

Official And Unofficial Versions Of Bukhara's History: Comparative Analysis Of The Works Of "Tuhfa-Yi Shahi" And "Tarikh-I Salatin-I Manghitiya"

Toshova Sharifa Panoevna,

**Researcher,
National Archaeological Center
of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan**

 **OPEN ACCESS**

**The American Journal of
Interdisciplinary
Innovations And
Research**

JULY 2020

Page No.: 60-69

Volume-II Issue-VII

PUBLISHED: 30 JULY 2020

www.usajournalshub.com/index.php/tajiir

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence.

Abstract

The article provides detailed information about the life of a prominent historian and poet Mirza Muhammad `Abd al-`Azim Sami Bustani (1838-1908), who lived and worked in Bukhara in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and his two historical works, "Tuhfa-yi shahi" and "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya". Although these works have rich factual data and devoted to the history of the last dynasty of Bukhara – the dynasty of Manghit, they are poorly studied. Both works, in particular the details of events that the author himself witnessed – the events of the Central Asian occupation by the Russian Empire, are original and these materials are of historical importance in covering the history of the region. The article explains the historical significance of these sources by comparative analysis of them. Also, the defeat of the Bukhara army by the Christian army during the occupation aggravated the political and economic crisis in Bukhara, which led to loss of reputations of Amir and officials. The works of Mirza Sami expose the horizons of the study of the attitude of the local intellectuals to the rulers of Bukhara and the Russian invasion during this crisis.

Keywords: Mirza Sami, Bukhara, Russian Empire, "Tuhfa-yi shahi" and "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", Amir, Islam, Christian "enslavement".

Introduction

It is clear that scholars, poets and historians wrote historical works in a short time when any major historical event occurred. However, between 1866 and 1868, a large part of the Bukhara Amirate was captured by the Tsarist Russia with fierce battles and heavy casualties. It was converted into a semi-colonial Amirate. This had a profound effect on the minds and memories of the indigenous peoples as a powerful ghost. However, the local intelligentsia did not rush to react. This is due to the fact that both Bukhara intellectuals, and Amir of Bukhara, believed in reconciliation and negotiation of lost territories. On the other hand, it was not conquered by a neighboring Islamic country, its freedom was taken by the Christian "enslavement" of the Christian community, the local intellectuals did not seem to dare to chronicle the events of that period because of the grief. Indeed, since the Russian invasion was the biggest political event in the Central Asian nation since the Chingis Khan invasion, it took some time to get used to it, to adapt and absorb it.

The materials and methods

Finally, one of the last representatives of the Bukhara Traditional Historical School, Mirza Muhammad 'Abd al-'Azim Sami made the first attempt to cover the events of the Russian invasion of the Amirate¹. Between 1316 and 1320/1898-1902, he compiled his work "Tuhfa-yi shahi" ("Gift for the King"). Shortly thereafter, he wrote his book "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya-yi dar as-saltana-yi Bukhara-yi Sharif" ("History of the State of the Manghit-rulers in Bukhara"). L.M. Epifanova published a translation and facsimile of the work in Russian in 1962. Historians such as Mirza Salim Bek (1850-1930), Sharif Jan Makhdum Sadr Ziya and Sadr al-Din 'Ayni (1878-1954), followed by 'Abd al-'Azim Sami also covered the topic.

'Abd al-'Azim Sami, a prominent historian of the time, a prominent poet and essayist, worked in a palace as well. In addition to the two historical works mentioned above, "Tanzih al-insha" ("Treatise on essay"), "Mir'at al-yaqin" ("Mirror of Faith"), "Mir'at-al-khayal" ("Mirror of the Dream"), "Dakhma-yi shahan" ("Tomb of Kings") and "Tazkirat al-fuzala" ("Notes about Scientists") were also written by him. In addition, there are reports that Sami translated two Arabic works into Persian (Muhtaram, No. 2252/2, ff. 112^b-113^a). One of these is the work by Husain al-Tavirani entitled "Masabih al-fikr fi wujub al-sayr wa-l-nazar". This work was translated by Sami in 1904 and named it "Mafatih al-abr fi-tarjumat masabih al-fikr" ("The Key of the Example in the Light of Thought"). The second is a work by an unnamed author called "A'lam al-nas". We have not yet received this translation made by Sami. Only one manuscript stored in Tajikistan has the history of translating the book "A'lam al-nas" into Tajik (Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii Nauk Tadziksnoi SSR, 1960, No. 283). Some aspects of the life and works of Mirza Sami have been studied by several scientists (Epifanova, 1962;

¹It is true that in the late 19th century, Ahmad Danish wrote a book about the history of the Manghit dynasty, shortly before Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. However, as this book focuses more on the criticism of the Bukhara community, it provides a brief overview of historical events, including the occupation of the country by Russian troops. Since the work was not named by the author, the translators and researchers called it with various names, such as "Historical and Critical Treatise", "History book", See: (Danish, 1967).

Nadzhafova, 1967; Khasanova, 1976).

The Main Results And Findings

The works of "Tuhfa-yi shahi" and "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya" by Mirza Sami plays an important role in studying the late history of the Bukhara Amirate. Both works were devoted to the history of the Manghite dynasty that ruled in Bukhara for over 170 years and were written in Persian. Orientalist Ibadulla Adilov, who was familiar with the cultural environment of the early 20th century, described the manuscript as a "formal version" of Bukhara's history, writing the "Tuhfa-yi shahi" manuscript in the Tashkent catalogue (*Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei*, 1952, No. 236). However, the author himself did not report anywhere in the book that he wrote it because of amir's order or presented it to the amir. Unfortunately, according to Adilov's conclusion, the author of "Tuhfa-yi shahi" was considered as a palace historian, and the work was added to the official history, to which researchers did not pay any attention for several years. Because during the Soviet era, the palace poets and historians were regarded as subjects of the rulers and were insufficiently studied. "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", which states that the activities of the Amir of Bukhara was critically illuminated, and was renamed as the "unofficial" version of Bukhara's history. For this reason, the later work was largely studied during the Soviet era.

It is well known that Mirza Sami wrote his great work "Tuhfa-yi shahi", devoted to the history of Manghit dynasty. Why did he write "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", a second story from the same epoch? In our article we will try to answer this question as much as possible and show the differences and similarities between the two works.

Before comparing the differences between the two works, we would like to draw the readers' attention to the changes in the life and thoughts of our historian. First of all, it should be mentioned that when he was old, he was expelled from the palace. The historian made considerable efforts to return to the palace and regain his former reputation. In the preface of "Tuhfa-yi shahi", even though Sami acknowledged that he had no other intention than to glorify "the name of the pious king (Amir Muzaffar (1860-1885) - Sh.T.)" with this work (Sami, No. 2188, ff. 5^b-7^b). However, he was trying to find a way to enter the heart of Amir 'Abd al-Ahad. He also devoted his translation of "Mir'at al-khayal" from Arabic to Persian to Amir 'Abd al-Ahad. Sami praised Amir 'Abd al-Ahad at the beginning, end, and special chapters of the work.

In the conclusion of his book, Sami appealed to the amir as follows: "He created and made a building that is free from rain and wind". He also asked the king to forgive him.

But all the efforts of the historian are wasted. He finally lost hope of returning to the palace again. The elderly Sami was forced to support his large family by copying manuscript books. As the life of the palace moved away and the hardships of life and the misery of poverty rose, the spirit of Sami criticism of the Amirates and officials, the condemnation of social injustice, and the grievance of modernity increased. This critical spirit is particularly evident in his work "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya".

Now let's go back to our purpose and compare the differences between the two works. These differences are particularly evident in the volume and chronological boundaries of the work, in the legalization and assessments of rulers and historical figures. After all, "Tuhfa-yi shahi" is superior to "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya" in volume

(the first one contains 299 folios and the second – 75 folios), in other words, it is the detailed description of events. The chronological limit of the first work is also broader than the latter. In particular, "Tuhfa-yi shahi" began with the events of the reign of 'Ubaydallah Khan (1702-1711) of the Janids (or Ashtarkhanids) and covered the events of the early 1870s. Although the last chapter was briefly mentioned by the author Amir 'Abd al-Ahad's (1885-1910) reign in Bukhara, the events of the period was not covered at all. One of the reasons that motivated Mirza Sami to write his next work was to write the events of the reign of 'Abd al-Ahad.

One of the main differences between the "Tuhfa-yi shahi" and the "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya" is, in our opinion, the issue of legitimacy, that is, the legitimacy of the power of the Manghit dynasty. It is well-known that after the Mongol invasion, there was a belief that supreme power in the areas under their control should be in the hands of the descendants of Chingis Khan, and it was deeply embedded in the minds of the people. Therefore, in Central Asia it was considered unlawful for a non-Chingisid to assume power, especially to declare himself a khan. Even in Central Asia, Amir Temur (1336-1405) did not change the situation and did not call himself khan, having overthrown the Mongol power and establishing a powerful state. Muhammad Rahim (1756-1759) was the founder of the Manghit dynasty in Bukhara for the first time in Central Asia without a Chingis generation and called himself "khan".

Most official histories covering the history of the Manghit amirs are based on a variety of legitimacy of their authority (Kugelgen, 2004). Of course, Sami also followed the tradition of his earlier court historians in "Tuhfa-yi shahi". In particular, according to him, every effort by Muhammad Hakim (He was the Minister of Abu'l-Fayz Khan) and his son Muhammad Rahim to take over the reigns is based on loyalty to Abu'l-Fayz Khan (1711-1747), high service to the government, and entrepreneurship. Especially, he writes: "The service of this family to the khan was perfect. Consequently, they used to do all the work of the Sultan with respect and sympathy for the State. No case would be solved without the father and son council meeting" (Sami, No. 2188, f. 13^b). However, in "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", the historian negatively criticized the actions of Muhammad Rahim and his father Muhammad Hakim for the authority.

Let's notice the differences in the two works. "Tuhfa-yi shahi" chronicled the invasion of the Iranian king Nadir Shah (1736-1747) in Central Asia in 1740. In it, Sami tried to ignore that Hakim Ataliq sent a letter to Nadir Shah inviting him to Bukhara and expressing his willingness to obey him. Sami explains that Hakim Ataliq sent a secret message to the king only after the army led by his son Riza-Quli Khan won the war in Qarshi and had no hope of winning the Uzbek army. He also emphasizes that he did this for "prudence and entrepreneurship" (Sami, No. 2188, f. 16^{a-b}). In his "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", the author says that Hakim Ataliq thought the arrival of Nadir Shah in Bukhara as a convenient time for gaining power, accepted as a "divine favor" and immediately expressed his devotion to the king (Sami, 1962, f. 56^a).

The author in two works also evaluated differently the execution of Abu'l-Fayz Khan under the command of Muhammad Rahim. In official history, Muhammad Rahim killed Abu'l-Fayz Khan to "remove this thorn from the foot of the property". Because, Abu'l-Fayz Khan's "character" was disliked by the Bukhara amirs and commanders (Sami, No. 2188, f. 34^a). In other words, it was stated that the amir's execution was primarily caused by

the Amir himself, and then it was done at the will of the amirs and aristocrats of Bukhara. The execution of Abu'l-Fayz Khan in the "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya" was regarded as a betrayal and injustice of the khan. After receiving the approval of the palace rulers, Muhammad Rahim ordered his officials to cut off the head of the Chingis ruler with a dagger of injustice, Sami said (Sami, 1962, f. 57^b). The historian also informed in an unofficial history that before Muhammad Rahim's announcement as an Amir, Abu'l-Fayz Khan's son – 'Abd al-Mu'min became an Emir of Bukhara. Muhammad Rahim gave his daughter to him. But a year later, 'Abd al-Mu'min, a descendant of Chingis Khan, was killed. According to the historian, the prince 'Ubaydallah had the same fate (Sami, 1962, f. 58^b).

In short, Mirza Sami justified in his "Tuhfa-yi shahi" that the founder of the dynasty of Muhammad Rahim executed Abu'l-Fayz Khan and princes. He also sought to justify his conquest of the Chingis family by various means. In the official version of history, however, Muhammad Rahim Khan's efforts to seize power are called by Mirza Sami "treachery", "deception", "cunning" and "violence".

The differences between official and unofficial histories are particularly evident in the assessments of Muhammad Rahim Khan, Amir Nasrallah (1826-1860) and Amir Muzaffar. In particular, the historian writes in "Tuhfa-yi shahi" about Muhammad Rahim: "Muhammad Rahim was a thoughtful, wise, and brave man, unparalleled in the help and courage, compassionate to the people of science and craftsmanship, and incomparable in the way of mercy and generosity" (Sami, No. 2188, f. 39^a). But a different picture can be seen in "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya": "Muhammad Rahim Khan won the ranks of the government by hitting the people with gifts and donations. He was unique in governing and entrepreneurship. But he was brave enough to destroy bloodshed and disobedient commanders, and would punish them for their small sins" (Sami, 1962, f. 59^b).

If you look closely, both the works of the historian completes each other. For example, in informal history, the historian draws a portrait of Amir Nasrallah in black paint and expresses his criticism openly: "He was a ruthless, bloody king. They did not count on anyone in the business, tried to ensure the implementation of Shari'a laws and to limit illegal activities" (Sami, 1962, f. 56^a). In official history, however, Sami refrained from making derogatory remarks about Nasrallah, on the contrary, portraying him as a just king who promoted sharia and improved the state of people.

Nevertheless, in the course of telling historical events, the historian could say that Nasrallah did not take into account the wise judgments of his subordinates and showed this to the students as a negative aspect of the Amir. For example, Amir Nasrallah mobilized troops in Kokand in 1842 to arrest Muhammad 'Ali Khan (1822-1842) and convene a meeting to decide the fate of the khan. At the meeting, Erdana Bi – lawyer from the Bukhara administration advised: "While a strong enemy like Nasara (Christians) is waiting for the door to invade Islamic countries, it is desirable that the khan should be alive to protect the country (Sami, No. 2188, f. 151^a). But his opinion was ignored by Nasrallah and he executed the khan.

In the official version, the historian spoke warmly about Muhammad Rahim, Amir Nasrallah, especially about Amir Muzaffar: "Amir Muzaffar was a merciful and compassionate khan, who was unique in giving donations (Sami, No. 2188, f. 229^a). Amir's conquest in the Shakhrisabz, Hisar-i Shadman or Kokand khanate is seen as a

"purge of rebellion" or a "necessary action". In the unofficial version, the Somali describes how Muzaffar did something praising in the beginning of his reign, and that he was cheering others on with his "good behavior" and "good manners", "chanting righteousness and wearing generous armor". However, as soon as the entire territory of from Hisar-i Shadman province to Kulab and Baljuvan was occupied by him, the treasury was filled with gold and the opposition was not remained in the country. Then the Amir became boastful. In repression and injustice, he was even worse than his father (Sami, 1962, f. 65^{a-b}).

Thus, in the unofficial history, Sami was seen as a critic of the Amir of Bukhara on the one hand, and on the other, he was an ardent advocate of Islam. He did not hide his enmity towards the "false" Shi'ite sect and the "Christian unbelievers". Before describing the events of the Amir 'Abd al-Ahad era, Sami emphasized these two enemies as they reflected on the internal and external causes that led to the destruction of the Bukhara state. He believes that the Russian invasion, that is, the Christian invasion, was the external cause of the "state desolation" and "destruction of the nation". Changes in personnel policy in the time of Amir Nasrallah were an internal reason for the state crisis. He strongly condemned the dismissal of many clever and enterprising individuals who were interested in the development of the country and the appointment of low-income persons. When writing about human resource developments, Sami was primarily referring to Shi'ite officials. In the time of the Manghite rulers, it was widely accepted that more and more Iranian slaves were involved in the government in order to limit the separatist policies of the Uzbek tribal leaders to the central government. According to Danish, Amir Nasrallah (1826-1860) forbade the heads of Uzbek tribes to leave their territory to consolidate their power and appointed Tajiks and foreigners to responsible positions (Danish, 1967, p. 39). During his time, Muhammad Shukur Khan was an Iranian leader, and 'Abd al-Samad Khan Tabrizi was recruited into the Bukhara army as a goal-scorer and included a large number of Shi'ites². The political influence of the Iranians continued to increase during the later Amirs. Many of them were appointed to positions without being released from slavery. For example, the Amir appointed Muzaffar Muhammad Shah as his prime minister. Four Iranian ministers from Muhammad Shah to Astana-Qul served as prime ministers (Satoru, 2011, p. 199).

The relationship between Sunnis and Shi'ites in Bukhara was much more serious during Sami's period³. According to Mirza Sami, as the influence of the Iranians in power increased, they also sought to strengthen their religious position. In turn, the Sunni cleric's reaction increased. Long before he wrote the "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya", he wrote "Mir'at al-yaqin" in 1303/1885 to "strengthen the community's clear beliefs free from any suspicions and prejudices". Years after the country was conquered by Russian troops, the power and violence of the "Cruel Shi'ites" reached its peak, and Sami returned

²The ambassador, who came to the emir of Nasrallah in 1844 by the King of Iran Muhammad Shah Qajar, gained agreement to free Iranian slaves in Bukhara from the amir and the amir agreed to release 1,000 of his own slaves bought by the emir for 30,000 golden coins. On his return from Bukhara, the ambassador was able to take 1,000 freed slaves to Iran, not the amir's soldiers.

³In an effort to counter the growing Shi'ite activity in Bukhara, Sunni scholars wrote to them a doxographic works as a denial. In the year 1303/1885, Mirza Sami wrote his book "Mir'at al-yaqin". A little later, one of the Bukhara intellectuals, Ahmad Danish (1827-1897), published the book "Mi'yar al-tadayyun" in 1311/1893-1894.

to this issue. In particular, the assassination of zakat officer Muhammad Sharif and the appointment of his son Astana-Qul in the position of his father in 1888 contributed to the strengthening of this rule, Sami said (Sami, 1962, ff. 107^a-108^b). During this period the political position of two officials in the khanate: Qazi al-Quzat Mulla Badr al-Din and Astana-Qul Qushbegi significantly increased. Astana-Qul sponsored the Iranians and invited them to the government (Sami, 1962, ff. 119^b-120^a). "The power of Astana-Qul in this state is a thousand times more than the rule of Ja'far Barmaki⁴ during the time of Harun al-Rashid⁵", Sami said in his book (Sami, 1962, f. 120^a). The Amir completely lost power, leaving only five and six judges and chairs, and collecting taxes for the Russian treasury (Sami, 1962, f. 111^b).

"Tuhfa-yi shahi" describes in detail the political situation in the country before the Russian invasion, the Bukhara-Kokand relations, and the immediate post-war occupation of the khanate by the Russian troops, such as Jizzakh, Samarkand, Katta-Qurghan.

Based on the data of the work, the following conclusions can be drawn.

On the eve of the Russian invasion, the Bukhara Amirate was more powerful than the Khiva and Kokand Khanates, but the political situation in the country was much more difficult. In particular, the dependence of the Shakhrisabz and Kitab regions and the Eastern Bukhara regions on the state of Bukhara were variable. In the first five years of his reign, Amir Muzaffar reintroduced these regions into the Bukhara state due to bloodshed and economic losses. The massacre of many soldiers and skilled soldiers while the enemy was on the threshold of the country undermined the Amirate's military might. On the eve of the war, Samarkand, the second capital of the Amirate, surrendered to the enemy without a fight, due to the complexity of the internal situation in Samarkand and the timeliness of its consequences. The inability and inexperience of Mayor Shir 'Ali Inaq has caused the hostility between the army and the people of city. As a result, instead of defending the city, Samarkand residents did not even allow Bukhara troops to enter the city after being defeated on Chupan-Ata hill.

Not only the local population, but many officials and commanders of the Amir were also dissatisfied with the policy of the Amir. Therefore, at a time when the fate of the country was being resolved, the Amir lost their support.

Shortly after the defeat of the main battles, national liberation movements broke out across the country. A range of strikes were started in the Amirate, they were headed by Prince 'Abd al-Malik, son of Amir Muzaffar, known as Katta Tura. Freedom movement covered two-thirds of the country, mainly Shakhrisabz and Kitab regions, Upper Zarafshan and all of Eastern Bukhara. Apart from the movement led by 'Abd al-Malik in Bukhara, the uprisings were continued in Nur-Ata by Siddiq Tura, in Khatirchi and Payshanba by Allah-Yar Bek Divanbegi and Ziyavuddin, in Narpay and Khatirchi by Baban Tuqsaba. That is

⁴Ja'far Barmaki is the minister of Harun ar-Rashid.

⁵Harun al-Rashid is the 'Abbasid Caliph. He reigned in 786-809. Until 803 the rule of the caliphate was practically in the hands of ministers of the Barmakian dynasty.

why the Amir could not establish peace in the country. The liberation movements of the local population were suppressed with the help of Russian troops, with the support of the governor general of Turkestan, who was interested in establishing peace in the Amirate.

In both of his works, Sami expressed regret over the deaths of Uzbek fighters in the fighting because of the military superiority of the Tsarist Russian army: "The Russian military knows nothing except fireworks and shotguns. The Uzbek soldiers in Turan had nothing except sword-fighting. They couldn't bear the rain of bullets, but they turned away ... Many people were killed" (Sami, No. 2188, f. 228^{a-b}).

In the perspectives of Mirza Sami, the notions of "just ruler", "justice and fairness" are considered as a priority of statehood. He believed that the ruler would win if he shows favor to his people, did not oppress them, and did justice. He believed that the Russians' arrival in this land was also a divine destiny. The country that was so powerful at the time during the reign of Daniyal (1758-1785). But according to the historian, next rulers forgot the "justice" and "grace". They were very badly behaved (Sami, 1962, p. 110^b). He considered that Nicholay II (1896-1918), the Russian king, was also subject to "the wrath of God" because of the injustice of his people. So Russia was in the flame of revolution (Sami, 1962, f. 112^a).

Mirza Sami believed that the 1905 Revolution and Russia's defeat in the Russian-Japanese War are the weakening of the "infidels" and the success of Muslims. This situation could allow us to easily recapture the occupied provinces of Russia, but he regreted that the work was being slowed down. A bit earlier, when the Turkish Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid (1876-1909) was described as a powerful leader of Muslims who constantly strive against the "unbelievers", Sami set him as an example for the Bukhara Amirs.

Conclusion

There are certain things in common between the "Tuhfa-yi shahi" and "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya". It is only natural that these two works were written in the same period. These parallels are first and foremost in the assessments of the time and personality of Amir Daniyal, Amir Shah Murad, and Amir Haydar. In both works, the activities of the above mentioned Amirs were positively assessed. Regardless of the situation or mood of the author, Mirza Sami maintained his relevance in writing the story. This was primarily due to his being a fair-tempered, affectionate and punctual man. For example, official history in the "Tuhfa-yi shahi" praised the rulers. Nevertheless, Muhammad Rahim said that all his efforts were to take over the throne of Bukhara, or that Amir Nasrallah's self-esteem did not take into account the wise opinions of state officials. He explained these bad characters in one word or another. Or, in the official version, even the author sometimes criticized Amir Muzaffar, he also acknowledged that during the first years of his rule Muzaffar was governed according to justice. On the contrary, in "Tarikh-i salatin-i Manghitiya" Sami was much more courageous than in his previous work and strongly criticised the activities of the Amir of Bukhara. However, he could not dare to express his thoughts openly every time. In particular, while criticizing Amir Muzaffar, he ended his opinions with the following phrases in Arabic: العقل يكفيه الاشارة ("a point is sufficient for the

wise man" or وفى الزيادة قطع الحلقو ("the rest cut the throat") (Sami, 1962, f. 65^b)⁶. In our view, this is due to the worldview and professionalism of Sami. The writer who had spent most of his life in the king's office had a view of the king as the vice of God on earth. There was a sense of divinity and fear of the ruler. In addition, during many years of secret service, using of praise phrases before the name of kings in the official correspondence was memorized by Sami. As a result, of course, he used the epithet "His Majesty" ahead of the Amir's names. Or, he does not hesitate to use phrases such as "the powerful Amir ... the glorious father ...", stating that there was no trace of previous power in the reign of Abdulahad. However, despite these minor drawbacks, two different perspectives by one historian provide readers with a broader understanding of the spirit, events, or activities of that time.

References:

- Ayni, Sadr al-Din. (1923): *Tarikh-i amiran-i manghitiya-i Bukhara*. Tashkent: Turkestanское gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.
- (2007): *Buxoro safarnomasi*. Translated from Persian for Uzbek by I. Bekdzan. Tashkent: Makhpirat nomidagi Orta Osiyo khalqlari instituti.
- Danish, Ahmad. (1967): *Traktat Akhmada Danisha. Istoriia Mangitstkoii dinastii* [The History of the Manghit Dynasty]. Translated by I.A. Nadzhafova. Dushanbe: Danish.
- Danish, Ahmad. *Mi'yar al-tadayyun*. Manuscript of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2187.
- (1998): *Katalog arabograficheskikh rukopisei Bukharskoi oblastnoi biblioteki imeni Abu Ali ibn Siny* [Catalog of Arabographic manuscripts of the Bukhara Regional Library named after Abu Ali ibn Sina]. Compiled by G. Kurbanov, F. Schwartz. Bukhara.
- (1960): *Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii Nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR* [Catalog of Oriental manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajik SSR]. Vol. I. Stalinabad: Poligrafkombinat.
- Kugelgen, Anke. (2004): *Legitimatsiya sredneaziatskoi dinastii Mangitov v proizvedeniakh ikh istorikov (XVIII-XIX vv.)* [The legitimization of the Central Asian Manghit dynasty in the works of their historians (XVIII-XIX centuries)]. Almaty: Dyke Press.

- Khasanova, Z.S. (1976). Sami i ego teoriia epistoliarnogo stilia v tadjikskoi literature XIX v. [Sami and the theory of the epistolary style in Tajik literature of the nineteenth century]. Auth., Ph.D. in Philosophy, Dushanbe.
- Makhdum, Sh. Tarikh. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2241.
- Makhdum, Sh. Muntakhab al-tavarikh. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 1304.
- Muhtaram, K. N. Tazkirat al-shu'ara. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2252.
- Salim Bek, Mirza. Tarikh-i Salimi. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2016.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. (1962): Tarikh-i salatin-i mangitiya [History of the Mangyt sovereigns]. Translated and edited by L.M. Epifanova. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoi Literatury.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Mir'at al yaqin. Manuscript of the Bukhara State Library.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Dakhma-yi shahan. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2188.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Mafatikh al-abr fi tarjumat masabikh al-fikr. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2194.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Mir'at ul-khayal. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2188.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Tazkirat al-fuzala. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 3396.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Tanzih al-insha. Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 293.
- Sami, Mirza 'Abd al-'Azim. Tuhfa-yi shahi, Manuscript of Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, No. 2091.
- Satoru, Kimura. (2011): Sunni-Shi'i relations in the Russian protectorate of Bukhara, as perceived by the local "ulama". In: UYAMA Tomohiko (ed.), Asiatic Russia: Imperial power in regional and international contexts. London, pp. 189–215.
- (1952): Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Uzbekistana [Collection of oriental manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan]. Vol. III. Tashkent: Fan.