The *Īnğū* in Iran under the Ilkhanate

Sanae TAKAGI

The Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan
(NIPPON ORIENTO GAKKAI)

The *Īngū* in Iran under the Ilkhanate

Sanae TAKAGI*

This paper attempts to analyze the nature, formation, and administration of the *īngū* in Iran under the Ilkhanate. The term *īngū*, derived from the Mongolian word *emčü*, refers to the private lands and subjects of Ilkhan, other Hülegüids, or other Chinggisids. During Abaqa Qan's reign, the influence of Jöči, Čaγatai, and Ögödei families in Iran gradually fell and the *īngū* of the Hülegüids began to increase. Although an Ilkhan's *īngū* formed during his reign usually passed to the next Ilkhan, the Ilkhan's sons had authority over the *īngū* that originated from before the Ilkhan's enthronement. In contrast to *īngū*, the term *dalāy* was applied to *dīwānī* property administered by the supreme *dīwān*.

Keywords: private property, *īnjū* (*emčü*), *khāṣṣa*, Ilkhanate, Iran

I. Introduction

The Ilkhanate was founded in Iran, roughly corresponding to the regions between the Amu river and the Euphrates, by a grandson of Činggis Qan (d. 1227 CE), Hülegü (d. 1265), as the result of his expedition and conquest from 1256 to 1260. This paper analyzes the *īngū* ~ *īṅṅū* in the Ilkhanid period (ca. 1256–after 1335).

The term *īngū*, which appears in Persian sources of this period, has been broadly interpreted as referring to the private lands and subjects of the Ilkhan and of his family.¹ Previous studies, as well as some contemporaneous Persian sources, also point out that the term *hāṣṣa*, a term with a long history of usage in Arabic and Persian by that time, gradually came to be used as a synonym of *īngū* in Ilkhanid Iran.²

In 1951, Masatsugu Murakami explained that the term *īngū* was derived from the Mongolian term *emčü* ~ *ömčü* (> Chin. *yan-chu* 奄出), which appears in the *Secret History of the Mongols*.³ He opposed the view that the term was derived from a similar Mongolian term *inje* (~ *inji* ~ *ingji*) “dowry; trousseau; serfs as part of the dowry.”⁴ According to Murakami, while the term

*Part-time Lecturer, Faculty of Letters, Arts and Sciences, Waseda University

¹ See, e.g., GT/Quatremère, 130–131; Minorsky 1943, 24–25; Barthold 1951, 258–260; Honda 1959, 44; Petrushevsky 1960, 240–245; TMEN II, Nr. 670; Petrushevsky 1968, 515; Togan, 1981, 238; Spuler 1985, 273–278; Lambton 1988, 118; Floor 2012, 107–108. Although some believe that *īngū* in Iran was “the appanages belonging to the relatives of the ruler [i.e., the Ilkhan]” (Schurmann 1956, 330), we find *īngū* belonging to the Ilkhan himself, as shown in this study.

² E.g., Floor 2012, 107; AM, 40. The general meaning of *hāṣṣa* is “private crown lands and other properties, real and moveable, owned or controlled directly by the ruler, as well as all functions, activities, and artifacts pertaining to the ruler, his court, and his family” (Floor 2012). On the *Aḥbār-i Muḡulān* (AM) cited here, see Takagi 2011.

³ SH/Kuribayashi, 176, 180, 296, 312, 416, 442, 462, 570; Murakami 1951, 704–706. This word is translated as *ti-ji* 梯己 “private savings; confidential; intimate” in the Chinese glossary of the *Secret History of the Mongols*, which was added on the right of each row of the text during the Ming period (Murakami 1951, 704, 706–708). Murakami also supposes that M. *emčü* ~ *ömčü* is derived from Old Turkic (Murakami 1951, 713–714). The Turkic term *inčü* is attested in a Manichaean Turkic text from Xinjiang and a Khotanese document from Dunhuang, both of which belong to the tenth century. See, e.g., Moriyasu 2004, 238.

⁴ For examples of such a view, see GT/Bloch, 215; Petrushevsky 1960, 240; TMEN II, Nr. 670; Buell 2003, 166, the second meaning of “INJE.” On the meaning of *inje*, see Lessing 1960, 411.

emčü was mostly used in the sense of “belonging to oneself” or “private, personal (properties or possessions)” in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, its Persian form *īngū* as used in Persian sources indicated crown lands and vassals residing in those lands.⁵ Minobu Honda basically agreed with Murakami’s view and stated that the term *īngū* as used in the Persian sources means both lands and their inhabitants, belonging to royal families (Honda 1959, 44). The interpretations of the term *īngū* presented by Murakami and Honda were shared, albeit in general terms, also by Gerhard Doerfer who defined the term *īngū* as signifying “crown land” and “immediate vassals (to the Ilkhanid house)” (TMEN II, Nr. 670). These fundamental understandings of the derivations and significations of the term *īngū* will serve as the starting point of discussions in this paper.

Because of limited information on *īngū* in Iran under the Ilkhanate, its actual characteristics and situations remain understood incompletely. Little is known, for example, about who could own *īngū*, of what the owners’ authority over *īngū* consisted, how it was formed, and how it was administered. Moreover, it is unclear whether the *īngū* of an Ilkhan normally passed to the next Ilkhan or to his descendants (Watabe 1997, 200).

The paper first examines how the term *īngū* is used in the Persian sources from the Ilkhanid period. This examination will clarify different aspects of *īngū* concept as shared in the milieu of Ilkhanid Iran where those sources were written. Then, the latter part of the paper will discuss about issues concerning formation, development, and administration of the Ilkhan’s *īngū*.

II. The *īngū* in Persian Sources of Ilkhanid Iran

The purpose of the chapter is to analyze how the term *īngū* is used in the Persian sources of Ilkhanid Iran, mainly chronicles, in order to clarify the common perception of *īngū* in those days.

First, what or who could be made *īngū*? The *īngū* in the Persian sources of this period consisted of subjects—troops, night guards (*kibtawlān*), artisans (*ūz*), bureaucrats, and other persons—and of real and movable properties, such as provinces (*wilāyāt*), districts (*bulūkāt*), cities, villages, lands, parcels of lands, and movable possessions (*amlāk wa ašqāṣ wa asbāb*).⁶

Second, who could own *īngū*? The *īngū* in Persian sources refers primarily to the property of Ilkhan and Hülegüid queens and princes (also princesses).⁷ In addition, the descendants of three sons of Činggis Qan, Jöči (d. ca. 1225), Čayatai (d. 1242), and Ögödei Qa’an (r. 1229–1241), also appear as owners of *īngū* properties (AM, 40; ĞT/Rawšan II, 1063; Takagi 2009, 145–146, 148–149). While the

⁵ Murakami 1951, 705; cf. Gong 2009. Murakami holds that the term *emčü* corresponds to Modern Mongolian *ömči* “inheritance; property” (see Lessing 1960, 635; SH/de Rachewiltz I, 506). However, “inheritance” is not necessarily the primary meaning of *emčü*, because *emčü* property consisted not only of the inheritance but also of things the owner personally acquired, as demonstrated in this study. Kazuhiko Shiraiwa, in a study published in 1988, surveyed how the term *īngū* was used in the *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ*. As for the derivation and significations of the term, Shiraiwa basically followed Murakami’s view in that study.

⁶ Troops: e.g., ĞT/Rawšan I, 616. Night guards: e.g., ĞT/Rawšan I, 616 (On P. *kibtawl* [< M. *kebe’ül*], which was a unit of *kesigten* [royal guards], see TMEN I, Nr. 322). Artisans: e.g., TW, 127; ĞT/Rawšan II, 1135; AM, 33a (On P. *ūz* [< T. *uz*], see TMEN II, Nr. 593; also in North China under the Mongol Empire, the Chinggisids and the commanders controlled their artisans [e.g., Matsuda 2002]). Bureaucrats: e.g., ĞT/Rawšan II, 1127, 1162. Provinces: e.g., ĞT/Rawšan I, 775; II, 1167. Districts: e.g., NQ I, 84 (on P. *bulūk* [< T. *bölük*], see TMEN II, Nr. 772). Cities: e.g., ĞT/Quatremère, 130, n. 112; Petrushevsky 1960, 241. Villages: e.g., ĞT/Rawšan I, 88; II, 1221. Lands, parcels of lands, and movable possessions: e.g., line 4 of a decree among the Ardabil documents (MMI, s.25883 (r.464); FABŞ, 118; PUM, Urkunde VII).

⁷ The examples of Ilkhan’s *īngū* will be discussed in detail later. For examples of *īngūs* of queens and princes (also princesses), see, e.g., ĞT/Rawšan II, 1445, 1509.

inğū belonging to the Chinggisids (including Hüleğüids) often appears in Persian sources, we scarcely find any other owners of *inğū* such as *amīrs* (M. *noyan*; commanders).⁸ Thus, the term *inğū* was used mostly and especially for the private property of Ilkhan, other Hüleğüids, and other Chinggisids.

Third, how did owners acquire their *inğū*? A person's *inğū* was generally formed from (α) things taken from his father and (β) what he personally acquired.

The *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ* contains references to *inğū* (α). It is reported in that source that Baraq (r. 1266–1271), a great-grandson of Čaγatai, said in the spring of 667 AH/1269 CE that sons of Hüleğü Qan, that is, his successor Abaγa (P. Abāqā, r. 1266–1281) and his brothers, received Iran as their father's *inğū* (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1068–1069). Likewise, Abaγa also reportedly stated in 668/1269–70, "This land [i.e., Iran] was inherited from my father, and this is our *inğū*. Today, we possess it by the sword" (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1071–1072). It seems unlikely that these reports of Baraq's and Abaγa's statements reflect authentic situation at that time, since, as we will see in the next section, Baraq held his own *inğū* properties in Iran then. However, both statements demonstrate a commonly accepted norm in those days: A person's children could inherit their parent's *inğū* and make it their own *inğū*.

Then, how did the owners personally acquire *inğū* (β)? We find cases in which captives were made *inğū*. For instance, according to the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ*, Sālī Noyan, the chief *amīr* of the *tamma* (garrison troops), when he conquered and plundered Kašmīr and Hindūstān, sent many captives from there to Hüleğü, and they lived in *inğū* villages in the Ilkhanate (ĠT/Rawšan I, 88). It seems that those inhabitants of the *inğū* villages were also *inğū*.

Moreover, it was not rare that people offered themselves, their families, or their private properties to the Ilkhan or other Hüleğüids as *inğū*, thereby making connections with them in the hope of their patronage.

For example, when Abaγa Qan fought the army of Baraq in Ḥurāsān and put it to flight in 1270, the ruler of the Šabānkāra district, Ġalāl al-Dīn Ṭayyib Šāh (r. 1265–1276), joined Abaγa's army. Afterwards, he stayed at the court of Abaγa for three years and offered his two sons as *inğū* of the sons of Arγun, who was Abaγa's son. When Arγun's son Ġazan (> P. Ġāzān, r. 1295–1304) ascended to the throne of Ilkhan, he appointed Ġiyās al-Dīn, one of the two sons of Ġalāl al-Dīn who were his *inğū*, over Šabānkāra.⁹ Also, according to the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ*, a unit of Arγun's *inğū* troops was formed during Abaγa's reign, when each *amīr* (*har amīr*) voluntarily offered their sons and brothers to Arγun as *inğū* (ĠT/Rawšan I, 616). Similarly, during Aḥmad Qan's reign (r. 1281–1284), Arγun received a message from Abaγa's former favorite retainer, Mağd al-Mulk Yazdī, who impeached Aḥmad's financial minister (*ṣāhib-dīwān*), Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad Ġuwaynī, on suspicion of poisoning Abaγa. In this message, Mağd al-Mulk reportedly stated, "I am your *inğū*": that is, he voluntarily sought to become Arγun's *inğū* (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1127). Furthermore, the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ* speaks of people in Iran giving their children to the Hüleğüid

⁸ For a rare example of *inğūs* of *amīrs*, see ĠT/Rawšan II, 1445.

⁹ MA, 177; Watabe 2007, 52. The Qa'an or the Ilkhan ordered the local rulers to offer their sons as hostages (Matsuda 1978; Matsuda 2002). This policy was similar to the practice of hostage (*nawā*) in Iran. When Hüleğü conquered Šabānkāra, he demanded a son of the then ruler as *nawā* (MA, 165–166). The Salghurid *atabegs* of Fārs, the Qutluğ-Khanid *sulṭāns* of Kirmān, and the Saljuq *sulṭāns* of Rūm let their sons or brothers stay at the court of the Qa'an or the Ilkhan (Takagi 2014a, 121, 123–126).

queens, princes (also princesses), and *amīrs* as *inǵū* or partner (*ūrtāqī*).¹⁰

We also find cases in which people offered their private properties for conversion into the *inǵū* of the Ilkhan and his family. For instance, Abiš Hātūn, the last Salghurid *atabeg* of Fārs and Hülegü's daughter-in-law, urged Aḥmad Qan to turn the former private lands of the *atabegs* into *inǵū*. With his permission, and after receiving the authority to gain a part of revenues from the *inǵū*, she converted many villages, cultivated lands, orchards, and parcels of land in Fārs into *inǵū* (TW, 211–212; Lambton 1988, 120; Watabe 1997, 192; Aigle 2005, 131). Likewise, around 679/1280–81, during Abaḡa's reign, Faḥr al-Dīn Ḥasan, a *sayyid* from Šīrāz, offered to convert the private lands his family had formerly owned in Šīrāz into the *inǵū* of Abaḡa's prince Arḡun. In this case, although Abaḡa permitted the conversion, Arḡun had to wait until his own enthronement before he could finally make the lands in question, along with many other real properties in Fārs, his *inǵū* because of the opposition first of local governors of Šīrāz and then of Abaḡa's successor, Aḥmad Qan (TW, 126, 230; FNN, 948–949).¹¹ However, once the conversion was realized, a son of Faḥr al-Dīn, Quṭb al-Dīn Aḥmad, was appointed to administer the *inǵū* and to collect revenue from it (TW, 231; Lambton 1988, 121; Watabe 1997, 203; Aigle 2005, 137–138). Further, this Quṭb al-Dīn was raised to the position of great secretary (P. *uluḡ bitikčī*, < T. *uluḡ bitigčī*) by Arḡun's son Ġazan Qan (TW, 419; TG, 605; Watabe 1997, 203), who had acquired the *inǵū* lands in question, along with the rest of the *inǵūs* of Fārs, during the reign of Baidu (Arḡun's cousin, r. 1295) (TW, 317–318; ĠT/Rawšan II, 1249).

These two cases, both pertaining to the formation of *inǵūs* in Fārs, indicate that landowners offered private lands of their family as *inǵū* lands in order to establish connections with the then Ilkhan or his family.¹² Quṭb al-Dīn's promotion to the position of the great secretary was no doubt a successful outcome of such a strategy. Also important is the fact that, in either case, it was a member of the family which had formerly owned the lands that was entrusted with the administration of or revenue collection from the same lands that were now turned into *inǵū*.

Finally, the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ* indicates that the Qa'an or the Ilkhan sometimes gave subjects and lands to someone of his family as *inǵū* of that person.¹³ For instance, Abaḡa Qan gave troops to his grandson Ġazan as *inǵū* (ĠT/Rawšan I, 616). It is also reported that a son of Činggis Qan, Ögödei Qa'an granted a province (*wilāyat*) in Transoxiana to his elder brother Čaḡatai as *inǵū* (ĠT/Rawšan I, 775).

The last question is the nature and the extent of influence and authority the owners wielded over their *inǵū*. The details of the above-mentioned episode of Čaḡatai's *inǵū* in the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḥ* gives an answer to this question. The account tells that Čaḡatai, at his discretion, bestowed

¹⁰ ĠT/Rawšan II, 1445; Petrushevsky 1960, 241. The mention of *amīrs* in this account suggests the possibility that they also had their own *inǵū* in the Ilkhanate, as mentioned earlier. On P. *ūrtāq* ~ *urtāq* (< T. *ortuq*, M. *ortuḡ*), see TMEN II, Nr. 446; Moriyasu 1997. This term was broadly used in the sense of commercial partner of the Mongol rulers in those days (Moriyasu 1997).

¹¹ Arḡun petitioned Aḥmad, the then Ilkhan, to transfer to him the *inǵū* in Šīrāz, citing the authorization he had got from Abaḡa to convert the related lands, along with the regions (*tūmānāt*) of 'Irāq-i 'Aḡam (see below for the status of 'Irāq-i 'Aḡam), into his personal *inǵū* (*inǵū-i ḥāṣṣ*) (TW, 126).

¹² To be exact, the related lands had first been placed under the control of the central *dīwān* before being converted into *inǵū*.

¹³ Lambton maintained that the term *inǵū* referred to the persons or lands the Qa'an gave to his relatives and others (Lambton 1988, 118; cf. Schurmann 1956, 330). However, as shown here, not all the *inǵū* was given by the Qa'an.

the province in question to a person whose name or post is not known to us. Maḥmūd Yalawači, who was responsible for the administration of the province, reported Čayatai's action to Ögödei. Ögödei reproached Čayatai and ordered him to explain it. In response, Čayatai wrote, "I acted misguidedly without knowing it. I have nothing to write to you. However, since you ordered me to write to you, I have written this much." Ögödei was pleased with Čayatai's reply, accepted his excuse, and then gave the province to him as his *inğū* (ĞT/Rawšan I, 775).

This episode shows that Čayatai had no authority to give, at his discretion, the provinces under the administration of Maḥmūd Yalawači to someone else (Kawamoto 2013, 179). It is unclear whether Čayatai was aware of this limitation on his authority or he did not know that the province was under the administration of Maḥmūd Yalawači. In any case, Ögödei made this province Čayatai's *inğū*, so that Čayatai's behavior was retroactively approved. In other words, Čayatai gained the right to own this land and to give it to someone else. Whether this episode is historically true or not, it shows shared understanding in Ilkhanid Iran, where the *Ğāmi' al-Tawārīḥ* was compiled, that the owner of an *inğū* could dispose of it at his discretion.

Hence, briefly stated, the term *inğū* as appearing in the Persian sources from the Ilkhanid period mainly denoted private subjects and lands. The owners of *inğū* as appearing in the Persian sources were the Ilkhan, other Hülegüids, other Chinggisids, and sometimes *amīrs*. The general understanding was that they possessed the authority to hold onto or dispose of *inğū* at their discretion. The sources presuppose the following as the ways in which a person's *inğū* could be formed: inheritance from his father, his personal acquisitions (e.g., captives or booty), offerings from *amīrs*, local rulers, or people, and gifts from the Qa'an or the Ilkhan.

III. The *İnğū* of the Ilkhan

In the previous chapter, we examined different aspects of *inğū* concept as appearing in the Persian sources from the Ilkhanid period. In this chapter, we will focus on Ilkhan's *inğū*. We will elucidate how Ilkhan's *inğū* in Iran came to be formed, how it was passed down through the generations, and how it was administered.

1. The formation of Ilkhan's *inğū* in Iran

How the Ilkhan's *inğū* in Iran was formed? As is well known, Batu Qan (d. 1256) and his son Berke Qan (r. 1257–1266) from the Jochids had great influence over parts of Iran during Hülegü's expedition. After Hülegü conquered Bağdād in 656/1258, Jochid princes, who had participated in the conquest, felt pride in their military exploits and complained that Hülegü ignored them. In those days, the local administrators and governors of Berke and his family, who had gained fertile districts in the provinces of Ḥurāsān, 'Irāq-i 'Ağam, Āzarbāyğān, Arrān, and Gurğistān, reportedly affirmed, "These districts are our *inğū*" (AM, 40; Takagi 2009, 145–146). This episode reveals that in these districts, which were practically subject to Berke and other Jochids, their officials claimed substantial property rights for the Jochids.

It is important to note that the provinces mentioned above were among the areas where Möngke Qa'an ordered a census in 1253 and allocated the lands and the inhabitants to the Chinggisids in 1256.¹⁴ In North China, Möngke took a census in 1252. He decreed that parts of persons controlled

independently by the Chinggisids to be placed under the control of the central government, thereby limiting those Chinggisids' authority over the people in question (Matsuda 1978; Matsuda 2002, 191–197; Matsuda 2013). This suggests that by conducting a similar census, Möngke tried to restrict the influence of related Chinggisids also in Iran. The above-mentioned claim by the administrators and governors affiliated with the Jochids therefore shows that the Jochids retained their authority over those provinces and owned them as *inǵū* or almost as *inǵū* even after Möngke's attempt at curtailing their influence over them.

It is also reported that in 665/1266–67, Baraq and Qaidu of Ögödeids, dispatching an envoy, required Abaḡa Qan to assess the revenue of their *inǵūs* in Iran, and Abaḡa acquiesced to their demands (ĞT/Rawšan II, 1063). Although the details of these *inǵūs* are unknown, at least some of Čaḡatai and Ögödei families held revenue-producing territories or subjects in Iran as their *inǵū*, even early in Abaḡa's reign (Takagi 2009, 148–149).

These references show that the *inǵū* of the families of Jöči, Čaḡatai, and Ögödei existed in Iran even after Möngke Qa'an's census. It appears, however, that through the time of political confusion following the sudden death of Möngke in 1259, Iran gradually came to be dominated by the Hülegüids as if it was their *inǵū*, although not all the Chinggisids agreed to their domination.¹⁵ The Jochid princes in Iran died inexplicably one after another, and the *amīrs* with troops dispatched by the Jochids fled Iran. Then, in 660/1261–62, a war between Hülegü and Berke broke out. Further, in 1270, the army of Baraq advanced into Hurāsān, and Abaḡa drove it away. Soon afterwards, Möngke's successor, Qubilai Qa'an approved Abaḡa's control of Iran (ĞT/Rawšan II, 1097). In this way, the influence of Jöči, Čaḡatai, and Ögödei families in Iran gradually fell. In contrast, remarkably, the *inǵū* of the Hülegüids began to increase by degrees.

In the late 1270s, Abaḡa turned parts of the provinces conquered by Hülegü into *inǵū*. For instance, in 676/1277–78, Šams al-Dīn Ğuwaynī, the financial minister of Abaḡa legally bought Arzanǵān (Erzincan) and its dependencies in Rūm and ordered that they be added to the *inǵū* and private lands (*ḥāṣṣa*) of the Ilkhan (*pādšāh*) (AA, 620; Cahen 1968, 332–333; Itani 1985, 49).

Another case in point is the forfeiture of private lands and movable property belonging to the *sultān* of the Qutluḡ-Khanids in Kirmān, Muḡaffar al-Dīn Ḥaǵǵāǵ. He had departed for Delhi in 669/1270–71 as the result of a dispute with Qutluḡ-Terken, a widow of his deceased father. Abaḡa ordered that Ḥaǵǵāǵ's properties be placed under the control of the ministry of private property (*dīwān-i ḥāṣṣ*) of the Ilkhan (*pādšāh*) (TŠ, 209). This ministry is also called the ministry of *inǵū* (*dīwān-i inǵū*) in a source from the Timurid period (ĞH III, 67). In 678/1279–80, Abaḡa entrusted a brother of Ḥaǵǵāǵ, Ğalāl al-Dīn Suyūrǵatmīš, with administration of this *inǵū*.¹⁶

Likewise, in the province of Lesser Lurs, after Abaḡa executed the *atabeg* Tāǵ al-Dīn Šāh in 677/1278–79, a son of the former *atabeg* Falak al-Dīn Ḥasan was appointed as the new *atabeg* and the governor of *dalāy* (*ḥākim-i dalā*) of the province.¹⁷ Simultaneously, his brother 'Izz al-Dīn

¹⁴ On the census and allotment, see TĞ/Qazwīnī II, 255–258; YS, Ch. 3, 49; Honda 1967, 105–107; Allsen 1987, 130–133; Allsen 2001, 177; Kawamoto 2013, 192–193.

¹⁵ On this process, see Takagi 2009.

¹⁶ TŠ, 209; SU, 50; ĞH III, 67. This entrustment was later temporarily withdrawn (SU, 51). In the Ilkhanid period, the private properties of dismissed or executed notables were confiscated and made the *inǵū* of the Ilkhan (Petrushevsky 1968, 516; Lambton 1988, 120; Watabe 1997, 192; Aigle 2005, 151; Floor 2012, 107).

¹⁷ The meanings of the term *dalāy* ~ *dalā* ~ *dala* will be discussed in the third section of this chapter.

Ḥusayn became his heir and the governor of *inğū* of the province (TG, 558; Petrushevsky 1960, 242). It is possible that Abaḡa gained new *inğū* properties there and that ‘Izz al-Dīn was appointed to administer them.

2. The inheritance of Ilkhan’s *inğū*

Who inherited the Ilkhan’s *inğūs*? As has been made clear above, the general understanding during the Ilkhanid period was that the *inğū* of a deceased person would be inherited by his sons. It is therefore interesting to observe that the general trend in the case of Ilkhan’s *inğū* was apparently that the next Ilkhan would succeed to the ownership of the former Ilkhan’s *inğū*.

The *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ* reports that all the troops dwelling in Iran and originated from Hülegü’s expeditionary army were attached to the personal *inğū* (*inğū-‘i ḥāṣṣ*) of Hülegü and other Ilkhans of his family (ĠT/Rawšan I, 615–616). It is assumed that it is the successive Ilkhans Abaḡa (Hülegü’s son), Aḥmad (Abaḡa’s brother), Arḡun (Abaḡa’s son and Aḥmad’s nephew), and Kiqatu (P. Kīḥātū or Gayḥātū, r. 1291–1295; Arḡun’s brother) that are meant here.¹⁸ Furthermore, we know that in the reign of Arḡun’s son Ḡazan, these troops belonged to him (ĠT/Rawšan I, 616). This instance appears to indicate that the *inğū* army of an Ilkhan was inherited by the next Ilkhan. However, because of related texts’ terseness, we cannot rule out the possibility that Hülegü’s *inğū* army was inherited by the Ilkhans from Abaḡa to Ḡazan not because they were Ilkhans, but because they were Hülegü’s descendants.

The case of the Qara’unas, a unit of ten thousand that formed a part of Hülegü’s expeditionary army and originally garrisoned the provinces between Ḥurāsān and Kašmīr, helps us clarify the rationales behind the inheritance of the *inğū* army. We now focus on this unit and examine whom this unit followed through the generations. A part of the Qara’unas became Abaḡa’s personal troops (*ḥāṣṣa*), when Abaḡa resided in Ḥurāsān during the reign of Hülegü. Probably during Abaḡa’s reign, Baḡdād was designated as their winter quarters (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1131; Shimo 1995, 80–86; Takagi 2014b, 28). Later, Aḥmad Qan appointed Ṭaḡačār as their commander (TW, 115). Subsequently, the Qara’unas defied Aḥmad, supported Abaḡa’s son Arḡun along with Abaḡa’s *amīrs* and personal guards, and finally became Arḡun’s personal *inğū* (*inğū-yi ḥāṣṣ*) (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1131, 1249; Takagi 2014b, 27). Still later, they followed another son of Abaḡa’s, Kiqatu Qan, who changed their commander at his discretion (TW, 260). When Baidu rebelled against Kiqatu and became the Ilkhan in 1295, Arḡun’s son Ḡazan demanded Baidu to transfer to him this *inğū* unit of his father Arḡun. Baidu rejected Ḡazan’s demand and asserted that Arḡun had treated him as a son and assigned Baḡdād and Ṭaḡačār to him. Baidu claimed that since Ṭaḡačār and Qara’unas followed him due to the said arrangement by none other than Arḡun, Ḡazan’s father, the unit should continue to follow him (TW, 318; ĠT/Rawšan II, 1249).

¹⁸ Baidu is not counted among the Ilkhans in the *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ* (the work does not have a separate section for his reign). On another note, it appears doubtful if all the members of Hülegü’s expeditionary army were Hülegü’s *inğū* as is claimed in the *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ*. The claim made in the *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ* is that Möngke Qa’an designated the expeditionary army as Hülegü’s *inğū* or as an army belonging to him (*az ān-i ū*). The truth, however, seems to be that most of the related troops gradually came to establish a close relationship with Hülegü, the successive Ilkhans, and their family. The related accounts in the *Ġāmi‘ al-Tawārīḥ* clearly aim to justify the Ilkhanid control of the army in Iran, which originally consisted of the soldiers drafted from the troops under the Qa’an and various other Chinggisids (Takagi 2014b).

Generally speaking, the Qara'unas were under the command of successive Ilkhans after Abaḡa, from Aḡmad to ʿazan. However, when we pay attention to the details, it becomes apparent that the Qara'unas also made moves that cannot be explained by the principle of Ilkhan-to-Ilkhan succession. First, the Qara'unas came to follow Abaḡa's son Arḡun even during Aḡmad's reign and finally became Arḡun's *inḡū*. This happened presumably because the troops had originally belonged to Abaḡa before Abaḡa's enthronement and they maintained a close connection with him. The assumption of the command of the Qara'unas by Kiqatu appears to be explainable by the same logic. Second, ʿazan found himself entitled to demand the Qara'unas from Baidu. This can also be explained by the fact that his father Arḡun had established relationships with the troops prior to his enthronement. In addition, the above statement of Baidu demonstrates that he also recognized that the sons or quasi-sons of Arḡun had the right to control the troops in question.

The inheritance of Ilkhan's *inḡū* troops by his son can also be confirmed in an account in the *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḡ* that is not related to the Qara'unas. The account in question reports that ʿazan inherited some of his personal *inḡū* troops (*inḡū'-i ḡāṣṣ*) from Arḡun, who had controlled them also as his *inḡū*. Interestingly, those troops again consisted of the units Arḡun had acquired before his enthronement during Abaḡa Qan's reign, that is, a unit that Abaḡa gave Arḡun as *inḡū* as well as another unit that was formed when *amīrs* voluntarily offered their sons and brothers to Arḡun as *inḡū* (ĠT/Rawšan I, 616). It is thus confirmed that it was the timing of the acquirement by the deceased Ilkhan that decided whether the *inḡū* troops of that Ilkhan would go to the next Ilkhan or to his sons.

Based on these examinations, we can now conclude that a new Ilkhan often acquired the former Ilkhan's *inḡū* troops along with other military forces. It has been made clear, at the same time, that sons of the former Ilkhan could claim the right to inherit the *inḡū* army their father had acquired before his enthronement, although such claims were not always accepted by the new Ilkhan.

This observation appears to be applicable to the inheritance of the *inḡū* properties that Abaḡa formed in Iran during his reign as well. The general rule, it appears, was that those properties be handed down by the successive Ilkhans. To begin with, it can safely be assumed that Abaḡa's successor Aḡmad gained those *inḡūs*, since it is highly unlikely that he approved of Arḡun's authority over them.¹⁹ After Aḡmad, most of the properties were probably inherited by Arḡun, and then by Kiqatu. It can also be assumed that when ʿazan became the Ilkhan, he acquired the properties in question.²⁰ After ʿazan, most of the *inḡūs* under him seem to have gone to his brother Öljeitü (r. 1304–1316) and then to Öljeitü's son Abū Sa'īd (r. 1316–1335), because the sons of ʿazan had died in early life and his daughter Öljei-Qutluḡ had married Abū Sa'īd (ĠT/Rawšan II,

¹⁹ The *inḡū* lands (*ḡālīṣāt-i inḡū*) that Arḡun demanded Aḡmad Qan to transfer to him (TW, 126) seem to have been the *inḡūs* formed during Abaḡa's reign. Aḡmad, who had stayed in Mongolia during Hülegü's expeditions and arrived in Iran as late as early in Abaḡa's reign, was reputedly envious of Abaḡa's throne from the beginning (AM, 46). After his enthronement, Aḡmad took hostile attitudes towards Arḡun, who also remained defiant towards him. Aḡmad tortured Arḡun's governor in Ray and disapproved of Arḡun's authority over the *inḡū* in Širāz (ĠT II, 1130; TW, 126). Furthermore, before the war with Arḡun in 683/1284, he captured several of Abaḡa's ex-attendants who supported Arḡun and plundered Arḡun's *inḡū* artisans of Ray (ĠT II, 1134, TW, 127).

²⁰ ʿazan's acquisition of the *inḡūs* in Fārs during Baidu's reign should be regarded as an exceptional case, as we will see shortly.

1215; MAŠ, 78a, 78b).

There is, at the same time, an interesting case which indicates that the properties acquired by an Ilkhan before his enthronement were supposed to go to his descendants. When Ğazan made the aforementioned demand on Baidu to hand over the Qara'unas, his demand also included the handover of the *inğūs* in Fārs and 'Irāq-i 'Ağam, which had formerly belonged to his father Arγun. What grabs our attention here is that while Baidu refused the handover of the Qara'unas, he consented to the handover of Fārs and most of 'Irāq-i 'Ağam where Arγun's *inğūs* existed (TW, 318–319; ĞT/Rawšan II, 1249; cf. TW, 317). As for the *inğūs* in Fārs, we already saw in the previous chapter that the conversion of related properties into Arγun's *inğū* had been approved by Abaγa during the latter's reign, although Arγun had to wait until his own enthronement to complete the conversion. In regard to Arγun's relation with 'Irāq-i 'Ağam, it is known that Abaγa, during his reign, gave to Arγun Malik Faḥr al-Dīn (*malik rā pidaram ba man dāda*) who seems to have been the governor of Ray at that time and that Arγun had his own *inğū* artisans in Ray during Aḥmad's reign.²¹ Thus, it is highly probable that Baidu had to accept Ğazan's demand pertaining to the *inğūs* in Fārs and 'Irāq-i 'Ağam because it was widely recognized that Arγun's links with those properties dated back to the period prior to his enthronement.

3. The administration of Ilkhan's *inğū*

Who administered the *inğū* of Ilkhan? In the narrative sources, we can find the names of six *amīrs* to whom Abaγa and the four Ilkhans descended from him delegated the administration of *inğūs* in provinces of Iran. Those six *amīrs* are: Altāğū Aqa from the Barγut tribe during Abaγa's reign (ĞT/Rawšan II, 1061; Shimo 1995, 240; PUM, 71); Buqa from the Ğalayir tribes and then Ṭağaçar from the Suqanut-Ba'arin tribe during Arγun's reign (ĞT/Rawšan II, 1167; TW, 231; Lambton 1987, 107; Shimo 1995, 245; PUM, 71; Aigle 2005, 137); Taiču during Kiqatu's reign;²² Satilmiš of Barγut (Altāğū Aqa's relative) during Ğazan's reign (MAŠ, 74a; Shimo 1995, 240–241), and Amīr Ḥusayn from the Ğalayir tribes during Öljeitü's reign (TW, 471; PUM, 71; Shimo 1995, 168).

Although it is naturally assumed that the *inğūs* mentioned in the narrative sources were the Ilkhan's, those sources unfortunately do not specify whose *inğūs* they are referring to. Ardabīl documents turn out to be helpful here. It is stated in one of them, that is, Amīr Ḥusayn's decree of 704/1305 (MMI, s.25883 (r.464); FABS, 118; PUM, Urkunde VII; ŞM, 175–176; Aubin 1975–76, 95–96), that Ḥusayn was entrusted with the inspection of *inğū* that consisted of lands, parcels of lands, and movable possessions (*amlāk wa ašqāš wa asbāb-i inğū*) by the edict of Öljeitü (PUM, 84). Evidently, lines 4–6 in this document are referring to Ḥusayn's position as the administrator of the *inğūs* in the provinces of Iran mentioned in the narrative sources. What we have to note here is the fact that the term *inğū* here is written outside the text of the document, on the extreme right margin of the paper, while a space is left blank within the line, where the word should be read, to show its location. This manner of writing was commonly used when the titles and names of the Ilkhans, their queens, princes (also princesses), and *amīrs* were mentioned or when the things

²¹ ĞT/Rawšan II, 1130, 1134; also see note 11 above.

²² TS, 180; Lambton 1987, 107; Lambton 1988, 121; PUM, 71. Amīr Ḥasan from the Ğalayir tribes may also have administered *inğū* during Kiqatu's reign (TW, 265; Shimo 1995, 166, 191). Taiču was dismissed in 692/1292–93, when *inğū* was integrated into *dalāy* as will be discussed below (TW, 268).

related to the Ilkhans were referred to in the Ilkhanid documents.²³ Thus, the document clearly shows that it was indeed Ilkhan's *inǧū* that Amīr Ḥusayn was entrusted by Öljeitü to administer.²⁴

Another document from Ardabīl, the Persian decree of Amīr Tāyfü issued in 700/1301, refers to the great *amīrs* (*umarā-yi kibār*) as the governors (*ḥukkām*) of *inǧū* (MMI, s.25859 (r.440); PUM, Urkunde IV). Also in this document, the text in line 8 is disposed in such a way that the term *inǧū* in line 9 would come to the head of the line. This suggests that the *inǧū* referred to in this document also belongs to the Ilkhan. These great *amīrs* may be identical with the *amīrs* in charge of the *inǧū* mentioned above, although it may also be possible that the term only denotes local officials who were entrusted with the administration of the *inǧūs* in and around Ardabīl.²⁵

Whether the *inǧūs* of Ilkhan were under the administration of the supreme *dīwān* or a special ministry remains incompletely understood (Hinz 1950, 137; Barthold 1951, 259; Petrushevsky 1960, 242; Petrushevsky 1968, 516; Togan 1981, 238; Lambton 1988, 121; PUM, 71). In some provinces and districts, we find specialized ministries under the name of *dīwān-i ḥāṣṣ* or *dīwān-i inǧū* to administer *inǧūs*. Besides the *dīwān-i ḥāṣṣ* in Kirmān, which administered the *inǧū* of Ilkhan there as mentioned earlier, we find in the sources references to the *dīwān-i inǧū* in Fārs (TW, 231; Petrushevsky 1960, 243), the *dīwān-i inǧū* in Rūm (TS, 228), and the *dīwān al-inǧū al-Ṣāhibī* in Yazd of 'Irāq-i 'Aḡam.²⁶ If the village confirmed as non-*inǧū* land by the supreme *dīwān* in the decree of 726/1326 (SAMI, s.250) is to be located in Fārs, the *dīwān-i inǧū* mentioned in the decree will probably denote the *dīwān-i inǧū* of Fārs.²⁷

An important question pertaining to the administration of the *inǧū* is relations between the *inǧū* and the *dalāy*. The term *dalāy* ~ *dalā* ~ *dala* appears as distinguished from the *inǧū* of Ilkhan in Persian chronicles. This term is derived from the Mongolian term *dalai*, "ocean; sea; great lake; much; many; in great number or quantity; universal; great" (TMEN I, Nr. 196; Lessing 1960, 224). According to an account pertaining to Möngke Qa'an's reign in the *Tārīḥ-i Waṣṣāf*, eight thousand of the inhabitants of Buḥārā were called the *dalāy-i buzurg* "the great *dalāy*," the subjects (*ḥāṣṣa*) belonging to the successive Qa'ans from the Chinggisids (TW, 51). Previous studies have made clear, however, that in the Ilkhanate the term came to denote the *dīwānī* property administered by the supreme *dīwān*: that is, the term signified state lands.²⁸

²³ Fragner 1999, 287; PUM, 21–22. For an actual example of that practice, see the appendix of Ṣayḥ al-Ḥukamā'ī's article in this volume.

²⁴ Gottfried Herrmann, who studied the same document, also expressed his opinion that Amīr Ḥusayn was administering Ilkhan's *inǧū* (PUM, 71). He does not clearly state his evidence, although it appears he is also based on the same observation as stated here.

²⁵ It may also be worth noting here that the terms *inǧū-i buzurg*, *inǧū*, and *inǧū-yi kabīr* are found in three of the Ardabīl documents published to the date (*Īnǧū-i buzurg*: Amīr Tāyfü's decree of 700/1301 [MMI, s.25859 (r.440); FABŞ, 113–114; PUM, Urkunde IV]. *Īnǧū*: Amīr Ḥusayn's decree of 704/1305 [MMI, s.25883 (r.464); FABŞ, 118; PUM, Urkunde VII; ŞM, 175–176; Aubin 1975–76, 95–96]. *Īnǧū-yi kabīr*: the decree of 725/1325 [MMI, s.25884 (r.465); FABŞ, 118; Herrmann and Doerfer 1975]). The adjective with the meaning "great" (e.g., P. *buzurg* or A. *kabīr*) was often used in Persian sources to describe something or someone related to or belonging to the Qa'an or the Qan from the Chinggisids, that is, mostly the Ilkhan in the case of Iran, out of respect for them (Shimo 1995, 455–475). Thus, it is highly probable that the *inǧūs* mentioned in those documents belonged to the reigning Ilkhans at their respective issue dates, that is, Gazan, Öljeitü, and Abū Sa'īd.

²⁶ This ministry administered the private properties formerly owned by *ṣāhib al-dīwān* Bahā' al-Dīn, a son of Şams al-Dīn Ğuwaynī (YY II, 496).

²⁷ See Ṣayḥ al-Ḥukamā'ī's article in this volume.

²⁸ Minorsky 1943, 25; Schurmann 1956, 330; Honda 1959, 44; TMEN I, Nr. 196; Togan 1981, 238; Floor 2012, 107. The term *dalāy* was sometimes used instead of the term *dīwānī* (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1481).

In Rūm during ʿAzan's reign, we find the ministry of *dalāy* (*dīwān-i dalāy*) and its two financial officers (*mustawfiyān*) alongside the *dīwān-i ĩngū* with its two financial officers (TS, 228). Similarly, two posts of governor of *dalāy* and governor of *ĩngū* existed in Lesser Lurs, as shown in the previous section.²⁹

Two categories of properties, however, could sometimes be administered together. The policy of integrating *ĩngū* into *dalāy* was temporarily adopted all over Iran in 692/1292–93, during Kīqatū's reign. Both in Rūm and in Fārs, for example, an official was appointed in that year to administer *dalāy* and *ĩngū* (TS, 180; TW, 268). We also find a unique reference to the ministry of *dalāy* and *ĩngū* (*dīwān-i dalāy wa ĩngū*) in Kirmān during Kīqatū's reign, probably as a result of the aforementioned policy (SU, 64). Likewise, the *Muršid fī al-Ḥisāb*, an accounting manual compiled in Persian during Kīqatū's reign, suggests that tax revenues from the *ĩngū* lands (*ziyā'-i ĩngūīya*) in the districts of 'Irāq-i 'Aḡam were administered together with the taxes collected and administered by the supreme *dīwān*, in those days (MH, 103a–106a; Watabe 2011, 27, n. 34).

Finally, it can be understood that most of *ĩngūs* were recorded in the ledgers of *ĩngū* (*dafātīr-i ĩngū*) by the end of 704/1305 at the latest, since Amīr Ḥusayn refers to some of those ledgers in his decree, dated Dū al-Ḥiḡḡa 704/1305.³⁰ According to the decree, these ledgers stated that two villages, a garden, and a cultivated plot were confirmed as the private property of Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥwāḡa Aqūtīn in the official surveys conducted during Arḡun's reign. Also, in Fārs during the reign of Arḡun, Amīr Ġūšī made a list (*fihristī*) of *ĩngū*, which consisted of villages, cultivated lands, water resources, mills, and irrigated and rain-fed lands (TW, 228; Lambton 1988, 121; Watabe 1997, 193; Aigle 2005, 141). Thus, at least the *ĩngūs* of several provinces seem to have been surveyed and registered during Arḡun's reign. It is likely that the ledgers of *ĩngū* were gradually compiled later, based on these lists of *ĩngūs* (TW, 56).

IV. Conclusion

The term *ĩngū* as appearing in the Persian sources from the Ilkhanid period mainly refers to the private lands and subjects of the Ilkhan, other Hūlegūids, or other Chinggisids. During Abaḡa Qan's reign, the families of Jōči, Čaḡatai, and Ögödei gradually reduced their influence on Iran. In contrast, in the late 1270s, Abaḡa Qan formed his own *ĩngūs* in the provinces. The *ĩngū* of an Ilkhan was inherited by the next Ilkhan, although the sons of the deceased Ilkhan could demand that part of their father's *ĩngū* that he had acquired before his enthronement. Further, at least Abaḡa and the four Ilkhans descended from him appointed specific *amīrs* to administer their *ĩngū*. Special ministries (or/and governors) of *ĩngū* existed in some provinces and districts. In contrast, *dalāy* or *dīwānī* properties were administered by the supreme *dīwān*.

Before closing the paper, it appears interesting to note that the general understanding attested in the Persian sources that a person's *ĩngū* would be inherited by his children can also be attested

²⁹ During the reign of Öljeitü, the then *atabeg* Badr al-Dīn Mas'ūd was appointed to the governorship of *dalāy* in Lesser Lurs, while his cousin 'Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad was appointed to the governorship of *ĩngū* there. Afterwards, the latter was entrusted with the administration of both *dalāy* and *ĩngū* (TG, 560).

³⁰ PUM, 85. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī also refers to the ledgers of *ĩngū* districts (*dafātīr-i bulūk-i ĩngū*) in NQ I, 84. Further, the ledgers (*dafātīr*) in line 5 of the decree SAMI, s.250 probably refer to the ledgers of *ĩngū* (see Šayḡ al-Ḥukamā't's article in this volume).

in the *Secret History of the Mongols*, an earlier source in which the term appears in its original form *emčü* (SH/Kuribayashi, 442–445; SH/de Rachewiltz, 153). It is therefore possible that we are witnessing in the Ilkhan-to-Ilkhan succession a new development in the history of *emčü*/*inǧū*. We need further studies, however, to ascertain whether this conjecture is correct and, more importantly, whether the Ilkhan-to-Ilkhan succession mirrored the elevation of the position of the Ilkhan vis-à-vis his close relatives.

Needless to say, further inquiries are necessary for us to fully understand the *inǧū* in Ilkhanid Iran. The tasks awaiting us include, in addition to the preparation of a list of *inǧū* areas throughout Iran, the elucidation of the difference between *inǧū* and share (A. *hişsa*; P. *baḥš*; M. *qubī*) of property, of the management of the revenues from *inǧū* with special reference to the Ilkhan's private treasury,³¹ of the purpose of integrating *inǧū* into *dalāy* during Kīqatū's reign (TW, 268) and probably also during Abū Sa'īd's reign (ŠN, 101), of the background for Ġazan's decision to convert parts of his *inǧū* properties into *waqf* (endowment) properties for his sons (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1590), and of the situation of *inǧū* after the decline of the Ilkhanate.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- AA = Ibn Bībī, *al-Awāmir al-'Alā'īya fī al-Umūr al-'Alā'īya*, ed. by, Ž. Muttahiddīn, Tihirān, 1390 AHS.
- Aigle, D. 2005: *Le Fārs sous la domination mongole: politique et fiscalité (XIII^e-XIV^e s.)*, Paris.
- Allsen, T. T. 1987: *Mongol Imperialism: The Policies of the Grand Qan Möngke in China, Russia and the Islamic Lands*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Allsen, T. T. 2001: "Sharing out the Empire: Apportioned Land under the Mongols," in A. M. Khazanov and A. Wink (eds.), *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, Richmond, 172–190.
- AM = Anon., *Aḥbār-i Muǧūlān dar Anbāna-yi Quṭb*, ed. by Ī. Afšār, Qum, 1389 AHS.
- Aubin, J. 1975–76: "La propriété foncière en Azerbaydjan sous les Ilkhans," *Le Monde iranien et l'Islam* 4, 79–132.
- Barthold, W. 1951: "Die persische Inschrift an der Mauer der Manūčehr-Moschee zu Ani," trans. by W. Hinz, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 101, 241–269.
- Buell, P. D. 2003: *Historical Dictionary of the Mongol World Empire*, Lanham, Maryland, and Oxford.
- Cahen, C. 1968: *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c. 1071–1330*, trans. by J. Jones-Williams, London.
- FABŞ = 'I. Şayḥ al-Ḥukamā'ī, *Fihrist-i Asnād-i Buq'a-yi Şayḥ Saḫī al-Dīn Ardabīlī*, Tihirān, 1387 AHS.
- Floor, W. 2012: "KĀŞŞA," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. 16, 106–112.
- FNN = Ḥasan Ḥusaynī Fasā'ī, *Fārs-nāma-yi Nāṣirī*, 2 vols., ed. by R. Fasā'ī, Tihirān, 1368 AHS.
- Fragner, B. G. 1999: "FARMĀN," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, vol. 9, 282–295.
- Gong, H. 2009: "Emčü and Its Related Issues in the Mongolian-Yuan Dynasty," *Xibei minzu yanjiu* 60, 42–62 (in Chinese with English abstract).
- ĠH = Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Ġuǧrāfiyā-yi Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū*, vol. 3, ed. by Ş. Saǧǧādī, Tihirān, 1378 AHS.
- ĠT/Blochét = Rašīd al-Dīn Faẓl Allāh Hamadānī, *Histoire des Mongols par Rashid el-din*, ed. by E. Blochet, Paris, 1911.
- ĠT/Quatremère = Rašīd al-Dīn Faẓl Allāh Hamadānī, *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, ed. by É. Quatremère, Paris, 1836, repr. in Amsterdam, 1968.
- ĠT/Rawšan = Rašīd al-Dīn Faẓl Allāh Hamadānī, *Ġāmi' al-Tawārīḫ*, ed. by M. Rawšan and M. Mūsawī, 4 vols., Tihirān, 1373 AHS.

³¹ For instance, early in Ġazan's reign, a certain amount from the annual revenue from *inǧū* properties was given as stipends (*idrār*), endowment (*waqf*), charity (*ṣadaqa*), and reward (*in'ām*) to the "amīrs, commoners and the noble, the rich and the poor, and soldiers" (*umarā wa waẓī' wa šarīf wa tawāngar wa darwīš wa laškārī*) who gathered at annual *qurirts* (assemblies) (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1385; Lambton 1988, 119). Afterwards, Ġazan apportioned revenue from parts of *inǧū* lands as *iqṭā'* (fief) among his troops and placed parts of his personal *inǧū* under administration of his queens (ĠT/Rawšan II, 1381, 1508; Lambton 1988, 123–124).

- Herrmann, G., and G. Doerfer 1975: "Ein persisch-mongolischer Erlaß aus dem Jahr 725/1325," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 125, 317–346.
- Hinz, W. 1950: "Das Rechnungswesen orientalischer Reichsfinanzämter im Mittelalter," *Zeitschrift der Geschichte und Kultur des Islamischen Orients* 29, 1–29 and 113–141.
- Honda, M. 1959: "On the *iqṭā'* (Military Fief) in Iran under the Mongol Domination," *The Annual Reports on Cultural Science* (Hokkaido University) 7, 35–54, repr. in Honda 1991, 233–260 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Honda, M. 1967: "Early Mongol Administration in Iran," *Hoppō bunka kenkyū* 2, 89–110, repr. in Honda 1991, 101–126 (in Japanese).
- Honda, M. 1991: *Historical Studies in the Mongol Period*, Tokyo (in Japanese).
- Itani, K. 1985: "The Ilkhanate and Rūm," *The World of Islam* 23–24, 34–54 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Kawamoto, M. 2013: *Mongol teikoku no guntai to sensō*, Tokyo.
- Lambton, A. K. S. 1987: "Mongol Fiscal Administration in Persia (Part II)," *Studia Islamica* 65, 97–123.
- Lambton, A. K. S. 1988: *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia*, New York.
- Lessing, F. D. 1960: *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, and London.
- MA = Muḥammad b. 'Alī Šabānkārā'ī, *Mağma' al-Ansāb*, ed. by M. Muḥaddis, Tihirān, 1363 AHS.
- MAŠ = Anon., *Mu'izz al-Ansāb fī Šağarat Salāṭīn Muğūl*, MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Ancien fonds, Persan 67.
- Matsuda, K. 1978: "The Ruling System of Mongol in North China," *Machikaneyama Ronsō* 11, 33–54 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Matsuda, K. 2002: "Mongol teikoku ni okeru kōshō no kakuho to kanri no shosō," in K. Matsuda (ed.), *Research on Political and Economic Systems under Mongol Rule, Report of the Scientific Research Project, Grant-in-Aid JSPS, Basic Research (B)*, Osaka, 171–199 (in Japanese).
- Matsuda, K. 2013: "Tōkaryō," in T. Okamoto (ed.), *Economic History of China*, Nagoya, 173–174 (in Japanese).
- MḤ = al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī, *Muršid fī al-Ḥisāb*, MS. Kitābhāna-yi Majlis-i Šūrā-yi Islāmī, no. 2154.
- Minorsky, V. 1943: "Introduction" in Anon., *Tadhkirat al-Mulūk: A Manual of Šafavid Administration (circa 1137/1925)*, trans. by V. Minorsky, Cambridge, 5–36.
- MMI = Mūza-yi Millī-yi Īrān (National Museum of Iran).
- Moriyasu, T. 1997: "Uigur Merchants on the Silk Road," in *Iwanami Kōza World History*, vol. 11, Tokyo, 93–119.
- Moriyasu, T. 2004: *Die Geschichte des uigurischen Manichäismus an der Seidenstraße*, trans. by Chr. Steineck, Wiesbaden.
- Murakami, M. 1951: "*Genchōhishi* ni arawareta Ōmō no imi ni tsuite," in *Wada Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Tōyōshi Ronsō*, Tokyo, 703–716.
- NQ = Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulūb*, ed. and trans. by G. Le Strange, 2 vols., Leiden and London, 1915.
- Petrushevsky, I. P. 1960: *Zemledelie i agrarnye otnošenija v Irane XIII-XIV vekov*, Moscow.
- Petrushevsky, I. P. 1968: "The Socio-Economic Condition of Iran under the II-Khāns," in J. A. Boyle (ed.), *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 5, Cambridge, 483–537.
- PUM = G. Herrmann, *Persische Urkunden der Mongolenzeit*, Wiesbaden, 2004.
- SAMI = Sāzmān-i Asnād wa Kitābhāna-yi Millī-yi Īrān (National Library and Archives of the Islamic Republic of Iran).
- Schurmann, H. F. 1956: "Mongolian Tributary Practices of the Thirteenth Century," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 19/3–4, 304–389.
- ŠM = Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn 'Abdī, *Šariḥ al-Milk*, ed. by M. Hidāyatī, Tihirān, 1390 AHS.
- SH/de Rachewiltz = Anon., *The Secret History of the Mongols*, 3 vols., trans. by I. de Rachewiltz, Leiden, 2006 and 2013.
- SH/Kuribayashi = H. Kuribayashi and Choijinjab, *Word- and Suffix-Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*, Sendai, 2001.
- Shimo, H. 1995: *The Political Structure of the Mongol Empire: The Core Tribes of the Ilkhanid*, Tokyo (in Japanese).
- Shiraiwa, K. 1988: "ĪNJŪ in the *Jāmi'* al-Tavārīkh of Rashīd al-Dīn," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 42/2–3, 371–376.
- ŠN = Mu'īn al-Dīn Aḥmad Šīrāzī, *Šīrāz-nāma*, ed. by I. W. Čawādī, Tihirān, 1350 AHS.
- Spuler, B. 1985: *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit 1220–1350*, Leiden.
- SU = Nāṣir al-Dīn Munšī Kirmānī, *Simṭ al-'Ulā lil-Ḥaẓrat al-'Ulyā*, ed. by 'A. Iqbāl, Tihirān, 1328 AHS.

- Takagi, S. 2009: "The Mongol Royal Family's Authority and Private Property in Iran under the Hülegü's Expedition," *Shiteki* 31, 133–156 (in Japanese).
- Takagi, S. 2011: "Akhhār-i Mughūlān as a Source of Early Ilkhanid History," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 82, 95–143 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Takagi, S. 2014a: "Two Dīwāns: Surveying the Reign of Īrān Zamīn in the Early Ilkhanids," *Tagen bunka* 3, 111–158 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Takagi, S. 2014b: "Composition and Attribution of Troops under Hülegü Khan's Command," *Inner Asian Studies* 29, 17–42 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- TG = Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Tārīḥ-i Guzīda*, ed. by 'A. Nawā'ī, Tihirān, 1339 AHS, repr. in 1362 AHS.
- TĠ/Qazwīnī = 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭā Malik Ġuwaynī, *Tārīḥ-i Ġahāngušāy*, 3 vols., ed. by M. Qazwīnī, Leiden, 1911.
- TMEN = G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, 4 vols., Wiesbaden, 1963–1975.
- Togan, Z. 1981: *Umumî Türk Tarihine Giriş*, 1946, 3rd ed., İstanbul.
- TS = Karīm al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad Āqsarā'ī, *Mūsâmeret ül-Ahbâr: mogollar zamanında Türkiye Selçukluları tarihi*, ed. by O. Turan, Ankara, 1944.
- TŠ = Anon., *Tārīḥ-i Šāhī*, ed. by M. Bāstānī Pārīzī, Tihirān, 2535 Š.
- TW = Šihāb al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh Šīrāzī, *Tağẓiyat al-Amṣār wa Tazẓiyat al-A'ṣār (Tārīḥ-i Waṣṣāf)*, ed. by M. M. Iṣfahānī, Bombay, 1853, repr. in Tihirān, 1338 AHS.
- Watabe, R. 1997: "The Local Administration of the Ilkhanid Dynasty: A Case of Fārs," *Annals of the Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 12, 185–216 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Watabe, R. 2007: "A Description of the History of Shabānkāras in the *Daftar-i Dilgushā*: A Study on Persian Verse Historiography (*tārīkh-i manẓūma*) as a Historical Material of the Mongol Period," *The Journal of Sophia Asian Studies* 25, 49–80 (in Japanese with English abstract).
- Watabe, R. 2011: "Murshid fī al-Ḥisāb: A Persian Accounting Manual in the Thirteenth Century Iran under Mongol Rule," in Y. Takamatsu (ed.), *The Pervasion of Persian Bookkeeping in the Islamic World*, Tokyo, 9–35 (in Japanese).
- YS = Song Lian, *Yuan-shi*, Beijing, 1976.
- YY = Ī. Afšār, *Yādgār-hā-yi Yazd*, vol. 2, Tihirān, 1374 AHS.

Acknowledgement

I am most grateful to the members of National Museum of Iran for kindly granting permission for our research. The research for this work was supported by grants-in-aid from the Toyota Foundation (Research Program D09-ID-043), the Mishima Kaiun Memorial Foundation in 2013, and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25770260.