

Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 60 (2006)

Heft: 2

Artikel: The Uzbek state as reflected in eighteenth century Bukharan sources

Autor: Holzwarth, Wolfgang

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147709>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 02.02.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

THE UZBEK STATE AS REFLECTED IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY BUKHARAN SOURCES

Wolfgang Holzwarth

Abstract

This paper approaches 18th century Bukhara in the context of the interaction between nomadic and sedentary groups, a continuous feature in Central Asian history.¹ The state we are dealing with here, originated in a nomadic confederation – the Shaybanid Uzbeks – conquering and migrating to a mixed agro-pastoral zone around 1500. This conquest, led by Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān, was the last great inroad of pastoralists from the Great Steppe (i.e. the Dasht-i Qipchaq) into Mawarannahr, where Uzbek dynasties ruled until 1920. If we perceive Uzbek statehood as the institutionalisation of the rule of the nomadic conquerors and their descendants in a sedentary context, the 18th century Bukharan state still bears the legacy of a nomadic conquest.

Before taking a closer look at 18th century Bukhara, it is perhaps worthwhile to recall the wider historical and geographical setting and to adopt a more general view on the persistence and constraints of nomadic rule in a sedentary context. Reviewing a vast sample of nomadic states which subjugated sedentary groups, Anatoly Khazanov distinguishes between two main historical scenarios or tendencies in the emergence and evolution of nomadic statehood.

“States of the first type (...) are those in which the subjugation and conquest of the sedentary population basically result in vassal-tribute or other primitive, and not always completely regulated forms of collective dependence and exploitation. These states were usually most stable and long-term where nomads and the sedentary population continued to inhabit separate ecological zones.”²

“States of the second type are particularly characteristic of those situations in which nomads, after conquering a sedentary state, or during the process of

1 This is a slightly revised version of an already published article (HOLZWARTH, 2004). A first draft had been presented at the Conference “Civilizations of Central Asia: Sedentary and Nomadic Peoples” in Samarkand, September 25–28, 2002. I am indebted to all those who variously supported me by sharing some of their knowledge and professional skills with me, especially Prof. Jürgen Paul, Ulrike Berndt, Hale Decdeli-Holzwarth, Kurt Franz, Thomas Herzog, Sigrid Kleinmichel, Deborah LeGuillou, Anna Renz, Nuryoghdi Toshev. All mistakes and inaccuracies are mine.

2 KHAZANOV, 1994:231.

conquest, moved onto the territory of this state and began to divide the same ecological zones between themselves and agriculturalists.”³

The state created by Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān around 1500 clearly fits to the second trajectory, in which the nomadic population has gradually been incorporated into the sedentary state. In this scenario the nomadic population tends to sedentarize and/or comes to be subjected to the ruler in much the same way as sedentary groups. This happens relatively quickly, usually within two or three successive generations. If this did not happen in the case of the Uzbek state, in Khazanov’s opinion, it was due to the shortage of arable land that posed an obstacle to sedentarization, and to the predominance of the appanage system, an ancient tradition in nomadic states.⁴ In my view it was less the ecological constraints than the political configuration that was decisive in hindering a rapid transition to the sedentary model of the state.

The present study draws primarily on 18th century Bukharan sources, concentrating on those from the late Ashtarkhanid period.⁵ In addition to narrative sources, such as chronicles, some special attention will be given to court documents, in particular to letters of appointment issued to office-holders by Bukharan rulers. Since only a few of these documents have been preserved in the original, the study will refer to a hitherto somewhat neglected category of sources: copies or rather extracts of original documents in so-called *inshā*-collections, which have been compiled to serve as stylistic models and guidelines to future court secretaries.

Conceived as a preliminary research report, this study does not attempt to present a single sustained and coherent account of the long and complicated process of transition and transformation that the integration of a large group of nomadic conquerors to an agro-pastoral zone entailed. Instead, a series of vignettes are presented, each pointing briefly to some different aspects of continuity and change, which, in my opinion, need to be considered in an attempt to outline and understand the overall process. The scope and focus of observation varies in each of the following sections in which various aspects of

3 KHAZANOV, 1994:232.

4 KHAZANOV, 1994:262; cf. BATRAKOV (1962:154–155), who argues that the lack of irrigation water in Central Bukhara (Zarafshan and Qashqa-Darya oases), which was noted as early as around 1500, impeded the expansion of agricultural production and hampered the sedentarization of nomads in Bukhara, whereas more favourable ecological condition facilitated the transition in Khorezm and Farghana.

5 The early Manghit sources have already been discussed in detail by BREGEL (2000) and KÜGELGEN (2002) in their works on related topics.

the basic question on nomadic rule in a sedentary context and state formation in Uzbek Central Asia are approached from different perspectives.

The first two sections focus on long-term continuities in Uzbek Central Asia, both the continuity of nomadic ways of life and the dominant role of Uzbeks in the military and the state. The third and the fourth sections discuss in more detail the continuity in the privileged social position of the former conquerors' descendants in 18th century Bukhara. The fifth section focuses on the changing significance of the *atālīq*, the highest state post that Uzbek tribal chiefs could hold in the 18th century. The sixth section presents a closer look at an Uzbek tribal chief who rose to the rank of an *atālīq* in the early 18th century, demonstrating the close interrelationship between Bukharan state affairs and Uzbek tribal politics in those days. The seventh section addresses the evolution and connotations of two particular terms used to denote the “totality of the Uzbeks” in 18th century documents and chronicles.

1. A bird's eye view of the presence of nomads in Mawarannahr

I shall proceed by giving a very brief account of the presence of nomads in Transoxania from 1500 to 1800 and then I shall turn to some special features and developments of the Uzbek state. The Uzbek conquests around 1500–1512 seem to have brought some 300,000 to 500,000 nomadic Uzbeks from the Great Steppe into an agro-pastoral zone,⁶ where the native population (nomadic and sedentary groups) could barely have exceeded four million people.⁷ The process of sedentarization or rather the transition to transhumant modes of husbandry seems to have started in the 16th century, as indicated by the term “winter-camp-dweller” (*qishlāq-nishīn*) emerging in the late 16th century, as opposed to

6 According to BREGEL (1991:74, note 13) the number of only those Uzbeks who remained in Mawarannahr and Farghana could not have been less than 200,000 to 400,000, whereas the total figure was probably much higher. SULTANOV (1982:21) estimates the number of nomadic immigrants coming to the land between the Sir-Darya and Amu-Darya, to be 240,000 to 360,000.

7 The conquered areas were much larger than the territory controlled by Bukhara in the 18th century. According to a rough but informed estimate around 1600, at a time of maximal expansion of the Uzbek state, the number of the total population in Uzbek Turan (i.e. Mawarannahr and Khorezm) and Balkh (Khurasan) could not have been higher than five million people (DALE, 1994:20–21).

“village-dweller” (*dih-nishīn*) and “steppe-dweller” (*ṣahrā-nishīn*).⁸ The speed of this process, however, should not be overestimated. The first estimates of relative and absolute figures, supplied by a Bukharan writer and a European traveller around 1820 still note a significantly high proportion of nomadic groups. According to Meyendorff the total population in the Bukharan state was two and a half million, among them one million nomads.⁹ ‘Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī speaks of large numbers of nomads (*ḥasham-nishīnān*) in the surroundings of Bukhara, among them Arabs, Turkmens, Uzbeks, Qaraqalpaqs, and Qunghrat. Many of them lived on the River Amu-Darya. Another area characterized by a particularly strong nomadic presence was the Middle Zarafshan Valley: “One can say that in the region of Miyānkālāt and towards Samarqand, the number of tent-dwellers (*ḥasham-nishīnān*) equals that of the city-dwellers (*shahr-nishīnān*). All the way from Bukhārā up to Samarqand, Jizdaq and Ūra-Tīpa there are villages (*dihāt*), towns (*kūy*) and nomads (*ḥasham-nishīn*) side by side.”¹⁰

It is clear that Uzbeks were not the only nomadic group in Mawarannahr, nor have all the Uzbeks groups and subgroups preserved a nomadic way of life up to the 19th century. In the following, I shall not address the question of sedentarization which remains open. Instead, I propose to follow a richer stream of 18th century Bukharan sources, for the critical social distinction in the Bukharan state was evidently not conceptualised between “nomad” and “sedentary” but between “warrior”/“Uzbek” and “subject”.

2. A note on the periodization of the Uzbek state

When referring to the political system created by Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān’s conquests in the Central Asian agro-pastoral zone as the “Uzbek state”, I partly follow Robert McChesney’s usage of the term “Uzbek”, both for the tribal

8 On this often-repeated argument which has, as yet, never been substantiated, see IVANOV, 1958:72; ABDURAIMOV, 1961, II:91; SHANIYAZOV, 1986:89. None of these authors mentions even a single source; ABDURAIMOV (1991:91) refers to a short note of BARTOL’D (1963:210), which does not lead us any further. On the single textual evidence that has so far been identified, see PAUL, 2002:50. It appears in a document issued in 1006/1598 by Abdallāh Khān II and refers to the town of Sighnāq on the Middle Sir-Darya. The original Persian text has been published by BARTOL’D, 1973:201.

9 MEYENDORFF, 1826:197.

10 BUKHĀRĪ. Ed./tr. Schefer, 1876:77(text); 171–172(tr.).

groups that provided most of the state's military and administrative manpower, and for the political system as a whole.¹¹ A major feature that McChesney attributes to the Uzbek state is the prevalence of certain modes of steppe political practice within the conquered territory, notably the "Chingizid system" and the "appanage system"; i.e. the Chingizid descent of the sovereign that was indispensable to the legitimacy of political rule, and the decentralization of authority based on ideals of equality among the members of the royal clan. Sons, brothers, and to a certain extent also cousins of the grand khan could all claim an appropriate share of the patrimony. These princes bore the titles *sulṭān* or even *khān* and reigned in the various regions that had been allotted to them as appanages. Hence, adopting McChesney's criteria, we could infer that the abolition of the appanage system in the late 17th century¹² hints at the decline of the Uzbek state in a narrower sense of the word,¹³ though the prerogative of Chingizid sovereignty has been perpetuated well into the 18th century.

Even after the downfall of Chingizid dynastical rule, some prominent features of the Uzbek state had persisted. Therefore I propose untying the somewhat too close a link between the "Uzbek state" and the "Chingizid state" that McChesney seems to favour, confining the "Uzbek state", as such, in the strict sense of the word, to the political formations in 16th and 17th century Central Asia. A closer look at 18th century Bukhara shows how viable the basic concept of the "Uzbek state" remained, notwithstanding important political and dynastical changes.

18th century Bukhara witnessed a transition of supreme power from the last Chingizid dynasty (variously referred to as "Ashtarkhānids", "Jānids", or "Tuqāy-Tīmūrīds") to the Manghits, an Uzbek tribal dynasty. The first Manghit to claim full sovereignty was Muḥammad Raḥīm, who in 1756 declared himself *khān*.¹⁴

A major trend under Manghit rule was, as Bregel points out, the gradual decline of power of Uzbek tribal chiefs, and the strengthening of the central government of Bukhara. Relying on the support of the urban population and creating a standing army, the Manghits achieved the centralization of power. The military role of Uzbek tribal chiefs was finally crushed during the reign of the

11 McCHESNEY, 1991:49–51.

12 McCHESNEY, 1991:149–163; 1996:138–139.

13 This is a simplified rendering. McCHESNEY does not explicitly make the point, focusing instead on successive alterations introduced into the political system between the early 16th and the mid-18th century.

14 At his inauguration that was deliberately staged in a Chingizid style, see Sela, 2003.

Manghit ruler Amīr Naṣrallāh (1827–1860), whose standing army was able to quell all Uzbek military uprisings.¹⁵ As a result, the Bukharan state “became a despotic monarchy, where the *amīr*, enjoying practically unlimited power, ruled through a huge bureaucratic apparatus. Persons of mean or at least non Uzbek origin (former Persian slaves, Turkmens, etc.), tied to the sovereign by personal loyalty, held key positions in this bureaucracy.”¹⁶

Seen against this historical background, the development of political systems from the nomadic conquest to the emergence of the “despotic” or “bureaucratic” Bukharan state reveal a long-term continuity which, in my view, can be regarded as a period of Uzbek statehood.

Throughout the 18th century, Uzbeks were by far the politically most dominant group in the Bukharan state and they were the backbone of the army. The highest state ranks and posts, in particular those vested with military authority, were reserved for their tribal leaders. When 18th century chronicles and documents speak of “the Uzbeks” in general terms, they often refer to military competence and prowess, and to a superior social position of the military (*sipāh*, *asākir*), as opposed to the mean estate of the subjects, i.e. the “poor” or “common people” (*fuqarā*).

Not until the mid-19th century could the Bukharan state, with its expanding non-tribal standing army establish a firm control over the former Uzbek military estate. The decisive shift in the balance of power towards the central authority finally shattered the privileged social position of the descendants of the former conquerors. Furthermore, the Uzbek warriors were reluctant to serve in the newly emerging regular army, whose instructors were Iranians, British-Indian deserters and Russian slaves. For, the chief arms of services of the nascent Bukharan standing army were infantry and artillery, whereas the Uzbek warriors favoured fighting in cavalry detachments.¹⁷ Thus, I would argue that around 1850, the Uzbeks lost control over the military domain in the Bukharan state, which they had gained around 1500. Seen from this point of view, the process of adaptation of nomadic rule to a sedentary society has lasted much longer than has hitherto been supposed. It was not a matter of two to three generations, as in other cases of nomadic conquests of sedentary areas, but a long and complicated process lasting for three and a half centuries.

15 BREGEL, 1998:419.

16 BREGEL, 1998:418.

17 KHANYKOV, 1843:306–314; GALKIN, 1869:210–212; TROITSKAIA, 1953.

The following section points to recurring textual evidence in late Ashtarkhanid and early Manghit sources that gives us some insight into autochthonous (emic) conceptualisations of what we might call “Uzbek statehood in the eighteenth century”.

3. The Uzbeks as warriors and their concept of the ideal state

As I have already mentioned earlier, we can see from 18th century Bukharan sources that an important social distinction is made between “warriors”/ “Uzbeks” on the one hand, and the “common people” on the other hand. Sources from the very beginning up to the very end of the 18th century reveal a striking persistence of the general concept that Uzbeks, as military commanders and soldiers, are entitled to receive a certain share of the state revenues from agricultural lands. Seen from their point of view, the ideal state is one in which their vested interests are safeguarded and the system of allocation and redistribution operates smoothly.

An early 18th century court chronicle outlines the ideal state of affairs in retrospect, referring to the rule of a Bukharan khan who died in 1702:

“In the days of this sublime king (Subhān-Qulī Khān, r. 1682–1702) the commanders and the troops (*umarā wa lashkarī*) lived absolutely free from anxiety and worries. Year by year they carried off their provisions and pay from the treasury and the peasants.”¹⁸

In the first decade of the 18th century a conflict unfolds between the military estate and the administrative bureaucracy. The same author, who has outlined the ideal system in the quotation above, describes its temporary breakdown as being a major reason for the downfall of the successive ruler, ‘Ubaydallāh Khān (r. 1702–1711). Please note in the following quotation that the terms “army” and “Uzbeks” are used synonymously:

“Discord arose between the king (*pādshāh*) and the army (*sipāh*). Trust and sincerity – such as is due [between them] – ceased to exist. (...). The courtiers

18 ‘*Alūfa wa marsūmāt-i khwudhā-rā dar har sana az khazīna wa ra’āyā mīburdand.* (MUHAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 6b; MUHAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:17). This is obviously a retrospectively idealized view. The poet Turdī Farāghī, a member of the Uzbek tribe of Yūz and a contemporary of Subhān-Qulī Khān, strongly criticizes the rule of the latter, in particular the decline of virtue and virility, and the growing influence of ladies (*xotun*) and eunuchs (*xojasaroy*) at the Bukharan court (TURDI, 1971:24).

(*sarāyān*), especially Bāltū Sarāyi and some government clerks and agents (*‘amala wa fa‘ala-i sarkār*) noticed that the king was not well disposed towards the military leaders (*umarā-yi sipāh*). (...) This stupid and short-sighted bunch of people was afraid of the Uzbeks. They disregarded the law (*ḥukm*) and started to lodge rash complaints about the state of the common people (*fuqarā*) and the uniform authority of the army (*ḥukm-i yaksān-i sipāh*). They carried it to a point where they brought along orders (*ḥukm*) and confiscated the agricultural estates and pensions (*arāḍiya wa tankhwāh*) of the Uzbeks. (...) Whereas the assignment of provisions for the soldiers was fully indicated in current fiscal inventories of agricultural land, they imagined [this agricultural land] to be their own private and tax-free land and disarranged the papers of the inventory register. The soldiers [in consequence] received nothing but a piece of paper”.¹⁹

This narrative clearly shows that the appropriation of agricultural surplus by the army could not have functioned without the paperwork and the files of the central financial administration. The administration was attached to the palace and, at times, pursued also its own particular interests. As the bureaucrats deliberately obstructed the established pattern of redistribution, the soldiers were left with “uncovered cheques” in their hands. In order to defend and safeguard their vested rights and interests, they directed their military power against the supreme ruler. They killed and replaced him shortly afterwards, in 1711.

We now turn to a source from the late 18th century: *Majma‘ al-arqām*, a manual of instructions for the Bukharan fiscal administration written in 1212/1798, during the reign of the Manghit ruler Shāh Murād (r. 1785–1800).²⁰ It demonstrates that the concept of the Uzbeks as warriors and their claim to the

19 *Wa barāt-i ‘alūfa-i sipāhī ki az arāḍiya-i rāyij-i daftarī fī l-jumla mawjūd mīshud, milk-i khālīš-i khwudhā pindāshā, awrāq-i daftar-rā parīshān kardand; sipāhī ba-juz kāghadh chīzī namīgirift.* (MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 202b–203a; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:235).

20 BADI‘-DĪWĀN. Facs. ed. & tr. Vil’danova, 1981. For further information about the author, Mīrzā Badī‘-Dīwān, a chancery official (*dīwān*) who had been promoted to the highest post in the Bukharan fiscal administration – *wazīr-i dīwān-i a‘lá* – in charge “of the books of assessment of receipts and disbursement of the treasury”, see BREGEL, 2000:1–6, 36. Bregel devotes special attention to a small treatise on Bukharan ranks and offices which as he convincingly shows, was appended to Mīrzā Badī‘-Dīwān’s manual by a copyist and spuriously ascribed to the same author. This appendix (*Tadhyīl*) has attracted considerable interest since SEMENOV (1948) published a Russian translation. Bregel’s critical investigations lead to the conclusion that “the *Tadhyīl* cannot be considered an entirely reliable description of the Bukharan administration before and after Shāh Murād” (BREGEL, 2000:18). The following quotation is taken from Mīrzā Badī‘ *dīwān*’s original work.

allocation of agricultural surplus was sustained even at the end of the 18th century. The manual describes the methods of documentation employed by the Bukharan revenue department and served as a kind of handbook for officials of the Bukharan treasury. Most of the rules and principles of fiscal administration described here, refer to the “income” side of model account books, especially to the design of tax registers of agricultural land irrigated by extensive channel systems, such as in the Bukhara oasis. On the “expenditure” or allocation (*tawjīha*) side, the model account books, or tax administration registers, reveal a striking persistence of features of Uzbek tribal organisation, and of the Uzbek warriors’ concept of the ideal state of affairs mentioned above. Thus, after having registered the taxed agricultural land on every level of administration, from the province (*wilāyat*) down to the administrative village (*qariya*), the revenue officials are instructed to proceed in the following way in order to complete their administrative records:

“Thereupon underneath the total revenue (*jamʿ*) of each province and each village (*qariya*), one has to write the name of the warrior (*ghāzī*) to whom the grain and the cash is to be delivered. The warrior has to be listed along with his tribe (*urūgh*), and if he is a dependant, along with [the name of] his chief (*matbūʿ*); if he is an office-holder (*ʿamal-dār*), along with the name of his office. Furthermore, the ‘method of assignments’ (*tarīqa-i tawjīha*) is the following: First the names of ‘those allowed a fixed pension’ (*muwazzafīn*) have to be written in such a way that first the name of a commander of several soldiers (*amīr-i baʿḍī ʿasākir*) is written along with the name of his office and tribe.

With regard to the rank (*rutba*) of that commander according to office and tribe (*dar ʿamal wa urūgh*), the ‘two sides’ have been fixed and designated in such a manner that to ‘the right side’ (*jānib-i ūng*) [tribes] like [the following] take [their] place (*ūrūn*)²¹: Manghit, Kīnakas, Karait, Dūrmān, Qungrāt, Khiṭāy, Qipchāq, Ūtārchī, Turkmān, Arlāt, Kiyat, Qirghiz, Qalān, Ūyshūn, Jūblājī, Qārī, Mughūl, Hāfiz, Ūglān, Tīlād. And to the left (*taraf-i sūl*): Qaṭaghān, Sarāy, Yābū, Baḥrīn, Jalāyir, Qānglī, Yūz, Mīng, Naimān, Qārliq, Burqūt, Ārghūn, Qūshchī, Ūghlān, Qalmāq, Fūlādchī, Qirq, Alchīn, Majār, Chīnbāy, Badāy, As,

21 In 18th century Bukhara, the Turkish term *ūrūn* (“place, seat”) can be distinguished from two other terms used for the concept of official “posts”, namely *manşab* and *ʿamal*. The *ūrūn* fixes court protocol positions of high officials, i.e. their seats to the right or left side of the ruler on ceremonial occasions (BREGEL, 2000:20–21, 24; cf. BLEICHSTEINER, 1952; MCCHESENEY, 1983:39–41).

Chibūrghān, Kīlchī, Tama, Misīṭ, Tātār, Ūyghūr, Baghlān, Īlach, Tanghut, *shāgird-pīsha*^{22, 23}

The long list of tribal names mentions twenty groups on the right (*ūng*) wing, and thirty-two on the left (*sūl*) wing. Thus we see the Uzbeks depicted once again as a military estate. It is worth noting that the two accounts presented above basically describe the same procedure by which the descendants of the former conquerors extracted agricultural surplus. No originals of the combined tax registers and army payrolls alluded to in these statements have been discovered as yet.

Considering the high rank the author of the “fiscal instructions” held in the Bukharan administration, there can be no doubt about the implementation of his scheme in Bukhara around 1800. We gain some insight into how the military-administrative system functioned from letters written by the successive Bukharan ruler, Amīr Ḥaydar (r. 1800–1826), to his governor in Qarshi. Here I am referring to a manuscript kept at Tashkent: copies of 279 letters, all written between 1800 and 1803,²⁴ which is an average of nearly two letters per week. Most of these letters deal with military issues. Roughly, half of the letters order the mobilisation and movements of troops; the other half allots revenue titles as salaries for soldiers of merit. A typical order of the first category, for instance, tells the governor of Qarshi to send some 700 soldiers (among them a specified number of Manghits from different subsections, as well as from other tribes) to the neighbouring district of Khuzar. A typical order of the second category, in turn, tells the governor of Qarshi to assign to some ten or fifteen soldiers, who are named, the revenue of one, or two, or five “ploughs of land” (*juft-i gāw*), sometimes also specifying the preferred village and area. We can infer from

22 Around 1800 the *shāgird-pīsha* (“servants; apprentices”) was a non-tribal group, that constituted a low-ranking and, numerically speaking, strictly confined body in the Bukharan military. They were mostly employed as guards, see VIATKIN, 1928:15–16; ABDURAIMOV, 1961:54. In 1123/1711, when Uzbek rebels attacked and looted the citadel of Bukhara, the *shāgird-pīshagān* were closely associated with the ruler’s confidants (*maḥramān*) and the palace eunuchs (*khwāja-sarāyān*) (MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 246b; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:275). In the 1830s and 1840s, two diverse connotations of the term *shagird-pisha* have been recorded by European travellers: a) a sizeable non-tribal section of the Bukharan cavalry made up of “mixed tribes of Bokhara” which were under the ruler’s direct command (BURNES, 1834/1992, II:374), and b) the Bukharan population of low, i.e. non-Uzbek origin, comprising Tajiks, persons of Persian descent as well as freed slaves (KHANYKOV, 1843:185).

23 Badī-Dīwān. Facs. ed. & tr. Vil’danova, 1981:f.14b–15a(text); 37 (tr.).

24 *Maktūbāt-i Amīr Ḥaydar*, MS. This collection has been studied in detail by VIATKIN, 1928.

these letters that the Bukharan ruler exercised much tighter control over all kinds of military affairs than a hundred years earlier.²⁵

The following two sections explore if and how continuities and changes in the political and military spheres during the century of transition from Ashtarkhanid to Manghit dynastic rule are reflected in documents, especially in letters of appointment issued to office-holders by Bukharan rulers.

4. “The Uzbeks” in eighteenth century Bukharan documents

18th century Bukharan documents usually refer to “the Uzbeks” or to “the totality of the Uzbeks” in cases where the ruler appoints certain individuals to high-ranking positions in the Bukharan state, in particular when the official position is closely linked to the military sphere.

One such example is the appointment of Farhād *biy bahādur atālīq* to the post of a general and “chief-commander” (*īlghār-bāshī*)²⁶. After announcing that Farhād *biy* has been bestowed the rank of a chief-commander of the victorious army, the Bukhara ruler calls the brave amirs (*umarā*), proud warriors (*mubārizān-i ghairat-anjām*), the toiling army-people (*lashkariyān*), those who volunteer to risk their lives, all the ninety-two tribal divisions of the Uzbeks of Mawarannahr (*jamhūr-i nawad-u-dū firqa-i ūzbakīya-i Māwarānnahr*) and the other soldiers of the steppe and the city (*sāʿir lashkar-rawān-i šahrā wa shahr*) to recognise the general’s authority and to obey his commands.²⁷

In documents referring to the office and rank of a *qāḍī-yi ʿaskar*, a “military judge”, we again come across the connection made between the army and “the Uzbeks”. For instance, in an original letter of appointment issued in 1130/1718 by Abū l-Fayḍ Khān relates the following: “We have bestowed upon Ibrāhīm Khwāja *raʿīs* the famous office and excellent rank of a military judge (*qāḍā-yi ʿaskar*) of the noble province (*wilāyat*) of Bukhara – may it be protected from

25 We should, however, bear in mind, that in the meantime the territorial realm of Bukhara had decreased considerably, and that the province of Qarshi, being a stronghold of the Manghit tribe, was particularly closely tied to the capital of Bukhara.

26 In the 16th century, *īlghār* meant “a rapid military campaign; light cavalry” (PAVET DE COURTEILLE, 1870/1972:131–132). Around 1800, the Bukharan ruler occasionally used the term in the sense of “troops; garrison” posted in a fort (*qūrghān*) (*Maktūbāt-i Amīr Ḥaydar*, MS, f. 115b).

27 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHAʿĀT*, MS, f. 131a. The first to take note of this collection and to advocate its study was SEMENOV, 1954:69.

disaster and evil! – and its dependencies in the same manner as the previous *qāḍīs*. The great sayyids, the respected *amīrs*, all the victorious army (*sipāh*) and soldiers (*asākir*) in whose footsteps follows victory, and [...] ²⁸ all the Uzbeks of the districts and places subjected [to Bukhara] should acknowledge the above mentioned [person] as holding this office”. They should not oppose his judicial authority, and they should have all their legal affairs settled by him.” ²⁹

Another letter of appointment, available only in an abbreviated version, mentions a certain Qāḍī Khwāja Shāh appointed to the position of military judge of Bukhara. Here again, “all the Uzbeks of the province” (*tamām-i ūzbakīya-i wilāyat*) are called to recognise him as military judge. In addition to the standard formula, the ruler here also calls on the “judges of the Tajiks of the places mentioned” (*quḍāt-i tājikīya-i maḥāll-i madhkūr*) to obey the supreme judicial authority of the military judge (*qāḍī-yi askar*) and not to oppose him or any deputy (*nā'ib*) he might appoint in the districts. ³⁰ Thus this document obviously associates the military and non-military spheres with ethnic categories: Uzbeks and Tajiks respectively.

Furthermore, we find the term “Uzbeks” in documents nominating certain individuals to the rank of *atālīq*, which until the middle of the 18th century was the highest position an Uzbek amir could be appointed to. In a letter of appointment, issued [in ca. 1131/1719] by Abū l-Fayḍ Khān to Farhād *biy*, the authority of the *atālīq* was defined as follows:

“We have bestowed upon [Farhād *biy bahādur*] the famous office and excellent rank of *atālīqī* over the realm of the noble province (*wilāyat*) of Bukhara – may God protect it from evil! – according to the model of the previous *atālīqs* with full and sole authority (*bi l-istiqlāl wa l-infirād*). The religious dignitaries (*arkān-i dīn wa millat*), the chancery officials (*dīwāniyān*), the chiefs and local headmen (*arbāb wa kadkhudāyān*), the Uzbek tribes of Mawarannahr (*īl wa aqwām-i ūzbakīya-i Māwarānnahr*), the commanders of fifty and the commanders of ten (*īlīk-āqāsiyān wa daha-bāshiyān*), those with bad and those with good fortune (*yābkhwurān wa ābkhwurān*), and the entire population of the city, the district and the province mentioned above [Bukhara]

28 Due to a defect in the original document, two or three words here are missing between “*asākir-i firūzī-ma'āthir wa*” and “*mutawaffina wa tamām-i ūzbakīya-i tūmānāt wa maḥallhā-yi maḥkūmāt*”.

29 Central State Archives, Republic of Uzbekistan, Fond I-126, op. 1, d. 2.

30 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA'ĀT*, MS, f. 104ab. Neither have I been able to identify the office-holder, nor to establish the date of this document.

have to recognise the above-mentioned [Farhād biy] as *atālīq* and “Pillar of the Amirs” (*‘umdat al-umarā*) of the above-mentioned province [Bukhara].”³¹

In 1756, on the occasion of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s ascendance to the throne of the Bukharan khan, the rising Manghit dynasty confirmed in principle the essentially military role of the Uzbek tribes and their legitimate claim to a share in government authority; as one of their court chroniclers expressed it:

“It was the honoured custom of the Sultans descending from [the Chingizid] Juchī and the mighty Uzbek khaqans (*khawāqīn-i ūzbakīya*) that among the thirty-two tribes of the Uzbek warriors (*sī wa dū ūrūgh-i ‘asākir-i ūzbakīya*), the rule of favours and the equality of kindness was observed. [Thus] the head of each tribe (*sardār-i har khailī*) and the chief of each troop (*pīshwā-yi har faujī*) were to be assigned the appropriate offices of authority and the suitable posts of governing according their ranks and their distinction within the [the hierarchy of the two] sides (*ba-qadr-i marātib wa tafāwut dar jānib*)”.³²

5. The changing role of the *atālīq* in eighteenth century Bukhara

The post and authority of the *atālīq* were subject to considerable change in 18th century Bukhara. In the Chingizid appanage system, i.e. up to the late 17th century, the *atālīqs* acted as chief military and political advisors to Chingizid princes and appanage holders.³³ Under these conditions, several Uzbek amirs held the post, at one and the same time, but they were based in different parts of the khanate and bound to different Chingizid authorities. In 1114/1702 the Bukharan khan granted the rank of *atālīq* and the honorary title “Pillar of the Amirs” (*‘umdat al-umarā*) to Muḥammad Raḥīm Yūz.³⁴ Still, a few years later there were several Uzbek tribal chiefs holding simultaneously the post and rank of *atālīq*.³⁵

The 1710s witnessed a readjustment of the office to the new political (i.e. *post* “appanage system”) conditions. The idea that there could be only one chief

31 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT*, MS, f. 129b–130a. See also below, section 6.

32 *KARMĪNĀGĪ*, MS, f. 190b. The translation partly follows BREGEL, 2000:20.

33 MCCHESENEY, 1983.

34 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 20b, 28b; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:34–35, 43–44.

35 During the Balkh campaign of 1119/1707, three Uzbek chiefs bearing the title *atālīq* were present in the royal camp, among them also Muḥammad Raḥīm Yūz (MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 118a).

military and political executive of a Chingizid ruler – a plenipotentiary *atālīq* – was implemented in political practice. As the importance of the (sole) *atālīq* in the Bukharan central government grew, the post became the object of intense rivalry between aspiring Uzbek amirs.³⁶ As is well known, the Manghit family that grabbed the post of *atālīq* immediately after the above mentioned Farhād did not cede it again. They came to be the most powerful men in 18th century Bukhara, acquiring supreme political authority and ousting the Chingizid-Ashtarkhanid dynasty.

On the accession of the Manghits to the throne of Bukhara, the political and military powers of the non-Manghit Uzbek amirs, officiating as *atālīqs*, declined. Immediately after the first Manghit ruler, Muḥammad Raḥīm (*atālīq* in 1160–1170/1747–1756, *khān* in 1170–1172/1756–1758), had himself proclaimed khan, he appointed his chief officials. The post of the *atālīq*, along with the honorary title “Pillar of the Amirs”, was given to Khwājam-Yār *biy* Ūtarchī – the son of Farhād *biy* and the tribal leader of the Khitay-Qipchaq at that time. The text of his diploma is not available. However, we can tell the decreasing significance of the post from the court chronicler’s narrative, who summarizes the content of his letter of appointment in the following words: “And a decree which the entire world has to obey was issued that the amirs and the Uzbek troops (*‘umarā wa sipāh-i ūzbakīya*) should address official petitions to him and should expect an answer [from him].”³⁷

When the second Manghit ruler of Bukhara, Muḥammad Dāniyāl *biy atālīq* (r. 1758–1785), reclaimed the title *atālīq* for Manghit sovereign, the post could obviously not any longer be conferred to a subaltern tribal chief. By the end of the 18th century, the post of the *atālīq* was dissociated from the realm of the military. According to an anonymous treatise on Bukharan state offices, around 1785–1800 the *atālīq*’s responsibility was to supervise the irrigation system and the distribution of water of the River Zarafshan from Samarqand down to Qarakul.³⁸ There are doubts about the authenticity of the source just referred to. Evidence from narrative sources, however, affirm that from the period of Amīr Ḥaydar (1800–1826) until the end of Manghit rule, the rank of *atālīq* was merely an honorary title. Parallel to the declining significance of the *atālīq*, the importance of the post of *qūšbīgī* (*qoshbegi*), which was not strictly reserved to persons of Uzbek tribal affiliation, steadily increased during the Manghit period.

36 See below, section 5.

37 KARMĪNAGĪ, MS, f. 192b. The English translation follows BREGEL, 2000:13–14.

38 *Tadhyil*, in: BADI’-DIWĀN. Facs. ed. & tr. Vil’danova, 1981: f. 89b–90a(text); 95(tr.).

Thus, the *qoshbegi* came to be the head of the entire administration of the state and the second person after the sovereign.³⁹ The declining importance of the *atālīq* highlights just one aspect of the overall decline in power of Uzbek tribal chiefs and the strengthening of the central government of Bukhara under the Manghit rulers.

6. The career of an Uzbek *amir*: Farhād biy

Farhād *biy* is an Uzbek tribal leader (*amīr*) whose military and political career during the first two decades of the 18th century is rather well documented. Copies of four letters of appointment issued to him are preserved in a Tashkent *inshā'* manuscript which, however, omits the names of the issuing authority as well as the dates. The copies appear under the following rubrics and in the following order:

1. Diploma of the post of an *atālīq* for Farhād *biy atālīq*;⁴⁰
2. Diploma of the post of an *īlghār-bāshī* and head of the army for Farhād *biy atālīq*;⁴¹
3. Diploma of the post of a governor of Samarqand province for Farhād *biy bahādur parwānachī*;⁴²
4. Diploma of the post of a governor of Anhār province in the manner of a reward for Farhād *biy*.⁴³

Contemporary chroniclers provide additional information. Farhād *biy* rose to prominence during the rule of 'Ubaydallāh Khān (1702–1711). We know that in 1116/1705 his base was a fortress located a night's ride from the village of Charkhīn (on the outskirts of Samarqand) on a route linking Samarqand with the capital, Bukhara.⁴⁴ He was a member of the Ūtārchī clan of the Uzbek tribe of

39 BREGEL, 2000:7–12, 14–15; KÜGELGEN, 2002:85–94.

40 *Manshūr-i atālīqī ki ba-imārat-panāh Farhād biy atālīq niwishta-and* (MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA'ĀT, MS, f., 128a–130a).

41 *Manshūr-i īlghār-bāshīgī-yi 'asākīr-i fīrūzī-ma'āthīr wa sardārī-yi sipāh ki ba-imārat panāh Farhād biy atālīq niwishta-and* (MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA'ĀT, MS, f. 130a–131a).

42 *Manshūr-i hukūmat-i wilāyat-i Samarqand firdaus-mānand ki ba-Farhād biy bahādur parwānachī niwishta-and* (MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA'ĀT, MS, f. 140a–141a).

43 *Manshūr-i hukūmat-i wilāyat-i Anhār ba-ṭarīqa-i juldu ki ba-Farhād biy niwishta-and* (MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA'ĀT, MS, f. 151b–152a).

44 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 42a, MUḤAMMAD AMĪN . Tr. Semenov, 1957:57.

Khitay-Qipchaq.⁴⁵ The Khitay-Qipchaq were one of the most powerful and largest Uzbek tribes in Bukhara. According to an 18th century chronicler they counted 100,000 families in 1129/1716–17, two early 19th century estimates are 120,000 persons, and 80,000 families respectively.⁴⁶ The Khitay-Qipchaq tribe was also among those Uzbek tribes that had most strongly retained a pastoral economy and a nomadic or transhumant way of life.⁴⁷

Farhād *biy* Ūtārchī (Ūtārijī) in 1119/1707 took part in the conquest of Balkh, leading a body of Khitay and Qipchaq troops (along with some of ‘Ubaydallāh Khān’s personal Qalmaq body-guards in one action).⁴⁸ He was among the distinguished commanders honoured in the celebrations upon the return of the victorious army to Bukhara.⁴⁹ Shortly after, still in the year 1119/1707–08, Farhād *biy* was rewarded on the khan’s order (*yārliġh*) for his devoted services in the Balkh campaign with the governorship (*hukūmat*) of Shahr-i Sabz.⁵⁰ The letter of appointment has not been preserved. The event has, however, been related by a court chronicler. His narrative deserves our attention, as it points to the decidedly pastoral economic interests of Farhād *biy*’s tribal following. Furthermore, the case shows how closely intertwined Bukharan state affairs and Uzbek tribal politics were in those days. Shahr-i Sabz, a fertile hill region, was dominated by an Uzbek tribal coalition referred to (in the first two decades of the 18th century) as the “Ūng-Sūl”, or “Ūng wa Sūl”, the right and the

45 His father, in all likelihood, was Khwāja-Qulī *biy* Ūtārchī (Ūtāji), who held in 1096/1684–85 the governorship (*hukūmat*) of Samarqand and rebelled against the Bukharan ruler, “relying on the multitude of the Khitāy tribe (*qabila-i Khitāy*)”. (TIRMIDHĪ. Facs. ed. & tr. Salakhedinova, 1971:123–125(text); 88–89(tr.). On these events see BURTON, 1997:332–333. In 1866, the Utarchi were considered to be the aristocratic section (*bekskoe otdelenie*) of the *Ktai*, i.e. Khitay (GREBENKIN, 1872:100). 18th century sources mostly mention the “Khitāy and Qipchāq”, or “Khitāy-Qipchāq” together, as if forming a stable union or even a single tribe. For further information on the Khitay-Qipchaq see IVANOV, 1937:27–32.

46 BALKHĪ, MS, f. 292b; IVANOV, 1937:30.

47 On the early 18th century, see the evidence quoted below. In the 19th century Khanykov still lists them as nomadic tribes: “2) Khitai, nomadise between Bukhara and Kermine. (...) 4) Kipchak, nomadise between Katta Kurgan and Samarkand” (KHANYKOV, 1843:64). For a discussion of 19th century evidence see IVANOV, 1937:30–31; TASHEV, 1972:52–54.

48 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f.100a; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:114. Farhād *biy*’s fortress could well have been Katta-Qurghan, which came to be a central place of the Khitay-Qipchaq territory in the Middle Zarafshan Valley in the early 19th century (IVANOV, 1937:27, 31–32).

49 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 118b; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN . Tr. Semenov, 1957:134. On the background to the Balkh campaign, see MCCHESENEY, 1991:163–166.

50 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 132a; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:150.

left (wing).⁵¹ By issuing the above-mentioned order, the khan intended to punish the Ūng-Sūl, as they had joined the Balkh campaign only reluctantly and deserted his forces once the battleground was reached.

“Furthermore”, the chronicler states, “the king thought that the Khiṭāy-Qipchāq tribe (*jamāʿat*) would solve the task of conquering the said province when he issued the royal order (*yārliḡh*) of that region’s governorship to Farhād. The painstaking *amīr* instantly set out towards the Khiṭāy-Qipchāq tribespeople (*īl wa ulūs*) who were living in the region of Qarshī, in the surroundings of Samarqand, and in Miyānkālāt. On his arrival, he spread the good news of such an authority among the people, and the prospects of pastures and grassland (*charāgāh wa ʿalafzār*) of that fresh land. The Khiṭāy-Qipchāq community (*qawm*) was living in poor conditions since their tribespeople (*īl wa ulūs-i khwud-hā*) were dispersed throughout all of the districts. They therefore wished to have such a fortified home [like Shahr-i Sabz]. The elders of that community cheered; as soon as the herald’s cry (*jār*) was heard, the troops gathered. They assembled in the area of Pul-i Mīrzā, which had been fixed as a meeting point (*būljār*). The remaining council (*kīnkāj*) was held in that area in the open air.”⁵²

Farhād *biy* failed to conquer Shahr-i Sabz with his Khitay-Qipchaq followers. Still, he was obviously promoted to a higher rank. Two years later, when he is mentioned as having set out for another campaign to Balkh in Shaʿbān 1121/October 1709, he is already referred to as Farhād *parwānachī* Ūtārchī (Ūtājī).⁵³

Two copies of diplomas issued to Farhād may reflect the difference in status between a *biy* and a *parwānachī*. Whereas Farhād, who only held the title

51 On some possible implications of the term, see MCCHESENEY, 1991:163. There is little information about the subgroups of the “Ūng wa Sūl”. Their leader is usually identified as a Keneges (Kanikas). In 1121/1709, however, a Manghit amir, Khudā-Yār *parwānachī* Manghit, was the head of the Ūng-Sūl tribe (*sardār-i firqa-i Ūng-Sūl*) (MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 153a; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:172).

52 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 132ab; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:150–151.

53 MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS, f. 173a; MUḤAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov, 1957:193; Ṭāli (MS, f. 8a) clearly spells *Ūtārchī*. The title *parwānachī* referred to one of the most prestigious court ranks in Bukhara. His duty, at least in the literal sense, was to hand over royal letters of appointment: He folded these letters and attached them to the turbans of the recipients who wore them for three days (ṬĀLĪ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:149, note 83). On the ranking of Bukharan state titles see SEMENOV, 1954:60–61. Here Semenov underlines the fact that state titles did not correspond to specific duties, at least not in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

biy, had received the tiny “province of Anhār” (*wilāyat-i Anhār*),⁵⁴ Farhād *parwānachī* was appointed to the governorship of the greater province of Samarqand (*ḥukūmat-i wilāyat-i Samarqand*).⁵⁵

A chronicler close to court circles has recorded the appointment or re-appointment of Farhād *biy parwānachī* Ūtārchī to the governorship (*ḥukūmat*) of Samarqand for the year of accession of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān (1711–1747), i.e. 1123/1711.⁵⁶ The chronicler’s narrative continues with Samarqand affairs. Here, Farhād *parwānachi* is depicted as a very brutal governor who oppressed the houses of the common people (*fuqarā*). News of his transgressions reached the court, but to no avail. Finally, in 1125/1713, “all the soldiers” (*hama sipāhī*) gathered in the city of Bukhara and decided to act in favour of another Uzbek chief. “They removed him [Farhād] from office and gave the governorship of Samarqand to Muḥammad Raḥīm *biy* Dūrmān. Since it was the home (*khāna*) of the Khitāy-Qipchāq, he could not establish a firm hold on that country (*mamlakat*)”⁵⁷ and called in the help of Sulṭān *tūqsāba*, his Keneges (Kīnakās) in-law and ally, from Shahr-i Sabz.

Tensions and hostilities further escalated. Farhād retired to his fortress and started to increasingly challenge state authorities. In 1126/1714 the Bukharan ruler Abū l-Fayḍ Khān laid siege to Farhād’s fortress (*qūrghān*). Farhād’s people had already fled to the mountains when one of the khan’s chief commanders sided with the besieged Farhād.⁵⁸ Following these events, we find Farhād moving around in Samarqand, Shahr-i Sabz, Qarshi, and again Miyankal, hiding and networking amongst competing Uzbek amirs. In 1129/1716–17 he put into action a well-planned scheme and struck with all his military power. He conquered Samarqand and appointed one of his tribesmen, Bāqī *biy* Qipchāq as governor (*ḥākīm*) of Qarshi.⁵⁹ Central Asia news that had been recorded by an

54 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT*, MS, f. 151b. The region of Anhār (lit. “the channels”) is located to the west of the city of Samarqand; the steep bank of the great Anhār-channel being the dividing line between the Samarqand oasis and the steppe (MAEV, 1875:3). Anhār was usually considered merely as an administrative subdivision (*tūmān*) of the greater Samarqand province, see VIATKIN, 1902:43–57. In an order (*ḥukm*) issued by ‘Ubaydallāh Khān, Anhār is also referred to as the *tūmān* of Anhār of the Samarqand province (*wilāyat*), see EGANI / CHEKHOVICH, 1982:61. This order mentions ‘Arab, Aimāq and Uzbek groups among the population of Anhār.

55 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT*, MS, f. 140a.

56 ṬĀLĪ’, MS, f. 33b; ṬĀLĪ’. Tr. Semenov, 1959:37.

57 ṬĀLĪ’, MS, f. 33b–34a; ṬĀLĪ’. Tr. Semenov, 1959:38.

58 ṬĀLĪ’, MS, f. 34a–35a; ṬĀLĪ’. Tr. Semenov, 1959:38.

59 ṬĀLĪ’, MS, f. 40b; ṬĀLĪ’. Tr. Semenov, 1959:43.

Uzbek émigré in Lahore gives another account of these events. According to this report, Farhād *biy*'s military actions were motivated by pastoral interests of his tribesmen and accompanied by the movement of flocks in search of new pastures:

“In 1129/1716–17 for lack of pasture (*az tangī[-yi] charāgāh*) the Khitāy and Qipchāq tribes (*aqwām*), roughly a hundred thousand families, moved from the direction of Miyānkāl to the surroundings of Samarqand and Qarshī and stripped the sown fields and the orchards bare like locusts. They treated the mean and nobles, the little and the big people in whatever manner they chose to do so.”⁶⁰

For two years Farhād *biy* was able to defy almost all efforts on the part of Bukharan troops and allies to encroach on his newly acquired territory. The only military success the weak Bukharan centre could claim was the conquest of the fortress of Kasbī⁶¹ by a certain Mīrzā Bēg Turkmān who was based at *Labāb*, the [Amu-Darya] riverside and “for two years launched battles against the Khitāys (*khitāyān*).”⁶² On the route linking Bukhara with Samarqand, the Bukharan frontier-post was the town of Karmina, which Farhād *biy* unsuccessfully attacked with his own allies, the *Yētī Urūgh* (“Seven Tribes”), in 1130/1717–18.⁶³

The pace of events accelerated when in Rajab 1131/May–June 1719, or 1130/June 1718,⁶⁴ Farhād *biy*'s relations to the Bukharan court completely changed. During the celebrations marking the first Friday of the month of Rajab, the two chief amirs, Ibrāhīm *atālīq* Kīnakas⁶⁵ and Khwāja-Qulī *dīwān-bēgī*

60 BALKHĪ, MS, f. 292a.

61 A small village called “Kazbi” by MAEV (1875:43) is located on the caravan route linking Bukhara with Qarshi.

62 ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 41a; ṬĀLĪʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:43. Semenov’s translation has “one year”. Semenov’s translation on several occasions proves to be imprecise and, at times, even misleading. I do not point to all the divergent renderings where they occur.

63 ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 41a; ṬĀLĪʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:43.

64 The year 1131/1718–19 is quoted by the chronicler at the beginning of his detailed narration of these events. There is, however, reason to doubt. The chronicler states that in the year “one thousand one hundred and thirty-one, on Friday the 4th of Rajab” a public solemnity was held in Bukhara according to dynastical custom to celebrate the first Friday in the month of Rajab (ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 94b; ṬĀLĪʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:45). The 4th of Rajab was a Tuesday in 1131/1719, and a Friday in 1130/1718 (WÜSTENFELD/MAHLER, 1926:24).

65 He was appointed *atālīq* in the aftermath of the Khitay-Qipchaq expansion in 1129/1716–17 (BALKHĪ, MS, f. 292b). Ibrāhīm *atālīq* turned into a major opponent of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān in the 1710s and 1720s (HOLZWARTH, 2006:192–195). The modern Bukharan intellectual Fiṭrat

Qatāghān, received orders and blessings for action “against the Qipchāq tribespeople (*īl-ulūs-i Qipchāq*) and Farhād *biy* Ūtarjī, who had kindled the flame of injustice in the garden-like Samarqand and burned the harvest of wealth of the Muslims.”⁶⁶ The two commanders in charge did not move since they considered their own forces as no match for the military strength of the Qipchaq (*aqwām-i Qipchāq*). Instead of setting out against the enemy, some 2,000 auxiliary troops (Kīnakas, Manghit and Juyūt) who had arrived from Shahr-i Sabz, the stronghold of Ibrāhīm *atālīq*, started to molest and loot peasant (*fuqarā*) families in the area around Bukhara. Next, Ibrāhīm *atālīq* attacked the citadel (*ark*) of Bukhara. The palace entourage of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān – including his personal Qalmaq bodyguard (*qalmāqān-i khāṣṣa-i sharīfa*) and other non-Uzbek elements styled *maḥramīya* (“intimates, confidants”)⁶⁷ and *khwājas* (“eunuchs”)⁶⁸ – as well as armed city-dwellers defended the Bukharan sovereign against his own Commander-in-Chief. Thereupon, Ibrāhīm gathered together his tribal followers outside the city gates and retired to Shahr-i Sabz, his summer camp (*yailāq-i khwud*).⁶⁹

An unfortunate successor to the chief Uzbek command post in Bukhara was killed by suspicious palace confidants after holding the *atālīq* post for just eight days.⁷⁰ Thereafter, the troublesome position was offered to a previous enemy of the state, Farhād *biy*. Letters assuring royal favours (*īnāyat-nāma-hā-yi khusrawī*) were sent to Farhād *biy* Qipchāq and his ally Bēg-Ūghlī Baḥrīn. Upon their arrival in Bukhara, Farhād received the post of *atālīq* (*manṣab-i atālīqī*).⁷¹ In a ceremony, which seems to have also symbolized the submission of the whole Khitay-Qipchaq tribe to the Bukharan sovereign, the newly appointed

ascribes him a very positive role in his drama “Abū l-Fayḍ Khān”, which was first staged in 1921 (KLEINMICHEL, 1993:170–180).

66 ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 97a; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:48.

67 Young (*khwurdsāl*), but military able and trained men (ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 113a, 119a, 60b; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:60, 65, 82). Qalmaq body-guards and *maḥramīya* were not mutually exclusive categories (ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 61a; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:83).

68 The report of Florio Beneveni, tsar Peter’s envoy to Bukhara, bears witness to that particular meaning of the term *khwāja*, “master”. Beneveni (in his report of 8-4-1726) refers to the chief court executive of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān, a certain *khwāja* Ulfat who bore the title *khwāja-i kalān*, “the great master” (ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 45a; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:70), as “Khoja Ulfet, the chief eunuch” (BENEVENI, 1986:127). On the “chief khoja of the palace khojas” in the early Manghit period, see BREGEL, 2000:26.

69 ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 99a–116b; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:48–62.

70 ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 117b–119a; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:64–65.

71 ṬĀLĪ^ʿ, MS, f. 120a; ṬĀLĪ^ʿ. Tr. Semenov, 1959:66.

atālīq offered a tribute (*pīshkash*) to Abū l-Fayḍ Khān, consisting of 10.000 sheep, 99 horses with gold-embroidered horse-blankets, and 1000 bales of cloth.⁷²

On accepting the post of an *atālīq*, Farhād *biy* moved with his sons and an unspecified number of Qipchaq followers to the city of Bukhara, where he resided near the Namāzgāh gate. In the following two years he led Bukharan military campaigns against Ibrāhīm *biy* in Shahr-i Sabz and against Turkmans on the banks of the Amu-Darya near Narazm, both with a moderate degree of success.⁷³ Posted in Bukhara, he is said to have feared for his life whenever he was summoned to the palace.⁷⁴ Indeed, the “people of the city” (*mardum-i shahr*), as the chronicler chooses to call the non-Uzbek entourage of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān in this context, watched Farhād *atālīq* with utmost suspicion and decided to take action against him when his close allies showed signs of insubordination in Miyānkāl. In an exchange of letters they were able to incite a number of Uzbek amirs to take action against Farhād *atālīq* who in 1134/1721–22 was killed in Bukhara.⁷⁵

In retrospect, the chronicler depicts Farhād *biy* as a greedy tyrant: “When he was governor of Samarqand, he imposed cash [payments] on the people on a daily basis using some pretext. The people obeyed and they fulfilled their obligations. The common people (*fuqarā*) moaned: ‘The carefree Farhād [is] the ruin of Samarqand’ and wept, but he was not afraid that someone would destroy Samarqand. The Uzbeks carried away everything that they found.⁷⁶ Furthermore, to everybody who went to him, he said: ‘Don’t you have a coin (*tanga*) in your pocket that you might give to my sons who have been pressing me since this morning?’ (...) To sum up: He had behaved in Samarqand like the tyrant Ḥajjāj, but he could not do that in Bukhārā because His Highness was on the ruler’s throne.”⁷⁷

72 BALKHĪ, MS, f. 293a. Balkhī dates Farhād *biy*’s promotion as well as this event to 1131/1719. The tribute represents a fair sample of goods produced in the Middle Zarafshan valley, where Miyankal is located. Cotton was grown on irrigated land; homespun coarse cotton cloth was one of the chief Bukharan exports in trade with the Kazaks.

73 ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 120b–121a; ṬĀLĪʿ.Tr. Semenov, 1959:66.

74 BALKHĪ, MS, f. 293a.

75 ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 121b–122a; ṬĀLĪʿ.Tr. Semenov, 1959:67; BALKHĪ (MS, f. 293a) dates the murder to 1132/1720–21.

76 *Wa har chih paidā mīshud, ūzbekān mīburdand.*

77 ṬĀLĪʿ, MS, f. 122ab; ṬĀLĪʿ.Tr. Semenov, 1959:67.

7. The thirty-two and the ninety-two Uzbek tribes (of Mawarannahr)

Some 18th century sources use fixed numbers to express the notion of “all Uzbeks”: either “thirty-two” or “ninety-two” representing the total number. Thus, the document endowing Farhād *biy* with rank of a general (issued around 1719–1720) mentions the “ninety-two Uzbek sections of Mawarannahr” (*nawad-u-dū firqa-i ūzbekīya-i Māwarānnahr*).⁷⁸ An early Manghit chronicler who describes the appointments to offices and posts made by Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān in 1756 uses the alternative number when he speaks of the “thirty-two tribes of Uzbek warriors” (*sī wa dū ūrūgh-i ‘asākir-i ūzbekīya*).⁷⁹

In 1781 when Russia proposed a trade agreement with Bukhara, the Bukharan ruler, Dāniyāl *biy atālīq*, replied that – following an established custom among the Uzbek people – he had to consult the leaders of the ninety-two Uzbek tribes on the matter before he could act.⁸⁰

In Amīr Ḥaydar’s letters to his governor in Qarshi, written between 1800 and 1803, we find an expression that stresses the central role of the Bukharan court for the ninety-two tribes: “The Almighty has given the power (*daulat*) to [us], the king, and for the ninety-two sections (*nawad-u-dū firqa*) this “golden threshold” (*altūn būsāgha*) is the place to come to.”⁸¹

A great deal has been written on the subject, often with the underlying assumption that the specified numbers of tribes (and their names listed in an additional category of sources) provide factual data on the composition of the Uzbek confederation at some stage in its development. V. V. Bartol’d, for instance, noting (in the 1920s) the difference in the numbers of Uzbek tribes mentioned in 1756 and 1781, concluded that this discrepancy points to a change in Uzbek tribal organization, the number of tribal segments rising from thirty-two to ninety-two between 1756 and 1781.⁸²

Meanwhile, additional sources have come to light which indicate that both numerical expressions, i.e. the concepts of the “thirty-two” and of the “ninety-two” tribes have coexisted since the early 16th century, when they are first traceable in a written source.⁸³

78 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT*, MS, f. 131a. On the context see above.

79 *KARMĪNAGĪ*, MS, f. 190b. For a full quotation see above.

80 ZHUKOVSKII, 1916:307.

81 *MAKTŪBĀT-I AMĪR ḤĀIDAR*, MS, f. 15b.

82 BARTOL’D, 1968:465.

83 SULTANOV, 1982:27.

The earliest reference to both these concepts is provided by the *Majmū' al-tawārīkh* of Mullā Sayf al-Dīn Akhsīkantī, who in 909–920/1503–1514⁸⁴ wrote down tales about places and shaikhs in the Farghana Valley. He wrote in Persian, and obviously drew on Turko-Mongol oral traditions.⁸⁵

The “thirty-two tribes”, here, appear in passing in a historical account of Toqtamish (the khan of the “Golden Horde” or *ulūs* of Jūchī, r. ca. 1378–95) which states that “the thirty-two tribes that had previously gathered around Fulād, submitted to Toqtamish.”⁸⁶

The “ninety-two tribes”, however, are given prominence in the context of a myth of origin of (Central Asian) nomadic tribes which is inextricably linked with Islam and the Islamization of Central Asian peoples. The narrative is followed by a list of 92 tribal names. While the list has attracted considerable scholarly attention, the narrative, carrying the main message has been completely neglected.⁸⁷

The *Majmū' al-tawārīkh* tells of ninety-two young men (from Turkistan, Khorezm and from among the Ghuzz tribe) who had accepted Islam and are said to have gone to Madina to support the Prophet Muḥammad in fighting the infidels. At first, the volunteers could not understand the Prophet’s command, but when they were told in the “Turkic” language “Attack!” (*ūrūsh kun*), the brave young men attacked the enemy and secured a victory for the Prophet who thereupon told his son-in-law, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, to give them tuition. With the permission and the blessing of the Prophet the ninety-two youths returned – to Rum, Khorezm, Mawarannahr, the Dasht-i Qipchāq, and Farghana. The following words link the list of tribal names to the narration:

“Ninety-two names remained of these ninety-two youths; the ninety-two Uzbek divisions (*nawad-u-dū qism-i ūzbek*) are from this very assembly. The master (*pīr*) of the ninety-two Uzbek divisions is the king of the heroes (*shāh-i mardān*). [The Prophet] – peace be upon him – said: ‘O ‘Alī these young men had been presented to me by their fathers, I gave them to you. Till the Day of Judgement they shall not dismiss your name from [their] tongues, and they shall

84 AKHSĪKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960. On the date of the chapters relevant here, see TAGIRDZHANOV’s introduction to the facsimile edition (AKHSĪKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960:10).

85 The text seems to contain the earliest tangible fragment of the Kirgiz epos of “Manas” (AKHSĪKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960:4).

86 *Ān-chi sī-u-dū jamā‘at ba-Fulād Khān jam‘ shuda būd, ba-Tūqtamish Khān tābī‘ shuda* (AKHSĪKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960:92 = f. 46b).

87 As already noted by DEWEESE, 1994:458–459.

serve your offspring, their offspring shall become numerous!’ Having said this he invoked a blessing. The ninety-two divisions of the nomadic tribes (*nawad-u-dū qism-i ilātīya*) stem from their very offspring. According to the book and according to the *Tawārīkh-i zubdat al-bashar*⁸⁸ these are the ninety-two divisions of the Uzbeks (*nawad-u-dū qism-i ūzbek*): Mīng, Yūz, Qirq [...].”⁸⁹

Similar texts and lists of ninety-two tribes have been produced well into the 20th century, and have been identified both in large manuscript repositories and in private collections in rural areas of Uzbekistan; some of these texts are entitled “genealogy” (*nasab-nāma*) of the Uzbeks.⁹⁰ Hardly two of these lists agree, and none of them actually presents an ancestral tree.

Analysing one of these lists of ninety-two tribes, Togan identified thirty-three Mongol tribal names among them. In his view, the list outlines the tribal composition of the Golden Horde.⁹¹ Romodin, however, argues that it is the list of the “32 tribes”⁹² which comprises the main components of a historical tribal confederation, namely that of the Uzbek *ulūs* founded by Abū l-Khayr Khān in the mid-15th century in the Dasht-i Qipchaq, whereas the lists of “92 tribes” include a much wider range of nomadic groups.⁹³ The earliest textual evidence

88 The literary source called “chronicles of the cream of mankind” (*Tawārīkh-i zubdat al-bashar*) from which the author gathered the names of the 92 tribes, has not come down to us.

89 AKHSİKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960:21–22 = f. 11ab. What follows is the full list of tribal names: “Mīng, Yūz, Qirq, Jalāyir, Sarāy, Qūnghūrāt, Ālchīn, Arghūn, Naimān, Qībchāq, Qalmāq, Chaqmāq, Qīrghīz, Qīrlīq, Turk, Turkmān, Bayāwut, Būrlān, Shimirjiq, Qabasha, Nujin, Kīlajī, Kīlakash, Būrāt, Ūbrāt, Qiyāt, Khitāy, Qanklī, Ūryūz, Jūnālāhī, Qūjī, Ūtārjī, Qūlādjī, Jiyūt, Jūyūt, Jaljūt, Tūrmāwut, Ūymāwut, Arlāt, Karait, Ōnkgūt, Tānkgūt, Mānkgūt, Jalāwut, Mamāsit, Markīt, [*Būrquūt, *Kait] Qūralāsh, Ōkīlān, Qārī, ‘Arab, Īlājī, Jubūrghān, Qīshlīq, Kīrāy, Dūrmān, Nābīn (Tābīn), Tāma, Ramadān, Ūyshūn, Bādān, Ḥāfīz, Āwirjī, Jūrāt, Tātār, Būrghā (*Yūrghā), Bātāsh, Qaujīn, Tūbālī, Tīlau, Kardārī, Sakhtiyān, Qirghīn // Shīrīn, Ōghlān, Jīmbāy, Ḥarkas (*Jarkas), Ūyghūr, Aghār, Yābū, Targhīl, Tūrgān, Tain, Quḥat, Fākhīr, Qūjalīq, Shūrān, Darajāt, Kimāt, Shuja‘at, Awghān.” (AKHSİKANTĪ. Ed. Tagirdzhanov, 1960:22–23 = f. 11b–12a). The names preceded by asterisk (*) have been amended on the basis of a parallel manuscript version, see SULTANOV, 1982:31.

90 AKHMEDOV, 1981:48–49; DONIYOROV, 1968:74–77.

91 TOGAN, 1981:42–43.

92 The topic of the “32 Uzbek tribes” did not develop into a popular literary genre and received little scholarly attention. For a full list of the “32 Uzbek tribes” of Khiwa, see VAMBERY, 1865:276–277, for an incomplete list from Bukhara, see BURNES, 1834/1992,II:266–267.

93 SULTANOV (1982:28) quoting a paper of V.A. Romodin, which is not available to me.

clearly supports the latter view, for the author of the *Majmū' al-tawārīkh* makes no distinction at all between “the Uzbeks” (*ūzbakīya*) and “the nomadic tribes” (*īlātīya*), and even includes Arabs and Afghans (*Awghān*) in his list.⁹⁴

To sum up this long digression for our purpose, two points can be gathered from the *Majmū' al-tawārīkh*'s account of the ninety-two sections. Firstly, its language fixes a definitely nomadic connotation of the term “Uzbek” in the early 16th century;⁹⁵ secondly, its narrative aims at expressing and firmly establishing a decidedly Muslim connotation of the term “Uzbek”.

So why “ninety-two” and “thirty-two”? I am not aware of any symbolic significance of these numbers in Turko-Mongol tradition. We know about a general tendency of steppe peoples to express political union by the number of confederate tribes.⁹⁶ Given the Islamic context and the Muslim educational background of early authors and narrators like Mullā Sayf al-Dīn, the peculiar numbers may point to a possible influence of a Hadith which states that the religion of Islam will be divided into “seventy-two sects”. Indeed, the Arabic term *firqa* (“part; sect”) is used most frequently when the formulation “ninety-two Uzbek tribes” is expressed in Persian, whereas in Central Asian Turki the term *baw/būy* (*boy*), “part”, is preferred instead.

In diplomatic correspondence of 16th century Shaybanid khans of Uzbek Central Asia, the “thirty-two” and the “ninety-two Uzbek tribes” still had distinct connotations. The smaller number denoted the tribal confederation led by the Shaybanids,⁹⁷ whereas the larger number included other, independent (Muslim) Turko-Mongol groups as well. In a letter sent to the Mughal emperor Akbar, ‘Abdallāh Khān II (r. 1583–1598) mentions the “ninety-two” Uzbek tribes:

“Thanks God, the gates of ease and repose are open to the population of the sublime territory. By divine grace, several thousand tribespeople (*īl wa ulūs*) of the ninety-two Uzbek tribes of Turan (*nawad wa dū firqa-i ūzbakīya-i mulk-i Tūrān*) that are more numerous than the spring rain [drops] and the stars on the

94 See the quotation above. On the term *īlāt*, “nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes”, see LAMBTON, 1971:1095.

95 “Uzbek” in the sense of “nomad” appears rather unexpectedly and late in a message sent by the Junghar (Oirat) ruler Galdan Tseren to Abū l-Khayr Khān of the Kazak Junior Horde: “We – [that is to say] the Kalmucks and Kaisaks – are *uzbeks*.” (MOISEEV, 1991:128, quoting a Russian archival source of 1742.

96 See DOERFER, 1963–1975, II:197–198.

97 When ‘Ubaydallāh Khān threatened the king of Persia on the brink of war, “he recounted his military strength in the terms of thirty-two tribal groups.” (HAIDAR, 2002:46)

firmament have fixed the earring of submission and obedience; [now] they are submissive, ready to carry out orders, and happy as they have benefited from noble favours. Even (*balki*) the Kazaks, Qaraqalpaqs and Kirgiz tribes (*firqa-i qazāq wa qarāqalpāq wa qirghizī*) who dwelled on the border of the sublime country and who had fought and killed [our people] since olden times, are now, by divine command, constantly waging war (*ghaza*) against the pagan Qalmāqs, and daily sending many captives and countless wealth to [our] firm and illustrious abode.”⁹⁸

By the late 17th century, the earlier distinction between the two formulas seems to blur, as can be gathered from a poem by the Bukharan Uzbek Turdī Farāghī. Turdī uses the image of a body with ninety-two limbs to appeal to unity and criticise tribal factionalism. “You narrow-minded *beks*, don’t say ‘Me first’, think of others. It is the home of the Uzbeks composed of ninety-two parts (*tūqsān ikī bawlī uzbek yūrtī-dūr*), treat [them] as equals. Don’t call one Qipchāq and Khitāy, the other Yūz [or] Naiman. Counting [even] a hundred and forty thousand (*qirq-u yūz mīng*), form one body (*jān*),⁹⁹ [as though] rising the head from one collar, the whole being clad in one robe.”

Conclusion

The Bukharan state as depicted in 18th century sources bears the legacy of the nomadic conquest around 1500. In the course of two centuries, in the sedentary context of Mawarannahr, nomadic rule had been institutionalised and transformed into Uzbek rule. Tribally organised Uzbeks constituted the military estate and the mainstay of the sovereign’s authority. Despite the successive breaks with Chingizid steppe traditions, the Uzbek state, that is the rule of the Uzbeks warrior tribes, persisted throughout the 18th century. Recent scholarly works on Central Asian history have concentrated on the important changes in the political and administrative structure, and the legitimation of political leadership in the early Manghit period. Setting the early Manghit period in a larger historical context and tracing thereby also the usage of the term “Uzbek” in particular, we come to conclude that the predominant features of the earlier social order, that is the Uzbek military estate and its claim to agricultural

98 *MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT*, MS, f. 9b.

99 In Hayitmetov’s edition: “khān” (xon) (Turdī 1971:13) whereas a manuscript version reads jān, “soul, spirit; self” (Turdī, MS, f. 10b).

surplus, survived these changes and were secured also in this period. We also see symbols of power and collective identity being transmitted from the late Ashtarkhanid to the early Manghit period. Appealing to the loyalty of the Uzbek tribes, Amīr Ḥaydar, who did not claim Chingizid descent to legitimate his rule, evokes a distinctively Chingizid imagery when he designates his palace as the “golden threshold” where the “ninety-two tribes” convene.

Bibliography

ABDURAIMOV, M. A.

1961 *Voprosy feodal'nogo zemlevladieniia i feodal'noi renty v pis'makh emira Khaidara*. Tashkent.

1966–1970 *Ocherki agrarnykh otnoshenii v Bukharskom khanstve v XVI–pervoi polovine XIX veka*. 2 vols. Tashkent.

AKHMEDOV, B. A.

1981 “O roli *pis'mennykh* pamiatnikov k izuchenii uzbekskogo naroda”. In: *Obshchestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane* 1981/12:44–50.

[AKHSĪKANTĪ, Sayf al-Dīn]. Facs. ed. Tagirdzhanov

1960 “*Sobranie istorii*”. *Madzhmū' at-tavārich*. Fotograficheskaia reprodukttsiia otryvok rukopisnogo teksta, vvedenie, ukazateli. Podgotovil k izdaniuu A. Tagirdzhanov. (Iranskaia filologiiia, 2). Leningrad.

ASKAROV, A. A. and R. G. MUKMINOVA (eds.)

1993 *Istoriia Uzbekistana, III: XVI – pervaiia polovina XIX veka*. Tashkent.

BADĪ'-DĪWĀN. Facs. ed. & tr. Vil'danova = Mīrzā Badī'-Dīvān

1981 *Madzhma' al-arqām (“Predpisaniia fiska”), priemy dokumentatsii v Bukhare XVIII v.*, faksimile rukopisi, vvedenie, perevod, primechaniia i prilozheniia A. B. Vil'danovoi. Moscow.

BALKHĪ, MS = Khwājam-Qulī Bēg Balkhī

Tārīkh-i *Qipchāq-khānī*. MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ouseley no. 185.

BARTOL'D, V. V.

1963 “Istoriia kul'turnoi zhizni Turkestana”. In: *Sochineniia*, II/1. Moscow:167–433.

1968 “Sovremennoe sostoianie i blizhaishie zadachi izucheniia istorii turetskikh narodnostei”. In: *Sochineniia*, V. Moscow:454–465.

- 1973 “Otchët o komandirovke v Turkestan”. In: *Sochineniia*, VIII. Moscow:119–210.
- BATRAKOV, V. S.
- 1962 “Osobennosti razvitiia sel’skogo khoziaistva Bukharskogo khanstva s poloviny XVIII do 70-ch gg. XIX veka”. In: *Nauchnye trudy Tashkentskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 193. Tashkent:154–184.
- BENEVENI, Florio
- 1986 *Poslannik Petra I na Vostoke. Posol’stvo Florio Beneveni v Persiiu i Bukharu v 1718–1725 godakh*. Otvestvennyi redaktor: N. A. Khalfin. Podgotovka teksta, vstupitel’naia stat’ia i kommentarii: V. G. Volovnikova. Moscow.
- BLEICHSTEINER, Robert
- 1952 “Zeremonielle Trinksitten und Raumordnung bei den turko-mongolischen Nomaden”. In: *Archiv für Völkerkunde* 6–7:181–208.
- BREGEL, Yuri
- 1988 “Mangits”. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, VI:418–419
- 1991 “Turko-Mongol Influences in Central Asia”. In: Canfield, R. L. (ed.): *Turko-Persia in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge:53–77.
- 1992 “Central Asia, vii: In the 13th/19th Century”, in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, V:193–205.
- 2002 *The Administration of Bukhara under the Manghits and some Tashkent Manuscripts*. (Papers on Inner Asia,34). Bloomington.
- BUKHĀRĪ. Ed. & tr. Schefer = Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary
- 1876/1970 *Histoire de l’Asie centrale (Afghanistan, Boukhara, Khiva, Khoqand) depuis les dernières années du règne de Nadir Châh (1153), jusqu’en 1233 de l’hégire (1740–1818)*. Publié, traduit et annoté par Charles Schefer. Paris. Reprint: Amsterdam.
- BURNES, Alexander
- 1834/1992 *Travels into Bokhara*. 3 vols. London. Reprint: New Delhi.
- BURTON, Audrey
- 1997 *The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History, 1550–1702*. New York 1997.
- CHEKHOVICH, O. D.
- 1954 “K istorii Uzbekistana v XVIII v.”. In: *Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniia* (Tashkent) 3:43–82.
- 1956 “O nekotorykh voprosakh istorii Srednei Azii XVIII–XIX vekov”. In: *Voprosy Istorii* (Moscow) 1956/3:84–95.

DALE, Stephen

1994 *Indian Merchants and Eurasian Trade, 1600–1750*. Cambridge.

DEWEESE, Devin

1994 *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and conversion to Islam in historical and epic tradition*. University Park, Pennsylvania.

DOERFER, Gerhard

1963–1975 *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 4 vols. Wiesbaden.

DONIYOROV, X.

1968 *O'zbek xalqining shajara va shevalari*. Tashkent.

EGANI, A. A. and O. D. CHEKHOVICH

1982 “Regesty sredneaziatskikh aktov”. In: *Pis'mennye pamiatniki Vostoka. Istoriko-filologicheskie issledovaniia. Ezhegodnik 1975*. Moscow:34–52 (text), 265–317 (facsimiles).

GALKIN, M. N.

1869 *Étnograficheskie i istoricheskie materialy po Srednei Azii i Orenburgskomu kraiu*. St. Petersburg.

GREBENKIN, A. D.

1872 “Uzbeki”. In: *Russkii Turkestan: Sbornik izdannyi po povodu politechnicheskoi vystavki.*, II. Pod red. V. N. Trockogo. Moscow:51–109.

Haidar, Mansura

2002 *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century*. New Delhi.

HOLZWARTH, Wolfgang

2002 “Nomaden und Sesshafte in *turkī*-Quellen (narrative Quellen aus dem frühen 16. Jahrhundert)”. In: *Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte* 4. Halle/Saale:147–165.

2004 “The Uzbek State as Reflected in Eighteenth Century Bukharan Sources”. In: *Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte* 15. Halle/Saale 2004, 93–129.

2005 “Relations between Uzbek Central Asia, the Great Steppe and Iran, 1700–1750”. In: Leder, S. and B. Streck (eds.), *Shifts and Drifts in Nomad-Sedentary Relations*. Wiesbaden:179–215.

IVANOV, P. P.

1937 *Vosstanie kitai-kipchakov v Bukharskom khanstve 1821–1825 gg. Istochniki i opyt ikh issledovaniia* (Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniia, 28). Moscow/Leningrad.

1958 *Ocherki po istorii Srednei Azii (XVI v. – seredina XIX v.)*. Moscow.

- KARMĪNAGĪ, MS = Qādī Muḥammad Wafā Karmīnagī
Tuhfa-i khānī. MS Kazan, Research Library of the State University, F-301.
- KHANYKOV, N. V.
1843 *Opisanie Bukharskogo khanstva*. St. Petersburg.
- KHAZANOV, Anatoly
1994 *Nomads and the Outside World*. 2nd ed., Madison.
- KLEINMICHEL, Sigrid
1993 *Aufbruch aus orientalischen Dichtungstraditionen. Studie zur uzbekischen Dramatik und Prosa zwischen 1910 und 1934*. Budapest.
- KÜGELGEN, Anke von
2002 *Die Legitimierung der mittelasiatischen Mangitendynastie in den Werken ihrer Historiker (18.–19. Jahrhundert)*. Istanbul 2002.
- LAMBTON, A. K. S.
1971 “Īlāt”. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, III:1095–1110.
- MAEV, N. A.
1875 *Ocherki bukharskogo khanstva*. Tashkent.
- MAKTŪBĀT-I AMĪR ḤAYDAR (ba-Muḥammad Ḥākīm Biy). MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 5412.
- MAKTŪBĀT, MANSHŪRĀT, MUNSHA’ĀT. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 289.
- MCCHESENEY, Robert
1983 “The Amirs of Muslim Central Asia in the XVIIth century”. In: *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 26/1:33–70.
1991 *Waqf in Central Asia: Four hundred years in the history of a Muslim shrine, 1480–1889*. Princeton, N.J.
1992 “Central Asia vi.: In the 10th–12th/16th–18th Centuries”. In: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, V:176–193.
1997 *Central Asia: Foundations of change*. Princeton, N. J.
- MEYENDORFF, Georges de
1826 *Voyage d’Orenbourg à Boukhara fait en 1820, à travers les steppes qui s’étendent à l’est de la mer d’Aral et au-delà de l’ancien Jaxartes*. Paris.
- MOISEEV, V. A.
1991 *Dzhungarskoe khanstvo i kazakhi, XVII–XVIII vv.* Alma-Ata.
- MUḤAMMAD AMĪN, MS = Mīr Muḥammad Amīn Bukhārī
‘Ubaydallāh-nāma. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 1532.

- MUHAMMAD AMĪN. Tr. Semenov = Mir Mukhammed Amin-i Bukhari
1957 *Ubaidulla-name*. Perevod s tadjhikskogo s primechaniiami A. A. Semenova. Tashkent.
- MUKMINOVA, R. G. and G. Agzamova
2001 “Gosudarstva Uzbekistana v XVI – pervoi polovine XIX veka”. In: Alimova, D. A. / Rtveladze, E. V. (eds.): *Ocherki po istorii gosudarstvennosti Uzbekistana*. Tashkent:95–118.
- PAUL, Jürgen
2001 “On Some 16th- and 17th-Century Documents Concerning Nomads”. In: DeWeese, Devin (ed.): *Studies on Central Asian History in Honor of Yuri Bregel*. Bloomington, Indiana:283–296.
2002 “Nomaden in persischen Quellen”. In: *Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte* 3. Halle/Saale:41–56.
2003 “The State and the Military – a Nomadic Perspective”. In: *Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte* 12. Halle/Saale 2003, 25–68.
- PAVET DE COURTEILLE, Abel
1870/1972 *Dictionnaire turk-oriental, destiné à faciliter la lecture des ouvrages de Baber, d'Aboul-Gazi (...)*. Paris. Reprint: Amsterdam.
- SELA, Ron
2003 *Ritual and Authority in Central Asia* (Papers On Inner Asia, 37). Bloomington.
- SEMENOV, A. A.
1948 “Bucharaskii traktat o chinakh i zvaniakh i ob obiazannostiakh nositelei ikh v srednevekovoi Bukhare”. In: *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* 5:137–153.
1954 “Ocherk ustroistva tsentral'nogo administrativnogo upravleniia Bukharskogo khanstva pozdneishego vremeni”. In: *Trudy Instituta istorii, archeologii i étnografii Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR*, 25: Materialy po istorii tadjhikov i uzbekov Srednei Azii, II. Stalinabad:1–75.
- SHANIYAZOV, K. Sh.
1986 “Nekotorye voprosy étnicheskoi dinamiki i étnicheskikh svyazei uzbekov v XIV – XVII veka”. In: *Materialy k étnicheskoi istorii naseleniia Srednei Azii*. Tashkent:83–93.
- SULTANOV, T. I.
1982 *Kochevye plemena Priaral'ia v XV–XVII vv. (Voprosy étnicheskoi i sotsial'noi istorii)*. Moscow.
- ṬĀLĪ', MS = ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭālī’
Tārīkh-i Abū l-Fayḍ Khān. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 11.

ṬĀLĪ^c. Tr. Semenov = Abdurrachman-i Tali^c

1959 *Istoriia Abulfeiz-chana*. Perevod s tadjhikskogo, predislovie, primechaniia i ukazatel' A. A. Semenova. Tashkent.

TASHEV, Kh.

1972 "Traditsionnoe zhivotnovodstvo uzbekov Srednego Zarafshana". In: Ziaiev, Kh. Z. / Lunin, B. V. (eds.): *Étnograficheskoe izuchenie byta i kul'tury uzbekov*. Tashkent:51–68.

TEUFEL, Franz

1884 "Quellenstudien zur neueren Geschichte der Chanate". In: Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 38:235–381.

TIRMIDHĪ. Facs. ed. & tr. Salakhedinova = Chodzha Samandar Termezi

1971 *Dastur al-muluk* ("Nazidanie gosudariam"). Faksimile stareishei rukopisi. Perevod s persidskogo, predislovie, primechaniia i ukazateli M. A. Salakhedinova. Moscow.

TOGAN, A. Z. V.

1981 *Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi*. Istanbul. (1st ed. Istanbul 1947).

TROITSKAIA, A. A.

1953 "Voennoe delo v Buchare v pervoi polovine XIX veka". In: *Trudy Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR*, 17: Sbornik statei po istorii i filologii narodov Srednei Azii. Stalinabad:211–217.

TURDĪ *Dīwān*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 1962/I.

TURDĪ. Ed. Hayitmetov = Turdi

1971 *She'rlar*. Nashrga tayorlovchi A. H. Hayitmetov. Tashkent.

VIATKIN, V. L.

1902 "Materialy k istoricheskoi geografii Samarkandskogo vilaieta". In: *Spravochnaia knizhka Samarkandskoi oblasti*, 7:1–83.

1928 "Karshinskii okrug, organizatsiia v nem voiska i sobytiia v period 1215–1217 (1800–1803 godov)". In: *Izvestiia Sredne-Aziatskogo otdela gosudarstvennogo russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva* 18:7–26.

VAMBERY, Hermann

1865 *Reise in Mittelasien von Teheran über die Turkmanische Wüste an der Ostküste des Kaspischen Meeres nach Chiwa, Bochara und Samarkand, ausgeführt im Jahr 1863*. Leipzig.

WÜSTENFELD, F.; E. MAHLER

1926 *Vergleichungs-Tabellen der Muhammedanischen und Christlichen Zeitrechnung*. 2nd ed. Leipzig.

ZHUKOVSKII, S. V.

1916 “K istorii snoshenii Rossii s Bukharoi i Khivoi kontsa XVIII veka: Posol'stvo perevodchika Bekchurina v Bukharu v 1781 godu”. In: *Vostochnyi Sbornik*, Petrograd, II:274–340.

