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This article focuses on the ways the Soviet authorities in Uzbekistan, and specially the scholars, dealt with the figure of ‘Ali Shîr Nawâ’î (844-906/1441-1501), the great poet of Central Asia, and his connections with Sufism, within an ideological framework dominated by the dogma of “scientific atheism.”

Nawâ’î was initiated into the Naqshshbandiyya order by his spiritual master and lifelong friend, the great Persian poet and mystic, Jâmî, in 881/1476-7. His work was deeply influenced by Sufism and Naqshbandî doctrine. During the Soviet period, due to his historical importance, the authorities had no choice but to take him into consideration in a way that would not detract the materialist ideology. Emphasis was therefore put on his “humanist” and “materialistic” conceptions, and even when the scholars had to speak of Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband they tried to conceal as much as they could his religious and mystical influences on the poet. So along with Nawâ’î, even Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband became some kind of pre-communist figure.

This sort of “patrimonialisation,” that is to say a kind of official exploitation of two major historical and religious figures in Central Asia turned into pre-Soviet characters, had soon had to face the independence of the country in 1991. During this period, speaking of Sufism was encouraged by the new authorities who wanted to promote what they regarded as “the golden heritage” of free Uzbekistan. But ten years after the independence, some Uzbek scholars pointed out the fact that in the field of “Navoishunoslik” (“Studies on Nawâ’î’s life and work”) Sufi matters were still not enough investigated. This shows how significant has been the impact of the Soviet ideological policies on modern Uzbekistan and some of the difficulties the country has to face to recover its own heritage.
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I. Introduction
Nizâm Dîn ‘Ali Shîr, later called Mîr ‘Alî Shîr, with the pen-name of Nawâ’î (1441-1501), is a well-known outstanding fifteenth century Chaghatay poet and an important Central Asian cultural figure of the reign of the Timurid sultan Husayn Bâyqarâ (1469-1506). After his death, his name was revered throughout Central Asia and the poet became a central feature of the cultural heritage of the region, especially in Uzbekistan, where Nawâ’î is still renowned above all other poets.¹

During the Soviet period the doctrine of “scientific atheism” kept a lot of Central Asian writers in the dark and numerous of works were banished from publication because of their connections with Islam. Nevertheless, a figure like Nawâ’î was one of major importance and in the construction of a new-born Central Asian Soviet republic like Uzbekistan, the authorities had no choice but to take him into consideration in a way that would not detract the materialist ideology.

Due to his relationships with great Sufi like Jâmî, his involvement in the Naqshbandiyya brotherhood—a Sufi order which became and remained an exceptionally important influence in its Central Asia homeland—and most of all the prominence given to Sufism in his own work, the problem for the Soviet authorities was far from easy. If the Soviets at first tried to conceal as much as they could Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband’s religious and mystical influences on Nawâ’î and emphasized the Chaghatay poet’s “humanist” and “progressive” conceptions so as to keep him away from Naqshbandi Sufism and religious matters, they eventually did not hesitate to tackle the Naqshband’s figure in a way that is quite significant of the methods the Soviet ideological policy was ready to put into practice.

This is that kind of methods and some of their repercussions on the studies devoted to Nawâ’î in Uzbekistan this paper would like to examine.

II. Nawâ’î’s Connections with Sufism
Considered as the greatest representative of Chaghatay Turkish literature which, thanks to him, reached its apogee in the second half of the fifteenth century at the court of Husayn Bâyqarâ in Herat, Nawâ’î was already regarded by his contemporaries as the greatest poet to have ever written in the Turkish language.² But, apart from his political and his intellectual activities, he became acquainted with the Naqshbandiyya tariqa founded in Bukhara by the Sheikh Mohammad Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband (1317-1389) which rapidly became the most important of all Sufi brotherhoods. The one who was to become an
important member was initiated into the Naqshbandiya order by his spiritual master and lifelong friend, the great Persian poet and mystic, Ḵāmī, in 1476-1477. Ḵāmī’s spiritual prestige was important: as the former disciple and successor of Sa’dd ud-Dīn Kashgharī (d. 1456), who was himself the successor of the great Bahā ud-Dīn Naqshband, Ḵāmī was the representative in Herat of the powerful Naqshbandiya order centred at the time in Samarqand.

When Nawâ’ī met Ḵāmī, not only he became his murīd (“spiritual disciple”), but soon they became close friends whose literary interests coincided. During all of his life Nawâ’ī remained loyal to his master, and strengthened their ties by a close intellectual collaboration. Moreover, it is well known that Ḵāmī’s most substantial and widely read contribution to the Sufi canon was perhaps his Nafahât ul-Uns (“Breaths of Fellowship”), a hagiographical compendium that marked the apex of the genre in Persian. But it is commonly less mentioned that it was Nawâ’ī who encouraged him to complete his work.6 Besides some three years after the death of Ḵāmī, ‘Alī Shīr Nawâ’ī translated the Nafahât into Chaghatay as Nasâyim ul-Muhabbat min Shamâyimi’l-Futuwwa (“Perfumes of Love from Zephyrs of the Futuwwa”). On the one hand, he abbreviated some of the entries found in the original, and on the other, he expanded it by including material on Ḵāmī himself as well. It was the first tazkirah ever written in Turkish which gives information about seven hundred and seventy Sufis.

Apart from the Nasâyim ul-Muhabbat a number of Nawâ’ī’s works are directly related to Sufism, and especially to the Naqshbandiya. Two pieces are particularly important. The first poem (dâstân) of Nawâ’ī’s Khamsâ, Hayrat al-abrâr (“The Confusion of the Righteous”) (1483) is a didactic mathnâvî modelled on Nizâmi’s Makhzan al-asrâr, Amîr Khusraw’s Matla’ al-anwâr and Ḵâmī’s Tuhfat al-abrâr. Like these three pieces, it is a mystical poem with illustrative anecdotes. The chapter XXI, for instance, is devoted to an eulogy of Bahâ ud-Dīn Naqshband. This chapter is built like a qasîda and his sarlawha9 is unambiguous:

In the eulogy of Khâja Bahâ ud-Dīn Naqshband, may his secrets be sanctified, [say that] the Designer of Art [God] with the pen of Wisdom, on the page of Time, has designed, with an Islamic manner, the ornament of his existence, and with his quality of true guidance, has erased the Chinese and European ornaments from the page of the heart of infidel peoples and [we present our] supplication to Khâja ‘Ubaidallâh, may God keep him healthy, who he is the absolute
successor of the holiness [Naqshband], and most of all the caliph of the truth.\textsuperscript{10}

Bahā ud-Dīn Naqshband is depicted as the one who has extended Islam throughout non-Muslim world and Khāja Ahrār\textsuperscript{11} is regarded as a “caliph.”

Significant references are also made to Bahā ud-Dīn Naqshband in \textit{Lisān ut-tayr} ("The Language of the Birds") a retelling of Attār’s \textit{Mantiq ut-tayr} ("Speech of the Birds") in Chaghatay Turkish. The \textit{Mantiq ut-tayr} is an allegorical poem whose subject is the quest of the birds for the mythical Simurgh, the birds typifying the Sufi pilgrims, and the Simurgh “the Truth.” Nawā’i claimed his work as a translation in Chaghatay Turkish of ‘Attār’s work. Although there are significant differences between the two works, like \textit{Mantiq ut-tayr}, \textit{Lisān ut-tayr} is also “a story about the hard journey to Sufi enlightenment.”\textsuperscript{12} Some verses of the poem tend to show that the Hoopoe who leads the birds to the Simurgh-God was no other than Bahā ud-Dīn Naqshband.\textsuperscript{13} His name is explicitly quoted in the \textit{sarlawha} of the chapter CLXIII:

Bahā ud-Dīn’s words at the stage of the perfect nothingness.\textsuperscript{14}

which means that Bahā ud-Dīn’s words are the way to obtain “perfect nothingness,” the aim of the mystical-Sufi quest.

These are two significant works that show the importance of the figure of Bahā ud-Dīn in Nawā’i’s work, but the question is much more complex since the matter of Sufism can be investigated in most of the poet’s works. For instance, whereas the \textit{Muhakammat ul-lughateyn} (“Judgment of Two Languages”) has always been considered as a kind of linguistic essay dealing with the respective merits of Persian and Turkish languages by different traditions of researchers, Alexandre Papas has recently advocated that the text dealt much more with mystic and Sufism than linguistics.\textsuperscript{15} Similarly, the question could be asked for the other \textit{mathnawīs} of the \textit{Khamsa}\textsuperscript{16} since each of the “narrative” poems embodies a mystical vision of the relation between the soul and God.\textsuperscript{17}

The question also remains for the divāns too. In 1996 A. Hajitmetov pointed out that in \textit{Badāe‘ul bidāya}, the first divān of Nawā’i, written during his youth, there was a \textit{qit’a} devoted to Naqshband. The \textit{qit’a} begins like this: “If you say let my solitude (\textit{khilwatīm}) not become society (\textit{anjuman}),” and ends with this \textit{matla’}:
With this melody you will become Naqshband
Nawâ’i if it comes your turn.18

a motto which reminds the famous Naqshband’s “khilwat dar anjuman (solitude within society).” According to Hajitmetov there are a great number of qit’a like this one in the other divâns.

These few aforementioned examples are good illustrations but a definitive answer on the influence of Naqshband’s Sufism in Nawâ’i’s work would be preliminary, and the point remains until further researches are done.19 The fact is that a satisfactory answer has been severely delayed since the question was tackled in an unambiguous way during the Soviet period.

III. Soviet Policies and Sufism in Uzbekistan
In 1924 the political map of contemporary Central Asia was born. The three khanats of Turkistan, Bukhara and Khiva were reconstituted as the Soviet socialist republics of Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, and later Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan also became union republics. These lands of Islamic tradition were confronted with one of the most important themes of Soviet ideology, the doctrine of “scientific atheism.” Since Stalin’s access to power, a period which saw the closure and—in many cases destruction— of mosques throughout Soviet Central Asia, up to Khrushchev who wanted a return to the revolutionary purity of the civil war era and launched antireligious campaigns in the late 1950’s, and even after in the Brezhnev period, the struggle against religion took many forms.20 As wrote Adeeb Khalid: “All form of Islamic expression came under sustained assault in the Soviet period: patterns of the transmission of Islamic knowledge were damaged, if not destroyed; Islam was driven from the public realm; the physical marking of Islam, such as mosques and seminaries, disappeared.”21

The problem was that the Soviets occupied a region which had become one of the most active areas of Sufis expansion. Several of the most important and celebrated brotherhoods were founded in Central Asia: the Kubrawiyya and Yasawiyya brotherhoods in the twelfth century and the Naqshbandiyya in the fourteenth. As a consequence of the Soviet occupation, much of the continuity of Central Asian Islam with its past, including the Sufi tradition, was irreparably disrupted. Due to the fact that the Soviet regime framed its official rhetoric in terms of progress, defining progress in entirely nonreligious and antireligious terms, no public position could be justified with reference to Islam and its moral or ethical value; at best, religion was a human construct corresponding with a
primitive stage in the development of human society: it was nothing but a “significant de-Islamization of the terms of public discourse.” The Naqshbandiyaa and Sufism in general were presented as tools of the state used to control the lives of working people. The fifteenth-century Naqshbandi saint, Khâja Ahrâr, the most influential figure after Bahâ ud-Dîn, was commonly portrayed as a large feudal land owner who used his religious status to oppress the peasantry and in particular the signatory to the unjust death warrant against Ulugh Bek.23

Thus, under the official state doctrine of “scientific atheism,” Islamic institutions were destroyed or dismantled, along with Sufi tariqas which suffered great damages.24 During the period, Islam and Islamic institutions, including Sufism, were constantly blamed for the “backwardness” of the Uzbeks.25 The practice of ziyârat (pilgrimage or visit to the tomb of a saint) was particularly discouraged and many tombs fell into disrepair, whereas ziyârat never completely ceased;26 and if the tomb of Naqshbandi had never been damaged by the Soviet authorities, the tomb of Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband’s pir Mir Kulâl fell into ruin.

The question that one could ask then is: what would happen for a figure like Nawâ’î who precisely glorified Khâja Ahrâr, who modelled his life on the teachings of great Sufi master like Bahâ ud-Dîn, and who took lessons from a mystic like Jâmî?

IV. The Political Significance of the Soviet Navoiyshunoslik
In fact, Alisher Nawâ’î was such a figure of Central Asia, and especially for Uzbekistan, that he could not be simply concealed by the materialist regime. From his death up to the making of the Soviet empire, generations of orientalist researchers had collected his work, worked on it and published studies on the subject.27

Among them, E. E. Bertel’s was certainly the most famous Russian scholar who contributed to make Nawâ’î a prominent figure. He was one of the Russian scholars who were evacuated from Leningrad during the World War II towards Tashkent where he began to work with Uzbek scholars on Nawâ’î’s work. Within the Soviet Empire the situation had changed, 1941 being the year of Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. The regime had to soften its relationships with Central Asian who participated to the conflict, and to this respect, Soviet cultural policies tended to take more into consideration national distinct characters. For those reasons, in Uzbekistan, a jubilee celebration was organized in 1941 for the five hundredth birth anniversary of the Chaghatay poet’s birth.28
After being cancelled, the celebration finally took place following the conflict and a book was published in 1946 in Russian. Bertel’s was one of the six contributors. His article dealt with the way Nawā’ī has imitated Nizāmī’s Khamsa and it is in fact quite representative: over the six articles four are devoted to literary aspects; none is related to Sufism or religion. Borovkov’s contribution is also significant: the scholar portrays Nawā’ī as founder of literary Uzbek, the use of the expression “literary Uzbek” implied that “Old Uzbek” was an equivalent of “Chaghatay Turkish,” the language in which the poet wrote a great part of his work. Thus Nawā’ī had become an “Old Uzbek writer” rather than a Turkish poet figure, since at the time Uzbek meant Soviet, and Turkish did not.

Bertel’s and Borovkov had set the tone: Nawā’ī is a great Uzbek writer who has established “Old Uzbek” language and literature. Nothing important has to be said about any kind of religious involvement. It’s a matter of Uzbek literature, language, and history. The major part of Soviet studies of Nawā’ī’s works would go that way.

To this end, the Soviet Navoiyshunoslik, that is to say the studies devoted to Nawā’ī’s work and life during this period, would not in any case interfere with the doctrine of “scientific atheism.” With this kind of nonreligious Nawā’ī who was suitable for the progressive materialist framework, the poet could also become a figure that contributed to establishing Uzbekistan as indigenous space. Along with the numerical indigenization of the communist party in Uzbekistan, the elaboration of a national Uzbek identity ethnogenesis, Nawā’ī took place in Khrushchev’s and Brezhnev’s policies that wanted to shape the contours of local Soviet societies in Central Asia. The aim was to make the five nations of Central Asia look natural, by giving them a common existence stretching back to time long forgotten and by celebrating the magnificent heritage that each nation has created. Along with Nawā’ī, figures such as Beruni or Ibn Sina were all claimed as Uzbek and were supposed in return to embody the qualities of the communist regime. Therefore humanities scholars came to see themselves as the keepers of their nations’ culture and Nawā’ī’s figure officially recognized as a member of the pantheon of national heroes. His name became ubiquitous in Uzbekistan, even a town was named after his name, and since 1959 the birth of the poet would be celebrated every year.

Thus, shaped by Soviet ideological policies, the Navoiyshunoslik could theoretically give a “suitable” version of the poet for the regime. But concretely, confronting this reshaping to his work was raising issues such as concealing Sufism, and more generally religious elements.
V. A Representative Handbook

Natan Muradovitch Mallaev published in Uzbek a well-known reference handbook in 1962 whose title was History of Uzbek Literature. In this work, the section which focuses on Nawâ’î begins with a general presentation setting the tone: the poet is presented as a “great humanist (gumanist),” a scholar (donishmand), a man who established the Uzbek classical language, a person of an encyclopaedic knowledge, but nothing is said about any religious activity nor idea. The lexicon is scientific and the mention madanij hajot rahbar which introduces the poet as “a guide for cultural life,” though being quite elliptic, is the only one that could recall any mark of religious activity. However, while reviewing the preceding works of orientalist scholars, the author stresses the point that it was the socialist times that gave great value to Nawâ’î’s work.

The chapter which deals with the poet’s life tries to hide his religious involvements. According to several sources, Nawâ’î is said to have read ‘Attâr when he was very young and memorized his book Mantiq ut-tayr. Mallaev emphasizes the supposed “bad influence” that this kind of reading has had on Nawâ’î due to its mystical aspects. At the same time, earlier in the text, his relations with Jâmî were described without any mention of the Naqshbandiyya order. Only their friendship, their literary collaboration, the example they represent for the cooperation of Uzbek and Tajik peoples were mentioned. The author speaks of relation of ustoz (“master”) and shogird (“student”) but no religious explanation was advanced. Nawâ’î and Jâmî are just two great poets and friends.

After the presentation of Nawâ’î’s life, Mallaev reviews a certain number of Nawâ’î’s works. All these works, according to the author’s commentaries, do not seem to involve neither religious nor Sufi influences. And when Mallaev tackles one of Nawâ’î’s major works, Hayrat al-abrâr, in which Sufi references are clear and numerous, he seems to consider that it is rather a question of philosophy than religion or Sufism, since the section which deals with these matters is entitled Falsafij masalalar (“Philosophical problems”). In the introduction of this section words like din, tassavuf, and islm are used to describe the mathnawi, but right away, Mallaev states that it is related to the “feudal” period the poet was forced to live in.

Then saying that poet’s philosophy is quite contradictory he stresses that Nawâ’î’s conceptions in this work are part of a kind of dialectic between materialistic and idealistic approaches. According to Mallaev’s words, the “materialist elements” refer to Nawâ’î’s acknowledgment of an “objective being (ob’ektiv borliq)” while the “idealistic” elements refer to the deification
(ilohijlashtirish) of this “objective being.” For this reason, without giving any further explanation, Mallaev describes Nawâ’i’s philosophy as a “pantheism.” Nevertheless the reader has to understand that:

In spite of Nawâ’i’s pantheism’s deification of the objective being and its idealistic meaning, his approach made of true love (samimij muhabbat) for the existing world, and especially for the human beings, had a progressive (progressiv) meaning concerning his optimistic view for human beings and their actions.55

Actually what is most important to Mallaev is to contrast Nawâ’i with mystical and ascetic Sufis. It is obvious when he claims:

Contrary to mystics who deny the objective being and ascetics who refuse it, not only Nawâ’i acknowledged objective being, but he tried to love it, to make it better, to fight for the happiness of human beings, and led the people to this.56

And when he feels he has to mention Nawâ’i’s eulogies about great Sufi figures such as Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband and Khâja Ahrâr, he states that in the feudal period authors like Nawâ’i were forced to do so.57

However we must not forget that:

Nawâ’i was not able to deeply understand the socio-political meaning of religion and Sufism, and above all that neither religion nor Sufism were essential and determining factors for his work.58

It is rather obvious that Mallaev’s purpose is to keep Nawâ’i away from Sufism and religion as far as he can. Emphasis put on Nawâ’i’s materialistik, progressiv, and gumanist (“humanist”) views bring him closer to the Soviet ideology than so-called idealistic conceptions. No wonder then if the following lines of the section tell a story from Hayrat ul-abrâr in which Nawâ’i ridicules dervishes,59 and if for the other mathnawis of the Nawâ’i’s Khamsa Mallaev does not mention any kind of Sufi influence nor interpretation.

Another problematic piece for the handbook’s author since it explicitly implies Sufi matters is Lisân ut-tayr, a work completed in 1498-1499 by Nawâ’i, which is a mystical mathnawi based on ‘Attâr’s Mantiq ut-tayr.60 As it was the case for Hayrat al-abrâr, there is no section in the handbook dealing with Sufi
or religious problems, and Mallaev also states that it’s nothing but “a complex philosophical work.” Complexity explained by the historical period, “full of contradictions.” Here the word “contradiction (ziddijat)” seems to refer to the presence of Sufi or religious elements in the text. So, as if he had to justify them, Mallaev explains that sometimes Nawâ’î has overcome the limits of his time (when Nawâ’î’s approach tends to be realistic), sometimes he wasn’t able (when his expression becomes Sufi or religious) to do that.

Actually what does interest Mallaev is not what Nawâ’î wasn’t able to do but certainly what he dared to. In the author’s words, in social matters (the most important for a Soviet reader), Nawâ’î would have gone beyond the principles of Islam and would have risen above his religious time. In fact,

Nawâ’î’s conceptions about objective being and divinity are very different from teaching of Islamic religion and even sometimes go in the opposite direction for some aspects.

Thus Nawâ’î contrasts to Islam but also to “mystical Sufism” and ascetics. The problem is that Mallaev does never make clear what he considers as “mystical Sufism” and does not specify the differences between Sufism and “mystical Sufism.” This statement seems even more obvious:

Nawâ’î’s pantheism with its optimistik meaning and its progressiv features compared to its time differs from Sufism’s pantheistic teaching.

Whereas Nawâ’î is an Islamic and a Sufi poet, it is only in a sense that comes in opposite to Islam and Sufism.

In fact, this kind of statements is repeated several times in the section. Emphasis is put on Nawâ’î’s rejection of “reactionary sheikhs (reaktion shajkhlar)” and ascetics’ “pantheism.” It’s his optimistik view towards human beings that makes him so different from others Sufi thinkers, even if these people are not described as “Sufi” but rather as “mystics,” “mystical Sufi,” “Sheikhs,” and “ascetics.” But the reasoning goes beyond:

Nawâ’î’s pantheistic conceptions are opposed to the teaching of Islam and to mystical and pessimistic Sufi’s conceptions.

Why isn’t it so obvious in the mathnawî, one should ask? Mallaev replies that
“Nawâ’î could not express his conceptions blatantly.” 66 Thus, the reader has to understand that Nawâ’î was a kind of heroic figure, dressed against Islam and “pessimistic Sufism.”

Therefore, since Nawâ’î’s “pantheism” does not mean a withdrawal of life (tarkidunjochilik), actually a conception which is conform to Naqshbandiyya doctrine (but Mallaev avoids to mention it), his acceptation of real life means, according to Mallaev, that he is inconsistent with ‘Attâr’s Mantiq ut-tayr, a “pessimistic” work in the terms of the author. Whereas ‘Attâr symbolizes “pessimistic Sufism,” Nawâ’î, more attached to real life, would embody an optimistic vision (the word “Sufism” is not mentioned here), and therefore a humanist and a progressive67 one, two key words of the Soviet ideology.

Actually, Mallaev’s handbook reflects the way the Soviet authorities wanted to exhibit the Chaghatay poet. Nawâ’î is a kind of avant-gardiste philosopher, with a materialistic approach, that makes him a pre-communist figure; and in this respect, the way Mallaev has concluded his section is unambiguous:

Nawâ’î who tirelessly sang praises of fight for humanism, friendship among people, peace and brotherhood, stands with great Soviet people who are building communist society, with all progressive people who are fighting for peace, democracy and socialism.68

Thus, no wonder Nawâ’î’s works were greatly censored; no wonder his clearly religious writings like other literatures which were steeped explicitly in the Islamic mystical tradition of Sufism or contained references to God, to the Prophet Muhammad, or the four Caliphs, were expunged;69 no wonder in Uzbek schools Farhâd wa Shirîn and Leyla wa Majmun, the two pieces that seemed the less religious, were the only ones to be studied: Farhâd was glorified for his Stakhanovism, and the two lovers were complained for their true love against “feudal reactionary society.” And more generally, in the public spheres, emphasis was strictly put on Nawâ’î moral and “humanist” teaching: it was his aphorisms and his ghazals that don’t explicitly imply religious matters which were published.70

Nevertheless, in the academic sphere, it was much more difficult to keep Naqshband’s influence in the dark and Uzbek scholars would have to face this problem soon or later. But they know that they would have to do so in a way that would not damage the framework of “scientific atheism.”
VI. Tackling the Naqshbandiyya Matters

In 1968 an article was published by V. J. Zohidov whose title was “Nawâ’î and the Naqshbandiyya” in a major revue of Uzbek linguistic and literature.\footnote{71} Zohidov was at the time regarded as one of the most respected in this type of research and his article is one of the very few that are devoted to this subject.\footnote{72}

The author begins saying that in order to understand Nawâ’î we have to examine his philosophical system\footnote{73} which is related to “Sufi-pantheist Naqshbandî.”\footnote{74} But even if Zohidov explains that he has to study Naqshband’s life and doctrine, even if the title of his article implies that it deals with Nawâ’î’s work, there won’t be in the paper a single reference that connects any Nawâ’î’s work with Naqshband’s teaching.

Presenting Naqshband’s conceptions, Zohidov opposes Naqshband’s “idealistic monism” (God is hidden in every element of this world\footnote{75}) with what he calls “Islam’s dualism” (there are two worlds, that of God and this world\footnote{76}). Then the author contrasts, in one sentence, Naqshbandî with other major Sufî figures like Hallâj, ‘Attâr and Rumi, whose rejection of world, according to Zohidov, is strictly opposed to Naqshband’s conceptions.\footnote{77} Emphasis is put on the necessity of the acknowledgement of the real life and the importance of taking benefits from it as Naqshband’s most important teaching.

Next, Zohidov outlines four characteristic mottos of the order: \textit{khilwat dar anjuman} (“solitude within society”), \textit{safar dar watan} (“travelling in the home”), \textit{nazar dar qadam} (“watching the steps”), \textit{khosh dar dam} (“awareness in breathing”). Actually, the presentation is quite biased since the four mottos are most of the time turned to support Soviet ideology’s slogans. For instance, while presenting \textit{khilwat dar anjuman}, as soon as the author has described the necessity of spending a social life without any kind of ascetic withdrawal, he uses his own interpretation so as to detract from other religious practices, arguing that Naqshbandî “shows that the other religious devotions are harmful” without solid justification.\footnote{78} This motto whose interpretation is the most developed is extended by stressing the necessity of helping people. What is interesting here is the example chosen by Zohidov: four peasants working together and helping each others in a single unity production which reminds a little the justification of Soviet kolkhozes. As for \textit{khosh dar dam}, the motto is interpreted as the necessity of enjoying benefits from the real world and turned against “religious leaders,” and eventually the prophet himself.\footnote{79}

Obviously what seems to interest Zohidov most is less the principles themselves than the rhetoric weapon he can turn against religious beliefs, and especially those of Islam. And so as to conclude, he does not hesitate to claim:
Therefore, Naqshbandî is not far from reviewing (revizija qilish) the religion of Islam, the reactionary Sufism (this of Rumî, Hallâj), and criticizing lots of their fundamentals.80

Yet, since this conclusion seems to be quite positive concerning an Islamic brotherhood, the author feels he has to moderate his word (but it is also in a way that would reduce religious matters):

We must mention that, although Naqshbandî had stood for pantheism, idealistic monism, and had produced therefore, especially vital, secular, optimistic conclusions that criticize Islamic religion in many matters, we must not forget that we cannot conclude that his conceptions (dunjoqarashlari) were completely free from mysticism,…from despairing and Platonist moments, and from Islamism.81

It is the same explanation that was given for Nawâ’î: despite his progressive conceptions fully in line with the materialist ideology Naqshband was restricted by the contradictions of his times.

Nevertheless,

In the conditions of the reign of foolish conservative reactionary Islamic religion, the fact he [Naqshband] came into light with secular ideas, and put forward democratic thoughts, in way that is significant enough, was a very courageous, and a avant-gardiste (ilghor) event, and for this aspect, Nawâ’î valued him especially highly….82

This would give the reason why Nawâ’î had written eulogies about him and had been initiated into the order by Jâmî. But being rather too obviously mystic for the author, Nawâ’î’s pir is put aside, for Zohidov assesses that “Alisher regarded Naqshbandî in a more concrete way than Jâmî did.”83 Here “concrete” is clearly an equivalent of “materialist.” And in the following lines two other key-words of the Soviet ideology appear in the same sentence: “democratic” and “progressive”;84 according to the author, these words would characterize features that explain the great popularity of the order in Central Asia (as they would explain the prosperity of the Soviet regime, the reader is supposed to add).

The way Naqshbandî is tackled does not differ very much from the manner
Nawâ’î was six years ago and shows how strong the ideological framework is. The same explanations for Nawâ’î and Naqshbandî are given: their connections with Islamic principles are related to historical conditions by which they were restricted. But what remains important is their historical contribution to the values that the Soviet ideology claims to embody: “humanism,” “progressism” and “realism.” And in a sense, Sufi matters are not very important since they differ from “Mystical Sufism,” “pessimistic Sufism,” and “reactionary Sufism.”

However, the question still remains and the authors do not give an answer: if “bad Sufism” is clearly stressed what kind of Sufism is the “good Sufism”? And if this “good Sufism” does exist, what kind of connection does link it with Nawâ’î’s life and work? In fact, it is clear that the point is not to give a philosophical or a moral definition of “convenient” Sufism nor define Nawâ’î’s real Sufism; but rather to see how prominent national figures may be suitable for the regime.85

Perhaps, Mallaev and Zohidov’s presentations and commentaries reveal how Nawâ’î and Naqshbandî could take place in the making of the “Homo islam-sovieticus” which typified not only the Brezhnev period in Central Asia,86 but the ways the Soviet ideology used great Islamic figures in Uzbekistan. As we said, all Islamic literatures as a part of the national heritage could not be denied completely, but their relationship to that heritage could be rethought in various ways. Therefore the so-called “materialistic and progressive ideology” made its own “patrimonial” use of those Sufi literature; a kind of exploitation which explains that fully concealment was not necessary.

VII. After the Independence: A Weighty Legacy

The collapse of the Soviet Union meant that the new Central Asian states could henceforth make their own cultural policy and thus act freely in the field of religious affairs. Interest in religion would not have to be hidden nor be shaped so as to fit the former materialist framework. Actually, as far back as the Gorbachev years, interest in religion already soared throughout the Soviet Union. More specifically, in Uzbekistan, interest in reopening shrines grew steadily.87 Vernon James Schubel wrote in the beginning of an article devoted to the present situation of the Naqshbandiyya in the country: “Since its independence from Soviet Union in 1992, it seems that there has been a tremendous resurgence of interest in Sufism among the people of Uzbekistan. One element of this renewed interest has been the appearance of numerous books, pamphlets, newspapers articles and television and radio broadcasts on the lives and teachings of the great awliyâs of Central Asia. These “post-Soviet
hagiographies,” presented almost entirely in the Uzbek language, rather than in Russian, are playing a great role in the process of the reconstruction of the Sufi tradition—especially the Naqshbandiya—in Uzbekistan.\textsuperscript{88} This resurgence of Sufi literature, including hagiographical materials, and the period around independence saw the publication for the first time of unexpurgated versions of Nawâ’î’s classical work.\textsuperscript{89}

The fact that the government has been supportive of “the reconstruction of the Sufi tradition” was due to its efforts to emphasize what the authorities regarded as the oltn meros, so as to say the “golden heritage” of the nation. Along with the reconstruction of the Sufi tradition as part of a glorious medieval past, Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband and ‘Alî Shîr Nawâ’î, the later as a representative of the Timurid period, were hence supposed to embody the great history of the country. The year 1993 was therefore officially recognized as the 675th birth anniversary of Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband’s birth and for this occasion major types of Naqshbandî literature were published.\textsuperscript{90} Sadriddin Salim Bukhari’s Dilda Yor,\textsuperscript{91} a popular work on Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband, was one of them; while including a brief biography and several explications of Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband’s doctrine, the author stressed the important role played by the Sufi master and the Naqshbandiya tradition on Uzbek literature and history and in particular his influence on Alisher Nawâ’î. Besides Bukhari does not hesitate to quote Nawâ’î’s tazkirah of great Sufi figures, the Nasîim ul-Muhabbat;\textsuperscript{92} similarly, other works of the poet are put in relation with the Naqshbandiya teaching: for example, chapters of Lisân ut-tayr, which had been republished without being expurgated, are directly connected to the Naqshbandi tradition.\textsuperscript{93} And when the bilingual revue Özbekistonda ijtimoij fanlar/Obshchestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane (Social Sciences in Uzbekistan), devoted a special issue to Naqshband’s birth, P. T Shodiev pointed out, in his paper, the importance of Naqshbandiyya influences of Nawâ’î and illustrates it by explanations on Nasâim ul-Muhabbat and commentaries on meaningful passages of Lisân ut-tayr.\textsuperscript{94}

Nevertheless, despite what had been done and claimed, three years later, in 1996—so as to say eleven years after the perestroika and five years after the formal independence of the country—Haytmetov noticed that the connections between Nawâ’î and Islam were still not enough studied. According to his own words, it was all the more pathetic that Islamic elements were central in Nawâ’î’s poetry, and contrary to Mallaev or Zohidov, during the Soviet period, he did not hesitate to write that: “In the formation and development of Nawâ’î’s work one of the most important factors is Islam and the Koran which organizes
its bases, along with hadiths of the prophet Muhammad." Haytmetov’s statement about the lack of investigation in this field was certainly not too harsh. It recalled that in spite of apparent claims for the return of Islam as a relevant factor in Navoiyshunoslik, one had to keep in mind that current academics were themselves trained in the former system which made antipathy to religion a cornerstone of its principle.

In 2001, ten years after the independence, a book dedicated for the five hundred and sixty years of the poet was published by the Nawā’ī’s Institute of Language and Literature. On the title page of the book it was notified that articles were devoted to problems which were not enough studied or could not be tackled before the independence; “the Sufi significance” of Nawā’ī’s work was identified as one of these problems. In the introduction of the book, authors asserted that only sixteen volumes over the twenty that constitute Nawā’ī’s complete work were published and that the seventeenth volume would be published soon. This seventeenth volume was Nasā’īm ul-Muhabbat and the introduction noticed that “it was the first time that this work would be fully published.” The next sentence is also significant: “So as to say that this precious source which deals with the history of Sufism, its expressions, its brotherhoods and the Sufi literature is doubtless interesting for scholars and writers, and in the same time for a large community of readers.” More than sixty years after the first jubilee of his five hundredth birthday, one of the most famous tazkirah written in Turkic Chaghatay, one of the most useful work devoted to Sufi figures in Central Asia, would be published in an uncensored version for the first time, in a country whose most famous artist was precisely ‘Alî Shīr Nawā’ī.

In one article of this book, whose title was “About Sufism and Nawā’ī’s poetry (Tasavvuf va Navoij she’riyati haqida),” Ibrohim Haqqul reminded the Uzbek reader that “it was well-known from history that Sufism was a teaching that influenced the development of our literature, our art and our music.” Nevertheless he deplored the lack of studies about Nawā’ī’s relationships with great Sufi figures in the field of Navoiyshunoslik. But there was an unexpected repercussion that was to be noticed by the author: “Even if during the Soviet period, in the field of literary studies, the authorities implemented the decision to keep away or to distinguish as much as they could Nawā’ī’s work from Sufism, after the perestroïka and the glasnost the absolutely opposite tendency began.” Haqqul explained that the quest for Sufi meaning had become to interest everyone, even these academics who before the independence denied any scientific value to Sufism. But the Sufi matters were not tackled
within a scientific framework, and the author called for a new organization of the *Navoiyshunoslik* that involves Sufism on a scientific level. As for as the controversies about Nawâ’î’s implication into the Naqshbandiyya order which kept on dividing the scholars’ community, Haqul was quite positive on this point: “There is no need to look for evidence additional to these that prove that Nawâ’î’s work is connected with Sufism: they are in the poet’s work itself.”

VIII. Conclusion

Since 2001, due to economic reasons that led to the decline in the publications and other conjectural factors, the global situation of the country did not contribute to create an atmosphere for extended research that could strengthen the position of Sufism in the field of *Navoiyshunoslik*. Nevertheless, beyond conjectural factors, the legacy of the Soviet era seems for the less weighty, and while dealing with the situation of the *Navoiyshunoslik*, it may be useful to keep in mind what Adeeb Khalid wrote about Islam in today’s Central Asia: “The way in which Central Asians relate to Islam, what Islam means to them, can only be understood by taking into consideration the experience of seventy years of Soviet rules. Although those years may seem like the blink of an eye in the long history of Islam in Central Asia, the Soviet period was one of enormous transformation in society and culture —transformation, moreover, in a mould that set Central Asia apart from much of the rest of the Muslim world.”

Studies on Nawâ’î’s life and work, in this respect, have been undertaken as far back as the poet’s death, but what had been called the *Navoiyshunoslik* was in fact a Soviet production; thus the Soviet science used its best tools (philology, linguistics and textual comparative analyses) to promote some aspects of the writer (the role he has played in the formation of Central Asian literature for instance), but discounted Sufi matter and more generally religious elements. For a poet like Nawâ’î, it was not without great consequences. Ideological blindness have isolated *Navoiyshunoslik* from the rest of Islamic-Sufi studies and built an iron curtain that kept it away from other fruitful researches. During the Soviet period the concealment of any hypothesis of Nawâ’î’s “truly” kind of Sufi involvement, the “patrimonisation” of Naqshbandiyya teaching, and eventually the “pre-Sovietization,” so as to speak, of characters like Ali Shir Nawâ’î and Bahâ ud-Dîn Naqshband deprived Uzbek people of a real scientific knowledge and an objective comprehension of two national great figures.

Recent works tend to show that if the *Navoiyshunoslik* wants to recover the means of scientific investigation, it may have to be more than a “post Soviet” field of research studies, and turn, to a certain extent, to something new.


3 See for instance Alexandre Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimbush, *Mystics and Commissars, Sufism in the Soviet Union*, London: C. Hurst and Co. Ltd, 1985, 8: “From the time of Timur and his successors, the brotherhood [the Naqshbandiyya] had numbered among its adepts rulers, wealthy merchants, military leaders, intellectuals, landlords, and poets such as Ali Shir Nawâ’î, Abdurrahman Jâmi and Mahtum Quli, as well as modest city-dwellers, craftsmen and even peasants.” See also Itzchak Weismann, *The Naqshbandiyya, Orthodoxy and activism in a worldwide Sufi tradition*, University of Exeter: Routledge, 2007, 15.

4 According to Bertel’s, Jâmî would have studied with his *murîd* at least fourteen books on Sufism, poetics and metrics; in E. E. Bertel, *Izbrannye trudy*, Vol. IV, Tashkent: Izdatel’stvo Nauka, 1965, 123.

5 An example of his openly proclaimed loyalty to Jâmî could be found in these verses quoted in Lâmiî Chelebi, *Nefehat Tercemesi*, Istanbul, 1872, 458: “Nawâ’î kim murid wa bandasidir/irâdat yolida afkandasidir” (“Nawâ’î, his disciple and slave/is prostrate before him in the path of discipleship”).


7 Nawâ’î’s *Khamsa* is a quintet modelled on the *Khamsa* of Nizâmî, Amîr Khusraw and Jâmî.


9 That is to say the few prosaic lines which introduce the distics and look like a title.


11 Nasîr ad-dîn ‘Ubaydallah al-Ahrâr (1404-1490), the most influential figure after Bahâ ud-Dîn in the Naqshbandiyya order.


13 For example, see T. Shodiev, “Navoij va Naqshbandija,” 42-43.


16 Nawâ’î’s *Khamsa* comprises: *Hayrat al-abrâr* (completed 888/1483), *Farhâd u Shîrîn* (completed 889/1484), a *mathnawî* modelled on Nizâmî’s *Khusraw u Shîrîn* and Amîr Khusraw’s *Shîrîn u Khusraw; Layli u Majnûn*, a *mathnawî* modelled on Nizâmî’s and Amîr Khusraw’s *mathnawî* s of the same name; *Sab’a-yi sayyâr* (completed about 889/1483), a
mathnawi modelled on Nizâmi’s Haft paykar and Amîr Khusraw’s Hasht bihisht, and Sadd-i Iskandarî (completed about 890/1485), a mathnawi modelled on Nizâmi’s Iskandar-nama and Amîr Khusraw’s Ayina-yi Iskandarî.

17 For brief useful thinkings on this point, see for example Alessio Bombaci, Histoire de la littérature turque, traduction par I. Melikoff, Paris: Klincksieck, 1968, 123-129.

18 “Bu ilâh ulla bûlghasen Nasqshbandi/Nawâ’î agar yetsa nawbat senga” quoted by A. Hajitmetov, Temurijlar davrî va izzek adabijoti, 28.

19 Najmiddin Komilov published a book in 1996 in which he stated that it was difficult to understand the Chaghatay poet and his work without taking into consideration the teachings of Sufism. See Najmiddin Komilov, Tasavvuf va Inson yoki Komil Inson Akhloqi, Toshkent: Özbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat ve Dzhamijat Qurulishi Akademijasi, 1996; see also A. Sh. Jözjoniy, Tasavvuf va Inson, Toshkent: Adolat, 2001, 179-180.


21 Adeeb Khalid, Islam after Communism, 2.

22 Ibid., 82.


24 For more details see Alexandre Bennigsen and S. Enders Wimbush, Mystics and Commissars.


26 Tombs of the most famous Naqshbandî awliyâ have always been important sites of pilgrimage not only for Central Asians, but for Muslims from throughout the Islamic world. According to J. Spencer Trimingham, Bahâ ud-Dîn’s mausoleum and the attached convent were erected in 1544 by Amîr ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Khân. It became “one of the most important places of pilgrimage in Central Asia.” See J. Spencer Trimingham, The Sufi Orders in Islam, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, 63-64.


28 In fact, in 1938 the Soviet regime had already planned an officially guided rehabilitation of the Chaghatay poet, and several additional memorial volumes appeared in the Soviet East outside Uzbekistan such as Ahmad Qul-Muhamedov’s Mir-Alî-Shir Nevaii’s Muhammat ul-lug hateyn. The central Academy of Science of the USSR decided to issue a volume devoted to Nawâ’î’s work. His first article and translation were written to commemorate the great poet in the 1920’s. Similarly, at the same period, several additional memorial volumes appeared in the Soviet East outside Uzbekistan such as Ahmad Qul-Muhamedov’s first Soviet publication of a translation of Nawâ’î’s Muhammat ul-lughat. The central Academy of Science of the USSR decided to issue a volume devoted to Nawâ’î in the autumn of 1926. No Central Asian authors participated (see V. V. Bartol’d, (ed.), Mir-Alî-Shir, Sbornik k pjesistoljetiju co dniya rozhdenija, Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1928).


31 Abdurahim Fitrat’s Specimens of Uzbek Literature published in 1928 and devoted most to Nawâ’î’s writing had been severely criticized since communist ideologists claimed that the book “outraged proletarians who could not stomach the Islamic mysticism, outright religiosity, lyrical imaginings, and magical fantasies of poet such as Mir Ali Shir….” See E. A. Allworth, The Modern Uzbeks, 226.


34 For a discussion on this topic, see “‘Caghatay’ ve ‘Eski Özbek dili terimleri’ in F. Sema Barutcu Özönder, Muhakemetü’l-Lugateyn, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1996, 4-9. The point is that Soviet views of nationality, laid out in its classical form by Stalin in Marxism and the Nationality Question linked territory, language and history as the basis of nationality. And the problem was that the Uzbek tribes came into the territory of modern Uzbekistan only in the sixteenth century. Therefore, “the solution [for the Soviet] was to emphasize the importance of the Turkic people earlier inhabiting Transoxiana, including the Timurid, and to downplay the number of new people brought in by the Uzbek invasion” (Beatrice Forbes Manz, “Tamerlane’s Career and Its Uses,” Journal of World History, 13-1 (2002), 16). To this respect, in 1928, Chagatayism had already become a severe political charge against Uzbek scholars, such as Fitrat, who used this word in their work (see E. A. Allworth, The Modern Uzbek, 226). Throughout 1936 and 1937, any reverence for the “Chaghatay” literary heritage was labelled a nationalism by communist ideologists.

35 Bertel’s work, despite of its undeniable quality, is in fact quite representative: while comparing ‘Attâr’s Mantiq ut-tayr with Nawâ’î’s Lisân ut-tayr, it is not very surprising that he stated that the latter is not a Sufi like the Persian poet, but rather a pure artist, whereas Nawâ’î expresses his poetry with Sufi elements (E. E. Bertel, “Nevâi i ‘Attâr,” in V. V. Bartol’d (ed.), Mir-All-Shir, Sbornik k pjesnotletija co dnja rozhdenija, Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1928, 24-82; and it is nothing but the same logic when Bertel’s considered that the fact that Nawâ’î joined the Naqshbandî tariqa was only due to his affection and his loyalty to Jâmî but it wasn’t in any case a “symbolic act (simvolicheskiy akt)” involving significantly his life and his creation (E. E. Bertel, Navoi, Moskva Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1948, 148).

36 From the Iranian suffix shunâs which means “knowledge.”

37 Navoiyshunoslik is still the academic designation that is given to the studies devoted to the Chaghatay poet.

38 This aspect will be discussed further on.

39 Universities (as it was the case for Samarkand University), streets, squares, and parks were named after his name.

40 The city known as “Kermine” under the Emirate of Bukhara was re-founded in 1958 under the name of the great “Uzbek” poet.

41 It is still the case on the ninth of February.

42 N. M. Mallaev, Özbek adabiyyot tarikhi, Birinci kitob, XVIII asrgacha, Örta va olij maktub,
Materialist Ideology Facing a Great Sufi Poet


43 Mallaev, Özbek adabijot tarikhı, Birinci kitob, XVII asrgacha, 399.
44 Ibid., 400.
46 Ibid., 404.
47 Ibid., 404.
48 Ibid., 404.
49 See section ‘Nawâ’î’s connections with Sufism’ of this paper.
50 Mallaev, Özbek adabijot tarikhı, Birinci kitob, XVII asrgacha, 477.
51 “religion.”
52 “Sufism.”
53 Ibid., 477.
54 A statement that, at least, opposes Nawâ’î to the Islamic credo of God’s unity.
55 Ibid., 477.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.; 478.
58 Ibid.
60 See section ‘Nawâ’î’s connections with Sufism’ of this paper.
61 “murakkab bir falsafij doston,” Mallaev, Özbek adabijot tarikhı, Birinci kitob, XVII asrgacha, 569.
62 Ibid.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.; 570.
67 Ibid.; 571.
68 My emphasis.
69 Ibid., “Conclusion,” 635.
70 Hayrat ul-abrær, for example, like the other masthnawīs, was published without the religious parts (the first eleven chapters) in the complete work edition of 1964 (Porso Shamsiev (ed.), Alisher Navoij, asarlar, ön besh tomlik, Khamsa, Hayrat ul-abrær, Toshkent: Özbekiston SSR Fanlar Akademijasi, 1964).
71 For example, see a collection of his aphorisms (Hikmat sözlar) which was published in 1966 for the 525th birth anniversary of the poet and in which each aphorism was translated in several foreign languages. There was no indication of the original work from whom each could come from.
73 See A. Hajitmetov, Temurijlar davri va özbek adabijoti, 27.
74 Here, again, expressions that could refer to religious or Sufi conceptions are carefully eluded.
75 Zohidov, “Navoj va Naqshbandijlik,” 16.
76 According to Zohidov’s words.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid., 16.
79 Ibid., 17. No example of other “harmful” religious practices is mentioned.
80 “Even if there are ideas in religious leaders’ and even in the prophet’s words that are contradictory to such joyful breathes, we must not consider them.” Ibid., 19.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid., 19. The following sentence goes in the same way: “It is exaggerated to say that Naqshband is completely far away from Islamic religion, from all its principles.” My emphasis.
83 Ibid.
One can easily figure out how Naqshband’s mottos like Az-zâhir li’l-khalq al-bâtin li’l-Haqq (“The exterior is for the world, the interior for God”) or Dil bâ Yâr, Dast bâ kâr (“The heart with the Friend, The hand at work”) could suit a kind of proto-sovietism, valuing the workers and focusing on materialistic aspects.


Vernon James Schubel, “Post-Soviet Hagiography.” 73.

In the late 80’s the publication of a new complete work edition of Nawâ’î was started. In 1991, Hayrat ul-abrâr was published with all the religious parts. See Alisher Navoij, mukanmal asarlar töplami, jettinchi tom, Khamsa, Hayrat ul-abror, Toshkent: FAN, 1991.

See A. Hajitmetov, Temuirjar davri va őzbek adabijoti, 27.


This new complete work edition started at the end of the 80’s. It is known as Alisher Navoij, mukanmal asarlar töplami, 20 tom, Toshkent: FAN. The last volume was published in 2003.


Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid., 7.

Ibid., 7-8.

Ibid., 9.

Adeeb Khalid, Islam after Communism, 2.

John O. Voll: “The actual and perceived isolation of Muslim Central Asia from the rest of the Islamic word reached a climax during the era of Stalin. For that time one can speak, as Alexandre Bennigsen did, of the “iron curtain” drawn by Yosif Stalin around the Muslim territories of the Soviet Union, hermetically sealing Soviet Central Asia and the Caucasus off the Middle East,” Beatrice F. Manz (ed.), Central Asia in Historical perspective, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994, 64.

See, for example, some of the works quoted in this paper that have been done after 1993.