



JUYBĀRIS

JUYBĀRIS, a prominent Bukharan family dynasty, whose leading social position in Bukhara lasted more than 500 years. One of the foundations of the family's status was spiritual. The Juybāris had K̅vājagān/Naq̅šbandi affiliations traced back by their 17th-century biographer, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb Juybāri, from the family eponym K̅vāja Moḥammad-Eslām (d. 14 October 1563), better known as “K̅vāja-ye Juybāri,” to the eponymous founder of the tradition, Bahā'-al-Din Naq̅šband (d. 1389) through K̅vājagi Aḥmad Kāsāni (d. 1549) known as the “Maḥdum-e A'zam,” Mawlānā Moḥammad Qāzi (d. 1515), 'Obayd-Allāh Aḥrār (d. 1490), and Ya'qub Čarkī (d. 1447), one of the three main successors (*kalifas*) of Bahā'-al-Din Naq̅šband (Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, *Maṭlab al-ṭālebin*, fols. 4a-b). During most of the period Juybāris held the office of *šayḳ-al-eslām*, the nominal head of the religious establishment, as well.

The family first came to real preeminence in the middle of the 16th century and remained a social, economic, and political force in the city until the Soviet Revolution. Its center was the shrine and cemetery of Čār Bakr, where most of its members were eventually interred. After the Soviet Revolution some of the family emigrated to Afghanistan, while those who remained behind worked to hide their identity and disassociate themselves from their heritage to avoid persecution (Babajanov and Szuppe, p. 24). For perhaps fifteen or sixteen generations, belying the Khaldunian model, members of the family acquired and disposed of great landed wealth, primarily in the Bukharan oasis but in other towns and cities of Transoxania and Khorasan as well. It is difficult to find any decline in the family fortunes during this lengthy period or any



diminution of its status. The family also played a prominent role in the commercial life of Bukhara, buying and building caravansaries and investing heavily, at least in the second half of the 16th century, in retail establishments—shops, shopping centers, and baths. The family firm, as it were, sent its factors on trading missions as far as Moscow, and they served as merchant-diplomats to India and Iran. Members of the family were notable patrons of the arts and architecture; they built centers of learning and established major charitable foundations to support them. They had themselves memorialized in several significant biographical works of the 16th and 17th centuries and so insured that they would be remembered through time. After the 17th century, however, information about the family must be gleaned from occasional references in narrative texts, biographical works, and the notarial and epigraphic trail it left behind.

Although affiliated with the K̅vājagān/Naqshbandi, the family members appear to us today less as spiritual guides than as individuals whose economic power made them important mediators in Bukharan society. It should be noted, though, that contemporaries in the 16th century would accord the family head the title of *moršed* (spiritual guide), and down through the centuries the family's place in the K̅vājagān *selsela* insured that they were thought of as spiritually empowered figures. Neṭāri Boḳāri, a leading arbiter of literary taste, refers to K̅vāja Moḥammad Eslām as his *moršed* (*Modakker-e aḥbāb*, text, 12), and clearly this was how the Shibaniid ruler, ‘Abd-Allāh Khan (r. 1583-98) saw both K̅vāja Moḥammad Eslām (1563-64) and his son and successor as head of the family, K̅vāja Sa‘d (d. 1589).

The family's first public role was as caretakers of the Čār Bakr shrine, located in Somitan, a sacred site of some antiquity (Babajanov and Szuppe, pp. 19-20). By the 15th century, it commemorated a 13th-century Bukharan scholar, Emām Abu Bakr Sa‘d, and served as an important cemetery. Somitan lies about six kilometers west of the walls of Bukhara City, and control of its region was the launching pad for the Juybāri family's economic and social prominence. But it is only with K̅vāja Moḥammad Eslām b. K̅vāja Aḥmad (1482-1563) that the family emerges as a powerful force in the Bukharan oasis as a whole and in Uzbek-Chingizid politics. His prominent role in politics and the social and economic life of Bukhara made him, rather than one of his forebears, the “founder” of the Juybāri dynasty.

The earliest attestation to Juybāri political prominence comes from Anthony Jenkinson, who arrived in Bukhara in December 1558 on behalf of a group of



London investors seeking an overland route to India. He was obviously very impressed by the power of Moḥammad Eslām. He calls him the “Metropolitane” of the city, most likely his understanding of the title *sheik-al-eslām*, and considered him “more obeyed than the King” (Jenkinson, pp. 84, 93). Moḥammad Islam was known at the time, and since, as “Ḳvāja Juybāri,” and he becomes the family’s eponym. The name “Juybāri” derives from the family residence in Juybār, a village just west of Bukhara that was eventually brought within the city walls in the late 16th century. Ḥāfeẓ-e Taniš’s *Šaraf-nāma-ye šāhi*, the dynastic history of the Abu’l-Khayrid/Shibanids, places Ḳvāja Juybāri at the center of the struggle for Bukhara which eventually resulted in the dominance of the Jāni-Begid clan of the Abu’l-Khayrid/Shibānids and particularly in the preeminence of ‘Abd-Allāh Khan in the political life of Transoxania, Cisoxania, Ḳvārazm, and eastern Khurasan after his capture of Bukhara in late Spring 1557. Ḳvāja Juybāri is given considerable play in the texts as mediator, facilitator, and all-round supporter of the Jāni-Begid clan led by ‘Abd-Allāh b. Eskandar. Whether his support at this time helps explain the origins of the family’s wealth and power or not, it certainly would have given its role as one of Bukhara’s leading families a considerable boost. It is important, however, to note that many of the surviving sources from Bukhara of the period during which the family is establishing its wealth and power are decidedly partisan to the Juybāri cause and perhaps exaggerate its role.

There seems little question of the extent of the real estate wealth which the family amassed during the 16th century and which it administered, augmented, and disposed of with considerable skill over the next several centuries. Hundreds of documents attesting to the real estate holdings of the family have survived. One important source is a register of those transactions that was compiled sometime after 1577, in all probability by a Juybāri employee, probably a steward managing their now substantial land holdings. The register is a codex entitled *Naql-e sawād-e koṭuṭ-e amlāk-e . . . Ḥaẓrat-e Ḳvāja Sa’d*. It contains the records of more than 400 land transactions of the family, notably, but not exclusively, those of Ḳvāja Juybāri and Ḳvāja Sa’d. The published version of the codex (*Iz arkhiva sheikhov Dzhuibari*) and its Russian translation (*Khozyaistvo dzhuibarskikh sheikhov*) have given scholars much material with which to analyze the economic power of the family prior to 1577 (see esp. the works of P. P. Ivanov and M. A. Abduraimov). In addition to this record, affidavits (*eqrārāt*) recording purchases as well as deeds of endowment (*waqfiyāt*, *waqf-nāmas*) held today in Uzbek and Tajik archives continued to document the family’s real estate dealings and charitable



endowments well into the 19th century (Szuppe and Babajanov, Appendix I; Egani and Chekhovich).

Complementing the real estate documents, devotees of the family wrote several biographical/hagiographical works in the 16th and 17th centuries, and many of these were assiduously copied and kept in circulation by the family in the 18th and 19th centuries. In the 16th century, these works, besides the biographical material contained in Ḥāfeẓ-e Taniš's work, included Ḥosayn al-Saraḳsi's *Sa'diya* written by 1580 and Badr-al-Din Kašmiri's *Rawzat al-reẓwān* completed about ten years later. Kašmiri would also include a section on the Juybāris in his *Ẓafar-nāma*, a verse work devoted to the Jāni-Begid Khan, 'Abd-Allāh b. Eskandar. Another very close associate of Ḳvāja Sa'd, Mir Pādšāh b. Amir Ḥaydar Balki Dawlatābādi (see Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, Tashkent ms. inv. 3757, fol. 93b) wrote two *maqāmāt* works, one for Ḳvāja Sa'd and the other for his second son, Ḳvāja 'Abd-al-Raḥim. A copy of these was commissioned by a later Juybāri and copied into a single codex in 1717-19. In 1663-64, a grandson of Ḳvāja Sa'd, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, wrote *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, a work, like the *Sa'diya*, and the *Rawzat al-reẓwān*, entirely devoted to the family, but in his case emphasizing the position of his father, Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, the eldest son of Ḳvāja Sa'd. In his work, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb grants Moḥammad Eslām and Ḳvāja Sa'd a total of forty-eight folios. To his uncles 'Abd-al-Raḥim and 'Abd-al-Karim he allows twenty-four and eight folios respectively. But he gives his father, Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, 121 folios.

These are not diminutive works: the *Rawzat al-reẓwān*, for example is more than 1,100 quarto pages, the *Ẓafar-nāma* amounts to nearly 1,200 pages, and the *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, to nearly 600. Besides information on the public works, associates and disciples, economies, and wonders (*karāmāt*) ascribed to these men, the *Rawzat al-reẓwān*, for example, also includes two long sections (fols. 97b-118b and 306b-367a) of the correspondence of Ḳvāja Moḥammad Eslām and Ḳvāja Sa'd, respectively, with more than fifty political figures of their time as well as shorter sections (fols. 257a-265a, 269a, 271b-273b) with letters from 'Abd-Allāh Khan to Ḳvāja Sa'd. These letters were no doubt chosen by Kašmiri to underscore the influence of both men with the ruling circles but nevertheless provide an important glimpse of the way in which the Juybāri shaykhs could employ the mediatory powers attributed to them.

In addition to the works commissioned by, or in some measure devoted to, the Juybāri family, other works of biography such as Neṭāri's *Modakker al-aḥbāb* and Moṭrebi Samarqandi's *Noska-ye zibā-ye Jahāngiri* and *Tadkerat al-šo'arā'*



offer much additional information on members of the family and their influence both within and outside the confines of the Bukharan oasis. Moṭrebi, for example, writing ca. 1627-28, tells of a large gift of money sent “in these days” by Jahāngir Pādšāh to Samarqand for repair and renovation of Timur’s tomb. To supervise the expenditure of the funds, Taj-al-Din Ḥasan and ‘Abd-al-Raḥim, sons of K̄vāja Sa’d, were sent from Bukhara to Samarqand (Moṭrebi, *Conversations*, p. 87; idem, *Noska*, p. 25). Moṭrebi was loyal to his hometown Samarqand, although he spent much time in Bukhara, and was writing in part to impress the Mughal emperor, Jahāngir Pādšāh. In his view the choice of the Juybāris to supervise the work reflected the high regard Jahāngir had for the family, especially for ‘Abd-al-Raḥim (see Moṭrebi, *Conversations*, 1998, pp. 60-61, 79-80).

The nature and extent of Juybāri wealth and, its perpetuation in an Islamic legal environment, inevitably led to competition and rivalry among family members for control. Moḥammad Eslām died in 1563, and although he was survived by three sons, one of them, K̄vāja Sa’d, emerges as not only preeminent, but the unchallenged leader of the family for the quarter century after Moḥammad Eslām’s death. From the sources available to us, he had sole control of the family’s wealth and clearly had worked himself into that position before the death of Moḥammad Eslām. When K̄vāja Sa’d died in Du’l-ḥejja 997/October 1589, however, there are some signs that rivalry developed between his three sons—the eldest, Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan (b. 1574), the second, ‘Abd-al-Raḥim (b. 1575), and the third, ‘Abd-al-Karim, known as ‘Abdi K̄vāja (of unknown birth date). It is noteworthy that K̄vāja Sa’d was already in his early thirties (*Maṭlab-al-ṭālebin*, fol. 79b) when his father died. But when he himself died, he was only in his late fifties and his sons were in their early teens, probably much more susceptible then to the influence of the many people surrounding their father than would have been the case had their father lived as long as his father had. It is not difficult to imagine a struggle taking place at this juncture between the older men and women, both in the family and those dependent on it, to advance the candidacy of one or another of the sons as leader of the family. Such a struggle is hinted at by the books written afterwards. Mir Pādšāh Balḳi Dawlatābādi appears to have been a supporter of ‘Abd-al-Raḥim, and his composition of ‘Abd-al-Raḥim’s *maqāmāt* (homilies, conversations) suggests a certain degree of partisanship. In addition, Moṭrebi Samarqandi, a contemporary of both men and with no particular ties to the family, clearly considered ‘Abd-al-Raḥim a far more impressive figure than Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan. When invited by Jahāngir to speak about the two brothers,



he lauds ‘Abd-al-Raḥim while remaining silent about Ḥasan (Moṭrebi, 1998; *Conversations*, pp. 60, 79). On the other hand, the *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, which was written by Ḥasan’s son, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, devotes disproportionate space and praise to his father, perhaps in reaction to the relatively greater prestige that his uncle’s reputation enjoyed by the time he sat down to write several decades after the deaths of his father and uncle. Moḥammad-Ṭāleb (fol. 172a-b) also speaks of the brothers having had a falling out and then being reconciled, which also indicates competition for control of the family’s resources. (Another work written for Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, *Fawā’ed-e laylat al-barāt*, might shed further light on the sibling rivalry, if any.) The third son, ‘Abd-al-Karim (or ‘Abdi Ḳvāja, as he was better known), seems to have been marginalized from the outset; he left Transoxania for India allegedly because of some “unworthy (*nāhanjār*)” activities (*Baḥr al-asrār*, fol. 144a) and died there fairly young (d. 1606-07, see-also Akbar-nāma III, pp. 1246-47), probably not yet out of his twenties. His descendants seem to disappear then from the epigraphic and narrative record. Maḥmud b. Amir Wali (Baḥr) mentions a son, ‘Ebād-Allāh Ḳvāja (cf. Babajanov and Szuppe, p. 128, where the son is named ‘Abd-Allāh Ḳvāja), but after him records of this line have yet to be discovered.

When Ḳvāja Sa’d died in late 1589, the most persuasive evidence is that the three sons stood on an equal footing as far as sharing in the estate is concerned. Kašmiri, who was a witness to the aftermath of his death, states that the khan, ‘Abd-Allāh, recognized the seniority of Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, referring to him as “brother” and ‘Abd-al-Raḥim and ‘Abdi Ḳvāja as “sons,” but he makes it clear that the sons were heirs to the real estate empire without distinction and that they should divide the legacy “according to the law” (“*ḥasb al-šar’*,” *Rawzat*, fol. 478b). *Šari’a* inheritance rules would have accorded all three sons equal shares. It is interesting to note, however, that Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, to the contrary, writing seventy years later, cites this same decree (*ḥokm*) and asserts that it gave his father two-thirds of all the property, ‘Abd-al-Raḥim the remaining one-third, and ‘Abdi Ḳvāja nothing (*Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, fol. 129a). This assertion should be understood in the context within which it was written, again perhaps trying to establish his father’s post-mortem preeminence. Other stories in *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin* reinforce the impression that Moḥammad-Ṭāleb is writing his father into history as the dominant and rightful heir to the charismatic power of Ḳvāja Sa’d. We must assume that the sons and grandsons of ‘Abd-al-Raḥim would have been equally devoted to his memory and legacy, and, based on the more or less independent perspective of Moṭrebi, they might have had justification in thinking he was a more fitting



heir to Ḳvāja Sa‘d’s charisma than Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan.

While the main focus of the *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin* is Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, there is also evidence there and elsewhere that Ḥasan and ‘Abd-al-Raḥim managed to live fairly harmoniously after their father died. There are references even in the *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin* (as in the *Noska* citation above) that depict the two as acting jointly, for example going to congratulate Wali-Moḥammad Khan on his succession to the khanate throne, after the death of Bāqī-Moḥammad Khan in 1605-06 (*Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, 166b), or on their coordinated diplomatic work with the Safavids (*Calendar of Documents 2*, pp. 232-33, 238; see also Eskandar Beg Monši, pp. 1180, 1185).

Until the middle of the 17th century, the works noted above offer a way to document the family and its evolving role in Bukharan society. We lack detailed biographical material about the generation after Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan and ‘Abd-al-Raḥim. The former had four sons, including his biographer, who reached maturity in the second quarter of the 17th century, and the latter had two sons and some noteworthy daughters surviving him (see Babajanov and Szuppe, Appendix II: IV and VI, pp. 129-30). Here again, it is not difficult to read into the *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin* competition between the fraternal lines over the family legacy; for example, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb renders his brothers in a sympathetic light while depicting ‘Ebād-Allāh Ḳvāja, his cousin and brother-in-law, the son of ‘Abdi Ḳvāja, as an opium addict and hostile to his father-in-law, Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan (see *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, fols. 184b-187b).

After the generation of the grandchildren of Ḳvāja Sa‘d, that is, Moḥammad-Ṭāleb and his siblings and cousins, the information becomes somewhat spottier. Tombstone inscriptions from Čār Bakr (the central Juybāri cemetery; Babajanov and Szuppe, pp. 41-111), documents (especially endowment deeds), and sporadic references in chronicles, biographies, and occasionally in manuscript colophons help fill in the blank. A daughter of ‘Abd-al-Raḥim, Āy Pādšāh Bibi, whose name and seal appear on endowment deeds, emerges as one of the more prominent members of the family in the second half of the 17th century, along with her siblings Moḥammad Ṣeddiq and Moḥammad Ṣāleḥ. In the late 17th-century work *Moḥiṭ al-tawāriḥ*, we are told that the ruling khan, Sobḥānqoli, held the Selsela-ye Ḳvājagān in the highest regard, and two of the four representatives of this “lineage” whom the author mentions are Juybāris, Moḥammad-Ṣeddiq and Moḥammad-Bāqer, the former the son of ‘Abd-al-Raḥim and brother of Āy Pādšāh Bibi and the latter their nephew (*Moḥiṭ*, fols. 172a-173b). Both men appear in the chronicles of the time



first in the context of the sudden and short-lived occupation of Bukhara by Anuša Khan of K̅vārazm in 1681 and, in the same year, as members of a welcoming delegation when Sobhānqoli arrived in Bukhara to succeed his brother ‘Abd-al-‘Aziz (II) on the khanate throne (Burton, pp. 325-26 and Ivanov, pp. 81-82 on the events; *Moḥit*, fols. 98b, 101a, 108b, and 168a on the Juybāri shaikh’s involvement). Moḥammad Šāleḥ, another brother, was a confidant of the khan, Emāmqoli (r. 1611-41; *Baḥr al-asrār*, fols. 124a, 144a, 356b). When his father died in India in the same year as Jahāngir Pādšāh (1627), Moḥammad-Šāleḥ went to India, was honored by the Mughal, Shah Jahān, and invited to stay. But he returned with his father’s body to the “homeland” (*waṭan-e ma’luf*; *Baḥr al-asrār*, fol. 144a) for burial at the Čār Bakr cemetery, though the tombstone can no longer be identified.

The next generation, that is, the great-great-grandchildren of Moḥammad Eslām “K̅vāja Juybāri,” maintained the Juybāri prominence in Bukharan society and politics as foundation heads (*motawalliān*), diplomats and mediators, and producers of children to intermarry with khanly, amirid, and other notable families. The foundation roles may be seen in their endowment deeds. A typical example of their domestic role as political mediators occurred when, in a dispute with the amirs loyal to ‘Abd-al-‘Aziz Khan (II), his brother and predecessor as khan at Bukhara, Sobhānqoli Khan called on Moḥammad-‘Ābed, the son of Moḥammad-Šāleḥ, to find some resolution (*Moḥit*, fol. 140a). Another striking example took place in 1740, when Bukhara surrendered to Nāder Shah Afšār (Bregel, “Bukhara,” p. 518a). The negotiators representing Nāder Shah and the Bukharan ruler, Abu’l-Fayz Khan (r. 1711-47) met at the home of ‘Abd-al-Hādi K̅vāja Juybāri, who at the time was chief judge (*qāzi-al-qoḏāt*) of “all of Māwarā’ al-nahr” (*Golšan al-moluk*, fol. 134b). Other instances where the family’s intercession and mediation are sought may be found in the letters contained in *Rawzat al-reẓwān* and *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*. The role they played as domestic mediators made the Juybāris attractive to the political leadership of Central Asia as ambassadors, and they went on missions to India and Iran and performed as diplomats in their correspondence with rulers in Kashghar and K̅vārazm (see Burton, pp. 157, 160, 186; Foltz, pp. 100-101). The role of marriage in linking the family’s fortunes with others of similar social status (the khanly, amirid, and scholarly families) is partly revealed in the Babajanov and Szuppe genealogy and may be further traced in the numerous writings about the family.

Although research on the family’s history through the late 18th and 19th



centuries remains to be done, there are many signs of its continuing social and political prominence. In the early 1820s, an Englishman, James Fraser, had come to Mashad hoping to visit Bukhara. Although he failed to obtain permission, he did hear reports from people coming from Bukhara that “The khaujajs of Joeebaur are the greatest of the holy personages; they belong to a family, who are understood to be descended from the khaliph Abubekr, and derive so much wealth from their large possessions, even more than from their sanctity and descent, that they may be in some measure considered independent of the king” (Fraser, *Narrative*, appendix B, p. 83). This description is not unlike that of his compatriot, Anthony Jenkinson, written two hundred and seventy years earlier. In the second half of the century, a Juybāri wrote to the Bukharan amir, Moẓaffar (r. 1860-86), and in his letter refers to the family’s payment of 10,000 tangas for a tax called amināna (according to Ivanov, p. 83, a tax on businessmen and the wealthy).

The origin and extent of the Juybāri economy. It is clear that the Juybāri family acquired enormous wealth and maintained it over time. The original source of that wealth is impossible to ascertain now. It has been suggested that it could be traced to the patronage which K̄vāja Moḥammad-Eslām, as caretaker of the Ār Bakr shrine and moršed to the mother of the Abu’l-Khayrid/Shibanid, ‘Abd-al-‘Aziz Khan (r. at Bukhara 1540-50), received from that woman (Szuppe and Babazanov, p. 21). This conclusion is circumstantially supported by the fact that the earliest surviving document recording a real estate purchase by Moḥammad-Eslām is dated 15 August 1544. This is a modest purchase of two small houses in Juybār for fifty-five tangas (*Iz arkhiva/Khozyaĭstvo*, doc. 94). Less than a month later, however, the Juybāri K̄vāja spent 3,000 tangas to buy the village of Qaṣr-e Luṭ in the Bukharan tumān (district) of Rud-e Šahr (*Iz arkhiva/Khozyaĭstvo*, doc. 217). It is of considerable interest to note that the seller was the Jāni-Begid, Eskandar Solṭān, who reigned as khan from 1561-83. This transaction is some evidence of ties to the Jāni-Begid clan long before it took Bukhara from the Šāh Bodāqids, the clan to which Moḥammad Eslām’s patroness belonged. It is not at all clear where Moḥammad Eslām raised the funds to pay the 3,000 tangas which was the recorded price of the village. There may have been real estate transactions before 1544 for which no documentation was available when the codex of Juybāri documents was compiled, sometime after 1577, that might have accounted for the money.

As a consequence of Moḥammad Eslām’s choosing to support the Jāni-Begid effort to seize Bukhara from the Šāh Bodāqid clan of the Abu’l-Khayrids, the



resources at his disposal increased, but not dramatically. By 1557, he seems to have been very well off. In the thirteen years from the record of his first real estate purchase until the taking of Bukhara, he spent some 20,000 tangas on forty-five properties. During the sixteen and one-half years after the conquest until 1563, the date of the last transaction in which he was a principal (doc. 90) and the year of his death, he purchased 137 properties and spent nearly 35,000 tangas.

Ḳvāja Sa’d, who was also actively purchasing property during his father’s lifetime, rapidly expanded the real estate holdings that Moḥammad Islam had created. Ḳvāja Sa’d showed considerable talent for real estate and corporate management, being particularly successful, to all appearances, in the quality of the employees he hired to manage his far-flung real estate empire. Under him, Juybāri properties, often extensive enough to require separate management by regions, extended throughout Transoxania (Bukhara, Samarqand, Karmina, Tashkent, Nasaf, Termed, Qarakol, Šahr-e Sabz, the Waḳš valley, Tashkent, and into Cisoxania (Andkhud, Balkh, and Badakhshan) and eastern Khorasan (Marv and Herat). Juybāri holdings are discussed in passing but with some detail by Kašmiri, writing in 1589, and then in much greater detail by Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, writing in the 1660s. Kašmiri notes that Ḳvāja Sa’d owned properties in Marv, Herat, Khorasan generally, Andkhud, and Badakhshan (see Kašmiri, *Rawzat*, fols. 261a, 255b, 146b, 261a, and 247b, respectively). The Juybāri codex of *eqrārāt* includes in its title the words “properties of Hażrat-e Ḳvāja Sa’d in *balada-ye Boḳārā*” but the documents also include properties purchased in Nasaf, Qarakol, Sāgarj, the environs of Samarqand, Karmina, and Abivard.

But it is Moḥammad-Ṭāleb who provides the most information about the organization and scope of the Juybāri economy. Under the heading “An account of the tribe of employees (*ṭā’efa-ye molāzemān*) of Hażrat-e Išan” (Ḳvāja Sa’d) he gives the names and titles of six department heads in the central administration (*divān*): Mollā Bābāqoli, attorney (*divān-e wakil*) for all properties, Mollā Solṭān-Moḥammad Poštak, chief minister (vizier) supervising four bureau chiefs (*daftar-dār*). Mollā Solṭān-Moḥammad, secretary supervisor (*kāteb*, *munši*, *mošref*) of household and workshop accounts. Mollā Šufi, bureau chief of miscellaneous income (*abwāb al-māl*). Mollā ‘Arab, bureau chief of income and expenditures (*karj*). Mollā Yusof-‘Ali, bureau chief of payroll (*[ma]wājeb*).

Each bureau head had several scribes (*moḥarrer*) working for him, and there



were another forty clerks (*nevisandas*) working in the *divān*. Moḥammad-Ṭāleb then goes on to individually name another thirty-three employees, including the chiefs of the regional property administrations (the *sarkārāt*): Bukhara (called the *sarkār* of the *tumāns*), Nasaf/Qarshi, Samarqand, Termed, Ḥeṣar (-e Šādmān), Badakhshān, Khorasan, and Marv. Balkh which had the most complex administration, had a *wakil*, *divān*, *daftar-dār*, and a *ṣāḥeb-e taḥwil-e naqda wa ḡalla* (treasurer for cash and grain). In all, says Moḥammad-Ṭāleb, seventy employees worked in K̄vāja Sa'd's corporate headquarters (*Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, pp. 94b-95b). This gives some sense of the elaborateness of the administration of the enterprise as it existed at the beginning of the 17th century. P. P. Ivanov provides a fairly detailed description of the scope of the Juybāri agrarianate economy under K̄vāja Moḥammad-Eslām, K̄vāja Sa'd, and K̄vāja Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan respectively, as well as their descendants down through the 19th century (Ivanov, *Khozyaĭstvo*, pp. 48-83). What is clear is that however much the Juybāri economy changed over time the family still remained one of the wealthiest and most influential in Bukhara through the 19th century.

Monuments and public works. The accumulation of such wealth was not an end in itself. From Moḥammad-Eslām's time onwards, much of that wealth was devoted to public works. The record of the Juybāri sponsoring of new public works—mosques, *madrasas*, *kānaqāhs*, parks, bridges, canals, caravanserais—as well as the maintenance down through time of those structures and the repair and renovation of buildings built by others is enormous, and details of these are found in *Rawza*, esp. fols. 289b-305a; *Maṭlab al-Ṭālebin*, fols. 92b-93b and the vast corpus of surviving Juybāri endowment deeds (*waqf-nāmas*; see Bibliography). By comparing the endowment deeds with the affidavits (*eqrārāt*) of the family's real estate purchases, one can see how extensively and how rapidly the purchased real estate was donated as *waqf* and used to endow public structures. The *waqf-nāmas* also indicate that a complementary purpose of establishing these endowments was to preserve and perpetuate the family. But in terms of scale and value, most of the income produced by these endowments, as far as we can tell today, went to support the public institutions and all the functions (and employees) associated with them. The success of an endowment policy which linked the fortunes of the family with those institutions (and vice versa) is reflected in the survival of many of the largest of those institutions (the Čār Bakr complex of madrasa, mosque, and *kānaqāh*; the Kālābād Madrasa; and the Gāwkošān Madrasa and Congregational Mosque). But most of the hundreds of public works, such as Āy Pādšāh Bibi's 1671 madrasas and water



tank (*ḥawẓ*) built “on the street (*kuy*) of the ‘Abd-al-‘Aziz Khan (I) mosque” (Egani and Chekhovich, no. 58), now survive only in the written record.

Bibliography :

16th century.

Anonymous, *Naql-e sawād-e koṭuṭ-e amlāk-e . . . Ḥaẓrat-e K̄vāja Sa’d . . .*, St. Petersburg, Institut Vostokovedeniya, Ms. No. B4388; edited by F. B. Rostopchin and published in transcription by E. E. Bertel’s, *Iz arkhiva sheikhov Dzhuībari*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow and Leningrad 1938.

Translation by Rostopchin but published under the name of Yu. P. Verkhovskii with the introduction of P. P. Ivanov as *Khozyaǐstvo dzhuībarskikh sheikhov*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow and Leningrad, 1954.

Badr-al-Din b. ‘Abd-al-Salām Kašmiri, *Rawẓat al-rezwān wa ḥadiqat al-ġelmān*, Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Ms. Inv. No. 2094, Tashkent. Idem, *Zafar-nāma*, Dushanbe, IVAN, ms. 779.

Dust-Moḥammad Bokāri, *Juybār al-asrār*, ms. 1461/VI, fols. 242a-254b, Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Tashkent. A. A. Egani and O. D. Chekhovich, “Regesty Sredneaziatskikh aktov” *Pis’mennye pamyatniki Vostoka* 1978/1979 (Moscow, 1984), doc. nos. 103-4, 106; no. 103 is found in *Iz arkhiva/Khozyaǐstvo* (doc. no. 176).

B. A. Kazakov, *Dokumental’nye pamyatniki Sredneĭ Azii*, Tashkent, “Uzbekistan,” 1987, esp. pp. 27, 31, 34, 76, 77.

Ḥāfeẓ-e Taneš, *Šaraf-nāma-ye šāhi* (also known as *‘Abd-Allāh-nāma*), partially ed. and tr. M. A. Salakhedinova, 2 vols. (of four projected; Moscow: Nauka, 1983-); British Library (India Office Collection) ms. No. 574.

Ḥosayn b. Mir Ḥasan Ḥosayni Saraḡsi, (*Manāqeb-e*) *Sa’diya*, Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Tashkent, mss. nos. 4514, 2323/III (fols. 31a-179), 1439/I (fols. 1b-181b; biographies of K̄vāja Moḥammad-Eslām [d. 971/1563-64] and his son K̄vāja Sa’d [d. 997/1588]).

Anthony Jenkinson, *Early Voyages to Russia and Persia by Anthony Jenkinson and other Englishmen with some Account of the First Intercourse of the English with Russia and Central Asia by Way of the Caspian Sea*, ed. E. Delmar Morgan



and C. H. Coote, London, 1886.

Uzbekiston Respublikasi Markaziy Davlati Arxivi, fond I-323, docs. nos. 32,115/2, 572, 574, 823/1, 823/3, 1214, 1247, and 1429/2 (the last three synopsized by Babajanov and Szuppe, 117-19).

17th century.

Anonymous, *Fawā'ed-e laylat al-barāt*, ms. inv. no. 11774, Tashkent, IVAN. Flyleaf states this is a genealogy (*nasab-nāma*) of the Juybāri Ḳvājas, an account of Čār Bakr, the benefits (*fawā'ed*) of the *šab-e barāt* (the night of 14 Ša'bān when the dead are remembered), and the *maqāmāt* of “Ḳvāja Juybār” (Moḥammad Eslām). This work was written for Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan, the grandson of Moḥammad Eslām. A. A. Egani and O. D. Chekhovich, “Regesty Sredneaziatskikh aktov,” *Pis'mennye pamyatniki Vostoka* 1975, 1976/1977, 1978/1979, Moscow, Nauka, 1981-1987, (1975): docs. nos. 43, 45, 46, 50, 63, 65; (1976/1977): doc. nos. 107, (1978/1979) doc. nos. 111-14, 116-18, 122, 129.

(None of these documents is found in the codex.) Abu'l-'Abbās Moḥammad-Ṭāleb b. Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan Juybāri, *Maṭlab al-ṭālebin*, Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Tashkent, ms. Inv. No. 80; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, ms. Or. oct. 1540.

Eskandar Beg Monshi, *History of Shah 'Abbas the Great*, 3 vols., tr. R. Savory, Boulder, Colo., 1978-86.

Maḥmud b. Amir-Wali, *Baḥr al-asrār fi manāqeb al-akyār*, London, British Library (India Office Collection), ms. no 575.

Moḥammad Amin b. Moḥammad Zamān Boḳāri Sufiāni, *Moḥiṭ al-tawāriḳ*, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. no. 472.

Sayyed Aḥmad Ḥosayni mašhur be Mir Pādšāh Balḳi Dawlatābādi, *Maqāmāt-e ḥazrat-e Ḳvāja Kalān Ḳvāja*, ms. 2323/IV, fols. 181b-215b, Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Tashkent. Idem, *Maqāmāt-e Ḳvāja 'Abd-al-Raḥim*, ms. 2323/V (fols. 216a-232a), Institut Sharqshinasliq Uzbekiston, Tashkent. Solṭān Moḥammad Moṭrebi (al-)Ašamm Samarqandi, *Noska-ye zibā-ye Jahāngiri*, Tehran, 1998; The *kātema* of this work, pp. 267-344, has been separately published by A. M. Mirzoev as *Kāṭerāt-e Moṭrebi Samarqandi*, Karachi, 1977 and tr. Richard C. Foltz as *Conversations with Emperor Jahangir*, Costa Mesa, 1998 (see below); Mirzoev also took selections from it, attributed the work to Jahāngir and



entitled it *Tadkerat al-šo'arā'*, Karachi, 1976.

Riazul Islam, ed., *A Calendar of Documents on Indo-Persian Relations II*, Karachi, 1982, esp. pp. 231-33, 238.

Firdawsi State Public Library, Tajikistan, doc. nos. 58, 101 (synopsized in Babajanov and Szuppe, pp. 123-24; see-also Egani and Chekhovich). Uzbekiston Respublikasi Markaziy Davlati Arxivi, fond I-323, doc. nos. 3, 5, 15, 55/16, 96, 115, 115/3, 115/4, 115/6, 274, 518, 568, 570, 572, 573, 574, 671, 823/2-823/6, 875, 1178, 1181/4, 1246.

18th and 19th centuries.

James Baillie Fraser, *Narrative of a Journey into Khorasan in the Years 1821 and 1822*, London, 1825.

G. N. Kurbanov, "Svitok dokumentov Daniyal Bii Atalyka (XVII v.)" [sic for XVIII v.], *Iz istorii kul'turnogo naslediya Bukhary*, Tashkent, 1990, pp. 79-105 (pp. 103-4 for Juybāri transactions from 1770s). Uzbekiston Respublikasi Markaziy Davlati Arxivi, fond I-323, doc. no. 1295/29.

Recent studies.

M. A. Abduraimov, *Ocherki po istorii agrarnykh otnoshenii v Bukharskom khanstve v XVI- pervoi polovine XIX v.*, 2 vols., Tashkent, 1966-70.

B. A. Akhmedov, "Rol' dzhuĭbarskikh khodzhei v obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni Srednei Azii XVI-XVII vekov." In *Dukhoventsvo i politicheskaya zhizn' na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke v period feodalizma*, Moscow, 1985, pp. 16-31.

Bakhtyar Babajanov and Maria Szuppe, *Les inscriptions persanes de Char Bakr, nécropole familiale des Khwāja Jūybāri près de Boukhara*, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part 4/31, Persian inscriptions down to the early Safavid Period, London, 2002.

Yuri Bregel, "Bukhara III. After the Mongol Invasion," in *Encyclopedia Iranica* IV/5, 1989, pp. 515-21.

Audrey Burton, *The Bukharans: A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial history, 1550-1702*, Richmond, Surrey, 1997.

Devin DeWeese, *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba*



Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition, University Park, Penn., 1994, esp. pp. 392-96, 401.

Richard Foltz, “The Central Asian Naqshbandi Connections of the Mughal Emperors,” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 7, 1996, pp. 229-39.

Idem, *Mughal India and Central Asia*, Karachi and New York, 1998, esp. pp. 97-103.

P. P. Ivanov, “Issledovanie,” in *Khozyaĭstvo dzhuiĭbarskikh sheĭkhov*, Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSR, Moscow, 1954, pp. 7-83.

R. D. McChesney, *Central Asia: Foundations of Change*, Princeton, 1996, esp. pp. 109-14.

Idem, “Some Observations on ‘Garden’ and Its Meanings in the Property Transactions of the Juybārī Family in Bukhara, 1544-77,” in Attilio Petruccioli, ed., *Gardens in the Time of the Great Muslim Empires: Theory and Design*, Leiden, Köln and New York, 1997, pp. 97-109.

Idem, “Bukhara’s Suburban Villages: Juzmandun in the 16th Century,” in Attilio Petruccioli, ed., *Bukhara: The Myth and the Architecture*, Cambridge, Mass., 1999, pp. 93-119.

Juergen Paul, “La propriété foncière des cheikhs Juybari,” *Cahiers d’Asie centrale* 3-4, 1997, pp. 183-97.

Florian Schwarz, “Bukhara and Its Hinterland: The Oasis of Bukhara in the 16th Century in the Light of the Juybārī Codex,” in Attilio Petruccioli, ed., *Bukhara: The Myth and the Architecture*, Cambridge, Mass., 1999, pp. 79-92.

Idem, *‘Unser Weg schliesst tausend Wege ein’: Derwische und Gesellschaft im islamischen Mittelasien im 16. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 2000, esp. chap. five.