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INTRODUCTION

The term "Central Asia" has been ascribed different meanings in different parts of the world and by different scholars, and the lack of consensus requires a definition each time the term is used. Not only non-specialists, but very often scholars specializing in various aspects of Asian history and anthropology lack a clear idea of the meaning of this term. The term itself may be interpreted differently in different European languages. In English, "Central Asia" would often mean the entire Inner Asian heartland, from the Ural River and the Caspian Sea in the west to Manchuria in the east, although just as often it would be used in a more restricted sense, being limited to the western part of the area. It is mainly in this more restricted sense that the term "Asie centrale" has been used in French, while the eastern part of the Inner Asian heartland is usually referred to as "Haute Asie". A similar distinction has usually been made in Russian, but here the term "Центральная Азия" (Central Asia) is applied to the eastern part of the Inner Asian heartland (Haute Asie), while the western part is called "Средняя Азия" (literally, Middle Asia). The German usage generally coincides with the Russian one, although the distinction between "Mittelasien" (i.e., "Средняя Азия") and "Zentralasien" (i.e., "Центральная Азия") is not drawn so consistently. Turkish and Arabic usage also coincide with (or follow?) the Russian (resp., "Orta Asya" and "Asiya al-Wustā"), while in Persian the terms "Āsiyā-yi Markāzī", "Āsiyā-yi Miyānā" and "Āsiyā-yi Wustā" are used indiscriminately.

Since the Russian annexation of a greater part of the Central Asian territory, completed by 1885, "Central Asia" in the Russian usage became associated with the Russian possessions in Central Asia, alternatively called "Turkestan", or "Russian Turkestan" (also Western Turkestan, to distinguish it from both Chinese, or Eastern, Turkestan and Afghan Turkestan). After the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and especially after the "national delimitation" of Central Asia of 1924, the term "Central Asia" in Soviet literature was used in a yet more restricted sense, being applied only to the Soviet republics of Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, and Kirghizia, while Kazakhstan was excluded from it and considered a separate entity. Many western scholars followed the Soviet practice, but during the last two decades or so there has developed an opposite tendency: to expand the meaning of the term "Central Asia", to include such regions as the Volga basin (esp. the region of the Volga Tatars) and Azerbaijan.

Soviet scholars, following the official practice of distinguishing between Central Asia and Kazakhstan, at the same time used these two terms as an almost inseparable pair ("Central Asia and

1 The term "Asia" itself is very often used — at least in the English-speaking world — to denote not the entire Asian continent, but only the eastern and southern parts of it, excluding the "Near East" or the "Middle East", with "Central Asia" sometimes included into the latter, but sometimes falling in-between.

2 This is also how Russian authors themselves translate this term into English, which is not an adopted English practice. About the use of the terms "Средняя Азия" and "Центральная Азия" in Russian literature see more in: A.G. Shprintsin, "Oboznanienie toponimov "Sredniaia Aziii" i "Tsentral'naia Azii" v razlichnykh iazykakh," in: SNV, vol. 18, 1976, p. 281-287.

3 About the origin and the transformations of the meaning of the term "Turkestan" see W. Barold, in EI, vol. 4, 1934, s. v. "Turkistan". Strictly speaking, "Russian Turkestan" as a political term was limited only to the territory of the governorate-general of Turkestan and did not include either the khanates of Bukhara and Khiva or the Kazakh region under the jurisdiction of the governors of Semipalatinsk, Akmolinsk, Turgay, and Uralak.

4 To some extent, this was a result of the identification of Central Asia with "Turkestan" and its population with Turks (with a total disregard for the Tajiks, both at present and in the past), actively promoted by the members of the "Turkestan" émigré communities in the West; therefore the Turks of the Volga basin and the Caucasus would become a part of greater "Turkestan". But such an approach has also been shared by some western scholars studying the Volga Tatars and Azerbaijan, probably for practical purposes.
Kazakhstan"), recognizing that, together, they form one single "historico-cultural region". Moreover, during the last decade Soviet historians have stressed the fact that Eastern Turkestan has also been an integral part of the same "ethno-cultural and historical region".

It seems, indeed, that the use of the expression "Central Asia", considered by many as "imprecise", is justified if we explain it not in terms of physical geography, nor on the basis of the contemporary political map of Asia, but rather as a distinct cultural and historical entity. Approached from this standpoint, Central Asia can be defined as the western, Turko-Iranian, part of the Inner Asian heartland, whose indigenous population consisted of various Iranian peoples, most of whom have been by now Turkicized, and whose growing Turkic population has to various degrees assimilated its indigenous Iranian culture; in geographical terms, it spreads from the Caspian Sea and the Ural river basin in the west to the Altai mountains and the Turfan oasis in the east, and from the limits of the Inner Asian steppe belt in the north to the Hindukush and the Kopet-Dagh in the south. Beginning with the 8th century A.D., it was gradually incorporated into the Islamic world. Being a part of the Islamic world, it shares many cultural features with its Islamic neighbors in the south and the west, but it combines them in a unique blend with the features which it shares with the world of the Inner Asian nomads. It belongs, thus, to both these worlds, being a border area for each of them.

The study of the history and culture of Islamic Central Asia, which is the subject of this bibliography, has until recently not been well developed in the West (with the exception of Eastern Turkestan), being almost an exclusive preserve of Russian and Central Asian scholars, due mainly to the inaccessibility of the region and of the sources for its study to westerners. In the post-WWII period, an interest has developed in the West in the contemporary affairs of Central Asia and its history under the Soviet regime, and this interest has produced a substantial body of literature. But the history and culture of the region before its annexation by Russia and later incorporation into the Soviet Union are still insufficiently known in the West, not only to the public at large, but also to the scholarly community; western scholars specializing in pre-Soviet Central Asia are very few, and those specializing in related fields, like historians or anthropologists dealing with other parts of the Islamic world, lack essential background in Central Asia. The situation can improve slowly if the resources needed for scholarly research become more accessible. Besides better access to such primary sources as archival documents and manuscript collections (found almost exclusively in the former Soviet Union), this will require also better access to bibliographical information.

A classified and comprehensive bibliography of the history and culture of Central Asia has not existed so far. In Russia, the first attempt at compiling a list of publications related to Central Asia was made by the renowned Russian bibliographer V.I. Mezhov, who in 1878-1888 published indexes to his *Turkestanskii sbornik*. There were a few other attempts at compiling a bibliography of all of Cen-

---

5. Recently, after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, both Russian and Central Asian scholars began to use the term "Центральная Азия" as an equivalent of the former pair "Средняя Азия и Казахстан", while the term "Средняя Азия" is still mostly being limited to Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, and Kirghizia.

6. See, for instance, B.A. Litvinskiĭ — preface to *Vostochnyi Turkestan i Sredniaia Azia: Istoria. Kul’tura. Sviazii*, Moscow, 1984, p. 4. Litvinskiĭ still formally distinguishes between "Central Asia" and "Eastern Turkestan", but at the same time shows that they form a single entity from the historical and cultural point of view.


8. *Turkestanskii sbornik sochinenii i istoet, otnosishchikhsia do Srednej Azii voobshche i Turkestanskogo kraia v osobennosti: Systematicheskie i zhurnaly uiechatel' sochinenii i istoet na russkom i inostrannych iazykah*, vol. 1-3, what is actually a bibliography, but only an index to this collection.
tral Asia, but none of them was very successful. After the "national delimitation" of Central Asia, the bibliographies of the entire Central Asia were replaced by the bibliographies of separate regions, usually union republics (Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, etc.). Each of these republics, being an artificial administrative creation, tried to assert its historical rights by tracing its origin as far back as possible, as a rule to prehistoric times, and projecting the history of the republic upon a much wider territory. This caused a considerable overlapping of these bibliographies, but none of them can be regarded as a bibliography of Central Asia, nor do they present the material with any degree of completeness, being especially weak in their coverage of works in languages other than Russian.

In the West, there appeared only two works that could be considered general bibliographies of Central Asia. The first one, by M.A.Czaplicka, is still sometimes used in the West, despite its glaring deficiencies, which make it, in the words of D.Sinor, "inutilisable". The second one, by R.A.Pierce, is a good introductory bibliography for the study of Central Asia in the 16th-20th centuries, but, as the author himself wrote in his preface, "it is not a finished effort, but preliminary to a more comprehensive list to be issued at a later date"; unfortunately, no such list has been issued.

The lack of a satisfactory comprehensive bibliography of Central Asia may seem to be somewhat compensated by the existence of numerous partial bibliographies. It is impossible to mention all of them here. Below only a brief survey of the main types of these works will be given.

Regional bibliographies have already been mentioned above. In addition to the bibliographies of all five former Soviet republics of Central Asia, as well as Karakalpakia, published at different times and greatly varying in their scope, both chronologically and topically, two bibliographies of Eastern Turkestan and bibliographies of several smaller regions should be mentioned. Another type is bibliographies by disciplines, such as archeology, anthropology (ethnography according to Russian terminology), folklore, etc. (their lists are found in the present bibliography, p. 2030 ff.). Almost none of them includes Central Asia in its entirety; rather, each deals with separate republics or peoples, and all of them are limited to material in Russian and Central Asian languages. The best bibliography of this type is the bibliography of Soviet archeological literature, which includes substantial sections on Central Asia. The most common type of partial bibliographies of Central Asia are topi-

9 The earliest of these actually preceded the work of Mezhov (N.V.Dmitrovskii, "Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' sochinenii o Srednej Azii, napechatannykh v Rossii na russkom izyke s 1692 po 1870 g.," in MSTK, vol. 3, 1874, p. 181-251), but it was limited only to works in Russian. The next one was published by V.D.Gorodetski and M.N.Gorodetskiia (Bibliografia Turkestana, vol. 1, Tashkent, 1913; no further volumes were published, but it was supplemented by A.V.Pankov and E.K.Betger in ITORGO in 1914-1917). After the revolution of 1917, only one more general bibliography of Central Asia was published (N.A.Burov and A.A.Garrtiskii, Kratkii bibliograficheskii ukazatel' literatury po Turkestana, Tashkent, 1924).

10 The first such regional bibliography was published, however, already in 1888 (Z.M.Penkina, Zakaspiiskii krai: Sistematicheski sbornik bibliograficheskikh ukazanii knig i statei o Zakaspiiskom krae i sopredel'nykh stranakh, StPbg).

11 The Turks of Central Asia in history and at the present day: An ethnological inquiry into the Pan-Turkian problem, and bibliographical material relating to the early Turks and the present Turks of Central Asia, Oxford, 1918 (the bibliography forms the second half of the book, p. 121-234).


14 See the complete list in the respective section of this bibliography, p. 2021 ff.


17 For instance, Western Uzbek (1956); Samarkand and its region (1935).

18 Sovetskaia arkeologicheskia literatura: Bibliografia; 8 volumes were published until 1989, covering the period from 1918 to 1981; no continuation seems to be forthcoming. Works on "Central Asia and Kazakhstan" are not further subdivided here by regions.