ASIATISCHE FORSCHUNGEN

MONOGRAPHIENREIHE
ZUR GESCHICHTE, KULTUR UND SPRACHE
DER VÖLKER OST- UND ZENTRALASIENS

Begründet von Walther Heissig

Herausgegeben von Thomas O. Höllmann

Band 161

2023

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Ishayahu Landa

Marriage and Power in Mongol Eurasia

A History of the Chinggisid Sons-in-law

2023

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2023
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Primerate, Budapest
Printed in Hungary

ISSN 0571-320X
eISSN 2940-3642
ISBN 978-3-447-12052-4
eISBN 978-3-447-39421-5

To Thomas T. Allsen (1940–2019), my teacher I have never met.

Content

Notes on dates and transliterations XI

List of abbreviations used in the text XIII

List of tables XV

Acknowledgements XVII

Introduction 1
- Research aims 1
- The state of the field: existing research on Chinggisid matrimonial relations, key approaches, and limitations 5
- Methodological remarks 9
- Sources and limitations 10
  - Chinese sources 10
  - Islamicate sources 12
  - Other sources 14
- Theoretical remarks 14
  - The term “tribe” 14
  - The term “imperial sons-in-law”, its variations and historical contexts 21
- Structure and scope of the discussion 26

Chapter I: Güregens before and under the United Empire (end of the twelfth century until 1259) 28
- Sons-in-laws of the Golden Lineage under Chinggis Khan’s rule (1206–1227) 41
- Sons-in-law under the Qa’ans (1227–1259) 49
- Conclusion 63

Chapter II: Chinggisid güregens under the Yuan 67
- The “inner circle” 67
  - Qonggirad 67
  - Ikires 78
  - Önggüt 82
  - Oyirad 88
  - Olqunu’ut 92
  - Qïpchaqs 93
  - Other tribes 99
- The “outer circle” 106
  - Uyghurs 106
  - Tibetans 112
  - Korea (Goryeo 高麗) 116
- Conclusion 124

Chapter III: The Chinggisid güregens of the Ilkhanate 130

The beginnings: Hülegü Khan (r. 1256–1265) ... 131
Abaqa (r. 1265–1282) ... 140
Yol Qutlugh ... 145
Taghai ... 147
Malika ... 149
Toghanchuq (Ṭūghājūq) ... 151
El Qutlugh ... 152
Öljetei ... 153
Abaqa: additional remarks ... 155
Aḥmad Tegüder (r. 1282–1284) ... 156
Küchük ... 158
Könchek ... 160
Chichek (Chijāk) ... 160
Mainu ... 161
Sailun (Sāylūn) ... 161
Keltürmish (Kāltūrmīsh) ... 162
Arghun Khan (r. 1284–1291) ... 164
Öljetei ... 165
Öljei Temür ... 168
Geikhatu (r. 1291–1295) and Baidu (r. 1295) ... 171
Ghazan (r. 1295–1307) ... 174
Öljeitü (r. 1304–1316) ... 181
Abū Saʿīd (r. 1316–1335) ... 191
Conclusion ... 194

Chapter IV: The güregens of the Jochid Ulus (mid–thirteenth – early fifteenth century) ... 200
Jochid matrimonial relations from 1206 until 1259: A Reassessment ... 201
The Jochid ulus from Berke to Toqto'a: 1256/1257 – 1312/1313 ... 205
The Jochid ulus from Özbek to Janibek (1307–1357) ... 213
Conclusion ... 221

Chapter V: The güregens in the Ögödeid and the Chaghadaid realms (until 1347) ... 225
Ögödeids ... 225
The Chaghadaids: From the mid-thirteenth century to the 1340s ... 237
Conclusion ... 248

Chapter VI: Legacy and memory of the imperial in-laws: The Great Crisis and beyond ... 253
The (post-)Ilkhanate ... 254
The Chaghadaid realm(s) ... 262
The Jochids: The Great Turmoil (Rus. *Velikaya zamyatnya*) ... 273
The Greater Yuan during the Crisis (up to the early fifteenth century) ... 282
Looking beyond the Crisis ... 287
Conclusions: Decline, power and sacrality ... 301

Conclusion: In-laws in the Chinggisid imperial architecture. General observations and final discussion 309
Who were the Chinggisid güregens and what was their range of power? A detailed close-up 310
The güregens in the Chinggisid power universe: Strengths and weaknesses 317
Matrimonial connections: General remarks 325
Concluding remarks 332

Appendices 335
Appendix I: Selected personalities (extended information and name variations) 337
Appendix II: Glossary 347

Bibliography 353
Abbreviations 353
Sources 354
Studies 361
Electronic/Internet databases 399

Index 401

Notes on dates and transliterations

The general transliteration system for Arabic, Persian, and Turkic follows the IJMES (International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies) standard, while the Persian and Turkic names and terms are transliterated as the Arabic ones for the sake of simplicity. In those cases when the Persian or Arabic names cannot be clearly identified and translated, the transliteration is given in capital letters.

Pinyin is used for Chinese, while all the Chinese characters are given in their traditional (*fantianzi* 繁体子) form. This is also relevant for all bibliographical information, regardless of whether the originals were published in the simplified or traditional form. All Chinese terms and names are given in the main body of the text with the Chinese characters by the first mentioning of the term or name.

For Old Slavonic/Russian, the ALA-LC transliteration system of the Library of Congress with small changes is used. Thus, "t͡s" for "ц" is being replaced by "ts", "ï" for "и" is being replaced by "y", and "è" for "э" is being replaced by "e" for the sake of simplicity and print matters.

Originally Mongol or Turkic names, even if found in the Persian and Arabic sources only, are usually given without the diacritical signs in the presumed original form. The transliterations of the Mongol names and terms in most cases refer to the rules of *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age*.[1] When the exact identification of the Mongolian names is not clear, and only Arabic or Chinese versions are provided, the exact transliteration according to the language in question is given, in most problematic cases followed by the sign (*) before the proposed name version or before the exact transliteration. The proposed or reconstructed name version is given preference over the literal transliteration of the Arabic, Persian or Chinese transliterations.

The dates are usually given according to the Gregorian calendar. All other calendar systems (*hijrī* [AH], traditional Chinese *nianhao* 年號 system, etc.) are given only when there is a specific reason for this.

1 Di Cosmo/Frank/Golden 2009.

Acknowledgements

This research started more than ten years ago, in August 2010, originating from a short talk on a greenish steppe roadside with Michal Biran of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem during our university field trip to Mongolia. It has been a long way to the final version of my dissertation in 2019 and up to the finalising of this book in winter 2023, and I certainly would not have been able to complete this task without the continuous and encouraging help of multiple people all across the globe. Whereas only some could be named below, all my friends and collegues from Bulgaria, China, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, South Korea, Switzerland, the UK, and the USA who are not mentioned by name should know that I am deeply indebted to their help and support all the way along and cherish the memory of our talks and meetings.

I would first of all like to thank my teachers, under whose supporting and leading hands I grew as a scholar since I entered the Hebrew University in October 2007. Profs. Michal Biran, Reuven Amitai, Yuri Pines, and Michael Stone invested a lot of support, understanding, and knowledge throughout all these years, helping me to mature and find my own way in research. Thank you all for your patience with me – I was not always an easy pupil. Michal Biran brought me into the Chinggisid universe and guided me all the way along, Reuven Amitai showed me the beauty of the Mamluk and Yuri Pines that of Chinese history and primary sources, while Michael Stone served not only as a scholarly example, but also as a personal supportive tutor throughout my most turbulent years at the university. While I limit myself to naming these four personalities, I am deeply indebted to all the teachers at the Hebrew University's Asian and Middle Eastern and Islamic departments, without whom I would have never become who I am today.

Following my language study at the Beijing Language and Culture University in the years 2011–2012, financed by the Chinese Research Council, which I keep in my memory as one of the most beautiful periods of my life until today, I moved to Germany. Here I am indebted to the Department of Sinology at the University of Freiburg which took care of me during my first years. Starting with 2018 and until now, the Department of Sinology at the University of Bonn became my scholarly home. The teams' warmth and support helped me to move through the years of the Corona pandemic. I would like to thank Prof. Ralph Kauz of the Department explicitly for giving me firm institutional and personal support throughout these years.

This work originates in my doctoral dissertation completed at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 2019. It received funding in its dissertation phase from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007–2013) / ERC grant Agreement n. 312397 and has been converted into a monograph with the financial support of the German Science Foundation (DFG, project no. 429873935). Since the first year of the Corona pandemic (2020) both the work on this monography as well as my overall scientific and intellectual progress has profited immensely from the critical feedback of members of the "Balzan Seminar on the Formation, Maintenance, and Failure of States in the Muslim World before 1800" under the leadership of Prof. Michael Cook,

Dr. Antoine Borrut and Dr. Marie Legendre, to whom, as well as to all my colleagues from the Seminar, I owe a good deal of gratitude.

The following text has been read critically and corrected by many people, among whom I would specifically like to name Mrs. Sally Ann Reiter and Dr. Geoff Humble. I thank you both for your work with my English. For all the mistakes and typos that remain, of course, I alone am responsible.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for being with me during all these years as well specifically my children for letting me to keep the correct priority of life in my mind. Most important of all, I would like to say thank you to my beloved wife Sara – without you, there would not be anything.

Unterdielbach, 30 April 2023

Introduction

Marriage is one of the oldest and most valuable social institutions in human history. The major function of marriage in pre-modern societies worldwide was providing political, societal, or economic security for the parties involved, both short- and long-term. It is obvious that, especially where powerful actors are involved in the establishment of matrimonial bonds, political considerations often take on a primary – if not exclusive – importance. This monograph interrogates the phenomenon in which men were granted the right and honour to marry women from the Chinggisid lineages across Mongol Eurasia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Over this period numerous descendants of Chinggis Khan ruled over or at least aimed to control two thirds of Eurasia, from Korea to the eastern borders of Hungary, and from Siberia to Aden, North Hindustan, and Vietnam. Those men married to the Chinggisid princesses became imperial sons-in-law (Mongolian *güregen*), a special group among the elites of the Chinggisid era. The study of these imperial in-laws, however, goes well beyond the reconstruction of Chinggisid matrimonial networks across Eurasia. Dealing with the very essence of Mongol rule, it illuminates how power networks were created and used, how the military was structured, and how tribal and ethnic diversity was organised and managed within the Mongol empire. Furthermore, the research analyses what the in-laws' history reveals about ways in which nomadic populations preserved or changed their identities under Mongol rule. By considering the Mongol *güregen* as a separate political and social institution deserving attention, this study provides an in-depth discussion of three major characteristics of Mongol Eurasia's nomadic history: the nomadic military, nomadic migrations, and nomadic identities under the Chinggisid rule – the last time in human history when a nomadic supra-polity directly influenced the history of the whole Eurasian continent.

Research aims

During the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century, Western, Chinese, and Russian research on the Mongol Empire was mainly characterised by various regionally-oriented approaches.[1] Political, economic, or cultural developments were not usually viewed within a broader comparative framework that considered what was happening in other areas controlled by the Chinggisid 'Golden Lineage'.[2] On the contrary, it was within the "Chinese", "Russian", "Iranian", "Polish" or other limited historical frameworks that discussions of Chinggisid conquests and rule took place.[3] The last three decades have seen

1 'Western' is used here in a very broad and non-political sense, meaning the research conducted under the auspices of the European, American, or Australian academies in various European languages.

2 On the *altan urugh*, the "Golden Lineage" or "seed" of Chinggis Khan's descendants, see more in Atwood 2004: 505–506; on the identification of the word altan ("gold") with "imperial", see Serruys 1962a. I have employed the expression "Golden Lineage" throughout this work for the sake of simplicity.

3 While the works of Barthold, Spuler, Pelliot, Hambis, Boyle, Endicott-West, Franke, Rossabi, Serruys,

major advances in the study of the Mongol Empire. Especially worth mentioning is the holistic Eurasian approach to the study of the Empire and the cultural turn that stresses the Mongols' contribution to cross-cultural contacts across Eurasia. This began during the 1980s with the works of the late Thomas T. Allsen (1940–2019), who has highlighted the interconnectedness of historical developments in the various parts of Mongol Eurasia and demonstrated the range of linguistic sources and cultural perspectives open to, and useful for, writing the Eurasia-wide history of Mongol rule. Following Allsen, scholars across the globe started using and developing this "Eurasian perspective" in the fields of political, cultural, religious, and social history.[4] One of the major accents of this new historiographical approach is an attempt to analyse Mongol Eurasia as a complex socio-political continuum united by the rule of Chinggis Khan's descendants, and whose various parts constantly interacted with and influenced each other up to at least the mid-fourteenth century. Cross-continental mass migration and transfer of knowledge, technologies, diseases, or ideas (religious or otherwise) are all research topics which have profited from this broad transdisciplinary approach.[5]

Following this trend, this study fills another research gap in imperial Mongol history, highlighting a topic largely neglected in the current scholarly debate. This is the phenomenon of the *güregen* sons-in-law of the Chinggisid clans across Mongol Eurasia from Chinggis Khan's rise to power until the second half of the fourteenth century, both under the United Empire (1206–1259/60) and in its four major successor *khanates* centred in the Volga region, China, Iran, and Central Asia. Such a study is especially necessary since, despite the amount of works on the political foundations of Mongol rule, the *güregen* institution has never received close examination. So far, research has primarily addressed imperial in-laws in the context of gender and the history of women in the Mongol Empire, i.e., as the matrimonial partners of Chinggisid princesses.[6] The very fact of the in-laws' marriages, their role in the Mongol political hierarchies and the continuous existence of this type of matrimonial partnership across the Eurasian-wide Chinggisid entities has been taken for granted, without scrutiny of the political, military and social aspects.[7] As this study demonstrates, the preservation of the Golden Lineage's nomadic intermarriage tradition with both important military families and local subject rulers all around Mongol Eurasia long after the conquests' completion forms a unique structural feature of the Mongol regimes across the continent, and should be seen as an indivisible part – and key pillar – of their political architecture. Looking at the *güregen* as a distinct Chinggisid political institution, and one characterized in its continuous history by certain rules and patterns, this study applies both holistic and comparative perspectives to analyse data on the Chinggisid in-laws from across the empire.

Cleaves or Halperin considerably advanced the study of Mongol rule in its various realms, none of them applied a Eurasian paradigm for a comparative study of the Eurasian continent as a whole.

4 For his major works see Allsen 1983a, 1983b, 1986, 1987a, 1987b, 1989, 1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 2001, 2004.

5 The publications of Michal Biran, Kim Hodong, Nicola Di Cosmo, Liu Yingsheng, Timothy May and to some degree Yoshiyuki Funada, Shim Hosung and Johan Elverskog are important examples of this trend.

6 For some examples see Rossabi 1979; Holmgren 1986; Uno 2009; Broadbridge 2016, 2018.

7 For a discussion of the existing research see below.

The book tackles several key questions: Firstly, the nature and functions of the *güregen* institution in Mongol Eurasia and how they developed and changed across time and place, from the pre-United Empire period (late-twelfth to early thirteenth centuries) until the mid-fourteenth century, the so-called Great Crisis of the Chinggisid states.[8] The study also selectively refers to the periods where *güregen* played a crucial political role in the post-Chinggisid realms, primarily post-Ilkhanid Iran (the Jalayirids), during the early Northern Yuan after the Ming victory in East Asia, during the reign of Toqtamïsh Khan in the Jochid *ulus*[9] and the first decades of the Chaghadaid separation from the rise of Tamerlane (r. 1370–1405) to the early fourteenth century. Secondly, this book positions the *güregen*s alongside other elements of the complex and multi-layered pan-Eurasian Mongol administration and defines the roles played by this distinct group. More specifically, it shows how this institution functions vis-à-vis other Mongol institutions, such as *anda* (blood brothers), *nöker* (companions), and the *keshig* (imperial guard and household), and how it coexisted with the many "local" governmental elements and structures of conquered regions and cultures (e.g. Chinese and Iranian bureaucracies, regional royal houses, and religious authorities) included or at least partly subdued within the Mongol administrative system.[10] The establishment of matrimonial relations with the major representatives of the tribal elites during the first years of the Chinggisid rule led to the establishment of in-law lineages as a powerful and distinct elite group with a considerable influence on Mongol politics. In this regard, the analysis of the *güregen* role and influence is of crucial importance to the history of Mongol Eurasia. Additionally, the following discussion pays special attention to differences in the ways the *güregen* institution was used in various cultural milieus, those with previous traditions of imperial in-laws as a separate institution, such as in China, and those without such precedents, namely the Islamicate realm.

The book addresses two groups of Chinggisid matrimonial partners. The first, the "inner core" or "inner circle", includes various representatives of the military tribal or ethnic elites of Mongol or Turkic origin who married the Chinggisids. In many of these cases these matrimonial relationships were of multi-generational nature. More broadly, while analysing the matrimonial relations of the Golden lineage one can distinguish three major forms. Firstly, there are cases in which the Chinggisids only took women from a specific "wife-giver" family. Secondly, there are "wife-taker" in-laws to whom the Chinggisids only gave women. Finally, there are cases in which both took place. As the study discusses the phenomenon of the Chinggisid *sons-in-law*, the "wife-givers"' policies will not be tackled separately, though they will be mentioned occasionally. The discussion of the "inner circle" thus concentrates primarily on the two other types. In many of the case studies, Golden lineage relations with representatives of the "inner circle" originated as early as Chinggis Khan's lifetime. The intergenerational continuation of those relations was therefore often

8 The "Great Crisis" comprises ca. four decades – 1330–1370 – during which two Khanates, namely the Yuan and the Ilkhanate, ceased to exist, while the two others, the Jochids and the Chaghadaids, went through a series of painful and centrifugal developments leading to their collapse as centralised entities in the long run. For more on the concept, see below (Ch. VI).

9 I prefer not to use the term "Golden Horde" since it was created later and arguably not used by the Chinggisids at that time (on this see Yudin 1992b: 32–33), instead adopting the more neutral "Jochid *ulus*".

10 See Appendix II, nos. 1, 16, 18 for the explanations of the terminology.

influenced by the conqueror's personal legacy. At the same time, there are several clear changes or divergences from the tradition established by the first Qa'ans (or Great Khans), especially visible after the Chinggisid split of the 1260s. This is seen in the new marriage lines introduced by specific Chinggisid branches much later on to address specific political needs, such as the Chinggisid-Jalayirid intermarriages, originally forbidden according to steppe law.

In addition to this major "inner circle" among the Chinggisid in-laws, there is an additional *güregen* category, namely the numerous subject (or allied) rulers or members of non-tribal elites allowed to marry Chinggisid princesses.[11] As with the first group, this phenomenon was also pan-Eurasian in scope. The honour of marriage to a Chinggisid princess was in some cases given as a gift to those members of ruling houses who submitted peacefully.[12] In some other cases (e.g. Rus' *knyaz* princes and Georgian relations with some of the Ilkhans), matrimonial ties were part of a broader geopolitical attempt to deploy contending local factions within the conquered population against others, to secure control over specific areas. These differences aside, in almost no cases (with specific exceptions in the Yuan realm) were such marriage relations multi-generational. Moreover, despite the high status of the ladies given to members of the "outer circle", in most cases (again with some Yuan exceptions) these marriages and the subsequent inclusion of non-Mongol elites into the Chinggisid inner circle was of lesser importance to Chinggisid foreign politics, especially when compared with military action or diplomatic alliances. This can be explained by the fact that in most cases the existence of a matrimonial link was of crucial importance in the traditional nomadic setting, but not in the context of Islamic or Christian law.[13] A close analysis of those marriages in the first decades of Mongol expansion shows that we cannot even be sure that the women given to foreign nobility (such as the Armenians or the Rus') indeed belonged to the ruling clan.[14] All in all, whereas here and there matrimonial relations could play an important role for the Chinggisids under specific historical conditions, generally speaking, the outer circle was of much less

11 Only in very rare cases were the Chinggisid princesses given to foreign rulers external to the Mongol Eurasian realms (such as the Mamluks).

12 Note the interesting suggestion by Togan (1998: 124–127, 137–138, cf. Broadbridge 2018: 3–4) that the Chinggisids destroyed the internal structure of the submitted entity in the cases of single dynastic power lineages (Kereyit, Naiman); whereas they did not when the submitted entity had more diffuse or fractured power structures (like the Baya'ut). While this claim might to some degree be useful for our understanding of the "inner circle", it does not seem to be applicable to many of the "outer circle" submissions. The lack of sources remains a problem here too, as we do not know, for example, what tribal or social structure the Oyirad possessed before they submitted to Chinggis Khan.

13 These two monotheistic traditions (and Confucian morality) rejected most variations on levirate or sororate marriages, preventing the Chinggisid court from exerting a long-term influence on their allies through the women given to them. On the conflicts between traditional nomadic levirate marriages and the *sharīʿa*-based or Confucian traditions see, e.g. Amitai-Preiss 1996: 2–3; Hodous 2015: 191 (for the Ilkhanate); Ratchnevsky 1968 as well as Holmgren 1986 and Birge 1995 (for China). Note also especially Birge 2017: 2–8 for a discussion of the legal cases provided by the *Yuan dianzhang* (hereafter - *YDZ*), and elsewhere in the text of the *YDZ*'s Chapter 18 ("Marriages"), provided in translation (*ibid*.: 87–277).

14 On this, see below, Chs. I and IV.

relevance for the stability of the Chinggisid rule as a whole when compared with the tribal elites.

The final issue to be addressed is the short- and long-term legacies of the *güregen* institution in Mongol Eurasia after the mid-fourteenth century collapse of the Mongol polities. Firstly, the preservation, and even the memory, of *güregen* status across Eurasia after the Great Crisis is of great interest. As is well-known, many parts of post-Chinggisid Eurasia, almost exclusively in the steppe and bordering areas, were marked by the crucial importance of the so-called "Chinggisid principle", under which only Chinggisid descendants were eligible to bear the title of *khan* or *Qa'an*, signifying overall or supreme rulership.[15] The preservation of this principle was often fictive, with small children or incapable adults enthroned and the real powerholders, close advisors and commanders of non-Chinggisid origin, taking *de facto* rule behind or through them.[16] The classic example is the rule of Temür and the early Timurids (1405–1415). Due to the "Chinggisid principle", however, it remained crucial to claim that their families or ancestors possessed matrimonial ties to the Chinggisids. As seen in the case of Jalayirid Iran and Azerbaijan, its founders' *güregen* status provided the contenders for power (Shaykh Hassan's family in the Jalayirid case) with the legitimacy required to establish "legitimate" succession to the Hülegüids. The question of these in-law regimes after the Chinggisid crisis will be tackled in Chapter VI. Another crucial, though difficult question that the Chapter addresses is the impact of the "imperial in-law" institution on tribal and ethnic identities in Mongol and post-Mongol Eurasia.

The state of the field: existing research on Chinggisid matrimonial relations, key approaches, and limitations

Despite the abundance of research on the Mongol Empire over recent decades, the *güregen* institution has barely been touched upon. Among the Western scholars who have written on gender issues in the Mongol Empire after the second world war Bettine Birge, Anne Broadbridge, Herbert Franke, Jenifer Holmgren, Timothy May, Bruno de Nicola, Morris Rossabi, and the Rev. Henry Serruys deserve specific mention.[17] Most of these researchers concentrated on Mongol rulers' wives and their roles and positions in Mongol politics, economy, and social life. Furthermore, most of them limited their focus either on the United Empire, the Yuan, or the Ilkhanid realms, and none examined the phenomenon in its full Eurasian context. Moreover, the non-Chinggisid grooms of Chinggisid princesses,

15 On the Chinggisid principle and its exceptions, see e.g. Miyawaki 1992, esp. 261, fn. 1, 1997: 45, 1999: 318–321; Biran 2004: 358–359; Elverskog 2010: 180, 187, 202–206, 219. Note de Rachewiltz 1983b on the differentiation between the terms *Qan* (Khan) and *Qa'an* and the claim that *Qa'an* was not used by the Chinggisids before the end of the 1220s.

16 See Ch. IV for a detailed discussion of the kingmakers of the late Jochid *ulus* and their puppet khans, as well as the similar situation in the Chaghadaid *ulus* from the mid-fourteenth century, discussed in Ch. V.

17 See e.g. Rossabi 1970; Serruys 1957, 1975; Franke 1980; Holmgren 1986; Birge 1995; Broadbridge 2008; May 2015; De Nicola 2017, and Broadbridge 2018.

which are the focus of this study, have received scant scholarly attention. Neither the scholars who deal with the Western parts of Mongol Eurasia nor those who specialise in the Yuan sufficiently highlighted the "male components" of Chinggisid marriage as an imperial political strategy, thus lacking a much-needed comparative and symbiotic perspective. Partial exceptions can be found in works by Jennifer Holmgren,[18] George Q. Zhao[19] and, recently, Anne Broadbridge. The first two authors concentrated on the Yuan realm. Holmgren's most important contributions, however, treat the subject only in passing. Whereas she provided significant information on levirate and sororate marriages in nomadic societies and a broad comparative discussion of nomad-sedentary intermarriage in other periods of Chinese history, she mentions Yuan in-laws quite briefly and does not delve into the diversity of primary data available.[20] Zhao's monograph was clearly intended to be a ground-breaking work on the subject, and, aiming to discuss the issue of Chinggisid marriage under the Yuan in general, included a discussion of Yuan *güregens*, but the work suffers from inconsistencies and the limited scope of its case studies undermine its overall importance.[21] The recent monograph "Women and the Making of the Mongol Empire" by Anne Broadbridge, a leading specialist on gender issues under Mongol rule, is probably the only work that comes close to this book's approach. Broadbridge dealt with Chinggisid matrimonial connections primarily through the perspective of their female counterparts, focussing, however, on the history of the United Empire and the Ilkhanate (dealing only briefly with the late Ilkhanate).

Relevant studies in other European languages are even more scarce. As far as German research is concerned, one can see a growing interest in the history of the expansion of Mongol rule in Eurasia and of the Mongol khanates in general.[22] This interest has never extended to the imperial sons-in-law.[23] The most important German study on Chinggisid

18 Holmgren 1986.

19 Zhao 2008.

20 See especially Holmgren 1986: 156–167 for a discussion of levirate marriage as a political strategy in the pre-Yuan period.

21 On the one hand, the author does not analyse his sources, but translates without locating them in their historical and social contexts. He uses a significant number of old and outdated secondary sources and translations (e.g. Cleaves' translation of the *SH*, D'Ohsson's and Vladimirtsov's works, without critical perspective). Deplorable is also the fact that Zhao utilizes an extremely small number of secondary sources, almost completely ignoring most of the research conducted (even in Chinese) since the 1990s. See Kollmar-Paulenz 2012: 1123 on these and other points, and also Allsen's review (2010) for a more positive opinion. While Zhao provides information on the six key Yuan *fuma* in-law groups (the Qonggirad, Ikires, Oyirad, Önggüt, Uyghurs and Koreans), his data is incomplete, and he excludes many other matrimonial partners discussed in Chapter 2 below.

22 See e.g. Fragner 1997, 2006a, 2006b, 2008; Herrmann 2004; Hoffmann 2008; Kauz 2006; Kollmar-Paulenz 2011; Krawulsky 1989, 2011; Pfeiffer 1999, 2006, 2013, 2014; Paul 2011a, 2011b; Pistor-Hatam 2003, Schottenhammer 2012, 2013. Unfortunately, most of those publications deal predominantly with the Ilkhanate, and the other Chinggisid Khanates very often remain untouched. Some exceptions of this rule include Kauz/Ptak 2001; Karbassian/Kauz 2015; Ptack 2015; and recently also Fiaschetti 2014a, 2014b, 2017. The most important German scholar of the Chinggisids in general and of the Yuan in particular was Herbert Franke (1914–2011), but he mainly published on this issue between the 1960s and 1990s, and therefore cannot be included in the new wave of interest in Mongol history over the last 20 years.

23 See e.g. Hoffmann 2014: 263, 267, 271, fn. 81, 287, who suggests the existence of the Chinggisid

marriage politics would be Karin Quade-Reutter's study (2003) of women from the Ilkhanid highest noble strata. This study lacks a broader comparative Eurasian framework and focusses primarily on the female part of the marriage alliances and less on their political functions. Its main interest is, in fact, not the major ruling family of the Ilkhanate, but the provinces of the Ilkhanate which were ruled indirectly, such as Herat or Kirmān, with discussion of most Chinggisid marriages being limited to a simple listing of names.[24]

None of the leading French-speaking scholars who have dealt with Mongol history, society, or law, have concentrated specifically on Chinggisid matrimonial relations or on the power mechanisms of Mongol Eurasia from this point of view.[25] The same applies to the once ground-breaking Russian research on the Jochid and the Chaghadaid *uluses*. The outstanding Russian school of Central Asian research, consisting of scholars with pre-revolutionary education, such as V. V. Bartold (1869–1930), B. Ya. Vladimirtsov (1884–1931) and Jamsrangiin Tseveen (1880–1942), has not been continued after their deaths.[26] While a number among the next generations of scholars have produced high-quality research, especially on Jochid and Ilkhanid history, the general state of affairs has been complicated since the end of the Second World War.[27] On the one hand, historical research in the Soviet era (and in today's Russia), has been at least partly doctrinally limited by the Marxist teleological understanding of history and, later, by L.N. Gumilev's theories, as well as by Soviet scholars' relative isolation. Another weakness of Russian scholarship is its (partly political) limitation to Jochid relations and policies concerning the Rus' lands. Contemporary exceptions include leading Russian specialists such as Roman Pochekaev, Tatjana Skrynnikova and Pavel Rykin, whose articles on the political elite of the Mongol Empire also touch upon the status of the *güregen*.[28] On the other hand, philological research, well-established in the pre-revolutionary era, has continued to develop and to produce high-quality translations of primary sources from Chinese, Persian and Mongolian

güregens at official Chinggisid court ceremonials, but neither comments on their existence nor discusses their roles and positions vis-à-vis the Chinggisid family.

24 Quade-Reutter 2003.

25 For the major French works on the Mongol period in Eurasian history see e.g. Aigle 2000, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2012; Hambis 1945, 1960, 1970, 1971, 1975; Ligeti 1965, 1973ab; Ligeti/Kara 1990; Mostaert 1927, 1950, 1957; Pelliot 1927, 1930, 1940/41, 1949/1963/1973. Also note the works of Marie Favereau, a leading Jochid historian (e.g. 2016, 2018ab, as well as her most recent major book on the Jochid ulus [eadem 2021]).

26 In fact, following Barthold's death nothing comparable to his famous and pathbreaking *Turkestan v epokhu mongol'skogo nashestviya* has been created by any Russian-speaking author (see Barthold 1963a). One must not forget Tsyben Zhamtsarano (1881–1942), one of the most prominent Russian Mongolists of Buryat origin, who passed away in the Sol-Iletzk (Orenburg oblast') prison after having been arrested on Stalin's personal order in 1937 for "anti-Communist activity", and only being rehabilitated in 1956 (see Reshetov 1998). Despite the fact that Zhamtsarano has not dealt with early Mongol history, he has lent great impetus to Mongol-Buryat studies in Russia through the first half of the 20th century until his arrest.

27 See e.g. Safargaliev 1960.

28 See e.g. Pochekaev 2014, 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2018, 2019; Skrynnikova 2006, 2009, 2013; Rykin 2011, 2013. In this context Nikolay Kradin should also be mentioned. He is one of the leading scholars of nomadic anthropology and archaeology, with a number of works dedicated to the Chinggisid history (Kradin/Skrynnikova 2006, 2022; Kradin 2009).

(partly also in the post-Soviet areas).[29] The renowned scholarly circle in Kazan around the Sh. Marjani Institute of History deals mainly with the Jochid *ulus*.[30] Among the scholars mentioned above only Rykin has seriously discussed the *güregen* phenomenon, limiting himself, however, to the early Chinggisid period.[31]

Chinese research is of special importance for this discussion. Numerous scholars from the PRC have dealt with political and cultural aspects of the Yuan dynasty over recent decades, placing an emphasis on Chinggisid matrimonial connections.[32] In this framework the question of the *fuma* 駙馬 (a Chinese term partly equivalent to the Mongol *güregen*) has been raised quite often in multiple contexts.[33] This can be explained in part by the fact that the *fuma* phenomenon was an important part of Chinese political culture before and after the Mongol conquests. In this context works by Hu Xiaopeng,[34] Bai Cuiqin,[35] Zhou Qingshu[36] and Zhang Daiyu[37] deserve special mention. Existing Chinese research is, however, very often limited to the Chinese realm and to Chinese primary sources, leaving Chinese scholars less keen to analyse the existence of similar marriage phenomena outside China.[38] Furthermore, current Chinese research views the Yuan primarily as a Chinese dynasty, and therefore its matrimonial connections are seen as a variation of previous polities' *heqin* 和親 policies.[39] The uniqueness of the Chinggisid case has not, therefore, received sufficient emphasis.[40]

Recent decades have also been characterised by the extensive development of Korean and Japanese research on Mongol history in general and Chinggisid history in particular. In Korea works by Kim Hodong have opened new directions for the study of Mongol rule in Eurasia since the 1990s.[41] A number of Korean scholars have touched upon the question of

29 The recent publications of *Dhayl-i jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh-i Rashīdī* (ḤA/Talyshkhanov 2007) and of *Shara Tudzhi* (Tsendina 2017) are good examples of this development.

30 Among the current and former members of this cluster, Ilnur Mirgaleev and Roman Hautala deserve special mention. Unfortunately, in the case of this cluster's work the *güregens* have not been dealt with. The major scholarly compendium, *The Golden Horde in World History*, published 2016 by this cluster and edited by Rafael Khakimov and Marie Favereau, scarcely mentions the Jochids' imperial in-laws or their matrimonial relations in a book of almost a thousand pages (e.g. Pochekaev 2016b: 238, 248, 253; Favereau 2016: 344). This illustrates the limited perspective of Russian scholars on the topic of Jochid intermarriage (and cf. Ch. IV).

31 Rykin 2011, 2013.

32 Leading senior scholars such as Liu Yingsheng, Li Zhi'an and Chen Gaohua should also be mentioned. For additional publications see Ch. III and also below.

33 On the specific characteristics of the various terms see below.

34 E.g. Hu 1998.

35 E.g. Bai 2006, 2008.

36 E.g. Zhou 1979.

37 E.g. Zhang 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2009.

38 This is obviously not the case in general, as the *Shuʿab-i panjgānah* reading group that worked at the Peking University under the leadership of Wang Yidan in the 2010s or works by Liu Yingsheng, Zhou Qingshu, Qiu Yihao, Yu Yusen, and Ma Xiaolin, among others, represent a recent and opposite trend.

39 *Heqin*, lit. "kinship [for] peace", i.e. *de facto* marriage alliance. For this traditional Chinese political policy of providing women to foreign rulers as a sign of gratitude from the imperial throne and part of tribute relations, see e.g. Cui Mingde 2004a, 2005; Di Cosmo 2002: 193–196.

40 See the works of Cui Mingde on this issue (e.g. 2004b).

41 See e.g. Kim Hodong 2005, 2006, 2009, 2013, 2014/15, 2015. For Mongol (Yuan)-Korean relations one also has to stress the importance of Lee Kanghan and Lee Myongmi. Of the recent generation of the