

Sāṭī Bīk (Sati Bek) and the Post-Ilkhānid Middle East

*Nilgün Dalkesen **

Abū Sa'īd died in 1335, and having no successor, political and social instability developed. The amīrs who aimed to gain control of the Ilkhānid crown competed with each other by crowning the non-Ilkhānid Chinggisid princes as puppet Khans. In such an environment, some Ilkhānid women, mainly Abū Sa'īd's sister Sati Beg as the real representatives of the Ilkhān, had an impact on political and military struggles; sometimes, they even directed those developments. Although many powerful amīrs gained support of the khans from the Chinggisid line, they were unable to realize their goal without the approval of Sati Beg. Certainly, the loyalty of the native people of the Middle East, especially the warriors of the armies in Turco-Mongol societies was necessary as, in general, they were loyal to the Ilkhāns, not the Chinggisids and the people that considered her important.

Key Words: Sati Beg, Abū Sa'īd, Ilkhān, Mongol woman, Chupanids

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sāṭī Bīk, Ebu Said, İlhanlı, Moğol kadını

Sāṭī Bīk (Beg) ve İlhanlı Sonrası Orta Doğu

Ebu Said Han'ın 1335 yılında ölümünden sonra, hâlihazırda yerine geçecek bir erkek evladı olmadığı için İlhanlı devletinde siyasi ve sosyal bir kargaşa oluştu. İlhanlı tahtına göz koyan emirler Cengiz Han soyundan prensleri tahta çıkardıkları kukla hanlar aracılığı ile birbirleriyle siyasi ve askeri mücadeleler içine girdiler. Bu ortamda başta Ebu Said'in kız kardeşi Sati Beg olmak üzere hanedanlık kadınları, İlhanlı hanedanlığının gerçek temsilcileri olarak siyasi ve askeri gelişmeleri etkilediler hatta çoğu zaman yönlendirdiler. Pek çok güçlü emir, yanlarına Cengiz Han soyundan hanları almalarına rağmen, Sati Beg'in onayını olmadan başarılı olamadılar. Bunda şüphesiz Orta Doğu coğrafyasında İlhanlı hanedanlığına mensup olan halkın, özellikle de orduların savaşı gücünü oluşturan Türk-Moğol topluluklarının Cengiz Han soyundan gelen bütün hanlara değil, İlhanlı hanedanlığına olan sadakatleri çok etkili olmuştur. İşte bu hanedanlığın temsilcisi olması Sati Beg'in cinsiyetinden daha önemli olmuş ve bu ara dönemde siyasi ve askeri gelişmelerde çok etkili olmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sati Beg, Ebu Said, İlhanlı, Moğol kadını, Çobaniler

Introduction

Abū Sa'īd died on 30 November 1335 leaving no heirs; thus, the question of who would inherit the throne became the main issue. The Ilkhānid lands became an arena for the amīrs' (tribal leaders) struggle to control the Ilkhānid realm by enthroning princes from the Chinggisid house as puppet khans. The amīrs had always been highly involved in the Ilkhānid military and administrative system. They had been in control of the provinces of the Ilkhāns as governors or commanders' armies or holding high bureaucratic positions in the court. The amīrs frequently engaged in conflicts with each other in order to gain more power and higher positions. In this political structure, the Ilkhāns had tried to control these amīrs by playing one against the other (Melville 1997, 89-117). After the death of Abū Sa'īd, under the atmosphere of uncertainty, the Ilkhānid women as representatives of the Ilkhānid House had to take greater responsibility in the state affairs in order to preserve the power of the dynasty.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. , İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi

The institutionalization of the dynastic women's power and prestige through the Chinggisid imperial traditions led these women to determine the flow of the political events of their age. According to Isenbike Togan, the following three aspects of the Chinggisid tradition remained constant in the aftermath of the Mongol Empire; legitimacy ensured by the presence of the dynastic family, the *Altan Urugh* (the Golden Seed), the dynastic families supra-religious attitude, and the position of women in the dynastic family (Togan 2013, 63). The main requirement for becoming a ruler was to come from the Chinggisid house, and this was the main obstacle for these amīrs to maintain their power. So, it was necessary for men from the Chinggisid line (puppet khans) to be enthroned as ruler, and possessing kinship ties through Chinggisid women as transmitters of the Chinggisid legitimacy (Melville 1999, 116) enhanced the charisma and prestige of these amīrs. Therefore, in post-Chinggisid Central Asia, Chinggisid women became key figures in politics, which enhanced their power and prestige. It is therefore possible to claim that the Chinggisid women were more prestigious than the Chinggisid puppet khans since they had more opportunity to use their power than the Chinggisid men.¹

In such an environment, Sati Beg, the daughter of the Ilkhān Ūljāitū from his wife Eltüzmīsh,² became a key figure. Without her support, neither the amīrs nor the Chinggisid puppet khans could enforce authority over their societies. She was a Chinggisid but also the only remaining living person from the house of Ilkhān. If Sati Beg was important only for her Chinggisid lineage, the authority of the khans from the Chinggisid lineage would not have faced constant fierce oppositions or at least one of them could have achieved support from some groups or a region. Sati Beg did not rule actively during her short reign of nine months (Bruno 2017, 244), but none of the Khans could reign and maintain power without the support of Sati Beg. This paper takes a gender perspective to reveal the social and political factors that made Sati Beg a central figure and evaluates the events after 1335 from a gender perspective.

This study mainly depends on the following sources which gave wide coverage to these events: *Majma' al-Ansāb* written c.1337 by Shabānqāra'ī, who was a high ranking bureaucrat in the court and a witness to the events; *Dhayl-i Jāmi' u' l- Tavārikkh-i Rashīdī* by a Timurid writer Khāfēz Abrū (d. 1450); and *Tā'rikkh-i Shaikh Uwais*, written by Ahrī and presented to the Jalāyirid ruler Shaikh Uwais (r. 1355-1374). This ruler was the son of Delshādād Khātūn and Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī, who played their parts in the period. *Tā'rikkh-i Elfī* was a World history, written by a commission on the order of Akbar Shah, ruler of the Mughal Empire in the first 1000 (1600 A.C.) years of the hegira. Although this book was written more than two centuries later, it includes more detailed information and does not undermine women's role as in the Shabānqāra'ī and Hāfēz Abrū who had more patriarchal approaches towards the role of women. Instead, the members of the commission did not make any distinction between men and women's activities, but narrated the women's activities naturally. This might be due to the cultural atmosphere of the Mughal court in which women played important roles and had very prestigious positions.³ Lastly, the Anatolian poet Aḥmadī (1334-1335) in his *divān* (collection of poetry) *Iskandar-Nāmeḥ* written in 1390 reported public memory of Anatolian people concerning the Chinggisids and Ilkhāns (Z.V. Togan 1970, 231).

Developments after Abū Sa'īd

Abū Sa'īd died when he was engaged in a campaign against the Uzbek Khan, who had set out to Dārband with his army. Among the notables, only his vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad and Amīr Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh Īnjū were present in the camp at that time. Maḥmūd Shāh wanted Sati Beg to be temporarily enthroned, until the new *padshāh* was crowned. The vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad refused this request on the basis that it would cause turmoil and plunder in the country. In fact, he was afraid of the power and prestige that Maḥmūd Shāh Īnjū possessed because he had been favored by Abū Sa'īd, who had given him governorship of Irāq and Irāqeyn, Fārs, Eşfehān, Kermān, Behre(?) (Elfī, 4470; Shabānkāra'ī, 299). Furthermore, the vizier claimed that before Abū Sa'īd died, he had named Arpa Khan as his successor (Shabānkāra'ī, 293, Hāfēz Abrū, 145). However, according to *Tā'rikkh-i Elfī*, Abū Sa'īd had not named Arpa Khan, any man from the line of Tului, son of Chinggis Khan to be heir of the country." (*Tā'rikkh-i Elfī*, 4468) Furthermore, *Tā'rikkh-i Elfī* gives more information about Hajī Khatun's opposition. The vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad used his own⁴ and Hajī Khatun's hatred against Chupanids (Baṭṭūta 2004, 323) in order to persuade Hajī Khatun to accept the accession of Arpa Khan. He

explained to Hajī Khatun that “when Abū Sa’īd was alive, he charged me (Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad) to give the right to rule to whomever I want but excepting the Chupanids.”⁵ At that time, the country was under the threat of the Uzbaq Khan who passed through Dārband and came to the riverside of Āb-Gur (Shabānkāra’ī, 294). Such an emergency was probably instrumental in Hajī Khatun’s approval of Arpa Khan. Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, Sati Beg and Hajī Khatun, mother of Abū Sa’īd conferred rulership on Arpa Khan from the family of Tolui, the youngest son of Chinggis Khan (*Tārikh-i Elfi*, 4469). The title *Khuṭba* was given in his name (Shabānkāra’ī, 293; Hāfez Abrū, 145; Wing 2016, 75-76). In this situation, notably Sati Beg, Abū Sa’īd’s mother Hajī Khatun, Abū Sa’īd’s estranged wife Baghdād Khatun and his last wife Delshād Khatun, who was also the niece of Baghdād Khatun whom Abū Sa’īd divorced in order to marry Delshād Khatun, became central figures in the current political developments (Dalkesen 2007, 183-198)

They approved the accession of Arpa Khan, but not his reign. Their actions and behaviors motivated and sometimes shaped the opponent amīrs who ruled in different parts of the Ilkhān. In *Elfi*, it was reported that his rule was not recognized by some part of the people (*ba’zī merdom*),⁶ and they opposed him with the support (*takhṣīṣ*) of Abū Sa’īd’s mother (Hajī Khatun) and Baghdād Khatun. Furthermore, it was claimed that for this reason, Arpa Khan organized the killing of Baghdād Khatun on the pretext of corresponding with Uzbek Khan and persuading him to come to Iran (Shabānkāra’ī, 296; Al-Ahrī, 159/ 59), but the real reason was Baghdād Khatun’s disapproval of Arpa Khan’s reign (Hāfez Abrū, 146). Furthermore, he forced Hajī Khatun to go to his brother ‘Alī Pādshāh, leader of Oyrat tribe in Diyarbakr (*Tārikh-i Elfi*, 4470). In fact, the first opposition to Arpa Khan had come from Abū Sa’īd’s pregnant wife Delshād Khatun, who, just after Arpa Khan’s accession to the throne, left his “urdu” and took refuge ‘Alī Pādshāh, uncle of Abū Sa’īd (Hāfez Abrū, 148). However, the sources avoid making any comments on her flight.

In spite of these oppositions, Arpa Khan defeated the Uzbek army, which was a good start to gaining approval of his ability and power. Furthermore, he immediately married Sati Beg in order to legitimize his power, gain sovereignty (*çon esteḳlāl yāfi*) and bind all the state affairs to himself (Shabānkāra’ī, 299; Hāfez Abrū, 149; Bruno 2017, 102-103). As this marriage was most probably undertaken by force, he was unable to reap the benefit of this marriage. In fact, only Ahrī claimed that Sati Beg was compelled (*der ḥabāle*) to marry Arpa Khan (Al-Ahrī, 159/60). Delshād Khatun taking refuge in Diyarbakr, Hajī Khatun’s being forced to leave the court and Baghdād Khatun’s execution made Ahrī’s claim possible. In reality, his enemies increased in number and made alliances among themselves in order to take military action against him because at the beginning Arpa Khan was not recognized by his subjects (*zendegānī ḥod*).⁷ Certainly, the unwillingness of the royal women to stand behind Arpa Khan helped in organizing and empowering opposing groups against Arpa Khan.

Maḥmūd Shāh Īnjū led the opposition movement against Arpa Khan by meeting with Uzbek Khan, sending a letter to Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī in Rūm (Anatolia), and making an alliance with ‘Alī Pādshāh. but Arpa Khan had Maḥmūd Shāh Īnjū killed. His son Mes’ūd Shāh went to Rum and entered the service of Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī. The first military action from Arpa Khan came from ‘Alī Pādshāh who was Abū Sa’īd’s cousin and the ruler of Diyarbakir, Mosul, Kordestān and Baghdād; furthermore, Delshād and Hajī Khatun took refuge with ‘Alī Pādshāh him. The other most powerful opponent of Arpa Khan was Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī. He was also the cousin of Abū Sa’īd and one of the most prestigious amīrs of his era. According to Shabānkāra’ī, “nothing would happen without his approval.” Shaikh ‘Alī who was the governor of Khurasan also took action against Arpa Khan (Shabānqāra’ī, 297-299).

Among these amīrs, ‘Alī Pādshāh, the Uyrat governor of Diyarbakr, became the first to take military action against Arpa Khan. According to Melville, Delshād Khatun’s flight to ‘Alī padshah, provoked the first internal attack on Arpa Khan’s position” (Melville, Chupanids) since all Arpa’s opponents were united under the leadership of ‘Alī Pādshāh, awarded Musa Han with the title of *Nāṣer al-Dīn* from the Hülegid line Padshah, and made Khwaje Zakiyā ‘Abd al-Rahman his vizier (Shabānqāra’ī, 302; *Tārikh-i Elfi*, 4470). Despite such enemies, Arpa Khan was certain of his superiority over his rivals, stating “... the dynasty and the royal army are all with me, why should I worry? (*che gham?*) (Shabānqāra’ī, 300). However, on the 10th Ramaẓān 736/1336, with a

powerful and well-organized army formed from soldiers from Arab and Iran, ‘Alī Pādshāh defeated and killed Arpa Khan.⁸

In addition to his victory over Arpa Khan, Abū Sa’īd’s wife Delshād Khatun gave birth to a daughter and in this way, ‘Alī Pādshāh became the protector of Abū Sa’īd’s family. In *Tārīkh-i Elḡī*, related to the birth of her daughter, it is stated that Delshād Khatun gave the control of their future to ‘Alī Pādshāh. [10]⁹ Some amīrs were disturbed by ‘Alī Pādshāh’s increasing power and regretted supporting him and began to look for a powerful leader to rise against ‘Alī Pādshāh: The former Diyarbakr ruler Ḥajī Ṭagāi persuaded Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī, the general governor of Anatolia, to go to Iran and crown Muḥammad Khan from the Hülegüid line sultan (*Tārīkh-i Elḡī*, 4471). Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani offered an alliance to ‘Alī Pādshāh against Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī but he refused this offer (*Tārīkh-i Elḡī*, 4472). Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī fought the Uyrat amīrs for a month defeating the Uyrats and ‘Alī and killed Musa Khan on June 20, 1338. The whole government and the amīrship of the country of Iran (Irāq-Ajam and Azarbāijān) came under Ḥasan Jalāyerī’s sovereignty (Shabānqāra’ī, 304-305. Ahrī, 162/64). He appointed Shams al-Dīn Zakāriyah vīzīr and married Abū Sa’īd’s wife Delshād Khatun.¹⁰ This time again, the Khorāsānian amīrs disrupted his power and united their forces against Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī. From the Cuchi, they crowned Toḡhā Tīmūr as sultan and marched to Sultānīyah. Meeting the troops of Shazadeh Sati Beg, his son Suyurgan, Emir Egrenj and his son Narīn Tagai from Iraq, they joined Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī in July 1337. They defeated Horasanian amīrs and recaptured Sultaniyah. (Elḡī, 4475; Loon 1954, 9); thus, Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī dominated Azarbaijan, Arran, and Iraq-Ajam and became the most powerful amīr of the Post-Ilkhānid lands.

At that time, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani and his brothers were in Rum in the fortress of Qara Ḥiṣār and Artanā, the vicegerent of Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī. Artanā was suspicious of Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani and wanted him to come to his camp. Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani started a rebellion (Ahrī, 65). Hereafter, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani and Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī, two most powerful families of the Ilkhāns, namely the Chupanids and the Jalāyerīds respectively, struggled for the crown of the Ilkhāns (Üçök 1965, 131; Wing 2016, 75). Patrick Wing describes the Chubani-Jalāyerī rivalry as follows:

Jalāyerī and Chupani rivalry was not a tribal conflict, a latent Jalayir-Sulduz feud in an eight/fourteenth century, but instead was an attempt by two Ilkhānid amīrs to reconstitute the Ilkhānid ulūs, albeit on a smaller scale, and reclaim their place within a political structure where practical affairs and symbolic legitimacy were firmly under the control. (Wing 2016, 86)

From then on, Sati Beg as a representative of the “legitimacy of the Ilkhānid house” became the central figure.

In 1338, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani played an incredible trick using his father’s memoirs that changed the course of events: His father Timurtash had governed Anatolia between 1318 and 1327, and during his rule, he solved many of the economic, political and social problems that had grown rapidly just before the Mongol invasion. After the Mongol invasion, these problems intensified (Sümer, 1969). The rule of Timurtash was accepted by people from all strata of society. On the strength of such great power, he revolted against Ilkhān Abū Sa’īd declaring himself to be the expected Mahdī. It was mainly the Turcoman and Mongolian people that believed in him and gave their support; however, he was not able to achieve his goals and took refuge in the Mamluk state where he was imprisoned and executed by Sultan Malīk Naṣīr. Ten years later, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani said that his father was not killed and he had returned. However, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani presented his fathers’ Turkoman *gulam* (slave) named Karachari as his father, even giving the concubines of his father and his mother to this false Timurtash. Timurtash’s followers believed this story and gathered around the false Timurtash (Dalkesen 2017, 301-324) and even Sati Beg and her son changed sides and joined Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani. On July 16, 1338, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani created a powerful army composed of Turco-Mongol nomadic people, and they met Alaṭagh in Azarbaijan and defeated Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī (Melville and Zaryāb, 2011). Later, it became apparent that he was not real Timurtash, but it was too late for Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī and the other amīrs. Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī never regained his old power.

In 739/1338, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani crowned Sati Beg Khan and appointed Rūkn-el-Dīn Sanjī and Giyāseddīn Muḥammad ‘Alī Shāh as vizier (*Tārīkh-i Elḫī*, 4481; Üçok 1965, 129). According to Melville, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani knew that the loyalty of the people living in lands was controlled by the Chupanids. As she was the sister of Abū Sa’īd, this act could be considered as a demonstration of loyalty to the Ilkhānid house (Melville, 2009; *Tārīkh-i Elḫī*, 4481).

In 739/July-August 1338, Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī tried to counter the actions of Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani by crowning Toḡha Timur Khan from Khorāsān. Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani this time played another trick: When he was informed about this invitation, he immediately offered Toḡha Timur the hand of Sati Beg and sought written assurances of his favor. Toḡha Timur accepted this offer because marrying Sati Beg would make his position long-lasting and more powerful, but when he sent the assurances to Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani, he immediately sent it to Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī and did not keep his promise. Toḡha Timur had to return to Khorāsān (Elḫī, 4482-3; Abru, 160; Melville and Zaryāb, 2011; Üçok 1963, 129-130) and Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī had to retreat and went South to conquer Iraq-Arab, Huzistān and Diyarbakr. Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī crowned Shāhzādeh Jehān Timur from the Geikhatu line and made Khwāje Shams al-Dī Zakariyā vizier (*Tārīkh-i Elḫī*, 4483).

However, nine months later towards the end of 739/circa May 1339, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani deposed her in favor of a distant kinsman, Solaymān Khan, and forced Sati Beg to marry him. Because Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani was suspicious of Sati Beg but he was too well aware of her value to discard her (Melville, 2011; Jackson, 2016; Z.V. Togan, 1970, 231-232, Üçok 1963, 130). Although she only reigned for nine months, coins continued to be struck in her name in Heṣn Keyfā (in modern Batman Province in southeastern Turkey) in 743/1342-3 and in Arzān (southwestern Armenia) as late as 745/1344-5.¹¹ He accompanied Solaymān and her son Suyurgan in 744/1343-4 to Diyarbakr (Ahrī, 171; Jackson, 2016). It seems that Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani gained the support of Sati Beg by crowning her (Üçok 1963, 130), and he did not want to lose this support by deposing her and led coins continued to be struck in her name. After that, she and her son took refuge with Amīr Artana in Anatolia, and sources do not mention her name. This leaves an important question concerning about the kind of understanding that made Sati Beg a key figure in the political developments of after Abū Sa’īd.

The power of Chinggisid Descent or the prestige of the Ilkhānid House

Whoever Sati Beg supported would gain military and political superiority over his rivals; for example, Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī and Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani. Those she did not support would lose their power such as Arpa Khan and Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī. Why was this support so important? Was it simply because she was from the Chinggisid Golden Lineage?¹² Many Chinggisid Khan from the Hülegüid and Toluid line were enthroned, but without support of Sati Beg, none could continue to reign. The public had long-lasting memories of the Ilkhānid and the legacy of the Ilkhān continued to be powerful. Being associated with the legacy of Ilkhān was very important in being able to exercise power in the Middle East at those times. The sources only mention the rival amīrs’ struggle for power at the top, but they do not refer to the people who constituted their military power. In this sense, the meaning of the terms in *Tārīkh-i Elḫī* for the opponents of Arpa Khan *merdom* (a man; a polite civilized man; civil, humane; capable of, worthy of)¹³ or *zendegānī* (the living)¹⁴ are more realistic. In this respect, more than leading amīrs, the loyalty of the public empowered Sati Beg.

In this sense, Sati Beg was not the first to possess this power. Timurtash, must have been well aware of the importance of influencing the public in the success of becoming a leader in the lands of Ilkhān. Similarly, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani used Sati Beg and his father Timurtash in his political struggle. After about ten years, thousands of Turco-Mongol warriors gathered around the “False Timurtash” and fought against the well-respected powerful Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī, who also had strong marital ties with the Ilkhān house. Patrick Wing, referring to the contemporary Arabian writers Makrīzī and Sāfādī, explains that being afraid of the memories of Timurtash, who claimed to be the expected Mahdī, Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī made an agreement with the Mamluk Sultan, Malīk Nasīr, who had Timurtash Noyan killed in 1327 (Wing 2016, 89). According to another example in

Aḥmadī's *Iskender-nāmeḥ*, when the army of Abū Sa'īd and that of Amīr Chupan engaged in combat, as the people heard Abū Sa'īd's name, they sided with his army.¹⁵

Sati Beg was favored by these Turco-Mongol elements (Bruno 2017, 244), and the amīrs had to cooperate with Sati Beg to achieve their political goals. Here, there is an important question: Who were these Turco-Mongol people that were determining the course of the political and military actions in the Middle East during the 14th century? These groups were mostly the Turco-Mongol pastoralists who provided the warriors and were only mentioned under the name of certain tribes or leaders. The Uyrats were very active in these political events as their traditional migration routes consisted of summer pastures in eastern Anatolia and winter pasture in the area around Mosul. This area was a buffer against the Mamluk Sultanate of Syria and Egypt. Furthermore, the region offered potential as a source of loyal military manpower (Sümer 1992, 33; Wing 2016, 78). The Uyrat tribe accepted the leadership of Shaikh Ḥasan, who had defeated their former leader 'Alī Pādshāh. He was from the Jalāyerī tribe that arrived in the Middle East along with Hülegü (Loon 1954, 6; Wing 2016, 67). Concerning the Chupanids, Ahrī reports that they left Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī and again joined Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani (Ahrī, 166/67). The Uighurs were seen in the battle against Arpa Khan and 'Alī Pādshāh. Shabānqāra'ī said that Amīr Egreñj joined this war with his Uighur army of 10, 000 on the side of 'Alī Pādshāh; (Shabānqāra'ī, 300). Was Shaikh Ḥasan Jalāyerī leader of the Jalāyerī tribe or Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani leader of the Sulduz tribe? Were the Oyrats, Jalāyerīds, Uighurs, Chupanids¹⁶ all homogeneous tribes? Or did they create a roof under which nomadic people gathered to live in groups and look after their interests?

Related to the social structure of Turco-Mongol tribal people, Isenbike Togan claims that they did not live only as a tribe (*kabile*, *boy*); it was also possible that they lived in small groups; i.e., *bölüks* (*buluo*). *Bölüks* formed in order to build a new order after a political disintegration or the political sanction of united society from the center (Togan 2009, 75-77). In general, they were not loyal to their leaders (begs);¹⁷ rather, when the leaders lost their power, tribal people left them and joined the powerful side. Sometimes, they were looking for their leaders; therefore, changing alliances was natural for them, and they were in fluid relations.

The mobility of steppe society gave individuals and groups freedom of residence, and hence, to some degree, freedom of political affiliation. Discontent with the current situation, individuals, families and clans could decamp for greener pastures and attach themselves to a new chief. This mobility prevented the evolution of strong territorial links and allowed for great fluidity in social organization. As a consequence, kinship and genealogical structure, however fictitious and politically motivated¹⁸ were given greater prominence as a vehicle for expressing political relationships. This also permitted great flexibility. Nomadic groups could easily regroup and reform (Golden 1992, 4-5).¹⁹

Since in the large Turco-Mongol population people could be a part of a tribe or smaller groups (in a clan or *bölük*) and were a main source of warriors, having good relations and possessing a consensus on common purpose²⁰ with them was of vital importance in the political goals of the leaders. For example, Shaikh Ḥasan Chupani regained support of the followers of his father Timurtash by creating a fake Timurtash about ten years later although Timurtash was neither Chinggisid nor their tribal leader. The states and empires established after the Mongols in the Middle East (Aqqyunlu, Qaraqyunlu, Ottoman and Safavids) were all non-Chinggisid. They were Turcomans, and most of them associated their lineage to the mythical Turkish ancestor of Oghuz Khan. In the post-Mongolian Middle East, certainly Sati Beg's noble Chinggisid descent was very effective, but being from the Ilkhānid house seems to have been far more effective in maintaining her high prestige among the Turco-Mongol tribal people. So, it follows that the House of Ilkhān was recognized and respected among these Turco-Mongolian and native people.

According to Zeki Velidi Togan, in the area of Anatolia and Azarbāijān, Abū Sa'īd was well-liked by the public. Togan based his opinion on the Anatolian poets Aḥmadī (1334-1335),²¹ in his divan *Iskandar-Nāmeḥ*, and Enverī, who lived at the end of the 14th and the beginning of 15th century. Togan claims that we should trust their reports about the Ilkhāns, because they did not write to appeal to someone and recorded only the public

memory (Z. V. Togan, 1970, 231). However, an examination of their work reveals that much of the information given by them about the Mongols and Ilkhāns is erroneous as if they wrote about what they heard or whatever they thought.²² For example, Aḥmadī supposed that Khodābandeh Muhammad Khan and Ūljāitū were different people. In reality, Khodābandeh Muḥammad was Uljaitu's Muslim name. According to Aḥmadī, after Khodābandeh Muḥammad reign of ten years, Ūljāitū succeeded him and furthermore Ūljāitū was a woman (7293-7294). This shows that he wrote without referring to written sources, and his writings were not based on fact but on hearsay and what the people around him believed. And his following verses about an ideal person also reflect the public opinion of his age about gender roles:

7296. Niçe 'avret var-durur erden ulu/Niçe er var ki 'avretten ālu /There are many women greater than men/There are many men inferior to women

7297. Ne-durur erlik sehā vū akl u dîn/Kimde kim var bu üçü erdür hemîn/Manliness is generosity, wisdom and religion/Whomever had these qualities are men (hero)

In general, Aḥmadī held no negative opinion about Chinggisids and their politics from Chinggis Khan to Abū Sa'īd. He spoke well of Abū Sa'īd as a good (7305-7308) and brave person.²³ He wrote about how the people favored Abū Sa'īd and left Amīr Chupan and sided with him during the battle between Abū Sa'īd Khan and Amīr Chupan. When they heard the name Abu Sa'īd, they immediately deserted Chupan.²⁴

Enverī, another Anatolian writer mentions Abū Sa'īd with greater homage. He wrote, "Yetmiş iki millet ider ānā du'ā"/Bī bedel evvel şaheb-e jūd ve 'itā/ Seventy-two nations pray for him/There is no person equal to him with regards to donation and generosity (Enverī, 14). Furthermore, Ibn-i Baṭṭūṭa's observation supports the two poets' views on Abū Sa'īd. He emphasizes his generosity to needy people with admiration. He also writes that Abū Sa'īd was victim of Chupan with the following words: "he is very young and king in name. Amīr Chupan dominated and conducted all state affairs" (Ibn-i Baṭṭūṭa 2004, 232). This shows that people had sympathy for Abū Sa'īd because although he was a good ruler, his hands were tied by the Chupanids and he could do nothing. During the period of turmoil, Sati Beg was only living representative of a well-liked dynasty, and this made her a prestigious and essential actor of the Middle East.

Conclusion

It seems that during the post-Ilkhānid Middle East, for the tribal groups, personal charisma and success were more important than their lineage, and once they entirely believed in this, their loyalty could be long lasting. So, we can claim that gaining the support of the populace was key to gaining superiority over rivals. This could be achieved only through winning their trust. The people followed the False Timurtash as the "real" Timurtash was a great statesman for them. Similarly, they preferred Sati Beg over the Chinggisid men since she was seen as a representative of the Ilkhānid house to which they were loyal. Sati Beg as a representative of the well-liked Ilkhānid House had great prestige among the people. So, it can be stated that in the Middle East, it was beyond a matter of being from the Chinggisid descent; it was the legacy of Ilkhān that was more important. It also reflects the fact that people gave more importance to personal merits and charisma than mere gender.

¹ These gender issues gained much greater importance among the Timurids (Manz 2003, 121-139).

² Sati Beg was married by her half-brother, the Ilkhān Abū Saʿīd Khan, in 719/1319 to the powerful Amīr Chupan as reward for his service in suppressing a rebellion, bore him a son Sorḡon (Surḡān), and was left a widow at her husband's execution in 727 /1327 (Peter Jackson, 2016).

³ See Balabanlılar, Lisa, *Imperial Identity in Mughal Empire: Memory and Dynastic Politics in Early Modern South and Central Asia*, I. B. Tauris, New York, 2012; Lal, Ruby, "Historicizing the Harem: The Challenge of a Princess's Memoir", *Feminist Studies*, c. 3/3 (Fall, 2004), s.590-616.

⁴ The Vizier was also the son of famous Ilkhānid vizier Rāshīd-al-Dīn, who was killed by Amīr Chupan.

⁵ Most probably, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad was afraid of power of Maḥmūd Shāh and other amīrs, and Arpa Khan was his plan. Otherwise, Abū Saʿīd might have shared his plan about his successor with his family and other persons around him.

⁶ *Chon ba'zī merdom u rā der ayām sābek bī i'ṭbār dīde būdend. (Tāriḥ-i Elḡī, 4469)*

⁷ *Ammā chon der ebtedā zendegānī hōd rā bī i'ṭbār dīde būd (Tāriḥ-i Elḡī, 4469).*

⁸ Amir Egrenj with an army of 10,000 composed of Uighurs and with an army of 10,000 Amīr Isan Kutlugh's son Amīr Maḥmūd joined 'Alī Pādshāh (Shabānkāra'ī, 300; (*Tāriḥ-i Elḡī*, 4471).

⁹ In *Tāriḥ-i Elḡī*, it was reported as follows: "wa az Delshād Khatun dukhteri be vocūd āmed, va amīr 'Alī Padshāh ra esteḡbāl dest be hem dād va umarā-yi dīger bī dakhil nemūd va serenjām umūr molk va māl ra az pīsh-i khod gereft" (*Tāriḥ-i Elḡī*, 4471).

¹⁰ This marriage was revenge for him because Abū Saʿīd Khan had forced his wife Baghdad Khatun to divorce and married her according to yasa. About this marriage Hafez Abru, "Having Delshād Khātūn cost the dreams of Baghdād Khātūn (*"Khayāl-i Baghdād Khātūn be vasl-i Delshād Khātūn bedel shode"*)." (Hāfez Abrū, 138); Similarly, in *Tāriḥ-i Elḡī* it was stated, "the World is a place of reward." (*Tāriḥ-i Elḡī*, 4472).

¹¹ On the coins is imprinted, al-Sulṭāna al-'ādila/Sāṭī Beg Khān, al-Sulṭāna al-a'zam/ Sāṭī Beg Khān (Diler 2006, 545-548).

¹² Sati Beg would become central to the political maneuvering of the amīr for the next few years. As an Ilkhānid princess, Sati Beg represented the charisma of the Chinggisids, and thus became an important figure as different parties attempted to claim that charisma for themselves. (Wing 2016, 75-76).

¹³ See, A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary, F. Steingass, Çağrı Yayınları, İstanbul, 2005 (First Editon 1892).

¹⁴ *Zendegān*, the living, A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary, F. Steingass.

¹⁵ 7338.Halk kim Çûpân katında var-idi /Kim ümîdi dâyimâ anlar deyî
7339.Bû Saîdüñ adını ki işitdiler/Orada Çûpânı koyup gitdiler

¹⁶ According to Veli Saltık, today a group who call themselves Shaikh Hasani's around Tunceli in Turkey are Mongols speaking Turkish, Kurdish or Zaza depending on their establishment area. He claimed that they are from Amīr Chupan's Sulduz tribe and in 1314, for the first time, they came with Amīr Chupan to Malatya. For more detailed information, see Saltık (2013, 290-295).

¹⁷ About the leadership, Ira Lapidus claimed that "Among Turkish Inner Asian peoples who accepted hierarchical rule and recognized dynastic rule, the most common form of leadership was the warrior chieftaincy supported by lineage of such warrior units and thereby dominated a subject population. Tribes were in effect the creatures of religious or political elites". (Lapidus 1990, 29).

¹⁸ For detailed analysis of tribal kinship understanding, see Barfield (1990, 153-182)

¹⁹ Power relations and struggles between these nomadic people and the leaders continued until the Ottoman conquest in the 16th century. Within this period, in these regions (roughly Azebaijān, Hamadān and Eastern Anatolia), the Aqquyunlu (1340-1514) and Karaqyunlu (1365-1469) Turcoman states as well as the Safavid state at the beginning of the 16th century was established by the Anatolian Turcomans.

²⁰ According to Aigle, the consensus of population is an important means of social control and mobilization of resources. In the Mongol empire, it became one of the principal instruments for extracting profit from the potential sources represented by the empire's subjects. (Aigle 2006-2007, 69)

²¹ For more detailed information about Ahmedī's life and work, see Ahmedī, *Iskender-nāme* (facsimile), ed. by İsmail Ünver (Ankara, 1983), 3-7.

²² İsmail Ünver claimed that generally Ahmaḡī did not interest details of the events but the general frame of them. *Iskender-nāme*, XIX. Mükremin Halil Yinanç also claimed that Enverī's information about the Mongols was completely wrong. *Düsturnamei Enveri*, p.7.

²³ 7335. Bû Saîd-ı şeh k'ulu sultân-ıdı /Adı dillerde Bahâdur Hân-ıdı

²⁴ 7336. Komadı oturmaga anı nâm u neng /Az kişi-y-le yürüdi Çûbâna teng

7337.Er gerek kim bezm günü bezm ide /Bzm konend ana göre rezm ide

7338.Halk kim Çûpân katında var-idi /Kim ümîdi dâyimâ anlar deyî

7339.Bû Saîdüñ adını ki işitdiler/Orada Çûpânı koyup gitdiler

Bibliography

- Aigle, Denis. "Iran under the Mongol Domination the Effectiveness and Failings of dual System," *Bulletin d'études Orientales, T-57 Supplément* (Institut Français du Proche-Orient, 2006-2007), 65-78.
- Al-Āharī, Abū Bakr al-Qutbī (fl. 1350s). *Ta'rīkh-i Shaikh Uwais (History of Shaikh Uwais). An Important Source for the History of Adharbajān in the Fourteenth Century*. Trans. J. B. van Loon (The Hague, 1954).
- Ahmedī, *Iskender-nāme* (facsimile) ed. İsmail Ünver (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1983).
- Barfield, Thomas J. "Tribe and State Relations," *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East* ed. Philip S. Khoury and Joseph Kostiner (Univ. of California Press, 1990), 153-182.
- Dalkesen, Nilgün. "İlhanlı Valisi Emir Timurtaş'ın isyanı," *Kebikeç*, no.43 (2017): 301-324.
- Dalkesen, Nilgün. "Gender Roles and Women's Status in Central Asia and Anatolia Between the Thirteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." Unpublished Ph.d. Thesis, Middle East Technical University (METU), Ankara, 2007.
- Diler, Ömer. *Ilkhanids, Coinage of the Persian Mongols* (İstanbul: Turkuaz Kitapçılık Yayıncılık, 2006).
- Golden, Peter. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples; Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992).
- Hāfez Abrū. *Zeyl-i Cāmi'u'l-tevārīh-i Reşīdī* ed. Hānbābā Beyānī (Tehrān: Şirket-i Tezamni 'Ali, 1317/1997).
- Jackson, Peter. "Sati Bik," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online 2016, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/sati-bik-princess> (accessed on 09 November 2016).
- Jürgen, Paul. "Mongol Aristocrats and Beyliks in Anatolia. A Study of Astarābādī's Bazm va Razm," *Eurasian Studies* 10, no.1-2 (2011):103-156.
- Ibn Battūta Tancī, Ebū Abdullah Muhammed, *İbn Battūta Seyahatnāmesi* I. Trans., A. Sait Aykut (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2004).
- Lapidus, Ira M. "Tribes and State Formation in Islamic History," *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East* ed. Philip S. Khoury and Joseph Kostiner (Univ. of California Press, 1990) 25-47.
- Manz, Beatrice Forbes, "Women in Timurid Dynastic Politics," *Women in Iran, From the Rise of Islam to 1800* ed. Guity Nashat and Lois Beck (Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois press, 2003), 121-139.
- Melville, Charles, "Anatolia under the Mongols," *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol I, Byzantium to Turkey 1071-1453* ed. Kate Fleet (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 51-101.
- Melville, Charles. *The Fall of Amir Chupan and the Decline of the Ilkhanate, 1327-37: A decade of Discord in Mongol Iran* (Bloomington, Indiana: Papers on Inner Asia, 1999).
- Melville, Charles and 'Abbās Zaryāb, "Chobanids" *Encyclopedia Iranica* (1991) 2011, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/chobanids-chupanids-pers>.
- Melville, Charles, "Abū Saī'd and the Revolt of the Amirs in 1319," *L'Iran Face À La Domination Mongole* ed. Denis Aigle (Téhéran: Institut Français de Recherche en Iran, 1997), 89-120.
- Nicola, Bruno. *Women in Mongol Iran; The Khatuns 1206-1335* (U.K.: University of Edinburgh press, 2017).
- Shabānkāre'ī, Muhammed b. 'Alī b. Muhammed, *Mecma'u'l-Ensāb*, ed Mīr Hāşim Muhaddis (Tehran: Emir Kebir, 1376/1997).
- Saltık, "Dede Şeyh Hasanlar ile Aşiret Şeyh Hasanlar," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* no. 66 (2013): 290-295.
- Spuler, Bertold. *İran Moğolları; Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür, İhanlılar Devri, 1220-1250*. Trans. Cemal Köprülü (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu: 1957).
- Tārīh-i Elfi; Tarih-i Hezar Sale-i İslam*, v.7 ed. Golamirza Tabatabayi Mecid (Tehrān: Şirket-i İntişarat-ı 'İlmi ve Ferhengi, 1382).
- Sümer, Faruk. *Karakoyunlular (Başlangıçtan Cihan Şah'a Kadar)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992).
- Sümer, Faruk. "Anadolu'da Moğollar," *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1969): 1-145.
- Togan, Ahmet Zeki Velîdî. *Umumi Türk Tarihine Giriş* (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1970).
- Togan, İsenbike. "Variation in the Perception of Jasagh," *History of Central Asia in Modern Medieval Studies. In Memoriam of Professor Roziya Mukminova* (Yangi Nashr, 2013): 67-101.

- Togan, İsenbike. "Boy Devlet İlişkileri ve "buluo" (bölük) Meselesi," *Doğu-Batı. Halil İnalcık Armağanı*. 2009, 43-86.
- Üçok, Bahriye. *İslām Devletlerinde Kadın Hükümdarlar*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1963).
- Yinanç, Mükremin Halil. *Düsturnamei Enverî* (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Encümeni Külliyyatı, İstanbul Evkaf Matbaası, 1929).
- Wing, Patrick. *The Jalayirids* (Edinburgh University Press, 2016).