

Preface

Jürgen Tubach, Sophia G. Vashalomidze, Manfred Zimmer

The anthology takes a comparative approach to reconstructing the perceptions that the Armenians and Georgians developed of their Mongol conquerors in the 13th and 14th centuries. The focus lies on the perception of the historical outcomes of nomadic / sedentary interactions from the perspective of both the mundane and the clerical nobility. The Caucasus and its immediate sphere of influence as a whole will serve as the regional framework for our anthology.

The broad scope of historical sequences regarding the Mongol conquest of Armenia and Georgia and the Mongol domination in and over Armenia and Georgia will be dealt with, whereby the local idiosyncrasies of these events are of particular interest.

In his article *‘Die Mongolen und das Christentum’* (‘The Mongols and Christianity’), Wilhelm Baum begins with the earliest source relating to early Mongol history, ‘The Secret History of the Mongols’, which was commissioned to be written by the founder of the empire, Genghis Khan, and is recorded only in Chinese translation. As the author himself remarks, we discover very little about the religion of the Mongols here. Faced with the very rapid growth of their empire, they showed themselves to be tolerant in religious matters and did not attempt to convert subjugated peoples to their beliefs.

The author tells of the papal legates to the Great Khan of the Mongols. An important part of his article is also dedicated to the times of Hulagu (1217–1265), Mongol ruler in Persia and founder of the Ilkhanate dynasty, and Abaqa (1234–1282), the second Mongol Il-Khan of Persia, and Il-Khan Argun (1285–1291). Particular attention is paid to relationships between the Il-Khans and the Christians after 1291. As Wilhelm Baum also rightly remarks, this by no means exhausts the sources concerning the history of the relationships between the Mongols and the Christians. In closing, he reports on the image of the Mongols in the ‘Chronicle of a Hundred Years’ from Georgia.

In his investigation *‘Beobachtungen und Notizen zur Situation der armenischen Fürsten unter der Mongolenherrschaft’* (‘Observations and notes on the situation of the Armenian princes under Mongol rule’), Heiko Conrad does not conduct a systematic examination of the individual royal families but uses the sources and particular reference to the ‘History of Armenia’ by Kirakos Ganjakec’i to study episodes and notes on individual princes contained therein, and endeavours to analyse them and place them in a wider context. The central focus here is the houses of the Zakarēans and Orbēleans, as well as the Prince of Khachen, Hasan Jalal.

Bayarsaikhan Dashdondog in her article ‘The Mongol Conquerors in Armenia’: Before the thirteenth century, the Mongols were hardly known to the Armenians. The occupation of territories in Central Asia caused the Mongols to enter the Caucasus. As a result, the Armenians came into direct contact with the Mongol nomads of the Inner Asian steppe. This interaction was one of the major examples of ‘east’ meeting ‘west’.

The Armenians’ relations with the Mongols were varied. The Greater Armenians became subjects of the Mongol Empire. The Mongol invasion of Greater Armenia took place over twenty years and was achieved through raids, diplomatic pressure and military actions.

In the military context, interaction between the Mongols and Armenians required a review of the composition and action of Mongol armies from Iran to the Caucasus, to Asia Minor, the Middle and Near East and even back in Mongolia. The effects of the first Mongol military raids, the diplomacy and the submission of Greater Armenian lords are considered in this study in order to enhance our understanding of this turning point in medieval history.

The arguments are set out for determining the reasons for the invasion of Greater Armenia and the motives of Armenian princes to submit. The study draws on sources written in Armenian and Mongolian, and in many other languages to exercise these features of the subject as fully as possible.

Dickran Kouymjian in his article 'Chinese Dragons and Phoenixes among the Armenians': The *pax mongolica* instituted after the conquests of Genghis Khan is the locus for the exchange, or better, the importation into imagination of medieval Armenia of a number of notions and artistic expressions from the extreme orient. At the time, Armenians were living under two quite separate regimes. In the historic homelands, independence had been lost and Armenians found themselves ruled by successive Seljuk, Turkmen, and Mongol dynasties. To the southwest in Cilicia on the Mediterranean coast a new Armenian political entity was established in the late eleventh century to become a fully recognized kingdom in 1198–1199, an ally of the Crusaders. The Cilician Armenian kings were among the first Near Eastern or European states to establish diplomatic relations with the great Mongols. By the mid-thirteenth century, what might be called an Armenian-Mongol treaty was concluded, though the contracting parties were hardly equal in terms of their relative power or influence; some interpret the agreement as a benign Armenian vassalage to the Mongol state.

During the following half-century Far Eastern influences, both Chinese and Mongol, penetrated Armenian culture particularly in the visual arts. Some came directly from the Mongol court in Qaraqorum, others by way of the Mongols of Iran, the Ilkhanids, after they took firm possession of the Near East from roughly 1260 on. Instances of this overland exchange, now commonly called the silk route, will be considered.

Timothy May in his article 'The Conquest and Rule of Transcaucasia: the Era of Chormaqan': Although the Mongols first invaded Transcaucasia in the 1220s, the actual conquest did not occur until the late 1230s under the leadership of the Mongol general Chormaqan (d. 1240). Under his command the Mongols made a rapid reduction of the Armenian and Georgian principalities and incorporated the territory into Mongol control. Although many of the princes fell to Mongol arms, the Mongols also gained the submission of many princes through diplomacy and appear to have established fairly amiable relations with their subjects. This paper will examine the conquests under the leadership of Chormaqan as well as his rule over the region. In addition, this paper will attempt to place Mongol Transcaucasia into the larger context of the Mongol Empire in terms of both the conquests as well as the administration of the new territories.

Alexandr Osipian represents in his article 'Baptised Mongol rulers, Prester John and the Magi: Armenian image of the Mongols produced for the Western readers in the mid-thirteenth – early fourteenth centuries' how the ruling elite of Cilician Armenia constructed a positive image of the Mongols to persuade the Franks / Latins that, even after the destruction of Poland and Hungary, the Mongols were still good allies to fight in alliance with against the Saracens. Thus, this article is devoted to the historical imagination and its uses in politics of the time.

Zaroui Pogossian in her article ‘Armenians, Mongols and the End of Times: An Overview of 13th Century Sources’: The purpose of this article is to explore the impact of the Mongol invasions on Armenian eschatological speculations. Prior to their appearance in the Caucasus and, eventually, the Cilician Kingdom of Armenia, there was an intense period of speculation – evident in various Armenian sources – as to the approaching End of the World. The establishment of an independent Armenian Kingdom in Cilicia was also viewed as part of the unfolding of the events that would mark the End and King Levon I was presented in some sources as the “Last Armenian King.” The immediate reaction to the appearance and conquests of the Mongols was also seen in this light. Even their appellation as “Nation of the Archers” fit a well-defined stereotype of peoples, often identified with Gog and Magog, and recalled eschatological fears and expectations. What has not been studied, however, is how their appearance was perceived as part of the Armenian royal ideology. If the Mongols as the “Nation of the Archers” were harbingers of the End, what was the role of Armenia and its king? The paper will analyze the various responses that can be found to this question in contemporary Armenian sources.

Johannes Preiser-Kapeller demonstrates in his study ‘Between Constantinople and the Golden Horde. The Byzantine ecclesiastical provinces of the Alans and the Zikhs in the Mongolian sphere of control in the 13th and 14th century’ that the metropolitan bishops of *Alania* and *Zichia-Matracha* played a not insignificant role in church politics in this contact zone between Golden Horde, Byzantium and the Latins. For the Patriarchate of Constantinople, these two churches served in a similar way to the much more important metropolitan see of Kiev and the whole of Russia as evidence for the still ‘ecumenical’ influence of the Byzantine church in the world.

Anton Pritula demonstrates in his article ‘A Hymn on Tiflis from Warda Collection: A Transformation of the Muslim Conquerors into Pagans’: The hymn is found only in one copy of the Warda *‘oniyātā* collection, namely in Add. 1983 dated to 1550 AD (f. 181), in the Cambridge University Library. There it cannot be attributed to Warda with certainty, even though it is ascribed to him.

The composition of the hymn on Tiflis is typical of one of the ‘catastrophic’ hymns ascribed to Warda. Its main part consists of very detailed and shockingly naturalistic descriptions of the terrors and destruction caused to the city by the foreign invaders. The terrible devastation and massacre makes the author doubt God’s justice, which he expresses by addressing to Him the crucial questions left without answer (stanzas 50–55). Finally Righteous God rebukes the author and explains to him His will, i.e. testing humans before their transition to the other world of eternal life (stanzas 56–61). Such a structure is met also in several other hymns ascribed to Warda. The role of the final condemner and revealer in different hymns may be played by various figures, such as God’s Righteousness, or the author’s Mind, or someone else. Thus, this type of hymn may be considered apologetic.

The origination of the late Syriac *‘onitā* genre from the dialogue poem (*soghītā*) is generally accepted. Among the great number of the *soghyātā* published by Sebastian Brock there is a poetic dialogue with the soul by St Jacob of Serugh. It consists of only three parts, each one being a long utterance by one dialogue participant. Although the details of this evolution still need require careful research, in the meaning of composition such a type of dialogue poem gives us a good parallel to the hymn group under discussion, going back to the Classical Syriac literature.

The historical context of the hymn is of particular interest. It describes the events that took place in 1220–1226 AD, a period when several different invaders encroached upon the

Georgian people. These events were described in Arabic, Persian, Armenian and Georgian sources, and hence, there is enough information with which to compare the hymn.

In the hymn the episode with the letters is also mentioned (stanzas 12–14), but with a specific pathos. The Muslim Khorasmians have been transformed into Magians, i.e. Zoroastrians, represented as pagans (stanzas 12–15), and Sharwa (Shalva) as a protector of Christianity from paganism (stanzas 12, 15). Killing the hero seems to be represented in the hymn as a part of some heathen ritual (stanza 15). The term ‘Magianism’ (*mgūšūtā*) also means ‘magic practicing, sorcery’. It is very tempting to suggest that here it could be a reflection of the fact that Mongols at this period were shamanist, and in this case we face a complete merging of the Mongols and the Khorasmians in the text.

One can see a very similar situation in another hymn, also within the same “catastrophic” group, namely the second one on the capture of Jerusalem, published by Th. Nöldeke, and then republished and studied by Alessandro Mengozzi. It was pointed out that the hymn contains many mistakes in different historical facts. Both scholars have suggested that it had been composed long after this historical event by a person whose only source was an oral narrator of the folk tradition.

Werner Seibt demonstrates in his study *‘Die orthodoxe Metropolis “Kaukasos”’* (‘The Orthodox Metropolis of “Kaukasos”’) that an Orthodox Metropolis of Kaukasos appears for a limited time in the 14th century among the metropolises of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in the register of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and in a few other sources, in particular in connection with problems that the Patriarchate had with the metropolitan of Alania at that time. This metropolitan interfered repeatedly in the affairs of the apparently neighbouring Metropolis of Kaukasos.

According to the author many factors speak in favour of locating this metropolis in the territory of the As / Os, the immediate forefathers of the modern Osetians. While the Alanian kingdom was converted by missionaries in the early 10th century and an orthodox metropolis had been erected there by the middle of that century, the conversion of the Osetians must not have begun until later. This conversion originated in Georgia, which experienced an enormous upturn in the 12th century and whose influence then also extended to North Caucasian areas. The first archaeological finds indicating the presence of Christian missionary work among the As also date from the 12th or 13th century at the latest.

However, the Mongols then considerably weakened Georgia's political power, which evidently enabled the Byzantines to put the Ecumenical Patriarchate in charge of the existing church organisation of the As / Os with the sanction and, presumably, the support of the Mongols and to convert it into a Greek Orthodox metropolis. It is surely no coincidence that the aforementioned metropolitan of Alania had particularly good relationships with the Mongols and knew how to play them off against the Patriarchate.

Yet the Byzantine reorganisation of the Metropolis of Kaukasos was only to be granted a few decades of success. On one hand, Islam soon made considerable progress in these regions, while changes in the political relationships between Byzantium and the Mongols, and in the latter's policies on religion, may have played a certain role.

In his article *‘Der Westfeldzug von 1219–1221: Die “Mongolenerwartung” im Kreuzfahrerlager von Damiette und im christlichen Kaukasus’* (‘The invasion of Khwarezmia in 1219–1221: The “expectation of the Mongols” in the Crusaders’ camp of Damietta and in the Christian Caucasus’), Aleksandre Tvaradze discusses sources such as the letters from Queen Rusudan and Atabeg Ivane to Honorius III and Kirakos Ganjakec'i's report from the Christian Caucasus. These documents suggest that the Mongols were also initially taken for the Christians in the Kingdom of Georgia. It is likely that this conviction led the Georgian

King George IV Lasha to make preparations for a crusade allegedly intended to free Jerusalem immediately before the Mongol invasion.

In addition, the article analyses the relevant Georgian and Armenian reports. Particular attention is paid to the following questions: what expectations could have developed with regard to the Mongols in the Christian Caucasus before the invasion by Jebe and Subotai; did these convictions or expectations also have corresponding political effects; how were the Mongols judged afterwards? In order to provide a broader context, the article also considers western sources. Combining the western and eastern sources makes it possible to reconstruct the historical circumstances which are particularly important to the history of the Crusades and the Georgian kingdom.

In her contribution *Mongol invasions in the Caucasus and the Georgian source Kartlis cxovreba*, Sophia Vashalomidze delivers an overview of the historical sources which bear testament to Mongol rule in ancient Georgia and, more specifically, present an image of the Mongols as told in *The Georgian Chronicle*.

This chronicle contains extensive information on the Mongol-Tatar rule in Georgia as well as on Asia and Europe in general. It reports not only on the political and military history of the Mongols, but also on the outer anthropological appearance of the Mongols, their language and way of life, system of government, feudal-nomadic economic system, customs and habits, religious views and their art of war and tactics of warfare.

The Georgian source therefore provides historical perspectives of historical events which lie further back in the past. Values, actions and judgements cannot be considered on an equal footing, as they do not take place concurrently, but in succession and are as such related to one another.

In his study *‘Zur Möglichkeit der Analyse nicht-rationaler Textelemente’* (‘On the possibilities of analysing non-rational text elements’), Manfred Zimmer observes that the conception of man also plays a major role in historiographical texts. This is of particular significance with regard to competition and change in the various phases of life in the context of individual vitality and fitness. It is especially in this factual milieu though that considerable numbers of non-rational accounts are to be found. A whole series of texts deal with a sphere of beauty and creative power (in both a positive and negative sense) which, although it is beneficial in its non-rationality to the persons that encounter it, is mostly characterised by problems concerning the ability of the affected persons to build relationships. As such encounters are at times a significant constituent of the overall events described in texts, a methodically secure set of concepts that makes it possible to handle these elements is essential. This contribution aims to suggest such a set of concepts. Central to this set of concepts are the concept of the Other World and the perception of impression. The concept of a life plan is suggested for fitting into the concept of the idea of man. The second section of the report uses several examples to demonstrate that non-rational accounts make up a notable portion of the Armenian reports concerned with the time of the Mongol invasions in Armenia and Georgia and the rule and retreat of the Mongols, thus further underlining the need to accord such accounts positive recognition.

Many thanks to all the authors for their valuable support and great cooperation. We are also grateful to Christiane Dankert, Dawn Williams and Jan Molzer for the correction work they have performed. Special thanks, too, are extended to Dr. Ursula Reichert, whose publishing house was kind enough to take on this anthology. In addition, we would like to thank the Gertrud-und-Alexander-Böhlig-Stiftung and the German Research Foundation (DFG), whose contribution to the printing costs was what made this publication possible.

We hope that with this anthology we will succeed in reviving scientific discussion of the Christian Orient, in particular the Caucasus.

