

PAPER

# CROSS-REGIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND DIPLOMACY BETWEEN SARBADARS AND MAWARANNAHR POWERS

Makhmudov Abdumalik Jumanazar ogli <sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> History teacher

\* [abdumalikmahmudov999@gmail.com](mailto:abdumalikmahmudov999@gmail.com)

## Abstract

This study investigates the diplomatic and intelligence connections between the Sarbadar movement of Sabzevar (1336–1381) and the political entities of Mawarannahr (Transoxiana) during the 14th century. Although geographically distinct, both regions faced the common challenge of post-Mongol fragmentation and engaged in meaningful cross-regional interactions. Drawing on Persian chronicles, Timurid sources, and comparative analysis of institutions, the research demonstrates that Sarbadar diplomacy involved formal embassies, intelligence gathering, religious networks, and commercial relationships. Particular attention is given to contacts with Amir Timur's rising state, revealing how diplomacy preceded conquest. The findings contribute to reassessing the Sarbadars as an active regional player rather than an isolated movement.

**Key words:** Sarbadars, Mawarannahr, Amir Timur, diplomacy, intelligence, Central Asia.

## INTRODUCTION

The 14th century in Central Asia was a period of profound political volatility. The collapse of the Ilkhanid Empire left Khorasan fragmented, while the decline of the Chagatai Khanate destabilized Transoxiana. Out of these circumstances emerged the Sarbadars, a movement rooted in rebellion and religious ideology, and Amir Timur, who rose from tribal power struggles to establish a new imperial order. Traditional scholarship often studied these polities separately, leaving their interconnections understudied. This article bridges that gap by examining Sarbadar-Timurid interactions across four dimensions: diplomacy, intelligence, religious networks, and commerce. By integrating these aspects, it seeks to reveal the complexity of 14th-century regional statecraft.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the Sarbadars began with early works that dismissed them as a minor episode in Iranian history. Persian historians such as Āyatī emphasized their religious roots, while Western scholars

like Smith and Melville highlighted their political institutions. Potter later deepened understanding of their reliance on Sufi mysticism. On the Timurid side, scholars including Manz and Bernardini focused on Timur's state-building but rarely linked him to Sarbadar diplomacy. A gap therefore exists: systematic analysis of Sarbadar-Mawarannahr diplomatic contacts. Primary sources—Hafiz-i Abru, Fasihi Khwafi, Sharaf al-Din Ali Yazdi—offer glimpses of interactions. Material culture, including coin circulation and architecture, provides corroboration. This study builds upon these foundations to illuminate a neglected sphere of medieval diplomacy.

## METHODOLOGY

To reconstruct cross-regional diplomacy, a triangulated approach is adopted. Textual analysis examines chronicles for evidence of envoys, correspondence, and intelligence. Comparative institutional study assesses similarities between Sarbadar administration and Timurid governance, with attention to chancery functions, intelligence systems, and the role of

Compiled on: September 16, 2025.

Copyright: ©2025 by the authors. Submitted to *Advances in Science and Sustainability* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

religious intermediaries. Material-cultural evidence, including numismatics and trade patterns, supplements literary sources. This interdisciplinary method recognizes the limitations of fragmentary records while offering a balanced reconstruction of political communication in a fragmented landscape.

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 Sarbadar Movement: Founded in Sabzevar in 1336, the Sarbadars grew from anti-Mongol resistance into a functioning polity. Leadership transitioned through multiple rulers, with Khwaja 'Ali Mu'ayyad the most prominent. Their governance blended Shi'a mysticism, particularly linked to Shaykh Hasan Juri, with military authority. Though territorially unstable, they controlled major cities like Nishapur and Tus.

4.2 Mawarannahr: After the fragmentation of the Chagatai Khanate, tribal confederations such as the Barlas and Ja'un-i Qurban competed for dominance. Urban centers like Samarkand and Bukhara asserted autonomy. Within this fractured context, Amir Temur rose, first as a Barlas leader, later as ruler of all Transoxiana by the late 1360s.

4.3 Interaction Points: Trade routes between Herat, Nishapur, and Samarkand allowed movement of goods and news. Sufi orders such as the Naqshbandiyya and Shaykhiya facilitated spiritual and intellectual exchange. Military entrepreneurs and mercenaries crossed borders, while both polities sought legitimacy in the post-Mongol order. These shared challenges fostered awareness and contact.

## EVIDENCE OF DIPLOMATIC INTERACTIONS

5.1 Formal Exchanges: Envoys from Khwaja 'Ali Mu'ayyad to "lords of Transoxiana" (ca. 1370) and to Amir Temur (1379–80) illustrate Sarbadar diplomacy. Conversely, Mujmal-i Fasihi notes messengers from beyond the Oxus arriving in Sabzevar with gifts (1375). These gestures, though fragmentary, confirm channels of official contact.

5.2 Intelligence Networks: Both Sarbadars and Timurids invested in espionage. Mu'ayyad maintained informants in neighboring states, while Temur built a vast system of spies. Their decisions—Mu'ayyad's alliances, Temur's timing of invasion—suggest awareness derived from such intelligence.

5.3 Religious Networks: Sufi sheikhs traveled between Nishapur and Bukhara, transmitting both spiritual authority and political information. Sarbadar association with Shi'a mysticism intersected with broader Sunni-Sufi connections. Religious legitimacy thus doubled as diplomatic currency.

5.4 Commerce: Caravans carried textiles, horses, and precious metals between regions. Merchants, often functioning as informal envoys, brought political news. Sarbadar coins circulated in Mawarannahr markets, and road security policies reveal shared interest in stable exchange.

## CASE STUDY: THE FINAL YEARS

In the late 1370s, Sarbadar power waned under external pressure and internal division. Khwaja 'Ali Mu'ayyad pursued multiple alliances, reaching out to the Jalayirids and to Amir Temur. Yazdi's *Zafarnama* records Mu'ayyad's envoy to Temur seeking protection. Temur responded diplomatically but soon invaded in 1381, ending Sarbadar independence. Yet integration was selective: Mu'ayyad briefly held authority under Timurid oversight, and Sarbadar elites entered Timurid administration. This sequence shows how diplomacy preceded and shaped conquest, easing the absorption of former rivals.

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Diplomatic frameworks in both polities reflected Mongol administrative heritage. Sarbadar chancery functions (*sahib-divan*) managed correspondence, while Temur institutionalized foreign relations within his supreme council. Protocols followed Islamic conventions of gift exchange, envoy recognition, and written-oral communication. Religious legitimacy was central: Sarbadars projected Shi'a identity, Temur Sunni orthodoxy. Nonetheless, Sufi orders bridged divides, functioning as unofficial diplomatic channels. Comparative evidence underscores that both systems valued diplomacy not as secondary to war but as integral to governance and expansion.

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study demonstrates that Sarbadar-Mawarannahr relations were active and complex. Sarbadars pursued calculated diplomacy, balancing alliances while gathering intelligence. Temur combined negotiation with espionage before conquest. Religious and commercial networks provided alternative channels of communication. These findings challenge portrayals of Sarbadars as isolated rebels and highlight their role in regional politics. More broadly, the case illustrates how diplomacy, intelligence, and trade underpinned post-Mongol state formation. It shows that military expansion was often preceded by strategic political engagement, confirming Central Asia as a networked political space rather than a set of isolated states.

## REFERENCES

1. Akhmedov, B. A. (1995). *Istoriya Balkha XVI–pervoy poloviny XVIII v* [History of Balkh from the 16th to the first half of the 18th century]. Tashkent: Fan.
2. Aubin, J. (1976). *Émirs mongols et vizirs persans dans les remous de l'acculturation*. *Studia Iranica*, 5(1), 41-72.
3. Āyatī, A. (1945). *Tārīkh-i Sabzavār*. Tehran: Chāpkhānah-i Dānishgāh.
4. Bernardini, M. (2000). *The Historiography Concerning Temür-i Lang: 16th-17th Centuries*. *Cahiers d'Asie centrale*, 7, 279-284.
5. Fasihi Khwafi, M. (1960). *Mujmal-i Fasihi* (M. Farrukh, Ed.). Mashhad: Bastan.
6. Fedorov, M. (2003). *Money circulation in the state of the Sarbadars*. *Iran*, 41, 157-169.
7. Hafiz-i Abru. (1959). *Zubdat al-tawarikh* (F. Tauer, Ed.). Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
8. Ibn Battuta. (1958-1971). *The Travels of Ibn Battuta, A.D. 1325-1354* (H. A. R. Gibb, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Jami, N. (1957). *Nafahat al-uns* (M. Towhidipur, Ed.). Tehran: Kitabfurushi-yi Mahmudi.
10. Manz, B. F. (1989). *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Melville, C. (2009). *The Sarbadars of Sabzavar: A Case of Revolutionary Deterioration*. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 37(2), 175-189.
12. Mir Khwand, M. (1853-1856). *Rawzat al-safa* (R. Hidayat, Ed.). Tehran: n.p.

13. Petrushevskiy, I. P. (1956). Dvizhenie serbedorov v Khorasane. *Uchenye zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniya*, 14, 91-162.
14. Potter, L. (2014). Sufis and Sultans in Post-Mongol Iran. *Iranian Studies*, 47(3), 357-385.
15. Rtveladze, E. V. (1996). *Pre-Muslim Coins of Chach* (Tashkent: Fan).
16. Smith, J. M. (1970). *The History of the Sarbadar Dynasty 1336-1381 A.D. and Its Sources*. The Hague: Mouton.
17. Yazdi, S. (1972). *Zafarnama* (A. Urunbaev, Ed.). Tashkent: Fan