

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

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

**Band:** 60 (2006)

**Heft:** 4

**Artikel:** Khoqand and Istanbul : an Ottoman document relating to the earliest contacts between the Khan and Sultan

**Autor:** Hisao, Komatsu

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147728>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 25.04.2026

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

# KHOQAND AND ISTANBUL: An Ottoman Document Relating to the Earliest Contacts between the Khan and Sultan<sup>1</sup>

Komatsu Hisao, Tokyo

## *Abstract*

This paper introduces an Ottoman document regarding how to treat a letter addressed to Sultan Mahmud II by ʿUmar khan of the Khoqand khanate. This document, prepared in the Sublime Porte, is of interest in the following three respects. First, it reveals the first official contact between the Khoqand khanate and the Ottoman Empire in 1820. By comparing with other historical sources and research results in Central Asian studies, we confirm the real motives of ʿUmar khan's mission to Istanbul as well as false information presented to the Sultan. Second, our document is none other than the one which J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont had believed to exist in his work (1972). Thirdly, our document shows clearly that ʿUmar khan's first attempt to obey the Ottoman Sultan (*iṭāʿat*) ended without any success. This fact invites us to reconsider the intimate relations between the two states during the reign of ʿUmar khan pointed out by Z.V. Togan (1981 [1942–47]). This paper discusses these points and presents the transcription of the document with a summarized translation and notes. Historical sources located in Istanbul, although limited in amount, are indispensable for reconstructing the history of Central Asia in its actual space.

This paper introduces an Ottoman document preserved in the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, Hatt-ı hümayun tasnifi, nr. 36547. This document, regarding how to treat a letter addressed to Sultan Mahmud II (r. 1808–1839) by ʿUmar khan (r. 1810–1822) of the Khoqand khanate, consists of a proposal offered by the Sublime Porte and the approval of the Sultan. Although no date is written on this document, another document (Hatt-ı hümayun tasnifi, nr. 36579), considered a draft or copy of the Grand vizier's reply to ʿUmar Khan mentioned in the above document, is dated 2 Zilhicce 1235 AH (2 September 1820). It is certain that our document was prepared in 1820.

Ottoman archives that reflect the relations between the Khoqand khanate and the Ottoman Empire have been investigated by some scholars. First, J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont analyzed in detail a document preserved in the Topkapı Sarayı Museum (E. 7120), which reports the information of the

1 This is the revised English edition of my Japanese paper (KOMATSU 1989).

Khoqand khanate provided by a Khoqand envoy that arrived in Istanbul in 1832. This enabled him to describe Central Asian (*Tūrān*) affairs in the early 19th century; however, his analysis was based on insufficient consultation of Central Asian local sources and research results in the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> Another scholar to study the texts was Mehmet Saray, who extensively used Ottoman documents located in the Archives in Istanbul to study the diplomatic relations between the Ottoman Empire and Central Asian khanates during the period of Russian expansion in this area. Introducing a number of unpublished Ottoman documents, the author tends to analyze these relations entirely from the viewpoint of the Ottoman Empire without consulting Central Asian or Russian sources, nor the historiography of Oriental studies in the Soviet Union.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, Sawada Minoru introduced a set of Ottoman documents regarding 5 Khoqandian soldiers who visited Istanbul in order to participate in the *jihād* of the Ottoman army in the late 1780s, throwing light on the earliest contacts between the Khoqandians and the Sublime Porte.<sup>4</sup> Lastly, selected Ottoman documents and transcriptions regarding the Khoqand khanate were recently published under the auspices of the Turkish government, which has had a great interest in Central Eurasia since the *perestroika*.<sup>5</sup>

Needless to say, these Ottoman documents contribute to the exploration of interesting aspects of Central Asian history from just before the Russian invasion, a period that had been awaiting further studies. However, we will be able to make the best use of these documents when we compare them with Central Asian and other sources, and consult the numerous research results in Central Asian studies. This paper is a case study in this approach.<sup>6</sup>

Our document is of interest in the following three respects. First, it reveals the first official contact between the Khoqand khanate and the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, we have not succeeded in finding other documents which had been attached to this for certain and submitted to the Sultan, such as the Ottoman translation of the original letter of °Umar khan and the statement of the envoy. However, our document allows us to confirm the begin-

2 BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT 1972:192–231.

3 SARAY 1984. See also a review by H. KOMATSU in *Barukan shōajia kenkyū* 14 (1988): 107–113.

4 SAWADA 1988.

5 BİNARK 1992.

6 The summary of our document (Hatt-ı hümayun tasnifi, nr. 36547) is presented in SARAY 1984:36–37, unfortunately, without comprehensive analysis.

ning of diplomatic contacts between the two states. Second, our document is none other than the one which J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont had believed to exist,<sup>7</sup> and in this context, its relevance to the document introduced by him is clear (E. 7120). Thirdly, our document shows clearly that °Umar khan's first attempt to obey (*iṭā'at*) the Ottoman Sultan ended without any success. This fact invites us to reconsider the intimate relations between the two states during the reign of °Umar khan pointed out by Z.V. Togan.<sup>8</sup> In this paper, we would like to discuss these points and present the transcription of the document with a summarized translation and notes.

## 1. Historical perspective of the document

°Umar khan was the second ruler since the Ming tribe, which had established its authority in the Ferghana Valley throughout the eighteenth century, had proclaimed its independence during the reign of his elder brother °Alim khan. According to Mir °Izzat Allah, who visited Khoqand in 1812–13, °Umar khan did not acknowledge the traditional suzerainty of Bukhara. His name, shown on silver coins issued by him, was also mentioned when every sermon (*khutba*) was delivered after the Friday prayer.<sup>9</sup> He was the ruler of a new rising state which competed with the Bukhara emirate and the Khiva khanate for supremacy in Central Asia, establishing diplomatic relations with Russia and the Qing Empire.<sup>10</sup>

During his reign the Khoqand khanate enjoyed the short-lived heyday of its prosperity. Extending its territory in the north along the Syr Darya to the southern Kazakh Steppes (so-called Dasht-i Qipchaq), its domain reached the southern shore of the Aral Sea and the Ili basin. In the south-west it repeatedly struggled with the Bukhara emirate for the Urateppa and Jizzakh regions. At the same time Khoqandian merchants began trade in the east with China in Xinjiang, and in the north and south, via Tashkent, with Russia, the Kazakh Steppes and India, contributing to the economic development of the Khoqand khanate.<sup>11</sup> The progress of international trade as well as the con-

7 BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT 1972:230.

8 TOGAN 1981:213, 216.

9 °IZZAT ALLĀH 1872:52.

10 As to °Umar khan see also NETTLETON 1981–82.

11 As to Khoqand's Eastern trade see SAGUCHI 1965; LEVI 1999; NEWBY 2005.

struction of new canals by khans and dignitaries in rural areas brought about rapid urbanization in the Ferghana Valley. In cultural affairs ʿUmar khan’s court provided suitable conditions for literary revival, especially for Chaghatay literature. It is well known that he was a renowned Persian and Chaghatay poet, and a self-acknowledged patron of literature following the example of the Timurid court.<sup>12</sup>

Although we have no definite sources that tell the reason why ʿUmar khan sent the mission to Istanbul, it is doubtless that his confidence in the rising power of the Khoqand khanate mentioned above encouraged his diplomatic approach to the Ottoman Empire. In the same period, Amir Haydar (1800–1826) of the Bukhara emirate, asserting his suzerainty over the Khoqand and Khiva khanates, endeavored to establish the supremacy of Bukhara in Central Asia (*Memālik-i Tūrān*) through acquiring the sanction of the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph.<sup>13</sup> In one of his letters addressed to the Ottoman Sultan in 1813 we read the following request:

All the countries of Ma wara’ al-nahr, Khoqand, Dasht-i Qipchaq, Khwarezm, Marv, Balkh, Kulab and Badakhshan belong to our domain, and from ancient times the khans of Bukhara have exercised their right to appoint and dismiss all local rulers. However, the rulers of Khoqand and Khiva often refuse to obey us. Therefore, considering the khan of Bukhara is a faithful subject of the Ottoman Empire, I would like to ask your favor of granting an edict (*manshūr*) that confirms Khoqand and Khiva are under our rule.<sup>14</sup>

Here we can see Amir Haydar’s claim to the legitimacy of the Bukhara emirate. We should also remember the fact that he printed the rather ambitious title of *Amīr al-Muʿminīn* (the chief of the faithful) on his coins. (The first silver coin with this title was issued in 1222/1807). Amir Haydar pretended to hold the supreme authority in Central Asia.<sup>15</sup> A recent study reveals that he was interested in the change of power from ʿAlim khan to ʿUmar khan in the Khoqand khanate by sending a letter to the latter.<sup>16</sup>

12 KÖPRÜLÜ *İA*:322; QAYUMOV 1961.

13 SARAY 1984:32; Amir Haydar’s application of obedience to the Ottoman Sultan was well-known in Central Asia. For example see MARJĀNĪ 1885:204; MEIENDORF 1975:141.

14 Summarized quotation from SARAY 1984:32.

15 BURNASHEVA 1967:118–119, 125. See also BUKHĀRĀʾĪ 1998:130, 132. For the comprehensive analysis of the legitimacy of the Bukhara Emirate see KÜGELGEN 2002.

16 According to KAWAHARA 2005, Amir Haydar sent ʿUmar two letters. In the first letter, criticizing the rule of his elder brother ʿAlim khan, Amir Haydar told ʿUmar that he was

Competing with Bukharan Amir Haydar's pretentiousness, °Umar khan adopted a corresponding title, *Amīr al-Muslimīn*.<sup>17</sup> V. Nalivkin and V.V. Bartol'd pointed out that it was adopted for the celebration of °Umar khan's conquest of Turkistan (old Yasi) and its suburbs in 1814.<sup>18</sup> In fact, the author of the *Ta'rikh-i Shahrukhi*, a Khoqandian chronicle, refers to °Umar khan often by this title after the annexation of Turkistan.<sup>19</sup> A contemporary Khoqandian historian Muhammad Hakim khan tells in his extensive work, *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh*, that this title, adopted in 1230/1815, was printed on his new coins and was announced in the Friday *khutba*.<sup>20</sup> While his edict dated November 1814 begins with the fixed phrase "Abū al-Muẓaffar wa al-Manṣūr Sayyid °Umar Bahādur khān sözüimiz," the later edict, dated March 25, 1817 for example, begins with "Abū al-Muẓaffar wa al-Manṣūr Amīr al-Muslimīn Sayyid °Umar Bahādur khān sözüimiz." In the stamp put on the latter we find a set of normative sentences that justify °Umar khan as a devout Muslim ruler such as "Authority derives God," "Oh God, thou art the creator, and I thy servant," and "I obey thy order."<sup>21</sup>

According to our document, in his letter to the Sultan, °Umar khan, stressing that he is a Muslim ruler devoting himself to holy wars, asks the Sultan to grant him "honor and happiness superior to those given to his peers and opponents." In this context, who were "his peers and opponents"? As mentioned below, his *jihāds* against Chinese and Russians were fictions and their powers were not yet real threats for him. As "certain experts of Central Asian affairs" had hypothesized, we consider that it was Amir Haydar of the

---

ready for dispatching the *Shaykh al-Islām* of Bukhara to Khoqand in order to reproach °Alim khan on the request of °Umar. In the second one, very likely sent after the enthronement of °Umar khan, Amir Haydar, congratulating him, proposed the friendship and unity of both countries, Bukhara and Khoqand. In the end of the letter Amir Haydar tells that Bukhara and Khoqand have two common enemies, the Qing Empire and Qajarid Iran.

17 Regarding °Umar's strong spirit of rivalry with Amir Haydar, a set of episode is known; according to Marjānī, °Umar khan used to put in the final verse of his own poem the following phrase, "°Umar Ḥaydarīn afzaldur (°Umar is superior to Ḥaydar)." (MARJĀNĪ 1885:204); a Khoqandian poet, based on the historical fact that °Umar became the Caliph of the Prophet in advance to Haydar, the Shiites called °Ali, composed a poem presenting Amir Haydar inferior to °Umar khan to gain a great success (TOGAN 1981:216).

18 BARTHOLD *EI*:963–964; NALIVKIN 1886:111–112.

19 NIYĀZ MUḤAMMAD 1885:93, 97, 103.

20 MUḤAMMAD ḤAKĪM khān 2006:136.

21 MUKHTAROV 1963:31–32, 76–77, 118–119.

Bukhara emirate who was mentioned as °Umar khan's peer and opponent. °Umar khan also wanted his sovereignty to be acknowledged by the supreme authority of the Sultan-Caliph and his khanate to be granted a higher status than the Bukhara emirate in the Islamic world order. °Umar khan's rivalry with Amir Haydar caused the former to send the first mission to Istanbul.<sup>22</sup>

The aforementioned Ottoman document introduced by J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont (E7120) records the statement of a Khoqandian mission made in the Sublime Porte. This mission, dispatched by Muhammad °Ali khan (1822–1842), the son and successor of °Umar khan, left Khoqand in October 19, 1831, and arrived in Istanbul on October 20, 1832. At the end of this document we read the following passage:

During the reign of his late father [°Umar khan], through a letter he petitioned the King of the world and the Emperor of the time, mighty and formidable, generous and noble his Majesty the Sultan to be his subject, and left a will to his son Muhammad °Ali khan that he should pledge his loyalty and subjection [to the Sultan]. Therefore in 12 Cemaziyül'evvel 1247 [Muhammad °Ali khan] ordered Damla Qâdi Ernazar Resâ and °Abdürrahman Beg Toqbay to leave Khoqand.<sup>23</sup>

If we trust the credibility of the above-quoted description, °Umar khan dispatched only one mission to Istanbul, and his letter to the Sultan is none other than the one referred to in our document.<sup>24</sup> These two documents

22 Two other reasons can be considered. First, when he adopted his new title *Amīr al-Muslimīn*, °Umar khan established a new title of rank and dignity for the dignitaries and soldiers of the Khoqand khanate (QAYUMOV 1961:60–61). It is possible that °Umar khan's admission by the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph was required to strengthen his authority over various political powers in the khanate, especially nomadic groups such as the Kazakhs, Qyrgyz, and Qipchaqs. Second, as the commercial interests of Khoqandian merchants extended into the Kazakh steppes and Xinjiang, diplomatic relations with Russia and China gained growing importance for the khanate. In such international relations °Umar khan was able to consider the assistance of the Ottoman Empire preferable for the future strategy of his khanate. The fictitious *jihāds* against Chinese and Russians, mentioned in the letter of °Umar khan addressed to the Sultan, turned into real threats for the khanate some decades later. Facing with Russian threats, Khoqand khans were obliged to seek support from the Ottoman Empire.

23 BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT 1972:198, 229.

24 Still, we should not omit the possibility that °Umar khan sent the second mission during the years of 1820–22. Without quoting any source, Qayumov writes that when

show that °Umar khan sent the first and last mission to the Sultan in 1820 and, following his father's unsuccessful attempt of subjection, Muhammad °Ali khan dispatched the second mission to Istanbul in 1831.

Khoqandian sources provide us with some interesting information as to these missions. According to the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh*, the first envoy Haji Mir Qurban, who returned to Khoqand later than 1820, brought about a set of gifts presented by the Sultan to °Umar khan such as a sword, pistol, clock, telescope, and an edict (*yarlīgh*).<sup>25</sup> However our document gives us a slightly different impression, because the Sublime Porte rejected the offer of subjection of °Umar khan and decided to grant an allowance of 2,500 kurus as well as a letter of vizier to the Khoqandian envoy. It is possible that the author of the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh*, Muhammad Hakimkhan, tried to depict the mission as successful for the sake of °Umar khan.

Regarding the second mission the *Ta'rikh-i Shahrukhī* tells us as follows:

In the fourteenth year of his reign [Muhammad °Ali khan] appointed °Abd al-Rahman Sharbatdar and Damulla Irnazar on a mission to Rum [the Ottoman Empire] in charge of serving his Majesty the Caliph and dispatched them with a great amount of gifts and fabrics. In the fifteenth year they received a variety of splendid gifts and permission to leave the Caliph. Although °Abd al-Rahman Sharbatdar passed away on his way back, Damulla Irnazar succeeded to return and reported in the presence of the khan every charity and favor granted by the Caliph on behalf of Muhammad °Ali khan. Holding a common assembly (*majlis-i °ām*), he appeared triumphantly dressed in Imperial clothes given by the Caliph. In honor of these sacred clothes he ordered all the ministers and generals to wear the most luxurious costume and provided the common people with a banquet celebrating the occasion.<sup>26</sup>

---

°Umar khan held a grand night party in April 1822, it was attended by envoys from Khwarezm and Rum. See QAYUMOV 1961:12.

25 MUHAMMAD HAKIM khān 2006:250–251.

26 NIYAZ MUHAMMAD 1885:116–117. See also BEISEMBIEV 1987:106–107; As to the date when the envoy was dispatched, the chronology of the *Ta'rikh-i Shahrukhī* does not coincide with that of the Topkapı Saray document (E. 7120). However, the accord of the names of two envoys shows that both sources tell the same mission to Istanbul. According to BEISEMBIEV 1987:107, among the gifts given by the Sultan were found “two nail clippings and a strand from the beard of the Prophet.”; Regarding this Khoqandian mission which had departed in 1831, some additional information is provided by the Russian envoy Demezov, who stayed in Bukhara in 1833–34. According to him, the Khoqandian mission, which had left Istanbul in January 1834, had suffered impolite treatment by the Amir in Bukhara, which brought about a fissure between the two states (DEMEZON 1983:69–70).

Apart from the real result of the mission, this large-scale celebration clearly shows how the authority of the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph was recognized in Central Asia. About thirty years later A. Vambéry (1832–1913), who traveled in Central Asia in 1863 just before the Russian conquest, points out that the Central Asian peoples' respect for the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph had survived. In a slightly ironical manner he writes as follows:

The Sultan of Constantinople is regarded as chief of religion and *khalif*, and as it was the practice in the Middle Ages for the three khanats of Turkestan to receive, as badges of investiture from the Khalif of Bagdad, a sort of court office, this old system of etiquette has not been abandoned even at the present day; and the princes, on their accession to the throne, are wont still to solicit, through the medium of an extraordinary embassy to Stambul, these honorary distinctions [...]. The inhabitants of Central Asia, indeed, are in the habit of associating with the word Roum (as Turkey is here called) all the power and splendor of ancient Rome, with which, in the popular opinion, it is identified; but the princes seem to have seen through this illusion, nor would they be disposed to recognize the paramount grandeur of the sultan unless the Porte associated its "firman of investiture" or its "licenses to pray" with the transmission of some hundreds or thousands of piastres. In Khiva and Khokand these firmans from Constantinople continue to be read with some demonstration of reverence and respect.<sup>27</sup>

These accounts suggest that close relations with the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph constituted one of the factors to vest legitimacy with the sovereignty of Khoqand khans, as well as other rulers in Central Asia.

Our document shows that °Umar khan's first petition of subordination to the Sultan was rejected in a roundabout way by the Sublime Porte. Another document (nr. 36579), that is supposed to be a draft or copy of the reply of the Grand vizier to °Umar khan, although confirming the reception of °Umar khan's letter as well as his envoy, also makes no response to the requests of °Umar khan. As to the rejection by the Sublime Porte M. Saray points out two reasons: first, the Ottoman traditional principle of Central Asian policy that acknowledged the Bukhara emirate as the legitimate successor state of the Shibaniid and prioritized relations with Bukhara over those with the Khiva and Khoqand khanates; second, it is possible that, when inquired about Khoqand affairs, the Sublime Porte consulted with the Bukharan *ulama* dispatched on a mission from Bukhara to Istanbul, and as a result,

27 VÁMBÉRY 1865:484–485.

received distorted information according to the interests of Bukhara.<sup>28</sup> Although his interpretation is acceptable, we should not miss the Sublime Porte's cautious attitude to the Russo-Ottoman relations indicated in our document. °Umar khan's "*jihād* against the Russians," even if it were a false story, could not be approved by the Ottoman Empire that preferred peaceful relations with Russia in those years.

It can be said that °Umar khan's first mission to Istanbul failed to achieve the expected results. However, Z.V. Togan pointed out that °Umar khan invited masters and teachers from "Turkey" to strengthen the Khoqand army, and presented the Sultan a collection of Chaghatay literature.<sup>29</sup> Togan's view of the close relations between °Umar khan and the Sultan, followed by H.F. Hofman and J.-L. Bacqué-Grammont,<sup>30</sup> seems to have been commonly accepted. How are we to consider, then, the inconsistency between our document and this common view?

Although we still lack sufficient sources that provide a definite answer to this problem, it is necessary to reconsider, at least, whether technical and military assistance was provided during the reign of °Umar khan by the Ottoman Empire. For example, in the spring of 1837, Muhammad °Ali khan dispatched a mission to Istanbul, and the envoy was given a personal letter addressed to the khan by the sultan together with an honorable medal and sword. Although such cordial treatment by the Ottoman authorities was not offered in the case of °Umar khan's former mission, even this mission did not succeed in obtaining the imperial permission to send instructors (otherwise textbooks) of infantry, cavalry and artillery troops as well as mining engineers that Muhammad °Ali khan had requested of the Sultan.<sup>31</sup> According to an Ottoman document, the Master of Foreign Affairs (Reis Efendi) reported the Sultan as regarding the conversation with the Khoqandian envoy leaving for the country as follows:

[The Khoqandian envoy] has requested us to dispatch some mining engineers to his country that lacks any specialists with a thorough knowledge of mine development. In response to his request I told that there is no specialist who dares to go their country so far from Istanbul, and that, even if dispatched, since the engineers are Greeks and Armenians, and they find neither compatriots nor co-believers [in Khoqand], it is impossible

28 SARAY 1984:37.

29 TOGAN 1981:213, 216.

30 HOFMAN 1969:230.

31 SARAY 1984:46–49.

for them to stay [for a longer period]. After listening to my persuasion he abandoned his request.<sup>32</sup>

This document shows that despite the eager request of the Khoqand khan, the Sublime Porte was too reluctant to offer any concrete assistance to a distant country in Central Asia.

More attractive is a collection of Chaghatay literature dedicated to an Ottoman Sultan. J. Eckmann confirms that a Chaghatay manuscript prepared in 1232/1816–17, that is, during the reign of °Umar khan, is located now in the Istanbul University Library (T 5452).<sup>33</sup> This large and elegant volume consists of Chaghatay poems including the works of °Umar khan himself, under the pseudonym *Amīrī*. Although Bacqué-Grammont, following Togan's writing, states that this manuscript was brought by the mission of °Umar khan, it seems there is still room to reconsider the history of this unique manuscript.

It is undeniable, however, that since the beginning of the nineteenth century there existed literary exchanges between the Khoqand khanate and the Ottoman Empire as seen in a Turkish poet's participation in the literary circle of °Umar khan.<sup>34</sup> In the end of the century a Naqshbandiyya *shaykh* in an Uzbek *tekke* [Sufi lodge] in Istanbul, Şeyh Süleyman Efendi (–1890/91), famous for his Ottoman-Chaghatay dictionary (*Lûgat-i Çağatay ve Türkî-i Osmânî*), published the collection of Chaghatay poems by °Umar khan for the Ottoman audience.<sup>35</sup> If Şeyh Süleyman Efendi's efforts contributed to heightening interest in the origin of the Turkish language and in the common people of Central Asia among Ottoman intellectuals, in other words, to

32 “Diyârlarında ma°den i°mâlini bilür adam olmadığından ma°denci ustâdlarından çend nefer adam istemişler ise de dilyârları uzak mahal olmak hasbıyla rızalarıyla kimse gitmeyeceği ve bil-farz gönderse bile Rûm ve Ermenî milletlerinden olup orada hemcins ve hemmezhepleri bulunmadığından durmayacakları îrâd olundukta bu istid°âlarından vazgeçip [...]” (Hatt-ı hümayun tasnifi, nr. 36550). This part is omitted in the summary shown by M. Saray.

33 ECKMANN 1964:392.

34 QAYUMOV 1961:12, 302–303.

35 Şeyh Süleyman Efendi, *Divân-ı Amîr ve Macma°u' ş-şu°arâ-yı Asyâ-yı Vustâ*, Istanbul, 1300/1884–85 (I have not seen this work yet). Following this work, another Uzbek *shaykh* in Istanbul published a concise Chaghatay grammar. Mehmet Sadık, *Üss-i Lisân-ı Türkî*, Istanbul, 1313/1895–96, 74 pp.

the rise of Turkism,<sup>36</sup> such literary relations should be interpreted from the viewpoint of intellectual history.

Diplomatic relations between the Khoqand khanate and the Ottoman Empire started in the reign of °Umar khan were put to an end by the Russian invasion to the former in 1865 and its final collapse in 1876. However, it never meant that the significance of the Sultan-Caliph was totally lost in the former domain of the Khoqand khanate. For example, in the side wall of a minaret, built in the courtyard of the mausoleum of Zengi Ata in 1312/1894–95, we find an interesting engraving of a labyrinth under the names of God, the Prophet and the four Rightly Guided Caliphs. In the center of this labyrinth is carved the Arabic word “*Qoṣṭantīniyya*.” We can interpret its implication as follows: “despite long distances and many obstacles we Muslims are connected with the Sultan-Caliph ruling in Constantinople.” Many pilgrims who visited this famous mausoleum in the suburbs of Tashkent were able to understand this meaning, which reminded them of their dual obedience to the Sultan-Caliph as well as to the Tsar. Some years later, when Dukchi Ishan raised the banner of holy war against Russian rule in Andijan, the shadow of the Sultan-Caliph appeared again. After the total failure of the Andijan uprising in 1898, the captured *īshān* confessed to Russian authorities that he received a letter from Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876–1909), who appointed him as the representative in Turkistan and instructed him to make Turkistani Muslims observe the *Sharia*. Although the Russian authorities seized this document and confirmed that it was forged, Dukchi Ishan himself was said to have believed it to be a genuine *farmān* (edict) from the Sultan until the last moment.<sup>37</sup> In July 1918 the Ottoman ambassador to Russia, Galip Kemal, received in Moscow six high officials of the former Turkistan Autonomous Government that had been destroyed by the Bolsheviks in Khoqand in February. Expressing their sincere subjection to the new Ottoman Sultan Vahideddin (r. 1918–1922), they asked the material and spiritual assistance of the Caliph for the sake of the national movements of Turkistan.<sup>38</sup>

36 AKÇURA 1928:322–324.

37 In this forged document was found a “Naqshbandiyya genealogy.” According to this, the teachings of the Prophet was transmitted through successive *shaykhs* to Sultan Abdülhamid II, until it finally reached Muhammad °Ali (Dukchi Ishan). (TERENCH'EV 1906:463–465; KOMATSU 2004:29–61).

38 SÖYLEMEZOĞLU 1953:99–103.

In the end of the eighteenth century, Central Asian khanates and the Ottoman Empire began close relations that were never seen before. These relations were not limited to political and diplomatic aspects, but evolved to include intellectual and cultural spheres. It is true that the Russian conquest and rule of Central Asia put an end to any relations at the state level. However, mutual relations at other levels survived into the early 1920s.<sup>39</sup> In order to reconstruct the history of Central Asia in its actual space it is necessary for us to take into consideration the dynamism of these relations. It is needless to say that historical sources located in Istanbul, although limited in amount, are indispensable for further studies. We expect that the original sources of its counterparts in Central Asia will be excavated in the near future.<sup>40</sup>

## 2. Transcription of the document

Şevketlü kerâmetlü mehâbetlü kudretlü velî-i ni<sup>c</sup>metim efendim pâdişâhım,

Hatâ ve Hotan taraflarında Deşt-i Kıpçâk Kozgân zemin hâkimi olan Seyyid Muhammed Ömer hân tarafından el-Hâc Seyyid Kurbân Efendi nâm kâsîd ile bu def<sup>c</sup>a cânib-i seniyyü<sup>3</sup>l-menâkıb-ı mülûkânelerine olarak bir kıt<sup>c</sup>a fârisiyyü<sup>3</sup>l-<sup>c</sup>ibâre nâme vürûd edüp lede<sup>t</sup>-tercüme fezleke-i mealinde bilâd-ı Kozgân zeminden serhadd-i Kâşgar ve Diyâr-ı Kîş ve Deşt-i Kıpçâk tarafından Türkistan ve vilâyet-i Mesca'ya varınca cemî<sup>c</sup>-i memâlik ve büldân hân-ı mûmâileyhin hayyite-i hükûmet ve iktidârında olarak mücerred tahsîl-i zuhr-ı âhîret niyyetiyle gazâ ve cihâddan gayri emeli olmayup bir müddetten berü Hatâ keferesinin yed-i tagallübünde olan kılâ<sup>c</sup>-yı İslâmiyyenin nez<sup>c</sup> ve istihlâsı zımında vâki<sup>c</sup> olan ceng ve muhârebâtında kendüsünün mansûr ve muzaffer olduğundan ve memleketine kurb ve civâr olan Kızılceriyye nâm mahalda kâ<sup>3</sup>in Rûsyalu ile dahi muhârebeden hâlî olmamak mülâbesesiyle bu âna kadar taraf-ı eşref-i pâdişâhânelerine nâme takdimine destres olamamış ve kendüsi her ne kadar bu<sup>c</sup>d-ı mesâfede vâki<sup>c</sup> olmuş ise de cânib-i celîlü<sup>3</sup>l-

39 For example see MUMINOV 2005.

40 In the case of the Bukhara emirate, some samples of diplomatic correspondence with the Ottoman Empire are preserved in the Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan (Tashkent). For the collection of the letters of Bukharan Amirs see KAWAHARA 2004.

merâtib-i dâverânelerine samîmî mutâva<sup>°</sup>at ve inkıyâdı ferîza-yı zimmet bilerek kemâl-i sıdk ve ihlâs derkâr idüğünden bahisle Hemedân kişîzâdelerinden ve erbâb-ı rüşd ü sedâddan mûmâileyh Kurbân Efendiyi Dersa<sup>°</sup>âdete ba<sup>°</sup>s ve tesyîr etmiş olduğunu ve tahrîri güncâyış-pezîr-i havsalâ-yı ta<sup>°</sup>bîr olmayan ba<sup>°</sup>zı makâsıd-ı hafîyye kâsıd-ı mûmâileyhin takririnden ma<sup>°</sup>lûm-ı <sup>°</sup>âlî buyuruldukta muktezâ-yı mekârim-i ahlâk-ı seniyye üzere eltâf-i <sup>°</sup>aliyye-i cihânbanîlerinden mültemes ve muntazarî olan bir kıt<sup>°</sup>a nâme-i <sup>°</sup>âlî ve tûğ ve şemşîr-i sâmi ile kendüsünün beynü<sup>°</sup>l-akrân ve<sup>°</sup>l-muhâlifin müftehir ve mesrûr buyurulmasını inhâ<sup>°</sup> ve istid<sup>°</sup>â etmiş ve kâsıd-ı mûmâileyh dahi kaleme aldırılan takririnde hân-ı mûmâileyh el-hâletü hâzihi ikiyüz bin kadar <sup>°</sup>askere mâlik ve <sup>°</sup>ale<sup>°</sup>d-devâm iştigâl-i esbâb-ı cihâda münhemik olarak zât-ı şevket-simât-ı hilâfet-penâhînin sıdk ve <sup>°</sup>ubûdiyyetini iltizâm edenler fâ<sup>°</sup>iz-i dest-mâye-i sa<sup>°</sup>âdet olageldiklerine binâen kendüsünün dahi nâmı ma<sup>°</sup>lûm-ı <sup>°</sup>âlî buyurulması ve Devlet-i <sup>°</sup>aliyye-i İslâmiyye tâbi<sup>°</sup>îninden olduğu bilinmesi âksâ-yı âmâli olup mûcib-i fahr ve rif<sup>°</sup>ati olmak için taraf-ı fâ<sup>°</sup>izü<sup>°</sup>ş-şeref-i tâcdârânedan kendüye bir kabza-yı şemşîr ihsân-ı hümâyûn buyurulması niyâz-ı mahsûsu olduğunu ve kâsıd-ı mûmâileyh hâmil olduğu işbu nâmenin cevâbıyla <sup>°</sup>avdetinde hân-ı mûmâileyh dayısı Kâsım Beyi <sup>°</sup>atebe-i <sup>°</sup>aliyyeye irsâl edeceğini iş<sup>°</sup>âr ve enbâ eylemiş olmağla Devlet-i <sup>°</sup>aliyye ile hân-ı mûmâileyh ve gerek eslâfî beyninde bu âna gelinceye değin bir gûne mu<sup>°</sup>ârefe ve mu<sup>°</sup>âmele sebkât etmeyüp mahalli dahi eb<sup>°</sup>ad mesâfe olduğundan evvel emirde hân-ı mûmâileyhin hâl ve keyfiyeti ol havâli ahvâline ittîlâ<sup>°</sup>î olan ba<sup>°</sup>zı erbâb-ı vukûftan sual ve taharrî olundukta hân-ı mûmâileyhin el-hâletü hâzihi hükümrân olduğu Hôkand memleketi Buhârâ'ya tâbi<sup>°</sup> olup hân-ı mûmâileyh on seneden berü Buhârâ hâkimi tarafına izhâr-ı suret-i muhâlefet ve isyân ile Hôkand'ı zabt etmiş ve ol vechile vâki<sup>°</sup> olan tuğyânî keyfiyeti Buhârâ ulemâsı tarafından hâkim-i müşârünileyhe bi<sup>°</sup>d-def<sup>°</sup>ât ifâde olunmuş ise de hâkim-i müşârünileyh Cenâb-ı Hakka havâle ederek tuğyânından iğmâz-ı <sup>°</sup>ayn etmişiken bu def<sup>°</sup>a hân-ı mûmâileyh Kâşgar memleketine dahi benim memâlikimdendir deyü müdâhale ile zabtı dâ<sup>°</sup>iyesine düşmüş ise de memleket-i Kâşgar hitta-yı Buhârâ muzâfâtından olup hân-ı mûmâileyhin işbu iddi<sup>°</sup>âsı beyhûde olduğunu ve zikr olunan Hôkand'ın bir tarafı Hatâ diyârı ve tâ<sup>°</sup>ife-i Hatâ dahi Çîne tâbi<sup>°</sup> olarak hân-ı mûmâileyh gerek Buhârâ ve gerek Hatâ taraflarından havf ve haşyet üzere idüğünü şifâhen ifâde ve ihbâr etmiş ve işbu vâki<sup>°</sup> olan takririni kaleme alması sipâriş olunmak mülâbesesiyle fârisiyyü<sup>°</sup>l-<sup>°</sup>ibâre olarak kaleme alup takdim eylemiş olduğundan tercüme ettirilüp sâlifü<sup>°</sup>l-beyân nâme tercümesi ve kâsıd-ı merkûmun takriri ve tercüme-i mezkûre dünkü gün ber mu<sup>°</sup>tâd akd

olunan encümen-i şûrâda kırâ<sup>3</sup>at birle müzâkeresi dermeyân olundukta hân-ı mûmâileyhin nâmesi ve kâsıd-ı merkûmun takriri mealleri cânib-i saltanat-ı seniyyeden kendüsine nâme-i hümayûn ve tûğ ve bir kabza-yı şemşîr irsâl ve ihsân buyurulmasını taleb ve istid<sup>4</sup>âdan ibâret olup Devlet-i <sup>5</sup>aliyyenin muttasıf olduğu şân ve şevket ve celâlet muktezâsı üzere inâyet ve eltâf-ı seniyyesi <sup>6</sup>âlem-şümûl olmaktan nâşî hân-ı mûmâileyhin mültemesi olan tûğ ve şemşîr dirîğ olunur nesne değil ise de tercüme-i takrîr-i mezkûr müfâdına nazaran hân-ı mûmâileyh halefen <sup>7</sup>an-selef ol diyârın hükümdârı olmayup zümre-i mütegalibeden olarak <sup>8</sup>ahd-i karîbde zuhûr ile Buhârâ memâlikinden olan Hôkand'ı tagallüben zabt ve şimdi Kâşgar vilâyetine dahi müdâhaleye tasaddi birle Buhârâ hâkiminin muhâlif ve mu<sup>9</sup>ârızı olduğundan mes<sup>10</sup>ulüne müsâ<sup>11</sup>ade ile tarafına nâme-i hümayûn ve tûğ ve şemşîr irsâl buyurulmak lâzım gelse bu iltifâtı serrişte ittihâz ve hakkında müsâ<sup>12</sup>ade-i Devlet-i <sup>13</sup>aliyye sünûhunu i<sup>14</sup>lân ile maslahatını tervîc ederek Buhârâ tarafıyla uğraşması ve Buhârâ ise ehl-i İslâm olup bu sûretin beynü<sup>15</sup>l-müslimîn kıtâl ve cidâl vukû<sup>16</sup>yı mazarratını müstetbi<sup>17</sup> olması melhûz olduğundan mâ<sup>18</sup>adâ han-ı mûmâileyhin nâmesinde vâki<sup>19</sup> olan iş<sup>20</sup>ârına göre kalemrev-i hükûmetinin bir tarafı Rûsyaluya kurb u civâr ve kendüsünün Rûsyalu ile dahi muhârebesi derkâr olup el-hâretü hâzihi Devlet-i <sup>21</sup>aliyye Rûsyalu ile musâlih olduğundan ber muktezâ-yı vakt ü hâl bu cihetle dahi mahzûrdan sâlim görünmediğine ve memâlik-i şâhâne ile hân-ı mûmâileyh beyninde begâyet bu<sup>22</sup>diyet mesâfe olarak kendüsi iki devlet aşırı bulunduğu binâen cânib-i saltanat-ı seniyyeden hân-ı mûmâileyh tarafına nâme-i hümayûn ve tûğ ve şemşîr irsâlinde sarf-ı nazar ile kendüsine makâm-ı sadâretten ba<sup>23</sup>zı münâsib nikât ve ta<sup>24</sup>bîrât-ı nâzikâne ile hüsn-i müdâfa<sup>25</sup>ayı mutazammın bir kıt<sup>26</sup>a mektûp tahrîr ve kâsıd-ı mûmâileyhe dahi cânib-i mîrîden iki bin beş yüz kuruş i<sup>27</sup>tâsıyla taltîf olunarak i<sup>28</sup>âde ve i<sup>29</sup>zâm olunması beynü<sup>30</sup>l-huzzâr tezekkür ve tasvîp olunmuş ve zikr olunan nâme ve takrir tercümeleriyle berâber meşmûl-i lihâza-yı ma<sup>31</sup>âlî ifâza-yı şehriyârîleri buyurulmak için ma<sup>32</sup>rûz-ı huzûr-ı lâmi<sup>33</sup>ün-nûr-ı mülûkaneleri kılınmış olduğu muhât-ı <sup>34</sup>ilm-i <sup>35</sup>âlîleri buyuruldukta ber-mûceb-i müzâkere hân-ı mûmâileyhe taraf-ı çâkerîden iktizâsına göre bir kıt<sup>36</sup>a mektûp tastîr ve imlâ<sup>37</sup> ve kâsıd-ı mûmâileyhe dahi iki bin beşyüz kuruş i<sup>38</sup>tâ<sup>39</sup> birle i<sup>40</sup>âde kılınması muvâfık-ı irâde-i seniyye-i cihândârîleri buyurulur ise emr ü fermân şevketlü kerâmetlü mehâbetlü kudretlü velî-i ni<sup>41</sup>metim efendim pâdişâhım hazretlerindedir.

[*Hatt-ı hümâyûn*]

Benim vezirim,

İşbu takririn ve name ve takrir tercümeleri manzûr-ı hümâyûnum olmuştur mecliste müzâkere olunduğu vechile hân-ı mûmâileyhe tarafından iktizâsına göre cevâp tahrîr olunup kâsıd-ı mûmâileyhe dahi iki bin beşyüz kuruş °atiyye verilüp i°âde oluna.

### 3. Translation and notes

Mighty and generous, noble and formidable, my protector, his Majesty the Sultan,

At the supreme threshold of his Majesty has arrived a Persian letter<sup>41</sup> from a ruler of the Qipchaq steppes and Kozgân<sup>42</sup> in the direction of Cathay and Khotan, Sayyid °Umar khan,<sup>43</sup> through his envoy Haji Sayyid Muhammad Qurban Efendi.<sup>44</sup>

41 Under the patronage of °Umar khan and Muhammad °Ali khan, nineteenth-century Khoqand witnessed the flourishing of the Chaghatay literature. However, as far as we know, all the letters of Khoqand khan addressed to the Sultan were written in Persian.

42 Here “Ferghāna” is miswritten. In another document, *Hatt-ı hümâyûn*, nr. 36579, it is written “Fergān.”

43 Despite their ordinary Uzbek tribal origins, Uzbek rulers in nineteenth-century Central Asia including °Umar khan obtained the titles of “*khān*” and “*sayyid*” by marriage with the “descendants” of the Chingizid and the Prophet to legitimate their rule (TOGAN 1981:204–205). Chingizid authority was preserved even in the beginning of the nineteenth century: while Amir Haydar declared his Chingizid origin at his enthronement, Khoqand khans kept their genealogy that made their origin Chingizid even through Babur and Timur. °Umar khan is said to have followed the example of Chingiz khan (BUKHARI 1861:text 5; NIYAZ MUHAMMAD 1885:107–108; BEISEMBIEV 1987:83–90, 153; NALIVKIN 1886:112). At the same time, however, as symbolized in the titles of “*sayyid*” and “*Amīr al-Muslimīn*,” Islamic authority became superior to that of Chingizid (BARTOL'D 1966 [1903]:316). This tendency must have corresponded to the increase of missions to Istanbul by Central Asian Muslim rulers.

44 The *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh* refers to this envoy, Haji Mir Qurban, twice. In both cases, accompanied by Khivan mission, he offers °Umar khan the gifts received from Ottoman Sultan Mahmud khan. However their meeting places differ both times, the first time in Khujand and the second in Tura Qurgan without any definite date (MUHAMMAD HAKİM khān 2006:174, 250). It seems that as to the reception of Haji Mir Qurban, some confu-

The summary of the [Ottoman] translation is as follows:

This khan rules all the countries that are located in a vast region extending from the Kozgān province to its borderlands with Kashghar and Kish<sup>45</sup> provinces, and from the Qipchaq Steppes through Turkistan to Mascha. Solely engaged in gaining bread for the next world, he has no desire other than conducting a holy war. Since some years he has gained victories in battles for liberating Muslim castles under the rule of infidel Cathays.<sup>46</sup> At the same time he has been engaged in struggling with Russians based in Qiziljar neighboring his own domain.<sup>47</sup> These busy engagements have pre-

---

sion occurs in the *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh*. The first story is adopted by NALIVKIN 1886:114.

- 45 The old name of Shahr-i sabz. Since the eighteenth century when the Keneges tribe declared their independence from Bukhara in this region, the ruler who entitled *walī-yi ni‘āmī* kept good relations with the Khoqand khanate.
- 46 During the reign of ‘Umar khan the Khoqand army never battled “to liberate Muslim castles under the rule of infidel Cathays.” Despite some tension, Sino-Khoqandian relations did not develop into open confrontation. It is true that the descendants of the Kashghar khojas who were expelled from East Turkistan after the Qing conquest in 1760 were sheltered in the domain of the Khoqand khanate. Since 1816 the Qing government asked ‘Umar khan to keep watch on Kashghar khojas, a potential enemy for the Qing rule in Xinjiang, in compensation for a great annual sum. The Qing government expected ‘Umar khan to prevent the Kashghar khojas from raising the banner of holy war against the Qing rule in Xinjiang. However in 1820, when Jahāngīr Khoja (1790–1828) made an unsuccessful invasion in Xinjiang, ‘Umar khan took no measures to stop the troops of Jahāngīr Khoja. Although this incident aroused Qing’s suspicion of ‘Umar khan, he succeeded to maintain good relations with the Qing government. In 1821 he asked the Qing government to allow a Khoqandian mission to travel to Beijing. The development of “Eastern trade” with Xinjiang was indispensable for the Khoqand khanate. As to the Sino-Khoqandi relations, see SAGUCHI 1962; DI COSMO 1997; NEWBY 2005. See also ATIF 1300:242–243.
- 47 Qiziljār is a Russian fortress, Petropavlovsk, which was constructed on the Irtish fortress line in 1752. Since the late 1760s this fortress town showed rapid development as a large trade center, where many merchants from Tashkent, Bukhara, Khoqand, Kashghar, and Russia as well as Tatar Muslim merchants gathered. In 1772, Catherine II allowed the building of a mosque in this town with a large Muslim population. Among Tashkent merchants in Petropavlovsk appeared even those who worked as agents to Moscow merchants. See: ZIYAEV 1983:95–97, 99, 101; BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT 1972:226–227.
- ‘Umar khan’s war against Russians is a false account. Rather, in that period commercial relations between Khoqand and Russia saw a rapid and widespread development. In 1806, Saint Petersburg, informed by a Khazakh chief about ‘Alim khan’s desire to expand trade with Russia and to attract Russian caravans, dispatched a caravan from Omsk

vented him from sending a letter to his majesty the Sultan. However despite such long distances he has been convinced that it is his sacred duty to render homage and service to his Majesty.

This time he is determined to send an envoy, the aforementioned faithful Qurban Efendi from the notables of Hamadan, to Istanbul in order to introduce his unlimited devotion and honesty to his Majesty. Confidential issues difficult to present in the letter are to be stated by the word of the envoy. In his letter the khan presents a petition to enjoy honor and happiness superior to his peers and opponents by receiving an Imperial letter as well as an honorable banner and sword. According to the statement of the envoy, the khan, holding a force 20,000 strong,<sup>48</sup> has never missed the opportunity

---

to Khoqand. Although this caravan reached only Turkistan, in 1811 Semen Aleinikov succeeded in arriving in Khoqand. In the *Ta'rikh-i Shahrukhī* we read a passage regarding °Alim khan's word of the holy war against Russians; however, we have no accounts of such holy wars as conducted by him (NIYĀZ MUḤAMMAD 1885:75–76).

°Umar khan himself, in 1812, sent an envoy named Shākirbek to Saint Petersburg to ask the Russian government for the expansion of trade with Khoqand and the protection of Khoqandian merchants. Although his request was approved by Alexandre I who was interested in the development of Eastern trade, the Khoqandian envoys (two persons) suffered accidental deaths on their return trip in the Russian domain. Acknowledging the need for an explanation, in May 1813 Russian authorities dispatched an official interpreter who worked in Siberia, F. Nazarov, to the court of °Umar khan with a large caravan of 100 camels that carried a load amounting to 20 thousand rubles. Nazarov succeeded to submit an Imperial letter to °Umar khan who “was under 25 years old and wore thick clothes made in China.” (NAZAROV 1821:53) Such Russian concerns indicate the importance of Central Asian trade for Russia. According to °Abd al-Karīm Bukhārī, Russians paid compensations to °Umar khan who grew angry at the death of his envoy (SCHEFER 1970:text 102).

During the reign of °Umar khan it was Tashkendi, or Khoqandi, merchants who played the most active role among Central Asian merchants who visited Russian towns on the Irtysh fortress line. Engaged in multilateral trade connecting Russia, Khoqand, Bukhara, Xinjiang (East Turkistan), and India (especially Kashmir), they gained profitable results. °Umar khan kept silent about Khoqand's active trade with Russia in his letter to the Sultan. It was after the 1820s that some tension between Khoqand and Russia broke out due to their struggles over influence on the Kazakh nomads. See: KHALFIN 1974: 222–226; ZIYAEV 1983:101–104, 109.

- 48 This number is clearly exaggerated. According to °Izzat Allāh, °Umar khan's army consisted of a 10,000 strong cavalry [horsemen] provided with lands and villages for their military services and some 30,000 strong militiamen required to donate one month of their service per year without payment (°IZZAT ALLĀH 1872:51). Nazarov also reports that the Khoqand army in the capital was some 12,000 strong (NAZAROV 1821:74). The

of holy war. Convincing that supreme happiness can be enjoyed only by those who share his Majesty Caliph's sincere honesty and devotion to God, he intended to introduce his name to his Majesty. His desire is to be acknowledged a vassal of the Supreme Islamic State and to be granted a sword of honor by his Majesty. It is stated "when his envoy returns to Khoqand with the answer of his Majesty, the khan will send a new envoy, his uncle Kâsım Bey, to the threshold of his Majesty."

However, as we have had no connection with the khan and his predecessors, and his country is located far from us, to begin with, we have consulted with some learned men who have a detailed knowledge of the activities and nature of the khan as well as of the affairs of that region.<sup>49</sup> They explained as follows: originally his country, Khoqand, belonged to Bukhara; however, through the last 10 years of battle with Bukhara he occupied the land of Khoqand. Although such a rebellious inclination has been cautioned repeatedly by the ulama of Bukhara, the ruler of Bukhara [Amir Haydar] has approved it as divine will. In recent years the khan intended even to interfere with the country of Kashghar, pretending that Kashghar also belongs to his country. However, given Kashghar belonged to Bukhara, his pretension has no room to stand. At the same time, as Khoqand is neighbor to Hatā [Xinjiang] and the tribes of Hatā are subject to China, the khan is facing threats both from Bukhara and China. On our request to prepare a written report, they submitted a Persian report. The translation of this report,

---

contemporary regular army of the Bukhara emirate is estimated to have been about 12,000 strong (SCHEFER 1970:text 76). According to the statements made in 1838 of a Khoqand envoy to Istanbul, Zâhid Hoca-yı Kalân, up to then, the Khoqand army was entirely composed of cavalry, and had no infantry troops. "Bizim ʿasâkirimizin cümlesi suvârî olup piyâdesi olmadığından [...]" (Hatt-ı hümayûn tasnifi nr. 36565-A).

49 These "learned men," as introduced by SAWADA, may have been the shaykhs of *Özbekler tekkesi*, also called *Buhara dergâhı*, in Istanbul (SAWADA 1988:201–203, 204–205). Still, it is possible for us to suppose that among them was found ʿAbd al-Karīm Bukhārī, who is known as the author of a history of Central Asia during 1740 to 1818. He arrived in Istanbul in 1807 as a member of a Bukharan mission and in 1818 was in charge of the chief secretary (*sar-kâtib*) of the Bukharan ambassador in Istanbul. In the same year he dedicated his historical work to ʿĀrif Bey, the master of ceremonies of the Sublime Porte. It is doubtless that this work was the most detailed account of Central Asian affairs in Istanbul of those days and that few were as well informed on those affairs as him (SCHEFER 1970:text 2–3). In any case, it is clear that these "learned men," who preferred to use Persian, took the side of Bukhara in the explanation of Central Asian affairs.

together with the aforementioned translation of the letter of the khan and the statement of the envoy, was read aloud in the last regular meeting of the State Council, and was submitted to discussion.

Since the noble favor of the Ottoman Empire with such great might and power is unlimited, we have no reason to deny the banner and sword that the khan requests. However, according to the aforementioned report, this khan is not a hereditary ruler of that region but an usurper, who has been gaining power in recent years to occupy Khoqand which had belonged to Bukhara, and is opposing the ruler of Bukhara by forceful interference in the Kashghar region.<sup>50</sup> If we grant him an imperial letter as well as a banner and a sword according to his request, it is doubtless that he will use our generosity as a suitable pretext to legitimate his rebellious activities against Bukhara. As Bukhara is also a Muslim state, it is inevitable that such confrontation brings about massacres and conflicts among the same Muslims. At the same time the khan's letter tells that his domain borders on Russian land and he is at war with the Russians. Since at present the Ottoman Empire and Russia are mutually at peace, his activities may possibly pose a threat to our relations with Russia. Moreover, Khoqand is located far from the Ottoman Empire, beyond two countries.<sup>51</sup>

Therefore the members of the Council have decided unanimously to decline the presentation of an imperial letter as well as a banner and a sword, and instead, to issue a discreet letter of rejection from the Sublime Porte, and to let the envoy return with an imperial donation of 2,500 kurus. We submit to his Majesty our report together with the translation of the letter and the statement concerned. Even though we suppose it may agree with his Majesty's will to prepare a suitable answer by your humble vizier and let the envoy return with an imperial donation of 2,500 kurus, the final order should be issued by mighty and generous, noble and formidable, my protector, his Majesty the Sultan.

50 This account was far from the actual situation in Kashgharia. °Umar khan petitioned the Qing government twice in 1813 and 1820 to authorize him to collect tax from Khoqandian merchants staying in Kashgharia (SAGUCHI 1966:389–392). Although his petitions were rejected by the Qing government, °Umar khan's bold policies may have been distorted or misunderstood as his intention of "occupation" by those who sided with Bukharan interests.

51 The "two countries" indicate Qajarid Iran and Bukhara.

[Imperial decree:]

My vizier,

This report and the translation of the letter and the statement concerned have been considered. As discussed in the council, prepare a suitable answer to the khan and let the envoy return with an imperial donation of 2,500 kuruş.

## Bibliography

AKÇURA, Yusuf

1928 *Türk Yılı 1928*. Istanbul.

ATIF, Mehmet

1300 (1882/83) *Kaşgar Tarihi: Bâis-i Hayret Ahvâl-i Garîbesi*, Istanbul.

BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT, J.-L.

1972 “Tûrân: Une description du khanat de Khokand vers 1832 d’après un document ottoman”. In: *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 13/2:192–231.

BARTHOLD, W.

*EI* “Khoqand”. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Vol. 2.

BARTOL’D, V.V.

1966 (1903) “Teokratichekaya ideya i svetskaya vlast’”. In: *Akademik V.V. Bartol’d Sochineniya*. Tom 6. Moskva.

BEISEMBIEV, T.K.

1987 “*Ta’rih-i Shakhrukhi*” *kak istoricheskii istochnik*. Alma-Ata.

BİNARK, İsmet

1992 *Osmanlı Devleti ile Kafkasya, Türkistan ve Kırım Hanlıkları Arasındaki Münâsebetlere Dâir Arşiv Belgeleri (1687–1908 Yılları Arası)* [Archive Documents Pertaining to Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Khanates of the Caucasus, Turkistan and the Crimea (1687–1908)] Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık, Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü. (Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı Yayın. 3).

BUKHĀRĀ’Ī, Mīrzā Shams

1998 *Tārīkh-i Bukhārā, Khūqand va Kāshghar (Dar sharḥ-i ḥukumrānī Amīr Mīr Ḥaydar dar Bukhārā, Muḥammad ‘Alī Khān dar Khūqand va Jahāngīr Khwāja dar Kāshghar)*. Muqaddima, taḥḥīḥ va taḥqīq-i Muḥammad Akbar ‘Athīq. Tehran.

[BUKHĀRĪ, Mīrzā Shams]

1861 *O nekotorykh sobyitiyakh v Bukhare, Kokande, i Kashgare: Zapiski Mirzy-Shemsa Bukhari. Izdannye v tekste, s perevodom i primechaniyami V.V. Grigorieva. Kazan'.*

BURNASHEVA, R.

1967 “Manety Bukharskogo khanstva pri Mangytakh (seredina XVIII – nachalo XXv.)”. In: *Epigrafika Vostoka*. 18:113–128.

DEMEZON, P.I.

1983 *Zapiski o Bukharskom khanstve (Otchety P.I. Demezoni i I.V. Vitke-bicha)*. Moskva.

DI COSMO, Nicola

1997 “A Set of Manchu Documents Concerning a Khoqand Mission to Kashgar (1807)”. In: *Central Asiatic Journal* 41/2:159–199.

ECKMANN, J.

1964 “Die tschaghataische Literatur”. In: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. II. Wiesbaden.

HOFMAN, H.F.

1969 *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*. Section III. Part 1. Volume 1. Utrecht.

[°IZZAT ALLĀH]

1872 *Travels in Central Asia by Meer Izzut-Oollah in the Years 1812–1813*. Translated by Captain Henderson. Calcutta.

KAWAHARA Yayoi

2004 “Mangitochō buhara amīrutachino shokanshūnituite [Collection of Letters of Bukharan Amīrs of the Manghīt Dynasty]”. In: SHINMEN Yasushi ed., *Chūōajianiokeru kyōzoku ishikito isuramunikansuru rekishiteki kenkyū* [Historical Studies on Group Identities and Islam in Central Asia]. Tokyo.

2005 “Amir Haydar maktublari”. In: *Tarixiy manbashunoslikning dolzarb muammolari (yozma manbalar asosida)*. Tashkent.

KHALFIN, N.A.

1974 *Rossiya i khanstva Srednei Azii (pervaya polovina XIX veka)*. Moskva.

KOMATSU Hisao

1989 “Kōkandoto isutanbūru: Ichi osuman bunshono shōkai [Khoqand and Istanbul: An Ottoman Document Relating to the Earliest Contact between the Khan and Sultan]”. In: *Barukan Shōajia Kenkyū* 15:35–52.

- 2004 “The Andijan Uprising Reconsidered”. In: SATO Tsugitaka ed., *Muslim Societies: Historical and Comparative Aspects*. London: Routledge Curzon:29–61.
- KÖPRÜLÜ, M.F.  
 İA “Çagatay Edebiyatı”. In: *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 3.
- KÜGELGEN, Anke von  
 2002 *Die Legitimierung der mittelasiatischen Mangitendynastie in den Werken ihrer Historiker*. Istanbul: Orient-Institut.
- LEVI, Scott C.  
 1999 “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transportation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade”. In: *Journal of Economic and Social History of Orient* 42/4:519–548.
- MARJĀNĪ, Shihāb al-Dīn  
 1885 *Mustafād al-Akhhār fī al-Aḥwāl Qazān wa Bulghār*. Vol. I. Kazan.
- MEIENDORF, E.K.  
 1975 *Puteshestvie iz Orenburga v Bukharu*. Moskva.
- MUḤAMMAD ḤAKĪM khān  
 2006 *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh: Selected History*. Edited by KAWAHARA Yayoi and HANEDA Koichi. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- MUKHTAROV, A.  
 1963 *Materialy po istorii Ura-Tyube: Sbornik aktov XVII–XIX vv.* Moskva.
- MUMINOV, Ashirbek  
 2005 “Shami-damulla i ego rol’ v formirovanii ‘sovetskogo islama.’” In: *Islam, identichnost’ i politika v postsovetskom prostranstve, Kazan’skii federalist*, No. 1 (13), Kazan’:231–247.
- NALIVKIN, V.  
 1886 *Kratkaya istoriya Kokandskogo khanstva*. Kazan’.
- NAZAROV, F.  
 1821 *Zapiski o nekotorykh narodakh i zemlyakh srednei chasti Azii*. S. Peterburg.
- NETTLETON, S.S.  
 1981–82 “Ruler, Patron, Poet: Umar Khan and the Blossoming of the Khanate of Qoqan, 1800–1820”. In: *International Journal of Turkish Studies*. 2/2:127–140.

NEWBY, L.J.

2005 *The Empire and the Khanate: A Political History of Qing Relations with Khoqand c. 1760–1860*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

[NIYĀZ MUḤAMMAD, Mullā]

1885 *Tarikhi Shakhrokhi, Istoriya vladetelei Fergany: Sochinenie Molly Niyazi Mukhammed ben Ashur Mukhammed Khokandtsa, izdannaya N.N. Pantusovym. Kazan'*.

QAYUMOV, A.

1961 *Qoqan adabiy muhiti (XVIII–XIX asrlar)*. Tashkent.

SAGUCHI Toru

1963 *18–19 Seiki Higashi Torukisutan Shakaishi Kenkyū* [The Social History of Eastern Turkistan in the 18th–19th Centuries]. Tokyo.

1965 “The Eastern Trade of the Khoqand Khanate”. In: *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 24:47–114.

SARAY, Mehmet

1984 *Rus İşgali Devrinde Osmanlı Devleti ile Türkistan Hanlıkları Arasındaki Münasebetler (1775–1875)* [The Relations between the Ottoman State and the Khanates of Turkistan during the Russian Occupation (1775–1875)]. Istanbul: İstanbul Matbaası.

SAWADA Minoru

1988 “Jūhasseiki sue isutanbūruno uzubekujinni kansuru bunsho siryō [Documents on Uzbeks in Istanbul in the End of the Eighteenth Century]”. In: *Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 3/2:107–113.

SCHEFER, Charles

1970 (1876) *Histoire de l'Asie Centrale par Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary – Afghanistan, Boukhara, Khiva, Khoqand depuis les dernières années du règne de Nadir Chah, 1153, jusqu'en 1233 de l'hégire, 1740–1818 A.D., Texte persan, publié d'après un manuscrit unique, avec une traduction française*. Paris (First edition 1876).

SÖYLEMEZOĞLU, Galip Kemal

1953 *30 Senelik Siyasî Hâtıralarımın Üçüncü ve Son Cildi: 1918–1922*. Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi.

TERENCH'EV, M.A.

1906 *Istoriya zavoevaniya Srednei Azii*. Tom 3. Sankt Peterburg.

TOGAN, A. Zeki Velidi

1981 (1942–47) *Bugünkü Türkili (Türkistan) ve Yakın Tarihi*. Cilt 1. *Batı ve Kuzey Türkistan*. Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.

VÁMBÉRY, Arminius

1865 *Travels in Central Asia; Being the Account of a Journey from Teheran Across the Turkoman Desert on the Eastern Shore of the Caspian to Khiva, Bokhara, and Samarcand, Performed in the Year of 1863.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

ZIYAEV, Kh. Z.

1983 *Ekonomicheskie svyazi Srednei Azii s Sibir'yu v XVI–XIX v.* Tashkent.