

## SUMMARY

The comprehensive study of the history of Cilician Armenia is one of the crucial tasks of Armenology. There has been an enormous amount of work conducted in this field during the past two centuries. In the course of time the knowledge about it has enriched parallel to the discovery of new historical sources. Having rich traditions of scientific research, many layers of the history of Cilician Armenia continue to be unstudied and many questions stay unanswered so far. The purpose of this study is to once again catch the eye of the researchers to a field of study like the history of political and diplomatic interrelations between the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia and the Mamluk Sultanate of Egypt and Syria. The research topic is undoubtedly of high relevance based on the awareness that many details of the political relations between the Armenian Kingdom and the Mamluk Sultanate have not been unveiled in depth so far. The main reason for this is the insufficient attention that the specialists in the history of Cilician Armenia paid to the Mamluk and generally to the Islamic historiographical heritage as of today. However, the study of the works of Arabic-writing historians (as well as the Persian-writing historians) of the 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries is indispensable to define the international weight of the Armenian kingdom in the arena of political powers of the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East regions and for the perception of the nuances of its relationship with adjacent non-Christian powers, especially the Seljuk Sultanate of Rum, the Mamluk Sultanate and the Mongol Ilkhanate. Herewith, the novelty of the present study is the examination of the historical sources of the Mamluk period that are of special interest for the study of the history of Cilician Armenia. It's worth to note that a great part of these sources is completely unknown to Armenology and is involved as sources of the history of Cilician Armenia for the first time.

Chronologically, the study relates to the span from 1260 to 1292. In the 40-50s of the 13<sup>th</sup> century after the subjugation of territories of Transcaucasia and Asia Minor by the Mongols, the risk of invasion by the new conquerors became an imminent threat for the Armenian kingdom as well. In the current situation, Cilician Armenia opted to announce its submission to the Mongols. After the final conquest of Persia, another great political power came into existence in the region – the Mongol Ilkhanate. During this period, in 1250, the Ayyubid dynasty was overthrown and the Mamluks seized the power in Egypt. The establishment of the Mamluk Sultanate opened a new era in the history of the Middle East. It took nearly a decade for the Mamluks to put their state on firm grounds. Sultan *Baybars al-Bunduqdārī* (1260-1277) played a decisive role in this endeavor whose 17-year power made the Sultanate one of the powerful players in the political arena of the Middle East – a worthy adversary for the Crusaders and the Mongols. *Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn‘Abd al-Ẓāhir* authored three panegyric histories, the first of which is devoted to sultan Baybars.

Already at the end of the 50s of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 60s, the military and political clash of these two states became inevitable. The Armenian Kingdom, that had established friendly relations with Mongols and accepted their predominance, involuntarily appeared at the front line of clashes of geopolitically hostile interests of the two superpowers being forced to take over the heavy strikes of punitive actions of the Sultanate from time to time. The relations between the Mamluk Sultanate and the Ilkhanate, accompanied by consecutive phases of massive military fights and diplomatic maneuver, remained the main factor determining the political situation in the region for at least 60 years. Another of *Ibn ‘Abd al-Ẓāhir*’s biographical works is devoted to sultan *al-Ashraf Khalīl* (1290-1293). The unique copy of this work preserved contains only parts 2 and 3 covering the last months of 1291 and the first months of 1292 (the exclusive report therein related to Cilician Armenia is dated by 1292).

It should be noted, however, that being a work related to source studies in its nature and focus, the current study does not claim to represent the complete and all-inclusive picture of the Armenian-Mamluk relations of 1260-1292. The

literary and historical sources from the Mamluk period (chronicles, biographical dictionaries, geographical treatises, administrative encyclopedias, chancery manuals, etc.) are renowned to be plentiful. They contain an abundant amount of data on the Armenian-Mamluk relations so that the information presented therein cannot be encompassed within one research anyhow. So, we can claim that the primary purpose of this study is the introduction to Mamluk historical and literary sources so far ignored by and even unknown to students of the history of Cilician Armenia as well as raising interest in Mamluk historical texts among the researchers in Armenia paving way for the development of the field and for new studies.

The book consists of a **Preface, Notes on Dates, Transliterations and Abbreviations**, an **Introduction**, three **Parts**, **Dynastic tables**, a **Glossary of Terms**, **Indices** and a **Bibliography**.

**Part 1: THE PLACE OF IBN ‘ABD AL-ZĀHIR IN THE MAMLUK HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION.** The first subheading of the chapter, **The Mamluk Period of Arabic-Islamic historiography: Overview of Sources**, is an introduction to the literary heritage of the key representatives of “the Mamluk historiographical tradition” encompassing 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> cc. of the medieval Islamic historiography.

Here some connections are made between historiographical traditions of the Ayyubid and Mamluk dynasties. It is emphasized that the second, in its essence, was the natural continuation and the development of the first. The historians of the new epoch generally preserved and developed the main methodology and genre peculiarities of the Ayyubid historiography (annalistic chronicles, biographies of individuals, biographical dictionaries, chancery and administrative manuals, etc.). However, the Mamluk epoch was a step forward from the previous one not only in terms of the development of new genres but also higher role of historiography in the public and political life and the social awareness of its importance. After, the issue of the appropriateness of differentiating between the division of “Syrian” and “Egyptian” schools of Mamluk history writing is discussed pinpointing to the main contextual and structural differences of the two branches of the tradition. The introduction to Arabic-writing authors of the 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries and the description of their

writings begins with those Ayyubid chroniclers who witnessed the dynastic transition from the Ayyubids to the Mamluks. They continued to record the historical occurrences for some time, often without hiding their emphasized intolerance towards the new regime.

The Mamluks, however, soon “found” their own historians, who, displaying loyal disposition to them, portrayed the Sultanate’s history in favorable colors and from the stand of legitimacy. Particularly, we speak about authors of panegyric biographies (for example, *Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir*), who usually held high positions in the court. Of higher status than these bureaucrat historians, were the historians who held lofty posts in the Mamluk military and administrative system (for example, *Baybars al-Manṣūrī* and *Abū al-Fidā’*). All other key historians of the Mamluk epoch also deserved special reference. The aspects of interest of Mamluk historical works related to the history of Cilician Armenia are elucidated offering some guidance to their further study.

The second subheading of the book includes a short description of the life and activity of one of the founders of the Mamluk historiographical tradition, *Muḥī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* – a court secretary – chief clerk, biographer, historian, poet. *Muḥī al-Dīn* enjoyed the favorable attitude and sympathy of sultan *Baybars al-Bunduqdārī*, which ensured the success of his later activity. Determined by the nature of the work of a royal clerk, soon friendly close relations developed between *Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* and sultan *Baybars*, and over time the Sultan started trusting his court secretary more and more important documents and even diplomatic missions.

Similar warm relations developed between *Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* and the successors of *Baybars*, particularly, *al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn* (1279-1290) and *al-Ashraf Khalīl*. The personal familiarity with the governing elite ensured high respect and authority for *Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* among the contemporaries.

*Muḥī al-Dīn ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* who, as we said, held the position of the chief clerk and secretary of the Sultanate’s chancery for a long time, is the author of biographies of three Mamluk Sultans – *Baybars*, *Qalāwūn* and *al-Ashraf Khalīl* (respectively, *Al-Rawḍ al-zāhir fī sīrat al-Malik al-Zāhir* – “The blooming garden concerning the biography of al-Malik al-Zāhir”, *Taṣrīf al-ayyām wa-l-‘uṣūr fī sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr* – “The glorious days and times in the biography of

*al-Malik al-Manṣūr*” and *Al-Alṭāf al-Ḥaḫfiyya min al-sīra al-ṣarīfa al-sultāniyya al-Malikiyya al-Aṣrafiyya* - “*The concealed benevolences of the noble life of sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf*” which was not finished). Being familiar with the sultans and being the witness and immediate participant of the events most of the time, having access to the rich documentary archives of the Mamluk chancery (documents, texts of treaties), *Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir* has preserved valuable details on the events of his time in this chronicles, including on the Armenian-Mamluk relations.

**Part 2: CILICIAN ARMENIA IN THE NETWORK OF POLITICAL RELATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST IN MID XIII CENTURY.** The first subheading of the chapter is titled “**Establishment of Mamluk Sultanate and the origins of the Armenian-Mamluk conflict**”. It provides a short overview of the fall of the Ayyubid dynasty and the historical circumstances of the formation of the Mamluk Sultanate. And despite of the fact that it took a decade from Mamluks to put their power on firm grounds, the date of birth of the Mamluk Sultanate of Egypt is deemed to be 1250.

The mid XIII century was a fateful period also for the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia. This was mainly related to the victorious march of the Mongols into Western Asia and the Middle East and the established geopolitical situation. The foresight and diplomatic skills of King Het‘um (1226-1269) allowed avoiding from a conflict with the new conquerors and keeping the country safe from their destructive invasion. It’s worth noting that before the appearance of the Mongols, the Armenian kingdom was under the suzerainty of the Seljuq Sultanate of Rūm or Iconium. However, when after the heavy defeat in the battle of Köse Dağ (or Ch‘man-katuk) in 1243 the Rumi Seljuqs declared their submission to the Mongols, the menace got closer and, consequently, the adoption of a new foreign policy course became an urgent issue also for Cilician Armenia. Under the established political conditions, the military and administrative elite of the country, on behalf of King Het‘um, decided to seek conciliation and alliance by accepting the suzerainty of the Mongols. The initiated negotiations with the Mongol commander Baiju Noyan were fruitful. After the diplomatic missions of Smbat the Constable and King Het‘um in 1247-1248 and 1254 to the courts of Güyük Khan (1246-1248) and Möngke

Khan (1251-1259) Cilician Armenia also acknowledged its vassalage to the Mongols. During the reign of the same Möngke Khan, his brother Hulagu completed the conquest of Persia, founding the Mongol Ilkhanate (1256-1335).

In 1259, Hulagu seized Baghdad and ruined the Abbasid Caliphate. Already next year, in 1260, he initiated the first “*Syrian campaign*” of the Mongols. The Armenian king Het‘um also took an active part in the conquest of Syrian cities. In the aftermath of Hulagu’s Syrian invasion, the Armenian Kingdom also had some territorial gains. In that way, the borders of the Armenian kingdom expanded up to the Euphrates river. Hromkla, the patriarchal see of Armenian catholicoses, accordingly, for the first time geographically joined Cilician Armenia.

But on 3 September 1260, in the battle of ‘Ayn Jālūt, the Mongols had to retreat to Iran after the crushing defeat they suffered at the hands of sultan Qutuz of Egypt. If we take into consideration the report of Smbat the Constable on the participation in the battle of 500 warriors sent by Het‘um, we can claim that this was the first immediate clash between the Armenians and the Mamluks. The Mongol-Armenian alliance became the main reason for strained relations and hostilities between Cilician Armenia and the Mamluk Sultanate, that soon developed into a direct military confrontation.

In the same 1260, as a result of the *coup d’etat* taken place in Cairo, the throne was seized by Baybars al-Bunduqdārī, one of the leaders of Bahrī Mamluks. Just from the beginning of Baybars’s rule until the dawn and destruction of the Armenian Kingdom (1375), the issue of the relations with this Muslim state found its permanent place in Cilician Armenia’s foreign policy agenda.

In the subheading “**The Mongols, Ilkhans and Cilician Armenia**” of the second chapter, the focus is on the Armenian-Mongol relations and on the historical works in Arabic and Persian delivering information about them. Whatever, as in the previous subheading in the case of the Mamluk Sultanate, here a brief account is provided to the historical conditions of the establishment of the *Mongol Empire* (*Yeke Monggol Ulus*) headed by Genghis Khan. After the death of the ruler, his sons and grandsons continued the territorial expansion of the Empire. By the end of the thirteenth century Genghis Khan’s

descendants had divided the state into four autonomous states (uluses) - the *Ulus of Jochi* (later *Golden Horde*, 1260-1480), the *Chagatai Ulus or Khanate* (1224-1678), the *Yuan dynasty* (1271-1368) created by *Kublai Khan* (1260-1294) and his successors and lastly the *Ilkhanate* (1256-1335).

The heavy defeat of Rumi Seljuqs in Köse Dağ alarmed the end of their superpower in Asia Minor. Under this condition, as we mentioned, king Het'um hurried to make a vow of peace and to express his submission to Mongols. *Ibn Bībī*, in his history of the Seljuq rulers of Rum, and Arab historian 'Izz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād give interesting information on the breaking of the Armenian-Seljuq relations and the establishment of the Armenian-Mongol relations.

In this period, however, despite of the submission to the Mongols, the Armenian-Mongol strong partnership relations were not set up. This situation made Het'um aware that he needs to establish stronger ties with the Mongols and made diplomatic relations with them official in order to neutralize the danger coming from the Sultanate of Iconium and gain complete security in the back.

There is an intriguing reference to Smbat's diplomatic mission to Qaraqorum (1247 / 1248), in *Tārīḥ-e Ğahān-Guṣā* ("The history of the world-conqueror") of Persian historian *Juwaynī*. The latter mentions a certain "*sultān-e Tākavor*" (*sultan of Takavor*) among the guests and envoys who visited Qaraqorum to participate in the coronation of *Guyūk*. This expression of *Juwaynī* has caused controversial comments among several modern researchers and became a reason of some erroneous verdicts on the identity of "*sultān-e Tākavor*". However, a report in Bar Hebraeus's Arabic chronicle allows correcting the mistake of the Persian chronicler.

**CHAPTER 3: TRANSLATIONS FROM SOURCES AND NOTES.** In three subheadings of this chapter, selected translations from the three biographies written by *Ibn 'Abd al-Ẓāhir* are presented concerning the Armenian-Mamluk, Armenian-Mongol and even Armenian-Seljuq relations and generally on different events of the history of Cilician Armenia in 1260-1292 during the reigns of Het'um I, Levon II (1269-1289) and Het'um II (1289-1307 with interruptions). The translations are furnished with extensive explanatory notes

and comments based on comparative analysis of different accounts relating the same events and incidents in Mamluk historical texts, as well as other sources in Armenian, Syriac, Latin, Old French, Persian.

The **Dynastic Tables** include a list of rulers who reigned in the three most powerful non-Christian states adjoining Cilician Armenia within the chronological scope of the work (1260-1292).

The **INDICES** contain lists of **Personal Names**, **Ethnonyms**, **Tribal names** and **Names of Religious Groups** and **Toponyms**.

The book is concluded with the **BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRIMARY SOURCES AND SECONDARY WORKS** referred to and cited in the notes.