# NOMADEN UND SESSHAFTE

*Sonderforschungsbereich Differenz und Integration*
Wechselwirkungen zwischen nomadischen und sesshaften Lebensformen
in Zivilisationen der Alten Welt

Herausgegeben im Auftrag des SFB
von Stefan Leder und Bernhard Streck

BAND 2

WIESBADEN 2005
DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

# Shifts and Drifts in Nomad-Sedentary Relations

Ed. by Stefan Leder and Bernhard Streck

WIESBADEN 2005
DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der
Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Umschlagabbildung: Barchan, Station an der transkaspischen Bahn
(fotografiert zwischen 1888 und 1893) von A. H. Mishon o. Michon
(Lebensdaten unbekannt, aktiv in Baku von 1879 bis 1905)
Archiv der Bibliothek der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Halle

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbiografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.ddb.de abrufbar.


ISBN: 3-89500-413-8
www.reichert-verlag.de

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier
(alterungsbeständig pH7 –, neutral)
Printed in Germany

# Contents

Preface VII

## Features of Nomadic Existence – In Between and Beyond Common Distinctions

Emanuel Marx: Nomads and Cities: The Development of a Conception 3

Günther Schlee: Forms of Pastoralism 17

Kurt Franz: Resources and Organizational Power: Some Thoughts on Nomadism in History 55

Michael Meeker: Magritte on the Bedouins: *Ce n'est pas une société segmentaire* 79

Katharina Lange: "*Shawāyā*": Economic Mélange, Pure Origins? Outsiders' and Insiders' Accounts of Tribal Identity in Northern Syria 99

Elena Marushiakova, Vesselin Popov: The Gypsy Court as a Concept of Consensus among Service Nomads in the Northern Black Sea Area 123

Udo Mischek: Gypsies in an Urban Context: The Dual Morphology of an Oscillating Society 149

## Constituents of Interrelation: Military Power, Economy, State Policies

Anatoly M. Khazanov: Nomads and Cities in the Eurasian Steppe Region and Adjacent Countries: A Historical Overview 163

Wolfgang Holzwarth: Relations Between Uzbek Central Asia, the Great Steppe and Iran, 1700–1750 179

Charlotte Schubert: The Henchir-Mettich Inscription (CIL VIII 25902): An Example of the Interaction Between Sedentary and Nonsedentary Population Groups in Roman North Africa 217

Thomas Brüggemann: Roman Order or Latin Culture? Forms of Nomadic Assimilation in the Late Antiquity of Northern Africa (3rd–5th Centuries) 241

Oliver Schmitt: Rome and the Bedouins of the Near East from 70 BC to 630 AD: 700 Years of Confrontation and Coexistence 271

Stefan Heidemann: Arab Nomads and Seljūq Military 289

Rhoads Murphey: The Resumption of Ottoman-Safavid Border Conflict, 1603–1638: Effects of Border Destabilization on the Evolution of Tribe-State Relations 307

## Conceptions and Perceptions of Nomadic Identity

Hans-Werner Fischer-Elfert: Sedentarism and Nomadism as Criteria of Ancient Egyptian Cultural Identity 327

Gundula Mehnert: Images of the Cimmerians and the Scythians and the Interpretation of Archaeological Remains in Transcaucasia 351

Saad Sowayan: *badw* and *ḥaḍar*: An Alternative to the Khaldunian Model 367

Thomas Bauer: Vertraute Fremde. Das Bild des Beduinen in der arabischen Literatur des 10. Jahrhunderts 377

Stefan Leder: Nomadic and Sedentary Peoples – A Misleading Dichotomy? The Bedouin and Bedouinism in the Arab Past 401

Thomas Herzog: Wild Ancestors – Bedouins in Mediaeval Arabic Popular Literature 421

Birgit Schäbler: The "Noble Arab": Shifting Discourses in Early Nationalism in the Arab East (1910–1916) 443

Barbara Drieskens: Arab or Not? Arab Identity in Present Day Cairo 469

Index 485

# Relations Between Uzbek Central Asia, the Great Steppe and Iran, 1700–1750[1]

Wolfgang Holzwarth

This paper investigates a reported worst case of nomadic-sedentary relations: steppe pastoralists ravaging the cultivated land of sedentary neighbours. The regional frame of our case comprises the Bukharan khanate and its Kazak neighbours in the Great Steppe. The period under specific concern is the second quarter of the 18th century, when the Bukharan khanate lived through turmoil and its established northern and southern boundaries seemed to dissipate. Large numbers of Kazak steppe pastoralists crossed the Sir River, moved into the Samarqand-Bukhara region, and eventually devastated agricultural lands during the years between 1723 and 1728. In 1740, an Iranian king, Nadir Shah, crossed the Amu River and rode in triumph into the Bukharan capital. In 1746, Iranian troops operated even on the banks of the Sir River.

Drawing on little known narrative sources and new documentary evidence, specifically Bukharan diplomatic letters to steppe leaders, the aim of the following study is twofold. Firstly, to review the background, course, and consequences of these extraordinary events that seem to indicate a break-down and re-structuring of regional networks. Considerable space is allowed for an outline of major geographical, economic and political features of Kazak-Bukharan relations between roughly 1700 and 1723. The immediate cause of the worst case scenario mentioned above were military events in 1723, when due to a shift of power in the Great Steppe, the Mongol Jungars pushed the Kazaks southwards into the agricultural heart of Uzbek Central Asia. Secondly, the study aims to trace changing perceptions of steppe peoples in the Bukharan khanate. The historical experiences between 1723 and 1747, it will be argued, had estranged the Uzbek Central Asian elites from their steppe heritage and cleared the ground for a breach with political ideals and traditions they had hitherto shared with their steppe neighbours.

---

[1] I am indebted to all those who helped me prepare the revised version by sharing some of their knowledge and time with me, namely Jürgen Paul, Ildiko Beller-Hann, Hale Decdeli-Holzwarth, Sigrid Kleinmichel and Nuryoghdi Toshev. All mistakes and inaccuracies are mine.

## 1. Relations between Uzbek Central Asia and its neighbours until 1723

### *Geographical and political realms*

Uzbek Central Asia, as understood here, is the historical area extending from the banks of the Amu-Darya in the south, to the banks of the Sir-Darya in the north. It largely corresponds to the Arabic geographical term Mawarannahr – *Mā warā' al-nahr*, "what is beyond the river [Amu]" –, that 18th century Muslim Central Asian writers most commonly used.

Mawarannahr represents a mixed agro-pastoral zone not unlike Iran. An ensemble of towns, agricultural oases and pastures characterizes the land between the rivers Amu and Sir. A particularly dense cluster of oases and towns stretches along a third river, the Zarafshan, that provides the irrigation water for the economic and political centres of Mawarannahr, namely Samarqand and Bukhara. At the fringe of the oases there were isolated pockets, as well as larger areas of uncultivated land, that mobile pastoral groups utilized. Spatial proximity of towns, villages and nomadic camps was a typical feature of Uzbek Central Asia.[2]

From about 1500, when the Shaybanid-Uzbeks of the Qipchaq steppe had conquered Mawarannahr, Uzbeks were the politically dominant group. Others shared the country with them. Besides some "pre-Uzbek" Turkic groups, such as the Barlas and other remnants of the *ulus* Chaghatay, there were pastoral Arabs, and a vast social stratum of peasants and townspeople, whom Bukharan sources refer to either as a social estate – the "common people" (*fuqarā*) as opposed to the "military" (*sipāh*) –, or as an ethnic category – "Tajiks" as opposed to "Uzbeks".[3] Speaking Central Asian Persian,[4] the Tajiks constituted the bulk of the Sunni Muslim sedentary population of Uzbek Central Asia.

Mawarannahr has rightly been depicted as a part of the greater "Turko-Persian" world.[5] Still, 18th century sources clearly perceive Iran and Mawarannahr as two distinct realms. The differences were expressed in terms of political tradition and confessional affiliation: while Uzbek Central Asia shared the Chingizid heritage with the Great Steppe, Iran did not. While Safawid Iran had opted for the Shia, Uzbek Central Asia favoured the Sunna.

---

2 As described in 1819 for the Zarafshan Valley from Bukhara to Samarqand, as well as Jizaq and Ura-Tepe by Bukhārī, *Histoire*, text, 77; tr., 171–172.

3 See Holzwarth, "Uzbek State", 106.

4 On details of the linguistic situation and the characteristic Tajik-Turkic bilingualism in the Zarafshan Valley, especially the Samarqand area, see Radlov, "Dolina", 67–69; Radloff, *Sibirien*, 467–468 [a German translation]; Fragner, "Nationswerdung", 22–23.

5 See Canfield, "Turko-Persian".

In marked contrast to the agro-pastoral ensemble in Iran and Uzbek Central Asia, the area north of the Sir-Darya – to be more precise, beyond the Sir-Darya riverine zone – was a vast open steppe, that 18th century Bukharan sources generally call the "Qipchaq Steppe" (*Dasht-i Qipchāq*).[6] The "Great Steppe", as understood here, is defined rather by land usage than by ecological conditions. Besides the steppe vegetation zone, it includes increasingly arid tracts – semi-deserts and deserts – towards the south. Pastoral nomads utilized the different ecological zones from the Central Asian deserts to the Siberian forest belt in long-range mobility, covering distances of 1000 to 1200 km.[7] But for the Sir-Darya riverine tract that cuts through the Central Asian desert zone, the absence of towns and villages characterized the Great Steppe. In the early 18th century, there were virtually no permanent settlements as far as a month's journey from the cities along the Sir-Darya (notably Turkistan and Tashkent) to the north – that is, up to the Russian Siberian towns (Tobolsk, Tara, Tomsk).[8] The Great Steppe constituted a part of the Turko-Mongol world. The Turkic and Muslim Kazaks, and their eastern neighbours, the Mongol and Buddhist Jungars or Oirats – Muslim sources call them *Qalmāq* – were the dominant inhabitants of the Great Steppe in the first half of the 18th century. Both these groups were pastoral nomads.

### *Frontiers between Mawarannahr and the Great Steppe: The Qizil-Qum desert and the Sir-Darya riverine zone*

The political centres of the Bukharan khanate, Bukhara and Samarqand, were strongly fortified cities that could resist assaults as long as the enemy did not employ shells and grenades. Both cities were encircled by irrigated agricultural land bordering, in turn, on steppes and semi-deserts. Both cities had sizeable groups of Uzbek nomads in their respective orbits. The two cities are located in unequal distance to the Sir-Darya that, generally speaking, separated Mawarannahr from the political realm of the Kazaks.

A route linking Bukhara with the lower course of the Sir-Darya took about a month and led through Qizil-Qum ("Red-Sand") desert.[9] Man made wells and

---

6 For a delimitation of the *Dasht-i Qipchāq*, also called *Dasht-i Qazāq*, in an early 19th century Bukharan account, see Bukhārī, *Histoire*, text, 87; tr., 194.

7 On the various ecological zones and their integration into Kazak pastoral migratory cycles in the colonial and pre-colonial period, see Tolybekov, *Kochevoe Obshchestvo*, 495–593. For Kazak tribes with winter camps near Tashkent, Samarqand and Bukhara in the early 19th century, see Bukhārī, *Histoire*, text, 87–88; tr., 194–195; Tulibaeva, *Kazakhstan*, 74, 103 note 2.

8 Whereas towns and agriculture had flourished in the 12th–14th centuries in regions like Ulugh-Tagh, Turghay and Sari-Su, mid-18th century travellers could only trace the ruins of earlier sedentary life (Janabel, *Qazaq*, 74).

9 For an itinerary, see Meyendorff, *Voyage*, 9–10.

some vegetation in protected hilly spots allow a sparse nomadic population in the huge sandy wastes covering 3000 square miles.[10] In the 19th century, the northern, and central parts of the Qizil-Qum were used as winter pastures by Kazak groups.[11] In 1820, the remotest Bukharan check-post was located on a well, five days north of the Bukharan oasis.[12] Nomads from Bukhara and Nurata (170 km north-east of the capital) utilized the southern and south-eastern fringe of the Qizil-Qum where desert and steppe soils merge.[13] The town of Nur (later: Nura, Nurata), situated on a chain of hills on the edge of the Qizil-Qum, has been a significant place on the Bukharan-Kazak frontier. In the 17th century, according to oral tradition, Kazak groups occupied the Nurata hills, pushing its earlier Uzbek inhabitants further south.[14] Kazak winter camps were obviously nearby, when in February 1748, in the context of a conflict with the Bukharan centre, an Uzbek tribal alliance that controlled the town (*qaṣba*) of Nur could mobilize the support of the Kazaks and "the people of Dasht-i Qipchāq".[15]

The Samarqand region played a key role as a relay – at times also as a barrier – in the Bukharan khanate's relations with its steppe neighbours. A route linking Samarqand with the upper course of the Sir-Darya took six days, leading across a chain of high hills and the Mirza-Chul steppe.[16] In the 19th century, the steppes on the left (southern) bank of the Sir-Darya were a zone of particular close interaction between nomads of the Great Steppe and Mawarannahr,[17] who utilized them in different migratory patterns: Kazaks in horizontal and long-distance, Uzbeks in vertical and short-distance pastoral mobility. Around 1710, residents of the Bukharan capital seem to have perceived the hills north of Samarqand as the limit of tighter or undisputed Bukharan control, with the understanding that the historic place name *Āq-Kūtal* corresponds to the modern Aktau and Goduntau, offshoots – as the Nurata hills – of the Turkestan chain that separates the Zarafshan Valley from the Sir-Darya and the Great Steppe.[18]

---

[10] Khoroshkhin, *Sbornik*, 443–472.

[11] Levshin, *Opisanie*, 34–35; Tolybekov, *Kochevoe Obshchestvo*, 519–554.

[12] Eversmann, *Reise*, 60.

[13] Khoroshkhin, *Sbornik*, 449.

[14] Shaniyazov, "Uzy", 72–73.

[15] Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, C-525, ff. 132b, 133b. The event is dated to Ṣafar 1161/February 1748. The Uzbek tribal alliance involved the Yeti-Urugh, or rather the Yeti-Urugh clan of Burqūt and their close allies, the Bahrīn.

[16] Called "Hunger Steppe" (*Golodnaya Step'*) by the Russians. For an itinerary, see Fedchenko, *Puteshestvie*, 47–49.

[17] Karmysheva, "Kochevaya step'", 50–51.

[18] Bukhārī, the chronicler of 'Ubaydallāh Khān (r. 1702–1711), twice mentions *Āq-Kūtal* among the places on the Mawarannahr-Kazak frontier, but does not specify its position. According to 17th century geography, *Āq-Kūtal* separated Samarqand and the Zarafshan Valley from "Khujand, Ura-Tepe and Dizzaq [Jizaq] and other eastern districts" (Maḥmūd b. Walī, *More tain*, 55). A 19th century author depicts *Āq-Kūtal* as a place on the route from Samarqand to Jizaq and

The Sir-Darya riverine zone was a frontier region with a more fluent political status. In general, the left (southern) bank areas – such as Jizaq, Khujand and Mirza-Chul – had closer ties to Bukharan khanate than the right bank. A last, unsuccessful attempt to actually enforce Bukharan claims to the right bank was made in 1688.[19] Still, Bukharan rulers at least nominally upheld these claims. In 1117/1705, 'Ubaydallāh Khān moved to Samarqand to stage an additional coronation ceremony, and to grant audience to representatives of tribes living near and beyond Samarqand. On the occasion, "the Uzbeks from its [Samarqand's] surrounding up to Ḍāmīn, Ūrā-Tepe, Shāsh, Farghāna, Khujand, Andigān, Tāshkand, Āq-Kūtal, Sayrām, and Turkistān"[20] waited upon the khan with presents (*pīshkash*) and declarations of loyalty. By submitting to the Bukharan khan, different tribes on the Sir-Darya frontier seem to have become "Uzbeks", at least in the eyes of the chronicler. Yet, a Bukharan letter sent to the Russian Tsar in 1705 reminds us that subordination did not blur ethnic categories for the Bukharan court. 'Ubaydallāh Khān states therein: "There are all kinds of peoples: countless Kazaks, Kirgiz, Qaraqalpaq, and Uzbeks in the Qipchaq steppe, and they all bow to Bukhara".[21]

Actually, Kazak khans often controlled the erstwhile Bukharan cities and territories on the right bank of the Middle Sir-Darya since 1628 (Turkistan) and 1642 (Tashkent). Non-Kazak sedentary people of Central Asian background called either "Bukharans" or "Sarts" inhabited the walled cities and fortified villages along the Sir-Darya and its tributaries. The *khojas* (*khwājahs*) – members of lineages dignified by their descent from eminent Sufi sheikhs – constituted an urban elite in the Sir-Darya cities.[22] Kazak khans, who at least temporarily – during the cold season – resided in the city of Turkistan, were able to exact and acquire

---

Zamin (*Ḍamin*), see Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 185. In its narrower sense, the "White Pass" (*Āq-Kūtal*) probably corresponds to a defile of the Jizaq river on the hill route linking Samarqand with Jizaq. Rock inscriptions discovered at the site – that some 19th century travellers call "Timur's Gate" – underline its strategic importance between the Samarqand oasis and the Great Steppe. One epigraph commemorates the safe return of the Timurid Mirza Ulugh Beg from a campaign into the "land of the Moghuls". Another inscription reports how in 979/1571–72 the Shaybanid 'Abdallāh Khān's forces confronted 400.000 men from Turkistan, Tashkent, Farghana and the Dasht-i Qipchaq, slaying so many enemies that the Jizaq river was bloodstained for a month (Maev, "Dzhizak", 278; Fedchenko, *Puteshestvie*, 48).

19 A Bukharan army had tried to re-conquer the town of Bishkand (Psikent), half way between the Sir-Darya and Tashkent, that was held by the Kazak leader Urus Sultan (Burton, *Bukharans*, 342).

20 *Firqa-i ūzbakīya-i aṭrāf wa nawāḥī-yi ānjāh tā ḥudūd-i Ḍāmīn wa Ūrā-Tīpa wa Shāsh wa Farghāna wa Khujand wa Andigān wa Tāshkand wa Āq-Kūtal wa Sayrām wa Turkistān* (Bukhārī, *'Ubaydallāh-nāma*, MS, f. 39b; tr. Semenov, 55).

21 Khilkov, *Sbornik*, 543–544.

22 On the *khojas* as urban nobility, particularly in Tashkent where they could gradually expand their administrative and political role during the 18th century, see Chekhovich, "Samouprav-lenie".

enough cereals and other goods to provide their nomadic followers with the basics they needed and the luxuries they desired from the "outside world". One of these Kazak khans, Tauka Khan (1680–1715) is said to have ruled ten or eleven towns in 1681, and 25 or 32 towns in 1696.[23] Kazak oral tradition remembers Tauka Khan as a successful leader and wise lawgiver. In retrospect, his rule appears as the last "glorious period" of the Kazak khanate.[24]

### *An integrated regional economy: Steppe pastoralists, Sir-Darya towns, and Mawarannahr*

The exchange of pastoral products for grain is rarely witnessed by our sources. Strong nomadic states, as the Jungar and Kazak polities were around 1700, tended to institutionalise the supply of agricultural staples through coercive means. The Jungars, besides imposing grain tributes on the oasis cities of the Tarim Basin (Kashgharia, Alti-Shahr),[25] had forced Kashgharian peasants to settle in Ili and till the soil right there, at the centre of their nomadic state.[26] The Kazaks, in turn, seem to have acquired most of their grain stocks through tributes exacted from weaker neighbours along the Sir-Darya, both from the settled "Bukharans" or "Sarts" in the agricultural areas around Tashkent and Turkistan,[27] and from agro-pastoral Qaraqalpaqs.[28] The sedentary subjects of the Sir-Darya riverine zone did not only produce the agricultural surplus redistributed in the Kazak khanate, they also played an important role as trade and diplomatic agents of Kazak khans. The Sir-Darya towns, hence, were the "hook", as Pishchulina puts it,[29] that linked the nomadic economy of the Great Steppe and the urban-sedentary economy of Mawarannahr.

---

[23] Burton, *Bukharans*, 337, 354.

[24] Levshin, *Opisanie*, 163, 165, 289–290, 367; Janabel, *Qazaq*, 126, 157. "After the death of Tauke Khan, in all three hordes (*zhuz*) there appeared their own khans (...). Ever since each Qazaq horde (*zhuz*) has its own history" (Sultanov, *Kochevye plemena*, 121).

[25] Beishenaliev, "*O nalogovom*", 134–136.

[26] Evidence of Russian envoys to the Jungars, namely Unkovskii (1722–1724) and Ugrimov (1731–1732). On Unkovskii's report, see Veselovskii, *Posol'stvo*, 186–187, 193, 195; Müller, "Neueste Historie", 130. For Ugrimov, see Zlatkin, *Istoriya*, 237–238 (quoting archival sources); the extract edited by Veselovskii (*Posol'stvo*, 233–273) omits the statements relevant here. For a summary of the Jungar empire's tax and tribute system, see Kuznetsov, "Dzhungarskoe khanstvo", 104.

[27] In 1697, Fedor Skibin reported that the *Kazak Orda* had 20 towns around Turkistan. "Bukharans" almost exclusively populated these towns, whereas the Kazaks lived in nomadic camps (MIUTT, 265); cf. Janabel, *Qazaq*, 146 note 103.

[28] On Qaraqalpaq agricultural tributes and military services to the Kazak khan Tauka around 1700, see Kamalov et al., *Iz istorii*, 22. On the agro-pastoral economy of the Qaraqalpaqs in 1740, see Muravin's report (Khanykov, "Poezdka", 551–552).

[29] Pishchulina, *Istochniki*, 173.

Notwithstanding the important role of the Sir-Darya sedentary belt in provisioning steppe peoples, there was a range of goods it could not produce, and which were manufactured in central Mawarannahr. Textiles seem to have been the most important merchandise the Bukhara khanate supplied to steppe peoples. From the 16th to the mid-18th centuries, there was a continuous Kazak and Jungar demand for Central Asian textiles, especially for coarse cotton materials (*karbās*).[30] In 1736, wearing cotton clothing was the fashion of well-to-do Kazaks, while the common people dressed in sheepskins and hides.[31] Bukharans, in turn, are said to have abhorred the appearance of poor Kazaks "like wolves, dressed in hides".[32] Besides fabrics, including silks and semi-silks, Mawarannahr also supplied metal wares, especially military equipment (swords, matchlocks and armour) to the Kazaks, whereas the Kazaks could offer their Central Asian neighbours basically animals and animal products, captives (slaves) and transit rights.

In the 17th and early 18th centuries, much of the exchange of goods between the Kazaks and their neighbours seems to have been carried out in joint commercial and diplomatic ventures of the Kazak khans with non-Kazak sedentary merchants.[33] Besides the "Bukharan" residents of the towns along the Sir-Darya, merchants from the Bukharan khanate had ready access to and enjoyed considerable privileges in the Kazak domain, as the two khanates were on good political terms. We know, for instance, that an ambassador of the Kazak khan was attached to a Bukharan caravan that in 1696–97 passed through Turkistan on its way to Siberia.[34]

Bukharans of religious standing, in particular the so-called *khoja*s, were key figures in the wider network, as the traceable activities of one of them, namely ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Khoja, might illustrate. Between 1709 and 1722–23, he moved at least four times between the Bukharan and Kazak courts, first as envoy of the Bukharan ruler ʿUbaydallāh Khān, later as ambassador of an unnamed Kazak khan. In 1709, at the beginning of his diplomatic career, the Bukharan khan had promised to reward his services with the rank of a court *naqīb*. The Kazaks, in turn, acknowledged his

---

30 Burton, *Bukharans*, 434; Burton, *Bukharan Trade*, 12, 16. Bukharan cotton was also exported to the Russian Siberian towns to the north (such as Tobolsk, Tara, Tomsk), as well as to Astrakhan and, later, Orenburg (Burton, "Marchands", 48–49).

31 Castle, "Journal", 124. Castle states that the Kazaks purchase all the cloth they needed from the Bukharans (ibid., 138). Reports on Kazak camps north of Khiwa in 1159/1746 mention a similar pattern: nobles wore semi-silks (*alācha*, here: *ālaja*), coarse cotton (*karbās*) and woollen fabric, whereas commoners dressed in sheep-, jackal- and foxskins (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, 1140).

32 Burton, *Bukharans*, 432 (quoting a 16th century source). Yet, skilfully tanned and dyed hides of Kazak origin, serving as material for waterproof robes, were much appreciated and bought at high prices in Bukhara (Burton, *Bukharan Trade*, 14–15).

33 Ibragimov, "Iz istorii", 43–46.

34 Burton, *Bukharans,* 354; Jababel, *Qazaq*, 168 note 172.

brother, Qarā Bahādur Khoja Sayyid Atā'ī, as their religious leader (*pīr*).[35] In 1722–23, a certain *Khoja Raim*, also called *Khoja Nakib* and *Nakib Khoja* – i.e. our ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Khoja Naqīb – resided at the Bukharan court as an envoy of the Kazak khan [Shāh Muḥammad?] of the *Turkistan Orda*. European observers noted that he was both a diplomat of a family venerated among the "Turks" and an enterprising "Bukharan" merchant engaged in long-distance caravan trade. Khoja Naqīb regularly crossed the *Kazak Ordas* from Khiwa and Bukhara to his trade outposts in Ufa and Tobolsk. He could further count on an unnamed *khoja* brother-in-law who resided in Astrakhan. Since his family base was the city of Tashkent of the Turkistan Orda,[36] we can discern the network of the Sayyid Atā'ī *khojas* connecting major trade ports at virtually all edges of the Great Steppe.

### *State politics and tribal affairs in Bukharan-Kazak relations*

Mutual military support as well as the exchange of envoys indicates that the Bukharan and Kazak khanates were by and large on good terms; they considered themselves as allies against a common non-Muslim foe – the Jungars. Besides top-level diplomatic relations between the political centres, the spatial proximity and social interaction of tribal groups on frontier was a vital – at times also disturbing – element in Uzbek-Kazak relations.

Contrary to the view that there had been a steady polarization and segregation between Kazaks and Uzbeks since the early 16th century – the Uzbeks becoming ever more settled and the Kazaks becoming ever more pastoral –,[37] the geographic and ethnic boundaries between the Kazak and Uzbek realms had remained permeable to individuals and tribal segments. Immigration of nomads from the Great Steppe into Mawarannahr had not ended with the Shaybanid-Uzbek conquests but continued, if on a reduced scale. Interaction between Kazaks and Uzbeks was particularly intense along the north-eastern frontiers of Mawarannahr, where the horizontal long-distance pastoral cycles of the Kazaks partly overlapped with the vertical short-range migratory routes of Uzbek herdsmen.

Uzbek tribal chiefs from the frontier region between Samarqand and the Sir-Darya were power brokers between Bukhara and the Great Steppe; they could recruit military support for the Bukharan centre from beyond the khanate's territories.[38]

---

[35] Bukhārī, *ʿUbaydallāh-nāma*, MS, f. 147b; tr. Semenov, 166. On the role of the *naqīb* and the decendants of Sayyid Ata, the person who is said to have brought Islam to the Dasht-i Qipchaq, see DeWeese, "Sayyid Ata"; id., *Islamization*, 228–229.

[36] Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 85–86 (Report of Nicolo Miner who left Bukhara on 10-4-1723), 120 (Beneveni's "Short Journal" dated 8-4-1726).

[37] Janabel, *Qazaq*, 76.

[38] Cavalry detachments of "Turkistan-Kazaks" among Bukharan troops were already noted in 1669–1673, see Pazukhin, "Nakaz", 61. In the 1680s Uzbek chiefs of the tribes of Naymān and

One of these chiefs, Muḥammad Raḥīm Yūz, was known for his ability to provide auxiliary forces in times of need due to the personal prestige he enjoyed among the Kazaks and Qaraqalpaqs and the other tribespeople from the regions of Andijan, Khujand, *Āq-Kūtal* and Tashkent up to the remote Sayram, Turkistan, Ulugh-Tagh and Kichi-Tagh.[39]

A case of (intended) Bukharan military support for the Kazaks is reported in Ṣafar 1121/May 1709, when the Samarqand governor informed the Bukharan khan about events beyond the Sir-Darya. The pagan Jungars (*kuffrat-i shūm-i Qalmāq*) had attacked the Kazak camps "like ants and locusts".[40] Many had fallen prisoner to the Jungars. Other Kazaks and Qaraqalpaq groups had left their original home (*yūrt-i aṣlī*) and taken shelter in Tashkent, where the (sedentary) inhabitants (*sakana*) were struck by fear of the pagan Jungar army. The Bukharan king was implored to protect the realm of Muslims and the subjects (*raʿāyā*), and to ward off the terrible foes who were threatening like "Gog and Magog" by erecting a solid rampart as the Alexander of the age.[41] Upon his arrival in Samarqand, ʿUbaydallāh Khān ordered the citadel to be repaired. The Bukharan army did not move further, perhaps because the *khoja*s of Tashkent had sent fresh news that the danger was already over. Having attacked the Kazaks, the Jungars had swiftly returned to their own country.[42]

From Samarqand ʿUbaydallāh Khān sent an envoy – the above-mentioned ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Khoja – to the Tashkent region with royal letters (*ʿināyat-nāma*s), precious robes, and Arab (*tāzī*) horses for the Kazak *khān*s and the *khoja*s of Tashkent.[43] The Kazak leader Ghāyb Khān was obviously one of the receivers of these letters and gifts. A Bukharan royal letter addressed to Ghāyb Khān[44] states that ʿAbd al-

---

Yūz – based in Samarqand and beyond – recruited auxiliary troops from among "the people of the Dasht-i Qipchāq that consist of Qaḍāq and Qarāqalpāq", and the "Qirghīz and Qaḍāq of Tāshkand" (Tirmidhī, *Dastūr*, text, 115, 178; tr., 84–85, 110).

39 Reported in the context Muḥammad Raḥīm's promotion in 1114/1702 to the rank of *atālīq* (Bukhārī, *ʿUbaydallāh-nāma*, MS, f. 20b; tr. Semenov, 35). According to Semenov, the last place name reads Kuchuk/Kichik-Tāgh. Validov ("Nekotorye", 78) reads "Kichī-Tāgh". For a Russian report of 1730 on "the mountains ulutov and kichitov" (to the north-west of the city of Turkistan), see KRO, 35–36.

40 Bukhārī, *ʿUbaydallāh-nāma*, MS, f. 144a; tr. Semenov, 163.

41 Ibid., f. 144b; tr. Semenov, 163. On Alexander and the Wall of Yājūj and Mājūj (Qur'ān, 18. 93–98) – barbarous and apocalyptic peoples of Gog and Magog, who, when allowed to unleash their destructive forces, inflict doom on the civilized world, see Van Donzel/Ott, "Yādjūdj wa-Mādjūdj". Late Ashtarkhanid sources also use the term "Yājūj and Mājūj" for Bukharan Uzbek tribes – such as the Bahrin, Keneges, Khitay und Qipchaq – in a state of rebellion (Bukhārī, *ʿUbaydallāh-nāma*, MS, f. 243b; tr. Semenov, 271; Ṭālīʿ, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 77b; tr. Semenov, 96).

42 Bukhārī, *ʿUbaydallāh-nāma*, MS, ff. 146a–147b; tr. Semenov, 165–166.

43 Ibid., MS, f. 147b–148a; tr. Semenov, 166–167. The reference in 1709, while Tauka Khan was still alive, to a plurality of *Qazāq khān*s is an early hint at the disintegration of the Kazak khanate.

44 The letter belongs to a set of three Bukharan state letters addressed to Kazak khans preserved in a Tashkent manuscript (*Maktūbāt*, MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of

Raḥīm Khoja has returned and communicated Ghāyb Khān's sincere wish to continue the friendship with Bukhara and to stand united against common enemies as during the days of the forefathers. The Bukharan khan proposes to further improve mutual relations. Ghāyb Khān should, however, see to it that the mob (*aubāsh*) among the Kazaks that may be striving after the wealth of the Muslims is henceforth prevented from coming [and raiding Mawarannahr]. "We", the Bukharan ruler concludes, "have also sent our well-wishers, elders, and servants to the Khiṭāy and Qipchāq, Yūz and Qirq, and the Yētī-Ūrugh to make sure that henceforth they do not go into Qazāq territories and camps."[45]

In Russian sources, Ghāyb Khān (who died in 1718) appears as Kaip Khan, following the Kazak pronunciation of his name. A recent critical review of available sources suggests that he was elected khan between 1703 and 1710.[46] Thus, the Bukharan letter to Ghāyb Khān might well have been written around 1709–1710. The tribal names mentioned in the above letter point to Uzbek groups on the Uzbek-Kazak frontier. The Khitay and Qipchaq had their stronghold in Miyankal, a section of the Zarafshan Valley extending from Karmina to the Samarqand oasis.[47] The Yuz and Qirq controlled the steppes and mountainous foothills between the Samarqand oasis and the left bank of the Sir-Darya near Khujand.[48] The Yeti-Urugh ("seven tribes") were a tribal cluster based in Miyankal. Narrative accounts first mention them in the 1710s, at times opposing, at times siding with the Khitay-Qipchaq of Miyankal.[49] Another stronghold of the Yeti-Urugh was the Nur

---

Sciences, inv. no. 289). The preserved copies or rather extracts of these letters omit the sender's name and the date. Apart from the context of the letter relevant here, which appears under the rubric "A *turkī* royal letter (*'ināyat-nāma*) written to the Qazāq khān" (*Maktūbāt*, MS, ff. 45b–46a), Bukharan narrative sources do not provide additional information on the subject matter and background of the documents. These royal letters have – according to my knowledge – not yet been considered in relevant studies on the subject of Bukharan-Kazak relations in the 18th century, cf. Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*; Tulibaeva, *Kazakhstan*.

45 *Bīz ham daulatkhwāh wa āqsāqāllār bandalārmīznī Khiṭāy wa Qipchāq wa Yūz wa Qirq wa Yētī-Ūrughgha yibārīb īdūk kīm bārīb ḍābiṭa qīldīlār kīm mūndīn ṣūngra Qazāq yūrt-āwulīgha bārmāsūnlār* (*Maktūbāt*, MS, f. 46a).

46 Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 105, 175 note 31. The rule of Kaip Khan, the son of Sultan Kosrou, has conventionally been dated to 1715–1718 (Levshin, *Opisanie*, 609). Ottoman archives, however, document diplomatic relations between the Porte and the Kazak khan Ghāyb Muḥammad since 1712 (Khodarkovsky, *Two Worlds*, 151f.; Saray, *Rus işgali devrinde*, 13).

47 See Holzwarth, "Uzbek State", 110–115.

48 Including Jizaq, Nau, Zamin und Ura-Tepe. On nomadic Yuz and Ming in Jizaq, see Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār al-aḥwāl*, MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 1936, ff. 49b–50a. On rebel Yuz and Ming who lived in the mountains (of what today is called the "Turkestan chain", north of the Zarafshan Valley) and on the banks of the Sir-Darya, see Muḥammad Kāẓim, *'Ālam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, II, 802. For 19th century accounts, see Grebenkin, "Uzbeki", 73; Radlov, "Dolina", 60–61.

49 Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 33b–35a, 157a; tr. Semenov, 38, 43, 134; Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 43b. Among the Yeti-Urugh of Miyankal, the *Yābū* are said to have been nomadic and particularly powerful (Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS, ff. 133ab, 151a–152b). In the early 19th century, the

(Nurata) hills bordering on Kazak territories in the open steppe, as mentioned above. Some Kazak groups bore the same names as these front-line Uzbek tribes.[50]

An astonishing piece of evidence on Bukharan-Kazak relations can tentatively be dated to the years 1718–1723.[51] In this document the Bukharan ruler bestows the post of *khān* and the sovereignty of the realm of Turkistan to a certain Shāh Muḥammad Khān. He calls upon the sultans, sheikhs, notables, chiefs, the various Kazak and Uzbek tribes, and the common and sedentary people to recognize the appointee as plenipotentiary khan.[52] Furthermore, the Bukharan ruler pledges to support the Kazaks against the Jungars. Whenever the pagan *Qalmāq* attack the Muslims, they should send a petition (*arīḍa*) to the Bukharan court which would then dispatch a body of warriors in the cause of religion (*mujāhidlār*) for their succour.

Zeki Velidi Togan has established "Shāh Muḥammad" as the name of Khan Tauka's son, who in Russian sources appears as "Shemeke".[53] Shāh Muḥammad/Shemeke (who died in 1737) must have obviously acceded to the khanship of Turkistan prior to the Jungar conquests in 1723. As Shemeke is said to have taken over the city of Turkistan upon the death of Kaip (Ghāyb) Khan,[54] his accession could even fall on the year 1718, when Kaip Khan was reportedly killed by rivals from the Middle Horde. Shāh Muḥammad (Shemeke) may well have been one of these rivals, the Middle Horde tribes of Nayman, Qipchaq, and Arghun (Argyn) being among his staunchest supporters.[55]

---

Nayman, Jalayir, Mitan and Qiyat were associated with the Yeti-Urugh (Ivanov, *Vosstanie*, 71, 116 note 13). In colonial times, "yeti urugh" was used as a generic term for heterogeneous Uzbek populations (Grebenkin, "Uzbeki", 52–53).

50 Tauka Khan is said to have formed an union of seven weaker Middle Horde tribes that he called "the seven tribes" (Yeti-Urugh; Kazak: Zhetiru) and attached these to the Alchin tribe to form the Junior Horde. The Qipchaq are a Middle Horde tribe, the Khitay (Kazak: Kita) a clan segment of the Junior Horde (Levshin, *Opisanie*, 289–290, 513–514).

51 Extracted under the rubric "A *turkī* khan diploma (*manshūr-i khānī*) issued to Shāh Muḥammad Khān Qazāq" (*Maktūbāt*, MS, ff. 42a–43a).

52 *Rutba-i buland-i khānlīq wa martaba-i arjumand-i sarwarlīq-i qalamraw-i Turkistannīng abā' wa ajdādī dastūrītik marḥamat qīldūk, bārcha salāṭīn-i nāmdār wa tūlā-yi mashāyikh wa ahālī-yi 'izzat-shi'ār wa umarā-yi dhūy 'l-iqtidār wa sānsīz īl wa ulūs-i qazāqiya wa ūzbakiya-i mutafarriqa wa fuqarā wa barāyā wa sakana wa mutawaṭṭina mushār ilaihinīng khān bi 'l-istiqlāl-i wilāyat-i madhkūr bilīb* (ibid., f. 42b).

53 Togan (*Türkili*, 174) identifies the Middle Horde khan "Şemeke" with Tauka Khan's son "Şah Mehmed". Further Russian renderings of his name are "Shamakha", "Shemyaki", "Semeke", etc.

54 See Nur Muhammad ("Skazka", 15). The Tashkent merchant, in my view, provides a plausible outline of the succession of khans in Turkistan. According to later Kazak historiography, Shemeke was elected khan when his elder brother, Bolat (Fulād) Khan, died in 1723 or 1724. Evidence of Bolat's alleged khanship (1715–1723) is, however, extremely scarce (Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 121–122). Siberian archival sources do not mention Bolat's name at all, see KRO, 16–29 (docs. nos. 16–22, dated 1716–1718).

55 Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 120, 122.

Bukharan aspirations for regional hegemony, as such, are not extraordinary. In 1109/1697, a Bukharan khan had issued a similar decree, appointing a Chingizid prince to rule Khorezm.[56] It is, however, astonishing that the Bukharan ruler issued the Kazak "khan diploma" most probably in 1718–1723, when Uzbek Central Asia – for all we know – was absorbed in internal struggles. The Kazaks must likewise have become very weak and divided, indeed, when Tauka Khan's son appealed to the Bukharan court. Whether or not Shāh Muḥammad (Shemeke) considered himself a vassal of the Bukharan ruler, he certainly welcomed any support from his southern neighbour in the aggravating inner-Kazak tussles and Kazak-Jungar confrontations.

In a second letter to Shāh Muḥammad (Shemeke) Khān,[57] the Bukharan ruler intervenes in favour of a certain Turāb Bahādur Ālchīn who resided in the Bukharan town of Karmina, and who had "no other place of hope" than the Bukharan court. While he had been in Bukhara to arrange some affairs, a band of Uyshun, Arghun and Qungrat men led by three personally named leaders came "according to camp's custom" (*yūrt-āwul rasmī bīla*) and abducted his wife and elder sister. The Bukharan ruler therefore requested Shāh Muḥammad to trace the two ladies in whatever polity and camp (*ulūs wa āwul*) they might be and to return them.

Obviously, the Bukharan protégé was a man of Kazak origin who had acknowledged the khan's authority. The incident seems to have been a marriage-related dispute settled according to Kazak customary law.[58] The band of abductors consisted of Middle and Senior Horde tribesmen; the plaintiff belonged to a Junior Horde tribe.[59] There is no clue as to the date of this letter. The fact that the Kazaks could effectively target a tent or homestead in central Bukhara, however, points to the increasingly troublesome years of the late 1710s and 1720s.

### *Declining trade and political decentralization*

Long-distance caravan trade with high value goods was a joint and mutually beneficial domain of Uzbek Central Asia and the Kazak khanate – with "Bukharan" merchants operating as middlemen. The symbiosis, ideally, enabled regional powerholders to derive sufficient wealth from Inner Asian caravan trade (through tolls, taxes, tributes and trade agents) and to translate that wealth into political stability in their respective realms. The steady influx of sedentary goods allowed the Kazak

---

[56] Burton, *Bukharans*, 358; Munis/Agahi, *Firdaws*, tr. Bregel, 53, 567.

[57] Appearing under the rubric "A *turkī* royal letter written to the Qazāq khān" (*Maktūbāt*, MS, ff. 45a–45b.

[58] Numerous regulations of Kazak customary law, as codified by Tauka Khan, concerned women and marriage (Janabel, *Qazaq*, 121).

[59] Uyshun (Uisun) as Senior Horde, Arghun (Argyn) and Qungrat (Konrat) as Middle Horde, and Alchin (Alshyn) as Junior Horde tribes, see Levshin, *Opisanie*, 289–291, 513–514.

rulers to enhance their prestige among different sections of the Kazak tribespeople, who in turn let the caravans traverse the Great Steppe in some safety, while Bukharan khans could reward their warriors with large sums of money and luxury goods.[60]

For reasons that need to be further explored, this apparently self-sustaining social arrangement destabilized in the early 18th century, as indicated by the slackening grip of both Bukharan and Kazak sovereigns on tribes.

An explanatory framework to be considered here points to the expanding European control of Asian trade routes as an important vehicle in the overall process, as it set limits to the generation of redistributable wealth through long-distance caravan trade. The growth of maritime trade seems to have slowly, but steadily reduced overland traffic and affected the wealth of inland Asia. Furthermore – and more tangible –, since the last decades of the 17th century, the establishment of direct Russian-Chinese trade relations through the so-called Siberian corridor affected the steppe peoples' control over Inner Asian trade routes.[61] The new route enabled Russian tradesmen to reach China without touching Kazak or Jungar territories, and thus undermined the intermediary role of Central Asian merchants and steppe peoples in Inner Asian trade. Subsequently, the so-called Siberian Bukharians, representing the northern outposts of the joint Kazak-Bukharan trade network, lost their quasi monopoly of Asian trade in Russian Siberian towns.[62]

The decline in trade revenues coincides with shifts in the balance of forces between the sovereigns and the tribal federations in both political realms. Since around 1700, the two khanates almost simultaneously decentralized. The fission and fusion of Kazak tribal polities in the early 18th century needs to be further investigated, but the general trend is clear. Disregarding three exceptional years (ca. 1727–1730), the number of Kazak khans steadily increased: one around 1700, at least two around 1709–1723, and five to six in 1731.

In the far better documented history of Uzbek Central Asia, one aspect of the decline of trade revenues was perhaps the financial crisis and the debasement of Bukharan silver coins that led to outbursts of violent clashes in 1120/1708–09 in the city of Bukhara.[63] Another aspect was the increasing tension between the po-

---

[60] Burton, *Bukharans*, 333.

[61] The Russian-Chinese Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689) marks an important step in the expansion of Russia's Siberian empire (Rossabi, "Decline").

[62] See Noack, "Bucharioten", 273–278. On Russian regulations concerning the protection of Siberian-Chinese trade, see Burton, *Bukharans,* 534, 543. In June 1700, to mention one of the trade bans, the Tsar forbade "Kalmucks" and "Bukharans" to purchase Siberian furs, since they would sell these to China and thus spoil the market for the Tsar's agents and traders (Burton, *Bukharan Trade*, 84).

[63] Bukhārī, *'Ubaydallāh-nāma*, MS, ff. 137b–143a; tr. Semenov, 156–162; Chekhovich, "K istorii", 64–67).

litical and administrative centre of the Bukharan khanate and the Uzbek tribes, the traditional mainstay of the military power of the Bukharan Chingizid sovereign. In the 1710s and early 1720s, a view current among Bukharan court circles was that the political system ailed, for the khan had to "buy" the loyalty and services of Uzbek tribes with presents and posts, while the Uzbek tribes demanded more than he could give them. Whenever one of these tribes was not properly funded, it resorted to violence, robbing caravans in the steppe, molesting merchants in the cities and so on.[64] In 1721–1723, when these conflicts reached a first peak, virtually all the caravan routes of the Bukharan capital were blocked.[65]

In the late 1710s and early 1720s, the established political order of Mawarannahr deteriorated to the point where Uzbek tribal conflicts led to a split of the Bukharan khanate.

A particular feature preceding and perhaps initiating the split of the Bukharan khanate were attempts of Uzbek tribes to expand their territorial control over pastures as well as centres of sedentary life and agriculture. At least some of the more powerful Uzbek tribes, at that time, were still largely concerned with and had vested interests in pastoral economy. For lack of pasture, the Khitay-Qipchaq, for instance, are reported to have driven their flocks in 1129/1716–17, into the provinces of Samarqand and Qarshi, "and stripped the sown fields and orchards bare like locusts."[66] This event represented a grave intrusion on the sedentary people, disturbing the delicate equilibrium between them and the interior nomads of the Bukharan khanate. Thereupon, the Bukharan sovereign, Abū l-Fayḍ Khān (r. 1711–1747), called in an assembly of Uzbek tribal chiefs (*amīr*s) and reprimanded them for failing to keep public order. To handle the crisis, Ibrāhīm *biy* Keneges (*Kanīkas*) was nominated *atālīq*.

The position of *atālīq*, which had developed into a central institution of the Bukharan khanate,[67] now became an object of intense rivalry among Uzbek tribal chiefs. In the six years between 1716 and 1722, the post changed hands three times: first Ibrāhīm *biy*, a chief of the Keneges-Uzbeks based in Shahr-i Sabz on the upper Qashqa-Darya held the post.[68] In 1131/1718, the office was conferred to Farhad *biy*,[69] the leader of the Khitay-Qipchaq mentioned above. In 1134/1721–22, when Muḥammad Ḥakīm, a leader of the Manghit tribe based in Qarshi took over the

---

[64] Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 4a–4b; tr. Semenov, 16; Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 71, 81, 126 (on gifts and ranks), 129; cf. Abduraimov, "Tarikhi", 31.

[65] See Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 76 (report dated 4-3-1723), 81 (dated 10-4-1723).

[66] Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 292a; tr., 262. For another account of these events, see Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 40b; tr. Semenov, 43. Cf. Holzwarth, "Uzbek State", 114–115.

[67] On the changing role of the *atālīq* in 18th century Bukhara, see Holzwarth, "Uzbek State", 105–107.

[68] See Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 41b.

[69] Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 293a; tr., 263.

position,[70] the Keneges and Khitay-Qipchaq united to form a greater-Samarqand alliance. They conquered the city of Samarqand and in December 1722 proclaimed a counter-khan: Rajab (Muḥammad) Khān.[71] Ibrāhīm Keneges, who became Rajab Khān's *atālīq*, and his associates had articulated their opposition to the Bukharan ruler Abū l-Fayḍ Khān in a well instituted pattern: they replaced an unwanted ruler with another eligible, i.e. necessarily Chingizid, candidate. Yet, whereas the candidates so far had been, as a rule, close patrilateral relatives of the deposed khan, the Uzbek *amīr*s had opted in this case for another Chingizid dynasty, the 'Arab-shahids of Khorezm. Rajab Khān's proclamation in Samarqand was, as such, tantamount to a declaration of war against Bukhara. The Bukharan chronicler 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭāli' describes the various battles that ensued up to early July 1723, when his narrative breaks off.[72]

Subsequent events, to which we shall turn below, are reported by Florio Beneveni, a Russian envoy who stayed in Bukhara from November 1721 to mid-March 1725, and by Khwājam-Qulī Beg Balkhī, a Central Asian émigré writing in Lahore at approximately the same time.

## 2. The Jungar-Kazak war of 1723 and its repercussions in Uzbek Central Asia

In the first half of the 18th century, the nomadic state of the Jungars rapidly expanded. In a last attempt to revive the Mongol Empire, the Jungars launched far-ranging military campaigns, even to Lhasa in 1716. Since 1709, they increasingly confronted the Kazaks. Having concluded a peace agreement with China in 1722, the Jungars directed their main forces against their western neighbours. In 1723 they expelled the Kazaks from their former eastern and south-eastern territories, i.e. from their summer pastures in the mountains east of the Sari-Su River and their winter pastures along the Sir-Darya including the cities of Turkistan and Tashkent.

---

[70] Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 122ab; tr. Semenov, 67.

[71] The proclamation of Rajab Khān occurred in Rabī' I 1135/December 1722 (Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 43a; tr. Semenov, 69). The Chingizid prince, Rajab Sultan, was a cousin of Shīr Ghāzī Khān, the ruler of Khiwa/Urganch at that time (Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 78 [report dated 4-3-1723]). On his mother's side, he was linked to a family of influential Samarqand khojas descending from Khoja Aḥrār (Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 66a, 123b–124a; tr. Semenov, 87, 68–69; 155 note 157; Bregel, "Central Asia", 193). The Samarqand khan controlled Sughd, Nur [-Ata], Miyankal, Qal'a-i Dabusiya, and even parts of Qarshi; Friday prayers were read, and coins minted with his name (Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 294a; tr., 264). No such coins have been traced, so far. An early Manghit source adds that a tribal alliance of Khitay and Qipchaq, Keneges, and Yeti-Urugh had raised Rajab Khān. As he immediately claimed the Bukharan throne, the troops of the Khitay-Qipchaq, Yeti-Urugh, Keneges, and parts of the Qungrat conquered Miyankal up to Karmina and Nur (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 43b).

[72] Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 158a–160b; tr. Semenov, 136–138.

Consequently, some Kazak groups moved west, their movements provoking clashes with Bashkirs and Kalmucks in the Yaik/Ural region, and with Qaraqalpaqs and Aral-Uzbeks in the lower Sir-Darya and Aral region. Others moved south towards the centre of Mawarannahr, the Zarafshan Valley.[73]

According to Kazak oral tradition, parts of the Senior and Middle Horde fled southwards towards Khujand and Samarqand, crossing the Sir-Darya in late spring 1723. Their traditions refer to these events as "lying down exhausted at Lake Alka" (*Alka-Kol sulama*). The Kazak historian Tynyshpaev has identified this lake to be on the left bank of the Sir-Darya, some 60 kilometres north-west of Khujand.[74] At their first assault, the Jungars had conquered the Kazak territories up to the banks of the Sir-Darya, including even Khujand, "on the Bukharan side".[75] According to a Central Asian news-writer in Lahore who repeatedly presents exaggerated figures, 150.000 Kazak families fled towards Samarqand. At that point, Rajab Khān and his *atālīq* Ibrāhīm Keneges broke off their campaign against Bukhara to prepare the defence of their base in Samarqand.[76]

### *Rival cities and their steppe allies (1): Samarqand and the Kazaks*

Within a few months, Samarqand and the Kazaks emerged as military allies. The Kazaks had either overrun Samarqand and adjacent areas,[77] or Rajab Khān had deliberately turned for help to the Dasht-i Qipchāq and the "hypocritical Kazaks" (*Qazāq-i pur nifāq*) – as Bukharan chroniclers started to call them for now on – in his war against Bukhara.[78] Accounts of the military events significantly diverge.

A first military confrontation occurred in spring-summer 1136/1724, when Samarqand forces and the Kazaks jointly entered Bukharan territory. News of grave disturbances reached Lahore.[79] Beneveni reports that in late August of 1724, when

---

[73] Moiseev, *Dzungarskoe khanstvo*, 67–77; Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 122–135; cf. the maps in Tolybekov, *Kochevoe obshchestvo*, 617; Bregel, *Atlas*, 58–59.

[74] The lake was located six kilometres north of the place, where the modern *Golodnaya Step'* irrigation channel bifurcates in two main channels (Tynyshpaev, "Ak-taban", 60), i.e. near the present-day village Dehqanabad. For descriptions of the landscape around Alka-Kol (Halqa-Kol) prior to its transformation in the colonial period, see Kushakevich, "Auly", 28–29; Stanishevskii, *Golodnaya Step'*, 9.

[75] Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 123, 126.

[76] Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 293b–294a; tr., 265–266.

[77] The Kazaks are said to have subdued parts of Mawarannahr, including Shahr-i Sabz (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1105), as well as the fortress of Yakka-Bagh, south of Shahr-i Sabz (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 92ab).

[78] According to Muḥammad Amīn (*Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 44b–45a), Rajab Khān requested Kazak support a year after the Wabkand battle.

[79] In spring 1136/1724, Ibrāhīm Keneges "led all the Kazaks, the *Ūng-wa-Sūl*, and the Khitay-and-Qipchaq to ruin Bukhara; day by day he passed the earth of that country through the sieve of death; a great famine occurred in the noble country [of Bukhara].", see Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f.

the inhabitants of Bukhara had been utterly terrified and ready to surrender, Rajab Khān's troops did not actually reach the capital. He returned to Samarqand, since some of his Uzbek forces had deserted him.[80] According to an early Manghit account, the united Samarqand and Kazak forces retreated after a few skirmishes with the Bukharan garrison that made daily sorties.[81] Until March 1725, when Beneveni left Bukhara, the city had apparently not been directly attacked. At that time, Kazaks (*Casahi*) – partisans of Rajab Khān – blocked the road and attacked travellers near the city of Samarqand.[82]

By June 1726, news had reached Lahore that Rajab Khān and Ibrāhīm *atālīq* "have instigated the blood-thirst of several hundred thousand Uzbeks and Kazaks. Abū l-Fayḍ Khān is not able to come out of Bukhara. The common people (...) are delivered to the mercy of the wave of events, the ways of escape are blocked in four directions; they consider themselves doomed".[83]

Finally, a Kazak assault on the city of Bukhara is said to have lasted two months in 1140/August 1727 – July 1728. In the same year Rajab Khān died, and the Kazaks left Mawarannahr.[84] Upon Rajab Khān's death, Ibrāhīm Keneges tried to proclaim a certain Ghāzī Khān in Samarqand, but was unable to do so. He finally came to Qarshi to make his peace with the *atālīq* of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Manghit, who arranged the governorship of Samarqand for him.[85]

The fall of the Samarqand khanate and the recovery of Bukhara are indicated in letters Abū l-Fayḍ Khān sent to Russia. In 1141/1728–29, he announces that the city of Samarqand is under his protection.[86] In 1734, he reports that the Kazaks had

294b; tr., 266. This note appears in his main text, concluded in Rabīʿ I 1137/November 1724. On the Ong-wa-Sol ("Right and Left"), an Uzbek tribal alliance located in Shahr-i Sabz, see Holzwarth, "Uzbek State", 111.

80 Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 88 (report dated 16-3-1725).

81 Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 45ab.

82 Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 95 ("Italian Journal"); Di Cosmo, "Envoy", 87.

83 Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 298a (in a postscript dated Shawwal 1138/June 1726).

84 According to Muḥammad Amīn, Rajab Khān died the same year as Muḥammad Ḥakīm's son Qurbān *mīrākhūr* (*Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 47ab), who, in turn, was killed in 1140/1727–28, "in the stratagem of the hypocritical Kazaks (*dar manṣūba-i jamāʿat-i qazāq-i pur-nifāq*) in the noble province of Bukhārā" (ibid., f. 40a). Two months after Qurbān *mīrākhūr*'s death, the Kazaks retreated from Bukhara (ibid., f. 47b). In another context Muḥammad Amīn states that Rajab Khān died six years after his proclamation in Samarqand (ibid., f. 106b), hinting thereby at early 1141/late 1728.

85 Ibid., ff. 47b–48a. It is unclear whether "Ghāzī Khān" refers to Rajab Khān's uncle Shīr Ghāzī Khān, the ruler of Khorezm who died in 1139/1727 (Munis/Agahi, *Firdaws*, tr. Bregel, 574 note 536) or 1140/1728 (Ṭāliʿ, *Tārīkh*, tr. Semenov, 155 note 157).

86 Khilkov, *Sbornik*, 563.

caused great damage in his realm, but circumstances have meanwhile improved, and foreign traders and ambassadors are coming to his country as before.[87]

### *Rival cities and their steppe allies (2): Bukhara and the Jungars*

By calling the Kazaks for support, the Samarqand forces had partly activated traditional regional networks. As noted above, Uzbek tribal chiefs based in the Samarqand region had strong ties to peoples in the Sir-Darya region, especially to Kazaks and Qaraqalpaqs whom they had earlier recruited for specific military enterprises.

The counter-alliance of Bukhara and the Jungars that emerged during the turbulent 1720s is unparalleled in the history of Uzbek Central Asia.

Already in 1723 an ambassador of the "*Hontaiji Khan* of the *Black Kalmuks*"[88] had arrived in Bukhara. He proposed an alliance against the Rajab Khān and the Kazaks who had taken shelter in the area surrounding Samarqand. As a reward for their military support, the Jungars flatly demanded the Bukharan khan to cede Samarqand's tributes and even threatened war.[89] According to the Lahore newswriter, the Jungar ruler sent threatening messages to both the khan of Bukhara and of Samarqand, demanding the agricultural taxes of their respective realms. We know that in the winter of 1136/1723–24, the Bukharan khan responded by a letter to the Jungar ruler (*Qūntājī* of the *Qalmāq*) and pledged to hand over the revenues of Samarqand and Shahr-i Sabz should Rajab Khān be defeated.[90] Among the Bukharan letters preserved in the Tashkent manuscript mentioned above, there is a royal letter addressed to the Jungar sovereign (*qūng-ṭāychī*),[91] which reflects these events, even if it does not touch the question of the Samarqand revenues. This letter confirms the arrival of an ambassador named Mīrzā Khoja, who had brought the news that the Jungar ruler had "opened the gates of relief [from Kazak oppres-

---

87 "Some unruly rude Kazaks (*samovolnye nepotrebenye Kirgis' Kasaki*), having come to our subjects by means of some malicious deceits (*nekotorymi nespravedlivymi lukavstvami*), have caused great damages. Therefore, when the brave soldiers (*bagatyr*) and the rest of our people were informed, they fought against the leaders of the said Kazaks till death, and some dispersed. Thereupon the situation improved." (Khilkov, *Sbornik*, 567).

88 Di Cosmo, "Envoy", 88. "Hontaigi Han delli negri Calmuchi" in the Italian original (Popov, "Snosheniya", 401). On the Oirat title *khong-tayiji*, meaning viceroy, that goes back to a Chinese title signifying "heir-apparent to the imperial throne" (*huang t'ai tzu*), see Miyawaki, "Birth", 150. As they were not direct descendants of Chingiz Khan, the Jungar rulers did not claim the title "khan". In the Italian text quoted above, as well as in Muslim sources, the Oirat title is considered sometimes as a personal name. Muslim sources transcribe the Oirat *khong-tayiji* variously as *qūng-ṭāychī*, *qūngtājī*, and *qūntājī* (see below).

89 Di Cosmo, "Envoy", 88–89; Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 96.

90 Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, MS, f. 298a; tr., 266.

91 Extracts appear under the rubric "A *turkī* royal letter written to the Qalmāq khān" (*Maktūbāt*, MS, ff. 46b–47a).

sion] for the *khojas*, notables, commoners and poor of Tashkent and Turkistan" and proposed a Jungar-Bukharan alliance. In his response, the Bukharan khan endorses the alliance and the continuous exchange of envoys and traders.[92]

A second Bukharan letter to the Jungar ruler can safely be dated to late 1727/early 1728, since the Bukharan khan offers his condolences to Galdan Chiring (r. 1727–1745) upon the death of the [former] *qūngtājī*.[93] The Bukharan khan reports that it has been several years, since the unruly Kazak tribe (*jamāʿat-i mufsid-i qazāq*) has come and oppressed his subjects. An envoy he had sent earlier to request the support of the Jungar ruler had fallen into the Kazaks' hands. Once again now, the Bukharan khan proposes to the Jungar ruler to attack the Kazaks either himself or otherwise sent a strong body of young men – shooters and strikers – under the command of a certain Sanjar Khān[94] against the Kazaks, since their plundering had severely affected the common people [of the Bukharan khanate].[95]

### *The Kazak siege of Bukhara, 1727–1728*

The Bukharan letter to Galdan Chiring indicates escalating Kazak encroachments, violence and despair in Bukhara in 1727–1728. Other sources point to the roughly same date of Kazak outrages in Bukhara. Chronological indications of Ivan Kirilov and Nikolai Grigor'ev hint at 1729 and 1727 respectively, whereas Muḥammad Amīn dates the Kazak assault on Bukhara to the year 1140/1727–28. What had happened? The three Kazak Hordes had united to fight the Jungars with considerable success in the years from 1727 to 1730 that Erofeeva calls "the great turn".[96] At the same historical moment, when the united Kazak Hordes defeated the Jungars in the Great Steppe and reclaimed much of the earlier territories, the Kazak groups who had earlier fled to Mawarannahr seem to have pillaged and left their place of exile. Hence, it appears, the Kazaks had come as refugees and left as conquerors. These particulars, in my view, are alluded to when our Bukharan sources refer to the "hypocrisy" of the Kazaks who had come to Mawarannahr by dirty tricks, i.e. under the pretence to seek shelter.

---

[92] Ibid., f. 46b.

[93] Extracts appear under the rubric "A *turkī* royal letter to the Qalmāq khān written on account of condolence" (*Maktūbāt*, MS, ff. 45a–46b). Tsewan Rabtan (r. 1697–1727) died in late 1727. A Jungar envoy reporting Tsewan Rabtan's death and Galdan Chiring's accession reached Tobolsk on 13-12-1727 (Zlatkin, *Istoriya*, 235; Moiseev, *Dzhungarskoe khanstvo*, 80).

[94] Not identified. Perhaps a close relative of Abū l-Fayḍ Khān, living at the Jungar court according to the Jungar custom, to demand hostages from subdued enemies and weaker allies.

[95] *Bīr jamʿ-i kathīr yīgitlār ātqūchīl[ar] wa chāpghūchīl[ar]nīng mustaʿidd wa ṭayyār qīlib, salṭanat-nishān Sanjar Khānnī bāsh qīlib, īldām qazāqning ūstīgha yibārsūn kīm bū jamāʿat-i mufsidning iftirāsī fuqarāgha kūp ūtdī* (*Maktūbāt*, MS, f. 45b).

[96] Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 141–142; Moiseev, *Dzungarskoe khanstvo*, 78–82; Bregel, *Atlas*, 58–59.

Kazak historical memory of these years is focused on their own suffering caused by the "bare-footed flight" (*aktaban shubryndy*) in 1723. Thirty-five years later Bukenbai, a military leader (*batyr*) of the Middle Horde tribe of Arghun, recalled how the Kazaks had been chased around "like rabbits" by their enemies and in what miserable state Middle Horde and Junior Horde nomads had reappeared – coming "almost all by foot" – in the steppe after years of suffering away from it:

> Not just the white tents, also the black smoked felts at best served to protect from heat and rain; many had only one horse, just five to ten sheep, and no cow at all.[97]

When prospects to return to the steppe improved, the impoverished nomads had to take precautions for their future survival. In their assault on Bukhara, most likely in 1727–28, the Kazaks aimed to exact ransom and to re-equip themselves for a pastoral subsistence. In a bulletin on Kazak affairs, dated May 1734, the Russian commander of Orenburg presents a first concise report:

> Five years ago, when they had lost the towns and provinces [Turkistan, Tashkent and Sayram] to the *kontaishe*, the Senior Horde moved to proper Bukhara and destroyed them all, the Uzbeks. They held the city under such a rigorous siege, that they [the city dwellers] were compelled to eat human flesh – if that is true. With difficulty they could extricate themselves from captivity, by giving many presents to the [Kazak] elders. And, that is really true, they have driven off the goats and sheep (that furnish the Bukharan sheep skins) almost in its entirety.[98]

In 1752, a Greek trader, who had lived in Bukhara for many years, provides supplementary information on the destruction of cultivated land, which obviously happened during the same siege:

> They [the inhabitants of the Bukharan oasis] have been utterly ravaged by the Kazaks (*Kirgiz*) twenty-five years ago, when also their gardens and the remainder [cultivations] were devastated in such a manner that for a long time afterwards they could hardly renew them. Even nowadays they are unable to bring them to the state prior to the Kazak havoc.[99]

The Kazak onslaught on Bukhara made a deep and lasting imprint on Bukharan recollections of the Kazak interlude and on perception of the Kazaks in Uzbek Central Asia (see below sections 4 and 5).

---

[97] KRO, 385 (doc. no. 150, A. Tevkelev, dated 20-6-1748). Bukenbai *batyr*, here, recalls scenes of misery witnessed in 1731–1732, when Tevkelev first had come to the steppe. Cf. Erofeeva, *Abulkhair*, 143; Levshin, *Opisanie*, 167.

[98] KRO, 110–111 (doc. no. 50, I. Kirilov, dated 1-5-1734).

[99] Grigor'ev, "Pokazanie", 230 (recorded in 1752).

## 3. Relations between the Great Steppe and Central Asia readjusted in the 1730s and 1740s

Following the breakdown of established relations to the "outside world" in the 1720s, the Kazaks readjusted their connections to their sedentary neighbours. In the north, a new Kazak-Russian alliance emerged, as indicated by the formal submission of Kazak leaders to the Russian Empire between 1731 and 1740 and by the foundation of the town and market of Orenburg in 1734 upon a Russian-Kazak understanding of common interests in trade relations.

In the south, the Kazaks tried to compensate for the loss of regular access to urban and agricultural centres in the Tashkent area and the Bukharan khanate by closer links to a south-western Central Asian neighbour, namely Khiwa (Khorezm). Kazak Chingizids ruled Khiwa in a nearly unbroken chain of succession from 1727–28 until 1758.[100] These Kazak khans of Khiwa were not merely puppets, as an often-repeated 19th century assessment makes us believe,[101] but an indispensable element of Khiwa's northern trade. Abū l-Khayr Khān clearly underlines this point in a letter to Russian authorities received in August 1745 in Orenburg:

> Envoys came from Khiwa, who want to have my son, Nur Ali Sultan as their khan. They write to me: 'The wild Turkmens and Bukhara have received military support from the Persians. We however do only accept a Kazak (*kirgis-kaisak*) ruler. We fear that our caravans will not be able to move to the north and Russia. Your son should come.'[102]

Matters were, however, complicated, since the temporary Kazak union of 1727–1730 had not endured, and the Kazak khanate split into fully independent and rival polities, each represented by their own khans who tried to channel caravans through their own territorial corridors. Both the Junior and the Middle Horde tried to establish their own transit routes between Khiwa and Orenburg. Caravans traversing Middle Horde territory were punished (by expropriation) when caught by Junior Horde gangs and vice versa.[103] Moreover, even the most prominent Kazak khans at that time lacked the authority to prevent their tribal following from joining raids of individual military leaders (*batyrs*) on caravans and adjacent areas. Thus, in the second quarter of the 18th century, caravan trade through the Kazak steppe was often interrupted and seriously impeded by the segmentation of

---

[100] Munis / Agahi, *Firdaws*, tr. Bregel, 62–69.

[101] Bukhārī, *Histoire*, text, 79; tr., 179–180.

[102] KRO, 322 (doc. no. 125, received 23-8-1745). Russian translation of an original "Tatar" letter. By the same letter Abū l-Khayr Khān requested the Russian Governor, Ivan Neplyuev, to send more wine and flour, as well as "an arm-chair in good condition", as the one received earlier was broken.

[103] Janabel, *Qazaq*, 128–129.

Kazak society.[104] In the 1740s and 1750s, the Kazaks basically sought to barter cotton fabrics from Khiwa for sheep and horses. More than once Kazak trade expeditions with huge flocks were attacked and looted by rivals and enemies before transactions were settled.[105]

In the south-east, the Kazaks returned to the Sir-Darya region around Turkistan and Tashkent in the 1730s, partly by force and partly by accepting Jungar supremacy. The situation, as described around 1734–1741,[106] was far from being settled. There were considerable tensions both between nomadic and sedentary people, and between various sections of nomadic overlords: Jungars and Kazaks, Middle Horde and Senior Horde, and, in Tashkent, rival Senior Horde leaders – all were claiming and exacting their own share of agricultural surplus and transit goods. Contemporary observers point to a lack of defensive capacities in the cities of Tashkent and especially Turkistan. Neither city had cannons. Rather low mud walls surrounded both. As there were no effective guards, Kazak gangs of ten men could break into Tashkent, loot the houses of resident "Sarts" and escape with their booty. Pastures of the Kazak Senior Horde surrounded the Tashkent oasis. Whenever the city people had "offended" the Kazaks, they could not reach their cultivated areas for fear of being caught and enslaved by the Kazaks. Between Tashkent and Turkistan, there were five smaller walled agricultural settlements (called *qurghan*). Refugees from Tashkent as well as "Sart captives" and "destitute Kazaks" inhabited these places, all engaged in agriculture for their Kazak lords.[107] Another walled town had recently been founded half a day south of Tashkent by a strategic move of Tuli *biy*, a Senior Horde chief who had recently lost Tashkent to a Kazak rival favoured by the Jungar ruler. The new town was built on the Chirchik River, precisely at the head of the major irrigation channel of the Tashkent oasis. There, immigrants from Tashkent, as well as "captive people" produced grain for Tuli *biy*, who could also threaten to cut off Tashkent's water supply in order to recover his share of the city's tributes.[108]

---

[104] Still in 1753, a Russian merchant noted that the "Sarts, i.e. merchants and grain-cultivators" of Khiwa, Bukhara and Tashkent wanted to increase their trade relations with Russia, but feared the Kazaks attacking and looting the caravans, see Rukavin, "Opisanie", 123–125.

[105] On Kazak demand for cotton fabrics from Khiwa in 1745, see KRO, 323–328. In 1750, 40.000 sheep were robbed on the way to Khiwa by a rival Kazak group (Vel'yaminov-Zernov, *Izvestiya*, 95). In 1171/1757–58, Khorezmian rebels seized many horses and sheep which Kazak traders had brought to exchange for cotton cloth (Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS, f. 285a; cf. Bregel's translation in: Munis/Agahi, *Firdaws*, tr. Bregel, 589).

[106] Sources include reports by the Tashkent merchant Nur Muhammad, the Russian major Karl Miller, and the Tatar merchant Shuba Araslanov (Dobrosmyslov, *Tashkent*, 14–23; Ogloblin, "Puteshestvie"; Rychkov, *Istoriya*, 101–102).

[107] Ogloblin, "Puteshestvie", 416.

[108] Ibid., 414.

In the end, the Kazaks could not restore their former hold on the Tashkent area. In the wake of the Jungar-Kazak wars and the devastations they had caused in the urban and agricultural centres of Mawarannahr, new powers had emerged on the former Uzbek-Kazak frontier along the Sir-Darya. By 1734–1741 these new political forces were already actively participating in Tashkent power games: firstly, the rising principality of Kokand based in the Farghana Valley ruled by an Uzbek tribal dynasty,[109] and secondly, the newly formed tribal group of *Qurama* that consisted of various Kazak, Qaraqalpaq and Uzbek components. The Qurama occupied territories between Tashkent and the Sir-Darya and were allies of Kokand.[110] By the early 19th century the Sir-Darya riverine zone up to the city Turkistan, the former capital of the Kazak khanate, had come under the rule of Kokand.

## 4. The Iranian interlude in Bukhara, 1737–1747

Eighteenth century Bukharan-Iranian relations had not been particularly intense until the first confrontation in 1737 with the army of Nadir Shah (r. 1736–1747) and the khanate's subsequent incorporation into Nadir Shah's empire in 1740–1747. The steppes and semi-deserts between Iran and Uzbek Central Asia had become unsafe when the Safawid Empire collapsed. Either Turkmen or Afghans plundered all the caravans that in 1722 tried to ply the route between Mashhad and Bukhara.[111] Incidentally, in 1723 the Afshar-Turkmen warrior and later Persian king Nadir started his breathtaking career as the head of a band of raiders in the area around Mashhad. As Iranian sovereign, Nadir Shah moved the Persian capital from Isfahan to Mashhad and built up an empire that extended from Baghdad to Delhi, and from the Persian Gulf to Bukhara and Khiwa. His state was based on an economy of pillage. During the Indian campaign in 1738–1739, Nadir's army looted an immense treasure (700 millions rupees in cash and kind)[112] that allowed for a regular soldier's pay in silver. Contemporary estimates of his army's size

[109] Nur Muhammad, "Skazka", 14. A considerable part of Kokand's population consisted of refugees who had come there from Samarqand and Bukhara since the late 1710s, see Beisembiev, "Migration", 36–37. Soon after the Kazaks had left Mawarannahr, Kokand forces led by Raḥīm Beg Qūqānī attacked the regions of Samarqand and Miyankal in the Bukharan khanate (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 48ab).

[110] Ogloblin, "Puteshestvie", 415 (for events in 1741); KRO, 326 (doc. no. 127, dated 20-10-1745). The afore-mentioned evidence has escaped the attention of Beisembiev ("Identity", 57–58), who links the ethnogenesis of the Qurama to 'Ibādallāh Khiṭāy's insurrection and flight across the Sir-Darya (see below note 123). For an account of the Qurama's agro-pastoral way of life in the second half of the 18th century, see Andreev, *Opisanie*, 53–55.

[111] Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 76. In two decades, only one Persian envoy reached the Bukharan court (ibid., 126).

[112] Perry, "Nādir Shāh"; Lockhart, *Nadir*, 152.

range from 80.000 to 200.000, among them Irani, Turkmen, Afghan, Baluch and – later on – Uzbek contingents.[113]

Consisting of artillery, cavalry and infantry with heavy muskets, the Nadirid army was far superior in strength to Uzbek Central Asian troops. The Bukharan army almost completely lacked artillery. In the early 1720s, Bukhara was the only Mawarannahr city that commanded an artillery force: 14 cannons and mortars. In 1723, during the first round of fighting between Bukhara and Samarqand, the Bukharan army had taken along a single field gun, one that Mughal Indian invaders had left in Balkh 75 years earlier; it exploded when fired by unskilled personnel.[114] Both Bukharan and Iranian sources point to the overwhelming impact of Iranian firepower on Central Asian troops. Uzbek and Turkmen troops who had tried to challenge the Nadirid army in 1150/1737 near Qarshi were utterly defeated when the smoke of "the cannons, mortars and muskets darkened the world".[115] Two Persian miniatures visualize the uneven sides on the Central Asian battlegrounds during the Qarshi campaign,[116] and the conquest of Khiwa in 1153/1740.[117] In the context of a Nadirid campaign in 1159/1746 against Kazaks near the Aral lake, an Iranian chronicler reports that the Kazaks and Qaraqalpaqs had never seen cannons before and were completely shocked by their effect.[118]

The Nadirid-Iranian influence on Mawarannahr may have been short, but it was powerful enough to have a lasting impact on the course of Bukharan history. It laid the foundation for a radical dynastic change that indicates a decisive stage in Uzbek Central Asia's breaking away from political ideals of the Great Steppe: the rise of an Uzbek tribal dynasty in Bukhara, namely the house of Manghit, from the second line of power to the position of the sovereign (*khān*) that had so far been monopolized by descendents of Chingiz Khan.

Muḥammad Ḥakīm Manghit (who died in 1157/1744–45)[119] and his son, Muḥammad Raḥīm (r. 1747–1758; as khan 1756–1758) were able to enhance their power by a special relationship to Iranian authorities. Since the first Bukharan-Iranian en-

---

[113] Arunova/Ashrafyan, *Gosudarstvo*, 130–132; for a first-hand description of Nadir's military camp, see Hanway, *Account*, 166–173.

[114] Ṭālī', *Tārīkh*, MS, ff. 75b–76a; tr. Semenov, 95. On firearms in 18th century Central Asia, in particular Khiwa, see Munis/Agahi, *Firdaws*, tr. Bregel, 584–586, note 383.

[115] Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 56b.

[116] A scene of the battle just mentioned, shows the Iranian army equiped with cannons and matchlocks chasing Uzbek and Turkmen mounted archers (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *'Alamārā*, Facs. ed. Miklukho-Maklai, II, 241 [f. 115a].

[117] This minature depicts Khorezmian mounted archers performing the "Parthian shot", chased by Iranian troops armed with cannons and muskets (Astarābādī, *Jahāngushā*, Facs. ed. Barūmand, 357).

[118] Muḥammad Kāẓim, *'Ālam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1138.

[119] Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 65 note 66. Since 1134/1721–22 (see above) he had held the post of *atālīq* almost continuously.

counters and negotiations in 1150/1737 in Qarshi (south of Bukhara), Muḥammad Ḥakīm and his son acted as middlemen between the Nadirid empire and the Bukharan khanate. When in 1153/1740, Nadir Shah crossed the Amu-Darya into Bukharan territory, the father came to offer submission. When Nadir Shah enrolled Bukharan Uzbek soldiers, the son was their commander.[120] Muḥammad Raḥīm participated in Nadir Shah's campaigns as far as the Caucasus and received the title "noble khan" (*khān-i karam*) for his services. This title would have been trivial for an Iranian or Mughal Indian nobleman, but for an Uzbek *amīr* it was a spectacular one, as his client jubilantly comments: "[Nādir Shāh] gave Raḥīm Khān the title *khān* and this good name will remain till the Day of Judgement".[121] Muḥammad Raḥīm spent at least four years in the camps of Nadir Shah's army outside of Bukhara. Upon his father's death, he inherited the Bukharan rank of *atālīq*.[122] In 1159/1746, Nadir Shah dispatched Muḥammad Raḥīm with a thousand Iranian troops to Mawarannahr to restore order in Bukhara where rebel Uzbek tribes had sacked the city. Muḥammad Raḥīm defeated these tribes with the help of Iranian troops and consolidated his position in Bukhara.[123]

When the news of Nadir's assassination spread in Bukhara, Muḥammad Raḥīm did not hesitate to kill Abū l-Fayḍ Khān in the month of Rajab 1160/July 1747 and occupy the throne of Bukhara.[124] A body of 500 Afghan soldiers that Muḥammad Raḥīm had inherited from the Nadirid army enabled him to assume and hold power.[125] For some years Muḥammad Raḥīm officially continued to act as *atālīq* of Chingizid "puppet khans" – until 1170/1756 when he proclaimed himself *khān*.[126] For the first time in Uzbek Central Asia, a non-Chingizid dared to assume the title *khān* and thereby to put himself on a level with descendants of Chingiz Khan.[127]

Nadirid Iran left a particularly positive impression on Bukhara, it appears, in contrast to its recent clashes with steppe neighbours. In 1737, when Bukharan and Nadirid forces first encountered each other, hardly ten years had passed since the Kazaks had left Mawarannahr. In 1739–1740, steppe peoples again raided Bukha-

---

[120] Bregel, "Central Asia", 194; Lockhart, *Nadir*, 189; Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 70ab.

[121] Ibid., f. 71a.

[122] Nadir Shah appointed Muḥammad Raḥīm *Khān* Manqīt – as the Iranian source calls him – as *atālīq* and governor (*ṣāḥib-i ikhtiyār*) of the country of *Tūrān* (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1102). According to a Manghit chronicler, Nadir Shah and Muḥammad Raḥīm jointly managed Mawarannahr affairs (Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS, ff. 95a–112a).

[123] In 1159/1746 Muḥammad Raḥīm accompanied the Persian general Behbūd Khān from Marw to Bukhara. In Bukhara, the joint Uzbek and Iranian forces subdued a rebellion in the regions of Miyankal and Samarqand. The ringleader, ʿIbādallāh Khiṭāy, and his tribal following (*īlāt*) of some 6000 families fled towards, and partly crossed, the Sir-Darya (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1101–1105, 1110).

[124] Ibid., 1122–1126.

[125] Grigor'ev, "Pokazanie", 229.

[126] Bregel, "Central Asia", 194; Sela, *Ritual*.

[127] Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 70.

ran territories, as Abū l-Fayḍ Khān reported to Nadir Shah, who, at that time, marched with his army from India into Central Asia:

> In short, the following happened [recently]: The Qalmāq and Qazāq, even some of the Uzbeks of the Dasht-i Qipchāq have pillaged the wealth of the Muslims in some cities and places. Attention may be given to the supervision of these wicked people whom I am about to annihilate.[128]

During the Nadirid era, influential Bukharan minds seem to have drawn a new mental map of Uzbek Central Asia and its neighbours. While the steppe peoples, now including the Kazaks, already stood for "chaos", Iran came to represent "order". A strong admiration of Nadirid-Iranian dealings runs through the earliest Bukharan Manghit source. The author refers to Nadir Shah by high honorary titles.[129] He depicts Nadir's son – who in 1737 had invaded Qarshi – as a civilized man who had "not come here to rob the belongings and cattle of the Qarshi people".[130] He meticulously notes the amount of silver coins Nadir Shah gave as gifts – in return for Bukharan war contributions – to Abū l-Fayḍ Khān and his retainers in 1740, as well as the price he paid for an additional amount of 130.000 measures of grain (130.000 rupees).[131] In short, the Bukharan chronicler experiences and/or stylises a "gentleman's way of conquest" that contrasts favourably to booty hunting of the Kazak ruffians.

## 5. The "seven years of Kazak oppression" in retrospect

No doubt, the presence of large numbers of Kazak pastoralists in the 1720s had aggravated the already critical situation in Mawarannahr. Intensified fighting, insecurity, scarcity and the destruction of cultivated land by steppe pastoralists ensued. There exists, however, no coherent account of Kazak moves during these years, nor do the available narratives mention individual Kazak groups or persons acting in Mawarannahr during the years under consideration. In the following, I propose to reconsider the Manghit accounts of the Kazak interlude, both as sources and images of history.

The contemporary statements of Florio Beneveni and of Khwājam-Qulī Beg Balkhī have been mentioned above. Other accounts were written a generation later, after 1747, when the Manghits, as a new Uzbek tribal dynasty on the Bukharan throne, had emerged as the winner of three decades of struggles among Bukharan

---

[128] *Maktūbāt*, MS, f. 54b; Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 63a. The (draft) copies that appear in both sources are almost identical. Muḥammad Amīn adds valuable information on the context that allows us to date the letter to the year 1153/1740.

[129] Ibid., f. 51a.

[130] Ibid., f. 54a.

[131] Ibid., ff. 70ab.

Uzbek *amīr*s and their various foreign allies. The two earliest Manghit sources are: *Maẓhār al-aḥwāl*, a biography of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Manghit by Muḥammad Amīn, who began to write in 1157/1744–45 while his benefactor was still alive,[132] and *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, written by the official court chronicler Muḥammad Wafā Karmīnagī after 1172/1759.[133] Two non-Bukharan accounts of the Kazak interlude also originated around 1750: a note by Muḥammad Kāẓim, who in 1159/1746 had come to Shahr-i Sabz and Samarqand along with Nadirid troops,[134] and a report by Nikolai Grigor'ev, an impoverished trader who had lived in Bukhara from around 1734 to 1752.

Sources from the time up to 1726, diverge from later accounts in two salient points: the ethnic affiliation of the ravaging people, and the duration of their oppression. According to Beneveni, who left Bukhara in mid-March 1725,[135] not the Kazaks but the Uzbeks had caused the ruin of Mawarannahr, in particular of the city of Samarqand that was "half depopulated and ruined by Uzbek attacks".[136] Balkhī, in his report of June 1726 points to a concerted action of "Uzbeks and Kazaks".

By 1750, that is a generation after the events, when recollections where shaped into more persistent forms, the Uzbek part of the drama was suppressed while the Kazak part was augmented. In retrospect, three of the four accounts under concern present the Kazaks as the main cause of the ruin of Mawarannahr, while the Iranian author tells us that the Kazaks and Jungars had jointly ravaged Mawarannahr.[137] As to the duration of Kazak devastations, the Greek tradesman hints at an event in one year, around 1727,[138] whereas the three other accounts state that they lasted for seven years.

---

[132] Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, ff. 2a–4b. Some parts of the work have obviously been added upon Muḥammad Raḥīm's accession to the throne of Bukhara (ibid., f. 90a), i.e. in 1747 or later. On this little known source, see Karimova, *Mazkhar*.

[133] Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*. On this work, see Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 106–111.

[134] Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1104–1113. The single existing MS is dated the 2nd Ṣafar, 1171/16-10-1757 (Lockhart, *Nadir*, 297).

[135] Beneveni, *Poslannik*, 91.

[136] Ibid., 124.

[137] "Nowadays [1159/1746] the original city of Shahr-i Sabz [is ruined] on account of quarrels and occurrences. For in the year 1135 [1722–23] the Qazāq and Qalmāq tribe (*ṭāyfa-i qazāq wa qalmāq*) came to power over the province of Māwarā'annahr, appropriated some of its districts and besieged the fortress of Bukhara for seven years. At the end of the mentioned [seventh] year a small pox epidemic broke out among them and many of them vanished. Remediless, upon the advice of their own *khoja*s they reversed the reigns and returned to the place they wished after having committed bloodshed and pillage in the whole country they had appropriated. Thereafter, due to scarcity and dearth the inhabitants of the noble city of Bukhara dispersed in search of help and means of livelihood; one body of these tribes spread in the regions of Khurāsān, Ūrganch and Astarābād. Since that date till now, the original city of Shahr-i Sabz is ruined and its inhabitants are straying away from it." (Muḥammad Kāẓim, *ʿĀlam-ārā*, ed. Riyāḥī, III, 1105).

[138] Grigor'ev, "Pokazanie", 230 (statement quoted above).

The image of "the locusts (in the gardens)" – a trope for pastoralists ravaging agricultural lands that we have come across in an account of "pre-Kazak" disturbances in Uzbek Central Asia – does not solidify in Manghit representations of the 1720s. It may have been on the verge of entering the historiographical tradition, though, when Muḥammad Amīn first summarized the catastrophic years:

> For seven years locusts have continuously come; the oppression (*fitna*) of the Kazaks took place; food became scarce and expensive. Human beings and dogs ate the flesh of each other. The people fled their native places and were scattered in every direction.[139]

It is hard to tell whether Muḥammad Amīn thought of grasshoppers or of nomads when he wrote about the coming of the locusts who indeed were and still are a real threat to cultivated land and pastures in Central Asia. The more eloquent and systematic Manghit court chronicler writing fifteen years later, just skips the locusts – whether real or metaphoric – in his presentation of the events:

> The demon-venerating and fairy-ridden Qazāq tribe came from the steppe (*dasht*) into the province of Samarqand with countless families and troops. They considered this affluent country booty and stretched the despotic hand to spoil the splendour and affluence of this province. Many times, they seized all what is due from the whole Miyānkāl region up to the Bukharan provincial districts (*tūmānāt*). For seven years, they opened the fist of injustice to raid the families of the people and to seize booty and captives from the peasantry. They devastated the fields, the orchards and the vegetable gardens of the masters of agriculture by animals trampling on them. They turned the sown field and the pastures of the country into a desert (*biyābān*) trodden by quadrupeds.[140]

None of the later Manghit historiographers, who added but few details or variations to the account, revived the trope of the locusts, but the notion of seven years of uninterrupted devastations by the Kazaks persisted.[141] The drastically negative image of the Kazaks ravaging Bukhara in Manghit historiography also served the purpose of casting a dark shadow over the rule of the last Chingizid sovereign of Bukhara.[142]

---

[139] Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhār*, MS, f. 48a.

[140] Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS, ff. 19b–20a. For a Russian translation based on a Tashkent MS, see Chekhovich, "K istorii", 72.

[141] Several later Manghit sources refer to the locusts in the ordinary sense of the word, depicting them as an additional calamity. Locusts are said to have devoured whatever was left over by the Kazaks (Muʿīn, *Dhikr*, MS, f. 145b; Muḥammad Yaʿqūb, *Gulshan*, MS, f. 154a; cf. Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 237).

[142] See Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 235–238.

## Conclusions: Patterns and trends in nomadic-sedentary relations in Mawarannahr and the Great Steppe, 1700–1750

To recapitulate, regarding nomadic-sedentary relations in the area and period under concern, we can discern *relatively* stable patterns of interaction in the beginning, their violent disruption in the middle, and a restructuring of nomadic-sedentary relations towards the end of the period reviewed.

Stable relations between Mawarannahr and the open steppe were premised on particular territorial arrangements and the balance of forces between and within the two neighbouring political realms. The Bukharan and the Kazak khanate were both nomadic-sedentary compounds, although with different types of nomadism and different forms of integration of nomadic and sedentary sections of society.

The Bukharan khanate was a sedentary state incorporating nomadic and sedentary sections of society, though its political texture was embossed by an erstwhile conquest of Uzbek nomads. 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. The Uzbek tribes mentioned in the course of this paper were typically based in the foothills of the Central Asian mountains, utilizing – at least their nomadic sections – seasonal pastures in adjacent plains and highlands in short-range, basically vertical migrations. Uzbek nomadic groups were enclosed by agricultural settlements and towns.

The Kazak khanate was a nomadic state with a sedentary appendix: a mobile tribal polity centred in the open steppe that had recently subjugated sedentary territories in the Sir-Darya riverine zone. Nomads and agriculturalists lived side by side only in the winter. For the rest of the year they were living apart, as the long-range pastoralists migrated far to the north. Kazak control of the former Bukharan cities and agricultural settlements of the Turkistan and Tashkent areas stabilized nomadic-sedentary relations. Firstly, it allowed the Kazaks regular access to agricultural products, so vital for pastoral societies. Secondly, it provided a territorial and social joint for a wide-stretched trade network.

In the early 18$^{th}$ century, two chief pillars that had hitherto sustained economical integration and symbiosis were crumbling. On the one hand, the joint shares of steppe pastoralists and Central Asian urban centres in Inner Asian caravan trade with luxury goods were steadily reduced. On the other hand, the Jungar expansion in 1723 abruptly cut off the Kazaks from much of the pasture lands as well as from the sedentary population of the Turkistan and Tashkent oases.

The years of turmoil, when considerable numbers of Kazak steppe pastoralists found shelter in Samarqand and – according to some Kazak traditions – also in Bukhara, are covered by a thick fog of impressive images of history that manifest and evoke the suffering of both the native population and the Kazak refugees.

Overpopulation, overgrazing and war (between Samarqand and Bukhara) were the general condition during this phase of intensified, at times violent, contact between Mawarannahr and steppe peoples. Both Uzbek Central Asian armies had to be exhausted, before the Kazak refugees could extort agricultural products and animals in Bukhara and Samarqand.[143] A re-evaluation of historiographical accounts suggests that Uzbek Central Asian representations of these years focus on the violent and destructive forces unleashed by Kazak pastoralists around 1727–1728, shortly before they returned to the Great Steppe. This lasting impression of the Kazak interlude gradually overshadowed the role of other agents – namely the Uzbeks – in the crisis that led to the ruin of the economic and political centres of Mawarannahr.

The consequences of the violent rupture of established relations between Uzbek Central Asia and the Great Steppe were manifold. With regard to nomadic-sedentary relations, three points ought to be mentioned.

First, Bukharan-Kazak relations completely reversed during these years. Until 1723, the khans of Bukhara and Turkistan, and probably also the Uzbek and Kazak frontier tribes, had considered themselves political and military allies, in particular against the non-Muslim Jungars. Subsequent events welded together a Bukharan-Jungar alliance against the Kazaks. Thus, the Kazaks eventually took over the role of the despicable steppe people from the pagan Jungars – at least in the eyes of the Bukharan court.

Second, the political landscape profoundly changed. In the wake of wars and devastation in the economic and political centres of Uzbek Central Asia, new political forces emerged from its former periphery on the Sir-Darya frontier. The rise of the Uzbek principality of Kokand, as well as the formation of the Qurama, a tribal patchwork of Kazak and Uzbek segments that opted for an agro-pastoral economy and short-range migratory cycles, parallels the decline of the Bukharan and Kazak khanates. People deserting Mawarannahr oases, as well as Kazak groups who had lost contact with their confederates in the Great Steppe, mixed in the frontier region to form new, locally based political alliances. In the context of Kazak efforts to re-establish access to Central Asian agricultural and urban products, Khiwa came to play a prominent role, as the main relay point of Kazak-Central Asian relations shifted from the south-east (Tashkent area) to the south-west (Khorezm).

Third, the release of agricultural land for pastoralism led to a partial re-nomadisation of Central Mawarannahr. By the mid-18$^{th}$ century, considerable tracts of formerly cultivated land in the Middle Zarafshan Valley had reverted to their natural state – reed-covered swamp – due to the destruction and/or neglect of irrigation

[143] This point is expressed by a Samarkand *waqf*-document of 1199/1784–85 (or later), see Vyatkin, "Primechanie", 236–237.

channels. Parts of this unclaimed land were occupied by immigrant Qaraqalpaq groups, who used them as winter pasture for their flocks.[144] Similar circumstances may also have affected the remarkably high proportion of nomadic groups among the population of Bukharan khanate that Russian travellers report from the early 19th century.

Whatever may have caused the upheavals in Uzbek Central Asia, the commitment of its ruling elite to traditions of the Great Steppe, such as the common Chingizid heritage, had probably subsided by the time the Kazaks left Mawarannahr. The Iranian interlude, it appears, just reinforced tendencies to break with political institutions and concepts of the steppe. It provided the political conditions to endow an Uzbek tribal chief with power superior to the Chingizid khan. Furthermore, Nadir Shah's Iran provided an intellectual appeal to influential Uzbek Central Asian minds. While the steppe peoples, including the Kazaks, already stood for "chaos", Iran came to represent "order". Taken together, the developments and experiences between 1723 and 1747 cleared the ground for the rise of non-Chingizid tribal dynasties, a turning point in the history of Uzbek Central Asia that signals its breach with the political ideals and traditions of the Great Steppe.

Seen from a bird's-eye view, the intensifying crisis of political and social integration of both the Kazak and the Bukharan khanate is not an isolated phenomenon of Central Asian and Steppe history, but parallels the decline and dismemberment of Safawid Iran and Mughal India at exactly the same time, pointing to interrelated regional histories and/or common economic and social undercurrents. The possible impact of shifting trade routes on the decentralization of political realms in Mawarannahr and the steppe has already been discussed above.

Another explanatory framework links epochal shifts in nomadic-sedentary relations to military developments. It postulates that the rise of the "gunpowder empires", with the help of cannonry, contributed to a change in the balance of power between the settled and the nomadic populations since around 1500. The steppe peoples, who had for centuries dominated Inner and Central Asia because of their better mobility, horsemanship and mastery of the bow, lost their military superiority. The spread of the cannon and the increased mechanization of warfare gave sedentary populations a new advantage.[145]

Actually, the Bukharan Chingizid khanate, representing the sedentary state in our regional frame, can hardly be called a "gunpowder empire", although it lasted for two and a half centuries. On the other hand, nomadic societies of the Great Steppe have responded quite differently to the challenges of the "gunpowder" age. The Kazaks did not employ artillery, and had to buy their matchlocks from sedentary

[144] Grebenkin, "Uzbeki", 94–97; Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfa*, MS, f. 233a; Validov, "Nekotorye dannye", 102–103.

[145] Canfield, "Turko-Persian", 19; Golden, *Nomads*, 45.

neighbours. The Jungar empire, however, made every effort to keep pace and to modernize its military with the help of European captives and advisors. It established special workshops for the production of arms, including – in the 18th century – fire-arms, such as matchlocks, mortars, and cannons. In the 1720s the Jungar nomadic state even experimented with a standing army based on European models.[146]

We have seen that the driving forces for the turmoil that Mawarannahr experienced in the second quarter of the 18th century were two powers expanding into Central Asia from opposite directions: the nomadic state of the Mongol Oirats (Jungars, *Qalmāq*) with its centre in the open steppe (Ili, Yeti-Su), and the empire of the Turkmen general and Iranian king Nadir Shah Afshar with an urban centre in an agro-pastoral zone (Mashhad, Khorasan). It is remarkable that one of the last Asian empires expanding prior to the colonial era was a nomadic state.

## Bibliography

Abduraimov, M. A.: "'Tarikhi Abulfaiz-khan' Abdurrakhmana Daulata i relyatsii Florio Benevini kak istochniki po istorii Bukharskogo khanstva v pervoi polovine XVIII v.", in: *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk Uzbekskoi SSR* 1958/6, 57–62.

Akhmedov, B. A. (ed.): *Materialy po istorii Srednei i Tsentral'noi Azii X–XIX vv.* Tashkent 1988.

Andreev, I. G.: *Opisanie Srednei ordy Kirgiz-Kaisakov*. Ed. I. Erofeeva. Almaty 1998.

Arunova, M. R./Ashrafyan, K. Z.: *Gosudarstvo Nadir-shakha Afshara*. Moscow 1958.

Astarābādī, Muḥammad Mahdī: *Tārīkh-i jahāngūshā-yi nādirī*. Bombay 1309/1892.

Astarābādī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Mahdī: *Tārīkh-i jahāngushā-yi nādirī*. Facs. ed. of an illuminated MS, dated 1171/1757–59 by 'Abd al-'Alī Adīb Barūmand. Teheran 1370 [sh.]/1991.

Balkhī, Khwājam-Qulī Bēg: *Tārīkh-i Qipchāq-khānī*. MS Oxford, Bodleian, Ouseley no. 185. For extracts, tr. from Persian by E. Khurshut, see Akhmedov, B. A. (ed.), *Materialy po istorii Srednei i Tsentral'noi Azii X–XIX vv.* Tashkent 1988, 256–270.

[146] Kushkumbaev, *Voennoe delo*; Moiseev, "O voennom dele".

Beisembiev, Timur: "Ethnic Identity in Central Asia and Kazakhstan in the 18th and 19th Centuries (According to the Khokand Chronicles)", in: *Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 6 (1991), 55–66.

——: "Migration in the Qoqand Khanate in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries", in: Komatsu Hisao et al. (eds.), *Migration in Central Asia: Its History and Current Problems*. Osaka 2000, 35–40.

Beishenaliev, T. O.: "O nalogovom oblozhenii v Dzhungarskom khanstve (po kitaiskim istochnikam)", in: *Pis'mennye pamyatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov Vostoka* 23 (1988). Part 1. Moscow 1990, 132–139.

Beneveni, Florio: *Poslannik Petra I na Vostoke. Posol'stvo Florio Beneveni v Persiyu i Bukharu v 1718–1725 godakh*. Ed. N. A. Khalfin. Moskva 1986.

Bregel, Yuri: "Central Asia vii. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries", in: *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, V, 1992, 193a–205b.

——: *An Historical Atlas of Central Asia*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Sect 8: Central Asia, 9). Leiden 2003.

Bukhārī, Mīr 'Abd al-Karīm: *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) par Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary*. Ed., transl. from Persian, and annot. by Charles Schefer. 2 vols. Paris 1873–1876. Reprint (in 1 vol.) Amsterdam 1970.

Bukhārī, Mīr Muḥammad Amīn: *'Ubaydallāh-nāma*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 1532.

Bukhārī, *'Ubaydallāh-nāma*, tr. Semenov = Mir Mukhammed Amin-i Bukhari: *Ubaidulla-name*. Transl. from Persian by A. A. Semenov. Tashkent 1957.

Burton, Audrey: *Bukharan Trade, 1558–1718*. (Papers on Inner Asia, 23) Bloomington 1993.

——: *The Bukharans: a Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History, 1550–1702*. New York, Richmond, Surrey 1997.

——: "Marchands et négociants boukhares, 1558–1920", in: *Cahiers d'Asie Centrale* 5–6 (1998), 37–62.

Canfield, Robert L.: "Introduction: the Turko-Persian tradition", in: Canfield, Robert L. (ed.), *Turko-Persia in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge 1991, 1–34.

Castle, John: "Journal von der A[nn]o 1736 aus Orenburg zu dem Abul Geier Chan der Kirgis-Caysack Tartarischen Horda vollbrachten Reise", in: *Materialien zu der Russischen Geschichte seit dem Tode Kaisers Peter des Großen*. Part 2: 1730–1741. Riga 1784, Appendix.

Chekhovich, O. D.: "K istorii Uzbekistana v XVIII v.", in: *Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniya Akademii Nauk Uzbekskoi SSR* 3 (1954), 43–82.

——: "Gorodskoe samoupravlenie v Tashkente XVIII v.", in: Gafurov, B. G./Litvinskii, B. A. (eds.), *Istoriya i kul'tura narodov Srednei Azii (drevnost' i srednie veka)*. Moscow 1976, 149–160.

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

——: "The descendants of Sayyid Ata and the rank of *naqīb* in Central Asia", in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115,4 (1995), 612–634.

Di Cosmo, Nicola: "A Russian Envoy to Khiva: The Italian Diary of Florio Beneveni", in: Stary, Giovanni (ed.), *Proceedings of the XXVIII Permanent International Altaistic Conference (Venice, 8–14 July, 1985)*. Wiesbaden 1989, 73–114.

Dobrosmyslov, A. I.: *Tashkent v proshlom i nastoyashchem. Istoricheskii ocherk*. Tashkent 1911.

Erofeeva, Irina V.: *Khan Abulkhair: polkovodets, pravitel' i politik*. Almaty 1999.

Eversmann, Eduard: *Reise von Orenburg nach Buchara*. Berlin 1823.

Fedchenko, A. P.: *Puteshestvie v Turkestan (1868–1871)*. Moscow 1950.

Fragner, Bert: "Probleme der Nationswerdung der Usbeken und Tadshiken", in: Kappeler, Andreas et al. (eds.), *Die Muslime in der Sowjetunion und in Jugoslawien*. Köln 1989, 19–34.

Golden, Peter B.: *Nomads and Sedentary Societies in Medieval Eurasia*. Washington, D.C. 1998.

Grebenkin, A. D.: "Uzbeki", in: *Russkii Turkestan: Sbornik izdannyi po povodu politechnicheskoi vystavki*. Vols. 1–3. Moscow 1872, vol. 2, 51–109.

Grigor'ev, N.: "Pokazanie Nikolai Grigor'eva 1752g.", in: *Orenburgskie gubernskie vedomosti* 1853; no. 38, 222; no. 39, 225–227; no. 40, 229–231; no. 41, 233–236. (Also available in separate print: Vel'yaminov-Zernov, V. V.: *Istoricheskie izvestiya o kirgiz-kaisakakh i snosheniyakh Rossii s Sredneyu Azieyu so vremeni konchiny Abul-Khair-khana (1748–1765)*. Ufa 1853, Appendix II.

Hanway, Jonas: *An Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea: With the author's journal of travels from England through Russia into Persia, and back through Russia, Germany and Holland*. 2 vols., 2nd ed., London 1754.

Holzwarth, W.: "The Uzbek State as Reflected in Eighteenth Century Bukharan Sources", in: *Orientwissenschaftliche Hefte* 15 (2004): *Mitteilungen des SFB "Differenz und Integration"* 4/2, 93–129.

Ibragimov, S. K.: "Iz istorii vneshnetorgovykh svyazei kazakhov v XVIII v.", in: *Uchenye zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya* 19 (1958), 38–55.

Ivanov, P. P.: *Vosstanie kitai-kipchakov v Bukharskom khanstve 1821–1825 gg.. Istochniki i opyt ikh issledovaniya* (Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniya, 28). Moskva, Leningrad 1937.

Janabel, Jiger: *From Mongol Empire to the Qazaq Jüzdar: Studies on the Steppe Political Cycle (13th–18th Centuries).* (PhD Diss.) Harvard University, Cambridge 1997.

Kamalov, S. K./Ubbiniyazov, Zh. U./Koshchanov, A. K.: *Iz istorii vzaimootnoshenii karakalpakov s drugimi narodami Srednei Azii i Kazakhstana v XVII – nachale XX vv.* Tashkent 1988.

Karimova, M.: *"Mazkhar al-akhval" Mukhammad Amina kak istochnik po istorii Bukhary serediny XVIII v.* (Diss. Abstract). Tashkent 1979.

Karmīnagī, Muḥammad Wafā': *Tuḥfat al-khānī.* MS St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. C-525.

Karmysheva, B. Kh.: "'Kochevaya step' Mavarannakhra i ee naselenie v kontse XIX – nachale XX v. (po etnograficheskim dannym)", in: *Sovetskaya Etnografiya* No. 1 (1980), 46–55.

Khanykov, Ya. V. (ed.): "Poezdka iz Orska v Khivu i obratno, sovershennaya v 1740–1741 gg. poruchikom Gladyshevym i geodezistom Muravinym", in: *Geograficheskiya izvestiya, izdavaemyya Imperatorskim Russkim Geograficheskim Obshchestvom* No. 2 (1850), 519–599.

Khilkov, Grigorii: *Sbornik knyazya Khilkova.* St. Petersburg 1879.

Khodarkovsky, Michael: *Where Two Worlds Met. The Russian State and the Kalmyk Nomads, 1600–1771.* Ithaca, London 1992.

Khoroshkhin, A. P.: *Sbornik statei, kasayushchikhsya do Turkestanskago kraya.* St. Petersburg 1876.

KRO = *Kazakhsko-russkie otnosheniya v XVI – XVIII vv. (Sbornik dokumentov i materialov).* Ed. V. F. Shakhmatov/F. N. Kireev/T. Zh. Shoinbaev. Alma-Ata 1961.

Kügelgen, Anke von: *Die Legitimierung der mittelasiatischen Mangitendynastie in den Werken ihrer Historiker (18.–19. Jahrhundert).* Istanbul 2002.

Kushakevich, A. A.: "Auly, urochishcha i kishlaki, v kotorych raspolozheny zimovye stoibishcha kochevnikov Khodzhentskago uezda", in: *Materialy dlya statistiki Turkestanskago kraya. Ezhegodnik* 1 (1872), 27–34.

Kushkumbaev, A. K.: *Voennoe delo kazakhov v XVII–XVIII vekakh.* Almaty 2001.

Kuznetsov, V. S.: "Dzhungarskoe khanstvo v 1745–1755 gg.", in: Khokhlov, A. N. (ed.), *N. Ya. Bichurin i ego vklad v russkoe vostokovedenie. Materialii konferentsii.* Part 2. Moscow 1977, 95–110.

Levshin, A. I.: *Opisanie kirgiz-kazach'ikh, ili kirgiz-kaisatskikh, ord i stepei.* 2nd ed. by M. K. Kozybaev. Almaty 1996. (1st ed. St. Petersburg 1832).

Lockhart, Laurence: *Nadir Shah. A critical study based mainly upon contemporary sources.* London 1938. Reprint Lahore 1976.

Maev, N.: "Dzhizak i Samarkand", in: *Materialy dlya statistiki Turkestanskago kraya* 2 (1873), 269–287.

Maḥmūd b. Walī, *More tain* = Makhmud ibn Vali: *More tain otnositel'no doblestei blagorodnykh (Geografiya)*. Transl. from Persian, and annot. by B. A. Akhmedov. Tashkent 1977. (Extracted from Maḥmūd b. Walī, *Baḥr al-asrār*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 2372).

*Maktūbāt, munsha'āt, manshūrāt*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 289.

Meyendorff, George de: *Voyage d'Orenbourg à Boukhara, fait en 1820, a travers les steppes qui s'étendent a l'est de la mer d'Aral et au-dela de l'ancien Jaxartes*. Paris 1826.

MIUTT = *Materialy po istorii uzbekskoi, tadzhikskoi i turkmenskoi SSR*. Part 1: *Torgovlya s Moskovskim gosudarstvom i mezhdunarodnoe polozhenie Srednei Azii v XVI–XVII vv*. Ed. A. N. Samoilovich. Leningrad 1933.

Miyawaki Junko: "The Birth of the Khong Tayiji Viceroyalty in the Mongol-Oyirad World", in: Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara (ed.), *Altaica Berolinensia: The concept of sovereignty in the Altaic world*. Wiesbaden 1993, 149–155.

Moiseev, V. A.: "O voennom dele i voinakh Dzhungarskogo khanstva", in: Iskhakov, G. M. (ed.), *Iz istorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii v Tsentral'noi Azii. (Srednie veka i novoe vremena)*. Alma-Ata 1990, 67–82.

——: *Dzhungarskoe khanstvo i kazakhi, XVII–XVIII vv*. Alma-Ata 1991.

Müller, G. F.: "Neueste Historie der Oestlichen Calmücken [...] Diese Nachrichten sind 1722 in dem Hoflager des jetzigen Contaischa von [...] Unkowsky [...] aufgezeichnet worden", in: *Sammlung Russischer Geschichte* 1,1 (1732), 123–140.

Muḥammad Amīn b. *mullā* Nūr Muḥammad: *Maẓhār al-aḥwāl*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 1936.

Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān: *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh*. Facs. ed. A. Mukhtarov. 2 vols. Dushanbe 1983–1985.

Muḥammad Kāẓim: *Nāma-i 'ālamārā-yi nādirī* (*Miroukrashayushchaya nadirova kniga*). Facs. ed. N. D. Miklukho-Maklai. 3 vols. Moscow 1960–1966.

Muḥammad Kāẓim Marwī: *'Ālam-ārā-yi nādirī*. Ed. Muḥammad Amīn Riyāḥī. 3 vols. Teheran 1364/1985.

Muḥammad Ya'qūb: *Gulshan al-mulūk*. MS St. Petersburg, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. C-1141.

Mukhtarov, A.: *Materialy po istorii Ura-Tyube. Sbornik aktov XVII–XIX vv*. Ed. A. A. Semenov/O. D. Chekhovich. Moscow 1963.

Mu'īn: *Dhikr-i ta'dād-i pādshāhān-i ūzbak*. MS Taschkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 4468/III.

Mūnis, Shīr Muḥammad Mīrāb/Āgahī, Muḥammad Rizā Mīrāb: *Firdaws al-iqbāl: History of Khorezm*. Transl. from Chaghatay and annotated by Yuri Bregel. Leiden 1999.

Noack, Christian: "Die sibirischen Bucharioten – eine muslimische Minderheit unter russischer Herrschaft", in: *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 41,2–3 (2000), 263–278.

Nur Mukhamed Mulla-Alimov: "Skazka priezzhago iz Tashkenta", in: Dobrosmyslov, A. I., *Tashkent v proshlom i nastoyashchem*. Tashkent 1912, 14–19 [Statement on Kazak and Upper Sir-Darya affairs, dated 15–3–1735].

Ogloblin, N.: "Puteshestvie russkikh kuptsov v Tashkent 1741–1742", in: *Russkii Arkhiv* 26,8 (1888), 401–416.

Pazukhin: *Nakaz Borisu i Semenu Pazukhinym poslannym v Bukharu, Balkh i Yurgench, 1669*. Ed. A. N. Truvorov. (Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka, 15). St. Petersburg 1894, 1–91.

Perry, John R.: "Nādir Shāh Afshār", in: *EI*$^2$, VII, 853–856.

Pishchulina, K. A.: "Pis'mennye vostochnye istochniki o prisysrdar'inskikh goradakh Kazakhstana XIV–XVII vv.", in: Tulepbaev, B. A. (ed.), *Srednevekovaya gorodskaya kul'tura Kazakhstana i Srednei Azii*. Alma-Ata 1983, 165–177.

Popov, A. N.: "Snosheniya Rossii s Khivoyu i Bucharoyu pri Petre Velikom", in: Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago Geograficheskago Obshchestva 9 (1853), 237–424.

Radloff, Wilhelm: *Aus Sibirien. Lose Blätter aus dem Tagebuche eines reisenden Linguisten*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1884.

—— [Radlov, V. V.]: "Srednyaya Zeravshanskaya dolina", in: *Zapiski imperatorskago Russkago geograficheskago obshchestva po otdeleniyu etnografii* 6 (1880), 1–92.

Rossabi, Morris: "The 'decline' of the central Asian caravan trade", in: Tracy, J. D. (ed.), *The Rise of Merchant Empires. Long-distance trade in the early modern world, 1350 – 1750*. Cambridge [etc.] 1990, 351–370.

Rukavin, D.: "Opisanie puti ot Orenburga k Khive i Bukharam. S prinadlezhashchimi obstoyatel'stvami byvshego pri otpravlennom v 1753 godu iz Orenburga v te mesta kupcheskom karavane, Samarskago kuptsa Danily Rukavina", in: *Novosti litteratury* 5/34 (1823), 118–127.

Rychkov, P. I.: *Istoriya Orenburgskaya po uchrezhdenii Orenburgskoi gubernii*. 2nd ed. Ufa 2001. (1st ed. St. Petersburg 1759).

Saray, Mehmet: *Rus işgali devrinde Osmanlı devleti ile Türkestan hanlıkları arasındaki siyasi münasebetler (1775–1785)*. Ankara 1994.

Sela, Ron: *Ritual and Authority in Central Asia*. (Papers On Inner Asia, 37) Bloomington, Indiana 2003.

Shaniyazov, K. Sh.: "Uzy (Iz istorii rodoplemennykh delenii uzbekov)", in: *Obshchestvennye nauki v Uzbekistane* 14,2 (1970), 69–73.

Sultanov, T. I.: *Kochevye plemena Priaral'ya v XV–XVII vv. (Voprosy etnicheskoi i sotsial'noi istorii)*. Moscow 1982.

Stanishevskii, A. V. (ed.): *Golodnaya step' 1867–1917. Istoriya kraya v dokumentakh*. Moscow 1981.

Ṭāli', 'Abd al-Raḥmān: *Tārīkh-i Abū l-Fayḍ-Khān*. MS Tashkent, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, inv. no. 11.

Ṭāli', *Tārīkh*, tr. Semenov = Abdurrakhman-i Tali': *Istoriya Abulfeiz-khana*. Transl. from Persian, and annot. by A. A. Semenov. Tashkent 1959.

Tirmidhī, *Dastūr* = Khodzha Samandar Termezi: *Dastur al-muluk* (*"Nazidanie gosudaryam"*). Facs. ed., transl. from Persian, and annot. by M. A. Salakhetdinova. Moscow 1971.

Togan, A. Zeki Velidi: *Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi*. Istanbul 1981.

Tolybekov, S. E.: *Kochevoe obshchestvo kazakhov v XVII – nachale XX veka (politiko-ekonomicheskii analiz)*. Alma-Ata 1971.

Tulibaeva, Zhuldyz M.: *Kazakhstan i Bukharskoe khanstvo v XVIII – pervoi polovine XIXv*. Almaty 2001.

Tynyshpaev, M. T.: "Ak-taban-shubryndy (Velikie bedstviya i velikie pobedy kazakov)", in: Shmidt, A. E./Betger, E. K. (ed.), *V.V. Bartol'du. Turkestanskie druz'ya, ucheniki i pochitateli*. Tashkent 1927, 57–68.

Validov, A. Z.: "Nekotorye dannye po istorii Fergany XVIII stoletiya", in: *Protokoly zasedanii i soobshcheniya chlenov Turkestanskago Kruzhka lyubitelei archeologii* 20,2 (1914–15) [1916], 68–118.

Van Donzel, E./Ott, Claudia: "Yāḏjūdj wa-Māḏjūḏj", in: *EI*$^2$, XI, 231a–233b.

Vel'yaminov-Zernov, V. V.: *Istoricheskie izvestiya o kirgiz-kaisakakh i snosheniyach Rossii i Sredneyu Azieyu so vremeni konchiny Abul-Khair-khana (1748–1765 g.g.)*. (Bukeevskoi Orde 200 let, 1) 2nd ed. [lacking the appendices] Almaty 2001.

Veselovskii, N. I.: *Posol'stvo k zyungarskomu khun-taichzhi Tsevan Rabtanu, kapitana ot artillerii Ivana Unkovskago i putevoi zhurnal ego za 1722–1724 gody*. (Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago geograficheskago obshchestva po otdeleniyu etnografii, 10/2) St. Petersburg 1887.

Vyatkin, V. L.: "Primechanie k perevodu Samariya", in: *Spravochnaya knizhka Samarkandskoi oblasti* 6 (1898), 217–259.

Zlatkin, I. Ya.: *Istoriya Dzhungarskogo khanstva, 1635–1758*. 2nd ed. Moscow 1983.