Josephine van den Bent
University of Amsterdam

Ilkhanid Sources in the Mamluk Sultanate: The Use of Juvaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* by al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr

Arabic sources are of great relevance to historians of the Mongols, in particular texts from the Mamluk Sultanate. The authors of many histories, geographical works, biographical dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other sources paid ample attention to the history of the Mongol conquests and developments in the successor khanates. This is especially true of the Ilkhanate—as their neighbor and, for a long time, primary enemy, the Mamluks had a clear interest in events there. Consequently, these sources also reveal much about Mamluk-Mongol relations, about how the sultanate positioned itself vis-à-vis the Ilkhanate and the Golden Horde, and about how Mamluk-era authors actively tried to make sense of the initial arrival of the Mongols in the Islamic world as well as the later conflicts with the Ilkhanids. Especially for the first Mongol conquests in Islamic territory, Mamluk-era authors largely relied on the reports in the earlier Arabic histories by Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1233) and al-Nasawī (d. 647/1249–50). For later periods, however, their source material is varied. In addition to using written texts, some authors were eyewitnesses of battles and occupations, of embassies and diplomatic letters, and so on. Other important sources of information for some authors were traders, envoys, and other travelers.[1]

Through these routes, material originating in a Mongol cultural context made its way into some of these works as well, especially from the Ilkhanate. A well-known example is the anecdote related by al-Nuwayrī (677–733/1279–1333), in which he reports that Chinggis Khan, at the prompting of a Jewish teacher, spent some time as an ascetic in the mountains. Reuven Amitai, who analyzed the story, pointed out that Chinggis Khan is portrayed as a sort of "Mongol *ḥanīf*" and is given a Muslim patina of sorts. The story probably arrived in the Mamluk Sultanate from the Ilkhanate, where it was likely part of attempts to integrate older Mongol ideas with the recent Ilkhanid adoption of

---

[1] For an extensive overview and discussion of Mamluk and other Arabic sources on the Mongols, see Reuven Amitai and Michal Biran, "Arabic Sources," in *The Cambridge History of the Mongol Empire,* ed. Michal Biran and Hodong Kim (Cambridge, 2023), 1007–45. See also Peter Jackson, *The Mongols and the Islamic World: From Conquest to Conversion* (New Haven, 2017), 14–45. On Mamluk-Mongol relations, see for example Reuven Amitai-Preiss, *Mongols and Mamluks: The Mamluk-Īlkhānid War, 1260–1281* (Cambridge, 1995); Anne F. Broadbridge, *Kingship and Ideology in the Islamic and Mongol Worlds* (Cambridge, 2008).

Islam.[2] Another Mamluk-era author, Ibn al-Dawādārī (ca. 686–735/1289–1336), included two elaborate and connected origin stories of the Turks and Mongols, respectively, which he claimed to have encountered in a Turkish book owned by an acquaintance.[3] While both the book—for which Ibn al-Dawādārī gives three variant titles—and one of its purported narrators—a certain Sulaymān ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq ibn al-Bahlawān al-Ādharbayjānī—remain shrouded in mystery for now, I have argued elsewhere that the Mongol origin story contains several echoes of other narratives dealing with the history of the Mongols, including the *Secret History* and Rashīd al-Dīn's (ca. 645–718/1247–1318) *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*.[4] The Mongol story of the miraculous impregnation of Chinggis Khan's foremother Alan Qoʾa was also known by at least some Mamluk-era authors, although they tend to identify the woman in question as Chinggis Khan's own mother.[5] It is noteworthy that in these renditions of the story the claim is always that the pregnancy was induced by the sun's rays, rather than—as the *Secret History* states—a mysterious yellow man who left in the shape of a dog. Denise Aigle and Michal Biran have pointed out that in Rashīd al-Dīn's rendition of the story the dog has already disappeared, in a shift to a more monotheistic interpretation of the myth (although the author himself remained doubtful).[6] Rather, the pregnancy

---

[2]Reuven Amitai, "Did Chinggis Khan Have a Jewish Teacher? An Examination of an Early Fourteenth-Century Arabic Text," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124, no. 4 (2004): 691–705; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab,* ed. Najīb Muṣṭafá Fawwāz and Ḥikmat Kashlī Fawwāz (Beirut, 2004), 27:207–8. On the "monotheisation" of Chinggis Khan, see also Michal Biran, *Chinggis Khan* (Oxford, 2007), 112–21.

[3]Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmiʿ al-ghurar,* ed. Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ ʿĀshūr (Cairo, 1972), 7:217–37; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Durar al-tījān wa-ghurar tawārīkh al-azmān,* ed. in *Die Epitome der Universalchronik Ibn-ad-Dawādārīs im Verhältnis zur Langfassung: Eine quellenkritische Studie zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Mamluken*, ed. Gunhild Graf (Berlin, 1990), 54–72. For an elaborate discussion of these stories see the various articles by Ulrich Haarmann, especially "Alṭun Ḫān und Čingiz Ḫān bei den ägyptischen Mamluken," *Der Islam* 51 (1974): 1–36; "Turkish Legends in the Popular Historiography of Medieval Egypt," in *Proceedings of the VIth Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies, Visby 13–16 August, Stockholm 17–19 August, 1972,* ed. Frithiof Rundgren (Stockholm/Leiden, 1975), 97–107; "'Großer Vater Mond' und 'Schwarzer Löwenjunge'—eine mongolisch-kiptschakische Ursprungssage in arabischer Überlieferung," in *Die Mongolen in Asien und Europa,* ed. Stephan Conermann and Jan Kusber (Frankfurt, 1997).

[4]Josephine van den Bent, "Mongol Origins in Mamluk Texts: An *Origo Gentis* in Ibn al-Dawādārī's *Durar al-Tījān* and *Kanz al-Durar*," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 24 (2021): 59–66.

[5]Al-Ṣafadī, *Kitāb al-wāfī bi-al-wafayāt,* ed. Aḥmad al-Arnāʾūṭ and Turkī Muṣṭafá, (Beirut, 2000), 11:154; Ibn Taymīyah, *Majmūʿ al-fatāwá,* ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Qāsim (Riyadh, 1995), 28:521; Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah* (Beirut, 1966), 13:117.

[6]Denise Aigle, *The Mongol Empire between Myth and Reality: Studies in Anthropological History* (Leiden, 2015), 127; Biran, *Chinggis Khan,* 116.

---

is caused by a more abstract "luminous shape" or light going into her belly.[7] It would seem that it was this "light" version of the story that made its way to the sultanate. Al-ʿUmarī's (700–49/1301–48/49) version of the narrative is especially conspicuous in this regard. A number of details in his text (suspicious family members, Alan Qo'a's predictions, an etymology) are strongly reminiscent of Rashīd al-Dīn's text.[8] Al-ʿUmarī does not mention *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* as a source for his work,[9] so it may well be that this was narrated to him by one of his informants. What all these examples show is that in the Mamluk Sultanate there was clearly not only an elaborate interest in the Mongols, but that there was an active exchange of ideas and information between the sultanate and Mongol territories, especially the Ilkhanate.[10] Although many of these exchanges appear to have been through oral informants, it is not always exactly clear how information reached the sultanate.

That is also the case in what is perhaps the best known case of incorporation of Ilkhanid material in Mamluk literature: the use of information from ʿAṭā Malik Juvaynī's (623–81/1226–83) *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* by al-ʿUmarī in his encyclopedic work *Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār.* In the early 1970s, David Ayalon showed that the Mamluk official based his section on the Mongol Yasa on the work by the Persian author, who worked in the service of the Mongols.[11] Ayalon's study mainly focused on the Yasa, and resolved a number of important issues in that regard, but a major question he raised in his first article remained unresolved: how did al-ʿUmarī—there is no indication that he knew Persian—obtain

---

[7]Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, *Rashiduddin Fazlullah's Jamiʿuʾt-Tawarikh: Compendium of Chronicles: A History of the Mongols,* trans. W. M. Thackston (Cambridge, MA, 1998), 1:117; Biran, *Chinggis Khan,* 116. There is also a connection to light in Rashīd al-Dīn's explanation of the meaning of *Niruʾun* (the Mongol elite descending from Alan Qo'a); see Jonathan Z. Brack, *An Afterlife for the Khan: Muslims, Buddhists, and Sacred Kingship in Mongol Iran and Eurasia* (Oakland, 2023), 160, n. 54.

[8]Al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār,* ed. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Shādhilī (Abu Dhabi, 2003), 3:100–1). For the similarities in content and differences in approach between Rashīd al-Dīn's and al-ʿUmarī's texts, see Josephine van den Bent, "Mongols in Mamluk Eyes: Representing Ethnic Others in the Medieval Middle East" (Ph.D. diss., University of Amsterdam, 2020), 87–89.

[9]Klaus Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich: Al-ʿUmarī's Darstellung der mongolischen Reiche in seinem Werk Masālik al-abṣār fī mamālik al-amṣār* (Wiesbaden, 1968), 174–75.

[10]See also Amitai, "Jewish Teacher," 705.

[11]David Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khān: A Reexamination (Part A)," *Studia Islamica* 33 (1971): 97–140; idem, "The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khān: A Reexamination (Part B)," *Studia Islamica* 34 (1971): 151–80; idem, "The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khān: A Reexamination (Part C1), The Position of the Yāsa in the Mamluk Sultanate," *Studia Islamica* 36 (1972): 113–58; idem, "The Great Yāsa of Chingiz Khān: A Reexamination (Part C2), Al-Maqrīzī's Passage on the Yāsa under the Mamluks," *Studia Islamica* 38 (1973): 107–56.

this information? Interestingly, there is another Mamluk-era author who used Juvaynī's chapters to make a list of Yasa rules: the famous historian Ibn Kathīr (700–74/1300–73). His discussion of the Yasa appears to have gone largely unnoticed, but it provides the opportunity to take another look at how Juvaynī's information ended up in the histories of the Mamluk Sultanate.

The Yasa in the Mamluk Sultanate: The Juvaynī–al-ʿUmarī–al-Maqrīzī Triangle

Al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr used Juvaynī's text for a specific part of their discussion of the history of the Mongols: the rise of Chinggis Khan and "his Yasa." The question of the "Great Yasa of Chinggis Khan" has long been debated by historians of the Mongol Empire. What exactly was it and what did it contain? Did it even exist? Traditionally, historians considered it a sort of written code promulgated by Chinggis Khan,[12] but no document of this sort has been found. Some have suggested it might have been for Chinggisid eyes only.[13] More recently, scholars have argued that non-Mongol authors were confused and mistakenly envisioned recorded edicts (*yasas* in plural and lowercase) and customs as forming the "Great Yasa."[14] At the same time, there are echoes in the sources of some kind of greater thing that is traced back to Chinggis Khan.[15] While what precisely the "Great Yasa" was remains unclear, "there was certainly something," to quote David Morgan.[16]

The existence of this "something" did not go unnoticed by the authors of the Mamluk Sultanate, who observed that this "Yasa" was a matter of quite some

---

[12] See D. O. Morgan, "The 'Great Yāsā of Chingiz Khān' and Mongol Law in the Īlkhānate," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1986): 163–66.

[13] E.g., Paul Ratchnevsky, "Die Yasa (Jasaq) Činggis-khans und ihre Problematik," in *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Altaischen Völker: Protokollband der XII: Tagung der Permanent International Altaistic Conference 1969 in Berlin,* ed. Georg Hazai and Peter Zieme (Berlin, 1974), 480–81; idem, "Die Rechtsverhältnisse bei den Mongolen im 12.-13. Jahrhundert," *Central Asiatic Journal* 31, nos. 1–2 (1987): 84–85.

[14] E.g., Morgan, "The 'Great Yāsā of Chingiz Khān'"; David Morgan, *The Mongols* (Oxford, 1986), 96–99; Denise Aigle, "Le grand jasaq de Gengis-Khan: L'empire, la culture mongole, et la sharīʿa," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 47, no. 1 (2004): 31–79; idem, *The Mongol Empire between Myth and Reality: Studies in Anthropological History* (Leiden, 2015), 134–56.

[15] Igor de Rachewiltz, "Some Reflections on Činggis Qan's Ĵasaɣ," *East Asian History* 6 (1993): 91–104; David Morgan, "The 'Great Yasa of Chinggis Khan' Revisited," in *Mongols, Turks, and Others: Eurasian Nomads and the Sedentary World,* ed. Reuven Amitai and Michal Biran (Leiden, 2005), 303–4.

[16] Morgan, *The Mongols,* 98. For other contributors to this debate, see for instance de Rachewiltz, "Some Reflections"; Morgan, "Revisited."

importance to the Mongols. They strongly connect it to the person of Chinggis Khan, and in general depict it as un-Islamic, and even anti-Islamic.[17] Mamluk treatment of the Yasa ranges from brief mentions—such as the one made by the historian Ibn Wāṣil (604–97/1208–98) contrasting the Yasa with the shariʿah[18]—to exaggerated stories like those recounted by al-Ṣafadī (696–764/1297–1363).[19] Some authors even included lists of rules supposedly found in the Yasa, and it was in this context that Ayalon first noticed the use of Juvaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* in the Mamluk Sultanate. The best known examples of such lists are those reported by al-ʿUmarī and al-Maqrīzī (766–845/1364–1442), and in the traditional approach to study of the Yasa, scholars attempted to use these to reconstruct the "legal code."[20] In his seminal series of articles, however, Ayalon showed that that approach needed to be abandoned. Taking the well-known section on the Yasa by al-Maqrīzī as a point of departure,[21] he demonstrated that al-Maqrīzī based his text on that of al-ʿUmarī, and also adapted it to better serve his argument against what he considered the increased use of administrative judgment by Mamluk chamberlains at the expense of shariʿah law as applied by the qadis.[22] More importantly for the matter at hand, Ayalon also demonstrated that al-ʿUmarī's text was based on Juvaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā.*

---

[17] See, e.g., Aigle, *The Mongol Empire,* 151–56; Robert G. Irwin, "What the Partridge Told the Eagle: A Neglected Arabic Source on Chinggis Khan and the Early History of the Mongols," in *The Mongol Empire and Its Legacy,* ed. Reuven Amitai-Preiss and David O. Morgan (Leiden, 1998), 8–11; van den Bent, "Mongols in Mamluk Eyes," 120–52.

[18] Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb,* ed. Ḥasanayn Muḥammad Rabīʿ and Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ ʿĀshūr (Cairo, 1972), 4:36.

[19] Al-Ṣafadī, *Kitāb al-wāfī,* 11:153. For a discussion of al-Ṣafadī's treatment of the Yasa and Chinggis Khan, see van den Bent, "Mongols in Mamluk Eyes," 142–46.

[20] They would also use Persian authors, European travellers, and the Syriac historian Bar Hebraeus (also known as Ibn al-ʿIbrī, [1226–86]). For an example of such an attempt at reconstruction, see George Vernadsky, "The Scope and Contents of Chingis Khan's Yasa," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (1938): 337–60. For a discussion of this approach, see for instance Morgan, "The 'Great Yāsā of Chingiz Khān.'" Another interesting list of "Yasa rules" is given by Ibn ʿArabshāh, *Fākihat al-khulafāʾ wa-mufākahāt al-ẓurafāʾ,* ed. in *Liber Arabicus seu Fructus imperatorum et jocatio ingeniosorum,* ed. Georg. Guill. Freytag (Bonn, 1832), 233–34. See Irwin, "What the Partridge Told the Eagle."

[21] Al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Mawāʿiẓ wa-al-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār,* ed. Muḥammad Zaynuhum and Madīḥah al-Sharqāwī (Cairo, 1998), 3:82–87.

[22] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 99–115; idem, "The Great Yāsa (Part C2)," 107–23. Ayalon also demonstrated that it is highly unlikely that the Yasa was ever used in the Mamluk Sultanate in the manner presented by al-Maqrīzī. Other authors have also pointed out problems with al-Maqrīzī's copying tendencies. Amitai, for instance, has shown that there are problems with the reliability of al-Maqrīzī's work for the early Mamluk sources. Not only does he not identify his sources, he is also careless in his summaries, leading to factual inaccuracies. See Reuven

In his section on the history and the lands of the Mongols, al-ʿUmarī included his famous list of Yasa rules, information about the rise to power of Chinggis Khan, and other information about him and the Mongols in general, all based on Juvaynī's history. Juvaynī, who was appointed governor of Baghdad after Hülegü's conquest of the city in 1258, completed the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* in 1260. The text has been very influential in the study of Mongol history, both in the present time and among medieval authors.[23] In the standard edition by Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī (1912–37), as in many of the manuscripts he used in preparing said edition, the text is divided into three parts.[24] It is in the first section, on the rise and exploits of Chinggis Khan and his immediate successors, that Juvaynī included a chapter entitled "Mention of the rules (*qawāʿid*) that Chinggis Khan promulgated after his rise, and the *yasas* that he ordered," which drew the interest of near-contemporaries and modern scholars alike.[25] It is this chapter and the two following, on Chinggis Khan's rise to power and on his sons, that mostly served as the source for al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr, but they also used material from elsewhere in Juvaynī's text.

In his article series, Ayalon noted first that al-ʿUmarī's passage on the Yasa is not a translation of Juvaynī's chapter on rules and *yasas* promulgated by Chinggis Khan, nor a good summary thereof; and second that although Juvaynī's chapter was his main source, al-ʿUmarī also used other sections of Juvaynī's text. Here Ayalon noted that al-ʿUmarī occasionally included details that appear to be added or changed. This last point is important for the present article, as is his third remark: al-ʿUmarī incorporated various rules and customs "which he ascribes to al-Juwayni, but which are not found in the latter's chronicle at all."[26] To explain this, Ayalon raised the question of the provenance of al-ʿUmarī's information, offering three possible explanations: (1) Juvaynī's chronicle has not survived in its entirety; (2) al-ʿUmarī was misled by his Persian-speaking informants who helped him make sense of Juvaynī's original text; and (3) al-ʿUmarī used additional sources without acknowledging them, yet attributed their in-

---

Amitai, "Al-Maqrīzī as a Historian of the Early Mamluk Sultanate (or: Is al-Maqrīzī an Unrecognized Historiographical Villain?)," *MSR* 7, no. 2 (2003): 99–118.

[23] Charles Melville, "Persian Sources," in *The Cambridge History of the Mongol Empire,* ed. Michal Biran and Hodong Kim (Cambridge, 2023), 884–85.

[24] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī (Leiden/London, 1912), lxi–lxxix; فآ—قی; Charles Melville, "Jahāngošā-Ye Jovayni," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online,* 2020, https://doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_3819.

[25] On the translation of *qawāʿid* here, see Morgan, "Revisited," 295–96. Another author who drew on Juvaynī's text in his discussion of the Yasa is Bar Hebraeus in his Syriac *Chronography* (Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa [Part A]," 127). See Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj,* trans. Ernest A. Wallis Budge, (London, 1932, repr. Amsterdam, 1976), 1:354–55.

[26] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 116–22, quotation on p. 116.

formation to Juvaynī. Ayalon considered the second option to be the most likely possibility.[27]

However, as mentioned above, Ibn Kathīr also used Juvaynī's text. In his report on the year 624 (1226–27) in his extensive history *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* Ibn Kathīr included a biographical notice *(tarjamah)* of Chinggis Khan, as one of the notables *(al-aʿyān)* who died that year. He briefly introduces him as the great ruler of the Mongols and the ancestor of the Mongol rulers of his own day, and states that Chinggis Khan was the one to introduce the Yasa[28] to which they adhere.[29] He then gives an account of the rise of Chinggis Khan, offers more information about the Yasa, and provides a list of Yasa rules and Mongol customs. This is followed by a number of anecdotes, and he ends with some comments about the sons of Chinggis Khan.

In what follows, based on a comparison between the accounts by Juvaynī, al-ʿUmarī, and Ibn Kathīr, I will first argue that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr seem to have independently used the same source material, and that this source would appear to have been a written text. Ayalon's observation that there are significant divergences between al-ʿUmarī's text and Juvaynī's original consequently also applies to *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* which again raises the question of the provenance of these differences. This is of course connected to the form in which Juvaynī's material was available in the sultanate. Ayalon gave a number of possible explanations for al-ʿUmarī's deviations, but I consider two other possible explanations to be more likely. The first is that an Arabic translation of (part of) Juvaynī's work was circulating in the Mamluk Sultanate and used by both al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr. Alternatively, their accounts may have been based on a Persian version after all, but one that differed significantly from Juvaynī's text as we have it today. Future research may offer a more definitive answer to this question, but for now both options underline that Ilkhanid material made its way to the sultanate not only in oral form through informants, but also as written texts.

---

[27] Ibid., 122–25.

[28] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 13:117. The 1966 edition reads *siyāsah,* which is not uncommon in Mamluk-era sources, but the 2010 Damascus edition reads *"al-yāsā"* (Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* ed. Riyāḍ ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Marād and Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf [Damascus, 2010], 15:159), as does an early, fifteenth-century manuscript I consulted (Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Arabe 1516, fol. 23r).

[29] The relevant section in Ibn Kathīr is *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 1966, 13:117–21; idem, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 2010, 15:159–65.

Al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr: Independent Dependence upon Juvaynī

In his biographical notice of Chinggis Khan, Ibn Kathīr immediately introduces Juvaynī as the source for his material, writing: "I have seen a volume composed by the vizier of Baghdad, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Juvaynī, on his biography and in which he relates his life" *(qad raʾaytu mujalladan jamaʿahu al-wazīr bi-Baghdād ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Juvaynī fī tarjamatihi fa-dhakara fīhi sīratahu).*[30] It is important to emphasize that he speaks of *seeing* a volume. Whereas al-ʿUmarī was vague about how he received his knowledge about Juvaynī's text, simply stating he "related" the information *(ḥaká al-ṣāḥib ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Juwaynī),* Ibn Kathīr is decisively clear that he used a written account. It thus appears that some kind of physical copy of Juvaynī's text was present in the Mamluk Sultanate, and based on the many parallels between this text and that of al-ʿUmarī, it seems likely that the same text was used by both authors. An overview of the three texts and parallels between them is presented next, followed by an analysis of their relationship.

---

[30] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 1966, 13:117–18.

Table 1. Al-ʿUmarī's and Ibn Kathīr's renditions of their respective sections on the Yasa and Chinggis Khan, with parallels in Juvaynī. Themati-cally (and content-wise) corresponding passages have been marked by color. Italics denote information that is unique to either al-ʿUmarī or Ibn Kathīr. If the information has a parallel in Juvaynī, it is also underlined. [31]

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
Chinggis Khan (CK) as ancestor of current Mongol rulers; lawgiver by means of Yasa (99–100)	CK as the great king of the Mongols; ancestor of the current Mongol rulers; the one who laid down the Yasa for them. Most of the Yasa contradicts God's laws (*sharāʾiʿ Allāh taʿālá*). He invented the Yasa himself. (117)	
Ancestor of CK, Alan Qoʾa, got pregnant from sun's ray, was taken to court. Lineage of CK given (100)	CK's mother claimed to have gotten pregnant from sun's rays, his father therefore unknown (117)	
Condemnation of story of Alan Qoʾa (101)		
(Mention of Juvaynī as source [102])	(Mention of Juvaynī as source [117–18])	
	His name was Temüjin (Timurjī) first, called himself CK when he became powerful. (118)	His name was Temüjin (Timurjīn) first, until he became powerful and it became Chinggis Khan. (Q26/B35)
CK is close to Ong Khan (Unk Khān), is promoted. Those around the ruler become jealous and pit him against CK. Ong (Uzbek) Khan upset with two young mamluks who flee to CK, who warn him of Ong Khan's plans against him. CK leaves with followers, fight with Ong Khan; youths made *tarkhān*. CK is generous to those who join him of Ong Khan's people. He fights Ong Khan, kills him, and seizes his kingdom. (102–5)	CK is close to "Uzbek Khān" (Ong Khan), but those around the ruler become jealous and pit him against CK. Ong (Uzbek) Khan upset with two young mamluks who flee to CK, who warn him of Ong (Uzbek) Khan's plan to kill him. CK keeps distance, gathers following of Mongol tribes and many of Ong (Uzbek) Khan's followers. He fights Ong (Uzbek) Khan, kills him, and seizes his kingdom. (118)	CK is close to Ong Khan, is promoted. Those around the ruler become jealous and pit him against CK. Ong Khan plots against CK. Two youths leave Ong Khan and warn CK of the plans against him. CK leaves with followers; battle between CK and small army against Ong Khan. CK wins booty. Youths made *tarkhān;* others who took part in the battle rise to high positions. Army reinforced, CK fights Ong Khan, kills him. (Q26–28/B35–38)

---

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
CK sends to tribes to inform them of his situation and power. Among the most important and large tribes to answer his call and submit to him are the Oirat and the QNQWRāT (Qonggirat). Most famous and largest tribe, from which he is descended, called Qiyāt (104–5)	More people join and surrender to CK. Key tribe was his own, the "Qayān" (Qiyāt). After that, two large tribes, the "Azān" (Oirat; the BNF MS has "Ūyrāt") and QNQWRāN (Qonggirat) (118)	Most noble and greatest tribe is the Qiyāt, tribe of CK. He was originally called Temüjin (Timurjīn), until he became powerful. [Moves to story of Ong Khan; see above] (Q25–26/B34–35) CK sends to tribes. Those who submitted, such as the Oirat and the QNQWRāT (Qonggirat), were favored. (Q28/B38)
His name was Temüjin (Timūjīn) first, called himself CK when he became powerful (105)		
	CK would hunt three months of the year, rest for war and government. *Ḥalqah* would have three months between both ends, and then would close in and gather innumerable kinds of animals within it. (118; 1.5 lines)	Hunt considered good training for war. Hunting ring formed for one to three months, ring contracted with animals inside. If any animals break through, those responsible are punished, perhaps even killed. Khan goes into ring first, then watches sons, then rests. After that, old men intercede for the lives of remaining animals. Large numbers of prey; if it is impossible to count all kinds of animals, they just count beasts of prey and onagers. Story that once, animals gathered turned towards the Qaʾan[32] and let out cry, like asking for mercy; he released them (Q19–21/B27–29)
	War with Khwārazm Shāh, "as we mentioned in the ḥawādith." (118)	
Juvaynī: They believe in unity of God, creation, etc. In his Jahānkushāy he said that some of CK's children were Christians or Jews, some reject all, some revere idols; no religious fanaticism. CK had at least some faith in God (105–6)		CK did not adhere to specific religion, but respected all religions. (Grand)children have chosen Islam, Christianity, revering idols, old custom of forefathers (Q18–19/B26)

[32] This story appears to have been about Ögedei. Juvaynī, *Genghis Khan: The History of the World Conqueror,* trans. J. A. Boyle (Manchester, 1997), 29, n. 9.

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
	CK died in 624. His body was put in an iron casket and hung between two mountains (118)	
	His book the Yasa written up in crude writing in two volumes and carried on camel (118)	
Regarding his Yasa: among it is what agrees with Shariʿah. He [Juvaynī] said: CK did not use lives of kings or books, but rules he set for everything all came of his own mind (106)		All that was written about older rulers CK invented from his own mind, did not use records (Q16/B23–24) CK Established rules from own mind. Many ordinances agree with Shariʿah (Q17/B25)
Rules recorded in book called The Great Yasa (al-yāsā al-kabīrah), must be taught to youngsters and obeyed, put in treasury and inherited by closest relatives (106)		Mongol children should learn writing from Uyghurs; yasas and ordinances to be written on rolls. Those called Great Yasa (*yāsānāmah-yi buzurg*), kept in treasury and produced upon ascension of khan (Q17–18/B25)
	According to "one of them," CK would repeatedly climb mountain until he became fatigued and fell unconscious, and he would order to write down what he said then. (118)	
	States that Juvaynī related that someone went to worship on a mountain, and heard a voice say: "We have made CK and his offspring king on the face of the earth." According to Juvaynī, high-ranking Mongols believed this and became Muslim. (118)	A man would walk naked through desert and mountains and return, and say that God had said to him: "I have given all of the face of the earth to Temürjin and his children, and given him the name Chinggis Khan and told him this and this is justice." This person is then identified as Teb-Tengri, who was eventually executed. (Q28–29/B39)

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
List of rules: adultery; sodomy; lying; sorcery; spying; meddling in fight; urinating in water; immersing in standing water; *receiving goods and losing them;* feeding prisoners; returning fugitives; animal slaughter; slaughtering Islamic way; *helping fellow soldier;*[33] old yasa: immersing in water [see Table 2]. (106–7)	"Then al-Juwaynī mentioned a little of the Yasa." List of rules: adultery; lying; sodomy; sorcery; spying; meddling in fight; urinating in standing water; immersing in standing water; feeding prisoners; returning fugitives; throwing food; eating first from offered food; sharing food; animal slaughter [see Table 2]. (118–19)	CK put down laws (*rusūm),* abolished disagreeable customs such as theft and adultery. (Q28/B39) Animal slaughter: yasa made in beginning of Mongol rule that slaughter should not be done in Islamic way (*tasmiyah),* but by "splitting the breast according to their custom." (Q163/B206) Chaghatai forbade slaughter in Muslim manner (Q227/B272)
	Contrariness of Yasa to Shariʿah (119)	
CK good for all religious communities, abrogated taxes for religious officials (107)		They encourage all religions. Most learned of all religions do not have to pay taxes and may not be spoken ill off. (Q11/B15–16)
Customs (*ādabihim):* eating first from offered food; sharing food; throwing food; no stepping over fireplace or plate of food; passer-by may join in with eating people; *no putting hands in water; no urinating on ashes; no* stepping on threshold of tent. Unfamiliar with washing clothes, *no differentiation between pure/impure like Muslims; no fanaticism between madhhabs.* Call ruler by his name; no meddling with money of the deceased (107–8)	Customs (*ādabihim):* extreme obedience to ruler; he can freely choose among their virgins; call ruler by his name; passer-by may join in with eating people; no stepping over fireplace or plate of food; no stepping on threshold of tent; no washing of clothes until visibly dirty; no meddling with money of the deceased (119)	Khan receives additional name, other royalty addressed by birth name. In correspondence referred to by that name (Q19/B26) Man may not join another unit. "Moonlike" girls found in the army are gathered. Men select them and take them to the khan/princes for them to choose from. *Yams* (relay stations) established in territory. Everyone divided into tens, hundreds, and thousands. No meddling with money of deceased. (Q24–25/B32–34) Yasa and Mongol custom say that in summer and spring no one may sit in water during the day, wash hands in running stream, draw water in silver/gold vessels, or lay out washed garments on the plain. (All for fear of thunder and lightning) (Q161/B204)
	Juvaynī gives a lot of information on CK's character; he was an associator and killed many (119)	

---

[33]Denise Aigle has pointed out that this might go back to paragraph 190 of the *Secret History.* Aigle, *The Mongol Empire,* 149.

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
	On cause for conflict with Khwārazm Shāh (119)	
Never an army like that of the Mongols in size, power, patience, obedience; never so many soldiers with a ruler, great obedience. After battle, pay taxes without complaint. When they prepare for war, commanders check their equipment to the smallest detail; punishment if things are not in order. Stranger is that their women take up their men's tasks for the ruler when the latter are away. Every pretty girl gathered at the start of each year and brought before the ruler, who picks freely for himself and his sons. *System of thousands, hundreds, tens.* (108–9)		Never an army like that of the Mongols, in patience, gratefulness, obedience. After battle, pay taxes without complaint. When they prepare for war, commanders check their equipment to the smallest detail; punishment if something is missing. Service men have to do devolves onto their wives and others who remain behind when they are away fighting. Everyone divided into tens, hundreds, thousands, ten thousands. (On the girls, see above.) (Q21–23/B29–31)
Some more Yasa: khan can punish over great distance; amirs may not visit/change position; postal system (109–10)		Khan can punish over great distance (Q23/B31) See above.
CK (and offspring) had great love for hunting whenever he was free from battle. Would cover a three-month distance, *ḥalqah* would then close in. He also considered hunt good practice for war. If any prey break through, those responsible are punished, perhaps even killed. Khan, his sons, and his entourage go into the ring first; Khan then watches sons' horsemanship and archery from high place. After that, youngsters (!) intercede for the lives of remaining animals. Story that once, animals gathered turned towards him and let out cry, like asking for mercy; he released them. (110–11; 16 lines)		See above.

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
	A selection of stories that Juvaynī narrated about Ögedei, but which Ibn Kathīr relates as being about CK (119–21): • *Farmer comes to CK with watermelons, is given CK's wife's valuable earrings* • *Buying jujube in market* • *CK giving money for glass from Aleppo (second part of the story as related by Juvaynī is missing)* • *Man lies about existence of treasure in order to see the khan* • *Breaking of pomegranate, handing out money like seeds* • *Unbeliever sees CK in dream, ordering the murder of Muslims* • *Three men to be executed, saved by statement of their wife/ mother/sister* • *Wrestler abstaining from intercourse*	Stories about Ögedei, nos. xi, xxv, xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxix, xl, xliv, xlv (as numbered in Boyle's translation; the stories appear in order). (Q168–69, 174, 177–78, 181, 183–84/B211, 217–18, 221–23, 225, 227–28.)
CK had many children. Most important wife was Ūbūljīn Bīkī; importance of children depends on mother. With her he had four sons. The oldest was "Jochi (Tūsh) father *(wālid)* of Orda (Q-rdū), Batu (Bātuh), Berke, and Berkecher (Tarakjār)." Responsibilities: Jochi (hunt), Chaghatai (execution of rules: *al-yāsāt wa-al-arghū*ʾ [34]), Ögedei (reason and government and army) [no mention of Tolui]. (111)	CK urged sons to harmony and against division, by means of arrow parable (121)	CK had many children. Most important wife was Yesünjin Beki;[35] importance of children depends on mother. With her he had four sons, each had a responsibility: Jochi (hunt), Chaghatai (execution of rules: "*yāsā va siyāsat*"); Ögetei (reason and administration of kingdom); Tolui (army). (Q29/B40)

---

[34] The *yārghū* was a Mongol court. Aigle, *The Mongol Empire,* 4, 150–51.

[35] Chinggis Khan's chief wife was called Börte. Boyle suggests that Juvaynī may be confusing her with Hülegü's wife Yesünjin (Juvaynī, *Genghis Khan,* 40, n. 1), and Anne Broadbridge suggests that he might have confused her with Yisuï, another wife of Chinggis Khan, of the Alchi Tatars (Anne F. Broadbridge, *Women and the Making of the Mongol Empire* (Cambridge, 2018), 58, n. 59, 83–89).

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Juvaynī
CK urged sons to harmony, against division, by means of arrow parable (112)	CK had many children; four sons most important: *Yūsī wa-HRYWL* [BNF MS: HRTWL, fol. 25r] *wa-Bātū wa-Barkah wa-Tarakjār.* They all have their own position (121)	CK urged sons to harmony and against division, by means of arrow parable (Q30/B41) Death of CK. From the Kipchak steppe come "the sons of Tūshī, Orda and Batu and Shībaqān (Sibaqan) and Tankūt and Berke and Berkecher and Togha-temür." (Q144–45/B183–84)
Division of territory. More than ten thousand descendants. (112–13)		Division of territory. More than ten thousand descendants. (Q31–32/B42–43)
"This is what al-ṣāḥib ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn [Juvaynī] related." (113)	*Juvaynī continues about the rule of his offspring until Hülegü, who he calls* pādshāh-i zādah, *and what happens in his day* (121).	

There are many striking similarities between al-ʿUmarī's account in his *Masālik al-abṣār* and Ibn Kathīr's version in *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* and both, as noted, claimed that Juvaynī was their source. The first question that comes to mind is whether it is possible that one is the source of the other: did Ibn Kathīr use al-ʿUmarī as an intermediary to Juvaynī's work, or vice versa? This seems unlikely. Al-ʿUmarī's section on Chinggis Khan's dealings with Ong Khan is significantly more elaborate and about four times longer than Ibn Kathīr's. Al-ʿUmarī included details he obtained from Juvaynī that are lacking from Ibn Kathīr's version. For example, he related that Chinggis Khan raised the two youths who informed him of Ong Khan's plot to the status of *tarkhān.*[36] On the other hand, Ibn Kathīr, unlike al-ʿUmarī, included Juvaynī's story about the divine voice on a mountain that proclaimed Chinggis Khan "king on the face of the earth."[37] Ibn Kathīr also included a selection from a large number of stories that Juvaynī related about Ögedei;[38] yet he mistakenly interpreted them as being about Chinggis Khan. These stories relate various occurrences in his dealings with his subjects, and are absent from *Masālik al-abṣār.* In Juvaynī, these stories are found in the same chapter ("On the deeds and actions of the Qaʾan") in which the information on the Mongol *yāsāt* and/or customs regarding open water and slaughter are related (see below).[39] Both authors, then, incorporated information that can be traced back to Juvaynī but is absent in the other's work. It therefore seems more plausible that they both relied independently on Juvaynī. There are some conspicuous differences between the Arabic and Persian texts, both in content and in structure. It should be noted that there is a large number of surviving manuscripts of the popular *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,*[40] and only some of these were

---

[36] Al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār,* 3:104–5; Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich,* ٤–٥; Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 27; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 37–38. The status of *tarkhān* exempted the person from taxes and allowed them the freedom to travel. It was used by the Chinggisids as a reward for loyal support. See for instance Marie Favereau, "Tarkhan: A Nomad Institution in an Islamic Context," *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 143 (2018), http://journals.openedition.org/remmm/10955.

[37] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 13:118; Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 28; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 39.

[38] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 158–91; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 201–36. Al-ʿUmarī gives a significantly different version of one of those stories, no. xxxiii in Boyle's translation, but names Möngke Khan as the benefactor, and gives his source as al-Fāḍil Niẓām al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍāʾil Yaḥyá ibn al-Ḥakīm al-Ṭayyarī (al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār,* 3:124–25 [ed. Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich,* ٢٣–٢٤/106–7]). He ends his short selection of stories by saying that this shows the extent of generosity in Möngke Khan. On al-Ṭayyarī, a former employee of the *dīwān* of Abū Saʿīd, see Lech, 36–37.

[39] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 158–91; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 201–36.

[40] Melville, "Jahāngošā-Ye Jovayni."

---

used in preparing the Qazvīnī edition. It is possible, especially for some of the smaller differences, that one or more of these manuscripts do contain (some of) the information currently unique to the Mamluk sources.[41] Nevertheless, the shared differences are significant and telling. For one, it suggests that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr used the same or a very similar source text. Second, as they did for Ayalon, these divergences raise a number of questions about the transmission of this and other Ilkhanid texts to the sultanate.

As discussed above, Ayalon mentioned not only al-ʿUmarī's addition of rules that were not listed in Juvaynī's account (see below), but further remarked that al-ʿUmarī's text contained details that are absent from Juvaynī. One example he gave is al-ʿUmarī's list of Muslim religious functionaries who are exempted from paying taxes, which Juvaynī did not mention;[42] another one is al-ʿUmarī's remark about the religious convictions of the (grand)children of Chinggis Khan. Some of them, according to al-ʿUmarī, adopted Christianity and Judaism, while others rejected all religions or revered idols. Ayalon pointed out that not only did al-ʿUmarī add Judaism, he also left out Islam.[43] While this bit of information is absent from *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* Ibn Kathīr's text also contains details not found in Juvaynī. For example, when he related the story about someone worshiping on a mountain (identified as Teb Tengri in Juvaynī), he added that "al-Juwaynī says that high-ranking Mongols *(mashāyikh al-Mughūl)* believed this and became Muslim."[44] This might echo the information on the religious convictions of the Chinggisid offspring as related by Juvaynī and al-ʿUmarī, but that seems unlikely to be the origin given the direct connection to the story of Teb Tengri, as indicated by Ibn Kathīr, and the fact that this information appears in an entirely different section in Juvaynī's text.

These details are unique to each of the respective works, but the two Arabic texts share elements that are not found in the Qazvīnī edition of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā.* For instance, al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr both reported that Ong Khan was upset with the two youths, and that was why they fled to Chinggis Khan. Juvaynī simply reported that they fled to Chinggis Khan and warned him due to the latter's good fortune. There is no mention of Ong Khan's anger.[45] In the same narrative, the Mamluk-era authors reported that Chinggis Khan showed generosity toward those who fled from Ong Khan and allowed them to join his troops.

---

[41] I look forward to the publication of Jan Jelinowski's dissertation, which will shed more light on the manuscript tradition of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* and I thank him for his insightful responses to my questions.

[42] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 121.

[43] Ibid., 116–17. See also Amitai, "Jewish Teacher," 698.

[44] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 13:118.

[45] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 27; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 36–37.

While there is indeed ample information on the generosity he showed to the two youths, as well as troops present at the battle, Juvaynī did not mention the latter coming from Ong Khan's entourage.[46] The narrative continues to describe how many tribes join Chinggis Khan, and both Arabic texts emphasize the large size of the Oirat and Qonggirat tribes, unlike Juvaynī.[47] Yet another example is found in a different passage: when discussing Mongol slaughtering practices, the Mamluk-era authors described that the animal's chest is split (which is indicated by Juvaynī), and that the butcher then reaches in to either take out the heart (both Mamluk-era authors) or crush it within the chest cavity (al-ʿUmarī). Again, this does not appear in the Persian text.[48]

That both Mamluk-era authors present similar information that is absent from Juvaynī's account is also evident from the "Yasa rules" that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr relate, as Ayalon already pointed out. As Table 1 shows, although there are slight differences in content and in the order of paragraphs, the two Arabic texts offer similar material. Not only do both Arabic texts contain actual lists of rules in a way they are not present in the Persian text, but many of the rules they include are not found there at all. These include elements such as the bans on sorcery; on feeding, dressing, or offering drinks to prisoners without permission; on sodomy; and on meddling in other peoples' fights; as well as many others I have not been able to trace back to the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*. For those that I have found, it is striking that they are gathered from all over the book (see Table 1): information found on pages 19 and 24–25 of the Qazvīnī edition is inserted among information that is derived from page 161. Additionally, the "Yasa" regulations were rephrased in a much more "rule-like" manner. Juvaynī wrote simply that Chinggis Khan established new rules and abolished "reprehensible customs" like adultery and stealing.[49] The two Mamluk-era authors, on the other hand, commented that "he who commits adultery, married or unmarried, is killed."[50] The two texts are very similar in this example (see also Table 2 below), while this section is among the farthest removed from the Persian text. These examples all suggest that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr had the same source material before them.

---

[46] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 27–28; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 37–38. These details also do not appear in Bar Hebraeus's discussion of this episode, also based on Juvaynī. Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography,* 1:352–53; Ibn al-ʿIbrī, *Tārīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal,* ed. Anṭūn Ṣāliḥānī (Beirut, 1890), 394–95 (the Arabic version does not mention rewards to others than the two youths).

[47] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 28; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 38–39.

[48] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 163; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 206. On the discrepancies in the slaughter rule between al-ʿUmarī and Juvaynī, see also Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 118–20.

[49] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 28; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 39.

[50] Al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār,* 3:106; Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 1966, 13:118.

This is further indicated by the similar structure of the Arabic texts. Both open with the introduction of Chinggis Khan as the ancestor of the current Mongol rulers, followed by mention of Chinggis Khan's ancestress claiming to have been impregnated by the sun's rays.[51] They both then identify Juvaynī as their source for the following account. In what follows, their narratives sometimes diverge (see Table 1), but generally maintain a shared sequence. Whereas the order of the main topics in Juvaynī's history is "Yasa—Ong Khan—offspring of Chinggis Khan," the Arabic versions follow the sequence "Ong Khan—Yasa—offspring of Chinggis Khan." This rearrangement could, of course, be coincidental. There are also differences: Ibn Kathīr's discussion of the hunt appears earlier in the text than in al-ʿUmarī's version, and the mention of Temüjin as Chinggis Khan's original name occurs at opposing ends of the section on Ong Khan (with Ibn Kathīr adhering to Juvaynī's order). Overall, however, there is a strong suggestion of a shared sequence. Moreover, this is supported by two key examples of smaller yet shared divergences from Juvaynī's structure.

The first occurs in the narrative about different tribes joining Chinggis Khan. In addition to the added information about the size of the tribes, both al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr include a mention of the Qiyāt tribe. At the very beginning of his description of Chinggis Khan's rise to power, before relating his conflict with Ong Khan, Juvaynī noted the Qiyāt tribe as superior over numerous other Mongol tribes, and as the tribe from which Chinggis Khan descended, with his forefathers as its chiefs.[52] The two Syrian authors, however, included Chinggis Khan's descent and the Qiyāt tribe in their sections on how Chinggis Khan was joined by many tribes. So, information from a different part of Juvaynī's text appears in the same place in the two Arabic accounts.

In this instance, the information can still be traced back to the same chapter in Juvaynī's history, but that is not always the case. When the three authors turn to Chinggis Khan's offspring, Juvaynī and al-ʿUmarī first discuss his sons and then his speech urging them to combine forces in harmony via the arrows' parable. Ibn Kathīr reverses that order. In the discussion of Chinggis Khan's sons, however, an interesting similarity appears again in the texts by al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr. Like Juvaynī, al-ʿUmarī points out that among the Mongols the position of the mother determines the position of the children. Like Juvaynī, he then mentions Chinggis Khan's most important sons and their responsibilities, although he leaves out Tolui (his army-related responsibilities are connected to Ögedei instead). After mentioning Jochi as the eldest, however, he adds that Jochi was "the father of Orda (Qurdū), Batu (Bātuh), Berke (Barka), and Berkecher

---

[51] Al-ʿUmarī's account is more elaborate and correctly identifies her as Alan Qoʾa (while Ibn Kathīr relates that it was Chinggis Khan's own mother).

[52] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 25–26; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 34–35.

(Tarakjār)."[53] This information does not appear in that chapter in Juvaynī, but rather appears to originate from a significantly later section concerning the death of Chinggis Khan.[54] That this information was clearly presented together in the source used by the Mamluk-era authors is evident from Ibn Kathīr's rendition. He wrote that Chinggis Khan had many children, among whom four sons were the most important, and continues: "the oldest of them is Jochi and HRY-WL and Batu and Berke and Berkecher (Tarakjār) *(wa-akbaruhum Yūsī [Jochi][55] wa-HRYWL wa-Bātū wa-Barkah wa-Tarakjār).* Each of them was assigned his own duties."[56] It is clear that some confusion arose here. The text lists five names rather than the aforementioned four sons, and Ordu's name has become rather mangled. Moreover, Orda, Batu, Berke, and Berkecher appear as Chinggis Khan's sons rather than Jochi's. At the current point in this research, it is impossible to determine where this went wrong: was the source text correct and did Ibn Kathīr (or his interpreter) get confused, or was the source text already corrupted and had al-ʿUmarī—who was generally well-informed about the Mongols[57]— (or his interpreter) corrected it? Regardless, the incorporation of this bit of information in this specific section of both al-ʿUmarī's and Ibn Kathīr's texts, in a very different location than in the Persian original, suggests again that they had a shared source: al-ʿUmarī did not, after all, arrange his information arbitrarily, as Ayalon thought.[58]

AN ARABIC TRANSLATION?

Based on the analysis presented above, it would seem that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr, independently from one another, used the same primary source material. Consequently, I think we can definitively rule out Ayalon's third option to explain the differences between Juvaynī's text and al-ʿUmarī's version, i.e., that al-ʿUmarī used additional sources and presented the information as being derived

---

[53] Al-ʿUmarī, *Masālik al-abṣār,* 3:111; Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich,* ١٣/99.

[54] Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 144–45; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 183–84. Alternatively, it might be derived from yet another section, on the death of Jochi (idem, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 221–22; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 266). Given the general focus on Chinggis Khan, the former appears more likely, perhaps supported by the phrasing, which is closer to the Arabic on page 144–45 *(...pisarān-i Tūshī [Jochi] Hordū va Bātū va Shībaqān va Tankūt va Berke va Berkechār va Tughātīmūr)* than on 221–22 *(...va pisarān-i ū BMḤL* ["Boghal," Boyle 266, n. 2] *va Hordū va Bātū va Shībaqān va Tankūt va Berke va Berkechār...).*

[55] The 2010 edition has "Tūlī" (164), based on two manuscripts; the BNF manuscript similarly reads "Tūlī wa-HRTWL wa-Bāqū wa-Barkah wa-Tarakjār," fol. 25r.

[56] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 13:121.

[57] Lech, *Das mongolische Weltreich,* 18–21, 29–41.

[58] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 131.

from Juvaynī's text. That is not to say that both authors may not have used additional sources. For one, I have been unable to trace the burial story in Ibn Kathīr and I feel like it would have been too good for al-ʿUmarī to pass up. However, the similarities in their information and repeated references to Juvaynī suggest that both authors genuinely believed that the text they used was Juvaynī's history of Chinggis Khan. An interesting detail that can be considered as supporting evidence is Ibn Kathīr's remark that Juvaynī relates that high-ranking Mongols converted to Islam because they were convinced by the voice heard by the worshiper on the mountain. This correlation between events does not appear in the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* although—as mentioned above—Juvaynī does mention Mongol adoption of Islam earlier in his text. As I have argued elsewhere, Ibn Kathīr's depiction of the Mongols, Chinggis Khan, and the Yasa is overall very negative, so it would seem unlikely that he would add this redeeming snippet of information on his own initiative. It does not tie in with his general program of depicting the Mongols, Chinggis Khan, and the Yasa as un-Islamic as possible.[59] It is much more likely that this came from the text that Ibn Kathīr described as being written by Juvaynī, "the vizier of Baghdad."

Some form of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* was clearly used by these two Mamluk-era authors, but what form was that? It would seem that the exchange of information between the Ilkhanate and the Mamluk Sultanate in this case constituted actual written material making its way to the latter. After all, Ibn Kathīr explicitly mentions that he "saw a volume."[60] Whether al-ʿUmarī had in front of him the exact same text or a closely related one in the same tradition is impossible to determine at this point. There is some reason to doubt that they used the exact same material, specifically based on the section on the origin of the rules of the Yasa. While thematically the two texts share clear parallels here— the rules come from Chinggis Khan's own mind, they are written down—the respective elaborations are surprisingly divergent. The sudden appearance of a camel instead of a treasury is especially noteworthy. This may have originated from a slightly different copy in the same tradition, but there are other potential explanations as well. Perhaps it comes from the same source as the story about the burial; perhaps Ibn Kathīr added it, together with the "crude writing," to defame the Mongols and their Yasa; or perhaps an interpreter somewhat mis-

---

[59] See van den Bent, "Mongols in Mamluk Eyes," 137–42.

[60] Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 13:117–18. Ibn Kathīr's text also confuses the name Ong Khan with the better known name Uzbak, or Öz-beg, Khan. (The Golden Horde was ruled by Öz-beg Khan 712–42/1313–41). In the fifteenth-century BNF manuscript, the spelling "Ortak" dominates. It is likely that this was a copyist's mistake, but if it was Ibn Kathīr's mix-up, this also suggests a written text rather than oral information. I thank Reuven Amitai for pointing out that this mistake is worth commenting on.

understood the text. Overall, however, the existence of Ibn Kathīr's text makes Ayalon's second suggestion, that al-ʿUmarī was misled by interpreters who distorted the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* as we know it today and thereby caused the divergences from Juvaynī's text, considerably less likely. If both authors were present at the same "translation session" it remains a possibility, but that raises the same questions regarding the aforementioned divergences.

It appears more likely, therefore, that Ibn Kathīr and al-ʿUmarī both had access to a volume that contained a version of Juvaynī's history that was somewhat different from the text we know now as the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā.* The question then is: was this a Persian text, accessed via interpreters, or was this an Arabic translation of (part of) the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā?* Overall, the two texts are not particularly similar in phrasing, which may suggest they were not using an Arabic text as their source—if that were the case, one might expect more textual similarities caused by copying. However, we can certainly not rule it out, especially in light of the first passage on Yasa rules. Table 2 shows how many of these regulations are almost identically worded. There is only one significant difference in this passage between the two: the rule found in al-ʿUmarī about receiving goods and losing them three times[61] is absent in Ibn Kathīr, who instead relates that "whoever immerses in [water] is killed"(both underlined). This rule is mentioned by al-ʿUmarī a little further down.

---

[61] This might reflect a thoroughly distorted interpretation of one of Juvaynī's stories on Ögedei (Juvaynī, *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* 167; idem, *Genghis Khan,* 209–10).

Table 2. A comparison of the wording of the first section on the rules of the Yasa by al-ʿUmarī (p. 106 in the 2003 edition or p. ۸/96 in the Lech edition) and Ibn Kathīr (pp. 118–19 in the 1966 edition), followed by a combined translation in which text unique to either author is placed in parentheses and attributed to its author with his initial in brackets.

al-ʿUmarī	Ibn Kathīr	Combined translation
fa-min dhālika anna	*(thumma dhakara al-Juwaynī nutafan min al-yāsā) min dhālika annahu*	(then Juvaynī mentions some details from the Yasa [K]) among which are that
man zanā sawāʾun an kāna muḥṣanan aw ghayr muḥṣan qutil,	*man zanā qutil, muḥṣanan kāna aw ghayr muḥṣan,*	he who commits adultery is killed, whether he is married or unmarried,
wa-man lāṭa qutil,	*wa-kadhālika man lāṭa qutil,*	and (similarly [K]) he who commits sodomy is killed,
wa-man taʿammada al-kidhb qutil,	*wa-man taʿammada al-kidhb qutil,*	and he who lies on purpose is killed,
wa-man saḥara qutil,	*wa-man saḥara qutil,*	and he who performs witchcraft is killed,
wa-man yatajassasa ʿalá qawm qutil,	*wa-man tajassasa qutil,*	and he who spies (on people [U]) is killed,
wa-man dākhila bayna ithnayn yakhtaṣimāna fa-aʿāna aḥadahumā qutil,	*wa-man dakhala bayna ithnayn yakhtaṣimāna fa-aʿāna aḥadahumā qutil,*	and he who comes between two quarrelling people and supports one of them is killed,
wa-man bāla min al-māʾ qutil,	*wa-man bāla fī al-māʾ al-wāqif qutil,*	and he who urinates in (standing [K]) water will be killed,
wa-man uʿṭiya biḍāʿah wa-khasira thumma uʿṭiya thaniyatan wa-khasira ilá al-thālithah qutil,	*wa-man inghamasa fīhi qutil,*	(and he who receives goods and loses them and then is given goods again and loses them until the third time is killed [U])/(and he who immerses in [water] is killed [K]),
wa-man aṭʿama asīr qawm aw kasāhu aw saqāhu⁶² bi-ghayri idhnihim qutil,	*wa-man aṭʿama asīran aw saqāhu aw kasāhu bi-ghayri idhn ahlihi qutil,*	and he who feeds a prisoner (of people [U]) or clothes him or gives him to drink without their permission is killed,
wa-man wajada hāriban aw asīran aw ʿabdan wa-la yarudduhu qutil	*wa-man wajada hāriban wa-lam yarudduhu qutil*	and he who encounters an escapee (or a prisoner or a slave [U]) and does not return him is killed

---

⁶²The 2003 Abu Dhabi edition has *shakāhu,* but Lech (*Das mongolische Weltreich,* ۸) has *saqāhu.*

The strong similarities between these paragraphs make the existence of an Arabic summary or translation of (at least part of) Juvaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* a serious option (although a similar list of rules in Persian translated literally by an interpreter could have yielded a comparable result). If there was indeed an Arabic text, various questions remain. Who would the translator have been, and where was it produced? Ayalon has pointed out that there was no real tradition in the Mamluk Sultanate of producing Arabic translations of Persian texts.[63] Such a translation was more likely produced in Baghdad or elsewhere in the Ilkhanate. Given the multilingual environment of the Ilkhanate, this was not uncommon: in addition to some authors writing in both Persian and Arabic, translations between the two languages were made frequently.[64] Rashīd al-Dīn famously stipulated in his endowment deed that his works, including those on the Mongols, were to be copied in both their original Persian and in Arabic translations, allowing them to reach a larger audience.[65] The production of an Arabic version of Juvaynī's text, which may well have been more like a digest than a complete translation, could account for the differences, both in content and in structure, between the Mamluk texts on the one hand and the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* on the other. A translator-*cum*-summarizer could have introduced additional information and details and could also have rearranged the order in which some of the material appears (the appearance of Jochi's sons in the section on Chinggis Khan's offspring, for instance).

Alternatively, al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr may have used a Persian text, but one that was somewhat different from the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* as we know it today. In a sense, this echoes Ayalon's "option 1," that we do not have a complete version of Juvaynī's chronicle. Ayalon himself argued that this seemed unlikely, at least to the extent necessary to explain all of the differences.[66] Moreover, there is much more material in Juvaynī's history that al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr do not use than the other way around, so, based on the evidence presented here, Ayalon's first option is not the most compelling conclusion. It is, however, possible that the two Mamluk-era authors had access to a different Persian text, such as a digest or summary of Juvaynī's work. They could also have used another Persian source, the author of which relied heavily on the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* or even incorporated significant sections of it with minimal alterations. If that is the case, however, both Mamluk-era authors were clearly aware that the original source of information was Juvaynī, given their many explicit references to

---

[63] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 124.

[64] Amitai and Biran, "Arabic Sources," 1030–31.

[65] Stefan Kamola, *Making Mongol History: Rashid al-Din and the Jami' al-Tawarikh* (Edinburgh, 2019), 112–15.

[66] Ayalon, "The Great Yāsa (Part A)," 122–23.

him. If they indeed used a text by another author, it would seem that at least Ibn Kathīr did not recognize that it was written by someone *using* Juvaynī rather than by Juvaynī himself, given his statement that he "saw a volume composed by the vizier of Baghdad." Perhaps, however, such a text served as an intermediary for the transmission of part of Juvaynī's material to the sultanate, where it was presented or interpreted as Juvaynī's own history. Whatever the form of this theoretical Persian text—a Persian summary, a transmission via another Persian text using Juvaynī, or even (part of) a manuscript version of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* that looked somewhat different from the text as we have it today—al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr would have required the help of interpreters. The input of those interpreters could be another possible source for some of the diverging information between al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr, such as Ibn Kathīr's mention of Chinggis Khan's burial and their differing portrayals of the Yasa in book form. Their presence could also explain Ibn Kathīr's confused interpretation of some of the information, especially his interpretation of the stories about Ögedei as being about Chinggis Khan.[67]

Concluding Remarks

Two Mamluk-era historians appear to have independently used the same (or very similar) version(s) of Juvaynī's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā,* which contained some conspicuous differences in both content and structure compared to the Persian text as we have it today. From a Mamlukist's point of view, this is relevant first because it allows for a thorough comparison of al-ʿUmarī's and Ibn Kathīr's respective utilizations of the text. Such a comparison reveals their differing intentions in their representation of the Yasa—that vague "something" that was clearly important to the Mongols and in which many Mamluk-era authors took an interest. Al-ʿUmarī, with his fairly impartial approach to the text, and Ibn Kathīr, with his recurring censure and rebuke, exhibited diverging interpretations of the Yasa's contents, made different choices in their respective selections, and had different messages they wanted their audiences to take away from it, which I have explored elsewhere in more detail.[68] Their shared use of this text

---

[67] Ibn Kathīr's identification of Chinggis Khan as the protagonist of these stories actually causes an issue in one of them as it becomes illogical. Ibn Kathīr relates: "An unbeliever came to him [Chinggis Khan] and said: 'While sleeping, I saw Chinggis Khan. He said: "Say to my son [*li-ibnī,* 2010 edition, 164]/father [*li-abī,* 1966 edition, 120] to kill the Muslims."' He [Chinggis Khan] said to him: 'This is a lie.' And he ordered him to be killed." The confusion is reflected in the differences between the editions, and some manuscripts have a slightly different text, along the lines of "he said to me once (*qāla lī marrah)* to kill the Muslims" (BNF Arabe 1516, fol. 25r). See also Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah,* 2010, 15:164, n. 1.

[68] Van den Bent, "Mongols in Mamluk Eyes," 137–42.

thus sheds light on the way in which different Mamluk-era historians thought and wrote about the Mongols and their history, what messages they wanted to convey, and why.

Moreover, the use of this source by al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr also demonstrates that historical material originating in a Mongol cultural context not only entered the sultanate via oral transmission—such as through al-ʿUmarī's and al-Nuwayrī's many informants[69]—but also in written form. Although most "Mongol material" appears to have entered the sultanate through oral reports, this text can be added to Ibn al-Dawādārī's still somewhat mysterious "Turkish book." It should be noted that neither of these texts appear to have seen widespread use: I have not been able to identify the use of Juvaynī's text in the work of another Mamluk-era author, nor have I found any traces of Ibn al-Dawādārī's Mongol story elsewhere. Nevertheless, these written sources were present in the sultanate and they were used, and readers there could satiate their curiosity about Mongol history and culture through the works of these Mamluk-era authors. Both al-ʿUmarī and Ibn Kathīr clearly felt that their Arabic-speaking audiences would be interested in what Juvaynī had to say on the Mongols in general and on the Yasa in particular. Together with other Mamluk-era authors writing on the topic, they set the stage for a significant *Nachleben* of the Yasa in the Mamluk Sultanate, perhaps best illustrated by al-Maqrīzī's cunning use of it in voicing his own political grievances.

A number of questions about the exact form(s) in which Juvaynī's text circulated in the sultanate remain. Why did this version include information not found in today's *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā* and why does it have some significant structural differences from the Persian text? Future research will need to consider how these variations speak to the channels of transmission into the sultanate. One option was that they used an Arabic translation, summarized and with some changes and additions, that circulated in the sultanate. Alternatively, it could have been a Persian text mediated by interpreters that these Syrian authors used—perhaps a Persian summary, another Persian text using Juvaynī, or even (part of) a divergent manuscript version of the *Tārīkh-i Jahāngushā*. Until more research is done (or, ideally, the Persian or Arabic volume used by these authors emerges), a definitive answer to these questions remains elusive. More research on both the Ilkhanid and Mamluk historiographical traditions and especially on their interrelationship is bound to shed new and revealing light on the exchanges of ideas and information between the sultanate and Mongol territories.

---

[69] Amitai, "Jewish Teacher."