



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Qadimism and Jadidism in Twentieth-Century Daghestan

Kemper, M.; Shikhaliev, S.

**DOI**

[10.1515/asia-2015-1009](https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2015-1009)

**Publication date**

2015

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Asiatische Studien

**License**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Kemper, M., & Shikhaliev, S. (2015). Qadimism and Jadidism in Twentieth-Century Daghestan. *Asiatische Studien*, 69(3), 593-624. <https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2015-1009>

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Michael Kemper\* and Shamil Shikhaliev  
**Qadimism and Jadidism in  
Twentieth-Century Daghestan**

DOI 10.1515/asia-2015-1009

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the interplay of Jadidism and “Qadimism” in the North Caucasus region of Daghestan, through the twentieth century, with a focus on educational methods for teaching Arabic and Islam. In the multi-ethnic context of Daghestan the issue of pedagogy was important not only for teaching the vernaculars but also for the transmission of Arabic, which retained its importance as a *lingua franca* of Daghestani scholars and intellectuals well into the Soviet period. We argue that all through the Soviet era, “Qadimism” (as the traditional teaching system) continued to be practiced in Daghestan alongside Jadid approaches, and both are still employed in the new Islamic schools that emerged in the early 1990s. Innovative aspects of this paper are: (1) it brings Daghestan into the debate about Jadidism, which has so far centered on the Volga-Urals and Central Asia; (2) it examines Jadidism in constant interaction with its competitor “Qadimism”, not as its antipode; and (3) it uses a longitudinal approach that covers the whole of the twentieth century, all historical breaks notwithstanding. Finally, this paper explores new methodologies by using the personal educational experience of one of its co-authors, who went through the mixed “Qadim”/Jadid/Soviet system in the 1980s and early 1990s. Our observations challenge the widespread assumption that Jadidism was overall an undoubted success story, and that “Qadimism” as a method was, after the establishment of Soviet power and even more so after its dissolution, bound to disappear.

**Keywords:** Daghestan, Jadidism, Qadimism, Arabic language, Volga-Urals, Islamic reform

## 1 Jadidism: Bringing Daghestan into the debate

The controversy between Muslim cultural reformers (Jadids) and representatives of traditional Islamic learning (“Qadims”) in late imperial Russia and the early

---

\*Corresponding author: Michael Kemper, University of Amsterdam, European Studies, Spuistraat 134, Amsterdam 1012VB, Netherlands. E-mail: m.kemper@uva.nl

Shamil Shikhaliev, Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography, Makhachkala, Dagestan, Russian Federation. E-mail: shihaliev74@mail.ru

Soviet Union has attracted much scholarly attention, both in the West and in Russia and Central Asia. The Jadid movement called for a modernization of Muslim schools (*maktabs* and *madrasas*) in imperial Russia: Jadid scholars and intellectuals introduced new pedagogical methods for spreading literacy, as well as regular school classes, systematic curricula, and well-defined school timetables. Jadidism also stood for the introduction of subjects that were usually not taught at most Muslim schools, such as mathematics, geography, history, and natural sciences. Importantly, the Jadid schools emphasized teaching in the vernacular languages, which in most Muslim regions of Russia was a regional form of Turkic (largely Tatar, with various degrees of Ottoman and other influences). With this program, Jadids turned away from the traditional (“*qadim*”, “old-style”) Islamic schooling, which they criticized as a mindless repetition of subjects that had lost their relevance in a quickly modernizing Russia.

The Jadid movement had its founding father in the Crimean Tatar intellectual and teacher Ismail Gasprinskii (1851–1914), who opened his first new-method school in Bakhchisarai in 1883.<sup>1</sup> Its program was quickly taken over, and adopted, by Tatars from the Volga-Ural region, where starting in the 1880s and 1890s several important Jadid schools were established.<sup>2</sup> Also in Central Asia (the Russian province of Turkestan and the Khanate of Bukhara in present-day Uzbekistan and Tajikistan), Jadidism found adherents, against the opposition of conservative ruling elites.<sup>3</sup> Eventually, Jadid intellectuals turned to politics, by participating in the construction and dissemination of secular nationalism, especially after the 1905 Revolution, when they could establish Muslim newspapers and journals,<sup>4</sup> and when Muslim intellectuals from all parts of the Empire met in a series of congresses.<sup>5</sup> A few prominent Jadids also took seats in the first Russian Duma, mostly joining up with the liberals.<sup>6</sup> Some political Jadids stressed the “Pan-Turkic” identity of Jadidism, and had a significant influence on the development of Turkish nationalism.<sup>7</sup> Many Jadids who after 1917 remained in Russia were first co-opted by the Bolsheviks (who were in dire need of local Muslim cadres to staff schools and administration), but then marginalized and also physically eliminated when enough Bolshevik cadres

---

1 Usmanov 2006. Gasprinskii was probably influenced by Ottoman reformed basic schools (*ibtidāiyya*), the first of which was opened by Sabit-Efendi in 1872; see Somel 1992; Ata 2009.

2 Mukhametshin 2005.

3 See Khalid 1999; Dudoignon 1996a, 1996b; Baldauf 2001; Babadzhanov 2007, 2008.

4 Usmanova 1996.

5 Noack 2000.

6 Usmanova 1998.

7 Meyer 2007, 2015 (focusing on Gasprinskii, Yusuf Akchura and Ahmed Ağaoğlu).

were ready to replace them.<sup>8</sup> After Stalin's death in 1953, some prominent Jadids were (posthumously) rehabilitated; and since the 1970s, official historiography in the Tatar Autonomous Republic, as well as in Soviet Uzbekistan and in the Caucasus, started to make positive references to several well-known Jadids, whom they praised as progressive indigenous intellectuals who spread "enlightenment" (*prosveshchenie/prosvetitel'stvo*) and criticized "religious obscurantism".<sup>9</sup> Today the Jadids are celebrated for their efforts to create national (Tatar, Uzbek, Azerbaijani etc.) cultural and political identities.<sup>10</sup>

While the general development of Jadidism and its political implications have been made clear in scholarly and popular studies, there are still several open questions. One of these, first formulated succinctly by Stéphane A. Dudoignon in 1997, is what exactly constituted the Jadids' counterpart, the "Qadimiyya" (in inverted commas, since this was rarely a self-designation).<sup>11</sup> Dudoignon posed this question with regard to the Volga-Urals, and focused on socio-economic aspects. He argued that Qadims and Jadids had a lot in common: both emerged from a general "renewal of ethics" among the Volga-Urals Muslims since the second half of the eighteenth century; and both trends benefitted from the new Islamic autonomy that the Russian state granted to the Muslim communities, and then from the emergence of a social group of Tatar merchants who supported both Jadid and Qadim schools and publications. Against this background, Dudoignon challenged the clear distinction between Qadims and Jadids in Tatar, Russian and Western historiography, especially since this distinction is all too often based on ideological premises of historians, who tend to put the Jadids into a positive light (since they shared the Enlightenment pathos) and dismiss the Qadims as enemies of reason and scientific inquiry.<sup>12</sup> The questioning of the Qadim-Jadid dichotomy has recently been taken further by a group of scholars around Paolo Sartori, especially with regard to Central Asia.<sup>13</sup>

**8** There is to date no comprehensive survey of the fate of Jadids in the USSR. For Central Asia, see Khalid 1999; Fedtke, 1998. For individual cases in Tatarstan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and Daghestan, see the respective surveys in Kemper et al. 2010.

**9** For this turn in Tatarstan, see Abdullin 1976; Bustanov/Kemper 2012. For Daghestan, see Kemper 2014.

**10** E.g. Khabutdinov 2003, 2008; Khakim 2010.

**11** Possible synonyms for Qadim would be old-style, classical, or conventional, but for the sake of simplicity we stick to Qadim and traditional, and will not always put the terms in inverted commas.

**12** Dudoignon 1997. Cf. Wennberg 2002.

**13** Conference *Beyond Islamic Modernism* (Vienna, 26–27 April 2014, organized by Paolo Sartori); a publication of the proceedings is underway.

However, this distinction is clearly made in the polemics of our historical protagonists, and one will have to find out what it stood for. For testing the viability of the Qadim-Jadid dichotomy, in this article we try to shed light on the core question of the Qadim-Jadid divide, namely the reform of Muslim education; and in this broad field we concentrate on teaching methods, which were the starting point of the Jadids' efforts. The classroom practice, the teaching methodology, and issues of pedagogy in general have received far less attention from scholars than the broader cultural and political questions related to Jadidism.

A second blank spot concerns the spread of Jadid thinking beyond the Turkic/Tatar lands and the urban areas of Central Asia. Our case in point is Daghestan, a Muslim region of the North East Caucasus with a strong tradition of Islamic scholarship since the medieval period. Daghestan hosts some twenty-five indigenous nationalities speaking distinct languages, the major groups being the Avars, Dargins, Laks, Lezgins, and Chechens, of the Caucasian language group, and the Kumyks and Azeris of the Turkic family of languages. While in the Tatar lands, educational reform (the *uṣūl-i jadīd*, "new method") began with the issue of how to teach reading and writing in one's native Tatar language, in the multinational context of Daghestan the issue of pedagogy was important for promoting not only "Turkic" but also the Caucasian vernaculars, as well as for teaching Arabic, which had for centuries been the prime language for Islamic education. In Daghestan also the Jadids used Arabic, much more than anywhere else in the Russian Empire.<sup>14</sup>

Thirdly, we argue that it is necessary to make a distinction between Jadidism, as a broad movement for modernizing education, and Islamic reformism, as a critique of the dominant legal school, and a call for changes in the fields of Islamic law. We will touch upon this issue repeatedly, but for the sake of clarity we will use the term Jadidism consistently in the sense of "Muslim educational reform movement", that is, limited to questions of teaching and pedagogy. As will be shown below, Jadidism in this sense comprised both adherents and opponents of far-reaching Islamic reforms. "Qadimism", by contrast, comprised no proponents of legal reform but was associated with the preservation of the Shāfi'ī legal school.

Not much has been written on Jadidism in Daghestan.<sup>15</sup> Some of the authors whom we classify as representatives of the movement were studied by

---

<sup>14</sup> For a survey of Arabic literature in Daghestan see Durgili 2004, 2012.

<sup>15</sup> For a survey of Islam in Daghestan in the Soviet period, incl. some Jadids, see Bobrovnikov et al. 2010.

Daghestani historians in the late Soviet period, and especially since the 1990s; but these studies are largely written from the perspective of how the Jadids paved the way for socialism,<sup>16</sup> and often motivated by the desire to prove that also the Kumyks, Laks, Dargins, and others had their own printed literature, in their native languages, before 1917.<sup>17</sup> Pioneering work on the life and work of individual Daghestani Jadids has been done by Gasan M.-R. Ozaev, mostly based on their Turkic-language heritage.<sup>18</sup> But a systematic evaluation of Jadidism as a coherent movement in Daghestan is still in its infancy;<sup>19</sup> and to date the only in-depth study of Jadid discourse in Daghestan is Amir Navruzov's analysis of the major Jadid newspaper, the Arabic-language *Jarīdat Dāghistān*.<sup>20</sup> Our knowledge of how Daghestani Muslim intellectuals of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were linked to Tatar Jadidism, and to Islamic reformists in the Middle East, is so far only based on anecdotal evidence.

In the present contribution we start with a discussion of the “traditional” *maktab/madrasa* teaching system that was in place in Daghestan before the advent of Jadidism, arguing that the traditional method of teaching Arabic and Islamic subjects was quite sophisticated and not as irrational as the Jadids would claim. The Qadim method was difficult but it had its internal logic. We then contrast this approach to the agenda of the Jadids, and follow the fate of Jadid and Qadim teaching methods after 1917. Here we demonstrate that in spite of the violent repression of Islam in the 1930s, Daghestani “Qadimism” continued to exist alongside the Jadid heritage, all through the Soviet era. Our method for tracking these developments over time is the analysis of surviving Daghestani manuscript and book collections, for these reflect what students and teachers read and copied. Such profiles allow for assumptions in which parts of Daghestan Jadid literature was popular, and where only Qadim titles were used. We then argue that in the 1990s, when new Islamic schools and even universities were established, both Jadid and Qadim methods were applied side by side, in the same schools but for different purposes. This last part of our paper is based on personal observation and interviews.

---

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Kaimarazov 1988, 1989.

<sup>17</sup> Isaev 1989, 1996. For Kumyk literature in the early Soviet decades see Guseinov 2009.

<sup>18</sup> Akayev 1992a; Ozaev 1992; Ozaev 2012a; Isaev 2003.

<sup>19</sup> Gadzhiev 2012; Kemper/Shikhaliev 2012a.

<sup>20</sup> Navruzov 2008, 2012.

## 2 The old method of learning: “Qadimism”

In 1909 the Jadid intellectual, teacher and writer Abū Sufyān b. Āqāy (Akaev, b. 1872 or 1873, died 1931 in Russian exile)<sup>21</sup> gave a characterization of the “old method” (*esgi qaida*, in Akaev’s native Kumyk). According to Akaev, pupils in old-method schools were made familiar with the Arabic alphabet by the Arabic name of its letters (*alif-bā’-tā’-thā’-jīm* etc.), not by its phonetic value (a-b-t-th-j), which seriously hampered the learning process. Letters were first repeated only in their non-connected form, without reference to their changing forms in words (where they have three more variants, depending on their position in the beginning, middle or end of a word). Only over time did students learn to connect letters into words. Importantly, in old-method schools writing was never trained in class. Rather, students would develop their writing skills, and their own handwriting, when individually copying course books that they needed for their lessons. Furthermore, these schools had no separation into classes of different levels (the teacher addressed every pupil individually, according to his level), no fixation of a course program, and no limit of how many years one would stay with a teacher.<sup>22</sup>

What can be added to Akaev’s description of “Qadimism” is that each class was very heterogenic, with advanced students employed to help their younger classmates. In harvest time students would go home to work in the fields, which made regular teaching difficult. In general a teacher lived on donations, which varied according to his status and the wealth of the local community.<sup>23</sup> Equally characteristic for “old-method” teaching was that it was based on manuscripts, not on the printed primers that were to become the domain of the Jadids. And old-method teaching had been in place for many centuries, and had ensured the reproduction of the learned elites.

In “old” schools, there was no discipline of teaching “Arabic language” as a distinct discipline – and no textbooks for learning Arabic, as an instrument for then studying Arabic-language works in the religious disciplines. Rather, the pupil was thrown directly into reading the Quran, without any propedeutic preparation for reading the Arabic script, and for understanding the Arabic language. The focus was on the rules of pronunciation, the distinctions between long and the extended vocals, the correct assimilation of consonants, the

<sup>21</sup> On Akaevs life see Akaev 1991.

<sup>22</sup> Akayev 1992b; Navruzov 2012: 43–57.

<sup>23</sup> For the difference between low and irregular incomes of Qadim teachers and fixed and better salaries at Tatar Jadid schools see Meyer 2012.

distinction between “soft” and “hard” consonants,<sup>24</sup> and the obligatory places of pausing in the reading of the Quranic verses. This was done without a systematic effort to make the student understand what he read. Some terms the pupils would know from their native languages (since the latter carried a significant amount of Arabic loanwords), but the sacred text was not translated and not explained.

The teaching fostered the development of the pupils’ visual memory; by regular repetition of certain phrases with vocalization, the pupil memorized how to read these words also without the diacritics that Quran copies use to have. This prepared students for the later stages when un-vocalized Arabic texts on other topics were read. No doubt, this way of learning required a lot of patience, stamina, and obedience from the students.

The next step was the teaching of Arabic grammar, followed by logic (*mantıq*), rhetoric (*balāgha*), Islamic law (*fiqh*), Quran interpretation (*tafsīr*), legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), and *ḥadīth*. The Daghestani Sufi and scholar Shu‘ayb al-Bāginī (1856–1912) provided us with a list of books that were read, consecutively, one after the other, at old-method schools; with three exceptions, all titles date from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries (sometimes in the form of commentaries on older works), and with the exception of one book of Daghestani provenance, all were composed in the Middle East (mostly in Egypt, Syria, and Iraq).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> In *tajwīd*, hard are the four emphatic consonants plus *khā*, *ghayn* and *qāf*. Other consonants can be hard in certain positions (e.g. in *Allāh* the *lām* is hard, but in *Ilāhī* it is soft).

<sup>25</sup> al-Bāginī al-Dāgīstānī 1999: 434–435. This list comprises *al-Mukhtaṣar al-ṣaḡhīr* (by the Daghestani scholar ‘Alī al-Ghumūqī, d. 1528); *Taṣrīf al-Zinjānī/Taṣrīf al-‘Izzī* (by ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Zinjānī, written in 655/1257); *Mī‘at ‘āmil* (by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī, d. 1078); *al-Ajurrumiyya* (by Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad al-Sinhāji Ibn Ajurruma, d. 1323); *Sharḥ al-unmūdḥaj* (by Muḥammad al-Ardabīlī [d. 1626], a commentary on *al-Unmūdḥaj fi l-naḥw* by Maḥmūd b. ‘Umar al-Zamakhsharī [d. 1144]); *Sharḥ marāḥ al-arwāḥ* (by Aḥmad b. Dīnqudḥī al-Rūmī [d. 1481] on *Marāḥ al-arwāḥ* by Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Mas‘ūd [d. 14<sup>th</sup> cent.]); *Sharḥ al-shāfiya* (or *al-Wāfiya*, by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr [d. 1411] on *al-Shāfiya* by Ibn al-Hājib [d. 1249]); *al-Fawāiq al-ḍiyāiyya* (by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī [d. 1492] on Ibn al-Hājib’s *al-Kāfiya*); *Sharḥ sullam al-mantıq* (by Aḥmad al-Damānhurī, d. 1778); *Ḥadā’iq al-daqa’iq* (by Sa’d al-Dīn al-Bardā’ī, on Zamakhsharī’s *Unmūdḥaj*); *Isāghūji* by Athīr al-Dīn al-Abḥarī (d. 1265); *Hāshiya al-Nu‘mān* (by Nu‘mān b. Shaykh Sa’id al-Shirwānī on *Sharḥ al-isāghūji* by al-Qāṭi, d. 1359); *al-‘Aḍudiyya* (or *Adab al-baḥṭh*, by ‘Aḍud al-Dīn al-‘Jī, d. 1355); *Sharḥ al-‘aqā’id* (by Taftazānī [d. 1390], a commentary on *al-‘Aqā’id* by al-Nasafī [d. 1142]); *Tuḥfat al-muḥtāj fi sharḥ al-minḥaj* (by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī [d. 1565] on *Minḥaj al-tālibīn* by Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Nawawī [d. 1278]); *Sharḥ jam‘ al-jawāmi‘ fi uṣūl al-fiqh* (by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Maḥallī [d. 1459] on *Jam‘ al-jawāmi‘* by Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī [d. 1370]); *Sharḥ minḥaj al-tālibīn* (by al-Maḥallī); *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* (by al-Maḥallī and al-Suyūṭī, d. 1505); *Faṭḥ al-mubīn li-sharḥ al-aḥādīth al-arba‘īn* (by al-Haythamī, on Nawawī’s *Kitāb al-arba‘īn*); *Faṭḥ al-bārī fi sharḥ ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī [d. 1449] on the famous *ḥadīth* collection of Bukhārī, d. 870). Years indicated largely according to Zamakhsharī’s (unfortunately outdated) *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*.



The result of this approach was a high level of knowledge not of Arabic as it was spoken in the Arab world but of a classical, medieval Arabic that was maintained as a “bookish” language. New terms and words that emerged in Arabic native-speaking regions were largely ignored. To be sure, Daghestani pilgrims brought home new books from the Middle East, including nineteenth-century prints; but these did not enter the curriculum. At the same time Daghestani students – especially those who studied for many years – acquired an excellent knowledge of all the subtleties of classical Arabic. This is evidenced by the fact that several Daghestani scholars settled in Medina, where they gained considerable prestige for their excellent skills of Arabic (including poetry) and classical Islamic literature.<sup>26</sup>

After having passed through a given *madrassa*, the gifted and experienced students would often move on to other villages, to complete their education by taking tutorships from scholars renowned in a given field. From the profiles of many Daghestani manuscript libraries that have come down to us we know that Arabic grammar and Islamic law, and partly also logic and rhetoric, were the subjects in which Daghestani scholars used to “specialize”; many works in these fields were preserved, read and copied, even if the particular titles did not appear in the school curriculum. And in these fields we also find compilations and original contributions written by Daghestani scholars.<sup>27</sup> *Ḥadīth*, *tafsīr* and *kalām*, by contrast, did not arouse much interest.<sup>28</sup> Remarkably, also medieval works of mathematics, astronomy and medicine were copied, which demonstrates that these “secular” sciences were transmitted as well, albeit in private, by teachers who otherwise taught the traditional religious and linguistic curriculum. In search of knowledge, Avar students would also go to Lak, Dargin or Kumyk masters, and students from the plain would go into the mountains. As Arabic was the target language, different ethnic backgrounds played no significant role. Classical Arabic, just as Sunni Islam, thereby functioned as an important marker of Daghestani identity.<sup>29</sup>

### 3 Teaching Arabic grammar, *Qadīmī*-style

It is often held against Qadim instruction that it only worked with commentaries and glosses, not with original texts. Yet many commentaries included the

<sup>26</sup> Kratchkovsky 1937; Reichmuth 1998: 26–29.

<sup>27</sup> For profiles of local libraries and Daghestani works in them, see Shikhsaidov et al. 2001, 2004, 2011; Osmanova 2008.

<sup>28</sup> As already noted by Saidov 1963: 119, 122.

<sup>29</sup> With the exclusion of Shi‘i communities in Derbend and the south of Daghestan, which are left out of consideration here; the advent of new-method schools in the Derbend area has probably to be studied in relation to Jadidism/modernism in Azerbaijan.

original texts that were commented upon, and thus offered a continuing and systematic engagement with the original texts. And as we will see below, these commentaries not only opened the student a pathway into the past of the discipline but were also complementing each other so that students would follow a well-defined curriculum of textbooks.

How course books were interconnected, and how their sequence in the teaching process made sense, can be demonstrated with the example of Arabic grammar, the teaching of which had a central place in the “old” curriculum.

The textbook to begin with was (and partly still is) *Taṣrīf al-‘Izzī*, composed by ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Zinjānī (d. 1257). *Taṣrīf al-‘Izzī* focuses on Arabic morphology (*ṣarf*): the construction of past, present, and future tenses, as well as the imperative; nominal forms derived from the *maṣdar* (“infinitive”); participles, construction of local forms, of terms for instruments, and so forth. Also treated are what we would call conjugation patterns (including verbs with a weak consonant), in addition to the singular and plural of nomina.

The book presupposes that all forms are learned by heart. Of course, for beginning students who do not know Arabic it is very difficult to understand the rules of word formation – and the method did not foresee any elucidation of these rules but just their practical application. Teaching consisted of reading a given word (in whatever form) to the student with the latter repeating that fragment. Central was the correct pronunciation of the Arabic inflections (Arab., *i‘rāb*) of each nominal form. The teacher would read each word separately, and translate it into the vernacular language, but he would not draw attention to the sentence in which it was embedded.

With this approach the meaning of the sentence as a whole played no role; the opportunity to use the context of the individual word for aiding its memorization was lost. Rather, the goal is to enrich the student’s lexicon of Arabic by gradually adding individual words to it. Learning all conjugations and declinations by heart allows the student to identify any of these forms in oral speech or in texts, and to mechanically produce them. This will help him in reading specialized religious literature.

The second book, *Mi‘at ‘āmil* by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 1078), is about Arabic syntax, and in particular the one hundred “guiding” particles (like *bi-*, “with, by” and *li-*, “for”) that determine the case of the following noun. The method remained the same: the student has to mechanically learn the particles, in isolation from their syntactical context. Even on this level the student does not yet understand why a certain form appears, in a given sentence, in, say, the genitive – he just learns the term, while the construction of the sentence, and the dependence of a word form on its function in the sentence do not yet play any role. He will not practice what he learned by speaking or writing exercises.

The next textbook, *al-Ajūrumiyya*, is equally devoted to syntax, but in a broader sense: here the student learns the various parts of a sentence, again with special attention to the case ending.

Important is the following step, introduced with *Sharḥ al-Unmūdhaj*. This book explains all major terms in the field of Arabic syntax that were discussed in the previous two books, and contains also a short chapter on morphology, with which the student had already been confronted in the course of reading the very first book, *Taṣrīf al-‘Izzī*. But the *Sharḥ al-Unmūdhaj* already presupposes that the student understands the text he reads: that is, at this stage the various threads are meant to come together.

The following work in the process, *Izhār al-asrār*, does not provide new elements of grammar but strengthens the understanding of what has already been achieved. The next level comprises more works from the same cycle that provide additional morphological forms and syntactical constructions, including ones that are not used in spoken language (e.g. six more cases of the Arabic verb that only occur in the Quran or in old poetry). Also explained are the views of the various linguistic schools (e.g. from Kufa or Basra) on this or that phenomenon.

The main goal of this whole curriculum is to gradually enlarge the lexicon of the student and to enable him to read without diacritics, and to understand how sentences are constructed (*tarkīb*) and how word forms are produced (*taṣrīf*). Old-method teaching taught the student to think in the categories of the classical Arabic system, without formulating these in the student’s native language. The vernaculars like Avar, Lak and Kumyk were of course used during classes, but not for providing a comparative linguistic framework through which the student would get a better understanding of Arabic. Rather, Arabic stood on its own and required pure memorization and internalization. Needless to say, the whole course of, for instance, grammar required several years, especially given the loose pedagogical structure in old-style *madrasas*.

The same methods were also used for other disciplines, like logic and rhetoric. Usually one would begin with the text (*matn*) of a given author and then proceed to read what later authors had added in the form of commentaries (*sharḥ*) and glosses (*hāshiya*). This model is also known from the nineteenth-century Volga area and Central Asia.<sup>30</sup> By contrast to these other areas (where also Turkic and Persian texts were read in class), the curriculum in old-style Daghestani *madrasas* was almost completely based on Arabic literature, up until the Russian Revolution.

---

**30** For the tradition of commenting theological and legal works, between the Volga and Bukhara, see Kemper 1998: 243–307.

## 4 The specifics of Jadidism in Daghestan

Daghestan was a latecomer in Jadidism; the first new-method school was only opened in 1902 by the above-mentioned Abū Sufyān Akaev in his native village of Nizhnee Kazanishche. Before that Akaev had visited the Jadid *madrasa* in Bakhchisarai, and had studied with Jadids in Kazan and Qarghali (Orenburg), from which he obviously took his inspiration.<sup>31</sup>

While Jadids elsewhere were united in their effort to make their native language the idiom of education, Daghestanis were divided on this issue. While some advocated the use of Turkic, others argued for Arabic. Yet the most influential Jadids, the Kumyk Abū Sufyān Akaev and the Lak ‘Ali Kaiaev (al-Ghumūqī, 1878–1943) called for the use of Daghestani vernaculars. In particular, Akaev opposed the state policy to promote the introduction of geography and history only in Russian schools, which he saw as an attempt at Russification; and he also opposed the promotion of “Turkic” as a new *lingua franca* for education in Daghestan, since, he argued, Tatar, Kumyk, Turkish and Azeri were different languages in their own rights.<sup>32</sup> Likewise, also the Lak Kaiaev saw an expansion of the use of Turkish as a threat to the “small” languages, and to the cultural identities attached to them.<sup>33</sup>

Importantly, the Jadids taught Arabic not in the beginning of the teaching process, as was customary in “old” schools, but at a later level, after the students had already become familiar with reading and writing the Arabic script of their native languages. And Arabic would be taught not as an *object* of study, for producing Islamic scholars highly specialized in Arabic linguistics, but as an *instrument* for understanding Arabic literature, and for students who would after graduation work in a whole variety of professions. The Jadids therefore introduced Arabic language as a distinct discipline alongside the others, in a curriculum that comprised fixed school hours, simultaneous teaching of various courses/disciplines (including history, medicine, natural sciences), with formal exams and diploma; eventually, other new elements were school desks and chairs, plus the blackboard.

Another Daghestani specificity is that Jadidism was strongly associated with a reform of religion, that is, with moving away from one specific school of Islamic law (in Daghestan, the dominant Shāfi‘ī *madhhab*) and to practice *talfīq*, the principle that a legal expert (*muftī*) is allowed to take “the best”

---

<sup>31</sup> Orzaev 2012b: 248.

<sup>32</sup> Akayev 1992c: 75.

<sup>33</sup> Kaiaev 1993: 363; Navruzov 2012: 65–66.

from the frameworks of all Sunni legal schools.<sup>34</sup> Here a major influence came from the Middle East, and particularly from the well-known reformists Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī, Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Rashīd Riḍā.<sup>35</sup> Daghestani scholars produced several manuscript treatises for or against *talfīq* and *ijtihād*<sup>36</sup> (the latter being understood as independent reasoning in Islamic law, either within a given *madhhab* or beyond).<sup>37</sup> The question of pedagogy stood in the shadow of this religious debate, much more than in the Tatar lands.

And while from the Tatar lands we know of a prolonged debate between adherents of old-style and new-style teaching in the popular Islamic press that emerged after 1905, in Daghestan the debate between Qadim and Jadid views continued in manuscript form. And when Daghestani scholars and intellectuals finally established an influential newspaper, *Jarīdat Dāghistān* (1913–1917), this was edited by the Jadid ‘Ali Kaiaev and left little room for defenders of old-style education.<sup>38</sup> This might account for the fact that while Jadid attacks on Qadim teaching were numerous, to this date we have not encountered a single source that would reflect a Qadim “counterattack” on Jadid educational methods. But perhaps a more important factor here is that Qadims were united with the Jadids in their critique of the Russian schools that began to open after the pacification of the North Caucasus in 1859.<sup>39</sup> This common adversary took away from the Qadim/Jadid opposition in terms of language and teaching. The major bone of contention was not the teaching method but the issue of legal (*fiqh*) reform, brought forward by some of the leading Jadids, but not by all of them. The Qadims opposed Islamic reform vehemently.

Among the proponents of Jadid educational methods (but not of Islamic reform) we find a prominent Daghestani Sufi, the Naqshbandiyya and Shādhiliyya master Sayf Allāh-Qāḍī Bashlarov (al-Nitsubkrī, 1853–1919), who

<sup>34</sup> On *talfīq*, see Krawietz 2002.

<sup>35</sup> The relations of Daghestani Jadids with the Arab reformists have not yet been studied systematically. For the impact of Abduh on Jadids in the Volga-Urals, see Dudoignon 2008.

<sup>36</sup> [Anonymous], *Risāla al-intiqād ‘alā Ṣāliḥ al-Yamanī fī mas’alat al-ṭalāq*, Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography, Makhachkala (IIAE), coll. 14, opis’ 1, № 785, 41 ff; Nadhir al-Durgili, *al-Ijtihād wa l-taqlīd*; idem, *at-Ta’līq al-ḥamīd ‘alā al-qawl al-sadīd*; idem, *al-Fajr al-ṣādiq fī radd ‘alā munkarī al-wasā’it wa-l-khawāriq*, IIAE, coll. M.-S. Saidov, op. 1, № 31, 112 ff; ‘Ali b. Abd al-Ḥamid al-Ġumūqī, *Risāla fī-l-taqlīd wa jawāz al-talfīq*, IIAE, coll. Saidov, op. 1, № 90, 19 ff; Mas ‘ūd b. Muḥammad al-Muhūkhi, *Ḥarq al-asdād ‘an abwāb al-ijtihād*, 27 ff (written in 1921; ms in private possession of the authors).

<sup>37</sup> Gould 2015.

<sup>38</sup> On Jadid critiques of the old methods, Navruzov 2012, 44–57.

<sup>39</sup> al-Bāgini 1999: 374; Omarov 1869: 45; Kaimarazov 1989: 69–71, 89–92; Kaiaev 1993: 360–361; Akayev 1992c: 75–76.

for a while taught at a Jadid school in the Volga area.<sup>40</sup> Similar cases are known from the Volga-Urals, where the prominent Naqshbandiyya khālidiyya shaykh Zayn Allāh Rasūlī from Troitsk (Rasulev, 1833–1917), as well as the Naqshbandiyya mujaddidiyya shaykh ‘Ālimjān Bārūdī (1857–1921) in Kazan, were both known as proponents of new-method teaching.<sup>41</sup> Obviously Naqshbandī shaykhs were aware of the available instruments to reach out to the larger population, which included not only Sufi techniques (like *dhikr* and *rābiṭa*)<sup>42</sup> but also Jadid pedagogy.

At first, Daghestani new-method schools used Jadid primers composed by Tatar scholars in the Volga lands, especially Aḥmad Hādī Maqṣūdī’s (1868–1941)<sup>43</sup> *al-Mu‘allim al-awwal*, *al-Mu‘allim al-thānī*, *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*, *al-Durūs al-naḥawīyya*, as well as Ṣun‘at Allāh Bekbulat’s<sup>44</sup> *Mabda’ al-qira’a*.<sup>45</sup> With the establishment of a first Daghestani Muslim printing house by Mirza Mavraev in Temir-Khan Shura (today Buinaksk) in 1905, Daghestani Jadids started to produce their own textbooks.<sup>46</sup> Between 1902 and 1917, Akaev published dozens of text books in Kumyk, including on Islam and Islamic law, mathematics, geography, natural sciences, and ethics; he also wrote a number of multi-language pocket dictionaries, as well as Kumyk translations of fragments from Arabic, Turkish and Persian belles-lettres.<sup>47</sup> Kaiaev published literature in his native Lak language,<sup>48</sup> and others did so in Avar, Dargin and Chechen.<sup>49</sup> Yet they also continued to write in Arabic within the discourse on Islam.

Similar to proposals by Tatar scholars and intellectuals (beginning with Ḥusayn Faizkhanov in 1862),<sup>50</sup> also Daghestani Jadids designed far-reaching plans about the development of several levels of educational institutions. Abū Sufyān Akaev suggested a two-stage model in which a regular basic school (*maktab*) would be followed by special education in a *madrasa* or university. The first three years of the *maktab* would comprise education only in the native

40 Shikhaliev 2007.

41 Iusupov 2003; Farkhshatov 2009.

42 Kemper 2002.

43 Lazzerini 1975, 260–261.

44 Bekbulat (1886–1955) graduated from the Jadid Ḥusayniyya-Madrasa (Orenburg) in 1906, then studied at al-Azhar; in 1910 he returned to teach at the Ḥusayniyya.

45 al-Maqṣūdī 1911, 1913a, 1913b; Bekbulat 1909.

46 Isaev 1996.

47 For Akaevs Kumyk publications see Orazhev 1992: 131–133.

48 E.g. al-Ġumūqī 1910.

49 See Isaev 1989.

50 Faizkhanov 2008.

vernaculars; the following five years would center on religious subjects and natural sciences. The goal was full literacy of the young generation; as a model Akaev referred to Germany, where “those who cannot read and write are forced to learn it.”<sup>51</sup> Higher education, in his model, had a secular pathway in the form of a university (*Dār al-funūn*) that would produce engineers and medical personnel, while those who wanted to become *muftīs* and *qādīs* would attend a *madrassa*. Such proposals had much common ground with the three levels that the Soviet government eventually introduced also in Daghestan (basic school, intermediate special education, and higher education in universities and institutes).<sup>52</sup>

## 5 Jadidism and “Qadimism” under the Bolsheviks

In the first decade of Soviet power, Islamic education functioned legally in Daghestan; by February 1925, the number of state-registered *maktabs* (mosque schools) and *madrassas* (seminaries for Islamic studies, often around one prominent teacher) amounted to 175, to which we have to add an even larger grey number of village schools.<sup>53</sup> These schools were however completely eliminated in the late 1920s and 1930s; during the collectivization campaigns hundreds of *imāms* and scholars were sent into exile or prison camps, and many were shot. By the late 1930s, the Islamic infrastructure of education was eliminated, and also the mosques were closed down.

Many Jadid schools (e.g. the one in the Kumyk village of Nizhnii Dzhengutai) were turned into Soviet schools; these Soviet schools were in the first years quite similar to the previous Jadid schools, in terms of structure and methods of teaching. Major characteristics of Jadid education, like the establishment of a teaching curriculum with exams, the simultaneous teaching of several subjects, and the integration of natural sciences, were close to the way how the Soviets wanted their education to work. Many Jadid teachers were thereby drawn into the new Soviet educational system. The Soviets had no one else to staff their schools with, and many Jadids saw themselves as natural allies of Soviet power. As a result, the teachers of the early Soviet schools were mostly graduates of local Muslim new-method schools; and many of them were sent to

<sup>51</sup> Akaev 1992c: 79–80.

<sup>52</sup> See Kaimarazov 1988: 57–71.

<sup>53</sup> A Soviet party leader of that time estimated that the overall number even ranged between 1,500 and 2,000. See Bobrovnikov et al. 2010: 107–121. Cf. Sulaev 2009: 85; Kaimarazov 1989: 108–138.

pedagogical technical schools (*tekhnikums*) for obtaining additional training. Avar Jadids like Muḥammad ‘Umarī al-Uḥlī (from the village of Okhli, b. 1899, d. in the 1940s in Soviet exile in Siberia) and Mas‘ūd al-Muhūkhi (from Mogokh, b. 1893, d. 1941 in Siberian exile) attended additional courses in the Avar Pedagogical Institute (*uchilishche*) in Buinaksk and were then employed to teach mathematics, the native vernaculars, geometry and other disciplines in Soviet schools.<sup>54</sup> To take another example, Magomed Battalov from Nizhnii Dzhengutai, who in the early 1920s graduated from the local Jadid *madrasa*,<sup>55</sup> began to work as a teacher for the Kumyk language in what was now the Soviet school in his native village.<sup>56</sup>

Other Jadids began to work in scientific institutions. The above-mentioned ‘Ali Kaiaev accepted work in the Institute of National Culture that was opened in 1924, where he worked on historical manuscripts. In 1938 eight of the 23 scholars at the Institute were arrested (the NKVD had identified the institution as a stronghold of “Trotskyism”), among them Kaiaev. At this occasion the authorities decided to get rid of the emphasis on “national cultures” in the Institute’s name, and turned it into the Institute of History, Language and Literature.<sup>57</sup> Kaiaev died in exile in Kazakhstan, in 1943.

Another interesting personality who found his way from Jadid to Soviet education was Kaiaev’s disciple Muḥammad-Sayyid Saidov (1902–1985). After having obtained an excellent Arabic-Islamic education, Saidov became active in Soviet education and journalism. In the 1920s and 1930s he subsequently worked as a teacher in a Soviet school, as corrector of a local typography, and then in the editorial department of the Avar newspaper “The Banner of Socialism”. The Soviet government entrusted him with the production of teaching materials and textbooks for Avar national schools.<sup>58</sup> Saidov miraculously survived the wholesale repressions of the 1930s, then obtained a secular education and went through the PhD track (*aspirantura*) at the Institute of Language and Thought (*Institut iazyka i myshleniia*) of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and defended a dissertation in a field of philology. He then obtained a position in the

54 Interviews Shikhaliev with Ali Omarov, son of the third DUMSK chairman/*mufī* (1975–1978) Ḥāfiẓ-Ḥāji Omarov (1914–2000) (Makhachkala, May 2011); with Magomed Guseinov (b. 1932) and Abdulmadzhid Suleimanov (b. 1940), Okhli, Levashinskiy district (March 2009).

55 The first new-method school in the village of Nizhnii Dzhengutai was opened in 1913 by Arslangirei Makhdilov. It had a separation of classes, and in the first year it hosted 150 pupils. Teaching was in Kumyk. See al-Jungūtī 1913: 3–4; Navruzov 2008: 43–50.

56 Interview Shikhaliev with school teacher I.Z. Magomedov (b. 1938), Nizhnii Dzhengutai, March 2010.

57 Kakagasanov et al. 1997: 8–9.

58 E.g. Saidov 1939.



Institute of History, Language and Literature (a predecessor of today's Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography), where he continued to conduct Arabic and Avar philological research until he passed away in 1985.<sup>59</sup> Saidov established a strong group of Arabic studies at the Institute, based on the huge manuscript collection.<sup>60</sup>

While the Jadid type of teaching thus merged with Soviet education, the Qadim way of transmitting Arabic and Islam continued in private, illegally, in opposition to Soviet secular education; and this “underground” Qadim teaching continued all through the Soviet era.

One reflection of what was taught in private circles can be found in the Daghestani book collections that survived in mosques or in private possession. The distribution of subjects, disciplines, and genres in these collections allows us to distinguish between regions where the old-method teaching was unchallenged, and others where both Jadid and Qadim works were in use. As old-style Arabic textbooks are present in all libraries, all over Daghestan, our criteria for differentiation must be the presence of Jadid works.

Roughly speaking, in the mountain areas of central Daghestan (including the districts of Gunib, Shamil', Khunzakh, Untsukul' and Akusha), which are in the first place populated by Avar-speaking communities as well as by Dargins and Laks, we find only Arabic-language works and textbooks that had been used in Qadim schools.<sup>61</sup> In these print and manuscript collections we hardly find any copies of the literature that was used in Jadid schools. Printed literature in these libraries consists largely of nineteenth-century publications from Egypt; and these are often the same works by medieval authors that had already been in use in the Daghestani Qadim *madrasas* in manuscript form.

The situation is very different in the libraries of the Daghestani lowlands (districts of Khasaviurt, Kiziliurt and Kaiakent), where we find more Arabic works of the Jadids, as well as literature in the Tatar and Kumyk languages. These teaching materials for new-method schools had been published in places like Bakhchiserai, Kazan, Orenburg and Temir-Khan Shura (Buinaksk). Here we also find the famous journals produced by Tatar publicists, like Gasprinskii's *Tarjūmān* and the journal *Shūrā* edited by Riḍā' al-Dīn b. Fakhr al-Dīn (Fakhretdinov, 1859–1936). Also represented are books in Ottoman, which were not typically used in Qadim schools. A third, intermediate or mixed region is the Daghestani foothills (the rayons of Buinaksk, Karabudakhkent, Tabasaran, Khiv and Akhty); here we do find more new-method literature than in the mountains, but the copies of the Qadim teaching

<sup>59</sup> On Saidov see Omarov/Shikhsaidov 2005: 11–22.

<sup>60</sup> Kemper 2014: 393–396 and 401.

<sup>61</sup> Authors fieldwork in various regions of Daghestan, 1997–2013.

cycle clearly dominate. This distribution demonstrates that the lowlands and foothills, and especially their towns with a significant Turkic-speaking population, were more in contact with Jadids from other parts of the Empire, through trade and educational networks, than the mountains.

Such a typology is of course generalizing, since the private (“illegal”) transmission of Islamic knowledge took on several elements of the Jadid and Soviet type of education. One major factor of change in the distribution of Qadim and Jadid types of education were Soviet resettlement policies that were enforced from the 1940s to the 1980s. In order to expand the *kolkhoz* and *sovkhos* agricultural sector in the lowlands, whole village populations from the mountains were resettled in the plains. Next to economic motives, this measure was also meant to enforce the secularization of the hitherto isolated mountain communities.<sup>62</sup>

Yet paradoxically, through this measure the religious elites of the mountain areas got into closer contact with the local population in the target places, where they influenced and enhanced the transmission of Islamic knowledge. Theologians and Islamic scholars from the resettled population thus began to work in lowland *kolkhozes*, sometimes several of them in one settlement. As a result, Muslim communities in places where once a Jadid education had been prevalent received education from mountaineer scholars, who used old-method teaching materials that they had brought with them from their original settlements.<sup>63</sup> Thus Islamic manuscripts that had been copied in the Avar mountains were now also studied by Kumyks of the plains. At the same time theologians and students relocated from the Avar mountains got familiar with the new-method textbooks (especially the primers produced by the Tatar scholar Aḥmad Hādī Maqṣūdi) that had been in use in the lowlands since the early twentieth century. In result, the resettlement areas produced a new amalgamated system of elements from two types of Islamic education that had hitherto been more or less separated. In how far Jadid literature also entered the old-method teaching in the mountains is so far difficult to establish.

## 6 Studying Arabic in the 1980s and 1990s: A piece of auto-ethnography

This mixed form of Islamic knowledge transmission in private continued all through the post-war period up to the end of the USSR. How this worked is

---

<sup>62</sup> Shikhaliev 2014.

<sup>63</sup> Fieldwork Shikhaliev from Khasaviurt and Kiziliurt rayons, 2009–2011, performed in the framework of the project *From Kolkhoz to Jamaat* (supported by the Volkswagen Foundation).

reflected in the experience one of the co-authors of the present contribution, Shamil Shikhaliev (b. 1974).

Shamil Shikhaliev first learned the basics of Arabic and of Islam from his grandfather, Zainalbek Shikhaliev (1911–1994). The latter had obtained his education in the early Soviet years in a *maktab*, and then in the (presumably Jadid) *madrasa* in his native village Nizhnii Dzhengutai. Zainalbek fought in the Second World War, was captured by the Germans and forced to work in German agriculture. After the war he was sent, like many Soviet prisoners of war in Germany, to a camp in Siberia. In 1953, with the opening of the Gulag camps after the death of Stalin, he was allowed to return to his native village where he was employed in the local *kolkhoz*. In the mid-1960s Zainalbek started to take lessons in Islam and Arabic from the local scholar Magomed-Zapir Magomedov (1906–1982), who is characterized in Soviet archival documents as a Muslim scholar with an “intermediate religious education” (*srednee religioznoe obrazovanie*), meaning he had studied at a local *madrasa* before these were eliminated.<sup>64</sup> He had been sent to Soviet camps twice. Magomedov was a disciple of the former local *qāḍī* Iusuf Gasanaev,<sup>65</sup> who belonged to those adherents of Jadid educational reform who defended *taqlīd* in legal matters, and who opposed the call for *ijtihād*.<sup>66</sup> After having completed his education with Magomedov, Zainalbek continued to take lessons from scholars in the neighboring Kumyk, Dargin and Avar villages.

Shamil Shikhaliev, the co-author of this piece, started to take lessons in Arabic from Zainalbek in 1983, during school vacations in summer. Zainalbek Shikhaliev’s method of teaching was Jadid, and he used prints and manuscripts from his own library that contained Qadim as well as Jadid books. Zainalbek first taught his grandson how to read individual Arabic letters, according to the Jadid phonetic method, and explaining the four possible forms of how to write Arabic letters. Then he linked letters with each other in different variants, adding the vocalization; in the following he made sure his disciple would understand what he is reading. Once Shamil mastered the Arabic alphabet and was able to read reasonably well, Zainalbek did not start with teaching the Quran. Rather, he

<sup>64</sup> Resheniia, prikazy, protokoly Soveta po delam religii pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR za 1969 g., State Central Archive of the Republic of Dagestan, f. r-1234 (Upolnomochennyi Soveta po delam religioznykh kultov pri Sovete ministrov SSSR po DASSR), op. 4, d. 48, p. 64.

<sup>65</sup> Yūsuf al-Jungūti (Gasanaev, 1869–1929) was a *qāḍī* in Nizhnii Dzhengutai, and co-founder and board member of the Arabic-language journal *Bayān al-ḥaqāʾiq* (1925–1928), and stood close to Akaev (in the early 1920s he belonged to the latter Muslim association, *Dini komitet*). In 1929 Gasanaev was accused of counter-revolutionary activities and executed in Buinaksk.

<sup>66</sup> Especially against Nadhīr from Durgeli (1891–1935); see Yūsuf al-Jungūti, *al-Qawl al-sadīd fi ḥasm māddat al-ijtihād wa wujūb al-taqlīd*, IIAE, f. M.-S. Saidov, op. 1, № 30, 34 ff.

translated several fairy tales from an Ottoman-Turkish language work into their native Kumyk, wrote them down in a Soviet-style exercise book (in Arabic letters), and read them with Shamil. Here he paid attention to the writing of this or that letter in a given word.

Zainalbek also assigned homework tasks, consisting of copying the Kumyk text in Arabic letters, and of reading the text. The next day the pupil had to retell the content of the story in his own words; the goal was not to learn the original text by heart but to comprehend its meaning. Other tasks comprised of transliterating a Kumyk text from the Cyrillic alphabet into the Arabic one. This took almost the whole day; in the morning the teacher would explain a new subject, and in the afternoon the new subject was studied, and homework was done. The latter was controlled the following morning.

What we see here is a strong emphasis on Jadid methodology: the phonetic method, learning the letter forms systematically, working with a text in the native language, and teaching how to write, plus a focus on understanding texts instead of learning them by heart. Importantly, the first texts were not taken from religious books but from easily accessible popular literature, roughly speaking from a genre that children use to be acquainted with – fairy tales. Also visible is an element from Soviet education, namely the free re-narration of a text.

After a long hiatus Shamil resumed learning from Zainalbek in 1990, in fact starting anew. This time the education encompassed a whole year on the weekends and during school vacations. Zainalbek did not re-start with Kumyk texts in Arabic script but immediately turned to Arabic grammar, with the help of *al-Mu'allim al-thānī*, the above-mentioned primer composed by the Tatar Jadid, Aḥmad Hādī Maqṣūdī. When this booklet was read Zainalbek started to read the Quran with his grandson, in Arabic. But half way through the Quran Zainalbek started to teach in parallel another work by Maqṣūdī, *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*. That is, he taught his disciple two courses simultaneously, one on the Quran and one on Arabic language.

After finishing *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*, Zainalbek began to teach the basic tenets of Islam by using the *Mukhtaṣar*, an Arabic textbook (in manuscript form, from his personal library) composed by 'Alī al-Ghumūqī (d. 1528), a famous Daghestani scholar from the Lak town of Kumukh. The teaching of the Quran continued in separate classes. The reading of the *Mukhtaṣar* was oriented towards understanding the text and learning it by heart. By this stage, the pupil was already able to understand what he read, on the basis of the Arabic he had acquired from the classes with Maqṣūdī's *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*.

Roughly once in two months Zainalbek held some form of examination; this would include an oral part (answering random questions based on the textbook)

as well as a written exam (either a dictation, or an independent reproduction of a text, with vocalization). After the termination of a given textbook he would conduct an extra examination, which could again include an oral part (to retell a text fragment, or to explain the meaning of a fragment from the Arabic text in the Kumyk language) as well as a dictation or a written exam in which questions needed to be answered.

Curiously, Zainalbek did not use Aḥmad Hādī Maqṣūdī's *al-Durūs al-naḥawiyya* for teaching Arabic grammar, although also this booklet was present in his library. Rather, grammar was taught by using the *Taṣrīf al-'Izzī*, the above-mentioned standard work in the Qadim circle of Islamic education.

Therefore, in Shamil's second start to learn Arabic and to study Islam we observe a mixture of the two educational systems: of Jadid provenance were the phonetic method, the use of Maqṣūdī's textbooks, and the circumstance that Arabic was taught as a separate discipline, as a tool for understanding the religious textbooks that would follow. Equally Jadid elements were the focus on understanding, through retelling the contents of the texts in the native Kumyk language, as well as the parallel teaching of several disciplines/books, and of course the oral and written exams. But there were also clear Qadim characteristics like the use of the textbooks *Mukhtaṣar* and *Taṣrīf al-'Izzī*, and the learning of the Quran (at an early stage) and of the *Mukhtaṣar* by heart. This methodological mixture was characteristic for many Daghestani villages in the Soviet period. After each lesson Zainalbek used to admonish his pupil not to tell anybody that he is working with Arabic-script texts.

The Soviet authorities strove to exterminate this "illegal" form of Islamic education; in official documents this teaching was termed a "violation of the legislation on religious cults." Not only the police were charged with fighting the "illegal" Islamic education, also Soviet schoolteachers were ordered to be vigilant. We know that in the late 1940s the above-mentioned Magomed Battalov, a teacher of the Kumyk language in the school of Nizhnii Dzhengutai, periodically used to write Arabic letters on the blackboard. Then he erased them and asked his pupils whether anybody knew these letters. As the village housed several persons who still knew Arabic, it is through such measures that the authorities tried to find out about underground teaching. The generation of seven- to ten-year olds had by that time been completely raised in Soviet schools, and after the double alphabet change for the vernaculars, first to Latin (in the late 1920s) and then to Cyrillic (in the late 1930s), children were supposed to have no literacy in Arabic.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Fieldwork by Shamil Shikhaliev, Nizhnii Dzhengutai, March 2010; interview with school teacher I.Z. Magomedov.

Another facet of the Soviet attempt to control and limit the education in Islam was the opening, in 1945, of the *Mir-i 'Arab madrasa* in Bukhara (Uzbekistan). The *Mir-i 'Arab* was a pro-Soviet institution that produced the “official” imams for the few mosques that were allowed to re-open; between the mid-1950s and the mid-1980s, the average number of mosques in the whole of the USSR was between 300 and 400<sup>68</sup> (including some 25–30 in Daghestan). While there is no comprehensive study of the Soviet curriculum of the *Mir-i 'Arab* and its implementation, we can assume that it was largely Jadid in origin, probably using Tatar Jadid primers.<sup>69</sup>

## 7 Qadim-Jadid patchworks at a post-Soviet Islamic university

Shortly before the end of the USSR, Muslim communities all over Daghestan began to construct new mosques, or to re-open the old ones. By 1998 approximately 1,500 mosques had state registration. But the 1990s also saw the return of full-fledged Islamic educational institutions, from mosque schools to *madrasas*; sixteen of the latter developed into Islamic institutes and universities.<sup>70</sup> From 1991 to 1994, Shamil Shikhaliev was a full-time student at the first of these post-Soviet Islamic institutions of higher education, the *Imām Shāfi'ī Islamic Institute* in Makhachkala. At that time this school did not yet have a license for issuing diploma, and the teaching process was much in flux. In terms of what was taught, however, the Institute could go back to readily available models of both Qadimism and Jadidism.

For Arabic teaching, the only available teaching materials in the first post-Soviet Islamic institutes were the works of the Tatar Jadids, especially *Mabda' al-qirā'a* and *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*; these primers were copied and reprinted in private. In 1993 the *Shāfi'ī Institute* (which would later obtain the status of Islamic University) started to get in touch with charitable foundations from the Arab world; through these contacts Maqṣūdī's manuals were replaced by the six-volume manual *Ta'lim al-'arabiyya li-ghayr al-nāṭiqīn bihā*, which had been

<sup>68</sup> Roi 2000: 66–67.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Arapov 2011: 253. On the *Mir-i Arab* syllabus (however without book titles) in the early post-WWII period see Bausani 1954. On the influence of the *Mir-i Arab* program on the Daghestani Soviet Islamic elite in the 1970s see Kemper/Shikhaliev 2012b: 94–99.

<sup>70</sup> For post-Soviet Islamic universities see Bobrovnikov et al. 2010: 151–159; Navruzov 2010: 150–164.

published in 1992 by the Saudi university Umm al-Qurā and financed by the Society for the Revival of the Islamic Heritage (*Jamī'at ihyā' al-turāth al-islāmī*) from Kuwait. It was this organization that also supported the Shāfi'ī Institute in Makhachkala. Other Daghestani Islamic institutes, and above all those of Salafi inclination,<sup>71</sup> used the Arabic manual written by Bagauddin Kebedov (Bahā' al-Dīn Muḥammad, b. 1942?), a vocal leader of the Salafi movement in Daghestan. The structure of this work was quite similar to Bekbulat's *Mabda' al-qirā'a* and Maqṣūdī's *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya*.<sup>72</sup>

Also the structure of the teaching process was conforming to that of Jadid *madrasas*. In the first study year there were four parallel courses: Quran and Quran recitation (*tajwīd*), the fundamentals of Islam (*uṣūl al-dīn*), Arabic grammar, and "Arabic language" as a distinct subject. As with secular higher education, the study year fell into two semesters, which ended with exams and reports; and classes comprised of two-hours sessions (R., *pariy*). The summer vacations coincided with those at secular universities, and the language of education was Russian, the *lingua franca* of modern Daghestan since WWII.

After students passed the courses on Quran and *tajwīd*, their curriculum comprised four two-hours classes per day: one on *uṣūl al-dīn* (based on 'Ali al-Ghumūqī's *Mukhtaṣar*, in addition to the anonymous works *Ḥadīth qudsī* and *Kitāb fi uṣūl al-dīn*); two on grammar (based on *Taṣrīf al-'Izzī*), and one on Arabic language (where *Mabda' al-qirā'a* was taught). After the completion of the three works of *uṣūl al-dīn*, students got their first classes in Shāfi'ī law, *fiqh*; and by that time the parallel course on Arabic grammar turned to *Mi'at 'āmil*. The third year continued with the subjects Arabic language, grammar (now with *Sharḥ al-Unmūdḥaj* and other books) and *fiqh*; a new subject was *tafsīr*.

In the teaching of Islamic disciplines, after the study of the Quran and the fundamentals of religion more classical works were employed in the following cycles, including Quran interpretation (with the famous *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* by al-Maḥallī, d. 1459, and al-Suyūṭī, d. 1505), several Shāfi'ī works of Islamic law (*Faṭḥ al-mu'īn* by al-Malyābārī, d. 1579; *Sharḥ Minhāj al-ṭālibīn* by al-Maḥallī), and the above mentioned *Faṭḥ al-mubīn* for *ḥadīth*.

All of these works belonged to the standard curriculum of old-method *madrasas* in Daghestan, where students learned them by heart. Also in the early 1990s students were obliged to do this, and much attention was paid to the full pronunciation of the Arabic inflexion forms in word endings. These courses were thus Qadim in character, with the sole exclusion of "Arabic

71 There is no recent study on the wide spectrum of Salafi groups in Daghestan. For some observations, see Kemper/Shikhaliev (forthcoming).

72 [Kebedov] 1992.

language”, which was organized around Bekbulat’s *Mabda’ al-qirā’a* and Maqṣūdi’s *al-Durūs al-shifāhiyya* (followed by Saudi textbooks from the end of the second year). How awkward this combination of Jadid materials in “Arabic language” and Qadim materials in the other disciplines was can be seen from the fact that the “grammar” teachers made no attempt to integrate Maqṣūdi’s other primer, *al-Durūs al-naḥawiyya*, which would have offered simplified explanations of Arabic grammar. In fact, the Daghestani teachers who had obtained a local underground education in the Soviet period had a very bad opinion of this work, arguing that only the traditional (Qadim) cycle of books can provide the language skills necessary for moving on to the disciplines of *fiqh*, *ḥadīth* and *tafsīr*.

Curiously, in teaching these works of the Qadim cycle, the Shāfi’ī Institute clearly employed Jadid methods. The texts were translated into Russian, and the teachers made sure the students would comprehend what was read. In addition, after each semester the students would have to pass an exam in the given discipline, usually by repeating fragments from memory and explaining them (in Russian). To be sure, some students used modern Russian textbooks in private, “under the desk”, to ease the understanding of the Qadim curriculum. But these were never used in class.

This was the program as Daghestani teachers taught it. It is interesting to note that there were also Arab teachers, who largely ran the al-Shāfi’ī Islamic Institute and also had their own group of local students; they did not employ the traditional Daghestani (and Tatar) primers. The students in their classes were not exposed to the Qadim manuals at all. Rather, the Arab teachers taught grammar in a simplified form, according to their own manuals and to contemporary models of language teaching in the Middle East. They put more emphasis on disciplines like “Arabic language” (using the above-mentioned Saudi textbook), *ḥadīth*, and dogmatics. The students took part in a modern language program but had significantly less training in Arabic grammar and Shāfi’ī law.

While the Arab personnel thus opted for a modernization of the curriculum, some Daghestani teachers of the Institute called for moving back to the Qadim style in its entirety, also in methods and structure. These scholars were elderly Sufis; their leader was ‘Abdallāh-Ḥājji Aligadzhiev (d. 2007), a grandson of the famous Naqshbandiyya khālidiyya shaykh ‘Alī-Ḥājji al-Aqūshī (Akushinskii, 1847–1928). Aligadzhiev had obtained his Islamic education in Kazakhstan, where ‘Ali Akushinskii’s family had been sent to in 1928; Aligadzhiev’s teachers were therefore sons of Daghestanis in exile. Accordingly, Aligadzhiev knew nothing of Jadidism, a teaching that he virulently opposed. He called for changing the Institute’s teaching schedule (the lesson format, the semester division, exams), and wanted to make students study the whole day long with one



teacher. Aligadzhiev and his followers also opposed the teaching of several courses in parallel, and opted for the consecutive model according to which a new subject/textbook was started only after the preceding one was finished; and they also wanted to move away from the teaching of Arabic as a separate discipline. This opposition to a modernized program reveals how much local teachers were attached to the Qadim methods they had been familiar with since their youth. However, these initiatives were rejected, certainly also under pressure from the foreign donors.

This mixed system – the complementary use of Jadid and Qadim features – has been applied in all post-Soviet Daghestani Islamic universities up to the present day. In the framework of the official “fight against Wahhabism”, in the late 1990s and early 2000s almost all Arab teachers were expelled from the Russian Federation, and Arab charities ceased their operations in Daghestan, including their sponsoring of local Islamic universities. The concomitant dumping of the “imported” teaching materials only solidified the place of the Qadim teaching cycle. While “Arabic language” continues to be a separate subject, some Islamic teaching institutes returned to the Tatar primer *Mabda’ al-qirā’at*, and others developed their own Russian-language textbooks of Arabic on models from the Arab world. While the structure and methods of teaching are thus taken from the Jadids, the literature used in the disciplines of *fiqh*, *ḥadīth*, *tafsīr* (and in some institutions, Sufism) remains thoroughly Qadim in nature. This turn away from Jadidism fits perfectly with a general trend in the Islam-related policies of the Russian Federation, namely to fend off external influences. As several prominent Jadids (like Kaiaev) went beyond the modernization of education and also demanded Islamic reform, Jadidism is often associated with Salafism, and Salafism is regarded as a dangerous infiltration from abroad. The promotion of the Qadim method of teaching is therefore understood as part of the defence of “traditional Islam”, which in Daghestan is based on conservative Shāfi‘ism and Naqshbandī Sufism.<sup>73</sup>

## 8 Conclusion: What Daghestan adds to the broader discourse on Jadidism

Coming back to the questions raised at the beginning of this article the following conclusions can be drawn. First, Jadidism spread in Daghestan later than in the Turkic-speaking areas of the Russian Empire. While the Turkic-speaking Kumyks

---

<sup>73</sup> Kemper/Shikhaliev forthcoming.

had a pioneering role (esp. Abū Sufyān Akaev), Jadidism in Daghestan was also developed by intellectuals and scholars of other nationalities (esp. the Lak ‘Ali Kaiaev). Against this multi-lingual background, one of the Tatar Jadids’ slogans, “unity in [Turkic] language” (Gasprinskii), did not make sense in Daghestan, where the representatives of the non-Turkic languages, and even some Kumyks, saw Turkification according to Ottoman or Tatar models more as a threat than as a promise.

Second, an important point is that Jadids and Qadims were united in their opposition to Russian education in Daghestan. The major dispute between Jadids and adherents of the “old method” was not on the issue of educational methods. Rather, the Qadims openly rejected only those Jadids who called for thorough reforms of Islam, and who challenged the dominance of the Shāfi‘ī legal school by calling for the application of new *ijtihād* and of *tafīq*, under the influence of the Middle Eastern reformists. These Jadids criticized not only the traditional system of how to teach, but also the traditions that the Islamic course books came from. In a word, the debate about teaching methods stood in the shadow of the discourse on Islam; and in that Islamic discourse, the term *jadīd* became all too often synonymous with *muṣliḥ* (“reformer”, i.e. of Islam),<sup>74</sup> in spite of the fact that only some proponents of educational modernization also called for a reform of Islam.

And while the traditional (Qadim) cycle of school books did not comprise natural sciences, the Jadids’ introduction of mathematics, geography and other “European” disciplines into the curriculum was not a major issue because also the traditional scholars cherished works on natural sciences (albeit from classical Muslim authors of the medieval period), which they however did not teach in regular classes; they kept them for private use.

At the same time there are also good reasons for not ignoring the differences in teaching methods. The book collections give us important clues about where Jadid primers were read, and where not. In those areas where we do find Jadid literature (above all in the plains and foothills), these are accompanied by books that were read in traditional schools. There are thus no “pure” Jadid libraries. However, in the Avar mountains the typical book collections were purely Qadim in nature. This leads us to the conclusion that it does make sense to differentiate between Qadim and Jadid approaches to education, even if there was no harsh confrontation between the proponents of the two systems of teaching, but between two visions on Islam.

---

74 E.g. Nadhir al-Durgili, *al-Ijtihād wa l-taqīd*, fol. 52; Yūsuf al-Junguti, *al-Qawl al-sadīd fi ḥasm māddat al-ijtihād wa wujūb al-taqīd*, fol. 67; Abd al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Uḥlī, *al-Jawāb al-ṣāliḥ li l-akh al-muṣliḥ*, ms in the archive of Shamil Shikhaliev.

What has become clear is that to regard the Jadids as proponents of secularization, as Soviet historiography portrayed them, makes little sense; the emphasis on Islam as the legal and moral foundation of society was something that the Jadids and the “Qadims” had in common. While in the Volga-Urals, the major Jadids are perceived as promoters of integration into the Russian Empire, in Daghestan the Jadids were as inimical to Russian rule as were the “Qadims”. This included enmity towards Russian education, which was seen as an instrument for Russification. To give an example, when in 1913 the Russian administration tried to enforce the use of Russian for all official purposes, a rebellion broke out (the “*anti-pisarskoe vosstanie*”), and among those who were involved in this movement was a prominent Jadid, the above-mentioned Naqshbandi Sufi master Sayf Allāh Bashlarov (whom the Russian authorities then exiled to the Volga region, where he deepened his knowledge of Jadidism).<sup>75</sup>

Jadidism, as a Muslim cultural reform movement of independent teachers, intellectuals and scholars, was brought to a violent end in the 1930s. Still, many Jadids became Soviet teachers, and their educational approaches were absorbed by the emerging Soviet education in the North Caucasus. The “old-method”, in contrast, did not find a new institutional framework. But after the horrors of the Stalin period had ended, the old method regained ground in the form of Islamic “underground” teaching in private lessons, both in Daghestan and in Daghestani communities in Kazakhstani exile. In some areas of Daghestan this “underground” system accepted Jadid elements. This mixture of methods was unintentionally fostered by Soviet resettlement campaigns.

The fundamental debate on Islam continued in the Soviet period as well: a number of traditional scholars (for our purpose, “Qadims”) obtained positions in the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of the North Caucasus (DUMSK, the Soviet Muftiate established in 1944 in Buinaksk), and resumed writing in Arabic. In their exchanges they did not oppose the introduction of Jadid-style educational methods. However, they did denounce those Jadids who, like ‘Ali Kaiaev, went beyond educational reform and also ventured to criticize the Shāfi‘ī *madhhab*, and called for “absolute *ijtihād*”.<sup>76</sup>

When in the early 1990s new Islamic institutes and universities were established, their education had a Jadid structure but the course books remained by and large Qadim in nature. The only exception is the discipline of “Arabic language”, which had been absent in the Qadim cycle; here Jadid primers were used. Obviously, this was an adaptation to the increased need to provide students with a quicker and higher level of spoken Arabic, given that travels to

---

<sup>75</sup> Shikhaliev 2003.

<sup>76</sup> Shikhaliev 2010.

the Arabic world were now becoming very popular. The example of the Imām Shāfi‘ī University, and the tensions between the “traditional” Daghestani teachers and the Arab sponsors, demonstrate how awkward this combination was – and that the difference between the two systems of education was clearly felt, even beyond the debate on the “correct” form of Islam. All Jadid and Soviet modernization of education notwithstanding (and also against new influences from the Middle East), “Qadimism” is still in place, and seems to have its merits.

Overall, the Daghestani material counters the widespread assumption that Jadidism was an undoubted success story, and that “Qadimism” was, after the establishment of Soviet power and even more so after its dissolution, bound to disappear. This misleading assumption is largely based on observations from Soviet and post-Soviet Tatarstan (and partly Uzbekistan), where the heritage of Jadidism was, and still is, the most popular gateway for reviving the Muslim past. In the Tatar lands of inner Russia, references to “Qadimism” are indeed only occasional, often dressed in vague language, and not backed up by the actual use of Qadim methods in the classroom.<sup>77</sup> In post-Soviet Daghestan, however, the power of Qadim approaches is still very tangible, with Qadimism not just being a project of political engineering but a living tradition of teaching habits that has survived violent repression. This continuing strength of Qadimism as a coherent method and curriculum, and its clear distinction from Jadid/Soviet/post-Soviet modernized education, might be a good argument for not debunking the Qadim-Jadid dichotomy altogether.

**Funding:** Dutch Scientific Organisation, (Grant/Award Number: PR-12-78); Gerda Henkel Foundation, (Grant/Award Number: AZ 29/EU 11).

## Bibliography

- Abdullin, Iakh'ia G. (1976): *Tatarskaia prosvetitel'skaia mysl'*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Akaev, Abusuf'ian (1991): “Avtobiografiia Abusuf'iana Akaeva”. In: *Rukopisnaia i pechatnaia kniga v Dagestane*. Edited by A.R. Shikhsaidov and G.M.-R. Orazaev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr AN SSSR, 130–143.
- Akayev, Abusupyan (1992a): *Payxammarni yolu bulan*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazaev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Akayev, Abusupyan (1992b): “Yashlar okhutaghan muallimlege bir-eki söz”. In: *Abusupyan Akayev, Payxammarni yolu bulan*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazaev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 64–65.

<sup>77</sup> On a major Tatar proponent of Qadimism, see Bustanov/Kemper 2013.

- Akayev, Abusupyan (1992c): "Til masalasi". In: *Payxammarni yolu bulan*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazhev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 75–84.
- Arapov, Dmitrii Iur'evich (ed.) (2011): *Islam i sovetskoe gosudarstvo (1944–1990). Sbornik dokumentov*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Mardzhani.
- Ata, Bahri (2009): "Selim Sabit Efendi'nin Okul Tarihi İnşası". *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 7.2: 377–392.
- Babadzhanov, Bakhtiiar M. (introd., analysis, facsimile) (2007): *Zhurnal "Khakikat" kak zerkalo religioznogo aspekta v ideologii dzhadidov*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo, Department of Islamic Area Studies.
- Babadzhanov, Bakhtiiar M. (2008): "Islam v forme dzhadidizma – chto eto?". In: *Shigabutdin Mardzhani: nasledie i sovremennost'*. Edited by L.I. Almazova and A.G. Khairutdinov. Kazan: Alma-Lit, 209–217.
- al-Bāginī al-Dāghistānī, Shu'ayb b. Idrīs (1999): *Tabaqāt al-khwajagān al-naqshbandiyya*. Damascus: Dar al-Nu'man li l-'ulum.
- Baldauf, Ingeborg (2001): "Jadidism in Central Asia within Reformism and Modernism in the Muslim World". *Die Welt des Islams* 41.1: 72–88.
- Bausani, Alessandro (1954): "L'odierno ordinamento degli studi islamici nella 'madrasa' Mir-i 'Arab di Bukhara". *Oriente moderno* 34: 395–404.
- Bekbulat, Sun'atullāh (1909): *Mabda' al-qirā'a*. Kazan: Kharitonov.
- Bobrovnikov, Vladimir/Navruzov, Amir/Shikhaliev, Shamil (2010): "Islamic Education in Soviet and Post-Soviet Daghestan". In: *Islamic Education in the Soviet Union and Its Successor States*. Edited by M. Kemper, R. Motika and St. Reichmuth. London and New York: Routledge, 107–167.
- Bustanov, Alfrid K./Kemper, Michael (2012): "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*. Edited by A.K. Bustanov and M. Kemper. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 29–54.
- Bustanov, Alfrid K./Kemper, Michael (2013): "Valiulla Iakupov's Tatar Islamic Traditionalism". *Asiatische Studien – Études Asiatiques* 67.3: 809–835.
- Dudoignon, Stéphane A. (1996a): "Djadidisme, mirasisme, islamisme". *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 37.1–2: 13–40.
- Dudoignon, Stéphane A. (1996b): "La question scolaire à Boukhara et au Turkestan russe, du 'premier renouveau' à la soviétisation (fin du XVIII siècle-1937)". *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 37.1–2: 133–210.
- Dudoignon, Stéphane A. (1997): "Qu'est-ce que la «Qadimiya»? Éléments de sociologie du traditionalisme musulman en Islam de Russie et en Transoxiane (de la fin du XVIIIe siècle au début du XXe)". In: *L'Islam de Russie. Conscience communautaire et autonomie politique chez les Tatars de la Volga et de l'Oural, depuis le XVIIIe siècle*. Edited by S.A. Dudoignon, D. Is'haqov and R. Mōhāmmātshin. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 207–225.
- Dudoignon, Stéphane A. (2008): "Echoes to al-Manār among the Muslims of the Russian Empire: A Preliminary Research Note on Riza al-Din Fakhr al-Din and the Šūrā (1908–1918)". In: *Intellectuals in the Modern Islamic World: Transmission, Transformation, Communication*. Edited by S.A. Dudoignon, Komatsu Hisao and Kosugi Yasushi. London and New York: Routledge, 85–116.
- al-Durgilī, Naḍīr (2004): *Die Islamgelehrten Daghestans und ihre arabischen Werke. Naḍīr ad-Durgilīs (st. 1935) Nuzhat al-adhān fī tarāḡim 'ulamā' Dāḡistān*. German transl., ed.

- comm. by M. Kemper and A.R. Šixsaidov (*Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia*, vol. 4). Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.
- al-Durgilī, Nadīr (2012): *Nazir al-Durgeli, Uslada umov v biografiakh dagestanskikh uchenykh (Nuzhkhāt al-azkhan fi taradzhim ‘ulama’ Dagīstan)*. *Dagestanskīe uchenye X-XX vv. i ikh sochineniia*. Ed., Russian transl. and comm. by A.R. Shikhsaidov, M. Kemper, and A.K. Bustanov. Moscow: Mardzhani.
- Faizkhanov, Khusain (2008): “Reforma medrese” (transl. by I.F. Gimadeev). In: *Reforma obrazovaniia: tatory Nizhegorodchiny i musul’manskii mir Rossii*. Edited. by D.V. Mukhetdinov. Nizhnii Novgorod: Medina, 6–19.
- Farkhshatov, Marsil’ N. (2009): “*Delo*” *sheikha Zainully Rasuleva (1872–1917): Vlast’ i sufizm v poreformennoi Bashkirii: Sbornik dokumentov*. Ufa: Institut istorii, iazyka i literatury UNTs RAN.
- Fedtke, Gero (1998): “Jadids, Young Bukharans, Communists and the Bukharan Revolution: From an Ideological Debate in the Early Soviet Union”. In: *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Vol. 2. Edited by A. von Kügelgen, M. Kemper and A.J. Frank. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 383–512.
- Gadzhiiev, A.-G. (2012): “Dzhadidizm v Dagestane”. In: *Abusifian Akaev: Epokha, zhizn’, deiatel’nost’*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazhev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo, 64–66.
- Gould, Rebecca (2015): “*Ijtihād* against *Madhhab*: Legal Hybridity and the Meanings of Modernity in Early Modern Daghestan”. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 57. 1: 35–66.
- al-Ġumūqī, ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Ĥamīd (1910): *al-Ĥikāya al-māḍiya bi lisān al-Ghāzi Ghumūqī*. Temir-khan Shura: Mavraev.
- Guseinov, Malik (2009): *Natsional’naia literatura kumykov 1920-1930-kh godov (poeziia, dramaturgiia, kritika)*. Makhachkala: Tipografiia Sultanbekova Kh.S.
- Isaev, A.A. (1989): *Katalog pechatnykh knig i publikatsii na iazykakh narodov Dagestana (dorevolutsionnyi period)*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii filial Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Isaev, Amirxan A. (1996): “Die ‘Islamische Druckerei’ von Muhammad-Mirza Mavraev”. In: *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia*. Vol. 1. Edited by M. Kemper, A. von Kügelgen and D. Yermakov. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 341–354.
- Isaev, Amirxan A. (2003): *Magomedmirza Mavraev – pervopechatnik i prosvetitel’ Dagestana*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr RAN.
- Iusupov, Munir (2003): *Galimdzhan Barudi*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo.
- al-Jungūtī, ‘Abd al-Ĥamīd (1913): “Risāla ilā al-idāra”. *Jarīdat Daghīstān*, 31 August.
- Kaiaev, Ali (1993): “Dve raznye orientatsii”. In: *Ali Kaiaev*. Edited by Iu.V. Medzhidov and M. A. Abdullaev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo, 360–366.
- Kaimarazov, G.Sh. (1988): *Formirivanie sotsialisticheskoi intelligentsii na Severnom Kavkaze*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kaimarazov, G.Sh. (1989): *Prosveshchenie v dorevoliutsionnom Dagestane*. Makhachkala: Daghuchpedgiz.
- Kakagasanov, G.I., Butaev, M.D., Dzhambulatova, R.I. (eds) (1997): *Repressii 30-kh godov v Dagestane (dokumenty i materialy)*. Makhachkala: Iupiter.
- [Kebedov] Bagauddin Mukhammad (1992): *Uchebnik arabskogo iazyka. Pervyi god obucheniia*. Moscow: Santlada.
- Kemper, Michael (1998): *Sufis und Gelehrte in Tatarien und Baschkirien, 1789-1889: Der islamische Diskurs unter russischer Herrschaft*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.

- Kemper, Michael (2002): “Khālidiyya Networks in Daghestan and the Question of *Jihād*”. *Die Welt des Islams* 42.1: 41–71.
- Kemper, Michael, Motika, Raoul, Reichmuth, Stefan (eds.) (2010): *Islamic Education in the Soviet Union and Its Successor States*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kemper, Michael/Shikhaliev, Shamil (2012a): “Dagestanskoe reformatorstvo pervoi treti XX veka kak raznovidnost’ dzhadidizma”. In: *Abusufian Akaev: Epokha, zhizn’, deiatel’nost’*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazhev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo, 52–58.
- Kemper, Michael/Shikhaliev, Shamil (2012b): “Administrative Islam: Two Soviet Fatwas from the North Caucasus”. In: *Islamic Authority and the Russian Language: Studies on Texts from European Russia, the North Caucasus and West Siberia*. Edited by A.K. Bustanov and M. Kemper. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 55–102.
- Kemper, Michael (2014): “*Ijtihad* into Philosophy: Islam as Cultural Heritage in Post-Stalinist Daghestan”. *Central Asian Survey* 33.3: 390–404.
- Kemper, Michael/Shikhaliev, Shamil (forthcoming): “Islam and Political Violence in Post-Soviet Daghestan: Discursive Strategies of the Sufi Masters”. In: *Constellations of the Caucasus: Empires, Peoples, and Faiths*. Edited by M. Reynolds and Hirotake Maeda. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Khabutdinov, Aidar (2003): *Lidery natsii*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Khabutdinov, Aidar (2008): *Ot obshchiny k natsii: tatar na puti ot srednevekov’ia k novomu vremeni*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Khakim, Rafael’ (2010): *Dzhadidizm (Reformirovannyi islam)*. Kazan: Institut Istorii AN RT.
- Khalid, Adeeb (1999): *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform. Jadidism in Central Asia*. Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.
- Kratchkovsky, Ignace (1937): “Daghestan et Yémen”. In: *Mélanges de géographie et d’orientalisme offerts à Émile-Félix Gautier*. Tours: Arrault, 288–296.
- Krawietz, Birgit (2002): “Cut and Paste in Legal Rules: Designing Islamic Norms with Talfiq”. *Die Welt des Islams* 42.1: 3–40.
- Lazzerini, Edward J. (1975): “Ġadidism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century”. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 16.2: 245–277.
- al-Maqṣudī, Aḥmad Hādī (1911): *al-Durūs al-naḥawiyya*. Kazan: Kharitonov.
- al-Maqṣudī, Aḥmad Hādī (1913a): *al-Mu’allim al-thānī*. Kazan: Kharitonov.
- al-Maqṣudī, Aḥmad Hādī (1913b): *Durūs al-shifāhiyya*. Kazan: Kharitonov.
- Meyer, James H. (2007): “Immigration, Return, and the Politics of Citizenship: Russian Muslims in the Ottoman Empire, 1860-1914”. *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 39: 15–32.
- Meyer, James H. (2012): “The Economics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Money, Power and Muslim Communities in Late Imperial Russia”. In: *Asiatic Russia: Imperial Power in Regional and International Contexts*. Edited by Uyama Tomohiko. London and New York: Routledge, 252–270.
- Meyer, James H. (2015): *Turks Across Empires: Marketing Muslim Identity in the Russian-Ottoman Borderlands, 1856–1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mukhametshin, Rafik (2005), *Islam v obshchestvennoi i politicheskoi zhizni tatar i Tatarstana v XX veke*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatel’stvo.
- Navruzov, Amir (2008): “Voprosy musul’manskogo prosvetitel’stva v gazete ‘Dzharidat Dagistan’ (1913–1918) i zhurnale ‘Baian al-khakaik’”. *Vestnik Instituta IAE* 1: 43–50.
- Navruzov, Amir (2010): “Ziiaiuschie vysoty: problem islamskoi vysshei shkoly”. In: *Dagestan i Musul’manskii vostok. Sbornik statei*. Edited by A.K. Alikberov and V.O. Bobrovnikov. Moscow: Mardzhani, 150–164.

- Navruzov, Amir R. (2012): “*Dzharidat Dagistan*” – *araboiazychnaia gazeta kavkazskikh dzhadov*. Moscow: Mardzhani.
- Noack, Christian (2000): *Muslimischer Nationalismus im Russischen Reich: Nationsbildung und Nationalbewegung bei Tataren und Baschkiren, 1861–1917*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Omarov, Abdulla (1869): “Vospominaniia mutalima”. *Sbornik svedenii o Kavkazskikh gortsakh*. 2. Tiflis: 48–49.
- Omarov, Khalata A./Shikhsaidov, Amri R. (2005): *Katalog arabskikh rukopisei (Kollektsiia M.-S. Saidova)*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr RAN.
- Orazaev, Gasan M.-R. (ed.) (1992): *Literaturnoe i nauchnoe nasledie Abusufiana Akaeva*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr RAN.
- Orazaev, Gasan M.-R. (ed.) (2012a): *Abusufian Akaev: Epokha, zhizn', deiatel'nost'*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Orazaev, Gasan M.-R. (2012b): “Khronologiiia zhiznennogo puti Abusufiana Akaeva, a takzhe posmertnykh meropriiatii i sobytii, sviazannykh s ego imenem”. In: *Abusufian Akaev: Epokha, zhizn', deiatel'nost'*. Edited by G.M.-R. Orazaev. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 248.
- Osmanova, Milena N. (2008): *Katalog pechatnykh knig na arabskom iazyke vypushennykh dagestanskimi izdateliami v Rossii i za rubezhom v nachale 20 veka*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr RAN.
- Reichmuth, Stefan (1998): “The Interplay of Local Developments and Transnational Relations in the Islamic World: Perceptions and Perspectives”. In: *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Vol. 2. Edited by A. von Kügelgen, M. Kemper and A.J. Frank. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 6–38.
- Ro'i, Yaacov (2000): *Islam in the Soviet Union: From the Second World War to Gorbachev*. London: Hurst.
- Saidov, Magomed-Saiid (1939): *Grammatika avarskogo iazyka. Uchebnik dlia nepolnoi srednei shkoly*. Makhachkala: Daguchpedgiz.
- Saidov, Magomed-Saiid (1963): “Dagestanskaia literatura XVIII-XIX vv. na arabskom iazyke”. In: *Trudy dvadtsat'-piatogo Mezhdunarodnogo kongressa vostokovedov*. Vol. II. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 118–123.
- Shikhaliev, Shamil (2003): “Saipulla-kadi, 1853-1919”. In: *Islam na territorii byvshei Rossiiskoi imperii. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. Edited by St.M. Prozorov. Fascicle 4. Moscow: Vostochnaia literature RAN, 72–73.
- Shikhaliev, Shamil (2007): “Ustav trekh tarikatov: Saifulla-kadi Bashlarov”. In: *Dagestanskii sviatyni*. Vol. 1. Edited by A.R. Shikhsaidov. Makhachkala: Epokha, 146–164.
- Shikhaliev, Shamil (2010): “‘Al-Dzhavab as-sakhikh li-l-akh al-muslikh’ Abd al-Khafiza Okhlinskogo”. In: *Dagestan i Musul'manskii vostok. Sbornik statei*. Edited by A.K. Alikberov and V.O. Bobrovnikov. Moscow: Mardzhani, 324–340.
- Shamil Shikhaliev (2014): “Downward Mobility and Spiritual Life: The Development of Sufism in the Context of Migrations in Daghestan, 1940s – 2000s”. In: *Allah's Kolkhozes. Migration, De-Stalinisation, Privatisation and the New Muslim Congregations in the Soviet Realm (1950s-2000s)*. Edited by S.A. Dudoignon and C. Noack. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 398–420.
- Shikhsaidov, Amri R./Tagirova, Natal'ia A./Gadzhieva, Diana Kh. (2001): *Arabskaia rukopisnaia kniga v Dagestane*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Shikhsaidov, Amri R., et al. (2011): *Katalog arabskikh rukopisei i staropechatnykh knig. Kolleksiia Dii'aaddina Iusuf-khadzhzhi al-Kurikhi*. Moscow: Vostochnaia Literatura.



- Shikhsaidov, Amri R., et al. (2004): *Katalog arabskikh rukopisei Nauchnoi biblioteki Dagestanskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii nauchnyi tsentr RAN.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin (1992): *Das Grundschulwesen in den Provinzen des Osmanischen Reichens während der Herrschaftsperiode Abdülhamids II (1876–1908)*, PhD Diss. University of Bamberg.
- Sulaev, Imanutdin Kh. (2009): *Gosudarstvo i musul'manskoe dukhovenstvo v Dagestane: istoriia vzaimootnoshenii*. Makhachkala: "Format".
- Usmanov, Mirkasym A. (ed.) (2006): *Ismail Gasprinskii: istoriko-dokumental'nyi sbornik*. Kazan: "Dzhien".
- Usmanova, Dilyara M. (1996): "Die tatarische Presse 1905-1918: Quellen, Entwicklungsetappen und quantitative Analyse". In: *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the 20th Centuries*. Edited by M. Kemper, A. von Kügelgen and D. Yermakov. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 239–278.
- Usmanova, Dilyara M. (1998): "The Activity of the Muslim Faction of the State Duma and Its Significance in the Formation of a Political Culture among the Muslim Peoples of Russia (1906–1917)". In: *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*. Vol. 2. Edited by A. von Kügelgen, M. Kemper and A.J. Frank. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 417–456.
- Wennberg, Franz (2002): *An Inquiry into Bukharan Qadīmism: Mirzā Salīm-bīk*. ANOR vol. 13. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.

---

**Note:** This paper was written in the framework of two projects: "Jadidism in Daghestan: Muslim Modernism between the Middle East and Russia", funded by the Gerda-Henkel Foundation (Shikhaliev), and "The Russian Language of Islam", supported by the Dutch Scientific Organisation (Kemper). We thank Anke von Kügelgen, Paolo Sartori and Rebecca Gould for their valuable critiques and suggestions.