

## THE WAFIDIYA IN THE MAMLUK KINGDOM \*

THE Westward migration of the Mongol peoples from the Eurasian steppe left a most durable impress on the Mamluk state. The influence of the Mongols' institutions on those of the Mamluks was very considerable,<sup>1</sup> but the Mamluk kingdom was made to feel the impact of that race in yet another way. The Mongols caused a violent upheaval among the peoples whose regions they overflowed, especially among those nomadic races which had preceded them in their Westward advance.<sup>2</sup> Large numbers of the populations thus displaced and dispersed by Mongol pressure entered the Mamluk kingdom in one of two ways : (a) as Mamluk slaves, enabling the Ayyubid Sultan Najm ad-Din as-Salih Ayyub, according to Ibn Khaldun, to buy Mamluks on an extensive scale,<sup>3</sup> and to organize his Bahriya regiment, from which the Mamluk state sprang up ; (b) as refugees and exiles who immigrated into the Mamluk kingdom with their tribal organization intact, in order to seek asylum from the Mongol hordes. This immigration of refugees was not, however, confined to races uprooted by the Mongol impact, but included a large proportion of Mongols who also came to seek shelter in the Mamluk state, as a result of the conflicts which broke out among the Western Mongol states, among the Mongol tribes, or between a Mongol Khan and one of his high-ranking subordinates. Some came in the wake of famines in their migratory regions, or because they were attracted by the wealth of Egypt. The immigration of Mongols took place, for the most part, during the reigns of the two Sultans, Baybars al-Bunduqdari and al-Adil Kitbugha, the first an admirer of the Mongol regime, and the second himself a member of that ethnic group.

The present paper is concerned with a description of the influx of these exiles and refugees into the Mamluk kingdom, which began as

---

[ \* This paper is a chapter from a work on the Mamluk army. ]

1. Ibn Taghribirdi, *an-Nujum az-Zahira* (Cairo ed.), VII, pp. 182-187. As-Suyuti, *Husn al-Muhadara* (Cairo, A.H. 1299), II, p. 130 Al-Maqrizi, *Khitat*, II, p. 219 ff.

2. The proportions of this upheaval can be learned from Ibn Khaldun, *Kitab al-'Ibar*, V, pp. 520, l. 18-521, l. 2, as well as pp. 371-373.

3. Ibn Khaldun, *lec. cit.*

early as the close of the Ayyubid period, and persisted on a fairly large scale through the first 70 or 80 years of the Mamluk period.

The immigrants in question are called in the sources principally by the name of wafidiya or wafidun,<sup>4</sup> (sing. wafidi or wafid), *i.e.*, "immigrants, those coming from outside," but also musta'minun or musta'mina,<sup>5</sup> *i.e.*, "those seeking aman (security, protection)." They entered the Mamluk state as *free* men, and *remained* free. It is, therefore, of some interest to examine the status of these immigrants within the military framework of a state in which the main road to joining the upper caste and to rise in the military or military-administrative careers was through Mamluk servitude.

The military status of the Wafidiya, especially that of the Tatars among them, was doubtless much superior to that of the Turcoman, Kurdish and Arab auxiliaries. This superiority was expressed by the fact that great numbers of them received permission to dwell in the capital of the realm,<sup>6</sup> and among those a fairly large proportion served with the troops of the Mamluk amirs,<sup>7</sup> while a limited number was even incorporated into the Royal Mamluks, some even into the Khassakiya,<sup>8</sup> the elite of the Royal Mamluks. Many intermarried with the Mamluks.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the status of the vast majority was much lower than that of most Mamluks. Although many of the Tatar Wafidiya succeeded in penetrating purely Mamluk regiments, most of them joined the Halqa,<sup>10</sup> whose status, though considerably higher than during the later Mamluk period, was greatly inferior to that of the Mamluk units. The Wafidiya's

4. Al-Maqrizi, *Kitab as-Suluk*, I, p. 686, l. 1 ; p. 798, l. 20 ; II, p. 8, n. 2 ; p. 13, l. 21 ; p. 22, l. 11. Zettersteen, *Geschichte der Mamlukensultane*, p. 39, l. 3 ; p. 209, l. 1. Abu al-Fida' *Kitab al-Mukhtasar fi Ta'rikh al-Bashar*, IV, p. 9, l. 11. See also references listed below.

5. *Suluk*, I, p. 500, ll. 5-6 ; p. 501, l. 1 ; p. 515, ll. 1-6 ; p. 516, l. 12. Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, *ad-Durar al-Kamina*, II, p. 176, ll. 12-13. For the meaning of *ista'mana*, cf. also Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 433, ll. 5-6. See also references listed below.

6. See below concerning the Wafidiya under Baybars and Kitbugha.

7. *Nujum* (C), VII, p. 190, l. 6. *Suluk*, I, 813, l. 5 ; II, p. 22, ll. 36-39 ; p. 23, ll. 1-4. Ibn Kathir, *al-Bidaya wa-n Nihaya*, XIV, p. 133, ll. 1-7. *Khitat*, II, p. 23.

8. *Nujum* (C), VII, p. 130, ll. 3-6. *Durar*, III, p. 248, ll. 13-17. *Suluk*, I, pp. 708, l. 10-709, l. 4. Ibn al-Furat, *Ta'rikh ad-Duwal wa-l-Muluk*, VII, p. 250, ll. 6-7. The composition of the Mamluk army in Egypt was as follows : I. Royal Mamluks (*mamalik sultaniya*), who were subdivided into : (a) the Mamluks of former Sultans (*mamalik as-Salatin al-Mutaqaddima*, *qaranis* or *qaranisa*) ; (b) the Mamluks of the ruling Sultans (*mushtarawat*, *ajlab julban*) ; from among these a corps of pages and body guards was selected, called *Khassakiya* ; (c) Mamluks of the amirs who passed into the service of the Sultan owing to the death or dismissal of their master (*sayfiya*). II. The Mamluks of the amirs (*mamalik al-umara'*, *ajnad al-umara'*). III. The sons of the amirs (*awlad an-nas*) and soldiers drawn from among the local population (*ajnad al-halqa*). The amirs were divided into three classes : 1. Amirs of Ten (*umara' ashara*) ; 2. Amirs of Forty (*umara' arba'in*, or *umara' tablkhana*) ; 3. Amirs of a Hundred and Commanders of a Thousand (*Halqa* troops) (*umara' mi'a muqaddamu alf*). An amir of the last named class is generally called in the sources by one of the following abbreviated designations : *amir mi'a*, *muqaddam alf*, or *amir alf*. Thus when we use now "Amir of a Hundred" and now "Amir of a Thousand," the reference is to the same rank.

9. *Suluk*, I, p. 813, ll. 6-7. *Khitat*, II, p. 22, ll. 36-39.

10. *Khitat*, II, p. 22. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 179, ll. 2-3. Abu al-Fida', IV, p. 103, ll. 13-14. *Nujum* (C), VIII, p. 42, ll. 2-3 ; p. 44, ll. 4-5. Also part of the *Halqa* were other large groups which received fiefs on the Palestine coast ; see below, and also A. N. Poliak, *REI*, 1935, p. 235. A. N. Poliak, "History of Land Tenure Relations in Egypt, Palestine and Syria at the close of the Middle Ages and in Modern Times," (in Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1940, p. 44.

chances for promotion were most restricted. The commander of one of their tribal units could not, upon entering the Mamluk state, generally hope for a rank higher than that of Amir of Forty (Tablkhana).<sup>11</sup> Even Turghay, the commander of the Oirats, and son-in-law of Hulagu Khan,<sup>12</sup> who came at the head of 10,000 first class horsemen, received the rank of Amir of Forty, and his lieutenant that of Amir of Ten. All the other chiefs and commanders who accompanied him were made Commanders of the Halqa (muqaddamu halqa) or received ordinary Halqa fiefs.<sup>13</sup> At the head of another group of Wafidiya stood 16 commanders, all of whose names were listed by the chronicist upon their entering the Mamluk state,<sup>14</sup> *but thenceforward nothing is heard of them.* Of the Wafidiya who came to Egypt during the migration of the tribes only a few were deemed worthy of biographies, and even they were accorded but a few lines.<sup>15</sup> The Sultan az-Zahir Baybars, who had received the first groups of Tatar Wafidiya with open arms, expressed his dissatisfaction at the sight of the constant rise of the immigrant tide by saying : " I fear there is something suspect in their coming from all sides " (akhsha ana fi maji ihim min kull jiha ma yustarab minhu).<sup>16</sup> And, indeed, from that time on the Wafidiya were no longer received with the same enthusiasm by that Sultan. The attempt made by Sultan Kitbugha, who, according to Ibn Kathir, was himself an Oirat,<sup>17</sup> to equalize the status of the Oirat chieftains with that of the Mamluk amirs, was nipped in the bud. His preferential treatment of the members of his race was, according to the explicit testimony of the sources, one of the two main causes of his deposition.<sup>18</sup> Turghay's abortive military coup under Sultan Lajin was ruthlessly suppressed, and he was executed together with other Oirat commanders.<sup>19</sup>

Thus the question poses itself : was the cause of the Wafidiya's failure to rise in rank intentional discrimination or lack of military qualities ? All signs, it seems to the writer, point to the first alternative, for the following reasons :

(a) It is said explicitly of the Khwarizmiya that they were an army of the first order which inspired the various Ayyubid states with

11. Nujum (C), VII, p. 190, ll. 3-6. Durar, II, p. 176, ll. 12-13. Suluk, I, (p. 611, ll. 1-7- ; II, pp. 13-14 ; p. 215, ll. 14-15. Zettersteen, p. 219, ll. 21-23. As-Sakhawi, at-Tibr al-Masbuk, p. 344, ll. 11-14. Suluk, I, p. 512, ll. 2-8.

12. Zettersteen, p. 38, l. 21. Nujum, (C), VIII, p. 60, l. 6.

13. Khitat, II, p. 22.

14. Suluk, I, p. 501, ll. 1-3.

15. Even the great Turghay was not deemed worthy of more than a few lines of biography (Manhal III, fol. 182B, l. 20-183B, l. 5).

16. Suluk, I, p. 515, ll. 1-6.

17. Ibn Kathir, XIII, pp. 338, l. 27-339, l. 1 ; p. 343, ll. 15-17. Maq, Khitat, II, p. 22, ll. 35-36. Maqrizi also states that the Oirats were of the same race as Kitbugha.

18. Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 406, ll. 11-21 ; p. 408, ll. 25-26. Durar, III, pp. 263, l. 19-264, l. 1. Suluk, I, p. 812, ll. 16-17. Khitat, II, p. 23, ll. 1-4. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, ll. 1-3. Al-Mufaddal b. Abi al-Fada'il, an-Nahj as-Sadid (in Patrologia Orientalis), XIV, pp. 592, l. 7-593, l. 3.

19. Khitat, II, p. 23, ll. 1-4.



fear ; their exploits are recounted with full details in the Mamluk chronicles.<sup>20</sup> In the war of as-Salih Najm-ad-Din Ayyub against the Syrian Ayyubids and against the Franks, it is specified that it was the Khwarizmiya who were the decisive factor in as-Salih Ayyub's victory.<sup>21</sup> And what was their reward ? They were removed from Egypt, and an attempt was made to settle them in distant areas ; they were even prohibited from entering Damascus. It is possible that the defence of the coastal area, with which they were entrusted was of the first strategic importance, but from the standpoint of the military hierarchy, it carried much less prestige than belonged to the Sultan's elite corps in Cairo itself, *i.e.*, to the body which determined the fate of the realm, and out of whose ranks had come all the great amirs, including the Sultan himself. That the Khwarizmiya considered their settlement on the coast an unparalleled injustice, is corroborated by their preference of a desperate struggle against the Sultan to bowing to his decree (see below).

(b) There were among the Mamluks many ways of climbing the military scale outside of pure soldierly abilities. Hundreds of such instances are to be found in the Mamluk sources, and many of these are interspersed throughout the writer's work on the Mamluk army, especially in the chapters on the structure of the army, on its ethnic composition, on its march, on pay, on the decline of the kingdom. Thus, if the Wafidiya were promoted on the basis of merit, there is evidence to show that a large number of worthless individuals amongst the Royal Mamluks was promoted to high rank.

(c) One of the ways open to the Mamluks for promotion was physical beauty.<sup>22</sup> The same fact did not, however, help the Oirats who were exceedingly handsome too (see below).

(d) Al-'Adil Kitbugha was an Oirat, who as a Mamluk succeeded in reaching the highest position in the kingdom, culminating in the sultanate. Such was the case also with Salar, an Oirat and Mamluk as well,<sup>23</sup> whilst among the 10,000 (or 18,000) Oirats who came as free individuals, *not one was found worthy of a dignity higher than that of the Amir of Forty*.

(e) We find the following statement in Ibn Khaldun : " The ruling circles begrudged the Sultan al-'Adil Kitbugha his preference of his own Mamluks over them, and his giving equal status to them with the Oirat Tatars, and therefore conducted negotiations for his deposition." (Kana ahl-ad-dawla naqamu 'ala as-sultan Kitbugha al-'Adil taqdim mamalikihi 'alayhim wa-musawat al-uwayratiya<sup>24</sup>

20. Cf. esp. Index to Vol. I of *Suluk*, and below, section on the Khwarizmiya.

21. A detailed description of this may be found in the chapter " The Army on the March " in our work on the Mamluk army. See also below, section on the Khwarizmiya.

22. This question is dealt with in the chapter " The Mamluk Races " in our work on the Mamluk army.

23. *Suluk*, II, p. 89, n. 1 ; p. 97, II. 1-5, 1. 12.

24. The text erroneously reads *اوربانية* but the correct reading is *اوراتیة*

min at-tatar bihim, fa-tafawadu 'ala khal 'ihi).<sup>25</sup> In other words, here were frustrated Mamluks striving *for* equality with Mamluks favoured by the Sultan, but struggling *against* equality with the Wafidiya, even to the point of conspiring against the Sultan who made them suffer this indignity.

(f) Also characteristic of the Mamluks' attitude towards the Wafidiya is the following occurrence. In a quarrel between two Mamluk amirs, one of them said to the other : " You are but a Wafidi exile, how do you give yourself airs of a Royal Mamluk ?" (anta wahid manfi wafidi, taj 'al nafsak mithl mamalik as-sultan).<sup>26</sup> The amir who was the target of this remark was himself a Mamluk, but his companion's invective showed with what sense of the superiority the Royal Mamluks looked upon the Wafidiya.

(g) A phenomenon characteristic of the Wafidiya's immigration to Egypt is the following: as long as this immigration was of very large proportions, and thus a peril to the ruling Mamluk caste, we find among the Wafidiya no amir with a rank higher than that of Amir of Tablkhana.<sup>26 a</sup> On the other hand, when that immigration dwindled down to a few hundred in the days of Muhammad b. Qalaun (first half of the 8th century), we come across several Amirs of Thousand among them, the most important being : 1. Jankali b. al-Baba, from the region of Amid, who received immediately upon his arrival in Egypt the rank of Amir of a Thousand, and became head of the Sultan's council (ra's al-mashura), and sat in state meetings and ceremonies second to the head of the right wing (ra's-al-maymana) ; he came in 703 with a very small number of followers, and earned the gratitude of the Mamluks for the important information he brought them concerning the Tatars.<sup>27</sup> 2. Muhammad b. Sharwin, the wazir of the Mamluk kingdom.<sup>28</sup> There were a few more Amirs of a Thousand of Wafidi origin in the days of an-Nasir Muhammad b. Qalaun.<sup>29</sup> We cannot, of course, be entirely certain that the 7th century Wafidi Amir of a Thousand was not over-looked, but in the days of an-Nasir Muhammad the presence of such amirs is immediately apparent and stands in contrast to the preceding period. This inspite of the fact that immigration was at least several scores of times larger in the preceding period than under an-Nasir Muhammad.

25. Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 408, 11. 25-26.

26. Suluk, II, p. 22, 1. 11.

26 (a) With the exception of Badr ad-Din Muhammad b. Berke Khan al-Khwarizmi, who reached a high rank because he was the brother-in-law of Sultan Baybars and the maternal uncle of al-Malik as-Sa'id Berke Khan, the Mamluk heir apparent ; as such he was not typical of the Wafidiya as a whole.

27. Ibn Kathir, XIV, p. 29, 11. 20-23. Zettersteen, p. 138, 11. 20-23. Suluk, I, p. 950, II. 2-7. ; II, p. 77, 11. 13-19 ; p. 955, 11. 19-20. Mujam (C), IX, p. 164, 11. 2-3. Durar, I, p. 539, 1. 10-540, 1. 20. Khitat, II, pp. 134, 1. 24-135, 1. 8.

28. See his biography in Durar and in Manhal.

29. See Ibn Kathir, XIV, p. 133, 11. 1-7. Nujum (C), IX, pp. 276, 1. 3-277, 1. 3. Nujum (p) V, pp. 51, 1. 21-52, 1. 8. Durar, II, p. 102, 1. 8 ; p. 227, 11. 13-17.

There is another interesting and noteworthy aspect to the Wafidi immigration. As a counter measure to the systematic destruction of the coastal fortifications, carried out by both the Ayyubids and the Mamluks. Owing to their naval weakness an attempt was made to settle part of the Wafidiya on the Syro-Palestinian coast.<sup>29 a</sup>. The beginnings of this settlement policy date back to the end of the Ayyubid period, *viz.*, to a time when the greater part of the coast was still strewn with crusader fort and only small sections of it were yet in the hands of the Muslims.

Below is an account of the immigration of the Wafidiya into the Ayyubid and Mamluk kingdom in chronological order.

### *The Khwarizmiya.*<sup>30</sup>

The Khwarizmiya were the first Wafidiya to enter the Bilad ash-Shamiya, and an attempt was made to settle them on the coast. They had been smitten by Jinghis Khan, and moved westward to Mesopotamia. In 641 they were invited by as-Salih Najm ad-Din Ayyub, the founder of the Bahriya Mamluk regiment, to come to Egypt in order to assist him in his wars against the Ayyubids of Syria and Palestine and against the Franks.<sup>31</sup> The invitation was accepted, and over 10,000 Khwarizmi horse-men, headed by four of their chiefs, of whom the most important was the amir Husam ad-Din Berke Khan al-Khwarizmi, came to the aid of al-Malk as-Salih.<sup>32</sup> They were the decisive factor in as-Salih's victory over the Syrian Ayyubids and the Franks, and in the conquest of Damascus. In the violent battle that took place in 642 between Gaza and Jaffa, and which "had no parallel in Islam, not even in the days of Nur ad-Din and Salah ad-Din," the Egyptian army was routed and fled until al-'Arish, abandoning all its equipment behind it. The Khwarizmiya, on the other hand, held their own. They eventually shook the Syrian lines, demoralized the Franks, surrounded them and cut them down by the sword.<sup>33</sup> In consequence of their military achievements, the Khwarizmiya hoped to share the conquered territory with the Ayyubid Sultan, but their wish was not fulfilled. They were forbidden entrance to Damascus, and were instead settled on the coast

29 (a) This problem is dealt with in the chapter "The Mamluks and the Sea" in our work on the Mamluk army.

30. Our purpose here is not to give a history of the Khwarizmiya, but to give an account of their arrival within the borders of the Ayyubid state and the unsuccessful attempt to settle them on the littoral. A list of references for an account of their history and their relation with the various Ayyubid Sultans, esp. with Najm ad-Din Ayyub, follows: Suluk, I, p. 255, 11. 7-9; 270, 11. 1-3; pp. 271, 1. 4-274, 1. 3; p. 279, 11. 9-10, p. 280, 11. 7-8, 11. 14-16; pp. 292, 1. 12-293, 1. 2; p. 302, 11. 14-15; p. 303, 11. 9-13; pp. 309, 1. 17-310, 1. 2. Nujum (C), VII, p. 293, 11. 11-12; p. 297; pp. 299, 1. 13-300, 1. 3; 305, 1. 13; p. 321, 11. 1-2; p. 322, 11. 1-13; pp. 332-326; pp. 356-357. Adh-Dhahabi, Duwal al-Islam, II, p. 105, 11. 4-5; p. 110, 11. 8-12; pp. 112-114.

31. Suluk, I, p. 315, 11. 5-7.

32. Suluk, I, pp. 316-317.

33. Sibṭ b. al-Jawzi, Mir'at az-Zaman (ed. Jewett), p. 494, 11. 3-16. See also references listed in note 30 above.



and other areas which were split up among them as feudal estates.<sup>34</sup> They rebelled against the Sultan, and after stubborn resistance, they were subdued. They were dispersed in all directions, and some of them joined the Tatars.<sup>35</sup> According to Ibn Khaldun, no trace was left of them in Syria (*dhahaba atharuhum min ash-sham*).<sup>36</sup> But according to a different account, some went to Belqa, joining the army of the Ayyubid Dawud, who intermarried with them and used them to increase his power ; some went to Nablus, and some to Harran.<sup>37</sup> Thus the first attempt to settle a warlike race on the Syrian coast ended in failure.

In connection with the Khwarizmiya, an error fairly common among Orientalists ought to be corrected. The Sultan al-Malik as-Sa'id Berke Khan, son of az-Zahir Baybars, is commonly believed to be the grandson on his mother's side of the Great Khan of the Mongols, Berke Khan b. Jushi b. Jinghis Khan, the chief of the Golden Horde and the great ally of the Mamluk Sultan.<sup>38</sup> This belief is entirely unfounded, as we shall endeavour to show. It is of some importance to set matters right, for the mistaken identification of the grandfather of the Mamluk Berke Khan is liable to distort our view of the relations between the Mamluk kingdom and the Golden Horde, which relations played a role of supreme importance in Islamic history in the later Middle Ages. A. N. Poliak, for example, holds that the Mamluk state was vassal to the Golden Horde,<sup>39</sup> and one of the key supports for his view is this mistaken identification. He goes so far as to state the following : " The comparison of the graduation of titles with that of the Golden Horde sheds a new light on the action of Baybars I, who called his son Barka Khan . . . after the latter's maternal grandfather, the Emperor of the Golden Horde. Its purpose was evidently not only to please the Emperor, but also to promote his son and his successors from kingship to imperial rank. The

34. Suluk, I, p. 321, ll. 13-14 ; p. 322, ll. 4-10.

35. Suluk, I, pp. 324-325.

36. Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 358, ll. 15-19. It is possible however that the banishment of the Khwarizmiya from the coast was not fully complete. Perhaps this is what may be inferred from the following : in 792, Muhammad Shah, the son of the amir Baydimur al-Khwarizimi, who had been governor of Damascus died, when Yalbugha an-Nasiri was deposed and Mintash became the ruler of the Mamluk state. The latter was supported by Muhammad Shah and all the Khwarizmiya (*sirat al-Khwarizmiya kulluhum suhbatahu*) (Ibn al-Furat, IX, p. 392, ll. 5-8). For other data concerning amirs with the title al-Khwarizimi in the period following the disbanding of the Khwarizmiya, see : Zettersteen, p. 132, l. 2. Suluk, I, p. 675, ll. 7-8 ; p. 710, l. 8 ; p. 855, l. 1 ; p. 869, l. 1. Nujum (C), IX, p. 326, ll. 4-5. Khitat, II, p. 317, l. 31. Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 477, ll. 21-24. Some of these amirs are specifically mentioned by the sources as being the descendants of the Khwarizmiya of as-Salih Ayyub.

37. Suluk, I, pp. 324, l. 1-325, l. 2.

38. Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 266 ; p. 277. W. Barthold, 12 Vorlesungen ueber die Geschichte der Tuerken Mittelasiens, p. 176. A. N. Poliak, REI, 1935, p. 233, n. 1; BSOS. vol. X, 1942, pp. 867-868 ; Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, Palestine and the Lebanon, p. 16, n. 5 ; History of the Arabs (in Hebrew), Jerusalem 1945, p. 223. For B. Spuler's opinion, see n. 48 below.

39. See especially : " Le Caractere Colonial de l'Etat Mamelouk dans ses rapports avec la Horde d'or " (in REI, 1935, pp. 231-248), as well as the influence of Cingiz Khan's Yasa on the Mamluk State (in BSOS, vol. X, 1942, pp. 862-876). In these two articles, Poliak makes a very important contribution to the study of Mongol influences on the Mamluk state. But the series of arguments he adduces to show that state was vassal to the Golden Horde cannot, for the most part, withstand criticism. These arguments are scrutinized in a special chapter of our work on the Mamluk army. We shall here limit ourselves to criticism of those relating to the subject of this paper.

promotion was particularly important because the title of Sultan was not Mongol, but one conceded by the Mongols to native rulers and chieftains subjugated by them in the West, while the title of Khan or Qan was according to the testimony of Juwaini and Bar Hebraeus, the only one accorded to the rulers of the Great Yasa. This object was attained, and the subsequent Emperors of the Golden Horde did not demand their mention as overlords in the Friday sermon in the Mamluk mosques.”<sup>40</sup>

The Mamluk sources, however, do not see eye to eye with this statement of Poliak's. They leave no shadow of doubt with respect to the correct identity of the grandfather of al-Malik as-Sa'id Berke Khan. All the sources which give the full name of that grandfather—and their number is by no means small—state that he was the amir Husam ad-Din Berke Khan b. Dawlat Khan al-Khwarizmi, the commander of the Khwarizmiya mentioned in this section.<sup>41</sup> The same conclusion emerges from the list of Sultan Baybars' wives, which has come down to us.<sup>42</sup> Here is the testimony of Ibn Shaddad, Baybars' contemporary<sup>43</sup> and the author of that Sultan's famous biography, *Sirat al-Malik az-Zahir* : “The first of his (Baybars') sons was al-Malik as-Sa'id Nasr ad-Din Berke Khan, who was born in Safar 658 in the al-'Ushsh quarter of Cairo. His mother was the daughter of the amir Husam ad-Din Berke Khan b. Dawlat Khan al-Khwarizmi al-Yemki.”<sup>44</sup> The parentage of the Mamluk Sultan Berke Khan may also be determined by means of his maternal uncle, the amir Badr ad-Din Muhammad, another son of the above-named Khwarizmi amir.<sup>45</sup> To this must be added that Berke, the son of Baybars, was born in Safar 658,<sup>46</sup> that is, some ten months before his father became Sultan, and over two years before the conclusion of the friendship pact between the Mamluk kingdom and the Golden Horde.<sup>47</sup> At such an early date, there was no question of marriage relations between the two powers, let alone between the Khan of the Golden Horde and a Mamluk amir.

We may with certainty conclude from the above that the whole matter of Baybars' marriage and the naming of his son Berke Khan must be entirely excluded from the framework of the relations between

40. BSOS, vol. X, 1942, pp. 867-868.

41. Nujum (C), VII, p. 179, 11. 6-8 ; p. 259, 11. 3-6 ; p. 267, 11. 3-4. Al-Kutubi, *Fawat, al-wafayat* I, p. 113, 11. 9-10. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XIV, p. 455, l. 4, p. 464, l. 4. Suluk, I, p. 640, l. 15 ; p. 641, 11. 2-3.

42. Suluk, I, p. 640, l. 15 ; see also footnote on that page.

43. Died 1284, *i.e.*, seven years after Baybars' death.

44. According to its Turkish translation, N. Serefuddin, *Baybars Tarihi*, p. 116.

45. Suluk, I, p. 533, 11. 5-6 ; p. 645, 11. 17-18 ; p. 650, n. 5 ; p. 674, 11. 12-13. Ibn al-Furat, VII, p. 126, 11. 22-24 ; p. 165, 11. 12-14. Nujum (C), VII, p. 262, 11. 10-11 ; 273, l. 11.

46. Besides Ibn Shaddad, quoted in note 44 above, see Nujum (C), VII, p. 179, 11. 6-8. Ibn al-Furat, VII, p. 166, l. 2. Suluk, I, p. 436, l. 12 ; p. 641, 11. 2-3.

47. The present writer knows of no relations between the two states previous to the endeavours to form an alliance between them.



the two great powers. This historical event should be brought down from the heights on which it has been placed without justification, to its rightful and modest place, *viz.*, the personal relations of the amir Baybars with a Wafidi amir who was the vassal of an Ayyubid Sultan,<sup>48</sup> and who happened to have a name and title identical with those of the Great Khan of the Mongols.

*The Shahrazuri Kurds (al-akrad ash-shahrazuriya)*

The second attempt to settle the coast, which was carried out after Egypt had slipped out of the hands of the Ayyubids, was much more successful. In 656, 3,000 Kurdish horsemen from Shahrazur, with their women and children, came to Damascus in flight from Hulaghu's armies. The Ayyubid an-Nasir was happy to receive them into the ranks of his army, hoping to enhance his power through them, but their demeanour towards him was haughty and obstinate, and they eventually passed over to his rival, the Ayyubid al-Mughith 'Umar in Kerak. The latter wanted to conquer Damascus with their help.<sup>49</sup> At the beginning of 657, the two Ayyubids came to an agreement whereby the Shahrazuriya were to be transferred to the coastal region (*ila al-a'mal as-sahiliya*).<sup>50</sup> It is uncertain which section of the coastal region was used for this military settlement, but it is stated that Nur ad-Din Badlan, the chief of the Shahrazuriya, then lived in Gaza.<sup>51</sup> Thus, also, az-Zahir Baybars had his Shahrazuri wife brought from Gaza.<sup>52</sup> In 669, Baybars was apprised of the fact that the Shahrazuriya were about to assassinate him and enthrone al-Malik al-'Aziz b. al-Mughith in his place. Al-'Aziz and the conspiring amirs were consequently imprisoned.<sup>53</sup> In 693, the Shahrazuriya were met with in Cairo, together with another group of Kurds, some Tatars, and members of the Halqa, siding with the amir Kitbugha in his war against the amir Sanjar ash-Shuja'i. On the latter's side were the Burjiya, the elite of the Mamluk army at that time.<sup>54</sup> There is here a clear indication of a coalition of underprivileged military formations against the Royal Mamluks.

---

48. Thus B. Spuler's view (*Die Goldene Horde*, Leipzig, 1943, p. 255), that Baljbar's son was called Berke in honour of the Mongol Khan cannot be accepted. Neither may any Mongol influence be ascribed to the existence of a Cairo quarter, or square, called Uzbakiya (Spuler, p. 255), for this quarter was not named after the Mongol Khan Uzbek, a contemporary of an-Nasir Muhammad b. Qalaun, but after Amir Uzbek, commander-in-chief of the army under Sultan Qayt Bay, *i.e.*, in the second half of the 15th century.

49. Suluk, I, p. 411, I. 14. p. 412. 1-2. Ibn Khaldun, V, p. 381, II. 21-25.

50. Suluk, I, p. 414, II. 9-12. In 658, Baybars went to the Shahrazuriya and wed one of their women (Fawat, I, p. 110. Nujum (C), VII, p. 101, I. 1). Under Sultan al-Muzaffar Qutuz Aqush al-Burunli is appointed governor of Gaza, and many Arab nomads settle with him in the coastal region, receiving large feudal grants. (Manhal, I, fol. 4A, II. 1-2).

51. Suluk, I, pp. 419, I. 15-420, I. 1.

52. Nujum (C), VII, p. 179, II. 12-13. Suluk, I, p. 640, II. 13-15.

53. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XII, p. 527, II. 1-3.

54. Nujum (C), VIII, p. 44, II. 4-5. Suluk, I, p. 800, I. 4. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 180, II. 20-21.

*The Wafidiya under az-Zahir Baybars*

The immigration of *Mongol* warrior tribes began under az-Zahir Baybars. That Sultan's admiration of the Mongol regime and military organization, some aspects of which he transferred to his state, undoubtedly rendered it easy for Tatar horsemen to enter his army. Even he, however ceased regarding this immigration with tolerance when it grew to exaggerated proportions, as has been pointed out above.

The first group of Tatar horsemen arrived during his reign in Dhul-Hijja 660, and numbered 200 persons, exclusive of women and children. They had been part of an expeditionary force sent by Berke Khan to the aid of Hulagu : when war broke out between the two Khans, Berke ordered his troops back to their country or, if there were no alternative, to the Mamluk kingdom. Baybars himself went out to meet them, and arranged a magnificent reception for them. Some were given amirs' ranks, and the rest were incorporated into the Bahriya regiment.<sup>55</sup> This reception enhanced the Tatars' desire to join the Mamluk army,<sup>56</sup> and in 661 a group of over 1,300 horsemen of Mongols and Bahaduriya makes its appearance.<sup>57</sup> In 662, several more groups arrived. These included Wafidun from Shiraz, headed by Sayf ad-Din Baklak and Iqtibar al-Khwarizmi, jamadar (master of the robe) of Jalal ad-Din Khwarizm Shah, as well as by the amir Husam ad-Din b. Husayn b. Malah, amir of 'Iraq, and many of the amirs of the Arab tribe of Khafaja (one of the most important of the tribes of Iraq in Mamluk times). The Sultan received them himself, and invested Baklak with an Amirate of Tablkhana. In the same year came Tatars and "Baghdadi Turks" (atrak baghdadia), as musta'mi-nun. The Sultan was fearful of this immigration, and instructed the army to stand ready.<sup>58</sup> In 675, the governor of Khartabirt (Kharput) and his entire household entered Egypt, as did Wafidiya from Anatolia, who were received by the Sultan himself.<sup>59</sup>

During the reign of Baybars, a total of 3,000 horsemen entered the Mamluk state. Some were made Amirs of Tablkhana, others Amirs of Twenty, Amirs of Ten, saqis, silahdars and jamdars (cup-bearers, armour bearers and masters of the robe); some were incorporated into

55. Suluk, I, p. 473, 11. 8-10 ; p. 474, 11. 2-7. Khitat, II, pp. 117-118. This great influx was preceded by smaller Oirat arrivals (Suluk, I, pp. 708-709). See also Abu al-Fida', III, p. 214, 11. 3-6. Suluk, I, 416, 11. 4-7.

56. Khitat, II, pp. 117, 1. 25-118, 1. 7. Suluk, I, p. 473, 1. 8-474, 1. 12 ; p. 477, 11. 1-14. Ibn Kathir, XIII, p. 234, 11. 14-15.

57. Suluk, I, p. 500, 11. 5-6 ; p. 501, 11. 5-7.

58. Suluk, I, p. 511, 11. 1-4, 11. 13-18 ; p. 516, 11. 11-12.

59. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XIV, 403, 1. 6 ; p. 406, 1. 2, Abu al-Fida', IV, p. 9, 11. 9-12. Khitat, II, p. 307, 11. 1-2.

the amirs' forces.<sup>60</sup> Baybars' reign is also marked by the absence of a single appointment to the rank of Amir of a Hundred.

It is worthy of note that Baybars concentrated all the Tatars who came during his reign in the capital, and did not send them off to the Syro-Palestinian coast, in spite of the fact that he was most interested in settling that coast with warrior tribes. It was he who settled it with Turcoman tribes. These were left with the burden of supplying themselves with horses and equipment, and thus he raised an army without expenditure (*fa-tajaddada lahu 'askar bi-ghayr kulfa*).<sup>61</sup> Three years later, after the destruction of Caesarea, 'Atlit and Haifa, he was approached by Franks (from the destroyed crusader towns ?) who offered him their services. He received them well, and allocated them feudal estates.<sup>62</sup>

Between the reigns of Baybars and Kitbugha, there occurred a great slackening in the immigration of Tatar Wafidiya. In 682, 19 horsemen came, together with their families,<sup>63</sup> and in 691, 300 horsemen.<sup>64</sup>

### *The Oirats*

The greatest wave of Tatar horsemen immigrating to the Mamluk kingdom came in 695,<sup>65</sup> under al-'Adil Kitbugha. It consisted of Qalmuqs, or Oirats, (called in Arabic sources *uwayratiya*<sup>66</sup> or '*uwayratiya*'<sup>67</sup>). They numbered, according to several sources, 10,000 "horses,"<sup>68</sup> and according to other sources, 18,000 "horses."<sup>69</sup> Their

---

60. Nujum (C), VII, p. 190, 11. 3-6. Ibn Kathir, XIII, p. 276, 11. 8-9. According to Poliak "the soldiers who went to Egypt under Baybars I and were accepted into the Mamluk army (the Wafidiya), must be viewed as reinforcements supplied by Berke to his vassal. Their numbers were fairly large: 200 in 1262 (A.H. 660), and 1,300 in 1263, and additional reinforcements in 1264 (REI, 1935, p. 233)." It is the writer's view that no proof of the vassalage of the Mamluk state to the Mongols can be adduced from the sending of reinforcements from Berke to Baybars, for the reason that such reinforcements were never sent. The only occasion that the name of Berke Khan is mentioned in connection with the Wafidiya relates to the groups of 200 horsemen who came in 1262 (A.H. 660). However, as has already been pointed out above in the discussion of the Wafidiya under az-Zahir Baybars, this group came to Egypt simply because it was unable to return to its own country. It entered Egypt not as reinforcements, but as seekers of protection (*musta'minun*), as is explicitly stated by the source (Suluk, I, p. 473, 11. 9-10). The later group of 1,300 Mongols came, not on orders from Berke, but because of the good reception Baybars had accorded the previous group (Khitat, II, pp. 117, I. 25-118, 1-7). The rest of the Wafidiya of Baybars' time had no connection with that Khan either, and certainly did not enter the Mamluk kingdom as reinforcements. Spuler, who at first accepts Poliak's view that these were sent as reinforcements. (Die Goldene Horde, p. 45), later retracts (p. 254, n. 35).

61. Suluk, I, p. 565, 1. 6.

62. Suluk, I, p. 258, 11. 3-4.

63. Suluk, I, p. 712, 11. 14-15.

64. Ibn Kathir, XIII, p. 330, 11. 26-27.

65. A very small number of Oirats immigrated as early as 691 (Suluk, I, pp. 708, 1. 6-709 1. 4. Ibn al-Furat, VII, p. 250, 11. 7-16), but it is doubtful whether these can be considered a forerunner of the great Oirat immigration.

66. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 203, 1. 18. Suluk I, p. 812, 1. 3.

67. Abu al-Fida, IV, p. 33, 1. 15. Zettersteen, p. 38, 1. 15. The first is the customary spelling.

68. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XIV, p. 588, 1. 6-591, 1. 2. Abu al-Fida', IV, p. 33, 1. 13. Zettersteen, p. 38, 1. 19. Nujum (C), VIII, p. 60, 1. 4. The Wafidiya, the 'Urban and the Halqa were sent on a military expedition to Upper Egypt (Suluk, II, p. 18).

69. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 203, 1. 18. Suluk, I, p. 812, 1. 4.



chiefs and commanders, numbering according to various accounts 113,<sup>70</sup> 200,<sup>71</sup> or 300,<sup>72</sup> came to Egypt and were received with marked honours. The remainder of the tribe, with their sheep and cattle, were sent to the coast, and settled in 'Atlit and its environs.<sup>73</sup> Abu al-Fida' is the only historian who claimed that the Oirats were settled in Qaqun.<sup>74</sup> Some were settled in al-Biqā' in Southern Lebanon.<sup>75</sup> They were forbidden to enter Damascus or other towns, which they passed on their way to the coast. Where they stayed, the towns markets would come out to them.<sup>76</sup> In a short time, this warrior race was absorbed by the inhabitants<sup>77</sup> of the coast.<sup>77</sup> Indeed, they were rarely heard from after their arrival in that region.

As to the Oirats who had entered Egypt, they attracted the Mamluk amirs by their rare beauty, and many of them and their young sons were admitted into the amirs' forces.<sup>78</sup> In addition, another large group of Oirats was brought from the coast, and incorporated into the amirs' troops.<sup>79</sup> Many Mamluks married Oirat wives.<sup>80</sup> The Oirats were renowned for their bravery and their wickedness.<sup>81</sup> The greater part of them were billeted in the military quarter of al-Husayniya, which in their day expanded to such a degree that it grew into the largest quarter in Cairo.<sup>82</sup> That al-'Adil Kitbugha was deposed partly because he favoured these compatriots of his, and that their leader Turghay was put to death, has already been mentioned above. Despite this, and despite the claim of several sources that the Oirats were absorbed into other army units,<sup>83</sup> they were again heard here and there. In 699, on the eve of the war against Ghazan, they were discovered in an extensive plot to assassinate Baybars al-Jashnakir and Salar while the Mamluk army was encamped in Tall al-'Ujul, and to restore to the throne their compatriot Kitbugha. Many were imprisoned and put to death.<sup>84</sup> In 709, an Oirat unit of the amirs' troops joined an-Nasir Muhammad b.

70. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 204, II. 17-18. Suluk, I, p. 812, I. 10. Nujum (C), VIII, p. 60, I. 12.

71. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XIV, pp. 588, I. 6-591, I. 2.

72. Khitat, II, p. 22, II. 22-26.

73. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, II. 5-9. Suluk, I, p. 813, II. 1-4. Zettersteen, p. 39, II. 16-22.

74. Abu al-Fida', IV, p. 33, I. 19.

75. Khitat, II, p. 22, II. 21-23.

76. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, II. 5-9. Suluk, I, p. 813, II. 1-3. Zettersteen, p. 39, II. 19-22.

77. Suluk, I, p. 813, II. 7-8.

78. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, I. 10. Khitat, II, p. 23, I. 13 ; p. 307, II. 17-19. In a letter replying to the Ilkhan Ghazan, an-Nasir Muhammad b. Qalaun claims that paederasty was unknown in Egypt until the arrival of the Oirats (Zettersteen, p. 102, II. 14-20).

79. Khitat, II, p. 22, II. 21-23.

80. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, I. 1. Khitat, II, p. 23, II. 4-13.

81. Khitat, II, p. 23, II. 14-15.

82. Khitat, II, p. 23, II. 11-12, II. 15-30.

83. Suluk, I, p. 813, I. 7. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 205, I. 1.

84. Zettersteen, p. 58, II. 1-5. An-Nahj as-Sadid, XIV, p. 623, I. 3-633, I. 5. Suluk, I, pp. 883, I. 7-885 I. 5.

Qalaun exiled at Kerak,<sup>85</sup> but as soon as an-Nasir was restored to the throne, he dismissed them from his service under pressure from the Royal Mamluks, who could not bear to have them on an equal footing with themselves, and claimed that they could not be trusted, since they had betrayed their former masters, the amirs.<sup>86</sup> This offered a new illustration of the consistent and stubborn manner in which the Royal Mamluks opposed any effort on the part of the free Tatar horsemen to enter the elite regiment of the army. Thenceforward, the Oirats sink lower and lower, and in 733 we find them or their descendants employed as attendants and servants (*atba'*)<sup>87</sup> to the Mamluks in the military barracks of the Cairo Citadel.

### *The Wafidiya after the Oirats*

The great Oirat wave of 685 virtually seals the chapter of the immigration of *Tatar* warrior tribes into the Mamluk kingdom. From here and there come only two other small groups, separated by long intervals of time. In 704, 200 horsemen arrive,<sup>88</sup> and in 717 hundred more, with their women and children.<sup>89</sup> In addition, a thin stream of lone Tatars continues to infiltrate.<sup>90</sup> In 841, the year of an-Nasir Muhammad's death, a sizeable wave of Wafidiya again enters the kingdom. Owing to a famine in the "Lands of the East" (*bilad al-mashriq*), a great multitude (*'alam 'azim*) of their inhabitants migrate to the banks of the Euphrates and to the region of Aleppo, and the governor of that city was instructed to let them enter any area they wished. They flow into the Aleppo district and other provinces, and some 200 of their horsemen reach Egypt. The Sultan quarters some of them in the barracks of the Cairo Citadel, makes others amirs, and transfers some to the service of his amirs.<sup>91</sup>

---

85. *Nujum* (C), VIII, p. 258, ll. 1-9. *Ibn Khaldun*, V, p. 413, ll. 11-15.

86. *Suluk*, II, p. 83, ll. 8-13.

87. *Suluk*, II, p. 377, ll. 4-9. Details of the causes leading to the Oirats' migration to Egypt, as well as abundant additional material on their history, may be found in Zettersteen, pp. 38-40. *Nujum* (C), VIII, p. 60. *Abu al-Fida'*, IV, p. 33. *Ibn Khaldun*, V, p. 406. *An-Nahj as-Sadid*, XIV, pp. 588-593. *Khitat*, II, pp. 22-23. *Suluk*, I, pp. 812-813. *Ibn al-Furat*, VIII, pp. 203-205. Cf. also *Suluk*, II p. 366, l. 7.

88. *Suluk*, II, p. 5, ll. 12-13. *An-Nahj as-Sadid*, XX, pp. 107, l. 15-108, l. 2. They were called *al-muqqaffiazun*, a usual appellation for those fleeing from or into the Mamluk kingdom.

89. *Suluk*, II, p. 174, ll. 3-4.

90. *Suluk*, II, p. 215, ll. 14-15 ; p. 517, ll. 9-10. Zettersteen, p. 195, ll. 17-18 ; p. 196, ll. 5-6 ; p. 212, l. 8 ; pp. 208, l. 25-209, l. 1 ; p. 219, ll. 21-23. *Durar*, II, p. 176, ll. 12-13 ; p. 227, ll. 12-17. *Ibn Kathir*, XIV, p. 133, ll. 1-7. *Ibn al-Furat*, XIX, p. 453, ll. 3-4.

91. *Suluk*, II, pp. 515, l. 16-516, l. 3.

With the wave of 741, Wafidiya immigration into the Mamluk kingdom practically came to an end.<sup>92</sup> The later Circassian period witnessed a sizeable immigration of Circassian adults into the realm, but it bore a wholly different character from the Wafidi influx for a number of reasons. First, most of these Circassian immigrants were blood relations of Mamluk amirs, in the narrowest sense of the word : fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, aunts and uncles. Second, some came as slaves and were as a matter of course incorporated into the Mamluk ruling caste. Third, those who came as free individuals—and they formed the majority—were also incorporated into that caste, as a result of the preferential policy followed by the Circassian Mamluks toward their compatriots.<sup>93</sup> Thus, they did not constitute a separate class or a special military unit.

A phenomenon analogous to the Wafidi immigration, however, did occur in the Circassian period, *i.e.*, the influx of a large number of Ottoman horsemen into the Mamluk kingdom. These came of their own free will in 894, and formed a separate unit in the Mamluk army, called *al-‘uthmaniya*.<sup>94</sup>

A description of the status of the Wafidiya is of special importance for the understanding of the Mamluk regime. It teaches us how limited were the opportunities open to those who served the Mamluk state as free men, without having passed through the crucible of slavery, even to those who came from the Mamluks' countries of origin. A. N. Poliak, largely as a result of his view that the Mamluk kingdom was vassal to the Golden Horde, is of the opinion that "the Mongols were always welcome in the Mamluk army, and only their high standing prevented them from becoming very numerous there, because they had to be enlisted as free and qualified warriors, and not as apprentices who remained temporary slaves until the completion of their military education.... But those knights who had never been slaves felt themselves superior to those who had to pass such an apprenticeship. Only towards the end of the Mamluk period was it imposed on the Mongols as on others."<sup>95</sup>

This view stands in glaring contradiction to the very essence of the Mamluk regime, and is not difficult to discard in the light of the facts. In the first place, the status of the free Mongols, as described in detail in this paper, was superior to that of other races only in so far as the

---

92. The stopping of the Wafidiya immigration was, no doubt, one of the causes of the decline of the Halqa, which ceased to receive human material comparable in military capacity to that which the regiments of Royal Mamluk and amirs' mamluks continued to receive until the last days of the state. Henceforward, the Halqa is compelled to recruit its members from among the sons of the amirs and the local population, who offered most dubious military abilities. The history and transformation of the Halqa are dealt with in detail in our work on the Mamluk army, in the chapter "The structure of the Mamluk Army."

93. The inclusion of free men into the ruling caste under the Circassians was one of the main factors contributing to the enfeeblement of the Mamluk army (cf. the writer's *The Circassians in the Mamluk Kingdom*, JAOS, 1949, pp. 135-147).

94. Ibn Iyas, *Bada'i' az-Zuhur*, III, p. 255, ll. 18-20.

95. BSOS, Vol. X, 1942, p. 867.



members of those races were themselves free. In the second place, after the end of the Wafidi immigration, that is, long before the end of the Mamluk period, the traces of the free Mongols vanish almost entirely. Further, the contemporary sources offer not a little information on Mongol Mamluks before 870, the date fixed by Poliak for the first appearance of Mamluks of this race.<sup>96</sup> We shall here single out information relating to the existence of Mongol Mamluks *in large* numbers as early as the reigns of the Sultans Qalaun and his son, an-Nasir Muhammad, *i.e.*, 130 to 190 years before 870.<sup>97</sup>

It is related of Qalaun that he owned Turkish, Mongol and other Mamluks in quantities unknown before him (*wa-malaka al-malik al-mansur min al-mamalik al-atrak wa-l-mughal wa-ghayrihim ma lam yamlukhu malik bi-d-diyar al-misriya qablahu*).<sup>98</sup> Thus it is clear that the Mongols formed one of the two most important stocks among the Mamluks of Qalaun, numbering 7,000 or 12,000 according to different versions, since other stocks are not deemed worthy of mention and are, except for the Turks, included under the heading of "others." Of even greater importance is the sources' account concerning the Mamluks of an-Nasir b. Qalaun. Ibn Taghribirdi states: "The traders bought many Mamluks, and the Sultan's kind dealing with them became well-known; hence the Mongols gave their sons and relatives to the traders, since they wished them to attain greatness (*raghbatan fi as-sa'ada*)."<sup>99</sup> Al-Maqrizi goes even further: "And the traders would bring him many Mamluks: and the Sultan's attitude towards his Mamluks became well-known in their country of origin (*al-bilad*), and the Mongols gave their sons, daughters and relatives to the traders, who bought them from them, wishing to enhance the glory and happiness of Egypt. The traders payed for every Mamluk from 20,000 to 30,000 and even 40,000 dirhams; as a result, quarrels and disputes arose among the Mongols (*fa-fasada bi-dhalika al al-mughal fima baynahum*), and they came to Egypt."<sup>100</sup> It should be stressed that the sources tell of no other race which sold its sons and daughters to the Mamluk state with the same fervour, that is,

96. BSOS, Vol. X, 1942, p. 867, following Ibn Taghribirdi, *Hawadith ad-Duhur*, p. 525.

97. In the early Mamluk period, the sources use *Mughal* and *Tatar* as generally interchangeable terms, but the latter term still remains to be thoroughly examined with respect to its use during the *later* Mamluk period. At any rate, it appears that Poliak considers the two terms synonymous in the later period also, for the reference on which he bases his stand (*Hawadith*, p. 525) "reads *mamalik tatar*," whereas he himself calls them Mongols. Below are a number of references selected at random indicating the presence of Tatar Mamluks in the Circassian period, before 870; *Nujum* (P), IV, p. 341, 11. 10-11; p. 635; VII, p. 154. *Manhal*, I, fol. 191 a. In 824, the Amir Qajqar al-Qurdumi, a Tatar, stood at the head of amirs and Royal Mamluks of Tatar extraction (*min jins at-tatar*). During the disturbances resulting from the death of Sultan al-Mu'ayyad Shaykh (*Nujum* (P), VI, p. 425, 11. 3-12).

98. Ibn al-Furat, VIII, p. 97, 11. 21-22.

99. *Nujum* (C), IX, p. 160, 11. 14-16.

100. *Suluk*, II, p. 525, 11. 6-10.

to such a degree that internecine quarreling burst out.<sup>101</sup> There is little doubt that they did so out of a clear awareness that only through slavery their relatives' success in the Mamluk kingdom, could be ensured, and that their lot would be unenviable were they to enter it as free persons.

DAVID AYALON (NEUSTADT)

---

101. Poliak's view (BSOS, *loc. cit.*) that "those knights who had never been slaves felt themselves superior, to the Mamluks" is erroneous. Not only is this view based on a single reference, but that reference itself leads to entirely different conclusions. For the famous Amir Qawsun an-Nasiri, though he did come to Egypt as a free man, became a Mamluk as a result of having been bought by the Sultan an-Nasir Muhammad for 8,000 dinars. The very fact that he was called an-Nasiri itself shows that he was one of the Sultan's Mamluks. He entered history because he was purchased by the Sultan; had he not been so purchased he would not have attained even to a tiny fraction of his brilliant career. Qawsun took pride not in the fact that he had been a free man, but in the fact that he had been bought by the Sultan, became one of his circle of intimates, and had not been trained in the military school like the rest of the Mamluks (*kana yaftakhir wa-yaqul ana ishtarani as-sultan wa-kuntu min khawassih wa-ammamani wa-qaddamani was zawwaajani bintahu wa-amma ghayri fa-tanaqqala min at-tujjar ila at-tibaq ila al-istablat*) (Durar, III p. 257, ll. 4-9). Cf. also Manhal, V, fol. 36B, ll. 6-10; Khitat, II, pp. 307-308). The words of Ibn Iyas (p. 168, I. 8), the last of Mamluk chronicists, must be interpreted in the light of the sources cited in this note, which are earlier, more detailed and more authoritative than Ibn-Iyas is with regard to the Bahri period. The special status of the Mamluks brought up together with the Sultan's sons, and not in the military schools with the rest of the Mamluks, is dealt with elsewhere in the writer's work on the Mamluk army.