

Asiatische  
Forschungen

---

161

Ishayahu Landa

# Marriage and Power in Mongol Eurasia

A History of the Chinggisid Sons-in-law

Harrassowitz  
Verlag



# 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

ISBN 978-3-447-12052-4

eISSN 2940-3642

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
Islamic 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 (Tūghājūq) .....	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 (Kāltürmīsh) .....	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 Sa‘īd (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. <i>Velikaya zamyatnya</i> ) .....	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* 繁体字) 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, “ѣ” for “u” is being replaced by “ts”, “ѣ” for “u” is being replaced by “y”, and “ѣ” 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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.



## List of abbreviations used in the text

<i>BXSJ</i>	<i>Beixun siji</i> 北巡私記
<i>CDHEC</i>	<i>Codex Diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis</i>
<i>CN</i>	<i>Chingiz nāme</i>
<i>DCN</i>	<i>Daftar-i Chingiz nāme</i>
<i>DFTB</i>	<i>Wang fu Defeng tang bei</i> 王傳德風堂碑
<i>FIQ/Bregel</i>	<i>Firdaws-i iqbāl</i> , transl. and ed. Yuri Bregel
<i>GCSXB</i>	<i>Gaochang wang shixun bei</i> 高昌王世勳
<i>ĤA/Bayānī</i>	<i>Dhayl-i jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh-i Rashīdī</i> , ed. Khānbābā Bayānī
<i>ĤA/Talyshkhanov</i>	<i>Dhayl-i jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh-i Rashīdī</i> , transl. and comm. E.R. Talyshkhanov
<i>HDSL</i>	<i>Heida shiliū</i> 黑韃事略
<i>HDSL/Olbricht</i>	<i>Heida shiliū</i> 黑韃事略, transl. and comm. Peter Olbricht et al.
<i>HDSL/Atwood</i>	<i>Heida shiliū</i> 黑韃事略, transl. and comm. Christopher P. Atwood
<i>HHS</i>	<i>Hou Hanshu</i> 後漢書
<i>ĤS</i>	<i>Ta’rīkh-i ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār-i afrād-i bashar</i>
<i>JS</i>	<i>Jinshi</i> 金史
<i>JT</i>	<i>Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh</i> , transl. Thackston
<i>JT/Boyle</i>	<i>The Successors of Genghis Khan [Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh]</i> , transl. Boyle
<i>JT/K</i>	<i>Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh</i> , edited B. Karimī
<i>JT/MS</i>	<i>Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh</i> , MS Tashkent (al-Bīrūnī 1620)
<i>JT/RM</i>	<i>Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh</i> , edited Rawshan and Mūsawī
<i>JT/Rus</i>	<i>Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh</i> , published by the Academy of Science of the USSR, 4 vols. (1.1: transl. L.A. Hegaturov, 1.2: transl. O.I. Smirnova, 2: Yu.P. Verkhovskoy, 3: A.K. Arends).
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Jiu Tangshu</i> 舊唐書
<i>JWDS</i>	<i>Jiu wudai shi</i> 舊五代史
<i>LRAC/LC</i>	<i>Laurentian-Radziwill-Academy Chronicle [Laurentian Codex]</i> , see also Lavrent’evskaya letopis’
<i>LRAC/MA</i>	<i>Laurentian-Radziwill-Academy Chronicle [Moscow Academy Codex]</i> , see also Lavrent’evskaya letopis’
<i>LS</i>	<i>Liaoshi</i> 遼史
<i>MA</i>	<i>Mu‘izz al-ansāb</i>
<i>MIKKh</i>	<i>Materialy po istorii kazakhskikh khanstv</i> , eds. S.K. Ibragimov et al.
<i>FIQ/...</i>	<i>Firdaws-i iqbāl</i> , transl. N.N. Mingulov
<i>TAKK/...</i>	<i>Ta’rīkh-e Abū al-Khayr Khānī</i> , transl. S.K. Ibragimov
<i>TGNN/...</i>	<i>Tawārīkh-i guzīda-i nuṣrat nāme</i> , transl. Veniamin P. Yudin
<i>BA/...</i>	<i>Bahr al-asrār fī manāqib al-akhyār</i> , transl. Klavdia A. Pishchulina
<i>MDBL/Olbricht</i>	<i>Mengda beilu</i> 蒙韃備錄, transl. and comm. Olbricht et al.
<i>MS</i>	<i>Mingshi</i> 明史
<i>MTZSL</i>	<i>Ming Taizu shilu</i> 明太祖實錄 [part of Ming shilu 明實錄]
<i>MYZSL</i>	<i>Ming Yingzong shilu</i> 明英宗實錄 [part of Ming shilu 明實錄]

<i>Novgorod I</i>	<i>Novgorodskaya pervaya letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov</i>
<i>Novgorod IV</i>	<i>Novgorodskaya chetvertaya letopis'</i>
<i>SH</i>	<i>The Secret History of the Mongols</i>
<i>SS</i>	<i>Songshi</i> 宋史
<i>SP</i>	<i>Shu'ab-i panjgānah</i>
<i>SP/MS</i>	<i>Shu'ab-i panjgānah</i> , MS Ahmet III 2937, Istanbul
<i>SWQZL</i>	<i>Shengwu qinzheng lu</i> 聖武親征錄
<i>TMEN</i>	Gerhard Doerfer, <i>Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen</i> , 4 vols.
<i>TMR</i>	<i>Tā'rikh al-rusul wa al-mülūk</i>
<i>TR/Ross</i>	<i>The Tarikh-i-Rashidi. A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia</i> , transl. by E. Denison Ross
<i>TSQ</i>	<i>Ta'rikh-i shāhī Qarākhitā'īyyān</i>
<i>TSU</i>	<i>Ta'rikh-i Shaykh Uways</i>
<i>XTS</i>	<i>Xin Tangshu</i> 新唐書
<i>XWDS</i>	<i>Xin wudai shi</i> 新五代史
<i>YDZ</i>	<i>Yuan dianzhang</i> 元典章
<i>YRZJ</i>	<i>Yuanren zhuanji ziliao suoyin</i> 元人傳記資料索引
<i>YS</i>	<i>Yuanshi</i> 元史
<i>YSCD</i>	<i>Yuanshi cidian</i> 元史辭典
<i>Waṣṣāf/HP</i>	<i>Geschichte Waṣṣāf's</i> , 4 vols., transl. Hammer-Purgstall
<i>WS</i>	<i>Weishu</i> 魏書
<i>ZGLS</i>	<i>Zhongguo lishi dituji</i> 中國歷史地圖集
<i>ZS</i>	<i>Zhoushu</i> 周書

## List of tables

Table I	Additional Ögedeid in-laws [p. 230-232]
Table II	Additional Toluid in-laws (Arigh Böke's line) [p. 236]
Table III	Additional Chaghadaid in-laws (pre-1347) [p. 244-245]
Table IV	Ulus Chaghatay before Temür (1340s-1360s) [p. 263-264]
Table V	Ulus Chaghatay under Temür: Connections with the Golden Lineage [p. 266-267]
Table VI	Ulus Chaghatay under Temür: Connections with non-Chinggisid groups [pp. 268-270]
Table VII	Moghulistan (1350s – late fourteenth century) [p. 271]





## 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 colleagues 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.

Unterdietbach, 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.<sup>1</sup> 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'.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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 Toqtaṁış Khan in the Jochid *ulus*<sup>9</sup> 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 *güregens* 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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 *sharī'a*-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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> 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,<sup>18</sup> George Q. Zhao<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> This interest has never extended to the imperial sons-in-law.<sup>23</sup> 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; Ptak 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.<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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*.<sup>28</sup> 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 nashestiya* 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-Iletsk (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 20<sup>th</sup> 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).<sup>29</sup> The renowned scholarly circle in Kazan around the Sh. Marjani Institute of History deals mainly with the Jochid *ulus*.<sup>30</sup> Among the scholars mentioned above only Rykin has seriously discussed the *güregen* phenomenon, limiting himself, however, to the early Chinggisid period.<sup>31</sup>

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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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,<sup>34</sup> Bai Cuiqin,<sup>35</sup> Zhou Qingshu<sup>36</sup> and Zhang Daiyu<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup> The uniqueness of the Chinggisid case has not, therefore, received sufficient emphasis.<sup>40</sup>

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.<sup>41</sup> A number of Korean scholars have touched upon the question of

29 The recent publications of *Dhayl-i jāmi' al-tawārīkh-i Rashīdī* (HA/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 *Shu 'ab-i panjānah* 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

the Goryeo kings' matrimonial relations with the Yuan, but there seems to have been no attempt to extend this research beyond Korea.<sup>42</sup> A number of outstanding Japanese scholars have recently worked with the Yuan or Mongol material, among them first and foremost Maasaki Sugiyama, Yoshiyuki Funada, Tomoyasu Iiyama, Dai Matsui, Masaki Mukai, Yasuhiro Yokkaichi and recently Yoichi Isahaya, to name but a few. Only two Japanese scholars, however, deal with the marriages of the Golden Lineage, namely Uno Nobuhiro, whose research concentrates mainly on the United Empire period, and Masahiko Morihira, working on Goryeo-Yuan relations.<sup>43</sup> Both Korean and Japanese research has only been indirectly available to me, in English or Chinese translation. However, to my knowledge, none of the scholars mentioned above has approached the *güregen* phenomenon from a pan-Eurasian perspective. Without doubt, therefore, a systematic study of the *güregen* institution from Korea to Hungary under the Mongol rule is desirable. Additionally, this work strengthens the holistic view of Mongol Eurasia as an interconnected and highly complex historical unit. It is through the final comparison provided in the conclusion that the author shows both continuity in, and transformations of, the steppe norms inherited by the Golden Lineage from Chinggis Khan's lifetime across some two hundred years.

## Methodological remarks

This monography provides a general analysis of the *güregen* institution in all of the Chinggisid states across Eurasia. Methodologically, this aim is mainly reached through the close reading of a wide variety of primary sources in multiple languages, combined with prosopographical analyses of in-laws' biographies. The combination of a broad historical perspective with zooms onto specific individuals' lives (what Subrahmanyam has called a "humanistic history") provides answers to questions such as why, when, and how the Chinggisid in-laws came into being, functioned within and exerted influence on the Mongol polities, as well as where they found themselves at the moment of the Great Crisis and during the following centuries.<sup>44</sup> Before starting the discussion, however, several methodological and theoretical remarks are necessary. The following will first deal with the state and limitations of the available sources and then turn to the issue of terminology. While many terms used in the following discussion can be questionable or tricky, in most cases footnotes will be employed to discuss their complexity. An exception has been made for two terms. First, the term "imperial son-in-law" and its diverse forms in various sources. Second, a short but crucial section on the understanding and use of the terms *tribe*, *kin* and *lineage*.

---

Yuan scholars in Korea one can also note Choi Soyoung (e.g. 2017) as well as Cho Wonhee (e.g. 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2020).

42 See, e.g. Ch'oe Yunjōng 2015; Kim Hyewōn 1989; Koh Myung-Soo 2015; Lee Ik-Joo 2009; Lee Myongmi 2003, 2013, 2016a, 2016b; Yi Sūnghān 1988, as well as Kim Hodong 2007.

43 See e.g. Uno 1993, 1999, 2009; Masahiko 2008, 2013.

44 See Subrahmanyam 2010: 120ff.

## Sources and limitations

Despite a significant amount of information on the imperial sons-in-law being scattered across contemporary Eurasian chronicles, little in-depth comparative research has been conducted on this topic. The major reason for this is the state of the available sources, and the need to approach an extremely broad range of texts to provide a suitably complete picture. The Eurasian dimension of Chinggisid expansion demands analysis of sources in Chinese, Persian, Arabic, Old Slavonic, and Latin at the minimum, while Tibetan, Georgian, Armenian, and Syriac, among others, offer additional perspectives. Sources written either at the Chinggisid courts or in areas involved in direct interaction with the Chinggisids are of particular importance. In some cases, however, especially when researching the Jochid and Chaghadaid realms, later chronicles (i.e. from the fifteenth century onwards) cannot be ignored. These narratives cannot, however, provide a full picture, more often than not being biased, censored, or only partially preserved. Therefore, a number of additional sources have been used in this work, including biographical dictionaries, genealogical treatises, archaeological information, epigraphic remains (primarily tomb and temple inscriptions), as well as travel records and epistles gathered from various parts of Eurasia.

It is of crucial importance that almost all of our sources were written by sedentary peoples conquered by the Chinggisids, not by the nomads themselves. With very few exceptions – *The Secret History of the Mongols* (Mon. *Monggol'un niucha tobcha'an*) prominent among them – almost all of the chronicles available to us were either compiled by sedentary writers (Ilkhanid, Chinese, Rus', Tibetan, Caucasian) under Mongol control or from among the Mongols' rivals (Europeans, Mamluks, or the Delhi Sultanate). It is quite logical to be suspicious of the content and the bias of both groups of sources. Indeed, sources from the first group more often than not betray some enmity towards the Mongols. It would, however, be just as naive to blindly trust the second group. Even if we omit the visible elements of some authors' enmity towards the Mongol conquerors, works by the (presumably) most loyal sedentary writers, such as Rashīd al-Dīn, very often include lacunas, contradictions, or clear bias toward specific Chinggisid patrons. Furthermore, whereas no medieval source is receptive to modern concerns, the sedentary primary sources are rarely interested in (or knowledgeable about) nomadic social and political institutions. Additionally, many writers tend to represent the Mongols as a “regular” Chinese or Iranian dynasty, belittling the role of Mongol institutions in favour of local forms.

### Chinese sources

The best-documented realm is probably the Chinese.<sup>45</sup> More than 120 names of individuals with the “imperial son-in-law” (*fuma*) ending can be found in the *Official History of the Yuan* (*Yuanshi* 元史, hereafter *YS*), with its variably detailed tables of princes and princesses (*biao* 表) and biographical sections (*liezhuan* 列傳) including extensive information on Chinggisid ties to other matrimonial partners.<sup>46</sup> The problematic nature of

45 Here, “Chinese sources” refers not only to those produced by Chinese writers or in China, but generally those in classical Chinese, such as the *Goryeosa* discussed in Ch. II.

46 I am using the standard edition, published by *Zhonghua shuju* 中華書局 in Beijing in 1976 and

the *YS*, hastily compiled during the very first years of the following Ming dynasty (1368–1644), has already been stressed by many scholars.<sup>47</sup> The reasons for this are beyond the scope of this study.<sup>48</sup> Whatever the reason, unfortunately, for more than half of the 120 *güregen* figures named in the *YS*, no further information can be provided. Furthermore, the compilers' inconsistent use of non-Chinese names for people and places adds to the confusion. The same person may thus appear in the texts under more than one name.

The *YS* alone thus does not meet the needs of this project, but this can be supplemented with the repertoire of tomb and temple inscriptions written on behalf of the Yuan sons-in-law. The contemporaneous compendium *Yuan wen lei* 原文類 (*A Collection of Yuan Dynasty Prose Literary Works*), as well as the modern *Quan Yuan wen* 全元文 (*Complete Yuan Prose Literature*), include many of these texts.<sup>49</sup> Use of the various Chinese inscriptions is especially important, as, written by famous Chinese literati, their content did not undergo censorship by the imperial archives and compilers and therefore arguably presents more “original” versions of imperial in-laws' biographies than those found in the *YS*. The non-Chinese duplicates of many inscriptions made available to us over recent decades through archaeological work, either in Mongolian or Turkic languages, are also of great importance.<sup>50</sup> Comparing them with the Chinese texts expands our understanding of the available data and the vocabulary used.<sup>51</sup>

Among the other Chinese sources three require special mention. The first is the *Sheng wu qinzheng lu* 聖武親征錄 (*Report on the Campaign of the Holy Warrior*), a Chinese translation of a lost Mongolian original report on the campaigns of Chinggis Khan, of special interest for the earliest phases of the conquests due to its supposed authenticity and a range of detail not met anywhere else.<sup>52</sup> Another is the *Official History of Goryeo* (*Goryeosa* 高麗史). Compiled under the supervision of Kim Jongseo 金宗瑞 (1383–1453) and Jeong Inji 鄭麟趾 (1396–1478) in the mid-fifteenth century, long after the Goryeo dynasty (918–1392) had fallen, the chronicle includes interesting remarks on the late Yuan

---

reprinted in 1995. This is the same standard edition digitised by the Scripta Sinica database (Ch. *Hanji quanwen ziliaoku jihua* 漢籍全文資料庫計畫) of the Academia Sinica. For a general discussion of Chinese official historiography see Wilkinson 2013: 620–644. For the discussion of the biography as an important medium of the traditional Chinese historical (both private and official) writing, see Olbricht 1957.

47 See more e.g. in Franke 1948, 5–6, as well as Franke 1952, 5–6; furthermore Wilkinson 2013, 779–780.

48 One possibility is that the data available to the Ming compilers was incomplete, either because of the abrupt Yuan collapse, due to censorship and selection of information preserved in the imperial archives, focusing on the Chinese sources (as opposed to Mongolian works that possibly did not fully survive). Perhaps lack of time did prevent the compilers from gathering enough information. For the broader theoretical discussion of the *YS* as the primary source, a historical text, and a literary creation, see Humble 2017: 5–13, esp. 6, fn. 16 and further the history of the compilation and its complicacies, *ibid.*: 47–66.

49 The standard Nanjing edition of 1999 for the *YWL* is being used throughout the text.

50 In some cases duplicates of Chinese inscription texts are included in literary collections (such as most of the inscriptions dedicated to or produced by the Qonggirad Princes of Lu), but in other cases originals survive through archaeology (such as the Önggüt Inscription of the *De feng Hall*). For both examples, see Ch. II.

51 For these examples, see Ch. II.

52 On this source see Biran 2007: 32; Atwood 2009; see also Hoffmann 2014: 253, as well as the introduction to the French translation in Pelliot/Hambis 1951: xi-xxvii.

years, which cannot be found elsewhere. An additional source used is the *Yuan dianzhang* 元典章 (1322, *Statutes and Precedents of the Yuan Dynasty*, hereafter *YDZ*), a compendium of legal and governmental communication.<sup>53</sup> Though this compendium, likely compiled under private or semi-official auspices, does not include data on specific Chinggisid in-laws, it includes information on the in-laws' official and administrative position under the Yuan, with forty-seven references across the text mentioning them as a group (generally *fuma*) in the context of Yuan officials' correspondence on legal issues.<sup>54</sup>

### Islamicate sources

Another big block of primary sources can be labelled "Islamicate", as they originated from and were written in the realms dominated by Islamic population and rulers. These were mostly composed in Persian and Arabic, with some Syriac works too.<sup>55</sup> Of primary importance within this group are the primary chronicles written under Mongol auspices, mainly in the Ilkhanate, alongside those composed under the Timurids. The three famous Ilkhanid historical compendia are the *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh* by Rashīd al-Dīn,<sup>56</sup> *Ta'rikh-i jahān-i gushāy* by al-Juwaynī,<sup>57</sup> *Tajziyat al-amṣār wa-tazjiyat al-a'ṣār* (also known as *Ta'rikh-i Waṣṣāf*) by Sharaf al-Dīn Shīrāzī Waṣṣāf al-Ḥaḍrat<sup>58</sup> and *Ta'rikh-i Öljeitü* by Abū al-Qāsim al-Qāshānī.<sup>59</sup> Each provides a unique set of contemporary data, helping us to reconstruct the identities and history of the Ilkhanid, and in some cases also Chaghadaid, sons-in-law and their families. These are augmented by local chronicles such as the *Ta'rikh-i Herat* and *Ta'rikh-i Shāhi Qarākhitaiyān*, providing a more local perspective on Ilkhanid history. Another example of these local histories are the texts produced by the Seljuqs of

53 Full title *Da Yuan shengzheng guochao dianzhang* 大元聖政國朝典章 (Statutes and Precedents of the Sacred Administration of the Great Yuan Dynastic State) (see Birge 2017: 57–72 for a general discussion of this source's origin and content).

54 On the work's composition, cf. de Pee 2007: 201, who favours official patronage and Birge 2017: 58–59, who questions it. Note, however, the title page of the *YDZ* with an edict ascribed to the Central Secretariat ordering the unknown author to compile the compendium. Even if this were a fake, the unknown author clearly aimed to create the impression of official auspices (the relevant passage can be found on the opening page of the *YDZ*'s original edition, reproduced in Birge 2017: 61, fig. 3.2 and cited in translation *ibid.*: 279–280; the original was not available to me). Note that the edition published by Chen Gaohua (2016) omits the title page. Unfortunately, Ch. XVIII of the *YDZ*, the one dedicated to the topic of "marriage" (*hunyin* 婚姻) and fully translated by Birge (2017), does not include any remarks on the Chinggisid in-laws, as it deals mainly with legal cases relevant to the lower societal layers. I am using the standard punctuated edition published in 4 volumes by the scholarly cluster under the general editorship of Chen Gaohua (Chen Gaohua et al. 2011).

55 Some of the sources used here were also originally written in other languages, such as Syriac, but produced in the Islamic realms.

56 For this I use both the Karīmī edition (1959) and the Rawshan/Mūsawī edition (1994–1995), as well as the first edition of Thackston's English translation (1998–1999). Hereafter *JT/K*, *JT/RM* and *JT* accordingly. Additionally, I use the Tashkent MS *al-Biruni 1620*, hereafter *JT/MsT*, for confirmation and checking rendering of the most problematic names.

57 For this I mainly use Boyle's translation (1997).

58 I mainly use the Bombay edition of the original and the German translation of the first four volumes by Hammer-Purgstall, recently published in Vienna (2010, 2012a, 2012b, 2016), as well as Ayāti's abridged version (1967) and the recent publication of the fourth volume of the history (Waṣṣāf/Nijād 2009).

59 For this I use Hamblī's edition (1969).

Anatolia, which include some highly valuable information on the Ilkhanid and Jochid realms.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, the further we move into the mid-fourteenth century, the more we need to use additional sources. A number of post-Ilkhanid sources are crucial, for instance the Jalayirid chronicle *Ta'riḵh-i Shaykh Uways* written (most probably) by al-Ahrī<sup>61</sup>. On the other hand, a significant number of historical compilations written under the auspices of the Timurid court are also of primary importance. The works of Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, al-Shāmī and al-Yazdī clearly fall into this category.<sup>62</sup> The last two are especially relevant for late fourteenth century Central Asian history, and therefore for the history of the Chaghadaid *ulus* in the times of the Great Crisis and its immediate aftermath. Finally, the sixteenth century *Ta'riḵh-i Rashīdī* by Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥaydar Dughlat Beg (d. 1551) is of importance for the history of the Eastern Chaghadaids (1370–1678).<sup>63</sup>

As historical chronicles of a specific dynasty or ruler in a certain period, all the sources presented above are interested in Chinggisid in-laws only when their biographies are related to the rulers under discussion. Therefore, each of the sources mentioned above affords only a very incomplete glimpse of Chinggisid history. We must therefore take two other groups of “Islamicate” sources into account. The first includes two Persian genealogical compendia, the *Shu'āb-i panjgānah* of Rashīd al-Dīn and the anonymous fifteenth-century *Mu'izz al-ansāb*, two unique sources which concentrate specifically on the military elite under the Chinggisids (and, in the second case, the Timurids, too). While providing detailed information on each ruler's military commanders, the compendia often (but, unfortunately, not always) mention marriages to Chinggisid princesses or add other valuable information. It is remarkable that scholars have not previously used these two compendia for an in-depth study of Chinggisid intermarriage and in-law lineages.<sup>64</sup> Unfortunately, these compendia merely list names with a limited amount of data and omit many individuals mentioned elsewhere.

The second large group of Islamicate sources are texts produced outside of the Chinggisid realm. A major part of those are Mamluk sources written in Arabic: historical chronicles, encyclopaedias and biographical compendia produced between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. Of primary importance are the works of Rukn al-Dīn Baybars al-Mansūrī (d. 725/1324–25), Shihāb al-Dīn al-Nuwayrī (d. 732/1331–32), Shams ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347–48), Ibn Faḍlallāh al-ʿUmarī (d. 749/1348–49), Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 764/1362–63), Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1441–42), and, finally, Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451–1452).<sup>65</sup> Primarily relevant to Mamluk-Ilkhanid relations, these works also include valuable information on Ilkhanate and Jochid

60 Such as the Aqserāyī/Işiltan 1943; Ibn Bībī/Duda 1959.

61 van Loon 1954.

62 E.g. *HA/Bayānī*, as well as *ZNS* and *ZNY*.

63 E.g. *TR/Ross*.

64 The first source is available through facsimile of MS Ahmet III 2937 (Topkapı Sarayı) published in Kazan in 2016. As of now this is the only published facsimile of the source (hereafter *SP/MS*). The second source was recently fully reproduced (from the Paris MS) and translated into Russian in Kazakhstan. While the translation may be faulty in some cases, comparison of photocopy and translation greatly facilitates work with this source.

65 For a detailed discussion of early Mamluk historiography, see e.g. Little 1970; for the later periods, see e.g. Massoud 2007.



politics, and even occasional references to the Chaghadaids and the Yuan. The Mamluk sources are of particular importance for research on the establishment of matrimonial bonds between the Mamluk Sultans and the Chinggisids – both Jochids and Hülegüids. In addition to the Mamluk sources there are several Persian chronicles compiled in the Delhi Sultanate and the famous Arabic travel diary of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Baṭṭūṭa, whose remarks offer additional insights into Jochid history and specifically Özbek Khan’s in-laws, among other issues. Finally, analysis of the “Islamicate” realm also includes various numismatic findings (mainly in the Jochid case) along with epigraphic remains, mainly produced under the Hülegüids.

### Other sources

Three more groups of sources are important for this study: Firstly, the Rus’ chronicles (*letopisi*) in Old Slavonic are an invaluable source on Jochid history. Fortunately, a significant number of those texts have been gathered over the last century and a half and published in Russia as part of the huge textual compendium *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey* (*Full Collection of the Russian Chronicles*, hereafter *PSRL*), currently comprising 33 volumes. While the Rus’ chroniclers were interested in the period of the Mongol conquests and Jochid control over the Rus’ territories mainly in terms of the “Orda’s” relations with the Rus’ principalities and provide less information on Jochid politics as such, they nevertheless include insights into matrimonial relations between the Jochid ruling house and the Rus’ *knyaz* (princes). Secondly, various Eastern European and Latin texts, primarily chronicles and epistles, provide information on Chinggisid (mainly Jochid) relations with the domains to their west. Data from Hungarian-related sources are particularly important in this regard, but Polish and ecclesiastical Latin sources are also useful. Finally, one should mention a number of Caucasian historical chronicles and historical compendia, such as the Armenian *Patmu‘iwn Hayots’* (*History of Armenia*) by Kirakos Gandzakets’i and the Georgian *Kartlis Tskhovreba* (*The Georgian Chronicles*) the last component of which, “Astslovani matiane” (“Chronicle of a Hundred Years”) is of primary interest for this project. From a region first conquered in the 1220s, these chronicles carefully gathered historical information concerning their respective countries’ relations with the Chinggisid overlords, including some unique pieces of information on imperial in-laws.

## Theoretical remarks

### The term “tribe”

As this research uses the term “tribe” extensively, it is important to dedicate a discussion to its usage and understanding. Very few other terms in historical, ethnographical, and anthropological publications have caused so much controversy over recent decades as “tribe”, alongside the connected concepts of “clan” and “kinship”. Debate over the internal organisational patterns of pre-modern nomadic societies has resurfaced in recent years following the 2007 publication of David Sneath’s *The Headless State*, in which Sneath argued that the whole idea of the “tribe” as the main organisation form of pre-modern

nomadic societies is a product of a social “evolutionist vision” embedded in the “colonial-era scheme of political evolution from tribal to state society and the associated concepts of kinship and pastoral-nomadic society as distinctive social types”.<sup>66</sup> While proclaiming the notion of “tribe” obsolete as a major building unit of nomadic societies, Sneath suggests the idea of “aristocratic orders”, powerful elite families, being the basis and the major founding blocks of nomadic “headless states”, societies organised from the bottom up.<sup>67</sup> Following fieldwork in present-day Mongolia, Sneath clearly extrapolated contemporary findings to pre-modern and even pre-Chinggisid realities, insisting on an absence of tribal markers in nomadic societies and seeing “aristocratic families” as their only organising principle, around which all other members of those societies cluster.<sup>68</sup> Sneath expands his theory well beyond Inner Asia, claiming its applicability to other nomadic societies, even including those as far as the African continent.<sup>69</sup> The publication of Sneath’s book led to a lengthy series of criticisms, followed up and challenged by Sneath’s own reply to his critics.<sup>70</sup> The impact of Sneath’s work should not be underestimated, as leading Mongolists including Christopher Atwood and Lhamsuren Munkh-Erdene follow or partly share Sneath’s views.<sup>71</sup>

Abolishing the idea of the tribe led Sneath to obligatorily denounce the idea of *kinship*. Blood or family-oriented kinship, a general term for organising society along the lines of (real or fictive) family connections, was seen by many anthropologists as one of the basic characteristics and structuring components of human societies in general and nomadic societies in particular.<sup>72</sup> The overwhelming importance of kinship for the different nomadic groups was stressed by Khazanov in his *Nomads and the Outside World*, alongside yet

66 Sneath 2007: 43–52, 52, 64, 202. Sneath attacked those disagreeing with him as promoting “conceptual apartheid” (Sneath 2007: 49), thereby polemicizing the debate and adding a “political labelling” (Khazanov 2010: 207). See Khazanov: “In the communist countries accusations of political incorrectness were quite a common practice even in scholarly debates, but one might expect a Western scholar to be disdainful of it.” (idem 2010: 207). David Durand-Guédy was even prompted to call Sneath’s book “a polemical pamphlet” (idem 2011: 122).

67 Sneath 2007: 2, 73–74 and further on his Chapter VI (pp. 181–204).

68 On this see especially the final chapter of Sneath’s book (2007: 181–204) and his polemical paper in the *Ab Imperio* volume produced in order to debate his thesis (2009).

69 See e.g. Sneath 2007: 58–58, 59–64, 71–84, and passim; cf. Barfield 2009: 943. Moreover, Sneath touches upon the reasons for the rise and fall of Inner Asian nomadic societies. In contrast to Thomas Barfield and others, he does not link them to steppe relations with China, but explains them only by internal factors related to nomadic aristocracies’ ups and downs (e.g. Sneath 2007: 195–204, on this note also Barfield 2009: 942).

70 See e.g. Abashin 2009; Barthold 2009; Golden 2009; Kradin/Skrynnikova 2009; Kivelson 2009; Munkh-Erdene 2009; Lim 2009; Edgar 2009; Elverskog 2009; Glebov 2009; Sneath 2009a; Sneath 2009b; Khazanov 2010; Sneath’s answer to Golden in Sneath 2010; Golden’s answer to Sneath in Golden 2010; Prior 2010; Durand-Guédy 2011; Kradin 2012.

71 See e.g. examples in Atwood 2010 and its revised version in Atwood 2015b, esp. 16–17; Munkh-Erdene 2011, esp. 212, 220 (and note esp. Munkh-Erdene 2009 with his partial critique of Sneath’s ideas).

72 See the detailed discussions of the term and the corresponding phenomenon in general as well as the different theoretical approaches towards it e.g. in Radcliffe-Brown 1941; Lévi-Strauss 1969, esp. Introduction (3–28) and Ch. VIII “Alliance and Descent” (98–118), Ch. IX “The Marriage of Cousins” (119–133) and Ch. X “Matrimonial Exchange” (134–145); Khazanov 1994: 138–144; Feinberg/Ottenheimer 2001; Ottenheimer 2001; de Souza 2009; also Schneider 2011 for the general theoretical discussion.

another factor, i.e. “descent”. According to Khazanov “kinship regulates relations within a relatively small collective (group) of people; it mediates the individual’s position in a system of horizontal ties by superseding the discrete character of different descent groups. Descent regulates relations between different groups and at the same time establishes the individual’s society as a whole [...]. Kinship establishes the position of the individual in society, descent legitimizes it”.<sup>73</sup> For him, the two terms coexist to regulate nomadic society on two different levels, that of *kinship* referring to the kin in its self-identification and allocation of duties and rights, while *descent* “operates [...] in governing the real allocation of genealogies [...] and in providing in the notion of common descent a bond for all the members of a given society”.<sup>74</sup> Needless to say, both the genealogies and the notion of common descent can be of real, constructed, or symbolic nature. Yet this distinction between “blood”-kin and descent was completely ignored by Sneath. For him, neither the case of the “Medieval Mongols” (employing a problematic Eurocentric term) nor other cases discussed in his book and the follow-up articles attest to the existence of anything similar to kin-tribe structures, and he even hesitates to describe the way his “aristocratic families” were organised with the word *clan*.<sup>75</sup> He suggests that scholars primarily use political terms, such as “principality” or “political entity” instead of “tribe”, as he does when mentioning the Kereyit, Merkit, Tatar, Jürkin or Taychi’ut.<sup>76</sup>

It is important to look briefly both at the disagreements between the revisionist school, to which Atwood and others belong alongside Sneath as well as the alternative approach supporting the idea of tribes and kinship/descent as key structuring systems of pre-modern nomadic societies.<sup>77</sup> One of the major points of disagreement lay in Sneath’s description of the terms *tribe* and *clan* as obsolete, Eurocentric and colonial in nature.<sup>78</sup> In the reaction to Sneath’s claims, it was noted that these terms were not invented by Western “colonial” scholars but that this was the lexicon used by the nomadic societies themselves and thus that of the primary sources.<sup>79</sup> Moreover, the meaning of the historical tribe was discussed long before Smith by Rudi Lindner. Unfortunately, Sneath does not mention Lindner and

---

<sup>73</sup> Khazanov 1994: 140.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*: 140.

<sup>75</sup> E.g. Sneath 2009b: 92–96.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*: 92.

<sup>77</sup> See the bibliography in this subchapter. I am aware of the general critical voices raised regarding the “tribe” issue by Fried (1966, 1975), Kuper (1982, 1988, see also the recent publication by Kuper [2003]), Schneider (1984) and Atwood (e.g. 2010), but a detailed discussion of these approaches belongs to a separate publication. For the counterbalance opinion see e.g. Kradin 2015.

<sup>78</sup> E.g. Sneath’s discussion in *idem* 2007: 43–52.

<sup>79</sup> Golden 2009. Some also stressed the limited number of sources (primary and secondary) used by Sneath and his seeming lack of acquaintance with works outside of the Western English-speaking scholarly world, in one case even accusing Sneath himself of “colonialist anthropology” (Kradin 2012: 130, see also Durand-Guédy 2011: 121.). Next, Khazanov and Golden rightly stressed that Sneath claims that “aristocracy orders” were the real power nexuses of the pre-modern nomadic societies without explaining at all where these “seemingly immutable and timeless” orders arise from, if not from the clan-tribe societal structures. Khazanov 2010: 207; see also Golden 2009: 661. Note, in fact, that Sneath himself concludes his book by saying that “the concept of aristocracy as an analytical and comparative term deserves to be developed more fully” (Sneath 2007: 204). Finally, a significant number of factual mistakes have also been discussed, as well as how Sneath’s approach contributes to the theoretical discussion on nomadic state-building (e.g. Golden 2009: 296; Durand-Guédy 2011: 122).

his works in his book. It is to Lindner's basic claims, however, that we should turn in this discussion, and it is on Lindner's concept of the "tribe" that this monography bases its own understanding of the term and its meaning. Back in 1980, Lindner demanded in his "What Was a Nomadic Tribe?" that differences between modern tribes and those of the nomadic past be taken into consideration. This should be given some thought. Lindner correctly criticised anthropologists for the direct extrapolation of anthropological models created for modern, observable, nomadic tribes onto those of the past (this is also where Sneath started his analysis). On the one hand, he stated that modern nomadic tribes are not independent from sedentary society but rather controlled by it, and on the other hand he stresses the political weakness of the tribe and therefore the very limited number of people willing to become part of it. Only seemingly similar to Sneath, however, Lindner stressed the political dimension of the tribe as "a political organism open to all who were willing to subordinate themselves to its chief and who shared interests with its tribesmen".<sup>80</sup> Unlike Sneath, at the same time, Lindner saw the tribes as a real functioning power and the major identity unit in the fluid nomadic societies of the past, where kinship, real or symbolic, played a crucial role as the *emotional* bond between the tribe's members.<sup>81</sup> This approach seems much more suited to the realities of the Mongols' nomadic world. Indeed, as is stressed throughout this research, the rise of large elite (but certainly not "aristocratic") families,<sup>82</sup> was an important feature of the time. Moreover, these large elite families have in some cases (but not the majority) almost become synonyms for certain tribal groups within the Chinggisid political architecture (e.g. the Qonggirad). However, while the rise of those "elite" families out of the broader tribal masses was the direct result of Chinggis Khan's rise to power, the waning of the Chinggisid "core" quickly led to those families' disappearance (at least from the sources). This alone did not, however, lead to the disappearance of the broader tribal masses or their ethnic markers.<sup>83</sup>

In terms of this research, this theoretical discussion is of primary importance for research on the Chinggisid sons-in-law of the "inner core", both in the broader context of the nomadic society of Mongol Eurasia in general and the political architecture of the Chinggisid supra-polity in particular. Both issues – the relevance of tribal terminology and of kinship and descent – are crucial.<sup>84</sup> With regard to the first issue, I start with the assumption that the tribe/clan terminology is the only suitable framework to grasp the ways in which the nomadic society of Eurasia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries perceived itself. While Sneath recommends using political terminology ("political entities") instead of tribal, and Atwood, another leading tribe-sceptic, suggests avoiding using the term at all, simply calling the Chinggisids' in-law families "vassal elites", it appears to me that no real

---

80 Lindner 1980: 701.

81 *Ibid.*: 700.

82 I prefer to avoid such loaded terms beyond their specific temporal, cultural and historical context. I prefer the rather neutral word "elites". The usage of the term "aristocracy" (from the Gr. ἀριστοκρατία, "rule of the best-born") outside of the European pre-modern history is as problematic for me as the usage of the terms "fiefs" and "Middle Ages" in the Chinese and Islamic context.

83 I exemplified this discussion in Landa 2016b: 189–191 on the Oyirad case in the Ilkhanate and the Mamluk Sultanate.

84 This obviously relates to the tribal elite families discussed below, those from the Chinggisid power circles' "inner core", not to the foreign rulers.

substitute for the notorious term can be provided.<sup>85</sup> Redefinition of the groups involved, namely moving from the identity dimension to the purely political or administrative, is highly misleading, as one inevitably loses a dimension essential to the understanding of Chinggisid history through their own eyes. Applying the recommendations of these two leading scholars would mean erasing the identity differences between the various groups which constituted pre-Mongol society, and which became the building blocks of the imperial Mongol armies.

As this research will show, differences between the various tribes were crucial to our sources' representation and judgement of various individuals. Namely, at least in Western Asia, contemporary authors saw the Mongols organised in units similar to those of the Arabs, which are commonly called *tribes*. This is indeed the language used by the sources (Ar. *qawm*, Ch. *bu* 部, *buluo* 部落, etc.), and even if one takes the various biases of these terms into account, it seems very strange to completely negate their language to fit the available texts into a specific theoretical framework. One can and should question the understanding of the tribe as one indivisible ethnic entity existing throughout time and space, one can and should also question the way the sources speak about the tribes, one should also indeed stress the importance of elite lineages in nomadic history, but one cannot remove tribal (identity) markers from the discussion, as this would leave the sources unreadable. As will be shown further, various tribal lineages were indeed often identified with the general tribal marker (as the family of Dei Sechen, Chinggis Khan's father-in-law, became *the* Qonggirad in many sources). However, in those cases the great elite families positioned themselves in relation to specific tribal markers. Furthermore, this is probably much more an issue of the way in which our sources perceived the tribal elites, drawing the readers' attention to some while eliminating the memory of others. The markers themselves, however, namely the tribal labels, remained intact. Finally, the "retribalisation" wave, which swept Eurasia in the mid-fourteenth century during the Great Crisis period, can also only be explained if one keeps in mind the importance of the tribal markers through the history of Mongol Eurasia.<sup>86</sup>

The issue of how one should understand those tribal entities is a different, yet related issue. The question is thus whether the kin/descent approach should be applied to the analysis of nomadic society, whether it represents a "colonial" perspective or whether kin and descent are, at least to some degree, categories inherent to nomadic societies. Following the many scholars cited above, I see kin and descent bonds (real or fictive "blood" connections) as two crucial mechanisms playing a major role on the level of smaller societal entities, such as families or clans. The more one moves towards the broader societal levels of the nomadic world, the more, it seems, do tribal markers play a role in the way various groups perceive one another. In this context, the development of *güregen* connections with the Chinggisid families was of crucial importance to the ethnogenesis in both Mongol and post-Mongol Eurasia, as in many cases it led to the establishment of multi-generational in-law lineages. New groups formed around these, but used their old tribal markers in order to identify themselves and their supporters (as we will see in the Jalayirid, Oyirad and Qonggirad examples). Therefore, Sneath's focus on the "nobility" (or

<sup>85</sup> For Sneath see idem 2009: 92; for Atwood I refer to personal correspondence from 28 December 2017.

<sup>86</sup> On this term, see Togan 1998: 13; for a broader discussion see Landa 2017: 1203, esp. fn. 81.

elite) groups is not wrong, but the way he tackled the problem seems rather misleading. While the various tribal in-law clans each developed their own network of supporters and each controlled a certain number of *qarachi* rank and file, all in-law lineages from a given tribe used the same tribal markers (which would not make sense were Sneath's theory correct).

Adding one more note to this discussion, I would like to turn the reader's attention to one very special case, which highlights one usually inaccessible aspect of tribal history. I am talking about early Oyirad history, and, more precisely, the way the Oyirad were perceived by outsiders (in our case, the Mamluk Sultanate). The Oyirad inhabited the Selenga areas during Chinggis Khan's lifetime.<sup>87</sup> A significant part left the Mongolian steppes following the waves of Chinggisid conquest. A large group found its way to Western Asia, where they were actively involved in the Ilkhanate, and about a *tümen* (a unit nominally ten thousand strong) fled to the Mamluk Sultanate at the very end of the thirteenth century.<sup>88</sup> The late thirteenth and early fourteenth century witnessed the appearance of multiple major Oyirad tribal elite families and lineages, who competed or tried to annihilate one another.<sup>89</sup> Importantly, the often praised '*aşabiyya*, i.e. the idea of feelings uniting a society, originally called "sense of kinship" in the pre-Islamic Arab world, developed by Ibn Khaldun in the late fourteenth century, do not seem to have been of special relevance to the different Oyirad wings in their competition at the Ilkhanid or Yuan courts.<sup>90</sup> However, throughout the whole period of Mongol rule in Central Eurasia the term *Oyirad*, as well as the tribal elite families bearing it, did not disappear, but flourished, even after the collapse of the Khanates.<sup>91</sup> The preservation of an Oyirad "imagined" community throughout at least two hundred years is, therefore, a fact.<sup>92</sup> There are indications, however, that at least some core of the Oyirad in the Ilkhanate – and, successively, in the Mamluk Sultanate – did belong to the same ethnic community. Multiple remarks in our sources concerning the beauty of their women and men, especially those found in the Mamluk sources, indicate not only a certain erotic agenda related to the Oyirad of both sexes among the Mamluk military (though some specific fantasies

87 For the discussion of the Oyirad original location and origins, see Landa 2016a, 174, fn. 68 and 175, fn. 70. Wu Qiyu comes to the conclusion that the Oyirads of Chinggis Khan's times were "predominantly Turkish in blood" (idem 1941: 219) but this is contradicted by Bartold 1968b: 275. According to Okada, these differences noticed by Rashīd al-Dīn could be explained by the influence of the neighbouring Naiman and Kirgiz, both of Turkic origin (Okada 1987: 183). As notices Bartold, the name of the Eight Rivers (Sekiz Muren) presents a combination of Mongol and Turkic languages (sekiz [Turc.] – eight, muren [mörön] [Mong.] – river) (Bartold 1968a: 125). On the relations between the "Oyirad" of the thirteenth century and the later tribal confederation known as the "Dörben Oyirad", see Okada 1987: 193–211; Landa 2016a, 175–176. For a different version on the origin of the name, see Bichurin, 1834: 3; Banzarov, 1891: 84; Ramstedt 1909: 550–557; Ubushaev 1994; Terentiev 2013: 203.

88 For a detailed discussion of these developments, see Landa 2016a: 174–192; 2016b, 2017, 2018a for Oyirad history in Western Asia. For some senior Oyirad in-laws under the Hülügüids see below, Ch. III. On the term 'tümen', see further Appendix II, no. 24.

89 For this see the detailed discussion in Ch. III.

90 See more on the concept as well as its modern analyses in Gellner 1975 and Darling 2007.

91 In Greater Iran we find Oyirad groups as late as the beginning of the fifteenth century, while in Western Mongolia the tribe still exists today.

92 I am not using this term in the context of Anderson's theory (see Anderson 1983 in general, and esp. pp. 5–7).

concerning Oyirad slaves can be read in these remarks), but also arguably suggests common physical features found among the representatives of the roughly ten thousand Oyirad people who crossed the Ilkhanid-Mamluk border in January 1296.<sup>93</sup> The question of whether the “Oyirad” all across Eurasia remained identical from the ethnic point should most probably be answered in the negative. The actual meaning of the term *Oyirad* has to be deciphered for each specific point of time and place in Mongol Eurasia and beyond, but it would be going too far, following Sneath, to proclaim the existence of the Oyirad “tribe” the fictive product of a modern colonial agenda.<sup>94</sup> Importantly for us, the Oyirad in Syria and Egypt were perceived by the Mamluk authors as a homogenous group – both culturally and, notably, from the point of view of the physical appearance. This implies, even though one cannot fully confirm this on other case studies, that almost a hundred years after the Chinggisid unification of the Mongolian steppes the Oyirad functioned outwards as an intact group. Furthermore, this might similarly imply that also other tribal military units might have avoided the “atomisation”. While the first pretenders to this role would be the tribal armies of the multiple in-laws all across the continent, the sources do not allow us to reach any solid conclusion.

In my opinion, therefore, it is both the domains of kinship *and* descent with which Sneath’s “aristocracy” and its (politically invented or real) identity operate. This theoretical discussion is of the utmost importance of research on imperial sons-in-law, whose tribal affiliations and matrimonial connections with each other and the ruling clan were (most of the time) scrupulously registered in the chronicles. As we will see, the imperial in-laws more often preserved control over their own armies and households and moved with them throughout Eurasia following the campaigns of conquest than did other tribal lineages. Therefore, it is through the lenses of this research that we can follow the migration of the broader tribal masses throughout Eurasia as a result of Mongol conquests and rule. Following our sources and their language, there is no way to approach the history of the Chinggisid sons-in-law without taking into consideration the importance of tribal markers in the Chinggisid army, society, and politics. As will be shown, the “tribe” remained a major reference point in the political lexicon and on the social level of the Chinggisid world. It certainly went through several changes imposed by and through the incorporation of the pre-Chinggisid tribal society into the Empire. Many tribal structures were broken, new “atomized” (Broadbridge) units were created, and the tribal legacy was at least partly replaced by the affiliation to a commander on the lower level and to the Ching-gisids on the uppermost. The tribal identity still did not disappear completely even among the members of units assigned to simple *nökers*. This is especially true with regard to the *güregens*’ tribal armies, which, as we have seen, preserved their homogeneity at least to some extent. As long as Chinggisid rule remained strong in Eurasia, the tribal notion remained, however, for “internal use”, for differentiating between various groups of the political and military strata of the Chinggisid societies, while the primary affiliation remained to the Chinggisids. As soon as the rules of the game changed and the Chinggisids’ position weakened, we witness the resurrection of old tribal identities across Eurasia – the Oyirads, the Jalayirids, the

93 For this see Landa 2016b: 185, fn. 159, and also 187–189.

94 Even less so should one dismiss the term *kinship*, firstly because the nomadic communities themselves used it. The fictional nature of most kinship claims does not entail the irrelevance of the concept.

Barlas, the Manghit, the Qonggirads. It is very telling that this “retribalisation” (Togan) is in many cases related to the in-laws, old and new, which makes sense as they headed the tribal units in question. It seems that in the Chinggisid political vocabulary the tribal identity remained of principal importance to the in-laws. During the period of Crisis, as discussed in Ch. VI, the “retribalisation” wave was to a significant degree strengthened by the rise of the in-laws in the vacuum left by the Chinggisids. Notwithstanding, the reader must keep in mind that the “tribes” of the “retribalisation” wave as a general rule were not obligatorily similar to those ethnic units which were known under their tribal names a hundred years before it. At the same time, at least in the case of the Oyirads and the Jalayirids (Ch. III), we can be sure that the major in-law lineages behind the tribes with the same names, namely the descendants of Tänggiz Güregen and Elgei Noyan, belonged (at least according to the preserved biographical data) to the same tribal groups that the sources refer to as “Oyirads” and “Jalayirs” many decades before the mid-fourteenth century. It is actually likely that the major in-law lineages gave the tribal name to those of their followers from outside who gathered around their tribal group and the identification remained for a longer period in time.

### The term “imperial sons-in-law”, its variations and historical contexts

The Mongol word *güregen*, also met as *küregen*, a cognate of the Turkic *küdagü*, does not mean anything else than “son-in-law”.<sup>95</sup> More precisely, this term denotes the understanding of a bridegroom or a woman’s husband “from the perspective of her family”.<sup>96</sup> The word can be found in its multiple variations in more than two dozen old and modern Turkic and Altaic languages, including Old Uyghur, Qarakhanid Turkic, Oguz, Kipchak, modern Uyghur and Uzbek.<sup>97</sup> In the political context of Mongol Eurasia, however, the word *güregen* gained a political connotation, exclusively denoting a man married to a Chinggisid princess.<sup>98</sup> As mentioned by Doerfer, this usage began with the *SH*, compiled around the 1250s.<sup>99</sup> Following Chinggisid expansion westwards, the term *güregen* entered the lexicon of the Persian and Arabic chronicles, and many examples are found in Ilkhanid and Mamluk sources.<sup>100</sup> Further on the term *güregen* or *küregen* entered the political lexicon of the Timurids and much later the Moghuls (1526–1878).<sup>101</sup> Interestingly, this word does not appear anywhere in the Rus’ chronicles, is not used as a loan word in any form. It seems that despite sporadic Mongol intermarriage with the Rus’ elite, the existence of this group never interested the chroniclers writing in Old Slavonic.<sup>102</sup>

95 Clauson 1972: 703. See al-Kashgari’s *küdagü* translated as “Bräutigam” (bridegroom) by Brockelman 1928: 115; Kashgari/Atalay 1941, 3: 166).

96 See Erdal 2015: 139 for a broader discussion of the linguistic connections between the Turkic and Mongol variations and their morphology. Note that he continues the older discussion of Bang (1919: 45–46) and Poppe (1927: 117).

97 Erdal 2015: 139, see also Rybatzki 2006: 569–570; Rykin 2011: 29, 38–39.

98 See Doerfer’s record of the word *kürgän* (*TMEN*, 1: 475–477, §340), where he explicitly writes about *güregen*: “Schwiegersohn; als spezieller Titel: ein Fürst, der die Tochter eines Čingisiden geheiratet hat” [i.e. “son-in-law; as a special title – a prince who married a Chinggisid daughter”] (*ibid.*: 475).

99 *TMEN*, 1: 475; the same examples in Rybatzki 2006: 93, 96, 112, 173 and passim.

100 See Ch. III and Ch. V for examples.

101 On this see below, Ch. V and Ch. VII.

102 This is reasonable if one takes into consideration the very small number of Rus’ *knyazes* involved in



This was not the case with the Chinese. When one reads Yuan-era Chinese sources, one must keep in mind that the *fuma* title awarded to Yuan sons-in-law is a translation of their nomadic, not Chinese, status. Unlike other peoples under Mongol rule, the Chinese were not only acquainted with the political phenomenon of imperial sons-in-law, but also had a special title and a position for such individuals in their complicated and developed hierarchy of noble ranks. The office *fuma duwei* 駙馬都尉 (Chief Commandant of Attendant Cavalry), the traditional Chinese political equivalent of the word *güregen*, was established in the second year of Han Wudi's (漢武帝, r. 141 BCE-87 BCE, fifth emperor of the Former Han) *Yuanding* 元鼎 era (i.e. 115 BCE).<sup>103</sup> This office existed alongside two other *duwei* offices – that of *fengche duwei* 奉車都尉 (Commandant-in-chief for Chariots)<sup>104</sup> and *qi duwei* 騎都尉 (Commandant of Cavalry), together known as the *san duwei* 三都尉 (three commanders).<sup>105</sup> At that time the salary of a *fuma duwei* (which also represented his status) equalled about two thousand *shi* 石 of grain, comparable to the salary assigned to the first three classes of official ranks.<sup>106</sup> It is unclear whether the office was already bestowed on imperial sons-in-law by that time.<sup>107</sup> Despite the fact that the office had existed since the Han era, it seems that it was only after the Jin dynasty (265–420) that the title became fully reserved for imperial sons-in-law.<sup>108</sup>

Two very rough categories seem to pertain to imperial sons-in-law before the Yuan. The first comprises non-Chinese rulers or members of affiliated ruling houses who were given Chinese princesses as part of diplomatic relations. This category includes all cases of the well-known *heqin* policy, i.e. the bestowal of princesses on non-Han rulers as part of tribute relations between the Chinese emperors and the “outside” world.<sup>109</sup> In this case, royal marriage was a tool for extending symbolic rule beyond the borders of the actual realm, established through the expansion of broader blood kin.<sup>110</sup> It seems that the *fuma duwei* title was not often used in *heqin* relations, the usual designation of the imperial son-in-law in this context being *xu* 婿 or *nixu* 女婿.<sup>111</sup> It would be wrong, however, to claim that the

---

matrimonial relations with the Chinggisids. On Jochid intermarriage with the Rus' see Ch. IV.

103 Bielenstein 1980: 29. According to Hucker, *fuma duwei* was a commander of the reserve horses accompanying a chariot or carriage (idem 1985: 219).

104 Hucker 1985: 212.

105 *Ibid.*: 219; Liu 2010: 50.

106 Zhang 2004: 1; Bielenstein 1980: 29; on the Han-era salary structure see Bielenstein 1980: 4–5, 125–131. See also Barbieri-Low/Yates 2015, 2: 983, fn. 6, also p. 1179, fn. 8 on the military function of the *duwei* position during the Early Han.

107 According to Bielenstein, during most of the Han period the office was mainly a sinecure and served as an addition to the bearer's other offices, except for in times of war (idem 1980: 29).

108 Zhang 2015: 295; further Huang 2010: 109; eadem 2013: 372–373.

109 For a very detailed discussion of *heqin* relations until the Tang see Pan 1997b; for the Sui and Tang see Skaff 2012: 203–240.

110 See the lengthy discussion in Skaff 2012: 203–240.

111 The example of the first is provided by the *Jiu Tangshu*, which describes the bestowal of princess Ningguo, the younger daughter of Tang Suzong 肅宗 (r. 756–762), on the Uyghur ruler Gele Qaghan (r. 747–759), in the first year of Suzong's reign, i.e. the first year of the *Qianyuan* era (758 AD). The source records the discussion between Tang Suzong's nephew Yu 瑒, who came to the Uyghur court accompanying the princess, and Gele Qaghan, who demanded that Yu bow to him. Yu, refusing, proudly mentioned that, while marrying “a true daughter of the emperor” (*tianzi zhen nü* 天子真女), the Qaghan became a son-in-law (*nixu* 女婿) of the Tang, and therefore he should have known the

title was not used in connection with foreign, non-Chinese rulers before the Yuan, as the example of Qapaghan Qaghan (r. 694–ca. 715) of the Second Turk Empire proves.<sup>112</sup>

The second category includes all those from the inner political realm of a specific dynasty who were granted a princess, and it seems that before the Yuan the title *fuma duwei* (or abbreviated to *fuma*) was used explicitly for this category. The criteria of choice, as well as the *fuma duwei* status and accordant privileges differ greatly from dynasty to dynasty, as well as the reasons for marrying princesses and the scope of a *fuma* son-in-law's ability to influence court politics. One of the most unusual groups are the imperial sons-in-law, whose destiny was to serve as de facto hostages or guarantees of their fathers' loyalty to the court. One example is An Qingzong 安慶宗 (d. 755), son of An Lushan 安祿山 (703–757), the famous Tang general and rebel of Sogdian origin. An Qingzong was executed following his father's rebellion.<sup>113</sup> The majority of imperial sons-in-law shared a more successful fate, however. In some dynasties, especially the Song, the *fuma duwei* were mostly known not for political influence or military success, but rather their outstanding cultural capacities. These include Wang Shen (王誥, c. 1036 – c. 1093), a “noted poet, calligrapher, artist and art collector”, and son-in-law of Emperor Yingzong 英宗 (r. 1063–1067) of the Song.<sup>114</sup> Li Wei (李瑋, d. 1086), a famous painter and calligrapher of the Northern Song and an imperial son-in-law of Emperor Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1022–1063), is another example.<sup>115</sup>

There are, however, some aspects of the history of the title which have still not been discussed. The existing research does not focus enough on the differences between the originally ethnic Han and non-Han dynasties in the ways that sons-in-law were chosen or in the degree of their political involvement. In general, the title seems to have been borrowed by non-Han dynasties for internal political usage, as were parts of the ranking table and Chinese administrative structures. There were some clear peculiarities. While it is plausible to suppose that in both cases imperial sons-in-law were chosen to secure the loyalty of groups important to a dynasty or a specific emperor, the question of who those persons were, and which considerations were important for their appointment, can be answered differently. A tentative suggestion is that the originally non-Chinese dynasties, mostly of

---

etiquette (JTS 195: 5200–5201; Pan 1997a: 294; Skaff 2012: 153; note also the strange mistake of Lung/Li 2005: 1001–1002, who identify the Uyghur ruler in question with Bilgä, who passed away in 734). For another example of Tang matrimonial policies, that with the Tibetan *btsan-po* (kings) see Pan 1997a: 247–252; and also eadem 1997b: 111–126 for a general discussion.

112 See Skaff for an analysis of Qapaghan's full title, which includes *fuma* along with other Chinese and steppe terms (Skaff 2012: 124). Note, however, that this is the only occasion this title appears in Skaff's monograph. A quantitative search through all the standard histories of China shows that the YS (316 cases) includes the most mentions of the term *fuma*, followed by the *Mingshi* 明史 (166 cases). The two Tang histories, the New and the Old, count 154 and 153 cases respectively, most of those, 145 and 103 cases respectively, in connection with the characters *duwei*, thus clearly identifying the official title of the Imperial Consort. In the YS, at the same time, the number of the *fu ma du wei* characters amounts to only 11 cases. A general analysis on the usage of the term in Chinese historical writing is still awaited, but it seems clear that there were significant differences between the way that pre- and post-Yuan historians used the term.

113 Yang 1952: 518–519; JTS, 187: 4892, 200a: 5369–5379; XTS, 191: 5527, 225a: 6416–6417.

114 Laing 1968: 419, also fn. 1.

115 On the marriage see SS, 115: 2733; 336: 10759; 341: 10881. He is explicitly called “*fuma duwei* Li Wei” in the *Songshi* 宋史 (SS, 302: 10025). See also van Gulik 1955: 90, cont. of fn. 10 (p. 89).

nomadic and semi-nomadic origin, tended to establish their *fuma/güregen* relations differently from the Han dynasties. A key difference was the very small number of Han *fuma* serving non-Han dynasties, the main example probably being the case of the Liao, during which the establishment of an exclusive and preferential marriage arrangement between the ruling Yelü 耶律 and the Xiao 蕭 in-law clan left little space for the inclusion of any additional or “alien” components.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, the *Liaoshi* 遼史, the dynastic history of the Kitan Liao, informs us of a certain Lu Jun 盧俊, of Han origin, who married princess Shuge 淑哥, fourth daughter of Emperor Jingzong 景宗 (r. 969–982) in 980.<sup>117</sup> Following the example of the previous Chinese dynasties, the Liao used the title *fuma duwei*, awarding it to Lu Jun just like the members of the Xiao clan.<sup>118</sup> The rarity of exceptions like Lu Jun underlines the Liao norm.

The imperial marriages of the Northern Wei (*Bei Wei* 北魏, 386–535) of Tuoba 拓跋 origin provide another, earlier case, although one of more complication and nuance. As noted by Holmgren, a prominent pattern of Northern Wei rule was the relatively low percentage of Han individuals among imperial sons-in-law.<sup>119</sup> Those admitted as sons-in-law were, however, very diverse, one of the main groups being defectors from the outside world rather than imperial elite clans. Thus, in Holmgren’s words, the Tuoba “used marriages of princesses of the blood as a political bribe to secure and retain the loyalty, not of the great clans of the military elite which customarily served Wei, but of resident ‘guests’ who came from hostile and/or independent foreign communities”.<sup>120</sup> We are also aware of some kind of preferential marriage, but very limited, with the Mu 穆 clan of the Dai 代 group within the Tuoba, but this is a unique example.<sup>121</sup> Additionally, only very few connections with Han elites can be found in the sources. Thus, Lu Xinzhi 陸昕之, of the influential Chinese Lu 陸 clan, married Princess Changshan 常山, one of Emperor Xianzu’s 顯祖 (r. 465–471) daughters, and became a *fuma duwei*.<sup>122</sup> As in other Chinese dynasties, the title of *fuma duwei* was in use, but, as noted by Liu Jun, the Northern Wei did not use the *fuma duwei* title for imperial sons-in-law from the beginning of the dynasty. Its usage only started with the rule of Emperor Mingyuan (明元, r. 392–423). Aside from 39 individuals who received the *fuma duwei* title under the Northern Wei, there were six who were not bestowed this title or are not recorded as having been awarded it.<sup>123</sup>

Finally, it is not clear whether all imperial sons-in-law of the Chinese dynasties held the title as well as whether all *fuma duwei* that we meet in the chronicles after the Northern Wei were indeed imperial sons-in-law. It should not be taken for granted that all imperial sons-

116 See further Wittfogel/Feng 1949: 206–212.

117 *LS* 65: 1002. This seems only to have been the case for the Liao, but the exact reasons for the marriage are not clear. Note also that the princess’ mother originated from the Bohai people and was a concubine, which likely lowered her children’s status. The marriage did not hold for long; they were divorced by order of the emperor (*LS* 10: 110; Wittfogel/Feng 1949: 258).

118 *LS* 8: 95, 84: 1307.

119 Holmgren 1983a: 81–82, 94.

120 Holmgren 1983a: 96–97, but also see Holmgren 1991: 80.

121 See *WS* 27: 661–673. The *WS* mentions eleven cases of family members being granted the *fuma duwei* title. In all cases marriage to a princess was a direct reason for this (see *WS* 27: 662, 663, 665, 666, 667, 671, 673).

122 *WS* 40: 909; Holmgren 1983b: 301–302.

123 Liu 2010: 51.

in-law were necessarily bestowed this title along with their princess. Another question arises when one reads the Standard Histories (*zhengshi* 正史), namely whether the shorter title *fuma*, which is often (and in varying frequency) used without the second part *duwei*, is equal in meaning to its full designation.<sup>124</sup> The most striking example is, indeed, the *YS*, which mentions only 11 people described as *fuma duwei*, while more than a hundred are simply referred to as *fuma*.<sup>125</sup> In this context, the question of whether all those called *fuma* also received the *fuma duwei* title, or whether this nomenclature was simply used by the Mongol rulers and therefore their Chinese chroniclers in order to designate those who married a princess, is also unclear. If the latter applies, then in most cases the Yuan *fuma* was a direct translation of the Mongol word *güregen*, and not connected with the position in the table of ranks. As this study will show, it seems indeed that the Yuan *fuma*, at least those of steppe (Mongol or Turkic) origin, united both traditions – the Chinese traditional bureaucracy and the steppe. Their power, privileges and status reflected their steppe origin, but it was under their Chinese cover and names that they were remembered in Chinese history. The discussion of the multiple tomb and temple inscriptions produced by them or in their memory by Han Confucians highlights the unique multicultural setting of the Yuan dynasty on Chinese soil and in Chinese historical memory.

Thus, Yuan sources indeed label the Yuan *güregens* with this title. At the same time and despite the borrowing of the title *fuma* (or rarely *fuma duwei*) from pre-Yuan Chinese traditions, it would be a mistake to claim a direct continuity for the phenomenon before and during the Mongol era. As shown in Ch. II, it is only in the way the Yuan structured its relations with foreign rulers or elites such as Tibetans and Koreans that some similarities with the classical *heqin* policies of the past can be discerned. The *güregen* bonds for “internal use”, especially those with tribal elite families begun before the conquest of China, were technically arranged in Chinese style but inherently resembled steppe power relations between the khan and his allies. In this regard they seem to resemble the matrimonial relations of the pre-Mongol non-Han dynasties, though with notable variations. A significant degree of independence granted to *güregen* in their appanages (Mon. *qubi*, Ch. *touxia* 投下) is only one example of the continuation of steppe customs on Chinese soil.<sup>126</sup> The lack of full *fuma duwei* titles granted to those married to Yuan princesses seems no coincidence. Apparently, the official title *fuma duwei* was indeed granted to a very limited number of Mongol sons-in-law, and the rest were called *fuma* in the Chinese sources precisely because they were Chinggisid *güregens*, but not included in the official ranking table at the *duwei* level. The only clearly identifiable ranking of Yuan sons-in-law is in their princely titles. In this they differ from all previous Chinese sons-in-law, representing steppe law, according to which marrying a princess made them members of the extended blood lineage. Finally, remarkably, even the way our sources talk about *fuma*

124 Hucker 1985: 291. For the general discussion of such a specifically Chinese form of the official historical writing, as the “standard” or “formal” dynastic histories, providing annual-biographic compilation of the historical data gathered during the existence of a certain dynasty and written under the auspices of the following one, see Wilkinson 2013: 620–644; for the more specific discussion of the major organisation principles and methods of the official histories conducted between the Tang and the Ming dynasties, see Yang 1957.

125 On this discussion, see below, Ch. II.

126 On the Chinggisid appanages, see Jackson 2009: 38–39.

is telling, positioning them in a logical row together with princes of the blood (*zhuwang*) or princesses (*gongzhu*) on various occasions, thus addressing these three categories of the Yuan society and separating them from all others.<sup>127</sup>

## Structure and scope of the discussion

The following book includes six chapters, a Conclusion and two Appendices. The chapters are first divided chronologically and then geographically: The first chapter analyses the formation of matrimonial connections created by Chinggis Khan and his direct heirs, the Great Khans, from the end of the twelfth century through the years of Temüjin's rise to power up to the death of Möngke Qa'an in 1259, covering the whole timespan of the *Yeke Monggol Ulus*, the United Empire (1206–1259).<sup>128</sup> The next four chapters roughly cover the time span from 1260 to 1370 across the four Chinggisid khanates: The second deals with the Yuan realm (*Qa'an ulus*) up to the fall of the dynasty in 1368. The third chapter analyses the Ilkhanid realm (*Ulus Hülegü*), from the 1250s to the death of Abū Sa'īd in 1335; it continues with a brief discussion of the post-Ilkhanid history until the second half of the fourteenth century. The fourth chapter discusses the Jochid realm (*Ulus Jochi*) from the early thirteenth century up to the end of Toqtamış's rule in the early fifteenth century. The fifth chapter tackles the Ögödeid and Chaghadaid *uluses*. Following the split of the Chaghadaid realm around the mid-fourteenth century, the chapter explores the matrimonial relations of the two newly established Chaghadaid branches up to the early fifteenth century. The sixth chapter examines the developments of the Great Chinggisid Crisis (1330s – 1370s); moreover, it looks into the legacy of the Chinggisid in-laws beyond the history of Mongol Eurasia proper – offering glimpses primarily into the history of the later Timurids, the Mughals and the Central Asian and Mongolian historical traditions after the early fifteenth century. The Conclusion sums up the main theses in an integral overview, combining the discussion with broader theoretical extrapolations both on the Chinggisid usage of the political marriages and the role the Chinggisid in-law relations played in the overall political and military composition of Mongol Eurasia. It uses the findings of the first five chapters to clarify and explain in detail the special position occupied by Chinggisid in-laws (here we primarily touch upon the members of the “inner circle”) in the imperial political architecture both as matrimonial partners to the Golden lineage and as military commanders. It concludes with a broader discussion of the overall development of the *güregen* institution in post-Mongol Eurasia, touching upon Temür's role and his legacy in this period. The two Appendices offer a systematic overview of the selected

127 There are multiple occasions on which such listings can be found both in the *YDZ* and in the *YS*. Thus, a number of examples include texts discussing various administrative issues, such as appanage management and taxation (e.g. *YS*, 101: 2599; *YDZ*: 3/1b [Chen Gaohua et al. 2011, 1: 73, section 8]; *YDZ*: 17: 1b [Chen Gaohua et al. 2011: 2: 580]) or questions related to the postal stations administration (e.g. *YDZ*: 2/18a [Chen Gaohua et al. 2011, 1: 65–67, sections 1, 3, 5, 7]), social and cultural occasions, such as sacrifices (e.g. *YS*, 103: 2636), or various questions of criminal legislation (e.g. *YS*, 105: 2684). The term “prince of the blood” is used here to designate male offspring of a Chinggisid father.

128 On the term ‘*Yeke Monggol Ulus*’, see Appendix II, no. 26.