



AKADEMİK TARİH VE DÜŞÜNCE DERGİSİ

Academic Journal of History and Idea

Research Article

Received: 08.03.2026

Accepted: 20.06.2026

Elshan Aslanov*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3823-4350>

Local Chronicles as Sources for the History of Karabakh in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

XVIII ve XIX. Yüzyıllarda Karabağ Tarihinin Kaynağı Olarak Yerel
Kronikler

Abstract

This article examines the role of local chronicles known as the Karabakhnamas as sources for the study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The study comparatively analyzes the formation of the Karabakh Khanate, the rise of Panahali Khan, the construction of the Shusha fortress, relations with the Khamsa meliks, and descriptions of the territorial boundaries of the Khanate on the basis of local chronicle sources. A comparison of the accounts provided by Mirza Adigozal Bey, Mirza Jamal Javanshir Garabaghi, Mirza Yusuf Garabaghi, Mir Mehdi Khasani, and other authors demonstrates that these chronicles contain valuable factual material for the study of the political, administrative, and historical-geographical development of the Karabakh Khanate. At the same time, the study establishes that the scholarly use of these sources requires careful consideration of the authors' perspectives, socio-political affiliations, and potential subjective interpretations. The findings indicate that the Karabakhnamas constitute an important source base for the reconstruction of the history of Karabakh in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when analyzed through comparative and source-critical approaches.

Keywords: Karabakh Khanate, Karabakhnamas, Panahali Khan, Shusha fortress, Khamsa meliks

Öz

Bu makalede, Karabağ Hanlığı tarihinin XVIII ve XIX. yüzyıllardaki gelişimini incelemede önemli bir yere sahip olan ve genel olarak Karabağnameler adıyla bilinen yerel kroniklerin kaynak değeri ele alınmıştır. Çalışmada Karabağ Hanlığı'nın kuruluş süreci, Penahali Han'ın iktidara yükselişi, Şuşa Kalesi'nin inşası, Hamsa melikleriyle ilişkiler ve hanlığın sınırlarına ilişkin bilgiler, yerel kronikler temelinde karşılaştırmalı olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Mirza Adıgözal Bey, Mirza Cemal Cavanşir Karabaği, Mirza Yusuf Karabaği, Mir Mehdi Hezani ve diğer müelliflerin aktardıkları bilgiler karşılaştırıldığında, bu eserlerin Karabağ Hanlığı'nın siyasi, idari ve tarihî-coğrafi yapısının araştırılması açısından önemli veriler içerdiği görülmektedir. Bununla

*PhD in History, History Faculty, Baku State University, Azerbaijan, tarixmuavin@mail.ru

Citation: Aslanov, E. (2026). Local Chronicles as Sources for the History of Karabakh in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, 13(2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.46868/atdd.2026.1141>

Copyright and License Statement — © 2026 Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi (Academic Journal of History and Idea). This article is published as an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>). The article may be used, shared, adapted, distributed, and reproduced in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes, provided that appropriate credit is given to the author(s) and the journal. The authors are solely responsible for the scientific, legal, and ethical content of the article; the editors and editorial board disclaim all responsibility.

birlikte, söz konusu kroniklerin bilimsel arařtırmalarda kullanımı sırasında müelliflerin olaylara bakıř açıları, içinde buldukları siyasi ve toplumsal çevreler ile eserlere yansıyan öznel deęerlendirmelerin de dikkate alınması gerekmektedir. Elde edilen bulgular, Karabaęnamelerin karřılařtırmalı ve kaynak tenkidi yöntemleri çerçevesinde incelenmesi hâlinde, XVIII ve XIX. yüzyıllar Karabaę tarihinin yeniden inřasında önemli bir kaynak grubu oluřturduęunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karabaę Hanlıęı, Karabaęnameler, Penabali Han, řıřa Kalesi, Hamsa melikleri

Introduction

The geopolitical landscape of the South Caucasus underwent significant changes in the middle of the eighteenth century. Following the death of Nadir Shah Afshar in 1747, the disintegration of the empire established by him created favorable conditions for the formation of independent khanates in the region (Azərbaycan tarixi, 2007; Afşar, 2015). The Karabakh Khanate was distinguished by its strategic geographical position, military-political significance, and regional influence among the political structures formed in the territory of Azerbaijan during this period (Mustafazadə, 2009).

The political history of the Karabakh Khanate is one of the important components of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of the history of Azerbaijani statehood. The political processes that took place in the region, internal power relations, the struggle against foreign interference, and issues of state formation make the history of the Karabakh Khanate an important subject of scholarly research. In this regard, the study of the stages of the formation, strengthening, and political development of the Khanate is of particular scholarly importance.

One of the main written sources for the study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate consists of local chronicles known as the “Karabakhnamas.” These sources contain information about the political situation of the Khanate, its administrative system, historical and geographical features, social relations, and, in part, its demographic situation. At the same time, these chronicles are regarded as important materials for studying the history of Karabakh from a source-critical perspective. Thus, the comparative study of the Karabakhnamas not only as sources of historical information but also as subjects of source-critical analysis is of considerable scholarly importance.

Although the Karabakhnamas have long been regarded as important sources for the study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate, their source value, reliability, and authorial perspectives have not always been examined through a comparative source-critical approach. Written by different authors under different political and social circumstances, these chronicles often present the same events in varying ways. Such differences make it necessary to evaluate the Karabakhnamas not only as narrative accounts but also as historical sources requiring critical analysis. Therefore, a comparative examination of these chronicles is essential for a more balanced reconstruction of the history of the Karabakh Khanate. The present study addresses this issue by analyzing the major Karabakhnamas and assessing their contribution to the study of Karabakh in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the role of the Karabakhnamas as historical sources for the study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and to determine the scholarly significance of the political, social, and historical-geographical information reflected in these sources. The study identifies similarities and differences in the approaches of different authors to the same events and evaluates information concerning the formation of the Karabakh Khanate, the construction of the Shusha fortress, and relations with the meliks. The main objectives of the study are to identify the source-study features of the principal works included in the “Karabakhnamas” collection, to analyze how important events in the political history of the Karabakh Khanate were reflected in these chronicles, to compare similarities and differences in the approaches of different authors to the same phenomena, and to determine the reliability of local chronicles as well as their limitations.

Methodology

This study employs historical-analytical, comparative, and source-critical methods. The main corpus consists of the Karabakhnamas written by Mirza Adigozal Bey, Mirza Jamal Javanshir Garabaghi, Mirza Yusif Garabaghi, Mir Mehdi Khazani, and other local chroniclers. The sources are compared according to four criteria: the formation of the Karabakh Khanate, the rise of Panahali Khan, the construction of the Shusha fortress, and relations with the Khamsa meliks. Particular attention is paid to the authors’ perspectives, their proximity to political authority, chronological accuracy, internal consistency, and potential subjective biases.

Karabakhnamas from the Perspective of Source Studies

One of the main written sources for the study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate is the group of local chronicles known as the Karabakhnamas (Hüseynov, 2012). These works are regarded as important sources reflecting the political history of the Karabakh Khanate, its administrative system, the historical and geographical characteristics of the region, and, to a certain extent, its social relations. The Karabakhnamas constitute a collection of historical chronicles written mainly during the nineteenth century, in which information concerning the formation and development of the Karabakh Khanate, as well as political developments in the region, is systematically presented. Beyond providing a chronological account of events, these sources offer valuable information regarding the political relations of the period and the historical evolution of the region.

The authors of the Karabakhnamas were predominantly individuals closely connected with the political and social life of the Karabakh Khanate. Among them, chroniclers such as Mirza Adigozal Bey, Mirza Jamal Javanshir Garabaghi, Mirza Yusif Garabaghi, Mir Mehdi Khazani, and Mirza Rahim Fena occupy a prominent place. Their works extensively address such important subjects as the

establishment of the Karabakh Khanate, the rise of Panahali Khan, the construction of the Shusha fortress, relations with the Khamsa meliks, and the political boundaries of the region. Some of these authors participated directly in administrative affairs, while others were contemporaries of the events they described, a circumstance that enhances the factual value of the information contained in their works.

One of the notable characteristics of the Karabakhnamas is that they were written by different authors at different times. This circumstance enabled the same historical events to be recorded from diverse perspectives. Consequently, the Karabakhnamas are not only sources that provide information about individual events but also constitute important material for the comparative study of the history of the Karabakh Khanate. The differing representations of the same phenomena by various authors make a source-critical examination of these texts particularly necessary.

The Karabakhnamas also possess certain limitations as historical sources. Since many of these works are based on the authors' personal observations or orally transmitted information, subjective interpretations can be observed in the presentation of some events. In particular, the fact that some authors served within the administrative structures of the Karabakh Khans occasionally contributed to favorable portrayals of the ruling authority. Furthermore, differences in the description of certain historical events and variations in chronological sequencing necessitate a careful and critical evaluation of these sources.

Thus, the Karabakhnamas constitute an important source base for studying the political and historical development of the Karabakh Khanate and are of particular significance for the reconstruction of the region's history. A comparative and source-critical analysis of these chronicles contributes to a more balanced and comprehensive understanding of the historical development of the Karabakh Khanate.

The Formation and Political Consolidation of the Karabakh Khanate

The weakening of central authority in the Iranian Empire following the death of Nadir Shah Afshar in the middle of the eighteenth century contributed to the emergence of new political entities in the South Caucasus. During this period, various feudal rulers and tribal leaders sought to establish independent authority in the region, resulting in the formation of several khanates across the territory of Azerbaijan (Azərbaycan tarixi, 2007). The Karabakh Khanate emerged as a consequence of these political developments and, within a relatively short period, became one of the region's important political centers. The formation and political consolidation of the Khanate were closely associated with the rise of Panahali Khan, the construction of new defensive fortifications, and the development of relations with local feudal forces in the region.

Panahali Khan's Rise to Power in Karabakh

The formation of the Karabakh Khanate and the rise of Panahali Khan are widely described in the Karabakhnamas. Although the authors of these chronicles present the events within a broadly similar historical framework, certain differences can be observed in their interpretations. A comparative analysis of the accounts provided by various authors allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the process of the formation of the Karabakh Khanate.

In Mirza Adigozal Bey's *Karabakhname*, Panahali Khan's rise to power is explained primarily in the context of the political vacuum and tribal relations that emerged after the death of Nadir Shah. The author notes that Panahali Khan, as an influential member of the Sarijali-Javanshir tribe, returned to Karabakh with the support of his followers and began to establish an independent authority there. In this interpretation, particular emphasis is placed on Panahali Khan's personal authority and the tribal support that facilitated his rise (Adigözəl bəy, 2006).

In Mirza Jamal Javanshir's *History of Karabakh*, Panahali Khan's rise to power is explained within a broader political context. The author presents this development as a consequence of the political instability that followed the death of Nadir Shah and argues that Panahali Khan successfully established an independent authority by taking advantage of the political vacuum in Karabakh. Mirza Jamal also notes that Panahali Khan constructed several fortresses to strengthen his authority, thereby contributing to the political stability of the Khanate (Cavanşir Qarabaği, 2006).

In Mirza Yusif Garabaghi's *Tarixi-Safi*, Panahali Khan's rise to power is interpreted mainly against the background of the broader political situation in the region and the shifts in authority that occurred across the Caucasus. The author notes that, following the death of Nadir Shah, competition among various local rulers intensified, and under these circumstances Panahali Khan succeeded in establishing his political authority in Karabakh. In this work, the narrative is presented primarily within the framework of wider regional political developments (Qarabaği, 2006).

In Mir Mehdi Khazani's *Kitabi-Tarixi Qarabağ*, Panahali Khan's rise to power is associated with the internal political dynamics of the Karabakh region. The author states that Panahali Khan consolidated the authority of the Khanate by bringing together various local forces under his leadership. Khazani also emphasizes the importance of relations with the Khamsa meliks during this process, noting that some of them initially opposed Panahali Khan's authority but later accepted his rule (Xəzani, 2006).

Thus, a comparative analysis of the Karabakhnama authors demonstrates that all of them associate Panahali Khan's rise to power with the political vacuum that emerged after the death of Nadir Shah. Nevertheless, each author interprets this development from a different perspective. While Mirza

Adigozal Bey emphasizes Panahali Khan's leadership qualities and the strength of the tribal alliances supporting him, Mirza Jamal Javanshir presents the process as a consequence of broader regional political developments. Mirza Yusif Garabaghi explains it within the context of wider political transformations in the Caucasus, whereas Mir Mehdi Khazani relates it primarily to the internal political dynamics of Karabakh. These differing interpretations indicate that the formation of the Karabakh Khanate was a complex and multifaceted historical process.

The Construction of the Shusha Fortress in the Karabakhnamas

One of the important events in the political history of the Karabakh Khanate is the construction of the Shusha fortress. This event is regarded as the beginning of a new stage in the state-building process of the Karabakh Khanate. The authors of the Karabakhnamas associated the construction of the Shusha fortress with the strengthening of the military defense system of the Khanate and the emergence of a new political center in the region. However, the accounts of different authors reveal certain variations in the interpretation of this development (Axundov, 1989).

In Mirza Adigozal Bey's *Karabakhname*, the construction of the Shusha fortress is associated with efforts to strengthen the defense system of the Karabakh Khanate. The author notes that Panahali Khan initially built the Bayat fortress but later concluded that it was not sufficiently suitable from a defensive perspective. As a result, the need arose for a more secure fortification. For this purpose, the Shahbulag fortress was first constructed, followed by the Shusha fortress, located in a mountainous and strategically advantageous area of Karabakh (Adıgözəl bəy, 2006).

In Mirza Jamal Javanshir's *History of Karabakh*, the construction of the Shusha fortress is likewise presented as an important component of Panahali Khan's policy of consolidating power. The author explains that, considering the limited defensive capabilities of the earlier fortresses, Panahali Khan decided to establish a new fortified city in a mountainous and difficult-to-access part of Karabakh. This fortress later became known as Shusha and developed into the principal political center of the Karabakh Khanate (Cavanşir Qarabaği, 2006; Mahmudov & Mustafayev, 2012).

In Mir Mehdi Khazani's *Kitabi-Tarixi Qarabağ*, the process of constructing the Shusha fortress is described in greater detail. The author states that Panahali Khan initially sought to strengthen his authority through the construction of the Bayat and Shahbulag fortresses. However, in light of the political and military challenges facing the region, a more secure and defensible location became necessary. Consequently, the territory of Shusha, situated in the mountainous part of Karabakh and possessing significant natural defensive advantages, was selected for the construction of a strong fortress (Xəzani, 2006; Bakıxanov, 2001).

In Mirza Rahim Fena's work, the construction of the Shusha fortress is also regarded as an important event in the political history of the Karabakh Khanate. The author emphasizes that Panahali Khan's consolidation of authority in Karabakh and the establishment of a new political center marked the beginning of a new stage in the political development of the region (Fəna, 2006; Qacar, 2019).

Thus, a comparative analysis of the Karabakhnamas demonstrates that all of these sources regard the construction of the Shusha fortress as a significant stage in the political and military consolidation of the Karabakh Khanate. Most authors note that Panahali Khan first established the fortresses of Bayat and Shahbulag before deciding to construct the Shusha fortress, which was better suited to the defensive requirements of the period. Nevertheless, while some authors interpret this development primarily as a military-strategic necessity, others explain it as part of the process through which the Khanate established its political center in the region. These differing perspectives indicate that state formation in the Karabakh Khanate developed through several interconnected stages.

The Karabakhnama Authors' Views on the Khamsa Meliks

One of the issues that played an important role in the formation of the political system of the Karabakh Khanate was its relations with the Khamsa principalities that existed in Karabakh. The authors of the Karabakhnamas addressed this issue from different perspectives and presented varying interpretations regarding the political position of the meliks and their relations with the Karabakh Khanate. From this perspective, a comparative analysis of these sources makes it possible to define more clearly the nature of the political relations that existed in the region during the formation of the Karabakh Khanate.

In Mirza Adigozal Bey's *History of Karabakh*, the Khamsa meliks are presented as local feudal rulers active in the region during the formation of the Karabakh Khanate. According to the author, during the initial stage of Panahali Khan's rule, some meliks opposed him together with the Javanshir and Otuziki tribes and even joined the struggle against the Khan's authority by establishing contacts with Haji Chelebi, the ruler of Shirvan. However, the political situation later changed, and some meliks, including Melik Shahnazar of Varanda, entered into an alliance with Panahali Khan and supported the consolidation of his authority. These accounts indicate the gradual expansion of the political influence of the Karabakh Khanate within the region (Adigözəl bəy, 2006).

In Mirza Jamal Javanshir's *History of Karabakh*, the relations between the Khamsa meliks and the Karabakh Khanate are explained in greater detail. The author notes that the principalities existing in Karabakh played an important role in the political life of the region and occupied different positions during the process of strengthening the Khanate. According to his account, some meliks initially opposed the rule of Panahali Khan; however, as political conditions evolved, several of them chose to

cooperate with the Khanate authorities. This process ultimately contributed to the strengthening of the political supremacy of the Karabakh Khanate in the region (Cavanşir Qarabaği, 2006).

In Mir Mehdi Khazani's *Kitabi-Tarixi Qarabağ*, the activities of the Khamsa meliks are presented within the context of specific military and political developments. The author notes that during the reign of Panahali Khan, the Talysh meliks and Melik Hatam of Chilabörd remained in conflict with him for an extended period. Although this struggle continued for several years, the authority of the Khanate ultimately prevailed, and the territories governed by these meliks came under the political influence of the Karabakh Khanate. As a consequence, the authority of the Khanate was strengthened and a greater degree of political stability was established in several parts of the region (Xəzani, 2006).

In *Tarixi-Safi*, Mirza Yusif Garabaghi presents the Khamsa meliks as representatives of the local feudal elite of Karabakh. Their relations with the Karabakh Khanate are interpreted within the broader context of the political transformations that occurred in the region during the middle of the eighteenth century. According to the author, following the death of Nadir Shah, competition for power in Karabakh intensified, prompting Panahali Khan to strengthen his position through the construction of the Bayat and Shahbulag fortresses. At the same time, internal disputes among the Khamsa meliks, particularly the rivalry between Melik Shahnazar and several other meliks, weakened their political cohesion and consequently facilitated the strengthening of Panahali Khan's position in the region (Qarabaği, 2006).

Thus, a comparative analysis of the Karabakhnamas demonstrates that the Khamsa meliks were among the important political actors in the region during the formation of the Karabakh Khanate. According to these sources, the meliks initially opposed the authority of Panahali Khan; however, as the political position of the Khanate strengthened, most eventually accepted its authority. These accounts indicate that the Karabakh Khanate emerged as a leading political force in the region during the middle of the eighteenth century.

Descriptions of the Borders of the Karabakh Khanate in the Karabakhnamas

The issue of the boundaries and territorial structure of the Karabakh Khanate occupies an important place in the works of the Karabakhnama authors. These sources address the geographical boundaries of the Khanate, its administrative organization, and its regional sphere of influence from different perspectives. A comparative analysis of the information presented by these authors demonstrates that the Karabakh Khanate developed across a broad historical and geographical area encompassing both mountainous and lowland regions and occupied an important political position within the regional landscape of its time.

In Mirza Jamal Javanshir's *History of Karabakh*, the borders of the Khanate are described on the basis of the historical and geographical characteristics of the region. The author states that the province of Karabakh covered an extensive territory and defines its borders as extending from the Khudafarin Bridge to the Sinig Bridge along the Araz River in the south, the Kura River in the east, the Goran River in the north, and the Karabakh mountain range in the west. These descriptions indicate that Karabakh consisted not only of mountainous territories but also included extensive lowland areas and strategically important river systems (Cavanşir Qarabaği, 2006).

In Mirza Adigozal Bey's *Karabakhname*, the territorial structure of the Khanate is explained primarily in connection with the expansion of political authority during the period of the Karabakh Khanate. According to the author, the military and political position of the Khanate was strengthened following the construction of the Shusha fortress during the reign of Panahali Khan. As a result, territories such as Meghri, the southern districts, Tatef, Sisyan, Zangazur, and Kapan came under the authority of the Karabakh Khanate. These accounts emphasize that the Khanate was understood not merely as a geographical area but also as an expanding sphere of political influence within the region (Adıgözəl bəy, 2006).

In Mir Mehdi Khazani's *Kitabi-Tarixi Qarabağ*, the borders and historical-geographical characteristics of the province are presented in a more systematic manner. The author defines the boundaries of the province by the Araz River in the south, the Kura River in the east, the Goran River in the north, and the mountainous ranges of Karabakh in the west. At the same time, he emphasizes that Karabakh constituted an integral part of the lowland country and refers to historical urban centers such as Barda and Beylagan. This approach presents Karabakh not only as an administrative unit but also as a region possessing a deep historical and geographical heritage (Xəzani, 2006).

In Mirza Yusif Garabaghi's *Tarixi-Safi*, the territorial structure of Karabakh is described primarily through its internal divisions. The author discusses the boundaries of each of the Khamsa districts separately and provides information regarding the geographical position, natural conditions, and economic characteristics of the Dizag, Varanda, Khachin, Chilabörd, and Talysh districts. These descriptions demonstrate that Karabakh is presented not merely as a geographical space but as a territorial unit characterized by defined administrative subdivisions and considerable economic potential (Qarabaği, 2006).

Thus, a comparison of the information contained in the Karabakhnamas demonstrates that the borders of the Karabakh Khanate are described from geographical, administrative, and political perspectives. While Mirza Jamal Javanshir and Mir Mehdi Khazani primarily focus on the historical and geographical contours of the region, Mirza Adigozal Bey emphasizes the political and military

dimensions of territorial expansion. Mirza Yusif Garabaghi, in contrast, highlights the internal administrative structure of Karabakh. Taken together, these sources indicate that the Karabakh Khanate was a political entity of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries characterized by a broad geographical area and substantial regional influence.

Conclusion

The study of the history of Karabakh in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries on the basis of local chronicles leads to several important conclusions. The Karabakhnamas constitute not merely a collection of chronological narratives but a complex body of sources reflecting the political thought, administrative structure, and historical-geographical landscape of their time. The fact that many of the authors were direct participants in, or contemporaries of, the events they described enhances the historical value of the information contained in these works.

A comparison of the chronicles indicates that the formation of the Karabakh Khanate was not simply a consequence of the collapse of Nadir Shah's empire but was also closely connected with the political consolidation efforts of the leading tribal and political elites of the region, particularly the Sarijali-Javanshir group. In this context, the policies pursued by Panahali Khan, culminating in the establishment of Shusha as the principal center of authority, played an important role in strengthening the military and political stability of the Khanate.

The analysis of relations with the Khamsa meliks demonstrates that the Karabakh Khanate employed both military and diplomatic instruments in the process of establishing and consolidating central authority within the region. The strengthening of the Khanate's position occurred alongside changing political alignments among the meliks and contributed to the consolidation of regional political authority. The consistency of the information provided by different authors regarding the borders of the Khanate, including references to the Kura River, the Araz River, and the Zangazur mountain region, suggests that both the lowland and mountainous parts of Karabakh were regarded as components of a broader administrative, political, and economic space. The source-critical analysis further demonstrates that the use of local chronicles in historical research requires careful consideration of the authors' perspectives, social positions, and possible biases. Consequently, these sources yield the most reliable results when examined through a comparative and critical methodological framework. In conclusion, local chronicles continue to constitute an important source base for the study of the Karabakh Khanate and its place in the history of Azerbaijani statehood. Their scholarly value is significantly enhanced when they are analyzed through comparative and source-critical approaches that take into account both their informational richness and their interpretative limitations.

Author Contributions

The author is solely responsible for the conceptualization, methodology, analysis, and writing of the study.

References

- Adıgözəl bəy, M. (2006). Qarabağnamə. İçinde A. Fərzəliyev (Haz.), *Qarabağnamələr* (Birinci kitab, ss. 7–116). Şərq-Qərb.
- Afşar, C. H. (2015). *Azərbaycan Nadir Afşar Devleti*. Hiperlink.
- Axundov, N. (1989). *Qarabağ salnamələri*. Yazıçı.
- Azərbaycan tarixi. (2007). *Yeddi cildə: III cild (XIII–XVIII əsrlər)*. Elm.
- Bakıxanov, A. A. (2001). *Gülüstanı-İrəm*. Mömin.
- Cavanşir Qarabaği, M. C. (2006). Qarabağ tarixi. İçinde A. Fərzəliyev (Haz.), *Qarabağnamələr* (Birinci kitab, ss. 117–167). Şərq-Qərb.
- Fəna, M. R. (2006). Tarixi-cədid Qarabağ. İçinde N. Axundov (Haz.), *Qarabağnamələr* (Üçüncü kitab, ss. 7–31). Şərq-Qərb.
- Hüseynov, Y. R. (2012). *Qarabağ tarixi mənbələrdə*. Şuşa.
- Mahmudov, Y., & Mustafayev, C. (2012). *Şuşa-Pənahabad*. Təhsil.
- Mustafazadə, T. (2009). *Qarabağ xanlığı*. Sabah.
- Qacar, Ç. (2019). *Köbnə Şuşa*. Şərq-Qərb.
- Qarabaği, M. Y. (2006). Tarixi-Safi. İçinde N. Axundov (Haz.), *Qarabağnamələr* (İkinci kitab, ss. 7–107). Şərq-Qərb.
- Xəzani, M. (2006). Kitabı-tarixi Qarabağ. İçinde N. Axundov (Haz.), *Qarabağnamələr* (İkinci kitab, ss. 107–235). Şərq-Qərb.