From 1917 to 1937

The Muftī, the Turkologist, and Stalin's Terror

Kemper, M.

DOI
10.1163/15700607-00572p02

Publication date
2017

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Die Welt des Islams

BRILL

DIE WELT DES ISLAMS 57 (2017) 162-191

DIE
WELT DES
ISLAMS
brill.com/wdi

From 1917 to 1937: The *Muftī*, the Turkologist, and Stalin's Terror

Michael Kemper
University of Amsterdam, Department of History, European Studies and Religious Studies
M.Kemper@uva.nl

Abstract

The Tatar religious scholar Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov (1859-1936) is well-known as a Jadīd publicist and historian, but his time as *qāḍī* and *muftī* of Soviet Russia (1918-36) is still unexplored. Muftī Fakhreddinov witnessed the Bolsheviks' gradual elimination of all Islamic community life. In 1935 he considered saving his personal archive from destruction by transferring it to the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad, the director of which, Turkologist Aleksandr N. Samoilovich (1880-1938), enjoyed his trust. But Fakhreddinov passed away in 1936, and in 1937 the NKVD constructed a group case against Muslim historians and philologists into which Samoilovich and Fakhreddinov's sons were also drawn. After Stalin's death in 1953, the "rehabilitation" of these victims of state terror was slow and selective, and scholarship on Islam in Russia was severely crippled. Only the late 1980s and the 1990s brought a window of opportunity for revisiting the Bolsheviks' destruction of the secular and Islamic elites.

Keywords

Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov – Aleksandr N. Samoilovich – Islam – Soviet Union – Islamic manuscripts – Tatar historiography – Red Terror – Rehabilitation

* The author is grateful to Alfrid K. Bustanov (Amsterdam/St. Petersburg) for his critical remarks on an earlier draft of this paper, and to Shamil Shikhaliev (Makhachkala) for providing him with a set of *Islām mäjälläse*. The author also thanks Rozaliya Garipova for discussions on the topics of our two papers.

 | DOI 10.1163/15700607-00572P02

The year 2017 marks the centenary of Russia's February and October Revolutions, both of which had a tremendous impact on Islam in Russia. The liberal revolution ended tsardom and boosted liberal and progressive Muslim intellectuals, who took the political lead in their communities. The October Revolution continued the promise of Muslim liberation, especially since Lenin and Stalin emphasized that Bolshevism would support the emancipation of minorities.[1] Russia's Muslims were now even called on to be the world's vanguard in the struggle against Western colonialism.[2]

Many conferences in Russia's regions will investigate the significance of 1917 for the empire's Muslim nations. But in 2017 we also mark eighty years since 1937, the peak of Stalin's Red Terror. The persecution and eradication of Islam in the Soviet Union had already started in the late 1920s, but the years 1936-38 witnessed the physical extermination of an elite of Muslim scholars, intellectuals, and politicians, including many who were fully committed to the Bolshevik regime.[3] 1937 therefore embodies the violent termination of Muslim cultural emancipation and religious autonomy in the USSR.

In what follows, I trace the tragic fates of two outstanding scholars of the early Soviet Union, Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov (1859-1936) and Aleksandr N. Samoilovich (1880-1938), and the liquidation of the intellectual and scholarly circles in which they operated. Both men made an impressive pre-revolutionary career, and both tried to navigate the new Soviet system. Fakhreddinov was the towering figure of pre-revolutionary Tatar Islamic studies and of Muslim journalism. From 1921 he served as the de facto *muftī* of the Russian Soviet Republic (RSFSR). From 1927, when most mosques and Muslim communities

1 For the political movements among Russia's Muslims in 1917-1918 see Salavat Iskhakov, *Rossiiskie musul'mane i revoliutsiia* (*vesna 1917 g.-leto 1918 g.*) (Moscow: Sotsial'no-politicheskaia mysl', 2004). On pre-revolutionary Tatar Muslim intellectuals see Christian Noack, *Muslimischer Nationalismus im Russischen Reich: Nationsbildung und Nationalbewegung bei Tataren und Baschkiren, 1861-1917* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2000); Volker Adam, *Russlandmuslime in Istanbul am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges: Die Berichterstattung osmanischer Periodika über Russland und Zentralasien* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002); Mustafa Tuna, *Imperial Russia's Muslims: Islam, Empire and European Modernity, 1788-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015). On the Soviet transformation of Muslim societies see Shoshana Keller, *To Moscow, Not Mecca: The Soviet Campaign against Islam in Central Asia* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001), and Adeeb Khalid, *Making Uzbekistan: Nation, Empire and Revolution in the Early USSR* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 2015).

2 Peter Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze: Lenin's Dream of an Empire in Asia* (London: John Murray, 1984).

3 For the murderous political infighting in Soviet Azerbaijan, see Jörg Baberowski, *Der Feind ist überall. Stalinismus im Kaukasus* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2003).

under his authority were closed down and their *imāms* driven from office, his tenure became a continual ordeal. In 1928 Fakhreddinov's only remaining publication, the official Islamic journal *Islām mäjälläse*, ceased to exist. For Samoilovich, by contrast, the 1920s and 1930s were the most productive time of his career, and his loyalty to the Soviet state brought him immense prestige. His scholarship contributed significantly to the Soviet construction of national languages and literatures, that is, to the ideological partition of the common Muslim cultural, literary, and linguistic heritage into national segments.[4] In this period the two men were in correspondence, in particular about the envisaged transfer of Islamic manuscripts from Fakhreddinov's disintegrating Muftiate in Ufa to Samoilovich's Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad. I will argue that Fakhreddinov was ambiguous about this transfer: he saw it as the only way to preserve the Muslim written heritage, but he also realized that it marked the final transfer of authority over Islam to the Marxist experts.[5]

Fakhreddinov passed away in 1936; in the following year Samoilovich was drawn into the state's terror machinery. He was executed in early 1938. In the final part of this paper I will look at how Samoilovich was posthumously "rehabilitated" in the 1950s and how, from the 1960s, Fakhreddinov's legacy was gradually reintroduced into the Soviet canon of Tatar literature. But in the post-war period, both the religious and the secular fields of Oriental/Islamic studies in Russia were so decimated that any serious engagement with the written heritage of our two protagonists was extremely difficult. As I will argue, this is still the case today.

Fakhreddinov: From Jadīd Journalist to Soviet *Muftī*

Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov (Riḍā' al-Dīn ibn Fakhr al-Dīn) is well known for his role in the development of Tatar Jadidism, the Muslim modernist trend of '*ulamā*' and intellectuals.[6] The Jadīds reformed the educational system of the

4 On the Orientalists' role in this project, see Alfrid K. Bustanov, *Soviet Orientalism and the Creation of Central Asian Nations* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015); on early Soviet nationality policies see Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001).

5 On early Soviet interpretations of Islam before the Great Terror years, see Michael Kemper, "The Soviet Discourse on the Origin and Class Character of Islam, 1923-1933", *Die Welt des Islams* 49:1 (2009), 1-48; idem, "Red Orientalism: Mikhail Pavlovich and Marxist Oriental Studies in Early Soviet Russia", *Die Welt des Islams* 50:3-4 (2010), 435-476.

6 On Fakhreddinov, see Fanil' N. Baishev, *Obshchestvenno-politicheskie i nravstvenno-eticheskie vzgliady Rizy Fakhretdinova* (Ufa: Kitap, 1996); *Tvorchestvo Rizy Fakhretdinova: issledovaniia,*

maktabs and madrasas by integrating Russian, Western, and Turkish models; opened the discourse of Russia's Muslims for secular knowledge on the modern world; and applied critical methods to the study of Islam and Muslim history in their home areas, including by considering Russian historiography.[7] The pioneer of this movement was the Crimean Tatar Ismāʿīl Gasprinskii (1851-1914), who in the early 1880s founded the first *uṣūl-i jadīd* ("new method") school and a Tatar-Russian newspaper.[8] Around 1890 Jadidism came to full blossoming in Volga-Urals cities like Orenburg, Ufa, and Kazan, as well as in Central Asia; by the 1910s it had reached Russia's North Caucasus. The Jadīds met the opposition of traditional ("*qadīm*") *ʿulamāʾ* who insisted on applying the "old methods" (*uṣūl-i qadīm*) in teaching and scholarship,[9] but by 1917, not the least with the help of the February Revolution that discredited the old order, Jadīd-minded intellectuals came to dominate Muslim education and Islamic interpretation in major cities and in some prominent rural schools.

---

materialy, chief ed. R.Z. Shakurov (Bashkirskii nauchnyi tsentr Ural'skogo otdeleniia AN SSR, 1988); *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, ed. by Raif Märdanov, Ramil Miñnullin and Söläyman Räkhimov (Kazan: Rukhiyat, 1999); *Rizaeddin Fäkhreddin:Mirasï häm khäzärge zaman. Fänni konferentsiya materiyallarï. Kazan, 16 noyabr' 1999 yel,* chief ed. Räwil Ämirkhan (Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani, 2003); Marsil' Farkhshatov, "Fakhretdinov, Rizaetdin", in *Islam na territorii byvshei Rossiiskoi imperii: entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. Stanislav M. Prozorov, vol. 1 (Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura RAN, 2006), 400-402. See also Ismail Türkoğlu, *Rusya Türkleri Arasındaki Yenileşme Hareketin Öncülerinden Rizaeddin Fahreddin (1858-1936)* (Istanbul: Ötüken, 2000); Ömer Hakan Özalp, *Rizaeddin bin Fahreddin: Kazan'la Istanbul Arasında bir Alim* (Istanbul: Dergah, 2001).

7 On Jadidism, see Edward J. Lazzerini, "Ğadidism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A View from Within", *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 16:2 (1975), 245-77; Ingeborg Baldauf, "Jadidism in Central Asia within Reformism and Modernism in the Muslim World", *Die Welt des Islams* 41.1 (2001), 72-88; Ahmet Kanlidere, *Reform within Islam: The Tajdid and Jadid Movement among the Kazan Tatars (1809-1917)* (Istanbul: Eren, 1997); Adeeb Khalid, *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1999).

8 On Gasprinskii, see *Ismägïyl Gasprinskii: tarikhi-dokumental' jïyentïk*, ed. by S. Räkhimov (Kazan: Jïyen, 2006).

9 Stéphane A. Dudoignon, "Djadidisme, mirasisme, islamisme", *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 37:1-2 (1996), 13-40; idem, "Qu'est-ce que la 'qadîmîya'? Éléments pour une sociologie du traditionalisme musulman, en Islam de Russie et en Transoxiane (au tournant des XIXe et XXe siècles)," *L'Islam de Russie: Conscience communautaire et autonomie politique chez les Tatars de la Volga et de l'Oural, depuis le XVIIIe siècle*, ed. by Stéphane A. Dudoignon, Dämir Is'haqov and Räfyq Möhämmätshin (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1997), 207-25.

The usefulness of the distinction between Jadidism and Qadimism has been challenged repeatedly.[10] On this question, I take an intermediate position: in the early years, Jadidism could be clearly identified by its pedagogical innovation, but the more it expanded the less value could be attached to the two categories – also the traditional scholars used the print media and expanded schooling, and among the proponents of the new methods we also find major Naqshbandī Sufis.[11] Ironically, the Bolsheviks reinforced the Jadīd-Qadīm dichotomy by co-opting many Jadīd-educated intellectuals and employing them in Soviet education, from where they continued to criticize their traditionalist counterparts. The Jadīds eventually reappeared as a group in the 1930s, when many of them fell victim to Stalin's terror, as we will see below. In terms of teaching methods, the distinction still makes sense today: in contemporary Daghestani madrasas, Jadīd and Qadīm methods compete with each other, sometimes at the same institution.[12] In general, research has paid more attention to the Jadīd-educated political intellectuals[13] than to the religious strand represented by Fakhreddinov and other scholars.

Born in 1859 in the small village of Kichuchat in Tataria, Fakhreddinov was first sent to an Islamic school in the town of Chistopol' east of Kazan, which was run by a prominent Naqshbandī, Muḥammad-Dhākir al-Chisṭāwī (d. 1893).[14] Yet it seems he rejected the Sufi-inspired approach at this school and soon went to a rural madrasa in Shalchaly, closer to his native village. He remained there for twenty years, first as a student and then as a teacher. In this

10 For an ardent critique of Jadidocentrism in Western research, see Dewin DeWeese, "It Was a Dark and Stagnant Night ('til the Jadids Brought the Light): Clichés, Biases, and False Dichotomies in the Intellectual History of Central Asia", *JESHO* 59 (2016), 37-92.

11 Shamil Shikhaliev and Michael Kemper, "Sayfallāh-Qāḍī Bashlarov: Sufi Networks between the North Caucasus and the Volga-Urals", in *The Piety of Learning: Islamic Studies in Honor of Stefan Reichmuth*, ed. by Michael Kemper and Ralf Elger (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming 2017).

12 Michael Kemper and Shamil Shikhaliev, "Qadimism and Jadidism in Twentieth-Century Daghestan", *Asiatische Studien – Études Asiatiques* 69.3 (2015), 593-624.

13 E.g. James H. Meyer, *Turks Across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856-1914* (Oxford University Press, 2014).

14 Al-Chisṭāwī (Kamalov) had obtained his initiation into the Naqshbandiyya khālidiyya from shaykh Maḥmūd Afandī al-Almālī (d. 1877), the founder of the Maḥmudiyya branch of the Daghestani Khālidiyya. See Al'frid Bustanov, "Sufizm bez granits: pis'ma dagestanskogo sheikha Makhmuda al-Almali v Chistopol' ", *Istoricheskie sud'by narodov Povolzh'ia i Priural'ia. Sbornik statei*, vol. 5, chief ed. Il'dus Zagidullin (Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani, 2015), 51-66.

period he wrote his first works, including a handbook on morphology (1887, obviously emanating from his teaching practice) and a work on women's hygiene and issues of pregnancy (1888), as well as a catechism introducing the basic tenets of Islam (*Kitāb al-iʿtibār*, 1888).

Fakhreddinov's booklets attracted the attention of Muftī Muḥammadyār Soltanov (in office 1886-1915), the state-appointed leader of the Orenburg Spiritual Administration of Muslims (*Orenburgskoe musul'manskoe dukhovnoe upravlenie*) in Ufa. This Muftiate, an imperial Russian institution, staffed and controlled the empire's mosques; kept records of the Muslim population; administered marriage, divorce, and inheritance cases; and issued fatwas that enforced loyalty and patriotism.[15] Muftī Soltanov invited Fakhreddinov to become co-worker (*qāḍī*) at the Muftiate. In Ufa, Fakhreddinov concentrated on studying and ordering the Muftiate's archive, which contained the register books of the Tatar mosque communities and a wealth of documents and correspondence. This archive became the source for Fakhreddinov's historiographical and biographical research on the Volga-Urals Muslims. As early as 1900, he published the first issue of his famous *Āthār* (*Traces*, *Works*), a compilation of historical information on Muslim scholars, *imāms*, and writers from the area; by 1908, fifteen brief issues, grouped in two volumes, had been published. Fakhreddinov continued this work on *Āthār* until his death, but the subsequent two volumes remained in manuscript form, as will be discussed below.[16]

While serving as *qāḍī* in Ufa, Fakhreddinov also became a bestselling author of easily accessible books and brochures, primarily on practical Islamic ethics. Between the late 1880s and 1917, he brought out twelve treatises of this type, under titles like "Family", "Student Ethics", and "The Well-Educated Father" ("Mother"/"Women"/"Child"). Some of these titles ran to eleven or twelve editions between 1898 and 1914,[17] which testifies to their public demand. All of his

15 Danil Azamatov, "The Muftis of the Orenburg Spiritual Assembly in the 18th and 19th Centuries: The Struggle for Power in Russia's Muslim Institution", *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries, vol. 2: Inter-regional and Inter-ethnic Relations*, ed. by Anke von Kügelgen, Michael Kemper, Allen J. Frank (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1998), 355-384; Robert Crews, *For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia* (Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press, 2009), 31-91.

16 For a modern edition (in Cyrillic Tatar transcription with Russian abstracts), see Rizaeddin Fäkhreddin, *Asar*, chief editor Mirkasïym Gosmanov, vol. 1 (Kazan: Rukhiyat, 2006), vol. 2 (2009), vols 3 and 4 in-one (2010).

17 *Tärbiyäli bala* ("The Well-Educated Child") was published eleven times; *Nasīḥät* ("Advice") saw twelve editions, and follow-ups (*Nasīḥät II* and *III*, 7 editions each). Madina F. Rakhimkulova, "Bibliografiia knig i statei Rizy Fakhretdinova", in *Tvorchestvo* (1988),118.

writings were written in the Tatar language, with strong Ottoman interferences, in Arabic script. He also produced studies of important historical personalities (from Ibn al-ʿArabī to al-Ghazzālī to Ibn Rushd) and edited excerpts from famous travel accounts related to the Volga-Urals (including those of Ibn Faḍlān and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa). Nine of his books deal with classical religious sciences (theology, law, hadith, and *sīra*); others, with the Russian Empire's regulations of Islam.[18]

In 1906, Fakhreddinov left the Muftiate to become a full-time journalist in Orenburg, where he and his son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (1887-1937) began work in the editorial office of the Tatar newspaper *Vaqït* (*Time*), organized and sponsored by the wealthy Rameev merchant family. In 1908, the Rameev brothers opened a new journal, *Shūrā* (*Council*). Fakhreddinov became its chief editor. In his 312 contributions to *Shūrā* between early 1908 and late 1917, when it closed, Fakhreddinov focused again on interesting personalities of Islamic history but also wrote on Greek philosophers, American millionaires, and European rulers.[19]

Fakhreddinov was sympathetic to the well-known Islamic reformers of the time; he had encountered Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī in St. Petersburg in 1888.[20] Starting in 1908, Fakhreddinov placed articles on Afghānī, Muḥammad ʿAbduh, and Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā in *Shūrā*.[21] But Fakhreddinov was not at the radical forefront of political Jadidism or Salafism; rather, he made a name for himself as a conservative authority on Islamic ethics and Muslim history and as a propagator of modern knowledge, including for women. The thrust of his work was to demonstrate Islam's scientific character and its adaptation to modernity. Although he criticized Sufism, in his historical works he also recorded Sufi lineages in detail. Fakhreddinov's sympathies for Jadidism are also reflected in

18 See the alphabetic list of titles given in Rakhimkulova, "Bibliografiia", 116-133. For a list of book editions, by years up to 1917, see Raif Mardanov, "Bibliografiia. Rizaetdin Fäkhretdinneñ basïlïp chïkkan khezmätläre häm äsärläre", in *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, 193-223.

19 Rakhimkulova, "Bibliografiia", 120-33; M.G. Gosmanov and R.F. Märdanov, *"Shura" zhurnalïnïñ bibliografik kürsätkeche* (Kazan: Milli Kitap, 2000).

20 Baishev, *Obshchestvenno-politicheskie,* 47-54; on Afghānī's stay in Russia (1887-89) cf. Nikki R. Keddie, *Sayyid Jamāl ad-Dīn "al-Afghānī": A Political Biography* (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1972), 292-305 (not using Russian/Tatar sources).

21 Stéphane A. Dudoignon, "Echoes to al-Manār among the Muslims of the Russian Empire: a Preliminary Research Note on Riza al-Din b. Fakhr al-Din and the Šūrā (1908-1918)", in *Intellectuals in the Modern Islamic World: Transmission, Transformation, Communication*, ed. by Stéphane A. Dudoignon, Komatsu Hisao and Kosugi Yasushi (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 85-116, esp. 114.

the fact that he sent his sons to a famous Jadīd school, the Ḥusayniyya Madrasa in Orenburg (where Fakhreddinov taught hadith and *sīra*), and his two daughters to a Russian gymnasium.[22]

In the turbulent summer between the two Russian revolutions of 1917,[23] a Muslim congress in Moscow heatedly debated Muslim national and religious autonomy in the future structure of Russia, and also elected a *muftī* and his *qāḍīs*.[24] Delegates asked Fakhreddinov to run as candidate for *muftī* in the reformed Muslim Spiritual Administration, or at least for *qāḍī*, but he refused.[25] Reportedly, at that time he was involved in the establishment of a parallel Bashkir Muftiate, as a delegate from the Muslim community of Orenburg.[26] Still, that project dragged on, and the closure of the Rameev publishing house and its outlets deprived him of his journalist's income. In March 1918, in the middle of the civil war between the Reds and the Whites, he returned to Ufa to start another tenure as *qāḍī* at what was now the Central Spiritual Administration for the Muslims of Inner Russia, Siberia, and Kazakhstan (TsDU).[27] He found work conditions awful and again made it his focus to preserve the Muftiate's archive. When Muftī Ghālimjān (ʿĀlimjān) Bārūdī passed away in 1921, Fakhreddinov took over his affairs, and in 1923, he was officially elected to the office of *muftī*. Fakhreddinov's appointment was furthered by the highest circles in Moscow, probably by Mikhail Kalinin, who was officially head of state through his function as chairman of the All-Russian (later Soviet) Executive Committee of Councils (VTsIK, a kind of government that officially stood above the people's commissariats/ministries).[28] The Bolsheviks wanted to have a less political figure than the previous *muftī*, Barudi, who had been a colorful personality in the Tatar Muslim movement of the revolutionary years.[29]

22 On his children see Arslan Sharaf, "Svedeniia o detiakh Rizaetdina Fakhretdinova", in *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, 189-92.

23 For state-Islam relations in early Soviet Tataria see Il'nur R. Minnullin, *Musul'manskoe dukhovenstvo i vlast' v Tatarstane* (*1920-1930-e gg.*) (Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani, 2006).

24 On the political discussions at this congress, see Shafiga Daulet, "The First All Muslim Congress of Russia: Moscow, 1-11 May 1917", *Central Asian Survey* 8.1 (1989), 21-47; for the religious issues and decisions, see Türkoğlu, *Rusya Türkleri Arasındaki Yenileşme,* 174-181.

25 Türkoğlu, *Rusya Türkleri Arasındaki Yenileşme,* 180-181.

26 Aislu B. Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane* (Ufa: Ufimskii poligrafkombinat, 1999), 108.

27 As'ma Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, 111-46, here: 124-27.

28 Bulat Sultanbekov, *Stalin i "tatarskii sled"* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo), 99.

29 For Barudi see Munir Iusupov, *Galimdzhan Barudi* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2003).

Most academic studies on Fakhreddinov have very little to say about Fakhreddinov's second tenure as *qāḍī* (1918-21) and then as *muftī*, and information on his activities after 1918 is very fragmentary. There is as of yet not even a list of Fakhreddinov's publications in *Islām mäjälläse* (1925-28), the journal of the Ufa Muftiate in the Soviet era.[30] Also, his manuscript legacy from that time has still not been systematically explored. Some information on Fakhreddinov's activities in this period is reflected in reports by the secret police (OGPU).[31] What is certain is that Fakhreddinov had to combine his interests as *muftī* with those of the Soviets. When an atrocious famine raged in the Volga area in the early 1920s, Fakhreddinov and his co-workers – including Käshshāf Tärjemānī[32] and Mukhlisa Bubi (Mukhliṣa Būbī)[33] – published a "call to all Muslim brothers" in the Party newspaper, *Pravda* (of 12 June 1923), in which they urged their co-religionists abroad to support the starving Muslims in Russia. But this arti-

30 The journal emphasized Islam's compatibility with science, the rights it accords to women, and loyalty to the Bolshevik regime. In *Islām mäjälläse*, Fakhreddinov published short articles on the history of the Qur'ān copies ascribed to Caliph 'Uthmān (second part in no. 4 [1925], 126-30, obviously on the occasion of the Soviet government's return of one such copy from Leningrad to Tashkent in 1923, with a commission headed by Fakhreddinov), on the history of the Friday prayer (11-12 [1925], 422-28; 24 [1927], 933-34), on Islam's organization in Russia up to the late 18th century (11-12 [1925], 460-65), and on Islam in al-Andalus (14 [1926], 557-62). One contribution introduces several Daghestani exiles to Inner Russia and Siberia (11-12 [1925], 487-90). In three consecutive articles Fakhreddinov argued against the blind following of religious authorities, and against the opinion that a scholar should never oppose the view of his master, and that a Ḥanafī who contradicts Abū Ḥanīfa's *madhhab* in a certain issue must be regarded as having left the Ḥanafī school (13 [1926], 514-19; 17 [1926], 688-92 [with a quote from Muḥammad 'Abduh's *al-Islām wal-naṣrāniyya*]; 18 [1926], 712-16). In other articles, he discussed the high status of women in Islam, in contrast to Judaism and Christianity (21 [1927], 825-29), and praised the courage of the Muslim men and women who suffered for their faith (15 [1926], 618-22). I have no access to issues 1-3, 9-10, and the one or two issues of 1928 when the journal ended; cf. Aislu Iunusova, "Islam madzhallasy", in *Islam na territorii byvshei Rossiiskoi imperii*, I, 161.

31 *Islam i sovetskoe gosudarstvo* (*Po materialam vostochnogo otdela OGPU. 1926 g.*), vol. 1, ed. by Dmitrii Iu. Arapov and Grigorii G. Kosach (Moscow: Mardzhani, 2010); *Islam i sovetskoe gosudarstvo* (*1917-1936*), vol. 2, ed. by Dmitrii Iu. Arapov (Moscow: Mardzhani, 2010). The Oriental Department of the OGPU ("United State Political Administration") was set up in 1922 to monitor the "Muslim" areas of the nascent USSR, and also involved in Soviet intelligence about the foreign Muslim world.

32 Cf. Aidar Khabutdinov, "Tardzhemani, Kashshaf (1877-1943)", in *Islam na evropeiskom vostoke. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* ed. R.A. Nabiev et al. (Kazan: Magarif, 2004), 317-18.

33 On Mukhlisa Bubi, see Rozaliya Garipova's contribution to this issue, as well as Alta Makhmudova, *Millät analarï: tarikhi-dokumental' häm biografik jïyentïk* (Kazan: Jïyen, 2012), 208-94.

cle was already imbued with propagandistic attacks on the allegedly "anti-Islamic policy" of the British government.[34]

In the first half of the 1920s, the major target of the Bolsheviks' anti-religious propaganda machinery was the Orthodox Church; mosque communities were harassed but not yet systematically targeted. The government even allowed for another congress of the "Muslim clergy", in 1923, where prominent Muslim scholars and intellectuals demanded that Muslim communities be allowed to restart formal Islamic education, and where Fakhreddinov was officially elected into the office of *muftī*. In October 1923, Kalinin's All-Russian Central Executive Committee allowed Muslims to organize Islamic education in their mosques, though not for children under eighteen, and not on official school days.[35] In Kazan, one new mosque was opened as late as 1926.[36] The early years of Fakhreddinov's tenure as *muftī* therefore still held the promise that he would be able to maintain the work of the Muftiate and protect the mosque communities.

In February 1925, Fakhreddinov was invited to Kazan, where he had a discussion with the chairman of the Tatar republic's government (*Sovnarkom*), Khadzhi Z. Gabidullin (who would be executed in 1937),[37] as well as with the eminent Tatar writer and public intellectual Ghālimjān (ʿĀlimjān) Ibragimov (who would die in a Soviet prison hospital in 1938); according to Ibragimov's memoirs, Fakhreddinov asked the government to help establish educational courses for *imāms* and to allow the *imāms*' children to study at secular schools. Gabidullin promised to ensure that *imāms* and mosques were protected from illegal assaults (such as violent anti-religious activities by local Party cells and the Komsomol youth organization).[38] Fakhreddinov met privately with the eminent Jadīd pedagogues, writers, and journalists Hādī Maqṣūdī (who would

34 Sultanbekov, *Stalin i "tatarskii sled"*, 99; cf. Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane*, 131, 134. Another co-author of the *Pravda* piece was Ṣābir Qāḍī; on him see *Asar*, vol. 3 [2010 edition], 367. For the Soviet document that was the base of the *Pravda* article see Arapov (ed.), *Islam*, vol. 2, doc. 10, 57-58.

35 Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane*, 135; Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, p. 13.

36 On this "Red Mosque" see Radik R. Salikhov and Ramil' R. Khairutdinov, *Istoricheskie mecheti Kazani* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2005), 166-68.

37 "Gabidullin, Khadzhi Zagidullovich (1897-1937)", *Liudi i sud'by: Bibliograficheskii slovar' vostokovedov-zhertv politicheskogo terrora v sovetskii period. 1917-1991*, ed. by Iaroslav V. Vasil'kov and Mariia Iu. Sorokina (St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, 2003), 107. In the 1930s Gabidullin worked at the USSR Commissariat of Enlightenment, and as historian and linguist at various universities in Moscow.

38 Sultanbekov, *Stalin i "tatarskii sled"*, 100-01.

be arrested repeatedly in the 1930s; d. 1941)[39] and Burhān Shäräf (who, with a brief interruption, would spend the years from 1932 to his death in 1941 in labor camps).[40] Topics of conversation included the planned introduction of the Latin alphabet for the Tatar language (which, we must assume, Fakhreddinov did not support), Muslim politicians in exile (with some of whom Fakhreddinov maintained contact), as well as issues of historiography, in which the new Soviet Tatar elite had a great interest. He also met Kazan's most prominent *imāms*, most of whom would soon be deported.[41]

In 1925, Fakhreddinov was invited to the celebrations of the two-hundredth anniversary of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad;[42] and in June/July 1926 Fakhreddinov officially headed the Soviet delegation to the First World Congress of Muslims in Mecca.[43] The congress was a political event to bolster the authority of Ibn Saʿūd, King of Najd and Hijaz at that time, whom the USSR wanted to employ against British interests in the Middle East. Fakhreddinov fulfilled his task: he praised the USSR's anti-colonial policies and demonstrated to the world that Muslims were not oppressed in the USSR.[44] On his way back, in Turkey, he was still able to meet with the exiled Bashkir politician Zeki Validov.

Fakhreddinov then had to prepare and direct the upcoming third congress of Muslim "clergy" that was to take place in Ufa in October/November 1926. The OGPU noted that in Tatar and Bashkir villages, hundreds of new Islamic schools were opened – dragging pupils away from Soviet schools – and that Muslims petitioned the authorities to permit an expansion of Islamic educa-

39 On Hādī Maksudov's repression see S. Rakhimova, "Ia blizhe vsekh byl sviazan s I. Gasprinskim", *Gasïrlar awazï/Ekho vekov*, May 1995 [inaugural issue of the journal], 177-95.

40 Ramzi Valeev, "Rassmotrev sledstvennoe delo po obvineniiu Burgana Sharafa…", *Gasïrlar awazï/Ekho vekov*, no. 1-2 (2001), 87-101.

41 Al'frid K. Bustanov, Il'nur R. Minnullin, "Vizit muftiia R. Fakhretdinova v Kazan' v 1925 g. glazami musul'manskoi elity: zapiska Saida Vakhidi", *Gasïrlar awazï/Ekho vekov* 3/4 (2014), 165-72.

42 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 135.

43 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 137; Sultanbekov, *Stalin i "Tatarskii sled"*,103; Kashshāf Tarjumānī, "Mäkkä-yi mökärrimä nädväse mönäsäbätiylä", *Islām mäjälläse* 18 (1926), 743-37 [on the delegation]; on the Meccan congress cf. Martin Kramer, *Islam Assembled: The Advent of the Muslim Congresses* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1986), 105-22, 186-91; Reinhard Schulze, *Islamischer Internationalismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Islamischen Weltliga* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 80-85.

44 "No. 9. Vsemusul'manskii kongress v Mekke (Interv'iu s glavoi delegatsii musul'man SSSR – predsedatelem TsDUM muftiem Rizauddin Fakhretdinovym)", in Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, 60-63.

tion.[45] The 1926 Congress in Ufa attracted 437 delegates, including a significant group from Kazakhstan (at that time still part of the RSFSR).[46] Judging from OGPU reports, one group of scholars and *imāms* demanded that the congress call for age restrictions for recipients of religious education to be lifted; for political/civil rights to be returned to Islamic functionaries, and for these functionaries to be paid a state salary; for the state's anti-religious propaganda in public and in schools to be ended; and for a printing house to be set up at the Muftiate. Radicals such as the Moscow theologian Mūsā Jārallāh Bigiev (d. 1949 in exile)[47] also criticized the Muftiate for inertia, and wanted to place it more firmly under the authority of the Council of Scholars (*sovet ulemov*), which comprised delegates from the various RSFSR regions and communities. This radical approach was countered by Fakhreddinov's co-workers, especially Käshshāf Tärjemānī, who pushed through more moderate proposals.[48] In the end Fakhreddinov was re-elected *muftī*; his trusted *qāḍīs* (the most prominent of whom being Tärjemānī,[49] Żiyā' Kämālī,[50] and Mukhlisa Bubi) were also confirmed in office. The OGPU therefore had good reason to regard Fakhreddinov's Muftiate as a reliable partner for curbing the activities of more radically minded scholars.[51] The state now maintained a separate Bashkortostan Muslim Spiritual Administration (also in Ufa) as a direct rival to Fakhreddinov's Central Administration of Muslims.[52] In April 1928, Fakhreddinov was once again summoned to Moscow to make a good impression on a state guest, the Afghan King Āmānallāh Khān.[53]

45 Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, doc. 3, 32-48, esp. 34; doc. 8, 53-59, here: 55.

46 Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam* vol. 1, doc. 11, 79. The parallel Bashkir Muftiate organized its own Congress in the same week, which suggests the Soviet authorities tried to play the two muftiates off against each other.

47 On Bigiev, see *Kniga o Muse-efendi, ego vremeni i sovremennikakh*, vol. 2, ed. by Al'mira N. Tagirdzhanova (Kazan: Idel'-Press, 2010).

48 Sirena Bagavieva, "Religiia vasha ostalas' tol'ko v vashei vole…" (o tret'em s"ezde musul'man Vnutrennoi Rossii i Sibiri)", *Gasïrlar awazï/Ekho vekov*, 1-2 (1999), 102-25, esp. 123-24. Cf. Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam* vol. 1, doc. 11, 82-83.

49 Tärjemānī ran the only Muslim journal in Soviet Russia, *Islam mäjälläse*, which he regarded as his own; Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, doc. 11, 86-90, here: 87. The income from the journal contributed significantly to the budget of TsDU (ibid., doc. 17, 106-09, here: 106).

50 On Kamalov see *Zyiaetdin Kamali: Filosofiia islama*, vol. 1, introd., transl., comm. by Leila Almazova (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 2010), 9-57.

51 Cf. Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, doc. 8, 53-59, here: 53.

52 Arapov/Kosach (eds), *Islam*, vol. 1, doc. 1, 25-29, here: 28.

53 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 139.

But by this time it must have become clear to Fakhreddinov that the state had decided to eliminate Islam. 1927/28 saw the start of collectivization, the enforced transformation of traditional village communities into collective farms. Countless *imāms* were imprisoned and exiled. Muslim congregations in the Volga-Urals were forced to "voluntarily" hand over their religious premises, which were to be turned into Soviet "cultural and educational centres".[54] In April 1929, the Soviet government obliged all mosque communities to reapply for registration, which made their closure a merely administrative issue. Professing loyalty to religion became dangerous: when mass celebrations of *qurbān bayrāmï*, in some Tatar villages in May 1929, resulted in vocal protests against local "atheists", ten supposed ringleaders were executed.[55]

In May 1930, Fakhreddinov arrived in Moscow to complain to the presidency of VTsIK about the disastrous effects of this policy. He reported that under various pretexts mosques had been forcibly taken by the local authorities and by Komsomol organizations; the extra taxes imposed on *imāms* had forced them out of office, and the families of exiled mullas, *muḥtasib*s (overseers of several mosque communities), and muezzins had been left in desperate conditions. As a result, almost ninety per cent of all *muḥtasib* offices ceased functioning, leaving the Muftiate without these important links to the individual communities. According to the *muftī*, ten thousand mosques had already closed down; the remaining two thousand were on the brink of collapse.[56] Fakhreddinov suggested that *imāms* should be allowed to leave the country; the archive of the Muftiate, he argued, should be taken into a state archive, and its library sent to the Academy of Sciences.[57] This was practically a recognition that the Muftiate had ceased to fulfil any function. Yet the Bolsheviks kept him in office, as a *muftī* without a flock.

54 Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane*, 147.

55 Indus Tagirov, "Uchastnikov Kurban-bairama prigovorili k rasstrelu…", *Gasïrlar awazï/ Ekho vekov*, 1-2 (1999), 126-35.

56 There were still some 3.600-3.900 imams and callers to prayer working in Tataria's mosques in 1929; five years later this number was reportedly reduced to one thousand. See Dilyara Usmanova, Ilnur Minnullin, Rafik Mukhametshin, "Islamic Education in Soviet and Post-Soviet Tatarstan", in *Islamic Education in the Soviet Union and Its Successor States*, ed. by Michael Kemper, Raoul Motika, Stefan Reichmuth (London and New York: Routledge, 2010), 21-66, here: 41. In Bashkiria, from 2.507 Muslim congregations in 1922, at least 1.047 were confiscated in the early 1930s (Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane*, 137 and 148).

57 Iunusova, *Islam v Bashkortostane*, 151-54 (excerpts from Fakhreddinov's report and notes of VTsIK representative Smidovich). Also Baishev, *Obshchestvenno-politicheskie*, 78.

Fakhreddinov passed away on 12 April 1936; soon after, forty-two co-workers of the Muftiate were arrested.[58] The Muftiate was not officially eliminated; it simply disintegrated.

Preserving Islamic Manuscripts: Fakhreddinov and A.N. Samoilovich

As a historian and scholar of Islam, Fakhreddinov realized that with the elimination of the Tatar Islamic elite, the historical memory of his community would also be lost. His 1930 intervention with VTsIK suggests that he regarded the Academy of Sciences as a possible refuge for the written Islamic heritage. Islamic literature would only be able to survive in the archive, in the museum (the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad had grown out of the imperial Asiatic Museum).[59]

According to the memoirs of his daughter Äsmā Shäräf (composed in the mid-1980s),[60] in 1932 Fakhreddinov wrote to the Soviet Academy of Sciences complaining that old books and manuscripts from village mosques and madrasas were being collected as waste paper (*makulatura*). The Academy responded by asking Fakhreddinov to send Oriental manuscripts to Leningrad. We must assume that this request was written by the director of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad (St. Petersburg), Aleksandr N. Samoilovich. Again according to Äsmā Shäräf, in the spring of 1935 Fakhreddinov did indeed send "many manuscripts, scientific works, documents, correspondences and genealogies" to the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad[61] to save them from destruction. This brings us to the question of how an Islamic authority cooperated with a Soviet academic scholar.

A graduate from the Oriental Faculty of St. Petersburg University in 1903, Samoilovich was an all-round scholar of the history and present of Turkic languages and literatures.[62] His career had started in 1900 with a research trip to

58 Sultanbekov, *Stalin i "tatarskii sled"*, 103.

59 For the history of this institution, see Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011).

60 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 113-14 (dated with "1983-1988").

61 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 140.

62 If not indicated otherwise, the following account of Samoilovich's career is based on Galina F. Blagova, "A.N. Samoilovich kak uchenyi-tiurkolog – lingvist, issledovatel' istorii sredneaziatsko-tiurkskikh literatur i istorii literaturnykh iazykov", in *A.N. Samoilovich. Tiurkskoe iazykoznanie. Filologiia. Runika*, edited by G.F. Blagova and D.M. Nasilov

Turkey, where he had studied Ottoman. But he had then made a name for himself as the foremost explorer of Turkmen dialects, manuscripts, poetry, and folklore. Starting in 1913 he had also published on Crimean Tatar, Azerbaijani, Uzbek, Kazakh, and Tatar materials, in addition to Orkhon runic inscriptions, and had made more research trips to Turkey, Central Asia, and the Caucasus, always documenting local dialects and hunting for manuscripts.

Samoilovich became a central figure in the Soviet project of constructing native languages and literatures for the newly created Soviet nations of Central Asia and the Caucasus, and although he did not join the Party, his career was boosted. In January 1922 he was made rector of the Petrograd/Leningrad Institute for Living Oriental Languages (*Petrogradskii institut zhivykh vostochnykh iazykov*); returned to the country's academic centre, he was charged with coordinating Soviet Turkology. Next to continuing his academic work on a wide range of sources, in 1922 Samoilovich started contributing to *Novyi Vostok* (*The New Orient*), the journal of Mikhail Pavlovich's new politically oriented Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies (MIV). He thus functioned as the Bolsheviks' bridge to the old traditions of Russian Orientology, as represented by his mentors and senior colleagues Platon M. Melioranskii (1868-1906), Vasilii Radlov (Radloff, 1837-1918), Vasilii Bartol'd (Barthold, 1869-1930), and Ignatii Iu. Krachkovskii (1883-1951), with whom he remained in close exchange. Samoilovich travelled from congress to congress and from expedition to expedition, in between lecturing before workers and publishing in Party newspapers about the ongoing work on the "linguistic front". He was acquainted both with Party leaders in the new Turkic republics in the Soviet south and with many researchers of Tatar, Bashkir, Turkmen, Uzbek, Kazakh, Azeri, and other Muslim nationalities.

Samoilovich became a driving force in the Soviet campaign for introducing Latin alphabets for all Turkic languages of the former empire;[63] in the debates on Romanization (*latinizatsiia*), he provided the theoretical background and guided the elaboration of norms and terminologies. Replacing the Arabic script for Russia's Turkic languages by Roman alphabets had already been debated by some native scholars before the Revolution. As early as 1914 Samoilovich joined this debate, with an article in the Tatar press in which he advocated the phonetic principle – that is, not transliteration but transcription – for an

(Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura, 2005), 13-50; see also F.D. Ashnin, "Spisok trudov A.N. Samoilovicha (s ukazaniem retsenzii na nikh)", *ibid.,* 951-72 (enumerating 400 titles that came out during his lifetime).

63 Ingeborg Baldauf, *Schriftreform und Schriftwechsel bei den muslimischen Russland- und Sowjettürken, 1850-1937* (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1993), esp. ch. 9.

envisaged "Latin" Tatar alphabet.[64] In 1926 Samoilovich was a major figure at the First All-Soviet Congress of Turkology in Baku, where the political demand of *latinizatsiia* was scientifically endorsed, exactly according to the phonetic method (which in fact stressed the difference to the Arabic script). With this event the Soviets also fulfilled another of Samoilovich's long-standing aims, namely to unite Russia's Turkologists in a huge congress series.[65]

For Samoilovich, participating in the Soviet "linguistic construction" was the practical application of his major long-term research project, a detailed classification of the various Turkic languages, within and beyond the Soviet borders. His goal was, as he phrased it in a letter to Bartol'd, to show "the unity in the field of literature and in the literary languages, in which a unification – though far from a complete merger – came about in the course of many centuries, through mutual cultural influences." Quite innocently, he referred to his approach as a sort of "cultural Pan-Turkism" (*kul'turnyi panturchizm*).[66] The irony is that this overarching interest foreshadowed his persecutors' accusations in 1937. But in the early and mid-1920s, his role as a link to native scholars in Baku, Ashgabat, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, and Kazan was still a valuable asset to the Bolsheviks.

In 1925, Samoilovich was elected a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Five years later he was a full member. His career peaked in 1934, when he was appointed director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (IVAN), then still located in Leningrad. IVAN was the major research institution of Soviet Orientology and Russia's central repository for Oriental manuscripts. His prestige allowed him to attend another congress in Turkey in 1935, where he presented a paper on the literary language of the Golden Horde.

It is unclear when exactly Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov first met Samoilovich. In the early 1920s Fakhreddinov was considered for a professorship in Leningrad, most probably at Samoilovich's Institute for Living Oriental Languages.[67] This suggests that the two already knew each other by this time. Samoilovich, it seems, regarded Fakhreddinov in the first place as a fellow Orientalist. The two met at the festivities for the anniversary of the Academy of Sciences, in Sep-

64 Baldauf, *Schriftreform,* 172, with reference to an article by Samoilovich in the Tatar journal *Mogallim* no. 8 (March 1914, 113-16).

65 Samoilovich envisaged such a congress already in 1913 and 1922, in conversations with colleagues; Baldauf, *Schriftreform,* 388.

66 Samoilovich in a letter (from Istanbul) to Vasilii V. Bartol'd, 27 September 1925; quoted in Blagova, "A.N. Samoilovich kak uchenyi-tiurkolog", 29-30.

67 Amirkhanov, "Rizaeddin Fakhreddin kak istorik", 34.

tember 1925 in Leningrad, and it was probably Samoilovich who invited the *muftī* to the event. According to Fakhreddinov's daughter Äsmā, in the summer of 1927 Samoilovich visited Fakhreddinov in Ufa, on his way back from an expedition,[68] and had a long talk with him in "Turkic", meaning they understood each other by using a mix of Turkic languages; "after this meeting they began to exchange letters, and my father even sent parcels with manuscript materials to the Academy of Sciences, to A. N. Samoilovich's name."[69]

Samoilovich's request for manuscripts was part of a broader attempt to bring Oriental materials into Soviet state archives and depositories; such centralization processes were also underway in Tashkent (Soviet Uzbekistan)[70] and Kazan. Samoilovich corresponded with the Tatar historian Sä'īd Väkhīdī (Vakhidov, b. 1887, executed 1937), who repeatedly donated significant numbers of manuscripts to various museum libraries in Soviet Tataria, as well as to the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad (where at least 181 Arabic manuscripts are marked as stemming from Väkhīdī's collection).[71] Väkhīdī also helped organize archeographic expeditions of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the Volga area: Soviet scholars went through the villages collecting Oriental manuscripts.[72] Anas B. Khalidov's catalogue of Arabic manuscripts in the collection of what is today the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg contains a diligent list of no less than 1,534 manuscripts that this expedition brought home from Tataria in just three seasons (1934-36).[73] This number excludes the Tatar-language manuscripts, whose number must have exceeded that of the Arabic works. But in Tatarstan, Väkhīdī was already harassed by the local authorities. In one of his letters to Samoilovich, he complained bitterly that in the Kazan museum where he was employed, he was prevented from publishing, and certain Tatar Bolshevik apparatchiks had published his works

68 In Ufa he was on 20 July 1927; Samoilovich's five-months travel of 1927 also took him to the Gorno-Altai region, Novosibirsk, and the Caucasus (Buinaksk, Kislovodsk, Baku). See Blagova ("A.N. Samoilovich kak uchenyi-tiurkolog", 46).

69 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 138.

70 Bakhtiyar Babajanov, "'Ulamā'-Orientalists: Madrasa Graduates at the Soviet Institute of Oriental Studies", in *Reassessing Orientalism: Interlocking Orientologies during the Cold War,* ed. by Michael Kemper and Artemy M. Kalinovsky (London: Routledge, 2015), 84-119, here: 85-86.

71 "Al'favitnyi spisok kollektsii", *Arabskie rukopisi Instituta vostokovedeniia Akademnii nauk SSSR. Kratkii katalog.* Vol. 2: Ukazateli i prilozhenie, pod red. A.B. Khalidova (Moscow: Nauka, 1986), 199.

72 Diliara Usmanova, "Rescuing the Tatar Muslim Heritage in the Soviet Union: The Expedition Diaries of Mirkasym A. Usmanov", in *The Piety of Learning* (forthcoming, 2017).

73 "Al'favitnyi spisok kollektsii", 197-203.

under their names.[74] Väkhīdī's transfer of manuscripts to St. Petersburg was thus an attempt at rescuing what could still be saved from the destruction in the region.

In early 1935, Fakhreddinov sent a package of manuscript materials to Leningrad. According to the Bashkir scholar S. M. Shingareeva (1988), on 5 February Fakhreddinov wrote to Samoilovich informing him:

> that he [had just] sent manuscript materials from his personal library to the Academy of Sciences; these materials concerned his own activities, and some materials for a re-edition of [Fakhreddinov's major biographical work] *Āthār*. At the same time he wrote that many manuscripts and rare books from his personal archive were lost due to the searches conducted in his apartment in 1911, 1918 and 1920, when he was living in Orenburg and Ufa, and that he himself, alas, sold some of his materials in 1933 and 1934 (in Ufa) to buy food. In the letter R. Fakhreddinov also expressed his sincere hope that his materials will be preserved well, and that his name will not be forgotten by the Academy of Sciences.[75]

This is a nice story: the old *muftī* is pleased to send his materials to the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and he hopes that the scholars in Leningrad will be grateful for this. The materials he provided are today kept in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg, the successor of the Leningrad branch of IVAN.[76] However, Shingareeva's reading of Fakhreddinov's 1935 letter is incomplete. A copy of the Tatar-language letter, preserved in the same Fakhreddinov collection in St. Petersburg, reads as follows:[77]

---

74 Institut vostochnykh rukopisei, Arkhiv vostokovedov, fond 111, opis' 1, delo 20 (Väkhīdī to Samoilovich, 5 Nov. 1936), 17 ff.

75 S.N Shingareeva, "Formirovanie lichnogo arkhiva Rizaitdina Fakhretdinova v nauchnom archive BNTs UrO SSSR", *Tvorchestvo*, 94-104, here: 98. The original letter is supposedly kept in the Public Library in St. Petersburg (fond 671, no. 251).

76 This collection (No. 131 in the "Archive of Orientalists" of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg) mainly contains Bashkir and Tatar genealogies, materials concerning the Ḥusayniyya *madrasa* in Orenburg, and letters and materials of the editorial board of *Shūrā*; see Shingareeva, "Formirovanie", 97.

77 Institut vostochnykh rukopisei, Arkhiv vostokovedov, fond 111, opis' 1, delo 22 (Fakhreddinov to Samoilovich, 8 February 1935), 2 pages (copy of the original, in Arabic-script Tatar). I thank the Institute's director, Irina F. Popova, for allowing me to take a copy from the document.

Honourable professor Samoilovich (*ḥörmätle Samayloyich ḥäżrätläre*)!

From the letter that the Academy sent to my name I understand that the Academy will establish a committee which believes that I have useful books [at my home or office]. For this reason I believe it is appropriate that I tell you about the calamities (*fājigäläre*) that have come over my religious and secular books, and that I offer my apologies [and explain] why I cannot send any works that this committee would find useful.

During my time in the city of Orenburg, in the night to 12 February 1911, officers from the gendarmerie and police (*jandarma vä palis mä'mūrlarï*) came and conducted a search of my place. They said, "While we have the right to take you with us and to put you into prison (*törmägä*), this time we leave you [here]". They put all kinds of letters and my unpublished works, including articles prepared for [the journal] *Shūrā,* into boxes (*yashchiklärgä*), and carried them away in a horse cart (*lomovoy yämshik berlä*). They only left me with my published works, as well as with some books that had been written a long time ago. This is my first point.

Second: When the [Russian Civil] War raged in the city of Orenburg in 1918, the biggest part of my library and all kinds of writings got destroyed.

Third: After I came [to live and work in] Ufa, in 1920, I myself spent a day in prison, and during that time my place was searched. What was left of my writings was taken away, nothing remained.

Fourth: [During the famine] in 1933-1934 we were in a dire situation because we could get no food. Instead of tea we drank hot water, and it was impossible to get products like honey, sugar, milk, fat or meat. While we were able to survive, it was not possible to [even] get food items like bread [in a shop]. As I was deprived of my [political] rights (*ḥoqūqsïz bulghanlïghïmïzdan*), the doors of the shops that still sold food items were closed for me. For this reason I was forced to buy food items like flour for baking bread from the hands of resellers, for a high price. On top of this, in February 1934[78] I was charged with an extra tax (*nalogh*) that I simply was not able to pay. I went to various places to hand in petitions, but that did not earn me anything except extra costs. It was so bad that I sold my precious books, and those that still had some market value. This way I could deliver the tax and was saved from the fate of perishing from hunger. It is natural that a person who has to spend his days in this way has no works that he could have sent, or could now send, to a scholarly treasure like the Academy, where scholars would derive benefit from them.

78 [The letter copy has 1334, which must be a mistake for 1934.]

> Unexpectedly, one time a wealthy/honourable person from another country said [to me]: "Send us the works that you wrote, we will publish them at our own costs, we have a perfect typography". For this reason I wanted to bring [my] *Āthār* [collection of biographic materials] into a new order, and wanted to store the letters that I had collected, as well as my excerpts from manuscripts written by our famous scholars, in the hands of that foreign brother. [To the authorities?] I explained [the reason for my travel by arguing?] that the doctor (*doqtor*) gave me the advice to go to a [vacation] place in summer. But how much I tried (*ijtihād qïlsamda*) to bring my own written works to a foreign country, it was to no avail. Therefore, I sent [only] the above-mentioned letters to the Academy, so that people would store them in a safe place. But as the postal fees (*pochta maṣrafï*) were very high, my volumes (*kölliyälär*) were in the end not sent off. At the mail office they do not accept anything for free.
>
> As I have perfect trust [in you] I explained to you my whole story. I hope that when you have read this to the end you do not regret having taken the time. I ask you to help that my name does not fall into oblivion in the Academy. I have no other wish. I am expecting death at any hour.
>
> Riżā'eddīn bin Fäkhreddīn, 5 February 1935, Ufa, Tukay [street] 8.

What we see here is that Fakhreddinov's letter is a decline, not a message accompanying a major package. When he claimed that he had nothing (or nothing more) to send, Fakhreddinov did not speak the truth: later, between the 1960s and 1980s, no less than forty volumes of manuscript material from his possession (including the unpublished volumes III and IV of *Āthār*) were transferred from the Muftiate to the Bashkir Branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (today the Institute of History, Language, and Literature in Ufa), where they are now stored.[79]

While this letter of 5 February 1935 has been known to Soviet scholars at least since the 1970s, reference was only made to the convenient parts of it, camouflaging the *muftī*'s despair, as well as his complaint that the Soviet system had deprived him of his civil rights and in fact had him starving.[80] Equally

79 For overviews, see A.I. Kharisov, "Kollektsiia rukopisei Rizaitdina Fakhretdinova v nauchnom archive BFAN SSSR", *Tvorchestvo*, 78-86; G.B. Khusainov, "Rukopisnoe nasledie Rizy Fakhretdinova" [first published in 1973], *Tvorchestvo*, 94-104.

80 E.g. Mökhämmät Gaynullin, *Tatar ädipläre* (*Ijat portretlari*) (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1978), 80; idem, "Riza Fäkhretdinov, 1858-1936", in *Tatar ädäbiyatï tarikhï. Altï tomda,* vol. 2, chief editor M.Kh. Gaynullin (Kazan, 1985), here: pp. 319-20.

omitted was Fakhreddinov's confession, in the same letter, that he had atttempted to take his manuscripts and own writings to an unnamed person "in a foreign country". This part of the text was first reproduced by the eminent Tatar historian Mirkasym A. Usmanov (1932-2010), who in 1990 used the letter to demonstrate Fakhreddinov's sufferings in the 1930s and the Stalinist eradication of Tatar intellectual life.[81] In 1996, the entire letter was also included, in Russian translation, in Fanil' Baishev's important monograph on Fakhreddinov.[82] But neither Usmanov nor Baishev drew attention to Fakhreddinov's having not complied with the request to send all he had. Fakhreddinov's trust in the Turkologist has gone equally unnoted: had Samoilovich passed this letter to the Soviet organs, they would certainly have ordered the *muftī* arrested for attempting to take his materials to a foreign country. The letter is therefore an impressive document of cooperation between religious and secular scholars, even though Fakhreddinov declined to send his whole archive.

Why did Fakhreddinov not send his most valuable manuscripts, his last *Āthār* volumes? Already Usmanov emphasized that even in his last years of life, Fakhreddinov continued to write on Islamic history.[83] But deprived of publication venues, he turned to documenting the Soviet persecution of Islam. Volume three of *Āthār*, edited in modern Tatar in 2010, presents the biographies of scholars who died after 1917, including those who became targets of Soviet repression.[84] To give an example, Fakhreddinov wrote the following on the fate of the well-known scholar Muḥammad-Najīb Tūntārī (d. 1930), who had regularly contributed to *Islām mäjälläse*:[85]

81 Mirkasïym Gosmanov, *Ütkännän kilächäkkä. Ot proshlogo k budushchemu* (Kazan: Tatarstan kitap näshriyäte, 1990), 65-68. According to Diliara M. Usmanova (personal message 12 March 2017), her father Mirkasym Usmanov once told her that when he came to Leningrad to work in the archive of IVAN, Fakhreddinov's package had still been unopened, and he was the first to investigate these materials. This would suggest that Samoilovich never saw these items, and that they might have survived the Stalin years due to the fact that they were still wrapped up.

82 Baishev, *Obshchestvenno-politicheskie*, 172-73.

83 Gosmanov, *Ütkännän kilächäkkä,* 67-68.

84 The 2010 edition of volume 3 comprises 18 scholars who died after 1917, but none after 1930. In the 1990s I briefly saw an entry on the eminent Naqshbandī Murād Ramzī (Manzilawī, d. 1934) in materials of the Fakhreddinov collection in Ufa, which indicates that the 2010 Kazan edition is not complete. Volume 4 contains only additional information on personalities covered in vols 1 and 2.

85 In *Islām mäjälläse*, Najīb Tūntārī published conservative articles dealing with ritual and theology (e.g. in nos 5-6 [1925], 191-94; 15 [1926], 613-15; 19 [1926], 741-45).

> He was imprisoned during the disaster and terror (*bäla vä dähshät*),[86] and in the incomparable catastrophe (*fājigä*) that fell on the heads of the scholars in this country. In the cold days of January, he was forced to march, at gun point. They say he couldn't walk anymore and perished. Others add more to this story.[87]

Because his goal was to preserve this kind of information, Fakhreddinov decided that his books were better kept in his office than in the archive of the perpetrators.

After Fakhreddinov: The Great Terror

Fakhreddinov died just before the Great Terror began to devour most of his friends and colleagues. Fakhreddinov's long-standing *qāḍī*, Käshshāf Tärjemānī, was arrested in 1936 and died in a Soviet labor camp in 1943;[88] another *qāḍī* and Islamic publicist, Żiyā' Kämālī, shared the same fate in 1942. Mukhlisa Bubi, a pioneer of Muslim education for women and the female *qāḍī* at the Muftiate, was executed in 1937. Shähär Shäräf, who in the 1930s had worked as treasurer of the Muftiate and whose son had married Fakhreddinov's daughter Äsmā, was executed in 1938.[89] But now also the secular Tatar elite was eliminated: Fakhreddinov's close friend from his time as a journalist, Fātiḥ Kärīmī (a son of Fakhreddinov's uncle Ghilmān Kärīmī), was executed in 1937, as were many others already mentioned above.

At least from the prosecution of Mukhlisa Bubi we know that by 1937, the NKVD interrogators also counted Fakhreddinov as an anti-Soviet activist, turning the deceased *muftī* into a "counter-revolutionary centre" that reached out to places like Kazakhstan and to anti-Soviet politicians in exile like Ghayaz (ʿAyāḍ) Isḥāqī and Zäkī Välīdī (Validov).[90]

86 [The editors here provide *dāhiyä* "genius" (and in a similar place *dākhiyä*), which must obviously be read as *dähshät*, "terror"].

87 Fäkhreddin, *Asar*, vol. 3 [2010 edition], 379.

88 Khabutdinov, "Tardzhemani".

89 *Tatarskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by M.Kh. Khasanov (Kazan: Institut Tatarskoi Entsiklopedii, 1999), 661.

90 Suleiman Rakhimov, "'Vinovnoi sebia ne priznala': Materialy sledstvennogo dela Mukhlisy Bobinskoi", *Gasïrlar awazï/Ekho vekov,* 1-2 (2000), 217-23, here: 219.

The Soviets now appointed a new *muftī*, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Rasulev (1889-1950),[91] who under Fakhreddinov had worked in the Muftiate's Council of Scholars. But the Muftiate remained dysfunctional until Stalin decided, during World War II, to revive it. In 1942, Rasulev provided religious legitimacy to Stalin and the Red Army by declaring *jihād* against Nazi Germany.[92] Starting in 1944, some mosques were allowed to reopen, and the Muftiate in Ufa – as well as three newly established Muftiates in the Caucasus and Central Asia – was charged with checking petitions for registering mosque congregations and with passing them to the state organs. By 1948, there were already 411 such "official" mosques in the USSR (but from then on numbers declined and did not reach 400 again until the mid-1980s).[93]

Fakhreddinov's children shared the fate of many other Jadīd intellectuals, who were first integrated into the Soviet system but then marginalized or killed. His son ʿAbd al-Raḥmān found employment in the Soviet newspaper *Bashkortostan* but was arrested shortly after his father's death, in the summer of 1936, and died in a prison in Ufa the following year. The *muftī*'s second Jadīd-educated son, ʿAbd al-Aḥad (Ghabdeläḥäd, b. 1889), obtained Soviet higher education and worked as an economist first in Ufa, then in Moscow, but was arrested in the spring of 1938 and shot in September. Two other sons, ʿAbd al-Rashīd (Ghabderrashīd, 1892-1953) and Saʿīd (1900-44), were not targeted by repression. Fakhreddinov's first daughter, Zäynäb (1894-1985), studied medicine at Kazan State University and later worked in a hospital in Kazan. His other daughter, Äsmā Shäräf (1906-93), the author of the memoirs already referred to, also managed to continue her education as a nurse and worked in a Kazan hospital until 1977. She had married the linguist, regional historian, and statistician Ghālimjān (ʿĀlimjān) Shäräf, son of the Muftiate official Shähär Shäräf. Ghālimjān Shäräf was incarcerated from 1937 to 1945.[94]

The persecution of Äsmā Shäräf's husband leads us to another moment where the Tatar line crossed the fate of the academician Samoilovich. In 1917-

91 Rasulev was the son of the famous Naqshbandī shaykh Zaynallāh Rasūlī from Troitsk (1833-1917); cf. Hamid Algar, "Shaykh Zaynullah Rasulev: The Last Great Naqshbandi Shaykh of the Volga-Urals Region", in *Muslims in Central Asia: Expressions of Identity and Change*, ed. by Jo-Ann Gross (Durham and London, 1992), 112-33.

92 Jeff Eden, "A Soviet Jihad against Hitler: Ishan Babakhan Calls Central Asian Muslims to War," *JESHO* 59.1-2 (2016), 237-64, here: 238.

93 For some official numbers, see Yaacov Ro'i, *Islam in the Soviet Union: From the Second World War to Gorbachev* (London: Hurst, 2000), 66-67.

94 Arslan Sharaf, "Svedeniia o detiakh Rizaetdina Fakhretdinova", in *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, 189-92.

18, Ghālimjān Shäräf had been involved in the project of several Muslim intellectuals to set up a Tatar-Bashkir state ("Idel'-Ural"). This nationalist project failed. The Bolsheviks instead created two separate, autonomous RSFSR republics – Soviet Tataria and Bashkiria – and integrated many leaders of the national intelligentsia into their new institutions. In this way Shäräf found employment at several research and teaching institutes in Tataria, publishing mainly on economy and phonetics; as a linguist, he opposed the introduction of the Latin alphabet for the Turkic languages of Soviet Russia, opting for keeping the reformed Arabic script for Tatar instead. Since the early 1930s he had been publicly criticized as a bourgeois scholar; on 24 March 1937, he was arrested and accused of being a member of a Pan-Turkist organization that strove for separating the Tatar ASSR from the USSR (which amounted to state treason, according to the infamous paragraph 58 of the Soviet legal code). His case was connected with those of two other former Jadīd (then Soviet) scholars, the Kazan Tatar historian Gäziz Ghöbäydullin (Aziz Gubaidullin, 1887-1938)[95] and the Crimean Tatar linguist Bekir V. Choban-zade (1893-1937); these were linked to the cases of other scholars-cum-politicians from national minorities.[96] All of these were shot dead, but Ghalimjan Shäräf's case continued until 27 February 1940, when he was sentenced to eight years of labor camp. When he returned in 1945, he worked at a village school; he died, presumably from exhaustion, in 1950.[97]

It is during the interrogations of these Muslim intellectuals that Aleksandr N. Samoilovich also got dragged into the collective Pan-Turkism case. The Crimean Tatar linguist Choban-zade was forced to confess that Samoilovich was familiar with all activities of the imagined counter-revolutionary Pan-Turkic organization.[98] The Ghöbäydullin case files indicate that he was, on 13 July 1937, specifically interrogated on Samoilovich. Ghöbäydullin said that Samoilovich had been an agent of the Tsarist police and an informant of the

95 "Gubaidullin, Gaziz Salikhovich (1887-1938)", *Liudi i sud'by*, 132.

96 Including the Kazakh Sandzhar Asfendiiarov (1889-1938), director of the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies (MIV) in 1927-28 and then active in the set-up of the Kazakh University; and Alibek A. Takho-Godi (1892-1937), former minister of enlightenment (1922-29) in Soviet Daghestan, then professor and Party bureaucrat in Moscow. See "Arkhivnye dokumenty o gibeli A.N. Samoilovicha", in Fedor D. Ashnin, Vladimir M. Alpatov and Dmitrii M. Nasilov, *Repressirovannaia Tiurkologiia* (Moscow: Vostochnaia Litaratura RAN, 2002), 7-20.

97 "Sharaf, Galimdzhan Sharafovich (1896-1950)", *Liudi i sud'by*, 416.

98 Ashnin, Alpatov, Nasilov, "Arkhivnye dokumenty o gibeli A.N. Samoilovicha", 18.

Turkish government. However, he refused to call Samoilovich a member of the Pan-Turkic organization that the interrogators were after.[99]

In the summer of 1937 the NKVD thus prepared a dossier on Samoilovich. Given his prominent position in Soviet Turkology; his encompassing interests as a Turkologist; his many travels to Azerbaijan, Central Asia, and Turkey; and his acquaintance with the above-mentioned scholars of various Muslim backgrounds, Samoilovich was now central in a network of nationalists who were, ironically, united by the accusation of Pan-Turkism.[100]

Fedor D. Ashnin, Vladimir M. Alpatov, and Dmitrii M. Nasilov published several documents from Samoilovich's NKVD (Interior Ministry) files that Ashnin briefly had access to in the late 1980s. The authors weighed several hypotheses as to exactly why Samoilovich had become a victim of the NKVD terror machine. While not a Party member, Samoilovich had displayed full loyalty to the state and had entertained no contacts with the personalities that Stalin singled out as his major enemies within the Party. And as a full member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Samoilovich had enjoyed a status that gave him some protection; of the eighty-nine academicians in early 1937, only eight were repressed and killed in 1937-38. The killing of a full Academy member needed to be confirmed by Stalin himself, who in some cases stopped the NKVD investigation, apparently because he deemed the victim to still be politically valuable. It was more common to persecute and kill the disciples of a famous academician, without touching the head of a given research school.[101] This was the case with the Arabist Krachkovskii, whom Stalin decorated for his international prestige even while some of his students were in the Gulag.[102]

But when Samoilovich was eventually arrested on 2 October 1937, the Pan-Turkist construction was supplemented with a new, and even more fantastic, Japanese line of investigation (under the same paragraph 58-1). Samoilovich was now also accused of having worked for the Japanese intelligence service since 1907 and of having set up the "counter-revolutionary bourgeois-nationalist organization" that had supposedly tried to separate the Muslim regions

99 "Gibel' professora Gubaidullina", in Ashnin/Alpatov/Nasilov, *Repressirovannaia Tiurkologiia*, 92-93. Ghöbäydullin listed not only Samoilovich but also other prominent academicians, like Indologist Sergei Ol'denburg (d. 1934) and Arabist Ignatii Krachkovskii (d. 1951), among the "counter-revolutionaries".

100 "Samoilovich, Aleksandr Nikolaevich", *Liudi i sud'by*, 340-41.

101 Ashnin/Alpatov/Nasilov, "Arkhivnye dokumenty o gibeli A.N. Samoilovicha", 8.

102 Michael Kemper, "Introduction", in: *I.Y. Kratchkovsky, Among Arabic Manuscripts: Memories of Libraries and Men* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 1-24.

from the Soviet Union in order to bring them under Japanese rule. The Pan-Turkist line of accusations was thus sandwiched in a new Japanese campaign.[103]

With Samoilovich, the investigators now invented a bridge between the Pan-Turkist group case and another accumulative campaign targeting scholars of the Far East. The prosecution assigned a central place to Pavel I. Vorob'ev (1892-1937), a scholar of Manchuria, China, and Mongolia, who in the mid-1930s had been Samoilovich's deputy for academic affairs at the Institute of Oriental Studies in Leningrad.[104] It is therefore plausible that Samoilovich was arrested and killed because the new Japanese group case projected Samoilovich's Institute of Oriental Studies as the alleged conspirators' base. Caught in the web of two conspiracy theories, Samoilovich's status as an academy member was insufficient to save him.

The Far Easternist Vorob'ev, as well as the Institute's scholar of Japan, Nikolai A. Nevskii (arrested merely one day after Samoilovich, on 3 October 1937),[105] were both executed on 24 November 1937. Samoilovich's case dragged on for several months, for unclear reasons; his death sentence was pronounced on 13 February 1938 and carried out on the same day. According to the documentation, Samoilovich had confessed that he introduced some of the above-mentioned persons into the "organization", but he only incriminated persons who he knew were already in prison.[106]

The Limits of Rehabilitation: Suppressing the Repression

Starting in the late 1920s, the Bolsheviks eradicated a thriving Islamic civilization. Their targeted killings in the 1930s eliminated a blossoming field of historical and philological studies that was driven by secular and religious Muslim intellectuals of Jadīd background. Even though it was under Stalin (in 1944) that a minimalistic Islamic infrastructure was recreated in the Soviet Union, the heritage of the Tatar Islamic scholars and intellectuals remained discredited.

Starting in the 1960s and 1970s, a new generation of Tatar Marxist scholars was allowed to make positive references to a few pre-revolutionary Muslim authors, in a state-endorsed attempt to produce a new Tatar historiography

103 Ashnin/Alpatov/Nasilov, "Arkhivnye dokumenty o gibeli A.N. Samoilovicha", 13.

104 Ibid. 13-14.

105 On Nevskii, see Vladimir M. Alpatov, *Iazykovedy, vostokovedy, istoriki* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2012), 121-35.

106 Ashnin/Alpatov/Nasilov, "Arkhivnye dokumenty o gibeli A.N. Samoilovicha", 20.

that emphasized that the Tatars had already developed their own trajectory towards progress: some Muslim writers of the past were now interpreted as having been "progressive in their time".[107] But Fakhreddinov remained a controversial figure, and at first only his 1903 moralistic novel, *Äsmā, yaki ghamäl vä jäzā* (*Äsma, or Deed and Punishment*), was innocent enough to be included into the new historical-literary canon of the Tatar Socialist nation.[108]

Because Fakhreddinov had never been convicted for state treason, he was not formally rehabilitated. As late as 1979, Tatar atheist scholars still described Rizaeddin Fakhreddinov as an anti-Soviet element spreading Pan-Turkist and Pan-Islamist propaganda, and as a ringleader of Tatar mullas rebelling against the Soviet order.[109] These clichés had accompanied the extermination of many secular and Muslim scholars, but not Fakhreddinov, who became an official enemy of the state only after his death. Protest against this posthumous defamation first came from Fakhreddinov's two well-educated daughters, Zäynäb and Äsmā. They wrote to the Party leadership in Soviet Tataria demanding this injustice be corrected. In July 1981, they even addressed the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev.[110]

Gradually, a new consensus emerged that Fakhreddinov deserved a worthy place in the history of the Tatar nation. In January 1984, first the Bashkir Institute of Language, Literature, and History in Ufa, and then in autumn also its Tatar counterpart, the Institute of History, Language, and Literature in Kazan, organized scholarly meetings to commemorate Fakhreddinov.[111] The focus was not on Fakhreddinov's Islamic work but on his role as a historian,[112] which was of special interest to the emerging Tatar and Bashkir national movements, in

107 For this phenomenon see Alfrid K. Bustanov and Michael Kemper, "From Mirasism to Euro-Islam: The Translation of Islamic Legal Debates into Tatar Secular Cultural Heritage", in *Islamic Authority and the Russian Language: Studies on Texts from European Russia, the North Caucasus and West Siberia*, ed. by A.K. Bustanov and M. Kemper (Amsterdam: Pegasus 2012), 29-54.

108 Republished in M. Gaynullin, *Tatar ädäbiyatï. XIX yöz* (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1968), 630-70.

109 Zinnat A. Ishmukhametov, *Sotsial'naia rol' i evoliutsiia islama v Tatarii. Istoricheskie ocherki* (Kazan: Tatknigoizdat, 1979), esp. 71-72.

110 "Pis'mo-obrashchenie As'my Sharaf i Zeinab Fakhretdinovoi L.I. Brezhnevu", in *Rizaetdin Fäkhretdin: Fänni-biografik jïyentïk*, 187-88.

111 Sharaf, "Vospominaniia ob ottse", 146. Some of the Ufa conference papers were published in *Tvorchestvo*.

112 Rizaeddin Fakhreddinev, *Bolgar vä Kazan törekläre*, translated and edited by Änvär Khayrullin (Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1993).

which historians had prominent positions.[113] From Fakhreddinov's thoroughly religious works only a compendium of 344 hadiths of the Prophet Muḥammad was republished.[114] And while Fakhreddinov's articles in *Shūrā* became a popular source for historians, the edition of the last volumes of his biographical dictionary *Āthār* (now stored in the Ufa Institute) dragged on until 2010.[115]

The official exculpation of secular victims of the Great Terror proceeded more smoothly because that was already part of Khrushchev's program of limited de-Stalinization. Samoilovich obtained his posthumous rehabilitation in August 1956; the procedure included a new investigation of NKVD documents on the Pan-Turkic and Japanese group prosecutions, including Choban-zade and Vorob'ev. In addition, the court ordered an expert review of Samoilovich's works, which concluded that they contained "no Turkophile and Japanophile tendencies".[116] Similar decisions were issued on Ghöbäydullin (in 1956), Choban-zade (in 1957), Asfendiiarov (in 1958), and others of the Pan-Turkism case, as well as on Far Eastern scholars like Nikolai Nevskii (in 1957). Ghalimjan Shäräf was rehabilitated only in 1991, probably following pressure from his widow, Äsmā Shäräf.[117]

The legal rehabilitation was merely designed as a repair of individual court mistakes, not as a rejection of the terror system as a whole. None of the prosecutors and torturers were ever brought to justice (if we exclude those who were exterminated under Stalin). And although the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies has a memorial board for the Institute's co-workers who perished in World War II (including the linguist, Arabist, and scholar of the Caucasus Anatolii N. Genko, who starved to death in a Soviet prison),[118] there is, to the best of my knowledge, no collective monument to remember the Orientalist victims of Stalin's terror machine. The same goes for religious personnel and Muslim intellectuals, although some received modest memorial boards, obviously on private initiative, in their Tatar villages.[119]

113 On the Tatar national movement see Marlies Bilz, *Tatarstan in der Transformation: Nationaler Diskurs und politische Praxis, 1988-1994* (Stuttgart: Ibidem publishers, 2007).

114 Rizaetdin bine Fäkhretdin, *Jävamigul'-kälim shärkhe*, translated into modern Tatar by Mädinä Räkhimkulova and Ravil Ütäbay-Kärimi, ed. by Vinerulla Yag"kub (Kazan: Iman, 1416/1995). The first edition was in 1916.

115 Fäkhreddin, *Asar*, vols 3 and 4 (2010).

116 Statement Supreme Court of the USSR [on Samoilovich's rehabilitation], 25 Aug. 1956, in Ashnin/Alpatov/Nasilov, *Repressirovannaia Tiurkologiia*, 18-19.

117 "Sharaf", in *Liudi i sud'by,* 416.

118 "Genko, Anatolii N. (1896-1941)", *Liudi i sud'by*, 113.

119 Personal communication by Alfrid K. Bustanov.

The legalistic character of the rehabilitation process also camouflaged the fact that with the violent loss of many of its best brains, not only religious but also Soviet Oriental studies were thrown back for decades. The vast majority of Jadīd-minded secular Muslim scholars had been wiped out; those who survived had been silenced or marginalized. The transmission of pre-revolutionary knowledge was, by and large, broken. The new generation that filled the positions in the expanding post-war field of Soviet education and research was thoroughly Soviet-educated and had a different attitude to the native Muslim literatures and histories of the USSR. Bobodzhan Gafurov, from 1956 to 1977 director of the Institute of Oriental Studies (that had been moved to Moscow in 1950), regularly praised the "progressive elements" among the pre-Soviet Russian school of Oriental studies, but he never attempted to address the issue of persecution; after Stalin, Soviet Oriental studies was meant to start from scratch and was directed towards the "de-colonizing world", not towards the Oriental heritage of the peoples of the USSR.[120] Work on Samoilovich's œuvre began, slowly, in the 1960s, but a first project to republish a selection of his work came to nothing.[121] In the 1990s, Samoilovich's historical and linguistic work was brought back into debate by Galina F. Blagova (1927-2013).

The scientific links between academic scholars and *imāms* that had been quite common in the 1920s and 1930s were also effectively erased. To be sure, also in the post-Stalinist USSR, some Orientalists were acquainted with *imāms* and *muftīs*, but it is difficult to detect cross-fertilization. And although individual Tatar enthusiasts continued to read, translate, collect, and comment on Islamic manuscripts, and even to write Islamic poetry, these activities were limited to small private circles.[122] Most private manuscript libraries in the Volga-Urals were destroyed, dispersed, or brought to state repositories, where they would largely remain unstudied until the 1990s.

120 Michael Kemper, "Propaganda for the East, Scholarship for the West: Soviet Strategies at the 1960 International Congress of Orientalists in Moscow", in: *Interlocking Orientalisms,* 170-210.

121 This project was shelved with the passing away of V.D. Arakin in 1983; the other driving force in the project, F.D. Ashnin, died in 2000. See "Ot sostavitelei", in Blagova (ed.), *A.N. Samoilovich*, 4-5.

122 Alfrid K. Bustanov, "Peresmotr kontseptsii sovetskogo islama: Zainap Maksudova i izuchenie tatarskoi literatury", in *Islam v mul'tikul'turnom mire. Musul'manskie dvizheniia i mekhanizmy vosproizvodstva ideologii islama v sovremennom informatsionnom prostranstve. 3-ii Kazanskii mezhdunarodnyi nauchnyi forum – 2013*, ed. by D.V. Brilev (Kazan, 2014), 482-88; idem, "Against Leviathan: On the Ethics of Islamic Poetry in Soviet Russia", in *The Piety of Learning* (forthcoming 2017).

The post-Soviet *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* of the 1990s produced many of the source volumes that I have referred to in this article, but since 2000 it has been slowly obliterated. In today's Russian Federation, the Muftiates show no interest in coming to terms with the eradication of Islam and Muslim scholarship in Stalin's USSR. When the honourable Muftī Gainutdin, head of the Moscow-based Spiritual Administration of Muslims of the Russian Federation (DUM RF), occasionally mentions the names of *imāms* who died in Stalin's terror, he still uses the vague Soviet terminology of "repression", avoiding any further reflection.[123] The new Islamic dignitaries in post-Soviet Russia regularly appear on scientific conferences to contribute to the memory of particular pre-revolutionary Jadīd scholars and intellectuals, but nowhere is there any attempt at conceptualizing violence in the modern history of Islam in Russia. Such an encompassing reappraisal of the consequences of state terror would ultimately throw a different light on the increasing links between the confessional leaders and the state in contemporary Russia. While the Russian Orthodox Church has sanctified a number of Stalinist terror victims as martyrs for their faith,[124] Russia's official Islamic authorities are increasingly hesitant, as is Russian Orientology, to remember the violence that decimated the ranks of their predecessors.

123 Muftii Ravil' Gainutdin, *Islam: otvet na vyzovy vremeni* (Moscow: Eksmo, 2011), 32.

124 Katya Tolstaya and Peter Versteeg, "Inventing a Saint: Religious Fiction in Post-Communist Russia", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 82.1 (2014), 70-119.