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Denunciation and Revenge

Riza Fakhreddinov on Īshmī Īshān

The Tatar text translated below reflects the famous conflict between Muslim modernist intellectuals (the so-called Jadids) and traditionalist scholars in the late Russian empire. Tatar Jadidism (named after the “new teaching method,” uṣūl-i jādīd) began in the 1880s as a call for Muslim educational reform according to European models and for the establishment of Muslim journalism in Russia. In the following decades, Jadid scholars and students thoroughly transformed Tatar education, literature, historiography, as well as religious, public and political life, with a diversity of trends and opinions that make it increasingly difficult to regard Jadidism as one coherent movement. As Anke von Kügelgen has emphasized, the Jadids argued that knowledge (ʿilm) must encompass not only religious sciences but also secular subjects; education had the task “to form a good child, mother and father, worker and citizen, on behalf of the respective nation or union.”¹

The historian, moralist and educator Riḍāʾaddin b. Fakhraddin (Fakhreddinov, 1858–1936) was a nodal figure in the vast Jadid religious and educational networks that spanned the Volga-Urals. From 1891 to 1906, Fakhreddinov served as an official (qāḍī) in imperial Russia’s Muftiate, the Orenburg Spiritual Administration of Muslims in Ufa. The tasks of this institution were to organize and control Islamic religious life in Inner Russia and Siberia. In 1906 Fakhreddinov quit this position and became a central personality in the new scene of Islamic journalism in the city of Orenburg, Russia’s gateway to the Kazakh Steppe; as chief editor of a famous Islamic literary magazine Shūrā,² Fakhreddinov maintained contacts with writers, educators and imams, and corresponded with readers about the history of the local communities and their spiritual leaders. In the midst of the Russian civil war, all Islamic journalism in the Volga-Urals region was closed down, forcing Fakhreddinov to return to work at the Muftiate. In 1921 his superior, Mufti ʿĀlimjān Bārubī (Galimdzhon Barudi), passed away and Fakhreddinov took over his functions; for the following fifteen years he would continue to serve as Soviet Russia’s Mufti. Formally the highest Muslim authority in the Russian part of the USSR, Fakhreddinov had nothing

¹ von Kügelgen 2017: 98, 79.
² Dudoignon 2006.
with which to resist Stalin’s violent assault on Muslim religious and intellectual life: starting in the late 1920s almost all mosques and Muslim schools were closed down, Islamic libraries were destroyed and imams (but also secular-minded Muslim intellectuals) were muted, exiled, imprisoned or executed. Mufti Fakhreddinov died a natural death in 1936, embittered by what he thought was the end of Islam in Russia. Indeed, immediately after his death, the other co-workers at the Muftiate were eliminated.

All through these years Fakhreddinov collected information about the biographies of Muslim scholars from the Volga-Urals and adjacent territories, which he brought together in his famous Āthār (Monuments). This four-volume work is the most encompassing of all Tatar biographical compilations from the Jadid era. Between 1900 and 1908 Fakhreddinov managed to publish two volumes of Āthār. His attempts to also have the third volume printed (as it seems, in 1906, 1911 and 1924) all failed; eventually he realized that the Bolsheviks would never allow him to publish this volume. Still, Fakhreddinov continued to work on Āthār III until briefly before his death, adding more biographies and new material to biographies that he had composed earlier. It was only in 2010 that his manuscript of Āthār III was published, in the form of a Cyrillic Tatar transcription, without content-related commentaries.

Āthār III is of particular interest because it covers Fakhreddinov’s contemporaries: the scholars who passed away between 1874 and 1930. One among these personalities is the Sufi grandmaster (īshān) and theologian Êshmuhammad b. Dinmuḥammad al-Tūntäri (Dinmukhametov, 1849–1919), and it is his biographical entry that I offer below in translation. In Tatar historiography, this Êshmuhammad (mockingly called “Êshmi Īshān”) is the archetype of the fanatic “Qadimist” (defender of the old), a representative of the Bukharan-style curriculum of Ḥanafī law, Māturīdī speculative theology and Naqshbandiyya Sufism. He became famous for his aggressive attacks against the Jadids and for denun-

3 Kemper 2022b: 91–92.
4 Riḍāaddin b. Fakhraddin, Āthār III. I am grateful to the director of the Institute of History, Language and Literature of the Ufa Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. Dr. Aibulat V. Psianchin, for allowing me to consult the manuscript of Āthār III, and to Prof. Dr. Marsil N. Farkhshatov for collegial support and advice. My thanks also go to Dr. Gulnaz Šibgatullina (University of Amsterdam) for a critical reading of the present contribution.
5 Rizaeddin Fakhreddin 2010. As well as Āthār III, this edition also encompasses volume IV, which consists of additions to the biographies covered in the previous three volumes.
6 The Persian-origin honorific ishān (“they”) means “revered Sufi master.” In the discourse of the new Muslim intellectuals of the Volga-Urals of the early twentieth century, “īshānism” had come to mean backwardness, superstition and the exploitation of believers.
ciations that he sent to the Tsarist police. Fakhreddinov was also among the targets of Ishmuḥammad’s accusations.

No wonder, then, that Fakhreddinov struggled with the question of whether, and how, to integrate his personal enemy into a book dedicated to the shining memory of the Tatars’ pious ancestors. In most biographical entries in Āthār III, Fakhreddinov is very respectful, even when discussing scholars whose opinions he did not share. His biographies usually follow a standard pattern: after mentioning the places where the person in question studied and worked (as imam or teacher), Fakhreddinov provided the names of his masters and disciples, and also of his wives and offspring; often he listed the person’s published and unpublished works and gave excerpts from his writings. Not so in the case of Ishmuḥammad: as the reader will see below, Fakhreddinov went right into particular episodes that are meant to reveal the evil character of this person. Indeed, Ishmuḥammad stands before us as a nasty and dangerous person who tried to use the Russian police to destroy his own Muslim opponents. With the help of several episodes, Fakhreddinov revealed the moral corruption and scholarly incompetence of this man, but also the rejection that Ishmuḥammad received from the pro-Jadīd Tatar elite of his time.

Fakhreddinov’s account is seemingly the most detailed biography of Ishmuḥammad written by a contemporary. Still, Ishmuḥammad remains an enigma, and it would be particular interesting to have a closer look at his Muslim supporters and sponsors, and at his students (none of whom Fakhreddinov mentions by name). However, my goal is not to establish the truth about Ishmuḥammad’s machinations, nor to reconstruct his networks. Rather, I suggest regarding Fakhreddinov’s entry on Ishmuḥammad foremost as a personal document about Fakhreddinov himself: the study of this biography sheds light on Fakhreddinov’s discursive strategies.

In Āthār III, Fakhreddinov often included reports by friends and colleagues, sometimes reproducing them in dialogical forms. This is also the case here: Fakhreddinov reproduces several conversations that others had with Ishmuḥammad. Even more, in this entry Fakhreddinov largely speaks through the statements of his colleagues, meticulously noting who said what – as well as when and on which occasion – about Ishmuḥammad’s behavior. It would, how-

---

7 On Ishmuḥammad, see Salikhov 2004; Ross 2019; Mökhāmmātshin n. y.: 175–176. My thanks go to Dr. Danielle Ross for sharing some Tatar materials about the Tüntär ışhāns with me.
8 Other scathing reports on Ishmuḥammad are very short, as if the authors wanted to avoid detail; see, e. g., Muhammad-Najib Tüntār’s Tatar-language history of Tüntär village (Tüntār n. d.: 21–22), and even Mozaffari 1931: 73–74.
9 Kemper 2021.
ever, be wrong to say that Fakhreddinov hides behind others: rather, he uses his informants to corroborate his own judgment on Ishmuḥammad and thus for defending himself against an evil accuser. Seen from this angle, there are few places in Āthār III where Fakhreddinov reveals more of himself, not as an actor but as a vulnerable victim. To be sure, Fakhreddinov also remarks that Ishmuḥammad was merely an imbecile who could not be taken seriously. At the same time Fakhreddinov did take him seriously, for he mentions that he produced a separate collection of materials by and on Ishmuḥammad, even storing this collection in the Muftiate’s library (where others would have access to them).

For the Jadīds of the late Russian empire, Ishmuḥammad was indeed a dangerous man. One of Ishmuḥammad’s denunciation letters to the police triggered the prosecution of ‘Abdallāh and ‘Ubaydallāh Būbi, prominent Jadid writers and educators who operated a large reformist madrasa in the village of Izh-Bubi. Starting in 1909, Ishmuḥammad wrote letters to the Russian authorities in which he accused the Būbi brothers of various political crimes – in the opaque catchwords of the day, conspiracy with the Ottomans, Pan-Islamism, socialism and anti-governmental propaganda among their students. The authorities launched investigations, and in January 1911 the Būbi brothers were arrested and brought to trial, with their madrasa closed down.¹⁰

What is less known is that Fakhreddinov was also drawn into this police campaign. A few days after the arrest of the Būbis, on 11 February 1911, the same governor’s office issued an order to search Fakhreddinov’s apartment in Orenburg and to confiscate whatever suspicious material was found.¹¹ Among the items the police took with them during their night raid was the Āthār III manuscript – the very item to which Fakhreddinov would later add his biography of Ishmuḥammad, the person who triggered that police campaign.¹²

In his biography of Ishmuḥammad, Fakhreddinov decided not to mention the case of the Būbis. He did, however, construct a link between Ishmuḥammad’s denunciations and the confiscation of the Āthār III manuscript. This he does by mentioning that the police searched his house in Orenburg, adding that they did not find his collection of items related to Ishmuḥammad. By storing these items in the Muftiate’s library, Fakhreddinov had paradoxically preserved the denunciation files produced by his enemy while his own work had been

---

¹⁰ Bubïy 1999: 48, 61–62. As Danielle Ross shows, students from the Tüntär madrasa were attracted to the Būbi madrasa, where they indeed started to radicalize (Ross 2020: 210–226).
¹¹ For a reproduction of the search warrant, see Bubïylar 1999: 196.
¹² For the police raid, see Rizaeddin Fäkhreddin 2010: 14. After a year the Āthār III manuscript was returned to Fakhreddinov.
taken away from him. Now was the time for revenge: Fakhreddinov said he had decided to burn these collected writings of Ishmuḫammad. We do not know whether he managed to do so; at any event, Fakhreddinov clearly determined how Ishmuḫammad should be remembered.

The Tatar manuscript text as it has come down to us demonstrates that Fakhreddinov composed his entry on Ishmuḫammad in increments. Ishmuḫammad’s biography is placed next to other entries on people who passed away in 1919, indicating that Fakhreddinov produced the first part of Ishmuḫammad’s biography shortly after the latter’s execution at the hands of the Bolsheviks in 1919 (and several of the episodes in that part of the biography emphasize that Ishmuḫammad’s sons, active Bolsheviks, did nothing to save their father from being shot). This part ends with a formula invoking God’s mercy, which indicates that this is where the entry was supposed to end. But then Fakhreddinov added an extra page with more reports about Ishmuḫammad, using another ink and a different paper (with the Russian name of a Soviet institution printed on it, obviously dating from the 1920s or even 1930s).

Finally, at one point Fakhreddinov must have added a loose piece of paper to the biography, placing it between the pages. This extra item, produced by another hand and in a more archaic style of Tatar, reproduces one of Ishmuḫammad’s attacks on Fakhreddinov himself, obviously from the time when Fakhreddinov was still working as qadi in the Muftiate (that is, before 1906). Unfortunately we do not know to whom Ishmuḫammad addressed this “annunciation letter” (iʿlān-nāma, as he called it). The editors of the 2010 Tatar Cyrillic edition omitted this separate piece of paper but the archivist of the Āthār III author’s manuscript clearly regarded the loose sheet as part of the biography and gave it page numbers. As will be shown below, in this letter Ishmuḫammad reacted to a statement that Fakhreddinov had published in a 1904 fascicle of the first volume of Āthār (meaning that in Āthār III, Fakhreddinov preserved his major enemy’s attack on Āthār I!). What enraged Ishmuḫammad in 1904 (or shortly thereafter) was Fakhreddinov’s claim that the study of the Quran must be based on the knowledge of natural and social sciences, and that such an approach can only be expected from a scholar who studied at “European and American universities and academies.” Ishmuḫammad’s letter turns out to be a defense of traditional Muslim Quran exegesis against the modernist/reformist embrace of European philological and historical methodologies. In Ishmuḫammad’s perspective, following Western approaches is nothing else but unbelief, and he corroborates that with quotes from the Quran. This additional document

13 The Muftiate’s archive is not open to research.
once more highlights the “İshmi İshān paradox”: a Muslim scholar who so vehemently rejected any Russian, Western and non-Muslim influence on Muslim society saw no problem in mobilizing the Russian authorities to harass and eliminate his Muslim opponents.

The following full translation of İshmuḥammad’s entry in Āthār III is based on my reading of Fakhreddinov’s autograph (stored today in the Ufa Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences), which in some places differs from the 2010 Cyrillic Tatar edition. My translation also encompasses the i’lān-nāma that Fakhreddinov inserted into the manuscript, thereby offering a glimpse at İshmuḥammad’s own discursive style. My transliteration of Tatar terms is slightly Ottomanized to avoid pronunciations that even the Orientalist might find confusing (i.e., the reader will find ʿilm ve maʿrifet in place of giylem və mąğ ˝rifät, [knowledge and enlightenment]). Words and phrases in parentheses (round brackets) are Fakhreddinov’s; those in square brackets contain my additions. In footnotes I provide information on personalities that Fakhreddinov mentioned in the text. Of particular interest is the role of the Kazan theologian and historian Shihābaddin al-Marjānī (1818–1889), whom Fakhreddinov saw as his personal model in scholarship and Islamic reform (iślāḥ); the entry starts with İshmuḥammad’s conflict with Marjānī, predetermining Fakhreddinov’s judgment about İshmuḥammad.

First document: Fakhreddinov’s biography of İshmuḥammad, Āthār III, fols. 297a–298a

İshmuḥammad b. Dīnmuḥammad b. Yārмуḥammad b. Manşūr. He was imam and mudarris in the famous village of Tüntār. In Rajab 1337 (April 1919) he was shot by the Bolsheviks, in the town of Malmyzh. He had almost reached the age of eighty. The place where he is buried appears to be unknown.

This person’s biography and his actions are well-known, and he is quite famous; for this reason I see no particular necessity to go into detail. I collected all the letters that people sent me about him and put them into my folders, including most of the newspaper articles about him. These materials were not lost in the course of the brutal searches [carried out in my house by the imperial police in 1911], and survived in the places where I had put them to escape the searches. I now regret [that I preserved these documents]; reproducing [here] only the things that I think are important, I decided to burn the rest.
In a Persian-language letter of 13 Shawwal 1296 [30 September 1879], Īshmʊḥammad Mullā expressed his admiration and respect for [Shihābuddin] al-Marjānī, and put himself in a very humble position. He said more or less the following: “The wife (ḥaram) of Shamsaddīn Ḥaḍrat wants to be my wife (refīqa), and she is putting pressure on me.14 But I do lack courage because she was my [late] master’s wife. For various reasons I have to be very circumspect, and therefore I decided to leave this place [i.e., Tüntär village]. I ask you to arrange that I obtain the place of Dāmullā Tajaddin in the city of Kazan.”

This is the most important part of this letter. I have seen this letter with my own eyes in one of Marjānī’s volumes, and I made a copy from the original. Did Marjānī respond to this letter or not? Did he try to bring [Īshmʊḥammad] to that position of imam [at a Kazan mosque], or did he refrain from doing so? I could not find this out.15

At any event another person was assigned to that position, and Īshmʊḥammad did not reach his goal. He then turned away from Marjānī and later even became his fiercest enemy. That is well known. He circulated many lies and much nonsense about Shamsaddin Ḥaḍrat’s wife, as people from his own circle used to tell [me]. As many stories testify, he wanted to make people believe that this woman was in love with him.

On 6 August 1919, I heard Mufti Dāmullā ʿĀlimjān [Bārüdī]16 saying the following about this person: “After he started to quarrel with Marjānī I said to Īshmʊḥammad: ‘In our time there are only two real scholars, namely Marjānī and

---

14 Īshmʊḥammad’s masters in Tüntär were first the famous ʿAlī Īshān al-Tüntārī and then the latter’s son-in-law, Shamsaddin b. Raḥmatallah al-Mazār-Āstī (d. 1293/1876). After ʿAlī Īshān’s death in 1874, Shamsaddin became the director of the Tüntär madrasa but died two years later on a ḥajj travel. Ishmʊḥammad then took over the Tüntär madrasa and, seemingly, came into conflict with ʿAfīfa, ʿAlī al-Tüntārī’s daughter and Shamsaddin’s widow.

15 Danielle Ross argues that Marjānī did not comply with Ishmʊḥammad’s request to intercede for him and that it was Marjānī who brought this devious episode into circulation (Ross 2020: 103). This assumption is not supported by Fakhreddinov, who emphasized that he did not know how Marjānī responded.

16 ʿĀlimjān (Galimjan) Bārüdī (Galiev, 1857–1921), imam in Kazan and founder of the famous Muḥammadīyya madrasa in that city, was a major representative of educational and religious reform. Ishmʊḥammad had already started to attack Bārüdī in the 1890s; see Ross 2020: 189. As well as publishing numerous primers and other works, in 1906 Bārüdī started editing the religious journal Dīn va maʾiškat. In 1917 he became the first elected Mufti of inner Russia (the office to which he would be succeeded by Fakhreddinov, in 1921). In Āthār III, Fakhreddinov often refers to Bārüdī as a close companion and source of information; see Kemper 2022a, passim.
Qannawji, and you started to attack both of them. With your writings you do not win the love of their followers, nor are your writings of much help to their enemies (because what he wrote was nonsense [ma’nāsīz sheyler]). Better remain silent.’ These words of mine made Īshmuhammad very angry, and he responded: ‘I am also going to write a refutation (reddiyye) against you!’ [fol. 297b] And he indeed wrote something. On this topic Īshmuhammad received advice (neṣiḥet) from his own shaykh Dhākir Ḥaḍrat (Chistayli). But he did not listen to the latter’s words, and even acted against him. The result was that his relations with Dhākir Ḥaḍrat were destroyed. One day I myself [i.e., ‘Ālimjān Bārūdī still speaking] said to Dhākir Ḥaḍrat: ‘Better stop feeling insulted by that Īshmuhammad, forgive him, he is a person whom nobody can take seriously (ulmadhūr bir adam).’ Dhākir Ḥaḍrat responded: ‘Here is a letter that he sent me. A dog wouldn’t eat it even if you smear butter on it – so full it is of ugly things. People will forgive me that I will now write a refutation, even if I do not feel any inclination to do so.’ Truly, Īshmuhammad had a plebeian character, and was a big liar! ... Shihāb Ḥaḍrat [Marjānī] was right in calling him a falsifier (muẓawwir).’

I heard Jihāngir Ākhūnd Ābizgildīn say: “In the summer of 1917 the Spiritual Administration (i.e. the Muftiate in Ufa, Diniyya nazaratï) sent me to Malmyzh region to resolve a dispute among the Muslims. There I ran into some kind of gathering (jiyen). A young man climbed up the minbar [i.e., the Friday preacher’s elevated chair in the mosque] and started to speak. He finished by

17 This is one of the few Tatar references to Indian reformists of the time. Siddiq Hasan Khān Qannawji (1832–1890) was the major scholar at the court of the female ruler of Bhopal, the Begum Shāh Jahān (whom Qannawji eventually married). Reportedly the author of some 200 published works, Siddiq Hasan Khān is regarded as a founding father of the Ahl-i ḥadīth movement. See Preckel 2000.

18 The Naqshbandiyya shaykh Muḥammad-Dhākir al-Chisṭāwī (Kamalov, d. 1893) maintained a large school in the city of Chistopol (today Tatarstan), on which see Ross 2020: 142–145 and passim.

19 In Tatar folk culture, the image of the dog is – like that of the pig – that of a dirty animal that eats everything (personal communication Dr. Al’fīna Sibgatullina, April 2021).

20 Instead of continuing with the remaining text preserved on folio 297b, the Kazan edition here inserts fol. 298ab, and then jumps back to 297b – without notification. This editorial change of folio sequence ignores the fact that 298a is written on different paper and in different ink, and probably at a later date.

21 The Jadid Abīzgīl’dīn (1875–1938) was director of the ‘Uthmānīyya madrasa in Ufa, and imam of Ufa’s first mosque. Starting in 1921 (when Fakhreddinov took over the responsibilities of the Mufti) he worked in the Muftiate, including as qadi (in 1923–1928 and 1932–1936). After Fakhreddinov’s death in April 1936 the Muftiate was dismantled. Abīzgīl’dīn was imprisoned in October of that year, and executed (for “Bashkir nationalism”) on 17 June 1938.
saying: ‘In order to improve the situation of the Muslims of Malmyzh district [ūyāz, from Russian uezd] one has first to finish off the İshmi İshāns [İshmi İshānlar].’ As long as the İshmi İshāns are alive it is impossible to spread knowledge and enlightenment (‘ilm ve ma’rifet) among the Muslims!’ I later learned that this young man was İshmuḥammad İshān’s own son ‘Abdalḥayy.’

End of quote from Jihāngir Āḵhūnd.

I also heard Kamāl Afandi Muẓaffar saying: “Among the papers in the political police administration (jandarma idāresi) of the city of Sarapul were İshmuḥammad Ḥaḍrat’s denunciations (si’āyet ‘ariḍaları, [‘slander ing petitions’]) about Muslims. The Reds (qızıllar) [i.e., the Bolsheviks] came with these papers to Malmyzh. [İshmuḥammad’s] companions in writing these denunciations were Dhākir Mullā and a person called Khalil. [The Bolsheviks] brought all three [authors of the denunciations] to Malmyzh and shot them. Two sons of İshmuḥammad, Nūr al-İslām and Nūr al-‘Iyān, knew that if two communists (kāmūnīst) served as guarantors (kāfīl) to ensure that İshmuḥammad would
not escape, they would not have shot them. But they refrained from serving as guarantors, even though they were communists. They did nothing to save their father from execution; rather, they wanted him to be shot.” End of quote from Kamāl Afandi.

All his life Dāmullā Īshmuḥammad was busy with writing, and he produced a lot of works. His faithful followers published these items and distributed them but he also left behind unpublished writings, and probably quite a lot. All scholars knew, however, that his works had no scholarly significance. In fact, this person was not a man of scholarship. Perhaps he once started on the path of scholarship; but then he went astray, and lost his way. I am totally convinced that if a reader is not afraid of spending his precious time on reading some of Īshmuḥammad’s works, he will soon find out that my words are not only true but indeed very true.

I collected all the printed works of Īshmuḥammad that I could find, and bound them into one volume (jild) that I brought to the library of the Spiritual Administration. I even entered them into the library catalogue (fihrist). In these writings there are many places where he curses me, sometimes mentioning my name and sometimes not; but as he was a person who cannot be taken seriously, and who acted irresponsibly, this did not make me angry.28

I wanted to preserve myself from writing this person’s biography, hoping I could leave this task to someone coming after me. But God the Exalted saw that this hope was not fulfilled. However much I shied away from this task I eventually did write about him. I hope that, God willing, with these writings of mine the account between him and myself is settled; but I also believe that much more can be said. May God the High and Great grant forgiveness!

[It seems Fakhreddinov’s first version of his entry on Īshmuḥammad ended here. The following text was obviously added at a later point: it is written on different paper29 and with purple instead of black ink – to mark the difference between the first and the later drafts.]

[fol. 298a] On 17 June 1909 there was a meeting in the house of our brother Fāṭih Afandi Karīmī30 in Orenburg. On that occasion Shākir b. ‘Abdallaṭīf

above-mentioned brother ‘Abdalḥayy, was one of the founders of the Soviet journal Yaqtī yul (Bright Path) in the 1920s.

28 This paragraph is a later addition by Fakhreddinov, written in a different ink and placed between the lines and then in the left margin.


30 Fatik Kārimi (Fatih Karimov, b. 1870, executed by the Bolsheviks in 1937) was a close friend of Fakhreddinov in Orenburg, and a famous writer of Tatar novels. Karimov also main-
Ḥakimi Tüntarı from Bugul’ma said the following: “Muḥammad-Kamāl [Muzaffarov] from Malmyzh once came to Ishmuḥammad Ḥaḍrat and said: ‘Ḥaḍrat! Something terrible happened! They exiled Dāmulā ‘Alīmān Ḥaḍrat [Bārūdī] from Kazan!’ To which Ishmuḥammad Ḥaḍrat immediately responded: ‘Not Riḍā [Fakhreddinov]? He should have been the first!’”

At one point I was of help to the madrasa of Najīb Makhdūm [i.e., Muḥammad-Najib Tüntarı]. After Ishmuḥammad heard that I was in Tüntär [supporting the Jadīd madrasa of his competitor], Ishmuḥammad became furious at me, and sent me a letter. It is difficult to imagine that any person in the world could be so insulting in his language, using so many shameful words, and be so dark in his heart. In his letter he told me: “May your tongue be immobile at the time that you die, so that it cannot pronounce the [confession of] faith [with the result that you end up in hell]!”

On 2 August 1905 I heard the following words from Luṭfallāh Afandī Ishāqī: “During his study time in Bukhara Ishmuḥammad wanted to learn mathematics (‘ilm-i ḥisāb), and for this purpose he went to a special teacher and started to take lessons. The teacher began by explaining the rules of addition; when adding numbers he said: ‘and so much [i.e., an interim sum] we keep in our heart [i.e., mind],’ thus beginning with a very easy thing to explain. But Ishmuḥammad was unable to imagine how ‘to keep this in his heart.’ Not knowing how to put this into practice he was forced to ask the teacher. The teacher was very astonished. Taking Ishmuḥammad’s question for a joke he responded himself with a joke. When he realized that Ishmuḥammad could not imagine and did not understand [how to add numbers] he gave him a serious clarification. But no matter how hard the teacher tried to explain the case with various methods: Ishmuḥammad continued to understand nothing. In the end he dropped

31 Presumably a member of the family that operated the Khakimov trading house in Malmyzh.
32 In 1908 Bārūdī was exiled from Kazan to Vologda in Russia’s North. After four months he was allowed to leave his place of exile; he went on an extended ḥajj and returned to Kazan in 1910. Bārūdī’s biographer Munir Iusupov (2003: 160) mentions Ishmuḥammad’s evil denunciations targeting Bārūdī but does not say they triggered Bārūdī’s exile.
33 Muḥammad-Najib Tüntarı (Shamsutdinov, b. 1862, died in 1930 in a Bolshevik prison) was the grandson of the famous Naqshbandiya shaykh ‘Ali Tüntarı; it was his mother (the widow of Shamsaddin) whom Ishmuḥammad harassed in the first episode mentioned above. A Jadīd pedagogue, Muḥammad-Najib Tüntarı opened a Jadīd school in Tüntär that competed with Ishmuḥammad’s madrasa. Between 1912 and 1916 Muḥammad-Najib Tüntarı occasionally contributed to Fakhreddinov’s Shūrā; Fakhreddinov devoted an entry to praising him in Athār III (fol. 327–328).
the mathematics lesson and never learned it. Unable to acknowledge his own shortcomings, ʿĪshmuḥammad used to say: ‘In order to be good in mathematics one has to be stupid.’”

On 12 March 1914 Muḥammad Kamāl Muẓaffar [i.e., the above-mentioned Muzaffarov] was at my place [in Ufa], and I heard him say: “The people whom ʿĪshmuḥammad Ḥaḍrat denounced to the government were servants of the religion and of the nation. These denunciations he composed together with a priest (pūp, R. pop) by the name of Anton, and with a missionary (mīsyūnir) by the name of Kuz’ma. ʿĪshmuḥammad always used to listen to their advice, and he acted in accordance with what they preferred.” Perhaps this priest and this missionary knew the Turkic language (türkicha), or they were from the Kreshchen community (kreshīn ṭāʿīfasi) [of baptized Tatars]. Kamāl Afandi must have said something about this, but I forgot what it was.

Second document: ʿĪshmuḥammad’s refutation of Fakhreddinov’s claim that Quran exegesis performed at non-Muslim universities is valid

[fol. 296a] [in pencil:] ʿĪshmuḥammad Mullā’s [writing]

[in black ink, by another hand:] Qāḍī Riḍāʾaddin Afandi, in the fifth part of his history, spoke about the tafsīr of the Quran, the source of our faith. There he claimed that according to his own opinion (mashrab), the scholars of the academies (āqādimiyya arbābī) indeed produce tafsīr.35 This would be a mashrab that no one shares with him, and as such it would not be a big thing to mention. We would have to remain silent on this. However, these pernicious

34 This document is a piece of brownish paper inserted in Āṯār III directly before Fakhreddinov’s biography of ʿĪshmuḥammad, integrated into the manuscript pagination as folios 296a and 295b (i.e., in reverse order; the verso page comes first).
35 In the fifth fascicle of Āṯār I (Orenburg: Karimov, 1904, p. 228–229), Fakhreddinov indeed criticized the tafsīr scholars of the past for including unreliable reports that even the compilers of A Thousand and One Nights would not have considered worthy of reproduction. He added: “In order to achieve competence in the interpretation of the Noble Quran and the hadith one first has to develop a way (yul) of doing tafsīr based on scholarship and the natural/social sciences (ʿilm vä fänn). Only after establishing such a method will some people be able to acquire real competence. Such a great and important service can only be expected from someone who conducted serious studies at the universities and academies of Europe or America, and who at the same time is a person of perfect morality. To expect such an accomplishment from other people would be in vain.”
fantasies are being spread among the common people. Their error is, first of all, based on [a wrong interpretation of] the verses of the Quran, and second, on a rejection of the rules of *tafsīr* (qāʿida-i tafsirīnīg ibāsī). For this reason I was forced to write this special announcement letter (*iʿlānnāma*).

God the Exalted said [6:39]: “And those who cry lies to Our signs are deaf and dumb, dwelling in the shadows.” [This verse] means that the groups who do not believe in the Quran and in the true messenger, and who while seeing the Quran are still unable to understand it, will remain in their ignorance.

God’s second verse [to be mentioned in this context] is [17:45]: “When thou recitest the Quran, We place between thee, and those who do not believe [in the world to come], a curtain [obstructing].” [This verse] means “unable to understand the meaning of the Quran”; in their hearts I put something that does not allow them [to understand].

His third verse is [17:46]: “And We lay veils upon their hearts lest they understand it, [and in their ears heaviness].” This noble verse testifies to the fact that in the hearts of the unbelievers there is something that prevents them [from understanding].

His fourth verse is [41:44]: “[Say: To the believers it (= the Quran) is a guidance, and a healing; but those who believe not, in their ears is a heaviness, and to them it is a blindness.] Those – they are called from a far place,” meaning these unbelievers are far away from the meanings of the Quran.

His fifth verse is [30:7]: “They know an outward part of the present life [but of the Hereafter they are heedless],” that is, it is not enough that these unbelievers try to achieve what is in this world.

The sixth verse is God’s word [56:79]: “[It is surely a noble Quran, in a hidden book,] only the purified shall touch [it].” This noble verse encompasses the term “purity” (Ar. ṭāhira) both in the formal (iṣṭilāḥiyya) and in the inner (bāṭiniyya) sense, namely “touching” (massa) in the sense of both “doing good deeds” [hasana, and therefore being in a pure state] as well as in the sense of “understanding” (idrāk) [and therefore having access to purity]. [And accordingly, God’s expression] “who is unbelieving and assigns other gods to God” (Ar. kafara wa-sharaka) refers to the group that is impure, and whose intellect is unable to touch the meanings of the Quran. [fol. 295b] In a similar way also many noble hadith traditions say that the unbelievers do not understand the meanings of the Quran.

[To sum up:] First of all, Riḍāʾaddin Qāḍī’s opinion (*mashrab*) has been refuted by arguments of the sharia. But second, it must also be rejected from the

---

36 Here and in the following the translation is based on Arberry 1955.
37 The Quranic words in square brackets are missing in the manuscript copy.
viewpoint of logical reasoning (vujûh-i ʿaqliyya). That is, to do a tafsîr is more than just explaining the Arabic words [of the Quran] one-by-one with the help of scholarship. Rather, a tafsîr is only completed if it employs the rule of linking and dividing, the manners of connecting [with Islam] and dividing [between Islam and unbelief], and the manners for detecting the true intention (qaʿida-i it-tiṣāl qâʿida-i infiṣāl vujûh-i vaṣl vujûh-i faṣl vujûh-i vuqûf ʿalâ l-murâd [sic!]).

But they [i.e., the scholars of the academies] are ignorant of the manners how to detect the intended meaning, and are unable to distinguish between departure (insirâf) [from Islam] and the lack thereof. For this reason, it is wrong to say that the works (? prâvâṭlari) of the academy scholars are tafsîr, and equally wrong to call them a translation.

Riḍâ Qâdî’s chimera has been refuted with the help of proofs from the Quran, from the hadith, and by rational thinking. Given that he continuously rejects the Quran there is a great fear that he will also do other [forbidden] things.
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38 In my understanding, what Ishmuḥammad here wants to express is that a distinction has to be made between scholars who are connected to the Quran and to Islamic lines of knowledge transmission, and unbelievers who lack this embeddedness in Islam. Only Muslims will reach the true meaning of the Quran because they are able to make the correct connections between individual Quranic statements and between these statements and the objects to which they refer. By mentioning a whole line of technical terms Ishmuḥammad of course also highlights his mastery of the Arabic tafsîr tradition.

39 Below on the same page (in another ink) there is a seemingly unrelated note, reading “al-Thamarât, year 1317, number 1276.” This appears to refer to the Syrian Islamic newspaper Thamarât al-funûn, which existed from 1875 to 1908. The year 1317 began on 11 May 1899, meaning this particular issue cannot contain a response to Fakhreddinov’s statements of 1904.
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