

Offprint

ARCHIVUM
EURASIAE
MEDII AEVI

IV
1984

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

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 Noğay 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.¹ 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 inviting to rule and in unseating the Çingisid xan.² Though their contributions 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 *karaçı*) beys is to be found in a neglected source for the history of the Crimean xanate, the *Umdet üt-tevarih*. Its author, Abdülgaflar Kırımı, was a member of the Crimean aristocracy whom the xan banished from the Crimea in 1744.³ Rather than presenting a simple history of the Giray line of Çingisids 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 pillars of the organization of the divan and other affairs of the Crimean xans. The first of the four pillars is the Şirin, the second Mansuroğlu, the third⁴ Barın, 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 Review* 26 (1967), pp. 548-558; and "Muscovy and Kazan' 1445-1552: A Study in Steppe Politics", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 1965), especially pp. 89-97.

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 Topkapı* (Paris-The Hague, 1978); A.W. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (Stanford, 1978); H. İnalcık, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy: The Crimean Khanate under Sahib Giray I", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3-4 i (1979-1980), pp. 445-466; and B.F. Manz, "The Clans of the Crimean Khanate, 1466-1532", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2 (1978), pp. 282-309.

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 *karaçıs*. 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 (*mükaleme*) 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 *Umdet üt-tevarih* incorporates many legendary accounts,⁶ there is no reason to doubt the reliability of this passage. Abdülgaḡfar 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.

Abdülgaḡfar 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" (*mükaleme*) with the famous *yarlıqs* of the Golden Horde, and the "seal" (*hitam*) with the *taḡas*.⁷ Abdülgaḡfar 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

⁵ Abdülgaḡfar Kırımı, ed. N. Asım, *Umdet üt-tevarih, Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası*, İlave (Istanbul, A.H. 1343), pp. 193-194. H. İnalcık has already drawn attention to this passage in his "Kırım", *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vi (Istanbul, 1955), p. 753. Cf., also his "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", p. 448 n. 8, for another version of the first portion of this passage.

⁶ See B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Russland, 1223-1502* (Wiesbaden, 1965²), p. 156 n. 12, p. 158 n. 25, and p. 162 n. 51.

⁷ On these terms in the Golden Horde see Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, pp. 305-310; M.A. Usmanov, *Jalovannie akti Djuçieva Ulusa XIV-XVI vv.* (Kazan, 1979); and I. Vársáry, *The Chancellery of the Golden Horde*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica (forthcoming).

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'yaminov-Zernov, *Izsledovanie o kasimovskix tsaryax i tsareviçax*, ii, Trudi Vostočnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago arxeologičeskago obščestva 10 (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 411-437. On the variant form *karaççı* in the Slavic sources see N. Veselovskiy, "Neskol'ko poyasneniy kasatel'no yarlikov, 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-muşṭalaḥ aṣ-ṣarīf*, a Mamlūk chancellery handbook by Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī (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):⁹

There are four *ulus* emirs (*amīr al-ulūs*) and the greatest of them is the *beylerbeyi* (*baklārī bak*). [He is the emir of emirs just as Quṭlūṣāh was under Gāzān, and Çubān 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 *yarlıq* as if he were there, and his deputy takes his place. They do not act upon any matter (*lā yumḍūna*) 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.¹⁰

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: Quṭlūṣāh, Gāzān, Çubān, Xudā-

fişeskago obşestva po oid. ètnogr. 34 (1900), pp. 525-536, especially p. 535; and Vásáry, *The Chancellery of the Golden Horde*. It is yet to be satisfactorily explained how the term *qaraçı* 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, *Obşçestvennıy stroy mongolov* (Leningrad, 1934), Index; and G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, i (Wiesbaden, 1963), pp. 397-398.

⁹ *Raspad Zolotoy Ordı, Uçenıe zapiski Mordovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 11 (Saransk, 1960), pp. 68-69.

¹⁰ Safargaliev read this passage in the collection of extracts and translations from Arabic sources edited by V.G. Tizengauzen, *Sbornik materialov otnosyāşıxıssa k istorii Zolotoy ordı*, i (St. Petersburg, 1884), referring to the translations on pp. 249 ('Umarı), 348 (Muhibbı), 411 (Qalqasandı), and 439-440 (Maqrızı). The passage appears in the original Arabic on p. 227. (In the Turkish translation — including only the first half of the original edition — by İ.H. İzmırlı, *Altınordu 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 'Umarı's *At-ta'rif bi-l-muşṭalaḥ 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 Muhibbı does, in fact, deal with the Golden Horde and the four *ulus* emirs, the reference to Qalqasandı is the same as in n. 14 below, and the reference to Maqrızı 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 Khan (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 *qaraçı* beys began during the reign of Özbek Khan.¹¹

A lengthier description of the government of Iran under the Mongols is to be found in the chapter on the Ilxanate in another chancellery manual by 'Umari, his *Masâlik al-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşâr*. 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 (*qûl*). Their names are supposed (*yuştaraştu*) to come after that of the sultan but before that of the vezir on *yarlıqs* and *fermans*. Even when one of them is not present, the names of all four are nevertheless written on the document.¹²

These two passages from the works of 'Umari depict an Ilxanid institution quite similar in characteristics to that of the *qaraçı* beys of the Crimean xanate as described in the *Umdet üt-tevarih*. 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-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşâr* relating to the *ulus* emirs of the Ilxanate give further details which are not reported for the Crimean xanate in the *Umdet üt-tevarih*.¹³ It is stated, for example, that the Ilxanid vezir issued *yarlıqs* and orders (*aḥkâm*) concerning finances called *altan tamğa* (*altân 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

¹¹ "The Clans of the Crimean Khanate", p. 282. V.L. Egorov also discusses centralized authority and "centrifugal tendencies" leading to disintegration in the Golden Horde ("Razvitie tsentrobejnih ustremлений v Zolotoy Orde", *Voprosi Istorii* 1974:8, pp. 36-50).

¹² 'Umari, ed.-trans. K. Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich. Al-'Umari's Darstellung der mongolischen Reiche in seinem Werk Masâlik al-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşâr*, Asiatische Forschungen xx (Wiesbaden, 1968), Ar. p. 93/trans. p. 153.

¹³ 'Umari/Lech, Ar. pp. 93-101/trans. pp. 153-159.

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

The army and governmental apparatus (*sulṭân*) 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 Baṭṭûṭa (1304-1377) in his *Rihla* to "the great emir 'Îsâ 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 Mamlûk chancellery manual by Qalqaşandî (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 'Umarî himself pointed in the passage quoted above. The Ilxanid vezir, 'as an appointee of the Ilxan,¹⁷ did not represent an institution

¹⁴ 'Umarî/Lech, Ar. p. 67/trans. p. 136; and 'Umarî/Tizengauzen, Ar. p. 208/trans. p. 229. See also Qalqaşandî, *Ṣubḥ al-a'şâ fî şinâ'at al-inşâ*, vii (Cairo, 1922), p. 304; and Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen, Ar. p. 401/trans. pp. 411-412.

¹⁵ Ibn Baṭṭûṭa, ed.-trans. C. Defrémery and B.R. Sanguinetti, *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, ii (Paris, 1949³), p. 395. It should be pointed out that this reference, which in the original Arabic reads *al-amîr al-kabîr 'Îsâ bak amîr al-ulûs ... wa-ma'nâhu amîr al-umarâ*, incorrectly defines "*ulus* emir" as "emir of emirs". If 'Îsâ Bey was indeed the emir of emirs, then he must have been, in fact, the *beylerbeyi* (*cf.*, n. 22 below).

¹⁶ Qalqaşandî, vii, p. 302, where it is reported, following *At-tatqîf* (*i.e.*, Muhibbî's *Tatqîf at-ta'rîf bi-l-mustalah aş-şarîf*), that in A.H. 782/1380-1381 A.D. the *nâ'ib* of Canibek Khan was the *beylerbeyi*, Qutlubuga Inaq. As there was no Canibek ruling at this date (Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, p. 453), either the date is wrong, or the use of the name Canibek is an anachronism (*cf.*, n. 22 below.) See also Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen, Ar. p. 401/trans. p. 412.

¹⁷ B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran. Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350* (Berlin, 1968³), pp. 282-288.

exercising political authority over the xan as did the *ulus* emirs and, later, the *qaraçi* beys. Although 'Umarî wrote that the vezir-issued documents were called *altan tamğa*, according to Ahrî's *Târîx-i Şayx Uvays* (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.¹⁸ The fact that these documents were signed by the four emirs shows that the vezir needed the same approval as the Ilxan 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 *qaraçi* beys, to the *yarlıqs* of the xan.¹⁹

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 *mudabbir* ("leader") and *nâ'ib* ("deputy").²⁰ A closer examination of the sources he refers to, however, reveals that Qutluq Temür is described at one point in Ibn Duqmâq only as *mudabbir mamlakatihi* ("leader of his country") under Özbek Xan, and in another is said to have been replaced as Özbek's *nâ'ib*.²¹ According to Muhibbî, Qutlabuğa, the head emir, was *nâ'ib al-qân* ("deputy of the xan") to Canbek (in A.H. 756/1355-1356 A.D.),²² and the vezir was one of the three remaining emirs (all four *ulus* emirs are described in part as *al-amîrî l-kabîrî*, "great emir").²³ 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

¹⁸ Ahrî, ed.-trans. J.B. van Loon, *Ta'riḫ-i Shaikh Uwais* ('s-Gravenhage, 1954), Pers. p. 161/trans. p. 62.

¹⁹ On the complicated question of the various *tamğas*, see W. Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series, N.S. 5 (London, 1977*), p. 387; Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, pp. 272 and 291; Usmanov, *Jalovannié akti*, pp. 147-151; and Vásáry, *The Chancellery of the Golden Horde*.

²⁰ *Die Goldene Horde*, pp. 301-302.

²¹ Ibn Duqmâq/Tizengauzen, Ar. pp. 318 and 321/trans. pp. 325 and 328.

²² Compare this date with A.H. 782/1380-1381 A.D. in n. 16 above.

²³ Muhibbî/Tizengauzen, Ar. p. 338/trans. pp. 348-349. On Muhibbî (also known as Ibn Nâzir al-Cayş [or: al-Cuyûş]), see C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2. Supplementband (Leiden, 1938), p. 176. For a different interpretation of the sources cf., M. Kafalı, *Altın ordu hanlığının kuruluş ve yükseliş devirleri* (Istanbul, 1976), pp. 115-133; and V.L. Egorov, "Zolotaya Orda pered Kulikovskoy bitvoy", *Kulikovskaya bitva*, ed. L.G. Beskrovniy (Moscow, 1980), pp. 174-213, especially the diagram on p. 176.

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 Baṭṭûṭa 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 (*nâ'ib*), the vezir, the chamberlain (*hâcib*), and the keeper of the seal which they call the *al tamğa* (*al tamğâ*) ... All four of them rose upon my entrance.²⁴

Ibn Baṭṭûṭa 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 tamğa*, 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 Moğolistān and Transoxania in 1334, the Çağatay xanate was reunited again under Tuğluq Temür in 1360; it was within this state that Temürleng rose to power.²⁶ Ibn 'Arab-şâh (1392-1450), describing Temürleng's father in his *'Acâ'ib al-maqdûr fî axbâr Tîmûr*, wrote (in the translation by Sanders):

The sounder opinion is that his [Temürleng'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 Baṭṭûṭa/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 35

²⁵ Cf., n. 15 above.

²⁶ J. Aubin, "Le khanat de Çağatai et le Khorassan (1334-1380)", *Turcica* 8 ii (1976), pp. 16-60.

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...²⁷

On the basis of this passage we may conclude not only that the four emirs described by Ibn Baṭṭûṭa at the court of Tarmaşirin represented the same institution as the four vezirs described by Ibn 'Arabşâh, but that the Çagatay xanate was organized along the same lines as the Golden Horde and the Ilxanate.²⁸

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.²⁹ 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.³⁰ 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 'Arabşâh, 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 Çagatay xanate, presumably also based on Ibn 'Arabşâh (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 *kürgän*, see Doerfer, *TMEN*, 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).

²⁸ See V.V. Bartol'd, "Ulugbek i ego vremya", *Soçineniya*, 2 ii (Moscow, 1964), pp. 25-198, especially pp. 33-36, for a discussion of the four leading tribes of the Çagatay xanate (based upon the passage in Ibn 'Arabşâh discussed above). For traditional accounts of the role of the emirs in the Çagatay xanate and the Timurid state see most recently B.F. Manz, "Administration and the Delegation of Authority in Temür's Dominions", *Central Asiatic Journal* 20 (1976), pp. 208-221; J. Aubin, "Le khanat de Çagatai et le Khorassan (1334-1380)"; and M. Haider, "The Sovereign in the Timurid State (XIV-XVth centuries)", *Turcica* 8 ii (1976), pp. 61-82.

²⁹ For general observations on state organization based on four tribes in Eurasian history cf., Veselovskiy, "Neskol'ko poyasneniy", p. 535; A.Z.V. Togan's important remarks in his *Ibn Faḍlân's Reisebericht*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 24 iii (Leipzig, 1939/Nendeln, 1966), pp. 155-158 and 261-263; and İnalçık, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", p. 448 n. 8; A.M. Hocart also discusses ancient forms of social organization based on the number four in his *Kings and Councillors. An Essay in the Comparative Anatomy of Human Society*, ed. R. Needham (Chicago, 1970²), Index (under "Four").

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.³¹ 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 Raşîd 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 Raşîd ad-Dîn's main source was none other than Pulad *çingsang*, the envoy of Qubilay Xan to the Ilxanid court).³² In this work the description of Yüan government under Qubilay (r. 1260-1294) stresses the role of four non-Çingisid emirs called *çingsangs* in the "Great Divan".³³ The officials at the Yüan court are ranked as follows according to Raşîd 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 *tümens vangshai*, and emirs, viziers, and ministers of the Divan, who are Taziks, Khitayans, and Uighurs, *finjan*. It is the custom in

³¹ "Structure and Function in the Yüan Imperial Government", *China under Mongol Rule*, ed. J.D. Langlois, Jr. (Princeton, 1981), pp. 25-55.

³² It is not clear why Raşîd 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 Gâzân (r. 1295-1304) appointed four emirs and gave them *tamğas* for affixing seals onto documents. (See Raşîd 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 Gâzân, 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.)

³³ Raşîd ad-Dîn, ed. E. Blochet, *Djami et-tévarikh*, ii, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial Series XVIII (Leiden-London, 1911), pp. 470-484; and trans. J.A. Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan* (New York, 1971), pp. 278-281.

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

Rašîd ad-Dîn goes on further to specifically name a number of the emirs and to mention that the "chief of the *finjans* is called *sufinjan*, 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 Rašîd 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 Rašîd ad-Dîn/Bloch, pp. 470-472; and Rašîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, pp. 278-279.

³⁵ Rašîd ad-Dîn/Bloch, pp. 476-477; and Rašîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, p. 279.

³⁶ Rašîd ad-Dîn/Bloch, pp. 478 and 480-481; and Rašîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, pp. 279 and 280.

³⁷ Rašîd ad-Dîn/Bloch, p. 483; and Rašîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, p. 281.

This xan has two great emirs, the vezirs, and each person who has this rank is called *çinkşân*. 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 *zûcîn*. [Below the two of them are two other emirs, and each of the two who are in this rank is called *samcîn*.] Below them are two other emirs, and each person who is in this rank is called *yûcîn*. The head of the scribes, and each person who is in this position is called *lancûn*, has the position of a private secretary (*kâtib as-sirr*).³⁸

(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-Fâdil Abû l-Ḥasan 'Alî l-Karbâlâ'î, who has been in audience with this xan and many of the princes of the land (*mulûk al-arḍ*) 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.³⁹

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 *qaraçı* 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*.⁴⁰ To complicate matters further, according to the Yüan

³⁸ 'Umarî/Lech, Ar. pp. 28-29/trans. pp. 110-111; and Qalqaşandî, iv, p. 486.

³⁹ 'Umarî/Lech, Ar. p. 34/trans. p. 114; and Qalqaşandî, iv, p. 487.

⁴⁰ On the *çingsangs* or *ch'eng hsiangs*, see Vladimirtsov, *Obščestvennîy stroi 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.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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).⁴³ Since Raşîd 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.⁴⁴

It has been the aim of this article to show that the institution of the *qaraçi* beys 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.⁴⁵ (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

⁴¹ *Yüan shih* (Peking, 1976), chap. 85: p. 2120 ff. For a translation of this portion of chapter 85 dealing with the various officials see P. Ratchnevsky, *Un Code des Yuan*, i, Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes chinoises IV (Paris, 1937), pp. 117-132.

⁴² H. Franke, *From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yüan Dynasty*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-his. Klasse 1978:2 (München, 1978), especially pp. 25-52.

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".

⁴⁴ J.D. Langlois, Jr., "Law, Statecraft, and *The Spring and Autumn Annals* in Yüan Political Thought", *Yüan Thought. Chinese Thought and Religion Under the Mongols*, ed. H. Chan and Wm. T. de Bary (New York, 1982), pp. 89-152, especially pp. 89-92.

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:

Blochet	Boyle	= Chinese
چينكمانك	<i>chingsang</i> (4)	<i>ch'eng hsiang</i> 丞相
طايفو	<i>taifu</i>	<i>t'ai fu</i> 太傅
فنجان	<i>finjan</i> (4)	<i>p'ing chang</i> (<i>cheng shih</i>) 平章政事
يو چينك	<i>yu-ching</i>	<i>yu ch'eng</i> 右丞
زو چينك	<i>zo-ching</i>	<i>tso ch'eng</i> 左丞
سم چينك	<i>sam-jing</i>	<i>ts'an (chih) cheng (shih)</i> 參知政事
سمى	<i>sami</i>	<i>ts'an yi</i> 參議
لنچون	<i>lanjun</i>	<i>lang chung</i> 郎中
* * *		
ونكشى	<i>vangshai</i>	<i>yüan shuai</i> 元帥
شوفنچان	<i>sufinjan</i>	(?) <i>p'ing chang</i> (?) 平章

⁴⁶ M.F. Köprülü has remarked in his "Bizans müesseselerinin osmanlı müesseselerine te'siri hakkında bâzı mülâhazalar", *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:

'Umarî (Qalqaşandî)	Lech	= Chinese
جَنكَمَان جَنكَمَان	<i>cinkşân</i> (2)	<i>ch'eng hsiang</i> 丞相
بَنجَار بَنجَان	<i>bincân</i> (2)	<i>p'ing chang</i> (<i>cheng shih</i>) 平章政事
زُوجِين زُوجِين	<i>zûcîn</i> (2)	<i>tso ch'eng</i> 左丞
سَمَجِين سَمَجِين	<i>samcîn</i> (2)	<i>ts'an (chih) cheng (shih)</i> 參知政事
يُوجِين يُوجِين	<i>yûcîn</i> (2)	<i>yu ch'eng</i> 右丞
لَنجُون لَنجُون	<i>lancûn</i>	<i>lang chung</i> 郎中