

**RECONSTRUCTING THE PAST: *JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES***

DOI.org/10.54414

**Print ISSN 29595207**

**Online ISSN 29595215**

**Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies** is a double blind peer-reviewed academic journal, published quarterly in English by Western Caspian University Press. The journal focuses on the publication of original research papers, devoted to the various issues of Historical Studies, and accepts articles from authors all around the World. Being published quarterly, the journal takes issues of copyright infringement and plagiarism in publication very seriously.

***Contacts***

*Address:* 31 Istiglaliyyat, Baku 1001

*Email:* [historical\\_studies@wcu.edu.az](mailto:historical_studies@wcu.edu.az)

*Phone:* (+99412) 492 74 18

© Western Caspian University

***EDITOR-IN CHIEF:***

**Huseyn Baghirov** (*Western Caspian University, Azerbaijan*)

***EDITORIAL BOARD:***

**Nabil Al-Tikriti** (University of Mary Washington, USA) *co-Editor*

**Eva-Maria Auch** (Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany)

**Mikheil Bakhtadze** (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia)

**Paulo Botta** (Pontifical Catholic University of Argentina, Argentina)

**Elio Brancaforte** (Tulane University, USA)

**Juan Signes Codoñer** (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

**Dali Kandelaki** (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia)

**Nigar Maxwell** (Freelance Researcher, UK)

**Arailym S. Mussagaliyeva** (Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan)

**Sergiu Musteata** ("Ion Creangă" State Pedagogical University, Moldova)

**Pawel Olszewski** (Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland)

**Yaroslav Pylypchuk** (National Pedagogical Drahomanov University, Ukraine)

**Michael A. Reynolds** (Princeton University, USA)

**Irina Shingiryay** (Oxford University, UK)

**Jeremy Smith** (Eastern Finland University, Finland) *co-Editor*

**Yu Tachibana** (Hokkaido University, Japan)

**Ahmet Taşağıl** (Yeditepe University, Turkey)

**Lala Alyeva** (Baku State University, Azerbaijan) *Deputy Editor-in Chief*

**CONTENT:**

**Note from the Editor in Chief**

*Huseyn Baghirov*.....4

**The Mystery of the Onoguris Fortress**

*Borbála Obrusánszk*.....5

**Some Aspects of Georgian-Azerbaijani Relations in 1918-1920**

*Mikheil Bakhtadze*.....17

**On Social And Political Issues of Iranian Azerbaijan in The Newspaper  
“Azerbaijan” (1947-1949)**

*Ali Farhadov*.....32

**Sacralization of Burial Places of Early Islamic and Subsequent Historical Figures of  
Fergana and Modernity**

*Abdukadir Zahidi (Zakhidov)*.....51

**On the Issue of Subordination of The Galician-Volhynian Princes to The Mongol  
Empire and Its Consequences**

*Vladyslav Gulevych*.....62

**SUBMISSION GUIDELINES**.....83

**Note from the Editor in Chief**

We are pleased to invite all scholars to publish their research papers on history and related to history fields, written impartially and analyzing the historical past without political bias.

*Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies* aims to foster recovering historical past without fear or favor, based not only on the historical methods and methodology, but also on an interdisciplinary approach.

Our purpose is to provide a forum for scientific research without political overtones.

Kind regards,

*Professor Huseyn Baghirov*

*Founder of the Western Caspian University*

## THE MYSTERY OF THE ONOGURIS FORTRESS

**Borbála Obrusánszky**

PhD in History

Karoli Gaspar University, Budapest, Hungary

[borbala.obrusanszky@gmail.com](mailto:borbala.obrusanszky@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8654-1796>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/FGXP7596>

**Abstract:** The names Honagur/Onogur etc. referring to the Huns and later to the Hungarians appear in the sources of the Caucasus region, which indicates that the Huns and their descendants played an important role in the region in the 5th-6th centuries. In my present study, I examine the name of the fortress, Onoguris, which often appeared in the Byzantine-Persian war, and which played an important role in the battles.

In my present study, I examine the name of the fortress, Onoguris, which reminds us the name Hungarians and appeared in the Byzantine-Persian, especially in the Lazica war, and which played an important role in the battles.

**Keywords:** *Caucasus, Lazica, Lazic war, Honagur, Onoguris, Huns, Hungarians*

### INTRODUCTION

Onoguris was one of the important fortresses of the western Caucasus in ancient Lazica, for which there was a fierce struggle between the Byzantines and the Persians in the middle of the 6th century. From the 1st century BC onwards battles raged already for the possession of this area between the two neighboring great powers, the Roman and Parthian Empires. Later on there was a competition for the control of this geopolitically extremely important area between the Persian Sassanids, who later replaced the Parthians, and the Eastern Roman Empire after the division of the Roman Empire in 395. There are many records of the centuries-old battles. The most interesting out of these for us are the events recorded by the historians Procopius<sup>1</sup>, Agathias<sup>2</sup> and Menandros Protector<sup>3</sup>, which the Byzantine sources call the Lazica War and the Georgians call the Egrisi War. Not only the armies of the two empires, but also mercenaries took part in the battles, for example the Huns living in the region, who fought sometimes on the Persian side, sometimes on the Byzantine side. The war in Lazica is also of particular importance to us, because in the historical sources reporting on it, the Huns who were believed to have disappeared appear again. A town called Onoguris also appeared, which contemporaries believe was the town of the Huns, and the name of which may be related to the Hungarians, Onogur/Hungarus. The Byzantine sources provide a new addition to the history of the European Huns, as well as the early, possible presence of Hungarians in the Caucasus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Procopius Caesarea (around 500–565) 6th century historian. His main work is the History of the Wars, in which he summarized the Goth, Vandal and Persian wars of Emperor Justinian I (r. 527–565).

<sup>2</sup> Agathian Myrine (around 530–582/594?) Continued the work of Procopius

<sup>3</sup> Continued the work of Agathias. He wrote his chronicle at the time of Emperor Mauricos (r. 582–602.)

The large-scale eastern wars were closely related to the large-scale plan of the then emperor, Justinian I (r. 527–565), who wanted to revive the Roman Empire after his accession to the throne. According to the Byzantine historian Agathias, the ruler could have decided very early on to reunite the former Roman territories, which is also supported by the fact that at the beginning of his reign he declared that the Gepids, Longobards, Franks and Alemanni settled in the territory of the former Roman Empire were all his subjects. [Agathias (1975): book I, 4] With this, he foreshadowed his claim to the old Roman lands. However, to implement his plan, he needed a well-trained force, so in addition to the imperial military, mercenaries were also employed, usually Huns, who were sometimes referred to as Sabirs, and who received significant support for their service. Procopius disapprovingly remarked that Justinian had supported the Huns too much: “For the loss of the empire he gave large sums to anyone among the Huns who came before him; as a result, the Roman land was exposed to frequent raids, because the barbarians who tasted the wealth of the Romans could no longer forget the road leading here.”[Prokopios (1984): 48] The Byzantine ruler had plans for Attila's successors. He successfully used their forces in the war against the Vandals (533–534) and the Goths (535–554), and after that he went to war with the Persians in several places in the east, one of the sites of which was the Second Lazica War (541–562).

## LAZICA

Colchis, an ancient state on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, had rich gold deposits. Gold was washed from the mountain streams. The ancient Hellenic Argonaut expedition was aimed at obtaining this region wanting to acquire the "golden fleece", i.e. the gold treasures of the region. A section of the famous Eurasian trade route, the Silk Road led through this area that connected Byzantium with Iran, Central Asia and China. This was a significant source of income for the powers that controlled the region. In the early Middle Ages, this area was called Egrisi by the locals, and Greek sources called it Lazica. Due to its strategic position, both regional powers wanted to extend their influence in the area, so there were almost continuous wars here from the 1st century AD. A determinative peace took place in Lazica in 387, in which the Romans and Persians divided the region between them: Iberia and most of Armenia came under Persian influence, while Lazica (formerly: Colchis) and a small part of Armenia belonged to Rome. In the first half of the 5th century, Christian persecution overshadowed the relationship between the two empires, and there was another change as well as the eastern half of the Roman Empire, known as Byzantium, took over these areas of the divided Roman Empire. The attack of the Persians subsided in the 440s, because they clashed several times with their eastern neighbors, the Hephthalites (White Huns), who were so successful that in 484 they captured and executed Shah Peroz I himself (457–484). The Persians paused their attack in the direction of the Caucasus for a while, then at the very beginning of the 6th century, during the reign of Shah Kavad I (488–531), the war between Byzantium and Persia started again for the possession of Armenia, and then in 520 they made peace. A significant change took place in the region when in 520/521, the king of Lazica, Tzath I (521/522–527), was baptized in Byzantium and married a Christian woman, which the Persians regarded as a threat. In response, the Persians wanted to forcibly convert

Christian Iberia to the Zoroastrian faith, at which point Gurganes<sup>4</sup> asked Emperor Justinian for help. A war raged between the two great powers until 532 when they made peace, in which they agreed on the influence of the region: Lazica went to Byzantium, but the Roman successor state had to pay 11 pounds of gold annually to the Persians. However, Khosrow I (531-579) broke this agreement called "the eternal peace" and in 540 launched an attack against the Byzantine Empire led by Justinian I and its vassal states on several fronts, including the Caucasus.

## THE LAZICA WARS

Due to its geographical location, Lazica was closely linked to the states of the Black Sea region, and in fact, the area was a Byzantine vassal state from the 6th century. The king of Lazica Gubazes II (541–555) wanted to change this. He rebelled against Justinian I and the Byzantine rule, because Tzibus the military commander sent to the area who was holding the title of *magister militum*, made the salt trade and other products a Roman monopoly [Procopius (1914): II, XV, 8–12], which sensitively affected the local merchants and the treasury of Lazica. As a result, the locals lost a significant amount of income. Gubazes therefore approached the Persian Shah Khosrow I with the proposal that Lazica would join them. [Procopius (1914): II, XVII, 1; Agathias (1975): II, XV, 17–18] The offer came in handy for the Persian ruler, because after he had gained authority over Iberia in the Caucasus in the peace treaty of 532, he wanted to expand further westward in order to reach the Black Sea, to control the caravan trade in the region and to increase the Persian treasury with its income. It came in handy for him that the Lazicians approached him and promised to surrender to him if he freed them from Tzibus. Shah Khosrow therefore took advantage of the opportunity. In 540 he canceled the eternal peace treaty that he concluded with the Byzantines in 532 and in 541 he launched his army against Lazica. At the border, Gubazes surrendered to him [Procopius (1914): II, XVII, 1] and handed over Petra, the Byzantine fortress on the Black Sea coast. However, the Persian alliance did not live up to the expectations. The Persian Shah settled Persians in Petra, and the Zoroastrian priests, the magus, wanted to forcefully convert the Christians to their own faith, which met with great resistance. When they wanted to resettle some of the people living in Petra into Persia, and at the same time Gubazes had found out that they wanted to kill him, he turned away from the Persians and turned to his old ally. In 548, he approached Emperor Justinian I, who sent 7,000 Roman soldiers and 1,000 Tzan (relatives of the Lazica) auxiliaries to protect the Lazicans. He appointed Dagisthaeus as general and ordered him to besiege and take Petra. The Byzantine forces marched towards Lazica in 549, scoring several victories against Persian forces, but failed to take the key fortress of Petra.<sup>5</sup> The Byzantine general did not pay attention to the defense of the mountain passes in the east, so the relief army led by the Persian Mihr-Mihroe<sup>6</sup> easily passed through the passes and relieved the besieged Petra. After that, Mihr-Mihroe left 3000 men in the fortress and retreated to Armenia. Gubazes and

---

<sup>4</sup> Vakhtang I. Gorgasali 447–522, King of Iberia

<sup>5</sup> Kobulteï, Adjara

<sup>6</sup> In the Byzantine Chronicles: *Mermeroes*

Dagisthaeus<sup>7</sup> made a repeated attack at Petra, causing great damage to the fortress, but failed to take it. At the same time, the Persian general Chorianes was killed in the battle by Phasis. Another large force under the command of the Byzantine Rhecithancus also appeared in the area, to whom the Lazicians and the Sabirs had joined. [Teall (1965): 62] Because of the failure, in 550 there was a change in the military leadership, Dagisthaeus was sent home and Bessas took over. The siege of Petra continued, and at the same time the two empires sat down to negotiate a truce. Bessas managed to take Petra in the spring of 551. As a result, Gubazes rejected Mihr-Mihroe's peace offer in 551. Then the Persian general, Mihr-Mihroe, besieged the capital of Lazica, Archaeopolis, and other nearby strongholds, including Onoguris, as well as some smaller strongholds on the right bank of the Phasis river. Onoguris fell, but he could not take Archaeopolis, and the Persian army suffered significant losses. The Byzantines mobilized more than 12 thousand people there, [Teall (1965): 63] so the Persian army retreated. Between 552–554 the Persians were only able to occupy small strongholds in Lazica. In 554, general Mihr-Mihroe retired due to illness and died later that year. He was replaced by Nachoragan, who repelled the Byzantine attack at Onoguris. In 555, the Persians continued to attack in the direction of the Phasis River, but were defeated by the new Byzantine general, Martin, who rectified with this the defeat at Onoguris. An elite unit fought on the side of the Persians, the Dajlamites, whom the Byzantines called Dilimnitas. This was a group of non-Persian, possibly mostly horsemen from the steppes, who lived in the southwestern part of the Caspian Sea, near the Albroz Mountains. According to Agathias, they lived on the banks of the Tigris River, on the border of Persia, and by the 6th century they played a significant role in the Persian army. [Agathias (1975): IV. 17. 6] They took part in the Lazica war (for example, at the siege of Archaeopolis), but the Sabirs, the Byzantine mercenaries inflicted such a defeat on them that they retreated. Further problems arose in the Lazica War. The Byzantine generals' trust in King Gubazes was shaken. The Byzantine commanders Bessas, Martin and Rusticus accused him of conniving with the Persians. Rusticus sent his brother Ionnes to Emperor Justinian to tell him that the ruler of Lazica wanted to change sides and go over to the Persians. The ruler ordered that if this was proven to be true, he could be killed. Rusticus and Ionnes then quickly murdered Gubazes. Some nobles from Lazica persuaded the emperor to nominate Tzates, Gubazes' younger brother, as their new king. In the meantime Senator Athanasius investigated the assassination. It turned out that Gubazes did not negotiate with the Persians after all and that the above Byzantine military leaders killed him purely for the sake of power. Therefore, Rusticus and Ionnes were arrested, tried and executed. In 556, the allies recaptured Archaeopolis and defeated Nachoragan. In 557, a truce was concluded and hostilities between the Byzantines and the Persians in the Caucasus were ended, and with the "Fifty Years' Peace" of Dara in 562, Khosrow I recognized Lazica as a Byzantine vassal state, but the Byzantines had to pay a certain amount of gold annually as tribute. The Persian shah made peace quickly supposedly in order to have enough forces to fight the Hephthalites, the White Huns living in the eastern borderland. The peace treaty consisted of 13 points, which were preserved for us by protector Menandros. The first point was that the Persians promised that they would not allow Huns, Alans or other

---

<sup>7</sup> The highest military rank



barbarians to pass through the Derbent Straits<sup>8</sup> and the Caspian Gate in the direction of the Roman Empire, and that the Romans would not send an army against the Persians. The second point was about the Saracens, who were allies of both empires. The third point was about the support of trade and the fourth point was about the protection of ambassadors. The sixth point provided for the free return of people who remained in each other's territory during the war, and in the eighth point it was forbidden to build border fortresses, with the exception of Daras. [Fragments of Menandros Protector (2019): 3]

## THE ROLE OF THE HUNS

As I mentioned above, the Lazica war is significant for us because the Huns appear again in the historical records, about whom only fragmentary texts survived after the death of Attila, i.e. from the second half of the 5th century, therefore some historians believed that the Huns disappeared from history after 453. According to some old theories, the Caucasian Huns were swept away by a migration that occurred in 463, which was confirmed to have happened only about a hundred years later,<sup>9</sup> [Obrusánszky (2013)] so Attila's people continued to play a decisive role in the region. The Huns, as can be seen from the source data below, did not disappear, and from the first half of the 6th century they often appear in Byzantine historical chronicles as the emperors needed their military forces. Procopius regularly mentions them in his works "The Secret Story" and "The History of Wars", and Agathias mentions the people living in the Caucasus region, namely the Sabirs, and mentions the fortress of Onoguris,<sup>10</sup> the siege of which he reports on. Another interesting fact is that Agathias also provides a brief summary of the Huns, according to which they once lived on the eastern shore of Lake Meotis, north of the Don River, exactly where the Hungarian chronicles described the residence of the Huns and Hungarians. [Pictorial Chronicle (1993): 4-5] Agathias himself also mentions that the other barbarian peoples who founded Asia near Mount Imaeus also lived there.<sup>11</sup> These people are called Scythians and Huns in general, but some tribes have their own names, such as Kutrigur, Utigur, Ultizur, Burugundi, etc. [Agathias (1975): Book V. 11. 2] With their sudden and unexpected attacks, they caused incalculable damage to the local people, over whom they extended their authority and occupied their territories. According to Agathias, some Hun tribes quickly disappeared from the region, citing the example of the Ultizurs and the Burungi, who were well-known at the time of Emperor Leo (r. 457-474), but not today. [Jordanes (1904): 50]<sup>12</sup> He considered it conceivable that they migrated,

---

<sup>8</sup> In the original text: Tzón

<sup>9</sup> Not a single source from the Caucasus writes about the migration of peoples in 463. The population movement following the Huns only occurred at the end of the 550s, when the Avars appeared in the foreground of the Caucasus. Modern literary summaries do not mention it either that new people arrived in 463.

<sup>10</sup> Onoguris, which was renamed Stephanopolis during the Byzantine period, was a town in Lazica (in present-day West Georgia, probably in the modern village of Khuntsi). It was recorded by the Byzantine historian Agathias in his account of the Lazica War between the Byzantine Empire and the Persian Empire. The exact location of the Sasan Empire is still under investigation.

<sup>11</sup> Caucasus

<sup>12</sup> Attila's son, Hernac, chose a place for himself and his people also on the edge of Little Scythia. His relatives Emnetzur and Ultzindur occupied Utus, Hiscus and Almus in coastal Dacia, and many of the Huns flocked here from all sides to Romania, after whom the Sacromontisians and Fossatisians are still named.

and with this the author also indicates that some Hun tribes played an important role in the second half of the 5th century, but only very few sources remain for us. Mention is also made of Anastasius' (491–518) "Long Wall", built on the western edge of the capital, which was strengthened at the end of the 5th century to stop the attacks of the Huns.<sup>13</sup> Agathias continued the brief historical summary of the Huns: during the Great Plague (541–543), there were Hun tribes with different names, they lived at the height of their power, most of them moved south and camped not far away, on the banks of the Danube. [Agathias (1975): Book V. 11. 2]. In the Byzantine work, we can read about the Central Asian White Huns, the Hephthalites, who fought mainly with the Persians: in 488, they defeated the Persian Shah Peroz's army, and killed him. Later on, there was a lot of mention of the Sabirs, who fought as mercenaries on either the Byzantine or the Persian side. Agathias also remarks on them that they were Huns and that they provided heavy cavalry for the Roman (Byzantine) army. He estimated their number at 2,000. They served under their main leaders Balmach, Cutilzis and Iliger Hun generals. [Agathias (1975): Book III. 17. 5] The author described them as particularly feisty people, always ready to attack foreign lands. They helped the Romans a lot against the Persians. At the siege of Onoguris around 554–555 the Sabir mercenaries killed many Dilimnites, who were the elite unit of the Persian army.<sup>14</sup> Later, another city, Rhodopolis, was taken by Elminzur, a Hun leader, with two thousand horsemen. [Agathias (1975): Book IV. 15]

#### THE IDENTIFICATION OF ONOGURIS

Agathias made only a brief description of the fortress of Onoguris, and unfortunately he did not give its exact location, so there is still a debate about where this fortress might have been. The author only wrote that it was close to Cotais (Kutaisi) and Mucheiris, from where the Persians sent reinforcements to help the besieged. [Agathias (1975): Book III. 9. 6] Unfortunately, ever since, none has been able to clearly determine where the city bearing the name of the Huns was, only assumptions were made about it. Determining the location was somewhat helped by the fact that the identification and subsequent excavation of the former capital of Lazica began in the 1930s with the participation of German archaeologists in the modern Georgian settlement of Nokalakevi<sup>15</sup> which is 52 kilometers from Cotais, modern Kutaisi. By the beginning of the 21st century, it was proven that the ruins found in Nokalakevi really belonged to the capital of Lazica.<sup>16</sup> The researchers believed that the Onoguris fortress must be nearby, and they are currently marking several places as possible locations. First, the Georgian translator of Agathias' work, Kauhchishvili, [Kauhchishvili (1936): 59–62. 1] tried to identify the settlement. Based on historical sources, he concluded that the fortress could be in the eastern part of Lazica, halfway between Archaeopolis and modern Kutaisi. Kauhchishvili identified Onoguris with the Ukimerion fortress,<sup>17</sup> which was in the

---

<sup>13</sup> The 56-kilometer-long fortress system built between the Marmara- and the Black Sea, which was used until the 7th century AD. According to assumptions, it already stood in the time of Leo I, around 469.

<sup>14</sup> Note L. 17

<sup>15</sup> It is located in Jikha, Samegrelo-Svaneti county, half way between Kutaisi (ancient name: Cotais) and Poti (Phasis).

<sup>16</sup> [www.nokalakevi.org](http://www.nokalakevi.org)

<sup>17</sup> Ukimerion Hill is in Kutaisi, the Bagrati Cathedral was built on it.

vicinity of Kutaisi. Berdzenishvili [Berdzenishvili (1975): 463–65] believed to have found the settlement near the Unagira Mountain and located the fortress in the vicinity of Bandza<sup>18</sup> and Nokalakevi. In the 1980s, excavations were carried out in the Abedati fortress, in the Martivili district, which was also a late antique fortress. Its construction was dated to the 4th century and it is just 13 kilometers north of the Nokalakevi fortress. This fortress is 50 kilometers from Kutaisi. Some have identified this fortress with Onoguris. [Zakaraia, P., Kapanadze, T. (1991); Lekvinadze (1993)] In the 2000s, after studying the work of Agathias, Pailodze believed that Abedati could not be identified with Onoguris due to the distance from Kutaisi. According to Braund, [Braund (1994): 306] the fortress could have been in the village of Sepieti, which is 70 kilometers from Kutaisi, so further than Abedati. He based her theory on the fact that the St. Stephen's Basilica stood in the settlement, after which Onoguris was later named. [Braund, D. & T. Sinclair (2000): 3-4. 9] Authors Braund and Sinclair [Braund, D. & T. Sinclair (2000)] also believed to have found the early medieval fortress at Sepieti, citing that an inscription from the 6th- 7th century was found, which contained the name Saint Stephen Basilica. [Everill et alii (2017): 356] The church in the settlement was built in the 5th-6th century and is currently dedicated to the archangels.

Pailodze [Pailodze (2003)] believed that the ruins near the settlement of Khuntsi could hide the fortress of Onoguris. This place is between Khoni and Martveli, 40 kilometers northwest of Kutaisi. In 2014, a Georgian-English archaeological expedition excavated the upper part of Khuntsi fortress and found many building remains. The expedition continued the excavation in 2015 and based on the samples taken from the excavated monuments, it was found that the age of the fortress is 646 (+/-160) years. Chronologically and because of the distance to Kutaisi, it is possible that the fortress of Onoguris once stood at this place. It is strange that Maksymink, who depicted the sites of the Byzantine-Persian war on a map, placed the fortress of Onoguris to the west of Archaeopolis, but did not add a textual comment to it. [Maksymink (2015)]

## THE NAME ONOGUR IN THE CAUCASUS

The Onogurs, who were members of the Hun confederation, populated the Caucasus region for at least four centuries and played a decisive role in political processes. Despite all this, no archaeological sites or culture have been linked to them, and many conflicting theories have come to light regarding the origin of the people. In the last nearly two hundred years, countless studies have been written about the Onogors. Foreign and Hungarian researchers have sometimes linked them to the Bulgarians and other times to the Hungarians. There is still a debate among researchers today as to whether the name Onogur refers to Bulgarians or Hungarians.<sup>19</sup>

The ethnicity of the people referred to as Onogur in Byzantine sources remains unresolved to this day. Researchers, primarily linguists, agree that in Byzantine sources the name onogur, in Latin sources the Hunuguri/Hungarus, etc. names are closely related

---

<sup>18</sup> The settlement is located east of Nokalakevi, approx. 10 kilometers away. To the southeast of the village of Bandza, in the neighborhood, there is a village called Onoghia, which name may be related to the early medieval fortress.

<sup>19</sup> It is known that the Hungarians called themselves Hungária. It is known through researchers József Thúry, Halasi-Kun, Péter Király, etc. that the Hungarus/Hunugri etc. names always referred to Hungarians.

to the Hungarians, however, there have been many conflicting theories about the relationship between the Hungarians and the Onogurs. The most significant publications on the subject were published by József Thúry, Gyula Németh, Gyula Moravcsik and Samu Szádeczky-Kardoss. Thúry<sup>20</sup> and Moravcsik<sup>21</sup> considered it possible that the name Onogur originally meant the Hungarians, while other researchers drew the conclusion from the data of the late chronicles (Theophanes and Nikephoros) that the Onogurs were Bulgarians. In this study, I searched for the answer to what historical sources of the time mention the Onogurs/Hunguris/Hungarus, and with whom and which peoples they were associated with in the 6th to 8th centuries. From this we can perhaps get an answer to who the contemporary chroniclers meant by onogurs. The very first data comes from the fragments of the rhetorician Priscos, who wrote an eight-volume work on the Huns in the 5th century, which was lost, but some fragments survived in later Byzantine works, so it was included in the Suidas lexicon compiled in the 10th century, in connection with the history of the Avars. C. de Boor [de Boor (1915)] questioned whether the part about the Avars was Priscus' original text, but Gyula Moravcsik rejected this suggestion. [Moravcsik (1930): 7] However, C. de Boor was right, because rhetor Priscus was not a contemporary of the Avars. He died in 471, so he could not possibly write about the migration that occurred in the middle of the 6th century. That is why it is a big mistake that historians and linguists use these fragments of Priscus, especially those written about the Avars, as primary sources, excluding source criticism. Priscus' fragment says that in 463 the Onogurs, Saragurs, etc. sent ambassadors to Byzantium. This happened while Priscus was still alive, but here this text was merely about the ambassadors. [Györffy (1986): 53] However, the second sentence is about the attacks of the Avars, which the Eastern Roman author Priscus no longer lived through. It must have been a late insertion, someone else's entry, which was unfortunately washed together with the first sentence. It cannot be ruled out that these two sentences were joined later, and the researchers created a migration from the ambassadors in 463. A migration that never happened, since the Avars only appeared in the Caucasus region at the very end of the 550s. Apart from this data, no other historical source knows about large population movements or migrations.

The following source comes from the 6th-century Gothic-Alan historian Jordanes, who wrote the following about them in his work called *Getica*: „Farther from these, over the Pontus Sea, lies the residence of the Bulgars, who have been made very famous by our misdemeanors. Here sprouted in two places, the sprawling trunk of the bravest nation, the Huns, the danger of the peoples. One is called the Altziagirus, the other the Saviruses (Sabír), because their places of residence are nevertheless separate from each other: that of the Altziagirus is near Chersona, where merchants longing for the treasures of Asia

---

<sup>20</sup> Thúry (1896), 8: „The fact that he mentions the Hungarians by three names at the same time eloquently proves how well the later Byzantine writers knew their older historical literature, because the V., VI. and VII. century Byzantine writers were the first among Europeans to call the Hungarians Ungroi, or the older, full form of this name Unuguroi, Onoguroi and they also clearly stated that they were people from among the Un, that is the Hun people. (pl. Agathias and Theo-phylactus).”

<sup>21</sup> Moravcsik (1930), 4: „When researching the prehistory of the Hungarian and Bulgarian people, it is equally important to examine the people's movements that took place in the Caucasus and on the northern coast of the Black Sea during the five centuries from the appearance of the Huns to the Hungarian conquest. The oldest traces that can be inferred from the written sources that remained for us lead back to the mentioned area and age for both peoples.”

transport their goods. In the summer, they wander the fields and set up homesteads where the herd's food lures them, and in the winter they retreat above the Pontic Sea. And the Hunugurs are known because they trade in ermine fur." [Jordanes (1904) 33–37]. Jordanes's description is important because he mentions the Onogurs very early on, whom he calls "Hunuguros" starting with h. This name is very similar to the name the Hungarians use: Hungarus, and moreover, the place of residence of this people was given in the same region as the Hungarian historical chronicles. The historian describes the Bulgarians (Bulgares) and the Hunugurs as separate peoples. After that, the third, fourth and fifth chapters of Agathias' 6th-century work talks about the Onoguris fortress in Lazica. In this the author also gave a brief explanation of the name of the place. He described that Onoguris is an ancient name that came from the Huns, which is why the settlement was named Onoguris. He then added that nowadays (in the time of Agathias) they no longer used this name, because the city was renamed after Saint Stephen their patron saint. [Agathias (1975): Book III. 5. 6]. It is possible that by the 6th century the Onogurs had already moved from the area, because there is no more mention of them in the area. Another report can be found in the 6th century work of the rhetor Zacharias, who wrote that beyond the Caspian Gates is the land of the Huns, where 13 Hun tent-dwelling peoples live, such as the Ungurs (Onogurs), Ugars, Sabirs, Kutrigurs, Avars, Kasars (Khazars), Dirmars, Saragurs, Barsils, Kulas (Hvárezmians) and the Hephthalites. The author did not connect the Bulgarians with the Onogurs, but classified them also among the Huns, and then noted that they were a pagan and barbarian nation with a separate language. [Kmoskó (2004): 99] This source also considers Bulgarians and Onogurs to be separate peoples within the Huns.

Movses Kalankatuyk, in his work entitled *Caucasian Albania* that he compiled in the 8th century, mentions Honagur, who came from the land of the Huns and attacked the Persians in the time of Sapor. At the very end of the 6th century, Menandros protector talks about the onogurs as "uniguros", and he calls the Sabirs as "Sabéros". [Fragments of Menandros Protector (2019): Gent.2] A fragment of Menandros claims that in 558 the Avars went to war with the Onogurs and at the same time destroyed the Sabirs. [Fragments of Menandros Protector (2019): 4438] Gyula Moravcsik assumed that these battles did not have serious consequences for the Onogurs, as they did not disappear from written sources. We meet them again two decades later, even then they were strong and powerful. [Moravcsik (1930): 14] They appear once again in a fragment of Menander, when a Byzantine embassy went to the Turkish Khagan in 576. The ruler of the Turks was threatening saying that his rule extended from the east to the west. In addition to the Alans he cited the Onogur tribes as an example, which - although they opposed the invincible Turks - did not achieve anything, and like other peoples, they too ended up in his servitude. [Fragments of Menandros Protector (2019): 206] According to Theophylaktos Simokattes, [Simokattae (1887): VII. 8. 13] the Onogurs once had a city called Bakath, which was destroyed by an earthquake. We have no other sources about this settlement, its identification is still unclear. Despite this, a whole migration theory was born about when the event could have happened and what kind of population movements it could have started. According to János Harmatta, the "Sogd kad" i.e. meaning "city", is hidden in the name. [Harmatta (1992): 257] According to the Hungarian researcher, the settlement can be identified with the Ustruxana/Ustrushana region, the capital of which is Bunjikat. The district is located in Transoxania, Central

Asia and is related to the Hunnic Kidarites and the White Huns (Hephthalites). Apart from this single piece of data, there is no other source for the fact that Onogurs actually lived in the city, but it can be verified that the Huns lived there for hundreds of years. Around 680, the Ravenna Geographer mentioned that there was a "patria Onogoria" in the Black Sea area, in the same place the 8th century Byzantine episcopal list contains a bishopric called Onogur, which is in the Azov Sea area. This is the same place that the Hungarian chronicles refer to as the Meotis Swamp, the early dwelling area of the Huns and Hungarians. [Moravcsik (1930): 14–15] The researchers were confused by the work of Theophanes,<sup>22</sup> who in the 6th–9th centuries summarized the history of Byzantium and the neighboring peoples. The author consistently called the Bulgarians as Bulgares from 513 until 812/813, with only one exception. At the year 678/679 he says: "In this year the Bulgars invaded Thrace. It is necessary to tell how the Onogundur Bulgarians relate to the ancient history of the Kotrigurs." [The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (1997)] Based on this single late 9th century record, most researchers believe that the Onogurs were actually Bulgarians. Only József Thúry [Thúry (1896): 8] believed that "Onogundur Bulgarian" means "Bulgarians belonging to the Onogurs", which indicates that the Bulgarians lived under Onogur rule for a while in a certain period of history, from which only Kuvra freed them. If we look at other Slavic, Byzantine and Frankish sources, we find that the "Hungarus/ Hungaria" etc. expressions applied exclusively to Hungarians.

The Latin name of the Kingdom of Hungary was Hungaria, which again confirms that the Byzantine version: "onogur" was also related to us Hungarians.

## CONCLUSION

The appearance of the Onoguris fortress and the Hun people living in the area in Byzantine and contemporary Caucasian sources indicates that the steppe people settled in many places in the region. The historical sources of the time show that the Huns played a decisive role in the Caucasus even after the death of Attila (453). Their forces were also used by the great powers of the region (Persians, Byzantines). In addition to the Hun name, onogur, honagur, hunuguri, etc. stand out, and it refers to the Hungarians. The contemporary documents also prove that steppe peoples, namely Sabirs and Onogurs, also lived in the western region of today's Georgia, which can open new perspectives in further research into the early history of the region.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agathias (1975). *The Histories*. Joseph D. Frendo (trans.) Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, vol. 2A, Series Berolinensis. Berlin, Walter De Gruyter
- Berdzenishvili Nicolos (1975). *Issues of history of Georgia*. VIII. Tbilisi, Metsniereba
- de Boor, Carolus (1915). *Suidas und die Konstantinische Excerptsammlung: Byzantinische Zeitschrift XXI*. 381–424. és XXIII. 1–127. – J. BECKER: De Suidae excerptis historicis. Bonnae
- Braund, D. (1994). *Georgia in Antiquity. A History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia, 550 BC–AD 562*. Oxford, Clarendon Press

<sup>22</sup> Theophanes, the Hivalló (approx. 758–817) His work called *Anni Mundi* summarized the history of the 6th–9th century

- Braund, D. & T. Sinclair (2000). Pontus-Phasis (87 Map). In R. J. A. Talbert (ed.): *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman world*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Paul Everill, Besik Lortkipanidze, Nikoloz Murghulia, Ian Colvin and Davit Lomitashvili (2017). The lost fortress of Onoguris? Newly discovered sixth-century AD fortifications at Khuntsistsikhe, western Georgia. *Antiquity*, Vol. 91, Issue 356, Cambridge University Press, <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.1>
- Györffy György (1986). *About the ancestors of Hungarians and the conquest. Reports from contemporaries and chroniclers*. Budapest, 1986, Gondolat Könyvkiadó
- Harmatta János (1992). The Onogur migration. In *Magyar Nyelv*, LXXXVIII. 3. szám (Sept) 257–271. p.
- Jordanes (1904). *The origin and actions of the Goths*. Medieval Chroniclers III, translated from Latin, provided with introduction and notes: dr. Bokor János. Editor: Gombos F. Albin. Brassó, Publisher: A „Brassói Lapok” nyomdája
- Katarzyna Maksymiuk (2015). *Geography of Roman-Iranian wars. Military operations of Rome and Sasanian Iran*. Siedlce, Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach
- Kapanadze T. (1987) Nokalakevis bazilikevi. In: P. Zakaria (ed.): *Nokalekevi Arkeopolisi argeologiuri gatkhvebi*. 1978-1982, II tomi, Tbilisi, pp. 90-125
- Kaukhchishvili, Simon (1936). *Georgica*. III. Tbilisi, Tbilisi State University
- *Pictorial Chronicle* (1993). About the old and recent deeds of the Hungarians, their origin and growth, their triumphs and their courage. Translated: Geréb László. Publisher: Magyar Hírlap és Maecenas Kiadó, Budapest.
- Kmoskó Mihály (2004). Syrian authors on the peoples of the steppe. *Hungarian Prehistoric Library*, 20. Editor: Felföldi Szabolcs. Budapest, Publisher: Balassi Kiadó
- Lekvinadze, V. (1993) Abedati Fortress. In P. Zakaria (ed.): *Nokalakevi-Archaeopolis III*. 209–22. Tbilisi, Metsniereba
- *Fragments of Menandros Protector* (2019). Translated and wrote suffix and notes: Fehér Bence. Publications of the Hungarian Research Institute 4. Budapest, Hungarian Research Institute
- Moravcsik Gyula (1930). To the History of the Onogurs. *Magyar Nyelv*, 1930, 26. évf., pp.4–18.
- Obrusánszky Borbála (2013) *Huns, Hungars, Hungarians*. Budapest, Kárpátia Műhely
- Pailodze, A. (2003). *Chronicle of Khoni*. Part II. Batumi, Alion
- Procopius (1914). *History of the Wars, Volume I: Books 1-2. (Persian War)*. Translated by H. B. Dewing. Loeb Classical Library 48. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Prokopios (1984). *Secret History*. Translated: Kapitánffy István. Budapest, Helikon Kiadó
- Szádeczky-Kardoss Samu (1995). Menandros Protector and the Onogurs. In *Antik Tanulmányok*, 39, 1–2. szám, pp. 123–126
- Teall, John L. (1965). The Barbarians in Justianian's Armies. In *Speculum*, Vol. 40. No. 2, pp. 294–322

- *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor* (1997). Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813. Cyril Mango and Roger Scott (trans.): Oxford, Clarendon Press
- Theophylakti Simokattae (1887). *Historiae*. Edited by Carolus de Boor. Lipsiae (Leipzig), Aedibus B. G. Tevnesi
- Thúry József (1896). *The Origin, Homeland and Migration of the Hungarians*. Budapest, Az Athenaeum Részvény Társulat Könyvnyomdája
- Zakaraia, P., Kapanadze, T. (1991). *Fortification and secular buildings of Tsikhegagi*. 1991. Tbilisi, Metshiereba (in Georgian)



**SOME ASPECTS OF GEORGIAN-AZERBAIJANI RELATIONS IN 1918-1920****Mikheil Bakhtadze**

PhD in History, Associate Professor  
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University  
Tbilisi, Georgia  
bakhtadzemisha@gmail.com  
OCRID ID: 0000-0002-3623-9924  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/DZGR8437>

**Abstract:** The border issue was very important in relations between the South Caucasian first republics, emerged in 1918. Despite disagreements regarding the Zagatala region and some other territories, there has never been an armed conflict between Baku and Tbilisi. Both Baku and Tbilisi understood perfectly well that any military conflict would be harmful for both states. Politicians from both countries really assessed the situation, and this indicates their professionalism and dignity. The issue of determining the border between Georgia and Azerbaijan has never reached the level of complicating the resolution of other issues or, moreover, aggravating the situation between the two states. It should also be taken into account that Georgia and Azerbaijan had much more common interests than controversial issues. One of the most important issues was the export of Baku oil, which passed through the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline and required coordinated actions of both states. One of the ways for transportation of the Baku oil was via the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline, and the other was by rail. Oil transported through the pipeline was mainly destined for Europe. For its needs, Georgia transported oil and various types of petroleum products mainly by rail. The treaties on transit, telegraph communications, and postal communications were signed between neighboring Georgia and Azerbaijan. The conclusions of these treaties were of great political and economic importance for both states. The agreement on railway communication, concluded on March 8, 1919, was of great significance. In order to protect the borders and independence of their states, the Georgian-Azerbaijani mutual defense treaty was signed on June 16, 1919 in Tbilisi. The establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan strained relations between Baku and Tbilisi. Soviet Russia used Soviet Azerbaijan, as well as Soviet Armenia, as a springboard for the occupation of Georgia<sup>23</sup>.

**Keywords:** *Georgia, Azerbaijan, First Republics, Treaties, Soviet Russia, Denikin's Volunteer Army, Military defense Pact, Economic Relations*

\*\*\*

On May 26, 1918 Georgia proclaimed its independence, which caused demission of the Transcaucasian Seim. The Muslim faction of the Seim, seeing that the South Caucasus cannot be a union, created the Azerbaijan National Council on May 27 and the next day,

---

<sup>23</sup> This research [grant number FR-21-13590] has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG)

on May 28 the National Council adopted the Act of Independence of Azerbaijan in Tbilisi. [Azimova (2023): 57] At that time, there was a Soviet government in Baku in the form of the Council of People's Commissars. In fact, there was a dual power in Azerbaijan: the Soviet government in the Baku governorate and the government of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic in the Elisabethpol governorate and Zagatala district [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (1998): 39]. The latter was in Ganja at the first stage. The government of the democratic republic moved to Baku only on September 17, 1918, after the liberation of the city with the help of Ottoman troops [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (1998): 46].

Baku was actually the economic center of the South Caucasus. Therefore, it is not surprising that many Georgians lived and worked in Baku. It is also natural that the government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia tried to protect them during the ongoing battles for Baku, and therefore turned to the government of Azerbaijan for help in protecting their compatriots. In response, the representative of the Azerbaijani government in Georgia stated that after the liberation of Baku, the Azerbaijani government will do everything to protect the personal and property security of Georgians living in Baku [Documents and Materials... (1919): 442].

The issue of borders was very important in relations between the states of the South Caucasus.

It should be noted that, despite disagreements regarding the ownership of the Zagatala region and some other territories, there has never been an armed conflict between Baku and Tbilisi, unlike Armenia. Armenia tried to resolve the border issue with both republics by force of arms, which was a false step. Both Baku and Tbilisi understood perfectly well that any military conflict would be harmful for both states. Politicians from both countries really assessed the situation, and this indicates their professionalism and dignity. The issue of determining the border between Georgia and Azerbaijan has never reached the level of complicating the resolution of other issues or, moreover, aggravating the situation between the two states.

It should also be taken into account that Georgia and Azerbaijan had much more common interests than controversial issues. One of the most important was the issue of Baku oil exports, which passed through the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline and required coordinated actions of both states. This oil pipeline was very important not only for these two states, but also for the entire South Caucasus as a whole. For export to the West, Baku oil passed through Georgia, so the Azerbaijani authorities had to take this fact into account and supply oil supplies to the neighboring republic in transit. However, thanks to the close political ties established between the two countries, there was no escalation between them. [Kobakhidze (2015): 137].

As you know, on June 4, 1918, the treaty of Batumi was signed between the Georgian Republic and the Ottoman Empire. After this truce, the city of Batumi remained in the hands of the Ottoman Empire [Government News (1918): No 115]. Thus, the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline at that moment ended up on the territory of three states. On the same day, a tripartite agreement on the oil pipeline was signed: between the Ottoman Empire, Georgia and Azerbaijan. According to the agreement, the parties stated that they would take care of the proper operation of the oil pipeline. The money received from the use of the oil pipeline will be divided between the three states in proportion to the length of the

oil pipeline section passing through the territory of each of them. [Documents and Materials... (1919): 364].

Oil transportation via the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline was resumed in December 1918. Here I would like to note that in addition to the fact that Batumi was the last point of the oil pipeline, the port of Batumi was also very important for Azerbaijan.

Therefore, Azerbaijan had its own interests in Batumi and Adjara with the Muslim population, and this had certain significance in the conditions of that time. At the beginning of September 1919, the Chairman of the Government of Azerbaijan, Nasib Bek Usubbekov, visited Tbilisi. On September 10, a gala dinner took place, which, in addition to the heads and members of the governments of Georgia and Azerbaijan, was attended by guests from Adjara: Memed Bek Abashidze and Jemal Bek Khimshiashvili. The Prime Minister of Azerbaijan stated: "The idea of common interests of these two republics is deeply rooted in the knowledge of the peoples of Georgia and Azerbaijan... Usubbekov then touched upon the results of this union and pointed out the great importance of this union for strengthening the true independence of Georgia and Azerbaijan. This connection has already given us the desired visible result: it has helped crown the Adjarian issue with success. At present, the Adjarians are completely free to self-determination and must be deeply convinced that their appeal within the Republic of Georgia is confirmed as the free expression of the will of friendly union of Georgia and Azerbaijan." In his response, Jemal-bek Khimshiashvili emphasized: "In Adjara there were some what hesitations. Who will he team up with? With fellow believers or blood brothers. The matter was decided in favor of an alliance with the brothers. I am glad that right now I heard the first advice about joining Georgia from a representative of our people of the same faith. I will inform the Acharians about this, and they will know that their decision was happily accepted by their fellow believers." The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan noted: "Batumi is of great national importance for the allied states of Transcaucasia, and he told Jemal Bek Khimshiashvili, yes, you can tell the Adjarians that their coreligionists, the Azerbaijanis, are happy to confirm your wise decision to join Georgia." [Reception in honor ... (1919), No 205].

Transport of oil via the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline was vastly different than its transportation by rail. Oil transported through the pipeline was mainly destined for Europe. For its needs, Georgia was forced to transport oil and various types of petroleum products mainly by rail. On December 15, 1918, the newspaper "Republic of Georgia" reported: "All oil must be transported from Baku to Batumi through pipes, so it is no longer possible to fill kerosene in Ganja. In this regard, it is necessary to send trains with tanks to Baku, a total of about five trains of 50 tanks each, which will constantly run between Tiflis and Baku until all the necessary oil is delivered to the Republic of Georgia" [On Oil Transportation (1918), No 116].

On December 26, a transit treaty was signed between Georgia and Azerbaijan. The conclusion of this agreement was of great political and economic importance for both states. Georgia was allowed to export oil and petroleum products for its own needs. Free transit was established, i.e. there was no customs duty. Azerbaijan received from Georgia: coal, products for the needs of railway, and others such as beans, cabbage, car tires, etc. Azerbaijan also used the territory of Georgia for transit goods: bread from Ukraine, and manufactured goods, such as shoes and other essential products from Italy.

[Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (1998): 96; Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 90-91].

Another transit treaty was signed between the two states on February 5, 1920 [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 451-454].

On June 21, 1918, the representative of Azerbaijan in Georgia, Mammad Jafarov, met with the Chairman of the Government of Georgia, Noe Ramishvili. The conversation touched on various issues. Among them is the division of property of the no longer existing Transcaucasian Federation. And also the current situation in Borchalo. Both sides agreed that all controversial issues should be resolved only through negotiations. [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 22].

On January 3, 1919, the treaty on telegraph communications was signed between the two neighboring states. According to the document, telegraph communication was established between Georgia and Azerbaijan and various issues, related to the telegraph, were clarified; citizens were allowed to use the telegraph and send telegrams, and tariffs were established [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 98-99].

The next day, on January 4, the treaty on postal services was signed [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 100-102].

Of great importance was the treaty on railway communication, concluded on March 8, 1919. Proper operation of the railways was very important for both countries, given that railways transported a large amount of goods. The treaty discussed various issues regulating the operation of the railway and the movement of trains. It is interesting that locomotives and carriages were declared the property of the state in whose territory they were located on May 26, 1918. A single timetable was established for the railway in accordance local time of the city of Tbilisi, that is, trains ran on Tbilisi time [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 144-147].

Members of the Azerbaijani government had to come to Batumi several times for various reasons. This is understandable, given that Batumi was the sea gate of the South Caucasus. At the beginning of October 1919, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, Mamed Jafarov, arrived in Batumi from Baku. He accompanied the head of the US mission, General Harbord. On the way back, he met with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Evgeni Gegechkori, and talked with him about current issues [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 325].

From October 28 to November 2, 1919, meetings of the joint commission of Azerbaijan and Georgia were held. The commission worked on a very important issue: establishing a temporary border between the Zagatala district and Signag district. The problem was complex and could not be easily solved. Moreover, the members of the commission, and these were representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Internal Affairs, did not have such powers. Basically, there was an exchange of views and discussion of issues related to the daily life of the population living in the border region. It was said that the border issue is important and should be resolved soon [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic, Foreign Policy (1998): 336-342].

On May 26, 1919, the Georgian representation in Azerbaijan solemnly celebrated the first year of independence. The newspaper "Ertoba" wrote that on the occasion of the anniversary of Georgia's independence, the Georgian mission in Baku was visited and congratulated by all ministers under the leadership of Prime Minister Usubbekov, the representative of the presidium of parliament Pepinov, the mountaineer delegation, the

diplomatic representative of Armenia Begzadyan, the representative of the National Council of Armenia Paronian, Ter-Mikaelian, Chubarian, and “Musavat” party representatives Rasulzadeh, Shefi-beg Rustambekov, Doctor Rakiev, representatives of Ukraine, Jews, Germans, representatives of the National Council of Georgians, the governor of Baku and others” [News (1919) No 119].

On May 29-30, the conference of the Caucasian states was held in Tbilisi, at which the difficult situation was discussed. By this time, General Denikin’s troops had already occupied almost the entire territory of the Mountain Republic. Delegates from Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and the Mountain Republic took part in the conference. Representative of the North Caucasus Alikhan Kantemir addressed the conference participants with an interesting speech and said that there is only one question - the Caucasian question. They want to destroy us. They want to destroy all four republics. One of them has already been destroyed, and that is us, the Mountain Republic. We believe that the attack is coming through us to you, Denikin is coming against you, and I ask you whether you will fight against him. You may think that he is not at war with you, that he is not coming at you, but I declare that the front is open. The front that we have been holding back for three months is open to attack, we took it upon ourselves... For us, it doesn’t matter what you do in terms of help, we have already died... We were defeated without you. I just don't want them to defeat you one by one. I know that Denikin will not attack you now. Denikin will wait, create a base in Petrovsk, but I assure you that in a week he will attack you. The positions of Georgia and Azerbaijan were almost identical. The Georgian delegation advocated for the conference to express its position and declare an official protest. Georgian delegates also demanded that military preparations begin. As for the position of the representatives of Armenia, they were against even expressing official protest and in the event of a possible military confrontation they only promised to maintain neutrality in relation to their neighbors [Georgian State Historical Archive. Fund 1861, Inventory 1, file 58 art. 39-47].

On June 1, 1919, interesting information was published in the newspaper of the Social Democratic Party “Ertoba”: “Mobilization has been announced in Azerbaijan. The situation has not changed. Over the past two days, a large number of young people are leaving Tiflis for Azerbaijan” [News (1919) No. 119]. Naturally, mobilization was announced in Azerbaijan, and those young people, obviously, went to protect the independence of Azerbaijan. It is difficult to say anything, but most of them were probably ethnic Azerbaijanis but citizens of Georgia. It is possible that Georgian youth also went to defend a neighboring and friendly state. Moreover, it was clear that if General Denikin captured Azerbaijan, then the next goal of the general, who dreamed of restoring “united and indivisible” Russia, would be Georgia. What is even more interesting is, that at the beginning of September, mobilization of Georgians was announced in Baku, which affected persons born in 1896-1898. They had to report to the Georgian Embassy before September 8 [News (1919), No 199].

On June 1, 1919, during his speech at the constituent assembly, Foreign Minister Evgeny Gegechkori said: “You know that Denikin's Volunteer army occupied Petrovsky and Derbent. The government and parliament of the Mountain Republic laid down their arms, and today Denikin is the ruler of the Mountain Republic... Today, Denikin’s black army has already approached the border of the Republic of Azerbaijan. You know, citizens, what the situation is on the second front, on the front where we stand face to

face with Denikin. This is the Sochi region, it is already becoming clear that Denikin's detachments will begin to operate there, and it is possible that in a few days we will already have a clash with them... On May 29, the conversation with Denikin's representatives clearly showed us what the general was interested in; that he is interested in Georgia as an independent state and he will draw his sword only when he surrounds the Georgian Republic with his dark forces... We already have proof of this that the Azerbaijan Republic is with us... Let everyone see who is now calling on the Caucasus' peoples to fight in solidarity and do a common cause. We, citizens, still do not have documents to declare to you that there is no such unity between us. We only express doubt about the current sad time and hope that this doubt will not be justified. But in any case, I must declare here, before you, that if Georgia and Azerbaijan are left alone in this battle, victory will still be ours!" [Constituent Assembly of Georgia (2019): 49-52].

Minister of War Noe Ramishvili stated: "I declare with full right that the military force called upon to defend our freedom and independence will fulfill its duty" [Constituent Assembly of Georgia (2019): 56].

During this extremely difficult period for Azerbaijan, the only Georgian deputy, Vladimir Bakradze, spoke at a meeting held on June 5 in the Azerbaijani parliament. He declared, "Citizens, deputies! I am glad that I have the opportunity to speak on behalf of Georgians living on the territory of Azerbaijan, when the bond between these two neighboring and friendly peoples is strengthened in the face of a common threat, when the unity of interests and the need for coordinated actions is recognized as a necessity. I am glad that at this very important historical moment I can convey to the highest representative body the interests of the Azerbaijani people, the sentiments of Georgians not only living within Azerbaijan, but also beyond its borders. A black cloud of black reaction has already appeared over Azerbaijan, the victim of which has already become one of our neighboring republics, the Mountain Republic. I will not talk about the circumstances under which the Mountain Republic fell; I will only allow myself to declare from this rostrum that the Republic of Azerbaijan will not suffer such a fate (long applause). Let me also express my deep conviction that the entire people will stand up to defend the sovereign rights of the Azerbaijani people, the democracy of Azerbaijan and defeat the black reaction coming from the north and threatening to destroy all our revolutionary gains. At the same time, I must state that the democracy of Azerbaijan will not be alone in this struggle. The entire democracy of Transcaucasia will support him in this fight. First of all, the democracy of Georgia and the Georgian regiments, those that are hardened in the struggle for freedom and independence of Georgia, will quickly come to the aid of the fraternal people defending their rights, their homeland and independence. No black forces can resist the army of democracy, imbued with high and holy goals and excited by one thought, one feeling, the motto of which is: either death or victory. Citizens! We live in a terrible atmosphere, a web of lies, provocations and hypocrisy is woven around us, but let me declare from this rostrum that Transcaucasian democracy will not fall into this web, and we already know who our enemy and friend are (applause). Citizens! Let's join forces to create a united front of Transcaucasian democracy against Denikin's reactionary front. And if we unite, if the Transcaucasian democracy turns its breast to the enemy who is destroying its rights, then the Denikins will not be dangerous to us, and we will easily defeat them. From this rostrum, I call on Transcaucasian democracy to recognize the seriousness of the moment, forget their

differences and unite their forces in the face of the threat coming from the north. Victory over Denikin's black forces promises us preservation of revolution's achievement, freedom and independence." [In the Parliament... (1919a), No. 130]

On June 15, a charity reception was held at the State Theater in Tbilisi. The speakers spoke about a possible campaign by General Denikin's army against the states of the South Caucasus. Georgian Foreign Minister Evgeniy Gegechkori noted: "Citizens, the purpose of my speech is to appeal to you for moral and material assistance in the war that black reactions waged against us... Our government has never pursued a policy of aggression, but the black general of the black reaction has challenged us gauntlet, and we accept it... Now the situation is this: the mountain republic has fallen, but do not think that it is defeated on the battlefield. No, the Mountain Republic was the victim of a terrible betrayal. Khalilov betrayed the people. This explains why the mountaineers rebel and attack the Volunteer Army. We are not alone in our struggle with Denikin. The proletariat of Baku and the entire Azerbaijan Republic are with us" [Morning Speeches (1919) No 130].

The position of Georgia and Azerbaijan was largely due to the fact that Denikin's troops were stationed at the borders of these states. The danger was serious. General Denikin's main goal was to march on Moscow and overthrow the Bolshevik government, although no one knew what kind of military operation he was planning in the Caucasus. Moreover, Georgia had experience fighting against the Volunteer Army.

In newly captured Petrovsk (Makhachkala), A. Denikin gathered his army, moved south and reached the northern borders of Azerbaijan. The parliament and government of the mountain republic were dissolved, and members of the government took refuge in Tbilisi. The Mountain Republic was a kind of buffer state between Azerbaijan and Russia, so its liquidation posed a direct threat to Azerbaijan. The mountain republic was in the strategic interests of Azerbaijan. After reaching the border of Azerbaijan, units of the Volunteer Army crossed the border in some areas and stood near the Yalama station. [Bogveradze Grigol (2002): 34-35]

The Mountain Republic played a "buffer" role in relation to Georgia, and after its fall, Denikin's Volunteer Army began to directly neighbor Georgia and could invade from Vladikavkaz. Although this road and direction was much more difficult to cross than Petrovsky-Baku, which also had a railway line, it still posed a threat to Georgia. Moreover, if we take into account that parts of Denikin bordered on Georgia and on the side of Abkhazia.

In the summer of 1919, Denikin had enough strength to capture Azerbaijan. His armies by this time had become even stronger and included 104,000 troops, 56,200 sabers, about 600 cannons, over 1,500 machine guns, 34 armored trains, 19 aircraft, 1 cruiser, 5 destroyers, 4 submarines and 20 armed ships. [Bogveradze Grigol (2002): 36]

Therefore, it is quite natural that in order to protect the borders and independence of their states, the Georgian-Azerbaijani Military Defense Treaty was signed on June 16, 1919 in Tbilisi. The parties agreed to defend the independence and territorial integrity of their countries with joint forces in the case of military aggression [Agreement Between... (1919): No. 133]

This treaty was one of the first serious steps towards uniting the forces fighting for independence and freedom in the Caucasus.

On June 22, 1919, during the ratification of the treaty by the Constituent Assembly, Georgian Foreign Minister Evgeny Gegechkori stated:

“On our initiative and at our insistence, on April 26, representatives of four states gathered at the Caucasus Conference. Our first meeting was promising... Despite some issues around which there is disagreement and confusion between us today, there is one thing that should bind us closely: this is the defense of the inviolability of our independence within the Transcaucasia... This is the common basis that should unite us and which should form a unity between these neighboring peoples... The Transcaucasian Conference resolved none of these issues... Here only two nations united against a common enemy... This treaty is directed only against those who want to destroy these two Transcaucasian republics and their democracy; this treaty is directed against the government that wants to enslave our people. [Speech by the Minister (1919): No. 136].

Further he said that this agreement is not aggressive in nature, being an act of self-defense, and it is clearly stated in the treaty from beginning to end. Gegechkori also indicated the this alliance is directed against external powers who would overthrow our republics, and, of course, one article, the third, says that only if any of our neighbors, which I do not want to think, would want to take advantage of this common difficult situation to realize their goals and solve their own internal affairs, in this case, unfortunately, this is a hostile situation. Under these circumstances, of course, we must act as our interests and the interests of democracy dictate... The Government of Georgia will use this treaty only to protect its interests, in order not to expose the people to all kinds of dangers, no matter where they come from. [Ibid, 136]

The treaty was also supported by representatives of opposition parties of Georgia. Federalist socialist Giorgi Lashkishvili stated:

*“This historical document in itself is excellent in many respects. First of all, it should be noted that this act is not a product of secret diplomacy. It was publicly, truly publicly, signed by democratic governments of democratic states; There are no double-edged, ambiguous or hidden thoughts in it; Its goals are clearly, directly and simply expressed as is characteristic of true democracy. It does not have any aggressive goals or offensive intentions, but is only reflective and defensive in nature; Its goal is the independence of our republics, the defense of our freedom and the gains of our revolution from external enemies with united forces. An important point of this document is that it does not isolate the neighboring republic that has not yet reached an agreement with us. On the contrary, it opens its doors wide to accept the Third Republic as a legitimate partner in the great cause of concord and union”* [Constituent Assembly of Georgia (2019): 228].

Spiridon Kedia, leader of the People's Democratic Party, emphasized in his speech that on June 16, an act was signed, between Georgia and Azerbaijan, the purpose of which is only self-defense and struggle and action by common means for the independent self-existence and freedom of each of them. [Constituent Assembly of Georgia (2019): 231-232]. Further he noted:

This treaty demonstrates that our responsible leaders have, from the very beginning, gotten rid of the party principles that hindered Georgian-Azerbaijani relations... But today one thing is missing: today, along with the defense agreement signed here between Georgia and Azerbaijan, we do not confirm another agreement, by Armenia. And it's not our fault” [Ibid]

Socialist Revolutioner Leo Shengelaya said:

“Today a new era begins in the international life of our republic, today we are no longer alone on the battlefield, we already have an ally, we have a friend! Thus, with the presented convention, the elimination of the isolation of our nation begins, and this is a great factor, a source of new hopes, a guarantor of a new victory! ... the convention concerns Georgia and Azerbaijan, and not the three Transcaucasian republics, as wanted and expected. The Ararat



Republic has not yet said its last word on the Convention, it is still silent.” [Constituent Assembly of Georgia (2019): 236-237].

The Azerbaijani parliament unanimously approved the treaty on June 27. Azerbaijani Foreign Minister Mammad Jafarov spoke at a meeting of the Azerbaijani parliament. He emphasized the very great importance of this treaty and added: “Only two nations did not join our treaty. These are highlanders and Armenians. As you know, the highlanders lost their independence, and if not for this sad fact, then, of course, the highlanders would be with us. The Armenians took a completely different position... We hope that the territorial disputes between Georgia and Azerbaijan will be resolved through mutual concessions.” Representatives of various parties also spoke. Rasalzade, leader of the Musavati party stated: “Today this treaty will be adopted not only by the parliament, it will be supported by the entire Azerbaijani people..” Abilov, representative of the socialist bloc, said: “It is necessary to establish a strong connection between the peoples of Transcaucasia to repel the black reaction.” Karabegov, representative of the Ittihadists noted: “This agreement is democratic and does not contain any aggressive goals.” Effendi, member of the Ehrar group said: “This connection is an indicator of correct solidarity and we congratulate and support.” Deputy Vladimir Bakradze also spoke and said, “June 16 should be considered a historical day in the history of Georgia and Azerbaijan. This treaty does not pursue any aggressive goals, it is only defensive in nature and its purpose is to protect the sovereign rights of the two nations and the inviolability of the territory. On behalf of Georgians living in Azerbaijan, Bakradze welcomes the agreement and expresses hope that it will bring the desired results. The parliament meeting was attended by Georgian Minister of Agriculture Noe Khomeriki, diplomatic representative Nikoloz Kartsivadze, Grigol Alshibay and others. [In the Parliament... (1919b), No 147]

Newspapers published in Baku wrote that new period begins in the life of Transcaucasian democracy. The period of differentiation gives way to federation... The reader will see from the contents of this treaty that the purpose of this union is a strong defensive bond. The need for such a connection is dictated by recent events, when Denikin decisively threatened these two republics... If in the face of this danger only two republics managed to understand each other and find a common language of struggle, then this is explained by the fact that, firstly, these two peoples are under immediate threat, and secondly, that, despite some differences, there has always been peace between the Turks and Georgians. Traditional friendship, not hatred... The signatory republics spent a lot of effort trying to attract the third Transcaucasian nation in the person of the government of Armenia to participation in this union. But this desire was in vain. We had to sign a contract only with representatives of Azerbaijan and Georgia, for which, without a doubt, we are not to blame. That we did not want to isolate Armenia is evident from the fact that we included in the agreement a clause allowing Armenia to join our Union, albeit belatedly... This historical act is all the more valuable as it will strengthen the traditional friendship between the two neighboring peoples and will push the peoples of Transcaucasia towards broader and stronger cooperation [Speech by the Minister (1919): No 136].

The great significance of the treaty of June 16 is also evidenced by the fact that the document translated into French was sent on July 24 to French Prime Minister Georges

Clemenceau with a corresponding explanatory letter from Nikoloz Chkheidze and Alimardan bey Tobchibashov [Topchibashi A.M. (2016): 53].

Already in exile, Rasulzade wrote: “The Azerbaijani people came to the idea of defending their national existence, because they perfectly understood that there was no salvation for them except the political union of an independent confederative Caucasus!” This idea was partially implemented in the form of military-defense treaty between Georgia and Azerbaijan” [Rasulzade M.E. (1930): 35].

The assessment of the Georgian-Azerbaijani treaty by the Chairman of the Government of Azerbaijan Nasib-bek Usubbekov is very indicative. In a conversation with a correspondent on September 10, 1919, he said that without Georgia they cannot come to an agreement with General Denikin, and then added that the alliance with Georgia is very popular and the strength of alliance is hidden in this combination of popularity and interests [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Foreign Policy (1998): 285-286].

Soon a joint military council was created. Meetings were held alternately every month in Tbilisi and Baku. This body monitored the fulfillment of the obligations assumed by the parties to the treaty, and during the war it was supposed to draw up a joint plan of action for the armed forces of both republics. The joint council included heads of the military departments of both countries. The Council did not have a permanent chairman; it was elected by the members at each session by majority vote. [Bogveradze Grigol (2002): 64].

After Denikin’s volunteer army virtually occupied almost the entire territory of the Mountain Republic, a large number of North Caucasian politicians took refuge in Tbilisi. The capital of Georgia became the political center of their national liberation movement. The North Caucasus Committee was active [GSHA. Fund 1864, Inventory 2, file 34 art. 15-16].

The North Caucasians continued to fight against the Volunteer Army, but soon another force actively joined the fight, the Red Army of Soviet Russia. This further complicated the situation and threatened not only the North, but also the South Caucasus.

On November 9, 1919, General Denikin issued an order and suspended all relations with Azerbaijan, the situation worsened. [Bogveradze Grigol (2002): 71].

On January 4, 1920, the representative of the government of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Mirza Vekilov, wrote to his government that he met with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Evgeny Gegechkori, who was concerned about the situation in the North Caucasus. Gegechkori emphasized that the creation of the Mountain Soviet Republic could be announced in the near future. This poses a threat to Georgia and Azerbaijan, so joint action is necessary. Both republics must prepare for military action [Union of United Highlanders... (1994): 354].

The Bolsheviks were able to defeat General Denikin and in the spring of 1920, the Volunteer Army was a thing of the past, but the inhabitants of Transcaucasia could not breathe freely, because new dangers and misfortunes were knocking on the door. [Firuz Kazamzade (2016): 313]. This new threat was Soviet Russia.

There were many issues to be resolved in relations between Georgia and Azerbaijan, and it was only natural that frequent meetings took place between members of the Georgian and Azerbaijani governments.

On March 26, 1920, Georgian Foreign Minister Evgeny Gegechkori arrived in Baku [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Foreign Policy (1998): 487].

At the end of March 1920, a special mission from Poland arrived in Georgia under the leadership of the Polish diplomat Titus Filipovich. "The de facto recognition of Georgia has increased the interest of the world's states in Georgia. Many trade, economic, and sometimes political missions arrived there, and one of them was the special Polish mission led by Titus Filipowicz, a close ally of Marshal Jozef Pilsutski. At the end of March 1920, his mission began fruitful negotiations on Polish-Georgian military-political cooperation, on the final initialing of the text of Union Treaty" [Wojciech Materski (1992): 8].

Probably, during his stay in Tbilisi, Titus Filipovich had a conversation about a military alliance against Soviet Russia. In this regard, interests completely coincided.

Negotiations on the Polish-Georgian-Azerbaijani military alliance could have been held in Baku, when at the end of April (April 20-27) a delegation of the Georgian military led by General Georgiy Kvinitadze was in the capital of Azerbaijan. The delegation also included: General Kirile Kutateladze, the commander of the artillery of the Georgian Armed Forces, and General Giorgi Takaishvili, the head of the Georgian Engineering Troops. The goal of the delegation was to develop plans for joint actions of Georgia and Azerbaijan in the event of aggression by Soviet Russia in the South Caucasus. It is important that Titus Filippovich was also in Baku at the same time. The latter, together with his companions, arrived in the capital of Azerbaijan on April 24 [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Foreign Policy (1998): 517].

It is significant that, together with Azerbaijani officials, the Polish delegation was met at the station in Baku by the deputy diplomatic representative of Georgia in Azerbaijan, Dgebuadze [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Foreign Policy (1998): 517].

At that time, the situation was favorable for considering a possible joint struggle between Poland and the states of the South Caucasus, Georgia and Azerbaijan against Russia. We should not forget that on June 16, 1919, Georgia and Azerbaijan signed a military defense treaty [Bakhtadze M. (2011): 215-238].

Interestingly, in 1920, the Azerbaijani government reviewed the land law, and this law was based on the agrarian law of the Georgian government [Azerbaijan Democratic Republic (1998): 90].

After the occupation of the North Caucasus, Soviet Russia was already preparing for an invasion of the South Caucasus. At 4 o'clock in the morning on April 28, 1920, the armored trains of Soviet Russia were already in Baku, where the creation of Soviet power was announced. Soon Soviet power extended to the whole of Azerbaijan. In early May, military operations began on the Georgian border. Units of the 11th Red Army tried to invade Georgia. At this stage, the Georgian armed forces were able to defeat the enemy and protect the independence of Georgia.

The establishment of Soviet power in Azerbaijan strained relations between Baku and Tbilisi.

The question of the Zagatala district arose again. As is known, on May 7, 1920, a treaty was signed between the Georgian Democratic Republic and the Russian Soviet Federative Republic, according to which the Zagatala district was declared to belong to Georgia. However, five days later additional articles of the treaty were signed, where the question of belonging the Zagatala district was changed and it was decided that the issue of disputed territories located on the border of Georgia and Azerbaijan, as well as in the Zagatala district, will be transferred to a mixed commission created from an equal number of representatives of the governments of Azerbaijan and Georgia, chaired by a representative

of the RSFSR. Every decision of this commission will be recognized as binding by the governments of Azerbaijan and Georgia. Georgia and Azerbaijan, until the commission makes a decision on the issues mentioned in Article I of this agreement, will not introduce new public formations into the Zagatala district other than those that are there at the time of the adoption of the additional agreement. [Newspaper "Communist" (1989): No. 132]

By May 12, 1920, units of the 11th Red Army were located in the Zagatala district, and Georgia's jurisdiction did not actually extend there. At the end of the same year, due to the introduction of additional military forces into the Zagatala district, which was, in principle, a violation of the treaty signed in Moscow, the Georgian government protested to the government of Soviet Azerbaijan and the representative of Soviet Russia in Georgia, Sheinman [From the Information Bureau... (1920) No. 296]. Of course, there was no reaction to this.

No less important was the issue of oil. Here we mean the uninterrupted operation of the Baku-Batumi oil pipeline, and Soviet Russia was also very interested in this, as it received a lot of money from oil exports, as well as the supply of oil directly to Georgia.

On November 14, 1920, Georgia signed the trade and transit treaty with Soviet Russia and Azerbaijan. In accordance to the treaty, Georgia, Russia and Azerbaijan granted each other the right of free transit. Russia and Azerbaijan were obliged to provide Georgia with 750 thousand feet of petroleum products in the first month after the first train of the Georgian Railway arrives in Baku, and then one million feet every month, starting from the second month. All these petroleum products were exempt from all duties and taxes on the part of Russia and Azerbaijan and were transferred to Georgia at the following prices: tank, for the needs of the railway, crude oil and fuel oil 25 manats per foot, refined oil 50 manats per foot, gasoline from 70 to 460 manats. Prices for the needs of government agencies, residents and industry have been doubled. On the other hand, Georgia allowed the export of durable firebricks and fire clay from the Shrosha plant without paying customs duties and other government taxes. Not more than 20,000 bricks and 5,000 feet of clay per month at prices set by the Ministry of Trade and Industry of Georgia, and also the amount of coal, timber and other materials needed for the railways of Russia and Azerbaijan in the amount was determined by a mixed commission. In addition, Georgia allowed the export of various goods and products, with the exception of all wheat and sugar, the total amount of which must not exceed the total value of petroleum products imported into Georgia. Georgia undertook not to export products from Russia and Azerbaijan beyond the borders of Georgia [Commodity Transit Agreement... (1920) No. 260]

The Ertoba newspaper noted, "For us, the political moment is more important than oil products... Based on this economic cooperation, we believe that the atmosphere of mistrust should slow down and we should move closer to normal state relations. This, in turn, confronts us with some important economic prospects... The First Transit Treaty, if it does not share the fate of the Akstaff Treaty, will become a great and powerful factor in the restoration of these relations" [Agreement (1920): No. 261].

As for the re-export of imported oil to other countries, here, as the Ertoba newspaper wrote, it was primarily meant, "petroleum products from Georgia will not fall into the hands of the enemies of Soviet Russia" [Again About the Agreement (1920): No 262].

The government of Soviet Azerbaijan, or more precisely the Bolshevik government of Soviet Russia, which actually ruled Soviet Azerbaijan, did not intend to fulfill the agreement. Moscow used Baku oil for political purposes and thus tried to influence the

Georgian government by preventing the supply of oil and petroleum products to Georgia. "Since Georgian trains, locomotives and crews heading to Baku for the delivery of petroleum products were detained by the authorities of the RSFSR and AzSSSR on the territory of the AzSSSR from December 5, the government of Georgia, to protect the interests of the Republic and the principles of relations, blocked (banned) the property of the RSFSR until the mentioned trains, locomotives and crews will not be returned to Georgia" [Note From the Ministry...(1921), No 14].

At the same time, an official protest was sent to the representative of Soviet Russia in Georgia. It said: "Blocking the transfer of petroleum products to Georgia cannot be considered other than a violation of the trade and transit treaty of November 14, 1920" [Representative of the RSFSR...(1921), No 15].

Statements of protest did not help matters, since blocking oil supplies to Georgia was part of Moscow's policy. It is interesting that the Bolsheviks named the persecution of communists in Georgia as the formal reason for non-compliance with the agreement. "Soviet Azerbaijan has long declared economic war on us. In the very first days, it violated the economic agreement signed with us, blocked our oil products... the situation between us and our neighbors is worsening... our government is still trying to find a language of reconciliation with our neighbors" [Representative of the RSFSR...(1921), No. 15].

The "language of reconciliation" could not be found, since Soviet Russia had already decided to occupy Georgia and was using Soviet Azerbaijan and Soviet Armenia as a springboard.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Again about the Agreement (1920). Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 262, November 17, 1920 (in Georgian)
- Agreement Between Georgia and Azerbaijan (1919) Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 133, 20 June 1919 (in Georgian)
- Agreement (1920). Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 261, November 16, 1920 (in Georgian)
- *Azerbaijan Democratic Republic* (1998) Азербайджанская Демократическая Республика (1918-1920). Редакционная коллегия: Ф. Максудов, И. Алиев, Н. Агамалиева, Ш. Алышанлы. Баку, Издательство Элм, 316 pages
- *Azerbaijan Democratic Republic. Foreign Policy* (1998) Азербайджанская Демократическая Республика (1918-1920). Внешняя политика (Документы и материалы). Баку, Издательство "Азербайджан", 632 pages
- Azimova, Aygun (1923). The Military-Political Situation In Azerbaijan In Conditions of the Conflict of the Bolsheviks And the National Forces (April-July 1918). *Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies*, Vol.1, No 1, pp. 54-67 <http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/CEWZ6639>
- Bakhtadze M. (2011) Бахтадзе М., Грузино-азербайджанский военно-оборонительный договор 1919 года. [Georgian-Azerbaijani Military-defense Treaty of 1919] *Труды Института истории Грузии имени Иване Джавахишвили*, Тбилисский государственный университет I, Том, 2011 (in Georgian) pp. 215-238
- Vogeradze, Grigol (2002). Богверадзе Григол. *Из истории военно-политических отношений Грузии-Азербайджана в 1918-1920 годах*. [On the History of

Georgian-Azerbaijani Military and Political Relations in 1918-1920] Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата исторических наук. Тб. 2002 (in Georgian) 243 pages

- Commodity Transit Agreement With Soviet Russia, And Azerbaijan (1920). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 260, 16 November 1920 (in Georgian)
- *Constituent Assembly of Georgia* (2019). Constituent Assembly of Georgia. Protocol of meetings, volume II, Tbilisi, Publication of the National Library of the Parliament of Georgia, 2019, 481 pages (in Georgian)
- *Documents and Materials on the Foreign Policy of Transcaucasia and Georgia* (1919). Документы и материалы по внешней политике Закавказья и Грузии. Тифлис, 1919 год, 514 pages
- From the Information Buro of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1920). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 296, 28 December 1920 (in Georgian)
- Georgian State Historical Archive (GSHA). Fund 1861, Inventory 1, file 58
- Georgian State Historical Archive (GSHA). Fund 1864, Inventory 2, file 34
- Government News (1918). Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 115, June 6, 1918 (in Georgian)
- In the Parliament of Azerbaijan (1919a). Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 130, June 15, 1919 (in Georgian)
- In the Parliament of Azerbaijan (1919b). Newspaper *Ertoba* (1919). №, July 5, 1919 (in Georgian)
- Kazemzade, Firuz (2016) Каземзаде Фируз. *Борьба за Закавказье 1917-1921 гг.* [The struggle for Transcaucasia 1917-1921] Тбилиси 2016, 328 pages
- Kobakhidze, Beka (2015). *The Georgian issue at the Paris Peace Conference*. Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences. Tbilisi, 2015 (in Georgian). 269 pages
- Last news (1919) Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 199, September 4, 1919 (in Georgian)
- Morning Speeches (1919) Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 130, 17 June 1919 (in Georgian)
- News (1919). Newspaper *Ertoba*, № 119, June 1, 1919 (in Georgian)
- The Newspaper *Communist* (1989) № 132, 8 June 1989 (in Georgian)
- Note From the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1921). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 14, 21 January 1921 (in Georgian)
- On Oil Transportation (1918). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia* (1918). № 116, 15 December 1918 (In Georgian)
- Reception in Honor of Nasib Bek Usubbekov (1919). The Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 205, 13 September 1919 (in Georgian)
- Representative of the RSFSR to the Government of Georgia (1921). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, № 15, 22 January 1921 (in Georgian)
- Rasulzade M. E. (1930) Расул-заде М. Э. *О Пантурсизме в связи с кавказской проблемой* [On Panturanism in connection with the Caucasian problem]. Париж, Издательский дом "Кавказ" К.Н.К., 1930, 76 pages
- Speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs (1919). Newspaper *Republic of Georgia*, №136, 24 June 1919 (In Azerbaijani)

- Topchubashi A.M. (2016) Топчибаши А.М., *Парижский архив (1919-1940). Книга первая (1919-1921)*. [The Paris Archive (1919-1940). First Book (1919-1921)] Москва, «Художественная литература», 568 pages
- Union of United Highlanders of the North Caucasus and Dagestan (1994) *Союз объединенных горцев Северного Кавказа и Дагестана (1917-1918 г.г.) и Горская республика (1918-1920 г.г.)*. Документы и материалы. Махачкала, Алеф, 290 pages
- Wojciech Materski (1992) Zagadnienie niepodległości Gruzji w stosunkach międzynarodowych 1918-1921. [The issue of Georgia's independence in international relations 1918-1921]. *Pro Georgia II. Prace i materiały do dziejów stosunków polsko-gruzińskich*, Warszawa, Uniwersytetowi Łódzkiemu, pp. 5-10

**ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES OF IRANIAN AZERBAIJAN  
IN THE NEWSPAPER “AZERBAIJAN” (1947-1949)****Ali Farhadov**

National Museum of History of Azerbaijan

[ali\\_farhadov@yahoo.com](mailto:ali_farhadov@yahoo.com)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9322-3670

<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/NFJN4000>

**Abstract:** The article presents an overview of the movement of "21 Azer" (December 12, 1945), social-political, economic, national and ethnic issues, and national enlightenment in Iranian Azerbaijan based on the 1947-1949 issues of the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, the organ of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) headed by S.J. Pishevari. The periodical was issued in the Azerbaijani Turkic utilizing the Arabic script during 1945-1946 in Tabriz under the governance of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) and in Baku from 1947 to 1949 due to the defeat of the ADP. Issues of the newspaper for 1947-1949 are stored in the Documentary Sources Fund at the National Museum for History of Azerbaijan. The newspaper “Azerbaijan” contains a critical stance towards the Qajar and Pahlavi authorities, an overview of socio-political, economic and cultural processes, some pieces of revolutionaries and intellectuals of the time, the activities of the ADP, and ethnic and ideological issues.

For a comprehensive presentation of the topic, this paper considers various sources and documents illuminating the historical context of the period have been utilized, including speeches, articles and other works by S.J. Pishevari, alongside with issues of the newspaper “Azerbaijan”.

**Keywords:** *21 Azer, Pishevari, “Azerbaijan” newspaper, national enlightenment, national issues*

**INTRODUCTION**

Although Seyid Jafar Pishevari (1893-1947) was originally from South Azerbaijan, he moved to Baku with his family at a young age, graduated from high school here, and engaged in pedagogical activity in the Khirdalan village of Baku. He participated in the meetings of the Iranian Social-Democrat (*Ictimaiyyun Amiyyun*) Party in Baku, joined the Justice Party of the Iranian communists in 1918, and assumed the role of editor of the organization's newspaper, "Hurriyyat". He asserted Marxism and social-democratic ideas and viewed them as the means for the salvation of the Iranian people. In 1920, he was sent to Rasht by the Justice Party to support the Gilan revolution led by Mirza Kuchik Khan in Iran [Tağiyeva et al., (2000): 249-251]. In the 1920s, S.J. Pishevari held leading positions as the responsible secretary of the Iranian Communist Party and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet-backed Gilan Republic [Pişəvəri (2005): 12-15].

Following the defeat of the Gilan revolution, he became the editor-in-chief of the newspaper "Haqiqat" of the anti-government Iranian Trade Union Organization in



Tehran. His publication of critical articles eventually led to the prohibition of the newspaper [Tağiyeva et al., (2000): 252]. The prevailing socio-political conditions in Iran, notably the official prohibition of communist propaganda in 1931, compelled him to, at least outwardly, abandon communist ideologies. During the 1930s and 1940s, while incarcerated in Tehran's Qasri-Qajar prison on charges related to communism, he personally sought forgiveness from the Shah for transgressions and mistakes he had not intentionally committed, as conveyed in his statement to the investigator [Rəhimli (Bije) (2019): 120] and said: "I am not adhering to this ideology anymore. It is very early for the acceptance of this belief in Iran. Communists traditionally draw strength from the working class, which is notably lacking in Iran. I find it unlikely that, even over the course of a century, the working class will emerge as a substantial force forming the majority of our nation" [Rəhimli (Bije) (2019): 122].

However, Pishevari acted according to the prevailing political conditions at the time. At the request of the USSR and Great Britain, S.J. Pishevari, who was released from prison after the resignation of Reza Shah in 1941, began working as an editor of the "Ajir" newspaper in Tehran and was elected a deputy to the Iranian parliament. Despite the non-acceptance of his deputyship by the Tehran government, he established the Azerbaijan Democratic Party on September 3, 1945, and initiated the publication of the party's newspaper, "Azerbaijan", laying the groundwork for national independence. M.C. Bagirov, the leader of Soviet Azerbaijan, played a major role in the appointment of S.J. Pishevari as the head of the ADP, recommending him on the basis of his previous affiliation as a communist and as "a person with considerable influence and respect in democratic entities [Həsənli (1998): 204-205].

In the appeal sent by S.J. Pishevari to the foreign ministers of major countries, it was said: "The condition of the Azerbaijani population, numbering five million in Iran, is unbearable. We advocate for the reinstatement of genuine democratic processes throughout Iran, accompanied by the granting of internal freedom and autonomy to the Azerbaijani people. Simultaneously, we await equitable legislation for the entire nation, allowing Azerbaijan to autonomously determine its destiny" [Qızıl səhifələr (1946): 38-39]. With the support of the Soviet government, the government of the ADP was established in South Azerbaijan on December 12, 1945, under the leadership of Pishevari.

The "21 Azer" movement of 1945-1946, waged in opposition to the Pahlavi monarchy that had held power in Iran since 1925, in the words of S.J. Pishevari, set the goal of "attaining freedom to address our national necessities while preserving the independence and integrity of Iran" [Pişəvəri (2016): 32]. S.J. Pishevari, a dedicated participant in the struggle for the freedom of the Iranian and Azerbaijani peoples, adopted the words of Mirza Kuchik Khan, a revolutionary figure in Gilan, as a slogan: "To build Tehran, all of Iran has been destroyed. To build Iran, it is necessary to destroy Tehran" [Pişəvəri (2016): 67]. S.J. Pishevari demonstrated that the Shah regime in Tehran was suppressing the people's freedom movement, devastating heroes such as Sattar Khan, Sheikh Khiyabani, Mirza Kuchik Khan [Pişəvəri (2016): 67].

S.J. Pishevari's activity, including the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, an official organ of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party [ADP] and the National Government [Xoşginabi (1948): 83, 4], which he founded, was based on national foundations. Emphasizing that the official language of the newspaper is Azerbaijani and inviting writers to take this responsible work seriously, S.J. Pishevari noted: "Our newspaper ("Azerbaijan"

newspaper) will now pay attention to the Azerbaijani language. Despite the baseless assertions of our adversaries, our language stands as vast and rich. We firmly believe that Azerbaijani writers, through their dedicated commitment, will enhance the beauty, progress, and evolution of our language by undertaking and successfully accomplishing this challenging task with faith and conviction" [Qızıl səhifələr (1946): 13].

In the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, the examination of Azerbaijan's history and culture during the Qajar and Pahlavi periods holds a prominent position. In his works and in the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, S.J. Pishevari accorded particular attention to the Mashruteh (Constitutional) Revolution against the monarchy and to the prominent intellectuals of that time.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Tabriz was also one of the cultural centers. During this period, the advanced training method applied by Mirza Hassan Roshdieh was widespread in Iran. Muhammad Ali Tarbiyat notes in "Danishmendani-Azerbaijan" ("Azerbaijani scientists") that M.H. Roshdieh, inspired by the alphabet reform like Mirza Fatali Akhundzade, wrote the first textbooks, "Vatan dili" (Motherland language), "Ana dili" ("Mother tongue") in South Azerbaijan written using sound and phonetic method [Tərbiyə (1967): 31; Məmmədli (2009): 19]. The textbook "Vatan dili" ("Motherland language") was published in Tabriz in 1905 in the Turkish (Azerbaijani) language [Beregian (1988): 47]. The book "Vatan dili" ("Motherland language") was taught as a primary school textbook in the schools of the Caucasus and Turkestan until 1917-1918 [Sərdariniya (2014): 109]. S.J. Pishevari described this work as "a unique work in the history of Azerbaijani education" [Pişəvəri (2016): 128]. M.H. Roshdieh also included Azerbaijani Turkish in the curriculum of the schools he operated [Cənubi Azərbaycan (1987): 418]. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper, under the editorial guidance of S.J. Pishevari, actively promoted the national pedagogical efforts of M.H. Rushdiyya, recognizing him as "a distinguished public figure and educator" [Azərbaycanın böyük xalq... (1945): 11, 1].

The South Azerbaijani intellectuals, such as M.A. Talibov and Z. Maragayi, were promoted in the newspaper "Azerbaijan". S.J. Pishevari recommended "reading Talibov's books and Ibrahimbey's travelogue" [Pişəvəri (2016): 16] to understand the Iranian constitutional revolution and the role of Azerbaijan in this movement. Sheikh Khiyabani, a patriot of constitutional movement and founder of the "Azadistan" government, was reported as "one of the prominent sayyids of Azerbaijan and outstanding thinker" in the "Azerbaijan" newspaper. It also was noted that he taught theological sciences in Tabriz, possessed extensive knowledge in religious sciences, and served at the Karimkhan mosque [Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani (1945): 43, 2]. The newspaper highlights Sheikh Khiyabani's efforts in the struggle against the Qajars and foreigners for the freedom of the people in Azerbaijan [Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani (1945): 46, 2]. Additionally, it provides information about the "Tajaddud" ("Renewal"), a newspaper published by him in Tabriz [Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani (1945): 76, 2].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper emphasizes Azerbaijan as one of the most ancient and cultural nations of the world, holds the view: "Every nation should determine its own destiny. Linguistic, cultural, economic, political and social freedom is the fundamental principle of this matter. However, innocent Azerbaijani children were deprived of education in their dear mother tongue" [Səməndər (1945): 1].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper accused the Pahlavi government of being a loyal servant to Western imperialists, illustrating how they brought ruin to the country, executed national heroes, and forced tens of thousands into exile. The newspaper accentuated the Pahlavis' reactionary policy, targeting not only Azerbaijanis but also patriotic intellectuals and workers throughout Iran, stating, "The reactionary forces spare no effort in shedding the blood of Iran's honest freedom seekers" [London...(1945): 10, 1].

During this period, "Azerbaijan" newspaper responded to those who accused the ADP government of splitting Iran as follows: "National autonomy does not mean fragmentation or annexation. Real democracy can only be achieved through local and national autonomy ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (1945): 42, 1-2]. The newspaper demonstrated that the genuine objective of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) is not the separation of Azerbaijan from Iran but rather the establishment of democracy in Iran and the provision of national and cultural rights to all the peoples of Iran. Simultaneously, it was asserted: "Those advocating for the territorial integrity of Iran within its present borders should recognize that such integrity can only be guaranteed through the establishment of a genuinely democratic government in Iran, coupled with the due respect for the languages, customs, traditions, and nationalities of all its diverse peoples" [Azərbaycan Midiyadır...(1948): 28, 3].

S.J. Pishevari, who expressed that "The whole of Iran aspires the restoration of the real democratic system and freedom" [London... (1945): 10, 1]: "Long live democratic Azerbaijan! Long live independent and free Iran!" [Pişəvəri (2016): 37], is an eminent social and political figure who fought for the freedom of not only Azerbaijan, but also the whole of Iran. However, Pishevari is primarily a socio-political figure and intellectual with the overarching goal of protecting and advancing Azerbaijan's national rights, culture, and national education. This is clearly noticeable in his articles and speeches in the 1945 issue of "Azerbaijan" newspaper. Pishevari, who devoted his life to the freedom and education of these people, declared, "The national government is nothing but our people" [Baş vəzirimiz...(1946): 1]. Criticizing the chauvinist language policy of the Pahlavi government, Pishevari says that it is not allowed to speak Azerbaijani in Iran's educational institutions, cultural centers, even in the premises of the Academy of Sciences in Tabriz, indicating that the ADP government successfully terminated this oppressive policy. S.J. Pishevari, emphasizing, "A nation cannot live without education", wanted Azerbaijani teachers and educators to impart knowledge to the children of the country with love and passion for freedom, aiming to enlighten and empower them. S.J. Pishevari noted that not only Azerbaijan but all the peoples of Iran expected democracy, human rights, and educational support from the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP).

21 Azer (December 12) marked not only the day of independence but also, a year later in 1946, the day of the downfall of the ADP government. After the withdrawal of military support by the USSR prompted by international pressure, thousands of Azerbaijanis in South Azerbaijan were subjected to violence, with many losing their lives, and their homes being destroyed and set ablaze. Following the occupation by the Pahlavi army, the leadership of ADP was forced to emigrate to Soviet Azerbaijan, and the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, the official organ of the party, continued its publication in Baku.

The “Azerbaijan” newspaper extensively addressed national and ideological issues during the Pahlavi rule in Iran, highlighted the chauvinistic policies directed against non-Persians, delved into the ethnic minorities residing in South Azerbaijan, and the national policies of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) as well as issues related to Marxism-Leninism. Although, on the eve of World War II, Reza Shah Pahlavi, who distrusted Great Britain and came closer to Germany, wanted to reduce the excessive oil concessions given to the British, especially the 80% share of the "Anglo-Persian Oil Company" [Bolat (2013): 58, 65] from Iran's oil revenues, and increase Iran's share to 20%, but he could not succeed in doing so. The propagation of Hitler's fascism within the country escalated rapidly, and Iran became a hub for German agents. In the country, "the heads of administration convened people daily in opium stores to discuss Hitler's bravery" [Əhmədžadə (1948): 68, 3]. After Nazi Germany attacked the USSR, the British and Soviet armies invaded Iran in the summer of 1941 with the objective of eliminating Reza Shah's pro-German stance. At the behest of the British and Soviet governments, Reza Shah was deposed from power, and his son Muhammad Reza was appointed as the new Shah. Exiled from Iran, Reza Shah passed away in South Africa in 1944 [Kurtuluş (2008): 67].

After invading Iran, the USSR and Great Britain partitioned the country into their respective spheres of influence. This new military-political situation led to struggle for independence of non-Persians in Northern Iran, especially Azerbaijanis and Kurds to establish national autonomy with the support of the Soviets.

The pro-Shah Iranian press of that time asserted that struggle for independence in Iranian Azerbaijan and Kurdistan were linked to the USSR, driven by aspirations for new oil fields [Həsənli (1998): 130-131]. The rejection of the Soviet government's concession and lease offer regarding North Iranian oil by the Mohammad Reza Shah government, supported by the British [Həsənli (1998): 136-137], created a unique situation that led the Soviet government to support national movements in South Azerbaijan and Kurdistan. The imposition of artificial restrictions on the national cultural development of non-Persians by the Pahlavi regime further accelerated this process.

Nearly every edition of the “Azerbaijan” newspaper, under the leadership of S.J. Pishevari and the Azerbaijan Democratic Party, which assumed power in Iranian Azerbaijan in December 1945 with the support of the Soviets, extensively addressed national problems. The newspaper consistently provided information about the ethnic minorities of the region, including the Assyrians, Armenians, and notably, the large Kurdish population. It was even dedicated a special page specifically for the Kurds. In the “Azerbaijan” newspaper, utilizing materials from the “Kurdistan” newspaper, the official organ of the Kurdistan Democratic Party led by Gazi Muhammad and established with the support of the Soviets, Kurds were provided with one-page educational and socio-political information in their own language. The “Azerbaijan” newspaper underscored the violation of Kurdish rights by Iran, Iraq, and Turkey [Kürd...(1949): 121, 1], the usurpation of their national and cultural freedoms [21 Azərin...(1948): 110, 1, 4: Əyyubi (1947): 4, 1]. It expressed a desire to safeguard the national and cultural rights of the Kurdish people [Kürd...(1949): 121, 1, 4]. As observed in the “Azerbaijan” newspaper, the “Kurdistan” newspaper similarly promoted the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Soviet ideology, the principles of friendship among peoples, and human rights policies [Kürdüstan (1948): 106, 2]. The telegrams sent by the Kurdistan Democratic Party to the

ADP showed the fraternity between the Kurdish and Azerbaijani people and expressed determination to jointly combat the common enemy.

### **National Journalism and Literature on the Pages of “Azerbaijan”**

The “Azerbaijan” newspaper allocated a substantial portion of its content to issues pertaining to science, national education, enlightenment and the articles aimed at solving these issues for the enlightenment of the Southern Azerbaijanis. The works of patriotic publicists, such as Fathi Khoshginabi, Mirrahim Vilayi, Ali Shamida, Jafar Mujiri, Ghafar Kendli on the topic of enlightenment were often featured in the newspaper. Fathi Khoshginabi, an oriental scholar, writer and poet, served as a member of ADP, and during the period of emigration, held the position of responsible secretary at the “Azerbaijan” newspaper, which served as the official organ of the ADP [İsmayılov (2021b)]. In his article entitled "Historical role of Azerbaijan newspaper", he specially appreciated significant role played by the “Azerbaijan” newspaper in the activities of the ADP. F. Khoshginabi in his article "Historical task of Azerbaijan newspaper in the new stage of our struggle" noted that "Azerbaijan" newspaper is "the influential weapon of ADP, the tongue of our people and the mirror of our glorious struggle" [Xoşginabi (1947): 1, 1]. F. Khoshginabi wrote in his article "We should create a national education": "They have prevented the distribution of books in our country so far. We must show the truth in our history. The books taught so far are all relics of the former dictatorial system. We request for support from all our educational professionals in the endeavor to foster a national culture" [Xoşginabi (1945): 89, 2].

Mirrahim Vilayi's articles in “Azerbaijan” newspaper are also interesting. M. Vilayi's series of articles entitled "Analysis on the Program of Azerbaijan Democratic Party" broadly interprets the program of the ADP. M. Vilayi noted: “The national autonomy established under the leadership of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party provided an opportunity for the five million people to revive their native language and culture, which had been suppressed by the reactionary state of Iran. He inaugurated schools and published books in native language for our people” [Vilayi (1948): 16, 4]. M. Vilayi showed that the ADP government does not pursue an ethnic, chauvinist policy and has granted all peoples residing in the country their national-cultural rights and freedom of press.

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper, promoting national literature, had a particular "Literature page" section, and the announcements indicated, "the pages of our journal are open for stories, articles and poems" [Diqqət (1949): 116, 4]. The appeal to the writers stated, "Due to the oppressive policy of the Tehran government, we have been deprived of the reading and writing in our mother tongue, and the opportunity to develop our own rich literature. Henceforth, our party prioritizes this matter and strives towards the advancement of our language. The objective of our newspaper in this matter is very essential. It is expected that our fellow poets and writers reflect the struggle for a happy life, freedom, and progressive ideology of our people in various aspects. Our fellow writers should pay attention to this topic and try to further develop our language based on the instructions of their native party" [Xoşginabi (1948): 56, 1].

After emigration, Ali Shamida, a prominent publicist, became the editor of "Azerbaijan" newspaper, an organ of ADP. In his article titled “There is No Freedom of

the Press in Iran” he illustrated the absence of genuine freedom of the press in the country, emphasizing that the majority of the ones that exist are subject to government influence. A. Shamida pointed out that newspapers such as "Ittilaat", "Gushesh", "Mehri-Iran", "Sitare", "Saba", which praised the German fascists, now serve the despotic Pahlavi government and Western imperialism [Şəmidə (1948): 43, 4].

A. Shamida also criticized individuals who utilize religion and sect as political tools in Iran, along with those who unknowingly follow them. He criticized those who used religion as a weapon and hindered people's struggle for freedom in his article "Religious propaganda or political activity!" A. Shamida wrote, "They exploit the religious and national prejudices of nations and peoples, inciting national and sectarian animosity and wars. Through various means of mischief, they obstruct people from establishing an independent and peaceful life. Furthermore, under the guise of sectarian propaganda, their aim is to dissuade the masses from the struggle for freedom by disseminating reactionary ideas, poisoning, and fabricating the ideology of the people" [Şəmidə (1949): 120, 4].

A. Shamida wrote that the foreign imperialist states used religious people along with the occupying army or experts to undermine the people they exploited. He also contended that the foreign missionaries operating in Iran were agents of the imperialists [Şəmidə (1949): 120, 4]. A. Shamida showed that Christian missionaries were mainly active against the USSR in South Azerbaijan, and at the same time they were trying to turn Iran into a colony of imperialists.

Also, significant articles by Jafar Mujiri are featured in the "Azerbaijan" newspaper. The Tabriz-based artist and writer J. Mujiri covered specific aspects of Azerbaijan's cultural history, exploring our classical poets and writers, providing insights into the Azerbaijani people's resistance against the Shah's regime, and documenting information on Azerbaijan in the Iranian press.

In his article "Tabriz", J. Mujiri explores the historical grandeur of the city in the Middle Ages, mentioning prominent Azerbaijani poets and Sufis such as Qatran Tabrizi, Khatib Tabrizi, Shams Tabrizi, Saib Tabrizi, and Khagani Shirvani's affinity for Tabriz as his second homeland. The article also mentioned Tabriz's historical significance as the capital of states such as Qara Qoyunlu, Aq Qoyunlu, and Safavids. J. Mujiri shows Tabriz's crucial role in events such as the Tobacco Protests, Constitutional Revolution, the struggle of Sheikh Mohammad Khiyabani, and the "21 Azer" movement. The author reflects: "During the "21 Azer" movement, the broadcasts from Tabriz radio earning the affection of the Iranian peasants and workers, penetrating the indifferent Pahlavi dynasty in Tehran like an arrow. Tabriz announced and proved to the Eastern world that the realization of peoples' freedom is not an unattainable dream but can be achieved through struggle" [Müciri (1948): 120, 1].

In this article of J. Mujiri, it is stated that these beautiful days of Tabriz came to an end with the defeat of the "21 Azer" movement and the occupation of the city by Muhammad Reza Shah's forces. Tabriz became a ruin. However, the author optimistically declares, 'Old Tabriz will avenge its enemies and, once again, inscribe a new chapter of pride in its venerable history [Müciri (1948): 120, 3].

J. Mujiri condemned the wrong religious policy carried out in the country under the guise of religion in his article "Let The Iranian Reactionaries Be Disgraced Once Again!" The author vehemently criticized the Pahlavi government, which uses religion for

political purposes, and its foreign patrons as follows: "The British imperialists who guide the Iranian reactionaries and their frauds masked by Pan-Islamism are also exposed. These reactionary actions, carried out under the guise of Pan-Islamism, poison the minds of the Iranian people" [Müciri (1949): 118, 3]. J. Mujiri criticized individuals who subjected people to oppression in the present world, attempting to sustain them with the promise of a better afterlife. He also denounced those who advocated the notion that "result of enduring hunger and poverty is commendable" [Müciri (1948): 68, 1].

J. Mujiri's article entitled "The government of Tehran is the enemy of our national monuments" criticizes the Pahlavi government's destruction of our national monuments and burning of books written in our mother tongue [Müciri (1949): 120, 4]. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper reported, "the government in Tehran shuts down schools teaching in the mother tongue while, instead, opening opium shops. This is the service of the treacherous rulers to the people" [Əhmədzadə (1948): 68, 3]. J. Mujiri pointed out that "their enmity could neither impede the struggle of our people nor weaken our national existence"[Müciri (1949): 120, 4]. The author attributes all these problems to the Pahlavi government, citing its lack of respect and care for the people. The author predicts, "the protests of the people of Iran indicate that this system of government will fall in the near future" [Müciri (1949): 118, 3].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper also presented noteworthy articles by Ghafar Kendli, an active participant in the "21 Azer" movement and a Tabriz-based literary critic. In his article "Fatali Khan of Quba", he delineates the period of the khanates of Azerbaijan, illustrating that their fragmented condition led to invasions as they failed to unite under a central government. The author described the existence of fragmentation, the absence of central authority, and the skillful exploitation of this situation by imperialist states as follows: "Trade has completely weakened. Both urban and rural life had stagnated. Scattered khanates, isolated economically and politically, were constantly fighting each other. This led to further economic collapse of the country. Neighboring states intensified the internal clashes between them to easily capture these khanates" [Kəndli (1948): 75, 4].

G. Kendli discusses Fatali Khan's attempt to unite other khanates around Quba and observes that, despite its brevity, "his effective initiatives contributed to the growth of the economy and culture in the country and the advancement of Azerbaijani cities [Kəndli (1948): № 75, 4]. G. Kandli appreciates Fatali Khan's attempt to unify the khanates, describing it as "a living witness of the struggle for a unified Azerbaijan" [Kəndli (1948): 75, 4].

In his article titled "Azerbaijani National Government Ensured the Freedom of the Peoples", G. Kandli discusses the ADP government's policy aimed at securing freedom for the people of Iran. The article shows that the Pahlavi government, fearing a unified resistance of the Iranian people against the Shah, employs a policy of Persian chauvinism. The author noted: "In the culturally, scientifically, and educationally lagging country of Iran, plagued by hardship, disaster, and poverty, the national oppression is particularly severe". Persian chauvinists aim to secure their dominance over other nations and, additionally, to retain exploitation of Persian workers, therefore try to poison them with the venom of nationalism. They fear the amalgamation of diverse peoples residing in Iran. [Kəndli (1948): 90, 1].

The newspaper "Azerbaijan" published poems and stories of Azerbaijani poets and writers such as Balash Azeroglu, Ali Tude, Ibrahim Zakir, Ashik Huseyn Javan, as well as poetesses Hokume Billuri and Madina Gulgun. And they reflect both political direction and national enlightenment, illuminating cultural issues and freedom, internationalism, and social problems. The themes of patriotism, national freedom and hatred of the cruel Shah's regime play a central role in these poems.

### **The National Enlightenment Concerns on the Newspaper's Pages**

The program and policy of the ADP paved the way for the use of the mother tongue in secondary schools, universities, and in the fields of radio and newspaper publishing. The ADP program declared: "The mother tongue is a great mean for the advancement of national culture. Therefore, our children should be educated in our mother tongue, whether in state or private schools. To achieve this, the preparation of textbooks and other educational materials is essential" [Qızıl səhifələr (1946): 67].

Considering the national rights of non-Azerbaijani people, the program mentioned: "Other nations living in Azerbaijan have the right to open a school in their mother tongue, and our party is completely convenient for that." [Qızıl səhifələr (1946): 67]. Commenting on the party program from this perspective, M. Vilayi emphasized the necessity of the establishment of "anjumens" (councils), self-governing institutions of the provinces, and national autonomy for the development of science and education in the country. In his series of articles entitled "Analysis of the Program of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party", he expressed that "Self-governance of the nationalities living in Iran through the establishment of councils and provinces, the creation of schools, education, and culture in their own national language, and the management of state organizations are essential conditions for autonomy. Public freedom, linguistic freedom and freedom of speech are the legal rights of every nation" [Vilayi (1948): 4].

During the ADP government, the national education policy was one of the top-priority issues for the state. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper emphasized the significance of protecting the rights of all nations and fighting against poverty to eradicate general illiteracy in the country. It was stated "To implement comprehensive education, it is essential to respect the rights of the Iranian people. This was accomplished during the time of the Azerbaijani national government. Orphaned children were placed in foster homes. Schools teaching in the mother tongue were established in cities and villages. Students received free books and educational materials. 600 students studied at Tabriz University; the first university opened in 1946. They were provided with accommodation, food, clothing, and stipend. Consequently, our native language developed significantly within a short period" [Əlioğlu (1948): 15, 1].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper characterized the Pahlavi government's neglect of education as follow: "The state does not allocate funds for the education of the nation. This is because an educated nation that contemplates its rights does not want to be enslaved" [Əlioğlu (1948): 14, 4]. The impediments to education were due to high costs, which hindered the increasing of local specialists and deprived underprivileged children of educational opportunities. The newspaper stated: "The doors of education and schools in Iran are closed to the children of hardworking people. Because all existing schools are private, and each person has to pay a certain amount of money per month to study in



these schools. For example, if a person wants to become an engineer or a doctor, he has to spend at least a few thousand tomans on education starting from elementary school until finishing high school. Of course, it is known that such conditions are impossible for poor children" [Davudzadə (1948): 1].

During this period, the "Azerbaijan" newspaper pointed out the detrimental effects of Azerbaijani students studying only in Persian in secondary schools, stating that these students "in the end know neither their own language nor Persian well. Of course, only the Persian language occupies most of their time in such a long time" [Məhəmmədzadə (1948): 68, 4]. As a consequence, students found it challenging to allocate time to learn subjects other than studying Persian, a foreign language to them, over an extended period. The Pahlavi government also targeted Azerbaijani teachers to undermine national education. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper reported: "Azerbaijani teachers have been dismissed with the permission of Tehran's Persian Ministry of Education, and the most reactionary Persian teachers are appointed to educate Azerbaijani children. As a result, local and experienced teachers of Azerbaijan remain unemployed and are forced to write petitions, letters, or engage in street vending" [Bəxşi (1948): 94, 1, 4].

The newspaper also showed that "when the teacher discusses the most basic rights that the people of Iran are deprived of, while teaching in the classroom, the Ministry of Education labels it as communist propaganda" [Şəkibxan (1948): 100, 1, 4]. The Pahlavi government, asserting that "the university should stay out of politics" [Şəkibxan (1948): 100, 4], intensified the dictatorship, threatened teachers and students with accusations of communism, exile, and imprisonment, attempted to undermine human rights, and to suppress the ideals of freedom.

Another method used by the Pahlavi government was demonstratively burning of books in the Azerbaijani language. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper expressed this by stating, "If the Tehran government truly supported the education of the people, it would not have demolished and looted the educational centers of our national government. It would not have set fire to the books printed in the mother tongue, a highly beneficial initiative of the national government that facilitated the education of our people" [Müciri (1949): 120, 4].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper conveyed the sentiment that "Even if they burn our books, they will not be able to extinguish the flames of revenge and the love of freedom burning deep in the soul and heart of every Azerbaijani" [Xoşginabi (1947): 47, 3].

In addition to violating the national rights of the non-Persians, the Pahlavi government also ignored and insulted their existence. The "Azerbaijan" newspaper wrote, "In a program on Tehran radio, all Azerbaijanis were derogatorily referred to as "portugalfurush" ("orange seller") due to those Azerbaijanis selling oranges. The term was used by Pahlavi propagandists and chauvinist officials to insult Azerbaijanis who were not fluent in Persian. Now let's see who are the Azerbaijanis being referred as "portugalfurush" in Tehran? They are Azerbaijani workers and peasants. They are peasants who escaped from the oppression of gendarmerie, landowners and state officials due to severe financial problems, and unemployed workers who were fired by oppressive factory owners. In spite of the disgraceful insult from the Tehran government, these individuals represent the most honorable, honest, and hardworking Azerbaijanis [Açıq təhqir.. (1949): 115, 1, 3].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper emphasized: "It is not shame for some individuals of our nation to sell oranges on the streets of Tehran; what is shame is for the government of Tehran to sell the economic and political freedom of the Iranian people to the Americans for a handful of dollars. Shah's betrayals and immorality in the palace are not disgrace, but is it deemed disgrace for Azerbaijanis to sell oranges to secure their daily life?" [Açıq təhqir... (1949): 115, 3].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper also commented: "Pahlavi chauvinists, who deny the national existence of our people and our mother tongue, shamelessly call the language of Azerbaijanis, several million people, a "local dialect" while speaking in Azerbaijani on Tabriz radio" [Məhəmmədzadə (1948): 68, 4].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper criticized the fact that after the fall of the ADP government, Tabriz radio became a tool in the hands of the reactionary Pahlavi government, speaking against the primary education of all citizens. It was stated in the newspaper: "Tabriz radio attracts the disdain of freedom-loving peoples in every word. This radio shamelessly addresses the people of Iran: "If all the Iranian nation receives primary education, then not only will no progress be seen in the administration of the country, it will even lag behind politically, but instead, five or ten political and scholarly individuals can govern the Iranian country with great dignity" [Məhəmmədzadə (1948): 82, 1].

The newspaper denounced the fact that during the Pahlavi period, secondary and higher schools only trained obedient and patient servants and officials, which were necessary for capitalists and landowners, and that they were deprived of social and political education. The author stressed that during the period of the ADP government, struggles against such negative situations, efforts to protect not only the national and cultural rights of Azerbaijanis but also those of all Iranian peoples were realized [Məhəmmədzadə (1948): 82, 4]. Unfortunately, the ADP was short-lived, and as a result, the Pahlavi rule once again hindered Azerbaijani national culture and human rights. In the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, it was mentioned that during the Pahlavi period, the absence of free education and instruction in the mother tongue, and the fact that most children had to work due to poverty, were the major impediments to general education [Əlioğlu (1948): 14, 4].

### **The Native Language Issues on the Pages of "Azerbaijan"**

The newspaper "Azerbaijan" criticized Pahlavi's oppression of national rights for using of native language, the development of national culture and schooling:

"Reza Khan's tyranny imported Hitler's fascist thoughts and actions to our motherland, strengthened oppression and slavery. The Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Assyrians, and Armenians living within Iran were prohibited from writing and reading in their native language, publishing books and journals, having art and theater, and using their native language in local administrations and courts. Consequently, it caused significant discord among the peoples. Despite the fact that four years have passed since the fall of this tyranny, that failed policy is still continuing. Perhaps the reactionary elements are gradually becoming more impudent, attacking the people and suppressing their democratic movement. Reactionary elements do not want our country to progress industrially and become strong and puissant" [Azərbaycan Demokrat Firqəsinin... (1948): 13, 3].

Condemning the education policy of the Pahlavi government, the "Azerbaijan" newspaper stated: "The main goal of the state in general education is to forcibly teach the Persian language to non-Persian nationalities. Persian is not the language of all peoples in Iran. One of the obstacles to general education is that the state does not take into account the language and national characteristics of the Azerbaijani, Kurdish, Armenian, and other peoples" [Əlioğlu (1948): 15, 1].

Taking into account the national rights of non-Azerbaijani people, it was mentioned in the ADP program that "Other nations living in Azerbaijan such as Kurds, Armenians, Assyrians have the right to open schools in their mother tongue, and our party is completely convenient for that [Qızıl səhifələr (1946): 67]. The program of the party was welcomed by non-Azeris. Assyrians, Kurds, and other peoples expressed their support for the establishment and program of the ADP through telegrams and letters sent to the "Azerbaijan" newspaper ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 6]. Five deputy seats were reserved for Kurdish representatives in the Milli Mejlis (National Assembly). The program of the National Government stated "The National Government of Azerbaijan considers all peoples living in Azerbaijan, including Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Armenians, Assyrians, and others, as equal in terms of rights and laws" ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 782].

The "Azerbaijan" newspaper, criticizing the national policy of the Pahlavis, wrote that during the reign of Reza Shah, "speaking Turkish in schools became a legal obstacle" and "they prohibited the Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Assyrians and Armenians, residing in Iran, writing and reading in their native language, publishing books and newspapers, creating art and theater works, and using their native language in local administrations and courts. So, a great strife arose between the peoples" ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 200].

S.J. Pishevari showed that the conflicts between the Kurdish-Azerbaijani peoples at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the tragedies caused by the Kurdish terrorists against our people, have already ended as a result of the ADP's policy, and that these conflicts are the result of the offensive policy of the Tehran government and imperialism. He noted, "the Tehran government's policy of treating these two nations with the same consideration, robbing and oppressing them, should be considered as one of the reasons that bind these nations together. Unfortunately, it can be asserted that before the formation of our party, there was no unity between Kurds and Azerbaijanis. Perhaps, on the contrary, the Tehran government and foreign imperialist states have fostered discord between these two nations [Pişəvəri (2005): 61-62]. "Azerbaijan" newspaper also mentioned that the British imperialists exploited the people and incited national problems via the companies they established in Iran. The newspaper showed that "Iranians have nothing to do with this big enterprise, which is outwardly named "Anglo-Persian Oil Company" [İngilis və İran... (1949): 117, 1]. The company used the shah's gendarmerie and police forces and many unemployed workers to oppress the Iranian protesting workers employed under low wages and in dangerous conditions. The company, in collaboration with British intelligence, maintained its private military forces. It was involved in smuggling, denied Iran its fair share of oil products, incited the Kurdish people to revolt against Iran, and fueled interethnic military conflicts to keep the shah in a state of fear [İshaqi (1948): 108, 4]. The ADP government, which emerged after the "21 Azer" movement, eliminated the artificial contradictions between the Iranian peoples and brought them closer in the struggle against the Pahlavi regime. "Azerbaijan"

newspaper wrote about this in its 12th issue of 1948: "The national movement that started in Azerbaijan aimed to strengthen the feelings of fraternity, friendship and love between peoples on the basis of sincerity against that treacherous policy. One of the primary goals of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party is to foster unity and solidarity among the Kurdish, Armenian, Assyrian, Azerbaijani, and Persian peoples residing in Azerbaijan, uniting them in a genuine sense. Respecting the national language, customs and traditions of these nations, providing all of them with political and social rights is the main line of our party".

In order to strengthen their power, the Pahlavis created contradictions and clashes between representatives of different religions and sects in the country. "Azerbaijan" newspaper wrote about it in the 90th issue of 1948: "Iranian reactionaries want to incite national bloodshed among the peoples living in Iran based on the outdated slogan of the British colonialists, "make discord, make government!". The first weapon in their hands to achieve this goal is the sect. They aim to create conflicts between peoples under the names of such as, Sunni-Shia, Muslim-Armenian. After the ADP government took power, it did not pursue an ethnic and chauvinist policy. Instead, it granted all peoples living in the country their national and cultural rights and freedom of press. In the 16th issue of "Azerbaijan" newspaper in 1948, it was noted, "Azerbaijan National Autonomy respected the rights of nationalities living in Azerbaijan, acknowledging their language, customs, and traditions. It granted them freedom of language and press, treating them with equal rights with the people of Azerbaijan and fostering a sense of fraternity". During the ADP government, which respects the national and cultural rights of all peoples in the country, the Kurdish, Armenian, and Assyrian peoples were given the right of primary education in their native language. Additionally, the rights of the Turkic-speaking Qashqais and other peoples living in other regions of Iran were defended through newspaper. Even a political-social newspaper called "Arevud" ("Sun") was published in Armenian. The "Armenian National Council" in Tabriz expressed in its appeal to the ADP: "The democratic slogans you declared in accordance with the Basic Law [constitution] of Iran align with the long-cherished dreams of Armenians of Azerbaijan. The provincial and regional councils proposed by you are precisely among the topics for the happiness and progress of our country that the Azerbaijan Democratic Party mentioned in its declaration" ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 113]. The Armenian newspaper "Antifascist" published in Tabriz actively promoted the Azerbaijan Democratic Party on its pages. Some Iranian Armenians, who had previously gained representation in local self-government by supporting the constitutional movement at the beginning of the 20th century, were now seeking to protect their national and cultural rights by supporting the new democratic government. The organization of Iranian Dashnaks, centered in Tabriz since 1892, deemed it unwise to join the ADP, stating: "It is highly perilous for us Armenians to engage in such parties. If we align with the Democratic Party, the Iranian government will accuse us of their activities and will harass our community". As the ADP government respects the rights of all peoples in the country, Assyrian Danil Yushia from Urmia was elected a member of the Central Committee of the ADP and a deputy to the National Assembly, and the representative of the Armenians of Tabriz, Simon Mkrtchyan, was elected a member of the 39-member National Delegation, which was the supreme governing body before the establishment of the National Assembly ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 607]. With this humanitarian

policy, the ADP showed the hands of peace of the people of Azerbaijan, towards the Assyrians and Armenians, who were involved in genocides against Muslims in South Azerbaijan at the beginning of the 20th century.

In the "Azerbaijan" newspaper, a special place was dedicated to the memory of the Kurdish socio-political figure Gazi Muhammad, portraying him as a "martyr Kurdish leader" [Kürdüstan (1947): 4, 2]. Ghazi Muhammad was a nationalist, a religious person, and despite being a Ghazi-Sharia judge, he was a person who knew world history and culture, several Western and Eastern languages, and he constantly defended the rights of non-Muslims. He was a figure loved by both Kurds and non-Muslims in Kurdistan [Qazi Muhammedin kızı..(2019)].

Ghazi Muhammad was the leader of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP), established on August 16, 1945, and the Kurdistan Republic, proclaimed on January 22, 1946 in Mahabad. M. Bagirov, who met with Gazi Muhammad in Baku in September 1945, and Soviet statesmen played a special role in the creation and support of the KDP [Mehabad... (1999): 29, 34]. In this meeting, M. Bagirov initially proposed autonomy for Kurdistan within South Azerbaijan, but after Gazi Muhammad objected, he agreed to establish Kurdish autonomy within Iran under the leadership of the Kurdistan Democratic Party [Aegleton (1989): 110-112]. The ADP government led by S.J. Pishevari demanded the autonomy of the Kurdistan to be established within Azerbaijan, however, the Kurds asserted territorial claims on provinces of Azerbaijan, such as Urmia, Khoy, and Maku. However, after some time, both governments recognized the necessity of forming an alliance against their common enemy, the Pahlavis, and gave up their mutual territorial claims [Aegleton (1989): 192, 242; Mehabad.. (1999): 29; Memmedli (2020): 1129-1130, 1143-1144]. In the program of the KDP, the autonomy of Kurdistan within Iran was defined [Aegleton (1989): 143-144].

Thus, with the establishment of the Republic of Kurdistan, Kurdish separatism triumphed in South Azerbaijan, the Kurds succeeded in establishing a new Kurdish autonomous state in the territory of South Azerbaijan in addition to the Iranian Kurdistan province with its center in Sanandaj. Along with the Pahlavi government, the Dashnaktsutyun and Tudeh (People) Party, a left-wing party, were also against the idea of autonomy for national minorities in Iran. One of the leaders of Tudeh, A. Ovanesyan criticized the nationalist movement of non-Persians in his articles in the party's newspaper "Rahbar" and indicated "we condemn provocateurs among the Iranian Azerbaijanis and Kurdish population who want to divide Iran" [Rahbar...].

The Iranian government offered Gazi Muhammad the idea of abolishing the Republic of Kurdistan and integrating it into the province of Iranian Kurdistan, appointing him as the governor of this province. However, this proposal was not accepted [Aegleton (1989): 244-245]. During the attack on South Azerbaijan in December 1946, Iranian Prime Minister Ahmad Qavam sent a telegram to the leader of Kurdistan, Gazi Muhammad, stating that he considered Urmia, Khoy, and other provinces to be "Kurdish areas" and promised to give them to the Kurds in exchange for support. However, A. Qavam's attempt to create discord between the Kurdish and Azerbaijani peoples failed. Gazi Muhammad rejected A. Qavam and asserted, "these two peoples cannot be separated" [Əlioğlu (1948): 107, 1].

ADP and KDP, the governments of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan were forced to join hands against the common enemy-the Pahlavi Shah regime. On April 23, 1946, an

agreement on political, economic, cultural, military cooperation and mutual assistance was signed between the two national governments in the city of Tabriz [Çeşmazer 68]. S.J. Pishevari wrote, "Kurds are a family of Azerbaijan. Let there be no discord between us" ["Azərbaycan" qəzeti (2022): 588]. According to the April 23 agreement, the protection of the rights of Azerbaijanis in Kurdistan and Kurds in South Azerbaijan was defined [Aegleton (1989): 194].

Gazi Muhammad refused to flee abroad during the attack of the Pahlavi army in Mahabad and stated, "I made a promise to my people that I will stand by them in both good and bad time" [Qazi Muhammedin kızı...(2019)]. He was executed by the Pahlavi Shah regime in March 1947. Consequently, following the destruction of Azerbaijani autonomy by the Shah's army in Iran in December 1946, Kurdish autonomy also met its end. S.J. Pishevari, the head of the autonomous government of Azerbaijan, was deceived and transported to Soviet Azerbaijan on the eve of the occupation of Tabriz. He passed away in 1947 as an emigrant, following a suspicious accident in Soviet Azerbaijan.

## CONCLUSION

Despite the defeat of the ADP government, it succeeded in perpetuating and disseminating its ideological principles through "Azerbaijan" newspaper. The inclusion of writings by publicists such as S.J. Pishevari, M. Vilayi, J. Mujiri, A. Shamida, as well as poets like A. Tuda, B. Azeroghlu, H. Billuri, and M. Gulgun, played a pivotal role in conveying the realities of South Azerbaijan to its readers. The newspaper significantly contributed to the fostering of national consciousness and the advancement of national culture in South Azerbaijan. A thorough examination of the "Azerbaijan" newspaper is crucial for understanding the national dynamics in Iran during the Pahlavi era, particularly the Kurdish, Armenian, and Assyrian problems, assessing the ADP's role in addressing these issues, and comprehending the interrelations among Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Armenians, and Assyrians. The fascist and chauvinist nationalist policies pursued by the Pahlavi regime prompted non-Persian ethnic groups, notably Azerbaijanis and Kurds, to assert their national-cultural rights and advocate for national autonomy, leading to numerous violent conflicts and massacres. Examination of materials from the "Azerbaijan" newspaper underscores that although the unifying policy of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) effectively solved these national issues in Iran, this policy were subsequently undermined by the Pahlavi regime's dismantling of national autonomies. The Pahlavis, oppressing the people through dictatorship and suppression, caused widespread resentment among the Iranian peoples. Despite its military strength and Western imperialist support, the Pahlavi regime ultimately faced removal and destruction due to widespread popular demand. The scholarly examination of the legacy of S. J. Pishevari and the "Azerbaijan" newspaper holds significance not only for delving into the historical, cultural, opinion journalism, and educational issues of the Qajar and Pahlavi periods but also for understanding the role of the people of South Azerbaijan in the democratic movement, their pursuit of national freedom, and their struggle. This area of research should be considered one of the primary focus for emerging scholars.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 21 Azərin 3-cü ildönümü münasibətilə təşkil olunmuş yığıncaqda yoldaş Rəhim Qazinin məruzəsi (1948) [Comrade Rahim Gazi's Report at the Meeting Organized on the Occasion of the 3rd Anniversary of 21 Azer]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 110, 1, 4
- "Azərbaycan" qəzeti (1945). [The Newspaper Azerbaijan], № 42, 1-2
- "Azərbaycan" qəzeti. *Azərbaycan Demokrat Firqəsi Mərkəzi Komitəsinin orqanı (1945-1946-cı illər, Təbriz)*. (2022). ["Azerbaijan" newspaper. Organ of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan (1945-1946, Tabriz)] I hissə. Azərbaycan dilinə transliterasiya və tərcüməsi. Məsul redaktor: S.Bayramzadə. Bakı: Elm, 928 page
- Açıq təhqir, aləni düşmənlik (1949). [Open Humiliation, Bitter Emnity]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 115, 1, 3
- Aegleton, W. (1989). *Mehabad Kürt Cumhuriyeti – 1946* [Mehabad Kurdish Republic]. Tərcümə: M.E.Bozarslan. Köln: Komkar, 321 pages
- Azərbaycan Demokrat Firqəsinin 1324-ci il mehr ayının 10-nunda birinci konqre tərəfindən qəbul olunmuş Məramnaməsi (1948) [Decree of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party Adopted by the First Congress on the 10th of Mehr 1324]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 13, 3
- Azərbaycan Midiyadır, Midiya Azərbaycan (1948) [Azerbaijan is Midiya, Midiya is Azerbaijan]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 28, 3
- Azərbaycanın böyük xalq və maarif xadimi Rüşdiyyə (1945) [The Great Public and Enlightenment Figure of Azerbaijan Rushdiyye]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 11, 1
- Baş vəzirimiz ağayi Pişəvərinin Daneşsəra salonunda söylədiyi nitqin məzmunu (1946) [The Content of the Speech given by our Prime Minister Agayi Peshavari in Daneshsara Hall], "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 124, 1, 5
- Beregian, S. (1988). *Azeri and Persian literary works in twentieth century Iranian Azerbaijan*. Berlin: Schwarz, 238 pages
- Bəxşi, R. (1948). Azərbaycanca müəllimlərin vəziyyəti [The situation of teachers in Azerbaijan]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 94, 1, 4
- Bolat, G. (2013). Anglo-Persian Oil Company'den British Petroleum'a (BP): İngiltərə'nin İran'daki Petrol Macerası, *History Studies*. Çankırı, № 5/2, pp. 57-77
- Cənubi Azərbaycan (1987). *Azərbaycan Sovet Ensiklopediyası*. [Azerbaijan Soviet Encyclopedia] X cild. Bakı: ASE Baş Redaksiyası, pp. 415-421
- Çəşməzər, M. (1986) *Azərbaycan Demokrat Firqəsinin (ADF) yaranması və fəaliyyəti (Cənubi Azərbaycan 1945-1946)* [The establishment and activity of the Azerbaijan Democratic Party (ADP) (Southern Azerbaijan 1945-1946)]. Bakı, Elm nəşriyyatı, 121 pages <http://www.achiq.info/m.hukumet/adfchL.pdf> (Assessed Date: November 15, 2023)
- Davudzadə (1948). Quru boş nəsihətlər [Useless Advice]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 70, 1
- Diqqət (1949). "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 116, 4
- Əhmədzadə (1948). Tiryək və tiryəkxanalar [Opium and Opium Shops]. "Azərbaycan" qəzeti, № 68, 3

- Əlioğlu. (1948), Azərbaycan və kürd xalqları öz azadlıqları uğrunda mübarizəni davam etdirirlər [Azerbaijani and Kurdish Peoples Continue To Fight For Their Freedom]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 107, 1
- Əlioğlu. (1948). İran mətbuatının ümumi təlim haqqındakı təklifləri [Iranian Media's Proposals on General Education]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 14, 4
- Əlioğlu. (1948). Ümumi təlimin icrasında maneəçilik törədən əsas səbəblər. Ana dili – Azərbaycan Milli Hakimiyyət dövründə ümumi savadlanma [The Main Reasons Hindering the Implementation of General Schooling. Mother Tongue - General Education During The Period of Azerbaijani National Government]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 15, 1
- Əyyubi, K. (1947). Kürd xalqı nə istəyir və nə deyir? [What do the Kurdish People Want and Say?] “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 4, 1
- Həsənli, C.P. (1998). *Güney Azərbaycan: Tehran-Bakı-Moskva arasında (1939-1945)* [South Azerbaijan: between Tehran-Baku-Moscow]. Bakı: “Diplomat”, 324 pages
- Xoşginabi, F. (1945). Biz milli bir mədəniyyət yaratmalıyıq [We Must Create a National Culture]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 89, 1945, 2
- Xoşginabi, F. (1947). Mübarizəmizin yeni mərhələsində Azərbaycan ruznaməsinin tarixi vəzifəsi [The Historical Task of the Azerbaijan Newspaper In The New Stage of our Struggle]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 1, 1, 3
- Xoşginabi, F. (1948). Azərbaycan ruznaməsinin tarixi rolu [The Historical Role of the Azerbaijani Newspaper]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 83, 4
- Xoşginabi, F. (1948). Yazıçılarımıza! [To Our Novelists!] “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 56, 1
- İngilis və İran neft şirkətində kargərlərin vəziyyəti (1949) [The Situation of Workers In British And Iranian Oil Companies]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 117, 1
- İshaqi (1948). İranda ingilis neft kompaniyasının əməliyyatı, ya istismarın ən vəhşi formu [The Operation of The British Oil Company In Iran, or The Most Brutal Form of Exploitation]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 108, 4
- İsmayılov, G. (2021a). 21 Azər hərəkətinin polkovnik fədaisi Əli Şəmidə [Ali Shamida, A Colonel Devotee of The Azer Movement]. <http://aze.adfmk.com/entries/daxili-x%C9%99b%C9%99r%C9%99r/21-az%C9%99r-h%C9%99r%C9%99kat%C4%B1n%C4%B1n-s%C9%99rh%C9%99ng-polkovnik--f%C9%99daisi--%C9%99li--%C5%9F%C9%99mi-d%C9%99> (Assessed Date: November 15, 2023)
- İsmayılov, G. (2021b). Fəthi Xoşginabi. [Fathi Khoshghinabi] <http://aze.adfmk.com/entries/daxili-x%C9%99b%C9%99r%C9%99r/f%C9%99thi-xo%C5%9Fgi-nabi-> (Assessed Date: November 15, 2023)
- Kəndli, Q. (1948). Azərbaycan milli hökuməti xalqların azadlığını təmin etmişdi [The National Government of Azerbaijan Ensured The Freedom of the Peoples]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 90, 1
- Kəndli, Q. (1948). Qubalı Fətəli xan [Fathali Khan of Quba]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 75, 4
- Kurtuluş, R. (2008). Rıza şah Pehlevi [Riza Shah Pahlavi]. *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 35-ci cild. İstanbul, TDV, 67



- Kürd millətinin azadlıq günü (1949) [Freedom Day of the Kurdish Nation]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 121, 1, 4
- Kürdüstan (1947) [Kurdistan]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 4, 2
- Kürdüstan (1948) [Kurdistan]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 106, 2
- Qazi Muhammed’in kızı: Dr. Abdurrahman Kasımlo 6 ay evimizde saklandı (2019) [Gazi Muhammed's Daughter: Dr. Abdurrahman Kasimlo Hid In Our House For 6 Months]. *Independent Türkçe*, 18 Kasım <https://www.indyturk.com/node/93156/ya%C5%9Fam/qazi-muhammed%E2%80%99-k%C4%B1z%C4%B1-dr-abdurrahman-kas%C4%B1mlo-6-ay-evimizde-sakland%C4%B1> (Assessed Date: November 15, 2023)
- Qızıl səhifələr (1946) [Golden Pages]. *Azərbaycan xalqının milli azadlıq yolunda mübarizəsi tarixindən*. Təbriz: Elmiyyə, 163 pages
- London əncüməninə göndərilən teleqraf (1945) [Telegraph to the London Conference]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 10, 1945, 1
- Mehabad Kürt Cumhuriyeti Archi Roosevelt Jr. ve William Aegleton Jr. tərəfindən nasıl anlatılıyor? (1999) [How is Mehabad Kurdish Republic explained by Archie Roosevelt Jr. and William Aegleton Jr.?] *Sterka (Astare) Bolşevik*, №.8, 26-44
- Memmedli, M. (2020). İran kürtləri (23.12.1946 tarixli Sovyet raporuna görə) [Iranian Kurds (According to the Soviet Report Dated 23.12.1946)]. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, № 9 (2), 1127-1148
- Məhəmməd zadə, H. (1948). Ana dili əbədi musiqi, ömrün qönçəli günlərinin solmaz bir dastanıdır (2-ci məqalə) [The Mother Tongue Is Eternal Music, A Timeless Epic of Life's Budding Days (Article 2)]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 68, 4
- Məhəmməd zadə, H. (1948). Maarif günəşindən hamı istifadə etməlidir [Everyone Should Use The Sun of Enlightenment]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 82, 1, 4
- Məmmədli, P. (2009). *Cənubi Azərbaycan mətbuatı tarixi* [History of South Azerbaijan Press]. Bakı: Elm, 230 pages
- Müciri. (1948). Mürtəcelər heç bir cinayətdən çəkinmirlər [Reactionaries Do Not Shy Away From Any Crime]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 68, 1
- Müciri. (1948). Təbriz [Tabriz]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 64, 1, 3
- Müciri. (1949). Qoy İran mürtəceləri bir daha rüsvay olsunlar! [Let The Iranian Reactionaries Be Disgraced Once Again!] “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 118, 3
- Müciri. (1949). Tehran hökuməti milli abidələrimizin düşmənidir [The Tehran Government Is The Enemy of Our National Monuments]. “Azərbaycan” qəzeti, № 120, 4
- Pişəvəri S.C. (2005). *Xatirələr*. [Memories] Tərtib edən: Y.Kənanı (Nəminli). Bakı: ADF, 395 pages
- Pişəvəri S.C. (2016). *Məqalə və çıxışlarından seçmələr* (Təbriz 1945-1946-cı illər) [Selections From Articles And Speeches (Tabriz 1945-1946 Years)]. Bakı: Nurlan, 432 pages
- Rahbar. Hezb-e Tude-ye İran [Leader. Tudeh Party of Iran] <https://eregime.org/index.php?s=241892331b754ed3a2818a407ee0988a&showtopic=20128&st=0&fbclid=IwAR3VF0tad-iGGu4RrYdpyHwa7nM7Frhvd-8kXOCmdQ7ZHdRlgv3nFY2Q> (Assessed Date: November 15, 2023)

- Rəhimli (Bije), Ə. (2019). *662 sayılı məhbus – S.C.Pişəvəri Seyid Cəfər Pişəvəriyə aid istintaq materialları (1930-1940)*. [Prisoner No. 662 – S.C. Peshavari Investigation Materials Related To Seyyed Jafar Peshavari (1930-1940)] Bakı: Nurlar, 184 pages
- Səməndər. (1945). Dözülməz cinayət [Intolerable Crime]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 3, 1
- Sərdariniya, S. (2014). *İrəvan müsəlman sakinli vilayət olmuşdur*. [Iravan Was A Province With The Muslim Population] Tərc: İ.Quliyev. Bakı: Zərdabi, 202 pages
- Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani (1945) [Sheikh Muhammad Khiyabani]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 43, 2
- Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani. (1945) [Sheikh Muhammad Khiyabani]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 46, 2
- Şeyx Məhəmməd Xiyabani. “Təcəddüd” ruznaməsinin tarixçəsi (1945) [Sheikh Mohammad Khiyabani. History of "Tajaddud" newspaper]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 76, 2
- Şəkibxan, F. (1948). Cavanları boğmaq istəyirlər [They Want To Strangle The Youth]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 100, 1, 4
- Şəmidə, Ə. (1948). İranda həqiqi mətbuat azadlığı yoxdur [There Is No Real Press Freedom In Iran]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 43, 4
- Şəmidə, Ə. (1949). Məzhəbi təbliğatdır, ya siyasi fəaliyyət! [Religious Propaganda Or Political Activity!] “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 120, 4
- Tağıyeva, Ş., Rəhimli (Bije) Ə., Bayramzadə S. (2000). *Güney Azərbaycan (məlumat kitabı)* [South Azerbaijan (Information Book)]. Bakı: Orxan, 519 pages
- Tərbiyət, M. (1967). *Danişməndani-Azərbaycan (Azərbaycan alimləri)*. [Danishmandani-Azerbaijan (Azerbaijani Scientists)] Bakı: Azərnəşr, 464 pages
- Vilayi, M. (1948). Azərbaycan Demokrat Firqəsi Məramnaməsinin təhlili [Analysis On the Program of Democratic Party of Azerbaijan]. “*Azərbaycan*” qəzeti, № 16, 4.

**SACRALIZATION OF BURIAL PLACES OF EARLY ISLAMIC AND  
SUBSEQUENT HISTORICAL FIGURES OF FERGANA AND MODERNITY****Abdukadir Zahidi (Zakhidov)**

PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor  
University of Applied Sciences  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan  
[zakhidiy48@mail.ru](mailto:zakhidiy48@mail.ru)  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/TQKH9702>

**Abstract:** The process of Islamisation in Central Asia took place over several centuries and was gradual. Nevertheless, the spread of Islam in the region, including Fergana, began in the 7th century as a result of the Arab conquest.

This paper examines the problem of the Arab emergence in the region, and along with them the first companions of the Prophet Muhammad (*sahaba or as'hab*) in Fergana during the military campaigns of Amir Qutayba ibn Muslim al-Bahili (d. 715) in the reign of the Umayyads (661-750). For this purpose, the sacred places “Mashadi Maidan” in Besharyk, “3000 fallen As'habs” near Kokand and two sacred places in the lower reaches of the Syr Darya River are considered in the light of history and cultural anthropology, including a number of shrines such as “Mashadi Maidans” on Pap (Bab), Kubo (Kuva), Kasan, Ahkikas, from Uzgend to East Turkestan.

These sacred places are a unique stage in the formation of Islamic culture and civilization. Interestingly, that nowadays the burial places of the Sahabas and other historical figures of Fergana have turned into places of pilgrimage for the local population and neighboring countries.

**Keywords:** *Islamisation of Turkestan, as'habs, Tabi'uns, Tabi' al-Tabi'ins, sacral burial places, Mashadi Maidanov, Ikhshid, Zondormush, Karvonbas, Besharyk, Kokand, Pap (Bab), Tengrism, Bodhisattva*

**INTRODUCTION**

Since ancient times, Fergana was one of the sacralized centers and heart for pilgrimage of ancient Turkic Tangrian beliefs, cults, divinely inspired sacred elders, evidence of which has reached us, primarily in the ancient Turkic *bitigs*.

And, subsequently, from the 2nd century BCE and through the 3rd-7th centuries AD, during the Sassanian power, Fergana became the location for the sacred objects of worship, such as the Turkic enlightened and divine men (Bodhisattvas), and the Mahayana Buddhism [Hui Jiao (1991): 99-130; Hee-Soo Lee (Cemil) (1991): 29-36].

Then, inspired, prophetic chants began to penetrate not only the Manichaean Gospels, psalms, but also in some places Zoroastrian, Mazdaism principles, values, and the Judaism dogmas and ideas of initial Christianity (before the canonical period, such as Nestorianism, Monophysitism, and other sects.

In the motley religious and ideological mosaic of the social and cultural life of Fergana, not only the bearers of the above mentioned beliefs, but also their sacred objects and cults coexisted perfectly, mutually enriching each other and developing in many vectors, creating, as it were, the foundations, principles and values of future tolerant elements cultures of local Turkish-speaking and other peoples.

Islam did not immediately become the dominant religion of this religiously diverse region, however its dissemination in the Central Asia begins with the early period of Islam. Making comparison, the same process could be observed in Azerbaijan, to the west of Caspian Sea, where as a result of Arab invasion Albanian Church failed to preserve its position [Aliyeva (2023): 6]

The study of sacred places that considered by local oral tradition as the burial places of the Sahabas of the Prophet Muhammad, is important in the light of studies on the history of Islamisation, which are important as a primary source for the history of Turkestan and Central Asia. This was a turning point in the Islamisation of the region. The works of the very first and most famous Muslim historians Gardizi, Idrisi, Masudi, Makdis, Yakubi, Ibn Khurdadbeh, Ibn Haukal, Ibn Fadlan, Madain, Tabari, Bal'ami, Beruni and Baykhaki contain valuable information about ancient and early medieval Fergana and its most famous personalities, scientists, politicians, shrines, including the first as'habas (sahabas), tabi'uns and tabi' al-tabi'ins.

There are many contemporary research works in connection with the history, problems of initial Islam and the formation of traditions, values of classical Islam, and Sharia in Central Asia, in Turkestan of that time. In particular, in connection with this topic, the research of Shou Yi Bai, who wrote about the clash between the Arabs and the Chinese, has a kind of creative significance, including the overthrow of the Fergana Ishkhids by the Caliph and the subsequent clash in 715 between China and the Caliphate [Bai, Shou Yi (2004): 236]. In the subsequent periods, especially in the period of the Mongol conquests, Islam further strengthened its position in the region. It should be noted that the descendants of Genghis Khan, who adopted Islam and declared it an official religion, influenced positively to this process. Especially, religious reform of Ghazan Khan Ilkhanid and acceptance by him the title "*Padishah-e Islam*" [Nasirov (2023): 32] was crucial.

Despite the fact that the issue on the spread of Islam in Central Asia, including Fergana, has been sufficiently studied, the issue addressed by this study has not been considered from the perspective of the existing shrines of the As'habas or Sahabahas, the companions of Prophet Muhammad. Moreover, these sacred places have to be scrutinized from the cultural anthropological perspective, as they are places for pilgrimage for the region's population and neighboring countries.

### **Beginning of the Arab Conquests and Fergana**

The first raids of Arabs, the bearers of the new religion, started at the second half of the 7th century in Central Asia, and from the beginning of the 8th century, the Arab armies began to systematically conquer the entire Central Asian region, including Uzbekistan, and Fergana. With the increasingly global process, the consequences and legitimization of the hereditary power of the Umayyads, not only the processes of initial spread of Islam were taking place, but also the weeding out of different Islamic groups,

the desperate Kharijites, and then the Shiites in the outlying regions of the caliphate, under the pious slogan of jihad, against infidels, mushriks, idolaters, but in fact in order to conquer more and more new lands, states, peoples.

During this period, when the ideas, teachings and social principles of first, Kharijism, Shiism, and then official Sunnism, were not yet completely formed, adherents, and followers of these doctrines in Islam, one way or another, during aggressive campaigns, raids and wars, and battles, fought hand in hand, and acted, as a united front, against a common and obvious external enemy. Moreover, their unity was rather in the nature of military-political unity, based on the recognition of the supremacy of the existing power in the center of Caliphate, namely the Umayyad dynasty. The Umayyads resettled many Arab tribes to strengthen themselves in the newly conquered countries. A striking example is the resettlement of Bukhara. Narshahi reports that when Qutayba, the commander of Umayyad Caliphate, came to Bukhara for the fourth time and captured it, he made peace with the population. Then Qutayba divided the shahristan and gave the Arab tribes Rabi'a and Mudar, and the rest residents of Yaman. In fact, the city was divided between Arabs and non-Arabs. [Narshahi (2011): 57]

The official authorities of the Umayyads were mainly engaged in state building, organization and management of society, the gradual introduction of secular and Sharia laws, without attaching much importance to religious and dogmatic disputes within the Muslim Ummah, or rather, without particularly emphasizing them, since they could become an unwanted detonator of the public peace of the Ummah, could nullify all the successes of external conquests, and could turn the real forces of the Muslim community from external conquests inwards, blowing it up from the inside, which was not at all part of the plans of the authorities. Therefore, when the Prophet himself was still alive, then during the time of the four righteous, Rashidun Caliphs, issues of religious dogma, including disputes over pagan beliefs and idolatry, were somewhat relegated to the background.

However, during the conquests, the Arabs encountered not only developed societies, and states, but also different and highly developed cultures, religions, alien laws, numerous non-Islamic ways of life, customs, traditions, all kinds of rituals, holidays, examples of pagan beliefs, and idolatry. The latter were united under the general, capacious concepts of “Shirk” (polytheism) and “Butparast” (idolatry), etc., and relations, controversial problems associated with these beliefs were more or less successfully resolved through the Nationwide Agreement of Muslims with Infidels, “Dar -ul-Islam” or “Dar-ul-Sulh”.

In accordance with the regulations of the Dhimmiyah, and specific issues of everyday life were also resolved in accordance with specific, written, legal agreements between locals and conquerors. Such an agreement between the Ikhshidids of Fergana and Caliph Usman ibn Affan can serve as classic example. More precisely it was signed between the famous Arab commander Afshin's great grandfather Uratepe, Haidar ibn Kavus and the governors of the Arab caliphate in the region, as well as thanks to the facilitating, charismatic power of the authority of the as'habs, tabi'uns and tabi-at-tabi'uns and Muslims, in general. Outstanding historians Narshahi, Bayhaki and other Arabic-language authors ensued not only information about the conclusion of such agreements, but also sometimes provided the texts of such agreements and other incidents related to this problem. In particular, al-Tabari, in his *Tarikh ar-rusul wa al-muluk*, provides

valuable information about the Arab conquests and events of this period [Tabari (1987): 381-420].

### **Sahabahs (As'hab) in Fergana and the Sacralization of Their Burial Places**

Accounts about the appearance of the as'hab of the prophet in the regions of Central Asia, Turkestan, and Fergana, given in the works of Arab historians and geographers, as well as other medieval classical historians, and the sacralization of sahabahs' burial places, make it possible to reduce in general terms a long process consisting of three stages.

The first period covers the Rashidun caliphs Uthman ibn Affan and Ali ibn Abi-Talib's reigns, in other words, from 644-656 and 656-661. This was the period of the appearance in Fergana one of the early sahabahs, sent as military commanders of Abdallah ibn Ali ibn al-Hussein ibn Ali Abi-Talib, the grandson of Abu Bakr-as-Siddiq and Ali ibn Abi-Talib and Muhammad ibn Abdallah ibn Jarir, Abdallah ibn Jabal. Under their leadership, more than 3,000 sahabahs, tabe'ins and tabi-at-tabe'ins arrived. In accordance to the local oral tradition, of them many found peace near the present city of Besharyk, at the majestic cemeteries of martyrs of the struggle for the faith, "Mashadi Maidan" (i.e. "burial place of martyred fighters"), near the city of Kokand, directly approaching the city on the banks of the Syr Darya (Jaxartes), under the same name "Mashadi Maidan", in ancient Pap (Bab), Chimiyan, Marginan, Kasan, Kuve (Kubo), "Safid Bulane" - Shahri-Nau, and other sacred places visited, 2800 sahabahs, tabi'uns and tabi-at-tabi'uns, where most likely were buried. Local traditions and the sacralization of these places make it possible to assert that these are their burials.

In the second period, during the initial rule of the Umayyads, many tabi'uns and tabi-at-tabi'uns, some Sahabah, as highly respected, charismatic persons, participated in raids on the cities of Fergana, as intermediaries in drawing up interstate and interpersonal agreements on the principle of "Dor-ul- Islam". One of them, as mentioned was the agreement with the Caliph 'Uthman ibn Affan himself, as reported by Tabari, between military commanders and great-grandfathers of Afshin ibn Kavus. [Tabari (1987), 381-440]. Many of fell in battles and were buried in Fergana.

In the third period, during of strengthening the Umayyads' reign, when their family-hereditary power was finally established, they began the systematic conquest of Fergana and all the Eastern outskirts, the famous Amir Qutayba ibn Muslim al-Bahiliy appeared as a bright, charismatic person, who, having completed the conquest of Fergana and the entire East. As a result of mutinies in the center and intrigues of the new Vali-nimat of Iraq and the entire East against Quteyba, he was killed in Kylychli-Ata on the way to Andijan, Uzgend, in 715-716.

In addition to the above, there is also information about the arrival in Kasan, in the 10th century, representatives of the extreme Shiite heretical sect "Isna al-ash'ariyya" (12 imams). Here are the family regalia of 2 of them:

1) Sultan Jalaliddin Samani (or rather "isna" al-ash'ariyya"), whose corpse was buried at the very top of the "Guzapoi mazar", has been preserved in the vicinity of the city of Namangan to this day;

2) Sultan Muhammad Gazi (Qazi), whose corpse was buried at the very top of Mazaristan on the bank of the Kalmok Ariga, surviving to this day. And the rest were buried on the outskirts of Kasan [Ibrat (1991), 266-327].

There is also information about the burials of the ancestors of the Makhdumi Azam Khoja Kasani, who first arrived in Uzgend to the Karakhanid Ilik Mazas (11th-13th centuries), became related to them, and then successively accepted the royal rank from them, in the person of Burkhanuddin Kylych Uzgandi, subsequently settled at the end of the 12th century and in the 1230s and 1240s, in Kasan [Muhammad Sadiq Hisari (1996): 65-113].

### **The Main Shrines Associated with The Sahabaa and Other Historical Figures and Monuments**

In general, in all the main regions of traditional Fergana, now part of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, along with the five sahabas, tabi'un and subsequent saints who came to Fergana, from its extreme region in the west, starting from the holy places of Uratapa- Panjikent down to Uzgend and the garrison town of Modu in the east, there are the following main, well-known shrines, *mazaristans* (cemeteries), which associates with the sahabas and historical figures. Based on my observations for many years, these shrines and sacred places are divided in to the twelve groups. Each of these groups has its particular importance both for history and culture of the region. They could be grouped as below:

I. Ura-Tepe, Panjakent ancient picturesque palace, Ustrushana and nearby Mazaristans.

II. Shrines of Khojand and Kanibadam-Isfar

Shrines in Khojand: 1) Mug cave, with its Mug documents and manuscripts; 2) Mazaristan Mugol Mountains; 3) the tomb of Sheikh Maslahatiddin Khojendi, which was equipped at the behest of Amir Timur and provided by his order with the 10,000 dinars' one-time monetary reward and official financial support in the form of a waqf.

Shrines in Kanibadam-Isfara: 1) the former capital of the Karakhanids near Isfara and its mazars<sup>24</sup>; 2) Places of martyrdom, burial places of the first sahabas tabi'uns and itabi-at-tabiun at the "Chili mahram" (burial of 40 holy sahabas) on the outskirts of Kanibadam.

III. Shrines of the city of Besharyk and its suburbs:

1) According to my observations, Besharyk was one of the last frontiers, where part of the more than 2800 martyrs of the sahabas and their followers were possibly buried. Great losses of the sahabas apparently led the famous sahaba Kab-ul-Ahbar into reckless despair and despondency, hopelessness probably forced him to return to the Hijaz, to Mecca and Medina, as eloquently testified by the sources. The main source for this statement is "Kitab Ka'b ul-Anbar". Its Manuscript is preserved in the Institute of Oriental Studies after Al-Biruni at Academy Sciences of Republic of Uzbekistan. [Китаб КаЪб... Инв.: 1284/1, 2а лист]

2) "Mashadi Maidan" (Square of Fighters-Martyrs for the Faith), located right on the approaches to the Central Asian Railway line, near the Besharyk junction;

3) Mazaristans of the Tuz Kuli (Salt Lake), on the banks of the river Syr Darya;

<sup>24</sup> *Mazar* and *Mazarat*- from Arabic "grave, burial", also means shrine, tomb and etc.

4) Places of Hamdam Kurbashi, where he struggled and died, and currently his burial is located in Besharyk;

IV. The ancient capital city Kokand, often a former military and garrison settlement during the times of the Karakhanids, Timurids, Baburids, and subsequent Kokand khans, has the following shrines:

“Mashadi Maidan”, located directly adjacent to the banks of the Syr Darya, on which the following sahabas were buried:

a) Mashadi Abdulloh ibn Ali ibn al-Hussein ibn Ali ibn Abu-t-Talib;

b) Mashadi Muhammad ibn Abdullah ibn Jarir. The burial does not currently exist. But the main sources give the name, indicate the location opposite Kokand, on the banks of the Syr Darya, information about the above-mentioned sahabas and other holy people [АМИНОВ Б., ВОХИДОВ Ш.Х. (2005): 7-26].

In addition to the graves of the sahabas, in Kokand there are burial places and tombs of historical figures and cultural monuments of subsequent periods, such as:

1. Shahand, the largest cemetery, a pantheon of deceased Kokand khans, including Amir Umar Khan, Madali Khan, Nadir and other great people, statesmen, scientific thinkers, poets and poetesses.

2. The place of the declaration and restoration of the first Uzbek national statehood in modern history, “Turkiston Mukhtoriyati” (1917-1921), is also revered.

3. Here not only Urda-Khana (House of Army) exists and has been preserved, but also numerous madrassas, masjids, khanaghahs, and etc., in the form of museums, libraries, and archives.

Kokand is one of the modern cities of Uzbekistan, where not only ideas about the restoration of Uzbek national statehood were born, but also the first Jadid mektebs, secondary specialized schools and higher educational institutions were born, the first theater groups, the first modern theaters, libraries were formed, modern scientific thought was born, the first academicians of the region, laid the foundations of the modern Uzbek national language and literature, all modern Uzbek science, traditions and schools of classical national culture.

V. Shrines and tombs of the Paps (Babs), one of the centers of ancient Turkic Tangrianism, ancient Turkic-Buddhist culture and one of the original centers of Islamic oppositional thought:

1) Kaysanites-Safid-Jamakits and Babs, Aslan Bab, Ishak Bab and many others;

2) The homeland of the great thinker Abu Bakr al-Bab al-Fargana al-Wasiti al-Mulhid;

3) Recently discovered, by chance, as a result of the annual spring floods, the place of Mazaristan on the banks of the Syr Darya, fighters against the first Arab conquests, the so-called, “Burials in Savata, woven from mulberry branches”, which has a fundamental scientific and universal significance.

VI. Shrines and tombs of the city of Kasan and its suburbs:

1) Holy place proving existence in the 9th century cult of the Sun;

2) The house of the Mugs and the mazaristan of the Mugs in the village of Chodak;

3) In addition, Chodak could be considered as the center of the Sufi brotherhood of Naqshbandiyya, in the association with the murids (disciples of Sufi master) Mawlana Lutfullah Chusti, Chimish Biy, who gave his blessing to Shahrukh Biy Atalyk, upon his accession to the throne of the Kokand Khanate and the founding of the Khanate;



4) Mazars of representatives of “Isna al-ash’ariyya” Shiism Sultan Jalaliddin Samaniy and Sultan Muhammad Ghaziyya;

5) Mazarats of Makhdum Azams.

VII. Margilan is one of the ancient cities of the Fergana Valley. In the dictionaries of Samani (12th century) and Yakut (13th century) the city is listed under the name “Marginan”. The shrines of Marginan and the surrounding area:

1) On the way to Andijan, in the town of “Kylychli Ato” there is Mazaristan, where Amir Kutayba ibn Muslim, the Arab governor of Khurasan, was buried, who was murdered in 715-716 in Fergana.

2) Another shrine associated with the descendants of the sahabas, specifically, with one of the sons of Abu Bakr al-Siddiq, the outstanding mutaqallim, teacher and thinker al-Sharif Hamza ibn Ali ibn al-Muhassin ibn Muhammad ibn Ja'far ibn Musa al-Khailami al-Fargani (died 1204 in Samarkand);

3) According to local legend, here is the mazar of Iskandar Zulkarnayn, that is, Alexander the Great. The Islamic hagiographic tradition asserts that Iskandar was one of the prophets.

4) Symbolic mazars of Ahmad al-Fargani, great mufassirs and representative of family dynasties of faqihs, incling mazar of Zakhiriddin al-Marginani and other fuqahas of the Marginans, Shams-ul-Aimma Abu Bakr al-Sarahsi;

5) The great scientist, one of the developers of the Aruz theory, Abu-l-Hasan al-Marginani, author of “Mahasin al-Kalam”, the forerunner of Raduyani and Rashid ad-din Watvat;

6) In addition to the shrines of the medieval period, this city is the birthplace of Muhammad Amin Bek as the commander-in-chief of the national liberation forces of Fergana, an outstanding political figure and thinker (1918-1920).

VIII. Shahimardan, Vaadil-Chimyon-Suh:

1) Sacred places of Caliph Ali ibn Abu-Talib, “White Water” and “Blue-Brown Water”, traces of his feet on the rocks, his sword (Zulfiqar) and his Duldul (bay horse) as personal attributes of his Majesty, in reality, they personified, continued in continuity the traditional pre-Islamic Tangrianism, Turkic-Buddhist cults, sacred actions;

2) Mazarats of Safid Bulana (Safid Pulon);

3) the mazars of Chimiyon - Khuvaido, the birthplace of great Muslim scientists and political figures, Alikhan Tura Soguni, Oltunkhon Tura and etc.;

4) Mazar, mausoleum and museum, monuments to Hamza Hakimzade Niyazi - as a martyr of the struggle for enlightenment [Zokhidiy (2018)].

IX. Mazarates of Kuva (ancient Kubo) and Shahri-nau:

1) The crypt of Buddha and his feet, as evidence of the existence of the center of ancient Turkic-Buddhist beliefs and culture (archaeological finds and other rarities);

2) The location of the Fergana ancient Turkic bitigs;

3) Mazar of “Mashadi Abdullah ibn Jabali”.

X. The shrines of Ilamish-Ahsikat-Andijan:

1) Ilamish, as the birthplace of Shamsiddin Iltutmush, the Delhi Sultahn and his daughter Sultan Raziyya Begim (XII-XIII centuries);

2) Mazarats of Jamaliddin al-Ilamishi al-Ahsikati al-Harawi (13th century);

3) The mazars of Dukchi Ishan and the places where the “Andijan Uprising” of 1898 unfolded (the place of his treasury, his remains in Mingtepe);

4) It has rich collection of oriental manuscripts and other books that came in various ways to manuscript preserves in the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, the Russian Federation and other states;

5) “Bobur Baghi” (Symbolic grave of Babur, garden, monument, museum);

6) Numerous madrassas, masjids, khanaghahs.

XI. Shrines and tombs of the city of Osh and its environs:

1) “The Sacred Mountain of the Prophet Suleiman” on the mountains Barakukh and Hanaf, with metaphorical name “Solomon's Throne”;

2) The mazar of Prophet Suleiman’s great and wise vizier Asaf ibn Burhiyya;

3) Mazarat of His Majesty Ukkash (Kazrati Ukkash);

4) “Sacred Mountains Aslan Baba”;

5) “Babur Khujrasi” (Babur’s Cell);

6) Mazarats of the great fuqihs, family dynasties of fuqihs of the city of Osh, Sirajiddin Ushi Maturidi, Bakhtiyor Oshiy Muniriddin Oshi;

7) Modern scientists and political figures, thinkers, such as Jumhur Rais, Primer Minister of the Bukhara People's Republic (BPR) Pulathoja Usmankhojaev, S.E. Azimov, academician Kh. Abdullayev and many others.

It should be noted that most of these shrines are connected by local legends, and not by historical reality.

XII. Shrines and tombs of the city of Uzgend and the border military garrison of the city of Modu:

1) Mazarats of the Karakhanid sultans Ilik Mazi and their descendants;

2) Mazars of Burkhaniddin Kylych Uzgandi and his descendants;

3) Sacred places, mazars of the military garrison town of Modu;

4) Mazars of great scientists, faqihs, with family dynasties, like Kazikhan Fatavi Uzgandi and his descendants;

5) Zindan (prison) where, by the verdict of the Sharia court, the great faqih, with the exalted and honorable national title of “Shams-il-Aimma”, the founder of the “Ferghano-Ush-Uzgend school of fiqh” Abu Bakr al-Sarhsi was sentenced to imprisonment, while in zindan (prison), for more than 15 years, he wrote his great book on Sharia “al-Mabsut” (Primordial Pure) [Абашин С.Н. (2003): 215-237; Зохидий А. (2016): 502-508].

Traditionally, Tashkent, Chimkent, Sayram, Taraz-Jalalabad, Tokmak-Balasagun, as well as Almalyk and all the main regions of Eastern Turkestan are geographically close to Fergana. This part of Central Asia, traditional Turkestan, was, of course, visited by the first sahabas of the Muslim prophet, who left their ethnogenetic, phylogenetic, ideological, epistemological, ideological traces, including in personal shajars, family trees [Аминов Б., Воҳидов Ш. (2005): 7-26]. They are represented mainly by the mazar-mausoleums of Zangi Ato Himmati, Hasti Imam (Kaffal Shashi al-Akbar), the Chagatai national pantheon in Tashkent, the mazar-mausoleums of Khoja Ahmad Yassavi, Aslan Baba, Ishak Baba, Iskhij Bab and all kinds of Ata, Grandfathers and Great-grandfathers, in Turkestan and its suburbs.

### **Shrines of the Sahabas and Other Monuments of Religious and Historical Character and Modernity**

All of the above mentioned shrines are now part of the regions and the cities of four republics in Central Asia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. They

constitute a separate region of the common Turkic and Islamic culture, civilization, historically related to the peoples of Central Asia. It is adjacent to the above-mentioned regions of Kazakhstan and Eastern Turkestan [Материалы... (1988): 63-76].

Therefore, after the conclusion of relevant interstate agreements, localization and inventory of the above-mentioned sacralized objects, monuments of Islamic culture and civilization, it would be necessary to compile an interstate register in a systematic form and not only smoothly include them in the list of monuments of universal human civilization, in routes, maps of international, regional tourism, but also to carry out, implement the following urgent tasks:

1. Restore and equip them in a modern way so that they could be preserved with the historical features.

2. As during the time of the Great Sahibkiran Amir Temur (in the form of Waqf), provide them with interstate and republican constitutional and legal immunity, in other words, status quo, economic financing, so that they could exist normally, function and be able to develop.

3. In accordance with interstate agreements and funding, it is fundamental to organize, develop research work on the above listed shrines, summarize materials, research results, report on their results at international and regional Symposiums, colloquia, conferences, in the media, including through UNESCO, publish their main results in annual oriental and Turkic collections, encyclopedias, as well as cover them in mass, popular science publications, in almost all languages of the peoples and nationalities of the region.

All these tasks, goals, and of course, are feasible as a result of strengthening cultural ties between the Republics of Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Kazakhstan. This serves the strategic goals, good will and intentions of the peoples of Central Asia. There are many historical prerequisites for this, such as shared culture, language and religious community. All this creates the basis for regional cooperation in the development of historical objects, shrines, monuments of common Islamic culture, and the civilization of the peoples of Central Asia.

Of course, it should be especially noted and emphasized the indisputable fact that, along with the general, progressive phenomenon of reviving the interest of the peoples of the region in their past, in spiritual sources, including religious-theological, Gnostic and Irphanic culture, sometimes, unfortunately, there is attempts to make a priori calls for general, not very healthy praise of even purely medieval, anti-scientific prejudices, to publish and propagate them in unacceptable forms, for example, attempts to restore and organize purely mystical zeal, treatment, and so on. Also it could be observed even in official, and in most cases, private publications, taking advantage of the moment of methodological turmoil, ideological indiscriminateness of leading ideological cadres and propagandists, attempts to “make ancient” one’s family, to compose new family trees-*shajara*, to assign unreasonably those or other pretentious citizens, contemporaries, in the *silsila* (holy chain) of certain Sufi tariqats. All such attempts not only run counter to modern development of Central Asia, but even disorganize all spiritual and educational work, in general, and in particular harm the formation of the modern scientific worldview of the individual. And, this will cause great harm to the common strategic goals of all Central Asian republics, which cannot be allowed under any circumstances. Therefore, representatives of science, primarily historical and oriental studies, as well as Islamic and Turkic studies, must take the initiative into their own hands.

Treating shrines as historical and cultural monuments requires the manifestation of a high level of political-ideological awareness and spiritual culture, as well as attention to problems between neighboring countries, and their traditions, customs, values, holidays and vital rituals. At the same time, it is necessary to prevent the development of superstition in relation to these monuments.

## CONCLUSION

Historically, Fergana was one of the sacralized centers of ancient Turkic beliefs, which, as a result of Islamisation, also became a place with many shrines associated with Islamic figures and, first of all, with the Sahabas, the companions of the Prophet Muhammad. They also serve as a primary source for studying the issue of Islamisation of the region. In addition to the sacred shrines of the Sahabas, Fergana also has historical and cultural monuments that require special attention, and this is also due to the fact that historical Fergana is divided between the republics of Central Asia.

A good knowledge of the elements of national life, way of life, even the psychology of the peoples of Central Asia can help in successfully resolving general cultural issues and raising the level of protection of monuments. The preservation and conservation of historical and cultural monuments, especially religion, should be accompanied by the development of knowledge among the population in order to prevent various superstitious beliefs in relation to these monuments.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Абашин С.Н. (2003) Бурханиддин Қылыч: ученый, просветитель, чудотворец. О генезисе культа святых в Средней Азии [Burhaniddin Kylych: scientist, educator, miracle worker. On the genesis of the cult of saints in Central Asia] /Подвижники Ислама. Культ святых и суфизм в Средней Азии и на Кавказе. Moscow, ВЛ РАН, pp. 215-237
- Aliyeva, L. (2023). Religion And Political Power In The Caucasian Albania Prior To And During The Arab Conquests. *Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies, Vol.1, No 2*, pp. 5-18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/PFYV4062>
- Аминов Б., Вохидов Ш. (2005) Введение [Introduction]. *История Казахстана*. Т. 1., Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, pp. 7-26
- Bai, Shou Yi (2004). Chinese Hui People in History (Vol.2). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company
- Hee-Soo Lee (Cemil) (1991). Islam ve Turk Kulturunun Uzak Doguya yayilmasi. [The spread of Islam and Turkish Culture to the Far East.] *Turkiye Diyanet Vakfi*. Ankara: 1991. 356 pages
- Hui Jiao (1991). Хуэй-Цзяо. Жизнеописание достойных монахов (Гао сэн чжуань). [The Memoirs of Eminent Monks (Gāosēng Zhuàn)] Том I. Серия: Памятники письменности Востока. Перевод с китайского, исследования и комментарий М.Е. Ермакова М. Наука, 256 pages
- Ibrat (1991). Исхакхан Ибрat. *Таърихи Фарғона* [History of Fargana]. Tashkent, Камалак, 336 pages

- *Китаб КаЪб ул-ахбор* [Kitab Ka'b ul-Anbar]. Manuscript from the Institute of Oriental Studies after Al-Biruni at Academy Sciences of Republic of Uzbekistan. Рукопись ИВ имени А.Р.Беруни АН РУз ". Инв.: 1284/1.
- *Материалы по истории и культуры Центральной Азии, X-XIX вв.*, [Materials on the history and culture of Central Asia, X-XIX centuries] Ташкент: ФАН. 1988, 413 pages
- Muhammad Sadiq Hisari (1996). Мухаммад Садик Йанги Хисарий. Мажмуъати мухаққиқийн. [Mazhmuat mukhaqiqi'in] Перевод на узб. язык, примечания и комментарии к.филос.н. А.Захидий // *Махдуми Аъзам. Сийрати ва мероси.* Ташкент, Адолат, pp. 65-113 (in Uzbek)
- Narshahi (2011). Абу Бакр Мухаммад ибн Джа'фар ан-Наршахи. *Та'рих-и Бухара. История Бухары.*[History of Bukhara] Перевод, комментарии и примечания Ш. С. Камолиддина. Археолого-топографический комментарий Е. Г. Некрасовой. — Ташкент: SMIA-SIA, 600 pages
- Nasirov, Nurlan (2023). The Main Course of The Foreign Policy of Ilkhanate Ruler Mahmud Ghazan Khan. *Reconstructing the Past: Journal of Historical Studies, Vol. 1, No 1*, pp. 31-45, <http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/VHHTT9322>
- Tabari (1987). *История Табару*// Tarikh ar-rusul wa al-muluk. [History of Tabari] Ташкент: ФАН, (In Russian translation), 440 pages
- Зоҳидий А. (2016). Ўзгандий, Бурҳониддин Қилич [Uzgandi, Burhoniddin Kilich] // *Ўрта аср Шарқ алломалари Энциклопедияси.* -Самарканд: Имом Бухорий Халқаро маркази, 678 pages, pp. 502-508
- Зоҳидий А. (2018). Сотук Буғро Хон; Бобур; Алихон Тўра Соғуний; Олтинхон Тўра ва бошқалар [Sotuk Bugro Khan; Babur; Alikhan Tura Soguni; Altynkhan Tura and others] // *Фарғона, Туркистон ва Шарқий Туркистон алломалари Энциклопедияси.* –Tashkent, Sharq. НММ БТ, 670 pages

**ON THE ISSUE OF SUBORDINATION OF THE GALICIAN-VOLHYNIAN PRINCES TO THE MONGOL EMPIRE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES****Vladyslav Gulevych**

M.S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukraine Archeography and Source Studies, Ukraine

gulevych\_v@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4040-817X><http://dx.doi.org/10.54414/BZFF5202>

**Abstract:** This research deals with the immediate consequences of the subordination of the most influential prince of Southern Rus', Daniel Romanovich, to the Mongol Empire at the beginning of 1246. It considers the problem of issuing symbols of Mongolian kaans' power to subordinate rulers, jarligs (yarlyks) and paitza, to the Galician and Volhynian princes (knyazes), conducting censuses of population on the conquered Galician-Volhyn lands for taxation, and introduction of taxes and duties by the Mongols in the territories, they conquered. Due to the conciseness of sources, in the Galician-Volhynian lands existence only part of the taxes and duties, known in other lands of Rus', can be confirmed. More clear conclusions can be drawn regarding the problem on introduction the Mongols' possible direct rule in Galicia, however currently known sources cannot reaffirm this assumption. In the same way, the sources do not contain information about the Horde origin of a small specific stratum of the population called "Ordyntsy" and "Kalannyie" on the territory of Galicia. The combination of known factors in the subordination of the Galician-Volhynian princes confirms the previously made assumptions about their rather specific status within the Mongol Empire.

**Keywords:** *Prince Danylo Romanovych, Volhynia, Galicia, Batu Khan, Jarlig (Yarkyk), Paitza, Taxes, Corvée, Ordyntsy, Kalannyie*

**INTRODUCTION**

The study on the history of relations between the princes of Rus' and the Mongol conquerors has, without exaggeration, a huge historiography, the analysis of which is not the task of this work. However, even despite the gigantic amount of seemingly comprehensive research on this topic, there are still many problems to solve that are very difficult, and sometimes simply impossible, due to the silence of sources. The subject of this research is determination of the immediate consequences of the Galician-Volhynian princes' subordination to the Mongol Empire in 1246.

The fact of Prince Daniel Romanovich's subordination to the power of the kaan through the "mediation" of Batu is undeniable. The author of the corresponding part of the Galician-Volhyn Chronicle (hereinafter - GVC) described this as such that the prince is now "called a serf" (холопомъ называется) [PSRL (1908): 808]. According to Ruthenian Pravda, there were three sources of servitude, limited to a certain "row" (riad)

(contract): marrying a serf, selling oneself into slavery, joining the tivuns (tiuns)<sup>25</sup> [Памятники (1952): 119; Зімін (1966): 56]. Other sources for serfdom were captivity, birth from a serf, crime, etc. From the point of view of a person of the 13th century, in the case of Daniel there is only one thing: the prince was forced to “sell” himself to Batu. Probably, Daniel’s co-ruler, his brother Vasilko Romanovich, should have been in the same condition. The existence of documentary evidence of subordination by any of the Romanovichs is carefully hushed up by the GVC, but in the Mongol Empire these were *yarlyk* and *paitza*, as well as taxes and duties.

### Jarlig and Paitza

Being administrative act of the kaan/khan, jarlig comes from the Mongolian “*jarliq*” or “*jarliy*”, where the root “*jar*” means “order, promulgation” [Сундуева (2011): 37-38; Усманов (1979a): 7-8; Усманов (1979b): 218-244]. In the Ruthenian written tradition, the familiar term “*gramota*” continued to be used for some time. Only at the beginning of the 16th century we encounter a “transitional” form, when in 1304, after the arrival of Grand Prince Andrei from the Horde, the dukes and the metropolitan bishop gathered and “read the gramota, the Tsar’s jarligs” [Приселков (1950): 351].

Nor a single of the princely jarligs has survived to this day, neither a single source mentions the issuance of jarligs to princes in the 13th century; moreover, it is not even known what their text might have been. We have only one indirect allusion to the jarlig in the GVC in a not entirely clear episode describing the events during the “Kremyanetskaya Kuremsina army” with the participation of a certain Andrei:

«Потом же Коуремьса приде ко Креманцю . и воева . вколо Креманца . Андрѣви же на двое боудоушоу . ввогда взываюшоуся королевъ есмь . ввогда же Татарьскимъ . держащоу неправдоу въ ср(д)ци . Б(о)гъ предасть въ рouchи и(х) вномоу же рекшоу. *Батыева грамота* оу меня есть» [ПСРЛ (1908): 829].

However commenting on the fragment mentioning the “Batu gramota”, V. Stavisky and A. Tolochko note, “in essence, we have before us a string of episodes that are not connected by plot or logic... The impression is that we have before us a “broken” text, a mixture of episodes from different stories, mechanically staged one after another” [ГВЛ:Т (2020): 511]. Though it is important that the author of the text does not deny the very fact of the existence of gramota. Thus, the next mention of the gramota of Jochi Khan, granted to the Orthodox Church, dates back to 1267 [Русский (1987): 588-589; Памятники (1953): 467-468]. Also, the “Tsar’s gramota” is mentioned in the agreement between prince Yaroslav Yaroslavich of Tver and Novgorod in 1270 [Грамоты (1949): 13].

Functions of paitza, its iconography, languages of inscriptions, metrology, etc. have quite a significant literature [Рева, Беляев (2017): 25-37; Крамаровский (2002): 212-224; Мальм (1976): 71-74; Münküev (1977): 185-215; Haneda (1936): 85-91; Лихачев (1916): 70-86; Иностранцев (1908): 0172-0179; Спицын (1909): 130-141; Mas Latrue (1870): 72-102; Банзаров (1850): 72-97], but its main purposes were still in the 19th

<sup>25</sup> Servants

century by Dorji Banzarov - a reward for important services and a certificate of protection [Банзаров (1850): 91].

We do not know whether Daniel and Vasilko received only jarligs, or whether paitzas were also added to them, but it is known that sometimes the khans issued them together. Thus, on September 17, 1332, Uzbek Khan issued the Venetians of Tana “paitza and privilege with red seals” (baisa et privilegium cum bullis rubeis) [Diplomatarium (1880): 244; Mas Latrie (1868): 584]. Khan Berdibek in the 1240-50s gave them jarligs with paitzas (preceptum et paysanum, baissinum de auro et nostrum preceptum cum bullis tribus; comandamento e paysam; comandamento cum le bolle rosse et lo paysam) [Diplomatarium (1880): 262, 263, 312; Diplomatarium (1899): 48, 51; Mas Latrie (1870): 585, 586, 587, 594, 595], and in 1357 to Metropolitan Alexei “baisu (i.e. paitza) and a jarlig with a scarlet tamga” [Памятники (1953): 470].

When rulers submitted to the Mongols, they were given a jarlig (decree) that indicated the khan’s approval as well as their own tamgha so that the orders the local notable issued were viewed in connection with the Mongol Empire [May (2017a): 96]. It is unknown what happened in the case of the Romanovichs. If Daniel and Vasilko received jarligs or jarligs along with the paitzas, then it was not Kaan, who did not exist at that time, who issued them, but Batu, although it cannot be ruled out that it was on behalf of the central Mongolian government.

It is also known that in the office of Kaan Munke there were “scribes of every kind for Persian, Uighur, Khitayan, Tibetan, Tangut, etc., so that to whatever place a decree has to be written it may be issued in the language and script of that people” [’Ala-ad-Din ’Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 607]. Since Batu borrowed the palace ceremonial of the Kaans, it can be assumed that he could also organize his office on the model of the imperial one. At his headquarters there should have been educated people who could read and write in Uyghur and Arabic script [Усманов (2009): 658-660]. Thus, in April 1246, John de Plano Carpini, together with Batu’s translators, translated the papal gramota “in the letter of the Ruthenias, Saracens and the language of the Tatars” [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 311]. Guillaume de Rubruk testifies that at the headquarters of Sartak, son of Batu, there were people who knew Armenian, Turkic, Arabic and Syriac languages [Guglielmo di Rubruk (2011):76]. In the description of the royal archive in the 1570s there is an interesting mention of “old *defters* from Batu and other kings; they have no translation [and] can’t translate anyone” [Описи (1960): 32]. Unfortunately, it is now impossible to say whether these were really “*defters*” of Batu. Since none of the jarligs issued to the princes has survived to this day, the possibility of writing them in the Ruthenian language remains exclusively hypothetical and very doubtful, since the jarligs to the metropolitans of Rus', Venetians and Genoese have reached us only in translations [Григорьев (2004); Григорьев, Григорьев (2002); Приселков (1916)].

One of the signs of the subordinate status of the princes relative to Batu and his descendants was their trips to the khan's headquarters. Among the Romanovichs, the only trip of Prince Daniel to Batu at the turn of 1245-1246 is documented. However it is possible that in the case of the Romanovichs we are hostages of the main source of this period, the GVC. Thus, an entry in the Volhynian kormchaia book reports that prince Vladimir Vasilkovich of the Vladimir principality (1247/49-1288), Daniel’s nephew, personally went to Nogai in 1286: «Въ лѣто 6794... поехал г(о)с(по)дъ н(а)шъ к Ногоеви» “In 6794... our lord visited Nogois” [Столярова (2000): 144-145;



Срезневский (1882): 147; Востоков (1842): 312]. This trip is in no way reflected in the GVC. That is, the compilers of the GVC could deliberately omit any information about the trips of one of the Romanovichs to Batu and his descendants. However, this assumption is purely hypothetical, since in the sources of the 14th century we do not have any hints about the trips of the Galician-Volhynian princes to Sarai. But the chronicles well reflect numerous trips in the 13th-15th centuries by the princes of North-Eastern Rus', often with the aim of resolving disputes regarding seniority, not only to Batu and his descendants, but even to Karakorum. What was the reason for such a striking difference? It is likely that in 1243 Batu recognized Yaroslav Vsevolodovich of Vladimir as the senior prince of Rus' and gave him Kyiv [ПСРЛ (1927): 470], and in 1249 Ogul-Kayмыш, the regent of the Mongol Empire, approved the main city of Rus' for his son Alexander [PSRL (1927): 742]. Daniel, and the other Romanovichs, were forced to abandon Kyiv, which quickly lost its status as the political center of Rus'. At the same time, the Romanovichs gradually moved away from the princes of North-Eastern Rus', abandoned the fight for the status of the Grand Prince, being satisfied with their Volhyn, Galician and other possessions. In the middle of these domains, no conflicts between them over seniority have been recorded. All this together meant there was no need to travel to Sarai and/or Karakoram in person.

### Taxes

One of the most important results of the Mongol subjugation of Rus' was the census, according to which taxation of the conquered population took place. The first mention of it is contained in sources under 1245, when the Mongols counted the population as a number, which began paying tribute to them: «сочташа я (i.e. population) в число и начаша на нихъ дань имати» [ПСРЛ (1851): 183; ПСРЛ (1925): 231; НПЛ (1950): 298; Серебрянский (1915): 50]. The Franciscan John of Plano Carpini also mentioned the census, noting that it was carried out by “a Saracen from the party of Kuyuk-kan (i.e. Kaan Guyuk), as they said, and Batu” [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 285]. Thomas Allsen suggested that these were two different censuses, of which 1245 was carried out on the initiative and for Batu's own purposes, and 1247 was carried out by order of the Kaan [Allsen (1981): 37-38]. But Guyuk was enthroned on August 24, 1246, and the Franciscan returned from Mongolia to Kyiv on June 9, 1247. Considering that the census requires travel from Mongolia to Rus' for the officials who carried it out, and this takes about three or more months, organizational preparation on the spot and traveling around a significant territory for its practical implementation, it is unlikely that the scribes coped with the task during the period from August 1246 to August 1247.

There is reason to assume that the census was carried out with the participation and support of the Mongolian “*darugachi* and *tanmachi*” stationed in Kyiv [The Secret History (1982): 215; The Secret History (2004): 205-206; Kozin (1941): 194]. As for the identity of the “Saracin”, the organizer of the census, he could have been the experienced Daruga of Turkestan and Transoxiana, Masud-bek [Рашид-ад-Дин (1960): 116; Воротынцев (2017): 137], who fled from Ogedei's widow, the regent of the Mongol Empire Turakin Khatun's repression to the possessions of Batu, where he was in 1242-1247. A. Gorsky suggests that the “Kyivan centurion Nongrot”, mentioned by John de Plano Carpini [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 331], came from the Congrat tribe, represented the Mongol administration and was involved in the census, like the two

foreman (desiatniks) who accompanied the Franciscan in Batu's headquarters. Thus, the time frame for the census can be narrowed, taking into account the time it took to prepare it, to the period between the winter of 1243-1244.

The first census took place, seemingly, only in lands subordinate directly to the Mongol administration. Among these, in addition to the Kyiv principality, one should also include Chernigov, whose prince Mikhail Vsevolodovich for a long time did not dare to return to his capital city [Русина (2005b): 27-28; Толочко (2000): 166-169], Pereyaslavskoye, which generally ceased to exist as an independent administrative and political unit [Коринный (1992): 131], and Podolia.

Already during the conquest of North-Eastern Rus', the Mongols put forward a demand to the Ryazan princes: "asking them for tithes in all: both in people, and in princes, and in horses, in every tenth" [НПЛ (1950): 74, 286]. Plano Carpini also wrote that they demanded "tithes of everything, both people and things." [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 285] But they put forward a demand to give tithes simultaneously with an offer to the princes to voluntarily join the Pax Mongolica, which they refused and were killed. And the Mongols behaved much harsher with the conquered peoples.

The population of Kyiv and its territories in 1240 although were significantly reduced [Ивакин, Комар (2016): 59-72], were not destroyed completely [Довженок (1978): 79-82]. Its restoration took place quite actively [Ивакин (2003): 61-65; Высоцкий (1985): 113-114], and already in 1245-1247 Breslau, Polish and Austrian merchants traded in Kyiv, as well as Italians from Genoa, Venice and Pisa [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 332, 399]. The gradual restoration of the region allowed the Mongols to increase exploitation of its population. Thus, John de Plano Carpini described the cruel collection of tribute by the "Saracens of Guyuk", when one of three sons was taken away, and unmarried men, unmarried women and beggars were taken away, the rest were counted and imposed a heavy tribute: the skin of a white (sic!) bear, a black beaver, sable, ferret, black fox [Giovanni di Plan Carpini (1989): 285]. Of these animals, the beaver, ferret and black fox were found in the territories of Southern Rus' indicated above, but not the sable and certainly not the polar bear. That is, the Franciscan either got something wrong, or mixed up tribute from different lands of Rus'. The situation in the Chinese possessions of the Batuids can clarify the brutal collection of taxes in Rus'.

According to the distribution of Ogedei's kaan, in 1236 in Northern China the house of Batu received the Pingyang region [Храпачевский (2009): 172, 247; Qiu (2018): 29-48] and 41,320 households in it. In 1255, the scholar Hao Jing, who later became Kublai's advisor, visited the Chinese possessions of Batu, after which he submitted a description of the dire situation in the region to the kaan. The House of Batuids was the de facto ruler of the territory under its control, even living far from China. Batu divided the territory among his family members according to Mongol tradition, and it appears that each prince or princess who received his share had unlimited power there. They exploited household labor to the extreme to extract gold and silver, which were locally processed into exquisite items before being transported to the Jochi Ulus [Rong (2021): 158-160].

In other Mongol uluses on conquered lands, they also practiced literally extracting taxes, especially arrears [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 118-119 (340 с.); 'Ala-ad-Din 'Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 539]. In particular, this was due to the introduction of the *kubchur* tax (қорçур / qūbchūr) based on the census of the settled population [Али-Заде (1945): 87-102; Morgan (1982): 127, 134; Бойматов (2018): 88-90], which was collected with

significant abuses without clearly established regularity [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 248; Ward (1983): 405]. Only under the kaan of Mengu was the kubchur regulated so as not to ruin the poorest payers [‘Ala-ad-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997): 519, 524].

It is unlikely that in Rus' the picking of men by the Mongols was connected with the construction of Sarai, as some historians suggest. Where exactly Sarai-Batu was located has not yet been established exactly, but today researchers are inclined to localize it at the site of the Krasnoyarsk settlement [Пачкалов (2002): 177; Пачкалов (2010): 300-309; Рудаков (2007): 24; Васильев (2009): 436-445; Васильев (2012): 266-270; Археология Волго-Уралья (2022): 39]. Based on the results of its excavations, it can be concluded that at the first stage of its existence between the second half of the 13th century and 1320s the city was located on an island formed by the Akhtuba, Karaulnaya and Mayachnaya rivers in a place that made it possible to control the waterways connecting the Upper and Middle Volga with the Caspian Sea, as well as the crossing across the Volga-Akhtuba floodplain. At the same time, archaeologists came to the conclusion that most likely, the main structures of this period were represented by adobe buildings, in which the traditionally settled population lived that came to the Lower Volga with the Mongols (officials, traders, artisans). It is likely that in this period there was no monumental architecture [Пигарёв (2016): 169-170]. Even in the 14th century this settlement was quite poor from an architectural point of view. Therefore, it is not for nothing that in 1255 Guillaume de Rubruk called it only a “new village” (Sarai, que est noua uilla), recently built by Batu [Guglielmo di Rubruk (2011): 288]. Thus, it is more likely that the picking of the men is related to Batu's desire to increase its military capabilities in preparation for war with Guyuk. The conflict between them [Historia (1967): 21] is confirmed by a contemporary of the events, K. de Bridra.<sup>26</sup> As for the taken away of women, they were always in demand as concubines and maidservants.

The payment of taxes by the Romanovichs and the serving of duties, the main source of this time, the GVC diligently passes over in silence. However we have some evidence of them from the chronologically close jarlig of 1267 by Khan Mengu-Timur, issued to the Orthodox Church: “dan” (tribute), “tamga”, “popluzhnoe” (plough), “yam”, “voyna” (war), “podvoda” (cart) and “korm” (feed) [Памятники (1953): 467-468].

“*Tamga*” is a commercial or customs tax introduced in China under the rule of Ögedei and subsequently extended to the entire empire. It amounted to approximately 5% of the value of the goods that the merchant transported. Its name comes from the receipt with the “tamga” stamp that the merchant received as confirmation of the tax payment specifically for this product. He could then travel throughout the empire and not pay any additional taxes on these goods, which significantly reduced the cost of doing business [May (2017a): 97; Вашари (1987): 97-103; Doerfer (1965): 554-565]. In addition to merchants, tamga was paid by the artisan population of cities [Али-Заде (1955): 55]. It was collected in the form of cash. Tamga was one of the main incomes of the khans and can be clearly seen in later sources. However, in the territory controlled by Daniel Romanovich and his brother Vasilko Romanovich, as well as their descendants, the collection of tamga is never mentioned in the sources.

---

<sup>26</sup> It is Bridra, not Bridia, that is recorded in the earlier of his two known texts. See Krawiec (2008): 160.

“*Popluzhnoe*”, obviously a tax on a certain plot of arable land, is perhaps identical to the “*kalan*”<sup>27</sup>, introduced land tax by the Mongols (about the “*xalan*” tax, see: Blake, Frye. (1949): 313, 387 nota 32), which was often paid in natural products [May (2017b): 100]. With this tax, the situation in the sources is similar to *tamga*.

The notion “tribute” is more difficult to define. Thus, in the will of Vladimir Vasilkovich (1287), distributed by the prince among the possessions, it is said, in particular, “а поборомъ и тотаръщиною к князю” [ПСРЛ (1908): 903-904; Купчинський (2004): 317]. According to V. Aristov, both mentioned taxes were of a situational nature [GVC (2020): 618-622]. However, Herbert Schurman believed that we are talking about the Mongolian taxes “*alban*” and “*qorčur/qūbchūr/qubčiri*”, that is, respectively “tribute” and “extortion”, and according to John Smith, on the contrary, “extortion” and “tribute” [Schurmann (1956): 304-389; Smith (1970): 46-85].<sup>28</sup> The question is whether *alban* and *kubchur* can be correlated with the “extortion” and “*tatarshchina*” mentioned in the will of prince Vladimir, or in the jarligns of the Orthodox Church of 1357 and 1379 “tax” and “tribute” [Памятники (1953): 469, 465], remains open, since the term “tribute” itself was known in Volhyn. Thus, prince Vladimir Vasilkovich bequeathed to his wife “the city of Kobryn” in 1287, both with people and with tribute” with the condition that “as they gave [tribute] in my presence, so should they give to my princess” [ПСРЛ (1908): 903].

In North-Eastern Rus', the Mongols handed over the collection of tribute to tax farmers, who then tried to compensate for their investments in excess at the expense of the taxed population: “вкупахуть бо ты оканънии бесурмене дани и оѡ того велику пагубу людемъ творяхуть” [ПСРЛ (1927): 476]. How Mongol tribute was collected in Volhynia and Galicia is unknown.

Regarding the regularity of payment of tribute/taxes, we have a mention only in the 14th century. Thus, the Polish king Wladislaw Loketek, in a letter to Pope John XXII dated May 21, 1323, wrote that the recently deceased Galician-Volhynian princes Andrei and Lev Yurievich paid the Tatars an “annual tribute” (*annua tributa*) [Monumenta (1913): 73].

### Obligations

“*Yam*” is a system of postal relay stations whose main function was the safe and fast delivery of messengers, envoys and materials from the provinces to the capital of Mongol Empire and in the opposite direction. *Yam* provided the travellers who had *paitza* and jarligns with means of transportation, provisions, and housing [Shim (2017): 110-112]. However, the system of pits was neither in the western nor in the eastern parts of the Jochi Ulus in the early 1250s was not installed [Shim (2014): 419-421]. Moreover, on the territory of Southern Rus' during the period of dominance of the Mongolian kaans and Horde khans, the *yam* system was not recorded in synchronous sources, and from later sources only one mention of *yam* is known in the falsified document of the late 15th and early 16th centuries [Lietuvos Metrika (2010): 15; Довнар-Запольский (1900): 3; Kuraszkiewicz (1934): 132-133].

<sup>27</sup> *Kalan* is a tribute, tax, *yasak*, and *kalanchy* is the one who collects taxes [Радлов (1899): 230]

<sup>28</sup> I take this opportunity to thank Roman Hautala (Oulu, Finland) for clarification and pointing out literature on this issue.

“Voyna” (war) is the princes' duty at the request of the Mongols to participate in their wars. The demand “въ поганьской быти воли ихъ и воевати с ними” (to be under the rule of the pagans and fight together) was presented by the Mongols to the princes at the early stage of their conquest of Rus' in 1238 [ПСРЛ (2000): 295]. The Mongols made a similar demand to the local rulers of Iran during its conquest [Рашид-ад-Дин (1946): 25]. John de Plano Carpini wrote that the Mongols demanded from the conquered peoples “that they go with them in the army against everyone whenever they (the Mongols) please” [Giovanni di Plan Carpine (1989): 285].

“Podvoda” (cart) is a transport duty that is well known from later times and consisted of providing vehicles to officials and accompanying them [Wysłouch (1936); Jarmolik (1992): 189-197]. However, during the reign of princes Daniel, his brother Vasilko and their descendants, references to the execution of carts duty by the population of the Galician-Volhynian lands were not mentioned in the sources.

“Korm” (feed) is a translation of the Mongolian word “süsün”, found in the jarligs of the Horde khans Toktamysh (1393) and Timur-Kutlug (1398), the Crimean khans Haji Giray (1453), Mengli Giray (1467), Saadat Giray (1523) and Sahib Girey (1523). “Ši'üsün” or “šüsün” was a technical term of the Mongolian postal system that outlined the duties of the postal station service in relation to government envoys and traveling officials. It included food, drink and probably fodder for horses [Vásáry (1977): 51-59; Allsen (2010): 267]. But the term “korm” to denote the duties of the population for the maintenance of officials or troops has been known in Rus' since pre-Mongol times: “и реч(ъ) Болеславъ . разведете дружину мою по городомъ . на кормъ” [ПСРЛ (1908): 130]. It is quite obvious that the population of Galicia and Volhynia performed this duty in relation to the Mongol army during several campaigns against Lithuania, the Polish and Hungarian kingdoms in the second half of the 13th century.

The described system of taxes and duties could be fully applied only if a census was carried out. But, unlike the well-known number of censuses of North-Eastern Rus', not a single source mentions the census in the territory of Galicia and / or Volhyn for the entire time of Tatar rule over them, just as they do not mention the presence of Baskaks and / or Darugs there. Among the duties, only “war” and “korm” are confirmed in the sources. Taking this into account, the conclusion suggests itself about a certain degree of exclusive status of the Galician-Volhynian lands in the Mongol Empire in general and the Jochi Ulus in particular. Probably, Daniel, Vasilko and their descendants were given the opportunity to determine tribute at their own discretion. In this regard, a still underestimated fact is that the Galician and Volhyn lands, unlike the rest of Rus', practically remained outside the Mongol, and subsequently the Horde monetary system. There are significantly fewer finds of Mongolian kaans' coins and khans of the Jochi Ulus on the territory of the Romanovich possessions than on the lands of their eastern neighbors.

### The Problem of Galicia

Researchers have long noted that after Daniel returned from Batu, the prince seemed to lose interest in Galich, for which he had fought throughout his entire previous life, and founded a new capital for himself in Kholm. GVC stopped mentioning Galich for almost thirty years. Because of this, researchers even suggest that, firstly, the Galician and

Volhynian lands were in different forms of dependence on the Mongols; secondly, the Mongolian census was carried out in Galicia; thirdly, because of this, Moutsi's demand to Daniel "give Galich" allegedly arose, and, as a result, the Galician land paid an annual tribute, and Volhyn was not included and did not pay a constant tribute; fourthly, the Galician land (or a significant part of it) generally came under the direct control of the Mongols [ГВЛ (2020): 621, 418].

A number of sources report that some principalities of Rus' were divided into "тьмы" (tumens), which researchers associate with the Mongol military decimal division into "tumens", administrative units that could mobilize a corps of 10 thousand soldiers, or had a population of 10 thousand men. Information about the existence and number of such units is brief and contradictory. The earliest mention is in the Lyubech Synodik, where they commemorate princes: "кн(я)зѧ Сѡл(е)га Романовича, Вел(икого) Кн(я)зѧ чер(ниговского): Леонтїа, оставившаго дванадѣсать темъ людей. и Прїемшаго Ангелскїй Сѡбразъ: Во Иноцех Василїа" [Зотов (1892): 26]. The identification of Oleg Romanovich (†after 1285), and his correlation with Leonty and Vasily has problems [Безроднов (2019): 16-34], and with this certain doubts arise regarding the twelve tumens in the Chernihiv region.

However, from later times it is known that in 1360 Khan Nauruz gave the Suzdal prince Andrei Konstantinovich "княжение великое, 15 темъ" (a great reign, 15 tumens) [ПСРЛ (1922): 68]. The situation was similar in other Mongol possessions. Thus, Hamdallah Mustafa Qazwini (1340) names a number of provinces under the rule of the Ilkhans, which were also divided into tumens: nine tumens in Persian Iraq, one in Armenia, nine in Herat and seven in Mazandaran [The geographical part of the Nuzhat-al- Qulūb (1919): 54, 100, 150, 156; Watabe (2015): 30]. In the South Caucasus, the Gurjistan vilayet was divided into eight tumens, five of which belonged to Georgians, and three were Armenians [Dashdondog (2011): 102; Бабаян (1969): 120].

Such a division into t'ma (tumens) could only occur if a population census was carried out, which corresponds to the situation in the Chernigov and Suzdal principalities and the Ilkhanate. However, the label of the Crimean Khan Mengli Giray to the Polish king and Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigismund I the Old (1507) seems to give reason to believe that there were tumen in Volhyn. He names: a) Kyiv, Smolensk, Podolsk, Kamenets, Bratslav, Sokal (Sokoletsk), Chernigov, Kursk; b) Tatar "Saraev son of Egaltai" tumen, as well as, c) "Volodimer tumen" and "Great Lutsk tumen" [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 555-558]. In group "a", obviously, a census was carried out, but we do not have any synchronous information about the census in group "c". It should be noted that Chernigov in the label appears as a single tumen, and not as a territory, divided into twelve tumens. Researchers attribute the appearance of the tumen of Yagoldai to a broad period of the late 14th - first half of the 15th centuries. [Чурсин (2021): 96-119; Горлов, Казаров (2015): 46-63; Зайцев (2014) 128-130; Хоруженко (2008): 302-311; Русина (2005а): 100-113; Kucziński (1965): 221-226]. These tumens are concentrated, albeit with inconsistent presentation, into three groups: 1) eastern (Kyiv, Chernigov, Kursk, next to which was the tumen of Yagoldaya); 2) Podolsk (Podolia itself, Kamenets, Bratslav and Sokolets); 3) western (Vladimir and Lutsk). We are primarily interested in the third group.

Since Podolia was under the direct rule of the Mongols and bordered the Galician land, it is necessary to delineate their border at least approximately. Due to the lack of

direct indications in the sources, this can only be done indirectly. Thus, in the grant from Jagiello of 1395 to Spytka of Melsztyn, the counties of Stenka and Terebovlya were named as part of Podolia, the castles of Skala and Chervonogrod are located to the west of Kamenets and are located on the left bank of the river. Streepa, and the royal act of 1403 reports that the route from Lvov to Tartary went first through Podolia, and then Kamenez: “Illis vero qui Thathariam transire voluerint per Podoliam et Camenez” [Kodeks (1879): 146]. The road from Lvov to Kamenets went through Terebovlya. Thus, the Podolsk tumen probably covered the territories to the west and northwest of Kamenets, namely: Terebovlya, Yazlovets, Chervonogrod, and also, possibly, Skala and Smotrich.

In this regard, a number of land centers in Daniel’s possessions is absent in the jarlig: Kholm, Dorogichin, Belz, Przemysl, Syanok, Galich and Lvov. The time of foundation of the latter is a debatable issue [Шишка (1993a): 25-36; Шишка (1993b): 9-13; Janeczek (1994): 7-36; Книш (2006): 53-56]. The mention of it in the Tver Chronicle under 1241 [ПСРЛ (1922): 375], according to J. Knysh [Книш (2008): 130-136], is the result of an unsuccessful interpolation of an excerpt from the “List of Ruthenian Cities, Far and Near” [НПЛ (1950): 476; ПСРЛ (1910): 163; ПСРЛ (1856): 240]. Thus, the first mention of the city in 1259 contains a GVC text that is problematic in terms of the chronology of events, which describes a fire in Kholm, which was allegedly seen even in Lviv [ПСРЛ (1908): 841]. Taking into account chronological errors, it can be dated to approximately 1256 [Історія Львова (1956): 8], and it testifies to the important status of Lvov already at that time.

However, it should also be noted that in the label of Khan Haji Giray (1461) Kyiv, Lutsk, Smolensk, Podolia, Kamenets, Bratslav, Sokolets (Sokal) and Chernigov are not called tumen, Vladimir is absent altogether, and only the possession of “Szaraiewicza Jagalta” is called "tumen" [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 529-530]. Mengli Giray's jarlig (1472) contains a similar list, but with Vladimir, although all the mentioned lands are also not called tumen [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 539-540]. In the jarlig of Sahib I Girey (1541) “Lucesk with tumens...; Smolnesk with tumen; Polotsk with tumens...; Podolia with tumens...; Sokal (Sokolets) with tumens...; Braslavl with tumens...; Korske (Kursk) with tumens; Saraevich Yakgaldai with tumens; Gōhura with tumens..., Rezinsky (Ryazansky) Pereyasavl with tumens...” [Kołodziejczyk (2011): 722-723]. That is, Kyiv is again not called tumen, Vladimir is missing, Lutsk is not one tumen, but several, Polotsk was added, which was never under the rule of kaans or khans, Sokal also has tumen in the plural, the incomprehensible “Ohura” appeared along with tumen and Pereyasavl - Ryazansky with tumen.

It is noteworthy that at the time, when the Crimean khans jarligs were issued in 1461, 1472, 1507, 1541, Kyiv, Lutsk, Vladimir, Podolie, and Sokolets were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Kholm, Dorogichin, Belz, Przemysl, Syanok, Galich and Lvov, missing from them, were still in the 14th century were part of the Poland Kingdom. It is problematic to explain their absence in the texts of the jarligs, even though the first two have come to us in a defective Polish translation with an obvious mechanical compilation of several texts.

Taking into account the described circumstances, we can say that the sources do not give reason to believe, firstly, that Volhyn (Vladimir and Lutsk lands) was divided by the Mongols into tumen, as well as Galicia, and secondly, that the taxation of the Galician

land in favor of the Mongols something different from Volhyn. In our opinion, Galich was not directly subordinate to the Mongols. This is also evidenced by the war of the Romanovichs with the Mongol ruler of the right bank of the Dnieper Kurumyshi (Kuremsa) for Bakota, located far to the southeast of Galich and which Daniel Romanovich considered his possession.

Associated with the Mongols is the still not fully explored existence in the Galician (5 villages) and Lvov (10 villages) lands of a very small population category of the “ordyntsy” and/or “kalannye”. From the acts of the 15th-16th centuries it is known that they lived under the authority of their officers with the characteristic Turkic name “vathaman” (vathamanum, vathaman, wathamano) [Akta (1887): 152-153, 156; Akta (1906): 239], i.e. ataman, in villages that belonged to the Polish king. They owned movable and immovable property, sometimes quite significant, provided carts at the request of the king, were on duty in the castle, delivered mail, in the event of the arrival of the monarch, provided four horses for his needs, grazed the royal cattle, and for this they used the land for free, but had no rights moving to another place of residence and changing duties [Vernadsky (1951): 255-264; Hejnosz (1928): 73-102; Линниченко (1894): 98-107].

According to G. Vernadsky, the term “kalannye” comes from the Turkic word “kalan”, that is, a land tax introduced by the Mongols. Researchers have suggested that the appearance of the Horde / sea otters is connected 1) with the Horde prisoners ransomed by the princes, who were settled in a certain area and obliged to perform service related to the Horde: to carry tribute, provide vehicles for this, etc.; 2) that these were “descendants of settler colonists from the lands of the Golden Horde” [Ждан (1967): 28]. Both versions are not sufficiently substantiated since all our knowledge about the Ordintsy and Kalannye comes from sources of the 15th-16th centuries in which the genesis of the existence and activities of these people is not traced.

In our opinion, it is very doubtful that the kalan was imposed by the Mongols on such a small group of the population and only in the Galician and Lviv lands. Already G. Vernadsky noted that the term “kalanniy” in the meaning of “unfree” was widely known in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania [Гістарычны слоўнік (1996): 186] in those territories where there was neither power nor taxes of the Mongol Empire and the Ulus of Jochi. Therefore, it is more reasonable to assume that this group of people was formed from among the prisoners taken by some prince from the Belarusian or Lithuanian lands and settled in the indicated areas for the purpose of “Horde service”. The duties of the Horde were not too burdensome, and they to a certain extent overlapped with those established by the Mongols, and also somewhat resembled the functions of the “Horde servants” of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, traces of which we find in the revision of the Ovruch Castle (1552). A whole category of servants is mentioned with the duty of “подводы и станции посломъ и гоньцомъ [великого князя литовского] винни давати слуги Ордынские” (Horde servants are obliged to give carts and lodging to ambassadors and messengers [of the Grand Duke of Lithuanian]) and “слуги ордынские - слуги которые повинны при послахъ и гонцахъ господарскихъ ездити до Орды” (servants of the Horde - servants, who are obliged to travel to the Horde with the ambassadors and messengers of the Lord [i. e. the Grand Duke of Lithuanian]) [Архив (1867): 41].

And yet, the existence of atamans at the head of the Horde does not allow us to completely discard the influence of the Horde element. This, however, does not mean that



people of Mongolian or Turkic origin lived under their leadership. Thus, in the Ovruch and Chernobyl districts of the Kyiv land, the atamans represented the local administration of the lower level, and in Mozyr and Lyubech they were “startsyy” (elders). The presence of an ataman in a certain area indicated its subordination to the Horde administration and reflected the political border of the second half of the 13th - first half of the 14th centuries. [Русина (1998): 83-84]. We see a similar picture in Moldova, where atamans (votamans) appeared, obviously, synchronously with the Podolian, Kyiv and, not excluded, the Galician. Sources indicate that they led rural communities [Documenta (1975): 59, 80, 119, 134, 136, 218, 254, 322, 340, 360, 373, 377; Bogdan (1913a): 367; Bogdan (1913b): 70-73] first in settlements with Moldavian and Ruthenian inhabitants, and subsequently Tatar ones [Documenta (1976): 152; Costăchescu (1932): 128].

Due to the lack of sources, it is impossible to answer the question about the time of the appearance of the “ordyntsy” today. Let us pay attention to the fact that the very name “Horde” was not recorded in the sources of Galicia and Volhyn in the 13th century. The residence of the Horde in only fifteen villages of the Galician and Lvov lands testifies against their direct subordination to the Mongols and makes us think that they probably received their name no earlier than the 14th century based on the specifics of his service - servicing contacts with the Horde. It would not be superfluous to point out that categories of population similar to the Galician Ordyntsy and Kalannye with the names “Ordyntsy” and “Deluy” arose in North-Eastern Rus', with functions, still not fully understood [Горский (2018): 173 -178].

## CONCLUSION

Summarizing the results of this short study, one can state that the sources of the Galicia-Volhynian principality are diligently silent about any kind of dependence of princes from the Mongol Empire:

- possible census of the population;
- possible trips of the princes to Batu;
- the system of collection and payment of taxes in favor of the Mongol Empire;
- serving by the population of the duties established by the Mongols.

However, the sources do not suggest that:

- the Mongols conducted a census of the population in Galicia-Volhynia lands;
- that Galicia was under the direct rule of the Mongols;
- that Volhynia was divided into tumens and its taxation was somehow different from Galicia.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* (1887). [Town and Country Documents from the times of the Republic of Poland from the so-called Bernardine Archive in Lwów] (Tom XII). Lwów: Z I związkowej drukarni we Lwowie. xiv + 408 pages
- *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie* (1906). [Town and Country Documents from

- the times of the Republic of Poland from the so-called Bernardine Archive in Lwów] (Tom XIX). Lwów: W drukarnia E. Winarza we Lwowie, xxxiv + 855 pages
- ‘Ala-ad-Din ‘Ata-Malik Juvaini (1997). *The History of the Word-Conqueror*. (Vol. II). Manchester: Manchester University press, UNESCO publishing, 763 pages
  - Allsen, T.T. (1981). *Mongol Census Taking in Rus’, 1245-1275*. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, V, 1, March, 32-53
  - Allsen, T.T. (2010). *Imperial Posts, West, East and North: A Review Article*. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, 17, 237-275
  - Blake, R.P., Frye, R.N. (1949). *History of the Nation of the Archers (The Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc’ Hitherto Ascribed to Marak’ia The Monk: The Armenian Text Edited with an English Translation and Notes*. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 12, 3-4, December, 269-399.
  - Bogdan I. (1913a). *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare Vol. 1. Hrisoave și cărți domnești (1457-1492)*. București: Atelierele grafice socec & Co., Societate anonimă, 518 pages
  - Bogdan I. (1913b). *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare Vol. II. Hrisoave și cărți domnești (1493-1503). Tractate, acte omagiale, solii, privilegiu comerciale, salu-conducte, scritori, 1457-1503*. București: Atelierele grafice socec & Co., Societate anonimă, 611 pages
  - Costăchescu M. (1930) *Documentele moldovenești înainte de Ștefan cel Mare*. Vol. II. Documente interne. Urice (Ispisoace), Surete, Regeste, Traduceri 1438-1456. Documente externe. Acte de inprumut, de omagiu, tractate, solii, privilegiu, comerciale, salveconducte, scritori 1387-1458. Iași: «Viața Românească» S.A., xxv + 955 pages
  - Dashdondog, B. (2011). *The Mongols and the Armenians (1220-1335)*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 290 pages
  - *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum sive acta et diplomata res venetas graecas atque Levantis illustrantia a. 1300-1350* (1880). Venetiis: Sumptibus societatis, 388 pages
  - *Diplomatarium veneto-levantinum sive acta et diplomata res venetas graecas atque Levantis illustrantia a. 1351-1454* (1899). Venetiis: Sumptibus societatis, 490 pages
  - *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (1975). A. Moldova. Vol. I (1384-1448) / Volum întocmit de C. Cihodaru, I. Caproșu, L. Șimanschi. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 605 pages
  - *Documenta Romaniae Historica* (1976). A. Moldova. Vol. II (1449-1486) / Volum întocmit de L. Șimanesci în G. Ignat și D. Agache. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 795 pages
  - Doerfer, G. (1965). *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*. (Band II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen: *alif bis ta*). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 671 pages
  - Giovanni di Plan Carpine. (1989). *Storia dei Mongoli*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, viii + 522 pages
  - Guglielmo di Rubruk. (2011). *Viaggio in Mongolia (Itinerarium)*. Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla Arnoldo Mondadori, 590 pages
  - Haneda, T. (1936). *Une tablette du décret sacré de l’empereur Genghis*. *Mémoires of*

*Research Department of Tōyō Bunko*, 8, 85-91

- Hejnosz, W. (1928). *Ius Ruthenicae. Przeżytki dawnego ustroju społecznego na Rusie Halickiej w XV wieku*. Lwów: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 112 pages
- *Hystoria Tartarorum C. de Bridia monachi*. (1967). Berlin: Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co, 44 pages
- Janeczek, A. (1994). Studia nad początkami Lwowa: bilans osiągnięć i potrzeb badawczych. *Rocznik Lwowski*, 7-36
- Jarmolik, W. (1992). Obsługa komunikacyjna posłów litewskich w późnym średniowieczu. In *Miasto. Region. Społeczeństwo. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Andrzejowi Wyrobiszowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę Jego urodzin*. Białystok: Dział Wydawnictw Filii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego w Białymstoku, pp. 189-197
- Krawiec, A. (2008). Drugi rękopis Historii Tartarów autorstwa C. de Bridra. *Roczniki Historyczne*, 74, 157-164
- *Kodeks dyplomatyczny miasta Krakowa 1257-1506* (1879). T. I / Wyd. F. Piekosiński. Kraków: W drukarni «Czasu», 370 pages
- Kołodziejczyk, D. (2011). *The Crimean Khanate and Poland-Lithuania: International diplomacy on the European periphery (15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries). A study of peace treaties followed by annotated documents*. Leiden; Boston, 1135 pages
- Kucziński, S.M. (1965). Jaholdai i Jaholdajewicze lenni księża tatarscy Litwy. In *Kucziński S.M. Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej X-XVII w.* Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe, pp. 221-226
- Kuraszkiewicz, W. (1934). *Gramoty Halicko-Wołyńskie XIV-XV wieku. Studjum językowe z zasilkiem funduszu kultury narodowej*. Kraków, 173 pages
- *Lietuvos Metrika* (2010). Knyga Nr. 22 (1547); Užrašymų knyga 22 / parengė Andrii Blanutsa, Dmytro Vashchuk, Darius Antanavičius. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 174 pages
- *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana* (1913) T. I. Acta camerae apostolicae. Vol. I. 1207-1344 / Edidit Joannes Ptaśnik. Krakow: E pypographia Universitatis Jagellonicae, xxxvii + 502 pages
- Mas Latrie, L. de. (1868). Privilèges commerciaux accordés a la République de Venise par les princes de Crimée et les empereurs mongols du Kiptchak. *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes. Revue d'Érudition, Consacrée spécialement à l'étude du moyen-age*, 4, sixième série, 580-595.
- Mas Latrie, L. de. (1870). Privilège commercial accordé en 1320 a la République de Venise par un roi de Perse, faussement attribué a un roi de Tunis. *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, 31, 72-102
- May T. Tamgha. (2017a). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia* (Vol. I, pp. 96-97). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO
- May T. Taxation (2017b). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia*. (Vol. I). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO, pp. 99-101
- Morgan, D.O. (1982). Who ran the Mongol empire? *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1, 124-136
- Münküev, N.Ts. (1977). A New Mongolian P'ai-tzu from Simferopol. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XXXI(2), 185-215

- Schurmann, H.F. (1956). Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 19, 3-4, 304-389
- Shim, H. (2014). The Postal Roads of the Great Khans in Central Asia under the Mongol-Yuan Empire. *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies*, 44, 405-469
- Shim, H. Yam (2017). In T. May (ed.). *The Mongol empire. A historical encyclopedia* (Vol. I). Santa Barbara-Denver: ABC-CLIO, pp. 110-112
- Smith, J.M. (1970). Mongol and Nomadic Taxation. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 30, 3-4, 46-85
- *The geographical part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulūb* (1919). Composed by Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī in 740 (1340). Leiden: E.J. Brill, London: Luzac & Co., xix + 322 pages
- *The Secret History of the Mongols* (1982). Done into English out of the Original Tongue and provided with an Exegetical Commentary by Francis Woodman Cleaves Volume I (translation). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University press - London, 172 pages
- *The Secret History of the Mongols*. (2004) A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century / Translated with a historical and philological commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz. Volume one. Leiden-Boston: Brill, Qiu, Y. (2018). Independent Ruler, Indefinable Role. *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 143, October, 29-48. <https://doi.org/10.4000/remmm.10237>, 342 pages
- Rong, F. (2021). *The Mongol empire: Fragmentation, unity, and continuity (1206-C.1300)*. A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the division of the humanities in candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy department of near eastern languages and civilizations. Chicago, 211 pages
- Vásáry, I. (1977). *Susun and süsun* in Middle Turkic Texts. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XXXI, 1, 51-59.
- Vernadsky, G. (1951). The Royal Serfs (Servi Regales) of the 'Ruthenian Law' and Their Origin. *Speculum*, 26, 2, 255-264
- Ward, L.J. (1983) *The Zafar-nāmah of Hamdallāh Mustawfī and the il-khān Dynasty of Iran*. A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Art. Department of Near Eastern Studies. (Vol. III). Manchester: University of Manchester, 390-674, i-ix pages
- Watabe, R. (2015). Census-Taking and the Qubchūr Taxation System in Ilkhanid Iran: An Analysis of the Census Book from the Late 13<sup>th</sup> Century Persian Accounting Manual al-Murshid fī al-Ḥisāb. *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko*, 73, 27-63.
- Wysłouch, S. (1936). *Posługi komunikacyjne w miastach W. Ks. Litewskiego na prawie magdeburskiem do połowy XVI w.* Wilno: Nakładem Instytutu naukowo-badawczego Europy Wschodniej, 207 pages
- Али-Заде, А.А. (1945). К истории феодальных отношений в Азербайджане. Термин «Купчур» [To the history of feudal relations in Azerbaijan. The term «Kupchur»]. *Известия Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР*, 5, 87-102
- Али-Заде, А.К. (1955). Из истории феодальных отношений в Азербайджане в XIII-XIV вв. Термин тамга [From the history of feudal relations in Azerbaijan in 13-14 centuries. The term tamga]. *Известия Академии Наук Азербайджанской ССР*, 5, 51-63

- *Археология Волго-Уралья* (2022) [Archaeology of the Volga-Urals]. В 7 т. Т. 6. Средние века (вторая треть XIII первая половина XV вв.). Эпоха Золотой Орды (Улуса Джучи) / Институт археологии им. А.Х. Халикова АН РТ; под общ. ред. А.Г. Ситдикова; отв. ред. В.С. Баранов. Казань: Изд-во АН РТ, 676 pages
- *Архив Юго-Западной России* (1867) [Archive of South-West Russia]. Часть 4. Акты о происхождении шляхетских родов в Юго-Западной России. Киев: В типографии Е. Федорова
- Бабаян, Л. О. (1969). *Социально-экономическая и политическая история Армении в XIII-XIV веках* [Socio-economic and political history of Armenia in the 13-14 centuries]. Москва: Наука, 334 pages
- Банзаров, Д. (1850). Пайзе, или металлические дощечки с повелениями монгольских ханов [Paize, or metal plaques with the commands of the Mongol khans]. *Записки Санкт-Петербургского археологическо-нумизматического общества*, 2/1, 72-97
- Безроднов, В.С. (2019). Князья брянские, их происхождение и потомство [Princes of Bryansk, their origin and descendants]. *Генеалогический вестник*, 59, 16-34
- Бойматов, Л. (2018). Тюрко-монгольские термины в налоговой системе Ирана и Центральной Азии XIII-XIV вв. [Turkic-Mongol terms in the tax system of Iran and Central Asia in the 13-14 centuries]. In *Духовно-исторические связи народов Ирана и Дашти Кипчака*. Алматы: Издательский дом «Библиотека Олжаса», pp. 87-95
- Васильев, Д.В. (2009). К вопросу о местонахождении первой столицы Золотой Орды [To the question about the location of the first capital of the Golden Horde] *Золотоордынское наследие*, 1, 436-445
- Васильев, Д.В. (2012). О населённых пунктах в дельте Волги, которые посетил Гильом Рубрук в 1254 году [About settlements in the Volga delta visited by William of Rubruck in 1254]. *Труды Камской археолого-этнографической экспедиции*, 8, 266-270
- Воротынцев, Л.В. (2017). Кем был «Сарацин» - переписчик, упоминаемый в «Истории монгалов» Плано Карпини: к вопросу о проведении первой ордынской переписи на Руси 1245 г. [Who was «Saracen» - the scribe mentioned in Plano Carpini's «History of the Mongols»: to the question of the first Horde census in Rus in 1245]. *Золотоордынская Цивилизация*, 10, 135-139
- Вашари, И. (1987). Заметки о термине *tartanaq* в Золотой Орде [Notes on the term *tartanaq* in the Golden Horde]. *Советская тюркология*, 4, 97-103
- Востоков, А. (1842). *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского музея* [Description of Russian and Slavonic manuscripts of the Rumyantsev Museum]. Санкт-Петербург, 903 pages
- Высоцкий, С.А. (1985). *Киевские граффити XI-XVII вв.* [Kyiv graffiti of the 11-17 centuries]. Киев: Наукова думка, 209 pages
- Галицько-Волинський літопис: текстологія (2020) [The Galician-Volhynia Chronicle: textology]. Київ: Академперіодика, 929 pages
- Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы [Historical dictionary of the Belarusian language] (1996). Выпуск 15. Катэгорычны. Мінск: Беларуская навука, 311

pages

- Горлов, А.В., Казаров А.А. (2015). О группе монет конца XIV в. из находок в курско-белгородском регионе и о времени вхождения «Яголтаевой тьмы» в состав Великого княжества Литовского [About a group of coins of the end of the XIV century from finds in the Kursk-Belgorod region and about the time of the entry of the "Yagoltay's t'ma" into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. *Средневековая нумизматика Восточной Европы*, 5, 46-63
- Горский, А.А. (2014). Утверждение власти Монгольской империи над Русью: региональные особенности [Assertion of the Mongol Empire's power over Rus: regional peculiarities]. *Исторический вестник*, 10(157), 58-79
- Горский, А.А. (2018). Московские «ордынцы» и «делюи» [Moscow's «ordyntsi» and «delyui»]. In *«Вертоград многоцветный»: Сборник к 80-летию Бориса Николаевича Флори*. Москва: Индрик, pp. 173-178
- Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова (1949) [Diplomas of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 205 pages
- Григорьев, А.П., Григорьев, В.П. (2002). Коллекция золотоордынских документов XIV века из Венеции: Источниковедческое исследование [A Collection of Golden Horde Documents of the 14 Century from Venice: A Source Study]. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петербур. ун-та, 276 pages
- Григорьев, А.П. (2004). Сборник ханских ярлыков русским митрополитам: Источниковедческий анализ золотоордынских документов [Collection of khan's jarliqs to Russian metropolitans: Source analysis of Golden Horde documents]. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во С.-Петербур. ун-та, 279 pages
- Довженок, В.О. (1978). Среднее Поднепровье после татаро-монгольского нашествия [Middle Podneprovie after the Tatar-Mongol invasion]. In *Древняя Русь и славяне*. Москва: Наука, pp. 76-82
- Довнар-Запольский, М.В. (1900). *Акты Литовско-Русского государства* [Acts of the Lithuanian-Russian State]. Выпуск 1 (1390-1529). Москва, 44 pages
- Ждан, М.Б. (1967). До питання про залежність Галицько-Волинської Русі від Золотої Орди [To the question of the Dependence of Galicia-Volhynia Rus on the Golden Horde]. *Український історик*, 1-2(13-14), 23-37
- Зайцев, И. (2014). Татарские политические образования на территории Великого княжества Литовского (Яголдаева «тьма») [Tatar political entities on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Jagoldai's «t'ma»)]. In *История татар с древнейших времен* (Т. IV). Казань, pp. 128-130
- Зімін, О.О. (1966). Устав про холопів - пам'ятка з історії холопства в Київській Русі [The Charter on Serfs - a monument to the history of serfdom in Kyivan Rus]. *Український історичний журнал*, 7, 48-60
- Зотов, Р.В. (1892). *О черниговских князьях по Любецкому синодику и о Черниговском княжестве в татарское время* [About Chernigov Princes according to the Lubech Synodicum and about the Chernigov principality in the Tatar period]. Санкт-Петербург, 328 pages
- Храпачевский Р.П. (2009). *Золотая Орда в источниках* [Golden Horde in sources]. (Т. 3). Москва: ППП «Типография «Наука», 336 pages
- Ивакин, Г.Ю. (2003). Историческое развитие Южной Руси и Батыево нашествие

- [Historical development of Southern Rus and the Batu invasion]. In *Русь в XIII веке: Древности темного времени*. Москва, pp. 59-65
- Ивакин, Г.Ю., Комар, А.В. (2016). После катастрофы: Киев в 1241 г. [After the catastrophe: Kyiv in 1241]. *Stratum plus*, 5, 59-72.
  - Иностранцев, К. (1908). К вопросу о «басме» [To the question of «basma»]. *Записки Восточного отделения императорского Русского археологического общества*, 18, 0172-0179
  - Історія Львова. Короткий нарис (1956). [History of Lviv. A short essay]. Львів: Видавництво Львівського університету, 304 pages
  - Книш, Я. (2006). Заснування міста [The founding of the city]. In *Історія Львова: у трьох томах* (Т. 1: 1256-1772). Львів, pp. 53-56
  - Книш, Я. (2008). Звітка про Львів у Тверському літописі під 6743 (1241) р. [Information about Lviv in the Tver Chronicle under 6743 (1241)]. *Княжа доба: історія і культура*, 2, 130-136
  - Козин, С.А. (1941). *Сокровенное сказание. Монгольская хроника 1240 г. под названием Monggol-un nigica tobciyan. Юань чао би ши* [Secret History. Mongol chronicle of 1240 entitled *Monggol-un nigica tobciyan. Yuan chao bi shi*]. (Том I). Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 619 pages
  - Коринный, Н.Н. (1992). *Переяславская земля, X - первая половина XIII века* [Pereyaslav land, 10 - first half of 13 century]. Киев: Наукова думка, 312 pages
  - Крамаровский, М.Г. (2002). Символы власти у ранних монголов. Золотоордынские пайцзы как феномен официальной культуры [Symbols of power in the early Mongols. Golden Horde paizas as a phenomenon of official culture]. *Туркологический сборник 2001*, 212-224
  - Купчинський, О. (2004). *Акти та документи Галицько-Волинського князівства XIII - першої половини XIV століть. Дослідження. Тексти* [Acts and Documents of the Galicia-Volhynia Principality of the 13 - first half of the 14 centuries. A study. Texts]. Львів: Наукове товариство імені Шевченка у Львові, 1285 pages
  - Линниченко, И.А. (1894). *Черты из истории сословий в Юго-Западной (Галицкой) Руси XIV-XV в.* [Features from the history of classes in South-Western (Galician) Rus' in the 14th-15th centuries]. Москва, 250 pages
  - Лихачев, Н.П. (1916). Басма золотоордынских ханов [Basma of the Golden Horde khans]. In *1885-1915. Сборник статей в честь графини Прасковьи Сергеевны Уваровой*. Москва, pp. 70-86
  - Мальм, В.А. (1976). Пайцза из Симферопольского клада [Paizsa from the Simferopol hoard]. In *Средневековая Русь*. Москва: Наука, pp. 71-74
  - *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов* (1950). [Novgorod First Chronicle of the Old and New Edition]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 642 pages
  - *Описи царского архива XVI в. и архива Посольского приказа 1614 г.* (1960). [Inventories of the tsar's archive of the 16 century and the archive of the Bureau of Ambassadors]. Москва: Издательство Восточной литературы, 193 pages
  - Памятники русского права [Monuments of Russian law]. (1952). (Выпуск первый). Москва: Государственное издательство юридической литературы, xvi + 287 pages

- *Памятники русского права* [Monuments of Russian law]. (1955). (Выпуск третий). Москва: Государственное издательство юридической литературы, 527 pages
- Пачкалов, А.В. (2002). О местоположении Сарая (первой столицы Золотой Орды) [On the location of Sarai (the first capital of the Golden Horde)] // *Археологія та Етнологія Східної Європи*, 3, 177
- Пачкалов, А.В. (2010). К вопросу об имени золотоордынского города, находившегося на месте Красноярского городища в дельте Волги [To the question about the name of the Golden Hord city located on the site of the Krasnoyarsk ancient settlement in the Volga delta]. *Средневековые тюрко-татарские государства*, 2, 300-309
- Пигарёв, Е.М. (2016) Красноярское городище и его округа [Krasnoyarsk ancient settlement and its districts]. *Поволжская археология*, 2(16), 164-181
- ПСРЛ (1927). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 1: Лаврентьевская летопись. Вып. 2: Суздальская летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку). Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 289-488 col.
- ПСРЛ (1908). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 2: Ипатьевская летопись). Санкт-Петербург, хvi pages + 938 col. + 87 + iv pages
- ПСРЛ (1851). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 5. VI: Псковские и Софийские летописи). Санкт-Петербург, vi + 277 pages
- ПСРЛ (1925). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 5. Издание второе: Софийская первая летопись. Выпуск первый). Ленинград: Издательство Российской Академии Наук, ii + 240 pages
- ПСРЛ (2000) *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 6. Вып. 1: Софийская первая летопись старшего извода). Москва: Языки русской культуры, viii + 312 pages
- ПСРЛ (1856). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 7. VII: Летопись по Воскресенскому списку). Санкт-Петербург, x + 345 pages
- ПСРЛ (1922). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Изд. 2-е. Т. 15. Вып. 1: Рогожский летописец). Петроград. xviii pages + 186 col.
- ПСРЛ (1910). *Полное собрание русских летописей* [The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles]. (Т. 23: Ермолинская летопись). Санкт-Петербург, v + 239 pages
- Приселков, М.Д. (1916). *Ханские ярлыки русским митрополитам* [Khan's jarliqs to Russian metropolitans]. Петроград, viii + 116 pages
- Приселков, М.Д. (1950). *Троицкая летопись. Реконструкция текста* [Troitskaya Chronicle. Reconstruction of the text]. Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР. 514 pages
- Радлов, В.В. (1899). *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий* [Experience of a dictionary of Turkic adverbs]. (Том 2. Часть 1). Санкт-Петербург, 1052 col.
- Рашид-ад-Дин. (1960). *Сборник летописей* [A collection of chronicles]. (Том II).



- Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 253 pages
- Рашид-ад-Дин. (1946). *Сборник летописей* [A collection of chronicles]. (Том III). Москва-Ленинград: Издательство Академии Наук СССР, 340 pages
  - Рева, Р.Ю., Беляев, В.А. (2017). Две серебряные золотоордынские пайцзы с уйгуро-монгольскими надписями [Two silver Golden Horde paizsa with Uigur-Mongol inscriptions]. *Золотоордынская цивилизация*, 10, 25-37.
  - Рудаков, В.Г. (2007). *Селитренное городище: хронология и топография* [Selitrennoye ancient settlement: chronology and topography]. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук. Москва.
  - Русина, О. (1998). *Сіверська земля у складі Великого князівства Литовського* [Siveria land as part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. Київ: Інститут української археографії та джерелознавства ім. М.С. Грушевського, 243 page
  - Русина, О. (2005a). До історії Київської землі у XIV-XV ст.: Яголдай, Яголдайовичі, Яголдайова «тма» [To the History of the Kyivan Land in the 14-15 centuries: Yagoldai, Yagoldaiovich, Yagoldai's "t'ma"]. In *Русина О. Студії з історії Київської землі*. Київ: НАН України, Інститут історії України, pp. 100-113
  - Русина, О. (2005b) До питання про київських князів татарської доби [To the question of Kyivan princes of the Tatar era]. In *Русина О. Студії з історії Києва та Київської землі*. Київ: НАНУ, Інститут історії України, pp. 9-37
  - *Русский феодальный архив XIV - первой трети XVI века* (1987). [Russian feudal archive of the 14 - first third of the 16 century]. (Т. III). Москва: Институт истории СССР АН СССР.
  - Серебрянский, Н.И. (1915). *Древнерусские княжеские жития. (Обзор редакций и тексты). Texts* [Old Russian princely hagiographies. (Review of editions and texts). Texts]. Петроград, ii + 186 pages
  - Спицын, А.А. (1909). Татарские байсы [Tatar's paizes]. *Известия императорской Археологической Комиссии*, 29, 130-141
  - Срезневский, И.И. (1882). *Древние памятники русского письма и языка (X-XIV веков). Общее повременное обозрение* [Ancient monuments of Russian writing and language (10-14 centuries). General Contemporary Review]. Санкт-Петербург: Типография императорской Академии Наук, iv + 390 col.
  - Столярова, Л.В. (2000). *Свод записей писцов, художников и переплетчиков древнерусских пергаменных кодексов XI-XIV вв.* [A collection of records of scribes, artists and bookbinders of Old Russian parchment codices of the 11-14 centuries.]. Москва: Наука, 543 pages
  - Сундуева, Е.В. (2011). *Звуки и образы: фоносемантическое исследование лексем с корневыми согласными (r/m) в монгольских языках: функции, семантика и поэтика: Монография* [Sounds and Images: A Phonosemantic Study of Lexemes with Root Consonants (r/m) in Mongolian Languages: Functions, Semantics and Poetics: A Monograph]. Улан-Удэ: Издательство БНЦ СО РАН, 344 pages
  - Толочко, О. (2000). Замітки з історичної топографії домонгольського Києва. V. В якому «Острові» жив Михайло Всеволодович 1242 року? [Notes on the historical topography of pre-Mongol Kyiv. V. In which «Island» did Mikhailo

- Vsevolodovich live in 1242?]. *Київська старовина*, 6, 166-169.
- Усманов, М.А. (1979a). *Жалованные акты Джучиева улуса XIV-XVI вв.* [Granted acts of Ulus of Jochi 14-15 centuries.]. Казань: Издательство Казанского университета. 318 pages
  - Усманов, М.А. (1979b). Термин «ярлык» и вопросы классификации актов ханства Джучиева Улуса [The term «jarlik» and issues of classification of acts of the khanate of Ulus of Jochi]. *Актовое источниковедение: сб. статей*. Москва: Наука, pp. 218-244
  - Усманов, М.А. (2009). Делопроизводство и канцелярская культура [Records management and clerical culture]. In *История татар с древнейших времен*. Т. III. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ, pp. 658-667
  - Хоруженко, О.И. (2008). Метрические росписи польским дорогам и локализация Еголдаева городища [Metrical descriptions of steppe roads and localization of the Yegoldai's settlement]. *Вестник РГГУ*. № 4/08. Серия «Исторические науки», pp. 302-311
  - Чурсин, Д.И. (2021). «Еголдаева тьма» и ее волости по данным исторических источников [«Yegoldai's t'ma» and its districts according to historical sources]. *История. Общество. Политика*, 2(18), 96-119
  - Шишка, О. (1993a). Історія Княжого Львова. Історико-бібліографічний огляд [The History of Princely Lviv. A historical and bibliographical review]. In *Вузівська бібліотека: історія, теорія, досвід роботи*. Львів, pp. 25-36
  - Шишка, О. (1993b). Історіографія Старого Львова [Historiography of Old Lviv]. *Євшан-зілля*, 7, 9-13.

## SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

**No fee** is charged from the authors during the submission, evaluation and publication process.

The article must be sent to email: [historical\\_studies@wcu.edu.az](mailto:historical_studies@wcu.edu.az)

*Article length:* Between 5000 and 15000 words maximum, including notes and bibliography.

The text needs to be typed with Word software 1997-2003. Font: Times New Roman. Format: 12, Single Line spacing

*Reference style:* [APA](https://apastyle.apa.org/) (<https://apastyle.apa.org/>)

Your article should be arranged in the following order:

### TITLE

Author's **First name** and **Last name**

Institution, Country

Email address

ORCID#

**Abstract:** as least 100, up to 300 words

**Keywords:** at least 6, up to 15 words

The main body of the article can be divided into paragraphs and titled at the discretion of the author.

References throughout the text: Author's name year: page, between square brackets. Ex: [Hubert (1986): 26]

Samples for **Bibliography:**

Whole authored book:

- Jackson, L. M. (2019). *The psychology of prejudice: From attitudes to social action* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association.

Chapter in Edited Book:

- Kumpfer, K. (2009). Prevention. In P. Korsmeyer & H.R. Kranzler (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of drugs, alcohol & addictive behavior* (3rd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 270-278). Detroit, MI: Macmillan.

The Journal article reference:

- Grady, J. S., Her, M., Moreno, G., Perez, C., & Yelinek, J. (2019). Emotions in storybooks: A comparison of storybooks that represent ethnic and racial groups in the United States. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 8(3), 207–217.

Titles and names written in **non-Latin scripts** must be transliterated before translating and citing. For example:

- Najm, Y. (1966). *Al-qissah fi al-adab Al-Arabi al-hadith* [The novel in modern Arabic literature]. Beirut: Dar Al-Thaqafah.

**NB1:** Please, do not forget to indicate DOI of the publication in bibliography, if it is provided.

**NB2:** Please, do not forget to provide URL of Internet sources and date of last access (for example: (Last accessed: October 6, 2023))