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Chinggis Khan is known to have been a legislator who promulgated a code of law (jasaq in Mongolian, yasa in Persian and Arabic) of extreme severity. Yet despite extensive study of the yasa, several questions still remain regarding this law code. What fields did the yasa cover? Was the yasa imposed on sedentary populations under Mongol rule, especially Muslims subject to Islamic law (shari'a)? Was it applied uniformly across all the territories of the Mongol empire and for its entire duration? And finally, after the fall of the Mongol empire, did the yasa endure under later Turkic-Mongol dynasties, notably in Central Asia? Before responding to these questions, it is first necessary to clarify the terminology found in the medieval sources and provide an overview of the research on the yasa, which, as early as the seventeenth century, aroused the interest of scholars investigating the Mongols.

THE YASA IN MEDIEVAL SOURCES

The jasaq is mentioned on several occasions in the letters sent by the khans to foreign powers as well as in the Secret History of the Mongols. In this founding text of Mongol identity, the term jasaq is variously used to denote a sovereign’s law in the exercise of his authority, a legal precedent, or a rule whose violation warranted harsh punishment. In Mongolian, the verb “jasaqla-” means to act according to the law, to administer, to govern; the noun jasaq therefore concerns the rules for the administration of the state. The Secret History differentiates between imperial decrees (i.e., jasaq) and custom (i.e., yosun, Persian yusun), which is mentioned twenty-two times in the text to express a way of acting or a custom. The jasaq and the yosun therefore have different sources of validity. With the jasaq, the leader enacts the law in the exercise of his authority: “The rule of our queen Gürbesi has become harsh”. With the yosun, that is, the unrecorded custom, it owed its validity to tradition: “Such is the way in which Yisügei carried off Lady Hö’elün”. Aside from the Secret History, the term yasa is first attested in a letter sent by Gıyük (r. 1246–1248) to Pope Innocent IV in 1246. In this document, yasa signifies the order or decree of the Great Khan.
The most important Islamic sources on the *yasa* in Muslim lands were written by ‘Ata’ Malik Juvayni (d. 681/1283), the only Persian historian to have visited Mongolia, and Rashid al-Din (d. 718/1318), who drew on Ghazan Khan and Bolad Chingsang. In the second chapter of his *Tarikh-i Jahangusha*, Juvayni explained how Chinggis Khan formulated laws: “In accordance and agreement with his own mind, he established a rule for every occasion and a regulation for every circumstance; while for every crime he fixed a penalty”. The *qawa'id* (laws) and the *yasa* mentioned by Juvayni concerned state matters: hunting and military training, the organization of the army, the postal network for official correspondence (*yam*), and the levying of taxes in the conquered territories. Unlike the Persian sources in which the word *yasa* was often associated with *yusun*, “custom”, this chapter on the *yasa* did not address Mongol customs and traditions. For Juvayni, the *yasa* concerned only state affairs, although he implicitly gave it a religious connotation, stating that infractions were punished with a legal penalty or *hadd*, a term borrowed from Islamic legal vocabulary.

The Eastern Christian sources also mention the *yasa*. In his Syriac chronicle, Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286), the highest dignitary of the Jacobite Church, who drew heavily on Juvayni, detailed numerous laws promulgated by Chinggis Khan. He recorded nine laws concerning the regulation of the army and appropriate conduct with an enemy, as well as several social rules; the violation of just one of these laws of military discipline was punishable by death. The rules of the *yasa* also appeared in the *History of the Tatars* by the Armenian historian Grigor Akanc’i (d. 1335), who clearly borrowed from oral sources. In the second chapter, entitled “Regarding the revivification of their faith, their precepts, and of their chieftain”, he enumerated six rules, writing: “These are the precepts of God which he imposed on them, and which they themselves call *yasax*”. The violation of these rules was followed by a merciless death.

In the Chinese sources, the term *jasaq* is only twice mentioned with *yeke* (great). In the *Yuan shi*, the official chronicle of the Yuan dynasty, Ögödei (r. 1229–1241) is said to have promulgated the “*yeke jasaq*”, glossed in Chinese as “the great [law] (*ta-fa-ling*)”, at the time of his enthronement at the *quriltai* in September 1229. The great *jasaq* also features in a document on the imperial family dating to 1264. Other references to the *jasaq* concern judgements relating to the interests of the state (military affairs, administration of postal relays, etc.) or serious crimes like murder.

The Mongol, Persian, Syriac, Armenian, and Chinese sources are unanimous on the point that the precepts of the *yasa* concerned state affairs. These rules of a general nature related to the art of governing and diverse regulations, notably on military matters. In most cases, their contravention was sanctioned by death.

The concept of *yasa* corresponds to the term *töörü* (*törä*), attested in ancient Turkish inscriptions with the signification of order, regulations, and laws. The expression “great principle” (*yeke töre*) appears several times in the *Secret History* in reference to fundamental issues of governance such as regulating the mutual obligations between a master and his subject. In paragraph 220, when Chinggis Khan declares, “I shall entrust him with an important task (*yeke töre*)”, this refers to the loyalty owed by Naya’a after his appointment as commander of the *tümen*. The “great norm” (*yeke yosu*) also regulated the spoils of war; as the exclusive property of the khan, he alone had the right to redistribute them.
According to Juvayni, the *yasa* and the edicts promulgated by Chinggis Khan were recorded on scrolls known as *yasa-nama-yi buzurg* [Great Book of the Yasa]. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether Chinggis Khan had already set out a code of law at the time of his enthronement in 1206. Immediately after Ögödei’s election in 1229, “first of all he made a *yasa* that such ordinances and commands as had previously been issued by Chingiz-Khan should be maintained . . . and protect against the evils of change, and alteration, and confusion”. After his subsequent investiture in 1246, Güyük “had upheld the *yasas* of his father and had not admitted any change or alteration of his statutes”. The declarations of Chinggis Khan’s successors thus support the idea that the Great Khan formulated a corpus of laws and decrees, although there is a lack of evidence for the existence of a written code of laws. Nevertheless, numerous regulations and decrees were put into writing at the time, as the Mongol chancellery issued documents in Uyghur script before the death of Chinggis Khan in 1227.

In the Arabic Mamluk sources, the *yasa* is often presented somewhat confusedly between law and custom. Fadl Allah ‘Umari (d. 749/1349) provided a list of Chinggis Khan’s *yasa* which, if contravened, were punishable by death, as well as a list of Mongol customs (*adab*). However, he also included customary laws, such as the proscriptions on water use like washing clothes in rivers and the ritual slaughter of animals without draining their blood. Unknowingly, Taqi al-Din ʿAbd al-ʿAbbas Ahmad Maqrizi (d. 845/1442) reproduced the list of Fadl Allah ‘Umari, although his account of the *yasa* was somewhat contentious. As Maqrizi intended to show the anti-Islamic character of the *yasa*, he introduced the rules using terms borrowed from the Islamic legal vocabulary: for example, “Chingiz-Khan made a law (*shara’a*)”, “he enacted as precept (*sharata*)”, “he ordered (*alzama*)”, and “he prohibited (*mana’a*)”. Prohibitions based on Mongol customs were thus presented as laws decreed by Chinggis Khan. The arguments of Ibn Taymiyya, who issued three anti-Mongol *fatwa* in response to Ghazan Khan’s attacks on Syria, also focussed on Mongol law. Due to the hostility between the Ilkhans and the Mamluk Sultan of Cairo, the majority of Mamluk sources are of a controversial nature. The other medieval sources, even those in Latin, make no confusion between the *yasa* and the *yusun*. Jean de Plan Carpin, for example, spoke of the laws and ordinances (*leges et statuta*) promulgated by Chinggis Khan, which he distinguished from Mongol customs and ancestral practices (*traditiones*).

**POLITICAL AND MILITARY REGULATIONS**

After conquering the tribes of Inner Asia, Chinggis Khan sought to ensure the stability of this nascent empire by creating a central authority to counter the former clan structures by removing the power vested in traditional authorities. He thus attempted to eliminate “any form of solidarity that did not serve the central authority”. At the *quriltai* of 1206 when Chinggis Khan founded the “great Mongol state” (*yeke monggol ulus*), he gave it a supreme judicial body. Appointed as supreme judge, Shigi Quduqu was tasked with overseeing all peoples of the empire:

> When protected by Eternal Heaven, I am engaged in bringing the entire people under my sway, be eyes for me to see with, ears for me to hear with. . . . Curbing
theft, discouraging falsehood, execute those who deserve death, punish those who deserve punishment.26

Shigi Quduqu’s function of judging crimes committed throughout the empire represented the prototype of the Mongol judicial machine, the jarqu/yarghu. In the Persian sources, the term yarghu is used to designate the court responsible for investigating—often with the use of torture—cases of deposed ministers, corrupt government officers, and other “enemies” of the state accused of violating the precepts of the yasa.27

The pursuit of conquests formed part of an ideology of submission. Jean de Plan Carpin thus wrote: “Another order is that they must subjugate the entire earth and make peace with no other nation that has not submitted to them”. This is how the Franciscan traveller understood the letter sent by Güyük to Pope Innocent IV in 1246:

> You who are the great pope, with the kings, will come all together in person to render us homage and we will have you hear the orders from the yasa. . . . By the force of God, from the rising to the setting sun, all lands have been granted to us. . . . And if you . . . contravene our orders, we will know you to be our enemies.28

Many decades ago, Eric Voegelin set forth the hypothesis that these letters should be regarded not as mere diplomatic correspondence but as real “acts of law”.29 And, indeed, they were understood in this manner by Bar Hebraeus, whose Syriac chronicle mentions the injunction made to sovereigns whom the Great Khan sought to bring under his power: “If they must write to rebels . . . , they shall merely be told: if you submit yourselves, you will find peace and benevolence. But if you continue to resist . . . only God knows what will become [of] you”.30

Many regulations in the yasa are of a military nature. Indeed, a disciplined army was the best means for Chinggis Khan to conquer new lands. In the Secret History, most of the jasaq are military orders relating to discipline or tactics. Paragraph 153 mentions two jasaq of Chinggis Khan that regulate the orders of battle and pillaging: “If we overcome the enemy, we shall not stop for booty. . . . If we are forced by the enemy to retreat, let us turn back to the point where we began the attack. Those men who do not turn back to the point where we began the attack shall be cut down!”31

The refusal to return to combat was viewed as a betrayal of both the Great Khan and one’s fellow soldiers. This act deserved the most degrading punishment—decapitation—because it entailed the spilling of blood, which, for humans, prevented the survival of ancestors and thus the transmission of clan identity.

The non-Mongol sources also mention numerous regulations on military discipline, with all infractions punishable by death. According to Jean de Plan Carpin and Juwayni, it was prohibited, under pain of death, to change military units. Bar Hebraeus stated that the commander who accepted the offender into his unit would also suffer the same fate.32 Once again, it can be assumed that the underlying offence resulting in this punishment was betrayal: whoever was complicit was also punishable by death. ʿUmari cites other rules dealing with the discipline and personal accountability of soldiers: “During an attack or retreat, if a soldier loses his pack,
This rule may be founded on the notion of *omoq*, which is expressed in paragraph 190 of the *Secret History*: “If, when one is still alive, the enemy is allowed to take away one’s quiver, what is the advantage of living?” In Mongolian, *omoq* (pride) and *oboq* (family, clan, tribe) are etymologically linked, but they evolved separately. The semantic link between the two terms may explain the signification of this *jasaq*. In Mongol society, the pride of the clan and its survival depended on its ability to defend itself or be avenged by its members. A soldier who had lost his quiver could no longer fulfil this fundamental duty, thus meaning that he had lost his honour. This explains the severe punishment imposed on the violator of this rule.

**THE REGULATION OF SOCIAL RELATIONS**

Chinggis Khan gave a legal framework to the newly founded Mongol state. Any act that could be a potential source of animosity between clans or individuals and that was punishable according to the pre-imperial vengeance system was henceforth regulated. Indeed, in the former tribal system, any crimes committed against a rival were viewed as legitimate revenge; they were external to the clan, and so aggression towards them could even be rewarded, as attested in the *Secret History*. Only acts that endangered the internal order of the clan were considered crimes. By contrast, in the state system established by Chinggis Khan, any offence was regarded as an attack against the imperial order.

At the *quriltai* of 1206, Chinggis Khan entrusted Shigi Qutuqu with the task of punishing theft and forbidding lying. Indeed, theft would have led to retaliation and hostility between tribes. All the sources describe the condemnation of theft, although their authors differ in terms of the punishment inflicted on the thief. Grigor Akanc’i wrote that the Mongols detested stealing so much that it was punishable by the most horrific death, while Guillaume de Rubrouck stated that the death penalty was only used for sizable thefts. Under Yuan rule, each stolen animal (camel, horse, ox, mule, etc.) was compensated by giving nine animals to the victim. Indeed, this penalty was a Mongol innovation in the Chinese penal system. Witnessing the punishment of theft in the court of Qubilai, Marco Polo stated that the theft of horses and other valuable goods carried the death penalty. In nomadic societies, livestock was a significant part of each clan’s wealth and an essential component of subsistence.

The condemnation of lying may also be explained in the context of the new imperial order. In the former clan system, as attested in the *Secret History*, it was not forbidden to use deception and lying to vanquish one’s external enemies. By contrast, in the new empire, any form of lying could jeopardise the order established by the Chinggisid clan, which made it a crime against the Khan.

In traditional Mongol society, murder was expiated through systems of redress, in particular the right to compensation (*haci*) for the victim’s family. The term *haci* expresses the idea of judgement rather than vengeance and even carries a positive meaning: the return of dues. As written by Juvayni, “In conformity with the ancient *yasa* of Chinggis-Khan, according to which the blood money (*qisas*) for a Muslim is forty *balish* and for a Khitayan [Chinese] a donkey.” Disregarding the edifying aspect of this narrative, Juvayni here refers to the right to compensation in the steppe.
society while using the Islamic term *qisas* for *haci*. Comparing Juvayni’s account with the legislation enforced by the Yuan dynasty in China, in cases of murder, compensation known as *shao-mai-yin*, literally “money [for] burning and burying”, was accorded with the amount fixed at fifty ounces of silver (*liang*), convertible into paper money. This compensation was given by the murderer to the parents of the victim. In this case, the compensation of the Mongols merged with an important custom of ancestor worship from Chinese culture.

Among the Mongols, marriage represented the rule (*töre*) par excellence, since it conditioned all other social relations. Indeed, *türe*, the Buryat form of the Classical Mongolian *töre*, nowadays signifies “the institution and ritual of marriage” on the one hand and “the [mode of] government” on the other. The basic notion underlying this root relates to engendering (*türeke*): it expresses the principles of alliance and filiation and considers the reproduction of society in absolute terms. All the sources, whether Christian or Islamic, mention that an adulterer is punishable by death. However, the term “adulterer” should be given the meaning accorded in Mongol society, which maintained strict exogamy. In this manner, adultery refers to what we can call “incest within the clan” that breaks the principle of exogamy, as opposed to the signification attributed by the monotheistic religions. The punishment for this crime was intended to preserve the principle of exogamy, as attested in the signification of the term *töre* and its derivative *törel*, which designates the exogamous kinship group. The purpose of the marriage was to perpetuate the lineages, a duty to the ancestors. It was also a means of contracting a relationship between the families of the spouses, as in the case of Chinggis Khan. When he was nine years old, his father said: “I shall ask his maternal uncles for a girl in marriage for him”. In these circumstances the adulterer could be a source of disorder within the clan, but if he committed adultery with a woman from another lineage, the internal harmony of the clan was not endangered.

**MONGOL CUSTOMARY LAW**

The issue of whether Mongol customary law was applied to the sedentary populations of the empire has kindled much debate among scholars, who have focussed on whether *shari’a* was abolished in Muslim lands. However, this issue cannot easily be resolved, as the circumstances of Muslims living under Mongol rule differed across the empire and changed over time.

With the exception of Juvayni, the Muslim authors pointed out the incompatibilities between certain Mongol customs and the *shari’a*. Muslims were particularly struck by the prohibitions relating to water use. Al-ʿUmari reported that according to the old *yasa* of the Mongols, it was forbidden to bathe in water, under penalty of death. To better illustrate how the Mongol customary law was in disagreement with Islamic law, al-Maqrizi mentioned that Chinggis Khan encouraged them to wear their clothes without washing them, and he banned them from saying that something was impure (*najis*), as he made no distinction between the pure and the impure.

The importance of spirits in the symbolic representations of shamanism, in which “soul” and “spirit” were homologous, may explain these taboos around water. After death, the soul was believed to have another mode of existence in the form of a
spirit. Because of this belief in spirits and out of respect to them, it was forbidden to immerse oneself in rivers or wash clothing and dishes there, so as not to pollute their places of dwelling. Among the medieval Mongols, the prohibitions around water, because of the spirits residing there, were combined with another factor: the fear of attracting storms, which were perceived as a supernatural punishment for failing to fulfill one’s obligations towards the spirits. Juwayni and the Latin sources clarify that these proscriptions applied in spring and summer, when humans or animals were frequently struck by lightning. These tragic deaths were interpreted as the vengeance of the spirits, and as a result, the family members of the deceased were isolated from the clan for a variable period of time. Juwayni wrote that according to the law and Mongol custom (dar yasa va adhin-i mughul), if a man was struck by lightning, his family was sent away from the tribe for a period of three years; in the case of an animal, the separation lasted for several months.\textsuperscript{51}

Furthermore, Mongol customary law specified slaughtering animals without spilling blood, which sparked condemnation from Muslims, as this practice went against ritual slaughter in Islam. The \textit{halal} method was both foreign and strange to the Mongols, because in their shamanic representations, spilled blood would not permit the symbolic survival of the animal. They believed in the necessity of conserving the breathing apparatus, considered to support the potential for life and allow the symbolic birth of a new animal.\textsuperscript{52}

Yet the question beckons as to whether this Mongol customary law, perceived by Muslims to be the \textit{yasa}, was actually imposed on Muslim populations. According to Anne Lambton, the Mongols in Iran did not seek “to impose upon the subject population Mongol customary law to the exclusion of shar’i law”.\textsuperscript{53} The Persian and Chinese sources nevertheless provide many examples of Muslims being prohibited from slaughtering animals in accordance with the Islamic ritual. Describing Chaghadai’s realm, Juwayni mentioned that Chaghadai strictly observed the laws of Chinggis Khan: to respect the \textit{yasa}, the Muslims of Khurasan did not dare to openly cut the throats of sheep and were forced to eat pork.\textsuperscript{54} Hülegü was said to have reinstated the obligation for Muslims to eat Mongolian food.\textsuperscript{55} Rashid al-Din narrated that Qubilai wanted to honour a group of Muslim merchants visiting his court by giving them food from his table. Irritated by their refusal, he apparently ordered all Muslims and the people of the book to kill animals following the Mongol custom.\textsuperscript{56} In 1280, Qubilai issued an edict banning Chinese Muslims from slaughtering animals according to the Islamic rite. However, the rule on animal slaughter was not continuously applied.\textsuperscript{57} Indeed, Qubilai’s efforts to enforce the prohibition of \textit{halal} slaughter were rather made “as a means to project his own Mongol identity”.\textsuperscript{58}

The manner in which Mongol law was applied in China under the Yuan dynasty may partly shed light on the situation in Muslim countries. Heng-chao Ch’en states that in penal matters, “Mongol customary law was an important source of law in China during the initial period of Mongol conquest”.\textsuperscript{59} However, he observes that penalties only applied to the Chinese when the violations concerned state affairs and that from 1280 onwards, the \textit{yasa} was only rarely mentioned, proof that these rules were poorly adapted to the sedentary Chinese population. It can thus be assumed that similar to the situation in China, the laws relating to state interests, military discipline, and the functioning of governance structures were imposed on all subjects.
Nevertheless, it is unlikely that customary law was imposed on all the subjugated populations. Juvayni recounted several anecdotes about the application of customary law in Muslim lands. He thus told of a Muslim who firmly closed all the doors of his house before slaughtering a sheep according to the Islamic ritual but was denounced by a Turk who illegally entered his house. Taken before Ögödei, the man was pardoned. Juvayni’s edifying story demonstrates that the application of the yasa was not systematic. A distinction was seemingly made between public and private spheres for the Islamic ritual slaughter. The situation of Muslims would have varied between regions: in Khurasan, in Central Asia under Chaghadai, or in China under Qubilai, their circumstances were undoubtedly more trying than in other periods or in other regions of the empire. In reality, however, it is difficult to see how the proscription of ritual slaughter could have been enforced in areas where relatively few or no Mongol soldiers were stationed.

In terms of private law, the subjugated peoples were probably often governed by local traditional rules. In the Islamic territories, even though certain Mongol customs were sometimes imposed on Muslims, the shari’a was seemingly never abolished by the Mongol power. If these customary laws had been enforced on a large scale throughout the Muslim lands under their rule, the Islamic sources would contain specific indications. Ibn Taymiyya, most notably, would not have hesitated to enlist this argument in his anti-Mongol fatwa.

THE LEGACY OF THE YASA IN CENTRAL ASIA

What became of the yasa after the fall of the Mongol Empire? This code of law remained a reference point in the broadest sense for Turkic and Mongol peoples, who, though Muslims, also upheld their customs and traditions until the end of the Turkic-Mongol dynasties, through to the Manghits. The yasa was clearly used for political purposes by Timur. The sources employ various expressions such as “the triumphant törä” (tura-i qabira) or even the formula “in accordance with the yasa of Chingiz-Khan and the törä of his excellence, the master of favourable conjunctions” (bi-mujib-i yasa-yi Chingiz Khani wa tura-yi hażrat-i sabib-qiran). Indeed, Timur informed a group of his emirs that obeying the decrees of heaven (hukm-i yarligh-i asamani) and the law of Chinggis Khan (tura-i Chinjiskhani) was both obligatory and necessary. According to Maria Subtelny, “the törä was a means for Timurids to maintain their warrior culture and Chaghatay identity as distinct from the sedentary Iranian population.”

In his study of the political orientations of Central Asia in the seventeenth century, Robert McChesney highlights the fact that all amirs were required to be loyal to the Mongol traditions and implicitly respect the Chinggisid law. The terms yasa and yusun, like ‘urf and siyasa, were still in use at the time. Mahmud b. Amir Wali, who authored a historical biography in the first half of the seventeenth century, considered that customary law was the expression of temporal and spiritual authority. This points to “the organic nature of the yasa”, as it could incorporate non-Chinggisid elements while remaining faithful to the Mongol tradition.

The Manghits were the first non-Chinggisid rulers to govern Mawarannahr after the Timurids. Like Timur, Muhammad Rahim (r. 1747–1759), the founder of the dynasty, married a woman of Chinggisid ancestry, but he replaced the title of khan
with *amir*. The final sovereign of the dynasty, Amir Sayyid ‘Alim Khan (r. 1910–1920), wrote in his memoirs that religious scholars considered him to be the representative of the Prophet and the guardian of the *shari’a*, although he did not fail to mention the Mongol tradition (‘adat-i mughul).68

**NOTES**

2. In modern Mongolian, *zasag* means “government”.
3. SHM §§9, 56, 96, 110, 116, 117, 139, 147, 150, 164, 177, 180, 216, 241, 244, 263, 270, 272.
4. SHM §189. Gürbesi was the mother of Tayan Qan of the Naiman.
5. On this term, see TMEN, I, n. 408.
6. SHM §56.
15. SHM, II, 814–815.
16. SHM §252, which refers to the “great norm” similarly to the “great principle” of §§208, 220; SHM, II, 919. See also Buell and Kolbas 2016, 43–64.
22. Aigle 2015b, 300–301.
25. Discovered as a child in a Tatar camp, Shigi Qutuqu was adopted and raised as the brother of Chinggis Khan. On his role, see Ratchnevsky 1965, 87–120.
26. SHM §203.
28. Carpini 1929, 64.
30. Bar Hebraeus 1890, 354.
31. SHM §153.
32. Bar Hebraeus 1890, 412.
33. Umari, 9.
34. On this notion, see Hamayon 1980, 122–123.
35. SHM §190.
36. On “oboq” and “omoq”, see Lessing 1960, 611. On the etymological evolution of the term, see TMEN, IV, n. 572.
38. Rubruc 1929, 2 & 186.
40. Polo 2003, II, 35.
41 On the term *haci* and this practice, see Hamayon 1980, 110–111.
42 Juwayni 1912, I, 164; *HWC*, I, 207.
43 On law under the Yuan dynasty, see Ch’en 1979; Aubin 1991, 253–254; Aubin 2004, 119–151; Ratchnevsky 1993, 161–179.
46 Hamayon 1990, 224.
47 Hamayon 1990, 760, n. 2.
48 *SHM* §61.
49 Umari, 9.
51 Juwayni 1912, I, 162.
52 Hamayon 1990, 397.
53 Lambton 1988, 90.
54 Juwayni 1912, I, 227; *HWC*, 272.
55 Cleaves 1992, 72; Polo 2004, 99. According to the historian Grigor Akanc’i (Blake and Frye 1949, 343), Hülegü ordered Muslims to eat pork.
56 RDB, 293–294.
57 See May 2019, 158–177.
58 See May 2019, 173.
59 Ch’en 1979, xiii; see also Serruys 1957, 137–190.
60 Jackson 2017, 310.
61 Subtelny 2007, 15.
63 al-Naṭanzi 1336sh/1957, 206.
64 Subtelny 2007, 17.
65 McChesney 1983, 35.
67 Manghit is the self-appellation of the Mongol and Turkic tribes that played an eminent role in the Golden Horde. On this dynasty, see Kügelgen 2013 (online).
68 Kügelgen 2002, 30, n. 136. On the *yasa* in Central Asia and Mongolia until the present day, see Aigle 2015c, 314–322.
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