



RESEARCH ON THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF THE FERGANA VALLEY, 1991–2026: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS OF ARTICLES AND CONFERENCE PAPERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES PUBLICATIONS

<https://doi.org/10.57033/mijournals-2026-4-0368>

Alisher Mamataliev

Acting Associate Professor of the Department of the Methodology of Social and Applied Sciences, A. Avloniy National Institute of Pedagogical Mastery, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: bogdod-2008@mail.ru

Received: 10-05-2026

Accepted: 28-05-2026

Published: 09-06-2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract. *This article examines the research questions, the evidentiary practices and the interpretations in the journal articles and conference papers upon the ethnography of the Fergana Valley published between 1991 and 2026. Rather than treating publication dates or numbers as evidence of disciplinary change, it compares the uses of historical sources and field materials, the assumptions behind ethnic classification, and the limits of generalizing from local cases. Studies of livelihoods, of communities and of rituals are read alongside later scholarship upon ethnonyms, borders, migration, local memory and intangible cultural heritage. A chronological and problem-oriented comparison reveals the continuing coexistence of historical-ethnographic reconstruction, of critical studies of ethnic categories and of ethnographies of everyday life. The findings are limited to the selected corpus of articles and conference papers and do not claim to cover the entire literature.*

Keywords: *Fergana Valley, historiography of ethnography, scholarly articles, conference papers, problem-oriented chronological analysis, ethnic classification, historical-ethnographic method, field evidence, ethnocultural relations, historical memory.*

INTRODUCTION

In the articles devoted to the ethnography of the Fergana Valley one and the same subject has been studied through different scholarly questions. A study of a marriage or a calendar rite, for example, may seek its historical origin, describe its territorial distribution, or explain its function in present-day family and neighbourhood life. Such works, although close to one another in subject, differ in their choice of sources and in the way their conclusions are drawn. For this reason it is not sufficient to group the articles published between 1991 and 2026 merely according to the phenomenon

to which they are devoted. It is necessary to determine through them how historical-ethnographic knowledge took shape, in what manner the earlier interpretations were continued, and at what point they were reconsidered. The historiographical problem of the article consists in disclosing these relations.

A certain experience has been accumulated in the historiography of the subject. The 2011 article of A. R. Mamataliev considered the ethnographic questions treated in the social science and humanities journals of the first period of independence (Mamataliev, 2011), and the same direction was continued in his conference publication of 2020 (Mamataliev, 2020:101-104). A. Kh. Doniyorov treated the problem of tradition and renewal in the ethnographic literature (Doniyorov, 2003:48-56), while B. Odilov specially analysed the historiographical aspects of the research upon economic and cultural life (Odilov, 2018:113-121). These works show that the publications upon the ethnography of Fergana have long been in scholarly circulation. The questions posed and the sources employed in the later articles have not, however, yet been fully compared with the views of the earlier research upon a single criterion, and it is upon this comparison that the present analysis rests, and in this that it differs from the earlier publications.

The principal material of the research was composed of the articles and papers published between 1991 and 2026 in local and foreign scholarly journals and in the proceedings of republican and international conferences. Monographs, dissertations and dissertation abstracts were not included as independent units of analysis. This choice is connected with the significance of the genre of publication: in a conference paper the scholarly question or a preliminary result may be set out briefly, whereas a journal article affords the possibility of disclosing the source and the evidence in greater detail. It would therefore not be well founded to apply the same requirement to both genres or to equate a thought expressed in a paper with a complete research result. Where the original text of a publication has not been fully examined, the evaluations were confined within the compass of the bibliographical information and of a reliable abstract.

MAIN PART

The articles were compared in the directions of ethnic communities and their mutual relations, of the rural environment, of economy and material culture, of family

and calendar rites, of pilgrimage, of migration, of everyday life at the border and of historical memory. Works upon political geography were drawn in only where they directly investigated the movement of the population, networks of kinship or local experience. Four questions were considered in the analysis: to what question the author sought an answer, upon what sources he relied, in what respect he differed from the earlier view, and to what degree he generalized his conclusion. It was likewise taken into account that the selected question does not embrace all publications; accordingly, the rare occurrence of a particular direction in this list does not signify that it has not been studied at all.

The research was built in a chronological and problem-oriented order: first the time of publication of the articles was taken into account, and within each period the mutually connected scholarly questions and the answers given to them were compared. There is no ground for turning this chronology into four stages severed from one another. Just as works directed at the reconstruction of ethnic history were published in the 2020s as well, so approaches founded upon the observation of everyday life occur already in the 2000s. At the centre of the analysis, therefore, stands not the question which method replaced which and when, but the manner in which different traditions existed side by side. This relation may be observed from the publications of the 1990s upon economic and communal relations.

In the 1991 article of U. S. Abdullaev the trade and economic relations between the peoples of Fergana are posed as a historical-ethnographic question (Abdullaev, 1991:57-60). Information upon the exchange of goods, upon the market and upon mutual need makes it possible to see the ethnic communities not as units separated from one another but as participants in particular economic relations. Afterwards V. B. Haqliev turned to the internal order of the rural community (Haqliev, 1997:81-85), E. Jumanazarov to the marriage customs of the Kyrgyz and the Uzbeks (Jumanazarov, 1999:50-53), and Abdullaev to the inter-ethnic influence in material culture (Abdullaev, 1999:62-69). The kinds of evidence in these studies are not identical: there is a difference between an economic relation, a communal practice and a rite. Despite this, they constitute a common historiographical direction in that they made the mutual relations of population groups an object of research.

A limitation characteristic of these works is likewise apparent: in many cases the name of the community, the ethnic composition or the local affiliation was accepted as

a preliminary classification, while the principal attention was directed at reconstructing economy, ritual and social relations. This cannot be called a regularity pertaining to all the articles of the 1990s, but in the question selected such a method predominates. The difference between the way the source named a community and the way the population named itself is not always disclosed. The later methodological disputes raised the necessity of examining these very ethnic categories, which had been accepted as though already known.

The theoretical foundations of ethnic classification were interpreted differently in the articles of 2005. S. S. Gubaeva defended ethnic consolidation as a long-continuing historical process (Gubaeva, 2005:48-51). S. N. Abashin, discussing post-Soviet views upon nationality, the theory of the ethnos and the constructivist critique, directed his attention to the conditions in which ethnic categories were formed (Abashin, 2005:83-86). His article of 2009 upon the term «sart» carries this question into the relation between scholarly and political classification (Abashin, 2009:252-278). It would not be correct to interpret these works as direct reviews written of one another, for their theoretical points differ: in the one case the historical continuity of the rapprochement between ethnic groups is explained, in the other the origin of the name and the definition given to them is questioned. For historiography this difference makes it possible to separate the information recorded in a source from the theoretical conclusion of the researcher.

The theoretical disputes did not push aside the traditional subjects of ethnography. A. A. Ashirov considered the historical layers of the beliefs connected with marriage and with dwellings (Ashirov, 2003:38-45; Ashirov, 2007:56-66); Sh. Atakhanov turned to the history of the migration of the Roma and to the ethnonyms applied to them (Atakhanov, 2005:47-55). I. Kho‘jakhonov treated the changes in the dwellings of the pastoral and semi-sedentary population (Kho‘jakhonov, 2005:83-84; Kho‘jakhonov, 2006:58-64), and M. G‘oziev the local features of the Tajiks of Kaptarkhona (G‘oziev, 2009:147-151). The term «Uyghur» in the article of G. Qosimova returns attention to the content of the name recorded in the source (Qosimova, 2006:143-145). It is difficult to assign all of them to a single method: in some the origin of a custom or of a dwelling is sought, in others the naming and the historical condition of a population group is examined. To designate the 2000s merely as a period of theoretical renewal would therefore narrow the existing picture.

In the same decade another side of the subject of research, namely the effect of the state border upon the life of the population, likewise began to appear clearly. In his article of 2006 N. Megoran studied the restrictions upon the Uzbek-Kyrgyz border in connection with the comings and goings of people and with their relations of kinship. Although the publication belongs to the field of political geography, the analysis of the border through the direct experience of the population makes it significant for the historiography of ethnography as well (Megoran, 2006:622-640). There is not sufficient ground for saying that this work was a ready theoretical model for the field research of the 2010s. It does, however, clearly confirm that the study of the border not merely as a line between states but as a factor affecting everyday relations existed already in the 2000s.

At the same time the continuity of the historical-ethnographic tradition may be observed from the conference materials of A. A. Sarimsoqov published between 2007 and 2009 (Sarimsoqov, 2007a:97-99; Sarimsoqov, 2007b:221-227; Sarimsoqov, 2009:83-89). In them the subject of agricultural customs, of views connected with the calendar of the year and of the seasonal rites of pastoralists is posed. The author's article of 2024 upon the rite of «qo'sh chiqarish» is connected with these researches in respect of subject (Sarimsokov, 2024:214-223). What new source or interpretation appeared between the early papers and the later article does not, however, follow from a comparison of titles alone. Until the evidence and the conclusions of the original texts are compared one by one, it is too early to express a firm opinion concerning a fundamental change of scholarly view. This example shows both the possibility and the limit of using a conference paper as a historiographical source.

In the same period works upon the objects of traditional life likewise increased. The conference materials of S. T. Davlatova devoted to craftsmanship, to clothing and to the funeral rite bring close to one another the questions of the making of an object, of its use and of the ritual meaning given to it (Davlatova, 2012a:223-229; Davlatova, 2012b:62-65; Davlatova, 2014). From the historiographical point of view this information does not of itself yield a precise conclusion concerning ethnic affiliation. The occurrence of the same object among different communities may also be connected with trade, with neighbourhood or with mutual cultural influence. For this reason, in evaluating clothing and craftsmanship as ethnic markers, the history of the object, the territory of its distribution and the date of the evidence must be distinguished. The value of the

publications upon the subject lies not in the number of objects enumerated in them but in the historical conclusion that is founded upon that evidence.

The study of the border through everyday experience was continued by yet another method in the 2011 article of M. Reeves. The observations in the villages of southern Kyrgyzstan are directed at understanding how the movement of the population, the relations of kinship and encounters with the state give meaning to the border (Reeves, 2011:905-923). The research question and the field of N. Megoran and of M. Reeves are not identical, and a direct scholarly influence between them cannot be confirmed without separate evidence. In both, however, the administrative mark of the border is distinguished from the way it is felt in daily life. This comparison shows that, rather than an entirely new subject appearing in the 2010s, a question posed earlier was deepened through field material.

The 2013 article of N. Megoran devoted to the city of Osh carries the question into the field of historical memory. That the Kyrgyz and the Uzbek communities do not narrate the past in the same way demands that historical events be distinguished from their later interpretation (Megoran, 2013:892-907). Here oral memory is not a direct answer to the question how an event took place, but a source for the question how a community remembers the past and how it uses that memory today. In this respect the research differs from the earlier articles directed at the reconstruction of ethnic history. At the same time the local works in the Uzbek part likewise widened, although in them the economy or the ritual practice of the community more often occupies the principal place rather than historical memory.

The articles upon the village of Mindon show this difference more precisely. A. Qayumov treated the local economic relations (Qayumov, 2012:53-55), S. T. Davlatova the function of clothing in the funeral rite and its change (Davlatova, 2012b:62-65; Davlatova, 2014), and B. R. Khalmuratov the symbolic attributes and religious conceptions (Khalmuratov, 2011:156-158; Khalmuratov, 2014:88-97). The studies are connected with one another in that they approach a single village or a particular practice, but their source base and the question they pose are not exactly the same. To draw the conclusion that a custom recorded in one place is proper to the whole valley requires comparative material. To indicate such a limitation is not to deny the local study; on the contrary, it is to determine within what compass it yields a reliable result.

The study of the function of rites in present-day social life is observed in the ethnography of pilgrimage as well. U. S. Abdullaev and M. A. Karimova considered the customs connected with the visiting of shrines by the women of Fergana in the relation between tradition and contemporary practice (Abdullaev & Karimova, 2015:72-74). In this case the fact that the shrine is a sacred place preserved from the past is not separated from the present-day need of those who visit it. The important difference for historiographical comparison is that to reconstruct the origin of a rite through written information is one task, and to observe its place in present-day family and communal relations is another. The second question does not annul the first; rather it widens the compass of the research.

H. Kikuta has analysed how the funds coming from labour migration in a neighbourhood community of the Fergana Valley are connected with the expenses of rites, with mutual assistance and with the norms relating to women (Kikuta, 2016:91-104). In this research the principal question has become not the history of the wedding tradition but the way it operates in changed economic conditions. The pilgrimage of women and labour migration are in content entirely different subjects. In both articles, however, the rite is not separated from the life of the community: it is considered together with the needs, the relations and the means of people. Such a comparison discloses that in ethnography the concept of tradition is being used not only as a custom preserved from the past but also as a part of the present social process.

The 2018 article of B. Odilov occupies a particular place in the evaluation of the literature of this period. Gathering the researches upon economic and cultural traditions, he considered from the historiographical point of view the manner in which agriculture, stock-breeding and craftsmanship have been investigated (Odilov, 2018:113-121). The object of the article is, however, limited to a particular compass of problems. It would not be correct to evaluate as its defect the fact that publications upon the border, upon migration or upon local memory did not enter into its compass. On the contrary, the mutual comparison of the existing historiographical studies helps to distinguish which works classified subjects and which examined the scholarly question and the attitude to the source. The present article observes this second question upon a wider scale.

In the articles published in the 2020s the study of traditional material culture has not been interrupted. M. Kh. Shomirzaev turned to the territorial and ethnic features of

embroidery (Shomirzaev, 2020:49-51). The resemblance of an object or of an ornament cannot, however, be made evidence of the complete identity of ethnic communities: the diffusion of an ornament and the self-naming of a community are different historical processes. In evaluating the value of such research, the material upon which the classification was built and the place and period from which the objects were brought are of decisive importance. If these questions are open, information relating to craftsmanship is effectively applied in reconstructing the history of ethnocultural relations.

The article of R. Atakhanov upon the traditional stock-breeding of the Karakalpaks likewise belongs to the direction of historical-ethnographic reconstruction (Atakhanov, 2020:4-9). Kh. Rakhmatillaev, for his part, has analysed upon historical material the ethnic composition of the population at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century and its change (Rakhmatillaev, 2022:140-144). In the first study the economic occupation and local experience, and in the second the records concerning the population, fulfil the office of the principal evidence. It would not be correct to apply to them the same criterion of method or of result. That both works return to the historical-ethnographic questions preserved in the 2020s as well testifies that the appearance of new anthropological approaches has not destroyed the earlier traditions of research.

The difference between two articles belonging to a single period is apparent in the publications of 2021 also. G. Valikhonova has treated upon the basis of historical information the influence of the political situation in Eastern Turkestan upon trade and ethnocultural relations (Valikhonova, 2021:311-316). S. Pietrowiak, for his part, has studied the relation between the rock images of Dul-Dul Ata, the local legends and the practice of pilgrimage (Pietrowiak, 2021:152-168). While the first work strives to explain the evidence of past relations as a historical process, the second gives its attention to the meaning that a sacred space acquires in present-day life. The unity of the date of publication is no ground for including them within a single contemporary method. Historiographical analysis must also take into account the temporal layer and the kind of evidence chosen by the authors.

Z. Yu. Esonov, who studies material culture, has turned to the craftsmanship of the Karakalpaks of Fergana (Esonov, 2023:603-606), and Sh. Abdusatorov and T. Babarakhimov to the place of economic occupations in the culture of food (Abdusatorov & Babarakhimov, 2024:4-7). In both directions objects and practices connected with

daily life are investigated. The evidence relating to the production, the diffusion and the consumption of a craft product is not, however, identical with the information that explains the function of a dish in family or communal practice. To lose sight of this difference is to confuse different historical phenomena under the general concept of material culture. For this reason the similarity of the subject of articles and their historical conclusion must be compared separately.

The 2024 article of A. A. Sarimsoqov devoted to the rite of «qo‘sh chiqarish» is a fitting example for comparison with the conference works of 2007 to 2009 (Sarimsokov, 2024:214-223; Sarimsoqov, 2007a:97-99; Sarimsoqov, 2007b:221-227; Sarimsoqov, 2009:83-89). In the later publication the research is directed at the territorial features of a particular custom, whereas in the early papers agriculture and calendar rites were posed as a wider subject. Such a narrowing of subject does not of itself prove that the method or the theory has been renewed. To determine that the view of the researcher has genuinely changed, the evidence of the first papers, the new material of the later article and the conclusions must be compared. It is precisely here that the difference between the history of publications and the history of a scholarly idea is manifested most clearly.

The 2024 article of O. K. Karataev and T. D. Kadyrov treats the settlement of the Kyrgyz and their clan composition upon a historical-ethnographic scale (Karataev & Kadyrov, 2024:69-87). In the same year S. Pietrowiak considered the healing practice of the border region through the family experience of a particular woman (Pietrowiak, 2024:109-130). The compass of generalization of the first work is wide, while the field of observation of the second is narrow and deep. It would be an error to evaluate them by asking which of them is the more scholarly. The principal criterion for historiography is not the scale of observation but the correspondence between the question posed by the author and the evidence adduced. Neither can a local observation of itself confirm a thought concerning a wide territory, nor can general statistics confirm the experience of a single family.

In the 2025 article of R. B. Bekmirzaev contemporary inter-ethnic relations are analysed upon the basis of historical information and of interview materials (Bekmirzaev, 2025). That the author has adduced the composition of the participants and the procedure of gathering information helps to evaluate upon which observations the result of the research rests. A conclusion drawn from local interviews is not, however, to be accepted as a general regularity for all groups of the population. The historiographical significance

of this article lies in its showing that ethnic relations may be studied not only as the history of unchanging communities of the past but also through the present experience of the participants.

The relation between ethnic affiliation and local neighbourhood is posed in the 2025 article of Chen Bram as well. In the published abstract it is stated that the relations between the Jewish and the Muslim communities of the Fergana Valley in the late Soviet period are considered in connection with the common environment of life (Bram, 2025:262-280). It does not follow from this that ethnic and religious differences disappeared; on the contrary, the question is posed in order to study how local relations existed side by side with different affiliations. Since the full evidentiary base of the work has not been independently examined, its conclusions have not here been extended beyond the compass of the abstract. To indicate openly the degree to which a source has been studied is necessary for the reliability of historiographical analysis.

In the conference materials of 2025 also, various questions relating to ethnic names, to local affiliation and to ethnocultural relations occur. N. M. Lukashova and Z. U. Yusupov have turned to the historiography of the term «sart» (Lukashova & Yusupov, 2025:91-95); A. Nurmatov has taken as his subject the relations between Fergana and the Central Tian Shan (Nurmatov, 2025:180-184), and Yo. A. Ortiqov the family and marriage relations of the Dungans (Ortiqov, 2025:204-207). Although these works appeared at a single conference, there is no ground for uniting them by a common method or a single scholarly conclusion. The sources of a discussion upon the history of an ethnonym and of a work treating contemporary family experience are in particular different. It must likewise be taken into account to what degree the extent of a paper has permitted the evidence to be disclosed. These publications accordingly show above all the directions of scholarly interest; their empirical result is evaluated according to the full text.

The article of D. Bobojonova belonging to the same period is directed at studying socio-economic changes in connection with inter-ethnic relations (Bobojonova, 2025:298-303). Such an approach makes it possible to see in a general picture the conditions in which the life of communities passed. Evidence describing an economic change does not, however, independently prove how neighbourhood, marriage or mutual trust changed within a particular family. For this reason a distinction must be preserved between works devoted to general social processes and research resting upon

interview and observation. Their comparison is important not in order to widen the subject, but in order to determine what kind of conclusion may be founded upon what kind of evidence.

The researches of 2026 upon family memory and ethnic affiliation disclose another side of this question. R. B. Bekmirzaev and his co-authors have considered the transmission of knowledge concerning the «seven forefathers» through family communication and digital means upon the example of a particular Kyrgyz clan community (Bekmirzaev et al., 2026). In another article of Bekmirzaev upon mixed marriages the place of the ethnic boundary in family decisions is discussed (Bekmirzaev, 2026). Although both turn to the family environment, their object of research is not the same: the one concerns memory of lineage, the other the choice of a marriage partner. There is likewise not sufficient evidence to transfer a conclusion founded upon a single community or a particular sample to the population of the Fergana Valley as a general regularity.

In the publications upon intangible cultural heritage it is observed that ethnographic practices long known are being interpreted within the compass of new concepts. A. R. Usmonov has regarded the local knowledge and experience relating to horticulture as a heritage (Usmonov, 2026:924-927); S. V. Yuldoshev has compared children's games according to their similar and differing aspects in various regions (Yuldoshev, 2026:715-723). The use of the term «heritage» or the increase in the number of regions is not, however, equivalent to a methodological novelty. For this it must be shown that the method of gathering evidence has changed, that a new source has been drawn in by comparison with the earlier work, or that a new interpretation has been elaborated. In the present analysis such a change was recorded only where the evidence adduced in the publications confirmed it.

The 2026 articles of U. G. Bakhromov upon the classification of clothing (Bakhromov, 2026:642-646) and of B. Sh. Shamshidinov upon the process of the sedentarization of pastoral ethnic communities likewise signify that historical-ethnographic questions are continuing (Shamshidinov, 2026:1555-1559). In the first work the distinguishing of the marks of material culture predominates, in the second the search for the factors of historical change. The articles of the same period upon memory, upon mixed marriage and upon life at the border rest upon other sources and upon observation of another scale. Their publication side by side does not confirm the

notion that ethnography is proceeding upon a single theoretical path; on the contrary, it may be seen that the traditions of research are continuing at one and the same time with different questions and different evidence.

The general result that follows from the publications considered is that the changes in the ethnography of the Fergana Valley have not taken the form of a successive replacement of scholarly traditions. Alongside works directed at reconstructing the history of economy, dwelling, clothing and rites, research founded upon the observation of the border, of migration, of local memory and of family relations has likewise developed. The subject itself need not be new: to seek the origin of a phenomenon, to observe it in present conditions, or to examine critically the ethnic name given to it are different scholarly tasks. In this respect the principal criterion of change in historiography is not the date of publication but the relation between question, evidence and interpretation.

The difference between the kinds of source establishes this conclusion still further. A census reflects the administrative classification of a particular period, a toponym the trace of a past naming, and a field interview the personal experience and family memory of a person. They may complement one another, but they are not interchangeable: a place name does not directly prove the number of the population at a given date, nor does a change in language or in ritual directly prove that ethnic affiliation has changed. For this reason the conclusion of a researcher must be evaluated according to what the source recorded and what it did not record. When an opinion concerning the whole valley is formed from a local observation in particular, the correspondence between the evidence and the scale of generalization remains the principal requirement.

This criterion pertains also to conclusions concerning an «unstudied subject». There exist special articles upon the pilgrimage of women, upon labour migration, upon mixed marriage, upon embroidery, upon the culture of food and upon children's games. The problem lies not in their absolute absence but in the limited comparison of the results of various local works upon the basis of the same questions and the same requirements of source. A study of one village or community does not fully represent the Uzbek, the Kyrgyz and the Tajik parts of the valley. There may likewise be publications that remained outside the selected question. Accordingly, evaluations concerning a gap in historiography must be given not in the form of a general judgment but in connection with the precise compass of the literature analysed.

The comparison of a journal article with a conference paper is, for its part, a distinct way of studying the history of scholarly views. Whether a question posed for the first time in a paper has been preserved in a later article, whether it has been supplemented with new field records or interpreted otherwise cannot be decided from the resemblance of titles. When an earlier historiographical survey is returned to, it must likewise be shown openly what new comparison or evidence has been added to that publication. For this a verifiable bibliographical base is necessary, in which the date, the place of publication, the kind of source and the content of the articles and papers are recorded. Such work serves to determine where a particular scholarly thought arose and how it was continued, rather than to increase the number of publications.

CONCLUSION

The comparison of the selected journal articles and conference papers has shown that in the ethnography of the Fergana Valley several traditions of research existed side by side in the course of the years from 1991 to 2026. In the 1990s economic relations, the rural community, material culture and rites were treated through historical-ethnographic sources. In the subsequent theoretical disputes the use of ethnic names in the sources and scholarly classification itself became an object of examination. The effect of the border upon everyday life was already investigated in the 2000s, and in the 2010s and 2020s this question widened still further through works upon migration, local memory, family experience and digital communication. For this reason it is better founded to explain the change in the field not as the complete disappearance of the earlier methods but as an increase in questions and in sources.

In the earlier historiographical works the systematization of publications upon economic and cultural traditions, upon ethnic communities and upon rites predominated. In the present analysis those results were compared with the later articles devoted to the critical examination of ethnic classification and to the study of the border and of memory through field material. As a result it was established that the long continuation of a particular subject and its investigation by an unchanging scholarly method are not one and the same phenomenon. The history of the same rite or ethnic group may be studied in different periods upon the basis of another question, another source and another interpretation. The historiographical result of the article likewise consists in

disclosing this difference not by enumerating publications but by comparing the relation between evidence and generalization in them.

In further research the original texts of the conference paper and the journal article of one and the same author must first of all be compared with one another: it will then become clear which evidence was repeated, which information was newly added and how the conclusion changed. At the same time, a local result cannot be raised to the level of the whole valley without taking into account the place and the time of the field research, the composition of the participants and the method of recording the information. For the comparison of the parts of Fergana lying in three states, the same questions and verifiable sources are likewise necessary. The conclusions of the article describe not all the ethnographic publications of the years from 1991 to 2026 but the questions of the selected articles and papers, and the open designation of this limit increases the reliability of the historiographical evaluations made.

REFERENCES

1. Abashin, S. N. (2005). Postsovetskiy natsionalizm, teoriya etnosa i konstruktivistskaya kritika [Post-Soviet nationalism, the theory of the ethnos and the constructivist critique]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, (1), 83–86.
2. Abashin, S. N. (2009). Vozvrashchenie sartov? Metodologiya i ideologiya v postsovetskikh nauchnykh diskussiyakh [The return of the Sarts? Methodology and ideology in post-Soviet scholarly discussions]. *Antropologicheskiy forum*, (10), 252–278.
3. Abdullaev, U. S. (1991). Khozyaystvenno-torgovye vzaimosvyazi narodov Ferganskoy doliny v kontse XIX – nachale XX veka [Economic and trade relations of the peoples of the Fergana Valley in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries]. *O‘zbekistonda ijtimoiy fanlar*, (2), 57–60.
4. Abdullaev, U. S. (1999). Otrazhenie mezhetnicheskikh svyazey v materialnoy kulture narodov Ferganskoy doliny v kontse XIX – nachale XX veka [The reflection of inter-ethnic relations in the material culture of the peoples of the Fergana Valley in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries]. *O‘zbekiston tarixi*, (4), 62–69.
5. Abdullaev, U. S., & Karimova, M. A. (2015). Obryady, svyazannye s poseshcheniem mazarov u zhenshin Fergany: traditsiya i sovremennost [Rites connected with the visiting of shrines among the women of Fergana: tradition and the present]. *Mezhdunarodnyy nauchno-issledovatel'skiy zhurnal*, (6–4(37)), 72–74.
6. Abdusatorov, Sh., & Babarakhimov, T. (2024). Aholi xo‘jalik mashg‘ulotlarining taomlardagi o‘rni (Farg‘ona vodiysi misolida) [The place of the economic occupations of the population in food (on the example of the Fergana Valley)]. *O‘zMU xabarlar / ACTA NUUZ*, 1(1.5.1), 4–7. <https://doi.org/10.69617/nuuz.v1i1.5.1.5047>
7. Ashirov, A. A. (2003). An‘anaviy nikoh to‘yi marosimlarining genezisiga doir ba‘zi mulohazalar (Farg‘ona vodiysi o‘zbeklari nikoh to‘ylari misolida) [Some observations upon the genesis of the traditional wedding rites]. *O‘zbekiston tarixi*, (2), 38–45.
8. Ashirov, A. A. (2007). O‘zbek xalqining turar joylar bilan bog‘liq urf-odatlarida diniy e‘tiqodlar simbiozi [The symbiosis of religious beliefs in the customs of the Uzbek people connected with dwellings]. *O‘zbekiston tarixi*, (3), 56–66.

9. Atakhanov, R. (2020). Fargʻona vodiysi qoraqalpoqlarida anʻanaviy chorvachilik xoʻjaligining oʻziga xos xususiyatlari [The distinctive features of traditional stock-breeding among the Karakalpaks of the Fergana Valley]. *Oʻtmishga nazar*, (6), 4–9.
10. Atakhanov, Sh. (2005). Loʻlilarning Oʻrta Osiyo hududiga koʻchib kelish tarixidan [From the history of the migration of the Roma into the territory of Central Asia]. *Oʻzbekiston tarixi*, (1), 47–55.
11. Bakhromov, U. G. (2026). Fargʻona vodiysi kiyim-kechaklarining tasnifi va etnik xususiyatlari [The classification and ethnic features of the clothing of the Fergana Valley]. *Qoʻqon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar*, 8(2), 642–646. <https://doi.org/10.70728/a.series.v08.i02.089>
12. Bekmirzaev, R. B. (2025). Ethno-anthropological and psychological analysis of modern inter-ethnic relations in the Fergana Valley. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 12(1), article 2524932. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2524932>
13. Bekmirzaev, R. B. (2026). Ethnosexual boundaries in the Fergana Valley: an ethnographic account of interethnic marriages in post-Soviet Central Asia.
14. Bekmirzaev, R. B., Osmonov, S., Berdiev, A., Osmonova, N., Tureeva, G., Alimova, N., Kuzikulov, I., Khalmuratov, B., Boymirzayev, K., Iminov, B., Ortikov, Y., Abduraupov, O., & Nazirov, M. (2026). «Seven generations and me»: a case study of genealogical memory and identity formation in Kyrgyz culture. *Genealogy*, 10(1), article 25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy10010025>
15. Bobojonova, D. (2025). [Article upon socio-economic changes and inter-ethnic relations], 298–303.
16. Bram, Ch. (2025). Jews and Muslims in the Ferghana Valley in the late Soviet era. *Central Asian Survey*, 44(2), 262–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2025.2455404>
17. Davlatova, S. T. (2012a). XIX asrning ikkinchi yarmi – XX asrda Fargʻona vodiysi anʻanaviy hunarmandchiligi holati [The condition of the traditional craftsmanship of the Fergana Valley]. In: *Fargʻona vodiysi tarixi yangi tadqiqotlarda. Republican scholarly conference materials* (pp. 223–229). Fergana.
18. Davlatova, S. T. (2012b). Dafn marosimlari kiyimlarining oʻziga xos xususiyatlari (Fargʻona tumani Mindon qishlogʻi materiallari asosida) [The distinctive features of funeral clothing]. In: *Fargʻona vodiysi tarixi muammolari. Republican scholarly conference materials* (pp. 62–65). Namangan.
19. Davlatova, S. T. (2014). Fargʻona vodiysi anʻanaviy kiyimlari: transformatsion jarayonlarning etnosotsiologik tahlili [The traditional clothing of the Fergana Valley: an ethnosociological analysis of the processes of transformation]. In: *Fargʻona vodiysi tarixi yangi tadqiqotlarda. Third republican scholarly and practical conference materials. Fergana*.
20. Doniyorov, A. Kh. (2003). Problemy traditsionnogo i innovatsionnogo v noveyshey etnograficheskoy literature Uzbekistana (1991–2002 gg.) [Problems of the traditional and the innovative in the recent ethnographic literature of Uzbekistan]. *OʻzMU xabarlar*, (1), 48–56.
21. Esonov, Z. Yu. (2023). Fargʻona vodiysi qoraqalpoqlari hunarmandchilik anʻanalari [The craft traditions of the Karakalpaks of the Fergana Valley]. *Gospodarka i Innovatsiya*, 42, 603–606.
22. Gʻoziev, M. (2009). Kaptarxona qishlogʻi tojiklari: tarixiy-etnografik maʼlumotlar [The Tajiks of the village of Kaptarkhona: historical and ethnographic information]. *Ijtimoiy fikr*, (3), 147–151.
23. Gubaeva, S. S. (2005). Etnicheskaya konsolidatsiya – protsess estestvenno-istoricheskoy [Ethnic consolidation as a natural-historical process]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, (1), 48–51.
24. Haqliev, V. B. (1997). XIX asr oxiri – XX asr birinchi choragida Fargʻona vodiysida qishloq jamoasi [The rural community in the Fergana Valley at the end of the nineteenth and in the first quarter of the twentieth century]. *Oʻzbekistonda ijtimoiy fanlar*, (3–4), 81–85.
25. Jumanazarov, E. (1999). Qirgʻiz va oʻzbeklarning nikoh udumlari tarixidan (XIX asr oxiri – XX asr) [From the history of the marriage customs of the Kyrgyz and the Uzbeks]. *Oʻzbekiston tarixi*, (3), 50–53.
26. Karataev, O. K., & Kadyrov, T. D. (2024). Kyrgyzy Ferganskoy doliny (uzbekskaya chast Ferganskoy doliny, II polovina XX v.) [The Kyrgyz of the Fergana Valley]. *Turkic Studies Journal*, 6(3), 69–87. <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2024-3-69-87>

27. Khalmuratov, B. R. (2011). Farg‘ona vodiysi o‘zbeklarining an‘anaviy turmush tarzi va marosimlar tizimida ramziy atributlar [Symbolic attributes in the traditional way of life and in the system of rites of the Uzbeks of the Fergana Valley]. *O‘zMU xabarlar*, (1), 156–158.
28. Khalmuratov, B. R. (2014). Farg‘ona vodiysi aholisining qadimiy diniy e‘tiqodlarida ayol talqini [The interpretation of woman in the ancient religious beliefs of the population of the Fergana Valley]. *O‘zbekiston tarixi*, (2), 88–97.
29. Kho‘jakhonov, I. (2005). Farg‘ona vodiysi chorvador aholisining an‘anaviy uy-joylari xususida [On the traditional dwellings of the pastoral population of the Fergana Valley]. *Ta‘lim tizimida ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar*, (2), 83–84.
30. Kho‘jakhonov, I. (2006). Farg‘ona vodiysida yarim o‘troq aholi doimiy uy-joylari transformatsiyasining ba‘zi jihatlar (XIX asr oxiri – XX asr boshlari) [Some aspects of the transformation of the permanent dwellings of the semi-sedentary population of the Fergana Valley]. *O‘zbekiston tarixi*, (1), 58–64.
31. Kikuta, H. (2016). Remittances, rituals and reconsidering women’s norms in mahallas: emigrant labour and its social effects in Ferghana Valley. *Central Asian Survey*, 35(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2015.1088229>
32. Lukashova, N. M., & Yusupov, Z. U. (2025). K istoriografii temy o sushchnosti termina «sart» [Towards the historiography of the question of the essence of the term «sart»]. *Partner Conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus*, 1(1), 91–95. <https://doi.org/10.66073/ReFocus-Conf/19>
33. Mamataliev, A. R. (2011). Farg‘ona vodiysi etnografiyasining o‘rganilishi (Mustaqillik yillari ijtimoiy-gumanitar jurnallardagi maqolalar asosida) [The study of the ethnography of the Fergana Valley]. *O‘zMU xabarlar*, (4/1).
34. Mamataliev, A. R. (2020). Farg‘ona vodiysi etnografiyasining o‘rganilishi (mustaqillik yillaridagi ijtimoiy-gumanitar jurnallarda keltirilgan maqolalar asosida) [The study of the ethnography of the Fergana Valley]. In: *Zamonaviy uzluksiz ta‘lim sifatini oshirish: innovatsiya va istiqbollar. International scholarly and practical conference materials* (pp. 101–104). Tashkent: TDPU.
35. Megoran, N. (2006). For ethnography in political geography: experiencing and re-imagining Ferghana Valley boundary closures. *Political Geography*, 25(6), 622–640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.05.005>
36. Megoran, N. (2013). Shared space, divided space: narrating ethnic histories of Osh. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(4), 892–907. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a44505>
37. Nurmatov, A. (2025). Ethno-cultural relations between the Fergana Valley and the regions of the Central Tian Shan. *Partner Conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus*, 1(1), 180–184. <https://doi.org/10.66073/ReFocus-Conf/40>
38. Odilov, B. (2018). Farg‘ona vodiysi aholisi xo‘jalik-madaniy an‘analarining etnologik tadqiqotlarda yoritilishi (XX asr oxiri – XXI asr boshlari) [The treatment of the economic and cultural traditions of the population of the Fergana Valley in ethnological research]. *Sharqshunoslik / Oriental Studies*, (2), 113–121. <https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.oriental-studies.16080>
39. Ortiqov, Yo. A. (2025). Dunganians of Uzbekistan in the background of modern processes: family, marriage and ethnocultural membership. *Partner Conferences of the International Scientific Journal Research Focus*, 1(1), 204–207. <https://doi.org/10.66073/ReFocus-Conf/45>
40. Pietrowiak, S. (2021). Celestial horses of Dul-Dul At: petroglyphs as the site of transformation and interaction in the Kyrgyz Fergana Valley. *Rock Art Research*, 38(2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.69978/rar.v38i2.229>
41. Pietrowiak, S. (2024). O dziedziczności uzdrawiania – opowieść etnograficzna. *Praktyki lecznicze jako część życia codziennego na pograniczu kirgisko-uzbeckim. Etnografia. Praktyki, Teorie, Doświadczenia*, 10, 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.26881/etno.2024.10.06>

42. Qayumov, A. (2012). Zamonaviy qishloqda xo‘jalik munosabatlari: o‘zgarishlar va innovatsiyalar (Mindon qishlog‘i misolida) [Economic relations in the contemporary village]. In: Farg‘ona vodiysi tarixi muammolari. Republican scholarly conference materials (pp. 53–55). Namangan.
43. Qosimova, G. (2006). Tarixiy manbalarda «uyg‘ur» atamasi: talqin va tahlil [The term «Uyghur» in the historical sources: interpretation and analysis]. Ta’lim tizimida ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar, (1–2), 143–145.
44. Rakhmatillaev, Kh. (2022). XIX asr oxiri – XX asr boshlari Farg‘ona vodiysi aholisining etnodinamikasi [The ethnodynamics of the population of the Fergana Valley]. FarDU Ilmiy Xabarlar, 28(6), 140–144. https://doi.org/10.56292/SJFSU/vol28_iss6/a27
45. Reeves, M. (2011). Fixing the border: on the affective life of the state in southern Kyrgyzstan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(5), 905–923. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d18610>
46. Sarimsokov, A. A. (2024). The ritual of «qo‘sh chiqarish» among Uzbeks and its territorial features (on the example of the Fergana Valley). *Historical Ethnology*, 9(2), 214–223. <https://doi.org/10.22378/he.2024-9-2.214-223>
47. Sarimsoqov, A. A. (2007a). Farg‘ona vodiysidagi dehqonchilik marosimlari haqida ayrim mulohazalar [Some observations upon the agricultural rites of the Fergana Valley]. In: Marg‘ilon shahrining jahon tsivilizatsiyasi tarixidagi o‘rni. International scholarly conference materials (pp. 97–99). Tashkent–Margilan: Fan.
48. Sarimsoqov, A. A. (2007b). Farg‘ona vodiysi o‘zbeklarining yil taqvim bilan bog‘liq qarashlari [The views of the Uzbeks of the Fergana Valley connected with the calendar of the year]. In: O‘zbekiston etnologiyasining dolzarb muammolari. Fourth republican scholarly and theoretical conference materials (pp. 221–227). Tashkent–Namangan.
49. Sarimsoqov, A. A. (2009). Chorvadorlarning yil taqvim bilan bog‘liq urf-odat va marosimlari [The customs and rites of pastoralists connected with the calendar of the year]. In: Farg‘ona vodiysi tarixi yangi tadqiqotlarda. Republican scholarly conference materials (pp. 83–89). Fergana.
50. Shamshidinov, B. Sh. (2026). Farg‘ona vodiysi chorvador etnik jamoalarining o‘troqlashish jarayoniga ta’sir ko‘rsatgan omillar (XIX asr oxiri – XX asr boshlari) [The factors that influenced the sedentarization of the pastoral ethnic communities of the Fergana Valley]. *Qo‘qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar*, 8(4), 1555–1559. <https://doi.org/10.70728/a.series.ijt.v08.i04.042>
51. Shomirzaev, M. Kh. (2020). Farg‘ona vodiysi xalqlari an’anaviy kashtado‘zligining etnohududiy xususiyatlari va omillari [The ethnoterritorial features and factors of the traditional embroidery of the peoples of the Fergana Valley]. *Fan va jamiyat*, (1-1), 49–51.
52. Usmonov, A. R. (2026). Bog‘dorchilikka oid nomoddiy madaniy meros (dala yozuvlari asosida) [Intangible cultural heritage relating to horticulture (upon the basis of field records)]. *Qo‘qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar*, 8(8), 924–927. <https://doi.org/10.70728/a.series.ijt.v08.i08.012>
53. Valikhonova, G. (2021). Sharqiy Turkistondagi siyosiy vaziyatning mintqa xalqlari etnomadaniy aloqalariga ta’siri [The influence of the political situation in Eastern Turkestan upon the ethnocultural relations of the peoples of the region]. *Jamiyat va innovatsiyalar*, 2(10/S), 311–316. <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-1415-vol2-iss10/S-pp311-316>
54. Gafurova, I. (2026). The study of the waqf institution in Turkestan. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary Human Studies*, 2(5).
55. Gafurova, I. (2024). Turkiston konfessiyalarga oid ilmiy tadqiqotlar. *Moturidiylik*, 4(3), 77–82.
56. Gafurova, I. M. (2024). Туркистонда православлик тарихи ва унга муносабат. *Islom tafakkuri*, 7(Special Issue 3/2), 79–82.
57. Yuldoshev, S. V. (2026). Study and comparative analysis of Tajiki children’s games. *Oriental Journal of History, Politics and Law*, 6(04), 715–723. <https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojhp1-06-04-78>