

4. The Order of Things in Eighteenth-Century Chronicles

The results of the last chapter suggest that in spite of all modifications of Transoxania's social order, patron-client relations still played a major role in the social and political life of the region. In this chapter I will shed light on power relations in Mā Warā' al-Nahr from an intrinsic perspective. Special attention will be paid to the dimension of authority that can be deduced from relationships and practices. Therefore I will investigate the language of power used in concrete authority relations.

The investigation pursues the following questions: How are social relationships described by the chroniclers and which vocabulary do they employ? To what extent does the picture derived from the chronicles correspond to Western theories on patronage? What particular services did dependent clients render to their master and what did they gain in return? Which conclusions may be drawn about the worldview of the Manghit chroniclers and their audience?

To find adequate answers to these questions, I will explore the semantic level of authority. By allowing the primary sources to speak for themselves, I hope to highlight the nature of patronage in Transoxania and the ways in which the social fabric of the region was described and perceived by the historians. The major focus will be on keywords and concepts connected with patron-client relations in the sources. This method is first of all indebted to Bourdieu, who argued that social power expresses itself in language. According to him, the spoken word exercises magical power; words make us see, believe and act.¹ However, the approach is also inspired by Mottahedeh and Paul, who explored the depiction of power relations in medieval sources. By placing emphasis on a range of settings and contexts connected to a kind of micro-politics, I will quote a large number of text passages to highlight different facets and aspects of social order as presented and illustrated in the sources. While the first sections deal especially with dimensions of patronage and its preconditions as reflected by the texts, the fourth and fifth sections will concern questions of gift giving and mediation, two topics closely linked to patronage. In the last sections I will discuss more general

¹ Bourdieu, *Die verborgenen Mechanismen*, 83–85. On the ordering aspect of language see Berger, *Sacred Canopy*, 20.

subjects like the depiction of order, the role of God as superhuman protector and the chronicles as products of power relations.

PRECONDITIONS FOR THE FORGING OF PERSONAL TIES

Despite the countless variations and different descriptions of patron-client ties in the sources, two main reasons or preconditions for their being established can be identified. First, we observe the element of fear and uncertainty, even perceived threat. Especially in hopeless situations and under the pressure of life-threatening circumstances, men felt compelled to enlist the aid of another, stronger person. The second reason is ambition and personal interest. Time and again we read about skillful personages whose behavior and strategies were strongly informed by personal interest and the quest for resources or an influential social position.

One of the most prominent relationships, described frequently and in detail by Bukharan and other historians, is that between the Iranian ruler Nādir Shāh and the leaders of the Manghit tribe. Upon Nādir Shāh's arrival at Karkī on Jumāda I 27, 1153/August 19–20, 1740, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, the young son of the Bukharan *atālīq* Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, attended his camp and “paid homage to the king of the star-like legions.”² This act of tribute and submission is one of the central motifs in historical accounts and the subject of different interpretations and staging.³ But what were the decisive factors behind a decision that led to the subsequent occupation of

² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 36a–b, 320b–321a; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 99). Mullā Sharīf gives Jumāda II 8, 1153/August 30–31, 1740, as the date of Nādir Shāh's arrival at Chār Jūy (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 264a). Moreover, he provides a slightly different version of this event. According to him, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī recognized the military strength and power of the Iranian conqueror and dispatched his younger brother, Muḥammad Danyāl Bī, together with his own son Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī to attend the Iranian camp and offer submission (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 262a). According to Ya'qūb, Muḥammad Raḥīm joined Nādir's army at Narazm located on the northern side of the Oxus (Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 3b). The Iranian author Kāzīm makes no mention of this fact. In his view, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was sent by the Bukharan ruler Abū'l-Faiz Khān after the Iranians had crossed the river (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 788).

³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 263a–b; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 3b. Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm also reports about this event. He writes that the notables of Bukhara decided to surrender because of Nādir Shāh's superiority and sent Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī and his son Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī to the camp of the emperor (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 69).

the khanate by the Iranian army? Let us focus on the arrival of the Qizilbāsh at the southern banks of the Oxus. Qāzī Wafā describes the event as follows:

“At that point in time when Nādir Shāh’s camp was pitched in the area of Balkh and nobody turned their countenance from the precious Bukhara to welcome his army, the fire of his rage became inflamed and he threw the thunderbolt of punishment into the stack of patience. [Then] he issued the following decree from the source of orders: The prudent heralds shall fly with hastening wings from one side of the army of fixed stars and the legions of Iran to the other in order to proclaim that all people of Turan, the mean and the noble, the whole dominion of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr, from the city of Bukhara and its dependencies to the hamlets, the distant places and villages of every tract of land, all the tribes and tribal contingents (*il wa ulūs wa hazārajāt*) of this kingdom, the clans and tribal factions, every renowned and glorious man, each and every being [...] have to be met and annihilated with the swords of the brave fighters. No rule should be disregarded in plunder and massacre of the whole populace and no path should remain unfollowed in the collection of tolls. They should exhibit all that is best and practicable in the customs of oppression and discord as well as in the requirements of sedition and wickedness to turn the kingdom of Turkistan upside down. With dispatching this statute the drums of departure came to sound and [...] his army moved from the area of Balkh toward Chahār Jū.”⁴

The author describes the deployment of the Iranian troops and Nādir Shāh’s choleric rage in vivid colors. The Iranian ruler had apparently expected the arrival of a delegation of Bukharan notables begging mercy and protection. If we believe Qāzī Wafā, the conqueror became all the more angry when he realized that the Bukharans had the audacity not to dispatch a delegation of nobles in spite of his overwhelming military power and the prowess of his troops. In light of the above-cited passage we can imagine how fast the news of his outrage spread throughout Transoxania through rumors and gossip. And it was not long before there was a reaction on the Bukharan side of the Oxus:

“When the sea of the Oxus and the stream of the Āmūya fell into perturbation, not only the king and all the *amīrs* of Bukhara but all areas and dependencies of Transoxania felt their state overthrown and they took a header into the abyss of fear and the maelstrom of dread.”⁵

Just the sheer size of the Iranian army triggered a wave of fear and sorrow on the side of Abū’l-Faiz Khān and the Bukharan *amīrs*, so they saw no other option than to dispatch the most senior Manghit *amīr*, Muḥammad Ḥakīm

⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 33b–34a.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 34a.

Bī, with gifts and presents to Nādir's camp. There he was to beg for mercy and protection of the populace. Prior to the *amīr*'s departure, Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān had summoned his commanders and notables for a *kingāsh*. At the end of their consultations they agreed that resistance was unthinkable in view of the Iranian superiority and a lack of military capacity on the Uzbek side.⁶ According to the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, the supporters of Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān opted for resistance, but Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq voiced his opposition to such a plan because of the military strength of the Qizilbāsh. The senior Manghit leader argued that Nādir Shāh had defeated large armies and gained access to the vast treasures of Iran and Hindūstān; he had dealt a resounding defeat to the Afghans and ordered the construction of a bridge across the "ocean-like Oxus." Thus resistance would meet with no success but with bloodshed and plundering campaigns.⁷ This picture is verified by the account of Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm Kashmīrī, who, accompanying Nādir's camp, states:

"Bokhara from being the residence of the monarch, is the finest city in Turan. As I was the deputy of Mirza Mohammad Ibrahim, the Dewan, who was ordered to entertain the King of Turan, I had the best opportunity of seeing every thing that is curious in the country, amongst which are the tombs of the holy men celebrated at full length by Jami, in his poem entitled Reshehat. Also on account of my office, I had a share of every kind of provisions, and fruits, that were sent to Nadir Shah, by the governors of different places. The inhabitants of Turan, when compared with those of Turkey, Persia and Hindostan, may be said to be poor in point of money, and the luxuries of life; but in lieu thereof, the Almighty has given them abundance of most exquisite fruits; with robust forms, and healthy conditions, the greatest of earthly blessings."⁸

Elaborating on the economic poverty of Mā Warā' al-Nahr, Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm offers three possible explanations: first, the region lacks a worldly government (*ḥukūmat-i dunyāwī*); second, Tīmūr had brought in the treasuries and riches of India only to destroy and to disperse all of them in a very short time; and third, he implicitly ascribes the political instability of the area to the waste of the former wealth of the populace and adds that the people of Turan obviously had no appreciation of or talent for preserving the financial wealth.⁹ I will come back to these explanations in one of the subsequent chapters, but for the moment let us consider the reasons for the

⁶ Ibid., fols. 37b–38a; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 788.

⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 264a–265b.

⁸ Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 41. For the original text see Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 72–73.

⁹ Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 42–43. For the original text see Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 73–74.

Manghit decision to surrender. This decision was perhaps partly informed by the experience the Uzbek had made three years before, when a small Iranian army under the leadership of prince Rizā Qulī Mīrzā had gained quick military successes on the battlefield in spite of striking numerical inferiority.¹⁰ According to Wafā, the personal ties between Nādir Shāh and the Manghit leaders can be traced back to that point in time. In 1737 the Iranian army occupied the town of Shulluk near Qarshī after a fifteen-day siege. After the fall of Shulluk, the conquerors arrested members of the local notability, among whom we find Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī, the younger brother of the *atālīq*.¹¹ Mullā Sharīf tells us that before the Uzbek-Qizilbāsh encounter the *amīr* had entered the town, where the warriors of the Manghit tribe were placed under his and Āla Shukūr Bī's command to organize the defense.¹² At the end of the siege Āla Shukūr Bī, who is mentioned as commander and governor of Shulluk, was injured by an arrow. He later died of the wounds.¹³ Following the fall of the town, the family members of the dead commander including Dānyāl Bī were imprisoned and transferred to Balkh. In this situation it is likely that the *amīr* acted as advocate for his fellow prisoners. According to the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, Nādir Shāh, who was at that time in Lahore, summoned the young Manghit *amīr*. On arriving at the Iranian camp, he paid homage to the ruler and entered his service later on.¹⁴ In this particular case we see a different quality of uncertainty and hopelessness. Faced with the occupation of Shulluk, the death of Āla Shukūr Bī and his own imprisonment, the *amīr* and the other captives had to fear the same destiny as the slaughtered. What was at stake in this situation was their survival.

¹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 26b–31b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 223b–233b; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fols. 3a–b; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 590–602.

¹¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 319a–b; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fols. 3a–b.

¹² Mullā Sharīf (see *Tāj*, fol. 223b) refers to Qāzī Wafā, who describes in detail how Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī joined his brother for the defense of Qarshī (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 319a).

¹³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 31a, 319a.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, fol. 319b. The *Ālamārā-yi nādirī* does not tell us anything about this. Although Kāzīm describes the siege and the subsequent conquest of the fortress of Shulluk in great detail, in his version of the story Rizā Qulī Mīrzā ordered the slaughter of all inhabitants. He implicitly justifies this step with the ongoing resistance of the population and the death of several Iranian commanders (e.g., Bābā Khān Chapushlū and 'Azīz Qulī Dādkhwāh) (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 597–602).

We read time and again about dangerous situations when the actors had no other choice but to surrender if survival was their major concern. Even Nādir Shāh himself was not spared from unpredictability. Prior to his ascent he very often had to deal with robbers and thieves from whom he snatched spoils made in plundering raids; sometimes he managed to free their captives. Once he had been the victim of a raid by Yāmūt Turkmen. On that occasion, his master Bābā ‘Alī Bēg Kūsa-Aḥmadlū rode out to free Nādir and protect him from slavery.¹⁵ This short episode may be insignificant at first glance, but it reveals the relationship between both men in a perfect way. In principle, we can start out from the assumption that Nādir’s family was not well situated after the early death of his father. Although Nādir had already entered the service of Bābā ‘Alī Bēg, he was very dependent on the protection of his mentor after the death of two of his most important family members (his uncle and his father). The event further shows the readiness on Bābā ‘Alī’s part to risk his own life for the ransom and protection of his protégé, who owed him his loyalty and his life.

I now suggest leaving the upper level of authority aside for a while to focus on local conditions. We can assume that in an environment characterized by constant warfare, sieges and looting campaigns, almost every individual was in urgent need of continuous protection. Thus we learn from Mullā Sharīf how local governors in the area of Balkh quaked with fear in the face of the Qizilbāsh advance in 1740:

“Arriving at the region of Balkh in Jumada I, they pitched the army camp at a distance of one *farsakh* in the area of Qūshkhāna. Whilst the troops were gathered, the message about the arrival of the royal army triggered a quake of immense fear which made the governor and the whole population (*khwāṣ wa ‘āmm*) in the regions of Andkhūd, Shibarghān, Kunduz, Badakhshān, Qabādiyān and Khatlān but also in Kilīf and Karkī tremble. The custodian of the towns of Andkhūd, Shibarghān and Balkh, who had been appointed by Rizā Qulī Mīrzā, set off together with the notables (*a’yān wa akābir*), the judges and *sayyids* laden with abundant gifts in order to welcome Nādir’s troops.”¹⁶

Here we observe how members of the local elite, who had been confirmed in their positions as governors or province officials by Rizā Qulī Mīrzā some years ago, were driven by fear and hurried to welcome the Iranian troops. They all owed their loyalty to the prince but nevertheless feared

¹⁵ Peter Avery, “Nādir Shāh,” 5–8. See also J. R. Perry: “Nadir Shāh Afshār,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., VII, 853.

¹⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 257a–b.

infringements and looting campaigns. To avoid the latter, they prepared themselves for the reception of the troops and offered a number of gifts.

The population of the tiny principality Kunduz experienced a similar situation when the local potentate Yūsuf Khān died in spring 1738 and Iranian troops led by Rizā Qulī Mīrzā approached the town. Just before this campaign, Yūsuf Khān had shown disobedience to the Qizilbāsh and provoked a rebellion with the assistance of the former *atālīq* of Balkh, Sayyid Khān Mīng (Qipchāq?). However, after the death of Yūsuf Khān and the flight of his ally, the populace quickly surrendered.¹⁷

THE IMAGE OF THE PROTECTORS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PROTÉGÉS

The death of a protector and the resulting gap indeed caused a tremendous feeling of insecurity. Persons in need of protection had to look for a new potential patron as soon as possible, and there is no question that anyone wanting to grant protection needed the resources and skills required for the demanding task of ensuring the survival of others. In the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* we find a long and interesting passage describing a message written by Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's associates and addressed to his son. This message and the entire context illustrate the bewilderment and consternation caused by the death of the *atālīq*:

“After the recitation of the *qurʿān* for the lord of the slaves and the giving of meals and victuals, they read the prayers for the *amīr-i kabīr*. The agents of the government of the dead *amīr* like Daulat Dīwānbēgī and others wrote a message with an explanation regarding the death of the laudable commander and sent it to Iran for the attention of the fortunate *amīr* [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī]. The essence of the message was as follows: When the magnificent father of the glorious commander left this transitory world and gave up his life to death, a group of followers and adherents remained without strength and wealth here in Bukhara at his camp. Having lost the means of subsistence, they bound tongue and heart to salvation by this exalted person. May the benevolent and kind protector providing the means of livelihood (*karīm-i banda-nawāz-i ḥaẓrat-i muḥaiman-i kār-sāz*) [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī] turn the look of mercy on the helpless, may he take the weakened under the umbrella of protection and security. Sitting on the throne of esteem, he will in every way look after us humble and poor [subjects]. Moreover, the honorable brother Yūqāshī Bī is entrusted with the guardianship of the tribes in Nasaf, his heart is also filled

¹⁷ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 608–09.

with anxiety. The rest of the affairs are manifest and apparent in the clear mirror of the thoughts of this exalted prince. May your days pass on as you desired. Farewell.”¹⁸

No matter whether the message really existed or whether it was invented by the author to achieve more authenticity, this extract is very instructive in several ways. First, it shows the importance of such laudable characteristics in the eyes of the chronicler, who makes every imaginable effort to extol his master for his flawless personality. Second, it allows the conclusion regarding the feeling of uncertainty, confusion and loneliness possibly overwhelming Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's followers after his death. In their message they lament having lost the means of subsistence, implying that the order of their world was out of joint. The author places emphasis on this great uncertainty in a situation where the *atālīq*'s servants and followers had lost their protector and employer. It therefore seems reasonable that they pinned all their hopes on his son Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, who at that time was staying at the Iranian court in Mashhad.

It does not surprise us that Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī and his colleagues extolled the *amīr* for his laudable characteristics. Thus the text is full of synonyms describing all the attributes ascribed at that time to a patron. First we come across *karīm*—a word of Arabic origin—meaning a generous, kind, benevolent and merciful man.¹⁹ An individual adorned with these attributes is termed *karīmu'l-akhlāq*, a respected, very kind and generous person who is exceptional in his behavior from every point of view. In addition, the word is ascribed to somebody coming from a prestigious family.²⁰

The term *karīm* also carries a marked religious connotation as it is one of the ninety-nine names and attributes of God: in Muslim historiographies and religious texts based on the Koran, God is described as merciful. Yet in the Koran itself, the word refers only in two short passages directly to God. Otherwise it is often ascribed to the prophets, the angels and, ironically, to

¹⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 52a–b. See also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 289b.

¹⁹ For the meaning of *karīm* (کَرِيم) see Heinrich Junker and Bozorg Alavi, *Persisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1965), 600; F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary. Including the Arabic Words and Phrases to be met with in Persian Literature* (1892; repr., Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1975), 1026.

²⁰ Steingass gives some additional meanings of the term, e.g., courteous, generous, gracious, forgiving, respectable, venerable, reverent, high-bred and God-fearing (see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1026).

unbelievers too. *Karīm* very often designates the rewards and provisions coming in useful to the believers.²¹ In Sura 27/40 we read:

“So when he saw it set in his presence, he said: ‘This is of the bounty of my lord in order to try me whether I shall be thankful or ungrateful; he who is thankful to his own good is thankful, and if anyone is ungrateful—my Lord is rich and generous’.”²²

Although this verse centers on the relationship between God and men, it can be applied to conventional patron-client relations. God is so sublime in his infinite mercy that gratitude is favorable but not a necessary obligation. However, in the second sura in which we come across the word *karīm*, he admonishes gratitude:

“[82, 6] O man, what has put thee wrong with thy Lord, the Generous, [7] Who hath created thee, and formed thee and balanced thee, [8] In whatsoever form He pleased constructed thee?”²³

The last verses again describe the relationship between God and the believer. God the Generous created and formed men, and gave them an appropriate form. Although he is not dependent on the gratefulness of his creatures because of his generosity and sublime nature, the chronicler gives the advice to be loyal and grateful to the Creator. The same may be said with regard to the relationship between protector and protégés. Showing mercy toward them, the former solicitously takes care of the latter and guarantees their survival and freedom from harm. In addition to *karīm*, Qāzī Wafā used attributes like *banda-nawāz* and *muhaiman* in his text. The first is more or less the Persian equivalent of the Arabic *karīm* and serves as an attribute for a kind and merciful person, while *muhaiman* stands for a protector par excellence. Moreover, it is also one of the many attributes of God, who has the power to protect men from danger and fear.²⁴ The next laudable characteristic applied to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī is that of a *kār-sāz*, meaning somebody who provides the means of subsistence and satisfies other men’s requirements and material needs. *Kār-sāz* is likewise one of the ninety-nine names and attributes of God, the Deity.²⁵

²¹ T. W. Haig, “*Karīm*,” *Enzyklopädie des Islam*, Ger. edn., II, 815.

²² Richard Bell, trans., *The Koran* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), Sura 27: 40, 367.

²³ Bell, *The Koran*, Sura 82: 6/7/8, 640.

²⁴ See Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1357; Junker and Alavi, *Wörterbuch*, 105, 784.

²⁵ ‘Alī Akbar Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, 50 vols. (Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tehrān/Dānishkada-yi adabiyāt, h.sh. 1341/1962), vol. 34 (ک-کاخ هشت بهشت), 133.

Besides these central terms, Manghit authors make strikingly frequent use of the element of *marḥamat*—the favor, mercy and compassion one has in relation to others. Seeking protection, the slaves and followers of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī appeal to his son for favor and compassion, because he should eventually take care of them. The vocabulary described above underlined the practical concepts of shelter (*panāh*) and protection (*ḥimāyat*) as well as care for the well-being of the subjects subordinated to a patron.

In the course of his work, Qāzī Wafā repeatedly refers to Muḥammad Raḥīm's praiseworthy virtues (*makārim-i akhlāq*) and innate mindfulness (*markūz-i jibillī*) including his merciful behavior,²⁶ causing him to treat defeated enemies with lenience and to close his eyes to the shortcomings of his officials. There was no lack of opportunities for displaying merciful and lenient behavior. For instance, when approached by the envoys of the Burqūt leader, Tughāy Murād Bī, asking for pardon in 1163/1749–50, the *amīr* generously forgave his wrong actions.²⁷ The author also puts forward his patron's personal qualities to explain Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's conduct in the aftermath of his final campaign to Shahr-i Sabz at the end of Jumāda II 1165/first days of May 1752. In Qāzī Wafā's view, the *amīr* "showed signs of dispensation of justice to the subjects of the area." At the same time, he ordered the affairs of this region and undertook measures for the security of the subjects.²⁸ In connection with the surrender of the Qazāq of Dīzakh in 1168/1755, the author effusively refers to him as "showing a royal diamond from the treasure of the illustrious mind which is the invisible inspirer."²⁹ Qāzī Wafā also adduces these characteristics to describe Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's actions subsequent to the subjugation of the Qungrāt chiefs of Shīrābād near the northern banks of the Āmū Daryā in spring 1170/1756. After the surrender of the Qungrāt, he generously forgave "their infamous actions."³⁰

²⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 139a, 149a, 156a, 212b passim.

²⁷ Ibid., fol. 165b.

²⁸ Ibid., fol. 199b.

²⁹ Ibid., fol. 225b.

³⁰ Ibid., fol. 270a.

RITUALS OF POWER: THE *BAY'Ā* AND *KŪRNISH*

Since I have discussed one of the reasons for the establishing of personal bonds, I shall now concentrate on the formal acts required to bind protectors and protégés together. Mottahedeh has provided one of the best works with respect to the forging of personal ties. Focusing on the oath system, he examined the patterns of acquired loyalties and personal commitment in Iraq during Buyid times. According to his results, oaths of allegiance (*bay'ā*) were highly formalized demonstrations of loyalty that were exchanged between subject and ruler, but also between the officials in the chain of the administrative hierarchy, and even between local leaders. Oaths of allegiance and vows served as instruments in cases of conflict and dispute, but were also exchanged between individuals who liked to assure one another of their continued friendship, cooperation and mutual commitment.³¹ Performed as a handclasp, the *bay'ā* served initially to seal a purchase or commercial contract. With this, the oath had a formal, almost “contractual” dimension.³² Yet it did not take the form of an ordinary, written contract bearing seal and signature. The oaths and vows were exchanged in purely oral form, without this diminishing the formality of the act. Remarkably, the relationship between God and man, according to the Koran, is defined by and based on a primal covenant between them. Islamic tradition considered this a very powerful argument for the moral responsibility of every individual toward the Creator.³³ Later the *bay'ā* served as an essential instrument for the demonstration of political loyalty implying concrete mutual obligations.³⁴ At the beginning, the *bay'ā* was performed between the Prophet and new

³¹ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 58–59.

³² The term can be etymologically traced to the Arabic word *bā'a* (to sell), describing sale and purchase as an exchange transaction. But this seems a very artificial explanation. The term derives from the physical gesture itself, which, according to ancient Arab custom, symbolized the conclusion of an agreement between two persons and consisted of a handclasp (E. Tyan, “Bay'a,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., I, 1113; Cl. Huart, “Bai'a,” *Enzyklopädie des Islam*, Ger. edn., I, 611).

³³ Mottahedeh notes that we find a series of passages and verses referring to the covenant (*uhūd*) between man and God in the Koran. The text directly addresses the perennial religious questions of the origin of man's moral responsibility to God. It furthermore shows that proof of man's commitment is a solemn covenant made between man and God at the beginning of time (Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 42–43).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 52–53. See also S. D. Goitein, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), 203.

believers. In later times, the act signaled the formal recognition of authority and obedience.³⁵ It was publicly performed after the enthronization of a new caliph and was subsequently repeated on many occasions. As a sign of servility, the oath was sworn by putting one's hand into the open palm of the caliph.³⁶ When semi-independent dynasties arose at the margins of the Abbasid caliphate, the *bay'a* and all its connotations were transferred to local dynasties. For instance, the Samanids took the oath for themselves and the heir apparent. The Buyids likewise used the oath as an instrument to maintain the loyalty of their followers.³⁷

In the Bukharan sources like the *Tuhfat al-khānī* we also come across the practice of the *bay'a* in connection with the installation of a new ruler. Qāzī Wafā in particular gives exact descriptions of the celebrations at Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's enthronization. This text says that on Rabi' I 23, 1170/December 15, 1756, the court servants cleaned the "hall of the royal reception" (*ṣahn-i kūrnish sarā-yi sulṭānī*) and spread out colorful carpets in order to prepare everything for the coronation of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. Beforehand, he had summoned the tribal leaders and commanders of the army as well as the representatives of the craftsmen's communities and the subjects to the Bukharan court.³⁸ After his coronation, the new ruler first turned to the public audience to receive homage from the urban population and was afterward placed on the white felt and put on the throne in accordance with the Mongol tradition.³⁹

"[Coming] from all corners of the hall of obeisance, the masters of congratulation and the lords of eloquence and salutation opened the hand of prayer for the congratulation of his royal majesty, and requested from God the augmentation of his power and rank. By the royal order, the distinguished possessors of administrative ranks as well as the entourage of *amīrs* and the 'pillars of government' (*arkān-i daulat*) came outside the court and turned around after the conclusion of magnificence [i.e., the enthronization]. Bowing their heads, they renewed the custom of obsequiousness and the ceremony of offering allegiance (*rasm-i mutābi'at wa āyīn-i mubāyi'at*). The great *amīrs*, the most revered

³⁵ Tyan, E., "Bay'a," 1113. Even if the *bay'a* served as a mere formal gesture, the Prophet never ignored or forgot it when he received new believers into the Muslim community (Reuben Levy, *The Social Structure of Islam* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 277, footnote no. 3).

³⁶ Huart, "Bai'a," 611.

³⁷ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 51–52.

³⁸ ... فرمان شد که نواب سلطنت و سران نصرت و پیشروان اهل حرفه و رعیت را خیل خیل بفنای بارگاه آورده ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 253a).

³⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 253b–254a.

judges and *sayyids*, the inferior government officials and [all those] gazing at ministerial ranks, came from the right-hand and left-hand side of the court and took seat in their places and positions.”⁴⁰

The festivities including a large banquet were about to start after the confirmation of a multitude of personal allegiances.⁴¹

In addition to the concept of the *bay'a* or *mubāyi'at*, we frequently find the ceremony of the *kūrnish* mentioned in the sources. However, at first glance it is not clear whether the two terms, the *bay'a* and the *kūrnish*, are used as synonyms or not. Since the Persian term *kūrnish* has several meanings, like obeisance, homage, salutation and prostration, the concept was linked to demonstrations of loyalty. Time and again we read about princes, tribal leaders and local dignitaries receiving the honor of the *kūrnish* before a superior leader or king. In some cases, the procedure appears to be just a kind of royal reception. Unfortunately, in most cases the texts do not permit concrete conclusions and deeper insights into the ceremonial aspects and details of the performance of the *kūrnish*. Although the term occurs very frequently in the sources, implying its importance in the daily life of subordinate individuals and power wielders, it seems problematic to reconstruct a detailed sequence of gestures, words and probable oaths exchanged from the texts. I presume the procedure was so common that most of the chroniclers did not pay attention to it, let alone give detailed information. Nevertheless, the fact that the *bay'a* was performed in a hall designated as the *kūrnish-gāh* or *kūrnish-sarā* (the hall of the royal reception) suggests a certain proximity or a very thin line of distinction between the *bay'a* and the *kūrnish*.

Let me reflect a bit more on the *kūrnish*, which was performed on an ongoing basis not only in front of the ruler, but also before high-ranking commanders and government agents like the *atālīq*. For instance, we read time and again how soldiers and government officials received the honor of salutation before the *atālīq* Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. This more or less ritualized act generally symbolized the formal recognition of authority of

⁴⁰ Ibid., fol. 254b. My translation differs from that of Ron Sela (see Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 14). Other Manghit chronicles devote far less space to the *bay'a* before the time of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān (see von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 276–77).

⁴¹ In the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* the term *bay'at/bay'a* appears in its original form only in one passage (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 132b). In Bukharan chronicles the equivalent Arabic term *mubāyi'at* (derived from the same root) is occasionally encountered (see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 63b, 149a, 254b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 454a).

any superior actor in a variety of situations, no matter whether he was a powerful commander, tribal leader or the king in person. It is remarkable that the Bukharan authors always write from the perspective of the subordinate actors promising fidelity when they come to talk about the *kūrnish*. The addressees of the salutation appear in contrast as passive recipients, even as unapproachable and enraptured. For example, Qāzī Wafā describes Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's salutation in front of Nādir Shāh as follows:

"[...] he paid with most excellent politeness homage to that king of the legions as numerous as the stars belonging to the celestial throne and presented [...] precious gifts and presents worthy of the authority of that illustrious king. These gifts seemed abundant and venerable under his [Nādir Shāh's] penetrating eyes and he granted him [Muḥammad Raḥīm] favors and attention. [...] Therefore, he treated him with royal benevolence and clothed his stature in a robe of honor (*khal'at-i mukrim*)."⁴²

Although this passage describes Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's homage to the Iranian ruler, it remains relatively vague in terms of content and words exchanged. We just learn that the young commander paid attention to all the rules of the procedure and approached the Iranian king with utmost politeness. Especially the beginning of this *kūrnish* is veiled in darkness. The offering of gifts in all likelihood marked the conclusion of the ceremony. However, the *kūrnish* in itself seemed to initiate a finely balanced sequence of acts involving a lot of giving and taking. What also becomes obvious is that it served as a demonstration of loyalty and that the entire procedure was accompanied by further exchange activities. The passage also suggests that it initiated the bond between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his new overlord. The final granting of the robe (*khal'at*) by no means marked the end of the chain of reciprocities. Now the young *amīr* together with his companions had entered Nādir's service.⁴³

The nature of my sources and the grid of available data unfortunately do not leave further scope for interpretation of this particular case. Yet the sources frequently reveal the same procedure that I have described here in a more exemplary and fragmentary manner. When Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, the father of the young Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, was dispatched from the Bukharan court later on to obtain mercy and extensive guarantees of security from Nādir Shāh, he was first received by his son, who was already in

⁴² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 36b–37a.

⁴³ Ibid., fols. 36b–38a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 264a; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 3b.

Nādir's service. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī accompanied his father in paying reverent homage to his overlord:

"Showing laudable respect and salutation, the noble *amīr* offered presents and rendered illustrious gifts under the eyes of the honored king. [Afterward], Nādir Shāh granted him royal favors (*iltifāt-i khusrawāna*) and pleased him with exquisite gifts and incomparable rewards."⁴⁴

Looking at this and the previous extract, we come to conclude that on the one hand the *kūrnish* served the firm recognition of superiority and authority; on the other hand it involved demonstrations of courtesy and praises. Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī probably wanted to appeal to the conqueror's leniency. After all, he had been dispatched by his own master, Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, and other Bukharan notables to obtain assurances and guarantees of security and to spare the populace plundering campaigns and massacre. The Bukharan *atālīq* knew that everything was at stake and his success depended on his conduct as well as on Nādir Shāh's concessions. Therefore he additionally underlined his submission with presents and recognized Iranian supremacy. The acceptance of the submission was likewise signaled by the presentation of counter-gifts. With this gesture, the Iranian ruler pledged the *amīr* his friendship, mercy and leniency.

Besides this coarse-grained data on homage and the exchange of gifts, early Manghit sources give instructive information leading to the conclusion that this act of salutation not only served to forge personal bonds between ruler and subject but, similar to the *bay'a*, also initiated "covenant-like ties" between the actors involved. In connection with the establishing of binding relationships, Qāzī Wafā informs us that at the end of Rabī' I 1169/December 1755, some envoys of the rabble-rousing *amīr* Fāzil Bī Yūz arrived at the court. After performing the *kūrnish*, they presented gifts and a message from their master in which he offered obedience and submission. Furthermore, the ruler of Ūrā Tippa reaffirmed the sincerity and trustworthiness of the envisaged "contract" by promising the delivery of the canonical alms (*zakāt*) and the provision of auxiliary troops.⁴⁵ Wafā depicts Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's reaction to these suggestions as follows:

⁴⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 38b.

⁴⁵ جهت تأکید صداقت پیمان و وثوق عهد و اطمینان قلب را با پیمان مؤکد و ممد ساختن مال ذکوة و آق اوایی و چریک خود را می دهیم ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 237b).

“Since it is the long-lasting rule of the paramount masters not to put the hand of rejection on the bosom of those asking [for pardon], and the envoys taking refuge in forgiveness and acquiescence in royal kindness, confirm the acceptance of submission and obedience by delivering the *zakāt*, the *āq ūylī* and the *chirīk*, they must send a son of Fāzil Bī to the world-protecting court and have to deliver the obligatory taxes, the *kharāj* and so on year by year in order to strengthen the covenant (*jihat-i mushayyad-i wuthūq-i ‘ahd wa paymān*).”⁴⁶

From this passage we learn that a covenant, probably based on an oath, was at least the subject of the negotiations immediately after the *kūrnish*. In another chapter of his comprehensive work, Qāzī Wafā tells us about the relationship of a certain Jum‘a Bēg with the Bukharan court. The chief of the Turkomān Yūzī had been a traditional ally of Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt for years. The author informs us that Jum‘a Bēg had formed part of Tughāy Murād’s “compact” when the latter had maintained good relations with the court.⁴⁷ After the beginning of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s rule, the Burqūt leader broke with the government and the compact became obsolete. We see here an interesting case of an indirect relationship with the royal court mediated by the bond of allegiance maintained by a third actor.⁴⁸

Demonstrating the importance of making covenants based on personal relationships and trustworthiness, Qāzī Wafā states that “for the bride of the kingdom the hand of compact is [like] a sharp sword, whilst the matrimony of the flaming sword Dhū’l-fiḳār is essential for the well-being of authority.”⁴⁹ This mirrors the dual strategy of maintaining authority by forging alliances through covenants based on mutual agreements and exchanged oaths of allegiance (*‘ahd wa paymān*) on the one hand, and employing coercive force if necessary on the other. The resulting bond was maintained by serious commitment and personal loyalty but also by military force when alliances were dissolved and obligations disregarded. Such bonds were not only made on the level of the ruler and subservient followers and allies, but tied even local actors together. One very prominent example in this regard is the forging of an alliance between local Uzbek chiefs, the leaders of the rebellious Kīnakās and Yūz tribes in Dhū’l-Qa‘da 1164/September–October 1751. At that time, the Kīnakās leadership resorted

⁴⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 238b–239a.

⁴⁷ ... بنا برآنکه رابطه قدیمی با جماعه برقوتیه داشت داخل در صلح و معاهده طغایمراد بی شده ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 246b).

⁴⁸ Ibid., fol. 247b.

⁴⁹ Ibid., fol. 252b.

to Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz, the ruler of Ḥiṣār, with whom they exchanged oaths of allegiance.⁵⁰

The relevance of oaths (*saugand*) is repeatedly mentioned in the sources.⁵¹ Following the information given by Qāzī Wafā, Mullā Sharīf records how Muḥammad Amīn Bī evaded a military defeat by hatching a plot in Ramaḥān 1168/June–July 1755. The chroniclers accuse the rebellious Yūz leader of having slipped a false message to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. According to this faked letter, a certain Quwwat Bī Qīrghiz, a commander in the camp of the Khoqandian ally Īrdāna Bī, was said to have clandestinely offered an oath of allegiance with the opponent Yūz leaders.⁵² Muḥammad Amīn Bī and his ally Fāzil Bī decided on this intrigue when Bukharan troops spelled a series of defeats for them. When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī learned about the treacherous content of this letter, he ordered a proper investigation of the affair since he had lost his trust in Īrdāna Bī's loyalty. He sent out his commanders Daulat Bī and Jum'a Qul Mingbāshī to confront his ally with the truth and to investigate the state of affairs. In this very unpleasant situation, the lord of Khoqand vehemently mentioned the oaths exchanged and reiterated the covenant with a new oath.⁵³

Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's chronicler devotes an entire chapter to the binding nature of oaths and emphasizes the steadfast commitment of his patron to covenants (*rusūkh ba 'ahd*), which he describes as one of the most praiseworthy characteristics of human beings.⁵⁴ Another mention of oaths describes a punitive expedition of Iranian troops against rebellious Uzbek tribes in the eastern and central parts of Miyānkāl in spring and early summer 1747. Upon the conclusion of the campaign, the Iranian commanders received a letter from Nādir Shāh's nephew 'Alī Qulī Khān.

⁵⁰ (ibid., fol. 168a; see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 368b).

(ibid., fol. 168a; see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 368b).

⁵¹ The terms *'ahd* and *paymān* have the additional meaning of an oath besides the ordinary connotation of a contract (see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 269, 874).

⁵² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 396b. Qāzī Wafā does not give detailed information about the content of the letter, but only mentions that it was a trick engineered by Muḥammad Amīn Bī. In addition, he says that the faked message was addressed to the Yūz *amīrs* Muḥammad Amīn Bī and Fāzil Bī. The essence of the message followed the rules of enmity and the path of trickery and fraud (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 236a).

⁵³ روز دیگر دولت بی و جمعه قل منگ باشی به امر کامیابی نزد ایردانه بی رفته تفحص حال گذشته نمودند او به ... غلاظ و شداد سوگندان یاد کرده پیمان را مؤکد به ایمان نمود (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 236a–b).

⁵⁴ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maṣṣhar*, fol. 25a.

Attached to this message we find the promise of distinct compacts and an oath (*mawāẓiq-i bayān wa saugand*). In view of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's ambitions, the Qizilbāsh leaders were ordered to protect Abū'l-Faiz Khān and not to allow his authority to become endangered.⁵⁵

The picture derived from sources like the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* and *Tāj al-tawārīkh* reveals that oaths were considered important. Yet although there are indications that oaths were subject to negotiations following the *kūrnish*, it remains uncertain whether the procedure involved an exchange of promises of fidelity. However, it can be regarded as a kind of initiator for the set-up of personal relations and as an instrument to ensure their maintenance and continuity. It was by no means an isolated act just performed to appeal to the mercy of superiors or to ease negotiations for security guarantees. *Kūrnishs* were performed frequently and repeatedly in order to maintain the continuity of personal relations and to persuade the factions and actors involved to meet their mutual obligations. For example, Qāzī Wafā mentions that when Nādir Shāh returned from Khwārazm via Bukhara to Mashhad, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī again presented gifts once he had recognized that the well-being and the security of the populace were not affected by the Iranian troops. Nādir Shāh is said to have been happy and pleased by this gesture.⁵⁶ The sources also reveal that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī expressed his fealty toward his lord more than once. The *Tāj al-tawārīkh* describes how after returning from Transoxania, he and his companions paid homage to Nādir immediately upon their arrival at the Iranian court in early summer 1747. On this occasion, the Bukharan *amīrs* and notables presented various gifts and were granted royal favors in return.⁵⁷

The rulers or commanders received the *kūrnish* from their warriors even during military campaigns. Especially in such critical situations, it was apparently important to assure oneself of the continued fidelity of one's own

⁵⁵ ... از آنجمله رقمی مشحون به نصایح ارجمند و مستحکم به مواتیق بیان و سوغند نزد بهبود خان و حسن خان و جعفرخان و سایر سرکرده های قزلباشیه ارسال نمود که سعی بلیغ در صحت حال و رونق آمل شاه ابو الفیض (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 111b). بظهور آرند ...

⁵⁶ چون امیر کبیر از معاودت کرایس کیوان مماس شاه ایران اطلاع یافت مراعات امانی و آمل مقیم و مسافر مملکت بل رفاهیت حال سپاه و رعیت را ملاحظه نمود و تنسوقات نامی و بیلاکات کرامی برداشته عشر آخر رمضان المبارک چون صبح ارادت مقارن آن آفتاب دولت گردید بعد از داخل شدن به کورنش آن عالیجاهی ایثار تحف و هدایا و اظهار از معانی و پیش کش نموده بملاقات آن خسرو جمشید جاه فایز و بهرمند آمد آن شاه نامی از وصول امیر (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 47a).

⁵⁷ حسب الامر شاهی یبز کورنش جمشید دستگاهی مشرف شده کرایم تحایف و شرایف ارمغانی از پیشگاه نظر (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 306b). جهانبانی گذرانیدند ...

following. When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī campaigned against the local ruler of Ūrā Tippa in summer 1168/1755, he took the *kūrnish* from his soldiers.⁵⁸ Although we do not possess any information about the particular behavior and actions of the Yūz leader, it seems reasonable that he likewise received homage from his warriors. There are indications in the sources that the rulers or commanders took oaths of fidelity from their followers prior to campaigns and major combats because it was precisely in these situations that loyalties were tested—there was always the risk of them eventually being broken. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭālī’ provides a very illustrative example in this regard.⁵⁹ The procedure took place in 1722 at Hazāra near the city of Karmīna. At the time, the tribes of Miyānkāl had sided with Rajab Sulṭān and his Kīnakās allies to put an end to the reign of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān. After all, the important cities of Samarqand and Shahr-i Sabz were already in the hands of the rebels and the scope of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān’s authority had shrunk dramatically. In light of this and the enemy’s superior numbers, a desertion of his warriors seemed the most probable scenario. Taking the *kūrnish* from them was the most suitable way to secure the support of the tribal leaders and their followers. The procedure described by Ṭālī’ followed a strict hierarchy. The first man paying obeisance was a certain Muḥammad Ḥāshim Khwāja Sayyid Atā’ī, who bore the rank of *naqīb* and expressed his loyalty with the following verses:

“O God, the king of the kings of Bukhara may live

As long as the heaven keeps on rotating,

And may his nature always be illuminated

By the grace of the possessor of the splendid sun [God]”⁶⁰

The *naqīb* was followed by other members of Sayyid Atā’ī’s entourage.⁶¹ Subsequently, it was the turn of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq and his

⁵⁸ امرای نامی به همراهی اهل ایل قراقلیاق قرین معسکر همایونی شدند امرا داخل کورنش عالی گردیده ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 229b–230a).

⁵⁹ Ṭālī’, *Tārīkh*, fols. 80b–89a; Semenov trans., 98–107.

⁶⁰ Ibid., fol. 80b; Russian text, 99.

⁶¹ The important military rank of *naqīb* was exclusively assigned to the descendants of Sayyid Atā. The *niqābat* set them apart from purely religious posts such as *qāzī* or *sheikh al-Islām*. Holding this position, Sayyid Atā’ī occupied one of the most prestigious seats to the ruler’s left side (for further details on this rank see Devin DeWeese, “The Descendants

Manghit contingents. According to Tāli', the commander-in-chief praised his lord and prayed for him. Genuflecting before the ruler, he praised him as follows:

"Oh world-possessing king and sublime conqueror of the world

May your person always be preserved from misfortune

It is my hope that all your enemies shall become unable

To repel an injury due to the protection of God the Merciful"⁶²

Although the author does not mention whether we are dealing here with a *kūrnish* or a *bay'a*, the procedure is illuminating. It shows that all tribal leaders and commanders expressed their loyalty to the ruler in a similar manner. If we take the *atālīq*'s genuflection literally, the ceremony appears to be an act of utmost devotion and subservience symbolizing the recognition of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān's superior rank and authority.⁶³ Moreover, in both passages the men referred to God as a witness to their allegiance. With this, their statements took on a distinct religious content, lending them additional validity. Unfortunately, the source does not inform us about the words and reactions of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, who appears as usual very passive in light of the procedure. In fact, this *kūrnish* is more a formal statement of fidelity addressed to the ruler than an exchange of oaths. The particular terms indicating an oath do not appear in the text. But similar to the *bay'a* on the occasion of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's coronation, the *kūrnish* described by Tāli' involved a prayer to God.

When in 1122/1710–11 the relationship between 'Ubaidullah Khān and his *atālīq* Ma'sūm Bī deteriorated,

"he several times summoned that *amīr* to his private room and gave [him] the opportunity of the royal reception and nothing other than kindness and favors was granted by the king to this commander. Furthermore, he brought in a new oath (*'ahd-i tāza wa paymān-i jadīd*) in order to do away with the doubts and suspicion of the *amīr* [...]"⁶⁴

This oath mentioned by the court chronicler notwithstanding, it did not prevent the *amīr* from withdrawing his loyalty and performing the *kūrnish*

of Sayyid Ata and the Rank of *Naqīb* in Central Asia," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115, no. 4 (1995): 612–34).

⁶² Tāli', *Tārīkh*, fol. 81b; Semenov trans., 100.

⁶³ Ibid., fols. 80a–89a; Russian text, 98–107.

⁶⁴ Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 219a; Semenov trans., 244.

before the king's younger brother when most of the other tribal leaders decided to remove 'Ubaidullah Khān. Hoping that the new oath between him and Ma'sūm Bī would work and unfold its binding force,⁶⁵ the old ruler still relied on the fidelity of his *atālīq* when it was too late. It is exactly against this background that the author mentions the following *ḥadīth*: "[For somebody without faith there will be no protection], and for someone without religion there is no covenant."⁶⁶ With this reference, the making of covenants and the swearing of oaths gains a distinct religious hue. Qāzī Wafā describes only one oath of fealty in its exact wording. According to him, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī summoned

"all *amīrs* and learned men of the guarded domains (*mamālik-i maḥrūsa*) and the governors and officials of the protected area (*wilāyat-i maḥfūza*). Thus, all small and big men from the cities, towns and villages assembled at the world-sheltering court [...] in order to put the right belief and the brilliant thought onto the touchstone. As soon as this ultimate goal and pleasing aim emerged safely and pure as gold out of the crucible of contention and disagreement, then the edict was drawn from the pages of the scribes and accepted by the polished signet ring [of the ruler]. And their request was generously received with the honor of [the ruler's] close attention. According to the divine will, in the first days of Rabi' I corresponding to the beginning of Sagittarius, the end of the autumn 1170/November–December 1756, orders were cautiously issued to the court servants to arrange the payments and goods, and to prepare everything for the dispensation of justice and required for the royal rank."⁶⁷

From this passage we learn about the preparations for Muḥammad Raḥīm's enthronement. Before usurping the Bukharan throne, he wanted to assure himself of the loyalty of the local governors. On the following pages, the author describes the arrival of everybody who was anybody. After a speech held by the future ruler in front of the notables, they recognized his claims with the following words:

"Oh King! Monarch, Sovereign

Oh Lord, Nourisher of the world

⁶⁵ Ibid., fols. 229a–b; Russian text, 255.

⁶⁶ Ibid., fol. 229b; Russian text, 255. [*Lā īmān li-man lā amānātun lahu*] *lā dīn li-man lā 'ahad lahu*. See *Musnad Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādr), III, 135; Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusain al-Bayhaqī, *Fihris aḥādīth al-sunan al-kubra* 11 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-fikr, 1980, 1986), VI, 288; Nūr al-Dīn al-Haithāmī, *Mujma' al-zawā'id* (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmīya 1408 h.q./1988), vol. I, 96.

⁶⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 251a. The second part of this quotation largely follows Sela's translation (Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 7).

You are worthy of the crown and the throne
 You are worthy of the parasol and the diadem of glory
 In your time the old world is renewed
 For you the throne of Khusrau is blessed
 You are the giver of orders and we are the slaves
 We bow to the scepter of [your] wisdom
 Each of our hearts is at your command and disposal
 All our oaths are bound to the covenant with you”⁶⁸

This poem seems to echo the oath in its purest fashion by giving its actual wording. After referring to God, as witness of the oath, the text switches between the second person singular (you) and the first person plural (we). Effectively describing the forging of a bond between the future ruler and other local and regional power holders, the text takes the form of a chain built on the interchange of verses referring to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his associates, who repeatedly point to their inferiority. The balance in the shift between we and you is further underlined by the fact that the poem contains exactly ten hemistiches. While the first two hemistiches appeal to God to validate the oath, the next hemistich strictly follows the distinction between the future *khān* (you) and the followers (we): “You are worthy of the crown and the throne” does not mention the nobles and governors. Yet when the governors and officials come to mention themselves in the corresponding hemistich, they not only refer to themselves but, in expressing the wish to give the insignia of authority to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, use the second person singular (you). The next verse shows the same pattern; both sides were tied together in the second hemistich. And the last two verses totally merge both pronouns! In every hemistich we find the mention of we and you, mutually changing their positions from the beginning of the hemistich to the end and vice versa. The principle of reciprocity seems very prominent here.

With the wording of these verses in mind, it becomes clear that we are dealing with a *bay’a* rather than with a *kūrniṣh*. The men promising fidelity mentioned an oath as well as a compact. The comparison with the

⁶⁸ Qāzī Wafā , *Tuḥfat*, fol. 252a. See also Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 9; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 276.

demonstrations of loyalty addressed to Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān at Hazāra in 1722 shows that the *kūrnish* served as a mere statement of loyalty without a formal oath. However, it is remarkable that the *kūrnish* and the *bay'a* included references to God.

It becomes obvious from the sources that the *bay'a* was only performed prior to the enthronization of a new ruler, while the *kūrnish* was an instrument to show submissiveness and continued loyalty in all other situations. Yet both concepts generally implied essentially the same: the recognition of authority. When Tughāy Murād Bī approached the court after Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's enthronization, he performed the *kūrnish* and not the *bay'a*!⁶⁹ Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān likewise had the honor of the *kūrnish* when he submitted to Nādir Shāh.⁷⁰

According to the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, many gestures of servility and submission were involved in the *kūrnish*. For instance, the author mentions the kissing of the ruler's hand (*dast-būs*) as a central element and sign of devotion. In connection with the quelling of a rebellion in Miyānkāl that challenged Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's authority in the first year of his atālīqate,⁷¹ we are informed that his commanders paid homage to their master right after the end of the first successful campaign and

“received the favor of kissing the fingers of affection and compassion of that [man] chosen from people by order of the Creator, God the Almighty. [...] And [even] Ghaibullah Bī, confessing weakness and deficiency, found the honor of kissing the hand of the high-ranking and elevated *amīr*.”⁷²

In Tāli's account we have already come across Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's genuflection as a symbol of respect and submission. With regard to the hand-kissing, it seems reasonable to assume that during the *kūrnish* the actors kneeled down or bowed to the *atālīq* and kissed his hand.⁷³ As Mullā Sharīf

⁶⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 265a.

⁷⁰ The Bukharan sources only speak of a meeting between Nādir and his Bukharan colleague (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 43a–b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 272b–273a; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 4a). 'Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī mentions that the Bukharan ruler saluted to Nādir (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 100)).

⁷¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 130b–138b.

⁷² Ibid., fol. 139a.

⁷³ There are similar passages mentioning the kissing of the hand (*dast-būs*) in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 216a, 236b, 247b, 264b). Furthermore, we find some instances of the kissing of the threshold of the royal throne (*āstān-būsī*), but it remains unclear whether this phrase just served as a rhetorical means underlining the devotion to

points out, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī “turned the countenance of loyalty” to the royal court after his return from Mashhad in 1746 just to have the honor of kissing Abū’l-Faiḥ Khān’s hand.⁷⁴ Remarkably, he was not then acting as the ruler himself but arrived at Bukhara to bring the enemies of the *khān* to heel. Some months before, he himself had taken the *kūrnish* from a group of Uzbek chiefs upon the defeat of the rebellious Khiṭā’ī in Miyānkāl, though he was acting more as a subordinate government agent in the service of Nādir Shāh and Abū’l-Faiḥ Khān than as an independent ruler.⁷⁵ However, the sources show that *amīrs* like Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt or Ghaibullāh Bī Baḥrīn hesitated for a long time and did not condescend thoughtlessly to this gesture, especially since it was regarded as an act of submission. The above-mentioned tribal leaders decided on this step only at the last moment when acknowledging the hard facts: submission was advisable in view of the superiority and military strength of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s Iranian allies.⁷⁶

Mullā Sharīf mentions a final *kūrnish* ordered by Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān just before his death in early 1759. “The commanders embellished with golden girdles, the trustworthy *amīrs*, the tribal contingents and the possessors of ranks and offices genuflected in the shade of the celestial throne and fulfilled the duty of the prayer.”⁷⁷ This brief description of the last *kūrnish* taken by the *khāqān* sounds somewhat similar to the *bay’a*. In both cases the revering nobles kneeled before the throne and performed the prayer.

It is worth noting that not only local actors such as the Miyānkālī *amīrs* and the Manghit *atālīq* assured each other of their mutual obligations by performing the *kūrnish* with all its implications; even a ruler’s son was committed to this gesture of respect toward his father. Upon his return to Karmīna on Dhū’l-Ḥijja 13, 1172/August 6–7, 1759, after a successful

the commander or ruler, or whether this gesture of servility was really part of the performance (ibid., fols. 263a, 272a, 279b, 284a, 294a, 303b).

⁷⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 145a.

⁷⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 74b. Kāzim, who emphasizes the activities of the Iranian commander Biḥbūd Khān, notes that the recalcitrant tribal leaders of the Qayyāt and Burqūt bowed to Iranian supremacy when the Iranian troops set off toward Miyānkāl to put down the rebellion of ‘Ibādullāh Bēg (Kāzim, *‘Ālamārā*, III, 1104).

⁷⁶ Kāzim, *‘Ālamārā*, III, 1104.

⁷⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 421b.

combat, the young *amīr* Shāh Murād paid homage to his father Dānyāl Bī and kissed his hand.⁷⁸

As we see, paying homage was not a simple act performed in an imprudent way; statements of loyalty and allegiance were not given freely or carelessly. Particularly in dangerous situations and during conspiracies, a hastily given promise of fealty could easily cause damage or even the death of those offering their submission and service too early. Reporting about the plot of the Uzbek *amīrs* against the ruler ‘Ubaidullah Khān in 1711, ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ṭālī’ tells us that the conspirators informed Ma‘šūm Atālīq several times by sending messengers. The *atālīq* behaved very carefully in this delicate situation because there were no guarantees of a success. Therefore he decided to wait as long as possible and prohibited the troops from leaving their quarters. It was not until the next morning that he attained certainty and decided to promise fidelity to the newly installed ruler Abū’l-Faiz Khān.⁷⁹ Mullā Sharīf comments on the *bay‘a* on the occasion of the change of power as follows:

“On the next day, all *sayyids* and judges, commanders and notables willy-nilly assembled in the royal hall of obeisance (*kūrnish-gāh*). Some of the *amīrs* and learned men [...] were not very content with Abū’l-Faiz Khān’s ascendancy. But when they recognized that most of the tribal leaders and renowned personalities had agreed upon accepting the admission of his claims and the removal of the dethroned king; when the enthronization was prepared and there was agreement amongst a large group of nobles and commoners, and when it became obvious that the palace, which is the seat of power and government, had found a new possessor, and that no drop of water poured in the endless ocean, and no limited number of persons in the immense crowd of people would spark rebellion or the

⁷⁸ امیرزاده کامکار بموافقت سپاه جرار عدد هزار نفر از معاودت نمودند و در منزل معهود بجز دست بوس والد (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 336a).

⁷⁹ چند مرتبه کس نزد معصوم بی فرستادند او مرد سپاهی در آمدن توقف می کرد ... و کس فرستاد و برسم جاسوسی خبریافت که در پیر مرزه در نزد خان شهید هیچکس نیست او نیز سوار شده قریب سحری بود که آمده رکاب همایون حضرت ابوالفیض خان بوسه داد ... (Ṭālī, *Tārīkh*, fol. 16b; Semenov trans., 25).

According to ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s chronicler, the *atālīq* very much hesitated to appear before the new ruler for the *kūrnish*, but in the end decided to pay homage. In this version of the events, the plot against the ruler had only succeeded insofar as the *sulṭān* was enthroned and many *amīrs* had performed the *kūrnish* in front of him while ‘Ubaidullah Khān was still alive (see Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 227b–228a; Semenov trans., 253). In Ṭālī’s account, Ma‘šūm Bī only joined the new king when he was certain about the death of his former master.

desire for opposition, they became obliged to follow the path of consent and let down the skirt of the reigning prince and eternal king from the hands of dependence.”⁸⁰

As I have indicated in the previous section, submission and surrender, and therewith the forging of personal ties, were offered in situations when actors experienced exceptional threats or dangers. Thus the promise of allegiance was sometimes given involuntarily. The above-cited extract from Mullā Sharīf’s *Tāj al-tawārīkh* may be interpreted as one instance of this.

As an act of submission and firm acknowledgement of authority, oaths or statements of allegiance were, of course, not always connected with a request for the mercy and leniency of the addressee. One could also refuse to swear allegiance. Having received the honor of paying obeisance, the eunuch Khwāja Ulfat appeared before Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī after his takeover in 1747. But being the *amīr*’s old adversary, he boasted by saying “unsuitable things” that proved decisive for his death sentence.⁸¹ Although the rulers often demonstrated ostentatious leniency and the character of the merciful lord was entrenched in their worldview, this was not a *carte blanche* for absolution in every case. Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz, the notorious troublemaker, is perhaps the best example of a leader whose appeals for mercy went unheeded. Acting from his principality Ḥiṣār, this *amīr* had challenged Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī for many years. Following his final defeat, he was taken prisoner and brought before the new *khāqān* who sentenced him to death, even though his rival had formally submitted and requested forgiveness.⁸²

Despite the importance of oaths of allegiance and the firm statements of loyalty during the *kūrnish*, we repeatedly observe breaches of the compact. Perhaps the most striking example in this respect are the Manghit nobles themselves. For a long time they had pursued a twofold tactic and remained in a waiting position before shifting their loyalty toward Nādir Shāh. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī had finally ordered the execution of his family’s old overlord, Abū’l-Faiz Khān. From a moral point of view, this murder appears in a negative light, as the assassination of the Chingizid *khāqān* took place in

⁸⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 133b.

⁸¹ ... در شبی که داخل دار السلطنه ولایت شده بکورشش امیر با جا و منزلت فایز آمد از خواهه مذکور حرفی چند (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 129b).

⁸² *Ibid.*, fols. 311a–b.

the *madrasa* Mīr-i ‘Arab.⁸³ While Qāzī Wafā leaves this deed of his patron uncommented, his colleague Mullā Sharīf, writing in the early nineteenth century, strongly criticized the murder and its executors. In his view, the murderers Jum‘a Qul Mingbāshī and ‘Abd al-Qayyūm Khwāja “had made themselves rejected by the people and the Creator, and were refused by the silent and the speaking persons.”⁸⁴ Mīr ‘Abd al-Karīm remarks that Muḥammad Raḥīm had even paid homage to Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān, only to order his death immediately after the *kūrnish* on the spot in the *kūrnish-khāna*.⁸⁵

Of course, our sources do not always draw a simple picture of ideally constructed bonds of loyalty that were maintained and proven under all circumstances. In many instances we observe actors who were in breach of their compact and looking for new allies. Departure from loyalty occurred for various reasons. Often personal ambitions or the wish to survive a dangerous situation were decisive. In other cases, local actors joined another protector because he was stronger, better endowed with resources and therefore more likely to provide support. Kāzīm reports about some chiefs of the Yūz, Khiṭā’ī and Qungrāt joining the Iranian camp prior to the battle of Qarshī in 1737 to give Rizā Qulī Mīrzā useful information on the military organization of the Uzbek troops.⁸⁶ The reader of the chronicles may well be surprised by the sudden and frequent making and breaking of personal ties for mutual benefit, firstly between the ruler and the Uzbek chieftains and also at the local level within the amirid class or between the *amīrs* and their associates. One excellent example is given in the *Tuhfat*, describing a campaign of Manghit troops against the Kīnakās of Shahr-i Sabz in late summer 1164/1751, although the Kīnakās leaders Subḥān Qulī Bī und ‘Ālim Bī had surrendered before. On the occasion of their first surrender, both had requested the intercession of Muḥammad Raḥīm’s paternal uncle Dānyāl Bī and

“wished to build the chamber of their new covenant (*‘ahd-i jadīd*) and to strengthen their compact with the bone of swearing and the strong oath. They sent the son of Subḥān Qulī

⁸³ Ibid., fols. 110b, 114b.

⁸⁴ Mullā Sharīf notes that Jum‘a Qul Mingbāshī could not enjoy his life any longer. He got what was coming to him during the siege of Qarshī in the time of Dānyāl Bī’s rule (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 338a–b). Regarding the execution of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān see also Ya‘qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 5a; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 1122.

⁸⁵ Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 51–52 (French text, 111).

⁸⁶ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 590.

Bī, Muḥammad Amīn Bēg [...] along with the said *amīr* [Dānyāl Bī] to the court of exalted power to lay the foundation of the compact of friendship.”⁸⁷

Here the reader is informed about the submission of the Kīnakās leadership and their offer of a new oath of allegiance. It is conceivable that the rebellious *amīrs* promised and swore fealty by appealing to God as witness to their oath. But despite these facts and their newly founded contract of friendship, the small principality was conquered by force in the aftermath, while the leaders of the recalcitrant Kīnakās tribe became wholly integrated into Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s network of loyalties.⁸⁸ On this occasion ‘Ālim Bī became obliged to the *atālīq* through an oath taken by Yūqāshī Bī, the brother of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, in return for guarantees regarding life and limb.⁸⁹ After their arrival at Bukhara, the Kīnakās *amīrs* were said to have instigated intrigues against the *atālīq*. Those plots provoked Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī to act mercilessly and to annihilate his rivals.⁹⁰ Warning about the consequences of a breach of the covenant, Mullā Sharīf states:

“The necessity of those covenants distant from fidelity caused damage to the cavern-like edifices of the spider-web and did not bring fortune to the center of the kingdom. Thus, the palm of his life was soon cut down by the saw of the inconstant compact (‘*ahd-i bī-thabātash*).

You shall never play with the conclusion of contracts

You will wade through blood with the breach of contracts

With spells of desire which is the adversary of life

One can never break the mystical talisman of contracts”⁹¹

⁸⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 189b.

⁸⁸ Muḥammad Wafā tells us that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Kīnakās adversaries finally agreed upon a new compact leaving the important town of Sang Furūsh and the nearby settlement of Kitāb as property to the Kīnakās chief ‘Ālim Bī (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 190b–197b).

⁸⁹ ... از جانب امدۀ الاعیان یوقاشی بی با امرای کینکاس امثال عالم بی و سبحان قلی بی و محمد امین بیگ در عدم ... ارتکاب ضرر و زیان بعرض و جان ایشان معاهده نموده پیمان را بغلاظ ایمان مؤکد فرمود (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 379a).

⁹⁰ ... اما اکثر اوقات از ایشان سخنان ناملایم و افعال ناشایست بوضوح میپویست ... از این سبب زلزله خواری و کدورت بل عراضه ادبار و نحوست در مجاری حال توابع و لواحق امرای کینکاس راه یافت (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 198a–b).

⁹¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 378a–b.

Since the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* was compiled in the early nineteenth century, we can conclude how vivid the idea of the oath as an instrument for the forging of personal ties still was at that time. Interestingly, Mullā Sharīf assigns magical significance to the compacts by comparing them with talismans. Assuring the actors of their mutual friendship and obligations, the talisman exerts a mystical influence. It alone assures the parties united by oath of the mutual benefits they gain through their relationship. The reason for this may have lain in the fact that the oath was in all probability sworn in the name of God.⁹² There are many references in the Koran to the validity of covenants and warnings about breaching them. For example, in one such passage the Koran tells us: "We made a covenant with Adam formerly, but he forgot, and We found not in him steadiness of purpose."⁹³ The horrible consequences of the breach of this primal covenant by paying attention to the whispering of Iblīs are well known.

In this sub-chapter I have discussed concepts like the *bay'a* and the *kūrnish*, the paying of homage and the exchange of oaths of fidelity, which involved a formal, even ritualized procedure. This included the kissing of the hand or a bow before the lord, as well as mutually exchanged promises of loyalty. The few passages giving an exact word-for-word account of oaths taken by inferior actors show that the *bay'a* was performed exclusively at the enthronization of a new ruler. The *kūrnish* was a firm statement of allegiance given at royal receptions. It was therefore very much a matter of daily social life. Initiating relationships, both included references to God, the prayer for the ruler and body postures (bowing of the head, prostrations). Both the *bay'a* and the *kūrnish* were associated with concrete social obligations. Furthermore, we can discern a number of passages in the Koran making the religious foundations of the oath system evident.

"The Islamic tradition did not give such a central position to oaths on the basis of a single passage in the Koran. It did so because the system of oaths was well suited to

⁹² Looking for Koranic evidence regarding the importance of the oath system, Mottahedeh reaches the conclusion that the compact between God and man overshadows any later oath we take. Sometimes an oath in the name of the Prophet or by the Koran is considered valid. But the validity of an oath by God's revelation rests on the recognition of the lordship of God as well as on the original covenant to obey the moral law. God is an active, not just a passive witness to a valid oath. When somebody swears by God, he is invoking divine wrath if he does not live up to the oath (Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 45).

⁹³ Bell, *The Koran*, Sura 20: 114, 300.

contemporary Near Eastern society, and because the Koran and the example of Muḥammad offered many precedents in which oaths had precisely this central importance.”⁹⁴

In the time of the caliphate, men swore by God and the Koran. The few passages I explored illustrate that even in eighteenth-century Transoxania, God was frequently courted to make oaths valid. The *bay‘a* at Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s enthronization as well as the numerous *kūrnishs* concluded with prayers for the well-being of his majesty, the continuity and prosperity of his authority and government, and to invoke the protection of God for the new ruler. The oaths before the king were underpinned with further substance since the rulers were perceived as God’s shadow on earth. With this concept as the background folio, the oath of allegiance to the ruler matched the oath of fidelity to God.⁹⁵ Although the sources teem with instances of a breach of contract, implying the dissolution of such relations, we can conclude that the oath system with all its dimensions (social, moral, religious, quasi-contractual in the sense of binding) was deeply rooted in contemporary worldviews. Despite the breaking of social ties, people seem to have believed in oaths and the entire ritual.⁹⁶

NOTIONS OF LOYALTY AND OBEDIENCE

In the previous section I showed how Bukharan historians describe the establishment of personal ties in the eighteenth century. In the next sections I will explore how bonds of loyalty are described in the sources and which stylistic instruments were employed by the chroniclers to depict relationships of loyalty. Particular attention will be paid to the connotations of loyalty in eighteenth-century Bukhara.

One of the first to address questions of loyalty was Roy Mottahedeh, who presented a groundbreaking study of power relations in the Buyid period. Placing emphasis on the behavior of individuals in society, he describes the various social commitments they made to each other. For his analysis the

⁹⁴ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 44.

⁹⁵ Goitein, *Studies*, 203–04; Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 44–45.

⁹⁶ Benevini reports that, according to Bukharan officials, the Khiwan ruler Shīr Ghāzī Khān was a betrayer who never kept his promises and not even an oath on the Koran (Benevini, *Poslannik* [Perevod s zhurnala italianskogo/Report dated February 1725 – transmitted by Peter Sofonov], 94–95. Di Cosmo, “A Russian Envoy,” 86.

author distinguishes between acquired loyalties and loyalties of category. The first kind of loyalty was “used as a basis for cooperation even when group self-interest was not threatened.”⁹⁷ Acquired loyalties were, according to Mottahedeh, enforced by a system of oaths and vows, implying serious social commitments,⁹⁸ and maintained by the exercise of patronage.⁹⁹ Under the Buyid administration, benefits (*ni‘ma*) played a crucial role in maintaining patron-client ties.¹⁰⁰ Based on self-conscious interests, loyalties of category were generated within the system of communal identities and kinship affiliations. In other words, these were loyalties produced by membership in social groups and classes (*ṭabaqāt, aṣnāf*).¹⁰¹ Social groups investigated by Mottahedeh were the ‘*ulamā*’, soldiers, members of certain professions, the peasantry (*ra‘īyah*), notables (*a‘yān*), and so on.¹⁰²

In his work on the Tuqay-Timurid takeover (1598–1605), Thomas Welsford provides a further study of the role of different kinds of loyalties displayed by various groups of people in the course of the dynastic change. Deviating from conventional connotations of loyalty, he understands “loyalty in purely descriptive terms, as a quality manifest in what people do, and are likely to do.”¹⁰³ He further defines loyalty as a variety of visible forms of people’s self-subjugation. Loyalty takes different forms on a wide scale between obedience or submissiveness on the one hand, and voluntaristic attachment like commitment or sympathy on the other.¹⁰⁴ In his analysis of the takeover and the role of individual and group behavior that shaped the course of historical events, Welsford adopts a typology of interpersonal attachments categorized according to their motivation by principle, by affection and by interest.¹⁰⁵ Exploring the first category with the example of charisma, which means that the rule of a divinely chosen dynast was important, he concludes that a patrimonial worldview was not very significant in early modern Central Asia. This he attributes to the lack

⁹⁷ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 40.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 42–72.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 82–96.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 72–81.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 105–07. Mottahedeh states that no sharp distinction can be made between loyalties of category and acquired loyalties (*ibid.*, 97).

¹⁰² See *ibid.*, 97–174.

¹⁰³ Welsford, *Four Types of Loyalty*, 18.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 21–22.

of any single genealogical mechanism for succession to the throne such as primogeniture, a lack that harks back to the Chingizid heritage and the system of collective authority.¹⁰⁶ Welsford further looks at affectional loyalty by taking the example of communal bonds in Badakhshan and north of the Sir Daryā during the Tuqay-Timurid takeover. In the Central Asian context, such loyalties pertain to craftsmen's communities, Sufi brotherhoods, urban neighborhoods and other similar groups. The cohesion of these communities was proportionate to the mutual physical proximity of their members. This resulted in close communal affiliations that enmeshed the individual within a smaller spatial-territorial framework than an empire or khanate, for instance the *tūmān* and the *wilāyat*.¹⁰⁷ Finally, the author scrutinizes clientelist loyalty, which he understands in terms of self-interest shaping an instrumental mode of behavior.¹⁰⁸

Mottahedeh's and Welsford's studies are rich and inspiring. But both follow more or less a calculus-oriented argumentation.¹⁰⁹ Here I argue that reference to interest and calculus fails to grasp the real incitement behind loyalty relations and the corresponding expectations. Furthermore, the adoption of a typology yields important results but does not help answer the question of the durability of these power relations.

In the following sections, I will concentrate on the imaging of social relationships that are primarily described in terms of loyalty in the chronicles. In so doing, I will continue to closely follow the original texts by citing various passages from a limited number of sources. In a first step I will shed light on the facets of meaning attached to particular terms and key words in the texts in order to illustrate the significance of loyalty. In addition, I will discuss which values our authors may have ascribed to these variables and how actions of individual actors are interpreted.

IKHLĀṢ, HAWĀ-KHWĀHĪ AND OTHER TERMS FOR LOYALTY

The Bukharan chronicles display an overwhelming repertoire of terms and phrases that outline loyalty, fidelity and devotion in manifold ways. Used interchangeably and synonymously, many of these words are embedded

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 76, 79–82.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 204–08.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 107.

¹⁰⁹ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 73–74, 78–79.

within contexts and situational descriptions concerned with the proof or the deconstruction of ties of allegiance. The term perhaps most often used is *ikhhlās*,¹¹⁰ a word of Arabic origin that signifies purity, sincerity, purification and candor. Furthermore, it also means pure friendship and sincere attachment, as well as loyalty, fidelity and intimacy.¹¹¹ There is a wide spectrum of different meanings attached to this term, most of them lying in the field of emotions, affection and even love. In addition to *ikhhlās* as the most common term, we also find the word *hawā-khwāhī*, especially in Qāzī Wafā's work.¹¹² As a synonym of *ikhhlās*, this word carries the connotation of devotion, fidelity and loyalty, as well as partiality, love and affection.¹¹³ Dihkhudā gives some other meanings like partisanship, friendship and closeness. But there are further significations of *hawā-khwāhī* such as assistance and favoring.¹¹⁴ In a few cases we find the synonym *hawā-dārī* in the sources.¹¹⁵ A *hawā-khwāh/hawā-dār* is consequently a follower, supporter or sympathizer, but also a friend, comrade or a well-wisher devoted to his companion in friendship and affection.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 149a, 163a, 218a, 237b, 258a passim. Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 109a, 140b, 287b, 326b passim.

¹¹¹ Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*, 26. Dihkhudā lists purifying or keeping pure (ویژه کردن/خالص داشتن) as meanings of *ikhhlās* (اخلاص). In addition we find a wide range of other content like to have a sincere friendship (دوستی خالص داشتن); to have sincere intentions (خلوص نیت داشتن); to have pure faith (عقیده پاک داشتن); to render sincere devotion (ارادت صادق داشتن) etc.; see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 5 (اژدها-اختیارات), 1023.

¹¹² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 89b, 273a, 263b, 312b passim. See also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 386a, 406a.

¹¹³ Junker and Alawi, *Wörterbuch*, 854. Steingass contents himself with the equivalent well-wishing (Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1516).

¹¹⁴ Dihkhudā lists the following meanings of *hawā-khwāhī* (هواخواهی): devotion, attachment, partisanship, partiality (طرفداری); friendship and love (دوستی); interest, connection, closeness and affection (علاقه); favoring und help (معاذت/مساعدت); Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 50 (هیبهاء-همواران), 328.

¹¹⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 355b, 424b, 480a. For the meaning of *hawā-dārī* (هواداری), see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 50 (هیبهاء-همواران), 328; Junker and Alawi, *Wörterbuch*, 854; Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1516.

¹¹⁶ In the *Lughatnāma* we find a wide spectrum of meanings for *hawā-khwāh* (هواخواه): friend, comrade, assistant, one who loves (محب/یار/دوست), follower, party supporter, sympathizer (طرفدار/موافق/هوادار); see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 50 (همواران-هیبهاء), 327; Junker and Alawi, *Wörterbuch*, 332, 496 689, 775, 854, 858.

Of course, the abundance of synonyms is not limited to these three key terms. Particularly in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* we encounter *daulat-khwāhī*,¹¹⁷ a term that originates from *daulat* signifying wealth, power, government, state, affluence and even luck.¹¹⁸ It is perhaps not surprising that with its comparatively broad spectrum of meanings, this word is closely connected with the sources of power, its institutions and organizations. Thus *daulat-khwāhī* may be translated as well-wishing, affection, loyalty and favorable attitudes.¹¹⁹ With respect to fidelity and devotion, we find the additional term *irādat*.¹²⁰ Derived from it are terms such as *irādat-kīsh* or *irādatmand* as attributes for devoted and sincere persons.¹²¹

ITĀ'AT, INQIYĀD AND ĪLĪ: OBEDIENCE AND SUBORDINATION

A glance at the sources reveals that the early Manghit historians placed great emphasis on the commitment to obedience as an essential sign of loyalty, subordination and recognition of authority. Whoever wanted to demonstrate loyalty was obliged to follow the path of respect. Many if not most of the social relations between individuals apparently entailed a strong notion of obedience. Even the *kūrnish* was not just a simple act to swear fealty to a master; it was a demonstration of obedient behavior and utmost humility. Similar to the concept of loyalty, we observe an overwhelming abundance of different synonyms—a fact that indicates the importance of this variable and the values ascribed to it by the chroniclers. Obedience was a norm of conduct. The term most often used by the authors is *itā'at*.¹²² In Qāzī Wafā's work it is said that subsequent to Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's conquest of

¹¹⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 140b, 145a–b, 195b, 287a, 306a passim; Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 290b.

¹¹⁸ Steingass, *Dictionary*, 546; Junker and Alawi, *Wörterbuch*, 334.

¹¹⁹ In the *Lughatnāma* we find similar synonyms: affection, well-wishing (سعادت طلبی/خیرخواهی), the attributes of a person who wants well-being, wealth and luck for others (Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 25 (داوری-دوک), 418).

¹²⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 214a, 221b, 261a passim.

¹²¹ The word *irādat* (ارادت) is not to be confused with *irāda* (اراده)—will or intention. Both terms are however listed together in the *Lughatnāma* (see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, j. 5 (اختیارات-اژدها), 1604–06).

¹²² The term has a great variety of meanings, like submission, surrender, subjection, subordination, fealty, loyalty, allegiance, obsequiousness etc. (see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 70–71). Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 39a, 137b, 240b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 266b, 300b, 326b, 360b passim.

Ḥiṣār in summer 1758, he was able to extend his authority to all of Transoxania and that

“from the beginning of autumn until the end of winter in the Year of the Badger, wise ambassadors came from Khoqand and Tashkent, from the domains of Khwārazm up to Haft Rīg, the Kazakh Steppe and the Qipchāq Steppe and arrived at the magnificent court. Coming from Marw, the dominion of Balkh and Kunduz-i Qaṭaghān, knowledgeable legates arrived at the glorious royal palace. They put the necklace of loyalty and obedience (*iṭā‘at*) on their neck, bowed their head to the saddle-straps of friendship and wrote the sign of love and fidelity on the forehead of their sincerity.”¹²³

Reflecting the interconnection of allegiance and subordination perfectly, this passage illustrates loyalty as a background folio against which obedience was pledged to the king by humble servants and messengers from other regions of Transoxania and adjacent areas. The latter were not part of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s dominion, but the fact that those “outside heralds” arrived from other realms and domains shows once more the relativity of political boundaries in comparison with more fluid personal ties. Furthermore, it is remarkable that love, friendship and devotion were not inconsistent with obedience and the acceptance of command but inherent in power relations.

As could be demonstrated before, bonds of allegiance were often forged in times of need or political crises. One of the best examples of this is the leadership of the Kīnakās tribe. When in Muḥarram 1164/November–December 1750, Manghit supporters mounted a campaign to occupy some fortresses, one Kīnakās group quickly surrendered irrespective of the ongoing resistance of their tribal colleagues.

“Showing prudence for the mode of security and hope, they sent their trustworthy men with presents to the royal court, where they read the transcript of subordination and made loyalty and confidence (*ikhlāṣ wa i‘tiqād*) the advocates of tranquility and relaxation for their clans and tribes.”¹²⁴

This extract from the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* illustrates how some Kīnakās sub-sections surrendered in the face of uncertainty and physical threat posed by the sheer military strength of the advancing Manghit troops. At the same

¹²³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 313b.

¹²⁴ Ibid., fol. 175a. Since the time of Abū’l-Faiṣ Khān, the Kīnakās had been regarded as the main adversaries of the Manghit. From their stronghold in Shahr-i Sabz they revolted several times against the Bukharan ruler and his supporters (von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 72, 75, 197).

time, we observe again the close connection between obedience and submission—here described with the term *īlī*—and loyalty.¹²⁵ Yet our author also mentions the continued resistance of the Kīnakās leaders, who refused to be incorporated into Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's retinue.¹²⁶ The decision to surrender was thus very common in order to prevent massacre or far-reaching looting campaigns. For example, Qāzī Wafā tells us about a punitive expedition launched by the Bukharan troops against the rebellious Yetī Ūrūgh in Miyānkāl in the first year of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's atālīqate. Here, the surrender of the populace of the small town of Boghūr Dāgh east of Khaṭarchī was due to the hopeless situation caused by the military activities of the Manghit supporters. It was against this backdrop that a group of inhabitants "saw their well-being in the demonstration of obedience toward the eternal might, and put the hand of intercession on the hem of protection."¹²⁷

In addition to *iṭā'at* and *īlī*, in the historical accounts we find other equivalent terms to express obedience and subordination. For example, the term *mutābi'at* means submitting, following, or conforming to the orders of the superior.¹²⁸ Followership and support always implied yielding to the authority of the superior person. Followers and associates in the retinue of a ruler, a strong military commander or a noble person are usually described as *tawābi' wa lawāḥiq*,¹²⁹ those who followed and bowed to the authority of their masters. Of course, inferior actors frequently defended themselves against all attempts of the Bukharan troops to incorporate them into the ruler's retinue, for a variety of reasons that will be explored later. For the moment, mention of deployment of military force as a source of power on the part of the army may be sufficient. In his description of the military advances of the Manghit troops against the Yetī Ūrūgh in Panjshanba and Khaṭarchī in 1748, Mullā Sharīf largely follows the *Tuhfat al-khānī*. Fearing

¹²⁵ The term *īlī* is derived from *īl*, which initially meant "peaceful" or "state of peace." Later the word was ascribed to pacified tribal groups or confederations. In Bukharan chronicles and other sources the word *īl* often appears in connection with *ulūs* as *īl wa ulūs* (Doerfer, *Elemente*, I, 194–201). The dictionaries give subordination, devotion and obedience as meanings of *īlī* (Steingass, *Dictionary*, 130; Junker and Alawi, *Wörterbuch*, 72).

¹²⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 176a–180a, 190b–197a.

¹²⁷ Ibid., fol. 137b.

¹²⁸ Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1152.

¹²⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 39b, 75a, 191a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 274a, 300a, 325a passim.

punitive measures by the army, they moved their livestock and possessions to the small mountain fortress of Nāybāsh. Upon their arrival in that area, the Manghit commanders attempted to persuade the rebels to surrender and to show obedience. Yet all their efforts were fruitless in the end as the unruly Yetī Ūrūgh preferred to abandon “the path of obsequiousness” (*tarīq-i mutābi‘at*).¹³⁰ The following punitive measures of the commanders were intended to be an admonitory example to other recalcitrant parts of the population.

In the sources, the word *mutābi‘at* does not occur separate from other indicators of subordination, but is frequently connected to the concept of *mubāyi‘at* originating from *bay‘a* (Pers. *bay‘at*). For instance, the *Tuhfat* informs us about the intentions of the Khoqandian *amīr* ‘Abd al-Karīm Bī to offer assistance and protection to Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān, who after the death of his *atālīq* Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī in 1744 was confronted with numerous rebellions. According to Qāẓī Wafā, the potentate from Khoqand made the offer to “punish every impudent and shameless person who has drawn his head out of the necklace of obedience and the saddle-straps of servility (*tūq-i iṭā‘at wa fitrāk-i mubāyi‘at*) and to hand him over to the *yāsā*.”¹³¹ In connection with the unrest in Miyānkāl during the first two years of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s reign as chief commander, our author complains about the Yābū tribe, which “has drawn the foot of promising allegiance (*pā-yi mubāyi‘at*) out of the circle of loyalty (*dāyira-yi ikhlāṣ*).”¹³²

Besides the above-listed terms of obedience, the reader regularly comes across the synonym *inqiyād*, which is frequently combined with *īlī* or *iṭā‘at*.¹³³ Both are used not only for esthetic or stylistic purposes, but to place additional emphasis on the dimension of obedient behavior as an indicator of subordination. According to Mullā Sharīf, “most of the governors of the fortresses of Transoxania put the neck of obstinacy into the necklace of obedience and submission” when in 1747 Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his

¹³⁰ هر چند امرای ارجمند مواظبه سودمند گفته روانه نمودند و به ایلی و اطاعت و دفع تعرض و خیانت از روی استمالت دلالت فرمودند چون بیدولتان را ایام حیات قریب شام ممات رسیده بود پشت پندار غفلت سرشار بر صیانت حصار و کثرت ادخار خود گذاشته از طریق متابعت که موجب سلامت ارباب غرامت بود انحراف ورزیدند (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 360b). Qāẓī Wafā names the fortress Nāybāsh/Yānbāsh (?) (Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 133a).

¹³¹ Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 63b.

¹³² Ibid., fol. 149a.

¹³³ Ibid., fols. 39a, 41b, 45b, 169a, 297b passim. Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 299a, 326b, 376a passim.

Iranian colleagues campaigned against the rebellious Khitā'i leader 'Ibādullah.¹³⁴ Other passages in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* as well as in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* prove the close interconnection between subordination on the one hand and loyalty on the other. When the Bukharan troops approached the town of Kū-yi Nau in Rabī' II 1162/March–April 1749,

“they sent trustworthy commanders together with their troops to the fortress of Kū-yi Nau, which was inhabited by the Baḥrīn and other tribes whose chiefs had turned to Tughāy Murād, the Yābū and the Turkmen to become the companions of rebellion and enmity. They appealed to their submission and obedience (*īlī wa inqiyād*) and those far-sighted people considered the preservation of their lives and property necessary, thus putting the cords of obedience to the *amīr* of exalted authority on the neck of loyalty.”¹³⁵

FARMĀN-BARDĀRĪ AND KHIDHMATGĀRĪ: SUBJECTION AND SERVICE

Ties of allegiance implied subjection to the instructions of social superiors (*farmān-bardārī*) and subservience or service (*khidhmatgārī*). The first term literally means the acceptance and execution of orders (*farāmīn*) issued by the lord or ruler. As the word *farmān-bardārī* suggests, subordinate actors always had to bow to the will, wishes and orders of their superiors. Rebellious and disobedient behavior including the refusal to carry out orders or to discharge duties was considered a sign of disloyalty and a challenge to any authority. In the *Tuḥfat* we read about an attempt by the governor of Marw, Shāh Qulī Khān, to dissuade the Uzbek commander-in-chief from the path of loyalty and compliance with the orders of Nādir Shāh when both returned from Bukhara to Mashhad in 1747.¹³⁶ This conspiracy failed as the Uzbek *amīr* and his associates felt uneasy with Shāh Qulī Khān's plan. Moreover, the outbreak of a rebellion in Marw prevented the governor from realizing his plans.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 299a.

¹³⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 155b–156a.

¹³⁶ چون شاه قلی خان راهنوز سر فتنه از جیب تهور بر نیامده بود با قبایل و خدم چنان مقرر و مصمم کرد که ... در (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 89b).

¹³⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 89b–91a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 304a–305a. Shāh Qulī Khān's rebellion was motivated by rumors about the plans of Nādir Shāh regarding the assassination of all Marwī officials. According to Kāzīm, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī conspired with Shāh Qulī Khān and took part in the rebellion but regretted his decision when the tide turned in favor of the supporters of Nādir Shāh (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 1112–17).

With regard to the countless military expeditions and the sieges of towns and smaller fortified settlements in the countryside, the sources repeatedly report the submission of the besieged population, or at least some factions and groups. For instance, when the Bukharan troops campaigned against the Kīnakās in Rabīʿ II 1164/March–April 1751, the Kīnakās *amīrs* sent negotiators to the Bukharan camp where they submitted and said:

“We helpless people are at the suggestion of heart and soul prepared to serve in consent with the royal *amīr* and we are ready for obedience and subjection (*farmān-bardārī*). Our hand of subordination will eliminate every thorn and thistle on the way of friendship and in the valley of promise and consent with root and branch.”¹³⁸

This passage mirrors the interconnection between loyalty, subordination and the acceptance of orders. The exercise of authority was impossible without its firm recognition on the part of the power subjects, whose submission entailed the execution of royal orders.

The connection between loyalty and *farmān-bardārī* as a general proof of continued allegiance not only applied to particular parts of the population or individual actors, but also at an overall tribal level. This implied that whole tribes had to bow to the supremacy of others by accepting and executing orders. For instance, Qāzī Wafā informs us that many members of the nomadic Qungrāt tribes

“inhabited the fortresses of Pāshkhūrd, Kū-yi Tan and Panjāb. Some of their tribes and sub-divisions had their winter quarters in well-protected mountains and valleys. Coming from near and far they put the necklace of loyalty on the neck of observance and subjection (*iṭāʿat wa farmān-bardārī*) and obediently expressed servitude and submissiveness to this justice-spreading dominion.”¹³⁹

According to the concept of more collectively held loyalties, punitive campaigns were often aimed at the subjugation of entire tribes or tribal sub-sections, which were then tied into the network of multiple allegiances. Referring to a verbatim monologue by Nādir Shāh, Mullā Sharīf provides an additional example of loyalties expressed at a more aggregate tribal level. According to the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, Nādir took the brave Uzbek tribes of Turan into his service and intended to bestow royal favors on them in accordance with their subservience and discharge of duties.¹⁴⁰ Interestingly,

¹³⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 180a.

¹³⁹ Ibid., fol. 240b.

¹⁴⁰ ... مرضای خاطر همایون از ورود رأیت نصرت آیت برین مملکت آنست که در حصول مدعای همت اعلیٰ بنابر مناسبت سلسله ترکمانیه فوج از قبایل جلادت خصایل اوزبکیه تورانیه بملازمت لوای جهانگشا مقرر و از

we find a similar connection between recruitment of troops and the fulfillment of obligations after the Manghit takeover in the year 1747 and the establishment of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's rule in Bukhara. In a speech addressing the other commanders and governors of Transoxania, the new *atālīq* demanded that

“the renowned people and warriors of the Uzbek tribes (*jumhūr-i mashāhīr wa 'asakir-i īl wa ūrūgh-i ūzbekīya*) should turn the countenance of fortune and devotion to the center of glory and felicity. With the consent of the small and the big people and the brave Turkic tribes serious efforts will be carried out for the prosperity of this exalted and high-standing *daulat* and great tasks will be accomplished together with the friends and followers.”¹⁴¹

Mullā Sharīf's descriptions end with Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's inspection of the arming and equipment of those tribal contingents bowing to his authority.¹⁴²

Of course, the execution of royal orders and service were inseparably interwoven. Terms like *khidmatgārī* and *farmān-bardārī* appear as two sides of the loyalty coin and are therefore often used as a word pair by the chroniclers. As I have shown, both variables not only applied to entire tribes, Uzbek soldiers or individual actors such as city notables or commanders. Governors or semi-independent chiefs ruling over neighboring territories became—at least in the Bukharan accounts—subject to royal authority after Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's final victory over his enemies in Ḥiṣār in 1758. As already mentioned, countless envoys arrived from the provinces of the new Manghit realm and neighboring principalities. When approaching the throne,

“every one of the informed and eloquent envoys passed under the eyes of the sun-like ruler whilst demonstrating courtesy with the tongue of devotion and obedience on the threshold of the heavenly throne. Expressing subordination and subservience (*īṭā'at wa khidmatgārī*) as well as reverence and subjection, they expected the decree of royal favor and kindness.”¹⁴³

In this extract we find once again the same connection between loyalty, obedience, subjection to orders and subservience. Moreover, the last

Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, مرحمت و عنایت کامکاری در خور فرمانبرداری و کارگذاری مستفید و بهره ور کردند fol. 273b).

¹⁴¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 355b.

¹⁴² هر طایفه و صنفی را که خیال هواداری و اندیشه خدمتکاری بود بمراسم جیابوسان فوج از نظر ایالت نشان ... گذرانیده (ibid., fol. 355b).

¹⁴³ Ibid., fol. 420a.

sentence refers to the expectations of the devoted envoys, which mirror the norm of reciprocity as they are directed toward signs of royal favor in return for submissiveness and the recognition of Muḥammad Raḥīm's superiority. These expectations suggest that acts of loyalty and subordination were not performed unconditionally but depended on signs of favor from the person in authority.

PROVISION OF RESOURCES BY SUBORDINATED ACTORS

Loyalty and subordination appear as rather abstract terms, roughly implying the duties and obligations of subjects of authority, but it has remained until now open to question what this actually meant in practice. In the previous chapters, we observed the phenomenon of gift giving and reciprocal exchange between subordinates and superordinates. Presents were indeed the first resources that were symbolically submitted to the superior as a sign of the recognition of authority. I will devote a separate chapter to this topic, and now want to concentrate on the provision of other, first and foremost material (non-human) resources.

Subordinated actors usually provided grain, which was needed to feed the soldiers, and sometimes they also supplied mounts and beasts of burden. Without sufficient resources a conqueror or commander lacked the means to maintain his army, the most import instrument for exercising authority. When Nādir Shāh established his overlordship in Bukhara, he demanded the supply of grain for his huge army. He was in urgent need of provisions, firstly because of the winter and secondly for the next military campaigns against the principality of Khiwa on the lower Oxus. In the *Tuhfat* we are informed that the Iranian conqueror ordered the incredible amount of two hundred thousand *kharwār* of grain to serve as daily allowances for his soldiers and as fodder for the horses and beasts of burden (*jīra wa 'alīq*).¹⁴⁴ The costs and payment of the grain were transferred to the royal treasury, while the Bukharan officials and *dīwān* functionaries were charged with the collection. According to Qāzī Wafā, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī fixed the payment and amount of grain to be delivered among the people of the city

¹⁴⁴ According to Muḥammad Amīn, Nādir purchased 130,000 *man* of grain in Bukhara (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhar*, fol. 70a).

and its hinterland.¹⁴⁵ Both our main sources tell us that the collection of grain followed the usual rule of a tax on one-third of the cereals (*ghalla-yi thulthāt*; *rasm-i thulthān*).¹⁴⁶ The chronicler of the *atālīq* also mentions ten thousand *man* of additional grain and ten thousand sheep furnished by his master and Abū'l-Faiz Khān.¹⁴⁷ If we believe Kashmīrī's travel account, the Transoxanian governors and lords supplied additional resources in the form of provisions (grain, fruits and perhaps also small livestock) after the firm establishment of Iranian supremacy.¹⁴⁸ Employing his typical ornate style, Mullā Sharīf explains the collection of grain and Nādir's subsequent reaction in the following words:

"Its acquisition was accomplished within a short time so that mountains of grain were gathered in the camp of the world conqueror where it became agreeable to the world seeking sights and the reason for amazement and [the subject] of conversation. Looking on the large amount of grain, the illustrious and sagacious king turned to the pillars of government (*arkān-i daulat*) and said: 'Each of these two kingdoms [Hindūstān and Turkestān] has been famous [...] for extraordinary singularities and unique qualities. The kingdom of Hindūstān is like the sea of Oman. Whilst the clouds of its spring rain scatter gold and jewels, the air of Turan is like the rainy clouds of the Urdībihisht and the Dār al-Islām [Bukhārā] smells like amber and scatters grain and delicate food.'¹⁴⁹

The provision of the two hundred thousand *kharwār* of grain in the aftermath of the Iranian occupation was not the only occasion where we observe the supply of grain to the foreign troops. In 1154/1741–42 the Iranian governor of Balkh, Niyāz Khān, led a plundering expedition across the Oxus. After looting the settlements of the Qungrāt Uzbeks north of the river, the Iranians proceeded to Khuzār. When Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq received messages about the new campaign, he sent five hundred *kharwār* of grain as provisions

¹⁴⁵ دوصد هزار خروار از غله ثلثات جهت جیره و علق لشکر منصور طلبیده ثمن اورا از خزانه عامره سیم و زر بخشید امیر عالیجاه قیمت غلاترا برعایای ولایت شهر و تومانات تقسیم فرموده ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 44b; see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 274b).

¹⁴⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 44b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 274b. Apart from the *Maḥzar al-aḥwāl*, other Bukharan and Iranian sources do not mention the provision of this large amount of grain to Nādir Shāh (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maḥzar*, fol. 70a).

¹⁴⁷ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maḥzar*, fol. 70a.

¹⁴⁸ On this occasion, the traveler complains about the food of the Bukharan ruler and his army. In his opinion, the food was unceremonious (*bī-takalluf*) and undelightful (*bī-ladhdhat*) (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 72–73). "But, the Almighty has given them abundance of most exquisite fruits; with robust forms, and healthy conditions, the greatest of earthly blessings." (Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 41; see also Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 72–73).

¹⁴⁹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 274b.

for Niyāz Khān's troops and their horses. Kāẓim remarks that even Bālta Bēg, the brother of the governor of Ḥiṣār, set off with additional provisions for the Iranian contingents.¹⁵⁰ This shows that not only Bukhara and its immediate surroundings were affected by the increasing demands of Nādir's army, but even more remote areas like Ḥiṣār-i Shādmān. In 1156/1743–44 Nādir Shāh dispatched his troops to build up a garrison at Sūqiyār on the banks of the Oxus, from where they were to crush a revolt in Khwārazm. He also sent a message to Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān including the order to furnish provisions and military equipment and to send it all with a horse caravan to Chahār Jū and Sūqiyār.¹⁵¹ Kāẓim's descriptions here are interesting because they show that the Bukharan representatives and their followers had to supply beasts of burden besides the usual food provisions. Solely furnishing grain and other food was obviously not sufficient without beasts of burden for transport. The animals however seem to have remained with the recipients of the resources.

Remarkably, a similar pattern of resource supply can be discerned on a more local inner-Bukharan level. In Muḥarram 1166/November–December 1752, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī was planning a military campaign to open access to the mountainous region east of Samarqand. In preparation for this expedition, he sent government officials to build storage facilities in Samarqand. The Bukharan administrators had received an unspecified sum of *dīnārs* to buy up the grain in local bazaars. The population in the vicinity was ordered to supply beasts of burden for the transport of the provisions to the city.¹⁵² Wafā's account continues with the successful collection of seven hundred *kharwār* of grain and its storage in Samarqand.¹⁵³ Prior to his

¹⁵⁰ Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, II, 830.

¹⁵¹ Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, III, 936. Since the establishment of Iranian supremacy in late 1740, Khwārazm had been permanently engulfed by unrest and warfare. According to Kāẓim, the main lines of conflict occurred between the Sālūr and the Yāmūt Turkmen. When in 1158/1745–46 the latter instigated an intrigue that led to the assassination of the influential Irtāq Ināq, the conflict escalated and caused the disruption of economic life. However, the Qizilbāsh led by influential commanders like Shāh Qulī Khān, Muḥammad Qāsim Khān Īshik-Āqāsībāshī, the *nāyib al-saltāna* of Herat, were able to defeat the Yāmūt and finally re-established Iranian overlordship in the area south of the Aral Sea (Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, III, 933–47).

¹⁵² ... چند کس از کارگذاران امین کفایت مآب را در سنه محرم الف و ست و ستون مانه بطرف سمرقند فرستاد و مصحوب ایشان بدرهای دینار ثمن غلات گردانید که از مواضع قریب میانکالات بنقد و قیمت ستانند و ترک و (Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 203a).

¹⁵³ Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 203b.

campaign to Jizakh in spring 1754, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered the collection and storage of eight thousand *kharwār* of grain out of the third (*thulthāt*), the obligatory tax levied on grain for the preparation of the next campaign.¹⁵⁴

While grain and other agricultural products used as food provisions were material non-human resources, subordinate groups had to deliver other non-human and human resources to the protectors. Our sources frequently mention the supply of troops and manpower as well as payment of the *zakāt* (initially alms given in accordance with the Islamic law). For instance, the rebellious Yūz leader Fāzil Bī sent his messengers and envoys to the royal court at the beginning of Rabīʿ I 1169/December 1755 to ask for pardon in light of his ignominious deeds. The messengers offered their loyalty and obedience with the following words:

“His Majesty, the possessor of grandeur and magnificence, the refuge of the world has witnessed himself the strong and the weak, the ignoble and the noble of our domain. For every one with a limited number [of followers] like us, resistance against the blows of the victorious troops is far off due to a lack of power and strength. Compared with the strength of His Jamshīd-like Majesty, we group of helpless and weak people are like a gazelle in front of the lion. [...] From today onward, we will obey and submit to the orders of His Majesty obeyed by the world. We are ready to fasten the belt of submission and obedience around the waist of heart and soul. We will recognize the rule based on obedience and subjection out of sincere intention and loyalty. We will arrange and strengthen the covenant and the tranquility of the heart with an oath to confirm the sincerity and the confidence of the compact. [In doing so], we deliver the *zakāt* (*māl-i zakāt*), the *āq ūylī* and the *qarā chirīk*.”¹⁵⁵

This passage is a verbatim speech by the Yūz envoys from Ūrā Tippa. What soon becomes clear is that the messengers offered loyalty and submission in a situation where they considered subordination to the ruler their only option. The first sentences clearly indicate the inferiority of the Yūz, expressed in a metaphoric comparison borrowed from the animal realm. Finally, they offered delivery of the *zakāt* and auxiliary troops, here described as *qarā chirīk* and *āq ūylī* (آق اوپلی). In most cases, the second term appears in contexts where local governors or chiefs who submitted to the ruler had to furnish a contingent of warriors (*chirīk*; *qarā chirīk*) and the

¹⁵⁴ فرمان داد تا که فصل تیر ماه هشت هزار خروار غله ثلثات میانکالات در شهر سمرقند مهیا گردند (ibid., fol. 222a).

¹⁵⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 237b.

zakāt.¹⁵⁶ The term *āq ūylī* is of Turkic origin, literally meaning “white house” or someone having a white yurt.¹⁵⁷ It designated family members, often the sons of local potentates, who sent them as pawns to the royal court after their firm submission in the course of violent conflicts. At the same time, it was also applied to entire tribal communities who had been exiled and resettled to guarantee lasting loyalty after their defeat.¹⁵⁸ The supply of manpower and pawns was a sign of lasting loyalty as well as a means designed to maintain the loyalty of tribal leaders and their followers. There is one passage in Qāzī Wafā’s account suggesting that these troops were stationed in local garrisons where they had been subordinated to the governors and commanders of the citadels.¹⁵⁹ This fact is confirmed by one of the *inshā’* collections dating back to the early nineteenth century (reign of *amīr* Ḥaidar) where we find both terms, *qarā chirīk* and *āq ūylī*, in the sense of irregular auxiliary troops that were recruited locally to man small garrisons. Some of the letters written by the *amīr* contain detailed lists of

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., fols. 238a, 239a, 298a.

¹⁵⁷ Sotūda, “Pīshguftār,” 18. Beisembiev simply translates the term as hostages (Russian “zalozhniki”) (Beisembiev, *Ta’rikh*, 92).

¹⁵⁸ Sotūda, “Pīshguftār,” 18. The Khoqandian chronicler Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān describes the *āq ūylī* as tribal contingents that were recruited for the army of mighty conquerors. The term is also used in the Iranian context, when Nādir Shāh recruited Uzbek troops for his army (Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 346). Although Kāzīm uses the term *āq yalū* (اق یلو), which sounds somewhat similar to *āq ūylī*, it is not clear if he meant the same thing. He uses the term for his descriptions of the battle of Qarshī between the Qizilbāsh and the Uzbeks in 1737 and designates the *āq yalū* as particular Uzbek and Turkmen tribal contingents from eastern Transoxania. Listing the *īlāt-i āq yalū/tāyifa-yi āq yalū* separately, he specifies them as being composed of warriors from Samarqand and Ḥiṣār. The leader of these tribes, Ādīna Qul Bī, is mentioned as commander-in-chief (*ṣahib-i ikhtiyār*) of Tashkent and Khojand and as leader of the *āq yalū* (*ūylī*?) (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 588, 592, 595, 799). In this context the term probably meant tribal groups who had been resettled from Ferghana and other areas in Samarqand in earlier times (ibid., 588, 592, 595). At the end of his work, Muḥammad Kāzīm uses the terms *mulāzīm* (attendant, companion) and *āq ūylī*—this time in its proper form (اق اوپلی)—synonymously (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 1111). ‘Ainī also mentions the term, saying that the Uzbek contingents recruited into Nādir’s army were registered in the *āq ūylī* list (*daftar-i āq ūylī*) (Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Ainī, *Tārīkh-i amīrān-i mānghitīya-yi Bukhārā* (Tashkent: Turkestanosoe gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo, 1923), 5–6).

¹⁵⁹ علی مراد قلیاق و امان باقی و شفیع غلچہبا فوج و کورن از هر دروازه خودہارا بہ درون شهر داخل کردہ ... و بسیاری از صاحبان اموال و اق اوپلی قلعه ارگ را بقتل رسانیدہ از حوادث ایام و سانحہ آتیہ اندیشہ نکردند (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 297b).

tribes (Sarāy, Manghit, Qūshchī, Qaṭaghān), clans and sub-sections (e.g., Bāy Bacha Manghit).¹⁶⁰

Qāzī Wafā gives detailed information about all the occasions when troops were recruited locally and absorbed into conquering armies. One of the most prominent instances of this was perhaps Nādir Shāh, who demanded a great number of soldiers to be recruited as regular attendants and followers (*mulāzim*). According to the *Tuḥfat*, he recruited ten thousand Uzbek warriors for his army.¹⁶¹ Yet we observe the same mechanism of recruitment and resettlement of entire tribes at the inner-Bukharan level. When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's troops defeated the Yetī Ūrūgh in 1161/1748, the *amīr* ordered some of the Yetī Ūrūgh to be exiled to Bukhara; the rest were removed from their traditional strongholds Khaṭarchī and Panjshanba, and they dispersed and resettled in other local *qal'as*.¹⁶² On the occasion of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's campaign to Ūrgūt in Rabī' I–II 1166/January–March 1753, Qāzī Wafā reports that the Bukharan troops proceeded to Shahr-i Sabz right after the expedition. Upon their arrival, the *atālīq* selected five hundred Ghalcha from the Tagāb area of Shahr-i Sabz to recruit them into his army. It is further said that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī divided this group (*qaum*) into contingents of tens and hundreds and brought them to Bukhara.¹⁶³ After dealing a final blow to the last supporters of his enemy Muḥammad Amīn Bī in Dhū'l-Qa'da 1171/July–August 1758, Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān recruited more than four hundred Ghalcha into his army. At the same time they delivered the taxes (*bāj wa kharāj-i har sāla*).¹⁶⁴ The recruitment of troops for the royal army was often connected with the taking of pawns from the families of defeated enemies, in most cases sons, brothers or other close relatives. For instance, in 1169/1755 a certain Jum'a Bēg was driven out of his *qal'a* in the northern mountains of Miyānkāl. He took

¹⁶⁰ Amīr Ḥaidar, *Maktūbāt*, makt. nos. 12, fols. 7b; 53, fols. 19b–20a; 87, fols. 37b–38a, 110, fol. 42a.

¹⁶¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 44b. The number of Uzbek warriors recruited into the Persian army greatly varies in the different sources between 6,000 (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 101)), 30,000 (Kāzīm, 'Ālamārā, II, 800) and 20,000 (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 74).

¹⁶² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 139b.

¹⁶³ از مردم تگاب شهر سبز پانصد نفر غلچه تفنگدار را انتخاب فرمود و جهت مهمات آن قوم امیرصده و دهه مقرر (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 216b).

¹⁶⁴ غلچه های دره مذکور با سیورین و بیلاک باستان بوسی سراق اجلال رسیده غاشیه اطاعت بر دوش افکندند و باج و خراج هر ساله را مقرر نموده ... و سه صد نفر تفنگچیان آنها بامر نافذ الاذعان صمیمه سپاه ظفر پناه شدند (ibid., fol. 308b).

refuge with his ally Tughāy Murād Bī, the Burqūt leader of Nūr, who feared to attend the royal court because of his own misbehavior in the past. In this situation, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered them to dispatch Tughāy Murād Bī's son and a brother of Jum'ā Bēg together with a contingent of fighters (*fauji az chirīk*). Both tribal leaders reacted promptly to this demand and sent their relatives with the troops to the royal camp.¹⁶⁵ Another prominent example is the recruitment of Qarāqalpāq contingents on the occasion of a punitive expedition against the city of Ūrā Tippa in Sha'bān 1168/May–June 1755.¹⁶⁶

With this course of action, the rulers killed two birds with one stone. First, they were able to enlarge their own army and to gain further manpower by the recruitment of additional fighters. Thereby they were able to create large heterogeneous armies that included a whole number of tribal segments and splinter groups. And second, the removal of entire tribes and the relatives of tribal leaders guaranteed the maintenance of loyalties in a setting characterized by constant warfare; a setting where many local actors undertook frequent attempts to ward off the dominion and control of the central rulers once their armies had withdrawn.

The *chirīk* or *qarā chirīk* were irregular armed forces that provided additional manpower and a workforce employed for special purposes. The Turkic term *chirīk* (چریک) means troops or army and had been used since the Mongol period. According to the Persian sources, *chirīk* were auxiliary troops, allied forces or legions sent by subordinated peoples. In other contexts the *chirīk* appear as local militias rendering support in times of war. Sometimes they are also described as irregular forces that were sent to support the army of the ruler.¹⁶⁷ In the Bukharan context, the term *qarā chirīk*—"black militia"—was used well into the nineteenth century and circumscribed troops recruited exceptionally in times of war. Consisting of cavalry and infantry contingents, these local militia forces assisted the army of the Bukharan ruler.¹⁶⁸ In Qāzī Wafā's account we read about a military campaign led by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī in spring 1164/1750 against

¹⁶⁵ حاکم نوررا چنان فرمود که ... پسر و برادر خود را با فوجی از چریک بمعسکر همایونی فرستانند ... پسر طغایمراد (ibid., fols. 247a–b).

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., fols. 229b–230a.

¹⁶⁷ Doerfer, *Elemente*, III, 65–67.

¹⁶⁸ Vjatkin, "Karshinskij Okrug," 15; Abduraimov, *Voprosy*, 53, footnote no. 137 on following page.

renegade sub-groups of the Sarāy Uzbeks in Khuzār south of Nasaf. When he laid siege to their bastion, the *atalīq* ordered three thousand men equipped with spades from Qarshī, two thousand soldiers from his own troops including the *qarā chirīk*, and some of the subjects of the dependencies of Bukhara. These contingents were employed for the digging of a canal intended to divert the water of the irrigation scheme of Khuzār. With this step the *amīr* planned to deprive the rebels of water urgently needed to survive the hot summer months.¹⁶⁹ The source tells us that the digging campaign was successfully finished within a relatively short time.¹⁷⁰ Diverting the water of the Khuzār canal helped the *amīr* shorten the siege of the town, which was occupied after the flight of the Sarāy leader.¹⁷¹ However, manpower was not only used for destructive purposes but also for the repair of regular irrigation canals.

The most common reason for recruiting men was the demand for warriors to augment the ranks of the army. The composition and structure of the Bukharan troops may therefore serve to map ties of allegiance and networks of loyalty. One interesting example in this regard is the division of the Uzbek army at the battle of Qarshī in the year 1737. Like in Mongol times, the troops were divided into three main bodies: center (*qūl*), right wing (*barānghār*, *maimana*) and left wing (*jawānghār*, *maisara*). Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq and other *amīrs* like Khwājam Yār Bī Utārchī were in command of the center. The right wing was composed of troops from Miyānkāl, mainly Yetī Ūrūgh and Burqūt contingents under the leadership of Ghaibullah Bī Baḥrīn, ‘Abd al-Sattār Bī Baḥrīn and Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt. Ādīna Qul Bī, the governor of Samarqand, was in charge of the left wing comprising ten thousand warriors from eastern Transoxania.¹⁷² The

¹⁶⁹ امر نمود که سه هزار مرد بیل زن و تشدارو جمعی صاحب متین کوه بر از شهر نسف به سرعت و اهتمام تمام جانب موکب فلک احتشام آرند و دو هزار نفر دیگر از حواشی لشکرگاه و مردم قرا چریک و رعایای تومانات انتخاب نمایند (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 182b).

¹⁷⁰ Our author gives exact information about the canal digging, which was concluded after twenty days. The new canal had a length of two thousand four hundred cubits (*gaz ba dhar* ‘*i shāhī*) and was in some sections about two spears in depth and of similar breadth (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 183a).

¹⁷¹ Ibid., fols. 183a–186b.

¹⁷² Ibid., fol. 29a. Mullā Sharīf’s version slightly differs from Qāzī Wafā’s account. He says that Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was in command of the center; Khwājam Yār Bī and Qutluq Dīwānbēgī headed the right wing made up of troops from Bukhara; the left wing was composed of contingents from Miyānkāl under the leadership of Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt, Ghaibullah Bī Baḥrīn and ‘Abd al-Satār Bī. The Qalmāq bodyguard *āltūn jilau*

center of the army was flanked by a corps of three thousand Qalmāq slaves of the “Golden Rein” (*āltūn jilau*) serving as the personal guard of Abū’l-Faiḏ Khān, and a corps of Turkmen warriors. Besides this arrangement that mirrored the web of mutual allegiances, a similar “social map” can be extracted from the distribution of city gates among the besiegers. During ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s siege of Balkh in 1707, the Bukharan Qaṭaghān led by Ūz Tīmūr Bī Dīwānbēgī together with the *ūng wa sūl* Uzbeks of Shahr-i Sabz commanded by Khudāyār Bī Parwānachī took up position at the village of Āsyā-yi Rīgak near the ‘Ukāsha and Ushtur Khwūr Gates of Balkh. However, after the *ūng wa sūl* tribes showed serious signs of disobedience, with a number of tribal leaders deserting, the battle order was regrouped as follows: the Balkh army led by ‘Ādil Bī Atālīq Mīng and Khūshhāl Bī Dīwānbēgī Mīng besieged the Water Gate (*darwāza-yi āb*); Farhād Bī Ūtārchī and Raḥmān Qulī Bī Dūrmān moved into position in front of the Chinghān Gate. The two *atālīqs* Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī Yūz and Ma’sūm Hājī Sarāy were placed in command of the center of the army; Ūz Tīmūr Bī Dīwānbēgī Qaṭaghān led the left wing, while his colleague Khudāyār Bī Manghit and the remaining *ūng wa sūl* troops formed the right wing.¹⁷³

Another immaterial resource provided by subordinates to the more powerful lords and protectors needs to be mentioned: it was information, for example about local conditions, power constellations, relationships and other circumstances. According to Mullā Sharīf, Nādir Shāh asked about the state of Bukharan affairs “and the situation of the ‘pillar of the nobles,’ the inclination of the hearts and the desolate state of the notables and grandees of the Kingdom of Turan,” in order to fathom out his strategic options and the conditions and power constellations in Bukhara.¹⁷⁴ If we believe the author, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī furnished the information needed to avoid mistakes and the dangers caused by unexpected resistance on the Uzbek

flanked the right wing while Ādīna Qul’s Samarqandī contingent protected the left wing (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 228b). The troops led by Ādīna Qul consisted mainly of tribal contingents (*ilāt va hazārajāt*) furnished by resettled tribes (*āq yalau/āq ūylī*) from eastern Transoxania and the Fergana Valley. Kāzīm lists the following tribal formations as troop suppliers: Yūz, Mīng, Qungrāt, Kīnakās, Bayāt, Qayāt, Armand (Arlāt?), Qazāq and Chaghatāy from Samarqand, Ūrā Tippa, Andijān, Marghīlān, Turkistan, Tashkent and Khojand (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 789).

¹⁷³ Amin Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 113a–b, 118b–119a; Semenov trans., 129, 134–35.

¹⁷⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 263a.

side.¹⁷⁵ We could also imagine that the new servant provided information on geographic conditions, power relations and the animosities between the last Tuqay-Timurid ruler and the several Uzbek *amīrs* and tribal leaders on the one hand, and those conflicts and rivalries amongst the *amīrs* on the other. Several sources agree on the fact that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his followers were integrated into the Iranian army and put under the command of prince Riṣā Qulī Mīrzā. Before crossing the Āmū Daryā, Riṣā Qulī's contingents were dispatched to secure the routes on the other side of the river.¹⁷⁶ According to Ya'qūb, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī acted as a guide for the Iranian troops by showing them the way to Bukhara and actively leading the Qizilbāsh through unknown terrain.¹⁷⁷ Kāzim gives a similar example of the provision of useful information to potential protectors. In his *Ālamārā-yi nādirī* we read how the tribal leaders of the Khitā'ī, Yūz, Qungrāt and other Uzbek tribes attended the camp of Riṣā Qulī Mīrzā prior to the arrival of the Iranian troops at Qarshī in 1737. In particular, a certain Ya'qūb Bī Durmān provided Riṣā Qulī Mīrzā with tactical information about the composition of the Uzbek forces including the *āq ūylī* and the advance of the Uzbek army on a regular daily basis.¹⁷⁸

The possession of useful local knowledge put inferior actors and subordinates in a comfortable position because potential invaders or protectors were in need of information to avoid unpleasant surprises and to move in unknown terrain. Thus local actors often made use of valuable information as a bargaining instrument when power was negotiated between its subjects and subordinate actors on the one side, and the potential protectors and superior actors on the other.

JĀN-SIPĀRĪ: SACRIFICE AND DEVOTION

One last important symbol of loyalty was sacrifice, the readiness to devote or give up one's life for the benefactor usually circumscribed by the terms *jān-sipārī* or *jān-nithārī*. Sometimes we also come across the word *jān-fishānī* in the sense of extreme diligence by spending one's life in the service of another man. Acts of devotion and sacrifice pertaining to all subordinates

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., fols. 263a–b.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., fol. 264a.

¹⁷⁷ Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 3b.

¹⁷⁸ Kāzim, *Ālamārā*, II, 590.

and power subjects—no matter whether palace servants, provincial governors, government officials or ordinary soldiers—were part of the loyalty-obedience-subjection nexus. They were not only obliged to the ruler but also to each other. Some of the tribal chiefs or influential government officials likewise had an extended retinue, the members of which owed their lord loyalty and obedience. Since Mā Warā' al-Nahr was permanently engulfed by warfare and violent conflicts, there was no lack of occasions to demonstrate subservience and subordination. Particularly these combat situations, in which the actors faced numerous dangers and threats to their life, were regarded as the best opportunities to prove one's loyalty. One case in point is the siege of Balkh in 1707. When the Bukharan troops attacked the city, many fighters "turned their life into the path for the hooves of the noble steed of the lion-hearted king."¹⁷⁹

In the following I will cite two distinct passages from different chronicles that show the importance of *jān-sipārī* as a sign of loyalty and devotion. The first is of special interest as it reflects the principle of devotion on a very high level within the Uzbek hierarchy. The text is from Mullā Sharīf's *Tāj al-tawārīkh* and records the last words of the terminally ill *amīr* Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī to his lord Abū'l-Faiḥ Khān when the latter paid a final visit to his commander-in-chief:

"Thanks to the Almighty, we reached exalted ranks and sublime offices due to the good fortune of attaining the favors and the tenderness rendered by the king of the universe. Thus, we became envied by the contemporaries and the nobles of the Kingdom of Turan and Iran. We fastened the girdle of affection [...] around the waist of subservience and followed steadily the path of fidelity in the service of the victorious emperor out of sincere confidence and submission. We did all that was in our power and undertook laudable endeavors and accomplished immense efforts. Since the attendance at the felicity guarding throne, the commencement of youthful power and strength, until the days when old age caused weakness and inability and finally up to the time of departure to the capital of eternity, we were attentively engaged in consideration of granted favors (*iṣṭinā'*) and in retribution for royal gratitude. We raised the banner of prosperity and reputation for the expansion of the fortunate dominion and the destruction of the enemies of the eternal authority. For the high paradise, we were the sincerest keeper of the temple of Mecca and a faithful target for the arrows of the adversaries [...] Thanks to God—we were not blamed for disobedience and rebellion like other *amīrs* and insolent people [...]"¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ Amīn Bukhārī, *ʿUbaidullah Nāma*, fol. 107a; Semenov trans., 122.

¹⁸⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 287a–b. Although Mullā Sharīf usually follows Qāzī Wafā in his descriptions of the reigns of Abū'l-Faiḥ Khān and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān, we do not

Even though the exact wording of this monologue may be fictive due to embellishments by the author, it shows the relevance of lasting loyalty to the ruler despite Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's own military power and the shortcomings and weaknesses of his lord. What is striking in this speech is the emphasis on all terms and categories relating to concrete commitments to the king. Presenting himself as a wholly devoted power subject who even in his last hours is subject to the orders of his lord, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī reminds the king of his true subservience and the things he had accomplished during his tenure. First, he points to his subservience (*khidhmatgārī*) as an indicator of his devotion. Second, the *amīr-i kabīr* underlines his loyalty with his sincerity in confidence and submission (*ṣidq-i i'tiqād wa farz-i inqiyād*). In the second part of his monologue, he is much more specific regarding his discharge of duties and acts of devotion in the service of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān. He reminds him of the immense lifelong efforts and endeavors he had undertaken for his lord. These efforts are described in terms of administration fostering the prosperity and well-being of the government and royal authority as well as in military terms. On his deathbed, the Bukharan *atālīq* places emphasis on the fact that he had committed himself to the fight against all enemies of the Tuqay-Timurid king. However, the last sentences form the most interesting part of the passage as they illustrate the interrelationship between loyalty, devotion and religion. Although *jān-sipārī* does not appear in this section, the *atālīq* presents himself as a devoted man by pointing to his past military activities and the fact that he spared no effort and made himself a target for the arrows of the enemies. Moreover, he also mentions the rewards he will receive on Judgment Day. Portraying himself as the keeper of the Meccan temple in addition to the mention of God and paradise, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī indicates his own personal expectations with respect to rewards in the hereafter. With this, his acts of loyalty and devotion take on a pronounced religious dimension. The path he followed all his life was not just that of loyalty to the ruler; by sacrificing himself for his lord, he demonstrated allegiance also to God as the final and highest authority. In the last sentence,

find any such monologue by the *atālīq* in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*. Qāzī Wafā just summarily describes the *khāqān*'s visit to the sickbed of the dying Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, but he does not refer to the content of this last talk between the ruler and his commander-in-chief (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 51b).

he remarks that he had not shown disobedience by becoming engaged in rebellions against the ruler.

The explanations and interpretations given here should be further expanded, as the extract can also be read from the perspective of the generous and noble lord who was concerned about the fate of his associates and surviving dependants. I will therefore take up the cited passage again in the next chapter.

The second extract comes from the pen of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭāli’, who dedicated the first pages of his work to the martyrdom of ‘Ubaidullah Khān. When messages about the encroachment of the conspirators on the royal camp reached the ruler, he was soon left to his fate by most of his followers who had previously sworn allegiance.¹⁸¹ Ṭāli’ describes the scene as follows:

“When his majesty remained alone, this insincere group surrounded him [...] Aflātūn Qūrchī, who was a Qalmāq but unequalled in fidelity, arrived, kneeled down and said: ‘Oh unfortunate afflicted King, oh poor Emperor and destitute Lord, today the bird of the soul has begun to flutter in the cage of the body. It wishes to fly to the garden of martyrdom. With the body veiled in the curtain of water, clay and soul, which are the perfect commanders-in-chief, both [*naḥs* and *dil*] pretend fidelity. Today I have overcome my low nature. Concupiscence, the habit of which is insincerity, has taken control over the advice of the heart, which is its fortune, and both are dressed in bloody tears of strong desire. Today I will dye the fist of my water and clay in the blood river of martyrdom. Tomorrow on the day of the great request I will join the ranks of the faithful and famous [men] who are ready to sacrifice their life (*khail-i waḥā-dārān-i jān-sipār*).”¹⁸²

Referring to Aflātūn, who was one of the Qalmāq slaves serving in the ruler’s personal bodyguard, the chronicler contrasts the sharp differences between him and the disloyal servants and followers of the ruler. Moreover, he implicitly reprimands all those who had left ‘Ubaidullah Khān to his own fate by portraying a humble slave as a hero who did not abandon his lord in this hopeless and dangerous situation. What is of special interest here is the use of the concept of *naḥs* and *dil* borrowed from al-Ghazālī’s notion of *naḥs*, *rūḥ* and *qalb* (Persian *dil*), which designate the seat of the intellectual process. In al-Ghazālī’s theology, the *naḥs* also stands for the “flesh,” the lower nature of which is very strong and likely to dominate man’s intellect and thought. This lower nature must be disciplined in the interest of ethics.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Ṭāli’, *Tārīkh*, fols. 20a–21b; Semenov trans., 27–29.

¹⁸² Ibid., fols. 21b–22b; Russian text, 29–30.

¹⁸³ Throughout history there has been considerable debate among Muslim philosophers and thinkers about the different contents and meanings attached to these three categories. This

Material substances like water, clay or even the heart are described as potentially weak, or as synonyms that stand for the base nature of earthly things. It is exactly the *nafs* that causes disloyalty and the breaking of oaths in the face of danger and life-threatening situations. Whether Aflātūn sacrificed his life for the king remains a subject for speculation; our chronicler might have invented the occurrence to give his account a more dramatic touch. But it is not so much historical truth and supposed reality that matter here. Rather, expressing his own opinion about sincere obligations involved in loyalty, Tāli' projects the ideal image of a loyal servant or *jān-sipār*. Aflātūn's sincerity makes up for his low status as a slave and even earns him a reputation in comparison to high-ranking actors who preferred betrayal and conspiracy. Similar to Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, Aflātūn refers to God and his rewards on Judgment Day by expressing his desire to join all those who trustingly sacrificed their life. This is further underscored by his last sentences: "Oh God, be my witness! I sacrificed half of my life to God."¹⁸⁴

This final statement confirms the notion that loyalty and service for a lord simultaneously implied loyalty and service for God. Loyalties and social commitments that the individual owed his master were also projected onto the Creator. This implicitly means that the breaking of ties of allegiance was tantamount to a break in the relationship between man and God. What is significant here is not so much historical reality or the event as such, but the projection of loyalty as a value that had a particular social meaning. *Ikhlāṣ* and *wafā-dārī* were entrenched in the worldview of Bukharan actors, whether high-ranking officials like the *atālīq* or slaves such as Aflātūn. The fact that many saw no problem in transferring their loyalties according to their current needs does not detract from the importance of all variables and categories of behavior attached to bonds of allegiance. Bukharan actors believed in the value of loyalty, irrespective of the many cases where we indeed observe a breaking of personal ties. This notion is supported by the chroniclers and their statements on *ikhhlāṣ*, *wafā-dārī* and *hawā-khwāhī* as well as on the value of oaths on almost every page of their comprehensive works.

caused a great variety of positions and interpretations. Many Muslim intellectuals even opposed al-Ghazālī's ideas surrounding the concept of *nafs* (see E. E. Calverley, "Nafs," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., VII, 880–83).

¹⁸⁴ Tāli', *Tārīkh*, fol. 22b; Semenov trans., 30.

ACTS OF FAVOR, GRACE AND COMPASSION

Because of the social dimension of power relations, we now have to consider the counterparts of the subordinates, the perspective of superior or dominating actors. In the following chapter I will explore particular acts of patronage and their performance on the northern side of the Āmū Daryā. We will see that loyalty was by no means given or owed unconditionally but highly depended on specific counteracts performed by the masters. The investigation concerns several questions: How are acts of patronage described in the sources and which vocabulary was employed? How do the Bukharan authors assess acts of patronage and which meanings do they ascribe to this practice?

At the beginning I adopt a philological approach similar to the previous chapter in order to briefly discuss the terminology used by the chroniclers. This procedure will enable me to come up with interpretations regarding the different meanings and facets of patron-client relations from the perspective of the social superiors as they are described in the sources. The subsequent sections are devoted to familiar underlying concepts connected with favor and compassion like affection, protection, nurture, promotion or solicitude.

MARḤAMAT, SHAFAQAT AND 'INĀYAT: TERMS FOR FAVOR, BENEVOLENCE AND AFFECTION

Remarkably, the language of patronage is couched in terms for favor, grace and gratitude. Granting favors of different weight and quality is perhaps the most striking and visible attribute of potential protectors. Bearing in mind the manifold phrases, expressions and words underlying the dimension of loyalty, we find a similar variety of different terms related to favor. This richness of synonyms seems to be a kind of mirror-image of the heterogeneity we observed on the loyalty side. One of the most common terms used for the description of favor in our sources is *marḥamat*.¹⁸⁵ This term covers a relatively wide spectrum of nuanced meanings expressed in different synonyms like mercy, pity, clemency and compassion.¹⁸⁶ The

¹⁸⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 115b, 149a, 156a, 197a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 187b, 273b, 279b, 302a, 348a passim.

¹⁸⁶ See Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1211. Dihkhudā gives a long list of meanings and related synonyms that can be translated into an equal number of different equivalents, such as *lutf* (لطف), *raqqat* (رقت), *mihrabānī* (مهربانی), *'aṭūfat*/*'āṭifat* (عطوفت). All these synonyms are

adjective *raḥīm* derived from it stands for individuals endowed with laudable characteristics such as leniency or pity. In addition, the term *raḥīm* is also one of the ninety-nine different names and attributes of God, who in many texts is described as God the Merciful or Compassionate. A very common synonymous noun to be found is *shafaqat*,¹⁸⁷ which has more or less the same meaning as *raḥmat* or *marḥamat*.¹⁸⁸ The adjective *shafīq* can be seen as synonymous with *raḥīm*.

One of the terms most often used in relation to acts of favor is *‘ināyat*.¹⁸⁹ It is noticeable that this word is primarily applied to contexts in which divine will and power played a central role.¹⁹⁰ Heavenly will and divine protection were indeed regarded as crucial by Bukharan authors, who devoted long passages of their works to detailed description and praise of the supernatural realms. According to the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān could summon his followers to the palace prior to his enthronization in late 1756 because of heavenly help (*ta’īdāt-i āsmānī*) and divine favor (*‘ināyat-i subhānī*).¹⁹¹ But the term *‘ināyat* comprises various further meanings, ranging from guarding and preserving to solicitude, anxiety, care, assistance and favor, to gift, present and bounty.¹⁹² Altogether Bukharan historians

on the spectrum of affectionate and emotional meanings (Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, vol. 44 (محمد-مخیول), 124).

¹⁸⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 76b, 97b, 149a, 214b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 204b, 286b, 537a passim.

¹⁸⁸ According to Dihkhudā the term *shafaqat* (شفقت), compassion, mercy, affection, also means *mihrabānī* (مهربانی), *raḥmat* (رحمت) and *ra’fat* (رافت) (see Dihkhudā *Lughatnāma*, vol. 31 (شرافی-شعرا), 432). Steingass, *Dictionary*, 749.

¹⁸⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 71b, 76a, 136a, 147b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 273b, 305a, 362b, 411a passim.

¹⁹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 21b–22a, 83a, 97b, 101b, 185a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 165b, 200b, 334b passim.

¹⁹¹ چون پرتو آفتاب سعادت آیاب تأییدات آسمانی از مطالع عنایات سبحانی ... بر وجهات (۴) مدعا و جیاه تمنای امیر الامرا تافت ... امیر منزلت تخمیر ابالت مکانی خواص مقربان و هواخواهان دولت جلالت بنیانرا در مجلس خاص الامرا تافت (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 334b).

¹⁹² Steingass, *Dictionary*, 869. Dihkhudā gives a similar list of synonyms comprising *madaḡ-gārī* (مدد گاری), *dastgīrī* (دستگیری), *yārī* (یاری) and *imdād* (امداد) with the meaning of help, aid, assistance, friendship, intimacy and favor; *maīl* and *muḥabbat* (محبت) meaning inclination, tendency, affection, love and benevolence; *tawajjuh* (توجه) signifying attention, favor, kindness, obligingness; and *mihrabānī* (مهربانی) for kindness or friendliness. In addition, Dihkhudā mentions other meanings like *lutf* and *iḥsān* (لطف و احسان)—favor, grace, compassion—as well as *bakhshish* and *an‘ām* (بخشش و انعام)—gift, present, bounty (see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, vol. 35 (علی بن شجاع-عل), 378).

made use of this term to describe acts of benevolence as attributes of merciful and kind lords and rulers but also of God.

In addition to *marḥamat*, *shafaqat* and *ināyat*, we frequently come across the terms *lutf* and *iltāf* that have similar connotations to those described above.¹⁹³ However, this word goes far beyond the meaning of favor as it circumscribes all the laudable attributes of benevolent protectors. While *lutf* generally reflects the characteristics of kindness and gentleness, and also generosity, its plural form *iltāf* refers to all kinds of benefits and favors that are granted by both human masters and God, the most important protector.¹⁹⁴ Interestingly, the extensive list of meanings given by Dihkhudā shows a number of alternative connotations such as softness, benevolence and good conduct. Beyond these synonyms we find the meaning of protection and guardianship attached to the word.¹⁹⁵ For example, when Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī prepared for a campaign against Shahr-i Sabz in 1164/1751, an exchange of letters and messages took place between him and the Kīnakās leaders. The royal messengers informed Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī about the false and distressing intentions of his enemies, whereupon the Manghit *amīr* gazed at the divine favors (*iltāfu'l-āhī*).¹⁹⁶ There are many instances in our sources pointing to the importance of destiny and divine favor, especially with regard to fortune in war and combats.

Besides these most common terms indicating human as well as divine grace and favor, we can identify a range of other terms with similar connotations. One example is *iltifāt*,¹⁹⁷ which means attention, regard and favor as well as respect and courtesy shown by superior actors (rulers, lords, commanders, tribal leaders) toward inferior power subjects.¹⁹⁸ According to Dihkhudā, the word means attention, favor and kindness (*tawajjuh*).

¹⁹³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 8a, 61a, 126a–b, 156a, 291a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 161b, 190a, 280a, 315a passim.

¹⁹⁴ According to Steingass, the term *lutf* also means direct benevolence and protection by God (Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1123).

¹⁹⁵ Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, vol. 42 (لـ), 204–05.

¹⁹⁶ محفل ارم آیین سعادت و تبلیغ مراسلات را از فصل و باب به آن برگزیده ملک و هاب معروض داشتند جهت آنکه (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 185a).

¹⁹⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 38b, 195a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 158b, 290a, 355b passim.

¹⁹⁸ Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*, 92. Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, vol. 6 (ال-النجہ خان), 13.

Moreover, its meaning has a distinct affective dimension, a fact that places *iltifāt* relatively high on the scale of emotion and affection. For instance, it also means care, desire, affection and solicitude as well as respect, education and protection.¹⁹⁹ Hence *iltifāt* is to be regarded as an umbrella term covering the whole vocabulary related to patron-client relations.

Two other terms with the meaning of favor and grace need to be mentioned here: first, *bakshāyish* meaning forgiveness, mercy and grace. This word appears quite often in Mullā Sharīf's *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, especially in situations where royal favor was expressed in demonstrations of generosity.²⁰⁰ The second synonym for grace and mercy is *ra'fat*, which occurs far less often than the other terms.²⁰¹ Finally, the reader of the chronicles frequently comes across the word *ihsān*, another equivalent term for grace and favor. Having the additional meaning of benevolence, this word appears very often in situations where the authors placed emphasis on the benevolent behavior of rulers and commanders.²⁰²

Summing up, I reach the conclusion that the vocabulary pertaining to acts of favor and grace is not only overwhelming, but in general broader, more complex and more blurred than the terminology of loyalty. This complexity of the repertoire mirrors to a certain extent the inequalities inherent in patron-client relations. Since the chronicles are devoted to the rulers or ruling dynasties, they adopt the perspective of the king or the ruling house in describing particular events. To flatter their patrons, Bukharan authors extol them with praiseworthy attributes such as leniency, generosity and kindness.²⁰³

¹⁹⁹ Dihkhudā gives the following synonyms for the word *iltifāt*: *wā nigaristan/bāz pas nigaristan* (وا نگرستن/ باز پس نگرستن)—to look back, to stare; *parwā[-yi kasi dāshtan]* پروای (کسی)—desire, inclination, affection, a turning toward, care concern, solicitude, respect, honor, education, protection etc.; *tawajjuh* (توجه)—turning toward, attention, favor, kindness etc. (see Dihkhudā, *Lughatnāma*, vol. 8 (ال-النجہ خان), 13–14; Steingass, *Dictionary*, 224, 333–34, 1454).

²⁰⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 123a, 281a, 362b, 477a passim.

²⁰¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 80b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 273a, 313b passim. For the meaning of *ra'fat* see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 563; Junker and Alavi, *Wörterbuch*, 347.

²⁰² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 97b, 145a, 263a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 281a, 302a, 404a passim.

²⁰³ Very often we find terms like *'āṭifat/ 'awāṭif* (عاطفت/ عواطف) that also stand for affection, kindness and benevolence in addition to grace (see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 36a, 76a, 93a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 110b, 263a passim). Another word Bukharan historians made use of is *nawāzish* (نوازش), which means to caress devoted servants and attendants in an

PARTICULAR ACTS OF FAVOR: PATTERNS AND SITUATIONS

In the following I will explore particular situations in which favors were granted to subordinates. First of all, I want to draw attention to a situation described in detail by Qāzī Wafā. Subsequent to the establishment of Nādirid authority over Transoxania in autumn 1740, the Iranian king revealed his plans as follows:

“Since the beginning of the foundation of authority (*salṭanat*) and the magnificent reign of the glorious emperor, the conqueror of the world Chingīz Khān, until the era of the Jamshīd-like king Shībānī Khān, the mighty lords of this family brought the resounding echo of the royal kettle-drum to the Pleiades in each and every of the past ages and centuries. Bringing the beautiful sound of imperial dignity to the ears of the Canopus and the small star in the Lesser Bear, the prospering line of this bright dynasty has never ever accepted extinction and cessation. Neither the manner of wickedness and depravity nor the bearings of damage and vicissitude found their way to the high-standing edifice of this magnificent [family]. Now sway over all tracts of land and dominion over many of the princes descending from Farīdūn have become possible for the exalted emperor—thanks to God the Generous, the protecting Lord. As a sign of gratitude for this great gift, we must regard respect for this dynasty, this ornament of the throne [...] as an obligation. Out of favor and mercy, we will grant the realm of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr and [its] capital Bukhara to the *yāsā* of the princes belonging to the dynasty of the noble *khāqān* and we will deliver the keys of the gates and the fortresses [...] to the submissive and trustworthy followers.”²⁰⁴

Putting these words into Nādir’s mouth, the author portrays the Iranian conquest of Transoxania as an immediate but final result of the previous military expeditions to other areas and countries.²⁰⁵ Divine will serves as the background folio for the final decision to deliver the newly gained Central Asian possessions to Abū’l-Faiḏ Khān. The chronicler explains this step and the respect for the old dynasty with gratitude to the Almighty for the great heavenly gift in the form of numerous conquests. Moreover, Nādir Shāh’s

affectionate way (see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 75b, 156a, 220b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 125b, 297a passim).

²⁰⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 97b–98a.

²⁰⁵ Mullā Sharīf largely follows the account given by Qāzī Wafā and emphasizes Nādir Shāh’s intentions to protect and to strengthen the last ruler of the Tughay-Timurid dynasty. In his version, Nādir assured that he would not destroy Bukhara, which he designates a “mine of the Imāms and the scholars,” a statement that mirrors the increasing importance of scholarship and religious piety at the time of the author. Moreover, he interprets Nādir Shāh’s decision to hand Bukhara over to its possessor as being due to utmost respect for the Chingizid dynasty (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 273b).

decision to reinstall the Tuḡay-Timurid ruler appears as an act of ultimate mercy and favor. This interpretation of the events is somewhat similar to Kāẓim's account. Stressing Nādir's role as king-maker (*tāj-bakhsh*), the *ʿĀlamārā* depicts the reinstatement and enthronization (*julūs*) of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān as an act of immense favor. Moreover, Kāẓim also tells us that Nādir acted against the advice of some of his attendants who suggested assassinating the Transoxanian ruler.²⁰⁶

What is most striking about this particular act of royal favor is the fact that it was performed against the background of submission by the Bukharan side. Nādir's decision to act once again as *tāj-bakhsh* was preceded by the surrender of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān and his retinue. In surrendering, the Bukharan ruler had offered some precious gifts and shown his subordination and obedience to the Iranian king. Looking at all the accounts, the ceremony of *tāj-bakhshī*, or the formal handover of authority, forms a step in a chain of reciprocities, irrespective of the different accentuation of our authors. Let us compare the different texts. I will start with a detailed analysis of Kāẓim's *ʿĀlamārā* as this work describes the Bukharan-Iranian encounter very closely:

- 1 Having suffered a final defeat in a battle between Uzbek and Iranian troops, Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān sent his commander-in-chief Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī and some envoys with a message and precious gifts to the Iranian ruler in order to offer unconditional surrender.²⁰⁷
- 2 Nādir Shāh sent a robe of honor (*khal'at*) and a message to the Bukharan ruler to assure him of his good intentions.
- 3 Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān set out for the Iranian camp where he was first received by Naṣrullah Mīrzā and 'Alī Qulī Mīrzā. Afterward a large feast was organized for the reception of the Bukharan ruler, who formally submitted while delivering his crown and a number of gifts.
- 4 The next day, Nādir Shāh sent valuable gifts on his part and received Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān for a private audience. Subsequently he arranged a second feast.
- 5 The following day, Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān and Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī visited the Iranian king.

²⁰⁶ Kāẓim's version of the events differs from the Bukharan authors in that he somewhat neglects the role the Manghit leadership played during the Iranian conquest. For example, he does not mention how Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī entered Nādir Shāh's service before the Iranian army crossed the Oxus (see Kāẓim, *ʿĀlamārā*, II, 796–99).

²⁰⁷ Kāẓim, *ʿĀlamārā*, II, 789–93.

- a) On this occasion they informed him about the situation and the circumstances in Turkistan.
- b) Nādir Shāh decided that his troops should not cause any harm or havoc to Bukhara and its population. Simultaneously he planned the re-enthronization of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān.
- c) Nādir Shāh placed the Bukharan ruler on the throne and returned the crown of Transoxania. At the same time, he again presented gifts to Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān.
- 6 The Iranian king demanded the recruitment of forty thousand Uzbek warriors for his army. These contingents were put under the command of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī Manghit and integrated into the Iranian army. He further arranged a marriage alliance to seal the new union between him and Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān.²⁰⁸

What can be identified here is a clear chain of reciprocal acts. Nādir Shāh, the superior actor, and Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān passed the role of giver and receiver to one another by performing complementary acts of loyalty and favor. The individual acts highly depended on counter acts, giving implied receiving and vice versa. It is worth mentioning again that the whole sequence was underpinned by a quite lengthy and complex gift-giving procedure. The mutual giving and taking culminated in the actual reinstatement of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān and the *tāj-bakhshī*, which is depicted as an act of utmost favor. It did not however mark the end point in the sequence but was followed by a similar counter act: the recruitment of Uzbek troops for the Iranian army.

Let me now consider the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, which—like other Bukharan works—places much more emphasis on the relationship between the Manghit *amīrs* and Nādir Shāh. As we have already seen, the Iranian conquest was more or less facilitated by an exchange of favors and acts of loyalty between Nādir Shāh and his Manghit protégés. We can identify the following sequence of events taking place after Nādir's arrival at Bukhara and the firm establishment of his authority on Sha'bān 12, 1152/November 13–14, 1739:²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 706–802. See also Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 100–01). This entire chapter of the *Ālamārā* is titled “The Honor of the Kissing of the Royal Threshold Granted to Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān.” According to Kāẓim, Nādir Shāh again mentioned his plans with regard to the recruitment of forty thousand Uzbek soldiers for Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān. In the same breath he offered military assistance in cases of rebellion (Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, II, 801–02).

²⁰⁹ The sources somewhat differ with regard to the exact date of the Iranian intervention: Qāẓī Wafā gives Wednesday Sha'bān 12, 1152, the Year of the Monkey, as the date of Nādir Shāh's arrival at Chahār Bakr (Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 42b). Yet this day was either

- 1 After his arrival at Chahār Bakr, one of the suburbs of Bukhara, Nādir Shāh received the surrendering Bukharan ruler. “He placed him on the throne of tranquility and granted him royal mercy.” At the same time, “he put the reins of general and detailed matters of grave importance of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr” into the hands of the *amīr-i kabīr*.²¹⁰
- 2 Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī led other Uzbek *amīrs* up to the royal throne where they paid homage to Nādir.
- 3 Nādir Shāh ordered the delivery of two hundred thousand *kharwār* of grain and the recruitment of ten thousand Uzbek warriors. Furthermore, he decided to take Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī’s son Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī into his service.

Although this sequence is much shorter compared to Kāzīm’s version, it reveals the same dynamic of complementary acts of favor (Nādir reinstated the Manghits as de facto regents of Bukhara) and loyalty. While the Bukharans gained overall guarantees of protection with the promise to avoid massacre, destruction and plundering campaigns in addition to the reinstatement of Abū’l-Faiz Khān, Nādir gained a large contingent of Uzbek soldiers in return and entered into a marriage alliance with the Tuqāy-Timurid ruler. Furthermore, he endorsed his own reputation by adding a further successful conquest to his long list of campaigns.²¹¹

A closer look at the Bukharan chronicles shows that in countless contexts and situations there was a similar dynamic of reciprocal exchange at the local (inner Transoxanian) level. Confronted with military defeat on the battleground, the leaders of the Yetī Ūrūgh, who posed the most serious challenges during the first two years of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s atālīqate, surrendered for the first time in 1160/1748. When they approached the Bukharan court to assure the subordination and submissiveness of their tribe, they brought gifts, whereupon their envoys were granted generous favors

Friday 13, or Saturday 14, 1739. The author has obviously given the wrong date and certainly meant Sha’bān 12, 1153/November 2, 1740, which was indeed a Wednesday. Mullā Sharīf follows the Iranian accounts in giving Jumāda II 14, 1153/September 6, 1740, as the date when the Iranian troops traversed the Oxus (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 217a. See also Lockhart, *Nadir Shah*, 187).

²¹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 43b–44a.

²¹¹ Kāzīm, *‘Ālamārā*, II, 796; Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 69–70; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 272b–275b; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 100–01).

(*‘ināyāt-i kirāmī*).²¹² The same pattern of exchange of gifts expressing submission and obedience but also favors that are not further specified appears time and again in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* and the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*. There was obviously no lack of occasions where favors in the form of rewards were granted in return for loyalty; especially after battles when soldiers and commanders had fulfilled their obligations and did not recoil from sacrificing their life in the service of their master. For example, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī participated in Nādir Shāh’s campaign against the Lazgīs in Dāghistān in 1154–55/1741–43. It was, however, not an easy task to put down the rebellion in this inaccessible, thickly wooded area. The Lazgīs, who were famous for their extraordinary fighting skills and bravery in war, put up stiff resistance to the Iranian army.²¹³ When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī successfully took control over the small mountain stronghold of Dībak, he was rewarded with royal favors (*marāḥim-i shāhanshāhī*).²¹⁴

Another example was the campaign against the Qazāq of Jizakh in spring and early summer 1167/1754. Although Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s troops laid siege to the town, their efforts to capture it were unsuccessful. When the siege of Jizakh became protracted, Jum’a Qul Mingbāshī, one of Muḥammad Raḥīm’s most famous confidants and commanders, entered the battlefield and attacked the city gate with his contingent of one thousand Afghan warriors. However, even the serious efforts of the *mingbāshī* and his troops brought no success. When three of his Afghans were killed and they withdrew from the fortress, Jum’a Qul was injured by a bullet shot from the city wall. In spite of this misfortune, the *amīr* “pleased him [Jum’a Qul] with the favors closely connected with royal compassion. He exalted him amongst his associates with continued rewards and privileged him amongst the soldiers and companions.”²¹⁵

Adopting this motif, Mullā Sharīf embellished it with a more ornate style in describing the rewards for Jum’a Qul’s efforts on the battleground:

“When observing that situation, the prestigious *amīr* dispatched attendants at high speed in order to bring the brave warriors who had rescued the zealous commander away from

²¹² چون آن جماعه مقارین آستان سعادت اقران گردیده تنسوقات خود را بامعان نظر امیر فوح سیر گذرانیدند و فضلی
از جریده ایلی و انقیاد ایل و الوس خود بر خوانده مشمول عنایات کرامی شدند
(Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 136a).

²¹³ For the entire campaign see Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 833–62.

²¹⁴ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 859.

²¹⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 225a. See also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 385b–386a.

the danger of the abyss. [Upon his arrival at the royal camp] he brought the wound of the Bījan-like hero with the salves of unique favors to the stairs of cicatrization and recovery.”²¹⁶

Another similar example in this regard was an unsuccessful campaign against the tiny chieftom of Nūr, located at the northwestern fringe of Miyānkāl, in Rabī‘ II 1161/March–April 1748. Upon the conclusion of this rather unsatisfying expedition, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered his troops

“to turn the countenance of devotion to the threshold of imperial power in order to expect benevolence and promotion (*‘ātifāt wa tarbiyat*). [...] After the return of the brave army, the successful *amīr* opened the hand of kindness and grace (*dast-i nawāzish wa marḥamat gushāda*) and comforted them with [all] kinds of benefits (*ṣunūf-i makārim*).”²¹⁷

This passage reflects the importance of various institutions. First we identify devotion expressed in military service regardless of the unsuccessful outcome of the campaign. The second emphasis is on the element of affection and benevolence promised by the *amīr* in the form of promotion and education (*tarbiyat*), a practice I will further explore in the next subchapter. This promise was fulfilled upon the return of the troops by opening the hand of kindness and favor. The rather abstract term *marḥamat* refers here to the granting of various benefits (*makārim*). Thus Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī showed his appreciation even though he must have been rather unsatisfied with the result of the expedition.

TARBIYAT AND IṢṬINĀ‘: NURTURE, PROMOTION AND MARKS OF FAVOR

Up to this point I have devoted considerable space to the concept of favor, which nevertheless remained unspecified as we have not learned what acts of grace it entailed. In the previous section we encountered *tarbiyat*, which often appears in connection with grace and compassion. This term carries different connotations like upbringing and education, nurturing and promoting someone, or fostering a person’s career. Paul also discovered *tarbiyat* in pre-Mongol sources and translates it as patronage. Correspondingly, the term *murabbī* designates a protector par excellence.²¹⁸ I discovered the term *murabbī* only a few times in Bukharan sources. In a document dating back to the late seventeenth century, the titles of *murabbī-*

²¹⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 386a.

²¹⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 145a.

²¹⁸ Paul, *Herrscher*, 174.

yi 'ulamā' (tutor of the religious scholars) and *mu'in al-fuqarā* (defender of the subjects) were applied to Allah Birdī Bī Ming, an influential Uzbek *amīr* in the time of Subhān Qulī Khān.²¹⁹ Muḥammad Amīn also portrays his patron Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq as a *mu'in al-fuqarā* and *ẓahīr al-ghurabā*, a supporter of the poor, and praises his character as a friend of the subjects and the 'ulamā'.²²⁰ In the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, Aḥmad Khwāja, an influential Sayyid Atā'ī sheikh and spiritual mentor of Amīr Ḥaidār, is described as *murabbī-yi tarbiyat*. Besides this term, I came across other words such as *ṣāhib* (lord or master), *kār-sāz* (one who renders material support), *muhaiman* (defender against fear and danger), *ḥāmī* (protector) or *rā'ī* (guardian, custodian).

Since *tarbiyat* or *parwarish* have multi-faceted meanings, it is doubtful whether Bukharan actors understood them as patronage in its present-day Western (rather negative) sense. Due to the fact that—in spite of their practical knowledge—human agents generally have no elaborated theory or concept of social relations, practices such as *tarbiyat* were most probably seen as something normal. Thus, from an internal point of view, it may seem problematic to simply translate *tarbiyat yāfta* as a client. Rather, we are dealing with persons who may have perceived themselves as followers or well-wishers enjoying a superior's support in the form of education, nurture, and promotion.²²¹

Mullā Sharīf in particular used *tarbiyat* very often in his descriptions of behavior and events. For instance, after the end of the Qazāq raids in Transoxania, a conflict evolved between the *atālīq* Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Manghit and the courtiers of Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān. Finally, the *amīr* withdrew from the court and left the field to his rivals. According to our author, he explained his decision to go to Qarshī in the following words:

"Since the oven of fear was inflamed by the events and the relentless storm of the calamity of hunger and the misfortune of scarcity has befallen the forts and *iqṭā*'s of the guarded kingdom, causing decline and weakness in the inhabited domains, the observance of the custom of loyalty and subservience as well as consideration of past privileges of royal favor and promotion (*ḥuqūq-i sawābiq-i marḥamat wa tarbiyat-i shahryārī*) do not allow distancing oneself from service for the felicity-guarding threshold in the midst of

²¹⁹ Chekhovich, *Dokumenty*, doc. 15, 79. See also Muḥammad Amīn, *Mazhar*, fol. 4b.

²²⁰ Muḥammad Amīn, *Mazhar*, fols. 2a, 4b–5a.

²²¹ The term *tarbiyat yāfta* (تربيت یافته) appears frequently in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 111b, 319a, 328a passim).

the hardships [brought about by] the vicissitudes of the time and the sedition of the mischief-creating curator of the age.”²²²

Viewing *tarbiyat* as essential for personal development and advancement, Mullā Sharīf underlines his practical comprehension of the term with the following verses:

“Although it was a drop of water from the river in paradise

Without nurture (*tarbiyat*) it will neither become a pearl nor a diamond

Without the warmth and the rain dropping from the clouds of Sun and Moon

No stone will become a ruby and no tree will become green

Without the solicitude (*parwarish*) of water and air it stands to reason

How should it grow, just out of soil?”²²³

Here the author portrays the principle of *tarbiyat/parwarish* as something inherent in the nature of things and human beings. Moreover, Mullā Sharīf immediately draws our attention to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, “whose star of dignity and grandeur signaled fortune from the zenith of Nādir Shāh’s *tarbiyat* and ‘*āṭifat*.”²²⁴

In addition to *tarbiyat*, the reader of the chronicles encounters the element of *iṣṭināʿ* that is far less easy to grasp. *Iṣṭināʿ* means to confer benefits but also to educate or to foster somebody (similar to *tarbiyat*).²²⁵ Beyond this, it also describes the giving of an entertainment to another person.²²⁶ Mottahedeh translates the phenomenon of *iṣṭināʿ* in Buyid Iraq as “fostering someone’s career” and describes it as a formal and serious relationship.²²⁷ From the Abbasid period onward, *iṣṭināʿ* was widely granted to slaves (*ghilmān*) in the service of the caliph’s army. In return, the Turkish client slave warrior was expected to show his loyalty with lasting gratitude for the benefits he had received from his master.²²⁸ Still, these expectations

²²² Ibid., fols. 194a–194b.

²²³ Ibid., fols. 211a–b.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ *Iṣṭināʿ* can probably be regarded as a synonym for *parwarish* and *tarbiyat*.

²²⁶ Francis Joseph Steingass, *A Learner’s Arabic-English Dictionary* (Model Town: Gaurav, 1986), 594. According to Steingass’ Persian-English dictionary, *iṣṭināʿ* means the bestowing or receiving of favors (Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*, 68).

²²⁷ Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 82–83.

²²⁸ Ibid., 84–89.

were only a structural by-product of *tarbiyat* and *iştināʿ*, not the driving force behind the principle. In a nutshell, the interests connected with these practices had been institutionally predefined for ages and matched the actors' worldview.

Because it is difficult to assess from a present-day normative perspective whether actors in Buyid Iraq and eighteenth-century Mā Warāʾ al-Nahr equally identified this concept with patronage as it is perceived in the Western world today, I would like to opt for another translation. Although *iştināʿ* (like *tarbiyat*) indeed comes very close to the concept of patronage, I argue that these terms represent only one dimension of patron-client ties.²²⁹ Therefore, I translate it here as the bestowing and receiving of favors and benefits, or as generously promoting somebody.

Let me again pick up one extract I cited from the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* in the previous chapter to highlight patterns of loyalty. This passage was concerned with the last words of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Atālīq to his master Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān. Even though the monologue of the dying *atālīq* may be wholly fictive in its exact wording, it gives an insight into the beliefs and ideas of the author. It is notable that reciprocity features prominently and forms the recurrent theme of the passage, which shows that receiving favors in the form of exalted rank, offices and honor in return for the constant proof of loyalty, and vice versa the bestowing of favors in return for loyalty and service, was a general procedure that characterized and maintained the social relationship between two actors. Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's speech further shows the importance of the concept in the thinking of men in mid-eighteenth-century Bukhara. These convictions are further underlined by the continued speech of the *amīr-i kabīr*:

"[...] Whatever appears from the noble character and the great laudable qualities of His Majesty the justice sheltering king due to royal kindness and the virtues of the just appreciation of the merits of astronomy, the support of the disciple walking on the paths of loyalty and the granting of particular favor is made up by the following: You shall open the wings of the affectionate phoenix with good intention and spread out the shade of the promotion offering banner (*zill-i lawā-yi tarbiyat*) over the heads of the successors and those who are left behind, over the brothers, sons and servants. You should in accordance with the sublime custom (*qāʿida-yi ʿaliya*) bestow daily increasing favors on the hereditary slaves and sincere followers, so that the chiefs and nobles of Turan and Iran

²²⁹ In my opinion, it is inappropriate to translate *iştināʿ* (استناعت) simply as patronage. Other aspects like quasi-adoption (*farzandī*) or protection (*himāyat*) are not covered by this term, which does also not appear to be a synonym of the former.

shall see and witness the signs and histories of benefits endowed with alchemical attributes. They shall make honorable mention and express the unique qualities of His Majesty the emperor with the language of praising for centuries.”²³⁰

This passage deserves attention as it sketches the principle of patronage without using any specific term for it matching the present-day Western connotation of the word. By placing emphasis on the exchange of kindness and particular favors generously granted in return for loyalty, the author outlines his ideas on justice and endows the institution with strong legitimacy through the words of his protagonist. In addition, the practice is described as a sublime custom or principle (*qā'ida-yi 'aliya*). With this speech the author portrays the *atālīq* as a generous protector himself. In Mullā Sharīf's opinion, he was concerned about the future of his clients, for instance his relatives and sons, but also other protégés, servants and slaves. It is worth noting that he cared for his followers even on his deathbed by making sure of continued favors and benefits for them from his own master. By embellishing this motif borrowed from Qāzī Wafā's *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, Mullā Sharīf makes every imaginable effort to present the Manghit leader as an example of a perfect patron.

The *atālīq*'s speech however leaves further scope for interpretation against the background of the statements he made before regarding his own relationship with the king. It reflects Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's dual role of a loyal servant or attendant to his master Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān on the one hand, and the protector of his relatives and own protégés on the other. From the chronicler's account, it seems to have been theoretically—and probably also in practice—possible to transfer “clientship” from one patron to another, or to make it in principle hereditary.²³¹

In Qāzī Wafā's work there are also instances of *tarbiyat*. When his troops failed to quell the rebellion of the Burqūt chief Tughāy Murād Bī in Nūr in 1161/1748, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī made a name for himself by promising kindness and promotion (*tarbiyat*).²³² Another example are the Kīnakās *amīrs* who offered loyalty and submission but demanded royal favors when

²³⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 287b–288a.

²³¹ چون حضرت خاقان عریض اخلاص تمهید و وصایای مراحل توحید استماع فرمودند اظهار حزن خاطر همایون و ابراز تربیت و عنایت سعادت مشحون درباره اعقاب و متعلقان عمده الاعیان ساخته بمستقر سلطنت مراجعت کردند (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 288a).

²³² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 145a.

they were confronted with a punitive expedition by Bukharan troops in Rabi' II 1164/February–March 1751:

“At the suggestion of heart and soul, we helpless people are ready to serve in consent with the royal *amīr* and for obedience and subordination. Our hand of subordination will eliminate every thorn and thistle on the way of friendship and in the valley of promise and consent with root and branch. The clouds of kindness and favors, and of promotion and grace (*ghammām-i tarbiyat wa ihsān*) must shower the fields of the desires tilled by us humble men.”²³³

Let me come back to the concept of *iṣṭinā'*. Since Mullā Sharīf describes the institution much more frequently and in more detail than other authors, I will demonstrate its implications by looking at the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*. The first passage I cite here is taken from a description of Abū'l-Faiz Khān's rule:

“[...] In the time of upheaval and the days of campaigns His Majesty the noble emperor and fortunate possessor of the throne of the transitory and the eternal kingdom saw the desire to cause harm and damage. [He took notice of the wish] for hostility and fraud nurtured by the rebellious Uzbek chiefs and the distinguished commanders in spite of complete favors and kindness [granted] without why and wherefore, and the promotion to high ranks and exalted offices. Guided by powerful fortune and assisted by prosperous felicity, he inflicted punishment on and took pawns from fraudulent commanders and despicable rebels [...] Because of his royal qualities, the king [...] smashed the group of slayers and fratricides with the sword of vengeance and did not leave [even] one of that insane group of *khwāja*-murderers alive. Although he struggled to put together the hearts by gratifying the notables and chiefs with aggrandizement through affection and favors (*iṣṭinā'*), the ill-bred and malicious tribes were occasionally engaged in striving for bad behavior, fraud and rebellion.”²³⁴

These words of the author are interesting insofar as they show the rule of the last Tuqay-Timurid king in a somewhat different light. While other Manghit chroniclers frequently refer to the personal weaknesses and deficiencies of Abū'l-Faiz Khān, Mullā Sharīf extols the ruler for his laudable characteristics and places special emphasis on the aspect of royal affection (*ʿaṭīfat*) and the bestowing of favors (*iṣṭinā'*). The latter is further specified in one of the previous sentences: here *iṣṭinā'* is ultimately linked to the appointment to sublime offices and ranks. At the same time, he rebukes the Uzbek tribal leaders for their ungratefulness.²³⁵

²³³ Ibid., fol. 180a.

²³⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 290b–291a.

²³⁵ At this point Mullā Sharīf's account considerably deviates from other Bukharan works, which often note the weakness and inability of the last Tuqay-Timurid king.

PATTERNS OF GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Yuri Bregel and Anke von Kügelgen provide substantial information on the duties and tasks of individual office holders as described in the sources discussed here.²³⁶ But I am not so much interested in the question of who was appointed to which office or which particular tasks and duties the different positions entailed as in the principles that governed the appointments.

I would like to start with two very prominent examples: the Manghit leaders Khudāyār Bī (r. 1714–16) and Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī (r. 1722–43), appointed to the office of *atālīq* and commander-in-chief (*amīr al-umarā*) respectively. The appointment of Khudāyār Bī was preceded by the rebellion of Farhād Bī Utārchī in the region of Samarqand in the years 1125–26/1713–15.²³⁷ Yet Ma‘šūm Bī Sarāy, the *atālīq* at that time, did not perform well in this campaign and it was broken off after a while.²³⁸ Mullā Sharīf justifies his dismissal in the aftermath of the expedition with distrust and lack of loyalty on the side of the Sarāy and their allies. His removal from the post was instigated by the notables and the “pillars of power,” who argued as follows:

“In spite of the necessity and obligations [connected] to the duty of promotion (*ḥuqūq-i tarbiyat*) and the reliance on royal favor, total misdemeanor and disobedience, shown by the *atālīq* at a time when loyalty and diligence [were regarded as a necessity], caused the enemies’ rejoicing at [our] misfortune and created resentment amongst the royal attendants.”²³⁹

Mullā Sharīf’s version of the events shows the linkage between acts of favor and loyalty. The *atālīq* was reprimanded for his behavior even though he had enjoyed royal promotion and care (*tarbiyat*). In the eyes of the courtiers,

²³⁶ Bregel, *Administration*; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 87–97.

²³⁷ Ṭālī‘, *Tārīkh*, fols. 33b–35a; Semenov trans., 37–39; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 139a–140a.

²³⁸ ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭālī‘ informs about a secret agreement between Ma‘šūm Bī and a certain Bāy Muḥammad Bī Dādkhwāh, the father-in-law of one of Farhād Bī’s sons. According to this agreement, the commander-in-chief broke off the siege of Farhād Bī’s stronghold Katta Qūrghān and took some of his sons into custody (Ṭālī‘, *Tārīkh*, fol. 34b; Semenov trans., 38). Mullā Sharīf only mentions that the king broke off the campaign and returned to his capital without punishing the Kḥiṭā’ī leader on the advice of loyal followers who were “frightened of the adverse and cheating group” (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 140a).

²³⁹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 140b.

Ma'sūm Bī had failed to prove his loyalty and therefore forfeited his high office. They now continued their advice by saying:

“Do bestow plentiful favor upon Khudāyār [Bī] Dīwānbēgī Manghit whose utmost devotion and bravery in royal service is evident; who is capable and skillful in [handling] the affairs of commandership and discharge of duties. Tie him to the court of proximity and reputation!”²⁴⁰

The courtiers had to give reasons for their choice of the Manghit leader and extolled him for his qualities, first and foremost loyalty and devotion, but also his skills as a military leader. According to the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, Abū'l-Faiz Khān accepted the request and bestowed royal favors on the former *dīwānbēgī* in the form of kindness and promotion (*nawāzish wa tarbiyat*). Subsequently, he sent him a royal diploma and appointed him to the post of commander-in-chief.²⁴¹ It is further mentioned that

“he was given pleasure with the fortune of the royal *kūrnish* and the seat (*ūrūn*) of the ‘pillar of the *amīrs*’ and entrusted with the loosening and tying (*hall wa 'aqd*) of the necessary matters of the government and the dismissing [from] and appointing [of] court offices.”²⁴²

However, Khudāyār Bī did not retain his new position for long. He was deposed and exiled soon after, his laudable characteristics notwithstanding.²⁴³

These events introduced new developments characterized by rebellions and the constant shift of the *atālīq* and *dīwānbēgī* positions as described in the previous chapter. Against this background, it is not surprising that the Bukharan ruler decided to appoint Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī b. Khudāyār Bī Manghit to the office of *parwānachī*. He sent a delegation of envoys to the region of Chirāghchī, the seat of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī.

“Upon their arrival at the envisaged area, they dismounted in sight of the fortress of Chirāghchī and informed Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī about the emperor's attention. Filled with joy and rejoicing at hearing the good news about the royal favor (*iṣṭinā'-i jahānbānī*), this handsome *amīr* left the fort and was elevated by the diploma of kindness and a robe of honor. [Afterward] he brought the custom of hospitality and entertaining to perfection.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., fol. 140b. For another version see Ṭālī', *Tārīkh*, fol. 35a; Semenov trans., 39.

²⁴¹ ... و پرتو آفتاب عنایت خاقانی بر وجہات اختیار نوازش و تربیتش تافت و یرلیغ کیمیا تبلیغ منشور امیر الامرای ... بنام نامی امارت پناهی موشح و به مهر اشرف اعلیٰ مزین و مرشح گردید (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 140b–141a).

²⁴² Ibid., fol. 141b.

²⁴³ Ṭālī', *Tārīkh*, fols. 39b–40a; Semenov trans., 42; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 143a.

When gaining repose of the heart and full confidence, he installed his brother Dānyāl Bī as vice-regent and, accompanied by the messenger [...], turned the countenance of loyalty to the court attached to the celestial sphere. When he had the honor to approach the steps to the felicity collecting throne, he received the fortune of kissing the royal hand (*dastbūs-i khusrawī*). [Subsequently], he presented gifts to the splendid eyes of the valuable pearl-like king and was distinguished from the other contemporaries and notables with the rank of *parwānachī*.²⁴⁴

The detailed description of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's promotion to the office of *parwānachī* shows that this particular appointment is embedded in an extended chain of reciprocities that continues, as the following sentences illustrate:

“Since His Majesty the king endowed with excellent wisdom saw the daily increasing traces of loyalty and well-wishing and the signs of attention and vigilance from the forelock of that Aristotle-like Ḥakīm, like the elevation in the countenance of the luminous sky or the resembling lines in the mirror of love, he made the brave and jewel-like *parwānachī* agreeable to [his] alchemic eyes. Due to his daily increasing fortune, he intensified his promotion and intimacy (*tarbiyat wa qurbatash*) from day to day.”²⁴⁵

In this admittedly special case, the personal relationship based on the exchange of favors and loyalty was a lasting one. As has been elucidated in the previous sub-chapter, the seemingly endless sequence of reciprocal services and favors was broken with the death of the *amīr* in 1743.

I shall now briefly turn to the most important round of gubernatorial appointments immediately after Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's enthronization in December 1756, described in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* under the title “The account of the distribution of offices and positions in the royal administration in accordance with [their] ranks and the rulers of the previous kings of Turan.”²⁴⁶ One of those who were generously favored in the round of appointments was the Yetī Ūrūgh chief Ghaibullah Bī Bahrīn, “whose loyalty to the imperial threshold has reached the stage of singularity.” He was finally appointed to the office of *dīwānbēgī* of the court due to royal

²⁴⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 145a–b.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., fol. 145b.

²⁴⁶ *Bayān-i taqṣīm-i ‘amal wa ūrūnhā-yi dastgāh-i sulṭānī ba marātib wa qā‘ida-yi qadīm-i pādishāhān-i tūrānī* [بیان تقسیم عمل و اورونهای دستگاه سلطانی بمراتب و قاعده قدیم پادشاهان تورانی] (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 257a–260a). This chapter is followed by an account of the appointments to religious offices *Bayān-i ūrūn wa manāshib-i aṣḥāb-i siyādat wa nijābat* [بیان اورون و مناصب اصحاب سیادت و نجابت] (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 260a–262b).

favor.²⁴⁷ Another follower mentioned in the illustrious group of appointees is Imām Qulī Bī Manghit, “who was in the matter of bravery the forerunner amongst the peers and equals, and has been for a long time girding the belt of loyalty for this threshold around his heart and life.” Imām Qulī Bī was granted the governorship of Yakka Bāgh and the position of *parwānachī* (*ūrūn-i parwānachī*).²⁴⁸ Besides proof of loyalty, we also observe the aspect of intimacy and personal proximity (*qurbat*) as the reason for an appointment. For instance, *amīr* Dānyāl Bī, “whose close relationship with the royal government is evident, was entrusted with guardianship over the region of Karmīna [and the title of] *dīwānbēgī*.”²⁴⁹

It should be mentioned that major rounds of gubernatorial appointments were in most cases carried out after distinct acts of loyalty. Those mentioned by the author of the *Tuhfat* took place when all the notables, *amīrs*, religious scholars and leaders of the craftsmen’s communities had confirmed Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s assumption of the *khān* title. Immediately after his enthronization they performed the *kūrniṣh* and offered the prayer for the well-being of the new ruler. Afterward, Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān showed his appreciation by appointing his officials, personal followers and notables to various offices.

There were, of course, many other occasions for proving continued loyalty and receiving the respective rewards. The frequent military campaigns in particular provided ideal opportunities to show loyalty and devotion in the service of a master. Accordingly, many appointments and promotion to offices occurred after combats. For instance, Mullā Sharīf describes how the Qaṭaghān *amīr* Maḥmūd Bī (d. 1717) assisted ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Khān (r. 1651–81) in defense against the incursions of the Khiwan ruler Abū’l-Ghāzī Khān (d. 1663). The young *amīr* was badly injured in a military encounter, but despite his injuries he struggled bravely to push the enemies back. According to Mullā Sharīf, the ruler rewarded Maḥmūd Bī with the title of *dādkhwāh* immediately after the battle.²⁵⁰ Another prominent

²⁴⁷ Ibid., fol. 258a.

²⁴⁸ امام قلی بی منغت که در شیوه شجاعت پیش رو معاصران بود و از دیرباز کمر هواخواهی بر میان دل و جان بسته
باضم حکومت یکہ باغ نام و اورون پروانچی دربار کیوان اشتہار را بہ او شفقت کردند
(Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 258b).

²⁴⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 258a.

²⁵⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 112b–113b. Mullā Sharīf gives a full explanation of this encounter without revealing his sources or informants. He states that the Qaṭaghān *amīr* was eighteen years old at that time. The battle mentioned by the author may have taken place

round of appointments, which is described in detail by the author of the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, was carried out by 'Ubaidullah Khān after the siege of Balkh and the defeat of the same Maḥmūd Bī in 1717:

"He ['Ubaidullah Khān] distinguished each one of the group of people who had opposed that man [...] [Maḥmūd Bī] and had shown extreme diligence and excellent endeavors in urging victorious attacks, with [...] offices and ranks [by bestowing] governorships, diplomas and robes upon them. He pleased 'Ādil Bī Ming, whose final loyalty had become agreeable to the sight of the divine shadow, with the post of the 'pillars of the *amīrs*' (*maṣṣab-i 'umdat al-umarā' ʿi-yi kull*) of the Mother of the Cities. Everyone in the Bukharan army who had shown devotion and subordination was rewarded with royal favors [...] and not even one of the bold and loyal heroes and glorious fighters [participating] in this campaign was spared the favor of the *suḷṭān*, this cherisher of the servants (*banda-parwar*), or remained without obtaining his wishes and desires."²⁵¹

The passage continues with royal appointments; for example, the ruler rewarded a certain Mullā 'Abd al-Raḥmān, who had also participated in the conquest of Balkh, with the office of minister and administrator in the *dīwān* of Balkh, while the governorship of Balkh was granted to a certain Ni'matullah Bī.²⁵² Very often, titles were granted to local actors to endorse their authority at local level. For instance, in 1709 'Ubaidullah Khān stopped at the village of Bāzār-i Qanbar Bī Qirq near Panjshanba when he was en route to Samarqand and distinguished the grandson of Qanbar Bī by bestowing the title of *jībāchī* upon him.²⁵³

in 1663 during the last of Abū'l-Ghāzī Khān's numerous campaigns against the Khanate of Bukhara. If Mullā Sharīf is right, Maḥmūd Bī was born around the year 1645 and lived to the considerable old age of seventy or seventy-two. 1717 as the year of his death is relatively well documented (see McChesney, *Waqf*, 167). However, the accuracy of Mullā Sharīf's account must be doubted as it seems unlikely that Maḥmūd Bī reached that age while still energetically heading military campaigns. He died in an earthquake in Badakhshān when fighting the Badakhshānīs. But he did become one of the most prominent and powerful amirid forces in the Balkh region during the reign of Subḥān Qulī Khān. Maḥmūd Bī assisted the Bukharan *khān* against the incursions of the Khiwan rulers Anūsha Khān (d. 1685) in 1684 and Ārang (d. 1694) (see Burton, *Bukharans*, 334, 336, 341, 344, 351).

²⁵¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 126a–b.

²⁵² ... عمل وزارت و شغل خطیر دیوانی مملکت بلخ بملا عبد الرحمن که در باب فتح حصار نهایت اجتهاد و اعتقاد ظاهر کرده بود تفویض یافت و بایالت آن ولایت نعمت الله بی که رکن رکین دولت بود مقرر گشت (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 126b).

²⁵³ Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 145b; Semenov trans., 164. In Central Asia it was common to name localities (town quarters, villages, hamlets) after their founders or after famous persons who often also acted as patrons.

Qāzī Wafā also mentions one single appointment made by Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān after his troops had dealt a final blow to the Qungrāt of Shīrābād south of Bāysūn in 1170/1757. Subsequent to the conquest of the citadel, he appointed Qilich Tupchībāshī to the post of governor of Qarākūl, because “his fathers had always served the great ancestors of the king ..., and because he arrived first together with his contingent at the foot of the citadel wall and made his breast the target for the arrows of the enemies.” It is further said that with this appointment he became the object of envy of the other associates.²⁵⁴

In the past, historians and travelers attempted to draw up a kind of list or index of the most important offices and the duties and functions attached to them.²⁵⁵ There is little to be added. As Anke von Kügelgen and Yuri Bregel point out, it is often difficult if not impossible to glean exact information on the functions and duties of the individual office holders from the sources.²⁵⁶ Although there exists an administrative manual compiled in the late eighteenth century, the *Majmāʿ al-arqām*,²⁵⁷ the tasks often seem to have been interchangeable since the hierarchy did not produce a clear chain of command. Instead, the relationships between strong Uzbek leaders and their vassals can be termed “friendships requiring permanent renewal by the exchange of gifts.”²⁵⁸ This corresponds to the fact that a title or office by no means entailed certain specific duties.²⁵⁹ For instance, the office of the *dīwānbēgī*, usually associated with administrative affairs (e.g., financial matters, tax collection, reception of foreign ambassadors and so on),²⁶⁰ was held by Muḥammad Daulat. According to the information given in the

²⁵⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 271a–b.

²⁵⁵ Bregel, *Administration*; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 87–97. See also A. A. Semenov, “Bukharski traktat o chinakh i zvanijakh i ob objazannostjakh ikh nositelej v srednevekovoj Bukhare,” *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* 5 (1948): 137–50. For a list of titles, ranks and duties in the eighteenth century, see Khanikoff, *Bokhara*, 235–50.

²⁵⁶ Bregel, *Administration*, 7–18; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 87–88, 94.

²⁵⁷ This frequently used handbook was published by Vilʼdanova (see Mīrzā BadīʿDīwān, *Madzhmaʿ al-arkām* (*ʿPredpisanija fiskaʼ*. *Priemy dokumentatzii v Bukhare XVIII v.*). Faksimile rukopisi, vedenie, perevod, primechanija i prilozhenija A. B. Vilʼdanovoj (Moscow: Nauka, 1981).

²⁵⁸ Noelle, *State and Tribe*, 121.

²⁵⁹ A. A. Semenov, “Ocherk ustrojstva tzentralʼnogo administrativnogo upravlenija Bukharskogo khanstva pozdnejshego vremeni,” in *Materialy po istorii Tadzhikov i Uzbekov Srednej Azii*, Vypusk II (Stalinabad: Izdat. Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoj SSR, 1954), 61.

²⁶⁰ Yuri Bregel, “Dīwān-Begī,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., XII Supplement, 227–28.

Tuhfat, he acted as the chief of the royal chancellery, the *dīwān*, but he was also responsible for the royal citadel (*arg*) and together with the chief *qāzī* managed the government when the ruler was absent.²⁶¹ When in 1756 Muḥammad Daulat was promoted to the rank of *qūshbēgī*, his “job” did not change significantly, while the other *qūshbēgī*, Barāt Bī, was appointed as governor of Samarqand.²⁶² Similarly, the Yetī Ūrūgh leader Ghaibullah Bī received the post of *dīwānbēgī-yi dargāh*, but the same office was also granted to Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī, the governor of Karmīna, and Jahāngīr Bī Sarāy. Subsequently, all three *amīrs* participated in military campaigns as they had before. Consequently, a *dīwānbēgī* could be a top official in charge of administrative affairs as well as a skillful commander or a governor (*ḥākīm*).

The fuzziness of titles, social ranks, offices and non-specified duties coincides with the designation of various office holders as *āqsaqāls* irrespective of their real influence and social status.²⁶³ Although the term itself is mostly applied to village representatives, in general it described social entrepreneurs. Hence a title or rank indicated the social status of its bearer, his relation to other actors and his seat in the royal throne hall, but also his position within the inner tribal hierarchy and at local level rather than a profession. Such a position was gained due to an actor’s own performance, skills and expertise, personal relationships and his closeness and loyalty to the king, or affiliations in important societal groups such as tribes, urban neighborhoods or Sufī convents. Noble birth and affiliation to an aristocratic lineage played a decisive role. Making a career and climbing the social ladder was, of course, sometimes also a matter of luck and successfully coping with challenges and dangerous situations. Nonetheless, the hierarchical order in general and the individual ranks in particular seem to have been not only blurred but also relative. Holding a specific title did reflect the status of an actor and how he was seen and classified by others. But an apparently low or high social status did not always correspond to real authority or proximity to the king. Cases in point are the palace eunuchs in the late Tuqay-Timurid period. As slaves and castrates they hardly

²⁶¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 152b, 170a, 178b, 192a passim. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 94.

²⁶² For a thorough discussion of the *qūshbēgī*, or more accurately *qoshbēgī*, see Bregel, *Administration*, 7–12.

²⁶³ See next chapter.

conformed to the ideal picture of the prowess and masculinity of the steppe warrior cultivated by the Uzbek chiefs and their retinues since they came to establish themselves as an entrenched elite in Mā Warā' al-Nahr. The procedure of the *kūrnish/bay'a* at Hazāra in 1722 reveals their inferior status and rank in comparison to the Uzbeks. Yet they nonetheless exercised great authority as favorites of the king and trusted servants of the harem. But this is a story to be told in the next chapter.

As we have seen, the pattern of gubernatorial appointments and the way Bukharan authors depict them is visibly shaped and determined by reciprocity. Forming part of a social nexus, the appointments—like many other structural aspects of social order—played a dual role. First, they represented rewards for services; and second, they fostered the influence and reputation of the office holders. With this twofold character, the appointment acted back upon the appointee because it further secured his loyalty to the ruler.

QURBAT: INTIMACY AND AFFINITY

Another element inseparably linked to social relationships is that of intimacy and affection. Related to the emotional dimension of patron-client ties, the element of *qurbat*—meaning intimacy, proximity or affinity—appears strikingly often in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, where it is particularly interwoven with the dimension of *tarbiyat*.²⁶⁴ In the last chapter I scrutinized a text passage depicting the promotion of Khudāyār Bī Manghit from the rank of *dīwānbēgī* to the position of *atālīq* and commander-in-chief of the Bukharan troops. On that occasion, the servants of the king advised him to bring this *amīr* to the court of proximity and reputation.²⁶⁵ After describing the duties and tasks of the new *amīr al-umarā*, Mullā Sharīf mentions the rise in Khudāyār Bī's rank of intimacy and reputation to the highest levels.²⁶⁶ Here we observe a crucial link between social ascent and the close relationship with the highest person in the prevailing hierarchy, the ruler, who granted

²⁶⁴ This connection between *qurbat* and *tarbiyat* is due to stylistic guidelines as it matches the rhyme scheme in the Persian prose text.

²⁶⁵ خدايار ديوان بيگي منغت را ... مشتمل عنايت سرشار و قرين در گاه قربت و اعتبار فرمانيد (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 140b).

²⁶⁶ ... رتبه قربت و اعتبارش در پايه اورنگ خلافت روز تا روز بدرجه اعلى رسيد (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 141b).

favors by promoting his protégés to offices and ranks. In the case of Khudāyār's son Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, a similar pattern of generously granted education and proximity to the royal court is identified as the reason for social ascent.

The next passage I want to cite is also taken from the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*. This extract is interesting as it gives an insight into the ascent of the Manghit tribe and its chieftains to the highest positions in the social hierarchy:

“Since former days and throughout the years and centuries, the plain of Qarshī up to the settlement of Chirāghchī has been the original domicile and winter quarters of the aforementioned tribes [the Manghit]. It is the birthplace of the forefathers endowed with the qualities of amīrhood, the ancestors of the *atālīq* of good disposition. The shoots of prosperity of the chiefs and nobles of that excellent and brave tribe attained the honor of growing up from this place and the fortune of elevation. They became objects of nurture and promotion (*tarbiyat*) granted by the rulers of the time and the powerful *khāns*, and, on account of honorable services and glorious deeds, reached the sublime ranks of intimacy and received the honor [of belonging to] the imperial court and the high office of commander-in-chief [...]”²⁶⁷

Briefly sketching the rise of the Manghit tribe and its leadership to prominence, the chronicler attributes the career and ascent of the tribal nobility to their promotion by the kings and rulers. In addition, he relates the attainment of ranks and offices also to personal affinity and intimacy with the ruling figures of the past. Thus personal closeness went hand in hand with appointments and privileges. A position in the governmental hierarchy was a clear indicator of proximity to or distance from the Bukharan court. As we have seen in the previous section, Qāzī Wafā explicitly mentioned Dānyāl Bī's proximity to the royal court as a reason for his promotion to the office of *dīwānbēgī* in the year 1756.

In the last chapter I demonstrated how Nādir Shāh ordered the supply of food provisions and the recruitment of Uzbek warriors for his army when he encamped in Chahār Bakr in autumn 1740. In addition to these orders, he stated that he would leave the crown and the throne of Mā Warā' al-Nahr at their original place and preferred to spend some days in close proximity to the royal troops because he regarded enjoying the company of his soldiers as laudable and suitable.²⁶⁸ The exact wording of Nādir Shāh's statements on

²⁶⁷ Ibid., fols. 195a–b.

²⁶⁸ اورنگ و افسر سلطنت بر قرار اصل مخصوص عالیجاهی باشد و چند روز تا مراجعت اعلام بیضا احتشام بمراعات اکرموا الضیف بودن والامقامی قرین مقاربت و مقرون اوردوی همایون مستحسن و مناسب مینماید (ibid., fols. 273b–274a).

personal closeness clearly indicates the positive meaning ascribed to affection and proximity. Close personal relations involving physical proximity between a lord and his followers are depicted as worth striving for.

BUNUWWAT AND FARZANDĪ: FILIATION AND SONSHIP

The element of *qurbat* and the notions of affection and affinity are interlinked with the paternal dimensions inherent in patron-client relations. One of the most prominent examples of this is the relationship between Nādir Shāh and the young Manghit *amīr*, a relationship that is the subject of colorful descriptions in a large number of Bukharan chronicles. Qāzī Wafā's *Tuḥfat al-khānī* provides a detailed account of the first meeting between the two men:

“When the king [...] opened [his] shrewd eyes to the true state of the fortunate *amīr* endowed with laudable qualities, with the mirror of the pure mind showing the rules of the governors and chiefs guided by divine wisdom, it became immediately manifest in his far-sighted mind [...] that this early fruit in the garden of dignity is a flower from the meadow of divine providence and the will of the Creator; a shining star from the zodiac of fortune and reputation. [He saw] the sun of power and felicity rising on the forehead of his conditions and desires as well as the star of magnificence and glory shimmering on the forelock of his honor and high virtues.”²⁶⁹

This passage illustrates not only the king's predictive abilities but also his belief in the divine preordination of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's rise to power. It continues with Nādir Shāh realizing that such a man would be the key to further conquests and honorable deeds. He received him with royal affection (*‘awāṭif-i khusrawāna*) and showered him with infinite favors.²⁷⁰ Following Qāzī Wafā's account, Mullā Sharīf also reports about Nādir's first talk with Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his companions. Accordingly, “he treated them in a courteous manner out of favor and affection.”²⁷¹ Considering Nādir's

²⁶⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36b.

²⁷⁰ فی الجمله مقدم بهجت مثال اورا مقدمه فتوحات ابواب و فهرست کتاب فصل و باب دانسته عنقریب باضعاف تصور خود مشاهده نمود از آن سبب به عواطف خسروانه پیش آمده خلعت مکاوم اخلاق بر قامت قابلیت این برگزیده حضرت مهین خلاق پوشانید و خزائن محاسن اشفاق بر تارک سر افزای او نثار نموده ... (ibid., fols. 36b–37a).

²⁷¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 263a.

passion for integrating young and skillful followers into his entourage,²⁷² it comes as no surprise that he was delighted with the young *amīr* and took him into his service. Yet although this decision was to Muḥammad Raḥīm's advantage, his father—at least in the opinion of the historians—was not very comfortable with his son's move to Mashhad.²⁷³ Qāzī Wafā explains Nādir's plan as follows:

"He summoned the fortunate *amīr*, the lord of the time, and told him that he may be the victorious stirrup-fellow of the world conqueror to remain as the sign of fortune in this family and as a monument generation after generation, and century after century constant and solid on the chessboard of the age due to permanent royal solicitude (*tarbiyat-i khusrawāna*). He shall truly be the cause for the relation and the source for the connection of the region of Turan with his [...] court."²⁷⁴

It should be emphasized that Nādir's decision to take the Uzbek *amīr* into his service is not explicitly explained in terms of pawn-taking, though Qāzī Wafā mentions that the conqueror contemplated bringing his new protégé to Mashhad having recognized Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's governmental activities and skills. This step is presented here as an act of royal favor manifest in the intended education and upbringing of the *amīr*. Adorning this motif borrowed from the *Tuḥfat*, Mullā Sharīf describes Nādir Shāh's talk with Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī in the following words:

"By throwing a look at [his] forelock filled with fortune, he has become a favorite of the king and worth receiving infinite caresses and favor. For this reason we selected him from the other notables of Turan and the *amīrs* of Turkistan and exalted him with the companionship of the bravery demanding royal camp of [my] oldest son Rizā Qulī Mīrzā. It is the desire of the mind endowed with alchemic excellence to further and to rear your fortunate son like the princes in the shade of protection and education (*zill-i ḥimāyat wa tarbiyat*). [...] There is hope that he will soon reach sublime ranks through service in the retinue connected with advancement and elevation."²⁷⁵

Here the author places emphasis on the affection Nādir felt for Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, and the paternal attitude of the Iranian king especially catches the

²⁷² Avery points out that Nādir's passion for recruiting manpower made him often conciliatory toward defeated enemies (Avery, "Nādir Shāh," 8).

²⁷³ According to Qāzī Wafā, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī even had tears in his eyes and remained in Bukhara with a broken heart.

امیر کامکار طوعاً و کراً با دلی خراب و دیده پرآب نور حدقه دولت را ... ملحق به معسکر شاهى نمود (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 44b–45a).

²⁷⁴ Ibid., fol. 44b.

²⁷⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Taj*, fol. 279b.

eye of the reader. Taking these statements and promises literally, the relationship between the Iranian conqueror and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī assumes a distinct social dimension as it is described like a father-son relationship. When the bad news about the death of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's father in 1743 reached the court at Mashhad, Nādir Shāh "expressed his sadness and grief. He comforted the high-born *amīr* with royal promises and elevated the foundation of his education and beneficence (*tarbiyat wa ihsān*)."²⁷⁶ This underlines the paternal aspect of Nādir's relationship with the Uzbek *amīr*. Qāzī Wafā in fact describes Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's attention to his son using the same vocabulary. Accordingly, "the *amīr-i kabīr* threw the light of attention and promotion onto his son."²⁷⁷ As usual, Mullāh Sharīf further embellishes the motif of royal grief:

"[...] gaining the news of the grievous calamity of the well-administering and welfare impressed *amīr*, the king being well acquainted with the quality of persons wanted [to follow] the customs of regret and approved of having recourse to God. Comforting the *khān* [Muḥammad Raḥīm] with royal kindness and favors, he held out hope and became the donator of sympathy for the confused mind."²⁷⁸

This shows the personal engagement of Nādir Shāh and his attempts to console Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī on his father's death. Moreover, it reflects the close social connection between the Iranian king and his protégé as well as the paternal aspect of Nādir's patronage. The king was obviously more than simply a master or social superior; Nādir Shāh's attitude and behavior echo his role of a father or "godfather" in relation to the Uzbek commander.²⁷⁹ This fact is underlined by the continued *tarbiyat* Nādir granted to Muḥammad Raḥīm. A similar personal bond can be found in the relationship between Nādir Shāh and Abū'l-Faiḥ Khān. Kāẓim, who focuses on this

²⁷⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 53a.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., fol. 20b.

²⁷⁸ Mullāh Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 290a. In most of the early nineteenth-century Manghit chronicles, Muḥammad Raḥīm is styled *khān*; the authors do not distinguish properly between *bī* and *khān* anymore. This can be interpreted as a sign that Chingizid descent as a precondition for the exclusive right to bear the *khān* title had lost its relevance in the Bukharan context. According to Ya'qūb, Nādir Shāh made Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī *khān* when he summoned him to his court to command the Uzbek troops (Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 4b).

²⁷⁹ The relationship between Nādir and his patron Bābā 'Alī Bēg was perhaps of a similar nature. After the death of Nādir's male relatives, Bābā 'Alī Bēg took him into his service and once freed him from the hands of robbers. He strengthened the paternal aspect of his patronage of Nādir by marrying the boy's mother (Avery, "Nādir Shāh," 7, 9).

relationship, puts the following words into Nādir's mouth when describing the scene after the reinstatement of the Bukharan ruler:

"I surrender the assembled domains of Turkistan to the sphere of your authority and adopt you now as a brother. It is my hope that we will walk along the path of unity, intimate brotherhood and alliance for the duration of our lives, and that we maintain the bond of friendship."²⁸⁰

The picture drawn by Kāzim is largely verified by the Bukharan authors when they talk about Nādir's decision to depose Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān and to place his young son 'Abd al-Mu'min Sulṭān on the Transoxanian throne. For example, Qāzī Wafā writes:

"I want His Sublime Majesty Shāh Abū'l-Faiẓ, that distinguished and successful [man] to place the throne of gladness and tranquility under the shadow of my power and in the neighborhood of my compassion. He shall spend his time free from sorrows in the shade of affection and under the wings of protection (*dar ẓill-i 'aṭūfat wa zīr-i bāl-i ḥimāyat*)."²⁸¹

Considering these words, Qāzī Wafā's audience hardly gains the impression of a strong and energetic ruler. Instead, Nādir's Bukharan counterpart is described as a weak actor in urgent need of protection. His removal and transfer to the Iranian court is portrayed as an act of favor, concretized by referring to other aspects of personal relations: affection (*'aṭūfat*) and protection (*ḥimāyat*). The author of the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* goes even further, saying:

"[...] most of the time, the splendid nature creates a beautiful countenance with the disposition to the demand for companionship and the wish for conversation with His Majesty Shāh Abū'l-Faiẓ. The pen of affection and affinity draws the plan ... for a luminous reunion with this scion of the illustrious Turkmen [?] house, this purest part of the Shibanid dynasty [?] on the board of the intelligent and compassionate mind ... He shall return to the seat of vice-regency, which is free of calamity, through royal affection and infinite favors [...]"²⁸²

With regard to the paternal dimension of patron-client relations in the Transoxanian context, another very interesting example is the relationship between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Khoqandian ally Īrdāna Bī (d. 1770). In the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* the latter is described as "having the qualities and

²⁸⁰ Kāzim, *Ālamārā*, II, 798–99.

²⁸¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 96a.

²⁸² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 313b.

nature of a foster son” (*farzandi/farzand-khwānda*). When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī set out on a punitive expedition against the Yūz of Ūrā Tippa in spring 1168/1755, the ruler of Khoqand sent a messenger to Muḥammad Raḥīm because “he had been in favor of diligence and subordination toward the veil and the guards of the felicity establishing threshold.” Besides, he had had no opportunity to meet with the Manghit *amīr* in the past year. Upon receiving the message, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered “the *farzand* to bring the flag of power on the way and to turn as soon as possible to the *qibla* of desires.”²⁸³ Confirming this fact, the *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* names Īrdāna Bī as a foster son (*farzand khwānda*) of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī.²⁸⁴ Before arriving at the Bukharan camp in Yām, the *amīr* sent several envoys to summon his foster son to visit the *atālīq* as soon as possible.²⁸⁵ In the *Tāj* we are informed about the *amīr*’s “longing to meet Īrdāna, who was endowed with the qualities of genuineness and ‘sonship’ (*bunuwwat*).”²⁸⁶ Contrasting the term for sonship with that for paternity (*ubūwat*), Mullā Sharīf even points to the reciprocal character of the relationship.²⁸⁷

Wafā reports how the ruler of Khoqand was finally received with all honors by his Bukharan colleague, who placed Īrdāna’s men on one side of the court.²⁸⁸ Mullā Sharīf writes:

“Out of love and kindness the splendor promoting [possessor] of royal authority drew him into the arms of affection and favor like a real son. He distinguished him with kinds of favor and solicitude and privileged him with an exalted position amongst the other dignitaries and notables.”²⁸⁹

Subsequent to the honorable reception, we observe again the ceremony of the *kūrnish* including the kissing of the royal hand and the exchange of presents. In addition, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered one of his best commanders, Jum’a Qul Mīngbāshī, to serve as a host (*mihmāndārbāshī*) to Īrdāna Bī.²⁹⁰

²⁸³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 228b–229a.

²⁸⁴ Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 355; II, 10.

²⁸⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 330b.

²⁸⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 389a–b.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., fol. 386a.

²⁸⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 231a.

²⁸⁹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 389b. See also Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 355.

²⁹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 231b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 390a.

Age difference apparently did not play any crucial role for the creation of such links. Muḥammad Raḥīm and Īrdāna were approximately the same age when they allied. A more interesting example is given by Muḥammad Amīn, who says that when laying siege to Qarshī, Rizā Qulī Mīrza and his commanders demanded an oath of allegiance from Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī to create a relationship characterized by brotherhood (*barādarī*) and sonship.²⁹¹ In this case, the actor who was to slip into the role of the *farzand* was even older than his counterpart.

A further example of paternal attitudes is the affinity between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his protégé Muḥammad Yūsuf Bēg Kīnakās, who turned to the Bukharan court in Dhū'l-Qa'da 1163/October 1750 to enlist the *amīr*'s support in a local marriage dispute. If we give credence to Mullā Sharīf's report, Muḥammad Yūsuf Bēg received the honor of paying homage to the *atālīq*. At the same time, "he was bound to the kindness and favor and was grateful beyond all measure for the affection because of being titled adopted child (*khaṭāb-i farzand-khwāndī*)."²⁹² In the same year, the *atālīq* sent his troops to Shahr-i Sabz to bring about a solution of the conflict in favor of Muḥammad Yūsuf Bēg.

There are other instances in Central Asian sources of virtual adoption even at local level. For example, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān recounts that the relationship between the Yūz leader Fāzil Bī b. Šādiq Bī and the Khoqandian ruler 'Abd al-Karīm Bī, similar to that between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Kīnakās protégé, was like a bond between father and son. Fāzil Bī Yūz is mentioned here as a foster son (*farzand khwānda*) of the Ming ruler 'Abd al-Karīm Bī.²⁹³ However, de facto sonship and adoption (*farzandī*, *farzand-khwānī*) was by no means exclusively a matter for rulers and governors. Local religious dignitaries like mullahs and Sufī sheikhs apparently played a similar role as "fathers" and protectors of persons who were on the run from their enemies.²⁹⁴ For example, the influential Dabībīdī sheikh Mūsā Khān Khwāja gave shelter to Āy Chūchūk Āyum, the widow of the Khoqandian ruler 'Abd al-Karīm Bī, when she left Ferghana because of her enmity with

²⁹¹ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhar*, fol. 54a.

²⁹² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 368b. Qāzī Wafā does not confirm this fact.

²⁹³ Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, II, 7.

²⁹⁴ Mullā Sharīf mentions that the ancestors of the famous Jūybārī *khwājas* were accepted as affiliated children (*qabūl-i farzandī*) by Khwāja Yaḥya, the great *khalīfa* of Sayyid Amīr Ḥamza b. Sayyid Amīr-i Kalān (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 482a).

Īrdāna Bī. The chronicler reports that the sheikh had compassion for her and granted her personal favors. After a while, she left Dahbīd for Ūrā Tippa, leaving her son Ḥakīm Tūra as an “adoptive son” in the Īshān’s care.²⁹⁵

RI ‘ĀYAT AND ḤIMĀYAT (ḤIRĀSAT, ḤIFĀZAT): ATTENTION, SOLICITUDE AND PROTECTION

Before turning to the material aspects of patronage, I want to highlight two other aspects closely interwoven with the patron-client nexus. One is the element of attention and solicitude (*ri ‘āyat*), the other is that of protection and support (*ḥimāyat*).²⁹⁶ Connected with the affective factor, both elements seem to be essential for the creation of lasting bonds between individuals. Both solicitude and protection heavily depended on the paternal dimension of patronage and were more or less interwoven with the element of *tarbiyat/parwarish*. Therefore, *ri ‘āyat*—solicitous and attentive behavior—must be regarded as a crucial sign of paternal attitudes in social relations. Attention and solicitude are often described in terms of particular favors that could take the form of appointments. One very striking example in this respect is the appointment of Khudāyār Bī Dīwānbēgī Manghit as governor of Shahr-i Sabz immediately after the enthronization of Abū’l-Faiz Khān in 1711. Mullā Sharīf explains this appointment as a step “intended to pay attention (*jihat-i ri ‘āyat*) to the minds of the intimates of Khudāyār Dīwānbēgī.”²⁹⁷

Going back to the pre-Mongol period, the term *ḥimāyat* (Arab. *ḥimāya*) is relatively well explored by Paul. Shedding light on the example of Khwāja Aḥrār, he explains how defenseless individuals put themselves and their property under the protection of stronger persons to escape taxation by the

²⁹⁵ چون به مقصد رسید، خاک آستان آن جناب را طوطیای دیده خود گردانید و آن هدایت پناه در باره ایشان لطف و مرحمت را بسیار کرد. ... چون چندی از این بگذشت، کینگس آیم از یک فرزند خاطر خود را جمع کرد، [جناب او را] به ده بید به خدمت حضرت ایشان به فرزند و گذاشت (Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, II, 16). Unfortunately, Ḥakīm Khān does not give the date of this event; from the text it appears that the incident occurred sometime in the 1750s during the reign of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī or slightly later in the time of Dānyāl Bī.

²⁹⁶ Mullā Sharīf in particular made use of both terms in order to describe the strategies of actors (see Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 129b, 138a, 146b, 204b, 262a, 279b, 288a, 316b, 326b, 339a, 340a, 442a, 463a, 477a, 540a passim).

²⁹⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 138a.

dīwān.²⁹⁸ Often these relationships ushered in fixed, quasi contractual conditions of rent tenure. In the Mongol period, single individuals and even whole populations inhabiting the conquered territories put themselves under the protective shield of the ruler, another influential member of the ruling house or some other person. Thereby they were practically removed from the grip of the *dīwān*.²⁹⁹ In the post-Mongol period, this practice gave rise to a stratum of influential persons positioning themselves between the population and the administration. According to Paul, the rather abstract term *ḥimāyatī* describes relationships of protection. In Abu'l-Khairid and Il-Khanid times, *ḥimāyatī* implied an exemption from the payment of taxes. Especially in Shibanid Central Asia, the social fabric was totally penetrated by such relations.³⁰⁰ The institution led to the emergence of factions, which, competing for resources, were at times severely opposed to one another.

Later on, the connotations of the institution of *ḥimāyat* slightly changed. As one of the most important characteristics of personal authority, it became common to ascribe *ḥimāyat* to the rulers, who are portrayed as shepherds watching over their subjects like sheep.³⁰¹ In the Manghit period, the authors often made use of *ri'āyat* as a synonym for *ra'īyat-parwarī*, taking care of the well-being of the humble subjects. For example, Mullā Sharīf explains how wealthy people and notables made charitable donations for the poor and those in need after the withdrawal of the Qazāq at the end of the 1720s. In this situation the emperor

“gave the order to remedy the desolate situation of the subjects and to pay attention to the helpless and weak [people] and to open the gates of clemency and high-mindedness (*murawat*) to the wishes of those subjected to the virulence of hunger.”³⁰²

In a similar fashion, Qāzī Muḥammad Wafā calls Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī a lenient and charitable benefactor, an ideal *ra'īyat-parwar* who always looked after the well-being of the poor and lowborn subjects and inhabitants of Qarshī. This included also the dispensation of justice in favor of those subject to oppression and tyranny, and many other benevolent acts bearing

²⁹⁸ Paul, “Forming a Faction,” 535–36.

²⁹⁹ Paul, *Naqšbandiyya*, 164–68.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 172–73, 185–86; Paul “Forming a Faction,” 535–36.

³⁰¹ Paul, *Naqšbandiyya*, 194–95.

³⁰² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 190a. According to Wafā, the economic recovery of the kingdom took place within a few years (see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 18a).

witness to his *ra'ayā-parwarī*.³⁰³ Based on protection, *ra'iyat-parwarī/ra'āyā-parwarī* rested on two pillars: first, the element of security, which was frequently threatened by rebellious governors, tribal leaders or invaders; and second, the well-being and tranquility that depended on political stability and security.³⁰⁴

Taking care of security, economic well-being, prosperity and calm are recurrent themes of the *Fürstenspiegel* genre. For instance, Ibn 'Arabī's advice to the rulers, enjoining generosity, justice, and other virtues conducive to the well-being of the subjects and political stability, as well as his administrative instructions are formulated in accordance with the conventions of content and sentiment.³⁰⁵ Compiling his *Siyāsat-nāma* in the Salchuq period, Nizām al-Mulk devoted a considerable part of this work to the problem of justice to be spread by the kings among the people to retain the satisfaction of God.³⁰⁶ Hāfiz-i Abrū, who wrote under Timurid patronage, explains the principles of righteous government (*siyāsat-i fāzila*) and lists here

- 1 the dispensation of justice
- 2 the strengthening of religion
- 3 the furthering of the truth (*ṣidq*) and sure knowledge (*yaqīn*)
- 4 charitable foundations (*khayrāt*) and good works (*mabarrāt*)
- 5 the control of the empire (*ḡabt-i mamālik*)
- 6 the maintenance of security
- 7 the fostering of economic prosperity and the well-being of the populace (*tarfiya-yi 'ibād*) linked to protection and the right regulation of worldly affairs.³⁰⁷

³⁰³ ... سحاب عدل شامل او باران رافت بر مضارق مظلومان ستم کشیده باریدن گرفت و کف دریا نوازش به جم رعایا (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 21a).

³⁰⁴ On security and well-being see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 33a, 38a, 44a, 61b, 175a, 212b passim. For other examples of *ra'iyat-parwarī/ḡuqarā-parwarī* see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 110b, 315b, 518b passim.

³⁰⁵ Aziz al-Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship. Power and the Sacred in Muslim, Christian, and Pagan Politics* (London/New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 1997), 129, 198–99.

³⁰⁶ A. K. S. Lambton, "Justice in the Medieval Persian Theory of Kingship," in *Theory and Practice in Medieval Persian Government*, ed. A.K.S. Lambton (London: Variorum Preprints, 1980), 103–04.

³⁰⁷ A. K. S. Lambton, "Early Timurid Theories of State: Hāfiz-i Abrū and Nizām al-Dīn Šāmī," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 30, no. 2 (1978): 5.

These components were also the subject of negotiations in times of crisis. For example, Qāzī Wafā explains his patron's decision to enter the service of Nādir Shāh not as a betrayal of the Chingīzid constitution or the legitimized ruler Abū'l-Faiz Khān, but as a step intending "to follow the way of tranquility and to take care of the interests and matters of the subjects."³⁰⁸ Somewhat later the same year (1740), Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was sent to the Iranian camp for exactly the same purpose.³⁰⁹ Mullā Sharīf depicts the consultations taking place at the Bukharan court and Muḥammad Ḥakīm's argumentation in light of the fast Iranian advance as follows:

"We have to treat him [Nādir Shāh] in the manner of obedience and need to come out of the gate of submission and consent for the reception of his illustrious banners. There is hope that ... submission and absence of enmity will together with divine help render the flames of the royal anger quiescent. The desire for tranquility on the side of the devoted [believers] and the security of the towns and districts shall become manifest in the mind of the hero of the age. ..."³¹⁰

Having concluded his mission successfully, the *atalīq*'s heralds fanned out and announced the end of the conflict, saying that the subjects

"shall draw the sign of security on the brow of their fortune! They have been saved from the misfortunes caused by the revolving heaven and from the adversities brought about by the vicissitude of night and day. They shall cover the stature of their tranquility with the robe of safety."³¹¹

According to Qāzī Wafā, following these announcements all inhabitants of the city quarters of Bukhara turned toward the residence of Muḥammad Ḥakīm. All the craftsmen and the entire subject population returned to their workshops and native places.³¹² When Nādir Shāh established his authority over Transoxania, the *atalīq* was mainly preoccupied with the affairs of the kingdom, paying attention to the security and prosperity of the capital and its dependencies.³¹³

³⁰⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36a.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., fols. 38a–b.

³¹⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 266a.

³¹¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 39a.

³¹² Ibid., fols. 39b–40a.

³¹³ امیر کبیر صائب الرأی را که مصالح امور مملکت به حس تدبیر و کفایت اهتمام او منتظم گردیده امانی یورت و آبادی ولایت رافکر عقدہ گشایش از جمله اسباب عادی بود باکمل نوازش و زبده سیور غامشی اختصاص داد (ibid., fol.44a).

As we have seen before, with the death of a protector his protective umbrella (*ẓill-i ḥimāyat va tarbiyat*) vanished, a fact that often caused an immense feeling of insecurity on the part of his former protégés (*tarbiyat yāfta*). Mullā Sharīf describes the reactions of the followers and servants of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān on the occasion of his assassination in 1747 as follows:

“From the occurrence of this soul-melting event, this confusion-creating happening, a group of men and women, whom the sun of the king, the pole of forgiveness, picked up from the earth like particles, [those] whose tranquility and desires had been for years under the shade of promotion and support cast by the wings of the royal phoenix (*sāya-yi bāl-i humā-yi humāyūn-i tarbiyat wa ḥimāyat*), scratched their breasts and faces with their fingernails. Scattering the dirt of abjection on their heads, they tore their brows and cut their hair out of grief and regret.”³¹⁴

Emphasizing the elements of protection and promotion, the chronicler explains the granting of patronage as spreading out an umbrella throwing shade over the receivers of favor. In the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* and other Bukharan works we frequently come across the concept of the protective umbrella or shade (*ẓill-i ḥimāyat [wa tarbiyat]*) under which numerous people and actors take refuge and feast on the security and repose.³¹⁵

The element of protection is mirrored by the designation of places and coordinates making up the sphere of royal authority, which were termed the “domains blessed with royal protection” (*mamālik-i maḥrūsa/wilāyāt-i maḥrūsa*). In addition, we find a large number of similar designations and synonyms, particularly in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, such as “the protected forts and citadels” (*qalā'-i maḥrūsa*),³¹⁶ “the protected places” (*amākin-i maḥrūsa*),³¹⁷ “the fortified well-guarded towns and cities” (*bilād wa amāār-i maḥrūsa*),³¹⁸ “the guarded districts” (*'arāẓī-yi maḥrūsa*),³¹⁹ and finally “the protected cities and dependencies” (*buldān-i bulūk-i maḥrūsa*).³²⁰ Affording shelter in times of war and rebellion, most of the towns and settlements are described as strongly fortified *qal'as* equipped with high mud walls (*bāra*) and towers (*burj*) to withstand sieges for at least a couple of days or, in the case of the major towns, even months.

³¹⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 339a.

³¹⁵ Ibid., fols. 156a, 279b, 287b, 319b, 328a, 393b, 408a, 455a, 513b passim.

³¹⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 233a, 405b, 509a.

³¹⁷ Ibid., fol. 311a.

³¹⁸ Ibid., fol. 312b.

³¹⁹ Ibid., fol. 374a.

³²⁰ Ibid., fol. 435a.

Underlining the constant need for protection, Qāzī Wafā devotes several pages to the reconstruction of the Bukharan city wall by order of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī in Rajab 1165/May–June 1752. As Wafā notes, the last time Bukhara had been provided with a strong fortification was in the time of ‘Ubaidullah Khān b. Sulṭān Maḥmūd b. Shāh Budāq (r. 1533–40). Implicitly raising a finger in warning, he describes the state of ruin the city wall had fallen into. Simultaneously, he rebukes the Juchid rulers for their inattentiveness to the well-being of the subjects and the maintenance of the fortifications.³²¹ Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī and other *dīwān* officials were in charge of the reconstruction work. They recruited craftsmen, master builders and construction workers from Bukhara and its immediate environs. Paying tribute to the *dīwānbēgī* for this masterly organizational feat, the author tells his audience about Muḥammad Daulat’s close supervision of the construction process in spite of his numerous other administrative affairs. Wherever he detected weak sections, he immediately ordered the demolition of those parts of the wall and their reconstruction in a stronger fashion.³²² In a similar vein, the author mentions Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s building activities in Nasaf, Shahr-i Sabz and Tirmīdh.³²³

In addition to erecting citadels, the ruler had to restore order by putting an end to rebellions and robbery. For this reason, anyone offering shelter and protection had a definite interest in securing the overland and trade routes needed for orderly traveling and commercial life.³²⁴ In early Sha‘bān 1166/June 1753, messages about robbery by Turkmen tribes south of Qarākūl reached the royal court. Since the Turkmen molested merchants and travelers, the *amīr* had to react and led a punitive campaign to Qarākūl.³²⁵ As Wafā reports, the local governor Jānī Bēg Yasāwulbāshī was immediately deposed because of “carelessness regarding the matters of the local government and attention to the province (*musāhala dar amr-i ḥukūmat wa pardākht-i wilāyat*).”³²⁶

³²¹ درینمدت خواقین جوچی نژاد بنابر قوت شوکت و یا عدم التفات به احوال رعیت باحیا واستحکام آن نپرداخته ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 201b).

³²² Ibid., fols. 201b–202a.

³²³ Ibid., fols. 200a, 202a, 217a, 294a.

³²⁴ On the connection between trade and the commercial-political interests of Indian, Iranian and Uzbek rulers prior to the eighteenth century, see Dale, *Indian merchants*, 30–41; Alam, “Trade, State Policy and Regional Change” 202–27.

³²⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 217b–218a.

³²⁶ Ibid., fol. 218a.

A similar episode is mentioned briefly with regard to raiding activities near Jizakh, where the Qazāq looted travelers and merchants. Their molestations caused an interruption of trade in the region, whereupon Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī called on his troops in winter 1166/1753–54 to launch a campaign the next spring.³²⁷

PROVISION OF RESOURCES BY SOCIAL SUPERIORS

As I was able to demonstrate in the chapter on loyalty and obedience, the provision of material resources was a crucial sign of loyalty and the acceptance of authority. Followers and those enjoying protection furnished resources in the form of grain and food provisions for the armies of the protectors. However, many resources were forcefully extracted just to distribute them further among one's own associates and soldiers. Very often, social superiors had to maintain a constant flow of resources to feed their entourage. Notions of generosity also came into play. Thus the provision of resources took the form of occasional gift giving.³²⁸ The rulers, for example, had to provide grain and other agricultural products. These were key resources, firstly because they were reproduced in an annual cycle, and secondly because grain was a durable product and relatively easy to store.

One case in point is Nādir Shāh. After the conquest of Delhi in 1739, he ordered the restoration and repopulation of the oasis of Marw that had fallen into decay during the two previous decades. This included the construction of large grain stores to hold the provisions required for the troops on their march toward Transoxania.³²⁹ According to Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm, Nādir

³²⁷ Ibid., fols. 222a–b.

³²⁸ See next section.

³²⁹ Kāzīm describes Nādir's attempts to reconstruct Marw in great detail. Besides the construction of storage facilities he ordered the settlement of three thousand peasants from Khurāsān to cultivate the lands at the upper reaches of the Murghāb River. According to Kāzīm, the oasis began to prosper a short time after the digging of new irrigation canals. Soldiers, who formerly received a payment of five *tūmān* for their services, had to furnish ten donkey loads (*kharwār*) of grain in return for half their salary. For the other half they built grain stores and laid in stocks. Recipients of a higher income (one hundred, sixty or fifty *tūmān*) had to furnish money in cash and grain for the reconstruction. The harvests of winter (*safīd barī*) and summer grain (*kabūd barī*) were delivered to the *bayt al-māl*, which had the monopoly on cash crops. When there were difficulties with the payment of the monthly salaries, they instructed the royal treasury in Mashhad to deliver money for the soldiers (see Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 610–15).

likewise ordered the governor of Balkh, Niyāz Khān, to lay in stocks of grain before setting out for Turkistan himself.³³⁰ We repeatedly see a similar pattern of distribution of grain (*ghalla*) in the Bukharan context. In Jumāda I 1161/April–May 1748, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's troops conducted a campaign against the recalcitrant leader of the Burqūt in Nūr, Tughāy Murād Bī. After concluding the campaign and lifting the siege of Nūr, the Manghit army withdrew to the fortresses of Deh Baland and Gharghān located in a dry and rugged environment, from where they informed the *amīr* about the state of affairs. On receiving this message, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī instructed his commander Jum'ā Qul to protect both forts with the help of one thousand warriors. At the same time, he ordered the supply of monthly provisions consisting of one thousand *man* of grain, the salary (*mawājib*) in the form of daily allowances, and barley for the horses (*jīra wa 'alīq*) from his fields and estates.³³¹

In Muḥarram 1166/November–December 1752, for his campaigns targeting the mountainous areas east of Ūrgūt, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī envisaged the construction of stores in Samarqand and the collection of grain for his troops. He therefore dispatched architects and craftsmen from Bukhara to construct facilities for the accommodation of the *amīr* and his troops. As Qāzī Wafā describes it, the government agents and officials collected more than seven thousand *kharwār* of grain and stored it in old *madrasas*.³³² This example shows that the ruler had to take care not only of the provision of food but also the housing of his followers. Almost all Bukharan and Iranian chronicles agree about the desertion of a contingent of around five hundred Afghan, Ottoman and Lazgī warriors on the occasion of the Iranian siege of Bukhara in summer 1747.³³³ While the Transoxanian accounts only mention that the Bukharan *atālīq* bestowed favors upon the

³³⁰ Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 68.

³³¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 145a.

³³² Ibid., fols. 203a–b.

³³³ Ibid., fols. 69a–b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 346b–347a; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 6a; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 51–52 (French text, 113). Kāzīm gives an exact number of soldiers going over to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Uzbeks: five hundred seventy Ghilzai Afghans and seven hundred Ottoman soldiers. He does not mention the Lazgī as deserters (see Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 1124–25).

deserters, Bukhārī and Kāzīm describe how Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī provided them with food and accommodation in Bukhara.³³⁴

Placing additional emphasis on the element of food and accommodation provided by his patron, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's chronicler describes the preparation for a military expedition to Jizakh in winter 1166/1753–54 in great detail. According to this account, government agents collected an amount of eight thousand donkey loads of grain to be stored in Samarqand. The *amīr* also ordered one thousand additional tents to be made for all of his soldiers who did not possess one. Ten warriors had to share one ordinary tent, whereas the commanders and leaders in charge of the larger contingents of a thousand and a hundred soldiers were accommodated in bigger tents.³³⁵ With these instructions Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī showed that he paid attention to the physical well-being of his soldiers. In 1168/1755, the Bukharan *amīr* mounted a campaign to Ūrā Tippa. On his arrival at Yām and Zāmin on Shaʿbān 23, 1168/June 3, 1755, he ordered the evacuation and resettlement of three thousand Qarāqalpāq households inhabiting the area adjoining the Sir Daryā. When the leader of the Qarāqalpāq joined the Bukharan camp three days later, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī granted him and his men robes of honor and ordered the delivery of one hundred *kharwār* of grain to the Qarāqalpāq.³³⁶

In addition to the provision of food and accommodation, the chronicles occasionally inform us that the ruler allotted land grants (*soyūrghāl*) to his followers.³³⁷ In Rabiʿ I 1164/January–February 1751, the rebellious *amīr*

³³⁴ Kāzīm, *ʿĀlamārā*, III, 1124. Bukhārī informs us that, appealing to their identity as Sunni Muslims, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī provoked the Afghans and their Ottoman colleagues to desert the Iranian camp by generously offering housing, women (wives) and food provisions (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 51 (French text, 113)).

³³⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 222a.

³³⁶ Ibid., fols. 229b–230a. According to Mullā Sharīf, the *amīr* provided them with four hundred donkey loads of grain as a benefit (*soyūrghāmishī*) (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 389a).

³³⁷ The term *soyūrghāl* is of Mongolian origin and describes a favor or proof of a favor. The plural word (*soyūrghālāt*) was often used as a synonym for *ʿawāṭif*, *tashrifāt* and *anʿāmāt* meaning favors, benefits and personal grants. A *soyūrghāl* initially took various forms (e.g., a robe of honor); later it was a land grant, formerly known as *iqṭāʿ*, bestowed on a person in return for certain services. The sources from the Ilkhanid and Timurid times leave it open to question whether the term denoted favors or provincial grants. Under the Timurids the *soyūrghāl* was not properly distinguished from *tuyūl*. Both signified the grant of a district or provincial administration or its taxes with or without immunities. (For further details see A. K. S. Lambton, "Suyurghāl," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn.,

Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt submitted to the government. If we believe Qāzī Wafā, his tiny principality Nūr had suffered immensely from a blockade imposed by Bukharan troops and the harsh conditions in the environs. When Tughāy Murād Bī turned to the government, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī not only forgave him his transgressions but made a major land grant (*soyūrghāl*). This consisted of fields and estates providing the means for Tughāy Murād's livelihood in return for a contingent of soldiers furnished by the Burqūt in times of war. Furthermore, the Burqūt *amīr* informed the *atālīq* about all events and developments in other regions of Transoxania.³³⁸ The *Tuḥfat al-khānī* makes mention of the village of Qarātagān in Nasaf, given as a *soyūrghāl* to Sufī Jān Muḥammad. Qāzī Wafā's interpretation suggests that this grant was intended "to make him [Sufī Jān Muḥammad] cheerful and comfortable in order to ensure that the prayer, performed by the pious men, will facilitate his elevation to the stairs of fortune."³³⁹

Another feature linked to patronage was the attention paid to the economic well-being of the area under royal protection. Providing a good example in this regard, Kāzīm informs us about the measures taken by prince Riżā Qulī Mīrzā in the aftermath of the campaign to Balkh in 1739. The new ruler succeeded in restoring peace and reviving the local agriculture and bazaar economy at least in the short term, because "the subjects slumbered in the cradle of safety and were freed of sorrows and satisfied."³⁴⁰ Although the Bukharan authors do not pay much attention to this topic, the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* mentions a canal-digging campaign near Samarqand initiated by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī after his expedition to Ūrgūt in Rabī' II 1166/March 1753. If we give credence to Muḥammad Wafā, the Manghit leader had been intrigued with restoring the economy of Samarqand for about one year. After the conclusion of the military campaign in the mountain area east of Ūrgūt on Jumāda II 6, 1166/April 9, 1753, the troops marched to the Dargham Canal

IX, 731–34; Doerfer, *Elemente*, I, 228; see also Roemer, "The Successors of Tīmūr," 131). According to Abduraimov, a *soyūrghāl* did not imply any direct access to or control of territories. In practice, however, the receivers of *soyūrghāl* land soon began to levy taxes in the form of money or in kind. Many Bukharan documents show that the holders of land grants not only had unhindered access to the territories but also controlled the local economy (Abduraimov, *Voprosy*, 16).

³³⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 166b.

³³⁹ Ibid., fol. 187a.

³⁴⁰ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 579.

watering the area of Samarqand.³⁴¹ The soldiers then gathered on the banks of the Zarafshān, where they were ordered to collect the branches of trees and anything that could be used for binding. The equipment for the reconstruction of the canal was then brought to the village (*mauza*) of Rabāt Khwāja, which was located directly at the intake of the Nahr-i Dargham. Here the subjects and inhabitants of the area took the branches and the other material furnished by the troops and diverted the canal toward the city of Samarqand. In this way, the *amīr* “not only granted high favors (*‘āṭifat-i wālā-jāhī*) but also the means of life to the subjects of that region.”³⁴²

BACK TO THE BEGINNING: NOTIONS OF FEAR AND ANXIETY

Terms such as favor and affection lead the reader of the chronicles to think of a state of calm or the fulfillment of mutual needs of patrons and clients. However, a closer look at the sources reveals that fear was seldom absent from the considerations and thinking of all actors, both the ruler and the ruled! Indeed, anxiety and worries form a recurrent theme in the chronicles.³⁴³ They accordingly contain a vast repertoire of terms expressing anxiety and its various connotations, ranging from *tars*, *khauf* and *harās* to *wahshat*, *dahshat*, *bīm*, *tashwīsh*, *iztirāb* and *khasiyat*. On the part of the subordinate, this feeling arose from individual norm violation and other conditions like warfare, lack of resources, expected punishment and so on.

Amīn Bukhārī reports how the *ūng wa sūl* troops and the Qaṭaghān engaged in an unauthorized raid on the settlement of Āsyā-yi Rīgak near Balkh in 1707. When they were summoned to the camp by the king, their leaders were ridden by fear (*khauf wa harās*) of the forthcoming punishment.³⁴⁴ Raids and invasion by foreign armies also alarmed the populace. When in 1709 the Qalmāq raided Tashkent and its surroundings,

³⁴¹ The Dargham Canal branches off to the left of the Zarafshān River, guaranteeing the water supply to Samarqand and the country to the south, and has a length of nearly 70 miles (Schuyler, *Turkistan*, I, 286). According to Fedchenko, this canal had a length of 47 miles (Fedchenko, “Topographical Sketch,” 453).

³⁴² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 214b.

³⁴³ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 16b, 33b, 34b, 100a, 114a, passim; Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 14b, 15b, 34a, 43a, 54a, 65b, 71a, 90a, 123a, 125b passim; Mullā Sharif, *Tāj*, fols. 113b, 121a, 127a, 154b, 157a, 180b, 220b passim.

³⁴⁴ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 114a; Semenov trans., 130.

“the inhabitants of that area were filled with the dread (*khauf wa harāsi*) of these devilish legions, the inhabitants of that area are troubled like a trembling willow or quicksilver.”

In light of this threat, the *amīrs* advised the king to go to Samarqand and take serious measures to defend the defenseless subjects against “the destruction caused by the apocalyptic enemies.”³⁴⁵ Simultaneously, the Uzbek commanders reminded him of his duties as a patronal ruler who had to protect his subjects from such threats.³⁴⁶ Similar nightmare scenarios are evoked by Qāzī Wafā’s description of Nādir Shāh’s invasion in 1740. When at the beginning no Bukharan representative visited his camp in Chār Jū, he grew angry and instructed his army

“to annihilate all the people of Turan, the noble and the lowly, all regions of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr from the city of Bukhara and its dependencies to the villages and towns, every region, tribe (*il wa ulūs*) and all tribal sub-divisions (*hazārajāt*) of that kingdom, every legion and group of people, every noble and powerful, and even every living being [...] with the sword blade of the brave, revengeful fighters. They shall not leave a single path unfollowed in observing the rules of raiding and killing all people and levying tributes. They shall exhibit all that is possible and in line with the conventions of oppression, rebellion and sedition to turn the kingdom of Turkistan upside-down. [...] When learning this dreadful news, the feelings of the king and the *amīrs* of Bukhara and all tracts and territories of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr changed and they fell into the abyss of fear and into the vortex of anguish and anxiety.”³⁴⁷

Even if Qāzī Wafā invented the story about Nādir Shāh’s terrifying orders, or possibly exaggerated the sorrows of the subjects to legitimate the decision of the Manghit leaders to join the enemy, it clearly shows the connection between fear and the quest for patronage. Mullā Sharīf finds more drastic words to describe the feeling of the Transoxanian people:

“When the sound of the [Oxus]-crossing legions came to the ears of the inhabitants of the villages and tracts of Bukhara like the sea surf, it caused perturbation among old and young. From uncertainty and the state of confusion of men and women, [the signs] of insurrection on the Day of Judgment became apparent in every region. All the inhabitants and villages, dependencies and tracts of land, all immovable and movable goods and things were seized by immense fear and horror [...]”³⁴⁸

It is clear that Mullā Sharīf follows Wafā’s account. The scenario outlined by both writers matches many other situations described in the sources,

³⁴⁵ Ibid., fols. 144a–b; Russian text, 163.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., fol. 144b; Russian text, 163.

³⁴⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 34a.

³⁴⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 267a.

situations in which terrified actors are intimidated by a superior force and beg the protection of those who actually use military means to create a dreadful situation and force their enemies into relations of dependency. For example, when Nādir Shāh sent his troops to suppress rebellions in Mā Warā' al-Nahr in 1744–45, most of the *amīrs* and local governors of Transoxania submitted to the Manghits because they feared the reactions of the Qizilbāsh.³⁴⁹ In his description of the war between the Yetī Ūrūgh and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī that took place in spring 1748, Wafā also points to the anxiety of the former, who were besieged in their fortress Khaṭarchī. The fear of annihilation caused them to gather for a *kingāsh*. Finally they sent messengers with various gifts to offer submission. While presenting the gifts to the Manghit *amīr*, “complete fright and fear befell the minds of the envoys.”³⁵⁰

Mullā Sharīf also makes use of ornate words to describe the feeling of those who experience a dangerous situation. When in 1707, for instance, the Bukharan army besieged Balkh, Maḥmūd Bī Qaṭaghān “saw his lucky star in decline hour by hour and fell into the net of anxiety like a fish out of fear for his life.”³⁵¹ After the successful conquest of Balkh and his return to the capital, the king sat on the throne with a peaceful mind (*āsūda-khātīr*),

“and none of the stubborn of the age and the governors and representatives of the regions and cities [...] had the possibility of disobedience and rebellion because of the impressive awe of the ruler and the fear of the bravery and grandeur of the ‘Lord of the Fortunate Conjunction,’ Sayyid ‘Ubaidullah Khān.”³⁵²

Describing the invasion of Shahr-i Sabz by the Bukharan troops and their allies in 1751, the author of the *Tāj* states that during the siege nobody left Shahr, not even to satisfy basic human needs, for fear of the army. Finally,

“Subḥān Qulī Bī, [the lord of Shahr-i Sabz], was caught in the web of horror and perplexity and agonized by the torture of perturbation and astonishment due to extreme calls for help and the complaints by the helpless and weak and the overwhelming superiority of the fighting [Bukharan] commanders.”³⁵³

³⁴⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 71a.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., fol. 136a. For the whole episode see fols. 135b–136a.

³⁵¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 121a.

³⁵² Ibid., fol. 127a.

³⁵³ Ibid., fol. 374b.

The Kīnakās *amīr* eventually gave in and ceded his bastion to the besiegers, while retreating to his last fortress Qūshchī.³⁵⁴ As we have seen, the conflict ended with the submission of the Kīnakās and their final execution the following year.

The death of an important *amīr* or the *atālīq* also gave rise to fear among the population. After the decease of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī in 1744, “the moon of order of the Turanian kingdom was on the wane of discord.” Here the author alludes to the legions of malefactors and upcoming conflicts. He also foreshadows the sorrows and fears of the people when learning of the *amīr kabīr*’s death.³⁵⁵ After Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s sudden death in early 1759, a similar “earthquake of anxiety shook every region.”³⁵⁶

Although most of the examples given by the historians suggest that fear was a matter of the lowborn, the subjects and rebels, kings were not spared this feeling either. On the rulers’ part we observe the fear of disobedience, rebellion, and the possible and sudden loss of supporters. The fluidity of the power structures always entailed the possibility of followers leaving the *Herrschaftsverband*. The sources indeed give the impression of rulers constantly engaged in “extinguishing the fire of *fitna*.” Every time one blaze was quenched, news arrived of new fires in other regions. In the end, a ruler or influential tribal leader was nobody without his followers. And it was not least against this backdrop that sticking to intermediaries and patrons, whether living patrons or saints, but also the need for “ordering activities” seemed so perfectly natural. Describing the efforts of two Naqshbandī sheikhs to settle a conflict between ‘Ubaidullah Khān and his unruly Uzbek soldiery in 1709, Amīn Bukhārī puts the following words into the mouths of the two mediators:

“it is necessary to clean up the dust of fear, which has settled upon the brow of the *pādishāh* from the side of the commanders and the soldiery, with amiable petitions and the sleeves of apology.”³⁵⁷

The reader of the chronicles often comes across the confusion or trouble of mind (*taraddud*, *parīshānī-yi khāṭir* or simply *parīshānī*) requiring mediators who “restored the peace of mind” (*khāṭir-jam ‘ī/āsūdagī-yi khāṭir*)

³⁵⁴ Ibid., fols. 374b–375a.

³⁵⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 54a.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., fol. 328a.

³⁵⁷ Amīn Bukhārī, ‘*Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 154b; Semenov trans., 174. For this episode see the section Mediation and Brokerage/Religious Nobles as Intermediaries in this chapter.

by relieving and comforting their clients.³⁵⁸ One good example is the settlement of the above-described conflict. When Sulṭān Khwāja, one of the two intermediaries, informed the *amīrs* about the compromise negotiated by the sheikhs and the king, “the minds of those afflicted people were completely cleaned of fear and dread (*khauf wa waḥshat*).”³⁵⁹

Because of permanent rebellions, military campaigns and the “ordering of local affairs” in their aftermath are seen as an efficacious remedy against fear on the part of the rulers. In 1747, for example, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī left Miyānkāl only after “clearing his comprehensive thoughts and the pure mirror of his mind of the muddy water raised by the Miyānkālī rebels.”³⁶⁰ Before he could leave that region, he settled the affairs of the government of Samarqand and simultaneously conferred leadership of the rebellious Khiṭā’ī-Qipchāq, including the ordering of their affairs, on Khwājam Yār Bī Ūtārchī.³⁶¹ In the *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, we read that after the conquest of Balkh in 1707, the Bukharan ruler moved westwards and passed through the area of Andkhūd. There he deposed the truculent governor Naẓar Dādkhwāh Turkomān, who had instigated his tribal fellowmen to block the trade routes. In his stead the king appointed a certain Arslān Bakāwul Turkomān as new governor and left Andkhūd only “after assuring himself completely of his peace of mind.”³⁶²

CONCLUSION

In the previous sections I investigated patterns of patron-client relations and their description in Bukharan chronicles dating back to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The textual analysis reveals that patron and clients figure recurrently in the sources. Forming one of the cornerstones of the local social order, patronage was also rooted in the chroniclers’ worldviews. As will be seen in one of the next sections, they too were locked into this kind of power relationship.

³⁵⁸ This is well in line with the results of Foster and Galt (Foster, “Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good,” 303, 307; Galt, “Rethinking Patron-Client Relationships,” 183).

³⁵⁹ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 159b; Semenov trans., 179.

³⁶⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 76b.

³⁶¹ Ibid., fols. 76a–b.

³⁶² Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 131b; Semenov trans., 150. For the whole episode see Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 130a–131b; Semenov, trans., 148–50.

Patron-client relationships do not catch the eye of readers of the chronicles easily. They are veiled under a thick veneer of terms denoting favor and loyalty and have to be distilled from the texts. This supports the argument that humans only possess a practical knowledge with respect to the social order(s) surrounding them.³⁶³ In the texts, loyalty, obedience, submissiveness and clientelist behavior are ultimately entwined with one another. And it is the fact that patron-client ties are surrounded by notions of loyalty that makes them so difficult to detect. As an age-old structural device, patronage was well known to the chroniclers and their audience; it was perhaps even seen as something natural. Hence, the phenomenon did not need to be defined or explained. Instead of one overall conceptual expression for patronage, I discovered a myriad of elements with rather nuanced and heterogeneous meanings. Social practices like *tarbiyat*, *iştināʿ*, *farzandī/bunnuwat*, *himāyat*, *riʿāyat* and so on, with many facets ranging from promotion, attention and education to nurture, sonship, protection and care, are fixed elements in the narratives of the chronicles and cover different dimensions of patronage. It is therefore difficult to find one term that is equivalent to the analytical term patronage. All these structural principles were firmly institutionalized elements, shaping the daily life of the ruler and the ruled. The various elements together with the underlying norm of reciprocity were deeply entrenched in the worldview of all the actors, who obviously shared a common understanding of social rules, norms and regulations. Endowed with a good knowledge of their society, they were aware of the consequences of certain rules but also understood the dynamics of forging social relations or abandoning established bonds of loyalty.

Of particular interest are the practices of *tarbiyat*, *parwarish* and *iştināʿ*, which have been investigated by Mottahedeh and Paul. Whereas *tarbiyat* and *parwarish* are linked to the paternalistic dimension of patron-client ties, it is likely that *iştināʿ*, which applied to the field of servants and military slavery in Buyid times, underwent gradual changes in the course of history or, depending on local circumstances, carried a variety of connotations from the very beginning. As a form of promotion and conscious career-fostering, *iştināʿ* in the eighteenth century was not restricted to a military slave elite but was also granted to Uzbek *amīrs* and even the commander-in-chief. Mullā Sharīf, in particular, describes the exchange and the granting of favors

³⁶³ See chapter Power, Authority and Social Order/The Concept of Social Order/World-view(s).

as something natural giving birth to precious jewels. He and his eighteenth-century colleague, who makes use of the term to pinpoint paternalistic dimensions, see *tarbiyat* as essential for the rearing of a child. Another important ingredient was *himāyat*, protection, the significance of which has slightly changed in the course of Central Asian history. In eighteenth and early nineteenth-century chronicles, it is one of the most important attributes and duties of the rulers and the Uzbek chiefs alike.

In most cases described in our sources, patronage epitomized a mechanism or means of survival that was decisive in a range of situations; it features prominently in times of crisis and uncertainty, but also in times of calm. Oaths of allegiance and other acts of submission were crucial for the establishment and maintenance of this kind of social relationship. In eighteenth-century Bukhara clientship was not easy, it meant serious social commitment and sometimes even deprivation. Acts of loyalty entailed subordination, obedience, subjection to the orders of the social superior, and even risking one's life in the service of a master. In addition, we observe the supply of material resources like grain and other harvests, beasts of burden, in all likelihood financial means, and manpower. Immaterial resources such as physical proximity and protection played an important role too.

As I could demonstrate, power manifested itself in social hierarchies and gaps that had to be bridged by intermediaries. We can also speak of concentric circles forming around patrons and mediators. For the individual, making the distinction between inside and outside and placing or identifying patrons as persons themselves belonging to the inner circle of somebody's clientele were essential aspects of social life. This kind of concentric order with many power brokers, who provided access to the inner circles of power by acting as intercessors, has already been shown for the medieval period by Paul.³⁶⁴ The fact that patron-client links played an important role in Mongol and pre-Mongol times points to their institutional durability. In spite of possible changes in the connotations of patronage, the practices linked to this mode of order continued to shape social life in Transoxania well into the eighteenth century. As before, most patrons owed their standing to the fact that they belonged to the retinue of a stronger, more influential actor with control over more or more important resources. Many protectors were simultaneously clients of somebody else ranking higher in the social hierarchy or being in control of specific resources. The Manghit chieftains

³⁶⁴ Paul, *Herrscher, Gemeinwesen, Vermittler*, 165–69.

are just one example in this regard. It should be remarked that the sources report cases of friendship (*dūstī*), but these were lopsided relations rather than friendships based on equality. This is true of the relationship between the Manghit leader and the Kīnakās *amīrs*, who explicitly asked for the resumption of their friendship, but also of that between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Manghit companions.

The relationships described in the sources were characterized by marked inequalities, which are indicated by far more components and duties on the patron's part. Accordingly, the sections of this chapter dealing with favor and grace are much longer than the section on loyalty. But this corresponds to the greater chances, the better social standing and the control and possession of more, better or more key resources on the patron's part. The greater space given to favor is probably also due to the dynastic perspective of the sources, which describe Nādir Shāh, the Tuqay-Timurids and Manghits as patron rulers. The imbalance in the vocabulary may hence also be attributed to the endeavor of the authors to flatter the rulers.

In spite of this asymmetry, actors situated at the level of the subordinates seemingly risked much more to receive and enjoy privileges and social services. In the worst case, they could lose their life. But irrespective of these risks, the actors often joined the entourage of a superior actor voluntarily in order to advance their own position and career. Finally, the investigation reveals that reciprocity played a definite role. In the narrative sources, many protagonists figure as patrons and/or clients who mutually passed the roles of givers and receivers to each other. Social relationships were confirmed by constantly exchanging acts of favor and loyalty. The salutation, particularly, engendered the constant expression and rehearsing of social rules. When reading the chronicles, we frequently see the actors engaged in body techniques: the genuflection, the raising of hands in prayer (*du'ā*) for the master, the bowing to kiss the royal hand and so on.³⁶⁵ All these gestures and postures are signs of the impact of power in the form of habitualized routines and rituals. As will be discussed in the next two chapters, power was also manifest in other institutions: the exchange of gifts and commodities, and mediation performed by social superiors in support of their followers.

³⁶⁵ For the phenomenon of body techniques see theoretical chapter Power, Authority and Social Order/Questions of Power and Authority/Symbolic Power.

Last but not least, the investigation of the language used by the historians suggests that the power relations and their mental devices constantly reproduced their own *raison d'être*. Permanent warfare and conflict, rebellion and a certain dearth of resources are typical of the social setting in the eighteenth century. Given these circumstances, fear, dread and suspicion were also part of the mindset of many actors, and as such reinforced structuring principles like patronage. Another crucial element closely related to patronage was the exchange of gifts, which will be explored in the following sections.

GENEROSITY AND GIFT GIVING

“The sun of magnificence lent an ear to the petitions of fidelity and the words of sincerity recited by the *ināqs* of the court and the commanders of the army in pardon-demanding and assertion-wakening language. [Thereupon] he made every one of the great *amīrs* glad, proud and content through joyful tidings with regard to the governorships of provinces and regions as well as by land grants and other graces. Thence they were allowed to depart from the favor spreading royal court for the preparation of the means for the expedition. He instructed the submissive heralds and the swift messengers proceeding on a journey to the moon with the gathering of the followers at the celestial court. When the troops appeared at the seat of glory and the heaven-like threshold without delay as numerous as the stars [...], the great treasurer opened the gates of the repository of benevolence on the orders of the generous *sulṭān* to make all legions grateful for the constantly increasing wealth in the form of dirhams and dinars.”³⁶⁶

This passage from the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* describes the first steps of ‘Ubaidullah Khān for the preparation of a campaign against the rebellious Uzbek *amīr* Maḥmūd Bī Qaṭaghān.³⁶⁷ This sort of description is typical of the sources. Despite the frequent occurrence of gifts and gift exchange in narrative sources, the topic of gift giving in Islamic societies still represents a research desideratum. One of the few scholars concerned with gift exchange is Hedda Reindl-Kiel, who is working on the gift system in the Ottoman Empire.³⁶⁸ She argues that in Ottoman society, presents were a

³⁶⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 114b–115a.

³⁶⁷ For more details on this campaign, see McChesney, *Waqf*, 160–67.

³⁶⁸ See here for example Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “Luxury, Power Strategies and the Question of Corruption. Gifting in the Ottoman Elite (16th–18th Centuries),” in *Şehrâyîn. Die Welt der Osmanen, die Osmanen in der Welt. Wahrnehmungen, Begegnungen und Abgrenzungen [Illuminating the Ottoman World. Perceptions, Encounters and*

material expression of honor and therefore part of the etiquette.³⁶⁹ Compared to the Western context, gifts served to indicate hierarchical structures; a gift always defined the social position of the giver in relation to that of the receiver. As part of the material culture, presents were important because status was not assigned within the framework of a corporate state but had to be acquired, for instance, through an office or proximity to an influential status bearer. Since the highly differentiated social realm could be made tangible by underpinning it with gifts,³⁷⁰ Reindl-Kiel describes the Ottoman gift system as “a special form of demonstrative consumption.”³⁷¹ As such, it followed historical Islamic precedents. One of the most common presents in the courtly sphere were robes of honor (Ottoman: *khil’at*), a legacy of early Islamic and pre-Islamic times, symbolizing the receiver’s relationship of vassalage to the giver.³⁷² The *khil’at* can be described as

“[...] an institutionalised gift, which was not to be ritually exchanged, since, in terms of the status hierarchy, it was always handed over in a downward movement. Hence it is never to be found among the tributary gifts (*pîshkeş*) sent by pashas to the Porte. *Hil’ats* were given out by the court, i.e. (at least in principle) by the sultan.”³⁷³

For a long time it was common to compare the granting of such a robe to Western badges of honor. Yet it differed from medals as it “stood for protection by the sultan for the receiver, which implied loyalty to the ruler by the bestowed [...]”³⁷⁴

Dealing with the phenomenon of gift giving and generosity in the Transoxanian context, the following sections pay special attention to the nature of the gifts presented and the varying occasions of the gift exchange as described in Bukharan chronicles. The terminology employed by the

Boundaries]—*Festschrift für Hans Georg Majer*, ed. Yavuz Köse (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 107–20.

³⁶⁹ Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “East is East and West is West, and Sometimes the Twain Did Meet. Diplomatic Gift Exchange in the Ottoman Empire,” in *Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province, and the West*, vol. II, ed. Colin Imber, Keiko Kiyotaki and Rhoads Murphey (London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 114.

³⁷⁰ Ibid.; Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “Der Duft der Macht. Osmanen, islamische Tradition, muslimische Mächte und der Westen im Spiegel diplomatischer Geschenke,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. 95 (2005): 198–99.

³⁷¹ Reindl-Kiel, “Der Duft der Macht,” 199.

³⁷² Ibid., 210.

³⁷³ Reindl-Kiel, “East is East,” 118.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 119.

authors to denote different dimensions of gift giving forms another field of inquiry. This section pursues the following questions: Why does the exchange of gifts figure so prominently in the sources? On what occasions were gifts exchanged, and what items were exchanged for what particular purposes? To answer these questions, I will first discuss the different terms for gifts and the norm of generosity used by the authors. In the next step, I will describe the occasions of gift exchange from the viewpoint of inferior actors by quoting a number of examples. This will help gain an overview of the varying contexts where gift giving was considered important. Afterward, I will pay attention to the concrete nature of the presents exchanged. Since the chronicles furnish much more data on gifts given by superior actors, this section largely takes the perspective of the rulers and their representatives. In addition, I will investigate notions of gratitude and right behavior as depicted in the sources, while the last sections will be devoted to particular instances of generosity and the question of how this norm affected the personalities of individual actors.

THE TERMINOLOGY OF THE GIFT IN THE CHRONICLES

Concerned with the topic of gift giving, we find a broad repertoire of terms in the chronicles denoting gifts presented on the most varying occasions. In fact, I identified a total of sixteen different words with this meaning. Most of them indicate the status of the giver and the recipient. This bolsters my argument that the high number of synonyms mirrors the general importance of gifts and gift giving in Bukharan society. On many occasions, particularly at the court and during acts of formal submission, gifts were considered a must. Moreover, the fine nuances and variations in the terminology lead to the conclusion that a gift was not simply a gift.

The terminology for the gift and gift giving falls into two categories: gifts offered by an inferior actor to a social superior, in most cases the king or an influential *amīr*, and the gifts presented by a superior actor to his followers. Within these two categories, we can identify numerous nuances and differences of degree.

The first category includes the *pīshkash*, a present always given by an inferior actor to a superior.³⁷⁵ The *pīshkash* is often regarded as the superior's due, and failure to produce it in the appropriate situation would be seen as a serious breach of protocol, as would failure to offer a present of suitable worth. A *pīshkash* may also be offered subtly to remind a higher-up of his duty to bestow something on the humble donor.³⁷⁶ The term itself might originally have had a fairly neutral connotation. It was probably in the fifteenth century that it came to be used as a kind of tribute given to the ruler or his officials. In previous times, the texts also make allusions to *pīshkashs* given by one ruler to another. According to Lambton, the term covered a wide spectrum ranging from regular and occasional payments, taxes and tributes to levies and gifts.³⁷⁷

Another present falling into this category are the *tansūqāt* (sing. *tansūq*), ideally a novelty or rarity seldom to be found in the country of the king so that it triggers admiration on being presented.³⁷⁸ Often appearing as a word pair, the *bīlākāt wa saurīn/sāwarī* have more or less the meaning of gifts. While the word *bīlāk* is of Turkic origin simply meaning a gift,³⁷⁹ the *sāwarī* is a Mongolian word for a "throne gift" that was presented to the ruler on the occasion of a visit, mostly in the form of food.³⁸⁰ *Tuḥfa* (pl. *taḥāyif/tuḥaf*), *hadiya* (pl. *hidāyā*), *pāy-andāz*, *tartūq* and *ṣilat* (pl. *ṣilāt*) are further used as equivalent terms for presents made by inferiors.³⁸¹ In addition, we find the

³⁷⁵ The term literally means "what is first drawn"/"the first fruits," implying a magnificent present, such as only presented to princes, great men and superiors, or sometimes to equals (Steingass, *Dictionary*, 267).

³⁷⁶ Anne H. Betteridge, "Gift Exchange in Iran: The Locus of Self Identity in Social Interaction," in *Anthropological Quarterly (Self and Society in the Middle East)* 58, no. 4 (1985): 192.

³⁷⁷ Ann K. S. Lambton, "Pīshkash: Present or Tribute?" in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57 (1994): 145–46, 150.

³⁷⁸ Doerfer gives a few examples from evident text passages: royal white falcons (*shāhīn*), sea falcons (*sunqūr-i baḥrī*), wild eagles ('*uqāb-i barrī*) and *tūpchāq* horses (Doerfer, *Elemente*, II, 570–73).

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 413–15.

³⁸⁰ Doerfer, *Elemente*, I, 335–36. The *sāwarī* (*saurīn*) was a gift offered in homage and salutation (see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 644).

³⁸¹ Other terms to be found in Persian sources are *tashrīf*, *taṣadduq*, *ta'āruf*, *khidmatī*, *taqdīmī*. These terms signify an inferior status of the giver (Lambton, "Pīshkash," 145).

armaghānī, a gift brought from a journey.³⁸² Another exceptional category are *tūqūz* gifts made up of nine different items or nine pieces of one item.³⁸³

Presents bestowed by superior actors as rewards for service and loyalty are referred to as *an'ām*, *bathl*, *'aṭā* (pl. *'aṭāyā*), *īthar*, *nawāl* and *mawāhib*. *Īthār*, for example, meant the scattering of coins, sweets and other valuables at certain festivities. Remarkably, the terms in the first category of presents offered to superiors outnumber those for the presents made by superiors by a ratio of ten to six.

Apart from the great variety of different meanings and the social value of gifts, they had a definite political character, and were often also transformed into taxes or dues.³⁸⁴

GIFTS FROM BELOW AND INSTANCES OF GIFT EXCHANGE

There were several occasions on which the exchange of gifts took place as a necessary component of the political scene. Most prominently, gifts were offered when inferior actors approached superiors to ask for leniency and protection. Besides, presents were used by skillful intermediaries and envoys to manipulate the recipient courts, thus making them accept their master's demands.³⁸⁵ In view of this, it is no surprise that gifts were usually presented as a token of submission at the *kūrnishs*. The example of the Manghit leadership offering a number of presents while asking for Nādir Shāh's mercy is just one case in point. When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī together with the Iranian troops expelled the rebellious Khiṭā'ī leader 'Ibādullah from the central parts of the Miyānkāl in spring 1747,

“the governors of the fortresses and mountain strongholds, and the headmen of the towns and the divisions of the tribes inhabiting that region brought numerous presents (*sāwarī*

³⁸² Steingass, *Dictionary*, 39. In Iran people bring a kind of souvenir (*saughātī*) and give it to those who remained at home. It is important to bring something unique that is not available in one's place of living. In Iran and present-day Afghanistan, each area and province has representative items that may be brought for influential superiors or relatives (see Betteridge, “Gift Exchange in Iran,” 192).

³⁸³ Doerfer, *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente*, II, 624–29.

³⁸⁴ Lambton concludes that from the Ilkhanid time onward, the *pīshkash* and *saurīn* (*sa'urī*) were often converted into taxes and dues. For example, under the Āq Quyunlū, the *pīshkash* levied on the people collectively was known as *pīshkash-i jam'ī* (Lambton, “Pīshkash,” 147–48).

³⁸⁵ “Gift Giving i. Introduction,” in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X, 606.

wa pīshkash) and beautiful gifts (*dast-āwīz-i dil-kash*) and were distinguished from their equals and privileged amongst their contemporaries by a miscellaneous multitude of goods connected to greatness.”³⁸⁶

This is a typical scene described by our sources, which mostly say nothing about the nature of items and goods offered by inferior actors. The counter gifts are very often likewise unspecified. The surrendering parties in all likelihood delivered provisions (natural products or a share of the harvest) and perhaps even money to satisfy the demands of the troops, so the gifts very much seem to be a kind of compensation for the missed opportunity to extract resources in the form of spoils from plundering campaigns. Another interpretation would suggest that the gifts were given as a kind of tax in a setting where the central administration lacked the means to impose levies on a regular basis. In addition, the giving of gifts signaled the subjection of a community to the rule of an *amīr* or king. Upon his appointment as *atālīq* in 1131/1718–19, Farhād Bī Ūtārchī and his Khiṭā’ī-Qipchāq tribespeople offered a large gift or tribute (*pīshkash*) to the Tuqay-Timurid king. This *pīshkash* consisted of ten thousand sheep, ninety-nine horses with gold-embroidered saddle-cloths and one thousand bales of cotton fabric (*pārcha*).³⁸⁷

The several dimensions of the presents quite apart, in the absence of security and a state holding a monopoly on the use of force, it was generally recognized that, since authority rested on personal relationships, protection had to be sought on a personal basis. It was also common sense that protection and leadership could not be offered or exercised without material support.³⁸⁸ The goods were offered voluntarily in exchange for “infinite favors” in the form of guarantees of security and the prevention of raids. This very common pattern of gift giving appears frequently in the sources against the backdrop of a threat created by the commanders and their troops.³⁸⁹ Hence, security is a kind of counter gift that was only given in return for first-hand gifts, such as material resources offered by surrendering actors. The latter at times converted the customary gift giving into a survival

³⁸⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 75b.

³⁸⁷ Balkhī, *Tārīkh*, fol. 293a.

³⁸⁸ Lambton, “Pīshkash,” 158.

³⁸⁹ See Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 135b, 137b, 156a, 175a–b, 207b, 230a, 244b, 272a, 231a passim. Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 220b, 258a, 263a, 274b, 284b, 300b, 387b, 388b passim; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 44, 46 (French text, 95, 100).

strategy used to seek personal advantages. For instance, the Kīnakās leaders submitted for the first time to the Bukharan troops at the end of Muḥarram 1164/December 1750 because

“they regarded prudence as the mode [to ensure their] security and hopes. They sent gifts and presents (*tuḥaf wa hidāyā*) to the court, the refuge of the world, and made loyalty and confidence the advocate of their well-being and tranquility by reading the manuscript of submission.”³⁹⁰

Since submission to superior actors and the request for protection were often connected with the *kūrnish*, we observe the delivery of gifts at the salutation performed by servants and officials. Mullā Sharīf reports that when Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī Manghit was summoned to the Bukharan court for his appointment to the post of *parwānachī* in 1129/1716–17, “he got ready for the fortune with respect to the kiss of the royal hand and rendered *ṣalāt wa sāwarī* fitting the imperial court under the luminous eyes of the pearl-like ruler.”³⁹¹

The numerous occasions on which the troops and supporters paid homage to the superior while delivering gifts suggest that these formed part of the protocol. It would simply have been considered inappropriate to appear before the ruler or any social superior without a present. As a consequence, it is frequently mentioned that the gifts offered were suitable and worthy of the person gifted. The fact that all persons paying homage brought presents leads me to conclude that there was in general no exception to this rule. At least I could not find any instances in the accounts reporting about a breach of the protocol. This custom goes hand in hand with the giving of counter gifts, the form of which depended on the context and the situation. While the sources often describe the reaction of the superior as a granting of unspecified favors or showing of royal sympathy, the rulers or commanders in fact appreciated gifts as they underlined their social position, influence, rank and superiority. Yet while the delivery of gifts in cases of military surrender merely resulted in favors and promises to avoid activities that could cause harm to the populace, the presentation of gifts at the *kūrnish* performed at court was often followed by some counter gifts symbolizing continued favor and friendship for the gift givers. In addition, the counter gifts served to show the acceptance of the presents delivered at submissions.

³⁹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 175a.

³⁹¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 145a.

For example, when Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī attended Nādir Shāh, the Iranian king bestowed some exquisite gifts and unique presents (*‘aṭāyā-yi arjmand wa an ‘āmāt-i bīnāzīr*) on him. As Muḥammad Wafā tells us, the Iranian king was not sparing with gifts such as a robe of honor (*khal‘at-i khāṣ*), an ambling-paced horse and even money.³⁹² This example and the following events illustrate that gifts can be compared to keys enabling the givers to enter the service of a social superior. The quest for protection and entry to the inner circle of a ruler or commander was often more decisive than the expectation of counter presents. The gift giving was in fact also a strategy to attract a potential patron and to make him lenient. For actors like Raḥīm Bī, the real advantage of the gift giving lay in the chance to climb the social ladder, to establish a relationship and to find protection. Consequently, at a *kūrnish*, whether in cases of appointment, general salutation or surrender, the first gift was offered by the inferior actor, who seems to have been the more active party in the ceremony.³⁹³

Receptions for the rulers upon their return from campaigns or stays in foreign countries provided further opportunities for gift giving. For example, upon his arrival at Bukhara in 1158/1745–46, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī was warmly welcomed by Muḥammad Daulat, a slave and follower of his father Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, his brothers Yūqāshī Bī and Barāt Qūshbēgī, as well as other relatives along with tribal leaders and religious dignitaries. On this occasion, all of them greeted the *amīr* with a number of “complete presents of the perfect intention.”³⁹⁴ Upon his return from Mashhad in Jumāda II 1160/June–July 1747, Muḥammad Raḥīm was welcomed in a similar fashion by “Qāzī Mīr Nizām al-Dīn Ḥusainī, Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī and a group of devoted servants and sincere officials with numerous gifts and presents.”³⁹⁵ Sometimes local representatives joined the royal camp en route to congratulate the ruler on his military triumph after sieges and campaigns. Following a successful expedition to Shahr-i Sabz, the chief judge of Bukhara, Mīr Nizām al-Dīn al-Ḥusainī, Shīr Ghāzī Khān Khwārazmī and other Bukharan nobles and *āqsaqāls* departed for Kish on Rajab 16,

³⁹² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 38b.

³⁹³ Ibid., fols. 80b, 156a, 175a, 200b passim. Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 297a, 298b, 306b, 326a–b, 380a, 411a passim.

³⁹⁴ ... از ولایت نخشب و نصف برادران با عز و شرف یوقاشی بی و برات قوشیگی و عم مودت شیم عالیجاهی دانیال بی و دیگر امرا و قربتیان الوس منقّیه و سادات عظام و قضاه ذوی الاحترام بلده قرشی با سورین تمام و بیلاکات مقضی المرام رسیدند (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 61b; see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 297a).

³⁹⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 105a.

1165/May 30, 1752, to pay homage to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and congratulate him. On this occasion, the nobles again delivered some gifts and enjoyed royal compassion in return.³⁹⁶

The exchange of gifts occurred not only at the royal court or the mobile camp but also at local level, for example between the *amīrs* and their associates. Especially those soliciting another man's aid and protection offered gifts. According to Qāzī Wafā, a certain Abdāl, one of the local leaders of the Qungrat of Bāysūn, visited Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz and, submitting some gifts, solicited the aid of the governor of Ḥiṣār.³⁹⁷

Besides the frequent occasions described above, there were of course exceptional cases of formalized gift giving, at marriages, festivities and coronation ceremonies. For example, after the conclusion of the marriage between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī Manghit and a daughter of the last Chingizid ruler Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān in December 1756,

“the resounding noise of congratulations and the ‘May they be blessed!’ spread to the cupola resting on the nine columns of the heavenly spheres. The nobles and commanders, and all the leaders of the contingents of a thousand and a hundred [warriors] brought fine horses as gifts and incredible presents and offered them under the penetrating royal eyes.”³⁹⁸

Although gift giving is mentioned so frequently, the chronicles furnish little information about the feelings and anxieties of actors when gifts are presented. Not a single case of gifts being rejected is reported by the chroniclers, who depict the act as a formalized standard procedure. But this does not mean that all presents were always accepted.³⁹⁹ We also gain little information about the items and goods offered to social superiors and cannot

³⁹⁶ حسب فرمان اقصی القضاة میر نظام الدین حسینی نیز با جمعی از آقسقالان بخارا کمر عزیمت جهت تهنیت فتوحات ارجمند بسته ... بعد از یومی چند بحضور امیر کامیاب واصل گردیده از آستان رفعت نشان شرف استسعاد یافتند و زبده تنسوقات و عذر بیلاکات را نثار محفل همایونی نموده از اشفاق کامکاری فایز و بهره ور آمدند (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 200b). Upon his arrival at Balkh in Jumāda I 1153/July 1740, Nādir and his troops were welcomed by local governors (*hukkām*), notables (*a'yān wa akabir*), religious dignitaries and judges who offered gifts and presents (*tansūqāt wa sāwarī*) (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 257b).

³⁹⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 265b.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., fol. 249b.

³⁹⁹ According to the hagiography *Anīs al-ṭālibīn*, Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband refused to accept gifts from the Kartid ruler of Herat and also rejected food from his table because he valued the loyalty of his own group higher than the courtesy of the ruler (Paul, “Scheiche,” 288).

say whether collecting suitable presents was problematic or not. Summarizing the events connected with the collection of gifts, the chroniclers briefly explain how surrendering actors quickly sent envoys and mediators equipped with presents to join the ruler's camp. In most cases, however, finding suitable items did not seem very difficult or time-consuming. In the *Tuhfat al-khānī* we read about a gift collection that probably took more time than usual. In early Jumāda II 1166/April 1753, Bukharan troops occupied the mountain strongholds east of Ūrgūt. On Jumāda II 7/April 10, 1753, a messenger arrived with a message (‘*arīza*) that Dūst Muḥammad, the ruler of Gshtut, was ready to submit and that “there will be no reason for a delay except for the collection of gifts worthy of the Saturn-like court.”⁴⁰⁰ In this particular case, the argument that the preparation of gifts would take time was perhaps delaying tactics. As we then learn, the governor of Gshtut left his native region and took refuge in the nearby mountain area together with his brother Iskandar.⁴⁰¹

OF JEWELS, HORSES AND RARE FABRICS: OBJECTS OF GIFT EXCHANGE

In the last section I discussed different occasions when social inferiors offered gifts, which are not specified except in a number of special cases where “ambling horses graceful in walking” were delivered to delight the royal heart. Upon Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's arrival at the Turkmen area south of Qarākūl in Rajab 1166/May–June 1753, the local leadership furnished a number of fine “horses as fleet as the wind.” Qāzī Wafā also gives the price of the Turkmen gift horses, underlining their high material value: each horse was worth between three hundred and five hundred *ṭillā*.⁴⁰²

The many instances and occasions of horse gifting mentioned in Bukharan sources are somewhat reminiscent of the role of horses as status symbols and luxury items in other Islamic polities.⁴⁰³ In Transoxania, horses

⁴⁰⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 215a.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., fol. 215b.

⁴⁰² Ibid., fol. 218a.

⁴⁰³ In the Ottoman Empire, horses were favorite items of gift exchange. The supposedly oldest, albeit highly disputed document, allegedly dating back to 1348, already mentions a gift horse. Ottoman governors sent horses together with other animals to the Porte, and in the gift traffic of the court with neighboring empires horses always played a crucial role. However, the documents do not provide any details concerning the race or type of gift horses. In most cases only the number of animals given is given (Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “No

were also given in return for appointments to offices and titles. Qāzī Wafā remarks that Khwājā Yār Bī Ūtārchī, who was appointed *atālīq* after the enthronization of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān in December 1756, received a jewel-encrusted staff and offered a total of ninety fine horses in return, some of which were Tūpchāq horses covered with blankets made of velvet, fine silk and brocade. The new *atālīq* took his place on the seat of the commander-in-chief (*ūrūn-i amīr al-umarāʾi*) only after delivering his presents.⁴⁰⁴ Muḥammad Daulat, who was promoted to the rank of *qūshbēgī*, likewise “rendered forty-five ambling Tūpchāq horses as a gift to thank his master for the office.”⁴⁰⁵ With this, the appointments seem to be merely steps in an endless chain of reciprocal acts. After all, the first round of appointments took place after Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s enthronization and the performance of the *bayʿa*, so the offices can be more or less equated with gifts that demanded some return gift. Nonetheless, it would seem unsuitable to describe the donation of horses as a means of purchasing a title, since according to the text the appointees thoroughly deserved the offices because of their steadfast loyalty. The offer of gift horses can thus be regarded as a sign of gratitude with which the appointees thanked Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī for the offices and titles.⁴⁰⁶

According to the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt wished for reconciliation with the Bukharan court a little later. He therefore sent envoys laden with presents to Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān and expressed his will to ally with the new king. After receiving a positive reply, the Nūr ruler gathered his tribesmen and collected sheep and horses to take as gifts to the

Horses for the Enemy: Ottoman Trade Regulations and Horse Gifting,” in *Pferde in Asien: Geschichte, Handel und Kultur*, ed. Bert G. Fragner et al. (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), 46–47.

⁴⁰⁴ یوم دوشنبه جهت بیلاک و سورین این رتبه علی نود اسپ بعض آن توپچاق یاپوق دار از تاس و مشر و زربفت ... بنظر انور کشیده (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 258a). The Tūpchāq horse was a fine, well-fed and beautiful horse of the Turkmen or Arab breed preferably given as royal presents to impress the receivers of the gifts (Doerfer, *Elemente*, II, 601–03).

⁴⁰⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 259a.

⁴⁰⁶ According to Wafā, “all commanders of His Majesty, the chamberlains and government officials, the governors of the towns, the judges and *sayyids*, the headmen of the tribal contingents and the villages and towns (*dārūghahā-yi hazārajāt wa kadkhudāyān-i qarī wa buldān*), [all of them] out of gratitude for this generosity offered infinite gifts (*saurīn wa bīlāk-i bī-shumār*) and delivered fine horses as presents to the Saturn-like court” (ibid., fols. 262b–263a).

capital.⁴⁰⁷ Apart from horses, we sometimes read about food provisions offered by inferiors to superiors. Similar to Jāwush Bāy, who hosted the emperor 'Abdullah Khān about one hundred sixty years before, Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān prepared everything for the reception of Nādir Shāh in 1747. For instance, he ordered the preparation of wheat, rice, sheep and barley for a banquet. According to Mīr 'Abd al-Karīm, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī submitted food and other gifts when he joined the conqueror and his troops at the southern banks of the Oxus.⁴⁰⁸

Apart from food, horses or small livestock, it was common to present the skulls of enemies beaten to death in combat. During the final battle between the Qizilbāsh and the Uzbeks taking place in the aftermath of the Manghit takeover in 1747, the Uzbek warriors killed Salīm Bēg, one of Nādir's commanders, and other Qizilbāsh just to bring their skulls to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. The *amīr* generously rewarded his men with robes of honor in return.⁴⁰⁹ According to Amīn Bukhārī, the Uzbek *amīrs* presented the head of the king to his brother Abū'l-Faiẓ Sulṭān after having him placed on the throne.⁴¹⁰

While there is not much information on the nature of the gifts rendered by inferiors, the sources provide a fine grid of data on the items given by superiors, especially the rulers. In most cases, devotees were rewarded for their services with an honorary robe (*khal'at*), as was usual among Islamic kings.⁴¹¹ The *khal'at* was a desired status symbol, the color and material of which expressed the social rank and standing of its wearer.⁴¹² And this was

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid., fol. 264b.

⁴⁰⁸ Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 45–46 (French text, 999).

⁴⁰⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 124b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 346b. Qāzī Wafā reports about a similar gifting of thirty skulls obtained from the enemies during the battle of Ūrgūt in late Jumāda I 1166/April 1753 (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 211a).

⁴¹⁰ Amīn Bukhārī, *Uḥaidullāh Nāma*, fol. 244b; Semenov trans., 272–73. Vámbéry describes the distribution of *khal'ats* in return for the skulls of beaten enemies in Khiwa (Hermann Vámbéry, *Mohammed in Asien. Verbotene Reise nach Buchara und Samarkand 1863–1864*, ed. P. Simons (Stuttgart: K. Thienemanns Verlag, 1983), 184–86).

⁴¹¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 36b, 38b, 94a, 184a, 197b, 204a, 221a, 230a, 271a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 109a, 123a, 172a, 273b, 284a, 378b, 465a passim; Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, II, 575, 609, 788, 794, etc.; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46, 47, 59, 74 etc. (French text, 100, 102, 135, 167).

⁴¹² According to an early nineteenth-century diplomat, *khal'ats* were also part of the outfit of Bukharan soldiers. Besides white turbans, they used to wear *khal'ats* of different fabrics and colors. Some soldiers wore *khal'ats* of striped silk, while the robes of others were

governed by strict rules. The nineteenth-century traveler Henry Moser describes how one of his servants obtained a silken robe. But when he put it on, he was told that he did not have the right to wear it. A violation of the dress code had severe consequences for the norm violator.⁴¹³

After his submission to Nādir Shāh in 1740, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī received a *khalʿat* from his new overlord.⁴¹⁴ In Mullā Sharīf’s account, the young *amīr* and his companions were awarded robes of honor interwoven with gold, rare girdles and valuable ambling horses adorned with golden saddles and jewel-encrusted bridles.⁴¹⁵ According to his chronicler, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī received a valuable horse, a robe, a bejeweled sword and an *anʿām* of two thousand *ashrāfī*.⁴¹⁶ Horses were not only given as tokens of wealth because of their material value. The reception of a gift horse was also regarded as a sign of rank, prosperity and personal closeness to the donor. Since a fine horse of the Turkmen or Uzbek breed embodied a highly regarded status object, it was very common to gift one’s own followers with horses.⁴¹⁷ In the *Tāj* we are informed that in 1737 Nādir Shāh sent forty thousand Nādirī coins (ten thousand *tūmān* according to the chronicler), three hundred robes, and one hundred Iraqi horses embellished with jewel-adorned bridles to Balkh when he received his son’s message about the successful conquest of Cis-Oxania.⁴¹⁸ A similar case of lavish gifting is reported to have taken place after the battle between Nādir’s troops and the Ottoman forces at Mosul in 1743. The king rewarded Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī for his outstanding bravery and military performance with a robe

made of woolen fabrics and even materials of woven camel hair (von Meyendorff, *Reise*, 224–25).

⁴¹³ Moser, *Durch Central-Asien*, 144–45.

⁴¹⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 38b.

⁴¹⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 263b.

⁴¹⁶ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maṣṣhar*, 67a.

⁴¹⁷ Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was likewise awarded a robe of honor and a fine horse when he saluted the Iranian king (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 38b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 288b). In Khwāja ‘Abd al-Karīm’s view, Nādir rewarded the *atālīq* with one thousand Indian *ashrafs*, twenty-five *tahān* (according to Gladwin Yazdī brocade) interwoven with gold, a robe and an unspecified number of Iraqi horses adorned with golden trappings (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 68–69; Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 35–36).

⁴¹⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 222a.

of honor, a girdle and a horse adorned with bejeweled bridles in addition to ten thousand Nādirī *dīnārs*.⁴¹⁹

One particular instance of gift exchange mentioned frequently and described differently by the chroniclers was the submission of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān to Nādir Shāh in autumn 1740. Kāẓim, for example, writes that the Bukharan ruler allegedly submitted different items of high symbolic value such as the coat of mail (*zirhī*) of Amīr Tīmūr, a helmet worn by Chingīz Khān, as well as his crown and the royal seal. Nādir showed his appreciation by sending numerous gifts, like eighteen valuable horses laden with jewels, Indian, Persian and European fabrics, precious daggers and swords adorned with diamonds, and an armlet valued at one hundred thousand Tabrīzī *tūmān*. In addition, he gifted colorful carpets and felts worth three thousand *tūmān* each.⁴²⁰ While neither Qāẓī Wafā nor the nineteenth-century chronicler Mullā Sharīf mention this exchange of gifts,⁴²¹ Bukhārī alludes to horses and some undefined gifts offered by Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, who regained his crown and a *khal'at* after paying homage to Nādir Shāh.⁴²² Referring to the return gifts made by Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm states:

“After the conclusion of these ceremonies, Abulfiez Khan, in token of his entire submission, sent to Nadir Shah, by Hakeem Ataleek, the diadem which he had himself worn, together with three hundred horses, and twenty Persian manuscripts most beautifully written. Nadir Shah returned the crown to Abulfiez Khan, with a message that he was to consider himself as King of Mahaverulnahr. The cattle were sent to the stables; and the books were divided amongst Mehdi Khan the Munshi ul Memalick, Mirza Zuckee and others.”⁴²³

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., fol. 284a. Qāẓī Wafā, who first describes this episode, only mentions that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī became exalted by the king's *tarbiyat*, *iltifāt* and *'ināyat*, but he does not mention gifts (Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 49a–b).

⁴²⁰ Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, II, 794–95.

⁴²¹ The Bukharan authors just explain the reception of the Transoxanian ruler in the Iranian camp and how Nādir Shāh treated him like his own sons (Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 43b–44a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 273a–b).

⁴²² Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 100).

⁴²³ Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 40. Unfortunately, the English translation teems with inadequacies. For instance, the original mentions two hundred fine horses of Turkic breed and three hundred camels sent as gifts to Nādir Shāh. According to the Persian text, the books were distributed to Mahdī Khān, Mīrzā Zakī und Mullā Firdausī. Kashmīrī also reports that Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān offered the *jīqa*, an ornament or precious stone worn in a turban, which was misleadingly translated as a diadem by Gladwin (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 72).

Here we observe how presents received at first hand were further distributed: the beautiful calligraphies were given to Iranian officials and dignitaries. Nādir Khān obviously had no problem with distributing objects he had received as gifts.⁴²⁴ While the Bukharan chroniclers do not pay attention to the aspect of king-making by Nādir Shāh, Kāẓim reports in detail about the largesse and the splendid ceremony taking place in a huge marquee.⁴²⁵ According to his version of the events, Nādir Shāh

“awarded the participants of the banquet exquisite gifts such as robes of honor, gold embroidered garments, and beautiful atlas, sable and ermine furs, warm woolen overcoats and fine brocade. [Hence,] the fields of desire and security of the tribal leaders and notables of Turkistan became flourishing, prosperous and fresh from the clouds of liberality and benevolence of the world-subduing king of kings.”⁴²⁶

Khawāja ‘Abd al-Karīm reaches the conclusion that Nādir had aimed at a further prestigious conquest rather than the extraction of wealth and treasures like in India. The king’s expenditure for robes of honor and all the gifts awarded to the ruler of Turan and the Uzbek troops amounted to a sum of three hundred thousand rupees. This and Nādir’s investments in the provisions for his own troops amounted to a “dangerous sum”!⁴²⁷

The opinion of the traveler notwithstanding, the Iranian ruler did not spend such an overwhelming amount just to further his reputation and satisfy the demands of the Uzbek soldiery because it was expected of him. Of course, he had to offer something to tie the loyal leadership into his network. In any case, all the expenditure seemed thoroughly appropriate. Meanness would have been seen as improper or even a loss of face for a man of his

⁴²⁴ The Russian envoy Florio Benevini was bewildered by a similar distribution of gifts among courtiers and nobles after his arrival at the Khiwan court in spring 1725. Consternated by the amount of presents he had to provide for Shīr Ghāzī Khān (r. 1714–28) and his courtiers, he describes how the ruler’s favorite Dūstūm Bāy distributed the gifts to the Uzbek ministers as he wished (Benevini, *Poslannik*, [Perevod zhurnal italianskogo/Report dated 1725—transmitted by Peter Sofolov], 103–04; Di Cosmo, “A Russian Envoy to Khiva,” 97).

⁴²⁵ Kāẓim, *‘Ālamārā*, II, 797–99.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, 799. The giving of fine fabrics like silk, brocade and woolen cloths and also colorful carpets had a long tradition in the entire Islamic world (R. B. Serjeant, “Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest,” in *Ars Islamica* 11–12 (1946): 98–145).

⁴²⁷ Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 72; Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 40. According to the *Mazhar*, Nādir Shāh spent forty thousand rupees on Abū’l-Faiz Khān and his followers, and one hundred thirty thousand rupees for the purchase of grain (see Muḥammad Amīn, *Mazhar*, fol. 70a).

standing and authority. Apart from this, the lavish giving of gifts followed an objectivated mode of action and was regarded as an indispensable component of the order of things and proper performance. In order to surpass his own generosity, Nādir—according to Khwāja ‘Abd al-Karīm—offered Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān some robes of honor, a diadem inlaid with precious diamonds, some horses adorned with golden saddles and bejeweled bridles in addition to three elephants he had brought from India.⁴²⁸

As we have seen before, gifts of money were absolutely normal. In 1747, a time when Nādir Shāh increasingly relied on his Afghan and Uzbek contingents,⁴²⁹ he strengthened his relationship with the Uzbek leadership by generously giving Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī three hundred thousand Indian rupees made of white gold (*zar-i safīd*) worth 2.5 *mithqāl* (a dram and three-sevenths) each. According to the Bukharan authors, the Manghit chief distributed one-third of this sum among the other Transoxanian *amīrs* and members of the religious establishment.⁴³⁰

Another situation of gift exchange described in a more detailed fashion is the first encounter between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his foster son Īrdāna Bī (d. 1774?), the ruler of Khoqand, in Sabāt on Ramaẓān 11, 1168/June 21, 1755.⁴³¹ On this occasion, Īrdāna Bī rendered valuable *tūqūz* gifts like nine Qalmāq slaves, nine falcons and royal falcons, as well as horses.⁴³² With regard to the Qalmāq slaves, Mullā Sharīf adds that their cheeks were hairless (*kal-rukhsār*).⁴³³ Delighted with these precious and valuable presents, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī

“put the hand of generosity on the hem of benevolence and granted some favors and gifts so that the eyes of the age remained astonished by observing them. He showered Īrdāna Bī and his commanders with opulent rewards in the form of money and goods, [such as] ambling horses, royal robes, tents made from gold and silver, camels clothed in long woolen blankets, daggers and swords adorned with jewels etc.”⁴³⁴

⁴²⁸ Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 78; Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 49–50.

⁴²⁹ Avery, “Nādir Shāh,” 51.

⁴³⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 94a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 316b–317a.

⁴³¹ Qāzī Wafā gives Sunday, Ramaẓān 11, 1168, as the date of the first encounter between the two men. But Ramaẓān 11 was either a Friday or a Saturday (June 20–21, 1755).

⁴³² چون ایردانه بیگ محقر پیش کشی بنظر کیمیا اثر حاضر آورده بود مثل یک توقوز غلام و جاریه قلماق و یک
... توقوز جانور از شفقار و شاهین و باز و چند دسته اسب ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 231b; see also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 390a).

⁴³³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 390.

⁴³⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 231b. See also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 390a.

The descriptions not only reveal which goods and items were appreciated and favored at that time, they also mirror the social and cultural value these articles had in the eyes of the actors. Besides robes and horses, we find several kinds of predatory birds for falconry.⁴³⁵ The falcons were probably a particular regional gift object from the mountains and steppes of Khoqand. And apart from the animals, we also see slaves being given to the ruler, who reciprocated with a number of luxury goods. It is worth noting that the gift exchange by no means ended with the reception of gifts from the ruler. Qāzī Wafā points out that on Ramaẓān 18, 1168/June 27, 1755, Īrdāna Bī's soldiers participated in the battle of Ūra Tippa in the service of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. On this occasion, they seized many weapons from the hostile Yūz contingents and brought captured Yūz warriors and the skulls of fallen enemies as gifts to the Bukharan commander-in-chief. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī showed his appreciation by rewarding Īrdāna and his men with three hundred ornamented objects, Tūpchāq horses with saddles and bridles, coats made of brocade and a collection of royal honorary garments made of velvet.⁴³⁶

Taking a stand on liberality and the provision of gifts, Mullā Sharīf provides a lot of information on a range of gift giving opportunities at the royal court. The passage this study commences with gives a good insight into the procedure of giving and taking. It describes how the ruler 'Ubaidullah Khān had invited his warriors and nobles to participate in a campaign to Balkh and offered governorships, land, offices and money gifts in return.⁴³⁷ The passage continues with detailed information concerning the exact amounts of money distributed to the soldiers: ordinary soldiers received fifteen *khānī*, medium ranks got between fifty and one hundred *khānī*, while the high-ranking commanders obtained twice as much before departing to Balkh in Dhū'l-Ḥijja 1118/March–April 1707.⁴³⁸

Confronted with considerable resistance at Balkh, the ruler ordered the treasurers “to prepare the presents and articles of infinite bounty” in order to spur his soldiers on. Spreading out *dīnārs* and *dirhāms*, the treasurers opened the chests full of robes interwoven with gold, jewel-embroidered clothes,

⁴³⁵ Falcons were also favored by the Ottoman sultans who received them from vasals or provincial governors (Reindl-Kiel, “Der Duft der Macht,” 216–18).

⁴³⁶ از اسیران و سران خصم و سلاحها پیش کش کشیده جلدی و نوازش یافتند ... روز دیگر امیر کامکار جهت انعام ایردانه بی و بهادران او سه صد اشرفی و اسپ توپچاق با زین و لجام و نفره کجیم دیبا و مکتوب سرو پای ملوکانه (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 235b).

⁴³⁷ See Introduction.

⁴³⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 115a.

colorful garments, light-blue woolen fabrics and Frankish candied sweetmeats (*nabāt-i farang*). According to Mullā Sharīf, they announced that everyone showing bravery and prowess could help themselves freely to the royal treasures.⁴³⁹

Amīr Haidar's chronicler describes another occasion of lavish giving when Nādir Shāh summoned the religious dignitaries and scholars to his camp at Najaf because "the Afghans, Turkmen, the legions of Turkistan and the Lazgī contingents from Dāghistān, as well as the people from Sindh, Hind, Balkh and Badakhshān forming part of his army" once gathered and demanded a clarification of religious matters. Nādir—as our author relates—felt a strong inclination toward the "Sunna and the announcement of Islam."⁴⁴⁰ After the end of the dispute, he generously awarded the Sunni scholar Īshān Ustād a shield made of silver and gold coins as well as golden robes of honor and a valuable horse. The remaining gifts were distributed among the other religious scholars from Turan, Afghanistan, Balkh, Iran, Rūm and Iraq.

"He opened the clouds resembling a gift embracing ocean with the fingernails of attention toward the small and the big people. Connected with joy and contending for glory, the religious scholars of every country returned praying and amazed to their native regions with pockets and hems full of dinars and dirhams whilst being cheerful like opened fire blossoms."⁴⁴¹

Emphasizing the ceremonial aspects of gift giving, Qāzī Wafā describes an episode of gift exchange that occurred between Dhū'l-Ḥijja 9 and 19, 1171/August 13–23, 1758, in connection with the seizure of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's arch enemy Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz by the Qaṭaghān Uzbeks near Qūrghān Tippa. The capture of Muḥammad Amīn Bī is depicted as the start of a finely balanced process of giving and taking between the ruler and the Qaṭaghān nobles. First, the Yūz *amīr* is described as an "excellent gift" (*tuhfa-yi 'ālī*) by the Qaṭaghān leaders who sent messengers to the royal camp. After his arrival at the center of Ḥiṣār, the

⁴³⁹ Ibid., fol. 123a.

⁴⁴⁰ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 307b. In 1743 Nādir Shāh invited Shiite and Sunni scholars to his camp at Najaf to reach an agreement in essential religious questions and to bring about a kind of reconciliation between the different schools (Tucker, *Nadir Shah's Quest for Legitimacy*; see also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 245–52).

⁴⁴¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 311b–312a. For a thorough analysis of Mullā Sharīf's assessment regarding the religious dispute, see von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 250–52.

ruler awarded them horses and robes of honor only to send them together with some of his confidants to their native region. Subsequently, three hundred members of the Qaṭaghān tribe departed for Ḥiṣār to deliver Muḥammad Amīn Bī. When they traversed the river Wakhsh on Dhū'l-Ḥijja 16/August 20, 1758, they were received with all honors by Muḥammad Mingbashī and Qarchaghāy Minghbāshī. After the execution of Muḥammad Amīn Bī, the ruler “opened the royal hand like an ocean of benefits and showered them [the Qaṭaghān] with benevolence,” awarding them three hundred horses, robes of honor and twenty thousand *khānī* coins.⁴⁴² By generously granting material benefits, Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān showed his gratitude and thanked the Qaṭaghān. After all, they had helped in putting his most determined adversary behind bars.

The frequent military campaigns and sieges of towns and settlements going hand in hand with plundering raids also offered opportunities for a ruler or commander to show his gratitude in the form of generous behavior. In one section of the previous chapter I explained the protection fee (*māl-i amānī*), usually extracted after sieges and military campaigns. In most instances, it was divided among the followers.⁴⁴³ This practice can be observed in the Mongol and pre-Mongol period but also under Tīmūr, whose economic considerations regarding the *māl-i amānī* or *na'l bahā* (hoof money) often guided his decision for negotiations with surrendering city notables.⁴⁴⁴ Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm reports about the institution of the so-called '*aṭā-yi na'l bahā*, the gift of the hoof money allocated by Nādir Shāh to his officials after the campaign to India.⁴⁴⁵

After subduing the Qungrāt in the area of Bāysūn in Jumāda II 1169/March 1756, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī ordered his men to erect the royal camp in one of the mountain valleys, whereupon many tribal leaders and chiefs of the Qungrāt came from the environs of Bāysūn and presented the *atālīq* with

⁴⁴² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 309b–312a.

⁴⁴³ Paul points out that in “tribal contexts” the leaders often enjoyed little more than the first pick, while in more regularized contexts the distribution of booty took a variety of forms, e.g., gifts, banquets and largesse (Paul, “The State and the Military,” 35–36).

⁴⁴⁴ Roemer, “Tīmūr in Iran,” 54; Manz, *Rise and Rule*, 93; Noelle-Karimi, *Pearl*, 61.

⁴⁴⁵ According to Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm, the lowest ranking office holders in Nādir's army received two Indian *ashrāfīs*, gold coins, each of which was equal to twenty-four silver rupees; the medium ranks were granted ten, twenty, one hundred, two hundred or three hundred *ashrāfīs*, while the highest ranking officials were rewarded with five hundred gold ducats (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 57).

valuable gifts. According to Qāzī Wafā, a certain Chahārshanba was so wealthy in terms of livestock, objects and material that most of the soldiers became rich. Remarkably, one-fifth of the spoils went to the royal treasury, the rest was divided among the soldiery. The women who had been captured during the campaign were released and brought to Qarshī, and the *amīr* announced that “everyone looking for a wife shall turn the head of devotion to the royal threshold.”⁴⁴⁶ Another round of generous distribution of resources took place after the final subjugation of Muḥammad Amīn Bī in 1171/1758. Wafā describes how the military leaders and tribal chiefs in his entourage were generously rewarded with gifts: Dānyāl Bī, for example, received a sum of three thousand *khānī*, whereas other commanders like Jum‘a Qul Tūqsāba, Ghalcha Bī, Murād Bī or the Shāh of Rāmit were satisfied with one thousand *khānī* respectively.⁴⁴⁷ It is likely that these sums did not remain with the commanders but were further distributed among their warriors.

In addition to the above-mentioned patterns of gift giving, the regular visits to holy shrines, forming a routine aspect in the life of the rulers and the population alike, provided a further opportunity to display generosity before the saints and the guards of the graves. On these frequent visits, rulers like Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān made charitable donations in the form of alms (*ṣadaqāt*) and gifts dedicated in connection with vows and promises made to God (*nadhr*) and the saints for their assistance during the envisaged campaigns.⁴⁴⁸ These were the only occasions when the superior kings and commanders assumed the role of inferior devotees vis-à-vis the saints and the superhuman protector.⁴⁴⁹ A widespread practice, the giving of alms

⁴⁴⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 244b.

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, fols. 305a–b.

⁴⁴⁸ Qāzī Wafā refers to these acts of charity against the backdrop of the ruler’s regular visits to the shrine of Bahā’ al-Dīn Naqshband near Bukhara (see Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 179a, 204b, 222b, 242a).

⁴⁴⁹ Mīr Muḥammad Amīn Bukhārī describes how the courtiers donated *ṣadaqa* and *nudhūr* to the poor and the derwishes when Subḥān Qulī Khān was on his deathbed. Similarly, when his successor ‘Ubaidullah Khān was infected with a serious disease following the campaign to Balkh, the *amīrs* and court servants endowed the deserving with alms. On that occasion, all the *sheikhs*, *khawājas*, *maulās* and *sayyids* but also the entire populace (*barnā wa pīr*) of Shibarghān prayed for the ruler. When in 1709 the ruler was seriously ill while staying at Samarqand, his servants granted *ṣadaqāt* and *nudhūr* to loyal shrines, *madrasas* and the deserving (Amīn Bukhārī, ‘*Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 7b, 128b–129a, 146b; Semenov trans., 18, 146–47, 165–66).

(*ṣadaqa*) is encouraged by many Koranic verses and traditions. *Ṣadaqa* serves first as an expiation of sins, and it is recommended that it be given immediately after any kind of transgression. Closely related to the expiatory function, alms giving plays a role in affording protection against all manners of evil. According to a tradition, *ṣadaqa* given by a Muslim wards off affliction in this world, questioning in the grave, and punishment on Judgment Day.⁴⁵⁰ The *nadhr* (pl. *nudhūr*) is an object linked to and sacrificed on the occasion of a vow. The consecration linked the person making the vow to the divine powers. Thus, the *nadhr* was a promise or guarantee that was in principle similar to an oath.⁴⁵¹

NAMAK-KHWURĪ: NOTIONS OF GRATITUDE AND RIGHT BEHAVIOR

A comparison of the sources with regard to grateful behavior shows that the various authors considered this topic in different ways. While Qāzī Wafā does not pay much attention to gratefulness, authors like Mullā Sharīf and ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ṭālī’ devote many pages to the subject because they regard gratitude for benefits received as an obligation. The value of gratitude is reflected by the language employed. The most common term used for gratitude is *namak-andīshī* or *namak-khwāragī*.⁴⁵² We also find the so-called *namak-ḥalālī*, which not only means gratitude but is used as a synonym for fidelity that is closely connected to *namak*—the benefits one enjoyed when serving a social superior. The term *namak* literally means the salt and the bread given to followers and protégés at the *khwān* of benefits. As already described, the lords and rulers had to provide resources for a considerable entourage made up of servants, slaves, warriors, commanders and government agents, but also the members of the religious establishment, a good part of the Uzbek tribal leadership and city notables. In return, they were obliged to carry out orders and to serve loyally. When in 1121/1709–10 the king ‘Ubaidullah Khān summoned his commanders and demanded a campaign against the notorious troublemaker Maḥmūd Bī, the *amīrs* replied:

⁴⁵⁰ For details about the *ṣadaqa* see T. H. Weir [A. Zysow], “Ṣadaqa,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., VIII, 708–16.

⁴⁵¹ J. Pedersen, “Nadhr,” in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., VII, 846–47.

⁴⁵² Mottahedeh discovered the term *shukr al-ni‘mah* in Buyid sources, meaning gratitude for benefits (Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 73).

“We servants have enjoyed the benefits (*ni‘mat*) for such a day. The noble order shall be issued that God the Most High willing, we will lead the army toward the enemy and will take revenge on this enemy of the king’s household.”⁴⁵³

On the brink of death, the unfortunate ruler ‘Ubaidullah Khān appealed to his enemies as follows:

“Oh you group of people, you know me. Who am I? I am a flower from the rose garden of Nūr Khānum and a cypress tree from the garden of Subhān Qulī Khān. It has been twenty-two years that your fathers received the benefits [literally: ate the bread and the salt (*nān wa namak*)] in the service of our father. It is now eight years that you people have eaten food from the table of my benefits, you cannot enjoy benefits [literally: eat salt and garlic (*sīr wa namak*)] and be ungrateful (*namak-dān shikanīd*)! [...]”⁴⁵⁴

This direct speech echoes the principles of reciprocity and gratefulness. First, ‘Ubaidullah Khān appeals to the conscience of his murderers by mentioning his noble descent. At the same time, he invokes the gratitude of his enemies by referring to the fact that their ancestors had continuously enjoyed the means of subsistence. The last statement is to be interpreted as a moral judgment: One cannot enjoy the benefits granted by the ruler and then show ungratefulness. Yet all his pleas for mercy were of no avail. According to ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s court chronicler, the new ruler Abū’l-Faiḏ Khān thought, “What a surprising group they are! They have been enjoying the benefits (*namak*) granted by my brother for years, but were they loyal?”⁴⁵⁵

Even before his assassination, the king still relied on the loyalty of his *atālīq* because of a new oath between them prior to the conspiracy leading to his death. According to his chronicler, in this situation the king thought that

“one day he had hunted the bird of the *atālīq*’s heart once more with the grain of benefits [by obeying] the rule of mankind (*ḥukm al-insān*)—man is devoted to benefits—and by making his mind cheerful with a robe and a girdle. As a new oath was sworn between the king and the *atālīq*, he will probably stick firmly to his oath.”⁴⁵⁶

Interestingly, the author explicitly alludes to a general, significant social rule (*ḥukm*) of mankind, making man a social being. Simultaneously, gift giving is presented here as a strategy the king purposefully made use of in order to impress his minister, to bind him to himself and to win his heart. However, in this particular case the instrument worked only in an ephemeral way and

⁴⁵³ Amīn Bukhārī, ‘*Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 171b; Semenov trans., 192.

⁴⁵⁴ Ṭālī‘, *Tārīkh*, fol. 23b; Semenov trans., 30.

⁴⁵⁵ Amīn Bukhārī, ‘*Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 228a; Semenov trans., 254.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, fols. 229a–b; Russian text, 255.

did not prevent the *atālīq* Ma‘šūm Ḥājī Sarāy from changing sides shortly thereafter.

Mullā Sharīf reports how ‘Ubaidullah Khān was left to his fate by his supporters prior to his appeal to the conspirators responsible for his assassination. Thereupon, “he shed jewel-bearing tears” and leaped onto his horse because of the “unjustness of his fraudulent protégés.”⁴⁵⁷ Here the term *namak-parwarda*, the one who is brought up at somebody’s expense, is a perfect correlate to the practices of *tarbiyat* and *iştinā‘* and can be viewed as a synonym of *tarbiyat yāfta*. Using this terminology, the author implicitly condemns the behavior of ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s followers and pronounces a moral judgment reflecting his understanding of morality. In a similar vein he puts the following words into ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s mouth: “Oh you people, be loyal [literally: think about the salt]! Refrain from killing me! [...] Is there nobody who considers fidelity?”⁴⁵⁸

Despite reciprocity being rooted in the worldviews of the actors, including the feeling of moral obligation to anybody who granted favors, this did not suffice to prevent ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s assassination. His murder shows that deviations from the norm were the order of the day. Norm violators are branded and condemned as *kūr-namak* or *namak-ḥarām*, literally “untrue to salt eaten together,” meaning ungrateful, perfidious and disloyal. Indignant about the rebellion of Ibrāhīm Bī in 1135/1722–23, Ṭālī‘ disparagingly writes: “This unfortunate and ungrateful group was through misfortune confounded in the desert of stupidity and astonished on the hill of aberration.”⁴⁵⁹ Sometimes we also read about the *kāfir-i ni‘mat* or *kufrān-i ni‘mat*,⁴⁶⁰ meaning ungrateful people who ignore the benefits granted them.⁴⁶¹

Consequently, the chroniclers view harsh punishment for ingratitude and betrayal as wholly justified. Ṭālī‘ mentions an episode taking place at the end of the military campaign conducted by Rajab Sulṭān and his allies in 1722–23. The two armies finally stood opposite each other at Wābkent in the *tūmān* Khitfar north of the capital. After twenty days the commander-in-

⁴⁵⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 133a.

⁴⁵⁸ Ṭālī‘, *Tārīkh*, fol. 24a; Semenov trans., 30.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., fol. 43a; Russian text, 69.

⁴⁶⁰ Mottahedeh also mentions “ingratitude for benefits” (*kufr-ni‘mah*) in the Buyid period (Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership*, 73).

⁴⁶¹ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 76a, 88b passim; Semenov trans., 89, 101 etc.

chief Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī received a message about the betrayal of a certain Maḥmūd Barakī, the leader of the Barakīyān community (*qaum-i Barakīyān*), who clandestinely sided with Ibrāhīm Bī. Maḥmūd Barakī and twenty of his men were the personal guard in charge of the king's security. Ṭālī' states that "God the Sublime got angry with him because he ignored fidelity and gratitude." He was imprisoned by the royal troops when he wanted to "injure the high-standing royal cypress tree." The ungrateful Maḥmūd was flayed shortly thereafter.⁴⁶² By pointing to this example of disloyalty, the author of the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān* explicitly warns his audience about the consequences of ingratitude and betrayal, which is not agreeable to God.

While Ṭālī' describes the following combat and the final victory of the royal troops in a mere summary manner, Mullā Sharīf mentions the spoils gained by the followers of Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān and his *atālīq* and the execution of four hundred captives because of disloyalty (*namak-ḥarāmī*) in Ramaḡān 1134/June–July 1722:

"When the insincere vagabonds of the Turkic tribes weighed the amount of disagreement of the impudent troops with the touchstone of comprehension and the measure of intelligence, and when they reached the highest steps of experience, the tidings of the cruel fate tried the excellent king with the adversities of fraud and the calamities of discord. With the passing of the days, months and years marked by all that inclination for disloyalty (*daghdagha-yi kūr-namakī*), the separation of intimates, the expediency of ingratitude and the witnessing of the enmity of the rebellious [tribal leaders], the complete loyalty, gratitude and attention shown by the pillar of the notables, [Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī] was viewed with affection by the luminous mind of the exalted king, the protector of the faithful friends and servants. According to the aforementioned premises and the numerous tests, he adorned the commander-in-chief with the title of *madār-i 'aliya-yi kull*, and privileged him by placing the reins of the command over the army and the discharge of duties in his hands. Thus, he vested him with the order of the kingdom and instructed him to take care of the affairs of the government."⁴⁶³

Here Mullā Sharīf contrasts disloyalty (*kūr-namakī*) with steadfast loyalty and gratefulness (*namak-andīshī*) by citing the examples of the rebellious Uzbek tribes and the Manghit leader. We are dealing with opposite word pairs rooted in the worldview of the chronicler, who clearly states what is right and just behavior and what is simply wrong.

⁴⁶² Ṭālī', *Tārīkh*, fols. 158a–159a; Semenov trans., 135–36.

⁴⁶³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 291b.

After all, gratefulness and loyalty are appreciated and regarded as obligatory. Showing gratitude is seen as ultimate social behavior that is valued in positive terms. Mullā Sharīf describes the reactions of the Bukharan nobles after they received more than one hundred thousand rupees in summer 1747 as follows:

“The king of Iran exalted the *amīrs* by distinguishing them with benevolent attention. He scattered much gold from the treasure of generosity so that the ocean of liberality seemed insignificant [compared to it]. The *amīrs* of Turan, who had just heard about the lavish giving of money (*lak-bakhshī*) from the Indian kings as if it was the fabulous bird *sīmurgh*, something they had never seen even a tenth of from the rulers and pillars of the age, took the generous giving of gifts and the scattering of this much silver and gold like the red brimstone or the green emerald made from the material of rare and marvelous locusts. They saw it as [something] beyond all doubt with regard to a trace of disgrace from the magnanimity of sublime desire [which was like] vernal clouds in that time.”⁴⁶⁴

Another example of royal appreciation and gratefulness is given by Qāzī Wafā. After a successful campaign against the Sarāy in Khuzār in spring 1164/1751, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī “thanked God the eternal master as a sign of his gratitude (*shukrāna*) for this sublime present.”⁴⁶⁵ Here God embodies the protector granting favor in the form of a victory leading to the final subjugation of the *atālīq*’s enemies.

THE MOTIF OF GENEROSITY IN THE EXAMPLE OF JĀWUSH BĀY

The Bukharan and Iranian chronicles compiled in the eighteenth century abound with a rich repertoire of synonymous terms describing generous behavior and the constant readiness to grant rewards. The textual analysis produces seven equivalent terms for munificence, echoing its importance as a norm. The most common equivalents found in the sources are *jūd* and *sakhāwat* circumscribing generosity and benevolence.⁴⁶⁶ Besides these we find other terms such as *karm/karam*, *makramat*, *badhl*, *ḥatamī* or *ḥātam-bakhshī*, *futūwat*, and *īdhār*, which means rather the actual act of gift giving.

With regard to the notions of generosity, the chronicles provide a fine grid of data indicating the value of this concept and the role it played in the thinking of the authors, their audience and the actors. Munificence is

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., fols. 317a–b.

⁴⁶⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 186b.

⁴⁶⁶ For the meaning of both terms see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 377, 660.

nonetheless seldom mentioned as an isolated norm, but it appears frequently as a laudable attribute of persons. One of the most interesting examples is provided by Qāzī Wafā, who describes the character of Jāwush Bāy, one of the ancestors of the future Manghit rulers, as follows:

“The star of generosity and beneficence (*akhtar-i jūd wa ihsān*) was luminous on the brow of his fortune and the *khwān* full of delicate food was [well] arranged awaiting guests from noon to evening, because of his candor and utmost purity of intention.

You shall give food to the sparrow, the partridge and the pigeon

So that one day the royal eagle will fall in the trap

One pearl will emerge out of many oysters

Of a hundred arrows one will meet the target”⁴⁶⁷

With this allegory our author points to the benefits resulting from beneficence. Highlighting the significance of generosity closely linked to reciprocity, the chronicler intends to kill two birds with one stone. First, he teaches his audience about the principle of bounty and the positive outcomes resulting from benevolent action. Second, and more important, the poem epitomizes a moral tale advising the reader to treat everyone with generosity and kindness irrespective of social status or influence. On the other hand, however, the poem also mirrors the overlapping of moral and mentally coded norms of generosity and reciprocity with utilitarian notions. This implies that these rules and the bountiful provision of gifts were both, namely moral “concepts” and strategies purposefully used to climb the social ladder or to pursue ambitious personal goals.

As Qāzī Wafā points out, Jāwush Bāy, the ancestor of Muḥammad Raḥīm, continued to grant benefits to all those in urgent need until he finally received a reward when the ruler ‘Abdullah Khān (r. 1582–98) arrived with his troops in the region of Nasaf. And although it was difficult to procure the means for a large feast from Qarshī and other towns, Jāwush Bāy “met the needs of the troops and the royal entourage by providing food and drink, daily allowances and clover for the horses.”⁴⁶⁸ Mullā Sharīf further embellishes this episode and says:

⁴⁶⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 7a. The same poem is to be found with exactly the same wording in the *Taj al-Tawārīkh* (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 203b).

⁴⁶⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 7b.

“Although it was a dark night, and, in view of heavy rainfall, thunderbolts and a difficult situation, thoroughly impossible to transport the means for a banquet worthy of such a mighty lord of the auspicious conjunction [...], none of ‘Abdullah Khān’s intimates drew the picture of the covenant and the service of this benevolent man with the reed pen of suspicion in the book of the places where things are supposed to be. [Jāwush Bī (Bāy?)] ordered and prepared all means for the observance of hospitality (*marāsim-i mīzbānī*) and all requisites for paying attention and respect [...] He spread out noble presents and precious gifts under the sublime and noble eyes. They brought eats and drinks, all that was required for the warriors of the royal camp from the banquet house. And even fodder for the horses of the troops as numerous as stars was supplied easily and available.”⁴⁶⁹

Qāzī Wafā unfortunately does not name his sources for his version of the events. The story Mullā Sharīf took from the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* may have circulated among the inhabitants of Nasaf at the time Muḥammad Wafā compiled his work. The narrative is interesting as it highlights the dynamic of the resulting developments. The author retrospectively interprets this episode as the trigger for the rise of Jāwush Bāy’s descendants to the highest positions. After hosting the ruler and his retinue, he gained the trust and favor of the Bukharan *khān*, whose notables—according to Mullā Sharīf—were also full of praise for him.⁴⁷⁰

The next episode linked to the destiny of Jāwush Bāy and his descendants also has to do with the importance of munificence. Reportedly the benefactor was once visited by Khizr, an immortal saint who plays a pivotal role in various Islamic legends and stories. Khizr, who also appears as al-Khaṣīr (“the green man”), is often equated with the prophet Elias.⁴⁷¹ In the

⁴⁶⁹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 204a.

⁴⁷⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 7b–8a; Mullā Sharīf notes that the next morning ‘Abdullah Khān granted favors (*‘ātifāt*) to Jāwush Bāy [Bī] and paid attention (*ra‘āyat*) to him (على ... الصباح خسرو صاحبقران اورا بمزيد عاطفت و رعایت نواخته (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 204b).

⁴⁷¹ This immortal saint or prophet appears in many pre-Islamic stories, for example in the Alexander legend under the name of Andreas, Alexander’s cook. According to this legend, he found the spring of life by chance and became immortal through contact with the water. In the Koranic story, he plays the role of a part-time traveling companion of Mūsā. The sources give varying dates for Khizr’s period; sometimes he is called a contemporary of Abraham, sometimes placed in the time of Farīdūn. There are indicators that he was a marine being, living either in a spring or on an island in the ocean. In addition, he is described as the patron of the seafaring people. In India he is revered as a river god by the name of Khwāja Khizr who sits on a fish. In other sources he is portrayed as part of the realm of vegetables. There are different opinions concerning his nature. He seems to be a hybrid between prophet, human, angelic, mundane and celestial being. Sufi

Bukharan chronicles he is portrayed variously, either as “one of the men of God,” a “mysterious guest,” the “discoverer of the secret veils,”⁴⁷² “one of the hidden men” or as “pīr endowed with a luminous mind.”⁴⁷³

The chroniclers report how Jāwush Bāy received Khizr in his tent and treated him with utmost hospitality when he “saw the traces of blessing” in his countenance. On this occasion, Khizr prophesied the rise of Jāwush Bāy’s descendants to prominence and power, and performed the prayer for them in order to underline his prophesy.⁴⁷⁴ This act of hospitality of the ancestor of the Manghit is presented in different ways by the authors. While Qāzī Wafā describes it “as the fulfilling of the obligations linked to a banquet and as obeying the custom of generosity,” Mullā Sharīf only explains it in terms of “fulfilling all the necessities and making evident his loyalty.”⁴⁷⁵

This story rests on the notion that the incessant rise of the future Manghit dynasty was divinely preordained. By telling the story right at the beginning of his work, Qāzī Wafā underlines the importance of the divine legitimation of the dynasty in general, and of his master in particular.⁴⁷⁶ Remarkably, the authors connect the role of the Manghit and their takeover to this episode, which is interpreted as the beginning of their ascent to the highest positions, and eventually the Bukharan throne.⁴⁷⁷ Apart from emphasizing the role of destiny and divine legitimation, the story transports a particular message. Without assuming a didactic tone, it says that hospitality and munificence are agreeable to God. The quality of generous behavior hence gains a

brotherhoods view him frequently as a saint who brings luck and protects against evil (A. J. Wensinck, “Al-Khizr,” in *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, 2nd edn., IV, 902–05).

⁴⁷² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 8a.

⁴⁷³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 204b. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 204.

⁴⁷⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 8a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 204b–205a; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 204.

⁴⁷⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 8a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 204b.

⁴⁷⁶ Anke von Kügelgen concludes that an emphasis on divine legitimation was a sign that a ruler was not legitimized in the traditional way (e.g., in genealogical terms) (see von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 203–06). But it can also be interpreted as a mechanism that generally came into play at the takeover of a new dynasty, the ascent of which was seen as a sign of divine favor.

⁴⁷⁷ Qāzī Wafā sees the visit of Khizr as “the beginning of the joyful fortune (*āghāzī būd az iqbāl-i masarrat sar-anjām*)” (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 8a). Mullā Sharīf interprets it as “the beginning of the prelude to the dawn of constant power ushering in the caliphate” (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 204b).

religious touch: the gift produces a benefit either immediately or in the future. Khizr's visit is presented as a divine test and as a vehicle to show the will of God manifest in the rise of the Manghit after successfully passing the test.

THE *TŪY* AND OTHER FESTIVITIES

In contrast to many sources from other time periods, the Bukharan chronicles compiled in the middle of the eighteenth century do not pay much attention to festivities, though these were occasions when urban notables and tribal leaders were able to bolster their reputation and authority through personal contact with the ruler and his retinue. Apart from a few cases, Qāzī Wafā and his colleagues do not report about splendid feasts. One notable exception is a feast that, according to Wafā, was customarily celebrated every year on Ramaẓān 17. The notables, the tribal leaders and commanders saluted the king at the royal citadel in Bukhara, after which they were entertained at a large banquet and celebrated *iftār*, the breaking of the fast:

“The *khwān* of generosity and benevolence was spread out before the *amīrs* and notables. They prepared and presented all kind of fruits and delicacies, drink and food to feed the mighty possessors of amirid ranks. When the taste of the people accustomed to sugar became the taster of the sweet honey and accepted the sweetness of other drinks, they shared the quality of the food and sorts of delicacies. And when they folded the skirts of convenience and abundance for the attendees of this assembly of drink and food [...], the overseers of the fireworks appeared on the roof of the *madrasa* opposite the royal palace. Preparing the means and gunpowder for the fireworks, all waited for an opportunity to see the king and the illustrious *amīrs*.”⁴⁷⁸

Although the banquet is described only briefly, the text allows a minimal insight into certain tastes at that time. The participants apparently were fond of fruits but also candies and honey. Wafā describes the preparations for the wedding ceremony in a similar vein; the court servants and cooks “arranged all kinds of meat and fruits in the royal kitchen and the wine cellar.”⁴⁷⁹ Another passage mentions the end of summer and the beginning of autumn as the preferred season “because all sorts of fruits and delicacies appeared on

⁴⁷⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 145b–146a.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 249a.

the *khwān* of abundance and [their] delicious taste provides a treat for the taste buds.”⁴⁸⁰

Coronations and enthronizations also provided the opportunity for sumptuous festivities. Amīn Bukhārī, for instance, devotes a detailed account to the splendid coronation feast of his master ‘Ubaidullah Khān in 1702, including the usual “shower of gifts” on the heads of the subjects and subordinates.⁴⁸¹ Mullā Sharīf embellishes the feast at Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s coronation in the following way:

“When the royal throne was adorned with final grandeur and splendor beyond all limits [...] the perfect and skillful lords of the *khwān* and the astute servants spread out the carpets of gifts and benefits and the tablecloth of generosity and gratitude. They brought plentiful sorts of sugar and sweet drinks as well as all kinds of eats and drinks and the mood of the attendees of the royal banquet became proud and modest of needs because of the abundant gifts and the entire benefits. And the eyes of the devotees at the foot of the royal threshold were grateful for listening to the melody of the flute and all the drink and food. Some of the learned scholars blessed with the talents of eloquence and the arts of the word recited tractates of the religious sciences and scientific problems at this paradise-like feast. Some of the poets who compiled well chosen *inshās* [full of] colorful imagination worthy of the splendid enthronization recited their poems [...] before the king. [Subsequently], each and every one of the wise scholars and the poets was grateful, fortunate and exalted amongst their peers and equals by the presents and rewards provided by the chamber of infinite grants and favors from the treasury of benefits and gifts. On this, the sea of wealth owned by the commander of the time came to boil by the order to bestow gifts in the form of adorned robes and colorful clothes on the group of the renowned notables and tribal leaders. In accordance with the orders issued by the grave pillar of victorious authority, [...] all the diligent *mihtars*, the royal *dīwān* officials and superintendents of the government opened the gates to the treasuries brimming with bounty. All the *sayyids* and judges, the commanders of the army, the leaders of the contingents of a hundred and ten were clothed in royal robes of honor and garments made of silk. The shadow of the heavenly court became shameful because of the final magnificence and splendor of the lords, and the tribal contingents adorned with robes made of brocade and garments made of velvet and silk caused the gardens to bloom out of jealousy.”⁴⁸²

Mullā Sharīf’s vivid explanations reveal a certain taste and sensual experiences, the preference for sweet dishes and eloquently recited poems, but they also reflect an aesthetic sense in the form of exquisite clothes made of the most valuable materials, such as gold-embroidered brocade (*dībā*,

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., fol. 159b.

⁴⁸¹ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 12a–16a; Semenov trans., 24–28.

⁴⁸² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 404a–405a.

zarbaft), velvet (*tās*) and silk (*kamkhā*). Beyond this, the long passage mirrors generosity and the granting of favors as a highly praised quality of the ruler, who showed his gratitude to the nobles and dignitaries after the *bayʿa* and the coronation.

Another example is reported by Qāzī Wafā. According to him, Dānyāl Bī organized a circumcision for his sons in Rabīʿ II 1176/October–November 1762.⁴⁸³ Messengers were sent in all directions to the different domains to spread the news about the *tūy* and to invite the *amīrs* of the borderlands (*umarā-yi sar-hadd*) and the governors of every region. Most of the noble men sent gifts worthy of such a great *tūy*.⁴⁸⁴ The notables and dignitaries like the Jūybārī *khwājas*, the Naqshbandī *sayyids* and the Sayyid Atāʾī, the judges Mīr Nizām al-Dīn Husainī and Abū Tāhir Samarqandī were invited and attended the *tūy*. We find of course a large number of other illustrious participants such as the commanders of the Uzbek troops. At this circumcision feast, “the *khānsālārān* served all sorts of fruits and delicacies and organized a royal banquet.” Singers, musicians, traveling entertainers and jugglers performed at the *tūy* and were awarded “suitable robes.”⁴⁸⁵

QUTLUQ BĀY DONATES A GARDEN

Unlike the historiographical works compiled in other periods, early Manghit chronicles make almost no mention of the cultural patronage that previous dynasties like the Timurids or the Shibanids were known for. Apart from the erection of citadels and the repair of the Bukharan city wall and some buildings in Samarqand, the sources leave out this aspect of authority.⁴⁸⁶ An

⁴⁸³ In the Ottoman context, circumcision feasts were also platforms for gift exchange (see Hedda Reindl-Kiel, “Power and Submission. Gifting at royal circumcision festivals in the Ottoman Empire (16th–18th centuries),” *Turcica* 41 (2009): 37–88).

⁴⁸⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 354a–b.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid. Qāzī Wafā spells it *khān* here instead of *khwān*.

⁴⁸⁶ One of the few examples of public building activities undertaken in the early eighteenth century was the reconstruction of the tomb of the fourth Caliph ʿAlī b. Abī Tālib in Mazār-i Sharīf near Balkh in 1116/1704–05. The renewal of the damaged cupola was ordered by Muḥammad Muqīm Khān (d. 1707), who instructed a certain Khwāja Faqīrī Dīwān with the supervision of the construction work. This is described by Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī as follows: “In the year 1116 early in the morning, the architects of destiny rebuilt the foundation of the azure-colored cupola covered with tiles reflecting the celestial sphere with the treasure of the genuine morning and golden bricks. The architects of divine ability and will free its brilliant and well-shaped new moon with the rope of the

explanation could be that the rulers neglected cultural patronage because they lacked the resources or the interest to invest in building and reconstruction activities. Notable exceptions mentioned by the sources were the donations of the chief eunuchs in Bukhara during the time of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, and a large garden sponsored by Qutluq Bāy Dīwānbēgī in the time of Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī (r. 1759–85).⁴⁸⁷

Qutluq Bāy was one of the old attendants and intimates of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān. According to Ya'qūb, he was one of the ruler's slaves (*ghulām*).⁴⁸⁸ He served for a time as governor of Sang Furūsh and the adjacent area Tagāb-i Kish in Shahr-i Sabz. According to the *Tuḥfat*, he bore the title of *mihtar* and was responsible for the administration of this region including the collection of the harvest, which also implied the collection of revenues.⁴⁸⁹ At the end of Ramaẓān 1170/June 1757, he generously hosted the ruler and his troops by arranging a splendid *tūy* to celebrate 'īd-i *fiṭr*. After Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's arrival, he furnished colorful linen and other valuable fabrics but also Tūpchāq horses with jewel-embroidered reins.⁴⁹⁰ Later, in the time of Dānyāl Bī Atālīq, he acted as *dīwānbēgī* and held the rank of an "administrator of the government and the royal household."⁴⁹¹

In 1175/1761–62, Qutluq Bāy planned a residence and a large garden "full of all sorts of fruits, delicacies and flowers" for Dānyāl Bī's relaxation

bright star from the deficiency of distortion and unevenness. [...] Its cupola was rebuilt with utmost strength so that if the lion of the firmament should set his steps on its top, his belly would be torn by its tip of iron, and its height reached such a degree that if the eastern sun made its rays the noose of the bright meteor to bind them on the shape of the moon, they would be too short for the battlement of its fortune. And if the wings of imagination put their steps on the top of its turrets, their heads would vanish on the roof of the cupola" (Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī, *Tadhkira*, 323–24, 326–27).

⁴⁸⁷ Investigating the role of gardens in sixteenth-century Bukhara, McChesney points to the various meanings of gardens as displayed in the documents of the Jūybārī archive (Robert D. McChesney, "Some Observations on 'Garden' and Its Meanings in the Property Transactions of the Juybari Family in Bukhara, 1544–77," in *Gardens in the Time of the Great Muslim Empires. Theory and Design*, ed. Attilio Petruccioli (Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997), 97–109.

⁴⁸⁸ Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 6b; Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 354.

⁴⁸⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 259b, 276b. On Qutluq Bāy's appointment as governor of Shahr-i Sabz, see Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 354.

⁴⁹⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 277a.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 354a.

and for him to spend his time together with the “other *amīrs*, the pillars of government, the chiefs and the *sayyids* of the kingdom.” He personally selected a plot in the village of Fashūn at a distance of one *farsakh* from Bukhara and ordered the construction of a palace and spacious gardens “emulating the gardens of paradise.” The author of the *Tuhfat al-khānī* tells us that the construction work took more than seven years. The arrangement followed the classical *chahār bāgh* model with an enclosure and the garden space divided into four parts:⁴⁹²

“Fastening the girdle of effort, the carefully planning carpenters and skilled architects opened the hands of attention and were commissioned with the construction of this sublime edifice. The wise gardeners engaged in the supervision of the construction of this colorful and freshness spreading garden instructed the details observing farmers and the learned land surveyors to design rectangular, hexagonal and octagonal meadows with the rope for the measuring of straightness and to build equilateral basins and circular pools in the middle of every garden plot. For this garden they should erect the pavilions of the four valleys as the stages for pleasure and vantage points. After fixing the space of the meadows and the creation of grass plots and fields, they planned the enclosure on the expanded, elevated ground. Afterward, they planted all sorts of fruit trees and diverse kinds of ordinary trees, flowers and odoriferous herbs in the plots and rivulets. [In addition, the gardeners] spread out all kinds of tendrils of wine, shoots of fruit trees, and prosperous palms over the fields and terraces. The traders brought the seeds of all famous flowers growing in every region [of the world] and filled the margins of the garden. After seven years of work carried out under the supervision of the architects and the guardians, the work on the sublime pavilion (*kūshk-i ‘ālī*) came to an end. Harmonious flowers spread a bewitching aroma and the fragrance of delightful fruits reached the senses of smell of the desirous. About twenty thousand tendrils of different types of grapes were green and flourishing. Fifteen thousand trees were laden with plentiful fruits and about one hundred thousand *safīd-dār* trees (?) stretched out their branches in the surroundings of the *chahār bāgh*. Accordingly, the palace and the garden were put in writing in 1182 h. q./1769–70—the Year of the Mouse.”⁴⁹³

⁴⁹² Gardens had been constructed throughout the entire region since ancient times. Apart from the practical aspects and the pleasure they gave, royal gardens also incorporated political, philosophical and religious symbolism. From the Achaemenid period onward, the idea of a garden as the embodiment of the earthly paradise was very prominent in the sources. The form of the gardens frequently resembled a cross inscribed in a square by four axes with water basins and channels intersecting the gardens. For example, in the Timurid period the gardens in the environs of Samarqand formed a necklace around the city and proliferated at Herat (Mehrddad Fakour, “Garden i. Achaemenid,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X, 297–98; Lisa Golombek, “Garden ii. Islamic Period,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X, 298–305).

⁴⁹³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 357a–b.

Although the numbers of trees and plants given by the author may be exaggerated, the fact that he describes the construction of the *chahār bāgh* of Fāshūn in such detail shows the undiminished interest of the people in luxurious gardens. Such gardens were still in use and highly favored to receive and host guests, to entertain notables and provide a delightful ambience for negotiations and festivities. Furthermore, the descriptions of the chronicler regarding the flowers and trees give an insight into the tastes of the time. Flowers were valued as an object of pleasure and delight, as were aromatic fruits and fine grapes. In the previous chapter I have already described the *khwān* of benefits (*khwān-i ni'am*) lovingly decorated with all sorts of fruits. The traveler Khwāja 'Abd al-Karīm Kashmīrī, who accompanied Nādir Shāh on his campaign to Turkistan, also praised the exquisite fruits of Bukhara.⁴⁹⁴ The ruler and his associates liked the colorful flowerbeds and the aroma of ripe fruits, the shady trees and the murmuring of cool water in the small canals and pools.⁴⁹⁵

Another example of a garden modeled on the classical *chahār bāgh* is the garden of Khānābād built under 'Ubaidullah Khān in 1121/1709–10 in the western part of Bukhara near the Tal-i Pāch Gate. Describing the construction work in great detail, the king's chronicler devotes a long poem to the earthly pleasures connected with gardens and extols the different fruits like apples, apricots, peaches and grapes for their unique flavor and sweetness.⁴⁹⁶ With these acts of cultural patronage, the sponsors of gardens in Bukhara and the authors praising them for their ambience and abundance of fine fruits followed long-established traditions to be observed in other parts of the Islamic East like Iran or India. The Iranian author Rustam al-Ḥukamā, for example, gives a detailed description of the Hasht Bihisht (lit. Eight Paradises) constructed under Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusain.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁴ Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 73; Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 41.

⁴⁹⁵ There are numerous other examples of spacious gardens in the major cities of Transoxania. In the nineteenth century, Schuyler admired the beauty of the gardens of Samarqand, like the Bāgh-i dilgushā or the Bāgh-i maidān (Schuyler, *Turkistan*, I, 239–40). In spring 1121/1709, while en route to Samarqand, 'Ubaidullah Khān stopped for a rest at Panjshanba, where his men pitched the royal tent in the garden of the nearby Bāzār-i Qanbar Bī. This garden with an impressive number of fruit-bearing trees and cypresses was so delightful that the king spent three days with festivities there (Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol.145b; Semenov trans., 164–65).

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid., fols. 165a–170a; Russian text, 184–91.

⁴⁹⁷ Hoffmann, *Persische Geschichte*, 188–89.

CONCLUSION

From the sources explored it is evident that the offer and exchange of gifts formed a significant routine aspect of social life in mid-eighteenth-century Bukhara. The accounts are illustrative of the ethos of society that demanded gifts to be offered.⁴⁹⁸ Of course, the institution was not a unique phenomenon limited to the Transoxanian setting; it could be encountered in the Arab world, in Iran and in the Ottoman Empire,⁴⁹⁹ where it was regarded as a social rather than economic behavior.⁵⁰⁰ At a symbolic level, the exchange of gifts played a crucial role in confirming the continuity and validity of social relations. A look at the sources discussed substantiates Rosenthal's observation that "literature (in the narrow sense of the term) tells us more about gifts than it does about commercial transactions."⁵⁰¹

Presents were an important component of the social fabric and mostly obligatory. They formed an inseparable part of the mindset of the actors, who in many cases did not think about whether to offer a present or not, they just did it automatically. From the psychological and mental aspects of gifts it was only a short step to obvious and latent purposiveness, which was fully realized and recognized. Presents were highly admired, a fact mirrored by the unbroken interest of Muslim readers in generosity as a virtue of great merit. But they were also politically motivated, especially on the part of those holding a position of authority in the community. The higher the social standing of a person within the power structure, the more he was expected to dignify his status and secure his position by frequent manifestations of largesse.⁵⁰² In fact, we are dealing with a subtle topic, the gifts representing a complex mixture between altruism and ultimate charity on the one side, and self-interest on the other. Gifts were used to attain certain individual goals, to establish useful personal ties with more influential social superiors, to make them lenient, to "buy" peace or to prevent raids. Accordingly, and

⁴⁹⁸ Lambton, "Pishkash," 149, 158.

⁴⁹⁹ See here "Hiba (parts i.–v. by several authors)," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., III, 342–50; Rudi P. Matthee, "Gift Giving iv. In the Safavid Period," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, X, 609–14; Lambton, "Pishkash: Present or Tribute?" 145–58; Reindl-Kiel, "Luxury," 107–20; Reindl-Kiel, "Der Duft der Macht," 195–258.

⁵⁰⁰ Anthony Cutler, "Gifts and Gift Exchange as Aspects of the Byzantine, Arab, and Related Economies," in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55 (2001): 248.

⁵⁰¹ F. Rosenthal, "Hiba," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., III, 342.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, 343.

similar to other geographical contexts, the various forms of gift exchange coincided with tribute, taxation, charity and commerce.⁵⁰³

Although presents were used to further individual aspirations, the gift giving cannot be reduced to blunt expectations and market behavior driven by utilitarian notions. Gifts were exchanged for the sake of the exchange itself. They were admired *and* desired.

As in other areas of the Islamic world and in other periods of its history, in the Transoxanian setting the giving of gifts was viewed as an institution contributing to the establishment of better personal and communal relationships. Acts of gift exchange signaled attention and affection and were vivid expressions of mutuality and solicitude. From the viewpoint of inferior actors, there were numerous occasions for gift giving: first, when rebels and disobedient tribes surrendered, second, on the occasion of salutation and homage, and third, on the return from military expeditions when notables and government officials welcomed their masters. Gifts were made in return for first-hand gifts at the end of the *kūrnish* and other acts of submission, at banquets, or before and after military expeditions—in short, in all situations where loyalties had to be confirmed.

It needs to be mentioned that the exchange occurred not only between individuals but also between groups that were mutually committed to each other.⁵⁰⁴ Many of the results discussed in this chapter correspond to the insights of Mauss. The objects of exchange were not exclusively utilitarian or commercial commodities but first and foremost courtesies, festivities, status symbols, military services and so on. The commercial aspect and the circulation of objects constitute here only one dimension of a more general social phenomenon. Most acts of gift giving took place voluntarily, though they were in fact obligatory.⁵⁰⁵ Against this backdrop, it becomes wholly understandable why the writers often neglected the precise nature of the gifts. What counted more was the standard procedure and the fact that the gifts helped create links between individuals. In contrast to a transactionalist understanding, according to which transacting as one should dissolves the obligations that link the parties, in eighteenth-century Bukhara the mutual obligations were never dissolved. This is best expressed by the high frequency of standardized and uniform gift giving, which seems to have had

⁵⁰³ “Gift Giving i. Introduction,” 605.

⁵⁰⁴ Mauss, *The Gift*, 3; Mauss, *Soziologie und Anthropologie* II, 15–16.

⁵⁰⁵ Mauss, *Soziologie und Anthropologie* II, 16.

a permanent character. This is not to say that the reception of presents was free of expectations and assessment of their economic value. In most instances the historian reads about presents worthy of or fitting their recipients, and passed under the alchemical eyes of the ruler, a statement indicating the evaluation of their “hard” but also their soft “social” value. In a few cases, the chroniclers even allude to the value of the gifts in cash, as a sign of the giver’s generosity.⁵⁰⁶ The morality of the exchange lies in the emotional and social value attached to the objects. This is underlined by the extraordinary richness of synonyms for generosity in general and presents in particular. Generosity and hospitality were also perceived as religious values, generous behavior was highly agreeable to God. As a virtue it applied not only to an ideal monarch but also to common people, as the example of Jāwush Bāy shows. Accordingly, an episode where munificence was displayed serves as an anchor for the chroniclers to explain the rise of the Manghit, which was linked to common notions of divine predestination legitimizing the new dynasty.

Generosity was an important characteristic ascribed to potential patrons, the most prominent example of whom is Jāwush Bāy, the ancestor of the future Manghit rulers. He always had the tablecloth of benefits (*khwān-i ni‘mat*) prepared to host people in need. In many cases, the *amīrs* are styled *walī-ni‘mī*.⁵⁰⁷ Linked to benefits (*ni‘ma/ni‘mat*), which contrasted with gratitude (*shukr*), this term appears to be a corruption of *walī al-ni‘am* or *wali-yi ni‘mat* (lit. “the lord of beneficence” or simply “benefactor”).⁵⁰⁸ The title of *walī-ni‘mī* has a long history. Paul detected it in documents and other written sources from the Samanid, Ghaznavid and Saljuq periods.⁵⁰⁹ The fact that the title survived until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries underlines

⁵⁰⁶ Comparing the Byzantine with the Ghaznavid example, Cutler states that both societies operated on the basis of a clear-headed and quantified evaluation of presents. Comparable measures were taken in Abbasid Baghdad. “Arriving on the backs of 500 animals, the Buwayhid prince’s gift was analyzed to the point where even the ‘silvery loops’ sealing the ten embroidered bags containing 50,000 Ammāni dinars were observed, as well as ‘500 garments varying in quality from the royal brocade costing 200 *dīnārs* to the simple white garment, the dyeing of which costs half a *dīnār*” (Cutler, “Gift and Gift Exchange,” 258).

⁵⁰⁷ Ya‘qūb, *Tārīkh*, fols. 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b passim; Muḥammad Amīn, *Maḥzar*, fols. 3b, 43b–47b; Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I, 353, 355, 363, 364, 369, 370, 377, 380–85 passim; II, 10–12, 19–20, 22–25, 27–28, 31 passim.

⁵⁰⁸ Bregel, *Administration*, 11, footnote no. 42. See also Beisembiev, *Ta’rikh-i shahrukhi*, 68.

⁵⁰⁹ Paul, *Herrscher, Gemeinwesen, Vermittler*, 163–64.

the longevity of patronage structures. A case in point were the Kīnakās *amīrs* of early eighteenth-century Shahr-i Sabz, who were generally designated in this way in the Khoqandian source *Ta'riḫ-i shāhrukhi*.⁵¹⁰ It is remarkable that Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī is called a benefactor (*walī-ni 'mā*) in Ya'qūb's *Tārīḫ-i salāṭīn-i Manghit*.⁵¹¹ In Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān's *Muntakhab al-tawārīḫ*, most of the Uzbek *amīrs* are also designated *walī-ni 'mī*.

Apart from a few cases, we gain little information on the nature of the objects, particularly with regard to presents given by inferiors to superiors. This lack of information may be due to the normalcy of gift giving; the chroniclers did not see any reason to give details about the presents offered as first-hand gifts by inferiors. In general, robes of honor, horses, bejeweled saddles and bridles, but also weapons (daggers, swords or sabers) were valued as status objects and therefore frequently exchanged. In some cases even slaves were presented as gifts.⁵¹² The chronicles also give some interesting insights into the tastes of that time and aesthetic notions. The objects of exchange, both material and immaterial, are the source of aesthetic emotions as well as emotions aroused by interest.⁵¹³ Beautiful fabrics like velvet, brocade or purple silk as well as woolen cloths were highly appreciated. In addition, the authors place emphasis on the sweetmeats and the drinks served at banquets. They say that these dishes and drinks were as sweet as honey. We also see the gifting of money especially by superiors, which was then distributed among their followers. Some of the passages I explored show that most of the actors obviously had no problem with further distributing gifts they had received before from other men. This and the fact that gift exchange figures as a recurrent theme in the narratives supports the conclusion that a great number of goods permanently circulated within the society.

⁵¹⁰ Beisembiev, *Ta'riḫ*, 71.

⁵¹¹ Bregel, *Administration*, 11, footnote no. 42; Beisembiev, *Ta'riḫ*, 68.

⁵¹² Philipp Effremov, who in the middle of the 1780s was captured by Qazāq tribesmen near Orenburg and subsequently brought as a slave to one of the slave marts of Central Asia, reports how he was first purchased by a certain Khwāja Ghafūr. But he only remained one month with his owner, who delivered Effremov as a present to his father-in-law Dānyāl Bī Atālīq (Effremov, *Devjatiletnee*, 19–21). Khwāja Ghafūr was an influential Sayyid Atā'ī sheikh who also performed military duties in the Bukharan army. Qāzī Wafā mentions him in the context of a punitive expedition against the Turkmen in Jumāda I 1176/November–December 1762 (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 358b–359a).

⁵¹³ See also Mauss, *The Gift*, 77.

Up to this point, we have seen the impact of power relations in the fields of patronage—here from the perspective of the patrons and the clients—and gift exchange. These were, of course, closely linked to each other, and sometimes it is difficult to differentiate between conventional provision of resources by patrons and clients on the one side and gift giving on the other. In the following section I will look into patterns of mediation, which were likewise interwoven with patronage.

MEDIATION AND BROKERAGE

Since patron-client relations are strongly connected with mediation, this subchapter is devoted to patterns of brokerage such as can be gleaned from our sources. The first section deals with numerous examples of intercession in a range of local settings. The main emphasis here will be on a dense description of mediation procedures and the role of particular middlemen. In the second section I will shed light on the role of local mediators acting at village level, which is not so easy to discover in the court chronicles; a fact leading me to more fragmentary accounts and small pieces of information in the overall puzzle of locally defined power relations. In the third section I will investigate the role of religious dignitaries and their position between earthly creatures and the realm of the supernatural. Here the emphasis will be on *īshāns* and *khwājas* and their role as mediators in worldly affairs like local conflicts as well as their dominating position as beneficiaries of court patronage. A second strand revolves around them as facilitators of a channel to God. Furthermore, I intend to focus on the role of saints and the importance of local shrines in achieving certain things. Afterward, I will concentrate on one particular group of middlemen: the Manghit *amīrs* and their strategies as social entrepreneurs. Since their relationship with the Iranian emperor Nādir Shāh runs like a recurrent theme through the chronicles, I will endeavor to establish a more coherent and conclusive picture of mediation procedures as an example of the exercise of authority. Quoting one example from the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, the fifth section explores the dynamics surrounding an attempt by Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān to mediate in a local conflict in Khwārazm, while the sixth section pays attention to the special characteristics of middlemen.

TASHAFU' AND TAWASSUL: INTERCESSION AND FORGING CONNECTIONS

The early Manghit chronicles often describe the element of *tashafu'* and *shafā'at*—intercession.⁵¹⁴ Accordingly, the mediator interceding on behalf of his protégés is designated a *shafī'*. Our sources describe instances when those in need of protection called for a *shafī'* to be sent from the royal court to put in a good word for them in critical situations, such as during wars, sieges or violent combats—altogether conflicts and disputes.

When the Bukharan troops besieged the Sarāy in spring and early summer 1164/1751, the local Sarāy leader Paqīṣd enlisted the aid of Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz, who gathered his supporters and other allies like Fāzil Bī, the ruler of Ūrā Tippa. Upon their arrival near Khuzār, they sent messengers to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and stated:

“[...] although the punishment of the small people is great, the pardon of the big people is absolutely immense, we have not come from Hiṣār for war but for intercession (*jihat-i shafā'at*) on behalf of the wicked mischief-makers of Khuzār. Thus, one must see the countenance of rectitude in the mirror of devotion and lend an ear to the offers [of submission]. One should grant a robe of forgiveness to Pāqīṣd, the son of Jūja Sarāy.”⁵¹⁵

In spite of the fact that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī did not lend an ear to the request of the envoys because he realized that they read the “tale of deceit and the fable of sorcery,” this episode gives a good insight into the dynamics of intercession. The Bukharan troops set out for their campaign on the advice of the Kīnakās leaders, who were actually part of a broader coalition including Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz and the local Sarāy renegades in Khuzār. Facing a massive military expedition of Bukharan troops, they soon submitted and diverted Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's attention to Khuzār.⁵¹⁶ The besieged Khuzārīs pleaded with their ally Muḥammad Amīn Bī for help when the Manghit leader instructed his men to change the course of the major irrigation channel of the area. According to Wafā, the populace sent for a protector when they ran out of water.⁵¹⁷ A bit later the same year, the Kīnakās leadership of Shahr-i Sabz faced a similar situation. Confronted with a punitive campaign by Manghit supporters, they summoned Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī to intercede. It was hence the brother of the *atālīq*

⁵¹⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 155b, 184a, 189a, 196a, 273b, 306b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 377b, 416a, 540a passim.

⁵¹⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 184a.

⁵¹⁶ Ibid., fol. 180a.

⁵¹⁷ Ibid., fol. 183a.

who brought Muḥammad Amīn Bēg, the son of Subḥān Qulī Bī Kīnakās, to the court, where “the noble *amīr* opened the eyes of mercy to his promotion and made him fortunate by granting favors.”⁵¹⁸ But this step did not prevent Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī from dispatching his troops again to Shahr-i Sabz. The campaign started on Shawwāl 23, 1164/September 13–14, 1751,⁵¹⁹ and led to the final submission of the Kīnakās leaders shortly thereafter. On this occasion, ‘Ālim Bī Kīnakās sent a message to the *amīr* suggesting:

“Our desperate situation is obvious and clear to the fortunate *amīr*. To put the steps of bravery onto the edge of the splendid carpet without an intercessor would be regarded as going off and departing from the path of politeness. Our request is connected with friendship and we appeal to the praiseworthy characteristics of the auspicious *amīr* to summon his respected brother Yūqāshī Bī from Nasaf. He must send him for the consolidation of the oath, for the confirmation of friendship and the compact to us astonished people. We shall dispose of all confusion of mind, which is the dust of the thoughts and the knot in the conscience of his excellence, with consultations (*mashwarat*) [...] Afterward we will put the hand of devotion on the hem of this manifestation of the Creator’s favor [...]”⁵²⁰

Another term that the reader often comes across is *tawassul* (توسل), closely linked to *wasīla*—whatever or whoever gains the favor of a superior person and facilitates the access to somebody higher in the social hierarchy. This concept can be traced to pre-Mongol times. According to Paul, in Samanid, Ghaznavid and Saljuq times, it was very common to approach somebody who could help in getting access to another person.⁵²¹ Indirect access was often facilitated through letters of recommendation (*sipārish*). The authors of such documents asked the recipient for help in gaining access to a third person, who was very seldom the ruler. Other instances of intercession can be found in cases similar to that of the Kīnakās leader who was out of favor. For example, a defeated provincial potentate requests the help of a commander, who was actually a slave, to bring his case before the ruler.⁵²²

Describing the same situation as Qāzī Wafā—the subjugation of the Kīnakās in 1751—the author of the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* writes that ‘Ālim Bī Kīnakās told the *atālīq* he did not dare come to the royal court without

⁵¹⁸ Ibid., fol. 189b.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., fol. 192.

⁵²⁰ Ibid., fol. 194a.

⁵²¹ Paul, *Herrscher*, 165–66, 170.

⁵²² Ibid., 165–66.

resorting to somebody for help and intercession (*bī tawassul wa tashafu*).⁵²³ The episode sheds light on the problematic nature of instrumental behavior. If we believe Qāzī Wafā and his protagonists, in this case the Kīnakās chiefs, the demand for a middleman was not only a question of protection and physical survival or a means of de-escalation. Paying homage and submitting to the king in the presence of an intermediary, who put in a good word for his protégés, was a matter of politeness and etiquette. It was regarded as normal, and appearing at the royal camp without an intercessor would have been a serious breach of the protocol. The Kīnakās leader further mentioned the need for consultations (*mashwarat*) and a consolidation of his oath of fidelity including the relationship with the court. Similar to Dānyāl Bī, who was requested as an intercessor earlier that year, Yūqāshī Bī facilitated the contact between the local leadership and his brother.

What then follows in our chronicle is the description of a long negotiation process involving a lot of giving and taking between the different actors. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī instructed his troops to erect the camp and ordered them to avoid destruction of the plots and the harvest in the region. When the Kīnakās once again sent a messenger saying words of politeness and consent, “the blossoms of joy and gladness flourished on the meadow of desires ... and he [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī] scattered the drops of kindness and promotion from the source of favor and mercy.”⁵²⁴ After his arrival at Shahr-i Sabz, Yūqāshī Bī entered into negotiations with his brother Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, who “spread out the *khwān* of consultations” to instruct him with the negotiations with ‘Ālim Bī. Receiving the message about Yūqāshī Bī’s arrival, the Kīnakās chief

“spread ou the carpet of fortune and cheerfulness. Being happy and rejoicing to meet the *amīr*, all the chiefs of the Kīnakās tribe (*tamām-i ru’sā-yi qabīla-yi Kīnakās*) and the populace of Sang Furūsh offered gifts and presents.”⁵²⁵

After the welcoming ceremony, ‘Ālim Bī expressed his loyalty to the Bukharan *atālīq* while informing him of his immense fears and concerns about Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s attitude. In the same breath “he requested repose from the prevalence of mercy and the source of confidence [Yūqāshī Bī] and directed the royal *amīr* toward the plea on his behalf.” Furthermore,

⁵²³ ... بی توسل و تشفع جرأت را ندارم که روی ارادت بسوی در بار امجد الاساطین گذارم (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 377b).

⁵²⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 195a.

⁵²⁵ Ibid., fols. 195b–196a.

he insisted on Yūqāshī Bī's mediation (*wisāṭat*) regarding the possession of Sang Furūsh and the village of Kitāb. When he gained information about the demands, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī generously "drew the line of acceptance on the page of favors," bestowed a horse and a robe of honor on 'Ālim Bī and granted him a diploma (*manshūr*) about the possession of Kitāb and Sang Furūsh. Finally, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī received his saluting troops and the tribal leaders who were led by Yūqāshī Bī and 'Ālim Bī. The whole procedure ended with a final banquet in the Āq Sarāy of Shahr-i Sabz.⁵²⁶

The episode demonstrates that a mediator was needed for several reasons: first, because of fear and concerns with respect to one's own security and protection; second, to negotiate personal demands and the distribution of resources (land, offices, titles, status, reputation, personal proximity to the ruler); and third, to bring about peace and a reconciliation with a third party, in this example the court. The middleman brokered a new alliance between the local leadership and the ruler. Finally, he facilitated the return of the regretful rebels to the court by accompanying them to the *kūrnish* and providing a communication channel to the ruler. Yet although this story illustrates that relatives of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī acted as intercessors, the circle of potential middlemen was apparently much wider. One of those frequently performing as a mediator was Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī, a Persian slave who served Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī and later also his son. In Dhū'l-Qa'da 1162/October–November 1749, the Sālūr Turkmen inhabiting the surroundings of the *qal'a* of Yāschī rose in rebellion. When Manghit troops encroached upon Yāschī, they learned that the inhabitants of that area were dissatisfied with the rebellion.

"They demanded that the fortunate *amīr* should dispatch Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī to foster the security and the hopes of the destitute because the good words of this 'Trust of Fortune' are accepted by the people, so that the dust of dread and anxiety will be washed from the face of the time and fortune afflicted subjects with the help of his good merits."⁵²⁷

According to Qāzī Wafā, the *amīr* reacted to the request of the populace and sent the *dīwānbēgī* to Yāschī in order to act on behalf of the people.

⁵²⁶ Ibid., fols. 196a–197a.

⁵²⁷ Ibid., fol. 161b.

Meanwhile, the troops encamped near the settlement did not interfere in the internal affairs of the populace.⁵²⁸

Qāzī Wafā gives a detailed account of another episode occurring in 1161/1748. On Jumāda I 22, 1161/May 19, 1748, the Bukharan troops had set out on a futile attempt to conquer the town of Nūr, located at the northwestern edge of the Miyānkāl. After their withdrawal, they imposed a blockade on the Burqūt and interrupted the traffic between the capital and Nūr.⁵²⁹ By late 1163/1750, the population of Nūr was on the verge of desperation because of the poverty and lack of resources. In this situation, Tughāy Murād Bī resorted to consultations with the other leaders of his tribe. Finally, he decided to submit and dispatched a group of “trustworthy men who knew about the minute details” to the court. On their arrival, “they requested the sign of forgiveness to be drawn on the pages of their mistakes.”⁵³⁰ The *amīr* reacted promptly and sent a certain Jānī Bēg Yasāwulbāshī to take care of the affairs of the Burqūt and to lift the blockade. Upon his return, Jānī Bēg delivered a message from Tughāy Murād Bī with a request that the *amīr* should send the *dīwānbēgī* to consolidate the agreement. On his arrival at Nūr, the latter met the Burqūt chiefs and “clothed their stature of submission and obedience with the favors of help and opened the gates of joy and gladness for this tribe.” When the “covenant of sincerity and consent” was concluded, Muḥammad Daulat returned to the Bukharan court with numerous gifts. He reported that Tughāy Murād Bī wanted to stay at Nūr until he had made up for his disloyalty.⁵³¹

In the cases discussed, the principle of negotiating peaceful settlements of disputes or a sharing of power between the ruler and the local leadership is a dominant element of the narrative. Resorting to consultations in order to reach a compromise or establish a state of harmony was obviously one of the high virtues needed to maintain the order of things. The author of the *Maṣḥar al-aḥwāl*, for instance, devotes an entire chapter to the necessity of consultations (*mashwarat*), stating that his master always observed this principle in dealing with the affairs of the people. He also refers to a

⁵²⁸ In the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* we are informed about the trickery of the local people who attacked the *dīwānbēgī* upon his arrival at Yāschī. Muḥammad Daulat broke off his mission and escaped (ibid., fols. 161b–162a).

⁵²⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 144b–145b.

⁵³⁰ Ibid., fol. 165a.

⁵³¹ Ibid., fols. 165b–166b.

prophetic tale, according to which God instructed the Prophet to resort to consultations in any case, even though he was much wiser than the population. In the same breath Muḥammad Amīn attributes proper conduct to the principle of *mashwarat*.⁵³²

Intercession and mediation came to bear significance in an environment influenced by permanent armed violence and conflict situations. For example, when the supporters of Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz entered the town of Dehnau on Ramaẓān 22, 1171/May 29, 1758, a complicated situation ensued with local Ghalcha, Qalpāq and Turkomān Yūzī troops besieging the city *arg* of Dehnau, while being simultaneously attacked by Bukharan troops who laid siege to the city wall.⁵³³ When Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's army gained the upper hand, the leaders of the rebellious tribes offered submission and enlisted the help of the senior judge, Mīr Niẓām al-Dīn Ḥusainī. Finally, some nobles serving in the royal army went to the city wall and pledged them to the agreement with the ruler. However, their submission came far too late: Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān ordered the execution of the mischief-makers.⁵³⁴

The sources report other cases of failed mediation. In 1747 Qābil Kīnakās approached the other Uzbek *amīrs* in Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's retinue to help save his life through the means of intercession. Although the *amīrs* gave this plea for help their consideration, Muḥammad Raḥīm got in ahead by putting the supplicant to death.⁵³⁵ Another interesting case of *tashafu* ' is described in the *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān*. The author of this source explains how the eunuch Khwāja Daulat Sarāyi and a certain Jaushan Qalmāq were accused of having instigated a plot against 'Ubaidullah Khān in winter 1711. While in the case of the eunuch the accusations were unjustified, the ruler's mother pleaded successfully on behalf of Jaushan Qalmāq for reasons that are not explained in the source.⁵³⁶

⁵³² Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhar*, fol. 26a.

⁵³³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 297b–307a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 412a–416b.

⁵³⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 307a–b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 416b.

⁵³⁵ ... دست توسل و التجا باذیال امرا زده نجات و جان بخشی خویش را از خدمت امیر جلالت کیش بوسیله تشفع آنها (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 305b).

⁵³⁶ القصه خواجه بیچاره را زنجیر افکندند بعد از یک هفته بی گناهی او به حضرت معلوم گردیده از عواطف (Tāli', *Tārīkh*, fols. 5b–6a; Semenov trans., 17).

VILLAGE ELDERS: FRAGMENTS FROM THE SOURCES

Apart from a very few instances, the chronicles do not furnish much information with regard to local elders and representatives such as village headmen, elders and other intermediaries. The data that can be gleaned from the sources permits at best a limited insight into patterns of representation or brokerage at local level, a fact that indicates the far-reaching autonomy enjoyed by the hinterland of Bukhara most of the time. In the majority of the cases to be discussed here, local elders—the “whitebeards” (*āqsaqāls*, *mū-safīd*, *rīshsafīd*) and village headmen (*kadkhudās*, *arbāb*)—come into play as the interlocutors of the rulers and the commanders of the royal troops, especially in the aftermath of sieges or military campaigns. Another category of intermediaries were urban notables, who were commonly described as *kalānān*, *akābir wa a ‘yān* or *ashrāf wa a ‘yān*.

Kāẓim, for example, describes how local elders and village headmen voluntarily surrendered to Rizā Qulī Mīrzā, who had invaded the mountain areas north of Tirmidh in late summer 1737. According to him, the *rīshsafīds* and *kadkhudās* collected gifts, went to the Iranian camp and formally succumbed. Then they sent a message to Dānyāl Bēg, the leader of the Qungrāt, requesting his immediate surrender, otherwise he would have to bear the consequences and even annihilation. Dānyāl Bēg reacted promptly by submitting together with his elders. Subsequently, “he was newly confirmed as the leader of his tribe.”⁵³⁷

A similar procedure can be discerned during the conquest of Balkh a bit earlier the same year. ‘Atā Bēg, the governor of Shibarghān, and his whitebeards and other tribal leaders (*rīshsafīdān wa sar-khailān*) collected presents to formally surrender to the Iranian prince. In return they were rewarded with robes of honor and royal solicitude. When the Qizilbāsh started to besiege Balkh, a group of urban nobles and elders created a fait accompli by approaching the Iranian prince and offering surrender even before the last Chingizid ruler Abū’l-Ḥasan Khān succumbed.⁵³⁸ Kāẓim describes the situation after the conquest of Balkh as follows:

“[...] the new lords took care of the well-being of the inhabitants and the economy. The craftsmen and sellers of cloths and fine material came to be relieved [of all worries], and sitting down, enjoyed the repose in their shops and cared for their uprightness. Coming

⁵³⁷ Kāẓim, *‘Ālamārā*, II, 584–85.

⁵³⁸ *Ibid.*, 576, 578–79.

from the dependencies and environs [of Balkh], the village headmen, elders and local chiefs (*kadkhudāyān*, *rīshsafīdān*, *arbābān wa zābiṭān*) saluted the prince in the royal camp.”⁵³⁹

The events explained here show that most of the local notables and elders submitted voluntarily to the new rulers of Balkh. Furthermore, we gain a fairly good insight into the dynamics ensuing from the interplay between the local leadership and the superior Iranian invaders. The usual negotiations began when local elders and urban notables offered their allegiance to Riṣā Qulī Mīrṣā. We are dealing here with a kind of interface between the local populations and the invaders that took shape according to the principle of reciprocity. Two sides were engaged in meetings and negotiations: the outside forces and commanders, and a stratum of mediators speaking on behalf of a range of clients and dependent persons in need of protection. The elders surrendered and acknowledged the superiority of the Iranians, while being confirmed in their positions as representatives of the populace that was not present here.

Similar patterns of surrender and the simultaneous giving of gifts are often described by Bukharan sources. In light of the overwhelming superiority and military strength displayed by Bukharan troops during their campaign against the Yetī Ūrūgh in Miyānkāl in Safar 1160–Rabīʿ II 1161/February–April 1747, the Yetī Ūrūgh chief Ghaibullah Bī Bahrīn dispatched a group of “people knowing about the details” (*mardum-i khwūrda-dān*) to prepare the ground for a submission.⁵⁴⁰ In Jumāda I 1166/March–April 1753, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī launched a campaign against the mountain areas east of Samarqand. After the conquest of Ūrgūt by royal troops on Jumāda I 20, 1166/March 25, 1753, and the subsequent resettlement of a part of the local population, “the *āqsaqāls* of the people of Shing and Māghiyān fell into the source of anxiety through the trumpet of ferocity” and succumbed voluntarily.⁵⁴¹ But nevertheless, Muḥammad Raḥīm’s troops caused immense havoc in the neighboring valley of Gshtut just a few days later, whereupon the local *qāzī* of Gshtut “received the honor

⁵³⁹ Ibid., 579.

⁵⁴⁰ چون از خوف تسلط و مهابت دولت خورشید منزلت امیر با اقتدار زلزله اضطراب در ارکان بنای حصار خطرچی و دیگر قلاع راه یافت غیب الله بی با مردم یتی اوروغ و بهرین کینگاش نموده و چنان قرار دادند که قطع مواصلت را به سر رشته مصالحت مربوط سازند و چندی از مردم خورده دان با تدبیر را مصاحب سورین و هدایا بدربار (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 135b–136a).

⁵⁴¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 213a–b.

of the royal *kūrnish*” together with the *mālik* of Falghar.⁵⁴² The *atālīq* showed his appreciation by appointing the *qāzī* judge of the four mountain valleys (*qazā-yi chārpāra-yi kūhistān*).⁵⁴³

It is worth mentioning that in the overwhelming majority of cases, village elders and urban notables do not seem important enough to be named by the court chroniclers. Local elders do not usually figure as individuals in the texts. We learn neither their names nor which positions they occupied within the local setting. Āl Muḥammad, Namāy Qul and Tābkat are exceptions in this respect. Although they are not explicitly mentioned as *āqsaqāls* or *kadkhudās* by Qāzī Wafā, they in fact acted as local mediators and protectors. Traversing the area of Qūshchī and Nauqad on Muḥarram 25, 1164/December 24, 1750, Manghit troops stopped at the village of Shikar Tarī (?). Āl Muḥammad and his colleagues then instructed their sons to pay homage to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and to deliver illustrious gifts.⁵⁴⁴

Apart from in this context of intercession characterized by submission and gift giving, local elders seldom appear in the accounts. One interesting example is furnished by Kāzīm, reporting about the looting campaigns of ‘Ibādullah Khiṭā’ī in early 1746. According to him, Abū’l-Faiḡ Khān dispatched troops to the Miyānkāl several times to bring the troublemaker to heel. When all the Bukharan army’s efforts turned out to be of no avail, the *rīshsafīds* and *kadkhudās* of the region intervened and negotiated a compromise in order to break the stalemate. Unfortunately, the agreement by which Samarqand and the central parts of the Zarafshān Valley were transferred to ‘Ibādullah did not prevent the Khiṭā’ī from conducting further plundering expeditions.⁵⁴⁵ Although mediation took place according to the standard procedure, it did not determine the outcome in this particular case. The situation remained as strained as before the peace talks and there was still a wide range of options for the actors, who were not bound to the result of the decision making.

Another interesting case is reported by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭālī’, the court chronicler of Abū’l-Faiḡ Khān. When Bukharan troops besieged the important town of Uzūlashkent near Karmīna, the elders and other wise

⁵⁴² The reeves of the small mountain valleys between Ḥiṣār and Qarāteḡin are called *māliks* in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* (ibid., fols. 216a, 284a).

⁵⁴³ Ibid., fol. 216a.

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid., fol. 175b.

⁵⁴⁵ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 1101–02.

people visited the troop commanders, who ordered the *khān* (*khwān*) of benefits to be spread out and food and fine sauces to be served. Others like Ḥājī ‘Abd al-Fatāḥ Dīwānbēgī provided pomegranates, further unspecified benefits (*ni‘mat*), fine juices and also sweets, valuable brocade and robes of honor.⁵⁴⁶ This shows that not only the act of mediation as such was of importance but also a nice atmosphere and a relaxed mood, which was apparently achieved by serving delicious food and offering valuable gifts.

Elders and urban notables usually welcomed the ruler after military campaigns. In most cases, a delegation of notables left the capital and received the king on his way. On such occasions, they also offered valuable gifts to please his heart.⁵⁴⁷ It was very seldom that urban notables were ordered to accompany the ruler on a campaign.⁵⁴⁸

The incidents described by the sources reveal the importance of mediation and brokerage even at local level. Here, elders frequently come into play, though they do not figure as individuals. Negotiations were important especially in the aftermath of sieges or campaigns. Both sides then had the option to make arrangements and to satisfy their interests. Reciprocity was crucial for both. While the conquerors or government agents had specific interlocutors to settle local affairs, the elders strengthened their own authority through the contact with their social superiors. In the following section, I will shed light on a special group of mediators, religious dignitaries and descendants of the Prophet.

RELIGIOUS NOBLES AS INTERMEDIARIES

In the sources God is generally viewed as the highest protector. Local saints as well as members of the religious establishment were therefore often requested to render assistance in worldly affairs. This is reflected in the manifold activities of Sufī brotherhoods, such as the Yasawīya or the Naqshbandīya, and a long-established tradition of visits to shrines and influential living sheikhs. This section is concerned with those who connected earthly creatures to the superhuman protector. For our purposes it makes sense to distinguish between saints whose graves and shrines were visited by the population and the rulers alike to enlist the help of God, on the

⁵⁴⁶ Tāli‘, *Tārīkh*, fols. 63a–b; Semenov trans., 84–85.

⁵⁴⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 60b, 61b, 179a–b, 197b, 279b, 286a passim.

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, fols. 192a, 200b.

one hand, and local *īshāns* and *khwājas* offering religious advice and guidance to their disciples on the other.

The first-hand resources of power at the disposal of *īshāns* and *khwājas* were religious knowledge and the high reputation they enjoyed in court circles and among the population:

“The essence of mankind and the purity of the family of the *īshāns*, the descendants of those having genealogy and lineage are the intrepid heroes in the arena of the *ṭarīqat*, the kings in the domains of the *sharīʿat* and the governors of the city [offering] insight into divine matters and mysteries. Every one of them has gained a seat in the court of spirituality and become the head of the legions of Islam. The outward appearance and inward qualities of these stars appearing as an example to be followed and being directed in the right way are adorned with the ornaments of exalting trumpets and embellished with the jewels of mystical meanings. It is obligatory to respect and honor this group, the members of this family and all those people who put the steps of submission into the circle of Islam.”⁵⁴⁹

This explanation proves that much of the prestige of religious scholars and dignitaries rested on descent from the Prophet. Endowed with pedigrees and a Prophetic lineage, *sayyids* were also esteemed as specialists in religious knowledge. These were the men who taught others and gave insights into spiritual wisdom. As intermediaries helping to obtain the assistance of the saints and the Almighty, they guided those who sought a mystical union with God on the divine steps of the spiritual path (*ṭarīqat*).

Ordinary people as well as the rulers also looked to dead saints for protection and therefore often paid visits to local shrines and tombs, which functioned as nodes and foci within a wider network of holy sites. In the accounts, the tomb of Khwāja Naqshband (1318–89) is the main destination for many Uzbek contingents joining the ruler on his campaigns. Not only the commander-in-chief and his entourage but also his warriors took the opportunity to visit the mausoleum and to solicit the help of the saint for the next voluntary encounters.⁵⁵⁰ Prior to an expedition against the Kīnakās in

⁵⁴⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 261.

⁵⁵⁰ Khwāja Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqshband is described as the seventh in a series of Central Asian masters of Sufism (*khwājagān*), which was established by Abū Yūsuf Hamadānī (d. 534/1140). Soon after his birth in Muḥarram 734/March 1318 in Qaṣr-i Hindūwān near Bukhara, Bahāʾ al-Dīn was adopted as a foster son (*farzand*) by Khwāja Muḥammad Sammāsī, a descendant of Hamadānī in the fifth generation. After having a vision in which ʿAbd al-Khālīq Ghijduwānī (d. 617/1220) enjoined the practice of the silent *dhikr*, he began to comply with this order. Later the sheikh spent several months in the company

spring 1164/1751, for instance, Muḥammad Raḥīm and his troops went to the mausoleum on Rabīʿ II 9, 1164/March 8–9. Entering it,

“the fortunate *amīr* bowed the brow of obedience and submission to show devotion and indigence in order to request strength and ability from the blessings of this jewel in the sea of secrets. He generously donated gifts to that sublime threshold by giving *nudhūr*, *ṣadaqāt* and other presents for the consideration of his claims. [Subsequently], the army of the heavenly pace came to move from this *qibla* of hopes and desires.”⁵⁵¹

The troops usually stayed overnight near the shrine, where Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī donated alms to the deserving,⁵⁵² an act that fitted the image of a king caring for the well-being of the poor.

Providing a link to the divine Creator, the saint and his *rauza* were frequented by all those who enlisted his help in solving problems or coping with trials. Tāliʿ reports about an amirid conspiracy hatched by Ibrāhīm Bī and Khwāja Qulī Bī in 1131/1719. The two *amīrs* had received the order to put down the rebellion of Farhād Bī in the eastern parts of Transoxania. But instead of launching an offensive against the Khitāʾī-Qipchāq, they went directly to the tomb of Khwāja Bahāʾ al-Dīn, where they remained for approximately two months to cook up their plans.⁵⁵³ Mullā Sharīf goes even further, saying that the conspirators “left Bukhara and made the tomb of Khwāja Naqshband, the *murshid* of high nature and intimate of God, their resting place” in order to solicit the aid of the saint for the “attainment of their vicious claims and desires.”⁵⁵⁴

of Maulāna ʿĀrif Dīggarānī and perfected the technique of the silent *dhikr*. Bahāʾ al-Dīn remained in the vicinity of Bukhara where he spent his life training disciples. He died on Rabīʿ I 3, 791/March 2, 1389, and was buried at Qaṣr-i ʿĀrifān. He became not only the founder of the *khwājagān*, the later Naqshbandīya, but also the patron saint of Bukhara, where he was known as the “Averter of Disaster” (*khwāja-yi balā-gardān*) (see Algar, “Naqshband,” 933–34). According to Jaworskij, most of the Bukharans reckoned three pilgrimages to the tomb of Khwāja Bahāʾ al-Dīn as equal to the *hajj* to Mecca and Medina. In earlier times, the *amīrs* went the whole way to the shrine on foot, but *amīr* Muzaffar al-Dīn used to ride on a donkey (Jaworskij, *Reise*, II, 356).

⁵⁵¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 179a. For a detailed description of the tomb of Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqshband, see Khanikoff, *Bokhara*, 120–21.

⁵⁵² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 204b–205a, 222b, 242a; Mullā Sharīf is far less concerned with the visits to the tomb of Khwāja Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqshband (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 113a, 169b).

⁵⁵³ Tāliʿ, *Tārīkh*, fols. 97b–98a; Semenov trans., 47–48.

⁵⁵⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 146b.

The sources report about the rulers' frequent visits to the tombs of holy men. These acts of pilgrimage were often combined with other activities, such as inspections or campaigns. After his enthronization in 1702, for example, 'Ubaidullah Khān visited a number of local shrines. In Ghijduwān he went to the tomb of Khwāja Jahān and en route had a close look at the conditions in the nearby *tūmān* of Kāmāt. Subsequently, he performed the *ziyārat* at the shrines of saints like Šūfī Chūbīn, Ḥaẓrat Sheikh Darwīsh, Khwāja 'Arif Rīwgaragī, Khwāja Aubān, Bābā Samāsī and Khwāja Rāmītanī, all of them in the surroundings of the capital. This *ziyārat* tour took about one week.⁵⁵⁵ Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's military expeditions were frequently interrupted for religious purposes, particularly to obtain the help of the saints in begging for God's protection. When he mounted a campaign against Ürgüt, the *atālīq* made a detour and encamped at Dabhd north of Samarqand where he visited the mausoleum of the Makhdūm-i A'zam on Jumāda I 6–7, 1166/March 10–12, 1753.⁵⁵⁶ On that occasion "he assisted the inhabitants of this sacred place with gifts."⁵⁵⁷ Two days later the *amīr* and his retinue spent a whole day visiting the holy sites of Samarqand, like the grave of Khwāja 'Ubaidullah Aḥrār. They also went to Tīmūr's tomb to perform the *fāṣila* in remembrance of the "Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction." Afterward he visited the famous *īshān* Khwāja Shahāb al-Dīn Sheikh al-Islām, who received him with all honors.⁵⁵⁸

Apart from mentioning shrine visits and naming influential *īshāns* and *khwājas*, the early Manghit chronicles do not refer to the connection of the new ruler with the brotherhoods. According to Babadzhanov, the first Manghit king looked upon the Sufis as opponents rather than as virtuous teachers.⁵⁵⁹ Most of the authors share the opinion that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's behavior was not guided by special respect for the sheikhs, though he believed in the supernatural capabilities of the Sufis.⁵⁶⁰ His belief was

⁵⁵⁵ Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 18b–19a; Semenov trans., 31–33.

⁵⁵⁶ The dates given by Wafā are probably wrong. According to him, Jumāda I 6, 1166, was a Monday, but it was in fact either a Saturday or a Sunday.

⁵⁵⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 206a.

⁵⁵⁸ Ibid., fol. 207a.

⁵⁵⁹ Baxtiyor M. Babadzhanov, "The Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya in Central Māwarā'annahr," in *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, ed. Michael Kemper, Anke von Kügelgen and Dmitriy Yermakov (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1996), 391–92.

⁵⁶⁰ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 329.

mirrored by the visits to holy places mentioned above. Sometimes religious nobles are also mentioned as part of his entourage or as a welcoming committee receiving him in Bukhara or before the city gates when he returned from campaigns. After the final subjugation of Shahr-i Sabz in 1751, a delegation of *‘ulamā* and sheikhs consisting of Qāzī Hādī Khwāja, Qāzī Mīr ‘Abdullah Faqīh, Qāzī Mīr Abū Ṭāhir Samarqandī, the *qāzī* ‘askar Khwāja Ni‘matullah Ṣadīqī, Qāzī ‘Ibādullah Khwāja, ‘Abd al-Qayyūm Khwāja, Muḥammad Amīn Khwāja as well as the Jūybārī sheikhs and other Naqshbandī dignitaries set off for Shahr-i Sabz to congratulate the ruler on his success.⁵⁶¹

Despite the piety of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān as reported by his chronicler, Mullā Sharīf is of the opinion that his bad behavior in connection with the visit to the tomb of Ḥaẓrat Khwāja [‘Abd al-Khāliq] Jahān at Ghijduwān was Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s undoing.⁵⁶² Whereas Qāzī Wafā merely mentions the visit in Jumāda II 1172/February 1759, his colleague reproaches the ruler for having breached the etiquette. He approached the tomb “without considering respect and politeness” on horseback instead of coming by foot to show devotion and respect. The chronicler explains this bad behavior by “growing pride connected with authority and rank.”⁵⁶³ Shortly thereafter, the ruler felt sick but did not admit his anxieties and bad state “due to excessive zeal and pride.” The next morning he visited the shrine of Khwāja ‘Ārif with “melting liver and burning countenance.”⁵⁶⁴ Mullā Sharīf interprets Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s illness and subsequent

⁵⁶¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 192a–b.

⁵⁶² Khwāja ‘Abd al-Khāliq Ghijduwānī was a famous Sufi sheikh born in Ghijduwān north of Bukhara. There is little and partly conflicting information about his life in the sources. He studied at Bukhara where he met his master Sheikh Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf Hamadānī (d. 535/1140) at the age of twenty-two. He entered the Sufi convent of the *khwājagān*, which later came to be known as the Naqshbandīya. Khwāja ‘Abd al-Khāliq probably died in 617/1220. He left several works among which the *Risāla-yi tarīqat* and the *Waṣīyat-nāma* figure most prominently (S. Naficy, “Khwāja ‘Abd al-Khāliq Ghijduwānī,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., II, 1077–78).

⁵⁶³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 420b; von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 327.

⁵⁶⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 421a. ‘Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī confirms that Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān was accompanied by his harem and the courtiers when visiting the tomb of Khwāja ‘Abd al-Khāliq. After his return, a *derwish* prophesied his approaching death, which made him sad since he lacked an heir. According to this version, the ruler made his paternal uncle Dānyāl Bī his successor and passed away soon after (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 53 (French text, 116–17)).

death as a form of divine punishment because of his sin against the saints.⁵⁶⁵ The mausoleum of Khwāja ‘Abd al-Khāliq always enjoyed great popularity among the population and the rulers alike.⁵⁶⁶

Another striking example of disrespect in front of a saint is reported by Qāzī Wafā, who informs us about a plundering expedition by ‘Ibādullah Khīṭā’ī in early 1158/1745. The Khīṭā’ī leader and his men raided the shrine of Bahā’ al-Dīn Naqshband, robbed the pilgrims and withdrew with a large number of captives. As our author states, the saint’s soul flew into a rage and decided on the annihilation of the rebels, who suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of their enemies near Khaṭarchī.⁵⁶⁷ Mullā Sharīf warns against such transgressions with the following verses:

“Everyone who neglects politeness to the men of the truth

Turns his life into a playground for knife games

The blade of the saints’ fury was doubtlessly unleashed

The arrogant, whose affairs are in bad vein, are doomed to misfortune.”⁵⁶⁸

According to his chronicler, ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s authority suffered the first serious cracks when the king showed signs of disrespect toward the descendants of Khwāja Aḥrār. On his visit to Samarqand in 1709, ‘Ubaidullah Khān II took up residence in Chaghar, one of the possessions of the Aḥrārī *khwājas* of Samarqand, when he saw the citadel in a state of disrepair. Until then, allegedly no stranger had entered that place. When the king got ill after only one day, this was widely attributed to his decision to reside there. Subsequently, he moved to the *arg* in spite of its ruined condition.⁵⁶⁹ He recovered only after leaving Chaghar and moving to the citadel.

Samarqand is the scene of a conflict that broke out between the two Uzbek factions of the Naymān and the Sarāy soon after the king’s recovery

⁵⁶⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 421b–423a.

⁵⁶⁶ For example, Khunjī describes the visit of his patron ‘Ubaidullah Khān (r. 1533–40) to the shrine in early 1509. The prince donated alms to the inhabitants of the neighborhood and ordered the recitation of the Koran (Ott, *Transoxanien*, 82–83).

⁵⁶⁷ از آنجا که موجّه قهر روح قدسی مثال آن بحر مکافات یعنی خواجه کرونّی سمات در جوش آمد ظاهرأ و باطنأ در اهلاك آن قوم بد گهر و اعدام اعدای فتنه گر توجه نموده عنقریب جزای بایسته و سزای شایسته رسانید ... (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 56b).

⁵⁶⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 295a.

⁵⁶⁹ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 146a–147a; Semenov trans., 165–66.

from illness.⁵⁷⁰ Against the backdrop of this dispute, the writer of the *‘Ubaidullah Nāma* narrates how two Naqshbandī dignitaries, Sultān Khwāja and ‘Abd al-Rasūl Khwāja Aḥrārī, mediated in a conflict that threatened to tear apart the king’s authority.⁵⁷¹ With this we observe a continued involvement of the Aḥrārī Naqshbandīs in local politics, here in the form of brokerage. Eventually the two met and said:

“We and you know that we are the *pīrs* and *murshids* of the king and the commanders. Now since discord and calamity emerged between the ruler and his *amīrs*, the fire of kingly rage and anger is inflamed. Thus, it is necessary to clean up the dust of fear, which has settled upon the brow of the *pādishāh* from the side of the commanders and the soldiery, with amiable petitions and the sleeves of apology.”⁵⁷²

Both finally went to the Uzbek camp at Samarqand, recited the *fātiḥā* and said:

“You people desired such a king! Thanks to God the Generous, He sent a ruler whose justice (*‘adl*) has become the source of the calm and tranquility of the subjects. Prosperity and security are such that in this kingdom the lamb drinks milk from the breast of the lion and the wolf and the sheep seek the company of each other. It is worth giving nothing else to the benefactor (*wal i-ni ‘mī*), one of whose gifts is beloved life, than good service. One should not approach the benefactor (*mun ‘im*) other than by traveling down the path of obedience. When the branch of a plant being nurtured in the shade of a cypress tree becomes arrogant and turns away, it will die! The particle is like dirt raised by the sun and should it turn away it will be humbled down! In such a time when messages about the movements of the Qalmāq spread [throughout the region] becoming the source of confusion amongst the subjects, is it really suitable for you people to behave impudently toward your lord and to add to the confusion within the kingdom or to pull out your feet from the circle of obedience just to announce words of rebellion and rashness? The rights resulting from the benefits of the king and his favors demand enormous obligations from you! It is imperative that you get ready and prepared by sincerely performing as well-wishers of the *pādishāh* and that you resolve the dispute directly by way of obsequiousness instead of throwing the subjects into anarchy (*harj wa marj*) and

⁵⁷⁰ See chapter Figurations of Power/The Circumstances under the last Tuqay-Timurids/Ni‘matullah Bī Naymān of Tirmidh.

⁵⁷¹ The Aḥrārī *khwājas* had a long tradition as mediators. Khwāja Aḥrār himself often mediated between Timurid contenders (see chapter Figurations of Power/The Circumstances/The Jūybārī Khwājas).

⁵⁷² Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 154a–b; Semenov trans., 173–74; Chekhovich, “K istorii,” 67–68.

becoming the target for the spears of the curse of the people so that history will engrave your bad repute on the pages of time.”⁵⁷³

This passage is one of a few cases in the chronicles giving the exact wording in an act of conflict mediation. Both middlemen used a mix of harsh and gentle words in order to push the Uzbek leadership toward reconciliation with the king. By bringing all their political influence to bear, they possibly hoped to protect their followers in the region of Samarqand. Whether their argument of stability and peace in the realm symbolized by the harmonious relationship between lamb and lion reflects historical realities is not of interest here. In view of the Qalmāq activities on the northern frontier, it was essential that the Transoxanian nobility cooperate in this situation, since a continued amirid rebellion could have caused further harm. Therefore the Naqshbandī dignitaries probably constructed an ideal state of political calm to persuade the *amīrs*. With this, the speech of the two sheikhs mirrors the doxic relationship of the *khwājas* to social reality and the prevailing power relations, but also the importance of reciprocity, here in terms of loyalty and obedience in return for benefits granted by the king as the ultimate source of peace and calm in the kingdom. The line of argumentation is clear, only the obligation to loyal service can save the population from anxiety and confusion.

Looking into our main source for the activities of Sufi sheikhs in the middle of the eighteenth century, we often come across a certain Ishāq Khwāja, a prominent member of the Dahbīdī branch of the Naqshbandīya. This sheikh figures prominently in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* as Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān’s *pīr*. Unfortunately, the source does not provide detailed information about this spiritual mentor of the ruler who is styled Īshān Ishāq Khwāja Makhdūm-i A‘zam prior to his appointment as the new Sheikh al-Islām and possessor of the *shāh-nishīn* in December 1756.⁵⁷⁴ Īshān Ishāq Khwāja was a son of Ibrāhīm Khwāja, an influential Dahbīdī sheikh whom Muḥammad Raḥīm had exiled from the capital. Later he refused to return but sent his son Ishāq Khwāja to Bukhara, where he received a *khānaqāh* and a *madrasa*

⁵⁷³ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 155a–b; Semenov trans., 174–75.

⁵⁷⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 227b, 249b, 261a. The *shāh-nishīn* was a special place on an elevated platform usually reserved for the guests of honor. Such a place apparently existed also in the hall of public audiences (Bregel, *Administration*, 23, footnote no. 80; Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 16, footnote no. 47).

together with a *waqf*.⁵⁷⁵ Ishāq Khwāja was named the *wakīl* of Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān's daughter at her marriage to Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān on Dhū'l-Ḥijja 28, 1170/September 23, 1756. He was also present at the coronation and helped place the new ruler on the throne.⁵⁷⁶

In the time before Raḥīm Khān's coronation, Ishāq Khwāja frequently accompanied the *atālīq* on military campaigns along with other religious dignitaries like Mīr Nizām al-Dīn Ḥusainī, 'Abdullah Khwāja Sheikh al-Islām or Ustād Qāzī Hādī Khwāja, and occasionally acted as his adviser in military matters. On his campaign against the Yūz leaders of Ūrā Tippa and Ḥiṣār in spring 1168/1755, for instance, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī requested the help of his *pīr*, who also bore the title of a spiritual mentor or literally "a guide showing the right way" (*hādī-yi irshād* or just *pīr-i irshād*), in approaching another protector,⁵⁷⁷ in this case the Makhdūm-i A'zam in his tomb at Dabhdīd.⁵⁷⁸ The *amīr* was in a difficult situation. When he visited the mausoleum of the saint, he was planning to attack his main adversaries, the Yūz *amīrs*, and a victory in battle was by no means certain.

In many cases, Ishāq Khwāja brought his expertise as a mediator to bear and facilitated the peaceful settlement of conflicts between the ruler and other tribal leaders. He continued to do so on numerous occasions even after the death of his disciple Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān. When several Uzbek

⁵⁷⁵ Babadzhānov, "The Naqshbandiya Muḡaddidiya," 392.

⁵⁷⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 209b, 210a, 227b, 247b, 249a–b.

⁵⁷⁷ The honorific title *pīr-i irshād* or *hādī-yi irshād* was generally applied to the Sufi *pīrs* of the rulers and other influential figures. For example, 'Ubaidullah Khān's *pīr* was a Naqshbandī sheikh by the name of Khwāja 'Abd al-Rasūl Aḥrārī, whose family still lived in Samarqand at that time. As his spiritual mentor he often advised the king in difficult situations (Amīn Bukhārī, 'Ubaidullah Nāma, fols. 141b–143b, 154b–158a; Semenov trans., 160–62, 173–77).

⁵⁷⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 227b. Aḥmad Kāsānī, commonly known by his honorific title Makhdūm-i A'zam ("The greatest Master"), was an important figure of the Naqshbandīya in Central Asia. He was born in 868/1463–64 in Kāsān in the Ferghana Valley. As a disciple of the sheikh Muḥammad Qāzī, he became one of the religious advisers of the appanage holder Jānī Bēg (d. 935/1528–29) at Karmīna. Initially, Kāsānī favored Bābur against the Uzbeks. But after the establishment of Uzbek rule, he cooperated with the new authorities and remained in Transoxania until his death in 1542. In spite of his frequent visits and stays in Bukhara, the radius of his influence was more limited to Dabhdīd and Samarqand. After Aḥmad Kāsānī's death, his *silsila* further expanded in Bukhara, though it was replaced by the Jūybārī *khawājas* who had been part of Khwāja 'Ubaidullah Aḥrār's organization (Schwarz, *Unser Weg*, 170–75, 188–89; Adshead, *Central Asia*, 158, 163; see also the explanations of Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 482a).

leaders rebelled in the capital, Muḥammad Dānyāl Bī dispatched him to negotiate with the mischief-makers and bring them back to the royal court.⁵⁷⁹

The most important act of mediation performed by Ishāq Khwāja is reported from early 1757, when he played a key role in bringing the Burqūt chief of Nūr back to the court. After Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's enthronization in late 1756, Tughāy Murād Bī decided to reconcile with the new ruler and pay homage. Since he had been out of favor for a long time, he solicited the intercession of three men: Muḥammad Daulat, who had gained the position of *qūshbēgī*, Jum'a Qul Tūqsāba and Īshān Ishāq Khwāja Makhdūm-i A'zam. While the first two were addressed to forestall the wish for an ultimate conciliation, the Burqūt leader asked the *īshān* for a plea to attain the pardon of the ruler.⁵⁸⁰ After collecting gifts, he departed for Bukhara and on Jumāda I 21, 1170/February 10–11, 1757, sent a message informing the court of his imminent arrival.⁵⁸¹ Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān dispatched his *qūshbēgī* to receive the Burqūt chief at Ghijduwān and accompany him on his way to Bukhara. When the two men met each other, Muḥammad Daulat "ensured peace of mind and affixed a royal '*ināyat-nāma* to his turban." They entered the capital one day later. Following the afternoon prayers, the *qūshbēgī* brought Tughāy Murād Bī to Īshān Ishāq Khwāja. Upon his arrival "he paid respect to 'the Asylum of Guardianship' and gained the honor of kissing his hand." Afterward he was accommodated in the house of his first intercessor. On Jumāda I 23, 1170/February 12–13, 1757, the *īshān* led the Burqūt chief to the court where he solemnly paid homage and was integrated into the army together with his fellow tribesmen.⁵⁸²

The Jūybārī *khwājas* played a similar role as intermediaries and protectors who maintained good relations with the royal court. When the unfortunate ruler Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān was about to be deposed in 1747, the senior leader of the Jūybārī Khwājas acted as an intermediary between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī Atālīq and the ruler. He was the one who informed

⁵⁷⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 326b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 428a–b.

⁵⁸⁰ عریضه دیگر مشتمل بر اخلاص و هواخواهی از روی نیاز به استان ایشان اسحاق خواجه مخدومی فرستاده ... زبده صفارت آنکه اگر یشفاعت آن هادی ارباب سلوک رقم عفو بر جراید ذلات او کشیده آید عنان نوسن توکل بسوی قبله امال منعطف ساخته بی تأمل عظمت استان بوسی سرادقات حشمت خاقانی نماید (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 263b).

⁵⁸¹ According to Qāzī Wafā, Jumāda I 21, 1170, was a Tuesday, but it was in fact either a Thursday or Friday.

⁵⁸² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 264b–265a.

the king of his imminent deposal. Although the king was sent to Jūybār together with the rest of his family, the Jūybārī *khwājas* were unable to protect him. Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān returned to the camp of the *atālīq* accompanied by some of the Jūybārī leaders.⁵⁸³ In Mullā Sharīf's opinion, the Jūybārī nobles refused to host the king and insisted on his return because they feared the reaction of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī.⁵⁸⁴ Besides the frequent visits to holy places connected with the duties and ceremonies of the *ziyārat*, the commander and future ruler was often in the company of learned men and religious nobles who smoothed the path leading to God. He also visited famous *īshāns* like Khwāja Shahāb al-Dīn Sheikh al-Islām to obtain their religious advice and to request their plea before God and in particular the saints. Sometimes he was welcomed by the *īshāns* upon his return to the capital.⁵⁸⁵ In addition, we see religious dignitaries like Īshān Ishāq Makhdūm-i A'zamī, Muḥammad Amīn Khwāja Naqīb, Mīr Nizām al-Dīn Ḥusainī or Shahāb al-Dīn Khwāja Aḥrārī attending the enthronization ceremony of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān.⁵⁸⁶ Qāzī Wafā also mentions an influential Sufi sheikh by the name of Jān Muḥammad who headed a small group of adepts and Sufis. According to the author, this sheikh acted as a *pīr* of the commander and devoted his life to the service of the Manghit leaders.

“He spent the morning praying and the evening answering questions for the dynasty of moon-like qualities, and the commander endowed with firmament-like rank mantled the stature of this essence of the people in robes of honor and bestowed turbans of reverence upon him. [The *amīr*] granted the village of Qarātagān in the region of Nasaf as *soyūrghāl* and *thulthān* for the livelihood of the sheikh and his followers and made them joyful by giving gifts so that the prayer of the excellent [sheikh] and the pious men may become the cause of ascending the stairs of fortune.”⁵⁸⁷

In spite of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's gifts and land grants, a letter written by the sheikh “bearing signs of the diminution and perturbation of the attendants in the service of the eternal government” fell into the hands of the court servants a little while later. The commander-in-chief punished the

⁵⁸³ Ibid., fols. 107b–108a.

⁵⁸⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 332a–b. ‘Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī largely agrees with this version of the events (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 51 (French text, 111–12)).

⁵⁸⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 286a.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., fol. 254a.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., fol. 187a. A *thulthān* was two-thirds of the harvest of a particular plot of land. Anke von Kügelgen concludes that two-thirds of the revenues from the Qazangāh-i Nasaf were left to the sheikh (von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 330, footnote no. 40).

sheikh and handed the letter to Qāzī Wafā with the instruction to tell the story in the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*.⁵⁸⁸

The cases discussed in this section show that local Sufi sheikhs still enjoyed the proximity of the court, even though Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī was not exactly famous for his respect for them. Of particular importance here is the promotion of the Makhdūm-i A‘zam Sheikh Īshān Ishāq, who was able to consolidate his position vis-à-vis the Jūybārī sheikhs with the help of his protégé. Since Sufi dignitaries provided a link to God, their support was always regarded as crucial, especially in times of crisis. Apart from their aid in soliciting God’s help, *darwīshs* and *īshāns* often intervened in worldly affairs, as the protection and mediation for Tughāy Murād Bī by Īshān Ishāq shows. In addition, they were sometimes deployed as envoys for delicate missions. ‘Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī reports that Nādir Shāh dispatched a messenger to Khiwa together with two Jūybārī derwishes termed as trustworthy in order to persuade the ruler Ilbārs Khān to submit. But the Khiwan ruler put the messengers to death. Indignant at this abomination, ‘Abd al-Karīm states that the murder of emissaries is not permitted in any religion of the world.⁵⁸⁹

Religious nobles continued to play a pivotal role as mediators well into the nineteenth and early twentieth century, a fact that is well documented by our sources. For instance, during his campaigns to Khurāsān, a number of *mullās* and other dignitaries marched in every contingent of Shāh Murād’s army to negotiate the terms of surrender with the chiefs who had been attacked.⁵⁹⁰ And even the nineteenth-century ruler Naṣrullah Khān relied on *khwājas* and *īshāns* as mediators.

The next section deals with one particular example of mediators, the chiefs of the Manghit tribe. The strategies employed by them to further their own ends are of special interest.

THE MANGHIT CHIEFS AS POWER BROKERS

As we have seen in the previous chapters, the Manghit leaders recognized the mood of the times when Nādir Shāh encroached upon Transoxania in autumn 1740. Changing tactics at the right time, they turned into a group of

⁵⁸⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 187a–188b.

⁵⁸⁹ Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 47–48 (French text, 105–06).

⁵⁹⁰ Malcolm, *History of Persia*, II, 169.

intermediaries who bridged the gap between the Iranian camp and the Bukharan court and positioned themselves at the negotiation hinge between the Iranian and the Turanian rulers. The chroniclers explain the motivation of the Manghit leadership in a similar way. According to Qāzī Wafā, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was touched by the plans of his son and wanted to prevent him from taking this step by giving advantageous advice.

“But this did not conform to the disposition of this far-sighted *amīr*, whose mirror-like intelligent nature and penetrating mind reflected the means of dominion and inspiration with regard to the affairs of power and authority.”⁵⁹¹

Here we gain a fairly good understanding of the role of interest and illusion in the worldview of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. He did not listen to his father’s advice calling for loyalty to Abū’l-Faiḏ Khān because it did not suit him and his interests in this particular situation! He wanted to join Nādir because he realized that this offered opportunities befitting his nature. The text shows how his worldview left its stamp on his character, determining his choice and ambition to rapidly climb the career ladder. If we give credence to the chronicler, Muḥammad Raḥīm’s father eventually accepted the ambitions of his son in view of his young age.⁵⁹² Mullā Sharīf’s version differs somewhat from this account. He is of the opinion that Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī persuaded his son to enter Nādir’s service because he knew that his career could not be fostered without royal assistance.⁵⁹³

Apart from these slight differences regarding the motivation of the Manghit leaders, all the sources agree that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī had already entered the service of Nādir Shāh when the Bukharan ruler and his entourage decided to send the *atālīq* as an intermediary to the Iranian camp.⁵⁹⁴ As we have seen, the Bukharan ruler took the decision to surrender on the advice of his *atālīq*. Yet when attending the advisory council in Bukhara, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī concealed the fact that his son had joined the Iranian ruler. Later he went to the Qizilbāsh camp himself and negotiated the conditions of his master’s submission.⁵⁹⁵

⁵⁹¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36a.

⁵⁹² Ibid., fol. 36a.

⁵⁹³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 262a–b.

⁵⁹⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 36b–37a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 263a–b; Ya‘qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 3b; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 46 (French text, 99).

⁵⁹⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 38b–39a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 268a–269b; Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 68–69. See also Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 35–36.

Mullā Sharīf explicitly states that Muḥammad Ḥakīm's advice was inspired by the quest to guarantee the well-being of the pious believers and the security of the towns and dependencies.⁵⁹⁶ In view of this and the subsequent negotiations including the exchange of gifts, the Manghit leaders, at least in terms of behavior and strategy, were not very different from ordinary elders and mediators. After the surrender of Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān and the settling of all terms and conditions, other local Uzbek leaders

"like Muḥammad Amīn Bī from Ḥiṣār, 'Ālim Bī from Shahr-i Sabz, Ya'qūb Bī from Qabādiyān, Ghaibullah Bī and 'Abd al-Satār Bī from Miyānkāl and Tughāy Murad Bī from Nūr came together with ambling-paced horses and gifts worthy of the court of the illustrious king and passed mediated and guided by the commander-in-chief, the lord of reputation, under the alchemical eyes of this fortunate ruler."⁵⁹⁷

The scene described by Qāzī Wafā is reminiscent of similar *kūrnishs* and acts of devotion mediated by intercessors at the Bukharan court. Thus the whole procedure resembles the countless other times when intermediaries guided the subjects of protection and intercession to the royal throne.

At the negotiation interface between their Iranian protectors and the other Transoxanian nobles, the Manghits were able to influence their masters in order to consolidate their own authority. On a number of occasions, they purposefully used the military clout of their partners to further their own ends. According to Kāzīm, it was not until the firm establishment of Iranian supremacy and the recruitment of Uzbek soldiers that Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī informed the Iranian king about the notorious Yūz, who were causing a lot of trouble in the area of Samarqand. Since their rebellious activities against the ruler of Turkistan created a state of unrest in the guarded domains, it would be expedient to dispatch Iranian troops in order to subdue them. Nādir reacted promptly to the request of the *atālīq* and sent Luṭf 'Alī Khān b. Bābā 'Alī Bēg Kūsa-Aḥmadlū with twenty thousand Iranian soldiers on a punitive campaign against the Yūz.⁵⁹⁸

After the withdrawal of the Qizilbāsh, the Manghits continued to play a crucial role as intermediaries between the Iranian and the Bukharan court. The link between the two kingdoms was maintained by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, whom Nādir had taken with him to Mashhad as guarantor of the relations

⁵⁹⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 266a.

⁵⁹⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 44a. See also Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 274a–b.

⁵⁹⁸ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 799, 819–20. This expedition by Luṭf 'Alī Khān is not mentioned by the Bukharan authors.

between Transoxania and Iran.⁵⁹⁹ This state of affairs did not change after Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's death in late 1743. The relations between the two entities were further strengthened when Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī was dispatched to Bukhara to ensure peace and order.⁶⁰⁰ On his return to Mashhad in spring 1747, he was accompanied by most of the Uzbek *amīrs* and the leaders of the influential Sufi brotherhoods.⁶⁰¹ When they arrived at Mashhad, all of them paid homage to Nādir and attended a royal banquet. After the usual exchange of gifts and acts of favor and praise, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī

“fastened the belt of the faculty of eloquent speech around the girdle of explanation and told the king about the affairs of the kingdom of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr and the royal residence Bukhara. [On this occasion] he offered some enigmas concerning the bad state of the region and the confusion amongst the soldiery and the subjects [...] as a tribute (*pīshkash*) to the illuminated mind.”⁶⁰²

Qāzī Wafā makes further mention of a robe of honor interwoven with gold and other jewel-embroidered clothes given by Nādir Shāh as rewards. It was at this ceremony that the Iranian ruler strengthened his relationship with the Uzbek elite by granting a huge money gift to his protégé Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, who generously redistributed one-third of this sum to the other *amīrs* in his retinue.⁶⁰³ Subsequently we learn that it was Nādir's intention to “take the seat of fortune of this high-ranking *amīr* to the apex of honor and the spirit of magnificence” by summoning him to the royal court.⁶⁰⁴ He told the notables of Turan about his decision to dethrone Abū'l-Faiz Khān and to place one of his heirs on the throne, a plan that was certainly inspired by the information given by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī beforehand. After a public speech held by Nādir in front of the other Transoxanian *amīrs*,⁶⁰⁵ the Uzbek leaders

⁵⁹⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 44b–45a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 275a–b.

⁶⁰⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 59b–81a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, 297a–301b; Kāzim, *Ālamārā*, III, 1102–04, Ya' qūb, *Tārīkh*, 4b–5b; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 50 (French text, 109).

⁶⁰¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 84a–b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 302a.

⁶⁰² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 93b.

⁶⁰³ See previous chapter.

⁶⁰⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 94b.

⁶⁰⁵ The *Tuḥfat al-khānī* provides a good insight into the speech Nādir Shāh held before the Uzbek leadership. He announced his plan to replace Abū'l-Faiz Khān with one of his sons and to “put the authority over good and evil, the dry and the moist [objects] into the hands ... of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān (Bī)” (ibid., fols. 95b–97a). See also next section.

“showed their readiness by putting the seal of silence on their lips. The group of *amīrs* wholly agreed in all things like a resplendent rose-bud of the privet bush and consigned the privilege of asking questions and giving answers to that revered king [Nādir Shāh] to this exalted commander [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī]. Really no one had the boldness to give an answer consisting of yes or no to the fortunate ruler.”⁶⁰⁶

What follows is another speech, this time by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, who confirmed this decision and proposed ‘Abd al-Mu’min Sulṭān as the successor to be placed on the Bukharan throne.⁶⁰⁷

Mullā Sharīf presents a somewhat different version of the events. In his view, Nādir summoned the Uzbek chiefs to inform them about his decision to bring Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān to his court.⁶⁰⁸

“When the ‘pillar of the nobles’ Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān became aware of the secret gold hidden in the royal mind and the whole compassion regarding the king connected to heavenly rank [Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān], he kneeled down following [the rules of] respect and adorned the words of consent and obedience with the pearls and diamonds of perspicuous language,”

informing the Iranian king about ‘Abd al-Mu’min, the son of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān.⁶⁰⁹ We learn of Nādir’s joyful reaction when he heard about the Turanian prince. At the subsequent banquet, Nādir instructed the Transoxanian nobles to return to Bukhara, to place ‘Abd al-Mu’min on the throne, to send his father to Mashhad and then to return to their native places and towns. In addition, he warned them not to show “negligence and ignorance in the detailed matters of government, the solicitude for the subjects and the dispensation of justice.”⁶¹⁰

Shortly after this banquet and receiving Nādir’s instructions, the group of Transoxanian nobles departed for Bukhara, but before setting out, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī left his enemies Khwāja Ulfat and Tughāy Murād Bī Burqūt at the Iranian court because of their opposition to the envisaged dethronement of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān.⁶¹¹ In Mullā Sharīf’s opinion, both were left at Mashhad due to their enmity and opposition to the commander-in-chief.⁶¹² However, en route the *atālīq* learned about the fall of Nādir’s

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid., fol. 97a.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid., fols. 97a–98a.

⁶⁰⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 312b–313b.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid., fol. 314a.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid., fol. 315b.

⁶¹¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 98b.

⁶¹² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 318a.

empire after his assassination on the night of Jumāda II 10–11, 1160/June 19–20, 1747.⁶¹³ In this situation he decided to keep the news about the collapse of the Afsharid Empire a secret. He even stationed his followers at the front and rear of his small caravan comprising the notables and a group of merchants in order to prevent the information about Nādir Shāh's end from leaking out to the Bukharan population, Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, and the Qizilbāsh troops that had remained in Transoxania to quell the rebellion of 'Ibādullah Khīṭā'ī while Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī stayed at the Iranian court.⁶¹⁴ Once he arrived at Bukhara, he sent for the Qizilbāsh commanders and entered into negotiations with the Iranian officials, the Jūybārī sheikhs and other actors on the envisaged enthronement of 'Abd al-Mu'min, while withholding the information about the end of Nādir Shāh's reign.⁶¹⁵ Mullā Sharīf reports in detail about the encounter between Biḥbūd Khān, the Qizilbāsh commander in Transoxania, and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. The *atālīq* arranged everything for private consultations with his partners and told them about Nādir's instructions concerning the deposal of the old king and the coronation of his twelve-year-old son. Yet in contrast to the other chroniclers, this author places additional emphasis on Muḥammad Raḥīm withholding the news about the events in Khurāsān to further his own ends.⁶¹⁶

⁶¹³ Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī had drawn conclusions about the decline of Nādir Shāh's authority after a nightly ambush by Qizilbāsh troops at Sarakhs (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 100a–104b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 320a–324b; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 5a; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 50 (French text, 111)).

⁶¹⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 104b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 325b; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fol. 5a; Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 50 (French text, 111).

⁶¹⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 105a–106a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 327a, 331b, 333a–334b; Kāzim, *Ālamārā*, III, 1120.

⁶¹⁶ ... و واقعه عروض اختلال بارکان دولت نادریه را جهت دفع الوقت و انجام مراد و دغدغه انفراد خویش باستصواب رای استبداد اندیش در منصبه کتمان مستور داشت و پرده از چهره شاهد همان راز شورش طراز بر نداشت (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 333a). Although Effremov presents a different version of these events, he also refers to the deliberate filtering of information by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. According to him, the *amīr* and his troops accompanied the Tuqay-Timurid princess who was married to Nādir Shāh on her way to Bukhara, where she wanted to visit the shrine of Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn and meet her parents. En route he received a message about Nādir's death. He then forged an official letter from Nādir Shāh containing an order, in which the Iranian king insisted on the assassination of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān, the enthronization of his son and Muḥammad Raḥīm's appointment as new *atālīq*. After Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān's violent death at the hands of the *amīr*, one of the king's protégés, the leader of his Russian guard, closed the city gates and resisted the new strongmen for about

Kāẓim tells us that he himself was sent as a messenger to negotiate the conditions for the stay of the Iranian troops in Bukhara. The *atālīq* told him that Nādir Shāh in person had ordered his troops to spend the winter in Bukhara. When Kāẓim was about to leave his interlocutor, Muḥammad Raḥīm took his hand and led him to his private room where he declared he would tell him all secrets out of a feeling of personal closeness. Then he explained Nādir Shāh's instructions, according to which the artillery, the arsenal, all the logistics and the horses should remain in Bukhara to be at Muḥammad Raḥīm's disposal. At the end of their private talk, the *atālīq* warned him not to tell anyone about the instructions except the *tūpchībāshī* and the *jabādārbāshī*. Kāẓim further mentions that the officials named agreed to keep quiet, and that he was against this plan because he "saw the fire of sedition and rebellion in Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān's eyes."⁶¹⁷

INSIGHTS INTO A *KINGĀSH*

In the previous chapters I demonstrated that middlemen were needed on many occasions. These included intercession before social superiors and potential protectors as well as before God, but also the solution of conflicts. In several situations we observed the gathering of elders and the formation of councils for consultations (*majlis-i mashwarat/maṣlaḥat*, *kingāsh*) and common decision making. Although our sources frequently mention such gatherings in a variety of difficult situations, they do not provide detailed information about the arrangements and procedural aspects of *kingāshs*. Such councils were often convened to solve problems and conflicts. For instance, in late 1160/1748 the Yetī Ūrūgh realized the hopelessness of their undertaking to put up resistance to the Bukharan troops and held a *kingāsh* in Khaṭarchī, where they decided "to tie the cut-off alignment [with the rebellious Burqūt] to the thread of reconciliation" with the Manghit *amīr*.⁶¹⁸

Qāẓī Wafā reports about a local conflict developing in Khwārazm in 1171/1757. This story and the following reconciliation of the rival Khiwan

one week. In this situation, Muḥammad Raḥīm sent the faked letter to the local *khwājas* and city elders and requested their intervention in order to settle the conflict. In Effremov's view, the mediation of the elders was successful. Finally, the Russian commander gave up resistance and was rewarded with the post of *tāqsāba* (*tūqsāba*); his troops received a number of gifts (Effremov, *Devjatiletnee*, 39).

⁶¹⁷ Kāẓim, *Ālamārā*, III, 1121.

⁶¹⁸ Qāẓī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 136a.

parties is also confirmed by Mūnis and Āgahī.⁶¹⁹ According to Wafā's descriptions, the local ruler Ghāyib Khān had always recognized the suzerainty of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān and had sent envoys with messages about his submissiveness to the royal throne. Yet when he had strengthened his authority, he became a ruthless tyrant and ordered the assassination of those who stood in his way, for instance a certain Khuzār Atālīq Manghit, one of the highest-ranking representatives of the Manghits in Khwārazm. In 1757 he gathered a huge army consisting of sixty thousand men, whereupon many members of the Manghit tribe fled to Bukhara to enlist the help of the newly crowned ruler, Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān. Subsequently, Ghāyib Khān asked his father, Bahādur Khān, to mobilize Qazāq troops in the Dasht-i Qipchāq to assist him in defending Khwārazm. When the ruler sent out his officials to collect the taxes needed to feed the new Qazāq supporters, the population rose in rebellion. Although the population and Ghāyib Khān's opponents raised his brother 'Abdullah to the throne after the flight of the former to the Qazāqs in the Dasht-i Qipchāq, the conflict in the Aral region further escalated when the local Qungrāt and Manghit Uzbeks killed Ghāyib Khān's brother Būrī Sulṭān. At the same time, the rebels sent messengers to the Bukharan court expressing loyalty and submissiveness to the new *khāqān* and suggesting a joint punitive expedition in order to annihilate Ghāyib Khān and his followers. Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān was discussing the chances of success of a military intervention when a delegation of Khwārazmians led by a certain Khwāja Naqīb and prestigious nobles arrived at Bukhara. The envoys informed the court about the state of affairs in Khwārazm and the readiness of the population to acknowledge Bukharan suzerainty. The complaints of the Manghit und Qungrāt were refuted in view of these developments and the demonstrations of loyalty shown by the intermediaries from Khiwa. The Bukharan ruler dispatched one of his court officials together with some of the local Khwārazmian envoys to Khiwa to examine the state of affairs. In addition, he ordered the "suitable masters" (*arbāb-i munāsib*) and the "people of the loosening and tying of that principality" (*ahl-i ḥall wa 'aqd-i ān wilāyat*) to appear at the Bukharan court.⁶²⁰

This story shows the dynamics of patronage as well as its interconnection with mediation practices. Firstly, the balance in the existing power relations

⁶¹⁹ Munis and Agahi, *Firdaws*, 69–70.

⁶²⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 286b–290b.

in Khwārazm was tipped when the ruler acted against the interests of local Uzbek chieftains and replaced some of them by introducing a new stratum of followers, the Qazāq. Secondly, the population rebelled when Ghāyib Khān attempted to forcefully extract the resources he needed to feed his new supporters.⁶²¹ Thirdly, those who had been left standing in this situation turned to an alternative protector (Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī) to solicit his aid against the oppressor. So the ensuing conflict as well as the need for a new patron, and intermediaries going back and forth between Bukhara and Khiwa, can be interpreted as unintended by-products of the underlying patronage structure. In other words, the episode sheds light on a self-enforcing mechanism that created its own *raison d'être*. The conflict broke out right after a shift in the local figurations of power. Ghāyib Khān is portrayed as a violator of norms: his attempts to foster a new group of associates by simultaneously offending the subjects of his realm alienated his former protégés, who did not feel committed to him any longer.

Qāzī Wafā further reports about the arrival of more than two hundred local *amīrs* and tribal chiefs in Sha'bān 1171/April–May 1758. The Bukharan *amīrs* and *sayyids* took their seats after paying homage to the rulers. Then the *īshik-āqābāshīs* led the Khiwan *amīrs* who also paid homage and performed the prayer. Subsequently, all the guests were accommodated in suitable rooms.⁶²² The next day was spent with the Friday prayers headed by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and a sumptuous banquet “making the eyes of desire satiated by the mass of fruits and food (*fawāk wa aṭ'ima*).” At this feast the king ordered his uncle Dānyāl Bī, together with the other commanders, the chief judge and the *sayyids* to arrange a banquet in the *chahār bāgh* outside the citadel.⁶²³

“They shall prepare each of the two [conflicting] Khwarazmian factions, comfort the masters of judgment and wisdom of that group with amiable admonitions and excellent promises and place all of them [on their seats] by resorting to promises and threats. They shall confirm the compact between the two sides with oaths to extinguish the fire of discord.”⁶²⁴

⁶²¹ According to Munis, he imposed a tax of forty thousand *ṭilā* on the inhabitants of Bīsh Qal'a (Munis and Agahi, *Firdaws*, 69). See also Bregel, “The new Uzbek states,” 398.

⁶²² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 291a.

⁶²³ *Ibid.*, fol. 291b.

⁶²⁴ *Ibid.*, fols. 291b–292a.

The following descriptions shed light on the composition and procedural aspects of the *kingāsh*:

“On the aforementioned day [...] they spread out colorful carpets and put up beautiful parasols in this paradise-like garden. The powerful *amīr* Dānyāl Bī, the chief judge Mīr Nizām al-Dīn, the *qāzī* Mīr Abū Ṭāhir Samarqandī, Jahāngīr Bī, Tughāy Murād Bī and other respectable *amīrs* sat in the seats of honor of this fortunate circle. [Subsequently] they placed the two conflict parties on suitable carpets and brought the gentle and the troublesome promises to the ears of wisdom of this illustrious group. Although both sides had contended against each other due to diabolic temptations and desirous fictions whilst becoming prepared for controversy, dispute and conflict, they found the way of rectitude and the path of pursuing the right course at the hint of the hidden inspirer and the guidance of the secret *murshid* and took refuge with the court of the great king. Now the verdict directed toward justness in arranging their affairs was as follows: ‘You shall quench all the previous resentments and disputes with the water of friendship and affection from the hearts of each other. You shall agree upon the tranquility of the region and regulate the affairs of the entire populace. Turk and Tajik shall act in consent and harmony without hypocrisy! Subsequent to the confirmation of the oath and the strengthening of the covenant, they must consider the affairs of the government and the order of their tribes as excellent wisdom and royal command! They have to obey the royal orders! The group of the Ūghlī, which is the fundament furnishing the notables of Khiwaq and other places, having relinquished the agreement with Ghāyib Khān and his brother, shall consent and unite with the Uzbek forces (*ulūs-i ūzbekīya*). One of the *suḷṭāns* staying at the royal court shall become their *khān*. [Afterward] we permit them to leave for their native places so that the ignoble and the noble can take care of the small and the big affairs and sit down in the shade of the eternal government in calm and repose!’”⁶²⁵

This passage of the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* is instructive as it shows a ruler in a somewhat different light. The conflict parties, here the rival factions of Khiwa, approached Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān as a potential protector who also offered mediation to resolve the conflict. In his role as an intermediary, the king was not very different from other mediators or power brokers (*rīshsafīd*, *āqsaqāls*, *īshāns*, *khwājas*, *amīrs* and the like) acting on the lower echelons of society. What is significant here is that the mediation activities are presented as a procedure rather than as an isolated act of power. Placing emphasis on the procedural aspects of brokerage, the source describes the different steps, including the homage before the ruler, the Friday prayers performed in a group of noble big men, and splendid festivities. The latter created the ambience all actors felt familiar with so that the negotiations could be concluded successfully. We also gain a fairly good idea of the

⁶²⁵ Ibid., fols. 292a–b.

whole garden scene and the arrangement of carpets and seats of honor. Yet in one respect the negotiations at this *kingāsh* were reminiscent of those between Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and the other Bukharan notables on the one hand and Nādir Shāh on the other in 1747. In both cases the talks were dominated by one or two key actors respectively, while the other actors remained largely passive in view of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān's and Nādir Shāh's authority.

WHAT MAKES AN IDEAL INTERMEDIARY?

Unfortunately, early Manghit chronicles furnish little information about the characteristics of middlemen. Apart from their many different titles, intermediaries are in most cases termed *mardum-i mu'tabar*—"respectable, honored or trustworthy persons"—or *ma'ārif-i mu'tabar*—"respected notables."⁶²⁶ Influential personages like Muḥammad Daulat Dīwānbēgī are sometimes also styled *mu'tabar-i daulat*—"the trustworthy man of the government."⁶²⁷ However, these descriptions do not tell us much about the personal characteristics of power brokers.

One exception worth mentioning is Jāwush Bāy, the ancestor of the Manghit rulers whom we have come across in one of the previous chapters. Jāwush Bāy is of interest inasmuch as he was a person who did not bear the rank of an *amīr* or an influential tribal chief. In the *Tuḥfat* he is described as a possessor of wealth (*ṣāhib-i māl*)⁶²⁸ and a rich person (*shakhṣ-i bā tharwat*), as is indicated by the title *bāy* meaning wealthy or rich.⁶²⁹ He had numerous herds in the pastures and valleys of Nasaf, and although he did not belong to the tribal aristocracy, he displayed all the signs of amirhood. He was, according to Qāzī Wafā, respected by his tribesmen.⁶³⁰ Mullā Sharīf, who to a large extent follows the text of the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*, writes:

⁶²⁶ Ibid., fols. 191b, 290a, 328a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 228b, 229b, 355b, 378a, 417a passim.

⁶²⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 370b.

⁶²⁸ The term *māl* signifies either wealth in terms of money or the possession of estates and/or flocks (see Steingass, *Dictionary*, 1142).

⁶²⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 7a.

⁶³⁰ مواشی و الاموال او متکاتر و در مراعی و به وادی خیل و گلّه او متوافر هر چند سابقه امارت نداشت اما لا حقه (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 7a–b).

“The said Jāwush Bī [Bāy?] is a rich and strong person (*shakhṣ-i ṣāhib-i tharwat wa muknat*), a guide in religious and worldly affairs. He had his tent and dwelling in the plain of Qarshī and the means of livelihood and prosperity were well prepared and put in order from every point of view. That owner of countless horses and camels and infinite flocks [of sheep] was according to the verified *ḥadīth*: ‘God loves the great solicitous ones among you and hates the bad!’ [?]⁶³¹—to the contentment and satisfaction of God the Sublime—elevated to the stairs of success and well known as a generous [man] amongst his tribe because of his immense reputation resting on generosity and sympathy for the poor [...] Like the possessor of the *dīnārs* of night and day and out of sincere intention, he prepared the tablecloth of benefits and gifts for weak people and guests. He gratified the poor, the needy and the hungry with all sorts of food and kinds of honors and attention according to the meaningful verse: ‘Honor the guest by avoiding denial and practicing injustice!’ [Following] the customs of bountifulness and [fulfilling] the duties of generosity, he cared for the hopes of the poor and the maniacs.”⁶³¹

I have already discussed Jāwush Bāy’s role as a generous host to the king ‘Abdullah Khān. Our two major sources give a detailed account of the contact between the king and the local big man and the fact that the encounter further endorsed Jāwush Bāy’s reputation among the Manghit. Lending additional meaning to the term “prestigious people,” by citing the example of Jāwush Bāy the extract from the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* drafts an ideal picture of the personal characteristics an intermediary should have. First, he should possess wealth, especially in terms of livestock (horses, camels, sheep etc.). Second, he had to be a respectable person whose reputation (*i’tibār, nīknāmī*) rested on laudable characteristics (like generosity), expressed by the daily giving of gifts and paying attention to the needs of the poor. As Mullā Sharīf illustrates, these attitudes are highly agreeable to God, whose satisfaction with the ancestor of the future Manghit rulers became manifest in their rise and growing influence. Furthermore, a good middleman should enjoy the personal proximity and the trust of more influential and stronger actors, in the best case the king or an influential government official. He should have numerous contacts and command an extensive network of followers and clients. Besides, intermediaries needed certain rhetorical skills to be able to speak on behalf of their clients and bring about a favorable solution of their problems through successful intercession.

⁶³¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 203a–b. The *ḥadīth* quoted by Mullā Sharīf could not be found in the common *ḥadīth* collections in spite of checking the available registers.

When in 1737 the Qizilbāsh besieged the city of Qarshī, a group of people requested the governor to send a mediator, who was to ensnare the besiegers with “sweet words” in order to obtain promises of protection.⁶³² After the combat between the Yūz and the Bukharan troops at Ūrā Tippa in Ramaẓān 1168/June–July 1755, the Yūz leader Fāzil Bī sent envoys of eloquent speech and excellent declamation to the capital, where they saluted the *atālīq* and told him “the essence of the message with the tongue of devotion and submission.”⁶³³ A similar situation is reported by Qāzī Wafā, who informs his audience that in Ramaẓān 1162/August–September 1749, when Bukharan troops approached the Nūr and Santāb mountains in the northern Miyānkāl, the Burqūt and the Turkomān Yūzī sent messengers with rhetorical skills (*īlchīyān-i sukhan-dān*) to the court.⁶³⁴ The envoys dispatched by rulers for consultations with enemies also acted as mediators and therefore needed such skills. When Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī entered into negotiations with the Kīnakās in Shawwāl 1164/August–September 1751, “he selected some confidants with mild and docile speech” (*mu‘tamadān-i mulāyim-sukhan*) for the consultations with ‘Ālim Bī Kīnakās.⁶³⁵ Upon his arrival at the Iranian camp near Karkī in 1740, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī informed his new master Nādir Shāh about the state of affairs in Transoxania in “beautiful and best words full of eloquence ... according to the rules of wisdom.”⁶³⁶

Eloquence and rhetorical skills are described as highly praised characteristics in some of the chronicles. Depicting the dispute between Sunni and Shiite scholars at the court of Nādir Shāh, Mullā Sharīf extols the virtues of the Sunni dignitaries as follows:

“They made the jewel-spreading tongue the interpreter of all sorts of knowledge and turned the agreeable and pearl-scattering speech into the storyteller of miracles and wonders in support of the sanctity of the heavenly caliphs belonging to Paradise. Galloping about the steed with gentle pace like the faculty of superior speech in the hippodrome of eloquence and the arena of rhetoric, they reported to the listener of this assembly of vigilance [...] about the superiority of the Sunni people and the failure of those deviating from the right way and turning to the *bid‘at* [...]”⁶³⁷

⁶³² Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhar*, fol. 54b.

⁶³³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 400b.

⁶³⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 160a.

⁶³⁵ Ibid., fol. 193b.

⁶³⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 263b.

⁶³⁷ Ibid., fol. 309a.

Besides possessing the usual characteristics like good reputation, generosity, wealth and rhetorical skills, intermediaries had to be of a certain age. This is underlined by the following proverb used by ‘Ubaidullah Khān when he heard that the young and inexperienced *amīr* Ni‘matullah Bī had ceded the *qal‘a* of Tirmidh to his father-in-law, who joined the Qaṭaghān *amīr* of Balkh, Maḥmūd Bī: “Well, to confer the duties of elders (*kalānān*) on young men and to lay the burden of a male camel on a *lūkuja* is far from the right way.”⁶³⁸ ‘Ubaidullah Khān had every reason to be angry, because Maḥmūd Bī ravaged the vicinity of the town together with rebellious Dūrmān and Qungrāt tribes.⁶³⁹

CONCLUSION

In the previous sections I explored patterns of mediation by citing different anecdotes and passages from the chronicles. A glance at the sources shows that *tashafu* ‘, *shafā‘at* and *tawassul* were a firmly institutionalized procedure that was mostly employed in cases of disgrace. Usually, the person out of royal favor took the initiative and asked the court to send an intercessor from the circle of intimates or relatives surrounding the ruler or commander-in-chief. The person requested was free to react to the demands, and dispatched an intermediary for the preparation of negotiations. As the accounts suggest, mediation formed part of a procedure expressed and characterized by multiple acts and sequences of exchange. In light of the fact that it played a pivotal role in the ceremonial life at court, perhaps even forming part of the protocol, informality was out of the question. Appearing before a superior actor or at the court without an intercessor was simply regarded as impolite behavior. All actors preferred the personal access through network relations. The case of the governor of Nūr reveals that sometimes a middleman was needed to approach another, more influential actor, like a Sufi sheikh who was to act as a potential intermediary facilitating access to the ruler. In the cases explored, intercessors led their clients to the royal throne, a fact that hints at the ceremonial aspect of intercession and patronage.

⁶³⁸ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 58a; Semenov trans., 72. The *lūkuja* is a dromedary of about seven years that was regarded as lacking stamina and strength in comparison to male camels (Doerfer, *Elemente*, IV, 18).

⁶³⁹ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 56b–58a; Semenov trans., 71–72.

We should not forget that intermediaries connected various groups that have to be seen as personalized networks. In principle, many people could act as middlemen, given a certain status and influence, the indicators of which were offices, wealth and contacts with other important personages. Eloquent speech was also important to obtain the desired outcome of negotiations. In view of the extreme fluidity of the circumstances, it makes no sense to differentiate between inside and outside in locating and identifying intermediaries. Instead, mediation was wholly situational and more a matter of one's position in the social hierarchy and strength due to the control of certain power means. As the example of the Manghit leaders illustrates, many intercessors drew their prestige from their personal contacts with other actors or the ability to recognize the mood of the time as early as possible. The role of many intermediaries was indeed twofold: they were patrons and intercessors for their own clients but highly dependent on somebody else's favor to protect their followers. Thus, men like Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī and his sons were clients of Nādir Shāh and patrons of other local Transoxanian notables and Uzbek chiefs. As such, they were not so different from other intermediaries like city notables, village chiefs and local elders, Uzbek tribal chieftains or Sufi sheikhs. Dignitaries like Mīr Nizām al-Dīn Ḥusainī, Īshān Ishāq Khwāja Makhdūm-i A'zam, or the Jūybārī *khwājas* were often requested as mediators because of their closeness to the supernatural realm and their outstanding religious knowledge. The Sufi sheikhs often played the role of religious mentors representing the ruler before and connecting him to particular societal groups.⁶⁴⁰

Quoting the example of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān, I demonstrated that a successful commander or even the ruler could wield authority by acting as a middleman. In 1757 the first Manghit *amīr* presided over an officially held *kingāsh*, a consultative council composed of other Uzbek chieftains and Sufi sheikhs. At this assembly he settled the conflict between contending factions from Khiwa. Most notably, the new ruler was approached by the Khiwans when his reputation and authority had reached its apex around 1756–57.

We should, of course, also bear in mind that the whole procedure, beginning with the choice of a certain mediator through the request and the actual intercession, was an act of power that led to the establishment of interfaces for negotiation and personal contact. These hinges were crucial because they provided the stage where relations and alliances were actually

⁶⁴⁰ Paul, "Scheiche," 287, 313.

forged. Yet the conditions at the link between clientage and patronage were characterized by visible inequalities due to differences in social status, rank and control of resources. When Nādir Shāh met his Manghit protégé along with other notables from Transoxania in 1747, only the king and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī acted as spokesmen. The other Uzbek chiefs and religious scholars remained silent, feeling it advisable not to speak, let alone protest against the decisions made. Furthermore, we can conclude that the Manghit leaders acted not only as middlemen but also as social entrepreneurs, since their relationship with the Iranians fostered their own reputation, thus greatly contributing to their rise in conjunction with the rapid expansion of their own personal network.

It is worth noting that authority came to bear significance precisely at the interface between patrons and clients. It was here that the means of power like land grants, offices, titles, and financial means were negotiated, distributed and redistributed. As could be demonstrated by focusing on the example of the Manghits, information—one of the most important resources—was prone to manipulation by the negotiators. The filtering of information took two forms: the strategic withholding of facts or a deliberate oversupply of detailed information.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the ways our chroniclers construct notions of a divinely sanctioned order, which constitutes a framework of action. Of particular importance here are energetic rulers who act as keepers of the political order, and sometimes even as refounders of the old empires.

THE PORTRAYAL OF ORDER IN BUKHARAN CHRONICLES

The topic of order figures prominently in our sources. The terms used to denote order are *intizām* or *niḡām*,⁶⁴¹ *nasaq*,⁶⁴² *zābiṭa*,⁶⁴³ and *inḡibāṭ*,⁶⁴⁴ while the orderly arranging of things is described as *tansīq-i mahām*,⁶⁴⁵ *taswīya-yi*

⁶⁴¹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 4b, 19a, 21b, 37b, 54a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 108b, 126b, 129a, 168b, 200a passim.

⁶⁴² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 44a, 59a, 64b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 269b, 316b, 353b, 445a passim.

⁶⁴³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 119a, 137b, 291b, 311b passim.

⁶⁴⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 68a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 315b.

⁶⁴⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 74a.

asās,⁶⁴⁶ *żabṭ wa nasq-i wilāyāt/mamālik*,⁶⁴⁷ *tanzīm-i qawā'id-i/mahām-i mamlakat*, *tansīq-i mamlakat* or *żabṭ wa baṣṭ-i intizām-i mamlakat*.⁶⁴⁸ This wide repertoire of phrases reflects the importance the chroniclers ascribed to ordering activities of the rulers and their agents. Often we are informed that the “reins of order” (*zamām-i mahām-i niẓām*), the “reins of authority” (*zamām-i ikhtiyār*) or the “bridles of ordering affairs” (*zamām-i ratq wa fatq*) were put in somebody’s strong hands.⁶⁴⁹ The rulers played a pivotal role in maintaining order, which is often equated with peace, security and calm.⁶⁵⁰ This kind of order based on a state of harmony and peace contrasts with the picture of disorder (*bī-żabaṭagī/bī-sāmānī*),⁶⁵¹ the most important signs of which are rebellion, unrest (*fitna*, *fasād*, *shūrish*, *āshūb*) and vicissitude (*inqilāb*) originating from conflict and dispute (*nizā'*, *jadāl*).⁶⁵² The historians sometimes also use words like chaos (*harj wa marj*) or confusion (*parīshānī*).⁶⁵³

As will be illustrated in the next sections, the Bukharan authors had clear ideas about order and how it should be maintained. They portrayed order as a direct outcome of acts of power such as dispensing justice and arranging local affairs, for instance after combats. Order and orderliness were associated with hierarchies and seating arrangements at court, which were often approved of and even admired. Finally, they also identify clear sources and causes of order and disorder.

JUSTICE-DISPENSING AND ORDERING RULERS

As we see in the chronicles, the strong arms of an energetic ruler or military leader were regarded as a crucial prerequisite for order. The historians

⁶⁴⁶ Ibid., fol. 74a.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., fol. 81a.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid., fols. 4b, 114a, 178b, 199b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 209a, 334a, 423b, 424a passim.

⁶⁴⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 44a, 54b, 251b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 137a, 154a, 291b, 336b, 353a, 424a passim. On the topic of order in Manghit chronicles with a similar overview of the terminology, see von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 255–58.

⁶⁵⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 38a, 50b, 61b, 63a, 257a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 111a, 157a, 191a, 258a, 266a, 316a passim. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 256.

⁶⁵¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 297a, 313b, 354b.

⁶⁵² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 54a, 69b, 81b, 99b, 128a, 130b, 214a passim. Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 108a, 157a, 267a, 291b, 348a passim.

⁶⁵³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fol. 127a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 161a, 183a, 296a, 354b, 434b.

consider the organization of punitive expeditions to be the most significant ordering activity needed to ensure security, calm and economic well-being. The far-flung military campaigns indeed demanded a considerable degree of internal organization, effort, cooperation and coordination: the transmission of messages and information (e.g., heralds had to be sent to the different domains and citadels to inform local governors and tribal chiefs about the imminent campaign and to summon them to the royal court),⁶⁵⁴ the provision of the troops and the arrangement of the weaponry,⁶⁵⁵ the coordination of the movement of troops and the entire equipment,⁶⁵⁶ and the regulation of affairs concerning the army, including the troop formations (division into contingents of one hundred and one thousand soldiers) and the order of battle (left wing, right wing, and the center).⁶⁵⁷

A closer look at our sources indicates that order indeed rested on a distribution of power through negotiations in the aftermath of military campaigns and sieges. In these contexts, order needed to be established and maintained by the king (e.g., the ordering of the affairs of the government and the population). Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's measures in Shahr-i Sabz after the execution of the Kīnakās leaders in 1752 are also described in terms of "arranging local affairs":

"Throwing the ray of attention, the fortunate *amīr* engaged in ordering the affairs of this region by paying close attention to all affairs of the entire populace. The thorns and thistles of the impudent people were removed from this domain with nurture and moisture (*tarbiyat wa tarāwat*). He displayed all signs of spreading justice (*mu'ādilat-gustarī*) to the inhabitants of this area and all manner of cultivating the smallest particles from the horizon of laudable virtues."⁶⁵⁸

⁶⁵⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 11b, 27b, 68b, 105a, 121b, 162a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 115a, 226a, 345a, 375a passim; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 585–86, 625, 787, 865 passim; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fols. 14a, 23a passim.

⁶⁵⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 69b, 128b, 136b, 205a, 222a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 140a, 298b, 356a–b, 383b passim; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, III, 936, 966 passim.

⁶⁵⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 36b, 73b, 129a, 204b, 242a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 121a, 298b, 361b, 383b passim; Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II/III, 585, 936, 966, 1103 passim; Ya'qūb, *Tārīkh*, fols. 5a, 11a, 22a.

⁶⁵⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 74a, 128a, 150a–b, 172a, 203a passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 120a, 175b, 228b, 391b passim. We find different terms like *intiẓām wa ihtimām dādan* (انتظام و اهتمام دادن), *ta'bīya wa taswīya namūdan* (تعبیه و تسویه نمودن), *muratab wa muntaẓam sākhtan* (مرتب و منظم ساختن), *zīb wa taz'īn bakshīdan* (زیب و تزئین بخشیدن) or *yāsāmīshī namūdan* (یاسامیشی نمودن) regarding the ordering of the troops or military formations.

⁶⁵⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 199b.

The chronicler explicates his descriptions by pointing to the indulgence of the ruler in generously forgiving the other surviving leaders of the Kīnakās, who feared punishment. In addition to these measures, the Manghit *amīr* ordered the repair of the fortress of Shahr-i Sabz, which was damaged by the ravages of the times. He also resettled many people from other forts in the vicinity and thus repopulated the city.⁶⁵⁹

Order and ordering measures can also be observed in the context of festivities at the court, during rounds of appointments, or when servants and subjects were instructed to carry out this or that assignment. One such example is Nādir Shāh giving instructions to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and the other Transoxanian nobles to put the affairs of Mā Warā' al-Nahr in order:

“Summoning the commander-in-chief, the possessor of the dominion of Turan, the group of *amīrs* and the commanders to the celestial court of Iran, it was the sublime purpose of the king of Farīdūn’s grandeur and the far-reaching goal of the great ruler to elevate the foundation of the high-ranking *amīr*’s seat of fortune to the summit of honor and the towers of magnificence. [He wished] to depose the king of Turan, Sayyid Abū’l-Faiz Khān, and to install an heir of his dynasty and a successor to his authority [...]. [He further aimed] to inform the Turanian *amīrs* about the meaning of his [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s] skills in regulating the affairs of kingdoms and his boldness in handling the matters of empires as well as about the essence of his character and his innate talents. After putting them several times on the touchstone, he saw them to be pure of every perturbation and without deceit caused by danger and anxiety, rendered clear and bright in the mirror of contemporary minds. He therefore made the private audience and his tent camp of indispensable distinction the place of the sunrise of authority and regal dignity, whilst turning the glorious throne into the place of the sunset of power and fortune. At this splendid and adorned dwelling place [Nādir’s camp at Langar-i Jām],* he turned the fortunate *amīr* [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī] together with the Turanian commanders and the royal vice gerents into intimate companions of kindness and favors, and into interlocutors of the vanguard of benevolence and respect. [...] He also arranged all sorts of fruits and viands and prepared all kinds of food and drinks one after another. After causing the hearts of the attendees of the banquet to overflow from the royal feast, he lifted the veil of concealment from the countenance of the henna adorned beautiful bride for the prayer. He provoked the talking parrot to chew the sugar of these unique words and agreeable advice and thus became the entertainer of the council of the Turanian *amīrs* and the intimates of Abū’l-Faiz Khān’s court. [Nādir Shāh] brought the dazzling jewels of pearl-scattering words through the bestowal of gifts to the ears of the commanders of the Turanian

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid., fols. 199b–200a.

* Langar is located in the Jām Valley in Khurāsān, 117 miles from Mashhad and 16 miles from Turbat-i Sheikh Jām on the main caravan road to Herat (Ludwig W. Adamec, *Historical Gazetteer of Iran*, vol. II: *Meshed and Northeastern Iran* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1981), 444).

kingdom, who were endowed with the qualities of amīrhood: ‘With this scattered substance and the brow of diligent search, which is the Lord of the Truth, the Most Holy, may He be exalted, the possessor of the universal kingdom and the master of its substance and the quarters of its heavens, the one who manifests the signs of night and day, the source of winter and spring, He turned in accordance with the beautiful order—‘He is it who hath made you vice-regents in the earth and hath raised some of you above others in rank, in order to try you by what He hath given you. Verily thy Lord is quick to inflict consequences, but He is forgiving and compassionate.’ (Koran XI/165)—the fortunate *sultāns* and high-born possessors of power into objects of grace and vengeance and into the source of poison and antidote. He showed affection and bestowed favors in the arena of granting the positions of kings and the rank of divine shades to this fortunate group [of men] and tied the ordering of the affairs of the poor, the subjects and the peasants to their good conduct and grasping justice. He distributed the areas of the inhabited quarters and the various regions of the world entirely and partly to each and every one of these keepers of gold crowns and commanders of legions as numerous as stars. With this desired condition, He paid attention to the dealings of the infirm and was [also] aware of the affliction of the inhabitants. With daily increasing might, He eased the conditions of every poor unfortunate [man] and trod upon the affairs [of every] infirm emperor. He appointed [kings] for the commoners and subjects, whom He had placed under the hands of dominion and in the valley of authority, to draw the arrows of their good fortune and cause them to swear fidelity.’⁶⁶⁰

Here Qāzī Wafā highlights the conditions and dynamics unfolding on the negotiation interfaces when superiors came to distribute the means of power among their followers. Explaining Nādir Shāh’s motives in summoning the notables and tribal chieftains from Transoxania, the passage sheds light on the importance of patronage as an instrument for the delegation of authority and a mode of conduct regulating governmental affairs in the name of the Almighty. In addition to the removal of Abū’l-Faiz Khān, the king intended to help his protégé by raising his reputation among the other Uzbek nobles and probable future rivals. The major components—hospitality and generosity but also rhetorical skills—are mentioned as forms of conduct. Nādir’s direct speech in the second part of the passage clearly echoes the crucial position of God the Almighty as the ultimate creator and protector of the order of things.

As mentioned in Nādir’s speech before the Uzbek commanders, the dispensation of justice (*mu’dalat-gustarī*) and mercy to subjugated parts of the population in the aftermath of sieges and campaigns is also seen as one of the measures contributing to order. The authors often refer to these

⁶⁶⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 94b–96a.

aspects as they were crucial in maintaining the desired state of calm, security and peace.⁶⁶¹ For example, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's chronicler describes justice (*'adl*) as "a kingdom-embellishing drop and a spark illuminating the dispelling darkness."⁶⁶² In view of the frightening situation and the turmoil following a ruler's death, it is understandable that, following the model of Amīn Bukhārī's *Ūbaidullah Nāma*, Mullā Sharīf extols 'Ubaidullah Khān for his justice and all the attributes a good ruler is usually associated with:

"He freed the tracts of land and territories, which were under the sway of his heavenly exalted father, with the light of justice from tyranny, vicissitude and damage by gratifying the notables and *amīrs* of the court, the governors and guards of the fortresses and the *iqṭā's* of the empire with royal favors. The gardens of the worldly and the religious matters flourished under the rain showers from the clouds of his justice and he conveyed the precept to nurture the poor subjects and the weak. He brought the voice of dispensing justice and burning tyrants to the environs of the kingdom and the pathways of the surroundings."⁶⁶³

This and many other passages mentioning the dispensation of justice by the rulers—especially after the end of sieges and campaigns—connect the subject of justice and rightness (*'adālat*, *mu'dalat*) to the proper exercise of protection. This is best achieved by the confirmation of local notables and tribal chiefs in their positions, but also, as the last extract shows, by the satisfaction of amirid demands. However, all those with a bad reputation as cruel oppressors need to be eradicated or subjected to the orders of the emperor. For example, regarding solicitude for the subjects and tirelessness in establishing order as royal virtues, 'Ubaidullah Khān announced his will to

"stand up from the resting-place and to get ready to cut short the tyrannical hands of the oppressors [...] so that the garden of desires inhabited by the populace of Mā Warā' al-Nahr will be cleared of the thorns of the mischief-makers and the path of security will be smoothed."⁶⁶⁴

The satisfaction of needs, implying material and military assistance or other forms of favor, is also crucial for the maintenance of order, as the following

⁶⁶¹ Ibid., fols. 93b, 126b, 131b, 212b, 252b, 319b. See also Muḥammad Amīn, *Mazhar*, fol. 43a.

⁶⁶² Muḥammad Amīn, *Mazhar*, fol. 15b.

⁶⁶³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 110a–b.

⁶⁶⁴ Amīn Bukhārī, *Ūbaidullah Nāma*, fols. 24b–25a; Semenov trans., 39.

direct speech by the Manghit leader on the occasion of the siege of Khuzār in Rabīʿ II 1164/February–March 1751 reflects:

“From the very beginning until now, the foundation of authority (*asās-i salṭanat*) and establishment of order in the domains of Turan and among the Turkic tribes had been kept in the imperial shade of high-standing kings. The order of the pillars of Mā Warāʾ al-Nahr and the Uzbek tribes has witnessed expansion under the auspices of the possessors of dignity and grandeur. The large and the small affairs of the populace—whether of nobles or commoners—were linked to and depended on their secret-discovering wisdom. The coins of the government were adorned with their illustrious names and the Friday prayers were recited under their noble title. Every influential person who raised the banner of independence in the center of glory, and all other high-ranking and bold commanders, even those from the most remote corners of the kingdom, bound their neck of hope to the saddle-straps of submission. They turned the countenance of need to the court, the refuge of the world, in order to obtain the means of prosperity and other necessary things. Now that the breeze of the gift emanating from the rose garden of the Creator’s generosity blows over the flag elevating this dynasty, all tribal leaders must bow the brow of obedience and devotion to the threshold of felicity and raise the banner of pride and respect on the fault of sun and moon.”⁶⁶⁵

Trying to underpin his master’s claims to the atālīqate, the chronicler refers to the order of Transoxania by enumerating the most important components of rule and authority: first, the essential insignia of governmental authority—the *sikka* and the *khuṭba*—the reading of the Friday sermon and the minting of coins in the name of the king. And second, royal patronage, which is not mentioned here explicitly but in fact meant. The speech suggests that personal contacts at the court and proximity to the ruler were important, even in remote areas. The new *atālīq* continued his speech to the envoys of Muḥammad Amīn Bī Yūz by pointing to the principle of delegated authority: the governors and *amīrs* have to subdue rebellious chiefs in the name of the ruler.⁶⁶⁶

In another passage of his voluminous work, Wafā attributes the observance of order to gubernatorial appointments in return for loyalty and service:

“Since it was the abiding custom of the Juchid rulers and the Uzbek *khāns* to distribute equal favors amongst the thirty-two Uzbek warrior tribes (*ūrūgh-i ʿasākir-i uzbekīya*) and to gratify the leader of every tribe and the chief of each lineage according to his

⁶⁶⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 184b.

⁶⁶⁶ و هر یاغی و شیریری که از ربقه فرمان و طوق اطاعت سر طغیان تابد جمهور بری از نفاق اورا بطریق صلاح و سداد هدایت و ارشاد نمایند و اگر از راه جهالت قدم به وادی خسران نهاد اورا بسزای واجب و جزای مناسب رسانند (ibid., fols. 184b–185a).

distinguished rank with honorable offices, *amīr* positions at the royal court and requisite seats, they regarded this laudable way as the cause of the order of the kingdom, as the reason for the enhancement of grandeur and dignity, as the source of prosperity and magnificence, and the precondition for the repose of the entire populace. The descendants of their descendants were under the condition of formal recognition endowed with the ability of their fathers and followed the path of their ancestors generation by generation. Likewise, for the brave heroes and the armed fighters, casting and chasing the dragon on the battlefield, [those] who killed the snatching basilisk with spears and annihilated the enemies of the age with lightning and sharp lancets, [the soldiers] who rendered praiseworthy service during the attacks of the misfortunes and calamities, all those fulfilling the duties of allegiance and acting on the salary of dependence—each and every one of them was exalted to the rank of amirhood and elevated with the governorship over provinces in accordance with his endeavors.⁶⁶⁷

Referring to the rule of the former emperors, who had taken the needs and services of the tribal leaders of *Mā Warā' al-Nahr* into consideration, *Qāzī Wafā* highlights the aspect of equality and egalitarianism by emphasizing the equal allocation of offices to all leaders of the Uzbek tribes commensurate with their efforts. But nonetheless, the text continues with graduation and distinction by rank and title. According to Anke von Kügelgen, we see here a clash between egalitarian notions and a sense of elitist thinking entrenched in social hierarchies.⁶⁶⁸ Furthermore, the chronicler identifies this way of rewarding the tribal leadership and their followers for their services as the ultimate source of order and prosperity guaranteeing the well-being of the entire population. By mentioning that the descendants of the early Chingizid rulers observed this custom from generation to generation (*baṭnan ba'd baṭn*), he points to the longevity of this rule.

In the *'Ubaidullah Nāma* the arranging or ordering of affairs is directly connected to the distribution of offices and ranks among the followers, as the title of the chapter describing a round of appointments after the conquest of Balkh in 1707 illustrates:

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid., fols. 257a–b.

⁶⁶⁸ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 257. The contrast between egalitarianism and elitism becomes clear when looking at the principle of divine providence derived from the Persian tradition of kingship (Stefan Leder, “Aspekte arabischer und persischer Fürstenspiegel,” in *Erlesenes – Sonderheft der Halleschen Beiträge zur Orientalwissenschaft anlässlich des 19. Kongresses der Union Européenne d'Arabisaunts et Islamisaunts*, ed. Walter Beltz and Sebastian Günther (Halle: Martin-Luther-Univ. Halle-Wittenberg, Institut f. Orientalistik, 1998), 128).

“[...] the arranging and ordering [the affairs] of the dominion of Balkh and the entrusting of the offices and the frontier lands of Balkh and Bukhara to the well-wishing *amīrs* and nobles as well as to the young fighters of the devoted and loyal army [...]”⁶⁶⁹

Each round of appointments mirrored social inequalities; not every man had access to the illustrious inner circle of actors around the ruler. In the sources, social hierarchies and the grid of power relations can be decoded in seating arrangements and battle orders.

HIERARCHIES AND SPATIAL MANIFESTATIONS OF SOCIAL ORDER

The division into right and left wing (*ūng wa sūl*) in battle was of similar significance for the organization of space at court and the rules determining the seating order. Modeled on Turko-Mongol customs, a distinct seating plan foresaw fixed seats (*ūrūn*, *maqām*) assigned to tribal chieftains, urban notables and religious dignitaries on both sides of the royal throne hall.⁶⁷⁰ Besides the arrangement of seats, we also see actors who were not permitted to sit down in the presence of the ruler; some others were not permitted to come by horse to the court.⁶⁷¹ Bleichsteiner describes the following arrangements and spatial division at the Tuqay-Timurid court:

“The places of honor on the left side were occupied by the Naqibs (Arab. *naqīb*, pl. *nuqabā*, ‘leader,’ ‘chief,’ ‘headman’) [...]. Only after them came the princes including the heir-apparent followed by the *qārī*, the leaders of the Dürmān, Qūshchī, Naymān and Qungrāt, after them the Supreme Atālīq and the Ughlān (probably princes of lower rank, later also pages), the *nangnah* (little old mother, old woman) of the Dürmān, Qūshchī, Naymān, and then the representatives of Qarluq Būyrāq tribes etc. The less venerable right side (Mongol. *barānghār*, Turkic *ung*) was primarily occupied by the members of the religious establishment headed by the Sheikh al-Islām. The religious dignitaries were followed by [...] the representatives of the Qarā Qiyāt and later also the Kīnakās. After them came the middle ranks (*ara*) of the Dürmān etc. [...] It should be noted that special places of honor were reserved for the original Mongol tribes, the Dürmān, Naymān and

⁶⁶⁹ *Dhikr-i tartīb wa tansīq-i mamlakat-i Balkh wa tafwīz-i ‘amal wa sar-haddāt-i Balkh wa Bukhārā ba umarā wa a’yān-i khair-khwāh wa jawānān-i sipāh-i jan-sipār wa daulat-khwāh ...* (Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 123b; Semenov trans., 140).

⁶⁷⁰ Bregel, *Administration*, 20; Holzwarth, “The Uzbek State,” 103–04. For an explanation of the Mongol term *ūrūn* and the arrangement of seats under the Mongols, see Doerfer, *Elemente*, I, 163–65.

⁶⁷¹ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 88.

Qungrāt, while the Turkic group of the Qarluq, but also that of the Qiyāt had to be content with less honored seats.”⁶⁷²

McChesney argues that this pattern should not be treated too rigidly, and although the position of the three *ulūsāt* Dūrmān, Qūshchī and Naymān was an important basis of their authority, the most influential *amīrs* of seventeenth-century Transoxania did not belong to these groups.⁶⁷³ Hence, we may conclude that this seating map did not mirror the actual political constellations but should be seen rather as a visible sign of inertia. Granting a special aristocratic status to the three above-mentioned tribes on the basis of their Mongol legacy, contemporary worldviews upheld the memory of a glorious past of the Uzbeks as a part of the Inner Asian steppe society. This memory was also cultivated by the ceremonial distribution of *kumys* among the tribal representatives in the seating plan described above. This ceremony was by no means chaotic but took place in an orderly way:

“When they prepared kumis at the court of the Uzbek *khāns*, at a sign from the *khān* one of the servants (*udaychī*) first filled his goblet, observing all the rules of etiquette. The *khān* tasted a bit and passed the rest to one of his trusted advisers with the rank of *amīr*. The *amīr* had to exchange the cup of the *khān* for his own goblet and drink the offered kumis. Subsequently, the *udaychī* drank and emptied his cup and passed a second one to the *khān* in the former order. Afterward it was the turn of the other *amīrs* to drink, and after them the other office holders (*īshik-āqā*, *qūrchī*) and finally the other persons present. During the distribution of the kumis, there was no confusion or chaos among the guests on the left and the right wing. They proceeded in an orderly manner, two men on each side sat down beside the *udaychī*, received from him one cup each, simultaneously emptied them and rose again, genuflected and returned to their places.”⁶⁷⁴

This sequence mirrors a strong sense of hierarchies and hierarchical thinking, indicated by the goblet passing from the highest-standing person, the king, down the line through permanent exchange. Our sources further suggest that the seating arrangements, based on the division into right and left, were very inert. They had been in place in the Turko-Mongol context since pre-Chingizid times and, in spite of minor modifications, continued

⁶⁷² Bleichsteiner, “Zeremonielle Trinksitten,” 182. The transliteration of the Turko-Mongol and the Arabic words in this passage and the markings in italics do not follow the German original! Some Turko-Mongol words were spelled incorrectly in the original, for example, *kart* instead of *qārt* or *nānā* instead of *nangnah*. For the exact transliteration see McChesney, “The Amirs,” 39–40.

⁶⁷³ McChesney, “The Amirs,” 40.

⁶⁷⁴ Bleichsteiner, “Zeremonielle Trinksitten,” 183.

well into the nineteenth century. Mullā Sharīf, particularly, argues in favor of the established social hierarchy. Interestingly, the historian describes this hierarchy in terms of order when he portrays the enthronization of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī:

“The illustrious *amīrs* and the revered notables genuflected on places of magnitude and rejoicing from the right-hand side to the left-hand side at the foot of the throne of celestial traces and performed the ceremony of congratulation and pleasure but also the necessary prayers and the eulogium. Those knowing about the rules of the seats and the order of the royal court placed the high-ranking judges and *sayyids*, the protectors, lords and governors of excellent qualities according to their ranks, titles and offices after the custom of the emperors on splendid carpets situated at the right and the left side (*ūng wa sūl*) of the heavenly throne hall. The group of the *tūqsābas*, *mīrākḥūrs* and other officials, who had been denied the rank of sitting down in the throne hall, stood at the end of this glorious assembly in a line from right to left, and, putting the hands of devotion on their waist, adorned the line with honorable etiquette. When the royal throne was ornamented beyond all limits and imagination with the utmost splendor and grandeur through the joyful enthronization of the fortunate ruler and the right and the left wing of the celestial court were totally embellished with the beauty and dignity of order (*ba ḥusn-i niẓām wa sha'n-i intiẓām*) through the presence of the revered office-bearers and the high-ranking commanders, the skillful *khwān*-bearing servants came and spread out the tablecloth of gifts and benefits as well as the *khwān* of generosity and gratefulness in front of the notables.”⁶⁷⁵

What Mullā Sharīf describes and praises here is very much in line with the tradition of chronicle writing. Many works that are classified as “mirrors for princes” fall back on the Iranian model favoring an elitist order.⁶⁷⁶ Apart from this, the passage describes a socially constructed hierarchy, which was being constantly created through ongoing exchange practices and the unequal distribution of power means. We can also conceive this hierarchy as a manifestation of the worldview and a reflection of actual power relations. What is most remarkable in the excerpt quoted above is the description of the court order based on ranks, offices and titles and the institutionalization

⁶⁷⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 403b–404a.

⁶⁷⁶ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 128–31; Lambton, “Medieval Persian Theory,” 96–97. Many political theories drafted by later Muslim scholars go back to the *Siyāsāt-Nāma* by Niẓām al-Mulk (408/1018–485/1092), whose teachings were a mixture between the ideal of the Persian kings and Islamic theory (A. K. S. Lambton, “Quis Custodiet Custodes. Some Reflections on the Persian Theory of Government,” in *Theory and Practice in Medieval Persian Government*, ed. A. K. S. Lambton (London: Variorum Reprints, 1980), 135–36, 140). See also Louise Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism in Islamic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 129.

of this order through the performance of the actors at the very moments described by the historian. We see the formation of “most beautifully embellished lines” and the left and right wings of the royal court. What we have here is not only the enthronization as a sequence of numerous acts, but also a moment of active enforcement and internalization of the social order at court by all persons in the throne hall. Their worldview is expressed not just by the distinct social status but also in body gestures and postures: the prostration, the genuflection, the bowed heads and bodies, as well as the arms bent and hands raised in prayer for the new king. In this way, the actors symbolically expressed their acceptance of the order and confirmed the new king in his superior rank.

Besides the detailed descriptions of the enthronization, the passage reflects perfectly the author’s *doxic* relationship to the existing order, which is, in his own opinion, beautiful and even esthetic. We should bear in mind that the passages cited in this chapter do not represent a theory of order drafted by the Manghit historians.⁶⁷⁷ Since their explanations are based rather on primary perceptions of the social universe, we are dealing here with first-hand insights or knowledge of the chroniclers that incorporated the structural principles and modes of order. The extracts from the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* and the *Tuhfat al-khānī* represent puzzle pieces of acts of understanding, but also of an unconscious misapprehension implicitly encompassing an appreciation and recognition of the social order.⁶⁷⁸ Finally, and as the above extract reveals, this order is confirmed by all *amīrs*, notables and servants. Its acknowledgement and tacit acceptance is enforced by the round of gift giving and the subsequent banquet that is only adumbrated at the end of the quotation.

The spatial manifestation of social order can also be observed in the arrangements of the army. The battle order as well as the position of different tribal contingents at the gates of besieged cities created an essential map reflecting social relationships and the figurations prevailing at a certain point in time.⁶⁷⁹ The respective position in this order was a strong indicator not only of loyalties and allegiances, but also of the close relations (*qurbat*)

⁶⁷⁷ Anke von Kügelgen reaches the same conclusion (von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 258–59).

⁶⁷⁸ See here Bourdieu, *Die feinen Unterschiede*, 734–35.

⁶⁷⁹ McChesney, “The Conquest of Herat,” 84–90; Noelle-Karimi, *Pearl*, 3; see also chapter The Figurations of Power/The Circumstances under the last Tuqay-Timurids/Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī Yūz.

one or another actor entertained with the ruler and the privileges and favors he enjoyed at the time of the siege. It is worth mentioning that the composition and division of the army was modeled on Mongol and pre-Mongol examples, a fact that underlines the longevity of social patterns, the dual organization of space, etiquette and ceremony.⁶⁸⁰

The inequalities inherent in this hierarchy and hierarchical thinking as well as its appreciation as something esthetic can be traced to ancient notions of justice (*'adālat*) and its normative conceptual adaptation in the *Fürstenspiegel* literature.⁶⁸¹ Preferring knowledge and wisdom as against justice, many classical Islamic authors do not precisely define justice.⁶⁸² But in many instances, Muslim authors place emphasis on the proper functioning of the government and the necessity of a strong ruler.⁶⁸³ In the time before the fall of the caliphate in 1258, justice was often interpreted as mirrored in a state of harmony and righteousness. Accordingly, retribution was the consequence for those who failed to live up to the ideal.⁶⁸⁴ Stating that his master always observed the rules of justice in his dealings with the people, one Bukharan chronicler, for instance, depicts justice as the response to the calls for help of the oppressed, while defining benevolent action as “anointing the wounds of the injured with the salve of tranquility.” He also states that in the scale-pan of worship to God, one hour of royal justice exceeds the worship of sixty years because the result of worship is only given to the worshiper, whereas the emoluments of justice benefit the entire population. If the success of the lords responsible for the worldly and the religious affairs is bound to and ordered by the blessings of this rule, the rewards will be beyond the limits of reckoning.⁶⁸⁵

⁶⁸⁰ Bleichsteiner also points to the longevity of these rules (Bleichsteiner, “Zeremonielle Trinksitten,” 181, 207).

⁶⁸¹ Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 128.

⁶⁸² Lambton, “Medieval Persian Theory,” 98–99.

⁶⁸³ One of the authors stressing the need for an administrator for the organization of society is Ibn Sīnā. According to him, society rested on transaction (*mu'āmala*), which requires a law (*sunna*) and justice (*'adl*) to be enforced by a legislator and preserver of justice (*mu'adil*) (Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 52).

⁶⁸⁴ A. K. S. Lambton, “Early Timurid Theories of State,” 2.

⁶⁸⁵ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maṣṣhar*, fols. 15b–16a.

Medieval authors like al-Farābī (d. 339/950) sometimes present a more pronounced understanding of the dispensation of justice.⁶⁸⁶ Al-Farābī's ideas on society and order are derived from Platonic sources, but his thoughts also reflect an acquaintance with Aristotelian philosophy. In his view, man is compelled by his nature as a human being to live in community.⁶⁸⁷ He regarded injustice to be found in imperfect polities as the disturbance of hierarchy.⁶⁸⁸ Azmeh argues that

“[b]oth in its Greek and Persian acceptations and in the Arthasastric tradition, and indeed according to the Muslim inheritors of the Near Eastern patrimony, the notion of normative equity intended a notion not of equality or equivalence, but of optimal proportionality among the unequal and uneven components of a composite. [...] Justice is the maintenance of the mean or of the just middle. All virtues can be reduced to this mean which consists of the maintenance of order, that is to say of stable proportionality composed of hierarchy and functional interdependence between the elements of the body social. [...] The legal definition of justice and injustice is not premised on a metaphysic of equality or inequality as such, and not necessarily on a metaphysic of equity, but rather on a technical conception of rule-boundedness; Muslim law did not assume legal persons to be equally subject to all rules, but legally differentiated women, slaves, non-Muslims, and other categories. [...] Overall justice is the maintenance of order and of the stable equilibrium of unequal parts.”⁶⁸⁹

Using the metaphor of the human body, al-Farābī likens the role of the heart to that of the ruler in society. All the limbs and organs function according to their position in the social hierarchy under the command of the heart and cooperate to achieve perfection.⁶⁹⁰ Aristotelian notions of division within society are reflected by al-Farābī's distinction between elite (*khāṣṣa*) and commoners (*‘āmma*),⁶⁹¹ a distinction that is also to be found in the Bukharan chronicles.⁶⁹² However, what we observe here is not the conscious following

⁶⁸⁶ On al-Farābī's life and work see J. Wansbrough, “Al-Farābī,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., II, 778–82.

⁶⁸⁷ Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 50–51.

⁶⁸⁸ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 129. The elitist model of society has its roots in the pre-Islamic Persian (Sasanian) society (Lambton, “Medieval Persian Theory,” 96–97. See also Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 67–90, 128).

⁶⁸⁹ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 128. On Muslim receptions of Greek and Persian ideas of society, see Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 42–90.

⁶⁹⁰ Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 52–53.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid., 54.

⁶⁹² Amin Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 2a, 12a, 15a, 34b, 147b passim; Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 18a, 34a, 52a, 82b, 94b, 96b, 107a, 110a, 215b, 255a, 292b, 316b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 121a, 184a, 200a, 293b, 375b passim.

of al-Farābī's philosophy by two Bukharan chroniclers, but the reflection of an unconscious adherence to hierarchical thinking entrenched in the contemporary worldview.

MULLĀ SHARĪF ESTEEMS KINSHIP AND GENEALOGICAL ORDER

Another important mechanism described by Mullā Sharīf is kinship mirrored in the formation of a tribal-genealogical order. Referring to God, he writes:

“Although it is the sunshine emanating from His High Majesty, the king of the moon-like procession, whose authority and justice illuminates the cities and the steppe, and despite the fact that the traces of His justice and immense wisdom as well as the reputation of His daily increasing might brought the essence of His perfection to the ears of the people of the inhabited quarter according to the verse—‘There will be no more relationships between them that day. Nor will one ask after another!’ (Koran XXIII/101) [...], it was—according to the words bearing witness to the miracle of order (*mu'jiz-i nizām*)—‘We have created you [...] races and tribes, that ye may show mutual recognition (not that ye may despise each other);’ (Koran XLIX/13)—the habit of the notables and leaders of every tribe, and particularly that of the Mongol *amīrs*, to preserve the lineages of their ancestors. They viewed them with respect and taught them to their grandchildren and descendants. They engraved [the genealogies] in the *dīwāns* and registers and made immense efforts to preserve them so that everyone knew his lineage and his tribe.”⁶⁹³

By quoting verses from the Koran, our author ascribes the existence of tribal genealogical order resting on kinship and descent to the work of the Creator. God created tribes as an inseparable part of the order of things, which he calls a miracle. The last sentences are of particular interest because they roughly explain the institutionalization of the genealogical order by the actors, who passed the genealogies and the knowledge about lineages and their—partly mythical—ancestors from one generation to the next. Two aspects are crucial here. First, things are not solely arranged by the king. Notables and tribal leaders also engaged in ordering activity, here by permanently preserving pedigrees and handing them down to younger generations. And second, this order rests on the habit of those actors of maintaining and transferring genealogical knowledge, which was part of contemporary worldviews.

The importance of genealogies is mirrored by the reference of the rulers to Chingizid descent as a centuries-old, important precondition for

⁶⁹³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 198b–199a.

legitimized rule.⁶⁹⁴ Some of the chroniclers invent a distinct Mongol ancestry.⁶⁹⁵ Living in the first part of the nineteenth century, Mullā Sharīf also belongs to those paying considerable attention to the Chingizids and genealogical legitimacy. For instance, he points to the importance of genealogical knowledge and says that learning the names of one's ancestors is praiseworthy. He exemplifies this by recording Abū'l-Faiz Khān's entire pedigree back to Chingīz Khān.⁶⁹⁶ He also endeavors to place the Manghits in genealogical proximity (*qurbat*) to Chingīz Khān by figuring out their ancestor to be Jaqsū, the great-great-grandfather of Chingīz Khān. With this, the Manghit leaders stand in the tradition of the Timurids and are therefore distinguished among the other Uzbek tribes.⁶⁹⁷ In his work, Mullā Sharīf often refers to Chingīz Khān, his legacy, and the importance of descent from the "Golden Clan."⁶⁹⁸ According to him, even Nādir Shāh mentioned the Chingizid order when he held his speech before the Uzbek commanders in 1747. On that occasion, Nādir Shāh allegedly confirmed the privilege of the offspring of the world conqueror to claim the throne, while the leaders of the Turkic tribes had to act as guardians. The chronicler put warnings into Nādir's mouth, admonishing the Uzbek notables not to transgress against the essential custom and the ancestral order, but to obey the Chingizids so that the foundation of authority will be maintained.⁶⁹⁹ In view of his favoring the descendants of Chingīz Khān, it is no wonder that Mullā Sharīf is very

⁶⁹⁴ The author of the *Tadhkira-yi muqīm-khānī* also focused on the norm of Chingizid descent by devoting the entire preface to Chingīz Khān and his campaigns. In "The Tale of Ascent of Chingīz Khān's Star of Fortune" he explains the conqueror's genealogy leading back to Alānquwā, the mythical first mother of the Mongols (see Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī, *Tadhkira*, 66–70). Writing in the early eighteenth century, Abū'l-Faiz Khān's chronicler, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ṭālī', traces his patron's descent not only to Chingīz Khān but also to Alānquwā (Ṭālī, *Tārīkh*, fol. 1a; Semenov trans., 13).

⁶⁹⁵ Von Kügelgen refers here to Mīrī, a chronicler writing in a hagiographic tradition, who claims that the brothers Manghit and Kīnakās were sons of Alānquwā. But this claim is not confirmed by Mongol-Persian sources (von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 218).

⁶⁹⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 134a–b. Mīr 'Abd al-Karīm also pays attention to Amīr Ḥaidar's Chingizid descent (*zi aulād-i Jingīz*) (Bukhārī, *Histoire*, 75 (French text, 168)).

⁶⁹⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 199a–b. The author also devotes a page to explaining the emergence of the Mongol order by linking the Manghits to the fate of Tūmanay Khān (*ibid.*, fol. 208a).

⁶⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, fols. 67b–68a, 199b, 209a, 233a, 273a, 316b, 335b, 340a.

⁶⁹⁹ از دستور اصل و نسق سلف تجاوز ننمایند و در اطاعت چنگیزیه بذل نفوس و صرف اطاعت مرعی فرمایند تا (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 316b).

indignant at Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's decision to assassinate the last Tuqay-Timurid king on Jumāda II 17, 1160/June 26, 1747.⁷⁰⁰ Coming back to this incident a bit later, he reproached the first Manghit ruler:

“[...] he reckoned the *yāsā* and the *yūsūn* of Chingīz Khān, the rule that was solidly and steadfastly established among the Mongol and Turkic tribes for a period of six hundred years, [the rule that] no one of the Uzbek tribal chiefs had broken for centuries and generations in spite of their immense power and [in the name of which] they fastened the belt of subservience and subjection in the capital of the Juchid rulers and the good-natured *khāns* around subordination and obedience, [...] to be null and void.”⁷⁰¹

According to von Kügelgen, all early Manghit authors depict the assassination of Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān as martyrdom. While Qāzī Wafā generously passes over this act without comment, Mullā Sharīf, writing his work during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, argues in favor of the Chingizids and strongly criticizes the ruler for this decision. He states that Muḥammad Raḥīm decided to put the Chingizid king to death due to “love of grandeur and avarice with regard to leadership and rebellion.”⁷⁰² Since no other author of that time expresses his critique in such a manner, this is the distinct personal opinion of an author paying a great deal of attention to the Mongol legacy. He states that the murderers of the *khāqān* “had made themselves rejected by the people and the Creator.”⁷⁰³ Mullā Sharīf's explanations and his assessment of this deed reveal his individual worldview, which is not free of contradictions. In contrast to Qāzī Wafā, who, writing in the middle of the eighteenth century, observed all the conventions of that time, Mullā Sharīf applies the *khān* title to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī already before the latter's coronation. It is obvious that from the early nineteenth-century point of view, the proper distinction did not matter any longer, because by 1820 or a bit later, the designation *khān* became an honorific title applied to some of the Manghit *amīrs* and their colleagues ruling the neighboring khanates of Khoqand and Khiwa.⁷⁰⁴ Although the

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., fols. 338a–b.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid., fol. 402a.

⁷⁰² Ibid., fol. 338a. See von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 326–27.

⁷⁰³ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 338b.

⁷⁰⁴ In the *Maḏhar al-aḥwāl*, the first Ming ruler of Khoqand, Raḥīm Khān, is simply called Raḥīm Bēg Qūqānī (Muḥammad Amīn, *Maḏhar*, fols. 48a–b), because this source was written at a time when Chingizid descent still mattered. Writing in the nineteenth century, a time when Chingizid ancestry lost importance, Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān calls his

historian has obviously given up the proper differentiation between Chingizids and non-Chingizids, he still devotes considerable space to the praise of Chingīz Khān's descendants and condemns Muḥammad Raḥīm's order to put Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān to death. Whether his pro-Chingizid attitudes also applied to his audience or the population can unfortunately not be ascertained on the basis of our material. But we should keep in mind that the principle of descent from the world conqueror remains a subject of debate in the sources, especially when it was broken (e.g., by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī who dethroned a Chingizid ruler), or when established kings were challenged by rival pretenders (e.g., in 1722–23 when Rajab Sultān, backed by his supporters, entered the fray).

CAUSES OF DISORDER

The most common picture drawn in the chronicles is that order is jeopardized by rebellious chieftains and officials, for instance in times of transition when a key actor like the ruler or commander-in-chief passed away. One prominent example is the death of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Atālīq in 1743, the results of which event are described as follows:

“The message about the death of the *amīr-i kabīr* spread in the dependencies and over the roads throughout the domains and the distressing news came to the ears of the small and the big people, the populace and the *mawālī*. The new moon of the order of Turan (*hilāl-i niẓām-i Tūrān*) was on the wane of discord and the empire struck by tyranny fell into a state of destruction. The desiring lords craned their necks of contention in the regions and localities because of greediness with regard to the possession of land. Likewise, the masters of oppression and harsh enemies turned to dispute and contest.”⁷⁰⁵

Mullā Sharīf depicts the implications of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's death more drastically:

“The news about the death of the glorious and far-sighted ‘Pillar of the Nobles’ spread in the vicinity and throughout the *iqṭāʿ*'s, towns and citadels. The chiefs of the rebellious and seditious Uzbek tribes, who had put the hands of injustice and oppression in the sleeve of patience and the heads of insolence and destruction in the pocket of hesitation, and each of the malicious mischief-makers and the godless oppressors [...], had witnessed with eyes of contest and disgrace that in the lifetime of the glorious and prudent ‘Pillar of the Commanders’ every stubborn and ill-bred [man], craning the neck of contest and

protagonist alternately Raḥīm Khān or ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Bī (Muḥammad Ḥakīm Khān, *Muntakhab*, I & II, 351 & 1–6, 643).

⁷⁰⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 54a.

malevolence in the kingdom, put his head like a blind man in the sand of perdition because of his [Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī's] far-sighted mind and victorious campaigns. They found now the opportunity for dispute and contest because the capital of the empire was without an illustrious commander-in-chief."⁷⁰⁶

The possible consequences of Subḥān Qulī Khān's death in 1702 are described in a similar way: "disorder in the dominion," "confusion among the soldiery and the subjects," as well as the idea of upheaval and vicissitude arose in every corner of the kingdom. In consequence, the Uzbek tribes and the notables raised 'Ubaidullah Khān to the throne to prevent the outbreak of rebellions.⁷⁰⁷

Another source of disorder was a careless king who neglected the government, or more appropriately, the principles of good governance prescribed by contemporary worldviews. In the eyes of our authors, the last two Tuqay-Timurid monarchs were prime examples in this regard because they ignored the proper exercise of *tarbiyat*.

Referring to the *Sirāj al-mulūk*,⁷⁰⁸ Mullā Sharīf cites the wise man Buzurgmihr. When asked by Anūshīrawān about the reason for the decline of kingdoms,⁷⁰⁹ he answered that it was caused by three factors: first, concealing news and events from the king; second, the promotion of "base and despicable people" (*tarbiyat-i mardum-i furū-māya-yi dūn*), in other words, having dealings with the wrong people; and third, tyrannical and greedy tax collectors. Here it is not promotion as such that is seen as a source of disorder, but the promotion of the wrong people! With his emphasis on proper *tarbiyat* and the maintenance of hierarchies, Mullā largely follows the example of Nizām al-Mulk (1018–92), who places

⁷⁰⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 294a.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid., fol. 108a. See here also Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 9b–10a; Semenov trans., 20–21.

⁷⁰⁸ The *Sirāj al-mulūk* ("The Lamp of the Kings") is written in Arabic by Abū Bakr al-Ṭurūshī (von Kūgelgen, *Legitimierung*, 257, footnote no. 21). See also *Azmeh, Muslim Kingship*, 105–06.

⁷⁰⁹ Anūshīrawān is often quoted in the *Fürstenspiegel* literature and administrative handbooks. For instance, Nizām al-Mulk refers to him when speaking about questions of justice and right government in his *Siyāsāt-nāma* (Lambton, "Medieval Persian Theory," 102).

emphasis on the importance of a clear social hierarchy and pays little attention to egalitarian principles.⁷¹⁰

Mullā Sharīf proceeds to cite Buzurgmīhr as follows:

“When the news in the dominion is kept secret from the ruler, *fitna* will arise in every corner! On the other hand, when despicable people enjoy proximity and promotion, and nothing of the meanness of their character remains other than the accumulation of visible wealth for themselves, and if they molest the noble men out of greediness for the dirty world and ignore humanity, the hearts of the good people become vexed and enraged with the king. As the people say: The perishing of the government is caused by the rise of the rabble [according to the verses]

If the mean gain rank and magnificence

The fortune of the kingdom will be destroyed!

And third: if the tax collectors are greedy and expose the populace to tyranny, the kingdom will be destroyed and the authority will fall prey to unrest and vicissitude!”⁷¹¹

Here Mullā Sharīf exactly follows Amīn Bukhārī’s account. ‘Ubaidullah Khān’s chronicler also cites Nizām al-Mulk with regard to the shortcomings of his master. He explicitly says that if base people become the subject of *tarbiyat* and fail to honor the notables, then the people will be exasperated with the king and his power will decline.⁷¹²

Qāzī Wafā draws a similar picture of Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān, whose deficiencies contrast with the positive engagement of the energetic Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī:

“Squadrons of malefactors drew the lancets of injustice to deal a blow on the royal court. They did all this because of the quest for enjoyment, the grip on the cup of vainglory and the extended hand of desire shaking the chain of pillage and plunder as well as the body of instructions for the collection of revenues. Taking the protection of his affairs and desires as the obligation of the king’s august person, the magnificent king Abū’l-Faiẓ Khān let the cup of pleasure and the goblet of cheerfulness circulate from the morning to the evening, and from the night to the morning. Dropping the bridle for the arrangement of affairs in the domains, he proved unable to ensure the prosperity and security in Bukhara and its dependencies. [...] The affairs of the government and wealth of the attendants fell to the mighty hands of ignoble and mean people, and that bad group of

⁷¹⁰ Nizām al-Mulk describes the supremacy of the noble over the mean and expresses the opinion that it is a sign of disorder and troubled times when base people (*furū-māya*) gain positions usually assigned to the nobles (*aṣīlān*) (Marlow, *Hierarchy and Egalitarianism*, 129).

⁷¹¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 129b–130a.

⁷¹² Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 200a–b; Semenov trans., 221–22.

people became [...] the interlocutors for the traders and craftsmen's communities. Closing the hands of munificence and respect in front of the great *sayyids* and the revered '*ulamā*' out of complete inattentiveness and inconsideration, they ignored the vicissitude of night and day and genuflected on the knees of disrespect. Since no one took care of the royal affairs, the foundation of the royal throne declined to an extent that it fell from the zenith of glory, and the bowl bearing witness to the reputation of the kingdom fell from the roof of grandeur to the ground of baseness. The banner of the horsemen in the arena of bravery sank down and the arms of the imperial guardians were fractured. The commanders of the army and mighty *amīrs* came down from the throne of reputation due to the king's inattentiveness."⁷¹³

The author places emphasis on the disorder caused by the ignorance of the king, who preferred to waste his time with carousals. He also refers to the activities of the ignoble courtiers, probably the harem eunuchs, and their quest for power. Neglect of the religious elite and the fact that the government was run by them are interpreted as unjust and as a source of decline. Here the chronicler spans a background folio against which he justifies the actions of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. While the fall of the last Tuḡay-Timurid monarch was inevitable and justified, the Manghit leader appears all the more as the refounder of an empire, as someone who restored its former splendor.

By explaining the deficiencies of the last Tuḡay-Timurid monarch through the mouth of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, Mullā Sharīf follows this line of argumentation. He alludes to the disorder, confusion, chaos and anarchy (*harj wa marj*) that struck Transoxania during the reign of Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān. Discord and sedition spread throughout the domains and caused immense destruction in various *iqṭā*'s due to the carelessness of the monarch, who neglected the administration, the soldiery and the promotion of his commanders.⁷¹⁴ In another passage Mullā Sharīf explains that Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān spent most of his time in the company of beautiful women with tulip-like cheeks, hyacinth-like hair and bodies like flowers. The ruler is portrayed as a lover of earthly pleasures (*'ishrat dūst*) and as a "protector of cheerfulness" (*ṭarab-parwar*) enjoying his life in the royal harem.⁷¹⁵

⁷¹³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 54a–55a. We see here also the author's strategy of making it clear that his patron was sufficiently legitimized by contrasting Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's energetic activities with the carelessness of the former king. Besides, this passage reflects the enmity between the Manghit and the courtiers of Abū'l-Faiḡ Khān, first and foremost the eunuchs.

⁷¹⁴ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 354b–355a.

⁷¹⁵ *Ibid.*, fols. 292a–b.

CONCLUSION

The previous sections show the various dimensions of order as described in the sources. The importance of order is underlined by the various synonyms to denote it, which are often used interchangeably. According to the narratives, ordering measures had to be taken by energetic rulers, for example in the course of military campaigns and sieges, serving to eliminate threats in the form of rebellions. Particularly the negotiations between the king and the local leadership in the aftermath of sieges are depicted in terms of ordering. The emphasis on the king being in control of the small and the big things is due to the dynastic focus of the sources. The image thus created is one of a tightly controlled order, adding to the illusion that power could be held like an object. Moreover, the chronicles conceal the fact that many actors, especially local power brokers of all shades, were also engaged in ordering activities, for example the regulation of village affairs. The preservation of genealogies or the observance of kinship and social hierarchies as reflected by contemporary worldviews also falls into the category of ordering.

Our sources further indicate the immediate causes of order and disorder. The practice of *tarbiyat*—favoring or promoting people—is seen as an ordering principle. Yet it could only unfold its power when the right people were promoted. The explanations offered by the chroniclers reveal the strong personal bias of contemporary thinking. It is not the institution as such that causes order or disorder, but the promotion of certain actors. Granting *tarbiyat* to the wrong people, the lowborn and ignoble, implied an ignorance of social hierarchies. The king was only able to dispense justice when observing the hierarchies and social differences. Rulers like Abū'l-Faiḏ Khān, who reportedly promoted the wrong people, were gauged in terms of carelessness.

THE SUPERHUMAN PROTECTOR AND THE ROLE OF DESTINY

This section revolves around the role of God as the supreme protector and the way in which Qāzī Wafā and his nineteenth-century colleague presented the divine principle in their works. Since Anke von Kügelgen provides a detailed investigation of the divine legitimation of the first Manghit rulers, I will only add my own observations to these findings. Furthermore, I will put the material to be discussed in a broader context of Muslim ideas on the attributes of God and the interrelationship between cosmos and politics.

In the *Tuhfat al-khānī* and the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, God appears as an omnipresent force constantly intervening in and influencing the course of history. Von Kügelgen concludes that the historians used salvation-historical formulas together with the divine right of kings as an instrument for the sacralization of profane history and the replacement of the worldly chronology with a sacral framework.⁷¹⁶ Since divine legitimacy was essential, some Manghit chroniclers legitimize the rule of the new dynasty by referring to the influence of God.⁷¹⁷ She further argues that the historians downplayed the lack of genealogical legitimacy on the part of the first Manghit rulers by consciously emphasizing divine preordination.⁷¹⁸ However, when looking at the history of mankind, we often observe divinity to be a dominant aspect for the interpretation and perception of kingship. The divinely legitimized kings frequently acted as refounders of imperial greatness in a cycle of rise and decline. In accordance with universal ideas originating from religion, kings were conceived as being allocated positions of decisive cosmic centrality. But nonetheless, there is no one-to-one correspondence between divine creators and worldly rulers, though deities were often seen as prototypes of kings. According to Azmeh, “the cosmic centrality of kings is therefore that of preservers and maintainers of both social and natural order.”⁷¹⁹

The idea that kingship was systematically integrated in a cosmic order was well established in the ancient Orient. There are many examples of the divine foundations of kingship,⁷²⁰ and the motif of divine or prophetic missions also has a long tradition. It features in the Old Testament and Muslim thinking “in keeping with the old Babylonian notion of kings being sent out by the gods on apostolic missions.”⁷²¹ In monotheistic religions, cyclic intervals at the beginning of history and the re-enactment of acts of apostolic quality can be observed. These refoundations occur regularly, “albeit in a separate register that organises the rhythm of divinity or of divine association as distinct from the regularity of the chronometer.”⁷²² Looking at

⁷¹⁶ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 202–03.

⁷¹⁷ In particular, Qāzī Wafā and Mullā Sharīf construct a notion of divine legitimacy, whereas other chroniclers writing in the nineteenth century seldom mention this aspect.

⁷¹⁸ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 203–06, 213.

⁷¹⁹ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 36.

⁷²⁰ *Ibid.*, 38–41.

⁷²¹ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁷²² *Ibid.*, 42.

the circumstances in pre-Islamic Iran, Azmeh remarks that the ancient Persian emperors should not only be viewed as the successors of epic heroes, but also as the initiators of new epochs signaling the recovery of their realms.⁷²³

As I demonstrated in the previous section, the representation of order and justice in the Islamic mirrors for princes harks back to pre-Islamic ideas. Likewise, the concept of the caliphate as a vice-regency installed by God can be seen as the continuity of ideas from pre-Islamic times that found their way into the works of the *Fürstenspiegel* literature.⁷²⁴ It thus seems reasonable to interpret the continuous reiteration of patterns of explanation with respect to the rise and decline of dynasties not just as a simple adoption and repetition of established ideas but also as a sign of inertia. For this reason, modifications initiated by a ruler had to be explained by referring to historical examples.⁷²⁵ Not surprisingly, Qāzī Wafā portrays the Manghit assumption of supreme authority as a continuation of the established order rather than as a break or new beginning. This is underscored by his master's speech before the nobles of Transoxania at his inauguration as new regnant *khān*. On this occasion Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī is depicted as the "protector of religious and worldly affairs":

"The reins of the affairs of mankind and the ordering of the daily matters (*niẓām-i maṣaliḥ-i ayām*) shall be placed in the strong hands of a mighty monarch so that the heroes of his blood-spilling sword will now and then tear the root of life from the enemies of the kingdom and the [Muslim] community with an assault 'wherein there is great might.' (Koran LVII/25) The guard of his sharp venomous sword will pour the wine of death into the mouth of the depraved whose deeds have pernicious effects on the religious and worldly affairs. Since the beginning of Muḥammad Khān Shībānī's dynasty and the manifestation of the star of his fortune, the past *sultāns* and ancestral *khāns* had made the laudable tradition the manual for noble ambition. They displayed miraculous power in arranging the affairs of the kingdom and strengthening its frontiers. For undertaking this exertion and immense effort, they earned fame in both worlds and brought out the polo ball of competition from the field of their contemporaries. [But] since the will of [God] the Unique and Almighty became manifest in the expiration of the rule of this dynasty and in the destruction of Mā Warā' al-Nahr, they read the meritless *khutba* for an entire

⁷²³ Ibid.

⁷²⁴ There are parallels between the Islamic perception of the rulers as the shadow of God on earth and Zoroastrian thinking (Lambton, "Justice in Medieval Persian Theory," 96–97). See also Sir Thomas Arnold, *The Caliphate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1924), 48; Leder "Aspekte," 126–27; Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 63.

⁷²⁵ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 211–13.

generation in the name of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān. During his reign all kinds of mischief-makers arose from every quarter of the realm to such an extent that in most of the cities and regions nobody remained! But according to the verse 'So the people who had done wrong were completely cut off' [Koran VI/45], not even a single one of the rebellious and seditious people has now been left due to my steadily growing power. It has been eleven years since the blow of the royal sword hamstrung the unbroken steed of wickedness and the piebald horse of depravity, and the hand of effort uprooted the tree of tyranny and oppression with root and branch. The ailing health of the kingdom was about to recover so that the four pillars of the edifice of prosperity reached the highest degree of elevation. And now it is proper for the agents of the government to adorn the royal throne with a ruler so that the splendor of his auspicious glory may mark the rise of the Canopus of a new dynasty!⁷²⁶

Two aspects are worth noting in the speech of the future king. First, he depicts the political order of Transoxania as enduring by suggesting an unbroken line of succession beginning with the reign of Muḥammad Khān Shībānī around 1500 down to himself. The continuation he refers to is not purely of a dynastic but also of a practical nature, expressed in the efforts of previous *khāns* to keep things in order. It is remarkable that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī does not mention the Tuqay-Timurids. Instead, he depicts the reign of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān as an insignificant interlude, a time of decline and destruction caused by rebellion and sedition. In contrast to his weak predecessor, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī (the future *khān*) appears as the savior of the kingdom and its people. He is presented as the refounder of the empire lying in ruins. Although he announces the establishment of a new dynasty, he is in fact described as somebody who brings about the restoration of the old order and the recovery of the empire.⁷²⁷ As I have already discussed, this pattern of historical interpretation has a long tradition and can be traced to ancient times. The adherence to old principles is often remarked and even seen in a positive light by the historians, who note that the ruler observed the old customs and rules that had been obeyed for generations and centuries. Qāzī Wafā, for instance, mentions that the appointment of government officials by his patron took place in accordance with ancient rules and customs.⁷²⁸ It is therefore hardly surprising that his chronicler describes Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's marriage to a daughter of Abū'l-Faiẓ Khān

⁷²⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 251b–252a. My translation slightly differs from that of Ron Sela, especially in the interpretation of the word *daulat* (see Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 7–8).

⁷²⁷ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 209.

⁷²⁸ See previous section.

immediately before his enthronization as a step intended “to infuse the dolorous lamp of the Chingizid dynasty with new life.”⁷²⁹ With this statement the author constructs a continuous line of succession, as Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī did with his above-quoted speech. The new ruler himself is portrayed as a refounder of the Shibanid realm. The enthronization ceremony took place according to Mongol customs. He was placed on the white felt carpet, “although this was the time-honored prerogative and lasting custom of the Chingizid *sultāns*.”⁷³⁰

Second, through the mouth of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, the author refers to divine will behind the decline of the central authority and the destruction of the empire, the sign of which was the *khuṭba* read in the name of a weak ruler. God’s omnipresence and unlimited power is a recurrent theme in many Bukharan sources,⁷³¹ especially the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* and the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*. As in many works written in the tradition of the mirrors for princes,⁷³² constant reference to the divine legitimation of authority features as a general pattern of interpretation and explanation of historical events in the chronicles I explored. This brings us directly to the question of divine attributes as described in the texts. God is portrayed as the driving force behind the course of history. As a result, many events and the ups and downs Mā Warā’ al-Nahr went through during the eighteenth century are interpreted as manifestations of His will (*mashīyatu ’l-lāhī/mashīyat-i subḥānī*). For example, the divine principle and fate are responsible for victory in battle in spite of numerical inferiority because it is God who renders assistance in hours of despair.⁷³³ The historians describe many situations and instances where God averts misfortune and disaster. For example, the Qazāq raids in the 1720s were put to an end owing to divine aid

⁷²⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 250a. Most of the chronicles do not tell the name of this princess. According to Mir Izzetullah, she bore the name Shems-ban-aim (Shams Bānū Āyim) (Mir Izzetullah, “Travels,” 341. This is confirmed by ‘Ainī, who spells it Shams Māh Bānū (Sadriiddin Aini [Šadr al-Dīn ‘Ainī], *Kulliyot*, vol. X: *Ta’rīkhī amironi manghitiyayi Bukhoro* (Dushanbe: Nashriyoti Irfon, 1966), 48). For further information see also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 226–27, footnote no. 172.

⁷³⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 253b–254a. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 209–10.

⁷³¹ God in His unquestioned omnipotence is found in the Koran with varying shades of emphasis (L. Gardet, “Allāh,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., I, 407).

⁷³² Leder, “Aspekte,” 128.

⁷³³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 14b–15a, 17b, 116a, 121a, 127b, 163b–164a, 176b–177b, 185a, 238b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 164b, 171a, 176b, 270b, 304a, 324a passim.

and infinite favor,⁷³⁴ and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's survival of an attempt on his life is also attributed to the Creator's help.⁷³⁵

Most noteworthy, the chroniclers also explain dynastic decline or the end of a ruler as divinely preordained. For instance, 'Ubaidullah Khān was warned about a conspiracy and a possible attempt on his life, but

"the sunset of 'Ubaidullah Khān's fortune and the days of vexation and confusion of the dear well-wishers loomed on the horizon because of the divine will and the heavenly fate. [...] And since the will of the eternal king [God] had become manifest in the martyrdom of this unique ruler, the efforts of the well-wishers did not have any effect in preventing the discord of providence [...]. The hand of destiny pulled the reins and led the steed out of the arena [of life] and the sun of felicity reached the horizon of perishing and decline."⁷³⁶

Mullā Sharīf also attributes this fatal development to the inattentiveness of the ruler. 'Ubaidullah Khān neglected the great *amīrs* and the notables but also the affairs of the kingdom. He did not observe the customs of the farsighted rulers and "was addicted to the proximity and promotion (*muqāribat wa tarbiyat*) of mean people. He always wished the company of women and eunuchs as well as the deficiencies of judgment."⁷³⁷ Writing a century earlier, Amīn Bukhārī goes even further saying:

"Swerving from the path of the past kings and the *ṭūrā* and *yāsā* of his ancestors, he was engaged in fostering base people and an ignoble group of paltry and weak men. He preferred the companionship of cowardly men, eunuchs and women. These improper attitudes of the king were the source of the perishing of his power. The conversation with the impotent and ignoble had its effects. [...] [Even] rulers cannot pass over the pillars of power, and other attendants and dependants. [Only] wise and good-tempered people disinterested in lofty aspirations should become his servants. [...]"⁷³⁸

Although God is seen as the primary cause behind the king's fall, it was 'Ubaidullah Khān's behavior that provoked His wrath. Hence the order assumes a divine hue, forming the background folio for 'Ubaidullah Khān's fall from divine favor and his ignominious end. Since the ruler had

⁷³⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 17b–18a.

⁷³⁵ Ibid., fols. 147b, 148b.

⁷³⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 129a, 130b, 133a. For this particular passage see von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 208.

⁷³⁷ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 128b. Mullā Sharīf follows Amīn Bukhārī, who points to the promotion of base people by his master 'Ubaidullah Khān (see next quotation and footnote).

⁷³⁸ Amīn Bukhārī, *'Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 199a; Semenov trans., 220.

endangered established rules by wrongdoing and immoral behavior, God turned away from him and installed somebody else to protect and maintain the order.⁷³⁹ Likewise, the rise of a new ruler to the zenith of authority is often interpreted as a sign of divine favor and the auspicious constellation of the planets, as the following statement illustrates:

“It was in the year 1161/1748 that the face of the old earth and the countenance of the old age regained the beauty of youth and the embellishment of brightness and freshness due to the promotion of the fortunate *amīr*. The cycle of the highest stars of the commander linked to felicity conjoined with the cycle of sun and moon, so that the star of his fortune was shining at the zenith of independence and at the apex of integrity.”⁷⁴⁰

Here we see the strong interconnection between belief in destiny and the power of the stars and certain constellations, and the interpretation of somebody’s rise to the highest tier of authority. Moreover, Wafā views order as something that is linked to and entirely determined by the forces of destiny:

“Having arranged the foundations of order during the compilation of eternal destiny, the quilt of predestination has drawn the cypher of all sorts and classes of people in the book of honor by quoting ‘It is We who have divided out amongst them their livelihood [...]’ [Koran XLIII/ 32]. By bringing the lowest to the highest zenith in accordance with the rules of ‘For each are grades according to what they have done’ (Koran XLVI/19), the pen of the creation and preordination has written each event and every calamity on the pages of the horoscope of the big and the small people.”⁷⁴¹

Apart from our authors’ belief in destiny, we see their projection of an image of a divine order, including the approved social hierarchies created by the Almighty. This portrayal is underscored by references to the Koran, suggesting that belief in the power of God was deeply entrenched in contemporary thinking. Accordingly, the pathways of destiny are a recurrent theme in the accounts and serve as an imperative for explanations of the turns of history:

“God the Praised says: ‘[Such has been] the practice [approved] by God already in the past: no change wilt thou find in the practice [approved] by God’ [Koran XLIII/23], the glorious and unique king of the [incomparable] kingdom. [According to] every plan,

⁷³⁹ Anke von Kügelgen notes that this pattern of the rise and fall of rulers mediated by the Almighty was less schematic than one might think at first glance, because it depended on the concrete measures taken by a ruler (von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 208).

⁷⁴⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 146b.

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., fol. 81b.

which has been written for the creatures of the two worlds with the pen of power and the quill of His will on the slab of genesis for the conveyance of advantages and detriment, it is clear and certain to the people of sharp intellect that in the hour of destiny, He will come from the place of fancy to the real world. And even if the tribes of possibilities make immense endeavors to ward off and prevent this event, yet it is, in accordance with the cypher of fate, impossible to change this course.”⁷⁴²

Mullā Sharīf continues to refer to the impact of fate in the next section:

“The dominion of Bukhara, the mean and malevolent as well as the old and the young people inhabiting the cities and the steppe were affected by the calamities and afflictions caused by hunger and scarcity as had been written by the quill of the divine will. The intention of God the powerful Ruler and the omnipotent Creator was manifest in the destruction and the confusion of that paradise-like realm.”⁷⁴³

The picture presented here is one of divine omnipotence, which somewhat relativizes the above-described image of men as responsible for their deeds. In Mullā Sharīf’s opinion God’s will is manifest in order and disorder, and it is impossible for humans to escape their fate (*qadr, qazā, taqdīr*).⁷⁴⁴ The passage quoted here refers to the havoc wreaked by the Qazāqs in the 1720s, and it is also God who acts as the rescuer freeing Transoxania from this nuisance.⁷⁴⁵ God is the Creator and the Destroyer, a principle that is apparent in blows of inevitable fate, for instance when an actor meets his death due to “the arrow shot by the bow of destiny.”⁷⁴⁶

The chronicles, and especially the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, reflect an image of a limitless God somewhat reminiscent of Ash‘arite ideas on divinity and the attributes of the Almighty.⁷⁴⁷ As the supreme representative of God, the

⁷⁴² Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 182b.

⁷⁴³ Ibid., fol. 183a.

⁷⁴⁴ Qāzī Wafā and Mullā Sharīf often refer to *taqdīr* or *qazā* (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 16a, 17b, 28b, 81b, 110b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 110b, 128b, 150b, 186b, 208b, 232b, 272a passim).

⁷⁴⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuhfat*, fols. 17b–18a; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 187b.

⁷⁴⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 232b.

⁷⁴⁷ According to Ash‘arite conceptions, “man’s ‘free’ action, his *ikhtiyār*, is only a special case of more general principles. God is the Creator of human acts, whatever they be. The text ‘God is the Creator of all that you do’ is interpreted in the sense of a creation *ex nihilo*. This means that God sets down to his merit or demerit the actions he performs, as the Koran expressly states, and that He rewards or punishes him, as promised. Man receives the ‘acquisition,’ the attribution of his acts (*kasb, iktisāb*: cf. Koran, ii, 281; lii, 21, etc.)” (L. Gardet, “Allāh,” 413). On the Ash‘arites see W. Montgomery Watt, “Ash‘ariyya,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., I, 969.

caliph was often described as a herdsman watching over a divinely desired order.⁷⁴⁸ The notions surrounding the caliphate suggest political authority as a kind of vice-regency, the caliph being a deputy or substitute of God.⁷⁴⁹ As such, the caliphs were commonly portrayed as God's shadow on earth.⁷⁵⁰ Authority appears to have been delegated along a hierarchical chain beginning with God via the Prophet and the caliphs down to the governors, judges and other office holders. The authority of the *sulṭāns* as representatives of the caliph at local and regional level was likewise delegated.⁷⁵¹ Later Muslim scholars like al-Ghazālī went even further, stating that not only the caliph but every person in authority is in a sense sacred.⁷⁵² After the disappearance of the Abbasid caliphate, the tendency arose to regard the members of local dynasties as shadows of God without an intermediary.⁷⁵³ Playing the role of God's legatee, the caliph acceded to his position by divine appointment or even by predestination. Blessed by God and guided by Him, the ruler personified divine authority and interceded between God and mankind.⁷⁵⁴

As I have illustrated in one of the previous sections, the rise of the Manghit is explained in terms of divine preordination, as was prophesied to their ancestor Jāwush Bāy. With this, the new dynasty stands in the tradition of historical examples like Chingīz Khān and Tīmūr.⁷⁵⁵ The former was favored by *möŋge tenggri* (the "Enduring Sky") granting a divine mandate

⁷⁴⁸ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 66; Lambton, "Quis Custodiet Custodes," 125.

⁷⁴⁹ Arnold, *Caliphate*, 45. At the beginning the caliphs were seen as the vice-regents of the Prophet (*califat rasūl Allāh*), but from the time of the Umayyads onward they were regarded as immediate representatives of God (A. K. S. Lambton, "Khalīfa. ii. In Political Theory," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn., IV, 948).

⁷⁵⁰ Arnold, *Caliphate*, 112, 114, 116–17; A. K. S. Lambton, "Khalīfa. ii. In Political Theory," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd. edn., IV, 949; Leder, "Aspekte," 133.

⁷⁵¹ Lambton, "Quis Custodiet Custodes," 125–27.

⁷⁵² Goitein, *Studies in Islamic History*, 204–05; Leder, "Aspekte," 133.

⁷⁵³ Lambton, "Quis Custodiet Custodes," 127; Lambton, "Khalīfa," 949; Arnold suggests four different reasons for this tendency: first, a king arrogates to himself this designation; second, the title "shadow of God upon earth" is a compliment to another monarch; third, somebody liked to flatter his patron; and fourth, the language used depended on the individual style of a court scribe (Arnold, *Caliphate*, 119).

⁷⁵⁴ Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*, 76.

⁷⁵⁵ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 203.

and good fortune (*sū*) to Temüchin.⁷⁵⁶ His rise to the zenith of authority was prophesied by shamans. Prominent here is the shaman Kōkōchū, who announced the agreement of the supernatural powers to Chingīz Khān's claims to khanship. His extensive conquests are presented as the realization of the heavenly instructions to conquer the world.⁷⁵⁷ Similar to Chingīz Khān, Tīmūr also claimed divine favor and used the modest beginning of his career to emphasize the miraculous character of his rise. Titled the "Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction," he even claimed to have had direct contact with the supernatural realm. This image of Tīmūr quickly found its way into historical accounts.⁷⁵⁸ Often described as the man chosen by God (*bar-guzīda-yi subhānī*),⁷⁵⁹ Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's rise is likewise portrayed and interpreted in terms of divinity:

"Since God the Creator and true Commander wanted it, He chose the *amīr*, the lord of dignity and grandeur, the strong prince among his peers and equals, and raised his glorious head by granting him the beautiful crown. By embellishing his stature with the dress of integrity and wisdom, He placed him on the sublime seat, and by adorning his ferocity with the robe of honor and greatness, He brought him to the throne of the heavenly fortune. From day to day He opened [the gates for] illustrious conquests and [the achievement] of all kinds of noble goals toward His desires. From hour to hour He unveiled the secrets of royal success and the light of the gifts connected with the conquests of countries and empires before his [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's] eyes. God opened the gates of assistance and victory as well as the doors of fortune and pride before his sufferings and conditions."⁷⁶⁰

Wafā continues his explanations by attributing the assistance rendered by Iranian contingents to defeat the rebellious Khiṭā'ī-Qipchāq to divine will.⁷⁶¹ The unlimited power of God and His omnipresence are also reflected by the opening words of the *Tuḥfat al-khānī*:

"In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate. Thanks to the Lord of the [incomparable] kingdom it is certain that upon the mandate obeyed by the entire world 'I will create a vice-regent on earth' [Koran II/30] and the 'We have honored the sons of

⁷⁵⁶ Anne F. Broadbridge, *Kingship and Ideology in the Islamic and Mongol Worlds* (Cambridge/New York et al.: Cambridge University Press 2008), 7.

⁷⁵⁷ Paul, "Scheiche," 316; Broadbridge, *Kingship and Ideology*, 7.

⁷⁵⁸ Manz, "Tamerlane and the Symbolism," 117; Manz, "Family and Ruler," 63.

⁷⁵⁹ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 6a, 36b, 67b, 212a, 260b passim; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 377b, 407b passim. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's successor Dānyāl Bī is also described as the man chosen by God in the *Tāj al-tawārīkh* (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 424a).

⁷⁶⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 67b–68a.

⁷⁶¹ Ibid., fol. 68a.

Adam' [Koran XVII/70], He installed crown bearers in the capitals, the *dār al-salṭanat* according to the verse 'Thou givest power to whom thou pleasest' [Koran III/26]. Thanks to the royal [divine] glory it is appropriate that He raised the 'Verily We have granted Thee a manifest victory' [Koran XLVII/1] on behalf of the intrepid hero of the legions struggling on the path of God in the book of victory."⁷⁶²

Like many other historians in the tradition of chronicle writing, Qāzī Wafā begins his work by referring to the crucial verses of the holy Koran to point out the divine legitimization of worldly rulers. In doing so, he makes it clear from the very beginning that the claims his master laid to supreme authority are legitimized. At the same time, he acknowledges the superiority of the Creator, who is portrayed as the highest principle and the most immanent source of power. A comparison with the *Tārīkh-i aḥmadshāhī*, an Afghan chronicle dedicated to Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī, the founder of the Durrānī Empire and a contemporary of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, shows a striking parallel:

"In the name of God the Merciful, the Compassionate. It is thanks to the increase of the boundless and particular royal [divine] essence that He granted the ennobling 'We conferred on them special favors, above a great part of Our creation' [Koran XVII/70] to the peoples of mankind and it is thanks to the incomparable royal [divine] glory and favor that He bestowed the diadem adorned with the jewels of—'We have honored the sons of Adam' [Koran XVII/70] on the proud heads of the mortals and that He elevated the crown wearers of countries and honored the reigning princes of the human world by granting them the beautiful position of authority and the excellent profession of the caliphate and royal fortune."⁷⁶³

The comparison shows that reference to God as an imagined source of power responsible for the delegation of authority was common, irrespective of the origin of the chroniclers. Of course, this pattern of explanation and introduction to a chronicle is rooted in established literary traditions and conventions matching the reading habits of the audience and the prevailing worldview of that time. Moreover, by portraying God as a king ruling over the heavenly realm that is also presented as a kingdom, both authors follow the Koranic example. The portrayal of God in the Koran is that of the Creator as a sovereign, a judge or king.⁷⁶⁴ Besides, worldly rulers appear in both works, the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* and the *Tārīkh-i aḥmadshāhī*, but also in the

⁷⁶² Ibid., fol. 1b.

⁷⁶³ Maḥmūd al-Ḥusainī, *Tārīkh*, 1.

⁷⁶⁴ L. Gardet, "Allāh," 407; Leder, "Aspekte," 133. On the portrayal of God as an absolute ruler in early Timurid chronicles, see Lambton, "Early Timurid Theories of State," 3–4.

Tāj al-tawārīkh as projection surfaces of God's favor. The rulers, and especially those rising from modest conditions to paramountcy, are the beneficiaries of generously granted divine grace. Kings like Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī and his Afghan contemporary are thus portrayed as men enacting a divinely desired order.

Despite differences in the historical manifestations of the sacred, there are cross-cultural commonalities. The sacred is something extraordinary standing out from the normal routines of everyday life. These results correspond to the theories of Thomas Berger, according to which "the cosmos posited by religion this both transcends and includes man," and is seen as an extremely powerful reality by humans, a reality presenting itself to man and locating his life in an ultimately meaningful order.⁷⁶⁵ The divine reality is underlined by the portrayal of the Creator in the chronicles, where God is frequently referred to as a merciful benefactor and protector. This image is reminiscent of some verses of the Koran portraying Him as the merciful benefactor (*raḥmān, raḥīm, ghafūr*) and as the protector (*wakīl*) par excellence. Mullā Sharīf, for example, describes God as the *malik-i mannān*, the beneficent or benign lord,⁷⁶⁶ and sometimes even as the *mun'im-i ḥaqīqī*, the true benefactor.⁷⁶⁷ Many Koranic verses also refer to God's help in hopeless situations and to His generosity.⁷⁶⁸

In the Bukharan chronicles, the Creator has the attributes of a kind of proto-patron. According to Amīn Bukhārī, it was He who—similar to worldly rulers—put the robe of world conquest and the cloth of the conquest of kingdoms and countries onto Chingīz Khān's descendants.⁷⁶⁹ And it was He who showed solicitude by rendering assistance to those in need and especially to the rulers enjoying divine protection. For example, Qāzī Wafā designates his master as a man chosen by the Protector and Creator (*bar-guzīda-yi ḥaẓrat-i muḥaiman-i khallāq*).⁷⁷⁰ The attribute *muḥaiman*, however, is also ascribed to Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī himself, who thereby appears as a recipient of divine favor. This enables him in turn to act as a worldly protector.

⁷⁶⁵ Berger, *The Sacred Canopy*, 26.

⁷⁶⁶ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 302a, 310b, 318a, 377b, 401a passim.

⁷⁶⁷ Ibid., fol. 340a.

⁷⁶⁸ Gardet, "Allāh," 407.

⁷⁶⁹ Amīn Bukhārī, *ʿUbaidullah Nāma*, fol. 158a; Semenov trans., 177.

⁷⁷⁰ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36b.

Following this example, Mullā Sharīf states that God guided Nādir Shāh's steps to Turan, whereupon Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī welcomed the conqueror and received royal 'aṭīfat and tarbiyat.⁷⁷¹ In the *Tuḥfat* we read about Nādir Shāh's clairvoyant skills, which enabled him to recognize his new protégé as "a fruit in the garden of generosity" and "a flower from the meadow of divine providence and the will of the Creator,"⁷⁷² enjoying divine solicitude and protection during the Iranian siege of Bukhara in 1747:

"[T]he will of God, the high Protector and eternal magnificent Ruler, [...] conjoined with the elevation of the praiseworthy *amīr*'s fortune. He desired his grandeur and high rank in order to exalt and privilege him amongst the other fortunate and powerful lords [...] [On the other hand, [He] hurled [...] the splendor of Nādir Shāh's reign to the ground of abjectness, decline, annihilation, and death. He rent the order of his troops—once as numerous as stars—and scattered them like leaves of a tree, making each of them fly to different parts of the world like stars or meteors."⁷⁷³

What we see by looking at these patterns of interpretation and thinking is in fact further evidence of the fusion of the divine cosmos with the world of earthly existence. It was also against this backdrop that the rulers and the populace alike turned to the shrines of saints to enlist their help in invoking God's blessing and assistance in worldly affairs.⁷⁷⁴ The favor granted by earthly rulers like Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī is thus at the same time divine favor, and protection granted by the king is also God's protection. Mulla Sharīf even goes so far as to say:

"It is convenient that he [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī/Khān] shall illuminate the world with the light of the caliphate and absolute kingship and with the ray of chastity and fortune. By dispensing justice, he shall keep the mirrors of the interior and the exterior free from the darkness of oppression and the dust of opposition. In this manner, a splendor-gathering and world-illuminating pearl, which is uncovered before the bright wisdom and the wise genius, has to be nurtured with special attention (*parwarda-yi tarbiyat-i khāṣ*) throughout centuries, years and months so that it will reach the steps of absolute dominion and

⁷⁷¹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 290b.

⁷⁷² Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 36b.

⁷⁷³ Ibid., fol. 115a.

⁷⁷⁴ Here we observe parallels with other non-Islamic contexts where the saints, the apostles and even the Virgin Mary functioned as intercessors of the believers before God (Kenny, "Patterns of Patronage in Spain," 17; Foster, "The dyadic contract in Tzintzuntan," 1281–82, 1286). Often it has been argued that political and religious patronage are mutually reinforcing (Jeremy Boissevain, "When the saints go marching out: Reflections on the decline of patronage in Malta," in *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*, ed. Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury (London: Duckworth, 1977), 81).

progress but also the ladder of merit and perfection. It shall not even once come from behind the veil of concealment to the visible world and must be nurtured and fostered (*parwarish wa tarbiyat*) like a ruby or a red-colored jewel and a green emerald through divine confirmation and favor.”⁷⁷⁵

Interestingly, the vesting of the king with worldly affairs is the direct result not only of God’s favor; Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī also enjoyed the attention of the Divine in the form of solicitude and promotion. Hence, *parwarish* and *tarbiyat* are by no means restricted to the worldly sphere, but are visible manifestations of divine grace granted to the man chosen by God.

This image of the characteristics of the king ideally reflecting the qualities of the Creator was well entrenched in the eastern part of the Islamic world and can be traced in the works of authors like Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū and Niẓām al-Mulk. According to the latter,

“there was a direct link between the ruler and God, ‘Who through the rays of the justice and coercive power of the kings of the climes, made the roads of the kingdom to be open and travelled by men, and caused the power of the exalted sultans to be like a vigilant protector over the crossing-places of the seas, waterless deserts and mountains so that mankind might come and from east to west and north to south, and so that towns and provinces might be populated and inhabited.”⁷⁷⁶

This concurrence of heavenly and earthly spheres converges in the designation *zillu’l-āhī* (*zill-i illāhī*)—the shade of divine shadow on earth. Interestingly, Qāzī Wafā and also Mullā Sharīf strikingly often make use of the term shadow (*zill* or *sāya*), which is in fact the visible manifestation of divine will. In the *Tuḥfat al-khānī* we read how “the shoot in the rose-garden of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī’s fortune shades the people of Bukhara who slumber in the cradle of safety.”⁷⁷⁷ Another time, “the attendants of the indispensable victory were sewing the tents of prosperity and tranquility under the shade of his [Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s] companions.”⁷⁷⁸ The most interesting case reported by the chroniclers is Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s role during the battle of Ūrā Tippa on Ramaẓān 18, 1168/June 27, 1755. Confronted with fierce resistance by the Yūz tribe, the supporters of the *atālīq* came and asked him to climb the hill towering above the battlefield in order to shade his troops with his stature from above. He reacted promptly to

⁷⁷⁵ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 200b.

⁷⁷⁶ Lambton, “Early Timurid Theories of State,” 3.

⁷⁷⁷ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 9b; see also Muḥammad Amīn, *Maẓhar*, fol. 43a.

⁷⁷⁸ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 61b.

this request and went to the top of the hill. From there, he drew the “bridles of assistance” and shaded his troops with “the wings of the phoenix of protection” (*zill-i sāya-yi humā-yi himayat andakht*). Not surprisingly, the victory of the Bukharan army was divinely confirmed shortly thereafter.⁷⁷⁹

The last example of divinely desired and mediated authority that I want to present here is ‘Ubaidullah Khān b. Subhān Qulī Khān, whose ordering of the affairs in the conquered region is depicted as follows:

“His Majesty, the Lord of the Auspicious Conjunction presided over the assembly of consultation with the *amīrs* and the commanders of the army to put [things] in order (*tartīb*). Casting the shade of attention on the settlement of the affairs of Balkh, on the arrangement of the means of tranquility and the well-being of the subjects, these were the favors given precedence by the justice-spreading king in abolishing the customs of injustice and oppression and in establishing justice and fairness.”⁷⁸⁰

‘Ubaidullah Khān is portrayed here as a ruler in action and a shade of the divine shadow. In the following text the author depicts the distribution of posts during a round of gubernatorial appointments in the aftermath of his military enterprise in Balkh. We thereby gain a deeper insight into the perception and understanding of justice in former times. Justice (*‘adālat, inṣāf*) is not presented as a nebulous category or concept. It is directly achieved by shading the humble subjects and ordering worldly affairs from below, but also by confirming the established hierarchy and enforcing the natural (albeit hierarchical) order of things. In this case, the ruler took the most convenient way to achieve all this by consulting his generals; ordering appears as an outcome of corporate decision-making.

THE CHRONICLES AS SNAPSHOTS OF SOCIAL ORDER

In the previous sections I explored the portrayal of principles shaping the interaction between actors. The investigation illustrates that patron-client relations based on the norm of reciprocity and a number of other structuring devices (such as generosity, gift giving, mediation, kinship) were typical of Transoxania’s social order. It seems evident that patronage played a crucial role in the exercise and maintenance of power relations, which are described as reciprocal loyalty-favor nexuses. As I was able to demonstrate, some of the authors like Qāzī Wafā or Mullā Sharīf also intuitively deduce ideas on

⁷⁷⁹ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 293a–b. See also Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 234a–b.

⁷⁸⁰ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 124a; Semenov trans., 141.

order from patronage. In particular, the norm of reciprocity features prominently as a recurrent theme dictating the narratives of the sources. The question is, do the quoted passages and the extracted courses of action reflect historical or social realities, or are we dealing rather with narrative structures and templates? Before discussing this question in detail, I want to propose a somewhat provocative answer to it: neither is the case!

As we could observe in the previous chapters, the sources not only mirror certain social conventions, norms and moral concepts, the authors also place emphasis on correct procedures and ceremonies rather than on single events or orders issued by the rulers. Since the texts do not necessarily reflect historical or social realities in every case, but transport images of what the respective authors perceived to be a proper course of action, they are full of repetitive processes. An actor is ready to submit; he approaches his social superior by presenting gifts; he is awarded a counter present; he genuflects and kisses the royal hand. The ruler is engaged in a violent encounter with his enemies; when recognizing his superior strength, he orders the plunder of his opponents and the destruction of their possessions; subsequently, local notables submit and offer gifts; finally, the king enters into negotiations with them and confirms their position. These sequences are often presented in a uniform and even stereotyped way. The chroniclers celebrated the cohesion of society by focusing on ceremonies, rituals and processes. We thereby gain a deeper insight into the ideas concerning proper conduct, as we are seeing mirror images of the worldview of the authors and their audience.

The authors, like all other protagonists, of course did not act alone and independently but were part of social networks. Men like Qāzī Wafā were locked in a patron-client relationship with their master. It was a relationship of mutual dependence: the chronicler was instructed to compile such a work and earned a living by it, while the patron could reckon on leaving his traces in history and earning a great reputation as a ruler and generous benefactor. Writing from the perspective of the rulers, the authors often praised the qualities of their patrons by adding ornate poems to their works, and these also showed the talent and the eloquence of the chronicler. He had to write in such a way that his master's rule was legitimized in the eyes of his contemporaries and posterity. According to the colophon of the *Tuhfat al-khānī*, Qāzī Muḥammad Wafā b. Qāzī Zahīr Karmīnagī was in the service of Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān and received the order to write this history after the return of his patron from Iran in 1158/1745–46. This author also proved to be a loyal servant, as he wished his master great success in the form of sweeping conquests. These were denied Muḥammad Raḥīm Khān because of

his early death, but his uncle Dānyāl Bī ordered the completion of the work ten years after the beginning of his own reign.⁷⁸¹ Qāzī Wafā and many of his predecessors and later colleagues had close contact with the court circles and often also with the ruler himself.⁷⁸² However, in his capacity as court chronicler, he was also a subordinate and had to carry out orders. For example, Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī once handed over a treacherous letter written by the Sufī *pīr* Jān Muḥammad to his chronicler and ordered him to include it in his work.⁷⁸³ Qāzī Wafā also writes that on the fourth day after the enthronization of his master, he recited the following *qaṣīda* in the royal throne hall to praise the king:

“Bravo, the heavenly essence of your fate by the aid of the Divine,
Soared like the sun from the imperial throne.

Today you have become worthy of the crown by eternal grace,
May the crown and the royal throne be blessed with your good fortune.

The summits of the conquest and ferocity of the Chingizids,
Were turned over by the fortune of glorious governance.

In this age, when the lamp shedding [light] of this land was extinguished,
You became the splendid torch of the reign of the Turanian kings.

The robe of authority looks beautiful upon the stature of your good fortune,
You raised the banner of justice in the kingdom of the Samanids.

Tyranny and oppression spread like a shadow in the world,

⁷⁸¹ See Qāzī Muḥammad Wafā Karmīnagī, *Tuḥfat al-khānī/Tārīkh-i raḥīm-khānī* (MS Tashkent: Institute of Oriental Studies, IVANRUz No. 2726/III), fol. 256a. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 107.

⁷⁸² von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 106–07.

⁷⁸³ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat al-khānī* (MS Tashkent: Institute of Oriental Studies, IVANRUz No. 16), fol. 188b.

But the beauty of your reign made the world as bright as the sun.

Your reputation for justice has seized the inhabited quarter in its entirety,
In the clime of world conquest you are second to Alexander.

May your existence shower everyone from the sea of God's generosity,
May every parched lip become moist and fresh like a spring cloud.

Although the inherited crown was worn out in the days of kings past,
In your time the imperial tiara became bejeweled once again.

Due to your preeminent, victorious, and just vestiges,
The old world has changed from desolation to prosperity.

Heaven has been preparing for a century the goblet of the desired wine,
May everyone, everywhere become easily sated by this decanter.

I am not smaller than an ant, and this prayer is on my tongue,
May God the Generous bestow upon you the expanse of Solomon's kingdom.

He became worthy of sitting on the throne of the kings,
Bravo, victorious king, Bravo, divine grace.

The glorious and splendid emperor, Raḥīm Khān, the religion-nurturing Shāh,
Adorn the throne of the empire due to divine favor.

Oh pen of reputation, write the year of this event with a joyful heart,

Today, kingship has placed the imperial crown upon [your] head.”⁷⁸⁴

Later Qāzī Wafā proudly mentions that he was the author of the verses on his master’s tombstone.⁷⁸⁵

Besides eulogies and the praising of their patrons, many authors perceived it as their duty to denigrate their enemies. For example, Amīn Bukhārī, the court chronicler of ‘Ubaidullah Khān, often disparaged Maḥmūd Bī Qaṭaghān as “Maḥmūd the Rejected,” or “Maḥmūd of Bad Fortune,” suffering an end that was not praiseworthy.⁷⁸⁶

Positioned between the present and the future, many of the chroniclers acted similarly to middlemen. They mediated first between the ruler and their own audience and, second, between the ruler and his circle of intimates on the one hand and the future readers on the other. By compiling a history for a ruler, a chronicler contributed to the prestige of his patron and was also able to foster his own reputation. Some writers managed to climb the social ladder in an environment where many of them suffered poverty.⁷⁸⁷ For instance, when he was taken into service by Amīr Ḥaidar (r. 1800–26), Mullā Sharīf praised his master as follows:

“Thank God, the glad news about the royal favors arrived

For the ant, the message about Solomon’s favors arrived

Oh heart, be cheerful, the time of hardship is over

Oh mind, be comforted, your confusion is over

By seeing him, the eyes of the waiting became illuminated

To such a degree that the pride of the Canaanite moon reached Egypt

⁷⁸⁴ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat* (IVANRUZ No. 16), fols. 156a–b. For another translation see Sela, *Ritual and Authority*, 17–18.

⁷⁸⁵ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 316b.

⁷⁸⁶ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 56b, 58a, 59b, 60b, 94a passim; Semenov trans., 71, 72, 73, 74, 107 etc.

⁷⁸⁷ On the poverty of learned men in Uzbek Central Asia, see Haidar, “Urban Classes,” 29.

Old age will now become young again

Utmost fortune reached the hands of Yūsuf II

Gracing the diadem of the ancestral *khāns*, the successor

From Nasaf with so much glory at the royal throne arrived

The glad news about pleasure and delight emanating from the splendor of his boldness

At the houses of the weak and harassed arrived

For a lifetime I rubbed my head for the prayer on his arrival

The hem of his favor with ease at my hands arrived⁷⁸⁸

Proceeding in this manner, Mullā Sharīf jubilantly states that with the message about the royal favors,

“he [Amīr Ḥaidar] cleared the mind leavened with honesty from the thorns and thistles of anxiety and grief; and I, the poor servant, set out at the given time according to the order issued by the bearer of the seal-ring of submission.”⁷⁸⁹

The author then reports on his reception at the throne hall and how the ruler requested him to compile a chronicle, and that he, “steadfast in his loyalty and solid in his faith,” had nothing other than eloquence in *inshāʾ* and the ability to write colorful poems as a means of earning an income and accumulating the wealth needed for luxury and delight.⁷⁹⁰ But unfortunately, these arts were not valued very highly “in the bazaar of his time,” let alone sufficient to make a living. Accordingly, he spent his life “mostly disturbed in the corner of obscurity without emolument and gains in the hope of being accepted by ‘perhaps’ and ‘maybe.’”⁷⁹¹ Not surprisingly, Mulla Sharīf enthusiastically praises the *amīr* for his initiative:

“They colored the gem of this generous Solomon-like man joined by many followers with the seal-gold in order to elevate this loyal devotee. The rank of this handful of base dust

⁷⁸⁸ Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 17a.

⁷⁸⁹ Ibid., fol. 17a.

⁷⁹⁰ Ibid., fol. 18a.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid., fol. 18b.

[...] increased due to the attainment of this unexpected fortune and the acquisition of this diploma, thus becoming the companion of the sun. By receiving that much favor and high attention, the blushing slave became distinguished amongst his peers and equals. From the gains of ignoble fate, this loyal servant without any future had no provisions and instruments in the treasury of thought and genius but the coins of the heart and the jewels of the soul to satisfy the needs connected with the arrival before the throne and to scatter them at the celestial court of His Majesty, the high-born king.”⁷⁹²

Our chronicler continues by vividly describing his meteoric rise at a relatively advanced age. His late career sharply contrasts with his life before he was taken into the ruler’s service: he now gained access to the highest court circles and the king himself—he was present at the *kūrnihs*, had a deep insight into the daily affairs of the court, and even participated in the councils of the notables.⁷⁹³ Muḥammad Amīn, the chronicler of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, also mentions that in the aftermath of a campaign to Qarshī, he received an *ūrūn*, a seat connected with a title.⁷⁹⁴

Another interesting example of chronicle writing as a part of the social order at the court was Amīn Bukhārī, who ascribes the following attributes to ‘Ubaidullah Khān:

“The monarch is like the key to the inhabited quarter in the mighty hand of the Lord of the world and the Ruler of mankind. [He is] a sign of His mercy. Glory be to Him Who installed Sayyid ‘Ubaidullah Muḥammad Bahadur Khān, vivifying the customs of the Muslims, the rising sun of justice, the guardian and caretaker (*ḥāmī wa rā’ī*) of the inhabited tracts of land and its peoples. He is the eradicator of tyranny and oppression, the succor of Islam, the supporter of the Muslims, and the defender of justice and religion.”⁷⁹⁵

Some folios later the author describes himself as a weak servant and poor man of base origin, without sufficient financial means and strength. He also informs us that he spent his life with satisfying and non-satisfying activities and that he had reached the age of fifty-nine “by drinking the irksome cup of reprehension.” Hence he had no hope of using his humble abilities to write metaphors and always thought about the way to find an arrangement (*intizām*) and to earn his living.⁷⁹⁶ Interestingly, he sought the advice of his *pīr*, who suggested turning to Bēg Muḥammad Bī Dadkhwāh, a well-wisher and intimate friend of the king, because “the tree of fortune shading the

⁷⁹² Ibid., fol. 19b.

⁷⁹³ Ibid., fols. 20a–b. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 112.

⁷⁹⁴ Muḥammad Amīn, *Maṣṣhar*, fol. 47a.

⁷⁹⁵ Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fol. 2a; Semenov trans., 11–12.

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid., fols. 3a–b; Russian text, 13.

learned and wise men became fruit-bearing due to the breeze blowing from the garden of his submission.” His *pīr* also told Mīr Muḥammad Amīn that if he took refuge under the “shade of benevolence of this *amīr*” he would attain the goals desired.⁷⁹⁷ Unfortunately, the author does not give the name of his *pīr*. All that we learn from the following text is that the *pīr-i khirad* and *murshid-i ‘aql* acted as a guide and master giving advice due to the favor and affection he felt for his disciple, but he obviously did not intercede with the *amīr* on behalf of his client. Since the latter did not belong to the retinue of Bēg Muḥammad Bī, he abandoned hope of being taken into service on a permanent basis, especially since entering the service of this man was not an easy thing. But if we believe his words, he was able to join the influential Dūrmān leader, who at that time acted as one of the confidants of the king ‘Ubaidullah Khān, by using the art of chronicle writing (*‘ilm-i tārikh*) as a pretext. Shortly thereafter, Bēg Muḥammad Bī took notice of Muḥammad Amīn’s abilities and had him brought to the court, where he found royal favor and was immediately taken into service. Muḥammad Amīn attributes his good fortune to the influence of the Creator, who drew the *amīr*’s attention to his work so the latter summoned him to the court.⁷⁹⁸ Hence the *‘Ubaidullah Nāma* not only provides snapshots of the social order at court and beyond, but the compilation of this chronicle can be attributed to the prevailing order of things. Given first the mediation of the *pīr*, who advised the author to solicit the aid of Bēg Muḥammad Bī, and second the initiative of the latter, it is a direct outcome of power relations and a chain of mediation acts.

Toward the end of his work he enthusiastically engages in a eulogy to his patron, who is depicted as a justice-nurturing ruler in whose kingdom “the lamb drank milk from the breast of the lion and the wolf and the sheep sought each other’s company.”⁷⁹⁹ It is only in the part of his work probably written after the death of his patron that the author also draws the attention of the reader to some of the king’s shortcomings by mentioning that in regard to the detailed affairs of the kingdom, he reacted simple-mindedly and thoughtlessly.⁸⁰⁰

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid., fol. 3b; Russian text, 13–14.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid., fols. 3b–4b; Russian text, 14–15.

⁷⁹⁹ For the whole eulogy to ‘Ubaidullah Khān, see Amīn Bukhārī, *‘Ubaidullah Nāma*, fols. 197a–198b; Semenov trans., 217–19.

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid., fol. 198b; Russian text, 219.

Some of the authors were not only involved in a patron-client relationship but often ascribe positive attributes to all the principles connected with it, such as generosity, leniency, protection and promotion, in order to underline the personal qualities of their masters. Sometimes they even manipulated their material in various ways to draw an ideal picture of their patrons. As they share the manipulation of information with generations of other intermediaries, the bias in their material is indicative of the mental impact of power structures at a very individual level. Mullā Sharīf, in particular, frequently expresses a positive attitude toward the existing order, and sometimes his *doxic* relation to the social hierarchy shows between the lines. There are many indications that the chroniclers were part of the structure of authority immanent in the social reality of the court and that the predominant mode of power occupied their minds and determined the various ways of chronicle writing. After all, it is certain firmly standardized repertoires that make up the ingredients of an ideal work: time and again we find traditional Islamic concepts of justice, harmony and controlled order linked to the belief that the entire creation was a manifestation of divine will and wisdom and that nothing was created without purpose.⁸⁰¹ In addition, we frequently come across other components like the dispensation of justice and liberality, the strengthening of religion, the fostering of the truth (*ṣidq*), the initiation of charitable foundations (*khairāt*), the control of the empire (*ḥabṭ-i mamālik*), the maintenance of security on the roads and guaranty of the well-being of the subjects (*tarfīya-yi ḥāl-i 'ibād*), taking care of the subjects and the regulation of worldly and religious affairs.⁸⁰²

Apart from their impact on the content of the sources and the characteristics of the protagonists portrayed, the relationships of authority immanent in the social order were also manifest in the narrative form and the vocabulary of many works. The worldview of the chroniclers structures the narratives in terms of both rhythm and speed. For example, the norm of reciprocity at least partly dictates the rhythm of the texts and the way the

⁸⁰¹ These concepts can be traced back to al-Fārābī, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, and also to Māwardī and al-Ghazālī. These ideas on the nature of things and divine creation also featured prominently in the works of authors like Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū writing in Timurid times (Lambton, "Early Timurid Theories," 2).

⁸⁰² Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū distinguished two kinds of rule, righteous government (*siyāsat-i fāzila*) and imperfect government (*siyāsat-i nāqiṣa*). The dispensation of justice, the strengthening of religion, taking care of the security and the well-being of the populace are signs of righteous government (Lambton, "Early Timurid Theories," 5).

reader is drawn in. Furthermore, the consistent exercise of power and the imprinting of relationships of authority also resulted in a standard repertoire of terms and expressions mantling the institutions of authority. Thus, each chronicle represents a snapshot of the worldview of its author and his thoughts, but also a kind of instant image of the order of things.

The emergence of certain standards does not mean that all sources are structured and written in the same way. As Anke von Kügelgen puts it, the sources differ considerably in style, content and structure, ranging from the bare presentation of facts and certain autobiography-like hybrid types to works written in a more ornate style. The local historiography was by no means a monolithic block. The style, composition and structure of a chronicle depended on the personal background, the *vita* and the individual worldview of its author. A court scribe accustomed to the typical chancellery style wrote a different chronicle than the prince who belonged to the military or a member of a Sufi brotherhood writing more in the hagiographic tradition. In view of this and the fact that the compilation of such a chronicle was to a large extent determined by the personal experiences of the author, it comes as no surprise that the material was arranged according to different literary traditions.⁸⁰³

The material I have presented and discussed in this chapter largely derives from two sources that were written by very eloquent authors known for their ornate chancellery style. Qāzī Wafā and Mullā Sharīf were in all likelihood court scribes, and in spite of the different emphasis in content and interpretation of certain events, they shared similar writing habits. Their works differ from those of the Iranian author Muḥammad Kāzīm and their Bukharan colleagues like Muʿīn, Muḥammad Yaʿqūb or Mīr ʿAbd al-Karīm Bukharī. This is best illustrated by focusing on the usage of the *khān* title, which reflects different ideas of order. Influenced by the prevailing Chingizid-inspired worldview, Qāzī Wafā used the *khān* title in the *yāsā*-sanctioned way by exclusively reserving it for descendants of Chingīz Khān. Accordingly, he properly distinguished between the Juchid-Chingizid line of Mā Warāʾ al-Nahr and the Uzbek *amīrs*, who were usually designated *bī* or *bēg*. It was not until Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī's enthronization following Mongol customs and the marriage to a Chingizid princess that his chronicler styled him *khān*. Prior to his patron's official inauguration in late 1756, Qāzī Wafā respectfully titled him *ṣāḥib-i zamānī* ("Lord of the Age"). Yet, living

⁸⁰³ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 453.

and writing in an Iranian context, for Kāzim such a meticulous distinction did not make much sense and would even have been trivial.⁸⁰⁴ Instead of properly distinguishing between Chingizids and non-Chingizids, he applied this title to most of the actors of his time, including many Qizilbāsh generals and members of the Uzbek nobility.

Irrespective of these differences in their worldview, we also observe similar ambiguities, especially with regard to the perception of either side during the establishment of Nādir's suzerainty. At the outset, the two authors argue from opposite vantage points, expressed by mutual hostility and ideological discord. As soon as the conquest ends in an agreement, this picture gives way to one of modest cooperation and pragmatism overcoming all previous rifts. This is exemplified by Nādir Shāh's paternal attitude in relation to his Uzbek commander, as stressed by Wafā, and by the military assistance the latter rendered to the former in the Caucasus, described by Kāzim in great detail. Interestingly, the worldviews of both chroniclers display striking similarities, expressed in parallel shifts of their narratives corresponding to similar perceptions and interpretations of the action taken by either side. The portrayal of the two counterparts follows a curve from mutual hostility to approval back to aversion, as displayed in the following contrasting passages of the *Ālam-ārā-yi nadirī*:

"As the Lord of Turkistan entered the area of Dībak [...] and although in the course of the next days the glorious Turkistānīs (*nāmdārān-i turkistānī*) tried their very best in the [ensuing] fight, the situation was by no means to their advantage. Forced by necessity, Raḥīm Khān Sardār ordered the commanders and glorious heroes to besiege that fortress like the gem of the ring and to struggle to tear down that *qal'a* by force. In a suitable hour, he distributed the towers of the fort among heroes in the hippodrome of the battle and all were engaged in the conquest of this well-fortified place. The lions in the forest of combat and the whale in the middle of the sea of war climbed the towers by using ladders and other means [...] In the morning, the brilliant victorious prince drew the golden blade out of the scabbard of vengeance for the conquest of the firmament-like citadel and exterminated the sun-like legions with that shining sword. By using the hooked goad of boldness and bravery, the leopards on the summit of bravery and the whales in the depth of courage caused the steadfast feet of the guardians of the fortress to shake [...]"

[...]

"Biḥbūd Khān said: 'Raḥīm Khān cannot contravene the royal decree without the permission of the 'Lord of the Fortunate Conjunction.' Even I do not dare show this bravery. That cowardly *khān* [...] who was in the service of the house of Chingīz Khān

⁸⁰⁴ Holzwarth, "Relations," 203.

and brought up by Abū'l-Faiz Khān, has forgotten about the duty connected to service and royal favors. He brought that illustrious king [Abū'l-Faiz Khān] to the threshold of martyrdom [...] [His] deeds are signs of deviousness and malice [...]’ Following the instructions of Raḥīm Khān, between two and three thousand slit-eyed Uzbeks (*uzbekān-i tang-chashm*) and furious knaves (*makkārān-i pur khashm*) took up position at the Qarākūl Gate.”⁸⁰⁵

What we see here are two different portrayals of the Uzbeks before and after Nādir Shāh’s death. Depending on the situation and interests of his patron Muḥammad Raḥīm and on the actions of the Iranian commander-in-chief, the shifts in Qāzī Wafā’s account run parallel to the ups and downs in Kāzīm’s narrative. Describing the Qizilbāsh as an army of infidels (*lashkar-i kufār*), legions of evil spirits (*sipāh-i shayāṭīn*) or a group of heretics (*firqay-i rawāfiẓ*), Qāzī Wafā portrays the ongoing struggle as a *jihād* between Muslims (*lashkar-i Islām*) and unbelievers. This emphasis on religious schism can be seen as a continuation of past interpretative patterns of Transoxanian-Iranian relationships, and at the same time it provides an insight into contemporary worldviews and patterns of perception concerning the Shiite population of Iran.⁸⁰⁶ Yet this picture completely changes after the successful mediation of the Manghit leadership and the formal establishment of Iranian control in autumn 1740. And even immediately before Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s break with the Qizilbāsh around Bihbūd Khān in 1747, the author points to peaceful coexistence by referring to the large army composed of Iranian and Uzbek contingents that were harmoniously encamped before Bukhara without engaging in predatory activities.⁸⁰⁷ Yet when the Uzbek commander tried to ward off his Iranian protectors in the aftermath of Nādir Shāh’s assassination, the positive picture drawn before soon changes again to one of mutual hostility, especially when the Qizilbāsh and the Uzbeks engage in a bloody battle for control of Bukhara.

⁸⁰⁵ Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 858–59; III, 1122, 1123, 1124.

⁸⁰⁶ Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fols. 26a–31b, 39b; Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fols. 224a–b, 229a–232b, 255a–257a. See also von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 240.

⁸⁰⁷ Qāzī Wafā attributes the state of harmony and the fact that the troops did not loot the local population to the successful handling by Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī (Qāzī Wafā, *Tuḥfat*, fol. 110a).

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I discussed social institutions such as can be gleaned from eighteenth-century Bukharan sources. Here, the patron-client nexus constitutes not only the basic social unit at an individual level, but also a form of power inherent in the social reality at the court level and the stratum of tribal leaders and religious dignitaries. The term patronage is just a workaround to grasp the realities on the scale of order I explored from an external perspective. It is a concept dug out of the Roman *patrocinium* by ethnologists who, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, applied it with some modifications to other, particularly non-Western contexts.⁸⁰⁸ In Transoxania, we find many but not all of its features that are so typical of other cultural contexts and even the Roman Empire. Patronage represents a particular mode of order and authority, forming an asymmetric structural device for distribution and redistribution of resources immanent in the social fabric of the court and beyond. Of course, social order in the context I have explored so far entails many other norms and institutions rooted in the worldview(s), like seniority, kinship, descent, marriage alliances, corporate consultations and decision making and so forth. As the historical overview shows, many of these institutions can be traced back to earlier (Mongol and even pre-Mongol) times in one or another form.

However, the texts do not correspond in every aspect to or give a true picture of the social reality in eighteenth-century Bukhara, but rather contain statements on how order should have been. In describing the power relations typical of this order, the Bukharan authors often adopt a rather narrow view, which can be attributed to their dynastic perspective. Patronage is depicted as an integral component of a building-block system that was part of a larger literary repertoire. On the part of the subjects and clients, the building blocks were loyalty, obedience, submissiveness and service, which are directly related to one another. Obedience and submissiveness are the first indicators of loyalty. Service and the provision of resources, which could also take the form of tributes and gifts, further signaled loyal behavior. On the side of the protectors, favors, benevolence and affection play an important role and

⁸⁰⁸ Pazmiño, *Klientelismus*, 19–20. “This use of the term goes back at least as far as Fustel de Coulanges’ *The Ancient City*: for de Coulanges patronage referred to a condition of legal inequality between patrons, who held political and ritual rights, and clients, who lacked such rights and could therefore only act through the mediation of their patron” (Weingrod, “Patrons,” 378).

serve to glorify the rulers. Due to the personal bias of the authors, we are often dealing with idealized and idealizing images of a divinely desired order. This order had to be enacted and maintained by energetic kings who, by decree of heavenly forces and destiny, engaged in arranging human affairs. The key role reserved for the rulers evokes an impression of close control exercised over the kingdoms of the past and their subjects. At the same time, the court chroniclers gloss over the ordering activities of city notables, tribal chieftains and religious dignitaries.⁸⁰⁹ This coincides with the fact that the populace figures as a non-entity at first sight, though a closer look shows how crucial the acceptance and consent of the people really was.

The ideal portrayals are not confined to the level of order only, but also apply to the characterizations of the rulers. In many cases they are endowed with laudable characteristics; for example, they figure as protectors of the poor and weak, as generous patrons and lenient toward their subjects and even rebels. The lavish rounds of gifting and opulent gifts given to servants and followers also match this portrayal. Furthermore, patron-client relations and exchange are celebrated as integral elements of this order. The images thus transported are also produced by the interplay between the chroniclers' individual worldviews and their position at court. Writing as clients of patron rulers, they wished to flatter their masters and thereby expressed their individual consent to the order of things. Sometimes they manipulated and conventionalized their material to meet the demands of the ruler and the reading habits of their audience. As an integral part of an inherited framework of authority, the chronicles also served as models and instruments for maintaining the order they depict so colorfully. Yet the corpus of rules, norms and traditions was not a matter of "concepts" or theoretical constructs. The court chroniclers possessed an intuitive knowledge that was well rooted in the thoughts of earlier writers and, as a kind of literary repertoire, was inherited from generation to generation. Applying it in their works without much reflection, they had no pronounced theory on authority.⁸¹⁰ By following certain traditions of chronicle-writing, authors like Qāzī Wafā, Amīn Bukhārī and Mullā Sharīf confirmed the existing order, including the obedience-reward nexus and the usual notions

⁸⁰⁹ Mullā Sharīf, for instance, mentions only casually that Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, the chief of the Manghit tribe, returned to Qarshī around 1730 and took care of the local order and the affairs of this region (Mullā Sharīf, *Tāj*, fol. 195a).

⁸¹⁰ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 258–59.

of justice versus tyranny. In doing so, the authors also encouraged and enforced the reading habits of their audience.

Not surprisingly, in lieu of a conceptual equivalent of the present-day Western analytical, but also morally loaded term “patronage,” a whole number of different terms and practices can be observed. The fact that the different institutions are portrayed as components of a divinely desired order of things rather than as patronage *per se* intensifies the impression that the several forms of exchange are seen as something completely natural. This is further underlined by the terminology employed in the sources. This aspect of the social relationship, combining and at the same time qualifying the distribution of material goods and rewards with that of immaterial goods like honor and favor, seems to be a decisive factor in the chronicles I explored. Thus the sources are, at least to a certain extent, also mirrors of the political reality of social life, within which the law as a binding and codified system of rules did not play any great role.⁸¹¹ Institutions like the *kūrnish* or the *bay'a*, the exchange of gifts and other resources, mediation, nurture, protection, paternity or sonship are partial dimensions closely linked to our conceptual understanding of patronage rather than being sole equivalents of it. In all likelihood, the terminology reflects a practical knowledge rather than concepts. The authors do not define or explain these terms, which pop up in the texts as natural elements of the order of things. In spite of appearing frequently in historical texts, the term *ḥimāyat*, for instance, is not explicitly elucidated by any author.⁸¹²

The expression *zill-i ḥimāyat wa tarbiyat*—“shade of protection and solicitude”—comes perhaps closest to the umbrella term “patronage,” meaning more or less the same. The habitualizing impact of this kind of power relationship coincides with a variety of synonyms for both parties in such a relationship. While social superiors are often portrayed as a *ḥāmī* (protector, supporter), *rā'ī* (guardian, caretaker), *kār-sāz* (one who provides the means of existence), *muhaiman* (defender from fear and danger), or *wālī-ni'amī* (benefactor), and in a few instances also as *murabbī* (rearer, tutor), subordinates do not appear as plain clients but are depicted as *khair-khwāhhān* or *daulat-khwāhhān* (sincere well-wishers), *mulāzimān* (servants, attendants), *muqarrabān* (intimate friends, favorites) and *parwarish-*

⁸¹¹ Leder, “Aspekte,” 148.

⁸¹² According to Jürgen Paul, references to *ḥimāyat* are widespread in the sources, but the terminology of the relationships often varies (Paul, *Naqšbandiyya*, 164).

yāftagān or *tarbiyat yāftagān* (protégés), sometimes even as *ghulāmān* (slaves, servants).⁸¹³

Another important aspect of the representation of order in the sources is the element of divine predestination and destiny. The motif of divinely legitimized rule and the frequent references to the Koran are not only a strategy to confirm the new dynasty's legitimacy.⁸¹⁴ Authors like Qāzī Wafā, Mullā Sharīf and Amīn Bukhārī thereby cement and anchor the images of order in a divine cosmos, thus addressing the religious sentiments of their audience and the populace.⁸¹⁵ At the same time, the present described by the historians is closely bound to the past. In other words, chroniclers such as Qāzī Wafā or Mullā Sharīf let the past live in the present and override the changes they witnessed themselves. The focus on destiny and the divine protector also exemplifies the differences between the authors. Not all historians stress divine right in the same manner. Muḥammad Amīn, Ya'qūb and Mīr 'Abd al-Karīm do not mention the hand of destiny behind the course of history.⁸¹⁶

Most remarkably, the enabling and constraining, but also the habitualizing effects of authority are felt in situations and moments of interaction, especially at the negotiation interfaces. Here it inscribes itself in the minds of the protagonists and has thus its most significant effects. This is where power reveals its relational character in the most striking way, as it puts the actors involved in positions of subordination and superordination. Here, at the interface between clientage and patronage, social superiors and inferiors meet each other and negotiate the distribution of the means of power. And it is here where the verbal rending and mending (*ratq wa fatq*) or the loosening and tying (*hall wa 'aqd*) predominantly takes place, where power is generated, decisions are made about the fate of others, and where actors speak or remain silent! In these situations the actors involved become engaged in ordering activities, which create the image, or rather the illusion, of "oriental despotism" and that power is an object to be grasped and possessed. But, in fact, it is already present at the places where patrons and

⁸¹³ Although the relations between the Uzbek *amīrs* are often portrayed as friendships, I have never come across the terms *dūstdār* or *dūstdārān*, as have been identified by Paul (see Paul, *Herrscher*, 174–75).

⁸¹⁴ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 203, 213.

⁸¹⁵ Kāzīm also mentions God's will as a major cause of Nādir Shāh's rise and military success (Kāzīm, *Ālamārā*, II, 796).

⁸¹⁶ von Kügelgen, *Legitimierung*, 213.

clients meet. The duality and fluidity of these power relations is mirrored by the fact that many protagonists indeed acted in a twofold way, as patrons of their own followers and as clients of their superiors.

In many cases, a *doxic* view of the socially constructed reality is evident. The subconscious acceptance of this kind of rule is reflected in the eulogies to the king and the statements about the beauty of seating arrangements. As an incorporated effect of being exposed to rule, the *doxa* is symbolically underlined by regular invocations for the ruler and his family, especially on occasions like the *kūrnish*.⁸¹⁷ The complex hierarchies, which emerged when social inferiors met with superiors,⁸¹⁸ were also approved of by some authors. This consent was displayed by the clear distinction between *khāṣ wa 'āmm*, or alternatively *khawāṣ wa 'awām*, the nobles who could refer to good birth and a highly esteemed genealogy on the one side, and the ordinary population on the other. As I have illustrated in the case of Mullā Sharīf, the author of the *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, this hierarchical order was often not simply accepted and valued. It was sometimes also admired and seen as something aesthetic or beautiful, irrespective of the fact that many actors, and even the authors themselves, struggled hard to increase their standing and to climb the social ladder.

In the current chapter I have investigated authority by concentrating on the semantics of the chronicles and the imaging of social order by the Bukharan historians. In the following chapter I will shift the focus to the developments in the nineteenth century. Instead of reconstructing a detailed history based on a chronological framework, I intend to explore the nineteenth century from four different perspectives: first, the order at court; second, the Russian politics and its results; third, the absorption of foreign travelers and envoys into Bukhara's social order(s); and fourth, the figurations of power and order at village level. I will therefore make use of

⁸¹⁷ Considering the pre-Mongol period, Paul also points to prayers against rulers (e.g., at the end of the Samanid era), especially when their actions or actual power figurations provoked the notables to withdraw their loyalty (Paul, "Herrschaft und Gesellschaft," 181–82).

⁸¹⁸ For instance, when Abū'l-Faiṣ Khān arrived at Nādir Shāh's camp in 1740, he was compelled to dismount from his horse at a place reserved for Qizilbāsh *amīrs* and ordinary commanders. Subsequently, he was received by Nādir and the Iranian nobles dressed in their most beautiful garments and robes (Kashmīrī, *Bayān*, 70–71; Gladwin, *Memoirs*, 38–39).

different categories of sources: court chronicles, travelogues and archival documents, first and foremost petitions to the Bukharan *amīrs*.

