

ANALYTICAL INTERPRETATION OF ALISHER NAVOI'S LEGACY IN 19TH–20TH
CENTURY RUSSIAN ORIENTALISM: SOURCES, METHODS, AND SCHOLARLY
APPROACHES

Ungalova Guldasta Amiriddin kizi

Tel. +99894 943-77-97

E-mail: unglovaguldasta@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines the analytical interpretation of Alisher Navoi's literary legacy in 19th–20th century Russian Orientalism, focusing on the sources, methods, and scholarly approaches. It highlights how Russian orientalists have engaged in philological analysis of Navoi's works, historical evaluation of his life and legacy, and philosophical-theoretical interpretations of his significance. The development of "Navoi studies" is traced chronologically, from initial inquiries in the late 19th century through the institutionalization and peak of research during the Soviet period in the mid-20th century.

Keywords: Alisher Navoi, Russian Orientalism, Navoi's legacy, philological analysis, historical evaluation, theoretical interpretation, 19th–20th centuries, Navoi studies.

Аннотация: В данной статье анализируется история и методы аналитической интерпретации творческого наследия Алишера Навои в русском востоковедении XIX–XX вв. Основное внимание уделяется филологическому анализу произведений Навои, их исторической оценке и философско-теоретической интерпретации российскими учёными-востоковедами. Поэтапно рассмотрены ранние исследования конца XIX – начала XX века, становление навоиведения в советский период и его расцвет в середине XX века. Отмечается, что XX век стал самым плодотворным периодом изучения творчества Навои в России [1, с.106]. Представлены филологические усилия (публикация текстов, перевод и анализ сочинений Навои), историко-биографические изыскания (оценка роли Навои в истории и культуре) и теоретические подходы (сравнение с Ренессансом, признание гуманистических идей поэта и т. д.).

Ключевые слова: Алишер Навои, русское востоковедение, наследие Навои, филологический анализ, историческая оценка, теоретическая интерпретация, XIX–XX века, изучение творчества Навои.

Abstract (in English)

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada XIX–XX asrlarda rus sharqshunosligida Alisher Navoiy ijodiy merosining o'rganilish tarixi, uslublari va ilmiy yondashuvlari tahlil qilinadi. Maqolada rus sharqshunos olimlarining Navoiy asarlariga filologik tahlili, tarixiy bahosi hamda falsafiy-nazariy talqinlari bosqichma-bosqich ko'rib chiqiladi. XIX asr oxiri – XX asr davomida Navoiy ijodi rus sharqshunosligida izchil o'rganilib, 1940-yillar va undan keyingi davrda yuqori cho'qqisiga erishgani ko'rsatiladi. Navoiy asarlarining matnshunoslik nashrlari, tarjimalari, uning hayoti va dunyoqarashiga doir ilmiy izlanishlar va rus olimlarining baholari, xususan, Navoiyning jahon madaniyatidagi o'rni haqidagi qarashlar yoritiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: Alisher Navoiy, rus sharqshunosligi, Navoiy merosi, filologik tahlil, tarixiy baho, nazariy talqin, XIX–XX asrlar, Navoiy asarlarini o'rganish.



INTRODUCTION. Alisher Navoi (1441–1501) – also known as Nizomiddin Mir Alisher – is celebrated as the founder of classical Chagatai (Old Uzbek) literature and a pivotal figure of the Timurid Renaissance. His literary heritage spans lyrical poetry, the renowned quintet *Khamsa*, as well as scholarly treatises in linguistics and ethics. Navoi’s works profoundly influenced Turkic-language literature and earned him recognition as a major figure in world literature. Unsurprisingly, the study of Navoi’s life and oeuvre (“navoivedenie”) became an important branch of Oriental studies. In particular, Russian orientalists of the 19th–20th centuries made significant contributions to analyzing, translating, and interpreting Navoi’s legacy. Their research ranged from philological examinations of Navoi’s poems and manuscripts to historical-biographical studies and theoretical frameworks situating Navoi’s work in a global context.

By the early 20th century, Russian scholars had recognized Navoi not only as a national poet of the Turkic world but also as a figure of “planetary” stature[1]/[2]. The sustained interest in Navoi’s legacy over two centuries of Russian Orientalism reflects both scholarly curiosity and the cultural policies of the Russian Empire and Soviet Union. Indeed, the **20th century proved to be the most fruitful period in Russia for Navoi studies**, when an unprecedented number of academic works on the poet were published [1, c.106]/[3]. This article provides a comprehensive overview of how Navoi’s heritage was analytically interpreted by Russian Orientalists in the 19th and 20th centuries, focusing on three main dimensions: (1) **philological analysis** of Navoi’s works (textology, translation, and literary criticism), (2) **historical evaluation** of Navoi (biographical studies and situating him in historical context), and (3) **philosophical-theoretical interpretations** (assessing his work’s originality, ideological significance, and comparisons to other cultural Renaissances).

The significance of this inquiry lies in understanding the scholarly approaches and methodologies that Russian researchers applied to Navoi's legacy, as well as recognizing their achievements and limitations. Early European orientalists (such as the French scholar A. B  l  n in 1861) and Russian scholars like M. A. Nikitsky in 1856 made initial attempts to introduce Navoi to Western audiences[4]. However, many 19th-century scholars regarded Navoi as merely an imitator of Persian poets, an epigone rather than an innovator [2, c.16][5]. It was largely the work of 20th-century Soviet Orientalists that dispelled this notion, demonstrating Navoi's originality and humanistic depth. Russian academic interest in Navoi was also spurred by imperial encounters with Central Asia: as Russian officials and missionaries gathered information in Turkestan in the nineteenth century, they were often impressed by Navoi's enduring popularity and the widespread tradition of *Navoi-khanlik* – gatherings to read and discuss Navoi's poetry – among the local populace[6][7]. Such observations, noted in colonial reports and encyclopedic entries, helped kindle scholarly engagement with Navoi's works.

In summary, Russian Orientalism's engagement with Alisher Navoi's legacy provides a revealing case of cross-cultural scholarly interaction: Russian academics and litterateurs became mediators of Navoi's works to the wider world, while also integrating his legacy into comparative literary studies and Soviet ideological narratives. This article employs a historical and textual analysis of published sources (monographs, articles, translations, and critical editions) to trace the development of Navoi studies (навоиведение) in Russia. By examining these sources, we aim to highlight the methodologies (e.g. philological vs. historical approaches) and scientific perspectives that characterized Russian scholarship on Navoi across the 19th and 20th centuries.



METHODS. This research is conducted as a historical-literary analysis of Russian Orientalists' works on Alisher Navoi. We adopt an IMRAD structure to systematically present the findings. In the Introduction, we established the context and significance of the topic. The Methods section clarifies our approach: namely, a qualitative analysis of primary and secondary sources, with attention to how Navoi's legacy was interpreted in different periods. We surveyed a wide range of sources – from 19th-century dissertations and notes in imperial journals to Soviet-era monographs and articles – focusing only on credible, documented publications (including those indexed in academic databases and archives). Each claim about a scholar's interpretation of Navoi is backed by references to authentic sources (in the original Russian where available), with citations formatted according to GOST style. We particularly relied on meta-analytical works by modern scholars that review the historiography of Navoi studies (for example, G. I. Halidova's monograph and articles), as well as on the writings of prominent orientalists such as V. V. Bartold, E. E. Bertels, A. N. Samoylovich, A. A. Semyonov, and others.

Our methodological approach can be described as interdisciplinary and historiographical. We examined how **philological methods** (textual criticism, comparative literature, linguistics) were applied by Russian scholars to Navoi's texts. We also considered **historical methods** in biography and intellectual history, analyzing how researchers reconstructed Navoi's life and times using primary sources (chronicles, memoirs of contemporaries like Babur or Jami). Furthermore, we explored the **theoretical frameworks** and philosophical perspectives brought by scholars – for instance, how Soviet orientalist scholars situated Navoi within Marxist historiography or world literature paradigms. By comparing works across different eras, we identified shifts in scholarly approach – for example, a move from antiquarian interest to more critical, scientific analysis in the Soviet period.

Limitations of the study primarily stem from the availability of sources: some 19th-century works on Navoi are relatively scarce or outdated, and certain early Soviet research remained unpublished due to historical circumstances (e.g., political repression). However, wherever possible, we have used published bibliographic data and modern analyses that reference those works. This ensures that the evidence presented is verifiable. All non-English terms and titles (e.g., *Mahbub-ul-qulub*, *Majalis un-nafais*) have been transliterated and explained for clarity.

By employing this rigorous methodological approach, we aim to produce a comprehensive and well-substantiated review of how Alisher Navoi's legacy was analyzed by Russian Orientalists, free of plagiarism or conjecture. Each section of the Results will correspond to one of the main focus areas (philological, historical, theoretical interpretations), supported by citations and followed by a Discussion synthesizing these findings.



RESULTS. Philological Analysis of Navoi's Works by Russian Orientalists. One of the central contributions of Russian orientalists to Navoi studies lies in philological analysis – the meticulous study, editing, and translation of Navoi's texts. This began in the late 19th century and reached fruition by the mid-20th century. Early efforts were cautious: for instance, the Russian orientalist M. A. Nikitsky wrote the first Russian scholarly work on Navoi's life and poetry, defending his master's dissertation “Mir Alisher Nizomiddin: kak gosudarstvennyy deyatel' i poet” in 1856 (published in Kazan) [1, c.110]/[8]. Nikitsky's dissertation was largely a biographical study, compiling information on Navoi from Persian and Turkic sources such as Dawlatshah Samarqandi's biographical dictionary and the notes of Babur. Although essentially introductory in nature, Nikitsky's work marked the first academic attempt to analyze Navoi's literary heritage in Russian. He provided summaries and extracts of Navoi's works (in translation) and notably commented on Navoi's role in elevating the Chagatai (Old Uzbek) language. For example, Nikitsky discussed the origin of the term “Chagatai language” and highlighted Navoi's linguistic contributions, noting how Navoi's writings exemplified the richness of the Turkic vernacular [3, c.119-123]/[9]. This focus on language and text set the stage for later philological endeavors.

Despite Nikitsky's pioneering study, throughout the late 19th century, comprehensive philological engagement with Navoi's works remained limited. Much of Navoi's Divans and mesnevî poems were available only in lithographed editions from Central Asia, often without critical commentary. Librarians and orientalists in the Russian Empire did catalog some manuscripts of Navoi – leaving remarks on their distinctive features – but systematic textological work had yet to be done/[10]. Notably, **I. N. Berezin**, a prominent Kazan-based orientalist, had in the mid-19th century published translations and studies of Turkic literature; by 1857 he compiled a Turkic literature chrestomathy that included fragments of Navoi's poetry, reflecting a growing scholarly appetite for such texts [2, c.16]/[11]. However, these efforts were fragmentary. By the turn of the 20th century, European scholars had made some inroads (with partial translations of Navoi into French and German), but the real philological breakthrough in Navoi studies would be driven by Soviet scholarship.

In the 1920s–1930s, Soviet orientalists began preparing critical editions and translations of Navoi's works as part of a broader initiative to celebrate the cultural heritage of the peoples of the USSR. A watershed moment was the lead-up to Navoi's 500-year anniversary, which fell in 1941. Under the guidance of academician **E. E. Bertels** – one of Navoi's most ardent researchers – a comprehensive plan was formulated to critically publish and study Navoi's oeuvre. According to archival records, in 1939 a special commission under the USSR Academy of Sciences (led by Bertels) outlined tasks such as: producing a **scholarly collected works** of Navoi, preparing critical texts of major works, translating Navoi's important treatises into Russian, and compiling a thorough description of Navoi manuscripts [2, c.16-17]/[12]/[13]. Although World War II delayed these projects, they eventually bore fruit in the late 1940s.

Specifically, in 1948 the orientalists **A. N. Kononov** and others published a critical edition of Navoi's Persian-language treatise *Mahbub-ul-qulub* (“Beloved of Hearts”) in the original script, accompanied by scholarly annotations [2, c.17]/[14]. This was one of the first instances where a work of Navoi was printed in a rigorously edited form based on manuscript collation. Around the same time, work progressed on Navoi's famous bilingual essay *Muhokamat-ul-lug'atayn* (“Judgment of Two Languages”), which compares Persian and Turkic. A Russian translation of this treatise was eventually completed by the turkologist A. A. Malikova and published in 1970 in Tashkent, within the tenth volume of Navoi's collected works [2, c.17]/[15]. Indeed, the **ten-volume collected works of Alisher Navoi**, published by the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences



between 1968–1972, stands as a crowning achievement of Soviet philological scholarship. It made Navoi's major works available in authoritative editions with Russian commentaries, fulfilling the ambitions set out decades earlier [4, c.5-7].

Several individual scholars' contributions deserve mention. **A. N. Samoylovich**, a prominent turkologist of the early 20th century, delved into Navoi's poetic style and versification. He was among the first to analyze Navoi's treatise on prosody, *Mizan-ul-avzan* ("The Measure of Meters"). Samoylovich studied the Turkic verse form *tuyuq* (a type of quatrain) using Navoi's examples, comparing Navoi's usage of this form with observations by Western scholars like H. Gibb and others [5, c.22-24]. He even translated a set of 16 *tuyuqs* by Navoi into Russian, thereby illustrating Navoi's mastery of this succinct genre [5, c.23]. Although one of Samoylovich's articles on Navoi's manuscript heritage remained unfortunately unpublished due to his untimely death in 1938 [5, c.19-21], his research notes and reviews (preserved in archives) indicate a rigorous philological approach – he examined manuscript variants and earlier printings to assess textual accuracy [5, c.25-33].

During the 1940s, **A. K. Borovkov** and **L. V. Volin** undertook the painstaking work of cataloguing and describing Navoi manuscripts in Soviet libraries. L. V. Volin completed a detailed description of all Navoi manuscripts held in Leningrad and other repositories by 1940, which was posthumously published in 1946 in a volume titled *Alisher Navoi* [2, c.17][16]. Borovkov, who edited that 1946 collection of articles, noted in his preface that each included study brought new factual material to light, enhancing the textual foundation for further research [2, c.17][17]. These efforts substantially improved the quality of texts available to scholars: where 19th-century researchers had often relied on imprecise lithographs or second-hand excerpts, Soviet philologists now had access to critically established texts of Navoi's writings.

Translation was another key aspect of philological engagement. Throughout the 20th century, many of Navoi's works were translated into Russian, making them accessible to a broad readership. Early literary translations began even in the late tsarist period, but the most notable were produced in the Soviet era. For example, in the 1940s and 1950s, selected ghazals of Navoi were translated by poets such as L. Penkovsky and A. Fitrat (the latter working from Uzbek versions) and published in Moscow and Tashkent[18]. An interesting case is that of the famed Russian poet **Boris Pasternak**, who, alongside other poets, participated in translating some of Navoi's lyrical poetry into Russian in the mid-20th century[19]. These literary translations, while not "scholarly" in the strict sense, were often informed by the academic editions prepared by orientalists. They helped propagate Navoi's poetic genius among the Soviet intelligentsia, bolstering claims that his talent was on par with the great poets of other nations.

By the late Soviet period, the philological study of Navoi was mature: virtually all of Navoi's major works had been published with commentaries, his poems translated, and comprehensive studies on his language and style had been written. One can summarize that Russian Orientalists laid a **solid philological foundation** for Navoi studies. Their critical editions and translations ensured that Navoi's textological legacy was preserved with scholarly rigor for future generations. This groundwork was essential for the higher-level analyses – historical and theoretical – that we shall discuss in the next sections.

Historical Evaluation: Biographical and Historical Studies of Navoi. Russian scholars have also approached Alisher Navoi's legacy through the lens of history and biography, evaluating his role as a statesman, intellectual, and cultural figure of the Timurid era. These historical evaluations sought to place Navoi in the broader socio-political context of the 15th century and to assess his impact on subsequent generations.



The initial comprehensive historical assessment of Navoi by a Russian academic came with the work of **Vasily Vladimirovich Bartold**, a towering figure in Russian Oriental studies. In 1928, Bartold published an extensive essay titled “Mir Ali Shir i politicheskaya zhizn” (“Mir Ali Shir and Political Life”) as part of a collection on Navoi [20]. This study, based on a thorough examination of Persian historical chronicles such as *Habib as-siyar* and Babur’s memoirs, **reconstructed Navoi’s biography** and his role at the court of Sultan Husayn Bayqara in Herat. Bartold’s narrative illuminated Navoi’s contributions as a vizier, patron of learning, and reformer. It was the first truly scholarly synthesis of factual data about Navoi’s life, earning recognition as “the first genuinely scientific compendium of data” on Mir Ali Shir [2, c.16] [21]. However, Bartold deliberately **eschewed literary analysis** of Navoi’s works, stating that as a historian he would not venture deeply into evaluating Navoi’s poetry [2, c.16] [22]. He focused on Navoi’s political and social activities – for example, his building of charitable institutions, his advisory role to Husayn Bayqara, and his influence on the politics of Khorasan. Bartold portrayed Navoi as a figure deeply engaged in the cultural flowering of the Timurid Renaissance, but also as a pragmatic statesman navigating court intrigues.

Bartold’s decision to leave out literary criticism underscores a division of labor in early Navoi studies: historians like Bartold and **A. A. Semyonov** concentrated on factual and historical contexts, while literary scholars addressed the texts. Semyonov, another Russian Orientalist who had lived in Bukhara, contributed a notable historical study titled “Vzaimootnosheniya Alishera Navoi i sultana Khuseyn-Mirzy” (“The Relationship of Alisher Navoi and Sultan Husayn Mirza”), published in 1960 in a festschrift in honor of academician I. Orbeli [6, c.238] [23] [24]. Drawing on newly available Persian sources and Navoi’s own writings (such as letters and the historic poem *Munsha’at*), Semyonov shed light on the friendship and political alliance between Navoi and Sultan Husayn. He offered a nuanced view of Navoi’s political philosophy, showing how Navoi sought to balance his literary pursuits with administrative duties. Semyonov’s chronological description of events – for instance, Navoi’s governorship in Astrabad and Nishapur, or his temporary fall from favor – provided context that enriched the understanding of Navoi’s works by linking them to events in his life. These historical narratives by Bartold, Semyonov, and others helped dispel earlier myths and gave Navoi a human, historically grounded profile rather than a legendary aura.

The Soviet period also saw the creation of **popular biographies and historical novels** about Navoi, which, while not strictly academic, influenced the perception of his legacy. For example, in 1939 (on the eve of the anniversary), a biography by A. Sharafutdinov was published in Tashkent in Uzbek. Though Bertels later criticized this work as having “no independent significance” [2, c.16] [25] – likely due to its unscholarly or overly reverent tone – it indicates the broader interest in Navoi’s life story at the time. Meanwhile, professional historians continued to refine the factual record. In the 1948 commemorative collection edited by Bertels, one finds essays on specific historical issues, such as Navoi’s relations with contemporary scholars, or the political climate of Herat during his service.

A key aspect of historical evaluation was verifying and contextualizing Navoi’s **own assertions** in his writings. Navoi authored works like *Tarikh-i muluki Ajam* (a history of Persian kings) and made autobiographical remarks in the prefaces to his poems. Russian scholars translated and commented on these, comparing them with external sources. For instance, Navoi’s statement about the genealogy of the Chagatai language was cross-checked with historical linguistics by Soviet academics to understand how Navoi viewed linguistic history [3, c.120-123] [26]. Similarly, Navoi’s accounts of contemporaries (e.g., in *Majolis un-nafais*, a biographical compendium of poets) were used by researchers like **N. Mallayev** (though writing in Uzbek, his



work was known to Russian scholars) to glean historical information on the literary milieu of the 15th century.

It should be noted that Soviet historiography sometimes placed Navoi within a Marxist framework, analyzing his class position and ideology. While Navoi was a feudal courtier, Soviet scholars often highlighted **progressive elements** in his thought – for example, his advocacy of justice, his critique of greed and ignorance in works like *Mahbub-ul-qulub*, and his efforts to make literature accessible in the Turkic vernacular. This led some to dub Navoi a “people’s poet” ahead of his time. As one Soviet literary historian opined, Navoi’s humanist ideas and ethical themes resonated with the values of the modern world, making him a precursor to enlightenment ideals [7, c.48-50]. Such interpretations sometimes went beyond strict historical evidence, but they were part of the intellectual environment in which Navoi’s legacy was framed in the USSR.

An important event illustrating the convergence of historical and philological scholarship was the **Navoi Jubilee of 1941** (belatedly celebrated in 1948 due to WWII). In preparation for this anniversary, Russian orientalists collected a wealth of historical data on Navoi. Archive documents show that a **Jubilee Committee** in Uzbekistan worked with the Institute of Oriental Studies to publish materials related to Navoi’s life [2, c.16-17]/[27]/[28]. Bertels’s unpublished draft article “K 500-letiyu Ali shera Navoi” (On the 500th anniversary of Navoi) reveals his assessment of the state of research up to 1939. Bertels lamented that “Navoi’s life and works have been very weakly studied” and could name only two old studies – one Russian (Nikitsky 1856) and one French (Bélén 1861) – which by then “had lost all value” [2, c.16]/[29]. He also noted the deficiencies of existing editions of Navoi’s works (mostly lithographs “without any criticism”) and stressed the need for scholarly rigorous publications [2, c.16]/[30]. The Jubilee efforts, therefore, aimed to elevate the study of Navoi to a new level, integrating historical, philological, and cultural analyses. As a result, the late 1940s saw not only textological work (as mentioned earlier) but also historical essays that incorporated newly discovered facts – for example, documents about Navoi’s endowment of schools and libraries in Herat, or letters indicating his interactions with other courts. This holistic approach painted a richer historical picture of Navoi.

In summary, Russian Orientalists’ historical evaluation of Navoi transformed our understanding of him from a legendary poet into a **three-dimensional historical personality**. Through critical use of primary sources, they clarified Navoi’s genealogy, education, career trajectory, and the socio-political impact of his works. They identified the phases of his life (youth in Herat and Samarkand, rise to Vizier, retirement, etc.) and correlated these with his writings. Importantly, they also preserved the historical sources themselves by translating and publishing them – such as Babur’s references to Navoi (translated by M. Salye in 1948) or the letters of Navoi found in manuscript collections. This rigorous historical groundwork ensured that any further theoretical or comparative study of Navoi would rest on solid evidence.

Philosophical and Theoretical Interpretations of Navoi’s Legacy. Beyond philology and history, Russian orientalists engaged with Alisher Navoi’s legacy on a philosophical and theoretical level, interpreting the broader meaning and significance of his work. This involved situating Navoi within comparative literary frameworks, assessing the originality of his poetic genius, and drawing parallels to other cultural movements such as the European Renaissance. Soviet scholars, in particular, were interested in the ideological content and humanistic values in Navoi’s writings, as well as in what his emergence signified for the evolution of Eastern literature.



A recurring theme in theoretical interpretations is whether Navoi's era constituted an "Eastern Renaissance." Renowned scholar **Viktor M. Zhirmunsky**, a comparative literature specialist, explicitly addressed this in his work. In a 1947 essay "Alisher Navoi i problema renessansa v literaturakh Vostoka" ("Alisher Navoi and the Problem of Renaissance in Eastern Literatures"), Zhirmunsky analyzed Navoi's time in the context of global cultural history[31]. He drew an analogy between Navoi and Western Renaissance figures, particularly noting how Navoi, much like the French humanist Du Bellay, championed the use of the native tongue for high literature [8, c.39-40]. Zhirmunsky **compared Navoi's literary revolution** – elevating Turkic (Chagatai) to a literary language – to the efforts of European Renaissance writers who elevated their vernaculars vis-à-vis Latin[32]. He concluded that Navoi, being fluent in Persian and an accomplished poet in that language, nonetheless became "the founder of a great poetry created in the native language," thereby marking a renaissance-like breakthrough in Turkic literature [9, c.312]/[2]. Zhirmunsky's comparative approach underscored Navoi's originality: contrary to earlier views of Navoi as an imitator of Persian poets, Zhirmunsky emphasized that Navoi's synthesis of Persian poetic forms with Turkic language and sensibilities was a creative act on a world-historical scale. He thus placed Navoi among the great innovators of world literature.

Another prominent theorist, **Nikolai I. Konrad**, also offered deep reflections on Navoi's place in global culture. Konrad, an orientalist who specialized in East Asian literature but had a broad interest in world literary processes, described Alisher Navoi as "a common achievement of world culture" [10, c.58]/[33]. By this, Konrad meant that Navoi's works had transcendent value not just for one nation (the Uzbek or Turkic peoples) but for humanity at large – much as Shakespeare or Ferdowsi are world heritage. Konrad argued that Navoi's humanism, ethical themes, and artistic mastery exemplified values that resonate universally. He also pointed out that Navoi's blending of Sufi philosophical concepts with poetic expression gave his work a spiritual depth comparable to Dante or Hafiz. Such statements by Zhirmunsky and Konrad in the mid-20th century signified a **paradigm shift** in the evaluation of Navoi: from a regional classic, he was being reclassified as a figure of world literature and a symbol of the "Eastern Renaissance."

E.E. Bertels, perhaps the most influential Navoi scholar, combined philological rigor with theoretical insight in his assessments. Bertels passionately countered the old notion that Navoi was derivative of Persian models. In a seminal article "Navoi i Attar" (published in the 1940s, later included in his *Selected Works* volume), Bertels **demonstrated Navoi's creative independence** by analyzing Navoi's poem *Lison ut-tayr* ("Language of the Birds"), which was inspired by Attar's Persian work *Mantiq-ut-tayr*. Bertels showed that Navoi did far more than translate or paraphrase Attar; he infused the poem with original episodes, local color, and his own ethical interpretations. He wrote: "The examination of *Lison ut-tayr* shows us a great artist, a master of the word, capable of creating an original work from given material... aside from this artistic talent we also see a man of broad education, varied interests, enormous life experience and – most importantly – a great heart full of love for the people around him" [11, c.104-110]/[34]. This eloquent appraisal by Bertels highlights Navoi's **humanistic ideals** (love for humanity, forgiveness of faults) as well as his artistry. Bertels's scholarship thus not only provided factual analysis but also a **value judgment**: he positioned Navoi as a poet of profound originality and humanism, effectively elevating Navoi's status in the eyes of those who might have dismissed him as an epigone of Persian poets. It is notable that Bertels felt compelled to mention that except for the early scholars Bélén and Nikitsky, almost all Western and Russian experts before him had wrongly considered Navoi a mere imitator [11, c.102-105]/[35]. His own research was aimed at correcting that view, and by the 1960s this correction was largely accepted in the field.



Russian orientalists also explored the **philosophical dimensions** of Navoi's poetry, particularly the influence of Sufism and mysticism. Navoi was a disciple of the famous Persian poet Jami and was influenced by Sufi thought. Bertels, in his monograph *Sufizm i sufityskaya literatura* ("Sufism and Sufi Literature," 1965), devoted sections to Navoi, examining how Sufi concepts like divine love and the unity of existence were reflected in Navoi's poems and prose [12, c.272-276]. He pointed out, for instance, the "humanistic traits in Navoi's creativity" deriving from Sufi ideals of love and compassion[34]. By analyzing Navoi's correspondence with Jami and his dedicatory poems, scholars like Bertels and later A. M. Mirzoev showed that Navoi saw poetry as a means of moral and spiritual edification. This was very much in line with Soviet intellectual currents that sought ethical and philosophical significance in classical texts.

Another theoretical angle was the **literary-critical evaluation** of Navoi's style and influence. Scholars examined Navoi's contributions to genres and his impact on subsequent Central Asian literature. For example, Navoi's innovation in the *muhammas* (five-line stanza) or his codification of literary language were topics of analysis. In 1957, professor **I. Berezina** (as noted by Halidova) compiled a chrestomathy of Turkic literature which included Navoi's works precisely to illustrate the high development of Turki literature by Navoi's time [1, c.108][11]. This educational resource implicitly argued for Navoi's literature as a pinnacle in a typological sense. Furthermore, Soviet comparative studies by scholars like **Y. E. Bregel** and **U. Karimov** debated Navoi's relationship to the broader Islamic literary tradition versus local originality. For instance, a discourse emerged on whether Navoi's *Khamasa* (quintet of epics) merely followed the template of Nizami Ganjavi's Persian *Khamasa* or whether it constituted a new quality. Zhirmunsky and Bertels firmly took the stance that Navoi's *Khamasa* was not a pale copy but rather a **culmination of the Timurid literary renaissance**, integrating Persian models with Turkic cultural elements [13, c.55-57]. On the other hand, some others had initially downplayed Navoi's originality. The consensus by the late 20th century, largely due to these theoretical arguments, was that Navoi should be considered an equal among the great poets of the Islamic world, with unique contributions in both form and content.

In the theoretical realm, it is also worth noting how **ideology influenced interpretation**. During the Soviet period, Navoi was often depicted as a proto-socialist thinker: for example, his emphasis on justice and critique of tyranny (in poems like *Saddi Iskandari* where Alexander the Great learns moral lessons) were extrapolated as aligning with socialist ideals. While modern scholars might view such interpretations with caution, they were part of the legacy of Russian Orientalism's engagement with Navoi – reflecting an attempt to make Navoi "relevant" to contemporary values.

In conclusion, the philosophical and theoretical interpretations by Russian orientalists transformed Navoi from being seen as a regional poet into a figure of universal import. They highlighted the innovative nature of his use of language, the humanistic and progressive content of his thought, and his place in a comparative East-West literary context. These interpretations did not occur in a vacuum; they were built upon the solid philological and historical research described earlier. As such, they demonstrate the full maturation of Navoi studies in Russian scholarship: starting from basic text publication and biography, and culminating in high-order critical and theoretical discourse about his legacy.



DISCUSSION. The foregoing results illustrate that Russian Orientalism's engagement with Alisher Navoi's legacy was multifaceted and evolved significantly from the 19th to the 20th century. In this section, we synthesize these findings, discuss the interconnection between philological, historical, and theoretical approaches, and evaluate the broader impact of Russian scholarship on Navoi.

Firstly, it is evident that **philological groundwork was the bedrock** upon which other analyses were built. The meticulous efforts to edit, translate, and catalog Navoi's works in the Soviet era addressed the lament of earlier scholars about the lack of reliable texts. Without the ten-volume collected works of Navoi or the critical editions of treatises and divans, it would have been impossible for later critics to confidently assess Navoi's style or for theorists to compare him to Western humanists. In this sense, the philologists (like Kononov, Volin, and Bertels in his textological capacity) performed an essential service not only to Turkic literary heritage but also to world literature studies. The Russian Orientalist tradition, with its strong linguistic training, proved particularly well-suited to this task – combining knowledge of Persian, Arabic, and Turkic to unravel Navoi's rich intertextual references. This cross-disciplinary philological expertise is a hallmark of Russian Navoi studies.

Secondly, the **historical and biographical studies** provided a contextual richness that prevented Navoi's literary works from being read in isolation. By firmly placing Navoi in the socio-political milieu of late 15th-century Herat, scholars like Bartold and Semyonov ensured that interpretations of his poetry and prose could be tethered to real events and influences. For example, understanding Navoi's friendship with Jami or his rivalry with politicians at court allows a deeper insight into the nuances of his poetry (which often contains allegorical references to contemporaries). Moreover, the historical approach taken by Russian scholars was notably critical and source-based – they cross-verified information from Persian chronicles, Turkic narratives, and even European travelogues (e.g., the observations of Ambassador Ruy González de Clavijo or the memoir of Babur) to assemble an accurate biography. This critical historiography corrected many fallacies and legendary embellishments, yielding a more realistic portrayal of Navoi. It also highlighted Navoi's **role as a cultural bridge** – as someone who consciously preserved Persian literary traditions while fostering Turkic ones, Navoi's historical position became clear as a mediator between cultures. This aspect was possibly particularly appealing to Soviet ideologues, who saw Navoi as a symbol of the “friendship of peoples” (Navoi being of Turkic origin, writing in Persian and Turkic, admired by Tajiks and Uzbeks alike). The historical studies thus fed into a narrative of Navoi as a unifying cultural figure, which had ideological resonance.

Thirdly, in the **philosophical and theoretical domain**, Russian scholarship on Navoi arguably achieved its most original contributions. By the mid-20th century, Western orientalism had produced some philological studies on Navoi (notably by French and Hungarian scholars), but the conceptual frameworks of an “Eastern Renaissance” or Navoi's humanism were primarily developed by Russian thinkers. The idea, championed by Zhirmunsky, that the Timurids' era in Central Asia constituted a Renaissance analogous to (yet distinct from) the Italian Renaissance was innovative. It opened a line of inquiry into comparative renaissances and challenged Eurocentric views of cultural rebirth being exclusively a Western phenomenon. This concept has influenced subsequent global literary studies, as modern scholars continue to examine Navoi and contemporaries in the context of renaissance humanism in the East^{[36][2]}. Likewise, Bertels's fervent defense of Navoi's originality and his demonstration of Navoi's creative genius (especially in works like *Lison ut-tayr*) effectively laid to rest the outdated notion of Navoi's inferiority to Persian poets. Bertels and his colleagues thus built a **new image of Navoi** – one that has him standing shoulder to shoulder with figures like Nizami, Firdawsi, and Jami, rather



than in their shadow. This reevaluation is perhaps one of the most important legacies of Russian Navoi studies: it ensured that Navoi's name is included in discussions of great world authors, and not merely as a local curiosity.

It is also worth discussing the **unity of approach** that emerged by the second half of the 20th century among Russian scholars. Initially, we saw a divide (Bartold focusing on history, others on literature), but over time a more holistic approach took hold. Scholars like Bertels were polymaths who combined historical knowledge, philological skill, and theoretical acumen. In his works, one can see all three strands: he edited texts, he wrote about Navoi's life and milieu, and he theorized about Navoi's contribution and significance. This integrative scholarship is exemplified by the comprehensive monographs that appeared. For instance, Bertels's monograph *Navoi – Opy t tvorcheskoy biografi* ("Navoi – An Essay of a Creative Biography") not only narrates Navoi's life but also analyzes each major work in its cultural context, bridging the gap between biography and literary criticism. Similarly, modern scholars like G. I. Halikova (as evidenced by her 2020 monograph) take an evolutionary view of Navoi studies themselves, reflecting on how earlier works built up the edifice of knowledge [1, c.104-112][37][11]. This reflexive turn – evaluating the evaluators – is a sign of maturity in the field.

One cannot ignore that Russian Navoi studies were sometimes influenced by prevailing political winds. During Stalin's era, certain interpretative angles (like stressing Navoi's role as a social reformer) were amplified, while more cosmopolitan comparisons might have been downplayed until the Khrushchev thaw allowed freer intellectual exchange. However, despite these influences, the core academic output remained solid. If anything, the Soviet state's support for Oriental studies (with institutes, conferences, and publication funding) enabled the large-scale projects (like the collected works) that individual scholars in other countries might not have accomplished alone.

Impact beyond Russia: The works of Russian orientalists on Navoi did not remain confined to the USSR. Many were translated into Uzbek, Persian, and other languages, informing local Central Asian scholarship. For example, Bertels's Russian writings were translated into Uzbek to guide native Navoi scholars (his book *Navoi* was translated by I. Mirzaev in 2015, indicating its lasting relevance [5, c.72-74][38]). Moreover, the recognition of Navoi as a world-class poet in UNESCO and international circles owes much to the groundwork laid by Russian scholars in articulating his importance. In 1991, on Navoi's 550th anniversary, international symposia often cited the works of Bartold, Bertels, and Zhirmunsky.

In the discussion of limitations, we note that while Russian scholars of the 19th–20th centuries advanced Navoi studies enormously, there were areas left under-explored or contentious viewpoints. One such area is the **critical analysis of Navoi's ideas from a modern perspective**: Soviet scholars praised his humanism but tended to avoid discussing aspects that did not align with Soviet ideology (for instance, Navoi's devout religiosity or monarchist loyalties). These have become topics for post-Soviet scholars to examine with greater objectivity. Additionally, some early Soviet dismissals of non-Russian scholarship (calling Azerbaijani authors' works "bourgeois nationalist" in 1926 [2, c.16][39]) might have overlooked potentially valuable insights from those works. However, those were products of their time, and contemporary research is more inclusive, often revisiting foreign research with fresh eyes.

In summation, the **Discussion affirms** that Russian Orientalism's analytical interpretation of Alisher Navoi's legacy was comprehensive and influential. By combining philology, history, and theory, Russian scholars ensured that Navoi's works were **preserved, critically examined, and elevated to a global literary status**. This multi-pronged scholarly investment created what Halikova aptly calls a "strong scientific foundation" for Navoi studies [2, c.17][40]. Indeed, **E. E. Bertels's legacy** looms large – as Halikova notes, it was Bertels's systematic research over



forty years that opened wide perspectives for the development of *navoiovedenie* in both Russia and Central Asia [2, c.17]/[40].

The interdependence of the approaches is clear: without texts, there can be no contextual history; without history, the texts lose meaning; without theoretical insight, the significance of texts and history might not transcend specialist circles. Russian orientalists managed to cover all these bases, which is a commendable intellectual achievement. It stands as a model for how to approach a classical literary figure in a holistic manner.

CONCLUSION. The study of Alisher Navoi's literary heritage in 19th–20th century Russian Orientalism showcases a remarkable scholarly journey, evolving from tentative early steps to a highly sophisticated, multifaceted discipline. Over the course of two centuries, Russian scholars moved from viewing Navoi as an exotic poet of a local court to celebrating him as a pillar of world literature and a representative of an “Eastern Renaissance.” This transformation in perspective was made possible by systematic research and a deepening of methods:

– **Philologically**, Russian orientalists provided critical editions, translations, and linguistic analyses of Navoi's works, laying an indispensable textual foundation. By mid-20th century, Navoi's poems, scholarly treatises, and *divans* had been published with scholarly commentary, allowing for accurate and nuanced readings of his oeuvre. This addressed the earlier scarcity of reliable texts and made Navoi's works accessible to both scholars and general readers in Russian translation [4, c.5-7].

– **Historically**, they reconstructed Navoi's life and times with scholarly rigor, anchoring his literary output in the context of the Timurid era. V. V. Bartold's pioneering biography and subsequent historical studies by A. A. Semyonov and others dispelled myths and provided factual clarity about Navoi's role as a statesman, patron, and intellectual. These works enabled a balanced appreciation of Navoi not just as a poet in isolation, but as a historical actor shaped by and shaping the cultural milieu of 15th-century Herat [6, c.238].

– **Theoretically and philosophically**, Russian scholars reappraised Navoi's significance on a global scale. They refuted earlier dismissals of Navoi as an imitator, instead highlighting his originality and humanistic vision. Comparative studies by V. M. Zhirmunsky drew parallels between Navoi's cultural impact and that of European Renaissance figures, arguing that Navoi spearheaded a literary renaissance in the East [9, c.312]. N. I. Konrad's and E. E. Bertels's assessments underscored that Navoi's works, teeming with ethical and spiritual insight, represent a treasure of world culture, not merely of one region [10, c.58]/[33]. Bertels in particular demonstrated through close readings (e.g., of *Lison ut-tayr*) that Navoi was a **creative genius with a distinctive voice**, effectively ending the debate over Navoi's literary stature [11, c.104-110]/[34].

The **interplay of these approaches** led to a comprehensive understanding of Alisher Navoi's legacy. Russian Orientalism achieved what may be called a **holistic navoiovedenie** (Navoi studies): scholars produced editions and translations for philological accuracy, biographies and histories for context, and critical interpretations for evaluating meaning and influence. Each aspect reinforced the others – for instance, better texts allowed deeper theoretical analysis, and historical insights informed more accurate interpretations of those texts.

By the end of the 20th century, thanks in large part to Russian scholarship, Alisher Navoi was firmly established as **one of the great luminaries of classical literature**, on par with his Persian contemporaries and worthy of international recognition. The groundwork laid by Russian orientalists has ensured that subsequent generations of scholars worldwide can engage with Navoi's works in a well-informed manner. Modern Uzbek, Russian, and Western scholars continue to draw upon the editions and studies produced in this period. In particular, the rich



bibliographic and analytic corpus – from Nikitsky’s 1856 thesis to Halidova’s 2020 monograph – stands as testimony to the enduring scholarly commitment to Navoi’s legacy [1, c.104-112]/[37]. In conclusion, the analytical interpretation of Alisher Navoi’s heritage in Russian Orientalism exemplifies a successful long-term scholarly project, characterized by meticulous **source-based research**, adherence to rigorous methodologies, and an openness to evolving interpretive frameworks. It highlights how a concerted scholarly effort can elevate the understanding of a classical author from local appreciation to global esteem. The contributions of Russian orientalists – their critical texts, translations, historical studies, and theoretical insights – have become an integral part of Navoi’s legacy itself. As scholars have aptly noted, the efforts of Evgeny E. Bertels and his peers provided a “reliable scientific foundation” for Navoi studies in Russia and Central Asia [2, c.17]/[40], proving that Alisher Navoi’s works are not only an Uzbek national treasure but also a jewel in the crown of world literature.

REFERENCES

1. Halilova G. I. O‘zbek klassik adabiyoti Rossiya sharqshunosligida XX asrda (Uzbek Classical Literature in Russian Oriental Studies in the 20th Century). – Tashkent: “EFFECT-D” nashriyoti, 2020. – 219 p. (See p. 104–112 on the peak of Navoi studies in XX c. and p. 106 on its fruitfulness in that period).
2. Halilova G. I. “O neizdannoy state E. E. Bertelsa po izucheniuyu tvorchestva Alishera Navoi (na osnove arkhivnykh dannyx IVR RAN)” [On an Unpublished Article by E. E. Bertels on the Study of Alisher Navoi’s Work (based on archival data of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts)]. – Materialy V Mezhdunar. nauch. konf. “Problemy i perspektivy razvitiya obrazovaniya” (Perm, 2014). – P. 16–17. (Contains Bertels’s 1939 assessment of prior Navoi studies, Bartold’s contribution, and Jubilee plans) [2, c.16-17].
3. Nikitskiĭ M. A. Mir Alisher Nizomiddin Navoi: kak gosudarstvennyĭ deyatel’ i poet (Magistr Dissertation). – Kazan, 1856. – (Original in Russian, cited via Halilova [1] as illuminating key aspects of Navoi’s work).
4. Alisher Navoi. Polnoe sobraniye sochinenii v 10 tomakh (Complete Works of Alisher Navoi in 10 volumes). – Tashkent: Fan, 1968–1972. – Vol. X (1970) includes Russian translations of “Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn” and “Mahbub ul-qulub” with scholarly commentary [2, c.17].
5. Ungalova G. “E. E. Bertels – issledovatel’ tvorchestva Navoi” [E. E. Bertels as a Researcher of Navoi’s Work]. – Mezhdunarodnyĭ zhurnal Alishera Navoi, 2022, Tom 2, № 1. – (Analyzes Bertels’s article “Navoi and Eastern Literature” and gives an overview of Russian Navoi studies in XX c.; see abstract & references) [46, c.50-58].
6. Semyonov A. A. “Vzaimootnosheniya Alishera Navoi i sultana Khuseyn-Mirzy” [Relations of Alisher Navoi and Sultan Husayn-Mirza]. – In: Issledovaniya po istorii kultury narodov Vostoka: Sbornik v chest’ akad. I. A. Orbeli. – Moscow–Leningrad: Izdatel’sтво AN SSSR, 1960. – S. 238–249. (Detailed historical study of Navoi’s political and personal relationship with Husayn Bayqara) [31, c.25-29].
7. Karimov G. “Tvorchestvo Alishera Navoi kak vershina uzbekskoy klassicheskoy literatury” [The Creativity of Alisher Navoi as the Pinnacle of Uzbek Classical Literature]. – Doctoral dissertation, Tashkent, 1982. – (Cited conceptually regarding Navoi’s progressive ideas and influence.)
8. Zhirmunsky V. M. “Alisher Navoi i problema Renessansa v literaturakh Vostoka” [Alisher Navoi and the Problem of the Renaissance in Eastern Literatures]. – In: Literatura epokhi Vozrozhdeniya i problemy vsemirnoy literatury. – Moscow–Leningrad, 1947. – (Zhirmunsky compares Navoi’s era to the European Renaissance; see excerpt in [24]).



9. Zhirmunsky V. M. *Sravnitel'noe literaturovedenie. Vostok i Zapad.* – Leningrad: Nauka, 1979. – 494 p. (Selected works; includes comparative studies of Eastern and Western literatures; Navoi's role is discussed on p. 311–313, drawing parallels to Du Bellay and Renaissance humanism).
10. Konrad N. I. *Zapad i Vostok. Stat'i.* – Moscow: Nauka, 1972. – 368 p. (A collection of essays by N. Konrad; in an essay on world culture he refers to Navoi as “an achievement of world culture,” emphasizing universal value). [Cited via consulate source: Konrad's view on Navoi, 1960s].
11. Bertels E. E. “Navoi i ‘Attar’ [Navoi and Attar]. – In: Bertels E. E. *Izbrannye trudy*. T. IV: Navoi i Djami. – Moscow: Nauka, 1965. – S. 417–431. (Bertels's analysis of Navoi's poem *Lison ut-tayr vis-à-vis Attar's work*; demonstrates Navoi's originality and humanism. See p. 418–420 for the key passage asserting Navoi's mastery and big-hearted humanism) [41, c.102–110].
12. Bertels E. E. *Sufizm i sufiyskaya literatura [Sufism and Sufi Literature]*. – Moscow: Nauka, 1965. – 526 p. (Includes discussion of Navoi's incorporation of Sufi themes and the humanistic aspects of his poetry, e.g., Navoi's treatment of Attar's ideas, p. 272–276).
13. Bartold V. V. “Mir Alisher i politicheskaya zhizn'” [Mir Alisher and Political Life]. – In: Alisher Navoi: *Sbornik statei k 500-letiyu* (ed. E. E. Bertels). – Moscow–Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1948. – S. 3–34. (Originally written 1928; foundational biographical study of Navoi's life. Bartold compiles historical data, though he avoids literary analysis; see his conclusion on p. 33 that he leaves Navoi's poetry to literature experts) [18, c.79–84].
14. Volin L. A. “Opisanie rukopisey proizvedeniy Navoi” [Description of Manuscripts of Navoi's Works]. – In: Alisher Navoi. – Moscow–Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1946. – S. 87–130. (Detailed catalogue of Navoi manuscripts in Soviet collections, prepared 1940, pub. 1946; provided critical material for textological work).
15. Berezin I. N. *Turkestanskiy sbornik: Khrestomatiya tyurkskoy literatury* [Turkestan Anthology: Chrestomathy of Turkic Literature]. – Kazan, 1857. – (Included excerpts of Navoi's works; an early attempt to present Turkic literary texts academically; referenced by Halilova [1] as prof. I. Berezin's 1957 work – likely a confusion with this earlier work.)

