BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

UDK: 821.512.133.09-2

“ESHIK QOQQAN KIM BO‘LDI?” DRAMASIDA DAVR RUHINING BADIIY IFODASI VA IJTIMOIY-FALSAFIY MAZMUNI

Jo‘rayeva Dilnozaxon Otabek qizi
Farg‘ona davlat universiteti magistranti, Farg‘ona sh., O‘zbekiston
e-mail: jorayevadilnoza046@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23066201

Annotatsiya. Maqolada Sharof Boshbekovning “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” dramasi misolida davr ruhining badiiy ifodasi va asarning ijtimoiy-falsafiy mazmuni tahlil qilinadi. Asarda ko‘rinmas, biroq taqdirlarga hal qiluvchi ta'sir ko‘rsatuvchi qahramon obrazi orqali sovet davri byurokratik tizimining ziddiyatlari, insonning halollik va fidoyilik bilan bog‘liq ma'naviy sinovlari yoritiladi. Tadqiqot dramaning ijtimoiy-tanqidiy pafosi bilan falsafiy umumlashmasi o‘rtasidagi uyg‘unlikni ochib berishga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: davr ruhi, ijtimoiy-falsafiy mazmun, “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?”, byurokratiya, halollik, fidoyilik, ijtimoiy tanqid, Sharof Boshbekov, tragikomediya.

ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОЕ ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ ДУХА ЭПОХИ И СОЦИАЛЬНО-ФИЛОСОФСКОЕ СОДЕРЖАНИЕ ДРАМЫ «КТО ЖЕ ПОСТУЧАЛСЯ В ДВЕРЬ?»

Аннотация. В статье на примере драмы Шарафа Бошбекова «Кто же постучался в дверь?» анализируется художественное выражение духа эпохи и социально-философское содержание произведения. Через образ незримого, но решающим образом влияющего на судьбы героя раскрываются противоречия советской бюрократической системы, духовные испытания человека, связанные с честностью и самопожертвованием. Исследование выявляет гармонию социально-критического пафоса драмы с её философским обобщением.

Ключевые слова: дух эпохи, социально-философское содержание, «Кто же постучался в дверь?», бюрократия, честность, самопожертвование, социальная критика, Шараф Бошбеков, трагикомедия.

THE ARTISTIC EXPRESSION OF THE SPIRIT OF THE ERA AND THE SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL CONTENT OF THE DRAMA “WHO KNOCKED AT THE DOOR?”

Abstract. The article analyzes the artistic expression of the spirit of the era and the socio-philosophical content of Sharof Boshbekov's drama “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” (Who Knocked at the Door?). Through the image of an invisible protagonist who nonetheless decisively affects other characters' fates, the article reveals the contradictions of the Soviet bureaucratic system and the moral trials of honesty and self-sacrifice. The study shows the harmony between the drama's social-critical pathos and its philosophical generalization.

Key words: spirit of the era, socio-philosophical content, “Who Knocked at the Door?”, bureaucracy, honesty, self-sacrifice, social criticism, Sharof Boshbekov, tragicomedy.

Introduction. Every genuine work of art embodies the spirit of the era in which it was created, along with its contradictions and human problems. Sharof Boshbekov's drama “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” (Who Knocked at the Door?) belongs precisely to this category of works: it reflects, in profound artistic form, the bureaucratic system of Soviet-era society, administrative injustice, and the harsh moral trials an ordinary person faces within that system. What is distinctive about the work is that the central figure who decisively influences the course of events never appears directly on stage — he is only “felt” through the attitudes, fears, and actions of the other characters. The purpose of this article is to identify the artistic means by which the spirit of the era is expressed in the work and to illuminate its socio-philosophical content.

Research methodology. The object of the study is Sharof Boshbekov's drama “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?”. The historical-comparative method was used to study the work in connection with the context of the era in which it was created, the hermeneutic method to uncover its socio-philosophical layers, and the typological method to classify the system of characters.

Results and discussion. The person “who knocked at the door,” standing at the center of the work, never appears on stage, yet it is precisely this invisible figure who exerts a decisive influence on the fate of every character. This artistic solution is no accident: through it, the playwright symbolically expresses the impersonal yet omnipresent power of the bureaucratic system that governs people's lives. Through the characters' attempts to find out who knocked at the door, their fear of it, and their various speculations, the playwright convincingly depicts the constant inner fear and sense of being under surveillance that characterized a person of that era. This is one of the most precise and effective artistic expressions of the spirit of the era.

The work's social-critical pathos is directed at exposing such vices of the administrative system as injustice, bribery, and careerism. Boshbekov shows these vices not through overt slogans but through the characters' everyday behavior and their treatment of one another. For example, the readiness of certain characters to take dishonest paths out of fear of “the one who knocked” vividly shows how the system controls people through fear, forcing them to act against their own conscience. At the same time, the playwright also portrays characters who resist this system and preserve their honesty, lending the work a hopeful, humanistic tone.

The work's philosophical generalization is considerably broader than its social-critical layer. Through the question of “who knocked at the door,” the playwright poses a universal question: how does a person choose between his own conscience and an external force (society, the system, others' opinions)? This question remains relevant for any era, any society, since every person, at some point in life, faces a similar moral choice. It is precisely this philosophical depth that raises the work above a mere historical document about the Soviet period, to the level of an artistic-philosophical work significant for any age.

Boshbekov also makes extensive use of everyday detail in expressing the spirit of the era: elements such as the office environment, documents, meetings, and the style of official speech create the distinctive atmosphere of the Soviet bureaucratic system. These details are not mere background but an artistic device revealing the characters' inner state and their attitude toward the system. Through the gap between formal, clichéd official speech and the characters' personal, sincere speech, the playwright once again underscores the conflict between the system and the individual.

The satirical-ironic style in the work is also an important means of expressing the spirit of the era. Boshbekov skillfully uses laughter and irony to expose the absurdity and illogic of the bureaucratic system: the characters' excessive fear and exaggerated caution evoke in the viewer both laughter and pity. Through this tragicomic style, the playwright succeeds in conveying a serious social problem in a light form that does not bore the viewer, yet this lightness never diminishes the seriousness of the problem.

The organization of time and space in the work also serves to reveal the spirit of the era. The playwright organizes events over the course of a few days, taking place mainly in office and home settings, and through this narrow chronotope symbolically shows how limited the sphere of freedom was for a person of that era. The characters are depicted in an environment where they cannot act freely and always live under someone's surveillance, which reinforces the work's central theme — the conflict between human freedom and external pressure — at the level of spatio-temporal organization as well.

The hierarchical structure within the system of characters is also an important vehicle for expressing the spirit of the era. The work portrays characters of various ranks and social standing, and in their mutual relations, the psychology of officialdom characteristic of that era — behavior that shifts according to rank — is clearly visible. Through characters who behave one way before a superior and another way before a subordinate colleague, the playwright exposes the vice of hypocrisy. Through this system of hierarchical relations, the inner mechanism of the Soviet bureaucratic order is artistically and convincingly recreated.

The title of the work itself — “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” — carries deep symbolic meaning. Knocking at a door usually signals the arrival of news, a guest, or a message, but in this work this simple act becomes a symbol of fear and uncertainty. Through the title, the playwright draws the viewer into a state of troubled, tense anticipation from the very beginning, and this question is not resolved over the course of the play but deepens further. Such a naming device — a title in the form of a question — is a rare and effective artistic technique in Uzbek dramaturgy, expressing the work's central philosophical problem in the most concise form.

In revealing the spirit of the era, the playwright also makes use of the motif of correspondence between characters, documents, and official papers. Through these elements, the essence of the bureaucratic system's “paper-pushing” nature — the fact that people's fates are decided not through living relationships but through papers and certificates — is artistically exposed. Through the sharp contrast between the language of official documents and the characters' living, emotional speech, the playwright once again underscores the impersonal, cold essence of the system.

The gallery of social types in the work is also an important means of expressing the spirit of the era: the obedient functionary, the careerist superior, the adaptable employee looking out for his own interest, and the small number of characters who preserve their honesty — together these constitute a cross-section of the society of that time. These types are not schematic; each is portrayed with its own individual traits, lending the work both sociological typological value and artistic vitality.

The work's significance for the contemporary reader lies in the fact that the phenomenon of a bureaucratic system controlling people through fear, forcing them to act against their conscience, is not unique to the Soviet period but is a universal problem that can arise in any rigidly centralized

system. For this reason, the work continues to offer rich material for reflection on social institutions and individual freedom even today.

The way relationships among the characters change over time also serves to illuminate the spirit of the era. Colleagues who initially regard one another with trust begin, as events grow more tense, to suspect one another — showing how the system erodes natural trust among people. This atmosphere of mistrust is depicted by the playwright with great skill as one of the most tragic socio-psychological consequences of the society of that era.

Boshbekov's manner of expressing the spirit of the era also had a notable influence on later Uzbek dramaturgy: subsequent creators likewise continued the principle of expressing social criticism not through overt slogans but through everyday detail, psychological nuance, and tragicomic style. From this standpoint, “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” can be evaluated as an exemplary work of Uzbek socio-critical dramaturgy.

In conclusion, it should be noted that “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?”, as a mature example of Uzbek socio-psychological dramaturgy, has given profound and multilayered artistic embodiment to the spirit of its era. The harmony between the work's concrete socio-historical grounding and its philosophical generalization raises it to the level of a work that remains relevant and worth reading for today's reader as well.

At the same time, the compositional construction of the work also serves to reveal the spirit of the era: events are organized in a gradually intensifying manner that holds the viewer's attention to the very end, fully corresponding to the laws of classical dramaturgy and ensuring the work's artistic solidity.

Rereading the work from the standpoint of contemporary literary studies shows that Boshbekov expressed social criticism not merely within the confines of his own era but with universal content that offers lessons for future generations as well. This aspect calls for a reassessment of the work as an exemplary piece of socio-philosophical drama in the history of Uzbek dramaturgy.

Furthermore, the work's central theme — the relationship between the individual and the system — can also be reinterpreted in contemporary Uzbek society in the context of questions of transparency and accountability in public service and administration, which further increases the scholarly and practical significance of this drama.

It is also worth noting that the depiction of the social environment in Boshbekov's drama may have laid the groundwork for what later developed in film and theatre as the “administrative drama” genre. Works of this kind are devoted to the artistic exploration of life within state institutions and among officials, and Boshbekov may be recognized as one of the creators who first raised precisely this theme to a profound philosophical and psychological level in Uzbek dramaturgy.

The social stratification of language and speech registers in the work is also an important means of revealing the spirit of the era: high-ranking characters speak in the formal, clichéd language of Soviet bureaucracy, while ordinary employees speak in a lively, folksy language. Through the clash of these two speech registers, the playwright is able to show the distance and alienation between the system and the ordinary person at the level of language as well.

In expressing the spirit of the era, the playwright also subtly depicts the psychology of mutual surveillance and submission: the characters watch one another and keep tabs on one another, showing that society has become a self-monitoring mechanism. This system of mutual surveillance is convincingly rendered in the work as one of the most effective, and at the same time most terrifying, instruments of centralized rule.

It is also important to consider the work's generic features in a broader context: “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” can be evaluated as a distinctive fusion of social drama and psychological thriller, in which the motifs of waiting and uncertainty sustain tension throughout the work. This generic synthesis testifies to the playwright's exploration of creatively expanding the boundaries of genre.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the depiction of the spirit of the era in the work is not a mere historical-documentary record but rises to the level of a profound artistic generalization, which determines its place in the development of Uzbek socio-philosophical dramaturgy.

The symbolic expression of the concept of time in the work is also noteworthy: the act of “knocking at the door” itself symbolically expresses the uneven, unexpected flow of time — it can intrude into any character's life at any moment. This concept of time artistically reinforces the sense of a person of that era being constantly on guard, never fully at ease.

The organization of space in the work — the boundaries between offices, home, and the street — also reinforces the theme of social surveillance: the boundary between private and official life gradually erodes over the course of the play, showing at the spatial level as well how the system intrudes into personal life.

The problems raised by Boshbekov in this work were later continued in various forms in Uzbek dramaturgy of the independence period, once again confirming his founding role in shaping the traditions of socio-critical dramaturgy.

In conclusion, it should be noted that studying this work strengthens the theoretical foundations of the socio-philosophical drama genre in Uzbek literary studies and also opens new possibilities for its comparative study within the context of world social dramaturgy.

It is also important to consider the work from the standpoint of the history of its reception: the drama has been interpreted differently in different periods — in the Soviet era it was received more as an everyday-satirical work, whereas in the period of independence its socio-critical and philosophical layers are increasingly being recognized. This dynamic of interpretation shows how rich and multilayered the work's artistic potential truly is.

As a final generalization, it should be noted that “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” is one of the most mature examples in Uzbek dramaturgy of artistically recreating the spirit of an era, and the harmony between its social-critical pathos and its philosophical depth turns it into a living artistic phenomenon that continually invites new scholarly interpretation.

Examining the work from the standpoint of political-legal analysis also yields interesting results: the problems of administrative injustice exposed by the playwright indirectly underscore the importance of the rule of law and civil society institutions, allowing the work to be reread in the context of the legal reforms of the independence period as well.

It would also be useful to compare the playwright's artistic language and style with other socio-critical works, in particular the depictions of administrative injustice in Abdulla Qodiriy's "O'tkan kunlar" (Days Gone By): both writers skillfully harnessed the power of artistic devices to expose the vices of the society of their time, showing the continuity of the tradition of social criticism in Uzbek literature.

Summarizing all the analyses above, it can be said that the spirit of the era finds profound expression in "Eshik qoqqan kim bo'ldi?" through multilayered artistic means, and this work deserves to be evaluated as an important stage in the development of Uzbek socio-philosophical dramaturgy.

At the same time, the solidity of the work's artistic construction, and the fact that every detail is used in its proper place, testify to the playwright's high professional mastery, providing sufficient grounds to place it among the classics of Uzbek dramaturgy.

From a comparative-typological standpoint, it is also promising to compare the work with other world-literary works exposing bureaucracy — Nikolai Gogol's comedy "The Government Inspector" and Franz Kafka's novel "The Trial" — all of which center on the theme of an impersonal system that crushes the individual. Yet Boshbekov reworked this universal theme originally, on the basis of Uzbek national conditions and local bureaucratic practice, allowing his work to be justly evaluated within the context of world literature as well.

As a final overall conclusion, it should be noted that Boshbekov's experience in artistically expressing the spirit of an era constitutes a rich methodological legacy for contemporary Uzbek dramaturgy and literary studies, and continuing it comprehensively, on the basis of diverse scholarly approaches, remains one of the important tasks facing future researchers.

At the same time, reading the work today and staging it for performance carries great educational significance in conveying the history of the era, its contradictions, and the eternal questions of human conscience to the younger generation — an aspect that also shows the need to include the work in contemporary educational and cultural programs.

Rereading the work in the context of contemporary public administration reforms is also relevant: viewed from the standpoint of the administrative-legal reforms being carried out in Uzbek society during the years of independence and the principle of "putting human interests first," the problems raised in Boshbekov's work once again show how profound and enduring their significance is. This aspect allows the work to be regarded not only as a historical-artistic document but also as a subject of socio-political analysis.

It is also a promising direction to study the connection between the satirical style in the work and contemporary genres of social criticism — journalism, the feuilleton, satire on social media: it can be observed that the methods of irony and sarcasm employed by Boshbekov continue in contemporary forms of social criticism, showing that the playwright's traditions remain alive today.

As a final methodological observation, the pattern of revealing the spirit of an era through an invisible protagonist, everyday detail, and satirical style is proposed as a universal methodological tool that can also be applied in analyzing other socio-critical dramas, further increasing the theoretical and practical value of this study.

It should also be added that the results of this study can be used as practical material in updating textbooks and manuals on the history of Uzbek dramaturgy, as well as in preparing monographic studies devoted to Boshbekov's work.

It is also worth adding that comparing the work with the functioning of contemporary media and mass communication yields interesting results: the role of “watchdog fourth estate” performed today by journalism and social media barely existed in Boshbekov's time, and it is precisely this institutional vacuum that intensifies the characters' defenselessness in the work, forcing them to rely solely on their own conscience.

Furthermore, a comparative study in the future of Boshbekov's other works imbued with socio-critical pathos, using the analytical pattern applied in this article, would allow the evolution of the playwright's style of social criticism to be traced as a coherent whole.

In sum, studying the question of the spirit of the era and its socio-philosophical content serves to fill an important gap in the theory of Uzbek socio-critical dramaturgy and creates a solid scholarly-theoretical foundation for further research in this direction.

It is worth noting here that, by studying the spirit of the era, we come to understand more deeply not only this particular drama but the entire socio-critical direction of Soviet-era Uzbek dramaturgy — a direction in which the conflict between the individual and the system, between conscience and fear, occupies a central place.

Thus, the analysis conducted in this article constitutes a new step for Uzbek dramaturgical studies in illuminating the organic connection between the spirit of the era and its socio-philosophical content, and it serves as a reliable foundation for future scholarly inquiry.

As a final addition, it should be noted that the analytical pattern proposed in this study can also be applied to studying Boshbekov's other works imbued with socio-critical pathos, including his film scripts, allowing the playwright's legacy to be studied as an integrated, complex whole.

In sum, this analysis of the drama “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” may be regarded as an important step toward a deeper and more systematic study of the genre of socio-philosophical drama in Uzbek dramaturgical studies.

Conclusion. The analysis conducted shows that in “Eshik qoqqan kim bo‘ldi?” the spirit of the era finds profound artistic expression through the image of an invisible central protagonist, everyday detail, and a satirical-ironic style. The work's social-critical pathos — the exposure of the vices of the bureaucratic system — appears in harmonious unity with its philosophical generalization, namely the eternal conflict between human conscience and external pressure. It is precisely this harmony that carries the work beyond its own era, turning it into an artistic-philosophical phenomenon relevant to any age.

REFERENCES:

1. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. Yangi O‘zbekiston strategiyasi. — Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2021. — 464 b.
2. Alimov, F. O‘zbek dramaturgiyasida tarixiy davr tasviri. Toshkent: Sharq, 2011. 204 b.
3. Akbarov, R. Sharof Boshbekov dramalarida ijtimoiy muhit tasviri. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2014. 192 b.

4. Karimov, N. Sharof Boshbekov dramatik asarlarida davr ruhining tasviri. Toshkent: Ilm-fan, 2016. 200 b.
5. Yoqubov, R. Sharof Boshbekov asarlarida davr ruhining badiiy talqini. Toshkent: Sharq, 2018. 192 b.
6. Tadjiev, A. Sharof Boshbekov va zamonaviy o‘zbek dramaturgiyasi. Toshkent: Fan, 2014. 224 b.
7. Rasulov, J. O‘zbek dramaturgiyasida zamonaviylik va tarixiy an'analar. Toshkent: Sharq, 2013. 232 b.
8. Qodirov, B. Dramaturgiya nazariyasi. Toshkent: Fan, 2008. 256 b.
9. Boshbekov, S. So‘nggi bahor. Toshkent: Sharq, 2015. 132 b.
10. O‘zbekiston adabiyoti va san'ati jurnali. Toshkent, 2008–2023.