



## ANALYSIS OF RESEARCHES ON THE EMBASSY OF ER-NAZAR MAQSUD UGLI

*Er-Nazar Maksudoğlu Elçiliği Üzerine  
Yapılan Araştırmaların Analizi*

**Dr. Sunnatillo HAMRAYEV**

National University of Uzbekistan, Faculty of History, Tashkent-  
Uzbekistan, E-mail: hamrayevsunnatillo1989@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7251-4609>

DOI: <https://doi.org/>

<b>Makale Türü</b>	Araştırma - Research	<b>Article Type</b>
<b>Geliş Tarihi</b>	27 Ağustos - August 2025	<b>Received</b>
<b>Kabul Tarihi</b>	2 Aralık - December 2025	<b>Acceptance</b>
<b>Yayın Tarihi</b>	31 Aralık - December 2025	<b>Publication</b>
<b>Sayfa Aralığı</b>	183 - 195	<b>Pages Range</b>

Sunnatillo Hamrayev, “Analysis of Researches on the Embassy of Er-nazar  
Maqsud Ugli”, *Academic Literature the Journal of Social Sciences Researches*,  
Volume: 3, Number: 3, December 2025, p. 183-195.

### Abstract

This article analyzes how the causes, goals, objectives, and outcomes of the embassy of Er-nazar Maqsud ugli, sent from Bukhara to Russia, have been interpreted in research from different periods. The study highlights the significance of this embassy in establishing and strengthening diplomatic relations between the Russian Empire and the Emirate of Bukhara, as well as the mutual interests of the two states. Based on existing research, the article details the stages of the embassy's journey, its composition, and a brief history. The historiography of the embassy spans Russian Imperial, Soviet, and post-independence literature. The historiographical analysis focuses on how the reasons for the embassy's formation, its intended purpose, and its results have been discussed. It also examines the differing viewpoints in studies from various periods regarding the embassy's role in the development of diplomatic relations between the two states. A comparative analysis is conducted on how the interests of both countries in the embassy have been explored in these studies. Furthermore, the article investigates researchers' opinions on the long-term goals of these diplomatic relations. Additionally, based on archival documents, this study clarifies several hypotheses put forward by researchers concerning the financing of the construction of the Embassy of Er-nazar Madrasah, built in the city of Bukhara in connection with the

results of the embassy. The article provides an analysis and scientific critique of the different approaches to the historical events surrounding this embassy found in research published during various periods.

**Keywords:** Embassy of Er-nazar, Emirate of Bukhara, Russian Empire, Catherine II, trade duties, Constantinople, Hajj, Trade Privileges, Fortifications.

### Öz

Bu makale, Buhara’dan Rusya’ya gönderilen Er-nazar Maqsud Uğlu elçiliğinin nedenlerinin, amaçlarının, hedeflerinin ve sonuçlarının farklı dönemlerde yapılan araştırmalarda nasıl yorumlandığını incelemektedir. Çalışma, söz konusu elçiliğin Rus İmparatorluğu ile Buhara Emirliği arasındaki diplomatik ilişkilerin kurulması ve güçlendirilmesindeki önemini ve iki devletin karşılıklı çıkarlarını ortaya koymaktadır. Mevcut araştırmalara dayanarak makalede, elçiliğin yolculuk aşamaları, heyetin bileşimi ve kısa tarihçesi ayrıntılı biçimde ele alınmaktadır. Elçiliğe ilişkin historiografi, Rus İmparatorluk dönemi, Sovyet dönemi ve bağımsızlık sonrası literatürü kapsamaktadır. Historiografik analiz, elçiliğin oluşturulma nedenlerinin, taşıdığı amaçların ve elde edilen sonuçların nasıl ele alındığına odaklanmaktadır. Ayrıca, elçiliğin iki devlet arasındaki diplomatik ilişkilerin gelişimindeki rolüne dair farklı dönemlerdeki çalışmaların ortaya koyduğu görüş ayrılıkları incelenmektedir. Bu çalışmalarda her iki ülkenin elçilikten beklentilerinin nasıl değerlendirildiği karşılaştırmalı olarak analiz edilmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra makale, araştırmacıların bu diplomatik ilişkilerin uzun vadeli hedeflerine ilişkin görüşlerini de irdelemektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ernazar Elçiliği, Buhara Emirliği, Rus İmparatorluğu, II. Katerina, Konstantinopolis (İstanbul), Hac, Ticari İmtiyazlar, Tahkimatlar.

### Introduction

After the collapse of the Ashtarkhanid dynasty in the Khanate of Bukhara in 1753, a new dynasty, the Manghits seized power. After establishing political order and solidifying their authority within the country, the new rulers sought to improve foreign relations. The official government of Bukhara re-established diplomatic relations with the Russian Empire, among other neighboring states. It is worth noting that the last embassy between Bukhara and Russia before the Manghit rule was sent by the Ashtarkhanid ruler, Abulfayz Khan in 1737–1740, known as the Khwaja Muhammad embassy. The first embassy sent by the Manghits to Russia was in 1774. Mulla Ernazar Maqsud ugli (also referred to as Ernazarbiy, Domullo Ernazar Elchi, and Ernazar Maksutov in some sources and literature - S.H.) was appointed to lead the embassy that the Emirate of Bukhara intended to send to the Russian Empire<sup>1</sup>.

Prior to this diplomatic assignment, Ernazar Maqsud ugli had visited Russia several times for trade purposes (starting in 1745) and to provide various services to the imperial court. It should be noted that in addition to his trade dealings, Ernazar Maqsud ugli earned the attention of the Russian Empress and court nobles, strengthening their trust in relation to Central Asia. For this reason, he had previously requested from Russian Emperor Peter III that Bukharans be allowed to travel to Mecca for pilgrimage via Astrakhan, as the route through Iran was dangerous. Furthermore, he requested that a mosque be built in Astrakhan at the expense of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств средней Азии с Россией в XVIII – первой половине XIX века. Ташкент: Фан, 2005, p. 167.

Russian Empire for the pilgrims to perform their prayers<sup>2</sup>. These factors played a crucial role in his successful completion of the tasks assigned to him during his subsequent diplomatic missions.

This merchant led official embassies to Russia on two occasions. The first embassy took place in 1774–1776, and the second in 1779<sup>3</sup>. After completing his second mission, he requested to travel to Mecca via the Ottoman Empire. While returning from his pilgrimage, he died of an infectious disease in the city of Konya<sup>4</sup>. The contribution and unique significance of Mulla Ernazar in the establishment and subsequent development of diplomatic relations between the Emirate of Bukhara and Russia have been emphasized in a number of historical studies. This is confirmed by Yakovlev's words about Ernazar Elchi: “Ernazar, like all Bukharans, was a clever and cunning man who skillfully earned the trust of our government”<sup>5</sup>.

## 1. Methodology

This study examines how Ernazar Maqsud ugli's two embassies to the Russian Empire have been addressed in historical scholarship. A clear logical and comparative historiographical approach is applied. The methodology is based on the following principles:

- *Source Criticism:* By analyzing the approaches of historical studies conducted from the 19th to the 21st century, the research investigates how different periods assessed Bukhara–Russia relations and the significance of Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassy within them. Particular attention is devoted to a re-examination of the interpretations of embassy outcomes based on archival documents.
- *Comparative Analysis:* The study explores the development of scholarly knowledge regarding Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassy and how interpretations shifted under the influence of socio-political contexts. In this regard, features of Soviet-era revisionism and the critical perspectives of contemporary postcolonial historiography are highlighted.
- *Historiographical Evaluation:* The research examines the views of major scholars such as Pyotr Shubinskiy, Sergey Zhukovskiy, Hamid Ziyoyev, Khondamiza G'ulomov, Akhmadjon Kholiqulov, Guldona Taniyeva, and Abdussattor Jumanazar. To illuminate historiographical debates and identify the author's own contribution, their differing interpretations of diplomatic relations, the results of the embassy, and socio-economic interactions are compared. By integrating these methodological approaches, the article seeks to provide a source-based and critically contextualized

---

<sup>2</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств средней..., р. 166-167.

<sup>3</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирناзар Максютлов, посланник бухарский // Сибирский вестник. Ч. I. 1824, р. 7–11; Сергей Жуковский, Сношения России с Бухарой и Хивой за последнее трехсотлетие. Петроградъ, 1915, р. 88–89; Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств Средней..., р. 67, 173, 178.

<sup>4</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II // Исторический вестник, № 2. 1897, р. 518-538.

<sup>5</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирناзар Максютлов, посланник бухарский..., р. 7-11.

interpretation of Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassy, emphasizing its unique role in Bukhara–Russia relations.

## 2. Literature review and Methods

The literature dedicated to the details of this embassy can be chronologically divided into three groups, based on the formation and development of historical-scientific knowledge. This approach allows us to observe how and from what perspective the problem was researched in different periods.

The first group comprises research published during the Russian Empire period<sup>6</sup>, the second group during the Soviet era<sup>7</sup>, and the third group during the post-independence period<sup>8</sup>. These groups include both specific studies on the embassy and other works that touched upon the topic to varying degrees.

## 3. Results and Discussion

We believe that the approaches to the historical events, details, and facts of this embassy should be analyzed with a focus on three key aspects: the reasons and objectives for its formation, the achievement of its goals (i.e., its results), and its significance and role in the subsequent political and strategic aims of both sides.

<sup>6</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирнazar Максюттов, посланник бухарский..., р. 7-11; Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., р. 518-538; Николай Остроумов, Бухарские и Хивинские посольства в Россию и русские посольства в Бухару и Хиву (Историческая параллель) // Туркестанский сборник Т. 436. 1907; Сергей Жуковский, Сношения России с Бухарой и Хивой за последнее трехсотлетие, Петроград, 1915.

<sup>7</sup> Абдуллахад Муҳаммаджонов, Нематов Т. Бухоро ва Хеванинг Россия билан муносабатлари тарихига доир баъзи манбалар, Тошкент, 1957; Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX асрлар), Тошкент: Фан, 1965; Павел Матвиевский, О роли Оренбурга в русско-индийской торговле в XVIII в. // История СССР. Москва, 1969. №3 р. 109; Ҳамид Зияев, XVIII асрда Ўрта Осиё ва Урал бўйлари, Тошкент: Фан, 1973; Гулсум Михалева, Торговые и посольские связи России со среднеазиатскими ханствами через Оренбург. Ташкент: Фан, 1982; Хондамирза Гуломов, Посольские связи Бухарского ханства с Россией в XVIII веке. Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент: 1984.

<sup>8</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств Средней..., р. 79; Ўзбек дипломатияси тарихидан. Тарихий очерклар ва лавҳалар. Хайруллаев М.М. таҳрири остида. Тошкент, 2003. р. 352.; Гулчеҳра Агзамова, Некоторые вопросы культурно-духовной жизни городов Среднеазиатских ханств// Культура кочевников Центральной Азии: материалы Международной конференции, Самарканд 22-24 ноября 2007 г. Самарканд: издание МИЦАИ, 2008, р. 34-40; История Узбекистана (XVI – первая половина XIX века) / Отв. ред. Д.А. Алимова. Ташкент: ФАН, 2012; Ҳамид Зияев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург орқали Россия билан элчилик алоқалари тарихи (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср), I жилд. Тошкент, 2014; Джурабаев. Дж. Бухарский эмират второй половины XVIII – первой половины XIX вв. в письменных источниках, Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Худжанд, 2014; Murat O'zkan. Buhara, Petersburg ve Istanbul arasinda diplomasi trafigi: Molla Irnazar Maksutov elçiliği // Gazi Türkiyat, Bahar 2019 / 24. р. 165-183.

■ *The first group research* from the Russian Empire period approached the reasons for the embassy from the perspective that Bukhara initiated the re-establishment of relations after a long hiatus and was the primary party interested in these relations. For example, Yakovlev's 1824 article "Мулла Ирназар Максүтов, посланник бухарский" (Mulla Irnazar Maksutov, the Bukhara Envoy), published in the journal "Сибирский вестник", is considered one of the earliest studies on the embassy. The author proposes the following reasons for Ernazar Maqsud ugli's first embassy. According to Yakovlev, the property of Bukhara merchants was looted in Russian territory by the Kirghiz (Kazakhs - S.H.) and the rebels of Yemelyan Pugachev. Yakovlev states that Ernazar Maqsud ugli was sent to Russia as an envoy to request compensation for the losses incurred by the merchants and to discuss the security of the trade routes, which was crucial for the Bukharans<sup>9</sup>.

On the matter of securing trade routes, the discussion centered on finding a safe passage through the Kirghiz steppe to Orenburg and the Russian Empire, rather than via Mangyshlak. The Russian government proposed building a fortress in the region to protect the merchants. Yakovlev notes that Ernazar Maqsud o'g'li rejected this offer, stating that such a fortress would always be under the threat of the Kirghiz and could raise suspicion among the Bukharans<sup>10</sup>.

It is worth noting that when comparing this issue of fortress construction with later research, a discrepancy appears in some of the information. For instance, researcher Kh. Gulomov, in his monograph, states: "*According to the envoy, it would be expedient to build a Russian fortress on the Emba River, which could provide shelter for trade caravans if the need suddenly arose*"<sup>11</sup>. Given that Gulomov's information is based on archival materials, it can be considered more reliable than Yakovlev's. Nevertheless, the issue of building a fortress warrants further investigation in subsequent studies on diplomatic relations.

The reason for the second embassy was again to seek compensation for the losses suffered by Bukhara merchants due to looting and to obtain permission for Bukharans to travel to Mecca via Constantinople (Istanbul - S.H.) and Russia<sup>12</sup>. The details of Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassies are presented in a brief and one-sided manner in the works of Yakovlev and S.V. Zhukovskiy. However, P.P. Shubinskiy offered some noteworthy observations on the embassy's significance for both sides and its role in subsequent political and strategic goals. He noted that during the first embassy, Ernazar Maqsud ugli met several times in Moscow with the envoy of the Ottoman Empire. These meetings reportedly involved discussions on establishing trade relations between the Emirate of Bukhara and the Ottoman Empire and allowing

<sup>9</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирназар Максүтов, посланник бухарский..., р.7-11.

<sup>10</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирназар Максүтов, посланник бухарский..., р. 7-11.

<sup>11</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, История дипломатических отношений государств Средней..., р. 43.

<sup>12</sup> Яковлев, Мулла Ирназар Максүтов, посланник бухарский // Сибирский вестник. Ч.I. 1824, р. 7-11.

Bukhara pilgrims to pass to Mecca via Khiva and Astrakhan, and to Constantinople and Anatolia via Russia's southern borders and the Black Sea<sup>13</sup>.

P.P. Shubinskiy put forward several ideas about the impact of this conversation on the diplomatic relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Emirate of Bukhara. He noted that the Turkish Sultan sent an envoy to the Khan of Bukhara, and the return embassy was the very one sent in 1779, led by Ernazarbiy and his son<sup>14</sup>. He also stated that the envoy's purpose in coming to Russia was to demand compensation for the losses from the plundered trade caravan that had not been paid after the first embassy, and to request 3,000 poods<sup>15</sup> of copper, which was essential for the Bukhara government<sup>16</sup>. Shubinskiy also discussed Ernazar Elchi's idea of reviving the old trade routes between East Asia and Western Europe through the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea, and the Baltic Sea. He claimed that this idea was not realized due to Ernazarbiy's death and Russia's focus on other pressing foreign policy issues<sup>17</sup>.

Research from the Russian Imperial period primarily explained the reasons for Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassy by focusing on the interests of the Emirate of Bukhara. The establishment of diplomatic relations was mainly attributed to the looting of merchants and the need to secure trade routes. The interests of the Russian side, such as the potential for mutually beneficial outcomes and the resolution of various political issues through this embassy in subsequent political processes, were not given attention. Moreover, the results of the embassy—specifically, whether its goals were achieved were presented by simply stating that while compensation for the merchants' losses was not paid, the envoy returned with grand gifts from Catherine II, which were used to build a madrasah in Bukhara, a fact mentioned with pride<sup>18</sup>.

It is worth noting that some Russian Imperial-era studies on this embassy contain certain confusing facts and hypotheses. For example, N. Ostroumov<sup>19</sup> briefly mentions the embassy, but the information regarding the historical process is far from the truth, and his thoughts on the embassy's results are not considered significant.

■ *The second group studies* from the Soviet period—provided information about Ernazar Maqsud ugli's embassy based on archival materials, which are considered valuable from a scientific perspective. In this period, the reasons for the embassy were supplemented, and the approach shifted slightly. For example, researcher H. Ziyoyev stated that the first embassy was conducted to remove obstacles to the development of trade relations between the two countries. He also noted that Russia was asked

<sup>13</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., p. 518-538.

<sup>14</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., p. 518-538.

<sup>15</sup> A pood (Russian: пуд) is an old Russian unit of mass, equivalent to approximately 16.38 kilograms or 36.11 pounds.

<sup>16</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., p. 518-538.

<sup>17</sup> See also: Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., p. 518-538.

<sup>18</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., p. 518-538; Сергей Жуковский, Сношения России с Бухарой и..., p. 89.

<sup>19</sup> Николай Остроумов, Бухарские и Хивинские посольства..., p. 72.

for permission to purchase three thousand poods of copper and weaponry<sup>20</sup>. The reasons for the second embassy were almost identical to the previous period's information, but there was less detail about the request to travel to Mecca via Russia's borders and the Ottoman Empire.

H. Ziyoyev emphasized that the relations were significant not only for Bukhara but also for Russia. He approached the problem from the perspective of Bukhara merchants' crucial role in the relations between Russia and Eastern states. According to Ziyoyev: "Bukharan merchants occupied a significant place in the trade between Central Asia and Russia through Orenburg, earning considerable profit. In turn, the Russian government was well aware of the crucial role played by Bukhara merchants in its relations with Central Asia and other Eastern countries"<sup>21</sup>. He also claimed that Russia's purpose in financing the construction of a madrasah in Bukhara was to demonstrate its power and increase its influence in the Uzbek khanates<sup>22</sup>. These ideas are notable as they represent the first such approach within the research on this topic.

In another work, H. Ziyoyev acknowledged that the Russian government gave envoy Mulla Ernazar Maqsudov privileges and gifts never before granted to any Asian person. For this reason, he states, the envoys were met with a fitting welcome, and efforts were made to encourage all their requests. The failure to compensate Bukhara merchants for their losses was explained by the impossibility of doing so<sup>23</sup>. Ernazar Maqsud o'g'li was given a ship for trade, granted a duty-free trade privilege for a certain amount of goods and a specific trade volume, and products like iron and copper, which were strictly controlled for export, were sent to Bukhara<sup>24</sup>. The granting of such privileges shows that the Russian Empire had an interest in its relations with the Emirate of Bukhara.

In his dissertation, "Посольские связи Бухарского ханства с Россией в XVIII веке" (*Diplomatic Ties of the Bukhara Khanate with Russia in the 18th Century*), Kh. Gulomov put forward the valid hypothesis that the embassy's goal was of political importance. He asserted that the main purpose of the second embassy was not merely to address the looting of merchants and the passage to Mecca, but to strengthen friendly relations with the Ottoman Empire<sup>25</sup>. In this period's research, the interests of both sides in the historical events related to the embassy were not adequately represented. While a clear logical analysis of Russia's goals in establishing diplomatic relations with Bukhara began to emerge, there was no discussion of Russia's interests in allowing Bukhara to communicate with the Ottoman Empire via Russian borders.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 77.

<sup>21</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, XVIII асрда Ўрта Осиё ва Урал бўйлари, Тошкент: Фан, 1973, р. 27.

<sup>22</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 80.

<sup>23</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р.79-80.

<sup>24</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р.79.

<sup>25</sup> Хондамирза Гулямов, Посольские связи Бухарского ханства с Россией в XVIII веке. Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент, 1984, р. 147.

The third group—research from the post-independence period—saw Kh. Gulomov<sup>26</sup> and H. Ziyoyev<sup>27</sup> as well as A.B. Khaliqulov.<sup>28</sup> provide more detailed information on the significance of Mulla Ernazar Maqsud o'g'li's embassy in the emergence and development of diplomatic relations between the Emirate of Bukhara and Russia compared to earlier periods. Their studies are valuable for their use of numerous literature and archival materials.

Research from this period is notable for portraying Bukhara as an equal partner in its relations with Russia. For instance, H. Ziyoyev's observations confirm this by stating that the embassy demanded that the Russian government find those responsible for the looting of caravans by bandit groups of Russian-affiliated Cossacks and return the goods to their owners<sup>29</sup>. Several reasons are given for the embassy, including the important tasks of reducing customs duties for the Bukhara Khan and resolving issues related to obtaining steel and lead, which were vital for Bukhara<sup>30</sup>.

In his research, Kh. Gulomov notes that the Bukhara Emirate's request for compensation from the Russian Empire for goods plundered by nomads was an acknowledgment that the Kazakh tribes had come under Russian jurisdiction<sup>31</sup>. This idea is notable for being the first of its kind in the historiography of the topic. However, it is worth noting that even in the research from this period, the historical processes related to the embassy are primarily focused on Bukhara's initiative and interests. The underlying reasons for the Russian Empire's fulfillment of almost all of the Bukhara government's requests remain a mystery.

This brings us to an analysis of the information related to the construction of the Ernazar Elchi Madrasah<sup>32</sup>, which is often mentioned alongside the embassy's history. This analysis reveals the unreliability of historical information regarding the madrasah's financing. Many studies claim that the Russian ruler Catherine II provided a charitable donation for the madrasah's construction. Orientalists and travelers such as A. Vambéry, N.V. Khanikov, and P. Savelyev state that the madrasah was built by

<sup>26</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств средней Азии с Россией в XVIII – первой половине XIX века, Ташкент: Фан, 2005.

<sup>27</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург орқали Россия билан элчилик алоқалари тарихи (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср), I жилд. Тошкент, 2014.

<sup>28</sup> Ахмаджон Холиқулов, Бухоро амирлигининг ташқи сиёсий алоқалари (XVIII асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср ўрталари) / масъул муҳаррир А.С. Сағдуллаев. – Тошкент, 2022. – р. 95-105.

<sup>29</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург..., р. 35.

<sup>30</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург..., р. 48.

<sup>31</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств..., р. 175.

<sup>32</sup> *For a detailed history of this madrasa, see:* Sunnatillo Hamrayev, Ernazar elchi madrasasini Yekaterina II qurdirganmi? // Akademik Ubaydulla Karimov tavalludining 105 yilligi munosabati bilan o'tkazilgan xalqaro ilmiy konferensiya materiallari to'plami. Toshkent: «Fan», 2025, p. 222-228.

Catherine II<sup>33</sup>. V.V. Krestovskiy provides details about the madrasah's activities, the subjects taught, the number of students and cells, its location, and the salaries of the teachers and students<sup>34</sup>. He based his information about the madrasah's founding on a conversation with one of its teachers, who claimed the madrasah was built 100 years before their conversation, in 1784<sup>35</sup>. However, Krestovskiy himself admitted that his stories were difficult to trust as they were not based on a reliable source. Similarly, orientalist N.V. Khanikov, relying on information that the madrasah was built with Catherine II's funds, concluded his analysis on the matter with the statement: "This is all we know for certain about this"<sup>36</sup>. Later, P.P. Shubinskiy, analyzing Krestovskiy's information, noted that he did not doubt Catherine II's involvement in the madrasah's construction<sup>37</sup>.

In his article, Shubinskiy also cites G. Poslavskiy, who, in his notes, mentions that the madrasah was built by Ernazar ambassador with 40,000 rubles allocated by Empress Catherine II<sup>38</sup>. It is important to note here that after studying documents related to Ernazar ambassador diplomatic activities, Shubinskiy stated that the embassy's purpose was other matters. He cast doubt on the idea that the madrasah was built with Catherine II's charitable funds and recommended that future historical research should avoid this erroneous idea<sup>39</sup>. None of the above information and views are supported by archival documents or based on a source written by a direct witness to the event. From this point of view, we cannot consider this information reliable. However, in Soviet and post-independence research, the idea that the Ernazar ambassador Madrasah was built with Catherine II's funds was continued without a solid foundation, based on the opinions of the aforementioned orientalist and travelers.

Another view on this matter exists in later studies. For example, H.Z. Ziyoyev quotes Y.G. Gulomov, who states: "Mulla Ernazar Maqsud ugli built a mosque in Bukhara with funds from the Russian state. The fact that this mosque was built with the help of the Russian state is still known to the people of Bukhara today"<sup>40</sup>. In another study, he claims that "they were so impressed with envoy Ernazar Maqsudov that there is information that Catherine II gave him 3,000 rubles to build a mosque in Bukhara. His mission was concluded very successfully"<sup>41</sup>. This situation, namely the rumors about the various privileges granted by Empress Catherine II, may have led to the popular belief that the madrasah was "built with the Empress's money" to

<sup>33</sup> Арминий Вамбири, Путешествие по Средней Азии, СПб., 1865, р. 180.; Павел Савельев, Бухара въ 1835 году. СПб., 1836. р. 10.; Николай Ханыков, Описание Бухарского ханства, СПб., 1843, р. 86.

<sup>34</sup> Всеволод Крестовский, Въ гостяхъ у эмира..., р. 343-345.

<sup>35</sup> Всеволод Крестовский, Въ гостяхъ у эмира..., р. 343-345.

<sup>36</sup> Всеволод Крестовский, Въ гостяхъ у эмира..., р. 344-345.

<sup>37</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., р. 518-538.

<sup>38</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., р. 518-538.

<sup>39</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., р. 518-538.

<sup>40</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 80.

<sup>41</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 49.

explain the source of his wealth. However, in our opinion, these rumors are not enough to confirm that the Ernazar Elchi Madrasah was indeed built with funds provided by the Russian Empire.

Among contemporary researchers who have studied the history of Bukhara's madrasahs, A. Jumanazar states that Ernazar ambassador decided to build a madrasah near the Devonbegi Pond (Labi Hovuz) in Bukhara<sup>42</sup>. He notes that the madrasah was completed in the Hijri year 1209 (1794-1795 AD)<sup>43</sup>. He also cites P. Savelyev and A. Vambéry to support the claim that the madrasah was built with funds from Russian Empress Catherine II<sup>44</sup>. Kh.G. Gulomov, who researched diplomatic relations between the Uzbek khanates and the Russian Empire, also continued the view of previous researchers that the madrasah was built with Catherine II's funds, citing Soviet-era literature<sup>45</sup>. Even though Ernazar Maqsud ugli died several years before the madrasah's construction, it was named after him. There is no clear information in the research about who led the construction and why it was named after Ernazar ambassador. This situation shows that an unfounded idea from the Russian Imperial era, which has no basis in any document and has not been confirmed, has been continued without justification.

G. Taniyeva states that she could not find any documents related to the madrasah's construction in the Russian archives and puts forward the hypothesis that the large sum of money given by Catherine II to Ernazar Maqsud ugli was because the Empress was in debt to the envoy<sup>46</sup>. In other words, she suggests that the money received from Catherine II was actually income earned from Ernazar Maqsud o'g'li's own investments. The author also makes reasonable assumptions about when and through whom Ernazar ambassador received the money left with Catherine II<sup>47</sup>. To clarify this matter, we consulted a source on the history of the madrasah. The Waqf Documents Collection in Fond I-323 of the National Archives of Uzbekistan was studied. In file 55-10 of this fund, there is a certified copy of the Ernazar Elchi Madrasah's waqf document, sealed by Amir Ma'sum (Amir Shah Murad – S.H.)<sup>48</sup>. It specifies the land allocated for the madrasah's construction and states that the expenses for the construction were to be covered by Ernazar Maqsud ugli's own funds. Furthermore, the document lists the waqf properties designated to cover the madrasah's operations, teachers' salaries, students' stipends, and other expenses<sup>49</sup>. Based on this document, it is appropriate to put an end to the various views and unsubstantiated claims that have existed so far regarding the madrasah's financing. The fact that the

<sup>42</sup> Абдусаттор Жуманазар, Бухоро таълим тизими тарихи..., p. 374.

<sup>43</sup> Абдусаттор Жуманазар, Бухоро таълим тизими тарихи..., p. 376.

<sup>44</sup> Абдусаттор Жуманазар, Бухоро таълим тизими тарихи..., p. 376.

<sup>45</sup> Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств средней..., p. 333.

<sup>46</sup> Гулдона Таниева, Император кема совфа қилган..., p. 37-38.

<sup>47</sup> Гулдона Таниева, Император кема совфа қилган..., p. 36-39.

<sup>48</sup> О'зМА, 323-jamg'arma, 1-ro'yxat, 55-10 yig'ma jild, p. 2.

<sup>49</sup> О'зМА, 323-jamg'arma, 1-ro'yxat, 55-10 yig'ma jild, p. 3-6.

story of another country's ruler's involvement in the construction and the use of this issue in the context of diplomatic relations between states indicates its relevance.

Thus, it must be acknowledged that the information claiming that this madrasah, which is interpreted as an example of friendship and cultural ties in Bukhara-Russia diplomatic relations, was built with funds from Russian Empress Catherine II is unfounded. It should also be noted that the information in the waqf document, which states that the madrasah was built with the envoy's personal funds, is reliable. Therefore, it is appropriate to rely on this fact in discussions on this matter.

In addition, it is noticeable that there are some numerical discrepancies regarding the same issues in the study of the embassy's history. For example, the conditions of the duty-free trade privilege granted to Ernazar Maqsud ugli after the first embassy serve as an example. The volume of duty-free trade is stated as up to 10,000 rubles in most studies<sup>50</sup>, while another study mentions up to 9,000 rubles<sup>51</sup> worth of goods (some studies list specific goods<sup>52</sup>. The duration of the privilege is stated as 5 years in some sources<sup>53</sup>, up to 10 years in others<sup>54</sup>, and as a period of 5 to 10 years in some<sup>55</sup>. This information is based on various archival documents, and it would be appropriate in future research to explain this variety or determine the correct figures.

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that the historical significance of the embassy, as reflected in research, lies in the fact that the first embassy led to the establishment of diplomatic relations with Russia, creating an opportunity for Bukhara to import goods for which there was high demand. The main significant aspect of the second embassy was the development of trade relations with Russia and the resulting opportunity to access the Ottoman Empire and Eastern European states through it.

A historiographical analysis of Ernazar ambassador's activities shows that the approach to diplomatic relations in the first and second groups of studies was mostly one-sided, focusing little on Russia's interests in these mutual relations. The third group of studies gives some mention to Russia's interests as well.

All research on the topic has relied on Russian sources, without utilizing local ones. This situation necessitates new research on the subject. A comparative analysis of

<sup>50</sup> Сергей Жуковский, Сношения России..., р. 89; Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 79; Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург орқали Россия билан элчилик алоқалари тарихи (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср), I жилд. Тошкет, 2014, р. 48. and etc.

<sup>51</sup> Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II..., р. 518-538.

<sup>52</sup> Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург орқали Россия билан элчилик алоқалари тарихи (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср), I жилд. Тошкет, 2014, р. 46-48.

<sup>53</sup> Ҳамид Зияев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг...), р. 79.

<sup>54</sup> Гулсум Михалева, Торговые и посольские связи России..., р. 66.

<sup>55</sup> Павел Матвиевский, О роли Оренбурга в русско..., р. 109.

sources from Russian archives with local sources, along with a systematic analysis of the research conducted to date, would allow for the introduction of new aspects of the history of diplomatic relations between the Russian Empire and the Emirate of Bukhara into academic discourse.

### Resources

Абдулаҳад Муҳаммаджонов, Нематов Т. Бухоро ва Хеванинг Россия билан муносабатлари тарихига доир баъзи манбалар, Тошкент, 1957.

Абдусаттор Жуманазар, Бухоро таълим тизими тарихи, Тошкент: Akademnashr, 2017.

Арминий Вамбири, Путешествие по Средней Азии, СПб., 1865, p. 180.

Ахмаджон Холиқулов, Бухоро амирлигининг ташқи сиёсий алоқалари (XVIII асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср ўрталари) / масъул муҳаррир А.С. Сағдуллаев. – Тошкент, 2022. – p. 95-105.

Всеволод Крестовский, Въ гостяхъ у эмира Бухарскаго, СПб., 1887.

Гулдона Таниева, Император кема совға қилган элчи. Илмий-оммабоп рисола, Тошкент, 2022.

Гулсум Михалева, Торговые и посольские связи России со среднеазиатскими ханствами через Оренбург. Ташкент: Фан, 1982.

Гулчеҳра Агзамова, Некоторые вопросы культурно-духовной жизни городов Среднеазиатских ханств// Культура номадов Центральной Азии: материалы Международной конференции, Самарканд 22-24 ноября 2007 г. Самарканд: издание МИЦАИ, 2008, p. 34-40.

Джурабаев. Дж. Бухарский эмират второй половины XVIII – первой половины XIX вв. в письменных источниках, Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Худжанд, 2014.

История Узбекистана (XVI – первая половина XIX века) / Отв. ред. Д.А. Алимова. Ташкент: ФАН, 2012.

Murat O'zkan. Buhara, Petersburg ve Istanbul arasinda diplomasi trafiği: Molla İznazar Maksutov elçiliği // Gazi Türkiyat, Bahar 2019 / 24. p. 165-183.

Николай Остроумов, Бухарския и Хивинския посольства въ Россию и русския посольства въ Бухару и Хиву (Историческа параллель) // Туркестанский сборник Т. 436. 1907, p. 72.

Николай Ханыков, Описание Бухарскаго ханства, СПб., 1843.

Павел Матвиевский, О роли Оренбурга в русско-индийской торговле в XVIII в. // История СССР. М., 1969. № 3. p. 109.

Павел Савельев, Бухара въ 1835 году. СПб., 1836.

- Пётр Шубинский, Бухарские посольства при дворе Екатерины II // Исторический вестник, № 2. 1897, р. 518-538.
- Sunnatillo Hamrayev, Enazar elchi madrasasini Yekaterina II qurdirganmi?// Akademik Ubaydulla Karimov tavalludining 105 yilligi munosabati bilan o'tkazilgan xalqaro ilmiy konferensiya materiallari to'plami. Toshkent: «Fan», 2025, p. 222-228.
- Сергей Жуковский, Сношения России с Бухарой и Хивой за последнее трехсотлетие, Петроградъ, 1915.
- O'zMA, 323-jamg'arma, 1-ro'xat, 55-10 yig'ma jild.
- Ўзбек дипломатияси тарихидан. Тарихий очерклар ва лавҳалар. Хайруллаев М.М. таҳрири остида. Тошкент, 2003. р. 352.
- Хондамирза Гуламов, Посольские связи Бухарскоо ханства с Россией в XVIII веке. Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент: 1984.
- Хондамирза Гуломов, Дипломатические отношения государств средней Азии с Россией в XVIII – первой половине XIX века, Ташкент: Фан, 2005, р. 333.
- Хондамирза Гуломов, История дипломатических отношений государств Средней Азии с Россией (XVIII – первая половина XIX вв.), Диссертация в виде научного доклада на соискание ученой степени доктора исторических наук. Ташкент, 2006, р. 79
- Хондамирза Гулямов, Посольские связи Бухарского ханства с Россией в XVIII веке. Дисс. канд. ист. наук. Ташкент, 1984.
- Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўзбекистоннинг Каспий-Волга бўйлари ва Оренбург орқали Россия билан элчилик алоқалари тарихи (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX аср), I жилд. Тошкент, 2014.
- Ҳамид Зиёев, Ўрта Осиё ва Волга бўйлари (XVI асрнинг иккинчи ярми – XIX асрлар), Тошкент, 1965.
- Ҳамид Зияев, XVIII асрда Ўрта Осиё ва Урал бўйлари, Тошкент: Фан, 1973.
- Яковлев, Мулла Ирназар Максютлов, посланник бухарский // Сибирский вестник. Ч. I. 1824, р. 7-11.