



ABDURAHMON SA'DIY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF NAVOI STUDIES IN UZBEK LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP

Ongalova Guldasta Amiriddin kizi,

Independent Researcher of the Department of Classical
Literature,

Institute of Languages and Cultures of Central Asian Peoples,
Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov

Tel.: +998 (97) 910-10-69; E-mail:

ungalovaguldasta@gmail.com

Abstract. *This article examines Abdurahmon Sa'diy's contribution to the development of Navoi studies in Uzbek literary scholarship. It argues that Sa'diy's work helped move the study of Alisher Navoi's legacy from reverential description toward literary-historical interpretation, source-based reasoning, textual awareness, and national literary-historical evaluation. Particular attention is paid to Sa'diy's 1949 doctoral research on Navoi, his theoretical textbook "Practical and Theoretical Lessons of Literature", his engagement with comparative literary methodology, his interpretation of Navoi's linguistic and poetic role, and his place in the formation of modern Uzbek philology. The article treats Sa'diy's contribution as one significant stage within a broader scholarly process rather than as an isolated individual achievement.*

Keywords: *Abdurahmon Sa'diy; Navoi studies; Alisher Navoi; Uzbek literary scholarship; literary historiography; source criticism; textual scholarship; national literary heritage; classical Uzbek literature; scholarly interpretation.*

Annotatsiya. *Maqolada Abdurahmon Sa'diyning o'zbek adabiyotshunosligida navoiyshunoslik rivojiga qo'shgan hissasi tahlil qilinadi. Unda Sa'diy tadqiqotlari Alisher Navoiy merosini ehtiromiy tavsif doirasidan chiqarib, tarixiy-adabiy talqin, manbaga tayangan tahlil, matniy sezgirlik va milliy adabiy meros mezonlari asosida o'rganishga xizmat qilgani asoslanadi. Maqolada Sa'diyning 1949-yildagi doktorlik tadqiqoti, "Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari" darsligi, qiyosiy metodga munosabati, Navoiyning til va she'riyatdagi roliga bergan bahosi hamda zamonaviy*

o'zbek filologiyasi shakllanishidagi o'rni yoritiladi. Sa'diy hissasi yakka hodisa emas, balki kengroq ilmiy jarayonning muhim bosqichi sifatida baholanadi.

***Kalit so'zlar:** Abdurahmon Sa'diy; navoiyshunoslik; Alisher Navoiy; o'zbek adabiyotshunosligi; adabiy tarixshunoslik; manbashunoslik; matnshunoslik; milliy adabiy meros; mumtoz o'zbek adabiyoti; ilmiy talqin.*

***Аннотация.** В статье анализируется вклад Абдурахмона Саади в развитие навоиведения в узбекском литературоведении. Доказывается, что исследования Саади способствовали переходу от почтительно-описательного отношения к наследию Алишера Навои к историко-литературной интерпретации, источниковедческому анализу, текстологической осознанности и оценке национального литературного наследия. Особое внимание уделяется докторскому исследованию Саади 1949 года, его учебнику “Практические и теоретические уроки литературы”, сравнительно-литературному подходу, оценке роли Навои в развитии тюркского языка и поэзии, а также месту ученого в формировании современной узбекской филологии. Вклад Саади рассматривается как важный этап более широкого научного процесса.*

***Ключевые слова:** Абдурахмон Саади; навоиведение; Алишер Навои; узбекское литературоведение; литературная историография; источниковедение; текстология; национальное литературное наследие; классическая узбекская литература; научная интерпретация.*

INTRODUCTION. The formation of Uzbek Navoi studies in the first half of the twentieth century was not a simple continuation of earlier reverence for Alisher Navoi. Before the rise of modern literary scholarship, Navoi's legacy had lived in tazkiras, poetic imitation, manuscript transmission, oral memory, courtly literary culture, and the moral authority of classical literature. The twentieth century changed the conditions of reading. Navoi's works had to be taught in schools and universities, interpreted in literary history, connected to national language and culture, prepared

for scholarly discussion, and placed within a developing system of Uzbek philology. In this transformation, Abdurahmon Sa'diy occupies a distinct position.

Sa'diy's importance lies not merely in the fact that he wrote about Navoi, but in the way his research participated in the methodological reorientation of Uzbek literary scholarship. The available materials show that the foundation of the Uzbek literary scholarly school in the 1920s and 1930s is associated with figures such as Abdurauf Fitrat, Abdurahmon Sa'diy, and Sadridin Ayniy, who helped initiate systematic and analytical approaches to classical literary heritage [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This does not mean that Sa'diy alone founded Uzbek Navoi studies. The more precise conclusion is that his work formed one important stage in the transition from biographical, commemorative, and descriptive treatment of Navoi toward scholarly interpretation.

The first half of the twentieth century was a period in which classical heritage became a field of academic inquiry, institutional teaching, and national literary historiography. Sa'diy's 1949 doctoral research, "Navoi's Creativity as the Highest Stage in the Development of Uzbek Classical Literature", is explicitly identified in modern Navoi scholarship as an important work within the postwar development of the field [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11]. His earlier theoretical and pedagogical activity is equally important: "Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari" was published in 1924 as one of the early Uzbek-language works on literary theory [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622]. These two facts – the early theoretical textbook and the later doctoral research on Navoi – mark the breadth of Sa'diy's contribution: he worked both on the theoretical language of literary study and on the scholarly positioning of Navoi within Uzbek classical literature.

The research problem of this article is therefore methodological and historiographical. How did Sa'diy's work contribute to the development of Uzbek Navoi studies? What did he add to the interpretation of Navoi's place in Uzbek literary history? How did his literary-theoretical background affect his reading of classical heritage? What is the relationship between Sa'diy's approach and the wider

intellectual environment of Jadid reform, early Soviet philology, university teaching, and national literary canon formation? Existing studies and reference materials mention Sa'diy's role, but his specific contribution to Navoi studies must be analyzed through source-based categories: literary-historical interpretation, comparative method, textual awareness, national literary heritage, and institutional scholarly formation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS. The materials used in this study include works and studies related to Abdurahmon Sa'diy's literary-theoretical activity, his role in Uzbek Navoi studies, his doctoral research on Navoi, his institutional activity, and modern assessments of his contribution. The source base includes the textbook "Navoiyshunoslik", which records Sa'diy's 1949 doctoral research on Navoi [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11]; N. Egamqulova's study of Sa'diy's early literary-theoretical textbook [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622–626]; institutional references to Sa'diy's activity in the Department of Uzbek Literary Studies at the National University of Uzbekistan [O'zbek adabiyotshunosligi kafedrasi, n.d.]; and materials describing his broader methodological role in Uzbek literary scholarship and Navoi studies.

The article uses source criticism, literary-historical analysis, historiographical analysis, contextual analysis, intellectual history, and textual-philological interpretation. Source criticism is necessary because not all materials have the same evidentiary status. Some claims are supported by page-specific published sources, such as Sa'diy's 1949 research [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11] or the publication history of his 1924 textbook [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622]. Other claims appear in electronic or institutional materials without page numbers; these are used cautiously and mainly to support broader contextual interpretation rather than exact textual claims.

Literary-historical analysis is used to examine how Sa'diy positioned Navoi within the development of Uzbek classical literature. Contextual analysis places Sa'diy between Jadid intellectual reform, early Soviet educational structures, and the

institutionalization of Uzbek literary studies. Historiographical analysis identifies how later scholarship frames Sa'diy's role, especially in relation to Fitrat, Ayniy, Vohid Abdullayev, and Botirxon Valixo'jayev. Textual and philological analysis is applied where the evidence points to Sa'diy's treatment of Navoi's language, poetry, the "Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn", and the relationship between Navoi and Jami.

The aim is not to reconstruct every detail of Sa'diy's biography, nor to overstate his role. The article assesses his contribution proportionately, using documented evidence and distinguishing between firmly established facts, cautious interpretations, and broader historiographical claims.

RESULTS. 1. Sa'diy in the early formation of Uzbek literary scholarship.

The available evidence situates Abdurahmon Sa'diy among the early builders of modern Uzbek literary scholarship. One source states that in the 1920s and 1930s Fitrat, Sa'diy, and Ayniy helped lay the foundations of a systematic and analytical methodology for studying classical literary heritage [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. While this statement is broad and requires careful interpretation, it aligns with more specific evidence: Sa'diy wrote one of the early Uzbek literary-theoretical textbooks, taught classical literature, and later defended a major doctoral study on Navoi.

Sa'diy's "Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari" was published in March 1924 in Tashkent [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622]. The same study notes that before the textbook appeared, Sa'diy presented a program for native language and literature education in "Bilim o'chog'i" in 1923 [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 625]. This shows that his activity was connected not only with research but also with curriculum, pedagogy, and the formation of literary study as a teachable discipline. In this sense, his later contribution to Navoi studies cannot be separated from his earlier attempt to build the conceptual language of Uzbek literary scholarship.

Egamqulova also records that Sa'diy worked as a leading researcher at the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan from 1948 until the end of his life [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 623]. This is important because

it places his mature scholarly activity within an academic institution. His Navoi-related doctoral research belongs to this period of academic consolidation, when classical literary heritage was being studied through institutional philology rather than only through individual intellectual initiatives.

2. The 1949 doctoral research and the academic framing of Navoi. The strongest documentary evidence for Sa'diy's direct contribution to Navoi studies is his 1949 doctoral research titled "Navoi's Creativity as the Highest Stage in the Development of Uzbek Classical Literature". Modern Navoi scholarship identifies this work as an important event in the development of the field [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11]. The title itself is methodologically significant. It does not treat Navoi merely as a great poet in isolation; it places his creativity within a developmental model of Uzbek classical literature.

This framing matters because modern literary history depends on periodization, hierarchy, continuity, and evaluation. To call Navoi's creativity "the highest stage" of Uzbek classical literature is to make a literary-historical argument: Navoi becomes a central figure through whom the development of Uzbek literature can be measured. Sa'diy's contribution, therefore, lies not only in admiration for Navoi but in the attempt to define Navoi's position within the structure of national literary history.

Institutional materials also describe Sa'diy's doctoral work as devoted to Navoi as the summit of Uzbek classical literature [O'zbek adabiyotshunosligi kafedrası, n.d.]. Although this institutional source is not page-specific, it supports the broader historiographical understanding that Sa'diy's research helped academically legitimize Navoi as a central phenomenon of Uzbek literary scholarship. The more cautious conclusion is that Sa'diy contributed to the scholarly framing of Navoi as a canon-forming figure within Uzbek classical literature.

3. Literary theory as preparation for Navoi studies. Sa'diy's contribution to Navoi studies did not begin only with his doctoral research. His earlier literary-theoretical works created the conceptual ground for reading classical literature.

Egamqulova notes that Sa'diy wrote a number of works as a literary theorist, including “Qavoyidi adabiya va unga ilova”, “Adabiyot usullari”, and “Go‘zal san’at dunyosida” [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 623]. These works indicate a broader concern with the theory of verbal art, genre, method, and literary analysis.

“Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari” is especially relevant. It was written at the request and decision of the Uzbek scholarly committee under the People’s Commissariat of Education of the Turkestan Republic [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 623, 625]. The fact that the book emerged from an educational-institutional request shows that literary theory was becoming part of official intellectual infrastructure. For Navoi studies, this meant that classical texts could be taught not only as revered heritage but as objects of systematic literary analysis.

The textbook also shows Sa'diy’s comparative horizon. Egamqulova records that in the 1924 textbook Sa'diy tried to compare Islamic Eastern literatures – Uzbek, Persian, Arabic, and others – with Western literary movements and to systematize literary trends [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 624]. This comparative orientation is important for the study of Navoi, whose work itself belongs to a multilingual and multi-traditional literary environment. Navoi’s creativity cannot be fully understood without considering Persian literature, Turkic literary language, Islamic poetic forms, and broader classical aesthetics.

4. Sa'diy’s comparative method and the synthesis of Eastern and Western approaches. Several materials describe Sa'diy as a scholar who combined Eastern classical poetics with Western and Ottoman literary scholarship. One source states that he used the achievements of Russian and Western literary scholarship, including A. Potebnya and A. Veselovsky, as well as Ottoman Turkish scholarly experience, thereby introducing a more analytical approach into Uzbek literary studies [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 624]. Another source interprets his intellectual training as a synthesis of Ottoman, Western, and classical Eastern methods [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O‘zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.].

This comparative method helps explain Sa'diy's place in Navoi studies. Earlier forms of Navoi reception often depended on admiration, poetic imitation, and tazkira-style evaluation. Sa'diy belonged to a generation that sought to interpret classical literature through categories such as literary history, social roots, poetic system, comparative influence, and national language. Even where the available evidence is fragmentary, the methodological direction is visible: Sa'diy treated classical literary heritage as a field requiring analysis rather than mere preservation.

The comparison of Eastern and Western literary systems is not a minor feature. Navoi's legacy stands at the meeting point of Turkic poetic creativity, Persian literary models, Islamic ethical and philosophical traditions, and courtly literary culture. A scholar trained to think comparatively could more easily interpret Navoi not as an isolated genius, but as a figure within a complex literary-historical system. This is one of the reasons Sa'diy's theoretical preparation matters for the history of Uzbek Navoi studies.

5. Navoi, language, and the problem of Turkic literary authority. One of the most important aspects of Sa'diy's Navoi-related work is his attention to Navoi's role in the development of Turkic literary language. The materials state that Sa'diy gave special attention to Navoi's struggle to raise the prestige of the Uzbek language and to the analysis of "Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn" [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. Another entry notes that in a 1928 article in "Maorif va o'qituvchi" Sa'diy discussed Navoi's service in developing poetry in the Turkic language [Sa'diy, 1928].

This is a central issue in Uzbek Navoi studies. Navoi's literary importance cannot be separated from his defense and artistic elevation of Turkic-Chagatai. The interpretation of "Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn" as a linguistic and cultural argument allows Navoi to be read not only as a poet but as a theorist of literary language. Sa'diy's attention to this aspect shows that he understood Navoi's place in Uzbek literary history through the relation between language, literature, and national cultural identity.

The materials also connect Sa'diy's appreciation of Fitrat's poetic reforms with Navoi's defense of Turkic expressive possibilities in "Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn" [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This is a suggestive historiographical point: Sa'diy appears to have seen a line of continuity between Navoi's language-conscious classical project and twentieth-century Jadid literary reform. This interpretation should be treated cautiously because the supporting evidence is not page-specific, yet it is methodologically meaningful. It suggests that for Sa'diy, Navoi's legacy remained active in modern debates over language and poetry.

6. Jami, Navoi, and the interpretation of literary influence. Sa'diy's contribution also includes his treatment of literary relationship and influence. The source materials state that he relied on "Xamsat ul-mutahayyirin" to explain Jami's influence on Navoi's worldview and creativity, as well as the role of the Naqshbandi order in the socio-cultural life of Khorasan [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This places Navoi within a network of intellectual, spiritual, and literary relations rather than treating him in isolation.

Another entry states that Sa'diy viewed the relationship between Jami and Navoi not merely as personal friendship but as a synthesis and cooperation between two major literary traditions – Persian and Turkic classical literature [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This interpretation is important for comparative literary history. It suggests that Sa'diy approached Navoi's work through interliterary contact, influence, and cultural mediation.

The available evidence also states that Sa'diy regarded one of Navoi's major services to Eastern literature as his encouragement of Jami's creative development [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. Since this claim comes from a non-page-specific electronic text, it should not be overstated. Still, it indicates that Sa'diy's interest in Navoi and Jami was not limited to biographical relationship. He treated their connection as a question of literary development, spiritual collaboration, and the interaction of Persian and Turkic literary worlds.

7. Literary influence after Navoi: muxammas and continuity. Sa'diy's interpretation of Navoi's influence extended beyond the poet's own century. The materials state that Sa'diy studied muxammases written to Navoi's ghazals by later poets such as Ma'dan, Mujrim-Obid, Niyoziy, and others, using this material to identify patterns of literary influence and continuity [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This is methodologically significant because it shifts Navoi studies from the study of a single author to the study of reception.

Reception history is essential to Navoi studies. Navoi's authority is not only in the internal structure of his works; it is also in the way later poets responded to, expanded, imitated, and reinterpreted his texts. By studying muxammases, Sa'diy examined how Navoi's ghazals became generative texts for later Uzbek poetry. Such work connects textual study, genre history, and literary influence.

The source base also states that Sa'diy studied how later poets followed the classical heritage through muxammases and ghazals, presenting this as evidence for the independence and identity of Uzbek poetry [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. Again, the evidence is not page-specific, so the conclusion must be cautious. Nevertheless, it supports the broader argument that Sa'diy contributed to the interpretation of Navoi not merely as a historical figure, but as a source of later poetic development.

8. Social and historical interpretation of classical literature. Sa'diy's work also reflects the attempt to interpret classical literature historically and socially. One source reports that in 1930 he published an article in "Yangi yo'l" titled "The Social Roots of Uzbek Classical Literature", where he examined the socio-historical foundations of Navoi's works through a sociological method [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. Because the evidence comes from an electronic text without page numbers, the exact scope of this claim requires further verification through the original issue. Yet the claim is valuable as a historiographical indication of how Sa'diy's method was understood.

This sociological framing belongs to the intellectual atmosphere of the late 1920s and early 1930s, when literary studies increasingly tried to connect texts to social history. The risk of such an approach is that it may reduce classical literature to social function or ideological explanation. The value is that it places literary works in relation to historical life rather than treating them as timeless objects. Sa'diy's contribution lies in participating in this methodological transition, even if later scholarship may revise or refine some of its assumptions.

The materials also state that Sa'diy classified Avloniy and his followers as didactic poets who continued Navoi's enlightenment tradition [Abdurahmon Sa'diyning O'zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This shows how he connected Navoi's ethical and didactic heritage to twentieth-century Jadid literature. Such a view turns Navoi into a living tradition rather than a closed classical monument. It also reveals Sa'diy's interest in continuity between classical and modern Uzbek literature.

9. Institutional role and academic continuity. Sa'diy's contribution was also institutional. He worked in higher education and later in the Academy of Sciences system. The materials state that during his leadership in the Department of Uzbek Literature at the National University of Uzbekistan, classical literature, especially Navoi's work, received strong scholarly direction [O'zbek adabiyotshunosligi kafedrasi, n.d.]. Another institutional source presents his doctoral dissertation on Navoi as part of the department's scholarly history [O'zbek adabiyotshunosligi kafedrasi, n.d.].

The exact details of institutional claims need careful verification, since the available sources are not page-specific. Still, the broader picture is supported by Egamqulova's page-specific evidence that Sa'diy worked as a leading researcher at the Institute of Language and Literature from 1948 until the end of his life [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 623]. His work therefore belongs not only to an individual intellectual biography but also to the institutional development of Uzbek philology.

The materials further state that Sa'diy's early scholarly views at Samarkand State University were developed by later scholars such as Vohid Abdullayev and

Botirxon Valixo‘jayev [Abdurahmon Sa‘diyning O‘zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This should be interpreted carefully: the evidence supports the idea of scholarly continuity, but it does not prove a direct linear school in every detail. A cautious formulation is that Sa‘diy’s work formed part of the intellectual environment in which later Uzbek and Samarkand-based studies of classical literature and Navoi developed.

DISCUSSION. Abdurahmon Sa‘diy’s contribution to Uzbek Navoi studies should be evaluated through methodology rather than through general praise. His role becomes clear when Navoi studies is understood as a scholarly field that needed several foundations: literary theory, historical periodization, source awareness, language analysis, comparative method, institutional teaching, and the ability to connect classical heritage with modern national literary identity.

First, Sa‘diy helped frame Navoi within literary history. His 1949 doctoral research explicitly presents Navoi’s creativity as the highest stage in the development of Uzbek classical literature [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11]. This formulation is not merely celebratory. It places Navoi into a developmental model and makes his work a key point of literary-historical explanation. Such framing is central to the emergence of modern Navoi studies.

Second, Sa‘diy contributed to the theoretical preparation of the field. His 1924 “Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari” was among the early Uzbek works on literary theory [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622]. The textbook’s comparative treatment of Eastern and Western literary traditions [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 624] created a methodological horizon in which Navoi could be read not only as a national poet but also as a figure within broader literary systems.

Third, Sa‘diy’s attention to language gives his Navoi scholarship a philological dimension. His reported focus on “Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn” and Navoi’s role in the development of Turkic poetry suggests that he understood Navoi as a central figure in the history of literary language [Sa‘diy, 1928; Abdurahmon Sa‘diyning O‘zbek Navoiyshunosligi, n.d.]. This is important because Uzbek Navoi studies developed

not only around themes and genres, but also around the historical status of the Uzbek literary language.

Fourth, Sa'diy appears to have treated Navoi's legacy as a system of relations: Navoi and Jami, Navoi and Persian literature, Navoi and later muxammas writers, Navoi and Jadid poetry, Navoi and national literary consciousness. This relational method distinguishes scholarly interpretation from isolated admiration. It asks not only "who was Navoi?" but "how did Navoi's work function in literary history?"

Fifth, Sa'diy's approach must be read historically. He wrote and worked in a period shaped by Jadid reform, early Soviet institutions, and the emerging academic study of national literatures. This context gave him new opportunities – textbooks, universities, research institutes, dissertations – but also placed him within the intellectual and ideological constraints of his time. For this reason, it would be inaccurate to present him as a fully modern scholar in the contemporary sense. It is more precise to say that he participated in the transition toward modern Uzbek literary scholarship.

Sixth, the limitations of the source base must be acknowledged. Some statements about Sa'diy's views are supported by page-specific studies, while others come from electronic materials without exact pagination. The page-specific evidence firmly supports his early literary-theoretical work [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 622–624], his Academy activity [Egamqulova, 2024, b. 623], and his 1949 Navoi dissertation [Sirojiddinov, Yusupova, Davlatov, 2020, b. 11]. More detailed claims about his interpretation of Jami, muxammas, or sociological method require further verification from Sa'diy's original texts. The available evidence allows a cautious but meaningful conclusion: Sa'diy was one of the important figures who helped turn Navoi studies into a structured scholarly field.

CONCLUSION. Abdurahmon Sa'diy's contribution to Uzbek Navoi studies is best understood not as a purely biographical fact but as a methodological stage in the scholarly interpretation of Alisher Navoi's legacy. His 1949 doctoral research, which presented Navoi as the highest stage of Uzbek classical literature, gave that

legacy a clear literary-historical framing and helped consolidate the academic standing of the field. The conceptual groundwork had already been laid in his 1924 "Amaliy ham nazariy adabiyot darslari" and in related theoretical writings, which contributed to the formation of Uzbek literary scholarship by supplying the conceptual tools needed for the study of classical literature. Sa'diy's comparative orientation, and especially his attention to both Eastern and Western literary traditions, helped carry Uzbek literary studies beyond mere description toward genuinely analytical interpretation, while his concern with Navoi's role in the development of the Turkic language and its poetry made the history of language an important component of Navoi studies. By examining Navoi in relation to Jami, to Persian literature, to the later muxammas writers, and to Jadid didactic poetry, he approached the poet above all as a figure of literary continuity and influence. All of this work belongs to a historically conditioned scholarly environment shaped by Jadid reform, the early Soviet academic institutions, and the institutionalization of Uzbek philology. The available evidence therefore supports a balanced conclusion: Sa'diy did not single-handedly found Uzbek Navoi studies, yet he contributed significantly to their transformation into a field grounded in literary history, source awareness, comparative method, national literary heritage, and scholarly interpretation.

REFERENCES

1. Sirojiddinov, Sh., Yusupova, D., & Davlatov, O. *Navoiy Studies* [Text]. Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2020. 576 p.
2. Egamqulova, N. "The First Source on Literary Theory in the Early Twentieth Century." *Modern Science and Research*, 2024, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 622–626.
3. *Abdurahmon Sa'diy's Historical Contribution to Uzbek Navoiy Studies and the Study of Classical Literary Heritage: A Systematic and Bibliographic Analysis* [Electronic text].
4. Панферова, И. В. (2016). Межпредметные связи как дидактический инструмент интеграции иноязычных коммуникативных навыков и

- умений в процессе формирования профессиональной компетенции будущих экономистов. Молодой ученый, (22), 252-254.
5. Vitalievna, P. I. (2015). Specific peculiarities of practical teaching English grammar at non-language University. European journal of education and applied psychology, (2), 58-63.
 6. "Department of Uzbek Literary Studies" [Electronic resource]. Official website of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek.
 7. Панферова, И. В. (2024). Организационные изменения в контексте модернизации современной школы. Экономика и социум, (12-2 (127)), 1378-1382.
 8. "Abdurahmon Sa'diy" [Electronic resource]. *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*.
 9. Sa'diy, A. "Alisher Navoi's Contribution to the Development of Poetry in the Turkic Language." *Maorif va o'qituvchi*, 1928, No. 5.
 10. Sa'diy, A. *Practical and Theoretical Lessons in Literature*. Tashkent, 1924.
 11. Sa'diy, A. "Curriculum of Mother Tongue and Literature for Uzbek Educational Institutions." *Bilim o'chog'i*, 1923, No. 1-2.
 12. "Scientific Schools" [Electronic resource]. Official website of Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov.
 13. Sa'diy, A. *Navoiy's Creative Work as a High Stage in the Development of Uzbek Classical Literature*: Doctoral Dissertation. 1949.
 14. Fitrat, A. *Rules of Literature*. Tashkent, 1926.
 15. Fitrat, A. *Samples of the Oldest Turkic Literature*. Tashkent, 1927.
 16. Navoiy, A. *Khamsat ul-Mutahayyirin*. Various editions.
 17. Navoiy, A. *Muhokamat ul-Lug'atayn*. Various editions.