THE QARAÇI BEYS OF THE LATER GOLDEN HORDE: NOTES ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MONGOL WORLD EMPIRE*

U. SCHAMILOGLU

Following the demise of the Golden Horde, a number of successor states arose to take its place, including most notably the xanates of Kazan, the Crimea, and Kasimov, as well as the Nógay Horde. The period of these states — which we may term here the Later Golden Horde — lasted from about the beginning of the fifteenth century till their conquest at various times by Russia. Though they all shared a common Çingisid heritage as embodied in the traditions of the Golden Horde, their history has most often been studied within the context of relations with such neighboring states as Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire. The history of the successor states has in this manner come to be treated in isolation from the history of the parent Golden Horde, with the result that some of the most fundamental features of the history of both the Golden Horde and the successor states have been misunderstood. The most striking example of this is the institution of the qaraçı beys.

The four qaraçı beys were the heads of the four leading clans in each of the successor states to the Golden Horde. Together they formed a “council of state” in each of the xanates representing the interests of the

*I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many teachers and friends who were kind enough to read this paper and offer their valuable comments. The present article supercedes an earlier version entitled “Notes on the Qaraçı Beys of the Golden Horde” which was originally to have appeared in a volume entitled Altaica. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference. It also includes portions of a paper entitled “Islamic Sources on the Government of Yüan China” which was read at the annual meeting of the Midwest Branch of the American Oriental Society held at Indiana University (Bloomington), February 20-21, 1984. The transliteration system used in this paper is based on the Republican Turkish alphabet.
“land” against those of the “sovereign”, the Çingisid xan. A number of
detailed studies based on the diplomatic sources preserved from the end
of the fourteenth century on have stressed the importance of the role of
the qaraçı beys in the internal affairs of these states, particularly in invit-
ing to rule and in unseating the Çingisid xan. Though their contribu-
tions are of the greatest value, these studies have failed to place the
institution of the qaraçı beys in its proper historical context by seeing it
as a phenomenon limited to just the Later Golden Horde, or in some
cases as an institution created in the first half of the fourteenth century.
I would like to propose instead that the institution of the qaraçı beys
found its origins in a pattern of state organization that typified in an
earlier period not only the Golden Horde, but the other divisions of the
Mongol world empire as well.

A revealing passage on the role of the qaraçı (Turkish karaç) beys is
to be found in a neglected source for the history of the Crimean xanate,
the Umde tüt-tevarin. Its author, Abdülgaflar Kirimi, was a member of
the Crimean aristocracy whom the xan banished from the Crimea in
1744. Rather than presenting a simple history of the Giray line of Çin-
gisids that ruled the xanate, it is, in fact, a work which stressed the role
of the Şirin clan, the leading clan of the Crimean “land”, in the history
of the xanate. The following is an abridged translation (from Ottoman
Turkish) of this passage:

Let it be known that it is not legal for a glorious order (emr-i azîm)
to be executed without it first passing to the able hands of and
being voted upon by the four principal beys, who are the firm pil-
lars of the organization of the divan and other affairs of the Cri-
mean xans. The first of the four pillars is the Şirin, the second
Mansuroğlu, the third Barin, and the fourth Sicivut, they being

1 I have borrowed from the terminology used in E.L. Keenan, Jr., “Muscovy and
Kazan: Some Introductory Remarks on the Patterns of Steppe Diplomacy”, Slavic
2 For references to the most important literature see A. Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de
Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapî (Paris–The Hague, 1978); A.W.
Fisher, The Crimean Tatars (Stanford, 1978); H. Inalelc, “The Khan and the Tribal Aris-
tocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I”, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 3-4 i
3 F. Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke (Leipzig, 1927),
p. 280.
4 I have read *salisen “third” for rabian “fourth” in the text.
called in the Tatar language the four *karaçı*. When a matter of state comes up ... (the religious leaders are invited) and the four *karaçı* beys with their mirzas ... (and the leaders of the other clans as well as the elders of the Crimean Porte) enter into a protocol (*mükalette*) following consultation. Once the emirs who have a vote [i.e., the *qaraçı* beys], who govern foreign affairs, have affixed (their) seal (*hitam*) to the protocol, it is submitted to the ulema with the question: “Is it in conformity to the canonical law?” If so, it is signed and submitted to his excellency the xan of famed noble qualities to be acted upon as required.5

Although the *Umdat üt-tevarih* incorporates many legendary accounts,6 there is no reason to doubt the reliability of this passage. Abdülgaffar had available to him sources which are not readily, if at all, available today. His own first-hand knowledge of the structure of the Crimean xanate also adds to the value of this passage as a unique capsule description of the institution of the *qaraçı* beys in the Crimean xanate.

Abdülgaffar highlights certain aspects of the institution against which earlier parallels may be drawn: although he used Ottoman terminology, it is possible to compare the “protocol” (*mükalette*) with the famous *yarlıqs* of the Golden Horde, and the “seal” (*hitam*) with the *tamgás*.7 Abdülgaffar uses the older terms, in fact, in his account of the earlier history of the Crimean xanate. As for the system of four *qaraçı* beys who must consent and affix their seal to the “protocols” (orders) of the xan, parallels to it, too, may be sought on the basis of similarity in characteristics rather than in common terminology.8

---


8 On the presence of *qaraçı* beys in the various successor states to the Golden Horde, as well as the term itself, see V.V. Vel'yaninov-Zernov, *Izledovanie o kasimovskix tsaryax i tsarevicaх*, ii, Trudi Vostočnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago arxeologiceskago obšestva 10 (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 411-437. On the variant form *karapçi* in the Slavic sources see N. Veselovskiy, “Neskol’ko poyasneniy kasateľnoj arhitekty, dannix xanami Zolotoy ordi russkomu duxovenstvu”, *Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago geogra-
M.G. Safargaliev has quoted the following passage from the *At-ta'rif bi-l-muṣṭalāh aṣ-ṣarīf*, a Mamlūk chancellery handbook by Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʻUmarī (1301-1349), as a description of the divan of the ruler of the Golden Horde, Özbek Xan (omitting, however, those parts in the passage which I have bracketed):

There are four ulūs emirs (*amīr al-ulaś*) and the greatest of them is the beylerbeyi (*bakläri bak*). [He is the emir of emirs just as Qūṭūṣāh was under Gāzān, and Čūbān under Xudābanda and then Abū Sa‘īd.] The most important matters are not dealt with except through them. If one of them is absent, his name is nevertheless signed to the *yardiq* as if he were there, and his deputy takes his place. They do not act upon any matter (*lā yumdūna*) without the vezir, and when they are not present, the vezir acts, giving the order (*amr*) to the deputies, and their names are then written. The true ruler is the vezir. Just as the beylerbeyi is the sole authority on military matters, the vezir is the sole authority on matters of finance, administration, and dismissal from office. On the most important matters he is the sole authority; but in matters of the property of the people they all have a say. The emirs generally do not know more than what their deputies tell them.

Safargaliev relates this passage to the Golden Horde even though it clearly refers to the Ilxanate (as understood from the personalities mentioned in the text but omitted by him: Qūṭūṣāh, Gāzān, Čūbān, Xudā-

*.fičeskago obšestva po otd. étnogr. 34* (1900), pp. 525-536, especially p. 535; and Vásáry, *The Chancellory of the Golden Horde*. It is yet to be satisfactorily explained how the term *qaraq* relates to the term *qaracu* found elsewhere in the Çingisid world in this and other periods, if it is at all the same word etymologically. On the term *qaracu*, see B.Ya. Vladimirtsov, *Obšestvenny stroj mongolov* (Leningrad, 1934), Index; and G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, i (Wiesbaden, 1963), pp. 397-398.


10 Safargaliev read this passage in the collection of extracts and translations from Arabic sources edited by V.G. Tizengauzen, *Sbornik materiaiov ostnosyaqčixsya k istorii Zolotoy ordi*, i (St. Petersburg, 1884), referring to the translations on pp. 249 (ʻUmarī), 348 (Muḥibbi), 411 (Qalqasandī), and 439-440 (Maqrīzī). The passage appears in the original Arabic on p. 227. (In the Turkish translation — including only the first half of the original edition — by I.H. İzmirli, *Atınumordo devleti tarihine ait metinler*, Istanbul, 1941, this passage appears on p. 408 and the translation on p. 407.) There is no heading in either the original or the Turkish edition of Tizengauzen’s work to indicate what state this passage is referring to, though it is clear from the context as well as from the complete text of ʻUmarī’s *At-ta’ rif bi-l-muṣṭalāh aṣ-ṣarīf* (Cairo, A.H. 1312) that this passage, which appears on pp. 45-46, is a continuation of the description of Iran that begun on p. 43. The reference to Muḥibbi does, in fact, deal with the Golden Horde and the four ulūs emirs, the reference to Qalqasandī is the same as in n. 14 below, and the reference to Maqrīzī is unclear.
banda, and Abû Sa‘îd). He further argues that no such divan existed in the Golden Horde prior to the reign of Özbek Xan (r. 1313-1341) because four emirs are not listed in yarlıqs dating prior to the reign of Özbek. Finally he concludes that the divan finds its origin during the reign of Özbek, who was responsible for centralizing the administration of the Golden Horde. Following Safargaliev, B.F. Manz has also supposed that the institution of the qaraçi beys began during the reign of Özbek Xan.\textsuperscript{11}

A lengthier description of the government of Iran under the Mongols is to be found in the chapter on the Ilxanate in another chancellory manual by ‘Umarî, his Masâlik al-abṣâr fî mamâlik al-amṣâr. One passage from this description is as follows:

The highest authority over the troops is the highest-ranking of the ulus emirs, the so-called beylerbeyi, that is the emir of emirs. There are four ulus emirs, the beylerbeyi and three others. Together they are called emirs of the flank (qâl). Their names are supposed (yuṣṭa-ratu) to come after that of the sultan but before that of the vizir on yarlıqs and fermanans. Even when one of them is not present, the names of all four are nevertheless written on the document.\textsuperscript{12}

These two passages from the works of ‘Umarî depict an Ilxanid institution quite similar in characteristics to that of the qaraçi beys of the Crimea xanate as described in the Umdet üt-tevarihi. Although there are certain differences, the presence of four emirs or beys who participated in the most important decisions of state is a very significant point that both states had in common, be it under different names. Other sections in the Masâlik al-abṣâr fî mamâlik al-amṣâr relating to the ulus emirs of the Ilxanate give further details which are not reported for the Crimean xanate in the Umdet üt-tevarihi.\textsuperscript{13} It is stated, for example, that the Ilxanid vizir issued yarlıqs and orders (aḥkâm) concerning finances called aḥlan tamğa (aḥlân tamğâ “golden seal”), whereas the ulus emirs issued orders concerning the army. It is also mentioned that the date was written on the document by a scribe other than the one who originally wrote the document. Furthermore, just as there are aspects to the


role of the ulus emirs not reported in the Umde jüt-tevarih for the qaraçı beys, the seal associated with the qaraçı beys is nowhere ascribed in the writings of 'Umarı to the ulus emirs. Fortunately, there is a comparison by 'Umarı himself of the system of government of the Golden Horde with that of the Ilxanate:

The army and governmental apparatus (sulṭān) of the rulers of this country [i.e., the Golden Horde] is set up just as in the Ilxanate with respect to the number of emirs, the legal prescriptions, and the roles of the officials, but the ulus emirs and the vezir do not have the same administrative powers as there.14

The value of this last notice is in showing that a Golden Horde institution described as being the same as that of the ulus emirs of the Ilxanate preceded the qaraçı beys of the Later Golden Horde. A reference by the well-known traveler Ibn Batṭūta (1304-1377) in his Rihla to “the great emir ʿĪsā Bey, ulus emir, meaning emir of emirs”, further shows that the title of “ulus emir” was also current in the Golden Horde.15 A notice in a later Mamlūk chancellery manual by Qalqaṣandī (d. 1418) finally establishes that the title of beylerbeyi, too, was current in the Golden Horde.16 Thus, not only were the systems of government in the two western divisions of the Mongol world empire described as being the same in the first half of the fourteenth century, but the titles of the corresponding offices were also the same.

There were, however, certain differences which went beyond those to which 'Umarı himself pointed in the passage quoted above. The Ilxanid vezir, as an appointee of the Ilxan,17 did not represent an institution

---


15 Ibn Batṭūta, ed.-trans. C. Defrémery and B.R. Sanguinetti, Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah, ii (Paris, 1949), p. 395. It should be pointed out that this reference, which in the original Arabic reads al-amīr al-kabīr ʿĪsā bāk amīr al-ulūs ... wa-maʾnāhu amīr al-umārī, incorrectly defines “ulus emir” as “emir of emirs”. If ʿĪsā Bey was indeed the emir of emirs, then he must have been, in fact, the beylerbeyi (cf., n. 22 below).

16 Qalqaṣandī, vii, p. 302, where it is reported, following At-taṭīf (i.e., Muḥibbī’s Taṭīf at-ṭāʾīf bi-l-muṣṭalḥa as-ṣarīf), that in A.H. 782/1380-1381 A.D. the nāʾib of Câmbek Xan was the beylerbeyi, Qutluğuğa İnaq. As there was no Câmbek ruling at this date (Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 453), either the date is wrong, or the use of the name Câmbek is an anachronism (cf., n. 22 below.) See also Qalqaṣandī/Tizengauen, Ar. p. 401/trans. p. 412.

exercising political authority over the xan as did the ulus emirs and, later, the qaraçı beys. Although 'Umarî wrote that the vezir-issued documents were called al-tamğa, according to Ah'î's Târîx-i Șâyx Üvays (fourteenth century) the documents issued by the vezir were called, in fact, al tamğa (al tamğâ‘ “red seal”), to which, at least in the one instance mentioned, four emirs affixed their signature. The fact that these documents were signed by the four emirs shows that the vezir needed the same approval as the Ilxn to issue documents. This further reinforces the view that the Ilxanid vezir was a separate official acting as a representative of the Ilxan, since in the Golden Horde the tamğa was presumably affixed by the ulus emirs, and later certainly by the qaraçı beys, to the yarlıq of the xan.

As such, the Ilxanid vezir did not have a counterpart in the Golden Horde, for what has been referred to as the vezir in the Golden Horde was, in fact, one of the ulus emirs. B. Spuler associates the title “vezir” appearing in the sources for the Golden Horde with the titles mudâbbir (“leader”) and nâ‘îb (“deputy”). A closer examination of the sources he refers to, however, reveals that Qutluq Temür is described at one point in Ibn Duqmâm only as mudâbbir mamlakatihi (“leader of his country”) under Özbek Xan, and in another is said to have been replaced as Özbek’s nâ‘îb. According to Muḥībbî, Qutlabûq, the head emir, was nâ‘îb al-qân (“deputy of the xan”) to Canibeck (in A.H. 756/1355-1356 A.D.), and the vezir was one of the three remaining emirs (all four ulus emirs are described in part as al-amârî l-kabîrî, “great emir”). It is thus possible to conclude that both the Ilxanate and the Golden Horde followed the same basic pattern of state organization, since the Ilxanid

---

22 Compare this date with A.H. 782/1380-1381 A.D. in n. 16 above.
vezir did not reflect a basic aspect of state organization, unlike the relationship between the ulus emirs and the xan.

In a different passage, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa indicated that the principal emirs at another court also numbered four:

The principal emirs were seated on chairs to the right and left of the xan. ... By the entrance to the tent were the deputy (nā'īb), the vezir, the chamberlain (ḥācīb), and the keeper of the seal which they call the al tamgā (al tamgā) ... All four of them rose upon my entrance.²⁴

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa clearly gave what he thought the Arabic equivalents of the offices to be, but it is not certain from the titles alone that he was describing the same institution. Perhaps he was mistaken here just as he was earlier in his understanding of the exact positions of the four emirs he was describing.²⁵ Since, however, the emirs who rose numbered four and one was described as the “keeper of the seal” known as the al tamgā, this passage may be viewed with confidence as relating to the institution discussed above. What is so striking about this passage, however, is that it relates neither to the Golden Horde nor the Ilxanate, but rather to the court of the last ruler of the Çağatay xanate, Tarmaşirin (r. 1326-1334). After having broken up into Moğolistan and Transoxania in 1334, the Çağatay xanate was reunited again under Tuğluq Temür in 1360; it was within this state that Temürşen rose to power.²⁶ Ibn 'Arab-şāh (1392-1450), describing Temürşen's father in his 'Acā'īb al-maqdūr fī axbār Tīmūr, wrote (in the translation by Sanders):

The sounder opinion is that his [Temürşen's] father, the above-mentioned Taragai, was among the magnates of the Sultan's court. ... But after conquering Transoxiana and rising above his companions, he married princesses and therefore they gave him the surname Kurkan, which in the Mogul language means Son-in-law, since he had gained affinity with kings, and enjoyed the highest authority in their courts. He was one of the four Viziers of the said Sultan, with whom was the hinge of evil and good, since they were the eyes of the kingdom, and by their advice affairs were directed. The Turks forsooth have tribes and a race, like the Arab tribes, and each of these Viziers was to his own tribe a tall wick for the lamp of

²⁴ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 35
²⁵ Cf., n. 15 above.
its counsels in the houses of its habitation. One of these tribes is called Arlat, the second Jalabar, the third Qavjin, the fourth Barlas. Timur, however, sprang from the fourth...  

On the basis of this passage we may conclude not only that the four emirs described by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa at the court of Tarmaširin represented the same institution as the four vezirs described by Ibn ‘Arabšāh, but that the Çağatay xanate was organized along the same lines as the Golden Horde and the Ilkhanate.  

The presence of this institution in three divisions of the Mongol world empire as early as the first half of the fourteenth century should immediately attract our attention, since such an institution has not as yet been described for the Çingisid states as a whole. As it represents a fundamental aspect of political and social organization, it is unlikely that it could have arisen simultaneously in these three states independent of one another. If it represents, in fact, a characteristic feature of the organization of the Çingisid states, then we should also be able to identify it in Yüan China, and, indeed, we do have some evidence for such identification.

27 Ibn ‘Arabšāh, ed. A. Shirwanee, The History of Timour, in the Original Arabic (Calcutta, 1818), pp. 9-10; and trans. J. Sanders, Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir (London, 1936/Lahore, 1976), p. 4. There is a similar description of the Çağatay xanate, presumably also based on Ibn ‘Arabšāh (but with the correct forms of the tribal names: Arlat, Calayir, Qavcin, and Barlas), in D. Sinor, Inner Asia: A Syllabus, Uralic and Altaic Series 96 (Bloomington–The Hague, 19712), p. 188. On the title kūrgan, see Doerfer, TME, i, pp. 475-477. Finally, note again the confusion of terminology in the Arabic (i.e., emirs in one source and vezirs in the other).


30 Cf., Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, pp. 301-302; and the views of Safargaliev and Manz discussed above. See also n. 32 below.
The recent survey of Yüan political and administrative institutions by D. Farquhar — who bases himself primarily on the official dynastic history, the Yüan shih — reveals a system incorporating the traditional bureaus and offices of Chinese administration with the additional bureaus required for dealing with Mongol, Uyğur, Tibetan, and Christian affairs. In fact, the greatest problem of Yüan administration as seen by Farquhar is whether or not Yüan rule contributed to the administrative centralization of the later dynasties. But just as unofficial sources (such as chancellery manuals, travelogues, and clan histories) provide an extremely valuable outside perspective on the government of the Golden Horde, the Ilxanate, and the Çağatay xanate, they can offer an illuminating perspective on the government of Yüan China as well.

The first source I would like to turn to is the Câmi' at-tavârîx of Raşid ad-Dîn (d. 1318). Although it is the official world history of the Ilxanate, it nevertheless offers important information on Mongol rule in another state, China (especially since Raşid ad-Dîn’s main source was none other than Pulad cîngsangs, the envoy of Qubilay Xan to the Ilxanid court). In this work the description of Yüan government under Qubilay (r. 1260-1294) stresses the role of four non-Çingisid emirs called cîngsangs in the “Great Divan”. The officials at the Yüan court are ranked as follows according to Raşid ad-Dîn (in Boyle’s translation and preserving his transliteration):

The great emirs who have the qualifications to be ministers and viziers are called chingsang, army commanders taifu, commanders of tûmens vangshai, and emirs, viziers, and ministers of the Divan, who are Taziks, Khitayans, and Uighurs, finjan. It is the custom in


32 It is not clear why Raşid ad-Dîn describes the role of the various emirs in his discussion of the government of Yüan China, since in his account of Ilxanid history he tends to de-emphasize it. An example of this would be the story of how the Ilxan Ġâzân (r. 1295-1304) appointed four emirs and gave them tamgâs for affixing seals onto documents. (See Raşid ad-Dîn, ed. A.A. Ali-zade, trans. A.K. Arends, Djami-at-tavarix, iii, Baku, 1957, Pers. pp. 500-504/trans. pp. 284-287.) When one views such a story within the context of the non-official sources quoted above, one must conclude that this institution was not founded by Ġâzân, and that it was, in fact, present in Iran even before his reign. (Of course, if one prefers to view this institution as having arisen independently in each of these states, then such an account is quite plausible.)

the Great Divan to have four chingsangs from amongst the great emirs and four finjans from amongst the great emirs of the various peoples, Taziks, Khitayans, Uighurs, and Christians. These too have ministers in the Divan, and the offices of the emirs and governors there are in accordance with their rank. Their ranks are shown in detail below.

First rank — chingsang (he is qualified to be a vizier or minister).
Second rank — taifu (he is an army commander and, however senior, must defer to the chingsang).
Third rank — finjan (these are ministers and viziers from the various nationalities).
Fourth rank — yu-ching.
Fifth rank — zo-ching.
Sixth rank — sam-jing.
Seventh rank — sami.
Eighth rank — lanjun.
Ninth rank — (not known; all secretaries are under him).34

Raşid ad-Dîn goes on further to specifically name a number of the emirs and to mention that the “chief of the finjans is called sufînjan, that is, ‘cream of the finjans’.”35 (This entire listing of various offices together with the original forms is to be found in Appendix I.)

This notice and listing of offices takes on greater interest for us when we also consider the following description of the affairs of “the Great Divan, which they call shing”;36

It is the custom for the above-mentioned emirs to go to the shing every day and interrogate people. The affairs of the country are numerous, and when these four chingsangs are sitting, the other officials also, each with their bitikchis, are seated in due order according to their office. In front of each of them is placed a stand like a chair with a pen-case on it. They are always there, and each emir has a special seal and tamgha. ... It is these four chingsangs that report to the Qa’an.37

A second account completely independent of Raşid ad-Dîn, that of the merchant and traveler Tâc ad-Dîn Ḥasan ibn as-Samarqandî, is preserved in ‘Umarî and Qalqaşandî. A portion of Samarqandî’s description of China lists the traditional offices of Chinese government (that part of the report which Qalqaşandî has omitted is in brackets):

34 Raşid ad-Dîn/Blochet, pp. 470-472; and Raşid ad-Dîn/Boyle, pp. 278-279.
35 Raşid ad-Dîn/Blochet, pp. 476-477; and Raşid ad-Dîn/Boyle, p. 279.
36 Raşid ad-Dîn/Blochet, pp. 478 and 480-481; and Raşid ad-Dîn/Boyle, pp. 279 and 280.
37 Raşid ad-Dîn/Blochet, p. 483; and Raşid ad-Dîn/Boyle, p. 281.
This xan has two great emirs, the vezirs, and each person who has this rank is called cinksân. Below the two of them are two other emirs, and each person who is in this rank is called bincân. Below the two of them are two other emirs, and each person who is in this rank is called zücân. [Below the two of them are two other emirs, and each of the two who are in this rank is called samecân.] Below them are two other emirs, and each person who is in this rank is called yûcân. The head of the scribes, and each person who is in this position is called lancân, has the position of a private secretary (kâ-tib as-sîr).  

(This listing of various offices together with the original forms is to be found in Appendix II.)

Another quotation from the Islamic sources dealing with Yüan China (also preserved in 'Umarî and Qalqaşandî) emphasizes that the emperor had four emirs:

The merchant Şarîf al-Fâdîl Abû l-Hasan 'Ali l-Karbâlî, who has been in audience with this xan and many of the princes of the land (mulâk al-arîd) and who has learned personally the great power of this ruler, the obedience of his underlings, and the security of his state, reported to me that the xan has four vezirs who exercise authority in the whole country, while he himself is consulted only in the rarest of instances.  

The information of the Islamic sources — coming as it does from three independent sources all of which are possibly first-hand — cannot simply be dismissed in favor of a traditional view of Chinese administration based strictly on the official Chinese sources. Two of the Islamic sources indicate that there existed at the court of the Yüan emperor a “Great Divan” in which four officials participated in the administration of the state much in the same way as the ulus emirs and the qaraşi beys of the other Çingisid states. The account of Samarqandî, on the other hand, echoes the official accounts of Chinese government. It is clear from both the Chinese and the Islamic sources, however, that there were other çingsangs (Chinese ch'eng hsiang) who were distinct from these four çingsangs. To complicate matters further, according to the Yüan

39 ‘Umarî/Lech, Ar. p. 34/trans. p. 114; and Qalqaşandî, iv, p. 487.
40 On the çingsangs or ch'eng hsiangs, see Vladimirtsov, Obyehestvennîti stroj mongolov, Index; Doerfer, TMEN, i, pp. 310-312; Sheng wu ch'in cheng lu, ed.-trans. P. Pelliot and L. Hambis, Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan, i (Leiden, 1951), pp. 193-200; and P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, i (Paris, 1959), pp. 67-68 and 365. On the finjans, the group of four emirs ranking beneath the çingsangs, see Doerfer, TMEN, i, pp. 377-378; and Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, i, p. 71.
shih, the actual number of officials varied within the course of each reign. Wherever they went, however, the Mongols adapted to and adopted practices of the great centers of civilization over which they came to rule, and this must be no less true of China. Perhaps such a "Great Divan" falling outside the traditional framework of Chinese bureaucracy did exist and was not recorded in the official history of the Yüan dynasty (which, of course, was compiled at the beginning of the following dynasty). Since Raşid ad-Dîn's account includes both kinds of descriptions, the presence of four extraordinary çingsangs can be taken as an indication of the dichotomy between Mongol and Chinese traditions of government.

It has been the aim of this article to show that the institution of the qaraçı bey in the Later Golden Horde is the continuation of a fundamental, but hitherto unstudied Çingisid institution. The present study can hardly be considered exhaustive: it is not yet clear, for example, whether this form of state organization is a Çingisid innovation or if it dates from an even earlier period. (Indeed, many of the sources and problems — let alone other aspects of this institution — have not even been touched upon in this article.) In either case, the argument presented here challenges many of the basic assumptions regarding the rise of the Mongol world empire. A re-examination of the political and social organization of the Çingisid states should therefore be a prerequisite for any further study of the influence of Çingisid traditions on other states such as medieval Russia. While the sources for one of the Çingisid states may be used in trying to understand the same institution elsewhere, it should be kept in mind that genuine differences may have

---


43 As described in the Islamic sources, the "Great Divan" must have fallen outside the purview of the chung shu sheng, or Central Secretariat. On the Central Secretariat, see the Yüan shih, chap. 85: p. 2120 ff.; Ratchnevsky, *Un Code des Yuans*, i, p. 117 ff.; and Farquhar, "Structure and Function in the Yüan Imperial Government".


45 See n. 29 above.
existed from one state to another, as well as from one period to another. Finally, it is hoped that the few sources brought together here will serve to stimulate further research on tribal organization in the Eurasian political-cultural sphere.46

Appendix I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blochet</th>
<th>Boyle</th>
<th>= Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chingsang (4)</td>
<td>ch'eng hsiang 丞相</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taifu</td>
<td>t'ai fu 太傅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finjan (4)</td>
<td>p'ing chang (cheng shih)平章政事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yu-ching</td>
<td>yu ch'eng 右丞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zo-ching</td>
<td>tso ch'eng 左丞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sam-jing</td>
<td>ts'an (chih) cheng (shih)参知政事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sami</td>
<td>ts'an yi 參議</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lanjun</td>
<td>lang chung 郎中</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *

| vangshai      | yüan shuai 元帥         |
| sufjinan      | (?) p'ing chang (?) 平章 |

46 M. F. Köprülü has remarked in his “Bizans müessesele rinin osmanlı müessesele rinin te’siri hakkında bazı mülähazalar”, Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası 1 (1931), p. 195 n. 2, that the institution of the beylerbeyis in various Turkic states deserves further study. With many misgivings, I have followed the usage in the secondary literature and employed the term “tribe” in this study when discussing the states of the Mongol world empire and the term “clan” when discussing the successor states to the Golden Horde.
Appendix II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Umarî (Qalqaṣandî)</th>
<th>Lech</th>
<th>= Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>جنکمان چینکمان</td>
<td>cinkšan (2)</td>
<td>ch'eng hsiang 丞相</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بنجار ہنیژان</td>
<td>bincan (2)</td>
<td>p'ing chang (cheng shih)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>زوجین</td>
<td>zúcın (2)</td>
<td>tso ch'eng 左丞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سمجین</td>
<td>samcìn (2)</td>
<td>ts'an (chih) cheng (shih) 參知政事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>یوجین</td>
<td>yúcın (2)</td>
<td>yu ch'eng 右丞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لنچون</td>
<td>lancún</td>
<td>lang chung 郎中</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>