusions of criticism in this area, we note that Azerbaijani prose, which in previous decades had made significant achievements in major epic forms, did not actively resort to monumental forms at a new stage.

In the earlier stages of development of literature, the encounter of “false epic” signs, outward monumentality in the tendency of fiction towards large forms, the schematism and template poetics created by it, at a new stage alienated writers from monumental forms. In addition to the outdated idea of life, the impossibility of writing with old means of expression and description led to the search for a new genre and style.

In this regard, the genres of narrative and storytelling in the prose of this literary stage are distinguished by a special activity compared to the novel. These forms of Azerbaijani prose, which were partially forgotten in the previous decades and lost their original value, not only gained special relevance in 1960-1970, but also became much richer in content, acquiring new ideological and artistic qualities and artistic features. Criticism sought to explain the reasons for the “rejection” of the broad epic genre in prose, the weakening of the writer’s propensity for the novel, and, conversely, the growing interest in the genres of story and narrative. The objective reasons for the “revival” of the story genre, once created by such great artists as J. Mammadguluzade, A. Hagverdiyev, Y.V. Chamanzaminli, are investigated and revealed, as

well as why the story lost its relevance in the first decades of the Soviet era. Literary criticism rightly observed that during the formation of Soviet literature in Azerbaijan, the “small” genres remained in the shadows for some time, as the creation of an exhaustive image of the revolution and the post-revolutionary years came to the fore as the main task. Years have passed, the new era has set new tasks for literature, and the content that has changed over time has required new forms” (Aliyeva, 1979: 128.)

Criticism linked the success of a number of prose works of the period to the fact that they were written only in the genre of miniature stories, thus emphasizing the undeniable importance of the genre in the new literary stage. For example, in Suleyman Rahimov’s “Kapaz” it was emphasized that the writer succeeded “precisely because he chose the genre of miniature stories”, and the way of depicting and criticizing his images appeared in a new, different form.

Anar’s fantastic story “Contact” also attracted critics, first of all, with its genre features. Criticism expresses the attitude to the incoherence and isolation of the protagonist, which leads to the loneliness of “The Connection”, and sees the closeness between Anar’s story and Kafka’s novel “Grief” or H. Kortsar’s stories. However, Chekhov’s story “The Man in the Sheath”, which directly resonates with “Contact”, draws attention with its unity of ideas and closeness to the artistic hero, is overlooked. However, the reason for the destruction of both the heroes of “The Man in the Sheath” and “Communication” was their isolation from the social environment, people, building a wall between them and artificially creating a shell for themselves.

The story “Communication” is not considered an example of fiction, far from everyday life, strictly separated from social life. “In this expressionist fiction, the real city, the real people are involved, but something strange was happening that people were in a terrible situation... This is a fantasy created by the hesitation between light and shadow, the appearance of obstacles, obstacles, passages, stairs on the road...” (Garayev, 1988: 144). Yashar Garayev also applies Olesha’s conclusion about fiction to Anar’s “Contact”, and considers his work, which arose as a reaction to resistance and obstruction, as a perfect example of the genre of fiction. The critics also complained about the lack of achievements in the field of biographical works, memoirs, and epistolary genres, emphasizing the importance of an active appeal to these important genres of prose. However, despite this criticism, these genres did not become relevant in the 60s and 70s.

Of particular interest in the critique of the period is the analysis of the characteristics of the novel genre. Although the number of works written in the novel genre during these years was small compared to other genres of prose, the literary-theoretical approach to the novel issue differed in its urgency and contradictory nature. The novel was one of the most serious creative issues in the 70’s, which constantly engaged in literary and theoretical thought at the All-Union level. Literary debates on the fate of the novel, which sometimes calmed down and sometimes intensified, are of great concern to writers and literary critics during this period, a series of articles on the problem are published, “Is the novel necessary?” The panorama of

thought around the question made it necessary to approach the problem in the context of the “Roman Crisis: Myth and Reality.” Russian literary criticism “Is there a crisis in the novel?”, “What social manifestations, philosophical and aesthetic factors affect the development of this genre, the fate of the genre as a whole?” was looking for answers to important questions such as. Beginning in the 1950s, the current state of the novel and the prospects of the genre in literature have been the focus of world literary and theoretical thought as a whole, and have taken an important place as a leading topic in international symposiums, conferences and collegiums. A. Rob-Grillet “For a New Novel” (1963), P. Alberes “History of Modern Novel” (1962), Gerda Zeltner “The Great Adventures of French Novel in the 20th Century” (1960), Georges Jean “Novel” (1971), R. By writing and publishing fundamental research in the world literary community in the 1960s and 1970s, such as Burnef and R. Kelle’s *The Sphere of the Novel* (1972), they confirmed the seriousness of the novel problem in European literary theory. In the early 70’s, Russian literary criticism put an end to the controversy by presenting to the literary world the book *The Fate of the Novel* (1975), which brought together the leading theoretical conclusions of Russian and European scholars on the novel problem. showed that he had arrived. As a result, he criticized the novel as a genre that can raise and solve the most pressing problems of modernity. In the 60s and 70s, this genre was enriched with valuable examples such as “Parvana”, “Mahshar”, and the most articles and reviews on criticism were written, and the work included in fundamental research on prose was “Violent Kur”. “Criticism notes that the achievements of prose in the 60s and 70s were not effective only for small genres, and drew attention to I. Shikhli’s novel “Violent Kur”, which clearly showed the importance and necessity of innovations brought by I. Huseynov to small genres.

In contemporary literature and criticism, the plot is perceived as one of the most important problems of artistic creation, and this important component of the work of art is valued as one of the most important factors in the perfect presentation of the content. The impossibility of understanding the aesthetic essence of any work without studying the peculiarities of the plot structure, of solving the issues it expresses, is an idea that has been repeatedly emphasized in the criticism of the 70s and 80s. Literary criticism draws attention to Isa Huseynov’s special attention and unique approach to genre, plot-composition issues, emphasizing that this factor also played an important role in his rise as an artist. Criticism considers the creation of a rather complex, dynamic and attractive plot as one of the most characteristic features of the poetics of Isa Huseynov’s prose. According to L. Hasanzadeh, “One of the features of plot-composition in I. Huseynov’s prose is that retrospect, which is often found in existentialist works, is very widespread here” (Hasanzade, 2007: 23).

The details given in the author’s “Telegram” story (“First Detail”, “Second Detail”, etc.) are evaluated in the context of the essence as “associative retrospectives”, “important parts of the composition that necessarily complement the plot line”. In the story “Native and Strangers” it is emphasized that retrospectives ensure the perfection of the work both in terms of content and plot-composition, and it is noted that the reader gets the basic information about the images in the work from such reminders of the researcher. Criticism is unfounded,

and he considers this example of the prose of the 60s, which was met with great sympathy, to be “a work of art with a single artistic plot.” In the materials of literary-theoretical analysis, attention is paid to various aspects of Isa Huseynov’s plot construction methods, and a complex double plot is considered typical for this prose.

In Movlud Suleymanli’s story “Mill”, at first glance, the plot seems very simple in criticism. However, when one pays attention to the issues hidden at the bottom of this apparent simplicity, one can see that the movement is absorbed in the text. Seeing the organic connection between E. Zolyan’s “Trap” and M. Suleymanli’s “Mill”, Y. Garayev observes the harmony of ideas in both works, the similarity of social problems and the closeness of the fate of female characters, and this comparison is completely true.

Among the renewed structural features of prose in the 1960s, the freshness of style also attracted the attention of critics. When looking at the literary-theoretical materials of the 60s and 70s, it is necessary to note that the issue of style arose from the need to speak about the freshness of the form of the renewed prose in literary criticism. Even when it was necessary to talk about style, its boundaries were narrowed, explained only in terms of the language element. In general, during these years, one of the obvious shortcomings of criticism was to understand and evaluate style as a phenomenon of literary language, speech, to explain the boundaries of style, the linguistic individuality of the work of art. This harmful tendency, rooted in Russian literature, is also evident in the assessment of the style of achievements of our national prose. This aspect is more noticeable in Gulu Khalilov’s monograph “From the history of development of the Azerbaijani novel”. We observe that three of the five tendencies in G.Khalilov’s classification of stylistic tendencies are based on the features of artistic language.

Criticism can clearly see the development of the literary language in the prose of Azerbaijan in the 60s and 70s, observed that it matured in the new literary stage in accordance with the period, events, human characters.

Thus, in the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century, among the main successes of literary criticism, Azerbaijan brought to the center of analysis important creative issues such as history and modernity, the concept of artistic hero, genre, plot and composition, style and language, explained the originality of the renewed prose.

Conclusion

The research revealed that in the period of the rise of Azerbaijani prose in the 1960s and 1970s, criticism had a great responsibility in terms of theoretical understanding of the new trend of aesthetic thought, and the successes and shortcomings of criticism in the process of evaluating prose were revealed. The changing prose of criticism has been shown by the unchanging method, by the arguments that attempts to reveal its specificity have failed when evaluated by the scientific-theoretical principles of social realism. The inability of critics to properly see the great innovations of the prose of the 60s, revealed that its focus on his errors in prose analysis only in the late 1970s, and his 20-year delay in classifying this prose as a

“new prose” event, were due to a long-standing misinterpretation of this important literary event. In 1990-2000, it was observed that criticism of literary facts from a completely new perspective acknowledged that the prose of the 60s and 70s went beyond the literary norms of social realism with all its parameters. When history and modernity, the most pressing creative problems of the time, were studied in isolation from each other, it was proved that criticism could not see their relationship. It is connected with this that he expressed the modernity of such works as “Violent Kur”, “Snowy Pass”, “Mahshar” (Apocalypsus) in the late 70’s, when he perceived history as a principle of “artistic perception of modernity”. It is obvious that the criticism came to the right conclusions when he explained the modernity of such works as “Bridge Builders”, “Telegram”, “White Harbor”, “Coolness” in unity with the national factor, in an organic connection with humanity. It is clarified that the sensitive attitude of the critic to a new type of prose hero, such as Nemat, Tahmina, Seriya, led to the connection of the main success in all genres of prose with the concept of a hero. The more objective assessment of the heroes who broke the framework of social realism in the 90s, the understanding of the tragedy of Jahandar agha and Ismail of Karbala at the level of the tragedy of national-historical existence is seen as the result of highlighting the national aspect in criticism. Evaluation of images born from the artistic logic of the period in the context of emancipation, time and human morality, national and moral values, psychology, contemporary human and social environment problems shows that the concept of artistic hero of the period found an objective scientific solution in the criticism of the 90s. Analysis of genre types, plot, composition, stylistic tendencies, and literary language of criticism reveals that all forms of prose are associated with its creative success. It has been proved that the acquisition of the prospect of integration of Azerbaijani prose into world prose in 1960-70 led to a new stage of development of criticism and resulted in the adoption and application of the leading trends of world literary and theoretical thought.

Yazarların katkı düzeyleri: Birinci Yazar %100

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article: First Author %100

Etik komite onayı: Çalışmada etik kurul iznine gerek yoktur.

Ethics committee approval: Ethics committee approval is not required for the **study**.

Finansal destek: Çalışmada finansal destek alınmamıştır.

Support Statement (Optional): No financial support was received for the study.

Çıkar çatışması: Çalışmada potansiyel çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

Statement of Interest: There is no conflict of interest between the authors of this article.

References:

- Aliyev, A. (1990). *Literature and truth*. Maarif publishing house.
- Aliyeva, S. (1979). Crafts lessons. *Azerbaijan magazine*, No 12, 119-142.
- Alishanoglu, T. (1999). *Azerbaijan "new prose"*. Science publishing house.
- Arif, M. (1968). *Selected works*. In 3 volumes, 2nd volume. Publication of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan.
- Asadullayev, S. (1975). *History, art, modernity*. Youth publishing house.
- Bayramov, G. (1988). *History and modernity*. See: Socialist realism at the modern stage. Science publishing house.
- Elchin. (1997). *The problem of history and modernity in literature (based on the theoretical study of the literary-historical process in Azerbaijan)*, Institute of Literature named after Nizami of ANAS.
- Garayev, Y. (1976). *Criticism: Problems, portraits*. Azerbaijan State Publishing House.
- Garayev, Y. (1988). *The criterion is personality*. Writer publishing house.
- Hajiyev, A. (1990). *Creative individuality of the artist*. API publishing house.
- Hasanzade, L. (2007). *Poetics of Azerbaijani prose of 50-60s (based on the works of Isa Huseynov)*, Institute of Literature named after Nizami of ANAS.
- Huseyn, M. (1962). New stage, new tasks. "*Azerbaijan*" magazine, No 7, 3-24.
- Huseyn, M. (1979). *Works*. 10 volumes. vol.10, Writer publishing house.
- Huseynov, A. (1976). The movement of time and the prose. The first article. "*Azerbaijan*" magazine, No 7, 195-208.
- Huseynov, A. (1980). *Prose and time*. Writer.
- Ibrahimov, I. (1962). Historical optimization paths. "*Azerbaijan*" magazine, No 7, 197-213.
- Khalilov, Q. (1973). *From the history of development of the Azerbaijani novel*. Science publishing house.
- Salamoglu T. (2005). *Poetics of the modern Azerbaijani novel (80s of the XX century)*. Science publishing house.
- Talibzade, K. (1994). *Selected works*. In 2 volumes, v.2, Azerbaijan State Publication.
- Zlobin, S. (1957). *About my work on a historical novel*. In kn: Soviet literature and questions of mastery. Issue. 1. Moscow.



Bu eser Creative Commons Atf 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır. (This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License).