

Danielyan, G. (2025). Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' al-Armanī, Emir of Mosul: Multireligious Coexistence under a “Tolerant” Ruler. *Al-Masāq. Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean*. 1-36

The official version of the article may be accessed via the publisher's website at the following link:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09503110.2025.2583776>

Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' al-Armanī, Emir of Mosul: Multireligious Coexistence under a “Tolerant” Ruler

Gagik Danielyan

Dipartimento di Storia Archeologia Geografia Arte e Spettacolo, Università degli Studi di
Firenze, Florence, Italy

ABSTRACT

Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', originally an Armenian slave who converted to Islam, was one of the most influential figures in the medieval history of Mosul. Rising through the ranks under the Zengid Atabegs, he capitalised on favourable political conditions to seize power and govern the city independently for more than four decades, a period depicted in contemporary sources as one of economic prosperity and vibrant cultural and artistic activity. This study examines Arabic, Persian and Latin narratives that illuminate key episodes of his early life and his interactions with Mosul's diverse communities. It focuses on biographical accounts concerning his origins, expressions of personal religiosity and religious policies. While the sources offer conflicting depictions of his religious orientation, some previously overlooked accounts – critically evaluated here – accuse him of neglecting Islamic practices and observing Christian festivals, whereas others highlight his Shī'ī leanings. Together, these accounts underscore the complexity of his religious identity.

1. Introductory Remarks

In the mid-thirteenth century, the Levant and Mesopotamia underwent drastic political and cultural upheavals. The Turkic (Seljuk and Oghuz) dynasties, the Kurdish 'Ayyūbids and the Crusader states – dominant forces since the previous century – now found themselves unable to withstand the rise of new powers in the region, most notably the Mongols and the Mamlūks (largely of Turkic Kipchak and Circassian origin). As a result, they collapsed. Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', one of the most charismatic statesmen of this era, emerged during these tumultuous times.¹ A manumitted slave, Badr al-Dīn had served as regent for the last three Zengid rulers for 23 years, effectively holding power since 1211. Shortly before the Mongols launched their initial incursions into northern Mesopotamia in 1234, he deposed the final Zengid ruler Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd (1219–1233) and established himself as the independent ruler of Mosul, a position he held from 1233 to his death in 1259.

There are various studies dedicated to Badr al-Dīn's political activities and career. My objective in this article is, therefore, to focus on specific biographical accounts preserved in

Arabic concerning his origin, expressions of his religiosity and his religious policies. Sources offer conflicting evidence about Badr al-Dīn's religious views. Some neglected accounts, whose authenticity and historical accuracy will be assessed below, accuse Badr al-Dīn of disregarding Islamic practices and celebrating Christian holidays, emphasising his inclination toward Shī'a Islam. These reports reflect the complexity of his religious identity and the diverse interpretations of his actions by contemporary and later historians. I bring together evidence from Arabic, Persian and Latin historical sources that recount significant episodes from Badr al-Dīn's early life and his interactions with the diverse communities under his rule.² Some of these narratives have been previously overlooked or received insufficient scholarly attention. Based on this evidence – particularly the information concerning Badr al-Dīn's age at the time of his enslavement and conversion to Islam – I propose that, as an Armenian convert and freedman, Badr al-Dīn likely did not entirely abandon elements of his original cultural and religious practices. Instead, his previous Christian beliefs seem to have continued to shape his conduct and attitudes toward Christianity and its followers. I hypothesise that Badr al-Dīn developed a multilayered or *hybrid* identity, integrating both the beliefs and practices of Islam, his adopted faith, and those of Christianity, his former faith. This blending of religious experiences likely inspired Lu'lu's inclusive governance, which contributed to Mosul's transformation into a cosmopolitan centre where diverse communities coexisted in relative harmony.

2. Thoughts On Conversion to Islam and the Case of Badr al-Dīn

Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu's life is an outstanding example for studying the phenomenon of conversion to Islam. Scholars have long sought to establish a unified framework for understanding the process of conversion. Arthur Darby Nock (1902–1963), one of the leading authorities of the history of religion, offered the following definition:

*By conversion we mean the reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another, a turning which implies a consciousness that a great change is involved, that the old was wrong and the new is right.*³

However, as recent studies have shown, romanticised notions such as the “reorientation of the soul” and an overemphasis on individual spiritual or psychological categories fall short in explaining or understanding the phenomenon of conversion. Today, we recognise the complex interplay of social, political and cultural factors intimately connected to questions of identity and the degree of radical or partial transformation of a person's worldview.⁴ In the context of medieval Islam, a convert's social status was also a crucial consideration. Examining the evidence concerning Badr al-Dīn – a medieval ruler and former military slave, rather than a voluntary convert – and his religious practices can shed light on several of these issues.

Medieval Armenian and Arabic historical sources contain many reports on numerous Islamised personalities of Armenian origin, who successfully integrated into the Islamic milieu and even reached high administrative, military and religious positions (such as generals, governors, viziers, judges, etc.). Despite plenty of evidence about Armenian converts to Islam in the Middle Ages, the topic has received uneven treatment within

Armenian and Islamic studies. Some converts, such as the Fāṭimid vizier Badr al-Jamālī (1074–1094) and his successors, have received disproportionately more attention, whereas various accounts of many other prominent Muslims of Armenian descent have never been properly explored. Transformations in ethnic, cultural and religious identity of Armenian converts to Islam have not been subject to detailed analysis. We still lack a clear understanding of the social integration and acculturation of Armenians in Islamic society, the circumstances that led to their adoption of Islam and what that meant regarding their former faith, including the possibility of their continued adherence to a crypto-Christian identity or developing a hybrid form of religious expression. There were also cases when they returned to Christianity, with attitudes to such “renegade Armenians” by their co-religionists and the Armenian Church on the one hand, and by the Muslims in Islamic society on the other, still needing a systematic investigation. Another unexplored issue is the question of how they overcame the barrier of knowledge of the language of the Qur’ān, Arabic, or if they had a prior knowledge of it.⁵ Although this article will not address all of these questions, it aims to provide answers at least to some on the example of one converted individual Badr al-Dīn, his religious beliefs and practices.

3. The Historical Background

Before Badr al-Dīn’s rule in Mosul, it had been governed by emirs from the Zengid dynasty. Badr al-Dīn’s good fortune and political ambitions paved his way from a military slave to the guardian of Zengid emirs’ underage sons, and then as their successor in his own right – as the independent Emir and Sultan of Mosul.

The Zengid dynasty of Syria and Upper Mesopotamia was founded by the Seljuk general ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī b. Āq Sunqūr (1127–1146), whom the Seljuq Sultan Maḥmūd II (1118–1131) had appointed the Governor of Mosul and the Atabeg of his two sons. During the reign of ‘Imād al-Dīn, Mosul gained *de facto* autonomy from the Great Seljuk Empire and significantly expanded its territories in Syria and northern Mesopotamia (Sinjār, al-Jazīra, Shahrazūr, etc.) at the expense of the Būrids, the Artuqids and the Franks. ‘Imād al-Dīn’s greatest achievement was the capture of Edessa in 1144, which earned him a reputation as “the standard-bearer” of the Holy War against the Franks.⁶ After ‘Imād al-Dīn’s assassination in 1146 by one of his eunuchs, his three sons inherited his possessions. Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd⁷ took the Syrian territories, Sayf al-Dīn al-Ghāzī received Mosul and Jazīrat ibn ‘Umār, while Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ruled Homs.⁸

The Mosul line of the Zengids survived until the mid-1230s and was overthrown by Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’, a *ghulām* (slave) of Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh I (1193–1211), the atabeg of Mosul. He proved himself a brave warrior and loyal servant of his patron and after Arslān Shāh’s death (1211), Lu’lu’ assumed the guardianship (*mudabbir al-dawla*) of Arslān Shāh I’s son ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd II (1211–1218), who had the regnal title *al-Malik al-Qāhir*. The latter entrusted his two teenage sons to Lu’lu’’s tutelage and guardianship before his death. Badr al-Dīn obtained letters of investiture from the Caliph of Baghdad for al-Qāhir’s son Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh II (1218–1219), and recognition as a deputy sultān (*nā’ib al-sultān*) for himself. But in fact, he seized power in Mosul and started to rule it in his own right.⁹ Sources accuse him of conspiracies

against the grandsons of his patron, Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh I, and for the usurpation of power in Mosul.¹⁰

This presumed coup by Lu'lu' raised a wave of opposition from Arslan Shāh II's uncle 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī, who, too, had legitimate ambitions for power.¹¹ In 1219, Arslān Shāh II died, and Badr al-Dīn placed his three-year-old brother Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd on the throne. Zankī soon allied himself with his father-in-law Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī, the Emir of Erbil, and began raiding the territories of Mosul. To resist his enemies' attacks, Badr al-Dīn now sought the support of al-Ashraf Mūsā, the 'Ayyūbid ruler of al-Jazīra (future Emir of Damascus in 1229–1237), recognising his suzerainty. Thanks to the interference of al-Ashraf, Badr al-Dīn managed to suppress Zankī's and Kūkbūrī's aggressive policy towards his *de facto* autonomous rule in Mosul. In 1233, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī died and the whole territory of his emirate was occupied by the Caliph of Baghdad. Soon after, Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd disappeared under obscure circumstances (in all likelihood he was killed by Lu'lu'),¹² and rule in Mosul was eventually fully assumed by Lu'lu'. This marked the official end of Zengid rule in Mosul. Lu'lu' received an investiture letter from the 'Abbāsid Caliph Mustanṣir (1226–1242). He accepted the regnal name al-Malik al-raḥīm (the merciful king) and began to rule Mosul independently (1233–1259).¹³

In the 1240s, when the Mongol threat became apparent, Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' had to voluntarily accept their supremacy, which saved his emirate from destruction. In 1246, he managed to receive a *yarligh* (patent of authority) for his rule from the great Mongol Khan Gūyūk (1246–1248). Moreover, in 1258, unable to convince the 'Abbāsid caliph Musta'ṣim bi-l-lāh (1242–1258) to submit to the Mongols, he, after some hesitation, chose to send Mosuli contingents led by his son al-Ṣāliḥ Isma'īl to participate in the siege of Baghdad and convey provisions and war materials to the Mongol troops, because he believed that the salvation of Mosul required such a course of action.¹⁴ Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' died in 1259.

Medieval historians speak highly of Badr al-Dīn's political foresight and diplomatic flexibility.¹⁵ He is usually presented in the sources as a man of Realpolitik, an adept negotiator and a good administrator, who ensured relative peace in Mosul for decades thanks to his political pragmatism, making it one of the most prosperous cities and centres of science, written culture and crafts of his time. However, his sons were unable to preserve their small lordships in the face of the rising power of two large-scale empires – the Mamlūks and the Mongols – and soon lost the once-flourishing emirate to the Mongols. After the battle of 'Ayn Jālūt (Spring of Goliath) on 3 September 1260, they started secret negotiations with Baybars al-Bunduqdārī (1260–1277), the Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt. As a result, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Isma'īl (1259–1262), the elder son of Badr al-Dīn, was executed by the Mongols, and two other sons, al-Mujāhid Ishāq and al-Muẓaffar 'Alī, fled to Cairo in 1262.¹⁶

4. A Neglected Piece of Evidence On Lu'lu''s Early Life

Badr al-Dīn's political activities and relations with neighbouring powers, namely the 'Ayyūbids, Khwārazmians, Artuqids, 'Abbāsids, Mamlūks and Mongols, are reported by numerous sources, such as chronicles as well as prosopographical works. There are, however, comparatively fewer sources about Badr al-Dīn's origin and early life. Studying these reports, including details such as the age at which he converted to Islam and his

initial integration into an Islamic milieu, can be valuable for understanding the circumstances of his conversion and the specific characteristics of his religious outlook.

Lu'lu's full name was *al-Malik al-Raḥīm Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' Abū al-Faḍā'il al-Armanī al-Atābakī al-Nūrī*. Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Qalqashandī (d. 1418), in his chancery manual entitled *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā* (Dawn for the blind), explained that the most suitable title for the name Lu'lu' was *Badr al-Dīn* (the full moon of the religion).¹⁷ In some building inscriptions and written sources Badr al-Dīn is named "*ibn 'Abd Allāh*" (son of a servant of God), a patronymic which usually indicated that the bearer was a first-generation Muslim. It was commonly given to non-Arab converts to Islam substituting a slave's non-Muslim father's name.¹⁸ Scholars have long relied on these elements in affirming that Badr al-Dīn was a converted Muslim. Given the epithet *al-Armanī*, it is naturally considered that he was of Armenian origin.

Almost nothing is known about Badr al-Dīn's early life. Douglas Patton, *al-Ruwayshidī* and P. Sappalean cite Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, *al-Dhahabī*, *al-Yāfi'ī*, Ibn Kathīr, *al-Ghassānī*, the *Dīwān* of 'Alī b. al-Muqarrab al-'Uyūnī al-Aḥsā'ī and Ibn Taghrī Birdī, who report that he was an Armenian slave from *Rūm* (i.e. Asia Minor) and that he had been initially bought by a tailor before being purchased by Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh I, Emir of Mosul.¹⁹ However, an important source that sheds new light on the origins of Atabeg Lu'lu' has heretofore been neglected by scholars. It is the biographical dictionary of one of the most famous historians of the Mamlūk era, namely Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Maqrīzī (d. 1441), entitled *Al-Ta'rīkh al-muqaffā al-kabīr* (The Great History in Continuation). The author aimed at collecting the obituaries of all the prominent personalities who lived in, acted, or had any links with Egypt. Al-Maqrīzī planned to compile a huge encyclopaedia comprising more than 80 volumes, but managed to complete only 16 volumes before he died. Of these 16 autograph volumes, only five have been identified to date in manuscript collections worldwide.²⁰

Badr al-Dīn's biography was not included in *Al-Ta'rīkh al-muqaffā*, at least in the parts that have come down to us. However, details concerning his enslavement and rise to power in Mosul were reported in the biography of another famous individual of Armenian origin (*al-armanī al-jins*) whose obituary was included in al-Maqrīzī's dictionary. That person was Emir Shams al-Dīn Abū Sa'īd al-Amīnī al-Mawsilī,²¹ whose nickname was likewise Lu'lu', just like Badr al-Dīn. The two probably also shared the fate of slavery. Al-Maqrīzī begins his account as follows:

He (Shams al-Dīn) was one of the mamlūks of eunuch Amīn al-Dīn Yumn, who [in his turn] was a freedman ('atīq) of Nūr al-Dīn Arslān b. 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd, lord of Mosul. He brought him up since childhood. The reason for this was that he (Shams al-Dīn) was taken [captive] from one of the villages of Mayyāfāriqīn when the army of Mosul attacked it. A woman purchased him and left him with a tailor so that the latter would teach [him] tailoring. At that time, Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', the [future] lord of Mosul, was already with that tailor. One day, Amīn al-Dīn Yumn was passing by when he saw him (Shams al-Dīn) with the tailor. He bought him from that woman, together with Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', who [later] became the master of Mosul. Years passed until Badr al-Dīn reigned in Mosul. He (Badr al-Dīn) arrested his [former] master (ustādh) Amīn al-Dīn Yumn, confiscated his property, and left no slave with him except [Shams al-Dīn] Lu'lu', the subject of this biography. He (Shams al-Dīn) started tailoring and supported his master with his earnings until al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī b. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn interceded for him in favour of Amīn al-Dīn. His intercession was accepted by Badr al-Dīn who agreed to send him to Aleppo on the condition that he (al-Malik al-Zāhir) would not take him into service.²²

According to this unique report, the two Lu'lu's were slaves of the same master for a while. It seems that Amīn al-Dīn Yumn (d. 1213/1214), himself a freedman of Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh I, treated Badr al-Dīn poorly during his time as a slave, since the latter waited for the opportune moment to take revenge on his former patron, once he rose to power in Mosul. It is noteworthy that A.-M. Eddé previously utilised al-Maqrīzī's report without reservation when detailing the activities of Shams al-Dīn Lu'lu' in her book *“La Principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep”*. However, several factors call for a cautious reading of this late-period author's account, even as there are reasons to regard it with some degree of credibility. First, al-Maqrīzī failed to cite the primary source of his information on Shams al-Dīn Lu'lu'. Moreover, a gap of more than two centuries separates the composition of al-Muqaffā from the period in which Badr al-Dīn lived. It is possible that al-Maqrīzī fabricated the connection between the two namesakes to enhance the distinctiveness of his biographical account. On the other hand, we should not overlook the possibility that he relied on sources available to him which have not reached us, such as Qutb al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī's (d. 1335) valuable but now lost biographical dictionary, entitled *Ta'riḫ Miṣr* (History of Egypt), which, as Frederick Bauden's recent research has demonstrated, he frequently utilised, albeit citing it only rarely.²³ While al-Maqrīzī's account of the connection between the two Lu'lu's is not supported by other surviving sources, it is known from his *Al-Ta'riḫ al-Muqaffā* and other works, including those of 'Izz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād, that Shams al-Dīn and Badr al-Dīn corresponded in the 1240s, during Shams al-Dīn's de facto rule of Aleppo as regent for al-Nāṣir Yūsuf and commander-in-chief of the Aleppan army.²⁴ However, historians offer no information regarding any connections or interactions between them following Badr al-Dīn's manumission, which, if present, would have undoubtedly lent greater credibility to al-Maqrīzī's account.

Ibn Khāṭib al-Nāṣiriyya (d. 1440) also made selections from Qutb al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī's biographical dictionary to compile his *Al-Muntaqā min ta'riḫ Miṣr*.²⁵ However, in the surviving version, we find no mention of any connection between the two Lu'lu's, aside from the previously cited report by 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād and al-Maqrīzī regarding their correspondence.²⁶ In his extensive work *Al-Durr al-Muntakhab fī Takmilat Ta'riḫ Ḥalab*, Ibn Khāṭib refers to additional selections from Qutb al-Dīn's book, but regrettably, it lacks a biography of Shams al-Dīn Lu'lu'. This absence prevents us from definitively corroborating al-Maqrīzī's account.²⁷

On the other hand, scholars of Mamlūk historiography recognise al-Maqrīzī as a generally reliable historian, whose works preserve valuable information from sources that are now lost and provide evidence surviving solely through his writings. For example, without his book *Itti'āz al-ḥunafā'* and the primary sources he employed, such as Ibn Muyassar (d. 1278), it would have been impossible to reconstruct numerous aspects of the history of the Fāṭimid Caliphate (969–1171). Weighing all the possibilities and despite the fact that he is a later source, I believe there is no compelling reason for wholly dismissing al-Maqrīzī's account of two Lu'lu's with complete scepticism. Rather, it opens up new perspectives on the life and identity of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' which I will set forth below.

Al-Maqrīzī's account offers no information about the identity of the woman who purchased Shams al-Dīn. The Damascene historian Abū Shāma (d. 1267), in his *Al-Dhayl 'alā al-Rawḍatayn*, includes a brief obituary note on Badr al-Dīn – also overlooked in scholarship – describing him as “a slave of Atabeg Zengi's daughter”, though he does

not provide her name.²⁸ Although it is possible that Abū Shāma and al-Maqrīzī meant the same woman, the limited available evidence prevents us from making any definitive conclusions on this matter. No further information about Lu'lu's early life is available beyond al-Maqrīzī's account. Nevertheless, this account is valuable as it lends support to certain hypotheses.

5. The Age at Which Lu'lu' was Enslaved and Converted

Why is this biographical account of Shams al-Dīn significant for understanding Badr al-Dīn's religiosity? It is generally assumed that a person's worldview and religious beliefs are shaped from an early age, heavily influenced by their surrounding religious environment and education. In cases of conversion, the earlier a child is immersed in the new environment and begins receiving religious instruction, the more deeply rooted and stable their understanding of the new faith becomes in adulthood. Without delving into modern or contemporary studies on the psychology and pedagogical aspects of this phenomenon, let us see how medieval thinkers viewed conversion and its psychological/pedagogical dimensions.

Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 923), a famous Muslim jurist, in his compendium of responsa attributed to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 855), the founder of the Hanbali school of Islamic jurisprudence, stated that the boy at the age of ten should already be beaten to make him perform the prayer.²⁹ According to another renowned jurist and theologian al-Ghazālī (d. 1111), the most suitable age for beginning Islamic education is seven, as this is when a child starts to comprehend and learn about the world, distinguishing between good and evil (the age of discernment). While Islamic law imposes no upper age limit for embracing Islam, al-Ghazālī noted elsewhere:

*At this [early] age learning is like engraving on a stone, while the teaching of an elderly person is arduous and troublesome.*³⁰

For military slaves (*ghilmān* or *mamlūks*) like Lu'lu', early adolescence was typically considered the ideal age for enslavement.³¹ However, our investigation into the timeline of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu's birth, enslavement and conversion likely suggests a different trajectory.

Arab historians do not mention the exact date of Lu'lu's birth, nor the date when he was taken captive and transferred to Mosul. Some Arabic sources agree that Lu'lu' was over 80 years old at the time of his death, some claim he was over 85, while others suggest he was more than 90 or even close to 100 years old. Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī (d. 1318) and Abū Sulaymān Banākatī (d. 1330) are the only authors who specifically mention Badr al-Dīn's age at the time of his death, stating it to be 96 years.³² If we calculate Badr al-Dīn's birth year by subtracting the age at death, as stated by Rashīd al-Dīn (96 lunar years, which is nearly 93 solar years) from his year of death (1259), he would have been born around 1166. According to Ibn al-Athīr, Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh I, who ascended the throne of Mosul in 1193, was about 20 years old at the time and 38 at his death in 1211.³³ This means that Nūr al-Dīn was born in 1173/1174. Shams al-Dīn Lu'lu', as narrated by al-Maqrīzī, was sold like Badr al-Dīn to Amīn al-Dīn Yumn, who himself was a freedman of Nūr al-Dīn. Shams al-Dīn was born in 585 AH (1189/1190), and both Lu'lu's were trained in tailoring by the same tailor for some time. Shams al-Dīn must have been at

least five to seven years old to learn the profession, making it chronologically implausible that Badr al-Dīn, who was probably even older than his master Nūr al-Dīn, could have entered his service many years before Nūr al-Dīn ascended the throne. Therefore, if he took Badr al-Dīn into his service at the beginning of his reign, the latter must have been at least 27 or 28 years old. Even if we rely on the average lifespan reported by Arab historians (85 lunar years, equivalent to nearly 82 solar years) rather than Rashīd al-Dīn's account, Badr al-Dīn would have been born around 1177. This would make him nearly the same age as his master, Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh. In any case, Ibn al-Athīr's chronicle confirms that by the end of Arslān Shāh's reign, Badr al-Dīn already held the high-ranking position of *amīr al-iṣḫsalār al-kabīr* (commander of the army), indicating that he was an adult by that time.³⁴ In sum, although the exact time of Badr al-Dīn's enslavement and emergence in Mosul and the length of his stay with his first master (Zengi's daughter?) and Amīn al-Dīn Yumn remain unknown, these events likely took place when he was already at a relatively mature age. This circumstance could have significantly influenced Badr al-Dīn's later life. Receiving Islamic education at an advanced age likely hindered his complete acculturation into a new religious and cultural environment. Additionally, Arabic sources provide some evidence of his literacy, including his knowledge of the Arabic language – a topic I consider important to explore further.

6. An Illiterate Ruler or a Benefactor of Intellectual Class? A Lover of World Pleasures or a Pious Ruler?

It is challenging to determine the specific characteristics of the upbringing and training of military slaves in Zengid Mosul. However, it can be assumed that, in general, their training did not differ significantly from the methods employed in the Mamlūk Sultanate, for which Arabic sources provide relatively extensive information.³⁵ The education received by converts to Islam was crucial, alongside the military training of slaves. Equally important for a convert was acquiring at least a basic knowledge of Arabic, sufficient to read the Qur'ān and grasp the fundamental principles of his new faith.³⁶ However, Badr al-Dīn's relatively late conversion to Islam may have prevented him from fully completing this stage of education. Primary sources shed some light on this. Ibn Ṭiḡṭāqā (d. 1309), in his *Kitāb al-Fakhrī*, states that Badr al-Dīn was illiterate, unable to read or write in Arabic (*kāna umiyyan lā yaktubu wa-lā yaqra'u*). Yet the same author also observes that Badr al-Dīn compensated for this deficiency by regularly engaging in conversations with leading scholars and intellectuals during his *majālis al-uns* (courtly gatherings), where historical and biographical works were read aloud to him.³⁷

Notably, in the case of *ghilmān* training in the Mamlūk Sultanate, knowledge of Arabic was also often limited, with communication typically occurring in various Turkic dialects.³⁸ Given this context, a difficult question arises: how did Badr al-Dīn, of Armenian descent, manage to communicate effectively with his entourage despite his poor proficiency in Arabic?

Additionally, Muslim historians and biographers do not report anything about his Islamic education. Some even accuse him of ignoring religion. But, for example, in the case of his "comrade", the aforementioned Shams al-Dīn Lu'lu' al-Amīnī, they consider

it necessary to give his teachers' names and stress the fact that he had a solid Islamic education and was a pious Muslim (*ḍayyīnān*, *ʿābidān*, *sāliḥān*).³⁹

Despite Badr al-Dīn's illiteracy and lack of Islamic education, other sources testify that his reign was a period of prosperity and splendour in the history of Mosul and Northern Iraq. Scholars concur that the scientific, cultural and artistic life (historiography, poetry, music, manuscript production), as well as crafts (such as inlaid metalwork), flourished under the aegis of Badr al-Dīn.⁴⁰ He used to bestow on poets up to one thousand dinars and had friendly relations with many Mosuli scholars and poets.⁴¹ He also commissioned the construction and restoration of many religious buildings including shrines, such as those dedicated to imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim, imām ʿAwn al-Dīn and imām al-Bāhir, madrasas (al-Madrasa al-Badriyya) and palaces (Qarā Sarāy) in the city and its environs.⁴²

In relation to the religiosity and religious tendencies of Badr al-Dīn – the main focus of this article – it is important to draw attention to another overlooked aspect of his behaviour and morals. Medieval sources indicate that the master of Mosul was not only a generous benefactor, but also a lover and patron of all kinds of worldly pleasures (lavish feasts, singing, music, dancing, drinking, concubines, etc.) and luxuries to the extent that myths arose about his indulgences. Ibn Ṭiqṭaqā notes that even the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphs would request singers from him for performances in Baghdad.⁴³ The anonymous author of the Persian geographical work *ʿAjāʾib al-dunyā* (Marvels of the World), written in the late 1220s, states that no place in the world had as many musicians and singers as Mosul. He adds that the people of Mosul were lively, joyful, always engaged in fun, and openly indulged in debauchery.⁴⁴ In addition to these accounts from Ibn Ṭiqṭaqā and the excerpt translated below, Ibn al-Shaʿār al-Mawṣilī also mentions the frequent drinking parties hosted by Badr al-Dīn Luʿluʾ in his palace and some of his drinking companions.⁴⁵ One may form a “visual” idea of the drinking parties and musical gatherings organised by Badr al-Dīn through lavish illustrations of manuscripts written under his patronage.⁴⁶ According to Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī (d. 1318), Luʿluʾ derived the greatest pleasure from his life.⁴⁷ But the most vivid depiction of his lifestyle comes from Ḥamdallāh Mustawfī (d. 1344) in his epic poem *“Zafarnāme”* (“The Book of Victories”):

*Not one of the other kings of the world acted as well as he. Day and night, all kinds of musical instruments were arranged before the king, and he occupied his time as his heart desired. Every good thing he desired was there, without stint, and he was never separated from the sound of music and drinking, and he listened constantly to the sound of melodies. Everything he had was unequalled in excellence, and it was with him by the month and by the year. Water from that well made a lofty paradise in the palaces of Mosul. When he gathered company around himself, for pleasure, anything the mind desired was available from him. Know that, without doubt, there was never one of the kings of the world before him who was like him, not Parwez or Bahram Gor. In the field of pleasure, they were not even his sons. Those two kings could not enjoy one-hundredth of Luʿluʾs pleasures, according to his custom and tradition.*⁴⁸

All these sources suggest that Badr al-Dīn led something of a pleasure-seeking lifestyle. This did not prevent him from expressing a form of spirituality, and in order to trace that we shall turn to exploring his personality as depicted by religious figures and scholars. There is another account of Badr al-Dīn being a great lover of feasts, which also contains intriguing information about his religious practices and connections with the Christian

community of Mosul. The boundary between Lu'lu's pursuit of worldly pleasures and his spiritual devotion – if such a boundary even existed – requires closer examination.

7. Two More Neglected Accounts of Badr al-Dīn's Life

Badr al-Dīn's political activities and relations with neighbouring powers – specifically the 'Ayyūbid s, Khwārazmians, Artuqids, lords of Sinjār, 'Abbāsids of Baghdad, Mamlūks of Egypt and the Mongols – are documented in numerous sources, such as chronicles as well as prosopographical works. In addition, there exist two previously overlooked obituaries of Badr al-Dīn found in the works of two fourteenth-century authors, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Dhahabī (d. 1348) and Khalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī (d. 1363), to which I wish to draw attention.

Al-Dhahabī compiled several works in *ḥadīth*, but his magnum opus is the multivolume universal history entitled *Ta'rikh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a'lām* ("The History of Islam and the Famous and Prominent"), in which the narrative of historical events reaches the year 1301. *Ta'rikh al-Islām* includes thousands of obituaries organised according to classes in the manner of the *ṭabaqāt* literature.⁴⁹ Among the author's other works, the two-volume *Duwal al-Islām* ("The Dynasties of Islam") is also worth a mention. This is an abridgement of al-Dhahabī's great history; however, the chronology of events, albeit in a very brief manner, continues the narrative of *Ta'rikh al-Islām* for four more decades, reaching up to 743 AH/1343–1344.⁵⁰ Al-Dhahabī also composed two biographical dictionaries. The first of them, entitled *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* ("Biographies of the Noble Celebrities"),⁵¹ is a massive biographical encyclopaedia, which however contains a much smaller number of obituaries than *Ta'rikh al-Islām*. The second, entitled *Al-'Ibar fī khabar man ghabara* ("Good Counsel Regarding the Reports on the Deceased People"), is a summary of *Siyar*.⁵² Another account of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu's life, very similar to the *tarjama* recorded by al-Dhahabī, is preserved in Khalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī's (d. 1363) biographical dictionary. Al-Ṣafadī is best known for his two works, a huge biographical encyclopaedia entitled *Al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* ("The Entirety of Obituaries") and a relatively shorter biographical dictionary entitled *A'yān al-'asr wa-a'wān al-nasr* ("The Notables of the Age and Advocates of the Victory").⁵³ The first includes nearly 14,000 biographies about prominent Muslims, starting from the time of the Prophet Muhammad, whereas the second contains about 2,000 biographies of prominent persons of the author's lifetime.⁵⁴ Al-Ṣafadī studied under al-Dhahabī, thus it is probable that he borrowed much from his teacher's works. For example, in the case of Badr al-Dīn's *tarjama*, his account is undoubtedly based on al-Dhahabī's *Ta'rikh al-Islām*. Let us take a closer look at the biographical records of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' in al-Dhahabī's⁵⁵ and al-Ṣafadī's⁵⁶ works, comparing them with the information existing in other sources if applicable.⁵⁷

8. Translation of the Obituary

"Sulṭān al-Malik al-Raḥīm Badr al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, Abū al-Faḍā'il al-Armanī al-Atābakī al-Nūrī, the freedman (*mawlā*) of Sulṭān Nūr al-Dīn Arslān Shāh, son of Sulṭān 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd.

He was the administrator of the affairs of the state of his master, who had granted him the rank of an emir. And when Nūr al-Dīn died, he administered the affairs of his son Sulṭān al-Qāhir ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd b. Nūr al-Dīn. When he also passed away in [6]15 AH (1218/ 1219), Badr al-Dīn placed on the throne one after the other the two young sons of al-Qāhir⁵⁸ who both were the sons of the daughter of Muẓaffar al-Dīn, Lord of Erbil. Then he seized the kingship of Mosul for 40 years.⁵⁹ More precisely, he became a sultan in 630 [AH], at the end of [the month] Ramaḍān (June/July 1233).

He was resolute and courageous, a good administrator, judicious and prudent, and gifted with generosity, leadership skills and patience. He had dignity, authority and political skills. [He was one of the most handsome men].⁶⁰ He paid a great deal of money to intelligence agents. He was cautious and flattering to the caliph on the one hand, on the other hand, the Tatars and the kings of other countries, and his power remained uninterrupted and no harm befell him. Along with his tyranny and oppression,⁶¹ he was loved by his subjects because he treated them both with goodwill and intimidation.⁶²

Shaykh Qutḥ al-Dīn mentioned him and wrote: “He was a glorious ruler, energetic, very influential and skilled in politics, violent towards his emirs. He killed, hanged and mutilated countless people until he established order in the country. Along with that, he was loved by his subjects, they used to swear on his life, exaggerated and nicknamed him Golden Cane (*al-qaḍīb al-dhahab*). He demonstrated a keen interest in information about his subjects.⁶³ He died in the ninth decade of life when his face was still fresh and his posture was good, and whoever saw him thought he was still middle-aged”.⁶⁴

I say: “When he saw that his neighbour Muẓaffar al-Dīn, the Lord of Erbil, celebrated the Prophet’s birthday with great pomp and spent a lot of money on it every year, displaying delight and adornments,⁶⁵ he chose another day in the year, the feast of the Palm Sunday of the Christians, May Allāh curse them, and organised entertainments, wine and singing festivities, which did not resemble the celebrations of the sacred birthday at all. He used to set an extremely long table at the edge of the city and gather the singers of the country. In this way, the table was completely covered with food and wine pitchers,⁶⁶ and people approached it. He was sprinkling gold [coins] on the people from the citadel, pouring gold on a gold tray, and throwing it at them. They were fighting and snatching light dinars (*al-danānīr al-khafīfa*) out of each other’s hands. In the end, he was passing to the tray, which had been cut from the edges to the centre and left hanging. As they tried to pull it from each other, pieces would break off, leaving a fragment in each person’s hand. It is told that there was a man in Mosul called ‘Uthmān the Butcher, who was very tall, strong-armed and powerful, so much so that he once entered a slaughterhouse with five sheep. To enter his village and carry out the slaughter, he took two heads under one armpit, two under the other, and held another head in his mouth. With all of them, he crossed the water (i.e. the river) to the other side. And when Badr al-Dīn would throw the tray at the people, they would fight for it for about an hour, and then if anyone picked it up, it was ‘Uthmān the Butcher. Men of knowledge and religion condemned him for celebrating the festivals of the unbelievers and for other things. [Even] their poet said about him:

*Yu‘aẓẓimu a’yād al-naṣārā talahiyyan*⁶⁷

*Wa-yaz’umu anna Allāh ‘Īsā b. Maryam*⁶⁸

*Idā nabbahathu nakhwatu aryahiyyatin*⁶⁹
*Ilā al-majd qālat armaniyyatuhu: nam.*⁷⁰

He praises Christian holidays with enjoyment
And claims that God is Jesus, the son of Mary.
And when a sense of honour and dignity would wake him up
To [achieve] glory, “[Go back to] sleep”, said his Armenianness.

It was noted that he reportedly entered the service of Hūlāwū (*Hülegü*) and presented him with expensive gifts, including an exceptional pearl. Badr al-Dīn asked to put it on the ear of King Hūlāwū, knelt, stretched his ear and put it through the hole.⁷¹ And when Badr al-Dīn came out, he overcame himself and said [to himself], or said this [directly] to Hūlāwū: “This is the ear pulling”. He (Hūlāwū) got angry and called him back and kicked him out immediately. And [only] Allāh knows the validity of this, I personally find it fabulous. However, he went to Hūlāwū, came under his subjection, supported him in whatever he wanted, and he (Hūlāwū) confirmed his rule over his country and imposed a large tax upon him to be paid in gold every year.

But when he died, the state collapsed [rapidly]. The Tatars besieged Mosul, its population resisted and [the city] was besieged for ten months, after which it was taken. There is no power nor strength except by Allāh. The Lord of Mosul passed away⁷² on Friday, the third of Shaʿbān (26 July 1259), after more than eighty years [of life]. May God forgive him.”

9. Badr al-Dīn and the Religious Communities of Mosul. Another Piece of Overlooked Evidence

This report by al-Dhahabī (and al-Ṣafadī) is thought-provoking. It, in fact, brings to light the overlooked aspects of Badr al-Dīn’s religiosity – specifically, his relationship with Christianity and Christians – and ties it to his Armenian origin. However, before drawing final conclusions, it is essential to offer the reader a general overview of the cultural environment in which a freed slave and former Christian came to power. The following discussion will focus on the religious practices and policies of Badr al-Dīn toward Mosul’s diverse ethno-religious communities. While medieval sources provide varying accounts of Lu’lu’s religious inclinations – accounts that may seem contradictory from a modern perspective – they might have been entirely consistent within the cultural and historical context of the time, which undoubtedly shaped the outlook of a former Christian like Lu’lu’. By addressing these issues, I hope to develop a clearer picture of multi-confessional Mosul through the lens of Badr al-Dīn’s religious practices.

First of all, it remains unclear from the historian’s account whether the Christians with whom the emir was celebrating Palm Sunday and other Christian holidays were Armenians or other Christians, such as Syriacs. So, was there even a small Armenian community in the Mosul region during Badr al-Dīn’s rule?⁷³ This will suggest that the emir may have felt greater ease in the company of fellow Armenians and was likely influenced by their presence, leading him to actively engage in Christian rituals.

Beginning with the Arab campaigns and conquest of Armenia in the seventh century, Armenians were brought to Syria and Iraq in large numbers as captives and prisoners of war. Most of them were enslaved, sold in slave markets, or converted to Islam and dispersed throughout the Islamic lands. Medieval sources also contain information about

many individuals of Armenian origin who lived and acted in various Mesopotamian cities. The ‘Abbāsids and other Muslim dynasties bought and recruited, among others, many Armenian slaves in their armies and administration. For example, an Islamised Armenian named Jamāl al-Dīn Āqūsh Namīla (al-Numayla), who was in the service of Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’, after his master’s death continued his career in Mamlūk Cairo and reached the high ranks of *amīr ṭablkhāna* (emir of the military band, i.e. of forty) and *amīr ḥājib* (chief chamberlain) under Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn (1279–1290).⁷⁴

There is, however, very limited information in the available sources regarding the presence of an Armenian community in the Mosul region during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. An Armenian cross-stone (*khač’k’ar*) with accompanying Armenian inscription dated to 1171, in the walls of the Syriac Monastery of the Martyrs Mar Behnam and Marth Sarah located 35 kilometres southeast of Mosul, is most likely a witness to the Armenian pilgrimage to Mosul and the neighbouring settlements.⁷⁵ The earliest evidence of an Armenian community in the region dates to the 1270s, when the Venetian merchant and traveller Marco Polo passed through the Mosul area, which was already under Mongol rule at the time. In addition to Nestorians and Jacobites, he also observed Armenians residing in the city.⁷⁶ According to a unique report of the anonymous author of the *History of Mar Yahballaha and Rabban Sawma*, an Armenian church of Erbil together with two Nestorian and one Jacobite churches was destroyed during the anti-Christian riots in 1310.⁷⁷ A continuator of Bar Hebraeus’ *Ecclesiastical History* reports about “priests and deacons of the Nestorians and the Armenians” in Karamles (Karamlesh), a village located about 28 kilometre southeast of Mosul, in 1364.⁷⁸ In any case, we lack sufficient evidence to suggest that significant Christian Armenian communities had been established in Mosul or its surroundings before or during the rule of Badr al-Dīn. Consequently, the Christians with whom Lu’lu’ allegedly celebrated Christian holidays were hardly Armenians.

The Syriac Christians (both Jacobites and Nestorians) constituted the majority of Mosul’s Christian population, primarily residing in nearby villages such as Bartellah and Qaraqush, etc. Unlike Armenians, they descended from one of the indigenous peoples of Mesopotamia. Even though, after the establishment of the Islamic Empire, Syriac Christians were gradually reduced in numbers in their homeland, a large Syriac population continued to inhabit the region. From 1155 onwards, the seat of the Grand Metropolitan of the East or the Jacobite Maphrian was located in Mosul, at St Matthew (Mar Mattai) Monastery.⁷⁹ Since the sixth century, an East Syrian (Nestorian) diocese with a bishopric had been functioning in Nineveh, the ancient Assyrian capital, which in the ninth century merged with the diocese of Mosul.⁸⁰

Bar Hebraeus in his *Ecclesiastical History* relates several stories of interference by the Lord of Mosul in the internal affairs of the Syrian Jacobite Maphrianate.⁸¹ In one case, he describes how the newly appointed Syrian patriarch Ignatius IV (1253–1258) was respectfully received by Lu’lu’ in 1253, again on Palm Sunday.⁸²

There is only scant information about the Jewish population in Mosul under Badr al-Dīn’s rule. Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (d. 1320), a Dominican friar and traveller, who visited Mosul (Nineveh) in 1289/1290, already under Mongol rule, writes in his itinerary that the city had a large Christian and Jewish population, and that the Governor of Mosul was a Nestorian.⁸³

It is known that there has been a Jewish quarter in Mosul since at least the ninth/tenth centuries, as evidenced by Arabic sources (al-Balādhurī, Ibn al-Faqīh).⁸⁴ The

twelfth-century Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela (d. 1173), who personally visited Mosul, reported the existence of a Jewish community of about seven thousand in the city.⁸⁵ In a letter from the Cairo Geniza dated 1236, a Jewish correspondent informs his correspondent residing in Cairo about a Mongol attack on the outskirts of Mosul. He describes how a group of Jews sought refuge in a synagogue and miraculously escaped death during the assault.⁸⁶ From another letter dated 1237, it becomes clear that the Jewish quarter continued to exist in the city at least during the reign of Badr al-Dīn.⁸⁷ We do not have direct evidence about the relations of the Sultan of Mosul with the Jews, but there are no reports on controversies of the ruler with the Jewish community. There is, however, compelling evidence that illustrates Badr al-Dīn's approach toward ethnic and religious minorities under his rule. Notably, according to Ibn Khallikān, Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Yūnus (d. 1242), a renowned Muslim polymath specialising in fields such as Islamic law, philosophy, mathematics and astronomy, had both Jewish and Christian students who studied the Torah and the Gospels under his guidance. These students were taught at al-Madrasa al-Badriyya, a school founded by Badr al-Dīn.⁸⁸ This example underscores the inclusive environment fostered by Badr al-Dīn, promoting intellectual and cultural exchange among diverse religious communities.

The Kurds were probably the only community with whom Lu'lu' had significant problems. They often raided the mostly Syriac Christian settlements surrounding Mosul, putting the population to the sword and looting the villages. In 1245, he executed Shams al-Dīn al-Ḥasan Tāj al-ʿĀrifīn, the leader of the ʿAdawiyya order (the future *Yezidis*) of the Kurds, fearing that they could invade and ravage Mosul. In 1254, the members of the ʿAdawiyya order revolted against his severe tax policy. The rebellion was brutally suppressed and the organisers and their supporters were sentenced to death. Lu'lu' even ordered to have Shaykh ʿAdī b. Musāfir's⁸⁹ tomb at Lalesh desecrated and his bones exhumed and burned.⁹⁰ The sources are silent about the real reasons for the strained relationship between the ruler of Mosul and the ʿAdawiyya, but these were hardly because of religious matters. Even though al-Ruwayshidī cites Ibn Khallikān, according to whom the ʿAdawiyya Kurds had departed from *uṣūl al-dīn al-Islāmī* (the bases of the Islamic religion) and even considered the tomb of Shaykh ʿAdī as the *qibla* instead of Mecca,⁹¹ it is more likely that in reality, Badr al-Dīn's wariness of the ʿAdawiyya was due more to political and security motives than religious and ideological ones.⁹²

Badr al-Dīn's rule was also distinguished by the balanced approach he adopted towards the local Shīʿa and Sunnī Muslim communities. Although this issue was partially addressed in previous scholarship (S. al-Ruwaishidi, S. al-Daywahjī, D. Patton, Y. Tabba), some valuable evidence has been overlooked by researchers. It should be noted that during the reign of Lu'lu's Zengid predecessors, several families, followers of the Shāfiʿī *madhhab*, such as al-Shahrazūrī, Ibn Muhājir, Ibn al-Athīr and Ibn Maʿna, occupied dominant positions in almost all spheres of civic life in Mosul. These families, closely related to the ruling dynasty, had concentrated in their hands all the political and economic power in Mosul and its surroundings. This continued in the early period of Badr al-Dīn's rule, but over time, the influence of Shāfiʿī Sunnism significantly declined, giving way to the growing prominence of the Shīʿa community. Nevertheless, Patton has pointed out that "there is no evidence that this was the consequence of a deliberate anti-Shafiʿī policy on Lu'lu's part".⁹³

There are otherwise some facts that indicate Lu'lu's inclination towards Imāmī Shī'ism. First of all, many buildings in Mosul datable to his rule have foundation inscriptions commemorating 'Alī b. Abī al-Ṭālib's and his descendants' martyrdom. Moreover, he also converted madrasas built by his Zengid predecessors or by himself into 'Alīd shrines or added such shrines to them (as in the case of al-Madrasa al-Badriyya and the *mashhad* dedicated to Imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim), or founded new ones, such as the *mashhad* dedicated to Imām 'Awn al-Dīn.⁹⁴ The Shī'ī sympathies of Badr al-Dīn are also confirmed by historiographical evidence. According to Ibn Kathīr, himself a Shāfi'ī, Badr al-Dīn sent a gold lantern (*qindīlan dhahaban*) worth a thousand dinars to al-Najaf every year as a gift to the sanctuary (*mashhad*) of Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.⁹⁵ In some copies of Ibn Kathīr's *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya* the relevant passage contains an essential postscript, harshly condemning Badr al-Dīn's deed:

*This act of sending a golden lantern to the shrine of 'Alī every year is proof of his stupidity (qillat 'aqlihi) and adherence to Shī'a [Islam]. God knows better.*⁹⁶

Badr al-Dīn frequently visited the *mashhad* Imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim, where he would spend days hosting gatherings attended by esteemed jurists, hadith scholars and madrasa teachers. During these sessions, he would order the reading of books on the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt (the family of the Prophet Muhammad).⁹⁷

Although the true motives behind his inclination towards Shī'ism, or at least his veneration of 'Alīd saints and martyrs, remain unclear, the political consequences of these tendencies are more apparent.⁹⁸ His actions promoted the influence of the Shī'ī minority against the political and economic dominance of the Sunnī community.⁹⁹ For example, when he commissioned the Ḥanbalī scholar 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ras'anī (d. 1263) to write a work on the virtues (*manāqib*) of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, this obviously contributed to the mutual recognition between the Sunnī and Shī'ī communities.¹⁰⁰ However, Badr al-Dīn's policies caused discontent among some members of the Mosul 'ulāma. The sources particularly emphasise the tense relationship between Shaykh Muwaffaq al-Dīn al-Kawāshī (d. 1281), a prominent Shāfi'ī ascetic and Qur'ān interpreter, and the Sultan of Mosul, though they do not provide a clear explanation for the underlying cause.¹⁰¹

One overlooked piece of evidence, preserved in Ibn Sha'ār al-Mawṣilī's poetry anthology, sheds some light on this issue. According to him, in 633 AH (January/February 1236), Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' ordered the closure of all madrasas in the city and dismissed all religious scholars and teachers, leaving only a doorman, a *farrāsh* (attendant), an *imām* and a *mu'adhdhin* in each school. He then redistributed the madrasas as *iqṭā'* (land grants) to his emirs and soldiers. This "hideous act", as Ibn Sha'ār describes it, might be linked to the accusations of favouritism toward Christians and the promotion of Shī'ism, as hinted at in al-Dhahabī's account. This decision provoked widespread outrage and despair among the religious scholars of the city, many of whom were compelled to leave Mosul. However, after a while, Badr al-Dīn reversed his decision, allowing the scholars to return to the madrasas in 634 AH (October/November 1236). In my view, this drastic measure was likely a response to significant resistance from the Sunnī orthodox majority against Lu'lu's religious policies. Although he ultimately withdrew from such a hard line stance, it appears he imposed his own conditions for coexistence within his realm.¹⁰²

In spite of the preserved evidence, Patton was reluctant to accept Badr al-Dīn's Shī'a orientation, arguing that the veneration of 'Alī and his descendants, which was probably widespread among the Sunnī orthodox population of Mosul as well, did not necessarily mean that Lu'lu' was a follower of the Shī'a creed.¹⁰³ This is likely why he attempted to align Badr al-Dīn's religious policy with the ideology of futuwwa – urban social groups or confraternities of young men, often associations of artisans and traders adhering to a code of honour.¹⁰⁴ Futuwwa gained significant popularity in the Islamic world from the twelfth century onward, particularly following the ecumenical reforms of Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180–1225). One of the goals of this mostly pro-Shī'a and Ṣūfī- oriented policy was conciliation between the followers of the Shī'a and Sunnī creeds and eliminating the fragmentation of Islamic society. The futuwwa institutions were also a convenient tool in the hands of the ruling authorities to control the population under them.¹⁰⁵ To sum up, I do not at all rule out that al-Nāṣir's ecumenical reform somewhat influenced Badr al-Dīn, but I will propose below a somewhat different hypothesis of Badr al-Dīn's religious behaviour and policies. Thanks to this, Mosul became a place of such well-ordered coexistence that modern researchers have described Badr al-Dīn's rule as “a short-lived and often forgotten period of tolerance”.¹⁰⁶ In the following sections, I will elaborate on Badr al-Dīn's “tolerant” rule by presenting my hypothesis regarding his religious identity.

10. An Analysis of al-Dhahabī's Account and Further Evidence on Badr al-Dīn's Christian Tendencies

Badr al-Dīn's more than 40-year rule, as demonstrated above, was distinguished by peaceful co-existence between different communities of the Mosul region. Some exceptions to this dynamic were the Kurds, whose issues, in my view, were primarily politically motivated. While there may have been some religious elements involved, these conflicts likely did not align with the paradigms that Badr al-Dīn established for the confessions under his rule.

Let us now return to the story recorded in the biographical dictionaries of al-Dhahabī and al-Ṣafādī, quoted in full above. None of the authors mention the name of the poet who composed the satire on Badr al-Dīn. One possible candidate is Jamāl al-Dīn 'Alī b. al-Muqarrab al-'Uyūnī al-Aḥsā'ī (d. 1232). He was one of Badr al-Dīn's contemporary poets, who stayed in Mosul for a while and dedicated panegyrics to him. Fortunately, Ibn al-Muqarrab's *Dīwān* has been preserved, but the two verses (especially the first verse) addressed to Lu'lu' differ somewhat from the versions recorded by al-Dhahabī and al-Ṣafādī. Although the first verse is even more insulting, it contains no mention of Jesus and Mary:

*Tasaltāna bi-l-Ḥadbā'*¹⁰⁷ 'abdun bi-lu'mihi
*Baṣīrun balā'*¹⁰⁸ 'an nayl makrumatin 'am[ī]
Idā ayqazathu lafẓatun 'arabiyyatun
Ilā al-majd qālat armaniyyatuhu: nam.

*A slave obtained power in Mosul (al-Ḥadbā') through his wickedness,
 [He is] clear-sighted, indeed, [though] blind to appreciate a noble deed.
 And when an Arabic word would wake him up
 To [achieve] glory, “[Go back to] sleep”, said his Armenianness.*¹⁰⁹

Notably, some copies of Ibn al-Muqarrab's *Dīwān* contain an introductory note about how Badr al-Dīn himself asked the poet to compose this satire against him. This sounds very strange, perhaps even absurd. It is more probable that this remark was added to the *dīwān* by later copyists and commentators. They were perhaps unaware of the real reasons for the poet's anger against his patron, trying to justify the poet, who usually praised and eulogised Badr al-Dīn in his poems.¹¹⁰ But these verses are more problematic than it seems. Particularly, the second of these two verses can also be found in the *dīwān* of the Damascene poet Ibn 'Unayn (d. 1233), who, as one may suggest, probably borrowed it from Ibn al-Muqarrab and used it in his satiric poetry.¹¹¹ At least, as Ibn Khallikān testifies, in 1226, he saw Ibn 'Unayn in Erbil as the envoy of al-Malik al-Mu'azzam (1198–1227), the 'Ayyūbid ruler of Damascus, to Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī, Emir of Erbil, where these mocking verses about Lu'lu' were probably also popular.¹¹² However, by examining medieval Arabic poetry, it becomes clear that the second verse has a much older history. In particular, in his commentary on the poem named *Lamiyyat al-'ajam* (*The Poem rhyming in -l- of the Non-Arabs*) composed by the alchemist and poet Abū Ismā'īl al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī al-Ṭughrā'ī (d. circa 1121), al-Ṣafādī notes that it was originally attributed to Khālīd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Qasrī (d. 743), the Governor of Iraq and Mecca under the rule of the Umayyad Caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik (724–743).¹¹³ As the sources report, Khālīd al-Qasrī's mother was a Christian, and Khālīd himself, nicknamed "a son of a Christian woman" (ibn al-naṣraniyya), was known for his favourable approach towards Christians and Christianity.¹¹⁴

So, in my view, it is more plausible that two versions of this satire existed, one version pointing to Lu'lu's Christian tendencies, the other version to his slave origin, and both were circulated orally during Lu'lu's lifetime and used by his opponents to criticise him. Al-Dhahabī and al-Ṣafādī documented one version, while another was attributed to Ibn al-Muqarrab and included in his *dīwān*.

As for the story recorded by al-Dhahabī and its bearing on medieval Christian– Muslim interactions, one may suppose that Badr al-Dīn's participation in Christian holidays was not necessarily motivated by his religious beliefs. He could have regarded the Christian festive practices merely as popular cultural events and components of urban life and perhaps many other Muslim civilians took part in those celebrations together with their master. Although al-Dhahabī does not write about this clearly, nevertheless, the participation of Muslims in Christian celebrations was not an extraordinary phenomenon in the Islamic world. For instance, as A. Chrysostomides has recently demonstrated, Muslim participation in major Christian festivals, such as Easter and Palm Sunday, is well documented throughout the 'Abbāsīd era.¹¹⁵ Several Coptic Christian festivals were also celebrated by the Muslim population of Fāṭimid Cairo.¹¹⁶ This was so widespread in the Mamlūk society that the prominent Sunnī Muslim legal scholar, theologian and chief Ḥanbalī qādī of Damascus, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328) had to issue a fatwa (legal ruling, verdict) forbidding Muslims to take part in non-Muslim celebrations such as Christmas, Maundy Thursday, Easter and Nawrūz (Nayrūz or the New Year).¹¹⁷ He also authored a separate treatise, *Iqtidā' al-ṣirāt al-mustaqīm* (*The Necessity of the Straight Path*), against the practice of Muslim imitation (*tashabbuh*) of or their participation in non-Muslim festivals and religious rituals.¹¹⁸ Notably, Ibn al-Sha'ār al-Mawṣilī included in his biographical dictionary a poem dedicated to Badr al-Dīn, composed in celebration of another non-Muslim holiday, Nayrūz (or Nawrūz, i.e. the Persian

New Year).¹¹⁹ In another instance, he reports that in the year 633 AH (1235/1236), the celebration of Rajab, one of the sacred months in the Islamic lunar calendar, coincided with the festival of Nawrūz. On this occasion, a Mosuli poet composed an ode dedicated to Sultan Badr al-Dīn.¹²⁰ The joint celebration of Islamic and non-Islamic holidays highlights the intercultural and interreligious communication that thrived in Mosul.

However, Badr al-Dīn may have had additional motives for celebrating Christian holidays and one should not immediately discard the significance of his Armenian Christian background, especially considering that he may have converted later, rather than as a child, as demonstrated above. Even after his conversion to Islam, he likely retained memories of his previous religious and cultural identity, at least regarding significant Christian customs and traditions. Another comment by al-Dhahabī in his *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* serves to support this suggestion:

*He used to celebrate Palm Sunday for what he had preserved from the customs (shi'ār, i.e. slogans) of his people (li-baqāya fīhi min shi'ār ahlihi).*¹²¹

In other words, Lu'lu's ethnic and cultural background, or rather what he had maintained from the "customs of his nation", could be the reason for his attendance at Christian festivals. But we should not disregard the fact that al-Dhahabī was not a contemporary of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'; he was active 50–80 years after Lu'lu's death, in a completely different political and cultural climate. Al-Dhahabī completed the first recension of his *Ta'rikh al-Islām* in 1314/1315, during the final, less aggressive phase of the Mongol–Mamlūk conflict. He later revised it in 1325/1326,¹²² following the peace treaty between the two sides, though Mamlūk hostilities against Cilician Armenia, the only Christian state neighbouring the Mamlūk Sultanate in the Levant, were still ongoing.

Islamic sources from that period reveal clear animosity towards Armenians, who were seen as Mongol allies and even labelled "the most abominable enemies of Islam".¹²³ It is possible that al-Dhahabī, influenced by the logic of his era – particularly the anti-Christian and anti-Shī'a polemics promoted by contemporaries such as Ibn Taymiyya¹²⁴ – saw Badr al-Dīn's Christian Armenian origin as the reason for his shameful actions. Interestingly, Ibn al-Dawādārī (d. 1335), a contemporary of al-Dhahabī, recounts in his *Kanz al-durar* the story of Badr al-Dīn's visit to Hülegü Khan's court, as mentioned earlier. Referring to his father, who in his turn claimed to have heard it from Emir Sayf al-Dīn Balabān al-Rūmī, Ibn al-Dawādārī describes how Badr al-Dīn was accompanied by a slave named Ayān, who was also an Armenian. According to the report, throughout the journey, Badr al-Dīn called his slave *armanī najis* (filthy Armenian). Considering Badr al-Dīn's background, this raises the question of whether Ibn al-Dawādārī used this epithet to mock or ridicule Badr al-Dīn's Armenian origin itself, rather than that of the slave. This suggests that we should approach al-Dhahabī's account of Badr al-Dīn's attachment to his "Armenianness" with caution, particularly since he did not cite the primary source for his account and we are in no position to state firmly that such accusations were current also during Badr al-Dīn's lifetime. On the other hand, he may have heard these stories about Badr al-Dīn from older-generation informants, such as his mother, who according to al-Dhahabī was the daughter of a wealthy Mosuli man named 'Alam al-Dīn Sanjar.¹²⁵ Additionally, there is yet another source contemporary to Badr

al-Dīn, which also testifies to his benevolent attitude towards Christianity, celebration of Christian holidays, and even his disregard of Islamic practices.

It seems that rumours about the religious views of the Sultan of Mosul were widespread not only in the Islamic but also in the Eastern Christian and even European environment. Papal Bulls issued in 1244 most likely have little to do with Badr al-Dīn.¹²⁶ More important is the letter of the papal legate Eudes (Odo) de Châteauroux (d. 1273), dated 31 March 1249 and addressed to Pope Innocent IV (1243–1254). Odo, who accompanied King Louis IX of France (r. 1226–1270) during the Seventh Crusade (1244–1254), was present when the envoys of the Mongol general Eljigidei, named Mark and David, arrived at the court of the King of Cyprus. They delivered a letter from Eljigidei proposing cooperation and a joint military campaign against the Muslims.¹²⁷ It was from them that King Louis and Odo learned information about Badr al-Dīn, Lord of Mosul. The papal legate writes in his report:

*He (King Louis – G.D.) asked similarly about the Sultan of Mosul (which in ancient times was called Nineveh), whether he was a Christian; and again, from what parts the envoys themselves had originated, and for how many years they had been Christians. Their replies to these questions were as follows ... Regarding the Sultan of Moyssac or Mosul, they assert that he was the son of a Christian woman and that he privately favours Christians. He keeps their festivals and does not observe any part of the religion of Mahomet: it is believed that if he had the opportunity, he would willingly become a Christian. The envoys said that they were natives of a city that lies two days journey from Mosul (formerly called Nineveh) and that they and their forebears were Christians.*¹²⁸

Of course, the ambassadors pursued propaganda purposes and aimed to demonstrate the benevolent treatment of the Mongols towards Christians and even to represent Mongol dignitaries (including Eljigidei) as Christians to convince the European sovereign to unite his forces against the Muslims.¹²⁹ However, the information they provided about Badr al-Dīn includes some nuances. The envoys confirmed the actions (celebrating Christian holidays, favouring Christians, being neglectful of Islam) in which Muslim authors accuse Badr al-Dīn using nearly the same wording. And it is curious that they, being Christians of the Mosul area, and while emphasising that Lu'lu' was a son of a Christian woman and sympathised with Christians, nevertheless represented him as a man who, though a Muslim, might at any convenient moment convert to Christianity. After all, they could have just as easily presented Lu'lu' as a Christian, similar to Eljigidei and even Gūyūk Khan, about whom they reported to have been baptised at Epiphany by a Christian bishop under the influence of his Christian mother, the daughter of the King Prester John.¹³⁰ Yet, despite these arguments, it is still wise to remain cautious about the sources and purpose of the information on Badr al-Dīn's religious belonging(s). The use of this information as a rhetorical tool, a common feature in Mongol correspondence with Western rulers, should not be underestimated.

However, it is noteworthy, that Odo's letter addressed to Innocent IV is not our sole source of information about this delegation. The account by Vincent de Beauvais and especially the letter from Jean Sarrasin, the Chamberlain of the King of France, to Nicolas Arrode, dated 23 June 1249, also corroborate Odo's account. These sources have been thoroughly examined, especially since the studies conducted by P. Pelliot.¹³¹ Particularly, Jean Sarrasin referred in his account to the Dominican friar and missionary André de Longjumeau who had led the Papal mission to the Mongols in 1245–1247.¹³²

During that journey, he travelled through several cities in the Levant and visited Tabriz and Mosul, where he engaged in discussions with Jacobite Syrian religious leaders. According to Jean Sarrasin, André de Longjumeau, who had some knowledge of Arabic and Syriac (Chaldean), as confirmed by Matthew of Paris, personally attended the reception of Christian delegates, one of whom, David, he had already met during his previous mission. Moreover, it was through André's interpretation that communication between the Christian delegates and the King of France took place, and he was also entrusted with translating the letter of Eljigidei into Latin.¹³³ Thus, André, who had recently visited Mosul and either heard about its lord first hand or perhaps even saw him, was likely one of the first individuals to share information about Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' in the Latin West. Would he have refuted or questioned the allegedly fake claims made by the Eljigidei's envoys, at least one of whom knew André in person, regarding Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'? While these accounts somewhat support the credibility of the rumours about Badr al-Dīn, the misinformation spread by Nestorian envoys – such as claims about the recent conversion of the Mongol military commander and even Güyük Khan to Christianity – prevents us from confidently asserting that the information they provided about Lu'lu' can be deemed entirely reliable. Be that as it may, these sources testify that rumours about Badr al-Dīn's "Christian" leanings or hidden identity were widespread. In response to this mission, King Louis dispatched an embassy headed by André de Longjumeau to Qaraqorum to congratulate the Mongol Khan on his baptism and to present him with gifts.¹³⁴ No further information about the ruler of Mosul appears in Latin sources until his death.

It is well known that the Mongols' interactions with the Christian West were often shaped by rumours, exaggerations, forgeries and legends (such as the Prester John legend).¹³⁵ Such stories were typically disseminated through the mediation of Eastern Christians, and while they occasionally mirrored actual historical events and underlying realities, scepticism inevitably remains a guiding factor in their final evaluation.

11. Badr al-Dīn's "Religion" as a Mode for Multicultural Coexistence? A Conclusion

To sum up, having studied all the accounts about the ruler of Mosul Badr Al-Dīn Lu'lu''s religiosity and religious tendencies – in particular, his apparent sympathy for Shī'ism, or at least his reverence for the 'Alīd saints and his habit of celebrating Christian holidays at the same time – it would be inaccurate to assert that Badr al-Dīn was a man without religion and that his behaviour was dictated solely by political calculations and *Realpolitik*, which, of course, were important in his actions. His inclination towards Shī'ism is evident, for instance, in his patronage of religious institutions and frequent visits to the shrine of Imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim. On the other hand, his practice of celebrating Christian holidays was most likely influenced by his former faith and cultural customs. So, in my opinion, *hybridity* could offer an alternative explanation for Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu''s religious conduct.

Religious conversion is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, and scholars have long debated its nature and dynamics. A more recent approach divides the conversion process into four interconnected categories: acculturation, adhesion or hybridity, syncretism and transformation.¹³⁶ Marc David Baer defines acculturation as follows:

*Acculturation is depicted as cultural change, incorporation or integration into the customs, habits, and language of a conquering civilization.*¹³⁷

In Lu'lu's case, however, the conversion process did not proceed smoothly. His late conversion, as suggested by our investigation into his probable birth and enslavement dates, coupled with his lack of formal Islamic education, likely hindered his full acculturation into the new environment. Equally significant is the convert's language proficiency, particularly in the context of Islam and Arabic. Even a basic grasp of the language would have facilitated a deeper understanding of the core principles and doctrines of the new faith. Entering this new religious context, Lu'lu', after his manumission, probably remained, at least culturally, linked to his Christian past. Moreover, under the influence of the multi-ethnic setting, he developed a hybrid worldview concerning religion and religious practices.¹³⁸ Furthermore, in a predominantly Sunnī milieu, his eventual shift to Imāmī Shī'ism likely marked a deeper transformation of his evolving identity.¹³⁹

On the other hand, his religious commitment, as reflected in the sources, was neither firmly anchored in Christianity nor fully devoted to Islam. The lines between his spiritual beliefs and worldly pursuits were blurred. Badr al-Dīn's Mosul, as suggested by medieval sources, appears to have been a city with a vibrant religious landscape, without, however, an exaggerated impact of religion on the city life. Badr al-Dīn himself openly indulged in worldly pleasures – lavish feasts, drinking, music, singing and concubines – frequently placing political expediency above religious devotion and skilfully adjusting his actions to suit shifting circumstances.

In this regard, another comment of al-Dhahabī in his *Duwal al-Islām* about Lu'lu' is very telling:

*He was brave, honourable, a diplomat, skilled in tyrannical [methods] (khabīran fī l-umūr al-zulm), but neglectful of religion (qillat al-dīn, literally: the paucity of religion).*¹⁴⁰

In conclusion, Badr al-Dīn's flexible confessional and cultural identities likely contributed to the criticism he faced from some contemporaries, with several Muslim historians and scholars even questioning his religiosity and commitment to Islam. However, Lu'lu's even-handed approach towards Mosul's diverse communities transformed it into a cosmopolitan hub where people of various ethnicities, languages, cultures and traditions coexisted in relative harmony. Badr al-Dīn's Mosul was a place where Jewish and Christian students could study the Pentateuch and the Gospels under the mentorship of a Muslim scholar working under the patronage of Badr al-Dīn at a school established by him. It evolved into a flourishing centre of cultural diversity, where mosques, churches and synagogues stood side by side, contributing to its vibrant intellectual and religious life. A unified cultural space emerged, where members of different religious communities could freely exchange their customs and traditions, and even take part in religious festivals and rituals alongside their ruler. The joint celebration of Rajab, a sacred month in the Muslim calendar, and the non-Islamic Nawrūz, as recorded by Ibn Sha'ār al-Mawṣilī, exemplifies this intercultural dialogue and religious symbiosis.¹⁴¹ However, Badr al-Dīn's hybrid identity remains a hypothesis that can be substantiated only to the extent permitted by the available sources discussed above – sources that nonetheless set him apart from many other medieval Muslim rulers who governed multi-

ethnic and multicultural societies. We lack the means to delve into the mind and soul of a medieval individual to discern his personal stance on religious expression. The information recorded in medieval sources about Badr al-Dīn reflects either the perceptions of his contemporaries or those of later generations, and at times, it may certainly carry elements of propaganda and religious biases (for example, anti-Christian or anti-Shī'a polemics), as demonstrated above. Consequently, we have no way of determining his sincerity regarding his religious tendencies or attachment to his "Armenianness". It may be more prudent to conclude that he, like many other medieval Muslim rulers, viewed religion primarily as a pragmatic tool for governing the diverse communities under his rule. Alternatively, he may have been so far-sighted and strategic that he deliberately cultivated these stories and crafted an image of himself as a just and tolerant ruler – a portrayal that garnered high praise from his contemporaries and resonated with later generations. It is therefore unsurprising that Ibn Taghrī Birdī, an Egyptian historian writing two centuries after Badr al-Dīn's death, offered a laudatory obituary, boldly proclaiming him as a ruler fit to govern the entire world. "How good is this king!" he writes, further declaring, "Humanity needs a ruler like him to rule the whole world".¹⁴² The historian's admiration underscores how Badr al-Dīn's image as a just ruler fostered an enduring legacy of "tolerance" in the collective memory of subsequent generations. While the modern concept of "tolerance" does not fully align with the values of a medieval society, his ability to navigate a diverse and multireligious milieu left a lasting impression.

NOTES

1. The word *lu'lu'* means "pearl" in Arabic. It was usually given to a person of servile origin, a guard or an officer or a leader of a special body of *ghulāms* in the service of a prince. See: **M. Canard**, "Lu'lu'," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn. (hereinafter – EI²), vol. 5 (KHE-MAHI) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 820.
2. Until recently, several studies, both articles and separate monographs, have been devoted to the rule of Badr al-Dīn in Mosul and his time. The first monograph, entitled *Imārat al-Mawṣil fī 'ahd Badr al-Dīn Lū'lū'* (The Emirate of Mosul under Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'), was published in 1971 by an Iraqi scholar Sawādī 'Abd Muḥammad al-Ruwayshidī. The book by Douglas Patton, with the title "*Badr al-Dīn Lū'lū'*, Atabeg of Mosul, 1211-1259", has been the most comprehensive account of Badr al-Dīn's life and rule in a European language since its publication in 1991. The third and most recent study by Hishām al-Basāt, entitled "*Tārīkh al-nuqūd fī nihāyat al-'aṣr al-'Abbāsī khilāl fatrat Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*" (Coinage of the Late Abbasid Age during the Era of Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu', a Numismatic History), is dedicated to monetary and numismatic issues. See: **S.'A.M. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil fī 'ahd Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, 606-660 ḥ./1209-1261 m. (Baghdad: Maṭba'at al-Irshād, 1971); **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, Atabeg of Mosul, 1211-1259 (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1991) and **D. Patton**, "Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu' and the Establishment of a Mamluk Government in Mosul", *Studia Islamica* 74 (1991), 79-103; **H. al-Basāt**, *Tārīkh al-nuqūd fī nihāyat al-'aṣr al-'Abbāsī khilāl fatrat Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'* (Beirut, 2010). Other most important studies on Lū'lū's life and political career are: **M. van Berchem**, "Monuments et inscriptions de l'atābek Lu'lu de Mossoul," in *Orientalische studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Band 1 (1906), 197-210; **K.V. Zettersteen**, "Lu'lu'," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st edn., vol. 3 (L-R) (Leiden-New York: E.J. Brill-Luzac & Co, 1936), 40-41; **M.B. al-Ḥusaynī**, *'Umla al-islāmiyya fī al-'ahd al-Atābikī* (Baghdād: Maṭba'at Dār al-Jāhīz, 1966), 57-64; **P. Sappatean**, "Hayazgi at'abek ew Musuli sult'an Patr Êt Tin Lulu" (The Armenian Atabeg and Sultan of Mosul Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'), *Haykazean Hayagitakan Handēs* 9 (1981), 121-130 (in Armenian); **S. al-Daywahjī**, *Tārīkh al-Mawṣil*, vol. 1 (Mosul: 1982),

307-323; **Cl. Cahen**, “Lu’lu’, Badr al-Dīn,” in *EF*², 5:821 (mistakenly states that Badr al-Dīn was a freedman, possibly black); **Ann. Hagedorn**, “Badr ad-Din Lu’lu’ von Mosul (reg. 1233-1259): Zu Auftraggebern islamischer Kleinkunst im 13. Jahrhundert,” in *25. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 8. bis 13.4.1991 in München*. Vorträge. (ZDMG Suppl. 10.), ed by C. Wunsch, 1994 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1994), 493-507; **K. Hirschler, D.F. Ruggles**, “Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’,” in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *THREE*, ed. by K. Fleet, G. Krämer, D. Matringe, J. Nawas, D.J. Stewart, Consulted online on 04 February 2024 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25101>.

3. **A.D. Nock**, *Conversion. The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1933, reprinted in 1988), p. 7.

4. The following studies provide valuable insights into both historical and contemporary issues in the study of conversion to Islam: **Th.W. Arnold**, *The Preaching of Islam: A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith*, 2nd edition (London: Constable & Company, Ltd., 1913); *Conversion to Islam*, ed. by **N. Levtzion** (New York-London: Holmes & Meier, 1979); **R.W. Bulliet**, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: A Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979); *Conversion to Islam in the Premodern Age: A Sourcebook*, ed. by N. Hurvitz, Chr.C. Sahner, U. Simonsohn, and L. Yarbrough (Oakland: University of California Press, 2020), 1-30 (General Introduction). For the general survey of religious and theoretical perspectives on religious conversion, see: *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Conversion*, ed. by L.R. Rambo and Ch.E. Farhadian (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). For more on military slavery in the context of medieval Islam, see note 35 below.

5. There are not many studies on the apostasy and conversion of Armenians to Islam in the Middle Ages. See: **Ed. Schutz**, “Armenia: A Christian Enclave in the Islamic Near East in the Middle Ages,” in *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. by M. Gervers and R.J. Bikhazi (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990), 217-236; **T. Greenwood**, “Conversion to Islam among the Armenian Elite: T’ovma Artsruni (Thomas Arcruni, d. ca. 292/904),” in *Conversion to Islam in the Premodern Age: A Sourcebook*, 114-118. S.B. Dadoyan’s studies (*The Fatimid Armenians: Cultural and Political Interaction in the Near East* (Leiden-New York- Köln: Brill, 1997); *The Armenians in the Medieval Islamic World: Paradigms of Interaction - Seventh to Fourteenth Centuries*, 3 vols. (New Brunswick, NJ - London: Transaction Publishers, 2011-2014; *Islam in Armenian Literary Culture: Texts, Contexts, Dynamics* (Leuven: Peeters, 2021)) shed considerable light on Medieval encounters and interactions of the Armenians with Islam, but in terms of more extensive and systematic use of Medieval Islamic sources many gaps are still to be filled in this field.

6. **H.A.R. Gibb**, “Zengi and the fall of Edessa,” in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1 (The First Hundred Years), ed. by M.W. Baldwin (Madison-Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 449-462; **C. Alptekin**, *The Reign of Zangī (521-541/1127-1146)*, PhD thesis (London: University of London, 1972); **D. Patton**, *A History of the Atabegs of al-Mawsil and Their Relations with the Ulema*, Ph.D. diss. (New York University, 1982), 81-115; **T. El-Azhari**, *Zengi and the Muslim Response to the Crusades. The Politics of Jihad* (London-New York: Routledge, 2016).

7. **N. Elisseeff**, *Nūr ad-Dīn. Un grand Prince musulman de Syrie au temps des croisades (511-569 / 1118-1174)*, 3 vols. (Damas: I.F.D. et Imp. Catholique, 1967).

8. On ‘Imād al-Dīn’s successors’ rule in Mosul, see: **S. al-Daywahjī**, *Al-Mawṣil fī al-‘ahd al-Atābikī* (Baghdād: Maṭba‘at Shafīq, 1958); **R. Jumaylī**, *Dawlat al-atābika fī al-Mawṣil ba‘ada ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī* (Beirut: 1970); **D. Patton**, *A History of the Atabegs*.

9. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 26-27; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 16.

10. **D. Patton**, “Ibn al-Sā‘ī’s Account of the Last of the Zangids”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 138.1 (1988), 148-158; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 33 (n. 77). For the details of Badr al-Dīn’s rise to power and relations with the neighboring states, see D. Patton’s and al-Ruwayshidī’s monographies cited earlier. Notably, the institution of the *atabegate* played a crucial role in Badr al-Dīn’s rise to power. An atabeg

(from the Turkish, meaning “father-lord”) was a military commander appointed as guardian and tutor to a young Seljuk prince who had been granted a city or province to govern, exercising political authority – in effect, the real power – on his behalf until he came of age. Over time, rulers and powerful atabegs in the atabeg states became entangled in internal conflicts and factional rivalries, which further eroded central authority. The eventual decline of the institution was accelerated by feudal fragmentation and the disruptive impact of external invasions, particularly those of the Mongols, which destabilized political structures across the Near East. For a general survey of the atabegate institution, see: **Cl. Cahen**, “ATABAK,” in *EI*², vol. 1, 731-732; **A.K.S. Lambton**, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia: Aspects of Administrative, Economic, and Social History, 11th-14th Century* (New York: The Persian Heritage Foundation, 1988), 229-233.

11. Arslān Shāh I’s son and al-Qāhir’s brother, the ruler of the fortresses of al-‘Aqr and Shūsh. Not to be confused with his namesake ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī (Zengi), the aforementioned founder of the Zengid dynasty.

12. See note 10 above.

13. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 29; 143-148; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 32-33. Only Ibn al-Fuwaṭī refers to Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ by the regnal name *al-malik al-mas’ūd*. See: **Ibn al-Fuwaṭī**, *Al-Ḥawādith al-jāmi’a wa-l-tajārib al-nāfi’a fī al-mi’a al-sābi’a*, ed. by M. al-Najm (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 2002), 52.

14. Ironically, one of the leaders of Baghdad’s defence was Lu’lu’’s son-in-law Mujāhid al-Dīn al-Duwaydār al-ṣaghīr, who was eventually beheaded by the Mongols, and his severed head was dispatched to Mosul to terrorize Badr al-Dīn and force him into total submission. **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 60-61.

15. Coins minted by Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’ are a vivid proof of his diplomatic flexibility. Every change in the political conjuncture of the region immediately found its expression on his coinage, which enabled him to ensure the continuity of his rule through his submission to the most influential political powers and recognition of their overlordship. The Atabeg of Mosul minted coins in the names of the Ayyubid rulers of Egypt and Syria (al-Malik al-Kāmil, al-Malik al-Ashraf, al-Nāṣir Yūsuf), ‘Abbasid caliphs (al-Mustansir bi-l-lāh and al-Musta’ṣim bi-l-lāh), the Seljuk Sultan of Rūm (Kaykhusraw II) and Mongol Khans (Möngke, Hülegü). See: **E. von. Zambaur**, “Nouvelles contributions à la numismatique orientale: monnaies inédites ou rares des dynastie musulmanes de la collection de l’auteur”, *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 7 (Wien: 1914), 152-157 [38-43]; **G. Hennequin**, *Catalogue des monnaies musulmanes de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Asie pré-mongole: les Salgūqs et leurs successeurs* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1985), 245-292; **W.F. Spengler, W.G. Sayles**, *Turkoman figural bronze coins and their iconography. Vol. II. The Zengids* (Lodi, Wisconsin: Clio’s Cabinet, 1992), 51-55; **Y. Jafar**, “Dinars and history of Badr al-Dīn Lū’lū’ of Mosul,” *Journal of the Oriental Numismatic Society* 201 (2009), 30-41 (comments on one of Lu’lu’’s epithets, *al-Nūrī*, which simply means “[a slave] belonging to Nūr [al-Dīn Arslān Shāh] and reads it “*al-nawarī*” instead, which means “a Gypsy”, considering it as an indication to his gypsy origin); **N. Amitai-Preiss, R. Amitai-Preiss**, “Two notes on the protocol on Hülegü’s coinage”, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 10 (1991), 122-123; **H. al-Basāṭ**, *Tārīkh al-nuqūd*, 131, 134-135. Another strong point of Lu’lu’’s external policy was diplomatic marriages. See: **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 47-49.

16. **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 70-83. For the details of Badr al-Dīn’s and al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Isma’īl’s relations with the Mongols, see: **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 241-262, 266-281. On Mosul’s further fate, see: **‘Alā’ Maḥmūd al-Qadāwī**, *Al-Mawṣil wa-l-Jazīra al-Furātiyya fī ‘ahd dawlat al-Mughūl al-Ilkhāniyya* (‘Ammān, 2015).

17. He writes this in the chapter dedicated to the titles of eunuchs (*alqāb al-khuddām al-khiṣyān*). See: **al-Qalqashandī**, *Ṣubḥ al-a’shā fī ṣinā’at al-inshā’*, vol. 5 (Cairo: al-Maṭba’a al-amīriyya, 1915), 489.

18. **D. Ayalon**, “Names, titles and ‘nisbas’ of the Mamlūks”, *Israel Oriental Studies* 5 (1975), 210-212. Between 614-616 AH / 1216/17-1219/20 illustrated copies of *Kitāb al-aghānī* (“Book of Songs”), a collection of poems and songs attributed to Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī (d. 967) were produced

in Mosul for Badr al-Dīn Lū'lū'. Six surviving volumes of the total twenty volumes have frontispieces that represent the ruler of Mosul and scenes from his courtly life. In one of those illustrations (MS Feyzullah Efendi 1566 on the monarch's (*tirāz* armbands "Badr al-Dīn Lū'lū' [b.] 'Abd Allāh" is readable. See: **D.S. Rice**, "The Aghānī Miniatures and Religious Paintings in Islam", *The Burlington Magazine* 95.601 (Apr., 1953), 128-135. Cf. **R. Hillenbrand**, "The Frontispiece Problem in the Early 13th-Century Kitāb al-Aghānī", in *Central Periphery? Art, Culture and History of the Medieval Jazīra - Northern Mesopotamia, 8th-15th centuries*, ed. by L. Korn, M. Müller-Wiener (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2017), 199-227.

19. In many places in his book, D. Patton refers to MS Sprenger 61 (Ahlwardt 9449) of the Berlin State Library, identifying it as one of the volumes of al-Birzālī's *Al-Muqtafi li-tārīkh al-shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Abī Shāma*. But this attribution isn't accurate. In reality, MS Sprenger 61 is one of the volumes of Ibn Kathīr's *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*. For more precise identification, see: **C. Brockelmann**, "IBN KATHĪR", *El*, vol. 2 (Leiden- London: E.J. Brill-Luzac & Co., 1927), 393. S. al-Ruwayshidī, for his part, made use in his book of the chronicle *Al-'Asjad al-masbūk* authored by al-Malik al-Ashraf al-Ghassānī (d. 1401) but confused it with another chronicle with the similar title by a Yemeni historian Shams al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan al-Khazrajī (d. 1410). See: **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, 13; **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 27; **P. Sappalean**, "Hayazgi at'abek", 122-124.

20. The surviving parts were edited by Muḥammad al-Ya'lāwī. See: **Al-Maqrīzī**, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr*, ed. by M. al-Ya'lāwī, 8 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1991). More on the composition of *Al-Tārīkh al-muqaffā* and the shortcomings of al-Ya'lāwī's edition, see: **F. Bauden**, "Taḳī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī", in *Medieval Muslim Historians and the Franks in the Levant*, ed. by A. Mallett (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2014, hereinafter - MMHFL), 191-196 and especially **F. Bauden**, "Al-Maqrīzī and His al-Tārīkh al-kabīr al-muqaffā li-Miṣr. Part 1: an Inquiry into the History of the Work," in *Studies in Islamic Historiography. Essays in Honour of Professor Donald P. Little*, ed. by S.G. Massoud (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2020), 66-124.

21. For another account of Shams al-Dīn Lū'lū's life, see: **al-Ṣafadī**, *Kitāb al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, ed. by A. al-Arnā'ūt and T. Muṣṭafā, vol. 24 (Beirut: Dār iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī, 2000), 307-308. According to 'Izz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād, emir Shams al-Dīn founded a *madrassa* in Aleppo. See: **'Izz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād**, *Al-A'lāq al-khaṭira fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa-l-Jazīra*, vol. 1.1, ed. by Y.Z. 'Abbāra (Damascus, 1991), 263. Cf. **D. Morray**, *An Ayyubid Notable and his World. Ibn al-'Adīm and Aleppo as Portrayed in his Biographical Dictionary of People Associated with the City* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 64.

22. **Al-Maqrīzī**, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr*, 5:11-12. Al-Maqrīzī continues that in 610 A.H. (1213/1214), after the death of Amīn al-Dīn Yumn, al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī accepted Shams al-Dīn under his service, manumitted him and made him one of the emirs of Aleppo. After the passing of al-Malik al-'Azīz Muḥammad b. al-Zāhir Ghāzī, Shams al-Dīn was one of the members of the regency council (led by the Dowager Ḍayfa Khatūn) of his minor son al-Nāṣir Yūsuf, then his chief advisor and the commander-in-chief of his armies. When in 1250 Mamlūks overthrew the Ayyubids and seized power in Egypt, Shams al-Dīn convinced al-Nāṣir to conquer Egypt from the newborn regime. However, this attempt failed, and Shams al-Dīn himself was taken captive in the crucial battle near al-'Abbāsa in 1251 and brutally killed. See: **A.-M. Eddé**, *La Principauté Ayyoubide d'Alep* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999), 128-130, 150-152, 273-274; **R.S. Humphreys**, *From Saladin to the Mongols: The Ayyubids of Damascus, 1193-1260* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 313-314, 318-319.

23. **F. Bauden**, "Al-Maqrīzī and His al-Tārīkh al-kabīr al-muqaffā li-Miṣr. Part 1".

24. **'Izz al-Dīn ibn Shaddād**, *Tārīkh al-Malik al-Zāhir*, ed. by A. Ḥuṭayṭ (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1983), 46-47; **al-Maqrīzī**, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr*, 6:302.

25. **Ibn Khāṭib al-Nāṣiriyya**, *Al-Muntaqā min tārīkh Miṣr*, ed. by A. 'Abd al-Sattār and A.F. Sayyid (Cairo: Dār al-kutub wa-l-waṭā'iḳ al-qawmiyya, 2012).

26. **Ibn Khāṭib al-Nāṣiriyya**, *Al-Durr al-muntakhab fī takmilat tārīkh Ḥalab*, vol. 5, ed. by Aḥmad Fawzī al-Hayb (Kuwayt, 2018), 2246.

27. Ibn Khāṭib provides some biographical details about Badr al-Dīn in the context of his biographical account of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismāʿīl, one of Badr al-Dīn's sons. In this case, he references another renowned aleppan historian, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī (d. 1325), whose historical work is now lost. See: **Ibn Khāṭib al-Nāṣiriyya**, *Al-Durr al-muntakhab*, vol. 2, 586-587.
28. **Abū Shāma**, *Tarājim rijāl al-qarnayn al-sādis wa-l-sābiʿ al-maʿrūf bi-l-Dhayl ʿalā al-Rawḍatayn*, ed. by M. al-Kawtharī (Beirut: Dār al-jīl, 1974), 203. Atabeg Zengi had five children, four sons and one daughter, about whom Arab historians are surprisingly silent and do not even record her name. Cf. **T. El-Azhari**, *Zengi*, 106-107. Probably she was the one who in 1138 was given to Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd, Atabeg of Damascus (1135-1139) in marriage. Shihāb al-Dīn was killed a year later, in 1139. See: **C. Alptekin**, *The Reign of Zengi*, 98. Almost nothing is known about the future fate of Zengi's daughter.
29. **Y. Friedmann**, "Practicalities and Motivations of Conversion as Seen through Early Ḥadīth and Law: ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Humām al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/827) and Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Khallāl (d. 311/923)," in *Conversion to Islam in the Premodern Age*, 77-78.
30. **A. Gilʿadi**, *Children of Islam. Concepts of Childhood in Medieval Muslim Society* (London: Macmillan, 1992), 53-54; For the discussion of the issue in the Andalusian context, see: **J.M. Safran**, *Defining Boundaries in Al-Andalus. Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Islamic Iberia* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 117-120.
31. **D. Ayalon**, "The Mamluk Novice (On His Youthfulness and on His Original Religion)," *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 54 (1986), 1-8; **A. Mazor**, *The Rise and Fall of a Muslim Regiment. The Manṣūriyya in the First Mamluk Sultanate, 678/1279-741/1341* (Bonn: V&R Unipress/Bonn University Press), 52-55. On the development of the institution of military slavery in Islām, see: **R. Amitai**, "The Mamlūk Institution, or One Thousand Years of Military Slavery in the Islamic World," in *Arming Slaves: From Classical Times to the Modern Age*, ed. by Chr.L. Brown, Ph.D. Morgan (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 40-78.
32. Cf. **al-Dhahabī**, *Al-Ibar*, 3:287 (more than 80 years); **al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar*, 23:357 ("almost 90 years"); **Ibn al-Dawādārī**, *Kanz al-durar*, 8:45 ("more than 85 years"); **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383 ("100 years", elsewhere: "almost 90 years"); **al-Kutubī**, *Uyūn al-Tawārīkh*, 20:216 ("80 years"); **Ibn Taghrī Birdī**, *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa-l-Qāhira*, vol. 7 (Cairo: Dār al-kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1938), 70 ("9th decade"); **Rashīd al-Dīn**, *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, vol. 2, ed. by B. Karīmī (Tehran: Eqbāl, 1960), 729; **Banākatī**, *Rawḍat ulī al-albāb fī maʿrifat al-tawārīkh wa-l-ansāb*, ed. by J. Shiʿār (Tehrān, 1969), 422.
33. **Ibn al-Athīr**, *Al-Tārīkh al-bāhir fī al-dawla al-atābikiyya (bi-l-Mawṣil)*, ed. by A. Ṭulaymāt (Cairo: Dār al-kutub al-ḥadītha, 1963), 198.
34. **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Luʿluʾ*, 12.
35. **D. Ayalon**, *L'esclavage du Mamelouk*. *Oriental Notes and Studies*, 1 (Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society, 1951); **D. Ayalon**, "Mamlūk. Military Slavery in Egypt and Syria," in D. Ayalon, *Islam and the Abode of War. Military Slaves and Islamic Adversaries* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1994), № 5, 9-14; **A. Mazor**, *The Rise and Fall of a Muslim Regiment*, 40-49.
36. On the knowledge of Arabic by the mamluks and their Islamic education, see also: **U. Haarmann**, "Altun n und Gingiz Hān bei den ägyptischen Mamluken," *Der Islam* 51(1), 4-6; **U. Haarmann**, "Arabic in Speech, Turkish in Lineage: Mamluks and Their Sons in the Intellectual Life of Fourteenth-Century Egypt and Syria," *Journal of Semitic Studies* XXXIII (1) (1988) 86-88, as well as **Chr. Mauder**, "The Development of Arabo-Islamic Education among Members of the Mamluk Military," in *Knowledge and Education in Classical Islam. Religious Learning between Continuity and Change*, vol. 1, ed. by S. Günther, 963-983 for more references on the topic.
37. **Ibn Ṭiḡtaḡā**, *Al-Fakhrī fī al-ādāb al-sultāniyya wa-l-duwal al-islāmiyya* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1966), 8, 18. Cf. *Al-Fakhrī, histoire des dynasties Musulmanes par Ibn aṭ-Ṭiḡtaḡā*, traduit de l'arabe et annoté prolégomènes par É. Amar (Paris: E. Leroux, 1910), 7-8, 26-27; *Al-Fakhrī: On the Systems of Government and the Moslem Dynasties*,

- composed by Muhammad son of ‘Ali son of Tabataba, known as the rapid talker, tr. by C.E.J. Whitting (London: Luzac & Co., 1947), 4, 15. The work was dedicated to the Ilkhanid governor of Mosul, Fakhr al- Dīn Īsā, in 1302.
38. **A. Mazor**, *The Rise and Fall of a Muslim Regiment*, 42-45.
 39. **Al-Şafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter), 24:407; **al-Şafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā’ūt / Muşţafā), 24:307; **al-Maqrīzī**, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr*, 5:13.
 40. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawşil*, 182-237. Apart from the copies of *Kitāb al-aghānī* (“Book of Songs”) mentioned in the note 18 above, another luxury manuscript most probably commissioned by Lu’lu’ was a copy of *Kitāb al-diryāq* (The Book of Antidotes) with a dedicatory frontispiece depicting the lord of Mosul in various courtly activities, now held at the Austrian National Library. See: **J.J. Kerner**, “Art in the Name of Science: the Kitāb al-Diryāq in Text and Image,” in *Arab Painting. Text and Image in Illustrated Arabic Manuscripts*, ed. by A. Contadini (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2010), 23-39 with further references. It is also noteworthy that one of the most brilliant works of the Medieval Arabic historiography, Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī’s (d. 1233) *magnum opus* *Al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh* (“The Complete History”) was completed in Mosul under the auspices of Badr al-Dīn. Another chronicle by Ibn al-Athīr entitled *Al-Tārīkh al-bāhir fī al-dawla al-atābakīyya* (A Splendid History of the Atabeg Dynasty) was devoted to Zengid history. See: **F. Rosenthal**, “Ibn al-Athīr,” in *EI²*, vol. 3 (H-IRAM) (Leiden-London: E.J. Brill-Luzac & Co, 1986), 724; **Fr. Micheau**, “Ibn al-Athīr,” in *MMHFL*, 52-83.
 41. **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, vol. 17, ed. by ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (Cairo: Dār Hajar, 1998), 383; **al-‘Aynī**, *‘Iqd al-jumān fī tārīkh ahl al-zamān*, vol. 1, ed. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn (Cairo: al-Hay’a al-miṣriyya al-‘āma li-l-kitāb, 1987), 200 (the obituary is placed under the year 656 AH). The anthology and biographical dictionary *Qalā’id al-jumān* by Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawşilī (d. 1256) includes dozens of poems composed by various poets and dedicated to the ruler of Mosul. See: **Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawşilī**, *Qalā’id al-jumān fī farā’id shu‘arā’ haṣa al-zamān*, 9 vols., ed. by Kāmil Salmān al-Jubūrī (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 2005).
 42. **Fr. Sarre, E.E. Herzfeld**, *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet*, Band II (Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer, 1920), 238-304; **S. al-Daywahjī**, “Madāris al-Mawşil fī al-‘ahd al-Atābakī,” *Sumer* 13 (1957), 114-116; **S. al-Daywahjī**, “Mashhad al-imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim,” *Sumer* 24 (1968), 171-182; **D. Patton**, *A History of the Atabegs*, 458-491 (Appendix V); **R.P. McClary**, “Remembering the Imām Yaḥyā ibn al-Qāsim Mashhad in Mosul,” *Iraq* 79 (2017), 129-154; **Y. Tabbāa**, *The Production of Meaning in Islamic Architecture and Ornament* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2021), 186-198.
 43. See: **Ibn Ṭiḡtaqā**, *Al-Fakhrī*, 47; *Al-Fakhrī, histoire des dynasties*, 76; *Al-Fakhri: On the Systems of Government*, 43.
 44. *‘Ajā’ib al-dunyā*, critical text, trans. from Persian and indices by A.P. Smirnova (Moscow, 1993), 530 (Persian text), 238 (Russian translation).
 45. **Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawşilī**, *Qalā’id al-jumān*, vol. 6 (Part 7), 34, 247, vol. 8 (Part 10), 270, 304. See also: **Qirṭāy al-‘Izzī al-Khazindārī**, *Tārīkh majmū‘ al-nawādir mimma jarā li-l-awā’il wa-l-awākhir*, ed. by H. Hein and M. al-Ḥujayrī (Beirut-Berlin: 2005), 87.
 46. See the notes 18 and 40 above.
 47. **Rashīd al-Dīn**, *Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh*, vol. 2, 729.
 48. **L.J. Ward**, *The Ṣafar-nāmah of Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi and the IlKhān dynasty of Iran*, unpublished Ph.D. diss, 3 vols. (University of Manchester, 1983), 173. I quote the translation by L.J. Ward.
 49. The work has been fully edited three times by different scholars. See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a’lām*, 52 vols., ed. by ‘U. ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmūrī (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-‘arabī, 1987-2000, hereinafter - *al-Dhahabī, Tārīkh al-Islām* (Tadmūrī); **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a’lām*, 17 vols., ed. by B. ‘A. Ma’rūf (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2003, hereinafter - *al-Dhahabī, Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma’rūf); **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a’lām*, 15 vols., ed. by M. ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Aṭā (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 2019, hereinafter - *al-Dhahabī, Tārīkh al-Islām* (‘Aṭā).

50. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Duwal al-Islām*, 2 vols., ed. by Ḥ.I. Marwa (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1999).
51. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'*, 25 vols., ed. by B.ʿA. Ma'rūf, Sh. al-Arna'ūt (et al.) (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1996).
52. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Al-'Ibar fī khabar man ghabara*, 4 vols., ed. by Abū Hājir Muḥammad al-Sa'īd b. Basyūnī Zaghlūl (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1985).
53. **Al-Ṣafadī**, *Kitāb al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* (Das biographische Lexikon des Ṣalāḥaddīn Ḥalīl ibn Aibak aṣ-Ṣafadī), 32 vols., ed. by H. Ritter et al (Beirut/Berlin: 1962-2013) (hereinafter: **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter)); **al-Ṣafadī**, *Kitāb al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, 29 vols., ed. by Aḥmad al-Arnā'ūt wa-Turkī Muṣṭafā (Beirut: Dār iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī, 2000) (hereinafter: **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā'ūt / Muṣṭafā)); **al-Ṣafadī**, *A'yān al-'Aṣr wa-A'wān al-Naṣr*, 6 vols. (Damascus, 1998, several editors).
54. **D. Little**, *An Introduction to Mamlūk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn* (Freiburger Islamstudien, Bd. II.) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970), 102-106, as well as, **D. Little**, "Historiography of the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk epochs," in *The Cambridge History of Egypt. Vol. 1: Islamic Egypt 640-1517*, ed. by C.F. Petry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 431-432.
55. I made use of all three modern editions of *Tārīkh al-Islām* which contain the passage in question, as well as the autograph copy of the relevant volume now kept at the Ayasofya Library (MS. 3013) in Turkey. See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Tadmurī), 48:322-324; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma'rūf), 14:864-866; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* ('Aṭā), 14:155-156; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-a'lām*, Ayasofya Kütüphanesi, MS. 3013, fols. 171v-172v (hereinafter: **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ayasofya)). **Al-Dhahabī's** account is also briefly quoted by Abū al-Maḥāsin b. Taghrī Birdī (d. 1470) in his *al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi*. See: **Ibn Taghrī Birdī**, *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa-l-mustawfi fī ba'da al-Wāfi*, vol. 9, ed. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn (Cairo, 2002), 178-179.
56. **Al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter), 24:407-408; **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā'ūt / Muṣṭafā), 24:308.
57. **D. Patton** found the report, which we will present below, to be fabulous and did not think it necessary to address it in more detail. See: **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, 66 (n. 75). Cf. **S. al-Daywahjī**, *Tārīkh al-Mawṣil*, 1:317.
58. Cf. **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383 ("he killed them treacherously one after another"); **al-Kutubī**, *Uyūn al-Tawārīkh*, vol. 20, ed. by F. al-Sāmir and N. 'Abd al-Mun'im Dāwūd (Baghdad: Dār al-Rashīd li-l-nashr, 1980), 216 ("he killed the young boy, hid him and and started to rule it in his own right"); **al-'Aynī**, *Iqd al-jumān*, 1:200 ("he treated the sons of his patron very cruelly and killed them treacherously").
59. Cf. *Tārīkh Abī al-Fidā' al-musammā al-Mukhtaṣar fī akhbār al-bashar*, vol. 2, ed. by M. Dayyūb (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-'ilmiyya, 1997), 307 ("for almost 43 years"); **Ibn al-Dawādārī**, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi' al-ghurar*, vol. 8 (Al-Durra al-zakiyya fī akhbār al-Dawla al-Turkiyya), ed. by U. Haarmann (Cairo: 1971), 45 ("for 47 years"); **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383 ("for nearly 50 years"); **Ibn Taghrī Birdī**, *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira*, 7:70 ("for 47 years").
60. The sentence between the square brackets is added here from *Siyar*. See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar*, 23:356 (*min aḥsan al-rijāl shaklan*); **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383 (*malīḥ al-ṣūra*); **al-'Aynī**, *Iqd al-jumān*, 1:200 (*malīḥ al-ṣūra*).
61. The editions by 'Umar Tadmurī and Muṣṭafā 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā actually read *ma'a zulmihi wa-jawdihi* (with his tyranny and generosity). However, in the autograph copy and edition by Bashshār Ma'rūf instead of the word *jawdihi* stands *jawrihi* (oppression, tyranny) which is more suitable to the context. See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Tadmurī), 48:322; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* ('Aṭā), 14:155. Cf. **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ayasofya), 171v; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma'rūf), 14:865. **Al-Ṣafadī's** *Kitāb al-Wāfi* also reads *jawrihi*. See: **Al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter), 24:408; **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā'ūt / Muṣṭafā), 24:308.
62. **Ibn al-Athīr** described the benevolent attitude and goodwill of his patron towards his subjects as follows: "They were hearing how *Badr al-Dīn* treated his soldiers and his subjects, his kindness towards them and

his bestowing money upon them.” See: *The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fi’l-ta’rikh. Part 3. The Years 589-629/1193-1231. The Ayyūbids after Saladin and the Mongol Menace*, trans. by **D.S. Richards** (Farnham-Burlington: Ashgate, 2008, reprinted by London-New York: Routledge, 2008), 193; **Ibn al-Athīr**, *Al-Kāmil fi’l-tārīkh*, 10:332.

63. According to Ibn Taghrī Birdī, when it happened, for example, that one of his subordinates suffered a loss of 100 dirhams in his country, he undertook to give him 10000 dinars as compensation instead. See: **Ibn Taghrī Birdī**, *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira*, 7:70.

64. Patton assumed that most probably the Damascene historian Quṭb al-Dīn al-Yūnīnī (d. 1326) is cited. However, the relevant passage is not found in the latter’s *Dhayl mir’āt al-zamān fi’l-tārīkh al-a’yān*. See: **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 4 and the note 5 on the same page.

65. The fame of the lavish celebrations of *mawlid* that Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī organized every year in Erbil was also widespread. Ibn Khallikān (d. 1282), himself a native of Erbil, described the details of those ceremonies in the biographical account of Kūkbūrī in his biographical dictionary *Wafayāt al-a’yān*. See: **Ibn Khallikān**, *Wafayāt al-a’yān wa-anbā’ abnā’ al-zamān*, vol. 4, ed. by Iḥsān ‘Abbās (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1977), 117-119; **Ibn Khallikan’s Biographical Dictionary**, tr. by W. MacGuckin de Slane, vol. 2 (Paris: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, 1843), 539-540. Cf. **G.E. von Grunebaum**, *Muhammadan Festivals*, introduction by C.E. Bosworth (London, Curzon Press, 1988), 73-76; **NJ.G. Kaptein**, *Muḥammad’s Birthday Festival: Early History in the Central Muslim Lands and Development in the Muslim West until the 10th/16th Century* (Leiden-New York- Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993, 40-41.

66. *Wa-yakūnu al-simāt khūnjan wa-bāṭiyat al-khamr*. *Khūnjā* is a salver, a flat tray of wood or silver or other metal used for serving dishes or beverages at a table.

67. In *Siyar al-Dhahabī* substitutes the word *maḥabbatan* (with love) for *talahiyyan* (with enjoyment). See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar*, 23:357.

68. Instead of *Allāh*, in al-Ṣafadī’s *Al-Wāfi* is *Ilah al-khalq* (God of the Creation or the Universe). See: **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter), 24:408; **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā’ūt / Muṣṭafā), 24:308.

69. Instead of “*nakhwatu aryaḥiyyatin*”, in al-Ṣafadī is “*nakhwatun ‘arabiyyatun*” (i.e. Arabic dignity). See: **Al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (Ritter), 24:408; **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Wāfi* (al-Arnā’ūt / Muṣṭafā), 24:308.

70. Instead of *nam* (sleep), in Tadmūrī’s and Aṭā’s editions stands غَم (from the root *ghamma* – to become cloudy or overcast, to make sad), whereas the autograph copy and edition by Bashshār Ma’rūf and *Siyar* read it *nam*. See: **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Tadmūrī), 48:324; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Aṭā), 14:157. Cf. **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ayasofya), 172v; **al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma’rūf), 14:866; **al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar*, 23:357. Regarding the word *armaniyyatuhu*, it can indeed be translated as “his Armenian [tongue],” but in both cases, it likely refers to his Armenian origin rather than the Armenian language. Therefore, I have opted to translate the term as “his Armenianness” to better convey its implied meaning.

71. Cf. **Bar Hebraeus**, *Chronography*, 434. Other Mamluk historians tell that before leaving for Tabriz, Badr al-Dīn had promised that he would take Hülegü by his ears. And when he met the Ilkhan and put the precious earrings on his ears with his own hands, he boasted that he had fulfilled his promise to the people of Mosul, albeit figuratively. See: **Baybars al-Manṣūrī**, *Zubdat al-fikra fi’l-tārīkh al-hijra*, ed. by D.S. Richards (Beirut-Berlin: 1998), 42-43; **al-Nuwayrī**, *Nihāyat al-arab fi’l-funūn al-adab*, vol. 27, ed. by N.M. Fawwāz and H.K. Fawwāz (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2004), 259-260; **Ibn al-Dawādārī**, *Kanz al-durar wa-jāmi’ al-ghurar*, vol. 7 (Al-Durr al-maṭlūb fi’l-akḥbār mulūk banī Ayyūb), ed. by Sa’īd ‘Abd al-Fattāh ‘Āshūr (Cairo: 1972), 306-308; **al-‘Aynī**, *‘Iqd al-jumān*, 1:179-180.

72. According to Ibn Kathīr the people of Mosul mourned his death deeply because of his benevolence and justice. See: **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383. Badr al-Dīn was first buried in the Mosul citadel, but then his remains were transferred to the sanctuary (*mashhad*) of Imām Yaḥyā b. al-Qāsim adjacent to the school which he had built, al-Madrasa al-Badriyya. See: **Ibn al-Fuwaṭī**, *Al-*

Hawādith al-jāmi'a, 242; **Ibn Khallikān**, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, 1:184; **Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary**, 2:165; **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:383. According to some reports, the remains of the Sultan were afterwards moved to the mashhad of Alī b. Abī Ṭālib in al-Najaf, if only the historians do not confuse this two shrines. See: **al-Kutubī**, *Uyūn al-Tawārīkh*, 20:216; **Ibn Duqmāq**, *Nuzhat al-anām fī tārikh al-Islām*, ed. by S. Ṭabbāra (Sidon-Beirut: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, 1999), 257. Cf. **S. al-Daywahjī**, “Mashhad al-Imām Yaḥyā”, 173; **Y. Tabbaa**, *The Production of Meaning*, 188-189.

73. Mosul is called *Mocl* (Մոժ) or *Mosl* (Մոսլ) or *Musul* (Մուսլու) in Medieval Armenian sources. However, Badr al-Dīn is not mentioned in any Armenian source of the time. Several authors have only recorded the event of the conquest of Mosul by the Mongols.

74. **Qirtāy al-ʿIzzī al-Khazindārī**, *Tārīkh majmūʿ al-nawādir*, 203; *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlukensultane in den Jahren 690-741 der Hīgra nach arabischen Handschriften*, Hrsg. von K.V. Zetterstéen (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1919), 24; **al-Maqrīzī**, *Kitāb al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr*, vol. 2, 247-248; **al-Maqrīzī**, *Musawwadat Kitāb al-Mawāʿiz wa-l-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-l-athār*, ed. by A.F. Sayyid (London: Muʿassasat al-Furqān li-l-turāth al-Islāmī, 1995), 398. The text reads “after the execution of Luʿluʾ by Hülegü”. Al-Maqrīzī probably confuses Badr al-Dīn with his son al-Malik al-Šāliḥ Ismaʿīl.

75. **G.G. Sargsyan** and **A. Harrak**, “Armenian Inscriptions and Graffiti at the Monastery of Mār Behnam and in Qaraqosh”, *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 15 (2015), 17-32. It is worth noting that the monastery of Mar Behnam, from the 12th-13th centuries, was also linked to Khidr (al-Khaḍir), regarded as an Islamic saint or prophet who conveyed the secrets of divine knowledge. The cult of Khidr, who was sometimes identified with the Christian dragon-slayer Saint George, created a symbolic link between the two religious traditions. This connection transformed the monastery into a shared sacred space for both Christians and Muslims. See: **E.S. Wolper**, “Khidr and the Politics of Translation in Mosul Mar Behnam, St George and Khidr Ilyas,” in *Sacred Precincts: The Religious Architecture of Non-Muslim Communities across the Islamic World*, ed. by M. Gharipour (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2015), 379-392. Cf. **S. Kuehn**, *The Dragon in Medieval East Christian and Islamic Art*, with a foreword by R. Hillenbrand (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 100-101.

76. *The Travels of Marco Polo*, trans. into English from the text of L.F. Benedetto by A. Ricci (London: Routledge, 1931), 24; **Marco Polo**, *The Description of the World*, composite trans. by A.C. Moule & P. Pelliot, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1938), 100.

77. See: *The Monks of Kublai Khan, Emperor of China or The History of the Life and Travels of Rabban Sawma*, tr. from the Syriac by E.A. Wallis Budge (London, 1928), 270; *History of Mar Yahballaha and Rabban Sauma*, ed., trans., and annot. by **P.G. Borbone**, tr. from the Italian by L.E. Parodi (Hamburg: Verlag Tredition, 2021), 197. See also: **J.M. Fiey**, *Assyrie chrétienne, contribution à l'étude de l'histoire et de la géographie ecclésiastiques et monastiques du nord de l'Iraq*, vol. 1 (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1965), 89.

78. **Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum**, t. 3, ed. by J.B. Abbeloos and T.J. Lamy (Paris/Louvain: Maisonneuve/Peeters, 1877), 525-526; **Bar Hebraeus**, *The Ecclesiastical Chronicle*, tr. by D. Wilmschurst (Piscataway, N.J.: Georgias Press, 2015), 488. See also: **J.M. Fiey**, *Assyrie chrétienne*, 2:410.

79. **P. Kawerau**, *Die jakobitische Kirche im Zeitalter der syrischen Renaissance* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1955), 21; **J. M. Fiey**, “Les diocèses du Maphrianat syrien, 629-1860”, *Parole de l'Orient*, t. 5, 1974, 150-154 [18-22]. On the history of St. Matthew monastery, see: **Ignatius Yacoub III**, *History of the Monastery of Saint Matthew in Mosul*, tr. by M. Moosa (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008).

80. **D. Wilmschurst**, *The Ecclesiastical Organisation of the Church of the East, 1318-1913* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 191.

81. **Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum**, 3:394-396; 413-416; 417-422; **Bar Hebraeus**, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle*, 440, 446, 448-450. On the relationship between Badr al-Dīn and the Christian population of Mosul, see also: **J.M. Fiey**, *Mossoul chrétienne: Essai sur l'histoire, l'archéologie et l'état actuel des monuments chrétiens de la ville de Mossoul* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique Catholique, 1959), 39-43;

- S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 44-51. On Medieval art heritage of Orthodox Syriac communities in the Mosul area in general, see: **B. Snelders**, *Identity and Christian-Muslim Interaction: Medieval Art of the Syrian Orthodox from the Mosul Area* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).
82. **Bar Hebraeus**, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle*, 448; **Gregorii Barhebraei** *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, 3:417-420. Although it is also noted that the Maphrian in turn had to collect a lot of money to prepare precious gifts for Lu'lu' in order to win his favor and to legitimize his election with his edict.
83. **R. George-Tvrtković**, *A Christian Pilgrim in Medieval Iraq. Riccoldo da Montecroce's Encounter with Islam* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 200. Cf. **'Alā' Maḥmūd al-Qadāwī**, *Al-Mawṣil wa-l-Jazīra*, 128-129; **P. Jackson**, *The Mongols and the Islamic World. From Conquest to Conversion* (New Haven- London: Yale University Press, 2017), 311.
84. More on Jewish communities in Mosul and other cities of Mesopotamia, see: **M. Gil**, *Jews in Islamic Countries in the Middle Ages*, translated from the Hebrew by D. Strassler (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2004), 491-519.
85. *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, critical text, trans. and commentary by M.N. Adler (London: Oxford University Press, 1907), 33-34.
86. **S. Goitein**, "Glimpses from the Cairo Geniza on naval warfare in the Mediterranean and on the Mongol invasion", *Studi orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida I* (Rome: 1956), 393-408; **M. Gil**, *Jews in Islamic Countries*, 431-432.
87. **S. Goitein**, "The Nāsis of Mosul and the Destruction of Their Houses by the Earthquake of 1237," *Braslavi Jubilee Volume* (Tel Aviv, 1970), 486-501 (in Hebrew); **S. Goitein**, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, vol. 2 (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), 290 n. 2.
88. **Ibn Khallikān**, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, 3:468; **Ibn Khallikan's** *Biographical Dictionary*, 5:312-313.
89. A Sufi mystic and the founder of the 'Adawiyya order and teachings from which the Yazidi religion emerged. After his death in 1162, he was canonized as deity by his followers. His sanctuary at Lalesh has been the holiest site for the Yazidism and the centre for Yazidi pilgrimage up till now. See: **B. Açıkyıldız**, "The Sanctuary of Shaykh 'Adī at Lalish: Centre of Pilgrimage of the Yezidis", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 72.2 (2009), 301-333. More on the Yazidism, see: **J.S. Guest**, *The Yezidis: A study in Survival* (London-New York: KPI, 1987); **G.S. Asatryan, V. Arakelova**, *The Religion of the Peacock Angel: The Yezidis and their Spirit World* (London-New York: Routledge, 2014) and the monograph by Ph.G. Kreyenbroek cited in the next footnote.
90. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 31-36; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, 64-65; **Ph.G. Kreyenbroek**, *Yezidism - Its Background, Observances and Textual Tradition* (Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 31-32. The story of Badr al-Dīn and Shams al-Dīn was integrated into the cultural and spiritual traditions of the Yezidi community. See: **Ph.G. Kreyenbroek, Kh.J. Rashow**, *God and Sheikh Adi are Perfect: Sacred Poems and Religious Narratives from the Yezidi Tradition* (Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 112-126.
91. **Ibn Khallikān**, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, 3:254; **Ibn Khallikan's** *Biographical Dictionary*, 2:197-198.
92. For an opposite point of view, see the note 103 below.
93. **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu'*, 65-67.
94. **S. al-Daywahjī**, "Madāris al-Mawṣil fī al-'ahd al-Atābikī", *Sumer* 13 (1957), 101-118; **Y. Tabbāa**, *The Production of Meaning*, 186-195.
95. **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, vol. 17, ed. by 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (Cairo: Dār Hajar, 1998), 383. Cf. **al-'Aynī**, *Iqd al-jumān*, vol. 1, 201. **Ibn Duqmāq** adds: "... and a candlestick inlaid with gold and silver. He considered one of his priorities to send a lantern costing one thousand dinar to Mashhad after every year of his life as a lord of Mosul. He continued doing this up to his death. It's told that they counted 40 lanterns and 40 candlesticks at Mashhad bearing his name. He was also giving a great deal of alms (al-ṣadaqa al-kathīra)." See: **Ibn Duqmāq**, *Nuzhat al-anām*, 258.

96. **Ibn Kathīr**, *Al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, 17:384 (n. 1).
97. **Ibn Yūsuf al-Kanjī**, *Kifāyat al-ṭālib fī manāqib ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib*, ed. by M.H. al-Amīnī (Najaf: al-Maṭba‘a al-Ḥaydariyya, 1970), 36-37; **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 42.
98. Scholars have long debated the Sunnī reverence for ‘Alī and his descendants, proposing various interpretations and terms to describe the phenomenon – such as “Alid loyalism,” “confessional ambiguity,” “imamophilism,” etc. A detailed discussion of these, however, lies beyond the scope of this article.
99. Similarly, B. Snelder argues that the construction of Alid shrines was part of Badr al-Dīn’s social policy which aimed at creating more general acceptance of Shī‘ism among the predominantly Sunnī population of Mosul. See: **B. Snelders**, *Identity and Christian-Muslim Interaction*, 103.
100. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 38; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 68.
101. **D. Patton**, *A History of the Atabegs*, 372-373; **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 69.
102. **Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawṣilī**, *Qalā'id al-jumān*, vol. 1.1, 266-267.
103. **D. Patton**, *A History of the Atabegs*, 184, 357-358. Cf. **K. Nováček**, **M. Melčák**, **O. Beránek**, **L. Starková**, *Mosul after Islamic State. The Quest for Lost Architectural Heritage* (Cham: Springer, 2021), 24-26, 312-313. In Y. Tabbāa’s opinion, Lu’lu’’s turn to Shī‘ism could be the reaction to the Sufi ‘Adawī movement led by the aforementioned Shams al-Dīn al-Ḥasan “who, claiming Umayyad descent and appealing to Arab ethnicity, called for opposing both Badr al-Dīn and the Zangids and, quite curiously, the establishment of a new Umayyad dynasty.” See: **Y. Tabbāa**, *The Production of Meaning*, 192-194. Cf. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 37-44; **S. al-Daywahjī**, *Tārīkh al-Mawṣil*, 1:316. I suggest to read Stephennie Mulder’s book which sheds light upon pilgrimage sites and martyrdom of ‘Alid saints in Medieval Syria many of which were founded or sponsored by Sunnī patrons and were venerated both by Sunnīs and Shī‘īs. See: **St. Mulder**, *The Shrines of the ‘Alids in Medieval Syria. Sunnis, Shi‘is and the Architecture of Coexistence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014). See also Josef Meri’s book on several shrines, pilgrimage sites and saints shared by Muslims, Christians and Jews in Medieval Syria as well as the recent book by A. Cuffel on the same topic. See: **J.W. Meri**, *The Cult of Saints among Muslims and Jews in Medieval Syria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); **A. Cuffel**, *Shared Saints and Festivals among Jews, Christians, and Muslims in the Medieval Mediterranean* (York, UK, ARC Humanities Press, 2024).
104. **D. Patton**, *Badr al-Dīn Lu’lu’*, 49-50, 67-69.
105. For the general introduction to the history of Medieval futuwwa institutions, see: **Fr. Taeschner**, *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam: Texte zur Geschichte der futuwwa* (Zürich-München: Artemis-Verlag, 1979); **Fr. Taeschner**, “AKHī,” in *El²*, vol. 1 (A-B) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986), 321-323; **Fr. Taeschner**, **Cl. Cahen**, “Futuwwa,” in *El²*, vol. 2 (C-G) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), 961-969. On Christian and Armenian futuwwa-like confraternities, see: **S.B. Dadoyan**, “A Case Study for Redefining Armenian-Christian Cultural Identity in the Framework of Near Eastern Urbanism-13th Century: The Nāṣirī Futuwwa Literature and the Brotherhood Poetry of Yovhannēs and Kostandin Erzēnkac’i, Texts and Contexts,” in *Redefining Christian Identity: Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, ed. by J.J. van Ginkel, H.L. Murre-van den Berg, and T.M. van Lint (Peeters: Leuven, 2005), 237-264; **S.B. Dadoyan**, “The Constitution for the Brotherhood of Erzinkay (1280) by Yovhannēs Erzēnkac’i (d. 1293): an Armenization of the Futuwwa Reform Project and Literature of Abbasid Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (d. 1225),” *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 29 (2003-2004), 117-165; **R. Goshgarian**, “Beyond the Social and the Spiritual: Redefining the Urban Confraternities of Late Medieval Anatolia,” PhD diss. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2007); **R. Goshgarian**, “Futuwwa in Thirteenth-Century Rūm and Armenia: Reform Movements and the Managing of Multiple Allegiances on the Seljuk Periphery,” in *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East*, ed. by **S.N. Yildiz**, **A.C.S. Peacock** (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 227-263.
106. **Y. Tabbāa**, *The Production of Meaning*, 195.
107. *Al-Ḥadbā’* (hunchback) was a nickname attributed to Mosul.

108. The word *balā* (بالا), translated above as “indeed”, also needs explanation. In Classical and Modern literary Arabic, the particle *balā* (yes, indeed, certainly) usually occurs as a reply to a negative statement or interrogation. However, in some instances, the word can also be the response to a simple negation or a reply to an interrogation without a negative. For examples of usage, see: **Ed.W. Lane**, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Book 1, Part 1 (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863), 257. A partial homonym, *balā* (بلاء) originating from the word root “b-l-w” or “b-l-ā”, has the meaning of “testing”, “affliction”, “trouble” or “misfortune”. See: **Ed.W. Lane**, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Book 1, Part 1, 257. Thus, I find the first meaning (yes, indeed) more appropriate to the context.
109. **Dīwān Ibn al-Muqarrab**, ed. by ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Hilū (Maktabat al-ta‘āwun al-thaqāfī, 1988), 505.
110. Cf. **S. Niazi**, *An Edition of the Dīwān of ‘Alī ibn Muqarrab and a Critical Study*, A Thesis Submitted to the University of London for the Degree of Doctor or Philosophy, School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. 1 (1975), 199-201; *Sharḥ Dīwān Ibn al-Muqarrab*, ed. and commented by ‘**Abd al-Khāliq b. ‘Abd al-Jalīl**, vol. 4 (Beirut, 2012), 2047-2050. On Khālīd al-Qasrī and his sympathies towards Christians, see: **G.R. Hawting**, “Khalid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḳasrī,” in *El²*, vol. IV (IRAN-KHA) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 925-927 and especially **L.B. Yarbrough**, *Friends of the Emir. Non-Muslim State Officials in Premodern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 58-61 (the verse attributed to Khālīd al-Qasrī is not addressed). Cf. **St. Judd**, “Ibn ‘Asākir’s Peculiar Biography of Khālīd al-Qasrī,” in *New Perspectives on Ibn ‘Asākir in Islamic Historiography*, ed. by St. Judd and J. Scheiner (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2017), 139-155.
111. *Dīwān Ibn ‘Unayn*, ed. by Khalīl Mardam Bek (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1974), 216.
112. See: **Ibn Khallikān**, *Wafayāt al-a’yān*, 5:15; **Ibn Khallikan**’s *Biographical Dictionary*, 3:177. Cf. *Sharḥ Dīwān Ibn al-Muqarrab*, 2047, note 320; **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 237.
113. See: **al-Ṣafadī**, *Al-Ghayth al-musajjam fī sharḥ “Lamiyyat al-‘ajam”*, vol. 2, ed. by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Hawwārī (Saida-Beirut: al-Maktaba al-‘Aṣriyya, 2009), 252.
114. On Khālīd al-Qasrī and his sympathies towards Christians, see: **G.R. Hawting**, “Khalid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḳasrī,” in *El²*, vol. IV (IRAN-KHA) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 925-927 and especially **L.B. Yarbrough**, *Friends of the Emir. Non-Muslim State Officials in Premodern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 58-61 (the verse attributed to Khālīd al-Qasrī is not addressed).
115. See: **A. Chrysostomides**, “There is no harm in it”: Muslim Participation in Levantine Christian Religious Festivals (750-1000), *Al-Masāq*, vol. 33.2 (2021), 117-138. Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī al-Shābushtī (d. 998/999) in his “Book of Monasteries” attests to Muslim attendance at the Palm Sunday festival, particularly at the al-A’lā Monastery in Mosul in the 10th century. See: **Al-Shābushtī**, *The Book of Monasteries*, ed. and trans. by H. Kilpatrick (New York: New York University Press, 2023), 230-237.
116. On the participation of the Muslim population of Fatimid Cairo in Coptic Christian festivals (e.g. Palm Sunday, Easter), see: **Y. Lev**, *State and Society in Fatimid Egypt* (Leiden-New York-København-Köln: E.J. Brill, 1991), 191-196; **H. Lufti**, “Coptic Festivals of the Nile: Aberrations of the Past?,” in *The Mamluks in Egyptian politics and society*, ed. by Th. Philipp and U. Haarmann (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 254-282.
117. **Ibn Taymiyya**, *Majmū‘ al-fatāwā*, vol. 25, ed. by ‘Abd Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Qāsim (Medina, 2004), 329-332; **J. Hoover**, “Ibn Taymiyya,” in *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, vol. 4 (1200-1350), ed. by D. Thomas and A. Mallett (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2012), 873-874. On celebrations of Coptic Nawrūz, which is not to be confused with the Persian Nawrūz, in the Islamic Egyptian society, see: **B. Shoshan**, *Popular Culture in Medieval Cairo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 40-51; **P. Walker**, *The Fatimids: Select Papers on Their Governing Institutions, Social and Cultural Organization, Religious Appeal, and Rivalries* (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 107-123.
118. **Ibn Taymiyya**, *Iqtidā’ al-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm li-mukhālafat aṣḥāb al-jahīm*, 2 vols, ed. by Nāṣir ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm al-‘Aql (Riyadh: Dār Ishbīliyya, 1998). For a general synopsis of the work, see: **J. Hoover**, “Ibn

Taymiyya”, 865-873. For the partial translation of the text, see: **M.‘U. Memon**, *Ibn Taymiyya’s Struggle against Popular Religion, with an annotated translation of his Kitāh iqtidā‘ aṣ-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm mukhālafat aṣḥāb al-jahīm* (Mouton - The Hague - Paris: Mouton & Co., 1976) and for the description of Palm Sunday celebrations, pages 211-212 therein.

119. **Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawṣilī**, *Qalā'id al-jumān*, vol. 2 (Part 3), 50, 81 and vol. 3 (Part 4), 105 (a panegyric dedicated to Amīn al-Dīn Lū'lū' al-Badrī, the freedman of Badr al-Dīn and his deputy).

120. **Ibn al-Sha‘ār al-Mawṣilī**, *Qalā'id al-jumān*, vol. 6 (Part 7), 24.

121. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Siyar*, 23:357.

122. **B.‘A. Ma‘rūf**, *Al-Dhahabī wa-manhajuhu fī kitāb Tārīkh al-Islām* (Beirut: Dār al-gharb al-Islāmī, 2008), 25-33; **Al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma‘rūf), 215-218.

123. **Al-‘Umārī**, *Al-Ta‘rīf bi-l-muṣṭalaḥ al-sharīf*, ed. by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shams al-Dīn (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya, 1988), 82.

124. See: **Th. Michel**, *A Muslim Theologian’s Response to Christianity: Ibn Taymiyya’s al-Jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ* (Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1984), 76-86. For a general survey of anti-Christian polemical works of Ibn Taymiyya, see: **J. Hoover**, “Ibn Taymiyya”, 834-878. For his anti-Shī‘a attacks, see: **Th. Michel**, *A Muslim Theologian’s Response to Christianity*, 56-67.

125. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Tārīkh al-Islām* (Ma‘rūf), 1:22; **B.‘A. Ma‘rūf**, *Al-Dhahabī wa-manhajuhu*, 74.

126. These entrusted the mission of evangelization of “Mosolini” or “Mossoliti” along with other peoples Franciscan and Dominican friars. See: **J.M. Fiey**, *Mossoul chrétienne*, 39; **J. Richard**, *La papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen-Âge (XIII-XIVème siècle)* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1977), 65.

127. On this embassy, it’s purposes and results, see: **P. Pelliot**, “Les Mongols et la papauté,” in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 8 (28) (1931-1932), 12-37 [150-175]; **J. Richard**, *Au-dela de la Perse et de l'Arménie. L'Orient latin et la découverte de l'Asie intérieure Quelques textes inégalement connus aux origines de l'alliance entre Francs et Mongols (1145-1262)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 159-162; **D. Aigle**, “The Letters of Eljigidei, Hülegü and Abaqa,” 145-152; **D. Aigle**, *The Mongol Empire between Myth and Reality. Studies in Anthropological History* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2015), 176-180.

128. **P. Jackson**, *The Seventh Crusade, 1244-1254: Sources and Documents* (Farnham-Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), p. 81.

129. For further details on Mongol religious policy in relation to the Christian world, often misunderstood as *religious tolerance*, refer to the research by P. Jackson: **P. Jackson**, “The Mongols and the Faith of the Conquered,” in *Mongols, Turks, and Others. Eurasian Nomads and the Sedentary World*, ed. by R. Amitai and M. Biran (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2005), 245-290 as well as **P. Jackson**, *The Mongols and the West, 1221-1410* (London-New York: Routledge, 2014).

130. **P. Jackson**, *The Seventh Crusade*, 80-81.

131. See n. 127 above.

132. **P.-V. Claverie**, “Deux lettres inédites de la première mission en Orient d’André de Longjumeau (1246),” in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, t. 158.1 (2000), 283-292; **J. Richard**, *Au-dela de la Perse et de l'Arménie*, 59-73.

133. *Letters from the East: Crusaders, Pilgrims and Settlers in the 12th-13th Centuries*, tr. by **M. Barber** and **K. Bate** (Farnham-Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), 146-151.

134. For André de Longjumeau’s second mission, see: **P. Pelliot**, “Les Mongols et la papauté,” 38-54 [176-192], 66-76 [204-214].

135. **D. Morgan**, “Prester John and the Mongols,” in *Prester John. The Mongols and the Ten Lost Tribes*, ed. by Ch.F. Beckingham and B. Hamilton (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 1996), 159-170; **D. Aigle**, *The Mongol Empire*, 41-65.

136. For the discussion of terms like acculturation, hybridity, syncretism, and transformation see: **M.D. Baer**, “History and Religious Conversion,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Conversion*, 25-47.

137. **M.D. Baer**, “History and Religious Conversion”, 26.

138. Religious hybridity was typical of Fatimid Egypt (909-1171), especially during the reign of the Armenian viziers. Cf. **Y. Lev**, *State and Society*, 179-196 (particularly 192-193). Badr al-Dīn Lu'lu's life and career bear a striking resemblance to that of Badr al-Jamālī Amīr al-Juyūsh, another Armenian convert to Islam who served as vizier and *de facto* ruler of the Fatimid state from 1074 to 1094 under Caliph al-Mustanşir bi'llāh (1036-1094). He, although considered a Shi'a Ismā'īlī Muslim, never showed deep devotion to Islam. Cf. **S.B. Dadoyan**, *The Fatimid Armenians*, 123-124 and **S.B. Dadoyan**, *The Armenians in the Medieval Islamic world*, vol. 2, 92. During his tenure, Christian (Copts, Armenians, Syrians) and Jewish communities flourished throughout Egypt, thousands of Armenians immigrated to Egypt and formed an influential community there. He received the Armenian Catholicos Gregory II the Martyrophile (Grigor Vkasaser, 1065-1105) with great honour and founded a patriarchal see of the Armenian Church in Egypt. According to Abū al-Makārim's (d. 1208) work, previously attributed to Abū Ṣāliḥ the Armenian, he was reportedly buried in the Armenian Saint James Church (kanīsat Mār Ya'qūb) in Cairo, although a few Islamic sources propose different locations for his burial. See: *Tārīkh Abū al-Makārim 'an al-kanā'is wa-l-adyura fī al-qarn 12*, part 2, ed. by al-Anbā Samū'īl (Cairo, 2000), 1; *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and Some Neighbouring Countries Attributed to Abū Ṣāliḥ the Armenian*, ed. and trans. by B.T.A. Evetts, with added notes by A.J. Butler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 1. On Badr al-Jamālī and Fatimid Armenians in general, see also: **M. Canard**, "Notes sur les Arméniens en Egypte à l'époque fatimide", *Annales de l'Institut d'Études Orientales* 13 (1955), 143-157; **A. Kapoian-Kouymjian**, *Le Catholicos Grégoire II le martyrophile (Vkasaser) et ses pérégrinations* (Extr.de Bazmavep 132, 3-4 (1974), 306-325) (Venise: 1975), 15-19; **J. den Heijer**, "Considérations sur les communautés chrétiennes en Égypte fatimide: L'État et l'église sous le vizirat de Badr al-Jamālī (1074-1094)" in *L'Égypte fatimide. Son art et son histoire*, ed. M. Barrucand (Paris, 1999), 569-578; **M. Brett**, "Badr al-Jamālī and the Fatimid renaissance," in *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk eras*, vol. IV (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 61-78. R. Shukurov's research on 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykawūs II (r. 1245-1262), the Sultan of Iconium, and his family offers another example of hybrid confessional and cultural identities, specifically within the Byzantine-Turkic context. See: **R. Shukurov**, *Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwus II in Byzantium (1262-1264/1265)*, in *Der Doppeladler. Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. by N. Asutay-Effenberger and F. Daim (Heidelberg: Propylaeum, 2016), 39-52 and **R. Shukurov**, *The Byzantine Turks, 1204-1461* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2016), 105-131. I also propose to read the book by R.J. Zorgati on the phenomenon of conversion and religious hybridity in al-Andalus. See: **R.J. Zorgati**, *Pluralism in the Middle Ages. Hybrid Identities, Conversion, and Mixed Marriages in Medieval Iberia* (Abingdon - New York: Routledge, 2012).

139. Badr al-Dīn's hybrid religious tendencies should not be mistaken for religious syncretism, in which converts blend their existing beliefs and practices with newly adopted ones to form a distinct religious synthesis. A notable example of syncretism is the creed *Dīn-i Ilāhī* ("God's religion"), promulgated by the Mughal Emperor Akbar (r. 1556-1605), which was primarily derived from Islam and Hinduism, while also incorporating elements of Zoroastrianism and Christianity. See: **M. Roychoudhury**, *The Din -i-Ilahi or the Religion of Akbar* (Calcutta: 1941).

140. **Al-Dhahabī**, *Duwal al-Islām*, 2:176.

141. Repressions and brutal persecutions of Christians began in Mosul immediately after the death of Badr al-Dīn, during the short rule of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'īl until the establishment of Mongol dominance over Mosul and al-Jazīra. See: **Bar Hebraeus**, *Ecclesiastical Chronicle*, 440-442; **Ibn al-'Ibrī**, *Tārīkh mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, ed. by A. Ṣāliḥānī al-Yasū'ī (Beirut: Dār al-Rā'id al-Lubnānī, 1994), 493-495. Cf. **S. al-Ruwayshidī**, *Imārat al-Mawṣil*, 49-50.

142. **Ibn Taghrī Birdī**, *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira*, 7:70.

Funding

Research towards this paper was carried out under the auspices of the European Research Council (ERC) — funded Consolidator Grant Armenia Entangled: Connectivity and Cultural Encounters in Medieval Eurasia 9th–14th Centuries (ArmEn), at the SAGAS Department of the University of Florence (grant agreement no. 865067), under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme.

ORCID

Gagik Danielyan <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7002-461X>