

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

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"¹ and his theory has been widely accepted, together with his term *wāfidīyah*, an Arabic "collective formation from *wāfid* 'one who comes, makes his way, in a delegation or group.'"² In his study, he criticizes A. N. Poliak, who stated that the *wāfidīyah* enjoyed high positions in the Mamluk army because of the vassal character of the Mamluks' relationship to the Golden Horde.³ Rather, Ayalon claims, the *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* only to the political situation inside the Mamluk Sultanate, and neglects the situation outside it. For example, he characterizes al-Zāhir Baybars and al-'Ādil 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 *wāfidīyah*'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, Ayalon states that the *wāfidīyah*'s inferior status is proved by the fact that most of them joined the *ḥalqah* unit.⁴ Yet, in another place, he points out the prominent position of the *ḥalqah* in the early Mamluk period.⁵ These two claims seem contradictory. Third, his survey tends to look at the *wāfidīyah* as a unit, so he fails to grasp their diversity. We must differentiate their commanders from their soldiers, the Mongol

© Middle East Documentation Center. The University of Chicago.

¹David Ayalon, "The Wafidiya in the Mamluk Kingdom," *Studia Islamica* 25 (1951): 89–104.

²David Ayalon, "Wāfidīyya," *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., 12:26–27.

³A. N. Poliak, "Le caractère colonial de l'État Mameluk dans ses rapports avec la Horde d'Or," *Revue des études islamiques* 9 (1935): 213–48.

⁴Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 90–91.

⁵David Ayalon, "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army," pt. 2, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15 (1953): 448–51. And see later section of the present article.



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."⁶

ARRIVAL OF THE MILITARY REFUGEES

WHO WERE THE WĀFIDĪYAH?: IBN SHADDĀD'S CATEGORIZATION

Actually, the term *wāfidīyah* is not found frequently in the contemporary sources, and though there are references to a *wāfidīyah* 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-Khwārizmīyah and the Kurdish Shāhrazūrīyah, 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."⁷ 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 *wāfidīyah* 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 wafada 'alayhi*). He classifies them into the following groups:⁸ (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)

⁶R. Stephen Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry*, rev. ed. (London, 1995), 182. For the historiography of the first part of the Mamluk period, see Donald P. Little, *An Introduction to Mamlūk Historiography: An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Biographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalā'ūn* (Wiesbaden, 1970). About the recent situation of the publication of Mamluk sources, see Li Guo, "Mamluk Historiographic Studies: The State of the Art," *Mamlūk Studies Review* 1 (1997): 15–43.

⁷Reuven Amitai, "The Remaking of the Military Elite of Mamluk Egypt by al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn," *Studia Islamica* 72 (1990): 149, n. 17.

⁸See also Peter M. Holt, "Three Biographies of al-Zāhir Baybars," in *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic World*, ed. David O. Morgan (London, 1982), 24–26.



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 Saljuqid *atābaks*.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 *wāfidīyah* for this study, represent three types of *wāfidīyah* 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 *WĀFIDĪYAH*’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 *wāfidīyah*. 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-Mustanşirī, a ruler of al-‘Irāq
300 horsemen ¹² |
| (2) | 660/1262 | Şaraghān Āghā, a commander of the Golden Horde
200 horsemen ¹³ |

⁹Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh al-Malik al-Zāhir* (Wiesbaden, 1983), 329–38.

¹⁰See Richard T. Mortel, “The Ḥusaynid Amirate of Madīna during the Mamluk Period,” *Studia Islamica* 80 (1995): 97–110. Strangely, Ibn Shaddād does not mention the sharifate of Mecca here. For the relationship between the Meccan sharifate and the Mamluk Sultanate, see Ota Keiko, “The Meccan Sharifate and its Diplomatic Relations in the Bahri Mamluk Period,” *Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies* 17, no. 1 (2002): 1–20. For the relationship between the Arabs and the Mamluk Sultanate, see M. A. Hiyari, “The Origins and Development of the Amirate of the Arabs during the Seventh/Thirteenth and Eighth/Fourteenth Centuries,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 38 (1975): 509–24.

¹¹Sato Tsugitaka, *State and Rural Society in Medieval Islam: Sultans, Muqta’s and Fallahun* (Leiden, 1997), 78.

¹²Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Al-Rawḍ al-Zāhir fī Sīrat al-Malik al-Zāhir* (Riyadh, 1976), 123–24; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab* (Cairo, 1923–98), 30:54–55; al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-Sulūk li-Ma’rifat al-Mulūk* (Cairo, 1939–72), 1:476; al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān* (Cairo, 1987–92), 1:333.

¹³Abū Shāmāh, *Tarājim 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 fī Tārīkh al-A’yān* (Hyderabad,



- (3) 661/1263 Karmūn Āghā, a commander of the Golden Horde over 1300 horsemen¹⁴
- (4) 662/1264 Sayf al-Dīn Baklak, a ruler of Shīrāz a large number (*jamā'ah kabīrah*)¹⁵
- (5) 662/1264 Jalāl al-Dīn Bashkar ibn Dawādār, a vassal of the Abbasids a large number¹⁶
- (6) 672/1273–74 Shams al-Dīn Bahādūr, a ruler of Sumayṣāṭ¹⁷ not specified
- (7) 675/1277 Ḥusām al-Dīn Bījār, a vassal of the Rūm Saljuqs, and several others¹⁸ not specified
- (8) 681/1282 Mu'min Āghā, a ruler of Mawṣil not specified, but a small number¹⁹
- (9) 681/1282–83 Sinān al-Dīn al-Rūmī, a son of a ruler of Amasia²⁰ not specified
- (10) 681/1283 Shaykh 'Alī, a Sufi shaykh several Mongols²¹
- (11) 683/1284 no specific names 4000 horsemen²²

1954–61), 1:496, 2:156; Mufaḍḍal ibn Abī al-Faḍā'il, *Al-Nahj al-Sadīd wa-al-Durr al-Farīd fīmā ba'da Tārīkh Ibn al-'Amīd*, in "Histoire des sultans mamlouks," ed. E. Blochet, *Patrologia Orientalis* 12, 14, 20 (1919–28), 1:442; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:64; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-Durar wa-Jāmi' al-Ghurar* (Cairo, 1960–92), 8:90.

¹⁴Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 177–80; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdat al-Fikrah fī Tārīkh al-Hijrah* (Beirut, 1998), 101; idem, *Al-Tuḥfah al-Mulūkīyah fī al-Dawlah al-Turkīyah* (Cairo, 1987), 51; al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, 1:534; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:89–90; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:501; al-'Aynī, *'Iqd*, 1:364–65.

¹⁵Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 198; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 105; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:99.

¹⁶Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 203, 209–10; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 109; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:111.

¹⁷Shāfi' ibn 'Alī, *Ḥusn al-Manāqib al-Sirriyah al-Muntaza'ah min al-Sīrah al-Zāhirīyah* (Riyadh, 1976), 153; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 131; idem, *Tuḥfah*, 78; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:207–8; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:611.

¹⁸Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 462; Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 153–58, 160, 174–75; al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, 3:164; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:233; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 2:403–6; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:621; al-'Aynī, *'Iqd*, 2:153–54.

¹⁹Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 196, 199.

²⁰Ibid., 216.

²¹Ibid., 217; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:88; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:708–9; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah fī Mulūk Miṣr wa-al-Qāhirah* (Cairo, 1929–49), 9:15.

²²Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif al-Ayyām wa-al-'Uṣūr fī Sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr* (Cairo, 1961), 68;



- (12) 695/1296 Ṭaraghāy, the commander of the Oirat tribe
10,000–18,000 households²³
- (13) 698/1299 Sulāmish, a lieutenant from al-Rūm
500 horsemen²⁴
- (14) 703/1304 Badr al-Dīn Jankalī ibn al-Bābā, a ruler of Ra’s al-‘Ayn
11 persons²⁵
- (15) 704/1304 Four *silāhdārīyahs* of Ghāzān
200 horsemen with their families²⁶
- (16) 705/1305–6 Sayf al-Dīn Ḥannā and Fakhr al-Dīn Dāwūd, brothers of
Amir Salār²⁷
not specified
- (17) 717/1317 Ṭāṭī, a commander of one thousand of the Mongols
100 horsemen with their families²⁸
- (18) 722/1322 Aḥmad, a son of an aunt of the sultan²⁹
not specified
- (19) 724/1323–24 Ḥasan, a relative of the sultan³⁰
not specified
- (20) 726/1326 Ṭāyirbughā, a relative of the sultan³¹
not specified

Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 240.

²³Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 291–92; idem, *Tuḥfah*, 146; Abū al-Fidā’, *Mukhtaṣar fī Akhbār al-Bashar* (Cairo, 1907), 4:34–35; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz*, 8:361–62; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:296–99; al-Jazarī, *Tārīkh Ḥawādith al-Zamān wa-Anbā’ ihī wa-Wafayāt al-Akābir wa-al-A’yān min Abnā’ ihī* (Sidon and Beirut, 1998), 1:286–88; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 2:590–93; Ibn Kathīr, *Al-Bidāyah wa-al-Nihāyah fī Tārīkh* (Cairo, 1932–39), 13:363; al-‘Aynī, *Iqd*, 3:278–79, 3:304–7, 311.

²⁴Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 302–3; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:373–75; al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, in *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography: al-Yūnīnī’s Dhayl Mir’āt al-Zamān*, ed. Li Guo (Leiden, 1998), 64–65; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 2:623–28; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:876.

²⁵Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Tuḥfah*, 175; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz*, 9:113; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 3:97–99; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāyah*, 14:31; al-‘Aynī, *Iqd*, 4:303–4; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:950; idem, *Al-Mawā’iz wa-al-I’tibār bi-Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ wa-al-Āthār* (Būlāq, 1270 A.H.), 2:134.

²⁶Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 32:86.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 96.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 254; al-‘Aynī, “Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān,” Istanbul, Bayazit MS Veliyyüddin 2394, fol. 112. For the manuscripts of al-‘Aynī’s chronicles, see Nakamachi Nobutaka, “Al-‘Aynī’s Chronicles as a Source for the Bahrī Mamluk Period,” *Orient* 40 (2005): 140–71.

²⁹Al-‘Aynī, “Iqd,” MS Veliyyüddin 2394, fol. 316.

³⁰*Ibid.*, fol. 472.

³¹Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 33:203; al-‘Aynī, “Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān,” Istanbul, Süleymaniye MS Süleymaniye 835, fols. 48v–49v.



- (21) 727/1327 Muḥammad Bīh ibn Jamaq, a relative of the sultan³²
not specified
- (22) 728/1328 Tamurtāsh, a lieutenant from al-Rūm
300–600 horsemen³³
- (23) 738/1337 Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn, an official of Baghdad
500 persons³⁴
- (24) 738/1337 Nāṣir al-Dīn Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh, an official of Baghdad³⁵
not specified

During Baybars’ reign, four groups were indigenous groups from Mongol-occupied areas (nos. 1, 4–6), one group came from the Rūm Saljuqs (no. 7), and two groups were Mongol tribesmen (nos. 2–3). Ibn Shaddād calculates the *wāfidīyah* 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,³⁶ are often combined as a single group under sixteen commanders in the sources.³⁷ It is noteworthy that in all cases these defections of the Mongol *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* 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.³⁸ The defections of the Rūm Saljuq *wāfidīyah*, whose arrivals spanned a long term, were caused by Baybars’ military campaign against al-Rūm.

Although a large number of refugees arrived during the reign of Baybars, the

³²Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 33:231–232; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 72r.

³³Abū al-Fidā’, *Mukhtaṣar*, 4:98; al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, in Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian Historiography*, 63–66; Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz*, 9:346–48; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, in *Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Mufaḍḍal b. Abī l-Faḍā’ il*, ed. Samira Kortantamer (Freiburg, 1973), 39–40; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāyah*, 14:138, 140; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:346–48; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 88r ff.

³⁴Al-Shujā’ī, *Tārīkh al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalāwūn al-Ṣāliḥi wa-Awlādihi* (Wiesbaden, 1985), 17–18; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:437–38; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd al-Jumān fī Tārīkh Ahl al-Zamān,” Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı MS Ahmet III 2911/a17, fol. 113v.

³⁵Al-Shujā’ī, *Tārīkh*, 27; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:446; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Ahmet III 2911/a17, fol. 113r.

³⁶For example, al-Yūnīnī describes the *wāfidīyah* in 661/1263 as *al-ṭā’ ifah al-thānīyah* and *al-ṭā’ ifah al-thālīthah*; see al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, 1:534, 2:195.

³⁷Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 84–85; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:501; al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd*, 1:365.

³⁸For no. 1 see al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:54–55. For no. 4 see Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 182; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:90. For no. 5 see *ibid.*, 207–8.



role of his policy of encouraging the *wāfidīyah* 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.³⁹

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 *wāfidīyah* (no. 12), and al-Manṣūr Lājīn accepted a group of refugees led by Sulāmish, a Mongol lieutenant of al-Rūm (no. 13). During al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's second reign, three groups arrived (nos. 14–16). Among these, it is true that the Oirat *wāfidīyah* was "the greatest wave of Tatār horsemen immigrating to the Mamluk kingdom."⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹

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 Abaghā's brother.⁴² The *wāfidīyah* in 683/1284 (no. 11) came because of the internal disorder in the Ilkhanid state after Arghūn's enthronement.⁴³ Ṭaraghāy, Sulāmish, and Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (nos. 12–14) were escaping the purge instituted by the Ilkhan Ghāzān. Some groups of the *wāfidīyah* 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. Tamurtāsh (no. 22), who rebelled against the Ilkhan Abū Sa'īd and defected, had been on friendly terms with a Mamluk amir, Sayf al-Dīn Aytamish.⁴⁴ But, in spite of their friendship, Tamurtāsh was executed by the sultan in conformity with the treaty. The defections of the last two groups of *wāfidīyah* (nos. 23–24) were caused by the political disorder after Abū Sa'īd's death. Khalīfah ibn 'Alī Shāh (no. 24) was

³⁹Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 98.

⁴⁰Ibid., 99.

⁴¹Of course, it is true that Kitbughā favored them after they came to the sultanate, but we must distinguish the reason for their defection from how the sultan treated them after they arrived.

⁴²Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 213, 215.

⁴³Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 68.

⁴⁴Al-'Aynī, "Iqd," MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 54v. See Donald P. Little, "Note on Aitamiš, a Mongol Mamluk," in *Die islamischen Welt zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit: Festschrift für Hans Robert Roemer zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Ulrich Haarmann and Peter Bachmann (Wiesbaden, 1979), 396–97.



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 *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* 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 cavalymen, 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

⁴⁵Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 90.

⁴⁶For 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.

⁴⁷Ibn 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.

⁴⁸For the *khāṣṣakīyah*, see Ayalon, "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army," pt. 1, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15 (1953): 213–16. But one finds among the *khāṣṣakīyah* those who were not mamluks. See *ibid.*, 215.



from ten to twenty cavalymen: "Amir of *ṭablkhānah*," generally translated as "amir of forty," derives from the word "band" (*ṭablkhānah*). It is the second highest rank of amir after "amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand" (*amīr 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 Shaddād, its existence is reasonable, given (b).

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

(e) Assigned to the *ḥalqah* 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-Dīn Salār al-Mustanşirī'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 Shaddād, when Baybars received them, "he made him [Salār] amir of fifty cavalymen, 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., Salār himself, those who were assigned to the sultan's own unit, and those who were divided among amirs' units. Salār's "fifty cavalymen" 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 *ḥalqah* unit, but it is unclear which they joined in this case. Thus, of Salār's three hundred followers, one-sixth stayed under their original leader (case d above), one-third joined the mamluk unit or *ḥalqah* 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 Şaraghān Āghā (see no. 2 in above list). When they arrived at Cairo, Sultan Baybars "made their leaders amirs with one hundred cavalymen or less and assigned the rest to his Baḥrīyah unit and to his mamluks."⁵² It is clear that Şaraghān and other anonymous leaders were permitted

⁴⁹See Ayalon, "Studies on the Structure," pt. 2, 467–71.

⁵⁰Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 331.

⁵¹Ibid., 330.

⁵²Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 138.



to keep more than one hundred of their followers in total. Since this group consisted of two hundred cavalymen,⁵³ 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).⁵⁴

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 *wāfidīyah* we know about in the period under discussion.

THE STARTING RANK OF THE WĀFIDĪ 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 *wāfidīyah* 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 *ṭablkhānah* and "from ten to twenty cavalymen," Shams al-Dīn Salār al-Mustanşirī was made amir of "fifty cavalymen," as seen above. The fact that not forty but fifty cavalymen 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 Sumayşāt (see no. 6 above) was made amir of twenty cavalymen, 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.⁵⁵

On the other hand, Sayf al-Dīn Şaraghān Āghā and other leaders of the first Mongol refugees in 660/1262 were made "amirs with one hundred cavalymen 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,"⁵⁶

⁵³Ibid., 137.

⁵⁴The Bahrīyah unit here means the Mamluk unit that Baybars founded, namely al-Bahrīyah al-Zāhirīyah. See David Ayalon, "Le régiment Bahriya dans l'armée mamelouke," *Revue des études islamiques* 19 (1951): 137.

⁵⁵R. Stephen Humphreys, "The Emergence of the Mamluk Army," pt. 2, *Studia Islamica* 46 (1977): 165–66.

⁵⁶Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 99.



as Sato Tsugitaka points out, Ayalon's statement is a mistake, "although the example of such an appointment was indeed rare."⁵⁷ Reuven Amitai-Preiss regards the report of this appointment as "mere hyperbole" because the appointment of one of the *wāfidiyah* to this rank "is not substantiated by one concrete example from the sources."⁵⁸ 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 *wāfidi* amirs must have been appointed to a relatively high rank in Baybars' reign.

However, it is true that most of the *wāfidi* amirs were appointed to the rank of amir of *ṭablkhānah*. The following list shows the starting rank of twenty-two *wāfidi* commanders.⁵⁹ 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 Ṣaraghān (2)	Amir of one hundred cavalrymen
3. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn and others (3)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
4. Sayf al-Dīn Baklak (4)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
5. Muẓaffar al-Dīn Washshāḥ ibn Shahrī (4)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
6. Jalāl al-Dīn Bashkar ibn al-Dawādār (5)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
7. Shams al-Dīn Bahādur (6)	Amir of twenty cavalrymen
8. Aqūsh (10)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
9. Ṭaraghāy (12)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
10. Ulūs (12)	Amir of ten cavalrymen
11. Badr al-Dīn Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (14)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
12. 'Alī (14)	Amir of ten cavalrymen
13. Nīrūz (14)	Commander (<i>taqdimah</i>)
14. Ṭāyirbughā (20)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
15. Yaḥyá ibn Ṭāyirbughā (20)	Amir of ten cavalrymen
16. Muḥammad Bīh ibn Jamaq (21)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
17. Tamurtāsh ibn Jūbān (22)	Amir of one hundred
18. Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn (23)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
19. Fakhr al-Dīn Maḥmūd (23)	Amir of <i>ṭablkhānah</i>
20. Ḥusayn (23)	Amir of ten cavalrymen

⁵⁷Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 101–2.

⁵⁸Reuven Amitai-Preiss, "The Mamluk Officer Class during the Reign of Sultan Baybars," in *War and Society in the Eastern Mediterranean, Seventh-Fifteenth Centuries*, ed. Yaacov Lev (Brill, 1997), 286. See also Ayalon, "Wāfidiyya," 27.

⁵⁹For the personal data of each amir, see the Appendix.



21. Kābik (23) Amir of ten cavalrymen
 22. Nāṣir 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.⁶⁰ 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 Ṭaraghāy amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand. But when he consulted with the amirs, they suggested to him that he should give Ṭaraghāy the rank of *ṭablkhānah* at first and promote him later.⁶¹

What the rank of *ṭablkhānah* actually means, however, must be considered. Some sources other than Ibn Shaddād state that Salār al-Mustaṣhirī was made an amir of *ṭablkhānah*.⁶² Therefore he became an amir of fifty cavalrymen 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.”⁶³ In these two examples, the rank of “amir of *ṭablkhānah*” is obviously not equal to having forty cavalrymen. 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.”⁶⁴ We must distinguish between the honorary meaning of the rank of *ṭablkhānah* and the number of cavalrymen 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.

⁶¹Al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd*, 3:306.

⁶²Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 123; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:55; al-‘Aynī, *‘Iqd*, 1:333.

⁶³Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Tuḥfah*, 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'*.⁶⁵ Consider the following passages:

[Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad] appointed him [Jankalī] amir of *ṭablkhānah* upon the *iqṭā'* of the amir Bahā' al-Dīn Qarāqūsh, who was transferred to Damascus.⁶⁶

The amir Bahā' al-Dīn Qarāqūsh was transferred to amir of Şafad, and Jankalī was granted his rank of amir, which is *ṭablkhānah*.⁶⁷

[Al-Nāṣir Muḥammad] ordered him [Jankalī] to live in the citadel, and on his settling down, ordered the amir Bahā' al-Dīn Qarāqūsh to leave for Şafad and granted his *iqṭā'* to this Jankalī.⁶⁸

All these three passages describe the same event. Although they have diverse information about the new post of the amir Qarāqūsh, in this case it is obvious that the rank of amir which he had held was connected with a certain *iqṭā'* and that Jankalī 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 Maḥmūd ibn Sharwīn (no. 15). Upon his arrival, this Maḥmūd was made only an amir of *ṭablkhānah*, but when the amir Ṭāyirbughā, who was one of the commanders of one thousand and was himself a *wāfiḍī* amir, died, Maḥmūd 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-'Ādilī.⁷¹

⁶⁵For the *iqṭā'* distribution to the *wāfiḍīyah* during the reign of Baybars, see Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 99–103.

⁶⁶Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 3:98.

⁶⁷Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:950.

⁶⁸Al-'Aynī, *Iqd*, 4:303.

⁶⁹Al-Shujā'ī, *Tārīkh*, 28; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:437.

⁷⁰Al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:294.

⁷¹Ibid., 446.



We can observe a result of the redistribution of *iqṭā*'s carried out by al-Manṣūr Lājīn and al-Nāṣir Muḥammad⁷² in the examples after Jankalī's defection in 703/1304. Because of the reform of the *iqṭā*' system, it became impossible to bestow high rank and large *iqṭā*'s upon *wāfidī* amirs when they arrived. Instead, the sultan consistently gave them the rank of amir 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.

WĀFIDĪ 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 *wāfidī* soldiers were incorporated into the sultan's mamluk unit (category [a] above). Baybars assigned fewer than half of the first Mongol *wāfidīyah* "to his Baḥrīyah 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 jamā'ah bayna aḍ'āfhā min al-mamālīk al-sultānīyah*).⁷³ Further, Qalāwūn assigned some of the followers of Shaykh 'Alī (no. 10) to his own mamluk unit or to the *khāṣṣakīyah*.⁷⁴

Sato states, "It is not clear whether the Mongols who were incorporated into the Mamluk corps became slaves or not."⁷⁵ 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*)."⁷⁶ We also noted above the *wāfidīyah* 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-Khaṭīrī and Bahādūr al-Damurdāshī (nos. 15 and 25 in the Appendix) were the most successful. These two came to Egypt under the command of *wāfidī* amirs, were assigned to

⁷²For the result of the redistribution of *iqṭā*'s (*rawk*), see Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 152–61.

⁷³Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 138.

⁷⁴Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 217; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:88; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:708–9.

⁷⁵Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 102.

⁷⁶Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 138.



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-Khaṭīrī as a "non-affiliated" amir, i.e., neither al-Manṣūrīyah nor al-Nāṣirīyah.⁷⁷ However, Aydamur's biography states that he was "the greatest of al-Burjī amirs"⁷⁸ and many sources call him "al-Manṣūrī." Bahādur al-Damurdāshī was one of the twenty-four commanders of one thousand at the time of the death of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, and he was classified among "his (i.e., al-Nāṣir's) mamluks and *khawāṣṣ*" and was called "al-Nāṣirī."⁷⁹ We can consider that these two were not only *wāfiḍīyah* 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 Salār's group, half of whom were divided among amirs' units. When Mu'min Āghā (no. 8 in list beginning on p. 57) and his followers sought refuge with Qalāwūn in 681/1283, his two sons were assigned to serve under the amir Sayf al-Dīn Ṭurunṭāy, *nā'ib al-salṭānah* of Qalāwūn.⁸⁰

Ibn Shaddād 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-'Ādil Kitbughā was dethroned, the new sultan al-Manṣūr Lājīn arrested three commanders of the Oirat refugees, Ṭaraghāy, Kaktāy, and Ulūṣ. 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."⁸¹ Second, when six hundred followers of Tamurtāsh arrived at Egypt in 728/1328, al-Nāṣir "was antipathetic towards those who were in Tamurtāsh's service and divided a part of them among amirs, so that they served under them without *iqṭā's*."⁸² 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 *iqṭā's*.

THOSE RETAINED IN THE UNIT OF THEIR ORIGINAL LEADER

Before seeking refuge, the *wāfiḍīyah* 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

⁷⁷ Amitai, "Remaking of the Military Elite," 149.

⁷⁸ Al-Yūsufī, *Nuzhat al-Nāṣir fī Sīrat al-Malik al-Nāṣir* (Beirut, 1986), 384.

⁷⁹ Al-Shujā'ī, *Tārīkh*, 112.

⁸⁰ Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 210.

⁸¹ Al-'Aynī, *Iqd*, 3:356.

⁸² Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj* in Kortantamer, *Ägypten*, 39–40; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:295.



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-Mustanşirī was allowed to keep his followers up to the limit of fifty persons out of three hundred, and Şaraghān Āghā kept at least one hundred out of two hundred. For the later *wāfidīyah*, 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 *wāfidīyah* groups in the Mamluk army, as will be seen later.

THOSE ASSIGNED TO THE ḤALQAḤ UNIT

Let us return to the previous question: did most of the *wāfidīyah* join the *ḥalqaḥ* unit (case [e] above)? Here also let us start with the reign of Baybars. During his reign, Ibn Shaddād states, none of the Mongol *wāfidīyah* were assigned to the *ḥalqaḥ* unit, as seen above, and no other contemporary sources report their assignment to the *ḥalqaḥ* either.⁸³ It is uncertain whether those of the *wāfidīyah* from al-‘Irāq commanded by Salār al-Mustanşirī who were “taken into service” were assigned to the *ḥalqaḥ* unit or the mamluk unit. As a whole, no *wāfidīyah* groups are described as assigned to the *ḥalqaḥ* during the reign of Baybars, except for a few ‘Irāqī *wāfidīyah*. 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 *iqṭā‘* in the *ḥalqaḥ*.”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 *wāfidīyah* who were assigned to the *ḥalqaḥ*. Al-Maqrīzī states that about 300 commanders of the Oirat refugees, except for Ṭaraghāy and al-Luṣūṣ (Ulūṣ), were made commanders in the *ḥalqaḥ* (*taqādum fī al-ḥalqaḥ*),⁸⁶ but this information is not found in any contemporary source. According to al-‘Aynī, who cites al-Yūsufī, Nīrūz, a brother of the amir Jankalī, was appointed *taqdimah*, which was possibly *taqdimat al-ḥalqaḥ* (commander of the *ḥalqaḥ*). Through all the period covered in the present article, we find no indication that the *wāfidīyah* in general joined the *ḥalqaḥ* unit, contrary

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

⁸⁴Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh al-Duwal wa-al-Mulūk* (Beirut, 1936–42), 8:179; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 8:42. See Ayalon, “Wafidiya,” 90, n. 10.

⁸⁵Baybars al-Manşūrī, *Zubdah*, 301; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:274; K. W. Zetterstéén, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mamlukensultane in den Jahren 690–741 der Hiğra nach arabischen Handschriften* (Leiden, 1919), 29.

⁸⁶Al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, 2:22; Ayalon, “Wafidiya,” 90, n. 10.



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 *iqṭā'*.⁸⁷ 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."⁸⁸ The basic disagreement between these two is whether there was much continuity between the Ayyubids and the Mamluks, or not.⁸⁹

Ayalon and Humphreys, however, agree that the *ḥalqah* in the Bahri period was still attached to the sultan as royal troops.⁹⁰ This seems to be a key to the solution of the obscure treatment of the *wāfidīyah*. As seen above, the Mongol *wāfidīyah* 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-Mustansirī, 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 *wāfidīyah* and the *ḥalqah*. Accordingly, we cannot support Ayalon's statement that we know the *wāfidīyah* 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

⁸⁷Ayalon, "Structure of the Mamluk Army," pt. 2, 448–56.

⁸⁸Humphreys, "Emergence of the Mamluk Army," pt. 2, 148, 163 ff.

⁸⁹For their arguments about the *ḥalqah*, see also David Ayalon, "From Ayyubids to Mamluks," *Revue des études islamiques* 94 (1991): 50–53.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 163.



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 *wāfidīyah* (nos. 1, 4, 12, 15, 20, 23, 24, 25, and 27 in the Appendix), while Ayalon counts only four amirs of one hundred.⁹¹ 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). *Wāfidī* 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 *wāfidīyah* 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-‘Ādil Sulāmish, a son of Baybars, was dethroned and Qalāwūn became sultan, a group called *al-tatār al-wāfidīyah* fled from Cairo, under command of their leader Sayf al-Dīn Karāy (no. 6 in the Appendix) and his sons.⁹² 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,⁹³ 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 *wāfidīyah* (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 Lājīn 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

⁹¹See Ayalon, “Wafidiya,” 93.

⁹²Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 193.

⁹³*Ibid.*, 200; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:36; Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh*, 7:221.



Sultan Kitbughā. 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.⁹⁴ 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 1299.⁹⁵

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., *wāfidī* 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.⁹⁶ *Wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidī* amirs who came to Egypt in 661/1263, and a daughter of Karmūn, the leader of these *wāfidīyah*, had been another of his wives. Qalāwūn married another daughter of Karmūn, who gave birth to his son al-Šāliḥ ‘Alī, and also the daughter of one of the Rūm *wāfidīyah*. She is known as the mother of al-Nāšir Muḥammad. Besides, Qalāwūn married his two sons, al-Šāliḥ ‘Alī and al-Ashraf Khalīl, to the daughters of Mongol *wāfidīyah*.⁹⁷

What was the reason for these close marital ties between the *wāfidī* amirs and the Mamluk elite? As for the Oirat, Ayalon points out their physical beauty and states, “Many Mamluks married Oirat wives.”⁹⁸ In my opinion, however, the Mamluk elites’ preference for the daughters of *wāfidī* amirs had rather to do with their fathers’ military ability. The sultans wanted marriage with their daughters for political reasons: they regarded the *wāfidīyah* as reliable supporters.

THE SECOND PHASE (AFTER 1310)

In this phase, i.e., the third reign of Sultan al-Nāšir Muḥammad and afterwards, unlike the first phase, we can find no unit that consisted of military refugees

⁹⁴ Al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:298.

⁹⁵ See no. 17 in the Appendix.

⁹⁶ See Humphreys, “Emergence of the Mamluk Army,” pt. 2, 159.

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 *wāfidīyah*, 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 *niṣbah* 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 Khaṭīr (nos. 13–14 in the Appendix) were promoted to high ranks, despite their original affiliation, the Rūm *wāfidīyah*.

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-Manṣūr Abū Bakr, a son of al-Nāṣir, he was appointed vizier.

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

⁹⁹Al-'Aynī, "Iqd," 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 *wāfidī* families and the Mamluk elite.¹⁰² These ties, however, were based on the sultans' favoritism toward them, while those in the first phase were based on the *wāfidīyah*'s military importance.

CONCLUSION

The present study has clarified that the *wāfidīyah*'s status was higher than scholars have realized. A certain number of them were recruited into the royal troops, not into the *ḥalqah*, a minor unit in the Mamluk army. Some of the *wāfidī* 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 *wāfidīyah* 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.¹⁰³ Therefore, in this phase, several highly advanced *wāfidī* amirs emerged from *wāfidīyah* groups which had only a small number of personnel or which had collapsed and completely dissolved.

It is true that the *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* were outsiders to the sultanate, just as the mamluks were. The *wāfidīyah* often shared with the royal mamluks the sense of belonging to a certain sultan,¹⁰⁴ because their only base of

¹⁰²See nos. 20 and 25 in the Appendix.

¹⁰³During the third reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad, there were many examples of amirs who attained the highest ranks without sufficient military training. See Amalia Levanoni, *A Turning Point in Mamluk History: The Third Reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad Ibn Qalāwūn 1310–1341* (Leiden, 1995), 34–40.

¹⁰⁴Cf. the Mongol *wāfidīyah* and Baybars' mamluk unit (al-Baḥrīyah al-Zāhirīyah) in the revolt of 680/1281: Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 193; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:78. The *wāfidī* amir Sayf al-Dīn Nūkāy was called a Zāhirī amir (al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, in Guo, *Early Mamluk Syrian*



power was the relationship with the sultan who recruited them. The present article shows that the situation of the *wāfidīyah* 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 *wāfidīyah* and Kitbughā's mamluks in the revolt of 699/1300: al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:883.



©2006 by Nobutaka Nakamachi.

DOI: [10.6082/M1D798K9](https://doi.org/10.6082/M1D798K9). (<https://doi.org/10.6082/M1D798K9>)

DOI of Vol. X, no. 1: [10.6082/M1P84901](https://doi.org/10.6082/M1P84901). See <https://doi.org/10.6082/3Q80-2815> to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See <http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html> for more information about copyright and open access.

APPENDIX: THE LIST OF THE WĀFIDĪ AMIRS

(The number after the name is the number of the group in the previous list with which the individual was associated.)

1. Sayf al-Dīn Ṣaraghān Āghā (no. 2): His name is found only in the account of 661/1263 (Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 180; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:89–90) and in the allocation list (*maktūb jāmi‘ bi-al-tamlīk*) of 663/1265 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 98–99; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:276–81; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 1:479–86; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:532–34). Amitai-Preiss identifies him as a leader of the Mongol *wāfidīyah* of 660/1262. See Amitai-Preiss, “Mamluk Officer Class,” 295.
2. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn al-Tatarī (d. 664/1266, no. 3): His biography is found in Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 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-Ṣāliḥ ‘Alī. Shāfi‘ ibn ‘Alī, *Faḍl al-Ma‘thūr min Sīrat al-Malik al-Manṣūr* (Sidon, 1998), 111; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 164, 228; idem, *Tuḥfah*, 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 Ḥimṣ in 679/1280 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 197; idem, *Tuḥfah*, 100; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:33–34; Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh*, 7:216).
4. Sayf al-Dīn Nūkāy al-Tatarī (d. 699/1300, no. 3): He was one of the fourteen Mongol commanders of 661/1263. He was arrested in Baybars’ reign but later was released and appointed amir of one hundred by Qalāwūn. He died at the battle of Wādī al-Khāzindār (al-‘Aynī, *Iqd*, 4:17). One of his daughters married Baybars (Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz*, 8:219; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 30:368; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:640–41; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 7:179). Another daughter, named MNKBK, married al-Ṣāliḥ ‘Alī ibn Qalāwūn in 681/1282 (Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 20; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 228–29; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:90; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:709) and gave birth to a prince, Mūsā (al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 32:170). A third daughter, named Ardukīn (Urduṭakīn), married al-Ashraf Khalīl ibn Qalāwūn in 682/1284 (Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 44; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 232–33; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:99; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:717.), and after his death married al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and gave birth to a prince, ‘Alī, who died at an early age. She died in 724/1324. Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj* in Kortantamer, *Āgypten*, 23; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 1:347–48;



- al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Veliyyüddin 2394, fol. 481; Howayda al-Harithy, “Turbat al-Sitt: An Identification,” in *The Cairo Heritage: Essays in Honor of Laila Ali Ibrahim*, ed. Doris Behrens-Abouseif (Cairo, 2000), 103–21.
5. Jamāl al-Dīn Khaḍir ibn Nūkāy (d. 728/1328, no. 3): He was an amir of *ṭablkhānah*. Biography: al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 33:275; Ibn Ḥajar, *Al-Durar al-Kāminah fī A‘yān al-Mī‘ah al-Thāminah* (Hyderabad, 1972–76), 2:205; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:304; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 109r; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 9:275. See also Sato Tsugitaka, “The Proposers and Supervisors of al-Rawk al-Nāširī in Mamluk Egypt,” *Mamlūk Studies Review* 2 (1998): 86.
 6. Sayf al-Dīn Karāy al-Tatarī (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 Sunqur al-Ashqar in Ṣahyūn, and returned to Cairo with al-Baḥrīyah al-Zāhirīyah and al-Tatār al-wāfidīyah in 680/1281 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 193, 195, 200; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:36; Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh*, 7:214, 221). He had two sons, Shams al-Dīn Āqsunqur and Alṭunṭāsh (Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 114, 338).
 7. Sayf al-Dīn Jabrak al-Tatarī (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 Ḥimṣ in 692/1293 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 181; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:33; Ibn al-Furāt, *Tārīkh*, 7:215; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:692).
 8. Ḥusām al-Dīn Bījār al-Bayburtī (d. 681/1282, no. 7): He and his son Bahādur came from al-Rūm in 675/1276, following Saktāy (no. 10 below) (Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 155). Biography: al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, 4:168; Ibn al-Ṣuqā‘ī, *Tālī Kitāb Wafayāt al-A‘yān* (Damascus, 1974), 54–55; al-Ṣafadī, *Al-Wāfi bi-al-Wafayāt* (Wiesbaden, 1961–), 10:360; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:711.
 9. Badr al-Dīn Bahādur ibn Bījār al-Bayburtī (d. 680/1281, no. 7): His wife was a daughter of Saktāy. Biography: al-Yūnīnī, *Dhayl*, 4:107; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:84–85; al-Ṣafadī, *Wāfi*, 10:295; al-Maqrīzī, *Al-Muqaffā al-Kabīr* (Beirut, 1991), 2:500; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Al-Manhal al-Ṣāfi wa-al-Mustawfā ba‘da al-Wāfi* (Cairo, 1986–), 3:427.
 10. Saktāy (no. 7): He was the first refugee from al-Rūm, who came in 675/1276 with his brother Jāwrajī. His daughter Ashlūn married Qalāwūn in 681/1282–83 and gave birth to his son al-Nāšir Muḥammad (Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Tashrif*, 110; Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 229; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 31:90, 267; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 1:709; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 1:459).
 11. Mubārīz al-Dīn Sawārī ibn Tarkarī, Amīr Shikār (d. 704/1304–5, no. 7): He was one of the Rūm *wāfidī* amirs (Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 154–55; al-Yūnīnī,



- Dhayl*, 3:166; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj*, 2:407–8). He is also known as one of the sixteen amirs who supported al-Manṣūr Lājīn in 696/1296 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 313). Biography: Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 382; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:14; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:275; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 8:217.
12. Sharaf al-Dīn Ḥusayn ibn Jandarbak (d. 729/1328, no. 7): He was one of the Rūm *wāfidī* amirs. He served the amir Lājīn (later sultan) and became an amir of one hundred in the third reign of al-Nāṣir. Biography: Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz*, 9:352; al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyah*, 33:288; al-Ṣafadī, *A‘yān al-‘Aṣr wa-A‘wān al-Naṣr* (Beirut and Damascus, 1998), 2:259–64; Mufaḍḍal, *Nahj* in Kortantamer, *Ägypten*, 44; al-Maqrīzī, *Muqaffá*, 3:649; idem, *Sulūk*, 2:313; al-‘Aynī, “‘Iqd,” MS Süleymaniye 835, fol. 128v; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Manhal*, 5:152; idem, *Nujūm*, 9:276–77. See also Amitai, “Remaking of Military Elite,” 162.
13. Badr al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn Awhād ibn Khaṭīr (b. 683/1284–85, d. 754/1253–54, no. 7): He was a son of the Rūm *wāfidī* amir Niẓām al-Dīn Awhād ibn Khaṭīr (Ibn Shaddād, *Tārīkh*, 174–75, 337; Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhir, *Rawḍ*, 462). His grandfather Sharaf al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn Khaṭīr was a prominent amir in the Rūm Saljuqid sultanate. Born in Damascus, he was favored by al-Nāṣir and held the posts of grand *ḥājib* and governor (*nā‘ib*) of Ghazza and Tripoli. Biography: al-Ṣafadī, *A‘yān*, 5:417–27; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 6:110; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 10:292–93.
14. Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Awhād ibn Khaṭīr (d. 749/1249, no. 7): He was a brother of the above Badr al-Dīn Mas‘ūd. He served also as *ḥājib* in Damascus and Cairo. Biography: al-Ṣafadī, *A‘yān*, 5:364; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 6:80.
15. ‘Izz al-Dīn Aydamur al-Khaṭīrī al-Manṣūrī (d. 738/1337–38, no. 7): Originally he was one of the mamluks of Niẓām al-Dīn Awhād ibn Khaṭīr (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-Yūsufī, *Nuzhah*, 384; al-Ṣafadī, *A‘yān*, 1:660; idem, *Wāfi*, 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, *Jāmi‘ 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-‘Ādil Kitbughā, but in the reign of al-Manṣūr Lājīn he and the Oirats were purged (al-‘Aynī, *Iqd*, 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 Burilṭāy, one of the sultan's mamluks, and 'Alā' al-Dīn Quṭulūbars al-Ādilī, a mamluk of Kitbughā, and revolted, but they were soon put down and executed (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, *Zubdah*, 330; idem, *Tuḥfah*, 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 Quṭquṭū, who was given an *iqṭā'* 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.
 20. Badr al-Dīn Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (d. 746/1346, no. 14): His daughter married Ibrāhīm, the son of al-Nāṣir, and he became one of the twenty-four amirs of one hundred in the third reign of al-Nāṣir. Biography: al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān*, 2:163–66; idem, *Wāfī*, 11:199–200; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:89–91; al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, 2:134–35; idem, *Muqaffá*, 4:75–77; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 10:143–44; Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 93; Amitai, "Remaking of the Mamluk Elite," 163; Sato, "Proposers and Supervisors," 80.
 21. Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Jankalī (b. 697/1297–98, d. 742/1342, no. 14): He was born in Diyār Bakr and came to Cairo with his father Jankalī. He became a Hanbali jurist (faqīh). Biography: al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān*, 4:379–95; idem, *Wāfī*, 2:310–13; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 5:155; al-Maqrīzī, *Muqaffá*, 5:508; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 9:325.
 22. Sayf al-Dīn Dilanjī (d. 751/1350, no. 14): He was a nephew of Jankalī. He arrived at Cairo in 730/1329–30 and later held the post of governor of Ghazza. Biography: al-Ṣafadī, *A'yān*, 2:356–57; idem, *Wāfī*, 14:28–29; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:228; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 10:249.
 23. Sayf al-Dīn Ṭāyirbughā (Zahīrbughā) (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:



- al-Şafadī, *A‘yān*, 2:111–15; idem, *Wāfi*, 10:400–3; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:62; 2:228–29. See also Shimo, *Political Structure*, 150–53.
25. Bahādur al-Damurdāshī al-Nāşirī (d. 743/1343, no. 22): He was originally a mamluk of Tamurtāsh and was later assigned to al-Nāşir’s mamluk unit. He became amir of one hundred in the latter half of the third reign of al-Nāşir. Biography: al-Shujā‘ī, *Tārīkh*, 252–53; al-Şafadī, *Wāfi*, 10:299; idem, *A‘yān*, 2:62–63; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:36.
26. Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn ‘Alī 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-Nāşir’s death he held the post of vizier three times. Biography: al-Şafadī, *A‘yān*, 5:399; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 6:90; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:755; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm*, 10:183; Ayalon, “Wafidiya,” 93.
27. Ḥusām 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-Shujā‘ī, *Tārīkh*, 19). Biography: al-Şafadī, *Wāfi*, 3:22; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 3:430.
28. Nāşir al-Dīn Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh (d. 749/1348, no. 24): He was a son of Tāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Shāh, a *şāhib al-dīwān* in the Ilkhanid state. He sought refuge in Damascus in 738/1337, counting on the support of the amir Sayf al-Dīn Tankiz al-Ḥusāmī, governor of Syria, and was appointed commander of one thousand of Damascus. Biography: al-Şafadī, *A‘yān*, 2:324–25; idem, *Wāfi*, 13:383–84; Ibn Ḥajar, *Durar*, 2:218; al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, 2:794; idem, *Muqaffá*, 3:767.

