

## **THE IDEOLOGICAL AND ARTISTIC ESSENCE OF YAQINI'S "ARROW AND BOW DISCUSSION"**

**Kodirjon Ergashev**

Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore of the  
Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan

Leading Research Fellow, Doctor of Philological Sciences

**Abstract:** The article is dedicated to illuminating the ideological and artistic essence of Yaqini's "Arrow and Bow" debate. The author focuses on the images of Arrow and Bow, which play a key role in expressing the idea and content of the work, their entry into literature, their essence as symbols, as well as the images of Kerish and Zihgir, and in this case, he critically approaches the ideas expressed in previous studies and puts forward his views.

**Keywords:** debate, arrow, bow, antagonistic forces. curvature, straightness, tradition, influence.

A striking example of the debate genre is Yaqini's work "Discussion Between the Arrow and the Bow." There is a brief information about Yaqini in Alisher Navoi's tazkira "Majolis un-nafois." Navoi mentioned him in the second majlis of the tazkira, that is, among the writers whom he saw and met in his youth. According to the poet, Yaqini wrote in Uzbek and Persian. In the tazkira, one of his verses is given in Uzbek and one in Persian. Navoi notes a peculiarity of his nature and writes: "Tundrak was a Mashrab man." At the same time, he specifically emphasizes that at the end of Yaqini's life, he "repented from indecent words and followed the path of righteous people" [1-332]. Navoi said nothing about Yaqini's writing of the debate. He also mentioned Yaqini's name in his work "Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn" and listed him among the poets who emerged from the time of Amir Timur until the end of Shahrukh Sultan's reign [2-534].

E.Rustamov writes about the two Yaqini mentioned in the first and second sessions of "Muhokamat ul-lughatayn." M. Abduvohidova also repeats this idea and writes that "Judging by the content of the discussion about 'Arrow and Bow,' the author of this work must be Yaqiniy, mentioned in 'First Assembly.'" In reality, information about only one Yaqini is given in "Majolis" and it is in the second majlis of the tazkira.

Although the "Arrow and Bow" debate is small in volume, it is distinguished by its weighty ideological and artistic content, as it addresses the core issue of society's life that has held an important place in all periods and times - the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil. The writer's address to such a topic and the introduction of the arrow and bow debate into literature was a great achievement of both Yaqiniy and Uzbek literature of that period. Yaqini himself emphasized the novelty of this topic in literature, noting that no one before him had written a work on this topic, and wrote in the introduction: "To this day, nothing constitutes the essence of the Turkic language and the essence of the Persian language, nor does anyone argue between the bow and arrow so that there would be no trace of it in the world."

Scholars who have studied the Yaqiniy debate, discussing the appearance of arrow and bow images in literature, pay attention to ancient Turkic legends related to Oghuz Khan and the

episodes related to arrows and bows in them. Most importantly, they try to show that these narratives influenced the creation of Yaqini's debate. In particular, E. Rustamov dwelled in detail on the legends and tried to show the connection between them and the "Discussion of the Arrow and the Bow" [3-199-201]. We see a similar situation in M. Abduvakhidova's book "Discussion in Uzbek Literature"[4-56-60]. It is true that there are episodes related to arrows and bows in the legends about Oghuz Khan, that these legends are widespread among the Turkic peoples, and that they are included in "Oghuznama" and historical sources attributed to writers such as Rashididdin and Abulgazi. However, in connecting the discussion with them, in particular, in attempts to show their influence on Yaqini's work, tension is noticeable. This can be seen in the fact that the legends and debates, the symbols of arrows and bows in them, express completely different content and ideas.

In legends about Oghuzkhan, episodes involving arrows and bows are connected with the issue of succession. When Oghuz Khan, who had conquered vast territories, was in the land of Sham, he secretly summoned a nuker, gave him a golden bow and three arrows, and ordered him to bury the bow in the eastern desert, with one end visible to the west. The goal was to decide who would inherit the throne after him and how power would be distributed among his sons. To resolve this at his own discretion, by issuing decrees, could lead to discontent, disagreements, and disputes among his sons. Therefore, he decided to use the ancient Turkic notions that the bow was a symbol of power and the arrow a symbol of diplomacy, and gave the aforementioned instruction to his nuker. Then he sent his sons hunting. During the hunt, three sons, led by Kun Khan, found the bow, and the remaining three sons found the arrow and brought it to their father. Oghuz Khan said that this was by God's will and announced the decision that Kun Khan would ascend to the throne after him, with the two sons who had found the bow sitting on his right side and the three sons who had found the arrow on his left side. This decision does not cause dissatisfaction among the sons, since it corresponds to the aforementioned Turkic concepts of the bow and arrow, as well as the interpretation of the above-mentioned event as the will of Tengri.

As we can see, in this case, the Arrow and the Bow serve as a means of resolving the issue of succession and power peacefully, without conflicts, ensuring compromise and moderation. In Yaqiniy's discussion, the Arrow and the Bow embody two opposing, antagonistic forces - straightness and crookedness, the Arrow appears as a symbol of straightness, and the Bow as a symbol of crookedness, and the discussion between them reflects the irreconcilable struggle between these two forces. This very circumstance determines the significance and originality of Yaqini's work.

Of course, the traditions formed in Eastern literature played an important role in the creation, artistic features, language, and style of "Arrow and Bow Discussion," in particular, the influence of works created before Yaqiniy is clearly felt. The greatest influence on this was exerted by Amiri's work "Discussion Between Bang and Chogir." This is evidenced by the form of Yaqini's work, the methods used by the author, and the style of narration. In particular, the author's words about the creation of this debate in the introduction are in harmony with the following words in the introduction to Amiri's work: "create a debate in the Persian style with the Turkic alphabet, so that no one (whoever) will come out of this style." If "Arrow and Bow Discussion" begins with the gathering of several brave young men and the arrival of a young man and an old man from the Turkestan side, then Amiri's work begins with the author's excursion and his arrival in a circle of several companions. In addition, it should be noted that

the methods used by the authors in both works are the same. In "The Debate Between Bang and Chogir," the characters turn to poetry in order to show their advantages and merits, citing poems written in praise of wine or in the description of bang. We see that the same method is used in Yaqini's work: To prove his point, the Arrow reads verses and couplets about the arrow from the divans of various poets, the Arrow cites poems related to him and tries to prove his superiority over the Arrow. In Amiri's work, there are also references to Quranic verses. In "The Discussion of the Arrow and the Bow," there is a similar reference. In it, the bow says: "I am the keeper of the secret that no one but me was intimate between Allah the Blessed and Exalted, the Exalted, the Exalted, and His beloved - peace be upon him...." This refers to the ninth verse of Surah An-Najm. The meaning of the verse is connected with the ascension of Muhammad. The translation of the verse into Uzbek is as follows: "So, (to Muhammad) it was as close as the distance between two bows, or even closer"[5-526].

In "Arrow and Bow Discussion," the process of argumentation and dispute between the two sides is skillfully depicted. The appearances of both characters - both the Arrow and the Bow - and their characteristics are revealed in this process and are revealed through words spoken in their own language. Yaqini's talent and gift as a writer is clearly visible in the language of the work, in particular, in the speech of the characters. It is especially interesting to observe how the Arrow and the Bow interpret each of their characteristics and use them for their own purposes. For example, the bow explains the curvature of its shape by the fact that it is always in ruku' (ruku' - the position during prayer) and tries to present itself as a pious person: "I am also in ruku' from the beginning of my life to the end, like an angel in the way of worship, and in the way of piety, I am mostly in chillad." Archers pull the bowstring when throwing a bow. The bow notes this as proof of his unequalness in the chapter of tolerance (patience, endurance, thoughtfulness): "And in the chapter of tolerance, I am convinced that the archers pull my sister, I did not hurt anyone by keeping her inside."

In addition, he attributes to himself such qualities as devotion and selflessness: "Also in devotion I listen to good and bad, however many do not listen to me... And on the battlefield of bravery, if I fall victim to anyone's greed, I want to sacrifice myself."

The arrow rejects the unfounded claims of the bow, exposing his crookedness and cowardice: "Uyalmay bahodurluq talashursan. "Aren't you the one who, on the day of battle, will appear before the warriors with piercing fangs, and you, yellow with fear, will shed tears amidst grief..." Just as the arrow objects to the words and arguments praising the bow itself, the bow also denies the thoughts expressed about the arrow itself, tries to condemn it, including accusing it of having conversations with thieves, lack of enthusiasm, and lack of generosity: "Base, for having conversations with thieves, they slaughtered your leafy flute robe and tore your insides. O humble one, how much you torment yourself, O reluctant one, for a single ear of grain, you sink into the earth like thistles beneath every bush and give your harvest to the wind."

When a bow is shot, the arrow escapes from the bow. The bow interprets this too in his favor. He says that the bullet escaped from his house. At this point, the words of the Arrow in response to the bow, that evil and good, crookedness and straightness can never be together anywhere, that there can be no closeness between them, the Persian rubai, cited to confirm these words, can express the main ideological content of the work. Unable to bear the arrow's well-founded and justified words, he appeals to Yoy Kerish (this word is incorrectly rendered as Girish in publications) and asks him to be the arbitrator between the two. In the course of the

conversation, he mentioned that he had been serving Kerish together with Zihgir for many years. Kerish, in agreement with Zihgir, decided to take the side of Yoy, Kerish's agent and Zihgir's accomplice, and to punish Ok. For this purpose, they summon him to their presence. Although he knew well the crookedness and treachery of Arrow-arc, he considered Kerish and Zihgir just as straightforward and honest as himself. Therefore, he goes to them without any worry and becomes a victim of deceit and injustice.

It should be noted that such a conclusion of the work is not unexpected or unnatural, but has a logical basis, since, as mentioned above, the work of Yaqini describes the struggle between two antagonistic forces - right and wrong. There can be no compromise between these two forces, and the struggle can only end with the destruction of one of them by the other. Therefore, in the "Arrow and Bow Dispute," the arrow is destroyed. Yaqini's depiction of the arrow as the defeated side is not without reason, but rather an echo of life's truth, as history indicates that the struggles between right and wrong, right and wrong in society often ended in the victory of wrong and injustice. In Abdulla Qodiriy's novel "Scorpion from the Altar," this bitter truth is also expressed in the words spoken by Anvar: "Even though I heard truth triumph over injustice on my lips, I haven't seen it in practice until now" [6-45]

Finally, it is necessary to dwell on another issue. Researchers understood the negative characters depicted in the work - Kerish and Zihgir - as the embodiment of the Timurids, and based on this, they spoke about the oppression and injustice done to the people during the Timurid era, writing that Yaqini exposed them in his debate[7-321]. In the debate, Yoy addresses Kerish thus: "For many years, Zihgir and I have joined forces and have been serving you as barlas." In this case, it is not necessary to understand the word barlas in its original meaning; the words of the bow "We are standing at your service, calling you barlas" mean "We consider you our leader and ruler and serve you." Kerish, depicted in the work, is a generalized figurative image of all the unjust, tyrannical, and treacherous officials, officials, and representatives of the military aristocracy of that time. It is closer to the truth to interpret the bow not as "a servant of the Timurids and Tarkhans, an image of rulers enriched by military campaigns and wars," as researchers write, but as a symbol of crookedness and debauchery, injustice and unfairness in general.

### **References:**

1. Alisher Navoiy. Majolis un-nafois. To'la asarlar to'plami. 10 jildlik.9-jild. T.,2011.332-bet.
2. Alisher Navoiy. Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn. To'la asarlar to'plami.10-jild. T., 2011.534-bet.
3. Istoriya uzbekskoy literatury v 2-x tomax. Tom 1.199-201-betlar.
4. M. Abduvohidova. O'zbek adabiyotida munozara. T., 1984. 56-60-betlar.
5. Qur'on karim ma'nolarining tarjima va tafsiri. Toshkent, 2007. 526-bet.
6. Abdulla Qodiriy. Mehrobdan chayon. Toshkent, 2017. 45-bet.
7. O'zbek adabiyoti tarixi. 5 tomlik. 1-tom. T., 1977. 321-bet;