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ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the rise of the Mongol Empire in its Inner Asian context, looking for evolutionary versus revolutionary features of the Mongol imperial enterprise. It then assesses the Mongol impact on Eurasia from three angles: the Mongol contributions to Eurasian integration; their impact on the Eurasian geo-political balance; and the long-term impact of their statecraft on the different regions over which they ruled.

What event or occurrence has been more notable than the beginning of the government of Chinggis Khan, that it should be considered a new era? (Rashid al-Din)²

The Mongol conquests have been defined as the last chapter of the Eurasian transformations of the tenth-thirteenth centuries. Yet with the same, or even better, justification they can also be regarded as the first chapter of a new era, perhaps the early-modern one.³ Certainly the impact of the Mongol period was strongly felt in the post-thirteenth century world as well. Before addressing the issue of Mongol legacy on Eurasia, however, I will analyze the Inner Asian background of the
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¹ I would like to thank Thomas T. Allsen, Reuven Amitai and Peter Jackson for their valuable comments on earlier drafts. This study was supported by grant 818/03 of the Israel Academy of Sciences.
Mongol Empire during the tenth to twelfth centuries, looking for evolutionary versus revolutionary features of the Mongol imperial enterprise. Then, the Mongol impact on Eurasia will be reassessed from three angles: the Mongol contribution to Eurasian integration, their impact on the Eurasian geo-political balance, and the future impact of their statecraft on the different regions under their realm.

The Mongols and the Inner Asian Tradition: Evolution versus Revolution

The Mongols did not arise from nothing, nor did they lack a cultural legacy of their own. In terms of political culture, religion, and military organization they continued a long tradition of steppe empires, while in terms of their relations with the sedentary civilizations they were influenced by the legacy of inter-regional nomadic states that arose in Manchuria and Central Asia in the tenth to twelfth centuries. Combining these two traditions, the unprecedented success of the Mongols resulted in a situation which, despite many continuities, was more revolutionary than evolutionary.

In terms of political-religious ideology, the Mongols followed the precedents established by earlier steppe empires that originated in Mongolia, notably the Xiongnu (third century BCE to fourth century CE), the Turks (sixth to eighth centuries CE), and their successors, the Uighurs (744-840), among which the Turkic Empire was by far the most influential. Those empires developed an ideology that legitimized the appearance and endurance of a super-tribal unit, and employed a military organization as an important structural element in the consolidation of such units.

The primary source of super-tribal unity in the steppe world was the belief in Tengri (Heaven), the supreme sky god of the steppe, who was able to confer the right to rule on earth to a single clan. The heavenly charisma resided in the royal clan, individual members of which could be elevated to the Khaqanate, the supreme office of the ruler, or toppled; but non-members could not aspire to the throne. The Khaqan was the political and military leader of the empire, whose possession of
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1 Whether this notion originated in the Chinese concept of the Mandate of Heaven, in a similar Iranian concept or in an Indo-Aryan concept brought first to the steppe and then into China is unimportant. For a recent discussion see Sanping Chen, “Son of Heaven and Son of God: Interactions among Ancient Asiatic Cultures regarding Sacral Kingship and Theophoric Names,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 3rd series, 12 (2002), 289-325.
the Tengri mandate was confirmed by success in battle on the one hand, and by the shamanic apparatus on the other. As Tengri did not bestow a mandate on every generation, such confirmation was important for securing the Khaqan’s power. Yet the Khaqan also had certain shamanic functions (apparent, for example, in the coronation ceremony), which enabled him to depose the shamans if they threatened his authority.5 The center of the world ruled by the Khaqan was the area around the Ötükän mountains near the Orkhon river in Central Mongolia (where the Turks left their famous inscriptions and where the Mongol capital, Qaraqorum, was built more than four hundred years later), a territory that was considered the sacred land of the nomadic world already under the Xiongnu.6

The Turk ideology was also used by the imperial successors of the Turks, the Uighurs in Mongolia and the Khazars on the European steppes. Both ruled over smaller-scale empires and in both the elite adopted a universal religion, Manichaeism or Judaism, alongside its Turkic tradition. Even though after the collapse of those empires (840 in Mongolia, c. 965 in Khazaria), and until the rise of the Mongols, no nomadic force aspired to unite the steppe or to use its universal tradition, it still served as “an ideology in reserve” among the former participants of the Turkic world, ready to be used in case the super-tribal empire should come into being.

Another important device for the endurance of a steppe empire was structural, namely, the decimal military organization, present already under the Xiongnu. Nomads are described as “natural soldiers,” since their pastoral way of life enabled them to acquire individual military skills (such as riding, shooting, endurance) from an early age, but the effectiveness of this skilled army varied greatly over the years.8 Since every nomad was a potential soldier, military organization was actually an important means for social organization. Although until the time of
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Chinggis Khan the decimal units (of 10, 100, 1000 and 10,000) were roughly arranged according to tribal lines, their existence was an important device which enabled the Khaqan to bypass the tribal channels. The decimal organization was also a useful means of incorporating new nomads into the empire’s army. The establishment of a royal guard, also present from the Xiongnu onwards, served the same functions and enabled the ruler to create a new elite, personally loyal to himself.9

While the Turkic Empire also created a political union across the vast area stretching from the borders of China to the Byzantine frontier, neither the Turks nor their predecessors or successors in Mongolia (until the rise of Chinggis Khan) ever tried to conquer the sedentary civilizations that bordered the steppe, implying that the universal rule of the Khaqan was limited to the nomadic world. Instead they consciously preferred to remain outside of the realm of their sedentary neighbors and use their mobility and superior military skills to secure their economic interests from the sedentary world through raids and alternating war and peace.10 The resources needed for the sustenance of the empire were therefore acquired through tribute from the sedentary civilizations, and trade revenues, often derived through circulating a portion of the collected tributes throughout Eurasia. The Orkhon inscriptions attest that the Turks were fully aware of the connection between the need to remain outside of the realm of the sedentary world, with its seductive luxuries, and their ability to retain their distinct identity and the military superiority that enabled them to extract revenue from China.11

Yet the period that immediately preceded the Mongols, from the tenth century onward, saw the emergence of another kind of nomadic state. These new polities originated not in Mongolia, but either in Manchuria or Central Asia, i.e., in regions in which the coexistence of nomad and sedentary was far more common than on the Mongolian steppe. They rose to power in the absence of a strong force on the steppe after the fall of the Uighurs (840), and the decline of the bordering sedentary empires: i.e. the collapse of Tang China (906), the decline of the Abbasid Caliphate from the middle of the ninth century.
and the Samanids from the mid-tenth century. Unlike their Mongolian predecessors, these states did conquer parts of the sedentary civilizations that bordered the steppe, thereby creating empires in which a nomadic (or semi-nomadic) minority, backed by a strong military machine, ruled a multi-ethnic nomad and sedentary population. This required the acquisition of knowledge and administrative skills to manage the government of the sedentary areas as well as new forms of legitimization.\(^{12}\) In establishing these states, the rulers became closely associated with the sedentary traditions of the peoples that they ruled; Chinese on the eastern steppe and Muslim on the western steppe (and, in the case of Hungary, even Christian). The sedentary influences played an important role in the shape of the royal institutions of these states and their administration, which included direct taxation of their sedentary population alongside tribute from China (on the eastern steppe) and a variety of indirect means of revenue collection (on the western steppe).\(^{13}\) Yet those external influences did not supplant the steppe past, which remained an important part of the elite identity and government. Even when some of these rulers became sedentarized, the nomads and former nomads continued to share many common features. They shared social values, such as the central role of warfare in everyday life, the high position of women and merchants; certain aspects of political culture, such as alliances through marriage, hunting as royal sport, the policy of holding hostages, and certain aspects of military organization (although the states certainly diversified their military organization and tactics under


\(^{13}\) Golden, “Ideology,” 73-4; Di Cosmo, “Periodization,” 32-3; Morgan, *Medieval Persia*, 34-40. While Hungary can be regarded as one of those mixed states that retained several Khazar influences, its limited connection with nomads after the collapse of the Khazars and the Christian ideology it adopted led to its rapid acculturation in the East-European world at the expense of its steppe roots, although it remained a frontier society. See P. B. Golden, “The Peoples of the Russian Forest Belt,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, ed. D. Sinor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 242-8; N. Berend, *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and ‘Pagans’ in Medieval Hungary c. 1000-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). In general, the European case is somewhat different than that of China or the Islamic World, mainly because after the period of the Huns (fourth-fifth centuries) and the Avars (sixth-ninth centuries) and certainly after the collapse of the Khazars in the tenth century, Europe was spared what China, Central Asia and the Middle East experienced time and again, namely invasion and domination by nomads. After the collapse of the Khazars, a modus vivendi between equals was arrived at between the nomads and “Russia,” the part of Europe most closely connected to the steppe. For Europe, therefore, the Mongol invasion came without any preparatory stage. (M. Gammer, “Russia and the Nomads: An Overview,” in *Mongols, Turks and Others: Eurasian Nomads and the Outside World*, eds. R. Amitai and M. Biran, forthcoming in Brill.)
the influence of their sedentary territories). On the western steppes such states were established by splinter groups of the Turks, such as the Qarakhanids (c. 950-1213), Saljuqs (c. 1044-1194), and Khwarazm Shahs (c. 1127-1220) while in the east, and of more immediate relevance for the Mongols, the founders were Manchurian peoples: the Khitans, formerly part of the Turkic world who came under a significant Uighur influence, who established the Liao dynasty (907-1125) and later the Qara Khitai (Western Liao) dynasty in Central Asia (1124-1218); and the Khitans’ former vassals, the Jurchens, who founded the Jin dynasty (1115-1234).

In their pre-imperial history, the Mongols were closely associated with the Manchurian dynasties. They entered Mongolia after the Khitans conquered it in the early tenth century, driving most of its original Turkic population westwards. Liao garrisons and the cities they established in Mongolia earned the Khitans great prestige among the Mongols. They also served as channels for transferring Chinese and Khitan institutions; some of the latter, such as the postal system (yam) or the ordo (camp of the ruler or a prince), were later adopted by the Chinggisids. The Jurchens, who deposed the Khitans in 1125, did not rule Mongolia, but played an active role in its tribal politics. Chinggis Khan’s forefathers had tribute relations with the Jin, and he himself probably spent several years in Jin captivity, thus becoming familiar with its institutions. The pre-imperial Mongols also had less frequent connections

14 Michal Biran, The Empire of the Qara Khitai in Eurasian History: Between China and the Islamic World, forthcoming in Cambridge University Press, Ch. 5.


with the Central Asian states, mainly through Muslim merchants. Of these states the Qara Khitai Empire was especially significant. Using Chinese trappings to rule a mostly Muslim population, the Qara Khitai narrowed the gap between the ways of ruling in Central Asia and China, thereby facilitating the Mongol’s ability to borrow traditions and personnel from both directions.19

The Mongols owed much to their direct predecessors on the margins of the steppe, especially their ability to combine nomad and sedentary territories and populations under effective rule. These states provided the Mongols with ready-made pools of officials, experienced in mediating foreign rule, either from the indigenous bureaucrats and scribal classes of those states, or, more commonly, from ex- (or post)-nomads who were already active (mainly as bureaucrats, governors or merchants) under the Mongols’ predecessors.20 The important roles of the ex-nomads Uighurs, Khitans and, to a lesser extent, the Khwarazmians and Khurasanians in the ranks of the early Mongol Empire certainly support this notion.21 Yet it would be misleading to describe the Mongols simply as the most successful of these states.22 First, because they also continued the tradition of the Mongolian steppe empires and, more importantly, because the phenomenal success of the Mongols resulted not only in quantitative change (i.e. a vaster empire) but also qualitative change, thereby making the Mongol period the watershed of Inner Asian history.

Chinggis Khan died in 1227, ruling over the greatest territory any one man had ever conquered, from north China to the Caspian Sea.

19 Biran, Qara Khitai, Conclusion.
20 Thomas T. Allsen, “Technologies of Governance in the Mongolian Empire: A Geographical Survey,” paper given in the MIASU Symposium on Inner Asian Statecrafts and Technologies of Governance, Cambridge UK, March 18-19, 2004. As Allsen claims, the absence of such personnel in Russia was at least partially responsible for the different—and indirect—government established by the Golden Horde.
His heirs continued to expand, creating an empire that at its height (1259) stretched from Korea to Hungary, from Yunnan (in south China) to Iraq. Unlike their predecessors, the Mongols conquered not only the margins of the sedentary civilizations but their centers as well, and while doing so they broke down the boundaries between the eastern steppe, a Chinese sphere of influence, and the western steppes, influenced by Islam. Moreover, the conquest was conducted in a way that paved the way for the creation of a new reality.

One major factor for both the Mongol success and the revolution it created was the unprecedented amount of destruction that accompanied the Mongol conquests, which resulted (among other things) in the annihilation, transfer and downgrading of sizable segments of the established Eurasian elites. A second factor was the new organization of the Mongol army: Chinggis Khan retained the classical decimal organization but abolished its linkage to the tribal system: the new Mongol units often comprised people from different tribes and were led primarily by Chinggis Khan’s nökers (personal allies), who became the new elite of the empire. The soldiers’ loyalty was thereby transferred from their tribe to their commander and beyond him to the Chinggisid family. The improved coordination of these newly created units certainly contributed to the success of their conquests. Another significant reason for the Mongol success was their willingness to learn from their subjects and their skill in doing so. They borrowed and adapted institutions from different edges of their empire (again mainly from either the Muslim world or China), both for the conquest and for the consolidation of their empire. This brought new technologies and personnel to the edges of the empire, encouraged the Mongol tendency of ruling through foreigners, and created an imperial culture (also maintained in the separate khanates established after 1260) that comprised not only the Mongols social and cultural norms and the indigenous traditions of the conquered but also foreign traditions imported by the Mongols (more about this below).

Thus, the background to the unprecedented success of the Mongols

23 For different explanations to Mongol destruction see Fletcher, “The Mongols,” 39-43, who sees the destruction mainly as a form of psychological warfare, and John Mason Smith Jr., “Demographic Considerations in Mongol Siege Warfare,” Archivum Ottomanicum, 13 (1993-94), 329-34, who stresses the demographic and tactical concerns behind it.
24 Morgan, The Mongols, 89-90. The military success of the Mongols owes much to this reorganization and to the efficient coordination between the units.
contributed to its revolutionary character. Moreover, this unprecedented success has its own implications, which in turn enhanced the new Eurasia created under the Mongols.

The phenomenal achievements of Chinggis Khan turned the Chinggisids into the new royal clan of the steppe. The Chinggisid principle, according to which only descendants of the Great Khan were eligible to bear the titles khan or khaqan, was sustained in Inner Asia for centuries, long after the dissolution of the Mongol empire.26

Moreover, already by the time of Chinggis Khan, the Mongols had revived the concept of universal nomadic rule sanctioned by Heaven. Unlike their predecessors, however, they broadened the concept, to include their right to rule over the whole world, in both its nomadic and sedentary realms. The center of the empire, however, remained in the steppe (at least till 1260), as suggested by the establishment of the Mongol capital, Qaraqorum, in the sacred place of the former nomadic empires in the reign of Ögödei, Chinggis Khan’s successor (1229-1241).27 Among the renowned expressions of this newly conceived ideology were the ultimatums the Mongol issued to different rulers of the world. Indeed, unlike their predecessors, the Mongols were unwilling to accept the coexistence of rival claimants to universal rule: they did not leave the Caliph intact, as the Saljuqs had done, nor were they prepared to accept the legitimacy of another Son of Heaven, as the Khitans and Jurchen had done vis-à-vis the Song emperor. The Pope, another significant claimant to universal authority, survived the Mongol onslaught, but the annihilation of the Song in China in 1276 and, more importantly, the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258, paved the way for major changes in these two realms.28

In terms of their relations with their sedentary subjects, after they had realized that it would be more profitable to tax their subjects than

26 See below.
28 For the Mongol ideology of world dominion see e.g. R. Amitai-Preiss, “Mongol Imperial Ideology and the Ilkhanid War against the Mamluks,” in The Mongol Empire and its Legacy (Leiden: Brill, 1998), eds. D. O. Morgan and R. Amitai-Preiss, 59-72, and the references on p. 62. This article shows that the ideology of world conquest was relevant even after the dissolution of the empire into four khanates in 1260 and into the fourteenth century; see also P. Jackson, “World-Conquest and Local Accommodation: Threat and Blandishment in Mongol Diplomacy,” paper given in the MIASU symposium on Inner Asian Statecraft and Technologies of Governance, Cambridge UK, March 18-19, 2004.
to annihilate them, the Mongols used direct taxation as the principal means of collecting revenues from their subjects, rather than the tribute and most of the other indirect solutions employed by their predecessors.\textsuperscript{29}

The vast empire and the eclectic state culture, combined with the fact that the Mongols ruled over the two most economically productive areas in Eurasia (China and the eastern Islamic world),\textsuperscript{30} certainly contributed to their ability to integrate the Eurasian world more than their steppe predecessors.

Integration on a Eurasian Scale

The Mongol period was a significant step towards closer integration of the old world, both inside and outside the empire’s realm. Certainly the vast dimensions of the empire contributed to that, but the role of the Mongols was not limited to the passive medium through which the sophisticated sedentary subjects learnt from one another, as suggested by the (problematic) term \textit{Pax Mongolica}.\textsuperscript{31} Instead they actively promoted inter-cultural exchange.

The Mongols’ active role originally derived from the fact that the formation of the empire, its continued expansion, and the establishment of its administration required a huge mobilization of people throughout the empire, and this mobilization was the first step towards cross-cultural exchange and integration. The mobilization is to be explained primarily by demographic considerations. In Chinggis Khan’s times the total population of Mongolia was about 700,000. Therefore, human capital was of primary importance to the nomads, and the political struggles that accompanied the formation of the Mongol state concentrated more on the control of people and herds than on territorial gains. The demographic balance also meant that in order to continue expanding, the Mongols had to make use of the already conquered subjects. The first and perhaps most wide-ranging means for Mongol mobilization was therefore the army. Already Chinggis Khan appropriated defeated nomads and subjugated tribes, organized in new decimal units among Mongol
princes and commanders, and sent them to fight across Eurasia, a process continued in the even larger scale campaigns of his heirs.32

The mobilization was not limited to the military sphere. In fact as soon as the Mongols found themselves rulers of an empire with a significant sedentary sector, they realized that they were lacking not only numbers but also specialists. Nomadic culture creates generalists, as every nomad is versed in variety of skills that allow him to survive in the steppe; but these skills are not sufficient for ruling a world empire. The Mongols therefore looked for specialists “skillful in the laws and custom of cities,”33 and redistributed them across Eurasia. This process involved both groups, like the 100,000 artisans taken in 1221 from Transoxiana to Mongolia and China, or the northern Chinese farmers sent to Merv and later transferred to Adharbaijan; and (many) individuals, specializing in various fields (such as military technology, administration, religion, trade, astronomy, medicine, cooking, wrestling, mechanical engineering). The collection of specialists was systematized already in the late 1230s by means of census, in which people were classified according to their skills (military, artisans, etc).34

Another factor that encouraged mobilization was the Mongol policy of ruling through strangers, a practice originating from the Mongol’s numerical inferiority and their fear of potential local resistance. Chinggis Khan already sent the Khwarazmian Maḥmūd Yalawach to rule in North China and the Khitan brothers, Yelū Ahai and Yelū Tuhua, to rule in Bukhara. This policy was further systematized in Yuan China, where the Mongols created a special category of semuren (people of various kinds), second only to the Mongols and more privileged than the Chinese, for their foreign subjects.35 The Mongols preferred foreigners who originated in the inter-regional nomadic empires, people who were not only skilled in the laws of the cities but also had connections to the steppe (e.g. Khitans, Uighurs, Khwarazmians), though other talented people (the famous example is Marco Polo) were also welcome. In order

32 Allsen, “Ever Closer Encounters,” 4; the best description of Mongol mobilization at its height, under Mongke Qa’an (1251-59) is to be found in Allsen’s Mongol Imperialism: The Policies of the Great Qan Mongke in China, Russia and the Islamic Lands (Berkely: University of California Press, 1989), esp. 189-216.
35 Alsen, “Ever Closer Encounters,” 6, and see n. 21 above; for the semuren, see, e.g., Frederick W. Mote, “Chinese Society under Mongol Rule, 1215-1368,” in The Cambridge History of China vol. 6, 644-8.
to secure the loyalty of this foreign strata, the Mongols aspired to give them “a taste of home,” and therefore brought foreign (mostly Muslim or Central Asian) food, medicine and entertainment into Yuan China.36

As suggested by the examples above, the Chinggisids regarded human talent (from both inside and outside the empire) as a form of booty, to be shared out among the family like material goods. The different khanates competed for these specialists and exchanged them in order to get a better grip on the economic and cultural wealth of their sedentary lands and to enhance their kingly reputation.37

These Mongol attitudes created innumerable opportunities for cross-cultural contacts. Most of what was transmitted was not the Mongol’s ethnic culture but elements of the cultures of their sedentary subjects, yet the Mongols initiated most of these exchanges; most of the carriers of culture were agents of the empire, while the Mongols served as the filter, directing which particular traits would be diffused across Eurasia. In short, the flow of people, ideas and goods across Asia was determined to a large extent by what the Mongols liked, needed and were interested in.38 These interests also included mobilizing the spiritual forces in their realm, and therefore scholars and clergy also traveled between the Mongol courts. The Mongols showed great interest in fields that were compatible with their own norms, mostly with their shamanic beliefs, such as astronomy, divination, medicine (=healing) or geomancy. They therefore promoted scientific exchanges. In Allsen’s eloquent argument, this meant that Muslim astronomers came to China not because they or their Chinese counterparts wanted scientific exchange, but because the Mongols wanted second opinions on the reading of portents.39

Trade was, obviously, another means of promoting integration, and the Mongols played an active role in promoting it too. The process of state formation among the nomads itself stimulated trade by increasing the demand for precious metals, gems, and especially fine cloth, all necessary to assert the new empire’s authority.40 Chinggis Khan was certainly aware of the benefits of commerce (which initiated the Khwârazm campaign), and Muslim merchants were among his earliest supporters,

36 Allsen, Culture and Conquest, 195-6.
38 Allsen, Culture and Conquest, 189-211.
39 Allsen, Culture and Conquest, 211.
even before he succeeded in uniting the Mongol tribes. Moreover, after the early conquests, the Mongol elite, the principal benefactor of the conquests’ booty, became extremely wealthy. It recycled this wealth by investing with their commercial agents (ortogh)—mostly Muslims and Uighurs—in ways that were often similar to western commenda and Muslim qirāḍ. The profits were spent on the lavish consumption characteristic of the “nouveau riche.” The establishment of Qaraqorum also promoted trade, as the resources of Mongolia could hardly support such a big city (in Mongolian terms) or its court. The Mongols were prepared to pay generously to remain on the steppe while enjoying the best of the agricultural world, and there were plenty of traders who seized the opportunity, benefiting from the safe roads and access to the postal stations.41 Even after the empire dissolved into the four khanates, Mongol governments continued to promote both local and international trade, which provided taxes, markets, profits and prestige. The khanates competed for commerce specialists, provided infrastructure for transcontinental travel, sometimes by building new cities, and were actively involved in the manipulation of bullion flow.42 Di Cosmo, who recently reviewed Mongol relations with the Italian merchants on the Black Sea shores, concluded that even in this arena of European expansion, the Mongol khanate of Qipchaq (the Golden Horde) played a leading role in determining the development of the trade. Moreover, Italian trade with Central Asia and China, places where the Italian city states refused to interfere diplomatically to secure adequate agreements for their traders, was made possible only by Mongols creating the infrastructure for such contacts, and indeed came to an end with the collapse of the Yuan dynasty in 1368.43

43 Nicola Di Cosmo, “Mongols and Merchants on the Black Sea Frontier (13th and 14th Centuries): Convergences and Conflicts,” forthcoming in Mongols, Turks and Others.
The wide-ranging mobilization and expanding trade led to frequent and continuous moves of people, goods, ideas, plants, and viruses throughout Eurasia. This in turn not only encouraged integration but also created means that facilitated further contacts, such as maps, which gave a visual dimension to the broadening horizons of the Eurasian people, multi-lingual dictionaries, and of course travel literature.\textsuperscript{44} The effects of the integration are apparent, for example, in the diffusion of information and technologies (e.g., gunpowder and distilling alcohol);\textsuperscript{45} in the adoption of “Tatar dress” in fourteenth-century England, in Yuan and Ming China, in Ilkhanid and post-Ilkhanid Iran, in Chaghadaid and Timurid Central Asia and in Mamluk Egypt.\textsuperscript{46} The famous pasta was imported from the Middle East by both China and Italy,\textsuperscript{47} and the Bubonic plague travelled all the way from south China to Europe and the Middle East.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{44} For cartography see Allsen, \textit{Culture and Conquest}, 103-14; for travel literature see, e.g., John Larner, \textit{Marco Polo and the Discovery of the World} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999). The development of lexicography is an especially good example of both the Mongol’s role in scientific exchange and the radiance of cross-cultural effects to territories outside the empire. The Mongols used diverse languages and scripts in the management of their empire, and their multilingual empire was a major catalyst in the growth of language studies throughout Eurasia. They generously rewarded those with linguistic skills, i.e., mastery of both the Mongolian language, in its spoken, written or printed forms, and mastery of foreign languages often conferred status and power. Moreover, Mongolian words and usages penetrated into Chinese, Russian and Persian languages. The Mongols organized schools for language training, encouraged translation and sponsored or inspired the compilation of multi-lingual vocabularies. Multi-lingual lists of terms (i.e., dictionaries) appear in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries not only in Iran and China but also in Armenia, Korea, North India, Egypt, Yemen and the Crimea. The two most famous compilations are the \textit{Rasulid Hexaglot}, with entries in Mongolian, Turkic, Arabic, Persian, Tibetan and Greek, and the \textit{Codex Cumanicus} with its Italo-Latin-Cuman-Persian vocabulary. The establishment of chairs of oriental languages in major European universities in the early fourteenth century is also ascribed to the Mongol’s influence, as this kind of knowledge was considered essential for converting the Tatars. See Thomas T. Allsen, “The Rasulid Hexaglot in its Eurasian Cultural Context,” in \textit{The King’s Dictionary}, ed. and tr. P. B. Golden (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 25-49.


\textsuperscript{47} Paul D. Buell, “Mongol Empire and Turkicization: The Evidence of Food and Foodways,” in \textit{The Mongol Empire and its Legacy}, 200-23.

Another significant mode of integration was in the field of religion. The Mongols provided a huge reservoir of potential converts for the different world religions, and missionaries were among those who roamed the open routes of the Mongol Empire. For reasons that cannot be discussed here (but had a lot to do with the Muslim ability to make their religion compatible with the Mongol’s shamanic practices), Islam was the great winner in the struggle for converts. By the mid-fourteenth century, after the Islamization of the Ilkhanate, the Golden Horde and the Chaghadaid Khanate, this resulted in the appearance of a new Turco-Mongolian elite in the region that lay between the Tian shan and the Volga as well as across most of the Middle East. This elite was Muslim, spoke Turkish and honored the traditions of the Mongol Empire. While China and Europe remained outside of this phenomenon, it is certainly a good example of integration on a rather significant scale.

The Mongols and the Eurasian Geo-Political Balance

Despite the tendency of Russian and Muslim thinkers (as well as some Chinese nationalists in the early twentieth century) to ascribe everything that went wrong with their civilizations to the Mongols’ influence, or Archibald Lewis’s assertion that the rise of Europe was made possible because it was spared the Mongol conquest, the Mongols did not cause drastic changes in the geopolitical balance of Eurasia. True, the initial invasions were traumatic enough, but the destruction was limited, both in extent and duration. As soon as the Mongols understood that they could get more out of their territories by taxation than by ravaging them, which was apparent already in Möngke’s reign (1251-59), they

49 There is a growing literature on Mongol Islamization, the most comprehensive work being that of Devin DeWeese, Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993); see also Peter Jackson, “The Mongols and the Faith of their Conquered,” forthcoming in Mongols, Turks and Others; on Christian conversion attempts see, e.g., J. R. S. Phillips, The Medieval Expansion of Europe (2nd edn; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 83-102.
consciously tried to limit the damage.\textsuperscript{53} This does not mean that there were no exceptions; the bloody conquest of Baghdad in 1258 is by far the most famous example. Furthermore, regions that became buffer zones between the Mongols and their enemies (e.g. Iraq) or between the different Khanates (Khurasan, Uighuria) certainly suffered multiple raids throughout the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Yet alongside both calculated and accidental devastation, there were positive attempts by the Khans to restore the productivity of their lands, attempts that were facilitated by the multiple possibilities of regional and international trade.\textsuperscript{54} The important productive regions, China and the Middle East, thus retained their status, both during and after the Mongol conquests.\textsuperscript{55}

Mongol rule was, however, geo-politically important in two ways. First, it led to shifting the political center of most of the empire’s regions, sometimes with enduring results. Second, the administrative divisions that after 1260 became four separate Mongol khanates were influential in shaping later political boundaries and ethnic identities.

Mongol rulers relocated the capitals of each of the established khanates, generally in a north-easterly direction. This may originally have reflected the location of Qaraqorum, the Mongol capital on the Orkhon river, or the nomads’ need to reside closer to the steppe. In China the capital shifted from Kaifeng and Hangzhou to Beijing;\textsuperscript{56} in the eastern Islamic world it moved from Baghdad to Tabriz in Adharbaijan, in Russia from Kiev to, first Saray (south-east of Kiev), and then Moscow (north-east again), and in Central Asia (the least defined case) from Balasaghun (modern north Kyrgyzstan) to the region of Almaliq, (in north Xinjiang). The central positions of Beijing and Moscow remain unchallenged; in Iran the area of Adharbaijan retained its importance until at least the end of the sixteenth century,\textsuperscript{57} while in Central Asia,
Samarqand and to a lesser extent Kashgar replaced Almaliq in the fourteenth century.

The Mongol conquests and the four khanates they later created also played important roles in defining later political and ethnic entities. In China the Mongol legacy was unification, after 350 years of separation between north and south. The extended boundaries of Mongol and post-Mongol China included Yunnan in the south-west, Gansu in the north-west and, despite Ming attempts to avoid it, significant parts of Inner Asia, namely, Tibet, Xinjiang, Manchuria and (Inner) Mongolia. 58 Ethnically, on the one hand the first alien conquest of the entire country might have given a boost to a development of proto-ethnic or patriotic Chinese identity (opposed to the universalistic idea of all-under-heaven) or at least to a bitter anti-foreignism. 59 On the other hand, it also resulted in assimilation of large numbers of steppe peoples (Uighurs, Khitans, Jurchens, Tanguts and even Mongols) into Chinese society, especially from the fourteenth century onward. Today the People’s Republic of China strongly emphasizes the multi-ethnic character of Yuan society as one of its major contributions to the “national characteristics of the contemporary Chinese people.” 60

The Mongols also contributed to Iran’s emergence as a distinct political and ethnic entity within the Muslim world. Like the Sasanid Empire, the orientation of the Ilkhanate, the Mongol state based in Iran, was more towards China and Europe than the Muslim Middle East. Moreover, Mongol Iran had much the same borders as the Sasanid Empire (and the modern state). The use of the name Iran to denominate a political entity, a Sasanian concept not used during early Muslim rule in Iran, was revived by the Mongols; the Persian language finally replaced Arabic...
as the preferred vehicle for writing history and soon became the written lingua-franca of the Turco-Mongolic world; and the ethnic composition of the population became much as it has since remained, i.e. including many Turkic and Turco-Mongolian nomads.\textsuperscript{61}

As for the rest of the Middle East, the Mongols’ annihilation of the Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad, reduced Iraq, once the center of the Islamic world, to a neglected frontier province, as it has remained almost ever since. Egypt, the only Muslim state to successfully defy the Mongols, improved its position as another center of the Muslim world; the establishment and consolidation of its Mamluk regime owes much to its successful struggle against the Ilkhanate.\textsuperscript{62} Even the emirate of Othman, later to become the Ottoman Empire, rose within the Ilkhanid sphere of influence.\textsuperscript{63} In general the Mongol period completed the process of Turco-Mongol (as opposed to Arab or Persian) dominance of the ruling elites of the Middle East, a process that had begun in the tenth century.\textsuperscript{64}

In Russia, the Mongols contributed significantly to the rise of Moscow, though the exact nature of this contribution is still debated.\textsuperscript{65} Moreover, Moscow used its claim as the successor to the Horde to justify its later expansion, and the emergence of Russia as a Eurasian power (as opposed to the few European city states in Kievan Rus times) can be traced to the legacy of the Horde.\textsuperscript{66} From the sixteenth century, however, Russia also used the Mongols (or Tatars) as its significant other, developing the concept of the Tatar Yoke and defining Russian identity as its total opposite.\textsuperscript{67}

In Central Asia the situation was more complex. While there is no modern continuation of the Chaghadaid khanate, in the late fourteenth

\textsuperscript{62} B. Lewis, 206.
\textsuperscript{63} R. P. Lindner, “How Mongol were the early Ottomans?” in The Mongol Empire and its Legacy, 282-9.
\textsuperscript{64} B. Lewis, “The Mongols, the Turks and the Muslim Polity,” 203.
\textsuperscript{65} Ostrowski, Muscovy, 1-27; Charles Halperin, Russia and the Golden Horde (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,1985), 53-60 and passim; Janet Martin, Medieval Russia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 382-5.
\textsuperscript{67} Ostrowski, Muscovy, 244-8.
In the fourteenth century it gave rise to the empire of Tamerlane and his short-lived attempt (1370-1405) to revive the Mongol Empire. This in turn led to the Timurid cultural renaissance in Iran and Central Asia (1405-1501), and to the establishment of the Moghul dynasty (1526-1838), which brought Chinggisid and Timurid traditions into India. In terms of ethnic change, however, the Mongol period was the most influential in this region. Mongol policies, especially military mobilization and the redistribution of the steppe peoples in their armies, led to the dispersion of many established peoples, who had long and celebrated pre-Mongol histories (such as the Uighurs, Khitans, Tanguts, Qipchaqs) and to the emergence of new collectivities, which formed the basis for many of the modern Central Asian peoples (e.g. Uzbeks and Qazaqs). From the fourteenth century onward, most of the pre-Mongol steppe peoples were either assimilated in the sedentary civilizations surrounding them, mainly in China or Iran, or reduced to clan or tribal units in the new collectivities established by the Mongols. After the disintegration of the empire these new collectivities had to refashion their identities. They often coalesced around the names of particular Mongol princes (e.g. Chaghadai, Özbeg, Nogai etc.) and eventually developed into the modern Central Asian peoples.

As for Western Europe, its main benefit from the Mongol period was not geo-political or ethnic but intellectual. Indeed it avoided the initial demolition and (unlike India and Egypt), after 1260, was hardly bothered by Mongol raids or the threat of them; its own economic growth enabled it (principally the Italian city-states) to fully benefit from the new channels of trade and travel opened by the Mongols. Moreover, technologically inferior and more provincial than either China or the Muslim world, there was much to be gained from taking part in the
Mongol “information circuit.”\textsuperscript{70} However, it took several centuries (and overcoming the Black Death) to translate the broadening geographical and intellectual horizons and technological diffusion into geo-political advantage.\textsuperscript{71}

\textit{The Legacy of Mongol Statecraft}

The Mongol legacy had different institutional impacts on the various civilizations that were affected by it. The most profound effects were in the regions where Mongol rule was longer-lasting, and where there was no strong indigenous tradition of a centralized state; namely Central Asia and Russia. A certain institutional legacy, however, can also be discerned in China and Iran, but the Mongol influence also reached beyond the limits of the empire, most notably in the Muslim world. It is also worthwhile differentiating between the practical borrowing of Mongol institutions on the one hand, and adopting the Mongol political ideology on the other.

The basic component of Mongol statecraft was the Chinggisid principle, i.e., the notion that only descendants of Chinggis Khan were eligible to bear the title khan, which denotes the highest political office. Although attempts to manipulate this principle began rather early (e.g., under Tamerlane), in Central Asia it remained in effect until the late eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{72} Moreover, in Uzbek Central Asia even the position of the non-Chinggisid military groups was determined according to the position of their forebears in Chinggis Khan’s army during the military campaigns of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{73} The Chinggisid principle was relevant in other parts of Eurasia as well: e.g. the Moghuls in India, although generally stressing their Timurid genealogy, also used their Chinggisid origins as a legitimating factor.\textsuperscript{74} Even in the Ottoman Empire, where Chinggisid origins played no part in the (non Chinggisid) rulers’ identities, the Uzbeks and Crimean Tatars enjoyed special prestige due


\textsuperscript{71} As Adshead put it: “If Europe came to dominate the world, it was possibly because Europe first perceived there was a world to dominate” (Adshead, \textit{Central Asia,} 77). For the connection between the Mongol period and European expansion in the modern period see, e.g., Larner, \textit{Marco Polo}, passim; Phillips, \textit{The Medieval Expansion}, passim.


\textsuperscript{73} McChesney, \textit{Central Asia}, 123-4.

to their Chinggisid genealogy. The Chinggisid principle also had a significant impact on Muscovy. The Russians were aware of it and in the Kulikovo era (around 1380) used it to justify their actions against the Golden Horde. Even after the overthrow of the Golden Horde in 1480, the grand princes of Moscow presented themselves as the successors of the Chinggisids, adopting the title tsar, which, aside from its Byzantine connotations, was also the title used exclusively to denote the Chinggisid Qipchaq khan. As late as 1575-6 Ivan the Terrible abdicated in favor of the Chinggisid Symon Bekbulatovitc. Chinggisid descent remained important in Russian politics until the westernization of Peter the Great in the seventeenth century, yet as late as the nineteenth century, Chinggisids living in the Russian Empire demanded a noble status on the basis of their genealogy. The Chinggisid tradition was also relevant in Qing China (1644-1911), where the Manchus, after marrying Chinggisid princesses and obtaining the Chinggisid seal from his heirs, used their position as successors of the Chinggisids as one facet in their complex legitimization.

In Central Asia the adherence to the Chinggisid legacy was also expressed in the continued importance of the Yasa, the collection of laws ascribed to Chinggis Khan. Even after the Islamization of the Mongols in the fourteenth century the Yasa continued to be adhered to alongside Muslim law, the Sharia, each having its own sphere of influence. The Yasa was authoritative in political and criminal matters as well as in determining court ceremonies and protocols, while the Sharia prevailed in dealing with cult, personal status and contracts. Our limited knowledge of the Chinggisid Yasa of the thirteenth century makes it difficult to establish how close the Timurid or Uzbek laws were to the original Yasa (certainly the Uzbek stress on seniority as the key principle for determining succession does not conform with the Mongol succession practices of the thirteenth century), but the mere fact that these laws were sanctioned by the name of Chinggis Khan is significant enough. In Moghul India, the Yasa (or Tūrāh) continued to be followed.
It was often invoked to highlight the rulers’ links to Chinggis Khan and Tamerlane, yet its practical use seems to have been limited to the realm of court ceremonies and etiquette. While not acknowledging any adherence to the Yasa, Russian diplomatic practices were borrowed from the Golden Horde, i.e., from the Yasa. The Yasa might have also encouraged the promulgation of the Ottoman codex of “secular” law, the qanun.

The borrowing of other elements of Mongol statecraft was typically more utilitarian in nature. The Mongols developed efficient means of ruling an empire, a fact that was not overlooked by their successors. The provincial division initiated in Yuan China remains the basis for Chinese provinces today, for example. The Mongol’s imperial postal system continues to be used in China, Iran and Muscovy. Mongol military institutions have had enduring legacies, not only among the nomads of Central Asia and Iran but also in China and Russia: Ming China retained the decimal division of the army, the system of military households, the personal guard of the emperor, the Yuan garrison system (weisuo), as well as incorporating many Mongols into its army.

Mongol financial institutions were also influential in Iran, Central Asia and Russia, all of which, for example, retained the tamgha (custom tax), despite (or because of) its un-Islamic character. In all three realms the names of the currency (tümen in Iran, kepeks in Central Asia [and Russia] and den’ga in Russia) come from the Mongol period, attesting to its role in shaping currency systems. Loan words also suggest that
other Muscovite institutions originated in the Golden Horde (e.g., *kanza* for treasury; *tarkhan* for tax exempt privileges). Ostrowski’s recent assertion that Muscovite central and provincial political institutions (such as the Boyar council) were directly borrowed from the Golden Horde is more questionable, but clearly the Mongol institutional legacy was stronger in the Russian realm, where the Mongol period was influential in turning a number of city states into the nucleus of a grand Eurasian empire.\(^88\)

In sum, the role of the nomads in the Eurasian transformations of the tenth to thirteenth centuries should not be underestimated.\(^89\) The period saw an intensification of nomad-sedentary relations, characterized by a growing nomadic political and military superiority, which reached its height under the Mongols. Although in the Mongol case there was no equation between political superiority and cultural dominance, the Mongols left a significant impact on Eurasian cultural and political development. They actively promoted contacts and exchange between different civilizations, both within and outside of their empire, and were the principal agents of cultural transfers, selecting which particular traits were diffused in either direction. The Mongols were also influential in shaping the future boundaries, centers, and ethnic definitions of their subject territories, as well as significantly contributed to their statecraft. The most enduring legacy of Mongol rule, in terms of both legitimation concepts and ethnic identities, was in Central Asia, which must be taken into account in any discussion of Eurasian transformations.

---


INDEX

Abbasid Caliphate 342, 347, 356
Abbasids 28
Abelard, Peter 91
Abraham, Meera 266n. 28
Absolutism 265, 269
Abu-Lughod, Janet 247, 248n. 1, 266n. 27
Achaemenids 254
Adalbert, St. 100, 106, 113
Adam Bremensis 174
Adharbaijan 349, 354
Adolphson, Mikael S. 41, 65, 66n. 22
Advaita/Advaitins 249-50
Ady, Endre 104
Aesthetics 258-60
Africa 271
Agentiality 47-48, 54-55
Aggala 259
Agricultural expansion 267, 269-70, 278
Agriculture 58, 62, 82, 161, 247, 267, 280
Akhi Juq 243-44
Akhi  see Futuwwa
Akkad 16
Alexander III, Pope 117, 123, 176
Alfonso VII, 256
Alfonso X. 256-57, 273-74
Almaliq 354
Al-Nasir li-Din Allah,  'Abbasid Caliph 213, 216, 221-27, 231, 244
Almudjatia 140
Álvar 250
Americas 17
Amir Khusrau 277
Anatolia 30
Andalusia 219-221
Anderson, Perry 160, 160n. 20, 265n. 26
Andhra 277
Andrew II, King of Hungary 128
Angevins 104, 129
Anglo-Normans 255, 257
Anglo-Saxon England 121
Anglo-Saxon kingdoms 111
Anglo-Saxons 253
Aquinas 110
Aquinas, Thomas 81
Arabs/Arabic 256, 266, 271-75
Arhus 116
Arians 111
Aristocracy, ecclesiastical 145, 147, 155
Aristocracy, lay
Arjomand, Said Amir 41-42
Arnason, Johann P. 48-49
Arnesen, Peter 331
Arnold of Regensburg 80-81
Árpád dynasty 122, 128
Ashikaga 277
Ashikaga Kan’ichi 32
Ashkawara Kan’ichi (1873-1948) 329-331
Asan, Ali 277n. 43
Ashikaga family 321
Bakufu 321
Assmann, Jan 50
Augustus, Emperor 17
Avadh 278
Averroes 249
Axial Age 15-16, 34, 45, 47, 49, 52, 54-55, 69, 77, 79, 96
Axial age 247, 248n. 4, 249, 254
Baba Farid 277
Bagge, Sverre 108, 108n. 41, 133n. 2
Baghdad 217, 226-27, 229, 354, 356
Bakufu (warrior government, Japan) 310, 316-317, 327-329
Balasaghun 354
Balkans 114

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2004
Also available online – www.brill.nl
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballala</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Sea</td>
<td>6, 115, 132-33, 135, 137, 144, 168, 170, 178-80, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangla</td>
<td>276, 277n. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbaricum</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfield, Thomas</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlett, Robert</td>
<td>99, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béla IV, King of Hungary</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictine order</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bently, J. H.,</td>
<td>269n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bently, Jerry</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbers</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berend, Nora</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard of Clairvaux</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavad Gita</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavata Purana</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhakti</td>
<td>249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs, Michael</td>
<td>263n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birge, Bettine</td>
<td>306-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birger brosa, jarl of Sweden</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birger Magnusson, jarl of Sweden</td>
<td>177, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgitta, St</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>148, 157-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittideva</td>
<td>250, 251n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black death</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black sea</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloch, Marc</td>
<td>99, 103, 109-10, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbio, abbey of</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhayana</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bortius de Dacia</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>21, 106, 117-8, 132, 152, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bol, Peter</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleslav Chrobry, King of Poland</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>91, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borghum</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borgoito, Michael</td>
<td>19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris and Gleb, Sts.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bóňivoj, Duke of Bohemia</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmans</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin restoration/Brahmanism</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevnov</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Elizabeth</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Peter</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno of Querfurt</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>23, 27, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>318, 324, 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakura Buddhism</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theravada Buddhism</td>
<td>27, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>52, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>30, 112, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullhe Shah</td>
<td>277n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchard of Worms</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bureaucracy</td>
<td>131, 132, 147-48, 157, 161-63, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, Robert I.</td>
<td>257n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium</td>
<td>100, 102, 106, 111, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium, Byzantine</td>
<td>342, 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium/Byzantine Empire/ ByzantineCommonwealth</td>
<td>21, 30-32, 37-38, 187, 196, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium, Byzantine world</td>
<td>67-69, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai Jing</td>
<td>(1047-1126) 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliphate</td>
<td>223-24, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abbasid</td>
<td>213, 221-27, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Cordova</td>
<td>220-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calukyas</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camundaraya</td>
<td>251n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolingian Empire</td>
<td>21, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caste</td>
<td>249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castles</td>
<td>82, 116, 124, 128, 132, 140-42, 146, 161, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castile/Castilian</td>
<td>254, 255-57, 259, 267, 272-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celibacy</td>
<td>82, 90, 131, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celibacy, clerical</td>
<td>82, 88-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>27, 266, 268, 273, 342, 343n, 345, 351-52, 354, 356-7, 358-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central Europe</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaghadaids, Chaghadaid Khanate</td>
<td>352, 353, 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanson de Roland</td>
<td>256, 273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Developmental paths, commonalities and differences 213-14
devotionalism 249
Dhanapala 251n. 4
dharma encyclopedias (dharmanibandhas), 252, 276
Di Cosmo, Nicola 288-91
Dimensions, existential 47, 49, 73
Diocletian 101
Distinction, Mosaic 50-51
Dominican order 119-20
Dominicans 119n. 103, 151
Duby, Georges 99, 109
Dumont, Louis 45
Duus, Peter 330-331, 333
Dvornik, Francis 103
Eastern Christendom 59, 67, 148
Eaton, Richard 271n. 35
economy of exploitation 131, 133
economy of plunder 131, 133
Ecumenical Renaissance 66 ff.
education, premodern systems of 276
Edward the Confessor, St., King of England 122
Eger 116
Egypt 48, 50, 59, 352, 356-57
See also Mamluk, Mamluks
Eigenkloster 119
Eisenstadt, S. N. 15-16, 39, 110
Eisenstadt, Shmuel, Noah 44, 46, 48, 68
Elbe 101
Elias, Norbert 13, 15, 19, 265 n. 26
Elite, clerical 91-7
elites, clerical 35-37
military 36
Elvin, Mark 25
Emeric, St. 114, 122
empire and papacy, conflict between 19
Empire
Achaemenid 52-53
Byzantine 53, 56
Ottonian 58
Roman 33
Sassanian 53
Engel, Pál 104
England 115, 122, 131, 134-35, 139,
144, 152-54, 159, 161, 163-65, 257,
263, 272, 274, 278, 352
Eryakui 315, 327
Ereganga 261
Erik Menved 140
Erik of Pommerania 157, 177
Eric, St., King of Sweden 121, 123
Erik, Saint, king of Sweden 176-77, 179
Esztergom 116
Eugene III, pope 181
Eurasia, Eurasian 44, 46, 55, 59, 62, 66, 69, 72
Europa Occidens 99, 109, 124
Europe 56-57, 60-62, 67-68, 73, 333, 355, 357-8
European expansion 351
European revolution, first 20-21,
131n. 1, 137, 160, 162
Europeanization 167, 175, 177-78
Fairhair dynasty 135
family structures 88-90
Far Northern civilization (Toynbee) 38
Fatimids 28, 41f.
feudal revolution 168-70, 180
feudalism 107, 206, 329-33
feudalism/feudal revolution 18-19
in Japan 32-33
finances, royal
Finland 6, 137, 164, 171, 171n. 8,
179, 179n. 20
Five Dynasties (907-960) 282-84
Flambard, Ranulf 84
Fletcher, Joseph 39
Fodevig, battle of 139
formative phases 13-17
France 131, 152-54, 159-60, 163-65,
257, 259, 272-73, 277
Franciscan order 119, 120
Franciscans 151
François I, 257
Frank, Andre Gunder 248, 254n. 10,
266n. 27
Franks 111
Friday, Karl 312
Fried, Johannes 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisians</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontiers</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuero (Andalusian municipal charter)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara family</td>
<td>315-316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Branch</td>
<td>310, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara no Michimaga</td>
<td>309, 314, 323, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futuwwa</td>
<td>224-29, 234-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangas</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaozong (Song emperor, r. 1127-1162)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauchet, Marcel</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudapada</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>252 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Estates</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genpei War (1180-85)</td>
<td>310, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentilismus</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard (Gellért) of Csanád, St.</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerber, Haim</td>
<td>218-19, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerbert d’Aurillac (Pope Sylvester II)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geremek, Bronislaw</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic peoples</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic tribes</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>102, 132, 144, 152-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Géza, Duke of Hungary</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghurwal</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazali</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibb, H.A.R.,</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gieysztor, Aleksander</td>
<td>105-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginezano</td>
<td>100, 116, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go-Daigo (1288-1339), emperor</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Bull (in Hungary)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Horde</td>
<td>351, 353, 356, 357, 359, 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gommans, Jos</td>
<td>269n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal, B. R.,</td>
<td>251n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go-Shirakawa (1127-1192), emperor</td>
<td>retired emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gööland</td>
<td>136, 173-174, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td>80, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graus, František</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great divergence (Pomeranz)</td>
<td>16, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece, Ancient</td>
<td>50, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Christianity</td>
<td>111-12, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory VII, Pope</td>
<td>22, 81, 81n. 14, 22n. 13 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greifswald</td>
<td>107n. 39, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossberg, Kenneth</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilds</td>
<td>218-19, 222, 226, 230-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>251, 266, 276-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunavarma</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptas</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurevich, Aaron J.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Györ</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajnal, István</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halecki, Oskar</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halecki, Oskar</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamadaní, Sayyed ‘Ali</td>
<td>228-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Empire</td>
<td>17, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handelsman, Marcelli</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangzhou</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans, King</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansa</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanseatic League</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapsburg Empire</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harald Fairhair</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harald Sigurdsson</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbsmeier, Christoph</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell, Robert M.</td>
<td>301, 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havihurst, Alfred F.</td>
<td>272n. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedevy/Schleswig</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedwig of Silesia, St.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegel</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heian age (794-1185)</td>
<td>311ff., 316, 322-325, 327, 334-335, system 322, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heian period (Japan)</td>
<td>32-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heian period</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemacandra</td>
<td>251n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hemisperic integration</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemple</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemple, Carl G.</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry I, king of England</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II, Holy Roman Emperor</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II, King of England</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heresy</td>
<td>94, 147-148, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>276-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Hirdskrå 140
Historicity, historicality 48, 54, 55, 72
Hodges, R., 272n. 36
Hodgson, Marshall G.S. 214-16
Hōjō family 317, 321, 328
Hollier, Denis 273n. 37
Holy Roman Empire 106-7, 117, 119, 122
hospitality 139
hospites 125
Howlett 257n. 14
Howlett, David 257n. 14
Hoyasal dynasty 250, 257, 258-63
Hugh of St. Victor 80
Huizong (Song emperor, r. 1101-1125) 297, 299
Hülegü 217
Humbert of Moyenmoutiers, Cardinal 81
Hungarians 99
Hungary 21, 104, 106, 114, 117-18, 125, 127, 132, 152, 155, 274, 343, 346
Hymes, Robert 304
Ibn ‘Abbād, Kadi of Seville 220-21
Ibn Batuta 228
Ibn Khaldun 220-22, 231, 244
Iceland 115
Ilkhanate, Ilkhanids 352-53, 353, 356
Il-Khanid empire 231-32
incest 89
India 26-30, 37, 39, 52, 57, 69, 73, 357, 358, 359
Indo-Islamic world 27
Indian Ocean 27, 38
Indo-Islamic world 27
inheritance systems 86-7
Inju dynasty 232-35
Inner Asia/Inner Eurasia 25-26, 32, 38-39
Inner Asia 339, 347
inquisition 6, 147-48, 163-64
intellectuals, medieval 20
intercivilizational encounters 27, 37-39
Inter-cultural exchange 348, 350, 352, 361
Iran 351, 355, 357-58, 360
see also Ilkhanate
Iran 228-44, 268
Iraq 346, 354, 356
Ireland 148
Iriki’m 324
Irish 111
Islam/Islamic world 17, 26-30, 37-39
Islamic rationalism 28
Islam, Islamicate 53, 69, 73
Islam, learning in 96
Islam, the Muslim world 346, 348, 353, 356-58
Islam/Muslims 17, 26-30, 37-39, 270-75, 277-78
Islamic law (= Shari‘a) 215, 218-19, 225, 227, 242
and civic agency 216-22
Islamic rationalism 28
Muslim/Islamic world 17, 26-30, 37-39, 346, 348, 353, 356-58
Islamicate civilization 214-16
Contrast to Christianity 214-15
Islamization 353, 359
Isma‘ils 226
Israel, Ancient 50, 54
Italian communes 19
Italy 102, 111, 131-132, 152, 164, 352
Jainism 250-51, 258
Jalayerid dynasty 232-36, 243-44
James I of Aragon 220
Janna 258-59
Janson, Tore 267n. 30
Japan 32-34, 63, 67-69, 71-73, 268
Jaritz, Gerhard 108
Jaspers, Karl 44-46, 48-49
Java 263, 269
Jayasi 277
Jelling dynasty 135
Jewish 112, 114
Jimutavahana 252
Jin dynasty 344
see also jurchens
Jōkyū War (1221) 317, 319
Judaism 50, 52, 341
judicial system 156
Jurchen Jin empire (1115-1234) 280, 289-90
Conquest of North China 299-300
INDEX

Madhva 250-51
Madhya Pradesh 261
Magdalino, Paul 31
Maghreb 221-22, 231-32, 244
magic 115
Magna Carta 128, 163
Magnus Eriksson, king of Sweden 177
Magnus Ladulås, king of Sweden 177
Maghreb 221-22, 231-32, 244
Magyar 272
Maharashtra 276
Mahmud of Ghazni 276
Mair, Victor H., 268n. 32
Mallikarjuna 258-60
Malthus, Robert 79n. 6
Malowist, Marian 105
Mamluk, Mamluks 352, 356
see also Egypt
Mandate of Heaven 341, 347
Manichaeism 341
Manuel I, Emperor 31
Marathi 261, 276, 277n. 42
Marco Polo 349
Margrete, Queen 157
Marriage 147, 149-50, 195, 198, 206, 209, 331
Martin, St. 118
Marxism 249
Marxism/Marxist approaches 32-33
Marx, Karl 330
Mass, Jeffrey P. (1941-2001) 315, 331-332
Mas’ud Sa’id Salman 277
Mattias, Master 153
Mauryas 254, 264
McGuire, Brian Patrick 108
McNeil, William 248
Medatithi 252 n. 7
Mediterranean Sea 271-74
Mencius 23
Mendicant orders 115
Mendicants 113, 119-20, 125, 125n. 133, 134, 151, 158
Menocal, Maria Rosa 274n. 39
Merchants 343, 345
Italian 351
Muslim 345, 351

see also Trade
Uighur 351
Mesopotamia 16
Mesopotamia 48, 39
Methodius, St. 112
Middle East 343, 352, 353, 355-6
Müidera 315
Military organization 138-39, 146, 340-42, 343, 346, 348
military technology 131, 132, 138, 142, 146
Minamoto no Mitsunaka (912-997) 315
Minamoto no Yoritomo (1147-1199) 316-318
Ming Dynasty 24-25, 64-65
Ming dynasty 352, 353, 360
Ming Rebellion 265
Modernities, early 43
Modernities, multiple 43
Modernities/modernities, early 23, 25, 39-40
Mogul dynasty 337-59
Mogulno 118
Mohammad [sic] 271
monastic institutions 251
monasticism 249
Mongke 353
Mongol Empire 339-361
see also Mongols
Mongol Yuan empire (1260-1368) 280, 290-91
Conquest of Southern Song 302
Governance 302-303
Mongolia 340-42, 344, 348-49, 351, 355
Mongols in Iran 217, 231-44
Mongols 106, 270, 355
Destruction 346, 333-4
ideology 347, 358
impact on geopolitical balance 353-8
Imperial culture 346
legacy of statecraft 358-361
military organization 346, 348
role in cross-cultural exchange 348, 359, 352
Mongols/Mongol Empire 25, 27, 32, 34, 38-39
monism 249

Downloaded from Brill.com04/11/2019 05:15:42AM
via free access
INDEX

Moore, R. I. 14, 21, 35-37, 62, 77, 99, 109
Moore, Robert 253n. 8
Moravia 112
Moravians 100
Mosaic Distinction 50, 51
Moscow, Muscovy 354, 356, 359, 360
Mote, Frederick W. 288-91
Mozaffarid dynasty 233-37
Mozarabs 272
Mudéjars (Spanish Muslims)
Mughal Empire 38
Mughal period 276
Muscovy 102
Muslim 114
Muslim/Islamic world 17, 26-30, 37-39, 346, 348, 353, 356, 357, 358
Islamization 333, 339
Nagacandra 259
Nagavarma II, 251n. 4
Nagavarma 258
Nagy, Piroska 108
Naitô Konan 22-25, 40
Naitô Torajiro 279
Naples 129
Nara 322, 324, 327-328, 336
age 323, 334
Narasimha II, 260
Narasimha 260
Nathamuni 250
Near East 48
Nebrija, Antonio 256, 257n. 4
Nelson, Benjamin 20, 213-14
Nemi 259
Neo-Confucianism (daoxue) 57, 65, 72, 302, 304-08
Neo-Confucianism 23-26
Neo-Confucians 249
New Policies (xinfa) 295-99
Nguyen The Anh 268n. 32
Nicholas of Árhus, St. 122
Nidaros/Trondheim 116
nomadic peoples 268-70
North Sea Empire 134-36
Norway 115, 121, 127, 133, 133n. 2, 134-36, 136n. 4, 136-39, 141-45, 147, 149, 151-59, 165
Norwegians 99
Nyberg, Tore 108
Observant Franciscans 116
Occident 42
Occitania 255, 274, 278
Odense 116, 118
Odilo 118
Odilo, abbot of Cluny 79
Ogodei 347
Olaf, Saint, king of Norway 176-77
Olaf, St., King of Norway 121
Olav Haraldsson, St 136
Olga 122
Olomouc 116
Ordericus Vitalis 80
Orientalism 125
Oriya 251
Orihon 341-42
Orthodox Church 101, 112
Osaka 328
Oso 116
Ostforschung 105
Otto III, Holy Roman Emperor 100, 107, 118
Otto of Freising 154, 154n. 15
Ottoman Empire 38, 102, 106
Ottoman empire 218-19, 230-31, 241-45, 356, 358, 360
Ottomans 374
Ottonians 119
Outukün 341
Pach, Zsigmond Pál 103
Padmanabha 276
paganism 115, 149
Palestine 273
Pampa 251n. 4, 258, 267
Pannonhalma 118
Papacy 117, 129
Papacy, Roman 81-2
papal monarchy 19, 26
Paramara kings 251n. 4
Paris 91, 152-53, 187n. 3, 188n. 6, 199n. 47, 199n. 49, 207n. 70
Paschal III, antipope 123
Peace of God 83
peasantry 168-71
peasants 140-43, 159, 165, 188-90, 193, 203-06, 325
Pechenegs 32
Pécs 116
INDEX

Blacks 372

Peterson, Charles 301-02
Petrus de Dacia 153
philology 257-59, 264
Piasts 129
Pirenne, Henri 271-72
Plague 352
see also Black Death
Plock 116
Poema de mio Cid 256, 267, 273
Poland 21, 104-6, 113-4, 117, 123, 127-9, 132, 133n. 2, 152, 155
Polanyi, Karl 82
Poles 100
Pollock, Sheldon 30, 39, 62, 213
Pomeranz, Kenneth 16, 35
Ponna 258
Po pope 347
population, South Asian 254n. 10
Po zna 116
Prague 116, 118, 152
prasasti 258
Premonstratensian communities 119
primogeniture 131, 159, 253
Prussians 119
Punjabi 277n. 43
Pusapahora 239
Puttapa, K. V., 259n. 16
Qara Khitai 344, 345
Qarqarans 341, 347, 351
Qaz aq 357
Qin Gui (1090-1155) 300
Qing Dynasty 24-25
Qing dynasty 359
Qingtang (Northeast Tibet) 297, 299
Qeapa 357
Radulphus Glaber 80
Ramanuja 250-51
Ranna 259
Rastrakuta dynasty 257-58, 266
Reconquista 273
Rellexivity 46
Reformation 145, 151
regimen regale and regimen politicum 157
regional identity 256, 259-64, 266, 274-77
Reichenau 100
Reid, Anthony 270n. 34
Reischauer, Edwin O. (1910-1990) 333
renaissance, twelfth-century 20, 26
ecumenical 34-35
Renaissances, ecumenical 43-44
revolutions 14-15
see iustus 156
Reynolds, Susan 322
Ribe 116
Rice, Lewis 260n. 18
Richards, John 253n. 9
Ro cher, Ludo and Rosane Rocher 252n. 7
Roland 273
Roma 100
Roman Empire 17, 21, 34, 53, 101, 132
Romance languages 255, 267, 272
Romanization 271
Romans 254, 264
Rome 111
Roskilde 116
Rostock 105n. 31, 152
royal saints 121-22, 156, 176
Rukannuddin Barbak Shah 277n. 42
Russia 102, 104, 106, 115, 356, 358, 360, 361
Kievan 31-32
see also Golden Horde, Moscow, Muscovy
Safavid empire (in Iran), 230-31, 244-45
Safavid Empire 38
sainthood 150
Saivism. 251
Sakai 328, 336
Saljuqs 344, 347
Samana 343
Samarqand 355
Sarmasia, Henryk 105
samurai 33, 311-12, 337
Sankara 250
Sanskrit 250, 254, 257-59, 261, 274-76
Saray 354
Sarbedars 237-43
Sasanid empire 355
Sassanian Empire 54
Sanskrit 250, 254, 257-59, 261, 274-76
Saray 354
Sarbedars 237-43
Sasanid empire 355
Sassanian Empire 54
INDEX

Sawyer, Birgit and Peter 108
Saxo Grammaticus 176, 182
Sázava 118
Scandinavia 107-8, 111, 118, 122, 129, 131-34, 137, 139, 141-42, 144-45, 157-60, 164, 133n. 2, 134n. 3, 136n. 4, 143n. 7, 149n. 10, 152n. 13
Schluchter, Wolfgang 39, 46
Schmugge, Ludwig 108
Scholasticism 145, 152-53
Schwartz, Benjamin 45
Sclavinia 100
Seegrün, Wolfgang 107
Seibt, Ferdinand 105
Sekkan jidai (regency age) 314
Self, conceptualization of 249-50, 267
See also regional identity
Seljuks 28-30, 223-24
Semauren 349
Serbia 114
Sexuality 149
Shaik Bada ud-Din Bajan 277n. 43
Shamanism, Shamans, Shamanic practices 341, 350, 353
Shang Dynasty 48
Shanyuan Treaty (1005) 291-93
Shari'a see Islamic law
Shenzong (Song emperor, r. 1067-1085) 293-98
Shirakawa (1053-1129), emperor, retired emperor 310
Shōen 315, 325
Shogun 316, 318
Shogunate see bakufu
Shudras 230
Sicily 255, 278
Sigutuna 116
Simon of Kéza 125
Sindhi 276, 277n. 43
Sino-steppe relations 25
Sixteen Prefectures 287-88, 291
Skara 116
Slavery 168, 169
Slavica orthodoxa 106
Slavonic tradition 111, 114, 118
Slavs 100, 272
Smith, Colin 256n. 13, 257n. 14, 273n. 38
Smith, Paul Jakov 24-25, 64
Smith, W. L., 277n. 42
Socarras 257n. 14
Social equality 250
Sociality 47, 55, 68
Sohravardi, 'Omar 224-8
Song China 322, 325-326, 336
Song Dynasty (960-1279)
- examination system 286-87
- founding 285-88
- Sino-steppe relations 291-92
- Southern Song continuation (1127-1279) 300-02
Song Dynasty 22-26, 33
Northern 22, 25
- Song-Yuan-Ming transition 26, 281-82, 303
Southern 24
Song dynasty 347
Song Dynasty 56, 63, 70
Southeast Asia 27, 40, 254, 269, 270n. 34
Southern 24
Southern Kingdoms (907-979) 282, 284-85
Southern Song (1127-1279) 300-02
Southern, Richard 26
Spain 256, 271-73
Spythihněv, Duke of Bohemia 112
Sri 249
Srivaisnavas 249-51
Sringeri 249, 251
St Alban 118
State formation 133-34, 145-46, 148, 154, 164-65, 174-75, 177-78
Stavanger Selje 116
Stephan, St., King of Hungary 104, 107, 113-4, 116, 118, 122, 128
Stephenson, Paul 41
Steppe empires, state formation 288-91
Steppe, political culture of 341-2, 343-4
Strayer, Joseph 19
Sufi literature 277
Sufism 224-28
Sultanate 223-24
Sumanobana 259
Superstition 115
Surdas 250

Downloaded from Brill.com04/11/2019 05:15:42AM via free access
Svealand
Sverker I, king of Sweden 176, 181
Sverre, King 158
Sweden 102, 115, 117, 121, 127, 133n. 2, 134-45, 150-52, 155-57, 159, 163-65
Swedes 99
Syria 273
Szávaszentdemeter 118
Szúcs, Jenő 101, 103, 104,
Tacitus 101
Taira no Kiyomori (1118-1181) 316
Taira no Masakado (2-940) 313-314
Taira no Todatsune (967-1031) 312-314, 316
Talbott, Cynthia 275n. 40
Tamerlane 357, 360
Tamil/Tamils 249, 251, 258, 261, 263n. 22, 274, 277
Tang Dynasty 23, 25, 56, 63
Tang-Song transformation 281
Tangut Xi Xia empire (ca. 990-1227) 280, 291, 293-94
Tanguts 355, 357
Tatar Yoke 356
taxes 139-41, 143, 186, 188, 190, 192-94, 199-201, 204-05, 209, 312, 315, 318, 323, 326-27
Telugu 261, 277n. 43
tRengri (Heaven) 340-41
Mandate of 341
Thailand 269
The King's Mirror 108n. 41, 153
the Spanish kingdoms 132, 132-54
Thongchai Winichakul 263n. 23
Thiby, Charles 278n. 44
Timur (Tamerlane) 231, 237, 242
Timurid 352, 359
Toqueville, Alexis 14
Tôdaiji 315, 322
Tôji 315, 327
Tokugawa age (1600-1868) 311, 333, 337
Tong Guan (1054-1126) 299
Tottman, Conrad 331
Toynbee, Arnold 38
trade 169, 170, 178, 180-81, 350-52, 354, 357
international 265-70, 274, 278
see also Merchants
Trafalgar 116
Turco-Mongolian see Mongols in Iran
Turk 352, 359
Turkish peoples 270, 275
Turks, Turkic empire 340-42, 344
Ukraine 118
Uighurs 340-42, 345, 349, 351, 355
Umayyads 28
Umma (Islamic community of believers) 218, 223
United States 248
universities 91, 152-53, 158-59, 164
Uppsala 116, 132, 191n. 15
Urban communities /urban revolution 19-20
urbanization 253-54, 266, 269-70, 278
Uzbek 337-59
Vác 116
Vaisnavism 250-51
Vallabha 250
Veda, André 108
Vedanta 250
Vernacularisation 57
Vespré 250
Vesprémgoly 118
Viborg 116
Vico 248
Vidyaranya 249-50
Vietnam 268
Vijayanagara 251, 265n. 25, 275
Vijnanesvara 252
Vikings 85, 99, 272, 133-34, 134n. 3, 138-39
Vinayaditya 259-61
Viraballala 258
Virasmesvara 238, 260
Visegrád 118
Visigoths 111
Vism 249-50
Visnupradhana 250, 260-61
Visvarupa 252n. 7
Vladimir, Grand Duke of Kiev 100, 112, 121
Voegelin, Eric 44
von See, Klaus 275n. 40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang Anshi (1021-1086)</td>
<td>295-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waqf (Islamic religious endowment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warring States Era (1467-1573) Japan</td>
<td>329-330, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Alfred</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Max</td>
<td>14, 19, 33, 42, 44, 216-17, 329-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil, Eric</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenceslas, St. Prince of Bohemia</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner, Michael</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Christendom</td>
<td>4-5, 13, 17-19, 21, 26, 28, 33, 35, 38, 61, 63, 68, 72, 111, 111n. 59, 117n. 90, 119, 131, 132-33, 137, 145, 148, 150, 160, 163, 165, 175, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>17-21, 29-30, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmitteleuropa</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehouse, D.,</td>
<td>272n. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittrock, Bjorn</td>
<td>39, 48, 213, 249n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Władysław Lokietek, King of Poland</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolters, O. W.</td>
<td>268n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Ian</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world-historical knowledge</td>
<td>247-48, 253, 263-65, 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Roger</td>
<td>255n. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaozong (Song emperor, r. 1162-1189)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinjiang</td>
<td>354-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiongnu</td>
<td>340-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaa</td>
<td>359-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan Dynasty</td>
<td>64-65, 67, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan dynasty</td>
<td>349-51, 355, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Za (guilds, Japan)</td>
<td>324, 327-329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao Kuangyin (Song founder, r. 960-760)</td>
<td>285-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhezong (Song emperor, r. 1086-1100)</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Dynasty</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Xi (1130-1200)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Yuanzhang (Ming founder, r. 1368-1398)</td>
<td>303, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmermann, Bénédicte</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zink, Michel</td>
<td>273n. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrianism</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>