

When the Primer Outranks the Poem: Genre, Evidential Force and The Reconstruction of Educational Thought in A Canonised Corpus

Baxtiyorova Mo'minaxon Odiljon qizi

Department of Pedagogy and Psychology, Kokand University, Kokand, Uzbekistan

Received: 27 July 2026; **Accepted:** 24 August 2026; **Published:** 19 September 2026

Abstract: Historians of education routinely draw on sources of very different kinds textbooks, novels, plays, journalism, autobiographies, editorial prefaces and treat them as interchangeable testimony to what an educator believed. This article argues that they are not interchangeable, and proposes an explicit hierarchy of evidential force ordered by genre. The instrument is developed and tested on a corpus in which the cost of ignoring genre is unusually visible: the writings of Hamza Hakimzade Niyazi (1889–1929), canonised in Soviet Uzbekistan as a revolutionary writer and edited accordingly. Three propositions that dominated the literature for half a century that he was irreligious, that he was a “singer of the revolution”, and that he stood apart from the Jadid school movement are re-tested against the corpus once its sources have been graded for reliability and ranked by genre. All three fail. The decisive counter-evidence in each case comes from the lowest-profile and least ideologically useful genres: the school primer, the school’s own administrative announcement, and the physical composition of a library. The article reports the outcome as a worked procedure rather than as a biographical revision, and closes by specifying the conditions under which the hierarchy applies and the two situations in which it should be suspended.

Keywords: Evidential force; source genre; textbook history; Jadidism; Central Asia; canonised corpus; historiography of education; source criticism.

Introduction: A historian of education reconstructing the views of an early twentieth-century schoolmaster will usually have several kinds of text to work with: the textbooks he wrote, the novels and plays he published, his journalism, his autobiography, the recollections of contemporaries, and the prefaces later editors attached to his collected works. Standard practice is to quote from all of them, distinguishing between them, if at all, by an informal sense of which passage seems most telling. The practice is understandable and, in most cases, harmless. It stops being harmless when the corpus has been reworked by an editorial programme with an interest in the outcome.

This article makes two connected claims. The first is that sources of different genres carry systematically different evidential force with respect to an author’s

pedagogical position, and that the ordering can be specified in advance rather than settled case by case. The second is that where the ordering is specified, propositions that appear well supported by a large literature can be shown to rest entirely on the weakest tier of evidence and can then be tested against the strongest.

The case is Hamza Hakimzade Niyazi (1889–1929), a schoolmaster and textbook author in colonial and early Soviet Turkestan whose posthumous canonisation makes him an unusually clear specimen. After his death he was elevated as the founder of Soviet Uzbek literature and commemorated for half a century; over the same period the three primers he wrote in 1914–15 “Yengil adabiyot, O’qish kitobi and Qiroat kitobi” remained in manuscript, and their full text entered

circulation only in 1988. The corpus available to scholars was therefore not merely tendentiously described; it was unevenly constituted, and the unevenness ran along genre lines. What the canon needed (drama, revolutionary verse) was published, reconstructed where lost, and taught; what it did not need (instructional prose grounded in Islamic categories) was not.

Three propositions became standard in that literature and shaped the school curriculum for decades: that Hamza was irreligious; that he was a “singer of the revolution” whose earlier educational work was preparatory to that role; and that his school “differed entirely” from the schools opened by the Jadid reformers. Each is a claim about an educator’s position. Each is therefore, on the argument advanced here, a claim on which the primers should outrank the poems.

The problem has been noticed in adjacent fields without being turned into a procedure. Textual scholarship has long insisted that the status of a text must be established before its meaning is argued about (Tanselle 1989; Greetham 1994), and literary theory has shown that the material surrounding a text prefaces, notes, series titles constitutes a distinct zone of authority that readers routinely mistake for the author’s own (Genette 1997). Book history has made the same point about the transmission of texts through editions and reading practices (Chartier 1994). Within the history of education, the standing methodological advice is to historicise, contextualise and beware of presentism (Depaepe 2010), and the history of political thought supplies the classic diagnosis of retrospective redescription (Skinner 1969). What none of these supplies is an operational rule telling a historian of education which of several available genres should govern when they disagree about an educator’s position. That is the gap this article addresses.

The article addresses three questions. (1) Can the evidential force of source genres be ordered in a way that is principled rather than ad hoc, and stated before the evidence is examined? (2) When such an ordering is applied together with a reliability grading of the corpus, what happens to the three standard propositions? (3) What are the boundary conditions of the instrument —

where does it fail, and where must it be suspended? The contribution is methodological: the case is used to build and stress-test a procedure, and the biographical findings are reported as its output.

METHODS

The corpus comprises four groups. (i) Instructional texts: the three primers, published under the general heading “Pedagogical Treatises” in TAT 2; the analysis draws principally on the preface to Yengil adabiyot (TAT 2, 314), the article “Ilm” (TAT 2, 365–366) and the section “Ikkinchi sinf uchun” (TAT 2, 369–396). (ii) Administrative and ego-documents: the announcement of the orphans’ school “Maktabi Dor ul-aytom” and the author’s autobiography. (iii) Publicistic and literary texts: journalism of the 1910s; the novel Yangi saodat (1915); the play Zaharli hayot (1916 lithograph); the play Boy ila xizmatchi in the text restored in 1939. (iv) Editorial paratext and secondary literature: the prefaces and annotations of the 1960 and 1988 editions, memoirs, and scholarship.

Manuscript witnesses were consulted where available: the two copies of the divan (Institute of Oriental Studies, Tashkent, inv. 8989; Kokand Literary Museum, R-89), the 1916 lithograph of the play (inv. 8180), and lithographs of the song collection (inv. 7628 I I, 7628 I II, 4066).

Before genre is considered, each text is graded for reliability on five criteria: proximity to the original (autograph, lifetime publication, later copy, reconstruction); editorial intervention (abridgement, substitution, change of genre, and whether disclosed); completeness (whole work or extracts); independent corroboration; and density of pedagogical information. The criteria yield three grades A (autograph or lifetime publication, no intervention), B (later publication, intervention disclosed or identified), C (reconstruction, extract, or undisclosed intervention). C-grade material may illustrate but may not ground a conclusion.

The instrument proposed here ranks genres by the distance they place between the author and the proposition attributed to him. The shorter the distance, the greater the evidential force with respect to that author’s educational position (Table 1).

Table 1

Genre hierarchy of evidential force for claims about an author's educational position

Tier	Genre	Author–proposition distance	Evidential force
1	Instructional text (primer, reader, lesson)	None: the author transmits to a child what he holds worth transmitting	Highest; decisive where genres conflict
2	Administrative and ego-document (school announcement, autobiography, correspondence)	Small, but shaped by an institutional or self-presentational purpose	High for facts of practice; moderate for beliefs
3	Publicistic text (signed article, public appeal)	Small, but shaped by an addressee and a censorship regime	Moderate
4	Literary text (novel, play, verse)	Mediated by a character; may be ironised or disowned	Low for position; high for the repertoire of problems the author found sayable
5	Editorial paratext and later testimony	Not the author's at all	Nil as testimony to the author; evidence of the interpretive regime

Three points of clarification. First, the hierarchy concerns one type of claim only what the author held about education. For other questions the order changes: a novel may be the best evidence of what a period found imaginable, and an editorial preface is the primary source par excellence for the history of interpretation. Second, the hierarchy is not a claim about literary value. Third, the two filters are independent and are applied in sequence: a tier-1 text may be C-grade (an unattributed extract from a primer) and a tier-4 text may be A-grade (a lifetime lithograph of a play). A source must clear both filters before it can ground a conclusion.

The ordering is defended on a single criterion, applied consistently: how far the genre permits the author to disown what the text says. At tier 1 the answer is not at all. A primer is not a representation of a view but an act of transmission: the author selects what a named year group will read, in what order, at what pace. At tier 2 a small distance opens, because an announcement or an autobiography is composed for an institution or for

posterity and may present its subject favourably; but the facts it states are ordinarily checkable against other records, which is why such documents are strong for practice and weaker for belief. At tier 3 the distance widens again with the addressee and, in colonial Turkestan, with censorship. At tier 4 it becomes structural: the author may voice a position through a character precisely in order to test or condemn it. At tier 5 the text is not the author's at all. The ordering is thus not a ranking of importance but a ranking of one specific property, and it is stated before the evidence is inspected so that it cannot be adjusted to fit a preferred conclusion.

Three propositions were extracted verbatim from the canonical literature and restated as testable claims. For each, the analysis (i) identified the tier and grade of the evidence actually adduced in the literature; (ii) searched the tier-1 and tier-2 material for confirming or disconfirming evidence; (iii) recorded the verdict; and (iv) noted whether the verdict depended on the hierarchy that is, whether it would have been reachable

without ranking the genres. Step (iv) is the test of the instrument: an instrument that only confirms what unranked reading already yields adds nothing.

Two safeguards were adopted to keep the procedure reproducible. First, both filters were applied to the whole corpus before any of the three propositions was examined, so that no source was graded with knowledge of the use to which it would be put. Second, each grading decision records the criterion that determined it (Table 2, final column), so that a reader who disputes a grade can see which criterion is in dispute and what would change if it were decided the other way. Where a source could be assigned to two tiers the autobiography, for instance, is an ego-document that also contains publicistic self-presentation the lower tier was chosen, so that the procedure errs against its own conclusions.

Three limitations bound the study. First, the primers are used in the 1988 printed text, which is graded A–B: no editorial intervention has been identified in them, but direct collation with the manuscript witnesses remains outstanding, and until it is completed all conclusions drawn from them carry that qualification. Second, no

curricula, timetables, class registers or examination materials from Hamza’s schools have been located; what the primers support is a reconstruction of design decisions, not of classroom practice. Third, page verification is incomplete: quotations taken from TAT 2 at 314, 365–366, 369–396 and 395 have been checked against the printed volume, while those drawn from the novel, the play, the autobiography and the school announcement are marked [p. —] pending verification (Table 4). Two of the three verdicts below rest wholly on verified pages; the third rests on material evidence reported in the secondary literature and is flagged accordingly.

RESULTS

Table 2 reports the first filter. Two results are worth isolating. The play that occupied the largest share of curricular time is C-grade: the circulating text was restored in 1939 by another author, and the edition’s own annotations state that the original has not been found. And the editorial prefaces the source of the three propositions under test are tier 5 and C-grade simultaneously, which is to say they carry no evidential force whatever as testimony to Hamza’s position.

Table 2

Reliability grade and genre tier of the principal sources

Source	Grade	Tier	Basis of grading
The three primers (TAT 2, 1988)	A–B	1	Printed in full from manuscript; no intervention identified; collation outstanding
“Maktabi Dor ul-aytom” (school announcement)	B	2	Contemporary publication; states the school’s admission and provisioning rules
Autobiography (Tarjimai hol)	B	2	Author’s own account; names dates and officials, hence checkable
Divan manuscripts (inv. 8989; R-89)	A	4	Primary witnesses; the Kokand copy made in 1915 by an associate
Zaharli hayot, 1916 lithograph (inv. 8180)	A	4	Lifetime publication
Boy ila xizmatchi, text of 1939	C	4	Original never found; circulating text is another author’s reconstruction
Prefaces and annotations (1960, 1988)	C	5	Documents of interpretation, not of authorship

The distribution across the table is itself a result. Of the sources that carry the highest evidential force for claims about educational position tiers 1 and 2 none was in full circulation before 1988. Of the sources that carry the least tiers 4 and 5 every item was published, repeatedly, and two of them were taught in schools. The canon did not argue against the primers; it never had to, because for fifty years there was nothing for the primers to argue with. This is what makes the case diagnostic rather than merely unfortunate: the editorial programme and the genre hierarchy line up almost exactly in inverse order, which is precisely the configuration in which unranked reading produces confident and wrong results.

The evidence adduced for this proposition in the canonical literature is drawn exclusively from tier 4: passages in the plays and verse in which characters denounce superstition, the venality of judges and clerics, and the mistreatment of women. Read without a genre filter, such passages can be made to support the claim. Read with one, they cannot, for the elementary reason that a character's denunciation is not the author's creed, and the target of the denunciation practice, not belief is visible in the passages themselves.

The tier-1 evidence settles the matter in the opposite direction, and it does so structurally rather than by isolated quotation. Yengil adabiyot opens with a lesson on divine unity; the section "Ikkinchi sinf uchun" opens with praise of God (TAT 2, 369). Most decisively, the obligation to acquire knowledge is grounded in the categories of the sharia. In the article "Ilm" the author writes: "In our sharia, the first thing made obligatory for us is to know by knowledge all the attributes of the Lord who brought us into being from nothing, and to do all that He has commanded and to refrain from what He has forbidden. And in order to know and do these things, one must first acquire knowledge" (TAT 2, 365). The same article states the anthropological premise of the whole system: "O children, the first thing necessary and needful for every human child in this world is to be possessed of knowledge. To call a person without knowledge fully human is precisely an error" (TAT 2, 365).

This is not an incidental religious colouring. It is the architecture of the book: the metaphysical ground is laid first, the value of knowledge is derived from it, and the moral content follows. A textbook author transmits

to seven-year-olds what he considers worth transmitting; there is no character to hide behind and no irony to invoke. The verdict is therefore refuted, and it depends on the hierarchy: without it, tier-4 passages and tier-1 passages appear as competing quotations of equal weight, and the dispute is irresoluble.

It is worth being explicit about why the structural argument is stronger here than any single quotation would be. A hostile reader can always suggest that a devotional passage in a textbook was a concession to a censor, a patron or a parent body. That suggestion is testable, and it fails on three counts. The devotional material is not appended but foundational: it occupies the opening block of the book, and the argument for studying is derived from it rather than laid beside it. It recurs across separate works rather than appearing once. And it survived into a Soviet-era edition whose editors had every reason to remove it and, as the record of substitutions elsewhere in the corpus shows, no scruple about doing so silently which indicates that it was too integral to excise without destroying the text. Concession explains an ornament; it does not explain an architecture.

One clarification is needed, since the finding is easily over-read. Refuting the proposition does not make Hamza a religious functionary. His position is that of a Muslim reformist intellectual for whom belief is retained while superstition, ignorance and injustice conducted under religious cover are attacked. It is precisely this distinction between religion and superstition that the canonical reading collapsed, and the collapse was possible only because the tier-1 evidence was out of circulation.

This proposition was the organising thesis of the field for half a century. Its evidential basis, as the first sustained critique observed, was never examined: whether Hamza had read Marx or Lenin before 1917, in what language, from where, or whether he took part in any demonstration, were questions the literature did not raise (Sharafiddinov 2004). The critique is a tier-5 source and cannot by itself settle the matter; but it correctly identifies that the proposition was inherited rather than demonstrated.

Two independent tests are available. The first is chronological. Every element of the educational system predates 1917: the schools were opened between 1910

and 1915, the primers written in 1914–15, the orphans' school and the reading tract for adults belong to 1914–15. The second is lexical and structural, and it is a tier-1 test: in the primers the aim of instruction is grounded in religious obligation, in the criterion of full humanity, and in the removal of social ills caused by ignorance “all the bad dispositions we have spoken of above arise solely from our ignorance and lack of upbringing” (TAT 2, 395). Class struggle, the proletariat and revolution do not appear as categories anywhere in the instructional corpus.

The verdict is not supported, with a rider. The rider is that the proposition is not merely unsupported but malformed: it redescribes pre-1917 activity in terms of a significance it could acquire only afterwards. This is the error Skinner named the mythology of prolepsis (Skinner 1969, 22–23) and Butterfield diagnosed in an earlier historiography (Butterfield 1931) a narrative organised by its endpoint, and therefore structurally unable to register whatever does not lead there. The educational work of 1910–15 is exactly what such a narrative cannot see, which is why its documentary base could be left unpublished without anyone experiencing a gap.

A second tier-1 consideration reinforces the chronological one. The instructional corpus is not addressed only to children. Alongside the primers Hamza produced a reading tract for adults whose preface identifies its audience with unusual precision married men and women over twenty, schooled in the old maktab in the old orthography and therefore unable to read the newly printed books and periodicals and which is deliberately set in the old orthography so as to reach them). Whatever one makes of the later literacy campaigns, this two-generation strategy is documented in 1915, before the political vocabulary of the canon existed, and it is intelligible entirely in terms of the educational premise stated in the primers: if ignorance is transmitted through the household, working with the child alone will not break the chain. A description that reads the adult work of the 1920s as the fulfilment of a revolutionary vocation has to ignore its 1915 prototype; a description that begins from the instructional corpus does not.

This proposition appears in an editorial preface tier 5, grade C alongside the classification of Jadid literature as “reactionary literature serving the interests of the

national bourgeoisie”. No tier-1 to tier-3 evidence is offered for it.

The counter-evidence is of a kind the hierarchy does not itself rank, and this is instructive: it is material. In 1915 Hamza assembled a library for his schools in Kokand containing Saidrasul Saidazizov's *Ustodi avval*, Munavvarqori Abdurashidxonov's *Yer yuzi*, Abdulla Avloniy's *Birinchi muallim*, Ikkinchi muallim and Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq, and Rustambek Yusufbek xoji's *Ta'limi avval* (Jabborov 2015; Karimov 2012). This is the core textbook stock of Jadid pedagogy. An acquisition list is an act, not a statement: it cannot be ironised, and it was not composed for an audience. One does not assemble the teaching apparatus of a system one opposes.

A tier-1 corroboration is available. The moral section of the primers organises virtues and vices in antonymic pairs and alternates verse with prose exposition the construction model of Sa'di's *Gulistan*, which is also the model of Avloniy's *Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq*. The author states the organising principle himself, at the close of the section: “The opposite of treachery is fidelity. Now, God willing, you will read about fidelity beginning with the second book” (TAT 2, 369–396). Shared method is weaker evidence than shared possession, but it points the same way. The verdict is refuted; the finding does not depend on the hierarchy, since material evidence would have settled it in any case, and this is recorded as a limit on the instrument's marginal value.

Testing negative propositions is only half of what the ranking makes possible. Once the instructional texts are treated as the governing evidence, they also yield a positive description that the earlier literature could not produce. Three features may stand for the rest. First, the ordering criterion of the material: the forty-five lessons of *Yengil adabiyot* move from the metaphysical ground through the school as an institution and the value of knowledge to moral exemplars, so that the material is sequenced by motivation and value rather than by the linguistic difficulty that governed the traditional maktab. Second, the design statements of the preface: a named year group, one lesson a week, a deliberate control of lexical difficulty in favour of “open meaning”, and an explicitly propaedeutic function in relation to the second year (TAT 2, 314). Third, the lesson apparatus of the moral section, in which a

couplet, a prose exposition and a story recur in a fixed order, and in which the story is presented as proof rather than ornament (TAT 2, 369–396).

None of these observations required new archival discoveries; all of them were available in the printed 1988 volume for more than three decades. What was

missing was not the documents but a rule that made them the governing evidence rather than one quotation-pool among several. This is the strongest practical argument for the instrument: it changes which texts a researcher reads first, and therefore what is found.

Table 3

Outcome of the three propositions after grading and genre ranking

Proposition	Evidence in the literature	Decisive counter-evidence	Verdict	Hierarchy needed?
Irreligious	Tier 4 (characters in plays and verse)	Tier 1: the book opens with divine unity; knowledge grounded in sharia (TAT 2, 365, 369)	Refuted	Yes
Singer of the revolution	Tier 5 (editorial paratext), repeated	Chronology (all elements pre-1917) plus tier-1 silence on class categories (TAT 2, 395)	Not supported	Partly
Opponent of the Jadids	Tier 5 (editorial preface)	Material: the 1915 library; corroborated by shared tier-1 method	Refuted	No

What survives the procedure is a positive description, and it is modest by design. Hamza is best characterised as a practitioner-didactician: an educator who wrote no theoretical treatise, whose principles are recoverable only from the structure of his instructional texts, and whose decisions arise from obstacles rather than doctrine adapting the script to the reader, dividing material into weekly lessons, supplying learning materials at the school's expense. Across every phase of his working life, from 1910 to 1929, the political framing changed repeatedly and the object of the work did not: bringing into education those whom education had passed by.

To check that the procedure is capable of returning an unfavourable result, it was also applied to a proposition congenial to the present argument: that Hamza's primers were composed with a deliberate instructional design rather than assembled ad hoc. Here the tier-1 evidence is strong the preface names a year group, a weekly cadence, a policy on lexical difficulty and a propaedeutic aim (TAT 2, 314) but it establishes

intention, not execution, and the documents that would show execution do not exist. The verdict recorded is therefore supported for design, not established for practice. The procedure does not deliver everything the researcher would like, which is the minimum condition for taking seriously the cases in which it delivers a great deal.

DISCUSSION

The hierarchy earns its place chiefly on Proposition 1, and the reason is generalisable. Where a claim concerns what an author held, the operative variable is the distance the genre inserts between the author and the proposition. A novelist may voice a view in order to examine or condemn it; a textbook author selecting what a first-year class will read has no such latitude, because the text is not a representation of a position but an enactment of one. The primer is, in this precise sense, a performative document. That is why its silences are informative too: the absence of class categories from the instructional corpus is evidence in a way that their absence from a lyric poem would not be.

The three propositions entered the literature through editorial prefaces and were sustained by repetition. Prefaces are routinely treated as quasi-authorial because they are bound into the same volume as the author's words; the hierarchy places them at tier 5, outside the authorial corpus altogether. Demotion does not mean discarding: as evidence for the history of interpretation, the 1960 preface is a primary source of the first rank, and reading it that way as a document of its moment rather than a defective piece of scholarship is more productive than correcting it.

The consequences of mixing genres were not confined to scholarship. Between the 1960s and the 1990s the school curriculum allocated ten to twelve hours to Hamza, of which six to seven were given to the play whose circulating text is a 1939 reconstruction (Abdurahmonova 2020). More than half of the curricular encounter with a canonised author was thus mediated by a C-grade, tier-4 text, and pupils were not told. The point is not that the play should have been excluded a reconstruction can be taught, and taught well, once it is labelled but that an unlabelled reconstruction teaches an epistemological lesson nobody intended.

The instrument is complementary to, rather than in competition with, the advice already available. Depaepe's commandments enjoin contextualisation and warn against anachronism (Depaepe 2010) but leave open which context governs when sources conflict; the hierarchy answers that question for one recurring class of conflict. Skinner's contextualism concerns the recovery of illocutionary intention (Skinner 1969) and is here specialised to a genre in which intention is unusually accessible, because instruction is itself an intentional act performed on a reader. Genette's account of paratext (Genette 1997) supplies the theoretical warrant for tier 5, and textual scholarship (Tanselle 1989; Greetham 1994) supplies the first filter. The contribution is the combination and the ordering, not the components.

The hierarchy should be suspended in two situations. The first is when the instructional text is itself an instrument of external compulsion a state-mandated textbook whose content the nominal author did not choose. Here the author–proposition distance reopens, and tier 1 loses its privilege; the historian must first establish authorial control over content. Hamza's

primers pass this test easily, since they were written for schools he opened himself, but many textbooks do not. The second is when the question is not what the author held but what a period made sayable, imaginable or publishable. For that question the ranking inverts, and literary and periodical sources become primary.

Three disclaimers are needed. It does not adjudicate between two tier-1 sources that disagree; for that, ordinary textual and contextual argument is required. It does not convert absence of evidence into evidence of absence in general the silence of the instructional corpus on class categories is informative only because the corpus is complete for the relevant years and the categories in question are ones a Marxist educator would have had occasion to use. And it does not license the reverse inference: showing that a proposition rests on tier-5 evidence establishes that it is unsupported, not that its negation is true. Proposition 2 is reported as “not supported” rather than “refuted” for exactly this reason.

If the genres that served a canon are the ones that were published, then the genres that did not serve it are the ones that remain to be found and they are systematically the humblest. For an educator this means curricula, timetables, class registers, admission notices, examination papers, book orders and library inventories. Such documents are rarely catalogued under the subject's name; they survive, if at all, in the education files of provincial administrative archives, in charitable-society records, and in the commercial papers of printers and booksellers. In the present case the search that would most improve the evidential base is not for further literary manuscripts, of which the field already has many, but for the school records of 1910–15 in the education holdings of the national and Fergana provincial archives, and for the original inventory of the 1915 Kokand library. The hierarchy thus has a practical corollary: it tells the researcher not only which sources to weight but which to go looking for.

The instrument is designed for corpora shaped by a canonising editorial programme, and such corpora are common: they occur wherever a state has needed a usable predecessor. The procedure requires only that the historian state the tier and grade of each source before argument begins, which has the incidental benefit of making the argument falsifiable a reader can dispute a grading without disputing the conclusion, and

can see immediately which conclusions would fall if a grading changed. Its principal cost is that it slows publication, since grading requires collation the secondary literature does not supply.

Three should be restated. The primers remain A–B rather than A until collated against manuscript witnesses; the verdict on Proposition 3 rests on material evidence reported at second hand, and the composition of the 1915 library should be verified against the original inventory; and page verification is incomplete, as Table 4 records. None of these affects the direction of the findings, but each affects the weight that can be placed on them, and the distinction between direction and weight is precisely what the procedure exists to preserve.

Demoting the canonical propositions carries its own temptation, which is to install an equally tidy counter-image. The subject of this case does not permit one: the same person was among the initiators of a Jadid national literature and contributed to the ideologised Soviet literature that displaced it; supported the short-lived Turkestan Autonomy and later served the Soviet state; honoured Islamic values and took part in an act of desecration at Shohimardon. A procedure that suppressed these facts would repeat, with the sign reversed, the operation it was designed to detect. What the hierarchy licenses is narrower and more defensible: a description of the educational position, held stable across the whole working life, alongside an unedited record of the political positions, which were not stable at all. Keeping the two descriptions apart is not evasion; it is the condition of being able to state either of them accurately.

CONCLUSION

Sources of different genres are not interchangeable testimony to what an educator believed, and the difference can be specified in advance. Ranked by the distance the genre inserts between author and proposition, instructional texts stand highest, administrative and ego-documents next, publicistic and literary texts below them, and editorial paratext outside the authorial corpus altogether. Applied together with a reliability grading, and tested on three propositions that governed a national field of scholarship for fifty years, the ranking refuted two and left the third unsupported; in the first case it was indispensable to the

result.

The wider implication concerns where historians of education should expect to find their strongest evidence. In a canonised corpus the genres that served the canon are the ones that were published, taught and quoted. The genres that did not serve it the primer, the timetable, the admission notice are the ones most likely to have been left unpublished, and, on the argument advanced here, the ones most likely to carry decisive weight. The archival implication follows directly: in such corpora the least conspicuous documents deserve to be looked for first.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurahmonova, B. 2020. "Hamza asarlarining ta'lim bosqichlarida o'rganilishi masalasi." *Pedagogik mahorat*, no. 4.
2. Amonov, Sh. 2019. "Hamza she'riyati: manba va matn tadqiqi." In *Hamza va XX asr o'zbek adabiyoti*. Tashkent–Kokand.
3. Avloniy, A. 1992. *Turkiy guliston yoxud axloq*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
4. Baldauf, I. 2001. "Jadidism in Central Asia within Reformism and Modernism in the Muslim World." *Die Welt des Islams* 41 (1): 72–88.
5. Butterfield, H. 1931. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. London: G. Bell and Sons.
6. Chartier, R. 1994. *The Order of Books*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
7. Chevallard, Y. 1991. *La transposition didactique*. 2nd ed. Grenoble: La Pensée Sauvage.
8. Depaepe, M. 2010. "The Ten Commandments of Good Practices in History of Education Research." *Zeitschrift für pädagogische Historiographie* 16: 31–34.
9. Dobrenko, E. 2001. *The Making of the State Writer*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
10. Dolimov, U. 2006. *Turkistonda jadid maktablari*. Tashkent: Universitet.
11. Gadamer, H.-G. 2004. *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Continuum.
12. Genette, G. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Greetham, D. C. 1994. *Textual Scholarship: An*

Introduction. New York: Garland.

14. Hamza Hakimzoda Niyoziy. 1988. To'la asarlar to'plami. 5 vols. Vol. 2: Pedagogik risolalar. Nasr. Tashkent: Fan. [cited as TAT 2]
15. Jabborov, N. 2015. Zamon. Mezon. She'riyat. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom.
16. Kamp, M. 2006. The New Woman in Uzbekistan. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
17. Karimov, N. 2012. XX asr o'zbek adabiyoti taraqqiyoti. Tashkent: Fan.
18. Keller, S. 2001. To Moscow, Not Mecca. Westport, CT: Praeger.
19. Khalid, A. 1998. The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia. Berkeley: University of California Press.
20. Khalid, A. 2015. Making Uzbekistan: Nation, Empire, and Revolution in the Early USSR. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
21. Qosimov, B. 2002. Milliy uyg'onish: jasorat, ma'rifat, fidoyilik. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat.
22. Sharafiddinov, O. 2004. Ijodni anglash baxti. Tashkent: Sharq.
23. Skinner, Q. 1969. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8 (1): 3–53.
24. Tanselle, G. T. 1989. A Rationale of Textual Criticism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.