

**THE EVOLUTION OF SOYURGHAL IN CHINGGISID
AND NON-CHINGGISID STATES
DURING THE POST-IMPERIAL PERIOD***

R. Yu. Pochekaev

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

Abstract: *Research objectives:* An analysis of the evolution of the land-law institution of soyurghal which was applied during the 15th–19th centuries in the Chinggisid and non-Chinggisid states that arose after the disintegration of the Mongol Empire and its uluses. This work is an attempt to clarify the reasons behind the preservation of this imperial legal institution during the post-imperial period, along with the points of commonality and differences which emerged during its evolution in the different states and regions of Asia.

Research materials: This research is based on wide range of historical and legal sources with information on soyurghal and its evolution. There are yarliks (or firmans) of monarchs (patents and letters), historical chronicles, along with treatises on the political and administrative structure of post-imperial states. The author analyses the documents of the Kazan, Crimean, Bukharan, and Khivan khanates, as well as Kashgharia, the states of Aq-Koyunlu and Qara-Kouynlu, Savafid Iran, and Mogul India. This research is also based on results of scholars who have already discussed soyurghal of the imperial and post-imperial period: M. Abduraimov, K.A. Antonova, A.M. Belenitskiy, P.P. Ivanov, A.K.S. Lambton, V.F. Minorskiy, Sh.F. Mukhamed'yarov, I.P. Petrushevskiy, M.A. Usmanov, etc.

The novelty of the study: The presented article is the first attempt to compare the evolution of institution of soyurghal based on a wide range of sources from different states and epochs to clarify basic trends of this evolution and find the reasons for using different categories of soyurghal in different states to a greater or lesser extent.

Research results: The author finds that during the 15th–19th centuries the institution of soyurghal had three meanings: land investiture for vassals (state and military officers), land investiture for state officers and clergy, and lastly a grant from the monarch to his subject in general. These different kinds of soyurghal were used in all states which were analyzed in the article. The conclusion is that this land-law institution was used in fact throughout the whole area of the former Mongol Empire and that this imperial legal tradition was preserved during the period after the disintegration of the empire itself.

Keywords: Mongol Empire, Chinggisid states, Jochid Ulus, Chaghadaid Ulus, Iran under the Safavids, Great Moghuls, Mongol imperial law, Islamic law, privileges and immunities

For citation: Pochekaev R.Yu. The Evolution of Soyurghal in Chinggisid and Non-Chinggisid States during the Post-Imperial Period. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie = Golden Horde Review*. 2018, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 729–740. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-4.729-740

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

Introduction

The land-law institution of soyurghal was established in the second part of the 14th c.¹ and widely used in the imperial states – successors of the Mongol Empire: Chaghatay Ulus (Timurid Empire) [23], the Golden Horde [14, p. 112–139] and Iran of Jalayirids [17, p. 210, 213, 215, 239]. In fact, it was a “modification” of the similar institution of iqta which was a landownership of military aristocracy in the Islamic states since the pre-Mongolian times and was adopted by the Chinggisids. But, in contrast to iqta, soyurghal was closer connected with immunities in taxation, administrative and judicial spheres. Scholars are inclined to connect soyurghal with the status of tarkhan: this status gave personal immunities (and even hereditary, for several generations), and soyurghal gave the same immunities to land tenures of tarkhans (also hereditary) [38, p. 324].

Origination of soyurghal was reasoned by long-term civil wars in the Chinggisid Uluses in the middle – second half of the 14th c.: rival claimants for the throne were interested in loyal vassals and tried to provide this loyalty by giving them vast land tenures with immunities in different legal spheres. As the role of military aristocracy increased after disintegration of the Chinggisid Uluses in the 15th–16th cc., the practice of granting of soyurghals was preserved in the post-imperial states including even these of them which rejected the legacy of the Mongol Empire in general (such as the states of Aq-Koyunlu, Qara-Kouynlu and Savafids in Iran or the Great Moguls of India).

The analysis of institution of soyurghal in the political and economical aspects in imperial period was done by famous scholars A.M. Belenitskiy (on a base of the Timurid state) [11; 23], I.P. Petrushevskiy (on a base of the Mongolian Iran) [32], A.P. Grigor’ev (on a base of the Golden Horde) [14]. Some researchers paid attention on the evolution of soyurghal in the post-imperial states: Sh.F. Mukhamed’yarov (Kazan Khanate), M.A. Usmanov (Kazan and Crimean Khanates) [26; 40], M. Abduraimov, P.P. Ivanov, R.N. Nabiev (Bykharan Khanate) [1–3; 16; 28], O.A. Evendiev, Sh.F. Farzaliev, V.F. Minorskiy, I.P. Petrushevskiy, A.K.S. Lambton (Iran during the rule of Aq-Koyunlu, Qara-Kouynlu and Savafids) [12; 13; 24; 33; 34], K.A. Antonova (the Mogul India), etc. But all of these scholars paid attention to specific states and didn’t make their aim to analyze the institution of soyurghal and its evolution in comparative legal context.

So, we are intended to analyze the evolution of soyurghal in different states on the space of the former Mongol Empire, clarify similar features and differences of its using in different states and regions and reasons of them. The source base for our research include a wide range of historical and legal monuments. Among them are yarliks and firmans of the khans of Kazan, Crimea, Bukhara, shahs of Iran, emperors of the Mogul India, historical chronicles of Bukhara, Khiva, India, political treatises of Safavid Iran, etc. Analysis of these sources allowed us to recognize three principal kinds of soyurghal, and it makes sense to examine in details each of them.

¹ I.P. Petrushevskiy in one of his early works dated the beginning of the use of soyurghals by the 13th c. [33, p. 58], but later revised his views.

The land investiture for military officers

The main (and, in fact, original) kind of soyurghal as land investiture was a land tenure for military officers. Firstly it was a “material supplement” for status of tarkhan and provided the taxation, administrative and judicial immunity not only for granted person himself but also for his land possession [2, p. 101; 26, p. 119]. Of course, such privileges provided loyalty of land-owners to their monarch – especially because even hereditary soyurghal had to be confirmed either by the next monarch, or to the heir of the previous owner (defterdar) [41, p. 43–45, 47, 73]².

At the same time each defterdar was, in fact, the absolute owner of his soyurghal: he had the full, administrative, tax and judicial authority on the people who lived within the borders of soyurghal, and officers of khans or shahs didn't have right to enter into his tenure [see e.g. 34, p. 231–232]³. And if tax collector for some reason took any collected levies or taxes from the soyurghal, the monarchs issued special edicts (firmans) to return the collected sum to the owners [34, p. 238–239].

In the 15th–16th cc. soyurghals for the military officers were extensive land possessions (regions with numerous settlements and even cities). This practice was widespread in all former uluses of the Mongol Empire: in the Jochi Ulus (Kazan and Crimea), the Central Asia (Bukhara and Khiva), Iran (states of Aq-Koyunlu, Qara-Koyunlu and Savafids).

Firstly the owners of soyurghals were tarkhans who were representatives of the “qara suyek” (“black bone) or non-privileged class by birth and acquired privileges of the “aq-suyek” (“white bone”⁴), including immunities. But already since the 16th c. the authority of the Chinggisids substantially decreases at the simultaneously rise of influence of tribal clans' aristocracy, and members of the “Golden Blood Line” (descendants of Chinggis Khan) also became the owners of soyurghals at the same terms as representatives of “qara-suyek” [2, p. 103].

The first examples of this trend took place in the state of Mukhammad Shaybani Khan (1500–1510) in the beginning of the 16th c.: after conquest of the Timurid state in Chaghatay Ulus (Mawrannahr) he granted with soyurghals his close relatives – son Mukhammad-Timur-sultan, cousins Khamza-sultan and Makhdi-sultan, uncles Kuchkunji-sultan and Soyunj-Khoja-sultan, etc. – as well as his loyal vassals from the clan aristocracy. So, Jan-Wafa-biy the Durman obtained Herat as soyurghal, Qambar-biy the Naiman – Marv, Kepeq-biy the Qushchi – Balkh⁵, etc. [15, p. 133; 16, p. 23]. The same policy was continued by one of the most famous Bukharan khans, Abdallah II (1563–1598) who also granted many of his relatives (at that not only Uzbek, but also Kazakh sultans) with soyurghals [15, p. 264; 16, p. 26; 18, p. 223]. The relatives of the Bukharan Shaybanids, Arabshakhids of Khiva used the same practice: according to Firdaws al-iqbal, for example, Aqatay Khan “granted Kat to the two sons of Qal Khan [his nephews – R.P.]” [15, p. 444;

² But we don't have an information that heir had to pay for confirmation of his rights [26, p. 124], as it was in medieval Europe for feud (“relief”).

³ It looks like an “udel” (appanage) in the Russia of the 12th–16th cc. or “pomest'e” (estate) in the Russian Empire of the 18th – middle of the 19th cc.

⁴ The representatives of the aq-suyek formally were only members of the Chinggisid family (only by male line), seyyids and khojas.

⁵ The statement of P.P. Ivanov that Kepeq-biy got Khorezm as soyurghal [16, p. 23] don't represent the facts: he was only an ataliq of the young Pulad-sultan, grandson of Shaybani Khan who was appointed by his grandfather the nominal ruler of Khorezm.

39, p. 34]⁶. The same practice was used also by descendants of Chaghatay – the khans of Kashgharia: different sultans gained soyurghals from khans individually or as heirs of their fathers [15, p. 387, 406].

Of course, giving of soyurghals to the members of khans' families was not aimed at strengthening the positions of ruling family: on the contrary, authoritative khans intended to reduce the status of their relatives (and often – rivals) to the same level as tribal leaders. As representatives of “qara-suyek”, Chinggisids-defterdars also could be deprived of their soyurghals on the will of khan at any time [16, p. 69; 26, p. 124–125]. Above mentioned Mukhammad Shaybani Khan more than once changed the owners of soyurghals and replaced his relatives by more loyal military commanders from the tribal aristocracy [see e.g. 15, p. 134]. According to Khafiz-i Tanysh Bukhari, of Shaybanid regional rulers, Khudayberdy-sultan decided to change his hereditary soyurghal in Karshi for soyurghal of his relative Klych-Qara-sultan in Sagardj: the latter was a cousin of powerful Abdallah Khan, and the owner of Karshi expected that this monarch wouldn't take the soyurghal of his close relative [18, p. 150]!

If the power of supreme rulers became weaker, and they had to share it with influential relatives, they also let them right to grant soyurghals. So, in the Crimean Khanate of the second part of the 16th c. soyurghals were given by qalgha-sultan Mukhammad-Geray (further Mukhammad-Geray II, 1577–1584) in 1576, Fatkh-Geray-sultan (further Fatkh-Geray II, 1596) in 1595 and even khan's daughter Mikhri-sultan-khani in 1588 [41, p. 44, 53, 55].

When the Chinggisids were removed from the power in the Central Asian khanates, the right to grant soyurghals to military officers was transferred to their heirs – new rulers of these states. So, the emirs of Bukhara granted soyurghals even in the first part of the 19th c. And the last example of using this kind of such land-law institution, as we know, took place in 1870s in the Jetysahr – the state of Yaqub-beq in Kashgharia (1864–1877): he uses this imperial institution to stimulate the loyalty and effective administration of his regional governors: they had to collect taxes for his treasure and participate in his military operations (as their predecessors even in the imperial period!), but besides that had an absolute power in their tenures. This practice allowed Yaqub-beq to rule without strong centralization of power and had control over regional rulers [40, p. 113–114].

Absolute power of defterdars on the territory of soyurghal and their numerous privileges and immunities were under the control of monarchs and central state authorities. Each yarlik or firman on granting the soyurghal was fixed in special registers (defters) as well as terms of possession: exemption of payment of all or specific taxes, judicial immunity or not, etc. Persian and Indian political treatises contain valuable information on the state structures with functions to track the holding of soyurghals and discharge the duties by their owners as well as propriety of official patents for soyurghals. Such functions were entrusted to viziers themselves, heads of divans of some high-level tax collectors [5, p. 46; 20, p. 111; 25, p. 78; 27, p. 15–16].

⁶ An interesting anachronism connected with such practice takes place in the “Qara Tavarikh” by Utemish-khadji, the Khivan author of the middle of 16th c.: he mentioned that Chinggis Khan gave conquered territories as soyurghals to his sons and grandsons [31, p. 20, 26]. Of course, the historian transferred realities in Khiva of his times to the early imperial period.

The land investiture for clergy and state officers

The 15th c. became an era of fight against the Chinggisid political and legal heritage headed by the Islamic clergy. It strongly demanded from rulers of the post-imperial Turkic-Mongol states to reject imperial state and legal institution including soyurghals. Monarchs of non-Chinggisid dynasties who needed the religious support to legitimate their rights for the throne couldn't ignore such demands. But at the same time they needed the loyalty of powerful clan aristocracy and high-level commanders who owned the hereditary soyurghals and didn't want to lose their benefits and privileges.

In search of compromise Uzun Hasan, the ruler of Aq-Qoyunlu (1453–1478) already in the second half of the 15th c. began to grant with soyurghals the influential representatives of Islamic clergy equally to emirs and military commanders [12, p. 172]. The Safavids who came to power not only as temporal but also as religious leaders continued this practice and since the times of Shah Tahmasp I (1524–1576) gave even more soyurghals to clergy [10, p. 28; 34, p. 235]. A temporal and military officers saved only their hereditary soyurghals⁷.

The soyurghals of clergy, however, also became hereditary and from time to time there were conflicts among heirs, and rulers had to solve them and divide landownership among two or more heirs [8, p. 163–164; 21, p. 44, 51]. No need to say that such cases also became a reason of diminishing of the size of soyurghals in the post-imperial states.

It's interesting that descendants of Chinggis Khan in their states also practiced granting Islamic clergy with soyurghals: after fall of imperial states their authority, as we already mentioned, substantially decreased, and they needed in religious ground of their power no lesser than non-Chinggisid rulers, their rivals. In the second half of the 16th c. Crimean Gerays began to grant khojas with soyurghals [41, p. 49]. Even powerful Shaybanids – such as Nawruz Akhmad Khan (1551–1556) or Abdulla Khan, – gave and confirmed soyurghals to seyids, khojas and ulama. According to the “Treatise on tithes and haradj lands” by Arif Bukhari, at the end of the 18th c. soyurghal became an ownership of clergy whereas military aristocracy gained only tankha [6, p. 17; 35, p. 197].

But the most radical transformation of soyurghal from temporal to clerical landownership took place in the Mogul India during the reign of Shah Akbar I (1556–1605). He replaced soyurghals for military aristocracy by new land-law institution – “jaghir” [7, p. 249] and left soyurghals only as clerical landownership⁸, at that firstly he gave them to Islamic clergy (“aime”, i.e. imams), but after his religious reform began to grant with soyurghals also Parsees and Hindus [8, p. 155–156; 9, p. 44, 58]⁹.

As substantial part of officials in Turkic-Mongol states were representatives of Islamic clergy, no wonder that at the same time the practice of granting them with soyurghals also took place.

⁷ For example, in 1656 Shah Abbas II (1642–1666) by own firman confirmed the soyurghal of emir who inherited it from his father, who, in his turn, gained firman from Safi I (1629–1642), father of Abbas, to confirm his own inheritance of soyurghal from his father in 1638 [21, p. 44, 46–47].

⁸ If representative of clergy decided to change a military career, he obtained not soyurghal, but jaghir [8, p. 158]

⁹ In search of “Indian” equivalent for Turkic word soyurghal Akbar used in some of his firmans word “madad-i me’ash” [8, p. 160–161].

The tradition of granting the state officers with soyurghal took place even in the 14th c.: according to “Dastur al-qatib” by Muhammad Nakhchivani, the Jalayirids provided with such landownership high-ranking officers – sahib-divan, etc. [20, p. 107]. However, it was not a wide-spread practice and it became usual only since the 16th–17th cc. when sheikhs ul-Islam, cadis and keepers of shrines also gained soyurghals [8, p. 167; 15, p. 490; 28]. The main difference of this kind of landownership from soyurghals of military officers and clergy was that they owned their soyurghals only while they kept their positions. For example, if the keeper of shrine was moved to another position, his soyurghal passed to his successor in this shrine [8, p. 167]. At that if son inherited the position of his father, soyurghal, in fact, became hereditary landownership – but, in any case, it was necessary to obtain confirmative yarlik from khan¹⁰.

The grants of monarch to his subject in general

The original meaning of the Turkic word “soyurghal” was “reward”, “bounty” from ruler to his subject: it was used already in early Turkic times [19, p. 513]. It kept this meaning in the Mongol empire, in the age of Chinggis Khan and his nearest successors [26, p. 118; 30, p. 75]. As we could see above, since the 1th c. it turned into land-law institution, but it is strange enough that even in the 16th–17th cc. soyurghal from time to time was used in its original meaning.

In the 1570s Baba-sultan, the Bukharan prince and long-term rival of Abdallah II, decided to make it up with khan and asked for soyurghal – not as landownership but as charity and forgiveness [19, p. 233]¹¹.

In letters of Crimean khans, sultans and ever high state officials (viziers, etc.) we also could find word “soyurghal” as “reward”, at that khan Islam-Geray III (1644–1654) and his nuraddin-sultan Ghazi-Geray asked Russian tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich (1613–1645) and Alexei Mikhailovich (1645–1676) to grant with soyurghal their ambassadors. Crimean viziers asked the same Russian rulers for “kazna” (“treasure”) to representatives of Geray house and soyurghals for their servants. In his turn the treasurer of khan in his letter informed tsar Mikhail that he granted Russian ambassadors with soyurghal [4, p. 215, 454, 507, 511, 560, 568, 619].

In the “Tadhkirat al-Muluk” the pay-roll is cited where expenditure for soyurghals and other grants exceeded 36 700 dinars: or course, here is a question of rewards, not a land-law institution [25, p. 109; see also: 26, p. 118–119].

And, at last, one more interesting example of soyurghal took place in Ferghana in 1578: regional ruler Muhammad-Khashim-sultan granted emir Ibrahim with soyurghal for reconstruction of aryk: his grant was an immunity from taxation of 1/5 of his harvest [28, p. 27].

The decline of soyurghal

As we noticed above, the owners of soyurghals in the early post-imperial period had many privileges in relations with state authorities and were absolute suzer-

¹⁰ R.N. Nabiev published a series of khans’ confirmative yarliks to hereditary cadis of Ferghana who from generation to generation took up this position and, consequently, had soyurghal [28; see also: 8, p. 168].

¹¹ Such use of soyurghal (“sojurqa-, erinčkä”) took place in the early medieval Turkic-language Turfanese texts [29, p. 513].

rains over their possessions – rulers, tax collectors and judges. But in the 18th–19th cc. rulers of Central Asia and Iran began to restrict the status of soyurghals.

Already in the 17th c. Bukharan rulers began to impose taxes on soyurghals and deprive their owners of immunities in administrative and judicial spheres. To avoid of discontent of powerful defterdars, khans and then emirs of Bukhara began to grant them with new form of privileged possession – *darbast* (*darubast*) equal to earlier soyurghals [2, p. 127; 35, p. 37]. Sometimes rulers used compromise in the land-legal policy and granted heirs of soyurghal owners with “soyurghal with rights of *darubast*”, and that allowed owners to save their privileges and immunities [2, p. 127; 37, p. 55].

Owners who were in emir’s good graces had chance to transform their soyurghals into “*mulk-i khurr*” (“white” private land property wit tax immunity): this practice was used by the rulers of Bukhara and Kashgharia in the 16th–17th cc. [2, p. 107; 28, p. 26]. But such examples were few in number, and the most part of defterdars became not absolute owners but only receivers of revenues from soyurghals¹², whereas the administrative and judicial power over them passed to khans’ officers [2, p. 104–105, 111]¹³.

To meet the demands of clergy the Persian shahs obliged the owners of soyurghals to pay Islamic taxes *ushr* and others [27, p. 16]¹⁴. In the 17th c. the owners of soyurghals in Iran also should pay some “presents”: in fact there were taxes to maintain state officials who didn’t get a salary. So, according to “*Dastur al-Muluk*” (treatise of the edge of the 17th – 18th cc.), each soyurghal should pay 90 dinars in favor of chief of tax collectors, 50 dinars in the favor of *munshi al-mamalik* (head copyist), 14 dinars in favor of copyists, 17 dinars in the favor of *daruga* (manager) of chancellery, etc. [27, p. 46–47, 64, 75, 80, 81]. And in the 18th c. according to “*Tadhkirat ak-Muluk* (c. 1725), chief vizier had from soyurghals 714 dinars [25, p. 86]. And the most part of soyurghals in this period was transformed into small ownerships over little settlement.

Just before the Russian conquest of the Central Asia, the soyurghal, in fact, disappeared from land law of khanates: the only forms of tenures given by khans to their officers were *amlyak* and *tankha* and they were not provided with wide range of privileges and immunities as soyurghal [22, p. 116–118].

Conclusion

As we could see, the institution of soyurghal in its three principal kinds was widely used in all states and regions of the space of the former Mongol Empire. The only exception, possibly, was the Mogul India during the reign of the emperor Akbar who used soyurghal only as investiture for clergy (at that not only Islamic one): we suppose that the reason of this approach was Akbar’s thoroughgoing reli-

¹² It looked similar to the early medieval European land-law institution of benefit (in particular in Carolingian France).

¹³ For example, Imam-Quli Khan of Bukhara (1611–1642) granted Khoja Yusuf with several settlements as soyurghal with benefit of 10 thousand *khani* [16, p. 81], i.e. this owner had right only to get only revenue from these settlements, not to govern them or judge their inhabitants.

¹⁴ In firmans of Akbar Shah of India at the end of the 16th c. and even in yarliks of Amir Khaydar of Bukhara (1800–1826) in the first quarter of the 19th c. soyurghals were exempted from payment of *zakat* and *haradj* [2, p. 108; 8, p. 160–161; see also, 1; 3].

gious reforms and did not reflected the situation in the land law of the post-imperial Turkic-Mongol world in general.

Earlier we already had an opportunity to see that the same situation was with another Mongol imperial legal institution, *tamgha*, which also was preserved and used for years after the fall of the empire and its direct heirs [36]. So, we have reasons to state that *soyurghal* also became an effective legal institution even in the states which rejected the Chinggisid political and legal heritage in general but preferred to save some useful institutions with some transformation and modifications because of the position of Islamic clergy and own political interests.

The case of *soyurghal* allows us to consider the post-imperial Turkic-Mongol world as a common legal space on a base of widely used imperial institutions. It doesn't mean that all states of this space were in a political unity, but they based their legal relations on the same institutions and principles, that gave them an opportunity to interact more effectively and even allowed to adopt easily to political and legal realities of another state if it conquered one or another region of the neighboring one.

We wish, this research allowed to continue the study of using Mongol imperial legal institutions and rules in the post-imperial Turkic-Mongol world to make sure that imperial law deeply influenced on legal development of the states of this region and caused future integration on the Eurasian space.

REFERENCES

1. Abduraimov M. *Voprosy feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya i feodal'noy renty v pis'makh emira Khaydara. Opyt kratkogo issledovaniya istochnika* [Questions of Feudal Landownership and Feudal Rent in the Letters of Amir Khaydar. Attempt of a Brief Research of the Source]. Tashkent, 1961. 111 p. (In Russian)
2. Abduraimov M.A. *Ocherk agrarnykh otnosheniy v Bukharskom khanstve v XVI – pervoy polovine XIX v.* [Essay on Agrarian Relations in the Bukharan Khanate of the 16th – first half of the 19th c.] Vol. 2. Tashkent, Fan Publ., 1970. 287 p. (In Russian)
3. Abduraimov M. Pozdneyschie upominaniya o soyurgale [Latest mentions of *soyurghal*] *Obshchestvennyye nauki v Uzbekistane* [Social Sciences in Uzbekistan], 1961, vol. 2, pp. 40–46. (In Russian)
4. Abduzhemilev R.R. (comp.), Mirgaleev I.M. (ed.). *Dokumenty Krymskogo khanstva iz sobraniya Khusayna Feyzkhanova* [Documents of the Crimean Khanates from the Huseyn Feyzkhanov's Collection]. Simferopol, Konstanta, 2017. 816 p. (In Russian)
5. Abul Fadhl Allami. *Ain i Akbari*. Vol. II. Transl. by H.S. Jarrett. Calcutta, Baptist Mission Press, 1891. 458 p.
6. Akhmedov B.A. Ikta v Sredney Azii v XVI – nachale XVIII vv. [Ikta in the Central Asia of the 16th – beginning of the 18th cc.]. *Formy feodal'noy zemel'noy sobstvennosti i vladieniya na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (Bartol'dovskie chteniya 1975 g.)* [Forms of Feudal Land Ownership and Possession in the Near and Middle East (Readings in honor of V.V. Bartol'd of 1975)]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1979, pp. 15–24. (In Russian)
7. Antonova K.A. Osnovnye formy feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya v Mogol'skoy Indii XVI veka [Principal forms of feudal landownership in the Mogul India of the 16th century]. *Uchenye zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniya* [Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental Studies], Vol. 5, 1953, pp. 245–274. (In Russian)
8. Antonova K.A. *Suyurghal v akbarovskoy Indii (k voprosu o formakh zemlevladieniya v srednevekovoy Indii)* [Soyurghal in the Akbar's India (on the forms of land-

ownership in the medieval India]. *Uchenye zapiski Tikhookeanskogo instituta* [Proceedings of the Pacific Ocean Institute], Vol. 2, 1949, pp. 149–176. (In Russian)

9. Ashrafyan K.Z. *Feodalizm v Indii* [Feudalism in India]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1977. 239 p. (In Russian)

10. Ashurbeyli S.B. Feodal'nye pozhalovaniya v Shirvane v XV–XVII vv. [Feudal grants in Shirvan of the 15th–17th cc.]. *Formy feodal'noy zemel'noy sobstvennosti i vladeniya na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (Bartol'dovskie chteniya 1975 g.)* [Forms of Feudal Land Ownership and Possession in the Near and Middle East (Readings in honor of V.V. Bartol'd of 1975)]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1979, pp. 25–31. (In Russian)

11. Belenitskiy A. K istorii feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya v Sredney Azii i Irane v timuridskuyu epokhu (XIV–XV vv.) (obrazovanie instituta «suyurghal») [On the history of feudal landownership in Central Asia and Iran in the age of the Timurids (establishment of the institution of soyurghal)]. *Istoriik-marksist* [Marxist Historian], 1941, vol. 4, pp. 43–58. (In Russian)

12. Efendiev O.A. Institut «suyurghal» i tsentralistskaya politika praviteley Ak-Koyunlu i pervykh Sefevidov [Institution of “soyurghal” and centralizing policy of Ak-Koyunlu rulers and the first Safavids]. *Formy feodal'noy zemel'noy sobstvennosti i vladeniya na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (Bartol'dovskie chteniya 1975 g.)* [Forms of Feudal Land Ownership and Possession in the Near and Middle East (Readings in honor of V.V. Bartol'd of 1975)]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1979, pp. 168–175. (In Russian)

13. Farzaliev Sh.F. O suyurgale v XV–XVI vv. (po «Akhsan at-tavarikh» Khasanbeka Rumlu) [On soyurghal in the 15th–16th cc. (according to “Akhsan at-tavarikh” by Khasan-beq Rumlu)]. *Formy feodal'noy zemel'noy sobstvennosti i vladeniya na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke (Bartol'dovskie chteniya 1975 g.)* [Forms of Feudal Land Ownership and Possession in the Near and Middle East (Readings in honor of V.V. Bartol'd of 1975)]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1979, pp. 141–145. (In Russian)

14. Grigor'ev A.P. Zolotoordynskie yarlyki: poisk i interpretatsiya [The Golden Horde yarliks: search and interpretations]. *Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik. 2005: Tyurkskie narody Rossii i Velikoy stepi* [Studia Turkologica, 2005: Turkic Peoples of the Russian and Great Steppe]. Moscow, Vostochnaya literatura Publ., 2006, pp. 74–142. (In Russian)

15. Ibragimov S.K., Mingulov N.N., Pishchulina K.A., Yudin V.P. (transl.) *Materialy po istorii kazakhskikh khanstv XV–XVIII vv. (Izvlacheniya iz persidskikh i tyurkskikh sochineniy)* [Materials on History of the Kazakh Khanates of the 15th–18th cc. (Extracts from the Persian and Turkic works)]. Alma-Ata, Nauka Publ., 1969. 652 p. (In Russian)

16. Ivanov P.P. *Khozyaystvo dzhuybarskikh sheykhov (k istorii feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya v Sredney Azii v XVI–XVII vv.)* [Ownership of Dzhuybari Sheikhs (on the history of feudal landownership in Central Asia of the 16th–17th cc.)]. Moscow; Leningrad, Akademiya nauk SSSR Publ., 1954. 380 p. (In Russian)

17. Khafiz Abru (Shikhab ad-Din Abdallakh ibn Lutfallakh al-Khavafi). *Zayl-i Dzhami at-tavarikh-i Rashidi («Dopolnenie k sobraniyu istoriy Rashida»)* [“Supplement to Compendium of Chronicles by Rashid”]. Transl. from Pers, intr., comments, notes and indexes by E.R. Talyshkhanov; ed. by I.M. Mirgaleev. Kazan, YaZ, 2011. 320 p. (In Russian)

18. Khafiz-i Tanysh Bukhari. *Sharaf-name-yi shakhi (Kniga shakhskoy slavy)* [The Book of the Shah's Glory]. Intr., transl, comments by M.A. Salakhedinova. Vol. 1. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1983. 298 p. (In Russian)

19. Khafiz-i Tanysh Bukhari. *Sharaf-name-yi shakhi (Kniga shakhskoy slavy)* [The Book of the Shah's Glory]. Intr., transl, comments by M.A. Salakhedinova. Vol. 2. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1989. 296 p. (In Russian)

20. Khatibi S. *Persidskie dokumental'nye istochniki po sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoy istorii Khorasana XIII–XIV vv.* [Persian Documental Sources on the Social-Economic History of Khorasan of the 13th–14th cc.]. Ashkhabad, Ylym, 1986. 134 p. (In Russian)

21. Lambton A.K.S. Two Safavid “Soyurghals”. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, vol. 14, 1952, 1, pp. 44–54.

22. Lunev Yu.F. *Gosudarstvo i pravo uzbekskikh khanstv s XVI po XIX veka* [State and Law of Uzbek Khanates from the 16th to the 19th centuries]. Moscow, AST, 2004. 216 p. (In Russian)

23. Melioranskiy P. Dokument uygurskogo pis'ma sultana Omar-Sheykha [Document of sultan Omar Sheikh in the Uyghur script]. *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo arkhologicheskogo obshchestva* [Proceedings of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society], vol. 16, 1904–1905, 1, pp. 01–012. (In Russian)

24. Minorsky V. A “Soyūrghāl” of Qāsim b. Jahāngīr Aq-qoyunlu (903/1498). *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, vol. 9, 1939, 4, pp. 927–960.

25. Minorsky V. (transl.). *Tadhkirat al-Muluk: A Manual of Safavid Administration (c. 1137/1725)*. Cambridge, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial, 1980. 218 p.

26. Muhamed'yarov Sh.F. *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiy i gosudarstvenniy stroy Kazanskogo khanstva (XV – pervaya polovina XVI vv.)* [Social-Economic and Political Structure of the Kazan Khanate (15th – first half of the 16th cc.)]. Kazan, Ikhlas, 2012. 276 p. (In Russian)

27. Muhammad-Rafi Ansari. *Dastur al-muluk* [Manual for Sovereigns]. Intr., transl., notes and index by A.B. Vil'danova. Tashkent, Fan, 1991. 139 p. (In Russian)

28. Nabiev R.N. Novye dokumental'nye materialy k izucheniyu feodal'nogo instituta «suyurgal» v Fergane XVI–XVII vv. [New documental materials on the study of feudal institution of “soyurghal” in Ferghana of the 16th–17th cc.]. *Proceedings of Academy of Science of Uzbek SSR. Series of Social Sciences*, 1959, vol. 3, pp. 23–31. (In Russian)

29. Nadelyaev V.M., Nasilov D.M., Tenishev E.R., Scherbak A.M. (eds.) *Drevnyurkskiy slovar'* [Ancient Turkic Dictionary]. Moscow, Nauka, 1969. 676 p.

30. Nikitin A.N. *Ulusnaya sistema Mongol'skoy imperii v pamyatnikakh pis'mennosti imperskikh tsentrov Chingizidskikh khanstv i Drevney Rusi* [The Ulus System of the Mongol Empire in Written Monuments of Imperial Centers of the Chinggisid Khanates and Medieval Rus']. *Cand. Sci. Diss. (history)*. Moscow, 2006. 340 p. (In Russian)

31. Ötemish Hajji. *Kara tavarikh* [The Black History]. Transl. by I.M. Mirgaleev, E.G. Sayfedinova; ed. I.M. Mirgaleev. Kazan, Marjani Institute of History of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2017. 312 p. (In Russian)

32. Petrushevskiy I.P. *Zemledelie i agrarnye otnosheniya v Irane XIII–XIV vekov* [Land and Agrarian Relations in Iran of the 13th–14th cc.]. Moscow; Leningrad, Akademiya nauk SSSR Publ., 1960. 492 p. (In Russian)

33. Petrushevskiy I.P. K voprosu ob immunitete v Azerbaydzhanе XVII–XVIII v. [On the immunity in Azerbaijan of the 17th–18th c.]. *Istoricheskiy sbornik* [Historical Collection], 1935, vol. 4, pp. 35–72. (In Russian)

34. Petrushevskiy I.P. K istorii instituta soyurgala [On the history of the institution of soyurghal]. *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* [Soviet Oriental Studies], Vol. 6, 1949, pp. 227–246. (In Russian)

35. Pishchulina K.A. *Ocherki istorii Kazakhskogo khanstva: Sb. Statey* [Essays on the History of Kazakh Khanate: Collected Works]. Comp. by K.Z Uskenbay. Almaty, Institute of history and ethnology named after Ch.Ch. Valikhanov, 2016. 350 p. (In Russian)

36. Pochekaev R.Yu. Tamgha and the struggle against it: on the history of medieval Turkic-Mongol taxation system. *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie=Golden Horde Review*. 2014, no. 4(6), pp. 77–95.

37. Rakhmanova L. Dokument XVI veka po istorii feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya v Sredney Azii [Document of the 16th century on the history of feudal landownership in Central Asia]. *Obshchestvennyye nauki v Uzbekistane* [Social Sciences in Uzbekistan], 1969, 6, pp. 55–56. (In Russian)

38. Schurmann H.F. Mongolian Tributary Practices of the 13th Century. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 19, 1956, pp. 304–389.

39. Shir Muhammad Mirab Munis & Muhammad Riza Mirab Agahi. *Firdaws al-iqbal: History of Khorezm*. Transl. from Chagat. & annot. by Yu. Bregel. Leiden; Boston; Köln, Brill, 1999. 718 p.

40. Tikhonov D. Nekotorye voprosy vnutrenney politiki Yakub-beka [Some questions on internal policy of Yaqub-beq]. *Uchenye zapiski Instituta vostokovedeniya* [Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental Studies], Vol. 16, 1958, pp. 109–137. (In Russian)

41. Usmanov M.A. *Zhalovannye akty Dzhuchieva Ulusa XIV–XVI vv.* [The Granted Acts of the Jochid Ulus of the 14th–16th cc.]. Kazan, Kazan State University Publ., 1979. 320 p.

About the author: Roman Yu. Pochekaev – Cand. Sci (Jurisprudence), Associate professor, Professor, Head of the Department of theory and history of law and state, National Research University Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, **ORCID:** 0000-0002-4192-3528, **ResearcherID:** K-2921-2015 (17, Promyshlennaya str., St. Petersburg 198099, Russian Federation). E-mail: ropot@mail.ru

Received August 24, 2018 Accepted for publication November 28, 2018

Published December 29, 2018

ЭВОЛЮЦИЯ СОЮРГАЛА В ЧИНГИЗИДСКИХ И НЕЧИНГИЗИДСКИХ ГОСУДАРСТВАХ ПОСТ-ИМПЕРСКОГО ПЕРИОДА*

Р.Ю. Почекаев

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

Цель исследования: целью настоящей статьи является анализ развития земельно-правового института союргала в чингизидских и нечингизидских государствах, выделившихся из состава Монгольской империи и ее улусов и существовавших в XV–XIX вв. Предпринимается попытка выявить причины сохранения этого имперского правового института в пост-имперский период, сходства и различия эволюции союргала в разных странах и регионах Азии.

Материалы исследования: основу исследования составляют исторические и историко-правовые памятники, содержащие сведения о союргале и дающие возможность проследить его эволюцию в рассматриваемый период – ханские ярлыки (жалованные грамоты и послания), исторические летописи и хроники, трактаты о политическом и административном устройстве пост-имперских государств. Анализируются документы Казанского и Крымского ханств, среднеазиатских ханств (Бухарского и Хивинского), Кашгарии, государств Ак-Коюнлу, Кара-Коюнлу и Сефевидов в Иране,

* Данное исследование выполнено при финансировании Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики», Санкт-Петербург, грант № 18-IP-01.

империи Великих Моголов в Индии. Методологическую основу исследования составляют труды исследователей, ранее обращавшихся к изучению института сююргала в имперский и пост-имперский периоды – М. Абдураимова, К.А. Антоновой, Б.А. Ахмедова, А.М. Беленицкого, П.П. Иванова, Э. Лэмбтона, В.Ф. Минорского, Ш.Ф. Мухамедьярова, И.П. Петрушевского, М.А. Усманова и др.

Новизна исследования состоит в том, что впервые предпринимается попытка на обширном сравнительно-правовом материале проанализировать основные тенденции в развитии института сююргала практически на всем пространстве бывшей Монгольской империи, выделить основные направления этого развития, выявить причины, почему отдельные виды этого земельно-правового института получили большее или меньшее развитие в отдельных государствах.

Результаты исследования: автор приходит к выводу, что в XV–XIX вв. институт сююргала разделялся на три вида: земельное пожалование служилой знати, земельное пожалование представителям духовенства (в первую очередь мусульманского) и пожалование со стороны монарха своим верноподданым или даже иностранцам в целом. Разные виды сююргалов в той или иной степени применялись практически на всем пространстве бывшей Монгольской империи, что позволяет сделать вывод о живучести имперской правовой традиции и отдельных правовых институтов даже через несколько веков после распада самой империи.

Ключевые слова: Монгольская империя, чингизидские государства, Улус Джучи, Чагатайский улус, Сефевидский Иран, империя Великих Моголов, право Монгольской империи, мусульманское право, привилегии и иммунитеты

Для цитирования: Pochekaev R.Yu. The Evolution of Soyurghal in Chinggisid and Non-Chinggisid States during the Post-Imperial Period // Золотоордынское обозрение. 2018. Т. 6, № 4. С. 729–740. DOI: 10.22378/2313-6197.2018-6-4.729-740

Сведения об авторе: Роман Юлианович Почекаев – доцент, кандидат юридических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой теории и истории права и государства Национального исследовательского университета «Высшая школа экономики» в Санкт-Петербурге, **ORCID:** 0000-0002-4192-3528, **ResearcherID:** K-2921-2015 (198099, ул. Промышленная, 17, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация). E-mail: ropot@mail.ru

*Поступила 24.08.2018 Принята к публикации 28.11.2018
Опубликована 29.12.2018*