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Preface
Preface

Central Asia or what was historically called Turkestan, is a huge landmass comprising the territories between the Amu and Syr Rivers (Mawaranahr in Arabic), Xinjiang or Chinese Central Asia, Khwarizm, Afghanistan, North West Frontiers of India including Sind, Multan and Kashmir, Mongolia and Tibet. Located on the cross roads of Grand Silk Route, the region had several fascinations: the home to diverse ethnic groups, and rich arts, cultures, faiths, learning and philosophy. Nonetheless, the region was largely landlocked and characteristic of barbarism and backwardness due to the presence of a swath of ethno-tribal and nomadic and semi-nomadic groups and communities. With the discovery of Sea Routes, Central Asia lost strategic importance, and the world focus shifted to outward, seaward, and westwards thereby subjecting the region to partial hibernation. Although the entire dynamics of the region’s past was meticulously highlighted by the Western and Russian scholars, the issues concerning land tenures and tribal organization were not analytically examined by them for certain limitations. True the foreign travelers plugged the gap. But since they belonged to a different educational background, they could not, as such, present a scientific view of the land tenures in terms of feudal mode of production.

The history of the Tsars as well as the Soviets abounds with information on the theme under reference. For strategic reasons, however, they did not allow unfolding the facts about agrarian and feudal structure of the region. This is the reason why Christopher Beckworth’s statement that “Central Asia is a missing link in the world history,” holds good even today. It is a fact that the post-Soviet writers strived to unravel the region’s rich past. However, due to changing regional and global scenario, they were soon caught up in discussion on contemporary issues:
geo-politics, geo-economy, security, energy, foreign investment, democracy, terrorism, drug trafficking, arms smuggling. With the result, the dynamics of feudalism, received little attention from the native scholars though some painstaking job was performed by the foreign NGO’s while examining the exploitative nature of the Khanates, Tsars and the Soviets. Therefore, the present work is not, in any way new, but rather a supplement to their endeavours to profile region’s land tenures under the Khanates of Khiva, Khokand and Bukhara. The work is devised into six chapters.

**Chapter I:**

This chapter discusses the issues concerning the region’s geo-physical frame, population, ethnic composition, land tenures, and religious-cultural fabric of the people of the Khanates of Khiva, Khokand and Bukhara. It also accounts for the history of the region since the Arab invasion: a phenomenon that changed the entire socio-economic and religio-spiritual texture of the region under the Khanates in medieval period.

**Chapter II:**

In this chapter, a modest effort has been made to study feudalism in a conceptual framework. The theories of eminent scientists right from Marc Bloch, Maurice Dobb, Perry Anderson, Henry Pirenne, Immanuel Wallesrtien, Guy Bois, Frank Perlin, down to F. W. Maitland, R. S. Sharma and Harbans Mukhia, have been randomly perused keeping in view the varying conditions and multilateral dimensions of feudalism in Europe, Japan, China, India, Russia, Spain, Turkey, Iran, Italy, and even in the nomadic Turko-Mongol societies of Eurasia. The chapter also takes note of a serious debate on Central Asian feudalism among the eminent social scientists like Boris Ya. Velidimirtsov, Sergey Tolstov, Zimanov, Potapov, S. E. Tolybekov, S. N. Wainstain, Yu I. Semenov and G. M. Markov, Sh. Nacadory, A. Minis, G. Sughbatoar, and N. Seradjav, N. Seradjav, Academician Sh. Natsagdorj, Earnest Gellner, Nikolay N. Kradin, Owen Lattimore, Lawrence Krader etc.
Interestingly, little effort was earlier made to engage debate on such a crucial issue in the Central Asian Khanates.

**Chapter III:**

The chapter deals in detail with the real working of feudalism in the Khanates of Khiva, Khokand and Bukhara. The information has been studied and presented under three headings: (i) Overview of Feudalism in Central Asia, (ii) Feudal Structure and Functioning, and (iii) Feudal Levies. The whole discussion is characteristic of information on the landlords, fiefs, manors, and the serfs from the early times of Qarakhanids (9th-10th century AD) down to the Mongols, Khanates and the advent of the Soviets. B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, the initiator of the debate on Central Asian feudalism, has designated the above period (12th-20th century) as feudal in context to Central Asia and Mongolia. He has based his whole argument on lord-tenant relationship, and maintained that while notionally land belonged to the Amir/Khan, certain strips of it were practically distributed by them among civil and military officials with absolute rights on everything from “below and above” the land, and which incidentally included the actual tillers, thitherto traditional owners/proprietors. In lieu thereof, the officials were required to acknowledge the Amir as their overlord and render him military service in the event of wars from within and outside the Khanates. Since, the estates of the land lords were usually big, they, as such, sub-infeudated them among their own men, which resultanty led to decentralization of the royal powers in all the three Khanates.

The chapter also profiles the status of the tenants (karandas) in these estates, under the most inhuman and appalling conditions. Treated virtually as commodities, they were inhumanly subjected to lots of unpaid and involuntary services, the payment of innumerable levies and exorbitantly fixed rent rate on the land use aside. They were tied to the land, and had no right to appeal before against the feudal excesses.
Chapter IV:

It examines the impact, good and bad, of feudalism on different organs of Central Asian Khanates, nobility, and the subjects at large. No doubt, feudalism developed amid crisis following socio-political break down, and redeemed the Amirs from the arduous task of protecting their subjects from foreign invaders, and which job was instead assigned to the most affluent local chieftains. They were compensated in terms of big landed estates, their resources, and the subjects. They were virtually recognized by law as being the “masters of whatever was above and below the land including of course the cultivators.” The said arrangement empowered the feudatories beyond proportions, which eventually transformed the real land owners into a most nascent class of tenants/serfs. The impact on their life pattern, attitude, and behaviour was, therefore, obvious because of the change in land tenures, which weakened them in many ways, and which is the central point of this chapter. The chapter also deals with feudal phenomenon on the Khanates and the feudal lords themselves.

Chapter V:

This chapter is devoted to a discussion on the challenges, threats, and response to feudal system in Central Asian Khanates. While feudalism emerged under the failing state systems, it nevertheless triggered such conditions as were characteristic of extreme level of peasant exploitation, their labour and surplus by the feudal lords, which eventually pre-empted their clandestine exodus from native villages and settlement elsewhere, indeed a major contributory to the agrarian crisis. This brought the Khanates face to face with several challenges and threats, which the stakeholders, however, strived to address within mutual constraints, and which sequentially averted an organized anti-feudal resistance in the Khanates of Khiva, Khokand and Bukhara. These and similar other type of issues are discussed in the present chapter.
Chapter VI:

This concluding chapter profiles the discussion contained in the preceding chapters. It argues that feudalism was the product of failing state systems across the globe. Though it originated in Europe, yet it transcended regional and geographic borders, and spread/appeared in Asia, Africa etc. from time to time. Feudalism in the Khanates of Khiva, Khokand and Bukhara being no exception to it, was also the product of the breakdown of the centralized Uzbek Khanate (16th century) due to tribal invasions, socio-economic deprivation, human insecurity, and ever decaying communication and transportation networks. It also possessed such features, exceptions apart, as were characteristic of European and Indian feudalism, and was, therefore, oriented to sustain the ruling elite, the landlords, while exploiting the labour and dispossessing the tenants/serfs of their surplus produce. In the process, not only that the basic producers were dispossessed of their generations - old hereditary and ownership rights on land, but they were also enslave and tied to the land in a manner that their self and that of their family became irrelevant. They were allowed simply a piece of land for use on rent basis, which too was exorbitant and unaffordable for them in view of their growing family needs. While for their own compulsions, they could not afford any organized “dissent” to the feudal order, they, however, were ceased of their excessive feudal exploitation under the patronage of their overlords, the Amirs/Khans. Therefore, they peacefully invoked the justice and fair treatment of the landlords, which in some, if not in all cases, was favourably considered by them for expediency.

Purely historical methodology has been followed in the completion of the present thesis. Besides primary and secondary sources, information available on web resources, print and electronic media was consulted in constructing information on Feudalism in the Central Asian Khanates (18th - Early 20th century). Every possible endeavor was made to avoid subjectivity and skip unauthentic information/statements. Nevertheless, the present work is not devoid of fault lines,
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Chapter I

Central Asian Khanates: A Profile

(A). Central Asia: General Features:

Central Asia or what was historically called Turkestan, was a huge landmass comprising the territories between the Amu and Syr Rivers (Mawaranahr in Arabic), Xinjiang or Chinese Central Asia, Khwarizm, Afghanistan, North West Frontiers of India including Sind, Multan and Kashmir, Mongolia and Tibet. However, the name Central Asia was used by Alexander Von Humboldt in 1843 A.D. to define a geographical space housing only what constitutes the modern five Central Asian Republics (CARs) of Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Kazakhstan. Anyway, the region had several fascinations: the home to diverse ethnic groups and rich arts, cultures, learning, philosophy, faiths and ideologies.

The region had a varying political history under the Greeks (4th c. B.C.), Parthians and Persians (2nd c. B. C - 226 A.D.), Kushans (3rd-5th c. A.D.), Huns (425 A.D.-557 A.D.), Arabs (8th c. -10th c. A.D.), Samanids (819-1005 A.D.),

---


The region though called as the Inner Asia by the American and Central Asia by the Soviet geographers, it was termed as Mawaranahr by the Arab historiographers. Ibn-i-Hauqal’s (10th c.), which defined the land between India in the east, Taraz (Kazakhstan) in the west, Amu Darya in the south and Aral Sea in the north: Ibn-i-Hauqal, Surat-ul-Arz, Iran, AH, 1345, pp. 12, 248. To the 15th century chronicler, Ibn-i-Arab Shah, it comprised the land beyond Oxus in the east (Turan) and Iran to the west: Ibn-i-Arab Shah, Ajaibul Maqdur fi Nawadir-i Timur, Eng. tr. John Herne Sanders, Tamerlane or Timur: The Great Amir, London: Luzac and Co. Ltd., 1936, p. 17. Hafiz Tanish, the 16th century chronicler, termed it as Transoxiana, the region surrounded in the east by Punjab Kohistan and Badakhshan, Kashgar, Moghlistan and the lands of Uighur in the north, Khwarizm in the west, Uzbekistan, Turkestan and Dasht-i-Qipchaq in the north-west, Caspian Sea in the south and Black Saghun in the north: Hafiz Tanish, Abdullahnama, MS, Indian Office Library, 574, f.102: Cf. Mansura Haider, Central Asia in Sixteenth Century, New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2002, fn. 5, p.23.
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Turks (12th-13th c. A.D.), Mongols (13th c.-15th c. A.D.), Uzbeks (1600-1860 A.D.), Tsars (1860-1917 A.D.) and the Soviets (1917-1991 A.D.): ² each dynasty transmitted its influence on the region which together transformed the region into a mixed brand of nomadic and sedentary cultures. ³ Significantly, it saw the rule of the three important independent Uzbek Khanates of Bukhara, Khiva and Khokand, all situated in the basins of Amu, Syr and Zarafshan Rivers respectively. ⁴

(B). Khanates: Geo-Physical Frame:

The Khanate of Bukhara, founded by the Manghits towards late 18th c., ⁵ was surrounded by the Taklamakan Desert in the north, Badakshan in the south of Afghanistan, the Khanate of Khokand in the east and River Oxus in the west. ⁶

---


⁴ Khanate defines a kingdom controlled by the king called Khan, who like the Sultans of Baghdad and Hindustan (India) was the administrative, judicial and civil chief. Moreover, he considered himself the representatives of God on the Earth: Devendra Kaushik, *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early 19th Century*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970, p.29; “The Political Geography of Soviet Central Asia: Integrating the Central Asian Frontiers”, *Geographical Perspectives on Soviet Central Asia*, pp. 40-41.

⁵ The Manghits were the Turkic nomadic tribes who traced their origin to the Mongol tribe of the Mangkits. In the 13th century, they moved westwards out of Mongolia and settled in Dashti-i-Qipckak located on the western side of the Caspian Sea. Subsequently, they dispersed in different directions and settled in Volga, Ural, Bukhara, Khiva, Zarafshan River valley and other towns of Jizak and Karshi and thereby merged with the Uzbeks, Karakal-paks and the Kazakhs. Influenced by the sedentary culture, they adopted agriculture and crafts though some of them did not abandon their semi-nomadic way of life: Chahryar Adle and Irfan Habib, *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. V, París: UNESCO Publishing, 2003, pp 53-54; *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early 19th century*, p.29.
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Khanate of Khokand, established by Alim Khan of Ming Dynasty in 1798-99 A.D., was encircled by the Great Horde (Southern Russia) in the north, Karategin and Badakshan on the south, Bukhara in the west and China (Xinjiang) in the east. Lastly, the Khanate of Khiva, also known also as Khwarizm, was situated towards the deserted cities of Fitnek in the south-east, Kungrat and Kohne Urjendj in the north-west and Medinen Koktceg in the south. Together with their distinct location, all of them constituted three separate territorial and administrative divisions of Central Asia before October Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

The Khanates sprawled over deserts, steppes, rivers, forests, oases, and mountains: 3/5th was under deserts, steppes and semi-arid terrain, and 1/5th under mountains and foot hills. With such a complex geographical texture and the distinct location from the seas, their climate was dry and continental, which caused lack of precipitation and conditions of extreme aridity in the region. However, the climate varied from place to place leading to regionalization of the physical geography in different ecological/physical zones in terms of climate, soil, precipitation, and vegetation. These macro-vegetation zones had again their specific deserts, steppes, forests and mountains.

---

7 Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early 19th century, p.29.
8 Travels in Central Asia, p.380.
9 Khwarizm is a Persian word meaning ‘war like’ or ‘rejoicing in war’. So the people residing in the land came to be called Khurasm in history.
10 Kohne Urjendj means the Old Urjendj, and was opposed to Yenji Urjendj, which means New Urjendj. The latter was the capital of the Khanate.
13 This geographical isolation from the oceans limited the scope of the region to play any role in the maritime trade: Travels in Central Asia, p. 1.
15 Across Central Asia: A Journey in Central Asia Illustrating the Geographical Basis of History, pp. 7, 8, 9.
16 The Soviet climatologists have divided the region into thirteen different ecological zones which corresponded to three macro-vegetation zones - deserts (Choll/Desht), steppes (Adar), forests/mountains (Tau): S. P. Suslov, Physical Geography of Asiatic Russia, San Francisco:
Deserts (low deserts) constituted the maximum area in the geo-physical frame of the Khanates. Karakum Desert, between the mountains of south ranges and the Amu River alone stretched over 3, 50,000 sq. kms. Another desert located towards the east of the Amu River, was Qazilkum followed by the Chuli Bukhara, Ha Darvesh, Chuand, Aqqum, and Golodnaya deserts. Most of the deserts were hot and lacked precipitation, hence lifeless. Whatever little water


Literally Karakum means ‘Black Desert’ in Turkic language. The area under the desert was divided broadly into two regions – Central Karakurum and the Zaunguz Pleatue. The vegetation was primarily ephemeral drought resistant plants like psammophyte seibroshwoo, the saksaul trees which were the sources of excellent wood for their high calorific value: “The Physical Geography of Soviet Central Asia and the Aral Sea Problem”, Geographic Perspective on Soviet Central Asia, pp. 81; Mission to Tashkent, pp. 261, 169; Physical Geography of Asiatic Russia, p.439.

Kazilkum, literally meaning ‘Red Sand’, stretched from Amu Darya to the foot hills of the Tianshan Mountains. The landscape throughout offered complex relief than the Karakum Desert. “The Physical Geography of Soviet Central Asia and the Aral Sea Problem”, Geographic Perspective on Soviet Central Asia, p. 82; History of Inner Asia, pp. 2-3.

Called as the Chuli Namaksar in the vicinity of Bukhara, the desert was wide enough and took fourteen days to cross it on the camel back. It deadness was such that the Mongols, known for their bravery, avoided passage through it. However, Shabani Khan is reported to have crossed it five times, and Abdullah Khan tried to populate it in 1585 AD by constructing mosques, ribats (frontier stations), and sardabhas (grottoes) and by assigning waste land as waqf: Hafiz Tanish, Abdallahnama, MS, Indian Office Library, Ethe 574, ff. 103-104: Cf. Central Asia in Sixteenth Century, 15.

The desert was between Khojand and Kandi Badam and was known for its violent and whirlwinds. Baburnama, Eng. trans. A.S. Beverigde, New Delhi, 1989, p. 9.

Central Asia in Sixteenth Century, pp. 15-16.

The maximum annual precipitation was six inches (146 millimeters) and the minimum was 1.8 inches. This lack of precipitation produced extreme aridity, highest amount of salinity, alkalinity which affected agriculture in the region.
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was there to the depth of pits and wells, it was brackish and salty.\(^{25}\) The number of rainfall days was less than forty days.\(^{26}\) Steppes were almost similarly situated for they had no trees but shrubs. These steppes extended across Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan and reached up to the Altai, Koppet Dag and Tian Shan ranges.\(^{27}\) They had simultaneously two types of rich black soil - dark chestnut soils and light chestnut soils. Former type existed in Ukraine and Kazak steppes and the latter in the present Central Asia.\(^{28}\) The climate was continental and maximum temperature in summer reached up to 40°C and below freezing point in winter.\(^{29}\) These steppes were moisture-deficient as the annual average precipitation was between 10 inches to 20 inches and the precipitation-evaporation ratio was 30%-59%\(^{30}\) which suited to pastoralism if not agriculture. However, few steppes were bestowed with water resources.\(^{31}\) On the other hand, oases of the Khanates were situated between the deserts and the steppes, generally on the foot of the mountains and the banks of the river valleys: Amu, Zarafshan, Murgab etc.\(^{32}\) Some of the oases occupied narrow belts, while others stretched over miles and miles together.\(^{33}\)

25 Stephen Graham, *Through Russian Central Asia*, London: Cassell & Co., 1916, p. 24. Such was the severity of the desert that the travellers had to often, if not always, kill their own camels and horses for food: *Purchas and His Pilgrims*, pp.13, 21.

26 The highest temperature in these steppes was recorded at 79°C though in January, it dipped to below the freezing point (-12°C in the lower Syr River in Kazakhstan): Lawrence Krader, *The Peoples of Central Asia*, London: Indiana University Publications, 1963, p. 15.

27 The maximum rainfall occurred in spring. Summers were dry and long as there were 204-288 working days of the season. Similarly, in Surkhan Darya oasis, had 202 clear days and only 37 cloudy days: *Physical Geography of Soviet Central Asia*, p. 78.


30 Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia, p.35.

31 However, the moisture problem was not that serious as steppes contained major river systems and tributaries like that of Ob Irysh, which drained the Kazak steppes. The Amu drained the tributaries of Liao and Sungari in the northern parts of Central Asia: Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia, p. 36.


33 For example, the middle Amu Darya oasis, in contrast to other oases, unceasingly stretched over hundreds of miles. It was endowed with water and fertile soil (alluvial soil) sufficing cultivation as a major feed to the humans since antiquity.: A.M. Khazanov, “Nomads and Oases in Central Asia”, in *Transition to Modernity: Essays on Power, Wealth and Belief*, John
The oases had river support systems and the important were the Amu and the Syr Rivers. The former was the largest river stretching over some 2,540 kms. in length. It originated from the Hindu Kush (Vrevshi Glacier) and was fed by the snowy water.\textsuperscript{34} The river deposits were the alluvium, phosphorus, lime and potassium especially in Bukhara and Samarkand which sufficed agriculture.\textsuperscript{35} Another largest river, Syr Darya, originated from central Tien Shan, also called Naryn. On merging with the Kashkadarya, it assumed the name of Syr Darya which flowed through Farghana, Bukhara and Khiva and finally terminated into Aral Sea.\textsuperscript{36} Generally, three-quarter of the water surface was used for cotton cultivation during the Soviet period.\textsuperscript{37}

Mountains-forests formed yet another geographical zone. They constituted just 10\% of the whole topography of the Khanates.\textsuperscript{38} The southern Bukhara and south-eastern part of Khokand were fully located in the Pamir-Altai and Tien Shan mountains. These mountains abounded with species of flora and fauna,\textsuperscript{39} water resources, timber and fuel wood.
(C). Ethnic Composition/Occupation:

The population of the Khanates was composed of different ethnic groups, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kyrgyz, Turkmens, Karakalpaks, Qipchaqs, Persians, Hindus, and

40 family (plants which include plants with flavour) with 455 species, parsley family (ornament flowers) with 415 species, brassicaceae family (it includes vegetables like sag, turnip, brinjal, mustard, reddish, carrot, etc.) with 264 species and Rosaceae (flowers) with 264 species: A. R. Mukhamejanov, “Natural life and the Manmade Habitat in Central Asia”, History of Civilizations of Central Asia, C.E. Bosworth, M. S. Asimov (ed.), Part V, pp. 275-276.

Uzbeks, professionally nomads belonged to mixed Turkic, Mongol and Iranian stock. By 1500 AD, they moved from Dasht-i-Qipchaq to the south and southeastern sides and settled in different parts of Turkestan, Zarafshan, Kashkadarya and Bukhara: Symour Becker, Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924, London: Harvard University Press, 1968, p. 7; A History of Inner Asia, p. 42.

By the 18th century, they were the most dominant ethnic group in three Khanates and had ninety-seven tribes (taifs) out of which thirty-six tribes (taifs) lived in Bukhara. However, they differed from each other in complexion, living pattern, manners, and social etiquettes. For example, the Uzbek of Bukhara was fair in complexion and the Uzbeks of Khokand in their loose clumsy dress looked like a helpless person: Travels in Central Asia, p. 380. Khivan Uzbek although honest than Bukharans had savageous character of the nomads: Travels in Central Asia, p. 346. Even in music and national poetry, Khivan Uzbeks were distinct from their Khokand crts although he was more coward than the Bukharans and Khivans: The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 365; Lawrence Krader, The Peoples of Central Asia, Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1963, pp. 60-63.

41 Tajiks were the aboriginal inhabitants of all cities of Central Asia. It was a dominant ethnic community in Khiva and in minority in Bukhara and Khokand. The Tajiks mostly lived in the city of Khojand and in the villages of Velekendez and Kisakuz. In physical features, they had well favoured face with clear olive complexion and black eyes and hair: Travels in Central Asia, pp. 367, 381; The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 364; The Peoples of Central Asia, pp. 54-56.

42 Meant in Turkic as ‘men who wandered about the fields,’ the Kyrgyz were pure nomads. They were at times called as the Kazakhs for their similar ethnic character and lived mostly in Khokand in the southern parts between Khokand and Sarikkul. In Bukhara, they lived in eastern parts of Karategin: Travels in Central Asia, p. 382; K.R. Kuehnast and D. Strouthes, “Kyrhyz : Muslim Community of Kyrgyzstan”, Encyclopedic Ethnography of Middle East and Central Asia, (ed.), R. Khanam, Vol. II, New Delhi: Global Vision Publishing House, 2005, pp. 506-507; Russian Protectorates of Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924, p. 7.

The Tajiks were very brave and beautiful and the tradition goes that “God made them with bones like those of horses and animals in their eyes - the crowning work of creation;” Travels in Central Asia, pp. 349, 369, 382, The Peoples of Central Asia, pp. 63-66.

43 Turkmens, descendents of the Turkic nomads, came to Central Asia in the 10th century from the Eurasian Steppes and settled in the south of Caspian Sea to the Amu Darya i.e., mostly in the Khanate of Khiva: Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924, p.7. In Bukhara, they were in minority as they simply constituted 5-10% of the total population: Mary Hordsworth, Turkestan in Nineteenth Century, London, 1959, p. 3. Rawlinson opines that they belonged to the Uzbek ethnic group and their chief tribes were: (i).
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Jews, Arabs, Uighurs, Kashmiries, etc. Each one of them had sub-ethnic groups based on different language, physiogamy and culture. For example, Khivans having Chadur who lived between Caspian and Aral Sea with 12,000 tents; (ii) Ersaris along the Amu Darya with 50,000 tents; (iii) Salov and Saruk on the Murgab and the Khojand territories with 20,000 tents; (iv) Tekkeh on the skirts of the hills from Merv to the Caspian Sea with 60,000 tents; (v) Youmut and Goklans along the shore of Caspian and boarders of Persia with 50,000 tents: George Rawlinson, *A Memoir of Maj. General Sir Henry Crewickle Rawlinson*, London, 1898, p. 333. But Vembry divides them chiefly into two tribes namely - Youmuts and Tchandor (Rawlinson’s Chadur tribe). Former were settled and the latter were the wanderers: *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 348.

The name Karakalpak was the constituent of two words - "Kara" meaning ‘black’, and ‘Kalpak’ meaning ‘hat’. They mostly lived in Khiva along the shores of Amu Darya up to Kungrat which forms the present Karalpakistan Autonomous Republic of Uzbekistan. They had ten tribes- Baymakali, Khandekli, Terstamgali, Atchamayli, Kaytchili Khitai, Ingaki, Kenegoz, Tomboyun, Shakoo and Ontonturuk: *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 348. The main occupation was cattle breeding: *Travels in Central Asia*, pp.348-349. As per the estimates of 1990, their number in the entire world was 6,50,000, out of which about 3, 50,000 lived in the Autonomous Republic of Karalpakistan (Uzbekistan): V.L.Mote, “Karakalpaks” in *Encyclopedic Ethnography of Middle – East and Central Asia*, R. Khanam (ed.), Vol. II, p. 401.

Qipchaqs were the primitive original Turkish race. They lived mostly in Khokand and played a dominant role in the political affairs of the Khanate. They spoke a dialect, which was mixture of Mongolian and Djagatai languages, and in physical features, they resembled with Mongolians: *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 383.

Persians were the earliest inhabitants of Central Asia who serviced as Iranians speaking Tajiks: V. V. Barthold, *Four Studies on the History Central Asian*, translation from Russian by V. and Minorsky, Vol. I, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956, p. 15. Being *Shais*, they served as slaves in the Amir’s office and practised small trade and handicrafts. However, by dint of bravery, some rose to high positions. For example, Shahrulk Khan and Mohammad Hassan Khan and their *Topchibachi* (chiefs of artillery) Zeinal Beg, Mohmad Bey, and Leshkar Bey served as commanders in Bukharan Khanate: *Russian Protectorates of Central Asia, Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924*, p. 7; *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 371.


Jews were the migrants from Kazvin and Merv (Iran) and settled in Bukhara, Samarkand and Karshi with total population of 10,000. They practised trade and handicrafts and being non-Muslims were subjected to annual *Jazia* (tribute) of over 2,000 *tillas*: *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 372.

the Iranian blood belonged to the pure Uzbek stock and same was the case with other ethnic groups, of whom a comprehensive group-wise data is far to seek. However, the entire population of the Khanates was estimated at five million: 3 million in Bukhara, 1.5 million in Khokand and 0.5 million in Khiva by 1850 A.D., though 1897 reports reveal a different story. Bukhara was estimated at 2½ to 3 million, Khiva between 700,000 to 800,000 and Khokand at 3 millions. Most of the population was settled in the river valleys or oases and very rarely in deserts or mountain regions. This raised immense pressure on the major cities and towns. By 1897, Farghana and Samarkand districts had together a population of 2,432,000 in an area of 161,000 sq. kms. averaging 15.1 persons per sq. km. Bukhara and Khivan population was estimated at 3.1 million over an area of 2,78,000 sq. km., averaging density of 11.2 persons per sq. km. Significantly, the higher ever density recorded was in Andijan with 464.6 persons per sq. km. notwithstanding the fact that Andijan constituted just 1% of surface area of the

---


51 *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 346.

52 Such difficulty was due to the sparse population of the Khanates. Secondly, was the fear of collecting the population information in the wake of Russian invasions. Thirdly, no need was felt by the rulers to gather the information regarding the number of population in their respective Khanates: *Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924*, pp. 6-7.


54 The low Soviet official figure of 1.53 million was due to the troubled years of civil war during 1917-1922 with a loss of 25% of population: *Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924*, pp. 6-7, 346.

55 Another estimate was that the population ranged from 506,000 to 1,100,000: I. I. Gier, *Turkestan*, 2nd edition, Tashkent, 1909, p. 9. However, the Soviet estimates in 1924 put the figure at 461,000: *Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva -1865-1924*, pp. 10, 347.

56 *Travels in Central Asia*, p. 380.

57 In Bukhara Khanate, the sedentary population was estimated at 65% out of which 20% were semi-nomadic and 15% nomads. In Khiva the figures was 72% sedentary out of which 6% was nomadic and 25% was semi-nomadic: *Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva - 1865-1924*, p.10.

58 *Peoples of Central Asia*, p. 172.
Republic of Uzbekistan. Compared to southern Turkmenistan, the deserts of southern Kazakhstan had fairly less population density of 0.9 persons per sq. km. and 0.8 persons per sq. km.; in both cases, the majority of population was rural.

The main occupation of the people was agriculture and herdsmship, which were complementary to each other. The crops were diverse in nature, value and varieties, and these included cotton, wheat, barley, rice, millet, maize, tobacco, sugar, poppy, etc. For millet, Khokand had high repute and barley was not so good and was used simply as fodder for the cattle. Sericulture was mainly produced in Bukhara and Khokand. Besides, the peoples, particularly Kyrgyz, Kazakhs, Kalmaks, Nayman, Qipchaqs, raised livestock including horses, camel,

---

60 The Peoples of Central Asia, p. 173.
61 The low population density was due to extreme climatic conditions including the lack of fodder for grazing of the livestock. Besides, the continuous life on the saddle reduced the sexual potency and process of reproduction among the humans in cities and towns: R. B. Ekvall, Cultural Relations on the Kansu - Tibetan Boarder, Chicago, 1939, p. 81: Cf. Central Asia, p.9.
62 The Peoples of Central Asia, p. 173.
64 Hunting was also an important occupation of the nomadic peoples though it lost its relevance once people took to settled way of life in the 19th century.
65 A History of Inner Asia, pp. 41-44; Central Asia, p. 10.
66 Cotton was mostly cultivated in Bukhara and Farghana. However, after the Russian conquest, its cultivation received the greatest impetus in all fertile areas to meet the requirements of the textile industries in Russia which production declined during American Civil War (1860-65).
67 Wheat was a special crop to Bukhara and Khiva: Travels in Central Asia, p. 419-420.
68 Maize was introduced from India, but was not so important crop: N. Masanov, “Northern Areas (Transoxiana and the Steppes) Pastoral Production”, History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. V, Part V, p.377.
69 Tobacco appeared in the region in the 17th century when it was banned in Persia by Shah Abbas I and in India by Emperor Jahangir. It was mostly cultivated in Karshi and was superior to Bukhara: Alexander Burns, Travels in Bukhara, p. 169.
70 Sugar was more expensive commodity than any other crop: Travels in Bukhara, p. 170.
71 Heart of Asia, p. 362; Travels in Central Asia, p. 420.
72 Alexander Burns, Travels, pp. 179-180.
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sheep, yaks, assess, etc. though only three animals- horses\(^{73}\), sheep\(^{74}\) and the camel\(^{75}\) were popular among the nomads. They exchanged their wool and milk for the grains and other products with the sedentary peoples, a contributory to rural-urban interdependence.\(^{76}\)

(D). Khanates: Religio-Cultural, Ideology and Political Profile:

Central Asia, cradle of civilizations, noticed several historical developments in its making.\(^{77}\) One such development was related to the faiths of the people: Paganism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism and Islam. The latter was introduced as a part of the religious duty\(^{78}\) by Qutaiba-ibn-Muslim in Bukhara and Samarkand and Transoxiana in 715 A.D,\(^{79}\) though its consolidation suffered a setback for power change in Arabia. It was with the efforts of Nasir Ibni Sayar (734-742 A.D), the

\(^{73}\) The horse was regarded by the people as an alter ego and, as such, was one of the most important means of transportation and warfare. It had different races and types. Turkmen Horse was the finest, sold between 100-300 ducats (gold coins formerly used in certain European countries), followed by Uzbek Horse, suited for long journeys, and exported to India and Afghanistan. Other two types were Kazak and Khokandi Horses: Travels in Central Asia, pp. 420-421, 431; A History of Inner Asia, pp. 41-42.

\(^{74}\) Sheep were source of meat and wool for domestic textile industries. Like horses, it had different types. However, sheep with fat tail and fine in taste were found in Bukhara: Travels in Central Asia, p. 421; A History of Inner Asia, pp. 41-42.

\(^{75}\) Camel was a main source of transport with two types – one humped and another double humped (Ner): Travels in Central Asia, p. 421; A History of Inner Asia, pp. 41-42.

\(^{76}\) Pivot of Asia: Sinkiang and the Inner Asia Frontiers of China and Russia, p. 152.

\(^{77}\) Till the 18\(^{th}\) century, Central Asia was considered as a black box by the Westerners with no civilizational past though Arnold Toynbee once described it as a region “where routes converged from all quarters of the compass, and from which routes radiate to all quarters of the compass.”: Regional Studies, Vol. XXIV, No.3, Institute of Regional Studies, Islamabad, 2006, p.36. However, after Soviet demise, it assumed importance to which energy explorations played a significant role. The region has become crucial to regional and global powers.

\(^{78}\) Narshakhi in History of Bukhara and Yakut Hamvi in Mujmu-ul-Buldan quoted Prophet Mohammad (SAW) saying that it was the religious duty of every Muslim to take Islam to Transoxiana: B. G. Gufurov, Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times, Vol. II, Kolkatta: Mouvana Abul Kalam Azad University, 2004, p. 8.

\(^{79}\) Though Qutaiba-ibn-Muslim succeeded in introducing Islam in different parts of Central Asia, yet Islam did not emerge as a popular faith for the people’s strong faith in Zoroastrianism and paganism. This is why clay statues, originally idols, were freely sold in Bukhara till the middle of the 10\(^{th}\) century. Rudki, a Tajik poet, in his verses expressed that Earth and Sky were the father and mother of mankind. It was only after the conversion of Mongols that Islam gained the real foothold in the region due to the royal patronage: Four Studies on the History of Central Asia, Vol. I, pp. 15-16.
ablest Arab General, that Islamic faith was permanently established in the region.\textsuperscript{80} The process of Islamization had followed a series of military expeditions under the Umayyids (661-750 A.D), and the Abbasids (750-1258 A.D.). In 751 A.D, the Abbasids defeated the Uighurs of Semireche in the Battle of Talas (near present Alma Atta) and, thus whole region including Kashghar then under the Qarakhanids, joined \textit{Daru-l-Islam}.\textsuperscript{81} On the weakening of the Abbasids, the proselytizing task was taken over by the Samanids (819-1005 A.D.).\textsuperscript{82}

The advent of Islam did not simply supplement the historical process of religious transformation but pointed to a radical transformation in the spiritual and temporal life of the people of the region.\textsuperscript{83} With it, came into being the Hanafite School of Thought in Central Asia,\textsuperscript{84} and, with that, Middle East was linked to China across Central Asia sigremarkable east-west integartion. The spread of the art of Chinese rag-paper to Samarkand and the Western world while replacing papyrus and parchment suffices east-west certify such connections.\textsuperscript{85} The same trend was reinforced by the export to and absorption of the art of Persian textile industry by the Samarkandis, Bukhars and Khwarzimis.\textsuperscript{86} Likewise, Arab natural sciences and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{80} \textit{A History of Inner Asia}, p. 62.
\item \textsuperscript{81} The advancement of the Arabs in Kashgar is doubted. While V.V. Barthold supports the theory (\textit{Four Studies on the History of Central Asia}, Vol. I, p. 11), B. G. Gufurov rejects the same: \textit{Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times}, Vol. II. However, the engraved names of the Arabs like Nasir Ibn Saleh Abu Mansur, Abdul Ayat, and Zakaria Ibn Qasim on boulders in the Tangchey area of Ladakh besides indicating Arab contact with Ladakh authenticate the Barthold’s theory: Abdul Ghani Skeikh, “Muslims in Ladakh and Sufi Traditions”, \textit{New Hope}, Vol. 4, No. 1, Jan-Feb., 2003, p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{82} Samanid dynasty was founded by Saman Kuda, a native of Balk, in the service of Asad, the Arab governor of Khurasan. But the family’s political fortune really began when Saman Khuda’s grandsons were rewarded for their invaluable services to Arab Islamic rule under Abbasid Caliph Al-Mamun (813-33 A.) in Samarkand, Farghana, Shash (Tashkent) and Herat: \textit{A History of Inner Asia}, p. 71.
\item \textsuperscript{83} \textit{A History of Inner Asia}, pp. 48-49.
\item \textsuperscript{84} \textit{Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times}, Vol. II, p. 8; \textit{Four Studies on the History of Central Asia}, Vol. I, pp. 15-16.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Very popular was the cotton fabric made in the small town of Vadhar to the east of Samarkand. However, the Arabs did not built new towns in Central Asia but upgraded Bukhara, Samarkand and Marv: \textit{Four Studies on the History of Central Asia}, Vol. I, p. 14.
\end{itemize}
philosophy found expression in the works of Al-Farabi (870-950 A.D), Ibni Sena (980-1037 A.D), Al-Gazali (1058-1111 A.D), Ibn-i-Khaldun (1331-1406 A.D).  

However, the 9th and 10th century observed the occupation of the region by the catalyst Turkic nomadic tribes of Qarakhanids and Ghaznavids (977-1186 A.D.) from the north-eastern steppes. By the 11th century, the Qarakhanids controlled the principal towns of Central Asia. Since the Qarakhanids parcelled out the state among officials who held fiefs in lieu of emoluments, it naturally weakened the state and paved the way for Central Asian occupation by the Seljuk Turks (1038-1194 A.D). In view of the varying political fortunes, the region made no unprecedented socio-economic development except under the Khwarizm Shahs with particular reference to Alau-din-Mohammad (1200-1220 A.D). The Khwarizmiks followed by the Mongols. Changiz Khan (1162-1227 A.D.), in particular, carved out a vast Mongol empire, which he later divided among his four sons as per the family traditions: Jochi, Chagtai, Ogedie/Ogatie, and Tuli.

---

88 The Turks were nomads who lived in the broad grass lands extending from the Caspian Sea to Mongolia. They served in the armies of all ruling dynasties of the region including Abbasids, Samanids, etc.
89 Qarakhanids did not rule whole Central Asia but only few of its provinces like Merv etc.: Four Studies on the History of Central Asia, Vol. I, p. 24.
91 A History of Inner Asia, pp. 97-98, 318.
92 A History of Inner Asia, p. 100.
93 They were called four pillars of the Mongol Empire as per Changiz Khan: “Whosoever, wishes to learn the Yasa (Changiz Khan’s Code) and Yasun (Mongol Customary Law) should follow Chagtai; whosoever, love poetry, wealth, chivalrous manners and comfort should walk in the footsteps of Ogatai, and whosoever, wishes to acquire politeness, good breeding, courage and skill in holding the weapons should wait in the attendance on Touli.”: Rashi-ud-din Tabib, The Successors of Changiz Khan, trs. John Andrew Boyle, New York: Columbia University Press, 1971, p.159.
94 Joshi, the eldest son was allotted the newly conquered area of west Irtysh as his ulus (fief): Central Asia, p. 100.
95 Chagtai was allotted Mawarannahr, Kashgaria, Semirechie, and Western Jungaria.
96 Ogedie received eastern Jungaria, Mongolia and the Chinese provinces.
97 In accordance with the Mongol customs, Touli, fourth son, took charge of his father’s household, the treasury and ancestral pastures: A History of Inner Asia, p. 113; Central Asia, pp. 100-101.
During the Chagta’ids (1227-1370 A.D), the native nomadic cultures combining different influences, strengthened. At the same time, the sedentary population was patronized to rebuild Bukhara, Samarkand and other important cities that had suffered the Mongol rage. In the process, followed a worthwhile intermixing of nomadic and sedentary peoples despite sharp ideological incompatibilities between Mongol traditions (Yasa) and Islamic law (Shari’ah). Eventually, the region was famous all over the world as the leading centre of multiculturalism. To quote Vambery:

“Amidst the terrible ravages committed by the Mongolians, theology and its votaries alone continued to flourish. In the early days of Chagtaid Khan the mullah of Turkestan had enjoyed a certain amount of protection … The spiritual teachers then became at the same time secular protectors and from this time forward we find the Sadr-i-Shariat (heads of religious bodies) and chief magistrates, and in general all men of remarkable piety, attaining an influence in the towns of Transoxiana unknown to the rest of Islam, an influence which maintains itself to this day.”

The Timurids succeeded Chagatais’ in 1370 A.D. Under them, the region registered a landmark development in agriculture, art, literature, science, poetry. They consolidated their rule by involving the nomads in the administration, socio-economic and cultural set up of the region. The thirty years rule of Ulug Beg (1347-1449) was a real breakthrough in astronomy, mathematics, arts and

98 The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 162.
100 History of Bukhara from the Earliest Period down to the Present, pp. 159-160.
101 A History of Inner Asia, p. 126.
102 Ulug Beg before assuming the power was a Governor of Transoxiana. When his father died in 1448 A.D., he was proclaimed as the Khan: The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 132.
literature\textsuperscript{104} so much so that Central Asia witnessed a real ‘renaissance’ after the Mongol cataclysm.\textsuperscript{105} However, the acts of the Timurids to grant administrative and revenue assignments, the \textit{iqtas}, with great deal of independence, contributed to recurring wars among the numerous recipients, which ultimately was the source of its downfall.\textsuperscript{106}

At the beginning of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, three important developments occurred in Central Asia with adequate impact on the region’s health.\textsuperscript{107} One was the emergence of the Shaibanids, the nomadic Uzbeks under Shaibani Khan or Shahi Bakt/Shibak/Shahi Beg (1451-1510 A.D.), who advocated a forward policy as viable mechanism to overcome his adversaries. As a result, Samarkand, Bukhara and Andijan were over run by 1500 A.D. However, his short term conquests were soon stalled by Zahir-ud-din Babar (1483-1530 A.D.), the then Farghana ruler who conquered Samarkand, Soghd, Karshi and Bukhara.\textsuperscript{108} In 1501 A.D., he was defeated, and by 1505, Shaiban Khan declared himself the \textit{de joure} ruler of Transoxiana\textsuperscript{109} including the Khanates of Bukhara and Khawarism (Khiva).\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{103} The astronomical observatory of Ulug Beg at the hill Chupa Ata in the eastern Samarkand was meant to measure time, course of planets and the position of the stars with accurate specimens in terms of time and space. However, Ulug Beg’s astronomical tables were later used by the European scientists in the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century.
\textsuperscript{104} One of the most important literati during the Timurid period was Mir Ali Sher Navai.
\textsuperscript{105} \textit{The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times}, p. 180; \textit{A History of Inner Asia}, p. 132.
\textsuperscript{106} \textit{A History of Inner Asia}, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{107} One important development was the discovery of sea route from Western Europe to India and China which marginalised Central Asias strategic and commercial importance. Second, was the establishment of Safavid Empire in Iran which cut Central Asia from the Middle East on account of ideological differences: Seymour Becker, \textit{Russian Protectorates in Bukhara and Khiva -1865-1924}, pp. 4, 346.
However, in 1510 A. D., Shaibanid rule terminated with the killing of Shaibani Khan by Shah Ismail, the Safavid king of Iran. Though with that Bukharan influence over Khwarizm ceased, yet Shaibanids loose control continued under Ubaydullah Khan (1512-1539 A. D.). In both ways, however, Shaibanids contribution to the regional development was worthwhile. Old land grants, suyurgul, were confiscated and re-assigned to new persons to give a feeling of state sovereignty, and, with that, the iqta system was reintroduced.\textsuperscript{111} Irrigation mechanism was developed to boost the agriculture production. Caravan sarias (moving traders) with sardabas (covered reservoirs) were constructed to boost trade and commerce and facilitate the smooth traveling of the caravans. Stone and metal works were improved. Madrassas (traditional colleges) were build to disseminate the secular and religious knowledge. The cumulative result of such reforms was that Bukhara and Samarkand became famous centres of art and literature next to other cities of the Muslim world.\textsuperscript{112}

By the middle of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, the Khanates fragmented into different principalities. Abdullah Khan assumed the Khanship of the Transoxiana, and the Russians drove Jani Khan, the Astrakhanid ruler of Volga, eastwards, whereupon he joined the military expeditions of Shaibanid ruler, Abdullah Khan.\textsuperscript{113} On his death and that of his son, Jani Khan became the ruler of Transoxiana and thus began the Astrakhanid or Tuquy-Timurids/Janids rule in Central Asia (1599-1785).\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{111} Iqta was a revenue assignment given to persons called Iqtadars in lieu of the services rendered to the state: Irfan Habib, The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1556-1707), New York: Asia Publishing House, 1963, f.n. 2, pp. 257-258. In Central Asia, it was first introduced by the Seljuks: History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Part V, pp. 37-38.

\textsuperscript{112} History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Part V, pp. 41-42.

\textsuperscript{113} The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, pp. 194-195.

\textsuperscript{114} The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, pp. 194-195; History of Civilizations of Central Asia, p. 45.
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Under the Janids (1599-1785 A.D), Central Asia registered great deal of progress no matter the region was susceptible to the Persian invasions under Nadir Shah in 1739 A.D. Under the circumstances, Janid king, Abul Fayz (1711-1747 A.D), became a vassal of Nadir Shah, and appointed the Manghit chief, Mohammad Rahim Bi, as the virtual vassal ruler of Bukhara. On the death of Nadir Shah (1749 A.D), Rahim Bi threw off the semblance of loyalty, entered into Bukhara and put to death Abdul Fayz and thus assumed as the Manghit rulership of Bukhara lasting up to 1919 A.D.

On the other hand, Safavid control over Khwarizm ended due to Shia-Sunni conflicts which brought one Uzbek group, the Illbars, under Din Mohmmad Hajam/Haji Mohammad Khan, in power in 1511 A.D. The Bukharan kings strived to bring Khwarizm under their control. Hajam was dislodged for a while. But with the support of Shah Tahmasp-I (1524-1576), the dethroned Illbar King re-assumed power of Khwarzm in 1598 A.D. However, during his reign, Khwarizm presented a hazy picture following seven years civil wars and the changing course of Amu River which miserably affected irrigation and agriculture, rather whole

---

115 During this period, trade and commercial relations with neighbouring countries like Russia improved. Fascinated by the development of the Khanates, the Mughal Indian Emperor, Aurangzab (1655-1705 A.D.) sent to Bukhara an ambassador with elephants and other costly goods as a token of respect. Ahmad II of Turkey also addressed Bukharan ruler in great epithets: History of Bukhara from the Earliest Period down to the Present, p.333; The Heart of Asia: A History of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian Khanates from the Earliest Times, p. 195; A. Mukhtarov, “The Manghists” in History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Part V, p. 53.


117 Manghits controlled Emirate of Bukhara up to 1860 whence it was conquered by the Tsars. So, after 1860, Bukhara became a vassal state of the Tsars till 1919.

118 Arabshahids / Yadigarid Shaibanids were a Chagatai dynasty which traced its lineage to Jochi through Shaiban: Ethnolinguistically, they were Kipckhak - Turkic speaking Turko-Mongols: A History of Inner Asia, Appendix I, p. 327; M. Annanepesov, “The Khanate of Khiva (Khwarazm)”, History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. V, p.64.

Khwarizm economy. It was compounded due to the ethnic conflicts under the reign of Isfandyar (1603-42). To please Turkmens for their backing, Isfandyar oppressed Uzbeks and Uighurs, many of whom fled to Bukhara and other adjacent regions. His successor, Abdul Ghazi (1642-1663 A.D) reversed the policy of Isfandyar and deprived the Turkmens of their land and water resources. The confiscated lands were divided among the Uzbeks as the civil and military officials in the administrative structure of the Khanate of Bukhara. Abdul Ghazi’s successors, Anusha Mohammad (1663-85 A.D.) and Erenk/Arang/Aurang (1688-1694 A.D.) were weak enough to stop Khwarizm becoming vassalage of Khanate of Bukhara in 1695. However, the ongoing civil wars pre-empted Russians to dip into the troubled waters of region in the 18th century for their imperialist designs. While Khwarizm was experiencing political instability, one of its kings, Khan Illbar II (1728-40 AD) attempted to conquer Khwarizm but was beheaded by Nadir Shah (1736-47 AD). In sequence, Nadir Shah installed Tahir Beg (1740) as a subordinate king of Khwarizm (Khiva) with some monetary obligations or tribute for corresponding protection (mali aman). With Nadir Shah’s death, Khiva registered civil war on the ethnic grounds, which continued for several years, whereafter one Mohammad Amin (Inoq) assumed the de facto khanship of Khiva (1770-1790 AD). It was ultimately his son, Nazar Khan (Iltuzar/Ilt Nazar Khan), who became the de

---


122 It is maintained that Abdul Ghazi was struck by poor performance of Khwarizm in literary field. As a result, he undertook the arduous responsibility of writing the history of the region. He wrote *Shajara-i-Terakine* which dealt with traditional history of Mongols. It was later supplemented by *Shajaratu’l Atrak*, which dealt with the history of Shaibanids and the Khanate of Khiva down to 1644. After him, it was continued by his son Anusha Mohammad in 1665: M. Annanepesov, “The Khanate of Khiva (Khwarazm)”, *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. V, p. 67.

jure Khan of Khiva in 1790 A.D. Thus appeared another independent Khanate of Khiva on the Central Asian map.\(^{124}\)

Khokand which formed a part of Khanate of Bukhara during the Shaibanids and Astrakhanids was divided among several Khawaja families.\(^{125}\) In 1709, Shahrukh Bi, the Khwaja of Chadak, rose against the Amir of Bukhara and assumed the title of Khan. Thus, was added to the Khanate of Bukhara and Khiva a third Khanate - Khanate of Khokand.\(^{126}\) The former two Khanates were reduced to vassalage by the Tsars and the latter was subsequently transformed into an oblast (province) of Governor-General of Turkestan under the Tsars (1860s-1919).\(^{127}\)

Thus, entire Central Asia was characteristic of endemic wars for power control among different dynasties. In the process, several empires emerged and disintegrated under the nomads and the sedentary peoples. Consequently, the region symbolised varying political fortunes during which Khanate of Bukhara, Khiva and Khokand sought birth with considerable foreign influences especially from Iran/Persia.


\(^{125}\) Khwaja was an honorific title assumed by the Naqsbandi dervishes of Transoxiana between the mid 16\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) century. Having the patronage of the rulers, the Khwajas wielded considerable spiritual, economic and political influences under different regimes in Kasghgar, Yarkhand, Khiva, Bukhara, Andijan, etc.: H. N. Bababekov, “Farghana and the Khanate of Khokand”, History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Vol. V, pp. 72-73; Four Studies on the History of Central Asia, Vol. I, p. 66; A History of Inner Asia, Appendix I, p. 329.


\(^{127}\) Central Asia, p. 204.
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Feudalism: A Conceptual Analysis

(A). Feudalism: A Debate:

Humans experienced inextricable hardships during their onward march to civilization. They traversed different historical periods to touch the civilizational heights, and each period had specific denominations to explain production relations.\(^{128}\) While the ancient period characterized predominance of city states and slavery, the medieval period, institutionally speaking, was known for feudal organization of state and society.\(^{129}\) According to Karl Marx, human history passed through five successive formations/modes: primitive (primitive Communism), slavery, in which land belonged to rich and labour was extracted from slaves, feudal in which land belonged to feudal lords and labour was done by the serfs, capitalism in which bourgeoisie controlled the industries and labour was provided by the proletariat, and Socialism/Communism where means and forces of production would be controlled commonly by the working class. All these stages characterized progressive epochs of economic formations of society.\(^{130}\)

Feudalism formed a dominant institution of medieval society. The scholars attach different meanings to it. During the 17\(^{th}\) century, it described all unfair and outdated laws or customs associated with the administration of the fiefs and traditional rights enjoyed by the warrior aristocracy. The word gained currency with Montesquieu’s definition about it in his classical work *De L’Esprit des Lois* (The


Spirit of Laws) in 1748. Since then, it remained the subject matter of debate among the medievalists especially on the issues related to feudal obligations and rights in the then social, political, economic, legal and administrative framework. Under the circumstances, some scholars termed the feudalism or lord-vassal personal relationship as the core of medieval mode of production. However, others recognized it as a fief and the seigniorial-manorial system, whereas many others explained it in terms of a method of the government, which devolved powers and authority to the landed aristocracy under what Perry Anderson designates as “scalar sovereignty” or “parcelized sovereignty.” Still many others defined it as a military system. To be precise, feudalism symbolized a blend of several elements together as per different versions. However, it reached to its heights during the 10th-13th century under what is termed as the period of the “Classical Age of Feudalism” in Europe, and spread to other parts of Europe, Africa, and Asia in sequence of socio-economic and political crises.

138 Besides Europe, feudalism existed in China, Iran, Arabia, Turkey, etc. However, among the non-European countries, Japan from the 14th century till the demise of Tokugawa state in 1867 AD., represented an archetypal example of developed feudalism having strong resemblance with European feudalism: Chris Wickham, “The Uniqueness of the East,” The Feudalism Debate, Harbans Mukhia (ed.), New Delhi: Monahar Publishers and Distributors, 1999, p. 112; T.J.Byres, “Modes of Production and Non-European Pre-Colonial Societies: Nature and
Generally, feudalism signified an institution based on tied labour of the un-free workers (serfs) to the lords. Its social pattern was hierarchical in organization with rulers, personnel, clerics, and literates at the top and the merchants, craftsmen, townsmen, and the peasants at the bottom. The serfs depended very largely on family labour to meet their feudal and other obligations. Consequently, a direct relationship existed between agricultural production and biological reproduction. Precisely, if a peasant family swelled in size, it was considered beneficial both to the serf and the lord.

Such a debate resurfaced with the emergence of the French Annals School of Thought during the 19th-20th century though Montesquieu had made its beginning long back in his classical work *The Spirit of Laws*. In their “stage theory” of the 20th century, the European radicals, Frederic Engels and Karl Marx, widened the scope of the debate while declaring feudalism as an important rather a basic stage for socialism. As per them, the societies are required to go through three transitional stages, feudalism, capitalism, and socialism to reach communism.\(^{139}\) Marx explained feudalism in terms of a specific form of production having two exploitative methods, economic and extra-economic.\(^{140}\) Under the one, the feudal lords approximated the whole lot of economic benefits accruing from serf’s hard labour on the demesne, and under the other, they extracted from them unpaid additional services, the forced labour, for constructing roads and castles, tending herds, and

\(^{139}\) Their concept raised serious concerns in the non-European states which did not experience capitalism in real sense: “Feudal Mutation: Military and Economic Transformation of the Ethnosphere in the Tenth to Thirteen Centuries,” *Journal of World History*, p. 505.

other unpaid domestic services. Maurice Dobb added one more dimension of “serfdom” in the feudal debate, which tied the serfs to the land of the lord. Under this “petty mode of production,” the feudatories systematically and unethically siphoned off surplus produce of the poor producer through various methods of “extra-economic compulsions.” Naturally, it forged a lord-serf conflict without affecting, at the same time, urban bourgeoisie and the feudal lord relationship. While Henry Pirenne meant by feudalism a closed estate economy, where production was largely for consumption, and where trade was practically absent, Immanuel Wallerstein understood it as a “redistributive world system based on the extraction of the surplus produce of the agricultural producers in the form of tribute to an imperial or state bureaucracy at a given level.” To Guy Bois, “Feudalism is the hegemony of a small scale individual production (hence the level of productive forces that this hegemony presupposes), and the seigniorial levy secured by constraint of political (extra economic) origin.” Frank Perlin explained feudalism as a “system wherein surplus was generated through the non-economic forces, the political and military power, baked by juridical institutions representing the permanent institutionality of the forces of repression.”

---

144 *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*, p.165.
The given theories on feudalism had other contributors too. To Rushton Coulbourn, feudalism was “a method of government not an economic and social order/system, though it obviously modifies and is modified by the social and economic environment”, and to Perry Anderson, it sounded a “specific organization in which large land ownership (of the feudal lords) with small peasant (who worked on it) extracted the surplus from the immediate producer by customary forms of extra-economic coercion–labour services, deliveries in kind, or rents in cash and where commodity exchange and labour mobility was correspondingly restricted.” However, feudalism was profiled by F. W. Maitland a half-century ago in regard to the constitutional history of England. To quote him, “We may describe feudalism as a state of society in which all or a great part of public rights and duties are inextricably interwoven with the tenure of land, in which the whole government system - financial, military, judicial - is part of the law of private property.”

Indian scholars and scientists like Nurul Hasan, R. S. Sharma, Irfan Habib, Harbans Mukhia, D. D. Kosambi, etc. also engaged in the above debate. According to Nural Hasan, feudalism was primarily “agrarian economy where the surplus is expropriated by a ‘fairly closed’ ruling class through both non-economic coercion and the role played by it in agriculture as well as the subsidiary handicrafts production.” Harbans Mukhia sees it as “a specific form of socio-economic organization of production in which the producer was neither an independent economic being nor was he completely separated from the means of production, and so was made economically dependent on the sale of his labour to lord to supplement

150 Lineages of the Absolutist State, p. 408.
152 S. Nurul Hasan, Thoughts on Agrarian Relations in Mughal India, New Delhi: People’s Publishing House, 1973, p. 2. He declares Mughal India feudal even if it does not have medieval European characteristics.
their income for sustenance.” Irfan Habib recognized fief and serfdom as very important to feudalism. Similarly, according to R. S. Sharma and B. N. S. Yadava, control over the peasant’s process of production by the landlords (serfdom) and decline of trade and urbanization were the core features of Indian feudalism.

(B). Feudalism in Central Asia: A Debate:

Russian, Central Asian and Mongolian scholars and social scientists entered into the above debate in the 20th century. It was initiated by the Soviet anthropologists Boris Ya, Velidimirsov and Sergey Tolstov in 1934. The former designated the 12th-20th century as the feudal age in Central Asia for it was characteristic of a class of feudal lords thriving on the surplus labour of the subjected peasantry. In fact, the debate had originally started from the 1920s and certain pluralist approaches were put forward. Some supported primitive-tribal nature of nomadic societies while others dwelt on their state-like characteristics. Since the mid-1930s, with Joseph Stalin's dictatorship, discussion on nomadic feudalism occupied a considerable space in historical literature. While officials defined nomadic feudalism in terms of land ownership, the revisionists linked it to cattle ownership. However, after Joseph

---

153 Harbans Mukhia, “Was There Feudalism in Indian History?,” *The Feudalism Debate*, Harbans Mukhia (ed.), New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 1999, pp. 36-37. Moreover, Mukhia took a different stand by saying that feudalism was “a non-universal, specific to time and region,” and discarded the Indian feudalism theory of R. S. Sharma on the grounds that peasantry was economically independent rather dependent on the lords for their sustenance.


Stalin’s (1930-1954) demise, the debate was given different dimension(s) by Zimanov, Potapov and S. E. Tolybekov. Accordingly, debate of feudalism in Central Asia revolved around pre-feudal and post-feudal issues of nomadic organization and its relevance to the Asiatic Mode of Production (AMP). The debate assumed heat with Velidimirtsov’s article in Soviet journal *Voprosy Istorii* on “Concerning the Essence of Patriarchal-Feudal Conditions of the Nomadic Peoples.” It led to the reinterpretation of historical literature on feudalism in Mongolia and Kazakhstan, and the rejection of the earlier theories, if not all. This was followed by a debate of S. N. Wainstain, Yu I. Semenov and G. M. Markov in 1970s on a “Non-Feudal” form or more precisely of a “Proto-Class” form of production in the development of nomadic societies. Influenced by the debate, the Mongolian historians like Sh. Nacadory, A. Minis, G. Sughbatoar, and N. Seradjav, established feudal traces in Central Asia and Mongolian societies for the presence of feudal class, subjected tenants and production relations based on extra-economic exploitation of the serfs by the privileged feudal class.

After Soviet disintegration (1991), feudal debate continued. While Central Asian scholars did not subscribe to the earlier definition (pre-Soviet definitions), they brought to fore new dimensions of pastoral economy in nomadic organization from the perspective of an evolutionary approach to explain a specific nomadic civilization in the history of Central Asia. The debate though complex and varied in expression, time and space, does not under-estimate the significance of core

---

160 The discussions and viewpoints put forward in favour and against were mostly in Russian language.
characteristics of feudalism: “exploitative relationship between land owner and the subordinate peasants, in which the surplus beyond subsistence of the later, whether in the form of direct labour, rent in kind or cash, is transferred under coercive sanction to the former.” Similar features are authenticated in etymological terms.

Etymologically, the term derived from word ‘feodum’ in Latin, ‘feodalite’ in French and ‘feudalismus’ in Germany, defines a ‘fief’ - a strip of land or territorial assignment granted by the lord (king) to persons (vassals) in lieu of their services to the state. Such a pre-capitalist relationship explained a systematic lord-vassals contract: the former granted fiefs to officials in lieu of civil and military services to be delivered by them in the event of war from within or outside King’s domain. Such kind of contract forged a land tenure pattern that recognized the vassal as the absolute owner of whatever was above and under land. However, a microscopic minority of landlords/nobles owned such large landed estates that symbolized self-sufficient economic units, wherein production was possible through hard agricultural labour of the serf. The landlord extracted the surplus through direct and extra-economic exploitation of the serfs. This is perhaps why Withold Kula writes:

“The term feudalism refers to socio-economic system which was predominantly agrarian … It referred to a corporate system in which the basic unit of production was a large estate surrounded by the small

---

163 It was simple and effective system, where the king owned all land. He kept for his disposal one quarter as his personal property, and some part was given to the church and the rest was leased out: Feudalism, p. xxii.
164 Feudalism, as a social formation, stood mid-way in the transition between slave-based mode of agricultural production and capitalism. Feudal Society, p. 446; Feudalism, p. xvi.
165 According to the Marxist philosophy, if the serf was forced to render labour on the lord’s personal land, the manse (fields where peasants had non-proprietary rights), and that too without wages, it was called direct - economic exploitation. If his family was forced to perform domestic works of the lord with no wages whatsoever, it was called extra-economic exploitation; hence, a case of double servility.
166 Indian Feudalism, p. 81.
plots of the peasants who were dependent on the former both economically and juridically, and who had to furnish various services to the lord and submit to his authority.”168

To Perry Anderson, feudalism constituted large land ownership with small peasant production, where exploiting class extracted the surplus from the immediate producer by customary forms of extra-economic coercion, labour, deliveries in kind or rents in cash, and where commodity and labour mobility was correspondingly restricted.169 Thus, feudalism was an alternative to societies based primarily either on the personal ties of kinship or on the impersonal bureaucratic structures of centralized politics. To be precise, it embodied a relationship between lord (patron) and vassal (client), and servile peasantry,170 and lord-tenant relationship was central to the land tenure structure, and so was the exploitation of the estate by its owner, controller, enjoyer or beneficiary to it.171 However, feudalism had divergent applications in distinct regions.172 To quote Marx, “it assumes different aspects and runs through its various phases in different orders of succession,”173 though the broad characteristics had universal applications. In that, the class of landlords and the servile peasantry and their relationship remained two most important constituents which Maurice Dobb calls bi-polar division of the society.174

169 *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*, p. 61.
170 The relation was often perpetuated through family structures and, in some cases, on kinship basis; Candice Goucher, Charles LeGuin, and Linda Walton, *In the Balance: Themes in Global History*, Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1998, selection from Chapter 7, “Ties that Bind: Lineage, Clientage, and Caste.”
172 As per one version, the size of noble or clerical domain in Europe were extended between the range of 2,000 to 4,000 acres. These large estates, therefore, required huge labour force to supervise it: *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*, p. 140.
(C). Feudalism: Genesis and Functioning:

The divergent opinions of the scholars should not presuppose that feudalism was an accidental development. It evolved in Europe under specific circumstances following the failure of the state system to protect its citizens from the onslaught of the marauders, barbarians, and other tribal and savageous groups. Not being specific to any particular period, event, time or space, it evolved gradually within the existing institutional framework and reached to climax during the 10th-13th centuries. The scholars like Marc Bloch, Joseph R. Strayer, R. Coulborn, Perry Anderson etc. have done a stupendous work to trace the feudal origin in Europe. By and large, they agree that feudalism was the natural concomitant of social and political chaos emanating from the breakdown of centralized government of Roman King, Merovingian Franks in the 6th-7th century. With that, law and order broke down and the peasantry denied paying the taxes without which it was difficult for the state to run administration and pay wages to army and bureaucracy. As an alternative thereof, the Roman King distributed fiefs among the powerful chiefs on the basis of give and take relationship, whereby the King (overlord) and the powerful chieftains (lords) agreed to the following effect:

“In as much as it is known to all and sundry that I lack the withdrawal to feed and clothe myself, I have asked of your piety, and your good will has granted to me permission to deliver and commend myself into

176 In the nineteenth century G. V. Below was the chief advocate of the view, which has its adherents today, that feudalism is a specific historical phenomenon, localized in time and space: Lawrence Krader, “Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of Middle Ages,” Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol.1, No. 1, p. 76.
177 It developed in Roman Empire during the Homeric age when the weak lords associated themselves with powerful lords and provided them food, shelter and weapons. But during 10th-13th century it assumed a definite shape in the European society.
178 In India to cope with the social crises, two alternatives were suggested by Mani Smriti and Sauti Puranas. First, was the use of force (danda) and second was the restoration of varnasramdharma that was a class based society on the bases of demarcation of professions: R. S. Sharma, “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?”, The Feudalism Debate, pp. 98-100.
your authority and protection … in return you have undertaken to aid and sustain me in food and clothing, while I have undertaken to serve you and deserve well of you as far as lies in my power. And far as long as I shall live, I am bound to serve you and respect you as a free man ought, and during my lifetime I have not the right to withdraw from your authority and protection, but must, on the contrary, for the remainder of my days remain under it. And in virtue of this action, if one of us wishes to alter the terms of agreement, he can do so after paying a fine solidi to the other man. But the agreement itself shall remain in force. Whence it has seemed good to us that we should both draw up and confirm two documents of the same tenor, and this they have done.”

The above act of homage by the lord reciprocated by the overlord through the ‘investiture’ of a flag, staff, chatter or some other symbol of the prosperity. Its record was kept in the rolls of the manorial court. The overlord-lord mutual agreement is further attested by the French jurist Beaumanoir. To quote him, “the lord is quite as much bound to be faithful to his man as the latter is bound in regard to the lord.” The similar type of fealty and faithfulness governed the lord-tenant relationship, which could severe only in the event of the non-fulfillment of the agreement by either of the parties: overlord, lord or tenant. However, land served as the core component of such a hierarchical relationship whereby a certain lord granted land to his vassal as tenement, for instance, in the Frankish kingdom. Such

180 The acts of investiture varied from region to region. Even a villain received his yard land or ox-gang from the steward of a lord after swearing an oath of fealty: *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 3, pp. 462-63.
182 The barons of Aragon swore to their king that they would obey and serve him if he maintained the rights, customs and laws of the kingdom: Paul Vinogradoff, “Feudalism,” *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 3, pp. 458-484. The peers of the kings of Jerusalem, according to the Assizes, lawfully refused allegiance and offered resistance in case of infringement of their rights. This all indicated that kings were not above law.
Tenements were those fractions of great estates which were cultivated not by the owners themselves but by *colonillaeti* or slaves for their own profit, in return for certain fixed rents and duties. The contemporary term for these tenements was *benificium*-benefice or benefit. However, during the Carolingian phase of feudalism (8th-10th century A.D), the otherwise two independent institutions, the vassalage and the benefice, were merged into a single institution. More so, the extent of fief widened with the inclusion of the state and church lands. Further change occurred with Charlemagne (768 A.D) under whom, the other segments of ruling elite, dukes, counts, potentates, bishops and abbots sub-infeudated their estates among smaller vassals. In this way, the institution of vassalage percolated down to the lowest rung of the society during the 10th and 13th century. The feudal institutions spread beyond the boundaries of Frankish monarchy, where the system was generalized and codified to a degree never known before. However, in this whole process of evolution of feudalism, appropriation of surplus labour and labour-intensive nature of agriculture formed the dominant features. The latter was characteristic of the lack of manure, primitive implements, and the defective methods of harnessing the draught power of the animals; extensive nature of agriculture amounted to the wastage of labour on the field which caused great labour demand, unaffordable, at times, to less resourceful vassalage.

---

184 The church could not hold the landed property beyond limits and surplus property was, therefore, given as benefices to the vassals in lieu of the payments of tithes by all inhabitants of the estate: *Feudalism*, p. xvii.
188 Another factor of the wastage of the labour was the distant location and access of the serfs to the lord’s fields. It crated the wastage of labour in traversing the lands from the village: George Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, tr. Cynthia Postan,
As a whole, feudalism was functional through several interdependent institutions as a pre-requisite of a well-defined overlord-lord-tenant relationship on hierarchical lines. In rank, the king was at the top of all vassals. Each vassal was in return, lord over lesser vassals, who too were the suzerain of those knights who had no vassals at the bottom. Both lord and vassal owed certain obligations to each other. The vassal pledged to render certain services to his lord, and, in return, the lord granted him a fief,\(^\text{190}\) piece of land inhabited by the hoards of traditional peasants. Notionally, the king owned these fiefs. But, in actual practice their proprietorship vested with the vassal at least until he rendered necessary services to his overlord.\(^\text{191}\) The entire kingdom was divided into fiefs, except for the land held by the King personally.

Since feudal tenure was hereditary, on the death of a vassal, his fief passed on to his next heir provided that he too demonstrated loyalty to his overlord and rendered him military services in the event of an external war.\(^\text{192}\) Whereas a knight was expected to furnish only his horse and armor, the vassal was required to supply hundreds of knights and men-at-arms. When summoned, they had to present themselves in the lord’s court for investure and clarification regarding intra-vassal disputes or for assisting the lords amid bankruptcy.

The social and economic organization of a fief was based upon the manor or a certain part of a fief held personally by the lord comprising villages, fields, mills, granaries and water irrigation channels. The earning there from supported the lord’s family. However, the manors were inhabited both by the freeman and serfs who together were called *villeins*. Freemen were tenants of the manor who paid rent in

---


\(^{190}\) *French Rural History*, pp. 73-74

\(^{191}\) These services mainly included rendering military service to lord in times of emergency, collecting revenue and maintaining law and order in the assigned region.

\(^{192}\) This method of holding another's land is called feudal tenure.

\(^{192}\) When a vassal died, his heir paid homage to the overlord in the same manner as that of his deceased father.
produce besides performed various forms of labour for the lord. However, they were free to leave the manor at will, which was unlike the serfs who were tied to the lord’s land. With extra hours labour on the field of his lord, they earned extra revenue with which they accounted for the rent in cash or kind. Their extra services were employed in building forts, roads, temples, massive and impressive structures. However, the personal enslavement of the serfs was such that they could not marry or leave the manor without the lord's consent, and were sold like slaves, exceptions apart. They had no “free peasant production” and were bound to raise the crops as per the lord’s choice. This rendered the manor a self-sufficient unit, embodying lord’s personal strip of land, the demesne, constituting between one-third and one-half of the total extent of fief. Rendering three days labour per-week on the demesne was almost mandatory for the serfs. Apart from manor, was the fief that the serfs ploughed for themselves with a certain obligation of rent and share from the forest produce, the hay, fire wood, dairy, meet etc. to the lord. In addition to the grazing fee, the serfs were bound to grind their grain in the lord’s mills and bake their bread in his ovens in lieu of a fee in grain or bread. It is amid these hard conditions that the serfs made a tough living for themselves: their houses damp, dirty and poorly heated with little or no windows. In the event of crop failure, they were strangulated, which subjected them to occasional crimes. Being punishable, the crimes, at times, earned death penalty, say in France though in England, only royal court awarded death penalty to a serf.

193 In Indian feudalism, the resources of the peasants, artisans, traders and other village men were transferred to the beneficiaries as per the orders of the lord: Indian Feudalism, p.188.
194 “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?” The Feudalism Debate, pp. 87, 95-97.
195 http://science.howstuffworks.com/feudalism1.htm
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(A). Overview of Feudalism in Central Asia:

Feudalism is generally defined as an exploitative lord-vassal rather than state-subject or ruler-rulled relationship. Such a relationship obtained not only in Europe, but also in other regions though with varying functioning and historical conditions, say in Europe, Japan, China, India, Russia, Spain, Turkey, Iran, Egypt, Italy, and even in the nomadic societies of the

---


198 Montesquieu (1689-1755) was the first who held this opinion. As per him feudalism was “an event which happened once in the world and which perhaps never happen again.” Calling it the ‘pure’ theory of feudalism, G. V. Below restricted the institution to the Germano-Roman parts of the middle ages, particularly to the Frankish and neighbouring states; hence, a specific historical phenomenon, localized in time and space. The theory has its adherents even today like Harbans Mukhia who sees feudalism specific to Europe: Marc Bloch, Feudal Society: Social Class and Political Organization, Vol. II, Tr. L. A. Manyon, Taylor & Francis, 2005, p. 162; Lawrence Krader, “Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of the Middle Ages,” Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. I, No. 1, London: Cambridge University Press, 1958, p. 76; Chris Wickham, “The Uniqueness of the East,” The Feudalism Debate (ed.), New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 1999, p. 114.

Turko-Mongol origin in Eurasia. Pertinently, the regional variations were determined by distinct geographical, climatic, technological, anthropological, cultural and ethnic considerations. Marx rightly argues, “it (feudalism) assumes different aspects and runs through different orders of succession.” Nevertheless, chief characteristics, more or less, remained the same across the world though these involved serious debate among the social scientists like Boris Ya. Velidimirtsov, Sergey Tolstov, Zimanov, Potapov, S. E. Tolybekov, S. N. Wainstain, Yu I. Semenov and G. M. Markov, Sh. Nacadory, A. Minis, G. Sughbatoar, and N. Seradjav, N. Seradjav, Academician Sh. Natsagdorj, Earnest Gellner, Nikolay N. Kradin, Owen Lattimore, Lawrence Krader, etc. Vladimirtsov designated the entire period of 12th-20th century Mongolia and Central Asia as feudal for the presence of feudal lords (nokut in medieval Mongol), fiefs, manors, and the serfs.
However, Vladimirtsov observed a great deal of affinity in Western Europe and the Mongol-Turkic socio-economic and political institutions. These institutions, according to Marc Bloch, were inclusive of all essentials pertaining to the land-based fiefs, landlords and peasantry or more precisely the serfs in feudal terminology. The core feature of the given fief-lord-serf relationship was the landed estate (fief) wherein the beneficiary, under the royal patronage, enjoyed enormous rights not only on land but even on the basic producers, the most exploited group of the nascent serfs. The institution of the land grant or fief was in vogue under the Khanates from the early times of Qarakhanids (9th-10th century AD) down to the Mongols and thereafter. Changiz Khan (1162-1227 AD) bestowed lands along with the subjects to his ruling elite/military commanders. Under the cover of the royal orders/charters, these beneficiaries exercised

---


To Samir Amin, feudal mode of production was characteristic of the social organization into two classes, the lords and the serf-tenants, appropriation of the surplus by the lords, as a matter of right (“dues”) and not through commodity relations, and absence of commodity exchange inside the "domain": Cf. Hassan Shaugannik and Hassan Shagannik, “Mode of Production in Medieval Iran,” Iranian Studies, Vol. 18, No.1, International Society for Iranian Studies, London: Taylor & Francis, Winter, 1985, pp. 76-77: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4310482 (accessed: 20/12/2008)


209 These landed estates were called as the Iqtas under the Seljugs. Literally, Iqta defined ‘a piece of land,’ was a territorial assignment granted by the king/sultan to the military or civil officials called muqta’s in lieu of their services to the state. These (iqtas) first appeared under the Umayyads (661-750 A.D.): Chris Wickham, “The Uniqueness of the East,” The Feudalism Debate, p. 125; Mansura Hiader, Medieval Central Asia: Polity, Economy and Military Organization (Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries), New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2004, fn. 171, p. 433.


The manuscript, Ta'rikh-i Guzida-i Nusratnama in Turkish, deals with Eastern Turkistan and discusses history of Turks from early times. It was copied in the sixteenth century, which copy is available in the British Library under the No. 3222.
innumerable powers within their defined estates, virtually their personal property. Such rights, they could, at will, share with their subjected peasantry in their specific fiefs termed as hoshun in the 18th century Mongolia. The holder of the hoshun was accordingly called nutug-un-ezen (lord of the domain) or nutug-un-ezen jasag noen (ruling noble lord of the domain) or simply jasag. On the disintegration of the Mongol empire in the 16th century, the Uzbek Khans (16th century) upheld the same system with differences in the names of land grants and termed them as iqta, tankhoh, waqf, and suyurgul. However, among the nomadic population, land usage was determined by the nature of their pastoral economy. The possession of pastureland depended upon the ability to seize land and hold it against the pressure of other groups. Boundaries were only vaguely defined and changed in accordance with the changing strength of each group. The winter camp, where a small amount of land was cultivated, was more permanent.


Before his death (1227), Changiz Khan divided the empire among his four sons as appendages - the vilayats, mamlekat or mulk as per the family traditions. Jochi, the eldest son was allotted the newly conquered area of west-Irtysh as his ulus (fief), Chagtai Mawarannahr, Kashgaria, Samirechie, and Western Jungaria, Ogedie/Ogatie eastern Jungaria, Mongolia and the Chinese provinces and the fourth son, Touli, was the in-charge of his father’s household, the treasury and ancestral pastures: Rashi-ud-din Tabib, The Successors of Changiz Khans, tr. John Andrew Boyle, New York: Columbia University Press, 1971, p.159; Gavin Hambly, Central Asia, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969, p. 100; Svat Succok, A History of Inner Asia, London: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 113; Medieval Central Asia: Polity, Economy and Military Organization (fourteenth to sixteenth centuries), p. 408.


(B). Feudal Structure and Functioning:

Since feudal institution was agrarian-oriented in the Khanates, agriculture was, as such, the main source of economy and means of production.\(^{216}\) The whole set of socio-economic and political relations revolved round lord-tenant ties within the medium of land tenures. According to the Islamic law, land in the Khanates belonged to the Khan, the *memlek-i-padshahi/memleke/mumlaki* or *mamlak*,\(^{217}\) much like the feudal societies in Europe. Being the legitimate owner, the Khan owned and governed everything from above and below in his specified landed estates. The peasants as the mere tenants, held non-proprietary nature of land rights, and paid a certain quantum, usually substantial, of their produce as rent for the use of the land of their over-lord, lord or sub-lord.\(^{218}\) Obviously, they were debarred from the rights to sell, mortgage, and transfer their land to any third party.\(^{219}\) In theory, therefore, private ownership on land was non-existent. But in practice, the over-lord, instead of

---

\(^{216}\) As per 1879 reports, in Bukhara, the sedentary population was estimated at 65%, semi-nomadic 20%, and nomadic at 15%. In Khiva, the figures were 72% sedentary, 6% nomadic, and 25% semi-nomadic. By 1913, agricultural sector constituted 73.8% of the national income, while industry, construction, transport and communication constituted 15.7% and remaining other sectors. However, under the Soviet industrialization policy (1930’s), it (agricultural share) reduced to 34.1%, while industry, construction and transport rose to 50% of national income: Symour Becker, *Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924*, London: Harvard University Press, 1968, p. 10; Devendra Kaushik, *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early Times*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970, p. 67; *Socialist Uzbekistan : A Path Equaling Centuries*, USSR Academy of Sciences (ed.), Moscow, 1982, p. 54.


paying in deficient cash, distributed some portion of land among his heirs, civil and military officials, as grants called tankhoh/chek. However, he reserved special type of land called khasa for his personal use. In return, the assignees committed to place at the Amir’s (overlord’s) disposal troops (qara-chirik). Besides, individual assignments, the Khans, and the tribal chiefs provided waqf grants for the maintenance of religious and other institutions. With the passage of time, such grants became hereditary and naturally the kings lost control over them. The right to use the land was not free, rather assignees paid a fee as tribute in the same sense as the English lords paid a fee to the king for holding their property. In some cases, however, the given rights were irrevocable both in terms of land ownership and its accruing revenue, which gave rise to different land tenures including tankhoh, waqf, amlok, khasa, milki, etc., all were the major socio-economic

---


221 As per estimates, the extent of Bukhara was 2, 50, 000 sq. kms. Because of vastness, some regions were inaccessible and so remained independent from the central control: Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times, Vol. 2, p. 393; E. A. Allworth, Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule, New York/London: Columbia University Press, 1967, p. 280.


224 The tribute was paid in kind, but after the Tsarist control it was paid in cash: Susan J. Buck, Gregory Gleason, “Legal and Institutional Change in Irrigation Systems of Soviet central Asia,” Paper presented at the Second Annual Convention of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, Winnipeg: Canada September 28, 1991, pp. 4-5.

225 Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times, Vol. 2, p. 393; The Peoples of Central Asia, p. 94.

Besides, there were miriie lands which included uncultivated and unused (mavor) areas. According to Muslim law, the latter could become the property (mulk/milki) of whoever brought it into use: “Land Reform in Turkestan,” The Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. 51, No. 124, p. 429.
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However, each set of land tenure had a varying share in the overall land composition. For example, in Bukhara 12.2% land was personal property of the Khan/Amir (khasa); 55.8% amlok (state land); 24.2% waqf, and just 7.8% was the milki, the personal property of commoners. [Fig.3.1] In Khiva, 2/3rd of the total irrigated and fertile land belonged to the Khans (overlords) and other lords; 1/7th was the waqf and amlok (state land) and only 1/10th of the total land belonged to the peasants (dehkan) as milki (private property).

Given the large estates, the assignees, at will, sub-divided them among their subordinates leading to the sub-infeudation of the estates. Ultimately a system of vassalage surfaced with a chain of potentates organized in hierarchical order. At the base of the structure, was a soldier with a tankhoh plot of one family on it, a qaravul-begi with a plot of six families, onboshi with 10 horsemen, a

---
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mirakhur with thirteen families,\textsuperscript{232} yuzboshi (100 horsemen)\textsuperscript{233} to a mongboshi (commander of 1,000 troops).\textsuperscript{234} [Fig. 3.2] The distribution pattern suffices decentralization of imperial power under the Khanates as was the case in classical feudalism.\textsuperscript{235} It also indicates varying estates and the rights of their holders in relation to their obligations vis-à-vis the Khans. The rights of some were absolute in terms of proprietorship whereas others had simply a right on revenue.\textsuperscript{236} On top of it, the revenue assignees were bound to deliver a considerable share of their revenue (wasilat) to their overlord (Khan/Amir).\textsuperscript{237} The said share was usually paid out of the rent and the personal share of the produce delivered by the peasants for the use of assignees land.\textsuperscript{238} By this arrangement, the peasants/tenants were under the double economic obligation: on the one hand, they paid rent to the grantee, and on the other, paid certain share of his produce to the over-lord.\textsuperscript{239} By and large, the assigned plots of land were “inclusive.” In the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, Abdullah Sultan and

\textsuperscript{232} D. Logofet, 	extit{Bukharskoe Khanstvo pod Russkim Protektoratum}, (The Khanate of Bukhara under the Russian Protectorate), St. Petersburg, Vol. 1, 1911, p. 244: Cf. Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia, fn. 10, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{233} Travels into Bukhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus, p. 336.


At Khulam, a minbashi (mongboshi) controlled twenty qalbas (a plot of cultivable land measuring 50 to 100 bighas in Medieval India), whereas his ten vassals held 10 qalbas each, and other four sub-vassals possessed 4 qalbas each, and finally at the lower rung, 2 qalbas and a cow were held by a single soldier: Hafiz Muhammad Fazil Khan, 	extit{Tarikh-i-Manazali-Bukhara}, tr. Iqtidar Husian Siddique, Centre of Central Asian Studies, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, 1981, fn. 3, pp. 26-27.

\textsuperscript{235} This system corresponds to D. D. Kosamb’s conception of “feudalism from below” and R. S. Shrama’s “political feudalism”: Irfan Habib, “Classifying Pre-Colonial India,” The Feudalism Debate (ed.), Harbans Mukhia, New Delhi: Monahar Publishers and Distributors, 1999, p. 193.


\textsuperscript{237} The payment was not rent, rather tribute in the same sense that English lords paid to the king for holding their property. However, after the Russian conquest, it was usually paid in cash: “Legal and Institutional Change in Irrigation Systems of Soviet Central Asia,” Second Annual Convention of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, pp. 4-5.

\textsuperscript{238} Soviets in Central Asia, p. 38.

\textsuperscript{239} “Legal and Institutional Change in Irrigation Systems of Soviet Central Asia,” p. 4.

Shighai Khan were granted Saghraj and Khujand (in Uzbekistan), and Asfandiyar was assigned the Vilayats of Farghana from Khojand to Oash and Andijan in modern Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan respectively. Similarly, Shah Nazar Bi Qarluq enjoyed the syurgul of Khujakat. These grants together comprised rights on land, water channels, water mills (asiyaha), mines, gardens etc. and the revenue accruing there from. Since these grants were quite large in extent, these were redistributed among the common masses for cultivation on rent bases. For instance, Rauz-at-ur-Rizwan refers to a Mirak who had assigned his estate to one or two barzgars (subordinate cultivators) to work for him under the title- ki az barai ishan kar mai kunand. The following fiscal reports of Khokand Khanate also refers to similar type of rent-based lord-tenant relationship:

“…The civil servants and the headmen of the villages (aminan wa oqsoqolan) report that the foundation of the locality of Gurg Tipa can be traced back to 120 years ago. Since then, [people] have been installed (mutawattin) [in that area]. For 90 years, as the estate was

---

241 Medieval Central Asia: Polity, Economy and Military Organization (fourteenth to sixteenth centuries), pp. 400-410.

In Indian context of feudalism, the grantee was assigned inclusive rights on land including mines: R. S. Sharma, “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?” The Feudalism Debate, Harbans Mukhia, (ed.), pp. 94-97. Similarly in Mongolia in a letter sent by the administrative office of the hoshun of Urjinjav, a jasag of Sainnoen Aimag, dated 1877, reveals: “the grass and water of a territory may be managed and assigned only by the ruler and jasag of the said land”: Proceedings of the hoshun of Prince Urinjav of Sain-Noen Khan aimag, for the year 1877; State Archives, 1-I3-40 and I-13-19: Cf. “The Economic Basis of Feudalism in Mongolia,” Modern Asian Studies, p. 267.

243 In many cases, the waqf establishment were so broad that the establishment in Bukhara included lands in the Samarkand region and vice versa: Niccolo Pianciola, “Waqf in Turkestan: The Colonial Legacy and the Fate of an Islamic Institution in Early Soviet Central Asia, 1917-1924,” Central Asian Survey, Volume 26, Issue 4, December 2007, fn. 26, pp. 475-498. (accessed: 10/01/2012)

244 Cf: Medieval Central Asia: Polity, Economy and Military Organization, p. 433.

In Mongolia, the dependent cultivators were called arat. The feudal lords, called jasags, were the owners, with full rights, of the territory of hoshuns, and could at any time appropriate any part of it for their personal use: “The Economic Basis of Feudalism in Mongolia,” Modern Asian Studies, p. 268.
waste land (*mayyitbudan-i-zamin*), they were engaged in agriculture as tenant farmers (*karanda*), thus rendering past sovereigns one-third of their produce…”

Lord-tenant mutual agreement was ceremo nised with an oath on Qur’an. One Malla Beg did so in Osh with the tenants of Otuz-oghul, Tait and Ichkilik clans in presence of two witnesses of Alim Bek Dadkhah and Syed Bek Dadkhah during the reign of Khuduyar Khan (1845-1858) of the Khokand. This sort of sub-infeudation of the estates gave way to sets of land rights, one belonging to the privileged class and other to tillers. Under the said agreement, the tenants (*karanda*), being the private property (of the lord), were debarred to leave the fief/village without the permission of his lord. Any violation thereof subjected the guilty to punishments like flogging and captivity. If they repeated such a fault second time, they were publicly nailed by an ear to a wooden post or to the house-door, and left as such for three days without food or drink. Moreover, they had no

---


247 *Dadkhah*, literally “a petitioner of justice” was an honorary title of middle rank in the Khokand Khanate.


249 In India there too existed different rights over a same piece of land: R. S. Sharma, “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?” *The Feudalism Debate*, p. 94.

250 The serfs in Egypt, Lebanon, and Palestine were called *fallah*: A. N. Poliak, *Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250 – 1900*, London: The Royal Asiatic Society, 1939, p. 64.


right to complaint whatsoever in any legal or administrative court. Their personal enslavement was such that they could not afford any marriage without the permission of their lords. Similarly, for any seditious act against the lord, they were tied hand and foot and held aloof in a room swarming with noxious flies whose stings caused death to them on the third or fourth day. These instances suffice to prove the fact that the tillers (karandas) were attached to the soil as serfs despite the revocable nature of estates or land grants.

The feudal tendencies were not far to seek in the lands granted by the state to the indigent families and religious or educational institutions for maintenance. Such grants, termed waqf (charitable endowments) were directly manned and monitored by a particular institution without any interference from the state. These combined landed property, water mills, orchards, and vineyards. Though their extent varied (59,991 tanop were reserved for waqf in Samarkand), yet these

253 In 1521 AD, when the peasants of the Rizqa requested the Egyptian Governor-General to ask the lords to levy reasonable rent on them, the lords replied that nobody is empowered to come between them and their serfs: Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Lebanon, 1250-1900, p. 64.

254 In Mongolia as per the set principles, the tiller could migrate within the limits of the grant (hoshun in Mongolia) and make use of the pastures of the grants but could not move outside the bounds of the hoshun. “The Economic Basis of Feudalism in Mongolia,” Modern Asian Studies, p. 268; James Hutton, Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, New Delhi: Manas Publications, 1875, reproduced 2005, p. 278.


256 As a rule, there were two types of waqf: public (khayri) and familial (ahlir). The first were endowments denoted for charitable institutions such as schools, mosques and hospitals. The second were endowments bequeathed by a person to his descendants.


endowments were strong economic units.\textsuperscript{259} Since, most of waqf grants were in the land-form, their value, as such, skyrocketed thereby demanding security and non-interference of state. Their curators, the clergy, enjoyed great political influence over the medieval state and the case of Jubari Sheikhs offers the typical example to this effect. They virtually functioned as princes.\textsuperscript{260} Since, these grants were essentially meant for the maintenance of the religious institutions, the madrassas, mosques, shrines, their pupils and the allied staff, were, as such, called waqfkhayri (the charitable grants). However, the curators apportioned a greater part of their revenue for their own families, of course with the consent of the state; hence, termed waqfiahli (family waqf). For instance, Khawaja Ahrar, a sufi saint held 35,000 hectares of agricultural land in the Samarkand region.\textsuperscript{261} Similarly, Khawaja Said (1531-1589), a disciple of Khawaja Islam (1493-1563), held huge landed estate in Samarkand with substantial revenue in cash, which he bequeathed to his primogeniture. As a result, his eldest son, Taj-ud-din Hasan (1547-1646), received a share of 14,000 ashrafi\textsuperscript{262} whereas his second son, Abdul Rahim, received 4,000

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}


\item Ashrafi was a golden coin and its value changed from time to time. One ashrafi during the Sultan Abbas II (1642-66) of Persia was of the value of 114 grains, which reduced to 114 and 84 grains during Sultan Husayn (1694-1722) : S. Moosvi, “The Monetary System in Safavid Persia,” \textit{History of Civilizations of Central Asia}, Part V, p. 454.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Besides, they held large estates yielding 40,000 Khansis as average income, large number of residential assets and 400 slaves apart. The third son of Abu Sa’eed, Abdul Karim, also possessed large landed estates along with irrigation channels and textile production centres. Consequently, the religious elite assumed the status of privileged nobility with substantial influence on the overall socio-economic and political fabric of the Khanates during the late medieval period. The waqf grants so held by them passed on from one generation to another. Being the custodians (mutawalis) of these grants, they exercised wide range of powers from within the religious estates: their administration, income and expenses, of course while keeping regard to their own interests. Nevertheless, the Khans had set rules of accountability for the grantees so as to protect the interests of the basic producers. The waqf and revenue documents of the period under reference amply suggest that repeated warnings were issued to erring mutawalis, and who, at times, were replaced by the pious ones. Thus they were required to conduct themselves

---

263 Mughal India and Central Asia, pp. 98-99.
264 Khans also termed tanga/tenghe, was worth 1/3rd of a rupee by 1605-27, which devalued to 1/5th by 1633: Audrey Burton, The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History (1550-1702), Surrey: Curzon Press, 1997, p. 87.
265 Mughal India and Central Asia, p. 99.

The Kabul waqafnama reads, “When he (custodian) imbibes the wine of death..., the one among His Excellency’s children, will be the custodian of this waqf, and males will be preferred over females... . If they are equal in relationship, then the eldest shall be the custodian.” “The Ahrārī Waqf in Kābul in the Year 1546 and the Mughūl Naqshbandiyyah,” Journal of the American Oriental Society, p. 229.

269 In 1868 in Tashkent, Abdul-Qasim Khan Ishan Tura Khan, a mutwalli of a madrasa presented a petition to the Chancellery of the City Commandant (nachal’nik goroda) complaining that merchants who used plots of waqf on Sundays refused the rent stipulated under the terms of a waqf deed. A commission of Muslim administrators qualified in Islamic property rights was
properly keeping in view the underlying spirit of the endowments and the interests of the allied tenants/agriculturists.\textsuperscript{270} It is worth mentioning that the custodians of these endowments did not cultivate the land themselves, but employed a hoard of cultivators for the purpose. The land holding varied in size and the requirement of the related families. The term “\textit{ketmans} of labour” in vogue in Central Asia and Sinkiang explained a triangular worker-land-water relationship.\textsuperscript{271} In a way, the term \textit{ketman} defined the quantum of the work and the proportionate wages that a labour was entitled for digging a canal. It also defined a unit of weight and measurement: on digging a “\textit{ketman}” of land, a worker was entitled to a “\textit{ketman} of water” which sufficed irrigation of six to fourteen acres of land.\textsuperscript{272} Under the circumstances, water disputes were not ruled out between the estate holders and land tillers, of which details are deficient for the Khanates. However, beyond Khanates, say in Sinkiang (Xinxiang), the water disputes between the cultivators of Yarkand and Merket lasted for 25 years in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{273}

In all cases, it is but certain that the agricultural tools, seeds, etc. were provided to the tillers by the feudatories on rent basis. In fact, the level of rent on land use, water rights, and draught animal was so exorbitant that it barely left anything with the peasants.\textsuperscript{274} They were required to pay the rent between 1/4\textsuperscript{th} and

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{274} The cultivators/peasants operated upon the land with the help of few simple tools and implements which included \textit{ketman} (hoe or spade) \textit{mola} (wooden harrow), \textit{orag} (sickle),
\end{thebibliography}
½ of the yield for land use, 2/5th to 3/4th for cattle and implements together, ½ to 4/5th for seeds and 1/4th to 1/6th of the yield on the leased capital and clothes. This subjected them to the option of exodus though it was punishable under the customary law. The cultivators who refused to till land owing to over-exactions were punished by the stoppage of water for general use. Such a practice antedated the 17th century, whence one feudal lord namely Baqi Mohmmad of Bukhara stopped the water supply of Nasaf Canal to the restive inhabitants for irrigation of their cultivable land. The given example points to the seigniorial rights of lord over the tenants and their continued attachment to land in the Khanates much like their European counterparts. Quite precisely, the tenants were exchanged like commodities and changed hands from person to person. They were evicted for

---

275 Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will, p. 24.
276 Besides exploitation, economic and political insecurity were important reasons that forced people to migrate. For example, following series of nomadic invasions of Qipchaqs on Samarkand in 1735, 12,000 residents moved to India: Scott C. Levi, “India, Russia, and the Eighteenth-Century transformation of Central Asian Caravan Trade,” India and Central Asia: Commerce and Culture – 1500-1800, Scott C. Levi (ed.), New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, fn. 84, p. 120; Ella R. Christie, Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand, London: Seeley Service and Co. Ltd., 1925, p. 204.

The land charters, for example, of India reveal that the landed beneficiaries enjoyed general control over means and forces of production. The plots of lands were directly donated to them by the king sometimes along with the sharecroppers, weavers and sometimes along with the cultivators: R. S. Sharma, “How Feudal was Indian Feudalism?” The Feudalism Debate, pp. 95-97.
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misconduct and refused right to land use for the feudal lord- indeed a replica of the lord-tenant relationship in English manorial villages.  

The seigniorial powers of the feudatories also extended to the slaves estimated at 30,000-40,000 Iranian and 3,000 Russian in Khiva and Bukhara around 1813. Their strength was even estimated at 1, 00,000 in Bukharan Amirate in 1860s. Like tenants, they ploughed lord’s land, maintained canals, gardens and reared livestock, made pottery and performed their many domestic activities. More than 1,000 slaves alone worked on the estates of Amir Nasrullah (1826-1860) of Bukhara. Since, the slaves were the cheap source of labour, their lords/masters were, as such, indisposed to their freedom. Alexander Burns reports about one such slave who worked for his master for long twenty-five years, but was denied freedom.


by his master. Similarly, a Persian slave, named Mohammad continued tending sheep of his master for eight years, with no hope of liberty. Therefore, like the serfs, the slaves were subjected to atrocities and exploitation by their masters/lords, and were, in no way, different from the servile peasants on feudal estates, which symbolized a multi-lateral unit of production, trade and consumption together.

Karl Marx denied feudal traits in Asia on the grounds of the presence of village communities, which recognized no serfdom. Instead, they upheld the principle of communal living and sharing of yield on need basis. But in the Khanates, these village communities called *mahallas* were distinct economic and self-governing social institutions of security with *oqsoqol* (village headman), *arq oqsoqol* (village official in-charge of canals) as the top officials. Being the

---

284 *Travels into Bukhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus*, pp. 119, 136
286 The basic difference between a slave and tenant under the feudal mode of production was that former (slave) worked in the fields with his master’s tools and implements, while a tenant did so on rent basis.
intermediaries between the lords and local people, these village officials acted as local lords in the villages, and subjected the villagers to *hasher* (forced labour) and various other levies.\(^{292}\) In this way, the village communities in the Khanates presented a different working than that of the Marxian model of village community; hence, a stratified social unit representing privileged and unprivileged despite the common ethnic bonds.

(C). Feudal Levies:

The serfs attached with the feudatories in the Khanates were bound to a variety of feudal levies and services:\(^{293}\) to dig new and repair the old canals, offer them certain days of unpaid services,\(^{294}\) till their personal land, work in their *karkhanas* (workshops), tend flocks and operate the water mills etc.\(^{295}\) In addition, each Kazak nomad delivered one among ten sheep each year to support the clergy under religious grant.\(^{296}\) Those who could not afford the same in kind, were free to pay it in terms of labour. Such a practice continued after the termination of the Khanates. For example in 1925, 58% of the tenants paid the rent through labour and only 16.2% of the middle peasants paid it in kind.\(^{297}\) The extents of the working hours a day were not the same in all types of the landed estates. However, by 1920’s, it was between fourteen to twenty hours a day on the cotton lands and in some cases, it was

\(^{292}\) *Journey to Khiva Through the Turkmon Country*, p. 129.

\(^{293}\) *The Modernization of Inner Asia*, p. 88.


\(^{295}\) This indicates that non-economic compulsion was an inseparable part of the feudal complex: *Travels into Bukhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus*, pp. 119, 136.

\(^{296}\) A. E. Hudson, *Kazak Social Structure*, New Heaven, 1938, p. 64
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from dawn to dusk. During hot summers, the per-day working hours were limitless as the tenant had to ensure the irrigation of the fields amid water scarcity. The concept of holidays and weekends was non-existent under such rigorous working framework. Thus, the feudatories exacted different type of services from those tenants who hired agricultural tools, seeds, etc. from them. Doing so, ensured cheap labour to the lords, kulaks, a dominant feudal characteristic indeed. Termed as metayage (in Uzbekistan), such a practice subjected the weak tenants to the continued dependence on the feudal lords, the kulaks, beys/biis/begs and manaps, and, at the same time, earned great deal of dividends to the lords at the cost of sweat and blood of the tenants. This hiatus between the labour potential of the peasant family and its resources was in fact the distinctive characteristic of the feudal mode of production in the classical stage.

Little wonder to notice marked diversity in the social structure under the Khanates in Central Asia. The privileged controlled maximum forces and means of production, and the unprivileged were despoiled off due of the fruits of their labour on land. The society was, as such, characteristic of ‘the White Clans’ (the upper stratum) and ‘the Black Clans’ (the commoners) in Khiva. The distinction compounded with the Tsarist occupation of the Khanates in 1860’s: between the bednyaki (hired labourers) and izdolshchik (share croppers), seredniaks (middle peasants) and kulaks and beys/begs (land lords), and batraks (landless agricultural

299 Kulak literally means ‘tight-fisted’, though in broader sense, it refers to a wealthy class of peasants in the Russian empire. They owned large farms and used hired labour. However, the origin of the term and author of the reforms of 1909 (Stolypin Reform) pointed to a group of prosperous and independent peasants who acted as a supporting structure for the vacillating Tsarist empire: Wikipedia Encyclopedia, 2001; Zhores A. Medvadev, Soviet Agriculture, London, 1987, p. 14; Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Ancient Times, p. 67.
300 Under the classical feudalism, the producer was neither completely separated from the means of production, nor was he an independent economic being. And this in fact distinguishes between the slave mode of production and the capitalist mode of production: Harbans Mukhia, “Maurice Dobb’s Explanation of the Decline of Feudalism in western Europe: A Critique”, Indian Historical Review, Vol. VI, No. 1-2, July-January, 1979-1980, pp. 154-84.
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The great deal of economic differentiation between the “exploiter” and the “exploited” was representative of another dominant feature of Khanates, often talked by Maurice Dobb as bi-polarity of European feudalism. This is amply evidenced by their material domestic possessions. While only 5.52% of kulaks in total population possessed 33.51% cattle wealth, 49.22% common peasant families possessed just 11-12% cattle wealth towards 1914.

It is a fact that feudalism was not prevalent in whole region of the Khanates as it had a big chunk of peasants holding milkiyati rights on private land. Their number was so large that land holdings (atleks) varied in size from 5 and 50 hectares under the Khivan Khanate. According to the 1909 statistical data, in Bukhara Khanate, majority of the peasantry (52%) owned irrigated land measuring 0.5-1.3 dessiatines, 33.3% between 1.3 - 3.3 dessiatines and 14% more than 3.3 dessiatines. In the Tchardjou Bekstov region (Charju) of Bukhara Amirate, an

303 Studies in the Development of Capitalism, p. 35.
304 Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early Times, p. 69.
307 One dessaitine was equal to 2.7 acres.
average holding measured 0.25 dessiatine. However, at certain places, the land holdings were very small. As per one estimate, in 1909 just 1% of the sown area of Farghana, Syr Daria and Samarkand oblasts was owned by private individuals, and the rest either under the waqf or landlords suggesting thereby the state property. Importantly, out of the total land holdings very less area was arable; hence, not in commensurate with the actual demand of the peasants. Consequently, they sold their energy and labour and toiled on feudal lands like their European feudalism: importantly, a single dessiatine of cotton land hardly sufficed the minimum requirements of a peasant family. Small land holdings apart, the private peasants’ proprietors were dependent upon the landlords (kulaks) for want of agricultural tools: spade (ketman), wooden harrow (mola), sickle (orag), wooden plough (amach), a pair of oxen (gosh) and a hoe, which were simple and primitive notwithstanding Tsarist reforms to replace them by metal ploughs, iron harrows and seeders by 1910. For limited access to the total means of production, the peasant proprietors and the serfs were constrained to borrow loans, seeds, implements, draught animals and other agricultural capital from the feudatories, and in lieu thereof shared 1/4th of their gross produce with them under the charikari

308 Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, p. 34.
309 Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia, p. 11.
311 During the 20th century, just 7% of total area in Uzbekistan was arable and rest was dominated by deserts, steppes and mountains: Republic of Uzbekistan: Biodiversity Conservation, National strategy Plan Action II, Tashkent, Decree No., 139, 1998.
314 Uzbekistan had 1,35,000 wooden ploughs, 1,071 metal ploughs, 337 iron harrows and 12 seeders by 1910: B. Tulepbayev, Socialist Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, Moscow: Nanka Publishers, 1986, p. 34.
315 Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule, p. 276; Central Asia, pp. 220-221; Modern Soviet Society, p. 81.
316 Socialist Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, p. 34.
system: in 72% cases the sharing was done on the ½ or 2/3\textsuperscript{rd} basis as the rate of interest was 40-60% on the borrowed loans from the landlords though they obtained the same on the subsidized 8-9% interest rates for promoting mono-culture. At the end of it, the milki land holders were left with no choice but to dispose of or pawn their lands to the big land lords. By 1914, therefore, 25-54.4% peasant families were landless in Farghana, Samarkand and Bukhara, and the rest retained just one 

dessiatine
of land with them; hence, fell far behind their landlord communities in material possession. This automatically ruled out the scope of their asset building under the Khanates.

Thus, whole region of Khanates was characteristic of feudalism during the 18\textsuperscript{th}-19\textsuperscript{th} century. Serfdom was its fundamental characteristic whereby tenants were attached to the land of the lord. Their exploitation by and dependence on the feudal class was but natural as was the case under the European “classical feudalism” in terms of land tenure and the right of users on means and forces of production. In a way, feudalism in the Khanates was a typical replica of European feudalism, exceptions apart.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early 19th Century}, p. 66.
\item \textit{Socialist Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan}, p. 73.
\item \textit{Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early 19\textsuperscript{th} Century}, p. 69.
\item \textit{Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early 19\textsuperscript{th} Century}, p. 69.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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Impact of Feudalism on Central Asian Khanates

For comprehending the impact and trend of development in a certain society, one needs to understand the entire dynamics of that society as regards the means and forces of production. Karl Marx poetically unfolds the implications of the mode of production while saying: “It (mode of production) assigns rank and influence to the others; bathes all other colours and modifies their particularity and as other determines the specific gravity of every being which has materialized within it.”

Therefore, if the mode of production is based on surplus extraction relations, it tends to impose very adverse impact on the growth and development of the societies. Divergent theories have been put forth to explain the impact of the feudal mode of production on societies. As per the classical economic school of thought, feudalism was a genius institution in the threatened politico-administrative and poorly endowed technological system in which the lords protected the peasants. This was significant in absence of well-organized markets and state-level subsidies. The constitutional experts, however, hold other way round. They perceive that feudalism exhibited denial of individual liberty in English and American societies. Similarly, Maurice Dobb, Rodney H. Hilton, Robert

---


322 The term “classical economics” was coined by Karl Marx. Adam Smith, David Ricardo and James Mill were the prominent economists of the said school.


Brenner, Hatcher and Bailey describe feudalism as an exploitative system wherein the basic producers were squeezed of their surplus produce and labour; hence, a deterrent to their growth. The fact of the matter is that whereas feudalism redeemed people amid crises, it juxtapose perpetrated immense exploitation of the serfs at the hands of the feudatories. The otherwise independent peasant community was enslaved on its account, which adversely affected the overall conditions of the hoards of tenants under the Khanates. This can better be understood under the following headings:

(A). Politico-Economic Impact on State:

To begin with, Central Asia was caught in a vicious web of political crises during the 18th century. The decentralized mode of feudal governance, practically fragmented the Khanates into number of power pockets held by swath of
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feudatories. These ran parallel to the state-run institutions. The success of feudal units of governance depended upon the lord’s personal strength, capability, resources and relations with the overlord, the Khan or Amir. Amir Nasrullah’s reign represents the successful tale of vassal-overlord relationship in Bukhara (1826-1860). Any weakness from either side was exploited by the other to its advantage. Usually, a failing state system sufficed the emergence and consolidation of feudal organs and transformed them into “parcelized sovereigns” in real practice.\(^{329}\)

We have ample references of the strong feudal power structures that were analogous to the state system from time to time. The feudatories of Shahr-i-Sabz,\(^{330}\) Ḥiṣar, Qarategin, and Darvaz\(^{331}\) in Bukhara and Nurata, Kolab, Khujand, Ura- Tube,\(^{332}\) Jizak, Khatirchi, Kattakurgan, etc. in Khokand, substantiate the fact.\(^{333}\) While thereupon, the royal power shrunk, that of feudatories swelled. Obviously, because of this factor, Abul Fayz Khan (1711-1747) of Bukhara was weakened and virtually confined to his fortified palace.\(^{334}\) The growing feudal influence was correspondingly felt in the royal assembly (jamo\(e\))\(^{335}\) to such an extent that Amir Daniyal (1758-1785) helplessly allowed Fazil Tutra/Tura to become de jure Khan of


\(^{331}\) The principality was located between the Khanates of Bukhara and Ḵhokand. Dominated by the Uzbek tribe of Yuz, it remained bone of contention between the three Khanates despite repeated efforts to resolve the conflict.


\(^{334}\) Jamoe literally meaning “gathering” or “assembly,” was a nominal consultative body of the Amir: Sarfraz Khan, Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will, New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003, p. 17.
Bukhara. In Khiva, the *otaliqs* (tutor/regent) assumed the same authority as that of the king. Muftis and qazis were no exception to above phenomenon. Oblivious of their religious obligations, they amassed disproportionate wealth from their religious grants, and, at times, meddled with political affairs of the Khanates. Makhdum-i-Azam, a *sufi* saint of the 19th century Farghana, frequently recruited Kyrgyz army to attack the cities of Eastern Turkestan. The other *sufi* leaders like Ihsan Baba Akhund Shadman, established his own standing army (*sarboz*) in the early 20th century. In sequence of their weakening tendencies, Amir Mużaffar (1860-1885) unusually shared his power with the *mullahs* of Bukhara and Samarkand.

True, instances exist which certify to the royal will to execute the recalcitrant lords, say in Khiva and quell them with military might. But this was possible

---

337 In Khiva, the title was awarded to those wazirs who were older than the Khan: *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. V, p. 79.
341 He initially held temporal and spiritual power in the Pamir region and Sinkiang (Eastern Turkestan). Gradually loss of influence in Sinkiang drove him into Farghana where he consolidated his position with the support of his accomplices.
with the backing of other feudatories under the normal vassal-overlord provisions. \textsuperscript{347} To weaken the strength of the feudatories, the Amirs, at times, took recourse to divide and rule policy, and used one vassal against another for the furtherance of the Khanates. The vassals were also used during inter-Khanate conflicts. Amir Nasrullah (1826-60) of Bukhara hired 10,000 Turkmen of Tekke and Salor tribes against Mohammad Ali of Khokand. \textsuperscript{348} External support was evenly sought by the Amirs to marginalize the insubordinate feudatories. Mohammad Rahim Khan (1865-1910) of Khiva invoked the support of a Russian commander, N. A. Ivanov, \textsuperscript{349} in August 1876 to subdue feudal chiefs of Iomut and Kara-Kalpaks and other restive Turkmen. \textsuperscript{350} The above instances of intra-Khanate and inter-feudal conflicts and wars, \textsuperscript{351} though rare, suffice their cascading effects in terms of the human killings and their exodus to neighbouring regions for security and sustenance. \textsuperscript{352} Otherwise the Khanates, vassals, and their inter-relations had smooth sailings within the mutually settled terms of vassalage.

However, as and when, their bilateral relations were strained, the feudatories encroached upon the Amir’s domain and realized tax otherwise payable to him on

\textsuperscript{346} Amir Masum Shah Murad (1785-1800) of Bukhara killed the Merv ruler, Bayram Ali Khan in 1785, plundered the oasis, destroyed the Sultan-band Dam, and diverted the irrigation channels to arable land in Bukhara: \textit{History of Civilizations of Central Asia}, Vol. V, p. 88.


\textsuperscript{348} \textit{Travels in Bukhara (1813-33)}, p. 345.

\textsuperscript{349} N. A. Ivanov was in-charge of Petro-Aleksandrovsk.

\textsuperscript{350} Paul George Geiss, \textit{Pre-Tsarist and Tsarist Central Asia: Communal Commitment and Political Order in Change}, London/ New York: Tylor and Francis Group, 2003, p. 228.


\textsuperscript{352} Following the series of invasions on Samarkand from the Qipchap steppes in 1735, about 12,000 residents fled to India: T. K. Beisembiev, “Farghana’s Contacts with India in the 18th and 19th Centuries,” \textit{Journal of Asian Studies}, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 124-35: Cf. Scott. C. Levi (ed.), \textit{India and Central Asia: Commerce and Culture (1500-1800)}, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007, fn. 84, p. 120.
the *milkiyati* (private) land.\(^{353}\) Further, *kharaj* was transformed into rent and land ownership rights of the peasants were confiscated in the process. The gradual absorption of peasant rights over the means and forces of production made the lords economically strong,\(^{354}\) whereupon they denied payment of state share to the weak Amirs. This was particularly true amid the conditions following natural calamities.

One feudatory of Balkh, Ihsan Khoja, expressed reluctance to remit land revenue of 20,000 *tillas* to Amir Nasrullah (1826-1860). Likewise, while exploiting the Amir’s weakness, some *waqf* institutions withheld the payment of 18 *lacs* out of total 36 *lacs* of rupees to the Amir from two regions of Balkh and Jizzak.\(^{355}\) This is not to deny that the Amirs would not exempt the feudal lords from annual tribute or fixed share from produce during eventualities. Yalangtush-bi, a feudal lord of Samarkand in the 18\(^{th}\) century was exempted from paying a stipulated share to the state.\(^{356}\) But in all cases, it amounted to economic loss to the Amirs and a serious impediment to the growth of the Khanates. Florio Beneveni reports about one Amir, Abdul Fayz Khan (1711-1747) of Bukhara, “The Khan says that he has great ideas but no power to implement them … because of the scarcity of the funds in the treasury.”\(^{357}\)

In order, therefore, to augment the exchequer, the Amirs and Khans adopted several measures including, for example, the sale of state land to the private individuals in Bukhara with tax exemption on 1/3\(^{rd}\) of the sold land.\(^{358}\) However, the

---


\(^{355}\) *Travels into Bukhara*, p.343.


\(^{358}\) Such land holdings exempted from tax were called *mulki-hurri-khalis*; *Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will*, pp. 24-25.
vendors were the big landlords rather than the commoners. As a result, the extent of the feudal land increased manifold measuring, for instance, 3,700 *dessiatines* of arable land alone in Zarafshan Valley in 1920.\(^{359}\) In one instance, Shah Murad (1800-1825) sold *madrassa* land to those private individuals\(^{360}\) who had no knowledge of learning. To quote Mir Izzatullah about Samarkand, “It (Samarkand) had fallen into such utter ruin and decay, that tigers and wolves had actually taken abode in the colleges … which were situated in the centre of the city.”\(^{361}\) [Fig. 4.1]

In Khokand, the Khans adopted a new monetary policy to cope up with the economic crises. The weight of the coins was reduced in the early 19\(^{th}\) century from 4.44 grams a *tanga/tenghe* (a silver coin) to 3-2.50 grams, while in the mid 19\(^{th}\) century one *tanga* was worth 20 silver *kopecks* only.\(^{362}\) The prices of the commercial crops correspondingly dropped. In Bukhara, an indigo costing 12 *tillas/pood*\(^{363}\) (one *tilla* was equal to 15 *rubles*), fell by 11 to 10, 8, 6, 4 and 2 *tillas* a *pood* by 1833.\(^{364}\) The purchasing power went so low that “the customers were dragged by his sleeves and flap,”\(^{365}\) and trading activities were again subordinated to the barter and credit system.\(^{366}\)

Therefore, under feudalism, the state(s) was relatively seen as a feeble organization overwhelmed by anarchy, chaos and confusion, thereby affecting the

\(^{359}\) *Muslim Reformist Political Thought: Revivalist, Modernist and Free Will*, p. 25.


\(^{362}\) The Life of Alimqul: A Native Chronicle of 19\(^{th}\) century Central Asia, fn. 165, p. 50.


\(^{364}\) One *pood* or *pud* was equal to 16.38 kg.


normative political order and economic development of the Khanates. However, the normalcy of lord-vassal relations and the obedience and allegiance of the feudatories to the Amirs, was, more often than not, governed by the ethnic factor.

(B). Socio-Economic Impact on Society:

Though the ‘classical school of economics’ viewed feudalism as an efficient institution, suiting to the indigent agricultural communities, yet the surplus extraction of gross produce from the tenants triggered artificial food scarcity when there was no crop failure. The procedure of surplus extraction was done through number of taxes/rents/levies imposed on the tenants in one or the other name. They subjected to pay $1/4$ - $1/2$ of the yield as rent to the lord for the leased land, $2/5$ - $3/4$ for the leased working cattle and implements, $1/2$ - $4/5$ for the leased seeds, and $1/4$ - $1/6$ of the yield for the leased money and clothes. Besides, they paid other feudal levies (wujuhat). Taken together, just a little of produce was left with the basic producers at the end. In the process, they were left with little or no food as is attested by Boris Pazuklin, the envoy of Tsar Alexci Mikhailovich (1875-1895) to Bukhara, “…and over the years very little bread is left in some homes [of Bukhara, Balkh and Khiva].” Therefore, for most part of the year, the serfs/tenants subsisted on fruits, vegetables, milk etc. The concept of surplus with them for rainy days was obviously a distant dream.

Since feudalism had an agrarian base in the Khanates as elsewhere, majority of the tenants (karandas) were engaged in agriculture and pastoral

---

368 *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia*, pp. 36-37.
farming on the landed estates of the feudatories. That the tenants constituted the bulk of the agricultural community is indicated by the greater share of the feudatories in the overall land distribution pattern: 12.2% land was *khasa* (personal property of the Amir), 55.8% *amlok* (state land), 24.2% *waqf* (endowment), and just 7.8% was *milki* (private) lands. This reveals that 92.3% of the peasant population, out-numbering the *milkiyati* holders, worked on rent basis. Living in the countryside and bound by law to the land, they depended on their little crops for subsistence; hence, money played a minor role in their economy. Amid this sort of “natural economy,” the society had two broad divisions, the lord and the servile peasantry. The former being privileged controlled maximum means and forces of production, and the latter facilitating their job to the effect. The society was, as such, characteristic of ‘the White Clans’ (the upper stratum) and ‘the Black Clans’ (the commoners) in the Khanate of Khiva. Such a division diversified further under the Tsars with the addition of the classes of the *bednyaki* (hired labourers), *izdolshchik/yarmichi* (share croppers), *seredniaks* (middle peasants) and *kulaks* and

---
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beys/biis (land lords), and batraks (landless agricultural workers).\(^{378}\) The great deal of economic differentiation between the “exploiter” and the “exploited” in Central Asian Khanates, created what Maurice Dobb terms as the “bi-polarity” of European feudalism.\(^{379}\) In sequence, tenants were reduced to the position of limited rather than absolute owners despite being the basic producers.

(C). Peasantry: Material Conditions:
As such, the serfs had a mere satisfaction from the right to land use (\(\text{tasarruf-i-malikana}\)), which assured him food for sustenance.\(^{380}\) They upheld the same right while bearing all sorts of feudal excesses.\(^{381}\) In sequence, a strong psychological land-tenant relationship existed, and to sustain which tenants always wished to have a male child to succeed them.\(^{382}\) Nevertheless, they had limited access to produce,\(^{383}\) which subjected them to most appalled conditions in terms of housing, food, and clothing.

---


383. Under the feudalism, tenants were provided limited lands so as to produce little lest they accumulate wealth and transcend the serf status. The concept of small holdings was also due to fragmentation of landed property on hereditary lines as is laid down in Islamic inheritance law. The shift from ‘patriarchal family’ to more ‘progressive’ family relations within feudalism was the offshoot of the Soviet regime: Paul Georg Geiss, “Mahallah and Kinship Relations: A Study on Residential Communal Commitment Structures in Central Asia of the 19th century,” *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 20, Issue 1, London: Routledge, 2001, p. 101.
As regards housing, these were scattered around the citadels (ark) of the lords, [Fig. 4.2 & 4.3] and symbolized adobe type of buildings generally made of mud in sharp contrast to the brick and stone made castles of the lords. A thick wall built up of lumps of loess mud surrounded the outbuildings and courtyards. A house had no windows facing the street, only a closed door, strongly barred at night. The household furnishings were simple. Reed mats were laid on the mud floors, and over these were spread felt or pile-less woven rugs while as in the homes of the rich, the floors were laid with Bukharan pile rugs or most highly prized Turkmen rugs. For keeping teapots and other household articles, niches in the mud walls were fixed. The other food items were kept in the packed clay terrace, called aivans. However, the lack of space in the dwellings and poor ventilation in hot seasons compelled the serfs to sleep in the aivans actually meant for storage purpose. For the guest, a single room was furnished and rest of the house was without matting. Similarly, the kibitkas (tents of nomads) were small and usually smoky and meant for multilateral purpose. By and large, the dwellings of the poor were ill equipped and poorly planned which exposed them particularly the women

385 Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand, p. 230.
386 Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, pp. 60-62.
387 The excavation conducted at Utrar (city in southern Kazakhstan) revealed that the main room of the household of the rich measured up to 45 square meters, whereas those of the poor measured 8 to 15 square meters. The usable floor space in the former was between 60 to 90 square meters and only 25 to 35 in the latter case: G. A. Fedorov-Davydov, “Archaeological Research in Central Asia of the Muslim Period”, World Archaeology, Vol. 14, No. 3, Taylor & Francis, Feb., 1983, p. 400, http://www.jstor.org/stable/124350, (accessed: 13/01/2010).
388 Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, p. 61.
389 Racial Problem in Muslim Soviet Central Asia, p. 47.
391 Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, p. 236.
and children to many diseases like blindness,\textsuperscript{392} rishta (an internal worm infection acquired by drinking impure water), cholera, leprosy, rheumatism, etc.\textsuperscript{393}

They had evenly the poor diet to thrive on. Though it varied, but bread formed the staple food (ash). Usually taken fresh, it was at times taken days after to make up the food shortage in the dwellings of the poor.\textsuperscript{394} Chinese green tea was commonly brewed by all and sundry.\textsuperscript{395} Instead of kumiss (a beverage made from mare’s milk), bozeh made from different kinds of grains, formed the beverage of the poor.\textsuperscript{396} Pilau, rice cooked with fat of mutton, vegetables and dried fruits, a favourite of the well-to-do, was rarely relished by the poor for poverty and servility. However, the pastoralists cherished barley instead of rice.\textsuperscript{397} Even the middle class relished it on certain occasions like feasts only. The poor mostly thrived on milk, curd, eggs, fruits and vegetables.\textsuperscript{398} Amid extreme food scarcity, grains of horse-fodder, the jogan, were taken as substitute for food by the poor.\textsuperscript{399} Poor food apart, clothing of the peasantry was no better. Mostly they put on ragged clothes.\textsuperscript{400}

Their material possessions were few and far between, and included simple tools such as a spade (katmen), wooden harrow (mola), sickle (orag), wooden


\textsuperscript{393} To end the cholera and rishta problem, a Russian engineer, Kh. V. Gelmen verily endeavored to drain the swamps, ponds around the capital city of Bukhara as the Amir Abdul Ahad (1885-1910) refused to provide 120,000 rubles for the plan despite his large income between 7 to 18 million rubles; Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva, 1865-1924, pp. 199-200; Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, p. 240.


\textsuperscript{395} Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, pp. 58-59.

\textsuperscript{396} Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, pp. 256.

\textsuperscript{397} Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{398} Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, pp. 249-250.

\textsuperscript{399} Nikolay Murav’yov, Journey to Khiva Through the Turkmon Country, London: Oguz Press, 1977, pp. 142-143.

\textsuperscript{400} James Hutton, Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, New Delhi: Manas Publications, 1875/ reprint 2005, p. 237.
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plough (amach), a pair of oxen (gosh) and hoe.\textsuperscript{401} Being insufficient, driving cattle like pair of oxen (gosh) together with implements were shared on shirkat basis.\textsuperscript{402} In fact, whole Uzbekistan had alone 1, 35,000 wooden and 1,071 metal ploughs besides 337 iron harrows and 12 seeders by 1910.\textsuperscript{403} Importantly, the share of the feudatories in the limited livestock was far greater than desired. This is why 5.52\% of kulaks (landlords) in the total population possessed 33.51\% cattle wealth, while as 49.22\% common peasants possessed just 11-12\% cattle stock by 1914.\textsuperscript{404} Due to the primitive means of production, the soil was not fertile. The only available source of manure, pigeon droppings,\textsuperscript{405} was insufficient to compensate the fertility loss. Productivity being inadequate, only 3-5 centners\textsuperscript{406} per-hectare fodder was produced to cater to the annual demand of 1,314 kgs for ten sheep.\textsuperscript{407} Many of the pastoralists were, as such, forced to sell their animals, particularly horses in the foreign markets. Eventually, they transformed from pastoralist to daily wagers.\textsuperscript{408}

Consequently, tenants were stressful following damage to standing crops, food and livestock, besides shrunken yields\textsuperscript{409} and reduced crop areas.\textsuperscript{410} Not surprising,
therefore, to see them clandestinely migrating to cities, which sequentially triggered contraction of village population. While Samarkand had a population of 1,50,000 souls in the 15th century,\(^4\) it declined to only 10,000 by the early 19th century.\(^4\) In Balkh (in the Khanate of Bukhara), the population dropped from 2,00,000 souls in the 16th century to 2,000 in the early 19th century.\(^4\) Similarly, the pastoralist population of Kazakhs in the Tian Shan Plateau declined by 9% between 1902 and 1912.\(^4\) True feudal excesses contributed to the human exodus to the urban areas but it was not the sole factor for the purpose.\(^4\)

Apropos to above circumstances, the tenants presented the view of a poor lot. An American, John D. Littlepage, wrote, “The peasantry (including both subjected and free cultivators) were being dragged under the police and set down as forced labourers.” A native of Turkestan, Zeki Vilidi Togan, presented a similar view


\(^4\) The estimate was given by a Spanish ambassador, Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the court of Amir Timur (1336 -1405). As per his statement, “… there was so great a number of people that they are said to have amounted to one hundred and fifty thousand persons, ... the city was not large enough to hold them:” Ruy Gonzalez, *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-6*, tr. Clements R. Markham, London: Hakluyt Society Publications, 1859, p. 171: Scott C. Levi, “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 537-38.


\(^4\) Yuri Bregel says that only one quarter of the city (of Samarkand) remained un-inhabited during the 18th century, while after thirty years of Burns, Arminius Vambery estimated Samarkand’s population between 15,000-20,000: S. A. M. Adshead, *Central Asia in World History*, p. 177; Scott C. Levi, “India, Russia and the Eighteenth-Century Transformation of the Central Asian Caravan Trade,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 537-38.


\(^4\) The other factors were unfavourable climatic conditions, decline in irrigation water, political instability.
following their execution and persecution by the feudatories in Farghana.\textsuperscript{416} For fear of their concerned lord, Nar Muhammad Parvanchi,\textsuperscript{417} the tenants of Qurama\textsuperscript{418} invoked justice while hanging applications (arizalar) on tress during the reign of Khudyar Khan.\textsuperscript{419} The eminent poet of the 17\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} century, Saiido Nasafi, highlighted the tenant sufferings at the feudal hands in Bahoriaty (The Spring Motives) in the following words:

\begin{quote}
“It is better not to walk along the streets of the rich  
From under the imprint of my foot gushes out a bloody spring.”
\end{quote}

Similar impressions are conveyed in his other verses:

\begin{quote}
“The sky is like a torso of the bent of old man  
World is like a ravaged village  
As the people of the world sucked each other’s blood  
The ferment is like a squeezed pomegranate,  
Destiny took away water and granary from the streams of the flowering garden,  
The soil in the garden is like a torn pocket  
In this colourful dress the wealthy man is like a worm wrapped in silk.”\textsuperscript{420}
\end{quote}

One gathers from above that feudal system was detrimental both to the state and the basic producers. For its obvious ramifications, the state lost its sovereignty by allowing the feudatories to share political power and economic resources. While

\textsuperscript{416} Soviet Empire: The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism, p. 176.  
\textsuperscript{417} Parvanchi was one of the highest official in the Khanate of Khokand. He controlled three thousand troops.  
\textsuperscript{418} The territory situated on the right plank of the Anger River, the contributory to the Syr Darya towards north of Tashkent. In the Khokand Khanate, it was a separate administrative unit (vilayat) with centre at Keravchi.  
\textsuperscript{419} It was an age-old practice in Central Asia. The applications for justice were hung on the big tress called chihilitan by Uzbeks or ghaybiran (secret friend) by South Kazakhstanis: Ismati, Tarikh-i-Khudayar Khan, MS No. SPbO IVAN of Russia, C 440, f. 114b: Cf. The Life of Alimqul: A Native Chronicle of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Central Asia, fn. 23, p. 20.  
\textsuperscript{420} Cf. Central Asia: Pre-Historic to Pre-Modern Times, Vol. 2, pp. 405-406.
the state’s own resources shrunk in sequence, the tenants were denied their natural right to produce for themselves; hence, siphoned of their surplus as a pre-requisite to their asset building capacity. On the other hand, the well-to-do class of landed aristocracy sustained on their sweat and blood, and thereby lived a life that had really no compatibility or resemblance with the toiled lot of the tenants.
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Challenge and Response to Feudal System

Feudal crisis or challenges denote an unpleasant phenomenon characterizing decline in the rural population, extent of arable land, quantum of produce and yield of land revenue. It was triggered by several factors which the scholars explain in their own ways. Whereas Maurice Dobb attributes it to “internal crises”, Henri Pirenne views the growth of trade and towns as its fundamental cause. However, Georgus Duby foresaw its reason in the development of technology and increased production, and labour. Whatever the underlying factors of the feudal decline, it has to be recognized that the decline pre-empted transformation of feudal to capitalist mode of production ending thereby the over-exploitation of scores of serfs or land-tied cultivators by the privileged feudal class in Central Asia as elsewhere. The decline was indeed the offshoot of the customary and legal recognition of the military powers of the feudal lords from time to time. Anyhow, given scenario was challenging to all the stakeholders for power gain and optimization of regional resources both from above and below. Each contending party had obviously its own specific mode to react, respond and contribute to the declining feudal trend for their own expediency. The whole dynamics of feudal crisis and its allied response in Central Asia was sequentially

---

multilayered in nature, organization, time and space as can be gauged from the below-given discussion:

(A). Internal Crises, Serf Reaction and Feudal Response:

(A.i). Internal Crises:

To begin with the established reality that the feudal institution was based on the exploitation of produce and labour of the tenants under the aegis of landlordism. Even though the serf-lord relations were apparently smooth but a simmering indignation existed at its root on the issue of the appropriation of produce. The feudal lords targeted to take away maximum from the serf, which they were reluctant to surrender for their own compulsions: growing family needs, traditional means of productions and climatic excesses. According to Maurice Dobb, the clandestine anti-feudal contempt finally proved counterprove to both the stakeholders. Nevertheless, the tenant reaction was obvious because feudalism was meant to favour the feudal lords at their cost. Quite exactly, they were subjected to multitude of exorbitant taxes and levies. For example, kharaj, was realized at 2/3rd of the produce as against ½ or 1/4th prescribed by the state. In addition, mirobana (water duty) was charged at the rate of 10% of the annual produce and so were four cattle required to be annually delivered by each tribal family in the name

---

426 *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, p. 36.
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of *kibitka* (house tax). The additional levies (*wajuhat*) included *kish puli* (levy on a pair of draught animal in relation to land holding), *yak shira* (head-wise levy on draught animals), *qafshan* (levy paid towards revenue functionaries like *amlokdar*), *tanaf puli* and *alaf puli* (levy on orchards and vegetable gardens), *kuprul puli* (toll on bridges), *baj* (custom duty paid towards the lord), *nikhana* (duty on marriage contracts), *tarikana/tarakana* (duty on legal documents of inheritance), various gifts presented to feudal lords on the eve of community feasts (*toi*) apart: in all fifty five in Bukhara and twenty five in Khiva. There number was in fact so large that Sadruddin Ayni argued: “only air was exempted from taxes and levies in Bukhara”. Further, the tenants were required to perform several unpaid services (*hasher*) to the feudal lords, to maintain their orchards, canals, houses and roads. Not only the tenants but even the artisans and merchant communities were subjected to *aminana* (tax paid by whole-sales in Bukhara) and *dallyali* (tax paid by the retailers towards the lords), the payment of *zakat* at the rate of 2 ½ % of

---

431 It was a household tax covering the nomadic population. Each household was to pay annually four cattle to the authority.


435 *The Life of Alimqul: A Native Chronicle of the 19th century Central Asia*, pp. 16, 60, fns. 77, 206, 207, 208; *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early Times*, p. 67;


their annual earnings aside.\textsuperscript{439} The exactions were so high that the concept of saving did not exist and purchasing over land (\textit{milki})\textsuperscript{440} was too distant for fear of high exactions.\textsuperscript{441} Paradoxically, rent was collected in advance for several years together and arbitrarily increased as high as seven fold.\textsuperscript{442} Consequently, the tenants had just not a little earnings for the whole year.\textsuperscript{443} Under the circumstances, they were forced to look around for food and borrow loans or else resort to theft and brigandage.\textsuperscript{444} The loans (\textit{bunak}) were provided by the feudal lords at quite high interest rates ranging between 40 and 60\% when these were obtained by the feudatories at low interest rates of 8-9\%.\textsuperscript{445} The debts so accumulated would force the tenant to sell whatever and if ever they had any material possession with them.\textsuperscript{446} On top of it, they had to buy the commodities at the exorbitant prices fixed by the feudatories themselves which was embarrassing to all lower strata of the Khanates.\textsuperscript{447} Compared to the high prices, wages were substantially low. A cobbler in Bukhara earned only

\textsuperscript{439} Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{440} It may be mentioned here that in the Khanates was also a class of free peasants who held land under \textit{milkiyati} rights. These peasants pay tax direct to state through intermediaries and rent to landlords.


\textsuperscript{445} \textit{Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early Times}, p. 69.


45 puls daily,\textsuperscript{448} whereas bread alone cost half the amount of his daily earnings. Similarly, a room in the caravanserai could be had at 2-4 tangas a month.\textsuperscript{449} The prices of the dress material being unaffordable,\textsuperscript{450} people wore ragged clothes.\textsuperscript{451} There was, therefore, a marked difference between the tenant earnings and the market prices of their daily consumer goods. The gap could have been easily plugged by them with surplus produce, which they did not have due to high exactions, traditional agricultural tools and lack of requisite manures.\textsuperscript{452} Most of the land situated between Panjdeh to Yalatun of the Murgab valley of Samarkand\textsuperscript{453} was deserted.\textsuperscript{454} This brought them face to face with their feudatories with exodus as a viable alternative to escape feudal highhandedness.\textsuperscript{455}

\textsuperscript{448} Pul or Ful was a copper coin and fifty puls were equal to one tenghe.

\textsuperscript{449} E. V. Rveladze, “Eastern and Northern Central Asia (c. 1750 to c. 1850),” History of Civilizations of Central Asia, Part V, p. 449.


\textbf{Price of Dresses in the Khanate of Bukhara 19\textsuperscript{th} century (in Tenghe)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dresses</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} Class</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} Class</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd} Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khivan</td>
<td>30 tenghe</td>
<td>20 tenghe</td>
<td>8 tenghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bokhariot</td>
<td>20 tenghe</td>
<td>12 tenghe</td>
<td>8 tenghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khokandi</td>
<td>12 tenghe</td>
<td>8 tenghe</td>
<td>5 tenghe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{451} James Hutton, Central Asia from the Aryan to the Cossacks, New Delhi: Manas Publications, 1875, reproduced 2005, p. 237.

\textsuperscript{452} The droppings of the cattle were mostly used as coal. The only manure was the silt from rivers and canals and pigeon droppings: Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule, p. 277.

\textsuperscript{453} About Samarkand, Mir Izzatullah observed, “It (Samarkand) had fallen into such utter ruin and decay, that tigers and wolves had actually taken adobe in the colleges ... which was situated in the centre of the city”: Mir Izzatullah, Travels in Central Asia in the Year 1812-13, tr. P. D. Henderson, Calcutta: Foreign Department, 1882, p. 56; Yuri Bregal, “Central Asia in the end of XVIII at the beginning of XIX century”: \texttt{http://www.ast.uz/en/catalog.php?bid=72&sid=71&aid=358}


\textsuperscript{455} The exodus was also facilitated by better life standards in cities and the failure of the feudatories to protect the tenants amid external invasions. Following the series of Qipchaq invasions into Samarkand in 1735 about 12,000 residents fled to India: T. K. Beisembiev, “Farghana’s Contacts with India in the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Centuries,” Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 124-35; Cf. Scott. C. Levi (ed.), India and Central Asia: Commerce and
(A.ii). Serf Reactions:

Serf reaction may simply be described as an anti-feudal civil dissension triggered by an inequitable resource sharing pattern, which recognized the feudatories as the chief appropriators of surplus.\textsuperscript{456} However, for want of political wisdom and proper leadership, the tenant reactions or uprisings were mostly expressed through the acts of exodus, protest, denial of rent and unwarranted services to the feudatories.\textsuperscript{457} Thus like the peasant uprisings, the tenant uprisings in the Khanates were symbolic of the “weapons of the weak.”\textsuperscript{458}

However, references to such uprising though ample lack several details about their real nature.\textsuperscript{459} In 1784 A.D. and on the eve of the assumption of Bukharan throne by Shah Murad (1785-1800 A.D.), a rebellion took place in which one thousand people died.\textsuperscript{460} In 1800 A.D., the Turkmen tenants and artisans of Merv reacted to the excesses of the Bukharan zakatchis\textsuperscript{461} and in 1801, the revolt spread to Kerki.\textsuperscript{462} The similar demonstration was recorded against the ill treatment of Mirza Razi of Mazandaran in 1813. The Yamuts and Goklan tribes stirred up and resisted the rule of Astrakhan in 1826-27 and 1841.\textsuperscript{463} The biggest uprising was that of the Kitay Qipchaq of Miyan Qala situated between Bukhara and Samarkand against the


\textsuperscript{457} Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, pp. 35-36.


\textsuperscript{459} The 18\textsuperscript{th} - 19\textsuperscript{th} century tenant reactions though widely discussed, demand real and scientific interpretation.

\textsuperscript{460} We do not have figures of the causalities of the serfs and milki holders in the rebellion: A. Mukhtarov, “The Manghits,” History of Civilizations of Central Asia (ed.), Part V, p. 57.  

\textsuperscript{461} Zakatchis were entrusted with the work of collecting zakat.

\textsuperscript{462} Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, p. 35.

reign of Sultan Haider (1800-25 AD). Khokand experienced several disturbances during the reign of Sher Ali Khan (1842-45 AD). In 1855, Abdul Vasi organized the revolt of the peasants and the serfs of Baljuan against the exorbitant rent/tax structure of Amir Muzaffar (1860-1885) of Bukhara. Hard pressed by the excesses of the feudatories in Tashkent, the masses at large welcomed the anti-feudal response of General Chernief in 1865 notwithstanding his representing the imperial Russia: “… let every man carry on his work … houses, gardens, fields, lands, and water mills, of which you have possession, will remain your property. The soldiers will take nothing from you ….” It was perhaps for this reason that the masses of the Amirate appreciated the upcoming Russian rule. In 1858 AD, in Tashkent and Dast-i-Qipchaq, the peasants/serfs of Kyrgyz and Kazak ethnic background sharply reacted to the additional taxes and levies levied by Mirza Ahmad Qushbegi. The anti-feudal uprisings gained momentum under the Tsarists (1860-1917 AD). Shahr-i-Sabz region of Samarkand registered a strong uprising in 1868 AD. Similarly, three oblasts of Samarkand, Farghana and Syr Darya experienced 668 uprisings from 1887-1898: 429 in Farghana, 182 in Samarkand, 57 in Syr Darya. The 16 bandit attacks in Farghana and 9 in Samarkand in 1899 enhanced to 324 in Farghana by 1917 and 166 in Samarkand by 1915.

---

465 To stabilize the situation Musalmaon Qul, the Mongbashio (commander of 1,000 troops) was sent to quell the revolt: *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Part V, p. 75.
466 The poor peasant leader was defeated and executed at Shahrisabz, nonetheless he remained a legend: *Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia*, p. 35.
467 Cf. Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand, p. 245.
470 *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early Times*, p. 82.
(A.iii). Feudal Response:

Since the feudatories thrived on the rent and labour of the tenants, the major source of their income, they, as such, strived to keep the tenants in good humour for they laid golden egg for them. Nonetheless, as a pressure tactics, they used force to reckon with the restive peasants and serfs. The response of the Amir Subhan Kuli Khan (1681-1702 AD) and Baqi Mohammad of Bukhara offer the typical example in this behalf. Being the lord and overlord both, the former enhanced the rent of the tenants by seven times, and the latter stopped the water supply of Nasaf Canal for irrigation of the arable land of the restive peasants. Simultaneously, for strategic reasons, they combined force with aid and assistance of the tenants, and provided them modern agricultural implements like metal plough driven by horses, yoke and assess: the latter were also used to drive mills (Chahar Kharas - Four Ass Mills).

True the tenants were bound to render extra service to the feudatories for the maintenance of their fields and houses. At the same time, the feudatories facilitated them drawing water from the canals for irrigation of their agricultural fields. Credit loans (bunak) and other agricultural implements were advanced to

---

472 The right to realize rent and extract labour were the essentials of the feudal mode of production: Cf. Irfan Habib, “Classifying pre-Colonial India,” The Feudalism Debate (ed.), New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 1999, p. 189.
477 Mirza Haider Daughlat informs by writing that in 1544 “he often found Chagtayid Khan, Sultan Vays Khan during hot seasons, with the help of his slaves, drawing water from the well in pitchers and pouring it himself over the land”: Mirza Hayder Doughlat, Tarikh-i-Rashidi, Eng. tr. N. Elias and E. Denison Ross, History of Mongols of Central Asia, 2nd ed., London, 1898, p. 67; History of Civilizations of Central Asia, p. 377.
them and, at times, levies and taxes were remitted. The provision of providing food, clothes etc. were the other sources of support to the tenants.

No doubt, at times, such a relief caused financial loss to the feudatories. But they made up the same by enforcing their own choice of production on the tenants. While Mohammad Rahim, Khan of Khiva, exempted cattle and other taxes of the tenants, he juxtapose forced them to grow wheat, rice, sesame and jugan to meet their export demand, which automatically restricted the scope of “free peasant production”. Further, the tenants were barred to sell whatever little surplus they had until the feudatories had disposed whole lot of produce and that too at the arbitrarily fixed prices. Similarly, the credit loans were advanced to the tenants at the high interest rate of 40-60%. Slaves too were subjected to a certain share of their produce to the feudal lords. For instance, a Russian slave, Gregory Pulakoff, paid seven tillas \((30 \text{ tillas} = 200 \text{ rupees})\) to his master out of income. Thus, feudal support to the tenants was virtually rhetoric, and sounded more to the benefit of lords than the tenants. Peasants’ recalcitrance was but natural to follow the above phenomenon.

(B). Role of the States:

Though theoretically, the Amir/Khan was sovereign and the feudatories were subservient to him, yet privileges granted to them virtually made them overlords in their respective estates. This sounded not only decentralization of royal power but

---

480 *Journey to Khiva Through the Turkmon Country*, pp. 139-140.
481 *Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from the Early 19th Century*, p. 69.
482 *Travels into Bukhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus*, p. 119.
483 *Travels into Bukhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus*, p. 136.
loss of state revenue in the regions so assigned to the feudatories. More so, it exposed the tenants to increasing complications. Perhaps for this reason, the state brought the lord-overlord relationship within the legal framework. With this intention, Amir Nasrullah (1826-1860) in Bukhara, introduced several politico-administrative reforms, to re-establish the state sovereignty and subject everything including the begs to it. Accordingly, he confiscated all tankhoh grants and brought them under amlok (state land) suggesting thereby that the rights of the feudatories on land were of non-usufruct nature. Subsequently, tankhoh grants were re-allotted to the able and loyal men who acknowledged the king as their sovereign. Similarly, waqf grants were rationalized on paternal rather than the hierarchical lines. The begs were also directed to share a certain part of their revenue with the state (the king as an overlord), and at the same time, state dependence on the feudatories for military services, were ended by creating regular state army (sarboz/askariyya) under the supervision of Tupchi-bashi-vi-lashkar (commander of artillery). Slavery was abolished by Abdul Ahad (Amir of Bukhara 1885-1910)

---

484 The weak feudal lords sub-infeudated their estates for reasons: to escape the obligations of payment of tribute to the overlord, and protection to the subjects in the event of external invasions.
485 He brought about radical change in the politico-administrative set up, he divided his whole Emirate into well defined twenty five to twenty eight vilayats and kept them under the control of begs (governors). The vilayats were sub-divided into amloks (from three to twenty five per vilayat), run by the amlokldars, who again were put under the control of begs. The amloks were further divided into hamlets/villages (qishloks) each kept under the aqsoqols (village elders). In financial matters, the position devanbegi (revenue minister) was consolidated. The zakatchis (collectors of zakat) were made accountable for the revenues to the Khans and begs. In this way, two administrative systems were evolved, one from above and another from below. More important was that the nobility was diversified to include people of different ethnic groups, the Tajik, Turkmen, Persians, etc.: Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, pp. 25-26, 28-29.
487 Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, pp. 25, 26, 27, 29.
488 Travel into Central Asia, p. 100; Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian, p. 27.
though its reminiscence continued. The Khan of Khokand, Alim Khan (1799-1811), worked out a four-pronged plan to strengthen the state against the feudal system: forbade feudal gifts and the taxes/levies except those prescribed by the state. He also de-recognized the prices of legal deeds at will and instead of land grants paid his officials in terms of regular salary. Similarly, in Khiva, Iltuzsar or Ilt Nazar (1804-1806) marginalized the power of the feudatories by including Sarts in administration.

Notwithstanding these measures to reinforce state system, the lord-serf relationship continued to be dominated by the seigniorial rights of the feudatories. As a matter of the fact, the feudal legacy was so well-propounded that it continued even after the fall of the Khanates and their occupation by the Tsars (1856-1917). Even the Tsars allowed Bukharan and Khivan vassals to retain their feudal privileges. The only change was in the composition of hitherto existing feudal


490 *Islam and Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asian*, p. 90.


492 Sarts were the members of the non-tribal or urban class. They spoke Turkic though the Tajiks among them spoke Persian: Svat Succek, *History of Inner Asia*, London: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 187.


structure. A new class (kulaks), loyal to the Tsars, was reorganized by the new regime by changing the feudal land tenure and its allied taxation systems.\textsuperscript{495} However, towards 1886, feudal basis were gradually marginalized, and vide “Statute for the Administration of the Turkestan Region”, the ownership rights of the feudatories, the mulki/milki (ownership) rights, on the big estates, were abolished and declared state property.\textsuperscript{496} The confiscated land was distributed among the tenants on customary law and hereditary basis.\textsuperscript{497} Waqf grants were transferred to village communities for use, and those held by the private persons (waqf-i-ahli) were allowed to be passed on next to their heirs. No land could be henceforth declared as waqf without the consent of the state, exceptions apart. Waqf grants were, therefore, directly brought under the state control.\textsuperscript{498} Though in the beginning, rights of the feudatories on water were allowed to continue under the regulation, “Temporary Rules on Irrigation of the Turkestan Region” (1877), but in 1888, district heads - aqsoqols (village elders), aryk-aqsoqols (village official in-charge of small streams) and mirobs (an official in charge of irrigation) were made responsible for equitable distribution of water with no preferential treatment to feudatories.\textsuperscript{499} Besides, a host of feudal levies were done away with and instead kharaj (at the rate of 1/10\textsuperscript{th} of the gross produce), tanop (orchard tax) and zakat (2 ½

\textsuperscript{495} General K. P. Kaufman had served in the military administration of Poland, and, as such, brought about several changes there after 1863. He applied the similar changes in Turkestan: D. S. M. Williams, “Land Reform in Turkestan,” \textit{The Slavonic and East European Review}, Vol. 51, No. 124, London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, p. 428: \url{http://www.jstor.org/stable/4206748}, (accessed: 06/12/2008)

\textsuperscript{496} “Fiscal Reform in Turkestan,” \textit{The Slavonic and East European Review}, p. 429.

\textsuperscript{497} Water problems of Central Asia, p. 23.
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% on the trading capital were realized. Any collection beyond the fixed schedule by the revenue functionaries was strictly checked. Land distribution was properly registered to avoid dispute among the users. In judicial matters, a plaintiff had the right to appeal to the Qazi whom he trusted more. These legislations regulated the feudal laws in Central Asia, which in itself posed a great threat to the existential reality of feudalism in the post-Khanate Central Asia. In fact, such changes in the feudal structure were pre-empted by commercialization of agriculture, and development of trade (both internal and external) and growth of cities and towns. At the end of it, feudalism gradually declined giving way to the

---

500 As per the Art. 6 of the Russo-Bukharan Friendship Treaty of 1873, only 1/40th was levied on the imports from Russia to Bukhara and exports from Bukhara to Russia: Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva (185-1924), Appendix 3, p. 319.


505 Cotton and wheat cultivation was widened to reduce the dependence on foreign imports. The cotton area increased from 1,080,000 in 1903 to 1,320,000 by 1913 in Bukhara, and from 510,000 to 915,000 in Khiva during the same period. The area under grains also increased substantially, with total harvest in southern Central Asia increasing from 2.2 million tons (138.6 million poods) in 1900 to 4.3 million tons (264 million poods) in 1915: Central Asia: A Century of Russian Rule, pp. 272, 276; Gerard O’Neill, “Land and Water Reform’ in the 1920s,” Central Asia: Aspects of Transition, (ed.), Tom Everett-Heath, London and New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003, p. 67.

506 The development of trade was nurtured by the means of communication in which construction of Trans-Caspian Railway played a crucial role. Started in 1881 from Gulf of Mikhailovsky to Qazil Arvat, the line reached Ashkhabad four years later, Merv in 1886, Charju and Amu Darya across the desert of Qara Kum at the end of 1886, and Samarkand in 1888. In 1894, the point of departure was shifted to Krasnovodsk. In 1898, the Marv-Khshki branch line was built and in 1899 appeared a new line from Samarkand to Andijan, with branches stretching to Tashkent and Novy Margelan. The main line from Krasnovodsk to Tashkent stretched over 1,748 versts: Cf. Islam and the Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia, p. 39; George Dubson, Russia’s Railway Advances into Central Asia, London, 1980, pp. 370-371; Russian Protectorates in Central Asia: Bukhara and Khiva (1865-1924), pp. 188-191. With the railway network, import-export increased. For example, Bukharan imports from Russia increased from 142.7 million rubles to 1,139 million rubles during 1849 to 1867 and from 43 thousand poods to 265 thousand poods during 1880 to 1913: Islam and the Russian Empire: Reform and Revolution in Central Asia, p. 42. Similarly, Khivan import-export from and into Russia increased from 3 million rubles between 1873-1885 to 11.8 million annually in 1898: Mary Holdsworth, Turkistan in
development of the capitalist mode of production.\textsuperscript{507} Though peasant exploitation continued,\textsuperscript{508} but the serfs were no more tied to land of the feudatories. The Law Code (\textit{Ulozhenie}) of 1649 A.D. granted serfs the right to leave the village temporarily in order to seek employment or to pursue other economic activities\textsuperscript{509} and take services with new class of bourgeoisie in towns and cities for better wages,\textsuperscript{510} food, and wage earnings in cash.\textsuperscript{511} The cash earnings, according to Marx, naturally was the last form of the dissolution of feudalism and growth of capitalism,\textsuperscript{512} and thereby a redeemer stimulant of age-long exploitation of servile serfs at the hands of the feudatories.\textsuperscript{513} Rustam Khan Urfi attests to the impact of money/gold circulation on the members of those families who were tied to the land of and bound by service to the great lord, Alim Khan, from 1910-1920.\textsuperscript{514} The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{507} T. H. Aston (ed.), \textit{The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-industrial Europe}, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, reprint 1995, p. 120.
\item \textsuperscript{508} Ya. Ya. Lyutsh, Russian political agent in Bukhara from I902 to I911, calculated that the peasants of Bukhara were taxed eight times as heavily as their cousins in Russian Turkestan: Cf: “Fiscal Reform in Turkestan,” Vol. 52, No. 128, \textit{The Slavonic and East European Review}, p. 392.
\item \textsuperscript{510} Turkmens employed in Khiva for making troughs and pipes from the trunks of the tress for water supply were paid forty to eighty kopecks a day with food: \textit{Through Khiva to Golden Samarkand}, pp. 76, 204.
\item \textsuperscript{511} Socialist Agrarian Reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, p.73.
\item \textsuperscript{513} Paul Sweezy (ed.), \textit{Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism}, Delhi: Aakar Books, reprint 2006, p. 43.
\end{itemize}
gradual shift from natural to market economy was, therefore, the last nail in the coffin of feudal mode of production in Central Asia and elsewhere.\footnote{515}

Though the Tsars relaxed the feudal laws,\footnote{516} it were actually the Soviets who actually eliminated feudalism for it ran across the Leninist-Marxist ideology of social development. They nationalized all means and forces of production to pave way for a classless society. The land and water under the big estates\footnote{517} of the feudatories and the church,\footnote{518} were confiscated and distributed among landless.\footnote{519} Stalin’s “Two class - one Stratum”\footnote{520} policy made a breakthrough in this behalf. Consequently, the share of feudal estates and kulak-bay holdings which was 11% in 1913, decreased to 5% by 1928 and just 0% zero percent by 1939.\footnote{521}


\footnote{516}{Vasily Jan (1874-1954), was a Soviet scholar who visited Khiva in 1902 and served as an inspector of wells in Turkistan between 1901-1904: Cf. Aftandil Erkinov, “A. N. Samojlovich’s Visit to the Khanate of Khiva in 1908 and His Assessment of the Literary Environment,” \textit{International Journal of Central Asian Studies}, p. 119.}

\footnote{517}{Belgian Tashkent Farm and American Singer Company offer two typical examples in this regard. Besides more than 700 such enterprises were nationalized: Najeda Ozerova, “Soviet Policy of Economic Nationalism in Uzbekistan and its Consequences-1917-1940,” \textit{Central Eurasian Studies Review}, Vol.3, No.2, 2004, p.25.}

\footnote{518}{All waqf grants of whatever nature were confiscated. Even mosques and madrassas were not spared, the Baraq Khan Madrassa (Tashkent) and Mir Arab Mosque (Bukhara) made exceptions: \textit{Central Asia in Modern Times: A History from Early Times} p. 231; R. R. Sharma, \textit{USSR in Transition: Issues and Themes (1922-82)}, New Delhi, 1985, p.212.}


\footnote{520}{Joseph Stalin defined class in terms of peasant/labour relations with the means of production and production relations, on which they held no proprietorship under the Soviets. Therefore, he recognized only two classes - working class and peasantry in the country. L. G. Churchward, \textit{Soviet Socialism: Social and Political Essays}, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1987, pp. 26-27.}

\footnote{521}{Socialist Agrarian reforms in Soviet Central Asia and Kazakhstan, p.91; \textit{Soviet Peasantry: An Outline History}, pp. 93-94.}
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Conclusion

Feudalism, as a political and socio-economic institution was a historical development. It stood mid-way in the transition of the Western European economy from a slave based system of agricultural production to one dominated by capitalism. The system evolved due to political bankruptcy and the failure of the Roman government to protect its subjects from the tribal inroads in the 7th-8th century. Pursuant to this, life had become most insecure. Socio-economic and political institutions had virtually crumbled and villages and towns had become isolated following breakdown of communication and transport network.

Under these circumstances, the Roman Empire allowed the strongest local chieftains to guard and raise fortified walls around their respective areas for human security. The emperor legally recognized these chieftains as the owners of whatever was under and above the land in the said areas. However, in return, they were bound to acknowledge the emperor as their overlord and provide him tribute and necessary military services as and when asked for.

For the fear of death, weaker sections of the peasantry sought refuge in the fortified domains of their lords. In lieu therefore, they pledged loyalty and surrendered their all hitherto-held hereditary rights on land. Thus, developed a give and take relationship based on a contract between the overlord and lord/ protector and the protected/the lord and the vassal.

On a personal bond, the lord provided a strip of land along with the agricultural inputs to the peasants from his estates. It was termed as “fief” from which latter emanated the term “feudal.” Thus, under forced circumstances, former peasant proprietors either became tenant farmers (paid rent to the lord for the use of his land) or worst serfs who were tied to the lord’s land in perpetuity. Besides working on the fief, they were required to render involuntary services on the
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personal land of the lord, the “manor.” They lived in dreary houses adjacent to
“manor,” the smallest land holding and the most self-sufficient productive unit. All
this led to radical change in land tenures and social formation, and evolved two
broad social divisions of the nobles and clergy on the one hand and most
unprivileged tenants on the other. Because of the immense exploitation of their
labour and produce, the latter were transformed into salable commodities, and thus
pushed to a life next to that of the animals.

However, feudalism either as a social and political organization or as a mode
of production, wherein the basic producers were siphoned of their surplus produce
through extra-economic force, was neither regional nor time-specific institution. It
was in vogue in different forms in both European and non-European communities
during a protracted course of history. In an ever widening circle, it obtained in
Spain, Mediterranean World, East Europe, Turkey, Iran, India, Japan, China
notwithstanding geographical, technological and cultural variations; hence, was
named differently such as European feudalism, Japanese feudalism, Indian
feudalism, Chinese feudalism, nomadic feudalism so on and so forth.

In Central Asian Khanates of Bukhara, Khiva and Khokand, the said
phenomenon surfaced with the chaotic conditions following the breakdown of the
centralized Uzbek Khanate (16th century), tribal invasions, socio-economic
depprivation and human insecurity, and ever decaying communication and
transportation networks. Thus developed feudalism out of a destabilized power
structure of the Khanates in the 16th century.

Since feudalism in the Khanates and elsewhere was agrarian-oriented, whole
set of social and economic relations revolved round the lord-tenant bond. True,
theoretically all land belonged to the Khan/Amir as mamlik-i-padshahi which left no
scope for private property in land. In actual practice, however, the Khans of Khiva,
Khokand and Bukhara parceled out some portions of land and its revenue among the
heirs, and civil and military officials in lieu of their salary. The land grants/estates
were made out of the state land termed amlok. These assignees called
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tanhkohdar/chekdar recognized the Amir as their overlord and agreed to pay tribute and provide him military services at the time of political crisis arising out of internal strife or external invasions. This sort of reciprocity of give and take relationship, made the feudal institution strong in the history of the Khanates.

However, since the estates were quite large in extent, the vassals sub-infeudated them among their own men. In this way, began the multi-layered process of lord-vassal relationship and the chain of potentates organized in some hierarchical order with Amir/Khan as overlord at the top and the petty civil official or soldiers at the bottom pledging. Still lower in feudal organization and social stratification was the peasantry (dehkan) who pledged loyalty to their concerned lords and surrendered hereditary land rights to them in exchange of the assured security.

The lords were entitled to enormous rights both on land and on peasantry, the most exploited group of the nascent serfs. They paid rent to the landlord for use of land and were tied to the same. They were disallowed to leave the land or village without the permission of their lords. The violation thereof, was reckoned with their flogging /death/captivity. On grounds of suspicion, their ears were nailed to a post or the house door, where they were left for three days without food and exposed to jibes of passersby. At times, they were subjected to death in an isolated room either by starvation or because of the strings/bites of the swarming flies. On top of it, they had no right to appeal before any legal or administrative authority. They were denied water rights for irrigation or else evicted from land in case they ever refused tillage of land due to over-exactions. They were bound to seek prior permission of the lords for marriage of their children suggesting extreme level of personal enslavement under the Khanates much like their European or Indian counterparts.

However, this should not presuppose that whole land in the Khanates was feudal in organization. There were indeed milkiyati sets of land held by the peasants with rights to possess, use, own, and “free production.” Nonetheless, their right to appropriate surplus was limited due to enormous state taxes and levies; hence,
approached the feudatories for agricultural capital, draught animals, seeds, implements etc., on much exorbitant interest rates of 40-60%, indicating their, over or covert, dependence on the feudal structure. In view of their incapacity to repay the same, they often, if not always, disposed of or pawned their lands to the feudatories as reimbursement.

Since feudalism in Central Asia was based on labour and surplus extraction of agricultural produce from the peasants through feudal mode of governance, it caused adverse impact on the overall growth and development of the Khanates. Politically, the Khanates fragmented into a number of power pockets held by hoards of feudal lords. These ran parallel to the state-run institutions and their holders practically functioned as “parcelized sovereigns” in their defined domain. The feudatories of Shahr-i-Sabz, Ḫišar, Qarategin, and Darvaz in Bukhara, and Nurata, Kolab, Khujand, Ura-Tube, Jizak, Khatirchi, Kattakurgan, etc. in Khokand substantiate the fact. This automatically triggered the circumstances whereby royal powers shrank and that of the feudatories swelled. The extent was such that the weak Amir Abul Fayz Khan (1711-1747) of Bukhara was virtually confined to his fortified palace.

The waqf grant holders, muftis and qazis, also developed feudal tendencies in view of weakening state system. They assumed next to the feudal lords in their own domain, amassed disproportionate wealth from their religious grants, and meddled with political affairs of the Khanates. The role of Makhdum-i-Azam, a sufi saint of Farghana, Ihsan Baba Akhund Shadman, in early 20th century, offers the typical example in this regard. As a matter of fact, the feudatories were emboldened enough to absorb in themselves the powers beyond their prescribed jurisdiction and legal framework. They denied the payment of dues to the Khanates causing immense loss to the exchequer.

Paradoxically, instead of daunting them for their violative behaviour, the Amirs and Khans adopted alternate measures to supplement the resources through the sale of state and madrassa lands to those private individuals who had no
knowledge of statecraft or learning. The Khan of Khokand adopted a new monetary policy to cope up with the economic crisis. The weight of the silver coins was reduced, say from 4.44 grams to 3-2.50 grams a tanga/tenghe (a silver coin) in the early 19th century: one tanga was worth 20 silver kopecks. Besides reinforcing the state exchequer, the said measure lowered down prices of the commercial crops: in Bukhara, an indigo costing 12 tillas/pood (one tilla was equal to 15 rubles), fell by 11 to 10, 8, 6, 4 and 2 tillas a pood by 1833. The purchasing power went so low that “the customers were dragged by their sleeves and flap” and trading activities were inevitably subordinated to the traditional barter and credit system. The given scenario suggests growing feudal powers in the face of weakening Khanates and the anarchy, chaos, and confusion following thereupon.

Encouraged by the said scenario, the feudal lords exploited the peasants/tenants/serfs beyond proportions. Under the rent structure, they realized 1/4 - ½ of the yield from the tenants as rent of the leased land, 2/5 - 3/4 as rent of the working cattle and implements, ½- 4/5th as interest on the given seeds, and 1/4th - 1/6th of the yield as interest on the leased money and clothes. Curiously, rent was collected in advance for several years together and arbitrarily increased as high as seven fold. The cruelest ever were the unpaid services asked from them by the feudatories (hasher) to maintain orchards, canals, houses, and roads. Taking advantage of the weak Amirs, the feudal lords encroached upon the state land and exploited peasant proprietors through an assortment of exorbitant taxes/levies. Kharaj was collected at 2/3rd of the produce as against ½ or 1/4th prescribed by the state, and mirobana (water duty) at 10% of their annual produce. Further, they were to annually deliver four cattle each tribal family in the name of kibitka (house tax), and the additional levies (wajuhat) like kishpuli (levy on a pair of draught animal in relation to land holding), yak shira (head-wise levy on draught animals), qafshan (levy paid towards revenue functionaries like amlokdar), tanafpuli and alafpuli (levy on orchards and vegetable gardens), kuprulpuli (toll on bridges), baj (custom duty paid towards the lord), nikhana (duty on marriage contracts),
tarikana/tarakana (duty on legal documents of inheritance), and various gifts to be presented to the feudatories on the festive occasions (toi): in all the levies numbered fifty five in Bukhara and twenty five in Khiva.

At the end, the peasants/tenants/serfs were barely left with anything except their own person. Boris Pazuklin, the envoy of Tsar Alexci Mikhailovich (1875-1895) to Bukhara, gives a pathetic view of the worsening situation: “… and over the years very little bread is left in some homes [of Bukhara, Balkh and Khiva].” Therefore, their conditions were most appalling as regards housing, food, and clothing. In fact, these aggravated in the event of crop failures, famines, draught, etc. Naturally, for most part of the year, the peasants subsisted on fruits, vegetables, milk etc. Building assets or keeping reserves of food stocks for rainy days was too distant a dream for the peasants at large. They were, more often than not, forced to borrow loans from the feudatories or resort to theft and brigandage for survival. The loans (bunak) were provided at exorbitant interest rates of 40-60% when the feudatories themselves obtained the same at quite low interest rates of 8-9%. As was natural, the debts accumulated year after year, which forced even the ordinary self-cultivating peasants whatever land or material possessions they had with them. Buyers in most, if not in all cases, were the feudal lords. Consequently, their landed estates enlarged manifold so that under the land distribution pattern, 12.2% land was under khasa (personal property of the Amir), 55.8% amlok (state land), 24.2% waqf (endowment), and just 7.8% was milki (private) lands. This indicates that 92.3% of the peasant population, out-numbering the milkiyati holders, worked on rent basis, and were inevitably dependent on the feudatories.

Living in the countryside and bound by law to the land, they depended on their little crops for subsistence. The share there from was so limited that their choice to buy even their routine consumer goods from the open markets at inflated prices fixed by the feudatories, was restricted. Amid this sort of “natural economy,” the society had two broad divisions, the lord, and the servile peasantry. The former were privileged enough to master maximum means and forces of production, and
the latter helplessly facilitated their urge for over-exploitation. This eventually forged great deal of economic differentiation between the “exploiter” and the “exploited” in the Central Asian Khanates, and thereby created what Maurice Dobb terms as the “bi-polarity” of European feudalism. On top of it, was the personal enslavement of the serfs, who were tied to land of the lord in the worst ever cruel form. Their routine personal and family activities were subordinated to the whims and wishes of the feudatories. They had no right to appeal against the feudal extortion, and had the mere satisfaction owing to right to land use (tasarruf-i-malikana).

Obviously, therefore, the peasants took exodus for better mode of existence. In sequence, village population contracted, say in Samarkand from 1, 50,000 souls in the 15th century to only 10, 000 towards the early 19th century. Similarly, the pastoralist population of Kazakhs in the Ti’en Shan Plateau declined by 9% between 1902 and 1912. In Farghana, Samarkand and Bukhara, 25-54% peasant families deserted by 1914, and those who stayed back had just one dessiatine of land for cultivation. The land situated between Panjdeh to Yalatun of the Murgab valley of Samarkand was, as such, deserted. However, the above abominable phenomenon must have not have been alone due to feudal or state excesses but rather other conditions related to natural calamity, political instability etc.

Even though the serf-lord relations were apparently smooth but a simmering indignation existed at its root on the issue of the appropriation of the produce. The feudatories claimed it under law whereas the tenants/serfs were reluctant to surrender the same for their own compulsions: growing family needs, traditional means of productions and climatic excesses. For these limitation, they could not contemplate in terms of any anti-feudal uprising fearing the patronage of the Amirs to them. Instead, one comes across the tenant supplications to them for justice and relief. This is why the tenants largely welcomed the anti-feudal drive of General Chernief in 1865 notwithstanding his representing the imperial Russia.
True the above predicament characterizing agrarian crisis, was quite deleterious to the peasantry for it denied them natural right to produce as per their own choice and optimize the surplus as a pre-requisite to their asset building capacity. But the feudatories themselves were uncomfortable with it because the peasants meant for them the hen that laid golden eggs for them in perpetuity. With this consideration in mind, the feudatories strived to keep the tenants in good humour by supporting them with money, loans, cattle, seeds, and other forms of agricultural investment. For strategic reasons, they provided them food, clothes and agricultural implements like metal plough driven by horses, yoke and ass, and facilitated them drawing water from the canals for irrigation of their agricultural fields. Credit loans (bunak), levies and taxes, at times, were remitted, say by Mohammad Rahim (1806–1826), the Khan of Khiva, and rent on land and cattle was exempted. Further, the peasants were permitted to dispose of their surplus, if any, before the stocks of the feudatories were exhausted.

However, the economic loss caused to the feudatories on above account was soon made up by them through corresponding measures, which included the cultivation of such crops, wheat, rice, sesame and jugan, as were relatively profitable to them. They enjoyed full patronage of the Amirs to impose their own choice of production on the tenants, though, at the same time, the Khanates showed considerable, if not equal, interests in the welfare of the tenants. For example, under The Law Code (Ulozhenie) of 1649 A.D., the tenants were empowered to leave the villages temporarily to seek employment with the bourgeoisie in towns and cities for better wages, food, and wage earnings in cash. The cash earnings, according to Marx, naturally was the last form of the dissolution of feudalism and growth of capitalism. Similarly, during 1826-60, Amir Nasrullah of Bukhara, introduced several politico-administrative measures to marginalize the feudatories for the relief of the peasantry, and the re-establishment of the Khanates’s preponderance over them. He confiscated all tankhoh grants and brought them under amlok (state land) and re-allotted them later to those able and loyal men who acknowledged the king as
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their sovereign. Likewise, waqf grants were rationalized on the hereditary lines. The begs/biis (feudatories) were directed to share a certain part of their revenue with the state (the king as an overlord). The state dependence on the feudatories for supply of troops was minimized by the recruitment of a regular state army (sarboz/askariyya). Slavery was done away with by Amir Abdul Ahad of Bukhara (1885-1910). During 1799-1811, Amir Alim Khan of Khokand worked out a four-pronged strategy to empower the state versus feudatories. He forbade feudal gifts and the taxes/levies excepting those prescribed by the state, and de-recognized the prices of legal deeds at will. Instead of land grants, he paid his officials in regular salary. Likewise, in Khiva, Iltuazar or Ilt Nazar (1804-1806) scuttled the feudatories by including Sarts (non-tribal urban dwellers) in administration.

Nonetheless, feudal excesses perpetuated as before. While Amir Subhan Kuli Khan (1681-1702 AD) enhanced the rent of the tenants by seven times, Baqi Mohammad stopped the water of Nasaf Canal for irrigation to the restive peasants of Bukhara. Even the early Tsars proved of no respite to the tenants on above account. The actual change occurred with the introduction of the “Statute for the Administration of the Turkestan Region” towards 1886, whereby ownership rights of the feudatories on the big estates, were withdrawn and declared state property. Subsequently, it was distributed among the tenants on the basis of customary law and hereditary principle. Waqf grants were transferred to village communities for use, and those held by the private persons (waqf-i-ahli) were allowed to be inherited by their next heirs. No further land was earmarked for the waqf grants. Aqsoqols (village elders), arik-aqsoqols (village official in-charge of small streams) and mirobs (official in charge of irrigation) were declared accountable for equitable water distribution with no preferential treatment to feudatories. Besides, a host of feudal levies were done away with, and instead of kharaj (at the rate of 1/10th of the gross produce), tanop (orchard tax) and zakat (2½ %) on the trading capital were realized. Any collection beyond the fixed schedule by the revenue functionaries was strictly forbidden. These legislations regulated the feudal laws in Central Asia
during the post-Khanate period. In fact, such changes in the feudal structure were pre-empted by commercialization of agriculture, development of trade (both internal and external) and the growth of cities and towns. With the declining trend in feudalism, capitalist mode of production surfaced as its alternative, and the serfs were instantly declared free from the feudal bondage.

In short, the feudalism in medieval Khanates of Central Asia was analogous to European feudalism in many, if not in all ways. Firstly, the Khan was an absolute ruler in Central Asia with no legal obligation/binding as was the case with their European counterparts. Secondly, private ownership in land was a powerful institution in Central Asia whereas it was weakly developed in medieval Europe. Thirdly, like Europe, Central Asian feudalism was governed by the hereditary principle, though the same was, at times, withdrawn on the grounds of expediency. Consequently, the Central Asia variety of feudalism characterized what is termed as the “prebendal” feudalism. Fourthly, vassals in Central Asia had no right to appeal against the lords whereas in Europe they had such a right guaranteed under feudal norms.
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Manghit Dynastic Rulers of the Khanate of Bukhara (1756–1920)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Hakim (1740–1743) installed in the Ashtarkhanid court by Nadir Shah of Persia; brought in his Manghit relatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Rahim (1743–1758) took title of Amir in 1756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Hakim (ca. 1740–1743) installed in the Ashtarkhanid court by Nadir Shah of Persia; brought in his Manghit relatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniyal</td>
<td>(1758–1785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Murad</td>
<td>(1785–1800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haidar</td>
<td>(1799/1800–1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasrullah</td>
<td>(1826–1860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzaffar</td>
<td>(1860–1885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Ahad</td>
<td>(1885–1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alim Khan</td>
<td>(1910–1920)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Qongrat Dynastic Rulers of the Khanate of Khiva (1804-1920)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iltuzar or Ilt Nazar</td>
<td>(1804–1806)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Rahim (I)</td>
<td>(1806–1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allah Quli</td>
<td>(1825–1840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Amin</td>
<td>(1846–1855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855–1867 period of war and multiple, short-lived rulers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Muhammad Rahim (II)</td>
<td>(1865–1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isfendiyar</td>
<td>(1910–1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayyid Abdullah</td>
<td>(1918–1920)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ming Dynastic Rulers of the Khanate of Khokand (1710-1876)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shah Rukh</td>
<td>(1710–1721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Rahim</td>
<td>(1721–1734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Karim</td>
<td>(1734–1750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irdana</td>
<td>(1751–1770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbuta</td>
<td>(1774–1798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alim Khan</td>
<td>(1799–1811)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umar</td>
<td>(1811–1822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Ali</td>
<td>(1822–1841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan Mahmud</td>
<td>(1841–1842)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shir Ali</td>
<td>(1842–1845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khudoyar Khan</td>
<td>(1845–1858; 1862–1863; 1865–1875)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Central Asian and Russian Terms

**Adat:** Customary law

**Aksaqal (Kyrgyz), Oqsoqol (Uzbek):** Literally a ‘white beard’, in Khanates a head of the village community (*Mahalla*)

**Aminana:** A market tax

**Amlok (Tajik, Uzbek):** State land

**Amlokdar:** Holder of *Amlok* land; a tax inspector; a local commander

**Aq suiek (Kazak):** A ‘white bone’; Kazak noble

**Arbob (Tajik):** An elder of community (*Mahalla*)

**Ariq (Uzbek):** An irrigation canal

**Ariq Aksaqal:** Official in-charge of irrigation canal

**Ark (Tajik, Uzbek):** A fortress

**Ash (Kyrgyz):** Food; common meal

**Betriki (Russian):** Landless peasant

**Bek (Uzbek, Tajik):** ruler of province (*Vilayat*)

**Beklik (Uzbek):** Province (*Vilayat*)

**Bi (Kazak):** A chieftain

**Bii (Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Kara-Kalpak):** A chieftain

**Bunak (Russian):** Credit given to peasants

**Chala manap (Kyrgyz):** A minor *manap*

**Cholok manap (Kyrgyz):** A curtailed *manap*, the village elder

**Chomry (Turkmen):** A settled Turkmen tribe

**Dap (Turkmen):** The customs; customary law

**Dasturkhan (Uzbek):** A cloth for meals

**Devon (Tajik, Uzbek):** Council of the ruler/Khan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devanbegi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Finance minister of the Emir of Bukhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodkhoh (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A military leader in the Khanate of Khokand; A high ranked official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbegi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A tribal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihsan</td>
<td>A dervish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guzar</td>
<td>A ward in towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokim (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovuz (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il (Turkmen)</td>
<td>A tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoq (Uzbek)</td>
<td>An Uzbek tribal leader; an official at Amir’s court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iorliq (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Land Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iorliqli mulk (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Land property due to title granted by the ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iuzboshi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A ‘head of hundred’; A minor regional commander or tribal leader with in the Khanate and Amirate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadid (Uzbek)</td>
<td>New Method; A supporter of reformed schooling in Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khasa</td>
<td>State land; private land of the ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kheradzh (Russian)</td>
<td>Harvest tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoja (Tajik)</td>
<td>An honourable; a person who is believed to decent from the Four Caliphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khun (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Blood money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundar (Kyrgyz)</td>
<td>A person who is in-charge of paying blood money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushachi</td>
<td>An agricultural labourer; one who collected fallen remains after the harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrassa (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>Islamic seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalla (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A village community; Neighborhood yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maktab (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A religious primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manap (Kyrgyz)</td>
<td>A Kyrgyz usurper, A Kyrgyz tribal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongboshi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A head of thousand; A regional commander in the Khanates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>A ruler in Bukhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirob (Uzbek, Tajik), Mirab (Russian)</td>
<td>An official in charge of irrigation canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mufti (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Religious head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulk (Tajik, Uzbek, Turkmen)</td>
<td>A property acknowledge by Islamic law; A private property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulki hurriat (Tajik)</td>
<td>Tax-free lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulki usher (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>Lands paying one-tenth of yield to the ruler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutvalle/Mutvalli (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A curator of waqf endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblast (Russian)</td>
<td>Regional Tsarist administrative unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noker/Nukar (Turkmen, Russian)</td>
<td>A slave, An armed tribesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogruk (Russian)</td>
<td>Tsarist administrative unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omci (Mongolian)</td>
<td>A land grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onbashi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A ‘head of ten’- a local leader in Khanates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otaliq (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A tribal leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjbegi</td>
<td>A minor water official of the Amirate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvonchee /Parvonchi</td>
<td>A military commander in Khokand; high ranked official in Bukhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podsholik (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Land of the Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qara suiek (Kazakh)</td>
<td>A ‘black bone’; Kazak commoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qala (Kazak, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qishlov (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A winter quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qishloq (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qazi kolan (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>Supreme judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubi (Mongolian)</td>
<td>A fief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queshbegi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>A minister at the court of Khiva; a governor in Khokand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rais (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>An official who supervised Islamic customs and controlled measures at market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarboz (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>An infantryman; a regular soldier of the Amir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sart (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Urban dweller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharia (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>Canonized Islamic law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suv (Turkmen)</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankhoh (Tajik), Tanho (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Tax-free lands granted by the emir in lieu of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanop (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>A square measurement (between 0.166 and 0.5 hectares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi (Kyrgyz)</td>
<td>A feast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuman (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>A military unit of ten thousand; an administrative unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urug (Turkmen)</td>
<td>A tribe; a tribal decent group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ushr (Tajik, Uzbek)</td>
<td>Tithe; a tax of one-tenth of the yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaqf (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>A religious estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajuhat</td>
<td>Additional levies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasilat</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasa</td>
<td>Mongolian customary law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakat (Uzbek, Tajik)</td>
<td>Religious alms; tax on merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakotchi (Uzbek)</td>
<td>An official who collected zakat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamini jamoat (Uzbek)</td>
<td>Communal land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Map. 1.1: Central Asian Khanates (18th Century)
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Chart 2.1

Feudal Economy Model

LLD = Low Level Development

- LLD of Productive Forces
- LLD of Division of Labour

LLD of Market
- Serfdom: Production Relations
  - Predominance of Production for Use
  - (The class antagonism an element of instability)

A Custom Bound Social System
- No Significant Development of Social Consciousness

Negligible Technical Progress

LLD of Productive Forces

Growth of External Market
- An External Dis-equilibrating shock factor

http://www.jstor.org/stable/4537392
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Fig. 3.1: Land Tenure System in Central Asia (18th century)
Fig. 3.2: Feudal Pyramid/Structure in Central Asian Khanates – 18th century (Top to Bottom)
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Fig. 4. 1: Kosh Madrassa’s (Bukhara) deteriorated arched gate. (Photo: Cf. *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Part V, Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2003, p. 500.)
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Fig. 4.2: Plan showing the development of Bukhara. The black area is the ark (citadel), the shaded area the sharistan, and I-IV illustrates the outer town with agriculture.