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ABSTRACT

TRIBAL POLITICS AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN

THE GOLDEN HORDE

ULI SCHAMIOGLU

This dissertation proposes a new model for the organization of the Golden Horde and the other states of the Mongol world empire. It discusses the "four-bey system" (the four qaraçı beys) in the successor states to the Golden Horde (termed here the Later Golden Horde, including the xanates of the Crimea, Kasimov, and Kazan), and proposes that it may be used as a paradigm for understanding the organization of the Çingisid states.

Chapter I includes a statement of thesis, a discussion of the method used in this work for evaluating the conflicting evidence of various categories of official and unofficial sources, a definition of a "ruling tribe", and a brief historical introduction.

Chapter II offers the first original survey of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde since V.V. Vel'yanov-Zernov (1864). It defines an original set of characteristic features which may be used to describe the role of the four qaraçı beys in these states.

Chapter III uses the same set of characteristic features to propose that such a system (known as the four ulus beys) also existed in the earlier Golden Horde as well as in the Ilxanate in Iran, in the
Çağatay xanate in Central Asia, in the Mongol Yuan dynasty in China, and in the Great Xanate of the 13th century.

Chapter IV re-examines the history of the Golden Horde in light of the "four-bey system". On this basis it is able to offer a new interpretation of the role of Moğay, Qutluq Temür, and a series of other figures in the Golden Horde. It also examines the problem of the two divisions of the White and Blue Hordes in the Golden Horde.

Chapter V traces the "four-bey system" from the time of Mamay in an effort to establish the continuity of the "four-bey system" from the Golden Horde to the rise of the states of the Later Golden Horde. It examines in particular the role of the Şirin "ruling tribe" in this series of events.
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This dissertation employs a unified transliteration system based on the Republican Turkish alphabet for non-Latin alphabets (excluding Chinese, which is given in Wade-Giles). Many common terms such as "vezir" are given in the convenient forms available in modern Turkish in preference to other available spellings in English. In the case of certain terms such as "bey" and especially beylerbeyi, the modern Turkish form is a convenient (though anachronistic and potentially misleading) alternative to the multiple forms one would have to use in order to be historically accurate. Certain other terms such as "xan" and "xanate" are given in forms following the transliteration system of this dissertation in preference to other available spellings in English.

Given the difficulty in establishing a practical and consistent usage, the author asks for the indulgence of the reader. The following special usages in this system are indicated as they would appear in English or according to other common scholarly conventions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>English and Other Scholarly Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ç&quot;</td>
<td>ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ç&quot;</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ğ&quot;</td>
<td>gh; Turkish &quot;soft ğ&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ı&quot;</td>
<td>Turkish and Turkic &quot;back [dotless] i&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;i&quot;</td>
<td>Russian yeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;j&quot;</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;q&quot;</td>
<td>velar or uvular k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ş&quot;</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;x&quot;</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ı&quot;</td>
<td>Arabic 'ayn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-v-
Most of the other characters will be easily recognized by Islamist and Slavist alike. Long vowels are indicated by a circumflex, except in the case of direct quotations of other works using a macron. Arabic  \( w \) is transliterated "w" for Arabic, but "v" for Persian and Turkic. In the same way Arabic  \( q \) corresponds to Persian  \( z \) and so on. The medieval Turkic words and names appearing in this work are transliterated according to this system as though they were in Çağatay, but without diacritical marks or indication of vowel length. Therefore, Tatar words and names are not indicated in their modern vocalization. Ottoman Turkish is rendered by modern Republican Turkish orthography.
This dissertation is first and foremost an interpretative essay covering the history of many regions of the world over many centuries. Since a dissertation must be a finite presentation of scholarly research and analysis and at the same time be submitted within a specified amount of time, this work does not nor can it claim to be an exhaustive treatment of its broad subject. The individual topics discussed in this work are each worthy of monographic treatment, but it is hoped that the results achieved in this work will more than justify the comparative approach used here stressing breadth over detail.

It is difficult for one person to consult even the readily-available printed sources for the history of the Mongol world empire, let alone master their languages, within the limits established for one's career as a graduate student. For this reason this work will limit itself to sources already published and rely heavily on a vast body of secondary literature in order to be able to present a cogent and complete argument within the time period allotted. This is especially true for Chapters II and V, which deal with the Later Golden Horde. These chapters defer to the work of earlier scholars who have studied the Slavic sources in depth simply in order to enable the project to reach completion in its present form. The focus throughout this dissertation will be the Islamic sources, which is the author's field of primary interest and training. At the same time it is these very sources which have been subjected to the most serious mishandling and misinterpretation by earlier scholars.
Though the archives of many states offer abundant material, the introduction of additional data and the fleshing out of the contours outlined in this work will remain for future stages of the project of which this dissertation is hopefully only the beginning. It is the presentation of a concept, the identification of a system of state and social organization in a number of states and an analysis of its bearing on Čingisid history as a whole, which is the main goal of this dissertation.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1. Statement of Thesis

This dissertation has as its focus a single important Çingisid institution which it tries to identify in a number of Çingisid states. This institution, which shall be called the "four-bey system", is known from the successor states to the Golden Horde as the four qaraçı beys. The first task of this dissertation is to further refine the definition of this system for the successor states to the Golden Horde (a period which may be termed here the Later Golden Horde). It then attempts to establish its existence earlier in the Golden Horde and the other states of the Mongol world empire; in these states the "four-bey system" was represented by the four ulus beys. The final step is to apply the concept of this system to a re-interpretation of the history of the Golden Horde and the transition to the Later Golden Horde.

The states of the Later Golden Horde (including the xanates of the Crimea, Kasimov, Kazan, and others) were each ruled by a sovereign who was called a "xan" and was descended from Çingis Xan. What makes these states remarkable, however, is the "four-bey system", in which four beys or "leaders" of one of a group of four "ruling tribes" ("extraordinary" or "high-status tribes") shared power with the sovereign in the governing of the "state". (The "state" also included other "tribes" ["ordinary", "non-ruling", or "low-status tribes"], as well as the indigenous peoples who were subject to the Mongol states following their conquest.) The "leaders" of these four "ruling tribes", who were called the four qaraçı beys, constituted the "land" in each of
these states and acted together as a "council of state" in deciding many of the important matters of state.¹ The four beys were also responsible for the selection of a new xan or the removal of an undesirable xan. Additional aspects of the "four-bey system" in each xanate are examined in an effort to present a summary of the characteristic features of this system. This will be the content of Chapter II.

Chapter III will take the "four-bey system" known from the Later Golden Horde as the basis for the reconstruction of the same system in the earlier Golden Horde. The scholars who pioneered the study of the history of the Golden Horde and the other Mongol states were not aware of the existence of the system described here, since the only significant description of the four qaraqi beys prior to the fourth decade of the 20th century appeared in Russia in the 19th century.² Although a few scholars have taken into account some of the same sources for the "four-bey system" in the Golden Horde as does this dissertation, they have not considered the evidence for the Later Golden Horde in their descriptions of the organization of the Golden Horde in the 13th-14th centuries. Without a clear picture of the institution of the qaraqi beys of the Later Golden Horde as a model or guide, the sources for the Golden Horde itself seem confused or contradictory.


² The first and only overview of this system was by V.V. Vel'yanov-Zernov, Izsledovanie o kasimovskix tsaryax i tsareviçax, ii, Trudi Vostočnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago arxeologičeskago obščestva 10 (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 411-437. For subsequent scholarship on this question see Chapter II as well as the Historiographical Essay (Part II of the Bibliography).
On the other hand, students of the successor states to the Golden Horde have studied the institution of the qaraçı beys as a phenomenon limited to the Golden Horde (but only in the 14th century) and the Later Golden Horde, or to just the Later Golden Horde. When the sets of sources are compared, a similar set of characteristic features emerges, which seems to apply to both the system of the four ulus beys in the Golden Horde and to the later qaraçı beys.

It is also possible to document the very same institution in the Ilxanate in Iran, the Çağatay xanate in Central Asia, and the Yuan dynasty in China. The existence of this institution in the other Çingisid states lends further credence to the theory that the institution of the qaraçı beys in the Later Golden Horde represents the direct historical continuation of a Golden Horde institution. It may then be argued that the institution of the ulus beys—which is documented beyond any doubt for the first half of the 14th century—derives from an institution which existed or developed at the beginning of the Mongol world empire in the first half of the 13th century.

Chapter IV will apply what is now known about the system of the four ulus beys to a fresh examination of the history of the Golden Horde in the 13th-14th centuries. It will look for the earliest indications of a system of four ulus beys and try to place various important figures in the history of the Golden Horde within such a framework. This, in turn, will reveal a thread of continuity in the history of the Golden Horde, less certain for the 13th century but easily documented for the 14th. The result will be a new explanation of such events as the "civil war" at the end of the 13th century and give a much clearer picture of events at the end of the 14th century.
Chapter V will address the question of the disintegration of the Golden Horde from a state of one or two divisions to a group of smaller states. Here, too, various important figures will be placed within the framework established for the earlier and the Later Golden Horde. This chapter will also serve as the bridge to show not only how the institution of the ulus beys led, in effect, to the emergence of new xanates, but also to show conclusively that the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde is the direct continuation of a "four-bey system" in the earlier Golden Horde.

The Bibliography will review the sources, the historiography, and the literature on "tribalism" in separate essays. This will be followed by an annotated bibliography of sources and a bibliography of works cited.

2. Method

This dissertation presents a unique set of methodological and philological problems. These include the problems of the selection and treatment of individual sources (such as how to group the available corpus of sources and how to compare sources from different cultural areas), the resolution of a multitude of contradictions between the sources, and the explanation of phenomena which seem to be similar but are widely separated in both time and space. In the field of Çingisid history these are to be expected, but it is the true exercises in comparative history which have yielded the most important results to date. Of course, such studies are also fraught with the greatest

obstacles of all. The present dissertation, involving the recasting of the context within which the data in the diverse primary sources are to be interpreted, may be considered as falling into the same category.

The most important element in the approach of this dissertation is that the characteristic features of an institution are much more important than just the name of the institution or the title of a person involved within it. Too many studies in Eurasian history have emphasized the etymology and continuity in the usage of a particular term in disregard for the possible evolution of that particular institution or office or the application of the same term to a completely different office. In the study of the Mongol world empire it is especially important to realize that different terms in sources written in different languages often refer to one and the same office, title, or rank. There are studies of the Golden Horde which have postulated multiple institutions simply on the basis of different translations of one and the same original term. This dissertation therefore seeks common characteristic features rather than similarities in terminology to identify the "four-bey system" at different times in various states.⁴

It has also been necessary for this dissertation to adopt a strategy for dealing with the abundant and oftentimes contradictory primary source material in order to try and prove the major theses. The first consideration which must be made is that not all sources are of equal value when trying to establish the existence of a particular institution. Some are obviously better informed, others are clearly ill informed. It is obvious that both kinds of sources cannot have equal

utility under all circumstances to the historian. Two other sets of more subtle distinctions must also be drawn, however: first, whether a source is an indigenous or an external source; and second, whether a source is an official or an "unofficial" source.

An important consideration for primary sources which is not usually made in the study of the Çingisid states is between indigenous or external sources. Numerous scholars have tried unsuccessfully to understand the early period of the history of the Golden Horde on the basis of such external sources as the Russian chronicles and other Western sources for the 13th century. Until the Russians gradually come to play a greater role in the politics of the Golden Horde in the 14th century and then in the Later Golden Horde, they are not such valuable observers. On the other hand, indigenous sources such as dynastic histories and histories written for the non-dynastic interests always offer valuable inside information. These sources have been underutilized, with the exception of certain well-known authors like Rašīd ad-Dīn who are available in translation. Many of the indigenous sources have yet to be incorporated into a synthesis of Çingisid history.

The Islamic sources from the Mamlūk states almost form a category of their own falling between the external sources and the indigenous sources. These narrative histories and other works for the history of the Golden Horde are often based directly on indigenous Golden Horde sources, be it native histories or the oral reports of embassies, merchants, and other travelers to and from the area. Until the Russian chronicles offer detailed information on the Golden Horde and especially the Later Golden Horde, the Mamlūk sources are the most informative on the internal events within the Golden Horde.
A second distinction that can be drawn is between official and "unofficial" sources. It will be a constant consideration in this work that indigenous "official" sources represent a particular point of view and thus often serve to filter events to represent such a point of view. For this reason, dynastic histories can be held as emphasizing the role of the dynasty, while those histories written by and for leaders of non-dynastic socio-political units can be seen as serving these non-dynastic interests. (Even the Russian chronicles should be viewed as official—though external—sources.) Often, persons, events, or institutions which are left out of one work can be easily documented from the other sources. One has simply to compare the accounts of Ilxanid history as contained in the official dynastic histories of Raşīd ad-Dīn and Ğuvaynī with the descriptions of Ilxanid institutions in the chancellery manual of 'Umārī to appreciate how completely an important institution such as the "four-bey system" can be written out of the official histories.

While a balance between the dynastic and non-dynastic perspectives is desirable, it serves a useful purpose to study particularly the perspective offered by non-dynastic indigenous sources for the purposes of this dissertation.

An important category of sources is that of impartial or "unofficial" sources. Two major genres fall into this category: travel literature and (arguably) chancellery handbooks. The accounts of Islamic and Western travelers usually are devoid of a strong political bias when discussing the characteristics of a political institution, although they are also apt as outsiders to be naïve or misinformed. (In this regard it is difficult to regard these sources strictly as external or internal sources, since they combine elements of both. What is more, there are
hardly any true indigenous "unofficial" sources for the Čingisid states, unless one wishes to include the manual of Naḫçivânî, for example.) In the case of the chancellery handbooks, it is the position of this dissertation that the Mamlûk chancellery manuals especially are of unusual value in the study of the Golden Horde and the Ilxanate because they were written with objectivity and accuracy as their goal. Furthermore, their information on the Golden Horde came directly from embassies and merchants. Most importantly, however, they offer concise information for which they are the sole source in their own period, but which is fully corroborated by data from the later period. Perhaps it is just because their accounts are not always corroborated in the contemporary sources that earlier scholars have not emphasized these sources over other literary sources such as dynastic histories.

To recapitulate, one can consider a source as: an external source that is official (Russian chronicles, Mamlûk chronicles), an external source that is "unofficial" (travelers, [arguably] chancellery manuals), an indigenous source that is official (dynastic histories, "ruling tribe" histories), or an indigenous source that is "unofficial" (perhaps Naḫçivânî). Added to this can be the criterion of whether a source is well informed or ill informed. This classification of sources should not be considered as a rigid categorization, but rather a tool for understanding why certain sources stress one set of facts while other sources do not stress that same set (or in fact suppress it). Such a tool is necessary since one major problem faced by students of Mongol history is that there are contradictions between some of the most basic sources. (This statement is not referring just to inconsistencies in genealogy, though these are sometimes involved.) Many of these
contradictions can thus be ascribed to the political filter through which the author presents his own point of view.

Many statements in the sources are completely fictional and contradict all other sources. One notorious work in particular by Națanzi has completely misled scholars for several decades about the most fundamental aspects of the organization of the Golden Horde, from the time it was first utilized by Yakubovskiy until Aubin and Safargaliev called attention to the inadequacies of this work around 1960.⁵ Though most of the works dealt with here cannot be accused of gross fictionalization of history, the most severe cases will be treated only with great caution and skepticism. In most cases where contradictions exist, however, there is insufficient comparative evidence from other sources on which to base a definitive judgement.

Scholars of the Čingisid states have often viewed the Mongol xan as a severe autocrat, though the work done on the Later Golden Horde since the 19th century justifies a reconsideration of this a priori conception. Such a view has also entered into the discussion of the development of autocracy in Russia, since many scholars seek an origin for this in the Mongol period.⁵ The conception of the xan as a Western-style sovereign determined the sets of facts which earlier scholars chose in preference to other possible sets and thus shaped the history which they wrote and which later authors used as a guide. This work does not base itself on a completely different set of sources (though it does

⁵ See the detailed discussion of this source in Chapter IV.

combine sources which have hitherto not been examined together), but simply seeks to confirm from many of the same sources other patterns for the earlier states which are familiar from an alternative model available from the later states.

Finally, this dissertation argues that the presence of the phenomenon of collegial rule in a number of related states is to be explained by common descent from a parent state. There is no basis for presuming that there was any change in the fundamental aspects of the organization of the Golden Horde over the two centuries of its existence into the period of the Later Golden Horde; in fact, Chapter V will attempt to prove just the opposite. There is no documentary proof of the independent origin of this institution in each of the other divisions of the Mongol world empire.\textsuperscript{7} Therefore, there is little justification for assuming that the existence of this form of government in the other states by the first half of the 14th century is purely coincidental, nor is there evidence for suggesting that the system was borrowed into one state from another.\textsuperscript{8}

3. Definition of "Ruling Tribe" in the Çingisid States

(13th-18th centuries)

One of the difficulties encountered in the writing of this dissertation or any work dealing with medieval Eurasian history is the definition of one's terms. Many terms have been used in the secondary literature concerned with Eurasian history without regard for their implications. The most important of these is the concept of "tribe",

\textsuperscript{[7]} The views of Safargaliev and Manz relating to this point are discussed in Chapter IV.

though there are many others, too. Especially the term "tribe" is the subject of a great deal of controversy in the social scientific literature, with many scholars finding the term to be a hindrance rather than a positive tool in the study of societies.

Anthropology as a discipline has its own agenda and concerns which often have little in common with those of the historian of medieval Eurasia. Anthropologists usually base their conclusions on synchronic observation, while it is exactly the sources for the earlier periods which are of greatest interest to the historian. At best anthropologists offer an alternative definition of "tribe" which does not dovetail with the data for medieval Eurasia; at worst they completely deny the validity of the term. Though this criticism of the term may well be justified for studies on other areas of the world, anthropological studies completely disregard the abundant source material available for Eurasia documenting the existence of socio-political groups which function as the building blocks of state organization. One should not fall prey to fashions and completely ignore these units, for much insight is to be gained from their study.\footnote{See Part III of the Bibliography for a review of the literature on "tribalism", including the views of other scholars on tribes in medieval Eurasian history.}

This section offers an empirical working definition of a "ruling tribe" as the basic social unit and building block of the Čingisid states. All the inhabitants of the lands of the Mongol world empire were either members of one of the constituent tribes of the empire, of which only the upper levels can be followed in the sources, or of one of the subject peoples. None of the definitions cited in the review of literature on "tribalism" can be used to explain the behavior of the
four social units within the tribal tetrarchy that is the "four-bey system", since they concern themselves primarily with social organization on the level of the individual families, or with a vertical description of the organization of the tribe and supra-tribal entities. This information is not available from the sources for the medieval period.

There is clear documentation of a system whereby the leaders of four individual socio-political groups which shall be called "ruling tribes" played a rigidly defined role in the governing of the Čingisid states. Precisely because of the consistent and regular character of their roles, this system must have reflected the most basic aspect of state organization based on a regular system of four "ruling tribes". This organizing principle appeared regularly over many centuries in all the Čingisid states, even where it has not been identified previously by scholars. This system can therefore serve as a serious tool not only for the study of Čingisid history, but for the study of the notion of "tribe" and therefore of society in Eurasia. A "ruling tribe" may be defined as follows:

* * *

1. In the Čingisid states of Eurasia in the 13th-18th centuries, any socio-political group which could act in concert with three other socio-political groups to constitute the "land" in a contract with the "sovereign" (a member of the ruling house descended from Čingis Xan) to form a "state" was by definition a "ruling tribe". The number of "ruling tribes" in a given state numbered four except in the rarest and most unusual circumstances.
2. Each "ruling tribe" was a socio-political group united around a locus of power on the basis of a common ideology. A "ruling tribe" could be left or joined, so that the rank and file membership was fluid and dynamic, and not restricted, static, and immutable. A "ruling tribe" could also be created by a small group of individuals and expand in size as it attracted new members, calling itself either a new "ruling tribe" or the branch of an existing "ruling tribe".

3. The locus of power in each "ruling tribe" was a separate hierarchy led by a leader or bey independent of the ruling Čingisid dynasty. The leader or bey was descended from earlier leaders of the "ruling tribe".

4. The basis for unity within a "ruling tribe" was a common ideology. This ideology may be defined as the shared belief in a bond of kinship between members of the "ruling tribe". The membership of the "ruling tribe" could also recognize that their "ruling tribe" was descended from an earlier "ruling tribe" of the same or a different name with whose members they may recognize some degree of kinship. The members of a "ruling tribe" below the level of the ruling elite led by the leader or bey did not necessarily share actual kinship bonds, nor are there sources to prove the case for or against actual kinship.

5. Each of these four "ruling tribes" participated in the formation and governing of one "state" and that "state" alone. Each "ruling tribe" functioned independently of related "ruling tribes" or unrelated "ruling tribes" of the same name in other "states".

6. There could be more than one "ruling tribe" by a given name owing to the great geographic expanses covered by the Mongol world empire. Thus, branches of the same "ruling tribe" with the same or a different
name may have existed at the same time in the territory of the Golden Horde, in the Ilخanate in Iran, in the Çağatay xanate, and in Yuan China, as well as in each one of the states of the Later Golden Horde. Some "ruling tribes" carried the name of a pre-Çingisid socio-political groups or "state" known to have had its own internal divisions, but these internal divisions are no longer discernible in the Çingisid period.

7. One of the "ruling tribes" and the leader of that "ruling tribe" within a "state" had special responsibilities in the governing of that "state" as a primus inter pares functioning as the chief spokesman for the "land".

***

In offering a definition of what can be called a "ruling tribe" it should be noted that the sources for the Çingisid states do not allow a universal definition of "tribe" for these states. The present definition is limited in time and space to certain socio-political groups within the Çingisid states of the 13th-18th centuries. It does not apply to the earlier tribes of Eurasia, to those tribes outside of the sphere of the Çingisid states, or to the post-Çingisid states.

The term "ruling tribe" also excludes groups subject to the Çingisid states as well as member socio-political groups which did not have the status of "ruling tribe" according to the above definition. These may also be termed "non-ruling tribes" ("ordinary" or "low-status tribes"), which together with the "ruling tribes" constituted the entire class of "tribes. This is not to say that the "four-bey system" or all varieties of tribalism arose as a reaction to creation of the Çingisid state--if anything, the opposite is probably the case. This is simply
because there is no data to support a blanket definition for all "tribes" in this period. The same definition probably would apply, but this can only remain a hypothesis. Table I may be used to illustrate some of the points included in this definition.

Many of the points in this working definition are subject to revision pending the introduction of more information, though the present definition is based on a body of data from sources for the history of Eurasia in the Čingisid period combined with those conclusions of anthropologists which can be incorporated. There are certain difficulties, such as defining more specifically the relationship between various groups of the same name or groups otherwise purported to be related to one another. Another facet of this question which is difficult to define is the degree of coordination of effort, if any, between "ruling tribes" of the same name, or of "ruling tribes" with different names which nevertheless understood themselves to be related to another. Dardess has made the argument that, at least in the earlier period, there was a serious problem of communication between the far-flung divisions of the Mongol world empire as far as the central administration was concerned.\[10] It is unlikely that the tribes had more resources at their disposal individually than did the dynasty.

Historians have traditionally used the term "tribe" when discussing these socio-political groups in the 13th-14th centuries and the term "clan" when discussing these exact same groups in the 15th century and beyond, which arises from the traditional separation of the

### TABLE I

**THE LOCI OF POWER IN OPPOSITION TO THE XAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xan</th>
<th>Tribe 1&quot;</th>
<th>Tribe 2&quot;</th>
<th>Tribe 3&quot;</th>
<th>Tribe 4&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ruling&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>***</th>
<th>***</th>
<th>***</th>
<th>***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

- 0 represents the individual at the center, the xan or tribal leader who is the true locus of power;
- | represents the ruling hierarchy extending below the locus of power open to the members of the dynastic or tribal ruling family;
- - represents the individuals outside the ruling hierarchy within the dynasty;
- * represents the individuals outside the ruling hierarchy within the tribe who may shift from locus to locus or from tribal allegiance to dynastic allegiance;
- = represents the relationship between the sovereign and the tribal leaders;
- V represents the hierarchy of offices directly appointed by the xan and led in certain states (the Ilxanate and the Çağatay xanate) by a vezir appointed by the xan. The holders of these offices could have come from any group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Tribes (no. 5, etc.)</th>
<th>. . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Image of table and diagram]
study of the Golden Horde from the Later Golden Horde.\textsuperscript{11} (The Russian equivalents of these terms would be \textit{rod} when describing the Later Golden Horde and \textit{plemya} when describing the earlier states.)\textsuperscript{12} This unconsidered use of terms is not limited to works dealing with Čingisid history, since even the standard early works treating the Turko-Mongol tribes have also left the question to the reader. The same term should be used for both, and this dissertation will use the term "(ruling) tribe". Even though the successor states to the Golden Horde (the xanates of the Crimea, Kasimov, Kazan, and so on) were smaller in size, they were miniature replicas of the parent Golden Horde. If the readers will excuse the analogy, a worm cut into four becomes four little worms which function in exactly the same way as did the one larger parent

\textsuperscript{[11]} A classic example of a scholar using the two different terms for the earlier and later periods would be B.F. Manz, who in her "The Clans of the Crimean Khanate, 1466-1532", Harvard Ukrainian Studies 2 (1978), pp. 282-309, used the term "clan" for the Later Golden Horde. She has used the term "tribe" for the earlier period in her "Administration and the Delegation of Authority in Temür's Dominions", Central Asiatic Journal 20 (1976), pp. 208-221; "The Ulus Chaghatay Before and After Temür's Rise to Power: The Transformation from Tribal Confederation to Army of Conquest", Central Asiatic Journal 27 (1983), pp. 79-100; and "Politics and Control under Tamerlane", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 1983), especially pp. 42-53 for her definition of a number of terms, including "tribe".

worm. Even the names of the "clans" often continue the names of the "tribes" (for example the Arğın, Barın, Calayır, and others).13

There are important conclusions by anthropologists of which historians of Eurasia should be aware. But there is a solid body of data for medieval Eurasia of which anthropologists should also be aware. The "four-bey system" has not been incorporated by those few anthropologists who have attempted to incorporate source material for medieval Eurasian history in their descriptions of Eurasian society. It is hoped that this definition and the discussion of the topic in this dissertation will contribute to a dialogue on this important question.

[13] For the classic description of the "tribes" of the 14th century, see Raşid ad-Din, ed. A.A. Romaskevič et al., Djami' at-tavārīḫ, i/1 (Moscow, 1968), pp. 233-569; and trans. L.A. Xetagurov, Shornik iletopisey, i/1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1952), pp. 92-187. There were many indigenous as well as external terms for these socio-political groups in the various sources written in a number of different languages. As was the case with the nomenclature for the qaraçı beys and their various predecessors, the different terms for these socio-political groups (often simply translations of the original terms) only serve to mask the characteristics of the original group.
4. Antecedents to the "Four-Bey System"

The working hypothesis that an organizing principle of "four" was an important universal aspect of state consciousness in Eurasian political culture might serve as one possible explanation for the existence of the "four-bey system" in the earliest Čingisid states. It is difficult, however, to establish socio-political organization based on the number "four" as a regular organizing principle in pre-Čingisid Eurasian states on the basis of the available sources. One can only refer to the more general cultural significance of the number "four", such as in the well-known phenomenon of the four cardinal directions in Eurasia and in China. Already in Han China, for example, the capital Lo-yang had four gates painted different colors facing the four cardinal directions. This, however, is not the same as four independent units within the state representing four separate socio-political units as contrasted with the dynasty, as is the case in the Čingisid period.

The four "horns" among the Hsiung-nu can be considered one of the few examples of state administration (rather than organization) in pre-Čingisid Eurasia based on the number "four" as an organizing

[14] It is still too early to establish whether this phenomenon of collegial rule arose in the main divisions of the Mongol world empire independently as a reaction to the imposition of a new ruling house led by Čingis Xan, or whether this system was already in place in the lifetime of Čingis Xan or earlier. Neither position, however, is irreconcilable with a view affirming common descent from the ulus beys of the Golden Horde to the garaqı beys of the Later Golden Horde.


principle.  This hierarchy among the leading officials may not, however, correspond to larger socio-political units in the state, since these officials seem to have been related to the leader of the Hsiung-nu himself, the shan-yü. On the other hand, one might also note that they were in charge of the army, as was the case with the "four-bey system" in the Čingisid period. Among the later European Huns--who may or may not be related to the Asiatic Huns, let alone the Hsiung-nu--it is difficult to find traces of such a system. The Akatziri, who revolted against Attila's leadership, can, however, be considered a clear example of a socio-political group with its own name forming a part of what might be called Attila's "tribal confederation" (see below).

Significantly more details are known about the organization of the Türk empire, though this information is not traditionally organized in a manner that can easily be fitted into the present discussion. The usual practice is to describe the dual kingship among the Türk (the ruler was called gağan and his second was called şad), a series of lesser offices, the internal division of the state into an eastern and a


western division, and a series of additional subject groupings such as
the Toquz Oğuz (i.e., the "Nine Oğuz") with its own internal
divisions.20 There also exists, however, an unclear and little-
discussed reference in the Greek sources to a four-fold division of the
Türk in the 6th century.21 In the same period one can also note the four
administrative and military units known as "horns" in Tibet in the 7th-
9th centuries. This, however, is said to have developed from a system of
three "horns" and to have later expanded to five.22 Except for these
examples, the sources for medieval Eurasia consistently do not support a
principle of state organization based on the number "four".

Students of medieval Eurasia have traditionally studied what are
called the various "tribal confederations", which in many cases can be
considered as "states" consisting of more than one "tribe". Of course,
the sources for the pre-Çingisid period are much more limited than for
the later period, and one cannot always distinguish the role of the
dynasty apart from the hypothetical "ruling tribes" of earlier states.
There are numerous examples of post-Türk Eurasian states with internal

[20] A convenient summary may be found in Golden, Khazar Studies, pp.
37-42. The names of many of these confederations or states incorporate
a form of the word og, a word meaning "arrow" which many scholars also
interpret to mean "tribe". Thus, the name Onoğur is usually understood
to mean "Ten Tribes". For a survey of this question see P.B. Golden,
"The Migrations of the Oğuz", Archivum Ottomanicum 4 (1972), pp. 45-84,
especially pp. 45-48. For a recent discussion of collegial rule in pre-
Çingisid Eurasia see also İ. Kafesoğlu, "The State Parliament among
Ancient Turks", Studia Turcologica Memoriae Alexii Bombaci Dicata,
Instituto Universitario Orientale. Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series

[21] E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux
Studies, i, pp. 37-42.

[22] G. Uray, "The Four Horns of Tibet According to the Royal Annals",
divisions. Rather than going into a lengthy survey, one can simply mention the successors to the Türk (the Qirguz, Basmil, Qarluq, etc.),\textsuperscript{23} the Uyğurs,\textsuperscript{24} the Onoğurs ("Ten Oğurs"),\textsuperscript{25} the Pechenegs,\textsuperscript{26} the Hungarians,\textsuperscript{27} and the Qumans\textsuperscript{28} as having amply documented socio-political units which could disassociate individually or in groups from the rest of the "confederation" to form a new "confederation" or "state". Without exception in the post-Türk period there is no grouping organized on the basis of the number "four" until the "four-bey system" of the Çingisid states. (These confederations are organized on the basis of, for example, three, seven, nine, twenty-four, etc. units.) This

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Gy. Moravcsik, "Zur Geschichte der Onoguren", Studia Byzantina (Budapest, 1967), pp. 84-118; and Golden, Khazar Studies, i, pp. 3-48.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} On the rich literature for this topic see most recently T. Lewicki, "Madjar, Madjaristan", Encyclopaedia of Islam\textsuperscript{2}, v (Leiden, 1984), pp. 1010-1022; and Magyarország története, i/1-2: Előzmények és magyar történet 1242-ig, ed. A. Bartha (Budapest, 1984).
\end{itemize}
leaves the rise of the Mongol world empire as the first clearly
documented example of the "four-bey system" in the historical sources.\textsuperscript{29}

Otherwise, one can only ask whether the existence of different
varieties of quadrapartite organization in the neighboring states in the
same or earlier periods can be related to this phenomenon at all. In
Sasanid Iran there was certainly a quadrapartite division in the state,
while in Armenia there were similar institutions one could also
compare.\textsuperscript{30} Unfortunately, studies of such phenomena do not offer
sufficient comparative material, for which reason this point must remain
open for future research.\textsuperscript{31}

5. Historical Introduction

This brief survey is not a historical introduction in the usual
sense. It is intended rather to enable the non-specialist reader to
follow the chronology of the many states and periods to which reference
is made in the course of this work. A general survey of the
historiography of the Mongol world empire will be found in Part II of
the Bibliography. Most of this historical introduction is based upon the
available secondary literature, though it also draws on original
interpretations.

\textsuperscript{29} Of course, one could speculate on further antecedents among the
Cürçen (Chin) and other peoples, but the traditional secondary
literature dealing with these peoples does not present sufficient data
which can be used in this discussion.

\textsuperscript{30} See the discussion and references in N. Adontz, ed.-trans. N.
Garsoian, Armenia in the Period of Justinian. The Political Conditions
based on the Naxarar System (Lisbon, 1970), pp. 167 ff. and 222-223 and
notes.

\textsuperscript{31} See also A.M. Hocart, who discusses ancient forms of social
organization based on the number four as an organizing principle in his
Kings and Councillors. An Essay in the Comparative Anatomy of Human
Society, ed. R. Needham (Chicago, 1970\textsuperscript{2}), Index (under "Four").
The Great Xanate in the 13th Century

Temüçin, later to be better known under the title Çağrısun Xan, was born in the second half of the 12th century. By the time his successive victories against neighboring groups such as the Merkit, Naiman, and Kereyit allowed him to call a qurultay (or "assembly") in 1206, he was already the leader of a powerful confederation centered on the Onon River and extending from the Altay Mountains to the Xingan Mountains. He conducted further victorious campaigns against the Chin dynasty in northern China, which fell in 1234. An important landmark in world history, no doubt, occurred when two years later Çağrısun Xan decided to send an army (perhaps in revenge for the slaying of his emissaries) against the Xwārazmšāh Muḥammad II. Not stopping in Xwārazm, the invading army passed through Iran into Azerbaycan, the steppes north of the Caucasus, the steppes of southern Russia, and finally rejoined the rest of Çağrısun Xan’s army, which was in the process of pillaging Transoxania. Çağrısun Xan finally died in 1227 while redirecting his attentions to matters further east.

The death of Çağrısun Xan marked a new phase in the history of the Mongol world empire in which there was now a question as to who would succeed to become the next Great Xan. Çağrısun Xan was followed in accordance with his wishes by his son Öğödei, who ruled as xan from 1229-1241. Following the death of Öğödei, Ghiyūk ruled as Great Xan from 1246-1248.

An important series of events began in the reign of Möngke, who ruled as Great Xan from 1251-1258. Möngke directed Hülegü to conquer Iran, and he directed Qubilay to conquer China. Until this time, a
number of the territories had been ruled by direct appointees of the great xan.

With the selection of Qubilay, who was now in China, as the next Great Xan, the split in the Mongol world empire became a more significant factor. Distances were too great to continue ruling the whole territory directly, and each individual state developed its own independent policies. More importantly, it will later be seen that each state probably had its own group of four "ruling tribes" participating in direct government. As long as the great xan ruled over these territories through appointees, they were under his direct control, but it must be considered for the purposes of our analysis here that from this point on four independent Čingisid states were in operation: the ulus of Coçi (together with the ulus of Orda), the ulus of Çağatay, the ulus of Hülegü, and the ulus of Qubilay (which also continues as the seat of the Great Xan).

The Yuan Dynasty in China

Part of the territories which became Yuan China was initially administered by a direct appointee of the great xan, Mahmud Yalavaç, as was just noted. Upon his elevation, Möngke ordered that Qubilay march on China, and in this manner the lands of China came to be governed as the fourth of the semi-independent territories of the Mongol world empire. Once Qubilay was in China, he also succeeded to the position of great xan, and the title remained within his state for his successors to claim.

A number of dates can be taken as the starting point of Mongol rule in China: 1215, when Čingis Xan seized Peking from the Chin
dynasty; 1260, when Qubilay became great xan and established his capital in Peking; or 1279, when Qubilay decided to proclaim the inception of his Chinese-style reign, which he called the Yüan (southern China was brought under Mongol control only in 1279). The Yüan dynasty continued past the death of Qubilay in 1294 and lasted till 1368, when the Mongol leadership had to finally retreat back into the steppe as the next dynasty, the Ming, was coming into being.

The Çağatay Xanate

The Çağatay xanate also seems to have come into existence during the lifetime of Çingis Xan. Some of the nearby territories of Transoxania, however, were ruled at the same time by a direct political appointee (a subordinate rather than a vassal) of the great xan in the Mongol capital Xanbaliq, namely Mas'ūd Bey, son of Maḥmūd Yalavaç.

After the death of the great xan Môngke, Qaydu (a grandson of Ögödey) established rule between the Kipchak steppe and Mongolia despite rivalries from other Çingisids. Qaydu also confirmed the rule of Maḥmūd Yalavaç and his three sons in Buxara and Samargand. There continued a series of rulers, ending with Tarmaşirin (r. 1326–1334). Following his rule, however, the xanate split in two. The eastern section seceded, and in the western section, Transoxania, the tribes gained the upper hand. The xan Qazan was overthrown in 1347 by the emir Qazğan. Qazğan appointed members of the house of Çağatay and Ögödey as xan, but was murdered in 1357. This allowed Tuğluq Temür, a real or supposed member of the line of Çağatay who had seized power in 1345 in the eastern territory of Moğolistan to profess Islam and seize the throne of Transoxania in 1360. Tuğluq Temür thus was able to reunite the ulus of
Çingis Xan's son. In 1361 Tuğluq Temür appointed his son Ilyas governor over Samarqand, and appointed as his "vezir" one Temürlenq, who was to then come to prominence. Termürlenq was, as will be seen, one of the four beys in the Çağatay xanate.

Following the reign of Temürlenq (d. 1405) the political situation in these lands deteriorated again, and his successors had to go on to India to continue their brilliant reign. Back in Transoxania, there was a great tribal realignment, when the fate of the tribes of the erstwhile Çağatay xanate became entangled with the history of the successor states to the Golden Horde.

The Ilxanate in Iran

The territories of Iran were initially administered by appointees of the great xan, first Körköz and then Emir Arğun. Shortly after his elevation, however, Möngke decided to send Hülegü to conquer Iran in what was the second Mongol campaign into Iran. Hülegü began his attack in 1259, and by the time of his death in 1265 he had established Mongol rule in Azerbaycan, founding a capital at Marâğa.

His successor, Abaga (r. 1265–1282), had to face battles with both elements of the Golden Horde and the Çağatay xanate. He also won victories against the Crusaders and fought the Mamlûks. He was succeeded by Ahmad for two years, but after that Arğun was able to take over (as he was willed to do by Abaga himself), reigning 1284–1291. While Ahmad had encouraged a policy of Islamization, Arğun followed a more liberal policy.

The next xan was Abaga's younger son Geyxatu, who was best known for introducing paper money into Iran; but this also cost him his life
in 1294. For a brief period he was replaced by Baydu, after which Arğun's other son Gızân converted to Islam and seized the throne. (He ruled 1295-1304.) His right-hand man, Nawrūz, participated in the severe persecution of Christians and Buddhists, who until then had been tolerated.

Gızân was followed by Ólceteytu (or Xudābanda), who reigned from 1304-1316, and then Abû Sa'id (r. 1316-1335). The Ilxanid state then disintegrated in the 1330s, when the foundation of the Calayirid state in western Iran sealed its fate.

The Golden Horde

It seems that a vassal state, the ulus ("appanage" or "patrimony") of Çingis Xan's eldest son Coçi, was created during Çingis Xan's own lifetime. As Coçi died before his own father, the western half of these lands were administered at the time of the death of Çingis Xan by his second son Batu (d. 1255-1256). The eastern half of the ulus of Coçi, as this entire territory was known, was given to Coçi's oldest son Orda.

The ulus of Coçi came to be known in the West as the Golden Horde. (The western and eastern halves or flanks of the Golden Horde were known as the White Horde and the Blue Horde respectively.) Though the term "Golden Horde" usually includes the ulus of Orda as well, the ulus of Orda is usually not taken into consideration in surveys of the Golden Horde, in part because there is so little data on it in the sources. This dissertation will consider the events in the western half of the ulus of Coçi in its discussion of the Golden Horde and will treat the ulus of Orda separately in Chapter V.
During the reign of Batu, the Russian principalities were subjugated and the limits of the expansion of the Golden Horde into Eastern Europe were reached in Hungary. Following his death, his brief successor was Sartaq. Since Sartaq died on the way home from visiting the great xan, however, a new ruler was again needed. This was Berke (r. 1257-1266), under whom further raids were conducted against Poland and the border feud with the Ilxanate began. Diplomatic exchanges in this regard were begun with the Mamlûk state. Berke also founded a new capital (known as New Saray or Saray Berke), which became an important urban center.

Berke was succeeded by Mengü Temîr (r. 1266-1280). Mengü Temîr continued diplomatic relations with the Mamlûk state, made peace with the Ilxanids, maintained friendly relations with the Byzantine Paleologues, and interfered in the Çağatay xanate.

His successor, Tuda Mengü (r. 1280-1287) is most notable for his interest in mystical Islam, which caused him finally to abdicate and seek a life of quiet contemplation. His successor, Telebuğa (r. 1287-1290), was ambushed and killed through a conspiracy of Noğay and the person who was to become the next xan, Toqta (r. 1290-1313). The most notable feature of the rule of Toqta is his struggle with Noğay (d. 1299), which many have characterized as a period of civil war in the Golden Horde.

Toqta's successor, Özbek Xan (r. 1313-1341), is perhaps the best-known of the rulers of the Golden Horde. He was a Muslim and under him Islam achieved new importance in the Golden Horde. He continued friendly relations with the Mamlûks, the Byzantines, the Genoese, and the Venetians. The Russians continued to be a subject people. The
dissolution of the Ilkhanid state into tribal confederations eased the tensions on the southern border.

Following Özbek's death, he was briefly succeeded by his son Tinibek, and then Canibek took over (r. 1342-1357). It was in this period that Mamay, whom we will discuss later, came into prominence. Following the death of Canibek, there began a long period of turmoil which many have seen as the darkest period in the history of the Golden Horde. That is the case only if one looks at the history of the succession of the xans. That is extremely complicated, but when the tribal patterns are studied, a completely different picture emerges.

As mentioned previously, the ulus of Coçi had been divided into two halves or flanks since the death of Coçi. Though the sources for the eastern or Blue Horde (in contrast to the western or White Horde) are quite sparse, there is little that went on in that division that is of major importance in so far as political history is concerned until the end of the 14th century. At that time, though it is still not completely clear how the two flanks related to each other, "ruling tribes" from the eastern division came to dominate over the western division. This is the period of the xan Toqtamış, his rival Temir Qutluq with his bey Edigil, the interference by Temür leng, and the beginning of the disintegration of the Golden Horde following the re-unification of the Blue and White Hordes.

The Later Golden Horde

The successor states to the Golden Horde were formed in the wake of the creation of multiple loci of power in the second half of the 14th century and this process continued through the 15th century. What was
possibly the remaining nucleus of the Golden Horde, called the "Great Horde" in the Slavic sources, continued till the beginning of the 16th century. The other successor states, however, played a more important role in this period.

The Crimea was one of the first distinct centers to emerge, but it is only in the 1440s that a continuous dynasty was founded by Haci Giray, who was invited to come from Lithuania to rule in the Crimea by the leadership of "ruling tribes" of the Crimea. This state came to be known as the Crimean xanate and continued as a part of the Ottoman Empire until the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, by which the Crimea became a part of the Russian Empire.

The xanate of Kazan was also formed in the first half of the 15th century, though there is some controversy over exactly when in the 1430s or 1440s. The xanate was finally conquered by Muscovy in 1552, the first foreign, non-Slavic state to be incorporated into the emerging Russian Empire centered in Moscow. The century of relations between Muscovy and Kazan has its own literature focusing on which state had the upper hand and when.

Though it was not the most prominent of the successor states, the xanate of Kasimov is important in terms of the data it offers for the analysis offered in this dissertation. It was founded in the middle of the 15th century by the sons of the founder of the xanate of Kazan who were in the service of one of the Russian rulers.

The Noğay Horde was, in fact, one of the Mangit "ruling tribes", though most historians have understood it to have formed an independent state. It can be argued that the various branches of the Mangit—that is, different Mangit "ruling tribes"—were affiliated with other states
including the xanates of Kazan and the Crimea, as well as the Şeybanid state.

There were a number of other states in this period about which much less is known, such as the Siberian xanate, centered around present-day Tyumen'. It was probably formed in the 15th century and continued until its conquest by Muscovy in the 16th century in the well-known campaigns of Ermak. There were also other xanates about which much less is known and which do not enter into the the analysis of this dissertation at all.
CHAPTER II
THE LATER GOLDEN HORDE AS A PARADIGM FOR THE
ORGANIZATION OF THE MONGOL WORLD EMPIRE

The very first question which must be addressed is why a study of
the tribal politics and social organization of the Golden Horde should
concern itself with the history of the Later Golden Horde. The first of
a number of reasons for this is that the states of the Later Golden
Horde represent a direct continuation of the parent Golden Horde. There
is no basis for assuming—either on the basis of the primary sources or
the standard secondary works—that the demise of the Golden Horde and
the subsequent emergence of successor states involved any change in
either the basic organization of these states or the fundamental notions
of statecraft in the Mongol states in this period. In fact, subsequent
chapters will present evidence to suggest that there was a very strong
continuity in the institutional history of the Golden Horde throughout
its existence and well into the period of the successor states.

The second reason is that there is a relative wealth of primary
source material available for the Later Golden Horde as compared to the
earlier Golden Horde. It is only at the end of the 14th century that
genuine specimens of yarlıqs ("diplomas" or documents) first become
available and form a substantial corpus of source material together with
the diplomatic correspondence preserved in Russian translation.¹ For the
earlier Golden Horde there is only a limited amount of correspondence

[1] For a bibliography of Turkic documents from this period see M.A.
preserved in Russian and Arabic translation. While some of the Russian translations are reliable, Keenan has attempted to show that those preserved in the Russian chronicles must be utilized with the greatest caution. Another example of a genre of historical source which is available for the period of the Later Golden Horde but non-existent for the Golden Horde itself is narrative dynastic and non-dynastic histories (the latter written from the perspective of the "ruling tribes"), which are well known for the later period. These works offer an inside perspective which cannot be compared with the laconic reports often found in the Russian chronicles.

Finally, there is a whole body of secondary literature dealing with the states of the Later Golden Horde. One may draw profitably on this literature to propose institutions for the Golden Horde that have otherwise not yet been described. In the case of the "four-bey system" described in Chapter I and known in the Later Golden Horde as the four qaraçí beys, this system can be directly applied as a working hypothesis.


[3] For a survey of Arab sources on the Golden Horde see S. Zakirov, Diplomatičeskije otnošenija Zolotoj Ordii s Egiptom (XIII-XIV vv.) (Moscow, 1966). Examples of correspondence emanating from the territories of the Golden Horde preserved in works such as Qalqashandi's Şubh al-aşâ fi şinâ'at al-ingâ' have not yet been studied as far as is known here, Zakirov's work not notwithstanding.


for the organization of the Golden Horde and the other states of the Mongol world empire. This dissertation is the first work to bring such evidence from the Later Golden Horde to bear on the governing and organization of the Golden Horde and the other Mongol states.

A detailed description of the organization and social structure of the states of the Later Golden Horde is unfortunately beyond the immediate scope of this dissertation, whose main focus must remain a new examination of the history of the Golden Horde. It will, however, briefly sketch the organization of the successor states to the Golden Horde in this chapter. In particular, it will examine in greater depth the main features of the "four-bey system"—that is the qaraqâl beys—as the fundamental feature of the governing and organization of the states of the Later Golden Horde. A more detailed description of the states of the Later Golden Horde should be a priority for future research.

The states of the Later Golden Horde each consisted of a number of different elements. At the bottom of the social order of the state was the subject population. In the khanate of Kazan, for example, there were indigenous Turkic and Finno-Ugric groups who were not considered a part of the Chingisid state. Examples of this are the Bashkirs, the erstwhile Hungarians (the Mâcâr of the Islamic sources), who


[7] The statements V.D. Smirnov, M.G. Safargaliev, and B.F. Manz in reference to the earlier Golden Horde will be discussed in the course of this work.

consistently remained a separate entity according to the sources, the
Cheremis (Mari), Chuvash, Votyaks (Udmurt), Mordvins, and other groups.\[9\]
The next step above them would have to be those "tribes" (or former or
potential "ruling tribes") who were members of the Qingisid state but
who did not form a part of the "land" in any of these states. In the
Crimean xanate, for example, certain tribes are represented in the
sources in addition to the obvious example of the "ruling tribes" who
later lost their high status in that xanate.\[10\]

At the highest level of society was the individual identified
most closely in the secondary works with the "state" in the Later Golden
Horde: the xan, who was descended from Qingis Xan and possessed of what
scholars dealing with Eurasia have often called "charisma". Like any
figure presiding over a state, the xan always had a hierarchy of
subordinates. Many of the important officers in the government were
direct appointees serving his will. Into this category one can probably
place the members of the chancellery, some of the administrators of
territories over which the xan had direct control, collectors of certain
taxes, and so on.\[11\]

\[9\] There is a rich literature on this question: see the references
in J. Pelenski, Russia and Kazan. Conquest and Imperial Ideology (1438-
1660s) (The Hague-Paris, 1974), pp. 4-8 (but cf. p. 56); and A.
Kappeler, Russlands erste Nationalitaten. Das Zarenreich und die Völker
der Mittleren Wolga vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert, Beiträge zur Geschichte
Osteuropas 14 (Cologne-Vienna, 1982).

\[10\] See for example Siroečkovskiy, "Muxammed-Geray i ego vassali", pp. 38-39; and Table II listing the "ruling tribes" of the Crimean
xanate later in this chapter.

288, for the example of the office of tudun of Kefe, who was appointed
by agreement of the xan and the "ruling tribes". On this office see
also V.D. Smirnov, Krimske xanstvo pod verkovnenstvom Ottomanskoy Porti
do načala XVIII veka (St. Petersburg, 1887), p. 39 ff.
A number of earlier scholars have focused on these various offices and the "feudal" relationships which they discern therein from the perspective offered by the extant Turkic yarlıqs.\textsuperscript{12} Such an approach does not result in an overview of society as a whole, but rather selected glimpses of a narrow portion of the upper strata of the ruling elite without regard for how they might fit into a broader concept of the administration of the successor states to the Golden Horde. Nevertheless, many positions are known from some of these documents which have been preserved. One particular document, the yarlıq of the xan of Kazan Sahib Giray (1523),\textsuperscript{13} contains a list of various officials who served the xan as judges, postal servicemen, customs officers and collectors of duties as well as other high-level administrators. According to Pelenski, who believes that the most important administrative function in the Mongol states was the collection of taxes, this implies that in the period of the Later Golden Horde the xanate's bureaucratic apparatus was effectively organized to conduct the administration of towns and the countryside.\textsuperscript{14}

The xan was not necessarily the most important figure in the state, however. The most important segment of the population of the "state" was the "land" consisting of the four (later sometimes five) "ruling tribes". They constituted the identifiable portion of the citizen population (as opposed to the subject population) in the Čingisid state. The leaders of the four "ruling tribes"—the four garaçi

\textsuperscript{12} See the discussion in Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, pp. 56-57.

\textsuperscript{13} On the yarlıq of Sahib Giray see Ş.F. Muxamed'yarov, "Tarkanıy yarlıq kazanskogo xana Saxib-gireya 1523 g.", Novoe o prošlem naşey strani. Pamyati akademika M.N. Tixomirova (Moscow, 1967), pp. 104-109; and Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{14} Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, p. 55.
beys—constituted a "council of state" serving interests diametrically opposing those of the xan. This "council of state"—and not those direct appointees of the xan—constituted the xan's divan.\textsuperscript{15}

The qaraçi beys of the "four-bey system" served an important role in the governing of each these states through the removal, selection, and investiture of Çağışid xans, as well as through their active part in the foreign and military affairs of the state. No decree of the xan was legal unless these four qaraçi beys approved it, often by applying their seal to the document in conjunction with the xan's own seal. It was also these four qaraçi beys who controlled the army. The leader of the four qaraçi beys was arguably as powerful as the xan, if not even more powerful at times. The xan could play off factions of the "land" against one another and when powerful, he could influence the selection of tribal leaders, even kill existing ones. Such an act, however, required courage, just as the attempted murder of a sovereign was a very bold act carrying great risks.\textsuperscript{16}

Between the qaraçi beys and the dynastic hierarchy of officials there were numerous other officials such as the various "inner beys" (içki beyler), the oğlan kıyım, and the religious hierarchy together with various other titles which appear in the sources. Their exact roles are not understood very well owing to a lack of adequate source material, and conflicting interpretations (however brief) have arisen in the secondary literature concerning this gray area between the


\textsuperscript{16} See for example Inalcik, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", pp. 453–466.
leadership of the "ruling tribes" and the dynasty. Their role may coincide regularly or only occasionally with the hierarchy subordinate to the xan described above.

Despite all the documentation available, the "four-bey system" has not yet received general acknowledgement as one of most basic aspects of the government and social organization in the states of the Later Golden Horde. Studies are still written in which the implicit model for the governing of the Later Golden Horde and the earlier states is autocracy or a less sinister Western model of kingship. An appreciation of this institution is an important basis for the argument posed in the following chapters of this dissertation, since it will form the basis of the model to be used to reconstruct the organization of the earlier Golden Horde itself. A satisfactory explanation of the organization of the Golden Horde is not possible in any other way.

The study of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde was pioneered in the 19th-century by V.V. Vel'yaminov-Zernov, who devoted a lengthy description to the qaraçı beys in his study of the xanate of Kasimov. He utilized a number of diverse Western, Slavic, and Oriental sources for documenting the existence of this system in the xanates of


[18] See for example the discussion of the views of Pelenski at the end of this chapter.

[19] Izsledovanie o kasimovskix tsaryax i tsareviçax, ii, pp. 411-437. All references—when available to modern editions—of the sources which Vel'yaminov-Zernov was the first to utilize will be followed by a reference to the appropriate pages of his work (hereafter abbreviated IKTsTs). A number of "bibliographic rarities" were unfortunately unavailable for the purposes of this discussion and it has been necessary to cite Vel'yaminov-Zernov in such cases.
the Crimea, Kazan, Kasimov, Siberia, and the Nogay Horde. Since Vel'yminov-Zernov saw the institution in much more limited terms than this dissertation proposes to do, he was satisfied for the most part to simply attest the presence of four beys called garaçis in these states. This has remained the basis for almost all the theoretical work done on the garaçı beys since. This chapter will take his work as a starting point and include many of his references, though it is not appropriate to completely recast all of his work here by cataloging his references, since the original work is available for scholars to consult. The discussion of differing interpretations of the role of the garaçı beys is relegated to the end of this chapter.

Though Vel'yminov-Zernov did a remarkably thorough job for his day of collecting references in the Western and Oriental sources to the garaçı beys, there remain a number of sources which were not available to Vel'yminov-Zernov in his time. For this reason there are additional characteristic features of this system not discussed by Vel'yminov-Zernov, but according to which the description in this dissertation is organized. The following list of characteristic features of the "four-bey system" highlights those features in the Later Golden Horde which are crucial for the application of the "four-bey system" to the earlier Golden Horde:
0. Etymology;
1. Four in number;
2. Leader of a "ruling tribe";
3. Deputies of the leader;
4. Beylerbeyi is chief of the four;
5. Beylerbeyi is head of the army;
6. The four qaraçı beys choose the xan;
7. The four qaraçı beys elevate the new xan;
8. Correspondence with foreign rulers;
9. Approve documents and seal them with a tamğa;
10. Religious qaraçıs.

It is necessary to turn first to the term qaraçı, since it has served as a stumbling block in the path towards a better understanding of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde. Numerous scholars have insisted on explaining this system strictly on the basis of their understanding of the meaning of the term qaraçı. The preference of this dissertation is to explain this system and its antecedents on the basis of its characteristic features.

Vel'yaninov-Zernov was the first to discuss the meaning of the word qaraçı. According to him, this term was used to mean an "underling, subject, or citizen" among the Kazakhs and Kirghiz. He also cites Abu 1-Çazi to show that among the medieval Uzbeks the term was used to mean "servant". Most scholars in this century have taken the meaning of the medieval term qaraçu to be connected with a Mongol etymology meaning 'black people'. Some have taken this to mean that the term qaraçu came

to have a derived meaning referring to those members of the state who were not a part of the ruling Çingisid dynasty. A few have further tried to connect the qaraçı beys in the Later Golden with such earlier references to the qaracu.

There are other possible etymologies suggested by alternative forms of this word in the sources for the Later Golden Horde. For example, some sources actually give the alternate form qaraça, while others give the form karapçı. The latter form karapçı of this term in Russian-language sources might suggest a labial consonant, which does exist in one possible etymology of this word. Vel'yanov-Zernov has already pointed out, without drawing any conclusion, that there exists in Kazan Tatar the verb gara- meaning to "look at, watch". (This verb

[22] A good survey of the meaning of this word as the 'black people, common people, i.e., non-Çingisid' is given by G. Doerfer, Türkische und mongolische Elemente in Neupersischen, i (Wiesbaden, 1963), pp. 397-398. (This work is hereafter abbreviated TMEN.)


[26] IKTsTs, ii, pp. 436-437.
is considered to be of Mongol origin in Turkic.)

A noun derived from this verb, *qaraçı* "watchman, guard", also exists in Kazan Tatar, though the modern dictionaries list a separate entry *karaçı* for the actual *qaraçı* beys. An etymology based on this verb is equally justifiable and more in line with the responsibilities of the four *qaraçı* beys. In this case, there should be a distinction in meaning between *qaraçı* and terms related to *qaranı* referring to the common people or any non-Çingisids.

The term *qaraçı* is also used in conjunction with a number of other terms from different languages. (This serves to demonstrate as well as anything else that different terms in different languages often

---

[27] G. Clausen, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* (Oxford, 1972), p. 645. L.V. Clark offers additional evidence in favor of the argument that this verb, which is known in the later Turkic languages, was not known in Old Turkic: "Mongol Elements in Old Turkic?", *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 75 (1977), pp. 110-168, especially pp. 144-146. See also Doerfer, *TMEN*, i, pp. 399-403, for a discussion of the term *garavul*—derived from this same verb—which appears in the sources for medieval Mongol history as a certain kind of guard corps.

[28] See W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbucbes der Türk-Dialekte* (Opit slovarya tyurkskix naręčiy), ii (St. Petersburg, 1899/ 's-Gravenhage, 1960), pp. 142-143; *Tatarsko-russkiy slovar* (Moscow, 1966), pp. 231-232; and *Tatar teleneq aqлатmaли yüzlege*, ii (Kazan, 1979), pp. 55-56. The last dictionary lists a separate entry *karaçı* on p. 57 referring to the *qaraçı* beys. (Modern Kazan Tatar orthography does not distinguish between *k* and *q*, representing both with "k").

[29] This point is also made by Xudyakov, *Oçerki*, p. 182. Xudyakov follows Vel'ymínov-Zernov for the most part in his discussion of the etymology of this term.

[30] The *Tatar teleneq aqлатmaли yüzlege* includes the following proverb as a part of the entry *karaçı*: *akıllı karaçı karanı [gadi keşene] xan itär "a wise qaraçı will make a black (person) [i.e., a common person] (into) a xan" (ii, p. 57), which is an example of the term *qara* referring to a commoner in the same sentence that the term *karaçı* refers to the leader of a "ruling tribe". Vel'ymínov-Zernov actually considers that in the Crimea this term had a second meaning extending to all the persons close to the xan, which is unlikely (*IKTsTs*, ii, p. 419).
represent the exact same title, dignity, or office.) The usual noun which the term garaçı modifies is the Turkic term "bey".\footnote{This term is rendered here in an arguably anachronistic manner in the Republican Turkish spelling, as is the case with all terms of Arabic, Persian, and Turkic origin where there is a convenient Turkish form available. There is no single form in the sources and uses of bek, bi, and numerous other variants occurs at random. The various forms in the literary sources in a final -k or -g possibly reflect archaism already for the 15th-16th centuries. What is more, the modern Kazan Tatar form in bi can go back either to a form *bây or *bâk (> *bîk > bi(y); cf. the feminine form bikâ) prior to the vowel shift of this period, another justification for this usage. On the origins of this term see Clauson, Etymological Dictionary, pp. 322-323.} A number of the Ottoman-period sources also interchange this term with "emir" \((\text{amîr in Arabic and Persian})\), and this is what is often referred to as knyaz' in Russian.\footnote{The Russian term knyaz' is most properly translated "duke" when referring to the rulers of the medieval Russian principalities. The usual translation "prince" as in "princes of the land" or "prince of princes", etc., by English-speaking scholars can be confused as a reference to a member of the Čingisid dynasty, which it most definitely is not. In such cases it is obviously a calque of Turkic expressions incorporating the term "bey". This dissertation retains the translation "duke" as the least confusing, though the term "prince" will be used when discussing the interpretations of others.} The term bey also takes on specific administrative ranks within the tribal or state hierarchy when used with the appropriate modifier. In this regard, though many sources speak of only the highest officials and call them beys, they are not considered here to always mean the leader of a "ruling tribe".

On the basis of the description of the functioning of the office of garaçı—and not on the basis of the identity of the term—there is no need to connect the system of the four garaçı beys with earlier references to the garaçu. The predecessors of the garaçı beys were simply referred to as beys, ulus beys or emirs, and possibly as noyons in Mongol. It is time to proceed with the description of these important characteristic features.
One of the most important characteristic features of the system of the four garaçi beys is the consistency with which the number "four" is operative as an organizing principle. All of the successor states to the Golden Horde began with a system of four "ruling tribes"; only in the Crimea did this number change. The change to five "ruling tribes" was not a minor development for the Crimean xanate, but a major departure from earlier patterns. Just as telling is that while the number four (and later five) remained constant, the participating tribes did not. This can be understood as a series of tribes plugging in and out of a system, which is taken here to mean that this aspect of the organization of the successor states, the tetrarchy of the "ruling tribes", was of far greater importance than the identity of the individual "ruling tribes" themselves. This was the fundamental feature of state organization in the western Eurasian steppe in the late Çingisid period.

The presence of four garaçi beys can be attested for the xanates of the Crimea, Kasimov, and Kazan. It is best to examine first the situation in the Crimea in a chronological order before going on to the other xanates, since the most abundant evidence—including a series of indigenous narrative histories—is for this state. The interpretation of the "four-bey system" in the other states can then be based on the data available for the Crimea. In this manner a number of facts and isolated references for the other xanates can be understood within a broader context.

Systematic documentation of the number of "ruling tribes" in the Crimean xanate (founded in the 1440s under Haci Giray) begins in the

[33] According to Keenan it was the case in the Astrakhan xanate as well as in the Siberian xanate ("Muscovy and Kazan", p. 551).
early 16th century. Two of the earliest examples are found in the
diplomatic correspondence of the Crimean xanate with Muscovy. One
document from 1508 includes what are interpreted here to be references
to the four "ruling tribes" in the Crimea as the Şirin, Barın, Arğın,
and Qipçaq. The same "ruling tribes" are repeated in a similar
document dating from 1517, except that this includes an explicit
reference to the qaraçis of these "ruling tribes".

The well-known traveler Sigmund von Herberstein, who traveled to
Russia in 1517-1526, lists four councilors to the Tatar kings, "whose
advice they mainly take in matters of importance". According to him the
first of these is called sчirнi, the second barni, the third gargni,
and the fourth tztizpan. (These forms clearly refer to the Şirin,
Barın, Arğın, and Qipçaq.) It is not certain, however, if Herberstein is
referring to the Crimea or one of the other states, and whether he
himself is referring to affairs that are of his own or an earlier time.

According to one native Crimean chronicle, the Es-seb üs-seyyar,
the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qipçaq were the "ruling tribes" of the

[34] Pamyatniki diplomatičeskix snošeniy moskovskogo gosudarstva s
krimskoyu i nagayskoyu ordami i s Turtsiyej, i-ii, ed. G.O. Karpov,
Sbornik Imperatorskago russkago istoričeskago obščestva 41 and 95
(hereafter abbreviated SIRIO) (St. Petersburg, 1884 and 1895/Nendeln,
38.

[35] SIRIO 95, p. 388; and Siroćkovskiy, "Muhammed-Geray i ego
vassali", p. 39.

[36] Notes upon Russia: Being a Translation of the Earliest Account of
that Country entitled Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii, ed.–trans. R.H.
82; and IKTsTS, ii, p. 412, comparing this account with Guagnini,
Sarmatiae Europeae Descriptio Alexandri Guagnini (Spirae, 1631), p. 110.
Crimean xanate in the reign of Sahib Giray (r. 1532-1551). Finally, the 19th-century Russian historian Karamzin also mentions the four garaçis of the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qıpçaq tribes on the basis of the *Krimskie dela* or "Crimean Acts". Although a date is not given for this document, it clearly falls in the same category as the above references, since the "ruling tribes" named are the same.

The sources covered thus far all give ample proof of the presence of four garaç beys and the four "ruling tribes" they represented in the Crimea. The regularity of the number "four" as an organizing principle is not important in and of itself; but it is a crucial characteristic feature in establishing the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Golden Horde. This is why it is necessary to explain the rise of the number of "ruling tribes" in the Crimea alone from "four" to "five" as the exception—so to speak—which proves the rule. The position taken here is that such a change could only have come about as a result of a major transformation or upheaval within the xanate, which in this case was provided by the final demise of the "Great Horde" in about 1502.

From the reign of Sahib Giray on there is disagreement in the sources as to which four or five "ruling tribes" constitute the "land" in the Crimea. According to the *Es-seb üs-seyyar*, during his rule other tribes were added to the "land" in reward for their service. This


version states that the Şirin, Arğın, Barın, and Qıpçaq were the four "ruling tribes" (as discussed above) until the elevation of the Sicivut and the Mansuri (that is, the Mangût).\(^{40}\) The Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han goes into even greater details on the incorporation of the Mangûts, led by Baqi Bey, into the Crimean xanate.\(^{41}\) This work states on numerous occasions that the qaraçi beys numbered four during the reign of Sahib Giray Xan and on other occasions explicitly mentions the Şirin, Barın, Mangût, and Qıpçaq.\(^{42}\) But on one occasion it also includes the Arğîn as a fifth "ruling tribe",\(^{43}\) as does the Umdet üt-tevarîh.\(^{44}\) If the various sources accurately reflect the confused events of this period, there was a long period of realignment among the "ruling tribes". This is an

\[40\] Muhammed Rza/Kazembek, p. 93; "Précis de l'histoire des khans de Crimée", pp. 367-368; and IKTS, ii, pp. 414-416 n. 56.


\[42\] Remnal Hoca/Gökbilgin, pp. 21/156, 27/165, 37/177-178, and 124/256. (All references to text editions incorporating both text and translation will refer to the two corresponding sets of pages separated by a slash in the order text/translation, whether the pagination is continuous throughout the whole work or not.)

\[43\] Remnal Hoca/Gökbilgin, pp. 112/245.

\[44\] Abdülgaftar Kırim, ed. N. Asım, Umdet üt-tevarîh, Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası, İlavе (İstanbul, A.H. 1343), p. 103. Abdülgaftar also lists a word VKYAN as the fifth word in the sequence: asker-i Kırim tertib üzere Şirin, Barın, Arğın, Kıpçaq, Mangût VKYAN beyleri ve kapi halkı .... Rather than seeing this as the name of a sixth tribe, it would be better to see this word as referring to another category of beys as discussed earlier in this chapter. Gökbilgin reads this term in the Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han as oğlangıyun and relates it to Uyğur oğlangu "gracieux, fragile" with a plural suffix -yun (Remnal Hoca/Gökbilgin, p. 288 and Index). (On this term in Old Turkic see Drevneturkiskiy slovar', ed. V.M. Nedlyaev et al., Leningrad, 1969, p. 363.) Inalcik reads this term in the same source as oğlan kiyun ("The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", p. 451). Since there is no need to see this term as one word, it can be read in the Umdet üt-tevarîh as ve KYAN beyleri with a different vocalization, since minor orthographic differences are not unusual for this corpus of sources.
obvious example of a time when the xan was able to exercise very great power, since such a realignment meant that certain "ruling tribes" lost their position in the "land" if the number of "ruling tribes" was to remain four or even five.\(^\text{[45]}\) It is in this period that the Qipçaq are no longer mentioned as a "ruling tribe", while the Arğın, Sicivut, and Barın constantly change status.

The account of the Polish writer Broniewski (1590) also falls into this period of new "ruling tribe" alignment, since he refers to the presence of four "ruling tribes" identified as the Şirin, Barın, Mangıt, and Qipçaq: *Sirinenses, Bachinienses, Mangutenses, caeterosque Kiuazios vel Duces, ex quibus Caiacei.*\(^\text{[45]}\)

Haci Mehmed Senai is another author who provides a brief description of the şaraçı beys, the "pillars of the state", in his *Tarih-i Islam Giray Han* (1601). Senai, who describes himself as a member of the aristocracy,\(^\text{[47]}\) makes special reference on numerous occasions to the leading "ruling tribe", the Şirin. According to the author, the four "ruling tribes" of the Crimean xanate were the Şirin, Mangıt, Sicivut, and Arğın.\(^\text{[48]}\)

\[45\] Cf. Bennigsen et al., *Le khanate de Crimée*, pp. 11-12, who feel that the number of "ruling tribes" rose to six. On this complicated period see also Smirnov, *Kırımko xeastro*, especially pp. 120-122 and 413 ff.; and Ö. Gökbilgin, 1532-1577 yılları arasında Kırım Hanlığının siyasî durumu (Ankara, 1973).


\[48\] Haci Mehmed Senai/Abrahamowicz, pp. 3/89.
Some sources in this period simply mention that there were five 
garaçis without explicitly naming the "ruling tribes". There are such 
examples dating from 1680 and 1682 among the Crimean documents which 
Vel'yanov-Zernov has edited in a separate work.\footnote{Materiali dlya istorii krîmskogo xanstva. Izvleçeniya, po 
rasporyajeniyu Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, iz Moskovskogo  
glavnago arxiva Ministerstva inostrannix del, ed. V.V. Vel'yanov-Zernov (St. 
Petersburg, 1864), no. 252: p. 653, no. 264: p. 691; and no. 266: p. 
695; and IKTsTS, ii, p. 413. (This work, which will hereafter be 
abbreviated MIKX, is also known by the French title Matériaux pour 
servir à l'histoire du khanat de Crimée.)} Another document in 
this collection dating from 1632 does name these tribes as the Şirin, 
Mangît, Arşûn, Sicivut, and Barîn.\footnote{MIKX, no. 20: p. 87; and IKTsTS, ii, pp. 413-414.} One must conclude on the basis of 
these sources that there were five "ruling tribes" in the Crimea in the 
17th century.

An important source for the Crimean xanate mentioned earlier, the 
\textit{Umdat üt-tevarih} (1740s), gives a description of the garaçí 
beys to 
which reference will be made on a number of points.\footnote{Abdülgaffar Krîmi/Aşım, p. 193-194. H. Inalcik has already drawn 
attention to this passage in his "Krîm", Îslâm Ansiklopedisi, vi 
448 n. 8, where he offers a liberal translation of the first portion of 
this description. An abridged translation of a longer portion of this 
description (including this reference) may be found in U. Schamiloglu, 
"The Qaraçí Beys of the Later Golden Horde: Notes on the Organization 
283-297, especially pp. 284-285.} An enumeration in 
this source of the "four pillars" who are collectively known as the four 
garaçís lists them in the following order: first the Şirin, second the 
Mansuroğlu, third the Barîn\footnote{Read *salîsen "third" for rabîan "fourth" in the text.}, and fourth the Sicivut. Another 
description of the role of the garaçí beys is found in the history
written by Halim Giray Sultan. This description, which is explicitly based on the Umdeğ ül-ahbar (another title for the Umdeğ üt-tevarih), enumerates the exact same "ruling tribes" as the description in the Umdeğ üt-tevarih. Thus, these two sources from the mid-18th century list four "ruling tribes" in the Crimea. It is not certain, though what point in time these sources are describing. The Umdeğ üt-tevarih gives the description apart from any chronological sequence in an appendix to the history. The Gülbüni hanan similarly inserts this entire description into the middle of the text.

Yet another set of data regarding this complicated question is provided by Peysonnél (1753-) and Baron de Tott (1767-). According to them the "ruling tribes" included the Şirin, Mansur, Sicivüt, Arğın, and Barın. In the words of de Tott: Après la famille souveraine, on compte celles de Chirine, de Mansour, de Sedjoud d'Arguin & de Baroun.  

Finally, this chapter would like to quote yet another source which follows almost verbatim the first part of the description cited in the Umdeğ üt-tevarih. Laškov published this in Russian as document no.

[53] Gülbüni hanan, yahut Kırım tarihi, ed. O. Cevdi (Istanbul, A.H. 1327), p. 40. A comparison of the two versions shows that the Halim Giray version is a somewhat liberal variation of the text upon which the printed edition of the Umdeğ üt-tevarih is based, including minor orthographic differences in the spelling of certain words. See also the problematic description in the Teğhis ül-beyan cited by Smirnov, Krimskoe xanство, p. 323. This source lists the "ruling tribes" (probably incorrectly) as the Şirin, Arğin = Yaşlaw, Barın = Sicivüt, and Mangıt.

[54] Peysonnél, Die Verfassung des Handels auf dem schwarzen Meere, trans. E.W. Cuhn (Leipzig, 1788), p. 31, cited in IKTsTs, ii, pp. 414-416 n. 70; and Baron de Tott, Mémoires du baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares, i-iv (Amsterdam, 1784), ii, p. 156; and IKTsTs, ii, pp. 414-416 n. 70. Although the overwhelming evidence is that the two names actually referred to the same "ruling tribe", according to Vel'yanov-Zernov the Mangıt replaced the Mansur: Rod Mangıt ustupil v posledstvii mesto rodu Mansur.
55 (dating from 1820) in his study of Crimean land tenure.\textsuperscript{55} According to this source the descendants of "Dangi Bey\textsuperscript{56}" always had power over the control of the peoples, whom the xans composed from four clans (rod) of beys. This source goes on that these four clans were the Şirin, Mansur, Barın, and Sicivut, in that order; they were called the four garaçi beys (in the Russian text simply dort-karaçi). Though this source dates from a more recent period, its reference to an earlier period is probably based on a similar (if not identical) Crimean source as the Ümde\textsuperscript{t} u[t-tevarih and the Gülbün-i hanan. It clearly confirms that the garaçi traditionally numbered four, though not a word is said about their having numbered five.

The task of following which "ruling tribes" formed the "land" in the Crimean xanate at any given point in time is quite difficult. Table II based on the references already cited is intended to help clarify this picture.

There are a number of references in the Russian sources to garaçi beys in the xanate of Kazan, though the source material is not as


\textsuperscript{56} This is a reference to Dangi Bey, who according to a Crimean source is the father of Örek Temür, father of Tegine; this Tegine is called the father of the Şirins in the Crimea in the Ümde\textsuperscript{t} u[t-tevarih (Abdülgaffar Kirimi/Asım, p. 46). On Tegine see also Smirnov, \textit{Krimskoe xanstvo}, pp. 202-203, 205, and 216-217; Sirocekovskiy, "Muxammed-Geray i ego vassali", p. 30; and Manz, "The Clans of the Crimean Khanate", p. 284; as well as the discussion in Chapter V.
# TABLE II

**THE "RULING TRIBES" OF THE CRIMEAN XANATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Şirin</th>
<th>Barıın</th>
<th>Siciut</th>
<th>Arğın</th>
<th>Qıqçaq</th>
<th>Mangît= Mansur, Mansuroğlu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>SİRİO 95</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>SİRİO 95</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517-1526?</td>
<td>Herberstein</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Karamzin</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-1551</td>
<td>Es-seb</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(+S)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>(+M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-1551</td>
<td>Ӧs-seyyar</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-1551</td>
<td>Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-1551</td>
<td>Umdet üttevarîh</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Broniewski</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Senai</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>MIKX #20</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>MIKX #252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(five &quot;ruling tribes&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>MIKX #264, #266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(five &quot;ruling tribes&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s</td>
<td>Umdet üttevarîh</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mğlu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s+</td>
<td>Gülbün-i hanan</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mğlu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753-</td>
<td>Peysonnel</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mğlu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767-</td>
<td>de Tott</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mğlu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Laşkov</td>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mğlu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explicit or as plentiful as for the Crimea. For this reason some of the passing references can only be interpreted as referring to the four qaraçı beys.

One well-known source, Kurbskiy's history of Ivan IV ("the Terrible"), mentions the qaraçı beys of the xanate of Kazan, but he does not mention their number. Another source which does list four "ruling tribes" has been published by Vel'yanov-Zernov. This is the translation of a document issued by the xan of Kazan Abd ül-Latif (r. 1497-1502), which specifically states that the "ruling tribes" in the xanate of Kazan were four: the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qipçaq.

Vel'yanov-Zernov cites as another example the four "dukes" (knyaz') Kel Ahmed, Urak, Sadır, and Ağış, whose names occur together in the sources in connection with their support for the Şeýbanid ruler Mamuq's attempt to wrest Kazan away from Muhammed Emin in 1496. Once Mamuq took the city, however, he imprisoned the four dukes of the Kazan "land" who had defected to him and confiscated the property of the merchants and of all the zemskie lyudi "people of the land". (The zemskie lyudi here refers in all probability to the four qaraçı beys representing the "land".) Vel'yanov-Zernov ventures the opinion that


[59] IKTsTS, i, Trudi Vostochnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago arxeologičeskago obšestva 9 (St. Petersburg, 1863), p. 209 n. 70; and ii, p. 427. Vel'yanov-Zernov also discusses the later role of the Mangıts in this xanate (IKTsTS, ii, pp. 427-428).

[60] IKTsTS, ii, pp. 420. See also Xudyakov, Oçerki, pp. 46-47.

this Urak is the same Urak who is called knyaz' Kazanskix knyazey "duke of the Kazan dukes" elsewhere in the sources in connection with his cooperation with a brother of Mamuq.\textsuperscript{62}

On the basis of these sources Vel'yaninov-Zernov concludes that, at least in the beginning, the number and identity of the "ruling tribes" in Kazan were exactly the same as in the Crimea. Since the episode with Mamuq took place before Abd ul-Latif became xan, one may conclude that the "ruling tribes" continued to number four throughout this period of conflict. Vel'yaninov-Zernov also concludes on the basis of these sources that the qaraçi in Kazan had the same number and function as in the Crimea.\textsuperscript{63} All of these conclusions are quite plausible.

For Kasimov there is less evidence in the various sources than for the xanate of Kazan. The evidence that does exist, however, is from the only extant indigenous Later Golden Horde chronicle outside the Crimea, the Cami üt-tevarix. The author/translator of this work, Qadir Ali Calayir, was himself a qaraçi bey (of the Calayir "ruling tribe").\textsuperscript{64} This highly condensed translation into Tatar of the famous work of the same title by Raşid ad-Din has a separate section at the end devoted to events in the xanate of Kasimov. According to this work there were four "ruling tribes" in Kasimov in the reign of Uraz Muhammed (r. 1600-1610). These four "ruling tribes", which were listed as constituting the right

\textsuperscript{62} See also IKTsTS, ii, p. 421; and Kudjakov, Oçerki, p. 183. This title and its variants referring to the head of the four qaraçi beys are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{63} IKTsTS, ii, p. 426. Pelenski cites additional sources referring to the very same "princes [i.e., dukes] of the land" Kel Ahmed, Örek, Sadır, and Ağış (Russian and Kazan, p. 29).

\textsuperscript{64} On Qadir Ali Calayir see Usmanov, Tatarskie istoriçeskie istoçñiki, pp. 40-51. On Uraz Muhammed see IKTsTS, ii, pp. 97-498.
and left flanks of the state, were the Arğın, Qıpçaq, Calayır, and Mangít.⁶⁵

On the basis of the sources presented thus far, it is clear that the "ruling tribes" were traditionally organized in groups of four. The sources describe such a situation for a number of different states in the Later Golden Horde over long periods of time.⁶⁶ Even where the sources give evidence for an increase in this number to five in the Crimean xanate, later historians still recount the traditional number four. Having established this, it is now time to examine the role of the individual qaraçı beys.

The first characteristic feature of the individual qaraçı beys themselves is that each led his own "ruling tribe". This is one of the most important aspects of the role of the qaraçı beys, but also one of the most difficult to prove. The sources do not extend coverage to the rank and file membership of a "ruling tribe", only to the ruling elite. For this reason it is easier to recognize the leader of a "ruling tribe", since this office carries a number of ex officio responsibilities within the state.

For the most part one must draw on ambiguous passing references in the sources. For example, one source for the Şirin "ruling tribe" prior to the foundation of the Crimean xanate, the Umdat üt-tevarib, has

[65] Cami üt-tevarix, ed. I. Berezin, Biblioteka vostochnix istorikov, ii/1: Sbornik letoptisey. Tatarskiy tekst (Kazan, 1854), pp. 170-171; and IKTsTS, ii, pp. 403-407. According to Vel'yaminov-Zernov, the Calayirs were a later replacement for the Şirin (IKTsTS, ii, pp. 431-435 n. 58).

[66] For Vel'yaminov-Zernov's data on the Siberian xanate, see IKTsTS, ii, p. 431. It would be premature to offer a definitive opinion on the organization of this state, on which there is a dearth even of secondary literature, other than to state that the term qaraçı is known in the sources for this state. (See also Yermak's Campaign in Siberia, trans. T. Minorsky and D. Willemar, ed. T. Armstrong, Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, II, 146, London, 1975, Index.)
the leader of the Şirin making an explicit reference to himself and his entire uruğ.  

Certain documents also allow one to venture the conclusion that each qaraçî bey led his own "ruling tribe". One of the Crimean documents, written in 1632 to the Polish king, speaks of the "Şirin bey and all of his people, the Mangit bey and all of his people, the Arğın bey and all of his people, and the Sicivut bey and all of his people". It is less likely that such a reference would mean just the hierarchy of the "ruling tribe". Additional documents published by Bennigsen also support this. In 1476 Eminek Bey of the Şirin referred to his own "close ones and 'clans' (aşair)" and in 1478 the same Eminek speaks of his own people and those of the other beys.  

Many studies have treated the Noğay Horde as an independent state, but modern scholars have traditionally ignored a fact which Vel'yaninov-Zernov documented: one of the titles of the ruler of the Noğays was qaraçî. There are a number of sources for the problem of what the qaraçî represented in the Noğay Horde, but at the same time the Noğay Horde falls into a special category. According to Vel'yaninov-Zernov, the meaning of qaraçî among the Noğays was: 'close one, servant, underling (citizen)'. He concludes that Noğay leader İsmail bey's use of the term qaraçî in describing himself

[67] Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, p. 47. This period will be the focus of Chapter V.

[68] MIKS, no. 20: p.87; and IKTsTS, pp. 413-414.

[69] Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée, pp. 61/62 and 72-73/70-71. The term aşiret (broken plural aşair) is used in the Umdat üt-tevarih as well (for example Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, p. 69).

[70] Prodoljenie drevney rossiyskoy vivliofiki (hereafter abbreviated PDRV) vii-xi (St. Petersburg, 1791-1801), vii, p. 287; xi, p. 128; vii, p. 318; xi, p. 123; ix, p. 74; xi, p. 257; and IKTsTS, ii, pp. 429-431.
(in 1553) meant that he understood himself to be a servant of the Muscovite ruler.\textsuperscript{71} This reflects a misunderstanding by Vel'yanov-Zernov of the fact that the Noğay leader was not a leader on the level of the Čingisid xan, even though he describes the sources according to which the Noğay "dukes" were descended from Edigü (leader of the Mangit "ruling tribe" during the period of transition from the Golden Horde to the Later Golden Horde at the turn of the 15th century). For example, the Noğay mirza Beleq Bulat wrote Ivan IV in 1556 that Ismail became "duke" like Edigü in earlier times, and Yunus the nur ed-din.\textsuperscript{72} In fact, there were a number of Mangit uluses, which suggests that each was a separate "ruling tribe" according to the definition given in Chapter I, since each acted in a different "state".\textsuperscript{73}

The mention of the name of Yunus the nur ed-din leads to the next point, namely a discussion of the deputies of the qarağı. The qarağı bey was the head of a separate hierarchy of "ruling tribe" officials independent of the dynasty and subordinate to him alone. These included a vice-leader and so on. Thus, while scholars have usually discussed the hierarchy of officials subordinate to the xan, the xan's was not the only hierarchy. This discussion of subordinate officials is important for the additional reason that it bolsters the argument according to which the qarağı bey led a "ruling tribe", since such an extended hierarchy must have ruled over a larger number of persons.

\textsuperscript{71} IKTsTs, ii, pp. 430.

\textsuperscript{72} PDRV, ix, pp. 248-249; and IKTsTs, ii, p. 418-419.

\textsuperscript{73} See Smirnov, Krımskoe xanstvo, p. 334 (citing the Telhis ül-beyan); and A. Bennigsen and Ch. Lemercier-Quelquejay, "La Grande Horde Noğay et le problème des communications entre l'Empire Ottoman et l'Asie Centrale en 1552-1556", Turcica 8/11 (1976), pp. 203-236. This will also be discussed below in the section dealing with the selection of the xan.
The sources do not offer sufficient evidence to conclude that the hierarchy was called by the exact same titles in all the xanates, though many of the names are shared. For the Crimean xanate the names of a number of positions of the hierarchy within the "ruling tribe" such as the galğa, nur ed-din, and others are known. Vel'yaminov-Zernov was the first to discuss these titles for the Crimea based on documents he himself edited. According to one of these the Şirin and the Mangıt had a galğa, a nur ed-din, and a kik bui. Two of these titles, galğa and nur ed-din, were also used for the dynastic hierarchy. The term galğa (Turkish kalğa) was used to refer to the heir to the Crimean throne.

Baron de Tott writes that the Şirin bey has his own Galga, Nouradin, and ministers, just like the xan. In the document published by Laşkov and cited earlier, the eldest of the Şirin "clan" (rod) is said to have the title of bey, the second after him to have had the title of kalga, and the third after him to have had the title of nuradin. Below them were the murzas, and though they were all respected, according to this document the Şirin murzas had pre-eminence. This source goes on further to state that the kalga and nuradin had their own "clans", one of the xans and the other of the Şirins. According to this document, the other "clans" did not have such a title.

[74] MIKK, no. 21, p. 91; and IKTsTS, ii, pp. 416-419 n. 56.


[77] Sbornik dokumentov po istorii krimsko-tatarskago zemlevladeniya, pp. 37-38. Vel'yaminov-Zernov also discusses the titles of bey and mirza before he discusses the garacıs (IKTsTS, ii, pp. 410-411).
The traveler Herberstein gives his own understanding of the ranking of the various officials in the Tatar states. He first gives the khan, whom he calls a "king", next comes the sultan ("the son of a king"), then bü ("duke"), mursa ("the son of a duke"), olbond ("a noble or councillor"), olboadula ("the son of a nobleman"), and said ("a chief priest"). A private man is called kși, the post of rank next to that of the king is called ulan, and then he finally mentions the four councilors, i.e. the four qaraçı beys.  

Here it must be considered that Herberstein was somewhat misinformed, since he mixes together various positions from different categories, such as the xan, bey, and chief religious leader. Therefore there is no obstacle to positing that the four councilors whom he lists should have actually been listed as a category within the larger groups known as the beys (his bü).

Vel’yaminov-Zernov also established that these terms existed among the Noğays and among the Şeybanids in Buxara. The most abundant information on these titles is in the sources concerning the Noğays, which document the titles qalğa, nur ed-din, keykobad, and taybuğa. According to Vel’yaminov-Zernov, the title nur ed-din first came into usage in honor of Nur ed-Din, son of Edigi, from whom the Noğay "dukes" are descended. To quote one source again, the Noğay mirza Belek Bulat

[78] Herberstein, Notes upon Russia, p. 82.

[79] IKTsTS, ii, pp. 416-419 n. 56.

[80] See IKTsTS, ii, pp. 242-245 n. 32., and 417-419. The Yayık (Ural) river was considered territory of Edigi, while the Volga was considered the territory of Nur ed-Din (see PDRV, x, p. 67; and xi, p. 50; and IKTsTS, ii, pp. 418-419).
wrote Ivan IV in 1556 that Ismail became duke like Edigül in earlier times, and Yunus the *nur ed-din.*

Thus, it is clear that in the states of the Later Golden Horde there is substantial documentation of a series of officials subordinate to the "ruling tribe's" leader. Though these names are traced back to the person for whom the positions are named, it is likely that the leader of the "ruling tribe" must have had a hierarchy going back to the beginning of the "ruling tribe".

Another feature of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde is that one of the four *qaraçı* beys was a *primum inter pares.* This was the leader of the chief among the four "ruling tribes", which in the Later Golden Horde was usually the Şirin. This leader had special *ex officio* authority as the chief spokesman for the "land". He was known in this capacity in the Russian sources *knyaz' knyazey* "duke of dukes", which is clearly a calque of the Turkic *beylerbeyi* (literally "bey of beys").

In the sources for the Crimean xanate there are a number of references to the head of the four beys. The *Umdat üt-tevariḥ* describes the ancestor of the Şirins in the Crimea, Örek Temir, as *emir-i kebir* "great emir" and *baş karaçı* "head *qaraçı*. It also describes Eminek Bey, one of the heads of the Şirin "ruling tribe", as *mir-i miran-i Şiriniyan olan *Eminek Bey (using the equivalent *mir-i miran from


[82]  See *IKTsTs*, ii, pp. 417-419.

[83]  Abdülgaffar Kırımlı/Asım, p. 79.
According to Baron de Tott, the Şirin bey is the chief of the Tatar nobility and represents the other beys.

There are no indigenous sources for the xanate of Kazan which would allow the documentation of this exact title in the original. The sources do list, however, a number of titles which are obviously Russian calques of the original Turkic terms. In the Russian sources there are numerous references to the knyaz' kazanskiy knyazey "duke of the Kazan dukes". Coming again to an example cited earlier, the sources published by Vel'yaminov-Zernov name one Urak as "duke of dukes", and then go on to mention the three other "dukes" with him by the name of Kel Ahmed, Sadır, and Ağış in connection with the "treason" being committed by the Kazan "land" in 1496. According to Vel'yaminov-Zernov this Urak is the same Urak who in other sources is called knyaz' Kazanskiy knyazey "duke of the Kazan dukes".

There seem to be a number of equivalents to the term beylerbeyi. The term knyaz' knyazey "duke of dukes" has already been mentioned as a

[84] Abdülgaffar Kırimi/Asım, p. 97. See also the yarlıq of Haci Giray Xan (1453) in A.N. Kurat, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivindeki Altın Ordu, Kırim ve Türkistan hanlarına ait yarlık ve bitikler (İstanbul, 1940), pp. 64–65.

[85] Mémoires du baron de Tott, ii, p. 157. The text actually reads that the Şirin bey represents the five other beys; but only four of them represent other "ruling tribes", while the remaining bey represents the familles annoblies (Mémoires du baron de Tott, ii, p. 156).


[87] IKTsTS, ii, pp. 420. Pelenski cites additional sources referring to the very same "princes [i.e., dukes] of the land" Kel Ahmed, Örek, Sadır, and Ağış (Russian and Kazan, p. 29).

[88] See also IKTsTS, ii, p. 421.
calque of beylerbeyi. Another title in the Crimean sources referring to the chief of the four qaraquivos is baş karaçi cited above. This would be identical to the office of beylerbeyi. At the same time, there are references to the bol'soy karaça "great karaça" in Kazan without references to the other qaraços.\textsuperscript{89}

Additional titles have led at the same time to a certain amount of confusion. According to certain sources each of the four beys is also calledulu(ţ) qaraçi, "great or elder qaraçi".\textsuperscript{90} Vel'yaninov-Zernov offers the explanation that all the persons close to the xan were called qaraçi and that these four were called uluğ qaraçi in order to distinguish them from the rest of the people who were known as qaraçi.\textsuperscript{91} He also writes that in Kazan the regular "dukes" were separate from the four qaraços, in support of which he cites the example i knyazem i vsem knyazem kazanskim "and to the (Kazan) dukes and to all the Kazan dukes".\textsuperscript{92} It therefore seems that the term uluğ qaraçi did not refer to the head of the four beys, but to each of the qaraçi beys. Vel'yaninov-Zernov's explanation of this is not, however, convincing.

Another important facet to the role of the chief of the four qaraçi beys is that he was a military leader and perhaps the head of the whole army of the xanate. There are no explicit descriptions of the beylerbeyi as the head of the army, but the qaraçi beys and especially


\textsuperscript{90} MIKX, no. 209: p. 609; no. 261: p. 677; no. 286: p. 747; and no. 115: p. 401; and IKTsTS, ii, p. 419.

\textsuperscript{91} IKTsTS, ii, p. 419. Note also the term baş beyleri "head beys" used in the Telhis ül-beyan cited by Smirnov, Krîmskoe xanstvo, p. 323.

\textsuperscript{92} IKTsTS, ii, pp. 421-422.
the beylerbeyi are often depicted in the narrative sources as leading the army in campaign.\(^{93}\) A number of documents also bear this out. For example, the very first document in the collection edited by Bennigsen et al., names the Şirin bey Eminek as head of the army.\(^{94}\)

There are some indications that the various beys were related to the division of the state into two flanks (according to which the army was also divided), but there is too little evidence to incorporate such data into an argument for all the states of the Later Golden Horde. According to one Crimean chronicle, the Es-seb üs-seyyar, the Şirin were the leading "ruling tribe" constituting the first in the army, and the Barın, Arğın, and Qıpçaq were the other "ruling tribes" constituting the left (eastern) flank. The original is as follows:\(^ {95}\)

\begin{verbatim}
dört nefer karacu tabir olunan ümeradan mirliva-yı
Şirin kendi kabilesi halkı ile talia-yı leşker
olmakla ... ve yine ümera-yı karacudan madud Arğın
ve Barın ve Kıpçaq taraf-ı yesar leşkerde ...
\end{verbatim}

This may be translated as:

From the four emirs called karacu the Şirin commander is the head of the army with his own tribe, and the Arğın, Barın, and Qıpçaq who are counted among the karacu emirs are in the army of the left flank.


\[^{94}\] *Le khanat de Crimée*, pp. 36/33.

\[^{95}\] Muhammed Rıza/Kazembek, p. 75; and *IKTsTS*, ii, pp. 412-413. Cf. the French translation of this chronicle, which reads as follows: "Les chefs des tribus de Karadjou, qui comprenaient celles de Baryn, d'Argyn et de Captchak, obtinrent le commandement de l'aile gauche, et les émirs de Chiryn celui du centre." ("Précis de l'histoire des khans de Crimée", p. 353.)
The documentation for the xanate of Kazan is not as abundant as for the Crimea. Kurbskiy mentions the qaraçıs in connection with a military role, writing that the xan of Kazan "shut himself up in the city with his thirty thousand picked warriors and with all their spiritual and secular karachi and with his bodyguard". He soon refers to them again, stating that Christian forces "drove back the karachi and all their forces".96

This data is enough to support the conclusion that the qaraçı beys, and in particular the chief among them, were in charge of the army, or certainly at least a part of it.

Yet another feature of the role of the qaraçı beys was their well-documented involvement in the selection of a Çingisid to rule as xan.97 The first important ruler of the xanate, Haci Giray, was invited to the Crimea by the Şirin and Barın clans.98 The narrative sources also relate other instances when a new xan was invited to rule over a state by the "land".99 In this regard there are samples of diplomatic correspondence between the Crimean "land" and the Ottoman Porte that have been preserved which concern the attempts of the "land to secure a new ruler.100 The qaraçı beys were able to assert their will against the

[96] History of Ivan IV, pp. 40-43; and IKTsTs, ii, p. 420. See also the discussion of the "spiritual" qaraçıs later in this chapter.


[99] On the invitation to Mengli Giray to rule the Crimean xanate see Abdülgaffar Kiriçi/Asım, p. 97; and Halim Giray Sultan/Cevdi, p. 16.

[100] See for example Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée, pp. 72-73/70-71.
xan, and sometimes the four qaraçı beys even took part in the murder of a sitting xan or another member of the ruling dynasty.  

It is clear from the sources that the same practice was in effect in the xanate of Kazan. According to the Russian sources the grand duke of Muscovy took an active role in the selection of the xan of Kazan in conjunction with the "dukes of the land", i.e., the qaraçı beys.  

According to the sources cited by Pelenski, "prince" (i.e., qaraçı bey!) Abd ül-Mümin invited Qasım to be xan over Kazan. Another passage, to which reference has already been made on more than one occasion, mentions one Urak as "duke of dukes", and then continues that the three other "dukes" with him by the name of Kel Ahmed, Sadir, and Agiș of the Kazan "land" were committing "treason". When the dukes of the land were accused of treason, this meant, of course, that they were cooperating with the Şeybanid Mamuq rather than with the Muscovite puppet Muhammed Emin. Even the Crimean chronicles confirm that the beys of Kazan invited Sahib Giray to rule in Kazan.  

It is also possible to fit the Noğays into this scheme. There is the misconception, or perhaps the alternative view, that the many uluses of the Noğays (i.e., the Mangıt "ruling tribes") formed a separate state, which is reinforced by the Muscovite practice of sometimes

[102] See the works of Keenan, Pelenski, and Manz.
[104] Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, pp. 29-30.
[105] Halim Giray Sultan/Cevdi, pp. 33 and 37. See also Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, p. 34; and Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée, pp. 110-117, for another example.
referring to their rulers as tsar', though the sons of the same tsar' were then called kniaz'. As mentioned above, at least one of the Noğay groups was led by a qaraçi, though it should be possible to document that more than one of their leaders was called a qaraçi. Since the Mangits or Noğays participated as a "ruling tribe" in more than one of the xanates, the Noğay Horde consisted, as far as can be determined, of a number of Mangit "ruling tribes".

One aspect to the Noğays which is not usually included in discussions of the Later Golden Horde is their role in the selection of the Şeýbanid rulers, that is in the selection of the Uzbek xans. Semenov notes that Abu l-Xayr Xan (r. 1429/30-1468/9) and his successors were chosen by the beys, though many more tribes are mentioned than just four "ruling tribes". Axmedov also notes that Abu l-Xayr united with the


[107] See IKTTS, ii, pp. 416-419 n. 56; and above.

In fact, the beys who chose the later xans were known in the sources as the qaraçı beys. After the four qaraçı beys selected a xan, the next step was a ritual investiture or installation of the xan. Their role in the ritual of elevation as a part of the installation of the xan can be considered another characteristic feature of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde. The traveler Schiltberger made note of such a ritual for the Tatar xans, though he may have been referring to an earlier period. According to his account, "when they choose a king, they take him and seat him on white felt, and raise him in it three times. Then they lift him up and carry him round the tent, and seat him on a throne, and put a golden sword in his hand. Then he must be sworn as is the custom."

Some of the sources for the Later Golden Horde make it clear that it was the four qaraçı beys who were the ones involved directly in this ritual elevation by holding the corners of the felt blanket (sometimes


white, sometimes black) used in this ceremony. In referring to the
erlier period of the Later Golden Horde prior to the foundation of the
Crimean xanate, the Umdet ʿit-tevariḥ describes that Muḥammed ʿoğlan
(i.e., Uluğ Muhammed) was raised by the beys on a piece of felt
"according to Tatar custom". This practice is also documented for the
xanate of Kasimov, as well as other states in this period.

Sources for the xanate of Kazan do not explicitly describe such a
ritual of elevation. The elevation and the whole process of enthronement
was, however, the consummation of what can be described as a legal
agreement between the xan and the beys of the "land". The sources for
Kazan described by Pelenski do indicate that such an act took place,
such as the oath taken by the assembly of the land in 1516 and the oaths
accepting Şah Ali (r. 1518–1521, 1546, 1551–1552) and Can Ali (r. 1532–
1535) as xan.

Another well-documented practice of the qarağı beys was their
diplomatic correspondence with foreign rulers. This practice can now be
better understood thanks to the Umdet ʿit-tevariḥ and other sources which
make it clear that these emirs (referring to the qarağı beys) were in
charge of foreign affairs. The diplomatic correspondence with the
Ottoman Porte and the Muscovite grand duke, as well as with one another
carried out in connection with this function, is clear evidence of this

[113] Abdülgaffar Kirimi/Asım, p. 75.

[114] See IKTsTs, ii, p. 403; and N.I. Veselovskiy, "Perejitki
nekotorix tatarskix obiçaev u russkix", Jivaya Starina 1912, pp. 27–38,
especially pp. 36–38. See also Abu l-Ḡazi, Histoire des mongols et des
taaraes par Aboul-Ghazi Bêhadour Khan, ed.–trans. P.I. Desmaisons (St.


point. This correspondence is preserved in the Russian, Turkish, and other archives.\textsuperscript{117}

A basic element in the relationship between the four qaraqı beys and the xan was that no decision of the xan was legal without their approval, which in the case of documents was indicated by affixing a seal. The Umdat üt-tevarihi makes it clear that the qaraqı beys of the Crimean xanate approved the documents of the xan through the affixing of a seal to the document.\textsuperscript{118} There are other sources for this as well. The Gülbüni hanan, in its version of the passage also found in the Umdat üt-tevarihi, says that the order of the xan was confirmed (tadik etdirirlerdi).\textsuperscript{119} Although the author of the Umdat üt-tevarihi used Ottoman terminology in this description, it is possible to compare the term mi̇kaleme "protocol" with the yarlıqs (documents issued, usually by the xan) of the earlier Golden Horde, and the term hitam "seal" with the tamgas.\textsuperscript{120} The Umdat üt-tevarihi also makes the point, however, that this practice was common at the beginning, but did not continue in the same manner throughout the history of the Crimean xanate.\textsuperscript{121}

The fact of the beys' approving the official documents issued by the xan was important not as an act, but because the orders of the xan

\[117\] See Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée.

\[118\] Abdülgaffar Kırimi/Asım, p. 194.

\[119\] Halim Giray Sultan/Cevdi, p. 40. The document published by Laškow states that without the consent of these four beys, the xan by himself could not undertake anything regarding the administration of the people (Sbornik dokumentov po istorii krimsko-tatarskago zemlevladieniya, p. 38).

\[120\] On these terms in the Golden Horde see Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, pp. 305-310; and Usmanov, Jalovannie aktı.

\[121\] Abdülgaffar Kırimi/Asım, p. 195. This particular passage also names the other seals associated with the leaders of the Şirin "ruling tribe".
were not legal without it.\[122\] On this basis the four beys can be considered as the equivalent of a legislative body. This also fits in with such descriptions of the qaraçı. For example Vel'yaminov-Zernov mentions that a marginal note in one of the manuscripts of Kurbskiy's account refers to them as the "Senate".\[123\] Such an interpretation is confirmed for the Crimea by Baron de Tott.\[124\] In a source for the Siberian xanate they are also referred to as dəməj, that is as an advisor or legislator.\[125\]

The final point this chapter will make about the role of the four qaraçı beys, or rather about the characteristic features of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde, is how they relate to the religious officials in these states.\[125\] The sources offer clear documentation for the existence of a second category of four religious officials who are also called qaraçıs. Much less is known about this second category. According to a passage in Kurbskiy which has already been cited, "the khan of Kazan' shut himself up in the city with his thirty thousand picked warriors and with all their spiritual and secular karachi (so vsemi karači duxovnimi i x i mirskimi) and with his

[123] IKTsTs, ii, p. 429.
[125] IKTsTs, ii, p. 431.
[126] On the religious officials in the Crimean xanate see Sirotcekovskiy, "Muhammad-Geray i ego vassali", p. 38; and Inalcik, "The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", p. 462. For the xanate of Kazan see also Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, pp. 55-56.
bodyguard". Vel'yaminov-Zernov refers to this passage, but only to
document the existence of this institution in Kazan.

The significance of this reference in Kurbskiy could easily have
gone unnoticed except that parallel reports in the Crimean sources serve
to bolster the notion that there was also a spiritual variety of
garaqis. According to a problematic passage in the Umdet üt-tevarih,
there were four main religious leaders in the Crimea who were invited
together with the four garaqi beys. This passage appears as follows in
Ottoman Turkish:

dört ocak tabir olunan ulema-yi izam ve meşayih-i
kiram ki evvelâ zaviye-yi Gölhşeyhi ve saniyen
Raven Kaçışeyhi ve salisen zaviye-yi Taşlışeyhi ve sair-i ulema-yi Kırim'in *eşbehleri

davet olunup...

This passage may be translated as follows:

[When a matter of state comes up] the noble ulema
and the gracious şeyhs who are known as the "four
lineages (ocak)" (which) are the şeyh of the
zaviye (home of a mystical fraternity) of Gölh,
second the şeyh of Raven Kaçi, third the şeyh of
the zaviye of Taşlı, and the other brave ones
(*eşbehleri) of the rest of the religious officials
of the Crimea are invited...

[130] This is written مولع in the printed edition.
[131] This is written راون ناچی in the printed edition.
[132] This is written طالق in the printed edition.
[133] This word is written either انقلر or انقلر in the
printed edition.
There were only minor differences between the Umdat Ut-tevarih and the Gûlbûn-i hanan (quoting another version of the Umdat Ul-ahbar) in the case of earlier citations. In this instance, however, there are major differences in the interpretation of the two versions of this passage. The following is a rendering of the version as given by the Gûlbûn-i hanan (the parentheses are in the printed edition):

(dört ocak) tabir olan olan ulama-yı ızam, meşayîh-i kiram ki (1) Gölc¹³⁵ şeyhi (2) Kaçî¹³⁶ şeyhi (3) Çöyinci¹³⁷ şeyhi (4) Daşlı¹³⁸ şeyhi ile yukarıda zikr olan olan dört sınıf karaçî beyleri, mirzaları ve kapı kulu ihtiyaçları davet olunduktan sonra...

This passage may be translated:

[When a matter of state comes up] after the noble ulama known as the "four lineages"—who are the gracious şeyhs (consisting of) 1. the şeyh of Gölc, 2. the şeyh of Kaçî, 3. the şeyh of Çöyinci, and 4. the şeyh of Daşlı—are invited together with the above-mentioned four classes of karaçî beys, mirzas, elders of the Imperial household...

In this second version there appear to be four separate şeyhs listed either as an improvement upon the version which is known from the printed text (citing four şeyhs but only naming three) or as an unfounded emendation. Whether founded on fact or not, this version gives a more distinct reading for the four separate religious groups and separating one of the toponyms given in the printed edition of the Umdat


[135] This is written كره in the printed edition.

[136] This is written فاص in the printed edition.

[137] This is written چورسنج in the printed edition.

[138] This is written طاغلي in the printed edition.
üt-tevarih into two. The standard Ottoman geographical dictionaries do not include these toponyms. Abrahamowicz, however, does discuss a place called "Taşlıq" which might be this same toponym. Elsewhere he also discusses the toponym Kaçı. The other zaviyes referred to in the passage above are not familiar from other sources.

This particular feature of the role of the qaraçi beys, or of a parallel set of qaraçi beys deserves further attention, since it poses a problem for the earlier Golden Horde or the other states Çingisid states. In other periods there are no other sources or examples with which to compare this phenomenon documented exclusively for the Later Golden Horde.

Now that the most important identifying features of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde have been described, it is possible to compare the above interpretation with the differing interpretations which have also been offered. The above discussion has incorporated the views of Vel'yaminov-Zernov and has referred to the main works by Siroeçkovskiy, Manz, Inalcik, and Bennigsen et al. in the discussion of various points of fact. This final section will briefly review several of the important differing general interpretations of the role of the qaraçi beys in the states of the Later Golden Horde and how this relates to the organization of the "state" in the view of certain authors.

[139] Haci Mehmed Senai/Abrahamowicz, pp. 50-51 and 58. The loss of the final -q does not pose a problem given the presence of strong Oğuz and Kipchak Turkic elements in the Crimea leading to great variety in such endings. See G. Doerfer, "Das Krimosmanische", Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, i, ed. J. Deny et al. (Wiesbaden, 1959), pp. 272-280; and "Das Krimtatarische", Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, i, pp. 369-390, especially p. 377.

Kudyakov briefly discusses the role of the four "ruling tribes" in the xanate of Kazan, relying primarily on the citations of Vel'yanov-Zernov. He does not apply this system to his analysis of the history of the xanate of Kazan. One problem in his conception of the system is that he lists separately officials or groups which this chapter identifies with the qaraqı beys. For example, there are lists of groups participating in the qurultay, which is the well-known medieval term he applies to the "assembly of the land" for the purposes of selecting a new xan. The data in this chapter, however, suggest that the primary actors in this assembly were the four qaraqı beys. He also discusses various kinds of emirs, beys, and mirzas as three of the four kinds of dukes in the xanate (the other category were the rulers of ethnic groups within the xanate). These, however, can also be interpreted in many instances as words from different languages referring to one and the same position.

A specialist on the question of the qaraqı beys in Kazan, E.L. Keenan, Jr., bases his own interpretation of their role on Vel'yanov-Zernov, supplemented by the results of his own research on the Russian sources. A number of his views are in keeping with the various views expressed above, namely that the state consisted of a xan invited by the "land", and that the relationship required a mutual confirmation. This was a dynamic relationship, and the xan required the backing of the qaraqıs, without which he could not survive. The relationship was quite

[141] Oçerki, pp. 239-293, especially p. 182.
[143] Oçerki, pp. 192-197.
dynamic, and in times of disagreement, the qaraçıs were able to depose the xan.\footnote{144}

Keenan also expresses a number of views which diverge from possible conclusions based on the data presented above. He sees a limited number of traditional seats of sovereign power to which this system was limited: Kazan, the Crimea, Astrakan, and Tyumen\footnote{145} in Siberia.\footnote{145} On the role of the qaraçı beys he further writes that:

Social and economic life in these centers was controlled by the aristocracy of the most important nomadic clans, trading dynasties, or agricultural communes. These magnates are known to the sources as "princes" (beg in Turkic, kniaz' in Russian); four of their number, who bore the title karachi (a term found throughout the Altaic world in the Mongol period), formed a state council.

Elsewhere he writes that the political and economic institutions of the xanates of Kazan and the Crimea seem to have been identical and that the same four "clans" seem to have occupied the leading positions in both xanates. He explains this not only by the shared Golden Horde traditions, but also by the agricultural rather than nomadic base of the power of the "clans".\footnote{146}

Keenan does not give any indication of exactly what he means by the traditions of the Golden Horde, since the secondary works on the Golden Horde do not cover any of the points covered in the present dissertation. What is more, he sees the agricultural role of the qaraçı beys as a main reason for the existence of the institution. It is possible to make the argument (probably correctly) that "ruling tribes"

\footnote{144} "Muscovy and Kazan", p. 551.
\footnote{145} "Muscovy and Kazan", p. 551.
\footnote{146} "Muscovy and Kazan" 1445-1552: A Study in Steppe Politics", Ph.D. dissertation, pp. 82 n. 2 and 95.
had their own specific territories, but it is a mistake to see the qaraqul beys as a strictly agricultural phenomenon. This could be used as an explanation for the system of the four qaraqul beys in Kazan alone and perhaps in the Crimea, too, where there was a long tradition of sedentary civilization, but it cannot be used to explain the universal presence of the "four-bey system" in all of the Çingsid states. Finally, the "clans" as he calls them (that is, the "ruuling tribes") changed in each of the states. It has already been discussed in an earlier section how the number of "ruuling tribes" in the Crimea rose to five, and already Vel'yaminov-Zemov discussed the later role of the Mangıts in the xanate of Kazan.\textsuperscript{147} It is also difficult to see how an agrarian system could afford such organizational flexibility, especially if changes in the composition of the four "ruuling tribes" in a given "state" involved shifts in population or migrations.

In the view of Pelenski, the xanate of Kazan was a loose conglomerate of a variety of peoples, some of whom were organized under native rulers.\textsuperscript{148} The Tatars were the dominant people of the xanate, and their central political system corresponded to those of the other "Mongol-Turkic" states. He goes on, however, to say that the xan, according to the rudimentary Mongol-Turkic political theory, was an unlimited ruler, though in actual practice only the powerful xans were such. Pelenski's view is a prime example of an a priori conception of the Çingsid xan as an autocrat (or at best a sovereign styled on some other Western theory of kingship).

\textsuperscript{147} IKTsTs, ii, p. 425.

\textsuperscript{148} Pelenski, Russia and Kazan, pp. 54-56.
He writes that the nobility and the land frequently exerted their influence in Kazan politics and considerably limited the power of the xan who in the majority of instances could be invested or deposed only with the consent of the ruling elite. He feels that Sahib Giray tried to introduce reforms (whatever this might be a reference to) and found a centralized state, but that the aristocracy defeated him and preferred to transform the xanate into a province of Muscovy.

Pelenski describes separately the qaraqıs, whom he calls councilors forming a royal council and representing the four main families of the country. As yet another institution he describes the vsya zemlya kazanskaya "the entire Kazan land", sometimes also interchanged with vse lyudi kazanskoy zemli "all the people of the Kazan land", which he compares with the concept of the qurıltay in the various Mongol states. Finally, he describes the upper class of the xanate of Kazan as the landed aristocracy, some members of which represented the major segment of the Kazan ruling elite. As just one more example, he writes that emirs, begs, and mirzas were the most privileged landowners. Many of these terms, however, are probably the identical title in various translations. Thus, Pelenski is quite confused as to the nature of these various institutions, which according to the evidence presented in this chapter represented different aspects of the the exact same institution under different names.

With this ends this chapter's discussion of the characteristic features of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde. This list of features may now be compared with the data for the earlier Cingisid states.
CHAPTER III

ANTECEDENTS TO THE QARAĞI BEYS IN THE GOLDEN HORDE AND THE OTHER STATES OF THE MONGOL WORLD EMPIRE (13TH-14TH CENTURIES)

The study of the various states of the Mongol world empire in the 13th-14th centuries has traditionally emphasized individual states, each with its own characteristic set of available sources and facts, in isolation from one another. The result of these independent studies has been differing perspectives on each of these Çingisid states simply because each earlier analysis has offered a different model of the organization of these states based on the random selection of data from the unique sources for each state. The aim of this chapter is to show that the system of the four qarağı beys in the Later Golden Horde can serve as an alternative unifying model for understanding the organization of the Golden Horde and the other states of the Mongol world empire in the 13th-14th centuries.¹

This chapter offers a point-by-point survey of the "four-bey system" in the 13th-14th centuries based on the set of characteristic features established for the Later Golden Horde. (Certain of the points established for the Later Golden Horde, tangential as they may have seemed to a discussion of the later period, are of paramount importance

¹ The major studies of each of these states are briefly reviewed in the Historiographical Essay in the Bibliography, though the differing general interpretations of the organization of these states are discussed at the end of this chapter. Although it would be possible to extend this discussion to later periods, this chapter limits its discussion of the organization of the states of the Mongol world empire, and especially of the Golden Horde, to the 13th-14th centuries. For data suggesting the applicability of the "four-bey system" to the Oyrat confederation in the 17th century, see J. Miyawaki, "The Qalqa Mongols and the Oyrad in the Seventeenth Century" Journal of Asian History 18:2 (1984), pp. 136-173.
in establishing this system in the earlier states.) The "four-bey system" serves as the working hypothesis according to which data is selected and analyzed for the Golden Horde and the other states of the Mongol world empire. In the case of the Golden Horde, this chapter focuses on the western half of the Golden Horde through the end of the 14th century. The western division of the entire Golden Horde, which is also known as the "White Horde", is that portion of the entire state which was synonymous in the primary sources with the Golden Horde. The problem of the eastern half of the Golden Horde, also known as the "Blue Horde", and the problem of its role in the rise of the successor states to the Golden Horde will be introduced in Chapter IV.

Even in the total absence of studies on the Later Golden Horde, a study assembling the data presented in this chapter would still be confronted with the problem of whether to approach the similarities in the organization of the Golden Horde, the Ilxanate in Iran, the Çağatay xanate in Central Asia, and Yuan China as a coincidence or as a related phenomenon. This dissertation proposes the theory that the "four-bey system" common to all these states did not arise independently in each of these states, but that it is a common inheritance from the parent state. Therefore, this theory assumes that there is a genetic or parent-child relationship to account for the presence of this institution so far across the boundaries of time and space.

The most noteworthy feature of the institution of the garaçı beys in the Later Golden Horde and the first point to be discussed here is that the "ruling tribes", and hence their leaders, regularly numbered four; the change of the number to five in the Crimean xanate was a major event and an exception. The political or cultural importance of the
notion of "four" can be documented as an organizing principal in the Çingisid states of the 13th-14th centuries as well.

There are a number of sources which refer to the presence of four leading officials in the Golden Horde, though they are known by different names. A series of these references can be found in the Islamic sources written in Arabic originating in the Mamlûk states. The first source to be mentioned here is one of the important chancellery handbooks written by Qalqaşandi (d. 1418), who quotes an unidentified earlier source in stating that there were four *ulus* emirs (*amir al-ulus*) in the Golden Horde.² Another description is afforded by the author Muḥibbi, whose full work remains unpublished except in the extracts by Tizengauzen. According to Muḥibbi, Qutluğuŷa was one of the four (emirs) of the xan Canûbek (r. 1342-1357) in "Uzbek's land", that is, in the Golden Horde.³

Although the above-mentioned sources discuss the presence of four emirs in the 14th century, the sources are not as abundant for the 13th century. One of the few possible references to the presence of four beys in this period in the Golden Horde is the statement by Mufaqat al that taxes on the Crimean town of Sudaq were divided between four Tatar "kings" (Ar. *mulûk*).⁴ It is likely that the Arabic term *malik* is used here as the equivalent of the Turkic term *bey*, since there were no four

[2] *Subh al-ašâ fi šinâ'at al-inşâ*, ed.-trans. V. Tizengauzen, Sbornik materialov, otmosyasçixsysa k istorii Zolotoy Ordî, i: Izvleçeniyâ iz soçineniy arabskix (St. Petersburg, 1884) pp. 401/412-413. (This work, also known by the French title *Recueil de matériaux relatifs à l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*, will hereafter be abbreviated "Tizengauzen 1".) On the term *ulus* see Doerfer, *TMEN*, i, pp. 175-178.


"kings" who could have collected taxes on the Crimea. In such a case this would be yet another example of the existence of more than one translation in a foreign language for a single Turkic or Mongol term. There is furthermore no basis for postulating so major a change from the 13th century to the 14th, which is another reason why it is likely that the same four leading officials are meant here, too. In that case, it also emerges how, at least in this instance, these four officials had a role in taxation and divided it among themselves.⁵

The Mamlûk chancellery works offer even more detailed information on the "four-bey system" in the Ilxanate, the Mongol state in Iran. One of the two Mamlûk chancellery works written by Ibn Faḍl Allâh al-'Umarî, his Masâlik al-abşâr fi mamâlik al-amşâr, explains that there were four ulus emirs in Iran, who together were also known as emirs of the "flank" (qûl).⁶

A second work by 'Umarî, his At-ta'rif bi-l-muṣṭalâh aṣ-ṣarîf states that in Iran there were four ulus emirs (āmîr al-ulûs) and that the most important matters were not dealt with except through them.⁷ Since 'Umarî died in 1349 A.D. and the historical figures he mentions in this description (Qûṭlûşâh, Ġâzân, Qûbân, Xudâbânda, and Abû Sa'id) go as far back in time as the end of the 13th century, this is clear documentation of the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Ilxanate at that early a date.

[5] This passage in Mufaḍḍal will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter IV.


There is a comparison by 'Umarī himself of the system of
government of the Ilxanate with that of the Golden Horde. He writes that
the army and governmental apparatus of the rulers of the the Golden
Horde was set up just as in the Ilxanate with respect to the number of
emirs, the legal prescriptions, and the roles of the officials. He also
writes, however, that the ulus emirs and the vezir in the Golden Horde
did not have the same administrative powers as in Iran. Qalqašandī also
quotes an earlier source (perhaps 'Umarī himself) to note that the four
ulus emirs in the Golden Horde, including the beylerbeyī, were not as
powerful as their equivalents in Ilxanid Iran. Although it is not
certain to what differences in administrative powers these authors are
referring, they offer valuable evidence which explicitly states that
there existed a Golden Horde institution identical to the ulus emirs of
the Ilxanate. Additional details available for the Ilxanate but not for
the Golden Horde will make it easier to demonstrate that it was the ulus
emirs (that is, ulus beys) who preceded the garaçī beys of the Later
Golden Horde in the "four-bey system".

Another interesting passage in 'Umarī states that the emirs came
to the court daily to take their sandalwood seats in order of rank, and
that the vezir also came every morning. Even though this passage
includes the four ulus beys, it also notes that they were not at court
every day because of their other duties and because they spent much of
their time in other seasonal quarters.

[8] 'Umarī/Lech, pp. 67/136; and 'Umarī/Tizengauzen, pp. 208/229. See
also Qalqašandī, Șubh al-a'dā' fi șinâ'at al-inşâ', vii (Cairo, 1922),
p. 304; and Qalqašandī/Tizengauzen, pp. 401/411-412.


There is substantial evidence for documenting the existence of the "four-bey system" in this period in the Çağatay xanate as well. According to Ibn 'Arabşah's description in his 'Acâ'ib al-maqdûr fî axbûr Timûr, Temürленг's father Taragay was among the "magnates" at the court of the ruler, one of the four "vezirs" who were the chief purveyors of advice to the ruler. This description parallels the ulus beys in the Golden Horde and Ilxanate and the qaɾaɾî beys of the Later Golden Horde. The "four-bey system" can therefore be identified in the Çağatay xanate before the middle of the 14th century.

In his Riḥla the traveler Ibn Baṭṭûta also gives a very suggestive description of the emirs at the court of another xan of the Çağatay xanate, Tarmâşirin (r. 1326-1334). According to him, the principal emirs were seated to the right and left of the xan. By the entrance to the tent were the deputy (nâ'îb), the vezir, the chamberlain (ẖâcîb), and the keeper of the seal which they call al tamâğa, and all four of these emirs rose upon Ibn Baṭṭûta's entrance. This account also fits into the model of the "four-bey system", though Ibn Baṭṭûta's rendering of the titles of these officials into Arabic indicates he probably had no accurate idea of their relative positions.

Both of these accounts relating to the Çağatay xanate are examples of an author mistranslating the indigenous terms into Arabic.


The important point, however, is that both sources speak of four leading emirs, and, if one does not allow the specific terminology to obscure the features of the institution, both of these passages are clear documentation of the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Çağatay xanate.\textsuperscript{13}

It is clear from the sources presented above that the presence of four bey can be documented for the Golden Horde, the Ilxanate, and the Çağatay xanate as early as the first half of the 14th century. Since the explanation adopted here for these similarities is descent from a common parent state, one may postulate that Yuan China also shared this same "four-bey system" of organization on some level. The most important Chinese dynastic sources on the governmental organization of the Yuan, however, are silent on some of the most important aspects of this institution. Unexpectedly, it is the Câmi' at-tavârîx and the Arabic chancellery manuals which offer the only useful evidence of any sort on the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Mongol state in China.

The Câmi' at-tavârîx, one of the most important sources for Ilxanid Iran and the other Mongol states, gives biographies of the most important Mongol rulers. In the case of Qubilay's biography, Raşîd ad-Dîn even happens to include a lengthy description of Yuan government under this xan. Since Raşîd ad-Dîn received his information from none other than Pulad çingsang, the envoy of Qubilay Xan to the Ilxanid

court, his source must be considered unimpeachable. Still, there are contradictory aspects to Raşid ad-Din's account.

In his description, Raşid ad-Din stresses the role of four non-Çingisid emirs called çingsangs in the "Great Divan". He further describes that at the Chinese court there were: great emirs called çingsangs who had the qualifications to be ministers and vezirs; army commanders called tayfu; commanders of tümens (detachments of 10,000) called vangshai (in Boyle's transliteration); and emirs, vezirs, and ministers of the Divan who are Taciks, Xitayans and Uyğurs called fincans. Raşid ad-Din also specifically names a number of the emirs and mentions that the "chief of the finjans is called sufinjan, that is, 'cream of the finjans'". Finally, he ranks the officials at the Yüan court as follows in Table III.

A second account completely independent of Raşid ad-Din, that of the merchant and traveler Tâc ad-Din Hasan ibn as-Samargandî, is


[16] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp.470-472; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 278.

[17] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp.476-477; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 279.

[18] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 470-472; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 279. On the çingsangs or ch'eng hsiangs, see Vladimirtsov, Obščestvenniy 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 fincans, 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. I. Berezin, the original editor of the Persian text of Raşid ad-Din's famous work, gave a translation of Raşid ad-Din's description of the government of China under Qubilai in his "Očerk vnutrennogo ustroystva Ulusa Djučijeva", Trudi Vostočnago otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago arxeologičeskago obščestva 8 (1864), pp. 385-494, especially pp. 487-494.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>chingsang (4)</td>
<td>ch'eng hsiang</td>
<td>丞相</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>taifu</td>
<td>t'ai fu</td>
<td>太傅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>finjan (4)</td>
<td>p'ing chang (cheng shih)</td>
<td>平章政事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>yu-ching</td>
<td>yu ch'eng</td>
<td>右丞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>zo-ching</td>
<td>tso ch'eng</td>
<td>左丞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>sam-jing</td>
<td>ts'an (chih) (cheng (shih))</td>
<td>参知政事</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>sami</td>
<td>ts'an yi</td>
<td>参議</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>lanjun</td>
<td>lang chung</td>
<td>郎中</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>sufinjan</td>
<td>[unknown]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preserved in the works of 'Umari and Qalqasandî. This account follows that portion of Raşîd ad-Dîn's description which describes the government of Yuan China in terms of the traditional Chinese ministries. A portion of what Samarqandî says about China is that the xan of China has two great emirs or vezirs called cînkân, two others below this rank called bincân, two others below this rank called zîcîn, two others below this rank called samcîn, and two others below this ranks called yûcîn. He also states that the head of the scribes is called iancûn and that this official has the position of a private secretary (kâtîb al-sîrîr).¹⁹ (In Qalqasandî's version, however, the official called samcîn is omitted.) This account is depicted in Table IV.

A third account in the Islamic sources dealing with Yuan China (also preserved in 'Umari and Qalqasandî) echoes that part of Raşîd ad-Dîn's description in which the emperor had four emirs. This is a very brief mention of the merchant Şarîf al-Fâdîl Abû l-Hasan 'Ali al-Karbalâ'î, who claimed to have had personal audiences with the xan in China and who also knew many of his princes. According to Karbalâ'î, the xan had four vezirs who exercised authority in the whole country while he himself was consulted only in the rarest of instances.²⁰ Such a description is a second independent attestation of the fact that there was a group of four special emirs who were active in the rule of the state.

The information of the Islamic sources—coming as it does from three independent sources, all of which are possibly first-hand—cannot

---

[¹⁹] 'Umari/Lech, pp. 28-29/110-111; and Qalqasandî, Şubh al-a'sâ, iv, p. 486.

[²⁰] 'Umari/Lech, pp. 34/114; and Qalqasandî, Şubh al-a'sâ, iv, p. 487.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Umari (Qalqasandī)</th>
<th>Lech[^]</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. cinkṣàn (2)</td>
<td>ch'eng hsiang 丞相</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. bincân (2)</td>
<td>p'ing chang  cheng shih  平章政事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. zūcîn (2)</td>
<td>tso ch'eng  左丞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. samcîn (2)</td>
<td>ts'an (chih)  cheng (shih)  参知政事</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. yûcîn (2)</td>
<td>yu ch'eng  右丞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. lancûn</td>
<td>lang chung  郎中</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^] Lech's readings are modified to conform to the transliteration system used in this dissertation.
simply be ignored even though the sources offer two versions which contradict one another. Nor can one simply dismiss these accounts in favor of a traditional view of Chinese administration based strictly on the official Chinese sources which have every interest in suppressing those features of Mongol government in China which did not conform to traditional imperial practices. After all, if the Islamic sources are legitimate sources for other aspects of Mongol history, they should be taken into consideration here, too.\footnote{Cf. the statement by H. Franke that "nobody will expect Raṣīd to teach us new facts concerning Chinese history" ("Some Sinological Remarks on Raṣīd ad-dīn's History of China", Oriens 4 [1951], pp. 21-26, especially p. 21).} Another point to note is that the official history of the Yüan dynasty, the Yüan shih was compiled only at the beginning of the following, non-Mongol dynasty, the Ming, by which time the Mongol practices still in existence under Qubilay might have disappeared.\footnote{On the compilation of the Yüan shih see for example H. Franke, \textit{Geld und Wirtschaft in China unter der Mongolen-Herrschaft. Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Yüan-Zeit} (Leipzig, 1949), pp. 16-34.}

The contradictions in this group of sources just described are that Raṣīd ad-Dīn and Samargandi echo the official accounts of Chinese government. Two other of the Islamic sources, again Raṣīd ad-Dīn and Karbalā'ī, 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 as did the ulus emirs and the qaraqūy beys of the other Čingisid states. (Other parts of Raṣīd ad-Dīn's description will be included later on in this chapter.)

It is also clear from both the Chinese and the Islamic sources, however, that there were other čingsangs (Chinese ch'eng hsiang) who were distinct from these four čingsangs. To complicate matters further,
according to the *Yüan shih*, the actual number of officials varied within the course of each reign. It is therefore possible that Rašid ad-Dīn and Karbalâ'ī obtained their information on the *ch'eng hsiangs* for a year in which they happened to number four.²³

In order to resolve these contradictions one must keep in mind that wherever they went the Mongols adapted to and adopted practices of the great centers of civilization over which they came to rule, and this can be no less true of China.²⁴ 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.²⁵ Since Rašid ad-Dīn's account includes both kinds of descriptions, the presence

---

²³ *Yüan shih* (Peking, 1976), chap. 85: p. 2120 ff. For a translation of this portion of chap. 85 dealing with the various officials see P. Ratchnevsky, *Un Code des Yuan*, i, Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études chinoises 4 (Paris, 1937), p. 117 ff. According to Ratchnevsky in 1262 there were four *ch'eng hsiangs*, in 1270 there were four, in 1272 there was one, in 1276 there were none, in 1277-1280 there was just one, in 1281 there were three, in 1282 there were six, and in 1283-1284 there was again just one (p. 121 n. 2).


of four extraordinary čingsangs can be taken as an indication of the
dichotomy between Mongol and Chinese traditions of government.\footnote{26}

This section has presented evidence to show the presence of four
leading non-Čingisid officials in the Golden Horde, the Ilxanate, the
Çağatay xanate, and Yuan China, which suggests that the "four-bey
system" existed in these states. The rest of this chapter takes the
presence of the "four-bey system" in these states as a premise and gives
evidence to document the points established in the preceding chapter for
the Later Golden Horde.

The second point which may be discussed here is that in the Later
Golden Horde the individual qaraçı beys were the leaders of their own
"ruling tribes". The sources for the Later Golden Horde are not generous
on this point, and it is even more difficult to prove for the earlier
period. For the 13th century there are hardly any reference in this
regard. Noğay, whom the next chapter will attempt to show as having been
one such ulus emir, is described as having consulted with his own
people.\footnote{27} There is somewhat more evidence for this point at the end of
the 14th century, since the later sources dating from the period of the
Later Golden Horde refer back to Edigü as an earlier leader of the
Mangūt "ruling tribe".

It is for the Çağatay xanate that the best sources exist for
demonstrating that the ulus beys were the leaders of their own "ruling

\footnote{26} J.D. Langlois, Jr., "Law, Statecraft, and The Spring and Autumn
Annals in Yuan Political Thought", Yuan 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.

\footnote{27} Rukn ad-Dīn Baybars, Zubdat al-fikra fī tarīx al-hicra,
Tizengauzen 1, pp. 87/110, using the Arabic term gawm. Nuwayrī, Nihāyat
al-arab fī funūn al-adab, Tizengauzen 1, pp. 137/158, uses the term
'ašīra, which is also known from the Later Golden Horde as discussed in
Chapter II.
tribes". One of these is Ibn 'Arabshâh's 'Acâ'ib al-maqdûr fî axbâr Timûr, which states that the "vezirs" were the rulers of their own "ruling tribes" (respectively the Arlat, Calayir, Qavcin, and Barlas). Temürler, like his father before him, was the head of the Barlas, the lowest in rank of the four "ruling tribes" in the Çağatay xanate. As Ibn 'Arabshâh writes (in the translation by Sanders), "The Turks forsooth have tribes and a race, like the Arab tribes, and each of the Viziers was to his own tribe a tall wick for the lamp of its counsels in the houses of its habitation."\(^{28}\)

Mirza Muhammed Haydar Duğlat, writing about the Çağatay xanate, also points this out: "All the above-mentioned men were Amirs and commanders of regiments and detachments. There was another set of men, who, although not Mirs or sons of Amirs, had yet each his own tribe and following."\(^{29}\)

There is little explicit evidence that can be offered here for the Ilxanate, except to note that the affiliations of some of the ulus beys are known. For example, the beylerbeyi at the time of 'Umarî's writing during the reign of the 12th Ilxan Sulṭân Muḥammad b. Taştîmür b. Isantîmür b. 'Anbarcî (r. 1336-1338) was Şayx Ḥasan b. Ḫusayn b. Aqbuğâ.\(^{30}\) As founder of the following Calayird state, Aqbuğâ was presumably of the Calayir "ruling tribe".\(^{31}\)

\(^{28}\) Ibn 'Arabshâh/Shirwanee, pp. 9-10; and Ibn 'Arabshâh/Sanders, p. 4.

\(^{29}\) Mirza Muhammed Haydar Duğlat/Elias and Ross, p. 309.

\(^{30}\) 'Umarî/Lech, pp. 93/153.

\(^{31}\) B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran. Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350 (Wiesbaden, 1968\(^{3}\)), p. 131; and 'Umarî/Lech, p. 334, n. 88.
The third point which may be discussed here is that the leader of each "ruling tribe" in the Later Golden Horde had a series of one or more deputies constituting a separate hierarchy subordinate to him independent of the Čingisid xan. The naming of certain positions for historical figures during the Later Golden Horde should not be taken to mean that these positions had not existed previously. It is likely that certain deputies had always existed, for if there is a person who is the leader, there can always be someone beneath him in a ruling hierarchy, especially since many of these positions were held by the son of the leader of a "ruling tribe". Nevertheless, the evidence for the Golden Horde itself is scanty. The best evidence comes from the Later Golden Horde, such as the remark in the Noğay Acts that Yunus was the nur ed-din under Edigi.\(^{32}\)

There is much better evidence from the sources for the Ilxanate to document that each leader of a "ruling tribe" had his own deputy. According to 'Umarî, if one of the ulus emirs was absent, his name would nevertheless be signed to the yarlıq as if he were there, and his deputy (nâ'ib) would take his place. The ulus emirs did not act upon any matter (lâ yumdûna) without the vezir, and when they were not present, the vezir acted, giving the order (amr) to the deputies, and their names were then written. 'Umarî also goes on to state that the (ulus) emirs generally did not know more than what their deputies told them.\(^{33}\)

The fourth point which may be described as a characteristic feature of the "four-bey system" in each of these states is that one of the four ulus beys acted as a first among equals. Qalqaşandî quotes an

\[32\] PDRW, ix, pp. 248-249; and IKTsTs, ii, pp. 418-419.

\[33\] 'Umarî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 227/249; At-ta'rif bi-l-muşţalaḥ aš-şarif, pp. 45-46.
earlier source in stating that there were four ulus emirs in the Golden Horde, of whom the greatest was the beylerbeyi, though it is also stated that the emirs were not as powerful there as in Iran.\[34\]

The Arabic sources also describe the beylerbeyi with other titles, too. For example, Qutluq Temür, who had been "deputy" (Ar. nā'ib) of Toqta, helped place his successor Uzbek on the throne.\[35\] This notion of deputy, however, is more appropriately understood as yet another aspect of the role of the head of the four beys. According to Ibn Duqmāq, Qutluq Temür—the same Qutluq Temür who helped seat Özbek—is called mudabbir mamlakatihi "leader of his country" under Özbek Xan, and in another passage is said to have been replaced as Özbek's nā'ib, or deputy.\[36\] A notice in the later Mamlûk chancellery manual by Qalqaşandî establishes that the nā'ib of Canbek was the beylerbeyi, Qutlubağa Inaq.\[37\] These sources show that the nā'ib of the xan in the Golden Horde was the head of the four ulus beys, while each ulus bey had his own deputy, also called nā'ib in the sources.

Ibn Baţţuţa defines the term "ulus emir" as "emir of emirs" in reference to a figure in the Golden Horde the passage al-amīr al-kabīr 'Isâ bak amīr al-ulūs ... wa-ma'nâhu amīr al-umārâ' "the great emir 'Isâ

\[34\] Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen 1, trans. pp. 412-413.
\[36\] Nuzhat al-anâm fî târîx al-islâm, Tizengauzen 1, pp. 318/325 and 321/328. See also Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, pp. 301-302, for additional references to the term nā'ib in the Golden Horde.
\[37\] Şubḥ al-a'şā, vii, p. 302, where this is reported following At-tatḥif (i.e., Muḥibbi's Taṭḥif at-ta'rīf bi-l-muṣṭalâh as-ṣarīf) for A.H. 782/1380-1 A.D. As there was no Canbek ruling at this date (Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 453), either the date is wrong, or the use of the name Canbek is an anachronism. See also Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen, pp. 401/412.
Bey, *ulus emir*, meaning emir of emirs*. The definition "emir of emirs" should, however, refer instead to the office of the *beylerbeyi*.\(^{38}\)

Numerous details are available for the office of *beylerbeyi* in the Ilxanate. According to 'Umarî's *Masâlik al-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşîr*, the highest-ranking of the *ulus* emirs was called the *beylerbeyi* (*baklârî bak*), i.e., emir of emirs.\(^{39}\) This is confirmed by 'Umarî's *At-ta'rîf bi-l-muşţâlah aş-şarîf*, which also states that the greatest of the four *ulus* emirs was the *beylerbeyi* (*baklârî bak*) and that the most important matters are not dealt with except through them. 'Umarî names Qutlûşâh as chief of these emirs under Ğâzân (r. 1295-1304) and Ğûbân, as the same under Xudâbanda (r. 1304-1316) and then Abû Sa'id (r. 1317-1335).\(^{40}\) The *beylerbeyi* current at the time of 'Umarî's writing was Şayx Ḥasan b. Ḥusayn b. Aqbuğâ.\(^{41}\)

There is little that can be said at this point about the Çağatay xanate. Ibn Baṭṭûţa's described the first of the four emirs at the court of the Çağatay xan Tarmaşîrin as the *nâ'ib*.\(^{42}\) This, however, is the same as the situation with the sources for the Golden Horde, namely that there are multiple translations in the sources for the head of the leaders of the four "ruling tribes".

\(^{38}\) Ibn Baṭṭûţa/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, p. 395. The term "great emir", a term often used in the sources to refer to the *ulus* beys, may reflect on the usage ṭulûq ṣarâçi "elder ṣarâçi, great ṣarâçi" in the sources for the the Later Golden Horde (see Chapter II).

\(^{39}\) 'Umarî/Lech, pp. 93/153.

\(^{40}\) 'Umarî/Tizengauzen, pp. 227/249; and 'Umarî, *At-ta'rîf*, pp. 45-46.

\(^{41}\) 'Umarî/Lech, pp. 93/153. This was during the reign of the 12th Ilxan Sulṭân Muḥammad b. Taştimur b. İsandimur b. 'Anbarci (r. 1336-1338).

\(^{42}\) Ibn Baṭṭûţa/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 35.
The fourth point concerns the military role of the ulus beys. The sources for the Later Golden Horde do not state explicitly that the four qaraçı beys were the supreme military leaders, though the evidence presented in the previous chapter does indicate a military role which they, and especially the chief of the four, had. One of the reasons for setting up this category at all in the Later Golden Horde is the abundant documentation of this point in the sources for the earlier period, especially for the Ilhanate.

It is clear from the sources for the Ilhanate that the head of the ulus emirs, the beylerbeyi, was the head of the army. According to 'Umari's Masâlik al-absâr, the highest authority over the troops was the highest-ranking of the ulus emirs, the beylerbeyi. Another work by 'Umari clearly states that the beylerbeyi was the sole authority on military matters (as opposed to the vezir, on whom see below). In the Golden Horde, there was a series of individuals described as leaders of the army, of which Noğay was only the first.

The fifth point involves a fundamental feature of the "four-bey system", namely the role of the ulus beys in the selection of the Çingisid xans. It is clear from the sources for the Later Golden Horde that the qaraçı beys were very strongly involved in the selection of the xans. While this phenomenon has been accepted by students of this later period, it is still foreign to students of the earlier period, who fail


[44] 'Umari/Tizengauzen 1, p. 227/249; and 'Umari, At-ta'rif, pp. 45-46.

[45] See for example Rashid ad-Din/Blochec, pp. 139 and 203; and Rashid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 123 and 160. These individuals will be discussed in much greater detail in Chapter IV.
to study this point systematically despite the wealth of evidence available to support such a role for the ulus beys in the Golden Horde.

Noğay was just the first in a series of Golden Horde figures who were known in the sources as kingmakers clearly deciding the fate of a series of rulers.\textsuperscript{46} According to contemporary sources and to later sources such as the *Umdet üt-tevarih*, the emirs were plotting to bring in an outside ruler such as Hülegü as early as after the death of Batu (d. 1256), just as Ğūbān later considered inviting Özbek to rule in Iran after the death of Xudābanda (d. 1316).\textsuperscript{47}

The German traveler Schiltberger also made note of the fact that the xan was not omnipotent, but that others had a role in choosing or dismissing him. In his discussion of the role of Edigi, leader of the Mangit "ruling tribe", he writes: "It is to be noted, that it is the custom for the king, in Great Tartary, to have a Chief to rule over him, who can elect or depose a king, and has also power over vassals. Now at that time Edigi was the Chief."\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{46} See for example Rukn ad-Dīn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 88/110-111; Nuwayri/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 136/157. See Chapter IV for details on other figures in the history of the Golden Horde known for this role.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibn Dugmāq/Tizengauzen, pp. 317-318/324-325 on the invitation for Özbek to rule in Iran; and Abdūlqaffar Kīrīmī/Asīm, p. 21, on the invitation by the emirs to Hülegü instead of Berke.

In the Ilxnate this can also be documented in the case of Ahmad (r. 1282-1284), who was not the appointed successor, but was imposed by the emirs. The Golden Horde ruler Özbek Xan was offered the Ilxnid throne by the Ilxnid ulus emirs, but declined the offer following consultation with his "deputy" (nâ'ib). This is a clear example that the Golden Horde and the Ilxnate shared in the same system of succession (or rather election) to the position of xan.

A passage in another work by Ibn 'Arabşäh gives a detailed description of the election of the Çağatay xans. According to this source, the election of a ruler was through the agreement and administration of the "heads" (Ar. ru'asâ': of the "ruling tribes"?). The various emirs gathered from all over and consulted among themselves for a few days. This gathering, which according to Ibn 'Arabşäh had been the continuous form of government in the Çağatay xanate, was called a gurilta. Temür leng is another example par excellence of the leader of a "ruling tribe" choosing a series of puppet xans. What makes the case of Temür leng unusual is that he was not originally the head of the leading "ruling tribe", but of the lowest-ranking one. Nevertheless, his power grew such that he was able to wield the most power.

[49] See for example the discussion in Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, p. 77 ff.
[50] Ibn Duqmâq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 317-318/324-325.
[51] Fâkihat al-xulafâ', ed. G.G. Freytag, i (Bonn, 1832), p. 234. This source has been cited by P.A. Boodberg, who acknowledges the assistance of W. Popper; Boodberg, however, mistakenly took this source out of context and attributed it to the time of Güngis Xan ("Marginalia to the Histories of the Northern Dynasties", Selected Works of Peter A. Boodberg, ed. A.P. Cohen, Berkeley, 1979, pp. 264-349, especially p. 310). Despite the number of important facts found in this work, neither Bartol'd nor any of the other major authors except Boodberg have referred to this source.
[52] Ibn 'Arabşäh/Shirwanee, p. 10; and Ibn 'Arabşäh/Sanders, p. 4.
In the Mongol government of Yuan China, there are many sources which discuss how the widow of the xan and the various officials (always including a ch'eng hsiang) were involved in the selection of who would be the next to rule. Such episodes are documented for the Yuan court in the Keng shen wai shih.\(^5\) In Chinese history, the women of the court, especially the mother of a ruler, traditionally played a very important role in court politics and rivalries. Nevertheless, this phenomenon in China can be taken to be a phenomenon of Mongol political life as much as of Chinese political life.

It is beginning with this point that the analogies can go back earlier in time to the history of the Great Xanate and the first free selection of the xan.\(^5\) It was Güyük who was elected, and according to Cuwayni the leading princes were decided on a son of Čingiz Xan, and it was the xan's widow Töregene Xatun who preferred Güyük.\(^5\) According to Rašid ad-Din, Töregene Xatun and most of the emirs decided on Güyük, who consented on the condition that the xanate remain within his family, to which the emirs agreed in writing.\(^5\)

---


[55] Cuwayni/Qazwini, i, pp. 206-207; and Cuwayni/Boyle, i, pp. 251-252.

[56] Rašid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 243-245; and Rašid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 181-182.
The sixth point involves the role of the ulus beys representing the four "ruling tribes" in the ritual elevation of the xan whom they had helped choose. Starting with the earliest sources, one may turn to paragraph 123 of the *Secret History of the Mongols*, which simply describes Çingis Xan's elevation to the office of xan by Altan, Quçar, and Saça Beki. According to Raşid ad-Din, when Temüjin returned from an especially successful campaign in the winter of 1202-1203, "tribes came to him from all directions with expressions of peace and submission. He organized a large meeting, and in thanks for this great good fortune and having established good and strict laws, he happily mounted the throne of the xan." These two accounts, however, offer little evidence which may be compared with later accounts. A third account, that in Haython's *La flor des estoires de la terre d'orient* does describe two coronations, including that of Çingis Xan. Though the accounts in this somewhat later source actually go back to the reigns of Güyük and Môngke, the account is nonetheless very interesting. It includes the details that the leaders of seven nations (named earlier as Tartars, Tangot, Eurach [Oyrat], Jalair, Sonit, Mengli, Tebet) pledged obedience and reverence to Canguis (Çingis [sic?]). They made a seat or throne in their midst, stretched out a black felt rug on the ground, and then elevated him, finally seating him on the throne. He then continues that at the two elections he attended he saw how the important persons (*hauz homes*) and those of the lineage of Çingis Xan gathered, raised the xan high, seated


him on the throne, and pledged obedience.\[59\] Perhaps the first part of this account deals with an oath of fealty rather than an election, though the source mentions two elections.

Specific accounts of the elevation ceremony of Ögödey Khan (r. 1229-1241), who was supposedly chosen by his father Čingis, are also available, beginning with that given by the *Secret History*. It states that Ögödey's older brother Çağatay raised him, and that Çağatay and their younger brother Toluy delivered the people of the middle to Ögödey.\[60\] According to Cuvayni, those attending first removed their hats and slung their belts across their backs. With Çağatay holding Ögödey's right hand, Otegin his left, and Noyan bearing a cup, all present knelt three times to the new xan, and the princes knelt three times to the sun.\[61\] According to Raṣīd ad-Dīn, those attending took off their hats and slung their belts across their backs. Then Çağatay took Ögödey's right hand, Toluy his left, and Otçigin his belt and thus seated him on the throne, with Toluy holding the cup. Then everyone knelt.\[62\]

More accounts are available about the investiture of Güyük, who was freely elected from among the successors of Čingis Khan. Cuvayni writes that on the appointed day the princes gathered together and took off their hats and loosened their belts. Yesū and Hordu took Güyük by the hand, set him on the throne, and seized their goblets. Those present


\[60\] *Secret History*, paragraph 269: p. 209.

\[61\] Cuvayni/Qazwini, i, pp. 147-148; and Cuvayni/Boyle, i, p. 187.

\[62\] Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Blochet, pp. 16-17; and Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Boyle, p. 31.
knelt three times to the new xan, gave him a written declaration of obedience, and then went to kneel three times to the sun. According to Raṣīd ad-Dīn, Ögödey's widow Töregene Xatun and most of the emirs decided on Gūyūk, who consented on the condition that the xanate remain within his family, to which the emirs agreed in writing. The princes took off their hats, loosened their belts, set him on the throne, and then took their cups. John of Plano Carpini simply writes that "they returned to the tent and placed Cuyuc on the imperial throne, and the chiefs knelt before him and after them all the people".

Möngke's accession to the throne was in two steps according to the account in Raṣīd ad-Dīn. The first stage was that the sickly Batu, xan of the Golden Horde, recommended while in his own camp that Möngke be given the position on the basis of his virtues, descent from Čingis Xan's youngest son Toluy, and personal acquaintance with the traditions of Čingis Xan. Raṣīd ad-Dīn wrote that at this time Batu rose up, all the princes and noyans loosened their belts and knelt down, and Batu seized a cup and installed Möngke. A year and a half later, at another meeting with representatives from all over at the original Mongol

[63] Cuwaynī/Qazwini, i, pp. 206-208; and Cuwaynī/Boyle, i, pp. 251-252.

[64] Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Blochet, pp. 243-245; and Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Boyle, pp. 181-182.

[65] John of Plano Carpini, "History of the Mongols", The Mongol Mission, ed. C. Dawson (London, 1955/Toronto, 1980), pp. 1-76, especially p. 63. This translation faithfully follows the Latin text of this passage as published by A. van den Wyngaert, Sinica Franciscana, i: Itineraria et relationes fratrum minorum saeculi XIII et XIV (Quaracchi-Firenze, 1929), p. 119. Cf. the tantalizing translation of this passage published in B. Spuler, trans. H. Drummond and S. Drummond, History of the Mongols. Based on Eastern and Western Accounts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (Berkeley, 1972), p. 88, according to which Gūyūk and his wife were both raised on a felt blanket and then proclaimed emperor and empress. (Spuler's source is F. Risch, Geschichte der Mongolen und Reiseberichte 1245-1247, Leipzig, 1930, pp. 242-244.)
campgrounds, Möngke was again set on the throne, and this time the emirs and troops outside the ordo knelt nine times together with the princes. Cuvayni gives a more stylized account of the same process, writing that Batu insisted that Möngke was the legitimate heir to the patrimony of Čingis Xan and, seizing a goblet, installed Möngke. He also relates the story of the second qurultay and how the princes took off their hats, slung over their belts, and raised Möngke.

A much later source from the Crimea, the Umdat üt-tevarih, also gives many tantalizing details for the Golden Horde itself. It relates that under Töde Mengü, the emirs of the Deşt-i Kipchak raised the xan, just as they had enthroned Mengü Temür in the same way. This source also explicitly relates how two emirs seated Özbek on a piece of white felt according to Mongol custom and raised him, with other tribes then coming to swear fealty. Even if one is reluctant to accept the authenticity of such an 18th century source (though it is presumably based on earlier sources), it is likely that the elevation of the xan was a practice which existed in the Golden Horde.

Further details based on the ritual of elevation may be culled from the sources for the Ilxanate. For example, Raşid ad-Din describes how arrow-bearer Xulacu took Arğun (r. 1284-1295?) by the right arm and

---

[66] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 277-278; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 202-203.

[67] Cuvayni/Qazwini, iii, p. 30; and Cuvayni/Boyle, ii, p. 568.


[69] Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, p. 35.
Anbarçi by the left to elevate him onto the throne. All present took Arğun by the belt, bowed to him, and gave him their greetings.\footnote{Raşid ad-Din, ed. A.A. Ali-zade, trans. A.K. Arends, Djami-at-tavârîğ, iii (Baku, 1957), pp. 198–199/115. See also Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, p. 264, for further references to sources for the ritual installation of the Ilxans, including the various details of the ritual noted above.}

A passage in Ibn 'Arabşâh's Fâkihat al-xulafâ' also gives a description of the ritual elevation of the Çağatay xans.\footnote{Ibn 'Arabşâh/Freytag, i, pp. 234–236.} After a xan had been selected in the qurîltay through the agreement of the participating emirs of the army and the heads of provinces, they placed him on a felt (rug) and elevated him from the ground onto the throne. Ibn 'Arabşâh continues that four emirs, each a great emir (amîr kabîr) held it by the corner and lifting it claimed it to be the banner of nobility. The xan shouted distinctly that he was not fit to rule over them, with the emirs saying he was. After this had been repeated, they seated the xan-elect on the throne, and then turned to what Ibn 'Arabşâh refers to as the accursed and satanic customs (tûrâ) of Çingis Xan, which they unfolded and proclaimed. After a recitation from this work, they pledged allegiance to the xan and the xan promised to comply with its provisions as well. They then hit the xan three times, turned to face the sun, hit him again, and then prostrated themselves. Finally, there was drinking and the distribution of gifts. In an extremely interesting final note, Ibn 'Arabşâh explicitly states that in all of the countries of the East from China, the Deşt (-i Kipchak), China (Sin), Moğolistan, and Cata and in the provinces of Çağatay and Rûm they are accustomed to most of these rules and practices.
In the Great Xanate it was Qubilay who was chosen to succeed by a group of princes and emirs on the death of Möngke (after Ariğböke). In Raşid ad-Din's account, those who elected him gave written undertakings and then knelt down before him. Very little else is known about his being named to the office of great xan, though much more source material exists for the official proclamation of the Yuan dynasty in 1272. This information does not, however, have any bearing on the elevation of Qubilay as great xan.

The ritual of elevation described in detail above is just about the only characteristic feature of the role of the four ulus beys which can also be documented for the Great Xanate. Though in and of itself it is not proof of the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Great Xanate, the same ritual was definitely associated with the four ulus beys later on. It is certainly a basis, however, for speculating on what can be learned about the Great Xanate despite the filter of the "official" sources.

The next point which may be discussed here concerns the correspondence of the ulus beys with foreign rulers, a practice for which there is abundant evidence in the Later Golden Horde. In the earlier period Nógay is one good example of an ulus bey corresponding with other states, since he corresponded himself with the Byzantines as well as with the Mamlûk rulers. It was, in fact, this correspondence

[72] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, p. 291; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 252.

[73] On the proclamation of the Yuan dynasty, see J.D. Langlois, Jr., "Introduction", China under Mongol Rule, pp. 3-21, especially pp. 3-7.
that confused a series of scholars trying to understand Noğay's place in the Golden Horde.\[74\]

In the Ilxanate, there is less information for documenting the correspondence of the emirs with foreign rulers, except to state that the emirs called upon Özbek to succeed to the Ilxanid throne, just as they had earlier invited Berke to do so.\[75\] Obviously, such a correspondence must have been carried out by the emirs.

The eighth point regards the application by the ulus emirs of seals to the documents issued by the xan, which showed that the ulus beys had a role in approving or vetoing such documents issued by the xan. It is for the reign of Ögödey of the Great Xanate that there are the earliest references to the use of the aI tamğa "red seal" in the Mongol world empire, which according to Raşid ad-Din is used by the secretaries for validating documents.\[76\]

For the Golden Horde there is little direct evidence for the application of tamğas as a sign of the ulus beys approving the orders of the xan, though it is known that emirs were co-signators to a number of documents which have been preserved in translation. Some of those sent to the Venetians with signatures on them have already been edited by Hammer-Purgstall in his history of the Golden Horde and discussed by

---


[76] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, p. 70; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 83. 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\[7\]), p. 387; Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, pp. 272 and 291; and M.A. Usmanov, Jalovannie akti Djuçieva Ulusa XIV-XVI vv. (Kazan, 1979), pp. 147-151.
Safargaliev.\textsuperscript{77} The number of names on these documents varied greatly, however, nor is it clear who many of the persons signing the documents were.

Two sources for the Ilxanate mention the presence of four emirs in connection with the practice of affixing seals to the documents issued by the xan. Their names are supposed (yüštarațu) to appear after that of the ruler but before that of the vezir on yarlıqs and fermans.\textsuperscript{78} Ahri's Tārīx-i Şayx Uways names four emirs in connection with the affixing of the seal.\textsuperscript{79} A different and curious statement is made by Raşīd ad-Dīn in connection with the reign of Gāzān (r. 1295-1304), again involving the affixing of seals. According to this account, Gāzān himself appointed four emirs to affix seals.\textsuperscript{80} This, in turn, is made to seem the first instance where four such emirs are mentioned. In the face of the evidence presented in this chapter it is difficult to accept this story at face value and believe that Gāzān was the founder of such an institution in the Ilxanate if, as argued in this dissertation, it existed in all the other Čingisid states.

There is very little explicit information to support the theory that the tamğa was applied by the four beys in the Çağatay xanate, though Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (1304-1377), describes the four main emirs at the

\textsuperscript{77} J. Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, das ist der Mongolen in Russland (Pest, 1840), pp. 519-522; and Safargaliev, Raspad Zolotoy Ordī, p. 110. Cf. also the names appearing in the yarlıqs in Priselkov, Xanskie yarlıki russkim mitropolitam, especially pp. 91-114; and Pamyatniki russkogo prava, iii, pp. 463-491.

\textsuperscript{78} 'Umāri/Lech, pp. 93/153.


\textsuperscript{80} Raşīd ad-Dīn/Ali-zade and Arends, pp. 500-504/264-287.
court of Tārmaširin in a passage already discussed above. Included in this group was the keeper of the seal which they call al tamga.81

Rāṣīd ad-Din's description of the affairs of "the Great Divan, which they call shing"82 in Yuan China is of interest for the discussion of seals as well. According to this passage in his world history, there are four emirs called čingsang in whose presence the other officials sit together with their bitikčis (secretaries) according to their rank. Each of these emirs has a special seal and tamga and it is these four čingsangs who report to the xan, i.e. Qubilay.83 The evidence of the use of seals by these officials is less forceful for China, however, since seals were commonly used there.

A number of the characteristic features of the institution of the qaraçı beys were not shared in the same way by the earlier states of the Mongol world empire. The most important difference is that the sources for the Later Golden Horde do not speak of a vezirate in the earlier period of the Later Golden Horde, while such a term and office was known in some of the earlier states. This cannot include the Golden Horde, however, since what has been referred to as the vezir in the Golden Horde was, in fact, one of the ulus emirs. Spuler associates the title "vezir" appearing in the sources for the Golden Horde with the titles mudabbir "leader" and nâ'ib "deputy".84 A closer examination of the sources he refers to, however, reveals that Qutluq Temür is described at one point in Ibn Duqmāq only as mudabbir mamlakatıhi "leader of his

[81] Ibn Baṭṭūta/Debrémy and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 35.
[82] Rāṣīd ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 478 and 480-481; and Rāṣīd ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 279 and 280.
[83] Rāṣīd ad-Din/Blochet, p. 483; and Rāṣīd ad-Din/Boyle, p. 281.
country" under Özbek Xan, and in another is said to have been replaced as Özbek's nā'ib. According to Muḥibbi, Qutlabuğa, the head emir, was nā'ib al-qān "deputy of the xan" to Canibek (in A.H. 756/1355-6 A.D.), and the vezir was one of the three remaining emirs (all four ulus emirs are described in part as al-amīrī l-kabīrī "great emir [adj.]". According to 'Umāri, in the Ilxnate the four ulus emirs did not act upon any matter (lā yumdūna) without the vezir, and when they were not present, the vezir acted, giving the order (amr) to the deputies, after which their names were written. Just as the beylerbeyi was the sole authority on military matters, the vezir, who was the "true ruler", was sole authority on matters of finance, administration, and dismissal from office. On the most important matters he was the sole authority; but in matters of the property of the people they all had a say.

While the military was under the supervision of the ulus emirs, the chancellery and judiciary were under the vezir. It is further stated that the Ilxnid vezir issued yarlıqs and orders (akhām) concerning finances called altan tamğa (altān tamğa) "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. Although 'Umāri wrote that the vezir issued documents called altan tamğa, according to the

[85] Ibn Dūqmāq/Tızengauzen 1, pp. 318/325 and 321/328.
[87] At-ta'rīf bi-l-muṣṭalāḥ aṣ-Ṣarīf, pp. 45-46; and 'Umāri/Tızengauzen 1, pp. 227/249.
[89] 'Umāri/Lech, pp. 100-101/158.
Tarix-i Ṣayx Uvays the documents issued by the vezir were called, in fact, al tamga (altamgä') "red seal", to which, at least in the one instance mentioned, four emirs affixed their signature.\(^9\)

The role of the vezir at first glance seems to be contrary to the "four-bey system". The Ilxanid vezir was, in fact, an appointee of the Ilxan. In this way, the vezir could not have represented an institution exercising political authority of the xan as did the ulus emirs and, later, the garaçi beys.\(^9\) 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. It should also be kept in mind that the the greatest of the officials, the beylerbeyi, had an income of 3,000,000 dinár râ'ic, while the vezir had an income of only half that.\(^9\) This further reinforces the view that the Ilxanid vezir was a separate official acting as a representative of the Ilxan, since in the Later Golden Horde the tamga was affixed by the garaçi beys to the yarlıqs of the xan. In the Çağatay xanate there was also a vezir appointed by and directly subordinate to the xan as known from Raṣīd ad-Dīn.\(^9\)

Another difference between the Later Golden Horde and the earlier Čingisid states concerns the so-called "religious garaçıs" of the later states. There is curiously little information to attest that religious

---

\(^{91}\) Ahri/van Loon, pp. 161/62.

\(^{92}\) Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, pp. 282-288. Naxçivâni also lists the ulus emirs before any other group in his ranking of various titles (Dastûr al-kâtib fi ta'ŷin al-marâtib, ed. A.A. Ali-zade, i/2, Moscow, 1971, pp. 2-8).

\(^{93}\) 'Umarī/Lech, pp. 95/155.

\(^{94}\) Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Blochet, pp. 193-197; and Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Boyle, pp. 154-156.
functionary counterparts of the qaraçı beys might have existed in the earlier states of the Mongol world empire.

Coming to other interpretations of the institutional history of the component states of the Mongol world empire in the 13th-14th centuries, this chapter must focus on studies of the Golden Horde. In fact, there are few adequate studies of the institutional history of any of the other states. Even so, it is not possible to offer a comprehensive review of all the works that have been devoted to these states, but of only the most important representative works.

The earliest study of the organization of the Golden Horde, and until quite recently the only one, is the classic study by I. Berezin. From the epoch of this work it is clear that in his day Berezin had available to him only a small fraction of the works available today; as a consequence, his work is based chiefly on the Tatar yarlıqs (of which he was the pioneering student), Raşid ad-Dîn's Câmi' at-tavârıx (he was the first to edit the Persian text) and the later Tatar redaction, plus some other sources, namely medieval Arabic chronicles and travelers.

Viewed from the perspective offered by the argument in this chapter, Berezin's work seems somewhat confused in its conceptualization. He offers a number of long lists of offices, presumably indicating how he ranks the various offices in each state. The lists are placed in the categories of the court nobility (dvoryâne), the army, the

[95] "Oçerk vnütrennyago ustrostva Ulusa Djuçieva".

[96] For a bibliography of the important series of publications on Tatar yarlıqs edited by Berezin upon which he bases much of his discussion see Usmanov, Jalovannie aktî, p. 302. Unfortunately, many of the important works by Berezin are not available for the purpose of this discussion.
religious class, and the civil ranks (grajdanske çini). He also gives lists of Ilxanid officials and the officials of Yuan China under Qubilay.

Under the court nobility of the Golden Horde Berezin discusses:

1. "Great", "middle", and "lower" dukes (oğlan, bek):

Berezin feels that the existence of the term amir-i buzurg "great dukes" (velikiy knyaz') from among the "ducal clans" (knyajeskiy rod) in Raşid ad-Din implies the existence of lesser dukes as well (by knyaz' he does not mean dynastic princes, who are called by him tsareviçi);

2. Appanage or ulus dukes (udel'niy knyaz'):

Berezin follows Ibn Baţţûta's definition of this term as "duke of dukes" and applies this to Raşid ad-Din and 'Umarî as well;

3. Tatar or horde (orðinskiy) dukes:

Berezin feels that, as in modern Mongolia, there must have been dukes (beys) without appanages and power who were notable for their origin in the Horde;

4. "People" dukes (el bekî):

These are supposed to be of foreign origin. (Berezin goes on to list six more offices which have not been discussed in this chapter.)


[99] "Oşerçk vnuten'nyago ustroystva", p. 487 ff., based on Raşid ad-Din as discussed earlier in this chapter.

In his discussion of the army organization, Berezin offers the following list:\textsuperscript{101}

1. Voevod (oğlan) of 10,000, 1000, 100, and 10: Berezin feels that these must have differed from the next listing only that they were of the royal family (tsareviç) while the next were simply dukes (knyaz').

2. Army duke (bek) of 10,000 (noyon), 1000 (ming), 100 (yüzs), and 10 (on).\textsuperscript{102}

In the final category of civil ranks Berezin discusses 32 ranks, of which the first is alpaut, the second the various darugas, and only the third are the tümen- and şehir beki and a number of additional titles. Berezin explains the absence of the eldest of the beys ('Umari's amir al-ülüs) by the fact that, according to 'Umari himself, they and the vezir do not have the same power as in Iran.\textsuperscript{103}

Thus, if Berezin's position has been correctly understood, his scheme of the organization of the Golden Horde is completely different from the "four-bey system" as presented in this chapter. He bases his scheme to a great degree on the titles which occur in various sources without the benefit of the greater amount of documentation available today. As a result, his reconstruction is extremely detailed, but misses the larger picture.

One of the most accurate descriptions to date of the structure of the Golden Horde is to be found in V.D. Smirnov's history of the Crimea

\textsuperscript{101} "Oчерк vnutronnago ustroystva", p. 444 ff.
\textsuperscript{102} Berezin also includes one more rank, that of the bugaul.
\textsuperscript{103} "Oчерк vnutronnago ustroystva", p. 449 ff.
Smirnov discusses the Mamlûk sources on the four ulus beys of the Golden Horde, and suggests that Noğay was one of them. Smirnov does not apply a model of the "four-bey system" either to the history of the Golden Horde or the Crimean xanate, nor is his understanding of the structure of the "four-bey system" in the Crimean xanate sophisticated enough for him to realize the full significance of his comparison of Noğay to Eminbek Bey, head of the Şirin "ruling tribe" in the Crimean xanate in the 15th century. One of the reasons for this is that his sources for this system in the Crimean xanate did not afford him the data he would have needed to reach a better understanding of the system. One of his sources in particular, the Telhis ül-beyan, seems to give misleading information on the role of the four qaraçı beys.

The two major histories of the Golden Horde in the first half of the 20th century, written by Spuler and Yakubovskiy, have been much more disappointing in their treatment of the institutional organization of the Golden Horde. Spuler has, in fact, very little to say about administration in his encyclopedic work. He spends time discussing the history of the ruling house, but devotes a scant two pages to what he terms the vezir (but which is actually a reference to the chief of the

[107] Krîmskoe xanstvo, p. 39. As noted earlier, Noğay will be discussed in Chapter IV as one of the ulus beys in the Golden Horde in the 13th century.
[108] See the discussion in Chapter II.
[109] Spuler, Die Goldene Horde; and Grekov and Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda i ee padenie. The interpretations of G. Vernadsky (The Mongols and Russia, A History of Russia, iii, New Haven, 1953) will be discussed in the next chapter.
ulus emirs, the beylerbeyi). He further states that it is only from the middle of the 14th century that the sources discuss the role of ulus emirs. He says that this development seems to have first taken place in Iran, though it cannot really be observed there (!).¹¹⁰

Yakubovskiy devotes a chapter to the internal organization of the Golden Horde, though he succeeds in discussing mostly sources relating to the Ilxanate while neglecting the important offices of the Golden Horde. He discusses the vezirate for the most part, mentions ulus emirs in passing, and discusses the other ranks he considers to be separate such as that of deputy (mâ'ïb). He also discusses the terms daruga and basqaq and the chancellery, all of which fall into the category of the hierarchy subordinate to the xan.¹¹¹

A scholar who has attempted a fresh examination of the issues relating to the history of the Golden Horde is M.G. Safargaliev in his Raspad Zolotoy Orđi. Safargaliev discusses the references to the ulus emirs in Tizengauzen's extracts from the Arabic sources and makes some attempt to understand the internal workings of the Golden Horde on this basis. One source which Safargaliev quotes in translation ("Umari's At-ta'rîf bi-i-muštalaḥ aṣ-ṣarîf, which has been cited often in this chapter) clearly speaks of four emirs, the ulus emirs. Safargaliev

¹¹⁰ Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, especially pp. 301-302.

connects this passage, however, with the Golden Horde even though it clearly refers to the Ilxanate. Elsewhere he speaks of six emirs.

One work which would require a more in-depth evaluation than is possible here is the history of the social structure of the Golden Horde written by the Soviet archeologist Fedorov-Davidov. In brief, Fedorov-Davidov offers a very detailed review of the sources to which he has had access in translation, and he brings many details to bear on the question of the social history of the Golden Horde.

In the course of this discussion he touches upon many of the points made in this chapter, such as the presence of four beys in the territory of the Golden Horde. He emphasizes the division of the entire Golden Horde into eastern and western divisions, to which he attaches great importance. He writes of different kinds of emirs, he discusses the vezirs of the xans of the Golden Horde, and he writes that emirs were not involved in the qurultay. Most surprising is

[112] Raspad Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 69-69, referring to the translations in Tizengauzen 1, pp. 249 ('Umarı), 348 (Muhibbi), 411 (Qalqaşandı), and 439-440 (Maqrızı). (The text for this passage appears on p. 227.) There is no heading in Tizengauzen's work to indicate what state this passage is referring to, though it is clear from the context (references to Qutluğāh, Gāzān, Qūbān, Xudābanda, and Abū Sa'īd) as well as from the Cairo edition of this work that this is a reference to Iran (in the Cairo edition this passage occurs on pp. 45-46, which is a continuation of the description of Iran begun on p. 43).

[113] Raspad Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 37 and 110. See the further discussion of Safargaliev's views in Chapter IV.


[115] Obščestvenniy stroy Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 90-91


[118] Obščestvenniy stroy Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 103-104.
Fedorov-Davidov's reference to the "ruling tribes" in the Later Golden Horde and even to the qaraqi beys in Kazan and Kasimov without applying this even once to the earlier Golden Horde.\footnote{119}

Another major work to appear recently, M. Kafalî's history of the Golden Horde, makes another attempt at a fresh reinterpretation of the sources, mostly the Islamic ones.\footnote{120} The author draws heavily on the fact that he has in his sole possession the unique complete manuscript—formerly in the library of A.Z.V. Togan—of the Tarih-i Dost Sultan, a work that was heavily used by the author of the Umdeî üt-tevarîh.\footnote{121}

Under the heading of state organization, Kafalî offers first a discussion of the division of the Mongol states into right and left flanks, the role of women, and turns to the role of the qurultay. Then he mentions that the ulus bey or ulus emir, of whom he says there was only one, and who was head of all the other beys in the ulus of Coçî. He cites 'Umarî in asserting that this individual had both administrative and military duties. In addition, according to Kafalî, there were two more emirs, the right-wing horde emir (in the Crimea) and the left-wing horde emir (in Xwârazm). He also discusses other offices such as the various secretaries, but ends his discussion of the ulus emirs with this. He then goes on to state that the Golden Horde was divided on three levels, that of the entire ulus, the two (right and left) hordes, and the cities. Coming to the military, according to Kafalî the emirs of

\footnote{119} Obşestvennyi stroy Zolotoy Ordî. pp. 168-172 and n. 2.

\footnote{120} Altîn Orda hanliğinin kuruluş ve yükseliş devirleri (İstanbul, 1976), esp. pp. 115-133.

\footnote{121} The Defter-i Çingizname is apparently an incomplete copy of the same work, so that these are the only two manuscripts known. On this work see Bartol'd, "Otchet o komandirovke v Turkestane", pp. 158-169; and Z.V. Togan, Tarihte usul (İstanbul, 1981\textsuperscript{1}), pp. 44 and 224. (This work is also known under the title Ötemiş Haci tarihi.)
Mongol descent managed to keep their control over the Turkic population which formed the basis of the territory. He also discusses the decimal system of organization and other elements. He does not continue his discussion of the larger picture of the role of tribes, though he does discuss many individuals whose historicity is questionable.

A series of articles by Egorov have appeared on the history and organization of the Golden Horde.\textsuperscript{122} His works offer one of the most successful attempts to date in the secondary literature (at least from the perspective of the interpretation offered in this chapter) to characterize the organization of the Golden Horde, though he makes the mistake of taking every single term present in the sources to mean a separate office. Egorov's own views are best represented by the translation in Table V of the schematic representation which he himself gives in one of his most recent works.

Though he does not explain the table in this work, he treats this theme in an earlier article.\textsuperscript{123} Egorov sees a well-developed administrative apparatus whose two highest officials were the beylerbeyi and the vezir, though their respective roles are not clearly delineated in the sources. According to the sources as interpreted by Egorov, the beylerbeyi controlled the army, carried on foreign relations, and was responsible for the legal and religious affairs of the state. The vezir came next in rank, though he was not anywhere near as powerful as the beylerbeyi. Egorov quotes 'Umar I as stating that the vezir was the real


\textsuperscript{123} "Gosudarstvennoe i administrativnoe ustroystvo Zolotoy Ordii", p. 37 ff.
TABLE V

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE OF THE GOLDEN HORDE ACCORDING TO EGOROV*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- supreme judge -

- foreign affairs -
  - beylerbeyi
  - army

- vezir -
  - divan of several chambers with secretaries

- 4 ulus beys
  - 70 commanders of 10,000 at the head of territories

- heads of regions and cities
  - (commanders of 1000)

authority—but as has already been seen above, this refers, in fact, to the Ilxanate. (Egorov's work is characterized by thoughtfulness but also by an inability to check the sources; more examples of this are given in the next chapter.) Egorov goes on further to explain that four ulus beys are known from the sources and that according to them the beylerbeyi was their head. He then goes on to recognize that the vezir was also an ulus bey, in fact the second one following the beylerbeyi. (This, of course, does not come through clearly from Table V, unless Egorov has changed his interpretation.) He also took this to mean that the state was divided into four uluses.

As is evident from the above review of the literature concerning the Golden Horde, even the best pictures do not document all the aspects of the institution documented in this chapter, nor do they acknowledge the presence of a similar institution in the Later Golden Horde except for the works of Smirnov (which has not had an impact on Soviet studies of the Golden Horde itself) and Fedorov-Davidov.

The Ilxanate has been the subject of numerous studies, but at the same time the system described in this chapter has been completely neglected. One work which has indicated many of the references in the sources to the problem of the ulus emirs in the Ilxanate is Uzunçarşılı's work on the structure of the pre-Ottoman states (the Selçuks, the Ilxanate, and the Mamlûks). Needles to say, this work, first published in 1939, has remained outside the mainstream of scholarship on the Ilxanate.

The work of Spuler is as disappointing for the Ilxanate as it is

for the Golden Horde. As has already been noted, he remarks in his history of the Golden Horde that he has trouble seeing this system in the Ilxanate.¹²５ In his history of the Ilxanate, he discusses the term of ulus and the various translations of beylerbeyi (such as amīr al-umārå’, mīr-i mīrān, etc.), who was the head of the army, but that is all.¹²⁶ The works of I.P. Petrushevskiy are generally considered to be the most authoritative studies of administration and land tenure in the Ilxanate.¹²⁷ His shorter article in the Cambridge History of Iran completely disregards the evidence on the role of the members of the divan and so of the army in the organization of the Ilxanate, in the collection of taxes, and so on. His monograph, though extensively researched, completely misses some of the most basic aspects of Ilxanid economic organization, since this is tied to the role of the army and taxation. His fifth chapter dealing with categories of land tenure follows the traditional Islamic categories from Selçuk and earlier times, including that of iqṭā’, plus nomadic categories such as certain Mongol terms for categories of land tenure or taxation and the lands of the nomadizing tribes. While he discusses important landholders such as


[¹²⁶] Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, p. 400.

the vezirs,\textsuperscript{128} he does not devote consideration to the other important channels of monetary activity.\textsuperscript{129}

Of all the Çingisid states, the tribal politics of the Çağatay xanate have come under the closest scrutiny thanks to the availability of abundant Islamic source material and the attraction of the personality of Temür leng. Many of the standard accounts have followed the description of the biography of Temür leng by Ibn 'Arabşâh as a good capsule description. This is true of the most influential discussion of the organization of the Çağatay xanate, which is to be found in Barthold's 	extit{Ulubek i ego vremya}.\textsuperscript{130} Nobody, however, has tied this description to a consistent pattern, nor have they shown any link to the garaçî beys of the Later Golden Horde.

In his analysis of the Çağatay xanate, J. Aubin discusses the individual tribes based very much on the problematic work of Naţanżî, but offers no model for the organization of this state.\textsuperscript{131} M. Haider also deals with the subject, but only in generalities.\textsuperscript{132} Most recently, Manz has written two articles and a dissertation on politics under Temür leng, but she has gone no further in her model of tribal organization than to accept Barthold's mention of the four tribes without taking it into any further consideration. This is all the more

\textsuperscript{128} Zemledelie i agrarnie otnošeniya, p. 282 ff.

\textsuperscript{129} Zemledelie i agrarnie otnošeniya, pp. 46-53.

\textsuperscript{130} V.V. Bartol'd, "Ulubek i ego vremya", 	extit{Soçineniya}, ii/2 (Moscow, 1964), pp. 25-198, especially pp. 33-36.

\textsuperscript{131} "Le khanat de Çağatai et le Khorassan", 	extit{Turcica} 8/ii (1976), pp. 16-60.

\textsuperscript{132} "The Sovereign in the Timurid State (XIV-XVth centuries)", 	extit{Turcica} 8/ii (1976), pp. 61-82.
surprising since she is also the author of an article on the role of the qaraqi beys in the Crimean xanate.\footnote{133}

Despite its obsolescence and other shortcomings, the history of China by O. Franke is still the most useful work for the purposes of the historian of the Eurasian steppe. He discusses the various institutional frameworks of each state in a manner that cannot be found elsewhere by the non-Sinologist. It is in such a context that he also discusses the institutional organization of the Yüan dynasty.\footnote{134} The other major works concerning the period of Mongol rule in China, such as the monograph and articles by Dardess, do not treat the institution described here.\footnote{135}

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.\footnote{136}

Finally one may turn to studies of the Great Xanate as the archetype for the organization of all the other states derived from it. The only major study of the organization of these states was written by


\footnote{134} O. Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, i-v (Berlin, 1948-1954).

\footnote{135} For example Conquerors and Confucians.

\footnote{136} "Structure and Function in the Yüan Imperial Government".
the great scholar of Mongol comparative and historical linguistics, B.Ya. Vladimirtsov. In his day Vladimirtsov was one of the only scholars who could seriously use the *Secret History of the Mongols*, upon which he based much of his work, though his work also covered up to the 17th century. He limited himself, however, to the documentation and explanation of terms as a linguist-turned-social historian might, rather than actually trying to establish what the roles of the various offices might have been.

With this the discussion of the "four-bey system" in the Çingisid states of the 13th-14th centuries is concluded. It is to be hoped that the reader now understands why the above discussion would not have been possible without reference to the system of the qaraçı beys in the Later Golden Horde. The next chapter goes one step further by offering an interpretation of the history of one state in particular, the Golden Horde, on the basis of the "four-bey system" as has just been established.

[137] *Obșestvenniy stroy mongolov.*
CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORY OF THE "FOUR-BEY SYSTEM" IN THE GOLDEN HORDE

This chapter shifts from a general description of the characteristic features of the "four-bey system" to a narrower study of the history of this system in the Golden Horde. It applies the characteristic features of the "four-bey system" established in the previous two chapters to prominent figures in the history of the Golden Horde through 1360. (Following the death of Berdibek in 1359 there is less reliable information on the "four-bey system", and together with the confused chronology of the 1360s-1370s and the establishment of Toqtamış as xan of the Golden Horde in 1381, there is a different set of problems which will be taken up in Chapter V.) It also takes into account certain details of the "four-bey system" specific to the of the Golden Horde, such as the frequent association of the ulus beys with the Crimea, Xwârazm, and Azaq/Azov.¹ This combination allows one to postulate that many of these individuals could well have been one of the four ulus beys at a given point in time. The result of such an examination is an "alternative history" of the Golden Horde emphasizing continuity in the history of the non-dynastic elements in the "state".

According to Raşid ad-Dîn, Çingis Xan assigned the ulus which later came to be known as the Golden Horde to his eldest son Coçi.² Since it is known that Môngke Xan later assigned specific "ruling tribes" to the newly-created uluses of Qubilay and Hûlegû, it is not unreasonable to expect that Çingis Xan also assigned specific "ruling

[1] For a discussion of these areas see V.L. Egorov, Istoriqeskaya geografiya Zolotoy Ordı v XIII-XIV vv. (Moscow, 1985)
tribes" to Coçi. On the basis of the traditional account given by Raşid ad-Din, it is not possible to decide which "ruling tribes" might have been assigned to Coçi or who the leaders of the four might have been.

It has already been noted in the previous chapter that Raşid ad-Din omitted or distorted numerous facts relating to the cooperation of non-dynastic elements such as the four "ruling tribes" in the selection of the xans and in the administration of the state. For this reason the Mamlûk sources take on a primary importance when they are available, for they offer important facts and a unique perspective not available in any of the other sources. As an example, one passage in the Arabic sources relates that the "people of the state" (ahl ad-dawla) opposed Tudun in favor of Berke. Such information goes beyond the official account in Raşid ad-Din, where it is simply stated that Berke succeeded Batu. Such a statement in the Mamlûk sources is entirely in line with the notion of leaders of "ruling tribes" choosing between more than one candidate in the election of a new xan. Unfortunately, the Mamlûk sources offer only limited details of this sort for the first half of the 13th century.

Nevertheless, by the middle of the 13th century there are a few isolated names which are known in the sources as possible principles in the "four-bey system". Among these one may mention Tabuq/Tayuq, ruler of the Crimea in 1263; another leader by the name of Toğbuğa; and Berke's vezir, Şaraf ad-Din al-Qazwini. On the basis of what little information exists about these individuals, one can only keep in mind that later

[3] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 217-221; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 222-226. Raşid ad-Din does not, of course, put it quite this way.


figures associated with the Crimea are usually one of the four leading ulus beys. What is more, it has already been pointed out in the previous chapter that in the 14th century the vezir was probably none other than one of these same four ulus beys; this will also be discussed in greater detail in this chapter. There is, however, no way to prove conclusively whether this might have been the case with Şaraf ad-Din al-Qazwīnī, too.

It is only for the second half of the 13th century that this chapter can offer the first detailed discussion of a figure within the "four-bey system" in the Golden Horde, namely Noğay, son of Bo'āl, son of Coçi, son of Čingis Xan.⁷ There are lengthy accounts of how Noğay was important in a number of ways, including his role in the selection and removal of a series of xans in the latter half of the 13th century. The abundance of source material on his career has also meant that there is a substantial body of secondary literature which treats his career. To the chagrin of many students of the early Golden Horde, however, at the same time Noğay is called a tsar’ in the Slavic sources, he is described in the Islamic sources only as an army leader.⁸ Though these and various epithets and descriptions have only served to confuse a series of scholars imposing a Western model of kingship on the Čingisid states, the career of Noğay can serve here as the first example of the leader of the four ulus beys in the Golden Horde.

Certain sources indicate that Noğay was a leader of the army perhaps as early as the reign of Batu Xan (r. 1237-1256), though most sources indicate that he became prominent under Berke (r. 1256-1266).

[7] Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, p. 122; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, p. 113.

Raṣid ad-Dīn calls Noğay an army commander (Per. laşma-kaṣ) under both Batu and Berke.⁹ Raṣid ad-Dīn also describes him as the head of the army of the right flank of the Golden Horde (Nūgāy-ī pesar-ī Tatār ki laşma-ī dast-ī rāst-ī ān ʿulūs midānast).¹⁰ The further reference to Noğay elsewhere in Raṣid ad-Dīn using the Persian term sar-laşma might be better understood as commander-in-chief, as does Boyle, or at least as the person in charge of the armies of the right wing in the Golden Horde.¹¹ According to the Tārīx-i guzīda, Noğay was known as an "emir of the army" (amīr-ī lahoma) under Toqta (Nūgāy ki amīr-ī lahoma-ī ʿulūs būd), though his activities under Berke are also described in this and other Persian sources.¹²

The Mamlūk sources in Arabic also discuss the military aspect of Noğay's career, but using a different set of terminology than the Persian sources. According to Ibn Xaldūn, Noğay rose in Berke's estimation during the campaigns against the Ilxan Abağa (r. 1265-1281), who was the successor to Hūlegū.¹³ According to the sources Berke placed him over an army (cabhaza câyṣ wa-qaddama 'alayhi Yisū Nūgā b. Tatār b. Muğul) against Abağa. The same sources also relate in greater detail that Berke placed Noğay over several tūmens (corps of 10,000) following his victories against Abağa.¹⁴ They also describe him in connection with

these campaigns as an army leader (mugaddim al-cayṣ) together with another leader complementing him (ṭumma ardafaḫu bi-mugaddim âxar) named Yesūntay. Other sources note under 1270 (in reference to the reign of Mengü Temür, r. 1269–1280) that Noğay was not just any army leader, but the greatest of the army leaders (akbar mugaddimī cayṣihī [or: cuyāṣihi]) in the land of the house of Berke.¹⁵

When it is considered that Noğay died around 1299–1300, this is a very long time indeed to have served in a military role or even to have lived in those days. The sources do, however, attest to his longevity.¹⁶ Since they invariably speak of the same person (based on the genealogy which is usually given correctly), the weight of the evidence goes against suggesting that there might have been two separate Noğays.¹⁷

The sources describe that Noğay was active in diplomatic exchanges, as is to be expected of a participant in the "four-bey system". The importance and respect accorded him can be seen from the protocol of the diplomatic exchanges conducted between the Golden Horde and the Mamlûk state. The list of gifts sent by the Mamlûk ruler to the north in 1282 included gifts for individuals in the following order:¹⁸

---


[17] One source does mention, however, that there were many Noğays. See Nuwayrî/Tîzengauzen 1, pp. 131/152.

1. "King" (malik) Mengü Temür;
2. Noğay;
3. "King" Aykaci (brother of "King" Mengü Temür);
4. Tuda Mengü, brother of Mengü [Temür], who later received the throne (mulk);
5. *Telebuğa (brother of Mengü Temür);
6. the xatuns Çiçek Xatun, Alçı Xatun, Tötlin Xatun, Tatayun Xatun, Sultan Xatun, and Xutlu Xatun;
7. emir of the left flank Mawu (or Ma’u) and emir of the right flank Tayra;\(^{13}\)
8. *Qutluq (wife of Aykaci); and

Another version of this list of gifts is somewhat condensed and in a different order. It lists the members of the dynasty first and concerning Noğay states that a part was for Noğay "for he was a leader among them and had renown" (fa-innahu kâna qad taqaddama 'indahum wa-shâra lahu ûkr baynahum).\(^{20}\) Here one should keep in mind that qaddama is used in the same sense as muqaddim al-cayş "commander of the army", the usual term which was used to describe exactly those ulus beys who

\[19\] It is not certain whether Mawu and Tayra were figures in the Golden Horde. If one interprets the two divisions of the Golden Horde as the right and left flanks, then one could then argue Mawu and Tayra's postions along such a principle. The problem with this solution is that each of the halves could have had its own internal divisions as well; there is sufficient data to argue such a case. If each was the head of his own flank, it would rule out the possibility of Noğay having been the head of either of the flanks, in which case it is unlikely that he could have been head of the ulus emirs. Neither explanation solves the problem, then, of why Noğay was so prominent. There also remains, of course, the possibility that the Mamlûks were anachronistically including names from an earlier period. For comparisons of Mawu/Ma’u to other names in this period, cf. Fedorov-Davidov, Obşçestvenniy stroy Zolotoy Ordi, pp. 53, 59, and 61.

\[20\] Rukn ad-Dîn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 82/104-105.
were commanders of the army. According to the description of another 
embassy, envoys were sent to the north in 1283-4 to Tuda Mengü, Noğay, 
and Qaydu (ruler in the Çağatay xanate).²¹

There are a number of passages in the sources which suggest that 
Noğay was the leader of his own "ruling tribe". He is said to have 
consulted with his own people (gawmu) when confronted by a threat from 
the xan (fa-cama'a kibar gawmihi wa-dawi maşwaratihi).²² According to 
Ibn Xaldûn, Noğay was a ruler over a group (tâ'ifa) in the land of the 
north and he had control over the kings of the descendants of Coçi Xan 
(wa-kân ḥâkim 'alâ tâ'ifa min bilâd aṣ-ṣimâl).²³ He is further 
described as ruler in the land of the north over many of the Tatars (al-
ḥâkim bi-bilâd aṣ-ṣimâl 'alâ kaṭîr min at-tatâr).²⁴ It should be 
remembered, however, that the few references mentioned here are no less 
scanty than the data for the Later Golden.

The most detailed and dramatic evidence regarding the career of 
Noğay and his role in deciding the fate of a series of rulers is to be 
found in the Mamlûk sources. According to Ibn Xaldûn, Noğay had control 
over the kings of the descendants of Coçi Xan (wa-lahu stibdaḏ 'alâ

²¹ Taşrif al-ayyâm, Tizengauzen 1, pp. 67/69; and Ruhn ad-Dîn 
Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 82/105. This is further grounds for not 
necessarily considering Mawu/Ma'u and Tayra to have been emîrs in the 
Golden Horde.

²² Ruhn ad-Dîn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 87/110. Nuwayri/ 
Tizengauzen 1, pp. 137/158, says that he "gathered the elders of his 
tribe" (fa-cama'a akâbir 'aṣîratihi), where the term 'aṣîra is used for 
"tribe, clan". (This term is also known from the Later Golden Horde as 
discussed in Chapter II.)

²³ Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 368/381.

²⁴ Ruhn ad-Dîn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 87/109.
A different version is to be found in 'Aynî, who states that after a certain episode Noğay became more important and came to be "considered among the xans" (wa-ṣâra ma'dûd fî l-xânât). The two specific episodes responsible for confounding generations of scholars have been the role Noğay played in the overthrow of the xan Telebuğa by Toqta (r. 1291-1312) and his subsequent falling out with Toqta. Both of these stories are well documented in the sources and generations of scholars have pored over the accounts of this period in an attempt to explain what is referred to as a "civil war" in the Golden Horde. They are worth repeating in detail as an example par excellence of the constant struggle between the Çingisid xan and the leadership of the "ruling tribes".

According to the sources the xan Tuda Mengü (r. 1280-1287) decided to retire from the position of xan to a life of quiet contemplation and was replaced by his brother Telebuğa. (There are no accounts preserved of Telebuğa's installation.) A source of tension between Telebuğa and Noğay is explained through the the story in many

[28] On the career of Noğay and his role in the selection of xans see the accounts in Rûkn ad-Dîn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 79-91/101-114; Nuwayrî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 131-139/152-161; Mufâddal/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 183-184/195-196; Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 368-370/380-383; and Maqrîzî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 422-423/434-436. See also Raṣîd ad-Dîn/Blochet, pp. 138-152; and Raṣîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, pp. 122-130. The remainder of the discussion of the career of Noğay and accounts of the subsequent ulus beys will cite a group of sources at the beginning of each discussion. Additional references will be made to these sources only when there are specific citations of the original text or some other detail requiring special notation.
sources that Telebuğa invited Nóğay to campaign with him against Krakow (KRK) and that they were satisfied with the campaign. On the way back home to the winter quarters, however, the weather turned very bad. Telebuğa returned home by a much more difficult route, with the result that many of his troops died of hunger. Whether this part of the account is fact or fiction, the sources use it to explain why Telebuğa decided to fight against Nóğay.

The sources further relate that a private meeting was set for the two through the mediation of Telebuğa's mother, but that the wise and experienced old Nóğay had met with some of the sons of the previous xan, Tuda Mengü, to win their support. Finally, at the time of the meeting, though Telebuğa had some of his sons with him, Nóğay's supporters were able to surround Telebuğa without his taking notice until it was too late. The eldest son of Tuda Mengü, Toqta, then killed Telebuğa and his own rival brothers.

Following these events, Toqta assumed the throne in A.H. 690/1291 A.D. Nóğay delivered the sovereignty to him and appointed (rattaba) Toqta and his brothers who had cooperated with him (wa-lammâ sallama lahu Nóğlya 1-mulk wa-rattabahu fihi rattaba 'indahu ixwatahu l-muttafiqîna ma'ahu).29 According to another source, when Telebuğa and his five brothers, all sons of Mônge Temîr, were killed, Nóğay seated Toqta on the throne of the country (aclasahu Nóğlya 'alâ kursî l-mulk), administered the affairs of Toqta's state (rattaba umûr dawlatihi), and delivered to him whoever was left from among the brothers who had participated with him (sallama ilayhi man baqiya min ixwatîhi l-lağîna

Noğay is supposed to have said, "These are your brothers and they are in your service," after which he entrusted them to Toqta (ha'ulâ'i iwxatuka yakûnûna fî xidmatika fa-stawṣ bihim). 31

Noğay then returned to his own position, but he did not easily forget those emirs who had earlier aligned against him. At a certain point Noğay sent his wife, Baylaq Xatun, to visit Toqta with the message that his "father" Noğay saw many thorns in Toqta's way, i.e., those emirs who had aligned themselves with Telebuğâ against Noğay. In response, Toqta had those emirs killed one by one. Later, Toqta was upset by his own mother's meddling, since she had ruled with Mengü Temîr and had also had an important role in the court of Telebuğâ, as well as in his death. Here Noğay helped Toqta by killing Toqta's mother on Toqta's behalf, together with an emir who was loyal to her and under her protection named Baytara. 32

Although the relations between Toqta and Noğay are supposed to have been amicable in 1293-1294, there are reports of an enmity between them by 1297-1298. According to the sources, there were various reasons for this enmity, but an important factor according to the sources was that Noğay's aforementioned wife Baylaq Xatun was afraid of their two sons Côke and Teke and swayed the xan against them. Another was that some emirs had left Toqta for the service of Noğay, and one had even married his daughter. Noğay had then turned down Toqta's request that


[32] One cannot help but wonder if there is any connection between this Baytara and the name of one of right-flank emir Tayra mentioned in the list of gifts sent to the north. The form bi is certainly a well-known later form of the earlier beg. (See also the discussion of this term in Chapter II.)
these emirs be turned over to him, in response to which Toqta sent Noğay a message which Noğay then supposedly discussed in a meeting with the elders of his "ruling tribe". Following Noğay's reply to Toqta that he would like his horses to drink from the Don river (near the capital of the Golden Horde, New Saray), both sides prepared for war.

The sources also explain that Noğay had been a dominant force over the "house of Berke" (meaning the territory of the Golden Horde), enthroning (yaxla'au) whom he pleased, doing away with those he did not like, and appointing him. He wanted to continue at this role, but this did not suit Toqta:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wa-ğâlika anna Nûgîya maḏdat lâhu mudda wa-huwa} \\
\text{ḥâkim fî l-mamlaka bâsiṭ al-yad fî bayt Barka} \\
\text{yaxlā'u min muṣâkihi man lâ yârḍâhu wa-man} \\
\text{iṣṭārahu fa-qad wallâhu ... fa-arâda an yastamarra} \\
\text{'alâ ḡâlika}
\end{align*}
\]

When Toqta and Noğay finally met in battle, Noğay's troops scattered the forces of Toqta, but he did not permit them to pursue the fleeing enemy. Following re-alignments, the two sides met again in 1299-1300. To end the story and the life of Noğay, a Russian came upon Noğay and killed him, but Toqta in return killed the Russian for having dared to kill so important a person. So ends what must be a classic description of the role of the head of the leaders of the "ruling tribes" in determining who is xan, and vice versa.

The greatest problem in applying the "four-bey system" to the second half of the 13th century is the dearth of sources that mention the presence of four "ruling tribes". This is compounded by the

[33] Rukn ad-Dīn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 88/110-111.
uncertainty surrounding the relationship between the uluses of Batu in the west (the "White Horde") and Orda in the east (the "Blue Horde") as the two divisions comprising the Golden Horde. Since the "four-bey system" has not yet been applied to the history of the Golden Horde, this is the first time that there emerges the problem of whether there were four separate "ruling tribes" in each of these divisions of the state, or whether the two together shared four "ruling tribes".34

The closest one can come to an attestation of the presence of four "ruling tribes" or ulus beys in the 13th century is a problematic passage in Mufaqqal relating to the attack of Noğay on the Crimean town of Sudaq in 1299, so shortly before his death.35 Tizengauzen's generally reliable translation in this instance completely misrepresents both this passage and the other sources relating to this episode.

According to Tizengauzen's translation of this passage, the "king" (malik) on the throne of the house of Berke, Noğay (النْغَي اوغْدْاى), came to the Crimean town of Sudaq.36 He asked those who supported him to leave, which was about a third of the population, and he had the town destroyed together with the rest of its inhabitants. The reason for this was that the income of Sudaq was divided among four "kings" (mulūk), one of whom was Toqta (تُقْتَا), who had diplomatic relations with Egypt. His partners [that is, the persons with whom he shared this income] also offended his deputies during (the division) of this income.

[34] This topic will be treated in greater depth at the end of this chapter.
[36] A part of the territories over which Noğay ruled, as will be discussed below. The various forms of the names are assigned letters in [brackets] for the sake of clarity in discussion.
The most important problem in the interpretation of this passage is the reading of names [A] and [B], which are almost identical in Tizengauzen's edition of the original Arabic text of this passage. Although they are similar, Tizengauzen chooses to read them differently: [A] as Noğay and [B] as Toqta. The editor of the full edition of Mufaddal's work, Blochot, reads both of Tizengauzen's forms of this name in the manuscript as انگای (identical to Tizengauzen's [B] form) and translates them both as Noğay. Further justification for seeing this name as Noğay is that the same source spells Noğay later as [C] انگای, while the other occurrences of Toqta's name are spelled [D] ابن تختی, [E] ابن تختی, and [F] ابن تختی. Obviously, the disputed form or forms resemble Noğay's name more than they do Toqta's.

As for the historical evidence for justifying reading both of these forms as Noğay, the very same source confirms that it was Noğay who conducted the raid on the Crimea. Rukn ad-Din Baybars also relates the story that Noğay sent Aqtaci, the son of his daughter, to the Crimea to collect the taxes (fa-arsala bn bintihi ila bilad Qirim la-cabâ l-mâl al-muqarrar 'alâ ahlihâ) while he was fighting Toqta in the north. This grandson was killed, however, by the population when he went to collect this income, and Noğay sent his forces to avenge this death.

Ibn Xaldûn relates a similar story, except that the name of the grandson

[37] Histoire des sultans mamlouks, ed.-trans. E. Blochot, ii, Patrologia Orientalis 14:3 (Paris, 1920), pp. 629-631. Blochot also reads that it was more than two-thirds of the population which left the town.

[38] Mufaddal/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 184/195. Blochot gives the same forms for these names as Tizengauzen. For form [C] see Mufaddal/Blochot, iii, Patrologia Orientalis 20:1 (Paris, 1928), p. 60; for form [D] see iii, p. 28; for form [E] see iii, p. 60; and for form [F] see iii, p. 101.
to whom Noğay had granted the Crimea as an iqṭā' was Qaraca (aqṭa'a sibṭahu Qarâcâ b. Taştîmür ... madīnat al-Qirim).41

This episode should be taken as a better reason for an attack than Tizengauzen's suggestion that Toqta and three other "kings" shared this income. For one thing, such an explanation does not make clear who the other three "kings" might have been.42 It also disregards the fact that the rulers of the Crimea, including Noğay, are often called "kings".43 This passage is therefore a possible example of how the four ulus beys might have shared revenues in this period. The description of Noğay as a ruler having control over the Crimea lends further support to the view that as ulus bey he was ruler over one of the important divisions of the Golden Horde. This point will be established for a series of later leaders of "ruling tribes" who are known to have been based in the Crimea.

Following Noğay's death there ensued a struggle between his sons.44 In the course of the accounts of these events in the sources it is noted that one of Noğay's sons, Cekes, had a "deputy" (nā'ib) Tunguz who later switched allegiance to Noğay's son-in-law Taz b. Müncük. It is


[40] Rukn ad-Din Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 88-89/111-112.

[41] Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 370/382-383.

[42] Cf. Mufaḍḍal/Blochet, ii, p. 630 n. 1, where Blochet expresses the opinion that these four "kings" were the Great Khan (who was the ruler of China), the Mongol "prince" of Iran, the "prince" of the (Golden?) Horde, and the "prince" of the realm of Çağatay.

[43] It has already been noted that Noğay is called a "king" in a later passage in Mufaḍḍal (Mufaḍḍal/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 184/195-196; and Mufaḍḍal/Blochet, iii, p. 60.)

also known that Taz and Tunguz tried to overthrow Özbek.\(^{45}\) This seems to indicate that Noğay's descendants tried to continue the "ruling tribe" and followed in the leader's role within the "ruling tribe". In the course of these descriptions other leaders of tümen such as Yancı (whom Toqta appointed to the same position as Yancı's brother Abaci) are also mentioned. These particular individuals are also described as army commanders and friends of Noğay.

As emerges from the main episodes of his life, Noğay is one of the best examples of the power politics that characterized the relationship between the dynasty and the leaders of the "ruling tribes" in the Eurasian steppe during the Mongol period. A review of the most important secondary literature dealing with this period reveals, however, that earlier scholars have been unable to place the career of Noğay within such a context as provided by the "four-bey system". This chapter cannot review the whole of the literature regarding the Golden Horde. It will, however, be useful to offer a representative review of the landmark works and the more recent scholarship to place the above discussion within the context of work that has been previously done (or not done) on the questions posed by this chapter.

To scholars since the 19th century the relationship between Noğay and a series of xans has been a cause for great puzzlement, especially since they did not base their analyses on a comparative framework for the study of the Mongol states which might have altered their premises regarding the role of the autocratic sovereign they took the xan to be. This puzzlement resulted in a monograph by N.I. Veselovskiy devoted to

\(^{45}\) Ibn Duğmâq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 316/323.
the life and times of Noğay. Since Veselovskiy's work was the culmination of earlier studies of the Golden Horde in the 19th century and has also served as the basis for subsequent studies of this period, it will be useful to briefly review Veselovskiy's argument and conclusions here.

Veselovskiy first reviewed the opinions of earlier scholars to have discussed the role of Noğay. According to him, Arximandrit Leonid had no reservations about describing Noğay as a xan, and the numismatist A.K. Markov saw Noğay not just as a xan, but as the founder of a short-lived dynasty. According to Veselovskiy, V.D. Smirnov—whose work has already discussed in the previous two chapters—felt that Noğay was only an emir and a favorite. Veselovskiy felt that as a descendant of the seventh son of Coçi, Noğay was not entitled to whole uluses, but does appear on the historical scene as the head of a tümen (corp of 10,000). Following an extensive review of the Western and Oriental sources available to him at the time, Veselovskiy returned to what he perceived as the essential historical question surrounding the career of Noğay: was he or was he not a xan?.

Veselovskiy regarded a number of facts in the sources as crucial. The Egyptian sultans sent gifts to the xans, but did not forget Noğay, who also corresponded independently with the Egyptians, just as he did with the Byzantines, which meant in Veselovskiy's view that he was in the position of a xan.

[48] Xan iz temnikov, p. 1. See also Smirnov, Krïmskoe xanstvo, pp. 31-39 and 96-102.
[49] Xan iz temnikov, p. 3.
In considering that Noğay's position approached that of a xan, he speculated that Noğay considered himself a xan, but did not wish to upset Čingisid traditions by being elevated as a true xan. He does point out, however, that there is no proof of Noğay ever having issued parligs in his own name. Veselovskiy wonders as well whether Noğay might have undergone the ritual elevation which he presumes to have existed in the Golden Horde (though not in the Ilxanate in Iran). He considers it unlikely, since there is no real description of such a ceremony for Noğay. Veselovskiy also considers the report in Mufaḍḍal that the taxes from the city of Sudaq were divided between four Tatar tsar's, showing that Noğay did not have sole control over the revenues of this particular city. Veselovskiy finally concludes that Noğay was, in fact, a xan, though perhaps just a vassal xan.50

A host of other scholars have also expressed an opinion on the matter since the time of the influential work of Veselovskiy. B. Spuler warns that the conclusion of many works to the effect that Noğay was an independent xan is misguided. Spuler feels that Noğay was never more than a "mayor of the palace" (Hausmeier) who in practice—though not officially—had control over the xan. He compares the role of Noğay to the emir Edigey and considers both of these figures to have been co-rulers after the fashion of the sacral dual kingship known from the earlier Turkic states.51

A.N. Nasonov, who investigates in detail the various Russian sources, also examines the sources referring to Noğay as a xan or

[50]  *Xan iz temnikov*, pp. 50-54. On the ritual elevation see the references in Chapter III.

One of Nasonov's conclusions is that a second center of political power emerged in the 1270s, and he speaks of co-rule (dvoevlastie) where Noğay was, in effect, the second ruler.53

According to A.Yu. Yakubovskiy, the short reign of Telebuğa (r. 1287-1290) was a time of feudal troubles in which the very power of the xan of the Golden Horde was under grave threat. Yakubovskiy correctly points out that while Noğay might have complete master over the political life in the Golden Horde, there was a sharp distinction between the dynasty of Çingis Xan and those outside of it. Here Yakubovskiy must mean that Noğay's role as an emir was more important that his descent from Çingis Xan, in the same way Temürleng took pride in his being an emir and not of the dynasty. Still he does not offer more information than this and adds that following Noğay's death, Toqta could consider himself an independent ruler.54

G. Vernadsky felt Noğay was passed over as a potential xan of the Golden Horde, but that he was too important to simply ignore. He further states that Batu must have confirmed Noğay's authority over the ordu troops (the "Mangkyt Horde", in his words, though the Mangıts are not attested in the sources) as a special corps for maintaining an orderly government in the xanate. He also feels that Noğay reached an agreement with Mengü Temür over ruling part of the lands and was authorized to carry on diplomatic relations.55 Later on, however, he feels that Noğay

[53] Mongoli i Rus', pp. 71 and 149.
became a true ruler in the reign of Tuda Mengü by declaring himself as xan of the Mangıts.⁵⁶

M.G. Safargaliyev simply reviews much of the earlier scholarship on the role of Noğay. He states that Noğay, who was descended from Çingis Xan, had the rights of an elder (aka), but that he did not have the right to sit on the throne of the Golden Horde.⁵⁷

A.N. Kurat felt that following his rise as a military leader, Noğay came to be the most powerful leader and to hold the administration of the Golden Horde in his hands as a result of the inner disturbances taking place in the Golden Horde. Even though in foreign sources he was known as a xan, since his father was not a xan, he could not call himself a xan.⁵⁸

According to V.L. Egorov as well, a new period opened with the reign of Telebuğa in which the chief actor was Noğay.⁵⁹ Egorov expresses the theory that Noğay was beylerbeyi—chief of the army—under Batu and Berke and continued in this post under Mengü Temür (r. 1267-1280) and Tuda Mengü (r. 1280-1287), a post which gave him great power.⁶⁰ Egorov

[56] The Mongols and Russia, pp. 174-175.

[57] Raspad Zolotoy Ordí, pp. 58-61. It is not clear what source uses the term aka, since Safargaliyev does not document this.


[59] "Razvitie tsentrobejnix ustremleniy v Zolotoy Orde", especially p. 40. See also his Gosudarstvennoe i administrativnoe ustrouystvo Zolotoy Ordí; and most recently Istoričeskaya geografiya Zolotoy Ordí, especially pp. 33-48.

[60] "Razvitie tsentrobejnix ustremleniy", p. 40 and n. 14. Alas, this theory cannot be proven, as the source to which Egorov refers in translation only (Rašid ad-Dín/Tizengauzen 1, trans p. 69) calls Noğay "head of the army of Batu and Berke", except that this corresponds to laşkar-kaş in the original Persian (see Rašid ad-Dín/Blochet, p. 43; and Rašid ad-Dín/Boyle, p. 143; and the discussion of this and related terms earlier in this chapter).
also considers that, over the course of events, a religious barrier came between Nógay's personal ulus and the rest of the Golden Horde: while Nógay was proclaiming himself guardian of old Mongol traditions, the rest of the Golden Horde was becoming Islamized. Under Tuda Mengü he retired to his own ulus and devoted his energies to making his own territories independent, as can be seen from his relations with a number of the Russian principalities. (These principalities refer to him in their chronicles as a tsar'.)\textsuperscript{51}

Egorov considers the best description for the state of affairs at this time as a split in the state and a separation of the ulus of Nógay from the rest of the territory of the Golden Horde; he says that one must speak of the sovereignty of Nógay's power. According to Egorov, Nógay completely cut off his relations with the xan and carried out his own active foreign policy, seeking to create an actual state. All this is supposed to fit in with Egorov's interpretation of the history of the Golden Horde based on competing centers of power.\textsuperscript{52}

G.A. Fedorov-Davidov has written an important work which could provoke a reaction on every page, but it is necessary to limit the comments here to Nógay and the "four-bey system".\textsuperscript{63} Fedorov-Davidov follows many of the earlier opinions, but adds that the fact of Nógay's diplomatic correspondences with foreign powers is in full agreement with his theory of the division of the ulus of Batu into two flanks (i.e., a right and a left) at this time. He states further that Nógay, as an

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51}} "Razvitie tsentrobejnix ustremleniy", p. 40 and n. 20.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52}} "Razvitie tsentrobejnix ustremleniy", p. 40-41.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{63}} Obozhestvennîy stroy Zolotoy Ordî.
elder (aka), had certain rights to the throne, and that the feudal nomadic aristocracy grouped around the two centers of power—Toqta and Noğay. Fedorov-Davidov also makes a distinction between Noğay and the other emirs, considering that Noğay had his own emirs, as would a xan, and that in the end what cost Noğay the struggle was that "his emirs" went over to the side of Toqta.

Noğay is sometimes connected in the secondary literature with the Mangıt "ruling tribe" which formed the basis of the Noğay Horde in the period of the Later Golden Horde. Vernadsky associated the ulus of Noğay with the Mangıt by considering that Noğay was made head of the ordu troops which he called the "Mangkyt Horde". Yakubovskiy wrote that there were many Qiyats in Toqta's army, but added without any reference that there were many Mangıts in the army of Noğay.

An interesting negative argument is suggested by Yu. Bregel's study of the Qongrat rulers according to the 19th century historian Munis. In this study Bregel points out that the Qongrat historian (the Qongrats were rivals of the Mangıts for quite some time by that point in Central Asian history), makes Noğay appear a Qongrat, just as he did with Musa Bey (a grandson of the the later Edigü and an important figure in the Noğay Horde), who most certainly was a Mangıt (or Aq Mangıt). Perhaps the medieval writers knew whether Noğay was a Mangıt, even

[64] Fedorov-Davidov does not document this usage either, which was also used by Safargaliev as noted above.

[65] Obğestvennıy stroj Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 72-74.

[66] For the literature on the Noğay Horde, see Bennigsen and Quelquejay, "La grande horde Nogay".

[67] The Mongols and Russia, pp. 164-165.

[68] Zolotaya Orda, p. 100, basing himself on Raşid ad-Dîn/Tizengauzen 2, p. 33.
though they did not say so explicitly. Since, however, there is no
direct corroboration of such a fact in the primary sources, the view
that Noğay was head of the Mangit tribe in this period can only remain a
very attractive theory. One thing that can be stated without any fear,
however, is that the "ruling tribe" which Noğay headed, whether it had
anything to do with the Mangit tribe or not, did not have a leading
status in the Golden Horde following Noğay's downfall.

If it is accepted that Noğay was indeed the chief of the ulus
beys, the struggle for power which Noğay and probably his "ruling tribe"
lost to Toqta and his loyalists opened the position to another
individual or "ruling tribe". In the period immediately following
Noğay's death it is not certain who might have filled the role of chief
of the ulus beys. According to certain sources, Toqta gave Noğay's
"place" (maqâm) to Saraybuğa b. Mengü Temür (Tūqṭā rattabahu [or: qad
rattabahu] fī maqâm Nuğlya), though it is not certain what is intended
in the sources by "place".70 The sources then reveal, however, that
Saraybuğa conspired with Noğay's remaining son Turay against Toqta to
place himself as xan, as a result of which Toqta later awarded this

[69] "Tribal Tradition and Dynastic History: The Early Rulers of the
357-398, especially pp. 391-392.

[71] Rukn ad-Dīn Baybars/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 93-94/117-119; Nūmayrī/
Tizengauzen 1, pp. 140/161-162; and Maqrīzī/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 371/284.
Cf. Naṭanzī, Tārīx-i anān-im-i Iskandar (=Muntaxab at-tavārīx),
Tizengauzen 2, pp. 232/127; and Gaffārī, Nūsax-i cahān-ārā, Tizengauzen
2, pp. 270/211 (who often follows Naṭanzī).
position to his own sons Tükelbuğa and İlbasar. Perhaps this should be understood to mean that it was only control over the Crimea and other specific territories that was given to these Saraybuğa without his being an ulus bey, especially if he wanted to be xan. (Territories along the Danube and Ural rivers are mentioned as having been the territories of Noğay.)

The historical figure who most clearly assumed the position of head of the ulus beys in the Golden Horde following this period of realignment was Qutluq Temür (d. ca. 1335). Qutluq Temür first appears in the sources as the "deputy" (nâ'iib) of Toqta and one of his emirs. According to one source, Qutluq Temür was entrusted with the administration of Toqta's state (wa-kaña Qutluqtimur yatawallî tadbîr al-mamlaka fî ḥayât Toqṭây wa-tartîb aḥwâlîbā). Thus while Toqta started his reign with the aid of Noğay, it was Qutluq Temür who ultimately took over Noğay's role in the state following the latter's death.


[73] Ibn Xaldûn also calls Qutluq Temür the "deputy" of Özbek's own father, but this is a contradiction of Ibn Xaldûn's own statement earlier that Qutluq Temür had been the deputy of Toqta (Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 371/384-385). Tizengauzen himself notes on p. 371 n. 8 that the statement that Qutluq Temür was the "deputy" of Özbek's father is not in one of the manuscripts of this work. Since Özbek's father, Toğrîlçâ b. Mengü Temür b. Togoqan b. Batu b. Coçî b. Çingiz, was never xan, the the preceding xan, Toqta, might have been meant (Raṣîd ad-Dîn/Boyle, p. 109 n. 66).

[74] Ibn Dugmâq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 316/323.
Ibn Xaldūn reports that upon Toqta's death Qutluq Temūr swore an oath of fealty to Özbek (wa-lammā halaka ḏuqṭāy bāya'a nā'ibuhu Qutluqtimur li-Uzbek) upon the advice of Özbek's mother.⁷⁵ According to Ibn Duqmāq, Qutluq Temūr cooperated with the widow of Toğrılca to elevate her son Özbek to the throne (fa-sta'āna bi-xātūn kābi ra min xawātīnihim kānat zawcat Ṭuğrılca wālid Uzbak wa-ttāfāqa ma'āhā 'alā iqāmat Uzbak).⁷⁶ Together, they joined in an alliance against Elbasmiş b. Toqta and his emir Qadaq.⁷⁷

Among the other descriptions of the role of Qutluq Temūr is that he was the leader of Özbek's country (mudabbir mamlakatihi [or: mudabbir dawlatihi wa-amrihi]).⁷⁸ In another source he is called the "emir of [the Golden Horde capital] Saray",⁷⁹ and in yet a third it is said that the government of Özbek depended on him.⁸⁰ On the basis of these descriptions alone it is already clear that the role of Qutluq Temūr under Toqta was the same as the descriptions of his role under Toqta.

Other facets of the role of Qutluq Temūr reported in the sources are that he was engaged in diplomatic correspondence, acting, in fact, as the intermediary between Özbek and Egypt. Furthermore, when Özbek Xan was offered the Ilxanid throne by the Ilxanid ulus emirs, he declined the offer following consultation with Qutluq Temūr. It is likely in this

---

[75] Ibn Xaldūn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 371/384. According to Tizengauzen's translation, Qutluq Temūr elevated Özbek to the throne on the advice of Özbek's mother.

[76] Ibn Duqmāq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 316/323.


[78] Ibn Duqmāq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 318 and n. 2/325.

[79] Hāfiż-i Abrū/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 244/141.

[80] Hāfiż-i Abrū/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 221-222/93.
instance that Qutluq Temür consulted with Özbek not only as his
"deputy", since he was not a true member of the hierarchy subordinate to
the xan, but as the chief spokesman for what is termed the "land" for
the Later Golden Horde.

A number of episodes form a perfect parallel to the way in which
Toqta killed Noğay's rival emirs on Noğay's behalf while Noğay killed
Toqta's mother on Toqta's behalf. According to one source, at the
beginning of Özbek's reign it was Özbek who killed Elbasmiş b. Toqta and
and Qutluq Temür who killed his emir Qadaq.\[81]\ When Noğay's son-in-law
Taz b. Münçük (the leader of that group which was trying to re-establish
itself as a "ruling tribe" if it was no longer that), tried to overthrow
Özbek, it was Qutluq Temür who killed Taz on behalf of Özbek. Özbek is
also reported to have killed a number of emirs and most of the baxşis\[82]\ and sorcerers (sahara) upon taking the throne.

According to Ibn Baṭṭūta, who traveled to the area of the
Golden Horde in 1333,\[83]\ Qutluq Temür was the representative of Özbek in
Xwārazm, "which was in the dominions of Özbek".\[84]\ At the same time Ibn

[81] Tārīx-i Șayx Uvays, Tizengauzen 2, pp. 229/100.

[82] Mufaḍḍal/Tizengauzen 1 186/197. "Lamas" according to some
scholars, though in the Later Golden Horde this term referred to the
scribes who wrote down the correspondence. See Usmanov, Jalovannie aktī,

Gibb, iii, Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, II, 141 (Cambridge,

[84] Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémercy and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 4.
Baṭṭūta also called him a "great emir" and said that Qutluq Temūr was, in fact, Özbek's governor over Xurāsān.\footnote{Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, p. 9. In the same passage Ibn Battuta refers to other "great emirs" as well, except that these are the yarğuṭis, or judges. Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii, pp. 11-12. On the yarğuṭis see Doerfer, *TMEN*, iv (Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 64-66.}

There are a number of significant differences between between the career of Qutluq Temūr and the career of Noğay. First of all, there is no indication in the sources that Noğay ever controlled any territory other than the Crimea (or a larger territory between the Danube and the Ural rivers) as his ulus. Qutluq Temūr, however, was sent to Xwārazm once Özbek relieved him for a short period of time of his duties as "deputy". There he replaced the brother named Bay Demir of Özbek's wife, Bayaluni Kātn, but in 1323-4 Qutluq Temūr was once again assigned to Özbek as his "deputy". It may be possible to relate this shifting in positions to the campaigns conducted at this time against the Çağatay xanate, for which reason Qutluq Temūr's expertise may have been required in the field.\footnote{For additional information, historical and otherwise, on Qutluq Temūr in Xwārazm see G.P. Snesarev, *Xorezmskie legendi kak istočnik po istorii religioznix kul'tov Sredney Azii* (Moscow, 1983), pp. 164-165.}

This shuffling of positions allows one to consider Özbek Xan as an example of a ruler who was powerful enough to carry out a change in the leadership of the "ruling tribes" (while Noğay was powerful leader of a "ruling tribe" who imposed a change in xans through the reign of Toqta). This is not an unusual occurrence, since there was a practice of mutual acceptance between the leader of a "ruling tribe" and the xan when either one changed.
The same sources which discuss Qutluq Temür offer for the first time more information than for the 13th century regarding other probable ulus beys in the state. When Özbek replaced Qutluq Temür as his "deputy" (nâ'ib) for a short period of time (1320–1321), his new deputy was Isa b. Körköz.\textsuperscript{87} This figure can therefore be considered one of the first historical examples of a second ulus emir within the state, since to have become deputy in place of Qutluq Temür, Isa b. Körköz must have been one of the four other ulus emirs.

Isa b. Körköz is described in the sources as a 	extit{muqaddim} (i.e., "army leader" as in 	extit{muqaddim al-çayş}) at the same time that Qutluq Temür was "deputy" (nâ'ib). Vassâf refers to both Qutluq Temür and Isa Bey as ulus emirs.\textsuperscript{88} Ibn Baṭṭūta also mentions Isa Bey as 	extit{amīr al-ulūs "emir of emirs"}.\textsuperscript{89} Since Ibn Baṭṭūta traveled to this area in 1333, could it be that Isa was the nâ'ib at this time as well, or at least that there was some memory of this?\textsuperscript{90}

In addition to Qutluq Temür and Isa Bey, Ibn Baṭṭūta also names a third person, Tuluq Temür, as Özbek's representative in the

\textsuperscript{87} For brief accounts of the career of Isa b. Körköz see Ibn Düğmâq/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 321/328; Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 372/388; and 'Aynî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 491-492/521-522.

\textsuperscript{88} Vassâf, 	extit{Kitâb-i mustatâb-i Vassâf}, Tizengauzen 2, p. 87; see also p. 89.

\textsuperscript{89} Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, p. 395. This is exactly that passage in which Ibn Baṭṭūta defines 	extit{amīr al-ulūs} as "greatest of the emirs".

\textsuperscript{90} It should be noted that the working hypothesis here is that there was only one "deputy" or nâ'ib at any one time. Certain sources might, however, lead one to also conclude that at least some—though not all—sources use the term nâ'ib interchangeably with ulus bey (or ulus emir).
Crimea (actually, he calls it the "city of Qiram").\footnote{91} Tuluq Temür, who is called an emir by Ibn Baṭṭūta, may be seen as the leader of a "ruling tribe" centered around the Crimea, just as Tayuq may have been the same in the time of Berke, and later certainly Noğay.

Ibn Baṭṭūta continues to give important information on the ulus beys of the Golden Horde by mentioning yet a fourth individual, Muhammed Xoca (with the nisba al-Xwārazmī according to Ibn Baṭṭūta).\footnote{92} This Muhammed Xoca is called the governor of Azaq, a territory which will also fit into later descriptions of ulus beys.

Thus, during the reign of Özbek Xan, the sources discuss four ulus beys: Qutluq Temür, Isa b. Körköz, Tuluq Temür, and Muhammad Xoca.\footnote{93} This coincides with the earliest explicit statements in the narrative sources that the ulus emirs in the Golden Horde numbered four. Since the sources state that they are not as powerful as the ulus emirs in the Ilxanate, perhaps such a statement reflects the renewed influence of the xans Toqta and after him Özbek.

If Qutluq Temür was the chief of the ulus beys, as seems likely, the head of the ulus beys in the time of Özbek either just happened to rule Xwārazm at the behest of the xan, or Xwārazm was the territory around which the "ruling tribe" headed by Qutluq Temür was centered. One of the other territories ruled by an ulus bey was the Crimea. It is

\footnote{91}{Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, pp. 358–359.}
\footnote{92}{Ibn Baṭṭūta/Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, p. 368.}
\footnote{93}{Another person described in the sources as ruler over Xwārazm, Yeseül b. Boraq, was not a figure in the Golden Horde and is described as a "nā'ib of Çağatay". Özbek actually sent Qutluq Temür against him.}
not clear what the difference was between the territorial associations of Qutluq Temür and Isa b. Körköz, however.

From about the time of the death of Qutluq Temür (ca. 1335), it becomes more difficult to trace with certainty the chronology of the individual leaders of the "ruling tribes" in the Golden Horde. A small number of ulus beys are known in this period, but it is not clear just when they were involved in this capacity, nor who some of their fellow ulus beys might have been. There is an individual named Melik Temür described as "deputy" (nâ'ib) of the Crimea in connection with events in the year 1340, which still falls within the reign of Özbek Xan. It is not difficult to see in this name the same Tuluq Temür as before, with the title Melik (Ar. malîk or "king") as a part of his name. There are also some other names which will be discussed later in this chapter, but they cannot be fixed to precise dates.

Although the career of Qutluq Temür may be viewed as that of successor to Noğay, he has hardly received the same degree of attention in the secondary literature. Nasonov, who discusses the "civil war" between Noğay and Toqta, mentions his successor Qutluq Temür in a single footnote in connection with the succession of Özbek Xan. Vernadsky, who has so many theories concerning the career of Noğay, makes no mention of Qutluq Temür at all.

According to Yakubovskiy, Qutluq Temür did help kill a son of Toqta's, enabling Özbek to sit on the throne, and Qutluq Temür began to


[95] It should be remembered that Noğay was also called "king" (malîk) of the Crimea as noted above.

[96] Mongoli i Rus', pp. 81-82 n. 3.
play an important role above all as ruler of Xwârazm, but as a relative, too. Later Yakubovskiy compares him in passing to Noğay. Even though Qutluq Temür was a relative of Özbek, he nevertheless was never considered a prince, but rather just one of the members of the ruling house, like Noğay. Yakubovskiy characterizes the government of the Golden Horde to be a feudal monarchy, and members of the ruling house such as Qutluq Temür also ruled individual portions of the state. Subsequent scholars since Yakubovskiy have been satisfied to only mention Qutluq Temür in passing (Safargaliev and Fedorov-Davidov) or to ignore him completely (Vernadsky). Egorov gives an analysis, only somewhat more generous than a passing mention, which discusses Qutluq Temür as an example of how each of the uluses remained an independent economic unit, with the example of Xwârazm in this case. He flatly states that under Özbek and his successor Canubek, a period in which the authority of the xans had become very great, there were no sharp clashes between the xan and the feudal lords. He attributes this to the fact that the respective policies of the two sides shared were in their mutual interest.

There are a number of scholars who discuss centralized government in various periods of the Golden Horde, a point of view which the "four-bey system" of course complicates. B.F. Manz has advanced the theory in a study of the qarağ beys in the later Crimean xanate that the "four-

[97] Zolotaya Orda, pp. 90-92 and 266.
[98] Zolotaya Orda, p. 105
[99] Zolotaya Orda, p. 124.
[100] Cf. Safargaliev, Raspad Zolotoy Ordı, p. 70; and Fedorov-Davidov, Obşestvenniy stroy Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 56 and 89-90 and n. 52.
[101] "Razvitie tsentrobejnix ustremleniy", p. 44.
bey system" was founded during the reign of Özbek Xan as a part of his efforts to centralize the administration of the Golden Horde.\footnote{Manz} Manz based herself on the translation in Safargaliev's \textit{Raspad Zolotoy Ordı} of what he referred to as a description of the divan (or court) of the Golden Horde under Özbek Xan. It is instructive to fully quote this passage here, including in brackets those parts of the passage which Safargaliev omitted in his translation:\footnote{Safargaliev read this passage in Tizengauzen 1, referring to the translations on pp. 249 ('Umarī), 348 (Muhibbī), 411 (Qalqaşandī), and 439–440 (Maqrizī). The passage appears in the original Arabic on p. 227. There is no heading in 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 'Umarī's \textit{At-ta'rif bi-l-muşaţalāh aš-şarīf} that this passage, which appears on pp. 45–46, is a continuation of the description of Iran begun on p. 43. The reference to Muhibbī does, in fact, deal with the Golden Horde and the four \textit{ulus} emirs, the reference to Qalqaşandī corresponds to his \textit{Śubḥ al-a'şā}, vii, p. 304, and the reference to Maqrizī is unclear.}

There are four \textit{ulus} emirs (\textit{aqrāb al-ulus}) and the greatest of them is the \textit{beylerbeyi} (\textit{baklari} bak). [He is the emir of emirs just as Qutlugh was under Gāzān, and Gubān under Xudābanda and then Abū Sa'id.] The most important matters are not dealt with except through them. If one of them is absent, his name is nevertheless signed to the \textit{parliq} as if he were there, and his deputy takes his place. They do not act upon any matter (\textit{lā yumdukh}) without the vezir, and when they are not present, the vezir acts, giving the order (\textit{amr}) to the deputies, and their names are then written. The true ruler is the vezir. Just as the \textit{beylerbey} 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 connected this passage with the Golden Horde even though it clearly refers to the Ilxanate (as understood from the personalities

mentioned in the text but omitted by him: Qutluğah, Gázán, Qubán, Xudâbanda, and Abu Sa'id). Some of the other sources he refers to do, however, refer to the Golden Horde.

Safargaliev further argues that no such divan existed in the Golden Horde prior to the reign of Özbek Khan because four emirs are not listed in yarlıqs dating prior to the reign of Özbek. Finally he also concludes that the divan finds its origin during the reign of Özbek, who was responsible for centralizing the administration of the Golden Horde. This is the foundation on which this theory rests.

To return to the history of the "four-bey system", under Özbek Khan's successor Canubek (r. 1342-1357) there are many names of individuals attested in the sources of whom some or all might have been leaders of "ruling tribes". If the information is accurate, however, it might mean a great rate of turnover for the beys or that the "ruling tribes" were shifting in their roles. Such a re-alignment might mean that the xan was in a very strong position, or that he was jockeying for power among the various "ruling tribes" and other potential "ruling tribes".

According to Muhibbi, Qutluuguja Inaq was one of the four persons who according to custom were rulers in the lands of the house of Özbek Khan.104 This source also notes that Qutluuguja Inaq was engaged in correspondence with Egyptian officials, who responded to him in 1351. He is also called the "deputy" (nâ'ib) of Canubek Khan. Very little else is known about this individual beyond the facts given in this description.

Muḥibbî also writes that Husam ad-Din Mahmud, also known as Mahmud Divani, was Canibek's vezir.\textsuperscript{105} There is, however, every reason for believing that he, too, was one of the four ulus beys, since he was one of the three companions of Qutlubuğa İnaq. All four of these individuals are further described as al-āmīrī l-kabīrī "great emir (adj.)."

For the brief reign of Berdibek (r. 1357-1359) there is also very little information. According to one source the aforementioned Mahmud Divani took part in the enthroning of Berdibek Xan.\textsuperscript{106} The sources also call Saray Temür b. (Emir) Caruq a vezir of Berdibek.\textsuperscript{107}

Interesting information relevant to these last two reigns is also to be found in the Venetian sources. According to the Golden Horde correspondences with the Venetians noted by Hammer-Purgstall, there were five persons who are named at the end of a document sent by Canibek in 1347: Mogalbey, Thouazi, Jagaltay, Jerdhezin, and Cotloboga.\textsuperscript{108} Safargaliev refers to this document and ambiguously states that three of Canibek's four (!) ulus emirs—Maglubey, Yangilbey, and Kutlubuga (in Safargaliev's spelling)—also signed a later agreement.\textsuperscript{109}

Even though it is the four ulus beys who are supposed to sign the documents, it is very difficult to find adequate outside documentation

\textsuperscript{[105]} Muḥibbî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 338/348-349; and Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 401/413.
\textsuperscript{[106]} Zayn ad-Din, Žayż-i târîx-i guzıda, Tizengauzen 2, pp. 225/96.
\textsuperscript{[107]} Zayn ad-Din/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 225/96; and Târîx-i Şayx Üvays, Tizengauzen 2, pp. 231/103.
\textsuperscript{[108]} Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, pp. 517-519. Mogalbey is also named earlier in this document in the variant spelling Mogalbei.
\textsuperscript{[109]} Safargaliev, Raspad Zolotoy Ordı, p. 110.
to verify that each of these individuals was an ulus bey. It is also possible that this was a theoretical role of the ulus beys which was not adhered to strictly. There is, of course, no obstacle to identifying the person named Cotloboga in this document with the aforementioned Qutlubuğâ Inaq. As for Mogalbei/Mogalbey, the less reliable source Națanžî names one Ilyas, son of Moğulbuğâ, as "emir of emirs" (amîr al-umârâ'). If one chooses to equate Mogalbei/Mogalbey with Moğulbuğâ—which would appear unsound philologically—then Mogalbei/Mogalbey could be a likely candidate to have been an ulus bey himself. 110

Another letter which has been preserved was sent to the Venetians in 1358 and includes the names Asambeî, Magalbeî, Sarabeî, Jagaltai, Tolobeî, and Cotulubuga as signatories.111 Safargaliyev's interpretation of this letter as published by Hammer-Purgstall is that new names appear among the "powerful high officials", namely (and again in his spelling): Alimbey (Ali-bek), Saray-bek, and Tulunbek.112 On this basis Safargaliyev believes that the number of ulus beys in the Golden Horde under Berdibek rose to six, which is according to him confirmed by the Arab sources. Safargaliyev does not consider, however, the additional name Cotuletamur which appears in an appended order to this second letter. 113


Some of the names mentioned in these two sources can be identified with historical figures known from other sources.\textsuperscript{114} Tulunbey is also known in the \textit{Nikonovskaya istoriya} as an emir of Canibek. He is supposed to have encouraged Berdibek to kill his father as a part of Tulunbey's plans to become the first emir in the realm.\textsuperscript{115} There is also an inscription from the Crimea which mentions Qutluq Temür as a "great emir" in 1358.\textsuperscript{116}

It has already been mentioned that, in addition to the individuals just discussed, there is a whole series of probable ulus beys for whom it is difficult to establish an absolute chronology. This refers to a number of names known for rulers of the Crimea in the mid-14th century without any more specific dates available except through conjecture. To briefly recap the earlier rulers of the Crimea, the first mention was of Tabug/Tayuq, then Noğay, and then Tuluq Temür under Özbek, who is perhaps to be equated with the Melik Temür known from 1340. After this time, a series of indirect references allow one to piece together a relative chronology of the rulers of the Crimea.

One reads in the sources that Ali Bey b. Isa b. Tuluq Temür ruled in the Crimea after Zayn ad-Din Ramazan, who is himself said to have been ruler of the Crimea in 1350.\textsuperscript{117} It is also noted in 1384-5 that the father of Hasan b. Ramazan (so, Zayn ad-Din Ramazan) was nā'ib in the

\begin{flushleft}
[114] For a discussion of certain of these figures see Safargaliyev, \textit{Raspad Zolotoy Ordı}, p. 110. Safargaliyev's annotation leaves much to be desired; since it seems that much of what he writes is based on unreliable sources such as the work by Naṭanzī, his conclusions should be regarded with caution.


\end{flushleft}
Crimea; Tizengauzen dates this on the basis of another document to 1356.\textsuperscript{118} The absolute chronology of this series is not known, nor is it certain whether Isa b. Tuluq Temûr might not have ruled, too.

Safargaliev further suggests on the basis of an inscription in the Crimea that Qutluq Temûr b. Tuluq Temûr was ruler in 1358.\textsuperscript{119} Among one of the additional possible dates comes from the notice that Xoca Ali Bey was probably one of the ulus emîrs in 1363-4, that is following the rule of Berdibek.\textsuperscript{120} All these points together makes it possible to establish the following relative chronology:

1. Tuluq Temûr [1333]
2. Melik Temûr ( = Tuluq Temûr?) [1340]
3. Zayn ad-Din b. Ramazan [1350-1356]
4. Qutluq Temûr (b. Tuluq Temûr?) [1358]

The evidence regarding these figures is at best fragmentary and in some cases conjectural (such as Safargaliev’s various statements regarding Qutluq Temûr, who might be the son of Tuluq Temûr and who might have ruled the Crimea). Clearly there is a series of often-related rulers of

\textsuperscript{[118]} 'Asqalânî, Kitâb anbâ' al-ğamr bi-abnâ' al-ˈumr, Tizengauzen 1, pp. 450/452 and n. 4 referring to Zayn ad-Din. For this date he cites a document in: "Heyd, Gesch. des Levanthandels", II, 203. (See W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age, Leipzig, 1885-1886/ Amsterdam, 1959, ii, p. 202 and n. 1.)

\textsuperscript{[119]} Safargaliev, Raspad Zolotoy Ordi, p. 70, citing A.Yu. Yakubovskiy, Razvalini Urtgenc (1930), p. 18. He does not mention, as noted earlier, the occurrence of the name Qutluq Temûr (Cotuletamur) in the continuation of the Venetian document to which he himself has referred earlier (Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, pp. 721-722).

\textsuperscript{[120]} Muhibbi/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 338-340/349-350; and Qalqașandi/ Tizengauzen 1, pp.401/413. Safargaliev believes that Xoca Ali Bey was ruler of the Crimea in 1364 (Raspad Zolotoy Ordi, p. 70), and Fedorov-Davidov discusses these names as well (Obşestvenny stroy Zolotoy Ordi, p. 101). See also the account of the career of Mamay below.
the Crimea which can be reconstructed on the basis of the narrative sources. These rulers in some instances coincide with potential candidates for consideration as ulus beys in this period, but there is not enough evidence to place these figures within a full historical context in contrast to the earlier period. For the reign of Özbek Xan there are probably four such ulus beys known and the sources relate quite clearly that Özbek's lands included Kafâ, Qiram, Mâçar, Azâq, Surdâq, and Xwârazm, plus his capital of Sarâ. ¹²¹ For later periods such as this, one can only rely on indirect evidence such as the statements by Muhibbi and Qalqaşandi that on the basis of protocol the rulers of the Crimea and Azaq were sent the same length letters, which is a small bit of evidence in favor of the interpretation of their similar roles.¹²²

While the organization of the Golden Horde was stable through about 1360, it is possible that at that point "ruling tribes" came to the western territories from the east during or following the instability of the 1360s–1370s. As a preliminary to a discussion of the role of the eastern "ruling tribes" in the next chapter, then this chapter must address the relationship between the White and Blue Hordes comprising the entire Golden Horde.

This division between the White (or western) and Blue (or eastern) halves of the Golden Horde goes back to the lifetime of Çingis

Xan himself.\textsuperscript{123} Already at this time, the western division headed by Batu was called the right flank, while the eastern division headed by the older of the two sons, Orda, was called the left flank. Even though legally the ulus of Orda was the senior, in practice Batu's ulus was the dominant half. Abu l-\c{G}azi's \textit{\c{S}ecer\c{e}yi Türk}, one of the only other sources for this territory of Orda in the 13th century, includes the information that Batu also gave his younger brother Siban land to the east of his own territory.\textsuperscript{124} According to Abu l-\c{G}azi, Orda's territory was to the east of Siban's territory, while Ra\c{s}id ad-Din does not include Siban among the princes of the left flank at all.

Very little is known about the rulers of the Blue Horde from sources for the early period. According to Allsen, the last documentary evidence regarding the person and rule of Orda dates from the 1250s. Orda was followed at some point by Qongqiran, according to Allsen from the late 1250s to the late 1270s. Qongqiran's successor was Orda's grandson, Qonici, who ruled from shortly after 1277 to a short time before 1300. Qonici, in turn, was succeeded by his own Bayan by 1299. Ra\c{s}id ad-Din speaks of Bayan as someone who is still alive and describes

\textsuperscript{[123]} On Orda and his successors through Sasibuğa (?) see Ra\c{s}id ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 90-106; and Ra\c{s}id ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 99-107. The best introduction to this early period in the history of the Blue Horde, kindly made available by the author for the purposes of this discussion, is T. Allsen, "The Princes of the Left Hand: An Introduction to the History of the Ulus of Orda in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries", \textit{Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi} (forthcoming), to which the reader is referred for further details. On the origins of the term "Golden Horde", see G.A. Bogatova, "Zolotaya Orda", \textit{Russkaya reč'} 1970:1, p. 76; and V.P. Yudin, "Ordi: Belaya, Sinyaya, Seraya, Zolotaya", \textit{Kazakhstan, Sredniyaya i Tsentrall'naya Aziya v XVI-XVIII vv.}, ed. B.A. Tuleipaev (Alma-Ata, 1983), pp. 106-165, especially pp. 131-133.

\textsuperscript{[124]} Abu l-\c{G}azi/Desmaisons, pp. 181/190-191. See also the discussion in Allsen, "The Princes of the Left Hand".
that he had fought battles with Du'a and Qaydu of the Çağatay xanate.\textsuperscript{125} The last potential ruler of the ulus of Orda was *Sasıbüqa (?), but he is merely mentioned by Raşid ad-Din as a son of Bayan, since it was too early for Raşid ad-Din to have known of his (possible) later reign.\textsuperscript{126} The only published source offering details on the fate of the ulus of Orda in the period following the account of Raşid ad-Din is Naţanzi's \textit{Muntaxab at-tavârīx}.\textsuperscript{127} Although it has been stated throughout the earlier chapters that Naţanzi's work is notoriously unreliable, it is now that this criticism will be addressed in detail.\textsuperscript{128}

The kindest words that the modern historian can have for Naţanzi is that he offers unique details not to be found elsewhere; the worst words one can have for his account is that it is a work of historical fiction with next to no corroboration of any of his details. As would any modern writer of historical fiction, Naţanzi has included many real historical personages. Scholars in the second half of the 20th century have labored under the burden first imposed by Grekov and Yakubovskiy—and their path was followed by many other scholars—who fully incorporated the details given by Naţanzi without taking into

\textsuperscript{125} Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 95-98; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 101-103.

\textsuperscript{126} Raşid ad-Din/Blochet, pp. 96; and Raşid ad-Din/Boyle, pp. 102. See also Allsen, "The Princes of the Left Hand". According to Raşid ad-Din/Blochet this form is ساس بوقا (ms. ساس بوقا), which Raşid ad-Din/Boyle reads as "Sati-Buqa".

\textsuperscript{127} Naţanzi/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 232-242/126-138; and Allsen, "The Princes of the Left Hand".

consideration the worth of the account as a whole.\[129\] But Națanızî's account of the history of the western half of the Golden Horde can speak for itself.

Națanızî follows the account of Raṣîd ad-Dîn through the defeat of Noğay and the flight of his sons, though he does not go so far as to include the death of Tobta.\[130\] He states that the ulus of Coçi was then split into two halves, and that the descendants of Noğay established themselves in the eastern half (according to him the areas of Uluğtağ, Sekizyağaç, Qaratal, Tuysen,\[131\] Cend, and Barçkend), calling themselves the sultans of the Ag orda "White Horde". The descendants of Tobta were assigned the western territories (according to him Ibir-Sibir, Rus, Libqa, Ükek, Macar, Bulğar, Başgírd, and Saray Berke), and they were called the sultans of the Kök orda. This already involves a number of problems, including the fact that this is the only source which calls the eastern horde the "White" and the western horde the "Blue".\[132\]

As for the subsequent rulers of the western half of the Golden Horde, Națanızî gives the following account. The ruler after Tobta was his son, Toğrul, who died in 1336–7. Toğrul was succeeded by his son Özbek, who ruled until his death in 1365. Then came the rule of Canibek,

\[129\] Zolotaya Orda, Index under "Anonim Iskendera".

\[130\] Națanızî/Aubin, pp. 68–81; and Națanızî/Tizengauzen 2, p. 127 n. 1.

\[131\] A number of scholars have read this as Tyumen' in Siberia following Națanızî/Tizengauzen 2, p. mention 127 n. 3. See Egorov, Istoričeskaya geografiya Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 128, 131, and 139.

\[132\] On the problem of the "Blue Horde" and the "White Horde" see Yudin, "Ordi: Belaya, Sinyaya, Seraya, Zolotaya", pp. 120–127. The nomenclature used by Națanızî also contradicts the traditional Eurasian color symbolism according to which white stands for the west, and blue stands for the east. Further references to these two hordes will ordinarily use the term White Horde to mean the western horde and Blue Horde to mean the eastern horde unless otherwise indicated in brackets.
then Berdibek b. Canibeck, and then finally Keldibek b. Canibeck, after which the emirs of the "Blue Horde" [*the western or White Horde!] decided to invite a xan from the "White Horde" [*the eastern or Blue Horde].

It is difficult to believe that Naṭanzi intended for this version to be taken seriously. Every other account unrelated to his follows the traditional account that Toqta ruled until 1312-3, when he was succeeded not by his son, but by Özbek b. Toğrilca b. Mengi Temür. Özbek's "classical" reign became as well known as, say, the reign of the 16th-century Ottoman sultan Süleyman the Magnificent, and to say that he ruled from 1336-7 to 1365 rather than the actual reign 1312-1341 is to strain the credulity of both the medieval and the modern reader. Following the very brief reign of Tinibek, Özbek's long-term (and not short-term) successor was Canibeck (1341-1357), followed by Berdibek (1357-1359). Nor can one find in the other sources names resembling those of most of the emirs named in this account (Toğlubey, Muqsan [?], Moğulbuğa, Ahmed, Nanguday and amīr al-umārā' Ilyas b. Moğulbuğa).¹³⁴

Most scholars have accepted Naṭanzi’s account of the history of the ulus of Orda after simply emending his confusion of the Blue and White Hordes. Given the preceding discussion of Naṭanzi's reliability, however, how can it be possible to justify the use of the Muntaxab at-tavârîx as a "unique" source for the history of the ulus of Orda without the gravest misgivings?

[133] See Raṣīd ad-Dīn/Boyle, p. 109 n. 66.

[134] See Natanzi/Tizengauzen 2, p. 129 n.1, for variant forms of the name Nanguday which the editors offer on the basis of the Temürid sources.
Briefly, Națanzî's account of the subsequent history of the ulus of Orda is as follows. Națanzî writes that Sasîbuğa\textsuperscript{135} b. Noğay (whom Raşîd ad-Dîn knows only as a son of Bayan, as noted above) ruled for 30 years in the "White Horde" [*Blue Horde in the east] until his death in 1320-1. He was followed by his son Erzen, who ruled 25 years until his death and burial in 1344-5 in Sîğnaq. He was followed for a short time by Mubârak Xoca, who left the throne after six months. The next ruler--by the order of Canîbek Xan (who is not supposed to have been ruling yet according to Națanzî's account!)--was his brother Çimtay, who ruled for 17 years (so until about 1361). His son Urus Xan, who during his father's lifetime wanted to rule the "Blue Horde" [*the western or White Horde], succeeded him.

There is very little literary evidence to corroborate the facts of this account, but Yakubovskiy does introduce the numismatic evidence published in the 19th century by P. Savel'ev. He offers one table giving Savel'ev's chronology and then gives the following second table with Savel'ev's spellings of the names corrected (Table VI).\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{135} Națanzî/Aubin, p. 88; and Națanzî/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 234/129 give the form ساس بوانا of this name (cf. Raşîd ad-Dîn above; see also Tizengauzen 2, Index under "Sasi-Buqa").

\textsuperscript{136} Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, pp. 310-312.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sasi-Buka, 709 (=1309-1310)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 720 (=1320-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubarek-xodja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720-745 (=1320-1--1344-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çimtay 745-762 (=1344-5--1360-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ximtay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762 (=1360-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(763-782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=1361-2--1380-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuy-xodja oglan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxtamiş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782 (=1380-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*] A.Yu. Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda i ee padenie (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), p. 312. The particular spellings of the above names are straight transliterations from Yakubovskiy.
It is important to note here that this series of coins does not answer the question of whether these individuals minted coins as Çingisid xans or another kind of ruler. The evidence is also confusing: according to Yakubovskiy, Mubarakxoca was the first to mint coins with his own name, meaning that he was the first xan of the "White Horde" [*the eastern Blue Horde] to declare his independence from the xan in Saray, the capital in the west. But the most important result of this and other literary evidence is that even Yakubovskiy—who first introduced Nađanži's work into scholarly consideration on the history of the Golden Horde—felt it necessary to drastically alter Nađanži's chronology of the rulers of the "White Horde" [*the eastern or Blue Horde] in response to this data in a second table.\(^\text{137}\)

The crucial question raised by the discussion of the White and Blue Hordes is whether each of the two uluses shared four "ruling tribes" divided equally between the two of them, or whether they had their two independent sets of four "ruling tribes". This question unfortunately has no easy answer, for its is based on whether the ulus of Coçi shared four "ruling tribes" with the ulus of Orda, or whether it was independent. A number of scholars, notably Fedorov-Davidov, have taken the position that the Golden Horde can be conveniently analyzed along these lines.\(^\text{138}\) The point of view espoused by this dissertation is that the sources are too contradictory to accurately establish such divisions as a useful tool of analysis. The sources make constant reference to the right and left flanks, but it is never clear in the


analyses whether this is within an ulus, or whether it represents the two halves of the entire Golden Horde.\textsuperscript{139}

This chapter has attempted to show that the "four-bey system" can be traced in the history of the Golden Horde through 1360. It has also attempted to show that the relationship between the White and Blue Hordes, and especially the history of the latter, is poorly understood, a problem compounded by the fact that too little is known about the four ulus beyers late in the reign of Canibe and during the reign of Berdibe. The confusing chronology of the next several decades point in the direction of a breakdown in the "four-bey system". One thing is certain, however: once the states of the Later Golden Horde are taken into consideration, it turns out that the "four-bey system" was definitely not a casualty of the turmoil in this period. The next chapter will try to analyze the evolution of the "four-bey system" after 1360 and understood how the "four-bey system" emerged stronger than ever in the states of the Later Golden Horde.

\textsuperscript{139} One may simply note the example already cited in Chapter II, according to which the head of the Şirin "ruling tribe" is presumably in the right flank while the three other "ruling tribes", the Arqin, Barin, and Qipçaq, are explicitly stated as being in the left flank (Muhammed Riza/Kazembek, p. 75; and IkTisTs, ii, pp. 412-413). On the basis of this particular reference one could claim that there was a division into two flanks within the "state".
CHAPTER V
THE TRANSITION FROM THE GOLDEN HORDE
TO THE LATER GOLDEN HORDE

This chapter brings the discussion of the "four-bey system" full circle by addressing the question of the organizational continuity of the Golden Horde into the 15th century and beyond. The principles of the "four-bey system" would lead one to seek in the emergence of the states of the Later Golden Horde the union of four potential "ruling tribes" with a Čingisid candidate for xan, but the evidence for this period is both relatively scarce and confusing. There is, however, just enough evidence in the sources to trace the role of certain "ruling tribes" in the rise of the Later Golden Horde. There is evidence in particular for tracing the rise of the Şirin "ruling tribe" from the late 14th century on until its role in the "foundation" of the Crimean xanate in 1449. This specific case study can serve as the example par excellence to prove that the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde had a genetic or child-parent relationship to the same system in the earlier Golden Horde.

Following the death of Berdibek Xan there took place a tremendous upheaval in the Golden Horde. This period saw the emergence of a whole series of "xans" supported by competing factions in the confused events

[1] The study of the period under question is fraught with numerous problems, including the lack of a satisfactory chronology. Such a chronology would be a separate undertaking in itself and certainly falls outside the focus of this chapter, which must concern itself with the "four-bey system". The discussion of the chronology of events in this chapter is therefore based on Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, pp. 272-335 and 374-428 (pp. 336-373 discuss the campaigns between Toqtamış and Temürleng, which are mostly irrelevant to the present discussion) and Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, pp. 109-208.
of the 1360s-1370s. There are a number of individuals whose active support of various candidates for xan would fit the role of an ulus bey in this period, especially Mamay, but the narrative sources which documented the "four-bey system" earlier are no longer available to fully document this system in the Golden Horde after the death of Berdibek. Many of the individual figures known in the sources for this period cannot even be placed for sure within either the White or Blue Hordes. At the same, the numismatic sources and the Russian chronicles offer important additional information to supplement the Mamlûk sources contributing to a new level of complexity and contradiction in the total information of the various kinds of sources. One result of this confusion in the sources is that scholars speak of over 25 "xans" over the next decade and a half.\^2 But while they have tried for generations to piece together the complicated chronology of who ruled for how many months in which city on the basis of either the numismatic evidence or the narrative sources (including unreliable sources such as the work by Naţanzi), they have not focused their research on possible continuity in the "four-bey system" in this period.

There is no need to go into the detailed chronology of these various rulers here, since it is not of direct concern for a discussion of the "four-bey system". It suffices to mention that the names of the most important competing figures which occur in the sources following the death of Berdibek in 1359 included Xızr, Temûr Xoca, Ordu Melik, Keldibek, Nevruz, Qulpa, Abdûlallah, Çerkes/Şerkes, Murat, Murid, and Aziz. Mamay supported the rule of Abdûlallah from about 1362 till about 1370, after which he supported Muhammed Bulaq. The names of other rivals

\[2\] See for example Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 272.
such as Urus Xan, Arabšah, Qarîxan b. Aybekxan, and others are also known. The importance of Mamay continued until his loss to the Russians at Kulikovo Pole in 1380 and his subsequent defeat by the new-comer Toqtamış, a member of the Blue Horde who had sought refuge with Temürğeng following Urus Xan's murder of his father.3

Despite the importance of his role as the leader of a "ruling tribe", most interest in Mamay's life is in connection with his defeat by the Russians in 1380 (an event whose importance has often been exaggerated as a turning point in Russian history).4 At any rate, none of the other ulus beys can be documented for certain, and no one individual stands out in the sources as having cooperated with three others to form a "state" in cooperation with a Çingisid. It would be possible to postulate on the basis of this apparent lack of stability in the governing of the Golden Horde in the 1360s-1370s that the "four-bey system" collapsed in the western ulus of Coçi, the traditional Golden Horde.

The interpretation of the events of the 1360s and 1370s offered by Ibn Kaldûn—who was, of course, a historian in his own right—

[3] This paragraph simply follows the account in Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, pp. 270-337. Cf. the other interpretations such as Safaryaliev, Raspad Zolotoy Ordî, pp. 111-144; Axmedov, Gosudarstvo koçe víx uzbekov, pp. 33-37; M. Kafalî, Altın orda hanîğînîn kuruluş ve yükseliş devirleri (İstanbul, 1976), pp. 89-99; and Egorov, "Zolotaya Orda pered Kulikovskoy bitvoy". A re-evaluation of this chronology in order to include more recent numismatic evidence and in order to discount the information given by Naţanzî is an important desideratum which falls outside the scope of this chapter.

[4] See the companion articles to the one by Egorov in the volume Kulikovskaya bitva cited above commemorating this event; V.V. Kargalov, Konets ordinskogo iga (Moscow, 19842), pp. 43-60; and most recently C. Halperin, Russia and the Golden Horde. The Mongol Impact on Medieval Russian History (Bloomington, 1985), pp. 69-70.
introduces a number of very attractive theories. Ibn Xaldūn makes a reference to one of the elders of the Mongol emirs named Mamay. Mamay is said further to have been a ruler in "his" (probably Berdibek's) state (wa-kâna mutaḥakkim fî dawlatihi) and that the Crimea (madīnat al-Qīrim) was a part of his territory.

Ibn Xaldūn writes that the emirs disagreed over the governing of the territories surrounding the capital Saray following the death of Berdibek and began to govern over their own territories independently. A turning point came when Mamay marched on Saray with Abdūllah, a young boy (ṣabīl) descended from Özbek Xan, as his own candidate for xan. After Mamay raised the young Abdūllah as xan, however, another one of the "emirs of the state" (amīr min umarâ' ad-dawla) disputed this selection. This rival of Mamay raised as xan another member of the dynasty named Qutluq Temūr, but Mamay attacked and killed both of them.

Ibn Xaldūn continues that Haci Şerkes left his territories in Astraxan and attacked Mamay, wrestling control of Saray away from him, after which Mamay returned to the Crimea to rule independently. When Haci Şerkes left Astraxan, however, Urus Xan sent his troops from Xwārazm to besiege Astraxan. Though Haci Şerkes's troops together with some of his emirs were able to drive away the invading forces, killing


[6] Ibn Xaldūn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 373/389. Tizengauzen interprets wa-kânat uxtuha Xānum bint Bardibak tahtā kabīr min umarâ' al-Muğul ismu hu Māmāy to mean that his sister "Xanum" was married to Mamay.

[7] The passage relating to Qutluq Temūr is not included--perhaps because it was a later addition in the Paris manuscript--in the seemingly reliable Bûlāq edition also used by Tizengauzen (Ibn Xaldūn/Tizengauzen 1, p. 374 n. 2). See also Qalgašandi/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 396/406. The name Qutluq Temūr is known from the Venetian source discussed above, though there is the name Temūr Xoca mentioned above as a dynastic figure (see Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 275).
many of the enemy, including the emir leading the besieging forces.

While Haci Şerkes was preoccupied with this campaign, Aybekxan attacked Haci Şerkes and took Saray away from him. Aybekxan there ruled for only a short time, after which his son Qarîxan ruled there. Then Urusxan succeeded in driving Qarîxan out of Saray back to his earlier possessions. At this time Urus Xan was in Saray, Mamay was in the Crimea, and the lands between Saray and the Crimea belonged to Mamay (wa-Mamây bi-1-Qirim wa-mâ baynahu wa-bayna Sarây fi mulkîhî [or: mamlakatihi]).

Most interestingly, Ibn Xaldûn describes these four individuals in this context—Mamay, Haci Şerkes, Urusxan, and Aybekxan—as the امراء المسيرة umârâ' al-masîra "emirs of the march". This term can also be read with a simple transposition of the Arabic letters (as already noted by Tizengauzen) as امراء المسيرة umârâ' al-maysara "emirs of the left flank". The term maysara is a term commonly used in the Islamic sources meaning the left (or eastern) flank of the state (the right or western flank usually is called the maymana). This could then serve as grounds for seeing all four of these individuals as alûs beys.

[8] It is not clear whether this passage (Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 374/391) should be read wa-waliya ba'dahu bi-Saray ibnuhul Qârif(n)xân using the active verb waliya "he ruled", or perhaps in the passive wa-wulliya "he was appointed", since waliya should take the preposition 'alâ rather than the preposition bi- (H. Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, ed. J.M. Cowan, Ithaca, 1976, pp. 1099-1100).

[9] Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 374/391. It is probably Mamay's territory that is meant here.

[10] Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 373/389-390 and note, where Tizengauzen himself proposes this emendation.

Ibn Xaldûn's assertion that all four of these individuals—Mamay, Haci Șerkes, Urușxan, and Aybekxan—were emirs is certainly worthy of consideration; the relative dearth of source material for the study of this period is itself one reason for seriously considering Ibn Xaldûn's alternate explanation. Mamay clearly fits the picture of an ulûs bey on all counts thus far. For example, it has already been noted above that he supported Abdullah as xan and after him Muhammed Bulaq. He is also called a "prince of the horde" (ordinskiy knyaz') and the commander of a corps of 10,000 (temnik) in the Slavic sources. Mamay is further called a noyan and given the same chancellery protocol (one-third page) as earlier ulûs emirs. Finally, as noted earlier, Mamay is described as ruling the state (kâna mutaḥakkim fî ḍawlatihî) under the earlier xan Berdibek.

Yakubovskiy has already pointed out that Haci Șerkes could easily be associated with the Șerkes Bey known from other sources, which is a clear description of this person as another bey. Although little is known about Aybekxan, Ibn Xaldûn's description of the role of Uruș Xan

[12] See also Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, pp. 285-286, for the Slavic sources which describe that in this period the "princes of the horde" were fighting amongst themselves.

[13] On this figure see also Axmedov, Gosudarstvo koçeñix uzbekov, pp. 35-36.


[17] Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 287. Even though Ibn Xaldûn mentions the emirs under Haci Șerkes, this does not prove that he was a xan, only that there were individuals under him in the ("ruling tribe"?) hierarchy.
is very problematic. The reason for this is that many scholars have considered Urus Xan as a Čingisid and a dynastic ruler in the eastern half of the Golden Horde known as the Blue Horde or the ulus of Orda. His role in Khwârazm, however, most resembled that of an ulus bey. The minting of coins in his name is not proof in itself that he was a dynastic figure, since Haci Ṣerkes also struck coins, as did a series of other non-dynastic rulers. According to Naťanzi, Urus Xan, who during his father's lifetime had wanted to rule the "Blue Horde" [*the western or White Horde], succeeded him.

To conclude this discussion, it is safe to say that in all probability Mamay was the head of the ulus beys in the White Horde and Urus Xan was a ruler of the Blue Horde. Though the temptation to see Urus Xan as an ulus bey (following Ibn Xaldûn) is great, too many later Čingisid rulers are directly descended from Urus Xan for him to have been just an ulus bey. Since it is impossible to establish on the basis of the extant sources multiple sets of four ulus beys supporting each proposed xan, one must conclude that in this period the "four-bey system" was not effectively operational. The problem is only compounded by the fact that too little is known about who the four ulus emirs late in the reign of Canûbek and during the reign of Berdibek might have been, nor is there reliable information on who the ulus beys under Urus Xan might have been (i.e., assuming he was a Čingisid xan). One thing is

[18] This name should probably be read Orus Xan, though scholarly convention is to call him Urus, as do the Russian sources.

[19] See for example the genealogy in Mu'izz/Tizengauzen 2, pp 61-63. Yakubovskiy (Zolotaya Orda, p. 306) for one states, following Naťanzi, that Urusxan was in Sìnqâq as a ruler of the Blue Horde (he actually uses the misnomer "White Horde", as will be discussed in the next chapter).

certain, though, the "four-bey system" was not a casualty of the turmoil in this period, since it is still attested later.

In reviewing the literature on Mamay's role in the Golden Horde, one sees a revived interest in the secondary literature. As has already been noted, many of the authors see Mamay and a host of other persons as dynastic figures. Vernadsky, however, clearly recognizes that "general" Mamay was not a Çingisid and even compares him with Noğay.²² Safargaliev does likewise.²³ Egorov calls Mamay beylerbeyi and indicates that this had something to do with his marriage to the daughter of the xan.²⁴ A more recent author, Kargalov, also calls Mamay a commander of 10,000 (temnik) who was able to unite the forces of the Golden Horde.²⁵

The establishment of Toqtamış in the western territories from about 1381 until the end of the 14th century opened a new period of stability in the history of the Golden Horde. Although the events surrounding the later career of Toqtamış are well known, his origins have not been carefully studied. Furthermore, very few scholars have noted the sources which permit one to once again trace the four "ruling tribes" of the Golden Horde under Toqtamış after an interregnum of over two decades.

Toqtamış was associated with Temirleng while he began conducting campaigns against Urus Xan (1374-5); his fourth campaign was in 1376-7.

[22] Mongols and Russia, p. 246.
[25] Konets ordinskogo iga, pp. 35-59. (Note the reference on p. 53 to Mamay and his three "dukes" [knyaz'].)
He took Siğnaq and Sawran, where he minted coins in A.H. 780-783, and in 1377-8 he already appeared along the Volga. Toqtamış finally came to rule the Golden Horde in 1381 after defeating Mamay, who had just suffered a defeat at the hands of the Russian at Kulikovo Pole in 1380. Following this second defeat Mamay fled the Golden Horde to take refuge with the Venetians in the Crimea, where his life came to an end.26 Toqtamış then went to the Crimea, whence Mamay had fled in anticipation of Toqtamış's arrival, continued inquiring about Mamay until news of his death was confirmed.

As xan of the Golden Horde, Toqtamış's territories included the Volga region from Haci Tarxan (Astraxan) to Bulgar, the northern Caucasus, and the region from the Volga to the Crimea; the only territory not included was Xwârazm, which was now in Temûrleng's hands.27 (According to Ibn Xaldûn, Toqtamış took possession of the territories belonging to Urus Xan in Saray.)28 It is thus clear that Toqtamış managed to control the traditional territories of the Golden Horde.

[27] Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 323.
[28] Ibn Xaldûn/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 376/393.
One important consideration is whether Toqtamış was a xan of the western White Horde, as at least one source suggests, or the eastern Blue Horde. An eastern origin would mean that already under Toqtamış Xan the western territories came under the domination of the east. Naṭanzī's unreliable work explains that Toqtamış was the son of Toyxoca oğlan, ruler of Mangıslaq. Toyxoca oğlan did not join Urus Xan when the latter set out for the western ulus after assuming the throne. As a consequence of this betrayal Toyxoca oğlan's son Toqtamış had to flee to Xwārazm. Urus Xan was succeeded by Temürbek Xan b. Muhammed Xan, and Temürbek xan was followed by Toqtamış, who also became ruler of the Golden Horde in 1381.\(^{29}\) Whether the details given by Naṭanzī are corroborated or not, most other sources also agree that Toqtamış was from the eastern Blue Horde.

Ibn Xaldūn introduces an attractive theory with regard to the career of Toqtamış.\(^{30}\) At the very beginning of his discussion of the events which took place in the 1360s-1370s discussed above, Ibn Xaldūn makes the statement that Berdibek's successor was his son Toqtamış, who was just a young "lad" (or "puppet [xan]?": ǰulām) at this time.\(^{31}\) The same passage continues that Toqtamış's sister, the daughter of Berdibek, was under one of the elders of the Mongol emirs named Mamay.\(^{32}\) Ibn Xaldūn's version of the subsequent career of Toqtamış explains that Toqtamış originally fled from a position as xan of the Golden Horde to

---

\(^{29}\) Naṭanzī/Tızengauzen 2, pp. 235-238/131-133.

\(^{30}\) Ibn Xaldūn/Tızengauzen 1, pp. 373-377/389-394.

\(^{31}\) Ibn Xaldūn/Tızengauzen 1, pp. 373/389.

\(^{32}\) Ibn Xaldūn/Tızengauzen 1, pp. 373/389. Tızengauzen interprets wa-kānat uxtuhu Xânum bint Bardibak taḥta kabîr min umarâ' al-Muğul ismuhu Mâmây to mean that his sister "Xanum" was married to Mamay.
the land of Urus Khan in Xvârazm and subsequently from there to the territory of the Çağatay xanate.

Qalqaşandî, who derives much in his account from Ibn Xaldûn, calls Mamay a deputy of Toqtamîš.\[^{33}\] This is probably based on Ibn Xaldûn's theory of Toqtamîš having been in the Golden Horde at so early a date. It is unlikely that it might refer to the period of Toqtamîš's return to the the Golden Horde in 1381, since that is the time of Toqtamîš's attempt to kill Mamay. No other source ascribes a White Horde origin to Toqtamîš.\[^{34}\]

It is strange that scholars have paid so little attention to the information contained in Ibn Xaldûn's account, whether reliable or not. (Certainly it has not been incorporated into any major interpretations of this period, while the wholly unreliable work of Naţânzi has gained wide acceptance.) According to most other sources, however, Toqtamîš was not Berdibek's son and did not become important in the Golden Horde until about 1380.\[^{35}\] The unresolved question of Toqtamîš's own origin will remain one of the obstacles to a solution of the later problem of the geographic origin of certain "ruling tribes".

At this point it is possible to introduce later Crimean sources referring to the events in this period such as the Umdat Ut-tevarih, which is based on the earlier Tarih-i Dost Sultan. Though the information contained in these two sources on the earlier Golden Horde prior to 1360 is suspect as regards the numerous figures in "ruling

\[^{33}\] Qalqaşandî/Tizengauzen 1, pp. 396-397/406 (but cf. Qalqaşandî/ Tizengauzen 1, p. 409 note).

\[^{34}\] Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 316 ff.

\[^{35}\] On Toqtamîš's genealogy, see for example the Mu'izz/Tizengauzen 2, p. 61.
tribes" who are not confirmed by other sources, this is the point at which the data from these sources begin to agree with a greater degree of harmony with the data from the other (contemporary) sources.

According to the information in the Umdeh ict-tevarih and the sources on which it is based—which must nevertheless be used with caution—Toqtaş's "elite companions" (has nöker) were the four "ruling tribes" of the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qıpçaq. Several passages in this work also note that in Toqtaş's time Toqtaş was the Çingisid xan while Şirin Örek Temür, son of Dangü Bey, was his chief bey. Şirin Örek Temür's son Tegine is also called the father of the Şirins in the Crimea.

If this information is accurate—which cannot be proven conclusively, but for which other supporting evidence will be offered—it is an important direct precedent for the exact same set of four "ruling tribes"—especially the leading Şirin "ruling tribe"—at the end of the 14th century as given in the later sources for the end of the 15th century. Of course, as with any source, this could be a later interpolation designed to prove a direct line of descent for later political purposes. This is why it is so important to determine whether Toqtaş was originally a xan of the western White Horde or the eastern

[36] Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, pp. 48, 55, and 79. See also Kafalı Altın orda hanlıği, pp. 31-47 and 101-114 (for a retelling of this series of events), especially p. 42. The great merit of Kafalı's work is that he also refers to the unique manuscript of the Tarih-i Dost Sultan (the Togan manuscript) in his possession; this work is otherwise unavailable to scholars. (See also the discussion in Chapter II.)

[37] See the discussion in Chapter II and especially Table II. Of course, there could have been more than one "ruling tribe" by the same name in the earlier period as based on the definition of "ruling tribe" offered in Chapter I. In the later period there must have been more than one Şirin "ruling tribe" based on Şirin participation in the other states as well.
Blue Horde; it becomes a question of whether the eventual continuation of the "four-bey system" is the direct continuation of a White Horde or Blue Horde practice.

In the Umde tevarih the Şirin "ruling tribe" is described as the "Şirin tribe with the Çöműç seal [or: brand] ÇVM(Y)Ç tamghaşı Şirin kabilesi which is a branch (şube) of the As (א) tribe (kabile). This might refer not to the name of another tribe or "ruling tribe", but perhaps to the geographic "As", which could conceivably be the territory north-east of the Black Sea, the historical Alania. Whichever might be the case, the Şirin are not easily linked with any other known historical entity. Since the Şirin and the three other "ruling tribes" mentioned are not the traditional "ruling tribes" of western Eurasia, this is one of the first documented examples of four "ruling tribes" forming a new "state" in cooperation with a Čingisid, in this case Toqtamış.

Toqtamış's relationship with Temür leng, leader of the "ruling tribes" in the erstwhile Çağatay xanate, turned to animosity by 1387. At this time, Temür decided to conduct a war against Toqtamış and began to support a rival to Toqtamış, namely Temür Qutluq Xan. Temür Qutluq defeated Toqtamış in 1398 and succeeded him as xan of what the Russian

[38] Abdülgaffar Kırımi/Asım, pp. 46 and 194. See also Kafalı, Altın orda hanlığı], pp. 39-42.

sources called the "Great Horde". Meanwhile Türkmen fled to Witold in
Lithuania. The numismatic evidence indicates that Temür Qutluq, who
minted coins in the traditional territories of the Golden Horde (New
Orda, Saray, Crimea, New Saray, and Haci Tarxan) reigned from 1397–
1400.

Temür Qutluq and Edigiš, who was his chief bey, are described as
old enemies of Türkmen together with Kince oğlan. There are numerous
sources which describe the role of Edigiš, who is one of the best-known
figures in this late period in the history of the Golden Horde. In his
yarlık of 1398, for example, Temür Qutluq himself named Edigiš, as his
chief bey. Another source clearly states that Temür Qutluq became a
xan in the territory of the Golden Horde and that Edigiš became his
emir. (Since this passage is from Națanzî, it might be subject to
some question, but it turns out that this is one of those statements in
the Muntaxab at-tavârîx which is corroborated by a number of other

[40] Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisey, xi: Patriaršaya ili
Nikonovskaya letopis' (St. Petersburg, 1897/Moscow, 1965), pp. 159 and
167. (This series will be abbreviated PSRL.)

[41] Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 137 ff. See also J. Pelenski, "The
Contest Between Lithuania-Rus' and the Golden Horde in the Fourteenth
Century for Supremacy over Eastern Europe", Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi


[43] Niżám ad-Din Şāmi, Zāfarnāma, Tizengauzen 2, p. 118. See also
Abdülgaffar Kırimi/Asım, p. 60.

[44] A.N. Kurat, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivindeki Altın Ordu, Kırım
ve Türkistan hanlarına ait yarlık ve bitikler (Istanbul, 1940), p. 148,
who bases himself on the edition by V.V. Radlov, "Yarlikli Toktamişa i
Temir-Kutluqa", Zapiski Vostocnogo otdeleniya Russkogo arxeologiqueskogo

[45] Națanzî/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 238/133.
sources.) Yet another source describes how Edigü took the Crimea, the capital Saray, and placed a Čingisid on the throne.\footnote{\[46\]}

Edigü's "ruling tribe" affiliation is well known, since in the later sources for the Mangit "ruling tribe" he is described as a recent ancestor.\footnote{\[47\]} In considering the reports in the sources concerning who the father of Edigü might have been, Bartol'd concluded that the report in Națanzi was quite plausible.\footnote{\[48\]} According to this account, his father was Baltičaq, who had been emir of emirs, that is, beylerbeyi in the left flank of the state.\footnote{\[49\]} Since it is Națanzi's Muntaxab at-tavârik that is considered the main source on Edigü's background, one must conclude that little is known is known in the way of reliable facts about Edigü's background.

It is certain, though, that Edigü continued to be one of the most influential ulus beys and certainly the most famous through the time of his death around 1419. The relationship between Temür Qutluq and Edigü is also the second example of a Čingisid who joins with other "ruling tribes" to form a state. It is not clear, however, which three other "ruling tribes" cooperated with Edigü in raising Temür Qutluq as xan. Following Temür Qutluq's death, Edigü raised Temür Qutluq's nephew

\footnote{\[46\] 'Aynī/Tizengauzen 1, 499-500/531-532.}
\footnote{\[47\] See for example Şaraf ad-Dīn 'Ali Yazdī, Žafarnāma, Tizengauzen 2, p. 148, as well as the discussion in Chapter II. Even though writers such as Ibn 'Arabsah call him a Qongrat, there can hardly be any doubt that this was a rewriting of verifiable facts (see Ibn 'Arabsah/ Tizengauzen 1, p. 457). Munis also calls a descendant of Edigü a Qongrat (see Bregel, "Tribal Tradition and Dynastic History", pp. 391-392).}
\footnote{\[48\] V.V. Bartol'd, "Otets Edigeya", Soçineniya, ii/1 (Moscow, 1963), pp. 797-804, especially pp. 798-799.}
\footnote{\[49\] Națanzi/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 236-238/132-133.}
Şadıbek (rather than Temür Qutluq's sons Temür or Pulad) as xan.\textsuperscript{50}

Şadıbek b. Qutlubek (b. Qutluq Temür) has left coins for the period 1400-1408.\textsuperscript{51}

The Slavic sources report turmoil in the Great Horde in 1407-1408, when Şadıbek was succeeded by Pulad/Bulat (d. 1410).\textsuperscript{52} Bulat's chief bey was the same Edigü, who according to the Russian chronicles was a "great horde duke" (knyaz' velikiy Ordînskiy Edigey).\textsuperscript{53} In one account Edigü attacked Russian lands with 4 Çingisid princes (tsarevîç') named Buçak, Tegriberdiy, Altamir, and Bulat (this Bulat is probably not the same as the xan Bulat?). This account also mentions other "dukes"—the "great duke" Edigü and "dukes" Maxmet, Isup son of Sulyumen, Teginya son of Şix, Saray son of Urusax, Obryagim son of Temiryaz, Yakşibi son of Edigü, Seityalibi, Burnak, and Erikliberdey—who must have been connected with the "ruling tribes", though not all could have been leaders of independent "ruling tribes".\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{50} Details of this can also be found in Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{51} Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 392. On this genealogy see Mui'izz/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 62-62.

\textsuperscript{52} PSRL, xi, pp. 201-202.

\textsuperscript{53} According to Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, pp. 61-62, however, Nur ed-Din b. Edigü raised Bulat as xan.

\textsuperscript{54} PSRL, xi, p. 205. The participation of Edigü's own son clearly demonstrates this.
Toya je zimi, mesyatsa Dekabrya v 20 den, knyaz'
Ordinskiy Edigey poveleniem Bulat-Saltana, tsarya
Bol'siia Ordî, priide rat'yu na Russkuyu zemlyu, a
s nim çetire tsareviçi da mnozi knyazi Tatarstii; a
se imena im: Buçak tsareviçi', Tegriberdiy
tsareviçi', Altamir tsareviçi', Bulat tsareviçi',
kyaz' veliki Edigey, knyaz' Maxmet, knyaz' Isup
Sulyumenev sin, knyaz' Teginya Sixov\(^{55}\) sin, knyaz'
Saray Urusaxov sin, knyaz' Obryagim Temiryazev sin,
kyaz' Yakshi Edigiev sin, knyaz' Seityalibiy,
kyaz' Burnak, knyaz' Erikliberdey.

It is not entirely clear who the Teginya, son of Six, mentioned in this
passage might have been. As noted earlier, the later Crimean sources
know a Tegin who was the son of Örek Temür. Since this Tegin is not
noted elsewhere in the Nikon chronicle, it can be viewed as an isolated
reference to a person with the same first name.

There is, however, the temptation to identify this person with
the Şirin Tegin b. Örek Temür with the explanation that the Nikon
chronicle gives a different or perhaps even incorrect form of the
father's name. First of all, the later sources know Tegin in an earlier
period, that is during the lifetime of Toqtamış. He is also attested a
number of years later in the Slavic sources, as will be seen shortly.
Second, if the above-quoted passage refers to the leaders of "ruling
tribes", there is a good possibility that the same Tegin was
cooperating as the leader of the Şirin "ruling tribe" under Bulat with
Edigü, leader of the Mangit "ruling tribe". After all, following the

\[^{55}\] One manuscript gives the alternate form tegin yaşixov of this
name (p. 205 n. k).
defeat of Toqtamış there was no other sovereign in the Golden Horde. Either the Şirin cooperated with Bulat and Edigü and the Mangıt, or else they did not (and according to the definition given in Chapter I were for the time being not to be considered a "ruling tribe").

Edigü's fortunes changed for one reason or another under Pulat's successor Temür Xan b. Temür Qutluq (r. 1410-1412), who minted coins in New Saray, Bulgar, New Bulğar, Orda Kefe, Azaq, Xwârazm, Sarayçiq, Xaci Tarxan, and Rakan. Edigü was not only not Temür Xan's chief bey (the sources mention one Gazan as his bey), Temür Xan and Edigü were, in fact, enemies.\[55\]

According to the Russian sources Celal ed-Din b. Toqtamış caused Edigü to flee to Xwârazm in 1412.\[57\] The sources indicate that the forces of Temür Xan also attacked Edigü when he was forced to flee to Xwârazm. Once in Xwârazm, Edigü was attacked by emir Qaculay of Celal ed-Din b. Toqtamış, who tried to kill him. Celal ed-Din, who had already attacked the Golden Horde in 1411, finally ousted Temür Xan in 1412. Celal ed-Din seems, however, to have died immediately thereafter and was quickly replaced.\[58\]

The renewed activity of the sons of Toqtamış in this period highlights a new development in the Golden Horde, namely the rise of two competing dynastic lines. The descendants of Toqtamış competed with the successors of Temür Qutluq, who had ousted their father.\[59\] They were

---

[56] Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 399. See also Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asim, p. 61.

[57] PSRL, xi, p. 218.

[58] Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, pp. 399-403.

[59] The most authoritative genealogy is still Mu'izz/Tizengauzen 2, pp. 62-63.
also enemies of Edigü, since Edigü had helped defeat their father and had later demanded that the Russians return the sons of Toqtamış to him.\textsuperscript{60} Since the formation of each "state" required a set of four "ruling tribes", it can be argued that there were now two (or perhaps more) competing sets of four "ruling tribes" in the territory of the Golden Horde. This is an important development if it is accepted that only one set of "ruling tribes" had existed in the territory of the Golden Horde from the time of Toqtamış's defeat through the reign of Bulat Khan.

The events in the decade following the succession of Temür Khan are somewhat unclear. The Nikon chronicle reports that Celal ed-Din was replaced after his death (in 1413) by Kerimberdi.\textsuperscript{61} Kerimberdi died in 1416 and was replaced in turn by Cabbarberdi b. Toqtamış, who died in 1417. The Russian sources are not as helpful for the events in the years which follow. There were a number of other rulers in this period: the supporters of Toqtamış's line seated Kebek, while Edigü's faction seated the Şeybanid Çekre, who then killed Kebek. After Çekre xan ruled for three years, he and other possible candidates for Edigü to support for xan died. According to Abdülgaффar, both of Edigü's next candidates, Seyyid Ahmed and Derviş oğlan, were from the meyser, or "left flank".\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{60} PSRL, xi, pp. 209-210.

\textsuperscript{61} PSRL, xi, p. 219.

\textsuperscript{62} On this period see Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, pp. 150-154; and Abdülgaффar Kırımı/Asım, p. 69 ff.
Meanwhile, according to the *Umdeṭ üt-tevarıh* another son of Toqtaṇış, Qadirberdi, had left for the Caucasus, followed by many beys (including the Şirin, Arğin, Barın, Qipçaq, and others). They finally attacked Edigü, which is when according to this source Edigü died. This must have taken place, if it ever took place at all, around 1419-20, which is when the news of Edigü's death reached the Mamlûk chroniclers. The description of the attack on the Russians 1408-1410 does not specify the territory where Teginya—if he was indeed the son of *Örek Temür*, and if so, where his "ruling tribe"—were located. Whether the Şirin had been in the Crimea up till now or not, one could use this as the earliest date after which the Şirin could have located (or re-located) to the Crimea.

Yakubovskiy supposed that Edigü, who was forced out of Xwârazm in 1413-4, was still in the Golden Horde in 1416-1419. He considers more specifically that Edigü was in the Crimea, based on the fact that Edigü's wife traveled to the south, which could have been safely accomplished only from there. According to 'Ayni, Edigü died in 1419 and that it was Qadirberdi b. Toqtaṇış who killed him. If this statement by 'Ayni is to be accepted, it can mean one of two things: either Qadirberdi was already in the Crimea (with or without the four

[63] Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, p. 153 n. 91, expresses the opinion that Kerimberdi and the Qadirberdi of some of the sources were in all likelihood the same person. Cf. Mu'izz/Tizengaüzen 2, pp. 62-63, which gives a genealogy including both Kerimberdi and Qadirberdi among the sons of Toqtaṇış. See also Smirnov, *Krîmskoe xanство*, pp. 180 and 205.

[64] Abdülgaffar Kûrîmî/Asim, pp. 70-72.


[66] 'Aynî/Tizengaüzen 1, pp. 500-501/532-533. (See also Ibn 'Arabşäh/Tizengaüzen 1, p. 474 n.1.) 'Aynî also states that Edigü made Dervişxan the ruler, but that he was only a puppet. See also Abdülgaffar Kûrimi/Asim, p. 71.
"ruling tribes" named earlier), or this is the date in which Qadiberdi—probably in the company of the four "ruling tribes" of the Şirin, Arğın, Barın, and Qipçaq—came to the Crimea.

The anonymous Continuator of Dahabi supplies important additional details in his notice of the death of Edigü.\(^67\) He wrote that the great emir in the Deşt(-i Qipçaq "the Kipchak steppe"), Edigü, died in A.H. 822/1419-20 A.D. and that he was responsible for the administration of the lands of Saray and Qipçaq (wa-kâna ilyâhi tadbîr mamlakat Sarây wa-Qibcâq). The sultans under him had no power, which is why many historians have called Edigü master of the Deşt (şâhib ad-dašt); but the rulers gave themselves up to him despite the fact that he was only the second emir in the land, and that there was another emir named NKYA نکا . The Continuator of Dahabi adds that the important emirs are emirs of the right flank (maymana) and the left flank (maysara). NKNA نکا was emir of the right flank and Edigü was emir of the left flank, but it was Edigü who was the famous one nevertheless.\(^68\)

Tizengauzen himself already proposed to emend the two forms NKYA and NKNA to read *Tegine *نکا on the basis that it was a name appearing in the Russian chronicles.\(^69\) Though he was not familiar with the other Crimean sources, this is completely justifiable on the basis

\(^{67}\) Continuator of Dahabi/Tizengauzen 1, p. 553.

\(^{68}\) One question raised by this notice is what was meant by the fact that Edigü and Tegine were emirs of two different flanks. As already noted in an earlier chapter, it is not clear whether such statements referred to a basic division within the Blue and White Hordes, a lower-level internal division within a single territory, whether Tegine and Edigü somehow represented different parts of the Crimea, or this could possibly be an anachronism.

\(^{69}\) Continuator of Dahabi/Tizengauzen 1, p. 553 n. 1.
of what has already been noted above, namely that the Şirin bey Örek Temür b. Dangi Bey served Toqtamış as chief bey (until 1398) and that his son, Tegine b. Örek Temür, was the father of the Şirins in the Crimea. 70 Thus, there is the mention of Tegine in the lifetime of Toqtamış, 71 the same or another Tegine in the Nikon chronicle for 1408-1410, and now around 1419-20.

According to the Mamlûk sources, which offer the most detailed chronology of the next decade and a half, the central Çingisid figure in the 1420s and the first half of the 1430s was Muhammed, better known as Ulu(ğ) Muhammed. 72 ʿAyni writes in his notice of the death of Edigû in (822/1419-20) that Uluğ Muhammed was the ruler of the Crimea. This is also repeated in the entries for 1421 and 1422-3, except that in the former year Muhammed encountered problems with the Şeybanid rulers Boraq b. Urus Xan and *Çekre. Despite these conflicts, he was able to maintain his primacy in the Golden Horde with the capital Saray.

It is known from other sources that after Boraq Xan defeated Kebek in 1422, he also caused Uluğ Muhammed to flee, appearing at the Lithuanian court in 1424. 73 ʿAyni continues that in 1424-5 Muhammed Xan continued as ruler in the Golden Horde, though there were no elders in the Golden Horde. While his capital at this time was Saray, ʿAyni reports under 1426-7 that Muhammed was in the Crimea and that the emirs were disagreeing among themselves. Boraq's continuing activities forced

[70] See also Abdûlgaﬀar Kiřimi/Asım, p. 81, for a reference to Tegine in the period following Edigû's death.

[71] Abdûlgaﬀar Kiřimi/Asım, p. 79.

[72] ʿAyni/Tizengauzen 1, 501-502/533-534. See also Smirnov, Krîmskoe xanstvo, pp. 178 ff and 201 ff. for the role of Uluğ Muhammed in this period and beyond.

Devletberdi to the Crimea. According to 'Aynī, in March of 1427 there arrived a letter to the Mamlûk court from Devletberdi stating that he had taken over the Crimea, and that there were three rulers at the time: Devletberdi in the Crimea, Uluğ Muhammed in Saray, and Boraq in the lands neighboring Temürleng. This was followed in 1428 by a letter from Uluğ Muhammed to the Ottoman sultan Murat II stating that he had sent Boraq and his chief bey Mansur (b. Edigû) fleeing. According to 'Aynī, by 1428–9 Uluğ Muhammed was also able to recover the Crimea, though Devletberdi made another attempt on the Crimea in 1429. Finally, 'Aynī reports for April of 1429 that the ruler of the Crimea was again Uluğ Muhammed.

A new set of rivals to Uluğ Muhammed appeared in the first half of the 1430s. After Devletberdi's final attack on the Crimea in 1429, Seyyid Ahmed (b. Kerimberdi b. Toqtamış) attacked the Crimea in 1433. At this time the Şirins supported Uluğ Muhammed against Seyyid Ahmed, who was supported by the descendants of Edigû, that is, the Mangit "ruling tribe". This is also the time at which Küçük Muhammed b. Temür Xan also appears as a threat to the position of Uluğ Muhammed in the Crimea. According to the Umdat Üt-tevârih, Gazi and Nevruz b. Edigû

[76] Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 159.
[77] Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 159. Seyyid Ahmed had appeared in the Golden Horde as the xan of the "Great Horde" in the early 1430s.
[80] Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 162.
fled to Kıcık Muhammed when Boraq became xan, and then Kıcık Muhammed became xan with Gazi b. Edigü as his baş (garaçıl). This work also states that Seyyid Ahmed was supported by the leader of the Qongrats. The new geographic distribution of territories was therefore as follows: Etil, Astraxan, and Sarayçiq belonged to Kıcık Muhammed; the Crimea belonged to Uluğ Muhammed; and Astraxan belonged to Murtaza b. Ahmed b. Kıcık Muhammed.

This series of confrontations among xans running across the map of western Eurasian—described above only in the most general terms—is not of interest in itself for the topic of this chapter. It can, however, serve as an example of a series events which can be better understood when the "four-bey system" is kept in mind. A Çingisid was a legitimate xan only so long as he had the support of four "ruling tribes". Therefore, one can see this period as a time in which a number of candidates for xan—or sets of four "ruling tribes"—competed with one another. The difference in this period, however, is that one can begin to sense an emerging geographic differentiation or localization between these competing rulers or lines.

Though it is not immediately apparent from the secondary literature other than Smirnov's Krımskoe xanstvo, there was a successor to Edigü as the most powerful individual within the "four-bey system" in the Golden Horde (if Edigü was very powerful at all in the last five years of his life). This person was Tegine, leader of the Şirin "ruling

[82]  Abdülgaffar Kirımı/Asım, p. 94
[83]  Abdülgaffar Kirımı/Asım, p. 94. Astraxan is not discussed as a separate xanate in this dissertation since very little information is available on the history of this state.
tribe". It has already been noted on the basis of less reliable sources that he might have been head of the Şirin at the time of the death of Toqtamış, and it is only on the basis of the circumstantial evidence that one can postulate that the Teginya, son of Şix, of the Nikon chronicle can be identified with the son of Örek Temür. A more likely identification, but still only a theory (however convincing), is the emendation of the name 'Ayni's account to read *Takinā.

The first undisputable attestation of Tegin's name in connection with the Şirin "ruling tribe" is from the end of this period in 1432, in connection with Tegin's support of Uluğ Muhammed.\[^{84}\] In this regard, one might add that according to the Umdet üt-tevarih Uluğ Muhammed was first made xan by the Şirin.\[^{85}\] The picture which emerges is that the Şirin, headed by Tegin in the 1430s—but perhaps since as early as the death of his father Örek Temür in the time of Toqtamış—had already been a major factor in steppe politics for decades, since their probable migration in the time of Toqtamış. It seems that they then migrated to the Crimea in the early 15th century, as noted above in connection with Qadirberdi.

The influence of the Şirins was countered in this period by the descendants of Edigü, who seem to have wielded power independent of one another. (This fits quite nicely with the account in the later Cami üt-tevarix, according to which the Edigü's "ruling tribe" branched out upon his death.)\[^{86}\] It has already been noted that in his letter to sultan

---

\[^{84}\] PSRL, xi, pp. 15-17. (There is a typographical error in Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, p. 159 n. 2, where the author gives Nikon, p. 157.)

\[^{85}\] Abdülgaffar Kırımı/Asım, pp. 75 and 92. See also Smirnov, Krimskoе xanstvo, p. 205, where the Barın also find mention.

Murat II, Uluğ Muhammed himself declared that he had chased away Boraq and Mansûr, which would have to be one of the sons of Edigû. Devletberdi must have been supported by yet a third group.

A new political map came into being in the mid-1430s, since henceforth there would be additional states created while the Crimea would continue on an independent course, as would the "Great Horde". The first such development came when Uluğ Muhammed fled to Belev in 1437, after which he took Kazan in 1438. With this, the ancient area of Bulgar had left the system of the Golden Horde together with the Crimea; the "Great Horde" was left as a nomadic state. The xanate of Kazan was thus founded in 1436, 1437 or 1445, depending on which scholar's views one wishes to espouse. According to Vel'yanov-Zernov, this took place in 1445. Most recently Pelenski has argued 1437, while Keenan argues for the date 1436. All these arguments miss the crucial question of how (and when) four socio-political groups joined Uluğ Muhammed (the Çingisid sovereign) to become "ruling tribes" and thus create a "state".

It is not certain which "ruling tribes" participated in the earliest history of this xanate, except that they must have numbered four. The evidence presented by Vel'yanov-Zernov for 1497-1502 allows one to propose that in the beginning the "ruling tribes" in the xanate of Kazan were the same as the original four in the Crimea, namely the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qıpçaq. Eventually, the Mangut also found their place in the xanate. It should also be kept in mind that the former area of Bulgar, by this time known as Kazan, was not uninhabited, but

[87] See the discussion and references in Yakubovskiy, Zolotoya Orda, pp. 414-417; and Pelenski, Russian and Kazan, pp. 23-25.

[88] IKTsTs, i, p. 209 n. 70; and ii, p. 427. See also the discussion in Chapter II.
there is too little information available on which "ruling tribes" participated early on in the xanate to posit migrations or political realignments of other kinds.

Another important new state was founded in 1452, namely the xanate of Kasimov. The creation of this xanate goes back to 1446, when two of Uluğ Muhammad's sons, Qasim (for whom the xanate was named) and Ya'qub/Yusuf, entered the service of Vasiliy II ("the Blind", r. 1425-1462). In 1452 Vasiliy gave Qasim the town known as Gorodets (or Meşčerskiy gorodok) as an appanage, or at least this is the traditional interpretation based on the work of Vel'yanov-Zernov. For one reason or another, this xanate had the same contingent of four "ruling tribes" as did the other xanates of the Later Golden Horde. According to Vel'yanov-Zernov, the four "ruling tribes" in the reign of Uraz Muhammed (r. 1600-1610) were the Arğın, Qipçaq, Calayır, and Mangit, with the Calayır a later replacement for the Şirin. Vásáry discusses an interesting genealogy relating to this area which suggests that the Şirin had been in there for a long time prior to the establishment of the Kasimov xanate; the following is his translation of the relevant section of the document:

In the year 6706 (1298) the Şirin prince Bachmet, son of Usejn, came to Meščera from the Great Horde, and conquered Meščera and settled down there, and his son Beklemiş was born in Meščera. ...

[89] IKTsTs, i, p. 26 ff.; and Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda, p. 418.
[91] I. Vásáry, "The Hungarians or Možars and the Meščers/Mišers of the Middle Volga Region", Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 1 (1975), pp. 237-275, especially p. 264. The document was originally published in Rodoslovnaya kniga knyazey i dvoryan rossiyskix i wiezjix, ii/2 (Moscow, 1787), p. 239.
Vásáry continues that at the very beginning of the 14th century a new appanage with this ruling dynasty of Tatar origin came into being. This territory was later granted by Toqtağış to Vasiliy I (r. 1389-1425), and in short formed the basis for the later territory of the Kasimov xanate.\textsuperscript{92}

This genealogy raises a number of questions at the close of this chapter's discussion, namely what the Şirin were doing in this territory at so early a date. In fact, the date 1298 given by Vásáry actually appears as 1198 in the original source, and according to Vásáry it is usually emended to *1298.\textsuperscript{93} According to the discussion earlier in this chapter, however, the future Şirin of the Crimea are discussed in connection with Toqtağış and possible migrations later in the early part of the 15th century.

First of all, it is quite well known (as noted in Chapter I) that genealogies can be problematic sources due to falsification and other reasons. This particular source may have been compiled as late as 1555 and it is quite possible that legendary accounts were incorporated into this account as well; this point is acknowledged as early as by Smirnov.\textsuperscript{94} If the details regarding the life of Aleksandr Ukoviç can, in fact, be used to establish without any doubt that the Şirin Baymet line was already in this territory in the 1360s, there is created a contradiction within the sources as to the origins of the Şirin "ruling

\textsuperscript{92} "The Hungarians or Možars", pp. 264-266.

\textsuperscript{93} "The Hungarians or Možars", p. 264 n. 94. See also the discussion in M.I. Smirnov, "O knyazyyax measçerskix XIII-XV v.v.", Trudi Ryazan'skoy ungenoy arx. kom. za 1903 g. 18:2 (1904), pp. 161-197. According to Smirnov, some manuscripts of the Rodoslovnaya kniga give 6606 (i.e., 1198), and some give 6706 (i.e., 1298), which he prefers (p. 170).

\textsuperscript{94} "O knyazyyax measçerskix XIII-XV v.v.", p. 173 note.
tribe" in the western territories. Though several local dukes are known in the tradition, the only person who can be attested historically is Aleksandr Uković, whose name occurs in documents which must be dated to the 1360s. Of course, there could have more than one socio-political unit with this name, perhaps even extending to this area. If the dating of this "dynasty" rests, in fact, on tenuous genealogical and other sources dating from a later period, one could suggest that a date further emended to 1398 would harmonize better with the other data presented thus far in this chapter.

The foundation of the xanates of Kazan and Kasimov was followed by the foundation of the Giray line in the Crimean xanate in 1449. It would be a mistake to consider that the Crimean xanate emerged in a vacuum, since it has already been demonstrated that through the 1430s the Crimea competed as one of the centers of the Great Horde, and it should be understood that figures such as Uluğ Muhammad tried to rule over the entire territory of the Golden Horde. The history of the xanate is usually begun with the invitation of the Crimean "land" to Haci Giray (nephew of Devletberdi b. Taş Temür). With this final event, the loss in the territorial integrity of the former Golden Horde was made permanent, since the Crimean xanate was to join the Ottoman Empire. The xanate continued in this capacity as the last survivor of the Golden

[95] "The Hungarians or Možars", p. 264; and Smirnov, "O knyazyax meşçerskix XIII-XV v.v.", pp. 173-176 and notes for additional references to the dating of this individual.

[96] See the genealogy in Mu'izz/Tizengauzen 2, p. 62. On the genealogy of Haci Giray as well as the invitation for him to rule in the Crimea see also Smirnov, Krimskoe xanstvo, p. 207 ff.; and H. Inalcik, "Hacı-Giray I", İslâm Ansiklopedisi, v (İstanbul, 1977), pp. 25-27.
Horded up until the Russian annexation of the Crimea from the Ottomans
Empire according to the terms of the Treat of Kucuk Kaynarca.97

Though the events in the Crimea in this period have received more
attention than the history of its sister xanates, it is not certain who
the various heads of the Crimean ulus beys (by now the qaraçi beys) in
this period were. Certainly shortly after this time the head of the ulus
beys was Mamaq b. Tegine, who was succeeded by Eminek b. Tegine.98 The
struggle between the various factions of the "land", as well as the
struggle between the "land" and the dynasty, is well known. From the
discussion in Chapter II it is clear that as early as 1508 the four
"ruling tribes" in the Crimea were the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and
Qapçaq.99 Therefore, the Şirin "ruling tribe" in what is officially
called the Crimean xanate was little more than a continuation of the
"land" that had ruled the Crimea for most of the first half of the 14th
century, if not longer. It is clear that the appellation "Crimean
xanate" is used out of deference to the line established by Haci Giray
and not the constant elements of the "ruling tribes".100

[97] See H. Inalcik, "Yeni vesikalara göre Kırım hanlığının Osmanlı
tabiliğine girmesi ve ahidname meselesi", Belleten 8 (1944), pp. 185-
229; and A.W. Fisher, The Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1772-1783

Inalcik ("Yeni vesikalara göre", p. 200) follows the Es-seb üs-sayyar
(Muhammed Fuza/Kazembek, p. 73) in noting that Tegine was dead by
the time of the rivalries following Haci Giray's death in 1466. See also
Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée, pp. 316-324; and Manz, "The Clans
of the Crimean Khanate", pp. 308-309.

[99] SIRO 95, pp. 20; and Siroecqkovskiy, "Muxammed-Geray i ego

[100] Again it should be noted to his credit that Smirnov does follow
the role of Tegine and the other leaders of the Şirin, though he does
not conceive of it as part of the "four-bey system".
The last entity which remained of the original White Horde of the Golden Horde was the nomadic "Great Horde" led by Seyyid Ahmed. There is no need to closely follow the history of this group; suffice it to say that after Seyyid Ahmed the Great Horde continued under Ahmed, and then Şeyx Ahmed.\(^{101}\) It was against this group that the Russians won a victory in 1480 and which has found a place in Russian historiography as the throwing off of the "Tatar Yoke".\(^{102}\) After the break-up of the "Great Horde" in 1502-1505 the former "ruling tribes" of this "state" joined the surrounding states, which accounts for the sudden addition of "ruling tribes" to the Crimea xanate.\(^{103}\)

Finally, in 1508, in the Crimean xanate there were listed the "ruling tribes" of the Şirin, Barın, Arğın, and Qipçaq, together with the additional groups of the Qiyat, Mangıt, Sicivut, and "Kourat" (Qongrat).\(^{104}\) These additional groups may be supposed to have been the "ruling tribes" of the Great Horde before its downfall. Clearly, elements of the Mangıts joined the Crimea. They also joined the xanate of Kazan, and certain groupings were also aligned with the Central Asian Şeybanids.\(^{105}\)

---


\(^{104}\) STRIO 95, p. 20; and Siroečkovskiy, "Muxammed-Geray i ego vassali", p. 38-39.

\(^{105}\) See the discussion and references in Chapter II.
The fact that the four "ruling tribes" of the Great Horde had presumably been the Qiyat, Mangit, Sicivut, and Qongrat can serve as a basis for speculation on what the "ruling tribes" of the Golden Horde itself might have been. Although there have been discussions in the secondary literature (based on indirect references from the 16th century) that Noğay of the 13th century was a Mangit, this information can serve neither to prove nor disprove such a hypothesis. One notes with great interest, however, that according to the Umdat üt-tevarih (based on the Tarih-i Dost Sultan) that Mamay is supposed to have been of the Qiyat, and there are other persons mentioned as being affiliated with the Sicivut.\footnote{106} It is still premature, however, to accept such later data for events prior to about 1380 without reservation, especially since many of the names listed in these two sources do not coincide with the individuals discussed in Chapter IV.

Thus this chapter has established that what began as a system of four "ruling tribes" in the White and Blue Hordes comprising the Golden Horde continued through the 15th century and beyond. The "ruling tribes" of the Blue Horde seem to have migrated to the western territories and taken their place beside their ruler Toqtamış, who was probably originally from the Blue Horde, too. The "four-bey system" thrived in this area after 1381, and—no doubt related to the increase in the number of Çingisids available—it spawned a new set of competing centers, each based on the "four-bey system". It is striking in the case of the "Great Horde" that one can speculate on the basis of its

\footnote{106} On the supposed importance of the Qiyat in the earlier period, see for example Abdülgaffar Kirimi/Asım, pp. 19 and 32, and pp. 40 and 45 for references to Mamay as a Qiyat. See also Kafalı, Altın orda hanlığı, for numerous references to supposed "ruling tribe" affiliations of earlier figures (based on the Tarih-i Dost Sultan and the Umdat üt-tevarih).
composition that it continued what was in all likelihood the same set of "ruling tribes" as the earlier Golden Horde. Most importantly, it has shown that the origin of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde can be traced back to the earlier Golden Horde, certainly to before the reign of Özbek Khan, and dating back perhaps to the very origins of the Golden Horde. This shows conclusively that the data for the Later Golden Horde can be applied with complete justification to the sources for the earlier Golden Horde, and therefore to the other Chingisid states of the 13th-14th centuries.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has attempted to suggest that the "four-bey system" known from the successor states to the Golden Horde (i.e., the Later Golden Horde) was the major socio-political organizing principle of all the Çingisid states of the 13th-14th centuries, and in particular of the Golden Horde. According to this system, a "state" consisted of a Çingisid sovereign called a xan who ruled the "state" in cooperation with the leaders of four socio-political units constituting the major unit in the citizen population of what may be called the "land". The first chapter of this dissertation has attempted to deal with the methodological problems relating to the study of this system, among which the most important is problem of the definition of the four socio-political units (in this work these units are called "ruling tribes") which each of the four beys individually led.

The second chapter of this dissertation is the first attempt at a synthesis of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde since the original description of this system over a century ago by Vel'yaminov-Zernov. None of the works mentioning or focusing on the role of the "tribes" or "clans" (i.e., "ruling tribes") of the Later Golden Horde since that time has examined a more extended set of characteristic features other than the fact that the qaraqız beys, as they were called, numbered four and participated in the selection of xans. This chapter extends the discussion of characteristic features beyond the mere fact of their numbering four. The list of features examined included the points that:
1. each bey led his own "ruling tribe";
2. the leader of a "ruling tribe" had his own deputies (and thus a ruling hierarchy) separate from the ruling hierarchy of the Çingisid xan;
3. the chief of the four qaraçı beys, called the beylerbeyi, etc., had a special role as a primum inter pares meaning that he was the chief spokesman for the four beys representing the "land";
4. the beylerbeyi was the head of the army;
5. the four qaraçı beys chose the xan;
6. the four qaraçı beys partciipated in the ritual elevation of the new xan;
7. the beylerbeyi corresponded with foreign rulers;
8. and the four qaraçı beys approved documents and sealed them with a tamğa.

Some of these features are well-documented in the sources for Later Golden Horde, while others can be recognized more clearly with the information of the sources for the earlier period. Similarly, while certain features are not stressed in the sources for the earlier period, they can be sufficiently documented by applying the categories stressed by the sources for the period of the Later Golden Horde.

Chapter III applied this set of characteristic features (minus the additional category of "religious qaraçıs" not attested for the earlier period) to a variety of official and unofficial sources for the 13th–14th centuries. The aim of such an approach was to attest the existence of this same "four-bey system" in the Golden Horde, the Ilxanate in Iran, the Çağatay xanate in Central Asia, the Mongol Yuan dynasty in China, and the Great Xanate.
Just about all the earlier studies of these states examined each Čingisid state independently of the other Čingisid states. This meant first of all that with one or two minor exceptions (such as Smirnov's history of the Crimean xanate) no work ever took into consideration the relatively detailed information for the Later Golden Horde in studying the 13th-14th centuries, even in the case of studies of the Golden Horde. Second, scholars rarely questioned the perspective or biases of their sources, with the result that studies of the individual states approached the unique set of sources for each state and reworked and synthesized the information available without ever questioning why certain details known for the other states were not included in the sources for that particular state. This has resulted in a different traditional approach to the sources for each of the major Čingisid states, resulting in a completely different picture of the organization of each of these states.

In contrast to these earlier studies, the third chapter of this dissertation stressed the accounts in unofficial sources such as Mamlûk chancellery handbooks and travelogues, and even sources which might best be termed anti-dynastic (as opposed to official dynastic histories) to find the data common to these states which suggests the presence of the "four-bey system" hitherto only known from the Later Golden Horde. The result was a picture quite different from any proposed thus far for the organization of not only a single state, such as the Golden Horde (for which the "four-bey system" has been inaccurately described on several occasions), but the Ilxanate, the Çağatay xanate, and possibly the Great Xanate and Yuan China (which carried the mantle of the Great Xanate). This chapter may therefore be considered the first study to
seek the unity in the socio-political organization of the Čingisid states, based, of course, on a later, well-documented paradigm.

The fourth chapter of this dissertation attempted to systematically trace the "four-bey system" established for the Golden Horde on the basis of known individuals rather than scattered descriptions. It took as its working premise the existence of this system in the Golden Horde from its very inception. On this basis, it was able to demonstrate that the career of Noğay in the second half of the 13th century, which has puzzled scholars for many generations, can best be understood as the head of the ulus beys in the Golden Horde. (There is too little evidence to comfortably discuss any earlier individuals as fitting this pattern.)

It also showed that Noğay was followed by Qutluq Temür, who himself participated in the selection of Özbek as the new xan, which in itself lends support to the view that the "four-bey system" did not find its origin in the supposed "reforms" under Özbek, as certain theories hold. There are a number of other individuals known from later in the 14th century who also fit this pattern. The "four-bey system" also allows one to follow the continuity in the state even while there were numerous competing xans, for example during the 1360s-1370s. The result is what may be characterized as an "alternative history" of the Golden Horde describing not the history of the ruling house, but of the leaders of those socio-political units which formed the basis of the vertical organization of the whole of the rank-and-file "citizen" (or "tribal") population (as opposed to tax-paying subject populations consisting of captured peoples and nations).
This chapter concluded with a discussion of the earliest division of the Golden Horde into two separate uluses, the western territory (or White Horde) of Coçi b. Çingis and the eastern territory (or Blue Horde) of Orda b. Çingis. While Fedorov-Davidov and other scholars have tried to analyze the social organization of the Golden Horde on the basis of the division of the Golden Horde into right and left flanks, the data offered by the "four-bey system" denies the validity of such a line of analysis. An awareness of the presence of four "ruling tribes" creates the possibility of asking whether the division into flanks is on the basis of the entire state (i.e., the whole of the Golden Horde), within each of the uluses of Coçi and Orda (known as the White and Blue Hordes, respectively), and later within each of the separate "states" ruled by xans. The possibility that every single reference to a right or left flank must be understood within this context had not even occurred to Fedorov-Davidov and others.

The fifth chapter of this dissertation attempted to bridge the gap between the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde (15th century and beyond) and the Golden Horde in the 13th-14th centuries. Until now one could only theorize that there was a continuity in the organization of the Golden Horde into the period of the Later Golden Horde. (Many did theorize this without even being aware of the existence of the "four-bey system" in the Later Golden Horde, let alone being able to prove its existence in the earlier period.)

This chapter resumed the discussion of developments in the Golden Horde starting with the reign of Toqtamış, who came from the eastern territories (the Blue Horde) to conquer the territories of the White Horde in 1381. If one accepts the accounts in later sources, Toqtamış
came to the western territories in the company of four "ruling tribes" which were originally in the territory of the eastern Blue Horde. This could mean that under Toqtamış the whole of the Golden Horde was reunited under one xan and one set of "ruling tribes". This situation was not to remain for long, since Temürleng (Toqtamış's erstwhile patron) sponsored a rival to Toqtamış named Temür Qutluq, who of course had his own set of "ruling tribes" led by Edigü of the Mangit.

A decade following Temür Qutluq's defeat of Toqtamış in 1398 there was a new set of divisions within the Golden Horde. The descendants of Toqtamış joined what the later sources describe as the main "ruling tribes" under their father to challenge the rule of the successors of Temür Qutluq, still led by Edigü as the chief bey. (It is still not clear whether in the preceding decade the various [former-] "ruling tribes" peacefully co-existed or whether there were other activities which continued unbeknownst to us.) Once again there were competing sets of four "ruling tribes", and this situation continued until the end of the history of the Later Golden Horde.

The former "ruling tribes" of Toqtamış formed the basis of the "states" which formed under a series of rulers, most notably Uluğ Muhammed, culminating finally in the beys' invitation to and the establishment of Haci Giray in what would come to be known as the Crimean xanate. Uluğ Muhammed established a "state" in Kazan in cooperation with a by-definition-independent set of "ruling tribes" (some or all of which bore the same name as and were possibly related to the "ruling tribes" in the Crimea) which came to be known as the xanate of Kazan. The sons of Uluğ Muhammed entered Russian service, but the vassal xanate which they helped found included four "ruling tribes" like
all the other xanates. Although there were other states as well in the Later Golden Horde, the last one to be discussed was the Great Horde, the remnant of what was the once more extensive Golden Horde. The "ruling tribes" in this state were quite different from the "ruling tribes" in the other successor states and were probably the same as the four under Temür Qutluq, who had earlier defeated Toqtamış. It is a matter for further speculation whether Temür Qutluq's "ruling tribes" might not have represented the original set of "ruling tribes" of the White Horde, i.e., the western division of the Golden Horde. Of course, there is the final conclusion that the "four-bey system" must have been equally operative in both the White and the Blue Hordes.

The preceding analysis is one level on which the "four-bey system" discussed in this dissertation may be considered significant. The first chapter of this dissertation discussed yet another level on which the evidence offered by the "four-bey system" may be considered significant. This relates to the discussions of "tribalism" in the professional anthropological literature and the working definition of a "ruling tribe" offered in this chapter.

There is no definition of "tribe" or "clan" in the anthropological literature which can fit the description of the larger socio-political units discussed in this work. The seven points of this definition are not intended to constitute a general theory of tribe applicable to other regions of the world, let alone to Eurasia in other periods. They are, however, the attempt of one historian--perhaps in agreement with no other historian or anthropologist--to arrive at a definition based on historical evidence which would be applicable in one
political-cultural area at one period in time. The main points of this
definition may be summarized as follows:

* * *

1. In the Čingisid states of Eurasia in the 13th-18th centuries, any socio-political group which
could act in concert with three other socio-political groups to constitute the "land" in a
contract with the "sovereign" (a member of the
ruling house descended from Čingis Xan) to form a
"state" was by definition a "ruling tribe". The
number of "ruling tribes" in a given state numbers
four except in the rarest and most unusual
circumstances.

This first point in the definition does not presume that there
were any special requirements as to the origins of the "ruling tribe";
such a requirement held only for the sovereign, who had to be a
descendant of Čingis Xan. This allows one to explain the rise to
prominence of "ruling tribes" such as the Şirin, who were a branch or
minor group of the As. Likewise, a group which was formerly a "ruling
tribe" but had since lost its status (perhaps the Mangit who joined the
Crimean xanate before their rise in status within the xanate, and the
Qipçaq after the rise of the Mangit) was, by definition, a former
"ruling tribe". By means of this semantic device, the definition avoids
applicability to every single socio-political unit in the Eurasian
steppe in this period. This is not to say that every single one of these
units could not have become a "ruling tribe", since this dissertation
holds the opposite as most likely to have been the case. Rather, too
little is known about these other groups except for their names.
2. Each "ruling tribe" was a socio-political group united around a locus of power on the basis of a common ideology. A "ruling tribe" could be left or joined, so that the rank and file membership was fluid and dynamic, and not restricted, static, and immutable. A "ruling tribe" could also be created by a small group of individuals and expand in size as it attracted new members, calling itself either a new "ruling tribe" or the branch of an existing "ruling tribe".

This point in the definition is in response to the justified criticism of anthropologists to kinship-based systems of tribes. In a discussion of medieval states, it is simply not possible to expect that the sources can be sufficiently abundant to offer a detailed picture of social and political life down to the last individual. The same holds true of any model which posits that there were rigidly defined political, linguistic, physiological, or other boundaries between the diverse groups rallying around a particular ideological flag in a given place and time. Instead, the term "locus of power" is intended to mean that the central actors—the leader of the "ruling tribe and his deputies—are well known in the sources, but that the lesser actors are hardly known. At the same time, although kinship is held to be the ideological "glue" binding a "ruling tribe", shifting allegiances were a commonplace among states and presumably on the level of "ruling tribe" membership, too. It is therefore best to treat them as an amorphous group as indicated in Table I without excluding the possibility of the formation of new groups.

3. The locus of power in each "ruling tribe" was a separate hierarchy led by a leader or bey independent of the ruling Çingisid dynasty. The leader or bey was descended from earlier leaders of the "ruling tribe".

Though many studies have taken all the offices and titles known from the various sources and lumped them together in a descending order,
there were, in fact, two independent hierarchies within the Çingisdid states. The xan and the ruling dynasty had one series of offices under them, while the leadership of the "ruling tribes" had another completely independent set of offices. This may be used to understand the role of the vezirate in the Ilxanate and the Çağtay xanate as opposed to the vezirate as described in the sources for the Golden Horde. In Iran and in Central Asia, for example, the vezir served at the will of the sovereign, the Çingisid xan. There was no question as to whether he could be removed or not, and he certainly exercised no control that we know of over the xan.

The leaders of "ruling tribes", on the other hand, were not directly controlled by the xan. The xan seemingly played a role in the naming or legal acceptance of a successor to a deceased tribal leader, just as the tribal leaders ratified a new xan. Otherwise, the only way a xan could have a tribal leader killed was, in effect, to wage an open war against him. (This is exactly the example of Noğay.) It is also clear in the Later Golden Horde that the tribal leader had a whole series of deputies in descending order beneath him. Thus, we know from the Crimean xanate that the tribal leader had his deputies such as first the qalğa and beneath him the nur ed-din.

4. The basis for unity within a "ruling tribe" was a common ideology. This ideology may be defined as the shared belief in a bond of kinship between members of the "ruling tribe". The membership of the "ruling tribe" could also recognize that their "ruling tribe" was descended from an earlier "ruling tribe" of the same or a different name with whose members they may recognize some degree of kinship. The members of a "ruling tribe" below the level of the ruling elite led by the leader or bey did not necessarily share actual kinship bonds, nor are there sources to prove the case for or against actual kinship.
Though it has already been noted above that kinship can serve as the ideological "glue" binding a "ruling tribe", this point asserts that such kinship can also be fictive, as it would have to be to accommodate new members joining a "ruling tribe". (In the case of the dynasty or the ruling elite of a "ruling tribe", however kinship was an important element.) This principle of fictive kinship can also be applied to the purported relationships between various "ruling tribes". While it is possible to date the sons of Edigü forming multiple Mangut "ruling tribes" in connection with the emergence of more than one candidate for xan, there are other "ruling tribes" who supposedly shared ancient kinship ties to distant "ruling tribes" with the same name.

5. Each of these four "ruling tribes" participated in the formation and governing of one "state" and that "state" alone. Each "ruling tribe" functioned independently from related "ruling tribes" and from unrelated "ruling tribes" of the same name in other "states".

This point makes it clear that the Şirin "ruling tribe" in the Crimean xanate was independent from the Şirin "ruling tribe" in the xanate of Kazan and in other "states".

6. There could be more than one "ruling tribe" by a given name owing to the great geographic expanses covered by the Mongol world empire. Thus, branches of the same "ruling tribe" with the same or a different name may have existed at the same time in the territory of the Golden Horde, in the Ilxanate in Iran, in the Çağatay xanate, and in Yuan China, as well as in each one of the states of the Later Golden Horde. Some "ruling tribes" carried the name of a pre-Çingisid socio-political group or "state" known to have had its own internal divisions, but these internal divisions are no longer discernible in the Çingisid period.
One good example to illustrate this point would be the Calayir "ruling tribe" of the Kasimov xanate, which probably had more in common with the competing "ruling tribes" within the same xanate than it did with the Calayirs in Iran who in the 14th century broke away from the Ilxanate to found their own line, or with the Calayirs who were one of the tribes in the Çağatay xanate in the time of Temür leng. 1

7. One of the "ruling tribes" and the leader of that "ruling tribe" within a "state" had special responsibilities in the governing of that "state" as a primus inter pares functioning as the chief spokesman for the "land".

This point relates to the role of the beylerbeyi within the system of the four "ruling tribes". This was a feature shared by all of the independent sets of four "ruling tribes", and it is especially important to any historical analysis because often only this person is documented in the sources, with the example of Edigü in many instances.

***

Finally, there are numerous new avenues for investigation which are opened up by an application of the "four-bey system" as a working hypothesis. Certainly, this dissertation has not offered the final word on the Golden Horde; this is just the first book-length treatment of the data for this system. There is much more work to be done both on the Golden Horde and on the Later Golden Horde, let alone separate projects focusing on the Ilxanate, the Çağatay xanate, and Yuan China. It is the hope of this writer to investigate these problems in a future stage of the project of which this dissertation is only the first step.

Another fruitful project would be further research with an eye to offering a more comprehensive study of "tribalism" in medieval Eurasia than has been offered to date. While it is the hope of this writer that professional anthropologists will consider the evidence presented in this work and offer their own models, there is a wealth of data for medieval Eurasia that remains untouched. It is the hope of the present writer that historians and other scholars will work to gather, make available, and interpret these data.

One of the important questions which arises from the scanty but very suggestive data for the early 13th century is what the origin of this fascinating phenomenon of socio-political organization might have been. None of the scholars who have dealt with the institution of the qaraçu beys has offered a satisfying answer to this question.\(^2\) On the basis of the evidence presented in this dissertation, one cannot help but wonder whether the Čingisid world empire itself arose through this system. This theory is plausible once it is remembered that the accounts of the rise of Čingis Xan in the Secret History or other official

[2] One might note as examples that according to Keenan, there was an agricultural or commercial basis for these "magnates", as he calls them ("Muscovy and Kazan", p. 551). Manz felt that this system was founded by Özbek Xan, as discussed above ("Clans of the Crimean Khanate", p. 281). İnalcıks says in part that the qaraçu beys go back to the qaraçu bo'ol in the Secret History, and he also mentions the nökers, or "companions", the latter showing that he is selecting just one of the terms used in the sources for the Later Golden Horde and seeking that particular term in the 13th century ("The Khan and the Tribal Aristocracy", p. 448 n. 8 and 451-452 n. 17). In the same notes İnalcık refers to the works of Togan, who actually discusses the three subordinates to the Xazar xagan, citing also the subordinates to the leader of the Mangi t "ruling tribe" (see Z.V. Togan, Ummi Türk tarihine giriş, Istanbul, 1979\(^2\), pp. 108 and 114; and Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 24:3, Leipzig, 1939/Nendeln, 1966, Ekzursus 94 and 100a). Xudyakov (Oçerki, p. 188-189; citing N.N. Firsov, Çteniya po istorii Srednego i Nijnego Povol'ja, Kazan, 1919, p. 70) also refers to the possible Volga Bulgarian origin of this system, also based on the account of Ibn Fadlān. See also Veselovskiy, "Neskol'ko poyasneniy", p. 535, for further conjecture on precursors of this system.
dynastic histories such as those written by Rašid ad-Dîn and Cuvaynî are likely to be biased or even fictionalized. Such a model was not applied to the history of the Mongol world empire because it was not known. Now that it has been described for the 13th-14th centuries, pre-13th century sources should also be examined with an eye to establishing the antecedents or precursors of the "four-bey system" in the pre-Çingisid states of medieval Eurasia.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bibliography consists of four sections. Except for the last section, it is intended not to be complete, but to provide a general orientation for the non-specialist reader. The first essay briefly reviews the categories of sources available for each state of the Mongol world empire. The second essay briefly reviews the historiography on the states of the Mongol world empire. The third essay offers a survey of the most important and representative literature concerning the study of "tribalism" in general and the study of "tribes" in Eurasian history in particular. The fourth and final section offers a bibliography of all the works cited.

I. Review of Sources

It is not the intention of this essay to offer an exhaustive survey of all the sources for the states covered in this dissertation. It emphasizes instead those sources which proved useful in arguing the thesis of this work. It should be noted that certain sources are

[1] For additional references to the sources for these states, one may consult the bibliographies of the following works: For the Great Xanate and Čingisid history in the 13th century see D. Sinor, Introduction à l'étude de l'Eurasie Centrale (Wiesbaden, 1963), pp. 294-304. For the Mongol Yuan dynasty in China, see China under Mongol Rule. For the Çağatay xanate and the later successor states, see Aubin, "Le khanat de Çağatai et le Khorassan"; Bartol'd, "Ulughbek i ego vremya"; and Materiali po istorii kazaxskix xanstv XV-XVIII vekov. For the Ilxanate, see Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran. For the Golden Horde, see Grekov and Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Orda; and Spuler, Die Goldene Horde. For the Later Golden Horde see Bennigsen et al., Le khanat de Crimée; Fisher, The Crimean Tatars; Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan' 1445-1552: A Study in Steppe Politics", Ph.D. dissertation; Manz, "The Clans of the Crimean Khanate"; Pelenski, Russia and Kazan; and Vel'yanov-Zernov, IKTsTs.
important for more than one state, and in these cases the appropriate
details will be given either under the heading of the state in which the
particular source originated, or under the state for which the
particular source is most important. Other sources have been noted only
once, but they are included nonetheless. Bibliographic and other
information on the primary sources cited in the course of the first
bibliographic essay will be found in the fourth section of the
Bibliography, including the necessary references in [brackets] following
each entry in the bibliography.

The Great Xanate

There are several groups of sources for the Great Xanate itself.
Many scholars have naturally turned to the Secret History of the Mongols
(Mongqol-un niuça tobça'an) for the origins and earliest history of the
Mongol world empire. The position taken in this dissertation is that the
Secret History, much of which discusses events prior to the thirteenth
century, is an official document of limited, even dubious historical
value. (This is not even to mention the formidable philological problems
in the correct interpretation of many passages, since this work was pre-
classical Mongol transcribed with Chinese characters and with an
interlinear Chinese translation which may not be reliable.) Much of what
is related in this work, especially as its relates to events before the
reign of Čingis Xan and especially before he was born, is arguably
fictionalized or at best legendary.

Additional sources on the Chinese side include the Shen wu ch'in
cheng lu, which gives an account of the early campaigns and is said to
be based on very early official records, and the Meng ta pei lu. For the
purposes of this work, however, such sources offer too little detail to be of much use when confronted with the data of the later sources.

Dynastic histories such as the Tārīḫ-i cahânguşâ of Cuvaynî and the Câmi' at-tavârîx of Raṣîd ad-Dîn (discussed under the Ilxanate) present the official view of the history of the Mongol rulers from the early 14th century; but when confronted with the evidence of the other sources, one must question their content regarding the role of the various "ruling tribes" and other socio-political units in the rise of the Mongol world empire. Otherwise, very little reliable information is available for the role of the various tribes in the rise of the Mongol world empire which might hint at any pattern outside the official dynastic sources.

Among the most important unofficial sources for later centuries are the travelers; but in the 13th century they, too, are very often ill-informed. John of Plano Carpini left Lyons in 1245 on his mission across Eurasia to an audience with Batu and to luckily witness the installation of Gûyük. The mission of William of Rubruck (1253–1255) also took him to see Batu and the later xan Mêngke. These two travelers offer many important observations, but they were not sufficiently well informed of the structure of Mongol society to understand what they were observing.

One additional source which can be mentioned here is Haython's La flor des estoires de terres d'Orient written in Old French. Haython lived in Armenia at the beginning of the 14th century and presented this work to Pope Clement V in 1307. It incorporates the accounts of earlier individuals such as the trip of Xetum to the court of Mêngke Xan in 1253–1255 and the trip of Smbat to Gûyük in 1248.
Yüan China

The Islamic sources, especially Raṣīd ad-Dīn, are important for the foundation of Mongol rule in China insofar as they concern the life of Qubilay Xan. After that the main source must be considered the official dynastic history of the Yüan, the Yüan shih. It is argued in this dissertation that the Yüan shih must be treated as a dynastic history with its own official perspective fitting events into the traditional patterns of the Chinese annals. Since this work was composed at the beginning of the Ming dynasty which followed, one can arguably treat the Yüan shih as a later document which may not accurately represent the Mongol traditions still existing earlier in the Yüan period. The translation by Ratchnevsky to which reference is made is a portion of chapter (chūan) 85 relating to administration included in his published translation of chapter 112.

Another Chinese source, the Keng shen wai shih of Ch'üan Heng, covers the period 1333-1368, therefore the later period of the Yüan dynasty. This work was also compiled during the Ming dynasty. It is hoped that a later stage of the project of which this dissertation is an early stage will also be able to incorporate data from the Yüan tien chang, which includes correspondence between the rulers and various officials.

Special emphasis is placed in this work on the Islamic sources for the government of Yüan China. These consist of the section dealing with China in Raṣīd ad-Dīn, and two travelers quoted in the chancellery manuals by 'Umari and the later work of Qalqašandî (for details see the sections on the Ilxanate and the Golden Horde respectively). There is great value attached to these reports in this dissertation because they
are external—and in the case of the travelers "unofficial"—observers. They offer a completely different perspective—fitting in with the model described in this dissertation—on Yuan administration in contrast to the official Yuan shih. Since these reports are based on first-hand observation, they are in every way legitimate sources.

The Çağatay Xanate

There is a dearth of sources on the history of the Çağatay xanate, which explains why so few works have treated its history in depth. While the important dynastic histories such as the Câmi' at-tavârûx offer details on the early history of the xanate, there is a gap for what follows. In the Temürid period there is already an abundant corpus of primary sources on which to draw.

Special emphasis is placed in this work on the writings of Ibn 'Arabşâh, who was born in Damascus in 1392. He moved to Samarkand in 1400-1, studied in Mongolia in 1408-9, went via the Crimea to Edirne where he served as private secretary (kâtîp üs-sîr) to Mehmet I, then to Aleppo in 1421, and finally to Cairo in 1436, where he knew Abû l-Maḥâsin. He died in 1450. Both of his works quoted, the 'Acâ'id al-maqdûr fi axbâr Timûr and the Fâkihat al-xulafâ', offer unique information relating to the model described in this dissertation. Though the autobiography is widely cited as a standard source on the "tribal" composition of the Çağatay xanate, the Fâkihat al-xulafâ' has been mysteriously ignored by most scholars. Later works also offer interesting observations on tribal organization in this state, and the Temürid-period chronicles offer extensive details on the relations of Central Asia with the Golden Horde at the end of the 14th century.
One of the important works for the history of the Timurid state is Niẓām ad-Dīn Ṣāmī's Ẓāfarnāma. Niẓām ad-Dīn Ṣāmī was living in Baghdad when it was taken by Temürleng in 1392-3. In 1401-2 Temūr ordered him to write in simplified language the history of his campaigns based on the official chronicles, which includes events to 1404. Niẓām ad-Dīn Ṣāmī died by 1409 or 1411-2. Another of the important Timurid-period sources was the Ẓayl-i Čāmi' at-tavārīx by Ḥāfiz-i Abrū (d. 1430), who was another friend of Temūrleğ.

The Tarix-i Raśīdī was written by Mirza Muhammed Haydar Duğlat (1499-1500--1551), who was of the eastern branch of the post-Çağatayid rulers which ruled in Moğolistan or Cata. This work, much of which consists of extracts from the Ẓāfarnāma by Yazdi, was written in the 1540s and is one of the main sources for its period.

Muḥammad b. Valī was born in Balx, served Sayyid Mīrakṣāh Kāsānī, and left for India in 1625. He returned to Balx in 1630, and at the command of the Astarxanid ruler Nādir Muḥammad he began his work, the Bahr al-asrār fī manāqib al-āxyār, in 1634.

Abu ۱-Ǧāzi lived 1603-1663 and was the son of the Şeybanid Arab Muhammed Xan. He spent a decade starting 1629 in exile at the Safavid court and in 1644-5 became xan of Xiva. His historical work, the Şecereyi Türk, is one of the important chronicles, in part because of the rich genealogical material for which he is sometimes the only source. (Of course, this also begs the question of his reliability.)

One collection of sources relating to the later successor states to the Çağatay xanate is the Materiali po istorii kazaxskih xanstv XV-XVII vv.. This work collects translations from Persian and Turkic
sources, mostly unpublished, relating to the history of Central Asia and especially the Kazakhs in the 15th-17th centuries.

The Ilxanate

There are several important categories of sources for the Ilxanate. The most famous are the dynastic histories of Cuvaynî, Raşid ad-Dîn, and Vaşşâf together with a series of later works. The earliest of these was by Cuvaynî, who lived 1225-1283. Cuvaynî was a leading Ilxanid official, a fact which is reflected in the official point of view in his work, the Târîx-i cabân-guşâ. It was completed in 1260, prior to most of his appointments.

The great historian Raşid ad-Dîn, compiler of the first universal history, the Câmi' at-tavârîx, was born in 1247-8 in Hamadân. He was a leading Ilxanid official, serving as vezir under Ğâzân (r. 1295-1304) and Ölceytu (r. 1304-1316), but he fell into disfavor in the following reign of Abû Sa'îd and died in 1318.

Vaşşâf dedicated his work, the Tacziyat al-amşâr va-tacziyat al-a'sâr, also known as the Kitâb-i mustaţâb-i Vaşşâf or simply as the Târîx-i Vaşşâf, to the Ilxan Ölceytu Xudâbanda in 1312, when his patron, the vezir Raşid ad-Dîn, presented him to the ruler.

Hamd Allâh Mustafvi Qazvînî (1280—1349-50) served as a leading Ilxanid official, ruling over various territories. His Zayl-i câmi' at-tavârîx is a continuation of the Câmi' at-tavârîx for the years 1336-1344 originally intended as an appendix to the Zâfarnâmâ, but appended by his son Zayn ad-Dîn to the Târîx-i guzîda.

Muhammad ibn Hindûşâh Naxçivânî was born in the late 13th century into a family serving the Ilxans. He served in the chancellery
or divân al-inşâ' under Ḥiyāṣ ad-Dīn, who was vezir to Abū Sa'īd (r. 1317-1335) and Arpaxan (r. 1335-1337). He began this handbook in the reign of Abū Sa'īd, but finished it late enough to dedicate it to the Calayirid ruler Uvays (r. 1356-1374).

The Tārīḫ-i Ṣayx Uvays by Ahri (also Ahari) referred to in this work deals primarily with the Calayirids. The author lived in Azerbaycan in the first half and middle of the 14th century and dedicated this work to the Calayirid rule Ṣayx Uvays (r. 1355-1374).

Finally one should mention Gaffārī (1515--1567-8), who dedicated his world history, the Nusax-i cahan-ârâ, in 1564-5 to Şāh Tahmâsp. In many of his points Gaffārī follows Naṭanzî, which is why he is mentioned in this work. (On Naṭanzî see below under the Golden Horde.)

The most important unofficial works quoted here for the Ilxanate are the Arabic chancellory manuals, notably those of 'Umarî, who is also quoted by Qalqaşandî. (These works are discussed in greater detail in the section on the Golden Horde.) These sources offer details which do not emerge from the dynastic histories, but which coincide completely with the system described in this dissertation. The authors of the chancellory manuals were not interested in forcing a point of view; rather, they were intending to be as accurate as possible when it came to these states. For this reason, without the chancellory manuals the institution to which this dissertation is devoted could not be described at all for the Ilxanate, since it represents interests contrary to those of the dynasty.
The Golden Horde

The sources for the Golden Horde, the main focus of this dissertation, deserve a bit more detailed appraisal than might be necessary for the other states. As stated in the Introduction, the sources for the Golden Horde can be divided into four groups, namely the indigenous official and "unofficial" sources, and the external official and "unofficial" sources.

Falling in the category of external "official" source would be the Russian chronicles. Much use has been made of them by scholars, but it should be noted that the Russian chronicles, while extremely valuable for the second half of the 14th century and beyond into the period of the Later Golden Horde, only create confusion when it comes to any time before the middle of the 14th century; this point has also been made in the discussion of the role of Noğay in Chapter IV. In the later period of the Golden Horde this dissertation has made use of the Nikon chronicle, which includes many different sources from earlier periods.

The most valuable sources for this period are without a doubt the external official and "unofficial" sources from the Middle East, namely the Arabic encyclopedic and chancellery works composed at the Mamlûk courts. Though some of these narrative sources can be considered official sources, they do not seem to have imposed a serious bias on events in the Golden Horde. First of all, though the Ilxanate was a hostile state, the Mamlûk states were allied with the Golden Horde. Merchants and envoys traveled between the two states, and much of the information is based on first-hand accounts of knowledgeable informants. This is extremely clear when the career of Noğay is considered, because the wealth of what is taken here to be accurate detail is in sharp
contrast to the laconic word or two of misinformation contained in the Russian chronicles. The Arabic sources continue to provide valuable information in the later period as well. In particular the virtues of the (arguably) "unofficial" chancellery manuals cannot be emphasized enough. Their information is indispensable for arguing the main thesis of this dissertation, since much of the remaining data would not necessarily prove sufficient for describing institutional continuity from the time of the Golden Horde down to the Later Golden Horde.

All scholars dealing with the Golden Horde have made use of the extremely useful collection of extracts edited and translated by Tizengauzen, and the present dissertation is no exception. Tizengauzen's work, which is also known under the French title *Recueil de matériaux relatifs à l'histoire de la Horde d'or*, consists of extracts from various Arabic sources for the history of the Golden Horde together with bio-bibliographic information for each source included. Given the high standards of Tizengauzen's editing, other editions have been consulted in this dissertation only when there have been particular philological problems requiring comparison of editions.

This work has created a false impression which too many scholars relying solely on Tizengauzen's translations have taken for granted, namely that Tizengauzen exhausted the corpus of Arabic and Persian sources. In some cases it is true that the extracts exhaust what is to be found in a particular work (such would be the case with Mufaddal and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa). In other cases, additional material repeating earlier sources is extracted (as is often the case with Qalqašandī), while details concerning later periods of Čingisid period are left out (as in the case of Cannābī). It is clear, however, that Tizengauzen has
not exhausted all the material in Qalqašandi's 14 published volumes. There are also some authors whose works have still not been published to this day, such as Muḥibbī, making comparison difficult.

Another problem which is especially vital is that one simply cannot always rely on Tizengauzen's translations. Though he is usually reliable, in some instances one must take exception to his interpretation of a particular passage (the translation might not even hint that he is emending the text or reading an unclear word or name in a very subjective manner), and especially important for institutional history is that he translates various technical terms from Arabic and Persian either inconsistently or very often with the same generic word. This is fine if one checks the original; unfortunately many scholars (especially Soviet scholars) have all too obviously not checked the originals. In this way, many works written relying solely on the translation in this work are seriously flawed. Tizengauzen's work must, however, be considered one of the most important contributions to the study of the sources for the Golden Horde to date.

While the volume of Arabic sources edited and translated by Tizengauzen was already published during the 19th century, the second volume of Persian sources was published posthumously only in the 1940s. One should keep in mind that this one volume of extracts and translations includes Raṣīd ad-Dīn, Cuvaynī, and a whole series of other authors. Obviously in this treatment of the Persian sources Tizengauzen is much more selective than in the case of his extracts from Arabic sources. What is more, the Persian texts are given only for the less common works.
Coming now to the individual works themselves, the Arabic-language work which forms one of the cornerstones of this dissertation is the *Masâlik al-abṣâr fī mamâlik al-amsâr* by Ibn Faḍl Allâh al-'Umarî, whose writings on the Mongol world empire were recently published by K. Lech. 'Umarî was born in Damascus in 1301 into a family which served the Bahri sultans of Egypt from about 1293-1393 in the chancellery or dîwân al-inşâ. Despite various fluctuations in his career, he served in the chancellery in Damascus until his death in 1349. His *At-ta'rîf bi-l-muṣṭalaḥ aṣ-ṣarîf* is a shorter work which also contains valuable information.

Another author of such a manual was Muḥibbî; unfortunately his work, the *Taţâţif at-ta'rîf bi-l-muṣṭalaḥ aṣ-ṣarîf*, is not yet published. Muḥibbî (also known as Ibn Nâzîr al-Cayṣ [or: al-Cuyûş]) was born in 1326 in Aleppo, where his father was in the military as nâzîr al-cayṣ. During his father's lifetime Muḥibbî worked in the chancellery for thirty years. After his father's death in 1377 he joined the military himself, where he continued to serve until his death in 1384.

Both of these authors, as well as others, are incorporated into the *Ṣubḥ al-a'ṣâ fī ṣinâ'at al-inşâ* of Qalqašandî, who was born 1355. Qalqašandî started work in the chancellery in 1389 and continued perhaps until his death in 1418.

Another "unofficial" source is Ibn Baṭṭûta, who was born in 1304 in Tangier and died in Morocco in 1368-9 or 1377. It is important to note that his travelogue or Rihla was retold from memory—without the notes which he had lost—years after the fact and was written down by Ibn Cuzayy, who may share some of the responsibility for problems
regarding parts Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's account, namely to Volga Bulgaria, China, Syria, and Arabia.

Among the scholars composing other genres of historical works, Rukn ad-Dīn Baybars, author of the Zubdat al-fikra fī tārīx al-hicra, died in 1325. Much of his work for the earlier period is derived from Ibn al-ʿAtīr.

Ibn Duqmāq was born around 1349 and was a zealous Ḥanafi. His commissioned history of Egypt, the Nuzhat al-anām fī tārīx al-islām, goes up to A.H. 779/1377-8 A.D. According to one scholar, Ibn Duqmāq's sources in another work on Islamic cities was based on better authorities than used by Maqrīzī. His works were also used by 'Asqalānī and Ṭūnī.

Ṭūnī was born in 1361 in Syria and knew Turkish, which he used for the purposes of translation and correspondence. He worked as inspector of pious foundations (nāẓir al-aḥbās) and later as muḥtasib, in 1425-6 he became chief qāḍī of the Ḥanafīs, and he was a professor at the Muʻayyadiya medrese. He fell from favor in 1449-50 and died in 1451. His history extracted by Tizengauzen is entitled the 'Iqd al-cumān.

'Asqalānī lived 1372-1449 and his career included positions as lecturer, professor, head of a college, and muftī, finally reaching Al-Azhar in Cairo. Most of works were compilations. The work included here is his history entitled Kitāb anbâ' al-ghamr bi-abnā' al-ʿumr.

Mufaddal continued the work of Ibn al-ʿAmīd (d. 1273), and his own work, An-nahc as-sādi d wa-d-durr al-farīd fī mā baʿda tārīx bin ʿAmīd was completed in 1358.
Nuwayrî (1279-1332) was one of the great encyclopedists. He rose to the ranks of nāzir al-cayq and later to nāzir ad-diwan. His famous work is the Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab.

Ibn Xaldûn was born in Tunis in 1332, spent much of his earlier career in Andalusia and North Africa, and finally reached Cairo, where he died in 1382. He is famous for his work in history and sociology, including the Kitāb al-'ibar wa-diwan al-mubtada wa-l-xabar fī ayyâm al-'Arab wa-l-'Acam wa-l-Barbar used here.

The work referred to in this dissertation as the compilation Târix salāṭīn Miṣr wa-ṣ-Ṣām wa-Bayt al-muqaddas wa-umarā'īhâ by Ibrâhîm Muğulṭây, who may be the same as 'Alâ' ad-Dîn Muğulṭây (d. A.H. 762/1360-1 A.D.), repeats the account in an untitled manuscript also studied by Tizengauzen. That particular work seems to constitute the eighth volume of some larger work.

Another famous Mamlûk historian, Maqrîzî (1364-1442), was an imam at the Hâkim mosque and a professor at the Mu'ayyadiya medrese. Of his many works quoted here is the Kitāb as-sulûk li-ma'rîfat duwal al-mulûk.

Additional works about which little can be said are the marginal notes in a manuscript of Dâhabî which this dissertation refers to as the Continuator of Dâhabî, and the anonymous Taṣrif al-ayyâm wa-l-'uṣûr bi-sirat al-malik al-Manşûr.

The Persian-language sources composed at various courts are also of great importance for the Golden Horde, both in the earlier and later periods. The sources for the earlier period would again include Raşîd ad-Dîn and Cuvaynî, which must be considered indigenous "official" sources. When the affairs of the Golden Horde become closely associated with the Temûrid struggles, one can mention Temûrid chronicles such as
Şaraf ad-Dîn 'Ali Yazdî's and Niẓâm ad-Dîn Şâmî's respective Žâfarnâmas, the work by Ḥamd Allâh Mustavfî Qazvînî and its various continuations, the continuation of Raṣîd ad-Dîn's universal history, and so on. For the Golden Horde these later sources can be considered official, though external, sources.

The Muʾizz al-ansâb fî șacarat al-ansâb, which was composed in 1426–7 at the command of Şâhrux, is a work of genealogy based on the Šuʿab-i pancâna of Raṣîd ad-Dîn with the addition of many later personages of the 14th century. This work offers many genealogies which cannot be corroborated from any other sources, especially as relates to personages affiliated with the Later Golden Horde. It is therefore not entirely clear how one should evaluate this work.

One work receiving considerable attention in this dissertation was written by Naṭanzî, who was probably from Sistan and lived at the court of Iskandar b. 'Umarşayx, to whom he dedicated one work in 1413. After this Naṭanzî went to Herat to the court of the Temûrid Şâhrux, to whom he dedicated this version of his work entitled the Muntaxab at-tavârix, also known as the "Iskandar Anonymous".

The Muntaxab at-tavârix (and several works which draw on it, notably Ǧaffârî), in contrast to the other works which can be used without serious misgivings, has caused a great deal of confusion in the study of the divisions of the Golden Horde. Yakubovskiy, who wrote one of the standard works on the Golden Horde, made use of the extracts of this work from Persian sources which formed a part of the Nachlass of Tizengauzen, emphasizing them heavily. First Aubin, then Safargaliev, and most recently Yudin, have called into question the reliability of this source. Many theories have been built on the unique assertions of
this work regarding the divisions of the Mongol world empire, and in
this work all the information in this work has been used with caution
and clearly labeled as suspect. (See the detailed discussion in Chapter
IV.) The position taken in this dissertation is that the information
contained in this work for the problem of the "Blue" and "White Hordes"
and other matters of Golden Horde history is to be considered
unreliable.

There are also some fairly early Turkic documents preserved in
Russian and Italian translations, and some original-language ones
preserved from the end of this period. Otherwise, the later Turkic
sources do have references to this period as well, but some of them are
so late that it is difficult to trust them completely. The Tarih-i Dost
Sultan, also known as Ötemiș Haci tarihi, has been studied by several
persons, most notably Bartol'd, Kafali, and Yudin. (It is also available
to scholars through the information passed on in Abdülgaffar Kirimi's
Umdat üt-tevarih, since the original history is unavailable even in
manuscript.) This work offers many details not corroborated by other
sources, and in the case of the White Horde-Blue Horde controversy
offers yet a third possibility, the "Gray Horde" (see Yudin's
discussion.)

Other "unofficial" sources for the early period, the travelers
John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck, are important for the
early Golden Horde, but do not offer much detail which has been
incorporated in this work for the Golden Horde. For the period of
transition from the Golden Horde to the Later Golden Horde, the remarks
of Schiltberger and Herberstein have been found useful since their
accounts are applicable to the earlier period as well.
The Later Golden Horde

For the Later Golden Horde there are a great number of official indigenous sources which may be used. A whole series of chronicles were written in the Crimea xanate by writers who were often members of the Çingisid Giray line. For example, the Gülbün-i hanan was written by Halim Giray Sultan (d. 1823), a Çingisid descended from Mengli Giray.

The Umret üt-tevarih, on the other hand, is an outstanding example of an official indigenous source representing the point of view of the Şirin "ruling tribe". Its author, Abdülgaffar Kırım, whom the xan banished from the Crimea in 1744, was a member of the Crimean aristocracy, namely the Şirin "ruling tribe". Rather than presenting a simple history of the Giray line of Çingisids that ruled the Crimea, this work stresses the importance of the role of the Şirins in the history of the xanate. Much of this work's account of the earlier period is based on the Tarih-i Dost Sultan, the unique complete manuscript of which was in the library of Togan and has been used by Kafalı. It is yet to be proven how reliable this work is for the early period prior to 1380. This work publishes many important Turkic documents emanating from the states of the Later Golden Horde, some published for the first time. This work is also known under the title Ötemiş Haci tarihi.

In addition, a series of other chronicles have also been consulted, including the Es-seb üs-seyyar, the published translation of which is highly abbreviated. Its author, Seyyid Muhammed Ruza (d. 1756) was also a member of the Crimean aristocracy.

The Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han was written by Remmal Hoca, who was physician to Sahib Giray and later entered the service of Sultan Selim
II. This work pays particular attention to the upheaval in the system of "ruling tribes" in the early Crimean xanate.

The Tarih-i Islam Giray Han, on the other hand, pays very little attention to the "ruling tribes". Its author, Haci Mehmed Senai, flourished in the 1640s.

Finally, one may make note of the Telhis ül-beyan fi kavanin al-ı Osman used by Smirnov, which does not seem to be the most reliable source for a discussion of the "ruling tribes" in the Crimea.

Though no indigenous source from the xanate of Kazan seems to have survived, for the Kasimov xanate there is a very important work by the qaraqı of the leading Calayır "ruling tribe", at the beginning of the 17th century, Qadır Ali Calayır. His history is a condensed translation of Raşid ad-Dîn's Câmi' at-tavârıx with an appended history of more recent events relating to the history of the steppe and the foundation of the Kasimov xanate. Berezin never published his planned translation of this work, which has been utilized by Vel'yaminov-Zernov. It is an invaluable source on the "ruling tribes" of the Kasimov xanate.

Another category of sources is the diplomatic correspondence (the letters being called yarlıqs), which should also be considered official indigenous sources, since they offer a very narrow perspective on a portion of the ruling elite. One work by edited by Vel'yaminov-Zernov and Molla Hasan Fayzhanoğlu (MJXX) published a number of yarlıqs issued by the Crimean xans. The originals of these documents are unavailable today. Bennigsen et al. have also published a work on the documents preserved in the Ottoman archives. Many of them are published for the first time, while many had been published earlier by Kurat and others.
Additional documents for the Crimea in later periods have been published by Laškov.

There are also the exchanges of diplomatic correspondence preserved in the Russian archives, but very little of this has been published. Certain volumes publish portions of the Crimean Acts, while others portions of the Nogay Acts. The archives of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union still contain a wealth of unpublished and inaccessible source material.

In this period the Russian chronicles are very important, as are all sorts of other East European sources. This dissertation has referred to the Nikon chronicle for the earliest period, relying on the work of Keenan, Pelenski, and others for sifting through them for this period for certain details not forming the basis of the argument of this dissertation. One exception to this is a recent work containing translations from Russian chronicles relating to the history of the so-called Siberian xanate in this period. Certain other East European sources such as those for Lithuania have been used by Spuler and have not been consulted directly.

One unusual source is Prince Kurbskiy's History of Ivan IV, which was written by a former member of the Muscovite court who defected to Poland. Although this is an antagonistic official work with a definite bias, there is no reason for considering his passing remarks about campaigns against the xanate of Kazan to be unreliable as passing observations. (There is an on-going debate over the authenticity of this work.)

Another unusual source is the genealogical work Rodoslovnaya kniga knyazey i dvoryan rossiyskix i v'iezjix. This particular source may
have been compiled as late as 1555 and it is quite possible that legendary accounts were incorporated into this account.

Also important are "unofficial" sources such as the Western travelers such as Herberstein, who was ambassador in Moscow from 1517-1526, and Schiltberger traveled to this area in the early 15th century. Peysonnel and Baron de Tott, on the other hand, were later observers of the Crimean xanate. Peysonnel lived in the Crimea from 1753 on, and Baron de Tott was at the court from 1767 on.

II. Historiographical Essay

In this section as well it is not possible to cover in depth the entire historiography relevant to the history of the Čingisid states ranging from medieval Russia and Iran to China. It would be useful, however, to briefly review the standard scholarly accounts of Mongol rule in each of these states, emphasizing those works which treat the organization of these states.¹ (Those works which have already been cited in the course of this dissertation will not be cited in full.)

The Mongol World Empire

There are a number of older works which attempt to survey the whole of Čingisid history, including the works by C. D'Ohsson and H. Howorth. Though these still have some value for the translations which they offer to those unable to deal with the original, they are sadly out of date. (The latter also has a reputation for unreliability.) The classic work by R. Grousset involved no first-hand use of primary sources and is also to be considered obsolete. The recent survey by J.J. Saunders, though completely based on primary and secondary literature available in European languages (excluding Russian!), is the most readable recent synthesis by a single author with any semblance of accuracy. The collective work Central Asia includes brief surveys of the various Čingisid states often based on original research. The collective work being produced by the researchers of the "Sonderforschungsbereich 12, Orientalistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Zentralasiens" affiliated with the University of Bonn will have to be considered the most authoritative synthetic treatment of the whole of the Mongol world empire once it is available. In all cases in each of the subsequent sections the reader is referred to this volume for additional references to secondary works.


The Great Xanate

There have been a number of studies of the rise of the Mongol world empire, but there have been very few attempts to deal with the organization of the Mongol states in this period; needless to say none have discussed anything even approaching the "four-bey system". The most notable work is Vladimirtsov's Obščestvennyi stroy mongolov, which is an important evaluation of the social structure of the Mongols from the time of Čingis Xan through the Mongol states of Inner Asia in the 16th-17th centuries. Vladimirtsov was, however, a linguist by training, and his evaluations of social categories (within a Marxist framework) were based according to terminology rather than seeking a common framework.

The other general histories of the Mongol world empire have also attempted to deal with the organization of the Mongol world empire, but their efforts, often centered around the Secret History, bear no relation to the system described in this dissertation.

Yüan China

The Mongol dynasty in China has not received all that much attention, surprisingly enough, which is why several recent works are all the more welcome. Franke's Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, though considered out of date by specialists in Chinese history, remains the only general treatment of Chinese history which is useful for the historian of the organization of the peoples of the Eurasian steppe. The same can be said for his treatment of the the Yüan period. Dardess has written a book on the Later Yüan, but his main interest is in Confucianism. Franke's recent work on the transformation of the Mongol state into the Yüan dynasty discusses select topics in the
transformation of the Mongol-style ruler to a Buddhist Chinese-style ruler, though of course he is not aware of the "four-bey system" discussed in this dissertation. Finally, the work China under Mongol Rule edited by Langlois contains much useful information, but it lacks such basic discussions as the composition of the Yuan shih. The discussion of Yuan administration by Farquhar also slavishly follows the official annals, as discussed in Chapter III.

The Çağatay Xanate

The Çağatay xanate has not received the kind of general historical treatment that it should, in part because there is a serious dearth of source material for the earlier period. Barthold's Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion contains the standard treatment of the early history of this xanate, but there is no work covering the later period with the exception of the brief survey by Hambly in the collective volume mentioned earlier. The most authoritative treatment of the period 1334-1380 is Aubin's article "Le Khanat de Çağataï et le Khorassan". Most recently, Manz has written a dissertation ("Politics and control under Tamerlane") and related articles concerning this xanate, but her discussion of the notion of tribe and tribal organization should be compared with the system described in the present dissertation.

The Ilxanate

Medieval Iranian history has received many monographic treatments in the various periods. The Mongol period received its first treatment by J. Hammer-Purgstall in his Geschichte der Ilchane, das ist der
Mongolen in Persien,
and more recently by Spuler in his Die Mongolen in Iran. The latter work is encyclopedic in nature, as is usually the case with the works of Spuler, but does not offer any conceptual advancement in its treatment of this state. The articles in the Cambridge History of Iran by J.A. Boyle\(^9\) and Petrușevski\(-\)y (this article is a distillation of his larger monograph in Russian) may be considered standard treatments of Ilxanid history. A cursory analysis of the history of the Ilxanate based on the "four-bey system" reveals that the work of Petrușevski\(-\)y does not even include those institutions which are of importance for this study; one must often conclude that Petrușevski\(-\)y--like any other historian--is extremely selective in his work in order to buttress the model upon which he bases his analysis. Spuler's work does briefly mention certain institutions which are relevant here, though with entirely different conclusions, as discussed already in Chapter III. Interestingly, many of the sources on the Ilxanate referred to in this dissertation have already been cited in an early work by Uzunçaşılı, but his treatment has remained completely outside the mainstream of studies on the Ilxanate.\(^10\)

The Golden Horde

The major studies of the Golden Horde have been written by Hammer-Purgstall, Spuler, and Yakubovski\(-\)y, Vernadsky, and Safargaliev.\(^11\)

\[8\] i-ii (Darmstadt, 1842-1843).

\[9\] "Dynastic and Political History of the İl-Khâns", Cambridge History of Iran, v, pp. 303-421.

\[10\] Osmanlı devleti teşkilâtına medhal.

\[11\] A thorough review of the historiography of the Golden Horde may be found in Fedorov-Davidov, Obščestvenniy stroy Zolotoy Ordı, pp. 3-25.
The first put together very diverse sources and drew the outlines for the study of the Golden Horde. Spuler wrote an intimidating work of an encyclopedic nature focusing in its political history section on Mongol relations with Eastern Europe. Though it incorporates many more sources than the present author is equipped to handle, Spuler had no imagination whatsoever in his treatment of the organization of the Golden Horde. Anybody who is mentioned in the sources under one title or another is lumped together with everyone else in his table of rulers at the end of the work. By its very thoroughness in certain respects, however, subsequent Western scholars have made the assumption that there is very little left to say on the Golden Horde.

Yakubovskiy, who calls Spuler a charlatan, does not necessarily offer a better treatment than Spuler. Though his work is a substantial improvement over earlier efforts by other Russian scholars such as Nasonov (unfortunately, Barthold did not express much interest in the Golden Horde at all), his accounts are very often based on one version in the sources which he uses without really analyzing the differences between the accounts, especially the conflicting accounts. An especially harmful result of his work was the wide-spread acceptance Naťanzī's views concerning the Blue and White Hordes as more accurate than the reports of the other sources. It has taken many decades to recover from this misinterpretation.

In the West a very influential scholar has been Vernadsky, who wrote many volumes on the history of medieval Russian, all of which refer heavily to steppe history. Unfortunately, Vernadsky's method cannot be considered acceptable today, and every conclusion he makes on the basis of the non-Western sources must be considered unreliable.
Though the work of Safargaliev has received a warm reception, his work contains many new interpretations which are often based on a method which must also be considered unacceptable. Except for an isolated reference or two, he seems to have not used Arabic and Persian sources in the original. His work has in turn been at the root of a new series of misinterpretations especially by students of the Golden Horde with an orientation in Russian history.

Another Soviet scholar, Egorov, has attempted to give a new picture of the organization of the Golden Horde. Although he is to be commended for finally taking into serious consideration the sources on the existence of the ulus beys, his method—when viewed in terms of the later sources—is flawed in that he attributes a completely different institution and function to each different title given in the sources (even though some of these are clearly different translations of the same presumed original title). This comes out most clearly in an article in which he gives a schematic diagram of the organization of the Golden Horde.

Another recent writer on the Golden Horde, the Turkish scholar Kafalı, also gives a picture of the organization of the Golden Horde which is clearly misguided when viewed from the perspective of the same institutions in the time of the Later Golden Horde. His references and coverage of sources is extremely uneven.

As for the organization of the Golden Horde, the first serious work was conceived and written by Berezin, whose views must be considered obsolete, though his work is still widely used. Another major work devoted solely to the social structure of the Golden Horde, that by the archeologist Fedorov-Davidov, is another work which should be
considered controversial. Though his thoroughness is to be admired, the preference of Soviet archeologists and ethnographers for writing history has in general not led to very fruitful results. Fedorov-Davidov bases his work on his conception of the ulus system and its relation to the division of the state into right and left flanks. He does not, however, differentiate the various levels of flanks to which the sources might refer.

Most recently, Halperin has also written a work treating Russian and the Golden Horde. As a historian of Russia, the author studies the history of the steppe from the perspective of its impact on Russia. Though this is a common approach to the study of Russian history, the author displays numerous misconceptions about the history of the Golden Horde, and, despite numerous references to the scholarly literature on the Mongol world empire, misses much of the most important literature on the Golden Horde.

The Later Golden Horde

The study of the Later Golden Horde has been a field apart from the rest of the study of the Mongol world empire. Some scholars such as Spuler, Yakubovskiy, Vernadsky, and Safargaliev have taken the events of the Golden Horde past 1500, well into the period of the Later Golden Horde. Unfortunately, it must be said that their conception of the organization of the Later Golden Horde was limited to a Western-style autocracy. On the other hand, the scholars focusing strictly on the Later Golden Horde took it for granted that the specialists on the earlier Golden Horde had spoken the final word.
The first major study of any of the successor states to the Golden Horde was Vel'yaminov-Zernov's study of the Kasimov xanate. It is a testament to his scholarship that this study (based on Oriental, Slavic, and Western sources) remains the basic work on this state to which modern scholars still refer.

The next major study, not counting Hammer-Purgstall's brief history of the Crimean xans extracted from his history of the Ottoman Empire, was Smirnov's history of the Crimean xanate, which also surveyed a wide range of Slavic and Oriental sources. This major undertaking, complemented by Laškov's numerous studies of land tenure in the Crimea, is still not surpassed with the exception of certain additional studies to be found in the recent useful work by Bennigsen et al. on documents from the Ottoman archives relating to the Crimea.

Special mention must be made, however, of the article by Siroečkovskiy on the reign of Muhammed Giray. Although this scholar did not have access to Oriental sources, his work is otherwise a model of synthesis based on Slavic and Western sources.

For the xanate of Kazan the first major history was the work by Xudyakov. Xudyakov relied mostly on the Slavic sources, as have more recently Keenan and Pelenski. There have been no other recent scholarly treatments of the history of this xanate. With the exception of studies on the Nógay Horde, including most recently the article by Bennigsen and Quelquejay, the study of the other successor states to the Golden Horde is even less developed.

The "Four-Bey System"

The institution of the qara çı beys was first examined by Vel'yaminov-Zernov in a twenty-six page study forming a part of the second volume of his monumental history of the Kasimov xanate. Though later scholars have not improved upon the main outlines of this institution as drawn by him, this is not to say that more cannot be said about this topic: since the 19th century, many weighty tomes have been written on the history of the various Mongol states and many more sources have been made available. Though Vel'yaminov-Zernov identifies the qara çı beys in the xanates of the Crimea, Kazan, Kasimov, the Nogays, and Siberia, he limits himself to describing them as the heads of a group of "ruling tribes" which at first numbered four and to listing the names of the "ruling tribes" which were involved. Any modern work must take as its first step the work of Vel'yaminov-Zernov, as does Chapter II of this dissertation.

Smirnov discusses certain features of the "four-bey system", even comparing early individuals such as Nogay with later figures such as Tegine. His early discussion of the qara çı beys was not, however, complete with regard to the various facets of their role, nor was his source on them, the Telhis ııl-beyan, reliable.

Sirotëkovskiy's 1940 article on the Crimean xan Muhammad Giray (r. 1515-1523) and his vassals also examines the role of the qara çı beys in the Crimea. On the characteristics of the qara çı beys Sirotëkovskiy follows Vel'yaminov-Zernov, adding additional references in the Russian and other East European sources; he does not make use of the Islamic primary sources. He identifies the Sirin in the Crimea as early as the 14th century and says that they spread elsewhere from the Crimea.
Quite another approach to the question of the qaraqı beys in the
Crimean xanate can be found in the works of the Ottomanist H. Inalcık.
He offers profound insights into the questions regarding the value of
the Ottoman and late Tatar-Ottoman source material, many of which he
himself introduces to the study of the role of the qaraqı beys.
Unfortunately, he makes token use of the Russian secondary materials
and does not take Russian primary sources into account at all.
Regarding the origins of the system, he takes the term nöker used in
connection with the qaraqı beys in some later sources to mean that the
system should be equated with earlier usages of the term for the 13th
century.

E.L. Keenan, Jr. has taken the opposite approach to the question
of the role of the qaraqı beys, basing his work mainly on the Russian
chronicles. Although he is the first to really use the abundant material
contained in these sources for the study of the diplomatic relations
between Muscovy and the various states of the Later Golden Horde, his
use of these same sources is less than adequate for understanding the
role of the system within the xanates themselves, which without direct
access to the Islamic sources (only barely in evidence in his work) is
futile. His conclusions regarding this institution is to call them
"magnates" without explaining further what he means. In an earlier
review of the work by Safargaliev he does refer to the presence of four
emirs in Iran and the Golden Horde, but he does not pursue this point
further.\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{Manz} has produced an interesting series of works, one of which
deals directly with the "clans" of the Crimean xanate. This article,

which is based mainly on Polish and Russian sources, offers a very useful survey of the role of the four main "ruling tribes" in the history of the xanate. One of the main objects of her article is to establish the genealogy of the Şirin beys. İnalcık, however, had shown both earlier and in a subsequent article in the same journal that Abdülgaffar Kirimi's Umdet üt-tevarih already gives this information. Manz also offers one of the only interpretations to date of the origins of the "four-bey system". She followed the misrepresented translation in Safargaliev's work (as discussed in Chapter IV) to conclude that Özbek Xan had founded this system as a part of his efforts to centralize this state. Both theories must be rejected on the basis of the evidence presented in this dissertation.

Finally, Bennigsen and his colleagues have written an interesting number of works trying to assess the role of the various "ruling tribes" in the states of the Later Golden Horde. A most important work is their recent assembly of Crimean documents from the Ottoman archives, which brings some new sources to bear on the question of the qaraçı beys. Though their work is notable in combining both the Ottoman and the Slavic sources, they do not break new ground conceptually regarding this system.
III. Review of Literature on "Tribalism"

This section will briefly survey the important anthropological works on tribes and pastoral nomadic societies in general and follow it with a section surveying the important works on tribes and pastoral nomadic societies in Eurasia. Such a review of the literature is a useful survey of the state of the field, but it should be noted that this literature does not form the intellectual basis of the argument of this dissertation. If anything, the reader should note that since the data for medieval Eurasia do not dovetail with the synchronic and diachronic data studied by anthropologists, their models—as they exist—are not suitable for the historian of the states discussed in this dissertation. This section therefore offers an appropriate backdrop and contrast to the empirical working definition of a "ruling tribe" in Eurasia in the Čingisid period offered in the Introduction and based on the "four-bey system".

A useful survey of the whole question of "tribalism" may be found in Tribesmen by M.D. Sahlins. Sahlins surveys what are considered to be the main models of a tribe, the varying degrees to which patterns of kinship determine what constitutes a tribe in different societies, and the different social structures prevalent among tribal societies. He

also underscores the opposing concept of tribal descent as a political ideology rather than a statement of actual fact. Though Sahlin's work surveys a range of "tribal" societies, there is no model described which fits the data for the "four-bey system" in medieval Eurasia during the Çingisid period.

One of the parts of the world which has been the focus of various theoretical approaches to the study of tribal society is the Near East. A recent attempt at a detailed description of a nomadic society in the Near East is D.P. Cole's *Nomads of the Nomads. The Āl Murrah Bedouin of the Empty Quarter.* Applying a series of terms based on the conventions of the group studied, Cole defines a tribe as all the male and female descendants of a pre-Islamic personage named Murrah. According to Cole, the tribe marks significant social, cultural, and even linguistic boundaries because of the differentiation created by the practice of endogamy. He further defines other units such as the 7 clans of 4-6 lineages each constituting the tribe, and the households uniting according to principles of patrilineal descent to form segments inclusive of kinship. Though this work represents a pragmatic approach, the level of society Cole examines cannot be studied for medieval Eurasia, nor would his approach be free of criticism from certain scholars such as Fried whose work will be discussed in a moment.

Another view of the problem of "tribe" is offered by E. Marx. He has written series of articles arguing that, at least for the Middle


[5] *Nomads of the Nomads,* pp. 82-104.
East, the tribe was "a social aggregate of pastoral nomads who jointly exploit an area providing subsistence over numerous seasons". The territory each tribe controlled was for its own subsistence or for the use of others, but various kinship and other structures existed for the purpose of controlling these resources. He also expresses the view that tribes can exist without a structural organization and a central leadership, but that these are likely to develop under the influence of neighboring polities. In a response to Marx, P.C. Salzman takes issue with aspects of Marx's definition. In particular, he disagrees with Marx's assertion that people will organize to control a certain territory because there exists a need to control it. According to Salzman, there is no connection between the territory a tribe controls and the subsistence area it does not control as a factor affecting tribal size and organization.

Iran also offers fertile territory for work on the question of nomadic society. One of the classic studies of any nomadic society, F. Barth's *Nomads of South Persia. The Basserî Tribe of the Khamseh*


Confederacy, offers a very detailed and useful discussion of Basseri economy. Barth's remarks on the size of herds needed for survival and related issues have nearly universal application. He also describes in brief the organization of the Basseri tribe (or il) as consisting of subgroups in the order tribe, section, oulad, and tent.

Most recently, the essays in a collective volume discussing tribal society in Iran and Afghanistan offer a representative sampling of the most recent attempts to come to an understanding of problems of tribe and society in this area. The definitions of tribe, state, and empire offered in this work, however, are intended strictly as tools for understanding the problems of tribe vs. state and the phenomenon of revolution in the modern period. No attempt is made at a comparison of the organization of the tribes in this area in the Ilxanid or post-Ilxanid period. In this work, L. Beck offers the following description of the vertical organization of the Qaşqai tribes:


[14] The main works on the Ilxanate do not cover the issue of tribal society adequately (see Chapter III). A recent work by J.J. Reid is devoted to tribal society in Iran in the post-Mongol period, but drawing on Mongol history as well. (Tribalism and Society in Islamic Iran, 1500-1629, Malibu, 1983). Reid writes that the two major elements in the organization of the qızılbaş system were "the il (sub-tribe, tribe) and the uymaq. The il was a conceptualization of the union of all the different qızılbaş tribes. It was similar to the concept of ulus then current in Central Asia among the Üzbeks, and the remnants of the ulus Çağhatai" (p. 28). It should be noted, first of all, that Reid leaves his terms undefined, and that his description of the organization of the Uzbeks and certainly of the Çağatay xanate does not coincide with the overview of the organization of the Çağatay xanate offered in Chapter III. Cf. also J.E. Woods, The Agquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire. A Study in 15th-9th Century Turko-Iranian Politics (Minneapolis-Chicago, 1976), especially pp. 8-12.
1. confederacy (il led by a member of the ruling family called an ilkhani);
2. consisting of five large tribes (taifeh) and smaller tribes led by a kalantar (from a family of xans called khavanin);
3. of which each tribe consisted of a vast group of sub-tribes (tirsh) ruled by a headman or kadkhuda;
4. tirshs consisted of pasture groups composed of encampments composed of households.¹⁵

Finally, E. Gellner offers the following definition of "tribe" in a companion essay to the articles in this work:¹⁶

A mutual local mutual-aid association, whose members jointly help maintain order internally and defend the unit externally. This assumption of peace-keeping and collective defence responsibility, which thus defines the tribe, is contrasted with a situation in which the maintenance of order, and defence, is assured by the central state and its specialised agencies (courts, nominated officials, police forces, army). ... These units may but need not be defined in terms of kinship ... The most significant trait of these groups is the simultaneous coexistence of diverse groups at different levels of size.

Gellner is clearly trying to reconcile the various contradictions inherent in the different descriptions of tribal society to date, such as what the role of kinship might have been in various tribes. Gellner draws, however, a clear distinction between tribe and state. Gellner's definition would not exclude the "ruling tribes" from consideration as "tribes", except that he sees an opposition between the "tribe" and the "central state", while in the Čingisid period the "ruling tribes" are an integral part of the "central state".¹⁷

[15] "Iran and the Qashqai Tribal Confederation", The Conflict of Tribe and State, pp. 284-313. The schema offered by G.R. Garthwaite is more closely approximating the description by F. Barth in his Nomads of South Persia ("Tribes, Confederation and the State: An Historical Overview of the Bakhtiari and Iran", pp. 314-330, especially p. 316.)


An opposite point of view is represented by M.H. Fried, who first questioned the validity of the term "tribe" in an article entitled "On the Concepts 'Tribe' and 'Tribal Society'", and who has since devoted a whole monograph to this subject. Because Fried's work represents the nihilistic extreme and has found an echo in the writings of one recent writer on Eurasian history (Lindner), it is worth treating Fried's views in detail at this juncture. According to Fried, the term "tribe" has been used as a catch-all phrase describing any possible social aggregate. It has often been substituted for an accurate description of how a particular society was organized, nor do groups that have been referred to as tribes usually coincide with politically boundable groups. The term does not necessarily imply that the members of a group cluster around a political leader, that kinship or anything else is the main social bond in the group, nor can it be used to predict how decisions are made in that group. As Fried writes:

[18] This article is reprinted in Essays on the Problem of Tribe. Proceedings of the 1967 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society., ed. J. Helm (Seattle, 1968), pp. 3-20. The contributors to this volume, a symposium organized by Fried following the original publication of his article, follow his lead in questioning the validity of "tribe" as a unit of analysis. They offer a series of critiques of the concept of "tribe" based either on mathematical models or examples drawn from areas of the world other than Eurasia. The one constructive contribution in this volume, an attempt at a typology of 100 "tribal" societies, includes examples drawn only from Africa, North America, South America, and Oceania. (R. Cohen and A. Schlegel, "The Tribe as a Socio-Political Unit: A Cross-cultural Examination", pp. 120-149.)


... there is no "tribal level" of polity. The concept of tribe has been used in connection with totally acausal organization and with command structures at the veritable level of kingdoms, or at least of emirates. A terminology that implicitly equates one of the old men, who is given to haranguing the young among the Ona, with the khan of the Mongols, cannot be of much use.22

Fried himself is following a theory of historical determinism when he states that tribalism (in his terminology "secondary tribalism") is a secondary development which occurs as a reaction to the presence of complex political structures known as states.23 While according to him some of its manifestations appear as early as the formation of the earliest states five millenia ago, the process of tribal formation has been mostly centered around the period of European colonialism and imperialism.24 As for pre-state societies, local aggregates formed in them through devices which were not military or economic (unlike the later societies), but ideological and ceremonial.25 He chooses to not call these pre-state aggregates "tribes".

Fried also associates the phenomenon of "secondary tribalism" with heavy military organization. According to Fried, although "secondary tribalism" does not necessarily lead to the formation of a

[22] The Notion of Tribe, pp. 64-65. It should be noted here that, at least according to my understanding of the "four-bey system", the Mongol khan does not fall into the category of tribal leader.


[24] The Notion of Tribe, p. 10. Gellner also argues in favor of the view that tribes are formed by contact with states: "Nomads are used to a level of technology which presupposes centers of artisan production and trade, that is, towns, and protection of these town by a specialized agency, namely the state." ("Tribal Society and its Enemies", The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan, p. 442.) Elsewhere Gellner has referred to his own distinction between "primitive" and "marginal" tribalism (The Saints of the Atlas, London, 1969, pp. 2-3). See also Khazanov, Nomads and the Outside World, pp. 151-152.

"secondary state", Eurasia is a special example where this has led to the creation of the great steppe empires which fall into the category of "secondary states". In this regard Fried follows Lattimore, whom Fried quotes as stating that feudalism in China did not result from the conquest of an agricultural people by nomadic warriors, but rather that China helped form steppe society "by extruding fragments of 'backward' groups".

Fried is correct in asserting that the term "tribe" cannot be a term with universal applications. He denies that a precisely defined social unit limited in time and space can be called a "tribe" (or any suitable neologism) and serve as a useful tool of analysis. Although Fried denies the validity of the term "tribe", a form of it ("secondary tribalism", which remains undefined) is nevertheless supposed to have come into being after the emergence of the first states. He simply skirts the issue by offering his own catch-all phrase, "secondary tribalism", which is, in fact, fraught with the exact same problems he notes for the term "tribe".

It is clear that anthropological thought on the question of tribalism and pastoral nomadic society in general ranges from a use of terms specifically geared to a particular society to the other extreme of denying any validity to the term "tribe" at all. At the same time it can be seen that any references to Eurasia at all are to works which are not authoritative on medieval Eurasian history and which are certainly not aware of the "four-bey system" discussed in this dissertation.


Works on tribes and pastoral nomadic society in Eurasia have usually not been at the forefront of professional debate in the discipline of anthropology. Scholars who have discussed Eurasian society at all have done so relying almost exclusively on the secondary literature. In his discussion of pastoral nomadism in Eurasia, Sahlins bases himself strictly on the works of Lattimore and Krader, neither of whom was aware of the "four-bey system", for information on how the states of Eurasia were organized.

Lattimore's classic works are certainly thought-provoking, but his use of primary sources is limited mainly to Chinese sources. His discussion of medieval Eurasia is based mostly on the secondary literature of his own day, and nowhere does he discuss any aspect of the history of the Čingisid empire in detail. His view of the rise of pastoral nomadism is to consider it, as noted earlier, a marginal society arising as a result of state influence.

Krader, like Lattimore, is not a medievalist. In one of his main works he offers a wealth of observations on the social systems of a number of modern Mongol peoples and the Kazakhs, but his discussion of the social structure of the Ordos Mongols in the 16th century is limited

[28] For a review of works dealing with pastoral nomadic societies in Eurasia see the references in Khazanov, Nomads and the Outside World, pp. 233-263.


to one Chinese description compared with a passage from the Secret History of the Mongols.\textsuperscript{32}

The appearance of Khazanov's Nomads and the Outside World, however, is likely to change this approach for the better by introducing a significant amount of new data and literature to the discussion of nomadic societies in Eurasia in particular. The wealth of data in this work literally invites a page-by-page commentary, but it will suffice to note that Khazanov is not aware of the "four-bey system", which means that even his conclusions are not directly applicable to the discussion in this dissertation. There are, however, a number of works which do contribute to the discussion of what a medieval Eurasian nomadic tribe was, and they are worthy of review here.

E.E. Bacon's Obok. A Study of Social Structure in Eurasia\textsuperscript{33} is one of the landmarks in the anthropological literature on Eurasian topics. The work is devoted to a description of what she calls obok structure, which is segmented lineage as first described by E.E. Evans-Pritchard.\textsuperscript{34} In her description primarily of Hazara Mongol society in


\[\text{(33)}\quad\text{Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 25 (New York, 1958/1966).}\]

\[\text{(34)}\quad\text{Obok, pp. vii-viii and 39-44. Though her unpublished description of segmented lineage predated Evans-Pritchard's The Nuer. A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People (Oxford, 1940), the delay in its publication allowed Evans-Pritchard's terminology time to gain acceptance (Obok, p. vii). For a survey of the literature on segmentary lineage see Khazanov, Nomads and the Outside World, pp. 144-148.}\]
Afghanistan as well as of Kazakhs and other groups she examines descent, property ownership, and other subjects of immediate concern to the anthropologist.

Bacon's work is of special interest here because she attempts to apply to the medieval Mongols what she knows as an anthropologist concerned with the modern Hazara Mongols. For Bacon the medieval Mongol tribal genealogical groups were political and territorial units, but the tribe was ideally a patrilineal descent group. At the same time, numerous non-kin groups and individuals became attached to the Mongols and even became incorporated into subsequent genealogies. Bacon's two main sources for these conclusions are the *Secret History of the Mongols* and Raşid ad-Din's *Câmi' at-tavârîx*. It difficult to accept the *Secret History of the Mongols* as a reliable historical source for events before the life of Čingis Xan. It is also widely know that genealogies are often subject to later manipulation, as Bacon herself demonstrates when she discusses Raşid ad-Din's assertion that Čingis Xan's ancestors go back to Japheth, son of Noah.

More recently J. Cuisenier has written on kinship and social organization among the Turkic peoples from the ancient Türk to the


[36] On these two works see the review of sources in Part I of the Bibliography.

modern Türkmen. This misguided attempt at a mathematical analysis of the organization of these peoples fails because the author takes fragmentary data for each period and then proceeds along the assumption that the nomads of Eurasia were organized in exactly the same way in each grouping in each historical period. Cuisenier offers the following definition of the oba, the name for a "tribe" known according to the author among the Selçuks:

1. Families and camp groups cluster around an already existing entity that is identified by a name, various emblematic marks, and a legendary genealogy.

2. Power within the group is exercised by a war chief whose titles are inherited through the paternal line but whose real authority is based on talent and success.

3. The fact that families and camp groups attach themselves to an oba does not preclude the formation of larger aggregations made up of splinter groups belonging to a different oba.

4. Aggregations of a number of different oba or of splinter groups belonging to different oba usually have a warlike purpose such as raids, pillage in enemy territory, or conquest.

Point 1 is somewhat puzzling, since it seems to preclude the possibility of new obas emerging. Point 2 could actually be a valid statement for the later period, except that Cuisenier does not make it clear whether he means the oldest son or any descendant in the paternal line from a

[38] J. Cuisenier, "Kinship and Social Organization in the Turko-
Mongolian Cultural Area", Family and Society: Selections from Annales:


particular leader. Point 4 is not a very sophisticated statement on pastoral nomadic economy.

S. Szynkiewicz has devoted an article to kinship organization among the medieval Mongols. He, too, bases his discussion on the Secret History of the Mongols. Since this dissertation takes the position that the data for the 11th century contained in this source has little historical foundation, it is of questionable relevance to a discussion of the later Čingisid states. Even so, his conclusions are not necessarily to be discarded since they may reflect on the practices within the ruling family at an early time.

Another important recent work is G.E. Markov's study of the nomads of Asia. For the medieval Mongols Markov makes many general statements, and the main problem is pinning him down on his terminology (such as what he understands by the term "tribe"). He also bases much of what he writes on the Secret History of the Mongols, on the translation of Rašid ad-Dīn's Câmi' at-tavârîkh, and on Vladimirtsov's Obščestvenny stroi mongolov.

On the aspects of vertical organization Markov states simply that there were sub-tribes (urug) and tribes (irgen). He describes the tribal system as an economic, military, and political organization whose


[42] Kočevniki Azii. Struktura xozyaystva i obščestvennoy organizatsii (Moscow, 1976), especially pp. 49-102 on the historical Mongols. E. Gellner offers a very stimulating review of earlier Russian writings on the question of pastoral societies in Eurasia covering the works of Vladimirtsov, Vyatkin, Potapov, Tolibekov, Markov, and Khazanov in the "Forward" to Khazanov's Nomads and the Outside World (pp. ix-xxv). Though all of these works cannot be covered here, it should be mentioned that the historian must be ever mindful of the uncritical approach to historical sources which many of these authors represent.
genealogical-tribal structure developed very slowly and only as the result of strong ethnic and military-political collisions. At every moment the genealogical-tribal structure seemed an ossified traditional scheme unable to transform itself quickly enough according to the needs of military and economic organization. For this reason, he writes, the genealogical tribe did not always fully coincide with the existing elements of a communal-tribal organization. According to Markov, the decimal organization of the army was a part of the social structure in the earliest period. He also discuss the heads of uluses, but again only for the period of the Secret History. For the later period Markov relies very heavily on I.Ya. Zlatkin's history of the Cungarian xanate. His great "discovery" is that the social organization of the Mongols in the 16th-17th centuries rested on military-tribal organization. He says that for the 15th-16th century Mongols, however, that it is very difficult to describe their political structure. It should be remembered, however, that this is exactly the period of the four qaraqi beys in the Later Golden Horde.

Finally, a series of stimulating works in the historiography of Eurasia has come from the thoughtful pen of Rudi Lindner, who attempts

to reach a usable definition of a medieval Eurasian nomadic tribe.\textsuperscript{47}

Incorporating many of the conclusions reached by anthropologists, he writes that "shared concerns" played a greater role in the formation of medieval tribes than did kinship, since the primary purpose of the tribe was the political one of defending and improving the position of the tribesmen \textit{vis-à-vis} the outside world. Anyone willing to follow the tribal chief and share the interests of the tribesmen could join this political organism. As the tribe grew, the "idiom of kinship" came to be the symbolic explanation of "comradeship", and the ideology of kinship came to determine the structure and content of genealogies.\textsuperscript{48}

Lindner's observations are a needed corrective to earlier studies of steppe history which discuss tribes without stopping for a moment to explain what is meant by a tribe.\textsuperscript{49} His definition is not without its shortcomings, however, and the most important among these is that he does not offer any suggestions on how to understand the subdivisions within that unit which he calls a "tribe". His application of a sophisticated conception of a nomadic tribe to the Huns serves to demonstrate this inadequacy.

According to Lindner, the Huns were a single tribe with Attila as its leader. The Huns may have relied on pastoralism for their livelihood

\begin{footnotes}

\item[48] "What was a Nomadic Tribe?", pp. 698-701.

\item[49] One recent example of this is T.I. Sultanov's \textit{KoçevYe plemena Priaral'ya v XV-XVII vv. Voprosi étničeskoy i sotsial'noy istorii} (Moscow, 1982), which attempts to catalog all sorts of "tribes" without any attempt to define the term or differentiate between the various groupings.
\end{footnotes}
before they arrived north of the Black Sea, but once they crossed the Carpathians they turned to "predatory extortion". Their success attracted new members from the sedentary population who had no background as mounted archers, leading to a decline in "tribal military skill".\textsuperscript{50}

The first question one must ask here is could the Huns have been a nomadic tribe at the same time as they were drawing on a sedentary population for members?\textsuperscript{51} If they were no longer nomadic, can they still be considered a "tribe" according to Lindner's definition? In his application of the concept of tribe to the earliest Ottomans, Lindner concludes that once the economic base of the Ottomans had become sedentary, once they had a growing infantry at the core of their army, and once they had to adapt themselves to administering a sedentary and sedentarizing society, the tribal chief was then a settled ruler.\textsuperscript{52}

More importantly, Lindner's two examples of the Huns and the early Ottomans simply does not take into account the other Eurasian groupings of socio-political units (also known as "tribal confederations") described in Chapter I.

There are numerous other works concerning medieval Eurasian history which have not been included in this survey, in part because they do not advance the understanding of what a medieval nomadic tribe in Eurasia was. Many of these works have been covered in the historiographical essay in Part II of the Bibliography.

\textsuperscript{50} "What was a Nomadic Tribe?", pp. 701-706.

\textsuperscript{51} Lindner suggests elsewhere that the Huns were no longer nomadic once they were in central Europe. See his "Nomadism, Horses and Huns", pp. 13-14.

\textsuperscript{52} "What was a Nomadic Tribe?", pp. 706-709.
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