



DOI: 10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-822-839

EDN: FCMGQF

Research article / Научная статья

Tatar Humanitarian Thought and “AZ i IA” by Olzhas Suleimenov

Ildus K. Zagidullin¹, Dania F. Zagidullina²

¹ Center for Islamic Studies, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, *Kazan, Russian Federation*

² G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and Art, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, *Kazan, Russian Federation*

 zagik63@mail.ru

Abstract. The study is devoted to the historiography of the ancient history and culture of the Turkic peoples in the context of the 50th anniversary of the publication of Olzhas Suleimenov’s book “AZ i IA”. The Book of a Well-Intentioned Reader.” The purpose of the research is to study and evaluate the works of Tatar humanities scholars on this topic from the perspective of modern science achievements, and to introduce new materials into scientific circulation. Special attention is given to reconstructing the stages of the development of scientific thought and understanding the contribution of individual researchers from the pre-Soviet and Soviet periods to this field of knowledge. At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, interest in the ancient layers of the culture of the Turkic peoples emerged in Tatar historical studies, largely influenced by the founder of Tatar historical thought, Sh. Mardzhani, and the educator K. Nasyri. A comparative analysis of the works of I. Khalfin, Kh.-G. Gabyashi, A.-Z. Validi, and others conducted in this article demonstrates their deep knowledge and broad perspective on the history and culture of the Turkic peoples of Russia. The authors point out that the key element of the high culture of the ancient Turks was the presence of writing, and they express their opinions about the time of its appearance, the existence of cities, crafts, trade, and agricultural production in the steppes. The style, structure, and nature of the presentation of the material are largely influenced by the fact that these publications were intended for students of madrasas, as well as for the mudarris and mugallim who taught there. These works played a key role in the introduction of the new subject “History of the Turks” in new-method Tatar schools in the 1910s, and in teaching the younger generation about their ancestors’ involvement in the ancient history of the Turkic peoples of Eurasia. In the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the history and culture of the Old Turkic period were mainly presented in G. Gubaidullin’s book “Tatar Tarihy” (“History of the Tatars,” 1922), written in the early years of Soviet rule, and in the first volume of G. Gubaidullin and G. Rakhim’s collaborative work “History of Tatar Literature” (1923). Scholars consider the Old Turkic period and the late 18th century to be part of the ancient era in the history of Tatar literature. In the following decades of Soviet rule, the study of the Old Turkic period became the prerogative of the capital’s academic research centers. However, the autochthonous concept, which recommended studying the history of the ethnic group within the borders of the national republic until the late 1980s, prevented the inclusion of the Old Turkic period in the comprehensive works “History of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.” This

© Zagidullin I.K., Zagidullina D.F., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

interrupted the tradition of considering the history of the Tatars as part of the history of the nomadic Turkic world. O. Suleimenov's book "AZ i IA," published in 1975, resonated with the sentiments of Tatar scholars, who, due to the suppression of research on ancient Turkic history in Tatar historiography, perceived it as a kind of breakthrough in the official ideology and its scientific institutions, which hindered the comprehensive study of the language, history, literature, and culture of the ancient Turks. This explains the relevance of this study. In the post-Soviet era, the inclusion of the ancient Turkic period in the history of the Tatars was preceded by the beginning of research on the history of the Golden Horde in the early 1990s, which revealed the Eurasian scale of the history of the Tatar people. A significant event in this process was the publication in 2002 in Kazan of the first volume of the seven-volume "History of the Tatars from Ancient Times," the book "The Peoples of Steppe Eurasia in Antiquity."

Key words: Ancient History and Culture of the Turkic Peoples, O. Suleimenov, G. Gubaidullin, I. Khalfin, H.-G. Gabashi, A.-Z. Validi

Conflict of interests: the authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

Authors' contribution: *Zagidullin I.K.* — the concept of studying the history and culture of Tatars in the prerevolutionary and Soviet periods; *Zagidullina D.F.* — the concept of research; References; sources analyzing.

Article history: received 10.08.2025; accepted 10.10.2025.

Conflict of interests: the authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

For citation: Zagidullin, I.K., and D.F. Zagidullina. 2025. "Tatar Humanitarian Thought and 'AZ i IA' by Olzhas Suleimenov." *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 22 (4), 822–839. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-822-839>

Татарская гуманитарная мысль и «Аз и Я» Олжаса Сулейменова

И.К. Загидуллин¹✉, Д.Ф. Загидуллина² 

¹ Центр исламоведческих исследований, Академия наук Республики Татарстан,
Казань, Российская Федерация

² Институт языка, литературы и искусства им. Г. Ибрагимова,
Академия наук Республики Татарстан, Казань, Российская Федерация
✉ zagik63@mail.ru

Аннотация. Исследование посвящено историографии вопросов древней истории и культуры тюркских народов в контексте 50-летия публикации книги Олжаса Сулейменова «Аз и Я». Книга благонамеренного читателя». Цель — изучение и оценка трудов татарских гуманитариев по этой теме с точки зрения достижений современной науки; введение новых материалов в научный оборот. Особое внимание уделено реконструкции этапов развития научной мысли, осмыслению вклада отдельных исследователей досоветского и советского периодов в данную область знаний. В татарской исторической науке интерес к древним пластам культуры тюркских народов проявился на рубеже XIX–XX вв., во многом под влиянием основоположника татарской исторической мысли Ш. Марджани и просветителя К. Насыри. Выполненный в статье *сравнительный анализ* трудов И. Хальфина, Х.-Г. Габяши, А.-З. Валиди и др. свидетельствует о глубоких знаниях и широте их взглядов по истории и культуре тюркских народов России. В качестве ключевого элемента высокой культуры древних тюрков авторы указывают наличие письменности, высказывая с акцентом на удревление свои версии о времени его появления, существование в степи городов, ремесел, торговли и земледельческого

производства. Во многом адресованностью этих изданий учащимся медресе, а также преподававшим в них мударрисам и мугаллимам объясняются стиль, структура и характер изложения материала. Эти труды сыграли ключевую роль в появлении с 10-х гг. XX в. в новометодных татарских школах новой учебной дисциплины «История тюрков» и формировании у подрастающего поколения причастности своих предков к древней истории тюркских народов Евразии. В Татарской АССР история и культура древнетюркского периода была представлена, главным образом, в написанных в первые годы советской власти книгой Г. Губайдуллина «Татар тарихы» («История татар», 1922) и в I томе совместного фундаментального труда Г. Губайдуллина и Г. Рахима «История татарской литературы» (1923). К древнему периоду в истории татарской литературы ученые относят эпохи, начиная от древнетюркской и заканчивая концом XVIII в. В следующие десятилетия советской власти изучение древнетюркского периода стало прерогативой столичных академических научных центров. Вместе с тем автохтонная концепция, рекомендуемая изучать историю этноса в рамках границ национальной республики вплоть до конца 1980-х гг., не позволяла включать древнетюркский период в обобщающие труды «История Татарской АССР». Так была прервана традиция рассмотрения истории татар как части истории кочевого тюркского мира. Увидевшая свет в 1975 г. книга О. Сулейменова «Аз и Я» оказалась созвучной настроениям татарских ученых, которые по причине вытеснения исследований древнетюркской истории из татарской историографии воспринимали ее как своего рода прорыв воздвигавшейся официальной идеологией и подвластных ей научных институций преграды на пути всестороннего изучения языка, истории, литературы и культуры древних тюрков. Этим объясняется актуальность данного исследования. В постсоветское время включению древнетюркского периода в историю татар предшествовало начало изысканий по истории Золотой Орды в начале 1990-х гг., показавшее евразийский масштаб истории татарского народа. Знаковым событием в этом процессе явилось издание в 2002 г. в Казани первого тома семитомной «Истории татар с древнейших времен» — книги «Народы степной Евразии в древности».

Ключевые слова: древняя история и культура тюркских народов, О. Сулейменов, Г. Губайдуллин, И. Хальфин, Х.-Г. Габяши, А.-З. Валиди

Конфликт интересов: авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Вклад авторов: *Загидуллин И.К.* — концепция изучения истории и культуры татар в дореволюционный и советские периоды в контексте социально-политической ситуации; *Загидуллина Д.Ф.* — концепция исследования, список литературы, анализ источников.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 10.08.2025; принята к печати 10.10.2025.

Конфликт интересов: авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Для цитирования: *Загидуллин И.К., Загидуллина Д.Ф.* Татарская гуманитарная мысль и «Аз и Я» Олжаса Сулейменова // Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики. 2025. Т. 22. № 4. С. 822–839. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-897X-2025-22-4-822-839>

Introduction

Olzhas Suleimenov's book "AZ i IA." The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader" is one of the phenomena that 'awakened' the scientific thought of all Turkic peoples, including the historical and philological thought of the Tatar people of the Soviet period, which made a vivid statement throughout the Turkic-speaking world in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

In Tatar historical science, interest in the ancient layers of the culture of the Turkic peoples arose largely under the influence of the founder of Tatar historical thought, Sh. Marjani¹, and the enlightener K. Nasiri². Their works substantiated the Bulgarian origin of the Tatars and, at the same time, defended the ethnonym ‘Tatars’, while the Tatar-Muslim intellectual elite mainly advocated for the preservation of the confessional name ‘Muslims’, which had prevailed among the Tatars (used as a marker of ethnic identity), or for the use of the ethnonym ‘Turks’, which emphasised the Tatar nation’s belonging to the Turkic world.

In Tatar historiography of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, works appeared in which the history of the Tatars was considered in the context of the history of the Turkic peoples. Their first scientific analysis is associated with the name of the famous Tatar historian Gaziz Gubaidullin,³ who on the second day of work (27 February 1926) of the First All-Union Turkological Congress, which Azerbaijani researcher Tamilla Kerimova called a congress that ‘united the Turkic world’ and ‘the most significant event in the history of Turkology of the new era, a bright page in the cultural life of the Turkic peoples’ [1. P. 20], delivered a report entitled “The Development of Historical Literature among the Turkic-Tatar Peoples.”

Gubaidullin begins his speech with a caveat: ‘I will only touch upon those works on the history of the Turkic-Tatars that were written by Turks of the Soviet Union and those that were written under some influence of Western European historical science’ [2. P. 100].

He names Ibrahim Khalfin⁴ as the first historian of this calibre and mentions his book ‘The Life of Genghis Khan and Aksak Timur...’ (1822), paying particular attention to its preface. Indeed, in it, the compiler, after briefly explaining the structure of the publication, formulated for the first time the goals of such scientific activity: ‘But in publishing these excerpts, as perhaps the only historical remains of the Kazan Tatars, the intention was to preserve as much as possible from distortion, so that by this means the attention of fellow scholars (as I explained at length in the preface) might be drawn to the search for and study of monuments to the history of

¹ **Shigabutdin Marjani** (1818–1889) was a Tatar Muslim theologian, educator, ethnographer, archaeographer, orientalist, and teacher. In 1885, he published the first volume of the book “Мөстафад эл-эхбар фи эхвали Казан вә Болгар” (Sources on the History of Kazan and Bulgar, 1885), in which he focused mainly on the history of the Volga Bulgars and Kazan Tatars, and also reported on the Khazars, Kipchaks, and Burtas, noting their common origins.

² **Kayum Nasiri** (Nasir Gabdelkayum Gabdenasirovich) (1825–1902) was a Tatar ethnographer, writer and educator in the second half of the 19th century.

³ **Gubaidullin Gaziz Salikhovich** (1887–1937) was a Russian and Soviet historian, orientalist, Turkologist, literary scholar, teacher, writer, and specialist in the history and culture of the Turkic peoples of Eurasia. He was a victim of Stalin’s repressions.

⁴ **Ibrahim Iskhakovich Khalfin** (1778–1829) — the first Tatar educator, gymnasium teacher, and the most prominent and talented member of the Khalfin family. In 1812, he was appointed lecturer in the Tatar language at Kazan University, and in 1823 he was elected adjunct professor of Oriental literature.

the Tatar tribes, which they have hitherto completely neglected' [3. P. 3–4]. The significance of this collection is undoubtedly determined by its purpose: as a textbook for students of Kazan Imperial University, it awakens interest in the history of the Tatar people among several generations of intellectuals.

Considering the very important role of another person, 'who lived and wrote among the Russian Turks in the 1840s' — the Azerbaijani historian Bakikhanov⁵ — Gubaidullin notes: 'Bakikhanov was fluent not only in Eastern languages, but also in Russian. He was familiar with Russian historians such as Karamzin and some ancient authors who, in one way or another, touched upon the past of this country in their works. Compared to other Turkic historians, such as the Tatar Marjani, the author of "Gulistan-i Iram" is quite European, and his way of thinking also reminds us of European and Russian historians'. [2. P. 113]. Already in our time, the prominent Azerbaijani historian and academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Azerbaijan SSR, Z.M. Buniatov, who prepared the edition for publication, wrote: 'An outstanding historian, philologist, poet, philosopher and encyclopaedic scholar of the first half of the 19th century. Abbas Kuli-aga Bakikhanov is the founder of Azerbaijani scientific historiography, and his work "Gulistan-i Iram" is the first monographic study of an academic nature' [4. P. 4].

Explaining his mission to the reader, Bakikhanov somewhat poetically states: 'To live in the present without knowing the past is like entering a desert without a path and wandering aimlessly. Danger is inevitable; if every person benefits from the experiences of their short life, then to what extent should we expect the same from history, which is based on the experiences of the whole of humanity? The study of history is especially important for the people whose past life it describes. It familiarises them with the qualities of their native land, with the character of the tribes that inhabit it, and draws conclusions from all the mutual relations between peoples, pointing out the harm and the benefit' [5. P. 8].

According to G. Gubaidullin, in the second half of the 19th century, the research paradigm of the Turkic peoples of Russia underwent a rethinking of their history and culture in the context of Eastern and Western (Russian and European) scientific traditions. He attributes an important role in this to the Tatar enlighteners Sh. Marjani and K. Nasiri. Their works substantiated the Bulgarian origin of the Tatars and, at the same time, defended the ethnonym 'Tatars', while the Tatar-Muslim intellectual elite mainly advocated for the preservation of the confessional name 'Muslims,' which had prevailed among the Tatars, or for the use of the ethnonym 'Turks,' which emphasised the Tatar nation's belonging to the Turkic world. G. Gubaidullin pays particular attention to Marjani's scientific works, which,

⁵ **Abbas Kuli-aga Bakikhanov** (1794–1847) was an Azerbaijani scholar, educator, poet and writer who wrote in Azerbaijani, Persian and Arabic. His book *Gulistan-i Iram* (History of the Eastern Caucasus) was the first attempt to provide a general overview of the history of Azerbaijan from ancient times to 1813. The book was written in 1841 in Persian. In 1844, Bakikhanov translated it into Russian under the title *History of the Eastern Part of the Caucasus*.

in his opinion, were written taking into account not only Eastern but also Russian historiography. The speaker notes: ‘Marjani was the first Turkic-Tatar historian in Russia to enter the European arena. At the VI Archaeological Congress of 1874⁶ in Kazan, he gave a presentation in the Turkic-Tatar language on the history of the Bulgars and Tatars, in which he attempted to clarify the previously unknown names of the Bulgar khans. This report by Marjani, which was later included in the “Proceedings of the Congress,” is the first attempt at a systematic presentation of the history of the Volga Turks [2. P. 114].

Having analysed K. Nasiri’s work in detail, Gubaidullin identifies the collection and systematisation of historical and cultural materials as an important part of his work: ‘Nasiri’s main contribution to the history of the Volga Tatars lies not in his systematic presentation of the history of his people, nor in his individual monographs, but in his collection of facts and historical documents’ [2. P. 116]. Along with him, the speaker mentions the names of I. Gasprinsky, G. Akhmarov, Yu. Akchura and R. Fakhriddin, who dealt with individual issues of this vast subject.

Among the first Tatar historians to present the history and culture of the Turks, Gubaidullin names Hasan-Gatu Gabyshi, Akhmet-Zaki Validi, and Gabdelbari Battala. In his opinion, their work contributed to the introduction of this subject into the curriculum of maktab and madrasas, thereby leading to the popularisation of this branch of science. However, he did not focus on Gabashi’s first textbooks, published at the end of the 19th century.

From the high rostrum of the congress, the speaker presented a brief overview of the situation with the study of the history of the Turkic peoples after 1917 in the republics. He testified that the historian knew his colleagues and their scientific interests well. In particular, G. Gubaidullin mentions with great respect Rashid Izmailov’s *History of Azerbaijan* (1923), the work of Mammad-Hasan Baharli, the activities of the novice historian Rza Shabanov and many others. As an example, he points out that ‘Azerbaijani Turks are not only interested in the history of their own literature, but also pay great attention to the study of the literary works of other Turkic tribes’ [2. P. 128]. In this regard, the scholar holds up their activities as an example to historians of other Turkic peoples.

He highly appreciates the work of ‘Professor Choban-Zade on the Kumyk language and literature, which provides us with important information on both the history and the literary history of the Kumyk people, which has been so little studied in Russian and European science’ [2. P. 128].

Regarding the history of the Uzbek people, Gubaidullin pays special attention to the collection of materials by Gazi-Alim Yunusov — folk dastans⁷, names of clans and their tamgas; the literary works of Aini and Vadud. He mentions B. Saliev’s ‘History of Bukhara’, translations of Vambery’s ‘History of Bukhara’

⁶ Here, G. Gubaidullin is mistaken by several years: the congress took place in 1877.

⁷ i.e., an ornate form of oral history from Central Asia, Iran, Turkey, and Azerbaijan.

and Academician V.V. Bartold's 'Turkestan in the Era of the Mongol Conquest', among others. He writes: 'The Uzbek intelligentsia, wise from the experience of other Turkic tribes, is in no hurry to hastily write the history of their people, limiting themselves for now to collecting historical material' [2. P. 129].

Among the Kazakhs, he mentions Chokan Valikhanov, Bukeikhanov, Khudayberdin, Divaev, Tynyshpaev, and among the Crimeans, the works of Osman Akchokrakly, Ahmed Ozenbashly, 'The Crimean Tragedy in the Tsarist Period or Tatar Resettlements', etc. Gubaidullin traces the works of Bashkir and Chuvash historians, pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of their works.

Unfortunately, during the Soviet period, historiography in this field remained outside the field of vision of researchers. Only at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries did the study of individual works begin.

Discussion

In Tatar historiography of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, works appeared in which the history of the Tatars was considered in the context of the history of the Turkic peoples. The first to use this approach to national history was H.-G. Gabashi⁸, author of such historical works as "Төрк ыруглары" (Turkic Clans, 1897), "Мохтасар тарих кауме төрк" (A Brief History of the Turkic People, 1899) and "Мөфассал тарих кауме төрк" (A Detailed History of the Turkic People, 1909), which outline the history of the Turks and indicate their place and role in world history.

In our opinion, these works, prepared as textbooks for madrasas, were prompted by important events in this field of science: the discovery in 1889 by N.M. Yadrintsev in Central Mongolia, on the banks of the Orkhon River, of ancient Turkic monuments in honour of Bilge Khan (735) and his brother, the commander Kyul-Tegin (732), as well as the discovery in 1891 of another (Ongin) monument of runic writing; the deciphering of the texts of the Orkhon runic monuments by Professor V. Thomsen; the publication in 1892 and 1893 by Russian Turkologist V.V. Radlov of the 'Works of the Orkhon Expedition' [6. 54–63].

On the title page of his textbook "Төрк ыруглары" (Turkic Clans, 1897), the author informs the reader that the book 'briefly tells about all the clans and peoples of the Turks and Tatars, about the peculiarities of their life'. This publication is the first serious study of this topic: to a certain extent, it contributed to the teaching of Turkic history and culture in Tatar makhtabs at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

⁸ **Gabashi Hasan-Gata Mukhammedovich** (1863–1936) was a Tatar religious and public figure, Muslim theologian, historian, and Turkologist. He was the author of studies on philosophy, pedagogy, and history. In January 1932, he was arrested, convicted and sent to a labour camp in the Arkhangelsk region. In early 1936, he was released on health grounds.

Along with this explanation, the book contains two more prefaces (addressed to adults and children), in which the author indicates that the material is intended for primary school and explains his goals and objectives. Given the novelty of the topic among the Turkic peoples, the author notes that ‘the first task in writing these stories is to provide knowledge about their history to most Turkic peoples’ [7. P. 2]. In his opinion, this is important in order to know the history of one’s people, one’s country, and one’s family. In the second preface, the author develops this idea further, continuing: ‘Know your homeland and serve it — love it!’ [7. P. 4].

Two years later, Gabashi published an expanded edition of his work under the title ‘Мохтасап тарих кауме төрк’ (A Brief History of the Turkic People, 1899). Here he considers it necessary to note that he collected material on ‘national history’ over a period of 16 years [8. P. 2]. It can be stated that Gabashi’s interest in the ancient Turkic period arose even before the great scientific discoveries of the late 1880s and 1890s, under the influence of his communication with Sh. Marjani and his publications.

Gabashi’s research experience allowed him to be the first Tatar historian to develop a general periodisation of Turkic history, identifying three stages: the Ancient Era, the Middle Ages, and the Modern Era. He begins the ancient era of Tatar history with the Xiongnu and the Huns and ends with the defeat of Volga Bulgaria by the Mongol armies in 1236. The Middle Ages cover the period from 1236 to 1552 [9].

In characterising the ancient era, the author adheres to the Biblical-Koranic version of the origin of peoples. According to his version, the Turkic peoples are descended from the son of Japheth, Turk, whom his father left behind as ruler and commanded his other sons to obey [9. P. 306]. Turk and the tribes settled in Central Asia near Lake Issyk-Kul and along the of the Altai Mountains [9. P. 38]. Referring to Friedrich Müller, H.-G. Gabashi identifies 17 Turkic peoples belonging to the Turanian group, which consists of 52 ethnic groups.

H.-G. Gabashi uses the term ‘Turks’ in two senses: to refer to the clans descended from the son of Japheth and belonging to the Turanian group, and to refer to the Turkic peoples themselves. Taking into account the similarity of material culture and nomadic lifestyle, he includes the Scythians, Massagetae, and Sarmatians among the Turks. The scholar pays special attention to the existence of cities, crafts, and agricultural production among nomadic peoples in ancient times. According to his information, the most ancient mention of the Turks is recorded in a Chinese source dating back to 2819 BC. It contains information about the way of life of the Turkic tribes living in northern and north-western China [9. P. 195].

H.-G. Gabashi reports on the deciphering of Turkic runic inscriptions by Professor Wilhelm Thomsen of the University of Helsinki and their publication by V.V. Radlov (with a translation into Russian) [9. P. 206]. The Tatar historian provides information on the geographical distribution of the identified Orkhon-

Yenisei written monuments [9. P. 205] and expresses the controversial idea that ‘runic writing is older than its Egyptian and Scandinavian counterparts’ [9. P. 204].

One of H.-G. Gabashi’s statements deserves attention: ‘To our great regret, the direct heirs of the great Turkic culture, the modern Turks, were deprived of the opportunity to recognise this heritage and did not engage in its study. The reasons for this sad phenomenon are, first, the illiteracy of one part of the population, second, the unwillingness of another part to accept help from outside, and third, the fact that researchers have paid more attention to two or three disciplines, without attaching sufficient importance to the study of history and its sources. Insha’Allah, interest in this science has recently begun to grow. We hope that in the future there will be worthy scholars among the Turks who will study the heritage of their fathers and grandfathers’ [9. P. 206]. These words are largely in line with O. Suleimenov’s feelings about contemporary Turkology.

In the early 1910s, discussions began on the topic of Tatar national identity (the Tatar press launched a debate entitled “Who are we?”, in which two opposing positions emerged: the ‘Tatars’, who advocated for the ethnonym ‘Tatars’, and the ‘Turks’, who defended the self-designation ‘Turks’).

It was during this period of lively debate that A.-Z. Validi’s⁹ book “Төрөк вә татар тарихы” (History of the Turkic Tatars, 1912) was published. Like Gabashi’s works, Validi’s book was written as a textbook for Tatar madrasas. It is noteworthy that his book was originally titled “History of the Turks”, but one of the leaders of ‘Tatarism’, writer and scholar Galimjan Ibragimov, and publisher Muhammad Idris suggested a different title: “History of the Tatars”. In the end, the author and publishers reached a compromise: the book was published under the title History of the Turkic Tatars [10. P. 184].

Three years later, in 1915, A.-Z. Validi published another work, “Кыскача рәсемле төрек-татар тарихы” (A Brief Illustrated History of the Turkic Tatars)¹⁰.

The titles of the chapters in the scholar’s book testify to his views on the stages of development of the history of the Turkic-Tatars. Thus, the chapter “The Turkic People in Antiquity” covers the historical period from the Xiongnu to the Turkic Khaganate inclusive [11. P. 181].

In it, the author briefly introduces the reader to the Xiongnu and Gungnir Khaganates and focuses on the Turkic Khaganate, which in the 7th century split into Western and Eastern parts. Validi lists the peoples who were under the rule of the great khagan (Oghuz, Uyghurs, Kyrgyz, Mirkyts, Karluk), and gives the names of famous khagans. The author cites internal unrest and external enemies as the

⁹ **Akhmet-Zaki Validi** (1890–1970) was a statesman, politician, military leader, and leader of the Bashkir national movement (1917–1920) who went into exile. He was a publicist, historian, orientalist-Turkologist, Doctor of Philosophy (1935), professor, and honorary doctor of the University of Manchester (1967).

¹⁰ In 1917, the second edition of this book was published, aimed at secondary school students.

reasons for the decline of the Western and Eastern Turkic Khaganates in the early 8th century [11. P. 21–22].

A.-Z. Validi pays great attention to the culture of the ancient Turks. The scholar emphasises that, along with nomadic animal husbandry, agriculture developed in the Turkic Khaganate, cities and fortresses were built, trade relations existed within the state and with neighbouring countries, and the khaganate maintained trade and diplomatic relations with Byzantium, China and Iran. The author cites the monuments to Kul Tegin and Bilge Khan as evidence of the existence of a national writing system, a national state and rulers, and as testimony to the high culture of the Turks [11. P. 22–23].

In 1913, Tatar historian and literary theorist G. Battalov¹¹ completed work on the textbook “Төрки-татар тарихы” (History of the Turkic Tatars). The first section of his work is devoted to the ancient Turkic period. The author provides brief information about the regions where Turkic tribes settled, describes the family and everyday life of nomads, their diet, and notes that even with a nomadic way of life, when conditions allowed, they engaged in agriculture and could begin to lead a sedentary lifestyle.

Battal admires the high morality, openness, loyalty, spiritual freedom, and diligence of the Turks, emphasising their hospitality and cordiality, as well as their military valour. He considers the Turks to be one of the most ancient peoples in the world. He does not rule out the possibility that the most ancient examples of writing among the Turks could have been made with the tips of spears on boards during the conclusion of treaties between themselves. In the section “Culture of the Ancient Turks”, the historian’s attention is mainly focused on the Orkhon-Yenisei monuments [12. P. 129]. Emphasising the perfection of the Turkic language and the presence of a unique style of presentation, he puts forward the version that writing appeared very early among the Turks [12. P. 125].

In summary, we note that the books by Gabashi, Validi and Battala do not have the scientific apparatus accepted for scientific publications, and they do not always indicate the names of the historical sources and scientific literature used, which, however, can be explained by the fact that they are addressed to students of Tatar madrasas, as well as to the mudaris and mugallims who taught there. These publications indicate that, starting in 1910, the subject “History of the Turks” appeared in Tatar schools using new methods. The dynamics of introducing a new subject into the curriculum depended primarily on the personality and professional training of the teacher and the availability of teaching aids.

At the same time, the first attempts were made to compile textbooks on the history of the Bashkirs from ancient times to the middle of the 18th century. For

¹¹ **Battalov Gabdelbary Gabdullovich** (1880–1969) – Tatar educator, journalist, historian. After the revolution, he left for Turkey, where he was known under the pseudonym ‘Battal-Taimas’.

example, in 1912, the Tatar mullah Munir Khad¹² published “The History of the Bashkirs” (‘Башкорт тарихы’) in Kazan at the Umid printing house. Parts of it were published in the journal *Shura*.

In the early years of Soviet power, the previous practice of presenting the history of the ancient Turkic period continued. In 1922, G. Gubaidullin published the book “Tatar History” [13. P. 65–195], the first two sections of which described the way of life and economic structure of nomads and examined the culture and written traditions of the ancient Turks.

G. Gubaidullin’s name is associated with the publication of a fundamental work on the history of Turkic-Tatar literature. In collaboration with his cousin, the renowned literary scholar and textual critic Gali Rakhim,¹³ he published “History of Tatar Literature”, which collected and systematised materials on the history of literature from ancient times to the first half of the 19th century. The first book (1924) examines common Turkic monuments of runic, Uyghur and Arabic writing, Sufism and its influence on Eastern literature, and provides information on Uyghur, Chagatai, Seljuk and Ottoman literature. The second book (1923) deals with the formation and development of the Tatar literary language, studies the “Codex Kumanicus”, tombstones, and labels, and analyses the works of Nasreddin Rabguz, “Кыйссас ал-анбия”, Suleiman Вакургани’s “Субат ал-гажизин”, “Кисекбаш китабы”, “Сайфульмулюк”, and others. The third book (1922) is devoted to the study of the works of poets and writers of the 17th, 18th, and first half of the 19th centuries, oral folk art, travel literature, etc.

The rich factual material and the presence of a theoretically sound conceptual basis indicate the authors’ scientific preparedness: a good knowledge of the history of Mongolia, China, Altai, Central Asia, and Europe; an understanding of all the subtleties of the history of religion and culture allows them to recreate the history of Turkic-Tatar literature against the backdrop of the history of Eurasia. Familiarity with translations of Chinese sources, original texts by European travellers, fundamental works by V. Radlov, V. Bartold, A. Samoilovich, V. Tomsen, S. Malov, F. Korsch, and others, research by Eastern Muslim and Tatar scholars and educators (in particular, Sh. Marjani, R. Fakhrutdin, Validi), the ability to read ancient texts, and an understanding of Turkic languages provided a broad historiographical and fundamental evidence base for their work. G. Rakhim, in particular, specifically

¹² **Muhammedmunir Muhammadkhadievich Khusainov** (1876–1913) – historian, writer, religious figure. He taught at the Mukhammadia madrasah, then at the Chelyabinsk madrasah. In 1912, he published *The History of the Bashkirs* (Bashkort tarihy). Using a wide range of sources, including folk legends, he described the customs and way of life of the Bashkirs, outlined their history from ancient times to the mid-18th century, and provided information about the Bashkir uprisings of 1735–1740 and 1755–1756.

¹³ **Gabdrakhimov Gali Mukhammetsakirovich** (1892–1943) was one of the leaders of the national revival in the early 20th century, a writer and literary scholar. In 1931–1934 and 1938–1940, he was unjustifiably repressed.

studied the writing of the ancient Turks, the Orkhon monuments, the literature of the Uyghurs and Uzbeks, and many other issues for this project.

To understand the significance of this project, it is necessary to mention that during this period, the history of Tatar literature as a science had not yet been developed. The development of the concept of the evolution of national literature in the context of common Turkic culture (in terms of the general and the specific) during the early stages of Tatar literature should be recognised as a major achievement of the scholars [14. P. 12–14].

The authors figuratively liken the literature of the Turkic peoples of the Middle Ages to a mighty tree that ‘spread’ its branches and flowers in all directions: in every region, among every people, works were created that were linked by common themes and motifs, such as the story of Yusuf and Zuleikha, which is widespread in Turkic literature. And although the Golden Horde era saw the beginning of geographical and linguistic differentiation among Turkic literatures, they did not lose their connections and continued to develop within a single literary community.

Scholars consider the ancient period in the history of Tatar literature to be the era from the ancient Turkic period to the end of the 18th century, when new phenomena appeared in literature: the transition from a medieval type of artistic consciousness to the enlightenment literary paradigm that prevailed from the second half of the 19th century.

The work of G. Rakhim and G. Gubaidullin is notable for its broad coverage of the cultural and historical context, which allows us to identify the historical, ethnic, and cultural factors that determined the formation and development of Tatar literature in the 8th–19th centuries.

Thus, as the authors note in the introduction to the publication, this work is not simply a history of Tatar literature, but a history of the culture (language, world-view, etc.) of the Volga Turks [15. P. 18].

The authors pay considerable attention to monuments of ancient Turkic writing. After reviewing existing scientific works on the origin of the ancient Turkic alphabet, they write: ‘According to Chinese sources, the most ancient Turkic people in history, known as the Xiongnu, had their own writing system. However, due to the fact that no written documents have survived from the Xiongnu, we cannot know for certain what this writing system was like, whether the Turks had their own alphabet at that time, or whether they used Chinese or some other alphabet’ [15. P. 52]. After analysing various points of view regarding the origin of the runic-like ancient Turkic scripts, Tatar scholars settled on two hypotheses: V.V. Radlov, who leaned towards the idea that the Turks received their alphabet from the Goths; and the hypothesis that the ancient Turks’ writing system was based on their clan symbols, or tamgas [15. P. 58–59]. In this regard, we note O. Suleimenov’s critical attitude towards the view that the Turks borrowed their writing system from the Iranians: ‘The Turkic writing system was hastily declared to have been borrowed

from the Iranians without rigorous analysis and comparison. They declared it and dismissed it. This hypothesis fit perfectly into the system of views on nomadic Asia, and therefore there was no need for any additional research to establish the true genesis of this writing system'.¹⁴

Regarding the time of the emergence of writing, Tatar scholars claim that it was much earlier than the appearance of the Orkhon tombstones [15. P. 60], noting that the samples found (at that time) date back to the 6th century. O. Suleimenov also draws attention to this problem, asking a largely rhetorical question: 'Does he question the fact that the Talas stones were written in the 5th–6th centuries AD? Is it possible, based on the tentative assumptions of Donner, Kallauer and Geikel, which were not made on the basis of extensive etymological research and without taking into account data from world alphabetic systems, to draw a clear line under the 5th–6th centuries today, declaring this date to be the beginning of the history of the Turks?'¹⁵

Thus, the views of Tatar scholars and Kazakh thinker O. Suleimenov on the emergence of writing among the Turks resonate: 'One thing is indisputable', emphasise G. Rakhim and G. Gubaidullin, 'the Turks had their own writing system in ancient times' [15. P. 59]. This statement is in line with O. Suleimenov's idea about the prehistory of Turkic runic writing: 'We can still afford to be cautiously positive in our statements, but, in essence, the assertion that this did not exist and should not have existed is unfounded! It is based not on firmly established facts, but on prejudiced tradition. No name in science can replace an argument. Sometimes the most vehement denials, based on visible emptiness, are intertwined with the greatest probabilities of error. As a writer and history enthusiast, I would not want Turkic writing, which could be important evidence of the antiquity of the Turkic language and culture, to be casually and without proof sacrificed to a false axiomatic thesis and interpreted as a coincidence not worthy of special consideration.'¹⁶

Despite criticism of G. Rakhim and G. Gubaidullin's *History of Tatar Literature* by some figures in Tatar science and literature (this criticism mainly boiled down to accusations of ignoring Marxist methodology), it began to be used as a basis for teaching Tatar literature in universities, teacher training colleges and technical colleges from the second half of the 1920s onwards.

The fate of the authors of the first multi-volume "History of Tatar Literature", who were the first to propose including the ancient Turkic period in the history of the literatures of the Turkic peoples (this approach is now accepted as the scientific basis by most Turkic scholars studying the literatures of various Turkic peoples), turned out to be tragic: in the 1930s, they fell victim to Stalin's repressions. Their

¹⁴ Suleimenov, Olzhas. 1975. *AZ i IA. The Book of a Well-Meaning Reader*. Zazushy, Alma-Ata, p. 201.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 203–204.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

names were long forgotten, although the scientific concept they created prevailed during the Soviet period, as evidenced by the histories of national literatures written in various Turkic-speaking republics.

From the 1930s onwards, the study of national history in the Tatar ASSR was carried out within the framework of the autochthonous concept: research was limited to the territories of the Volga-Kama region, i.e. Volga-Kama Bulgaria, the Kazan Khanate, the Kazan Governorate and the Tatar ASSR.

In the post-war period, there was no scientific field of ‘Tatar history’ in the Tatar ASSR. Collective works published in the 1950s–1980s under the title History of the Tatar ASSR covered the history of the region, presenting stories about the material and spiritual culture of the ethnic group in the Volga-Kama region in the Middle Ages, the Modern Age and the Contemporary Age. In this regard, the ‘exclusion’ of certain periods of Tatar history, in particular the ancient Turkic period, is noteworthy. It is noteworthy that in the collective monographs “History of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic”, after the section on the primitive communal system, written on the basis of archaeological excavations in the Volga-Kama region, there was immediately a section on the history of Volga Bulgaria. Thus, a whole layer of history associated with the ancient Turkic world was removed. It turned out that the study of history in the TASS and the scientific discoveries of Soviet scientists in Moscow, Leningrad and the union republics on the ancient Turkic period existed as if in parallel worlds, without intersecting.

The first attempts to change this situation began only in the 1950s: the literature department of the Institute of Language, Literature and History, headed by Doctor of Philology Mukhammet Gainullin,¹⁷ began work on a textbook-anthology entitled ‘Борынгы әдәбият тарихы’ (History of Ancient Literature). This work was published in 1963 (compiled by H. Mukhammetov, H. Khismatullin, Sh. Abilov, U. Belyaeva, S. Isanbaev). However, it only included materials on literature from the 13th to 18th centuries.

Around the same time, Doctor of Philology Khatip Usmanov¹⁸ compiled books in the Tatar language in the anthology genre: “Татар әдәбияты тарихы буенча материаллар” (Materials on the History of Tatar Literature, 1967), “Татар шигыре” (Tatar Verse, 1964), “Шигырь төзелеше” (Versification, 1967; 1975), “Борынгы төрки һәм татар әдәбиятының чыганақлары” (‘Sources of Ancient Turkic and Tatar Literature’, 1981), which present examples of poetic texts, including those from ancient and medieval pan-Turkic monuments.

¹⁷ **Gainullin, Mukhammed Khairulloviç** (1903–1985) — Soviet Tatarstan literary scholar, Doctor of Philology (1958), professor (1967), director of the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Kazan Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1944–1953, 1959–1961). Honoured Scientist of the Tatar ASSR (1963) and the RSFSR (1973).

¹⁸ **Usmanov Khatib Usmanoviç** (1908–1992) — Soviet Tatarstan literary scholar, Doctor of Philology (1962), professor (1964). Honoured Scientist of the Tatar ASSR (1968).

However, even these attempts did not lead to a breakthrough in the humanities. Tatar Soviet historical science still did not recognise the common Turkic period in the history of the Tatars. The resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of 9 August 1944 “On the state of and measures to improve mass political and ideological work in the Tatar party organization,” which contained a point about errors in the coverage of the history of the Golden Horde and the epic “Идегей”, imposed a taboo on research of a ‘nationalist nature.’ In accordance with this resolution, the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Kazan branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, together with the Department of History and Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Moscow, initiated a scientific session on the ethnogenesis of the Kazan Tatars on 25–26 April 1948. In it, the penetration of the Turkic element (Bulgars) into the Middle Volga region was linked to the population of the Khazar Kaganate.¹⁹ On the question of the ethnogenesis of the Kazan Tatars, it was concluded that ‘local tribes and Turkic-speaking peoples (Bulgars and others) had a decisive influence on their formation’²⁰.

In the first chapter, ‘The History of the Formation of the Tatar People,’ of the collective historical and ethnographic monograph ‘Tatars of the Middle Volga Region and of the Urals’ (1967), published by Nauka, the 1948 position was briefly stated: ‘The main ancestors of the Tatars of the Middle Volga Region and the Urals were numerous nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes, mostly Turkic-speaking, who from about the 4th century AD began to penetrate from the south-east and south into the forest-steppe part of the Urals to the upper reaches of the Oka River Oka, gradually assimilating the ancient aborigines. In the 9th century, in the central part of this territory, the new tribes formed a union, and later an early feudal state, Volga-Kama Bulgaria’ [16. P. 9].

In general, the autochthonous concept, which recommended studying the history of the ethnic group within the borders of the national republic, and the Bulgarian concept of the ethnogenesis of the Tatars until the end of the 1980s did not allow the ancient Turkic period to be included in general works on history. First of all, the tradition of considering the Tatars as part of the nomadic Turkic world was interrupted.

Thus, O. Suleimenov’s book “AZ i IA,” published in 1975, resonated with the sentiments of Tatar scholars who, due to the exclusion of research on ancient Turkic history from Tatar historiography, perceived it as a kind of breakthrough in the barriers erected by the official ideology and the scientific institutions under its control to the comprehensive study of the language, history, literature and culture of the ancient Turks.

¹⁹ *The Origin of the Kazan Tatars. Materials from the Department of History and Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, organised jointly with the Institute of Language, Literature and History of the Kazan Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences on 25–26 April 1946 in Moscow (based on the transcript)*. 1948. Kazan: Tatgosizdat. Scientific and Technical Literature Sector, p. 10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 3–4.

It is significant that seven years after O. Suleimenov's publication caused a stir in official circles, in 1982 N. Fattakh²¹ completed his work "Тел тарихы" (History of Language), which argued that existing scientific approaches to the study of the genesis of language were controversial. It is known that the writer travelled to Moscow to seek support for his ideas from the capital's linguists, but found no understanding among them [17. P. 6–7].

In his book, N. Fattakh offers one of the options for deciphering the Phaistos Disc; he sets out his vision of the linguistic connections between Turkic and ancient Indo-European languages, etc. It is noteworthy that the book was only published in Russian in 1999 under the title "The Language of Gods and Pharaohs. Historical and Linguistic Studies."

The liberalisation of science during the years of perestroika contributed to a revival of interest in national history. Tatarstan's desire to obtain the status of a union republic and the simultaneous work that began on creating a scientific and educational structure corresponding to this status played a positive role in this process. As a result, in 1991, the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan was established, which became a new milestone in the history of the humanities in the republic. Two years before this momentous event, in 1989, the Faculty of Tatar Philology and History and the Department of History of the Tatar People were established at Kazan State University. In 1994, the Institute of Tatar Encyclopaedia was opened as part of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, and in 1996, the Sh. Marjani Institute of History was separated from the G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and History. This institutionalisation of the humanities had a beneficial effect on the development of research in the field of history, language, literature and culture of the Tatar people.

The first volume of the academic publication 'History of the Tatars from Ancient Times' (2002) [18], prepared by the Sh. Marjani Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, presented the ancient and medieval history of the Turkic tribes as part of the history of Eurasia (the Xiongnu, the Huns, the Turkic khaganates, the Tatars, the Khazar Khaganate, Great Bulgaria, the Oghuz, Pechenegs, Kimaks, Kipchaks, Polovtsians, etc.); as a result, the history of the Tatar ethnic group came to be perceived as a history of Eurasian scale.

According to the scientific director of the volume, S.G. Klyashtorny,²² 'the history of interaction and, in part, the merging of all groups of the ancient population over two to two and a half thousand years is the process during which ethnic consolidation took place and Turkic-speaking ethnic communities were formed. It was from among these closely related tribes that the modern Turkic peoples of Russia and neighbouring territories emerged in the 2nd millennium AD [18. P. 13].'

²¹ **Fattakhov Nurikhan Sadrilmanovich** (1928–2004) — Tatar writer, translator, author of works on history and linguistics; historical novels.

²² **Klyashtorny Sergey Grigorievich** (1928–2014) — Russian Turkologist, specialist in the ancient and medieval history of the Turkic peoples.

Conclusion

People say, ‘It's time to gather stones.’ Much of what was once expressed by our respected thinkers, often contrary to the dogmas that once existed, is now perceived as words that open horizons for new scientific research. This includes the study of ancient Turkic history and culture, which began in Tatar humanities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. However, during the Soviet era, this field of scientific research was banned in the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. In such conditions, O. Suleimenov's book “AZ i IA” became a kind of revelation, motivation, and guide to action for Soviet and contemporary Tatar humanities scholars from the moment it was published.

Undoubtedly, Olzhas Suleimenov's emotional statements, such as those concerning the determination of the date of the formation of writing among the Turkic peoples (‘But it can be said with certainty that all the problems (or rather, misfortunes) of Turkic palaeography are connected with this artificial date. It allows us to treat runes as a provincial, later, borrowed script that is of no fundamental interest to general palaeography’),²³ and 50 years ago, and today, give pause for thought. The thinker's words about The Tale of Igor's Campaign (‘It seems to me that we should at least tentatively try to accept the fact as it is and recognise that The Tale is a literary monument of at least two time periods — the 12th and 16th centuries. What in it has been preserved from the original and what has been added by the copyist? [“Zadonshchina,” which obediently follows the poetics of “The Tale,” might help])²⁴ resonate with discussions surrounding many monuments of Tatar literature.

It was only in the 1990s that a systematic rethinking of the historical destinies of the peoples of Russia began, a departure from the dogmatic attitudes of the Soviet era and the construction of new theories and methodologies. It is symbolic that the first scientific conference in Russia dedicated to the Golden Horde was organised and held in Kazan in 1992. This event was the first step in researching the history of the Tatars in the context of Turkic Eurasian history. A new stage in the implementation of this new approach was marked by the publication in 2002, thanks to the help and assistance of representatives of academic centres in the capital, of the first volume of the seven-volume “History of the Tatars from Ancient Times” — the book “Peoples of Steppe Eurasia in Antiquity.”

References

1. Kerimova, T. 2016. ‘The Congress that united the Turkic world (dedicated to the 90th anniversary of the First All-Union Turkological Congress)’. *Izvestiya of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan. Series of Social Sciences*, no. 3, pp. 20–34.

²³ Suleimenov Olzhas. 1975. *AZ i IA. The Book of the Well-Intentioned Reader*. Zazushy, Alma-Ata. P. 204.

²⁴ *Ibid*, P. 21.

2. Gubaidullin, G.S. 1926. “The Development of Historical Literature among the Turkic-Tatar Peoples”. *The First All-Union Turkological Congress: Verbatim Report*. Baku, pp. 39–56. Quoted in: *Turkological Studies*. 2019. 2(3), pp. 100–117.
3. *The Life of Genghis Khan and Aksak Timur, with various historical passages, arranged alphabetically for students, compiled by Ibrahim Khalfin, a lecturer at the Imperial Kazan University*. 1822. Kazan: Imperial University Press. 82 p. Print. (In Russ.)
4. Buniyatov, Z.M. 1991. “From the Editor”. *Bakikhanov A. K. Gulistan-i Iram*. Baku: Elm, 1991. P. 4–7. Print. (In Russ.)
5. Bakikhanov, A.K. 1991. *Gulistan-i Iram*. Baku: Elm. 304 p. Print. (In Russ.)
6. Shcherbak, A.A. 1972. “V.V. Radlov and the Study of Runic Monuments. Turkological Collection. 1971”. Moscow: Nauka; Main Editorial Office of Oriental Literature, pp. 54–63. (In Russ.)
7. Hasangata’s Gabashi. 1897. *Turkic clans*. Kazan: Lito-Tipografiya I. N.N. Kharitonov. 20 p. Print. (In Tatar.)
8. Hasangata’s Gabashi. 1899. *A brief history of the Turkic clans*. Kazan: Lito-Tipografiya I. N.N. Kharitonov. 56 p. Print. (In Tatar.)
9. Gabashi, H.-G. 2009. *General History of the Turkic Peoples*. Kazan: Fen Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan. 248 p. Print. (In Russ.)
10. Alishev, S.H. 2006. *Tatar historians*. Kazan: Tatar book publishing house. 206 p. Print. (In Tatar.)
11. Validi, A-Z. 1992. *A Brief History of the Turkic Tatars*. Compiled by R. Amirkhan. Kazan: Tatar book publishing house. 181 p. Print. (In Tatar.)
12. Battal, G. 2023. *Selected Works*. Compiled by L.Sh. Garipova, L.R. Nadyrshina, A.N. Khasanova, and G.M. Khannanova. Vol. 2. Kazan: Institute of Language, Literature, and Art. 256 p. Print. (In Tatar.)
13. Gubaidullin, G. 1989. *When History Opens. Selected Works*. Kazan: Tatar book publishing house, pp. 65–195. Print. (In Tatar.)
14. Zagidullina, D.F. 2022. Preface. “*Rakhim G., Gaziz G. History of Tatar Literature. The Ancient Period.*” Compiled by L.Sh. Garipova, G.A. Khusnutdinova, A.M. Akhunov, and I.G. Gumerov. Kazan: Institute of Language, Literature, pp. 5–16. Print. (In Tatar.)
15. Rakhim, G. and G. Gaziz. 2022. *History of Tatar Literature. The Ancient Period*. Compiled by L.Sh. Garipova, G.A. Khusnutdinova, A.M. Akhunov, and I.G. Gumerov. Kazan: Institute of Language, Literature. 300 pp. Print. (In Tatar.)
16. *Tatars of the Middle Volga and Ural Regions*. 1967. Edited by N.I. Vorobyov and G.M. Rakhmatullin. Moscow: Nauka. 538 p. Print. (In Russ.)
17. Fattah, N. 1990. *Genealogy. Historical and Linguistic Research*. Kazan: Tatar book publishing house. 325 pp. Print. (In Tatar.)
18. Klyashtorny, S. 2002. Preface to the Volume. “*History of the Tatars from Ancient Times*”. 7 volumes. Vol. 1. The Peoples of Steppe Eurasia in Antiquity. Kazan: Rukhiyat, pp. 12–16. Print. (In Russ.)

Bio notes:

Ildus K. Zagidullin is a Doctor of Historical Sciences, Senior Researcher at the Centre for Islamic Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 420111, Russian Federation. Kazan, 20 Bauman St. ORCID: 0000-0003-0501-2177. E-mail: zagik63@mail.ru.

Dania F. Zagidullina is a Doctor of Philology, Professor, Chief Researcher at the G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and Art of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, Academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 420111, Russian Federation. Kazan, 20 Bauman St. ORCID: 0009-0000-1651-8347.