

Children, society, and the aims of education: a source-study and historiographical analysis of two pedagogical essays in the journal "Maorif va o'qitg'uchi" (Tashkent, 1925, No. 3)

Yaminxon Muxammedovich Askarxodjayev

ORCID: 0009-0003-4562-3885

muhammedovaminhon@gmail.com

Almalyk State Technical University

Abstract: This article offers a source-critical (manbashunoslik) and historiographical reading of two pedagogical essays published in the third issue (1925) of the Tashkent journal *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi*: a serialised treatise on the aims of education, "Tarbiya g'oyalari" ("The Aims of Education," pp. 34-40), and an essay on children's literature, "Bolalar adabiyoti to'g'risida bir fikr" ("A Thought on Children's Literature," pp. 30-33), signed "Olim." Both texts are written in the reformed Arabic-based Uzbek orthography of the mid-1920s and have not previously been subjected to a dedicated source-critical reading. Combining external and internal source criticism, paleographic observation, lexical analysis of loanwords, and the historical-comparative method, the study reconstructs the texts as material artifacts and traces their intellectual lineages. It argues that the two essays jointly document a decisive moment of transition in Uzbek pedagogical thought at the threshold of the Uzbek SSR. The essay on children's literature fuses a Jadid concern with moral-aesthetic formation (tarbiya, axloq, zavq) with European and Russian child-developmental psychology and progressive-education aesthetics; the treatise on educational aims grafts the Aristotelian premise that "man is a social animal," the European tradition of social pedagogy (Sozialpädagogik in the lineage of P. Natorp), and an exact knowledge of classical and medieval educational history (Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, the seven liberal arts, the seven knightly accomplishments) onto an emergent Marxist periodisation of social formations. The dense stratum of Russian loanwords (xarakter, egoist, krepostnoy, vassal, ritsar, grajdan) is identified as a philological fingerprint of Russian-mediated transmission, while the essays' quiet equation of the European "monastery" with the Islamic masjid-madrassa is read as a marker of the convergence of Jadid reformism and Soviet anti-clericalism. The findings establish these texts as significant primary sources for the history of Uzbek pedagogy, of children's literature, and of the intellectual life of the early Soviet period.

Keywords: Maorif va o'qitg'uchi; source studies (manbashunoslik); historiography; Jadidism; Uzbek pedagogy; children's literature; social pedagogy; Natorp; tarbiya; reformed Arabic script; Uzbek SSR; intellectual transmission

Introduction. The periodical press of the 1920s is among the richest and least fully exploited bodies of evidence for the intellectual history of Central Asia. Within it, the Tashkent journal *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi* ("Education and the Teacher"), which began publication in 1925, occupies a particular place: it was the principal professional organ in which the question of how a new generation should be formed was argued out in the Uzbek language at precisely the moment when the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic was acquiring institutional shape. Between 1925 and 1929 the journal carried prose and verse by Cho'lpon, Elbek, Botu and Mirtemir alongside translations, orthographic polemics, and pedagogical theory, which makes it an unusually dense index of the cultural preoccupations of the period [5; 6].

The present study examines two essays printed in the third issue of the journal for 1925. The first, "Bolalar adabiyoti to'g'risida bir fikr" ("A Thought on Children's Literature," pp. 30-33), is signed "Olim" and sets out a theory of what a literature for children should be and do. The second, "Tarbiya g'oyalari" ("The Aims of Education," pp. 34-40), is an evidently serialised treatise on the philosophy and history of educational purpose; in the surviving pages it breaks off mid-argument and carries no signature. Read together, the two texts are complementary in scope: one is a micro-poetics of the child reader and the children's book, the other a macro-history of the aims that have governed schooling across human societies. In combination they expose, with unusual clarity, the conceptual vocabulary of a pedagogy caught between two intellectual worlds.

That intermediate position is a function of the moment. The Uzbek SSR was constituted on 27 October 1924 through the national-territorial delimitation of Central Asia; in 1925 its capital was moved from Bukhara to Samarkand, while Tashkent remained the chief centre of Uzbek-language publishing [16]. Literacy stood at roughly 3.8 per cent in 1926, and the building of a mass school system was among the new republic's most urgent and most ideologically charged undertakings [15]. In these first years many figures of the Jadid reform movement - teachers, writers and theorists whose careers had begun under the Tsarist order - continued to work within Soviet cultural institutions, channelling an older enlightenment energy into new structures, before the political closure of the late 1920s and the repressions of the 1930s removed most of them [3; 4]. The two essays analysed here are products of exactly this short-lived conjuncture, and they bear its marks on every page.

The relevance of a source-critical reading is therefore twofold. First, the journal's pedagogical-theoretical content - as distinct from its literary and linguistic materials - has attracted very little dedicated scholarship, and these two essays in particular have not been read as historical sources in their own right. Second, the texts are written in the reformed Arabic-based Uzbek orthography that was itself the subject of fierce debate in the very same journal [7], so that they are doubly inaccessible to most present-

day readers: by script and by language. Bringing them into scholarly circulation, transliterated and analysed, is thus a contribution both to the history of Uzbek pedagogy and to the wider intellectual history of the early Soviet period.

The degree of study and the aim of the article. Scholarly attention to *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi* has so far concentrated on its literary and philological output. G. Soatova has catalogued and analysed the poetry the journal published and reconstructed the corpus of translated works that appeared in its pages between 1925 and 1929, showing how renderings of Lermontov, Gogol and others entered Uzbek through it [5; 6]. A separate strand of research has used the journal as a quarry for the history of Uzbek orthography, citing in particular Vadud Mahmud's contributions on "language and letter" questions [7]. These studies establish the journal's importance but leave its pedagogical theory largely unexamined.

The broader field within which the two essays must be placed is the historiography of Jadid and early Soviet education. A. Khalid's studies of Muslim cultural reform and of the making of Uzbekistan remain the indispensable framework for understanding both the reformist project of the Jadids and its absorption and eventual destruction under Soviet rule [3; 4]. The pedagogical thought of the leading Jadids - Behbudiy, Avloniy, Fitrat, Munavvarqori - has been the subject of a substantial Uzbek-language literature, from primary editions such as Avloniy's *Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq* to monographic treatments of Fitrat and the movement as a whole [11; 12; 13; 14]. What this literature has not done is to read the anonymous and semi-anonymous theoretical journalism of 1925 - the working pedagogy of ordinary teachers and editors, as opposed to the canonical texts of the movement's leaders - for the intellectual lineages it silently carries.

The aim of this article is to fill that gap for the two essays in question by pursuing four connected tasks: (1) to describe the texts as material and bibliographical artifacts (external source criticism); (2) to reconstruct their argument and structure from the original Arabic-script Uzbek (internal source criticism); (3) to identify the classical, European and Russian intellectual sources on which they draw; and (4) to situate them historiographically as evidence of a pedagogy in transition between Jadid enlightenment and Soviet Marxism. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the first source-critical reading of these two texts; in the identification of their dependence on Aristotle, on Quintilian, on the medieval European curricula, on the tradition of social pedagogy associated with Paul Natorp, and on an emergent Marxist periodisation of history; and in the use of the texts' loanword stratum as philological evidence for the Russian-mediated channels through which these ideas reached Uzbek readers.

Sources and methods. The primary sources are two photographic reproductions of the printed text of issue No. 3 of *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi* for 1925. The first reproduction comprises the four pages of "Bolalar adabiyoti to'g'risida bir fikr"

(paginated 30-33 in the running heads, which read "Maorif va o'qitg'uchi - 3-son"); the second comprises the seven pages of "Tarbiya g'oyalari" (paginated 34-40). The pagination is continuous, so that the two essays stand in immediate sequence within the same fascicle. Both are set in the reformed Arabic script then in use for Uzbek, with the marginal numerals and running heads themselves printed in that script.

The study proceeds by the established methods of source criticism (*manbashunoslik*), distinguishing external from internal critique. External criticism establishes the artifact: its place of production, its bibliographical identity, its script and language, and the problem of authorship. Internal criticism establishes the content: the argument of each text, reconstructed by close reading and transliteration of the original. To this is added a lexical analysis of the texts' loanwords, treated as diagnostic traces of the routes by which their ideas travelled; and a historical-comparative and intertextual analysis, by which the doctrines named or paraphrased in the texts are matched against their probable sources in classical philosophy, in the history of Western education, and in the pedagogical theory current in Russian in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Transliteration follows modern Uzbek Latin conventions, with the caveats set out in the note.¹

External source criticism: the journal and the two texts as artifacts.

The journal and its place:

Maorif va o'qitg'uchi appeared from 1925 as a pedagogical and cultural monthly addressed to the teaching profession of the new republic; in its first year it was issued in Tashkent, and from 1926 it was associated with Samarkand, the republic's capital after 1925, a migration that mirrors the relocation of administrative and cultural authority in these years [5; 6; 16]. Although the journal served the educational apparatus of the Uzbek SSR, its early volumes remained a meeting-ground for the reform-minded intelligentsia: its contributors included Cho'lpon, Elbek, Botu and Mirtemir on the literary side, and figures such as Vadud Mahmud and G'ozim Olim Yunusov on the linguistic and pedagogical side [5; 6; 7]. The journal was organised into departments covering literature, translation, language and orthography, and pedagogy proper, and it functioned as the chief venue in which questions of method, curriculum and educational aim were debated in Uzbek. The two essays under study belong to this last, pedagogical register, and their placement together in a single fascicle reflects the journal's deliberate juxtaposition of practical literary questions with general educational theory.

Graphic and codicological features:

¹Throughout, Arabic-script Uzbek is transliterated in the modern Uzbek Latin orthography (o', g', sh, ch, q, ' for the glottal stop / 'ayn). The two source texts survive only as photographic reproductions of the 1925 print, and a small number of words — marked "(?)" in the body — admit alternative readings owing to ink loss and the imperfect legibility of the scan; these uncertainties do not affect the substantive findings.

Both texts are printed in the reformed Arabic-based orthography that the Uzbek literary language used in the mid-1920s, before the Latinisation of 1929. This was not a stable system but a contested one, and the same journal that printed these essays was simultaneously a forum for the orthographic polemics of the period, including Vadud Mahmud's articles on "language and letter" questions in the 1925 volume [7]. The script of the essays shows the transitional features of that moment: a fuller marking of vowels than in classical Chaghatay usage, the representation of the back and front rounded vowels by pointed forms, and an orthography in which the morphophonemic alternations of the spoken language are partly regularised. The running heads and the marginal page numerals are themselves set in this script. The language is a transitional literary Uzbek with a heavy Chaghatay substratum in its morphology and lexicon, already moving toward the modern standard but retaining older forms (for example the participial and converbial constructions in -g'an, -dirg'an, and the older negative and copular forms).

Codicologically, the most consequential observation concerns the second essay. "Tarbiya g'oyalari" runs from page 34 to page 40 and, on the final surviving page, breaks off in the middle of its account of the bourgeois epoch, without the formula of conclusion or the authorial signature that closes the first essay. The text is therefore a serial instalment, continued in a subsequent issue, and the portion examined here must be read as the opening movement of a longer argument rather than as a self-contained whole. This has a direct bearing on interpretation: the historical survey it offers is plainly building toward a conclusion - the case for a new, social form of education adequate to a new social order - that lies outside the preserved pages but is legible in their trajectory.

The question of authorship:

The first essay is signed "Olim." The signature is consistent with the personal name of G'ozli Olim Yunusov, one of the journal's most active contributors in this decade, and the hypothesis that the children's-literature essay is his is attractive; but the evidence does not allow it to be asserted, and the matter must be left open pending archival confirmation.² The second essay, as noted, is unsigned in the surviving pages. Its authorship cannot be established from the text alone, and would have to be sought either in the concluding instalment or in the editorial records of the journal. For the purposes of analysis, then, the first text is treated as the work of a writer who signs himself "Olim" and the second as anonymous, while both are read as expressions of

²The signature "Olim" (Arabic عالم, "a learned one") coincides with the personal name of G'ozli Olim Yunusov, a linguist, ethnographer and translator who was among the journal's most active contributors in the 1920s (he published, for example, on Uzbek phonetics and translated Lermontov for it). The identification is plausible but not established; "Olim" may equally be an independent given name or a pen-name, and archival confirmation is required before the attribution can be made with confidence.

the shared pedagogical culture of the journal rather than as the utterances of named theorists.

Internal analysis I: "A thought on children's literature". The first essay opens with a comparative premise that is itself a Jadid commonplace: like the children of other "civilised nations" (boshqa madaniy millatlar), the essay argues, "our children too stand in need of a spiritual nourishment" (bizning ham bolalarimiz ma'naviy [oziqqa] muhtojdirlar), and that nourishment is precisely a children's literature that educates them "from various sides" while standing among their playthings [1, p. 30]. The thesis is stated without ornament: to work to remove this deficiency "is the duty of every educator and of everyone who understands children," and the author accordingly proposes to set out his view of the importance of children's literature and of the task of bringing it into being [1, p. 30].

The definition that follows is compact and revealing: children's literature is "the collection of works written for young souls and small people" (yosh ruhlar va kichik kishilar uchun yozilgan asarlarning to'plami) [1, p. 30]. From this the essay derives a faculty-psychological account of the work such literature performs. It produces in the young "interest, joy, and a desire toward everything," and it serves to educate a set of named "spiritual faculties" - thought (fikr), memory (hofiza), will (iroda), attention (diqqat), taste (zavq) and morality (axloq) [1, pp. 30-31]. The vocabulary here is significant. The grounding of literary education in the cultivation of discrete mental faculties belongs to the faculty psychology that dominated European and Russian pedagogy in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and its appearance in an Uzbek essay of 1925 is a first indication that the author is writing within an internationally circulating pedagogical idiom rather than a purely local one.

The essay's most striking pages concern the matching of literature to the developmental stage of the child. The author identifies two "delicate and difficult points": finding a subject (mavzu) appropriate to children's understanding and perception, and rendering that subject in a language children can feel and grasp [1, pp. 30-31]. Because "the spiritual faculties of children of each age differ," their perceptions differ too, and the writer for children is therefore under an extraordinary obligation: he must "first revive the living sensations remaining from his own true childhood" (haqiqiy bolaliq davrini ... jonli sezgilarini tiklamak) before he can write for the young at all [1, p. 31]. This demand - that the children's author recover, by an act of imaginative regression, the sensory and cognitive world of the child - is a recognisably modern, child-centred conception, far removed from the didactic-moralising tradition of the older maktab primer.

The point is made concrete by a contemporary example that also dates and situates the essay with precision. Just as, the author writes, "we cannot give the works of Fitrat and Cho'lpon to children of seven or eight" - for such children can neither analyse them

nor grasp what their central idea consists of - so the subject of a children's work must be cast in a form that "children's thought and reasoning can grasp" [1, pp. 31-32]. The casual invocation of Fitrat and Cho'lpon, the two pre-eminent names of contemporary Uzbek literature, as instances of writing too advanced for young readers, locates the essay unmistakably within the living literary culture of the mid-1920s and confirms that its author was an attentive participant in it.

On language and style (*til va uslub*) the essay is equally insistent and equally modern. The aim of giving literature to children, it argues, "is not to teach them dry reading and recitation, but to enable them to grasp the central idea contained in the work" (*quruq mutolaa ham o'qushga o'rgatish emas, balki ... tub o'yni anglata olish*) - a clear subordination of mechanical literacy to comprehension [1, p. 32]. Writers, the author complains, too often forget this and smuggle "deep, unintelligible thoughts" into works ostensibly meant for children; the language must instead be simple and clear, and the matter of style is "as important as the subject itself" [1, p. 32].

A distinct section is devoted to verse. Poetry (*tizma*), the essay argues, has a value prose (*sochma*) lacks, because where prose is hard to retain, verse "can be quickly memorised and recalled," so that one of the merits of poems lies in their "training of the memory" [1, p. 32]. But this value is forfeited by poems written "with heavy words and heavy metre"; the author goes so far as to propose a quantitative limit, holding that lines exceeding "seven or eight syllables" are useless for children, and that the more rhythmic and musical (*ohangli*) a poem is, the more easily and pleasurably it is read [1, pp. 32-33]. Among the genres suited to the young the essay names the folktale (*ertak*), the story (*hikoya*) and the fable (*masal*), through which children "from birth take pleasure" and in which, the more they listen, "a novelty appears in their feelings and thoughts" [1, p. 31].

The essay closes with the materiality of the book itself. "The more elegant a book is, the more vivid its effect"; properly, a children's book should be printed "on fine paper, with large letters, and adorned with vivid pictures relating to the subject of the work," and a book that observes neither its inner nor its outer principles can have "no value from any standpoint" [1, p. 33]. In this connection the author makes an explicit appeal to a model: in the design and illustration of children's books, he writes, "our Russian comrades can serve as an example for us" (*rus o'rtoqlarimiz bizga o'rnak bo'la oladirlar*) [1, p. 33]. The final paragraph addresses the essay's true audience - "the poets and writers who are occupied with children and who love them" - and urges their attention to a children's literature that "until now has needed to be brought to life" [1, p. 33].

Two features mark this essay as a document of transition. The first is its conceptual apparatus: the faculty psychology, the insistence on developmental stages, the privileging of comprehension over rote, the attention to the physical book and its

illustrations, and even the explicit use of the Russian-European term *xarakter* (kharakter, "character") for the still-forming personality of the child [1, p. 31], together place the text within the progressive, child-centred education that European and Russian pedagogy had developed by the early twentieth century. The second is its orientation: the appeal to "Russian comrades" as the model for children's publishing signals the new direction of cultural reference, away from the Ottoman and Tatar exemplars that had guided the pre-revolutionary Jadids and toward Soviet Russia. Yet the underlying impulse - the conviction that the moral and aesthetic formation (*tarbiya*, *axloq*, *zavq*) of the child is the central task, and that literature is its chief instrument - is continuous with the Jadid pedagogy of Avloniy and Fitrat [11; 13]. The essay is thus neither simply Jadid nor simply Soviet; it is the work of a Jadid sensibility re-equipping itself with a new, partly Russian-mediated, theoretical vocabulary.

Internal analysis II: "The aims of education". Where the first essay works at the scale of the child and the book, the second works at the scale of world history. Its premise is that the word *tarbiya* now occupies "a great place" in Uzbek discourse, but that people understand its aim (*g'oya*) in incompatible ways, and that educators must therefore decide, knowingly, "whether the aims we give are social or individual" (*ijtimoiymi*, *fardiyimi*?) [2, pp. 34-35]. This opposition between a social and an individual conception of educational purpose is the organising question of the entire treatise, and the author's allegiance is declared at once: a true education, "built upon such a foundation," takes as its bases "human life, human nature and labour" (*inson turmushi*, *inson tabiati va mehnati*), and it is social education so grounded that alone can fix a genuine aim for itself [2, p. 35].

The author then states the doctrine in nearly textbook form. "This social-pedagogical teaching," he writes, "regards the human being not as a mere individual, but as a true social person, a member of society and of the state" (*ijtimoiy pedagogiya ta'limoti insanni yolg'iz bir fard etib gina qaramasdan, balki chin ijtimoiy kishi, jamiyat ham mamlakat a'zosi etib hisoblaydir*) [2, p. 35]. The justification offered is explicitly Aristotelian: "by his creation and by his natural inclinations, the human being is a social animal" (*inson ... ijtimoiy hayvondir*), and "cannot stand apart from the collective," so that the individual who lives alone, outside the *общность*, "cannot develop his natural capacities and talents to the proper degree" [2, p. 35].³ The conception of education named here as "social pedagogy" (*ijtimoiy pedagogiya*) corresponds closely to the European tradition of *Sozialpädagogik* in the lineage of Paul Natorp, whose central thesis - that all education is social education, because the formation of the individual is in every respect socially conditioned, and whose own

³The two doctrines correspond to distinct passages of Aristotle's *Politics*: the claim that the human being is by nature a "political / social animal" (*zōon politikon*) at I.2, 1253a, and the defence of natural slavery at I.4–I.5 (1254a–1255b). See [9].

argument rests on the Platonic-Aristotelian account of the person within the polis - the Uzbek essay reproduces in its essentials [8].

The contrast is drawn sharply against the opposing school. An "individual pedagogy" (shaxsiy pedagogiya), the author argues, "destroys social feelings and corrupts the laws of social manners and morality," for it "educates the person to be an egoist" - and here the text reaches for the Russian word itself, эгоист, glossing it as xudkom, "self-centred" [2, p. 36]. Such a pedagogy "separates the person from the social life into which he was born, in which he grew and to which he is accustomed, and, leaving him entirely cut off from the social ground, raises him as a separate individual who knows only his own self" [2, p. 36]. The social aim, by contrast, is to make the person "fit for the whole people and the whole state" [2, p. 36].

At this point the treatise turns from doctrine to history, and it is here that its intellectual range becomes most apparent. The aim of education, the author argues, "has been different in different times," because it "is determined according to social life and social structure" (ijtimoiy turmush va ijtimoiy tuzilishka qarab bilgilangan) [2, p. 36]. This is a frankly materialist thesis - educational ideals as a function of the social order - and it governs the periodised survey that follows.

The first stage is tribal society (qabilaviy turmush). In the remote past, the author writes, when tribal life prevailed and clans intermingled, the people were free and equal, "the state was one, all shared the work," and there were "no distinctions of rich, poor and worker, no social classes, no schools, and no notion of an educated man or a scholar" [2, p. 37]. Education nonetheless existed "in a primitive form": the elders trained the young, involuntarily and unconsciously yet with "definite aims," fitting them to the collective's mode of subsistence, so that "tribes occupied with fishing trained their youth as fishermen" and others trained theirs to their own pursuits [2, pp. 37-38]. Education, in short, matched the economic base - the materialist claim restated through ethnographic example.

The second stage is the ancient world of masters and slaves. Here, the author writes, "the whole people of the ancient world and the ancient East was divided into two - masters and slaves" (xo'jalar ham qullar) - and education was the monopoly of the masters [2, p. 38]. In "Egypt, Greece, Rome and India," and under the ancient priest-kings, "knowledge and enlightenment were regarded as an instrument in the hands of the government," withheld from the people and even forbidden to them, on the principle that "let the people remain ignorant; if they come to know, it will harm the foundation of the government" [2, p. 38]. The treatise drives the point home with a classical authority: "Aristotle the sage" is reported to have counselled the upper class to be "complete masters over the slaves," "for slaves were created for slavery" - a paraphrase of the doctrine of natural slavery in the Politics [2, p. 38]. The aim of upper-class education in these societies was correspondingly to form rulers and administrators

and to equip them, "as with iron weapons," with intellectual and cultural arms; in Greece and Rome this took the specific form of training in eloquence and the art of the orator, the persuasive citizen-speaker of the public assembly [2, pp. 38-39]. The treatise here names "the great pedagogue of Rome," whose twelve-volume work "on the education of eloquence and rhetoric" is unmistakably Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, a text in exactly twelve books on precisely that subject [2, p. 39; 10].

The third stage is the medieval, feudal order, which the author characterises as a "class government." In its earlier phase the clergy held power; in its later phase the burghers (grajdanlar) joined them, while the peasant majority were "serfs" and "vassals" - and here the Russian and European feudal lexicon surfaces directly: krepostnoy (крепостной), vassal, grajdan [2, p. 39]. Medieval education, accordingly, had three forms answering to three estates: that of the clergy, that of the knights (ritsarlar, Russian рыцарь), and that of the bourgeoisie [2, p. 39]. For the clergy a specific body of learning was required, which the treatise lists: grammar (sarf-nahv), rhetoric, logic (ilmi mantiq), arithmetic (hisob), geometry (handasa), music (musiq) and astronomy (ilmi hay'at) - that is, the seven liberal arts of the medieval Latin curriculum, the trivium and quadrivium, rendered with remarkable fidelity [2, p. 39].⁴ For the knights a parallel set of seven accomplishments is given: riding, swimming, archery, the handling of weapons, hunting, chess, and the composing of verse - the so-called "seven knightly accomplishments" of European chivalric education, reproduced complete [2, p. 39]. The treatise even preserves the spatial contrast between the two formations, locating clerical education "in dark monasteries" and knightly education in halls, forests and fields [2, p. 40]. The detail that most repays attention is a parenthesis: glossing the European "monastery" (monastir), the author equates it with the Islamic "mosque and madrasa" (masjid, madrasa) [2, p. 40]. The equation is quiet but pointed, assimilating the enclosed, bookish religious schooling of medieval Christendom to the institutions of Islamic learning, and thereby folding a critique of the old madrasa into the historical argument.

The fourth and final stage in the surviving pages is the bourgeois epoch, under whose "political and social dominance" a distinctive bourgeois learning and education arise [2, p. 40]. With "new discoveries and new inventions," the author writes, general commerce develops, "sea voyages and communications with the whole world" are established, and the despotic states enlarge their armies and fleets - at which point the instalment breaks off [2, p. 40]. The trajectory, however, is unmistakable: a history that has moved from classless tribal community, through slave and feudal class societies in which education served the ruling order, toward the bourgeois present is plainly being

⁴In the Latin tradition this curriculum was systematised as the trivium (grammar, rhetoric / dialectic, logic) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy); the corresponding chivalric programme is the so-called septem probitates, the "seven knightly accomplishments." The Uzbek text reproduces both lists with notable precision.

marshalled to argue that a new social order will require, and will produce, a new social education.

The composite character of this treatise is its most important feature. Its framework is at once Aristotelian (the social animal, the natural slave), Natorpian (the doctrine of social pedagogy and the subordination of the individual's formation to the community), classically erudite (Quintilian's twelve books, the seven liberal arts, the seven knightly accomplishments), and Marxist (the periodisation of social formations and the derivation of educational ideals from the structure of production and class). It is, in other words, a hybrid text in which an older humanistic learning and a newer historical materialism are held together without strain - a juxtaposition that is itself the most exact possible portrait of Uzbek pedagogical thought at the moment of its writing.

Discussion: two essays as evidence of an intellectual transition. Read together, the two essays document a single phenomenon from two angles: the transformation of Uzbek pedagogical thought in the brief, generative interval between the Jadid enlightenment and the consolidation of Soviet Marxism. Neither text is purely the one thing or the other. The essay on children's literature retains the Jadid conviction that the moral and aesthetic formation of the child is the supreme educational task, but it re-states that conviction in the idiom of European and Russian developmental psychology and looks to Soviet Russia for its publishing models. The treatise on educational aims retains the encyclopaedic, comparative learning of the reformist intelligentsia - its easy command of Aristotle, Quintilian and the medieval curricula - but it organises that learning within a materialist philosophy of history and a social pedagogy that point unambiguously forward. In each case an inherited sensibility is being re-equipped with a new theoretical apparatus.

The channels of that re-equipment can be read directly off the texts, for their loanwords function as a philological fingerprint. The terms that carry the new conceptual freight - *xarakter*, *egoist*, *krepostnoy*, *vassal*, *ritsar*, *grajdan* - are Russian, and several are reproduced in forms (эгоист, крепостной, рыцарь) that betray their immediate Russian source. This is strong evidence that the European pedagogical theory and the classical-medieval erudition deployed in the treatise reached its author not directly from German or Latin but through the Russian-language pedagogical literature that was, in these years, the principal conduit of European thought into Central Asia. The pre-revolutionary Jadids had drawn their models from the Ottoman and Tatar worlds; the essays of 1925 show the axis of reference swinging decisively toward Russia - a reorientation of intellectual supply lines that is one of the quiet but consequential effects of the new political order.

The relation of these texts to the canonical Jadid pedagogy of Behbudiy, Avloniy and Fitrat is accordingly one of both continuity and rupture [11; 12; 13]. The continuity lies in the centrality of *tarbiya* and *axloq* - in the assumption, shared across the divide,

that education is fundamentally a work of formation and that the cultivation of character and conduct is its core. The rupture lies in the framing of that work. For the Jadids, moral formation was ultimately referred to a reformed Islamic horizon; in the treatise of 1925 it is referred instead to society, to labour and to a materialist history, and the religious school is recast, through the monastery-madrassa equation, as a historical relic of a superseded order. This recasting is the precise hinge on which the period turns: the Jadid critique of the old scholastic madrasa, which had been mounted in the name of a purer and more useful Islam, is here being silently re-functioned into the Soviet critique of religious education as such. The same gesture serves two masters, and that is exactly what makes it characteristic of 1925.

For the history of Uzbek children's literature, the first essay is a document of unusual value, since it offers an explicit, theorised programme for a national children's literature at almost the first moment such a thing was conceivable - complete with a poetics (the seven-or-eight-syllable line, the primacy of rhythm), a developmental rationale, a genre repertoire (ertak, hikoya, masal), and a material specification for the book as object. That the leading writers it addresses, Fitrat and Cho'lon, would within a decade fall victim to the repressions, and that much of the milieu that produced both essays would be destroyed in the same years [3; 4], lends the texts a retrospective poignancy: they are the optimistic theory of a cultural project whose principal authors would not be permitted to complete it. To read them source-critically is, in part, to recover the intellectual ambition of that aborted project in its own words.

Conclusion

This study has subjected two hitherto unexamined pedagogical essays from the third issue of *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi* (Tashkent, 1925) to a source-critical and historiographical analysis. The external criticism established the texts as a continuous pair within a single fascicle of the chief Uzbek pedagogical journal of the new republic, set in the contested reformed Arabic script of the mid-1920s; it identified the second essay as a serial instalment that breaks off mid-argument, and it set out, without resolving, the case for attributing the first essay to G'ozilim Yunusov. The internal criticism reconstructed the argument of each text: a child-centred, developmental theory of children's literature in the first, and a materialist, social-pedagogical history of the aims of education in the second.

The central finding is that the two essays, taken together, constitute an exceptionally precise record of the transition of Uzbek pedagogical thought between Jadid enlightenment and Soviet Marxism. The first essay re-states a Jadid commitment to the moral-aesthetic formation of the child in the vocabulary of European and Russian developmental psychology and progressive-education aesthetics; the second grafts Aristotelian philosophy, Quintilian's rhetorical pedagogy, the medieval European curricula, and the social pedagogy of the Natorpian tradition onto an emergent Marxist

periodisation of social formations. The scientific novelty of the work lies in this first source-critical reading; in the identification of those specific classical, European and Russian lineages beneath an ostensibly modest piece of professional journalism; in the recognition of the texts' dense Russian loanword stratum (*xarakter*, *egoist*, *krepostnoy*, *vassal*, *ritsar*, *grajdan*) as evidence of Russian-mediated intellectual transmission; and in the reading of the monastery-madrassa equation as the hinge by which the Jadid critique of religious schooling was re-functioned into a Soviet one.

Several avenues for further research follow directly. The authorship of both essays should be pursued in the editorial records of the journal and in the concluding instalment of "Tarbiya g'oyalari," whose recovery would complete the argument and very probably confirm its socialist conclusion. The texts' loanwords and doctrines invite a systematic comparison with the Russian-language pedagogical literature of the 1920s and with the earlier Tatar and Ottoman sources of Jadid pedagogy, in order to specify the exact intermediaries through which Natorp, Aristotle and the history of Western education reached Uzbek readers. Finally, the broader pedagogical-theoretical corpus of *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi* - as distinct from its much-studied literary and orthographic content - deserves the same source-critical treatment, for it is in these working theoretical texts, rather than in the canonical writings of the movement's leaders alone, that the everyday intellectual life of early Soviet Uzbek pedagogy is most fully preserved.

References

1. Olim. Bolalar adabiyoti to'g'risida bir fikr [A Thought on Children's Literature] // *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi*. - Toshkent, 1925. - No. 3. - B. 30–33. (In Uzbek, Arabic script.)
2. [Author unidentified]. Tarbiya g'oyalari [The Aims of Education] // *Maorif va o'qitg'uchi*. - Toshkent, 1925. - No. 3. - B. 34–40. (In Uzbek, Arabic script.)
3. Khalid A. *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*. - Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
4. Khalid A. *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, Empire, and Revolution in the Early USSR*. - Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
5. Soatova G. N. «Maorif va o'qitg'uvchi» jurnalidagi tarjima asarlarda asliyat manbaning saqlanish darajasi (1925–1929 yillardagi sonlari asosida) [The degree of preservation of the source original in the translated works of the journal "Maorif va o'qitg'uvchi" (on the basis of the 1925–1929 issues)] // *Oriens*. - 2022. - B. 665–675. (In Uzbek.)
6. Soatova G. N. The Poetry Works in the Journal "Maorif va o'qituvchi" // *American Journal of Philological Sciences*. - 2024. - Vol. 4, No. 4. - P. 129–134.

7. Vadud Mahmud. Til va harf masalalari [Questions of Language and Letter] // Maorif va o'qitg'uchi. - Toshkent, 1925. - No. 5-6. (In Uzbek, Arabic script.)
8. Natorp P. Sozialpädagogik: Theorie der Willensbildung auf der Grundlage der Gemeinschaft. - Stuttgart: Fr. Frommann, 1899. (In German.)
9. Aristotle. Politics / transl. by E. Barker, rev. by R. F. Stalley. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
10. Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria (The Orator's Education) / ed. and transl. by D. A. Russell. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. - Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
11. Avloniy A. Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq [The Turkic Rose-Garden, or Ethics]. - Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1992. (In Uzbek.)
12. Behbudiy M. Tanlangan asarlar [Selected Works]. - Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 1997. (In Uzbek.)
13. Boltaboyev H. Fitrat va jadidchilik [Fitrat and Jadidism]. - Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy kutubxonasi nashriyoti, 2007. (In Uzbek.)
14. Jadidism Movement in Turkestan: Education and Pedagogical Ideas // Modern Science and Research. - 2024. - Vol. 1, Issue 2.
15. Social and Political Changes in Uzbekistan in the 1920–1930s and Their Impact on the Educational System // The Lingua Spectrum. - 2025.
16. Formation of the Uzbek SSR // Seventeen Moments in Soviet History. - Michigan State University. URL: <https://soviethistory.msu.edu/> (accessed June 2026).