

СТАТЬИ

УДК 94(515+517)

DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-1.6-17

**“KING” GODAN: STATUS OF THE RULING CHINGGISID
IN MONGOLIAN AND TIBETAN SOURCES*****R.Yu. Pochekaev**

*National Research University Higher School of Economics
St. Petersburg, Russian Federation
ropot@mail.ru*

Research objectives: Analyzing characteristics of the legal status of Prince Godan, son of Ögedei Khan, who was often mentioned in different imperial, Tibetan, and late medieval Mongolian sources; clarifying the reasons why he was given the title of khan in some sources, though he never possessed this title. The author attempts to define the status, level of power, and real position of Godan among the Chinggisids and in the political structure of the Mongol Empire.

Research materials: The basis for research comprises three groups of historical sources – Mongolian imperial historiography (works of Juwayni and Rashid al-Din, “Yuan shih”, etc.), Tibetan historical works (“The Blue Annals”, “Pagsam-jonsan”, “Debter-chjamtso”), and late medieval Mongolian chronicles created under the influence of Tibetan Buddhist historiography (“Golden Tale”, “Crystal Mirror”, “Yellow History”, “White History”, “Jewel beads”, etc.). The author also used the works of specialists on Mongolian and Tibetan historiography (such as Sh. Bira, R.E. Pubaev, Yu.N. Rerikh, A.D. Tsendina) as well as the works of researchers of political and religious history of the Mongol Empire (such as V.L. Uspenskiy, H. Franke, C.P. Atwood, etc.).

The novelty of the study: It offers a systematization of historical sources of different origins to clarify some aspects of the political biography of Prince Godan, identifying his legal status as a Chinggisid and the ruler of an ulus. At the same time, the author tries to not refute sources with contradicting statements but to clarify the reasons behind such contradictions and to find information which could clarify and complement the data of other sources.

Research results: The author tries to systematize different sources on the status of Prince Godan as one of the key political figures in the history of the Mongol Empire from the 1240s to the beginning of the 1250s and the ruler of a large ulus with substantial level of power, which could be compared with that of rulers of the Golden Horde, the Chaghadaid Ulus, etc. Also, the reasons behind the brief existence of Godan’s ulus and loss of his status already by the time of his direct descendants are analyzed.

Keywords: Mongol Empire, Tibet, prince Godan, religious policy of the Chinggisids, Mongolian historiography

For citation: Pochekaev R.Yu. “King” Godan: Status of the Ruling Chinggisid in Mongolian and Tibetan Sources. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2018. Vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 6–17. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-1.6-17

* The research for this article was funded by a grant from the National Research University Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, Grant № 18-IP-01.

Introduction

Among the numerous Chinggisids prince Godan¹ belong to persons who are widely presented in different sources on the history of the Mongol Empire, as well as its relations with China and Tibet. His name is mentioned more than once in Mongolian imperial historiography, Tibetan chronicles and in late medieval Mongolian historiography of the 17th–19th cc.

At the same time, Godan didn't attract an interest of researchers. Only several works have been devoted to his person and activity including several encyclopedic articles and works on Mongol-Tibetan relations in the 13th c. [e.g. 2, p. 321; 38]. The only article which, as we know, was devoted directly to Godan was written by A.D. Tsendina who concentrated on several questions of different evaluations of this prince in Persian and Chinese sources of the 13th–14th cc. and Mongolian chronicles of the 17th–19th cc. The conclusion of researcher was that "Godan was never a central figure in the Mongolian history of the 13th century", the ruler of "peripheral lands between China, Mongolia and Tibet", and his wars "were neither large-scale nor significant ones" [30, p. 245; see also: 19, p. 265].

This article is an attempt to clarify why such "insignificant" Chinggisid, nevertheless, was presented so often in sources of different origin since 13th to 19th cc. and why he was mentioned in some sources with the title of khan or king. To answer these questions we need to analyze different types of sources about Godan, systematize their information and understand what was his real role as representative of the ruling dynasty of the Mongol Empire and the ruler of own ulus. To our mind, such clarification could also add some valuable knowledge of the ruling system of the Mongol Empire in the mid-13th c.

Godan in the Mongolian imperial historiography

The first mention of Godan in the Mongol imperial historiography is dated by 1225 when he with his elder brother Guyuk took part in the Chinggis Khan's expedition against the Tangut Kingdom: both of them were sent back with gifts given by their uncle Tolui, the nominal owner of the conquered lands by authority of Chinggis Khan himself [27, p. 536–537]. As we can see, the prince who was born in 1206 or 1208, began to participate in military campaigns of the Mongol Empire in very young age.

But his real military career began in 1235, at once with his brother Guyuk, Batu, the ruler of the Golden Horde, and Möngke, the future khan of the Mongol Empire. But if they were together directed to the Western campaign, Godan received own army for the military operations against the Jin and Southern Sung empires.

Chinese dynastic histories "Yuan shih" and "Sin Yuan shih" contain a valuable information on the campaign of Godan in north-west China although their compilers were not interested in glorification of the descendant of Ögedei. It makes us to suppose that Godan, in fact, was not so "insignificant" person as well as his wars.

The military power of Godan was strengthened by his father who give him personal military troops as permanent subjects. So, a thousand of Jalayir warriors un-

¹ His name in different sources and, correspondingly, in research works is written in different forms: Kután, Kōdōn, Ko-duang, etc. In this article we use the form accepted by one of the most competent specialists in the Mongolian historiography, A.D. Tsendina. Nevertheless, his name as well as other names in citations will be used in form as they are cited.

der the command of Doladai ba'urchi was given by Ögedei Qa'an (r. 1229–1241) to Godan. And then, after the death of Tolui (1232), two thousand of his soldiers from the Suldus and Sunit tribes were given to Godan in spite of objection of Tolui's sons [27, p. 72, 612–613, 793].

In 1235, Godan took Gunchang and captivated its general Wang Shixian, spared his life and take him at his service. Several months ago he entered the Myangzhou and killed its governor Gaotzia [16, p. 256; 18, p. 170]. According to “Sin Yuan shih”, Ögedei at the end of 1235 ordered Godan to proclaim edict on the surrender of more than 20 district cities of Jin [22, p. 113]. Next year Godan with Wang Shixian conquered several districts in Shu province, executed commander Tsao Yu-weng² and took Chengdu in the Sichuan province. In 1236–1239 prince fought against Sung and conquered Sichuan completely [16, p. 260–261, 271; 18, p. 173, 175].

During his campaign Godan more than once took part in *quriltai* where his father Ögedei distributed new territories among the Chinggisids. Prince also was granted with new possessions along with such significant relatives (*chu-wangs*) as Chaghatai, Khojin-beqi and Alakhai (daughters of Chinggis Khan), etc. [16, p. 260; 18, p. 172–173].

In 1239, Godan returned to the territories conquered earlier and received from his father Ögedei Khan the ulus on the territory of former Tangqut Kingdom (provinces Gansu and Liangzhou). By his own will he appointed Wag Shixian a commander-in-chief over 20 districts of Jinzhou and after his death in 1243 handed his position to his son Wang Dacheng [16, p. 296].

After the death of Ögedei (1241) most part of his high officials were subjected to repressions and some of them had to run away. Chinqai, the “chief vizier” of Ögedei, and emir Mahmud Yalavach fled to Godan who granted them asylum and rejected all requests of his mother Töregene to give them up [1, p. 241–242; 27, p. 800–801]. To our mind it was a demonstration of his independent policy and at the same time of his discontent with the preference which Töregene gave to his elder brother Guyuk.

Sudden death of Töregene (1246) resulted in repressions against her favorites, and Godan played an important part in these developments. As he was ill, he spread a rumor that the cause of his illness was a witchery of Fatima, a chamberlain of Töregene. Soon after that his brother Guyuk received information on the death of Godan. Fatima was prosecuted, tortured and put to death with her retainers [1, p. 245; 27, p. 802–803]. Godan himself after the execution of Fatima enigmatically “revived” and soon arrived to Mongolia with his sons to take part in the *quriltai* where elections of a new khan should take place [1, p. 249].

Godan proposed own candidature for the throne “because his grandfather had once made a reference to him” [1, p. 251]. We don't know the details of this “reference” except the above-mentioned fact of granting Guyuk and Godan in 1225 during the Tangqut campaign. But several scholars suppose that Chinggis Khan

² This episode was fixed even in the Manchu history of the Yuan dynasty “History of the Celestial Empire” written in the 17th c. [20, p. 66].

designated Godan a heir of Ögedei at the throne of the Mongol Empire (as appointed Ögedei himself as his own successor) [4, p. 553]³.

However, Godan's candidature was rejected by the participants as he was "somewhat sickly" and chose was fixed upon his elder brother Guyuk [1, 251]⁴. Nature of Godan's illness is not determined in the Mongol imperial historiography, and we could find details in other sources.

Since Guyuk ascending the throne and until 1251 Godan was not mentioned in the Mongol imperial sources, there is a reason to suppose that he might die already in 1247 [2, p. 321]. But then his name is mentioned again in the beginning of the 1250s.

Godan didn't attend at the *quriltai* where Möngke, the elder son of Tolui, was elected a khan: according to Rashid al-Din, he was presented by his son Mönggätü [27, p. 828]. After his ascension, Möngke Khan dispersed all troops of Ögedei's descendants "except those who belonged to Kötän", as "he had always been friendly" to him. The new monarch also confirm the status of Godan as the ruler of Tangqut *yurt* [27, p. 608, 623].

After 1251, Godan is never mentioned in the Mongol imperial historical sources as living person.

Godan in Tibetan sources

Tibetan sources mention Godan at the first time in 1239 or 1240 when he sent a detachment under command of Dorta Darkhan (*tarqan*) into Central Tibet [7, p. 312; 29, p. 76]. A.D. Tsendina considers this expedition as an attempt of Godan to find competent and famous leader who could negotiate with him and inform about Buddhism [31, p. 123; 33, p. 129]. But this position was criticized by another researchers [e.g. 38, p. 112]. In fact, the actions of Dorta were more warlike than diplomatic, and his cruelty became a reason of giving him in Tibetan historiography the nickname "Black Dorta" [24, p. 167, n. 304].

However, powerful representatives of Tibetan Buddhist clergy preferred to surrender and begin negotiations with Dorta and informed him that the most famous leader of Tibet was Kunga Gyaltsen, better known as Sakya Pandita, the head of Sakya religious school [23, p. 181; 26, p. 143; 29, p. 76]. In 1244, Godan invited Sakya Pandita to his court, and this invitation later served a base for Tibetan legend on the prophesy allegedly made by Pandita's uncle and preceptor in 1216 that he would be invited by the Mongol leader and it would contribute to the flourishing of Buddhism [9, p. 214, n. 11; 33, p. 167–168].

The meeting of Godan and Sakya Pandita took place only in 1247 because of Godan's absence before in Liangzhou (he was at the *quriltai* of 1246). But it resulted in issuing an edict of prince which in fact was a treaty between the Mongol ruler and Tibetan hierarch. Godan recognized Sakya Pandita a ruler of Tibet and obliged to protect Buddhism and its clergy in his lands. The Tibetan high priest in

³ Friar Giovanni di Plano Carpini mentioned Godan ("Cocten") among the descendants of Ögedei with Guyuk and Shiremun [13, p. 64], who also were the pretenders for the throne. It means that this prince was a noticeable figure in the Mongol Empire in the middle of the 1240s and the real claimant for the khan's title.

⁴ In several copies of "Jami'u't-tawarikh" the reason of election of Guyuk was not the illness but the death of Godan: "Since Kötän, whom Genghis Khan appointed to be emperor after the Qa'an, has passed away..." [27, p. 805].

his turn sent letters to Tibetan rulers and monasteries with order to submit to the Mongols, pay them tribute⁵ and obey to *darugachis* with golden *paitzas* [2, p. 321; 5, p. 83; 24, p. 79; 26, p. 145]. It caused specific form of cooperation between the Mongol ruler and Tibetan hierarch named “patron – priest” which later became characteristic of relations of Tibetan leaders with the Mongol and Chinese emperors [23, p. 182; 29, p. 77; 31, p. 124].

It's interesting that Godan is mentioned in Tibetan chronicles with the title of king [e.g. 24, p. 78, 80], although, as well known, he never was a khan.

Early Tibetan sources didn't mention Godan's policy on propagation of Buddhism in Mongolia and told about his permission to build temples and preaching in his lands [26, p. 145]. According to the later Tibetan chronicle “Debter-jamtso”, Godan protected the secular rulers of Tibet as well and even gave a princely status to the descendants of former Tibetan kings; thus, they became a part of the Mongolian elite in the ulus of Godan. To establish more close ties with new elite, Godan even intended to marry his daughter to nephew of Sakya Pandita [8, p. 53; 23, p. 182].

But in historical chronicles of the 17th–18th c. the idea of connection of political and religious history was widespread, and Godan (as well as Chinggis Khan, Ögedei, Qubilai, etc.) was presented as adherent of Buddhism who was one of the first rulers who converted to and propagated the “Yellow religion” in Mongolia [5, p. 247; 8, p. 14; 25, p. 238; 37, p. 56]. This trend substantially influenced the late medieval Mongolian historiography and absolutely transformed a portrait of Godan.

Godan in the late medieval Mongolian (Buddhist) historiography

The new stage in the development of Mongolian historiography was connected with the conversion of Mongol ruling elite into Buddhism and accepting of Tibetan examples of historical works both in form and content. As a result, Mongolian historians of the 17th–19th cc. used Tibetan chronicles as an information on the history of Mongolia and, following their conception, they wrote about spreading of Buddhism in Mongolia since the first half of the 13th c. In such a way, the real policy of Godan was replaced by the Buddhist legend.

According to the new version of Tibetan policy of this prince, he had a specific sick named in different sources the “dragon illness”, “alagh-marya”, “illness of earth and water” and even leprosy [17, p. 87; 32, p. 149; 34, p. 82, 115, n. 85]. Sakya Pandita healed him and also demonstrated different “miracles”, and Godan accepted initiation to Buddhist divinity and became an adherent and propagandist of this religion and even was recognized a reincarnation of bodhisatva (Buddhist celestial) [5, p. 178–179; 17, p. 87; 30, p. 245–246; 32, p. 32–33, 60; 33, p. 118–119, 124].

Such version looks explicable as Mongolian historians tried to “age” the Buddhist traditions in Mongolia. But they, like their Tibetan colleagues, began to mention Godan with the title of khan. As a result he was presented in Mongolian Buddhist chronicles as successor of his father Ögedei or his brother Guyuk. In several

⁵ The tribute includes gold dust, silver, ivory (bought from India and Nepal), pearls, carmine, ochre, furs and fells, wool.

sources he is presented even as a father of Guyuk! And the duration of his reign varies from nine to forty years [3, p. 125; 14, p. 155; 33, p. 107]!

Several historians who didn't follow the Tibetan tradition completely demonstrated their doubts in such status of Godan. For example, Rashi-Puntsug, the author of "Bolor erikhe" ("Cristal Beads", 1775) noted that they borrowed information on the reign of Godan "from small works" and "these words are contradictory" [33, p. 191–192]. Some other historians tried to find the explanation for this contradiction and ascribe the contacts with Sakya Pandita and propagation of Buddhism not to Godan, but to his father Ögedei who, in fact, was a khan [5, p. 283; 10, p. 41; 33, p. 119].

One more stereotype about Godan in the late medieval Mongolian historiography is the absence of descendants: this statement is presented in some chronicles [14, p. 153; 33, p. 167; cfr. 21, p. 386, n. 56]. As we will see bellow, Godan had numerous sons, grandsons, etc. To our mind this statement means that his descendants never were khans.

So, we can say that in late medieval Mongolian historiography Godan appeared not rare but, unlike imperial historiography, more often as an adherent of Buddhism than the powerful Chinggisid ruler.

The status of Godan as a Chinggisid prince and ulus ruler

The information on Godan in different sources is various and sometimes contradictory. But we suppose that our task is not to "eliminate" the data which seems to be doubtful, but to try to combine it and clarify the real status of Godan.

The analysis of Mongolian imperial historiography convinced us that Godan, in fact, was not an "insignificant" Chinggisid. On the contrary, he seems to be a potential successor of his father Ögedei Khan. This opinion is proved by some facts.

1. Personal command of military troops in the war against Chinese empires. As we remember, his brothers and cousins sent to the West had a joint command.

2. Creation for Godan of own ulus not far from the "home *yurt*" (Mongolia) and, at the same time, near the family domain of Ögedei. It shows us that khan didn't want to send his second son far from himself as it happened with his first-born Guyuk, sixth son Qadan, etc.

3. Godan had right to appoint military commanders and administrators on the conquered land (the case of Wang Shixian and his son), grant titles to the ruling elite of vassal states (Tibetan princes); such competence was an element of legal status of powerful rulers of the largest uluses of the Mongol Empire – the Golden Horde, Chaghadaid Ulus, Ilkhanate, and never belonged to junior Chinggisids in these uluses.

4. Godan had right for independent foreign policy and signing treaties' edicts. It also shows his specific status in the Mongol Empire. We should remember that Godan was titled a khan in Tibetan chronicles: it means that for Tibetan authorities he was the highest authority to deal on questions of war and peace, vassalage and tribute etc.⁶ Of course, in their eyes he was a real monarch with full range of power.

⁶ The same status, for example, had Batu, the ruler of the Golden Horde, in the eyes of Russian princes as they interacted with him: he is titled "king" in Russian medieval historiography.

5. P. Ratchnevsky notes that Godan in his edicts⁷ appealed to the will of Heaven and sees in this formula the evidence of his real independence [28, p. 150].

To our mind, Ögedei tried to make Godan the most appropriate candidature for the throne of the Mongol Empire after himself, show to the Chinggisids and imperial elite his abilities of military leader, ruler and diplomat. And Godan's claim for the throne in 1246 was appropriate. But as we saw, the participants of *quriltai* preferred him his elder brother Guyuk.

The pretext for such decision was an illness of Godan. In this aspect we could trust the information of late medieval Mongolian chronicles that prince had a skin disease⁸. Many of the Chinggisids had different problems with their health (rheumatism, podagra, etc.), but such illnesses were "implicit" and were not an obstacle to claim for the throne. Skin disease was more obvious and meant the corporal defect incompatible with accession for the throne. But we suppose that even such illness could be even the pretext: the Mongol ruling elite didn't want to give a power over empire to the effective ruler and commander and preferred to enthrone a less gifted Guyuk.

After the return in his ulus, Godan concentrated on the relations with own subjects and new Tibetan vassals using his status of real independent ruler. The absence of his contacts with other members of Ögedei's family could be explained by his offence for their unwillingness to support his claim for the throne. At the same time, progressive illness, probably, didn't allow him to take an active part in elections of khan in 1251, and his support of Möngke had a goal to guarantee a saving of his status in Tangqut and Tibet for his descendants – that was a reason that his sons attended a *quriltai* and voted for Möngke.

The conspiracy of the Ögedeids against the new khan in the same 1251 caused the distrust of Möngke and his brother Qubilai (who had the ulus in China) toward powerful and really independent Godan. That's why already in 1251, probably not long before the death of Godan, Möngke ordered his commander Khoridai to intrude into Tibet to establish the immediate control of khan over this vassal state. In the same year, Sakya Pandita died, and when Godan intended to establish contacts with his nephew and successor, Pagpa Lama, Qubilai gave order to send new Tibetan hierarch to him [23, p. 182; 26, p. 145].

Obviously, the existing of independent ulus under the power of strong and effective ruler was not in the interests of the Toluid family, and they made an attempt to restrict the power of Godan. At the same time, Möngke and Qubilai knew about his illness and didn't want to demonstrate the evident intention to destroy his ulus until his death which took place in 1251 or 1252.

Heritage and heirs

Different sources give us different information on the descendants of Godan. According to Rashid al-Din, he had three sons: Mönggätü, Küyän and Jibik Temur [27, p. 623]. In accordance with the "Yuan shih", Godan had five sons: Märgidäi, Mönggätü, Jibik-Temur, Täbilä, Kurlük, and several of them also had sons [15, p. 74]. In the "Mu'izz al-ansab", the Central Asian Persian-language genealogical

⁷ Right to issue edicts is already an evidence of his substantial legal status.

⁸ A.D. Tsendina soundly notes that the illness of Godan is real, but not a metaphoric "sore of unbelief" [33, p. 125].

work of the 15th c. based on earlier imperial sources, five sons are mentioned as well: Mönggätü, Ching-Temur, Irijan, Yisu-Tukan and Küyän [36, p. 58]⁹.

Sons of Godan took part in the *quriltai* of 1251 where they supported a candidature of Möngke [1, p. 568]. Because of that they were granted by Möngke with *ordu* as well as his other supporters [27, p. 842]. It means that they had an opportunity to succeed to their father. But the policy of Möngke aimed at strengthening the control over Godan's uluses, began in the last years of the life of the latter, continued after his death towards to his sons. Märgidäi, the elder son of Godan saved a right to issue edicts, but, unlike father, had to appeal to will of khan [28, p. 151]: it reflected his subordinate position and dependent rule.

Another son of Godan, Jibik-Temur, was an addressee of Pagpa Lama's “Jewel beads” (also known as “Admonition for the prince Jibik-Temur”, 1266) where the Tibetan hierarch explained the advantage of using “two wealths” or combination of temporal power of the Mongol ruler and spiritual power of the Tibetan high priest [5, p. 87–88]. It allows us to suppose that this son of Godan continued to contact with Tibetan Buddhist church established by his father. But we also know that already in 1253 Qubilai established immediate relations with Pagpa Lama and the next year issued so called “Tibetan edict” prescribing the control of Tibet directly by Mongol administration in China (submitted to Qubilai himself). The “Pearl Edict” of 1264 giving immunities and privileges to Tibetan church completely tied Tibet with new Mongol khan, leaving Godan's descendants aside [8, p. 14; 35, p. 168–169; see also: 12, p. 64–69].

Despite the fact of permanent support of the Toluid family by Godan and his sons khan Qubilai had reasons to suspect them in contacts with rebels. So, when Ariq Böqa began the confrontation with his brother Qubilai, he tried to attract the sons of Godan to his side [27, p. 875]. Rashid al-Din accentuated that the descendants of Godan, in contrast to other representatives of Ögedei, didn't support their relative Qaidu in his struggle with Qubilai [27, p. 626]. Nevertheless, there are several mentions in the “Jami'u't-tawarikh” that “the offspring of Ögö dai Qa'an's son Kötän... conspired to join Qaidu” as well as a lot of other Chinggisid princes [27, p. 282–282]. Probably, there were only suspicions, but the affiliation of Godan's descendants with the dynasty of Ögö dai could attract Qaidu's attention to the ulus of Godan and trouble Qubilai's positions in Tangqut and Tibet [6, p. 45].

According to the Chapter CVII of “Yuan shih”, the sons and grandsons of Godan had titles of *wangs* (princes) and *ta-wangs* (grand princes). His grandson Bäg-Temur (son of Kürlük) was a prince of Fen-yang (in Shan-hsi province), and his own son Yäsü-Boka was a prince of Chin as well as his own son Toq-Temur [15, p. 74–76]. But already in the middle of the 1260s the united ulus of Godan was spread among his descendants and divided in provinces of Shan-hsi and Sichuan which were placed under authority of specific Central Secretariat branches in 1266 [11, p. 384, 387]. We suppose that such changes in the status of Godan's ulus were connected with political developments in the Mongol Empire of this period, firstly with civil wars between Qubilai and Ariq-Böka in 1260–1264 and then between Qubilai and Qaidu in the 1260s – 1290s.

⁹ There is a mess of sons and grandsons of Godan in different sources. So, in the “Yuan shih” Iranjin mentioned as son of Mönggätü, Godan's son, whereas in the “Mu'izz al-ansab” he is a son of Godan himself. Similarly, Kürlük and Täbilä, the sons of Godan according to the “Yuan shih”, are mentioned as his grandsons in the “Mu'izz al-ansab” (sons of Küyän).

And although Rashid al-Din mentioned that Godan's descendants "at recent... are with Oljaitu Qa'an [Temur, successor of Qubilai, 1295–1307 – *R.P.*] and command their troops as usual" [27, p. 613], it is undoubtedly that they didn't obtain the status of their ancestor and became no more than minor Chinggisids who had own possessions in autonomous uluses but were under the control of Central administration of the Yuan Empire. Moreover, in 1292 Qubilai's third son Kammala is mentioned as ruler of Tangqut or, in fact, real successor of Godan's ulus [see 10, p. 54, n. 2].

Conclusion

The analysis of sources on prince Godan allows us to assert that in the 1240s – beginning of the 1250s he was one of the most powerful Chinggisids in the Mongol Empire, the claimant for the imperial throne and the ruler of own autonomous ulus, and has a competence for the foreign policy, control of vassal states, grant with titles and post-attitude. Such power belonged to other influential Chinggisids who also ruled large and autonomous uluses, such as Batu in the Golden Horde or, later, ilkhan Hulagu in Iran. But already since the beginning of the 1250s khan Möngke and his brother Qubilai began restrict his power and spread their control over the ulus of Godan in Tangqut and his vassal state in Tibet. After the death of Godan his descendants, because of their affiliation with the Ögedeid dynasty (permanent opponents of Toluid family), inherited only the divided parts of his ulus and fell under the control of Yuan imperial administration, such as the most part of the Chinggisids in China.

REFERENCES

1. Ata Malik Juvaini. *The History of the World-Conqueror*. Boyle J.A. (trans.). Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1997. LXVIII + 764 p.
2. Atwood C.P. *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire*. New York, Facts of File, Inc., 2004. X + 678 p.
3. Baldanzhapov P.B. (trans.). Čayan teüke – «Belaya istoriya» – mongol'skiy istoriko-pravovoy pamyatnik XIII–XVI vv. [Čayan teüke – “White History” – Mongolian historical and legal monument of the 13th–16th cc.]. Ulan-Ude, Buryat Scientific Center of Siberian branch of RAS Press, 2001. 200 p. (In Russian)
4. Bartol'd V.V. *Sochineniya* [Collected works]. Vol. I: Turkestan v epokhu mongol'skogo nashestviya [Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 1962. 760 p. (In Russian)
5. Bira Sh. *Mongol'skaya istoriografiya (XIII–XVII vv.)* [Mongolian historiography (13th–17th cc.)]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1978. 320 p. (In Russian)
6. Biran M. *Qaidu and the rise of the independent Mongol state in Central Asia*. Richmond, Curzon, 1997. X + 197 p.
7. 'Cos lo-tsa-ba gZhon-nu-dpal. *The Blue Annals (Deb-ther sNgon-po)*: *The History of Buddhism in Tibet, VI–XV cc.*. G.M. Roerich (trans.). Calcutta, Motilal banarsidass, 1949 [Russ ed.: Goy-lotsava Shonnupel. Sinyaya letopis'. Istoriya buddizma v Tibete, VI–XV vv. / Per. s tib. Yu.N. Rerikha; per. s angl. O.V. Al'bedilya i B.Yu. Khar'kovoy. St. Petersburg, Evraziya Publ., 2001. 768 p.]
8. Dugarov R.N. «*Debter-Chzhamtso*» – istochnik po istorii mongolov Kuku-nora [“Debter-jamtso” as a source on history of the Mongols of Kuku-Nor]. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., 1983. 95 p. (In Russian)

9. Dylykova V.S. *Tibetskaya literature* [Tibetan literature]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1985. 240 p. (In Russian)
10. Elverskog C.J. *Buddhism, History and Power: The Jewel Translucent Sutra ad the Formation of Mongol Identity*. Ph.D. Diss. Bloomington, Indiana University, 2000. XVII + 572 p.
11. Farquhar D.M. *The Government of China under Mongolian Rule: A Reference Guide*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990. 594 p.
12. Franke H. *From Tribal Chieftain to Universal Emperor and God: The Legitimation of the Yüan Dynasty*. Munich, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978. 85 p.
13. Friar Giovanni di Plano Carpini. *The Story of the Mongols whom we call the Tartars*. Hildinger J. (trans.). Boston, Branden Publishing Co., 1996. 136 p.
14. Galdan. *Istoriya, imenuemaya «Erdeniyn erikhe»* [History named "Erdeniyn erikhe"]. P.B. Baldanzhapov, Ts.P. Vanchikova (trans.). Ulan-Bator; Ulan-Ude, ADMON, 2012. 442 p. (In Russian)
15. Hambis L. Le chapitre CVII du Yüan che. *T'oung Pao*, 2nd ser, vol. 38, 1945, pp. I–XII + 1–181. (In French)
16. Iakin, monk. *Istoriya pervykh chetyrekh khanov iz doma Chingisova* [History of the first four khans of the house of Chinggis]. St. Petersburg, K. Kray's printing house, 1829. XVI + 440 p. (In Russian)
17. Jambadorji. *Khrustal'noe zerkalo* [The Crystal Mirror]. Korol' B.I., Tsendina A.D. (trans.). *Istoriya v trudakh uchenykh lam* [History in the Works of Learned Lamas]. Moscow, KMK Scientific Printing Association, 2005, pp. 62–154. (In Russian)
18. Khrapachevskiy, R.P. (trans.). *Zolotaya Orda v istochnikakh*. Kitayskie i mongol'skie istochniki [The Golden Horde in the sources, Vol. 3: Chinese and Mongol sources]. Moscow, 2009. 335 p. (In Russian)
19. Kuchera S. *Zavoevanie mongolami Tibeta* [Mongol conquest of Tibet]. Tikhvinskiy S.L. (ed.). *Tataro-mongoly v Azii i Evrope* [The Tataro-Mongols in Asia and Europe], 2nd ed. rev. and suppl. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1977, pp. 260–281. (In Russian)
20. Larichev V.Ye.(ed.), Tyuryumina L.V., Kamenskiy P.I. (trans.). *Istoriya Nebesnoy imperii. Istoriya pervykh pyati khanov iz doma Chingisova* [The history of the Celestial Empire. Vol. I. The history of the first five khans from the generation of Chinggis]. Novosibirsk, Institute of archaeology and ethnography of Siberian branch of RAS, 2011. 220 p. (In Russian)
21. Lubsan Danzan. *Altan Tobchi («Zolotoe skazanie»)* [The Golden Tale]. Shastina N.P. (trans.). Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1973. 440 p. (In Russian)
22. Munkuev N.Ts. *Kitayskiy istochnik o pervykh mongol'skikh khanakh: Nadgrobnaya nadpis' na mogile Elyuy Chu-tsaya* [Chinese source on the first Mongolian khans: Epitaph of Yeh-lu Chu-tsai]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1965. 224 p. (In Russian)
23. Petech L. *Tibetan Relations with Sung China and the Mongols*. M. Rossabi (ed.). *China among Equals: The Middle Kingdom and Its Neighbors, 10th–14th Centuries*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1983, pp. 166–194.
24. Pubaev R.E. (trans.). *Pagsam-dzhonsan: Istoriya i khronologiya Tibeta* [Pagsam-jonsan: History and chronology of Tibet]. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., 1991. 307 p. (In Russian)
25. Pubaev R.E. *«Pagsam-dzhonsan» – pamyatnik tibetskoy istoriografii XVIII veka* [Pagsam-jonsan – a monument of Tibetan historiography of the 18th century]. Novosibirsk, Nauka Publ., 1981. 264 p. (In Russian)
26. Rerikh Yu.N. *Mongolo-tibetskie otnosheniya v XIII i XIV vv.* [Mongol-Tibetan relations in the 13th and 14th cc.] Rerikh Yu.N. *Tibet i Tsentral'naya Aziya. Stat'i, lektzii, perevody* [Tibet and Central Asia: Articles, lectures, translations]. Samara, Agni, 1999, pp. 140–152. (In Russian)

27. Rashiduddin Fazlullah. *Jami' u' t-tawarikh. Compendium of Chronicles. A History of Mongols*. 3 vols. Thackston W.M. (trans.). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998–1999. 1540 p.
28. Ratchnevsky P. *Un code des Yuan*. Vol. 2. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1972. XI + 199 p. (In French)
29. Schaik S. van. *Tibet: A History*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 2011. XXIII + 324 p.
30. Tsendina A. Godan Khan in Mongolian and Tibetan historical works. *Studia Orientalia*, vol. 85, 1999, pp. 245–248.
31. Tsendina A.D. ... *I strana zovetsya Tibetom* [... And the country is called Tibet]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 2002. 304 p. (In Russian)
32. Tsendina A.D. (trans.). *Istoriya Erdeni-dzu* [A History of Erdeni Zuu]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 1999. 255 p. (In Russian)
33. Tsendina A.D. *Mongol'skie letopisi XVII–XIX vekov. Povestvovatel'nye traditsii* [Mongolian chronicles of the 17th–19th cc.: Narrative traditions]. Moscow, Russian State Humanitarian University Publ., 2007. 272 p. (In Russian)
34. Tsendina A.D. (trans.). *Zheltaya istoriya (Shara tudzhi)* [The Yellow Chronicle (Sir-a tuyuji)]. Moscow, Nauka – Vostochnaya literature Publ., 2017. 406 p. (In Russian)
35. Uspenskiy V.L. Mongoly i buddizm v XIII veke [Mongols and Buddhism in the 13th century]. *Buddizm i khristianstvo v kul'turnom nasledii Tsentral'noy Azii. Materialy mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii. Bishkek, 3–5 oktyabrya 2002 g.* [Buddhism and Christianity in cultural heritage of Central Asia: Materials of international conference. Bishkek, October 3–5, 2002]. Bishkek, 2003, pp. 166–172. (In Russian)
36. Vokhidov Sh.H. (trans.). *Mu'izz al-ansab («Proslavlyayushchee genealogii»)* [Mu'izz al-ansab (“Glorification of genealogies”)]. Almaty, Dayk-Press, 2006. 672 p. (In Russian)
37. Vostrikov A.I. *Tibetskaya istoricheskaya literatura* [Tibetan historical literature]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 1962. 428 p. (In Russian)
38. Wylie T.V. The First Mongol Conquest of Tibet Reinterpreted. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 37, No. 1, 1977, pp. 103–133.

About the author: Roman Yu. Pochekaev – Cand. Sci. (Jurisprudence), Docent, Professor, Head of the Department of theory and history of law and state, National Research University Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, **ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4192-3528> (17, Promyshlennaya Str., St. Petersburg 198099, Russian Federation). E-mail: ropot@mail.ru

*Received January 10, 2018 Accepted for publication March 12, 2018
Published March 29, 2018*

**«ЦАРЬ» ГОДАН: СТАТУС ВЛАДЕТЕЛЬНОГО ЧИНГИЗИДА
В МОНГОЛЬСКИХ И ТИБЕТСКИХ ИСТОЧНИКАХ**

Р.Ю. Почекаев

*Национальный исследовательский университет «Высшая школа экономики»
Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация
ropot@mail.ru*

Цель исследования: характеристика правового статуса царевича Годана, сына Угедэя, многократно упоминающегося в монгольских имперских, тибетских и позднесредневековых монгольских источниках, выяснение причин именованья его «царем» и «ханом» в ряде средневековых памятников, хотя в реальности он ханского титула не носил. Автор предпринимает попытку определить реальное место Годана в политической структуре Монгольской империи, его положение и компетенцию.

Материалы исследования: основу исследования составляют три группы источников – монгольская имперская историография (сочинения Джувейни, Рашид ад-Дина, «Юань ши» и др.), тибетские исторические сочинения («Синяя летопись», «Пагсам-джонсан» и «Дэбтэр-чжамцо»), позднесредневековые монгольские летописи, создававшиеся под влиянием тибетской буддийской историографической традиции («Алтан тобчи» / «Золотое сказание», «Болор толи» / «Хрустальное зеркало», «Шара туджи» / «Желтая история», «Цаган теукэ» / «Белая история», «Эрдэнийн эрихэ» / «Драгоценные четки» и др.). Также автор в значительной степени опирался на работы специалистов по монгольской и тибетской историографии – Ш. Биры, Р.Е. Пубаева, Ю.Н. Рериха, А.Д. Цендиной и др., а также исследователей политической и религиозной истории Монгольской империи – В.Л. Успенского, Г. Франке, К. Этвуда и др.

Новизна исследования: автор предпринимает попытку систематизации источников различного происхождения для прояснения ряда вопросов из биографии царевича Годана и уточнения его правового статуса как представителя правящего рода Монгольской империи. При этом, отмечая противоречия различных источников и проясняя причины этих противоречий, автор не противопоставляет их, а старается найти в них сведения, уточняющие и дополняющие друг друга.

Результаты исследования: автор, соотнося данные различных источников, выявляет особенности правового статуса царевича Годана как одной из ключевых политических фигур Монгольской империи 1240-х – начала 1250-х гг. и владельца обширного улуса со значительными властными полномочиями, сопоставимыми с полномочиями правителей Золотой Орды, Чагатайского улуса и т.п. Также проанализированы причины кратковременности существования этого улуса и утраты статуса, которым обладал Годан, уже его ближайшими потомками.

Ключевые слова: Монгольская империя, Тибет, царевич Годан, религиозная политика Чингизидов, монгольская историография

Для цитирования: Pochekaev R.Yu. "King" Godan: Status of the Ruling Chinggisid in Mongolian and Tibetan Sources // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2018. Т. 6, № 1. С. 6–17. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-1.6-17

Сведения об авторе: Роман Юлианович Почекаев – кандидат юридических наук, доцент, профессор, заведующий кафедрой теории и истории права и государства Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» в Санкт-Петербурге, **ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4192-3528>** (198099, ул. Промышленная, 17, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация). E-mail: ropot@mail.ru

*Поступила 10.01.2018 Принята к публикации 12.03.2018
Опубликована 29.03.2018*