



2006

Ulus Emirs, Keshig Elders, Signatures, and Marriage Partners: The Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Christopher P. Atwood

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/ealc>

 Part of the [East Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#)

Ulus Emirs, Keshig Elders, Signatures, and Marriage Partners: The Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Disciplines

Arts and Humanities | East Asian Languages and Societies

CHAPTER 5

Ulus Emirs, *Keshig* Elders, Signatures, and Marriage Partners: The Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

CHRISTOPHER P. ATWOOD

Introduction

As one of the last Chinggisid states, and one whose political arrangements, thanks to Russian and Ottoman archives, are known in relatively great detail, the Crimean Khanate has attracted considerable interest in Inner Asian and Islamic studies. Among the most remarked upon of the khanate's institutions was the presence, alongside the Chinggisid khan, of four family chiefs, called *qarachu begs* or *qarachï beys*, who generation after generation held preeminent power among the khan's subjects. The term *qarachu beg*, usually translated as 'commoner commander' actually referred to their status as non-Chinggisids (see Skrynnikova's discussion of the term *qarachu* in this volume). In fact the *qarachu begs* were, relative to others in the khanate, anything but common – they were extremely proud of their ancient status and resentful of any efforts by the khan to promote new men (Manz 1978; Inalcik 1979–1980).

Each of these four lords headed one of the four powerful families that dominated the non-Chinggisid following of the Crimean khans. These four families were ranked as follows: first the Shirin, then the Barïn (Ba'arin), the Arghïn, and lastly the Qïpchaq (Qipchaq). Not until around 1520, did the Manghït (Mangghud) family, refugees from the Noghay khanate, attempt to break into the ranks of these four. The head of the Shirin family was known as the *bash-qarachu* or 'head

of the *qarachu begs*', and it was he to whom the Crimean khan granted his daughters in marriage. After a swift rise to power, the Manghıt took over this role as marriage partners of the khan.

The four *qarachu begs* had many prescribed privileges. The assent of the four *qarachu begs* was necessary for the enthronement of a new khan and every coronation included not only an oath by the *begs* to obey the khan, but a confirmation by the khan of the status of the *begs*. Important state affairs were to be decided by the khan in consultation with the four *qarachu begs*, and their seal was required upon all documents, but particularly those addressed to foreign powers. Collective withdrawal by the four *qarachu begs* thus paralyzed the khanate and was usually followed by the fall of one khan and his replacement by a new one chosen by the four *begs*.

What is the origin of this institution? Was it a Crimean innovation, or a part of the Chinggisid legacy? Certainly the Crimean historians, such as the mid-sixteenth century courtier-historian Remmal Khoja and the mid-eighteenth century writer 'Abd-al-Ghaffar, considered this institution to be a part of the ancient *'töre* or *yasa* of Chingiz Khan' (Inalcik 1979–1980: 445–48, 448 n. 8; Schamiloglu, 1984: 284–85). Just as certainly the institution was widespread among all the successor states to the Golden Horde, as has been recognized since the nineteenth century. Yet can it be found before the fifteenth century and outside the territory of the former Golden Horde? In 1984, Uli Schamiloglu, noting many references to four pre-eminent non-Chinggisid *begs* in the three western Mongol realms, the Golden Horde, the Chaghatay khanate, and the Il-Khanate during the fourteenth century, came to the conclusion that the Crimean histories that described the four *qarachu begs* as an ancient Chinggisid institution were in fact correct (Schamiloglu 1984). Thus the institution of four great family heads, called *qarachu begs*, or *ulus emir* 'captains of the realm', headed by a *begleribeg* or 'commander of commanders', was part of the original framework of the empire, dating

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

back to its origins. He even claimed to be able to find traces of this institution in the government of the Mongol Yuan dynasty in China, although it was, he claims, covered up or misunderstood by Chinese historians.

Examination of the specific privileges of the four *qarachu begs* shows, however, that they represent a gradual conglomeration of rights that cohered around the originally very different position of chief of the four three-day shifts (*keshig*) of the imperial bodyguard (the *keshigten* or 'shift men'). By dividing up the different rights implied in the mature *qarachu beg* system it is possible to specify where and how they developed. It can also be shown that this system of fourfold chiefs was indeed found in the Yuan dynasty under Qubilai and his successors, although not in the place where Professor Schamiloglu was looking for them.

The Four *Keshigs* and Counter-Signed Signatures

The key to the institutional ancestry of the four *qarachu begs* system was given about fifty years ago, by Francis Cleaves, although its relevance to this problem has not yet been realized. In his 'A Chancellery Practice of the Mongols' of 1951, he noted that numerous extant fourteenth-century decrees of the Yuan dynasty, as well as letters from the Il-Khanate, followed the khan's name with the following formula: 'such-and-such day of the shift (*keshig*) of such and such person' (Cleaves 1951). As he notes, this is clearly a reference to the institution of four three-day shifts, which is attested in the *Secret History of the Mongols* (§192, 227; see Cleaves 1982 and Rachewiltz 1972), in the *Yuan shi*, chapter 99 (Song 1370/1976: VIII/99, 2523–2524; Hsiao 1978: 92–94), and in Marco Polo (Yule and Cordier 1871/1975: I, 379).

All three state that the four *keshig* guards operated on a twelve-day cycle.¹ Every three days, a different *keshig* chief

¹ Mongolian *keshig* stems from Old Turkish *kezik*, from the verb *kez-* 'to tour' with the primary meaning of 'tour of duty', and derived senses of

commanded the imperial guard. The chiefs were called elders (*ötögü*) in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, translated as chief (*zhang*) or official (*guan*) in Chinese, and as commanders (*amir* or *emir*) in Persian. The *Yuan shi* mentions the specific days in terms of the twelve animal cycle, noting that the first or great shift was on the monkey, hen, and dog days, the second on the pig, mouse, and ox days, the third on the tiger, hare, and dragon days, and the fourth on the snake, horse, and sheep days. During his three day shift, each *keshig* elder served as supreme commander of the imperial bodyguard as a whole, while the other three *keshig* elders served under him. The chancellery formula of 'such-and-such a day of the shift of such-and-such a person' thus obviously refers to the particular day on which the document was produced. The fact that the shift commander's name is added to decrees indicates that by the fourteenth century, if not before, these four shift commanders were already counter-signing imperial decrees.

As Cleaves noted, this role is confirmed by several extant Il-Khanid documents that include an actual attestation of the four chiefs. One of them, dated 1302, shares this formula, stating: 'In witness thereof. First day of the *keshig* [shift] of Oirad. Qutlugh-Shah, Rashid al-Daula, and Iramadan.' Three other decrees dated from 1292 to 1320 show the same pattern of three Mongol elders and one Persian vizier (see Table 1). Rashid al-Din explicitly states that: 'there are also four amirs appointed from *gäzigs* [*keshig*]; each one has a special black seal so that when an edict is sealed they can place seals on the reverse in order that no one may deny his knowledge of it.' The

'courage' and 'fever and chills' (see Mahmūd al-Kâşgarī 1982-1985: I, 197; Nadeliaev 1969). The -z- in Old Turkish is impossible in Middle Mongolian and is hence rendered sometimes as -s- and sometimes as -j-, which resulted in the differing forms *kesig*~*keseg* for 'shift, turn' and *kejig*~*kijig* 'plague'. Rashid al-Din uses the Turkish form, while the Chinese transcription goes back to *keseg*. The dominant form, however, uses -i-, which makes the -s- an affricate yielding the standard Mongolian *keshig*.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

vizier – who was, with the exception of Buqa of the Oyat Jalayir from 1285–1289, always a non-Mongol – also places the khan's red seal on the document (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 725–26).² What Rashid al-Din does not make explicit but is clear from the extant examples is that the vizier while controlling the khan's red seal, also affixed his own black seal on the documents along with the three other *keshig* elders.

It is striking that a Persian vizier is thus found within the ranks of the four elders of the imperial bodyguard, an institution often taken to be the acme of Mongol tribal rule. This should not be surprising, however, as there is independent evidence that one of the viziers at least, Rashid al-Daula, or Rashid al-Din, was in fact a *keshigten* or 'shift man' with the office of *ba'urchi* or steward, one of the humble-seeming but actually very influential positions held by *keshig* members (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 642). Equally striking though is the parallel with the statutes of the *keshig* in force under the Mongol Yuan dynasty in China. As described in the *Yuan shi* chapter 99, the position of *keshig* elder or chief (Chinese, *qiexie zhang*) was originally distributed to Chinggis Khan's 'four champions' (*dörben külü'üd*), Boroghul (Hü'üshin family), Bo'orchu (Arulad), Muqali (Jalayir), and Chila'un (Suldus). With the extinction of Boroghul's lineage, the first shift was taken over by the emperor directly, who operated through men of the less distinguished Besüd lineage. Similarly with the 'early' (*zao*) extinction of Chila'un's line (in the Yuan at least), 'it was subsequently the Right *Chingsang* [Grand Councillor, a position equivalent to Persian vizier or Sahib-Divan] who was usually in command of the Fourth *Keshig*,' that is, on snake, horse, and sheep days (Hsiao 1978: 93).

² The bestowal of the red seal as a sign of rise to ultimate power under the khan is mentioned for Buqa (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 541, 568), Sadr al-Din Zanjani (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 640), and Sa'd al-Din Sawaji (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 650).

The chronology of the Il-Khanid documents indicates that this system of counter-signing of the khan's documents by his *keshig* elders, one of whom was, ex officio, his chief vizier or councillor, was in fact borrowed from the Yuan dynasty. Despite the existence of several original documents from the reigns of Abagha (1265–1282) and Arghun (1284–1291), not one has preserved any system of counter-signing, yet all of the complete documents from Geikhatu/Irinchindorji's reign (1291–1295) on do. Evidently the system of countersigning by the four *keshig* elders was not an ancient inheritance from the Chinggisid past, but a Yuan innovation adopted by the Il-Khans under the reigns of Irinčin-Dorji and Baidu, who, confronted by both financial disaster and the constant threat of execution by rebellious lords, hoped to ride out the storm by decentralizing the regime. (See for example the revealing citation from the Persian historian of the Il-Khanate Vassaf in Martinez 1986: 197–98.) Similarly, comparative data from the *yarliqs* (edicts) preserved in medieval Russian translation show the practice of counter-signing by the four great lords probably came into use in the reign of Özbeġ (1313–1341).³ It was not in use in the 1267 decree of the Golden Horde ruler, Mengü-Temür, for example.

Confirmation of the fact that counter-signing by the *keshig* elders was not in use before the time of Qubilai comes from the one description of chancellery procedure in place before Qubilai's time. In the reign of Öġödei, two Song Chinese envoys report that Öġödei's chief scribe (*bichi'echi*),

³ *Yarliqs* dating to 1267 (the edict from Mengü-Temür to Metropolitan Peter), 1307/1308 (from Tiuliak to Michael), and 1323 (from Lady Taidula to Ioan) do not list the concurring nobles, while those of 1351 (from Janibeg and Taidula to Theognost) and 1357 (from Berdibeg to Alexei) do (Priselkov 1916: 57-61). M.G. Safargaliev (1960: 68) first drew the conclusion that the change occurred sometime in the reign of Özbeġ (1313-1341). The absence on Taidula's *yarlik* may be an omission or due to her being a *khatun* (lady), not a khan.

Chinqai, was required to add his attestation to all documents issued by Yelü Chucai in Chinese, before the document would be valid (Peng and Xu 1237/1962: 10a/483). The strong implication is that only the scribe Chinqai's signature was needed to validate decrees, not those of all four *keshig* elders; otherwise Chinqai's would not have been described as the only thing attesting to their validity. Extant early documents and descriptions indicate that even this attestation was used only on Chinese documents and not on documents as a whole.

***Keshig* Elders in the Yuan Dynasty**

Once the origin of the four *qarachu beg* system and their right to countersign and seal documents is traced to the four shift commanders of the *keshig* guards, then a number of differences become immediately evident, attesting to the extensive institutional evolution occurring between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. This institutional evolution can be sketched with any detail only for the unified empire, the Yuan dynasty, and the Il-Khanate. While this cannot therefore help us clarify the institutional evolution in the Golden Horde, it does clarify the Mongol imperial legacy which the Golden Horde inherited.

Due to the relative abundance of Yuan records from Qubilai Khan's reign on, examination of the *keshig* is best begun with this successor state. A superficial examination of chancellery documents from the Yuan (usually found within the Yuan law codes or document compilations, or in stone inscriptions) at first raised a number of doubts about the accuracy of the *Yuan shi*'s description of the four shifts. Subsequently, however, an intensive examination of the *keshig* commanders mentioned in translated Chinese decrees, culminating in Chin-fu Hung's exhaustive study, has conclusively demonstrated that from 1283 up until 1340, three families, the Arulad, the Jalayir, and the Hū'ūshin, did indeed dominate the *keshig*, thus basically confirming the *Yuan shi*'s description (see Table 2). Hung demonstrated that certainly most, and probably all, of the discrepancies can be explained

by corruptions in the various texts recording the date of particular decrees, which thus results in erroneous calculations of which *keshig* the person belonged to (Hong 2003). Another important fact that emerges is that regular *keshig* elders, presumably while off on assignment, appear to have frequently delegated their shifts to otherwise unknown subordinates, resuming their posts only on return to the court.

Following Hsiao (1978: 213–14 n. 31), Hung did, however, also demonstrate that actually it was the fourth *keshig* (snake, horse, and sheep days), not the first as the *Yuan shi* states, that was originally assigned to the Hü'üshin family descendants of Boroghul. If Chila'un's Suldus had ever hereditarily held a *keshig* (a fact about which there is reason to doubt) it must have been the first *keshig* (monkey, hen, and dog days), not the fourth. The Hü'üshin family's hereditary control of the fourth *keshig* did indeed eventually lapse after 1337, confirming the *Yuan shi*'s statement that the fourth shift was eventually placed under the appointed civil officials. From then on we find that the signatories in the fourth shift are of various lineages but all important figures (*chingsangs* 'grand councillors' or *pingjangs* 'managers') in the Secretariat.⁴ The description of the four *keshigs* in the *Yuan shi* – the first directly under the emperor, the second under the Arulad, the third under the Jalayir, and the fourth under the Secretariat – thus emerges as an accurate description only of the post-1337 Yuan situation.

Yuan historical records indicate that Qubilai created a personal *keshig* organization even before he became great khan in 1260. After he became great khan, however, dayguards (*turghaq*) were recruited from all over the empire in 1263 (Hsiao 1978: 76–77, 43), thus adding a much larger number, eventually reaching 12,000, to the earlier skeleton. As a prince and Möngke Khan's viceroy in North China, Qubilai appointed

⁴ Here I use the common Mongolian renderings of these Chinese terms, which in modern Mandarin are *chengxiang* and *pingzhang* respectively.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Antong (or Hantum; 1245–1293), then aged 13, as an elder in his *keshig* guard in 1257. Antong was the great-grandson of Muqali and of the Jalayir family and son of Ba'atur (d. 1261), a commander in Qubilai's service. His mother Temülün was the elder sister of Qubilai's wife Chabi. Antong came to Qubilai's attention because of his reverent and respectful attitude toward his elders (Su 1335/1962: I/1, 7a; Song 1370/1976: X/126, 3081, and X/119, 2942). Similarly, after Qubilai became great khan, Öchicher (1247–1311), descendant of Boroghul of the Hü'üshin family, was appointed as head of a *keshig* in 1262 at age 16; his father Shiremün, who apparently died shortly before then, had been in Qubilai's entourage.⁵ Again Öchicher was appointed not because of his political importance but because of his appearance and poise (Su 1335/1962: I/3, 2b–3a; Song 1370/1976: X/119, 2949). Although they do not use the term 'elder' explicitly, both biographies are quite alive to the irony of teenagers being made seniors over all other courtiers. The earliest known *keshig* elder on the Arulad shift was Qutu[q]dar, a little known figure who made a career in the Secretariat along with Antong and was later enfeoffed as the Duke of Shouguo (Song 1370/1976: IX/112, 1276–79; II/25, 572).

Just as important as this initial appointment was how, during the latter period of his long reign, Qubilai turned away from both Chinese Confucian advisers and from the immigrant (*semu*) finance experts he had relied on before in favour of the descendants of the old families of Chinggis Khan's *nökörs* or companions. It was in this context that during his unusually long reign Qubilai allowed the *keshig* to become monopolized by three old families, a tradition his successors followed. Even

⁵ In both cases, the boys' age is given as *nian* (years for dating), not *sui* (years dating from conception, set at one year before birth) as one would expect, although in context the interpretation as age rather than as a reign year or date is unavoidable. It is possible that this was due to a *zhou sui* or Western Eurasian style calculation which would make the years of appointment 1258 and 1263 respectively.

though the Yuan emperors continued to recruit a *keshig* guard anew each reign, the same families and often the same actual *keshig* elders commanded the newly recruited *keshigten*.

At the same time, the list of *keshig* elders in the Yuan is anything but a record of the political movers and shakers in the dynasty. John W. Dardess's description of Aruqtu, who held the Arulad shift off and on from 1336 to 1350 is perhaps typical: 'a man of impeccable lineage . . . a political nonentity who lacked previous administrative experience' (Dardess 1973: 81). Only after 1337, when the Hū'ūshin lineage lost control of the fourth *keshig*, did politically powerful Mongols like Berke-Buqa of the Eljigid and Toqto'a of the Merkid join the scions of the dynasty's powerful families in commanding a *keshig*.⁶ Contrary to the *Yuan shi*'s assertion, however, we know that the Hū'ūshin lineage had not 'died out' but continued to the end of the dynasty. Thus, the transfer of the headship of the fourth *keshig* to the most senior of the civil officials was linked to the rise of a more socially mobile, meritocratic Mongol/*semu* Confucian elite, the very opposite of the aristocratic dominance of the monarchy expressed in the classic *qarachu beg* system (see Dardess 1973).

***Keshig* Elders in the Unified Mongol Empire**

While the *Yuan shi* description of the *keshig* elders turns out to be roughly accurate for the Mongols in China from Qubilai Khan's time on, it is directly contradicted by the *Secret History*

⁶ The *Yuan shi* chapter on the *keshig* adds after Boroghul's name the note, *hou jue* ('was cut off later') (Song 1370/1976: VIII/99, 2524). Yanai Watari (1930: 234-40), who believed the Yuan *keshig* did not follow the prescriptions of the *Yuan shi*, applied this note to Boroghul's family, while Ch'i-ch'ing Hsiao, aware that the Hū'ūshin family did indeed retain its position in the *keshig* for many decades after Qubilai's death, attributed that phrase only to Boroghul personally (Hsiao 1978: 92-93, 213-14 n. 31). It does appear, however, that the Boroghul's family lost its position in the *keshig* before the end of the dynasty (although it did not die out). The *Yuan shi* note must thus be understood as referring to the fourth *keshig* after 1337.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

of the Mongols. According to this source, there seems to have been no assignment of slots as *keshig* elder to any particular family. Most *keshig* heads were members of the powerful families, but not in a way consistent with the description in the *Yuan shi* chapter 99. Of the seven captains of a thousand in his dayguards, Chinggis chose four as *keshig* elders: 1) Buqa, a relative of Muqali (Jalayir); 2) Alchidai, a relative of Ilügei (another Jalayir); 3) Dodai Cherbi (of unknown family origin); and, 4) Doqulqu Cherbi of the family of Jedei (Mangghud) (*Secret History of the Mongols* §227). Also in clear distinction from the *qarachu beg* system, these four *keshig* elders served not as heads of families or lineages as corporate units but rather as officials chosen specifically by the khan. While part of the new elite, they were not themselves important leaders but rather junior relatives of and hostages for the loyalty of their more powerful relatives (*Secret History of the Mongols* §224; Hsiao 1978: 37, 40–41).

Other traditions about Chinggis Khan's *keshig* also existed. The *Yuan shi* claims that from Chinggis's time, men of the Besüd family acted for the khan in supervising the first or *yeke keshig*. In the *Secret History*, Degei of the Besüd was Chinggis Khan's original shepherd and was listed as one of his four councillors (§§124, 210, 216) but other than that records no special Besüd role in the *keshig*. Rashid al-Din refers only to the family's special role as shamans for sessions of healing and revival (*jasal*) (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998: I, 109). By contrast, Rashid al-Din states that the Gürle'üd family was especially trusted in the guards regiments of both Chinggis Khan and his sons, serving in Chinggis Khan's time within the *keshig* of Jedei of the Mangghud family (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998: I, 54; cf. Rashid-ad-Din/Khetagurov 1952: 117; Jedei's brother Doqulqu Cherbi was a *keshig* elder). This tradition is not attested anywhere else.

The domination of the four *keshigs* by four families was contrary (in principle at least) to the replacement of the *keshigten* with each new reign. As with the Yuan dynasty, after

the khan's death, all the *keshigten*, or at least the vital nightguards, were in theory supposed to be retired permanently to guard the *ordo* or palace tent of the deceased khan and new *keshigten* recruited by his successor. In the *Secret History* §231, Chinggis Khan emphasizes that the guards are his *emchü* (private property) and bequeaths them to his sons in perpetuity not as working guards but as memorials of himself. The retirement of the previous emperor's *keshigten* and the recruitment of four new *keshigs* at each change of reign is also treated as regular policy in the *Yuan shi* (Hsiao 1978: 94). This system of recruiting a guard for the life of the khan only, inherited from the Khitan practice under the Liao dynasty (Wittfogel and Fêng 1949: 508–17, esp. 510), obviously served to reduce the danger that the khan would become prisoner of over-mighty subjects ensconced within his own guard.

In reality, however, the Mongol emperors generally replaced only part of the previous *keshigten* and refused to allow vast amounts of men to be tied up as *keshigten* for deceased emperors. In the Yuan dynasty old *keshigten* were frequently 'recycled' (Hsiao 1978: 219 n. 63), and this precedent appears to have been set quite early. Comparing the list of Ögödei's *keshig* captains in the *Secret History of the Mongols* §278 with that of Chinggis in §§225–227 and 234 shows that the captains of the nightguards were all replaced, but that the captains of the quiver bearers were all 'recycled', as was one of the dayguard shift captains (Alchidai of the Jalayir). Indeed some of the turnover in dayguards may be due simply to natural mortality. Thus one dayguard captain, Mangghudai, is probably the son of Jedei of the Mangghud family (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998: I, 103), and hence nephew of the previous shift captain, Doqulqu Cherbi. Unfortunately the family affiliation of the other new captains is unknown as is which one of the six dayguard captains of a thousand served as elders of the four shifts. All that is stated is that a different officer, Eljigidei, was given general supervision of the shift guards. (This Eljigidei is either Elji'idei, the

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

younger brother of Ilügei of the Jalayir, or else Eljigidei of the Suldus, both of whom were in Ögödei's service; see Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998–1999: I, 39, II, 280).

Ögödei's descendants likewise continued the use of his former *keshig* elders, although the family origin of the elders involved is unclear. His son and successor Güyüg recruited new *ba'aturs* (crack troops) from the Mongols, but also took over for his own use half of Ögödei's *keshigten*, appointing one of Ögödei's old dayguard captains Yekü (=Jegü) and another whose name remains unreconstructable to take charge of them (Song 1370/1976: I/2, 39).⁷ One of Ögödei's dayguard captains, Qongqortaqai, appears in 1251 as an agent for Ögödei's grandsons Naqu and Khoja, while the Temür mentioned in the same passage as commander of Qaraqorum and agent along with Qongqortaqai may be Temüder, another dayguard captain (Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 200).

It appears therefore, that while there was considerable tendency for *keshig* headship to pass down in families, the *Yuan shi* description of four *keshig* elders assigned to the four families of Suldus, Arulad, Jalayir, and Hü'üshin represents not the original situation under Chinggis Khan or his immediate successors, but one begun under Qubilai Khan in his vice-regal *keshig* guard, and subsequently retrojected back to Chinggis's time by the *Yuan shi* editors. The special status of the 'four champions' (*dörben küliü'üd*), Chila'un, Bo'orchu, Muqali, and Boroghul, of those four families was well-known in Yuan-era sources. Unlike the other numbered heroes listed in the *Secret*

⁷ The *Yuan shi* text has *Yequmenda'r* as one word. The most plausible reading is that *Yequ* (<Yekü) is one person and that *-menda'r* represents a second name with one or more initial characters missing. The Chinese character *-da'r* represents the Mongol *-dar/-der*, which forms personal names from adjectives or numerals. The character *-men* (Middle Mandarin *-mun*) would represent *mun/mün* in Mongolian. If the *-n* in *mun* represents an *-r* as is sometimes found in Yuan-era transcriptions, then *-mundar* might even represent *-murder*, as in Temürder/Temüder.

History (the four dogs, the four foundlings, the four councillors, etc.), the four champions are found for example both in the *Shengwu qinzheng lu* (Wang 1926/1962: 28b/62) and in Su Tianjue's biography of Muqali (Su 1335/1962: I/1, 1a). This familiarity presumably led the *Yuan shi* compiler to guess that precedents from Chinggis Khan's time had determined Qubilai's choice of the Arulad, Jalayir, and Hū'ūshin for his own *keshig*. The addition of Chila'un's Suldus, who had never been prominent in the Yuan, would thus be an understandable error.

In conclusion, then, there appears to be no evidence that command of Chinggis Khan's four *keshig* was monopolized by four families. Indeed the problem in sorting out who exactly were the four *keshig* elders in the time of Chinggis Khan and his immediate successors is a product of the excess of contradictory traditions. An additional complication is that many commanders were also put in groups of four (*Secret History of the Mongols* §§209, 214, 216). As Schamiloglu (1984) and others have already noted, the number four was evidently widely used in classifying commanders or officials among the Mongols and their predecessors. At this time, however, there was certainly no monopoly of offices in the hands of any four families. Qubilai's restriction of the *keshig* supervision to three great families and his introduction of the practice of having these *keshig* elders counter-sign decrees thus appears to be a major institutional innovation.

Keshigs and Qarachu Begs in the Western Khanates

The creation of personal *keshig* guards probably began even before the break up of the unified empire. As we have seen, Qubilai established his own personal *keshig* guard while his elder brother, Möngke, was still reigning as great khan. After the break-up, the recruitment of *keshigten* for princes serving as powerful regional viceroys was common in Mongol practice. Again as with Qubilai's *keshig*, the shift assignments for these *keshig* guards did not necessarily follow those

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

prevalent in the sovereign's *keshig*. Thus in the later Yuan dynasty, El-Temür, a Qipchaq, supervised a *keshig* for Haishan, the heir apparent then serving on the frontier in Mongolia, for ten years (Song 1370/1976: XI/138, 3326), although Qipchaqs played no role in the Yuan imperial guard. Similar vice-regal *keshig* guards with Besüd and Mangghud men as elders and attached Qara'una *tümens* as *ba'aturs* (crack troops) were recruited several times in the Il-Khanate to serve the crown prince in Khorasan and guard the frontier (Shimo 1977: 134, 173; cf. Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998–1999: I, 103, 110, II, 283–84). (The Qara'unas were a body of Mongol garrison troops stationed permanently in the Afghanistan area from Ögödei's reign onward. Organized into *tümens*, they were not controlled directly by any Chinggisid princes, although different Qara'unas preferred the service of differing Chinggisid lines.) These *keshigten* survived as a corporate unit even into the time of Tamerlane (T'ovma 1987: 1). The rulers of the eastern Blue Horde in the Qipchaq Khanate also disposed of such a vice-regal *keshig* guard (Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 101). Finally, within Tolui's family, Rashid al-Din describes the household staff of Melik-Temür, a son of Ariq-Böke who had rebelled against Qubilai Khan. In it we find four *keshigs* headed by one Suldus man and three Qongqotan men (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: II, 462; Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 313–15). Thus regional *keshig* guards were alike in shape and developing their own traditions well before the unified empire's break-up in 1260.

From the perspective of the Yuan Dynasty *keshig* practices, the Il-Khanate's *keshig* organization in some ways seems rather more conservative. Although the material in Table 1 is comparatively scanty, it shows that there was no identification of particular shifts with particular great families. The families involved varied in each reign. In Irinchin-Dorji's reign, two Jalayir brothers (Shigtür and Aq-Buqa) supervised two out of four *keshigs*, and in 1336 two Uighurs and in 1337 two Suldus are represented. Thus in the Il-Khanid arrangement,

as under Chinggis, the *keshig* elders were not representatives of families but personal choices of the khans. It should also be noted that none of the sources cited in Schamiloglu's 1984 paper on the four *ulus* emirs institution in the Il-Khanate ever suggest that these positions had to be lodged in particular families. Thus, although the practice of having *keshig* elders counter-sign decrees was adopted from that of the Yuan, the hereditary monopoly of the *keshig* commands was not.

In other ways, however, the Il-Khanate made progressive changes in the original institution. The Il-Khans began to require their chief civil officer (the vizier or *sahib-divan*) to serve as *keshig* elder and counter-sign all decrees alongside the other *keshig* elders by 1292 at the latest, over forty years before the Yuan adopted the same practice. The existing material is somewhat unclear, but while the literary sources speak of four *ulus* emirs and the vizier as a fifth (e.g. van Loon 1954: 62, 67; and Lech 1968: 153; cf. Melville 1990: 63; Schamiloglu 1984: 286–87), the extant *jarliqs* are always signed by only four persons, one of whom was the vizier. Thus while the vizier was certainly in some sense part of the *keshig*, it is hard to say if he ever actually served as *keshig* elder *ex officio* or else was a fifth figure always on duty who substituted for one of the four Mongol *keshig* elders on a rotating schedule. In any case, if there is a link between the Il-Khanate counter-signing by the vizier and the Yuan counter-signing by the *chingsang* of the secretariat, it must be a case of the Yuan adopting a practice from the Il-Khans rather than the other way around.

At the same time, however, the Il-Khans also designated particular commanders as more or less permanent *begleribegs* or 'commander of commanders'. This usage is found in Rashid al-Din, and seems to indicate that among the four *keshig* elders one commander would be granted a preeminent position. Those so designated by the early Il-Khans include Elege under Hüle'ü, his sons Shigtür (under Arghun and Irinchin-Dorji) and Aq-Buqa (under Irinchin-Dorji), Buqa

of the Oyat Jalayir (under Ahmad Tegüder and Arghun), Ta'achar (Taghachar) of the Suqai'ud Baarin (under Baidu), Qutlugh-Shah of the Mangghud (under Ghazan), and Chuban of the Suldus (under Öljeitü and Abu Sa'id) (Rashid-uddin/Thackston 1998–1999: I, 38, 39, 103, III, 557, 580; Martinez 1986: 197; Schamiloglu 1984: 286). Comparing these names to the list of signatories of documents, it seems likely that this *begleribeg* was always one of the four *keshig* elders, a fact explicitly stated to be so by al-'Umari (cited in Schamiloglu 1984: 287). In this way, the *begleribeg* position appears to be the earliest known analogue to the position of *bash-qarachu* or chief of the four *qarachu* begs in the Crimean institutions.

Still, it is important to note that in the Il-Khanate, the *begleribeg* position, while marked by concrete symbols of royal favour such as the right to carry a parasol (Rashid-uddin/Thackston 1999: III, 551), was not yet monopolized by one family, although it had strong tendencies to be lodged in either the Jait Jalayir or Suldus lineages. Moreover, while there is a rough overlap between the four *keshig* elders and the leading commanders of the empire, the overlap is only rough. Lists of great commanders (emirs or *noyans*) under the Il-Khans regularly include more than four in their lists, and the list of signatories we find on the documents include persons who appear not to have been very powerful, such as Iramadan of the Baya'ud. Thus in both the Yuan and Il-Khanate regimes, the khans did not become imprisoned by their own *keshig* elders, and diverse families still also had access to the khans.

From Keshig Elders to Qarachu Commanders

Even if we combine the Yuan practice of allowing three great non-Chinggisid families to monopolize the *keshig* elder positions, and the Il-Khanid practice of appointing one of the *keshig* elders as *begleribeg*, there is still a considerable gap between the *keshig* elder institution as we see it in the Yuan and the Il-Khanate, and the *qarachu beg* institution of the

Golden Horde successor regimes. The *keshig* elders were not as such the main political actors in either the Yuan or Il-Khanate system. Indeed the system of counter-signing was adopted as much to guarantee that these great lords would not later disavow the khan's decrees as it was to prevent the khan from decreeing something with which they disagreed (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: III, 726). In the Yuan and the Il-Khanate, the *keshig* elders were at least formally chosen by the emperor, but the *qarachu begs* were first and foremost heads of their families. The *begleribeg* changed in each reign of the Il-Khanate but the position of *bash-qarachu* (which must have evolved from *begleribeg*) was fixed within a single family. Finally, none of the persons listed in Tables 1 or 2 (with the exception of Chuban in the Il-Khanate) ever lifted his hand against his sovereign, while armed resistance to the khan's will was endemic in the *qarachu beg* system.

All of these changes add up to saying that the *keshig* and their elders as structured under the unified empire, the Yuan, and the Il-Khanate, were in general instruments of monarchic power, while the *qarachu begs* and the *bash-qarachu* in particular was the primary resister of unlimited monarchic power and represented rather the interests of the *ulus* or the non-Chinggisid aristocracy. When did this transformation occur? While this is not a question that can be answered in detail, these changes do not seem to have ever occurred in the Yuan or the Il-Khanate. The revolt of Chuban was perhaps the closest thing to an attempt of a *begleribeg* to turn his khan into a puppet, but it ended in complete failure.

Thus the transformation from the monarchic *keshig* system to the aristocratic *qarachu beg* system seems to have taken place only in the Chaghatayid and Jochid realms. There is little information on the workings of the *keshig* in these khanates, but the description of the late Chaghatayid/early Timurid court in Ibn 'Arabshah (1392–1450) does identify the positions of the four chiefs being hereditary in four families. He describes the Chaghatay realm at the time of Timur's father

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

as having four viziers, each representing one of the great houses that assisted the Chinggisid khan: the Arulad, the Jalayir, the Qa'uchin (the 'old ones'), and the Barulas (Ibn Arabshah/Sanders 1936: 4; cf. Schamiloglu 1984: 290–91). Given later developments, it seems something of the kind should have also existed in the Golden Horde before its breakup in 1360. It is possible that the Chaghatay Khanate was imitating Qubilaid practice. Another possibility is that this was a later result of contingent political factors in the latter half of the fourteenth century weakening the khan and depriving him of his right to pick his own *keshig*.

One factor that might have influenced this development was the early designation of particular thousands for Chinggis Khan's elder sons Jochi and Cha'adai, who formed the Golden Horde and the Chaghatay khanates. Both Rashid al-Din and the *Secret History of the Mongols* mention Chinggis's division of a certain amount of men to both Jochi and Cha'adai. (Ögödei also received such a portion but his people were dispersed after Möngke Khan's accession in 1251 and there is disagreement over whether Tolui received a special grant of people [*Secret History of the Mongols* §§242–243; Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: II, 279–81].) The two ruling families of the thousands granted to Cha'adai, the Barulas and Jalayir, were among the subsequent *ulus* emir families noted by Ibn 'Arabshah. One could thus imagine that at first, with only four families in their personal following, the Chaghatay and Golden Horde khans found that these four families had, early on, acquired an incontestable right to control of their *keshigs*. At the present level of knowledge, however, such a connection is speculative.

Coronation Rituals and *Quda* (Marriage Ally) Ties

The *qarachu begs* also played the primary role in the coronation ceremony of the Crimean Khans and the *bash-qarachu* monopolized the marriage of the khan's daughters, thus acquiring the title of *küregen* ('son-in-law') and the influence that that entailed. Here too, however, the evidence

that these rights were ancient features of the Chinggisid *jasaq* is slight; indeed all the evidence leads the other way.

Ron Sela's comprehensive review of the information available on Mongol-era and post-Mongol coronations demonstrates that despite confident avowals found in the sources, there was no unchanging body of Chinggisid coronation ritual. In the coronation of Chinggis Khan himself in 1206, only Hetum, a fourteenth century Armenian chronicler, mentions those participating and he gives a list of the captains of seven nations — Tatars, Tangut, Oirat, Jalayir, Sönid, Mengli (Mangghud?), and Tibet — that does not fit any possible list of Chinggis's four chief commanders. Accounts of the coronations of Ögödei, Güyüg, and Möngke stress the role of the two senior Chinggisid princes, one at each hand, leading the new khan to the throne. The Persian historian Vassaf, describing the coronation of Haishan as khan of the Yuan (1307), mentions the specific roles of four lords at each corner elevating the khan on a piece of felt, two lords leading him to the throne, and a seventh lord presenting him with the ceremonial liquor (Sela 2003: 26–32). Comparison would suggest that the two lords leading the candidate to the throne were generally Chinggisids, while the four lords elevating the khan were non-Chinggisids, perhaps even *keshig* elders, but this is speculation. In fact, however, the only known cases of *keshig* elders participating in a coronation were in 1282 when Shigtür of the Jalayir was one of the two lords leading Ahmad Tegüder to the throne, and 1317 when Sewinch of the Uighur and Chuban of the Suldus performed this role (Sela 2003: 31). In neither case, however, did they function as part of a body of four commanders.

Data on marriage partners likewise demonstrate that the *keshig* elders and the imperial *quda*, or marriage partners, remained separate during the empire. Thanks to Rashid al-Din's comprehensive records, the families of Chinggis Khan's in-laws are known, and there is no overlap between the in-law families and those prominent in the *keshig*. The families of

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Chinggis's major wives are Qonggirad, Merkid, Tatar, Jurchen, Kereyid, and Tangut. The families of his sons-in-law are Ikires, Oirat, Önggüd, and Olqunu'ud (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: I, 146–49). Only one man from any of these families (the Qonggirad Aqutai, of the family of Alchi *Noyan*) held a captaincy of a thousand in the *keshig* but even he was not a *keshig* elder.

The precedent of the marriage with the Qonggirad, who never acquired a significant position in the *keshig*, was soon enshrined in law. In 1227, Alchi Noyan, the brother of Chinggis's Qonggirad wife Börte, received the title as 'state maternal uncle' (*guo jiu*), and in 1237, it was decreed that, 'If the Qonggirad lineage gives birth to a daughter, in that generation, she shall be made an empress, and if they give birth to a son, in that generation, he shall be granted imperial princesses. Every year in the first moon of the four seasons, we shall have the decree which they have been granted read and it shall not be cut off from generation unto generation' (Song 1370/1976: X/118, 2915). Jochi and Cha'adai's primary wives were indeed Qonggirad, although Ögödei's primary wife was Naiman and Tolui's primary wife Kereyid (Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 99, 107, 135, 18–19, 159; Song 1370/1976: IX/106, 2693–94, 2701). In no case, however, did the immediate generation after Chinggis Khan merge the ranks of his *keshig* chiefs with those of his primary marriage partners.

The same can also be demonstrated for Qubilai, albeit with one exception. The families of his main wives were Qonggirad, Merkid, Dörbed, and Baya'ud, yet he also married a woman of Boroghul's Hü'üshin family, whose descendant Öchicher was one of the leading *keshig* elders in Qubilai's court (Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 241–45). This was not, however, the start of a trend; Yuan sources demonstrate beyond a doubt that the primary *quda* (marriage ally) families were the Qonggirad and the Ikires on a reciprocal basis, while the Baya'ud and Naiman provided empresses and the Önggüd and Oyirad regularly received princesses (see Tables 3 and 4).

Since, however, the origins of over a third of the Yuan empresses are unknown, it is quite possible that a number of minor empresses or imperial concubines may have actually belonged to *keshig* families.

Among the Il-Khans, intermarriage with *keshig* families is better documented. Thus the Baya'ud seem to have been commonly members of the *keshig* and also in-laws of the khans. The powerful Jait Jalayir and Suldus also played a significant role (see Tables 5 and 6). Yet it must be noted that with the exception of Irinchin-Dorji, who married two women of the Jait Jalayir, no other Il-Khan up to and including Ghazan Khan intermarried with the family of his *begleribeg*. Similarly, the most prominent *quda* families in the Il-Khanate, particularly the Qonggirad, the Kereyid, and the Oirad ruling lineage (all of whom inherited this *quda* relation since the time of Chinggis Khan), do not seem to ever have supplied *ulus* emirs. Thus while some overlap between the major *keshig* families and the *quda* families occurred, the Il-Khans avoided top-level alliance. Not until the time of the Jalayir regime, after the breakup of the Il-Khanate and the Timurid domination of the Chaghatay khans, do we find the title of *küregen* (son-in-law) coming to be tied to the chief king-maker commander in the polity.

This conclusion seems opposed to that of Shimo Hirotoishi, who has concluded that 'the center of Il-Khanid power was formed by the *nökörs* who were related to the Chinggisid house by marriage, but not by descendants of the chiliarchs who served Chinggis Khan' (Shimo 1993). Shimo based his argument, however, primarily on longevity as a family in office. Given the high incidence of unnatural death among the top leaders of the Il-Khanate, the truly powerful families at any one time were unlikely to be the ones with the greatest longevity. In fact one can see two different patterns of influence among the Il-Khanate courtiers. The first, pursued mostly by well-established families and exemplified by prestigious but colourless figures such as Su'unchaq of the

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Suldus and Shigtür of the Jalayir, was one of long-term but moderate influence on the throne, while the second, usually pursued by figures of low-born Mongol lineage such as Buqa under Arghun or Ta'achar under his successors, pursued maximum influence and usually ended in a dramatic fall. Chuban was the only figure of old family to achieve maximum influence over his khan, and suffered the corresponding penalty. Indeed Ibn Fadl al-'Umari, after describing the institution of the four *ulus* emirs, notes that 'The emirs generally do not know more than what their deputies tell them' (cited in Schamiloglu 1984: 286). As we have seen, this contrast can also be found to a degree in the rather less lethal Yuan court.

Again, we must be wary of assuming that a *keshig* elder, simply by virtue of his position or even long-standing family influence, was necessarily the real power in the court, any more than that every khan simply by virtue of being the khan was the real decision maker in his realm. A good example of this can be seen in the short reign of Musa Khan in 1336. While 'Ali Padshah of the Oirat was the real power behind the throne, his name was not mentioned on the edicts and he presumably did not command a *keshig* (van Loon 1954: 62).

Conclusion

To review: 1) The origin of the *begleribeg* system lies in the system of four *keshig* elders appointed by Chinggis Khan. 2) In the time of Chinggis and his immediate successors, the *keshig* elders were not representatives of families and were chosen on an individual basis by each khan. 3) It is possible that among the *keshigs* of Chinggis Khan's elder sons, the *keshigs* soon became associated with particular families. 4) Qubilai initiated a linkage of the *keshig* elders with particular families in his realm and the system of them countersigning imperial decrees. 5) This system of countersigning soon spread to all the separate khanates. 6) The Il-Khanate, at least, did not adopt the system of drawing the *keshig* elders from fixed families. 7) The

designation of a *begleribeg* or commander-in-chief began in the Il-Khanate soon after its inception in 1256; this *begleribeg* was always one of the *keshig* elders. The other *keshig* elders began to be called *ulus* emirs. 8) These usages also appear later in the Jochid and Chaghatayid realms, but whether the appearance of borrowing from the Il-Khanate is only the result of better documentation in the latter is unclear. 9) Only in the later fourteenth century, in the decaying Chaghatayid realm, does the full *qarachubeg* system appear in which four families rigidly dominated the khan's councils and monopolized intermarriage with the khan.

While much about this process of aggrandizement of the *keshig* elders remains unclear, enough is known to show it provides an important case study in Mongol institutional evolution. Rather than being an example of a single institution inherited from the days before the empire split in 1260, however, it is an example of the continuing institutional exchange and borrowing between the different successor states of the Mongols, borrowing that went on despite their wars and rivalries.

This growth in the power of the *keshig* elders and their families marked the transformation of the Chinggisid polities from one type of monarchy to another. Using the language of Machiavelli in the fourth chapter of his *Prince*, the early Chinggisid polity was a monarchy or principality governed 'by one prince with the others as his servants, who, as ministers, through his grace and permission, assist in governing the kingdom.' Over the course of the centuries, the Chinggisid successor state became a principality governed 'by a prince and barons who hold that position not because of any grace of their master but because of the nobility of their birth' (Bondanella and Musa 1979: 88). This contrast, which I referred to earlier as one of monarchy and aristocracy, could also be compared to Montesquieu's distinction of despotism (Machiavelli's bureaucratic principality) and monarchy (Machiavelli's aristocratic principality) found in the *Spirit of the Laws*

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

(Montesquieu 1989), except that Montesquieu's description of despotism is so often more a polemic caricature rather than a reasonable description. These distinctions, built for a world where the great majority of states were at least formally monarchies, are more applicable to Inner Asia than the classical Greco-Roman typologies such as the monarchy-aristocracy-republic typology of the late Plato and Aristotle (Plato 1963: *Statesman*, 301a–303c; Aristotle 1984: 1160a–1161b; Aristotle 1986: 1279a–1280a). The applicability of European medieval and early modern typologies to polities formed in nomadic conditions demonstrates that Inner Asian political forms are not a unique formation, but in many ways analogous to political forms found among sedentary societies.

Table 1: Signatories of known Il-Khanate edicts and those described as four *ulus* emirs in literary sources.

1292	Shigtür (Jalayir)	Aq-Buqa (Jalayir)	Ta'achar (Ba'arin)		Sadr al-Din Zanjani
1302 ¹	Oirad	Qutlugh- Shah (Mangghud)	Iramadan (Baya'ud)		Rashid al- Daula
1305	Qutlugh- Shah (Mangghud)	Chuban (Suldus)	Sewinch (Uighur)		illegible black seal
1320	Ögrenchi (Uighur)	Dawlat- Shah (Baya'ud)	Dimishq- Khoja (Suldus)		Taj-ad-Din 'Ali-Shah
1336	Hasan Buzurg (Jalayir)	Ögrenchi (Uighur)	Ortoq- Shah (Baya'ud)	Mahmud (Uighur)	Ordu-Buqa (Yürkin)
1337	Sorqan Shira (Suldus)	Hasan Kuchik (Suldus)	'Ali b. Ögrenchi (Uighur)	Mahmud b. Amir 'Ali Kurd	Muhammad 'Ali Padshah (Oirat)

Sources: 1292: Soudavar 1992: 34–35; 1302: Ligeti 1972: 257; 1305: Mostaert and Cleaves 1962: 85; 1320: Cleaves 1953: 27–33; 1336 and 1337: van Loon 1954: 62, 67

Sources for family affiliations: Shigtür, Aq-Buqa, Qutlugh-Shah, Iramadan: Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998–1999 (see index); Chuban, Dimishq-Khoja, Sorqan Shira, Hasan Kuchik: Melville and Zaryâb 1992; Sewinch and Ögrenchi (brothers): Melville 1999: 45; Dawlat-Shah *Jarghuchi* (son of Alghu *Jarghuchi*): Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998: I, 97, Melville 1999: 22; Mahmud (son of Esen-Qutlugh), Ortoq-Shah (son of Alghu *Jarghuchi*): Melville 1999: 45, 44; Ordu-Buqa (grand-nephew of Nurin *Aqa*): Melville 1999: 67; Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998–1999: I, 161, III, 633.

¹For the 1302 signatures, I follow the readings in Ligeti 1972: 257. For the reading of 'Üred' in this source and Cleaves 1951, I read Oirad; given the relative inconsistency in use of the double yodh to mark diphthongs in Middle Mongolian, the reading of Oirad as against Üred is equally plausible and is more likely as a proper name.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Table 2: *Keshig* elders in the Yuan Dynasty, from documents and literary sources.

Year:	Great <i>Keshig</i> : monkey, chicken, dog days	Second <i>Keshig</i> (Arulad): pig, mouse, cow days	Third <i>Keshig</i> (Jalayir): tiger, rabbit, dragon days	Fourth <i>Keshig</i> (Hü'üshin): snake, horse, sheep days
1283			Antong (Jalayir)	
1284		Qutu[q]dar ¹	Tegüder ²	Öchicher (Hü'üshin)
1286		Ba'arin		
1287			Antong (Jalayir)	Öchicher (Hü'üshin)
1288				Öchicher (Hü'üshin)
1291		Qutu[q]dar		
1292		Qutu[q]dar		
1293			Udu'utai (Jalayir)	
1305		Qutu[q]dar		
1307				Öchicher (Hü'üshin)
1308			Baiju (Jalayir) Yoqai	
1309		Jirghalang ³		
1310			Isdan	

CHRISTOPHER ATWOOD

	Great <i>Keshig</i> :	Second Keshig (Arulad):	Third Keshig (Jalayir):	Fourth Keshig (Secretariat):
1313			Baiju (Jalayir)	
1314		Mulaghu (Arulad)	Baiju (Jalayir)	
1315– 1316		Mulaghu (Arulad)		Esen-Temür (Hü'üshin)
1317– 1320			Baiju (Jalayir)	Esen-Temür (Hü'üshin)
1321– 1323		Shigtür ⁴	Baiju (Jalayir)	
1325		Sarman		
1329			Dü'ürin-Temür (Jalayir)	
1330			Köche-Beg	
1331– 1335		Acha'achi	Dü'ürin-Temür (Jalayir)	
1336		Aruqtu (Arulad)		
1340– 1345		Aruqtu (Arulad)	Dü'ürin-Temür (Jalayir)	Berke-Buqa (<i>Pingjang</i> , Left <i>Chingsang</i> ; Eljigid)
1347		Yaoyao (Arulad)		
1350		Aruqtu (Arulad)		
1352		Yaoyao (Arulad)	Dü'ürin-Temür (Jalayir)	Toqto'a (Right <i>Chingsang</i> ; Merkid)

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

	Great <i>Keshig</i> :	Second Keshig (Arulad):	Third Keshig (Jalayir):	Fourth Keshig (Secretariat):
1361				Qonichin
1363		Qara-Jang (Arulad)		
1366				Öljei-Temür (Right <i>Chingsang</i>)

Note:

The first or great keshig (*yeke keshig*) was directly under the emperor and those signing for him are not mentioned. The family affiliation for each shift and that of the individual shift captains, where known, is given in parentheses.

Sources: Hong 2003: 368–73; Song 1370/1976: VIII/95, 2440. Individual years have been combined where there is no evidence of a change in personnel.

Family affiliations: Tu 1934/1984: 989, 1000, 1003; Dü'ürin-Temür: Hong 2003: 351.

¹*Chingsang* in the Secretariat, 1265–1277, enfeoffed as Duke of Shouguo, 1316 (Song 1370/1976: IX/112, 1276–1279; II/25, 572).

²Censor, 1304, later enfeoffed as Duke of Yunguo, 1311 (Song 1370/1976: II/21, 461; II/22, 489).

³Censor, 1297, in the Secretariat 1320–1323 (Song 1370/1976: XIII/173, 4046; IX/112, 2822–25).

⁴Grand Supervisor of Agriculture, 1323 (Song 1370/1976: III/28, 632; III/29, 639).

⁵Censor, 1359 (Song 1370/1976: IV/45, 948).

CHRISTOPHER ATWOOD

Table 3: *Quda* families in the Yuan dynasty, Qubilai to Toghhan-Temür.

	Qubilai 1260-94	Temür 1294-1307	Haishan 1307-1311	Ayurbarwada 1311-1320	Shidebala 1320-23	Yisün-Temür 1323-28	Qoshila 1328-29	Tuq-Temür 1329-32	Irinchinbal 1332	Toghhan-Temür 1333-1370	Total
Qonggirad	2	1	2	1		3		1	1	1	12
Ikires			1		1	1					3
Baya'ud	1	1									2
Naiman						1	1				2
Merkid	1										1
Dörbed	1										1
Hü'üshin	1										1
Tangut			1								1
Qarluq							1				1
Qïpchaq										1	1
Ki (Korean)										1	1
unknown	4	1	1	1	2	5	5				18

Sources: Song 1370/1976: IX/106 and X/114; Tu 1934/1984: chapter 19; Rashîd al-Dîn/Boyle 1971: 241-45.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Table 4: *Küregen* (imperial son-in-law) families in the unified Mongol empire and Yuan dynasty.

Qonggirad	(granted marriages to Luguo and Yunguo princesses):.....	18
Ikires	(granted marriages to Changguo princesses): ..	12
Önggüd	(granted marriages to Zhaoguo princesses):	9
Oirat	(granted marriages to Yan'an princesses):	6
Uighur	(granted marriages to Gaochang princesses):	4
Koryô Wang	(granted marriages to Gaoli princesses):	4
Qarluq	(first granted marriage to princess Töre):	4
Olqunu'ud ¹	(first granted marriage to princess Shumqan): ...	4
Oronar ²	(first granted marriage to princess Dairqan):	2
Unidentified	(first granted marriage to princess Ashlun):	2

Sources: Song 1370/1976: IX/109; Hambis 1954.

¹I identify Chahu (< Chaqu~Chaghu~Cha'u[r]) who married Princess Shumqan with Cha'ur Sechen of the Olqunu'ud family, son of Taichu (Rashiduddin/Thackston 1998: I, 87, 148; Rashid-ad-Din/Khetagurov 1952: I, 164, II, 70). Princess Shumuhan may thus be the same as Chinggis's favourite daughter Altalun (otherwise not found in Song 1370/1976), or more likely a sister sent in her place after Altalun's mysterious execution (see Rashîd al-Dîn /Boyle 1971: 121).

². This refers to the family of imperial sons-in-law Batu (or Ba'atur) and his son Ajuqluq. Batu is elsewhere mentioned in Peng and Xu 1237/1962: 24a/511 as a son-in-law of Temüjin, while Ajuqluq has a brief biography in Song 1370/1976: X/123, 3024-25 ; in Song 1370/1976: XI/131, 3196 he is said to be of the Oronar family.

CHRISTOPHER ATWOOD

Table 5: *Quda* families in the Il-Khanate, Hüle'ü to Ghazan Khan.

	Hüle'ü 1256– 65	Abagha 1265– 82	Ahmad 1282– 84	Arghun 1284– 91	Irinchin- Dorji 1291–95	Ghazan 1295– 1304	Total
Qonggirad	1	2	3	1	1	1	9
Jait Jalayir			1	1	2	1	5
Oyirad (Qutuqa'i)	2			2			4
Kereyid	1			1	1		3
Baya'ud		1		1		1	3
Khitan (of Kerman)		1			1		2
Suldus	1					1	2
Arulad					1		1
Eljigin						1	1
Byzantine		1					1
Seljuk				1			1
endogamous			1				1
unknown		1					1

Source: Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: II, 471–72; III, 515, 547, 561–62, 579–80, 593–94.

Evolution of a Classic Mongol Institution

Table 6: *Küregen* (royal son-in-law) families in the Il-Khanate, Hüle'ü to Irinchin-Dorji.

	Hüle'ü 1256– 65	Abagha 1265– 82	Ahmad 1282–84	Arghun 1284– 91	Irinchin- Dorji 1291–95	Total
Qonggirad	1	1		1		3
Oyirad (Qutuqa'i)	2					2
Oirat (Arghuni)	1	1				2
Kereyid			2			2
Tatar		1	1			2
Hü'üshin		1			1	2
Mangghud				1	1	2
Baya'ud		1				1
Dörben				1		1
Jait-Jalayir				1		1
Georgian		1				1
Khitan (of Kerman)		1				1
unknown		1	3			4

Source: Rashiduddin/Thackston 1999: II, 476, III, 516, 547–48, 562, 580.