

The Evolution of Group Identity among Bukharan Intellectuals in 1911-1928: An Overview

By Hisao KOMATSU

Introduction

As widely known, Bukhara was the most celebrated center of Islamic civilization in Central Asia since the Arab conquest in the 8th century until early 20th century. The name of Bukhārā-yi sharīf, Holy Bukhara, derives from the outstanding status that this city had enjoyed due to its eminent scholars, the sacred tomb of Shaykh Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband (1317-1389) and for a number of madrasas which attracted numerous students from all over Central Asia, as well as its political and economic importance.

Since the Uzbek-Manghit amirs ascended the throne of the Khanate of Bukhara in the late 18th century, religious character of Bukhara was intentionally strengthened by the rulers. For the Manghits, not Chingizids by origin, Islamic authority was indispensable to obtain their dynastic legitimacy. Amīr Haydar (1800-1826), while declaring his sincere obedience to the Ottoman Caliph, did not hesitate to bear the title of *Amīr al-Mu'minīn*.¹⁾ However, enjoying social and economic privileges afforded by Manghit rulers, the Bukharan ulama tended to assume a strictly conservative attitude against any changes and innovations in Islam.²⁾ Due to the religious authority of Bukhara, Russia after her conquest of Central Asia, left the Khanate of Bukhara as her protectorate with autonomy (1868) to avoid any religious unrest that could threaten her colonial rule within the newly established Turkistan Region. During the Czarist period, Islam in Bukhara coexisting with the despotic regime of the Khanate, exposed such stagnation and corruption as severely criticized by foreign Muslims and later the reformist-minded Young Bukharans consisted of urban intellectuals.³⁾

It was the Russian Revolution that brought the authority of Bukhārā-yi sharīf to an end. In 1920 for the first time in world history, a People's Soviet Republic took the place of an Islamic state and in 1924, on the Bolshevik design, the short-lived Bukhara Republic was divided into three socialist republics based on the principle of nationality such as Uzbek, Turkmen and Tajik. In the course of this drastic change from Islamic to Socialist civilization, what developments occurred to group identity of the Bukharan intellectuals, and how did it evolve? These problems may be of some interest

to those who attempt to consider current nationality questions in Soviet Central Asia in their historical perspective. The purpose of this paper will be to analyze the evolution of group identity among Bukharan intellectuals between 1911 and 1928 with references to Bukharan and Turkistanian sources as much as possible. Among others, our consideration will be focused on 'Abdurra'uf Fitrat (1886–1937), one of the eminent Jadid leader and a typical figure of the *Revolutionary generation* in the modern history of Central Asia who strived for the revolution of colonial Turkistan.

Up to recent years Soviet historians paid little attention to Central Asian Jadids who conducted a national-reform movement around the *New Method School* (*Mäktäb-i jädid*) in pre-revolutionary Russian Turkistan and consisted the main body of the Muslim communists after the October Revolution. The negative definition of the Jadid, "anti-revolutionary bourgeois nationalist" was enough to prevent any original studies, and as a result, many aspects of the important events and trends in the modern history of Central Asia were to remain untouched. However, recently preparing the new edition of the *History of Uzbek SSR*, several Uzbek scholars began to emphasize the necessity of reexamination of their modern history including such major subjects as the Andijan Uprising in 1898, the Jadid movement and others. On the occasion of a conference held by the Institute of History, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences at Tashkent in 1987, A. S. Sadykov stated "In the forthcoming comprehensive work on the history of Uzbekistan, it is expected to find the development process of bourgeois nationalist ideology, the enlightenment trend, and the sufficient and profound evaluation of the Jadid movement and the Jadid press in all."⁴ From such a liberal standpoint we may be able to expect new developments in Jadid studies in the Soviet Union.

At the same time, as for Fitrat himself, his rehabilitation is progressing in wider scale. Although his progressive aspect as a leading reformist in pre-revolutionary Turkistan has been evaluated since the 1970s, in the last several years, arguments are made on his role in the development of Uzbek Soviet literature in the 1920 to the 1930s. In the recent issue of *Sharq Yulduzi*, the organ of the Uzbekistan Writers Union, Fitrat's historical play *Abulfayz Khan* was republished after a period of 65 years.⁵

At the present, we are not favoring source materials related to the *Revolutionary generation* in the modern history of Central Asia. However, when noticing the symptom of change in research trends among Soviet scholars, it may be of some importance to attempt this overview, even in a tentative form.

1. The *Munāzara* and Its Perspective

First of all, it will be useful for our analysis to recall the eminent Russian orientalist, V. V. Barthold's (1869–1930) general description of group identity among Central Asian sedentary population. In 1908 he wrote:

Sedentary population in Central Asia defines itself firstly as Muslim and then as an inhabitant of a certain city or district. National consciousness has no significance for him. Only in the recent years there arose aspiration for national unity under the effects of European culture (through Russia).⁶⁾

In essence his observation coincides with Zeki Velidi Togan's (1890-1970) remarks on the pre-revolutionary denomination of the Mā warā' al-Nahr Turks. Among them, according to him, it was the first criterion of identity whether one is a nomad/seminomad (Uzbek) or a sedentary (Sart/Türk). The latter which lacks any common self-denomination, used location to which they were attached as their self-denomination, for example Tashkentlik, Khokandlik, etc., and the former, the descendents of Shiban Uzbeks, preserved their traditional tribal system fairly well. In other words, the name of Uzbek was used in a restricted and narrow sense.⁷⁾ Though Bartol'd ignores elemental factors such as socio-economic development within Central Asia and cultural impacts of Tatar or Ottoman intellectuals on Central Asians, his definition can be accepted as our starting point.

In 1911, a Persian work titled *Munāẓara* (*Debate*) was published in Istanbul. The author was a young Bukharan student 'Abdurra'uf Fitrat. In this work Fitrat attacked the backwardness of Bukhara and eagerly incited Bukharan Muslims to a reform movement, especially in the area of educational reform against the strong opposition of conservative Bukharan ulama. This created aggressive arguments for and against the *New Method School* among the Bukharans. Concerning the influence of the *Munāẓara*, the contemporary Bukharan Jadid ulama Sadriddin 'Ayniy (1878-1954) describes in the following manner:

In those days the impact of the *Munāẓara* was tremendous. On one hand it awakened the opponents from their idleness to such a degree that they were convinced that it was not enough to condemn two or three infidels to stop the *New Method* movement. On the other hand attracted the common people and youth to the reformist side to bring an intellectual revolution among them.⁸⁾

However, within the context of our subject, the most interesting aspect in the *Munāẓara* is that Fitrat introduced the new concepts of *vatan* (fatherland) and *millat* (people) to the Bukharans in a positive and an integrative sense. In his opinion, these are fundamental principles for the Bukharan struggle against external dependence and internal sectarianism. The *Munāẓara* was written during the days of Great-Russian chauvinism demanding the annexation of Bukhara from Russian government, and just after Russian troops entered Bukhārā-yi sharif for the first time to suppress the cruel Sunni-

Shiite conflict in 1910. It is clear that Fitrat gave these two words, *vatan* and *millat*, an active and immediate significance. Fitrat writes "Bukhara is ours, we are Bukhara's."⁹ This *wataniyya* concept was to become the fundamental ideology of the Young Bukharan movement whose ultimate objective was the establishment of a constitutional state rather than the Khanate of Bukhara.¹⁰

It is an undeniable fact that in Fitrat's Bukhara nationalism, his attachment to the city Bukhārā-yi sharīf played a prominent role. However in another work written in 1912, *The Travels of an Indian Muslim in Bukhara*,¹¹ Fitrat succeeded in vividly describing various social and economic problems in his fatherland through the Indian eyewitness who traveled to such major cities in the khanate as Qarshi, Shahr-i sabz, Khatirch and discussed with every stratum of the society, a craftsman, trader, peasant and ulama. It is clear that Fitrat's *vatan* was not merely restricted to the city Bukhārā-yi sharīf, but conceived as the whole Khanate of Bukhara.

Fitrat's Bukharan nationalism was quite a new ideology in comparison with the traditional self-consciousness mentioned above. However, at the same time, it should be noticed that his nationalism was strongly inspired by Islam. His activism seems to have stemmed from his sincere adherence to Islam itself. Fitrat writes:

Present prosperity of idol-temples comes from our ruin
The union of the infidels—from our distress
Islam in itself is the same as it was
Every defect in existence comes from us who claim to be a Muslim
Islam is our honour, Islam is our happiness¹²

As to the predecessor of Fitrat as a national reformist, we know a Bukharan ulama Ahmad Dānish (1827–1897) who designed concrete means to defend the independence of Bukhara in the end of 19th century.¹³ But it was probably the contemporary Islamic reformists who directly influenced his terminology and logic of national reformism. In the *Munāẓara* we can find numerous influential predecessors as Muḥammad 'Abduh (1849–1905), Abdurreshid Ibrahim (1857–1944) and others. In fact 'Abduh's articles translated into Ottoman Turkish were presented in a weekly series on the *Sırat-ı Müstakim* which was Fitrat's favorite journal in both Bukhara and Istanbul.¹⁴ On the other hand, Ibrahim's energetic activities which presents striking contrast to the decadence of Bukharan ulama are highly valued as a great devotion to Islam by the author. Fitrat writes:

Abdurreshid Ibrahim of Noghay left his home taking only 12 rubles for China and Japan in order to bring into existence the unity of Islam, and in Tokyo, the capital of Japan, he succeeded in converting some Japanese notables to Islam to organise an Islamic society. This is nothing else than

sincere devotion to Islam.¹⁵⁾

His close relation with this famous Pan-Islamist in Russia and the Ottoman Empire may be testified by Fitrat's "open letter" addressed to a Bukharan vizier who closed down a *New Method School* because of its "unlawfulness." Fitrat's Persian article protesting against the vizier was published on the Ottoman journal *Taaruf-ı Müslimin* which was edited chiefly by Abdurreshid Ibrahim.¹⁶⁾ It was probable that during his stay in Istanbul, approximately in 1910–1914, Fitrat was under the heavy influence of progressive Ottoman Islamist trend.

As seen above, while Islam is the fundamental factor or the source of dynamism, ethnic consciousness and terms are insubstantial or lacking in his early idea. It is worth noticing that until 1916, he wrote his works only in Persian,¹⁷⁾ the language commonly used in Bukhārā-yi sharīf, and he was totally indifferent to Turkism or Pan-Turkism which was surfacing in Istanbul and prevailing among Russian Muslims in those days. In 1912 when the first Bukharan journal *Bukhārā-yi Sharīf* was published in Persian, *Türk Yurdu*, the organ of Turkism in Istanbul, commented on an "irrational condition" in Bukhara. In their opinion, the journal should be edited in Turkish, since Bukhara was "the cradle of the world-conqueror the Turks."¹⁸⁾ Moreover this kind of argument was not new for Russian Muslims. As early as 1909, a Tatar author wrote in the leading journal *Shura* as follows:

The official language in Bukhara is Persian, and all documents relating to juridical matters and administrative affairs are written in Persian. Urban dwellers communicate in it, although the public language is Uzbek (Chaghatay).

Though Bukharan amirs are Uzbek by origin and the Uzbek population is twice as much as the Tajik in their number, Persian has been accepted as the official language. This Persian usage came from the imitation of Persian orthography by the Eastern Turks as seen in the history. However this is a terrible threat that can cause the separation of the great Turkic people.¹⁹⁾

The contrast between Fitrat and foreign Pan-Turkists is striking. It seems that ethnic consciousness had little significance to Fitrat, the eminent leader of the Young Bukharans, at least until 1916.

In contrast with Bukhara, by the end of 19th century, in Russian Turkistan, Turkification of the Persian-speaking population was at the final stage as a result of gradual sedentarization of Turkic nomadic groups and their intermingling with the Iranian-Tajik population.²⁰⁾ This centuries-long process seems to have also been accelerated by Russian rule. In 1899 the Gov-

ernor of Turkistan, General Dukhovskii reported to Nicholas II that Turkification of Persian-speaking Tajiks were rapidly enhanced by socio-economic developments in the area and the adoption of the so-called *Sart* language, which was used by the sedentary Turkic population, as the official language for the Muslim subjects, and that Turkistan Muslims consisting almost a homogenous entity even in the terms of nationality could be potentially dangerous for Russian rule.²¹⁾ This Turkification process is observed by Bartol'd also. "While academician Radloff heard exclusively Persian conversation on the streets of Samarkand in 1868, on my observation (for example in 1904) the population of Samarkand preferred Turkic to Persian considerably."²²⁾ On the other hand, Tatar and Ottoman publications, circulated in Turkistan, propagated Pan-Turkic idea mainly in cultural terms. As seen later, the Turkic literary language in Turkistan from the end of 19th to the beginning of 20th century experienced strong influences from Tatar or Ottoman literary languages, which show us the real picture of the penetration of Pan-Turkism into Turkistan. As the result of these developments, especially after the revolution in 1905, an aspiration for Turkic nationalism rooted in Turkistan was to emerge, coexisting with traditional group identity in life style, tribal or regional terms.²³⁾

In this context one of the Jadid-reformist leaders in Turkistan, Mahmud Khoja Behbudiy's (1874–1919) argument is worth analyzing. In 1909, demanding the autonomous administration by the Turkistan Muslim Spiritual Board as to the Russian military system, he wrote the following:

Muslim population in Turkistan generally communicate in Turkic (*Türki tili*). In the southern region there are only 100 thousand Persian-speaking population. However, since they also know Turkic, their official language is Turkic. Appeals for local courts and *Darilkazas*, whole registers, proceedings, and certificates are written in Turkic. Among the Turkistanians there are no differences in attire, religion and language. On their terminology, urban dwellers are called Sart, rural population—Uzbek or Turkmen, nomads in the steppes—Kirghiz or Kazakh. Still as far as religion, faith, customs and manners are concerned, there are no differences among each other.²⁴⁾

In Behbudiy's simple interpretation we can find an expression of integrated Turkic self-consciousness rooted in Turkistan (*Türkistanilär*). And this ideology was to be promulgated through a major reformist journal such as *Sada-i Türkistan* (*The Voice of Turkistan*) circulated since 1914. This journal should be noticed in two aspects. First, the editors began to use an original and well arranged Turkic orthography which was expected to eliminate the chaos of literary language in Turkistan and bridge the gap between colloquial and literary languages. Secondly, they defined the territory of Turkistan apart

from the realm established by the Russian authority and adopted their lines to defend the interests of Turkistan people.²⁵⁾

In the case of Fitrat, his approach to Turkistan identity differed from Behbudiy at least in his starting point. Although considering Bukhara as an integral part of Turkistan, in the *Munāzara*, Fitrat refers to it not so much in ethnic context as in religious and territorial terms. He writes:

It is science that made uncivilized Russians the master of Muslim slaves of Tatar, Kirghiz, Turkistan and Caucasus... If you Turkistanian Muslims continue to waste valuable youth by engaging in meaningless scholastic studies and remain deprived of useful science, in the near future Islam in Turkistan will disappear without any traces other than its name in history.²⁶⁾

Even if Fitrat himself was not yet a Turkist, his Persian works made him one of the leading Jadids by the distinct reformist idea and excellent style. In 1913 the Uzbek version of the *Munāzara* was published in Tashkent as a play of two acts. When his patriotic poems were published in the *Sada-i Türkistan* in June 1914, Russian authorities confiscated the issue. By 1914, Fitrat's remarkable influences on Turkistanian Muslims became rebellious in the eyes of the colonialists.²⁷⁾

As the national movement in Turkistan grew, interrelations between Turkistanian nationalists and Young Bukharans were strengthened and adherence to Turkistan began to have more weight with the Young Bukharans. It was on the eve of the great popular revolt against the mobilization orders of Nicholas II in Turkistan in 1916²⁸⁾ that Fitrat wrote an impressive poem in Turkic addressing to the "great Turkic people of Turkistan."

Oh great, Oh Turkic people raise your eyes!
And glimpse the world that now around you lies!
The glowing fire to bursting flame thus fan,
There shall no tyrant live in Turkestan! ²⁹⁾

The 1916 revolt seems to have been the turning point in his literary career. Thereafter he preferred Turkic to Persian in his publications. But we cannot ignore the drastic transition in his self-consciousness either. His diapason of *wataniyya* was clearly spread to Turkistan and the trend of *qaw-miyya* emerged in his thought. After the February Revolution, Fitrat will be found among the editors of the *Hürriyet (Liberty)*, one of the leading Jadid journal in Turkistan with "Pan-Turkic tendency"³⁰⁾ as well as a member of the Central Committee of the Young Bukharans.

2. The Chaghatay Gurungi

In 1918, the revolt planned by the Young Bukharans in cooperation with the Bolsheviks against the Bukharan amir totally failed. Numerous reformists and alleged Jadids were massacred by the mob stirred by the fanatical Bukharan ulama. Survived revolutionaries including Fitrat, Fayzulla Khojaev (1896–1938) and Abdulkadir Muhiddinov (1892–1934) were compelled to take refuge in Soviet Turkistan. There the émigrés entered into a close relation with Turkistanian Muslim communists who were involved in the matters of colonial revolution rather than class struggle. They considered the contemporary Soviet power as the only instrument by which their national self-determination could be attained in spite of its defects. In 1920 at the third regional conference of Muslim communists. T. Ryskulov (1894–1943), the president of the Central Executive Committee of Turkistan Soviets, stated:

If we ask who are blamed for the tragedy happened in Turkistan, they are, on one hand, rebels who soiled the banner of the proletariat with the blood of oppressed peoples and, on the other hand, educated bays and fanatical mulla-ulemists who were historically responsible for the leaders among their people. Now Turkic communists should correct the historical error, especially, of Turkistanian people. The representatives of Turkic workers, the true revolutionaries, who gathered under the red banner of communism, constitute a united communist organization. Turkic communists will not only defend the interests of factory-railway proletariats but also consider its own duty to supply the cultural-economical needs of the people who lives in the surrounding thousand kilometers of sandy steppes and kishlaks.³¹⁾

Simultaneously the Young Bukharan émigrés came into contact with the former Ottoman officers released from Russian prison camps with strong Pan-Turkic aspiration inspired by such ideologue as Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924). It should not be underestimated that they provided the Young Bukharans with certain political ideology. According to Togan who worked with them during 1920–1921, Ottoman Turkish political literature published during the years of the Great War and İsmail Suphi Soysallıoğlu, a member of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, who visited the Bukharan People's Republic in June 1921, contributed to the political orientation of the Young Bukharans.³²⁾ It may be useful for our study to refer to a prophetic Ottoman article.

In 1918, Ziya Gökalp wrote an essay entitled *What is to be done by the Russian Turks?* to the *Yeni Mecmua*. In this essay, understanding the Russian revolution to be the forth *Ergenekon* for the Russian Turks, he lectured the strategy for the establishment of an united and independent Turkic-Muslim state in Central Asia as well as the effectiveness of Solidarism (*Tesa-*

nüdcülük), as the alternative to Communist socio-economic system. Denying any attachments to subgroups of the Turkic people, he stressed the unity of them and demanded only Turkic-Muslim identity. The state language should be Ottoman Turkish which is the common language for all Turkic people. While arguing upon the establishment of centralized administrative system and national standing army, he considered the appearance of charismatic leader of Timur type, *Sahibkiran*, as the indispensable condition for success.³³⁾ His romantic idea inevitably reminds us of the future adventure of Enver Paşa (1881–1922). And in the late 1920s, A. Muhiddinov who ascended to a high position in the Tajikistan government clearly confessed that the Young Bukharans including himself had been influenced by such strong Ottoman impacts.³⁴⁾

In any case, before the Turkistanian Muslim communists brought forward the new designation of their state and party, "The Turkic Soviet Republic" and "The Communist Party of Turkic Peoples" for "the interests of international unification of workers and oppressed peoples" in the beginning of 1920s,³⁵⁾ the Young Bukharans found themselves in the same stream with enormous vitality. During this period, Fitrat joined the newly born Bukhara Communist Party in 1919 (the central committee member since June 1919) and later edited the Uzbek socio-political and literary-scientific journal *Tang* (*Dawn*: 9 April 1920–15 May 1920) published by the BCP. The main objective was the enlightenment of the masses. In the first issue they stressed; "Without enlightenment, any revolution cannot gain a sound foundation. Long live revolution in the Orient!"³⁶⁾ At the same time he had a close relationship with the editorial board of the *Ishtirakiyun* (*Communism*: 21 June 1918–12 December 1920), the organ of the Turkistan Regional Bureau of Muslim Organizations (Muslim Bureau). This Bureau was established in March 19 in order to narrow the gap between the Soviet government and the Muslim masses who were ignored by both the Party and Soviet apparatuses since the revolution. Affiliated with the Turkistan Regional Committee of RCP (b) and the Central Bureau of Muslim Organizations in Moscow, where A. Muhiddinov was sent as the liaison staff of Turkistan Muslim Bureau, the Muslim Bureau under Ryskulov's leadership tended to disobey the instructions of the Communist Party. "In spite of being the inner organization of the Turkistan Communist Party, the Muslim Bureau behaved oneself like a government in its activities."³⁷⁾ And it were the organ of this independent Muslim communist group and the *Tang* that provided opportunities of publicity to a new literary movement inaugurated by Fitrat until the Bolsheviks' censorship limited their work.³⁸⁾

In 1918, Fitrat gathered young Turkistanian writers and poets, founded a literary circle called Chaghatay Gurungi (Chighätay Gurungi: Chaghatay Conversation) in Tashkent.³⁹⁾ As the Gurungi suffered severe criticism as "anti-revolutionary bourgeois nationalist organization" from the Soviet gov-

ernment and Proletarian circles since the early 1920s, no monographs were written in the Soviet Union. However, it seems that there appeared the ethos of *the Revolutionary generation* in the Gurungi activities. Having recourse to some native sources, we can examine them in a general form.⁴⁰⁾

One of their main objectives was to reform the traditional Arabic orthography to adopt a new modified writing system that could show all vocals in their Turkic literary language and contribute to the development of literacy among the people. As to the orthographic reform, a statement written by the pen name of Chaghatay Gurungi states as follows:

We ask to gentlemen who consider us your enemy because we adopted the new orthography. In which side can writers be found who are making one's best endeavors for the sake of wakening the Turkic world? In your side or Chaghatay Gurungi's? All our efforts are dedicated to the Turkic world. All of us know the new spelling which was made to prevail among Ottoman soldiers by Enver Paşa who is making every effort among Ottoman brothers for the Pan-Turkic idea. Both celebrated Ottoman general Gazi Muhtar Paşa (1839–1918) and great philosopher Ahmed Mithat Efendi (1844–1912) were the supporters of the modified Arabic orthography. They did not consider it harmful to either Pan-Islamism or Pan-Turkism. But our professors do (*Ishtirakiyun*, 1919, No. 112).⁴¹⁾

This statement was published as a reply against criticism uttered by conservative circles who preached the eternal superiority of the Arabic orthography and some nationalists including famous Turkistanian Jadid, Abdurashidkhan Munavvarqari (1878–1931) who were afraid that the new phonetic writing system could make Turkic literary languages split from each other by admitting different writing systems to each dialects. It was in 1923 that modified Arabic alphabet was officially adopted in Turkistan. (Thereafter in 1927 the Latin alphabet, and since 1940 the Cyrillic were adopted in Uzbekistan.) The Chaghatay Gurungi's attempt to introduce the new orthography should be estimated as the first and autonomous orientation towards the alphabet reform. However their attempt which appeared extreme in those days portrayed the Gurungi members as Bolsheviks in the eyes of ordinary Muslims.⁴²⁾

In spite of some nationalists' distrust of the Gurungi, it is clear that the Gurungi members had vital ambition to bring about the rebirth of Turkic language. They searched the origin of their national culture in the pre-Islamic period of the Turkic history with eminent pride and confidence. Fitrat states:

It is not after the Arab invasion that Turkic civilization was established. Long before their Islamization, Turkic people had their own poems, poets and literature. We have no reasons to hesitate to declare this fact (*Ishti-*

rakiyun, 1919, No. 140).⁴³⁾

If the Gurungi members preferred Turkic nationalism to Islam, the remark of M. B. Salihof, an eager denouncer of the Gurungi, that the Jadids changed their theme from the magnification of Islamic history to the honor of the Turks after the Revolution⁴⁴⁾ may be acceptable at least as far as the outlook of the transformation is concerned, especially in the case of Fitrat. However, at the same time he could not help but admit the miserable fate of the Turkic language. He writes:

Though our Turkic is the most wealthy language in the world, in the past it was suppressed by not only Arabic but also Persian. However when we have the past in our eyes, it turns out that the greatest physician Ibn Sina, "the second Aristotle" Farabi, the celebrated Arabic lexicographer Jawhari, the distinguished monotheistic philosopher Jelaled-din Rumi, and one of the outstanding figures in Persian literature Nizami were all Turkic in origin. Unfortunately in spite of their Turkic origin, Mahmud of Ghazna invited Firdausi to write the *Shahname* which described the defeat of the Turks... furthermore, even the Ottoman sultans preferred Persian poems in order to express their passions. Although Turkic encountered an unfortunate destiny and suffered many hardships for the past thousand years, it has not perished but have been alive and will live... Some people say "We love Turkic *ulus* (people), but Turkic language is rough, music is tasteless, and history is dark." They are worth getting some thrashings. But Turkic *ulus* cannot dare to do so, as far as Turkic language remains in such unfortunate conditions (*Ishtirakiyun*, 1919, No. 132).⁴⁵⁾

If Fitrat's linguistic nationalism was represented in extreme enthusiasm, it comes from the fact that the Chaghatay Gurungi's cultural nationalism was motivated by the sharp contrast between the past glory and the present misery of their Turkic culture. The more seriously they understood the miserable conditions of their own culture and probably society, the more hastily they set about their revival movement.

The Chaghatay Gurungi's third feature is found in their approach to a new Turkic literary language. While the Volga Tatars and Azeris produced their own literary languages based on local dialects with the assistance of vital national bourgeoisie, in Turkistan there were no common literary language based on the native dialects until the revolution. During the colonial period, some Turkistanian writers used various compromised languages that were mixture of each local dialects and the Volga Tatar language learned through the *Vakit* and *Shura* of Orenburg, so-called Common Turkic prevailed through the *Terjuman* over the Russian Turks, or Ottoman Turkish,

and other old-fashioned Chaghatay language. Besides them there existed the *Sart* language which was formulated by Russian orientalist N. P. Ostroumov (1846–1930) and was introduced as an official language in Russian Turkistan. For example, it was used in the *Türkistan Vilayetinin Gazeti* (1870–1917). However, according to a contemporary observer, this *Sart* had a tendency to separate itself from other Turkic languages such as Tatar and Kazakh dialects. Overall, although the influence of Tatar was outstanding, Ottoman Turkish elements began to appear considerably in Turkistanian publications since the former Ottoman officers obtained a number of posts in educational organizations in Soviet Turkistan where instruction staffs were scarce. Against such a chaotic situation of literary language, the Chaghatay Gurungi attempted to create a modern literary language based on Turkistan dialects as endeavored by the *Sada-i Türkistan* several years before the revolution.⁴⁶⁾

The Chaghatay Gurungi's linguistic Turkistan nationalism is indicated in its own name clearly. It tried to establish a new literary language through the modern rebirth of the Chaghatay language which once developed in Turkistan and prevailed as the common literary language as Persian among the Central Asian Turks since the 14th to the 19th century. The Gurungi did not hesitate to express its pride of the Chaghatay supremacy. Fitrat writes:

It is Chaghatay literature that occupies the supreme position among the entire Turkic literature. The Chaghatay language attained the highest level among the all Turkic dialects. Therefore we must create pure Chaghatay literature (*Ishtirakiyun*, 1919, No. 132).⁴⁷⁾

From a historical point of view the origin of such enthusiasm for Chaghatay-Turkic literature may be found in the Chaghatay renaissance around the Khokand and Khiva courts in the beginning of the 19th century and the gradual Turkification of literary language in Turkistan since the last quarter of the 19th century.⁴⁸⁾ The "Chaghatayism" of Gurungi members are shown in their pen names and titles of their works, for example Batu, Chigatay, Temochin, Chinghis khan, *The Mausoleum of Timur* and others. In spite of some Pan-Turkic motives, their "Chaghatayism" seems to have been related to local nationalism. It is known that they made efforts to expel Ottoman Turkish elements from the literary language and openly criticized the educational method of the former Ottoman officers who applied the Ottoman method directly for Turkistanian youths.⁴⁹⁾ In 1929, Fitrat making objections to the Proletarian criticism who denounced the Gurungi "Pan-Turkist society," stated as follows:

The Chaghatay Gurungi fought Pan-Turkist societies which worked ostensibly for the sake of Uzbek nationalism, language and literature, and the former Jadids who contributed to the Pan-Turkist movement.

You downgraded the Chaghatay Gurungi as the Pan-Turkists' group. These days you are making this propaganda among the masses. However in those days the Gurungi struggled with Pan-Turkism and Pan-Islamism.⁵⁰⁾

Fitrat's utterance suggests the great difference in the interpretation of Pan-Turkism between the Gurungi and the Soviet authorities. For Fitrat, local Turkistan identity was too self-evident to confuse with the so called Pan-Turkism. At least it is undeniable that his local identity was alien to the above mentioned Ziya Gökalp's centralized Pan-Turkic idea. According to Togan, Fitrat as well as Galimjan Ibragimov (1887–1938), a Volga Tatar writer, opposed the idea of political unity of the Turks and viewed Pan-Turkic cultural unity beyond possibility.⁵¹⁾ If so, Fitrat's idea should be interpreted in the context of the emergence of cultural nationalism in modern Turkistan, or as a strong motive to identify themselves with their national heritage to be developed. According to Fitrat, modern and vital literary language and literature of Turkistan were to be established by utilizing the ample legacy of classical Chaghatay literature.

However, in spite of the Gurungi's enthusiastic efforts, the revival of the Chaghatay language was never an easy task. At first, advocating the purification of the literary language, they attempted to drive out such foreign vocabularies as Arabic, Persian and Russian. But it meant the abandonment of a great number of Arabic-Persian words which were fully absorbed in the Chaghatay Turkic and formed as an integral element. According to the account of Abdurrahman Sa'diy (1889–1956), a Tatar scholar of Uzbek literature, Arabic-Persian terms appearing in the works of Ali Shir Nava'iy (1440–1501) and Abulghazi Bahadur khan (1603–1663) occupied 70% and 50% respectively of each work. Instead of Arabic-Persian words they searched for pure Turkic terms in the ancient Turkic language (for example, *faydā*→*asiq*, *dunya*→*ačun*) and old usage remaining in rural areas. Such contemporary Uzbek words as *ortaq* and *bildirish* are products of their purification movement.⁵²⁾ However their impatience and simple methodology could not bring forth expected results. On the occasion of the Conference for Uzbek language, orthography and writers (Samarkand, 1929), Crimean Tatar Turkologist B. Chobanzade (1893–1937) pointed out the narrow path which the Gurungi encountered briefly. "The Chaghatay Gurungi, appearing with the motto of reviving the Chaghatay language, as the result there was nothing else to be done than to approach the living Uzbek dialect."⁵³⁾

In addition to the above mentioned activities, the Chaghatay Gurungi did not spare their efforts in training younger writers and poets, collecting folklore and prevailing popular theaters. Among the first generation of the Uzbek Soviet writers there were numerous figures who were trained at the Gurungi seminars, and in the late 1920s one of the former members attempted

to defend their positive activities citing an episode of brave members who engaged in collecting folklore in rural areas under the Basmachi attacks.⁵⁴⁾ Fitrat's patriotic dramas such as the *Mausoleum of Timur* (*Timurin Saghanäsi*, 1920) and *Indian Revolutionaries* (*Hind Ikhtilalchiläri*, Berlin, 1923) are said to have moved the audience to tears in every performance. The latter was performed not only in Turkistan but also abroad and, as noted by J. Neru, contributed to the growth of Indian independence movement against British rule. However, when Timur arose from his grave to warn the present people who submits to the foreign rule, it was inevitable to raise the suspicions of the Soviet authorities.⁵⁵⁾ In 1922 the Chaghatay Gurungi was forced to dissolve after displaying nationalistic motives abundantly. However the former members continued their "Chaghatayist" activities in the newly born Uzbekistan Republic. On the publications of the *Qizil Qalam* (*Red Pen*), the first literary organization of Uzbekistan where the "Chaghatayist" took the initiative, the portraits of Turkistanian heroes such as Timur (1336–1405), Husayn Bayqara (1438–1506), Nava'i, Babur (1483–1530), Shaybaniy khan (1451–1510) and others were sending a silent but eloquent message to the readers.⁵⁶⁾

The name Chaghatay might be the symbol of local and cultural Turkistan nationalism which emerged gradually in the course of the 19th century and was strengthened through the revolutionary events in the first two decades of 20th century. While Turkistanian Muslim communists strived for the autonomous rule persistently, it can be said that the Chaghatay Gurungi aimed at the establishment of Turkistan national culture. It seems that Turkistan had a reality for both of them.⁵⁷⁾ There were sufficient reasons why the technical term "Old Uzbek" took the place of "the Chaghatay language" which can suggest "the anti-revolutionary nationalist society of Uzbek bourgeois intellectuals" in Soviet Turkology, succeeding the exclusion of the historical term "Turkistan" from the Soviet vocabulary.⁵⁸⁾

3. The National Delimitation

During the exile period of Young Bukharans, their revolutionary literature addressed to Bukharans within the khanate were written in Turkic or used a bilingual format. Traditional Persian superiority in Bukharan literary circles was threatened as well as the political power of the amir, that was suppressed by the military forces of the Red Army and Bukharan revolutionaries in September 1920. It was an inevitable result of the vital Turkism of the Young Bukharans that Turkic was announced as state language of the Bukhara People's Republic in March 1921.⁵⁹⁾ At the time, while Turkic symbolized the "new civilization," Persian signified the "old." In early 1920s Bukharan intellectuals, taking a similar path as Fitrat, shared Turkic ethnic identity. For instance, in spite of his Tajik origin, 'Ayniy did not hesitate to

write a Turkic-Uzbek poem entitled *Turan March*:

Wake up, Turan people, wake up!
The whole world is on the rise
New age, new era has begun,
Uzbek, Kazak, Turkmen, Tatar,
Some years have passed, now
Free yourself from separation,
No more isolation ⁶⁰⁾

In this poem, the author who later became respected as the "founder of Tajik Soviet literature," showed no signs of Tajik self-consciousness. The same attitude was observed by Togan in the case of another eminent Young Bukharan, A. Muhiddinov who deeply appreciated Turkic cultural tradition in Turkistan regardless of his Tajik origin.⁶¹⁾ These facts show that Uzbek-Tajik distinction did not have any importance among the Young Bukharans and was alien from their original identity. During this period Turkic identity played a predominant role in their ideology.

Even if ethnic consciousness existed among the Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kazakhs and Turkmens in pre-revolutionary Turkistan, it must have been far from national identity in the European sense. However, after the revolution and civil war, the Bolsheviks recognized these ethnic groups as separate nations, and set about the work of nation-building in Central Asia based on their theory of nationality policies formulated as early as 1920, that resulted in the Delimitation of Central Asian nationalities in 1924-25. Consequently the Bukhara People's Republic was divided into the three national republics and the district of Bukhara was incorporated into the Uzbek Republic. It is well known that one of the objectives of this policy was to drive out strong "Pan-Turkism," or more precisely, Turkistan nationalism prevailing among the indigenous Muslim communists and intellectuals.⁶²⁾

The Young Bukharans' resistance against the Bolshevik nationality policy is well described by Togan who succeeded in organizing a clandestine nationalist society known as "Central Asian National Popular Muslim Association (Orta Asya Milli Avami Müslüman Cemiyetleri Ittihadı)," later "Turkistan National Union," in Bukhara during the summer of 1921. According to the program adopted at the Samarkand congress, the Union's departments were set up not on ethnic subdivisions as Uzbek, Tajik, Turkmen and others, but on regional division such as Bukhara, Khiva, Eastern and Western Kazakhstan, Turkistan (the central region of the former Turkistan Region), Bashkurdistan, and Turkmenistan. Their indifference to ethnic subdivisions presents a striking contrast to the Bolsheviks' approach who set up separate ethnic sections consisting of Kazakh, Turkmen and Uzbek to arrange the administrative units in Soviet Turkistan since 1920. However, although the foundation

of Turkistan wide nationalist organization under the historical symbol of a grey wolf was a remarkable achievement as Togan himself pointed out, the Union could not determine a path between the Basmachis and the Bolsheviks.⁶³⁾

On the other hand, it is certain that the Young Bukharans intended to maintain the entity of Bukharan state as much as possible. In this multi-ethnic state consisted of Uzbeks (50.7%), Tajiks (31.1%), Turkmens (10.3%) and the others,⁶⁴⁾ the most serious ethnic conflict was found between Turkmens and the majority. In February 1921, the First Congress of Bukhara Communist Party passed the following resolution.

In view of the nationalistic intolerance which grew among the Turkmens, the First Congress will entrust the Central Committee of BCP with a task to convene an all Bukharan Turkmen congress in Kerki or Charjuy no later than April 1, 1921 and properly make up the agenda for this historical congress of the people hostile to us for centuries.⁶⁵⁾

As a result, in September 1921, within the Central Executive Committee of the Bukhara Republic the Turkmen section was established under the pressure of the Bolsheviks who conceived that ethnic separation is indispensable in order to "liquidate the remnants of ethnic antagonism inherited from the period of feudalism by the indigenous population of Central Asia."⁶⁶⁾ The Turkmen Section was the first step of their delimitation policy as to the Bukhara Republic.

In 1923 on the occasion of the First Qurultay of Education, Fitrat, then the People's Commissar (*Nazir*) of Education of the Bukhara Republic, commented the Turkmen problem that was raised consistently by the Turkmen Section. The Section complained to the Commissariat of the delay of educational works in the Turkmen territory. Replying to the complaints somewhat ironically, Fitrat attributed the causes not to the reluctance of the Commissariat but to the socio-economic conditions of "nomadic" Turkmens not accustomed to the civilized way of life. According to him, the Turkmen problem could be solved only through a gradual and uncompulsory method of enlightenment among the *jämaät*. The plan was to dispatch *peshqädäm* (well-trained) Turkmen students educated in Bukharan madrasas to Turkmen territory as traveling teachers. However he did not overlook another factor of the Turkmen problem. "Since they live in the border area," "a foreign political incitement among them" also should be taken into consideration.⁶⁷⁾ No matter how serious the Turkmen problem was, the Young Bukharans believed it was possible to solve the issue in the near future without dividing their own state into ethnic portions. It was in August 1924, just 3 months before the state ceased to exist, that they published a well prepared school text-book *Bukharan Geography* which instructed the multi-ethnic composition of the

Bukharan population to the new generation of Bukharan people.⁶⁸⁾

It was the natural course that there appeared repeatedly potential opposition to the Delimitation policy for long years in the form of aspiration for Turkistan or Pan-Turkic cultural unity. For instance, on the occasion of the first All Union Turcological Congress held in Baku in 1926, the Uzbek delegate M. Rahmanogli stated:

Since the establishment of individual Turkic republics in the Soviet Union, each people began to use the reformed Arabic writing systems which differed from one another. As differences grew, mutual development of the Turkic peoples suffered. The publications of the Kazakhs, Tatars, Turkmens and Uzbeks became too different from each other to be utilized by another people. Therefore the need for a new scientific alphabet for all Turkic peoples (*bayn al-Turk*) is increasing daily. In this context the new Latin alphabet successfully used by the Azeris since 1922 is worth noticing. We Uzbeks fully agree with its adoption. In this way we can break with such parasites of the Turkic world as mullas, ishans, sufis and so on who have settled in the fortress of the Arabic writing system.

Let the development of the Turkic peoples be prosperous!

Long live the Soviet power that gave the oppressed peoples the rights for their cultural development!⁶⁹⁾

Not being able to accomplish his naive ideal, potential aspiration for the Turkic union or Turkistanian idea seems to have been expressed not only throughout the 1920s but also until the present day, especially in cultural affairs.⁷⁰⁾

The Delimitation caused another nationality problem in Bukhara. In 1928, the previously mentioned Muhiddinov, the Chairman of the Tajikistan Council of People's Commissars at the time, wrote an article "Is the population of Bukhara and the suburbs Tajiks or Uzbeks?," in which he tried to attract the Party's attention to the critical conditions in Bukhara. His argument may be summed up as the following:

From the pre-Islamic era, the population of Bukhara has been Tajik whose ancestors were the Soghdians. Even under the Turkic rulers the official language was Persian, and Turkic literature was never supported at all. Although there are some Uzbek groups and a few Bukharans with knowledge of Uzbek language, both within the city and in the suburbs of Bukhara, Persian is exclusively used for communication. The Bukharan women never know Uzbek without exception. However, after the revolution in 1920, the state language was turned into Turkic-Uzbek and education in the native language was ignored. Why did this happen?

It was caused by Pan-Turkism (*Ittihad-i Turk va zabān-i Turk*) which penetrated deeply into the minds of the political leaders including myself. Even after the Delimitation, this unjust policy was never corrected, but strengthened in Uzbekistan. It is considered as crime to call the Bukharans Tajik. In the 1926 census they were compelled to declare themselves Uzbek. Assimilation, Uzbekification, do not mean the cultural development of Bukharan Tajiks. There are loud complaints among them. The Party and the Soviet government should solve this serious nationality problem from the Central Asian perspective.⁷¹⁾

It is clear that his discussion is based exclusively on the linguistic criterion. Concerning the language of the Bukharans, he was right. O. Sukhareva, a Soviet ethnographer famous for her outstanding field survey in Bukhara, reports the majority of Bukharan population remained Persian-speaking up to recent times.⁷²⁾ The persistence of Persian language in Bukhara is a remarkable phenomenon in the history of Central Asia. How could Bukhara preserve the tradition against the vital process of Turkification that proceeded also in the Bukhara oasis?⁷³⁾ At the present it may be possible to postulate three factors. First, the Islamic learning in Bukhara was conducted in Persian rather than Arabic. Regardless of their past glory, Bukharan ulama's terrible ignorance of Arabic were criticized by the modern Muslim reformists. In other words Islamic civilization in *Bukhārā-yi sharīf* was embodied by Persian. Therefore as far as the fame of Bukhara was needed for the ulama and rulers, the esteemed position of Persian could not be challenged. Secondly, Bukhara had never experienced the direct rule of the Russians who adopted Turkic as the official language. Consequently the above mentioned linguistic change in Samarkand was not brought about in Bukhara. And finally any disasters Bukhara suffered in its history did not exterminate the indigenous population and their ethnic traditions were preserved considerably well.

Although Persian dominance in Bukhara is an undeniable fact, language is not always the decisive factor in ethnic or national identity among Central Asian urban population. Bilingualism or Persian-speaking Uzbek was not a rare case in Central Asia. Moreover statistic data relating to the population of Bukhara district in 1924 did not favor Muhiddinov's viewpoints. The ethnic composition in the Bukhara district (the Bukhara oasis) was registered as follows:

Uzbek: 72.5% / Tajik: 9.9% / Turkmen: 3.2% / Arab: 8.0% /

The Others: 6.4%

Total population: 341,420 (within city limits: 37,495)⁷⁴⁾

When the national census was conducted in 1926, within Bukhara city there were 30,000 Uzbeks and 8,000 Tajiks registered. Most of Bukharans preferred

to identify themselves as Uzbek disregarding their Persian usage. In many cases they confessed "We are Uzbek, our language is Tajik (Persian) (*Khudomo uzbek, lafzamo tojik*)." And to the question "Before the revolution how did you call yourselves?," some of them answered "We called ourselves Muslim, neither Tajik nor Uzbek."⁷⁵

It seems that Muhiddinov failed to obtain any positive results. Nonetheless his article is an interesting document of the newly born Tajik nationalism which sharply opposed the Uzbeks who held almost all historical centers of "Tajik culture" as Bukhara and Samarkand. Soviet historian Vahabov attributed the outburst of nationality conflicts between Uzbeks and Tajiks during 1927–1928 to Uzbek national deviationists who violated the Soviet law that secured the official use of Persian in education, publications and Party-Soviet activities for the Tajik minority living in Uzbekistan. Such conflicts were reported not only in Bukhara but also in Samarkand and Chust. However, few known cases of serious conflict between them before 1924 and their socio-cultural homogeneity was so strong that even Bolsheviks had to treat them with the notion of a single nation under the name of "*Uzbeko-Tadjiki*" group in their early design of "administrative-territorial *perestroika* of Turkistan" based on the nationality principle in 1920, we must seek another and more essential cause of the conflicts.⁷⁶

We have no materials concerning Fitrat's attitude towards the conflicts among Uzbeks and Tajiks, although Batu, the former Gurungi member, was accused of ignoring the Samarkand conflict despite of his leading post in Samarkand local committee of the Party.⁷⁷ However it is worth examining Fitrat's approach to the new alphabet for the Tajik language. When they set about the alphabet reform from the Arabic to Latin since 1927, he was commissioned to devise an original plan along with two eminent Russian orientalists A. A. Semenov (1873–1958) and A. A. Freiman (1879–1968). One of the characteristics of Fitrat's project was to maintain the unity of new alphabets of the Uzbeks and the Tajiks as far as possible, esteeming the historical-cultural unity (*yegānegī*) between the two peoples. Such aspect of his project, as soon as presented to the committee, was exposed to severe criticism that denounced him "Pan-Turkist" ignoring the individuality of the Tajik language and literature. Among the energetic critics against Fitrat's project was an experienced Iranian revolutionary A. Lahuti (1887–1957) who emigrated to the Soviet Union after the failure of the Tabriz revolt in 1922 and devoted himself to the development of Tajik Soviet culture.⁷⁸ Now Fitrat was to suffer the blame laid by the survivor of the Tabriz *mujāhidīn* whom he praised sympathetically citing the names of the leaders, Sattār khān and Bāqir khān in the *Munāẓara*.⁷⁹ In any case it seems that for a Turkistanian bilingualist Fitrat, it was not an easy task to break down the *yegānegī* tradition to establish two different cultural systems independent of each other, even if he preferred Turkic to Persian.

4. The Literary History

Toward the end of the 1920s, among the former Young Bukharans a remarkable diversity of group identity surfaced. Khojaev was an alleged "Uzbek nationalist" having the esteemed post of the Chairman of the Uzbekistan Council of People's Commissars, also Muhiddinov in the same post of Autonomous Tajikistan, an ardent Tajik nationalist with a somewhat irredentist tendency. When the latter accused "a group who were showing off a new type of nationalism for Pan-Turkism in spite of their responsible position in Uzbekistan" in his above mentioned article, it is obvious that he denounced Khojaev. And 'Ayniy was a devoted Tajik writer whose distinguished work *Anthology of Tajik Literature* (Moscow, 1926) contributed to the nation-building of the Tajiks considerably. In this comprehensive work including the master pieces of Tajik literature from Rudaki (?-940) to Lahuti, the author proudly maintained the existence of the Tajik people since the early period in Turkistan and Mā warā' al-Nahr even under Turkic political rule, criticizing the former Soviet nationality policies that ignored Tajiks and their culture affording a preference to the Uzbeks. For many years 'Ayniy's anthology was supported by Tajik youths as their most favorite book and his fame of the founder of Tajik Soviet literature was to be established more firmly.⁸⁰⁾ But it should not be overlooked that in his anthology Fitrat was highly estimated by his contribution to modern Tajik prose literature.

Although since the 1905 revolution in foreign newspapers *Fārsī* essays were written by Tajiks (for instance Mīrkhān Pārsāzāde contributed to the *Habl al-Matin*) and Mahmud Khoja Behbudiy and others compiled some school textbooks, it was 'Abdurra'uf Fitrat who inaugurated to take a new literary tone into Tajik prose literature.⁸¹⁾

It was possible for 'Ayniy to consider Fitrat as an outstanding Tajik writer in spite of the latter's strong Turkist tendency.

As a contrast to these former colleagues, Fitrat seems to have crystallized his national identity which he embraced since the Gurungi period despite of working within the framework of Uzbekistan. After being dismissed from an important position in the Bukharan Republic in 1923, Fitrat devoted himself to study history and literature of Central Asia.⁸²⁾ Although *Eng Eski Turk Ādābiyati Nāmunālari* (Tashkent, 1927), the Uzbek annotated select translation of Mahmud Kashghari's *Divan Lughat al-Turk*, shows his excellent ability as a Turkologist, the *Ozbek Ādābiyati Nāmunālari* (*Anthology of Uzbek Literature*, Tashkent-Samarkand, 1928) may be more interesting for our analysis. The objective of this work is to present the historical development of Uzbek literature from its origin and there appears clearly his understanding of national culture. It may be useful for our last consideration to

cite the editor's preface and the table of contents which is lacking in the original publication.

This is the first volume of the *Anthology of Uzbek Literature* which was compiled under the instruction of the Scientific Center affiliated to the Uzbekistan People's Commissariat of Education. Our readers will probably question the meaning of Uzbek literature.

As well known it is after Shaybaniy khan of the Uzbeks put an end to the Timurids, in other words the political superiority of the Uzbeks was established in the beginning of the 16th century that our country was gradually called the country of Uzbeks. However, everyone knows that Turks lived in Central Asia since the ancient period. Apart from the controversial problem whether ancient Khorezmian civilization was a product of the Turks or not, the historical sources relating to the Tujue, Qarakhanids, Qarakhitayids and Chaghatayids reveal this indisputable fact. Of course these people living in Central Asia from the earliest time had their own literature. In the course of history, their literature being influenced by neighbouring peoples, attained the high stage of its development and came to be known as the Chaghatay literature corresponding to the rule of the Chaghatayids. Even after the beginning of the Uzbek rule, this literature survived until the Jadid literature emerged. Therefore it is an incorrect method to approach our literary history by ignoring the pre-Uzbek period of Central Asian Turkic literature, especially the Chaghatay literature. This is our viewpoint from which this anthology was compiled.

As to the history of Uzbeks, Central Asian Turks, a number of works have been written in Arabic, Persian and Turkic up to present times. But they exclusively confine our political history within a narrow framework, and are useless for other interests. It is extremely difficult, virtually impossible to extract informations concerning the socio-economical conditions of the people and country. As a matter of fact, such informations are nonexistent. However surveys of literary history assist considerably to supply the needs. The relations and perspectives between every ruling class such as feudal lords and the people, relations between intellectuals or poets and the ruling class, how the former did coax or cheat the masses for the interests of the ruling class, and how they stirred the pleasure of the ruling class (according to Babur's expression *äysh*/pleasure and *fisq*/debauchery), these problems can be understood only through the examination of our literary history. Moreover investigation of our past literary works which teach us our predecessors' experiments would neither be useless nor unnecessary work for the Proletarian literature that we intend to create. This short explanation should clarify for what objective we compiled this anthology.

The first volume presents the selections of masterpieces relating to the pre-Uzbek period. The anthology covering from the Uzbek period to Jadidism and Jadid and post-Revolutionary literature will constitute the second volume.⁸³⁾

The table of contents

I. Tribal literature (Turkic epics and the reflection of Shamanism)	
1) An old Uygur story (dated to 8-9 centuries)	pp. 19-27
2) Selections from <i>Divan Lughat al-Turk</i>	28-33
3) The epic <i>Alpamysh</i> (collected by Gazi Alim)	33-43
II. Literature during the period of Feudalism (From the 8th century to Islamic literature)	
1) The Orkhon inscription (732)	50-58
2) <i>The Book of Dede Korkut</i>	58-68
3) <i>Divan Lughat al-Turk</i>	68-70
III. Literature during the period of Commercial Capitalism	
1) <i>Qodatqu Bilig</i>	79-87
2) <i>Ibat ul-Haqaiq</i>	87-96
3) Yasavi and Baqirghani	97-104
4) Rabghuzi, <i>Qisas ul-Anbiya</i> (1310)	104-112
5) Anonym, <i>Miftah ul-Adil</i>	112-124
6) Durbek, <i>Yusuf Zulayha</i>	124-139
7) Lutfiy, <i>Divan</i>	140-149
8) Ataiy, <i>Divan</i>	151-158
9) Husayn Bayqara (1438-1506)	158-167
10) Nava'iy (1440-1501)	170-276
11) Babur (1483-1530)	277-319

In spite of some Marxist phrases, this anthology can be analysed as proletarian Uzbek in form and Central Asian Turkic in essence. The editor is apparently unconcerned with the framework of Uzbek or Uzbekistan. The importance given to the Chaghatay literature and total disregard of Tajik-Persian works prevailed in the past remind us of his ardent Gurungi idea. According to Fitrat, modern Uzbek literature was to be created on the resourceful heritage of Central Asian Turkic literature more than anything. Consequently it was inevitable that as soon as this anthology was published, it suffered harsh criticism from the Proletarian circle in Uzbekistan. They criticized in two points. Firstly, although it contains numerous samples of the Chaghatay literature filled with abstract-religious conception, especially the influence of Sufism, Fitrat explained them as a basis for Uzbek proletarian literature. Secondly, 90% of Chaghatay vocabulary are of Arabic-Persian words, and except madrasa graduates, nobody can understand their meaning.

In short, declaring that "Chaghatay literature is foreign to contemporary Uzbek literature in both form and content," they condemned Fitrat's anthology which attempted for the first time to evaluate Uzbek literary heritage from a historical perspective.⁸⁴⁾ The sharp contrast in the Soviet evaluation of the two anthologies edited respectively by 'Ayniy and Fitrat seems to show implicatively the character of Soviet literary politics during the 1920s.

In the end of 1920s Fitrat, advancing the immutable value of the Chaghatay literature and the literary tradition since the ancient times, was accused of "anti-Soviet bourgeois nationalist." However it is of interest that in later years, Uzbek scholars began to follow the path opened by Fitrat while preparing the publication of history of Uzbek literature. The last edition published in 1987 presents the framework established by Fitrat is adopted almost as it was by contemporary Uzbek scholars. While the masterpieces of the Chaghatay literature occupy the main place in it, studies on the works of such prominent Sufi poets as Yasavi and Baqirghani are encouraged, for "it is undoubted that they will offer new information relating to the history of Uzbek language."⁸⁵⁾ It can be said that Fitrat's anthology provided the latter generation with a valuable criterion of the genuine classics of Uzbek literature. If a contemporary Uzbek scholar, S. Zufärov praises Fitrat as "thoroughly acquainted with the history of Uzbek literature,"⁸⁶⁾ it should be interpreted in this context.

Conclusion

Fitrat in the end of 1920s was far from himself in the Istanbul period. Firstly the former Bukharan patriot turned into Turkistan nationalist. It is difficult to consider that after 1924 his identity was restricted to Uzbek or Uzbekistan. Secondly it seems that for Fitrat Islam has lost any positive meaning whereas it was the source of dynamism and activism as seen in the *Munāẓara*. In 1929 he wrote:

The need of religious reform led me to atheism. I became aware that nothing remains in religion when fanaticism and ignorance was removed from it. I am convinced that religion will never agree or unite with science. Therefore I left religion and became a spreader of atheism.⁸⁷⁾

In his youth, he was known as an outstanding student in the historical Miri Arab madrasa in Bukhara. His attitude to Islam should be examined in connection with studies on the evolution of Islam in modern Central Asia.

Recent trends in Soviet Central Asia seems to show that the legacy of Turkistanian intellectuals who sought their own national identity during the revolutionary decades bear significant meanings in the evolution of nationality issues with critical moments.⁸⁸⁾ Further studies are required as well

as source materials relating to the lost generation.

Abbreviations

- Hâtıralar*: Z. V. Togan, *Hâtıralar: Türkistan ve Diğer Müslüman Doğu Türklerinin Millî Varlık ve Kültür Mücadeleleri*, İstanbul, 1969.
- Munâzara*: Fitrat Bukhârâyî, *Munâzara-i mudarris-i Bukhârâyî bâ yak nafar farangî dar Hindistân darbâre-i makâtib-i jadîda*, İstanbul, Matbaa-i İslâmiye, 1327/1911.
- NAT*: Şadr al-Dîn 'Aynî, *Namûna-i Adabiyât-i Tâjîk*, qism 1-3, Moscow, 1926.
- Salîhof*: M. Büzrük Salîhof, *Özbek âdâbiyatida millâtchilik kôrnishlari (Qisqacha tarîkh)*, Tashkent, 1933.
- TKM*: Til-îmla kônferensiyâsi materiallari: 1929 nchi yil Mayning 15-23 nchi künlärîdâ Samarqandda bütûn Özbekistan mîqyasida toplanghan Özbek til-îmlachilari vâ âdiblari kônferensiyâsinin tola hîsabi, Tashkent, 1931.
- Türkistan*: A. Z. V. Togan, *Bugünkü Türkîli (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi*, İstanbul, 1942-47, rep. 1981.
- Бухара: Комиссия по районированию Средней Азии. Материалы по районированию Средней Азии, Кн. 1, Территория и население Бухары и Хорезма, часть 1, Бухара, Ташкент, 1926.
- ОНУ: Общественные науки в Узбекистане.

Notes

- 1) Shihâb al-Dîn Merjânî, *Mustafâd al-Akhbâr fî Ahwâl Qazân wa Bulghâr*, 1, Kazan, 1885, p. 185; P. Бурнашева, Монеты Бухарского ханства при Мангытах (середина XVIII-начало XX в.), Эпиграфика востока, 18, 1967, стр. 118, 125-127; M. Saray, *Rus İşgali Devrinde Osmanlı Devleti ile Türkistan Hanlıkları Arasındaki Siyasi Münasebetler (1775-1875)*, İstanbul, 1984, pp. 33-36; H. Komatsu, Khoqand and Istanbul: An Ottoman Document Relating to the Earliest Contact Between the Khan and Sultan, *Balkan and Asia Minor Studies*, No. 15, pp. 36-37, 49. (in Japanese)
- 2) For the indigenous accounts of Bukharan ulama, see Sadriddin 'Ayniy, Buhara inqilabining tarihi, *Uchqun*, No. 2, 1923, pp. 9-16.
- 3) For instance, Mehmed Zahir Bigiyev, *Mavarannâherdâ Sâyahat*, Kazan, 1908, pp. 78-79, 100-108. For the Young Bukharans' reform-revolutionary movement, see Ф. Ходжаев, К истории революции в Бухаре и национального размежевания Средней Азии, Избранные труды, Том 1, Ташкент, 1970; H. Carrère d'Encausse, *Islam and the Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia*, London, 1988.
- 4) З. Файзиева, Совещание по проблеме «национально-освободительное движение в Узбекистане 80-90-х годов XIX века», ОНУ, 1988, No. 5, стр. 49. See also the following articles published in ОНУ, Э. Ю. Юсупов/Б. В. Лунин, Андижанское восстание 1898 года в советской литературе, 1987, No. 1, стр. 18-31; М. Г. Вахабов, Еще раз об Андижанском восстании 1898 года, 1987, No. 7, стр. 43-56; Х. З. Зияев, О социальной сущности Андижанского восстания 1898 года, 1987, No. 7, стр. 57-63; Х. З. Зияев, К изучению национально-освободительных движений в Узбекистане 80-90-х годов XIX века, 1988, No. 6, стр. 28-36; Б. Х. Эргашев, О сущности и развитии антифеодальных взглядов младобухарцев, 1988, No. 8, стр. 59-62; Ш. С. Зиямов/Р. А. Нуруллин, Турар Рыскулов, 1988, No. 10, стр. 32-37; Б. Х. Эргашев, Революционная, партийная и государственная деятельность Абдукадыра Мухитдинова, 1989, No. 10, стр. 33-40. cf. Р. Фиш, Правда революции и националистическая мифология, Наука и религия, 1988, No. 11, стр. 4-6; W. Fierman,

Glasnost' in Practice: The Uzbek Experience, Central Asian Survey, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1989, pp. 14-15.

The reevaluation of the Jadid movement in the Soviet Union was inaugurated by Tatar scholars rather than Uzbek scholars, see, M. Yama-uchi, *Troi "armées" musulmanes qui ont fait l'histoire: L'Armée Divine de Vaïsov, l'Armée Verte des Bolcheviks d'Anatolie et l'Armée Rouge Musulmane de Sultangaliyev*, Tokyo, 1988, pp. 301-312. (in Japanese)

- 5) Э. Каримов, Развитие реализма в Узбекской литературе, Ташкент, 1975, стр. 91-126. According to Karimov, although in the 1930s young Uzbek writers and poets pointed out the "democratic" character in Fitrat's pre-revolutionary works, their draft report entitled "Uzbek Jadid Literature" suffered so immense changes and eliminations that the original version could not be identified. Там же, стр. 115; *Ādābiyat tārīhi: Muvaffāqiyatlār vā muāmmalār, Sharq Yulduzi*, 1988, No. 12, pp. 184-195; E. Kārimov, «Ābulfāyẓkhan» tārikhiy drāmāsi hāqidā, *Sharq Yulduzi*, 1989, No. 1, pp. 81-82; Fitrat, Ābulfāyẓkhan, idem, pp. 83-104; История узбекской литературы, Том 2, С XVII в. до Великой Октябрьской социалистической революции, Ташкент, 1989, стр. 345-441 (Узбекская предреволюционная литература 1905-1917 гг.); Ā. Āliev, Fitrat vā uning «Ārslan» drāmāsi, *Gulistan*, 1989, No. 12 (478), pp. 22-24.
- 6) В. В. Бартольд, Сарт, Сочинения, Том 2-2, Москва, 1964, стр. 528-529.
- 7) Ahmed Zeki Velidi (Togan), *Türkistan matbuatı, Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 2. cilt, 1928, p. 606. See also, М. Вахабов, Формирование узбекской социалистической нации, Ташкент, 1961, стр. 197-198.
- 8) *NAT*, p. 533.
- 9) *Munāẓara*, p. 67.
- 10) For the details see, W. L. Hanaway, Jr., Farsi, the Vatan and the Millat in Bukhara, E. Allworth ed., *The Nationality Question in Soviet Central Asia*, New York, 1973, pp. 143-150; H. Komatsu, Fitrat'in *Münazara'si* üzerine notlar, *Doğu Dilleri*, Cilt. 2, Sayı 4, 1981, 1981, pp. 157-168; H. Komatsu, The *Munāẓara* by Fitrat: The Concept of Reform in Modern Central Asia, *Balkan and Asia Minor Studies*, No. 7, 1981, pp. 53-69. (in Japanese)
- 11) 'Abd al-Ra'ūf (Fitrat), *Bayānāt-i Sayyāh-i Hindī*, Istanbul, Matbaa-i İslāmiye, 1330/1912. It is likely that this work was written under the influence of Zayn al-Ābidīn Marāghayī, *Seyāhatnāme-i Ibrāhīm Bik*, Vol. 1, Cairo, n. d., Vol. 2, Calcutta, 1905, Vol. 3, Constantinople, 1909, which contributed to the awakening of Persian people in the late Qajar period. The latter was also popular among Bukharan intellectuals. See, Зайн ал-Абидин Марагани, Дневник путешествия Ибрагим-бека, Издание подготовили Г. П. Михалевич и А. М. Шойтов, Перевод с персидского Г. П. Михалевич, Москва-Ленинград, 1963, стр. 231; *Türkistan*, p. 415.
- 12) *Munāẓara*, p. 67. The first four verses are not the original of Fitrat but probably a quotation from Hafez Shirazi or Sa'di. See, İttifak ve dostluk hakkında Hafez Shirazi, *Shura*, 1917, No. 12, p. 285.
- 13) Ahmaḍ Makhḍumi Donish, *Risola yo mukhtasare az' ta'rikhi saltanati khonadoni Manghitiya*, Stalinabad, 1960, pp. 161-162.
- 14) И. И. Умняков, К истории новометодной школы в Бухаре, Бюллетень Среднеазиатского Государственного Университета, Том 16, 1927, стр. 88. On the *Sirat-i Müstakim*, Bukharan affairs were considerably well reported during 1909-1910. They had several correspondents in Bukhara.
- 15) *Munāẓara*, p. 14. cf. Abdürreşid İbrahim, *Ālem-i İslām ve Japonya'da İntişar-ı İslāmiyet*, Cilt 1, İstanbul, 1912, pp. 427-428; On the career of İbrahim, see, M. Tahir, Abdurrashid İbragim, 1857-1944, *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1988, pp. 135-140; In the Uzbek version this passage was changed to the humanitarian activities of L. Tolstoi. Fitrat, Muallim Haji Mu'in Samarqandi (trans.), *Hindistandā bir färāngi ilā Buharali bir mudarrisining bir nechā mäsälälär ham usul-i jädidā hususidā qilgān munazāräsi*, Tashkent, Türkistan Kitabkhanäsi, 1913, p. 13.

- 16) Buharalı Abdür-rauf, Buhara veziri Nasrulla Bi Pervaneçi Efendi hazretlerine açık mektup, *Taaruf-ı Müslimin*, Cilt 2, Adet 25, s. 10, 8/XII/1910. This journal too had a close relationship with Bukharan intellectuals. For instance see, Buhara hal-i tehlikede, Cilt 1, Adet 2, s. 29-30, 28/IV/1910; Buhara hal-i tehlikededir, Cilt, 1, Adet 3, s. 47-49, 12/V/1910 and others. On the journal, see, A. Bennigsen/Ch. Lemerrier-Quelquejay, *La presse et le mouvement national chez les musulmans de Russie avant 1920*, Paris-La Haye, 1964, pp. 174-175.
- 17) On the Persian works of Fitrat, see, *NAT*, pp. 531-545.
- 18) « Buhara-yi Şerif » gazetesi, *Türk Yurdu*, Cilt 1, 1911-1912, p. 632.
- 19) Abdülkerim Sayidov, Bukhara, *Shura*, 1909, No. 5, p. 147.
- 20) For the development of turkification in 19th century Central Asia see, Yu. Bregel, The Sarts in the Khanate of Khiva, *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 1978, pp. 120-151; T. K. Beisembiev, Ethnical Identity in Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the 18th and 19th Centuries (According to the Khokand Chronicles), a paper submitted to the international conference "Pre-Modern and Modern National Identity in Russia / the USSR and Eastern Europe", London, April 3, 1989.
- 21) Всеподданнейший доклад Туркестанскаго Генерал Губернатора от Инфантерии Духовскаго, Ислам в Туркестане, Ташкент, 1899, стр. 12-13. cf. H. Komatsu, Islam in Turkistan: Governor-General Dukhovskii's memorandum to Nikolai II, *The Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters Tokai University*, No. 50, 1988, pp. 46-48. (in Japanese)
- 22) В. В. Бартольд, Таджики: Исторический очерк, Сочинения, Том 2-1, Москва, 1963, стр. 468.
- 23) Nationalist trends in Turkistan Muslim periodicals after the 1905 revolution have not been studied satisfactorily. Soviet studies bear strong bias against Jadids. For instance see, A. В. Пясковский, Революция 1905-1907 гг. в Туркестане, Москва, 1958, стр. 542-566; X. Вахидов, Просветительская идеология в Туркестане, Ташкент, 1979. For the detailed analysis of nationalist trends in pre-revolutionary Turkistan, see, E. Allworth, The "Nationality" Idea in Czarist Central Asia, E. Goldhagen, ed., *Ethnic Minorities in the Soviet Union*, New York, 1968, pp. 229-250.
- 24) Mahmud Khoja Behbudiy, Türkistan idaresi, *Shura*, 1908, No. 23, p. 720. cf. Mustafa Chokayev, Turkestan and the Soviet regime, *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, 18, 1931, p. 414; On the controversy of the Turkistan Muslim Spiritual Board see, K. E. Бендриков, Очерки по истории народного образования в Туркестане (1865-1924 гг.), Москва, 1960, стр. 76; H. Komatsu, op. cit., pp. 62-63.
- 25) A. Rauf Muzafer, Türkistanda bügenge hayat X, Anatili ve imla, *Shura*, 1917, No. 6, p. 128; *Hâtıralar*, p. 136; *Türkistan*, p. 355; The self-determined territory of Turkistan may coincide with the territory of the *Turkistan Federation* projected by Togan and his comrades. For the map see, *Türkistan*, p. 371.
- 26) *Munāzara*, pp. 22-23. cf. E. Allworth, op. cit., p. 246.
- 27) Э. Каримов, указ. соч., стр. 114; История узбекской литературы, Том 2, стр. 378; М. Рахманов, Узбекский театр с древнейших времен до 1917 года, Ташкент, 1981, стр. 271. For a rare instance of Turkistanian Jadid's criticism on Fitrat, see, Mahmud Khoja (Behbudiy), *Munazara* hakkında, Appendix to the Uzbek version of the *Munāzara* cited above, pp. 37-41. In this essay Behbudiy attempts to criticize Fitrat who did not mention the need of learning of Russian language that was indispensable for the awakening of Bukharan Muslims.
- 28) When Russian plan to mobilize approximately 250 thousands Turkistanian Muslims as war workers, Turkistanian Jadids gathered at the house of Behbudiy in Samarkand to discuss how to deal with the mobilization order. Participants came from Tashkent, Khiva, Bukhara, Jizzakh and Khokand adopted a resolution to protest against the order. Their direct relations with the popular revolt that began in Khojent on July 4 are not known. Abdullah Receb Baysun Türkistanlı, *Türkistan Millî Hareketleri*, İstanbul, 1943, pp. 18-19. The author Baysun (1892/3-1956) was a member of the Young Bukharans. On

- his career see, Mutlu, Abdullah Recep Baysun hakkında, *Türkistan Sesi*, Yıl 1, sayı 8–9, 1957, pp. 36–40. Until recently Soviet historians denied Jadids' participation in the 1916 revolt and stressed their reactionary character as "followers of czarism." For instance see, М. Г. Вахабов, Восстание 1916 года—поворотный пункт освободительного движения народов Туркестана, ОНУ, 1986, No. 7, стр. 27–28. This problem will require further studies.
- 29) B. Hayit, *Islam and Turkestan under Russian Rule*, Istanbul, 1987, p. 430. The original of this poem was not found.
- 30) A. Bennigsen/Ch. Lemerrier-Quelquejay, op. cit., p. 267.
- 31) Г. Сафаров, Колониальная революция (опыт Туркестана), Москва, 1921, стр. 109.
- 32) *Hâtıralar*, pp. 375–376; *Türkistan*, pp. 415–416.
- 33) Ziya Gökalp, Rusya'daki Türkler ne yapmalı?, *Yeni Mecmua*, 1918, No. 38, pp. 233–235. This essay was also published as a 16 page brochure in the same year. For his Solidarism see, Z. Toprak, Mesrutiyet'te Solidarist Düşünce: Halkçılık, *Toplum ve Bilim*, Bahar 1977, Sayı 1, pp. 92–123.
- 34) A. Muhiddinov, Mardum-i shahr va aṭraf-i Bukhārā Tājikand yā Uzbek, *Rahbar-i Dānish*, 1928, No. 8–9 (11–12), p. 16.
- 35) For the recent Soviet study on the local nationalism of Turkistan Muslim Communists see, В. М. Устинов, Служение народу (Партийная и государственная деятельность Т. Рыскулова), Алма-Ата, 1984, стр. 62–78.
- 36) Т. Эрназаров, Расцвет народной печати в Узбекистане, Ташкент, 1968, стр. 55. On the *Tang* also see, E. Allworth, *Uzbek Literary Politics*, The Hague, 1964, p. 113; A. Bennigsen/Ch. Lemerrier-Quelquejay, op. cit., pp. 270–271.
- 37) В. М. Устинов, указ. соч., стр. 58. On the Turkistan Muslim Bureau see, М. Назаров, Коммунистическая партия Туркестана во главе защиты завоеваний Октябрьской революции (1918–1920 гг.), Ташкент, 1969, стр. 127 и след.; С. Назаров, Руководство ЦК РКП(б) партийным строительством в Средней Азии, Ташкент, 1972, стр. 130–152; Г. С. Абдусаттаров, Из истории строительства местных организаций Компартии Туркестана, Ташкент, 1984, стр. 39–50. On the Central Bureau of Muslim Organizations in Moscow see, Yama-uchi, *The Vision of Sultangaliev*, Tokyo, 1986, pp. 226–236. (in Japanese)
- 38) Salihof, p. 38.
- 39) Before the Chaghatay Gurungi, Fitrat initiated the Turkistan Society for Theater, Music and Literature (Turkistan teatr, muzika vā ādābiyat dāstāsi) in Samarkand in 1917. See, История узбекской литературы, Том 2, стр. 352–353.
- 40) Concerning the Chaghatay Gurungi the most reliable work is E. Allworth, op. cit., pp. 43–51, 109–116. For the Soviet criticism on the Gurungi see, Esen Tursun, *Türkistanda* «Til Siyaseti», *Yash Türkistan*, No. 46, 1933, pp. 15–17; М. Вахабов, указ. соч., стр. 314–321, 452–453.
- 41) Salihof, p. 40; For "the new spelling" (Ordu elifbası) of Enver Paşa, see, A. S. Levend, *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sedeleşme Evreleri*, Türk Dil Kurumu, Ankara, 1972 (3. baskı), p. 360. On Gazi Muhtar Paşa's attempt, see, Н. Тюрякулов, К вопросу о латинизации тюркских алфавитов, Новый Восток, 1925, No. 10–11, стр. 221.
- 42) Salihof, pp. 42–43; In later years Fitrat pointed out that it was himself that brought forward the reform of Arabic alphabet for the first time in Turkistan and because of this proposal he suffered various offense from Pan-Turkists. Fitrat, *Dar gird-i alifbā-yi nau*, *Rahbar-i Dānish*, 1928, No. 10(13), pp. 8–9.
- 43) Salihof, p. 41.
- 44) Salihof, p. 45.
- 45) Salihof, pp. 40–41.
- 46) For the literary language in Turkistan in the beginning of 20th century and the Chaghatay Gurungi's language policy see, *ТКМ*, pp. 10–12, 62, 71; *Türkistan*, pp. 502–503; А. В. Пясковский, указ. соч., стр. 564; E. Allworth, The "Nationality" Idea in Czarist

- Central Asia, pp. 233-234, 238-241. In the early Uzbek literary works published after the October revolution there were a number of "Ottoman" words such as *buyurun*, *baş üstiine*, *isterim*, *ne güzel*, *olabilir*, *parlak*, and *yüksek*. See Salihof, pp. 47, 56.
- 47) *Ishtirakiyun*, 1919, No. 132 (Fitrat), cit. Маджиди, Литература Узбекистана, Революция и национальности, No. 11 (57), 1934, стр. 75,
 - 48) According to T. K. Beisembiev, among the historical works written in the Khanate of Khokand during 1816-1876, 15 titles were written in Tajik-Persian and only 8 in Chaghatay-Turkic. However during 1876-1915 years within the same area there were 12 Turkic works, only 5 in Persian. See also, NAT, p. 197: *Türkistan*, pp. 213, 501; История узбекской литературы, Том 2, стр. 79-116.
 - 49) *TKM*, p. 71; Salihof, pp. 39-40, 42-43. When Effendiev, a former Ottoman officer and a member of the Turkish Communist Party, was appointed as the Commissar of Education in the Turkistan Republic, Turkish method of education was very popular in Turkistanian schools. Г. Сафаров, указ. соч., стр. 172-173.
 - 50) Salihof, p. 28.
 - 51) *Türkistan*, p. 562.
 - 52) *TKM*, pp. 11-12, 22, 51-52, 84; Salihof, p. 46. Linguistic Turkism emerged also among some Ottoman intellectuals since the end of 19th century. Interrelations in these trends should be studied further.
 - 53) *TKM*, p. 13.
 - 54) *TKM*, p. 51.
 - 55) *Türkistan*, p. 520; B. Hayit, *Türkistan'da Öldürülen Türk Şairleri*, Ankara, 1971, pp. 20-22. For the criticism of "bourgeois nationalism" found in Fitrat's plays see, Salihof, pp. 68-69, 72-73; Т. Т. Турсунов, Октябрьская революция и узбекский театр, Ташкент, 1983, стр. 47. On the comment of Neru see, *Ädäbiyat tärihi: Muväffäqiyatlär vä muämmalär*, *Sharq Yulduzi*, 1988, No. 12, p. 191.
 - 56) Salihof, pp. 46, 100; Маджиди, указ. статья, стр. 76-77.
 - 57) For the details of Turkistanian identity, refer to the excellent studies of E. Allworth, Bilim Ochaghi 'The Source of Knowledge': A nationalistic periodical from the Turkistan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, *Central Asiatic Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1965, pp. 61-70; do., The search for group identity in Turkistan, March 1917-September 1922, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Winter 1983), pp. 487-502.
 - 58) Г. Ф. Благова, Тюркск. чагатай-Русск. чагатай-/джагатай- (Опыт сравнительного изучения старото заимствований), Тюркологический сборник 1971, Москва, 1971, стр. 187. While Blagova is critical of the term "the old Uzbek", Soviet historians are still very cautious of the term "Turkistan". See, Н. А. Асыллова/Г. А. Агзамова, Об употреблении географических названий «Мавераннахр» и «Туркестан», ОНУ, 1988, No. 7, стр. 35-39.
 - 59) История Бухарской Народной Советской Республики (1920-1924 гг.): Сборник документов, Ташкент, 1976, док. No. 271, стр. 429. On the publication affairs in the Bukhara People's Republic, see, Т. Эрназаров, указ. соч., стр. 54-63; Б. Х. Эргашев, Из истории идеологической работы Бухарской компартии (1920-1924), ОНУ, 1987, No. 6, стр. 58-62.
 - 60) Salihof, p. 71.
 - 61) *Hâtıralar*, p. 364.
 - 62) М. Вахабов, указ. соч., 324-325; T. Rakowska-Harmstone, *Russia and Nationalism in Central Asia: The Case of Tadzhikistan*, Baltimore and London, 1970, pp. 70 ff.
 - 63) *Türkistan*, pp. 431-434; *Hâtıralar*, pp. 375-376.
 - 64) Бухара, стр. 166.
 - 65) История Бухарской Народной Советской Республики, док. No. 50, стр. 101.
 - 66) М. Вахабов, указ. соч., стр. 401-402. On the nationality problem in the Bukhara Republic, see, S. Becker, National Consciousness and the Politics of the Bukhara People's Conciliar Republic, E. Allworth ed., *The Nationality Question in Soviet Central Asia*,

- New York, 1973, pp. 159-167. Also see the interesting analysis of Turkmen problem in Khiva during 1910-1924: D. B. Yaroshevski, *The Central Government and Peripheral Opposition in Khiva, 1910-24*, Y. Ro'i ed., *The USSR and the Muslim World*, London, 1984, pp. 16-39.
- 67) Maarif Ishlāi (Birinji Maarif Qurultayida Fitrat ortaqning maaruzasi), *Uchqun*, No. 2, 1923, pp. 3-4. Fitrat was invited to Bukhara government as a representative of the native intelligentsia along with 'Ayniy by the Bolsheviks in 1922 and at first was appointed as the Commissar of Foreign Affairs. А. Ишанов, *Роль компартии и советского правительства в создании национальной государственности узбекского народа*, Ташкент, 1978, стр. 185.
- 68) Shakir Ya'qub-Sā'id Ahrari, *Buhara Jägrafyāsi (Mäktüb Sabaqligi)*, Eski Buhara, 1924, 44 pp. cf. T. Kocaoglu, *The Existence of a Bukharan Nationality in the Recent Past*, E. Allworth ed., op. cit., pp. 151-158.
- 69) Baku shehrinde olan birinji Türkoloji Kurultayında Uzbekistan vekili Harezmi Mulla-bekjan Rahmanoglinin Latin alifbası hususunda ma'ruzası, Бюллетень организационной комиссии по созыву 1-го Всесоюзного Тюркологического Съезда, 1926, No. 4, pp. 9-11. cf. Ahmet Zeki Velidi, *Türkistan matbuatı*, p. 616.
- 70) For instance consult the following. W. Fierman, *Uzbek Feelings of Ethnicity: A study of attitudes expressed in recent Uzbek literature*, *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, Vol. 22, No. 2-3, 1981, pp. 187-229; A. Hetmanek, *Aesop and the Turkistanian Idea*, in E. von Mende, Hrsg., *Turkestan als historischer Factor und politische Idee: Festschrift für Baymirza Hayit*, Köln, 1988, pp. 59-80; H. B. Paksoy, *Alpamysh: Central Asian Identity under Russian Rule*, Connecticut, 1989.
- 71) A. Muhiddinov, *Mardum-i shahr va atrāf-i Bukhārā Tājikand yā Uzbek, Rahbar-i Dānish*, No. 8-9(11-12), 1928, pp. 15-18. cf. Б. Х. Эргашев, *Революционная, партийная и государственная деятельность Абдукадыра Мухитдинова*, стр. 39.
- 72) О. А. Сухарева, *Квартальная община позднефеодального города Бухары (в связи с историей кварталов)*, Москва, 1976; H. Komatsu, *Notes on the mahallas of Bukhara: Based on the ethnographical material collected by O. A. Sukhareva*, *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, No. 16, 1978, pp. 192-206. See also, Бухара, стр. 230. However it looks strange that the compilers mentioned that Tajik remained the state language in Bukhara until the National Delimitation in 1924.
- 73) Бухара, стр. 160.
- 74) Бухара, стр. 94, 166.
- 75) О. А. Сухарева, *К истории городов Бухарского ханства*, в кн.: *Материалы второго совещания археологов и этнографов Средней Азии, 29 Октября-4 Ноября 1956 года Сталинабад, Москва-Ленинград, 1959*, стр. 79-80.
- 76) М. Вахабов, указ. соч., стр. 324-325, 464.
- 77) М. Вахабов, указ. соч., стр. 464.
- 78) On the controversy over the new Tajik alphabet, see, Tājik, Maḍmūn-i sukhānhā hamgī yak ast va likin libāseshān mukhtalif ast, *Rahbar-i Dānish*, 1928, No. 7 (10), pp. 33-35; Fitrat, *Dar gird-i alifbā-i tāza, Rahbar-i Dānish*, 1928, No. 4-5(8), p. 13; Fitrat, *Dar gird-i alifbā-i nau, Rahbar-i Dānish*, 1928, No. 10(13), pp. 9-10; Б. С. Асимова, *Языковое строительство в Таджикистане 1920-1940*, Душанбе, 1982, стр. 53-57.
- 79) *Munāẓara*, p. 14.
- 80) *NAT*, pp. 3-4; *История таджикского народа*, Том 3, кн. 1, Москва, 1964, стр. 208. Tajik was not considered as a single people and ignored in the constitution of the Turkistan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. It was only in 1924 that Tajik was given an autonomous republic in Uzbekistan, and at last in 1929 an independent Soviet Socialist Republic. Almost in parallel with 'Ayniy's work, a general history of the Tajiks was published. В. В. Бартольд, *Таджики: Исторический очерк*, в кн.: *Таджикистан, Сб. статей под ред. Н. Л. Корженевского*, Ташкент, 1925, стр. 93-111.

- 81) NAT, p. 531. See also p. 455. At present while Fitrat is described as an Uzbek writer and scholar in the *Uzbek Soviet Encyclopaedia*, he is also a Tajik writer and scholar in the *Tajik Soviet Encyclopaedia*. cf. Г. А. Ашуров, Движение социально-философской мысли таджикского народа от просветительства к ленинизму (постановка проблемы), Известия Академии Наук Таджикской ССР, Отделение общественных наук, No. 3 (121), 1985, стр. 32-33.
- 82) On Fitrat's works in this period, see, Timur Kocaoglu, Türkistanlı bilgin Abdurrauf Fitrat'ın Türkoloji sahasındaki unutulmuş eserleri, *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten 1982-1983*, 1986, pp. 101-112.
- 83) Fitrat, *Ozbek Ädäbiyati Nämünäläri*, 1 inji jild, Tashkent-Samarkand, 1928, pp. XI-XII. The second volume and *History of Uzbek Jadid Literature* were completed by Fitrat until 1935. But the political atmosphere in the 1930s probably did not permit them to be published. Э. Каримов, указ. соч., стр. 115.
- 84) E. Allworth, *Uzbek Literary Politics*, pp. 53-56.
- 85) История узбекской литературы, Том 1 (С древнейших времен до XVI в.), Ташкент, 1987, стр. 65.
- 86) S. Zufärov, ((«Abulfäyzkhan»)) Näshrgä täyyarlavchidän, *Sharq Yulduzi*, 1989, No. 1, p. 103.
- 87) Э. Каримов, указ. соч., стр. 111. Until recent times it was merely Fitrat's anti-religious writings that could enjoy Soviet appreciations. For instance see, X. Г. Кор-оглы, Узбекская литература, Москва, 1968, стр. 127-135.
- 88) For instance, P. M. Масов, Проблемы изучения социалистического строительства в Таджикистане, История СССР, 1989, No. 4, стр. 130-136; Н. В. Хотамов, Не извращать ленинскую национальную политику, в сб.: Национальный вопрос и межнациональные отношения в СССР: История и современность, Вопросы истории, 1989, No. 5, стр. 32-34; W. Fierman, Cultural Nationalism in Soviet Uzbekistan: A Case Study of *The Immortal Cliffs, Soviet Union/Union Soviétique*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1985, pp. 1-41.

Acknowledgement: I would like to acknowledge my special debt to Mr. Nuri Akbayar who provided me an important source material indispensable for this study.