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

The existence of military refugees from Mongol territory during the Bahri Mamluk period was of great importance for the history of the Mamluk Sultanate politically, diplomatically, and culturally. David Ayalon studied this group over fifty years ago in his article "The Wafidiya in the Mamluk Kingdom" and his theory has been widely accepted, together with his term wafiyyah, an Arabic “collective formation from wa‘fīd ‘one who comes, makes his way, in a delegation or group.’” In his study, he criticizes A. N. Poliak, who stated that the wafiyyah enjoyed high positions in the Mamluk army because of the vassal character of the Mamluks’ relationship to the Golden Horde. Rather, Ayalon claims, the wafiyyah 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 wafiyyah only to the political situation inside the Mamluk Sultanate, and neglects the situation outside it. For example, he characterizes al-Zahir Baybars and al-‘Afdil Kitbugha as “an admirer of the Mongol regime” and “a member of that ethnic group” respectively, as if these factors caused these immigrations. The wafiyyah’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 wafiyyah’s inferior status is proved by the fact that most of them joined the hulqah unit. Yet, in another place, he points out the prominent position of the hulqah in the early Mamluk period. These two claims seem contradictory. Third, his survey tends to look at the wafiyyah as a unit, so he fails to grasp their diversity. We must differentiate their commanders from their soldiers, the Mongol
tribesmen from indigenous groups within Mongol-ruled territory, and groups who came in the early Mamluk period from groups who came in relatively later periods.

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

ARRIVAL OF THE MILITARY REFUGEES
WHO WERE THE WĀFIDĪYAH?: IBN SHADDA’S CATEGORIZATION

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

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

---


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

Among these, groups (a) and (d) should be excluded from this study, because they came to the sultanate and then returned to their country; they never became regular members of the Mamluk army.¹⁰ All the refugees of groups (e) and (h) and a part of those of (c) were Ayyubid princes in Syria and Saljuqid atābakhs.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 wāfīdiyah for this study, represent three types of wāfīdiyah 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 Wāfīdiyah’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 wāfīdiyah. 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-Mustansīrī, a ruler of al-‘Īrāq |
| 300 horsemen |
| (2) 660/1262 | Ṣaraghān Āghā, a commander of the Golden Horde |
| 200 horsemen |

---


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


The Rank and Status of Military Refugees in the Mamluk Army: A Reconsideration of the Wafi diyah (MSR X.1, 2006)

©2006 by Nobutaka Nakamachi.
DOI: 10.6082/M1D798K9

DOI of Vol. X, no. 1: 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.
The Rank and Status of Military Refugees in the Mamluk Army: A Reconsideration of the Wafi diyah (MSR X.1, 2006)

©2006 by Nobutaka Nakamachi. DOI: 10.6082/M1D798K9. See https://doi.org/10.6082/M1P84901 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.

(12) 695/1296 Taraghāy, the commander of the Oirat tribe 10,000–18,000 households
(13) 698/1299 Sulāmish, a lieutenant from al-Rūm 500 horsemen
(14) 703/1304 Badr al-Dīn Jankalī ibn al-Bābā, a ruler of Ra’a al-‘Ayn 11 persons
(15) 704/1304 Four silāḥdārīyahs of Ghāzān 200 horsemen with their families
(16) 705/1305–6 Sayf al-Dīn Ḥannā and Fakhr al-Dīn Dāwūd, brothers of Amir Salār not specified
(17) 717/1317 Tāṭi, a commander of one thousand of the Mongols 100 horsemen with their families
(18) 722/1322 Ahmād, a son of an aunt of the sultan not specified
(19) 724/1323–24 Ḥasan, a relative of the sultan not specified
(20) 726/1326 Tāyirbūghā, a relative of the sultan not specified

Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 240.


26Al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 32:86.

27Ibid., 96.


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

30Ibid., fol. 472.

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

Although a large number of refugees arrived during the reign of Baybars, the
role of his policy of encouraging the wāfidiyyah 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 wāfidiyyah (no. 12), and al-Manṣūr Lājin 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 wāfidiyyah was "the greatest wave of Ṭatār 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 Abagha's brother.42 The wāfidiyyah in 683/1284 (no. 11) came because of the internal disorder in the Ilkhanid state after Arghūn's enthronement.43 Ţaraghāy, Sulāmish, and Jankalī ibn al-Bābā (nos. 12–14) were escaping the purge instituted by the Ilkhan Ghāzān. Some groups of the wāfidiyyah 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. Tamurtaš (no. 22), who rebelled against the Ilkhan Abū Saʿīd 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 wāfidiyyah (nos. 23–24) were caused by the political disorder after Abū Saʿīd's death. Khalīfah ibn ‘Alī Shāh (no. 24) was

39 Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 98.
40 Ibid., 99.
41 Of 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.
43 Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf, 68.
also an associate of a Mamluk amir, Sayf al-Dīn Tankiz, and when the Ilkhan Abū Sa‘īd died, Khalīfah first sought refuge with Tankiz.

The wa‘fīdīyah 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 wa‘fīdīyah 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.”

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). 

Others were made amirs of ṭablkhānah, others were made amirs given from ten to twenty cavalrymen, and others were incorporated into amirs’ units.

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.

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

---


46 For the 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 Taghri Birdi’s Chronicles of Egypt (Berkeley, 1955), 95.

47 Ibn Shaddād, Tārīkh, 337–38. A similar passage can be found in al-Yūnīnī, Dhayl, 3:256–57, and Ayalon cites the latter (“Wafidiya,” 98-99). However, the former is more first-hand information.
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from ten to twenty cavalrymen: "Amir of tablkhanah," generally translated as "amir of forty," derives from the word "band" (tablkhānah). It is the second highest rank of amir after "amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand" (amīr mi‘āh 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 wāfidiyāh. But in another place, Ibn Shaddād cites the regulation that non-Mongol wāfidiyāh 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-Mustansirī’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 cavalrymen, took into service one hundred persons from those who arrived with him, and divided the rest among amirs.”51 In this passage, we find mention of those who were appointed to the rank of amir, i.e., Salār himself, those who were assigned to the sultan’s own unit, and those who were divided among amirs’ units. Salār’s “fifty cavalrymen” meant that he could retain his own followers within the limit of fifty. Those who were taken “into service” would have joined either the mamluk unit or the 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 Saraghān Āghā (see no. 2 in above list). When they arrived at Cairo, Sultan Baybars “made their leaders amirs with one hundred cavalrymen or less and assigned the rest to his Baḥrīyah unit and to his mamluks.”52 It is clear that Saraghān and other anonymous leaders were permitted

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

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

The Starting Rank of the Wāfiḍiyah 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 wāfiḍiyah 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 cavalrmen,” Shams al-Dīn Salār al-Mustansīrī was made amir of “fifty cavalrmen,” as seen above. The fact that not forty but fifty cavalrmen 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 Sumaysīṭ (see no. 6 above) was made amir of twenty cavalrmen, which is also not in accordance with the normative size of Mamluk amirs’ units, as R. Stephen Humphreys has shown, at least during the reign of Baybars.

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

---

53Ibid., 137.
as Sato Tsugitaka points out, Ayalon’s statement is a mistake, “although the example of such an appointment was indeed rare.” Reuven Amitai-Preiss regards the report of this appointment as “mere hyperbole” because the appointment of one of the wāfidiyyah to this rank “is not substantiated by one concrete example from the sources.” In my view, there is no logical reason for denying this appointment itself, although we should not regard it as to the highest rank of amir because of the lack of a strict uniformity of rank in the early Mamluk period. At least one of these Mongol 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. 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. Şarīm al-Dīn Şaraghān (2) Amir of one hundred cavalrymen
3. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn and others (3) Amir of ṭablkhānah
4. Sayf al-Dīn Baklak (4) Amir of ṭablkhānah
5. Muţaffar al-Dīn Washshāh ibn Shahrī (4) Amir of ṭablkhānah
7. Shams al-Dīn Bahādūr (6) Amir of twenty cavalrymen
8. Aqūsh (10) Amir of ṭablkhānah
9. Taraghāy (12) Amir of ṭablkhānah
10. Ulūs (12) Amir of ten cavalrymen
12. ‘Alī (14) Amir of ten cavalrymen
13. Nīrūz (14) Commander (taqdimah)
14. Ṭāyirbughā (20) Amir of ṭablkhānah
15. Yahyā ibn Ṭāyirbughā (20) Amir of ten cavalrymen
16. Muḥammad Bih ibn Jamaq (21) Amir of ṭablkhānah
17. Tamurtāsh ibn Jūbān (22) Amir of one hundred
18. Najm al-Dīn Mahmūd ibn Sharwīn (23) Amir of ṭablkhānah
19. Fakhir al-Dīn Mahmūd (23) Amir of ṭablkhānah
20. Ḥusayn (23) Amir of ten cavalrymen

57 Sato, State and Rural Society, 101–2.
59 For the personal data of each amir, see the Appendix.
21. Kābik (23)  Amir of ten cavalrymen
22. 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 ʿtablkhānah. Only three commanders (nos. 2, 17, and 22) were made “amir of one hundred” when they arrived. Six commanders (nos. 7, 10, 12, 15, 20, 21) were appointed to a lower rank like ten or twenty cavalrymen, but in the case of five of them (nos. 10, 12, 15, 20, 21) their colleague commanders from their same group were given ʿtablkhānah rank.

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

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

---

60 But 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.
63 Baybars al-Maṣṣūrī, Tuhfah, 175. In fact, Jankalī was appointed amir of ʿtablkhānah upon arrival, and then was raised to amir of one hundred. See below.
64 Humphreys, ‘Emergence of the Mamluk Army,’ pt. 2, 169.
amir in the Mamluk Sultanate always involved distribution of an *iqṭā‘*. Consider the following passages:

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

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

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

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 Jankal was granted both at the same time. As for the correspondence between the rank of amir and an *iqṭā‘*, another example can be found in the case of Mahmūd ibn Sharwān (no. 15). Upon his arrival, this Mahmūd was made only an amir of *tablkhānah*, but when the amir Ṭayirbughā, who was one of the commanders of one thousand and was himself a *wāfidī* amir, died, Mahmūd was raised to commander of one thousand in his place, and at the same time he received Ṭayirbughā’s *iqṭā‘*.  

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: Tamūrtaš (14) gained the rank of amir of one hundred in the place of Amir Sanjar al-Jamaqdār, and Khalīfah ibn ʿAlī Shāh (19) was appointed commander of one thousand in Damascus in the place of Amir Barsbughā al-ʿĀdilī.  

---

65 For the *iqṭā‘* distribution to the *wāfidīyah* during the reign of Baybars, see Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 99–103.  
71 Ibid., 446.
We can observe a result of the redistribution of *iqṭāʾ*’s carried out by al-Manṣūr Lājīn and al-Naṣīr Muḥammad in the examples after Jankalī’s defection in 703/1304. Because of the reform of the *iqṭāʾ* system, it became impossible to bestow high rank and large *iqṭāʾ*’s upon *wāfīdī* amirs when they arrived. Instead, the sultan consistently gave them the rank of amir of *tablkhānah* as an honorary rank. Accordingly, it is meaningless to compare their starting ranks, most of which were amir of *tablkhānah*. 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 *wāfīdī* soldiers were incorporated into the sultan’s mamluk unit (category [a] above). Baybars assigned fewer than half of the first Mongol *wāfīdīyah* “to his Bahriyah unit and to his mamluks,” as seen above, and when the number of military refugees increased after that, Baybars “divided all groups among twice their number of royal mamluks” (wa-yufarriquhum kull jamāʿah bayna adʿāfha min al-mamālik al-sultānīyah). Further, Qalāwūn assigned some of the followers of Shaykh ʿAlī (no. 10) to his own mamluk unit or to the *khāṣṣakīyah*.

Sato states, “It is not clear whether the Mongols who were incorporated into the Mamluk corps became slaves or not.” In my opinion, they did not become slaves, but remained free men, for one would expect some evidence of the conflicts that would have occurred if they had been enslaved. Rather, the sources emphasize their honorable positions within the Mamluk army: Ibn Shaddād ranks this group as first on the above-mentioned list, and Ibn ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir states, “Each one of them became like an independent amir attended by soldiers and slaves (*ghilmān*).” We also noted above the *wāfīdīyah* 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-Khaṭībī and Bahādur al-Damurdāshī (nos. 15 and 25 in the Appendix) were the most successful. These two came to Egypt under the command of *wāfīdī* amirs, were assigned to

---

72 For the result of the redistribution of *iqṭāʾ*’s (rawk), see Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 152–61.
75 Sato, *State and Rural Society*, 102.
the sultans’ mamluk units, and reached the rank of amir of one hundred and commander of one thousand in their later careers. Amitai-Preiss regards Aydamur al-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 Muhammad, 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 wāfidiyyah 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 Ṭuruntāy, nā’ib al-saltānah 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-ʿĀdil Kītbughā was dethroned, the new sultan al-Manṣūr Lājīn arrested three commanders of the Oirat refugees, Tārāghāy, Kaktāy, and Ulūs. 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 Tamūrtāsh arrived at Egypt in 728/1328, al-Nāṣir “was antipathetic towards those who were in Tamūrtāsh’s service and divided a part of them among amirs, so that they served under them without iqtā’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 iqtā’s.

**Those Retained in the Unit of Their Original Leader**

Before seeking refuge, the wāfidiyyah had been part of a military organization, very different from that of the army of the Mamluk Sultanate, stationed in Mongol-controlled areas. After they sought refuge, most had to accept being dispersed into
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77 Amitai, “Remaking of the Military Elite,” 149.
79 Al-Shuṭayrī, Tārīkh, 112.
81 Al-ʿAynī, ‘Īqd, 3:356.
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, Salar al-Mustansir was allowed to keep his followers up to the limit of fifty persons out of three hundred, and Sarghân Âghâ kept at least one hundred out of two hundred. For the later wa'fidiyyah, 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 wa'fidiyyah groups in the Mamluk army, as will be seen later.

THOSE ASSIGNED TO THE ḤALQAH UNIT

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

After the reign of Baybars, also, we find only a few cases of wa'fidiyyah who were assigned to the ḥalqah. Al-Maqrizi states that about 300 commanders of the Oirat refugees, except for Taraghây and al-Luşûs (Ulûs), were made commanders in the ḥalqah (taqâdatum fi al-ḥalqah), but this information is not found in any contemporary source. According to al-'Aynî, who cites al-Yûsufî, Nirûz, a brother of the amir Jankalî, was appointed taqdimah, which was possibly taqdimat al-ḥalqah (commander of the ḥalqah). Through all the period covered in the present article, we find no indication that the wa'fidiyyah in general joined the ḥalqah unit, contrary
to Ayalon’s statement.

Besides, it is necessary to clarify what the term ḥalqah meant in this period. Here, Ayalon and Humphreys’ argument about the ḥalqah is helpful. They both accept the fact that the ḥalqah in the army of Saladin was an elite force under the personal command of the sultan. Ayalon considers that the ḥalqah kept its high position at least until the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and that it gradually declined because of the redistribution of iqtā’.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 wāfidiyyah. As seen above, the Mongol wāfidiyyah 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-Mūstansīrī, 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 wāfidiyyah and the ḥalqah. Accordingly, we cannot support Ayalon’s statement that we know the wāfidiyyah 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

---

⁸⁹ For their arguments about the ḥalqah, see also David Ayalon, “From Ayyubids to Mamluks,” Revue des études islamiques 94 (1991): 50–53.
⁹⁰ Ibíd., 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 wafidiyah (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 wafidi 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). Wafidi 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 wafidiyah who come in the reign of Baybars (nos. 2–3 in the list) often appear in the sources as a group under Mongol commanders afterwards. For example, in 680/1281, when Sultan al-ʿĀdil Sulāmish, a son of Baybars, was dethroned and Qalāwūn became sultan, a group called al-tatār al-wafidiyah 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 wafidiyah (no. 7 in the list) left little trace in the sources after their defection. But two of their leaders (nos. 11 and 12 in the Appendix) achieved high positions in the reign of al-Manṣūr Lājin and the third reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Therefore it can be supposed that this group also maintained its political power for a long time.

As for the famous Oirat refugees (no. 12 in the list), they retained not only their tribal solidarity, but also their religious creed and lifestyle during the reign of
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\(^91\)See Ayalon, "Wafidiya," 93.

\(^92\)Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 193.

\(^93\)Ibid., 200; al-Nuwayrī, Niḥāyāh, 31:36; Ibn al-Furat, 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. Yet this situation did not continue for long, as seen above. After their leaders were arrested, they could no longer remain a strong military faction and we find only a few accounts about them, such as the short-lived riot in 1299.

We can generalize the first phase using the five categories mentioned above as follows: a large number of category (d) soldiers continued to serve under category (b), i.e., wāfīdī 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. Wāfīdiyyah 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 wāfīdiyyah 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 wāfīdī amirs who came to Egypt in 661/1263, and a daughter of Karmūn, the leader of these wāfīdiyyah, had been another of his wives. Qalāwūn married another daughter of Karmūn, who gave birth to his son al-Ṣālih ‘Alī, and also the daughter of one of the Rūm wāfīdiyyah. She is known as the mother of the sultan, al-Nāṣir Muḥammad. Besides, Qalāwūn married his two sons, al-Ṣālih ‘Alī and al-Ashraf Khalīl, to the daughters of Mongol wāfīdiyyah.

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

THE SECOND PHASE (AFTER 1310)
In this phase, i.e., the third reign of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and afterwards, unlike the first phase, we can find no unit that consisted of military refugees
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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.
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-Nāṣīr rather than his troop’s strength. This connection is reflected in the fact that his daughter married a son of al-Nāṣīr.

If we again take an example from the Oirat wāfidiyyah, 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-Nāṣīr Muḥammad, Qararnah was sent to the Ilkhanids as an envoy, and during the reigns of the sons of al-Nāṣīr, 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 Tamūrtāsh (no. 24 in the Appendix) was welcomed by al-Nāṣīr Muḥammad at first, but when al-Nāṣīr arrested Tamūrtāsh and executed him, the men were divided among Mamluk amirs.99 Bahādur al-Damurdāshi (no. 25 in the Appendix) had been under this Tamūrtāsh’s command, as his niṣbāh shows, and then was assigned to al-Nāṣīr’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-Nāṣīr, 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 Ḵaṭṭir (nos. 13–14 in the Appendix) were promoted to high ranks, despite their original affiliation, the Rūm wāfidiyyah.

One of the last refugees, Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAwār (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-Nāṣīr. And then, in the reign of al-Manṣūr Abū Bakr, a son of al-Nāṣīr, he was appointed vizier.

Thus, throughout the second phase, we can find several wāfidi amirs (category [b]), who kept only a few of their original soldiers (category [d]) under their
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100Ibid., fols. 171v–172r.
101However, I could not find any evidence that he was a vizier in Baghdad in Persian sources.
command. These amirs were able to reach high rank, not by their military importance, but by their strong connections to the sultan or by their skill as administrators. In this phase, we also find high amirs recruited into the sultans’ units (category [a]) whose advancement owed to personal factors.

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

**Conclusion**

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

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

Therefore, in this phase, several highly advanced wāfidi amirs emerged from wāfiḏiyah groups which had only a small number of personnel or which had collapsed and completely dissolved.

It is true that the wāfidiyah were not mamluks, i.e., those who were brought to the Mamluk Sultanate as slaves or captives. But differences between free men and slaves in the Mamluk army seems to have been less significant than has been realized, at least in the early Mamluk period. The wāfidiyah were outsiders to the sultanate, just as the mamluks were. The wāfidiyah often shared with the royal mamluks the sense of belonging to a certain sultan, because their only base of
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102 See nos. 20 and 25 in the Appendix.

103 During 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.

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


2. Sayf al-Dīn Karmūn al-Tatarī (d. 664/1266, no. 3): His biography is found in Ibn ‘Abd al-Zāhīr, 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-Zāhīr Baybars and then the amir Sayf al-Dīn Kunduk al-Zāhīrī, 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, Ṭārīkh, 338. His name is found only in the account of the battle of Hīms in 679/1280 (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 197; idem, Tuḥfah, 100; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:33–34; Ibn al-Furāt, Ṭārīkh, 7:216).
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7. Sayf al-Dīn Jubrak al-Tātārī (no. 3): He was one of the fourteen Mongol commanders of 661/1263. His name is found only in the account of the battle of Hīmṣ in 692/1293 (Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdah, 181; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:33; Ibn al-Furtāt, Tārīkh, 7:215; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 1:692).


10. Sakṭāy (no. 7): He was the first refugee from al-Rūm, who came in 675/1276 with his brother ʿĀǧvrāj. His daughter Ashlūn married Qalāwūn in 681/1282–83 and gave birth to his son al-Nāṣīr Muḥammad (Ibn ʿAbd al-Zāhir, Tashrīf, 110; Baybars al-Mansūrī, Zubdah, 229; al-Nuwayrī, Nihāyah, 31:90, 267; al-Maqrīzī, Sulūk, 1:709; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 1:459).

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


14. Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥwād ibn Ḳaṭṭār (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 Hajar, Durar, 6:80.

15. ‘Īzz al-Dīn Aydamur al-Ḥaṭṭār al-Manṣūrī (d. 738/1337–38, no. 7): Originally he was one of the mamluks of Nizām al-Dīn Aḥwād ibn Ḳaṭṭār (father of the amirs numbered 13 and 14 above) and was later assigned to the Burjīyāh 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, Wāfī, 10:17; Ibn Hajar, 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, ḽāmi’ al-Tawārikh (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 Burītāy, one of the sultan’s mamluks, and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Qutulūbars al-‘Ādīlī, a mamluk of Kitbughā, and revolted, but they were soon put down and executed (Baybars al-Manṣūrī, Zubdah, 330; idem, Tuhfah, 156; al-Nuwayrī, Nīḥyah, 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-Nāṣīr. He was sent as envoy to the Ilkhanids several times. Biography: Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 4:290.

19. Sulaṃish (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 Quṭqūṭū, 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.


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

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

25. Bahādūr al-Damūrdašī al-Nāṣīrī (d. 743/1343, no. 22): He was originally a mamluk of Tamurtāsh and was later assigned to al-Nāṣīr’s mamluk unit. He became amir of one hundred in the latter half of the third reign of al-Nāṣir. Biography: al-Šujāʿī, Tārikh, 252–53; al-Šafādī, Wāfī, 10:299; idem, Aʿyān, 2:62–63; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 2:36.


27. Ḥūsām al-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn Mūḥammad ibn al-Ghawrī (no. 23): He came to Egypt with the above Māḥmūd ibn Sharwīn and was appointed Hanafi qādī (al-Šujāʿī, Tārikh, 19). Biography: al-Šafādī, Wāfī, 3:22; Ibn Ḥajar, Durar, 3:430.