



**FAMILY, KINSHIP AND LEGAL PRACTICE IN THE KHIVA KHANATE:
MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, PROPERTY, CHILD WELFARE AND DYNASTIC
CONTINUITY, LATE 18TH–EARLY 20TH CENTURIES**

R.A.Axmedov

*Abu Rayhon Beruniy Urgench State University, Uzbekistan
Independent Researcher*

ABSTRACT:

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 30.09.2026

Revised: 01.10.2026

Accepted: 02.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

*Khiva Khanate;
family history; kinship;
marriage; Firdaws al-
Iqbal; qadi courts;
mahr; bride-price;
divorce; inheritance;
guardianship; child
welfare; Sharia;
Qungrat dynasty.*

This article examines family relations in the Khiva Khanate from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century by bringing together two complementary bodies of historical evidence: the narrative and genealogical information contained in Firdaws al-Iqbal by Sher Muhammad Munis and Muhammad Riza Agahi, and judicial documents reflecting the practical regulation of family disputes in Khiva. Previous scholarship has generally examined the political history of the Khiva Khanate, the development of Islamic legal institutions, or the literary and historiographical characteristics of Firdaws al-Iqbal separately. This article instead approaches the family as an integrated social and legal institution connecting marriage, kinship, reproduction, property, inheritance, child protection, community relations, cultural transmission, and dynastic continuity.

The study employs historical-critical, comparative-historical, source-critical, and microhistorical methods. Firdaws al-Iqbal provides evidence concerning genealogy, childbirth, kinship, marriage, family rituals, education, and dynastic succession, while judicial documents reveal how family relations became concrete legal claims involving bride-price, mahr, divorce, marital conflict, domestic violence, inheritance, guardianship, and property. The evidence demonstrates that family relations in Khiva operated



within a plural legal environment in which Islamic law, local custom, qadi practice, administrative authorities, and community representatives interacted. Particular attention is given to cases involving the return of bride-price, divorce following the failure to consummate a marriage, violence against women, and the protection of inherited property belonging to a woman and her minor child.

The article argues that the family in the Khiva Khanate cannot be understood merely as a private domestic unit or through normative Islamic law alone. It constituted a multifunctional social institution in which biological reproduction, kinship, economic exchange, legal claims, social protection, cultural continuity, and political legitimacy intersected. The study also demonstrates the methodological limitations of applying modern legal categories such as “alimony” retrospectively to Khivan society.

Introduction

The history of the Khiva Khanate has traditionally been studied primarily through political institutions, dynastic change, military conflicts, economic relations, state administration, diplomacy, historiography, and cultural development. Such approaches have produced an extensive body of scholarship, yet they have paid comparatively less attention to the family as an independent historical institution.

This gap is especially significant because family relations constituted one of the principal mechanisms through which social identity, property, inheritance, education, kinship, and political succession were reproduced. In the Khiva Khanate, family was not an isolated domestic sphere. It was connected to religious norms, customary practice, economic exchange, community organization, and, in the case of ruling families, dynastic legitimacy.

The difficulty of reconstructing the history of the family is partly explained by the nature of the available sources. Family relations were rarely recorded as a separate, systematically organized subject. Instead, information about marriage, childbirth, kinship, inheritance, divorce, property, family rituals, and household relations is dispersed across historical chronicles, genealogical narratives, biographical accounts, legal documents, judicial records, and administrative correspondence.



One of the most important sources for the social history of Khorezm is Firdaws al-Iqbal, begun by Sher Muhammad Munis and subsequently continued by Muhammad Riza Agahi. The work is widely recognized as a major source for the history of Khorezm and contains information extending beyond political events to genealogy, biographies, social life, ceremonies, and interpersonal relations.

The significance of Firdaws al-Iqbal for family history lies particularly in its genealogical structure. Historical personalities are often identified through their fathers, brothers, ancestors, descendants, and other relatives. Consequently, kinship is embedded in the very manner in which historical actors are represented.

At the same time, a narrative chronicle cannot by itself reconstruct the practical functioning of family relations. It tends to record politically or socially significant events rather than routine household life. Judicial documents provide a complementary perspective because they preserve moments in which family relations became contested claims requiring institutional intervention.

The catalogue of Khiva qadi documents compiled by A. O'rinboyev and other scholars covers documents dating from 1765 to 1924 and includes 1,713 documentary records. These materials contain evidence concerning marriage, mahr, inheritance, property, and other social relations.

The studies of Ulfat Abdurasulov and Paolo Sartori are particularly important for understanding this documentary environment. Their research demonstrates that legal disputes in Khorezm cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between state authority and Islamic law. Instead, qadis, representatives of the khan's administration, local officials, and community institutions participated in processes of dispute settlement.

This article therefore combines the two source traditions.

The first — Firdaws al-Iqbal — allows the study of family as genealogy, kinship, reproduction, cultural transmission, ritual, and dynasty.

The second — judicial and legal documents — makes it possible to examine family as a field of legal claims, economic obligations, conflict resolution, property protection, and social regulation.

The central research question is:

How did family relations function simultaneously as social, economic, legal, cultural, and dynastic institutions in the Khiva Khanate from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century?

The article advances three related arguments.

First, family relations in Khiva extended far beyond the husband–wife relationship and included wider networks of kinship, descent, inheritance, guardianship, and community support.

Second, family relations were not regulated by a single institution. Islamic legal norms interacted with customary practices, qadi courts, administrative authorities, and community mediation.



Third, the political significance of family became particularly visible in ruling households, where genealogy and biological continuity were connected to dynastic legitimacy and succession.

2. Historiography and Research Gap

Existing scholarship relevant to this study can be divided into several groups.

The first group consists of studies devoted to the history and historiography of Khorezm. Q. Munirov examined the historical works of Munis, Agahi, and Bayani and demonstrated their significance for reconstructing the history of Khorezm. N. Jabborov has analyzed Firdaws al-Iqbal as an important example of Agahi's historical-literary prose, emphasizing its representation of political events as well as social and cultural life.

The second group consists of studies dealing with the historical and legal functioning of Sharia in Central Asia. P. Sartori's work on Islamic law and cultural change in Russian Central Asia, together with his research with U. Abdurasulov, has demonstrated that legal practice in Khiva involved complex interactions among Islamic jurisprudence, administrative institutions, and local social structures. Their research specifically challenges the idea that Islamic law functioned independently of state authority.

The third group consists of documentary studies. O'rinboyev and colleagues catalogued a substantial corpus of Khiva qadi documents, creating an important foundation for research into everyday legal practice. Sartori and Abdurasulov subsequently published and analyzed selected judicial documents, including cases involving marriage and family disputes.

Despite these important contributions, family history remains fragmented between literary-historical studies and legal-historical research.

Studies of Firdaws al-Iqbal have identified genealogical, biographical, cultural, and ceremonial information, but family relations have generally not been reconstructed as an independent analytical category.

Conversely, studies of Khiva's judicial system have analyzed legal documents and mechanisms of dispute resolution but have not fully connected individual family disputes to the broader social functions of kinship, reproduction, cultural transmission, and dynastic continuity.

This article addresses this gap by integrating social history of the family with legal history and the history of political genealogy.

The novelty of the approach is therefore not the discovery of an entirely unknown source but the reorganization and interpretation of dispersed evidence through a common analytical framework.

3. Sources and Methodology

The principal narrative source is the Firdaws al-Iqbal of Munis and Agahi. The study uses the 2010 Tashkent edition prepared by N. Jumakhoja, S. Ro'zimboyev, and A. Axmedov, together with the critical and translated editions associated with Yuri Bregel.



The second category consists of judicial documents of the Khiva Khanate. The documentary corpus described by O'rinboyev and colleagues contains materials from 1765–1924, including records related to marriage, mahr, inheritance, and property.

The study also draws on the documentary analyses of Sartori and Abdurasulov. Their research is particularly important because it reconstructs not merely legal rules but the mechanisms through which disputes moved between different institutional levels.

The methodological framework combines:

1. **historical-critical analysis** — to establish the historical context of family relations;
2. **source criticism** — to distinguish narrative representation from documentary evidence;
3. **comparative-historical analysis** — to compare narrative and judicial sources;
4. **microhistory** — to reconstruct individual family cases;
5. **institutional analysis** — to identify the roles of qadis, administrative officials, and community representatives;
6. **genealogical analysis** — to examine the relationship between kinship and political succession.

A central methodological principle is the avoidance of anachronism.

For example, the contemporary legal concept of “alimony” cannot simply be treated as an equivalent of historical mechanisms of family support in the Khiva Khanate. The documentary evidence is better interpreted through historically appropriate categories such as maintenance, guardianship, inheritance, property rights, and protection of dependants.

4. Family and Kinship in Firdaws al-Iqbal

The representation of family in Firdaws al-Iqbal is closely connected with genealogy.

Historical figures are frequently presented through their fathers, brothers, ancestors, or descendants. Such descriptions demonstrate that individual identity was embedded in a broader network of kinship.

This is particularly evident in the treatment of rulers. Genealogical information is not simply supplementary biographical data; it forms an important part of the narrative structure of the chronicle.

In the Bregel edition, the genealogy of the rulers is placed among the introductory materials of the work. The instructions attributed to Eltuzar Khan emphasize the importance of recording the ruler's “illustrious ancestry” and forefathers. This demonstrates that genealogy had political significance in addition to its familial meaning.

Thus:

family → genealogy → lineage → dynastic identity → political legitimacy

constituted an important conceptual chain in the historical representation of Khivan political society.



This relationship is particularly important for the Qungrat dynasty. The continuity of the ruling family was simultaneously biological and political. The birth of descendants could therefore acquire significance beyond the household itself.

5. Childbirth, Kinship and Cultural Continuity: The Case of Agahi

One of the clearest examples of the connection between family, kinship, and cultural transmission is the account of Muhammad Riza Agahi's birth.

Munis records:

“Bu yil mohi mazkur, ya’ni zulqa’daning o’nunda, shanba kuni Erniyozbekkim, faqirning inisidur, hazrati vohib-ul atoya bir farzandi arjumand va valadi saodat payvand ato qildi va ul nur hadaqai jalol va hadiqai kamol Muhammadrizobekka mavsum bo’ldi.”

(Munis and Agahi, Firdavs ul-iqbol, 2010, p. 202).

The passage is important because it establishes several relationships simultaneously. Erniyozbek is identified as Munis's younger brother, while the newborn is identified as Erniyozbek's son and named Muhammad Riza.

This is therefore more than a simple record of childbirth. It is a concise genealogical statement connecting three generations and establishing the place of the newborn within the family network.

The later biography of Agahi indicates that following his father's death he was raised under Munis's care. Consequently, biological kinship became connected to education and cultural transmission.

The relationship between Munis and Agahi may therefore be understood through three levels:

biological kinship → social care → cultural transmission.

This case demonstrates that the family operated as a mechanism through which knowledge and intellectual traditions could pass between generations.

It also provides a useful methodological example. A single biographical passage can provide evidence simultaneously for demographic history, kinship history, childhood, education, and cultural reproduction.

6. Marriage as a Social and Legal Institution

Marriage constituted the principal mechanism for creating a new household and expanding kinship relations.

The evidence from Khiva demonstrates that marriage had several interconnected dimensions:

- religious;
- contractual;
- economic;
- familial;
- ceremonial;



- communal.

Abdurasulov and Sartori emphasize that marriage in Khorezm was connected with a sequence of practices including engagement, marriage contract, and wedding celebration. Their analysis also demonstrates that Sharia operated as part of a wider system of social governance rather than as an isolated body of religious norms.

The documentary evidence is especially valuable because it demonstrates what happened when the marriage process broke down.

A document concerning a marital dispute records that a girl had been promised to a man who paid the customary qālīng. The couple became engaged, but the marriage did not take place. The groom subsequently brought a claim against the bride's father and another individual. The parties eventually reached an agreement under which the bride's father would return the bride-price.

The case demonstrates that marriage negotiations could create property obligations even before the marriage itself was completed.

The economic dimension of marriage is also visible in the biography of Munis. Q. Munirov records that Munis borrowed 100 ashrafi in connection with his marriage. This individual example should not be generalized to the entire population, but it demonstrates that marriage could involve significant financial preparation.

Marriage therefore occupied the intersection of household formation and economic relations.

7. Bride-Price and Mahr: Between Norm and Practice

One of the most important economic aspects of marriage was the relationship between qālīng and mahr.

The documentary evidence indicates that qālīng could consist of money, clothing, and other goods. At the same time, the historical distinction between qālīng and mahr was not always stable.

Sartori and Abdurasulov's analysis of a Khorezm legal case shows that qālīng could function in practice as a synonym for mahr, although the actual recipient and management of the payment could differ.

This distinction is analytically important.

A purely normative reading of Islamic law might focus on the legal rights associated with mahr. A social-historical reading must additionally ask:

- Who provided the payment?
- Who received it?
- When was it transferred?
- What happened if the marriage failed?
- Could it become the subject of litigation?
- What role did the bride's family play?



The 1910 case provides a direct answer to the final stage. When the marriage failed, the bride-price became the object of a legal claim and eventual settlement.

Thus, marriage payments should be studied not only as Islamic legal concepts but also as instruments of family economy and social negotiation.

8. Divorce and Marital Conflict

The practical operation of family law becomes especially visible in divorce disputes.

A document dated 16 October 1916 records a case involving a woman who announced her intention to divorce because the marriage could not be consummated. The resulting conflict became a dispute between the two families and was ultimately handled through legal procedures.

The significance of this case extends beyond the specific reason for divorce.

It demonstrates that:

1. women could become active participants in marital disputes;
2. divorce could produce conflict between wider kinship groups;
3. marital disputes could enter formal legal processes;
4. qadis played an important role in adjudicating such conflicts.

The documentary evidence further demonstrates that the resolution of family disputes was institutionally plural. Depending on the nature of the claim and the existence of counterclaims, cases could involve representatives of the khan, local authorities, or qadis.

The legal system therefore cannot be understood as a simple hierarchy in which every family dispute automatically went directly to a qadi.

Instead, dispute resolution operated through multiple institutional channels.

9. Family Violence and the Legal Position of Women

Family relations could also involve physical violence.

A document from December 1916 records a complaint concerning a woman who had suffered bodily harm at the hands of her son-in-law. The woman's relative initiated the claim against the husband, and the dispute was subsequently considered according to Islamic law and transferred to qadis.

This case should not be used to establish the frequency of domestic violence in Khiva, since judicial records are inherently selective: they preserve conflicts that entered a legal or administrative process.

Nevertheless, the document is important for understanding the legal possibilities available to families.

The case indicates that physical violence within a family relationship could become a legally articulated claim.

It also demonstrates the importance of kinship networks in protecting vulnerable family members. The woman did not appear in the documentary record as an isolated individual; her relative participated in the legal process.



Kinship could therefore operate in two directions:
as a mechanism of social control and as a mechanism of protection.

10. Children, Guardianship and Inheritance

The intersection of family, inheritance, and child protection is particularly visible in a document dated 30 December 1912.

Following the death of Muhammad Jon, his wife Ayimsun Bika and minor son Quchqar inherited money and a horse. The property was held by Ayimsun Bika's brother, and a dispute subsequently emerged concerning the inheritance. The case was transferred to a qadi, who summoned the parties, employed an oath procedure, and ordered the return of the inheritance and compensation concerning the horse.

This case is significant because it demonstrates that the property interests of a woman and a minor could be articulated as legally recognizable claims.

The case also reveals the relationship between:

widowhood → minor child → inheritance → guardianship → judicial protection.

This is especially important for the history of children.

Rather than assuming that minors were merely passive objects within family structures, the documentary evidence demonstrates that their property interests could become the subject of judicial intervention.

The case therefore contributes to a broader understanding of childhood in Central Asian legal history.

11. Beyond the Modern Concept of “Alimony”

The question of children's material support requires particular methodological caution.

The term “alimony” belongs to a modern legal vocabulary and should not automatically be projected onto the Khiva Khanate.

The documentary evidence does not justify the claim that a legal institution identical to modern statutory child support existed in Khiva.

Instead, the historical analysis should distinguish among:

- maintenance;
- guardianship;
- inheritance;
- property rights;
- family support;
- protection of minors.

The Ayimsun Bika case is especially useful because it demonstrates the protection of property belonging to a woman and a minor child rather than a modern system of periodic post-divorce payments.



Therefore, “alimony” can be used only as a comparative analytical term, not as the historical name of an equivalent institution.

This distinction is important for avoiding anachronistic interpretations of Islamic legal history.

12. Family Rituals and the Social Community

Family relations were also expressed through ceremonies.

Firdaws al-Iqbal contains descriptions of weddings, circumcision ceremonies, wrestling, horse racing, and other public entertainments. The circumcision celebration of Rahmanquli Tura, the second son of Muhammad Rahim Khan I, is particularly significant.

The event was not presented as a private family ceremony. It involved public celebration and entertainment, illustrating how elite family rituals could become social and political events.

Nurboy Jabborov's analysis of Firdaws al-Iqbal likewise identifies wedding, sport, and popular entertainment as important elements of the work's social and literary representation.

The judicial sources provide a complementary perspective.

A dispute concerning qālīng in 1915 involved local community representatives, including elders and katkhudas.

This demonstrates that family relations were embedded in local social institutions.

The family was therefore connected to the community through two major mechanisms: ritual participation and dispute mediation.

13. Family, Genealogy and Dynastic Continuity

The political dimension of family relations becomes clearest in the context of the ruling dynasty.

The genealogical structure of Firdaws al-Iqbal demonstrates that the history of the ruling family was itself a major component of historical writing.

Eltuzar Khan's instruction to Munis to record his ancestry shows that genealogy served a political purpose. The ruler's descent was not simply a matter of personal identity but a means of constructing historical legitimacy.

In this context, the family of the ruler had at least four simultaneous dimensions:

1. **household** — the domestic family;
2. **kinship group** — relations of descent;
3. **dynasty** — continuity of ruling lineage;
4. **political institution** — legitimacy and succession.

The birth of a descendant within a ruling household could therefore acquire significance far beyond biological reproduction.

This relationship can be conceptualized as:

reproduction → succession → dynastic continuity → political legitimacy.

Such a perspective makes family history directly relevant to the political history of the Khiva Khanate.



14. The Plural Legal Environment of Family Relations

One of the most important conclusions emerging from the combined sources concerns the legal environment in which family relations operated.

It would be misleading to describe Khivan family law as simply “Sharia law” in a narrow sense.

The documentary evidence demonstrates interaction among:

- Islamic legal norms;
- qadi courts;
- khan's administrative representatives;
- local officials;
- community elders;
- katkhudas;
- customary practices;
- negotiated settlements.

Sartori and Abdurasulov explicitly challenge the tendency to portray Islamic law as a self-contained field independent of state officials. Their work demonstrates the importance of understanding Sharia as part of governance in Khorezm.

The 1915 qālīng dispute, for example, involved local elders and katkhudas.

The 1916 divorce case, by contrast, moved into a qadi-based legal framework.

The 1910 marital dispute demonstrates the role of the khan's administrative apparatus in dealing with a conflict arising from an incomplete marriage arrangement.

These cases indicate that family disputes could move across institutional boundaries.

Consequently, the legal history of the family should be understood as a plural and negotiated legal field, rather than as the mechanical application of a single legal code.

15. Discussion

The combination of Firdaws al-Iqbal with judicial documentation makes it possible to reconsider the place of the family in Khivan history.

The two source types have different evidentiary characteristics.

Firdaws al-Iqbal provides a genealogical and narrative perspective. It reveals how family, kinship, ancestry, childbirth, cultural transmission, and dynastic continuity were represented in historical writing.

Judicial documents provide a conflict-centered perspective. They reveal what happened when marriage arrangements failed, property was disputed, divorce was sought, violence occurred, or inheritance became contested.

Neither source category can independently provide a complete history of family life.

The chronicle does not systematically record ordinary households.



Judicial documents disproportionately preserve disputes rather than harmonious relationships.

Their combination, however, produces a much more sophisticated historical picture.

The narrative evidence establishes the structural importance of kinship, while judicial evidence demonstrates the institutional consequences of kinship.

For example, the Agahi case shows how biological kinship could develop into educational and cultural transmission.

The Ayimsun Bika case shows how family relationships could generate property claims requiring judicial intervention.

The 1910 case demonstrates the economic consequences of marriage negotiations.

The 1916 divorce case shows that marital breakdown could become an institutional dispute.

The 1916 violence case demonstrates that kinship could mobilize legal protection.

These examples collectively support the argument that the family functioned as a central intersection of social relations.

16. The Main Functions of the Family in Khivan Society

The combined evidence allows eight principal functions of the family to be identified.

16.1. Reproductive function

The birth of Agahi illustrates the biological continuation of family lines.

16.2. Genealogical function

Kinship determined how individuals were historically identified and socially positioned.

16.3. Educational function

The relationship between Munis and Agahi demonstrates transmission of knowledge through kinship.

16.4. Economic function

Marriage involved qālīng, mahr, wedding expenses, and other property relations.

16.5. Legal function

Family disputes could become formal claims involving qadis and administrative authorities.

16.6. Protective function

Relatives could defend the interests of women and minors.

16.7. Cultural and ritual function

Weddings and circumcision ceremonies connected families to broader communities.

16.8. Dynastic function

Among ruling families, biological continuity became linked to political succession and legitimacy.

These functions should not be understood as separate categories. They frequently overlapped.

For example, inheritance was simultaneously a family, economic, legal, and genealogical phenomenon.



Marriage was simultaneously a religious, economic, social, and legal process.

The birth of a ruler's son was simultaneously a biological, familial, genealogical, and political event.

This interconnectedness is precisely why the family should be treated as a historical institution rather than merely a domestic category.

17. Conclusion

The analysis of Firdaws al-Iqbal together with judicial documents of the Khiva Khanate demonstrates that family relations between the late eighteenth and early twentieth centuries formed a complex social, economic, legal, cultural, and political system.

The evidence leads to several conclusions.

First, family relations were deeply embedded in kinship and genealogy. Individuals were frequently represented through their relationships with fathers, brothers, ancestors, and descendants.

Second, marriage was both a social and legal institution. Engagement, marriage contracts, qāling, mahr, wedding ceremonies, and related financial arrangements could generate legally significant obligations.

Third, the economic dimension of marriage was substantial. The 1910 case demonstrates that bride-price could become the subject of a legal claim when marriage failed to take place.

Fourth, divorce was not simply a private decision between spouses. The 1916 case demonstrates that marital breakdown could generate conflict between families and enter judicial procedures.

Fifth, family violence could become a legally articulated dispute. The 1916 case involving bodily harm demonstrates that relatives could seek legal protection for an injured woman.

Sixth, women and minors could possess legally recognizable property interests. The Ayimsun Bika case is particularly significant because it shows judicial intervention concerning inheritance belonging to a woman and her minor son.

Seventh, family disputes were handled through multiple institutional channels. Qadis, representatives of the khan's administration, local officials, elders, and katkhudas could all participate in dispute resolution.

Eighth, the family of the ruling elite had an additional political function. Genealogy and descendants were closely connected to the continuity of the Qungrat dynasty and the legitimacy of political authority.

The article therefore proposes a broader conceptualization of family in the history of the Khiva Khanate:

Family was a multifunctional social institution in which reproduction, kinship, education, property, law, community relations, cultural transmission and dynastic power intersected.

This conclusion also has methodological implications.



The history of the Khivan family cannot be reconstructed exclusively through normative Islamic law, nor can it be reduced to isolated judicial disputes. A more complete picture emerges when narrative, genealogical, legal, and documentary sources are read together.

Furthermore, modern legal categories should not be imposed directly on the historical evidence. In particular, the modern institution of “alimony” should not be assumed to have existed in identical form. Historical mechanisms of maintenance, guardianship, inheritance, and protection of children's property should instead be reconstructed within their own legal and social context.

Ultimately, the study demonstrates that the history of family in Khiva offers a productive bridge between social history, legal history, gender history, genealogy, and the history of political power.

References

1. Abdurasulov, U., & Sartori, P. (2017). Take Me to Khiva: Sharīʿa as governance in the oasis of Khorezm (nineteenth–early twentieth centuries). *Islamic Law and Society*, 24(1–2), 20–60. DOI: 10.1163/15685195-02412p02.
2. Abdurasulov, U., & Sartori, P. (2020). Take Me to Khiva: Sharīʿa as governance in the oasis of Khorezm (nineteenth century–early twentieth). In P. Sartori & D. Ross (Eds.), *Sharīʿa in the Russian Empire: The Reach and Limits of Islamic Law in Central Eurasia, 1550–1917* (pp. 328–362). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. DOI: 10.1515/9781474444316-012.
3. Bartold, V. V. (1964). *Sochineniya*. Vol. II, Part 2: *Raboty po otdelnym problemam istorii Sredney Azii*. Moscow: Nauka.
4. Jabborov, N. (2021). “Firdavsu-l-iqbol” – Ogahiyning badiiy-tarixiy nasrdagi ilk tajribasi. *Oltin Bitiglar – Golden Scripts*, 3, 38–66.
5. Ivanov, P. P. (1958). *Ocherki istorii po Sredney Azii*. XVI – seredina XIX vv. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
6. Munirov, Q. (1960). *Munis, Ogahiy va Bayoniyning tarixiy asarlari*. Tashkent: Fan.
7. Munirov, Q. (2002). *Xorazmda tarixnavislik (XVII–XIX va XX asr boshlari)*. Tashkent: Gʻafur Gʻulom nomidagi Adabiyot va sanʼat nashriyoti.
8. Munis, Shermuhammad, & Ogahiy, Muhammad Rizo. (2010). *Firdavs ul-iqbol*. N. Jumaxoʻja, S. Roʻzimboyev, & A. Axmedov (Eds.). Tashkent: Oʻqituvchi.
9. Munis, Shir Muhammad Mirab, & Agahi, Muhammad Riza Mirab. (1999). *Firdaws al-Iqbal: History of Khorezm*. Translated and annotated by Yuri Bregel. Leiden–Boston–Köln: Brill.
10. Oʻrinboyev, A., Xorikova, T., Isogay, K., Fayziyev, T., & Joʻrayeva, A. (2001). *Katalog khivinskikh kaziiskikh dokumentov XIX–nachala XX vv.* Tashkent–Kyoto: International



Research Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Kyoto University.

11. Sartori, P. (2010). Colonial legislation meets Sharī'a: Muslims' land rights in Russian Turkestan. *Central Asian Survey*, 29(1), 43–60.

12. Sartori, P. (2016). *Visions of Justice: Sharī'a and Cultural Change in Russian Central Asia*. Leiden: Brill.

13. Sartori, P., & Abdurasulov, U. (2020). *Seeking Justice at the Court of the Khans of Khiva (19th–early 20th Centuries)*. Leiden–Boston: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004427907.

14. Spies, O. (1991). Mahr. In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., Vol. VI, pp. 78–80. Leiden: Brill.

15. Vohidov, Sh., Bekchanov, I., & Polvonov, N. (2010). *Munis va Ogahiy. Firdavs ul-iqbol*. Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi.