

KEBEK AND YASAWR

— The Establishment of The Chaghatai-Khanate —

KATŌ Kazuhide

Introduction

In the latter half of 13th century, the Mongol Empire split into some historical worlds, such as China, Iran, Central Asia, Qipchaq Steppes, as times went by. The process of this split was that of power struggles among the Mongolian rulers which were known as “**Rebellion of Ariq Boke**” and “**Rebellion of Qaidu**” and they involved the whole of the Empire.

The Chaghatai Ulus (*ulus* = tribe, nation) which had their headquarter in the Ili Valley established their power in Māwarā' al-Nahr and Semirechye seizing the moment of these internal troubles, and about 1306 under Du'a Khān succeeded in getting the sovereignty there by themselves. This was a birth of a Mongol state in Central Asia, what is called 'the Chaghatai-Khanate' which equaled to the Yüan Dynasty (元朝) in China, the Il-Khanate in Iran and the Qipchaq-Khanate in South Russia.¹⁾

This newborn state had to hurry up to strengthen *Khān's* power and arrange the ruling system, in order that it might rule princes of the Chaghatai Ulus and the Ögedei Ulus who would behave only for their own interests, and might rebuild the sedentary society of Central Asia which had been confused by the long power struggles among Mongol leaders.

But no sooner had Du'a himself had felt happy at the result of unification than he died of a disease in 1307, and so the works were thereafter handed to his sons. **Barthold** says that under the reign of Kebek Khān (1318–26) the Chaghatai-Khanate succeeded in centralizing and got its firm foundation for the first time.²⁾

In this writing, I'll try to trace concretely the way how the Du'a family strengthened *Khān's* power and established its reign system during the first quarter of 14th century, dealing with the struggles between Kebek and Yasawr both of whom were princes of the Chaghatais.

On this story of the struggles between Kebek and Yasawr, **D'Ohsson** already wrote in detail in the chapters of the Il-Khanate history, but ignored throughly the meaning of them which would have worked in the history of the

Chaghatai-Khanate.³⁾ And **Vámbéry** and **Oliver**, who made a special study of the history of the Chaghatai-Khanate, spared only several lines for them between Kebek's big brother Esen-Buqa Khān (1310–1318) and Yasawr. Besides they had mistaken Kebek for Esen-Buqa, when they described about them.⁴⁾ **Grousset** also simply wrote about them.⁵⁾ **Barthold** and the rest historians of the Soviet Union took a slight interest in the theme. And **Stroeva** was the first historian who was bent to study it.⁶⁾ **Stroeva** stood on a working hypotheses which was originated by **Barthold**⁷⁾ and consolidated by **Yakubovskii**⁸⁾ and **Petrushevskii**.⁹⁾

The hypothesis is as the following:

After the building of the Mongol Empire, among the Mongol leaders in Central Asia, there appeared two political tendencies in contradiction. The one aimed at the establishment of a centralized state by strong *Khān's* power and tried to control the military-nomadic aristocracy who intended to be centrifugal. It was characterized by an approach to the native sedentary society and by a protect of Islām and the culture of sedentary people. In it were included *Khāns* and the leaders of sedentary people who joined hands with them. And the other only regarded the sedentary people as objects of their pillage and uncontrolled exploitation following Mongolian customs and nomadic traditions. It aimed to root up the cities which would be the anti-Mongol headquarters and to change irrigated lands into the pasturelands. They fought against Islām and the sedentary culture by means of their "*Yasa* (customary law) of Chingiz-Khān and nomadic Uyghur culture". And it was supported by most of Türk-Mongolian nomadic aristocracy.

According to **Stroeva**, the struggles between Kebek and Yasawr, which happened in the Chaghatai-Khanate during the first half of 14th century, were the most typical ones between these two directions: Kebek was devoted to strengthen *Khān's* power and control the nomadic aristocracy. At the same time, he moved his abode from the Ili Valley to the sedentary area of *Māwarā' al-Nahr* and built his own palace there, and then he made a reform of money system and gave order to the sedentary society. Yasawr, on the other hand, who was in the struggle with Kebek, found his own way in plundering the sedentary people. He ignored the political boundary and *Khān's* policy of centralizing. He faithfully obeyed his own interests. As you have seen, Kebek was a person who strongly drove this direction and Yasawr was one who followed that direction.

I think that **Stroeva**, though she tried to substantiate the above hypothesis, did it in order to make Yasawr to be a complete type of the second direction. And it is a question that she didn't touch at all that Yasawr was a muslim. Besides the hypothesis itself that **Stroeva** followed imputed both the aspiration for feudalism and protection of its nomadic tradition to the military-nomadic aristocracy. It seems to be too much simplified to draw a sharp line between normadism and sedentarism as if there was no other direction but these two.

I'll propel my own argument keeping these problems mentioned above in my mind. The historical materials and their abbreviations on which I stood were as

the followings.

- JT:** Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl-allāh, *Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, ed. by B. Karīmī, 2 vols., Tehrān, 1959.
- TU:** 'Abd-allāh b. Muḥammad al-Qāshānī, *Tārīkh-i Ūljāytū*, ed. by M. Hambli, Tehrān, 1970.
- TW:** 'Abd-allāh b. Faḍl-allāh, *Tārīkh-i Waṣṣāf*, Tehrān, 1959.
- TH:** Sayf b. Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Harawī, *Tārīkh-nāma-yi Harāt*, ed. by M. Z. al-Ṣiddīqī, Calcutta, 1944.
- ZN/S:** Nizām al-Dīn Shāmī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, ed. by F. Tauer, Praha, 1937.
- ZN/Y:** Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, ed. by A. Urnbayev, Tashkent, 1972.
ed. by M. 'Abbāsī, 2 vols., Tehrān, 1957.
- MT:** Mu'īn al-Dīn Naṭanzī, *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh*, ed. by J. Aubin, Tehrān 1957.
- DJT:** Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Dhayl-i Jāmi' al-Tawārīkh*, ed. by K. Bayānī, Tehrān, 1971.
- MS:** 'Abd al-Razzāq Samarqandī, *Matla'-i Sa'dayn wa Majma'-i Baḥrayn*, vol. 1, ed. by A. Navā'ī, Tehrān, 1974.
- RŞ:** Mīrkhwānd, *Rawdat al-Ṣafā*, vol. 5, Tehrān, 1960.
- ḤS:** Khwāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, ed. by J. Humā'ī, vol. 3, Tehrān, 1954.
- IB:** *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, par C. Defrémery et B. R. Sanguinetti, t. III, Paris, 1949.

I. Prince Yasawr

Yasawr belonged to a family of Būri who was the second son of Mö'etūken, the second son of Chaghatai.¹⁰⁾ (TW, 509; JT, 534–6) His great grandfather Qadaqchi Sechen was the third son of Būri and he took part in the expedition to the South Sung (南宋) which Möngke Qa'an made in 1255 as a commander of the right wing (JT, 536, 601) and his grandfather Toqa-Temür (Buqa-Temür) held a post of Chaghatai-Khān (1272).¹¹⁾ (JT, 548) Though we have never informed of his father Örüq-Temür, there is no doubt that Yasawr came of the Chaghatai Family. He was born in about 688 A.H. (1289 A.D.), because Qāshānī writes that he was 28 years old in the year of 716 A.H. (1316/17). (TU, 220)

The time we find the name of Yasawr in some historical materials for the first time was after the death (fall, 1301) of Qaidu Khān of the Ögedeis, who had got the supremacy in Central Asia for some time and when the leadership struggle between Chaghatai-Khān Du'a and Chapar, a son of Qaidu was getting deeper.

In 705 A.H. (1305/6) he and his maternal uncle Jinkshī made a fight against Shāh-Ughūl, a son of Qaidu, and Bābā-Ughūl of the Jochi-Qasars between Samarqand and Khujand. According to Qāshānī, the conflict was caused by the speech and action of Kūresbe of the Ögedeis: He planned to plunder Samarqand

and Bukhārā and cross over the Amu Darya, but he was arrested by Bābā who tried to check his plan because he declared that he did not need to obey the Chapar group as he belonged to the Du'a's. When Yasawr made a protest with Bābā against this affair, Bābā sent Küresbe to Chapar. So Yasawr in great anger began to attack him. Though the Du'a group and the Chapar group were going to have a meeting together in Shāsh in order to settle the conflict by arbitration, Yasawr, Jinkshī and others, with a large force, attacked Bābā and Shāh who had been waiting disarmed for them. Then they drove away Bābā to Khwārazm and plundered the *Ordo* (*Ūrdū* = nomadic encampment) of Shāh in Tālās (Ṭarāz) (TU, 35-7; TW, 515-17)

After that, when Dhū'l-Qarnayn, a prince of the Chaghatais, was appointed to rule over the upper valleys of the Amu Darya, Küresbe refused the army assignment which he had been told to offer. And so Yasawr attacked and caught him with the aid of Dhu'l-Qarnayn and Jinkshī. (TW, 513)

These two wins mentioned above formed a part of Du'a's works of unification in the way that the Chaghatais got an advantage over Māwarā' al-Nahr.¹²⁾ By this time, Yasawr, at the young age of 17, had already shown his military ability and had been an active leader of the Du'a group.

Meanwhile considering Yasawr had his resident place (*maqām*) in Samarqand (TW, 519) and he is said to have started from Samarqand later when seeking refuge in Khurāsān, there is no doubt his *Ordo* and *Yurt* (*Yūrt* = nomadic land) were near Samarqand. And according to **Qāshānī**, Yasawr became a muslim guided by Badrmandānī of Bukhārā. (TU, 213) I guess Badrmandānī was the same person with Badr al-Dīn al-Maydānī whom **Ibn Baṭṭūṭa** described. (IB, 556) Though the time he became a muslim was unknown, I presume that he had contact with Islām from a pretty early stage, judging that he sought refuge in Khurāsān accompanied with lots of *Imāms* who had been in Samarqand and Bukhārā. (TU, 219) It might be said that Yasawr settled himself in the center of Māwarā' al-Nahr which, in Central Asia, was playing a great part in both economical and cultural sides, and he made a deeper relation with the sedentary society under the effect of Islām establishing himself as a powerful leader of the Du'a group.

Du'a, who expelled the Qaidus' princes and got the sovereignty in Central Asia in the hands of the Chaghatais, died of a disease in 706 A.H. (1306/7)¹³⁾ and his son Könçek succeeded him. (TU, 53; TW, 518) It was this period that Yasawr, at last, overthrew Küresbe who had kept turbulent and made the sovereignty of the Du'a Family stable.

But when Könçek died in the end of 707 A.H. (May or June, 1308), Taliqu (Naliqu), Yasawr's granduncle, seized the power in place of the Du'a Family. By this time, Qutluq Khwāja, the eldest son of Du'a, had been dispatched to Afghanistan by Qaidu and already died about 698 A.H. (1298/9) from the injury on his way from India (TU, 192-3) and Esen-Buqa (Īsan-būqā) had been appointed to the successor of Qutluq Khwāja by Du'a and then he was far in

Afghanistan. (TW, 509–10) I think these were why Taliqu who was one of the elders in the Chaghatai Ulus succeeded the post of *Khān* of the Du'a Family, which had not found a qualified person within its relations.

Taliqu was a muslim whose mother was Turkān, a daughter of Sulṭān Rukn al-Dīn of the Qara-Khitais in Kirmān, and he began to apply pressure to the Du'as' princes and *amīrs*. Against this condition, Örüġ (Urūk), Taliqu's cousin, first rose, saying like this:

"A person but sons of Du'a cannot be a king of the *ulus*(*pādshāh-i ulūs*) in stead of them ignoring their dignity." (TU, 147)

According to Waṣṣāf, Örüġ began to resist him with Shāh, saying as the following:

"We had long regarded Du'a as our elder (*āqā*). Now that Du'a died, his sons have a priority (*rutbat-i ruḡhān*) of it now." (TW, 518–9)

Next Yasawr rose against Taliqu with Jinkshī. (TU, 147; TW, 518–9)

These stories mentioned above show that Taliqu was not always installed by the consensus of the Chaghatais. At the same time, we can also know that the Du'as' authority over the throne of Chaghatai Khān had been widely received taking into consideration that Örüġ and Yasawr both of whom were closely related to Taliqu made a resistance to him. But the result was that Örüġ was killed in battle with Taliqu and other princes against him were also beaten. As for Yasawr, though he was once pitted in Farghāna against the 'Alī Malik's force which Taliqu had sent, being outnumbered, he had to retreat in order to recover his own army. (TW, 518–9) Thus the princes of the Du'a group as well as Yasawr were driven into a corner and Taliqu got more and more power. But the tide turned quickly when Kebek appeared.

2. Prince Kebek

Kebek belonged to a family line of Yesün-To'a, who was the third son of Mö'etüken and Büri's younger brother. His grandfather was Chaghtai-Khān Baraq (1266–71) and his father was Du'a. (JT, 536–9, 546–8; TU, 147; TW, 519) Though the year of his birth has not been ascertained, I guess he did not come of age yet at the time of Könček's death and may have been 5 or 6 years younger than Yasawr, judging from the matters that he was written in the description of about 708 A.H. (1308/9) as "Du'a's younger son (*pīsar-i kihān-i Duwā*)" or "Du'a's smaller son (*pīsar-i kūchaktar-i Tuwā*)" (TU, 147; TW, 519), and when his big brother Könček died, he was not recognized as the most pertinent successor though he was possibly near the *Ordos* in Almaliq where his father and big brother stayed.¹⁴⁾ Considering that Kebek was so yong, it seems to be natural that

he was “so astonished and frightened that he ran into the tent of Ūzan-bahādur crying, explained Taliqu’s intention and plans to him clinging to his skirt and made requests for his help and protection from an injury done at the bottom of his misfortune,” when some *amīr* informed him the Taliqu Group’s resolution that “the best policy for both our kingdom and *ulus* is to root Du’a’s descendants up.” (TU, 147)

This is how Ūzan-bahādur swore to help him and planned to attack Taliqu in the midst of a banquet. And as soon as Ūzan left the banquet at the right moment, 200 mounted warriors led by Kebek and his brother Ebügen (Abūkān) and 100 mounted warriors by Ūzan who had been standing ready fired Taliqu’s *Ordo* and killed himself and all his subordinates. (TU, 147–8; TW, 519) Waṣṣāf says that this coup d’état happened in 708 A.H. (1308/9).

But just after Kebek regained the sovereignty in the hands of the Du’a Family, he came across a crisis. Qaidu’s son Chapar who had been impelled to obey Du’a launched the force of the Ögedeis with Yangichar, Tügme (Tükma), Urlā, Oros (Urūs) and other princes against Kebek. Though he left the Qunās Plain in Almaliq and met the Chapar’s force, he was defeated and all his force were put to rout. But as ‘Alī-Ughūl, Taliqu’s nephew in Ūzkand, Shaykh Tīmūr, a son of Chaghatai Khān Mubārak-Shāh (1266), Shāh-Ughūl of the Qaidus and others offered to help him, he began to battle against the Chapar’s force again at the Qunās Plain and got a victory with difficulty. On the other hand, Chapar and others took refuge in the Yüan Dynasty across the Ili River and Tügme was killed being chased by Kebek’s force. (TU, 148–9; TW, 519)

As mentioned above Kebek succeeded in seizing the sovereignty of the Chaghatai-Khanate in his hands, surmounting the crisis that the rule of the Du’a Family might be collapsed. This also meant that most of the elements of the Ögedeis, which had long been the greatest ones to give the Chaghatai-Khanate instability, were expelled and removed. But we are impressed that this success rather depended on the abilities of the princes or *amīrs* such as Örüg and Yasawr who resisted against Taliqu, Ūzan-bahādur who planned the coup d’état and ‘Alī who helped Kebek defeat Chapar than Kebek’s himself. This proves that the supporters of the Du’a Family’s sovereignty were covering a wide range, but it also shows that the sovereignty was still effeminative then. Circumstanced as it was, there was no wonder if anyone like Taliqu had requested the post of Khān. In this sense the policies Kebek made afterwards were worthy of note.

At first Kebek sent Pülād Gürkān as his envoy to Wu-tsung (武宗) Qaishan, Qa’an of the Yüan Dynasty, and told him as the following:

“Taliqu had usurped the post of our father. And I recaptured it from him by the power both of our great god and of Qa’an’s government. As Tügme turned against us, I removed him. I would like to serve you Qa’an from now.”

Qa'an was pleased with this offer and gave him gifts.¹⁵⁾ (TU, 149) It can be said that Kebek did it in order to call Taliqu "an usurper" and to justify the sovereignty of the Du'a Family by *Qa'an's* authority.

Next, in reward for a distinguished service of 'Alī-Ughūl, Kebek gave him 'the governorship and commandership of Khutan area (*iyālat wa imārat-i diyār-i Khutan*)' and put 'the whole of Turkistan area (*tamāmat-i hudūd-i Turkistān*)' into his hands. But as soon as 'Alī left for there, Kebek sent a unit of his army and killed him. According to **Qāshānī**, Kebek did it for that he was "afraid of 'Alī's rebellion because he was a brave warrior." (TU, 149) The aim of his resolute decision was made to remove a being which was great enough to endanger the Du'a Family's sovereignty.

And in the beginning of 709 A.H. (about June, 1309) Kebek summoned *Quriltai* (royal congress) and had the enthronement of his elder brother Esen-Buqa determine there. According to **Qāshānī**, he told Esen-Buqa who was in Afghanistan like this:

"I cleansed the throne and crown defiled by the rebellious elements, defeated all the enemies, snatched the throne and released it for you. You must start for the capital of the kingdom at once day or night and rule your army and people. How long the throne and crown had been remained without its own subordinates and master." (TU, 149)

Thus Esen-Buqa who had just come back from Afghanistan installed himself in the post of Chaghatai-Khān. (TU, 149–50; TW, 519–20)

By the way, **D'Ohsson** and others¹⁶⁾ say that when the coup d'état succeeded, Kebek enthroned himself once, and then abdicated the throne in favour of Esen-Buqa, but we can not find any clear descriptions about Kebek's enthronement. I guess that Kebek did not dare to enthrone himself because of his youth and brought his elder brother who was better equipped with considerable experiences than himself. This fact shows that Kebek was so afraid of the weakness of the Du'a Family's sovereignty that he proceeded the matter of enthronement very carefully and coolly as well as when sending his envoy to *Qa'an* and killing 'Alī. This indicates unquestionably that Kebek was a very excellent ruler.

After the enthronement of Esen-Buqa, **Qāshānī** says:

"He put Farghāna and Māwarā' al-Nahr under Kebek's administration and sent him to Kish and Nakhshab." (TU, 150)

Thereafter Kebek's *Ordo* and *Yurt* were settled in the Kashka-Daryā Valley and he made it his headquarter. Later, it may have been when he was Khān, he built a palace himself near the town of Nakhshab.¹⁷⁾ (ZN/Y, 1136, I-85)

And **Naṭanzī** says:

Esen-Buqa told Kebek “to select the rich (*mutamawwilān*) from the whole of *Ulus* for himself, and Kebek did as he was told” and the descendants of them were proud that they were Kebek’s *injū* (*injūgarī-yi Kabak*) even in the days of the Tīmūrids. (MT, 107)

It is probable that the word ‘the rich (*mutamawwilān*)’ means some powerful *amīrs* or Mongol tribes, and Kebek was permitted to select them as ‘*injū*’ (private retainers).¹⁸⁾

Thus, with great authority and powerful retainers, Kebek got the inflexible post in the place of Māwarā’ al-Nahr and Farghāna. There is no doubt that this fact had determined how he ruled afterwards. And the right and advantage of Yasawr, who had established his own footing there, was spoiled and his post was getting endangered by that. This was the beginning of the antagonism between them which happened later.

3. Antagonism between Kebek and Yasawr

When Esen-Buqa was a ruler, with the Yüan Dynasty and the Il-Khanate he had discords again which had long stopped since the peace was made in 704 A.H. (1304/5).¹⁹⁾ At that time in Afghanistan, Dāwd Khwāja who was a son of Qutluq Khwāja was appointed as the successor of Esen-Buqa and he was leading the *Nikūdarīyān*. Though Tīmūr Gūrkan and Lakmīr both of whom were sons of Abājī, husband of Du’a’s daughter, were placed under his command, they asked Īl-Khān Öljeitü an aid to free themselves from it. Complying with this request, in the beginning of 712 A.H. (about May–June, 1312) the army of the Il-Khanate which was stationed in Khurāsān accompanied with Tīmūr etc. attacked Dāwd Khwāja and drove him away beyond the Amu Darya. Thus Dāwd Khwāja escaped to Esen-Buqa and asked protection of him. (TU, 152, 201–2)

About the same time, Abīshqā who was sent to the Yüan Dynasty as an envoy by Öljeitü dropped carelessly that *Qa’an* and Īl-Khān was going to attack the Chaghatai-Khanate from both sides.²⁰⁾ (TU, 203–4) And besides, Esen-Buqa and Tūghājī Jīnsānk, a commander of the Yüan force which was stationed in the Altai Area, held a conference in order to demarcate the frontier lines of their *Yurts*, but it ended in the rupture. These circumstances being piled up, Esen-Buqa rushed into distrust of *Qa’an* and Īl-Khān and acted unwisely to detain their envoys who passed through his land.²¹⁾ (TU, 204–5) Following that, he sent his army to Tūghājī three times but ended in failure. (TU, 205–8)

The result was that *Qa’an* issued an imperial ordinance (*ḥukm-i yarlāgh*):

“Drive away the enemies from their *Yurts*. Plunder their summer quarters and winter ones and make them your own region.”

This time the Yüan force led by Tūghājī attacked into the land of the Chaghatai-Khanate.²²⁾ Their situations were now reversed. According to **Qāshā-nī**, Esen-Buqa made up his mind to occupy the Khurāsān Area in the west to make it serve as his lands and *Yurts* when lots of them might be usurped by the Yüan force, and wished to retaliate upon them for Dāwd Khwāja. (TU, 208)

In fact, Kebek being as a head, the expeditionary forces led by some *amīrs* and princes, such as Yasawr, Jinkshī, Dāwd Khwāja, Shāh etc., crossed over the Amu Darya in the fall of 713 A.H. (fall, 1313).²³⁾ (TU, 153, 209; TW, 610) **Qāshānī** says that the numbers of their forces were 40 thousands or 5 *tūmān* (*tūmān* = ten thousands) (TU, 164, 209), but **Sayfi** says they were 60 thousand mounted warriors. (TH, 630) Seeing the personnel of the princes, it was a grand-scaled forces which most of the leading princes stationed in Māwarā' al-Nahr joined. We know what a large hope Esen-Buqa had on this expedition then. The Chaghatai Army beat easily the vanguard of the Il-Khanate Army which were late to concentrate troops, and reached the plain of Murghāv. Though Amīr Yāsāwl who was a head of *amīrs* in Khurāsān called his army and to meet them at once, the result was that they were defeated and Būjāy, one of the main *amīrs*, died and Amīr Yāsāwl himself narrowly escaped death. (TU, 153, 209–10; TW, 610; TH, 607–9, 629–35; DJT, 106–110)

In the midst that the Chaghatai army was making such military achievements, Kebek and Yasawr began to be in antagonism to one another; Kebek insisted that they should kill Arā-tīmūr, an *amīr* of *hazāra* (a unit of 1,000 warriors accompanied with each family) and his retainers whom the Chaghatai Army had caught in Murghāv. On the other hand, Yasawr prevented it and took Arā-tīmūr over as his adopted son. (TU, 209) Besides when Kebek and Jinkshī tried to chase the running enemy and attack them as far as Tūs, Yasawr stopped them saying:

“Why can we kill and destroy muslims in the month of Ramaḍān?” (TU, 210)

According to **Sayfi**, though Kebek attacked and killed the running warriors of the Khurāsān Army, Yasawr only took away horses and weapons from them and released them. And other princes were going to pursuit them even through the night, but this time also he stopped them saying:

“We should return, because most of the Khurāsān *amīrs* were killed and most of their soldiers were wounded. Some great doctors and eminent scholars say that it should not be praised to chase the enemy on the run.” (TH, 635; DJT, 110)

Here Yasawr seems very magnanimous in contrast with Kebek who seems cruel in his eagerness to do his duty completely. But it is hard to see that these doings of Yasawr's were expression of his unalloyed magnanimity based on his religious mind. I guess that he tried to impress his magnanimity on the Il-Khanate

side to enter friendly relations with it. In fact when he took refuge in Iran later, Amīr Arā-tīmūr whom he had helped mediated between him and Īl-Khān. (TU, 213) And **Qāshānī**, a historian of the Il-Khanate, who put down his pen just after Yasawr's refuge, wrote about Yasawr's doings and his personality with good intentions. But Kebek seems to have penetrated into his inner motive, when he said to Jinkshī during the expedition to Khurāsān as the following:

"Yasawr has an intention to stay in this verdurous pastureland, the plain like a paradise on earth." (TU, 210)

By the way, **Sayfī** says that Kebek had noticed Yasawr's intention to take refuge in Iran since some years before when he made an expedition to Khurāsān and he made a statement to Esen-Buqa like this:

"Prince Yasawr devotes his mind to Khurāsān and asks a friendship with Ūljeytū (Ūljāytū Sultān). It should not be permitted that he raises a disturbance and takes the people of Māwarā' al-Nahr away to Khurāsān beyond the River (Amu Darya). If I get an ordinance of the World-Conqueror (*ḥukm-i yarlīgh-i Jahān-gushāy*), I will kill or catch him."

But Esen-Buqa remained neglecting Kebek's opinion. (TH, 640; DJT, 113) Judging from these matters, Kebek and Yasawr had already been in antagonism at this time, that is, this was trying to control the arbitrary behaviors of some princes and *amīrs* in order to strengthen the sovereignty of the Du'a Family and that was seeking a new world in hatred of Kebek's control. And we should think the antagonism came to the front when they made an expedition to Khurāsān.

In the month of Dhū al-Qa'da of 713 A.H. (Feb.-Mar., 1314), the Chaghatai Army hastily withdrew themselves, firstly as the Khān ordered that they should come back to meet the invading Yüan Army,²⁴ and secondly as provisions with them had already been exhausted. (TU, 164, 210-11) The expedition to Khurāsān resulted in failure. And Kebek attributed it to Yasawr when he informed Esen-Buqa. **Qāshānī** says that Esen-Buqa took the post and the right of command from Yasawr and gave them to Kebek, telling him to subdue Yasawr. On the other hand, **Sayfī** says that Esen-Buqa promised Kebek to summon Yasawr in the coming winter because he was, at that time, afraid lest the Khurāsān Army might counterattack. (TU, 211; TH 641; DJT, 113) Either way Esen-Buqa needed to take some steps against Yasawr. But it was in 716 A.H. (1316/7) when Yasawr began to go south to take refuge in Iran²⁵ that Esen-Buqa actually ordered Kebek to subdue him. (TU, 217-8; TH, 640) It is probable that Esen-Buqa could not help putting off disposal of Yasawr under such difficult conditions as there remained many troubles with the Yüan and the Il-Khanate.

In 716 A.H. (1316/7), Kebek started to subdue Yasawr at last. But as Yasawr who was informed of it by Jinkshī had already prepared, he could repulse his

attack and besides put many of the *amīrs* and warriors who had belonged to Kebek under his control. Then Yasawr sent Arā-tīmūr to Öljeitü as his envoy and he himself hastily left Samarqand for Tirmidh with his forces. On their way to the southward Yasawr's army plundered Samarqand, Sāgharj,²⁶⁾ Kish, Nakhshab, Kūftan²⁷⁾ and others, and took the residents with them as their captives "without Yasawr's permission". But as Bukhārā was far from where they passed, it escaped from them.

On the other hand, Arā-tīmūr who came to Öljeitü asked him to accept Yasawr's refuge and give him *Yurt* in Balkh and Shuburqān (Shufürqān). Öljeitü granted all these requests and sent the Khurāsān Army commanded by Amīr Yāsāwl in order to help Yasawr over the Amu Darya. Meanwhile, Esen-Buqa who had been informed of Kebek's disadvantage sent reinforcements for him, but Kebek accompanied with Jinkshī and Shāh who met Yasawr at 鐵門關 (*Dar-i Āhanīn*) was defeated again because of the Khurāsān Army. In some of battles fought near and around Tirmidh too, the day was against Kebek. After all, in the month of Rajab of 716 A.H. (Sep.–Oct., 1316), crossing the Amu Darya Yasawr stood on the Shuburqān Plain and the Khurāsān Army returned back with a great deal of war trophies and captives at the same time, says Sayfī. (TU, 211–8; TH, 640, 643–4; DJT, 113–5)

As mentioned above, Kebek had Māwarā' al-Nahr damaged a great deal and besides he could not prevent Yasawr from taking refuge in Iran. But that Yasawr and princes and *amīrs* under him had gone meant the absence of obstacles when he would strengthen Khān's power and it seems to have been unfathomably significant for his later rule. On the contrary the Il-Khanate which accepted Yasawr came to be troubled by his actions.

4. Yasawr in Khurāsān

As soon as Yasawr was settled in Khurāsān, sending his envoy to Öljeitü, he tendered his submission. In answer to this, Öljeitü issued an Imperial ordinance like this:

"I gave Yasawr the lands from the Amu Darya to the boundary of Māzandarān. *Amīrs* and *maliks* in Khurāsān should give him as much service and respect as possible and they must not infringe any terms of submission, any orders and prohibitions of his." (TH, 644–5)

According to Qāshānī, a written contract (*Ahd-nāma*) passed between them. (TU, 218; DJT, 118–9) There is no doubt that Öljeitü took these steps for defenses against the attack of the Chaghatai-Khanate. Yasawr consequently got the power to lead the *amīrs* and *maliks* in Khurāsān. When Öljeitü died²⁸⁾ and next Abū Sa'īd was throned,²⁹⁾ another written contract passed again between them and Yasawr's post was re-recognized anew. (TH, 659–69; DJT, 129–33)

As the result, among *amīrs* in Khurāsān, there appeared a movement to strengthen their position through promoting friendship with him. At first hoping to get a marital relation with Yasawr, Amīr Yāsāwl, a chief *amīr* there came to him in *Ordo* with a great deal of presents.³⁰⁾ Amīr Bīktūt who tried to obstruct it imbued Yasawr with a doubt about Amīr Yāsāwl and at last getting Yasawr's reliance, he murdered him successfully.³¹⁾ Over against this, Prince Minqān opposed Bīktūt with Amīr Yāsāwl's sons to take revenge for Amīr Yāsāwl, but most of *amīrs* in Khurāsān were spontaneously or unwillingly submitted to Yasawr because Amīr Īsan-qutlugh, the successor of Amīr Yāsāwl stood behind Bīktūt. (TW, 620–22; TH, 649–55, 670–73; DJT, 123–26)

All of the *amīrs* and *maliks*, however, did not agree to the submission to him. Above all, Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn, the ruler of the Kurts in Herāt had refused to submit to Yasawr from the first. Following him, Tīmūr, a son of Abājī leading the *Nikūdarīyān*, Malik Naṣīr al-Dīn in Sīstān and other *maliks* in Khurāsān resisted stoutly. Because of that, Yasawr tried attacking Herāt and Sīstān, but both resulted in failure. (TH, 645–48, 656–59, 674–77; DJT, 135–39)

In spite of these facts, taking advantage of the power struggles among *amīrs* under Īl-Khān Abū Saʿīd, Yasawr who was encouraged at the swell in his power, at last, began to aim the sovereignty of all over Iran. According to Sayfī, Prince Yasawr said:

“I hope that God . . . gives the Kingdom of Iran to me and so each of you possesses a domain and becomes a master of wealth and rank.”

Amīrs and chiefs of army much applauded him. (TH, 655) In connection with this, Sayfī says that Amīr Īsan-qutlugh urged Yasawr, in an epistle, to advance into 'Irāq. (TH, 673)

In the month of Jumādā al-Ākhira, 718 A.H. (Jul.–Aug., 1318), Yasawr disclosed a plan to his *amīrs* that he would invade 'Irāq by way of Khurāsān. According to Sayfī, he said to his *amīrs* as the following:

“I made up my mind to go to Khurāsān, because I was informed that Emperor Abū Saʿīd had not ascended the throne yet and *amīrs* were entering into the affairs of State at each own discretion. If this news be true, I will leave Khurāsān for 'Irāq and make Sulṭān Abū Saʿīd sit on the throne and root out the opposed and the opponents to his State and return home. But if this news be false and Sulṭān Abū Saʿīd had happily sat on the inherited throne, I will return from the districts of Māzandarān.” (TH, 680–81)

In the month of Rajab (Aug.–Sept., 1318), Yasawr's army rushed into Khurāsān. Then he himself reached Māzandarān and did Bīktūt Dāmghān. But Yasawr's request to submit to him was refused by the cities of Khurāsān and Yasawr's men were killed in some of them, for example in Mashhad. The result

was that he could not control Khurāsān and was also obliged to withdraw Māzandarān. (TH, 680–81, 688–91).

Meanwhile, Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kurt complained to Īl-Khān Abū Saʿīd about Yasawr and was given a definite promise to help him by Amīr Chūbān, who was Great Amīr (*Amīr-i Buzurg*). Amīr Ḥusayn was installed to subjugate Yasawr at once. (TH, 692–93; DJT, 133) That is, the thing having come to such a pass, the Il-Khanate authorities considered Yasawr's behaviors a rebellion. Therefore seizing the chance that Yasawr was out, Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn attacked *Ordo* of Abū Yazīd, a son of Būjāy in Bādghīs and arrested the families of both Abū Yazīd and Bīktūt's men. Yasawr immediately asked to return the captives and no sooner had the request been refused than he tried to beseige Herāt three times in vain and devastating all around there, he withdrew his troops. (TH, 693–717)

After this time, Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn conquered *maliks* who followed Yasawr such as Quṭb al-Dīn of Isfīzār, Yīnāl-tikin of Farāh, 'Abd al-'Azīz of the fortress of Zara in Bākharz and Khwāja Majīd of Khwāf etc. one after another and gradually razed the base which supported Yasawr. (TH, 717–42, 750–65)

At last in the month of Jumādā al-Awwal of 720 A.H. (Jun.–Jul., 1320), Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn requested Chaghatai-Khān Kebek to dispatch his army. In answer to it, did he dispatch princes such as Īljikidāy, Rustam, Munkalī-khwāja, Būlād with his 40,000 mounted warriors and sending an envoy to Amīr Ḥusayn, he planned to attack against Yasawr in concert with the Khurāsān Army. Thus 40,000 mounted warriors of the Khurāsān Army led by Amīr Ḥusayn and Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn etc. took the field to fight Yasawr. As soon as the Chaghatai Army came up to Yasawr's camp, a group of the warriors were secretly sent into Yasawr's camp to urge his *amīrs* to break away from him. Consequently so did they all together and attacked Bīktūt to kill him, when both armies began to fight. Having known this matter, Yasawr escaped with his family, but Īljikidāy made his 1,000 mounted warriors chase him. They captured him and killed him then and there. (TH, 765–68; DJT, 158–59; MS, 51–2)

Yasawr died at the age of 32. It was the end of a prince Yasawr who held sway over Khurāsān and watched for a chance to rule the Il-Khanate once. With this, actions of Yasawr's Party came to an end, but his descendants who returned to Māwarā' al-Nahr got influence and power again in the Samarqand Area as "*Yasāwriyān*" after the middle of 14th century, and got to take part in the political situation after the Chaghatai-Khanate collapsed. (ZN/S, 15, 35–6; ZN/Y, 95a. 986. 1156, 1166, 121a, 1-32, 41, 90, 92, 106; MT, 197, 235, 240, 266 etc.)

By the way, Qāshānī says that Yasawr was "lovely-faced, good-natured, great shining and was a possessor of a little projecting and notably broad forehead, beloved disposition, praiseworthy visions, one eye squinting, a high statue, a strong physique and fat body," (TU, 220) and he spent pretty many pages to tell about Yasawr's bravery. The episode of Yasawr and his female slave in his descriptions makes us recall the story of that Hsiang-yü (項羽) and Yü-mei-jên (虞美人). (TU, 209) Reading them we can imagine Yasawr to have been a typical

nomadic aristocrat : great, manly, large-minded, matchless in strength and bravery and besides affectionate.

Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn, however, commented on Yasawr as the following:

“Prince Yasawr will not bring any benefits to me, *amīrs* and *maliks* living here, for Māwarā’ al-Nahr was devastated because of his actions and thousands of muslims were ruined by his fearless army. After all Prince Yasawr will raise disturbances over here and the armies of various countries will take many years to suppress them.” (TH, 646)

There were the very words of a ruler who belonged to sedentary societies. That is, seeing from the viewpoints of ruling states or making societies stabilized, Yasawr’s actions were nothing but obstructives. For example, at the sight of his last moment, it is evident that thinking too highly of Bīktūt only, he failed to grasp other *amīrs* successfully and his army was what is called a medley army linked up by way of taking booties to the last — an army not enough systematized. For example, it is said that about Rabī’ I, 719 A.H. (Apr.–May, 1319), when Yasawr himself led the army and besieged Herāt, though his warriors fought desperately when he watched them, they abstained from fighting when he did not watch them. (TH, 713) Yasawr had been solely plundering and using armed forces from the beginning to the end, and we can never find any basic principles or firm policies in his actions. In this way, Yasawr belonged to the second political direction told by **Stroeve**.

But he was a muslim. About his faith Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn strictly criticizes like this:

“If Prince Yasawr had had even the least faith, he would not have been so eager to kill thousands of muslim people. . . . I can not rely upon his good deeds external.” (TH, 648)

Nevertheless judging from these matters that he visited the Gāzurgāh (Anṣārī’s grave) in Herāt, Shaykh Jesht’s grave in Jesht and Shaykh Aḥmad’s grave in Jām (TH, 654, 680, 688), that taking refuge in Iran, he was attended by Imāms of Bukhārā and Samarqand, such as Najm al-Dīn ‘Aqilī, Sayf al-Dīn ‘Asaba, Najm al-Dīn Samīnī, Sayf al-Dīn Bakhshī and Jamāl al-Dīn Nasafī (TU, 219) and that he had them Imāms grade Najm al-Dīn Ṭayyibī’s learnings who was the Chief Justice (*Qāḍī al-Quḍāt*) of Rūm dispatched by Öljeitü as an envoy (TU, 218), though leaning toward Ṣūfizm, Yasawr seems to have been quite familiar with Islām and its culture and had some understanding even of Islamic learnings. Though the way of his faith like this was blamed by Malik Ghiyāth Al-Dīn, it might be a type of ways how the Türk-Mongolian nomadic aristocracy received Islām at that time.

In Central Asia in the first quarter of 14th century, especially in Māwarā’

al-Nahr, there appeared some nomadic aristocrats who was getting more and more to be devoted to the Islamic sedentary culture, though they kept their nomadic constitution intensely like Yasawr on the one side. I think in those days the most fundamental problem for them, nomadic aristocrats, was not in that they should "be nomadic or sedentary" or they should "accept Islamic culture or not", but in "how they should be generally related with Islamic culture and the sedentary societies" and besides "how they should keep their control over the sedentary people."³²⁾ One of the weak points of **Stroeva's** hypothesis is it can not include the viewpoint mentioned by me above.

And in case of Yasawr, setting aside the aspect of his accepting Islām, if we speak of the way he was related with the sedentary societies, he relied on nothing but the way of plundering or using forces that remained as it had been and he revealed a lack of fixed policy when he ruled the sedentary people. Here we can recognize the limitations of his political actions.

5. A Just Khān, Kebek

Though Kebek became a Khān as a successor of his brother, we can find pretty little of historical materials that tell us about his rule. Speaking of the period of the reign, it is only known by **Naṭanzī** (**MT**, 109–11) that he was enthroned in 709 A.H. (1309/10) and died a natural death in 721 A.H. (1321/2) after 12 years' rule. But I think this information to be unreliable. As I mentioned above, about the end of 716 A.H. (1316/7) Esen-Buqa was still at the position of Khān. And in the records of the Yüan Dynasty, there being such a description "In 1320 (延祐七年), the younger brother Kebek (弟怯別) ascended the throne",³³⁾ and he had sent envoys to the Yüan with many presents every year from 1321 (至治元年) to 1326 (泰定三年).³⁴⁾ Besides some of the coins with stamps of Kebek's name exist even now and they extend over years from 722 A.H. (1322/3) to 725 A.H. (1324/5).³⁵⁾ Judging from these matters, it seems that Kebek began to reign in 1317 at the earliest or in 1320 at the latest and ended in 1326. **Oliver** and **Barthold** adopted 'about 1318' as the year of his enthronement³⁶⁾ and it has seemed to be reasonable.

The name of Kebek as a Khān appeared in a description when Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn, a ruler of the Kurts, requested him to send the army in order to subjugate Yasawr. That is, in Jumādā I of this year (Jun.–Jul., 1320), Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn wrote to 'the Just Prince Kebek (*Pādshāhzāda-yi 'Ādil Kabak*)' as the following:

"Prince Yasawr bringing his army from Māwarā' al-Nahr to this country, destroyed Khurāsān a great deal and killed about 10,000 people ranging from *Sayyids* and *Imāms* to women, children and the poor. . . . And though for forty days he besieged Herāt by means of 40,000 warriors fearless of bloodshed, by the grace of God and by a favor of Imperial dignity [of İl-Khan,] he could nothing but burn out the cereals and kill small numbers of

the poor or ruffians. And a thousands of brave warriors under his control were killed in the City of Herāt. At present a rumour that he is watching Māwarā' al-Nahr spreads out in Khurāsān. Unless you a Just Prince (*Bādshāhzāda-yi 'Ādil*) dispatch your army to these provinces in order to drive him away and to root him up, there will happened some disturbances in your districts again and both confusions and seditions will get more and more than before."

Answering this, Kebek wrote:

"It is well known that I did not intend to send my army over the Amu Darya. But now Malik made clear that Prince Yasawr was making a great destruction and you the servants of the supreme God were in the middle of grief and misfortune because of Yasawr's injustice and the oppression by his army, it has got fair for me that I will do my best to drive him away by my force."

This is the story that Kebek came to send his army to attack Yasawr. (TH, 765-68)

From this we know that Kebek never sent the army until Malik of Herāt strongly requested that, as himself had not had on intention to invade Iran in those days, probably since his enthronement. Taking this idea into consideration with the description in **Yüan-shih** that Kebek gave the Yüan many presents every year, it shows that Kebek tried to settle the antagonism which was between the Il-Khanate and him or the Yüan Dynasty and him. It must have been an expression of a friendly feeling for Kebek presented by the Il-Khanate and the Kurds that Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn expressly requested his army and Amīr Ḥusayn of the Khurāsān Army answered him at once. When all is said, Yasawr was removed by all the powers of these states which found identity of their interests in unification and stability of each one and Kebek could realize to strengthen Khān's power by them.

By the way in the description by **Sayfi** mentioned before, Kebek was added a new title of 'Just Prince' (*Bādshāhzāda-yi 'Ādil*) different from the old and simple one 'Prince' (*Shāhzāda*). And another one which **Sayfi** called '*Bādshāhzāda*' was only Du'a Khān and he seems to have clearly distinguished it from '*Shāhzāda*'. (ex. TH, 401) This fact must show that Kebek was recognized as an legitimate and eminent Khān at least under the Kurds sovereignty which **Sayfi** served. Here I will pay attention to the point that the title '*Bādshāhzāda*' was affixed '*Ādil*'. **Waṣṣāf**, who was a historian of the Il-Khanate living in the same days, had already called Kebek '*Shāhzāda Kabak 'Ādil*' in the description about the expedition to Khurāsān by the Chaghatai Army. (TW, 613) And that makes us possible to suppose that it was general to affix '*Ādil*' to the name when they called Kebek in those days. That this title was not only a diplomatic rhetoric is shown, for example, in such descriptions as the followings:

A description of **Ibn Baṭṭūṭa** visiting Māwarā' al-Nahr in 1333:

"Though Kebek was an infidel, he was just (*'ādil*) in government, and showed equity to the oppressed and favour and respect to the *Muslims*." (**IB**, 31)

Other descriptions of the historians under the Timūrids:

"When Kebek's turn came, the Kingdom got splendor because of his greatness and the fame of his justice and good money (*'adl wa 'adalī*) was known all over the world" (**ZN/S**, 14); "Kebek Khān, a son of Du'a khān, was a sovereign of admirable personality and the Kingdom got brightness with his completeness in preparation, with his excellence of his rule, and with his wisdom and his authority, and the fame of his justice (*'adl*) was known all over the world." (**ZN/Y**, 80a); "The 10th king Kebek Khān was an sovereign whose nature was admirable within the imperial lineage and he was a just ruler (*jahān-dārī-yi ma'dalat-shi'ār*)." (**RS**, V 227); "According to the agreement of chroniclers' opinions, Kebek Khān was the manifestation of a sign of justice (*'adl*) and tolerance and he was the appearance of a light of mercy and favour." (**HS**, III, 90)

Other historical materials tells us in detail how Kebek was "just in government" and friendly to Islamic and sedentary societies by means of some anecdotes. They were as the following:

(1) "A dialogue between Kebek and a theologian Badr al-Dīn al-Maydānī about his name Kabak" written by **Ibn Baṭṭūṭa** (**IB**, 32):

It is related that this king Kabak, in a conversation on one occasion with Badr al-Dīn al-Maydānī, the jurist and homiletic preacher, said to him: 'You assert that God has mentioned everything in His exalted Book?' 'Yes' said Badr al-Dīn. Then said Kabak 'Where is my name in it?' to which he replied 'It is in His word *In whatsoever from He would He hath composed thee (rakkabak)* [LXXXII, 8]'. This reply pleased him, he said "*Yakhshī*" ('good' in Turkish) and showed great favour to him and increased respect for the Muslims.

(English translation by **H. Gibb**, *the Travels of Ibn Battuta*, vol. III, Cambridge, 1971, p. 556.)

(2) "A story in which a certain *amīr*'s arbitrariness for a poor woman was accused" written by **Ibn Baṭṭūṭa** (**IB**, 32-3):

It is related that a woman laid a complaint before him against one of the *amīrs*. She stated that she was a poor woman, with children to support, that she had some milk [for sale] with the price of which she could procure food

for them, and that this *amīr* had taken it from her by force, and drunk it. He said to her, 'I shall cut him in two; if the milk comes out of his belly, he has gone to his fate, but if not I shall cut you in two after him'. The woman said, '[No,] I release him from the obligation, and will make no demand on him.' But Kabak gave the order, the man was cut in two, and the milk came out of his stomach.

(Eng. tr. by **H. Gibb**, *op. cit.*, pp. 556–7.)

(3) "A story telling how defferent the way was in which Kebek treated the sedentary people from that of Esen-Buqa's" (**MT**, 107–8):

[When the Yüan Army attacked the frontier of Qarākhwāja,] Esen-Buqa and Kebek with a large force set out in order to repel it. Since it was impossible for them to march on the same route because of the large numbers, Esen-Buqa went by way of Kāshghar and Kebek went by way of Almāligh.

The army of Esen-Buqa marched sacking the stations on their way, with the intention that if they are superior in force at the time of encountering with the enemy, after conquering and subduing it, he will permit the inhabitants to cultivate again in lapse of time and in case that they happen to be defeated, the stations will be unable to be taken advantage of by the enemy.

But Kebek made [his soldiers?] cultivate and sow all of the districts which were on his way, with the aim that if he is superior to the enemy, [even] people of foreign countries will implore his help with knowing his fame of justice, and even if he is defeated, people will long and ask for him.

[When they joined battle,] Īnkarjāq, Chief Amīr of Esen-Buqa, fled from the center (*qalb-gāh*) and so the army of Esen-Buqa were completely defeated. Kebek planted his foot firmly and set his teeth of trust on his lips of patience and made so much effort that his army kept off their feet withering. . . . But when five sixths of their forces were put to flight, Kebek could not hold out any more. His victory ended insufficiently in a draw and he turned back his horse. On their way home, the army of Esen-Buqa could find nothing but fruits of regret raised from seeds of their own workings wherever they reached. They went to eat even all their horses up.

On the other hand, the army of Kebek, on their way home, went peacefully and contented with foods and celebrations (*jarghālānk*) presented everyday. Whenever they reached the stations, Kebek sent sorts of products, grains, meat, drink and special dishes (*sūsūnāt*) to Esen-Buqa as a present and a greeting. . .

(4) "A story about the investigation of human bones left on the roadside and his judgement for the crime" written by **Naṭanzī**, **Yazdī** and others (**MT**, 110–11;

ZN/Y, 80a-6; RS, V, 227-8; HS, III, 90):

One day [Kebek] went mounted under the name of hunting and found a skull of a man on the roadside. He said to his retainers, "this skull complains of its suffering to me by circumstances and wants the inhabitants around here to be revenged for itself. I have to investigate what happened." And then he alighted there, summoned all [*amīrs*] who had *Yurt* there and he casted his own eyes upon them one by one. Suddenly his eyes stopped upon a person, whose wickedness Kebek's heart had attested. Kebek called him in his presence and gently inquired of him several times why that skull had been left in the place. But the answer remained unsettled. And then he ordered that the man should be tortured. After he had much severity, he confessed: "a rich merchant arrived at the boundary of this environs and a devil tempted me to aim at him. I will obey the mandate of the Emperor." Kebek ascertained the birthplace and the dwelling place of the killed person and found his heirs out. He gave them the possessions of the killer and some of the [Khān's] treasury as indemnification for the killed person. And Kebek burnt the criminal [*amīr*] to death. (MT, 110-11)

It is undoubtful that these anecdotes were under the traditional type of '*andarz*' (Iranian didactic literature). And so I do not think they always tell us what actually happened. But no one had caused so many anecdotes as Kebek among successive Chaghatai Khāns. From that, we can suppose how well Kebek was known as a just sovereign in the Muslim society those days.

Now we have known that Kebek, though he himself was not a muslim, was a sovereign who was devoted to realize Islamic culture and put his heart into welfare and stability of the sedentary societies improving official discipline of the state. Kebek's image like this must have been a reflex of his political idea that he had consistently pursued for ten years or more since the coup d'état in which he defeated Taliqu. And the idea was to control the arbitrary behaviors of nomadic aristocracy and at the same time to establish a centralized government, strengthening Khān's power by the united efforts with sedentary rulers. It resulted in being accomplished at last when, overthrowing his biggest enemy Yasawr, he got powerful enough to control the nomadic aristocracy who were apt to follow anyone blindly. In this sense Yasawr's death was symbolic of establishment of the Chaghatai Khanate by Kebek.

Conclusion

Thus power struggles in Central Asia during the first quarter of 14th century was a process to unify political powers within the Mongol rulers. It ended in the Du'as sovereignty getting a firm foundation by Kebek Khān and after his reign, the Chaghatai Khanate could enjoy its unity and stability for a while. I think

Kebek reached here by the same way as Īl-Khān Ghāzān's ruling efforts to reconcile 'tribe' and 'finance'. That is why Kebek was called 'Little Ghāzān'.³⁷⁾ And it was the way every Mongol ruler had to naturally go in order to maintain his government system. In this article, I tried to show some ideas about the political side of this way by means of some compiled histories mainly. And in another article I will try to examine the understructure of it, that is, the socio-economical conditions by using documents, coinage and other historical materials together.

Notes

- 1) For the details see **K. Kato**, *The Birth of the Chaghatai-Khanate, Collected Papers of Near Eastern Studies and Indology in Commemoration of Dr. A. Ashikaga's 77th Birthday*, Tokyo, 1978, pp. 143–160 (in Japanese).
- 2) **W. Barthold**, *Čaghatai-khān, EI*, 1st ed., Leiden, 1913, vol. 1, p. 814; **В. Бартольд**, *История культурной жизни Туркестана, Сочинения*, т. II-1, Москва, 1963, стр. 263.
- 3) **C. M. D'Ohsson**, *Histoire des Mongols*, Amsterdam, 1852, T. IV, pp. 565–68, 605–8, 613–30, 642–44.
- 4) **A. Vámbéry**, *Geschichte Bochara's*, Pesth, 1872, repr. 1969, p. 171; **E. E. Oliver**, *The Chaghatai Mughals, J.R.A.S.*, vol. XX, part 1, Jan. 1888, p. 106.
- 5) **R. Grousset**, *L'Empire des Steppes*, Payot, Paris, 1939, repr. 1965, pp. 413–4, 462.
- 6) **Л. В. Строева**, *Борьба кочевой и оседлой знати в Чагатайском государстве в первой половине XIV в., Памяти академика Игнатия Юлиановича Крачковского, Сборник статей*, Ленинград, 1958, стр. 206–20.
- 7) **В. В. Бартольд**, *История Туркестана, Сочинения*, т. II-1, Москва, 1963, стр. 152–4; **его же**, *История культурной жизни Туркестана*, стр. 262–5.
- 8) **А. Якубовский**, *Тимур, опыт краткой характеристики*, ВИ, 1946, No. 8–9, стр. 48–52.
- 9) **И. П. Петрушевский**, *Из истории Бухары XIII в., Ученые записки ЛГУ, Серия востоковедческих наук*, вып. 1, Ленинград, 1949, стр. 111–13; **его же**, *Земледелие и аграрные отношения в Иране XIII–XIV веков*, Москва-Ленинград, 1960, стр. 48–52.
- 10) **Waṣṣāf** says, "Yasawr-Ughūl, son of Ūrk-timūr, son of Būqā-tīmūrfar (*nabīra?*-yi Būqā-tīmūrqar), son (*nabīra?*) of Qadāqāy, who was a son of Būrī, son of Mītūkāy-far (*nabīra?*-yi Mītūkāy-qar), son (*nabīra?*) of Jaghatāy."
- 11) Toqa-Temūr was throned after the brief reign (1271) of Negübei who was throned after the death of Baraq Khān (1266–71), father of Du'a. But the exact term of his reign is still unknown. The terms of reign mentioned above stands on **J. A. Boyle** (*The Successors of Genghis Khan*, tr. from the Persian of Rashīd al-Dīn, New York & London, 1971, p. 345).
- 12) For the details see **Kato**, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–54.
- 13) **Qāshānī** says that the news of Du'a's death arrived at the court of Īl-Khān on 18th. of Jumādā II in 706 A.H. (Dec. 25, 1306), but **Waṣṣāf** writes on the death of Du'a and the enthronement of Kōnchek in the end of 706 A.H. (the middle of 1307).
- 14) According to **Qāshānī** (TU, 39–40), the *Ordo* of Du'a, and maybe of Kōnchek too, were in the Qunās Plain in the Almalīq Area undoubtedly. And judging from the fact that Kebek left the Qunās Plain against Chapar right after the coup d'état mentioned later (TU, 148) and then he met Ešen-Buqa in the Qunās Plain (TU, 150), I am sure of that he was just in the Qunās Plain when Kōnchek died.
- 15) We can not find a description of this sending envoy in the historical sources of the Yüan Dynasty.
- 16) **D'Ohsson**, *op. cit.*, t. II, pp. 520–21; **Vámbéry**, *op. cit.*, pp. 169–71; **Oliver**, *op. cit.*, pp. 411–12.
- 17) **Yazdī** says, "the reason why the city is famous by the name of Qarshī is that Kebek Khān built a palace (*qasrī*) in the place of 2 *farsakhs* (1 *farsakh* = 6.24 km) from Nasaf and Nakhshab and Mongols used to call a palace *qarshī*."

- 18) It is unknown whether they were the same as "Tümän of Kebek-Khän (*Tümän-i Kabak-Khän*)" in the description of **Yazdi** (*ẒN/Y*, 113a, 2486, 298a, I-83, 462, II-25).
- 19) **T. Saguchi**, The solidarity of the Great khan of the Yüan Dynasty with Royal families of the western three Khanates in the 14th century: Historical research on the Chaghatai Ulus, *Reports of Researches on the North Asia*, No. 1, 1942, pp. 1-64 (in Japanese); **Kato**, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-150 (in Japanese).
- 20) 拜住元帥出使事實 (清容居士文集 34) says on the careless speech of Abishqā (阿必失哈) in the article of 1313 (皇慶二年).
- 21) 拜住元帥出使事實 (皇慶二年條) says that Pai-chu (拜住) was arrested on the way to the Īl-Khān Öljeitü and was inquired rigidly by Esen-Buqa.
- 22) The Biography of Ch'uang-wu-êrh (牀兀兒) in *Yüan-shih* (元史 128), 句容郡王世續碑 (國朝文類 26) and 拜住元帥出使事實 say that Esen-Buqa (諸王也先不花) rebelled in 1314 (延祐元年).
- 23) **Qāshānī** writes that the crossing of the Amu Darya by the Chaghatai Army happened in the end of Ramaḍān in 713 A.H. (Jan., 1314) (**TU**, 153), but in another place (**TU**, 164) he says that 5 months had already passed after its crossing when the news of its return reached Öljeitü in Dhū al-Qa'da in 713 A.H. (Feb., 1314). Judging from this account, we can confirm that the Chaghatai Army crossed the Amu Darya in October in 1313. The description of **Waṣṣāf** (**TW**, 610) that Öljeitü himself took the field against the Chaghatai Army and arrived at Ṭūs at the beginning of winter in 713 A.H. (the early winter in 1313) supports this judgement.
- 24) The Biography of Ch'uang-wu-êrh in *Yüan-shih* (元史牀兀兒傳) and 句容郡王世續碑 say that in 1315 (延祐二年), Ch'uang-wu-êrh defeated Ebügen (也不干) and Qutlugh-timūr? (忽都帖木兒) who were dispatched by Esen-Buqa at Chimkant (赤麥干) and then chased them as far as 鐵門關. But it is difficult to consider that the Yüan Army made an invasion as far as 鐵門關 (*Darband Āhanīn*) which is located between Kish and Tirmidh. I think this account was exaggerated, or this 鐵門關 indicated a different place. On the other hand, **Qāshānī** (**TU**, 210-11) says that the Yüan Army occupied the summer quarter at Talās and the winter quarter at Īsun-kūk that were the *Yurt* of the Chaghatai Family (*ulūs wa urūgh-i Jaghātāy*), and sacked the *Ordos* and (their) wife and children (*urdū-hā wa zan wa farzand*). Talās coincides with Ṭarāz (**TU**, 214), but it is unknown where Īsun-kūk was. I guess that the Yüan Army invaded from Ṭarāz Area to the districts of Īsbijāb at the most where Chimkant was located.
- 25) According to **Qāshānī**, the going south of Yasawr and his battles with Kebek happened from Rajab, 716 A.H. (Sep.-Oct., 1316) to Sha'bān (Oct.-Nov., 1316). **Sayfi** describes on Yasawr's taking refuge from Jumādā I, 716 A.H. (Jul.-Aug., 1316) to Rajab (Sep.-Oct., 1316).
- 26) Sāgharj was a village of the district of Īshṭikhān, NW of Samarqand. cf. **W. Barthold**, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, London, 3rd. ed., 1968, pp. 95-6.
- 27) Kūftan coincides with the district of Guftān, north of Tirmidh? cf. **W. Barthold**, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
- 28) On the date of the death of Öljeitü, **Qāshānī** (**TU**, 222) says Ramaḍān 27, 716 A.H. (Dec. 13, 1316), **Waṣṣāf** (**TW**, 617) says Ramaḍān 29 (Dec. 15) and **Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū** (**DJT**, 119) says Shawwāl 1 (Dec. 17).
- 29) It happened in the spring of 717 A.H. (spring of 1317) according to **Waṣṣāf** (**TW**, 618) and in the beginning of Ṣafar, 717 A.H. (Apr., 1317) according to **Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū** (**DJT**, 123).
- 30) For the lady whom Amīr Yāsāwl proposed a marriage to, **Waṣṣāf** (**TW**, 620) gives Īsan-qutlugh, a daughter of Dhū'l-Qarnayn who was Yasawr's nephew. But **Sayfi** (**TH**, 649) says merely that she was one of Yasawr's daughters.
- 31) According to **Sayfi** (**TH**, 649), Amīr Yāsāwl died in the month of Muḥarram, 717 A.H. (Mar.-Apr., 1317).
- 32) **Petrushevskii** had already referred to this viewpoint in the case of Iran. cf. **И. П. Петрушевский**, *Земледелие и . . .*, стр. 51.
- 33) 拜住元帥出使事實 (延祐七年條).
- 34) 英宗本紀 part 1~30 and 泰定帝本紀 part 1~2 in *Yüan-shih* (元史) vol. 27.
- 35) **E. E. Oliver**, The Coins of the Chaghatai Mughals, *J.A.S.B.*, part 1, No. 1, 1891, p. 11; **М. Е. Массон**, Историческая этюд по нумизматике джагатаидов, *Труды САГУ*, Новая серия, вып.

- CXI, 1957, стр. 47–49.
- 36) **Oliver**, *The Chaghatai Mughals*, p. 106; **ditto**, *The Coins of . . .*, p. 9; **Бартольд**, *Очерк истории Семиречья*, *Сочинения*, т. II-1, Москва, 1963, стр. 75; **его же**, *История Туркестана*, стр. 152; **его же**, *История культурной жизни . . .*, стр. 263.
- 37) **S. Uemura**, *The Rise and Fall of the Chaghatai Khanate*, part 3, *the Mongol* (蒙古) vol. 8, no. 12, 1941, p. 71 (in Japanese).