THE HISTORY OF MAIMANA IN NORTHWESTERN AFGHANISTAN
1731-1893

BY
JONATHAN L. LEE

Reprinted from
IRAN XXV 1987

Published by
THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PERSIAN STUDIES
The town of Maimana is at present the provincial capital of the Afghan province (wilāyat) of Fāryāb (Maps 1–2). In 1958 it was estimated to contain 30,000 persons (Huchlum, 1958), but by 1978 the population had risen and was probably over 40,000, with around 1,000 shops in four main bazaars. The present regional boundaries of Fāryāb also include the town and district of Andkhoi, but this is a recent arrangement, since historically Maimana and Andkhoi were ruled by separate dynasties which were established in control of these regions by Nādir Shāh.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Maimana, under its Uzbek Wāli, was the paramount town of the Chahār Wilāyat (“Four Provinces”) which also included Shibarghān, Sar-i-Pul and Andkhoi. Although each region was independently ruled by Uzbek or Afshar dynasties, which frequently squabbled amongst themselves, when faced with an external threat they sank their differences and worked together to maintain their independence under the leadership of Maimana.
Maimana’s importance in Turkistan (sic., in this context, the largely ethnically Turkish region of northern Afghanistan lying to the south of the Oxus and the modern border with the USSR) was also due to its strategic position. Situated on the north-western edge of the Tur-Band-i-Turkistan (or Turkistan mountains), it lay across the main trade route between Persian Khurasan, Turkistan and Transoxiana. It also had strong links with Merv, and with Kabul through Ghur and Bamiyan. Its citadel guarded the northern entrance to Badghis and at the same time controlled access to Turkistan from the south-west. Consequently, Maimana plays an important role in the history of Turkistan, and on several occasions was responsible for indirectly influencing events much further afield.

Maimana’s origins are obscure, as little archaeological survey work or excavations have been undertaken in the immediate area. Dupree (1970: 161ff) found lithic and ceramic materials from the Middle Palaeolithic and late Neolithic-Bronze Age, in a cave near Bilcheragh in Gurziwan (Map 2), and early Iron Age ceramics (late second to early first millenium B.C.) were recovered from the citadel mound in the centre of Maimana (Ball, 1982: 1: 178). It is only in the Islamic era that the town assumes any character, under its former name, al-Yahudiyya or al-Yahudiyyan, the city of the Jews. In the tenth century A.D. this town was the second most important of the area, and was the residence of the Malik of Guzgän (Minorzky, 1970: 107). During this period, the region of Guzgän (or Jūzjān), now known by the name of Gurzīwān, was the seat of the native Farighūnid dynasty. It would appear that until the Mongol conquest of Turkistan in the thirteenth century the city of Fārīyāb overshadowed all other towns, and was the trading and administrative centre of Western Turkistan. Once this town had been
destroyed by the Mongols, along with the network of hill and cave fortresses in Gharchistan and Gurizwan, a change in the settlement patterns of the region appears to have occurred. These fortresses and towns were not generally rebuilt, but there was need for some central meeting and gathering grounds for the Mongol, and later Uzbek, horsemen, where they were near enough to raid into the settled areas of Herat and Khurasan, and yet sufficiently far away to pre-empt a surprise attack. The valley of the Maimana river offered both these advantages, as well as access to the pasturages of Bādghis and Gurizwan, and consequently Maimana and other smaller towns in Bādghis became centres of tent-dwelling Mongol and Turko groups, who gradually began to cultivate the fertile Loess chah soils, and at a later date involved themselves with mercantile activities of all sorts.

Uzbek involvement in Maimana commenced under the Shaibanid Muhammad Khān, who by the beginning of the sixteenth century had begun to send his forces into Fāryāb and Maimana. In 1605 Maimana's governor was a certain Tahir Bi, who ruled for the Wāli Muhammad, who defeated the Uzbeks at Aχmar, to the south of Maimana (map 2). By 1611 we read of an Uzbek ruler actually in Maimana, and Uzbek influence continued to expand in Turkistan generally throughout the century. Nadir Shah's conquest of Herat in 1731 brought Maimana under his control, as he sent a detachment of troops to subdue the region (Lockhart, 1939: 53). Uzbeks also formed a major part of his army, but on his assassination in 1747, these Uzbek troops returned to their Turkistan homelands whilst the Afghans established Ahmad Shah Durrani as their leader.

The modern history of Maimana must really be considered to start from the conquest of the region by Nadir Shah, and the subsequent appointment by Ahmad Shah of Hájjí Khān Mīngi, as his governor in Maimana. According to Conolly's report on Maimana, written in 1810, Hájjí Khān was made governor of both Balkh and Maimana as a reward for faithful service to Ahmad Shah. Hájjí Khān had served in Nadir's army under Ahmad, and enlisted the patronage of his master to secure for himself a lucrative position. However, Conolly's report is inaccurate in several ways when compared to more contemporary sources. The Tarikh-i Ahmad Shāh of Mahmud al-Husaini confirms that Hájjí Beg, along with other tribal leaders and notables from Balkh and Turkistan, came to Ahmad Shah's court to ask for favours and to complain about the exactions of Rahim Khan Bukharay, the Musa of Turkistan. He appears to have received the title of Wāli-i Balkh at this period, and from henceforth was known as Hájjí Khān in honour of his new status. He was also given the title of Sāhib-i Ikhṭiār, or Chief Collector of Taxes, for Turkistan, but the military power was invested in another person, ‘Atā’ Ālāh Khān Turkman. At the same time, a campaign was launched to re-establish Ahmad Khan's control over Turkistan, which included Chichakku, Maimana and Andkhoi. The area was finally reported subdued in 1741: 1751, but although Hájjí Khān is called Wāli of Balkh for a short time after, it appears he was replaced as Wāli only allowed to administer the taxes of the Turkistan region, with Maimana as his provincial seat (Mahmud, 1974: 128, 167).

Hájjí Khān was far from being an ideal ally of Ahmad Shah. The Tarikh reports him as being frequently in rebellion, and he was noted for his exactions and oppressions in respect of realising the revenues (Mahmud, 1974: 353fl). After many complaints, Ahmad Khan appointed a judicial investigator or Danūghā Adālat, though Hájjí Khān and his allies managed to frustrate his efforts to bring him to heel. Instead, he and his confederates supported a Bukharan invasion of Aqcha and forced Ahmad Khan's forces to retire on Balkh (Mahmud, 1974: 355fl, 514fl). Although a nominal ally of the Afghan ruler, Hájjí Khān was essentially involved in furthering his own interests and that of the Turkmans and Uzbeks at the expense of the Afghans at Balkh. It is clear that, although Hájjí Khān may have been Wāli of Balkh for a short time after 1751, his main involvement in this area was as the tax collector, and that his actual governorship was based on Maimana. This is consistent with the geography of Turkistan, too, as it is difficult to see how Hájjí Khān could have been the actual governor of both Maimana and Balkh, given the numerous petty states, such as Aqcha, Shibarghān, Andkhoi and Sar-i-Pul which lay between them. As the Tarikh informs us of separate rulers of Andkhoi and Shibarghān, it is perhaps misleading to think of him as the actual civil governor of Balkh. Had he been so, he would have doubtless lived in the town.

Conolly, although he gives no dates, lists a series of periods of time for the reigns of Hájjí Khān's immediate successors. He claims that Hájjí Khān died before Ahmad Shah, i.e. before 1773, and was
succeeded by his son Jan Khan. The *Timur* mentions a certain Shah Nazar Khan (op. cit., 516ff.) as being the son of Hajji Khan Mingi, who as his representative at peace negotiations would have doubtless been the heir. Whether Shah Nazar died before his father is not known, and we have to rely on Conolly's report that Jan Khan was the next ruler. Ahmad Shah Durranii died in 1773, and was succeeded by his son, Timur Shah, who gradually lost control of Turkistan with the exception of Balkh. Maimana continued to send in tribute in cash and kind, according to Serwar, and was comparatively prosperous. However, at this period Maimana controlled a larger area of territory than it did in the nineteenth century, as it included Sar-i-Pul in the east and probably Bala Murghab to the southwest.

Conolly informs us that Jan Khan lost control of Balkh at some point during Timur Shah's reign. We have seen that even Hajji Khan did not have civil control over Balkh, and we assume that it was the right and ability to collect the revenues of the Balkh area which was lost to his son. This event undoubtedly occurred in 1789, when Balkh revolted against Timur Shah at the instigation of the Amir of Bukhara (Vampré, 1873: 356; Dupree, 1978: 344). Although a treaty was eventually patched up between Timur and the Amir, the real authority in Balkh lay with the Uzbeks and Bukhara. Timur Shah still had the right to appoint a governor to the town, but the terms of the agreement permitted the local people to choose their own nominee, restricted his retinue to a mere handful and refused him the rights to raise any revenue by taxation. As a consequence, Balkh was virtually free to pursue its own interests without Afghan control, and the reluctance of Afghan officials to accept the position of Wali of Balkh was a subject of considerable mirth throughout Turkistan (Ferrier, 1858: 191ff.).

Conolly's report on the history of Maimana was very extensively used by the Political and Secret Office in India when it came to writing about the earlier period of Maimana's history, and using the information which he gave on the span of individual ruler's reigns, a chronology was developed which is in fact quite inaccurate. These tables took no account of more contemporary reports, such as those by Ghulam Serwar (1793–5) and Edward Stirling in 1828–9. This is quite surprising, since Serwar's report is filed in the Records of the East India Company and was available; and though Stirling was never asked to submit a report, Calcutta had only itself to blame since he was employed by the Civil Branch of the service and was under the impression, later to be refuted, that his travels in Turkistan were officially sanctioned by the Government. Using the information supplied by these two individuals, we discover than Jan Khan was still alive in 1795 and did not die in 1790. Rahim Khan, who succeeded him, was assumed to have been killed in 1798, but Stirling states in 1828 that Rahim's son, 'Ali Yar Khan, was at the most twenty-four or twenty-five years old and therefore could not have been born before 1803–4. Consequently, his father's death can only be placed at the earliest in ca. 1804. Conolly also claimed that 'Ali Yar Khan "died fourteen years ago", which would give us a date of 1826 for the end of his reign. However, Stirling visited Maimana in November 1828, and 'Ali Yar Khan was still alive, so Mizrâb Khan could not have reigned as long as Conolly thought. Burns states in 1838 that Mizrâb had reigned "some six years", which would give us the date of 1831–2, which is consistent with Stirling's Journals, and would place the death of 'Ali Yar around 1830. Using the information of Serwar, Stirling and Burns, it is still possible to reconcile their accounts with Conolly's estimates for the reigns of individual rulers in Maimana, provided we dismiss the later and inaccurate dating used by Wheeler (1869), MacGregor (1871) and the *Afghanistan Gazetteer* (1895). The following revised chronology and the line of succession in Maimana, from Hajji Khan to the removal of the last of Maimana's hereditary Walis, also shows the "official" dates as given by British Indian sources from the last century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler's name and comments</th>
<th>Reign (Conolly)</th>
<th>&quot;Official&quot; dates</th>
<th>Revised dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajji Khan Mingi: died naturally (?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1751–ca. 1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Khan, son of Hajji Khan: died naturally (?)</td>
<td>commenced prior to Timur Shah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1773–ca. 1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest son of Jan Khan: deposed and blinded</td>
<td>not long, if at all</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ca. 1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim Khan, son of Jan Khan: murdered</td>
<td>&quot;some years&quot;</td>
<td>1790–1798</td>
<td>1795–ca. 1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad Khan, another son of Jan Khan: murdered</td>
<td>&quot;ten or twelve&quot;</td>
<td>1798–1810</td>
<td>1804–1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali Yar Khan, son of Rahim Khan: d. of cholera</td>
<td>&quot;sixteen years&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1810–1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Regent, murdered</td>
<td>&quot;died 11 yrs. ago&quot;</td>
<td>1810–1826</td>
<td>1814–1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Regent, murdered</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud Khan, son of Ahmad Khan: poisoned</td>
<td>&quot;five or six months&quot;</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1830–1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this point, Conolly’s chronology becomes redundant, and there is contemporary evidence for all of the following dates, which are generally agreed to be accurate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule, etc.</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mizâb Khan, half-brother of Maimana; poisoned</td>
<td>1831–1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hukumat Khan, elder son of Mizâb Khan, and Sher Khan, half-brother to Hukumat. Sher Khan deposed 1845–1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hukumat Khan, sole rule; murdered by brother, Husain</td>
<td>1847–1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain Khan, son of Mizâb Khan; deposed by Afghans</td>
<td>1862–1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Governors removed at beginning of Second Anglo-Afghan War</td>
<td>1876–1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilâqâr Khan, son of Hukumat Khan; deposed by Afghans</td>
<td>1879–1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husain Khan, second reign; deposed by Afghans and executed?</td>
<td>1884–1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wâli Muhammad Sharif Khan, son of Husain Khan, deposed after rebellion against Afghan rule</td>
<td>1888–1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Governors in Maimana, which becomes a province of Afghanistan, under direct rule</td>
<td>1893 onwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We return to the chronological events in Maimana from the accession of Jân Khan, son of Hâjjî Khan. Though little is known about the situation in Maimana during the latter part of the eighteenth and early years of the nineteenth century, we are given some details of Maimana’s economy in the information supplied by Ghulam Serwar. Horses and sheep were the main stock items sent to Timûr Shâh, and the expenses and revenues are given as:

- Taxation from land 100,000 rupees
- Wajf or religious endowments 10,000
- Expenses of the “king” 35,000
- Amount sent to Afghan treasury 65,000

The expenses of the Wâli (Jân Khan) are given as 100,000 rupees. The revenues of Balkh at the same period were approximately four times as great. Despite the revenues sent to Timûr Shâh in Kabul, during the 1790s Maimana became virtually independent in respect of internal policy.

Jân Khan died ca. 1795, but his eldest son and heir was deposed and blinded by another son, Rafîm Khan, who reigned until ca. 1801. He had a son called ‘Ali Yâr Khan who was eventually to succeed to the throne of Maimana. However, this did not occur immediately on his death. Rafîm Khan was murdered in his turn by another of his brothers, Ahmad Khan, who managed to maintain his position for some ten years before he too was murdered. These deaths appear to have promoted considerable hatred between the families of the two brothers, Ahmad and Rafîm, and Ahmad’s sons fled to Mazâr-i-Sharif in order to avoid falling into the hands of their uncle’s family.

On the death of Ahmad Khan, Rafîm Khan’s son ‘Ali Yâr Khan was set up as Wâli. As he was a boy of about ten years of age at the time, he was doubtless under the control of the Rafîmî family, who having deposed the murderer of ‘Ali Yâr’s father, saw in this child an opportunity to further their own ends. It was early in ‘Ali Yâr’s reign that Zulfiqâr Shâr Khan, the governor of Sar-i-Pul for the Maimana Khanate, broke away and established his own kingdom around the town, thereby causing considerable loss to the Maimana treasury. Due to the internal strife among the ruling family in Maimana, very little could be done about this defection, though this did not prevent ‘Ali Yâr marrying a daughter of Zulfiqâr Shâr Khan later in his reign, and indeed Zulfiqâr’s sister was ‘Ali Yâr’s mother.

The first European eye-witness account we have of Maimana is that given by Edward Stirling (1797–1873), who was in Maimana at the end of 1828. Prior to his visit, only Izzat Allâh (Meer Izzat Ullah), a British native agent, had actually visited the area, but although he reported extensively on the other Uzbek Khanates such as Andkhoi, his report on Maimana is disappointing, as he does not mention the ruler’s name. Maimana, at the time Izzat Allâh was there (1813), was little more than a “large village”, but was already developing into a commercial centre, and doubtless coinage was now being used instead of the barter employed in the town at the time of Ahmad Shâh. Izzat Allâh’s visit was made just before ‘Ali Yâr succeeded to the rule of the area, Stirling’s visit in 1828 came towards the end of ‘Ali Yâr’s reign; by that time Maimana had a population of ten to fifteen thousand, and new grants of land had been made, which in turn indicates an increased tendency towards a sedentary life style, even in the outlying areas. Bukharan currency was in general use in the town, and Hindu merchants had taken up residence, presumably acting as money lenders for the traders. More than half
the population, however, were tent dwellers, and barter was still in use in the upper Shirin Tagao, around Bilchehāgh. Amongst the produce, grain and various fruits appear to have been the most important, and horses, sheep and goats abounded. There was a weekly bazaar in Maimana. The Khanate stretched from the borders of Audkhoi and the Turkistan desert lands, north of the modern Daulatabād (i.e. Fārāb). To the south the areas around Qarurchak and the Murghāb were semi-independent but had close links with their Uzbek neighbours. In the east, Maimana's borders reached as far as the Mīrzā Wulang pass which is the watershed between the Shirin Tagao and the Sar-i-Pul river systems.

'Ali Yār Khān was generally well spoken of as a ruler, and under him the town had obviously prospered and grown. No doubt the stability which the fourteen years of his reign created assisted trading confidence enormously, aided by the increased traffic in Persian slaves from Khurasan, many of whom passed through Maimana en route to Bukhara and other cities of Transoxiana. During 'Ali Yār's reign two such Persian slaves, from the same family, rose to high office, and indeed, on his death from cholera in 1830, it was a Persian who was made Regent for 'Ali Yār’s “infant” heir. However, this individual did not last long as he grew too self-important, and was soon murdered. The two sons of Aḥmad Khān, who had been living in Māzār-i-Sharīf since their father's death, had moved to Shibargān on the passing of 'Ali Yār Khān, hoping that the situation in Maimana would allow them to return and claim their rights, and it could well have been that a faction loyal to them disposed of the Regent, for the two brothers were invited to return and take control of affairs.

Mīrzāb Khān was the elder of the two, but because he was the son of a Persian slave woman, and thus only half-Uzbek, his younger half-brother, Muhāmmed Khān, was preferred as ruler, and Mīrzāb had to be content with the position of Wazir. Muhāmmed survived for about six months, dying from poison administered by an unknown hand. Mīrzāb took over, and in order to deflect strong rumours that he had had his half-brother removed so that he could rule in his stead, he had a slave girl of 'Ali Yār’s mother tortured, and extracted a confession that she had administered the poison at the instigation of her mistress. This provided an ideal opportunity to exterminate the family of 'Ali Yār and thus remove all rivals to the throne. 'Ali Yār's mother and his infant son were put to the sword, and the child’s mother, the daughter of Zulfiqār Shīr Khān, was placed in the harem of Mīrzāb Khān. As a result of this Zulfiqār Shīr Khān declared war on Mīrzāb, set up another son of Aḥmad Khān, a half-brother to Mīrzāb, and marched his armies to within a few miles of the citadel, but was eventually pushed back by Mīrzāb Khān. Although this war continued until the death of Zulfiqār Shīr in 1840 and beyond, the threat was never as serious as it had been in the first few years of Mīrzāb’s reign.

Mīrzāb ruled from 1831 to 1845, a period of growing external pressure on Maimana with the involvement of Persia, Bukhara, Herat, and later Afghanistan and Britain in the affairs of Turkistan. Mīrzāb had to learn how to “stand with his legs in two boats”, playing one power off against the other, and making token submissions to whoever was most in the ascendancy at the time. The growing interest of the East India Company in the affairs of Central Asia was shown by the mission of Burnes to Bukhara in 1832, and later by the presence of Pottinger during the siege of Herat by the Persians (1837–8). During this siege, a Persian force marched to the Murghāb to subdue a confederacy of Uzbek, Turkman, and Aimaq tribesmen whom Mīrzāb Khān had gathered together to assist Kāmrān and Yār Muhammad at Herat. The Persians defeated Mīrzāb, who retired to the Maimana citadel and eventually was obliged to submit to Persian demands. The possibility of Persian forces marching into Turkistan proper and attacking Balkh caused considerable alarm in Kabul, as well as making the siege of Herat more secure. The threatened invasion never materialized, and although Mīrzāb was obliged to send his son as a hostage to the Persian camp at Herat, the protracted operations before Herat kept the Persian army fully occupied. So much so that in the following year (1838), Mīrzāb was able to send a delegation to the Amir of Bukhara, who had come to Balkh and had replaced the incompetent governor who had allowed the powerful Uzbek ruler of Qunduz, Mūrād Beg, to occupy some of his territory (Gazetteer, 1895-11: 39). The son of the deposed Governor, the Aīshān Uruk, fled to Qunduz and later re-established himself in Aqcha as its ruler. He was to play a major part in the Uzbek wars against the Afghans in the 1850s.
In 1839 Miżrāb was host to Eldred Pottinger. After his successful defence of Herat, Pottinger had been replaced by Major Todd and recalled to Kabul. His journey took him via the northern route, hence through Maimana. His visit came at a critical juncture in Afghanistan's history, when the combined East Indian and Sikh army had captured Kabul, and had replaced Dost Muhammad Khan with Shah Shujā'-al-Mulk (Dupree et al., 1978). A year later, 1840, a further official envoy, Captain Arthur Conolly, was also received in Maimana after crossing the Tir-Band-i-Turkistān via Chaghchérān, the upper Murghāb and Hashtūmin. Both men were anxious to gain Miżrāb Khan's support for British policy, and to prevent him and the other Uzbeks of the Chahār Wilāyat from siding with Dost Muhammad Khan who, ousted from his rule in Kabul, was raising an army in Turkistan (Yapp, 1962). Both Pottinger and Conolly submitted recommendations that Maimana, and indeed the rest of Turkistan, should be annexed to Shah Shujā’s domains. In the short term, Maimana was urged to submit to Yār Muhammad in Herat, whose claim to the right of sovereignty over the Chahār Wilāyat had been supported eagerly by Todd and his superiors.

Pottinger and Conolly's reports give a detailed picture of Maimana at the turn of the decade. Although there were still no regular accounts kept, and everything was left in the hands of an arbitrator (Ferrier, 1857: 202ff.), district governors had been appointed in the Chahar Wilāyat, and in time, the tribes of the region were a dependency of the Wāli of Maimana, but by 1845 they had broken away and become autonomous, and Maimana's border was drawn at Qal'a-yi Wālī (Map 2). This loss of territory cannot be dated specifically, but the disagreements between Ḥukumat Khan and his brother following the death of Miżrāb Khan, which must have weakened the power of Maimana to influence events in these remote regions, may well have given these Aimaq tribes the opportunity to declare their independence.

The death of Miżrāb Khan brought about a change of foreign policy in Maimana. Previously, Maimana had supported Rustam Khan of Shibargān against their mutual enemy Zulfiqār Khan of Sar-i-Pul. Zulfiqār had died in 1840 and had been succeeded by his eldest son Maḥmūd, who struck fear into Uzbek and Aimaq alike (Ferrier, 1857: 225). Under Ḥukumat Khan and Shēr Khan, Maimana shifted from the support of Rustam Khan to siding with Maḥmūd Khan. As a consequence of this, Rustam Khan, who in 1844 had invaded Andkhoi and deposed Ghāzanfar Khan the Afsār ruler, was faced with a combination of Uzbek states which included his former ally, Sar-i-Pul, and Aqcha, with the tacit support of the Mir Wālī at Khūlīn and the Amir of Bukhara, who endorsed Ghāzanfar's claims to Andkhoi. As a consequence, Rustam was deposed for a while, and Maḥmūd took over the running of Shibargān until Rustam Khan was eventually allowed to return from Bukhara where he had been imprisoned, and reclaim his territory (Ferrier, 1857: 202ff.).

By 1847 the political situation in Maimana had again deteriorated. Ḥukumat Khan and Shēr Khan, after jointly ruling the Khanate for two years, were again fighting each other. This gave Yār
Muhammad at Herat a further opportunity to intervene, this time militarily. After subduing the Hazara and Aimaq tribes in the Hari Rud and Murgab areas of Ghur and Badghis, he marched with a strong army across the Murgab to intervene in the affairs of Maimana (MacGregor, 1871: 92). Ḥukumat Khan, despite being the rightful heir to the Maimana throne, was unable to raise sufficient support to oust his brother, and appealed to Yar Muhammad for help. As the ruler of Herat had long desired to control not only the Ghuristan Hilqiyyat but to hold Turkistan as well, he was only too willing to assist. Yar Muhammad’s first objective was Chichaktu (Map 1) which he put to the sword, and this made Ḥukumat Khan hurry to his camp from Maimana to remonstrate with his ally about the harm which his army was doing to his cause and reputation. Having settled the affairs of Chichaktu, the combined Uzbek and Herati armies moved on Shīr Khān’s fortress of Khairābād, on the Maimana-Andkhoi road (Map 2). Faced with superior numbers, Shīr Khān fled, but was later captured. Ḥukumat Khān thereupon assumed control of the whole of Maimana, as a vassal and ally of Yar Muhammad.

Whilst in Khaīrābād, Ḥukumat Khān and Yar Muhammad were visited by Ghazanfar Khān of Andkhoi, who had again been ousted from his possession by his arch-rival Sāfi Khān. In return for an annual tribute, Ghazanfar asked for the allies’ assistance in removing Sāfi Khān, who was immediately ordered to appear before Yar Muhammad or face an attack. Sāfi Khān had little option, and went to Khairābād, only to be imprisoned and replaced by Ghazanfar. The Herat army then marched to Andkhoi, and in order to realise the tribute which Ghazanfar had promised to Yar Muhammad, the army went on an orgy of looting and plundering, stripping the town bare of everything portable and plunged it into a serious economic decline from which it never recovered (Vambéry, 1863: 239).

Yar Muhammad pushed on with his troops to Aqcha with the goal of taking Balkh, but was prevented from conquering it. By this time winter was approaching; the large army was running short of provisions and was beginning to suffer from the cold. Andkhoi was devastated, and was unable to supply the army. Shibarghan also refused to open its gates, and Yar Muhammad, faced with starvation, was incapable by this time of mounting a siege of the town. He ordered his troops to retire on Maimana, but although Ḥukumat Khān was his ally, the people of Maimana, hearing of what had happened to Andkhoi, shut the gates of the city on the Herat army and their own Hādi, forcing Yar Muhammad to take a circuitous route around the town. It was now mid-winter, and snow, ice, wind, and shortage of fuel and fodder decimated the once-powerful force as it struggled across the passes south of Maimana towards Balkh. Thousands of troops and their pack animals perished, and Yar Muhammad’s successes were completely negatived, as news of his defeat by the elements spread throughout Turkistan, leading to revolts and massacres of the Herati garrisons. Thus, by the early months of 1849, Yar Muhammad had nothing to show for his ambitious invasion.

Ḥukumat Khān, now in sole control of Maimana, also took advantage of Yar Muhammad’s weakness and withheld promised tribute, but it was not until the autumn of 1849 that the ruler of Herat was able to mount a further offensive, this time aimed at bringing Maimana to heel. Although his army invested the city and harvested the local produce, they were unable to make an impression on the walls or citadel. The siege dragged on for eleven months until Yar Muhammad replaced his general, who opened negotiations and exacted a reduced tribute from Ḥukumat Khān in return for removing his force to the Murghāb.

By the time this occurred, another invasion of Turkistan was under way, this time in the east. Dost Muhammad Khān, the Amīr of Kabul, had ordered his troops into Turkistan, and by January 1850, Khuhn and Balkh had fallen. Uzbek resistance was fierce, and the Afghan garrison suffered severely from cold and hunger during the first three winters of the campaign since the Uzbeks had refused to supply their army. The Afghans incurred the displeasure of the Amīr of Bukhara, who regarded Balkh and Turkistan as his own sphere of influence. But although on several occasions during the 1850s Bukhara threatened and moved armies to the Oxus, the Amīr never invaded Turkistan in force, and thereby made it inevitable that the Uzbek Khanates of Turkistan would fall one-by-one to the Afghans.

Aqcha finally fell to Dost Muhammad in the early months of 1851 after a bloody and protracted campaign. The Ašḥāṣa Uruk and Sudur, the rulers of Aqcha and Balkh, were exiled to Kabul along with their families, but Shibarghan and the other areas generally remained under their own Uzbek
rulers, who submitted to Dost Muhammad (MacGregor, 1871: 148). In 1854, however a small Bukharan force, led by the deposed Mir Wali of Khulm, entered Shibarghan and Hakim Khan, the son of Rustam Khan, joined in rebelling against Afghan control of Turkistan. It was not until several months later that Afzal Khan, the Afghan governor of Turkistan and son of Dost Muhammad Khan, was able to regain possession of the town. During this rebellion, Maimana actively supported Hakim Khan.

Shibarghan's fall, and the imposition of an Afghan garrison to watch over Hakim Khan's administration of the area, was of great concern to Maimana. In four years, Hukumat Khan had seen a series of Afghan successes that had reduced formerly independent Uzbek states into subject territory. Andkhoi had tendered its submission, and possibly Sar-i-Pul, though the latter was not garrisoned until later in the decade. Of the major Uzbek states in the Chahar Wilayat, Maimana alone remained independent. In an effort to find allies, Maimana turned to Persia and Herat, and in 1855 Persian forces marched into Herat and crossed the Murghab. Hukumat Khan, despite his flirting with a Persian alliance, had not reckoned on a Persian invasion and occupation of Maimana. In four years, Khan, 58 which plunged Afghanistan into a period of civil disorder and unrest. Maimana at the same time had its own traumas, for in the spring of 1862 Hukumat Khan had been brutally slain by his brother Husain Khan, 63 who set himself up as ruler instead of his father. The year of Dost Muhammad's death also saw Vambéry in Maimana. He found the territory had again decreased in size since Ferrier's day; Khairabad in the north was now an Afghan stronghold, and in the south-west Qal'a-yi Wali had been lost and the border was some thirty or forty kilometres nearer Maimana, at Chichaktii. Turkman raids in these outlying areas had also increased considerably. The insecurity of the times was reflected by a strengthening of the Maimana citadel with ditches, a necessary precaution since Husain Khan had gone onto the offensive against Afghan positions in Turkistan which bordered on his domains (Vambéry, 1864: 244ff.). The Khanate's population had risen to 100,000 individuals, about 1,500 houses were to be found in Maimana, three mosques, two madrasas, and a brick-built bazaar, all demonstrating the growth of the town's trade and influence in the region.
Maimana and the Uzbeks of Turkistan played an important part in the civil war of 1863–8. Although Dost Muhammad had nominated Sher ‘Ali as his heir, Afzal Khan rebelled and set himself up as Amīr in Turkistan, and in 1866 he succeeded in defeating Sher ‘Ali and taking over control in Kabul. Sher ‘Ali fled to Qandahār and thence to Herat and Turkistan, where he began to regroup after the Uzbeks had declared in his favour. In return for their support, Sher ‘Ali promised to return the Chahār Wilāyat and other provinces of Turkistan to their hereditary rulers, provided they continued loyal to his cause throughout the war.64 His most loyal Uzbek ally was Husain Khān of Maimana (MacGregor, 1871: 163ff.), who in the winter of 1867–8 escorted Sher ‘Ali through his territory en route to Herat.65 Sher ‘Ali had arranged that the Uzbeks in Turkistan would try and tie down ‘Azīm Khān’s general, ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān, in Turkistan, whilst he would march on Qandahār via Maimana and Herat.66 The success of this vast pincer movement depended on the ability of the forces in Turkistan, but the early weeks of the invasion of Turkistan by ‘Abd al-Rahmān did not augur well for Sher ‘Ali and his Uzbek allies, for by the middle of February Balkh, Āqcha and Shibargān had fallen to ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān,67 and only Maimana lay between him and Herat, Shēr ‘Alī’s stronghold. Both sides knew that if Maimana fell quickly, Sher ‘Ali would be obliged to recall his forces from their advance on Qandahār, and there would be little immediate hope of him regaining possession of his capital. Through a series of negotiating manoeuvres, whereby Husain Khān skilfully held out sufficiently tempting offers to induce ‘Abd al-Rahmān to believe Maimana was on the verge of capitulating, Husain Khān managed to delay an Afghan advance on Maimana for over a month.72 When it became obvious that Maimana was playing for time, ‘Abd al-Rahmān moved his entire army on the town and attempted to storm it, but was repulsed. Consequently, he was obliged to mount a siege, which delayed him even further. Finally, news of the fall of Qandahār to Sher ‘Ali reached him and the Afghan general knew that the only way to oppose Shēr ‘Ali was to march to Herat. To risk withdrawal from before Maimana would imply a defeat and would provoke a general uprising in Turkistan which he would be obliged to quell. At the same time, Husain Khān had also heard from Shēr ‘Ali of his success,73 and prepared himself for the final confrontation. Early on the morning of 17 May 1868, the Afghans attacked the walls of Maimana from all sides, and fierce hand-to-hand fighting took place in the breaches, with women throwing rocks and stones down on the attackers.74 By the evening the Afghans had failed to enter the town, and the next day were obliged to retire on Takhtapul and abandon their march on Herat. Maimana’s brave resistance ensured that Shēr ‘Ali’s army took Kabul without much trouble, and re-established the Amīr on his throne. ‘Azīm Khān and ‘Abd al-Rahmān were obliged to flee to Bukhara until after the death of Shēr ‘Ali in 1879.75

Maimana’s loyalty to Shēr ‘Ali waned after he had taken Kabul, mainly due to the oppressive rule of Ālam Khān, his governor in Turkistan. Despite numerous complaints from all the Uzbek Mīrs, who had been restored to their former territories, Shēr Ali continued to support Ālam Khān since he managed to realise considerably more revenue for the Amīr than previous Wālis had done.76 After a period of coolness, Maimana was found in correspondence with exiles in Bukhara, and the decision was finally made to subdue the territory. In 1875 Nāʿīb Ālam Khān marched a force in excess of ten thousand troops to Maimana, and laid siege to the town (Maitland, 1888:II: 105ff.). After long and fierce resistance, Maimana finally fell to the Afghans on 14 March 1876.77 Husain Khān and his family and property were taken prisoner, and the town given over to loot and pillage in which an estimated 15,000 men, women and children were put to the sword.78 For a while Husain Khān’s life hung by a thread, but he was eventually confined in Kabul under strict surveillance.79 Nāʿīb Ālam also took the opportunity to implicate the other Mīrs of the Chahār Wilāyat in Maimana’s resistance, and deposed them too.80 An Afghan governor, with a large garrison, was given charge of Maimana.81

Maimana was under direct rule by the Afghans until the outbreak of the Second Anglo-Afghan War in 1879. When it became obvious in Kabul that a British invasion was inevitable, the garrisons in Maimana and elsewhere in Turkistan were withdrawn to Herat, Qandahār and Kabul, and the son of Hukumat Khān, Dilāwār Khān, was allowed to control the affairs of Maimana on condition that he would maintain the peace. However, on his arrival in Maimana he appears to have turned on the Afghan garrison, massacred them, and reasserted Maimana’s independence.82 The reappearance of ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān in Turkistan, following the flight and subsequent death of Shēr ‘Ali in Māzar-i-
Sharif in 1879, led to further disturbances in Turkistan in which Maimana was directly involved.\(^3\) ‘Abd al-Rahmān was eventually recognised as Afghanistan’s Amir by General Roberts in July 1880 (Hall, 1981: 19), and Dilawār Khān was, in Maimana, left in control of its affairs until 1884.

In the spring of this year, Ištāq Khān, the Afghan governor of Turkistan, marched on Maimana which had again proved recalcitrant. The memories of the previous conquest were still fresh in the people’s minds, and the unpopularity of Dilawār Khān in the town itself led to the quick and bloodless submission of the area (Merk, 1888). Dilawār Khān was sent to Kabul, and replaced by the former Waļī Ḥusain Khān, but his power was severely reduced, as he had an Afghan governor as well as a military garrison placed in the town. It was during his second reign that the Afghan Boundary Commission (1884–6) was engaged to survey the area, and its work is still regarded as sufficiently authoritative for the main Gazetteers to be reprinted.\(^4\) However, by far the most informative of the Commission’s work is contained in the highly restricted work entitled Reports of the Intelligence Party, the five volumes of which contain the diaries of Major Maitland and Captain Peacocke, reports on the tribes of western Afghanistan and various miscellaneous reports on routes and surveys. Amongst the latter is Merk’s report on Maimana. Both Maitland and Peacocke, as well as Merk and others of the party, visited
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Map. 3. Maimana in 1888, from Peacocke’s Diary.
Maimana, and Peacocke's map of the town is the earliest we have of the town and citadel of Maimana (Map 3). When compared with the town plans of 1949 (Map 4), 1964 (Map 5) and 1973 (Map 6), we can see how much Maimana has expanded and has been re-designed over a hundred years, with the addition of new bazaars, the destruction of the citadel, and the expansion of the residential areas at the expense of agriculture.

The Commission reported extensively on the trade, administration, revenues and geography of the Maimana area. The town itself was reported to have had 4,000 houses, or a population in excess of 20,000 persons, with the total overall estimate of 10,000 families for the whole region (Maitland, 1888: 532f.). It should be remembered that Maimana was still recovering from the effects of the massacre in 1876, and the region under its control had once more been reduced, since Gurziwān and the region known as Bandar in the south, bordering on the middle reaches of the Murghāb, were no longer considered as under Maimana’s control (Maitland, 1888). Maimana had also become ethnically more diverse; the population of the town included not only Uzbeks but Turkmans, Aimaqs, Arabs and Baluch (Maitland op. cit.). In the later years of the 1880s, numbers of Afghans (Pushtuns) were also relocated in the area, and grew in influence and power over the ensuing decades (Tapper, 1973).

Merk (1888: 266) states that the bazaar of Maimana contained 235 shops, with Jewish and Hindu traders amongst them. Merk lists the following as the main items of trade: Bukhara and Mashhad silk, Russian leather, sugar (from France via Russia), Russian paper, English cottons, tea from Bombay, indigo from India, lungis from Peshawar, as well as knives, needles, etc. Wheat, barley, tobacco, pounded mulberries, rice (from Aqcha), cotton, raisins, walnuts and fruit of every description

are given as the main agricultural produce of the area. The main manufactured goods in the area were a coarse sort of cotton and a thick cloth called barak or kurk made of goat’s hair. There is no mention in his report of the famous carpet or karakul industry, and considerable revenue must have been derived from the breeding and sale of sheep and other cattle. He dismisses the horses of Maimana as “miserable specimens”.

In 1888 ‘Abd al-Rahmān’s governor in Turkistan, Ishāq Khān, rebelled and declared himself Aмир of Afghanistan (Khalfin, 1888: 257–8) and in order to encourage the Uzbeks to support his cause, he pledged that the Chahār Wilāyat would be independent of Afghanistan, an announcement received with considerable enthusiasm by the inhabitants of the area (Khalfin, 1888). However, Ḥusain Khān refused to acknowledge Ishāq’s rebellion, and was imprisoned for his pains, but his son, who remained in Maimana, continued to resist all attempts to win him to the rebel’s side. Indeed, he and the Afghan governor in Maimana, who was also loyal to ‘Abd al-Rahmān, sent recalcitrant members of the Afghan army to Herat, where they were executed. On Ishāq’s defeat, Turkistan once more experienced severe reprisals for its rebellion, and prisoners were exiled to Kabul for aiding Ishāq’s cause. Ḥusain Khān did not, however, live to see his loyalty rewarded, as Ishāq executed him before matters were settled in the area. He was succeeded by his son, Muḥammad Sharif, who signed a treaty with ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khān whom he acknowledged as “my king and master”.

Muḥammad Sharif kept the treaty until 1892, when he was ordered by the Aмир to send troops into the Hazārajāt to assist with operations there. The troops rebelled and attacked the Afghan garrison,
but were themselves soon defeated near Almar, and Muḥammad Sharif deposed (Gazetteer, 1895: 221-2). He was sent to Kabul, and Maimana was placed under direct rule from Kabul, and the line of Hāj Khān Mingi ceased to rule the area.

Under the rule of Muhammad Nadir Shah (1929–33), Maimana was made a minor province of Ḥukm-i aʿlā, under a chief administrator (Gregorian, 1969: 298), and it was probably during this period that the remaining Jewish inhabitants left the town either for Persia or to live in Herat or Kabul (Byron, 1937: 294–5; Gregorian, 1969: 429–30). In 1934 Maimana was visited by Robert Byron, who witnessed the construction of a new bazaar of 200 shops being built in the southern part of the town (Byron, 1937: 269ff.); by 1957 a hotel had been built to accommodate foreign guests and the few tourists who ventured to the area (Douglas, 1958) The governor at this time, Ghulām Ḥайдār ʿAdālat, had expended a lot of energy in improving the area, and had begun to encourage local cottage industries.

Maimana in 1978 remained relatively underdeveloped when compared to other areas of Afghanistan which had benefited considerably from foreign aid. At that time, Fāryāb did not have a single kilometre of paved road, and the journey from Andkhoi to Maimana, and from Maimana to the outlying areas was long, arduous and frequently hazardous. The bazaar had grown to around a thousand active shops, though the bazaar to the west of the citadel and central park seemed to be losing out to the more prosperous ones to the north and south. The citadel had been destroyed, and a cinema and teashop had replaced the former Wālī’s palace. The Afghan governor’s residence was next door to the tourist hotel. There was little trace of the former walls of the town. The outlying areas, especially Gurziwān, proved particularly rich in archaeological terms, and several large and unrecorded sites were discovered (Grenet et al., 1980: 81ff.).
In conclusion, it can be generally stated that Maimana's economy has undergone considerable change since the time of Nādir Shāh, as the emphasis of the settlement has moved from the nomadic life style inherited from the Mongol, and more directly, from the Shaibanid Uzbek invasions. The plundering raids into Khurasan gave rise to a slave trade which provided considerable opportunities for enrichment without Maimana's being directly involved with the risks. At the same time, and directly related to this, was the transit trade between various states which passed through Maimana. The growth in the bazaar and in trade also went hand-in-hand with the cultivation and later the irrigation of land, and a trend towards a more sedentary life style can be discerned throughout the nineteenth century. There is still much semi-sedentary farming in the outlying areas, and during the summer many villages in Gurziwān are empty except for older men and the sick, the rest of the community have moved to the summer pastures and pitch their yurts and tents near a convenient source of water. The only true nomads in the area are the Pushtun maldars who are permitted to graze their flocks in designated areas.

Historically, Maimana appears as the most important and strategic area of western Turkistan, and was a major influence in the whole of the area from the time of Nādir Shāh onwards. Generally speaking, its significance in influencing the course of the history of Turkistan and Afghanistan has been more or less completely ignored by modern historians, though during the last century—despite a considerable amount of misinformation about the place—its strategic importance was well-known, so much so that many claims and counter-claims were forwarded by rival powers for the right to control its affairs. Despite this pressure, its Wālīs managed to maintain their own position. The conquest of Herat by Dost Muḥammad Khān in 1863, which isolated Maimana as the only independent state in Turkistan, was the beginning of the end for its rulers. The final conquest was delayed due to the civil war, but once the town had fallen and large numbers of its citizens and soldiery were killed, it had little hope of regaining its independence.

ADDENDUM

Ad Map 3. Since this article was written, an earlier drawing of the citadel of Maimana, done by ʿAbd al-Rahmān Khān, has come to light in the Political and Secret Department Records.
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Connolly, op. cit., p. 17. He passed from Chaghchirgan through the Darra-ya Khargosh ("Hare's valley") to the Zungan valley, Misur, and on to Hashimun.
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Connolly, loc. cit., but he was alive when Pottinger was in Maimana the previous year. Pottinger calls Zulfiqar's eldest son "Muhamad", but Ferrier (1857: 225), who was the only European to visit Sar-i-Pul during the reign, calls him Mahmud.


Taylor, op. cit., fol. 867.

Taylor, op. cit., fol. 868, and others are vague about how far Yar Muhammad managed to march towards Balkh, but it seems certain that he took Aqcha (cf. Ferrier, Caravan Journeys and Wanderings in Persia, Afghanistan, Turkestan and Baluchistan, p. 213).
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CF Translated of Cabul Intelligence up to 16 March 1850, I.O.R.L., ESLB, L/P/S/5/204, no. 6 of 15 May 1850, and other similar reports for the period. In the winter of 1850, the Bukharan Amir had ordered all citizens of Balkh and Tashkurgan to leave the area and take their winter supplies with them, an order which was universally obeyed.
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The siege of Shibargarh by Afghan forces is reported in some detail by the Kabul News Items and other information sent from Kabul. Cf. Abstracts from the Kabul News Letters, 6-25 October 1854, and translation of a letter from Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khán to Dost Muhammad Khán, Balkh, 28 November 1854. I.O.R.L., ESLB, L/P/S/5/222, no. 3, 8 January, no. 13, 8 February 1855.

Afzal Khán to Dost Muhammad Khán, 25 November 1854.

Extracts from the Kabul News, 18 October—15 November 1855. I.O.R.L., ESLB, L/P/S/5/226, fols. 523-34.

Ibid. The Persian nominee was a certain Mirzâ Muhammad Beg "who formerly ruled" Maimana. He may have been a relative of 'Ali Yar Khan's Persian administrators, otherwise there is no record of any Persian ruling Maimana.


Extracts from the Kabul News, 20 January—13 February 1856.

Extracts from a Kabul Newsletter, 18 February—23 March 1856. I.O.R.L., ESLB, L/P/S/5/227, fols. 600-10. Cf. also Wheeler (1869: 78-80) and MacGregor (1871: 153-4) for summaries of these events.


The death of Hukumat Khán is reported in Extracts from the Diary of the Cabul Vakil for the week ending 2 March 1862. I.O.R.L., India, Foreign (Political) Correspondence, P/204/60, fols. 151-2. Cf. also Vambéry (1864: 249); Merk (1888: 263).

Vambéry, loc. cit., says that Hussain Khán was Hukumat's son, but another more contemporary source, Diary of the Cabul Vakil, week ending 2 March 1862, says that he was his brother, as does Merk, loc. cit., who makes the point that the account he had received from the Wâlî's own officials differed from the accepted version. Vambéry is wrong in several respects in his description of the Châhab Wâlidat.

Qâ’l-ya Wâlî, according to Vambéry (1864: 256), had been destroyed by Turkmans two years previously (1861), the inhabitants massacred or sold as slaves, and the place deserted. Turkman raids into areas formerly under Maimana's control continued to intensify right into the 1860s, when the Boundary Commission reported that vast areas of Badghis, Murghâb and Maimana had been completely destroyed.

Extract from the Kabul Diary, 29 April—5 May 1864. I.O.R.L., IP(F)/C/P/204/73, no. 40, pp. 102-3. Afzal Khán also offered the Uzbeks similar terms, but in general they all supported Shér 'Ali unless obliged to submit to Afzal Khán by force of arms.


Afzal Khán had died in September 1867 and had been succeeded by 'Azim Khan. However, it was 'Abd al-Rahmân Khán, son of Afzal Khán, who organized and led the military campaigns against Shér 'Ali and his allies.

'Abd al-Rahmân's campaign in Turkistan receives extensive notice in the Kabul Diaries. Aqcha fell on 14 February 1868, and by 8 March Shibargarh was also subdued. Cf. I.O.R.L., IP(F)/C/P/438 I and ESLB/L/P/S/5/261.

From ca. 8 March to 12 April. He finally arrived outside Maimana on 28 April.


Kabul Diary, 4—8 June 1868, Appendix A. I.O.R.L., IP(F)/C/P/4382/2, no. 191, pp. 167-8 of July 1868.

The siege of Mymenah by Abdur Rahman Khán in May 1868 is one of the great events of modern Afghan History," Sir H. Rawlinson, Memoranda on the frontier of Afghanistan, London, 18 June 1869, Umbrella Papers etc. 1869, I.O.R.L., Political & Secret Dept. Library, L/P/S/20/B17A (these papers are mistakenly listed under Burns, Sir A., but this is an error of classification). The successful resistance of Maimana receives hardly any mention in modern European histories of Afghanistan; they prefer instead to concentrate on the fall of Qandahâr. The latter would never have occurred had not Husain Khán held his ground against overwhelming pressure to capitulate. All the other Uzbek rulers had been subdued, and he could expect little help from them or from Herat, but he remained loyal to Shér 'Ali and ensured his conquest of Qandahâr and Kabul.

The Kabul Diaries through the years 1869—76, when 'Alam Khan died and his family was disgraced, are full of the Murs' complaints about the situation in Turkistan, which was exacerbated by a severe famine caused by the devastation of the civil war. Cf. Kabul Diary, 26—29 June 1874, I.O.R.L., ESLB, L/P/S/5/276, fols. 305.

Kabul Diary, 17—20 March 1876. I.O.R.L., Secret Letters and Enclosures from India, L/P/S/7/7, p. 638.

Estimates of the number of dead vary from 8,000 to 15,000; I have preferred Merk's figures.
80 Ibid. Nāʿīb ʿAlām had persistently asked Shēr ʿAli for permission to depose all the Mīrs of the Chahār Wīlāyat, but Shēr ʿAli had maintained the agreement which he had signed with them in 1867. ʿAlām Khān used the rebellion of Maimana as an excuse to remove them. He was also responsible for the misappropriation of several millions of rupees which were the private fortune of Husain Khān. It was over this issue that he was finally disgraced by the Amir.
82 Gilgit Diary, 18–25 February 1879, I.O.L.R., SLEI, L/PS/7/22, pp. 163–4. Research on the period 1876–93 is as yet only partially completed. The situation of Maimana during the Second Anglo-Afghan War is still uncertain.
83 Journal of Political Events etc., from May 1879, I.O.L.R., SLEI, L/PS/7/22, p. 1307.
84 Adamec (1973) reprinted the main Gazetteers with few alterations, and with the inclusion of photocopied aerial survey maps. The Reports of the Intelligence Party have not been reprinted, and can be found in the I.O.L.R. under Curzon Additional Ms., Ext. 371/1.
85 The mound, however, remains, and the modern park in the centre of the town was the residential quarter of the citadel.
86 Maitland (1888/533) gives the figure as 150 shops.
87 Seven Hindu and eight Jewish shops, according to Merk (1888), Maitland (1888/533) gives the figure as fifteen Hindu and twenty-five Jewish ones.
89 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., fol. 541
92 Ibid., fol. 557
93 Ibid.
94 At that time, there was a paved road under construction between Shibargān, Andkhōi and Maimana, eventually intended to link Balkh with Herat via Maimana. It is unclear how far this road has been completed.