

Tārīkh-i Khumūlī As A Source on The Final Phase of Janid (Astrakhanid) Rule in Bukhara

Diloram Khujamkulovna Sangirova

Associate Professor, Gulistan State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 13 February 2026; **Accepted:** 10 March 2026; **Published:** 31 March 2026

Abstract: This article examines Mullā Jum‘aqlī Khumūlī’s Tārīkh-i Khumūlī as a retrospective local narrative of the final phase of Janid (Astrakhanid) rule and the transfer of effective power to the Manghit elite in Bukhara. Rather than treating the chronicle as a transparent record of mid-eighteenth-century events, the study distinguishes between eyewitness testimony, reports derived from earlier written and oral traditions, and the author’s nineteenth-century interpretation of dynastic change. External and internal source criticism, historical comparison, chronological analysis, narrative analysis, and a systemic approach are employed. The findings show that Khumūlī explains the collapse of Janid authority not only through Nādir Shāh’s intervention but also through the erosion of central power, court and tribal rivalries, the growing autonomy of provincial military elites, and the political passivity attributed to Abū al-Fayz Khān. Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī’s rise is presented as a gradual process based on military experience, control of information, alliance-building, and selective use of Chinggisid legitimacy. At the same time, discrepancies between Khumūlī’s account and other historical evidence – especially concerning the identity and sequence of the nominal Chinggisid khans – demonstrate the need for caution. Tārīkh-i Khumūlī is therefore most valuable not as an eyewitness chronicle of the 1740s, but as evidence of how the transition from Janid to Manghit rule was remembered, morally evaluated, and politically legitimized in nineteenth-century local historiography.

Keywords: Mullā Jum‘aqlī Khumūlī; Tārīkh-i Khumūlī; Janid dynasty; Astrakhanids; Abū al-Fayz Khān; Nādir Shāh; Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī; Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī; Manghits; Bukhara; Transoxiana; Chinggisid legitimacy; source criticism; local historiography.

Introduction: Written works produced by local historians occupy a central place in the study of Central Asian statehood. Such texts preserve more than a sequence of political events: they also reveal the organization of government, relations between rulers and court officials, the changing position of military and tribal elites, mechanisms of dynastic legitimation, and the moral and intellectual assumptions of the environment in which an author wrote. For this reason, local chronicles must be read simultaneously as repositories of historical information and as constructed narratives shaped by retrospective knowledge, political expectations, and literary convention.

One of the important texts in this category is Tārīkh-i Khumūlī, composed by Jum‘aqlī ibn Ṣūfī Muḥammad

Tughāy al-Turkī al-Samarqandī, known by the pen name Khumūlī. Born in 1190 AH/1776–77 CE, Khumūlī lived under the early Manghit rulers and wrote in an intellectual milieu closely connected with Samarkand, Urgut, Bukhara, madrasas, Sufi networks, and the administrative culture of the Bukharan state. His work combines historical narrative, autobiography, biographical and hagiographical material, and descriptions of institutions and urban life. It is particularly valuable for the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when some of the events described fell within the author’s lifetime and, in several cases, within his personal observation.

The political background to the chronicle’s earlier chapters was the profound crisis of the Bukharan Khanate during the first half of the eighteenth century.

Under Abū al-Fayṣ Khān (r. 1711–1747), the authority of the Janid court contracted, tribal and provincial leaders gained increasing autonomy, economic and demographic disruption affected the central regions, and the khan's ataliqs acquired decisive influence. Nādir Shāh's campaign of 1740 did not create these structural weaknesses, but it altered the balance of power by drawing Manghit leaders – specially Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī and his son Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī – into an imperial network of military service and patronage. Modern scholarship generally emphasizes that the rise of the Manghits emerged from the interaction of internal fragmentation, external intervention, and the long-standing problem of political legitimacy in a polity where the title of khan remained tied to Chinggisid descent [18; 19].

This article asks how *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* explains the decline of Janid rule and the rise of Manghit power. Its principal objective is not simply to extract factual information about the 1740s and 1750s, but to identify the causal structure, moral judgments, political contrasts, and legitimating strategies embedded in Khumūlī's narrative. The article also distinguishes between passages based on personal observation and those that represent a later reconstruction of events that occurred before the author's birth. This distinction is essential because the value of the text changes according to the temporal distance between author and event.

The article's contribution lies in treating the Janid section of *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* as a retrospective political narrative that functions as a prehistory of Manghit rule. Khumūlī juxtaposes the weakness of Abū al-Fayṣ Khān with the decisiveness of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, links foreign intervention to domestic administrative collapse, and presents the preservation of Chinggisid forms as a temporary instrument in the construction of a new non-Chinggisid dynasty. At the same time, the article subjects these claims to source criticism and notes points at which the chronicle's sequence differs from other evidence.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH GAP

The study of Mullā Jum'aqulī Khumūlī's life, literary activity, and historical writings began through biographical notices and manuscript catalogues. Qori Rahmatulloh Vozeh [1], Mir Muhammad Siddiq Hashmat [2], Sadriddin Ayni [3], Sadri Ziyo [4], P. Qayumiy [5], and compilers of catalogues of Oriental manuscripts [6] provided early information about the author and his works. Sadriddin Ayni's use of Khumūlī in studies of the Manghit rulers was especially important for bringing the chronicle into scholarly circulation. Nevertheless, Ayni's principal concern was

the political history of the Manghit dynasty, and he did not isolate Khumūlī's representation of the late Janid period as a separate source-critical problem.

A. Abdurahmonov's dissertation on Khumūlī of Urgut and his literary heritage constituted an important stage in the specialized study of the author [7]. It examined Khumūlī's biography, literary activity, and the mixed composition of his writings, drawing attention to historical, autobiographical, and hagiographical components. Because the dissertation was written primarily within literary studies, however, the chronicle's account of the final Janid decades was not systematically compared with other historical traditions or analyzed as a narrative of dynastic transition.

The work has also been discussed in surveys of Tajik literature and regional history [8; 9]. Ahmad Hojizoda later offered a fuller overview of Khumūlī's life and assessed *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* as a significant source for Manghit-period historiography [17]. Western and German-language scholarship has used the text in broader discussions of Central Asian literature, Sufi networks, political culture, and dynastic legitimacy [10; 11]. Anke von Kügelgen's research is particularly relevant because it demonstrates how Manghit historiography compensated for the dynasty's non-Chinggisid origin through genealogy, marriage, ritual, and historical writing [11; 19]. B. Babajanov and H. Yuldoshkhojayev likewise drew on Khumūlī's material in studies of the Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya and the source base of Uzbek history [12].

A decisive advance was the publication of a critical text of *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* by Ghulom Karimiy and Iroda Qayumova [13]. By comparing several manuscript copies, the editors established a reliable textual basis for research on the work's structure, language, authorial identity, and manuscript tradition. Sh. Vohidov subsequently prepared a Tajik translation with an introduction, textual variants, notes, and appendices [14]. M. Mukhiddinova's dissertation examined the work's composition, manuscript history, information sources, and representation of the Bukhara Emirate [15]. These studies have substantially improved access to the text, yet the chronicle's account of Janid decline has generally remained subordinate to broader discussions of Khumūlī or the Manghit period.

The existing scholarship therefore leaves several interrelated questions open. How does Khumūlī construct the political image of Abū al-Fayṣ Khān? Which internal and external causes does he assign to the collapse of Janid authority? How does he represent Nādir Shāh's intervention and the political apprenticeship of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī? What role do

Chinggisid legitimacy, marriage, puppet khans, ritual enthronement, military patronage, and provincial elites play in his explanation? Finally, how should the historian evaluate a narrative written decades after the events it describes? These questions define the research gap addressed below.

METHODOLOGY AND SOURCE-CRITICAL FRAMEWORK

The study is based on the principles of historicism, critical objectivity, contextual interpretation, and systematic source analysis. The reports contained in *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* are not accepted as ready-made historical facts. They are interpreted as statements produced within a nineteenth-century political, social, religious, and literary environment and shaped by the author's worldview, access to information, and relationship to Manghit rule.

External source criticism is used to assess the date and circumstances of composition, the author's chronological distance from the events, his education and social milieu, and his level of participation in the episodes described. The mid-eighteenth-century Janid material is classified as retrospective, whereas several passages concerning Amir Shāh Murād, Samarkand, the Tilla-Qori Madrasa, and building projects are treated as eyewitness or near-eyewitness testimony. This differentiation prevents information of unequal provenance from being assigned the same evidentiary weight.

Internal source criticism focuses on the vocabulary applied to historical actors, moral and confessional judgments, causal explanations, narrative selection, and the contrast between weak and strong rulers. Particular attention is paid to the opposition between Abū al-Fayz Khān, portrayed as politically passive and inattentive to the welfare of his subjects, and Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, represented as militarily experienced, strategically disciplined, and capable of using circumstances to his advantage.

Historical comparison is used to place Khumūlī's account alongside other local and modern reconstructions of the transition. Chronological analysis tests the sequence of deposition, enthronement, assassination, and assumption of titles. Narrative analysis identifies the plot through which Janid disintegration, Nādirid intervention, Muḥammad Raḥīm's rise, the use of nominal Chinggisid rulers, and the eventual assertion of Manghit sovereignty are linked as a single causal chain. Finally, a systemic approach treats dynastic change not as the product of one individual or one battle, but as the interaction of external patronage, administrative crisis, tribal politics, military organization, religious and urban elites, symbolic capital, and inherited traditions of legitimacy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The source-critical analysis shows that *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī* is not a primary eyewitness source for the final stage of Janid rule. Nevertheless, it preserves a coherent nineteenth-century interpretation of the weakening of central authority under Abū al-Fayz Khān, Nādir Shāh's intervention in Transoxiana, and the transfer of practical power to the Manghit leadership. The Janid section functions less as an autonomous dynastic history than as an explanatory prologue to the emergence of a new political order.

Khumūlī creates this effect through the selection and arrangement of episodes. The diminishing capacity of the khan, the rise of ataliqs and tribal leaders, the presence of foreign troops, the unrest in Mīyānkāl, the military advancement of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, and the management of Chinggisid symbols are presented as interconnected developments. The narrative thereby converts political fragmentation into a causal sequence that culminates in the appearance of a ruler capable of restoring order. In this scheme, the decline of one dynasty becomes the historical justification for the rise of another.

This narrative architecture also reveals a possible dynastic tendency. Khumūlī lived under the Manghits, and later Manghit rulers are frequently represented in positive moral and political terms. The contrast between the irresolution of Abū al-Fayz and the decisiveness of Muḥammad Raḥīm produces the impression that Manghit rule was not merely victorious but historically necessary. Such a pattern does not invalidate the chronicle; rather, it clarifies the kind of evidence it offers. The text is especially important for understanding the political memory and legitimating discourse of the Manghit period.

Khumūlī reports that Nādir Shāh subordinated Transoxiana, retained Abū al-Fayz nominally as khan, and entrusted effective administration to Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, the Manghit ataliq. The chronicle further states that Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī was sent to Nādir Shāh, appointed commander of Uzbek forces, and exposed to the political and military practices of the Afsharid court. In Khumūlī's narrative, this service is not an incidental biographical detail. It constitutes the formative stage through which Muḥammad Raḥīm acquired the experience and networks later required to dominate Bukhara.

Modern reconstructions confirm the importance of Nādir's 1740 campaign and the role of the Manghit leadership, but they also indicate that the chronology was more complex than a simple transfer of government. Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī was already a central figure in Bukharan politics, and after his death

in 1743 renewed tribal conflict prompted further Nādirid intervention. Muḥammad Raḥīm returned with military support and gradually became the effective ruler [18; 19]. The difference is significant: Khumūlī compresses several stages into a morally and politically intelligible transition, whereas comparative history reveals overlapping jurisdictions and shifting alliances.

The chronicle's account of unrest in Mīyānkāl illustrates this process. When disturbances led by Ibādullāh Beg broke out and Abū al-Fayẓ requested assistance, twelve thousand troops were reportedly sent and remained in Bukhara [13, fol. 186a; 14, p. 69]. The continued presence of these forces altered the internal balance of power. Although the Janid khan remained the formal sovereign, military coercion, administrative initiative, and external patronage increasingly strengthened the Manghit position. Khumūlī thus records the emergence of a dual structure: dynastic authority remained Chinggisid in form, while practical control shifted toward the ataliq and his military supporters.

A distinctive feature of Tārīkh-i Khumūlī is that political events are evaluated through moral and religious categories. The author condemns the violence attributed to the troops sent from Nādir Shāh's dominions and simultaneously criticizes Abū al-Fayẓ for failing to protect the country and its subjects. The chronicle states:

"They oppressed the poor and the weak of that land and violated the sons and daughters of the Muslims. Abū al-Fayẓ Khān, absorbed in pleasure and amusement, paid no attention to kingship or to the care of the subjects. Because of their hostility toward the people of the Sunna, the Shi'i soldiers exceeded all limits in oppression. In that turmoil, most places of Transoxiana, once resembling the Garden of Iram, were ruined, and the cries of the weak and helpless reached the heavens" [13, fol. 186a; 14, p. 69].

This passage should not be read as a neutral ethnographic description of every unit in Nādir's army. Its rhetoric combines the "mirror for princes" ideal of a ruler responsible for the protection of the ra'iyya with a Sunni confessional vocabulary that intensifies the moral condemnation of foreign troops. The sectarian language is therefore evidence of Khumūlī's narrative and religious framing as much as it is evidence for violence. The historian must separate the probable occurrence of coercion and abuse from the author's literary explanation of those actions.

Abū al-Fayẓ's image performs a clear causal function. Although Khumūlī recognizes him as the lawful representative of the Chinggisid dynasty, he depicts the khan as unable to restrain armed forces, discipline court factions, or protect the population. Janid decline

is consequently explained not only as the result of foreign conquest but as a crisis of governance. In the author's political ethics, legitimacy without effective justice is insufficient. This criticism prepares the narrative space for Muḥammad Raḥīm, whose legitimacy is initially weaker by descent but whose capacity for action is portrayed as stronger.

Khumūlī presents Muḥammad Raḥīm's rise neither as an accidental coup nor as the straightforward result of military force. It is described as a gradual process founded on prior experience, command over troops, control of information, and the ability to manage relations with local elites. The chronicle attributes to Nādir Shāh a decree directing Muḥammad Raḥīm to remove Abū al-Fayẓ from office, send him on pilgrimage, elevate his young son, and administer Bukhara as vizier and ataliq:

"After much reflection and consultation with chosen men, the shah summoned Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī. Following lofty admonitions and valuable counsel, he gave him a decree and patent, ordering him to go to Bukhara, release Abū al-Fayẓ Khān from his office, send him to perform the pilgrimage and circumambulate the Ka'ba, raise his son—although he had not yet reached maturity—to the khan's throne, and himself serve as the boy's vizier and ataliq, attending to the prosperity of the cities and the flourishing of the people of devotion" [13, fol. 187a; 14, p. 70].

The passage is important because it presents Manghit power as legally delegated and morally purposeful: the new administrator is instructed to restore urban prosperity and religious life. Yet its documentary form must be treated cautiously. Khumūlī wrote long after the alleged decree, and the text may preserve a later narrative of authorization rather than the wording of an authentic chancery document. Its greatest value lies in showing how later historiography represented Muḥammad Raḥīm's authority as derived from imperial sanction before it became independent.

The chronicle assigns particular importance to Muḥammad Raḥīm's handling of the news of Nādir Shāh's assassination in 1747. As he returned to Transoxiana with the remaining Uzbek forces, he allegedly ordered his companions to conceal the event and prevent merchants or travellers from carrying the news to Bukhara ahead of him:

"Keep the news of Nādir Shāh's killing hidden in your hearts. Let no one speak of it; otherwise, his tongue will be cut from his mouth and his head from his body. Guard the roads, and allow no merchant or other person to carry the report to Bukhara before us" [13, fol. 190a; 14, p. 70].

Whether every element of this dramatic speech is

verbatim is less important than its narrative purpose. Khumūlī depicts information as a political resource. Secrecy prevents rivals from reorganizing, preserves military discipline, and allows Muḥammad Raḥīm to arrive before the political consequences of Nādir's death are widely understood. This emphasis on communication, timing, and controlled disclosure distinguishes the chronicle's explanation from a purely military account of regime change.

The source also attributes Muḥammad Raḥīm's success to coalition-building. He is said to have won over Uzbek tribal groups, amirs, and military leaders, exploited divisions among opponents, and presented the restoration of order as a common political objective [13, fol. 192a; 14, p. 76]. The formation of Manghit rule is therefore represented as the convergence of military, political, and social factors. Coercion remained central, but it operated alongside patronage, negotiation, and the redistribution of offices and rewards.

The establishment of Manghit power did not immediately abolish the political language of Chinggisid legitimacy. According to Khumūlī, Muḥammad Raḥīm did not at first assume the title of khan directly after the removal and death of Abū al-Fayḏ. Instead, he preserved a Chinggisid figure on the throne, governed as ataliq, and reinforced his position through marriage. The chronicle states that he married his daughter to Ubaydullāh Khān and ruled in the name of the young sovereign [13, fol. 193a; 14, p. 77]. This narrative accurately captures the broader principle that Manghit authority initially required Chinggisid mediation.

The identity and sequence of the nominal khans, however, expose an important source-critical problem. Khumūlī's account foregrounds Ubaydullāh, whereas Muḥammad Kāẓim's account and numismatic evidence cited in modern scholarship identify Abū al-Fayḏ's twelve-year-old son 'Abd al-Mu'min as the Chinggisid ruler proclaimed in 1747. Some sources then mention an 'Ubayd Allāh at a later stage before Muḥammad Raḥīm's own proclamation as khan [18]. The discrepancy should not be silently harmonized. It demonstrates that Khumūlī's retrospective sequence reflects the historical memory available to him and may compress, reorder, or conflate short-lived puppet reigns.

This correction changes the interpretation of the passage without diminishing its analytical value. The central point is not that Khumūlī provides a fully reliable list of enthronements, but that he understood Manghit power as a staged transition. The new rulers first governed through Chinggisid forms, exploited marriage ties and the office of ataliq, secured military

and social support, and only then asserted sovereign titles. The chronicle thus documents the continued political force of Chinggisid legitimacy even when effective power had moved to a non-Chinggisid clan.

Khumūlī also notes that Muḥammad Raḥīm distributed regular salaries and gifts to troops and showed respect and patronage to the 'ulama, sayyids, and representatives of the urban population. These measures broadened the social base of the new regime. Military loyalty was purchased and maintained, while religious and urban elites were incorporated into the symbolic order of the dynasty. Legitimation, in this account, was not a single ceremonial act but a continuous political practice.

The chronicle represents enthronement on the Kōk Tash ("Blue Stone") in Samarkand as a major step in the formalization of sovereignty. According to the narrative, after the death of the nominal Chinggisid ruler, Muḥammad Raḥīm organized a ceremony in Samarkand, ascended the Kōk Tash, and was proclaimed an independent khan. Regardless of the precise chronology, the episode reveals how a non-Chinggisid ruler appropriated the spatial and ritual symbols of earlier Central Asian monarchy.

Khumūlī returns to the Kōk Tash in his account of Amir Ḥaydar's visit to Samarkand. He reports that an order was issued to recover the stone associated with the reception hall of Bāqī Muḥammad Khān (r. 1599–1605), which had remained neglected and partly buried since the time of Subḥān Qulī Khān. The stone was uncovered, decorated with fine carpets, and prepared for enthronement [13, fol. 272a; 14, p. 155]. The ruler then "stepped upon the Kōk Tash with dignity and majesty, a crown upon his head, like the sun illuminating the world," and held a public and private audience [13, fol. 272b; 14, p. 156].

This later episode demonstrates the persistence of the symbol beyond Muḥammad Raḥīm's reign. The Manghits did not simply reject the political culture of the Shaybanid and Janid periods; they selectively reactivated its monuments, ceremonial spaces, titles, and genealogical associations. The recovery of the Kōk Tash from ruins may itself be read as a political metaphor: the new dynasty claimed to restore and inhabit the sovereign order of Transoxiana while presenting itself as the heir to earlier state traditions.

Khumūlī's descriptions of provincial lineages show that the weakening of the Janid state cannot be reduced to events at the Bukharan court. The chronicle praises the ancestry of Quliqa Beg, Fazil Beg, and Muhammad Amin Beg and describes groups associated with Khujand, Ura-Tepa, and Hisar-i Shadman as long-standing holders of amirates and military commands. It records

their construction of mosques, places of worship, and madrasas and emphasizes the prestige of the Yuz and Qirq communities [13, fol. 209b; 14, p. 94].

These reports illuminate the political ecology of the khanate. Central authority depended on the cooperation of provincial amirs and tribal commanders who controlled armed followers, local revenues, and regional institutions. As the court's capacity weakened, military resources became concentrated in the hands of local elites and political autonomy expanded in the provinces. The Janid crisis was therefore both vertical and territorial: the khan lost leverage over actors who were indispensable to state power but increasingly capable of acting independently.

The chronicle's information on the Dār al-Shifā Madrasa adds an institutional dimension to the analysis. Khumūlī attributes this charitable foundation to 'Abd al-'Azīz Khān, described as a pilgrim to the Two Holy Sanctuaries [13, fol. 238b; 14, p. 124; 16]. He emphasizes the terms of the endowment, according to which teaching was reserved for scholars proficient in the exoteric sciences, Sufi knowledge, and medicine. Although this passage is not directly concerned with the fall of the Janids, it preserves a memory of Janid patronage and demonstrates that the dynasty's legacy was not represented exclusively through political decline. Educational, medical, architectural, and charitable institutions formed a continuing layer of authority that later rulers could inherit and reactivate.

This evidence also helps refine the article's central argument. Dynastic replacement did not produce a total institutional rupture. Manghit rulers operated within a landscape of madrasas, waqf foundations, urban monuments, court offices, provincial hierarchies, and ritual sites created or developed by earlier dynasties. Khumūlī's narrative therefore depicts change through a combination of political discontinuity and institutional continuity.

The evidentiary value of Tārīkh-i Khumūlī varies substantially across its sections. Khumūlī did not witness the events surrounding Nādir Shāh's campaigns, the last years of Abū al-Fayẓ, or the first consolidation of Muḥammad Raḥīm's power. These passages were necessarily constructed from earlier texts, oral reports, family and local memory, and historiographical convention. By contrast, parts of the narrative concerning Amir Shāh Murād and Samarkand are explicitly grounded in personal observation.

Khumūlī records that he was studying religious sciences at the Tilla-Qori Madrasa when he encountered the ruler known in the source as Ghāzī Ma'sūm (Amir Shāh Murād). He describes following the ruler after the dawn prayer to the site of a planned building project and

hearing him instruct the architects where to lay the foundation and place the gate [13, fol. 254b; 14, p. 139]. Elsewhere, the author insists that what he wrote about a building project was based on seeing and hearing the events himself rather than on second-hand conversation [13, fol. 274b; 14, p. 157].

Such authorial statements increase the value of the relevant passages, but they do not automatically eliminate problems of memory, selection, and self-presentation. Eyewitness testimony is still mediated by the time of writing and by the author's desire to establish credibility. Nevertheless, it belongs to a different evidentiary category from the account of the 1740s. The chronicle should therefore be disaggregated internally: each report must be evaluated according to its date, provenance, rhetorical form, and relationship to the author's own experience.

Khumūlī's position within the Manghit period also requires attention. The generally positive representation of later Manghit rulers and the contrast between Abū al-Fayẓ's weakness and Muḥammad Raḥīm's effectiveness may reflect a dynastic orientation. The Janid past is organized into a story of disorder, while Manghit action is organized into a story of restoration. This does not mean that every statement is invented. It means that factual reports are embedded in a broader explanation of why a new dynasty deserved to rule. The source is consequently most productive when used both to reconstruct events through comparison and to study the historical imagination of nineteenth-century Bukhara.

CONCLUSION

Mullā Jum'aqulī Khumūlī's Tārīkh-i Khumūlī is an important local source for studying the final phase of Janid rule and the formation of Manghit power in Bukhara. Its account links Abū al-Fayẓ Khān's political weakness, Nādir Shāh's intervention, the authority of Muḥammad Ḥakīm Bī, the military and political advancement of Muḥammad Raḥīm Bī, and the transformation of administrative and dynastic authority. The chronicle does not present these developments as isolated episodes; it integrates them into an explanatory narrative of regime change.

The analysis shows that Khumūlī attributes the decline of the Janids to a combination of external and internal causes. Nādirid military pressure was decisive, but it operated within a polity already weakened by the contraction of central authority, court and tribal conflicts, provincial autonomy, and the inability of the khan to protect his subjects. The moral criticism of Abū al-Fayẓ serves to transform political ineffectiveness into a failure of just kingship.

Muḥammad Raḥīm's rise is represented as a gradual

political strategy rather than a sudden military seizure of power. Service under Nādir Shāh, command over troops, control of information after the shah's death, alliance-building with military and local elites, and patronage of religious and urban groups are all presented as components of his success. Manghit sovereignty was initially constructed through the continued use of Chinggisid rulers, marriage, the office of ataliq, and inherited court rituals. The Kōk Tash ceremony and the later revival of the same symbol under Amir Ḥaydar show that the dynasty sought legitimacy through the selective appropriation of earlier political traditions.

At the same time, the article has identified factual and chronological points that require correction or qualification. In particular, Khumūlī's emphasis on Ubaydullāh does not fully correspond to evidence that identifies 'Abd al-Mu'min as the first nominal Chinggisid khan elevated after the deposition of Abū al-Fayḏ. Rather than concealing this discrepancy, source criticism turns it into evidence of how short and unstable reigns were remembered and reorganized in later historiography.

The central methodological conclusion is that Khumūlī's eyewitness reports must be distinguished from his retrospective accounts. Passages on Amir Shāh Murād, Samarkand, and construction activity may preserve first-hand observation, whereas the Janid material reflects earlier written sources, oral transmission, local historical memory, and Manghit-period political interpretation. Accordingly, Tārīkh-i Khumūlī should be used in two complementary ways: comparatively, for reconstructing the transition from Janid to Manghit rule, and discursively, for examining how that transition was justified in nineteenth-century local historiography.

REFERENCES

1. Qori Rahmatulloh Vozeh. *Tuhfat al-ahbab fi tadhkirat al-ashab*. Manuscript, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, inv. no. 2336/1, 145 fols. See also R. Hadi-Zade, *Istochniki k izucheniyu tadzhikskoy literatury vtoroy poloviny XIX veka* [Sources for the Study of Tajik Literature of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century]. Stalinabad, 1956.
2. Hashmat, Mir Muhammad Siddiq. *Tazkirat al-shu'ara*. Manuscript, Abu Rayhan al-Biruni Center of Oriental Manuscripts, no. 2778, fols. 51a–b.
3. Ayni, Sadridin. *Ta'rikhi amironi Manghitiya-i Bukhoro* [History of the Manghit Amirs of Bukhara]. Tashkent, 1923, p. 15.
4. Sadri Ziyov. *Tarikh*. Manuscript, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, no. 2241, fol. 324.
5. Qayumiy, P. *Tazkirayi Qayumiy*. Vol. 3. Tashkent, 1998, p. 517.
6. *Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisey Akademii nauk Respubliki Uzbekistan* [Collection of Oriental Manuscripts of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan]. Tashkent: Fan, 1952, vol. 3, no. 2785; KVR I, no. 177.
7. Abdurahmonov, A. "Khumulii Urguti va merosi ejodii u" [Khumūlī of Urgut and His Creative Heritage]. Candidate of Philological Sciences dissertation. Samarkand: Alisher Navoi State University, 1972, pp. 52–102.
8. Hodizoda, R., U. Karimov, and S. Sadiev. *Adabiyoti tojik: asrhai XVIII va ibtidoi asri XX* [Tajik Literature: The Eighteenth Century and the Beginning of the Twentieth Century]. Dushanbe, 1988, p. 242.
9. Mukhtorov, A. *Hisor: ocherkhoi ta'rikhi (okhiri asri XV–avvali asri XX)* [Hisar: Historical Essays from the Late Fifteenth to the Early Twentieth Century]. Dushanbe, 1995, pp. 104–106.
10. Hofman, H. F. *Turkish Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*. Section III, pt. I. Utrecht, 1969, pp. 247–249; von Kügelgen, Anke. "Die Entfaltung der Naqshbandiya-Muğaddidiya im mittleren Transoxanien vom 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Stück Detektivarbeit." In *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 2, edited by Anke von Kügelgen, Michael Kemper, and Allen J. Frank, 101–151. Berlin, 1998.
11. von Kügelgen, Anke. *Legitimatsiya sredneaziatskoy dinastii mangytov v proizvedeniyakh ikh istorikov (XVIII–XIX vv.)* [The Legitimation of the Central Asian Manghit Dynasty in the Works of Its Historians, Eighteenth–Nineteenth Centuries]. Almaty: Daik-Press, 2004, pp. 158–167. Russian translation of *Die Legitimierung der mittelasiatischen Mangitendynastie in den Werken ihrer Historiker*. Würzburg: Ergon, 2002.
12. Babajanov, B. "On the History of the Naqshbandiya-Mujaddidiya in Central Mawara'annahr in the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries." In *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*. Berlin, 1996, pp. 395–398; Yuldoshkhojayev, H. "Tārīkh-i Khumūlī as a Unique Source on the History of Uzbekistan." In *Istiqlol yillari: milliy-diniy qadriyatlarining xalqqa qaytishi*, 164–166. Tashkent, 2001.
13. Mullā Jum'a-qulī Khumūlī. *Tārīkh-i Khumūlī*. Critical

edition prepared by Ghulom Karimiy and Iroda Qayumova; editor-in-chief Haydar Yuldashkhojayev. Samarkand–Tashkent: International Institute for Central Asian Studies / Mega Basım, Istanbul, 2013. 243 pp.

- 14.** Vohidov, Sh. *Mullā Jum‘aqlī Khumūlī va asari ӯ “Ta’rikhi Khumūlī”* [Mullā Jum‘aqlī Khumūlī and His Work Tārīkh-i Khumūlī]. Introduction, textual variants, notes, and appendices. Dushanbe, 2025. 272 pp.
- 15.** Mukhiddinova, M. “Tārīkh-i Khumūlī as a Source for the History of the Bukhara Emirate.” PhD dissertation in History, specialization 07.00.01. Samarkand State University, 2023. 182 pp.
- 16.** Sangirova, D. “Hajj and the Ruling Pilgrims.” *A Look at the Past*, no. 18 (2019): 27.
- 17.** Hojizoda, Ahmad. “Ilmi ta’rikhnigori tojik dar ahdi Manghit: Ta’rikhi Khumūlī chun sarchashmai mu‘tamadi ta’rikhi” [Tajik Historiography under the Manghits: Tārīkh-i Khumūlī as a Reliable Historical Source]. *Ravshanfikir*, 21 July 2020.
- 18.** Bregel, Yuri. “Central Asia vii. In the 18th–19th Centuries.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 5, fasc. 2 (2000): 193–205; updated 13 December 2017.
- 19.** von Kügelgen, Anke. “Manghits.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Published 20 July 2004; updated 27 November 2012.