

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL ISSUES OF STUDYING THE HISTORY OF UZBEK KHAN ABDULLA KHAN II

Akbar Zamonov

PhD, professor, head of "History" department of Kimyo International University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The article analyzes the personality of Shaybani Abdullah Khan, a great statesman who worked in the second half of the 16th century; the scientific-theoretical aspects of studying his history, historiography and source studies. Shaybanis, especially, the personality of Abdulla Khan, one of the largest representatives of the dynasty, his exclusion from research during the Soviet and independence periods, and ideological influences on his personality are discussed.

Keywords Shaybanis, Shaybani Khan, source, historiography, Soviet period, years of independence, personality, Abdulla Khan, Bukhara Khanate, Turan, Uzbekistan, study, state, Khanate.

INTRODUCTION

There are still many individuals in the history of Uzbekistan who have not been sufficiently studied, not introduced to the public, and who have not received their due assessment. One of them is Abdullah Khan ibn Iskandar Khan, a great statesman, a skilled commander, and a creative ruler. If Muhammad Shaybani Khan (1500-1510) was the founder of the Uzbek state, his nephew Ubaydullah Khan (1533-1540) was the protector and strengthener of this state, Abdullah Khan (1557-1598) was the creator of the centralized state, who ended the political disunity. Also, in international politics, one of the four major states that emerged in the East was the Khanate of Bukhara during the time of Abdullah Khan. The Khanate of Bukhara had the power to compete with the Babur state during the period of Jalaluddin Muhammad Akbarshah (1556-1605),

the Safavid state of Iran during the period of Shah Tahmosb (1524-1576) and Shah Abbas (1587-1627), and the Ottoman state during the period of Sultan Suleiman (1520-1566), and being larger than some of them in terms of territory, The Khanate of Bukhara was raised to a higher level by the efforts of Abdullah Khan.

Sources and historiography of the subject

Shaybani Abdullah Khan ibn Iskandar Khan's personality and information about his activities are covered in the following sources created in Movarounnahr, Khorasan and Iran: Hafiz Tanish al-Bukhari's "Abdullanoma" ("Sharafnomai Shahi"), Muhammadyar ibn Arab Muhammad Qatagan's "Musaxhir al-bilad", Muhammad Talib's "Matlab ut-talibin", "Tarihi tomm" by Sharofiddin Rakimi, "Tazkirat us-shuaro" by Mutribi Samarkandi, "Tarihi Muqimkhani" by Muhammad

Yusuf Munshi, "Shajarai Turk" by Abulghozi Bahadirkhan, as well as Hasanbek Rumlu's "Ahsan at-Tavorikh", Iskandarbek Munshi's "History of Alamaroi Abbasi" are among them [1].

During the years of independence, the Shaybani period became one of the less studied periods. Even so, it would be a mistake to say that there is complete indifference or underestimation towards Shaybani Khan and Abdullah Khan in Uzbek history. While the general picture remains unchanged, there are plenty of researchers who advance new perspectives. Although there were no special works devoted to the personality of Abdulla Khan during the Soviet period and the years of independence, as well as abroad, certain studies have been conducted within the framework of one or another research. In particular, during the Soviet period, V.V. Bartold, P.P. Ivanov, A.A. Semyonov, M.A. Salakhedinova, E.A. Davidovich; in the years of independence R.G. Mukminova, B. Ahmedov, H.H. Torayev, G.A. Agzamova, A. Ziya, G. Sultonova, A. Jumanazar; foreign scientists such as Mustafa Budak, Remzi Kilich, Gulay Karadag Chinar, Abdukadir Majid, Hamza Kamal [2] paid attention to some aspects of Abdullah Khan's work in their scientific research.

In recent times, supporters of Abdullah Khan's personality re-evaluation have also been increasing. For example, since 2006, the author of this paper has been conducting scientific research on the history of the Shaybani period, and now he is preparing a special scientific work on the topic of "Bukhara Khanate during Abdullah Khan's time". Also, the fact that the issue of Abdullah Khan's personality has left the circle of a couple of amateurs interested in history and reached the official media, newspapers, magazines and websites, is a sign of a significant shift. It is in such debates that new views are found and refined.

Why did Abdullah Khan's identity remain behind the scenes?

It is known that during the last one and a half centuries, the era of the Uzbek khanates in the XVI-XIX centuries was backward, and their statesmen were viewed unilaterally as the cause of this backwardness. In the general context of historical research, relatively backward periods, historical figures with a negative image are hardly studied by generations as important history. Shaybani Khan and his descendants who ruled the Turan region have been poorly researched for many years according to the above criteria. Shaybani Khan, Ubaydullah Khan and Abdullah Khan, who were the biggest representatives of the dynasty, at first glance, are seen as the accomplishers of great things, who caused great historical changes, but in Uzbek history, they were openly condemned or at least indifferent to their activities. First, during the Soviet era, the rulers of the Shaybani period were left behind the curtain. There were a number of reasons for this, of course. First of all, the main goal of the Soviets to criticize the Khanate period and their rulers was to idealize the existing, current system, in the words of Abdulla Kadiri, to instill in the public what was brought to light from "the dirtiest, darkest days of our history, the former Khanate period." Therefore, this approach was also reflected in historical stories and novels (for example, the works of Cholpon, Abdulla Kadiri, Mirkarim Asim, Pirimkul Kadirov, etc.). Secondly, approaches to Uzbek historiography during the Soviet era did not significantly differ from those in literature: the era of the Shaybanids is characterized by political instability, invasion campaigns, and at the same time, the dictatorial rule of the khans. Because the Soviet state was established in the ruins of the Uzbek khanates, a kind of statehood that began during the Shaybanids period. For this reason, Soviet science, which studied the figures of the Uzbek khanates, tried to "stone" its ideological opponent, instead of impartially illuminating the past. This prevented an unbiased approach to the period of the Khanate

and the inclusion of some important events, achievements and individuals, including representatives of the Shaybanid dynasty, into the scope of research. As a result, it was concluded that the national heroes and major historical figures in the history of Uzbek statehood lived mainly in the period before the 16th century and no one like them emerged after that. Thirdly, the history of the Soviet era interpreted Genghis Khan as an evil, bloodthirsty conqueror, a tyrant and destructive ruler. The empire he created, and the state policy implemented by his descendants were looked upon with negative colors. Naturally, Abdullah Khan, who belonged to his generation, also fell under this shadow. Fourthly, when talking about the Shaybani dynasty or the personality of Abdullah Khan, concepts such as "Uzbek state", "Uzbek people" or "Uzbeks" should be used in parallel with them. When the policy of glorifying the single Soviet people was the main ideology of the Soviet state, it was impossible to objectively evaluate the Uzbek state, the characteristics of the Uzbek people, and the successful activities of Shaybani Khan or Abdullah Khan, who were its rulers.

Why did Abdullah Khan's personality go unnoticed during the years of independence?

First, the historiography of independent Uzbekistan still cannot completely leave the model of the Soviet era. The periodization and general view of our history created by the Soviet school of history is still preserved, the list of historical figures to be officially selected has hardly changed (some figures such as Amir Temur have been added), approaches have hardly changed. Secondly, there is no attempt to re-evaluate the period of the Khans, particularly the representatives of the Shaybani dynasty, and rewrite their history. The Uzbek khanates, which played a decisive role in the formation of the Uzbek nation, the ethnic, political and cultural image of

Central Asia, remains, and more emphasis is placed on the times before them. During the general criticism of the Khanate era, the Shaybani state and one of its great rulers, Abdullah Khan, was included in this circle of "backwardness". However, in terms of borders and political structure, the era of Shaybani differs from the khanates of the following centuries. It would be unfair to consider the Shaybanids as a backward and weak dynasty of their time. Thirdly, in the early years of independence, the anniversaries of great Timurid representatives such as Amir Temur (1996), Mirzo Ulug'bek (1994), Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur (1993) were celebrated internationally. The factor of Amir Temur was transformed into one of the main ideas of the state, an ideological force uniting the nation. The legacy of the Timurids was widely studied and promoted at the national level. At a time when such an ideological and political factor was being absorbed into the people's psyche, the Shaybanids, who swept the Timurids from the stage of the Turanian throne, took shape as a common enemy. Fourthly, in 1998, the first President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Islam Karimov, met with a group of historians and intellectuals of other fields, and set before them the task of impartially researching the history of the Uzbek people and statehood, not connecting the origin of the Uzbek people only with the Shaybanids, and studying their ancient roots on a scientific basis. As a result, most experts approached the history of the Shaybani period cautiously and could not adequately assess the reformist policy of the dynasty's representatives in the fields of statehood, science and culture. And these did not allow to introduce Abdullah Khan, the biggest representative of the dynasty, to the public.

The need to study Abdullah Khan's personality

During his time and even after his death, historians described Abdullah Khan as "master", "great khagan", "prosperity period of Bukhara state", "the

last great ruler of Turan". Even in the 19th century, when the Turkestan region was in a socio-political decline, historians and public figures felt the need for a strong ruler like Amir Temur and Abdullah Khan, and in their works hoped for the return of such rulers. For example, Ahmad Donish (1827-1897) writes in his work: "Every hundred and thousand years of the Hijri, a ruler who renews the state and society appears. Amir Temur Korogoni was born as a mujaddid (renovator) of the eighth hundred years of the Hijri. After that, Mujaddids came from every corner of the Islamic land. For example, Sultan Husain (Mirza) left Herat near the ninth mia (hundred, century). Abdullah Khan came out of Bukhara as a mujaddid at the beginning of the millennium" [5]. It can be seen that the writer hoped that the society felt the need for such a powerful person during the tyranny of the Russian Empire.

It is known from history that when the country is in decline, the instability is on the rise, and the country is trampled under the feet of invaders' horses, great leaders and statesmen emerge and unite the country and the people under a single flag (for example, Jalaluddin Manguberdi, Amir Temur, etc.). Abdulla Khan also grew up in a highly conflicted period in the history of Uzbek statehood, when the country was divided into several parts and disorganized. He united the divided state with "sword and blood" while adhering to the existing political and social customs and traditions. A united and militarily-politically strong state will be able to carry out large-scale reforms. In this situation, Abdullah Khan strengthened the management procedures and began to implement reforms that improved the socio-economic condition of the population. Representatives of the field of science and culture were glorified, and they became scientific creators of reforms. The country became a field of creativity, and Abdullah Khan himself remained as the ruler who built the most buildings in history. It is important that the

exemplary path of Uzbek statehood covered by this person's courage and tenacity is an example for the young generation coming up today.

Today, it is necessary not to limit the list of historical figures to be studied within the framework of history education and research, to avoid making biased conclusions by comparing one of them with another. A list of political figures consisting of only Jalaluddin Manguberdi and Amir Temur falls short to show the richness and greatness of the past. The history of Uzbek statehood needs more serious research.

Comparing and distinguishing historical figures, recognizing only the strongest and looking indifferently at the rest creates a big gap in society's consciousness. With this point of view, the Shaybanids believed that Temur, who overthrew the kingdom, was not able to create a strong state, was not a "spiritual" and tolerant person, invaded our country, was a nomad, therefore, a "savage". Also, a comparative argument is often put forward: Was Amir Temur greater or Abdullah Khan? Was Abdullah Khan as great as Amir Temur? To evaluate one person, comparing him with another person does not lead to correct conclusions: not everyone can be equally great and equally strong, but everyone has their own place in history.

Amir Temur and Abdullah Khan - a common destiny.

In Turanian historiography, the title "master" has been applied to many rulers who built a centralized state and carried out victorious campaigns. For example, historians often used this quality in relation to Genghis Khan, Amir Temur and Abdullah Khan. In the years of independence, when the factor of Amir Temur became a separate idea in Uzbekistan, the concept that the word "sahibqiran" was used only for Amir Temur was absorbed into the minds of our people, and the word "Sahibqiran" became understood only by

Amir Temur. However, in the sources of the 16th-19th centuries, along with Amir Temur, Abdullah Khan is also referred to as "sahibqiran". Even the word "sahibqiran" was used as a synonym instead of the name Abdullah Khan.

It is known that there are few individuals who created a large empire and built a centralized and comprehensively strong state in the Turan region. When it comes to this issue, of course, Amir Temur is remembered as a great statesman who performed this task. In the sources of the XVI-XIX centuries, later, in the works of Jadid representatives, Amir Temur and Abdullah Khan are described in a row, they are compared to each other. Because Amir Temur was the first representative of the local statesmen who united the Turan region around a single center and built the largest empire in this region, while Abdullah Khan was the last. In the sources, some powerful statesmen are compared to each other with some duty phrases. For example, in the works "Zafarnama" dedicated to the history of Amir Temur, "Abdullanama" dedicated to Abdullah Khan, and "Musahhir al-bilad", while commenting on the strength of the states of both individuals and the strict establishment of laws and regulations, it is said: "if a single soul, a single body walks on a broad daylight from east to west with a golden plate like the sun on his head, no one will be able to take a look at him." In most of the sources related to the period of Abdullah Khan ("Abdullanoma", "Musahhir al-bilad", "Rawzat ar-rizvan"), Khan's activities related to the conquest of countries, the appointment of ambassadors and governors, and the management of the army are compared to Amir Temur. Also, modern writers who dreamed of national independence (in particular, Behbudi, Fitrat) asked "divine powers" to people like Amir Temur and Abdulla Khan to come from the depths of history and liberate the society from the oppression of colonialism.

Of course, such comparisons are not in vain. If the life paths of both statesmen are analyzed, there are commonalities in their activities in many areas.

First, there are many similarities in the state activities of both: neither Amir Temur nor Abdullah Khan inherited the power from their father, and they came to the top of the state through military and political struggle. After Amir Temur took over the power of Movarounnahr, two of the Chigatai Khans - Suyurgatmish Khan (1370-1388) and his son Sultan Mahmud Khan (1388-1402) were placed on the throne as "supreme rulers" and practically kept the reins of government in their hands. When Abdulla Khan took over the power of Bukhara in 1557, he dethroned his uncle Pirmuhammad Khan (1557-1561), then his father Iskandar Khan (1561-1583), and practically ruled the state himself.

Secondly, when both rulers came to the political arena, the country was in decline, there was an increase in disorganization, instability, looting, and invasions of neighboring countries. They (Amir Temur and Abdullah Khan) won in this struggle (1370, 1557) and were able to build a centralized state in a short period of time. Also, after the death of both of them (1405, 1598), the large empire they built began to disintegrate as a result of mutual crown-throne disputes.

Thirdly, Amir Temur's loyalty to the three sheikhs was very high. These are Shamsiddin Kulol, Sayyid Baraka and Zainiddin Tayabadi. 1) Shamsiddin Kulol (died 1370, Kesh) was the elder of Amir Temur's father Amir Taragai (died 1360). For the first time, he told Temur himself the prophecy about his bright future. 2) Amir Temur met Mir Sayyid Baraka (died 1404) for the first time in 1370 near Termiz. At the first meeting, Mir Sayyid Baraka presented Amir Temur with a drum and a flag, symbols of the kingdom, glory and victories. 3) Zainiddin Tayabadi was a great Khorasan "sheikh" and "sheikh ul-Islam". Timur met the

sheikh during one of his campaigns to Khurasan (1381) and expressed his respect for him and began to glorify him as a pir.

Abdulla Khan also devoted himself to the scholars of three religions and always tried to strengthen the country with their spiritual support. 1) Khoja Islam Joybari (1493-1563) was followed first by Iskandar Khan, and then by his son Abdullah Khan. In 1557, Abdullah Khan took over Bukhara with the help of this scholar. 2) After the death of Khoja Islam, Abdullah Khan elevated his son Khoja Sa'd Joybari to the rank of "sheikh ul-Islam" of the state and was under his spiritual influence until the death of Khoja (1589). 3) Abdullah Khan was very devoted to Qasim Sheikh Azizon of Karmana (d. 1581) and took an active part in solving many of the political conflicts of Sheikh Khan with neighboring countries (Khorazm, Kazakh Khanate) by diplomatic means. Also, the rulers always relied on the help of these scholars in the management of the state and society.

Fourthly, a monument with almost the same content has been preserved from both rulers in one place. Rather, Abdullah Khan imitated Amir Temur in this matter. In the Ulughtog Gorge (a mountain located 100 km north of Jezkazgan, north of the Sarisu River) in the present Republic of Kazakhstan, a "Zafarnoma" engraved on stone by both rulers was found (stored in the Hermitage Museum of Russia). In 1391, Amir Temur, during his campaign against Tokhtamysh Khan, reached Ulughtog, built a bridge on top of it in one day, built a camp, and ordered the army to collect stones from the surrounding area and build a tower-like structure. Stone masons wrote inscriptions in 2 languages - Arabic and ancient Uyghur. The inscription consists of 11 lines, 8 of which are in ancient Uighur and 3 in Arabic. The text of the memorial engraved in Turkish script is as follows: "In the year seven hundred and ninety-three, between the summer (koklam) month of the year

of the sheep, Temurbek, the sultan of Turan, marched against Bulgar Khan Tokhtamish Khan in the name of Islam with three hundred thousand soldiers. He reached here and built this hill as a sign. God bless you, inshallah. May God have mercy on the people, remember us with a prayer" [4].

200 years later, Abdullah Khan, who marched to Dashti Kipchak, against Baba Sultan, followed the example of his predecessor and built a mosque opposite the minaret built by Amir Temur, as a memorial of the Ulughtog expedition. Hafiz Tanish Bukhari writes about this: "On that day (May 3, 1582), the prayer stopped until noon and he ordered the army to collect a lot of stones." Following the order, they built a mosque in that place from the collected stone. With this, they left a monument of the high-ranking king in the pages of the newspaper. Such a thing was done by Amir Temur Koragon, the city-dweller, religious pole of the world" [6].

Fifth, it is known that Amir Temur built many structures during his career not only in Movarounnahr, but also in Khorasan, Iran, the Middle East and the Caucasus, which were part of the state. In particular, the central cities of Movarounnahr - Samarkand and Kesh - became a wide area of creativity, many masters-builders of the East participated in the construction of structures such as mosques, madrasas, houses, mausoleums, and minarets. During the period of Abdullah Khan, hundreds of structures were built in Movarounnahr, although their height and grandeur did not reach Amir Temur's structures, but in terms of quantity, they were more than the number of buildings built by all the Timurids. In this regard, the academician V.V. Bartold, who assessed their contribution to architecture, rightly called Amir Temur "the first builder of Central Asia" and Abdullah Khan as "the second builder of Central Asia" [3].

REFERENCES

1. Hafiz Tanish al-Bukhari. Abdullanoma / translated from Persian by S. Mirzaev. Scientific editor, editor, author of foreword and comments B. Akhmedov. - T.: Sharq, book 1, 1999; Book 2, 2000; Muhammadyar ibn Arab Qatagan. Musakhkhir al-bilad. - T.: Sharq, 2009; Muhammad Talib. Matlabut-talibin / translation from Persian and comments by G. Karimi and E. Mirkomilov. - T.: Movarounnahr, 2016; Mutribi Samarkandi. Tazkirat ushshuaro. / Translation from Persian, author of introduction and comments I. Bekjonov. T.: Muntoz soz, 2013; Sharofiddin Rakimi. The history is complete. / Translated from Persian by N. Norkulov and H. Bobobekov. - T.: Spirituality, 1998; Muhammad Yusuf Munshi. Tarikh-i Mukim-khani (Mukimkhanskaya istoriya) / Perevod s Tajikskogo, predislovie, primechanie i indikator prof. AA. Semenova. - T, 1956; Abulghazi Bahadirkhan. His family name is Turkish. T.: Cholpon, 1990; Hasanbay Rumlu. Ahsaneut-tawarikh (Historical chronicle of the events of 807-985 Hijri / 1404-1578 AD). Translation and comments from Farsi: Corresponding member of AMEA, Doctor of History, Professor Oktay Afendiyev, Doctor of Philosophy in History, Docent Namik Musali. Kastamonu, 2017; Iskadarbek Munshi Turkman. Abbasi is a historical figure. / Translation from Persian to Azerbaijani, introduction, comments by Oktay Efendiev, Namik Musali. Baku, 2009.
2. Бартольд. В.В. Туркестан в эпохи монгольского нашествия / Соч. в 9 томах. Т. I. - М.: Восточной литературы, 1963; Бартольд. В.В. История культурной жизни Туркестана / Соч. в 9 томах. - Т. II. Ч.1.- М.: Восточной литературы, 1963; Давидович Е.А. Корпус золотых и серебряных монет Шейбанидов. XVI век. — М.: Наука. Главная редакция восточной литературы, 1992; Иванов П. П. Хозяйство Джуйбарских шейхов. К истории феодального землевладения в Средней Азии в XVI—XVII в., М.—Л., Изд-во АН СССР, 1954; Семёнов А.А. Очерк устройства центрального административного управления Бухарского ханства позднейшего времени // Материалы по истории таджиков и узбеков Средней Азии. - Вып. II. - Сталинабад, 1954; Салахетдинова М. А. Неизвестный документ, составленный в связи с походом шейбанида Абдулла-хана II на Герат в 1578 г. // Письменные памятники и проблемы истории культуры народов Востока. XXII годичная научная сессия ЛО ИВ АН СССР (доклады и сообщения). 1988 г. Часть 1. М.: Наука, ГРВЛ, 1989; Салахетдинова М. А. Некоторые данные источников о борьбе Абдулла-хана II за власть в Бухаре // Письменные памятники и проблемы истории культуры народов Востока. X годичная научная сессия ЛО ИВ АН СССР (автоаннотации и краткие сообщения). М.: ГРВЛ, 1974.. Ahmedov V. Uzbek nation. - T.: "Nur", 1992. - pp. 26-125; This is the author. Lessons from history. - T.: Teacher, 1994; A. Ziya. History of Uzbek statehood. - T: East, 2001; H. Toraev. The role of Khojabor Khojas in the socio-political and spiritual-cultural life of the Bukhara Khanate in the 16th-17th centuries. Doctor of historical sciences, thesis abstract. T., 2007; G. Sultanova Relations of the Bukhara Khanate with the Kazakh and Yorkent Khanates in the second half of the 16th century: History. candidate. dissertation. - T., 2005; Zamonov A. T. Army structure and military management in Bukhara Khanate. Doctor of Philosophy of History (PhD), dissertation and monograph. - T., 2018; G. Agzamova. "Uzbek cities and urban life in the first half of the 16th-19th centuries". History is a science. Ph.D., dissertation. - T., 2000;

Muqimov Z. Owners of sword and pen. (Historical records about state figures.) - Samarkand, 1996, 2008; Hosseinishirazi S. S. Military-political relations between Maverannakhra and Iran in the XVI century. Dissertation na soiskanie uchenoy stepi candida istoricheskix nauk. Monday, 2014; Budak M. The beginning of Ottoman-Uzbek political relations // Eurasian Studies. - Ankara, 1996. - No. 4.; Remzi Kılıç. Ottoman inkwells (1530-1555) // Laws of history. - No. 2. - Ankara, 2001; Abdulkadir Macit. Sheybanî Khanate (1500-1599). Istanbul, 2015.

3. Бартольд. В.В. Туркестан в эпохи монгольского нашествия / Соч. в 9 томах. Т. I. – М.: Восточной литературы, 1963.
4. Sharafuddin Ali Yazdi. Zafarnoma. / The authors of the foreword, translation, comments and indicators are Ashraf Ahmad, Haydarbek Bobobekov. T.: New age generation, 2023. - p. 505-506.
5. Ahmed Donish. Risola or a brief history of the kingdom of the House of Mangits. / The author of the translation, comments and introduction is Qiyamiddin Yoldashev. T.: National encyclopedia of Uzbekistan DIN, 2014. – 17 p.
6. Hafiz Tanish Bukhari. Abdullahnama. / Translation from Persian by S. Mirzaev and Yu. Hakimjonov. Thai for publication. B. Ahmedov. Book 2. - T.: Sharq, 2000. - 71 p.