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The Rank and Status of Military Refugees in the Mamluk Army: A Reconsideration of the Wāfidiyya

The existence of military refugees from Mongol territory during the Bahri Mamluk period was of great importance for the history of the Mamluk Sultanate politically, diplomatically, and culturally. David Ayalon studied this group over fifty years ago in his article "The Wafidiya in the Mamluk Kingdom" and his theory has been widely accepted, together with his term wāfidiyya, an Arabic "collective formation from wāfid 'one who comes, makes his way, in a delegation or group.'" In his study, he criticizes A. N. Poliak, who stated that the wāfidiyya enjoyed high positions in the Mamluk army because of the vassal character of the Mamluks' relationship to the Golden Horde. Rather, Ayalon claims, the wāfidiyya were constantly discriminated against in the Mamluk military system throughout the Mamluk period because they were not mamluks, i.e., of slave origin.

In the view of the present author, however, his study is too narrow. First, he connects the arrival of the wāfidiyya only to the political situation inside the Mamluk Sultanate, and neglects the situation outside it. For example, he characterizes al-Ẓāhir Baybars and al-ʿĀdil Kitbughā, the two sultans who received the largest and second largest number of Mongol immigrants, according to his counting, as "an admirer of the Mongol regime" and "a member of that ethnic group" respectively, as if these factors caused these immigrations. The wāfidiyya's influx, however, must not have had much to do with the reigning sultans; rather, it was caused by internal factors within the Ilkhanid state. Second, Ayâlon states that the wāfidiyya's inferior status is proved by the fact that most of them joined the ḥalqah unit. Yet, in another place, he points out the prominent position of the ḥalqah in the early Mamluk period. These two claims seem contradictory. Third, his survey tends to look at the wāfidiyya as a unit, so he fails to grasp their diversity. We must differentiate their commanders from their soldiers, the Mongol
tribesmen from indigenous groups within Mongol-ruled territory, and groups who came in the early Mamluk period from groups who came in relatively later periods.

All of these problems resulted from the lack of adequate published sources in Ayalon’s time. In the present day, because research in Mamluk historiography has progressed and more Arabic sources have been published, we have access to more thirteenth- and fourteenth-century contemporary sources. The present state of research “simply demands that this part of his work be redone.”

ARRIVAL OF THE MILITARY REFUGEES

WHO WERE THE WĀFIDĪYAH?: IBN SHADDĀD’S CATEGORIZATION

Actually, the term wāfidiyyah is not found frequently in the contemporary sources, and though there are references to a wāfidiyyah in the Mamluk army, the designation must have been temporary and indefinite. Ayalon uses this word in the extremely wide meaning of “immigrants, those coming from outside” and includes not only al-Khwārizmiyyah and the Kurdish Shahrazūriyyah, who came before the Mongols, but also Frankish and Maghribi refugees, and even those who came from the Ottoman state. On the other hand, later scholars use this term in a narrower sense, as “individuals and groups of tribesmen who fled to the Sultanate from Mongol controlled territory.” We shall also follow the latter definition in this study. Accordingly, this study generally limits itself to the period from the formation of the Mongol state in Iran until its end, i.e., from 1258 to 1335.

But before we proceed to the main subject, we must make clearer who the wāfidiyyah were by referring to a contemporary account. ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, the author of Sultan Baybars’ biography, Tārīkh al-Malik al-Zāhir, lists the names of 201 refugees who entered the sultanate during his reign in a section titled “Those who came to him” (man wa`fada ‘alayhi). He classifies them into the following groups: (a) those from Medina and Yanbu’ (19 persons); (b) those from al-‘Irāq (21 persons); (c) those from al-Mawṣil (17 persons); (d) amirs of al-‘Arab and al-Turkumān (46 persons); (e) Muslims who were displaced by the Mongols (al-Tatār) (21 persons); (f) those from Bilād al-Rūm (35 persons); (g)

---


Mongols (40 persons); (h) those from Māridīn (1 person); and (i) notables of the Franks (2 persons).⁹

Among these, groups (a) and (d) should be excluded from this study, because they came to the sultanate and then returned to their country; they never became regular members of the Mamluk army.¹⁰ All the refugees of groups (e) and (h) and a part of those of (c) were Ayyubid princes in Syria and Saljuqīd atābahs.¹¹ Therefore they did not come from “Mongol-controlled territory” any more than group (i), the Frankish refugees. The other three groups, which can be regarded as wafdīyah for this study, represent three types of wafdīyah during Baybars’ reign: indigenous soldiers who came from areas newly occupied by the Mongols (b), subordinates of the Rūm Saljuqs (f), and Mongol tribal units (g).

Chronology of the Wafdīyah’s Defections

Other contemporary sources do not indicate when or under what circumstances all those listed by Ibn Shaddād arrived in the Mamluk Sultanate. This shows that the sources do not transmit all the information about the wafdīyah. Still, we have twenty-four examples during the period covered in the present article of groups of refugees whose arrival times are known. The following list shows the arrival year of these groups, their leaders’ names, and the size of the group.

1) 660/1262 Shams al-Dīn Salār al-Mustansirī, a ruler of al-‘Irāq 300 horsemen¹²
2) 660/1262 Şaraghań Āghā, a commander of the Golden Horde 200 horsemen¹³

---

¹¹Sato Tsugitaka, State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta’s and Fallahun (Leiden, 1997), 78.
¹³Abū Shāmāh, Tarājīm Rijāl al-Qarnayn al-Sādis wa-al-Sābi‘ (Cairo, 1947), 220; Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, Rawḍ, 137–38; al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl Mir’āt al-Zamān fi Tārīkh al-A’yān (Hyderabad,
(3) 661/1263 Karmūn Āghā, a commander of the Golden Horde
over 1300 horsemen\(^4\)

(4) 662/1264 Sayf al-Dīn Baklak, a ruler of Shīrāz
a large number (*jamā’ah kabīrah*)\(^5\)

(5) 662/1264 Jalāl al-Dīn Bashkar ibn Dawādār, a vassal of the Abbasids
a large number\(^6\)

(6) 672/1273–74 Shams al-Dīn Bahādur, a ruler of Sumaysī\(^7\)
not specified

(7) 675/1277 Ḥusām al-Dīn Bījār, a vassal of the Rūm Saljuqs, and several
others\(^8\)
not specified

(8) 681/1282 Mu’min Āghā, a ruler of Mawsīl
not specified, but a small number\(^9\)

(9) 681–82/1282–83 Sinān al-Dīn al-Rūmī, a son of a ruler of Amasia\(^10\)
not specified

(10) 681/1283 Shaykh ‘Alī, a Sufi shaykh
several Mongols\(^11\)

(11) 683/1284 no specific names
4000 horsemen\(^12\)


\(^{19}\) Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 196, 199.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 216.


\(^{22}\) Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrīf al-Ayyām wa-al-‘Uṣūr fi Sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr* (Cairo, 1961), 68;
(12) 695/1296 Tañraghá, the commander of the Oirat tribe
10,000–18,000 households\(^{23}\)

(13) 698/1299 Sulañmish, a lieutenant from al-Rúm
500 horsemen\(^{24}\)

(14) 703/1304 Badr al-Díñ Jankalí ibn al-Bábá, a ruler of Ra’s al-‘Ayn
11 persons\(^{25}\)

(15) 704/1304 Four siláðdáriyahs of Gházán
200 horsemen with their families\(^{26}\)

(16) 705/1305–6 Sayf al-Díñ Hånná and Fakhr al-Díñ Dâwúd, brothers of
Amir Salâr\(^{27}\)
not specified

(17) 717/1317 Táti, a commander of one thousand of the Mongols
100 horsemen with their families\(^{28}\)

(18) 722/1322 Añmád, a son of an aunt of the sultan\(^{29}\)
not specified

(19) 724/1323–24 Håsan, a relative of the sultan\(^{30}\)
not specified

(20) 726/1326 Táyirbughá, a relative of the sultan\(^{31}\)
not specified

---

Baybars al-Manšúr, Zubdah, 240.


\(^{26}\) Al-Nuwayrî, Nihâyah, 32:86.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., 96.


\(^{29}\) Al-‘Aynî, “‘Iqd,” MS Velîyyüddin 2394, fol. 316.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., fol. 472.

During Baybars’ reign, four groups were indigenous groups from Mongol-occupied areas (nos. 1, 4–6), one group came from the Rûm Saljuq (no. 7), and two groups were Mongol tribesmen (nos. 2–3). Ibn Shaddâd calculates the wâfîdiyyah from the Mongol tribesmen to have numbered about three thousand horsemen, while the chronicles state that there were two groups, of 200 and 1,300 men, respectively. These two groups, which some historians count more accurately as three groups, are often combined as a single group under sixteen commanders in the sources. It is noteworthy that in all cases these defections of the Mongol wâfîdiyyah were unexpected events for the Mamluk Sultanate; we can find no evidence that the Mamluks enticed them to immigrate. On the other hand, some of the indigenous wâfîdiyyah from areas newly occupied by the Mongols had had connections with the Mamluk Sultanate, and Baybars seems to have pursued a “head-hunting” policy toward them. The defections of the Rûm Saljuq wâfîdiyyah, whose arrivals spanned a long term, were caused by Baybars’ military campaign against al-Rûm.

Although a large number of refugees arrived during the reign of Baybars, the
role of his policy of encouraging the waḍidiyyah to immigrate should not be overestimated. Most of their defections reflected the situation of Mamluk-Mongol relations in those days rather than Baybars’ admiration of the Mongol regime and military organization.  

Further, even in the post-Baybars period refugees in some number came to the sultanate continually. In the reign of al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn we find four groups of refugees (nos. 8–11), one of which consisted of four thousand horsemen, and the total number of these refugees is larger than the total number in Baybars’ reign. Afterwards, Sultan Kitbughā received the famous Oirat waḍidiyyah (no. 12), and al-Manṣūr Lājīn accepted a group of refugees led by Sulāmīsh, a Mongol lieutenant of al-Rūm (no. 13). During al-Nāṣir Muhammad’s second reign, three groups arrived (nos. 14–16). Among these, it is true that the Oirat waḍidiyyah was “the greatest wave of Tatār horsemen immigrating to the Mamluk kingdom.” Their defection itself, however, probably had nothing to do with the fact that Kitbughā was also a Mongol mamluk, contrary to Ayalon’s suggestion, since no evidence of “head-hunting” on Kitbughā’s part is found.  

Most of their defections were motivated by disorder upon the deaths of Ilkhan rulers and purges carried out by the Ilkhans. Mu’min Āghā (no. 8) was suspected of the murder of the Ilkhan Abagha’s brother. The waḍidiyyah in 683/1284 (no. 11) came because of the internal disorder in the Ilkhanid state after Arghūn’s enthronement.  

Ṭaraghāy, Sulāmīsh, and Jankāli ibn al-Bābā (nos. 12–14) were escaping the purge instituted by the Ilkhan Ghāzān. Some groups of the waḍidiyyah consisted of family members of the Mamluk elite (nos. 16, 18–21), especially the relatives of the sultans, who arrived around the year 722/1323, in which the Mamluks and the Mongols came to an agreement on a peace treaty. Tamurtaş (no. 22), who rebelled against the Ilkhan Abū Saʿīd and defected, had been on friendly terms with a Mamluk amir, Sayf al-Dīn Ayta mish. But, in spite of their friendship, Tamurtaş was executed by the sultan in conformity with the treaty. The defections of the last two groups of waḍidiyyah (nos. 23–24) were caused by the political disorder after Abū Saʿīd’s death. Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh (no. 24) was
also an associate of a Mamluk amir, Sayf al-Dīn Tankiz, and when the Ilkhan Abū Saʿīd died, Khalīfah first sought refuge with Tankiz.

The wāfidiyyah defections reviewed here can be characterized as follows: first, most of them were caused by the internal political situation of the Ilkhanids, rather than that of the Mamluk Sultanate. Second, especially in the later period, the wāfidiyyah often had some connections with the Mamluk elite before their defections.

STARTING ASSIGNMENTS

THE HIERARCHY OF ASSIGNMENTS: ACCOUNTS FROM THE REIGN OF BAYBARS

Ayalon states in his article that ‘most of them joined the ḥalqah, whose status . . . was greatly inferior to that of the Mamluk units.”45 This statement has formed the basis for the idea that the military refugees were a group discriminated against in the Mamluk Sultanate. In this section we shall see if most of them actually joined the ḥalqah unit or not.

Here let us refer to Ibn Shaddād again. He states that those who sought refuge from al-Tatār during the reign of Baybars were assigned positions as follows:

Among them some were assigned exceptionally to the khāṣṣakīyah; others were assigned to the unit of silāḥdār (armor bearers), the unit of jamdār (wardrobe keepers), and the unit of sāqī (cupbearers).46 Others were made amirs of ṭablkhānah, others were made amirs given from ten to twenty cavalrymen, and others were incorporated into amirs’ units.47

In this account, we find a somewhat hierarchical order of treatment of these newcomers. This can be categorized as follows:

(a) Recruited into the sultan’s units: khāṣṣakīyah, silāḥdār, jamdār, and sāqī: All of these units are regarded as consisting of Mamluks.48

(b) Appointed to the rank of amir, i.e., amir of ṭablkhānah or an amir having

---

46 For translation of the words silāḥdār, jamdār, and sāqī, see William Popper, Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans 1382–1468 A.D.: Systematic Notes to Ibn Taghrī Birdī’s Chronicles of Egypt (Berkeley, 1955), 95.
47 Ibn Shaddād, Tārīkh, 337–38. A similar passage can be found in al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, 3:256–57, and Ayalon cites the latter (“Wafidiya,” 98-99). However, the former is more first-hand information.
from ten to twenty cavalrymen: "Amir of tablkha≠nah," generally translated as "amir of forty," derives from the word "band" (tablkhana≠). It is the second highest rank of amir after "amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand" (amir mi≠ ah wa-muqaddam alf).49

(c) Integrated into the units of various amirs.

(d) Retained in the unit of their original leader: though this group is not mentioned specifically by Ibn Shadda≠d, its existence is reasonable, given (b).

As far as we can see from this passage, there is no requirement that they join the halqa≠ units, which Ayalon regards as the main destination of the wa≠fidi≠yah. But in another place, Ibn Shadda≠d cites the regulation that non-Mongol wafidi≠yah who came from al-‘Irāq and other regions join the halqa≠ unit.50 We can thus add provisionally to the four above-mentioned categories a fifth category:

(e) Assigned to the halqa≠ unit.

In order to consider whether assignments to all five of these categories were actually made in practice, let us take two examples from events that occurred in the reign of Baybars.

The first example is Shams al-D|n Sala≠r al-Mustans˝ir|’s group, who arrived in Egypt in 660/1262 and were the first military refugees in the reign of Baybars (see no. 1 in list above). According to Ibn Shadda≠d, when Baybars received them, "he made him [Sala≠r] amir of fifty cavalrymen, took into service one hundred persons from those who arrived with him, and divided the rest among amirs."51 In this passage, we find mention of those who were appointed to the rank of amir, i.e., Sala≠r himself, those who were assigned to the sultan’s own unit, and those who were divided among amirs’ units. Sala≠r’s "fifty cavalrymen" meant that he could retain his own followers within the limit of fifty. Those who were taken "into service" would have joined either the mamluk unit or the halqa≠ unit, but it is unclear which they joined in this case. Thus, of Sala≠r’s three hundred followers, one-sixth stayed under their original leader (case d above), one-third joined the mamluk unit or halqa≠ unit (case a or e), and half were assigned to various amirs’ units (case c).

The next example is the first group of Mongol refugees which came in 660/1262, one of the leaders of which was Sayf al-Dīn Ṣaraghān Āghā (see no. 2 in above list). When they arrived at Cairo, Sultan Baybars "made their leaders amirs with one hundred cavalrymen or less and assigned the rest to his Bah|=yah unit and to his mamluks."52 It is clear that Ṣaraghān and other anonymous leaders were permitted

50Ibn Shadda≠d, Tarikh, 331.
51Ibid., 330.
to keep more than one hundred of their followers in total. Since this group consisted of two hundred cavalrymen, we can conclude that more than half of them stayed in the service of their original leader (case d) and that less than half joined the mamluk unit (case a).

These two examples show that the five categories of Ibn Shaddād can be substantiated by fact, even though the difference between (a) and (e) is unclear. As this categorization applies to the reign of Baybars only, let us examine the cases of all other wāfidiyah we know about in the period under discussion.

THE STARTING RANK OF THE WĀFIDI AMIRS

First, let us investigate the military refugees who were appointed to the rank of amir in the above category (b). Ibn Shaddād ranks this category as second to those who were recruited into the sultan’s unit. But we treat them first here because they were commanders of the various wāfidiyah groups originally. Although some of the soldiers under them reached the rank of amir during their later careers in the Mamluk army, we shall treat them in a later section and here look at the starting rank to which the commanders were appointed on their arrival.

Although Ibn Shaddād states that the commanders were made amirs of tablkhānah and “from ten to twenty cavalrymen,” Shams al-Dīn Salār al-Mustansīrī was made amir of “fifty cavalrymen,” as seen above. The fact that not forty but fifty cavalrymen were allowed to Salār means in those times there was a lack of the strict uniformity of rank of later times, i.e., amir of one hundred, amir of forty, amir of ten. In 672/1273–74, Shams al-Dīn Bahādur from Sumaysīt (see no. 6 above) was made amir of twenty cavalrymen, which is also not in accordance with the normative size of Mamluk amirs’ units, as R. Stephen Humphreys has shown, at least during the reign of Baybars.

On the other hand, Sayf al-Dīn Saraghān Āghā and other leaders of the first Mongol refugees in 660/1262 were made “amirs with one hundred cavalrymen or less,” as seen above. If we take this as appointment to the rank of “amir of one hundred,” they can be regarded as having gotten a higher rank than Ibn Shaddād’s generalization. On this point, while Ayalon states that “Baybars’ reign is also marked by the absence of a single appointment to the rank of Amir of a Hundred,”

53Ibid., 137.
as Sato Tsugitaka points out, Ayalon’s statement is a mistake, “although the example of such an appointment was indeed rare.”

Reuven Amitai-Preiss regards the report of this appointment as “mere hyperbole” because the appointment of one of the wāfiḍiyah to this rank “is not substantiated by one concrete example from the sources.” In my view, there is no logical reason for denying this appointment itself, although we should not regard it as to the highest rank of amir because of the lack of a strict uniformity of rank in the early Mamluk period. At least one of these Mongol wāfiḍī amirs must have been appointed to a relatively high rank in Baybars’ reign.

However, it is true that most of the wāfiḍī amirs were appointed to the rank of amir of ṭablkhānah. The following list shows the starting rank of twenty-two wāfiḍī commanders. The number in parentheses is the number of the group they were associated with in the list above.

1. Shams al-Dīn Salār (1) Amir of fifty cavalrymen
2. Ṣarīm al-Dīn Ṣaragḥān (2) Amir of one hundred cavalrymen
3. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn and others (3) Amir of ṭablkhānah
4. Sayf al-Dīn Baklak (4) Amir of ṭablkhānah
5. Muẓaffar al-Dīn Washshāḥ ibn Shahrī (4) Amir of ṭablkhānah
7. Shams al-Dīn Bahādūr (6) Amir of twenty cavalrymen
8. Aqūsh (10) Amir of ṭablkhānah
9. Taḥaghāy (12) Amir of ṭablkhānah
10. Ulūs (12) Amir of ten cavalrymen
12. ‘Alī (14) Amir of ten cavalrymen
13. Nīrūz (14) Commander (taqdimah)
14. Ṭāyirbughā (20) Amir of ṭablkhānah
15. Yahyā ibn Ṭāyirbughā (20) Amir of ten cavalrymen
16. Muḥammad Bīḥ ibn Jamaq (21) Amir of ṭablkhānah
17. Tamurtāsh ibn Jūbān (22) Amir of one hundred
18. Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn (23) Amir of ṭablkhānah
19. Fakhr al-Dīn Maḥmūd (23) Amir of ṭablkhānah
20. Ḥusayn (23) Amir of ten cavalrymen

57 Sato, State and Rural Society, 101–2.
59 For the personal data of each amir, see the Appendix.
21. Kābik (23)  Amir of ten cavalrymen
22. Naṣir al-Dīn Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh (24)  Amir of one hundred in Syria

We find that most of them initially held the rank of amir of ṭablkhānah. Only three commanders (nos. 2, 17, and 22) were made “amir of one hundred” when they arrived. Six commanders (nos. 7, 10, 12, 15, 20, 21) were appointed to a lower rank like ten or twenty cavalrymen, but in the case of five of them (nos. 10, 12, 15, 20, 21) their colleague commanders from their same group were given ṭablkhānah rank.

This tendency seems to reflect the idea in those days that the rank of ṭablkhānah was the one suitable for refugee commanders. For example, Sultan Kitbughā welcomed the Oirat refugees, who arrived in 695/1296, and intended to appoint their commander Tāraghāy amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand. But when he consulted with the amirs, they suggested to him that he should give Tāraghāy the rank of ṭablkhānah at first and promote him later.

What the rank of ṭablkhānah actually means, however, must be considered. Some sources other than Ibn Shaddād state that Salār al-Mustanṣirī was made an amir of ṭablkhānah. Therefore he became an amir of fifty cavalrmen and amir of ṭablkhānah concurrently. Moreover, when Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (11) arrived in Cairo in 703/1304, Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad “made him an amir of ṭablkhānah and granted him one hundred cavalrymen.” In these two examples, the rank of “amir of ṭablkhānah” is obviously not equal to having forty cavalrmen. Humphreys points out the honorary meaning of the rank of ṭablkhānah bestowed on foreign vassals in the earlier years of Baybars’ reign and states, “this title signified less a specific rank than one’s entry into the political-military elite of the Kingdom.”

We must distinguish between the honorary meaning of the rank of ṭablkhānah and the number of cavalrmen that they could accommodate, at least in the second reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad.

Furthermore, we must pay attention to the fact that appointment to the rank of

---

60But three more amirs (nos. 11, 14, and 18 in the above list) were raised to amir of one hundred soon after their arrival. See below.
63Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Tuhfah, 175. In fact, Jankalī was appointed amir of ṭablkhānah upon arrival, and then was raised to amir of one hundred. See below.
64Humphreys, ‘Emergence of the Mamluk Army,’ pt. 2, 169.
amir in the Mamluk Sultanate always involved distribution of an *iqṭā’*. Consider the following passages:

[Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad] appointed him [Jankal] amir of *tablkhānah* upon the *iqṭā’* of the amir Bahā’ al-Dīn Qaraqūsh, who was transferred to Damascus.66

The amir Bahā’ al-Dīn Qaraqūsh was transferred to amir of Ṣafad, and Jankal was granted his rank of amir, which is *tablkhānah*.67

[Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad] ordered him [Jankal] to live in the citadel, and on his settling down, ordered the amir Bahā’ al-Dīn Qaraqūsh to leave for Ṣafad and granted his *iqṭā’* to this Jankal.68

All these three passages describe the same event. Although they have diverse information about the new post of the amir Qaraqūsh, in this case it is obvious that the rank of amir which he had held was connected with a certain *iqṭā’* and that Jankal was granted both at the same time. As for the correspondence between the rank of amir and an *iqṭā’*, another example can be found in the case of Mahmūd ibn Sharwān (no. 15). Upon his arrival, this Mahmūd was made only an amir of *tablkhānah*, but when the amir Ṭāyirbughā, who was one of the commanders of one thousand and was himself a ḍafīdī amir, died, Mahmūd was raised to commander of one thousand in his place, and at the same time he received Ṭāyirbughā’s *iqṭā’*.69

These examples show that there was a one-to-one correspondence between each rank of amir and a certain *iqṭā’* in this period. In order to recruit a commander of the military refugees, it was necessary for the sultan to transfer another amir or to wait for some amir’s death. This rule can also be substantiated by the following two examples: Tamurtāsh (14) gained the rank of amir of one hundred in the place of Amir Sanjar al-Jamaqdār,70 and Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh (19) was appointed commander of one thousand in Damascus in the place of Amir Barsbughā al-‘Ādillī.71
We can observe a result of the redistribution of *iqṭāʾ*’s carried out by al-Manṣūr Lājīn and al-Naṣir Muḥammad in the examples after Jankalī’s defection in 703/1304. Because of the reform of the *iqṭāʾ* system, it became impossible to bestow high rank and large *iqṭāʾ*’s upon ṭabīṣī amirs when they arrived. Instead, the sultan consistently gave them the rank of ṭablkhānah as an honorary rank. Accordingly, it is meaningless to compare their starting ranks, most of which were amir of ṭablkhānah. Rather we must investigate their ranks later in their careers.

**Waṣīdī Soldiers Assigned to Units**

**Those Recruited into the Sultan’s Mamluk Unit**

During the reign of Baybars, there are statements that a part of the ṭabīṣī soldiers were incorporated into the sultan’s mamluk unit (category [a] above). Baybars assigned fewer than half of the first Mongol ṭabīṣī “to his Bahriyah unit and to his mamluks,” as seen above, and when the number of military refugees increased after that, Baybars “divided all groups among twice their number of royal mamluks” (wa-yufarriqhum kull jamāʾih bayna adʿāfihā min al-mamālik al-sulṭāniyyah). Further, Qalāwūn assigned some of the followers of Shaykh ‘Alī (no. 10) to his own mamluk unit or to the khāṣṣakīyah.

Sato states, “It is not clear whether the Mongols who were incorporated into the Mamluk corps became slaves or not.” In my opinion, they did not become slaves, but remained free men, for one would expect some evidence of the conflicts that would have occurred if they had been enslaved. Rather, the sources emphasize their honorable positions within the Mamluk army: Ibn Shaddād ranks this group as first on the above-mentioned list, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir states, “Each one of them became like an independent amir attended by soldiers and slaves (ghilmān).” We also noted above the ṭabīṣīyah of Salār, one hundred of whom were taken into service, but we could not determine whether they joined the mamluk unit or the ḥalqah. Thus, the historians of the early Mamluk period seem to have regarded the fact that they were assigned to the immediate control of the sultan as important, while they disregarded whether or not they became slaves.

Among those in this category in the later period, Aydamur al-Khatirī and Bahādur al-Damūdāshī (nos. 15 and 25 in the Appendix) were the most successful. These two came to Egypt under the command of ṭabīṣī amirs, were assigned to
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72 For the result of the redistribution of *iqṭāʾ*’s (rawk), see Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 152–61.
75Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 102.
the sultans’ mamluk units, and reached the rank of amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand in their later careers. Amitai-Preiss regards Aydamur al-Khatır as a “non-affiliated” amir, i.e., neither al-Manşûrîyah nor al-Nâşirîyah. However, Aydamur’s biography states that he was “the greatest of al-Burjî amirs” and many sources call him “al-Manşûrî.” Bahâdûr al-Damurdâshî was one of the twenty-four commanders of one thousand at the time of the death of al-Nâşir Muhammad, and he was classified among “his (i.e., al-Nâşîr’s) mamluks and khawāṣṣ” and was called “al-Nâşîrî.” We can consider that these two were not only wâfidîyah but also mamluk amirs. Thus, even in this later period, the difference between free men and slaves in the Mamluk army was not always clear.

**THOSE DIVIDED INTO THE AMIRS’ UNITS**

This category (category [c] above) can be found in the case of Salâr’s group, half of whom were divided among amirs’ units. When Mu’min Āghâ (no. 8 in list beginning on p. 57) and his followers sought refuge with Qalâwûn in 681/1283, his two sons were assigned to serve under the amir Sayf al-Dîn Ṭūruntây, nā’īb al-saltânah of Qalâwûn.

Ibn Shaddâd ranks this category as the last on the list shown above, and its minor position within the Mamluk army is substantiated by the following two examples. First, when al-‘Ādîl Kitbughâ was dethroned, the new sultan al-Manṣûr Lâjîn arrested three commanders of the Oirat refugees, Târâghây, Kaktây, and Ulûs. As for the rest of them, “some of them came to serve under amirs [in Egypt] and others went to Syria and sought to enter the service of amirs.” Second, when six hundred followers of Tamurtâsh arrived at Egypt in 728/1328, al-Nâşîr “was antipathetic towards those who were in Tamurtâsh’s service and divided a part of them among amirs, so that they served under them without iqtâ’s.” Both examples show that this category did not provide favorable conditions for the military refugees, and the latter shows that they were assigned without being given iqtâ’s.

**THOSE RETAINED IN THE UNIT OF THEIR ORIGINAL LEADER**

Before seeking refuge, the wâfidîyah had been part of a military organization, very different from that of the army of the Mamluk Sultanate, stationed in Mongol-controlled areas. After they sought refuge, most had to accept being dispersed into
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various units of the Mamluk army, but a part of them (case [d] above) were able to remain in the service of their original commanders, who had gained the rank of amir.

As seen above, Salār al-Mustanṣirī was allowed to keep his followers up to the limit of fifty persons out of three hundred, and Saraghān Āghā kept at least one hundred out of two hundred. For the later wāfidiyyah, we have little information on how many followers remained under their commanders. But I suppose that a certain number of them remained in their original leaders’ units and that these units constituted the various wāfidiyyah groups in the Mamluk army, as will be seen later.

Those Assigned to the Ḥalqah Unit

Let us return to the previous question: did most of the wāfidiyyah join the ḥalqah unit (case [e] above)? Here also let us start with the reign of Baybars. During his reign, Ibn Shaddād states, none of the Mongol wāfidiyyah were assigned to the ḥalqah unit, as seen above, and no other contemporary sources report their assignment to the ḥalqah either.83 It is uncertain whether those of the wāfidiyyah from al-‘Irāq commanded by Salār al-Mustanṣirī who were “taken into service” were assigned to the ḥalqah unit or the mamluk unit. As a whole, no wāfidiyyah groups are described as assigned to the ḥalqah during the reign of Baybars, except for a few ‘Irāqī wāfidiyyah. Ayalon points out that the amir Sayf al-Dīn Qunqur al-Tatarī, who came to Egypt in the reign of Baybars but whose arrival year is unknown, “was assigned a good iqt¸a‘ in the ḥalqah.”84 If we consult with more contemporary sources, however, we find no account like this.85

After the reign of Baybars, also, we find only a few cases of wāfidiyyah who were assigned to the ḥalqah. Al-Maqrīzī states that about 300 commanders of the Oirat refugees, except for Taraghāy and al-Luṣūṣ (Ulūṣ), were made commanders in the ḥalqah (taqādum fi al-ḥalqah),86 but this information is not found in any contemporary source. According to al-‘Aynī, who cites al-Yūṣufī, Nīrūz, a brother of the amir Jankalī, was appointed taqdimah, which was possibly taqdimat al-ḥalqah (commander of the ḥalqah). Through all the period covered in the present article, we find no indication that the wāfidiyyah in general joined the ḥalqah unit, contrary

83See the cases of Saraghān Āghā and Karmūn Āghā (nos. 2 and 3 in the list).

Article: http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/MSR_X-1_2006-Nakamachi-Nobutaka.pdf
to Ayalon’s statement. Besides, it is necessary to clarify what the term ḥalqah meant in this period. Here, Ayalon and Humphreys’ argument about the ḥalqah is helpful. They both accept the fact that the ḥalqah in the army of Saladin was an elite force under the personal command of the sultan. Ayalon considers that the ḥalqah kept its high position at least until the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and that it gradually declined because of the redistribution of iqtā’. On the other hand, Humphreys argues that the ḥalqah was already weak at the beginning of Baybars’ reign, because “it comprised the bulk of the provincial Syrian troops.” The basic disagreement between these two is whether there was much continuity between the Ayyubids and the Mamluks, or not.

Ayalon and Humphreys, however, agree that the ḥalqah in the Bahri period was still attached to the sultan as royal troops. This seems to be a key to the solution of the obscure treatment of the waḥidiyyah. As seen above, the Mongol waḥidiyyah in the reign of Baybars were assigned to the sultan’s mamluk unit without being enslaved, supposedly. We can just say that they joined the royal troops. The expression khāṣṣakīyah used by Ibn Shaddād can be used whether they were mamluks or free men. As for the troops of Salār al-Mustansīrī, there is no designation whether they joined the mamluks or the ḥalqah; they are simply described as being taken “into service.”

In my view, during the reign of Baybars, the ḥalqah, the khāṣṣakīyah, and even the sultan’s mamluks constituted one royal troop, and there was no distinction among the terms. The distinction between mamluks and free men inside this troop would not have mattered in this period. So I disagree with Humphreys on the point that he regards the ḥalqah of Baybars as second-class royal troops. Rather, I agree with Ayalon’s view of the early Mamluk ḥalqah, but disagree with him on the point that regards the ḥalqah as a separate troop from the mamluks.

It is true that the ḥalqah became second-class royal troops but only in a later period. Furthermore, we have found little connection between the waḥidiyyah and the ḥalqah. Accordingly, we cannot support Ayalon’s statement that we know the waḥidiyyah were discriminated against because they joined the ḥalqah.

**Advancement in the Mamluk Army**

So far we have only dealt with the rank assigned to military refugees when they...
had just arrived. But we can also identify those who were later promoted to higher rank. Especially, we can identify nine amirs of one hundred from the wāfidiyyah (nos. 1, 4, 12, 15, 20, 23, 24, 25, and 27 in the Appendix), while Ayalon counts only four amirs of one hundred. Besides, other wāfidī amirs seem to have reached politically important positions at the Mamluk court, although they are not described as amirs of one hundred in any source (nos. 2, 5, 6, 11, 13, and 22 in the Appendix). Wāfidi amirs in high positions can be seen throughout the period in question. If we divide this period into two phases, with the third enthronement of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in 1310 as a dividing point, we can see that the reasons for their advancement were different in the two phases.

**The First Phase (1262–1310)**

In the first phase, from the outset of the Mamluk Sultanate until 1310, i.e., before the third enthronement of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, most of these refugees remained with their own military units which maintained their solidarity. Let us look at some groups which arrived at various times.

The Mongol wāfidiyyah who come in the reign of Baybars (nos. 2–3 in the list) often appear in the sources as a group under Mongol commanders afterwards. For example, in 680/1281, when Sultan al-ʿĀdil Sulāmīsh, a son of Baybars, was dethroned and Qalāwūn became sultan, a group called al-tātār al-wāfidiyyah fled from Cairo, under command of their leader Sayf al-Dīn Karāy (no. 6 in the Appendix) and his sons. This episode shows that they had still kept their Mongol tribal bond for about twenty years. Since this Karāy and his unit returned to Cairo later and submitted to the authority of Qalāwūn, it seems they maintained their unit during the reign of Qalāwūn. There are also some accounts in the chronicles stating that one of their leaders, Sayf al-Dīn Nūkāy (no. 4 in the Appendix) participated in several expeditions against the Crusaders and the Mongols until 699/1299, so we can suppose that their unit continued to exist as a viable military unit no less than thirty-six years after their arrival.

The Rūm wāfidiyyah (no. 7 in the list) left little trace in the sources after their defection. But two of their leaders (nos. 11 and 12 in the Appendix) achieved high positions in the reign of al-Manṣūr Lājin and the third reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Therefore it can be supposed that this group also maintained its political power for a long time.

As for the famous Oirat refugees (no. 12 in the list), they retained not only their tribal solidarity, but also their religious creed and lifestyle during the reign of
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Sultan Kitbugha. For example, it is reported that they did not observe the fast in the month of Ramaḍān, and that they ate the meat of horses that they had not slaughtered according to Islamic conventions, but had been beaten to death, as was their custom. Yet this situation did not continue for long, as seen above. After their leaders were arrested, they could no longer remain a strong military faction and we find only a few accounts about them, such as the short-lived riot in 1299.

We can generalize the first phase using the five categories mentioned above as follows: a large number of category (d) soldiers continued to serve under category (b), i.e., waḍīdī amirs. These amirs were advanced for reasons of their military ability and the large number of category (d) soldiers under their command, for the sultans in this phase needed these military refugees in order to solidify the newborn Mamluk state as well as to bolster their own authority. Wāḍīdīyāh of categories (a) and (c), i.e., those taken into the units of the sultan or other amirs, are also found in this period, but these categories produced no high-ranking amirs.

On the other hand, the wāḍīdīyāh in this phase are also characterized by their marital ties to the sultans. For example, two of the four wives of Baybars at the time of his death were daughters of Mongol wāḍīdī amirs who came to Egypt in 661/1263, and a daughter of Karmūn, the leader of these wāḍīdīyāh, had been another of his wives. Qalāwūn married another daughter of Karmūn, who gave birth to his son al-Ṣālih ‘Alī, and also the daughter of one of the Rūm wāḍīdīyāh. She is known as the mother of the sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Besides, Qalāwūn married his two sons, al-Ṣālih ‘Alī and al-Ashraf Khalīl, to the daughters of Mongol wāḍīdīyāh.

What was the reason for these close marital ties between the wāḍīdī amirs and the Mamluk elite? As for the Oirat, Ayalon points out their physical beauty and states, ‘Many Mamluks married Oirat wives.’ In my opinion, however, the Mamluk elites’ preference for the daughters of wāḍīdī amirs had rather to do with their fathers’ military ability. The sultans wanted marriage with their daughters for political reasons: they regarded the wāḍīdīyāh as reliable supporters.

The Second Phase (After 1310)
In this phase, i.e., the third reign of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and afterwards, unlike the first phase, we can find no unit that consisted of military refugees

94 Al-Nuwayrī, Niḥāyah, 30:298.
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97 See nos. 2, 4, 6, and 10 in the Appendix.
98 Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 92, 100.
alone, and only those amirs who had personal connections with the sultan could reach high rank.

The amir Badr al-Dīn Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (no. 20 in the Appendix) advanced to the highest rank in the Mamluk Sultanate, but when he arrived in Egypt in 703/1304, he had brought only several horsemen with him. So when he was made an amir of one hundred, his unit could not have consisted of Mongols only. The reason for his advancement is unknown, but it is clear that it depended on his personal connection to Sultan al-Nāṣir rather than his troop’s strength. This connection is reflected in the fact that his daughter married a son of al-Nāṣir.

If we again take an example from the Oirat wāfidiyah, the amir Qararnah (no. 18 in the Appendix) is noteworthy. After the dissolution of this group, most of the Oirat were divided among the amirs’ units, and it is not clear how this amir Qararnah was treated. But during the third reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, Qararnah was sent to the Ilkhanids as an envoy, and during the reigns of the sons of al-Nāṣir, he was sent to post-Ilkhanid Baghdad twice. These appointments were presumably due to his geographical knowledge of Iran or his skill as an interpreter of the Mongol language. He eventually reached the rank of amir of ṭablkhānah, thus becoming the most successful Oirat in the Mamluk Sultanate.

The group commanded by Tamurtāsh (no. 24 in the Appendix) was welcomed by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad at first, but when al-Nāṣir arrested Tamurtāsh and executed him, the men were divided among Mamluk amirs.99 Bahādur al-Damurdāshi (no. 25 in the Appendix) had been under this Tamurtāsh’s command, as his nisba shows, and then was assigned to al-Nāṣir’s mamluk unit. Afterwards, though his former colleagues vainly rose in revolt in 732/1331–32,100 he reached the highest rank of amir, and his prosperity continued until his death in 743/1343, in the reign of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl. He married a daughter of al-Nāṣir, and it is clear that his advancement was closely related to his personal connection to the sultan. Similarly, the brothers Badr al-Dīn and Sharaf al-Dīn ibn Khāṭīr (nos. 13–14 in the Appendix) were promoted to high ranks, despite their original affiliation, the Rūm wāfidiyah.

One of the last refugees, Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn (no. 26 in the Appendix) was supposedly advanced because of his skill as an administrator. Before coming to Egypt, he had been a vizier of Baghdad,101 and that is why he was treated favorably by Sultan al-Nāṣir. And then, in the reign of al-Maṃṣūr Abū Bakr, a son of al-Nāṣir, he was appointed vizier.

Thus, throughout the second phase, we can find several wāfidi amirs (category [b]), who kept only a few of their original soldiers (category [d]) under their

---

99Al-‘Aynī, “‘Īqd,” MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 97v.
100Ibid., fols. 171v–172r.
101However, I could not find any evidence that he was a vizier in Baghdad in Persian sources.
command. These amirs were able to reach high rank, not by their military importance, but by their strong connections to the sultan or by their skill as administrators. In this phase, we also find high amirs recruited into the sultans’ units (category [a]) whose advancement owed to personal factors.

In this second phase, we still find several examples of marital ties between wāfidi families and the Mamluk elite. These ties, however, were based on the sultans’ favoritism toward them, while those in the first phase were based on the wāfidiyah’s military importance.

CONCLUSION
The present study has clarified that the wāfidiyah’s status was higher than scholars have realized. A certain number of them were recruited into the royal troops, not into the halqah, a minor unit in the Mamluk army. Some of the wāfidi amirs reached the highest rank in the Mamluk army.

Of course, their status was not unchanging from the beginning to the end, and the change in their status closely reflected the change of structure of the Mamluk Sultanate. At the outset of the Mamluk Sultanate, the wāfidiyah could retain their tribal units because the sultans needed to make use of their capable forces to strengthen the newborn state and to solidify their own authority. Owing to this tribal solidarity, their leaders could reach high positions in the Mamluk military system. In the third reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, however, the centralization of power was achieved, and the sultan no longer needed to depend on strong units of military refugees. He could advance his favorite retainers whether they were sultan’s mamluks or not. Therefore, in this phase, several highly advanced wāfidi amirs emerged from wāfidiyah groups which had only a small number of personnel or which had collapsed and completely dissolved.

It is true that the wāfidiyah were not mamluks, i.e., those who were brought to the Mamluk Sultanate as slaves or captives. But differences between free men and slaves in the Mamluk army seems to have been less significant than has been realized, at least in the early Mamluk period. The wāfidiyah were outsiders to the sultanate, just as the mamluks were. The wāfidiyah often shared with the royal mamluks the sense of belonging to a certain sultan, because their only base of
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power was the relationship with the sultan who recruited them. The present article shows that the situation of the wāfīdīyah cannot be explained by the dichotomy of slave and free man. It also casts a new light on the Mamluk political order and the relationship between the Mamluk army and the sultans’ household.

Historiography, 72). See also the Oirat wāfīdīyah and Kitbughā’s mamluks in the revolt of 699/1300: al-Maqrīzī, Suluq, 1:883.
APPENDIX: THE LIST OF THE Wāfīdī Amirs
(The number after the name is the number of the group in the previous list with which the individual was associated.)


2. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn al-Tatarī (d. 664/1266, no. 3): His biography is found in Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, Rawd, 264; Shāfi‘ ibn ‘Alī, Ḥusn, 111; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 30:130. He sought refuge in Cairo in 661/1263 accompanied by another thirteen Mongol commanders and their men, and his name is also found in the allocation list of 663/1265. One of his daughters married al-Zāhir Baybars and then the amir Sayf al-Dīn Kunduk al-Zāhirī, while another married al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn and gave birth to his son al-Šāliḥ ‘Alī. Shāfi‘ ibn ‘Alī, Faḍl al-Ma‘thūr min Sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr (Sidon, 1998), 111; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 164, 228; idem, Tuhfah, 56, 87. See also Amitai-Preiss, “Mamluk Officer Class,” 296.

3. Badr al-Dīn Baktāsh ibn Karmūn (no. 3): Ibn Shaddād, Tārīkh, 338. His name is found only in the account of the battle of Himṣ in 679/1280 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 197; idem, Tuhfah, 100; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:33–34; Ibn al-Furāt, Tārīkh, 7:216).


6. Sayf al-Dīn Karāy al-Tātārī (no. 3): He was one of the Mongol refugees, but only later historians list his name (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 84; idem, Tuhfah, 51; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 1:501; al-‘Aynī, ‘‘Iqd, 1:365). One of his daughters married Baybars. When Qalāwūn became sultan, Karāy joined the amir Shams al-Dīn Sunqūr al-Ashqar in Ṣāḥyūn, and returned to Cairo with al-Baḥrīyāh al-Zāhirīyāh and al-Ṭātār al-wāfidiyāh in 680/1281 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 193, 195, 200; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:36; Ibn al-Furat, Tārīkh, 7:214, 221). He had two sons, Shams al-Dīn Aqsunqūr and Aṭṭunṭāsh (Ibn Shaddād, Tārīkh, 114, 338).

7. Sayf al-Dīn Jabrāk al-Tātārī (no. 3): He was one of the fourteen Mongol commanders of 661/1263. His name is found only in the account of the battle of Ḥims in 692/1293 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 181; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:33; Ibn al-Furat, Tārīkh, 7:215; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 1:692).


11. Mubāriz al-Dīn Sawārī ibn Tarkarī, Amīr Shikārī (d. 704/1304–5, no. 7): He was one of the Rūm wāfidi amirs (Ibn Shaddād, Tārīkh, 154–55; al-Yūnīnī,
Dhayl, 3:166; Mufaddal, Nahj, 2:407–8). He is also known as one of the sixteen amirs who supported al-Manṣūr Lājin in 696/1296 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 313). Biography: Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 382; al-Maqrīzī, Sulük, 2:14; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 2:275; Ibn Taghrībirdī, Nujūm, 8:217.


15. ʿĪzz al-Dīn Aydamur al-Ḵaṭṭīr al-Manṣūrī (d. 738/1337–38, no. 7): Originally he was one of the mamluks of Nizām al-Dīn Awḥad ibn Ḫaṭṭīr (father of the amirs numbered 13 and 14 above) and was later assigned to the Burjīyah unit by Qalāwūn. He reached the rank of amir of one hundred in the third reign of al-Nāṣir. Biography: al-ʿUṣūfī, Nuzhah, 384; al-Ṣafadī, Aʿyān, 1:660; idem, Wāfī, 10:17; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 1:511–12; Ibn Taghrībirdī, Manhal, 3:180–82; idem, Nujūm, 9:312. See also Amitai, “Remaking of the Military Elite,” 161; Sato, “Proposers and Supervisors,” 82.

16. Ṭaraghāy (no. 12): He was a leader of the Oirat refugees in 695/1296. For his career under the Mongols, see Rashīd al-Dīn, Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh (Tehran, 1995), 1262, and also Shimo Hirotoshi, The Political Structure of the Mongol Empire: The Core Tribes of the Ilkhanid (in Japanese) (Tokyo, 1995), 275–76. He was favored by al-ʿĀdl Kitbughā, but in the reign of al-Manṣūr Lājin he and the Oirats were purged (al-ʿAynī, ʿIqd, 3:356). His brief biography is found only in Ibn Taghrībirdī, Manhal, 6:381–82.

17. Ulūṣ (d. 699/1300?, no. 12): After the purge of the Oirat, among their leaders,
he was the only one released, for unknown reasons. In 699/1300, he conspired with Sayf al-Dīn Burīṭāy, one of the sultan’s mamluks, and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Qutulūbars al-‘Ādīlī, a mamluk of Kitbughā, and revolted, but they were soon put down and executed (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 330; idem, Tuhfah, 156; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:381; Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz, 9:15; Mufaḍḍal, Nahj, 2:632; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 1:883).

18. Qararnah (d. 749/1348–49, no. 12): One of the Oirat refugees, he was appointed amir of ṭablkhānah by al-Nāṣir. He was sent as envoy to the Ilkhanids several times. Biography: Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 4:290.

19. Sulāmish (d. 698/1299, no. 13): He was the governor of al-Rūm under the Ilkhanids and sought refuge in Egypt in 698/1299. Leaving his brother Qutqutū, who was given an iqtā’ in Egypt, he went to al-Rūm, where he was caught and executed by the Ilkhanid army. See Rashīd al-Dīn, Jāmi’, 1287, 1289; Shimo, Political Structure, 129.


23. Sayf al-Dīn Tāyīrbughā (Ẓahirbughā) (d. 738/1337, no. 20): He was one of the relatives of Sultan al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn. When he arrived with Ilkhanid envoys in 726/1326, he was made amir of ṭablkhānah, and was raised to the rank of amir of one hundred before long. He read and wrote the Mongol language in the sultan’s court. Biography: al-Ṣafadī, A’yān, 2:635–36; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 2:234.

24. Tamurtāsh (Damurdāsh) ibn Jūbān (d. 728/1328, no. 22): He was the governor of al-Rūm in Ilkhanid territory, and he sought refuge in Egypt in 728/1328. He was made amir of one hundred, but al-Nāṣir executed him seven months after he arrived, on account of the peace treaty with the Ilkhanids. Biography:

25. Bahādur al-Damūrdaš al-Nāṣir (d. 743/1343, no. 22): He was originally a mamluk of Tamurtaš and was later assigned to al-Nāṣir’s mamluk unit. He became amir of one hundred in the latter half of the third reign of al-Nāṣir. Biography: al-Shujāʿī, Tārīkh, 252–53; al-Ṣafādī, Wāfī, 10:299; idem, Aʿyān, 2:62–63; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 2:36.

26. Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn ʿAlī ibn Sharwīn (d. 748/1347, no. 23): Known as "the vizier of Baghdad." He sought refuge from Baghdad accompanied by some officials and their families in 738/1337. He was made amir of one hundred and after al-Nāṣir’s death he held the post of vizier three times. Biography: al-Ṣafādī, Aʿyān, 5:399; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 6:90; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 2:755; Ibn Taghrībirdī, Nujūm, 10:183; Ayalon, "Wafidiya,” 93.

27. Ḥusayn al-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ghawrī (no. 23): He came to Egypt with the above Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn and was appointed Hanafi qadi (al-Shujāʿī, Tārīkh, 19). Biography: al-Ṣafādī, Wāfī, 3:22; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 3:430.
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