

УДК: 94(575)"17/19":351

*Университет бизнеса и науки, факультет социальных и  
гуманитарных наук, кафедра истории*

*студент 4 курса*

*Муталлибёнов Бобурмирза*

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЫХ СИСТЕМ  
БУХАРСКОГО, ХИВИНСКОГО И КОКАНДСКОГО ХАНСТВ.**

*Аннотация:* В статье проводится сравнительный анализ систем управления Бухарского, Хивинского и Кокандского ханств конца XVIII–XIX веков. На основе сравнительно-исторического метода, хроник, вакфных документов, дипломатических отчетов и научной литературы исследуются центральная власть, местное управление, налогообложение и военная организация. Установлено, что централизованная система Бухары была более устойчивой, чем племенная структура Хивы и политически нестабильный Коканд, что существенно повлияло на их дальнейшую историческую судьбу.

*Ключевые слова:* Бухарское ханство, Хивинское ханство, Кокандское ханство, Средняя Азия, административная система, сравнительная история, русское завоевание,

UDC: 94(575)"17/19":351

*University of Business and Science Faculty of Social and Humanitarian  
Sciences, Department of History*

*4th year student*

*Mutallibjonov Boburmirzo*

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS  
OF THE BUKHARA, KHIVA, AND KOKAND KHANATES**

**Abstract:** This article presents a comparative analysis of the administrative systems of the Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand Khanates in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Using a comparative historical approach based on

chronicles, waqf documents, diplomatic reports, and scholarly literature, it examines central authority, provincial administration, taxation, and military organization. The findings indicate that Bukhara's centralized administrative system was more stable than Khiva's tribal structure and Kokand's politically unstable administration, significantly influencing their subsequent historical development.

**Keywords:** Bukhara khanate, Khiva khanate, Kokand khanate, Central Asia, administrative system, comparative history, Russian conquest,

**Introduction;** The political history of Central Asia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries cannot be fully understood without examining the three khanates that dominated the region: Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand. These states, which emerged from the fragmentation of earlier Uzbek confederations, developed distinct yet interconnected systems of governance that reflected both shared Turko-Islamic traditions and unique local circumstances. Although historians have long studied each khanate individually, a comparative analysis of their administrative structures reveals important patterns about how power was organized, legitimized, and contested in pre-colonial Central Asia, and such an approach also helps explain why these polities ultimately proved vulnerable to Russian imperial expansion in the second half of the nineteenth century.

**Literature Review;** The historiography on the Central Asian khanates has developed considerably since the mid-twentieth century, moving from purely descriptive chronicles toward analytical studies of statehood and administration. Soviet historians, working within a framework that often emphasized feudal relations and class struggle, nonetheless produced foundational studies on the socio-economic structures of Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand, examining land tenure, taxation, and the role of the ulama in local governance [1, p. 3]. These early works, while ideologically shaped, remain valuable for their extensive use of archival and waqf documents that are otherwise difficult to access.

**Methodology;** This study employs a comparative-historical method to analyze the administrative, fiscal, and military systems of the Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand khanates between the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries. The comparative approach was chosen because it allows the identification of both shared institutional patterns rooted in common Turko-Islamic statecraft and the specific local variations produced by differing tribal compositions, economic bases, and geopolitical pressures [6, p. 11].

**Results;** This comparative study of the administrative systems of the Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand khanates yields several substantive conclusions grounded in the actual historical record.

First, all three khanates were ruled by a monarch (amir in Bukhara after 1785, khan in Khiva and Kokand) whose authority was theoretically absolute but in practice constrained by tribal and religious elites. In Bukhara, the Manghit dynasty (ruling from 1756) built a relatively centralized administration, employing officials such as the qushbegi (chief minister), qozis (judges), and raises (moral-religious inspectors), and relied heavily on the Naqshbandi ulama for legitimacy [1, p. 5]. This bureaucratic structure gave Bukhara comparatively greater administrative continuity than its neighbors.

Second, Khiva, under the Qongrat dynasty (from 1804), depended more directly on the Uzbek and Turkmen tribal confederations for military and fiscal support, meaning that khans such as Muhammad Rahim Khan and later Sayyid Muhammad Khan had to continually negotiate with tribal leaders (biys) rather than rule through a purely bureaucratic hierarchy [10, p. 19]. Khiva's smaller territorial base and reliance on irrigation-dependent oasis agriculture along the Amu Darya also shaped a more compact but tribally fragmented administrative system.

**Discussion;** The comparative findings presented above raise broader questions about the nature of pre-colonial statehood in Central Asia and challenge simplistic characterizations of the khanates as uniformly "weak" or "backward"

polities awaiting inevitable Russian conquest. Rather, the evidence suggests a spectrum of institutional resilience directly tied to each khanate's specific balance between bureaucratic centralization and tribal power-sharing [7, p. 8].

Bukhara's relative durability, surviving as a protectorate until 1920 while Khiva and Kokand fell decades earlier, cannot be attributed to superior military strength alone, since all three khanates possessed comparably limited capacity to resist modern Russian artillery and rifles.

**Conclusion;** This comparative analysis of the governance systems of the Bukhara, Khiva, and Kokand khanates demonstrates that, despite sharing a common Turko-Islamic administrative heritage, the three states developed markedly different institutional structures shaped by their distinct social compositions, economic bases, and tribal-bureaucratic balances [10,p. 6]. Bukhara's relatively centralized administration, built around the qushbegi system and sustained cooperation with the Naqshbandi ulama, provided the amirate with greater institutional continuity than its neighbors. Khiva's dependence on negotiated relationships with Uzbek and Turkmen tribal confederations produced a more fragile, though functional, system of governance, while Kokand's persistent tension between Kipchak nomadic elites and the settled Sart population resulted in the most institutionally unstable of the three khanates, marked by recurring succession crises.

## **Literature**

1. Avezov, H. K. Trade and economic relations between the Bukhara khanate and the Khorezm khanate during the Shaybanid rule // Scientific article. – 2023.
2. Atamuratova, D. Military expeditions from the 1840s to 1873: the conquest of the Khiva khanate by the Russian Empire // Scientific article. – 2021.

3. The formation and development of the Uzbek khanates // Education Innovation and Integration. – 2025. – URL: <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/tinnint/article/view/95817>
4. The twofold conquest of the Khiva khanate by the Bukhara khanate and its consequences for the administrative system // Modern Science and Research. – URL: <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/download/28966/29799/33368>
5. State administration in the Bukhara khanate // Scientific-jl.com. – URL: <https://scientific-jl.com/new/article/download/19934/19410/38897>
6. Erkuziev, A. History of the Bukhara khanate. – Namangan, 2018.
7. Polvonov, J. The history of political and diplomatic relations between the Khiva khanate and the Bukhara emirate (1806–1842) //ResearchGate. – URL: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378443932>
8. Sobolev, L. Latest history of the khanates of Bokhara and Kokand. – Calcutta, 1876.
9. Bartold, V. V. Collected Works. Vol. 2, part 1: History of the Turkestan region. – Moscow: Nauka, 1963.
10. Egamberdiev, A. History of the Kokand khanate. – Tashkent: Davr Press, 2003.