

«ӨЗІРЕТ СҰЛТАН» Ұлттық тарихи-мәдени музей-
қорығы» РМҚК
ЯСАУИТАНУ ғылыми орталығы

<https://journalyasawicenter.com>
ISSN 3134-8440 ISSN 3134-8459

IRSTI: 13.11.44

<https://doi.org/10.67217/2026.03.08>

Ali Rafet Özkan

Professor, Ankara University
Ankara, Türkiye

e-mail: ozkanarafet@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7710-5471>

AHMAD YASAWI'S HIKMATS: ETHNOCULTURAL IDENTITY AND SOCIAL COHESION

Аңдатпа. Бұл баяндамада Қожа Ахмет Ясауидің хикметтерінің жаһандану, жедел модернизация және идентификациялық саясаттардың қысымы жағдайындағы ХХІ ғасырдағы қазақ қоғамында этномәдени бірегейлікті сақтау мен қоғамдық тұтастықты нығайтудағы стратегиялық рөлі талданады. Қазақстан тәуелсіздік алғаннан кейін тіл мен мәдени мұраны сақтау, әртүрлі этникалық топтар арасындағы үйлесімділікті қамтамасыз ету, әлеуметтік-экономикалық теңсіздіктерді жою және жаһандық ықпалдар жағдайында ұлттық бірегейлікті нығайту сияқты көпқырлы сынқатерлермен бетпе-бет келуде. Баяндамада Ясауидің төзімділік, әділет, бірлік, рухани тереңдік және адам сүйіспеншілігі секілді әмбебап хикметтерінің қазақ мәдениетінің негізгі тетіктерін нәрлендіріп, ұлттық бірегейліктің тұрақтылығын қамтамасыз етуде әрі қоғамдық келісімді күшейтуде қазіргі заманға сай бағдар ұсынатыны қарастырылады. Сонымен қатар, цифрландыру алып келген жаңа идентификация формалары мен жастар құндылықтарының өзгеруі аясында Ясауи ілімдерінің қайта пайымдалу әлеуеті талқыланып, ХХІ ғасырдағы қазақ қоғамында кездесетін бірегейліктің әлсіреуі, әлеуметтік поляризация және мәдени жаттану сияқты мәселелерге практикалық шешімдер ізделеді. Баяндамада Ясауи ілімдерінің тек мәдени мұра ғана емес, сонымен бірге ХХІ ғасырдағы қазақ қоғамының бірегейлік пен тұтастық мәселелеріне қатысты стратегиялық аналитикалық және моральдық негіз ұсынатыны дәлелденеді.

Кілт сөздер: Ахмет Ясауи, «Диуани хикмет», этномәдени бірегейлік, сопылық, төзімділік, ұлттық бірегейлік, жаһандану, идентификациялық саясаттар, цифрландыру, әлеуметтік поляризация.

Abstract. This article examines how the ethical vocabulary of the Yasawi tradition can inform contemporary debates on ethnocultural identity and social cohesion in Kazakhstan. Using qualitative document analysis, it reads a verified Turkish edition of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet* alongside recent scholarship on civic and ethnic identity, language practices, young people's media use, and inequality. The analysis is organised around four themes: responsibility towards vulnerable people; self-discipline as a counterweight to pride and ostentation; justice in public conduct; and the integrative function of accessible language. The findings indicate that Yasawi's

legacy can furnish a shared moral vocabulary, but only when interpreted inclusively and without turning a historical Sufi corpus into a direct policy manual. Its contemporary value lies less in supplying ready-made solutions than in sustaining ethically grounded deliberation across education, cultural institutions, and digital media. Social cohesion nevertheless also depends on credible language policy, equality of opportunity, and institutional justice. The article therefore proposes a critical appropriation of Yasawi's legacy that joins historical awareness to civic inclusion.

Keywords: Ahmad Yasawi, Dīwān-i Hikmet, Kazakhstan, ethnocultural identity, social cohesion, language policy, youth, digital media, public ethics.

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается, каким образом этический словарь ясавийской традиции может быть включён в современные дискуссии об этнокультурной идентичности и общественной сплочённости в Казахстане. Исследование основано на качественном анализе документов: проверенное турецкое издание «Диван-и Хикмет» сопоставляется с новейшими работами о гражданской и этнической идентичности, языковых практиках, медиаповедении молодёжи и социальном неравенстве. Анализ сосредоточен на четырёх темах: ответственности перед уязвимыми людьми, самодисциплине как противодействии высокомерию и показному благочестию, справедливости в общественном поведении и объединяющей функции доступного языка. Результаты показывают, что наследие Ясави способно предложить общий нравственный словарь лишь при инклюзивном толковании, которое не превращает исторический суфийский корпус в непосредственное руководство по государственной политике. Его современная ценность состоит прежде всего в поддержке содержательного обсуждения в образовании, культурных учреждениях и цифровой среде. Вместе с тем общественная сплочённость зависит также от справедливой языковой политики, равенства возможностей и доверия к институтам. При таком подходе культурная память становится не средством унификации, а пространством ответственного диалога, где историческая критика, языковое многообразие и равное гражданское достоинство дополняют друг друга.

Ключевые слова: Ахмед Ясави, «Диван-и Хикмет», Казахстан, этнокультурная идентичность, общественная сплочённость, языковая политика, молодёжь, цифровые медиа, публичная этика.

Introduction. Debates over identity in Kazakhstan have not unfolded after independence merely as a return to the past or a revival of national symbols. Institutions inherited from the Soviet period, the public prominence of Russian, efforts to consolidate Kazakh as the state language, the civic attachment of diverse ethnic communities, and the relationship that younger generations have forged with global culture constitute interlocking dimensions of the same process. It is therefore analytically unhelpful to posit a fixed and categorical opposition between Kazakh identity and Kazakhstani identity. Research indicates that ethnic affiliation, citizenship, linguistic

competence, and institutional trust carry different weights in individuals' identity preferences (Burkhanov, 2017; Rees & Williams, 2017). The ethnic and linguistic diversity documented by the 2021 census likewise requires social cohesion to be approached not through a vision of cultural uniformity, but within a framework attentive simultaneously to common belonging and plurality (Bureau of National Statistics, 2023).

Khoja Ahmad Yasawi matters to this debate not as the author of a ready-made political programme, but as the focal point of a religious-literary tradition with deep resonance in Kazakhstan's historical memory. Because accounts of Yasawi's

historical personhood are interwoven with hagiographic narratives and extant recensions of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet* were compiled in different periods and milieus, not every saying attributed to him can be assigned directly to the twelfth century (Eraslan, 1989; Eraslan, 1994). Yet the idiom of the hikmet tradition—formed around vernacular Turkic, moral exhortation, the disciplining of the self (*nafs*), solidarity with the poor, and the critique of injustice—testifies to a genuine cultural circulation that endured across Central Asia for centuries. The dissemination of the Yasawiyya through differing chains of transmission and practices across various regions further shows that this legacy cannot be reduced to a single historical template (Tosun, 2013).

The central question of this article is what resources Yasawi's hikmats offer for preserving ethnocultural identity and strengthening social cohesion in twenty-first-century Kazakh society, and where the limits of those resources lie. The article advances the following argument: Yasawi's legacy can furnish a shared moral vocabulary through such principles as responsibility toward vulnerable groups, a piety free of ostentation, just conduct, and accessible language; it cannot, however, substitute for structural responses to language policy, economic inequality, discrimination, or digital information disorder. The task, therefore, is not to transpose the past directly into the present, but to read a historical textual tradition critically and bring it into conversation with pluralist citizenship.

Yasawi's present-day visibility does not derive solely from poetic texts. The mausoleum in Turkistan, practices of visitation, official commemorations, and academic publications constitute a field of memory in which the historical figure is continually reinterpreted across distinct social milieus. The mausoleum's inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2003 also brought the religious, architectural, and historical layers of this field to international attention (UNESCO, 2003). Yet the widespread recognition of a symbol does not imply that everyone invests

it with the same meaning. Yasawi's name may evoke different associations for a devout visitor, a student, a historian, or a local citizen from a different ethnic background. Such plurality is not a weakness of the legacy; it is evidence that interpretation is socially situated.

This study does not treat ethnocultural identity as merely knowledge of one's origins or as a fixed inventory of traditions. Rather, the concept denotes the historically reconstituted configuration of language, family memory, narratives of the past, religious symbols, and everyday practices of belonging. Social cohesion, in turn, does not mean the elimination of difference; it refers to citizens' capacity to participate in common institutions with equal respect and to negotiate disagreement without recourse to violence. These definitions matter because cultural continuity and political unity are not synonymous. A tradition may reinforce ethnic memory while excluding other groups; conversely, an inclusive discourse of citizenship may trivialise the linguistic and mnemonic claims of particular communities. The contribution of Yasawi's legacy can be assessed only when these two risks are considered together.

From this perspective, identity is not a frozen template to be preserved, but a responsible and negotiable relationship with the past.

Establishing such a relationship does not require a choice between memory and critique. Representing the historical figure solely through the idiom of hagiography may appear to shield him from criticism, but in fact diminishes his intellectual depth. Conversely, identifying textual strata, comparing editions, and filtering out doubtful attributions do not amount to denying Yasawi's cultural significance. Academic integrity is not a distancing gesture that devalues the legacy; it is a form of proximity that makes visible the pathways through which that legacy reached the present. Such an approach also enables younger readers to encounter the sources directly, rather than merely repeat received

judgements, and to assume responsibility for their own interpretations.

2. Materials and Methods. The study is based on qualitative document analysis. Its primary text is Hayati Bice's edition of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet*; particular attention is devoted to passages addressing solidarity with the broken-hearted and the poor, criticism of bribery and injustice, discipline of the self, and opposition to ostentatious piety (Yesevî, 1993, pp. 122, 163, 184). To distinguish the text's historical layers, encyclopedia entries on Ahmad Yasawi, the *Dīwān-i Hikmet*, and the *Yasawiyya* were assessed comparatively. This procedure makes it possible to read the hikmats not as an immutable text wholly attributable to a single author, but as an ethical tradition that took shape around Yasawi and expanded over time.

The secondary literature was delimited to scholarship on identity formation, citizenship, language preferences, young people's use of digital media, and socioeconomic inequality in contemporary Kazakhstan. The texts were analysed under four themes: inclusive belonging, language and transmission, public ethics, and structural constraints. This is not a field study measuring the present-day effects of the hikmats; it therefore makes no claim of direct causality between Yasawi's teaching and social cohesion. Its purpose is to compare normative principles derivable from the historical corpus with problem areas identified by contemporary empirical research and to subject claims about their applicability to critical scrutiny.

Three criteria governed source selection. First, the study included only works whose bibliographic records and publication venues could be verified. Second, sources were evaluated not simply on the basis of a broadly relevant title, but according to whether they substantively addressed the claim for which they were cited. Third, direct quotations were required to include edition and page information. Aphorisms circulating online without a specified edition, or absent from the accessible text of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet*, were excluded from the analysis. Respect for

Yasawi and source criticism were thus treated not as opposites, but as complementary dimensions of scholarly responsibility toward a historical legacy.

The analysis proceeded by first reading the relevant passages in the primary text and then examining how the same theme appeared in contemporary research. The theme of solidarity with the poor and the wounded, for example, was paired with current data on inequality; the preference for plain language with research on language policy and young people's linguistic practices; and the critique of bribery with debates on public justice and institutional trust. This pairing does not assert historical equivalence. The religious and ethical concepts of the twelfth century are not identical to the concepts of citizenship and public policy used today. The purpose of the comparison is not to erase that distance, but to determine which questions an older ethical idiom can keep alive in contemporary debate.

3. Analysis: Sources of Social Ethics in the Hikmet Tradition. The textual history of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet* establishes the first limit on contemporary interpretation. Extant manuscripts differ in language, content, and the number of hikmats they contain, and some poems are known to have been incorporated into the collection by Yasawi dervishes in later periods (Eraslan, 1994). This does not diminish the work's value, but it does require caution in making categorical claims that "Yasawi said" a particular thing. It is more precise to say that certain lines articulate an ethical orientation preserved within the Yasawi tradition. This approach attends to historical criticism without disregarding the enduring influence of hagiography, poetry, and Sufi-order memory in Kazakh culture.

One distinguishing feature of the hikmats is their connection of abstract ethical teaching to everyday relations. The line in the first hikmet, "Wherever you encounter the broken-hearted, be a balm to them," transforms compassion from a general sentiment into a concrete relationship with the wounded person (Yesevî, 1993, p. 122). The same passage

repeatedly insists on caring for the stranger, the orphan, and the poor. The conception of commonality at work here rests not on an identity that renders everyone alike, but on assuming responsibility in the presence of vulnerability. This emphasis is consequential for contemporary social cohesion, because common belonging is strengthened not only through allegiance to symbols, but also through conduct and institutions that protect the dignity of different sections of society.

The second axis is the critique of the *nafs*, pride, and ostentation. In the *hikmats*, moral corruption is not represented solely as the failing of others; the speaker also interrogates his own inadequacy, performative piety, and excessive attachment to the world. This self-critical idiom offers a standard that should inform public invocations of the legacy. A discourse that exalts Yasawi's name while exempting its own relations of power and interest from scrutiny contradicts the *hikmats'* ethic of self-reckoning. Yasawi's legacy should therefore be read not as an identity marker used to prove one community's superiority over others, but as an ethical resource that summons individuals and institutions to examine their own conduct (Kalm, 2017).

The third axis concerns justice, which appears not as an abstract object of praise but through criticism of the abuse of concrete offices. The fifty-third *hikmet* censures a *qadi* who accepts bribes and a *mufti* who issues unjust *fatwas*; the eighty-ninth laments the disappearance of justice among rulers and generosity within society (Yesevî, 1993, pp. 163, 184). These lines do not contain a modern conception of the rule of law, and presenting them as a programme addressed directly to contemporary institutions would be anachronistic. They nevertheless articulate an unequivocal moral objection to the use of public authority for private gain. Their contemporary corollary is to connect the expectation of justice not merely to individual benevolence, but to demands for accountability and equal treatment.

The plain and rhythmic Turkic of the *hikmats* is likewise integral to their social function. Despite the scholarly and literary

prestige of Arabic and Persian, Yasawi is understood to have preferred an idiom accessible to broad sections of the population (Eraslan, 1989). This choice suggests that cultural heritage should not remain knowledge confined to specialists. Plain language, however, does not entail reducing complex questions to slogans. Aphorisms falsely attributed to Yasawi and unsourced social-media images may be readily intelligible, yet they weaken historical knowledge. Ethical transmission therefore requires not only accessibility, but also transparency about sources and an account of textual variation.

Read together, these four themes show that the *hikmet* tradition does not construct social ethics through obedience alone. The interrogation of one's own *nafs*, care for the vulnerable, and criticism of injustice in public office distribute responsibility in several directions. The resulting moral horizon encompasses not only the duties of the governed toward rulers, but also the accountability of those who wield power. It would be mistaken to equate this horizon with modern democracy; it nonetheless resists reducing justice to a unilateral demand for loyalty. The most productive question Yasawi's legacy can contribute to the present debate is therefore this: Does an appeal to unity make audible the injustices experienced by society's less visible constituencies, or does it conceal them within the rhetoric of a common identity?

4. Results and Discussion: Identity, Language, and Cohesion in Contemporary Kazakhstan. Nation-building in Kazakhstan has sought to pursue simultaneously the historical and linguistic consolidation of ethnic Kazakh identity and the idea of a Kazakhstani identity encompassing all citizens. These two orientations sometimes reinforce one another, but they may also generate tensions over language, representation, and narratives of the past. Nationwide research has shown that knowledge of Kazakh, trust in institutions, and perceptions of discrimination are associated with both ethnic and civic nationalist orientations

(Burkhanov et al., 2017). This finding demonstrates that social cohesion does not arise spontaneously around a single symbol; it is shaped by citizens' everyday experiences, linguistic opportunities, and expectations of fair treatment.

Using data from 2014, Rees and Williams found that a supraethnic Kazakhstani identity resonated within society, while language remained a significant line of differentiation in its adoption (Rees & Williams, 2017). A more recent study of 4,000 participants examined shifts in ethnic and civic attachments between 2016 and 2023, demonstrating that the field of identity is not static (Sadvokassova et al., 2024). Any account of the integrative capacity of Yasawi's legacy must therefore avoid treating "Kazakh society" as a monolithic voice. For that legacy to be inclusive, it must also recognise the right of diverse ethnic and religious communities to maintain distance from this cultural resource or to interpret it differently.

Language is the most visible domain of ethnocultural continuity. Recent scholarship documents increasingly positive attitudes toward Kazakh, alongside the continuing role of Russian in everyday and public life and the value attached to English in education and global mobility (Jarlhøj & Valijärvi, 2024). A large-sample study conducted among university students in 2023 likewise shows that language use within the family and the language of instruction are decisive in young people's ethnolinguistic affiliation (Zharkynbekova et al., 2025). Yasawi's preference for accessible Turkic can, in this context, provide a historical model for supporting cultural production in Kazakh. It should serve not to encode multilingualism as a threat, but to strengthen Kazakh in high-quality education, publishing, and digital content.

The principal difficulty in language policy lies in the gap between symbolic value and the practical conditions of everyday use. Declaring a language the bearer of national heritage cannot produce the intended outcome when high-quality textbooks, scholarship, children's content,

and public services are unavailable in that language. Conversely, construing the experience of Russian-speaking citizens as evidence of deficient loyalty may narrow the basis of common citizenship. Yasawi's preference for intelligible language should therefore be read less as a criterion of linguistic purity than as a principle of access. The aim is not to place people in a hierarchy according to the language they use, but to make learning and using Kazakh practicable, substantively rewarding, and voluntarily valued in everyday life.

The digital sphere is not merely an external force that erodes identity. Social media constitute a bidirectional environment in which young people produce new narratives about history, music, language, and religion while also encountering misinformation, cyberbullying, and polarising content. Research on social-media use among young people in Kazakhstan places particular emphasis on the need for information security and digital literacy (Nussipova & Slanbekova, 2024). In this environment, renewing Yasawi's legacy must involve more than multiplying brief and emotive slogans. Bilingual or trilingual digital content that introduces different recensions of the hikmats, makes citations visible, and involves young people in interpretation can foster more durable forms of cultural learning.

A simple but auditable publication principle can guide digital transmission: every quotation should identify the work, editor or translator, year of publication, and page number, while doubtful textual status should be stated explicitly. Providing a contextual note when a hikmet is recorded or adapted into a short video does not diminish its impact; on the contrary, it enables audiences to engage with the source. The assumption that young people merely consume prefabricated content should likewise be abandoned. Collaborative digital editions, podcasts, and oral-history projects undertaken by universities, museums, and local cultural organisations can develop both linguistic competence and source literacy. Cultural transmission can thus become an

experience of inquiry and production rather than a one-directional act of admonition.

The material foundations of social cohesion cannot be disregarded. The World Bank's 2024 assessment notes that, despite long-term growth and declining poverty in Kazakhstan, inequalities of opportunity, disparities in educational quality, and regional vulnerabilities persist (World Bank, 2024). Merely reminding economically and institutionally excluded groups of common values does not answer their demand for justice. The hikmats' concern for the poor and condemnation of bribery can strengthen the ethical rationale for social policy, but cannot replace concrete arrangements governing resource distribution, social protection, education, and law. The contemporary value of Yasawi's legacy should be sought precisely in its refusal to reduce structural problems to deficits of spirituality.

This distinction is especially important for public institutions. Compassion may encourage individual acts of assistance; justice requires that services not vary according to personal proximity, ethnic origin, or economic power. Yasawi's call to stand with the poor is therefore incomplete when confined to charitable activity. Reducing regional disparities in education, ensuring access to public services for persons with disabilities, maintaining transparent application procedures, and investigating allegations of discrimination effectively are institutional dimensions of the same ethical question. A discourse of shared values generates trust only when supported by citizens' everyday experience of equal treatment.

Taken together, the findings reveal two distinct uses of heritage. In its representational use, Yasawi's name becomes a sign of a shared past through ceremonies, monuments, slogans, and official narratives. In its relational use, the ethical criteria articulated in the hikmats are used to interrogate how people treat one another and how institutions treat citizens. The representational dimension is not wholly dispensable: shared symbols can sustain a sense of belonging. Yet when

heritage remains at this level alone, it becomes a decorative device that ratifies existing practice. A relational reading, by contrast, converts compassion, justice, and self-discipline into questions against which contemporary conduct can be tested. The approach proposed here is to strengthen this second dimension and connect symbolic visibility to ethical responsibility.

5. The Contemporary Function of Yasawi's Legacy: Possibilities and Limits. The findings indicate that the contribution of Yasawi's legacy to social cohesion depends on four conditions. The first is textual integrity: the edition in which a saying appears must be identified, and later fabrications must not be attributed to Yasawi. The second is inclusive interpretation: compassion, justice, and self-scrutiny must be connected not to the superiority of a particular ethnic group, but to the equal dignity of all citizens. The third is institutional embodiment: ethical language must be supported by practices such as equal service provision, transparency, and measures against discrimination. The fourth is participatory transmission: young people should be regarded not as passive recipients of heritage, but as agents who debate it through its sources and produce it anew across contemporary media.

In education, the most productive approach is to establish relationships among text, history, and contemporary problems, rather than presenting the hikmats as moral maxims to be memorised. Students can compare different editions of the same hikmet, discuss the social problem addressed by a particular line, and evaluate where it converges with or diverges from the vocabulary of contemporary law and citizenship. Such pedagogy does not turn Yasawi into an untouchable symbol; it takes him seriously within his historical context. Çetin's examination of the contemporary traces of the Yasawi tradition in the spiritual life of the Kazakh people indicates that mausoleum visitation and cultural memory remain vibrant. This observation, however, should not be generalised into the assumption of a uniform religiosity across society (Çetin, 2025).

For cultural institutions and digital publishing, the priority is reliable access to texts. Comparative online presentation of editions of the *Dīwān-i Hikmet*, accompanied by concise explanations, audio renderings, and contextual notes in Kazakh, Russian, and English, can open the legacy to both local and international audiences. The UNESCO World Heritage status of Yasawi's mausoleum underscores that this heritage is not only religious, but also historical and architectural (UNESCO, 2003). Popularisation, however, is no justification for abandoning critical knowledge. In place of unsourced quotation cards, content standards should identify the edition, hikmet number, and translator.

For civil society and local communities, Yasawi's name acquires substance when it is connected to projects of shared responsibility rather than invoked as an abstract appeal to unity. Hikmats concerning the poor, orphans, and the broken-hearted can provide an ethical point of departure for youth volunteering, support for older people, disability access, and encounter programmes among different communities. The criterion is not whether a project bears Yasawi's name, but whether it genuinely safeguards vulnerable persons' dignity and right to speak. This approach moves the legacy beyond ceremonial repetition and closer to practices of everyday solidarity; it also enables citizens who do not share the religious reference to participate through the common language of human dignity and justice.

The most consequential limit arises when a historical Sufi corpus is converted into a direct source of contemporary state policy. Such a use may both constrict the spiritual quest articulated in the texts and turn Yasawi's legacy into an instrument for legitimating official identity. Social cohesion does not consist in silencing criticism or rendering differences invisible. As Schatz observes in explaining the absence of conflict in multiethnic Kazakhstan, accommodation depends not only on discursive frames, but also on how compromise and power relations are managed (Schatz, 2000). Yasawi's legacy

can therefore be integrative insofar as it nourishes public debate open to plurality; when used to police the boundaries of a single correct identity, it can become exclusionary.

The study's limitations should also be specified. The analysis is based on a particular Turkish edition and a selected body of recent scholarship; it is not a philological investigation comparing the full range of Kazakh, Chaghatay, and Russian manuscripts and editions. Nor does it directly observe how students, religious officials, members of different ethnic communities, or visitors to the mausoleum interpret Yasawi. Future research would benefit from interviews across different regions, analysis of intergenerational differences in interpretation, and mapping the circulation of sayings attributed to Yasawi in digital media. Such field data would make it possible to test how the ethical framework proposed here actually resonates within society.

The success of such initiatives should not be measured solely by the number of activities conducted. Relevant indicators might include students' ability to cite sources and discuss divergent interpretations in an educational programme; the proportion of verified quotations, quality of Kazakh-language content, and accessibility in a digital project; and beneficiaries' participation in decision-making in a local solidarity initiative. These measures are more demanding than the visibility of Yasawi's name, but better suited to assessing the social effects of the legacy. They also foster a culture of evaluation open to criticism: an initiative that fails to achieve its intended outcome is not placed beyond scrutiny merely because it is associated with a sacred or national symbol. Historical reverence thus becomes not an obstacle to institutional learning, but a reason for greater rigour.

Conclusion. The significance of Ahmad Yasawi's hikmats for contemporary Kazakhstan does not lie in their offering a prescription transmitted unchanged from the twelfth century to the present. Read together with the textual strata formed across

different periods, the *Dīwān-i Hikmet* articulates a compelling ethical orientation centred on compassion, self-discipline, justice, and accessible language. Within an ethnically and linguistically plural society, this orientation makes it possible to conceive common belonging not only through history and symbols, but also through the treatment of vulnerable persons and the just exercise of public authority.

The study's principal conclusion is that Yasawi's legacy cannot generate social cohesion on its own. Contemporary research shows that identity preferences are shaped jointly by language, citizenship, trust, family, and educational practices, while the digital sphere enables both cultural production and information disorder. Problems such as poverty and inequality of opportunity likewise require institutional solutions rather than moral exhortation alone. Yasawi's ethical idiom should therefore be situated not in place of public policy, but within the ethical scrutiny of policies that claim to be just and inclusive.

Within this framework, the most viable approach combines education grounded in verified texts, multilingual digital publishing committed to source transparency, local initiatives centred on solidarity with vulnerable groups, and public debate open to divergent interpretations. Such an approach neither confines Yasawi to the past nor instrumentalises him according to present needs. The vitality of the legacy is measured less by the frequency with which it is invoked than by the extent to which the relationship between compassion and justice can be enacted within contemporary citizenship.

References

1. Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2023). National Composition, Religion and Language Proficiency in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Results of the National Population Census of 2021. Astana. <https://stat.gov.kz/en/national/2021/>
2. Burkhanov, A. (2017). Kazakhstan's National Identity-Building Policy: Soviet Legacy, State Efforts, and Societal Reactions. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 50(1), 1-14. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cilj/vol50/iss1/1/>
3. Burkhanov, A., Sharipova, D., & Alpeissova, A. (2017). The Determinants of Civic and Ethnic Nationalisms in Kazakhstan: Evidence from the Grass-Roots Level. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 23(2), 203-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2017.1311143>
4. Çetin, H. (2025). Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Geleneğinin Kazak Halkının Maneviyatındaki Rolü ve Önemi [The Role and Importance of the Khoja Ahmad Yasawi Tradition in the Spiritual Life of the Kazakh People]. *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi*, 113, 405-419. <https://doi.org/10.60163/tkheba.1604710>
5. Eraslan, K. (1989). Ahmed Yesevî [Ahmad Yasawi]. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2, 159-161. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ahmed-yesevi>
6. Eraslan, K. (1994). *Dîvân-ı Hikmet* [The Book of Wisdom]. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*, 9, 429-430. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/divan-i-hikmet>
7. Jarlhøj, M. E., & Valijärvi, R.-L. (2024). Changing Language Policies and Ideologies in Kazakhstan: An Interview-Based Study. *SN Social Sciences*, 4, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-024-00829-5>
8. Kalın, İ. (2017). Hoca Ahmed Yesevî, Hüküm ve Hikmet [Khoja Ahmad Yasawi, Judgment and Wisdom]. *Bilig*, 80, 1-14. <https://izlik.org/JA39CP73DN>
9. Nussipova, A. U., & Slanbekova, G. K. (2024). Social Media Landscape in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Navigating Youth Behavior and Ensuring Information Security. *Journal of Philosophy, Culture and Political Science*, 89(3), 68-78.

- <https://doi.org/10.26577/jpcp.2024.v89-i3-07>
10. Rees, K. M., & Williams, N. W. (2017). Explaining Kazakhstani Identity: Supraethnic Identity, Ethnicity, Language, and Citizenship. *Nationalities Papers*, 45(5), 815-839. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1288204>
 11. Sadvokassova, A., Burkhanov, A., & Sharipova, D. (2024). In Search for Kazakhstani Identity: Societal Perceptions of Kazakhstan's Nation-Building. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 31(1), 114-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2024.2422198>
 12. Schatz, E. A. D. (2000). Framing Strategies and Non-Conflict in Multi-Ethnic Kazakhstan. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 6(2), 71-94.
 13. Tosun, N. (2013). Yeseviyye [The Yasawi Order]. *TDV Encyclopedia of Islam*, 43, 487-490. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/yeseviyye>
 14. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2003). Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1103>
 15. World Bank. (2024). Kazakhstan: Poverty and Equity Assessment. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099121024150515312>
 16. Yesevî, A. (1993). *Dîvân-ı Hikmet* [The Book of Wisdom] (H. Bice, Ed.). Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
 17. Zharkynbekova, S., Ayupova, G., Galiyeva, B., Shakhputova, Z., & Zabrodskaia, A. (2025). Ethno-Linguistic Identity of Kazakhstani Student Youth in Modern Multinational Context of Kazakhstan: Sociolinguistic Analysis of Empirical Research. *Languages*, 10(2), 33. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10020033>

Автор туралы:

Али Рафет Өзкан - профессор Анкара университеті Теология факультеті, Философия және дінтану бөлімінің профессоры, Түркия/Анкара

About the author:

Ali Rafet Özkan - Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religious Sciences, Faculty of Divinity, Ankara University, Türkiye/Ankara

Об авторе:

Али Рафет Озкан – профессор Анкарский университет, факультет теологии, отделение философии и религиоведения, Турция/Анкара