

(The impact of rebellions and revolutions on the sultans of the Bahri Mamluks and the position of historians on them)

Thanaa Rasheed Kamel *, Prof. Dr. Mohammad Karim AL-jumaily
Iraqi University, College of Education, History Department

Abstract

The era of the Maritime Mamluk state in Egypt witnessed a political, urban and scientific renaissance that placed them in the ranks of stable countries to be reckoned with among the existing states at the time. And all this thanks to the interest of their sultans in the necessity of the permanence of the state and its protection from abusers and those outside its authority.

As well as the good organization of its administrative and scientific affairs. However, there were some rebellions that came out against their kings that tried to destabilize the security of the country and Egyptian society. Their sultans confronted it and restored the prestige of the state to extend its control over Egyptian society.

Keywords: The Mamluks, Qutuz, Al-Zahir Baybars, Aybak, Muhammad bin Qalawun

Introduction

From the beginning of its era until its end, the Mamluk state was subjected to many internal and external wars and conflicts, and most of those conflicts and movements were internal rebellions at the expense of the throne and the assumption of the Sultanate. He has to face coups and plots against him, so the established rule of the Mamluks appeared, which is the rule for the strongest, as we mentioned earlier.

Talking about these rebellions stems from the historian's vision and interaction with the historical event, as well as talking about the philosophy of the movement or rebellion, meaning whether the cause of this movement or rebellion was political, religious or national. In addition, how did the sultans deal with these rebellions and the means they took to eliminate them, whether by confrontation or other methods.

The research was divided into two sections, the first section detailing three rebellions that broke out against the Sultanate. The second is also three rebellions that were clarified in the study with a conclusion of the most important results that emerged from the research, as well as a list of the most important sources and references that you used in the research.

The first topic

First: Historians' positions on the rebellions against Sultan Al-Mu'izz Aybak (648-655 AH).

Al-Mu'izz Aibak ascended the throne of the Mamluk Sultanate with the approval of the senior princes of Salihya, and the princes swore an oath of loyalty and obedience to him, but this matter did not appeal to the Ayyubid princes in the Levant, as it was the first movements against him by these princes.

The rebellion of the Ayyubid princes in the Levant (648 AH / 1250 AD):

The Ayyubid princes rejected the sultanate of al-Mu'izz, and their word came together to establish a sultan from the Bani Ayyub, so the choice fell on Musa al-Ashraf, who was a boy and did not exceed ten years of age, and al-Mu'izz Ibek mourned for him.

Taghri Bardi commented on this event, saying: ((We must have a sultan from Bani Ayyub who all agree to obey him.... They chose to raise a boy over them from Bani Ayyub, and the agreement was signed on the honorable king Muzaffar al-Din Musa bin Sultan al-Malik al-Kamel)). Also, some of the Maritime Mamluks had agreed with the Ayyubids on the Ayyubid era of rule, but they were not satisfied with the Sultanate of Ibek.

1466

* Corresponding Author

Al-Ayni described this event by saying: (The reason for this was that when they saw the occurrence of disagreement in the country, and the discontent of everyone on one side, and the occurrence of turmoil in the Egyptian lands, they said: It is necessary to establish a person from Bani Ayyub so that everyone gathers to obey him, and the dispute will rise, Their opinion agreed on the establishment of the honorable king Muzaffar al-Din Musa mentioned, and that the king al-Mu'izz, Izz al-Din, will be the one I will cry over. After two campaigns by the Ayyubid princes in the Levant against Al-Mu'izz Aibak, the Caliph Al-Mu'tasim Billah intervened and made peace between them, and this reconciliation was an official recognition of the Mamluk state by the Abbasid Caliphate.

The rebellion of the Mamluk princes (651 AH / 1253 AD):

The rebellion of the Mamluk princes against Al-Mu'izz was represented by Faris Al-Din Aqtay. Al-Muizz wanted to limit the influence he granted to Aqtay, after he had tyrannized Aktay to the extent that his companions began calling him the title of King Al-Jawad.

In the year (651 AH / 1253 AD) Aktay nominated himself for the Sultanate.

Al-Maqrizi mentioned in detail about that incident by saying: "In the year six hundred and fifty-two, in which the matter of the knight became aggravated, Aqtay al-Jamdar and the navy sided with him, so that when Aqtay rode from his house to the castle, he lit a group in front of him at his command and he did not deny that from them, and his companions used to take people's money and their women." And their children are in their hands, and no one is able to prevent them, and they used to enter the bathrooms and take women from them by force, and their harm was a lot. His opinion of him, so Aqtay rode unprepared and indifferent, when he entered through the castle door and was in the hall of pillars, the castle door was closed and prevented his kings from crossing with him, so a group of people came out in the corridor that had prepared to kill him: Qutuz, Bahadur and Sanjar Al-Ghanmi, so they attacked him with swords until he died). In this threat, al-Maqrizi shows the extent of the persistence of Aktay and his group, as they reached the limit of transgression against the people, as well as his transgression against al-Muizz Aibak, through his attempt to ascend the throne of the Sultanate.

As for Ibn Katheer, he described this incident by saying: (The knight Aqtay came from Upper Egypt and plundered the money of the Muslims and captured some of them, and with him was a group of marines who corrupted the land. His wife Shajarat Al-Durr reported that he had killed my dogs, so she gave him permission, and he worked on him until he killed him this year...).

Al-Yafi'i referred to that incident, saying: (When the Sultanate contacted King Al-Mu'izz, he reached out to me by showing signs and strutting, and kept riding the knee of a king, and married the daughter of the owner of the mother-in-law. Al-Muizz and his wife Shajarat al-Durr agreed upon him and arranged for him to be killed.

The tribe of Ibn al-Jawzi also indicated the reason for the killing of Aktay by saying: (Aktay died in Egypt, heinous killers, and he had been tyrannical, arrogant, arrogant and tyrannical, so that if he rode from his house in Cairo to the castle, he would kill a group and not turn to the king).

In light of the texts reported by historians about the rebellion of the knight Aktay, we find that they agree on the growing power of Aktay and his lack of respect for the personality of Sultan al-Muizz. In his powers granted and bypassing the Sultan.

Second: Historians' positions on the rebellion of Prince Qutuz against Sultan Al-Mansur Nur al-Din Ali bin Aybak: (655-657 AH).

We have previously referred to how Sultan Al-Mansur Nur al-Din Ali bin Aybak ascended the throne of the Sultanate after the murder of his father, by meeting the condolence princes on his assumption of the throne and appointing Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz Atabak for him. Then Qutuz took advantage of the young age of the sultan and tyrannized the sultanate and was able to depose Sultan Al-Mansur Nur al-Din Ali bin Aybak and replace him on the throne of the sultanate. Al-Yafi'i explained the reason for the rebellion of Al-Muzaffar Qutuz by saying: "In it, the boys of Al-Malik Al-Mu'izz arrested the son of his teacher, Al-Malik Al-Mansur.

Al-Suyuti also commented on this event, saying: (Then, Prince Seif al-Din Qutuz, the owner of al-Mu'izz, arrested al-Mansur and arrested him at the end of Dhul-Qa'dah in the year fifty-seven and took his place and was called the Victorious King after he gathered the princes, scholars, and notables, and they issued a fatwa that al-Mansur is not fit for a king, no Especially in this difficult time that needs a chivalrous and obedient king in order to establish jihad. From these two texts we conclude that Qutuz rebelled against Sultan al-Mansur and wanted to take possession of the sultanate for himself.

Third: Historians' positions on the rebellions against Sultan al-Zahir Baybars (658-676 AH).

1- The rebellion of Prince Alam al-Din Sanjar al-Halabi in Damascus in the year (658 AH / 1260 AD):

Sultan al-Muzaffar Qutuz, before his death, appointed Prince Alam al-Din Sanjar al-Halabi over Damascus. Upon his obedience and allegiance to him in the Sultanate, they answered him and called himself the Mujahid King.

Then he proceeded to make the railroad and the sermon in his name in Damascus and was able to gain independence in the Levant, and this may pose a great danger to the state, and re-separate the Levant from Egypt and this will weaken the Islamic state, in addition to that it represents a danger to the rule of Al-Zahir Baybars, so it was necessary for Al-Zahir to get rid of this movement Especially since the danger of the Mongols still exists, as well as the danger of the Crusaders present in the Levant who seek to return to the areas from which the Muslims expelled them, so Baybars prepared a campaign led by Prince Alaa Al-Din Al-Bandaqdar to the Levant to regain control over it, so he was able to arrest Prince Sanjar Al-Halabi and bring him To Cairo in the year (659 AH / 1261 AD).

Al-Nuwairi justified this by saying: (When he arrived, he arrested him at Qalaat al-Jabal, then released him after that and deposed him, and he continued to serve until he prepared him for the Procuratorate of Aleppo.

Abu al-Fida mentioned about Sanjar al-Halabi's revolution, saying: "Al-Malik al-Zahir Baybars, the ruler of Egypt, prepared a military, with Alaa al-Din al-Bandaqdar, who is the teacher of al-Malik al-Zahir, to fight Alam al-Din Sanjar al-Halabi, who had seized Damascus. They reached Damascus on the thirteenth of Safar of this year, and when The military of Egypt reached Damascus, Al-Halabi went out to fight them, and the owner of Hama and the owner of Homs were in charge of Damascus.

As for Al-Maqrizi, his text was more detailed. He mentioned that incident by saying: (Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir Baybars sent Prince Jamal al-Din al-Muhammadi to Damascus with one hundred thousand dirhams and walls and took off two thousand dinars in kind to win the people against the Mujahid Sanjar. Al-Qaymariya and left Damascus.... They called for the name of King Al-Zahir Baybars, so Damascus was shaken, and the Mujahid sent Singer to them with a military, but he was defeated, and he went out by himself and carried his companions, so they fled from him and then returned to him, so he went out and killed several of his group. Al-Bandaqdar - the professor of the Zahir King to the city and its king, and the people swear to the Zahir King and he did her order...).

We conclude from the previous texts that this rebellion posed a great danger to the state, because the state of the Bahri Mamluks will be divided into two parts, and there will be two sultans, one in Damascus and the other in Egypt, and this division will expose it to danger from the side of the Mongols and the Crusaders, and the second danger is a threat to the Sultanate of Al-Zahir Baybars and his rule of the Egyptian lands, and Al-Zahir was able to get rid of that rebellion.

2- The rebellion of Prince Aqosh al-Barali in Aleppo in the year 660 AH / 1262 AD:

After Al-Zahir managed to put an end to the rebellion of Sanjar al-Halabi, he became suspicious of Aqosh and decided to arrest him, but Aqosh fled to Aleppo and took control of it. Four months later, as soon as he felt the danger, he went to Al-Bireh and took it, then walked to Harran and resided there, approaching and moving away from Aleppo for fear of the apparent. Al-Zahir directed a campaign against him, but he fled and made the command of Aleppo Alaa Al-Din Al-Bandaqdari. Then Al-Birli returned to Al-Bireh and dispersed his friends to Aleppo, and when Al-Bunduqdari heard it, he fled to Hama and Al-Birli entered Aleppo, pretending to obey Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars.

And when he felt the defeat of his army and the loss of his battle with the Mongols, and he lost Aleppo and many of the areas that were under his control, he realized that his order was over, so he sent to Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars in Egypt asking him for safety and declaring his obedience to him. And when he arrived in Egypt, he honored him and gave him the best.

Ibn Katheer mentioned this incident by saying: (And the Zahir king became independent in all of Syria and Egypt, and things were described to him, and he was left to dispute except the Turk, so he went to Al-Bireh and seized it and disobeyed him there....

As for al-Dhahabi, he referred to it by saying: (At the beginning of it, al-Barali entered Aleppo again, and al-Bandaqdar left it, and al-Barali showed obedience to the sultan....). Al-Yunini mentioned it, saying: (Al-Malik al-Zahir took control of Damascus, Baalbek, al-Subiya and Aleppo and its businesses except for al-Bireh.

It seems that most historians passed on this event in passing, and perhaps one of the most important

reasons for this is the short duration of this movement, as well as the speed of its end at the hands of Al-Zahir Baybars, and even some historians did not find any words about it in their books.

The second topic

Fourth: Historians' positions on the rebellions against Sultan Al-Mansur Qalawun (678-689 AH).

After the overthrow of Sultan Al-Adil Salamish, whom the princes, notables and judges met to depose in the year (678 AH) after a rule that lasted for three months, he was replaced in the Sultanate by Saif Al-Din Qalawun and was given the title of King Al-Mansur.

1- Sanqar al-Ashqar's rebellion:

Prince Shams al-Din Sanqar al-Ashqar was the deputy of the Levant, and he was not satisfied with what happened with the ouster of Salamish and the Sultanate of Qalawun, but the people of Damascus declared their support for the Sultan.

Prince Sanqar al-Ashqar declared himself sultan over Damascus and became independent in the Levant from Egypt, and announced his movement against Sultan Qalawun. Khalkan when he supported the Ashqar Sanqar movement.

After a campaign led by al-Mansur Qalawun against Sanqar al-Ashqar, Sanqar's army began to withdraw and retreat, which caused the defeat of the Levant Army, and a number of princes asked for safety from the sultan. Sultan Qalawun to repel the danger of the Mongols and the retreat of Shams al-Din from his movement. Al-Nuwari referred to this movement by saying: (When Sultan Al-Mansur became king and settled in the Sultanate, it occurred to Shams Al-Din Sanqar Al-Ashqar to tyrannize the Sultanate of Al-Sham, and the matter insisted on what it was at the end of the Ayyubid state, so he gathered the princes who were with him, and deluded them that the news had reached him, That the Sultan Al-Malik Al-Mansur was killed while drinking wine and called them to obey him, and he swore them to himself, so they answered him and swore to him, and he was called the perfect king).

As for Al-Safadi, he mentioned that incident with some brevity, saying: (Sanqar Al-Ashqar traveled to Damascus as a representative there... So he went out and established himself in Damascus, and was called Al-Malik Al-Kamel). Ibn al-Wardi said: "On the twenty-fourth of Dhul-Qa'dah, Sanqur al-Ashqar took power in Damascus and swore an oath from him from the princes and soldiers, and was called the full king."

As indicated by Ibn Abi Al-Fadael: (The princes of Damascus agreed with Prince Shams al-Din Sanqar al-Ashqar that they own him, so he went to the hunt and swore to him, so when it was the eve of Friday, the fourteenth of Dhu al-Hijjah, Prince Shams al-Din will settle al-Shaqar from the house of happiness to the castle in Dust. The king and called the full king).

Perhaps Ibn Katheer mentioned this incident in more detail than his predecessors of historians, by saying: (Prince Shams al-Din Sanqar al-Ashqar rode from Dar al-Sa'dah, after the afternoon prayer, with a group of princes and soldiers on foot in front of him. The princes pledged allegiance to him over the sultanate, and he was called the full king, and he lived in the citadel, and the caller in Damascus called for that, and when it became Saturday, he summoned the judges, scholars, dignitaries and heads of the country to the mosque of Abu al-Darda' in the citadel, and they swore and swore to him by the rest of the princes and the soldiers....).

It is clear to us from the texts that historians reported on Sanqar al-Ashqar's rebellion, we find that he had justifications to get out of it, his resentment at the ouster of al-Adil Salamish, and al-Mansur took possession of the sultanate. He seeks to obtain the Sultanate through the Levant.

2- The Rebellion of the Zahiriyah Princes (680 AH / 1281 AD):

This rebellion appeared after the rebellion of Sanqar al-Ashqar and some of the Zahirite princes led him against his rule in the year (680 AH / 1281 AD), when he was on his way from the Levant to Egypt. Prince Badr al-Din Besri told him that Prince Seif al-Din Kondak al-Saqi and a group of Zahirite princes had agreed with the Mongols on His assassination, and the conspiring princes also informed the Crusaders in Acre about that and advised them not to make any agreement with the Sultan because he would be killed, but they refused to cooperate with them and warned Qalawun about them. And those with him from the apparent princes conspiring against him, and when these people realized that their movement had failed, they asked for pardon and safety from the Sultan, but he did not accept their request, and he ordered their execution, and also arrested the princes who doubted their loyalty to him and imprisoned them and a group of princes fled from him.

Ibn al-Wardi mentioned that incident by saying: (Then the year six hundred and eighty entered, and

Sultan al-Mansur Qalawun in al-Rawha', then marched to Baisan and captured a group of al-Zahiriya and executed Kondak).

As for Ibn Abi Al-Fadael, he referred to that incident by saying: (And from this year, Kondak was caught and drowned in the Tiberias sea, and the reason for this was that he agreed with a group of princes....Most of them were from the Tatars that if they reached Hamrat Beisan at the time of the battle with Sharia, they would kill the Sultan. There, Besri informed about it, and the sultan knew about it. Perhaps Al-Ayni detailed this incident in precise detail by saying: Its content is to protect yourself, for you have a group of princes who have agreed on you to kill you, and they wrote to the Franks and said to them: Do not reconcile with him, even if he gives you what he gave you, for we have cooked fate for him, and the matter remains slow...).

Fifth: Historians' positions on the rebellions against Sultan Al-Ashraf Khalil (689-693 AH).

As soon as Al-Ashraf ascended the throne of the Sultanate, the princes began plotting against him, so they incited Prince Husam Al-Din Tarantai, the deputy of the Al-Ashraf Sultanate, against the Sultan. Al-Ashraf took measures that would strengthen his authority and ward off any movement against him, and among those measures was the dismissal of Minister Singer Al-Shujai from the position of the ministry, as well as the dismissal of the Sultanate's deputy, Hassem Al-Din Tarantai, and appointed Prince Badr Al-Din Pedra in his place, so the hostility between the princes and Al-Ashraf Khalil increased. From Pedra and Husam Al-Din Lajeen on the killing of Al-Ashraf.

Al-Ayni explained to us the reason for the dismissal of Tarantai and that the princes were behind that. He mentioned that by saying: (The reason Tarantai touched lies that were in the souls latent, the trigger of power and grudges folded her guts on that, when she owned possession to seek revenge, and what Tarantai was on has been mentioned. From the sanctity and the mastery of his teacher and the enforcement of his order until the death of Al-Mansur, and when he took possession of his son after him, he took the measure against him and his entourage. who takes refuge in it...).

And when they had an opportunity to get rid of Al-Ashraf, they attacked him in a place called Hammamet for hunting. When the Sultan reached Trojeh, he sent Pedra to the princes who were against the Sultan.

It seems that Al-Asami's narration agrees with Rabati Al-Maqrizi and Ibn Ta'zi Bardi, as he confirmed this by saying: Cairo and Al-Ashraf and Amir Shekar remained repelling, so they surrounded him, and there was none with him except Shihab Al-Din bin Al-Ashhal, the aforementioned prince of Shekar. A sword, but in the middle of it was a rope taut, then the Emir Bahadur Ras Nuba came and the sword was inserted from below, and slashed with it to his throat and left him lying in the wilderness...).

Al-Maqrizi went on to describe that incident by saying: (When it was the time of the afternoon, Pedra sent someone to reveal the news of the Sultan. One of the princes, so he asked them, but they did not answer him, and they passed in their market until they reached the sultan who was alone. So Pedra started with the sword and struck him with his hand. Then he struck him again, slap his shoulder. So Prince Lajin came forward and said to him: O Pedra, who wants the king of Egypt and the Levant, this will be his blow. So the head of his nub came to him and put the sword in his back and leaned on it until he pulled it out of his throat..).

Ibn Taghri Bardi also mentioned it in more detail, saying: (And King Al-Ashraf drew from the King of Egypt undisputedly until he left Cairo and went to the lake to fish. And when he was in Batrujeh on Saturday the twelfth of Muharram at the time of the afternoon, his deputy, Prince Pedra, and with him a group of princes came to him. King Al-Ashraf had ordered him in the morning to go to the corridor and the soldiers towards Cairo, and Al-Ashraf and Amir (Shakara hunting, so they surrounded him and only Shihab Al-Din Ibn Al-Ashal Amir) remained with him. He resolved it, and Lajeen shouted at Pedra: Whoever wants this king will be his strike, so King Al-Ashraf fell from his horse and he did not have a sword, but in the middle of it was a taut rope, then the prince came with the head of a Nuba, and he inserted the sword from below and slashed it to his throat, and they left him lying in the wilderness.).

Sixth: Historians' positions on the rebellions against Sultan Al-Nasir Muhammad bin Qalawun (693-741 AH).

1- Rebellion of Kitbugha, Deputy of the Sultanate (694 AH / 1294 AD):

Sultan Al-Nasir Muhammad bin Qalawun assumed the throne of the Sultanate after the murder of his brother Al-Ashraf. His sultanate passed through three successive stages until, in the third, he was able to establish the pillars of his rule.

During his first reign, Zain al-Din Katbugha was appointed deputy of the sultanate. Kittbugha adopted

the order to overthrow the sultan with the help of Alamuddin Sanjar al-Shujai and Husam al-Din Lajin Atabek al-Askar, despite their meeting to depose the young sultan, but they differed among themselves over the assumption of the sultanate, each of them wants to be the sultan. The dispute aggravated among them, especially between Katbugha and al-Shuja'i. Indeed, in the year 693 AH / 1293 AD, Katbugha was able to besiege al-Shuja'i in the citadel and kill him. So the young Sultan was deposed and Katbugha ascended the throne of the Sultanate in the year (694 AH / 1294 AD) and appointed Lajeen as the deputy of the sultanate.

Abu al-Feda described this incident by saying: "Prince Zain al-Din Katbugha al-Mansouri sat on the bed of the kingdom, and called himself the just king Zain al-Din Katbugha and took the people to swear an oath to that, and he addressed him in Egypt and the Levant. about people...).

As for Al-Dhahabi, he mentioned the Sultanate of Katbugha by saying: (On the eleventh of Muharram, Prince Rukn ad-Din Katbugha the Turk, and Al-Mughal Al-Mansouri, who was called the just king, swore to him by the princes in Egypt and the Levant).

Al-Yafi'i mentioned him very briefly, saying: (The just king, Katbugha Al-Mansouri, ruled Egypt and the Levant, and he is about fifty years old...), he was only a transmitter.

Ibn Katheer went on to describe him, saying: (And the Emir Katbugha became on the eleventh of Muharram, so he sat on the bed of the kingdom, and King Al-Nasir Muhammad bin Al-Mansour deposed him and kept him in his family's house, and that he did not leave him).

As for Al-Maqrizi, he mentioned how Katbugha took over the throne of the Sultanate by saying: (When the sedition of the Mamluks was taking place that morning in the courthouse, he gathered the princes and said to them: The law of the kingdom has been broken and the sanctity is not fulfilled in the Sultanate of Al-Nasir because of his young age. that...).

The self-made also mentioned the tyranny of Katbugha and his monopoly over the sultanate, saying: (And he tyrannized Katbugha by the order of the kingdom due to the young age of the sultan, then it seemed to him to depose him and rule in his stead, so he agreed with the senior princes on that, so they agreed with him and deposed Nasser on the twenty-first of Muharram in the year six hundred and ninety-four, and they ruled Katbugha and called him just).

Historian Ali Ibrahim Hassan described him in his book: (Katbugha was a bad luck. After his rule, the country was hit by high prices and epidemics, so that people were pessimistic about his sultanate and wished for his demise. So severe was the drought that hit the country that it ran out of the sultan's treasuries and animal fodder, and it was the most important factors that affected the country. The country decreased the water of the Nile in the year (694 AH), so drought spread over most of the lands, and agricultural crops decreased and did not meet the country's needs).

2- Husam al-Din Lajin's rebellion in 696AH/1296AD:

After Katbugha assumed the throne, he received the princes and the Mongol soldiers fleeing to Egypt, and brought them close to him, which angered the princes and the Mamluk soldiers against his policy, so Lajeen plotted a plot to kill him, but he did not succeed. / 1296 AD) and was called King Al-Mansur, and he considered Al-Nasir Muhammad an obstacle in his path and he had to get rid of it so that he could preserve his throne, especially since the people supported the rule of Al-Nasir and considered him the owner of the legitimate right.

Lajeen sent Al-Nasir to Karak in the year (696 AH / 1296 AD) after he convinced Al-Nasir that he would be his deputy and would hand him over the sultanate after he reached the age of majority. The discontent of the princes and the soldiers against him increased when he issued an order to work with the rock system, and he was called the Hasami rock after him, so two of his close royal mamluks were able to kill him and his deputy, Menkotamer, and paved the way for the return of Al-Nasir Muhammad. He was fourteen years old.

Abu al-Fida went on to mention Lajeen by saying: (Husam al-Din Lajin, nicknamed King Al-Mansur, sent Mawlana Sultan Al-Nasir from the hall in which he was in the Citadel of the Mountain, to Karak. As for Al-Dhahabi, he mentioned it very briefly, saying: (As for Lajin, he was driven into the treasuries and rode in the trample of the king, and the armies were in front of him, and they pledged allegiance to him, and two did not swear against him).

And Ibn Kathir mentioned him by saying: (When the treasury arrived and the armies went to the Egyptian lands, he entered it in great pomp.).

3- Seif al-Din Salar's rebellion in the year (708 AH / 1208 AD):

After Al-Nasir ascended the throne of the Sultanate, he appointed Seif Al-Din Salar as deputy of the

Sultanate and Prince Rukn Al-Din Baybars Al-Jashankir as the administrator. Going to Hajj in order to avoid a military confrontation with the princes.

Al-Nasir went to Karak in the year (708 AH / 1308 AD) with a number of his mamluks, then wrote to the princes that he had abandoned the sultanate and resided in Karak. Baybars took over the Sultanate and gave the castle of Karak to Al-Nasir, thinking that Al-Nasir Muhammad would be satisfied with it. Correspondence continued between Nasser and the princes of the Levant, and these princes offered support and loyalty to Nasser and supported him, so Baybars learned of these correspondences and threatened Nasser and threatened him if he did not stop writing to the princes, his fate is exile to Constantinople.

After Nasser felt that confrontation was necessary, he began to write to the princes of Levant, so these princes took upon themselves the support of Nasser so that he could return to the throne of his sultanate, in addition to that, the majority of the princes and the Sultanate Mamluks left Cairo and went to King Nasser in Karak, determined that he should return to the throne of the Sultanate.

So Al-Nasir and those with him of the princes moved from Karak in the year (709 AH / 1309 AD), and they went to the Castle of the Mountain, so Al-Nasir ascended to it and settled on his throne in the same year, and thus the third Sultanate of Al-Nasir began.

Abu Al-Fida mentioned the departure of Sultan Al-Nasir Muhammad to Karak and his abandonment of the throne of the Sultanate by saying: A means to the station in Karak, and the reason for that was the takeover of the kingdom by Salar and Baybars al-Jashankir, and their tyranny in matters, and exceeding the limit alone with money, commands and prohibitions, and they did not leave our master the Sultan except the name, despite what was from them of besieging our master the Sultan in the castle, and other things that do not shrink the soul From it, Mawlana the Sultan gave his nose, may God perpetuate his kingdom from that, and he left the Egyptian lands and settled in Karak).

He also mentioned the Sultanate of Baibars by saying: (Baybars rode the Jashankir from his house with the emblem of the Sultanate to the Great Iwan at the Castle of the Mountain, and sat on the king's bed on the twenty-third Saturday of Shawwal.

As for al-Yafi'i, he referred to that rebellion by saying: (The Sultan went to Karak to perform Hajj and entered it, and sent its deputy, Jamal al-Din to Egypt, and asceticism in his possessions to stone him in it, and brandishing himself Baybars al-Jashankir, authorizing and nicknamed Muzaffar. Al-Nasir's book came from Karak, that he did not entrust anyone, and he chose cessation and isolation in Karak, and that he has a pledge of allegiance to them, and he ordered them to obey whoever takes over, on the condition of agreement and what is in it permit to isolate himself).

Ibn Kathir also mentioned it, saying: (When King Al-Nasir settled in Karak and decided to reside there, he wrote a letter to the Egyptian lands that included isolating himself from the kingdom, so he proved this to the judges in Egypt, then it was executed on the judges of Levant and the pledge of allegiance to Prince Rukn Al-Din Baybars Al-Jashankir in the Sultanate, on the twenty-third From Shawwal on Saturday after the afternoon, in the house of Prince Seif al-Din Salar, the notables of the state from the princes and others gathered and pledged allegiance to him to the victorious king).

Al-Asami went on to mention him by saying: (The owner of Salar and the professor of his house, Baybars Al-Jashankir, denied him, and that turmoil lasted between them until he appeared in Ramadan in the year seven hundred and eighty-eighth, heading to the Hijaz and leaving Cairo and heading to Karak, dissatisfied with them and turning away from the king of Egypt....., So the princes agreed on the sultanate of Baybars al-Jashankir and gave him authority and called him al-Malik al-Muzaffar....).

Conclusion

The search yielded several results, which are summarized as follows:

- 1- The rebellions that broke out against the Mamluks in time or place have one motive, which is to reach the Sultanate.
- 2- All those who made these rebellions were from the princes or from the entourage of the sultans.
- 3- The danger of these rebellions due to the unstable conditions of the country and the aspiration of the Mongols and the Crusaders to seize them.
- 4- Despite the seriousness of these rebellions, they did not reach their goal because the Mamluk sultans were able to eliminate them.

References

1. Ibn Iyas, Muhammad bin Ahmad al-Hanafi (died: 930 AH).
2. Badaa'i Al-Zohour fi Waqa'iq Al-Daur, Tah, Muhammad Mustafa, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabiya, Cairo.
3. Ibn Taghri Bardi, Abu al-Mahasin Jamal al-Din Yusuf bin Abdullah (died: 874 AH).
4. The shining stars in the kings of Egypt and Cairo, vol., Dar al-Kutub, Egypt, vol.
5. Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani, Abu Al-Fadl Ahmed bin Ali (d.: 852 AH).
6. The pearls inherent in the notables of the eighth century, T., Muhammad Abd al-Ma'in Khan, 2nd Edition, Council of the Ottoman House of Knowledge, Hyderabad, India, 1972 AD.
7. Al-Hamawi, Shihab Al-Din Abu Abdullah Yaqt Al-Roumi, (T.: 626 AH).
8. Dictionary of Countries, 2nd Edition, Dar Sader, Beirut, 1995 AD.
9. The tribe of Ibn al-Jawzi, Shams al-Din Yusuf bin Qazaghali (died: 654 AH).
10. The Mirror of Time in the History of Notables, Tahih and Commentary, Ibrahim Al-Zaybak, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Resala Al-Ilmiyya, Damascus, 2013 AD.
11. Al-Suyuti, Jalal Al-Din Abdul Rahman bin Muhammad bin Othman (T.: 911 AH).
12. Hassan Al-Mahazar fi Akhbar Egypt and Cairo, Tah, Khalil Al-Mansour, I 1, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1997.
13. Ibn Shaddad, Izz al-Din Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Ibrahim al-Halabi (died: 684 AH).
14. The dangerous relationships in the remembrance of the princes of the Levant and the Jazira, Teh, Yahya Abrah, Bt, Dar Al Fikr Al Contemporary, Beirut, 1998 AD.
15. Al-Safadi, Al-Hassan bin Abi Muhammad Abdullah Al-Hashimi Al-Abbasi (T.: 717 A.H.).
16. The picnic of the owner and the owned in a brief biography of the ruler of Egypt from the Kings, Tah, Omar Abdel Salam Tadmuri, 1st edition, Al-Masaba Al-Asriya, Beirut, 2003 AD.
17. Al-Ainy, Mahmoud bin Ahmed Al-Ghaithabi (died: 855 AH).
18. Contract of Juman in the History of the People of Time, T., Muhammad Muhammad Amin, bt, The Egyptian General Book Organization, Cairo, 1987 AD.
19. Abu al-Fida, the supportive king Imad al-Din Ismail bin Ali (d. 732 AH).
20. Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar Al-Bishr, 1st Edition, Al-Hussainiya Egyptian Press, Cairo, Bt.
21. Al-Maqrizi, Ahmed bin Ali bin Abdul Qadir, Taqi Al-Din Abu Al-Abbas Al-Husseini Al-Obaidi (d. 845 AH).
22. Behavior to Know the Countries of Kings, Tah, Muhammad Abdel Qader Atta, I 1, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1997 AD.
23. Ibn al-Wardi, Omar bin Muzaffar bin Omar bin Abi Al-Fawares (died: 749 AH).
24. Tarikh Ibn al-Wardi, i 1, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, Beirut - Lebanon, 1996 AD.
25. Al-Yafi'i, Abu Muhammad Afif Al-Din Abdullah bin Asaad bin Ali bin Suleiman (T.: 768 AH).
26. The Mirror of Heaven and the Lesson of Vigilance in Knowing What Is Considered to Be a Time Incident, Tah, Khalil Al-Mansour, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyya, Beirut, 1997 AD.
27. Recent references:
28. Hassan, Ali Ibrahim.
29. History of the Maritime Mamluks and in the era of Nasser Muhammad in particular, 2nd floor, Egyptian Renaissance Library, Cairo, b.
30. Dahman, Mohamed Ahmed.
31. A Dictionary of Historical Words in the Mamluk Era, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Fikr, Damascus, 1990 AD.
32. Al-Abadi, Ahmed Mukhtar.
33. On the Ayyubid and Mamluk history, bt., University Youth Foundation, Alexandria.